

***Extra Assignment: Programming Assignment***  
*Problem report and Explanation of Solutions*

Student: 葛洋晴

ID: 108006205

*All problems were solved using C/C++, if you would like to know how to compile and execute each file go to the "README.md" file. In addition, important comments can be found in each problem script.*

## Problem 1

---

### *Description:*

You are given an array containing  $n$  positive integers. Your task is to divide the array into  $k$  subarrays so that the maximum sum in a subarray is as small as possible. *Explanation:* An optimal division is  $[2,4]$ ,  $[7]$ ,  $[3,5]$  where the sums of the subarrays are 6, 7, 8. The largest sum is the last sum 8.

### *Input*

The first input line contains two integers  $n$  and  $k$ : the size of the array and the number of subarrays in the division. The next line contains  $n$  integers  $x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n$ : the contents of the array.

### *Output*

Print one integer: the maximum sum in a subarray in the optimal division.

### *Constraints*

- $1 \leq n \leq 2 \cdot 10^5$
- $1 \leq k \leq n$
- $1 \leq x_i \leq 10^9$

### *Example*

Input:

5 3

2 4 7 3 5

Output:

8

### ***Solution proposed:***

Pseudocode of the solution

MAX-SUBARRAY-SUM(A, k)

```
1  Left = the max element in array A
2  Right = total sum of the elements in A
3  Result = Right
4  while Left ≤ Right:
5      middle = (Right + Left) / 2
6      if IS-VALID-PARTITION(A, k, middle):
7          Result = middle
8          Right = middle - 1
9      else
10         Left = middle + 1
```

IS-VALID-PARTITION(A, k, middle)

```
1  Sum = 0
2  Subarrays = 1
3  for each number in the array
4      if Sum + number > middle
5          Subarrays = Subarrays + 1
6          Sum = number
7      if Subarrays > k:
8          return false
9      else
10         Sum = Sum + number
11 return true
```

### ***Time complexity and how it works:***

Array Initialization for  $n$  elements takes  $O(n)$  and the use of Binary Search reduces the time complexity to  $O(n \cdot \log(\text{sum of array}))$ , where sum of array is from the maximum element to the sum of all elements.

The smallest possible maximum subarray sum Left is the largest single element in the array, this is because, in the worst case, a subarray may consist of only one element, so the maximum subarray sum cannot be smaller than the largest element.

The function IS-VALID-PARTITION checks whether it is possible to divide the array into at most  $k$  subarrays such that no subarray's sum exceeds mid. And if the number of subarrays exceeds  $k$ , return false (partition is invalid).

## Problem 2

---

### *Description:*

There are  $n$  cities and  $m$  flight connections between them. Your task is to determine the length of the shortest route from Syrjälä to every city.

### *Input*

The first input line has two integers  $n$  and  $m$ : the number of cities and flight connections. The cities are numbered  $1, 2, \dots, n$ , and city 1 is Syrjälä. After that, there are  $m$  lines describing the flight connections. Each line has three integers  $a$ ,  $b$  and  $c$ : a flight begins at city  $a$ , ends at city  $b$ , and its length is  $c$ . Each flight is a one-way flight.

You can assume that it is possible to travel from Syrjälä to all other cities.

### *Output*

Print  $n$  integers: the shortest route lengths from Syrjälä to cities  $1, 2, \dots, n$ .

### *Constraints*

- $1 \leq n \leq 10^5$
- $1 \leq m \leq 2 \cdot 10^5$
- $1 \leq a, b \leq n$
- $1 \leq c \leq 10^9$

### *Example*

Input:

```
3 4
1 2 6
1 3 2
3 2 3
1 3 4
```

Output:

```
0 5 2
```

### ***Solution proposed:***

Dijkstra's Algorithm is efficient for finding the shortest paths from a single source node with non-negative edges. Below is the Pseudocode of the Algorithm inspired mostly from the book *Introduction to Algorithm*, 4<sup>th</sup> edition, T.H. Cormen et al.

Pseudocode of my solution:

```
DIJKSTRA(G, distance, n)
// G is a vector of vectors which stores pairs of numbers, that is G[a] is the vertex we are at,
// and the vertex b and weight w as a pair (b, w).
1  Q =  $\emptyset$     // min-heap as priority queue for storing the pairs according to their weights.
2  distance[1] = 0
3  Add the pair (b, w) to Q
4  while Q is not empty:
5      d = w from the pair (b, w) from the priority queue Q
6      u = b from the pair (b, w)
7      Pop the first pair from Q
8      if d > distance[u]:    //only the most up-to-date and valid distances are processed.
9          skip to the next pair
10     for each vertex v adjacent to G[u]:
11         w = weight between u and v
12         // RELAX
13         if distance[u] + w < distance[v]:
14             distance[v] = distance[u] + w
15         Add the pair (distance[v], v) to Q
```

### ***Time complexity and how it works:***

Initialization of distances may require  $O(V)$ .

Each push and pop to Q requires  $O(\log V)$  since Q is implemented as a min heap. To maintain the heap property. Therefore, because of a priority queue implementation, the time complexity of the Algorithm is  $O((V + E) \log V)$ . Since each edge is relaxed at most once, and the priority queue operations dominate the runtime.

At the relaxation step found in the block RELAX, the condition ensures that a shorter path to node v is found only when we found a better path u to v through an edge with smaller weight w, and thus finding a better path thanks to the greedy principle of the Algorithm.

For the small optimization done at lines 8 ~ 9, when a shorter path to u is found, its updated distance is pushed into the priority queue. However, the outdated distances may still exist in the queue. If the distance d currently being processed from the priority queue is greater than the shortest distance[u] it means that d is outdated.

### Problem 3

---

**17-2** Binary search of a sorted array takes logarithmic search time, but the time to insert a new element is linear in the size of the array. We can improve the time for insertion by keeping several sorted arrays.

Specifically, suppose that we wish to support SEARCH and INSERT on a set of  $n$  elements. Let  $k = \lceil \lg(n + 1) \rceil$ , and let the binary representation of  $n$  be  $\langle n_{k-1}, n_{k-2}, \dots, n_0 \rangle$ . We have  $k$  sorted arrays  $A_0, A_1, \dots, A_{k-1}$ , where for  $i = 0, 1, \dots, k - 1$ , the length of array  $A_i$  is  $2^i$ . Each array is either full or empty, depending on whether  $n_i = 1$  or  $n_i = 0$ , respectively. The total number of elements held in all  $k$  arrays is therefore  $\sum_{i=0}^{k-1} n_i \cdot 2^i = n$ . Although each individual array is sorted, elements in different arrays bear no particular relationship to each other.

The data structure contains only positive integers, and duplicates are not allowed.

The first line inputs a number  $n$ , representing how many pieces of data are in the data structure.

The second line inputs  $n$  numbers, representing the values stored in the data structure.

The third line inputs a number  $m$ , representing how many operation commands are given.

The following  $m$  lines contain operation commands:

s represents search,

d represents delete,

i represents insert.

The number following the command letter represents the target of the operation.

Flatten the array and sort is not allowed!

*Input Format:*

```
7
0 1 2 3 4 5 6
6
s 5
d 2
i 7
s 25
d 36
i 3
```

*Output Format:*

```
Found
Delete Success
Insert Success
Not Found
Delete Failed
Insert Failed
```

### ***Solution proposed:***

Simple representation of the data structure:

#### **Structure** LAYER

A **vector** as underlying structure

A vector of flags indicating which slots are logically removed.

ALIVE-COUNT()    // Check how many elements in the layer are not deleted.

#### **Class** DS-LAYERS

A vector of the structure LAYER

BUILD(A)    // Builds the layers using the initial values from array A.

SEARCH(X)    // Binary Search

INSERT(X)

REMOVE(X)

For each operation inside the DS-LAYERS Class

#### BUILD(A)

1    **for** each value in A:

2        INSERT(value)

#### SEARCH(x)

// Check each non-empty layer using binary search.

1    **for** each  $layer_i$  up to  $k$ :

2        **if**  $layer_i$  is **not empty**:

3            Left = 0

4            Right =  $layer_i.size$

5        **while** left  $\leq$  right:

6            middle = (Left + Right) / 2

7            **if**  $layer_i[middle] == x$ :

8                **if**  $layer_i$  is **not deleted**:    // From the Flag in our structure.

9                **return** (i, middle)    // from  $layer_i$  and middle the index array

10            **else**:

11                **break** the while loop    // Found, but the layer is marked as deleted.

12            **else if**  $layer_i[middle] < x$ :

13                Left = middle + 1

14            **else**:

15                Right = middle - 1

16 **return** (-1, -1)    // "Not Found", return invalid indices.

```

INSERT(x)
1  if SEARCH(x) is not equal to -1:
2      return false          // Duplicated element, do not insert
3  Let Carry be an array containing the element x // Similar to a binomial array.
4  for each layeri up to k:
5      if layeri is empty:    // Insert the new element into the layer.
6          layeri = Carry
7          Set the Flags to false
8      return true
9  else:
10     mergedArray = MERGE-SORTED-ARRAYS(layeri, Carry) // Merge the
        arrays because the layer is full.
11     layeri.clear // Clear the contents of this layer.
12     Carry = move(mergedArray)

```

The merged array must have size  $2^{(k+1)}$  if it merges exactly, or possibly less if we started with fewer elements. But in this approach, we expect exactly  $2^{(k+1)}$  if the layer had  $2^k$  elements and carry had  $2^k$  as well.

Each Layer contains:

- array: sorted array of size  $2^k$  (if nonempty)
- deleted: same size, marking which slots are logically removed

A visualization of the structure following the offer testcase is shown as below:

<i>layer<sub>0</sub></i> :	6			
<i>layer<sub>1</sub></i> :	4	5		
<i>layer<sub>2</sub></i> :	0	1	2	3
<i>layer<sub>3</sub></i> :	<i>empty</i>			
...	<i>empty</i>			
<i>layer<sub>k</sub></i> :	<i>empty</i>			

*After all the insertion of our initial values.* In my code you will find that I thought my solution for a maximum number of  $k=16$  layers, which is  $2^{16}$  elements. However, in case of need of more layers change the value of the static constant variable MAX\_LAYERS inside the DS\_LAYERS class.

**REMOVE(x)**

```

1  returned pair as ( $layer_k$ , pos) from SEARCH(X)
2  Index =  $layer_k$ 
3  Position = pos
4  if Index == -1:
5      return false    // Element x doesn't exist
6  Alive = get the not deleted elements from  $layer_{Index}$ 
7  Capacity =  $layer_{Index}.size$ 
8  if  $2 \cdot live < capacity$ :
9      Let LiveElements be an array with the not deleted elements in  $layer_{Index}$ 
10     Clear up  $layer_{Index}$ 
11     MERGE-UP(Index + 1, LiveElements)
12 return true

```

- Utility functions -

**MERGE-SORTED-ARRAYS( $layer_i$ , Carry)**

```

1  Let Alive be array with the elements of  $layer_i$  that hasn't been delete it yet
2  for value in  $layer_i$  that are not flagged as deleted
3      Add value to Alive array
4  Let Result be the array resulting after merging Alive and Carry

```

**MERGE-UP( $L$ , Carry)**

```

1  for  $layer_i$  from  $L$  up to  $k$ :
2      if  $layer_i$  is empty: // We insert our new element into the layer
3           $layer_i = Carry$ 
4          Set the Flags to false
5          Return
6      else:
7          mergedArray = MERGE-SORTED-ARRAYS( $layer_i$ , Carry)
8           $layer_i.clear$  // Remove the contents of this layer
9          Carry = move(mergedArray)

```

**Time complexity analysis:**

- SEARCH(X): Each layer's binary search is  $O(\log 2^k) = O(k)$  In the worst case with  $\log n$  layers, searching running time is  $O(\log^2 n)$ .
- INSERTION(X): From an Amortized sense, each insertion can cause merges up through multiple layers, but each element only moves up a constant number of times. Based on this knowledge then we have an amortized time of  $O(\log(n))$ .
- REMOVE(X): If a layer has more than half deleted, we physically rebuild it once in a while. By its amortized time again  $O(\log(n))$ .