

### 7.3-2

In the worst case, when RANDOMIZED-PARTITION partition the array into  $n-1$  elements and 0 elements. Number of call to RANDOM = Number of call to RANDOMIZED-PARTITION.

$T(n) = T(n-1) + 1$  So we know  $T(n) = \Theta(n)$

Similarly, in the best case,  $T(n) = 2T(n/2) + 1$ ,  $T(n) = \Theta(n)$

### 9.3-1

If we divide the input into 7 groups instead of 5, after partitioning the input array with the median-of-median, say  $m^*$ , as the pivot element, we can get a lower bound on the number of elements that are greater than  $m^*$  and a lower bound on the number of elements smaller than  $m^*$  as follows.

For elements greater than  $m^*$ , half of sublists consisting of 7 elements has at least 4 elements that are greater than  $m^*$ . We here are indeed discounting the sublist containing  $m^*$  and the final sublist which has a size at most 7. Thus number of elements greater than  $m^*$  is at least  $4 \cdot (\lceil \frac{1}{2} \lceil \frac{n}{7} \rceil \rceil - 2) \geq \frac{2n}{7} - 8$ .

Similarly, the number of elements that are smaller than  $m^*$  is also at least  $\frac{2n}{7} - 8$ .

So the algorithm in step 5, calls itself recursively on a problem of size at most  $n - \frac{2n}{7} - 8 = \frac{5n}{7} + 8$ . Thus the recurrence relation for the runtime becomes

$$T(n) \leq T(\lceil \frac{n}{7} \rceil) + T(\frac{5n}{7} + 8) + O(n).$$

We want to verify if the above recurrence has the solution that  $T(n) = c \cdot n$  for some constant  $c > 0$ . To do so, we use the substitution method of solving recurrence relations. Assume  $T(n) \leq c \cdot n$  for some  $c > 0$ . We have that,

$$\begin{aligned} T(n) &\leq T(\lceil \frac{n}{7} \rceil) + T(\frac{5n}{7} + 8) + a \cdot n \\ &\leq c \lceil \frac{n}{7} \rceil + c(\frac{5n}{7} + 8) + a \cdot n \\ &\leq cn/7 + c(\frac{5n}{7} + 8) + a \cdot n \end{aligned}$$

The above RHS is at most  $c \cdot n$  iff

$$\begin{aligned} cn/7 + c(\frac{5n}{7} + 8) + a \cdot n &\leq c \cdot n \\ 8c + a \cdot n &\leq \frac{cn}{7} \\ a \cdot n &\leq c(\frac{n}{7} - 8) \\ c &\geq \frac{a \cdot n}{(\frac{n}{7} - 8)} = \frac{7an}{n-56} \end{aligned}$$

So we should choose  $n > 56$  and then a constant  $c$  exists such that  $c > \frac{7a}{1 - \frac{56}{n}}$ .

So if we choose  $n > 2 \cdot 56 = 112$ , we have that  $1 - \frac{56}{n} > 1/2$  and  $c > 14a$ . Since

the conditions for choosing  $c$  can be satisfied, the SELECT algorithm still runs in linear time.

For the case when we divide the input elements into groups of 3 elements each, we can still compute the number of elements that are greater than  $m^*$  and smaller than  $m^*$  similarly. We get that at least  $2(\lceil \frac{1}{2} \lceil \frac{n}{3} \rceil \rceil - 2)$  elements are greater than  $m^*$  and a like number are smaller than  $m^*$ . Thus, in step 5, the size of the subproblem is at most  $n - (\frac{n}{3} - 4) = \frac{2n}{3} + 4$ . The recurrence relation for the running time of SELECT becomes

$$T(n) \leq T(\lceil n/3 \rceil) + T(\frac{2n}{3} + 4) + O(n).$$

The solution for above recurrence does not satisfy  $T(n) = O(n)$ . So with groups of 3 elements SELECT does not run in linear time. The reason for this is that during step 5, we are still left with a subproblems of total size  $n$ . Thus, we did not manage to reduce the size of the problem effectively. This can also be seen by solving for  $T(n)$  using the iteration/recursion tree method where at each level of the tree we have a subproblem of size  $n$  and we are performing  $O(n)$  work at each level of the tree. So the overall runtime cannot be linear. On the other hand, for the case where we divided the input into sublists of size 5 or 7, the total size of the problem reduces to less than  $n$ .

For the case of dividing the input into sets of size 4, a similar calculation would show that the runtime of SELECT would be  $O(n \log n)$ . It would be good exercise to put the size of the sublist as a parameter  $b$  and deduce conditions of the value of  $b$ . (as in Q5).

## 9-1

a. Sort the numbers using merge-sort or heapsort, which takes  $\Theta(n \lg n)$  worst-case time. (Don't use quicksort or insertion sort, which can take  $\Theta(n^2)$  time.) Put the  $i$  largest elements into the output array, takes  $\Theta(i)$  time.

Total worst-case running time:  $\Theta(n \lg n + i) = \Theta(n \lg n)$

b. Implement max-priority queue takes time of  $\Theta(n)$ . Call Extract-Max  $i$  times takes time of  $\Theta(i \lg n)$ . So total worst-case running time is  $\Theta(n + i \lg n)$ .

c. Use the SELECT algorithm to find the  $i$ th largest number in  $\Theta(n)$  time. Partition around that number in  $\Theta(n)$  time. Sort the  $i$  largest takes  $\Theta(i \lg i)$  worst-case time.

Total time:  $\Theta(n + i \lg i)$ .

## 17.1-3

For the first  $2^n$  operations, the sum of costs are:

$$1 + 2 + 1 + 4 + 1 + 1 + 1 + 1 + 8 + \dots + 2^n = \sum_{i=1}^n 2^i + (2^n - n)$$

$$\text{So the cost per operation is } \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n 2^i + (2^n - n)}{2^n} = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{2^{n+1} - 2 + 2^n - n}{2^n} = 3$$

## 17.2-2

Let the amortized cost of each operation be:  $\hat{c}_i = 3$

Suppose  $\lg n$  is interger, then:

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{i=1}^n c_i &= 2^{\lg n+1} - 1 - 1 + 2^{\lg n} - \lg n) \\
&= 2n - 2 + n - \lg n \\
&= 3n - \lg n - 2 \\
\sum_{i=1}^n \hat{c}_i - \sum_{i=1}^n c_i &= 3n - (3n - \lg n - 2) = \lg n + 2 > 0
\end{aligned}$$