

This network has N = 8 vertices and M = 8 edges, so redundancy R = 1

To find a spanning tree, we will have to discard an edge.



Five edges are bridges (red) and so must remain. The other three edges form a circuit of length 3, and we can discard any edge.



BC, or

×



CG, or



## BG.

In more complicated situations, the procedure is the same – we need to bust up circuits.



Here is a weighted network with N = 8 and M = 11, so redudancy R = 4.

Our goal is to find the minimum spanning tree of the network.

There are many different spanning trees, and we don't want to list them all, so let's develop a strategy here...



Here, we look at the first circuit to bust.



Clearly, get rid of the most expensive.

How about in ABCDHA?

DFGD?

DFED?



This is the minimum spanning tree.

But the business of looking for circuits and dropping links is a little tedious. There is an easier way.

K



Kruskal, an American mathematician, who first proposed the algorithm in 1956.

 $\mathbf{K}$  Recall the cheapest-Link algorithm. This is a bit like that, but there are some essential difference, too.

**X** Like the cheapest Link algorithm, choose the cheapest link

**XX** forming no circuits

**%** But 3 or more edges at a vertex is OK.

Let's try it.

30



Cheapest edge is AB, with a cost of 3

What is the next edge?



DE, with a cost of 4

And next?

R



AH for 5

Next?



CD costing 6,

And next?





FG at 8

And next?

R



Finally, BC with a cost of 9



So we have the minimum spanning tree at a cost of 42

K



**X** What is truly remarkable about Kruskal, is that unlike the Cheapest-Link Algorithm, **X** It always produces an optimal solution!



Let's revisit the Amazon...

×







What do we do in this case?

If both are OK, choose one at random. But in this case...

×



We rule out AB (why?) and instead choose DG.

K



K



We need to rule out BC and CF,

×



×



And we are done, at a cost of \$299 million. We drop the remaining links.



R