

## Assignment 1: Difficult: Non Dominated Points

### **Solution:**

#### **Algorithm:**

Let us consider all the points in set  $P$ . First, we divide  $P$  into two parts by the median of  $x$ -coordinate of all the points. Each part will have  $n/2$  points each. Let us call left half as  $P_l$  and right half as  $P_r$ . Then, we find the point  $y_{\max}$  with maximum  $y$  coordinate in  $P_r$ .  $y_{\max}$  has to be a non-dominated point in  $P_r$  as discussed in method 1 in lectures, and because every non-dominated point in  $P_r$  has to be a non-dominated point for  $P_l$ ,  $y_{\max}$  turns out to be a non-dominated point for the whole set of points  $P$ . We then proceed to remove all the points from set  $P$  which are dominated by the point  $y_{\max}$  as they cannot be non-dominated points. Then recursion step is followed to repeat the same algorithm on  $P_l$  and  $P_r$  to find non-dominated points in both sets. The final set of non-dominated points has to be  $y_{\max}$ , non-dominated points in  $P_l$  and non-dominated points in  $P_r$ .

#### **Pseudo Code:**

```
NonDomPoints(P) {
    if  $P = \emptyset$  : return  $\emptyset$ 
    if  $|P| = 1$  : return  $P$ 
    set ans =  $\emptyset$ 
    Let  $x_{\text{med}}$  be the median of  $x$ -coordinate of the points in  $P$  ..... $O(n)$ 
    Partition  $P$  into two sets  $P_l$  &  $P_r$  about median  $x_{\text{med}}$  ..... $O(n)$ 
        Let  $P_l$  be all the points with  $x$ -coordinate  $\leq x$ .
        Let  $P_r$  be all the points with  $x$ -coordinate  $> x$ .
    Let  $y_{\max}$  be the point in  $P_r$  with the maximum  $y$ -coordinate ..... $O(n)$ 
    ans = ans  $\cup$   $y_{\max}$ 
    Delete every point dominated by  $y_{\max}$  in  $P_l$  ..... $O(n)$ 
    Delete every point dominated by  $y_{\max}$  in  $P_r$  ..... $O(n)$ 
    L = NonDomPoints( $P_l$ ) ..... $T(n/2, h-1)$ 
    R = NonDomPoints( $P_r$ ) ..... $T(n/2, h-1-h_1)$ 
    ans = ans  $\cup$  L  $\cup$  R
    return ans
}
```

#### **Correctness :**

We need to show that this algorithm correctly identifies all the non dominated points. This is a divide & conquer based algorithm. Assuming that the non dominated points in left & right subpart are correctly identified. At each step we are first removing the point  $y_{\max}$  with max  $y$  coordinate in  $P_r$ . And after removing all the points dominated by  $y_{\max}$  from  $P_l$  &  $P_r$ , we are running this algorithm separately for  $P_l$  &  $P_r$ . This ensures that at each step of recursion we add one point in our answer set unless the set is empty. Since we have removed all points dominated by  $y_{\max}$  beforehand, we ensure that the recursion step for  $P_l$  doesn't return any point which will be dominated by any point in  $P_r$ . After recursion for  $P_r$  &  $P_l$  we'll have all non dominated points from  $P_l$  &  $P_r$ . Thus, at each step we get an exhaustive set of all non dominated points in a given set of points.

#### **Time Complexity:**

To get an intuition that time complexity has to be  $O(n \log n)$ , consider the recurrence tree used to calculate time complexity in case of  $O(n \log n)$  solution. At each step we used to divide  $n$  into two parts of  $n/2$  and we keep doing this till we have one or no points at the end. The time complexity comes out to be  $O(n \log n)$  because at each level of tree,  $O(n)$  time was spent and

the height of tree was  $\log n$ . In the case of this algorithm, at each recursion, we ensure that we have one non-dominated point discovered, as well as the points dominated by it. So, each recursion gives one dominated point and takes  $O(n)$  time for  $n$  points in the set. And if there is no dominated point in the set, we figure it out in  $O(1)$  time. So, the height of the tree can be considered to have decreased to  $\log h$  in this case. Even when there is a case when there are no non-dominated points present, we invest only constant time  $O(1)$  on it, not adding to the total time complexity. Thus, our total time complexity turns out to be  $O(n \log h)$ .

In simple terms, whenever we have non-dominated points in our set, we figure one of them for sure and also eliminate the points dominated under it, which can then result in such a case that  $P_i$  does not have any points remaining. This is because there were no non-dominated points in  $P_i$  and hence no extra time was spent on figuring this out. Hence time complexity is  $O(n \log h)$ .

The formal proof can be done as:

To prove: Time Complexity of the given algorithm is  $O(n \log h)$ .

Given that there are total  $h$  non-dominated points, if  $L$  has  $h_1$  elements  $R$  will have  $(h-h_1)$  elements. More precisely, Since we are removing  $y_{\max}$  beforehand  $R$  will have  $(h-h_1-1)$  elements. Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} T(n, h) &= O(n) + T(n/2, h_1) + T(n/2, h-h_1-1) & \text{if } h \geq 2 \\ &= O(1) & \text{if } h \leq 1 \end{aligned}$$

Claim:  $T(n, h) = O(n \log h)$

For  $h = 1$ , this doesn't hold. Time complexity is  $O(1)$ .

Base case:  $h = 2$ , there are 2 possibilities.

- 1.) Both non-dominated points are in  $R$
- 2.) 1 is in  $R$  and 1 is in  $L$ .

*# Impossible case: Both non-dominated points can't be in the  $L$  set. As the point with maximum coordinate is always a non-dominated point.*

In first case:  $h_1 = 0, h-h_1-1 = 1$

$$\begin{aligned} T(n, h) &= cn + T\left(\frac{n}{2}, 1\right) \\ &= cn + b \frac{n}{2} \\ &\leq an \log 2 \end{aligned}$$

Induction:

$$\begin{aligned} T(n, h) &= cn + T\left(\frac{n}{2}, h_1\right) + T\left(\frac{n}{2}, h-h_1-1\right) \\ &\leq cn + b\left(\frac{n}{2} \log h_1 + \frac{n}{2} \log (h-1-h_1)\right) \\ &= cn + b \frac{n}{2} (\log (h_1 * (h-1-h_1))) \\ &\leq cn + b \frac{n}{2} (\log \left(\frac{h}{2} * \frac{h}{2}\right)) \\ &\leq cn + b \frac{n}{2} * 2 * \log (h) \\ &= O(n \log h) \end{aligned}$$

Thus, the time complexity of this algorithm is  $O(n \log h)$ .