

# #1 Assignment - CMPT 405

Luiz Fernando Peres de Oliveira - 301288301 - lperesde@sfu.ca

September 17, 2018

**#1** - Let  $C$  be the array containing all the possible coins  $\{1, 5, 10, 25, 100, 200\}$ . Let  $V$  be the total change value.

Algorithm:

**Input:**  $C, V$

```
 $d \leftarrow \text{sort } C \text{ such that } d_1 \geq d_2 \geq \dots \geq d_n$ 
 $res \leftarrow \emptyset; i \leftarrow 1$ 
while  $V > 0$  do
  if  $V \geq d_i$  then
     $n_{coins} \leftarrow \left\lfloor \frac{V}{d_i} \right\rfloor$ 
     $V \leftarrow V - (n_{coins} * d_i)$ 
     $res \leftarrow res \cup \{(d_i, n_{coins})\}$ 
  end if
   $i \leftarrow i + 1$ 
end while
return  $res$ 
```

*Intuition:*  $\forall (d_i, d_j) \in C, 1 \leq i < j \leq n, d_i \geq 2 * d_j$ , meaning that if I the algorithm chooses any  $d_j$  over any  $d_i$ , it will have to pick at least 2 times more coins for some value  $V$  that satisfies both  $d_i$  and  $d_j$ .

*Proof.* The only way to give more coins than the smallest possible number of coins for any change would be in a case where the algorithm chooses  $d_j$  over a  $d_i$  (see *Intuition*). Now, imagine that the algorithm chooses  $d_j$  over  $d_i$ , then we have two cases:

- Case 1.  $d_i > V$ :

If so, we are done because there are no possible ways of choosing  $d_i$  for value  $V$ .

- Case 2.  $d_i \leq V$ :

If that was the case, we would have an optimal set  $OPT$  such that  $OPT_{i-1} \cup d_j \subseteq OPT$ , which is not the case, once the iteration  $i$  will happen before the iteration  $j$ , causing the algorithm to choose  $d_i$  over  $d_j$  (and never the opposite) for any value  $V$  that satisfies both  $d_i$  and  $d_j$ .  $\square$

## #2 a)

Greedy approach to the fractional knapsack:

- $n$  objects and a knapsack
- item  $i$  weighs  $w_i > 0$  and has utility  $u_i > 0$
- fill knapsack so as to **maximize** total utility/weight, not exceeding total capacity  $W$

Algorithm approach:

- sort items in decreasing order of their utility-to-weight ratio  $u_i/w_i$
- repeatedly add item with max ratio  $u_i/w_i$ . If not possible to add the whole object, add a fraction  $\alpha \in (0, 1)$  of it, if possible.

*Proof.* Let  $K_{opt}$  be the optimal set of items in a knapsack and let  $K_j$  be the chosen items after an iteration  $j$ ,  $0 \leq j \leq n$ .

*Base case:*  $K_0$ :  $K_0$  is promising since the total number of chosen objects, in this case *none*, does not exceed total capacity  $W$ , there exists some optimal  $K_{opt}$  such that  $K_0 \subseteq K_{opt} \subseteq K_0 \cup \{i_1, i_2, \dots, i_n\}$ .

*Induction step:* Assume  $K_{j-1}$ . Since  $K_{j-1}$  is promising for stage  $j-1$ ,  $K_{j-1} \subseteq K_{opt} \subseteq K_{j-1} \cup \{i_j, i_{j+1}, \dots, i_n\}$ . We want to show  $K_j$ . On a stage  $j$  we have two cases:

Case 1.  $i_j$  is rejected. Then  $K_{j-1} \cup \{i_j\}$  or  $K_{j-1} \cup \{i_j * \alpha\}$  (any fraction  $\alpha \in (0, 1)$  of  $i_j$ ) exceed the capacity  $W$ ; thus,  $K_{j-1} = K_j$ . Since  $K_{j-1} \subseteq K_{opt}$  and  $K_{opt}$  does not exceed the total capacity  $W$ ,  $i_j \notin K_{opt}$ . So  $K_j \subseteq K_{opt} \subseteq K_j \cup \{i_{j+1}, i_{j+2}, \dots, i_n\}$ .

Case 2.  $i_j$  or  $i_j * \alpha$  is added to  $K_{j-1}$ . Let item  $i_{chosen}$  be  $i_j$  or  $i_j * \alpha$  (whichever was added to  $K_{j-1}$ ). Then  $K_{j-1} \cup \{i_{chosen}\}$  does not exceed the total capacity  $W$  and we have  $K_{j-1} \cup \{i_{chosen}\} = K_j$ .

Case 2.1.  $i_{chosen} \in K_{opt}$ . Then we have  $K_j \subseteq K_{opt} \subseteq K_j \cup \{i_{j+1}, i_{j+2}, \dots, i_n\}$ .

Case 2.2.  $i_{chosen} \notin K_{opt}$ . We show that there is another maximum set of utility-to-weight items  $K'_{opt}$  that witnesses the fact that  $K_j$  is promising. For example, consider an item  $i_{chosen}$  added to  $K_{opt}$ . This will exceed the capacity  $W$  and the knapsack will contain at least one item of  $\{i_{j+1}, i_{j+2}, \dots, i_n\}$ .

*Proof of claim:*  $K_{opt}$  contains all elements of  $K_{j-1}$  and can be obtained from  $K_{j-1}$  by adding some items from the set  $\{i_j, i_{j+1}, \dots, i_n\}$ . Adding  $i_j$  does not exceed capacity  $W$ , so the excess in  $K_{opt} \cup \{i_{chosen}\}$  must contain some elements other items in  $\{i_{j+1}, i_{j+2}, \dots, i_n\}$ .

□

## #2 b)

item	utility	weight
1	2	1
2	1000	1000

$W = 1000$

$K_{opt} = \{i_2\}$ (utility = 1000),  $K_{greedy} = \{i_1\}$ (utility = 2)

### #3

The idea here is to use the greedy approach of the **set cover** problem. Let  $U$  be the collection with all tiles  $a_{ij}$ .

Algorithm:

**Input:**  $U$

```
for  $i$  from 1 to  $K$  do
  for  $j$  from 1 to  $n_i$  do
     $arr[i] \leftarrow$  sort tiles such that  $a_{ij} \geq a_{ij+1} \geq \dots \geq a_{i_n i}$ 
  end for
end for
 $S \leftarrow$  create sets  $S_1, S_2, \dots, S_{max(n_i)}$  using adjacent tiles in  $arr$ .
 $C \leftarrow 0$ 
while all tiles are not covered do
  choose  $s \in S$  such that  $s$  contains most uncovered tiles.
  mark the tiles in  $s$  as covered
   $C \leftarrow C + 1$ 
end while
return  $C$ 
```