CS271: Project 1

Dang Truong, Casey Kotbyul Kim

16 September 2022

1. Prove Theorem 3.1 on page 48:

For any two functions f(n) and g(n), $f(n) = \Theta(g(n))$ if and only if f(n) = O(g(n)) and $f(n) = \Omega(g(n))$.

Proof. Assume that $f(n) = \Theta(g(n))$. We will prove that f(n) = O(g(n)) and $f(n) = \Omega(g(n))$. By the definition of Θ -notation, since $f(n) = \Theta(g(n))$, there exists positive constants c_1 , c_2 , and n_0 such that $0 \le c_1 g(n) \le f(n) \le c_2 g(n)$ for all $n \ge n_0$. Since $0 \le c_1 g(n) \le f(n)$ for all $n \ge n_0$, where c_1 and n_0 are positive constants, $f(n) = \Omega(g(n))$. As $0 \le f(n) \le c_2 g(n)$ for all $n \ge n_0$ with positive constants c_2 and c_0 , c_1 for c_2 for c_2 for c_3 for all c_3 for all c_4 for c_3 for c_4 for c_5 for all c_5 for all c_6 for all c_6

Assume that f(n) = O(g(n)) and $f(n) = \Omega(g(n))$. We will prove that $f(n) = \Theta(g(n))$. Because $f(n) = \Omega(g(n))$, there exists positive constants c_3 , n_3 such that $0 \le c_3 g(n) \le f(n)$ for all $n \ge n_3$. Since f(n) = O(g(n)), there exists positive constants c_4 , n_4 such that $0 \le f(n) \le c_4 g(n)$ for all $n \ge n_4$. If we pick $n_5 = \max\{n_3, n_4\}$, then $0 \le c_3 g(n) \le f(n) \le c_4 g(n)$ for all $n \ge n_5$. Thus, $f(n) = \Theta(g(n))$.

Therefore, for any two functions f(n) and g(n), $f(n) = \Theta(g(n))$ if and only if f(n) = O(g(n)) and $f(n) = \Omega(g(n))$.

2. Prove the following using the definitions of O, Ω , and Θ .

(a)
$$n^2 + 3n - 20 = O(n^2)$$

Proof. We need to find positive constants c and n_0 such that $n^2 + 3n - 20 \le cn^2$ for all $n \ge n_0$. Dividing both sides by n^2 gives $1 + 3/n - 20/n^2 \le c$. This inequality holds if we choose c = 2 and $n_0 = 4$. Since there exists c = 2 and $n_0 = 4$ such that $0 \le n^2 + 3n - 20 \le cn^2$ for all $n \ge n_0$, we have that $n^2 + 3n - 20 = O(n^2)$.

(b)
$$n - 2 = \Omega(n)$$

Proof. We need to find positive constants c and n_0 such that $n-2 \ge cn$ for all $n \ge n_0$. Dividing both sides by n gives $1-2/n \ge c$. We have that

$$1 - \frac{2}{n} \ge 1 - \frac{2}{4} \quad \text{(when } n \ge 4\text{)}$$
$$\ge \frac{1}{2}$$

Thus, we can choose $n_0 = 4$ and c = 1/2 so that $n - 2 \ge cn \ge 0$ for all $n \ge n_0$. Therefore, $n - 2 = \Omega(n)$.

(c)
$$\log_{10} n + 4 = \Theta(\log_2 n)$$

Proof. First, we will prove that $\log_{10} n + 4 = \Omega(\log_2 n)$. We need to find positive constants c_1 and n_1 such that $\log_{10} n + 4 \ge c_1 \log_2 n \ge 0$ for all $n \ge n_1$. We have that $\log_{10} n + 4 = \log_{10} 2 \cdot \log_2 n + 4 \ge c_1 \log_2 n$. Dividing both sides by $\log_2 n$ gives $\log_{10} 2 + 4/\log_2 n \ge c_1$. This inequality holds when $n \ge 2$ and $c_1 = 0.3$. Since there exists positive constants $c_1 = 0.3$ and $n_1 = 2$ such that $\log_{10} n + 4 \ge c_1 \log_2 n \ge 0$ for all $n \ge n_1$, $\log_{10} n + 4 = \Omega(\log_2 n)$.

Next, we will prove that $\log_{10} n + 4 = O(\log_2 n)$, meaning that we have to find c_2 and n_2 such that $\log_{10} n + 4 \le c_2 \log_2 n$ for all $n \ge n_2$. Dividing both sides by $\log_2 n$ gives $\log_{10} 2 + 4/\log_2 n \le c_2$. When $n \ge 16$, we have

$$\log_{10} 2 + \frac{4}{\log_2 n} \le \log_{10} 2 + \frac{4}{\log_2 16}$$

$$= \log_{10} 2 + 1$$

$$< 2$$

Hence, by choosing $c_2 = 2$ and $n_2 = 16$, we have $0 \le \log_{10} n + 4 \le c_2 \log_2 n$ for all $n \ge n_2$. Therefore, $\log_{10} n + 4 = O(\log_2 n)$.

Since $\log_{10} n + 4 = \Omega(\log_2 n)$ and $\log_{10} n + 4 = O(\log_2 n)$, it must be the case that $\log_{10} n + 4 = \Theta(\log_2 n)$ (by the theorem we proved in question 1).

(d)
$$2^{n+1} = O(2^n)$$

Proof. To prove that $2^{n+1} = O(2^n)$, we will find positive constants c and n_0 such that $0 \le 2^{n+1} \le c2^n$ for all $n \ge n_0$. Since $2^{n+1} = 2 \times 2^n \le c2^n$ when $c \ge 2$, we can choose c = 2 and $n_0 = 1$ so that $0 \le 2^{n+1} \le c2^n$ for all $n \ge n_0$. Hence, $2^{n+1} = O(2^n)$.

(e)
$$\ln n = \Theta(\log_2 n)$$

Proof. We will first prove that $\ln n = \Omega(\log_2 n)$. We need to find positive constants c_1 and n_1 such that $\ln n \ge c_1 \log_2 n$ for all $n \ge n_1$. Dividing both sides by $\log_2 n$ gives $\ln 2 \ge c_1$. This inequality holds if we choose $c_1 = 0.5$ and $n_1 = 1$. As there exists $c_1 = 0.5$ and $n_1 = 1$ such that $\ln n \ge c_1 \log_2 n \ge 0$ for all $n \ge n_1$, $\ln n = \Omega(\log_2 n)$.

Next, we will prove that $\ln n = O(\log_2 n)$. We need to find positive constants

 c_2 and n_2 such that $0 \le \ln n \le c_2 \log_2 n$ for all $n \ge n_2$. We have that $\ln n = \ln 2 \cdot \log_2 n \le c_2 \log_2 n$ when $c_2 \ge \ln 2$ and $n \ge 1$. Thus, we can choose $c_2 = 1$ and $n_2 = 1$ so that $0 \le \ln n \le c_2 \log_2 n$ for all $n \ge n_2$. Hence, $\ln n = O(\log_2 n)$. By the theorem we proved in question 1, $\ln n = \Omega(\log_2 n)$ and $\ln n = O(\log_2 n)$ imply that $\ln n = \Theta(\log_2 n)$.

(f)
$$n^{\epsilon} = \Omega(\log_2 n)$$
 for any $\epsilon > 0$.

Proof. We will prove that there exists positive constants c and n_0 such that $n^{\epsilon} \ge c \log_2 n \ge 0$ for all $n \ge n_0$. For any $\epsilon > 0$, we can choose $0 < c \le \epsilon$ so that

$$\begin{split} c\log_2 n &\leq \epsilon \log_2 n \\ &= \log_2 n^{\epsilon} \\ &\leq n^{\epsilon} - 1 \\ &\leq n^{\epsilon} \end{split} \tag{when } n \geq 1) \end{split}$$

Thus, we can choose $c = \epsilon$ and $n_0 = 1$ so that $n^{\epsilon} \ge c \log_2 n \ge 0$ for all $n \ge n_0$. Hence, $n^{\epsilon} = \Omega(\log_2 n)$ for any $\epsilon > 0$.

3. For each of the following recurrences, find a tight upper bound for T(n). Prove that each is correct using induction. In each case, assume that T(n) is constant for $n \leq 2$ and that floor division applies to all recurrences.

(a)
$$T(n) = 2T(n/2) + n^3$$

Proof. We will prove that $T(n) = O(n^3)$. We will adopt the inductive hypothesis that $T(n) \le cn^3$ for all $n \ge n_0$, where c and n_0 are positive constants. Assume by induction that $T(k) \le ck^3$ for all $n_0 \le k < n$. If $n \ge 2n_0$, we have that

$$T(n) = 2T(n/2) + n^{3}$$

$$\leq 2c\frac{n^{3}}{8} + n^{3}$$

$$= \frac{cn^{3}}{4} + n^{3}$$

$$= cn^{3} - \frac{3cn^{3}}{4} + n^{3}$$

$$\leq cn^{3} \quad (\text{when } c \geq \frac{4}{3})$$

Hence, the inductive case holds. Next, we will prove that the inductive hypothesis holds for the base case of the induction, that is, $T(n) \leq cn^3$ when $n_0 \leq n < 2n_0$. We can choose $n_0 = 1$. We have $T(1) \leq c \leq c1^3$ when $c \geq T(1)$, where T(1) is constant by assumption. Thus, the base case holds. Therefore, we have $T(n) \leq cn^3$ for all $n \geq 1$, which implies that $T(n) = O(n^3)$.

(b)
$$T(n) = T(9n/10) + n$$

Proof. We will prove that T(n) = O(n). We want to find positive constants c and n_0 such that $T(n) \le cn$ for all $n \ge n_0$. Assume by induction that $T(k) \le ck$ for all $n_0 \le k < n$. If $n \ge (10/9)n_0$, we have that

$$T(n) = T(9n/10) + n$$

$$\leq c. \frac{9n}{10} + n$$

$$= cn - \frac{cn}{10} + n$$

$$\leq cn \quad \text{(when } c \geq 10\text{)}$$

Thus, the inductive case is true. We will prove that the inductive hypothesis holds for the base case of the induction, that is, $T(n) \le cn$ for all $n_0 \le n < (10/9)n_0$. If we pick $n_0 = 1$, the base case becomes $T(n) \le cn$ for all $1 \le n < 10/9$. Since by assumption T(1) is constant, we have $T(1) \le c.1$ when $c \ge T(1)$. Therefore, the base case holds. Since $T(n) \le n$ for all $n \ge 1$, it must be the case that T(n) = O(n).

(c)
$$T(n) = 7T(n/3) + n^2$$

Proof. The solution to this recurrence is that $T(n) = O(n^2)$. We will adopt the inductive hypothesis that $T(n) \le cn^2$ for all $n \ge n_0$, where c and n_0 are positive constants. Assume by induction that $T(k) \le ck^2$ for all $n_0 \le k < n$. If $n \ge 3n_0$, we have that

$$T(n) = 7T(n/3) + n^{2}$$

$$\leq 7\frac{cn^{2}}{9} + n^{2}$$

$$= cn^{2} - \frac{2cn^{2}}{9} + n^{2}$$

$$\leq cn^{2} \quad (\text{when } c \geq \frac{9}{2})$$

Therefore, the inductive case holds. We will prove that the inductive hypothesis holds for the base case of the induction, that is, $T(n) \leq cn^2$ when $n_0 \leq n < 3n_0$. We can pick $n_0 = 1$. Since T(1) and T(2) are constants, we have $T(1) \leq c1^2$ and $T(2) \leq c1^2$ when $c \geq \max\{T(1), T(2)\}$. Thus, the base case holds. Therefore, we have $T(n) \leq cn^2$ for all $n_0 \geq 1$, which implies that $T(n) = O(n^2)$

(d)
$$T(n) = T(\sqrt{n}) + 1$$

Proof. The solution to this recurrence is that $T(n) = O(\log_2 \log_2 n)$. We will adopt the inductive hypothesis that $T(n) \le c \log_2 \log_2 n$ for all $n \ge n_0$, where

c and n_0 are positive constants. Assume by induction that $T(k) \le c \log_2 \log_2 k$ for all $n_0 \le k < n$. If $n \ge n_0^2$, we have

$$\begin{split} T(n) &= T(\sqrt{n}) + 1 \\ &\leq c \log_2 \log_2 \sqrt{n} + 1 \\ &= c \log_2 \log_2 n^{\frac{1}{2}} + 1 \\ &= c \log_2 (\frac{1}{2} \log_2 n) + 1 \\ &= c \log_2 \log_2 n + c \log_2 (\frac{1}{2}) + 1 \\ &= c \log_2 \log_2 n - c + 1 \\ &\leq c \log_2 \log_2 n \quad \text{(when } c \geq 1\text{)} \end{split}$$

Hence, the inductive hypothesis holds for the inductive case. We will prove that the inductive hypothesis holds for the base case of the induction, that is, $T(n) \leq c \log_2 \log_2 n$ when $n_0 \leq n < n_0^2$. If we pick $n_0 = \sqrt{5}$, the base case becomes $T(n) \leq c \log_2 \log_2 n$ when $\sqrt{5} \leq n < 5$, so we will check T(3) and T(4). Since T(n) is constant for all $n \leq 2$, $T(3) = T(\sqrt{3}) + 1 = T(1) + 1$ and T(4) = T(2) + 1 are also constant. When $c \geq \max\{T(3), T(4)\}$, we have $T(3) \leq c < c \log_2 \log_2 3$ and $T(4) \leq c < c \log_2 \log_2 4$. Therefore, the base case holds. Since $T(n) \leq c \log_2 \log_2 n$ for all $n \geq \sqrt{5}$, it must be the case that $T(n) = O(\log_2 \log_2 n)$.

(e)
$$T(n) = T(n-1) + \log_2 n$$

Proof. We will prove that $T(n) = O(n \log_2 n)$. We want to find positive constants c and n_0 such that $T(n) \le c n \log_2 n$ for all $n \ge n_0$. Assume by induction that $T(k) \le c k \log_2 k$ for all $n_0 \le k < n$. If $n \ge n_0 + 1$, we have that

$$\begin{split} T(n) &= T(n-1) + \log_2 n \\ &\leq c(n-1) \log_2 (n-1) + \log_2 n \\ &= cn \log_2 (n-1) - c \log_2 (n-1) + \log_2 n \\ &\leq cn \log_2 (n-1) - 3 \log_2 (n-1) + \log_2 n \quad \text{(when } c \geq 3) \\ &\leq cn \log_2 (n-1) \quad \text{(when } n \geq 3) \\ &\leq cn \log_2 n \end{split}$$

Thus, the inductive case is true. We will prove that the inductive hypothesis holds for the base case of the induction, that is, $T(n) \leq cn \log_2 n$ for all $n_0 \leq n < n_0 + 1$. If we pick $n_0 = 3$, the base case becomes $T(n) \leq cn \log_2 n$ for all $1 \leq n < 1$. We have $T(n) = T(n) + \log_2 1 \leq n < 1$. We have $T(n) = T(n) + \log_2 1 \leq n < 1$. Therefore, the base case holds. Hence, we have $T(n) \leq cn \log_2 n$ for all $n \geq 1$, which implies that $T(n) = O(cn \log_2 n)$.

4. Carefully prove by induction that the i^{th} Fibonacci number satisfies the equality

$$F_i = \frac{\phi^i - \widehat{\phi}^i}{\sqrt{5}},$$

where $\phi = (1 + \sqrt{5})/2$ is the golden ratio and $\hat{\phi} = (1 - \sqrt{5})/2$ is its conjugate.

Proof. We will prove this with strong induction.

Hypothesis: Let P(i): $F_i = \frac{\phi^i - \widehat{\phi^i}}{\sqrt{5}}$ for every non-negative integer i.

Base case: When i=0, the right-hand side of P(0) is $\frac{\phi^0 - \widehat{\phi}^0}{\sqrt{5}} = \frac{1-1}{\sqrt{5}} = 0 = F_0$ (based on the definition of Fibonacci numbers). Hence, P(0) is true.

When i=1, the right-hand side of P(1) is $\frac{\phi^1 - \widehat{\phi}^1}{\sqrt{5}} = \frac{\left(\frac{1+\sqrt{5}}{2}\right)^1 - \left(\frac{1-\sqrt{5}}{2}\right)^1}{\sqrt{5}} = \frac{\left(\frac{1+\sqrt{5}}{2}\right)^1}{\sqrt{5}} = \frac{\left(\frac{1+\sqrt{5}}$

 $\frac{\sqrt{5}}{\sqrt{5}} = 1 = F_1$ (based on the definition of Fibonacci numbers). Hence, P(1) is true.

Inductive step: We fix some $k \ge 1$ and assume that the hypothesis P(i) is true for all $0 \le i \le k$.

We want to show that P(k+1) is true, that is

$$F_{k+1} = \frac{\phi^{k+1} - \widehat{\phi}^{k+1}}{\sqrt{5}}$$

Since F_{k+1} is the (k+1)-th Fibonacci number, using the recursive definition of Fibonacci numbers and the inductive hypothesis, we have

$$\begin{split} F_{k+1} &= F_k + F_{k-1} \\ &= \frac{\phi^k - \widehat{\phi}^k}{\sqrt{5}} + \frac{\phi^{k-1} - \widehat{\phi}^{k-1}}{\sqrt{5}} \quad \text{(by inductive hypothesis)} \\ &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{5}} \left[\left(\frac{1 + \sqrt{5}}{2} \right)^k - \left(\frac{1 - \sqrt{5}}{2} \right)^k + \left(\frac{1 + \sqrt{5}}{2} \right)^{k-1} - \left(\frac{1 - \sqrt{5}}{2} \right)^{k-1} \right] \\ &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{5}} \left[\left(\frac{1 + \sqrt{5}}{2} \right)^{k-1} \cdot \left(\frac{1 + \sqrt{5}}{2} + 1 \right) - \left(\frac{1 - \sqrt{5}}{2} \right)^{k-1} \cdot \left(\frac{1 - \sqrt{5}}{2} + 1 \right) \right] \\ &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{5}} \left[\left(\frac{1 + \sqrt{5}}{2} \right)^{k-1} \cdot \left(\frac{3 + \sqrt{5}}{2} \right) - \left(\frac{1 - \sqrt{5}}{2} \right)^{k-1} \cdot \left(\frac{3 - \sqrt{5}}{2} \right) \right] \\ &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{5}} \left[\left(\frac{1 + \sqrt{5}}{2} \right)^{k-1} \cdot \left(\frac{6 + 2\sqrt{5}}{4} \right) - \left(\frac{1 - \sqrt{5}}{2} \right)^{k-1} \cdot \left(\frac{6 - 2\sqrt{5}}{4} \right) \right] \\ &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{5}} \left[\left(\frac{1 + \sqrt{5}}{2} \right)^{k-1} \cdot \left(\frac{1 + \sqrt{5}}{2} \right)^2 - \left(\frac{1 - \sqrt{5}}{2} \right)^{k-1} \cdot \left(\frac{1 - \sqrt{5}}{2} \right)^2 \right] \\ &= \frac{\left(\frac{1 + \sqrt{5}}{2} \right)^{k+1} - \left(\frac{1 - \sqrt{5}}{2} \right)^{k+1}}{\sqrt{5}} \\ &= \frac{\phi^{k+1} - \widehat{\phi}^{k+1}}{\sqrt{5}} \end{split}$$

Hence, P(k+1) is true.

Wrap-up: Since the base cases hold for i = 0 and i = 1, by the inductive case, we see that P(2) holds. Since P(0), P(1), and P(2) hold, it must be the case that P(3) holds. Continuing in this manner, we can prove that P(i) is true for all $i \geq 0$.