# Lab Report Knapsack

Simon Jönsson, Fanny Karelius 2017-10-11

# Introduction

In this lab we implement different solutions for the **0/1-knapsack**- and **unbounded knapsack** problem. We have implemented both a parallel and non-parallel brute force solution, a dynamic programming solution and a solution using the greedy heuristic. We have documented the runtimes and the profiling of each solution.

# Runtime of codes

# Bruteforce knapsack solution

#### Parallel

```
system.time(brute_force_knapsack(x = knapsack_objects[1:20,], W = 3500, parallel=FALSE))

## user system elapsed
## 30.299  1.315  31.823

Non-parallel

system.time(brute_force_knapsack(x = knapsack_objects[1:20,], W = 3500, parallel=FALSE))

## user system elapsed
## 19.109  1.474  20.663
```

# Dynamic knapsack solution

```
system.time(knapsack_dynamic(x = knapsack_objects[1:500,], W = 3500))
## user system elapsed
## 5.584 0.234 5.843
```

# Greedy knapsack solution

```
system.time(greedy_knapsack(x = knapsack_objects[1:1000000,], W = 3500))

## user system elapsed
## 1.371 0.196 1.573
```

# **Profiling**

Bruteforce knapsack solution

Parallel

```
lineprof(brute_force_knapsack(x = knapsack_objects[1:12,], W = 3500, parallel=TRUE))
## Reducing depth to 2 (from 16)
##
       time alloc release dups
                                                                        ref
## 1
      0.005 2.647
                                                     c("matrix", "unlist")
                        0
                           161
## 2
     0.001 0.191
                        0
                             0
                                                                   "matrix"
                                               c("::", "getExportedValue")
## 3 0.004 1.070
                        Λ
                           467
     0.001 0.133
                           191
                                             c("parallel::mclapply", "::")
     0.001 0.087
## 5
                        0
                             5
                                                       "parallel::mclapply"
                            49
                                         c("parallel::mclapply", "lapply")
## 6
     0.003 0.051
                        0
## 7
     0.001 0.019
                            11
                                                       "parallel::mclapply"
                        0
## 8 0.001 0.035
                        0
                             1 c("parallel::mclapply", "lazyLoadDBfetch")
                                 c("parallel::mclapply", "selectChildren")
## 9 0.001 0.017
                        0
                             8
## 10 0.008 0.485
                        0
                            11
                                        c("parallel::mclapply", "cleanup")
## 11 0.004 2.058
                                                     c("lapply", "Filter")
                        0
                            13
## 12 0.001 0.000
                        0
                             9
                                                        c("lapply", "FUN")
##
                                      src
## 1
     matrix/unlist
## 2
     matrix
## 3
     ::/getExportedValue
     parallel::mclapply/::
## 4
## 5
     parallel::mclapply
## 6
     parallel::mclapply/lapply
## 7
     parallel::mclapply
     parallel::mclapply/lazyLoadDBfetch
     parallel::mclapply/selectChildren
## 10 parallel::mclapply/cleanup
## 11 lapply/Filter
## 12 lapply/FUN
```

Here we see that apart from allocation, all segments of the code are in similar timesteps - quite tricky to identify bottlenecks. However one could look over using some primitive functions instead of using lapply to find the row with near-optimal value. A suggestions might be using max().

### Non-parallel

```
lineprof(brute_force_knapsack(x = knapsack_objects[1:12,], W = 3500, parallel=FALSE))
```

```
time alloc release dups
## 1 0.004 2.694
                          161 c("matrix", "unlist") matrix/unlist
                       0
                       0
## 2 0.001 1.709
                             0
                                            "matrix" matrix
                                   c("apply", "FUN") apply/FUN
## 3 0.003 2.292
                       0 3458
                                             "apply" apply
## 4 0.001 0.772
                       0
                          849
                       0 7837
                                   c("apply", "FUN") apply/FUN
## 5 0.009 6.435
```

Here we see that the apply function and the unlist function creates alot of allocation. Creating a solution which does not use unlist but instead without pre-allocation might help. Also the apply function might be exchanged with using a  $\max()$  primitive. Generating the matrix with given parameters: weight and val one could use  $\max$  to find the maximum val given that the weight  $\leq W$ .

# Dynamic knapsack solution

```
lineprof(knapsack_dynamic(x = knapsack_objects[1:100,], W = 3500))
```

#### ## Reducing depth to 2 (from 66) ## time alloc release dups ref ## 1 0.011 9.748 0 4879 c("compiler:::tryCmpfun", "tryCatch") ## 2 0.206 170.571 0 245 c("matrix", "replicate") ## 3 0.002 0.002 0 "matrix" ## 4 0.007 0 6629 3.931 character(0) 0.002 ## 5 0.715 0 2395 "max" ## 6 0.002 0 1025 0.701 character(0) ## 7 0.001 0 997 0.337 "max" ## 8 0.001 0 694 0.251 character(0) ## 9 0.001 0.618 0 517 "max" ## 10 0.002 0 2478 1.035 character(0) ## 11 0.001 0.345 0 939 "max" ## 12 0.002 0.869 0 1029 character(0) ## 13 0.001 0 1478 "max" 0.598 ## 14 0.002 0.979 0 2367 character(0) ## 15 0.001 0 891 0.408 "max" ## 16 0.001 0.686 0 843 character(0) ## 17 0.002 0.737 0 2814 "max" ## 18 0.002 1.412 0 1608 character(0) ## 19 0.002 0 2554 1.030 "max" ## 20 0.001 0 1014 0.690 character(0) ## 21 0.002 0.869 0 1790 "max" ## 22 0.003 1.410 0 3256 character(0) ## 23 0.005 0 6000 3.017 "max" character(0) ## 24 0.001 0.601 0 1322 ## 25 0.001 0 1243 0.558 "max" ## 26 0.001 0.503 0 1152 character(0) ## 27 0.002 0.432 0 1705 "max" ## 28 0.003 0 2276 1.173 character(0) ## 29 0.001 0.380 374 "max" ## 30 0.002 1.083 0 1864 character(0) ## 31 0.001 0.589 0 1158 "max" ## 32 0.001 0.581 0 1218 character(0) ## 33 0.002 0.776 0 1510 "max" ## 34 0.002 0 1732 0.528 character(0) ## 35 0.001 0 652 0.167 "max" ## 36 0.001 343 0.497 0 character(0) ## 37 0.001 0 1026 0.638 "max" ## 38 0.003 1.411 0 2956 character(0) ## 39 0.002 1.072 0 2677 "max" ## 40 0.001 815 0.714 0 character(0) ## 41 0.003 1.559 0 3754 "max" ## 42 0.001 0 940 0.687 character(0) ## 43 0.001 0.628 0 1421 "max" ## 44 0.001 0.554 0 1299 character(0) ## 45 0.002 0 2545 1.193 "max" ## 46 0.001 0.477 0 1064 character(0) "max" ## 47 0.002 0.593 0 1212 ## 48 0.001 0.364 996 character(0) ## 49 0.002 0 2040 1.038 "max"

character(0)

"max"

## 50 0.002

## 51 0.001

1.224

0.336

0 1910

0 1478

```
## 52 0.004
                           0 4428
                                                             character(0)
              2.463
## 53 0.002
              1.292
                           0 2783
                                                                    "max"
## 54 0.001
                           0 1241
              0.667
                                                             character(0)
## 55 0.004
              2.284
                           0 4834
                                                                    "max"
## 56 0.001
              0.702
                           0 1264
                                                             character(0)
## 57 0.002
              1.208
                           0 2605
                                                                    "max"
## 58 0.001
              0.671
                           0 1342
                                                             character(0)
## 59 0.002
                           0 2649
                                                                    "max"
              1.134
## 60 0.001
              0.497
                           0 1083
                                                             character(0)
## 61 0.005
              2.700
                           0 5633
                                                                    "max"
## 62 0.001
              0.592
                           0 974
                                                             character(0)
## 63 0.002
                           0 2559
                                                                    "max"
              1.200
## 64 0.002
                           0 2530
                                                             character(0)
              1.150
## 65 0.003
                           0 2951
                                                                    "max"
              1.479
## 66 0.002
              0.807
                           0 2386
                                                             character(0)
## 67 0.005
              2.989
                           0 5599
                                                                    "max"
## 68 0.002
              1.138
                           0 2381
                                                             character(0)
## 69 0.001
                           0 925
              0.731
                                                                    "max"
## 70 0.001
              0.626
                           0 1509
                                                             character(0)
## 71 0.003
                           0 3295
              1.605
                                                                    "max"
## 72 0.001
              0.341
                           0 1317
                                                             character(0)
## 73 0.004
              2.171
                           0 4245
                                                                    "max"
## 74 0.001
                           0 943
              0.443
                                                             character(0)
## 75 0.001
              0.000
                              915
                                                                    "max"
##
                                 src
## 1 compiler:::tryCmpfun/tryCatch
## 2
      matrix/replicate
## 3
      matrix
## 4
## 5
      max
## 6
## 7
      max
## 8
## 9
      max
## 10
## 11 max
## 12
## 13 max
## 14
## 15 max
## 16
## 17 max
## 18
## 19 max
## 20
## 21 max
## 22
## 23 max
## 24
## 25 max
## 26
## 27 max
## 28
## 29 max
```

```
## 30
## 31 max
## 32
## 33 max
## 34
## 35 max
## 36
## 37 max
## 38
## 39 max
## 40
## 41 max
## 42
## 43 max
## 44
## 45 max
## 46
## 47 max
## 48
## 49 max
## 50
## 51 max
## 52
## 53 max
## 54
## 55 max
## 56
## 57 max
## 58
## 59 max
## 60
## 61 max
## 62
## 63 max
## 64
## 65 max
## 66
## 67 max
## 68
## 69 max
## 70
## 71 max
## 72
## 73 max
## 74
## 75 max
```

Here we identify that the segment in the code that takes most time to run is the replicate function. This could be handled by some other primitive, or maybe the pre-allocation can be circumvented by having dynamic size of the vector.

# Greedy knapsack solution

```
lineprof(greedy_knapsack(x = knapsack_objects[1:20000,], W = 3500))
## Reducing depth to 2 (from 37)
      time alloc release dups
##
## 1 0.002 2.902
                       0 3038 c("compiler:::tryCmpfun", "tryCatch")
## 2 0.008 1.406
                       0 218
                                    c("stopifnot", "is.data.frame")
## 3 0.004 9.748
                       0
                                            c("replicate", "sapply")
                           44
## 4 0.001 0.336
                       0
                            5
                                                             "order"
## 5 0.003 0.622
                       0
                           48
                                                        character(0)
##
                                src
## 1 compiler:::tryCmpfun/tryCatch
## 2 stopifnot/is.data.frame
## 3 replicate/sapply
## 4 order
## 5
```

# Parallelizing brute force knapsack

Not alot to improve on here.

The performance that could be gained is non-existent since the lapply used doesn't contain any calculations. So there is little to no sequential computations that are done. If we had a computationally heavy lapply segment then we could gain an decrease in computation time.