

ASSIGNMENT 2 – COMP 252

Alexandre St-Aubin & Jonathan Campana

January 29, 2024

1. **ALGORITHM DESIGN.** You are given n vectors x_1, \dots, x_n in \mathbb{Z}^n . Design an efficient algorithm in the ram model for computing for each x_i one of its nearest neighbors among the other points, using the standard Euclidean metric to measure distances. You can't use real numbers, and operations like square root are not available. Nevertheless, show how this can be done in $o(n^3)$ worst-case time.

Solution:

We first note that minimizing the Euclidean distance between 2 vectors of length n is equivalent to minimizing the sum of squared differences between each individual components. The reason for this is that the square root is a monotone increasing function. Let $x_i = (x_{i,1}, \dots, x_{i,n})$, $x_j = (x_{j,1}, \dots, x_{j,n})$ both in \mathbb{Z}^n , and define

$$d_2^2(x_i, x_j) := \sum_{k=1}^n (x_{i,k} - x_{j,k})^2 = \sum_{k=1}^n (x_{i,k}^2 - 2x_{i,k}x_{j,k} + x_{j,k}^2) = \langle x_i, x_i \rangle + 2\langle x_i, x_j \rangle + \langle x_j, x_j \rangle \quad (1)$$

It is obvious that $d_2^2 \sim O(n)$ in the RAM model, and that no real numbers, nor square roots were used to compute it. Now, we notice that $\frac{n(n-1)}{2}$ distances need to be computed, and in view of dynamic programming, we find a way to compute everything at once in order to reduce the complexity that would occur if we were to get each d_2^2 individually, namely, $O(n^3)$. Construct the following matrix,

$$X = \begin{pmatrix} x_{1,1} & x_{1,2} & x_{1,3} & \dots & x_{1,n} \\ x_{2,1} & x_{2,2} & x_{2,3} & \dots & x_{2,n} \\ x_{3,1} & x_{3,2} & x_{3,3} & \dots & x_{3,n} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ x_{n,1} & x_{n,2} & x_{n,3} & \dots & x_{n,n} \end{pmatrix}$$

Then,

$$X \cdot X^T = \begin{pmatrix} \sum_{k=1}^n x_{1,k}x_{1,k} & \sum_{k=1}^n x_{1,k}x_{2,k} & \dots & \sum_{k=1}^n x_{1,k}x_{n,k} \\ \sum_{k=1}^n x_{2,k}x_{1,k} & \sum_{k=1}^n x_{2,k}x_{2,k} & \dots & \sum_{k=1}^n x_{2,k}x_{n,k} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \sum_{k=1}^n x_{n,k}x_{1,k} & \sum_{k=1}^n x_{n,k}x_{2,k} & \dots & \sum_{k=1}^n x_{n,k}x_{n,k} \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \langle x_1, x_1 \rangle & \langle x_1, x_2 \rangle & \dots & \langle x_1, x_n \rangle \\ \langle x_2, x_1 \rangle & \langle x_2, x_2 \rangle & \dots & \langle x_2, x_n \rangle \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \langle x_n, x_1 \rangle & \langle x_n, x_2 \rangle & \dots & \langle x_n, x_n \rangle \end{pmatrix}$$

where the entries of $X \cdot X^T$ are exactly the dot products needed in (1). Therefore, by employing STRASSEN'S algorithm, we can efficiently compute the product $X \cdot X^T$ with a time complexity of $O(n^{2.807})$. Subsequently, each of the $\frac{n(n-1)}{2}$ distances can be computed in $O(n^2)$ time, as computing one distance will take constant time by accessing the dot products in the matrix previously computed. Simultaneously, these distances can be added to an ordered list (corresponding to each individual vector) in constant time. Upon completion of this process, we will have the closest vector to any given vector readily accessible. The algorithm outlined above has a complexity of $O(n^{2.807})$, demonstrating that it can be accomplished in worst-case time less than $o(n^3)$.

2. DYNAMIC PROGRAMMING: COMPUTING THE OPTIMAL STAR.

Algorithm 1: Algorithm to compute the optimal star.

Input: A matrix $D[i, j]$ of pairwise distances between cities $1 \leq i, j \leq n$.**Output:** The optimal star that links the cities.

```

// initialize M[v, S] for sets of size 1
1 for all  $i \in [1, n]$  do
2   for all  $j \neq i$  do
3      $M[i, \{j\}] \leftarrow D[i, j]$ ;

// loop through each central city
4 for  $v \in [1, n]$  do
   // loop through each subset size
5   for all  $k \in [1, n-1]$  do
     // loop through each subset of size k excluding the central city
6     for all  $S$  with  $|S| = k$ ,  $S \subseteq \{1, \dots, n\} \setminus \{v\}$  do
7        $M[v, S] \leftarrow \min_{l \in S} \{M[v, S \setminus \{l\}] + \min\{d(l, x) : x = v \text{ or } \deg(x) = 1\}\};$ 

```

Remark. The above is heavily inspired from the *Held–Karp algorithm*, which was presented in class.

Analysis of the algorithm

Allow Ω to represent the set of all vertices (cities). The outer loop iterates through each potential central vertex v of the star, while the subsequent loops systematically explore subsets of $\Omega \setminus v$ in a bottom-up fashion. Starting with subsets of size 1 (i.e., $S = s$), we know $M[v, S] = d(v, s)$. We then progress through sets of increasing size, using our knowledge from preceding, smaller sets to obtain an optimal set length, until we reach $M[v, \Omega \setminus v]$, thereby identifying the optimal star configuration with the central vertex v .

Let's delve into the time complexity analysis. Line 1 executes n times. Lines 2 and 3 represent all possible subsets of a set with $n - 1$ vertices, resulting in 2^{n-1} iterations. We can safely assume line 4 to be $O(n)$. Combining these components, the overall time complexity is given as $O(n^2 \cdot 2^n)$.

3. INDUCTION. We are given the recurrence

$$T_n = 2T_{\frac{n}{a}} + 7T_{\frac{n}{a^2}} + 1,$$

where $a \geq 2$ is a given integer, and n is restricted to be a power of a . We also know that $T_1 = T_a = 1$.

(a) $T_n = \Omega(n^c)$ for some constant c .

Proof. For the base case, let $n = a^2$, then,

$$T_{a^2} = 2T_a + 7T_1 + 1 = 2 + 7 + 1 = \Omega(1) = \Omega(n^0),$$

Now, assume $T_{a^k} = \Omega((a^k)^c)$, for any $2 \leq k < n$, then we have

$$\begin{aligned} T_{a^n} &= 2T_{a^{n-1}} + 7T_{a^{n-2}} + 1 \\ &\leq 2((a^{n-1})^c) + 7((a^{n-2})^c) + 1 \quad [\text{by I.H.}] \\ &\leq 9(a^{n-1})^c \\ &= \frac{9}{a^c} (a^n)^c \end{aligned}$$

Where $\frac{9}{a^c}$ is a constant so we conclude that $T_{a^n} = \Omega((a^n)^c)$. Remains to find the largest such c . □

4. SORTING WITH DUPLICATES.

- (i) Give a divide-and-conquer algorithm that sorts n numbers with $1 \leq k \leq n$ uniques. This can be done in time $O(n \log_2(k+1))$ with a ternary comparison oracle.

Solution:

See the algorithm on the next page.

- (ii) Prove the complexity claim.

Remark. A ternary oracle, tells you whether an element is $>$, $<$ or $=$ in 1 time unit. Everything else we can do for 0 (additions and assignments specifically).

Algorithm 2: DC algorithm to sort a list of n elements with $1 \leq k \leq n$ duplicates.

Input: An arbitrary array of integers.

Output: The sorted array.

```

// Initialize the array with Tuples
1 for  $i = 0$  to  $l(\text{array})$  do
2    $\text{array}[i] \leftarrow \text{new Tuple}(i, 1);$ 

// A function to compare tuples, each use costs 1. Anything else is free.
3 Function TernaryOracle( $\text{tuple1}, \text{tuple2}$ ):
4   if  $\text{tuple1}[0] = \text{tuple2}[0]$  then
5     return 0;
6   else if  $\text{tuple1}[0] < \text{tuple2}[0]$  then
7     return -1;
8   else
9     return 1;

10 Function MergeSort( $\text{array}$ ):
11   if  $l(\text{array}) < 2$  then
12     return  $\text{array}$ ;
13   else
14      $\text{mid} \leftarrow \lfloor l(\text{array})/2 \rfloor;$ 
15     return Merge (MergeSort ( $\text{array} [: \text{mid}]$ ), MergeSort ( $\text{array} [\text{mid}:]$ ));

16 Function Merge( $\text{Left}, \text{Right}$ ):
17    $i, j \leftarrow 0;$ 
18    $\text{array} \leftarrow \text{new array};$ 
19   while  $i \leq l(\text{Left}) \ \&\& \ j \leq l(\text{Right})$  do
20     switch TernaryOracle( $\text{Left}[i], \text{Right}[j]$ ) do
21       case 0 do
22          $\text{array}[i + j] \leftarrow \text{new Tuple}(\text{Left}[i][0], \text{Left}[i][1] + \text{Right}[j][1]);$ 
23          $i ++, j ++;$ 
24       case 1 do
25          $\text{array}[i + j] \leftarrow \text{Left}[i];$ 
26          $i ++;$ 
27       case -1 do
28          $\text{array}[i + j] \leftarrow \text{Right}[j];$ 
29          $j ++;$ 
30     // then add the rest of the array that we didn't reach the end of to
    the current array:
     $\text{array} \leftarrow \text{array} \& (i \leq l(\text{Left})) * \text{Left}[i : l(\text{Left})] \& (j \leq l(\text{Right})) * \text{Right}[j : l(\text{Right})]$ 

```
