2.1-3 Linear Search

```
1: procedure LINEAR-SEARCH(A, v)

2: for i \leftarrow 1 to length[A] do

3: if A[i] == v then

4: return i

5: return NILL
```

Proof of correctness To prove linear search is correct, I formulate a *loop invariant* that need to hold true at *initialization*, during *maintainance* and at *termination*.

Loop invariant At the start of loop iteration i, the value v is not in the sub-array A[1..i-1]. In formal terms, $v \notin \{A[j]|j \in \{1,...,i-1\}\}$

Initialization At initialization i = 0, so the sub-array A[1..i-1] is empty. So v is trivially not a member of that array, and the loop invariant holds.

Maintenance Assuming that v is not in the sub-array A[1..i-1] at the start of iteration i, then two outcomes are possible during the iteration. Either, A[i] == v and the loop terminates, or $A[i] \neq v$ and v is not an element of the array A[1..i] which is the loop invariance condition for iteration i+1.

Termination The algoritm terminates in two different ways. The first happens when A[i] == v, assuming $v \notin A[1..i-1]$ before termination, then the loop invariant still holds. Again, assuming $v \notin A[1..i-1]$ before termination. In the second case we have that i = n+1, in that case $v \notin A[1..i-1] = A[1..n]$, which is the entire array, and the procedure returns NILL.

2.2-3 Running time of Linear search

Assuming the index of correct element is uniformly distributed from 1 to n, the expected index is E[i] = n/2. So the average case running time must be $c_1 \frac{n}{2} + c_2$, where c_1 is the running time of each comparison A[i] == v and the loop increment, and c_2 is the running time of the return statement. In the worst case the algorithm needs to run through all n elements as well as returning NILL, so the running time is $c_1 n + c_2$. Both the average and worst case running times of linear search are $\Theta(n)$.

2.3-3 Linear Reccurence

To show that the reccursion

$$T(n) = \begin{cases} 2 & \text{if } n = 2\\ 2T(n/2) + n & \text{if } n = 2^k, \text{ for } k > 1 \end{cases}$$

is $T(n) = n \lg n$. Assuming that n is a power of two we have $n = 2^k$ for $k \in 1, 2, \ldots$ For k = 1 we have that T(n) = T(2) = 2 by definition of T.

$$2\lg(2) = 2 = T(2).$$

Hence the claim holds for k = 1.

Next, assuming that $T(2^{k-1}) = 2^{k-1} \lg 2^{k-1} = (k-1)2^{k-1}$ we have that,

$$T(n) = 2T(n/2) + n$$

$$= 2T(2^{k}/2) + 2^{k}$$

$$= 2T(2^{k-1}) + 2^{k}$$

$$= 2((k-1)2^{k-1}) + 2^{k}$$

$$= k2^{k}$$

$$= 2^{k} \lg(2^{k}) = n \lg n$$

so the claim also holds for k given it holds for k-1, at since it holds true for k=1 it holds for any $k \geq 1$.

2.3-5 Binary search

```
1: procedure Binary-Search(A, p, r, v)
        if p \leq r then
2:
           m = p + \left\lfloor \frac{r-p}{2} \right\rfloor
if A[m] == v then
3:
 4:
               return m
 5:
 6:
            else if A[m] > v then
               return Binary-Search(A, p, m - 1, v)
 7:
            else if A[m] < v then
 8:
                return Binary-Search(A, m +1, r, v)
9:
10:
        return NILL
```

In the worst case, binary search needs to split the array in two, untill the last split goes from two elements to a single one. A way of assessing the running time is to understand how many possible splits can be made. Assuming the length of the array is $n=2^k$, the length after the first split is simply n/2. Finding the length of the consequent halfed arrays, amounts to raising the half to the number of splits and multiplying by the initial size, n. So, to find the number of splits which result in the length of 1, we need to solve the following,

$$1 = \frac{n}{2^x} \Leftrightarrow 2^x = n \Leftrightarrow x = \lg n.$$

So we can conclude, that the recursion calls itself at most $\lg n$ times, this is an indication of the worst case running time being $\Theta(\lg n)$.