500509944

COMP2123 Assignment 4

1. We can prove the correctness of this algorithm by first showing that our algorithm maintains the invariant that T is always a spanning binary tree (SBT) for a number of vertices unless it is not possible. Now initially, T is empty, and our invariant trivially holds. Assuming that T is a SBT for n iterations/vertices, we can observe that our invariant still holds on its n+1th iteration, as we will add a new vertex to T unless there are no edges present in S, in which case we would violate the binary constraint and we return infeasible.

Now we can prove that if such a tree exists, our algorithm finds the one of minimum weight. Suppose that our algorithm returns a tree \mathbf{T} that is not the minimum weight SBT (MWSBT). Let \mathbf{M} be the actual MWSBT and (\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}) be the first edge in \mathbf{T} that is not in \mathbf{M} . Since \mathbf{T} is not the MWSBT, there must exist an alternate path from \mathbf{u} to \mathbf{v} (P) in \mathbf{G} which has a smaller weight than (\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}) . Now there must exist an edge (\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) in P such that \mathbf{x} is \mathbf{S} and \mathbf{y} is in R since it wasn't chosen. However, in the iteration of our algorithm where we consider (\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) , It would have been chosen since it has a smaller weight than (\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}) . This contradicts our initial assumption that (\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}) is the first edge in \mathbf{T} not in \mathbf{M} and therefore \mathbf{M} cannot exist and therefore our algorithm correctly returns the MWSBT.

- 2. a) We first create an empty priority queue of size mkl, a distance array dist of size mkl to store the minimum cost to reach each stop and an array prev of size mkl to store the previous stop and instance for each stop and instance. Now we initialize all elements in dis to infinity except for the origin stop a, which is set to 0 and all elements in prev to null. First, we insert all buses that stop at origin stop a with a departure time at or after t into the priority queue with their respective costs. While the priority queue is not empty, we do the following:
 - Extract the stop (cur) with the minimum cost from the priority queue.
 - For each neighbouring stop (next) reachable from the same bus line, calculate the cost which is the cost of dist[cur]. If the cost is lower than the current cost stored in dist[next] and the arrival time at next is before or at the t', update dist[next] with the new cost and enqueue next into our priority queue. Set prev[next] to cur to track the previous stop and instance.
 - Repeat the previous step but for each neighbouring stop reachable from a different bus line, where we calculate cost by adding dist[cur] with the cost of next.

If the loop terminates and the value at **dist[b]** is still infinity, then we return an empty array as it is not feasible.

Else, we start by initializing a list-based stack **reverse** of size I. While our destination stop **b** is not the origin stop **a**, we push **b** to the list and set b to the previous stop by accessing **prev[b]**. Finally initialize another stack **res** of size I and first push the origin stop **a**. Then we push the elements of **reverse** in reverse and return **res**.

- b) To prove the algorithms correctness, we can use the fact that our algorithm utilizes Dijkstra's Algorithm by treating the timetable as a directed graph, where each node represents the triplet of form (stop, arrival, departure) and the edge weights are the fares between stops. Since the fares are non-negative, our algorithm can be applied to find the cheapest path (since our edges are costs) from the starting stop-time pair to the destination stop-time pair.
- c) Our algorithm is dominated by Dijkstra's Algorithm which means it takes **mkl**(log(**mkl**)) time.
- 3. a) We can solve this problem utilizing a greedy algorithm with backtracking. We initialize two variables, one to represent the minimum cost (minCost) which is initially infinity and a list-based implementation of a stack (traversals) of size n. We define a recursive function (search) that takes arguments for the current shape (shape), a stack of traversals (curTraversals), the current cost (cur) and its current depth (depth) as follows:
 - If shape is **B**, we compare **cur** with **minCost**. If it is smaller, we update **minCost** to **cur**, set **traversal** to **curTraversals** and return.
 - If **depth** is equal to **n**, then we return as we have exhausted all shapes for this current traversal.
 - Else, we iterate over every shape (**nextShape**) expect **shape** in our collection of shapes and do the following:
 - Check if **nextShape** overlaps with **shape** and if **shape** is a square, **nextShape** is not a square.
 - If both of these conditions are met, then we calculate the area of nextShape, add it to cur and push nextShape to curTraversals.
 - We recursively call search(nextShape, curTraversals, cur, depth + 1)
 - Finally, we pop **nextShape** from **curTraversals** for backtracking purposes.

We would call search with parameters **A**, an empty stack, the area of **A** and 0. Then return **traversals** as the solution.

b) We can argue the correctness of this algorithm by maintaining an invariant that our recursive function search correctly explores all valid traversals from **nextShape** to **B** considering only the remaining **n** - **depth** shapes. This holds for our base case where if the current shape is **B**, we update **minCost** and **traversals** if necessary. Assuming that our invariant holds up to the (**depth-1**)th shape, we can observe that it also holds for the (**depth**)th shape, as we consider all valid shapes within the given

constraints and since we assume that the invariant holds for the (depth-1)th recursive call, we can conclude that during the (depth-1)th call, all valid partial traversals from the (depth-1)th shape to shape B were correctly explored. Our algorithm is also guaranteed to terminate as we either terminate when the current shape is B, or if depth is equal to n.

c) Our algorithm takes $O(n^2)$ time since for shape, we consider all other shapes and make recursive calls to explore the traversal.