

# DASTA STRUCTURE AND ALGORITHM

## CLASS 1

---

Seongjin Lee

Updated: 2017-03-06  
DSA\_2017\_01

insight@gnu.ac.kr  
<http://resourceful.github.io>  
Systems Research Lab.  
GNU



# Table of contents

1. Miscellenea
2. Basic Concepts
3. Algorithm Specification
4. Recursive Algorithms
5. Data Abstraction
6. Performance Analysis
  - 6.1 Time Complexity
  - 6.2 Asymptotic Notation
  - 6.3 Practical Complexities

## MISCELLENEA

---

Fundamentals of Data Structure in C, 2nd Ed.

by Horowitz, Sahni, and Anderson-Freed

<http://www.cise.ufl.edu/~sahni/fdsc2ed/>

Presentations are uploaded in

- [https://github.com/resourceful/lecture\\_dsa2017-1](https://github.com/resourceful/lecture_dsa2017-1)

# Contact

E-mail: [insight@gnu.ac.kr](mailto:insight@gnu.ac.kr)

Room: 407-314

Visiting Hour: Monday and Wednesday 14:00 - 16:00

# Evaluation

- Midterm - 20%
- Final - 30%
- Assignments - 40%
- Attendance - 10%

## BASIC CONCEPTS



# Overview: System Life Cycle

## Requirements

- describe informations(input, output, initial)

## Analysis

- bottom-up, top-down

## Design

- data objects and operations performed on them

## Coding

- choose representations for data objects and write algorithms for each operation



# Overview: System Life Cycle Cnt'd

## Verification

- **correctness proofs:** select algorithms that have been proven correct
- **testing:** working code and sets of test data
- **error removal:** If done properly, the correctness proofs and system test indicate erroneous code

# ALGORITHM SPECIFICATION

---

# Algorithm Specification

## Definition

- a finite set of instructions - accomplish a particular task

## Criteria

- zero or more inputs
- at least one output
- definiteness(clear, unambiguous)
- finiteness(terminates after a finite number of steps)

# Algorithm Specification: Selection Sort

Ex Selection Sort: Sort  $n$  ( $n \geq 1$ ) integers

- From those integers that are currently unsorted, find the smallest and place it next in the sorted list

```
for (i=0; i<n; i++) {  
    Examine list[i] to list[n-1] and suppose  
    that the smallest integer is at list[min];  
  
    Interchange list[i] and list[min];  
}
```

# Algorithm Specification: Selection Sort

## finding the smallest integer

- assume that minimum is `list[i]`
- compare current minimum with `list[i+1]` to `list[n-1]` and find smaller number and make it the new minimum

## interchanging minimum with `list[i]`

- **function:** `swap(&a,&b)`
- **macro:** `swap(x,y,t)`
- The function's code is easier to read than that of the macro but the macro works with any data type

# Algorithm Specification: Selection Sort

- **function:** swap(&a,&b)

```
void swap(int *x, int *y){  
    int temp = *x;  
  
    *x = *y;  
  
    *y = temp;  
}
```

- **macro:** swap(x,y,t)

```
#define SWAP(x,y,t) ((t) = (x), (x) = (y), (y) = (t))
```

# Algorithm Specification: Binary Search

assumption

- sorted  $n(1)$  distinct integers stored in the array list

return

- index  $i$  (if  $i, \text{list}[i] = \text{searchnum}$ )
- or  $-1$  (otherwise)

# Algorithm Specification: Binary Search

denote left and right

- left and right ends of the list to be searched
- initially, left=0 and right=n-1

let  $\text{middle} = (\text{left} + \text{right}) / 2$  middle position in the list

compare  $\text{list}[\text{middle}]$  with the searchnum and adjust left or right

|       |   |   |   |   |    |    |    |    |    |
|-------|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|----|----|
| value | 1 | 5 | 7 | 8 | 13 | 19 | 20 | 23 | 29 |
| index | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4  | 5  | 6  | 7  | 8  |

assume searchnum is 23



# Algorithm Specification: Binary Search

compare `list[middle]` with `searchnum`

1. `searchnum < list[middle]` set right to `middle-1`
2. `searchnum = list[middle]` return `middle`
3. `searchnum > list[middle]` set left to `middle+1`

|       |   |   |   |   |    |    |    |    |    |
|-------|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|----|----|
| value | 1 | 5 | 7 | 8 | 13 | 19 | 20 | 23 | 29 |
| index | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4  | 5  | 6  | 7  | 8  |

# Algorithm Specification: Binary Search

if searchnum has not been found and there are more integers to check

- recalculate middle and continue search
- determining if there are any elements left to check

|       |   |   |   |   |    |    |    |    |    |
|-------|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|----|----|
| value | 1 | 5 | 7 | 8 | 13 | 19 | 20 | 23 | 29 |
| index | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4  | 5  | 6  | 7  | 8  |

- handling the comparison (through a function or a macro)

|       |   |   |   |   |    |    |    |    |    |
|-------|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|----|----|
| value | 1 | 5 | 7 | 8 | 13 | 19 | 20 | 23 | 29 |
| index | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4  | 5  | 6  | 7  | 8  |

# Algorithm Specification: Binary Search

- **function:** compare(int x, int y)

```
int compare(int x, int y){  
    if (x < y) return -1;  
    else if (x == y) return 0;  
    else return 1;  
}
```

- **macro:** COMPARE(x, y)

```
#define COMPARE(x,y) (((x) < (y) ? -1: (x) == (y)) ? 0: 1)
```

# Algorithm Specification: Binary Search

```
int binsearch(int list[],int searchnum,
              int left,int right) {
    int middle;
    while(left <= right) {
        middle = (left + right) / 2;
        switch(COMPARE(list[middle],searchnum)) {
            // COMPARE() returns -1, 0, or 1
            case -1: left = middle + 1;
                    break;
            case 0: return middle;
            case 1: right = middle - 1;
        }
    }
    return -1;
}
```

# RECURSIVE ALGORITHMS

---

# Recursive Algorithms

direct recursion

- call themselves

indirect recursion

- call other function that invoke the calling function again

recursive mechanism

- extremely powerful
- allows us to express a complex process in very clear terms

**any function that we can write using assignment, if-else, and while statements can be written recursively**

# Recursive Algorithms: Binary Search

transform iterative version of a binary search into a recursive one

- establish boundary condition that terminate the recursive call
  1. success: `list[middle]=searchnum`
  2. failure: left & right indices cross
- implement the recursive calls so that each call brings us one step closer to a solution

# Recursive Algorithms: Binary Search

```
int binsearch(int list[],int searchnum,int left,int right) {
    int middle;
    if(left <= right) {
        middle=(left+right)/2;
        switch(COMPARE(list[middle], searchnum)) {
            case -1 : return
                binsearch(list,searchnum,middle+1,right);
            case 0 : return middle
            case 1 : return
                binsearch(list,searchnum,left,middle-1);
        }
    }
    return -1;
}
```



# Recursive Algorithms: Permutations

given a set of  $n( > 1)$  elements

- print out all possible permutations of this set

eg) if set a,b,c is given,

- then set of permutations is  
(a,b,c), (a,c,b), (b,a,c), (b,c,a), (c,a,b), (c,b,a)

# Recursive Algorithms: Permutations

if look at the set a,b,c,d, the set of permutations are

1. a followed by all permutations of (b,c,d)
2. b followed by all permutations of (a,c,d)
3. c followed by all permutations of (a,b,d)
4. d followed by all permutations of (a,b,c)

**“followed by all permutations”** : clue to the recursive solution

# Recursive Algorithms: Permutations

```
void perm(char *list,int i,int n) {
    int j,temp;
    if(i==n) {
        for(j=0;j<=n;j++)
            printf("%c", list[j]);
        printf(" ");
    }
    else {
        for(j=i;j<=n;j++) {
            SWAP(list[i],list[j],temp);
            perm(list,i+1,n);
            SWAP(list[i],list[j],temp);
        }
    }
}
```

initial function call is

- `perm(list,0,n-1);`

recursively generates permutations

- until `i=n`

# DATA ABSTRACTION



# Data Abstraction: Data Type

## definition

- a collection of objects and
- a set of operations that act on those objects
- basic data type
  - char, int, float, double
- composite data type
  - array, structure
- user-defined data type
- pointer data type

# Data Abstraction: Abstract Data Type (ADT)

## definition

- **data type** that is organized in such a way that
- **the specification** of the objects and **the specification** of the operations on the objects is separated from
- **the representation** of the objects and **the implementation** of the operations

specification

- names of every function
- type of its arguments
- type of its result
- description of what the function does

classify the function of data type

- creator/constructor
- transformers
- observers/reporters

# Data Abstraction: Abstract Data Type

```
structure Natural_Number(Nat_No) is
  objects: an ordered subrange of the integers
           starting at zero and ending at the max.
           integer on the computer
  functions: for all x, y in Natural_Number;
             TRUE, FALSE in Boolean,
             and where +, -, <, and == are
             the usual integer operations,

  Nat_No Zero() ::= 0
  Nat_No Add(x,y) ::= if ((x+y)<=INT_MAX) return x+y
                     else return INT_MAX
  Nat_No Subtract(x,y) ::= if (x<y) return 0
                          else return x-y
  Boolean Equal(x,y) ::= if (x==y) return TRUE
                       else return FALSE
  Nat_No Successor(x) ::= if (x==INT_MAX) return x
                        else return x+1
  Boolean Is_Zero(x) ::= if (x) return FALSE
                      else return TRUE
end Natural_Number
```



# Data Abstraction

**objects** and **functions** are two main sections in the definition

function Zero is a **constructor**

function Add, Subtractor, Successor are **transformers**

function Is\_Zero and Equal are **reporters**

# PERFORMANCE ANALYSIS



# Performance Analysis

## Performance evaluation

- performance analysis: machine independent complexity theory
- performance measurement: machine dependent

## space complexity

- the amount of memory that it needs to run to completion

## time complexity

- the amount of computer time that it needs to run to completion

# Performance Analysis: Space Complexity

fixed space requirements

- don't depend on the number and size of the program's inputs and outputs
- eg) instruction space

variable space requirement

- the space needed by *structured variable* whose size depends on the particular instance,  $I$ , of the problem being solved

# Performance Analysis: Space Complexity

total space requirement  $S(P)$

$$S(P) = c + Sp(I)$$

- $c$  : constant representing the fixed space requirements
- $Sp(I)$  : function of some characteristics of the instance  $I$

# Performance Analysis: Space Complexity

```
float abc(float a, float b, float c) {  
    return a+b+b*c+(a+b-c)/(a+b)+4.00;  
}
```

- input - three simple variables
- output - a simple variable
- fixed space requirements only  $S_{abc}(I) = o$

# Performance Analysis: Space Complexity

## Iterative Version

```
float sum(float list[], int n) {  
    float tempsum = 0;  
    int i;  
    for(i = 0; i < n; i++)  
        tempsum += list[i];  
    return tempsum;  
}
```

- output - a simple variable
- input - an array variable

# Performance Analysis: Space Complexity

## Pascal pass arrays **by value**

- entire array is copied into temporary storage before the function is executed
- $S_{sum}(I) = S_{sum}(n) = n$

## C pass arrays **by pointer**

- passing *the address of the first element* of the array
- $S_{sum}(n) = 0$



# Performance Analysis: Space Complexity

## Recursive Version

```
float rsum(float list[],int n) {  
    if(n) return rsum(list,n-1) + list[n-1];  
    return 0;  
}
```

### handled recursively

- compiler must save
  - the parameters
  - the local variables
  - the return address
- for each recursive call

# Performance Analysis: Space Complexity

space needed for one recursive call


- number of bytes required for the two parameters and the return address
- 6 bytes needed on 80386
  - 2 bytes for pointer list[]
  - 2 bytes for integer n
  - 2 bytes for return address

assume array has  $n = \text{MAX\_SIZE}$  numbers,

**total variable space  $\text{Srsum}(\text{MAX\_SIZE})$**

- $\text{Srsum}(\text{MAX\_SIZE}) = 6 * \text{MAX\_SIZE}$

# PERFORMANCE ANALYSIS : TIME COMPLEXITY



# Performance Analysis: Time Complexity

The time  $T(P)$ , taken by a program  $P$ ,

- is the sum of its compile time and its run(or execution) time
- We really concerned only with the program's execution time,  $T_p$

count the number of operations the program performs

- give a machine-independent estimation

# Performance Analysis: Time Complexity

## Iterative summing of a list of numbers

```
float sum(float list[], int n) {  
    float tempsum=0;  
    count++; /* for assignment */  
    int i;  
    for(i = 0; i < n; i++) {  
        count++; /* for the for loop */  
        tempsum += list[i];  
        count++; /*for assignment*/  
    }  
    count++; /* last execution of for */  
    count++; /* for return */  
    return tempsum;  
}
```

# Performance Analysis: Time Complexity

eliminate most of the program statements from Program to obtain a simpler program that **computes the same value for count**

```
float sum(float list[], int n) {  
    float tempsum=0;  
    int i;  
    for(i = 0; i < n; i++)  
        count+=2;  
    count += 3;  
    return tempsum;  
}
```

# Performance Analysis: Time Complexity

## Recursive summing of a list of numbers

```
float rsum(float list[], int n) {  
    count++;  
    if(n) {  
        count++;  
        return rsum(list,n-1)+list[n-1];  
    }  
    count++;  
    return 0;  
}
```

# Performance Analysis: Time Complexity

when  $n=0$  only the if conditional and the second return statement are executed (termination condition)

- step count for  $n = 0 : 2$
- each step count for  $n > 0 : 2$

total step count for function :  $2n + 2$

- less step count than iterative version, but
- take more time than those of the iterative version



# Performance Analysis: Time Complexity

Matrix Addition determine the step count for a function that adds two-dimensional arrays(rows and cols)

```
void add(int a[][M_SIZE],int b[][M_SIZE],int c[][M_SIZE],
        int rows,int cols) {
    int i, j;
    for(i = 0; i < rows; i++)
        for(j = 0; j < cols; j++)
            c[i][j] = a[i][j] + b[i][j];
}
```

# Performance Analysis: Time Complexity

apply step counts to add function

```
void add(int a[][M_SIZE],int b[][M_SIZE], int c[][M_SIZE],
        int rows,int cols) {
    int i,j;
    for(i = 0; i < rows; i++) {
        count++;
        for(j = 0; j < cols; j++) {
            count++;
            c[i][j] = a[i][j] + b[i][j];
            count++;
        }
        count++;
    }
    count++;
}
```

# Performance Analysis: Time Complexity

combine counts

```
void add(int a[][M_SIZE],int b[][M_SIZE],int c[][M_SIZE],
        int rows,int cols) {
    int i, j;
    for(i = 0; i < rows; i++) {
        for(j = 0; j < cols; j++)
            count += 2;
        count += 2;
    }
    count++;
}
```

initially count = 0;

total step count on termination :  $2 \cdot \text{rows} \cdot \text{cols} + 2 \cdot \text{rows} + 1$ ;

# Performance Analysis: Time Complexity

## Tabular Method

construct a step count table

1. first determine the step count for each statement
  - $\text{steps}/\text{execution}(s/e)$
2. next figure out the number of times that each statement is executed
  - frequency
3. total steps for each statement
  - $(\text{total steps}) = (s/e) * \text{frequency}$

# Performance Analysis: Time Complexity

Iterative function to sum a list of numbers

| Statement                       | s/e  | Frequency | Total steps |
|---------------------------------|------|-----------|-------------|
| float sum(float list[],int n) { | 0    | 0         | 0           |
| float tempsum=0;                | 1    | 1         | 1           |
| int i;                          | 0    | 0         | 0           |
| for(i=0;i<n;i++)                | 1    | n+1       | n+1         |
| tempsum+=list[i];               | 1    | n         | n           |
| return tempsum;                 | 1    | 1         | 1           |
| }                               | 0    | 0         | 0           |
| total                           | 2n+3 |           |             |

Figure: step count table

# Performance Analysis: Time Complexity

Recursive function to sum a list of numbers

| Statement                        | s/e    | Frequency | Total steps |
|----------------------------------|--------|-----------|-------------|
| float rsum(float list[],int n) { | 0      | 0         | 0           |
| if(n)                            | 1      | $n+1$     | $n+1$       |
| return rsum(list,n-1)+list[n-1]; | 1      | $n$       | $n$         |
| return 0;                        | 1      | 1         | 1           |
| }                                | 0      | 0         | 0           |
| total                            | $2n+2$ |           |             |

Figure: step count table for recursive summing function

# Performance Analysis: Time Complexity

## Matrix addition

| Statement                        | s/e | Frequency     | Total steps          |
|----------------------------------|-----|---------------|----------------------|
| void add(int a[][M_SIZE] ... ) { | 0   | 0             | 0                    |
| int i,j;                         | 0   | 0             | 0                    |
| for(i=0;i<rows;i++)              | 1   | rows+1        | rows+1               |
| for(j=0;j<cols;j++)              | 1   | rows·(cols+1) | rows·cols+rows       |
| c[i][j] = a[i][j] + b[i][j];     | 1   | rows·cols     | rows·cols            |
| }                                | 0   | 0             | 0                    |
| total                            |     |               | 2·rows·cols+2·rows+1 |

**Figure:** step count table for matrix addition

# Performance Analysis: Time Complexity

**factors:** time complexity

1. input size

- depends on size of input( $n$ ):  $T(n) = ?$

2. input form

- depends on different possible input formats
  - average case:  $A(n) = ?$
  - worst case:  $W(n) = ?$
- concerns mostly for “worst case”
- worst case gives “upper bound”
  - exist different algorithm for the same task
  - which one is faster ?



# PERFORMANCE ANALYSIS : ASYMP- TOTIC NOTATION

---

# Performance Analysis: Asymptotic Notation

comparing time complexities

- exist different algorithms for the same task
- which one is faster ?




Figure: Which one is faster?

# Performance Analysis: Asymptotic Notation

Big “OH”

- **def**  $f(n) = O(g(n))$ 
  - iff there exist positive constants  $c$  and  $n_0$  such that
  - $f(n) \leq c \cdot g(n)$  for all  $n, n \geq n_0$




Figure: Which one is faster?

# Performance Analysis: Asymptotic Notation

$$f(n) = 25 \cdot n, g(n) = 1/3 \cdot n^2$$

○  $25 \cdot n = O(n^2/3)$  if let  $c = 1$

| n  | $f(n) = 25 \cdot n$ | $g(n) = n^2 / 3$ |
|----|---------------------|------------------|
| 1  | 25                  | 1/3              |
| 2  | 50                  | 4/3              |
| .  | .                   | .                |
| .  | .                   | .                |
| .  | .                   | .                |
| 75 | 1875                | 1875             |

**Figure:** Which one is faster?

$$|25 \cdot n|1 \cdot |n^2/3| \text{ for all } n \geq 75$$

# Performance Analysis: Asymptotic Notation

$$f(n) = O(g(n))$$

- $g(n)$  is an upper bound on the value of  $f(n)$  for all  $n$ ,  $n \geq n_0$
- but, doesn't say anything about how good this bound is
  - $n = O(n^2)$ ,  $n = O(n^{2.5})$
  - $n = O(n^3)$ ,  $n = O(2^n)$
- $g(n)$  should be as small a function of  $n$  as one can come up with for which  $f(n) = O(g(n))$

$$f(n) = O(g(n)) \neq O(g(n)) = f(n)$$

# Performance Analysis: Asymptotic Notation

**theorem)** if  $f(n) = a_m n^m + \dots + a_1 n + a_0$ , then  $f(n) = O(n^m)$

**proof)**

$$\begin{aligned} f(n) &\leq |a_k| \cdot n^k + |a_{k-1}| \cdot n^{k-1} + \dots + |a_1| \cdot n + |a_0| \\ &= |a_k| + |a_{k-1}|/n + \dots + |a_1|/n^{k-1} + |a_0|/n^k \cdot n^k \\ &\leq |a_k| + |a_{k-1}| + \dots + |a_1| + |a_0| \cdot n^k \\ &= c \cdot n^k (c = |a_k| + |a_{k-1}| + \dots + |a_1| + |a_0|) = O(n^k) \end{aligned}$$

# Performance Analysis: Asymptotic Notation

**Omega def)**  $f(n) = \Omega(g(n))$

- iff there exist positive constants  $c$  and  $n_0$  such that  $f(n) \geq c \cdot g(n)$  for all  $n, n \geq n_0$
- $g(n)$  is a lower bound on the value of  $f(n)$  for all  $n, n \geq n_0$
- should be as large a function of  $n$  as possible

**theorem)** if  $f(n) = a_m n^m + \dots + a_1 n + a_0$  and  $a_m > 0$ , then  $f(n) = \Omega(n^m)$

# Performance Analysis: Asymptotic Notation

**Theta def**  $f(n) = \Theta(g(n))$

- iff there exist positive constants  $c^1$ ,  $c^2$ , and  $n^0$  such that
- $c^1 \cdot g(n) \leq f(n) \leq c^2 \cdot g(n)$  for all  $n$ ,  $n \geq n^0$
- more precise than both the “big oh” and omega notations
- $g(n)$  is both an upper and lower bound on  $f(n)$



# Performance Analysis: Asymptotic Notation

## Complexity of matrix addition


| Statement                        | Asymptotic complexity                   |
|----------------------------------|---|
| void add(int a[][M_SIZE] ... ) { | 0                                       |
| int i, j;                        | 0                                       |
| for(i = 0; i < rows; i++)        | $\Theta(\text{rows})$                   |
| for(j = 0; j < cols; j++)        | $\Theta(\text{rows} \cdot \text{cols})$ |
| c[i][j] = a[i][j] + b[i][j];     | $\Theta(\text{rows} \cdot \text{cols})$ |
| }                                | 0                                       |
| Total                            | $\Theta(\text{rows} \cdot \text{cols})$ |

**Figure:** time complexity of matrix addition

# PERFORMANCE ANALYSIS : PRACTICAL COMPLEXITIES

---

# Performance Analysis: Practical Complexities



**Figure:** Class of time complexities

# Performance Analysis: Practical Complexities

polynomial time

- tractable problem exponential time
- intractable (hard) problem

eg)

- sequential search
- binary search
- insertion sort
- heap sort
- satisfiability problem
- testing serializable scheduling

# Performance Analysis: Practical Complexities

|                |             | instance characteristic n |   |    |       |                |                        |
|----------------|-------------|---------------------------|---|----|-------|----------------|------------------------|
| time           | name        | 1                         | 2 | 4  | 8     | 16             | 32                     |
| 1              | constant    | 1                         | 1 | 1  | 1     | 1              | 1                      |
| log n          | logarithmic | 0                         | 1 | 2  | 3     | 4              | 5                      |
| n              | linear      | 1                         | 2 | 4  | 8     | 16             | 32                     |
| n log n        | log linear  | 0                         | 2 | 8  | 24    | 64             | 160                    |
| n <sup>2</sup> | quadratic   | 1                         | 4 | 16 | 64    | 256            | 1024                   |
| n <sup>3</sup> | cubic       | 1                         | 8 | 64 | 512   | 4096           | 32768                  |
| 2n             | exponential | 2                         | 4 | 16 | 256   | 65536          | 4294967296             |
| n!             | factorial   | 1                         | 2 | 24 | 40320 | 20922789888000 | 26313×10 <sup>33</sup> |

Figure: function value

# Performance Analysis: Practical Complexities

If a program needs  $2^n$  steps for execution

- $n=40$ : number of steps =  $1.1 \times 10^{12}$  in computer systems
  - 1 billion steps/sec — 18.3 min
- $n=50$  — 13 days
- $n=60$  — 310.56 years
- $n=100$  —  $4 \times 10^{13}$  years

If a program needs  $n^{10}$  steps for execution

- $n=10$  — 10 sec
- $n=100$  — 3171 years