Homework 8 Due November 20, 2019

(a) The Mandrill and Baboon are two *fictitious* problems that accept a weight graph and return an integer. Consider the reduction below, which reduces the Mandrill problem to the Baboon problem.

```
Input: G = (V, E): weighted graph with n vertices and m edges
  Input: n, m: order and size of G
  Output: Mandrill(G)
1 Algorithm: MonkeyBusiness
H = Graph(n);
3 for u \in V do
     for v \in V do
         if G.isAdjacent(u, v) then
            Let w be the weight of (u, v);
            if w > 100 then
7
                H.addEdge(u, v, 5 + w/20);
8
            else if w > 25 then
9
               H.addEdge(u, v, \sqrt{w});
10
            end
11
12
         end
      end
13
14 end
15 return Baboon(H);
```

1. What is the worst-case time complexity of this reduction if we use an adjacency matrix to represent the graphs G and H?

$MonkeyBusiness = O(n^2) + O(Baboon(H))$

2. Suppose that we know that the complexity for Baboon is bounded above O(B(m,n)) and below by $\Omega(b(m,n))$ for a graph with m edges and n vertices. What does the algorithm above prove about the complexity of Mandrill, assuming that B(m,n) and b(m,n) are both larger than your answer to question 1? Justify your answer.



Mandrill = O(B(m,n)). We cannot determine with the information given the lower bounds of Mandrill.

(b) The Knapsack Problem (KP) gives you a target integer t and an array data with n positive integers, and it returns the subset of data with a sum as close as possible to t without going over.

The <u>Knapsack Size Problem (KSP)</u> gives you a target integer t and an array data with n positive integers, and it returns the largest integer less than t that some subset of data sums up to.

The <u>Full Knapsack Problem (FKP)</u> gives you a target integer *t* and an array *data* with *n* positive integers, and it returns **true** if there is a subset of *data* that sums to exactly *t* and **false** otherwise.

1. Prove that $FKP \in NP$ by giving pseudocode for polynomial-time verification algorithm for FKP.

2. What kind of reduction do you need between *FKP* and *KSP* to prove the complexity of *KSP* is polynomial if $FKP \in P$? Justify your answer.

To prove *KSP* is polynomial, we must go from our unknown, KSP to our Known FKP

