UNIVERSITY WISCONSIN MADISON, COMPUTER SCIENCE DEPARTMENT

CS577 Assignment 2

Lei Kang, Liang Wang, Yan Zhai

March 11, 2013

PROBLEM 1

1.1 First we say L_i is the i th layer when peform BFS from a node v in a graph G (as the definition in book P79) L_0={v}.
We modify the original BFS .In each vertex x,we add an additional field C to count the number of shortest paths from the v to that vertex x.So initially for start node v,we set $C(v)$=1(itself),for other vertexs x we set $C(x)$=0.
Then we use BFS.During BFS process, for a node x in L_j,we set $C(x)$ to be the sum of the $paths$ of its neighbor nodes in L_{j-1},So

$$C(x) = \sum_{y \in Neighbors(x) AND layer(y)=layer(x)-1} C(y)$$

All the shortest paths from v to a node w (layer j) must have length i,and each of these shortest path is like $< v, x_1, x_2 ... x_i .. x_j = w >$,where x_i is the node at L_i in the BFS tree and $1 \le i \le j$ The only changed to the original BFS is the couter C(x) for each vertex x.Obviously, the initialization take O(n) time and updating counter at any vertex x takes O(|Neighbors(x)|) time.Since

$$\sum_{x \in V(G)} |Neighbors(x)| = 2E = 2m$$

and the original BFS takes $O(m+n)$,therefore the total time of this algorithm is:
$O(m+n)+O(m)+O(n) = O(m+n)$

PROBLEM 2

2.(a) Let s be the root of G_π.Then consider the following 2 situations:
(1)If s has at most one child:
if s has no child, G must have exactly one node, so in this case, s is not an articulation point.
if s has one child x, if s is removed , only the edge $(s,x)$and the back edges to s will be removed. so that all other nodes will still be connected. So s is not an articulation point.
(2)If s has at least two children: since there is no any cross edge for each child tree in G DFS trees , then deleting s will make each child tree disconnected. Thus if s is an articulation point of G then it at least has two children.

2.(b) We prove it from two directions:

(1) If v has a child s such that there is no back edge from s or from any descendant of s to a proper descendant of v, then v is an articulation point.

Prove: Consider the subtree of the DFS tree rooted at s. Consider edge (x,y), which x is in this subtree.Then y, must either be v or within the subtree. Because if (x,y) is a tree edge, y must be in the subtree; otherwise, (x, y) is a back edge, y could not be conneced to an ancestor of v in given condition, so that it must link to v or a node in the subtree. In this case,if we remove v, x and the parent of v must be disconnected. So v must be an articulation point.

(2) If for each child s of v, there is some back edge from s or from some descendant of s to a proper descendant of v, v is not an articulation point.

Prove: let p be the parent of v in the DFS tree.We assume v has k children in the DFS tree. Then consider delete v from the graph. For the DFS tree, it will be partitioned into exactly (k+1) connected components,where the vertex p and v's child vertices be indistinct parts.However, from our condition, each child vertex of v must be connected to p in G. Thus, the graph G after removal of v is still connected, so that v is not an articulation point.

2.(c) We can compute v.low for all vertices v by starting at the leaves of the tree G_π. We compute v.low as follows: v.low = min(v.d, min y.low, min w.d) ychildren(v) backedge(v,w) For leaves v, there are no descendants u of v, so this returns either v.d or w.d is there is a back edge (v, w). For vertices v in the tree, if v.low = w.d, then either there is a back edge (v, w), or there is a back edge (u, w) for some descendant u. The last term in the min expression handles the case where (v, w) is a back edge. If u is a descendant of v in G_π, we know that u.d > v.d since u is visited after v in the depth first search. Therefore, if w.d < v.d, we also have w.d < u.d, so we will have set u.low = w.d. The middle term in the min expression therefore handles the case where (u, w) is a back edge for some descendant u. Since we start at the leaves of the tree and work our way up, we will have computed everything we need when computing v.low. For each node v, we look at v.d and something related to all the edges leading from v, either tree edges leading to the children or back edges. So, the total running time is linear in the number of edges in G, O(E).

2.(d) For root,we only need to check if it has more than 1 child based on (b).If root has more than 1 child, it is a articulation point O(1) time.

Then for other vertices use the same algorithm in (c). If s.low >= v.d, which means that subtree rooted at s has no back edge to the ancestors of v in G,then delete v would disconnect G, because based on (b) any nonroot vertex v is an articulation point if and only if it has a child s in G_π with no back edge to a proper ancestor of v. The algorithm in (c) take O(E) time. So the total time is O(E).

2.(e) We prove it from two directions:

(1)if an edge (u, v) is a bridge then it can not lie on a simple cycle .

Prove:Assuming (u,v) is a bridge. After we remove (u,v),G will be disconnected, so then there is no path from u to v .However , if (u,v) is on a simple cycle, then based on the property of cycle, there will be a path like u.x1.x2...xn.v.u,remove edge(u,v) will not affect the other edges in this path, so there still is a path from u to v,which means (u,v) is not a bridge.This is against our assumption. So (u,v) is not on a simple cycle. (2) if an edge (u, v) is not on a simple cycle, then it is a bridge. Prove: Beacuse if edge (u,v) is not on a simple cycle, there will be only one path from u to v (If there are two paths u.x1.x2...xn.v and u.v, then u.x1..xn.v.u is a cycle) Then delete (u,v) would disconnect u,v

2.(f) xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx Use the algorithms and conclusions in (c) (d)

Any bridge in the graph G must exist in the graph G. Otherwise, assume that (u, v) is a bridge and that we explore u first. Since removing (u, v) disconnects G, the only way to explore v is through the edge (u, v). So, we only need to consider the edges in G as bridges. If there are no simple cycles in the graph that contain the edge (u, v) and we explore u first, then we know that there are no back edges between v and anything else. Also, we know that anything in the subtree of v can only have back edges to other nodes in the subtree of v. Therefore, we will have v.low = v.d since v is the first node visited in the subtree rooted at v. Thus, we can look over all the edges of G and see whether v.low = v.d. If so, then we will output that (parent[v]G , v) is a bridge, i.e. that v and its parent in G form a bridge. Computing v.low for all vertices v takes time O(E) as we showed in part (c). Looping over all the edges takes time O(V) since there are |V | 1 edges in G . Thus the total time to calculate the bridges in G is O(E).

2.(g) To prove this statement, we need to show:

a) Any non-bridge edge belongs to a biconnected component.
According to part(e), we know that such edge should appear on at least one simple cycle. Thus it means it must be in some biconnected component.

b) A non-bridge edge can only belong to one biconnected component.
If not then we assume a non-bridge edge $e = (u, v)$ belongs to two biconnected components G_1 and G_2. From the definition we just need to show that: for any $e_1 = (u_1, v_1)$ and $e_2 = (u_2, v_2)$ in $G_1 \cup G_2$, there is a simple cycle containing e_1 and e_2. If e_1 and e_2 both belongs to G_1 or G_2, then it is obvious. Not losing generality we assume $e_1 \in G_1/G_2$ and $e_2 \in G_2/G_1$, and we show that there is a simple cycle C containing e_1 and e_2.

For convenience we use $a - b$ to represent there is a simple path between vertex a and b. The cycle construction could be following:

- according to definition of e, there would be a cycle $C_1 = (v_1, u_1) - p_1 - (u, v) - q_1 - (v_1, u_1)$ containing e and e_1. Similarly, we have another cycle $C_2 = (v_2, u_2) - p_2 - (u, v) - q_2 - (v_2, u_2)$. Here p_1, q_1, p_2, q_2 are simple paths.
- starting from u_1 along the path $p_1 - u$, until we meet the first vertex x on p_2 or q_2. The existence of such vertex is gauranteed by u. Similarly, we could find y by travelling along $q_1 - v$.
- if x and y are on the same path, for example, p_2, then we can paste $x - (u_1, v_1) - y$ into cycle C_2, replacing the path of $x - y$, and it's easy to see this new cycle is simple
- if x and y are on the different paths, let x on p_2 and y on q_2, then paste $x - (u_1, v_1) - y$ into C_2 by replacing the path $x - (u, v) - y$, producing a simple cycle containing $(u1, v1)$ and $(u2, v2)$

So we could always produce a simple cycle containing e_1 and e_2, thus any non-bridge edge could only appear in one biconnected component.

2.(h) We could DFS once to compute the biconnected components. But an easier way is to DFS twice: the first time we find all the bridges. Then we remove all the bridges, and do DFS on the generated forest. Each connected sub-graph is then a biconnected component. The correctness is supported by part(2.g), since biconnected components are a partition of the non-bridge graph. The total cost of doing this is:

- cost of find all bridges, O(E)
- cost of removing bridges, doing on the original graph requires O(E) time
- cost of DFS on the generated forest, requiring O(E) time

so the total complexity is O(E)

PROBLEM 3

3.1 I think the running time should be $O(LlogL + Ln)$
We reduce the problem to the shortest-path problem:
First we construct a graph with L vertices, labeled $v_0, v_1 ... v_{L-1}$. For a vertex v_x,we perform the

following process:For each $l_i(i=1,2...n)$,calculate $(x+l_i)modL$,say y then we add a edge from v_x to v_y, and $w(v_x,v_y)$ is the value l_i . So for two nodes v_x and v_y,if $v_x - v_y \equiv l_i(modL)$,then there is an edge between them.
Example:say $n=2, l_1=2, l_2=3$ and $L=7$. So we have 7 vertices: $v_0, v_1...v_6$.
At vertex $v_5, 5+l_1=5+2\equiv 0mod7$,so there is an edge from v_5 to v_0 with weight l_1,
$5+l_2=5+3\equiv 1mod7$,so there is an edge from v_5 to v_1 with weight l_2
This problem is converted to find the shortest path from v_0 to v_0.
Then,we add a anthor node v_L,serve as the "mirror" vertex of v_0,which means v_L connects to the same vertices as v_0,so this problem is converted to find the shortest path from v_0 to v_L.
Then we use Dijkstra's algorithm.The graph has L + 1 vertices and at most (L + 1)n edges; constructing it takes O(Ln) time. The cost of running Dijkstra's algorithm on the graph is $O(LlogL+Ln)$, hence the total running time is also $O(LlogL+Ln)$.

PROBLEM 4

4.1 In the graph G,use BFS until find a cycle,then delete the heaviest edge on this cycle. For each 'delete' operation,we get a new Graph G_i and we say the original graph G is G_0.
so G_i is still connected and has the same spanning tree with G_i-1,and but $E(G_i)=E(G_i-1)-1(i=1,2..)$ (For any cycle C in the graph, if the weight of an edge e of C is larger than the weights of all other edges of C, then this edge cannot belong to an MST). Repeat same process 8 times (total 9 times),the G_0 become a connected graph G_9 .G_9 has at most n-1 edges and the same spanning tree as G_0. In fact,G_9 is connected , has n vertices and n-1 edges,so G_9 is a tree.From previous process,we know G_9 is also the minimum spanning tree of $G_0=G$.
BFS and find heaviest edge take O(V+E)=O((n+8)+n) $\approx$ O(n) time.