



















We already showed this finds a spanning tree: That was part of our definition of a good maze.

Proof by contradiction that Kruskal's finds the minimum: Assume another spanning tree has *lower cost* than Kruskal's Pick an edge  $\mathbf{e_1} = (\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v})$  in that tree that's *not* in Kruskal's Kruskal's tree connects  $\mathbf{u}$ 's and  $\mathbf{v}$ 's sets with another edge  $\mathbf{e_2}$ But,  $\mathbf{e_2}$  must have at most the same cost as  $\mathbf{e_1}$ ! So, swap  $\mathbf{e_2}$  for  $\mathbf{e_1}$  (at worst keeping the cost the same) Repeat until the tree is identical to Kruskal's: contradiction!

QED: Kruskal's algorithm finds a minimum spanning tree.

