

"Due" Wednesday, May 3, 2017 at 8pm

This homework will not be graded. However, material covered by this homework *may* appear on the final exam.

 Let Φ be a boolean formula in conjunctive normal form, with exactly three literals in each clause. Recall that an assignment of boolean values to the variables in Φ *satisfies* a clause if at least one of its literals is TRUE. The *maximum satisfiability problem* for 3CNF formulas, usually called MAX3SAT, asks for the maximum number of clauses that can be simultaneously satisfied by a single assignment.

Solving MAX3SAT exactly is clearly also NP-hard; this question asks about approximation algorithms. Let $Max_3Sat(\Phi)$ denote the maximum number of clauses in Φ that can be simultaneously satisfied by one variable assignment.

- (a) Suppose we assign variables in Φ to be TRUE or FALSE using independent fair coin flips. Prove that the expected number of satisfied clauses is at least $\frac{7}{8}Max_3Sat(\Phi)$.
- (b) Let k^+ denote the number of clauses satisfied by setting every variable in Φ to TRUE, and let k^- denote the number of clauses satisfied by setting every variable in Φ to FALSE. Prove that max $\{k^+, k^-\} \ge Max_3Sat(\Phi)/2$.
- (c) Let *Min3Unsat*(Φ) denote the *minimum* number of clauses that can be simultaneously left *unsatisfied* by a single assignment. Prove that it is NP-hard to approximate *Min3Unsat*(Φ) within a factor of 10^{10¹⁰⁰}.
- 2. Consider the following algorithm for approximating the minimum vertex cover of a connected graph *G*: *Return the set of all non-leaf nodes of an arbitrary depth-first spanning tree*. (Recall that a depth-first spanning tree is a rooted tree; the root is not considered a leaf, even if it has only one neighbor in the tree.)
 - (a) Prove that this algorithm returns a vertex cover of G.
 - (b) Prove that this algorithm returns a 2-approximation to the smallest vertex cover of G.
 - (c) Describe an infinite family of connected graphs for which this algorithm returns a vertex cover of size *exactly* 2 · OPT. This family implies that the analysis in part (b) is tight. [*Hint: First find just one such graph, with few vertices.*]

3. Consider the following modification of the "dumb" 2-approximation algorithm for minimum vertex cover that we saw in class. The only change is that we return a set of edges instead of a set of vertices.

```
\begin{array}{c} \underline{\text{APPROXMINMaxMatching}(G):}\\ \hline M \leftarrow \varnothing\\ \text{while G has at least one edge}\\ uv \leftarrow \text{any edge in } G\\ G \leftarrow G \setminus \{u, v\}\\ M \leftarrow M \cup \{uv\}\\ \text{return } M \end{array}
```

- (a) Prove that the output subgraph *M* is a *matching*—no pair of edges in *M* share a common vertex.
- (b) Prove that *M* is a *maximal* matching—*M* is not a proper subgraph of another matching in *G*.
- (c) Prove that *M* contains at most twice as many edges as the *smallest* maximal matching in *G*.
- (d) Describe an infinite family of graphs *G* such that the matching returned by APPROX-MINMAXMATCHING(*G*) contains exactly twice as many edges as the smallest maximum matching in *G*. This family implies that the analysis in part (c) is tight. [Hint: First find just **one** such graph, with few vertices.]



The smallest maximal matching in a graph.