# ALGORITHMS

# Choosing between Exact and Approximate Problem Solving

- One of the most important decision is to choose between solving the problem exactly or solving it approximately.
- In the former case, an algorithm is called an exact algorithm; in the latter case, an algorithm is called an approximation algorithm.
- Why would one opt for an approximation algorithm?
- First, there are important problems that simply cannot be solved exactly for most of their instances; examples include extracting square roots, solving nonlinear equations, and evaluating definite integrals.
- Second, available algorithms for solving a problem exactly can be unacceptably slow because of the problem's intrinsic complexity.
- This happens, in particular, for many problems involving a very large number of choices.

#### Algorithm Design Techniques

• An algorithm design technique (or "strategy" or "paradigm") is a general approach to solving problems algorithmically that is applicable to a variety of problems from different areas of computing.

#### Designing an Algorithm and Data Structures

- While the algorithm design techniques do provide a powerful set of general approaches to algorithmic problem solving, designing an algorithm for a particular problem may still be a challenging task.
- Some design techniques can be simply inapplicable to the problem in question.
- Sometimes, several techniques need to be combined, and there are algorithms that are hard to pinpoint as applications of the known design techniques.
- Even when a particular design technique is applicable, getting an algorithm often requires a nontrivial ingenuity on the part of the algorithm designer.
- With practice, both tasks—choosing among the general techniques and applying them—get easier, but they are rarely easy.

- Once you have designed an algorithm, you need to specify it in some fashion.
- Sometimes an algorithm is described in words (in a free and also a step-by-step form) or in pseudocode.
- Using a natural language has an obvious appeal; however, the inherent ambiguity of any natural language makes a succinct and clear description of algorithms surprisingly difficult.
- Nevertheless, being able to do this is an important skill that you should strive to develop in the process of learning algorithms.

- Pseudocode is a mixture of a natural language and programming language-like constructs.
- Pseudocode is usually more precise than natural language, and its usage often yields more succinct algorithm descriptions.
- Surprisingly, computer scientists have never agreed on a single form of pseudocode, leaving textbook authors with a need to design their own "dialects."
- Fortunately, these dialects are so close to each other that anyone familiar with a modern programming language should be able to understand them all.

 For the sake of simplicity, someone can omit declarations of variables and use indentation to show the scope of such statements as for, if, and while.

 An arrow "←" can be used for the assignment operation and two slashes "//" for comments.

• In the earlier days of computing, the dominant vehicle for specifying algorithms was a flowchart, a method of expressing an algorithm by a collection of connected geometric shapes containing descriptions of the algorithm's steps.

• This representation technique has proved to be inconvenient for all but very simple algorithms; nowadays, it is not used usually.

#### Proving an Algorithm's Correctness

- Once an algorithm has been specified, you have to prove its correctness.
- That is, you have to prove that the algorithm yields a required result for every legitimate input in a finite amount of time.
- For some algorithms, a proof of correctness is quite easy; for others, it can be quite complex.
- A common technique for proving correctness is to use mathematical induction because an algorithm's iterations provide a natural sequence of steps needed for such proofs.
- It might be worth mentioning that although tracing the algorithm's performance for a few specific inputs can be a very worthwhile activity, it cannot prove the algorithm's correctness conclusively.
- But in order to show that an algorithm is incorrect, you need just one instance of its input for which the algorithm fails.

#### Proving an Algorithm's Correctness

• The notion of correctness for approximation algorithms is less straightforward than it is for exact algorithms.

• For an approximation algorithm, we usually would like to be able to show that the error produced by the algorithm does not exceed a predefined limit.

- We usually want our algorithms to possess several qualities.
- After correctness, by far the most important is efficiency.
- In fact, there are two kinds of algorithm efficiency: time efficiency, indicating how fast the algorithm runs, and space efficiency, indicating how much extra memory it uses.
- Another desirable characteristic of an algorithm is simplicity.
- Unlike efficiency, which can be precisely defined and investigated with mathematical rigor, simplicity, like beauty, is to a considerable degree in the eye of the beholder.

- For example, most people would agree that Euclid's algorithm is simpler than the middle-school procedure for computing gcd(m, n), but it is not clear whether Euclid's algorithm is simpler than the consecutive integer checking algorithm.
- Still, simplicity is an important algorithm characteristic to strive for. Why?
- Because simpler algorithms are easier to understand and easier to program; consequently, the resulting programs usually contain fewer bugs.
- There is also the undeniable aesthetic appeal of simplicity.
- Sometimes simpler algorithms are also more efficient than more complicated alternatives.
- Unfortunately, it is not always true, in which case a judicious compromise needs to be made.

- Yet another desirable characteristic of an algorithm is generality.
- There are, in fact, two issues here: generality of the problem the algorithm solves and the set of inputs it accepts.
- On the first issue, note that it is sometimes easier to design an algorithm for a problem posed in more general terms.
- Consider, for example, the problem of determining whether two integers are relatively prime, i.e., whether their only common divisor is equal to 1.
- It is easier to design an algorithm for a more general problem of computing the greatest common divisor of two integers and, to solve the former problem, check whether the gcd is 1 or not.
- There are situations, however, where designing a more general algorithm is unnecessary or difficult or even impossible.
- For example, it is unnecessary to sort a list of n numbers to find its median, which is its the smallest element. [n/2]
- To give another example, the standard formula for roots of a quadratic equation cannot be generalized to handle polynomials of arbitrary degrees.

- As to the set of inputs, your main concern should be designing an algorithm that can handle a set of inputs that is natural for the problem at hand.
- For example, excluding integers equal to 1 as possible inputs for a greatest common divisor algorithm would be quite unnatural.
- On the other hand, although the standard formula for the roots of a quadratic equation holds for complex coefficients, we would normally not implement it on this level of generality unless this capability is explicitly required.

- If you are not satisfied with the algorithm's efficiency, simplicity, or generality, you must return to the drawing board and redesign the algorithm.
- In fact, even if your evaluation is positive, it is still worth searching for other algorithmic solutions.
- Recall the three different algorithms in the previous section for computing the greatest common divisor: generally, you should not expect to get the best algorithm on the first try.
- At the very least, you should try to fine-tune the algorithm you already have.

- Most algorithms are destined to be ultimately implemented as computer programs.
- Programming an algorithm presents both a peril and an opportunity.
- The peril lies in the possibility of making the transition from an algorithm to a program either incorrectly or very inefficiently.
- Some influential computer scientists strongly believe that unless the correctness of a computer program is proven with full mathematical rigor, the program cannot be considered correct.
- They have developed special techniques for doing such proofs but the power of these techniques of formal verification is limited so far to very small programs.

- As a practical matter, the validity of programs is still established by testing.
- Testing of computer programs is an art rather than a science, but that does not mean that there is nothing in it to learn.
- Of course, implementing an algorithm correctly is necessary but not sufficient: you would not like to diminish your algorithm's power by an inefficient implementation.
- Modern compilers do provide a certain safety net in this regard, especially when they are used in their code optimization mode.
- Still, you need to be aware of such standard tricks as computing a loop's invariant (an expression that does not change its value) outside the loop, collecting common subexpressions, replacing expensive operations by cheap ones, and so on.

- In the academic world, the question leads to an interesting but usually difficult investigation of an algorithm's optimality.
- Actually, this question is not about the efficiency of an algorithm but about the complexity of the problem it solves:
- What is the minimum amount of effort any algorithm will need to exert to solve the problem?
- For some problems, the answer to this question is known.
- For example, any algorithm that sorts an array by comparing values of its elements needs about n log2 n comparisons for some arrays of size n.
- But for many seemingly easy problems such as integer multiplication, computer scientists do not yet have a final answer.

- Another important issue of algorithmic problem solving is the question of whether or not every problem can be solved by an algorithm.
- We are not talking here about problems that do not have a solution, such as finding real roots of a quadratic equation with a negative discriminant.
- For such cases, an output indicating that the problem does not have a solution is all we can and should expect from an algorithm.
- Nor are we talking about ambiguously stated problems. Even some unambiguous problems that must have a simple yes or no answer are "undecidable," i.e., unsolvable by any algorithm.
- Fortunately, a vast majority of problems in practical computing can be solved by an algorithm.