

## Problem Set 1

**Name:** Kim Heesuk

### Problem 1-1.

(a)  $f_1 = \log n^n = n \log n \in O(f_2)$ ,  $f_3 = \log n^{6006} = 6006 \log n \in \Theta(\log n)$ . So that  $f_3 \in O(f_1)$ . Meanwhile  $f_4 \in O(f_2)$ , and  $f_5 \in O(f_3)$ , the answer is  $(f_5, f_3, f_1, f_4, f_2)$ .

(b)  $f_2 \in O(f_5)$  and  $f_5 \in O(f_4)$ . Also  $f_1 \in O(f_2)$ ,  $f_5 \in O(f_3)$ . For  $f_3$  and  $f_4$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \log \frac{f_3}{f_4} &= \log \frac{2^{6006^n}}{6006^{2^n}} \\ &= 6006^n \log 2 - 2^n \log 6006 \\ &= 2^n (3003^n \log 2 - \log 6006) \rightarrow \infty \end{aligned} \tag{1}$$

$f_4 \in O(f_3)$  and the answer is  $(f_1, f_2, f_5, f_4, f_3)$ .

(c) Firstly,

$$\begin{aligned} f_2 &= \binom{n}{n-6} = \frac{n!}{6!(n-6)!} \\ &\in \Theta(n(n-1) \dots (n-5)) \\ &= \Theta(n^6), \end{aligned} \tag{2}$$

so  $f_5 = n^6 \in \Theta(f_2)$ . For  $f_4$ , by the Stirling's approximation,

$$\begin{aligned} \log f_4 &= \log \binom{n}{n/6} = \log \frac{n!}{(n/6)!(5n/6)!} \\ &\sim \log \frac{\sqrt{2\pi n}(n/e)^n}{\sqrt{2\pi n}(n/6e)^{n/6} \sqrt{2\pi n}(5n/6e)^{5n/6}} \\ &= \log \frac{(6/5^{5/6})^n}{\sqrt{2\pi n}} \\ &\in \Theta\left(n \log(6/5^{5/6}) - \frac{1}{2}(\log n + \log 2\pi)\right) = \Theta(n). \end{aligned} \tag{3}$$

since  $6/5^{5/6} > 1$ . Hence  $f_2 \in \Theta(f_5) \in O(f_4)$ ,  $f_4 \in O(f_1)$  since  $f_4 \in \{2^p | p \in \Theta(n)\} \subset \Omega(n^6)$  and  $\log f_1 \in \Theta(n \log n)$ . Also by the Stirling's approximation,

$$\begin{aligned} f_3 &= (6n)! \sim \sqrt{12\pi n}(6n/e)^{6n} \\ &\in \Theta((6n)^{6n}) \subset \Omega(n^n) = \Omega(f_1). \end{aligned} \tag{4}$$

Thus the answer is  $(\{f_2, f_5\}, f_4, f_1, f_3)$ .

- (d) Using the Stirling's approximation,  $f_1 \sim n^{n+4} + \sqrt{2\pi n}(n/e)^n \in \Theta(n^{n+4})$ . Also considering  $f_5/n^{12} = n^{1/n} \rightarrow 1$ ,  $f_5 = n^{12+1/n} \sim n^{12} \in \Theta(n^{12})$ . It is obvious that  $f_2 = n^{7\sqrt{n}} \in O(n^{n+4}) = O(f_1)$  and  $f_3 = 4^{3n \log n} \in O(7^{n^2}) = O(f_4)$ . Finally for  $f_3$  and  $n^{n+4} \in \Omega(f_1)$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \log \frac{f_3}{n^{n+4}} &= \log \frac{4^{3n \log n}}{n^{n+4}} \\ &= 3n \log n \cdot \log 4 - (n+4) \log n \\ &= ((3 \log 4 - 1)n - 4) \log n \rightarrow \infty, \end{aligned} \tag{5}$$

$f_3 \in O(n^{n+4}) = O(f_1)$ . The order should be  $(f_5, f_2, f_1, f_3, f_4)$ .

**Problem 1-2.**

(a)  $T(k) = O(\log n) + T(k - 1)$ ,  $T(k) = O(k \log n)$

```

1     def reverse(D, i, k): # T(k)
2         if k < 2:
3             return
4         D.insert_at(i + k - 1, D.delete_at(i)) # O(log(n))
5         reverse(D, i, k - 1) # T(k - 1)

```

If we call `reverse(D, i, 1)`, it returns and it is correct. Assume `reverse(D, i, k)` works right, `reverse(D, i, k + 1)` should work right because it deletes element of  $i$ 'th index, and insert it to  $i + k$  (next to the pre-deletion index  $i + k$ ) and reverses  $k$  items starting at index  $i$  of  $D$ , which resulting reverse  $k + 1$  items starting at index  $i$ .

(b)  $T(k) = O(\log n) + O(\log n) + T(k - 1)$ ,  $T(k) = O(k \log n)$

```

1     def move(D, i, k, j): #T(k)
2         if k < 1:
3             return
4         temp = D.delete_at(i) # O(log(n))
5         if j < i:
6             D.insert_at(j + 1, temp) # O(log(n))
7         else:
8             D.insert_at(j, temp) # O(log(n))
9         move(D, i, k - 1, j) # T(k-1)

```

Note that when  $j \geq i + k$  (which can be just  $\neg(j < i)$  since  $i \leq j < i + k$  is false), `D.delete_at(i)` makes the index of element with pre-deletion index  $j$  be  $j - 1$ .

**Problem 1-3.** `build(X)` constructs a static array with size  $|X|$  and store pages in that array. Also, it initializes some fields to provide operations for bookmarks.

- `A` index of page placed on in front of bookmark  $A$
- `B` index of page placed on in front of bookmark  $B$
- `array_front`
- `array_behind`
- `array_index` index of page of `array_behind[0]`

Pages between the bookmarks will be stored in separate arrays `array_front` and `array_behind` on which `place_mark(i, m)` called.

When there is no bookmark placed, `place_mark(i, m)` just set field `m` to `i`. There are three possible cases left.

1. One bookmark is placed and call `place_mark(i, m)` for that bookmark
2. One bookmark is placed and call `place_mark(i, m)` for other bookmark
3. All bookmarks are placed

For each cases, setting `m` to `i` is trivial.

For second case, let's assume  $B > A$ . Set `array_index` to  $(A + B)/2$  and construct dynamic array with size  $2 \cdot (B - \text{array\_index})$  for `array_behind`, and move page from index `array_index` to `B` here. For `array_front`, do same thing with size  $2 \cdot (\text{array\_index} - A)$ . If  $B = A$ , construct two empty dynamic arrays for  $A = B = \text{array\_index}$  with certain fixed size. This is needed to operate `shift_mark` correctly.

For third case, if such of a operation expands `array_front` or `array_behind`, if size of an array does not exceed the capacity of array, it could be just moving the elements. Else, each dynamic array can be expanded with twice of previous capacity. If it reduces but does not cross the `array_index` on either side, just setting `m` to `i` is sufficient. If it crosses, reallocate `array_front` and `array_behind` with same method for second case with new `array_index = (A + B)/2`.

Time complexity for this operation  $O(n)$  in worst case.

Assuming  $A < B$ , `read_page(i)` returns the  $i$ 'th index of original array if it is not between to the two bookmarks. (i.e.  $\neg(A < i \leq B)$ ) If it is, return sufficient page from `array_behind` or `array_front` due to the `array_index` and `i`. Note that `array_front` is inversed. It consumes constant time on either cases. So its  $O(1)$  in worst case.

On `shift_mark(m, d)`, the method is same as third case for `place_mark(i, m)` so we can just call this function with  $i = m + d$ . Note `m` denotes the field `A` or `B` which tracks index of page placed on in front of bookmark. Since  $d \in -1, 1$ , most operation would be done in constant time when it does not exceed the capacity or `array_index` in reduction. When the reallocate happen in each case, the time consumption would be  $O(n)$  however it can be said that the running time of operation is  $O(1)$  in amortized case since it is rarely happen.

**Problem 1-4.**

- (a)
- (b)
- (c)
- (d) Submit your implementation to `alg.mit.edu`.