Question 4:

1. is

For the above statement to hold, the following must hold for constant witnesses and .

Given that for ,

As increases, so does , this means that for any pair of witnesses and , there exists a value for which will make greater than , meaning the statement is is not true.

1. is

decreases as increases for , as for ( is undefined). For the witnesses this means that taking a value of yields , or , thus can be used. The witnesses show that is .

1. is

For this to be true,

Using L'Hôpital's rule:

As the limit does not equal zero, .

1. is
2. is

Question 5:

This is of the form , where , and . This is the second of the three cases in master theorem as , meaning the runtime in this case is .

TODO: Add witnesses…

For this runtime recurrence, , and .

Here , as this is not constant the runtime complexity cannot be resolved using the Master Theorem.

In this case, . The use of the Master Theorem requires thus here it cannot be used.

Question 6: (b)

For an array length of four of less the worst-case input is the same as that of the insertion sort – a reverse sorted list (in this case from low to high), this will cause the insertion sort part of the algorithm to compare every item. When the merge sort is added in some worst-case examples are:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Number of Items | Number of Comparisons | Worst Case Example |
| 0 | 0 | [] |
| 1 | 0 | [1] |
| 2 | 1 | [1, 2] |
| 3 | 3 | [1, 2, 3] |
| 4 | 6 | [1, 2, 3, 4] |
| 5 | 8 | [1, 3, 2, 4, 5] |
| 6 | 11 | [1, 3, 4, 2, 5, 6] |
| 7 | 15 | [1, 3, 4, 2, 5, 6, 7] |
| 8 | 19 | [1, 3, 4, 5, 2, 6, 7, 8] |
| 9 | 22 | [1, 3, 4, 5, 2, 7, 6, 8, 9] |
| 10 | 25 | [1, 4, 3, 5, 6, 2, 8, 7, 9, 10] |

This was done using the following code by calculating every permutation of the list [1, …, n] and counting the number of comparisons. The variable is global and is incremented on each comparison. The worse cases shown occur when merge sort has to compare every value in the merge function.

