1. Determine the asymptotic running time of the following procedure (an exact computation of number of basic operations is not necessary):

```
int[] arrays(int n) {
   int[] arr = new int[n];
   for(int i = 0; i < n; ++i){
      arr[i] = 1;
   }
   for(int i = 0; i < n; ++i) {
      for(int j = i; j < n; ++j){
        arr[i] += arr[j] + i + j;
      }
   }
   return arr;
}</pre>
```

**Soln**: Running time is  $O(n) + O(n^2)$ . By an exercise, this is  $O(n^2)$ .

2. Consider the following problem: As input you are given two sorted arrays of integers. Your objective is to design an algorithm that would merge the two arrays together to form a new sorted array that contains all the integers contained in the two arrays. For example, on input

```
[1, 4, 5, 8, 17], [2, 4, 8, 11, 13, 21, 23, 25] the algorithm would output the following array: [1,2,4,4,5,8,8, 11, 13, 17, 21, 23, 25] For this problem, do the following:
```

A. Design an algorithm Merge to solve this problem and write your algorithm description using the pseudo-code syntax discussed in class.

Soln: Pseudo-code design description

```
Algorithm Merge(arr1, arr2):
    Input: Two sorted arrays arr1 and arr2
    Output: A merged sorted array containing all elements of arr1 and arr2

If length of arr1 is equal to 0 then return arr2

End If

If length of arr2 is equal to 0 then return arr1

End If

n1 ← length(arr1)
n2 ← length(arr2)
result ← array of size (n1 + n2)
i ← 0 // Pointer for arr1
j ← 0 // Pointer for result
```

```
// Traverse both arrays until one is exhausted
   while i < n1 and j < n2 do
      if arr1[i] \le arr2[j] then
         result[k] \leftarrow arr1[i]
         i \leftarrow i + 1
      else
         result[k] \leftarrow arr2[i]
         j \leftarrow j + 1
      end if
      k \leftarrow k + 1
   end while
   // Store remaining elements of arr1
   while i < n1 do
      result[k] \leftarrow arr1[i]
      i \leftarrow i + 1
      k \leftarrow k + 1
   end while
   // Store remaining elements of arr2
   while i < n2 do
      result[k] \leftarrow arr2[j]
     i \leftarrow i + 1
      k \leftarrow k + 1
   end while
   return result
end Algorithm
```

B. Examining your pseudo-code, determine the asymptotic running time of this merge algorithm

**Soln**: The overall running time of the algorithm is dominated by the main while loop and the step that handles the remaining elements. Therefore, the asymptotic running time of the merge algorithm is O(n1+n2).

C. Implement your pseudo-code as a Java method merge having the following signature:

```
int[] merge(int[] arr1, int[] arr2)
Be sure to test your method in a main method to be sure it really works!
```

## Soln:

```
public class MergeSortedArrays {
    private static int[] merge(int[] arr1, int[] arr2){
        if(arr1.length == 0) {
            return arr2;
        }
        if(arr2.length == 0) {
```

```
return arr1;
  int n1 = arr1.length;
  int n2 = arr2.length;
  int[] result = new int[n1 + n2];
  int i = 0, j = 0, k = 0; // Initialize the pointers for arr1, arr2 and result respectively.
  // Traversing both arrays
  while (i < n1 \&\& j < n2){
     if(arr1[i] <= arr2[j]){
       result[k++] = arr1[i++];
     }else{
       result[k++] = arr2[j++];
  // Store remaining elements of arr1
  while (i < n1)
     result[k++] = arr1[i++];
  while (j < n2)
    result[k++] = arr2[j++];
  return result;
public static void main(String[] args) {
  int[] arr1 = \{1, 4, 5, 8, 17\};
  int[] arr2 = {2, 4, 8, 11, 13, 21, 23, 25};
  int[] arr3 = {};
  int[] arr4 = {};
  int[] mergedArray1 = merge(arr1, arr2);
  int[] mergedArray2 = merge(arr1, arr3);
  int[] mergedArray3 = merge(arr3, arr4);
  System.out.println("Merged array1: " + Arrays.toString(mergedArray1));
  System.out.println("Merged array2: " + Arrays.toString(mergedArray2));
  System.out.println("Merged array3: " + Arrays.toString(mergedArray3));
```

3. **Big-oh and Little-oh.** Use the definitions of O(f(n)) and limit facts about o(f(n)) given in class to decide whether each of the following is true or false, and in each case, prove your answer.

By definition => O(f(n)): g(n) = O(f(n)) if there exist constants c > 0 and  $n_0$  such that for all  $n \ge n_0$ ,  $0 \le g(n) \le c \cdot f(n)$ . and o(f(n)): g(n) = o(f(n)) if for any constant c > 0, there exists an  $n_0$  such that for all  $n \ge n_0$ ,  $0 \le g(n) \le c \cdot f(n)$ .

```
A. 1 + 4n^2 is O(n^2)
To prove: 1+4n^2 = O(n^2)
```

By the definition of O(f(n)), we need to find constants c > 0 and  $n_0$  such that  $1 + 4n^2 \le c \cdot n^2$  for all  $n \ge n_0$ .

For  $n \ge 1$ ,  $4n^2 \ge 4$ . Thus,  $1 + 4n^2 \le 4n^2 + 1 \le 4n^2 + n^2 = 5n^2$ .

So,  $1 + 4n^2 \le 5n^2$ . Let c = 5 and  $n_0 = 1$ .

Hence,  $1 + 4n^2 \le 5n^2$  for all  $n \ge 1$ , proving that  $1 + 4n^2 = O(n^2)$ .

Therefore, true.

B.  $n^2$  - 2n is not O(n)

To prove:  $n^2$  - 2n is not O(n)

Suppose  $n^2 - 2n = O(n)$ .

By definition, there exist constants c > 0 and  $n_0$  such that  $n^2 - 2n \le c \cdot n$  for all  $n \ge n_0$ .

Dividing both sides by n (for n > 0), we get  $n - 2 \le c$ .

As n grows larger, the left-hand side n - 2 grows without bound, while c is a constant.

This is a contradiction because no constant c can be bound n - 2 as  $n \to \infty$ .

Therefore, **true** because  $n^2 - 2n$  is not O(n).

C. log(n) is o(n)

To prove: log(n) = o(n)

By definition,  $\log(n) = o(n)$  if for any constant c > 0, there exists an  $n_0$  such that  $\log(n) < c \cdot n$  for all  $n \ge n_0$ 

Consider the ratio  $\log(n) / n$ .

 $\lim_{n\to\infty} \log(n) / n = 0$  because the logarithm function grows much slower than the linear function.

For any c > 0, we can find an no such that for all  $n \ge n_0$ ,  $\log(n) / n < c$ .

Hence,  $\log(n) < c \cdot n$  for sufficiently large n, proving  $\log(n) = o(n)$ .

Therefore, true.

D. n is not o(n)

To prove:  $n \neq o(n)$ 

By definition, n = o(n) would mean that for any constant c > 0, there exists an  $n_0$  such that  $n < c \cdot n$  for all  $n > n_0$ .

This simplifies to 1 < c, which is not possible for all constants c.

In particular, if c = 1, then  $n < 1 \cdot n$ , which is a contradiction.

Therefore, n cannot be o(n) because n grows exactly as n.

Hence, **true**. n is not o(n).

**Power Set Algorithm**. Given a set X, the power set of X, denoted P(X), is the set of all subsets of X. Below, you are given an algorithm for computing the power set of a given set. This algorithm is used in the brute-force solution to the SubsetSum Problem, discussed in the first lecture. Implement this algorithm in a Java method:

## List powerSet(List X)

```
public class PowerSetAlgo {
   private static List<Set<Integer>> powerSet(List<Integer> X) {
      List<Set<Integer>> P = new ArrayList<>();
      Set<Integer>> S = new HashSet<>(); // S is the empty set
      P.add(S); // P is now the set { S }

   while (!X.isEmpty()) {
      Integer f = X.remove(0); // Remove the first element from X
      List<Set<Integer>> newSubsets = new ArrayList<>();

      for (Set<Integer> x : P) {
            Set<Integer> T = new HashSet<>(x); // Create a new set T
            T.add(f); // T is the set containing f and all elements of x
            newSubsets.add(T); // Add T to the new subsets list
      }

      P.addAll(newSubsets); // Add all new subsets to P
   }

   return P;
}
public static void main(String[] args) {

   List<Integer> X = new ArrayList<>();
   X.add(100);
   X.add(225);
   X.add(30);
}
```

```
List<Set<Integer>> powerSet = powerSet(X);
    System.out.println("Power Set: " + powerSet);
}
```