CS711008Z Algorithm Design and Analysis

Lecture 5. Basic algorithm design technique: Divide-and-Conquer

Dongbo Bu

Institute of Computing Technology
Chinese Academy of Sciences, Beijing, China

Outline

- The basic idea of divide-and-conquer technique;
- The first example: MERGESORT
  - Correctness proof by using **loop invariant** technique;
  - Time complexity analysis of recursive algorithm;

- Other examples: COUNTINGINVERSION, CLOSESTPAIR, MULTIPLICATION, FFT;
- Combining with randomization: QUICKSORT, QUICKSORT, and FLOYDRIVEST algorithm for SELECTION problem;
- Remarks:
  1. Divide-and-conquer technique is usually serving to reduce the running time though the brute-force algorithm is already polynomial-time, say $O(n^2) \Rightarrow O(n \log n)$ for the CLOSESTPAIR problem.
  2. This technique is especially powerful when combined with randomization technique.

分完之后还有和
原问题相同
的结构.

- Suppose the input of a problem is related to the following data structures, perhaps we can try to divide it into sub-problems, i.e., problems with the same structure but smaller size.
  - An **array** with n elements;
  - A **matrix**;
  - A **set** of n elements;
  - A **tree**;
  - A **directed acyclic graph**;
  - A **general graph**;
  - ......

SORT problem: to sort an array of n integers

SORT problem

INPUT: An array of n integers, say $A[0..n-1]$;
OUTPUT: the items of A in increasing order.

1. **Divide into a $n-1$-length array and an element**: to solve the original problem, it suffices to solve a smaller sub-problem; thus the problem is shrunk step-by-step. In other words, a feasible solution can be constructed step-by-step.

A_0	A_1	$\cdots$	A_{n-2}	A_{n-1}

A_0	A_1	$\cdots$	A_{n-2}		A_{n-1}

2. **Divide into two halves**: the original problem is decomposed into several independent sub-problems; thus, a feasible solution to the original problem can be constructed by assembling the solutions to independent sub-problems.

$$\boxed{A_0} \boxed{A_1} \boxed{\cdots} \boxed{A_{\lceil \frac{n}{2} \rceil}} \boxed{\cdots} \boxed{A_{n-1}}$$

$$\boxed{A_0} \boxed{A_1} \boxed{\cdots} \qquad \boxed{A_{\lceil \frac{n}{2} \rceil}} \boxed{\cdots} \boxed{A_{n-1}}$$

- Basic idea: At each step of the execution, we have several elements in its correct order, i.e., $A[0..j-1]$ has already been correctly sorted, and the objective is to put $A[j]$ in its correct position. This way, the final solution is constructed step-by-step.

$$\boxed{A_0}\ \boxed{A_1}\ \cdots\ \boxed{A_{n-3}}\boxed{A_{n-2}}\boxed{A_{n-1}}$$

$$\boxed{A_0}\ \boxed{A_1}\ \cdots\ \boxed{A_{n-3}}\boxed{A_{n-2}}$$

$$\ldots\ldots$$

$$\boxed{A_0}\ \boxed{A_1}$$

INSERTIONSORT(A, n)

1: **for** $j = 0$ to $n - 1$ **do**
2:    $key = A[j]$;
3:    $i = j - 1$;
4:    **while** $i \geq 0$ and $A[i] > key$ **do**
5:       $A[i+1] = A[i]$;
6:       $i - -$;
7:    **end while**
8:    $A[i+1] = key$;
9: **end for**

A_0	A_1

A_0	A_1	A_2

......

A_0	A_1	$\cdots$	$A_{\lceil \frac{n}{2} \rceil}$	$\cdots$	A_{n-1}

(see a demo here)

(handwritten annotations)

找到 A 中比 k 大的数，向后移动。并将 key 插入。

$\bar{j}^-$

5 1 2 3 4
key
$\bar{j}=0$,
$\bar{i}=-1$
$A[0]=5$.

$key=1, \bar{j}=1, \bar{i}=0$
$5>1$
$A[1]=A[0]=5$.
$\bar{i}=0 \; -- \; =-1$
$A[0]=key=1$

Trial 1: Analysis of INSERTIONSORT algorithm

- Worst case: if $A[0..n-1]$ has already been sorted.
- Time complexity: $O(n^2)$.
- In fact, the running time is $T(n) = T(n-1) + cn = O(n^2)$.

$$\boxed{8}\boxed{7}\boxed{6}\boxed{5}\boxed{4}\boxed{3}\boxed{2}\boxed{1}$$

$$\boxed{7}\boxed{8}\boxed{6}\boxed{5}\boxed{4}\boxed{3}\boxed{2}\boxed{1}$$

$$\vdots$$

$$\boxed{1}\boxed{2}\boxed{3}\boxed{4}\boxed{5}\boxed{6}\boxed{7}\boxed{8}$$

INSERTSORT: 28 ops

Figure 1: von Neumann in 1940s

- Key observation: the problem can be decomposed into two **independent sub-problems.**

$$\boxed{A_0 \mid A_1 \mid \cdots \mid A_{\lceil \frac{n}{2} \rceil} \mid \cdots \mid A_{n-1}}$$

$$\boxed{A_0 \mid A_1 \mid \cdots} \qquad \boxed{A_{\lceil \frac{n}{2} \rceil} \mid \cdots \mid A_{n-1}}$$

1. **Divide** divide the n-element sequence into two subsequences; each has $n/2$ elements;
2. **Conquer** sort the subsequences recursively by calling MERGESORT itself;
3. **Combine** merge the two sorted subsequences to yield the answer to the original problem;

MERGESORT(A, l, r)

1: /* To sort part of the array $A[l..r]$. */
2: **if** $l < r$ **then**
3:     $m = (l + r)/2$; // m denotes the middle point;
4:     MERGESORT(A, l, m);
5:     MERGESORT(A, m, r);
6:   MERGE(A, l, m, r); // combining the sorted subsequences;
7: **end if**

MERGE (A, l, m, r)

1: /* to merge $A[l..m]$(named as L) and $A[m+1..r]$ (named as R). */
2: $i = 0; j = 0;$
3: **for** $k = l$ to r **do**
4:     **if** $L[i] < R[j]$ **then**
5:         $A[k] = L[i];$
6:         $i++;$
7:     **else**
8:         $A[k] = R[j];$
9:         $j++;$
10:     **end if**
11: **end for**

min

$A[0..k-1]$ is sorted

A_k

sorted $A[l..m]$ (called L)   sorted $A[m+1..r]$ (called R)

L_i R_j

(see a demo)

Correctness of MERGESORT algorithm

Loop invariant: (similar to **mathematical induction** proof technique)

1. At the start of each iteration of the **for** loop, $A[l..k-1]$ contains the $k-l$ smallest elements of $L[1..n_1+1]$ and $R[1..n_2+1]$, in sorted order.
2. $L[i]$ and $R[j]$ are the smallest elements of their array that have not been copied to A.

Proof.

- Initialization: $k = l$. Loop invariant holds since $A[l..k-1]$ is empty.
- Maintenance: Suppose $L[i] < R[j]$, and $A[l..k-1]$ holds the $k-l$ smallest elements. After copying $L[i]$ into $A[k]$, $A[l..k]$ will hold the $k-l+1$ smallest elements.

$\square$

- Since the loop invariant holds initially, and is maintained during the **for** loop, thus it should hold when the algorithm terminates.

- Termination: At termination, $k = r + 1$. By loop invariant, $A[l..k-1]$, i.e. $A[l..r]$ must contain $r - l + 1$ smallest elements, in sorted order.

Time-complexity of MERGESORT algorithm

Merge(A, l, m, r)

1: /* to merge $A[l..m]$(denoted as L) and $A[m + 1..r]$ (denoted as R). */
2: $i = 0$; $j = 0$;
3: **for** $k = l$ to r **do**
4:    **if** $L[i] > R[j]$ **then**
5:       $A[k] = R[j]$;
6:       $j + +$;
7:    **else**
8:       $A[k] = L[i]$;
9:       $i + +$;
10:    **end if**
11: **end for**

遍历一遍

$T(n) = O(n)$

Time complexity: $O(n)$. (see a demo)

- Let $T(n)$ denote the running time on a problem of size n. We have the following recursion:

$$T(n) = \begin{cases} c & n \leq 2 \\ T(n/2) + T(n/2) + \underline{cn} & otherwise \end{cases} \quad (1)$$

为什么 "$\bar{x}$" $+ cn$ "?

| 2 | 4 | 5 | 7 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 6 | $T(n)$ MERGE: $O(n)$

| 2 | 4 | 5 | 7 | $T(\frac{n}{2})$ | 1 | 2 | 3 | 6 | $T(\frac{n}{2})$

计算递规时间复杂度

的三种方式：

- Ways to analyse a recursion:
    1. **Unrolling the recurrence to find a pattern:** unrolling a few levels to find a pattern, and then sum over all levels;
    2. **Guess and substitution:** guess the solution, substitute it into the recurrence relation, and check whether it works.
    3. **Generating function**

- Unrolling the recurrence to find a pattern: unrolling a few
 levels to find a pattern, and then sum over all levels;

$$T(n) \qquad \dots cn$$

$$T(\tfrac{n}{2}) \qquad T(\tfrac{n}{2})$$

- Unrolling the recurrence to find a pattern: unrolling a few
  levels to find a pattern, and then sum over all levels;

$$T(n) \qquad \ldots cn$$

$$T(\tfrac{n}{2}) \qquad T(\tfrac{n}{2}) \qquad \ldots cn$$

$$T(\tfrac{n}{4}) \ T(\tfrac{n}{4}) \ T(\tfrac{n}{4}) \ T(\tfrac{n}{4})$$

- Unrolling the recurrence to find a pattern: unrolling a few levels to find a pattern, and then sum over all levels;

$$T(n) \qquad \ldots cn$$

$$T(\tfrac{n}{2}) \qquad T(\tfrac{n}{2}) \qquad \ldots cn$$

$$T(\tfrac{n}{4}) \; T(\tfrac{n}{4}) \; T(\tfrac{n}{4}) \; T(\tfrac{n}{4}) \ldots cn$$

$$c \; c \; c \; c \quad c \; c \; c \; c \quad \ldots cn$$

$\log_2 N$

$\log_2 N \times Cn$

$= N \log N$

- Unrolling the recurrence to find a pattern: unrolling a few
  levels to find a pattern, and then sum over all levels;

- Guess and substitution: guess a solution, substitute it into the recurrence relation, and justify that it works.
- Guess: $T(n) \leq cn \log_2 n$ for all $n \geq 2$;
- Verification:
  - Case $n = 2$: $T(2) = c \leq cn \log_2 n$;
  - Case $n > 2$: Suppose $T(m) \leq cm \log_2 m$ holds for all $m \leq n$. We have

$$
\begin{array}{rcl}
T(n) & = & 2T(n/2) + cn \quad \text{(2)} \\
& \leq & 2c(n/2) \log_2(n/2) + cn \quad \text{(3)} \\
& = & 2c(n/2) \log_2 n - 2c(n/2) + cn \quad \text{(4)} \\
& = & cn \log_2 n \quad \text{(5)}
\end{array}
$$

- Guess and substitution: one guesses the overall form of the solution without pinning down the constants and parameters.
- A weaker guess: $T(n) = O(n \log n)$. Rewritten as $T(n) = k \log_b n$, where k, b **will be determined later.**

$$
\begin{aligned}
T(n) &= 2T(n/2) + cn \\
&\leq 2k(n/2) \log_b(n/2) + cn \quad \text{(set b=2 for simplification)} \\
&= 2k(n/2) \log_2 n - 2k(n/2) + cn \\
&= kn \log_2 n - kn + cn \quad \text{(set k=c for simplification again)} \\
&= cn \log_2 n
\end{aligned}
$$

Master theorem

Theorem

Let $T(n)$ be defined by $T(n) = aT(n/b) + n^d$ for $a > 1$, $b > 1$ and $d > 0$, then $T(n)$ can be bounded by:

1. If $d < \log_b a$, then $T(n) = O(n^{\log_b a})$;
2. If $d = \log_b a$, then $T(n) = O(n^{\log_b a} \log n)$;
3. If $d > \log_b a$, then $T(n) = O(n^d)$.

- Intuition: the ratio of cost between neighbouring layers is $\frac{a}{b^d}$.

$\log_b n = \dfrac{\log_a n}{\log_a b}$

$\dfrac{n^d}{b^d}$

Proof.

$$
\begin{aligned}
T(n) &= aT\left(\frac{n}{b}\right) + n^d \\
&= a\left(aT\left(\frac{n}{b^2}\right) + \left(\frac{n}{b}\right)^d\right) + n^d \\
&= \ldots \ldots \\
&= n^d\left(1 + \frac{a}{b^d} + \left(\frac{a}{b^d}\right)^2 + \ldots + \left(\frac{a}{b^d}\right)^{\log_b n}\right) \\
&= \begin{cases} O(n^{\log_b a}) & \text{if } d < \log_b a \\ O(n^{\log_b a} \log n) & \text{if } d = \log_b a \\ O(n^d) & \text{if } d > \log_b a \end{cases}
\end{aligned}
$$

- Example 1: $T(n) \le 3T(n/2) + cn$

  $T(n) = O(n^{\log_2 3}) = O(n^{1.585})$

- Example 2: $T(n) \le 2T(\frac{n}{2}) + cn^2$

 $T(n) = \sum_{j=0}^{\log n} \frac{cn^2}{2^j} = cn^2 \sum_{j=0}^{\log n} \frac{1}{2^j} = 2cn^2$
  (Note: not $O(n^2 \log n)$)

- Example 3: $T(n) \le T(n/3) + T(2n/3) + cn$

| 8 | 7 | 6 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |

| 7 | 8 | 6 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |

⋮

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |

INSERTSORT: 28 ops

| 8 | 7 | 6 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |

MERGESORT step 1: 4 ops

| 7 | 8 | 5 | 6 | 3 | 4 | 1 | 2 |

MERGESORT step 2: 4 ops, save: 4 ops

| 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |

MERGESORT step 3: 4 ops, save: 12 ops

COUNTINGINVERSION: to count inversions in an array of n integers

Practical problems:

1. to identify two persons with similar preference, i.e. ranking books, movies, etc.
2. In case of **meta search engine**, each engine produces a ranked pages for a given query. Comparison of the rankings help identify consensus or similar interests.

Formalized representation

INPUT: n (distinct) numbers $a_1, a_2, ..., a_n$;
OUTPUT: the number of **inversions**, i.e. a pair of indices such that $i < j$ but $a_i > a_j$;

Figure 2: Sequence comparison of the 5' flanking regions of mouse, rat and human ERβ.

Reference: In vivo function of the 5' flanking region of mouse estrogen receptor β gene, The Journal of Steroid Biochemistry and Molecular Biology Volume 105, Issues 1-5, June-July 2007, pages 57-62.

- Motivation: how to measure the association between two genes when given expression levels across n time points?
- Existing measures:
  - Linear relationship: Pearson's CC (most widely used, but sensitive to outliers)
  - Monotonic relationship: Spearman, Kendall's correlation
  - General statistical dependence: Renyi correlation, mutual information, maximal information coefficient
- A novel measure:
$$W_1 = \sum_{i=1}^{n-k+1}(I_i^+ + I_i^-)$$
  Here, I_i^+ is 1 if $X_{[i,..,i+k-1]}$ and $Y_{[i,..,i+k-1]}$ has the same order and 0 otherwise, while I_i^- is 1 if $X_{[i,..,i+k-1]}$ and $-Y_{[i,..,i+k-1]}$ has the same order and 0 otherwise.
- Advantage: the association may exist across a subset of samples. For example,
$$X: \ 1\ 3\ 4\ 2\ 5$$
$$Y: \ 1\ 4\ 5\ 2\ 3$$
$W_1 = 2$ when $k = 3$. Much better than Pearson CC, et al.

- Solution: index pairs. The possible solution space has a size of $O(n^2)$.
- Brute-force: $O(n^2)$ (checking each pair (a_i, a_j)).
- Can we design a better algorithm?

Devide

- Key observation: the problem/solution can be divided into subproblems/solutions;
- Divide-and-conquer strategy:
  1. **Divide:** divide into two subproblems: $A[0..n/2]$ and $A[n/2 + 1...n - 1]$;
  2. **Conquer:** counting inversion in each half by calling COUNTINGINVERSION itself;

2	5	3	1	7	4	6	8

2	5	3	1

7	4	6	8

Combine

- **Combine:** how to count inversion (a_i, a_j), when a_i and a_j are in different half?
- A simple enumeration will take $\frac{n^2}{4}$ steps. Thus,
 $T(n) = 2T(\frac{n}{2}) + \frac{n^2}{4} = O(n^2)$.

- **Combine:** how to count inversion (a_i, a_j), when a_i and a_j are in different half? 难搞.
- A simple enumeration will take $\frac{n^2}{4}$ steps. Thus, $T(n) = 2T(\frac{n}{2}) + \frac{n^2}{4} = O(n^2)$.
- We will get a $O(n \log n)$ algorithm if we can perform "combine" step in $O(n)$ time.
- Thing will be easy provided each half has already been sorted!

half 排序后两个 half 间
的逆序不变.
〈但组内肯定变了〉

1 3 5 2 2 4 6 8

(See a demo)

SORT-AND-COUNT(A)

1: Divide A into two sub-sequences L and R;
2: $(RC_L, L) = $ SORT-AND-COUNT(L);
3: $(RC_R, R) = $ SORT-AND-COUNT(R);
4: $(C, A) = $ MERGE-AND-COUNT(L, R);
5: **return** $(RC = RC_L + RC_R + C, A)$;

MERGE-AND-COUNT (L, R)

1: $RC = 0; i = 0; j = 0;$
2: **for** $k = 0$ to $\|L\| + \|R\| - 1$ **do**
3:    **if** $L[i] > R[j]$ **then**
4:      $A[k] = R[j];$
5:      $j + +;$
6:      $RC+ = (\frac{n}{2} - i);$
7:    **else**
8:      $A[k] = L[i];$
9:      $i + +;$
10:    **end if**
11: **end for**
12: **return** (RC, A);

Time complexity: $T(n) = O(n \log n)$.

Handwritten annotations:

- $\overset{2}{\text{(A)}} \overset{5}{}$ if len(A)==2.

- $2 \quad 5 \quad 3 \quad 1 \quad 7 \quad 4 \quad 6 \quad 8$
- $2 \, 5 \, (3 \, 1)$
- $\frac{2 \, 5}{\uparrow}$ $1 \, 3$
- $2 \quad 5$
- A 返回有序数组.

- $1 \, 3 \, 5 \, 7$ $2 \, 4 \, 6 \, 8$
- $\uparrow i$ $\uparrow j$
- 对 "i" 未流, "j" 之后 的都逆序对.
- $\therefore$ RC += $(\frac{n}{2} - i)$
- = $(\|L\| - i)$

- $L = 2, \quad R = 5$
- 0 to 1
- $2 > 5$?
- $A[0] = 2. \quad i = 1$
- $A_0 = 2,$

- if $i == \|L\|$
- for j to $\|R\|$
- $A[k]$

- A sorted array has an inversion number of 0.
- Thus, we can treat the sorting process as a process to decrease inversion number to 0.
- Suppose we can record the decrement of inversion number during the sorting process, the sum will be the inversion number.

The general DIVIDE-AND-CONQUER paradigm 范例

Basic
Idea

- Basic idea: Many problems are recursive in structure, i.e., to solve a given problem, they call themselves several times to deal with closely related **sub-problems**. These sub-problems have the same form to the original problem but a smaller size.
- The divide-and-conquer paradigm contains three steps:
  1. **Divide** a problem into a number of **independent sub-problems**;
     How to divide? at middle-point; divide into two parts with odd- and even- indices; enumerate all cases of dividing point; randomly choose one, etc.
  2. **Conquer** the subproblems by solving them recursively;
  3. **Combine** the solutions to the subproblems into the solution to the original problem;
     Sometimes clever ideas are needed to combine.

QUICKSORT algorithm: divide according to **a randomly-selected pivot**

Figure 3: Sir Charles Antony Richard Hoare, 2011

QUICKSORT(A)

1: $S_- = \{\}; S_+ = \{\}$;

2: Choose a pivot $A[j]$ **uniformly at random**;

3: **for** $i = 0$ to $n - 1$ **do**

4:     Put $A[i]$ in S_- if $A[i] < A[j]$;

5:     Put $A[i]$ in S_+ if $A[i] \geq A[j]$;

6: **end for**

7: QUICKSORT(S_+);

8: QUICKSORT(S_-);

9: Output S_-, then $A[j]$, then S_+;

- The randomization operation makes this algorithm **simple** (relative to MERGESORT algorithm) but **efficient**.

- However, the randomization also incurs a difficulty for analysis: Instead of selecting the median $A_{\lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor}$, we use a randomly chosen A_j as pivot and divide based on its value; thus, we cannot guarantee that each sub-problem has exactly $\frac{n}{2}$ elements.

- **Worst case:** selecting the smallest/biggest element at each iteration;

$$T(n) \leq T(n-1) + cn \Rightarrow T(n) = O(n^2)$$

- **Best case:** select the median exactly at each iteration;

$$T(n) \leq 2T(n/2) + cn \Rightarrow T(n) = O(n \log n)$$

巧妙) 中川意,

- **Most cases:** instead of selecting the median exactly, we can select a **nearly-central pivot** with high probability. We claim that the expected running time is still $T(n) = O(n \log n)$.

- Let X denote the number of comparison in line 3 and 4;
- It is obvious that the running time of QUICKSORT is $O(n + X)$. We have the following two key observations:
- **Observation 1:** $A[i]$ and $A[j]$ are compared at most once for any i and j.

- Define index variable $X_{ij} = I\{A[i]$ is compared with $A[j]\}$.
- Thus $X = \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \sum_{j=i+1}^{n-1} X_{ij}$.

$$
\begin{aligned}
E[X] &= E[\sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \sum_{j=i+1}^{n-1} X_{ij}] \\
&= \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \sum_{j=i+1}^{n-1} E[X_{ij}] \\
&= \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \sum_{j=i+1}^{n-1} \Pr(A[i] \text{ is compared with } A[j])
\end{aligned}
$$

- **Observation 2:** $A[i]$ and $A[j]$ are compared iff either $A[i]$ or $A[j]$ is selected as pivot when processing elements containing $A[i, i+1, ..., j]$.
- We claim $\Pr(A[i]$ is compared with $A[j]) = \frac{2}{j-i+1}$. (Why?)
- Then:

$$
\begin{aligned}
E[X] &= \sum_{i=1}^{n} \sum_{j=i+1}^{n} \Pr(A[i] \text{ is compared with } A[j]) \\
&= \sum_{i=1}^{n} \sum_{j=i+1}^{n} \frac{2}{j-i+1} \\
&= \sum_{i=1}^{n} \sum_{k=1}^{n-i} \frac{2}{k+1} \\
&\leq \sum_{i=1}^{n} \sum_{k=1}^{n} \frac{2}{k+1} \\
&= O(n \log n)
\end{aligned}
$$

Here k is defined as $k = j - i$.

只有A[i]或A[j]被选为轴时, A[i], A[j]才可能会主比较.

- Let's examine a simple example first: For a set with only 3 elements $A = \{1, 2, 3\}$, each element will be selected as pivot with equal probability $\frac{1}{3}$.
- In two cases, $A[1]$ is compared with $A[3]$. Hence, $\Pr(A[1]$ is compared with $A[3]) = \frac{2}{3}$

- Let's further consider a larger set A with 4 elements. $\frac{1}{6}$
- Each element will be selected as pivot with equal probability $\frac{1}{4}$: the selection of $A[1]$ or $A[3]$ as pivot will lead to a direct comparison of $A[1]$ and $A[3]$. In contrast, the selection of $A[4]$ as pivot produces a smaller problem, where $A[1]$ will be compared with $A[3]$ with a probability of $\frac{2}{3}$. Hence,

$$
\begin{aligned}
\Pr(A[1] \text{ is compared with } A[3]) &= \frac{1}{4} + 0 + \frac{1}{4} + \frac{1}{4} \times \frac{2}{3} \\
&= \frac{3}{4} \times \frac{2}{3} + \frac{1}{4} \times \frac{2}{3} \\
&= \frac{2}{3}
\end{aligned}
$$

$$\boxed{1} \boxed{2} \boxed{\cdots} \boxed{i} \boxed{\cdots} \boxed{j} \boxed{\cdots} \boxed{n}$$

- Now let's extend these observations to general cases. By induction over the size of A, we can calculate the probability as:

$$
\begin{aligned}
\Pr(A[i] \text{ is compared with } A[j]) &= \tfrac{1}{n} + \tfrac{1}{n} + \tfrac{n-(j-i+1)}{n} \times \tfrac{2}{j-i+1} \\
&= \left(\tfrac{j-i+1}{n} + \tfrac{n-(j-i+1)}{n}\right) \times \tfrac{2}{j-i+1} \\
&= \tfrac{2}{j-i+1}
\end{aligned}
$$

MODIFIEDQUICKSORT(A)

1: **while** TRUE **do**
2:    Choose a pivot $A[j]$ **uniformly at random**;
3:    $S_- = \{\}; S_+ = \{\}$;
4:    **for** $i = 0$ to $n - 1$ **do**
5:       Put $A[i]$ in S_- if $A[i] < A[j]$;
6:       Put $A[i]$ in S_+ if $A[i] > A[j]$;
7:    **end for**
8:    **if** $\|S_+\| \geq \frac{n}{4}$ and $\|S_-\| \geq \frac{n}{4}$ **then** 靠近中心，否则重做.
9:       break;
10:   **end if**
11: **end while**
12: MODIFIEDQUICKSORT(S_+);
13: MODIFIEDQUICKSORT(S_-);
14: Output S_-, then $A[j]$, and finally S_+;

- MODIFIEDQUICKSORT works when all items are distinct.
  However, it is slower than the original version since it doesn't
  run when the pivot is "off-center".

best pivot

good pivots

- It is easy to obtain a **nearly central pivot**:
  - $\Pr(\text{select the } \textbf{centroid} \text{ pivot }) = \frac{1}{n}$
  - $\Pr(\text{select a } \textbf{nearly central} \text{ pivot}) = \frac{1}{2}$
  - Thus $E(\#\texttt{WHILE}) = 2$, i.e., the expected time of this step is $2n$.
- **Nearly central pivot** is good:
  - The recursion tree has a depth of $O(\log_{\frac{4}{3}} n)$, and $O(n)$ work is needed at each level.
  - So $T(n) = O(n \log_{\frac{4}{3}} n)$.

QUICKSORT(A, l, h)

1: **if** $l < h$ **then**
2:    $p =$ PARTITION(A, l, h);
3:    QUICKSORT$(A, l, \mathbf{p - 1})$;
4:    QUICKSORT$(A, p + 1, h)$;
5: **end if**

PARTITION(A, l, h) 比较 true 的个数。

1: $pivot = A[h]$; $i = l - 1$;
2: **for** $j = l$ to $h - 1$ **do**
3:    **if** $A[j] < pivot$ **then**
4:       $i + +$;
5:       Swap $A[i]$ with $A[j]$;
6:    **end if**
7: **end for**
8: **if** $A[h] < A[i + 1]$ **then**
9:    Swap $A[i + 1]$ with $A[j]$;
10: **end if**
11: **return** $(i + 1)$;

$$A = \begin{array}{ccccc} 0 & 1 & 2 & 3 & 4 \\ 2 & 1 & 5 & 4 & 3 \end{array}$$

PIR (A, 0, 4)

① $P = A[4] = 3$, $i = 0 - 1 = -1$

② $j = 0$, $A[0] = 2 < 3 \Rightarrow i = 0$, $A[i] = A[0] = A[j] = 2$

③ $j = 1$, $A[1] = 1 < 3 \rightarrow i = 1$, $A[i] = A[1] = A[j] = 1$

③ $j = 2$. $A[2] = 5 \nless 3$

④ $j = 3$ $A[3] = 4 \nless 3$

⑤ $A[h] = 3 < A[i+1] = A[2] = 5 \rightarrow A[h] = A[2] = 5$, $A[2] = 3$.

$$A = 2 \quad 1 \quad \overset{i+1}{3} \quad 4 \quad 5$$

- Basic idea: elements in $A[l..i] \leq pivot$; elements in $A[i + 1..j - 1] > pivot$.
- Sorting the entire array: QUICKSORT$(A, 0, n - 1)$.

Hoare's implementation [1961]

QUICKSORT(A, l, h)
1: **if** $l < h$ **then**
2:     $p =$ PARTITION(A, l, h);
3:     QUICKSORT$(A, l, \mathbf{p})$;
4:     QUICKSORT$(A, p + 1, h)$;
5: **end if**

PARTITION(A, l, h)
1: $i = l - 1$; $j = h + 1$; $pivot = A[l]$;
2: **while** TRUE **do**
3:     **repeat**
4:         $j = j - 1$;
5:     **until** $A[j] \leq pivot$;
6:     **repeat**
7:         $i = i + 1$;
8:     **until** $A[i] \geq pivot$;
9:     **if** $i \geq j$ **then**
10:         **return** j;
11:     **end if**
12:     Swap $A[i]$ with $A[j]$;
13: **end while**

- Sorting the entire array: QUICKSORT$(A, 0, n - 1)$.

NUMBER OF ITEMS	MERGE SORT	QUICKSORT
500	2 min 8 sec	1 min 21 sec
1,000	4 min 48 sec	3 min 8 sec
1,500	8 min 15 sec*	5 min 6 sec
2,000	11 min 0 sec*	6 min 47 sec

* These figures were computed by formula, since they cannot be achieved on the 405 owing to limited store size.

- Note: The preceding QUICKSORT algorithm works well for lists with **distinct elements** but exhibits poor performance when the input list contains many **repeated elements**. To solve this problem, an alternative PARTITION algorithm was proposed to divide the list into three parts: elements less than pivot, elements equal to pivot, and elements greater than pivot. Only the less-than and greater-than pivot partitions need to be recursively sorted.

Extension: sorting on dynamic data

- When the data changes gradually, the goal of a sorting algorithm is to sort the data at each time step, under the constraint that it only has limited access to the data each time.
- As the data is constantly changing and the algorithm might be unaware of these changes, it cannot be expected to always output the exact right solution; we are interested in algorithms that guarantee to output an approximate solution.
- In 2011, Eli Upfal et al. proposed an algorithm to sort dynamic data.

SELECTION problem: to select the k-th smallest items in **an array**

INPUT:
An array $A = [A_0, A_1, ..., A_{n-1}]$, and a number $k < n$;
OUTPUT:
The k-th smallest item in general case (or the median of A as a
special case).

- For example, given a set $A = [18, 15, 27, 13, 1, 7, 25]$, the
  objective is to find the median of A.
- A feasible strategy is to sort A first, and then report the k-th
  one, which takes $O(n \log n)$ time.
- In contrast, when using divide-and-conquer technique, it is
  possible to develop a faster algorithm, say the deterministic
  linear algorithm ($16n$ comparisons) by Blum et al.

$\text{SELECT}(A, k)$

1: Choose an element A_i from A as a pivot;
2: $S_+ = \{\}$;
3: $S_- = \{\}$;
4: **for** $j = 1$ to n **do**
5:    **if** $A_j > A_i$ **then**
6:       $S_+ = S_+ \cup \{A_j\}$;
7:    **else**
8:       $S_- = S_- \cup \{A_j\}$;
9:    **end if**
10: **end for**
11: **if** $|S_-| = k - 1$ **then**
12:    **return** A_i;
13: **else if** $|S_-| > k - 1$ **then**
14:    **return** $\text{SELECT}(S_-, k)$;
15: **else**
16:    **return** $\text{SELECT}(S_+, k - |S_-| + 1)$;
17: **end if**

best pivot

| A_0 | $\cdots$ | $A_{\frac{n}{4}}$ | $\cdots$ | $A_{\frac{n}{2}}$ | $\cdots$ | $A_{\frac{3n}{4}}$ | $\cdots$ | A_{n-1} |

good pivots

- We have the following three options:
  - Worst choice: select the smallest element at each iteration.
    $T(n) = T(n-1) + O(n) = O(n^2)$
  - Best choice: select the median at each iteration.
    $T(n) = \underline{T(\frac{n}{2})} + O(n) = O(n)$ $\quad a=1, b=2, f(n) = O(n).$
  - Good choice: select **a nearly-central element** A_i, i.e.,
    $|S_+| \geq \epsilon n$, and $|S_-| \geq \epsilon n$ for a fixed $\epsilon > 0$.

$$
\begin{aligned}
T(n) &\leq T((1-\epsilon)n) + O(n) \\
&\leq cn + c(1-\epsilon)n + c(1-\epsilon)^2 n + \dots \\
&= O(n)
\end{aligned}
$$

- The problem of finding the median turns into finding **an element close to the median**, say within $\frac{n}{4}$ from the median.
- How can we efficiently get **a nearly-central pivot**?
- We estimate median of **the whole set** through examining a **sample of the whole set**. The following samples have been tried:
  1. Selecting a central pivot via **examining medians of groups**;
  2. Selecting a central pivot via **randomly selecting an element**;
  3. Selecting a central pivot via **examining a random sample**.
- Note: In 1975, Sedgewick proposed a similar pivot-selecting strategy called **"median-of-three"** for QUICKSORT: selecting the median of the first, middle, and last elements as pivot. The "median-of-three" rule gives a good estimate of the best pivot.

SELECTMEDIAN(A)

1: Line up elements in groups of 5 elements;
2: Find the median of each group; $O(\frac{6n}{5})$ time
3: Find the median of medians (denoted as M); $T(\frac{n}{5})$ time
4: Use M as pivot to partition the input and call the algorithm recursively on one of the partitions. at most $O(\frac{7n}{10})$ time

- Basic idea: "median of group medians" is nearly central.

	0	5	6	21	3	17	14	4	1	22	8
	2	9	11	25	16	19	31	20	36	29	18
Medians	7	10	13	26	27	32	34	35	38	42	44
	12	24	23	30	43	33	37	41	46	49	48
	15	51	28	40	45	53	39	47	50	54	52

- Advantages:
  1. Median of medians M is nearly-central as at least $\frac{3n}{10}$ elements are larger, and at least $\frac{3n}{10}$ elements are smaller than M. Thus, at least $\frac{3n}{10}$ elements can be deleted at each iteration.
  2. It takes only $T(\frac{n}{5})$ time to find the median of medians.

- Running time:
  $T(n) = T(\frac{n}{5}) + T(\frac{7n}{10}) + \frac{6n}{5} = O(n)$. Actually it takes at most $24n$ comparisons.

- Question: what happens if we divide the set into groups of 3 elements?

QUICKSELECT(A, k)

1: Choose an element A_i from A **uniformly at random**;
2: $S_+ = \{\}$;
3: $S_- = \{\}$;
4: **for** $j = 1$ to n **do**
5:     **if** $A_j > A_i$ **then**
6:         $S_+ = S_+ \cup \{A_j\}$;
7:     **else**
8:         $S_- = S_- \cup \{A_j\}$;
9:     **end if**
10: **end for**
11: **if** $|S_-| = k - 1$ **then**
12:     **return** A_i;
13: **else if** $|S_-| > k - 1$ **then**
14:     **return** QUICKSELECT(S_-, k);
15: **else**
16:     **return** QUICKSELECT($S_+, k - |S_-| + 1$);
17: **end if**

best pivot

$$A_0 \quad \ldots \quad A_{\frac{n}{4}} \quad \ldots \quad A_{\frac{n}{2}} \quad \ldots \quad A_{\frac{3n}{4}} \quad \ldots \quad A_{n-1}$$

good pivots

- Basic idea: when selecting a pivot A_i uniformly at random, it is highly likely to get a good pivot since a fairly large fraction of the elements are nearly-central.

Theorem

The expected running time of QUICKSELECT *is $O(n)$.*

Proof.

- We divide the execution into a series of phases: We say that the execution is in phase j when the size of set under consideration is in $[n(\frac{3}{4})^{j+1} + 1, n(\frac{3}{4})^j]$, say $[\frac{3}{4}n + 1, n]$ for phase 0, and $[\frac{9}{16}n + 1, \frac{3}{4}n]$ for phase 1.

- Let X be the number of steps that QUICKSELECT uses, and X_j be the number of steps in phase j. Thus, $X = X_0 + X_1 + ...$.

- Consider phase j. The probability to find a nearly-central pivot is $\frac{1}{2}$ since half elements are nearly-central. Selecting a nearly-central pivot will lead to a $\frac{3}{4}$ shrinkage of problem size and therefore make the execution enter phase $(j + 1)$. Thus, the expected iteration number in phase j is 2.

- There are at most $cn(\frac{3}{4})^j$ steps in phase j since there are at most $n(\frac{3}{4})^j$ elements. Thus, $E(X_j) \leq 2cn(\frac{3}{4})^j$.

- Hence $E(X) = E(X_0 + X_1 + ...) \leq \sum_j 2cn(\frac{3}{4})^j \leq 8cn$.

- In 1973, Floyd and Rivest proposed to select pivot using **random sampling** technique.
- Basic idea: A random sample, if sufficiently large, is a good representation of the whole set. Specifically, the median of a sample is an unbiased estimator of the median of the whole set, and we can find a small interval that is expected to contain the median of the whole set with high probability.

FLOYD-RIVEST-SELECT(A)

1: Select a small random sample S (with replacement) from A.
2: Select two pivots, denoted as u and v, from S through recursively calling
   FLOYD-RIVEST-SELECT. The interval $[u, v]$, although small, is expected to
   cover the k-th smallest element of A.
3: Divide A into three dis-joint subsets: L contains the elements with values
   less than u, M contains elements with values in $[u, v]$, and H contains the
   elements with values greater than v.
4: The partition of A into these three sets is completed through comparing
   each element e in $A - S$ with u and v: if $k \leq \frac{n}{2}$, e is compared with v first
   and then to u only if $e \leq v$. The order is reversed if $k > \frac{n}{2}$.
5: The k-th smallest element of A is selected through recursively running over
   an appropriate subset.

- Here we present a variant of Flyod-Rivest algorithm called
  LAZYSELECT, which is much easier to analyze.

LazySelectMedian algorithm

LazySelectMedian(A)

1: Randomly sample r elements (with replacement) from $A = \{a_1, a_2, ..., a_n\}$. Denote the sample as S.

2: Sort S. Let u be the $(1-\delta)\frac{r}{2}$-th smallest element of S and v be the $(1+\delta)\frac{r}{2}$-th smallest element of S. **//The median is expected to be in the interval $[u, v]$ with high probability.**

3: Divide A into three dis-joint subsets:

$$
\begin{aligned}
L &= \{a_i : a_i < u\}; \\
M &= \{a_i : u \le a_i \le v\}; \\
H &= \{a_i : a_i > v\};
\end{aligned}
$$

4: Check the following constraints of M:

- M covers the median: $|L| \le \frac{n}{2}$ and $|H| \le \frac{n}{2}$
- M should not be too large: $|M| \le c\delta n$

If one of the constraint was violated, got to Step 1.

5: Sort M and return the $(\frac{n}{2} - |L|)$-th smallest of M as the median of A.

Input: A. **Set** $n = |A| = 16$ **and** $\delta = \frac{1}{2}$

8	1	15	10	4	3	2	9	7	12	5	16	14	6	13	11

$\downarrow$**Sample** $r = 8$ **elements**

8	1	15	10	4	3	2	9	7	12	5	16	14	6	13	11

$S = \{2, 4, 5, 8, 11, 13, 15, 16\}$

$\downarrow$**Divide** A **into** L, M, **and** H

			u									v				
1	3	2	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13		15	16	14

L M H

Return 7 **as the median of** A

$$S = \{2, 4, 5, 8, 11, 13, 15, 16\}$$

| | | | u | | | | | | | | v | | | | |
| 1 | 3 | 2 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | | 15 | 16 | 14 |

L M H

- We expect the following two properties of M:
  - On one side, $|M|$ should be **sufficiently large** such that the median of A is covered by M with a high probability;
  - On the other side, $|M|$ should be **sufficiently small** such that the sorting operation in Step 5 will not take a long time.
- We claim that $|M| = \Theta(n^{\frac{3}{4}})$ is an appropriate size that satisfies these two constraints simultaneously.
- To obtain such a M, we set $r = n^{\frac{3}{4}}$, and $\delta = n^{-\frac{1}{4}}$ as M is expected to has a size of $\delta n = n^{\frac{3}{4}}$.

$\textsc{LazySelectMedian}(A)$

1: Randomly sample r elements (with replacement) from $A = \{a_1, a_2, ..., a_n\}$. Denote the sample as S. **//Set** $r = n^{\frac{3}{4}}$

2: Sort S. Let u be the $(1 - \delta)\frac{r}{2}$-th smallest element of S and v be the $(1 + \delta)\frac{r}{2}$-th smallest element of S. **//Take** $O(r \log r) = o(n)$ **time**

3: Divide A into three dis-joint subsets: **//Take** $2n$ **steps**

$$
\begin{aligned}
L &= \{a_i : a_i < u\}; \\
M &= \{a_i : u \leq a_i \leq v\}; \\
H &= \{a_i : a_i > v\};
\end{aligned}
$$

4: Check the following constraints of M:

- M covers the median: $|L| \leq \frac{n}{2}$ and $|H| \leq \frac{n}{2}$
- M should not be too large: $|M| \leq c\delta n$

If one of the constraints was violated, got to Step 1.

5: Sort M and return the $(\frac{n}{2} - |L|)$-th smallest of M as the median of A. **//Take** $O(\delta n \log(\delta n)) = o(n)$ **time when setting** $\delta = n^{-\frac{1}{4}}$

- Total running time (in one pass): $2n + o(n)$. The best known deterministic algorithm takes $3n$ but it is too complicated. On the hand, it has been proved at least $2n$ steps are needed.

Theorem

With probability $1 - O(n^{-\frac{1}{4}})$, LAZYSELECTMEDIAN reports the median in the first pass. Thus, the total running time is only $2n + o(n)$.

$$S = \{2, 4, 5, 8, 11, 13, 15, 16\}$$

- There are two types of failures in one pass, namely, M does not cover the median of the whole set A, and M is too large. We claim that the probability of both types of failures are as small as $O(n^{-\frac{1}{4}})$. Here we present proof for the first type only.

- We argue that $|L| > \frac{n}{2}$ occurs with probability $O(n^{-\frac{1}{4}})$. Note that $|L| > \frac{n}{2}$ implies that u is greater than the median of A, and thus at least $\frac{1+\delta}{2}r$ elements in S are greater than the median.
- Let $X = x_1 + x_2 + \ldots x_r$ be the number of sampled elements greater than the median of A, where x_i is an index variable:
$$x_i = \begin{cases} 1 & x_i \text{ is greater than the median of } A \\ 0 & otherwise \end{cases}$$
- Then $E(x_i) = \frac{1}{2}$, $\sigma^2(x_i) = \frac{1}{4}$, $E(X) = \frac{1}{2}r$, $\sigma^2(X) = \frac{1}{4}r$, and

$$
\begin{align}
\Pr(|L| > \tfrac{n}{2}) \quad &\leq \quad \Pr(X \geq \tfrac{1+\delta}{2}r) \tag{6} \\
&= \quad \tfrac{1}{2}\Pr(|X - E(X)| \geq \tfrac{\delta}{2}r) \tag{7} \\
&\leq \quad \tfrac{1}{2}\frac{\sigma^2(X)}{(\frac{\delta}{2}r)^2} \tag{8} \\
&= \quad \tfrac{1}{2}\frac{1}{\delta^2 r} \tag{9} \\
&= \quad \tfrac{1}{2}n^{-\frac{1}{4}} \tag{10}
\end{align}
$$

MULTIPLICATION problem: to multiply **two n-bits integers**

- Problem: multiply two n-bits integer x and y;

$$
\begin{array}{r}
12 \\
\times 34 \\
\hline
48 \\
36 \\
\hline
408
\end{array}
$$

- Question: Is the grade-school $O(n^2)$ algorithm optimal?

- Conjecture: In 1952, Andrey Kolmogorov conjectured that any algorithm for that task would require $\Omega(n^2)$ elementary operations.

- Key observation: both x and y can be decomposed into two parts;
- Divide-and-conquer:
    1. **Divide:** $x = x_h \times 2^{\frac{n}{2}} + x_l$, $y = y_h \times 2^{\frac{n}{2}} + y_l$,
    2. **Conquer:** calculate $x_h y_h$, $x_h y_l$, $x_l y_h$, and $x_l y_l$;
    3. **Combine:**

$$\begin{aligned} xy &= (x_h \times 2^{\frac{n}{2}} + x_l)(y_h \times 2^{\frac{n}{2}} + y_l) & (11) \\ &= x_h y_h 2^n + (x_h y_l + x_l y_h) 2^{\frac{n}{2}} + x_l y_l & (12) \end{aligned}$$

- Example:
  - Objective: to calculate 12×34
  - $x = 12 = 1 \times 10 + 2$, $y = 34 = 3 \times 10 + 4$
  - $x \times y = (1 \times 3) \times 10^2 + ((1 \times 4) + (2 \times 3)) \times 10 + 2 \times 4$
- Note: 4 sub-problems, 3 additions, and 2 shifts;
- Time-complexity: $T(n) = 4T(n/2) + cn \Rightarrow T(n) = O(n^2)$

Question: can we reduce the number of sub-problems?

$\times$	y_h	y_l
x_h	$x_h y_h$	$x_h y_l$
x_l	$x_l y_h$	$x_l y_l$

- Our objective is to calculate $x_h y_h 2^n + (x_h y_l + x_l y_h)2^{\frac{n}{2}} + x_l y_l$.
- Thus it is unnecessary to calculate $x_h y_l$ and $x_l y_h$ separately; we just need to calculate the sum $(x_h y_l + x_l y_h)$.
- It is obvious that
  $(x_h y_l + x_l y_h) + (x_h y_h + x_l y_l) = (x_h + x_l) \times (y_h + y_l)$.
- The sum $(x_h y_l + x_l y_h)$ can be calculated using only **one** additional multiplication.
- This idea is dated back to Carl. F. Gauss: Calculation of the product of two complex numbers
  $(a + bi)(c + di) = (ac - bd) + (bc + ad)i$ seems to require four multiplications, three multiplications ac, bd, and $(a + b)(c + d)$ are sufficient because $bc + ad = (a + b)(c + d) - ac - bd$.

Figure 4: Anatolii Alexeevich Karatsuba

- Karatsuba algorithm was the first multiplication algorithm
  asymptotically faster than the quadratic "grade school"
  algorithm.

- Divide-and-conquer:
  1. **Divide:** $x = x_h \times 2^{\frac{n}{2}} + x_l$, $y = y_h \times 2^{\frac{n}{2}} + y_l$,
  2. **Conquer:** calculate $x_h y_h$, $x_l y_l$, and $P = (x_h + x_l)(y_h + y_l)$;
  3. **Combine:**

$$
\begin{align}
xy &= (x_h \times 2^{\frac{n}{2}} + x_l)(y_h \times 2^{\frac{n}{2}} + y_l) \tag{13} \\
&= x_h y_h 2^n + (x_h y_l + x_l y_h) 2^{\frac{n}{2}} + x_l y_l \tag{14} \\
&= x_h y_h 2^n + (P - x_h y_h - x_l y_l) 2^{\frac{n}{2}} + x_l y_l \tag{15}
\end{align}
$$

- Example:
  - Objective: to calculate 12×34
  - $x = 12 = 1 \times 10 + 2$, $y = 34 = 3 \times 10 + 4$
  - $P = (1 + 2) \times (3 + 4)$
  - $x \times y = (1 \times 3) \times 10^2 + (P - 1 \times 3 - 2 \times 4) \times 10 + 2 \times 4$
- Note: 3 sub-problems, 6 additions, and 2 shifts;
- Time-complexity:
  $T(n) = 3T(n/2) + cn \Rightarrow T(n) = O(n^{\log_2 3}) = O(n^{1.585})$

- For large n, Karatsuba's algorithm will perform fewer shifts and single-digit additions.
- For small values of n, however, the extra shift and add operations may make it run slower.
- The crossover point depends on the computer platform and context.
- When applying FFT technique, the MULTIPLICATION can be finished in $O(n \log n)$ time.

Figure 5: Sun SPARC4, g++ -O4, random input. See

- Problem: Given two n-digit numbers s and t, to calculate $q = s/t$ and $r = s \mod t$.
- Method:
  1. Calculate $x = 1/t$ using Newton's method first:
  $$x_{i+1} = 2x_i - t \times x_i^2$$
  2. At most $\log n$ iterations are needed.
  3. Thus division is as fast as multiplication.

- Objective: Calculate $x = 1/t$.
  - x is the root of $f(x) = 0$, where $f(x) = (t - \frac{1}{x})$. (Why the form here?)
  - Newton's method:

$$x_{i+1} = x_i - \frac{f(x_i)}{f'(x_i)} \qquad (16)$$

$$= x_i - \frac{t - \frac{1}{x_i}}{\frac{1}{x_i^2}} \qquad (17)$$

$$= -t \times x_i^2 + 2x_i \qquad (18)$$

- Convergence speed: quadratic, i.e. $\epsilon_{i+1} \leq M\epsilon_i^2$, where M is a supremum of a ratio, and ϵ_i denotes the distance between x_i and $\frac{1}{t}$. Thus the number of iterations is limited by $\log \log t = O(\log n)$.

- Objective: to calculate $\frac{1}{13}$.

#Iteration	x_i	ϵ_i
0	0.018700	-0.058223
1	0.032854	-0.044069
2	0.051676	-0.025247
3	0.068636	-0.008286
4	0.076030	-0.000892
5	0.076912	-1.03583e-05
6	0.076923	-1.39483e-09
7	0.076923	-2.77556e-17
8	...	...

- Note: the quadratic convergence implies that the error ϵ_i has a form of $O(e^{2^i})$; thus the iteration number is limited by $\log \log(t)$.

MATRIX MULTIPLICATION problem: to multiply two **matrices**

- Matrix multiplication: Given two $n \times n$ matrices A and B, compute $C = AB$;
  - Grade-school: $O(n^3)$.
- Key observation: matrix can be decomposed into four $\frac{n}{2} \times \frac{n}{2}$ matrices;
- Divide-and-conquer:
  1. **Divide:** divide A, B, and C into sub-matrices;
  2. **Conquer:** calculate products of sub-matrices;
  3. **Combine:**

$$\begin{pmatrix} C_{11} & C_{12} \\ C_{21} & C_{22} \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} A_{11} & A_{12} \\ A_{21} & A_{22} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} B_{11} & B_{12} \\ B_{21} & B_{22} \end{pmatrix}$$

$$
\begin{array}{rcll}
C_{11} & = & (A_{11} \times B_{11}) + (A_{12} \times B_{21}) & (19) \\
C_{12} & = & (A_{11} \times B_{12}) + (A_{12} \times B_{22}) & (20) \\
C_{21} & = & (A_{21} \times B_{11}) + (A_{22} \times B_{21}) & (21) \\
C_{22} & = & (A_{21} \times B_{12}) + (A_{22} \times B_{22}) & (22)
\end{array}
$$

- We need to solve 8 sub-problems, and 4 additions; each addition takes $O(n^2)$ time.
- $T(n) = 8T(n/2) + cn^2 \Rightarrow T(n) = O(n^3)$

Question: can we reduce the number of sub-problems?

Figure 6: Volker Strassen, 2009

- The first algorithm for performing matrix multiplication faster than the $O(n^3)$ time bound.

- Matrix multiplication: Given two $n \times n$ matrices A and B, compute $C = AB$;
    - Grade-school: $O(n^3)$.
    - Key observation: matrix can be decomposed into four $\frac{n}{2} \times \frac{n}{2}$ matrices;

  Divide-and-conquer:
    1. **Divide:** divide A, B, and C into sub-matrices;
    2. **Conquer:** calculate products of sub-matrices;
    3. **Combine:**

$$\begin{pmatrix} C_{11} & C_{12} \\ C_{21} & C_{22} \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} A_{11} & A_{12} \\ A_{21} & A_{22} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} B_{11} & B_{12} \\ B_{21} & B_{22} \end{pmatrix}$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
P_1 &= A_{11} \times (B_{12} - B_{22}) & (23) \\
P_2 &= (A_{11} + A_{12}) \times B_{22} & (24) \\
P_3 &= (A_{21} + A_{22}) \times B_{11} & (25) \\
P_4 &= A_{22} \times (B_{21} - B_{11}) & (26) \\
P_5 &= (A_{11} + A_{22}) \times (B_{11} + B_{22}) & (27) \\
P_6 &= (A_{12} - A_{22}) \times (B_{21} + B_{22}) & (28) \\
P_7 &= (A_{11} - A_{21}) \times (B_{11} + B_{12}) & (29)
\end{aligned}
$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
C_{11} &= P_4 + P_5 + P_6 - P_2 & (30) \\
C_{12} &= P_1 + P_2 & (31) \\
C_{21} &= P_3 + P_4 & (32) \\
C_{22} &= P_1 + P_5 - P_3 - P_7 & (33)
\end{aligned}
$$

- We need to solve 7 sub-problems, and 18 additions/subtraction; each addition/subtraction takes $O(n^2)$ time.
- $T(n) = 7T(n/2) + cn^2 \Rightarrow T(n) = O(n^{\log_2 7}) = O(n^{2.807})$

Advantages

- For large n, Strassen algorithm is faster than grade-school method. [1]
- Strassen algorithm can be used to solve other problems, say matrix inversion, determinant calculation, finding triangles in graphs, etc.
- Gaussian elimination is not optimal.

---

[1]This heavily depends on the system, including memory access property, hardware design, etc.

- Strassen algorithm performs better than grade-school method only for large n.
- The reduction in the number of arithmetic operations however comes at the price of a somewhat reduced numerical stability,
- The algorithm also requires significantly more memory compared to the naive algorithm.

Fast matrix multiplication

- multiply two 2×2 matrices: 7 scalar sub-problems:
  $O(n^{\log_2 7}) = O(n^{2.807})$ [Strassen 1969]
- multiply two 2×2 matrices: 6 scalar sub-problems:
  $O(n^{\log_2 6}) = O(n^{2.585})$ (impossible)[Hopcroft and Kerr 1971]
- multiply two 3×3 matrices: 21 scalar sub-problems:
  $O(n^{\log_3 21}) = O(n^{2.771})$ (impossible)
- multiply two 20×20 matrices: 4460 scalar sub-problems:
  $O(n^{\log_{20} 4460}) = O(n^{2.805})$
- multiply two 48×48 matrices: 47217 scalar sub-problems:
  $O(n^{\log_{48} 47217}) = O(n^{2.780})$
- Best known till 2010: $O(n^{2.376})$ [Coppersmith-Winograd, 1987]
- Conjecture: $O(n^{2+\epsilon})$ for any $\epsilon > 0$

CLOSESTPAIR problem: given a set of points in a plane, to find the closest pair

INPUT: n points in a plane;
OUTPUT: the pair with the least Euclidean distance;

- Computational geometry: M. Shamos and D. Hoey were working out efficient algorithm for basic computational primitive in CG in 1970's. Does there exist an algorithm using less than $O(n^2)$ time?

- 1D case: it is easy to solve the problem in $O(n \log n)$ via sorting.
- 2D case: a brute-force algorithm works in $O(n^2)$ time by checking all possible pairs.
- **Question:** can we find a faster method?

Trial 1: Divide into 4 subsets

- Divide-and-conquer: divide into 4 subsets.

- Difficulties:
  - The subsets might be unbalanced — we cannot guarantee that each subset has approximately $\frac{n}{4}$ points.
  - Since the closest-pair might lie in different subsets, we need to consider all $\binom{4}{2}$ pairs of subsets to avoid missing, thus complicating the "combine" step.

格子间比较的
次数过多.

Trial 2: Divide into 2 halves

- **Divide:** divide into two halves with equal size.
  It is easy to achieve this through sorting by x coordinate first,
  and then select the median as pivot.

- **Divide:** dividing into two (roughly equal) subsets;
- **Conquer:** finding closest pairs in each half;

- **Divide:** dividing into two (roughly equal) subsets;
- **Conquer:** finding closest pairs in each half;
- **Combine:** It suffices to consider the pairs consisting of one point from left half and one point from right half.
    - There are $O(n^2)$ such pairs;
    - Can we find the closest pair in $O(n)$ time?

- **Observation 1:**
  - The closest pair is located in left part, or right part, or within δ of the middle line L.
  - The third type occurs in a narrow strip only!
  - Thus, it suffices to check point pairs in the 2δ-strip.
  - Here, δ is the minimum of $ClosestPair(LeftHalf)$ and $ClosestPair(RightHalf)$.

- **Observation 2:**
  - Moreover, it is unnecessary to explore **all** point pairs in the 2δ-strip.
  - Let's divide the 2δ-strip into grids (size: $\frac{\delta}{2} \times \frac{\delta}{2}$).
  - A grid contains **at most one** point. $dist_{max} = \frac{\sqrt{2}}{2}\delta \subset \delta \rightarrow \partial$ 就不是最短距离.
  - If two points are 2 rows apart, the distance between them should be over δ and thus cannot construct closest-pair.
  - Example: For point i, it suffices to search within 2 rows for possible closest partners ($< \delta$).

$$\sqrt{\partial^2 + \frac{\delta^2}{4}} = \frac{\sqrt{5}}{2}\delta > \partial$$

范围内入会有点,

杯两个格之间的相等应.

- Green: point i;
- Red: the possible closest partner (distance $< \delta$) of point i;

- Green: point i;
- Red: the possible closest partner (distance $< \delta$) of point i;

- If all points within the strip were sorted by y-coordinates, it suffices to calculate distance between each point with its next 11 neighbors.
- Why 11 points here? All red points fall into the subsequent 11 points.
- Reason: All the points in red are within 3 rows, which have at most 12 points.

CLOSESTPAIR($p_i, ..., p_j$) /* $p_i, ..., p_j$ have already been sorted according to x-coordinate; */

1: **if** $j - i == 1$ **then**
2:     **return** $d(p_i, p_j)$;
3: **end if**
4: Use the x-coordinate of $p_{\lfloor \frac{i+j}{2} \rfloor}$ to divide $p_i, ..., p_j$ into two halves;
5: $\delta_1 = $ CLOSESTPAIR(left half); $T(\frac{n}{2})$
6: $\delta_2 = $ CLOSESTPAIR(right half); $T(\frac{n}{2})$
7: $\delta = \min(\delta_1, \delta_2)$;
8: Sort points within the 2δ wide strip by y-coordinate; $O(n \log n)$
9: Scan points in y-order and calculate distance between each point with its next 11 neighbors. Update δ if finding a distance less than δ; $O(n)$ return δ

- Time-complexity: $T(n) = 2T(\frac{n}{2}) + O(n \log n) = O(n \log^2 n)$.

- Note: The algorithm can be improved to $O(n \log n)$ if we do not sort points within 2δ strip from the scratch every time.
    - Each recursion keeps two sorted list: one list by x, and the other list by y.
    - We merge two pre-sorted lists into a list as MERGESORT does, which costs only $O(n)$ time.
- Time-complexity: $T(n) = 2T(\frac{n}{2}) + O(n) = O(n \log n)$.

- Objective: to find the closest pair among these 8 points.

- Objective: to find the closest pair among these 8 points.

- Pair 1: $d(A, B) = \sqrt{2}$;
- Pair 2: $d(C, D) = 3$; $\Rightarrow \min = \sqrt{2}$; Thus, it suffices to calculate:
- Pair 3: $d(B, C) = \sqrt{2}$;
- Pair 4: $d(B, D) = \sqrt{5}$; $\Rightarrow \delta_L = \sqrt{2}$.

- Pair 1: $d(A, B) = \sqrt{2}$;
- Pair 2: $d(C, D) = 3$; $\Rightarrow \min = \sqrt{2}$; Thus, it suffices to calculate:
- Pair 3: $d(B, C) = \sqrt{2}$;
- Pair 4: $d(B, D) = \sqrt{5}$; $\Rightarrow \delta_L = \sqrt{2}$.

- Pair 1: $d(A, B) = \sqrt{2}$;
- Pair 2: $d(C, D) = 3$; $\Rightarrow \min = \sqrt{2}$; Thus, it suffices to calculate:
- Pair 3: $d(B, C) = \sqrt{2}$;
- Pair 4: $d(B, D) = \sqrt{5}$; $\Rightarrow \delta_L = \sqrt{2}$.

Left half: A, B, C, D

- Pair 1: $d(A, B) = \sqrt{2}$;
- Pair 2: $d(C, D) = 3$; $\Rightarrow \min = \sqrt{2}$; Thus, it suffices to calculate:
- Pair 3: $d(B, C) = \sqrt{2}$;
- Pair 4: $d(B, D) = \sqrt{5}$; $\Rightarrow \delta_L = \sqrt{2}$.

- Pair 1: $d(A, B) = \sqrt{2}$;
- Pair 2: $d(C, D) = 3$; $\Rightarrow \min = \sqrt{2}$; Thus, it suffices to calculate:
- Pair 3: $d(B, C) = \sqrt{2}$;
- Pair 4: $d(B, D) = \sqrt{5}$; $\Rightarrow \delta_L = \sqrt{2}$.

$\delta_L = \sqrt{2}$

- Pair 5: $d(E, F) = \sqrt{5}$;
- Pair 6: $d(G, H) = \sqrt{2}$; $\Rightarrow \min = \sqrt{2}$; Thus, it suffices to calculate:
- Pair 7: $d(G, F) = \sqrt{5}$; $\Rightarrow \delta_R = \sqrt{2}$.

- Pair 5: $d(E, F) = \sqrt{5}$;
- Pair 6: $d(G, H) = \sqrt{2}$; $\Rightarrow \min = \sqrt{2}$; Thus, it suffices to calculate:
- Pair 7: $d(G, F) = \sqrt{5}$; $\Rightarrow \delta_R = \sqrt{2}$.

- Pair 5: $d(E, F) = \sqrt{5}$;
- Pair 6: $d(G, H) = \sqrt{2}$; $\Rightarrow \min = \sqrt{2}$; Thus, it suffices to calculate:
- Pair 7: $d(G, F) = \sqrt{5}$; $\Rightarrow \delta_R = \sqrt{2}$.

- Pair 5: $d(E, F) = \sqrt{5}$;
- Pair 6: $d(G, H) = \sqrt{2}$; $\Rightarrow \min = \sqrt{2}$; Thus, it suffices to calculate:
- Pair 7: $d(G, F) = \sqrt{5}$; $\Rightarrow \delta_R = \sqrt{2}$.

- Pair 5: $d(E, F) = \sqrt{5}$;
- Pair 6: $d(G, H) = \sqrt{2}$; $\Rightarrow \min = \sqrt{2}$; Thus, it suffices to calculate:
- Pair 7: $d(G, F) = \sqrt{5}$; $\Rightarrow \delta_R = \sqrt{2}$.

- Pair 8: $d(C, E) = 1$;
- Pair 9: $d(D, E) = \sqrt{10}; \Rightarrow \delta = 1$.

- Pair 8: $d(C, E) = 1$;
- Pair 9: $d(D, E) = \sqrt{10}$; $\Rightarrow \delta = 1$.

$$\delta = \min\{\delta_L, \delta_R\} = \sqrt{2}$$

$\delta_L = \sqrt{2}$

$\delta_R = \sqrt{2}$

- Pair 8: $d(C, E) = 1$;
- Pair 9: $d(D, E) = \sqrt{10}; \Rightarrow \delta = 1.$

- Pair 8: $d(C, E) = 1$;
- Pair 9: $d(D, E) = \sqrt{10}$; $\Rightarrow \delta = 1$.

- Pair 8: $d(C, E) = 1$;
- Pair 9: $d(D, E) = \sqrt{10}$; $\Rightarrow \delta = 1$.

- We calculated distances for only 9 pairs of points (see 'blue' line). The other 19 pairs are redundant due to:
    - at least one of the two points lies out of 2δ-strip.
    - although two points appear in the same 2δ-strip, they are at least 2 rows of grids (size: $\frac{\delta}{2} \times \frac{\delta}{2}$) apart.

Extension: arbitrary (not necessarily geometric) distance functions

Theorem

We can perform bottom-up hierarchical clustering, for any cluster distance function computable in constant time from the distances between subclusters, in total time $O(n^2)$. We can perform median, centroid, Ward, or other bottom-up clustering methods in which clusters are represented by objects, in time $O(n^2 \log^2 n)$ and space $O(n)$.


(See Eppstein 1998 for details.)

VLSI embedding: to embed a tree

INPUT: Given a binary tree with n node;
OUTOUT: Embedding the tree into a VLSI with minimum area.

- Let's divide into 2 sub-trees, each with a size of $\frac{n}{2}$.

- We have:
  $H(n) = H(\frac{n}{2}) + 1 = \Theta(\log n)$
  $W(n) = 2W(\frac{n}{2}) + 1 = \Theta(n)$
- The area is $\Theta(n \log n)$.

Trial 2: divide into 4 sub-trees

- Let's divide into 4 sub-trees, each with a size of $\frac{n}{4}$.

- We have:

$$L(n) = 2L(\tfrac{n}{4}) + 1 = \Theta(\sqrt{n})$$

- Thus the area is $\Theta(n)$.