

# 10. Homework

Due 4/27/10 before class

## 1. Hamiltonian Cycle (4 points)

Given that the Hamiltonian cycle problem for undirected graphs is NP-complete, show that the Hamiltonian cycle problem for directed graphs is also NP-complete.

## 2. Subgraph isomorphism (5 points)

The subgraph isomorphism problem takes two graphs  $G_1$  and  $G_2$  as input and asks whether  $G_1$  is isomorphic to a subgraph of  $G_2$ . See page 1082/1171 for the definitions of graph isomorphisms and subgraphs. Show that the subgraph isomorphism problem is NP-complete.

*Hint: Show that the problem is in NP, and then show that it is NP-hard. For the NP-hardness you need to pick an NP-hard problem (ideally one that involves a graph and a subgraph), and polynomially reduce it to the subgraph isomorphism problem.*

## 3. $\Pi_1 \leq \Pi_2$ (8 points)

Let  $\Pi_1$  and  $\Pi_2$  be decision problems and suppose  $\Pi_1$  is polynomial time reducible to  $\Pi_2$ , so,  $\Pi_1 \leq \Pi_2$ . Answer and justify each of the questions below:

- If  $\Pi_2$  is NP-complete, does this imply that  $\Pi_1 \in NP$ ?
- If  $\Pi_1$  is NP-complete, does this imply that  $\Pi_2 \in NP$ ?
- If  $\Pi_2 \in P$  does this imply that  $\Pi_1 \in P$ ?
- If  $\Pi_1 \in P$  does this imply that  $\Pi_2 \in P$ ?
- If  $\Pi_1$  and  $\Pi_2$  are NP-complete, is  $\Pi_2$  polynomially reducible to  $\Pi_1$ ?
- If  $\Pi_1 \in NP$  does this imply that  $\Pi_2$  is NP-complete?
- If  $\Pi_2 \notin P$  does this imply that  $\Pi_1 \notin P$ ?
- If  $\Pi_1$  is NP-complete and  $\Pi_2 \in P$ , what does this imply?

## 4. Vertex Cover for trees (5 points)

Develop a linear-time greedy algorithm that finds an optimal vertex cover for a tree. Argue why the cover computed by your algorithm is indeed an **optimal** vertex cover.

## 5. Vertex Cover and Clique (4 points)

The vertex-cover problem and the clique problem are complementary in the sense that an optimal vertex cover is the complement of a maximum-size clique in the complement graph. (So, the reductions we showed on the slides actually work in both directions.)

Give a counter example which shows that the approximation algorithm for vertex cover does not imply that there is a polynomial-time approximation algorithm with a constant approximation ratio for the clique problem.

FLIP OVER TO BACK PAGE  $\implies$

## Related questions from previous PhD Exams

Just for your information. You **do not** need to solve them for homework credit.

1. This problem is concerned with NP-completeness.

Consider the following two decision problems.

### VERTEX COVER.

**Instance:** An undirected graph  $G = (V, E)$ , and a positive integer  $k$ .

**Decision Problem:** Is there a vertex cover of size  $k$ ? A *vertex cover* is a subset  $V' \subseteq V$  such that if  $(u, v) \in E$ , then  $u \in V'$  or  $v \in V'$  (or both).

### INDEPENDENT SET.

**Instance:** An undirected graph  $G = (V, E)$  and a positive integer  $k$ .

**Decision Problem:** Is there an independent set of size  $k$ ? An *independent set* is a subset  $V' \subseteq V$  such that each edge in  $E$  is incident on at most one vertex in  $V'$ .

- (a) Define *polynomial-time reducibility*.
  - (b) Show that INDEPENDENT SET is polynomial-time reducible to VERTEX COVER.
  - (c) Suppose problem  $P_1$  is polynomial-time reducible to problem  $P_2$  ( $P_1 \leq_P P_2$ ). If there is a polynomial algorithm for  $P_1$ , what can be implied about  $P_2$ ? If there is a polynomial algorithm for  $P_2$ , what can be implied about  $P_1$ ?
  - (d) Consider the complexity classes P, NP, NP-complete, and NP-hard. If  $P \neq NP$ , what would be the subset relationships among these four classes? If  $P = NP$ , what would be the subset relationships among these four classes?
  - (e) Assume that VERTEX COVER is an NP-complete problem. Use VERTEX COVER to show that INDEPENDENT SET is NP-complete. Specify what steps need to be done, and provide the details of your solution.
2. This problem is concerned with NP-completeness. Let  $\Pi_1$  and  $\Pi_2$  be two decision problems for which is known that  $\Pi_1 \leq_P \Pi_2$  (i.e.,  $\Pi_1$  is polynomially reducible to  $\Pi_2$ ). Briefly state what can be inferred (if anything) in each of the following cases.
    - (a)  $\Pi_1 \in NP$
    - (b)  $\Pi_2 \in P$
    - (c)  $\Pi_1$  is NP-hard
    - (d)  $\Pi_2$  is NP-complete