

## Solution keys: HW12

Problem 1:

Consider  $A_1A_2A_3$ , where  $A_1 : 2 \times 1$ ,  $A_2 : 1 \times 3$ , and  $A_3 : 3 \times 3$ . The greedy algorithms (a) and (c) will compute in the order of  $(A_1A_2)A_3$  with the cost to be 24, however the optimal order is  $A_1(A_2A_3)$  with the minimum cost of 15.

Consider  $A_1A_2A_3$ , where  $A_1 : 2 \times 1$ ,  $A_2 : 1 \times 3$ , and  $A_3 : 3 \times 1$ . The greedy algorithm (b) will compute in the order of  $(A_1A_2)A_3$  with the cost to be 12, however the optimal order is  $A_1(A_2A_3)$  with the minimum cost of 5.

Problem 2: What is the optimal way to compute  $A_1A_2A_3A_4A_5A_6$ , where the dimensions of the matrices are:  $A_1 : 10 \times 20$ ,  $A_2 : 20 \times 1$ ,  $A_3 : 1 \times 40$ ,  $A_4 : 40 \times 5$ ,  $A_5 : 5 \times 30$ ,  $A_6 : 30 \times 15$ ? To answer the question, you must first use dynamic programming to build the  $6 \times 6$  table.

Solution: We first recognize that  $p_0 = 10$ ,  $p_1 = 20$ ,  $p_2 = 1$ ,  $p_3 = 40$ ,  $p_4 = 5$ ,  $p_5 = 30$ , and  $p_6 = 15$ . Then we use the formula

$$m[i, j] = \min_{i \leq k \leq j-1} \{m[i, k] + m[k+1, j] + p_{i-1}p_kp_j\}, i < j$$

to construct the table. Note the number inside the parenthesis is the  $k$  that gives the minimum for the corresponding  $m[i, j]$

$i \setminus j$	1	2	3	4	5	6
1	0	200 (1)	600 (2)	450 (2)	850 (2)	1150 (2)
2		0	800 (2)	300 (2)	950 (2)	1100 (2)
3			0	200 (3)	350 (4)	800 (5)
4				0	6000 (4)	5250 (4)
5					0	2250 (5)
6						0

To construct the ordering, we first go to entry  $m[1, 6]$ . Its  $k$ -value of 2 suggests the following partial ordering of

$$(A_1 \times A_2) \times (A_3 \times A_4 \times A_5 \times A_6).$$

Then we go to  $m[3, 6]$ . Its  $k$ -value of 5 suggests the following partial ordering of

$$(A_1 \times A_2) \times ((A_3 \times A_4 \times A_5) \times A_6).$$

Finally we go to  $m[3, 5]$ . Its  $k$ -value of 4 completes the optimal ordering of

$$(A_1 \times A_2) \times (((A_3 \times A_4) \times A_5) \times A_6).$$