

# 350 HW 3

①  $\text{min} = 1000; \text{max} = -1000;$   
 from  $i = 0$  to  $n$   
   if  $a[i] > \text{max}$   
      $\text{max} = a[i]$   
   if  $a[i] < \text{min}$   
      $\text{min} = a[i]$   
 done

② LinearSelect =  $O(i \cdot n)$  avg run time //  $S(A, n, i)$   
 MergeSort =  $O(n \log n) + O(1)$  avg run time //  $T(A, n, i)$

Algorithm S performs much better than Algorithm T for values when  $i \ll n$ . Because Alg. S depends on  $i$  and  $n$ , while Alg. T depends only on size of input,  $n$ , when  $i \ll n$ , Alg. S will be the better choice.

Algorithm T performs better than Algorithm S for values where  $i$  is close to the size of  $n$ . Once  $i$  becomes too large, Algorithm S will begin to perform in roughly  $O(n^2)$  while Algorithm T will remain  $O(n \log n)$ .

③ ~~Complexity~~ Complexity analysis for Worst-case linear select if  $k=3$ .

Each group has a median, & we have at least 2 numbers in each group less or equal to median. totally we have  $\frac{n}{3}$  medians and among them we have  $\frac{n}{10}$  medians less or equal to MM. So in original  $A[1..n]$ , we have at least  $2 \cdot \frac{n}{10}$  numbers less or equal to MM.

Since every # in low is  $\leq \text{MM}$ ,  $|\text{low}| \geq \frac{2n}{10}$

And  $|\text{low}| + |\text{high}| \leq n$ .

Therefore  $|\text{low}| \leq \frac{8n}{10} \geq |\text{high}|$  and  $\max\{|\text{low}|, |\text{high}|\} \leq \frac{8n}{10}$ .

Step ① write a formula:  $T_w(n) = T_w(\frac{n}{3}) + T_w(\frac{8n}{10}) + O(n)$

Step ② Guess:  $T_w(n) = O(n)$ , That is,  $\exists c > 0, T_w(n) \leq c \cdot n$  for all  $n$ .

F.H:  $\forall i \leq n, T_w(i) \leq c \cdot i$

~~Step 3~~

Step 3 on bulk:



Step ③: check:

$$\begin{aligned} T_w(n) &= T_w\left(\frac{n}{3}\right) + T_w\left(\frac{8n}{10}\right) + a \cdot n \\ &\leq C \cdot \frac{n}{3} + C \cdot \frac{8n}{10} + a \cdot n \\ &\leq C \cdot \frac{10n}{30} + C \cdot \frac{24n}{30} + a \cdot n \\ &\leq \frac{34}{30} \cdot Cn + a \cdot n \\ &\leq C \cdot n \text{ when } C > 7a \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, Worst-case time complexity is  $O(n)$   
(complexity analysis for worst-case linear select if  $k=7$ .)

Each group has a median + at least 4 numbers in each group less or equal to the median. Totally we have  $\frac{n}{7}$  medians + among them,  $\frac{n}{10}$  medians less or equal to MM. For each median, we have 4 numbers in the group the median belongs to that are less or equal to median. So, in original  $A[1..n]$  we have at least  $4 \cdot \frac{n}{10}$  numbers less or equal to the MM.

- Since every # in low is  $\leq MM$ ,  $|low| \geq \frac{4n}{10}$ .

- And  $|low| + |high| \leq n$ .

Therefore  $|low| \leq \frac{6n}{10} \geq |high|$  and  $\max\{|low|, |high|\} \leq \frac{6n}{10}$ .

Step ① Write a formula:  $T_w(n) = T_w\left(\frac{n}{7}\right) + T_w\left(\frac{6n}{10}\right) + O(n)$

Step ② Guess:  $T_w(n) = O(n)$ . That is,  $\exists c > 0, T_w(n) \leq C \cdot n$  for all  $n$ .

I.H:  $\forall i < n, T_w(i) \leq C \cdot i$

Step ③ Check:

$$\begin{aligned} T_w(n) &= T_w\left(\frac{n}{7}\right) + T_w\left(\frac{6n}{10}\right) + a \cdot n \\ &\leq C \cdot \frac{n}{7} + C \cdot \frac{6n}{10} + a \cdot n \\ &\leq C \cdot \frac{10n}{70} + \frac{42n}{70} \cdot C + a \cdot n \\ &\leq C \cdot \frac{52}{70} \cdot n + a \cdot n \\ &\leq C \cdot n \text{ when } C > 7a. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, worst-case time complexity is  $O(n)$ .



④ iSelect(A, n, i)

r = partition(A, 4, n)

// O(n)

① if i == r, return A[r]

// O(1)

② if i < r, return quickselect(A, 4, r-1, i)

// O(n<sup>2</sup>)<sub>worst</sub> + O(n)<sub>avg</sub>

③ if i > r, return linearSelect(A, r+1, n, i-r)

// O(n)

probabilities

$$A = \frac{1}{n}, B = \frac{r-1}{n}, C = \frac{n-r}{n}$$

Worst-Case Time Complexity

Step 1

$$\text{Formula: } T_w(n) = \max_{1 \leq r \leq n} \{O(n) + O(1) + T_w(r-1) + T_w(n-r)\}$$

Step 2

Guess:  $T_w(n) = O(n^2)$ . That is,  $\exists c > 0$ , such that  $T_w(n) \leq c \cdot n$  for all  $n$ .

$$\text{I.H: } \forall i < n, t_w(i) \leq c \cdot i^2$$

Step 3

Check:

$$T_w(n) = \max_{1 \leq r \leq n} \{O(n) + T_w(r-1) + T_w(n-r) + O(1)\}$$

$$\leq \max_{1 \leq r \leq n} \{c \cdot (r-1)^2 + c \cdot (n-r) + a \cdot n\}$$

$$F(r) = c \cdot (r-1)^2 + c \cdot (n-r) + a \cdot n$$

$$F'(r) = 2cr - 3c = 0, 2r - 3 = 0, r = \frac{3}{2}$$

$$F(4) = cn + an$$

$$F(n) = c \cdot (n-1)^2 + a \cdot n$$

$$F\left(\frac{3}{2}\right) \approx c \cdot \frac{1}{4} + c \cdot \left(n - \frac{3}{2}\right) + a \cdot n$$

$$= F(n) = c \cdot (n-1)^2 + a \cdot n = cn^2 - 2cn + 4 + a \cdot n$$

$$\leq cn^2 \text{ when } c \gg a.$$

Clearly, iSelect has a worst-case time complexity of  $O(n^2)$ .

Avg-Case Time Complexity

Step 1: Formula:  $T_{avg}(n) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{r=1}^n \left\{ \frac{1}{n} \cdot O(1) + \frac{r-1}{n} \cdot T_{avg}(r-1) + \frac{n-r}{n} \cdot T_{avg}(n-r) + O(n) \right\}$

Step 2: Guess:  $T_{avg}(n) = O(n)$ . That is,  $\exists c > 0$ , such that  $T_{avg}(n) \leq c \cdot n$  for all  $n$ .

$$\text{I.H: } \forall i < n, T_{avg}(i) \leq c \cdot i$$

Step 3: Check:  $T_{avg}(n) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{r=1}^n \left\{ \frac{1}{n} \cdot O(1) + \frac{r-1}{n} \cdot T_{avg}(r-1) + \frac{n-r}{n} \cdot T_{avg}(n-r) + O(n) \right\}$

$$\leq \frac{1}{n} \sum_{r=1}^n \left\{ \frac{1}{n} \cdot a + \frac{r-1}{n} \cdot c \cdot (r-1) + \frac{n-r}{n} \cdot c \cdot (n-r) + a \cdot n \right\}$$

$$= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{r=1}^n \frac{1}{n} \cdot a + \frac{1}{n} \sum_{r=1}^n \frac{r-1}{n} \cdot c \cdot (r-1) + \frac{1}{n} \sum_{r=1}^n \frac{n-r}{n} \cdot c \cdot (n-r) + \frac{1}{n} \sum_{r=1}^n a \cdot n$$

$$= \frac{a}{n} + \frac{c}{n^2} \sum_{r=1}^n (r-1)^2 + \frac{c}{n^2} \sum_{r=1}^n (n-r)^2 + a \cdot n$$



// middle terms are same

$$= \frac{2c}{n^2} \sum_{r=1}^n (r-1)^2 + a \cdot n + \frac{a}{n}$$

$$\leq \frac{2c}{n^2} \cdot \int_0^n x^2 dx + a \cdot n + \frac{a}{n}$$

$$= \frac{2}{3} c \cdot n + a \cdot n + \frac{a}{n}$$

$$\leq c \cdot n \text{ when } c \gg a.$$

Because  $\frac{2}{3} < 1$ , we can conclude that I select to have an average-case time complexity of  $O(n)$ .

- ⑤ For any given  $n$ , if you want to sort  $n$  numbers, the fastest approach would be  $\lceil \log_2 n! \rceil + c$  comparisons. This, however, assumes we only compare 2 numbers at a time. If we were comparing 5 numbers in a single operation, it should follow that the fastest approach could take  $\lceil \log_5 n! \rceil + c$  comparisons. This is because if we can compare 5 numbers instead of 2 numbers, each comparison will split the data set into fifths rather than halves.