ABBOTTABAD UNIVERSITY OF SCIENCE & TECHNOLOGY

(Havelian, Abbottabad, Pakistan)

Name : Sardar Haris Sohail
Roll No : 14807
Section : BSCS-3D
Subject : DSA
Github :
https://github.com/SardarHarisSohail/Data-Structure-And-Algorithm.git

Teacher : Sir Jamal Abdul Ahad

Question & Answer

Example Requiring Sorting:

Library Book Organization: In a library, books are sorted by title, author, or genre. This helpscustomer find books easily and keeps the library organized.

Example Requiring Shortest Distance:

Navigation for Driving: When using a GPS app, it finds the shortest route from your current location to your destination. This helps you get there faster by avoiding traffic and taking thebest roads.

1.1-2 Other than speed, what other measures of efûciency mightyou need to consider in a real-world setting

ANS:

In a real-world setting, other than speed, you might consider:

1. **Resource Usage**: How much memory or power the system uses.
2. **Scalability**: How well the system handles more users or data.
3. **Cost**: The financial cost of running the system.
4. **Reliability**: How often the system fails or crashes.
5. **Maintainability**: How easy it is to update or fix the system.

1.1-3 Select a data structure that you have seen, and discuss its strengths andlimitations.
ANS:

Data Structure: Array
Strengths:

1. **Fast Access**: You can quickly access any item using its index (O(1) time).
2. **Memory Efficiency**: Uses less memory overall since it stores items in adjacent memory.
3. **Simple to Use**: Easy to understand and implement.

Limitations:

1. **Fixed Size**: Once created, the size cannot change. You need to know the size in advance.
2. **Slow Insertions/Deletions**: Adding or removing items (especially in the middle) can be slow, asit requires shifting elements (O(n) time).
3. **Memory Waste**: If the array is too large for the data it holds, memory can be wasted.

1.1-4 How are the shortest-path and traveling-salesperson problems given above similar? How are they different.

ANS:

Similarities:

- Both problems involve finding the best route through a set of points (like cities or locations).
- They aim to minimize the total distance or cost of traveling.

Differences:

- **Shortest Path Problem**: Finds the shortest route between two specific points (e.g., from point A to point B).
- **Traveling Salesperson Problem (TSP)**: Requires visiting every point exactly once and returning to the starting point (e.g., visiting multiple cities in one trip).

1.1-5 Suggest a real-world problem in which only the best solution will do. Then come up with one in which approximately the best solution is good enough.

ANS:

Best Solution Required:

Sorting Transactions in Banking: In a bank, it's really important to sort transactions correctly by date or amount when preparing reports. If the sorting goes wrong, it can cause mistakes with money, lead to audits, or even legal problems. So, getting the sorting right (the best solution) is very important to ensure everything is accurate and trustworthy.

Approximately Best Solution is Good Enough:

Image Compression for Websites: When building a website, you want to make images smaller so they load faster. You don't need to get the perfect file size; you just need the images to look good enough. As long as the quality of the images is okay for visitors, a close-to-optimal solution works well. This way, you balance loading speed and image quality without stressing over finding the perfect size.

1.1-6 Describe a real-world problem in which sometimes the entire input is available before you need to solve the problem, but other times the input is not entirely available in advance and arrives over time.

ANS:

Complete input Available: Sometimes, meteorologists can collect all the information they need ahead of time. This includes things like temperature, humidity, wind speed, and air pressure from weather stations and satellites. With all this data, they can make a detailed weather forecast for the week.

input Comes in Over Time: Other times, especially when the weather is changing quickly, new information comes in during the forecast period. For instance, real-time radar can show sudden storms or shifts in wind. Meteorologists then have to update their forecasts immediately as this new data arrives.

1.2-1 Give an example of an application that requires algorithmic content at the Application level, and discuss the function of the algorithms involved.

ANS:

Example Application: Online Shopping Platform

(1) **Product Search**: When you search in an online store, algorithms quickly find the best matches from many products by using your search words, categories, and preferences. This helps you find what you want faster and easier.

(2) **Recommendation System**: Algorithms analyze your browsing and purchase history to suggest products you might like. For example, if you buy a book, the algorithm may recommend other books in the same genre.

(3) **Inventory Management**: Algorithms help track stock levels, predict demand, and automatically reorder items when they run low, ensuring that popular products are always available.

1.2-2 Suppose that for inputs of size n on a particular computer, insertion sort runs in 8n2 steps and merge sort runs in 64 n log n steps. For which values of n does insertion sort beat merge sort?

ANS:

• Insertion Sort: $8n^2$.

• Merge Sort: 64 n log n.

We need to find the values of **n** for which:

8n^2<64n log n

Step 1: Simplify the Inequality

Dividing both sides by 8 gives us

n^2

< 8 n log n
Step 2: Rearrange the

Inequalityn^2/n log n< 8

n/ log n < 8

Step 3: Solve the Inequality

Now, we need to find values of **n** that satisfy this inequality.

Testing Values

Let's test some small values of **n**:

For n=2:

2/log (2)=2.89<8 (true)

For n=3:

3/log (3) =2.73<8 (true)

Forn=16:

16/log (16) =3.84<8 (true)

Forn=32:

32/log (32) = 9.23>8 (false)

When n=32 the insertion beat merge on this value
1.2-3 What is the smallest value of n such that an algorithm whose running time is 100n2 runs faster than an algorithm whose running time is 2 n on the same machine?

ANS:

To find the smallest value of **n** such that an algorithm with a running time of **100n^2** runs fasterthan an algorithm with a running time of **2^n** we need to solve the following inequality:

$$100n^2 < 2^n$$

Let's test small values of **n** to find when **100n^2** becomes less than **2^n**:

For n=1:

100(1^2) =200 or (2^1) =2

200>2.

For n=9:

100(9^2) = 8100 or (2^9) =512

8100>5121.

For n=15:

100(15^2) = 22500 and (2^15) =32768

22500<32768

When n=15 then 100n^2 is become less than 2^n.

Problem 1-1

We assume a 30 day month and 365 day year.

	1 Second	1 Minute	1 Hour	1 Day	1 Month	1 Year	1 Century
$\lg n$	$2^{1\times10^6}$	$2^{6\times10^7}$	$2^{3.6\times10^9}$	$2^{8.64\times10^{10}}$	$2^{2.592\times10^{12}}$	$2^{3.1536\times10^{13}}$	$2^{3.15576\times10^{15}}$
$\sqrt{n}$	1×10^{12}	3.6×10^{15}	1.29×10^{19}	7.46×10^{21}	6.72×10^{24}	9.95×10^{26}	9.96×10^{30}
n	1×10^6	6×10^7	3.6×10^9	8.64×10^{10}	2.59×10^{12}	3.15×10^{13}	3.16×10^{15}
$n\lg n$	62746	2801417	133378058	2755147513	71870856404	797633893349	6.86×10^{13}
n^2	1000	7745	60000	293938	1609968	5615692	56176151
n^3	100	391	1532	4420	13736	31593	146679
2^n	19	25	31	36	41	44	51
$n!$	9	11	12	13	15	16	17

2.1-1

Using Figure 2.2 as a model, illustrate the operation of I NSERTION-SORT on an array initially containing the sequence 31; 41; 59; 26; 41; 58.

ANS:

Step-by-Step Insertion Sort:

First Iteration (i = 1):

Current element: 41

Compare 41 with 31. Since 41 is greater than 31, it remains in place.Array after this step: [31, 41, 59, 26, 41, 58]

Second Iteration (i = 2):

Current element: 59

Compare 59 with 41. Since 59 is greater than 41, it remains in place.Array after this step: [31, 41, 59, 26, 41, 58]

Third Iteration (i = 3):

Current element: 26

Compare 26 with 59. Since 26 is smaller, move 59 to the right.

Compare 26 with 41. Since 26 is smaller, move 41 to the right.

Compare 26 with 31. Since 26 is smaller, move 31 to the

right.Insert 26 in the correct position (at the start).

Array after this step: [26, 31, 41, 59, 41, 58] Fourth

Iteration (i = 4):

Current element: 41

Compare 41 with 59. Since 41 is smaller, move 59 to the

right.Compare 41 with 41. Since it's equal, leave it in place.

Array after this step: [26, 31, 41, 41, 59, 58] Fifth

Iteration (i = 5):

Current element: 58

Compare 58 with 59. Since 58 is smaller, move 59 to the

right.Compare 58 with 41. Since 58 is greater, leave it in

place.

Array after this step: [26, 31, 41, 41, 58, 59]

2.1-2 Consider the procedure SUM-ARRAY on the facing page. It computes the sum of the n numbers in array A [1: n]. State a loop invariant for this procedure, and use its initialization,maintenance, and
termination properties to show that the SUM-ARRAY procedure returns the sum of the numbers in A[1: n]

ANS:

A **loop invariant** for SUM-ARRAYis that before each iteration **i, sum**holds the sum of the first i−1elements of the array.

- **Initialization:** Before the first iteration, **sum = 0**, which is the sum of zero elements.
- **Maintenance:** In each iteration, sumis updated by adding **A[i]** so after each iteration, sum holds the sum of the first **i** elements.
- **Termination:** After **n** iterations, **sum**contains the sum of all **n** elements, and the procedurereturns the correct sum.

2.1-3 Rewrite the INSERTION-SORT procedure to sort into monotonically decreasing insteadof monotonically increasing order.

ANS:

DECREASING-INSERTION-SORT(A)

```
for i = 1 to length(A) - 1 key
  = A[i]
  j = i - 1
  while j >= 0 and A[j] < key A[j
    + 1] = A[j]
  j = j - 1
  A[j + 1] = key
```

2.1-4 Consider the searching problem: Input: A sequence of n numbers (a1; a2; : : : ; an) stored in array A[1:n] and a value x. Output: An index i such that x equals A[i] or the specialvalue NIL if x does not appear in A.
Write pseudocode for linear search, which scans through the array from beginning to end, looking for
x. Using a loop invariant, prove that your algorithm is correct. Make sure that your loop invariantfulfills the three necessary properties.

ANS:

LINEAR-SEARCH (A, n, x)

  for i = 1 to

  nif A[i] ==

  x

    return   i
  return NIL

Explanation:

  • Start at the first element of the array.
  • Compare each element **A[i]** with the value **x.**
  • **If A[i]=X** return the index **i.**
  • If the loop finishes without finding x, return NIL.

2.1-5
Consider the problem of adding two n-bit binary integers a and b, stored in two n-element arrays $A[0:n-1]$ and $B[0:n-1]$, where each element is either 0 or 1, $a = \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} A[i] \cdot 2^i$, and $b = \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} B[i] \cdot 2^i$. The sum $c = a + b$ of the two integers should be stored in binary form in an $(n+1)$-element array $C[0:n]$, where $c = \sum_{i=0}^{n} C[i] \cdot 2^i$. Write a procedure ADD-BINARY-INTEGERS that takes as input arrays A and B, along with the length n, and returns array C holding the sum.

ANS:

ADD-BINARY (A, B, n)

 C [0] = 0 // Initialize carry for i = 0 to n-1

 sum =A[i] + B[i] + C[i] // Sum of bits and

 carry C [i + 1] = sum mod 2   //   Store

 result bit

  C[i] = sum div 2   // Update carry

 <u>**return C**</u>

2.2-1 Express the function n^3/1000 +100n^2 - 100n + 3 in terms of ,notation.

ANS:

To express the function in Big-O (,-notation) in an easier way, follow these simple

steps:Given function:

f(n)=n^3/1000+100n^2−100n+3

Steps:

1. **Find the biggest term**:
   - o   **n^3** is the biggest term because it grows faster than **n^2, n** and any constant.
2. **Ignore the constants**:
   - o   Ignore the constants like **1/1000,100 and -100**They don't matter for **Big-O**, only the biggest term does.
3. **Write the Big-O notation**:
   - o   The biggest term **is n^3**, so the function **is O (n^3).**

Final answer:
   O(n3)

Consider sorting n numbers stored in array $A[1:n]$ by first finding the smallest element of $A[1:n]$ and exchanging it with the element in $A[1]$. Then find the smallest element of $A[2:n]$, and exchange it with $A[2]$. Then find the smallest element of $A[3:n]$, and exchange it with $A[3]$. Continue in this manner for the first $n-1$ elements of A. Write pseudocode for this algorithm, which is known as *selection sort*. What loop invariant does this algorithm maintain? Why does it need to run for only the first $n-1$ elements, rather than for all n elements? Give the worst-case running time of selection sort in Θ-notation. Is the best-case running time any better?

Ans:

Selection Sort Algorithm

Selection sort repeatedly selects the smallest element from the unsorted portion of the array and swaps it with the element at the beginning of the unsorted portion.

SELECTION-SORT(A)

 for i = 1 to n - 1 min_index

  = i

  for j = i + 1 to n

  if A[j] <

  A[min_index]

  min_index = j

  exchange A[i] with A[min_index]

Worst-Case Running Time:

The worst-case time complexity of selection sort is O(n^2), where:

- The outer loop runs n−1n−1 times.
- The inner loop runs for a decreasing number of elements, specifically n−1, n−2 ..., 1 comparison.
- The total number of comparisons is $\sum$i=n−1=2n(n−1), which is O(n2)O(n^2)O(n2).

Best-Case Running Time:

The best-case running time is also O(n^2). Unlike some sorting algorithms (like insertion sort), selection sort performs the same number of comparisons regardless of the input order. Hence, even if the array is already sorted, it still has to perform the inner loop for every element, resulting in O(n^2) comparisons.
2.2-3

Consider linear search again (see Exercise 2.1-4). How many elements of the input array need to be checked on the average, assuming that the element being searched for is equally likely to be any element in the array? How about in the worst case

Using ,-notation, give the average-case and worst-case running times of linear search. Justify your answers

ANS:

LINEAR-SEARCH (A, n, x)

  for i = 1 to

  nif A[i] ==

  x

  return

  ireturn

  NIL

Worst-Case Analysis:

In the worst case, the element is either at the last position or is not in the array at all. In both cases, the search will have to check all n elements.

Thus, in the worst case, **n elements are checked**.

- In O-notation, the worst-case running time is als O(n).

Average-Case Analysis:

If we assume that the element we are searching for is equally likely to be any element in the array, the number of comparisons depends on where the target is located:

- If the target is at index 1, only 1 comparison is needed.
- If the target is at index 2, 2 comparisons are needed, and so on.
- If the target is at index nnn (the last element), nnn comparisons are needed.

On average, the position of the target will be somewhere in the middle of the array. Thus, the average number of comparisons is the mean of the sequence 1,2,3,…,n.

2.2-4 How can you modify any sorting algorithm to have a good best-case running

To improve the best-case running time of any sorting algorithm, **check if the array is already sorted** before running the algorithm. If it's already sorted, you can skip the sorting process entirely, reducing the best-case running time to O(n).

2.3-1 Using Figure 2.4 as a model, illustrate the operation of merge sort on an array initially containing the sequence h3; 41; 52; 26; 38; 57; 9; 49.

ANS:

1. **Step 1: Split the array** into two halves:
   - o Left half: [3, 41, 52, 26] o Right half: [38, 57, 9, 49]
2. **Step 2: Keep splitting** each half until every part has only one element:
   - o Left half [3, 41, 52, 26]becomes   [3], [41], [52], [26] o Right half [38, 57, 9, 49]becomes [38], [57], [9], [49]
3. **Step 3: Merge the parts** back together while sorting them:
   - o [3]and [41]merge to become [3, 41] o [52]and[26]merge to become [26, 52]
   - o Now, [3, 41]and [26, 52]merge to become [3, 26, 41, 52] o Similarly, merge [38]and [57]tobecome [38, 57] o Merge [9]and [49]to become [9, 49]
   - o Then, merge [38, 57]and   [9, 49] to become [9, 38, 49, 57]
4. **Step 4: Final merge**: oMerge [3, 26, 41, 52]with [9, 38, 49, 57]to get the sorted array:

$$[3,9,26,38,41,49,52,57]$$

Result: The sorted array is [3, 9, 26, 38, 41, 49, 52, 57].

2.3-2

The test in line 1 of the MERGE-SORT procedure reads "**if** $p \geq r$" rather than "**if** $p \neq r$." If MERGE-SORT is called with $p > r$, then the subarray $A[p:r]$ is empty. Argue that as long as the initial call of MERGE-SORT$(A, 1, n)$ has $n \geq 1$, the test "**if** $p \neq r$" suffices to ensure that no recursive call has $p > r$.

ANS:

In the **MERGE-SORT** algorithm, the condition if $p \neq r$ is enough because:

1. **Splitting**: The algorithm splits the array into two parts, ensuring p is never greater than r in recursive calls.

2. **Stopping**: When $p = r$, it means there's only one element left, so recursion stops.
3. **Initial Call**: If MERGE-SORT(A, 1, n) has $n \geq 1$, then all recursive calls will also satisfy

   $p \leq r$.

Conclusion: The check if $p \neq r$ ensures recursion stops correctly, and the splitting methodprevents any invalid calls where $p > r$.

2.3-3 State a loop invariant for the while loop of lines 12-18 of the MERGE procedure. Show how to use it, along with the while loops of lines 20-23 and 24-27, to prove that the MERGE procedure is correct.

ANS:

The loop invariant for the **MERGE** procedure states that at the start of each iteration, the elements merged into A from subarrays L and R are sorted, and all elements in A[p...k-1] are in sorted order. Initially, no elements have been merged, so the invariant holds. During each iteration, we compare the current elements from L and R, adding the smaller one to A and moving the corresponding index forward, which keeps the merged portion sorted. The loop continues until one subarray is fully merged, allowing any remaining elements from the other sorted subarray to be addeddirectly to A. Thus, the **MERGE** procedure correctly combines two sorted subarrays into one sorted array.

2.3-4

Use mathematical induction to show that when $n \geq 2$ is an exact power of 2, the solution of the recurrence

$$T(n) = \begin{cases} 2 & \text{if } n = 2, \\ 2T(n/2) + n & \text{if } n > 2 \end{cases}$$

is $T(n) = n \lg n$.

ANS:
Since n is a power of two, we may write n = 2k . If k = 1, T(2) = 2 = 2 log(2). Suppose it is true for k, we will show it is true for k + 1. T(2k+1) = 2T (2^ k+1/ 2)+ 2k+1 = (2T) 2^ k + 2^k+1 = 2(2^3 log(2^k)) + 2^k+1

= k2^ k+1 + 2^k+1 = (k + 1)2^k+1 = 2^k+1 log(2^k+1) = n log(n)

You can also think of insertion sort as a recursive algorithm. In order to sort $A[1:n]$, recursively sort the subarray $A[1:n-1]$ and then insert $A[n]$ into the sorted subarray $A[1:n-1]$. Write pseudocode for this recursive version of insertion sort. Give a recurrence for its worst-case running time.

ANS:
INSERTION-SORT(A, n)

1. if n ≤ 1

2. return

3. INSERTION-SORT(A, n - 1) // Sort the first n - 1 elements

4. INSERT(A, n)   // Insert the nth element into the sorted subarray

INSERT(A, n)
1. key = A[n]   // The element to be

inserted2.   i = n - 1

3. while i > 0 and A[i] > key

4. A[i + 1] = A[i]   // Shift elements to the

right5.   i = i - 1

6. A[i + 1] = key   // Place the key in the correct position

Recurrence for Worst-Case Running Time

Let T(n) be the worst-case running time of the recursive insertion sort for an array of size nnn. The recurrence relation can be expressed as follows:

T(n)= {c if n=1, T(n−1) +O(n) if n>1T(n)

2.3-6

Referring back to the searching problem (see Exercise 2.1-4), observe that if the subarray being searched is already sorted, the searching algorithm can check the midpoint of the subarray against v and eliminate half of the subarray from further consideration. The binarysearch algorithm repeats this procedure, halving the size of the remaining portion of the subarray each time. Write pseudocode, either iterative or recursive, for binary search.
Argue that the worst-case running time of binary search is big O log n.

ANS:

A binary search wouldn't improve the worst-case running time. Insertion sort has to copy each elementgreater than key into its neighboring spot in the array. Doing a binary search would tell us how many how many elements need to be copied over, but wouldn't rid us of the copying needed to be done.

The **while** loop of lines 5–7 of the INSERTION-SORT procedure in Section 2.1 uses a linear search to scan (backward) through the sorted subarray $A[1 : j - 1]$. What if insertion sort used a binary search (see Exercise 2.3-6) instead of a linear search? Would that improve the overall worst-case running time of insertion sort to $\Theta(n \lg n)$?

ANS:
Using binary search in insertion sort speeds up finding the insertion point from O(n) to O(log n).However, the time to shift elements remains O(n)

Thus, the overall complexity is:

T(n)=O (n log n) +O(n)

=O(n^2)

Conclusion

So, insertion sort still has a worst-case time complexity O(n^2), even with binary search.

Describe an algorithm that, given a set S of n integers and another integer x, determines whether S contains two elements that sum to exactly x. Your algorithm should take $\Theta(n \lg n)$ time in the worst case.

ANS:
1.   FUNCTION find_pair_with_sum(S, n, x)

2.   SORT(S)   // Sort the set S in O(n log n) time

3.   left = 0   // Initialize left pointer

4.   right = n - 1 // Initialize right pointer

5.   WHILE left < right DO

6.   current_sum = S[left] + S[right] // Calculate current sum

ANS(b):
Here's a simpler and shorter explanation:

1. **Coarseness k**: We can start merging arrays when they are at most size k.
2. **Merge Depth**: The depth of the merge process is log2(n/k). This tells us how many levelswe need to merge to get one sorted array.
3. **Time per Level**: Each level of merging takes O(n)time because we have to look at allelements.
4. **Total Time**: So, the total merging

time is:Θ(log(n/k))

ANS(c):
. Viewing k as a function of n, as long as k(n) ∈ O(lg(n)), it has the same asymptotic. In particular,for any constant choice of k, the asymptotic are the same.

ANS (D):
. If we optimize the previous expression using our calculus 1 skills to get k, we have that c1n−nc^2/ k = 0 where c1 and c2 are the confidents of nk and n log(n/k) hidden by the asymptoticnotation. In particular, a constant choice of k is optimal. In practice we could find the best choice of this k by just trying and timing for various values for sufficiently large n.

```
for i=0 to n

do yi = x for

j=1 to n  yi =

yix end for

y = y + aiyi

endfor
```

This code has runtime $\Theta(n^2)$ because it has to compute each of the powers of x. This is slowerthan Horner's rule

ANS(C):

Initially, i = n, so, the upper bound of the summation is −1, so the sum evaluates to 0, which is the valueof y. For preservation, suppose it is true for an i, then,

$$y = a_i + x \sum_{k=0}^{n-(i+1)} a_{k+i+1}x^k = a_i + x \sum_{k=1}^{n-i} a_{k+i}x^{k-1} = \sum_{k=0}^{n-i} a_{k+i}x^k$$

At termination, $i = 0$, so is summing up to $n - 1$, so executing the body of the loop a last time gets us the desired final result.

ANS(D):
We just showed that the algorithm evaluated $\sum_{k=0}^{n} a_k x^k$. This is the value of the polynomialevaluated at x.

2-4 Inversions
Let $A[1:n]$ be an array of n distinct numbers. If $i < j$ and $A[i] > A[j]$, then the pair (i, j) is called an *inversion* of A.

a. List the five inversions of the array $\langle 2, 3, 8, 6, 1\rangle$.

b. What array with elements from the set $\{1, 2, \dots, n\}$ has the most inversions? How many does it have?

c. What is the relationship between the running time of insertion sort and the number of inversions in the input array? Justify your answer.

d. Give an algorithm that determines the number of inversions in any permutation on n elements in $\Theta(n \lg n)$ worst-case time. (*Hint:* Modify merge sort.)

ANS(a):
. The five inversions are (2, 1), (3, 1), (8, 6), (8, 1), and (6, 1).

ANS(b):

The n-element array with the most inversions is $\langle n, n-1, \ldots, 2, 1 \rangle$. It has $n-1 + n-2 + \ldots + 2 + 1 = \frac{n(n-1)}{2}$ inversions.

ANS(c):
The running time of insertion sort is a constant times the number of inversions. Let P I(i) denote the number of j < i such that A[j] > A[i]. Then n i=1 I(i) equals the number of inversions in A. Now consider the while loop on lines 5-7 of the insertion sort algorithm. The loop will execute once for each element of A which has index less than j is larger than A[j]. Thus, it will execute I(j) times. We reach this while loop once for each iteration of the P for loop, so the number of constant time steps of insertion sort is nj=1 I(j) which is exactly the inversion number of A.

ANS(D):

Algorithm 6 M.Merge-Sort(A, p, r)

if $p < r$ then
  $q = \lfloor (p+r)/2 \rfloor$
  $left = M.Merge - Sort(A, p, q)$
  $right = M.Merge - Sort(A, q+1, r)$
  $inv = M.Merge(A, p, q, r) + left + right$
  return inv
end if
return 0

Algorithm 7 M.Merge(A,p,q,r)

```
inv = 0
n₁ = q − p + 1
n₂ = r − q
let L[1,..n₁] and R[1..n₂] be new arrays
for i = 1 to n₁ do
    L[i] − A[p + i − 1]
end for
for j = 1 to n₂ do
    R[j] = A[q + j]
end for
i = 1
j = 1
k = p
while i ≠ n₁ + 1 and j ≠ n₂ + 1 do
    if L[i] ≤ R[j] then
        A[k] = L[i]
        i = i + 1
    else A[k] = R[j]
        inv = inv + j // This keeps track of the number of inversions between
the left and right arrays.
        j = j + 1
    end if
    k = k + 1
end while
if i == n₁ + 1 then
    for m = j to n₂ do
        A[k] = R[m]
        k = k + 1
    end for
end if
if j == n₂ + 1 then
    for m = i to n₁ do
        A[k] = L[m]
        inv = inv + n₂ // Tracks inversions once we have exhausted the right
array. At this point, every element of the right array contributes an inversion.
        k = k + 1
    end for
end if
return inv
```

3.1-1 Modify the lower-bound argument for insertion sort to handle input sizes that are not necessarily a multiple of 3.

ANS:

To modify the lower-bound argument for Insertion Sort for input sizes not a multiple of 3, we simply note that the number of comparisons in the worst case is:

T(n)=n(n−1)/2

This holds for any size **n** regardless of whether it's a multiple of **3**. The time complexity remains **O(n^2).**

3.1-2 Using reasoning similar to what we used for insertion sort, analyze the running time of the selection sort algorithm from Exercise 2.2-2

ANS:

To analyze the running time of **Selection Sort** using reasoning similar to Insertion Sort, let's break it down step-by-step:

Selection Sort Process:

1. Find the smallest element in the array and swap it with the first element.
2. Find the second smallest element and swap it with the second element.
3. Continue this process for all elements.

Comparisons in Selection Sort:

For an array of size n:

1. In the first pass, it makes n−1n-1n−1 comparisons to find the smallest element.
2. In the second pass, it makes n−2n-2n−2 comparisons to find the second smallest element.
3. This continues until the last pass, where it makes 1 comparison.

Total Comparisons:

The total number of comparisons is:

T(n)=n(n−1)/2

Time Complexity:

Since T(n)=n(n−1)/2 the time complexity of Selection Sort is O(n^2) similar to Insertion Sort. However, unlike Insertion Sort, the number of swaps in Selection Sort is O(n), since it performs exactly one swap per pass.

3.1-3
Suppose that α is a fraction in the range $0 < \alpha < 1$. Show how to generalize the lower-bound argument for insertion sort to consider an input in which the αn largest values start in the first αn positions. What additional restriction do you need to put on α? What value of α maximizes the number of times that the αn largest values must pass through each of the middle $(1 - 2\alpha)n$ array positions?

ANS:
The lower-bound argument for Insertion Sort with αn\alpha $n \alpha n$ largest values in the first αn\alpha $n \alpha n$ positions shows that the number of comparisons is proportional to $\alpha(1-2\alpha)n$ To maximize the number of comparisons, α=1/4

The additional restriction is that αn\alpha $n \alpha n$ must be an integer.

Let $f(n)$ and $g(n)$ be asymptotically nonnegative functions. Using the basic definition of Θ-notation, prove that $\max\{f(n), g(n)\} = \Theta(f(n) + g(n))$.

ANS:

Step-by-Step Proof:

Let f(n) and g(n) be asymptotically nonnegative functions (i.e., they are nonnegative for large n).

Upper Bound:
max(f(n), g(n)) ≤f(n)+g(n))

his is because the maximum of two values is always less than or equal to their

sum. So:max(f(n), g(n)) =O(f(n)+g(n))

Lower Bound:

max(f(n), g(n)) ≥f(n)+g(n))>=f(n)+g(n)/2

This is because the maximum of two numbers is always at least half their sum.

Therefore:max(f(n), g(n)) =Ω(f(n)+g(n))

This gives us the lower bound.

Since max(f(n), g(n)) is both O(f(n)+g(n) and Ω(f(n)+g(n)), we conclude:

max(f(n),g(n)) =Θ(f(n)+g(n))

Thus, max(f(n), g(n))=Θ(f(n)+g(n))

3.2-2

Explain why the statement, "The running time of algorithm A is at least $O(n^2)$," is meaningless.

ANS:
The statement "The running time of algorithm A is at least O(n^2) is meaningless because O(n^2) represents an **upper bound**, not a lower bound. The correct way to describe a lower bound is to useΩ\Omega-notation, as in "The running time is at least Ω(n^2)."

Is $2^{n+1} = O(2^n)$? Is $2^{2n} = O(2^n)$?

ANS:
1. Is $2^{n+1} = O(2n)$.

We know that:

$2^{n+1} = 2 \cdot 2^2$.

This shows that 2^{n+1} just a constant multiple of 2^n, specifically $2^{n+1} = O(2^n)$
2. Is

$2^{2n} = O(2^n)$ We

know that:

$2^{2n} = (2n)^2$

This grows much faster than 2^n because squaring 2^n increases its growth rate significantly. Therefore, 2^n grows exponentially faster than 2^n and we cannot say that $2^{2n} = O(2^n)$

thus, the correct answer is:

   ☐ $2n+1 = O(2^n)$ ☐
      $2^{2n} \neq O(2^n)$

3.2-4 Prove Theorem 3.1

Statement: $f(n) = \Theta(g(n))$ if and only if $f(n) = O(g(n))$ and $f(n) = \Omega(g(n))$.

Proof:

1. (If $f(n) = \Theta(g(n))$):

   - By definition, there exist constants c_1, c_2, and n_0 such that:

     $$c_1 g(n) \leq f(n) \leq c_2 g(n) \quad \text{for all } n \geq n_0.$$

   - Thus, $f(n) = O(g(n))$ (upper bound) and $f(n) = \Omega(g(n))$ (lower bound).

2. (If $f(n) = O(g(n))$ and $f(n) = \Omega(g(n))$):

   - Assume:

     $$f(n) \leq c_2 g(n) \quad \text{and} \quad f(n) \geq c_1 g(n) \quad \text{for all } n \geq n_0'.$$

   - This implies:

     $$c_1 g(n) \leq f(n) \leq c_2 g(n) \quad \text{for all } n \geq n_0'.$$

   - Therefore, $f(n) = \Theta(g(n))$.

Conclusion:

Thus, $f(n) = \Theta(g(n))$ if and only if $f(n) = O(g(n))$ and $f(n) = \Omega(g(n))$.

3.2-5

Prove that the running time of an algorithm is $\Theta(g(n))$ if and only if its worst-case running time is $O(g(n))$ and its best-case running time is $\Omega(g(n))$.

ANS:

Proof of Theorem

Statement: The running time of an algorithm is $\Theta(g(n))$ if and only if its worst-case running time is $O(g(n))$ and its best-case running time is $\Omega(g(n))$.

Proof:

1. (If $T(n) = \Theta(g(n))$):
   - By definition, there exist constants c_1, c_2, and n_0 such that:
   $$c_1 g(n) \le T(n) \le c_2 g(n) \quad \text{for all } n \ge n_0.$$
   - Thus:
     - $T(n)_{worst} = O(g(n))$ (from the upper bound).
     - $T(n)_{best} = \Omega(g(n))$ (from the lower bound).

2. (If $T(n)_{worst} = O(g(n))$ and $T(n)_{best} = \Omega(g(n))$):
   - Assume:
   $$T(n) \le c_2 g(n) \quad \text{and} \quad T(n) \ge c_1 g(n) \quad \text{for sufficiently large } n.$$
   - Combining these gives:
   $$c_1 g(n) \le T(n) \le c_2 g(n),$$
   - Therefore, $T(n) = \Theta(g(n))$.

3.2-6

Prove that $o(g(n)) \cap \omega(g(n))$ is the empty set.

ANS:

Suppose we had some f(n) $\in$ o(g(n)) $\cap$ w(g(n)). Then, we have 0 = limn→∞ f(n) g(n) = ∞

3.2-7

We can extend our notation to the case of two parameters n and m that can go to ∞ independently at different rates. For a given function $g(n, m)$, we denote by $O(g(n, m))$ the set of functions

$O(g(n, m)) = \{ f(n, m) :$ there exist positive constants c, n_0, and m_0
such that $0 \le f(n, m) \le c g(n, m)$
for all $n \ge n_0$ or $m \ge m_0 \}$.

Give corresponding definitions for $\Omega(g(nm))$ and $\Theta(g(n, m))$.

ANS:

$\Omega(g(n, m)) = \{f(n, m) :$ there exist positive constants c, n0, and m0 such that f(n, m) $\ge$ cg(n, m) for all n $\ge$n0 or m $\ge$ m0$\}$

3.3-1

Show that if $f(n)$ and $g(n)$ are monotonically increasing functions, then so are the functions $f(n) + g(n)$ and $f(g(n))$, and if $f(n)$ and $g(n)$ are in addition nonnegative, then $f(n) \cdot g(n)$ is monotonically increasing.

ANS:

Let n1 < n2 be arbitrary. From f and g being monatomic increasing, we know f(n1) < f(n2) and g(n1) < g(n2). So f(n1) + g(n1) < f(n2) + g(n1) < f(n2) + g(n2).

Since g(n1) < g(n2), we have f(g(n1)) < f(g(n2)). Lastly, if both are nonegative, then, f(n1)g(n1) = f(n2)g(n1) + (f(n2) − f(n1))g(n1) = f(n2)g(n2) + f(n2)(g(n2) − g(n1)) + (f(n2) − f(n1))g(n1) Since f(n1) ≥ 0, f(n2) > 0, so, the second term in this expression is greater than zero. The third term is nonnegative, so,the whole thing is< f(n2)g(n2).

3.3-2

Prove that $\lfloor \alpha n \rfloor + \lceil (1 - \alpha)n \rceil = n$ for any integer n and real number α in the range $0 \le \alpha \le 1$.

ANS:

To prove that

$$\lfloor \alpha n \rfloor + (1 - \alpha)n = n$$

for any integer n and real number α in the range $0 \le \alpha \le 1$:

1. **Express** αn: Let $\alpha n = k + f$, where $k = \lfloor \alpha n \rfloor$ (integer) and $f = \alpha n - k$ (fractional part, $0 \le f < 1$).

2. **Substitute:**

$$n = \lfloor \alpha n \rfloor + (1 - \alpha)n = k + (1 - \alpha)n.$$

3. **Rearrange:**

$$n - (1 - \alpha)n = k \implies \alpha n = k.$$

4. **Rewrite:**

$$\lfloor \alpha n \rfloor + (1 - \alpha)n = k + (n - \alpha n) = n.$$

Thus, the equation holds true:

$$\lfloor \alpha n \rfloor + (1 - \alpha)n = n.$$

Use equation (3.14) or other means to show that $(n + o(n))^k = \Theta(n^k)$ for any real constant k. Conclude that $\lceil n \rceil^k = \Theta(n^k)$ and $\lfloor n \rfloor^k = \Theta(n^k)$.

ANS:

To show that $(n + o(n))^k = \Theta(n^k)$ for any real constant k:

1. **Expand Using the Binomial Theorem:**

$$(n + o(n))^k = \sum_{i=0}^{k} \binom{k}{i} n^{k-i} o(n)^i.$$

2. **Dominant Term:**

   - The leading term is n^k.

   - The term $kn^{k-1}o(n)$ and higher-order terms become negligible as n approaches infinity because $o(n)$ grows slower than n.

3. **Conclusion:**

$$(n + o(n))^k = n^k + o(n^k) = \Theta(n^k).$$

Thus, we conclude that:

$$d(n)^k = \Theta(n^k) \quad \text{and} \quad \lfloor n \rfloor^k = \Theta(n^k).$$

3.3-4 Prove the following:

a. Equation (3.21).

b. Equations (3.26)3(3.28).

c. lg.,.n// D ,.lg n/.
ANS(a):

a. Prove Equation (3.21)

Equation: $\Theta(f(n)) + \Theta(g(n)) = \Theta(\max(f(n), g(n)))$

Proof:

- Let $f(n) = \Theta(h(n))$ and $g(n) = \Theta(k(n))$.
- Thus, there are constants c_1, c_2, c_3, c_4 such that:

$$c_1 h(n) \leq f(n) \leq c_2 h(n) \quad \text{and} \quad c_3 k(n) \leq g(n) \leq c_4 k(n).$$

- Therefore:

$$\Theta(f(n)) + \Theta(g(n)) \leq \Theta(\max(h(n), k(n))).$$

- Hence, $\Theta(f(n)) + \Theta(g(n)) = \Theta(\max(f(n), g(n)))$.

ANS(b):

b. Prove Equations (3.26) and (3.28)

Equation (3.26): $\Theta(f(n)g(n)) = \Theta(f(n))\Theta(g(n))$

Proof:

- Given $f(n) = \Theta(h(n))$ and $g(n) = \Theta(k(n))$, we have:

$$c_1 c_3 h(n)k(n) \leq f(n)g(n) \leq c_2 c_4 h(n)k(n),$$

- Thus, $\Theta(f(n)g(n)) = \Theta(h(n)k(n))$.

Equation (3.28): $\Theta(f(n) + g(n)) = \Theta(\max(f(n), g(n)))$

Proof:

- This follows directly from part (a):

$$\Theta(f(n) + g(n)) = \Theta(\max(f(n), g(n))).$$

ANS(C):

c. Prove $\log(\Theta(n)) = \Theta(\log n)$

Proof:

- If $f(n) = \Theta(n)$, then:

$$\log(c_1) + \log(n) \leq \log(f(n)) \leq \log(c_2) + \log(n).$$

- Thus, $\log(f(n)) = \Theta(\log n)$ because the constants $\log(c_1)$ and $\log(c_2)$ do not affect the asymptotic notation.

Is the function $\lceil \lg n \rceil !$ polynomially bounded? Is the function $\lceil \lg \lg n \rceil !$ polynomially bounded?

ANS:

1. Is log(n) polynomial bounded?:

Yes, log(n) is polynomially bounded. For any k>0, log(n)≤n0.5 sufficiently large n.

2. log(log(n)) polynomially bounded?:

Yes, log(log(n)) is polynomially bounded. For any k>0, log(log(n)) n^{0.1} is for sufficiently large n.

★ 3.3-6

Which is asymptotically larger: $\lg(\lg^* n)$ or $\lg^*(\lg n)$?

ANS:
Asymptotically, log(log(n)) is larger than log(\sqrt\log(n)).

3.3-7

Show that the golden ratio ϕ and its conjugate $\hat{\phi}$ both satisfy the equation $x^2 = x + 1$.

ANS:

To show that the golden ratio ϕ and its conjugate ψ satisfy the equation

$$x^2 = x + 1,$$

we will first find the golden ratio ϕ and its conjugate ψ.

Step 1: Solve the equation $x^2 = x + 1$

1. Rearrange the equation:

$$x^2 - x - 1 = 0.$$

2. Use the quadratic formula:

$$x = \frac{-b \pm \sqrt{b^2 - 4ac}}{2a} = \frac{1 \pm \sqrt{1^2 - 4 \cdot 1 \cdot (-1)}}{2 \cdot 1} = \frac{1 \pm \sqrt{5}}{2}.$$

Step 2: Identify the roots

- The two roots are:

  - $\phi = \frac{1+\sqrt{5}}{2}$ (the golden ratio),

  - $\psi = \frac{1-\sqrt{5}}{2}$ (the conjugate).

Step 3: Verify both values satisfy $x^2 = x + 1$

1. For ϕ:

   - Calculate ϕ^2:

   $$\phi^2 = \left(\frac{1+\sqrt{5}}{2}\right)^2 = \frac{(1+\sqrt{5})^2}{4} = \frac{1 + 2\sqrt{5} + 5}{4} = \frac{6 + 2\sqrt{5}}{4} = \frac{3 + \sqrt{5}}{2}.$$

   - Calculate $\phi + 1$:

   $$\phi + 1 = \frac{1+\sqrt{5}}{2} + 1 = \frac{1 + \sqrt{5} + 2}{2} = \frac{3 + \sqrt{5}}{2}.$$

   - Since $\phi^2 = \phi + 1$, the golden ratio satisfies the equation.

2. For ψ:

   - Calculate ψ^2:

   $$\psi^2 = \left(\frac{1-\sqrt{5}}{2}\right)^2 = \frac{(1-\sqrt{5})^2}{4} = \frac{1 - 2\sqrt{5} + 5}{4} = \frac{6 - 2\sqrt{5}}{4} = \frac{3 - \sqrt{5}}{2}.$$

   - Calculate $\psi + 1$:

   $$\psi + 1 = \frac{1-\sqrt{5}}{2} + 1 = \frac{1 - \sqrt{5} + 2}{2} = \frac{3 - \sqrt{5}}{2}.$$

   - Since $\psi^2 = \psi + 1$, the conjugate also satisfies the equation.

Prove by induction that the ith Fibonacci number satisfies the equation

$$F_i = (\phi^i - \hat{\phi}^i)/\sqrt{5},$$

where ϕ is the golden ratio and $\hat{\phi}$ is its conjugate.

ANS:

First, we show that $1 + \phi = \frac{6+2\sqrt{5}}{4} = \phi^2$. So, for every i, $\phi^{i-1} + \phi^{i-2} = \phi^{i-2}(\phi + 1) = \phi^i$. Similarly for $\hat{\phi}$.

For $i = 0$, $\frac{\phi^0 - \hat{\phi}^0}{\sqrt{5}} = 0$. For $i = 1$, $\frac{\frac{1+\sqrt{5}}{2} - \frac{1-\sqrt{5}}{2}}{\sqrt{5}} = \frac{\sqrt{5}}{\sqrt{5}} = 1$. Then, by induction,

$$F_i = F_{i-1} + F_{i-2} = \frac{\phi^{i-1} + \phi^{i-2} - (\hat{\phi}^{i-1} + \hat{\phi}^{i-2})}{\sqrt{5}} = \frac{\phi^i - \hat{\phi}^i}{\sqrt{5}}.$$

Show that $k \lg k = \Theta(n)$ implies $k = \Theta(n/\lg n)$.

ANS:

To show that $k \log k = \Theta(n)$ implies $k = \Theta\left(\frac{n}{\log n}\right)$:

1. **Start with:**

$$k \log k = \Theta(n)$$

This means there exist constants $c_1, c_2 > 0$ such that:

$$c_1 n \leq k \log k \leq c_2 n.$$

2. **Rearranging:** From $c_1 n \leq k \log k$:

$$k \geq \frac{c_1 n}{\log k}.$$

From $k \log k \leq c_2 n$:

$$k \leq \frac{c_2 n}{\log k}.$$

3. **Assume:** Let $k = \frac{n}{\log n}$ (for large n):

$$\log k \approx \log\left(\frac{n}{\log n}\right) = \log n - \log(\log n).$$

4. **Final Bounds:**

- Lower bound gives:

$$k = \Theta\left(\frac{n}{\log n}\right).$$

- Upper bound also gives:

$$k = \Theta\left(\frac{n}{\log n}\right).$$

3-1 Asymptotic behavior of polynomials

Let

$$p(n) = \sum_{i=0}^{d} a_i n^i,$$

where $a_d > 0$, be a degree-d polynomial in n, and let k be a constant. Use the definitions of the asymptotic notations to prove the following properties.

a. If $k \geq d$, then $p(n) = O(n^k)$.

b. If $k \leq d$, then $p(n) = \Omega(n^k)$.

c. If $k = d$, then $p(n) = \Theta(n^k)$.

d. If $k > d$, then $p(n) = o(n^k)$.

e. If $k < d$, then $p(n) = \omega(n^k)$.

ANS(a):   a. If $k < d$, then $p(n) = O(n^k)$.

Proof: Since d is the highest degree of the polynomial, for large n, the term a n^ddominates thepolynomial. Therefore, we can write:

$$p(n) \leq Cn^d \text{ for some constant } C > 0 \text{ and sufficiently large} .$$

Now, if $k < d$, we can find a constant M such

$$p(n) \leq Cn^d \leq C'n^k \text{ that: for some } C' > 0 \text{ and} \qquad n$$

sufficiently large

where $C' = Cn^{d-k}$. Thus, we can conclude that $p(n) = O(n^k)$.

ANS(b):

If $k = d$ then $p(n) = \Theta(n^k)$.

Proof: Following from part b, we already established that:

$$p(n) \geq a_d n^d \text{ for sufficiently large } n .$$

Thus, we can conclude that p(n)=Ω(nd)p(n) = Ω(n^d)p(n)=Ω(nd).

Thus, we can write:

$$p(n) \geq C'n^d \text{ for some constant } C' > 0.$$

Combining both results, we get $p(n) = \Theta(n^d)$.

ANS(C):

c. If $k = d$, then $p(n) = \Omega(n^k)$.

Proof: Following from part b, we already established that:

$$p(n) \geq a_d n^d \text{ for sufficiently large } n.$$

Thus, we can conclude that $p(n) = \Omega(n^d)$.

ANS(D):

d. If $k > d$, then $p(n) = o(n^k)$.

Proof: Since $k > d$, we can write:

$$p(n) \leq Cn^d \quad \text{for some constant } C > 0 \text{ and sufficiently large } n.$$

For sufficiently large n, we have:

$$\frac{p(n)}{n^k} = \frac{Cn^d}{n^k} = Cn^{d-k} \to 0 \text{ as } n \to \infty.$$

Thus, $p(n) = o(n^k)$.

ANS(e):

e. If $k < d$, then $p(n) = \Omega(n^k)$.

Proof: For $k < d$, since d is the highest degree term, we have:

$$p(n) \geq a_d n^d - \sum_{i=0}^{d-1} a_i n^i.$$

For sufficiently large n:

$$p(n) \geq Cn^d \quad \text{and thus, } p(n) \geq C'n^k \text{ for some constant } C' > 0,$$

leading to $p(n) = \Omega(n^k)$.

3-2 Relative asymptotic growths

Indicate, for each pair of expressions (A, B) in the table below whether A is $O, o,$ $\Omega, \omega,$ or Θ of B. Assume that $k \geq 1, \epsilon > 0,$ and $c > 1$ are constants. Write your answer in the form of the table with "yes" or "no" written in each box.

	A	B	O	o	Ω	ω	Θ
a.	$\lg^k n$	n^ϵ					
b.	n^k	c^n					
c.	$\sqrt{n}$	$n^{\sin n}$					
d.	2^n	$2^{n/2}$					
e.	$n^{\lg c}$	$c^{\lg n}$					
f.	$\lg(n!)$	$\lg(n^n)$					

ANS:

Asymptotic Relationships:

A	B	O	o	Ω	ω	Θ
$\log^k n \, n$	n^ϵ	yes	no	no	no	no
n^k	c^n	yes	no	no	no	no
$\sqrt{n}$	$n^{\sin n}$	yes	no	no	no	no
2^n	$2^{n/2}$	no	no	yes	no	no
$n^{1+\epsilon}$	$c^{\log n}$	yes	no	no	no	no
$\log(n!)$	$\log(n^n)$	yes	no	no	no	no

3-3 Ordering by asymptotic growth rates

a. Rank the following functions by order of growth. That is, find an arrange-
ment $g_1, g_2, \ldots, g_{30}$ of the functions satisfying $g_1 = \Omega(g_2)$, $g_2 = \Omega(g_3)$, ...,
$g_{29} = \Omega(g_{30})$. Partition your list into equivalence classes such that functions
$f(n)$ and $g(n)$ belong to the same class if and only if $f(n) = \Theta(g(n))$.

Chapter 3   Characterizing Running Times

$\lg(\lg^* n)$	$2^{\lg^* n}$	$(\sqrt{2})^{\lg n}$	n^2	$n!$	$(\lg n)!$
$(3/2)^n$	n^3	$\lg^2 n$	$\lg(n!)$	2^{2^n}	$n^{1/\lg n}$
$\ln \ln n$	$\lg^* n$	$n \cdot 2^n$	$n^{\lg \lg n}$	$\ln n$	1
$2^{\lg n}$	$(\lg n)^{\lg n}$	e^n	$4^{\lg n}$	$(n+1)!$	$\sqrt{\lg n}$
$\lg^*(\lg n)$	$2^{\sqrt{2 \lg n}}$	n	2^n	$n \lg n$	$2^{2^{n+1}}$

b. Give an example of a single nonnegative function $f(n)$ such that for all func-
tions $g_i(n)$ in part (a), $f(n)$ is neither $O(g_i(n))$ nor $\Omega(g_i(n))$.

ANS(A):

$2^{2^{n+1}}$
2^{2^n}
$(n+1)!$
$n!$
$n2^n$
e^n
2^n
$\left(\frac{3}{2}\right)^n$
$(\lg(n))!$
$n^{\lg(\lg(n))}$ $\lg(n)^{\lg(n)}$
n^3
n^2 $4^{\lg(n)}$
$n \lg(n)$ $\lg(n!)$
$2^{\lg(n)}$
$(\sqrt{2})^{\lg(n)}$ n
$2^{\sqrt{2 \lg(n)}}$
$\lg^2(n)$
$\ln(n)$
$\sqrt{\lg(n)}$
$\ln(\ln(n))$
$2^{\lg^*(n)}$
$\lg^*(n)$ $\lg^*(\lg(n))$
$\lg(\lg^*(n))$
1 $n^{1/\lg(n)}$

ANS(b):
If we define the function

$$f(n) = \begin{cases} g_1(n)! & n \mod 2 = 0 \\ \frac{1}{n} & n \mod 2 = 1 \end{cases}$$

Note that f(n) meets the asymptotically positive requirement that this chapter puts on the functions analyzed. Then, for even n, we have

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{f(2n)}{g_i(2n)} \geq \lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{f(2n)}{g_1(2n)}$$
$$= \lim_{n\to\infty} (g_1(2n) - 1)!$$
$$= \infty$$

And for odd n, we have

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{f(2n+1)}{g_i(2n+1)} \leq \lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{f(2n+1)}{1}$$
$$= \lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{2n+1}$$
$$= 0$$

By looking at the even n we have that $f(n)$ is not $O(g_i(n))$ for any n. By looking at the odd n, we have that $f(n)$ is not $\Omega(g_i(n))$ for any n.

3-4 Asymptotic notation properties

Let $f(n)$ and $g(n)$ be asymptotically positive functions. Prove or disprove each of the following conjectures.

a. $f(n) = O(g(n))$ implies $g(n) = O(f(n))$.

b. $f(n) + g(n) = \Theta(\min\{f(n), g(n)\})$.

c. $f(n) = O(g(n))$ implies $\lg f(n) = O(\lg g(n))$, where $\lg g(n) \geq 1$ and $f(n) \geq 1$ for all sufficiently large n.

d. $f(n) = O(g(n))$ implies $2^{f(n)} = O\left(2^{g(n)}\right)$.

e. $f(n) = O\left((f(n))^2\right)$.

f. $f(n) = O(g(n))$ implies $g(n) = \Omega(f(n))$.

g. $f(n) = \Theta(f(n/2))$.

h. $f(n) + o(f(n)) = \Theta(f(n))$.

ANs(a):

a. **False**

b. **False**

c. **True**

d. **True**

e. **False**

c. $\Theta(f(n)) + \Theta(g(n)) = \Theta(f(n) + g(n))$

Proof: Let $f(n) = \Theta(f(n))$ and $g(n) = \Theta(g(n))$. Then we can write:

$$c_1 f(n) \le f(n) \le c_2 f(n)$$

and

$$d_1 g(n) \le g(n) \le d_2 g(n)$$

for some positive constants c_1, c_2, d_1, d_2 and sufficiently large n.

Now, we can combine these:

$$f(n) + g(n) \ge c_1 f(n) + d_1 g(n) \quad \text{(using lower bounds)}$$

For sufficiently large n, either $f(n)$ or $g(n)$ will dominate, leading to:

$$\Theta(f(n)) + \Theta(g(n)) = \Theta(f(n) + g(n)).$$

ANS(D):

Here's the short proof for the identity $\Theta(f(n)) \cdot \Theta(g(n)) = \Theta(f(n) \cdot g(n))$:

Proof:

1. **Definitions:**
   - Let $f(n) = \Theta(f(n))$ implies $c_1 f(n) \le f(n) \le c_2 f(n)$ for some constants $c_1, c_2 > 0$.
   - Let $g(n) = \Theta(g(n))$ implies $d_1 g(n) \le g(n) \le d_2 g(n)$ for some constants $d_1, d_2 > 0$.

2. **Multiply the inequalities:**

$$(c_1 f(n))(d_1 g(n)) \le f(n)g(n) \le (c_2 f(n))(d_2 g(n))$$

This simplifies to:

$$c_1 d_1 f(n)g(n) \le f(n)g(n) \le c_2 d_2 f(n)g(n)$$

3. **Conclusion:** Since $c_1 d_1$ and $c_2 d_2$ are constants, we have:

$$\Theta(f(n)) \cdot \Theta(g(n)) = \Theta(f(n) \cdot g(n))$$

ANS(e):

e. Asymptotic Bound

Claim: For any real constants $a_1, b_1 > 0$ and integer constants k_1, k_2, the following asymptotic bound holds:

$$(a_1 n^{k_1} \log^{k_2}(a_2 n)) = \Theta(n^{k_1} \log^{k_2} n).$$

Starting with the left-hand side:

$$a_1 n^{k_1} \log^{k_2}(a_2 n) = a_1 n^{k_1} (\log(a_2) + \log(n))^{k_2}.$$

Using the Binomial Theorem:

$$(\log(a_2) + \log(n))^{k_2} = \sum_{j=0}^{k_2} \binom{k_2}{j} (\log(a_2))^{k_2-j} (\log(n))^j$$

Dominant Term:
The dominant term when n is large is log^k2(n)

$$a_1 n^{k_1} \cdot \Theta(\log^{k_2}(n)).$$

Conclusion:
Thus, we conclude:

$$(a_1 n^{k_1} \log^{k_2}(a_2 n)) = \Theta(n^{k_1} \log^{k_2}(n)).$$

ANS(f):

Summation Identity

Claim: For S⊆ZS we have:

$$\sum_{k \in S} \Theta(f(k)) = \Theta\left(\sum_{k \in S} f(k)\right),$$

$$c_1 f(k) \leq \Theta(f(k)) \leq c_2 f(k)$$

for some constants c1,c2>0

2. **Summing up:**

Then,

$$\sum_{k \in S} c_1 f(k) \leq \sum_{k \in S} \Theta(f(k)) \leq \sum_{k \in S} c_2 f(k).$$

3. **Using the convergence assumption:**

Since both sums $\sum_{k \in S} f(k)$ converge, we have:

$$c_1 \sum_{k \in S} f(k) \leq \sum_{k \in S} \Theta(f(k)) \leq c_2 \sum_{k \in S} f(k).$$

ANS(g):

g. Counterexample for Product Identity

Claim:

$$\prod_{k \in S} \Theta(f(k)) \neq \Theta \left(\prod_{k \in S} f(k) \right).$$

Counterexample:

Let $f(k) = \frac{1}{k}$ for $S = \{1, 2, 3, \ldots\}$:

- $\prod_{k \in S} \Theta(f(k))$ converges (to a constant),
- $\prod_{k \in S} f(k)$ diverges to 0.

Thus, the identities do not hold.

3-6 Variations on O and Ω

Some authors define Ω-notation in a slightly different way than this textbook does. We'll use the nomenclature $\overset{\infty}{\Omega}$ (read "omega infinity") for this alternative definition. We say that $f(n) = \overset{\infty}{\Omega}(g(n))$ if there exists a positive constant c such that $f(n) \geq cg(n) \geq 0$ for infinitely many integers n.

a. Show that for any two asymptotically nonnegative functions $f(n)$ and $g(n)$, we have $f(n) = O(g(n))$ or $f(n) = \overset{\infty}{\Omega}(g(n))$ (or both).

b. Show that there exist two asymptotically nonnegative functions $f(n)$ and $g(n)$ for which neither $f(n) = O(g(n))$ nor $f(n) = \Omega(g(n))$ holds.

c. Describe the potential advantages and disadvantages of using $\overset{\infty}{\Omega}$-notation instead of Ω-notation to characterize the running times of programs.

Some authors also define O in a slightly different manner. We'll use O' for the alternative definition: $f(n) = O'(g(n))$ if and only if $|f(n)| = O(g(n))$.

d. What happens to each direction of the "if and only if" in Theorem 3.1 on page 56 if we substitute O' for O but still use Ω?

Some authors define $\tilde{O}$ (read "soft-oh") to mean O with logarithmic factors ignored:

$\tilde{O}(g(n)) = \{f(n) : \text{there exist positive constants } c, k, \text{ and } n_0 \text{ such that } 0 \leq f(n) \leq cg(n) \lg^k(n) \text{ for all } n \geq n_0\}.$

e. Define $\tilde{\Omega}$ and $\tilde{\Theta}$ in a similar manner. Prove the corresponding analog to Theorem 3.1.

ANS(a):

a. Relationship Between $f(n)$ and $g(n)$

Claim:

If $f(n)$ and $g(n)$ are two asymptotically nonnegative functions, then either $f(n) = O(g(n))$ or $f(n) = \Omega(g(n))$ (or both).

Proof:

If $f(n)$ grows at least as fast as $g(n)$ for infinitely many n, then $f(n) = \Omega(g(n))$. If $f(n)$ does not grow faster than $g(n)$, then $f(n) = O(g(n))$. Thus, one of the relations must hold.

ANS(b):

b. Existence of Functions

Claim:

There exist asymptotically nonnegative functions $f(n)$ and $g(n)$ such that neither $f(n) = O(g(n))$ nor $f(n) = \Omega(g(n))$.

Example:

Let $f(n) = n$ and $g(n) = n \log n$. Then:

- $f(n)$ is neither $O(g(n))$ nor $\Omega(g(n))$.

ANS(c):

c. Advantages and Disadvantages of Using Ω^*

Advantages:

- More expressive for certain comparisons when functions oscillate between bounds.
- Helps in cases where functions are tightly bounded.

Disadvantages:

- Can be less intuitive than the standard definitions of O and Ω.
- May complicate the analysis of algorithms if overused.

ANS(d):

d. Impact on Theorem 3.1

Claim:

Using O' instead of O in Theorem 3.1 means that the condition must hold for O' which accounts for logarithmic factors.

Result:

The conclusions may remain valid, but the specific constants involved in the analysis may change.