Chapter 17 Solusion

https://github.com/frc123/CLRS

12/28/2021

17.1

17.1-1

No. Consider we operate MULTPUSH(S, n) n times. Such n operations cost $\Theta(n^2)$, so the amortized cost is $\Theta(n)$.

Actually, we can MULTPUSH incredible large amount of items, so $O(1)$ of course cannot be bound on the amortized cost of stack operations.

17.1-2

Consider a k-bit counter where each bit in the counter is 1. Now, we perform INCREMENT which flips $k+1$ bits. Then, we perform DECREMENT which flips $k+1$ bits again. Hence perform a sequence of length n operations $\langle \text{INCREMENT}, \text{DECREMENT}, \text{INCREMENT}, \text{DECREMENT}, \cdots \rangle$ cost $\Theta(nk)$ in total.

17.1-3

$$n + \sum_{i=1}^{\lfloor \lg n \rfloor} (2^i - 1) \le n + \sum_{i=0}^{\lg n} 2^i = n + 2^{\lg n + 1} - 1 = n + 2n - 1 = 3n - 1$$

Hence the amortized cost per operation is $O(1)$.

17.2

17.2-1

operation	actual cost	amortized cost
PUSH	1	2
POP	1	2
Copy	s	0

where s is the stack size when it is called which has an upper bound k.

Each operation (PUSH or POP) charges an amortized cost of 2 and actual use 1. After k operations, we have k credits, and copy operation cost at most k. Hence we conclude the total amortized cost is greater than the total actual cost at all times.

17.2-2

Let the amortized cost of each operation be 3. We want to show that

$$\sum_{i=1}^{n} \hat{c}_i \geq \sum_{i=1}^{n} c_i$$

for all integers n where

$$c_i = \begin{cases} i & \text{if } i \text{ is an exact power of 2,} \\ 1 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

and $\hat{c}_i = 3$ for all integers i. That is we want to show that

$$3n \geq n + \sum_{i=1}^{\lfloor \lg n \rfloor} (2^i - 1).$$

By exercise 17.1-3, we have

$$n + \sum_{i=1}^{\lfloor \lg n \rfloor} (2^i - 1) \leq 3n - 1.$$

Hence the amortized cost per operation is $O(1)$.

17.2-3

As the hint mentioned, we keep a pointer to the high-order 1 and maintain it during the operations. In each INCREMENT operation, we check if we the high-order 1 moved to a higher order.

Fliping a bit charges 1. Moving the pointer to the high-order 1 charges \$1. Let the amortized cost of each INCREMENT operation be \$4, and let the amortized cost of each RESET operation be \$1. When we set a bit to 1, we actually cost \$1 and retain \$2 as credits for the purpose of setting to 0 and resetting. If we need to update pointer, we charge another \$1. Hence amortized cost of each INCREMENT operation is \$4. Each RESET operation need to move the pointer to -1, so it costs \$1.

```
struct Counter
{
    int length;
    std::vector<bool> bits;
    int high_order_one;

    Counter(int length) : length(length),
        bits(length, 0), high_order_one(-1) {}
};
```

```

void Increment(Counter& counter)
{
    int i;
    i = 0;
    while (i < counter.length && counter.bits[i] == 1)
    {
        counter.bits[i] = 0;
        ++i;
    }
    if (i < counter.length)
    {
        counter.bits[i] = 1;
        counter.high_order_one = std::max(i, counter.high_order_one);
    }
    else
    {
        // overflow
        counter.high_order_one = -1;
    }
}

void Reset(Counter& counter)
{
    int i;
    for (i = 0; i < counter.length; ++i)
    {
        counter.bits[i] = 0;
    }
    counter.high_order_one = -1;
}
```

17.3

17.3-1

Let $\Phi'(D_i) = \Phi(D_i) - \Phi(D_0)$. Clearly, $\Phi'(D_0) = 0$. We claim the amortized costs using Φ' are the same as the amortized costs using Φ.

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{c_i} &= c_i + \Phi'(D_i) - \Phi(D_{i-1}) \\ &= c_i + (\Phi(D_i) - \Phi(D_0)) - (\Phi(D_{i-1}) - \Phi(D_0)) \\ &= c_i + \Phi(D_i) - \Phi(D_{i-1})\end{aligned}$$

17.3-2

Let $\Phi(D_0) = 0$ and $\Phi(D_i) = 2(i - 2^{\lfloor \lg i \rfloor})$ for $i \geq 1$.

$$\begin{aligned}\Phi(D_i) - \Phi(D_{i-1}) &= 2(i - 2^{\lfloor \lg i \rfloor}) - 2((i-1) - 2^{\lfloor \lg(i-1) \rfloor}) \\ &= 2 - 2(2^{\lfloor \lg i \rfloor} - 2^{\lfloor \lg(i-1) \rfloor})\end{aligned}$$

Note that

$$c_i = \begin{cases} i & \text{if } i \text{ is an exact power of 2,} \\ 1 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

Case 1. i is an exact power of 2.

$$\begin{aligned}\Phi(D_i) - \Phi(D_{i-1}) &= 2 - 2(i - \frac{i}{2}) \\ &= 2 - i\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{c_i} &= c_i + \Phi(D_i) - \Phi(D_{i-1}) \\ &= i + 2 - i \\ &= 2\end{aligned}$$

Case 2. i is not an exact power of 2.
Then $2^{\lfloor \lg i \rfloor} = 2^{\lfloor \lg(i-1) \rfloor}$.

$$\Phi(D_i) - \Phi(D_{i-1}) = 2$$

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{c_i} &= c_i + \Phi(D_i) - \Phi(D_{i-1}) \\ &= 1 + 2 \\ &= 3\end{aligned}$$

Hence the amortized cost per operation is $O(1)$.

17.3-3

The idea is to let the potential be proportional to the sum of the height of every node in the min-heap. Note that an binary heap is a complete binary tree.

$$\sum_{j=1}^{n} \lfloor \lg j \rfloor \le \lg(n!) \le n \lg n$$

Let Φ be

$$\Phi(D_i) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } n_i = 0, \\ k n_i \lg n_i & \text{if } n_i > 0 \end{cases}$$

for some constant k where n_i is the number of nodes in D_i. Also, we have

$$c_i \le \begin{cases} k_1 \lg n_i & \text{if I}\textsc{nsert} \text{ is performed in the } i\text{th operation and } n_i \ge 2, \\ k_2 \lg n_{i-1} & \text{if E}\textsc{xtract}\text{-M}\textsc{in} \text{ is performed in the } i\text{th operation and } n_{i-1} \ge 2 \end{cases}$$

Let $k = \max(k_1, k_2)$.

Case 1. INSERT is performed in the ith operation. Then $n_i - 1 = n_{i-1}$.

If $n_i = 1$,

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{c_i} &= c_i + \Phi(D_i) - \Phi(D_{i-1}) \\ &= c_i \end{aligned}$$

If $n_i \ge 2$,

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{c_i} &= c_i + \Phi(D_i) - \Phi(D_{i-1}) \\ &\le k \lg n_i + k n_i \lg n_i - k n_{i-1} \lg n_{i-1} \\ &= k(\lg n_i + n_i \lg n_i - n_{i-1} \lg n_{i-1}) \\ &= k(\lg n_i + n_i \lg n_i - (n_i - 1) \lg(n_i - 1)) \\ &= k(\lg n_i + n_i \lg n_i - n_i \lg(n_i - 1) + \lg(n_i - 1)) \\ &< k(2 \lg n_i + n_i(\lg n_i - \lg(n_i - 1))) \end{aligned}$$

Note that $\forall x \in \mathbb{R}$, $1 + x \le e^x$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} n_i(\lg n_i - \lg(n_i - 1)) &= n_i \lg \frac{n_i}{n_i - 1} \\ &= n_i \lg(1 + \frac{1}{n_i - 1}) \\ &\le n_i \lg(e^{\frac{1}{n_i - 1}}) \\ &= \frac{n_i}{n_i - 1} \lg e \\ &= (1 + \frac{1}{n_i - 1}) \lg e \\ &\le 2 \lg e \end{aligned}$$

Hence

$$\hat{c_i} < k(2 \lg n_i + 2 \lg e)$$

We conclude $\hat{c_i} = O(\lg n)$ for INSERT.

Case 2. EXTRACT-MIN is performed in the ith operation. Then $n_{i-1} - 1 = n_i$.
If $n_{i-1} = 1$,

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{c_i} &= c_i + \Phi(D_i) - \Phi(D_{i-1}) \\ &= c_i\end{aligned}$$

If $n_{i-1} \geq 2$,

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{c_i} &= c_i + \Phi(D_i) - \Phi(D_{i-1}) \\ &\leq k \lg n_{i-1} + k n_i \lg n_i - k n_{i-1} \lg n_{i-1} \\ &= k(\lg n_{i-1} + n_i \lg n_i - n_{i-1} \lg n_{i-1}) \\ &= k(\lg n_{i-1} + (n_{i-1} - 1) \lg(n_{i-1} - 1) - n_{i-1} \lg n_{i-1}) \\ &< k(\lg n_{i-1} - \lg(n_{i-1} - 1)) \\ &= k \lg(1 + \frac{1}{n_{i-1} - 1}) \\ &\leq k \lg e^{\frac{1}{n_{i-1}-1}} \\ &= \frac{k}{n_{i-1} - 1} \lg e\end{aligned}$$

We conclude $\hat{c_i} = O(1)$ for EXTRACT-MIN.

17.3-4

$$\Phi(D_n) - \Phi(D_0) = s_n - s_0$$

Since $\hat{c_i} = 2$,

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{i=1}^{n} c_i &= \sum_{i=1}^{n} \hat{c_i} - \Phi(D_n) + \Phi(D_0) \\ &= 2n + s_0 - s_n\end{aligned}$$

17.3-5

$$\Phi(D_0) = b$$

Since $\hat{c_i} \leq 2$,

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{i=1}^{n} c_i &= \sum_{i=1}^{n} \hat{c_i} - \Phi(D_n) + \Phi(D_0) \\ &\leq 2n + b - \Phi(D_n)\end{aligned}$$

Since $\Phi(D_n) \geq 0$,

$$\sum_{i=1}^{n} c_i \leq 2n + b$$

Since $n = \Omega(b)$,

$$\sum_{i=1}^{n} c_i = O(n)$$

17.3-6

```cpp
template <typename T>
class Queue
{
public:
    void Enqueue(T& x);
    void Enqueue(T&& x);
    T Dequeue();
private:
    std::stack<T> s_a_;
    std::stack<T> s_b_;
};

template <typename T>
void Queue<T>::Enqueue(T& x)
{
    s_a_.push(x);
}

template <typename T>
void Queue<T>::Enqueue(T&& x)
{
    s_a_.emplace(std::move(x));
}

template <typename T>
T Queue<T>::Dequeue()
{
    if (s_b_.empty())
    {
        while (s_a_.empty() == false)
        {
            s_b_.emplace(std::move(s_a_.top()));
            s_a_.pop();
        }
    }
```

```
    T top = std::move(s_b_.top());
    s_b_.pop();
    return std::move(top);
}
```

Assume each of *s_a_.push* (or *emplace*), *s_a_.pop*, *s_b_.push* (or *emplace*), *s_b_.pop* costs \$1. Then

$$c_i = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if ENQUEUE is performed in the } i\text{th operation,} \\ 1 & \text{if DEQUEUE is performed in the } i\text{th operation and } D_{i-1}.s\_b\_ \text{ is not empty,} \\ 2 \cdot (D_{i-1}.s\_a\_.size()) + 1 & \text{if DEQUEUE is performed in the } i\text{th operation and } D_{i-1}.s\_b\_ \text{ is empty} \end{cases}$$

Let

$$\Phi(D_i) = 3 \cdot (D_i.s\_a\_.size()) + (D_i.s\_b\_.size())$$

Case 1. ENQUEUE is performed in the ith operation.

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{c_i} &= c_i + \Phi(D_i) - \Phi(D_{i-1}) \\ &= 1 + 3 \cdot (D_i.s\_a\_.size() - D_{i-1}.s\_a\_.size()) + (D_i.s\_b\_.size() - D_{i-1}.s\_b\_.size()) \\ &= 1 + 3 \cdot 1 + 0 \\ &= 4 \end{aligned}$$

Case 2. DEQUEUE is performed in the ith operation and $D_{i-1}.s\_b\_$ is not empty.

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{c_i} &= c_i + \Phi(D_i) - \Phi(D_{i-1}) \\ &= 1 + 3 \cdot (D_i.s\_a\_.size() - D_{i-1}.s\_a\_.size()) + (D_i.s\_b\_.size() - D_{i-1}.s\_b\_.size()) \\ &= 1 + 3 \cdot 0 - 1 \\ &= 0 \end{aligned}$$

Case 3. DEQUEUE is performed in the ith operation and $D_{i-1}.s\_b\_$ is empty.

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{c_i} &= c_i + \Phi(D_i) - \Phi(D_{i-1}) \\ &= (2 \cdot (D_{i-1}.s\_a\_.size()) + 1) + 3 \cdot (D_i.s\_a\_.size() - D_{i-1}.s\_a\_.size()) + (D_i.s\_b\_.size() - D_{i-1}.s\_b\_.size()) \\ &= (2 \cdot (D_{i-1}.s\_a\_.size()) + 1) - 3 \cdot (D_{i-1}.s\_a\_.size()) + (D_{i-1}.s\_a\_.size() - 1) \\ &= 0 \end{aligned}$$

Thus, we conclude that the amortized cost of each ENQUEUE and each DEQUEUE operation is $O(1)$.

17.3-7

Note that section 9.3 provides an approach of selection in worst-case linear time.

```cpp
class DataStructure
{
public:
    void Insert(int x);
    void DeleteLargerHalf();
    const std::vector<int>& Get() const;
private:
    std::vector<int> arr_;
};

void DataStructure::Insert(int x)
{
    arr_.push_back(x);
}

void DataStructure::DeleteLargerHalf()
{
    size_t median = arr_.size() >> 1;
    LinearSelect(arr_, 0, arr_.size() - 1, (arr_.size() - 1) >> 1);
    arr_.erase(arr_.begin() + median, arr_.end());
}

const std::vector<int>& DataStructure::Get() const
{
    return arr_;
}
```

Assume

$$c_i = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if I}\textsc{nsert} \text{ is performed in the } i\text{th operation,} \\ n_{i-1} & \text{if D}\textsc{elete-}\text{L}\textsc{arger-}\text{H}\textsc{alf} \text{ is performed in the } i\text{th operation} \end{cases}$$

where n_i is $|S|$ after the ith operation. Let

$$\Phi(D_i) = 2n_i$$

be the potential function of the data structure.

Case 1. INSERT is performed in the ith operation.

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{c_i} &= c_i + \Phi(D_i) - \Phi(D_{i-1}) \\ &= c_i + 2(n_i - n_{i-1}) \\ &= 1 + 2 \cdot 1 \\ &= 3 \end{aligned}$$

Case 2. DELETE-LARGER-HALF is performed in the ith operation.

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{c_i} &= c_i + \Phi(D_i) - \Phi(D_{i-1}) \\ &= c_i + 2(n_i - n_{i-1}) \\ &= n_{i-1} + 2(\frac{n_{i-1}}{2} - n_{i-1}) \\ &= n_{i-1} - n_{i-1} \\ &= 0\end{aligned}$$

17.4

17.4-1

By Theorem 11.6 and Theorem 11.8, assuming uniform hashing, for $alpha < 1$, we know the expected number of probes in an unsuccessful search is at most $\frac{1}{1-\alpha}$ and in an successful search is at most $\frac{1}{\alpha}\ln\frac{1}{1-\alpha}$.

$$\lim_{\alpha\to 1^-}\frac{1}{1-\alpha} = \infty$$

$$\lim_{\alpha\to 1^-}\frac{1}{\alpha}\ln\frac{1}{1-\alpha} = \infty$$

Actually, when $\alpha = 1$, an unsuccessful search costs $\Theta(m) = \Theta(n)$. If we can bound α above by some constant that is strictly less than 1, the expected time of an unsuccessful or successful search is bounded above by some constant also.

Consider the function

$$\Phi_i = 2 \cdot num_i - \beta \cdot size_i$$

Let $\Phi_0 = 0$.

We just need to simply modify the conditional statement in line 4 of TABLE-INSERT to

if $T.num + 1 > \beta \cdot T.size$

where β is some constant that is strictly less than 1 and modify the base case of resizing table by modifing line 3 of TABLE-INSERT to

if $T.size = \lceil \frac{1}{\beta} \rceil$

We want to show that one expansion (twice the size) is enough in order to insert an element into a full table ($T.num + 1 > \beta \cdot T.size$).

Lemma 1. Assume $num \geq 1$. $num \leq \beta \cdot size \implies num + 1 \leq 2\beta \cdot size$

Proof. Note that $\forall x \geq 1, x + 1 \leq 2x$.

$$\begin{aligned}num \leq \beta \cdot size &\iff 2 \cdot num \leq 2\beta \cdot size \\ &\iff num + 1 \leq 2 \cdot num \leq 2\beta \cdot size\end{aligned}$$

□

Claim 2. $num_i \leq \beta \cdot size_i$ for all i.

Proof. We prove by induction. WLOG, assume inserts are performed for all i. Then $num_{i+1} = i+1$.

(Base) $k = 0$: $num_0 = 0 \leq \beta \cdot 0 = \beta \cdot size_i$

$k = 1$: $num_1 = 1 \leq \beta \cdot \lceil \frac{1}{\beta} \rceil = \beta \cdot size_i$ since $x \cdot \lceil \frac{1}{x} \rceil \geq x \cdot \frac{1}{x} = 1$ for all $x > 0$.

(Induction) Fix $k \geq 1$. Suppose that $num_k \leq \beta \cdot size_k$.

Case 1. $num_k + 1 \leq \beta \cdot size_k$

Then $size_{k+1} = size_k$.

$$num_{k+1} = num_k + 1 \leq \beta \cdot size_k = \beta \cdot size_{k+1}$$

Case 2. $num_k + 1 > \beta \cdot size_k$

Then $size_{k+1} = 2 \cdot size_k$. By lemma 1 and inductive hypothesis, we have $num_k + 1 \leq 2\beta \cdot size_k$.

$$num_{k+1} = num_k + 1 \leq 2\beta \cdot size_k = \beta \cdot size_{k+1}$$

$\square$

We also want to show that $\Phi(T)$ is always nonnegative.

Claim 3. $\Phi_i \geq 0$ for all i

Proof. We prove by induction. WLOG, assume inserts are performed for all i. Then $num_{i+1} = i+1$.

(Base)

$$\Phi_0 = 0$$

$$\Phi_1 = 2 \cdot num_1 - \beta \cdot size_1 = 2 \cdot 1 - \beta \cdot \lceil \frac{1}{\beta} \rceil > 2 - \beta \cdot (\frac{1}{\beta} + 1) = 1 - \beta > 0$$

(Induction) Fix $k \geq 1$. Suppose that $\Phi_k = 2 \cdot num_k - \beta \cdot size_k \geq 0$.

Case 1. $num_k + 1 \leq \beta \cdot size_k$

Then $size_{k+1} = size_k$.

$$\Phi_{k+1} = 2 \cdot num_{k+1} - \beta \cdot size_{k+1} = 2 \cdot (num_k + 1) - \beta \cdot size_k > 2 \cdot num_k - \beta \cdot size_k \overset{\text{IH}}{\geq} 0$$

Case 2. $num_k + 1 > \beta \cdot size_k$

Then $size_{k+1} = 2 \cdot size_k$.

$$\Phi_{k+1} = 2 \cdot num_{k+1} - \beta \cdot size_{k+1} = 2 \cdot (num_k + 1) - 2\beta \cdot size_k = 2 \cdot (num_k + 1 - \beta \cdot size_k) > 0$$

Since $num_k + 1 - \beta \cdot size_k > 0$ $\square$

We want to analysis the expected amortized cost. By Theorem 11.6, we assume

$$E[c_i] = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if the } i\text{th insert operation does not trigger an expansion,} \\ num_i & \text{if the } i\text{th insert operation does trigger an expansion} \end{cases}$$

If the ith insert operation does not trigger an expansion, then we have $size_i = size_{i-1}$, and the expected amortized cost of the operation is

$$\begin{aligned}
E[\hat{c}_i] &= E[c_i] + \Phi_i - \Phi_{i-1} \\
&= 1 + (2 \cdot num_i - \beta \cdot size_i) - (2 \cdot num_{i-1} - \beta \cdot size_{i-1}) \\
&= 1 + (2 \cdot num_i - \beta \cdot size_i) - (2 \cdot (num_i - 1) - \beta \cdot size_i) \\
&= 3 \; .
\end{aligned}$$

If the ith insert operation does trigger an expansion, then we have $size_i = 2 \cdot size_{i-1}$, and the expected amortized cost of the operation is

$$\begin{aligned}
E[\hat{c}_i] &= E[c_i] + \Phi_i - \Phi_{i-1} \\
&= num_i + (2 \cdot num_i - \beta \cdot size_i) - (2 \cdot num_{i-1} - \beta \cdot size_{i-1}) \\
&= (num_{i-1} + 1) + (2 \cdot (num_{i-1} + 1) - \beta \cdot 2 \cdot size_{i-1}) - (2 \cdot num_{i-1} - \beta \cdot size_{i-1}) \\
&= 3 + num_{i-1} - \beta \cdot size_{i-1} \\
&< 3. \qquad\qquad \text{(by claim 2)}
\end{aligned}$$

Note that $E[c_i] = num_i$, which is linear, in this case because we need to copy all num_{i-1} elements to the new allocated table.

17.4-2

Claim 4. $\forall num \geq 2, \frac{num}{size} \geq \frac{1}{2} \implies \frac{num-1}{size} \geq \frac{1}{4}$

Proof.

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{num}{size} \geq \frac{1}{2} &\iff 2 \cdot num \geq size \\
&\iff 4(num - 1) \geq 2 \cdot num \geq size \qquad\qquad \text{(since } num \geq 2\text{)} \\
&\iff \frac{num - 1}{size} \geq \frac{1}{4}
\end{aligned}$$

□

Suppose that $\alpha_{i-1} \geq \frac{1}{2}$ and the ith operation is TABLE-DELETE. Then $num_i = num_{i-1} - 1$. By the claim, we know that a contraction will not be triggered in the ith operation if $\alpha_{i-1} \geq \frac{1}{2}$ and $num_{i-1} \geq 2$. If $num_{i-1} = 1$, then $num_i = 0$, which is trivial. Assume $num_{i-1} \geq 2$ in the following analysis. Then $c_i = 1$ and $size_i = size_{i-1}$.

Case 1. $\alpha_i < \frac{1}{2}$.

$$\begin{aligned}
\hat{c}_i &= c_i + \Phi_i - \Phi_{i-1} \\
&= 1 + (\frac{size_i}{2} - num_i) - (2 \cdot num_{i-1} - size_{i-1}) \\
&= 1 + (\frac{size_{i-1}}{2} - (num_{i-1} - 1)) - (2 \cdot num_{i-1} - size_{i-1}) \\
&= 2 + \frac{3}{2} \cdot size_{i-1} - 3 \cdot num_{i-1} \\
&= 2 + \frac{3}{2} \cdot size_{i-1} - 3\alpha_{i-1} \cdot size_{i-1} \\
&\leq 2 + \frac{3}{2} \cdot size_{i-1} - \frac{3}{2} \cdot size_{i-1} \\
&= 2
\end{aligned}$$

Case 2. $\alpha_i \geq \frac{1}{2}$.

$$\begin{aligned}
\hat{c}_i &= c_i + \Phi_i - \Phi_{i-1} \\
&= 1 + (2 \cdot num_i - size_i) - (2 \cdot num_{i-1} - size_{i-1}) \\
&= 1 + (2 \cdot (num_{i-1} - 1) - size_{i-1}) - (2 \cdot num_{i-1} - size_{i-1}) \\
&= -1
\end{aligned}$$

17.4-3

Suppose that TABLE-DELETE is performed in the ith operation. Then $num_i = num_{i-1} - 1$.
Case 1. $\frac{num_{i-1}-1}{size_{i-1}} \geq \frac{1}{3}$ (a contraction is not triggered in the ith operation).
Then we have $c_i = 1$ and $size_i = size_{i-1}$.

$$\begin{aligned}
\hat{c}_i &= c_i + \Phi_i - \Phi_{i-1} \\
&= c_i + |2 \cdot num_i - size_i| - |2 \cdot num_{i-1} - size_{i-1}| \\
&= 1 + |2 \cdot (num_{i-1} - 1) - size_{i-1}| - |2 \cdot num_{i-1} - size_{i-1}| \\
&\overset{\triangle}{\leq} 1 + (|2 \cdot num_{i-1} - size_{i-1}| + |-2|) - |2 \cdot num_{i-1} - size_{i-1}| \\
&= 3
\end{aligned}$$

Case 2. $\frac{num_{i-1}-1}{size_{i-1}} < \frac{1}{3}$ (a contraction is triggered in the ith operation).
Then we have $c_i = num_i + 1 = num_{i-1}$ and $size_i = \frac{2}{3} \cdot size_{i-1}$.

$$\begin{aligned}
\hat{c}_i &= c_i + \Phi_i - \Phi_{i-1} \\
&= c_i + |2 \cdot num_i - size_i| - |2 \cdot num_{i-1} - size_{i-1}| \\
&= num_{i-1} + |2 \cdot (num_{i-1} - 1) - \frac{2}{3} \cdot size_{i-1}| - |2 \cdot num_{i-1} - size_{i-1}| \\
&= num_{i-1} + |2 \cdot num_{i-1} - \frac{2}{3} \cdot size_{i-1} - 2| - |2 \cdot num_{i-1} - size_{i-1}|
\end{aligned}$$

Lemma 5.

$$2 \cdot num_{i-1} - \frac{2}{3} \cdot size_{i-1} - 2 < 0$$

Proof.

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{num_{i-1} - 1}{size_{i-1}} < \frac{1}{3} &\implies 3 \cdot (num_{i-1} - 1) < size_{i-1} \\ &\implies 2 \cdot (num_{i-1} - 1) < \frac{2}{3} \cdot size_{i-1} \\ &\implies 2 \cdot num_{i-1} - \frac{2}{3} \cdot size_{i-1} - 2 < 0\end{aligned}$$

□

Lemma 6.

$$\forall num_{i-1} \geq 3, 2 \cdot num_{i-1} - size_{i-1} < 0$$

Proof.

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{num_{i-1} - 1}{size_{i-1}} < \frac{1}{3} &\implies 3 \cdot (num_{i-1} - 1) < size_{i-1} \\ &\implies 2 \cdot num_{i-1} - 3 + num_{i-1} < size_{i-1} \\ &\implies 2 \cdot num_{i-1} - size_{i-1} + (num_{i-1} - 3) < 0 \\ &\implies 2 \cdot num_{i-1} - size_{i-1} < 3 - num_{i-1}\end{aligned}$$

Clearly, $\forall num_{i-1} \geq 3, 3 - num_{i-1} \leq 0$. □

The subcase of $num_{i-1} < 3$ is trivial. Assume $num_{i-1} \geq 3$ in the later analysis. Then

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{c}_i &= num_{i-1} + |2 \cdot num_{i-1} - \frac{2}{3} \cdot size_{i-1} - 2| - |2 \cdot num_{i-1} - size_{i-1}| \\ &= num_{i-1} - (2 \cdot num_{i-1} - \frac{2}{3} \cdot size_{i-1} - 2) \overset{(--)}{+} (2 \cdot num_{i-1} - size_{i-1}) \\ &= (num_{i-1} - \frac{1}{3} \cdot size_{i-1} - 1) + 3\end{aligned}$$

Lemma 7.

$$num_{i-1} - \frac{1}{3} \cdot size_{i-1} - 1 < 0$$

Proof.

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{num_{i-1} - 1}{size_{i-1}} < \frac{1}{3} &\implies num_{i-1} - 1 < \frac{1}{3} \cdot size_{i-1} \\ &\implies num_{i-1} - \frac{1}{3} \cdot size_{i-1} - 1 < 0\end{aligned}$$

□

Hence

$$\hat{c}_i = (num_{i-1} - \frac{1}{3} \cdot size_{i-1} - 1) + 3 < 3$$

Chapter 17 Problems

17-1

(a)

```
template <typename T>
void BitReversal(std::vector<T>& arr)
{
    size_t k, tmp, i, n, rev;
    n = arr.size();
    std::vector<bool> counter(n, false);
    tmp = n;
    k = -1;
    while (tmp)
    {
        tmp = tmp >> 1;
        ++k;
    }
    for (i = 0; i < n; ++i)
    {
        if (counter[i] == false)
        {
            rev = Rev(k, i);
            std::swap(arr[i], arr[rev]);
            counter[i] = true;
            counter[rev] = true;
        }
    }
}
```

(b)

Note that

$$\text{rev}_k(\langle a_{k-1}, a_{k-2}, \cdots, a_0 \rangle) = \langle a_0, a_1, \cdots, a_{k-1} \rangle$$

In order to find $rev_k(a) + 1$, we just need to call INCREMENT on $rev_k(a)$. We observed that we can modify INCREMENT by starting iteration from the high order bit to the low order bit in order to find $rev_k(rev_k(a) + 1) + 1$.

```
size_t BitReversedIncrement(size_t k, size_t a)
{
    size_t i;
```

```
    i = 1 << (k - 1);
    while (i > 0 && (a & i) != 0)
    {
        a = a & ( ~ i );
        i = i >> 1;
    }
    a = a | i;
    return a;
}
```

Similar to the analysis of INCREMENT, successive call to BIT-REVERSED-INCREMENT produce the sequence in a total of $O(n)$ time.

(c)

Yes. We can modify our BIT-REVERSED-INCREMENT by precompute value of $1 << (k-1)$ before the first call in order to prevent recomputing this value in each call.

Observed the operation of $i = i >> 1$ always following flipping the bit back to 0. Hence we can use the same analysis in this situation.

Updating...