

## Homework 4

1. Given  $k$  sorted lists  $L_1, L_2, \dots, L_k$ , with  $1 \leq k \leq n$ , such that each list contains some numbers in sorted order (e.g., in descending order) and the total number of numbers in all lists is  $n$ , using a heap, design an  $O(n \log k)$  (not  $O(n \log n)$ ) time algorithm for sorting all  $n$  numbers in the  $k$  sorted lists.

Create a max-heap with the first element of the  $k$  sublists. Place the root into the sorted result set, then add the next element from the list that the root came from. Percolate down, spending  $\log(k)$  time to reheapify the heap. Continue this procedure until no elements remain in the sorted sublists, and you'll end up with the fully sorted result set. This will take  $\log(k)$  time for each of the  $n$  elements, or  $O(n \log(k))$ .

2. Let  $A$  be an array of  $n$  distinct elements that store a max heap (a max heap is one that stores the largest key at its root). Each element of  $A$  is also called a “key” of the heap. The largest key of  $A$  can clearly be reported in constant time (simply by looking at the key stored at  $A[1]$ , without removing it from  $A$ ). We denote the operation of reporting the largest key in  $A$  (without removing that key from  $A$ ) by  $\text{Report-Max}(1)$ . A generalized operation of  $\text{Report-Max}(1)$ , denoted by  $\text{Report-Max}(k)$  can be defined as follows: Given an integer  $k$  as input, with  $1 \leq k \leq n$ , report the largest  $k$  keys (i.e., the 1st, 2nd, ...,  $k$ th largest keys) in  $A$  without removing them from  $A$ . Design an algorithm to implement  $\text{Report-Max}(k)$  in  $O(k \log k)$  time. (Note: Although  $k$  can be equal to  $n$  in the worst case,  $k$  in general is much smaller than  $n$ ).

After working on this problem by myself for a while, I talked about it with Richard Hansen (who also did not know the answer) and we discovered this solution:

For  $k = 1$ , return  $A[1]$ . Then recursively examine  $A[2]$  to  $A[n]$ , and percolate down the top value. This should create another max-heap from  $A[2]$  to  $A[n]$ . Repeat this procedure  $k$  times, and then once you return the first  $k$  elements of  $A$  should be the sorted set of 1st through  $k$ th largest elements.

3. This problem is concerned with range queries (we have discussed a similar problem in class) on a binary search tree  $T$  whose keys are real numbers (you may assume no two keys in  $T$  are the same). Let  $h$  denote the height of  $T$ . The range query is generalization of the ordinary search operation. The range of a range query on  $T$  is defined by a pair  $[x_l, x_r]$ , where  $x_l$  and  $x_r$  are real numbers and  $x_l \leq x_r$ . Note that  $x_l$  and  $x_r$  need not be keys stored in  $T$ .

Assuming a search function that locates the next-highest node for a search parameter that does not exist, begin by recursively searching for  $x_l$ . Begin the result set from  $x_l$ , then begin traversing back up the tree from child to parent, appending the key value to the result set and then adding the in-order traversal of each right subtree to the list of results. Once you reach the lowest common ancestor between  $x_l$  and  $x_r$ , add it to the result set and begin traversing down the search path to  $x_r$ . Add the in-order traversal of each left subtree followed by the node key to the result, finally ending at  $x_r$ . If the last node is equal to  $x_r$  ( $x_r$  is in the tree), add it, otherwise ignore it. If the search algorithm finds the next-smallest number, you'll need to do this comparison on  $x_l$  instead, or if the search algorithm is indeterminate the comparison must be run on both endpoints.

This approach requires two searches at  $O(h)$  time and several in-order traversals at a combined  $O(k)$  time, where  $k$  is the number of nodes in between  $x_l$  and  $x_r$ . Therefore this algorithm takes  $O(2h + k)$  or  $O(h + k)$  time.

4. Consider one more operation on the above binary search tree  $T$  in Question 3: range-sum( $x_l, x_r$ ). Given any range  $[x_l, x_r]$  with  $x_l \leq x_r$ , the operation range-sum( $x_l, x_r$ ) reports

the sum of the keys in  $T$  that are in the range  $[x_l, x_r]$ .

For each node, maintain a second data member that stores the sum of that node's data and all of its children's data. This will take constant time, as for any node  $v$  you can compute the sum with  $v.\text{left.sum} + v.\text{data} + v.\text{right.sum}$ .

Then, exactly like the range-min operator we did in class, starting from the common ancestor of  $x_l$  and  $x_r$  traverse the tree down to  $x_l$ , adding up the values of any nodes greater than  $x_l$  and the sums of their right subtrees. Then add up all of the data values and sums of left subtrees down the search path to  $x_r$ , ignoring any nodes that are greater than  $x_r$ . Finally, add these two values together with the data value from the common ancestor, and return this value as the result.

This algorithm requires  $O(h)$  time for the two branch traversals, and  $O(1)$  time for the sum calculations, leading to a combined time complexity of  $O(h)$ .