

# COP290 Maze-Simulation

Aniket Gupta  
2019CS10327

Aayush Goyal  
2019CS10452

May 2021

## 1 Minimum Spanning Tree

### 1.1

### 1.2

## 2 Huffman Encoding

### 2.1

### 2.2

Since these are 16 bit characters then there are a total of  $2^{16}$  characters that are possible. We will denote  $2^{16}$  by  $n$ . Let the frequencies of them be  $f_1, f_2, \dots, f_n$ , and they are in increasing order. It is given that  $f_n < 2 \cdot f_1$ .

Now let's say we consider any numbers from them. Let them be  $f_i$  and  $f_j$ .

Claim 1:  $f_i + f_j \leq f_n$  (and hence greater than every other frequency). Proof of claim:  $f_i \leq f_1$  and  $f_j \leq f_1$  and thus  $f_i + f_j \leq 2 \cdot f_1$ . Also it is given that  $f_n \leq 2 \cdot f_1$ , thus this directly proves that  $f_i + f_j \leq f_n$ .

Now in Huffman encoding we choose the 2 vertices with minimum frequency (say  $f_1$  and  $f_2$ ) and combine them. Then place a node with value  $f_1 + f_2$  and then recursively solve the problem further. The symbols that will be chosen in the next iteration will be  $f_3$  and  $f_4$ , since  $f_4 = f_5 = f_n \leq f_1 + f_2$ . And hence we will join  $f_3$  and  $f_4$  from the set and replace with a node of value  $f_1 + f_2$ . This will go on and ultimately we will end with these frequencies in the set:  $f_1 + f_2, f_3 + f_4, f_5 + f_6 \dots f_{n-1} + f_n$ . Thus all of the symbols will be combined.

Claim 2: let  $f$  be a set of numbers of size  $n$ , here  $n$  is a power of 2. Let the numbers be  $f_1, f_2, f_3, f_4 \dots f_{n-1}, f_n$ . If we make another set  $ff$  from it such that it is  $f_1 + f_2, f_3 + f_4, \dots, f_{n-1} + f_n$ , then it is of half the size and also follows the property that maximum element is less than twice the minimum element.

Proof of Claim: The minimum element of  $ff$  set is  $f_1 + f_2$  and the maximum element is  $f_{n-1} + f_n$ . Now we know that  $f_n \leq 2 \cdot f_1$  and  $f_{n-1} \leq 2 \cdot f_1$  and since  $f_1 \leq f_2$  we can also write that  $f_{n-1} \leq 2 \cdot f_2$ . Adding both the inequalities we get  $f_n + f_{n-1} \leq 2 \cdot (f_1 + f_2)$ .

Thus for the set  $ff$  formed in the above mentioned way, the maximum is less than twice of the smallest element.

Thus the same pattern will form here and the after combining 2 of them pairwise we will end up nodes of frequency  $ff_1 + ff_2, ff_3 + ff_4, \dots, ff_{\frac{n}{4}-1} + ff_{\frac{n}{4}}$

### 3 Graduation Party of Alice

#### 3.1

The following problem can be represented as a graph. With the  $n$  people as the nodes of the graph and there is an edge between 2 nodes if the 1 people know each other. Once the graph is ready, we can make an adjacency list for the same in  $O(m)$  time.  $n$  -> no. of people that are invited to the party and  $m$  be the no. of pairs who know each other (hence the number of edges in the graph will be  $m$ ).

We can maintain an array which will store the degree of each vertex and this can be done in  $O(n+m)$  time using DFS.

Claim 1: Any node in the graph which has a degree less than 5 cannot be invited to the party.

Now we will keep removing the nodes of the graph which have a degree of less than 5. Notice that as we remove a vertex the degree of its neighboring vertices will also change and we will update their degrees. Removing a node can cause the reduction in degree of other nodes. If the degree of those vertices fall below 5 then we can't invite them to the party either and we will have to remove them as well. Now this process will continue until every vertex in the graph has a degree more than 4.

Let the current number of nodes in the graph be  $n'$ . Now consider a node whose degree is more than  $n'-6$ . Then that person doesn't know less than 5 people and we must do something in this case.

Claim 2: Let  $V$  be the current set of nodes and  $n'$  be the size of  $V$  that is  $|V|$ . Any vertex whose degree is more than  $n'-6$  cannot be the part of our final optimal solution.

Proof of Claim: We will show that there is no final optimal solution in which it doesn't know at least 5 people of all the invited people. Consider the current state of node set  $V$ . We know that the final set which will be invited to the party is a subset of the current  $V$ . Let the node with degree more than  $n'-6$  be  $v_0$ . Now if any vertex is removed from  $V$  (which is not  $v_0$ ) then there are 2 possible cases. Either it is a neighbour of  $v_0$ , that is it knows  $v_0$ , or it is not a neighbour of  $v_0$ , it doesn't know  $v_0$ . If it doesn't know  $v_0$  then removing it from  $V$  only reduces the no. of people  $v_0$  doesn't know. If we remove any node which is the neighbor of  $v_0$ , then removing them doesn't change the number of people  $v_0$  doesn't know. Hence the only possibility is we remove the  $v_0$ .

Thus any vertex with degree more than  $n'-6$  cannot be the part of our final solution and it must be removed from  $V$ .

Now we know that all the vertices with degree less than 5 must be removed and all the vertices with degree more than  $n'-6$  should also be removed and this process must continue until all the nodes left in the final  $V$  has a degree more than 4 and less than  $n'-6$ .

Once such a  $V$  is achieved then we can show that all of these people can be invited to the party. Consider any node from the set  $V$ , let it be  $v_1$ . Then  $v_1$  has a degree of more than 4 and thus it has at least 5 neighbors and thus knows at least 5 people who will come to the party. Also its degree is less than  $n'-6$  which means there are at least 5 vertices that are not connected to  $v_1$ . Hence there are at least 5 whom  $v_1$  doesn't know. Hence all of them can be invited to the party.

The problem can be solved in  $O(m \log m)$  time using priority queue. The Pseudo code for it is written below. We can initially insert all the nodes in the Priority queue. Whenever any node is found to have a degree of less than 5 or more than  $n'-6$ , then it is removed and marked so.

#### 3.2

Consider all of them are standing in a sorted order of their ages. Let us call them  $a_1, a_2, a_3, a_4, \dots, a_n$ . Thus we know that  $\text{age}[a_1] \leq \text{age}[a_2] \leq \text{age}[a_3] \dots \leq \text{age}[a_n]$ . Now consider the table on which  $a_1$  is sitting and let this table be  $T$ .

Claim 1: If  $a_k$  is sitting on  $T$  in optimal arrangement and there exists a person (say  $a_1$ ) with age less than  $a_k$  not sitting on  $T$  (say they are sitting on table  $T_1$ ), then there also exists an optimal solution in which  $a_k$  is sitting in table  $T_1$  and  $a_i$  is sitting on table  $T$ .

Proof of claim: Let's say the person with age less than that of  $a_k$  is  $a_i$ ,  $a_k$  is a person sitting on the table and  $a_i$  is not sitting on the table  $a_k$ . Let's say  $a_i$  was on the table  $T_1$ . We can exchange the position of  $a_i$  and  $a_k$  in this case. Because:  $a_i$  can be placed on table of  $a_1$  since  $\text{age}[a_i] - \text{age}[a_0] \leq \text{age}[a_k] - \text{age}[a_0]$ . And we can also place  $a_i$  in place of  $a_k$  of  $a_i$  since the least age of a member in that is greater than or equal to  $\text{age}[a_1]$  and thus the least upper bound possible is  $\text{age}[a_1] + 9$  and we know that since  $a_k$  was sitting on  $T$  so  $\text{age}[a_k] \leq \text{age}[a_1] + 9$ . Thus we can always exchange  $a_i$  and  $a_k$ . Keeping  $a_k$  in the other table can provide more flexibility on the other table.

Now using the above we can place  $S = a_1, a_2, a_3 \dots, a_m$  people on the first table, here  $m \leq 10$  and  $\text{age}[a_m] - \text{age}[a_1] \leq 10$ .  $\text{age}[a_1] \leq \text{age}[a_2] \leq \text{age}[a_3] \dots \leq \text{age}[a_m]$ . If  $m \leq 10$  then either we don't have enough number of people or  $\text{age}[a_{m+1}] - \text{age}[a_1] \leq 10$ .

Let  $J$  be the set of all the people and  $S$  be the set that we have placed. Now define  $J^* = J - S$ .

Claim 2:  $\text{opt}(J) = \text{opt}(J^*) + 1$ ,  $\text{opt}(J)$  is the minimum number seats required to arrange the set of people  $J$  on tables under the required constraints.

Proof of Claim: We will show that both the inequalities:  $\text{opt}(J) \leq \text{opt}(J^*) + 1$  and  $\text{opt}(J) \geq \text{opt}(J^*) + 1$  hold. ... (i)

Proof of (i): After placing  $S$  on 1 table we are left with  $J^*$  people and  $\text{opt}(J^*)$  will place all of them on some table. And hence there exists one arrangement in which the arrangement can be done in  $\text{opt}(J^*) + 1$  no. of tables. Thus  $\text{opt}(J) \leq \text{opt}(J^*) + 1$

Proof of (ii): Let  $A$  be the optimal arrangement of  $J$  in which all the people in set  $S$  are placed on a single table and only they can be seated on that table (say table  $T$ ). Now none of the people from  $J^*$  can be seated on that table  $T$  since either  $T$  is full or their age is more than  $\text{age}[a_1] + 9$ . Thus the  $A - T$  can be used to place all of the members of  $J^*$ . Thus  $J^*$  members can be placed using  $\text{opt}(J) - 1$  tables. Hence one solution of size  $\text{opt}(J) - 1$  exists for  $J^*$ . This shows that  $\text{opt}(J^*) \leq \text{opt}(J) - 1$ .

hence from both (i) and (ii) we have,  $\text{opt}(J) = \text{opt}(J^*) + 1$ .

Now for calculating the final we can maintain a freq array.  $\text{freq}[i]$  denotes the number of people with age  $i + 10$ . Now we can start placing them on tables in increasing order as we have discussed above, by recursively dividing the problem into a smaller sub-problem.