

BITS Pilani, Pilani Campus  
2<sup>nd</sup> Semester 2016-17 - Mid-Semester Test  
CS F211 Data Structures & Algorithms

Time: 90 minutes

(Open Book)

Marks: 50

**IMPORTANT NOTE:**

- Write algorithms in C-like pseudocode. Do not write prose.
- Answers will be marked for correctness as well as for clarity / precision and efficiency.

End of NOTE.

**Q1. [Expected Time: 24 minutes**

**Marks: 3+3+2+2=10M]**

- (a) Use the partitioning procedure (from Quick Sort) to design an algorithm to sort a list of  $N$  values each with a key  $S$ ,  $C$ ,  $H$ , or  $D$  using at most  $2 \cdot N$  comparisons. Assume  $part(Ls, lo, hi, piv)$  is available and returns  $p$  such that  $Ls[j] \leq piv$  if  $lo \leq j < p$ ;  $Ls[p] = piv$ , and  $Ls[j] > piv$  if  $p < j \leq hi$ . Also assume  $S < C < H < D$ .
- (b) What is the worst-case number of swap operations required in an implementation of *partition* that scans the list from both ends? Let the size of the list be  $N$ . [Note: The answer should be an accurate function i.e. do not use order notation. End of Note.] When does the worst case occur?
- (c) Why does Insertion Sort run faster than Quick Sort on “small” lists?
- (d) Which of the following implementations of *insertInOrder* will perform better if the list  $Ls$  is stored in a magnetic tape (or other sequential access data storage)?

*insertInOrder1*( $x$ ,  $Ls$ ,  $size$ )

```
{  
    for ( $j=0$ ;  $j<size$  &&  $Ls[j]<x$ ;  $j++$ ) /*do nothing */ ;  
    if ( $j==size$ ) {  $Ls[j]=x$ ; return; }  
    do {  $t=Ls[j]$ ;  $Ls[j]=x$ ;  $x=t$ ;  $j++$ ; } while ( $j<size$ );  
}
```

*insertInOrder2*( $x$ ,  $Ls$ ,  $size$ )

```
{  
    for ( $j=size$ ;  $j>0$  &&  $Ls[j]>x$ ;  $j--$ )  $Ls[j]=Ls[j-1]$ ;  
     $Ls[j]=x$ ;  
}
```

**Q2. [Expected Time: 5 minutes**

**Marks: 1+3=4M]**

Consider the following sorting algorithm:

*maxsort*( $Ls$ ,  $N$ )

```
{  
    if ( $N \leq 1$ ) return;  
     $ml = findMax(Ls, N)$ ; // findMax returns the index of the maximum value in  $Ls[0]..Ls[N-1]$   
    swapArrElem( $Ls, N-1, ml$ ); // swapArrElem( $A, x, y$ ) swaps the values at  $A[x]$  and  $A[y]$   
    maxsort( $Ls, N-1$ );  
}
```

- (a) What is the space complexity of *maxsort* (as given)? [*findMax* uses  $O(1)$  space, worst case].
- (b) Rewrite *maxsort* as an  $O(1)$  – worst-case – space algorithm.

**Q3. [Expected Time: 15 minutes**

**Marks: 6M]**

Design an ADT *MaxStack* with the following operations – each of  $O(1)$  time complexity – on a LIFO list:

- *push* (adds the given element to the top of the list),
- *pop* (deletes the top element and returns it),
- *create* (creates a new list), and
- *max* (returns the maximum value in the list).

**Q4. [Expected Time: 36 minutes]**

**Marks: 4+4+6+4+6=24M]**

(a) Consider the following hash function for string  $x$  of length  $k$ :

$$h(x, a, m) = (x_0 * a^{k-1} + x_1 * a^{k-2} + \dots + x_{k-2} * a + x_{k-1}) \bmod m$$

$a$  is a constant in the range  $1..m-1$ . Write a  $\theta(k*b^2)$  time algorithm for  $h$ , where  $b=\log(m)$ .

(b) Suppose the inputs are hyperlinks (i.e. URLs for web pages). Change the hash function in (a) and your algorithm so as to reduce the time complexity of hashing to  $\theta(\log(k)*b^2)$ .

[Hint: You may sample the characters. End of Hint.]

(c) Design a hashtable  $T$  (with operations *create*, *add*, and *find*) such that:

- the hash function,  $h1$ , is the one you designed in answer to (b)
- collision is resolved by storing the values in a nested hashtable using an additional hash function  $h2$ : i.e.  $T[j]$  is a hashtable for each  $j$  in  $0..m-1$  and
- each hashtable  $T[j]$  is separately chained i.e. collision due to  $h2$  is resolved by chaining elements in a linked list.

[Note: Write algorithms for the three operations. Assume duplicates don't happen. (i.e. input strings are unique.). End of Note.]

(d) Design a suitable hash function  $h2$  for your hashtable design in (c) considering the input strings (i.e. URLs), the size of the top level table  $m$ , and the hash function  $h1$ . Choose an appropriate modulus (i.e. size of the nested tables) and justify your choices (of hash function and modulus).

(e) Analyse the worst-case and expected-case time complexity measures of *add* and *find* operations in your answer to (c). Account for the hashing cost as well in your analyses.

**Q5. [Expected Time: 10 minutes]**

**Marks: 6M]**

Consider a list of (first degree) student records at BITS (from creation of the University to today). The list is to be sorted by ID i.e. to be *multi-key sorted* by the following fields in that order:

<AdmissionYear> <Campus> <Degree> <3DigitCode>.

- The University was created in 1964. Each year at most 1000 first degree students are admitted in a campus. Number of students within a degree may vary.
- Campus codes are P, D, G, and H. ( $P < D < G < H$ )
- Degree codes are A1,A2,A3,A4,A5,A7,A8,B1,B2,B3,B4,B5, and D1 in increasing order.

Design your own sorting algorithm using any or all of bucket, radix, and insertion sorting ideas:

- You may assume procedures *bucket(Ls, lo, hi, bucketList, numBucks, getKey)*, and *insertSort(Ls, lo, hi, getKey)* are available.
  - Mention any assumptions you make about these functions and any additional helper functions you use.
- Note that *getKey* is a function – that is passed as an argument to these sorting procedures - to get the key of a given element:
  - Mention all the *getKey* functions used (and what they return) for clarity.
- Assume *bucketList* is an array of pairs of the form <bucket, count> i.e. for instance, *bucketList[2].count* gives the number of elements added to *bucketList[2].bucket*.

For instance, *bucketSort(Ls, lo, hi, bucketList, numBs, getKeyCampus)* will bucket elements *Ls[lo]..Ls[hi]* into *numBs* buckets in *bucketList* using *getKeyCampus(e)* to get the key of an element *e*. The sorted output should be back in the original space (i.e. *Ls*).

=====END=====