CS 561, NP-Hardness and Approximation Algorithms

Jared Saia University of New Mexico



- P, NP and NP-Hardness
- Reductions
- Approximation Algorithms

1

- Q: What is a minimum requirement for an algorithm to be efficient?
- A: A long time ago, theoretical computer scientists decided that a minimum requirement of any efficient algorithm is that it runs in polynomial time: $O(n^c)$ for some constant c
- People soon recognized that not all problems can be solved in polynomial time but they had a hard time figuring out exactly which ones could and which ones couldn't

— NP-Hard Problems ——

- Q: How to determine those problems which can be solved in polynomial time and those which can not
- Again a long time ago, Steve Cook and Dick Karp and others defined the class of *NP-hard* problems
- Most people believe that NP-Hard problems *cannot* be solved in polynomial time, even though so far nobody has *proven* a super-polynomial lower bound.
- What we do know is that if *any* NP-Hard problem can be solved in polynomial time, they *all* can be solved in polynomial time.

Circuit Satisfiability

- **Circuit satisfiability** is a good example of a problem that we don't know how to solve in polynomial time
- In this problem, the input is a *boolean circuit*: a collection of and, or, and not gates connected by wires
- We'll assume there are no loops in the circuit (so no delay lines or flip-flops)

Circuit Satisfiability _____

- The input to the circuit is a set of m boolean (true/false) values $x_1, \ldots x_m$
- The output of the circuit is a single boolean value
- Given specific input values, we can calculate the output in polynomial time using depth-first search and evaluating the output of each gate in constant time

Circuit Satisfiability

- The circuit satisfiability problem asks, given a circuit, whether there is an input that makes the circuit output **True**
- In other words, does the circuit always output false for any collenction of inputs
- Nobody knows how to solve this problem faster than just trying all 2^m possible inputs to the circuit but this requires exponential time
- On the other hand nobody has every proven that this is the best we can do!





An and gate, an or gate, and a not gate.



A boolean circuit. Inputs enter from the left, and the output leaves to the right.

We can characterize many problems into three classes:

- P is the set of yes/no problems that can be solved in polynomial time. Intuitively P is the set of problems that can be solved "quickly"
- NP is the set of yes/no problems with the following property: If the answer is yes, then there is a *proof* of this fact that can be checked in polynomial time
- **co-NP** is the set of yes/no problems with the following property: If the answer is no, then there is a *proof* of this fact that can be checked in polynomial time

• NP is the set of yes/no problems with the following property: If the answer is yes, then there is a *proof* of this fact that can be checked in polynomial time

NP

- Intuitively NP is the set of problems where we can verify a **Yes** answer quickly if we have a solution in front of us
- For example, circuit satisfiability is in NP since if the answer is yes, then any set of *m* input values that produces the **True** output is a proof of this fact (and we can check this proof in polynomial time)



- If a problem is in P, then it is also in NP to verify that the answer is yes in polynomial time, we can just throw away the proof and recompute the answer from scratch
- Similarly, any problem in P is also in co-NP
- In this sense, problems in P can only be easier than problems in NP and co-NP



- The problem: "For a certain circuit and a set of inputs, is the output **True**?" is in P (and in NP and co-NP)
- The problem: "Does a certain circuit have an input that makes the output **True**?" is in NP
- The problem: "Does a certain circuit always have output true for any input?" is in co-NP



Most problems we've seen in this class so far are in P including:

- "Does there exist a path of distance $\leq d$ from u to v in the graph G?"
- "Does there exist a minimum spanning tree for a graph G that has cost $\leq c$?"
- "Does there exist an alignment of strings s_1 and s_2 which has cost $\leq c$?"

There are also several problems that are in NP (but probably not in P) including:

- Circuit Satisfiability
- **Coloring**: "Can we color the vertices of a graph G with c colors such that every edge has two different colors at its endpoints (G and c are inputs to the problem)
- Clique: "Is there a clique of size k in a graph G?" (G and k are inputs to the problem)
- Hamiltonian Path: "Does there exist a path for a graph G that visits every vertex exactly once?"

The \$1 Million Question ____

- The most important question in computer science (and one of the most important in mathematics) is: "Does P=NP?"
- Nobody knows.
- Intuitively, it seems obvious that P≠NP; in this class you've seen that some problems can be very difficult to solve, even though the solutions are obvious once you see them
- But nobody has proven that $P \neq NP$

- Notice that the definition of NP (and co-NP) is not symmetric.
- Just because we can verify every yes answer quickly doesn't mean that we can check no answers quickly
- For example, as far as we know, there is no short proof that a boolean circuit is *not* satisfiable
- In other words, we know that Circuit Satisfiability is in NP but we don't know if its in co-NP



- We conjecture that $P \neq NP$ and that $NP \neq co-NP$
- Here's a picture of what we *think* the world looks like:



_ NP-Hard _____

- A problem Π is NP-hard if a polynomial-time algorithm for Π would imply a polynomial-time algorithm for every problem in NP
- In other words: Π is NP-hard means that if Π can be solved in polynomial time then P=NP
- In other words: if we can solve one particular NP-hard problem quickly, then we can quickly solve *any* problem whose solution is quick to check (using the solution to that one special problem as a subroutine)
- If you tell your boss that a problem is NP-hard, it's like saying: "Not only can't I find an efficient solution to this problem but neither can all these other very famous people." (you could then seek to find an approximation algorithm for your problem)



- A problem is NP-Easy if it is in NP
- A problem is *NP-Complete* if it is NP-Hard and NP-Easy
- In other words, a problem is NP-Complete if it is in NP but is at least as hard as all other problems in NP.
- If anyone finds a polynomial-time algorithm for even one NPcomplete problem, then that would imply a polynomial-time algorithm for *every* NP-Complete problem
- *Thousands* of problems have been shown to be NP-Complete, so a polynomial-time algorithm for one (i.e. all) of them is incredibly unlikely



A more detailed picture of what we *think* the world looks like.

- In 1971, Steve Cook proved the following theorem: Circuit Satisfiability is NP-Hard
- Thus, one way to show that a problem A is NP-Hard is to show that if you can solve it in polynomial time, then you can solve the Circuit Satisfiability problem in polynomial time.
- This is called a *reduction*. We say that we *reduce* from Circuit Satisfiability to problem A
- This implies that problem A is "as difficult as" Circuit Satisfiability.

____ SAT ____

- Consider the *formula satisfiability* problem (aka SAT)
- The input to SAT is a boolean formula like

 $(a \lor b \lor c \lor \overline{d}) \Leftrightarrow ((b \land \overline{c}) \lor \overline{(\overline{a} \Rightarrow d)} \lor (c \neq a \land b)),$

- The question is whether it is possible to assign boolean values to the variables a, b, c, \ldots so that the formula evaluates to TRUE
- To show that SAT is NP-Hard, we need to show that we can use a solution to SAT to solve Circuit Satisfiability



- Given a boolean circuit, we can transform it into a boolean formula by creating new output variables for each gate and then just writing down the list of gates separated by AND
- This simple algorithm is the reduction
- For example, we can transform the example ciruit into a formula as follows:





 $(y_1 = x_1 \land x_4) \land (y_2 = \overline{x_4}) \land (y_3 = x_3 \land y_2) \land (y_4 = y_1 \lor x_2) \land (y_5 = \overline{x_2}) \land (y_6 = \overline{x_5}) \land (y_7 = y_3 \lor y_5) \land (y_8 = y_4 \land y_7 \land y_6) \land y_8$

A boolean circuit with gate variables added, and an equivalent boolean formula.







- The original circuit is satisifiable iff the resulting formula is satisfiable
- We can transform any boolean circuit into a formula in linear time using DFS and the size of the resulting formula is only a constant factor larger than the size of the circuit
- Thus we've shown that if we had a polynomial-time algorithm for SAT, then we'd have a polynomial-time algorithm for Circuit Satisfiability (and this would imply that P=NP)
- This means that SAT is NP-Hard

Showing NP-Completeness ____

- We've shown that SAT is NP-Hard, to show that it is NP-Complete, we now must also show that it is in NP
- In other words, we must show that if the given formula is satisfiable, then there is a proof of this fact that can be checked in polynomial time
- To prove that a boolean formula is satisfiable, we only have to specify an assignment to the variables that makes the formula true (this is the "proof" that the formula is true)
- Given this assignment, we can check it in linear time just by reading the formula from left to right, evaluating as we go
- So we've shown that SAT is NP-Hard and that SAT is in NP, thus SAT is NP-Complete



- In general to show a problem is NP-Complete, we first show that it is in NP and then show that it is NP-Hard
- To show that a problem is in NP, we just show that when the problem has a "yes" answer, there is a proof of this fact that can be checked in polynomial time. Such a proof is sometimes called a *certificate*
- To show that a problem is NP-Hard, we show that if we could solve it in polynomial time, then we could solve some other NP-Hard problem in polynomial time (this is called a reduction)

3-SAT _____

• A boolean formula is in *conjunctive normal form* (CNF) if it is a conjunction (and) of several *clauses*, each of which is the disjunction (or) of several *literals*, each of which is either a variable or its negation. For example:

 $\overbrace{(a \lor b \lor c \lor d)}^{\text{clause}} \land (b \lor \overline{c} \lor \overline{d}) \land (\overline{a} \lor c \lor d) \land (a \lor \overline{b})$

- A *3CNF* formula is a CNF formula with exactly three literals per clause
- The 3-SAT problem is just: "Is there any assignment of variables to a 3CNF formula that makes the formula evaluate to true?"



- 3-SAT is just a restricted version of SAT
- Surprisingly, 3-SAT also turns out to be NP-Complete
- 3-SAT is very useful in proving NP-Hardness results for other problems, we'll see how it can be used to show that CLIQUE is NP-Hard



- To convert an arbitrary formula into 3-SAT form, need to deal with:
- Clauses with just 1 or 2 literals
 - Replicate literals to bring the number up to 3: $(\neg x_1 \lor x_5) \rightarrow (\neg x_1 \lor \neg x_1 \lor x_5)$
- Clauses with 4 or more literals
 - Chaining: split into multiple clauses, using new "linking" literals
 - $\mathsf{E.g.:} (x_1 \lor x_2 \lor x_3 \lor x_4) \to (x_1 \lor x_2 \lor z) \land (\neg z \lor x_3 \lor x_4)$
 - Replace $(x_1 \lor \ldots \lor x_k)$ with k 2 new clauses $(x_1 \lor x_2 \lor z_1) \land (\neg z_1 \lor x_3 \lor z_2) \land (\neg z_2 \lor x_4 \lor z_3) \land \ldots (\neg z_{k-1} \lor x_{k-1} \lor x_k)$
- Can do all this in polynomial time



- The problem CLIQUE asks "Is there a clique of size k in a graph G?"
- Example graph with clique of size 4:



• We'll show that Clique is NP-Hard using a reduction from 3-SAT. (the proof that Clique is in NP is left as an exercise)



- Given a 3-CNF formula F, we construct a graph G as follows.
- The graph has one node for each instance of each literal in the formula
- Two nodes are connected by an edge if: (1) they correspond to literals in different clauses and (2) those literals do not contradict each other



- Let F be the formula: $(a \lor b \lor c) \land (b \lor \overline{c} \lor \overline{d}) \land (\overline{a} \lor c \lor d) \land (a \lor \overline{b} \lor \overline{d})$
- This formula is transformed into the following graph:



(look for the edges that *aren't* in the graph)

Reduction _____

- Let F have k clauses. Then G has a clique of size k iff F has a satisfying assignment. The proof:
- k-clique ⇒ satisfying assignment: If the graph has a clique of k vertices, then each vertex must come from a different clause. To get the satisfying assignment, we declare that each literal in the clique is true. Since we only connect non-contradictory literals with edges, this declaration assigns a consistent value to several of the variables. There may be variables that have no literal in the clique; we can set these to any value we like.
- satisfying assignment \implies k-clique: If we have a satisfying assignment, then we can choose one literal in each clause that is true. Those literals form a k-clique in the graph.




Consider the formula: $(a \lor b) \land (b \lor \overline{c}) \land (c \lor \overline{b})$

- Q1: Transform this formula into a graph, *G*, using the reduction just given.
- Q2: What is the maximum clique size in *G*? Give the vertices in this maximum clique.

CLIQUE is NP-Complete ____

- To show CLIQUE is NP-Complete, must now show it is in NP
- An efficiently checkable proof (aka certificate) that there is a CLIQUE of size k in a graph G = (V, E) is just a subset V' of V of size k
- To check this proof, need to go through every pair of nodes u and v in V' and check that $(u, v) \in E$.
- This just takes polynomial time in the input size.

- Independent Set is the following problem: "Does there exist a set of k vertices in a graph G with no edges between them?"
- It is easy to show that independent set is NP-Hard by a reduction from CLIQUE (will do now in class).
- Thus we can now use Independent Set to show that other problems are NP-Hard



- A *vertex cover* of a graph is a set of vertices that touches every edge in the graph
- The problem *Vertex Cover* is: "Does there exist a vertex cover of size at most k in a graph G?"
- We can prove this problem is NP-Hard by an easy reduction from Independent Set

- Key Observation: If I is an independent set in a graph G = (V, E), then V I is a vertex cover.
- Thus, there is an independent set of size k iff there is a vertex cover of size |V| k.
- For the reduction, we want to show that a polynomial time algorithm for Vertex Cover can give a polynomial time algorithm for Independent Set

- We are given a graph G = (V, E) and a value k and we must determine if there is an independent set of size k in G.
- To do this, we ask if there is a vertex cover of size |V| k in G.
- If so then we return that there is an independent set of size $k \mbox{ in } G$
- If not, we return that there is not an independent set of size $k \mbox{ in } G$



- A c-coloring of a graph G is a map $C: V \to \{1, 2, \ldots, c\}$ that assigns one of c "colors" to each vertex so that every edge has two different colors at its endpoints
- The graph coloring problem is: "Does there exist a *c*-coloring for the graph *G*?"
- Even when c = 3, this problem is hard. We call this problem *3Colorable* i.e. "Does there exist a 3-coloring for the graph G?"



- To show that 3Colorable is NP-hard, we will reduce from 3Sat
- This means that we want to show that a polynomial time algorithm for 3Colorable can give a polynomial time algorithm for 3Sat
- Recall that the 3-SAT problem is just: "Is there any assignment of variables to a 3CNF formula that makes the formula evaluate to true?"
- And a 3CNF formula is just a conjunct of a bunch of clauses, each of which contains exactly 3 variables e.g.

 $\overbrace{(a \lor b \lor c)}^{\text{clause}} \land (b \lor \overline{c} \lor \overline{d}) \land (\overline{a} \lor c \lor d) \land (a \lor \overline{b} \lor d)$



- We are given a 3-CNF formula, *F*, and we must determine if it has a satisfying assignment
- To do this, we produce a graph as follows
- The graph contains one *truth* gadget, one *variable* gadget for each variable in the formula, and one *clause* gadget for each clause in the formula



- The truth gadget is just a triangle with three vertices T, F and X, which intuitively stand for **True**, **False**, and **other**
- Since these vertices are all connected, they must have different colors in any 3-coloring
- For the sake of convenience, we will name those colors True, False, and Other
- Thus when we say a node is colored "True", we just mean that it's colored the same color as the node ${\cal T}$





- The variable gadget for a variable a is also a triangle joining two new nodes labeled a and \overline{a} to node X in the truth gadget
- Node a must be colored either "True" or "False", and so node a must be colored either "False" or "True", respectively.



• The variable gadget ensures that each of the literals is colored either "True" or "False"

The Clause Gadgets

- Each clause gadget joins three literal nodes to node T in the truth gadget using five new unlabelled nodes and ten edges (as in the figure)
- This clause gadget ensures that at least one of the three literal nodes in each clause is colored "True"
- Example clause gadget for the clause $a \lor b \lor \overline{c}$





Consider the formula $(a \lor b \lor c) \land (b \lor \overline{c} \lor \overline{d}) \land (\overline{a} \lor c \lor d) \land (a \lor \overline{b} \lor \overline{d})$. Following is the graph created by the reduction:





- Note that the 3-coloring of this example graph corresponds to a satisfying assignment of the formula
- Namely, a = c = True, b = d = False.
- Note that the final graph contains only *one* node T, only *one* node F, only *one* node \overline{a} for each variable a and so on



- The proof of correctness for this reduction is direct
- If the graph is 3-colorable, then we can extract a satisfying assignment from any 3-coloring, since at least one of the three literal nodes in every clause gadget is colored "True"
- Conversely, if the formula is satisfiable, then we can color the graph according to any satisfying assignment



True or False

True or False



- We've just shown that if 3Colorable can be solved in polynomial time then 3-SAT can be solved in polynomial time
- This shows that 3Colorable is NP-Hard
- To show that 3Colorable is in NP, we just need to note that we can easily verify that a graph has been correctly 3-colored in linear time: just compare the endpoints of every edge
- Thus, 3Coloring is NP-Complete.
- This implies that the more general graph coloring problem is also NP-Complete



Consider the problem 4Colorable: "Does there exist a 4-coloring for a graph G?"

- Q1: Show this problem is in NP by showing that there exists an efficiently verifiable proof of the fact that a graph is 4 colorable.
- Q2: Show the problem is NP-Hard by a reduction from the problem 3Colorable. In particular, show the following:
 - Given a graph G, you can create a graph G' such that G' is 4-colorable iff G is 3-colorable.
 - Creating G' from G takes polynomial time

Note: You've now shown that 4Colorable is NP-Complete!

___ Hamiltonian Cycle _____

- A Hamiltonian Cycle in a graph is a cycle that visits every vertex exactly once (note that this is very different from an *Eulerian cycle* which visits every *edge* exactly once)
- The Hamiltonian Cycle problem is to determine if a given graph G has a Hamiltonian Cycle
- We will show that this problem is NP-Hard by a reduction from the vertex cover problem.

- To do the reduction, we need to show that we can solve Vertex Cover in polynomial time if we have a polynomial time solution to Hamiltonian Cycle.
- Given a graph G and an integer k, we will create another graph G' such that G' has a Hamiltonian cycle iff G has a vertex cover of size k
- As for the last reduction, our transformation will consist of putting together several "gadgets"

Edge Gadget and Cover Vertices ____

• For each edge (u, v) in G, we have an *edge gadget* in G' consisting of twelve vertices and fourteen edges, as shown below



An edge gadget for (u, v) and the only possible Hamiltonian paths through it.



- The four corner vertices (u, v, 1), (u, v, 6), (v, u, 1), and (v, u, 6)each have an edge leaving the gadget
- A Hamiltonian cycle can only pass through an edge gadget in one of the three ways shown in the figure
- These paths through the edge gadget will correspond to one or both of the vertices u and v being in the vertex cover.



• G' also contains k cover vertices, simply numbered 1 through k

- For each vertex u in G, we string together all the edge gadgets for edges (u, v) into a single vertex chain and then connect the ends of the chain to all the cover vertices
- Specifically, suppose u has d neighbors v_1, v_2, \ldots, v_d . Then G' has the following edges:
 - -d-1 edges between $(u, v_i, 6)$ and $(u, v_{i+1}, 1)$ (for all i between 1 and d-1)
 - k edges between the cover vertices and $(u, v_1, 1)$
 - k edges between the cover vertices and $(u, v_d, 6)$



- It's not hard to prove that if $\{v_1, v_2, \ldots, v_k\}$ is a vertex cover of G, then G' has a Hamiltonian cycle
- To get this Hamiltonian cycle, we start at cover vertex 1, traverse through the vertex chain for v_1 , then visit cover vertex 2, then traverse the vertex chain for v_2 and so forth, until we eventually return to cover vertex 1
- Conversely, one can prove that any Hamiltonian cycle in G' alternates between cover vertices and vertex chains, and that the vertex chains correspond to the k vertices in a vertex cover of G

Thus, G has a vertex cover of size k iff G' has a Hamiltonian cycle



- The transformation from G to G' takes at most $O(|V|^2)$ time, so the Hamiltonian cycle problem is NP-Hard
- Moreover we can easily verify a Hamiltonian cycle in linear time, thus Hamiltonian Cycle is also in NP
- Thus Hamiltonian Cycle is NP-Complete



The original graph G with vertex cover $\{v, w\}$, and the transformed graph G' with a corresponding Hamiltonian cycle (bold edges). Vertex chains are colored to match their corresponding vertices.



- A problem closely related to Hamiltonian cycles is the famous *Traveling Salesperson Problem(TSP)*
- The TSP problem is: "Given a weighted graph G, find the shortest cycle that visits every vertex.
- Finding the shortest cycle is obviously harder than determining if a cycle exists at all, so since Hamiltonian Cycle is NP-hard, TSP is also NP-hard!



- In 1999, Richard Kaye proved that the solitaire game Minesweeper is NP-Hard, using a reduction from Circuit Satifiability.
- Subsequently, people have shown that Sudoku, Donkey Kong, Zelda, Pac-Man, Tetris, Mario, Lemmings are NP-Hard

- Consider the *optimization* version of, say, the graph coloring problem: "Given a graph *G*, what is the smallest number of colors needed to color the graph?" (Note that unlike the *decision* version of this problem, this is not a yes/no question)
- Show that the optimization version of graph coloring is also NP-Hard by a reduction from the decision version of graph coloring.
- Is the optimization version of graph coloring also NP-Complete?

- Consider the problem 4SAT which is: "Is there any assignment of variables to a 4CNF formula that makes the formula evaluate to true?"
- Is this problem NP-Hard? If so, give a reduction from 3SAT that shows this. If not, give a polynomial time algorithm which solves it.

Challenge Problem

- Consider the following problem: "Does there exist a clique of size 5 in some input graph G?"
- Is this problem NP-Hard? If so, prove it by giving a reduction from some known NP-Hard problem. If not, give a polynomial time algorithm which solves it.



- A *vertex cover* of a graph is a set of vertices that touches every edge in the graph
- The decision version of *Vertex Cover* is: "Does there exist a vertex cover of size k in a graph G?".
- We've proven this problem is NP-Hard by an easy reduction from Independent Set
- The *optimization* version of *Vertex Cover* is: "What is the minimum size vertex cover of a graph *G*?"
- We can prove this problem is NP-Hard by a reduction from the decision version of Vertex Cover (left as an exercise).

Approximating Vertex Cover _____

- Even though the optimization version of Vertex Cover is NP-Hard, it's possible to *approximate* the answer efficiently
- In particular, in polynomial time, we can find a vertex cover which is no more than 2 times as large as the minimal vertex cover
Approximation Algorithm

- The approximation algorithm does the following until G has no more edges:
- It chooses an arbitrary edge (u, v) in G and includes both u and v in the cover
- \bullet It then removes from G all edges which are incident to either $u \mbox{ or } v$

```
Approx-Vertex-Cover(G){
  C = {};
  E' = Edges of G;
  while(E' is not empty){
    let (u,v) be an arbitrary edge in E';
    add both u and v to C;
    remove from E' every edge incident to u or v;
  }
  return C;
}
```



- If we implement the graph with adjacency lists, each edge need be touched at most once
- Hence the run time of the algorithm will be O(|V| + |E|), which is polynomial time
- First, note that this algorithm does in fact return a vertex cover since it ensures that every edge in *G* is incident to some vertex in *C*
- Q: Is the vertex cover actually no more than twice the optimal size?



- Let A be the set of edges which are chosen in the first line of the while loop
- Note that no two edges of A share an endpoint
- Thus, any vertex cover must contain at least one endpoint of each edge in A
- Thus, $|C^*| \ge |A|$, for an optimal cover C^*
- Further, |C| = 2|A|
- Thus, $|C| \leq 2|C^*|$

Which means that the vertex cover found by the algorithm is no more than twice the size of an optimal vertex cover.



- An optimization version of the TSP problem is: "Given a weighted graph G, what is the shortest Hamiltonian Cycle of G?"
- This problem is NP-Hard by a reduction from Hamiltonian Cycle
- However, there is a 2-approximation algorithm for this problem if the edge weights obey the *triangle inequality*

Triangle Inequality

- In many practical problems, it's reasonable to make the assumption that the weights, c, of the edges obey the *triangle inequality*
- The triangle inequality says that for all vertices $u, v, w \in V$:

$$c(u,w) \le c(u,v) + c(v,w)$$

- In other words, the cheapest way to get from u to w is always to just take the edge (u, w)
- In the real world, this is usually a pretty natural assumption.
 For example it holds if the vertices are points in a plane and the cost of traveling between two vertices is just the euclidean distance between them.

- Given a weighted graph G, the algorithm first computes a MST for G, T, and then arbitrarily selects a root node r of T.
- It then lets L be the list of the vertices visited in a depth first traversal of T starting at r.
- Finally, it returns the Hamiltonian Cycle, H, that visits the vertices in the order L.

```
Approx-TSP(G){
  T = MST(G);
  L = the list of vertices visited in a depth first traversal
      of T, starting at some arbitrary node in T;
  H = the Hamiltonian Cycle that visits the vertices in the
      order L;
  return H;
}
```

79



The top left figure shows the graph G (edge weights are just the Euclidean distances between vertices); the top right figure shows the MST T. The bottom left figure shows the depth first walk on T, W = (a, b, c, b, h, b, a, d, e, f, e, g, e, d, a); the bottom right figure shows the Hamiltonian cycle H obtained by deleting repeat visits from W, H = (a, b, c, h, d, e, f, g).



- The first step of the algorithm takes $O(|E| + |V| \log |V|)$ (if we use Prim's algorithm)
- The second step is O(|V|)
- The third step is O(|V|).
- Hence the run time of the entire algorithm is polynomial



An important fact about this algorithm is that: the cost of the MST is less than the cost of the shortest Hamiltonian cycle.

- To see this, let T be the MST and let H^* be the shortest Hamiltonian cycle.
- If we remove one edge from H^* , we have a spanning tree, T^\prime
- So, $w(H^*) \ge w(T') \ge w(T)$
- Hence $w(H^*) \ge w(T)$



- Now let P be a depth first traversal path of tree T which traverses each edge exactly twice
- In our example, P = (a, b, c, b, h, b, a, d, e, f, e, g, e, d, a)
- So w(P) = 2w(T)
- This implies that $w(P) \leq 2w(H^*)$

_ Analysis ___

- Unfortunately, P is not a Hamiltonian cycle since it visits some vertices more than once
- However, we can delete a visit to any vertex and the cost will not increase *because of the triangle inequality*. (The path without an intermediate vertex can only be shorter)
- By repeatedly applying this operation, we can remove from *P* all but the first visit to each vertex, without increasing the cost of *P*.
- In our example, this will give us the ordering H = (a, b, c, h, d, e, f, g)



- By the last slide, $w(H) \leq w(P)$.
- So $w(H) \leq w(P) = 2w(T) \leq 2w(H^*)$
- Thus, $w(H) \leq 2w(H^*)$
- In other words, the Hamiltonian cycle found by the algorithm has cost no more than twice the shortest Hamiltonian cycle.



- Many real-world problems can be shown to not have an efficient solution unless P = NP (these are the NP-Hard problems)
- However, if a problem is shown to be NP-Hard, all hope is not lost!
- In many cases, we can come up with an provably good approximation algorithm for the NP-Hard problem.