Discrete Mathematics

Lent 2009

MA210

Solutions to Exercises 9

(1) There are 5 cities. The cost of building a road directly between i and j is the entry $a_{i,j}$ in the matrix below. An indefinite entry indicates that the road cannot be built. Determine the least cost of making all the cities reachable from each other.

Solution. We order the edges according to the weights: 12, 23, 13, 45, 25, 15, 24, 35, 14. Kruskal's Algorithm accepts edges 12, 23, then rejects 13, then accepts 45, 25, and then it stops. Thus, the least cost to build the road network is 3 + 3 + 7 + 8 = 21.

(2) For natural numbers n and p, let G(n, p) be the complete graph with vertex set {1, 2, ..., n}, and let the weight of the edge ij be given by c_{ij} = |i − j| mod p. (So c_{ij} ∈ {0, 1, ..., p − 1}.) For every n and p, determine the minimum weight of a spanning tree in G(n, p).

Solution. We must distinguish two cases: $p \ge n$ and p < n.

• When $p \ge n$, we have that

$$1 \le |i - j| < n \le p$$

for every $i \neq j$, $1 \leq i, j \leq n$. From this, we obtain $c_{ij} = |i - j| \geq 1$ for every two vertices $i \neq j$ of G(n, p). Since every spanning tree of G(n, p) must have n - 1 edges and each edge has weight at least 1, it follows that every spanning tree of G(n, p) must have total weight at least n - 1.

On the other hand, the edges 12, 23, ..., (n-1)n have all weight 1 and form a spanning tree of G(n, p). Hence, the minimum weight of a spanning tree of G(n, p) is n - 1.

• When p < n, we must be more careful because some edges have weight 0. Let ij be any edge of G(n, p). Then, $c_{ij} = 0$ if and only if |i - j| is divisible by p. So, when does this happen ?

We write n = mp + r, where $0 \le r < p$. We notice that any edge with both endpoints in $\{p, 2p, 3p, \ldots, mp\}$ or in $\{1, 1+p, 1+2p, \ldots\}$ has weight 0. More generally, for $0 < k \le r$, we set

$$X_k = \{k, k+p, k+2p, \dots, k+mp\}$$

and, for $r < k \leq p$, we set

$$X_k = \{k, k+p, k+2p, \dots, k+(m-2)p, k+(m-1)p\}.$$

Note that $c_{ij} = 0$ if and only if $i, j \in X_k$ for some k.

We order the edges of G(n, p) in the following order: first we list all the edges with both ends X_1 , then all the edges with both ends in X_2 , etc., until we list all the edges with both ends X_k . After this we put edges 12, 23, ..., (p-1)p, all of which have weight 1. Then, we list all the remaining edges in any non-decreasing order.

So, what happens when we run Kruskal's Algorithm on this order? It first accepts every edge with both endpoints in X_1 as long as it does not create a cycle. The crucial observation is that after Kruskal's Algorithm examines all the edges with both endpoints in X_1 , the edges selected form a spanning tree on the vertices in X_1 . In other words, Kruskal's Algorithm picked exactly $|X_1| - 1$ edges (each of weight 0).

The same thing remains true for the other sets X_k : after Kruskal's Algorithm examines all the edges with both endpoints in X_k , the edges selected form a spanning tree on the vertices in X_k . Hence, Kruskal's Algorithm picked exactly $|X_k| - 1$ edges.

So, before proceeding to edges 12, 23, etc., Kruskal's Algorith selected

$$(|X_1| - 1) + (|X_2| - 1) + \dots + (|X_p| - 1) = |X_1| + |X_2| + \dots + |X_p| - p = n - p$$

edges. These edges form a forest with exactly p components (one on every X_k). Now, edge 12 connects components on X_1 and X_2 to a tree on $X_1 \cup X_2$. Adding the edge 23 creates a tree on $X_1 \cup X_2 \cup X_3$. Similarly, when we add the edge (k - 1)k, we join two components, one on $X_1 \cup X_2 \cup \cdots \cup X_{k-1}$ and the other one on X_k , and obtain a tree on $X_1 \cup X_2 \cup \cdots \cup X_k$. Thus, we never create a cycle. Hence, Kruskal's Algorithm accepts p - 1 edges 12, 23, ..., (p - 1)p and then stops because it selected n - 1 edges. What is the weight of this spanning tree? The only edges with non-zero weight are 12, 23, ..., (p-1)p, hence, the minimum weight of a spanning tree is p-1.

- each of the edges 12, 23, ..., (p-1)p connects two of the components (draw a picture to see this!)
- (3) (a) What is the chromatic number of the complete graph K_n?
 Solution. Every two vertices of K_n are adjacent, therefore, every two vertices must have different colours in any colouring of K_n. Clearly, if every vertex get a distinct coulour, we obtain a proper colouring of K_n. Thus, χ(K_n) = n. □
 - (b) What is the chromatic number of the path P_n ?

Solution. Clearly $\chi(P_1) = 1$. Since P_n has at least one edge for $n \ge 2$, we have $\chi(P_n) \ge 2$. P_n also has no (odd) cycles, so it is bipartite. Each partite set can be viewed as one colour class, so we have a proper colouring of P_n with two colours. Hence, $\chi(P_n) = 2$ for n > 1.

(c) What is the chromatic number of the cycle C_n ?

Solution. Since C_n has at least one edge for $n \ge 3$, we have $\chi(C_n) \ge 2$. As observed in part (b), any graph is colourable with 2 colours if and only if it is bipartite.

For *n* even, C_n has no odd cycles, so it is bipartite and $\chi(C_n) = 2$. For *n* odd, C_n is not bipartite, so $\chi(C_n) > 2$. It is easy to see that if C_n has vertices v_1, \ldots, v_n and edges $v_1v_2, v_2v_3, \ldots, v_{n-1}v_n, v_nv_1$, then $c(v_1) = c(v_3) = \cdots = c(v_{n-2}) = 1$, $c(v_2) = c(v_4) = \cdots = c(v_{n-1}) = 2$, $c(v_n) = 3$ is a proper colouring of C_n with 3 colours. Hence, for *n* odd, $\chi(C_n) = 3$.

- (4) Prove or disprove:
 - (a) Every k-chromatic graph G has a proper k-colouring in which some colour class has $\alpha(G)$ vertices.

Solution. This is false. Let G be a graph with vertices $\{a, b, c, A, B, C\}$ and edges $\{aA, aB, aC, bA, cA\}$. This graph is bipartite (why?), hence it is 2-chromatic. In every 2-colouring of G, the vertices a and A must be in different colour classes because aA is an edge. However, this force B, C to be in the same colour class as A, and b, c to be in the same colour class as a. Hence, in every 2-colouring of G, every colour class has size 3.

However, $\{b, c, B, C\}$ is an independent set of size 4, so $\alpha(G) > 3$.

(b) For every *n*-vertex graph G, $\chi(G) \leq n - \alpha(G) + 1$.

Solution. Let G = (V, E) be a graph and let X be an independent set of size $\alpha(G)$. We assign the same colour 1 to all the vertices of X. Each of the remaining $n - \alpha(G)$ vertices gets a new colour. Except colour 1, all the other colour classes have size 1, i.e., they cannot contain an edge. The colour class for colour 1 is X and it contains no edge because it is an independent set. Hence, we found a proper colouring of G using $n - \alpha(G) + 1$ colours. This means that $\chi(G) \leq n - \alpha(G) + 1$.

(c) For every two vertex disjoint graphs G and H, $\chi(G + H) = \max{\{\chi(G), \chi(H)\}}$.

Here, G + H is defined as follows: Let G = (V, E) and H = (V', E') be two graphs with disjoint vertex sets, i.e., $V \cap V' = 0$. The disjoint union of G and H, denoted by G + H, is the graph with vertex set $V \cup V'$ and edge set $E \cup E'$.

Solution. G + H contains both G and H as subgraphs. SO, every proper colouring of G + H also produces a proper colouring of G and H. Hence, $\chi(G + H) \ge \max{\chi(G), \chi(H)}$.

On the other hand, since $\chi(G), \chi(H) \leq \max{\chi(G), \chi(H)}$, we can find a proper colourings of G and H using $\max{\chi(G), \chi(H)}$ colours. Since there is no edge between G and H in G + H, we can combine these two colourings to a colouring of G + H. Hence, $\chi(G + H) \leq \max{\chi(G), \chi(H)}$.

(5) Let G be a graph. Prove that there exists some ordering of the vertices of G such that the greedy algorithm uses exactly $\chi(G)$ colours.

Solution. Take any colouring of G using $\chi(G)$ colours. (We may not know how this colouring looks like, but we do know it exists!) We first list the vertices from colour class 1, then from colour class 2, etc., and the end we list the vertices from the colour class $\chi(G)$. So, we have an ordering of the vertices of G. (More precisely, we know that the ordering described above exists.)

So, how will the greedy algorithm (GA from now on) colour graph G using this order? First, remember that each colour class is an independent set. So, the GA will assign colour 1' to all the vertices coming from colour class 1. (We use 1' to distinguish this colour from colour 1 used in the definition of the ordering.) Then, the GA will assign colour 1' or 2' to all the vertices coming from the colour class 2. This is because each such vertex may have neighbours among vertices from the colour class 1 (GA coloured these by 1') but none coming from the colour class 2.

In general, when the GA considers a vertex coming from the colour class i, it gets a colour from $\{1', 2', ..., i'\}$ because may have neighbours among vertices from colour classes 1, ..., i-1 (GA coloured these by one of $\{1', ..., (i-1)'\}$) but none coming from the colour class i.

Hence, the GA used at most $\chi(G)$ colours $1', 2', \ldots, \chi(G)'$. But no proper colouring of G can use less than $\chi(G)$ colours (this comes from the definition of $\chi(G)$, so the GA used exactly $\chi(G)$ colours.

- (6) Find the minimum distance for the following codes:
 - (a) $C_1 = \{10000, 01010, 00001\};$
 - (b) $C_2 = \{0000, 0011, 0101, 0110, 1001, 1010, 1100, 1111\};$
 - (c) $C_3 = \{000000, 101010, 010101\}.$

Suppose we want to add extra codewords to the codes above. For which of the three of them is that possible without altering the minimum distance?

Solution. A quick examination yields $\delta(C_1) = 2$, $\delta(C_2) = 2$, $\delta(C_3) = 3$.

We can add 11111 to C_1 and 111000 to C_3 . (Check!) If we can add any word to C_2 , it must have distance at least 2 from every word of C_2 . Since 0000, 1111 $\in C_2$, every such word must contain at least two 0's and at least two 1's. But the length of the code is 4 so if we want to enlarge C_2 without changing the minimum distance, such a word must have exactly two 0's and exactly two 1's. Number of such words is $\binom{4}{2} = 6$ (Why ?) and we see all of them are already in C_2 .

(7) Prove the triangle inequality: for all $\bar{\boldsymbol{x}}, \bar{\boldsymbol{y}}, \bar{\boldsymbol{z}} \in \{0, 1\}^n$,

$$d_H(\bar{\boldsymbol{x}}, \bar{\boldsymbol{z}}) + d_H(\bar{\boldsymbol{z}}, \bar{\boldsymbol{y}}) \ge d_H(\bar{\boldsymbol{x}}, \bar{\boldsymbol{y}}).$$

Solution. Let $\bar{x} = x_1 x_2 \dots x_n$, $\bar{y} = y_1 y_2 \dots y_n$, $\bar{z} = z_1 z_2 \dots z_n \in \{0, 1\}^n$ be given. Let A be the set of positions at which \bar{x}, \bar{z} differ, that is,

$$A = \{i \mid 1 \le i \le n, \ x_i \ne z_i\}.$$

Then, $|A| = d_H(\bar{\boldsymbol{x}}, \bar{\boldsymbol{z}})$. Similarly, we define

$$B = \{i \mid 1 \le i \le n, \ z_i \ne y_i\},\$$
$$C = \{i \mid 1 \le i \le n, \ x_i \ne y_i\}.$$

Then, $|B| = d_H(\bar{z}, \bar{y})$ and $|C| = d_H(\bar{x}, \bar{y})$.

We will show that $C \subset A \cup B$. Indeed, let $i \in C$, that is $x_i \neq y_i$. If $i \notin A \cup B$, then $i \notin A$ and $i \notin B$, so $x_i = z_i$ and $z_i = y_i$. Hence, $x_i = z_i = y_i$ and this is not possible. Thus, $i \in A \cup B$.

Consequently, we have $|C| \leq |A \cup B|$ and

$$d_H(\bar{\boldsymbol{x}}, \bar{\boldsymbol{y}}) = |C| \le |A \cup B| \le |A| + |B| = d_H(\bar{\boldsymbol{x}}, \bar{\boldsymbol{z}}) + d_H(\bar{\boldsymbol{z}}, \bar{\boldsymbol{y}}).$$

(8) Construct a binary code C of length 6 such that |C| = 5 and C is 1-error-correcting.

Solution. We know that C is 1-error-correcting if and only if $\delta(C) \ge 2(1) + 1 = 3$. So, we need to find binary code C of length 6 such that |C| = 5 and $\delta(C) \ge 3$. One such a code is

 $C = \{000000, 101010, 010101, 111100, 001111\}.$

(Are you sure?)