15-451 Assignment 07

Karan Sikka

ksikka@cmu.edu

Collaborated with Dave Cummings and Sandeep Rao.

Recitation: A November 7, 2014

1: A Densely-Knit Community

(a) (b) (c) (d)

2: Large + Dense = Difficult

The problem is in NP because there exists a poly-time verifier as follows:

Given a (G, K, D) and a potential solution S of size K, compute the density which is

$$\frac{|{\tt edges}(S)|}{|S|}$$

Note: Computing edges of S can be done in $|S|^2$ time.

The problem is NP-hard because we can show a a Karp reduction from K-Clique to it.

Given G, K we want to output YES if there exists a K-clique in G.

Observe that the number of edges in a K-clique is $\frac{K(K-1)}{2}$ because you can pair each vertex with each other vertex and divide by 2 to eliminate the same pair written backwards. Therefore the density of a K-clique is

$$\frac{\frac{K(K-1)}{2}}{K} = \frac{K-1}{2}$$

Also, a graph that is not a K-clique has a strictly smaller density because you would have to add

edges to make it a K-clique, thereby increasing the density. Therefore if a graph has density equal to $\frac{|V|-1}{2}$ it must be a K-clique.

We construct an input to the Reasonably Sized problem as follows: Let $D = \frac{K(K-1)}{2}$ Let G be the same graph as in the K-clique problem. Let K be the same K.

This correctly outputs YES when there is a K-clique and NO when there isn't because of the way we set D.

Since the problem is NP and NP-hard, it's NP-Complete.

3: A Well-Separated Problem

(a) The problem is in NP because there exists a poly-time verifier as follows:

Define the proof of the solution as a K-element subset of X. We compute distances between each pair of distinct points and check that that they are greater than or equal to Δ . If all pairs satisfy the condition, then we verify that this is a solution. Otherwise it is not.

The Well-Separated problem is in NP-Hard because there is a Karp Reduction from the Independent Set decision problem which is NP-hard to this problem. The reduction is as follows:

Independent set

```
we want to output YES if there exists a set of vertices of size k such that no two of them are adjacent. To craft our input to the Well-Separated oracle, we construct a set X from the vertices of G, let K=k, let \Delta=1.25, for all i\in V let d(i,i)=0,
```

for all $i, j \in V : i \neq j \land (i, j) \in E$ let d(i, j) = 1 for all $i, j \in V : i \neq j \land (i, j) \notin E$ let d(i, j) = 1.5

Given a graph G = (V, E) and integer k,

We pass this input to the well separated problem, which will return YES if there exists a set of elements of size K where all distances are greater than 1.25.

Observe these elements in X map directly to vertices in V which are not adjacent due to the way we constructed the input to the Well-Separated problem.

Also note that the construction of d correctly obeys the triangle inequality, because two of the shortest distances (1+1) is still greater than the longest distance (1.5).

(b) We will present the algorithm, prove a condition about it's correctness, and show that it runs in poly time.

Algorithm:

Call one set with separation at least $\Delta^*/2$ set C.

We will maintain a vector of all points which are potentially in C, initially containing all points. We will also maintain a vector of points which we know are in C.

- 1. Pick a point u potentially in C, and examine how far away all other points are from it.
- 2. Add u to the set of known points C.
- 3. Remove u from the set of points potentially in C.
- 4. Remove all points not at least $\Delta^*/2$ from u from the set of points potentially in C.

Repeat for a total of K iterations,

resulting in a set C with K points at least $\Delta^*/2$ away from each other since at each step we eliminate points which could invalidate this invariant.

Now we need a proof that we can perform this K times, or in other words, we never run out of points potentially in C from which to select at each iteration.

Proof:

We were allowed to assume there exists some set of K points with separation Δ^* .

For convenience, let's call these the optimal points.

Lets examine how many optimal points are eliminated from the potentially-in-C set in one iteration of the algorithm.

Claim: At most one optimal point is removed from the potentially-in-C set.

If we select optimal point u, we will see that all the other optimal points are at least Δ^* away from u, and they will not be eliminated from the potentially-in-C set in this iteration. u will be the only optimal point removed.

If we select non-optimal point u, we will see that at most one optimal point is less than $\Delta^*/2$ away from u.

This due to the triangle inequality. Consider a nonoptimal point u, the nearest optimal point v, and any other optimal point w.

$$\Delta^* < d(v, w) < d(v, u) + d(u, w)$$

Since v no farther from u than w, d(v, u) may be less than $\Delta^*/2$, but d(u, w) will certainly be at least $\Delta^*/2$.

Therefore at most one optimal point is removed from the potentially-in-C set in each iteration of the algorithm.

We know there were K optimal points to start out with in the potentially-in-C set.

Therefore the algorithm can be run at least K iterations before running out of points to select.

Runtime:

The algorithm runs K iterations, each iteration takes O(|X|) work, so the runtime is O(K * |X|).

(c) You could run the algorithm on all possible values of Δ^* . More formally:

Modify the algorithm from B to return NONE if it runs out of points potentially in C before running K iterations.

Observe that the optimum separation delta may only be one of $\binom{|X|}{2} \le |X|^2$ values: the distances $d(i,j): i \ne j$.

Sort the values from highest to lowest, and run the algorithm with these values.

Return the none-NONE answer corresponding to the input with highest Δ^*

Sorting takes $O(|X|^2 * log(|X|^2))$ and the rest takes $O(K * |X| * |X|^2)$. The limiting step is $O(K * |X|^3)$

Note: you could do this faster by using binary search instead of linear search, but it doesn't matter for the sake of this problem.