


CHALMERS

EXAMINATION / TENTAMEN

Course code/kurskod		Course name/kursnamn		
TIN093		Algorithms		
Anonymous code Anonym kod		Examination date Tentamensdatum	Number of pages Antal blad	Grade Betyg
TIN093-47		2016-10-22	6	5

Solved task Behandlade uppgifter No/nr	Points per task Poäng på uppgiften	Observe: Areas with bold contour are to completed by the teacher. Anmärkning: Rutor inom bred kontur ifylles av lärare.
1	X 7	
2	X 6	
3	X 7	
4	X 8	
5	X 8	
6	X 13	
7		
8		
9		
10		
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
Total examination points Summa poäng på tentamen	49	

Family name+First name (Blockletters) Efternamn+Förnamn+Initialer(textas)	THORSELL ERIK
Signature Namnteckning	
Year of Admission Antagningsår	2016
Programme acronym Program	MS/11
Date of Birth Year Month Day Personnummer år mån dag	2010-10-17 1101711

TIN093-47

$e(A, B)$ = edit distance of A and B.
 AC = A concatenated w C.

1.1

The edit distance between C and C = $e(C, C) = 0$ since the words are the same. Given any two words A and B we can concatenate them w C to get AC and BC but we can always align AC and BC s.t. the C-part of the word is a perfect match.

Hence $e(AC, BC) \leq e(A, B)$. *But why can't we align them better?* 2/4

1.2

ALGORITHM
 LOGARITHM

Since the last 5 characters is a perfect match this candidates to be a good alignment of the words. In task 1 we showed that adding a substring to the end of two words does not change the edit distance. Hence we are really looking to solve the edit distance between:

ALGO
 LOGA

5/6

The G in ALGO and LOGA aligns well (and moving the words to get another alignment does not yield a better result). We therefore need to change 3 letters in one of the words for them to be equal.

~~Why do you change~~
 Why doesn't it?

TINO93-47

2.1

$$R(k, x, y, z) = R(k-1, x-w_k, y-w_k, z) \vee$$

$$R(k-1, x-w_k, y, z-w_k) \vee$$

$$R(k-1, x, y-w_k, z-w_k)$$

If it is not possible to store w_k on two disks there exist no solution and the algorithm will return 0.

The answer is given by $R(n, u, u, u)$.

2.2

The algorithm runs in $O(nU)$ time, pseudopolynomial. More on this in question 3.

can't answer
a question
in another questions
answer.

PS: sounds like
a newscenter
:-)

TIN093-47

Disks: D_0, D_1, D_2 Capacity: U One file exists w size: $U/2$ and all files have total size $\frac{3U}{2}$.

3.1

An algorithm belongs to NP if it is possible to verify a solution of the algorithm in polynomial time. If given a suggestion on how to store our files we can check if the suggestion is a valid storage configuration in polynomial time. We simply store the files as suggested and if they fit the solution is valid.

3.2 HalfHalf Subset Sum \leq Redundant Storage (HS \leq RS)

Assume we have an algorithm capable of solving RS. We want RS to succeed for some instance x iff there exist a subset with sum $w = \sum_{i=0}^n w_i$ in x .

Let $U = \sum_{i=0}^n w_i$, add to set of numbers an element of size $\frac{U}{2}$. Iff RS is able to fit the "files" into 3 disks of size U there exists a subset of size w .

This is true because the extra element of size $\frac{U}{2}$ forces all original elements to be written to D_0 and (D_1 xor D_2). Hence we must be able to fit half of the set into D_1 and half into D_2 for RS to work.

This takes $O(n)$ time ✓

3.3

No! It is merely pseudopolynomial! U is exponential in the size of the input. It is polynomial only in the magnitude of input numbers.

TIN093-47

4.1

The recurrence equation for the number $T(n)$ of comparisons:

$$T(n) = 1 \cdot T\left(\frac{n}{3}\right) + cn^0$$

Here the 1 represents the number of subinstances we look at. The 3 is the divisor. We split each instance into three. The instance has size n .

The zero comes from the fact that we do a constant number of operations each iteration.

In the master theorem we would have: $a=1, b=3, k=0$.

4.2

$T(n) = T\left(\frac{n}{3}\right) + O(1) \Rightarrow T(n) = O(\log n)$ since $a=1 < b^k$ in accordance w the master theorem.

TIN093-47

k persons

$G = (V, E)$ with n nodes and m edges and a subset $T \subset V$ of k terminal nodes
All edges have length 1.

Problem: Find a node $v \in V$ w the same distance to all nodes $t \in T$, also minimize the solution.

If we use BFS it takes $O(m)$ time per run. BFS will return the distance between the start node and all the other nodes in the graph. If we run BFS from each terminal node it would take $O(km)$. We would save each node's "distance from terminal node t_i ($1 \leq i \leq k$) while running the algorithm ($O(n)$) and then check these values to see if any node have the same distance to all terminal nodes. If several exist, we pick the smallest. $O(n)$.

8

slightly confusing writing but OK

TIN093-47

$G=(V,E)$ is an undirected graph with unit edge lengths. Assume there is a clique $C \subset V$ w k nodes.

5.1

Since we have only changed the clique it's enough to look at the nodes and edges connected to any node in the clique.

The reason the modification works is because the distance between any two nodes in a clique is 1. Hence as soon as you reach a node $v_c \in C$ there is only 1 step to any other node in C .

If we want to reach a node "on the edge of C ", that is at least one edge incident to v_c is not part of the clique, all is well if we are coming from outside C . If we are already inside C this is true as well since the distance between two nodes used to be 1 and is now $\frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{2} = 1$.

If we are outside of the clique and want to reach a node that is not on the edge of C we will make our way to C and then take one step $= \frac{1}{2}$ to the new node and then one step $= \frac{1}{2}$ to any other node, hence the modification works for this case too.

5.2

When $k=4$ it makes a difference. A complete graph of 4 nodes has 6 edges but our modified version has only 4. An undirected clique contains $O(k^2)$ edges whereas our modified version contains $O(k)$ edges.

Difference for general k ?

5.3

Since Clique \in NPC it seems like a bad idea, BFS can be used to get the shortest path from a node to all other nodes in $O(m)$ time. What we want to know is if it's a good idea to: look for a clique (exponential time) and swap the edges to a new edge (have to look at all edges in the clique). When this is done we will have looked at all the edges in the clique (and the graph) already, so we could have used BFS from the start.

5.4

Since k -Clique only works for a fixed k we cannot solve the general clique problem.

In order to find a k -Clique you could check if you get k nodes left after deleting all nodes with fewer or more than $k-1$ incident edges.

Does this work in every case? (Is the condition sufficient?)

And what is now your conclusion?