Total marks: 55

[5] 1. b), c), d), h) and i).

[4] 2. (a) Let T_1 by *any* min cost ST of G. We show that if T_2 is the output of Kruskal's algorithm on G, then $T_2 \subseteq T_1$. To this end we show the following loop invariant: $T \subseteq T_1$.

Initially $T = \emptyset$, so $T \subseteq T_1$. Suppose now that $T \subseteq T_1$. We show that this continues to be true after one more execution of the loop.

If e_i is rejected, then T remains unchanged, and so $T \subseteq T_1$. Otherwise, we must show that $T \cup \{e_i\} \subseteq T_1$. So suppose, by way of contradiction, that $e_i \notin T_1$. Let T_2 be the result of Kruskal's algorithm. By the Exchange Lemma there is an edge e_j such that $e_j \in T_1 - T_2$, and $T_3 = T_1 \cup \{e_i\} - \{e_j\}$ is a ST.

$i \neq j$ since $e_i \notin T_1$.

Suppose $j < i$. Then e_j must have been rejected, so it would have formed a cycle in T, and so it would have also formed a cycle in T_1, hence $e_j \notin T_1$, contradiction.

Suppose $i < j$. Then $c(e_i) < c(e_j)$, and it would follow that $c(T_3) < c(T_1)$, contradiction.

Thus, there can be no such e_i.

Therefore $T_2 \subseteq T_1$, and so $T_2 = T_1$, so T_2 is in fact the unique min cost ST for G.

[3] (b) G has a unique min cost ST in this case as well. The proof is the same as in the previous case, but this time when considering the case $i < j$, we have to deal with the possibility that $c(e_i) = c(e_j)$, i.e. that $i = 1$ and $j = 2$. But if $e_1 \notin T_1$, then if we add e_1 to T_1 we get a cycle, and a cycle must contain at least 3 edges, so it contains some e such that $e \neq e_2$, so if we replace e by e_1, we get a ST of a smaller cost, contradiction.

[3] (c) In this case G doesn't have a unique min cost ST: consider the case where G has 3 vertices and edges of the same cost between them. Then any two edges form a min cost ST for G, so G has 3 min cost spanning trees.

[5] 3. (a) Let $N = 30$. Then the greedy solution is $L = \{25, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1\}$, while the optimal solutions is $\text{Opt} = \{10, 10, 10\}$, so $|\text{Opt}| = 3 < 6 = |L|$.

[10] (b) We define L to be promising if it can be extended (by adding a list of coins) to an optimal solution to the Make-Change problem with input (p, n, N). We now prove, by induction, that "L is promising" is a loop invariant of the above algorithm.

Basis Case: Initially, L is empty, so any optimal solution extends L. Hence L is promising. *Induction Step*: Assume that L is promising, and show that L continues to be promising after one more execution of the loop:

Suppose L is promising, and $s < N$. Let L' be the list that extends L to the optimal solution, i.e. $L, L' = L_{\text{opt}}$. Let x be the largest item in C such that $s + x \leq N$.

case (i) $x \in L'$. Then $L' = x, L''$, so that L, x can be extended to the optimal solution L_{opt} by L''.

case (ii) $x \notin L'$. We show that this case is not possible. To this end we prove the following claim:

Claim: If $x \notin L'$, then there is a sublist L_0 of L' such that $x =$ sum of elements in L_0.

Proof of Claim: Let B be the smallest number such that $B \geq x$, and some sublist of L' sums to B. Let this sublist be $\{e_1, e_2, \ldots, e_l\}$, where $e_i \leq e_{i+1}$ (i.e. the elements are in non-decreasing order). Since x is the largest coin that fits in $N - s$, and the sum of the coins in L' is $N - s$, it follows that every coin in L' is $\leq x$. Since $e_l \neq x$ (as $x \notin L'$), it follows that $l > 1$.

Let $D = x - (e_2 + \ldots + e_l)$. By definition of B we know that $D > 0$.

Each of the numbers $x, e_2, \ldots, e_l$ is divisible by e_1 (to see this note that all the coins are powers of p, i.e. in the set $\{1, p, p^2, \ldots, p^n\}$, and $e_l < x$ so $e_1 < x$). Thus $D \geq e_1$.
On the other hand $x \leq e_1 + e_2 + \ldots + e_l$, so we also know that $D \leq e_1$, so in fact $D = e_1$. Therefore $x = e_1 + e_2 + \ldots + e_l$, and we are done.
Thus $\{e_1, e_2, \ldots, e_l\}$ can be replaced by the single coin x. If $l = 1$, then $x = e_1 \in L'$, which is a contradiction. If $l > 1$, then $L, x, L' - \{e_1, e_2, \ldots, e_l\}$ sums up to N, but it has less coins than $L, L' = L_{\text{opt}}$ which contradicts the induction hypothesis. Thus case (ii) is not possible.

[3] 4. (a) $R(j)$ = length of the longest subsequence (where any two consecutive members differ by at most 1) which ends in a_j. Then, the answer is $L = \max_{1 \leq j \leq n} R(j)$.

[4] (b) Let $R(1) = 1$, and for $j > 1$,

$$R(j) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } |a_j - a_i| > 1 \text{ for all } i,\ 1 \leq i < j. \\ 1 + \max_{1 \leq i < j}\{R(i) | |a_j - a_i| \leq 1\} & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

[3] (c) Write the algorithm:

```
R(1) ← 1
for j : 2..d
    max ← 0
    for i : 1..j − 1
        if (R(i) > max & |a_i − a_j| ≤ 1) then
            max ← R(i)
        end if
    end for
    R(j) ← max +1
end for
```

5. Let $s = s_1 s_2 \ldots s_n$, where $s_i \in \{0, 1\}$.

[6] (a) $R(j) =$ `true` iff the string $s_1 s_2 \ldots s_j$ can be expressed as a concatenation of some of the t_i's, allowing repetition. Thus, $R(j)$ is true if the initial segment of s, consisiting of the first j bits of s, can be expressed with the t_i's. Then, the answer to the problem is given in $R(n)$. If $j = 0$, then $s_1 s_2 \ldots s_j$ is the empty string by convention.

[6] (b) Initial condition: $R(0) =$ `true`.
For $j > 0$ define:

$$R(j) = \texttt{true} \text{ iff for some } i \in \{1, \ldots, m\} \text{ we have: } \begin{cases} |t_i| \leq j \\ s_1 s_2 \ldots s_j = s_1 s_2 \ldots s_{j-|t_i|} t_i \\ R(j - |t_i|) = \texttt{true} \end{cases}$$

[3] (c) Easy .