

P1) Given a connected graph  $G = (V, E)$  with  $n$  vertices and  $m$  edges where every edge has a positive weight  $w_e > 0$ , for any pair of vertices  $u, v$  define  $d(u, v)$  to denote the length of the shortest path from  $u$  to  $v$  in  $G$ .

- a) Prove that  $d(., .)$  is a metric, namely it satisfies the following three properties: (i)  $d(u, v) \geq 0$  for all  $u, v$  and  $d(u, v) = 0$  only when  $u = v$ . (ii)  $d(u, v) = d(v, u)$  for all vertices  $u, v \in V$ . (iii)  $d(u, v) + d(v, w) \geq d(u, w)$  for all  $u, v, w \in V$ .
- b) Let  $d^* := \max_{u, v \in V} d(u, v)$  denote the longest shortest path in  $G$ . Design an  $O(m \log(n))$  time algorithm that gives a 2-approximation to  $d^*$ , i.e., your algorithm should output a number  $\tilde{d}^*$  such that

$$\tilde{d}^* \leq d^* \leq 2\tilde{d}^*.$$

In this part you can use the Dijkstra's algorithm which finds the shortest path from a given vertex  $s$  to all vertices of  $G$ . We will discuss Dijkstra's algorithm later in the course. You can further use this algorithm runs in  $O(m \log n)$ .

**Part a)** (i)  $d(u, v) \geq 0$  holds since all edges have non-negative weights. (ii)  $d(u, v) = d(v, u)$  since the graph is undirected, any path from  $u$  to  $v$  is also a path from  $v$  to  $u$ . (iii) holds by composing paths: Any path from  $u$  to  $v$  can be concatenated with a path from  $v$  to  $w$  (possibly deleting repeated vertices) to obtain a path from  $u$  to  $w$ . This gives a candidate path from  $u$  to  $w$  and  $d(u, w)$  is the shortest one that may or may not pass  $v$  along the way.

**Part b)** We run the Dijkstra's algorithm from an arbitrary vertex  $v$ . Let  $u$  be the farthest vertex from  $v$  in the output of Dijkstra's algorithm. we output  $d(u, v)$ . Let  $u^*, v^*$  be the farthest vertex in  $G$ , and  $d^* = d(u^*, v^*)$ . We need to show that

$$d(u, v) \leq d^* \leq 2d(u, v).$$

The first inequality,  $d(u, v) \leq d^*$  follows by optimality of  $d^*$ , i.e., that  $d^*$  is the largest shortest path among all pairs including  $u, v$ .

To prove the second inequality we used the triangle inequality of  $d(., .)$ ; namely:

$$\begin{aligned} d(u^*, v^*) &\stackrel{\text{(iii) of part a)}}{\leq} d(u^*, v) + d(v, v^*) \\ &\stackrel{\text{(ii) of part a)}}{=} d(v, u^*) + d(v, v^*) \\ &\stackrel{u \text{ is the farthest from } v}{\leq} d(v, u) + d(v, u) = 2d(v, u). \end{aligned}$$

P2) Suppose you are given  $n$  coins with value  $v_1, \dots, v_n$  dollars, and you want to change  $S$  dollars. You can assume  $v_i \neq v_j$  for all  $i \neq j$ . Design a polynomial time algorithm that outputs the

number of ways to change  $S$  dollars with the given  $n$  coins. For example, if for values 1, 2, 3, 4 we can change 6 in 2 ways as follows:

$$2 + 4, 1 + 2 + 3$$

**Solution:** I start by writing a wrong DP: Let  $OPT(S)$  be the number of ways to change  $S$  dollars with coins  $v_1, \dots, v_n$ . One can say either OPT uses  $v_1$  or  $v_2, \dots$  or  $v_n$  so one can write

$$OPT(S) = \sum_i OPT(S - v_i).$$

This is wrong, why? Because it double counts. For example, say  $v_1 = 1, v_2 = 2$  and  $S = 3$ . Then, we write  $OPT(3) = OPT(1) + OPT(2)$ , and since  $OPT(1) = 1, OPT(2) = 1$ , we get  $OPT(3) = 2$ . But the write answer is  $OPT(3) = 1$ . So, where is the mistake? We are double counting 1, 2 and 2, 1.

The right way to do it is to do a two-dimensional OPT: Let  $OPT(s, i)$  be "the number of ways to change  $s$  dollars using only coins  $v_1, \dots, v_i$ ". **Base Case:**  $OPT(0, i) = 1$  and  $OPT(s, 0) = 0$  for any  $s > 0$ .

Now, we do the inductive step: We "guess" whether coin  $v_i$  used in  $OPT(s, i)$ . Note that  $v_i$  can be used only if  $v_i \leq s$ . If we use coin  $v_i$  then we need to change the rest of  $s - v_i$  dollars using coins  $v_1, \dots, v_{i-1}$ . So, we claim that  $OPT(s, i)$  is the sum of all of these possibilities.

$$OPT(s, i) = \begin{cases} OPT(s - v_i, i - 1) + OPT(s, i - 1) & \text{if } v_i \leq s \\ OPT(s, i - 1) & \text{o.w.} \end{cases}$$

First, we are not double counting in the above calculation: This is because whether we put  $v_i$  in or out we are counting two different approaches that to change  $s$  dollars so we don't double count. Second, we count all possibilities because OPT other uses or doesn't uses  $v_i$ .

The algorithm follows:

```

for  $s = 0 \rightarrow S$  do
  | Set  $M[s, i] = empty$  for all  $0 \leq i \leq n$ 
end
Function  $OPT(s, i)$ 
  | If  $s = 0$  return 1 else if  $i = 0$  return 0
  | If  $M[s, i] \neq empty$  return  $M[s, i]$ 
  | If  $v_i \leq s, M[s, i] = OPT(s - v_i, i - 1) + OPT(s, i - 1)$  else  $M[s, i] = OPT(s, i - 1)$ .
  | return  $M[s, i]$ 
OPT(S,n).

```