Exercise 16.1-3

Description

Not just any greedy approach to the activity-selection problem produces a maximum-size set of mutually compatible activities. Give an example to show that the approach of selecting the activity of least duration from among those that are compatible with previously selected activities does not work. Do the same for the approaches of always selecting the compatible activity that overlaps the fewest other remaining activities and always selecting the compatible remaining activity with the earliest start time.

Solution

Counter example for always selecting the activity with the least duration: Let \((s_1, f_1) = (3, 5); (s_2, f_2) = (1, 4); (s_3, f_3) = (4, 7).\) The greedy solution is \{activity 1\}. The optimal solution is \{activity 2, activity 3\}.

Counter example for always selecting the task with fewest overlaps: Let \((s_1, f_1) = (3, 5); (s_2, f_2) = (0, 2); (s_3, f_3) = (6, 8); (s_4, f_4) = (2, 4); (s_5, f_5) = (4, 6); (s_6, f_6) = (1, 3); (s_7, f_7) = (1, 3); (s_8, f_8) = (5, 7); (s_9, f_9) = (5, 7).\) The Greedy solution is \{activity 1, activity 2, activity 3\}, optimal solution is \{activity 2, activity 3, activity 4, activity 5\}.

Counter example for always selecting the task with earliest start time: Let \((s_1, f_1) = (2, 4); (s_2, f_2) = (4, 6); (s_3, f_3) = (1, 8).\) The Greedy solution is \{activity 3\}, optimal solution is \{activity 1, activity 2\}.
Exercise 16.3-3

Description

What is an optimal Huffman code for the following set of frequencies, based on the first 8 Fibonacci numbers?

\[ a:1 \quad b:1 \quad c:2 \quad d:3 \quad e:5 \quad f:8 \quad g:13 \quad h:21 \]

Can you generalize your answer to find the optimal code when the frequencies are the first \( n \) Fibonacci numbers?

Solution

The following figure is the optimal Huffman code for the first 8 numbers:

Now, we generalize this the first \( n \) Fibonacci numbers. Let \( f_i \) be the \( i \)th Fibonacci number and \( fc_i \) be the Huffman code for \( f_i \), then \( fc_1 = 1^{n-2}0 \), \( fc_2 = 1^{n-1} \), \( fc_i = 1^{n-i}0 \), \((i = 3,4, \ldots, n)\), where \( 1^j \) denotes the concatenation of \( j \) 1’s.

Now let's prove the correctness. Let \( S_i = \sum_{j=1}^{i} f_j \). We claim that \( S_i < f_{i+2} \).

Let's prove it by induction.

Base step: for \( j = 1 \), \( S_1 = f_1 < f_3 \) obviously holds.

Inductive step: Let's assume \( S_j < f_{j+2} \) for all \( j = 1,2, \ldots, i-1 \). Now let's show \( S_i < f_{i+2} \) holds.

\[ S_i = S_{i-1} + f_i < f_{i+1} + f_i = f_{i+2}. \]

Hence the node with the value \( S_i \) will always combine with \( f_{i+1} \). Therefore, we obtain the Huffman tree similar to the figure.
Exercise 16-1(a)

Description

Coin changing
Consider the problem of making change for \( n \) cents using the fewest number of coins. Assume that each coin's value is an integer.

(a). Describe a greedy algorithm to make change consisting of quarters, dimes, nickels, and pennies. Prove that your algorithm yields an optimal solution.

Solution

Given \( n \) cents, let \( n_q = \lfloor n/25 \rfloor, r_q = n - 25n_q, n_d = \lfloor r_q/10 \rfloor, r_d = r_q - 10n_d, n_k = \lfloor r_d/5 \rfloor, r_k = r_d - 5n_k, n_p = r_k \). Thus, we can make change for \( n \) dollars by obtaining \( n_q \) quarters, \( n_d \) dimes, \( n_k \) nickels, and \( n_p \) pennies. This Greedy algorithm requires \( O(1) \) time.

Next, we'll prove the correctness. We prove it by induction. First, the Greedy algorithm produces optimal solutions for arbitrary \( n \) if there are only nickels and pennies, and let's denote the Greedy algorithm by \( A_2 \). Assume that the optimal solution is \( x_k \) nickels and \( x_p \) pennies. If \( x_p \geq 5 \), then it's not optimal because \( x_k' = x_k + \lfloor x_p/5 \rfloor \), \( x_p' = x_p - 5\lfloor x_p/5 \rfloor \) gives fewer number of coins, contradiction.

Next, we prove that the Greedy algorithm also works if there are only dimes, nickels, and pennies, and we denote this Greedy algorithm by \( A_3 \). Otherwise, assume the optimal solution is \( x_d, x_k, x_p \). Then \( x_p < 5 \); otherwise we can employ \( A_2 \) to \( 5x_k+x_p \) to get a better solution. If \( 5x_k+x_p < 10 \), then \( (x_d, x_k, x_p) \) is also the greedy solution to \( A_3 \) and is optimal. If \( 5x_k+x_p \geq 10 \), which implies \( 5x_k \leq 10 \) since \( x_p < 5 \), then we can get a better solution \( (x_d + \lfloor x_k/2 \rfloor, x_k - 2\lfloor x_k/2 \rfloor, x_p) \). Therefore, \( A_3 \) produces optimal solution.

Finally, we prove that the Greedy algorithm is correct if there are quarters, dimes, nickels, and pennies, and we denote this algorithm by \( A_4 \). Otherwise, assume the optimal solution is \( x_q, x_d, x_k, x_p \). We know that \( x_k < 2 \) and \( x_p < 5 \); otherwise, we can use algorithm \( A_3 \) to get a better solution on the input \( 10x_d+5x_k+x_p \). Let \( n_q = \lfloor n/25 \rfloor \). If \( x_q = n_q \), then this optimal solution is also the solution to algorithm \( A_4 \). If \( x_q < n_q \), then by \( A_3 \), each quarters will lead to \( 1 \) more coins, which means that \( (x_q, x_d, x_k, x_p) \) is not optimal.

Altogether, the greedy algorithm yields optimal solution.