Problem 1

1.

```
function GetBoundary(P)
  bound1 = 1
  bound2 = 2
  n = P.len
  for i from 3 to n:
     query_result = PancakeGodOracle(P, bound1, bound2, i)
     if query_result == i:
        continue
     else if query_result == bound1:
        bound1 = i
     else if query_result == bound2:
        bound2 = i
     return bound1, bound2
```

Query is done for n-2 times, therefore the query complexity is O(n)

2.

My implementation is a pancake variation of quicksort. The recursion depth on average would be $O(\log n)$, and in each depth the query complexity is O(n), therefore the total query complexity is $O(n \log n)$

3.

```
function InsertPancake(L, new_pancake)
    l = 1;    r = L.len
    L.append(new_pancake)
    new_p = L.len
    final_pos = -1
    while l < r:
        mid = floor((l+r)/2)
        query = PancakeGodOracle(P, l, mid, new_p)
        if query == new_p:
            r = mid-1
        else:
            l = mid+1
        final_pos = l
        for i from final_pos to L.len-1
            swap(L, i, L.len)</pre>
```

My implementation is a pancake variation of binary search. The query complexity can be easily found to be $O(\log n)$

4.

```
/* A[1:i+1] means the array A from first element to i-th element */
function SortPancakesAgain(P)
  for i from 2 to P.len
    InsertPancake(P[1:i+1], P[i])
```

InsertPancake() runs n times, therefore the query complexity is $O(n \log n)$

6.

For n=2, if P[2] > P[1], they will be swapped and then P is in descending order.

For n=3, the code would look like:

```
ELF-SORT(P, 1, 2)
ELF-SORT(P, 2, 3)
ELF-SORT(P, 1, 2)
```

The first two line moves the smallest element in P to the end, and the last line sorts P[1] and P[2] . P will be in descending order.

Assume that $\forall \ n \leq k$, ELF-SORT(P, 1, n) sorts P[1] to P[n] in descending order. As shown above, this is true $\forall \ n \leq 3$.

ELF-SORT(P, 1+t, n+t) also sorts P[1+t] to P[n+t] in descending order because it's just a shift on P[n+t] in descending order because it's just a shift on P[n+t] in descending order because it's just a shift on P[n+t] in descending order because it's just a shift on P[n+t] in descending order because it's just a shift on P[n+t] in descending order because it's just a shift on P[n+t] in descending order because it's just a shift on P[n+t] in descending order because it's just a shift on P[n+t] in descending order because it's just a shift on P[n+t] in descending order because it's just a shift on P[n+t] in descending order because it's just a shift on P[n+t] in descending order because it's just a shift on P[n+t] in descending order because it's just a shift on P[n+t] in descending order because it's just a shift on P[n+t] in descending order because it's just a shift on P[n+t] in descending order because it's just a shift or P[n+t] in descending order because it's just a shift or P[n+t] in descending order because it's just a shift or P[n+t] in descending order because it's just a shift or P[n+t] in descending order because it's just a shift or P[n+t] in descending order because it's just a shift or P[n+t] in descending order because it's just a shift or P[n+t] in P[n

For n=k+1, the code would look like:

```
Delta = floor((k+1)/3)

ELF-SORT(P, 1, k+1 - Delta)

ELF-SORT(P, 1 + Delta, k+1)

ELF-SORT(P, 1, k+1 - Delta)
```

Because we are only considering $n \ge 4$ in this part, Delta or Δ is always larger then 1. Therefore all those three ELF-SORT() would sort the respective range in descending order.

The first two ELF-SORT() will sort the least $\frac{n}{3}$ element to the correct place, and the last one will sort the first $\frac{2n}{3}$ elements to the correct place. Therefore P is sorted in descending order.

Since ELF-SORT (P, 1, n) works for n=1,2,3, and if for n=k ELF-SORT works, it would also work for n=k+1. By mathematical induction, ELF-SORT (P, 1, n) sorts P in descending order $\forall n \in \mathbb{N}$.

For $n \geq 3$, the code would look like:

```
Delta = floor(n/3)
ELF-SORT(P, 1, n - Delta)
ELF-SORT(P, 1 + Delta, n)
ELF-SORT(P, 1, n - Delta)
```

From this, it's obvious that $T(n)=3T(rac{2}{3}n)+\Theta(1)$, because $oxed{floor()}$ runs at constant time

For n=2, the running time is the time of two comparisons and a swap, which is $\Theta(1)$.

For n=1, the running time is the time of two comparisons, which is $\Theta(1)$.

8.

By the recurrence relation we have:

$$\begin{split} T(n) &= 3^1 T((\frac{2}{3})^1 n) + \Theta(1) \\ 3^1 T((\frac{2}{3})^1 n) &= 3^2 T((\frac{2}{3})^2 n) + 3^1 \Theta(1) \\ 3^2 T((\frac{2}{3})^2 n) &= 3^3 T((\frac{2}{3})^3 n) + 3^2 \Theta(1) \\ & \cdots \\ 3^{k-1} T((\frac{2}{3})^{k-1} n) &= 3^k T(1) + 3^{k-1} \Theta(1) \ \lor \ 3^k T(2) + 3^{k-1} \Theta(1) \end{split}$$

Summing all k equations and replacing T(1) and T(2) with $\Theta(1)$ yields:

$$T(n) = 3^k \Theta(1) + \sum_{i=0}^{k-1} 3^i \cdot \Theta(1)$$

$$= \sum_{i=0}^k 3^i \cdot \Theta(1)$$

$$= \frac{3^{k+1} - 1}{3 - 1}$$

$$= \frac{3}{2} 3^k - \frac{1}{2}$$

And because $k = \lfloor \log_{\frac{3}{2}} n \rfloor$, we have:

$$egin{align} T(n) &= rac{3}{2}3^k - rac{1}{2} \ &= rac{3}{2}3^{\lfloor\log_{1.5}n
floor} - rac{1}{2} \ &\leq rac{3}{2}3^{1+\log_{1.5}n} - rac{1}{2} \ rac{3}{2}3^{1+\log_{1.5}n} - rac{1}{2} &= rac{9}{2}n^{\log_{1.5}3} - rac{1}{2} \ &\leq rac{9}{2}n^3 \end{gathered}$$

Choose $n_0=1$ and $c=\frac{9}{2}$, we have:

$$egin{aligned} orall & n \geq n_0 = 1, \ & T(n) \leq rac{3}{2} 3^{1 + \log_{1.5} n} - rac{1}{2} \ & \leq rac{9}{2} n^3 \ & = c \cdot n^3 \ \Rightarrow T(n) = O(n^3) \end{aligned}$$