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Abstract: Greedy algorithms are used in solving a diverse set of problems in small computation time. However, for solving problems using greedy approach, it must be proved that the greedy strategy applies. The greedy approach relies on selection of optimal choice at a local level reducing the problem to a single sub problem, which actually leads to a globally optimal solution. Finding a maximal set from the independent set of a matroid M(S, I) also uses greedy approach and justification is also provided in standard literature (e.g. Introduction to Algorithms by Cormen et al.). However, the justification does not clearly explain the equivalence of using greedy algorithm and contraction of M by the selected element. This paper thus attempts to give a lucid explanation of the fact that the greedy algorithm is equivalent to reducing the Matroid into its contraction by selected element. This approach also provides motivation for research on the selection of the test used in algorithm which might lead to smaller computation time of the algorithm.  
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I. INTRODUCTION  

Many problems in various areas of engineering are solved using a greedy approach. A greedy approach to solve a problem refers to making a decision based upon what looks optimal at the moment and reduces the problem to a single subproblem. Although, making a locally optimal choice might lead to suboptimal solution to the original problem, in many cases, it may lead to an optimal one. Finding a maximal set out of the set of independent sets of a matroid is one such problem and use of a greedy algorithm to solve the problem is well known and universally accepted. This paper tries to explain some important underpinnings of the justification for using greedy algorithm for finding maximum weight subset of S. Hence we arrive at a contradiction. Thus the theorem is proved.  

MAXWEIGHT (M, w)  
1. A = ∅  
2. Sort elements of S in monotonically decreasing order  
3. For each element of x ∈ S if A ∪ {x} ∈ I A = A ∪ {x}  
4. return A  

The above algorithm return an optimal solution.
III. VALIDITY OF MAXWEIGHT

The section gives the formal proof that is provided in support of the above algorithm in standard literature. We make the following observations which will be used.

1. If \{x\} \notin I, then x \notin A for all A \subseteq I

To prove these, suppose otherwise, i.e. \{x\} \notin S and A \subseteq I such that x \in A

\[ \Rightarrow \{x\} \not\subseteq A \]

\[ \Rightarrow \{x\} \in I \text{ by hereditary property.} \]

\[ \Rightarrow \text{Contradiction} \]

Hence the theorem is proved.

2. If M (S, I) is a weighted matroid with S sorted into monotonically decreasing order by weight, then if x is the first element such that \{x\} \notin I (if such an element exist), there exists an optimal subst A of S such that x \in A (the optimal refers to maximum weight independent subset).

This is typically known as optimal substructure property.

Proof: Let B be a nonempty optimal set. If x \in B, the theorem is true.

If x \notin B, let A = \{x\}.

Till |A| < |B| we can add some y \in B such that A = A U \{y\}

So at a point |A| = |B|, such that A and B have |A|-1 same elements such that x \in A, x \notin B, z \in B, z \notin A for some w (z) \leq w (x).

Because z \in B \Rightarrow w (z) \leq w (x) as x is heaviest independent element of S.

\[ \Rightarrow A = B - \{z\} \cup \{x\} \]

\[ A = w(A) = w(B) + w(x) - w(z) \]

\[ w(A) = w (B) + w(x) - w(z) \leq w(s) \]

\[ \Rightarrow w(A) \text{ is optimal.} \]

Hence the theorem is proved.

3. Matroids exhibited optimal substructure property. If we select maximum weight element x \in S such the \{x\} \notin I, their remaining problem is to find an optimal subset of matroid M' (S', I') such that I', S' = \{y : y \in S \text{ and } (x,y) \in I\} and thus, y should have been selected but the algorithm would not select it. This is not usually explained in standard literature and is the core motivation of this producing this paper.

IV. EQUIVALENCE OF MAXWEIGHT AND CONTRACTION OF MATROID

We will now try to prove that ,at every iteration, the element selected is an element of contraction of M by previous element and that every element of S of current reduced matroid is considered.

Proof: At every step A is selected if A U \{x\} \in I. Let the loop run N time and let xk denote element selected at the kth iteration such that optimal set formed finally is A = \{x1 x2... xN\}

Now xn is selected if AU \{xn\} \in I, where A = \{x1, x2...xn-1\} Assuming that till (k-1)th iteration, all elements selected were part of corresponding contraction, i.e. \{xi-1,xi\} \in I for all i = 2, k-1 for i = 2 A = \{x1\} \Rightarrow A U \{x1\} \in I if and only if \{x1, x2\} \in I.

\[ \square \]

This proves that for any element x \in S, A U \{xn\} \in I is equivalent to \{xn\} \in I or (xx, xx) \in I.

Therefore we can rewrite the algorithm as MAXWEIGHT (M, w)

1. A = \{x\}

2. Sort S in monotonically decreasing order

3. For every element x \in S if \{x\} \notin I

    \[ A = A U \{x\} \]

    prev = x

    \[ M(S, I) = M'(S', I') \text{ where } M'(S', I') \text{ is contraction of } M(S, I) \text{ by prev.} \]

4. Return A

The results of both the algorithms will be same.

V. CONCLUSION

Thus both forms of the algorithm are equivalent. The running time of both the algorithm is O(nlgn+nf(n)) where (f(n)) is the asymptotic time taken for test, be it A U \{x\} \in I or \{x\} \notin I. This, if in any problem, the computation of test \{x\} \notin I, takes lesser time, the algorithm claimed in the paper might give better result in terms of the running time. Also the paper gives
a clear explanation of the validity of using greedy approach in finding a maximum weight maximal independent set of a matroid. Thus, further scope of research may lie towards finding the test which takes lesser time to check independence of the set containing element being considered at every loop iteration in this greedy approach.
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