1. (Kleinberg Tardos 7.27) Some of your friends with jobs out West decide they really need some extra time each day to sit in front of their laptops, and the morning commute from Woodside to Palo Alto seems like the only option. So they decide to carpool to work. Unfortunately, they all hate to drive, so they want to make sure that any carpool arrangement they agree upon is fair and doesn’t overload any individual with too much driving. Some sort of simple round-robin scheme is out, because none of them goes to work every day, and so the subset of them in the car varies from day to day.

Here’s one way to define fairness. Let the people be labeled $S = \{p_1, \ldots, p_k\}$. We say that the total driving obligation of $p_j$ over a set of days is the expected number of times that $p_j$ would have driven, had a driver been chosen uniformly at random from among the people going to work each day. More concretely, suppose the carpool plan lasts for $d$ days, and on the $i^{th}$ day a subset $S_i \subseteq S$ of the people go to work. Then the above definition of the total driving obligation $\Delta_j$ for $p_j$ can be written as $\Delta_j = \sum_{i:p_j \in S_i} \frac{1}{|S_i|}$.

Ideally, we’d like to require that $p_j$ drives at most $\Delta_j$ times; unfortunately, $\Delta_j$ may not be an integer.

So let’s say that a driving schedule is a choice of a driver for each day — that is, a sequence $p_i_1, p_i_2, \ldots, p_i_d$ with $p_i_t \in S_t$ — and that a fair driving schedule is one in which each $p_j$ is chosen as the driver on at most $\left\lceil \Delta_j \right\rceil$ days.

(a) Prove that for any sequence of sets $S_1, \ldots, S_d$, there exists a fair driving schedule.

(b) Give an algorithm to compute a fair driving schedule with running time polynomial in $k$ and $d$.

**Solution:** We convert the problem into a network flow problem. First we construct a graph as follows. We denote the vertex $p_i$ as the $i$-th driver. Moreover we denote the vertex $q_j$ as the $j$-th day. If $p_i$ can drive on the $j$-th day, we simply draw a directed edge from $p_i$ to $q_j$ of capacity 1. Finally we draw a source $s$ which connects each $p_i$ with capacity $\left\lceil \Delta_i \right\rceil$ and a sink which connects each $q_j$ with capacity 1. It is easy to find that computing a fair driving schedule is equivalent to computing the maximum flow problem. The only thing we need to do is to prove that the value of the maximum flow is $d$.

First of all, it is obvious that for any flow $f$, $|f| \leq d$. Thus if we are able to find a flow $f$ with $|f| = d$, we are done. This is easy to achieve. Consider the following flow.

$$f_{pq_j} = \frac{1}{|S_j|}, \quad f_{sp_i} = \sum_{j:p_i \in S_j} \frac{1}{|S_j|} \leq \left\lceil \Delta_i \right\rceil, \quad f_{q_jt} = 1.$$ 

This flow satisfies all the constraints and have value $n$. Thus there exists a fair schedule. For computing it, we simply adopt the Ford algorithm.

2. Recall Karger’s algorithm for the global min-cut problem. In this problem we modify the algorithm to improve its running time.
(a) Prove that if we stop the original Karger’s algorithm when the remaining number of vertices is
\[
\max \left\{ \left\lceil 1 + \frac{n}{\sqrt{2}} \right\rceil, 2 \right\},
\]
the probability that we have contracted an edge in the min-cut is less than 1/2. Let’s call this procedure \textit{Partial Karger}.

\textbf{Solution:} Denote \( A_k \) as the event that we do not contract an edge in the min cut. Suppose we stop at the \( k \)-th step, then:

\[
P(\bigcap_{i=1}^{k} A_i) \geq \frac{(n - k)(n - k - 1)}{n(n - 1)}
\]

If we set \( k = n - \left\lceil \frac{n}{\sqrt{2}} \right\rceil - 1 \), we have:

\[
P(\bigcap_{i=1}^{n - \left\lceil \frac{n}{\sqrt{2}} \right\rceil - 1} A_i) \geq \frac{\left\lceil \frac{n}{\sqrt{2}} \right\rceil (\left\lceil \frac{n}{\sqrt{2}} \right\rceil + 1)}{n(n - 1)} \geq \frac{n/\sqrt{2}(n/\sqrt{2} + 1)}{n(n - 1)} \geq \frac{1}{2}
\]

(b) Now suppose we apply \textit{Partial Karger} to two copies of \( G \) to produce graphs \( G_1 \) and \( G_2 \). We then recursively apply these steps to \( G_1 \) and \( G_2 \) and so on until each recursive call returns a graph on two vertices. If \( r(n) \) is the running time of this process as a function of the number of vertices \( n \) of \( G \), derive a recursive equation for \( r(n) \) and solve it to obtain an explicit expression for the running time (you may use \( O(\cdot) \) notation to simplify your recursive equation).

\textbf{Solution:} The operation cost for contracting a single edge is \( O(n) \). Thus the operation cost for partial Kager is \( O(n^2) \). By recursion we have:

\[
r(n) = 2r(n/\sqrt{2}) + O(n^2)
\]

By Master’s Theorem we obtain \( r(n) = O(n^2 \log n) \).

(c) Show that the algorithm in part (b) produces \( O(n^2) \) contracted graphs on two vertices each. Prove that the probability that at least one of them contains a global min-cut is at least \( 1/\log(n) \) up to a multiplicative constant.

\textbf{Hint:} Think of the recursion as a binary tree with paths leading to the \( O(n^2) \) leaves representing the two-vertex contracted graphs.

\textbf{Solution:} By using partial Karger’s algorithm, we obtain graphs \( G_1, G_2 \) from the original graph \( G \). Here \( G_1, G_2 \) have \( \left\lceil \frac{n}{\sqrt{2}} \right\rceil \) vertices. We continue using partial Karger’s algorithm, so that \( G_1, G_2 \) keep branching. In the end we get a binary tree. The height of the tree is \( \log_{\sqrt{2}} n \). Thus the total number of leaves is \( O(2^{\log_{\sqrt{2}} n} = O(n^2) \). Now we proceed to prove that the probability that at least one of the leaves contains a global min cut is greater than \( c/\log n \). We denote
such probability as \( f(n) \). Moreover we denote \( p \) as the probability in part (a).

We know from part (a) that \( p < 1/2 \).

We consider \( 1 - f(n) \), which is the probability that none of the leaves contains a global min cut. Since the algorithm \( G \) branches to \( G_1 \) and \( G_2 \). By independence we only consider the probability that none of \( G_1 \)’s leaves contains a global min cut. There are two cases that can make this happen. (1) We contracted an edge in the min cut when we derive \( G_1 \) from \( G \) using Karger’s algorithm, which has probability \( p \). (2) We did not contract an edge in the min cut when we derive \( G_1 \) from \( G \), but we unfortunately contracted a min-cut-edge in the following steps, which has probability \((1 - p)(1 - f(n\sqrt{2}))\). Thus we have:

\[
1 - f(n) = (p + (1 - p)(1 - f(n/\sqrt{2})))^2 = (1 - (1 - p)f(n/\sqrt{2}))^2 \\
\leq (1 - \frac{1}{2}f(n/\sqrt{2}))^2 = 1 - f(n/\sqrt{2}) + \frac{1}{4}f^2(n/\sqrt{2})
\]

Thus, \( f(n) \geq f(n/\sqrt{2}) - \frac{1}{2}f^2(n/\sqrt{2}) \). We prove by induction that \( f(n) \geq c/\log n \) for some small \( c \). Here we take the logarithm under base \( \sqrt{2} \). Suppose this holds for \( k \geq n \), then for \( k = n \), we have:

\[
f(n) \geq f(n/\sqrt{2}) - \frac{1}{4}f^2(n/\sqrt{2}) \geq \frac{c}{\log n - 1/2} - \frac{c^2}{4(\log n - 1/2)^2}
\]

We want to prove that the right hand side is less than \( c/\log n \), that is:

\[
\frac{c}{\log n - 1/2} - \frac{c^2}{4(\log n - 1/2)^2} \leq \frac{c}{\log n}
\]

This is equivalent to \( \frac{\log n}{2} \leq c \). If we choose \( c \) to be less than 2, then this indeed holds. Thus we completed the induction process.

(d) Compare the running time of the above algorithm to Karger’s original given the same probability of failure.

**Solution:** For the partial Karger’s algorithm, the success probability is \( c/\log n \). Thus we need to run it \( \log n \) times to achieve constant success rate. The total run time is \( O(n^2 \log n) \) times \( O(\log n) \), which is \( O(n^2 \log^2 n) \) time. For traditional Karger’s algorithm, the total run time is \( O(n^2 m \log n) \). Obviously, partial Karger’s algorithms is significantly smaller.

3. An independent set in a graph is a set of vertices with no edges connecting them. Let \( G \) be a graph with \( nd/2 \) edges \( (d > 1) \), and consider the following probabilistic experiment for finding an independent set in \( G \): delete each vertex of \( G \) (and all its incident edges) independently with probability \( 1 - 1/d \).

   (a) Compute the expected number of vertices and edges that remain after the deletion process. Now imagine deleting one endpoints of each remaining edge.
**Solution.** Each node survives with probability $1/d$. Thus the expected number of nodes is $n/d$. Each edge survives with probability $1/d^2$ (both its ends must survive independently). Thus the expected number of edges is $nd/2 	imes 1/d^2 = n/2d$.

(b) From this, infer that there is an independent set with at least $n/2d$ vertices in any graph with $n$ vertices with $nd/2$ edges.

**Solution.** After applying this sampling, we create an independent set as follows: for each edge in the resulting graph, delete one of the endpoints. After doing this for each edge, none of the remaining vertices are connected by any edges, i.e. form an independent set. If $G' = (V', E')$ is the graph we obtain after sampling, we expect the size of the independent set to be

$$E[\text{size of independent set}] = E[|V'|-|E'|] = n/d - n/2d = n/2d$$

Since there will be at least one outcome with a value equal to (or greater than) the expectation, by the probabilistic method there must be an independent set of size $\geq n/2d$.

4. Prove that a graph can only have at most $\binom{n}{2}$ different cuts that realize the global minimum cut value.

**Solution:** Suppose we run Karger’s min cut algorithm we saw in class. Let $x_i$ be the event that the algorithm returns the $i$th global min cut. Suppose there are $s$ different min cuts, then the probabilities of realizing each in the algorithm will be disjoint (all end with different sets of nodes at the conclusion of the algorithm). We saw in class that for a given global min cut, the probability of returning that cut is $\geq \frac{2}{n(n-1)}$. So we have:

$$P[\text{returning a global min cut}] = P[\bigcup_{i=1}^{s} x_i] = \sum_{i=1}^{s} P[x_i] \geq s \frac{2}{n(n-1)}$$

We also have that the probability of returning a global min cut is $\leq 1$, so we need the above to be upper bounded by 1, which means $s \leq \frac{n(n-1)}{2}$.

5. Exhibit a graph $G = (V, E)$ where there are an exponential (in $|V| = n$, the number of nodes) number of minimum cuts between a particular pair of vertices. Do this by constructing a family of graphs parameterized on $n$ and give a pair of vertices $s, t$ such that there are exponentially many minimum cuts between $s$ and $t$.

**Solution.** For $n = 3$, we simply have a path of length 2 between the two ends $s$ and $t$. For $n > 3$, each new vertex will be connected to $s$ and $t$ (and nothing else) creating an additional path of length 2 between $s$ and $t$.

For general $n$, to separate $s$ and $t$, we must cut one edge along every edge-disjoint path between them. There are $n-2$ paths between $s$ and $t$, each of length 2. So we have $n-2$ binary choices, giving $2^{n-2}$ different minimum cuts.

6. Exhibit a directed graph that has cover time exponentially large in the number of nodes. Contrast this with the cover time of undirected graphs discussed in class.
9. Suppose we have a 2n 7. Given a directed graph G n 8. Compute the cover time of a Hamiltonian cycle with capacity one edges. We connect each virtual copy node in R our constructed in the max flow. Realize that a Cycle Cover will contain exactly one cycle. For each original node in G, we connect each virtual copy node in R to a source s with capacity one edges. We connect each virtual copy node in R to a sink t also with unit capacity edges.

Now, use Ford-Fulkerson. When FF terminates, we get a set of edges which are saturated in the max flow. Realize that a Cycle Cover will contain exactly n edges. If there is a cycle cover, it must mean that each node has one incoming and one outgoing edge exactly; we may turn this into a flow of size n in our constructed graph above which still respects all capacity constraints. Conversely, if there is a flow of size n on our constructed graph, then we may translate such a flow into a cycle cover; for each node u ∈ V, it contains exactly one incoming and one outgoing edge, and each node in L has a corresponding node in R. If the flow returned by FF < n, then no cycle cover exists.

8. Compute the cover time of a Hamiltonian cycle with n vertices.

**Solution.** First of all C(G) ≤ 2m(n − 1) = 2n(n − 1), so C(G) is O(n^2). Now we compute the maximum resistance in the graph. For two points that are x and n − x edges away from each other, the resistance between these two points are R = 1 1 x+1/(n−x) = x(1 − x/n). The maximum of this function is achieved at x = [n/2] and R_{max} = θ(n). Then C(G) ≥ mR_{max} implies C(G) is Ω(n^2). Hence C(G) is Θ(n^2).

9. Suppose we have a 2n × 2n (n ≥ 2) table where each cell is filled with an integer in {1, 2, 3, ..., 2n^2}. Moreover, each integer shows up exactly twice. Show that one can pick 2n cells that satisfy all the following conditions: (1). all the numbers written in these cells are distinct; (2). in each row exactly one cell is picked out; (3) in each column exactly one cell is picked out.

**Solution.** Take a random permutation π of {1, 2, 3, ..., 2n}, pick out π(i)-th cell from row i. Any 2n cells chosen this way satisfy condition (2) and (3). We show that the probability of these cells satisfying condition (1) is positive: For any j ∈ {1, 2, 3, ..., 2n^2}, the probability of picking out two j’s in our 2n cells is: 0 if the two j’s
are in the same row or column: $\frac{1}{2^n} \times \frac{1}{2^{n-1}}$ if the two $j$'s are in different rows and columns.

By union bound, the probability of satisfying condition (1) $\geq 1 - 2n^2 \times \frac{1}{2^n} \times \frac{1}{2^{n-1}} > 0$ when $n \geq 2$. Therefore there is a way of choosing $2n$ cells that satisfies all the three required conditions. \qed

10. Say we have an $n \times n$ checkerboard. The tiles are two-colored, i.e. white and black. We delete an equal number of white and black squares from the board. Describe and analyze an algorithm to determine whether an efficient tiling of Dominoes (which are $2 \times 1$ pieces) exists, subject to the constraint that each square is covered and no domino is hanging off the board.

Your input is a two-dimensional indicator array, of size $n \times n$, whose $i,j$ value is one if and only if the square in row $i$ and column $j$ has been deleted. Your output is a single bit; you do not have to compute the actual placement of the dominoes. In the example shown above, your algorithm should return True.

**Solution.** We draw edges between white and black nodes if they are adjacent. Realize that since we lay a $2 \times 1$ domino, and since we can't have a domino hanging off the board, each domino must cover exactly one black and one white tile (since the board does not have two adjacent tiles the same color). We seek to find a Perfect Matching on this board, i.e. for each white tile remaining, we wish to pair with it a black tile such that we may lay exactly one domino atop both.

We then run a max-flow on this new graph, and return true if and only if a perfect matching is found.

---

\[1\text{With credit to Jeff Erickson: http://jeffe.cs.illinois.edu/teaching/algorithms/}.\]