Proposed solution to problem 1

- (a) (0.25 pts.) A graph with n vertices has $O(n^2)$ edges.
- (b) (0.25 pts.) A connected graph with n vertices has $\Omega(n)$ edges.
- (c) (0.25 pts.) A complete graph with n vertices has $\Omega(n^2)$ edges.
- (d) (0.25 pts.) A min-heap with n vertices has $\Theta(n)$ leaves.
- (e) (0.25 pts.) A binary search tree with n vertices has height $\Omega(\log n)$.
- (f) (0.25 pts.) A binary search tree with n vertices has height O(n).
- (g) (0.25 pts.) An AVL tree with n vertices has height $\Omega(\log n)$.
- (h) (0.25 pts.) An AVL tree with n vertices has height $O(\log n)$.

Proposed solution to problem 2

- (a) Breadth-first search.
- (b) Dijkstra's algorithm.
- (c) Bellman-Ford's algorithm.
- (d) There cannot be any cycle with negative weight in the graph.
- (e) By induction over the number of arcs of the path.
 - **Base case:** If the path has not arc, the source vertex u is the same as the target vertex v. So in this case we have that $\omega_{\pi}(c) = \omega(c) = 0$. Since $\omega(c) \pi(u) + \pi(v) = 0$, what we wanted to prove holds.
 - **Inductive case:** Assume that the path has k arcs, that is, is of the form (u_0, u_1, \ldots, u_k) , where $u_0 = u$ and $u_k = v$. As u_1, \ldots, u_k is a path from u_1 to u_k with k-1 arcs, we can apply the induction hypothesis. So $\omega_{\pi}(u_1, \ldots, u_k) = \omega(u_1, \ldots, u_k) \pi(u_1) + \pi(u_k)$. But

$$\omega_{\pi}(u_{0},...,u_{k}) = \omega_{\pi}(u_{0},u_{1}) + \omega_{\pi}(u_{1},...,u_{k})
= \omega_{\pi}(u_{0},u_{1}) + \omega(u_{1},...,u_{k}) - \pi(u_{1}) + \pi(u_{k})
= \omega(u_{0},u_{1}) - \pi(u_{0}) + \pi(u_{1}) + \omega(u_{1},...,u_{k}) - \pi(u_{1}) + \pi(u_{k})
= \omega(u_{0},u_{1}) - \pi(u_{0}) + \omega(u_{1},...,u_{k}) + \pi(u_{k})
= \omega(u_{0},...,u_{k}) - \pi(u_{0}) + \pi(u_{k})$$

(f) If π is a potential, then the reduced weights ω_{π} are non-negative. So we can apply Dijkstra's algorithm to compute the distances with weights ω_{π} from s to all vertices. Then we can compute the distances with weights ω using the following observation: if $u,v\in V$ i c is the minimum path with weights ω from u to v (which exists by hypothesis), then c is the minimum path with weights ω_{π} from u to v and $\omega(c) = \omega_{\pi}(c) + \pi(u) - \pi(v)$.

Proposed solution to problem 3

- (a) If M is an $n \times n$ matrix, function matrix mystery(const matrix & M) computes $M^{\sum_{i=1}^{n} i}$, or equivalently, $M^{\frac{n(n+1)}{2}}$.
- (b) The product of two matrices $n \times n$, which is computed by function aux, takes $\Theta(n^3)$ time. Since $\Theta(n)$ iterations are performed, and in each of them two matrix products are computed with cost $\Theta(n^3)$, in total the cost is $\Theta(n^4)$.
- (c) A possible solution:

Fast exponentiation makes $\Theta(\log(n(n+1)/2)) = \Theta(\log(n))$ matrix products, each of which takes $\Theta(n^3)$ time. In total, the cost is $\Theta(n^3 \log n)$.

Proposed solution to problem 4

- (a) The witness is p.
- (b) The code of the verifier is between lines 4 and 16.
- (c) A possible solution:

```
bool ham2_rec(const vector < vector < int >> & G, int k, int u, vector < int >> & next) {
    int n = G.size ();
    if (k == n)
        return find (G[u].begin (), G[u].end (), 0) ≠ G[u].end ();

    for (int v : G[u])
        if (next[v] == -1) {
            next[u] = v;
            if (ham2_rec(G, k+1, v, next)) return true;
            next[u] = -1;
        }
    return false;
}
```

bool *ham2*(**const** *vector*<*vector*<**int**≫& *G*) {

```
int n = G.size ();
  vector < int > next(n, -1);
  return ham2_rec(G, 1, 0, next);
}
```

(d) One can replace the call

```
return find (G[u].begin(), G[u].end(), 0) \neq G[u].end(); by
```

```
return not G[u].empty() and G[u][0] == 0;
```

(e) If *G* is not connected then it cannot be Hamiltonian. In this case the function only needs to return **false**.