

# Information Retrieval

## Exercise Sheet 3

Najji Hendo

Armin Saur

November 24, 2019

### Exercise 1

Proof  $\Theta(\log_2 d_i) \forall i$  for galloping-search.

The number of exponential steps is  $\log_2 d_i$ , because:

For computing upper border applies  $j' \geq j_i$ ,  $j' = 2^{\lceil \log_2 d_{j'} \rceil}$ .

$$O_{exp}(\log_2 d_i) = \begin{cases} d_i > d_{j'} & \text{or} \\ d_i = d_{j_i} \end{cases}$$

So the exponential search for  $B[j_i]$  is over the distance  $d_{j'}$ , so it always needs the same number of steps.

The binary search for the complete distance  $d_i$  is always over the area of  $d_{j'}$ , which is, like the exponential search, in  $O_{bin}(\log_2 d_i)$ . If  $d_i = d_{j'}$  the binary search is not needed.

$$\Theta(\log_2 d_i) = \begin{cases} O(\log_2 d_i) & \text{full exponential and binary search} \\ \Omega(\log_2 d_i) & \text{only exponential search} \end{cases}$$

### Exercise 2

- Proof why  $\mathcal{O}(\sum_{i=1}^k \log_2 d_i)$  is not correct using counterexample:  
when the gaps are always one then  $d_i = 1$

$$\implies \mathcal{O}(\sum_{i=1}^k \log_2 d_i) = \mathcal{O}(\sum_{i=1}^k \log_2 1) = 0.$$

and the time complexity cannot be 0.

- Proof  $\mathcal{O}(k \cdot \sum_{i=1}^k \log_2 (n/k))$  is not correct using counterexample:  
When  $(\text{len}(A) = \text{len}(B)) \implies k = n$

$$\implies \mathcal{O}(k \cdot \sum_{i=1}^k \log_2 (n/k)) = \mathcal{O}(k \cdot \sum_{i=1}^k \log_2 1) = 0.$$

and the time complexity cannot be 0.

### Exercise 3

$$k \cdot \log_2(1 + n/k) \leq k + n$$

$$\text{constraint} := k \cdot \log_2(1 + n/k) - k - n = 0$$

$$\begin{aligned} \implies L &:= k \cdot \log_2(1 + n/k) + \lambda(k + n) \\ &= k \cdot \log_2(1 + n/k) + \lambda k + \lambda n \end{aligned}$$

- $\frac{\partial L}{\partial k} = \log_2(1 + n/k) + k \cdot \frac{-n}{k^2} \cdot \frac{1}{1 + \frac{n}{k}} + \lambda$   
(I)

- $\frac{\partial L}{\partial n} = \frac{k}{k^2} \cdot k \cdot \frac{1}{1 + \frac{n}{k}} + \lambda = \frac{1}{1 + \frac{n}{k}} + \lambda$   
(II)

- $\frac{\partial L}{\partial \lambda} = -k - n$   
(III)

$$\text{from (I)} \implies \lambda = -\log_2(1 + n/k) + \frac{n}{k} \cdot \frac{1}{1 + \frac{n}{k}}$$

$$\text{from (II)} \implies \lambda = \frac{-1}{1 + \frac{n}{k}}$$

$$\begin{aligned} &\text{from (I) and (II):} \\ &-\log_2(1 + n/k) + \frac{n}{k} \cdot \frac{1}{1 + \frac{n}{k}} = \frac{-1}{1 + \frac{n}{k}} \\ &-\log_2(1 + n/k) + \frac{n}{k+n} = \frac{-1}{1 + \frac{n}{k}} \end{aligned}$$