

## Homework 6

David Yang and Nick Fettig

1. Let **E2S** be the problem of determining, given a graph  $G = (V, E)$  and a positive integer  $k$ , whether there is a set  $S \subset V$  such that  $|S| = k$  and for all distinct  $u, v \in S$ , the length of the shortest path between  $u$  and  $v$  is exactly two. Prove that  $\text{IS} \leq_p \text{E2S}$ .

*Solution.* Consider an instance of IS,  $(G(V, E), k)$ . Define a new graph  $G'$  with all vertices in  $V$  and an additional vertex  $v^*$ . Furthermore, define the edges of  $G'$  to be the edges  $E$ , and edges between each vertex in  $V$  to  $v^*$ . Formally,  $G'$  is a graph with

- vertex set  $V' = V \cup v^*$
- edge set  $E' = E \cup \{\overline{vv^*} \mid v \in V\}$

Note that this is a transformation that can clearly be implemented in polynomial time in the number of edges and vertices.

We claim that  $(G, k)$  is in IS if and only if  $(G', k)$  is in E2S.

For the forward implication, note that for any two vertices  $u, v$  in an independent set of  $G$ , the minimum length between  $u$  and  $v$  is by definition  $\geq 2$ . Furthermore, with the construction of  $v^*$ , there is a path  $u - v^* - v$  of length 2 in  $G'$ , so the length between any two vertices  $u, v$  in the same set of vertices in  $G'$  is exactly 2. Thus, if  $(G, k)$  is in IS, then  $(G', k)$  is in E2S.

For the reverse implication, consider some set  $S \subset V'$  in  $G'$  with  $|S| = k$  satisfying E2S. Consider any vertices  $u, v$  in  $S$ . By definition, the minimum length between  $u$  and  $v$  is two, and so the length between  $u$  and  $v$  in the graph  $G$  must be greater than or equal to 2. Consequently, any vertices in some set  $S$  satisfying E2S will also be vertices in some independent set in  $G$ .<sup>1</sup> Thus, if  $(G', k)$  is in E2S then  $(G, k)$  is in IS. ■

<sup>1</sup>this also follows since  $v^*$  cannot be in this E2S set, since the distance between  $v^*$  and every other vertex in  $G'$  is one by construction.

2. Consider the two following decision problems.

**PARTITION:** Given a set  $X$  of positive integers, can  $X$  be partitioned into two sets  $L$  and  $R$  (meaning  $L \cap R = \emptyset$  and  $L \cup R = X$ ) such that

$$\sum_{\ell \in L} \ell = \sum_{r \in R} r?$$

**KNAPSACK:** Given a list of  $n$  positive weights  $w_1, \dots, w_n$ ,  $n$  positive values  $v_1, \dots, v_n$ , a positive capacity  $W$ , and a target value  $V$ , is there a subset  $S \subseteq \{1, \dots, n\}$  such that

$$\sum_{i \in S} w_i \leq W \text{ and } \sum_{i \in S} v_i \geq V?$$

Prove that  $\text{PARTITION} \leq_p \text{KNAPSACK}$ .

*Solution.* Consider an instance of PARTITION defined by a set  $X$  of positive integers  $X = \{x_1, \dots, x_n\}$  which has sum  $T = \sum_{i=1}^n x_i$ . Define an instance of KNAPSACK with a list of  $n$  positive weights and values as follows:

$$\{w_1 = v_1 = x_1, w_2 = v_2 = x_2, \dots, w_n = v_n = x_n\}$$

and  $W = V = \frac{T}{2}$ , which is a transformation that can be done in  $O(n)$  time.

We claim that  $X$  is in PARTITION if and only if the designed instance is in KNAPSACK.

For the forward implication, note that if  $X$  is in PARTITION,  $X$  can be partitioned into two sets  $L, R$  with equal sum. By definition, this sum must be equal to half the total sum of the elements of  $X$ , which is simply  $\frac{T}{2}$ . Since the weights and values are defined as the elements in  $X$ ,  $S = L$  is a subset satisfying KNAPSACK with  $W = V = \frac{T}{2}$  and the defined list.

For the reverse implication, note that if there is a subset  $S \subset \{1, \dots, n\}$  satisfying

$$\sum_{i \in S} w_i \leq W \text{ and } \sum_{i \in S} v_i \geq V$$

with  $W = V = \frac{T}{2}$ , then the subsets  $S$  and  $\{1, \dots, n\} \setminus S$  are the corresponding indices for the sets  $L$  and  $R$  satisfying PARTITION, with the original set  $X$ . ■

3. We define a geometric knapsack problem **GEOKNAP** as follows. The input consists of a set of  $n$  small polygons  $\mathcal{P}_1, \dots, \mathcal{P}_n$  each given by clockwise lists of their vertices; a value  $v_i$  for each polygon  $\mathcal{P}_i$ ; a big polygon  $\mathcal{Q}$ ; and a target value  $V$ . The question is whether there is some set of small polygons with total value  $\geq V$  that can fit inside  $\mathcal{Q}$  without overlapping, assuming that we are allowed to translate or rotate the polygons. Prove that **KNAPSACK**  $\leq_p$  **GEOKNAP**.

*Solution.* Consider an instance  $K$  of **KNAPSACK** defined by a list of  $n$  positive weights and values  $w_1, \dots, w_n$  and  $v_1, \dots, v_n$  with a positive capacity  $W$  and target value  $V$ . Define an instance  $G$  of **GEOKNAP** defined by

- a set of  $n$  rectangles  $\mathcal{P}_1, \dots, \mathcal{P}_n$  each of which has dimension

$$\left( \min_{i \in \{1, \dots, n\}} w_i \right) \times w_i.$$

- a big polygon  $\mathcal{Q}$  of size  $1 \times W$
- a target value  $V$

where  $W, V$  are the same values as defined in the instance of **KNAPSACK**. This is a transformation that can be done in  $O(n)$  time.

We claim that  $K$  is in **KNAPSACK** if and only if  $G$  is in **GEOKNAP**.

For the forward implication, note that  $K$  being in **KNAPSACK** implies a subset  $S \subseteq \{1, \dots, n\}$  with

$$\sum_{i \in S} w_i \leq W \text{ and } \sum_{i \in S} v_i \geq V.$$

By construction, then, the set  $SP = \{\mathcal{P}_i \mid i \in S\}$  is a set of small polygons that can fit inside  $\mathcal{Q}$  (since the sum of widths of elements in  $SP$  is less than  $W$ ) that also has total sum  $\geq V$  by definition; thus,  $G$  is in **GEOKNAP**.

For the reverse implication, consider some set  $SP$  of rectangles  $\mathcal{P}_i$  (with the previously defined  $W, V$  and list of weights and values) satisfying **GEOKNAP**. Note that rotations of these rectangles force them out of  $\mathcal{Q}$ , so we know that the axes of each rectangle lie parallel to the axes of  $\mathcal{Q}$ . Consequently, since the rectangles in  $SP$  fit in  $\mathcal{Q}$ , we must have that

$$\sum_{i \in SP} w_i \leq W.$$

Furthermore, since their values sum to a total value  $\geq V$ ,

$$\sum_{i \in SP} v_i \geq V$$

is also satisfied. Thus, by definition, the set  $S$  of the indices of rectangles is part of an instance  $K$  in **KNAPSACK**. ■

4. Define the problem TRIHIT as follows. The input consists of a set  $T$  of  $m$  triangles, each given by its vertices, a set  $P$  of  $n$  points, and a parameter  $k$ . The question is whether there is a subset  $S \subseteq P$  of cardinality  $k$  such that each triangle in  $T$  has some point from  $S$  in its interior. Prove that  $\text{IS} \leq_p \text{TRIHIT}$ .

*Solution.* First, note that  $\text{IS} \leq_p \text{VC}$ . We claim that  $S \subset V$  be a vertex cover in  $G$  if and only if  $V \setminus S$  is an independent set in  $G$ . This follows directly from the definitions of vertex cover and independent set. A vertex cover  $S$  must “hit” every edge, in the sense that every edge has an endpoint in  $S$ . Consequently,  $V \setminus S$  is a set containing at most one endpoint of every edge, which is an independent set of  $G$  by definition.

Since  $\text{IS} \leq_p \text{VC}$ , to show  $\text{IS} \leq_p \text{TRIHIT}$ , it suffices to show that  $\text{VC} \leq_p \text{TRIHIT}$ . Consider an instance of VC, defined by a graph  $G$  with vertex set  $V$  and edge set  $E$ , and the parameter  $k$  representing the size of a potential vertex set.

For each edge  $e_i \in E$ , create a triangle defined by three vertices  $v_{i_1}, v_{i_2}, v_{i_3}$ , and two points  $p_{i_1}, p_{i_2}$  such that  $\overline{p_{i_1}p_{i_2}}$  is enclosed in the interior of this triangle. This transformation can be implemented in  $O(|E|)$  time, and yields an instance of TRIHIT with input set  $T$  consisting of  $|E|$  triangles, a set  $P$  of  $2|E|$  points, and the same parameter  $k$  as the instance of VC.

We claim that  $(G, k)$  is in VC if and only if this new  $(T, P, k)$  is in TRIHIT.

For the forward implication, note that if  $(G, k)$  is in VC, there is some vertex cover of size  $k$  in  $G$ , which includes at least one endpoint of every edge in  $G$ ; by construction, this means that each of our constructed triangles has at least one point (representing the endpoints of an edge) in its interior. Thus, if  $(G, k)$  is in VC, then  $(T, P, k)$  is in TRIHIT.

For the reverse implication, note that if  $(T, P, k)$  is in TRIHIT, then is some subset  $S \subseteq P$  of cardinality  $k$  such that each triangle in  $T$  contains a point from  $S$  in its interior. By construction, then, this means that every edge in  $E$  has one of its endpoints represented in  $S$ , and thus,  $G$  must have a valid vertex cover of size  $k$ , i.e.  $(G, k)$  is in VC. ■