

ADS2 — Hand-in (Flow/Matching) — Worked Solutions (REVISED)

Field	Value
Title	ADS2 — Hand-in (Flow/Matching) — Worked Solutions
Date	2025-10-19 (Europe/Copenhagen)
Author	Mads Richardt
Sources used	handind25.pdf (assumed §1.1–§1.2), algo2_week2.pdf, algo2_week3.pdf, algo2_week4.pdf, algo2_week5.pdf
Week plan filename	handind25.pdf (assumed week plan / hand-in)

General Methodology and Theory

- Pattern: reduce assignment/scheduling constraints to **integral max-flow** / (bi)partite **b-matching** with node-splitting for node capacities.
- Recipe: (1) identify decision makers and items; (2) build layers $s \rightarrow \text{agents} \rightarrow \text{items} \rightarrow t$ (and periods as needed); (3) encode limits with capacities; (4) run max-flow; (5) **accept** iff flow value equals the required total; read choices from saturated arcs.
- Correctness: with integer capacities, max-flow admits an **integral optimum**; min-cut gives tight bottleneck certificates.

Notes

- Per-agent total limit \Rightarrow capacity on $s \rightarrow \text{agent}$ (or split agent node).
- Item “at most once overall” \Rightarrow node-split $T_{\text{in}}(j) \rightarrow T_{\text{out}}(j)$ with capacity 1.
- Per-period exact quota k across 3 days \Rightarrow arcs $s \rightarrow D_d$ each of capacity k and require total flow $= 3k$.

Coverage Table

Weekplan ID	Canonical ID	Title/Label (verbatim)	Assignment Source	Text Source	Status
1.1	—	Cake Meeting — maximize number of cakes (<i>label assumed; confirm exact phrasing</i>)	handind25.pdf §1.1 (<i>assumed</i>)	handind25.pdf §1.1 (<i>assumed</i>)	Solved

Weekplan ID	Canonical ID	Title/Label (verbatim)	Assignment Source	Text Source	Status
1.2	—	Cake Meeting — exactly k per day; baker/day caps (<i>label assumed; confirm exact phrasing</i>)	handind25.pdf §1.2 (<i>assumed</i>)	handind25.pdf §1.2 (<i>assumed</i>)	Solved

BLOCKERS (metadata only, solutions below are complete): Need exact page/section numbers for §1.1–§1.2 in *handind25.pdf* to replace the “assumed” tags.

Solutions

Exercise 1.1 — (Cake Meeting) Maximize number of cakes

Concept mapping. Bipartite b -matching: left side = bakers (capacity 4 each), right side = cake types (capacity 1 each), edges = compatibility.

Method. Build a directed network:

- Source $s \rightarrow B_i$ with capacity 4 for each baker i .
- For each compatible pair (i, j) , add $B_i \rightarrow T_{\text{in}}(j)$ of capacity 1.
- For each type j , add node-split $T_{\text{in}}(j) \rightarrow T_{\text{out}}(j)$ with capacity 1 and then $T_{\text{out}}(j) \rightarrow t$ with capacity 1. Run max-flow. The value $|f^*|$ equals the number of cakes. The chosen pairs are saturated arcs $B_i \rightarrow T_{\text{in}}(j)$.

Pseudocode.

```

Algorithm: cake_max_cakes
Input: bakers B with caps (4 each); types T (cap 1 each via node split);
compat E ⊆ B×T
Output: value |f*| and set of (baker, type)

build nodes: s, t, B_i (∀i), T_in(j), T_out(j) (∀j)
add s→B_i (cap 4)
for (i,j) in E: add B_i→T_in(j) (cap 1)
for each j: add T_in(j)→T_out(j) (cap 1); add T_out(j)→t (cap 1)
run max_flow(s, t)
extract { (i,j) | B_i→T_in(j) saturated }
// Time: O(E · √V) typical with Dinic; Space: O(E)

```

Verification.

- Feasibility: each type carries at most 1; each baker uses at most 4; flow conserves at internal nodes.
- Optimality: any feasible assignment induces a flow of the same value; hence max-flow equals the optimum.

Pitfalls. Forgetting to split types (permits duplicates); modeling baker cap with parallel edges (bloats the graph).

Variant drill. Heterogeneous totals c_i : set $\text{cap}(s, B_i) = c_i$ (no other change).

Transfer Pattern (mapping guide).

- Archetype: bipartite **b-matching via flow**.
- Recognition cues: “at most once per item”; agent upper bounds; compatibility subset.
- Mapping steps: agents \rightarrow left nodes with cap; items \rightarrow right nodes with node cap 1 (split); compat \rightarrow edges of cap 1; run max-flow.
- Certificate: list saturated $B_i \rightarrow T_{\text{in}}(j)$ arcs; min-cut identifies bottlenecks.
- Anti-cues: unlimited copies of types (not matching-like).

✓ **Answer:** Build the flow as above; the maximum number of cakes equals $|f^*|$.

Concept mapping. Three-day layered flow with per-day quotas and baker day-caps while enforcing unique types overall.

Network.

- Days: create D_1, D_2, D_3 with $s \rightarrow D_d$ capacity k for each day $d \in \{1, 2, 3\}$.
- Type once: for each type j , split $T_{\text{in}}(j) \rightarrow T_{\text{out}}(j)$ with capacity 1.
- Day chooses a type: add $D_d \rightarrow T_{\text{in}}(j)$ capacity 1 for all (d, j) .
- Baker per-day cap: for each baker i and day d , add node $BD(i, d)$ and arc $BD(i, d) \rightarrow B(i)$ with capacity 2.
- Compatibility: for each compatible (i, j) and any day d , add $T_{\text{out}}(j) \rightarrow BD(i, d)$ with capacity 1.
- Baker total: add $B(i) \rightarrow t$ with capacity 4.

Run max-flow; **accept** iff the value equals $3k$. Extract triples from saturated paths $s \rightarrow D_d \rightarrow T_{\text{in}}(j) \rightarrow T_{\text{out}}(j) \rightarrow BD(i, d) \rightarrow B(i) \rightarrow t$.

Pseudocode.

```

Algorithm: cake_schedule_3days
Input: bakers B; types T; compat E; integer k
Output: assignment of exactly k per day, or infeasible with a cut

build D_1..D_3; add s→D_d (cap k)
for each j: add T_in(j), T_out(j); add T_in→T_out (cap 1)
for each d,j: add D_d→T_in(j) (cap 1)
for each i,d: add BD(i,d); add BD(i,d)→B(i) (cap 2)
for each i: add B(i)→t (cap 4)
for each (i,j) in E, for each d: add T_out(j)→BD(i,d) (cap 1)
run max_flow(s, t)
if |f*| = 3k: return triples (d, j, i) from saturated paths else return

```

```
infeasible + min-cut
// Time:  $O(E \cdot \sqrt{V})$  typical; Space:  $O(E)$ 
```

Why constraints hold.

- Exactly k per day: total demanded flow is $3k$, and only arcs $s \rightarrow D_d$ can supply it, each bounded by k , so each day is saturated to k .
- Type ≤ 1 : the split edge has capacity 1.
- Baker ≤ 2 per day: enforced by $BD(i, d) \rightarrow B(i)$ capacity.
- Baker ≤ 4 total: enforced by $B(i) \rightarrow t$ capacity.
- Compatibility: only allowed arcs $T_{\text{out}}(j) \rightarrow BD(i, d)$ exist.

Pitfalls. Omitting $D_d \rightarrow T_{\text{in}}(j)$ cap 1 (could allow multiple picks of the same type per day in some variants); forgetting baker-day nodes (can't enforce ≤ 2 /day).

Variant drill. Unequal day quotas k_d : set $\text{cap}(s, D_d) = k_d$ and accept iff $|f^*| = \sum_d k_d$.

Transfer Pattern (mapping guide).

- Archetype: **layered flow with per-period quotas and agent caps.**
- Recognition cues: “exactly k per period”, “agent daily cap plus total cap”, “unique items overall”.
- Mapping steps: periods \rightarrow day nodes with exact-flow caps; items \rightarrow node-split of cap 1; agents \rightarrow per-day nodes feeding a total-cap node; compat \rightarrow arcs from items to agent-day nodes.
- Certificate: flow value $= 3k$ and the list of picked triples (d, j, i) ; min-cut shows bottlenecks when infeasible.
- Anti-cues: if items may repeat across days, drop the global split and cap per day instead.

✓ **Answer:** Build the layered network; accept iff $|f^*| = 3k$; read off the schedule from saturated paths.

Puzzle

Hall-style glimpse. Suppose every baker offers at least 4 distinct types and every type is offered by at least one baker. Claim: constraints (1)–(3) alone always allow at least $\min\{t, 4b\}$ cakes. Decide true/false and justify via a Hall-type condition for b -matchings; if false, give the smallest counterexample.

Summary

- 1.1: bipartite b -matching via max-flow; types split to enforce uniqueness; value $|f^*|$ is the maximum number of cakes.
- 1.2: add day layer with quotas, baker-day nodes (cap 2) and baker total (cap 4); accept iff $|f^*| = 3k$; extract triples.
- Certificates: min-cut for infeasibility; saturated arcs as witnesses for feasibility.
- Transfer: same blueprints apply to staffing shifts, course-project assignments, and sports scheduling with daily quotas.