

Given a function `rand7` which generates a uniform random integer in the range 1 to 7, write a function `rand10` which generates a uniform random integer in the range 1 to 10.

Do NOT use system's `Math.random()`.

Example 1:

Input: 1

Output: [7]

Example 2:

Input: 2

Output: [8,4]

Example 3:

Input: 3

Output: [8,1,10]

Note:

- `rand7` is predefined.
- Each testcase has one argument: `n`, the number of times that `rand10` is called.

Follow up:

- What is the **expected value** for the number of calls to `rand7()` function?
- Could you minimize the number of calls to `rand7()` ?

Solution

Approach 1: Rejection Sampling

Intuition

What if you could generate a random integer in the range 1 to 49? How would you generate a random integer in the range of 1 to 10? What would you do if the generated number is in the desired range? What if it is not?

Algorithm

This solution is based upon [Rejection Sampling](#). The main idea is when you generate a number in the desired range, output that number immediately. If the number is out of the desired range, reject it and re-sample again. As each number in the desired range has the same probability of being chosen, a uniform distribution is produced.

Obviously, we have to run `rand7()` function at least twice, as there are not enough numbers in the range of 1 to 10. By running `rand7()` twice, we can get integers from 1 to 49 uniformly. Why?

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
2	8	9	10	1	2	3	4
3	5	6	7	8	9	10	1
4	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
5	9	10	1	2	3	4	5
6	6	7	8	9	10	*	*
7	*	*	*	*	*	*	*

A table is used to illustrate the concept of rejection sampling. Calling `rand7()` twice will get us row and column index that corresponds to a unique position in the table above. Imagine that you are choosing a number randomly from the table above. If you hit a number, you return that number immediately. If you hit a `*`, you repeat the process again until you hit a number.

Since 49 is not a multiple of 10, we have to use rejection sampling. Our desired range is integers from 1 to 40, which we can return the answer immediately. If not (the integer falls between 41 to 49), we reject it and repeat the whole process again.

```
C++JavaCopy
1 class Solution {
2 public:
3     int rand10() {
4         int row, col, idx;
5         do {
6             row = rand7();
7             col = rand7();
8             idx = col + (row - 1) * 7;
9         } while (idx > 40);
10        return 1 + (idx - 1) % 10;
11    }
12};
```

Complexity Analysis

- Time Complexity: $O(1)$ average, but $O(\infty)$ worst case.

The **expected value** for the number of calls to `rand7()` can be computed as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} E(\text{\# calls to rand7}) &= 2 \cdot \frac{40}{49} + \\ &\quad 4 \cdot \frac{9}{49} \cdot \frac{40}{49} + \\ &\quad 6 \cdot \left(\frac{9}{49}\right)^2 \cdot \frac{40}{49} + \\ &\quad \dots \\ &= \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \left(\frac{9}{49}\right)^{k-1} \cdot \frac{40}{49} \\ &= \frac{80}{49 \cdot \left(1 - \frac{9}{49}\right)^2} \\ &= 2.45 \end{aligned}$$

- Space Complexity: $O(1)$.

Approach 2: Utilizing out-of-range samples

Intuition

There are a total of 2.45 calls to `rand7()` on average when using approach 1. Can we do better? Glad that you asked. In fact, we are able to improve average number of calls to `rand7()` by about 10%.

The idea is that we should not throw away the out-of-range samples, but instead use them to increase our chances of finding an in-range sample on the successive call to `rand7`.

Algorithm

Start by generating a random integer in the range 1 to 49 using the aforementioned method. In the event that we could not generate a number in the desired range (1 to 40), it is equally likely that each number of 41 to 49 would be chosen. In other words, we are able to obtain integers in the range of 1 to 9 uniformly. Now, run `rand7()` again to obtain integers in the range of 1 to 63 uniformly. Apply rejection sampling where the desired range is 1 to 60. If the generated number is in the desired range (1 to 60), we return the number. If it is not (61 to 63), we at least obtain integers of 1 to 3 uniformly. Run `rand7()` again to obtain integers in the range of 1 to 21 uniformly. The desired range is 1 to 20, and in the unlikely event we get a 21, we reject it and repeat the entire process again.

```
C++JavaCopy
1 class Solution {
2 public:
3     int rand10() {
4         int a, b, idx;
5         while (true) {
6             a = rand7();
7             b = rand7();
8             idx = b + (a - 1) * 7;
9             if (idx <= 40)
10                return 1 + (idx - 1) % 10;
11            a = idx - 40;
12            b = rand7();
13            // get uniform dist from 1 - 63
14            idx = b + (a - 1) * 7;
15            if (idx <= 60)
16                return 1 + (idx - 1) % 10;
17            a = idx - 60;
18            b = rand7();
19            // get uniform dist from 1 - 21
20            idx = b + (a - 1) * 7;
21            if (idx <= 20)
22                return 1 + (idx - 1) % 10;
23        }
24    }
25};
```

Complexity Analysis

- Time Complexity: $O(1)$ average, but $O(\infty)$ worst case.

The **expected value** for the number of calls to `rand7()` can be computed as follows (with some steps omitted due to tediousness):

$$\begin{aligned} E(\text{\# calls to rand7}) &= 2 \cdot \frac{40}{49} + \\ &\quad 3 \cdot \frac{9}{49} \cdot \frac{60}{63} + \\ &\quad 4 \cdot \frac{9}{49} \cdot \frac{3}{63} \cdot \frac{20}{21} + \\ &\quad \left(\frac{9}{49} \cdot \frac{3}{63} \cdot \frac{1}{21}\right) \times \\ &\quad \left(6 \cdot \frac{40}{49} + \right. \\ &\quad \quad 7 \cdot \frac{9}{49} \cdot \frac{60}{63} + \\ &\quad \quad \left. 8 \cdot \frac{9}{49} \cdot \frac{3}{63} \cdot \frac{20}{21}\right) + \\ &\quad \left(\frac{9}{49} \cdot \frac{3}{63} \cdot \frac{1}{21}\right)^2 \times \\ &\quad \left(10 \cdot \frac{40}{49} + \right. \\ &\quad \quad 11 \cdot \frac{9}{49} \cdot \frac{60}{63} + \\ &\quad \quad \left. 12 \cdot \frac{9}{49} \cdot \frac{3}{63} \cdot \frac{20}{21}\right) + \\ &\quad \dots \\ &= 2.2123 \end{aligned}$$

- Space Complexity: $O(1)$.

Rate this article: ★★★★★

Type comment here... (Markdown is supported)

Preview

Post

vadimtucaev

★ 119

July 21, 2018 1:21 AM

First approach can be done much more effective:

```
int
rand10(void)
{
```

13

Share

Reply

SHOW 6 REPLIES

Rooppesh

★ 5

May 31, 2020 10:13 AM

Why won't rand7()*rand7()/2 work?

1

Share

Reply

SHOW 2 REPLIES

Kelvos

★ 1

February 17, 2020 12:51 AM

the formatting in the solution page is a bit off if anyone can give it an update

1

Share

Reply

sanazk

★ 3

November 6, 2018 10:45 AM

Can someone explain to me how the table works? I can't figure out what the numbers are and how the table is filled out?

1

Share

Reply

SHOW 2 REPLIES

ckclark

★ 27

October 16, 2018 10:17 AM

The expected value of Approach 2 should be 3158401 / 1440000 = 2.19333402777778

1

Share

Reply

SHOW 2 REPLIES

abdlwahdsa

★ 0

January 13, 2019 2:25 AM

a simpler way to think the first 2 rand7() calls give a number in [41,49] is to do 1 more rand7() and think of the 3 calls so far as a 3-dim index into a 7x7x7 cube. if it falls in [1,340] then we're good. this way we end up with the same passing probability of 340/(7x7x7) = 340/343. This can be generalized more easily i think. (higher dimensional cubes)

0

Share

Reply

jstein

★ 1

March 27, 2019 3:24 PM

Just notice $7 * 7 * 7 = 2401$, and we know the prob of having to call `rand10()` again is just $1/2401$. Though the worst time complexity is still $O(\infty)$, the prob of worse cases are much smaller (compared to the prob in Approach 1, which is $9/49$).

0

Share

Reply

SHOW 1 REPLY

maliksagar

★ 11

February 25, 2019 11:56 AM

Simple , concise and can be extended for any k

```
class Solution extends SolBase {
    static final int K=10;
    int curr=rand7();
```

0

Share

Reply

SHOW 4 REPLIES

aniket978

★ 11

July 18, 2018 11:14 PM

Complexity analysis is left blank. Is it a mistake?

0

Share

Reply

SHOW 1 REPLY

awaracoder

★ 13

June 3, 2020 10:16 AM

Copy the expected value explanation to a MathJax editor to render it.

0

Share

Reply

123