

---

**Instructions:** Same as for Problem Set 1.

---

**Readings:** Kleinberg and Tardos, Sections 11.2, 11.8; Sections 13.1-13.4, 13.6. Read Sections 13.12 and 13.9 for background material on probability.

1. (12 points) Consider the following variant of the set cover problem. We are given a universe  $U$  of  $n$  elements and a collection  $\mathcal{F} = \{S_1, S_2, \dots, S_m\}$  of subsets of  $U$ . The goal is to pick a subfamily  $\mathcal{G}$  of  $\mathcal{F}$  to maximize the number of elements of  $U$  which are covered *exactly once* by this subfamily.
  - (a) Suppose each element of  $U$  is present in exactly  $k$  sets. Give a randomized algorithm that outputs a subfamily which uniquely covers a number of elements which is in expectation at least  $1/e$  times the optimal value.  
How does your analysis change if each element  $u$  is contained in  $k_u$  of the sets, where  $k \leq k_u \leq 2k$  for all  $u \in U$ ?
  - (b) Using the above algorithm and classifying elements into suitable groups, obtain a  $O(\log B)$  approximation algorithm for the general problem, where  $B$  is the maximum number of sets to which any element of  $U$  belongs.
2. (12 points) In this problem, we will revisit the Contraction algorithm for computing minimum cuts, and consider its ability to find near-minimum cuts. For an integer  $\ell \geq 1$ , define an  $\ell$ -approximate cut to be a cut whose size is at most  $\ell$  times the size of the minimum cut. (We are considering unweighted, undirected graphs in this problem.)
  - (a) Prove that a single trial of the contraction algorithm yields as output an  $\ell$ -approximate cut with probability at least  $\Omega(n^{-2/\ell})$ , where  $n$  is the number of vertices in the graph.
  - (b) For each fixed integer  $\ell \geq 1$ , give a polynomial time algorithm that outputs a list of all  $\ell$ -approximate cuts in the graph. Prove also that, in any  $n$ -vertex graph, there are at most  $n^{2\ell}$   $\ell$ -approximate cuts.
3. (10 points) Consider the problem of finding a subset  $S$  of vertices of an unweighted, undirected graph  $G = (V, E)$  that maximizes the density  $\rho(S) = \frac{|E(S)|}{|S|}$  where  $E(S)$  is the set of edges both of whose endpoints belong to  $S$ . In Problem Set 3, you were asked to give a flow-based polynomial time algorithm for this problem. In this exercise, you will prove that a simpler algorithm delivers a good approximation. The problem is equivalent to finding a subgraph of  $G$  of largest average degree. Intuitively, we should throw away low-degree vertices to produce such a subgraph. This motivates the following natural greedy approach.

The algorithm maintain a subset  $S$  of vertices. Initially  $S = V$ . In each iteration, the algorithm finds  $v_{\min}$ , the vertex of minimum degree in the subgraph  $G[S]$  induced by  $S$ . It then removes  $v_{\min}$  from  $S$  and move on to the next iteration. The process terminates when the set  $S$  is empty. Of all the sets  $S$  constructed during the various iterations of the algorithm, the algorithm returns the set  $S$  maximizing  $\rho(S)$  as the output.

Prove that the above is a 2-approximation algorithm for the problem of computing a set with largest density  $\rho(S)$ .

4. (16 points) For this problem you can use the following fact concerning polynomials.

Let  $p$  be a prime and  $\mathbb{F}_p = \{0, 1, \dots, p-1\}$ . Let  $Q(X_1, X_2, \dots, X_m)$  be a **nonzero** polynomial in  $m$  variables with coefficients being integers from  $\mathbb{F}_p$ , with the degree of  $Q$  in each  $x_i$  being at most  $d$ . Then, if  $r_i$  is picked uniformly at random from  $\mathbb{F}_p$  for each  $i$  independently, the probability (over the choice of the  $r_1, \dots, r_m$ ) that  $Q(r_1, r_2, \dots, r_m) \equiv 0 \pmod{p}$  is at most  $md/p$ .

You can also use the fact there is always a prime between  $M$  and  $2M$  for  $M \geq 2$ .

- (a) Suppose Alice has an  $n$ -bit string  $a \in \{0, 1\}^n$  and Bob has an  $n$ -bit string  $b \in \{0, 1\}^n$ . Alice wishes to send a single message to Bob upon receiving which Bob can ascertain whether  $a = b$  or not. Of course one obvious way for Alice to achieve this goal will be to send the entire string  $a$  itself. But this requires communicating  $n$  bits and Alice prefers to be lazy and transmit fewer bits if possible.

- i. Prove that every deterministic strategy for Alice that always lets Bob conclude the correct answer requires Alice to send  $n$  bits.
- ii. Demonstrate a randomized strategy for Alice and Bob under which Alice sends only  $O(\log n)$  bits and Bob errs with probability at most  $1/n$  in ascertaining whether or not  $a = b$ .

- (b) In this problem we revisit the question of existence of perfect matchings in bipartite graphs. We have already seen how to solve this question with a deterministic algorithm. In this exercise, you will develop a randomized algorithm for this task; this algorithm is perhaps somewhat simpler, and also (something we won't get into) is amenable to parallelization.

- i. Given a bipartite graph  $H = (V, W, E)$  where  $V = \{v_1, \dots, v_n\}$  and  $W = \{w_1, \dots, w_n\}$ , define an  $n \times n$  matrix  $A(H)$  as follows. For  $1 \leq i, j \leq n$ , the  $(i, j)$ 'th entry of  $A(H)$  is defined as

$$A(H)_{i,j} = \begin{cases} x_{i,j} & \text{if } (v_i, w_j) \in E \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

where each  $x_{i,j}$  used is a new indeterminate. Prove that the determinant of  $A(H)$ ,  $\det(A(H))$ , is nonzero as a polynomial in the  $x_{ij}$ 's if and only if  $H$  has a perfect matching.

(Recall that for a matrix  $B = \{b_{i,j}\}_{1 \leq i, j \leq n}$ ,

$$\det(B) = \sum_{\sigma \in S_n} \text{sgn}(\sigma) \prod_{i=1}^n b_{i, \sigma(i)}$$

where the summation is over all permutations on  $\{1, 2, \dots, n\}$  and  $\text{sgn}(\sigma)$  is the "sign" of the permutation  $\sigma$ , where  $\text{sgn}(\sigma) = 1$  for even permutations and  $-1$  for odd permutations.)

- ii. Use part (a) to give a randomized algorithm for perfect matching with the following properties: (i) if  $H$  has no perfect matching, the algorithm always rejects, and (ii) if  $H$  has a perfect matching the algorithm accepts with probability  $1 - 1/n$ .