

Lab04-Matroid

CS214-Algorithm and Complexity, Xiaofeng Gao, Spring 2020.

* If there is any problem, please contact TA Yiming Liu.

* Name: ShaoxingLin Student ID: 517010910028 Email: Johnson-Lin@sjtu.edu.cn

1. Give a directed graph $G = (V, E)$ whose edges have integer weights. Let $w(e)$ be the weight of edge $e \in E$. We are also given a constraint $f(u) \geq 0$ on the out-degree of each node $u \in V$. Our goal is to find a subset of edges with maximal weight, whose out-degree at any node is no greater than the constraint.

- (a) Please define independent sets and prove that they form a matroid.
- (b) Write an optimal greedy algorithm based on Greedy-MAX in the form of *pseudo code*.
- (c) Analyze the time complexity of your algorithm.

Solution.

- (a) We consider the pair (E, \mathcal{I}) , where E is the edges of graph G , and \mathcal{I} is a family of subsets of E . A subset of E is in \mathcal{I} if its out-degree at any node is no greater than the constraint. We then prove that (E, \mathcal{I}) is matroid.

Suppose $I \in \mathcal{I}$ and $I' \subseteq I$, since $I \in \mathcal{I}$, thus its out-degree at any node is no greater than the constraint, and since $I' \subseteq I$, we can get I' by deleting some edges in I , and this operation will not increase the out-degree of the set, thus I' also satisfies the requirement, so we have $I' \in \mathcal{I}$.

For any subset $F \subseteq E$, let $d_F^+(u)$ be the number of out-edges at u which belong F . Then all maximal independent sets in F have the same size, that is $\sum_{u \in V} \min\{f(u), d_F^+(u)\}$. Thus, we have for any any subset $F \subseteq E$, $u(F) = v(F)$, where $v(F)$ is the maximum size of independent subset in F and $u(F)$ is the minimum size of maximal independent subset in F .

Thus, we can say that (E, \mathcal{I}) is a matroid.

- (b)

Algorithm 1: *greedy1*

Input: directed graph $G = (V, E), w(e)$ for $e \in E$ and $f(u)$ for $u \in V$

Output: a subset of edges with maximal weight, whose out-degree at any node is no greater than the constraint

```
1 sort the edges in  $G$  into ordering  $w(e_1) \geq w(e_2) \geq \dots \geq w(e_m)$ ;
2  $A \leftarrow \emptyset$ ;
3 for  $i \leftarrow 1$  to  $m$  do
4   if  $A \cup \{e_i\} \in \mathcal{I}$  then
5      $A \leftarrow A \cup \{e_i\}$ ;
6   else
7     continue;
8 return  $A$ ;
```

- (c) The for loop will run m times, and each time the algorithm needs to judge whether A is still independent after adding e_i into it. If we use an array of size n to store the out-degree of every node in A (if a node is not in A , then the corresponding value in the array is 0), the judgement can be done in $O(n)$ time. Thus, the time complexity of the algorithm is $O(mn)$.

2. Let X, Y, Z be three sets. We say two triples (x_1, y_1, z_1) and (x_2, y_2, z_2) in $X \times Y \times Z$ are *disjoint* if $x_1 \neq x_2, y_1 \neq y_2$, and $z_1 \neq z_2$. Consider the following problem:

Definition 1 (MAX-3DM). *Given three disjoint sets X, Y, Z and a nonnegative weight function $c(\cdot)$ on all triples in $X \times Y \times Z$, **Maximum 3-Dimensional Matching** (MAX-3DM) is to find a collection \mathcal{F} of disjoint triples with maximum total weight.*

- (a) Let $D = X \times Y \times Z$. Define independent sets for MAX-3DM.
- (b) Write a greedy algorithm based on Greedy-MAX in the form of *pseudo code*.
- (c) Give a counterexample to show that your Greedy-MAX algorithm in Q. 2b is not optimal.
- (d) Show that: $\max_{F \subseteq D} \frac{v(F)}{u(F)} \leq 3$. (Hint: you may need Theorem 1 for this subquestion.)

Theorem 1. *Suppose an independent system (E, \mathcal{I}) is the intersection of k matroids (E, \mathcal{I}_i) , $1 \leq i \leq k$; that is, $\mathcal{I} = \bigcap_{i=1}^k \mathcal{I}_i$. Then $\max_{F \subseteq E} \frac{v(F)}{u(F)} \leq k$, where $v(F)$ is the maximum size of independent subset in F and $u(F)$ is the minimum size of maximal independent subset in F .*

Solution.

- (a) We consider the pair (D, \mathcal{I}) , where \mathcal{I} is a collection of subsets of D . A subset of D is in \mathcal{I} if all triples in it are disjoint. We will prove (D, \mathcal{I}) is an independent system. Suppose $I \in \mathcal{I}$ and $I' \subseteq I$, since all triples in I are disjoint and we can get I' by deleting some triples in I , thus we can say all triples in I' are also disjoint, that is $I' \in \mathcal{I}$, so (D, \mathcal{I}) is an independent system.

(b)

Algorithm 2: *greedy2*

Input: $D = X \times Y \times Z$ and a nonnegative weight function $c(\cdot)$ on all triples in D

Output: a collection \mathcal{F} of disjoint triples with maximum total weight

```

1 sort all triples in  $D$  into ordering  $(x_1, y_1, z_1) \geq (x_2, y_2, z_3) \geq \dots \geq (x_n, y_n, z_n)$ ;
2  $\mathcal{F} \leftarrow \emptyset$ ;
3 for  $i \leftarrow 1$  to  $n$  do
4   if  $\mathcal{F} \cup \{(x_i, y_i, z_i)\} \in \mathcal{I}$  then
5      $\mathcal{F} \leftarrow \mathcal{F} \cup \{(x_i, y_i, z_i)\}$ ;
6   else
7     continue;
8 return  $\mathcal{F}$ ;
```

- (c) A possible counterexample is that we let $X = \{1, 2\}, Y = \{3, 4\}, Z = \{5, 6\}$ and suppose there exists a nonnegative weight function $c(\cdot)$ that would give the triples in $X \times Y \times Z$ weights like below. The \mathcal{F} given by Alg.2 is $\{\langle 1, 3, 5 \rangle, \langle 2, 4, 6 \rangle\}$ and the total weight is 12, however, the optimal solution would give \mathcal{F} as $\{\langle 1, 4, 6 \rangle, \langle 2, 3, 5 \rangle\}$, the total weight is 14.

triple	weight
$\langle 1, 3, 5 \rangle$	10
$\langle 1, 3, 6 \rangle$	9
$\langle 1, 4, 5 \rangle$	8
$\langle 1, 4, 6 \rangle$	7
$\langle 2, 3, 5 \rangle$	7
$\langle 2, 3, 6 \rangle$	5
$\langle 2, 4, 5 \rangle$	4
$\langle 2, 4, 6 \rangle$	2

- (d) Let \mathcal{I}_x be a collection of subsets of D , a subset $I \subseteq D$ is in \mathcal{I}_x if for any two different triples in it, say $\langle x_i, y_i, z_i \rangle$ and $\langle x_j, y_j, z_j \rangle$, we have $x_i \neq x_j$. \mathcal{I}_y and \mathcal{I}_z are similar. Then, we can see that $\mathcal{I} = \bigcap_{i \in \{x, y, z\}} \mathcal{I}_i$, where \mathcal{I} is the same as the one defined in the answer to Q. 2a.

We want to prove that (D, \mathcal{I}_i) ($i \in \{x, y, z\}$) is a matroid. Suppose $I \in \mathcal{I}_x, I' \subseteq I$, it is easy to see $I' \in \mathcal{I}_x$. Suppose there are two different subsets of D , say I_1 and I_2 , such that $I_1 \in \mathcal{I}_x, I_2 \in \mathcal{I}_x$ and $|I_1| < |I_2|$. We say that there must exist a triple $\langle x_{i2}, y_{i2}, z_{i2} \rangle$ in I_2 , such that x_{i2} is different from the first element of every triple in I_1 . Suppose it is not that case, then we have for any triples in I_2 , there exists a triple in I_1 , who has the same first element with it. Then according to the definition of \mathcal{I}_x , we have that $|I_1| \geq |I_2|$, which contradicts that $|I_1| < |I_2|$. Thus, there exist a triple $\langle x_{i2}, y_{i2}, z_{i2} \rangle$, whose first element is different from the first element of every triple in I_1 , then $I_1 \cup \{\langle x_{i2}, y_{i2}, z_{i2} \rangle\}$ is in \mathcal{I}_x . Thus, (D, \mathcal{I}_x) is a matroid, and the prove for (D, \mathcal{I}_y) and (D, \mathcal{I}_z) are similar.

Therefore, according to **theorem1**, we have $\max_{F \subseteq D} \frac{v(F)}{u(F)} \leq 3$.

□

3. **Crowdsourcing** is the process of obtaining needed services, ideas, or content by soliciting contributions from a large group of people, especially an online community. Suppose you want to form a team to complete a crowdsourcing task, and there are n individuals to choose from. Each person p_i can contribute v_i ($v_i > 0$) to the team, but he/she can only work with up to c_i other people. Now it is up to you to choose a certain group of people and maximize their total contributions ($\sum_i v_i$).

- (a) Given $\text{OPT}(i, b, c) = \text{maximum contributions when choosing from } \{p_1, p_2, \dots, p_i\}$ with b persons from $\{p_{i+1}, p_{i+2}, \dots, p_n\}$ already on board and at most c seats left before any of the existing team members gets uncomfortable. Describe the optimal substructure as we did in class and write a recurrence for $\text{OPT}(i, b, c)$.
- (b) Design an algorithm to form your team using dynamic programming, in the form of *pseudo code*.
- (c) Analyze the time and space complexities of your design.

Solution.

- (a) We consider whether we can choose p_i . If we can choose p_i , then

$$\text{OPT}(i, b, c) = \max\{\text{OPT}(i-1, b, c), v_i + \text{OPT}(i-1, b+1, \min\{c-1, c_i\})\}$$

If we can not choose p_i , then

$$\text{OPT}(i, b, c) = \text{OPT}(i-1, b, c)$$

Thus, the recurrence for $\text{OPT}(i, b, c)$ is

$$\text{OPT}(i, b, c) = \begin{cases} \max\{\text{OPT}(i-1, b, c), v_i + \text{OPT}(i-1, b+1, \min\{c-1, c_i\})\} & c_i \geq b, c > 0, \\ & i \geq 0 \\ \text{OPT}(i-1, b, c) & c_i < b, c > 0, \\ & i \geq 0 \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

- (b) We first create a 3 dimensional array M and initialize it with -1 and two global arrays, which are initialized by c_i and v_i ($i \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$).

Algorithm 3: Compute-M(i, b, c)

Input: i, b and c

Output: the value of $M[i, b, c]$

```

1 if  $M[i, b, c]$  has been computed then
2   | return  $M[i, b, c]$ ;
3 else if  $c_i \geq b$  and  $c > 0$  and  $i \geq 0$  then
4   |  $M[i, b, c] \leftarrow$ 
      |  $\max\{\text{Compute-M}(i-1, b, c), v_i + \text{Compute-M}(i-1, b+1, \min\{c-1, c_i\})\}$ 
5 else if  $c_i < b$  and  $c > 0$  and  $i \geq 0$  then
6   |  $M[i, b, c] \leftarrow \text{Compute-M}(i-1, b, c)$ 
7 else
8   |  $M[i, b, c] \leftarrow 0$ 
9 return  $M[i, b, c]$ ;

```

Suppose the array M has been computed, then we call $\text{Find-Solution}(n, 0, n)$ to get the people we choose.

Algorithm 4: Find-Solution(i, b, c)

```

1 if  $i = 0$  then
2   | return  $\emptyset$ ;
3 else if  $v_i + M[i-1, b+1, \min\{c-1, c_i\}] > M[i-1, b, c]$  then
4   | return  $\{i\} \cup \text{Find-Solution}(i-1, b+1, \min\{c-1, c_i\})$ ;
5 else
6   | return  $\text{Find-Solution}(i-1, b, c)$ ;

```

- (c) Since we need a 3 dimensional array M and two global arrays, the space complexities is $O(n^3)$. To choose the people we need, we just need to figure out the array M , time spent on this is no more than the number of items in M , after that we need to call $\text{Find-Solution}(n, 0, n)$, this takes $O(n)$. Thus, time complexities is bounded by $O(n^3)$.

□

Remark: You need to include your .pdf and .tex files in your uploaded .rar or .zip file.