

4-2.

- (a) Go through the array once, calculating the max and min element so far. Find the difference.
Runs in $O(n)$ time.
- (b) Find the difference of $S[0]$ and $S[n-1]$. Runs in $O(1)$ time.
- (c) Sort the array in $O(n \log n)$; then go through the array finding the two pairs that are closest in $O(n)$. Runs in $O(n \log n)$ time
- (d) Same as (c) without the need to sort in $O(n \log n)$ to give $O(n)$

4-6.

Sort one of the sets, say S_1 . This is $O(n \log n)$

Walk each element of S_2 , find the difference between S_i and x . This would take $O(n)$

Do a binary search of S_1 to see if that value exists in S_1 . This is $O(\log n)$ each.

Total run time : $O(n \log n) + O(n \log n) \times O(n) \rightarrow O(n \log n) + O(n \log n) \rightarrow O(n \log n)$

4-12.

Build an unsorted list in $O(n)$ that ensures that the smallest item is at the top of the heap. Next, extract the k smallest items in $O(k \log n)$ time to give the desired $O(n + k \log n)$ run time.

4-29.

The lower bound on sorting is $\Omega(n \log n)$; if his claim is true, then it would be possible to use his data structure to sort a sequence of n numbers in $O(n)$ time by just inserting all the numbers and then extracting the maximum values consecutively.

4-33.

1. low = 0, high = n

2. mid = low + high / 2

3. if A[mid] == mid return true

4. Do ->

 if A[mid] > mid

 possible index is in the left half of the array

 high = mid

 return to 2

 else

 possible index is in the right half of the array

 low = mid

 return to 2