

## CSC373

### Midterm 2 answers and notes

#### Question 1

a) The DP recurrence is:

$$C[j] = 0 \text{ if } j=1. \text{ Otherwise: } C[j] = \min_{1 \leq i < j} \{C[i] + p_{ij}\}$$

Common mistakes:

1. People basically gave a Bellman-Ford recurrence, solving for every endpoints:  $C[i,j] = \min_{i < k < j} \{C[i,k] + C[k,j], p_{ij}\}$ . This is unnecessary since the question explicitly asked for the cost of getting to post  $j$  from the **starting** post - 3 points deduction.
2. Some people forgot to give the base case ( $j=1$ ) - 1 point deduction.

b)

---

```
1. Initialize array: C[1 . . . n]
2. C [1] = 0
3. for i ← 2 to n do:
4.     C [i] ← ∞
5.     for j ← 1 to i-1 do:
6.         C [i] ← min{C [i], C [j] + pij}
7.
8. return C [n]
```

---

Common mistakes:

1. Not initializing the array, or not initializing properly. 1 point deduction in most of the cases.
2. For people who used the Bellman-Ford solution: No extra deduction was made, however many people didn't implement their algorithms correctly. Namely, they gave 3 nested for-loops, traversing on  $i$  ( $1 \leq i \leq n-1$ ),  $j$  ( $2 \leq j \leq n$ ) and an intermediate index:  $k$ , where:  $i < k < j$ , and evaluated the expression  $C[i,k] + C[k,j]$ . However, this expression will not work since it uses values which haven't been set yet. 3 points deduction.

c) The reduction is correct. Most people got this part right.

d) Using the reduction from part (c):  $O(n^2 \log n)$ . Using the reduction from part (a):  $O(n^2)$ . The algorithm from part (a) is faster. People who used the Bellman-Ford solution for part (a) and analyzed their algorithms correctly got full marks for this part (they got an  $O(n^3)$  running-time).

## Question 2

Part (a)

We can simply replace every edge  $e$  of the edge-set with two opposite edges of the same capacity and reduce the problem to finding a minimum  $s$ - $t$  cut in a directed graph. We know from the lectures that this can be done by a maximum flow computation using the Ford-Fulkerson algorithm. To find the min-cut, run an exploration algorithm on the (final) residual graph of the FF algorithm (BFS or DFS) starting from the vertex  $s$ . Set  $A$  the set of the vertices that you visited on this exploration, and  $B = V \setminus A$ . This will correspond to the undirected min-cut of  $G$ .

Common mistakes:

- Unclear construction of the directed graph., i.e., not specifying capacities, not replaced all undirected edges (2 marks off)
- Wrong Reduction to directed graph. ( 3-5 marks off).
- Don't specify how to find the min-cut from the residual graph, i.e., run BFS or argue how to find it: (1-2 marks off).

Part (b)

A naive solution is to run algorithm of part (a) for every distinct pair of vertices  $s, t$  and keep the minimum cut over all distinct pairs. This takes  $O(n^2)$  calls to the algorithm of part (a).

It can be done using  $O(n)$  calls to the algorithm of part (a). First we can arbitrary choose a vertex  $s$ . Let  $S^*$  be a subset of vertices of  $V$ , that gives an optimal cut ( $(S, V \setminus S)$  is an optimal cut), then  $s$  will either be in  $S$  or in  $V \setminus S$ . Thus, for every  $t$  in  $V \setminus S$ , we solve two maximum flow problems, one giving us the minimum  $s \rightarrow t$  cut, the other giving us the minimum  $t \rightarrow s$  cut. Taking the minimum over all such cuts, we get the global min-cut in a undirected graph.

Common mistakes:

- Design an algorithm that gets as input vertices  $s, t$ . (2-4 marks off)
- Wrong algorithm, don't run algorithm of part (a) over all pairs or run it only on two arbitrary pairs. (2-4 marks off)

## Question 3

Most students got this question right. There are two possible solutions:

- Using the max-flow min-cut theorem immediately implies the claim.
- Argue that the Ford-Fulkerson algorithm holds the invariant that at every iteration the current flow is multiple of 3; therefore at the last iteration will have a flow which is multiple of 3 and by correctness of FF is the max-flow.