Algorithms I

Definition

An **algorithm** is a *well defined* computation procedure that takes a set of values as input and produces a set of values as output.

Note: the term *well defined* is itself, not well defined.

Definitions

- **Problems** have specific inputs and outputs, input must be finite and not a stream of data.
- **Problem instances** is a specific set of inputs for a problem. A problem can have a Big-O but not a problem instance.
- A program is **correct** if for every input instance, it terminates with the correct output.

Note

- Randomised algorithms is a branch of incorrect algorithms.
- Some algorithms produce incorrect outputs with a probablility (e.g. quantum computing)
- Some algorithms loops infinitely for some inputs, but runs a lot faster that an algorithm that guarantees termination for cases where it terminates. It might be possible to determine whether it will terminate for a specific input before running it.
- Some algorithms gives an output within a margin of error (e.g. A* vs Dijkstra)

Notation

Arrays

- `A[1]` is the first item
- `A[1..n]` is an array of length `n`
- `A.length` is the number of items in the array

We write pseudocode that is

- Imparative
- Block structured
- Fixed form (indentation matters)
- Parameters are passed by values, objects are passed by pointers
- Loop induction (for loops) increments after the final loop

```
for i=1 to 10
  // do stuff
```

After this loop, consider `i=11`

Sorting

Each **key** may have attached payloads.

Insertion Sort

```
for j = 2 to A.length
  Key = A[j]
  i = j - 1
  while i > 0 && A[i] > Key
    A[i + 1] = A[i]
    i = i - 1
  A[i + 1] = Key
```

Use proof by induction for algorithms:

- **Initialisation**: find a property that is true at the start of the program

  P: at the start of each loop, $A[1...j-1]$ contains the $1...j-1$ items in sorted order.

  At the start of the first loop, that is just $[a_1]$, true.

  > **Note**
  > Define "the start of the loop" as: after assigning the value of j, but before running the first line of code in the loop.

- **Maintenance**: show that the property is maintained as the program is running.
- **Termination**: when the program terminates, show the output is correct.

  After the last loop, $A[1...A.\text{length}]$ would have been containing all the items $1...A.\text{length}$ in order.

  And then we can also show the program terminates as it only needs to complete the loop $A.\text{length}$ items.

> **Note**
> Which is the same as the following Hoare logic proof.
>
> Let P, Q be pre and post-conditions, B be body of the loop, C be condition for the loop.
>
> Given:
> 1. $\{P\}\ B\ \{P\}$
> 2. $P \land \neg C \Longrightarrow Q$
>
> Then $\{P\}$ while C do B $\{Q\}$

Analysis

> **Definition**
> **Analysis** is about predicting the resources (CPU, memory, disk operations) for input instances we haven't ran our algorithm on.

Input measurement	**Description**
$A.\text{length}$	Common for every day senarios, but may be incorrect if each item in array can have variable size (e.g. big integer)
no. of bits/bytes	Useful for algorithm that operates on some bit/byte value.
$2^{A.\text{length}}$	Overestimates the size in most cases, but can be used for search lists.

> **Definition**
> The **running time** of a program is the number of **basic operations**. (as they all cost 1)
>
> | **Basic operation** | **Cost** |
> |---|---|
> | Indexing an array $A[i]$ | 1 |
> | Arithmetic operation | 1 |
> | Comparisons | 1 |

Basic operation	Cost
Assigment to variables	1

One basic operation might not be equal to one clock cycle, if you change the cost of the basic operations, the running time changes.

Note
Comparisons (numbers) is usually done by subtracting one from another, then compare with 0.

Orer of Growth

- $\Theta(g(n))$ is the **asymptotic tight bound** for $g(n)$

$$f(n) \in \Theta(g(n)) \Longrightarrow \exists c_1, c_2, n_0 \in \mathbb{R}^+ : (\forall n \geq n_0 : c_1 g(n) \leq f(n) \leq c_2 g(n))$$

- $O(g(n))$ is the **asymptotic tight upper bound** for $g(n)$

$$f(n) \in O(g(n)) \Longrightarrow \exists c, n_0 \in \mathbb{R}^+ : (\forall n \geq n_0 : f(n) \leq cg(n))$$

- $\Omega(g(n))$ is the **asymptotic tight lower bound** for $g(n)$

$$f(n) \in \Omega(g(n)) \Longrightarrow \exists c, n_0 \in \mathbb{R}^+ : (\forall n \geq n_0 : cg(n) \leq f(n))$$

- $o(g(n))$ is the **asymptotic non-tight upper bound** for $g(n)$

$$f(n) \in o(g(n)) \Longrightarrow \forall c \in \mathbb{R}^+ : (\exists n_0 \in \mathbb{R}^+ : f(n) < cg(n))$$

- $\omega(g(n))$ is the **asymptotic non-tight lower bound** for $g(n)$

$$f(n) \in \omega(g(n)) \Longrightarrow \forall c \in \mathbb{R}^+ : (\exists n_0 \in \mathbb{R}^+ : cg(n) < f(n))$$

Properties of Orders of Growth

$$\Theta(g(n)) \subseteq O(g(n))$$
$$\Theta(g(n)) \subseteq \Omega(g(n))$$

- **Transitive**: satisfied by all 5 orders

$$f(n) \in \Theta(g(n)) \land g(n) \in \Theta(h(n)) \Longrightarrow f(n) \in \Theta(h(n))$$

- **Reflexive**: satisfied by the tight bounds Θ, O, Ω

$$f(n) \in \Theta(f(n))$$

- **Symmetric**: satisfied by Θ

$$f(n) \in \Theta(g(n)) \Longrightarrow g(n) \in \Theta(f(n))$$

Analysis of Insertion Sort

```
for j = 2 to A.length          // ran (n-1)+1 times
  Key = A[j]                   // ran n-1 times
  i = j - 1                    // ran n-1 times
  while i > 0 && A[i] < Key    // ran sum_(j=2)^n t_j times
    A[i+1] = A[i]              // ran sum_(j=2)^n (t_j - 1) times
    i = i - 1                  // ran sum_(j=2)^n (t_j - 1) times

  A[i+1] = Key                 // ran n-1 times
```

Where t_j is the number of times the while loop is tested on the jth cycle.

- Best case: $t_j = 1$ then $T(n) = pn + q$
- Worst case: $t_j = j$ then $T(n) = pn^2 + qn + r$
- Average case: the claim is that on average, half of the keys in $A[1...j-1]$ will be less than $A[j]$

  $t_g = j/2$ gives $T(n) \in O(n^2)$

The worst case is useful because
- It gives the upper bound on resource
- Often the same as the average case

Insertion sort is an **incremental algorithm**: it builds up an output that satisfies some properties.

Divide and Conquer

1. Split into 2 or more smaller subproblems.
2. call the same algorithm on each subproblem recursively.
3. Combine solutions to the subproblems to build the solution to the original problem.

> **Note**
> Recursion will terminate because the subproblem will get smaller and smaller.

Merge Sort

```
// we are sorting A[p..r]
if p < r
  q = floor((p + r) / 2)
  MergeSort(A, p, q)
  MergeSort(A, q + 1, r)
  Merge(A, p, q, r)
```

And `Merge` defined as

```
n1 = q - p + 1
n2 = r - q

L = new Array(1 .. n1 + 1)
R = new Array(1 .. n2 + 1)

L[1 .. n1] = A[p .. q]
L[n1 + 1] = infinity
R[1 .. n2] = A[q + 1 .. r]
R[n2 + 1] = infinity

i = j = 1

for k = p to r
  if L[i] <= R[j]
    A[k] = L[i]
    i = i + 1
  else
    A[k] = R[j]
    j = j + 1
```

- If the length of the array is not a power of 2, pad ∞ to the end so that it is.
- After sorting, remove the added ∞ at the end of the sorted array.

The input array is modified, `Merge` has no return value.

Recurrence Relations

The input size is lengh of the region to be sorted $n = r - p + 1$

Let $T(n)$ be the cost of solving $\text{MergeSort}(A, p, r)$
- If $p = r$, $T(1) = 1$
- If $p < r$

<table>
<tr><th>Action</th><th>Cost</th></tr>
<tr><td>Calculate q</td><td>$\Theta(1)$</td></tr>
<tr><td>Calls itself on 2 subproblems</td><td>$T(n/2) \times 2$</td></tr>
<tr><td>Calls $\text{Merge}(A, p, q, r)$
<table>
<tr><th>Action</th><th>Cost</th></tr>
<tr><td>Creates 2 arrays of length $n + 2$</td><td>$\Theta(n)$</td></tr>
<tr><td>Loop n iterations: assign into array and increment i or j</td><td>$\Theta(n)$</td></tr>
</table>
</td><td>$\Theta(n)$</td></tr>
</table>

$$
\begin{aligned}
T(1) &= 1 \\
T(n) &= \Theta(1) \text{ work} + 2 \cdot T\left(\frac{n}{2}\right) + \Theta(n) \text{ work} \\
&= k_1 + 2 \cdot T\left(\frac{n}{2}\right) + k_2 \cdot n
\end{aligned}
$$

Definition

A **closed form solution** is not defined in terms of itself through direct or indirect recursion.

$$
\begin{aligned}
T(n) &= k_1 + k_2 \cdot n + 2 \cdot T\left(\frac{n}{2}\right) \\
&= k_1 + k_2 \cdot n + 2 \cdot \left(k_1 + k_2 \cdot \frac{n}{2} + 2 \cdot T\left(\frac{n}{4}\right)\right) \\
&= k_1 + k_2 \cdot n + 2 \cdot \left(k_1 + k_2 \cdot \frac{n}{2} + 2 \cdot \left(k_1 + k_2 \cdot \frac{n}{4} + 2 \cdot T\left(\frac{n}{4}\right)\right)\right) \\
&\vdots \\
&= k_1 \cdot \underbrace{(1 + 2 + 4 + \ldots)}_{\log n \text{ terms}} + k_2 \cdot n \cdot \underbrace{(1 + 1 + 1 + \ldots)}_{\log n \text{ times}} + 2^{\log n} \cdot T(1) \\
&= k_1 \cdot (n - 1) + k_2 \cdot n \log n + n \\
&\in \Theta(n \log n)
\end{aligned}
$$

Note

We preserved the equal signs instead of saying "this term dominates" so we know $T(n) \in \Theta(f(n))$ instead of just $O(f(n))$

If the array length is not a power of 2

$$
T(n) = T(\lceil n/2 \rceil) + T(\lfloor n/2 \rfloor) + k_1 + k_2 \cdot n
$$

Which gives the same solution.

The Master Theorem

Let $a \geq 1$ and $b > 1$ be constants.

- $T(1) = 1$
- $T(n) = a \cdot T(n/b) + f(n)$

Note
n/b can be interpreted as ceil or floor, it doesn't matter.

$$f(n) \in O\left(n^{-\varepsilon + \log_b a}\right) \text{ for some } \varepsilon > 0 \Longrightarrow T(n) \in \Theta(n \log_b a)$$
$$f(n) \in \Theta\left(n^{\log_b a}\right) \Longrightarrow T(n) \in \Theta(n \log_b a \cdot \lg n)$$
$$f(n) \in \Omega\left(n^{\varepsilon + \log_b a}\right) \text{ for some } \varepsilon > 0 \text{ and } f(n/b) \leq cf(n)$$
$$\text{for some } c > 1 \text{ for all sufficiently large } n \Longrightarrow T(n) \in \Theta(f(n))$$

Note
There is an extended master theorem for conditions between case 2 and 3.

Quicksort

```
QuickSort(A, p, r)
  if p < r
    q = partition(A, p, r)
    QuickSort(A, p, q - 1)
    QuickSort(A, q + 1, r)

Partition(A, p, r)
  x = A[r]
  i = p - 1
  for j = p to r - 1
    if A[j] <= x
      i = i + 1
      swap(A[i], A[j])
  swap(A[i + 1], A[r])
  return i + 1
```

The strategy: **divide** (partition array into 3 parts), **conquer** (recurse on L and G), **combine** (no-op).

Requirements for **Partition(A, p, r)** is
- Pick any element as pivot
- Rearrange so array looks like $[\text{items} \leq \text{pivot}, \text{pivot}, \text{items} \geq \text{pivot}]$

$$[L, x, G]$$

Proof
Let P be the statement:
1. If $p \leq k \leq i$ then $A[k] \leq x$
2. If $i + 1 \leq k \leq j - 1$ then $A[k] > x$
3. If $k = r$ then $A[k] = x$

Note
No statements made for $j \leq x \leq r - 1$ which is the unprocessed region.

- **Initialisation**: (1) and (2) vacuously true, (3) is true by definition.
- **Maintenance**

    - Case does not enters if branch: (1) and (3) remains true, (2) is true as the new item $> x$
    - Case enters if branch: (3) remains true, (1) and (2) are true as their new items both satisfies contraint.
- The final swap ensures post-condition.

Performance

The number of comparisons depends on how Partition splits the array.

Best case: partition splits array in half

$$T(1) = 1$$
$$T(n) = 2 \cdot T\left(\frac{n}{2}\right) + k \cdot n$$
$$T(n) \in \Theta(n \log n)$$

by master theorem.
