

# CSC263 Assignment 3

Akhil Gupta, 1000357071

November 2015

1. Give an algorithm for the following problem. The input is a sequence of  $n$  numbers  $\{x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n\}$ , another sequence of  $n$  numbers  $\{y_1, y_2, \dots, y_n\}$ , and a number  $z$ . Your algorithm should determine whether or not  $z \in \{x_i + y_j \mid 1 \leq i, j \leq n\}$ . You should use universal hashing families, and your algorithm should run in expected time  $O(n)$ .

Answer: We need to check whether  $z = x_i + y_j$ . In order to accomplish this, we can use universal hashing. We can insert all  $\{x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n\}$  into a hash table  $T$  and check whether  $z - y$  is in  $T$ . Hence, we need to use the insert and search functions i.e.  $\text{Insert}(T, x)$  and  $\text{Search}(T, z - y)$ . From lecture, we know that the expected time for a search is  $O(1)$  and insert is also  $O(1)$ . Since we have  $n$  numbers in  $\{x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n\}$  and  $n$  numbers in  $\{y_1, y_2, \dots, y_n\}$ , the expected time for insert is  $n * O(1) = O(n)$  and search is  $n * O(1) = O(n)$ . In our algorithm, we need to insert all  $\{x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n\}$  into a hash table  $T$  and search through all  $\{x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n\}$  for  $z - \{y_1, y_2, \dots, y_n\}$  to check if it is in  $T$ . Therefore, the runtime is  $O(n) + O(n) + O(n) = 3O(n)$  which is approximately  $O(n)$ .

2. (a) What is the worst-case time complexity of a single operation in a sequence of  $m$  ENQUEUE and DEQUEUE operations? Derive matching upper and lower bounds. That is, define an initial situation by describing what  $H$  and  $T$  look like at the start, and then define a sequence of  $m$  operations, where the sequence consists of ENQUEUE's and DEQUEUE's. Then show that one of the operations in the sequence (probably the last operation) will have the claimed worst-case time. For the upper bound, show that no operation in any  $m$ -operation sequence can ever take more time than the claimed worst-case time.

Answer: The worst-case time complexity of Enqueue in a sequence of  $m$  operations is  $O(1)$  because all Enqueue has to do is push the element onto the stack  $T$  which takes constant time. The worst-case time complexity of Dequeue in a sequence of  $m$  operations is  $O(n)$  where  $n$  is the number of elements on the stack. The worst case occurs when we need to pop all  $n$  elements from  $H$  and push them into another stack  $T$  and then pop  $H$ . This takes  $2n + 1$  operations, therefore, runtime is  $O(n)$ .

Initially  $H$  and  $T$  are empty stacks with each 6 slots.  $H = x \ x \ x \ x \ x \ x$  and  $T = x \ x \ x \ x \ x \ x$

Define a sequence of  $m$  operations: Enqueue( $Q$ , 1), Enqueue( $Q$ , 2), Enqueue( $Q$ , 3), Enqueue( $Q$ , 4), Enqueue( $Q$ , 5), Enqueue( $Q$ , 6), Enqueue( $Q$ , 7), Enqueue( $Q$ , 8)

The above operations take  $8 * O(1) = O(1)$  constant time

After these operations:  $T = 6 \ 5 \ 4 \ 3 \ 2 \ 1$  and  $H = 7 \ 8 \ x \ x \ x \ x$

Continuing the sequence of  $m$  operations: Dequeue( $Q$ ), Dequeue( $Q$ ), Dequeue( $Q$ ), Dequeue( $Q$ ), Dequeue( $Q$ ), Dequeue( $Q$ ), Dequeue( $Q$ ), Dequeue( $Q$ )

Now we encounter a problem, after the first 2 dequeues,  $\text{stackEmpty}(H)$  returns true which means  $H$  is empty. According to our code, if  $H$  is empty, we transfer the items of  $T$  to  $H$  by popping each item of  $T$  and then pushing it into  $H$  and then pop  $H$ .

Note that  $\text{stackEmpty}(H)$  takes  $O(1)$  time and the first 2 dequeues take  $2 * O(1) = O(1)$  constant time

After the first 2 dequeues:  $H = x \ x \ x \ x \ x \ x$  and  $T = 6 \ 5 \ 4 \ 3 \ 2 \ 1$

After transferring the items of  $T$  into  $H$ , we have  $T = x \ x \ x \ x \ x \ x$  and  $H = 6 \ 5 \ 4 \ 3 \ 2 \ 1$ .

The above operation took  $O(1)$  time to call `stackEmpty(H)` +  $6*O(1)$  time to pop all the elements in  $T$  +  $6*O(1)$  time to push all the elements into  $H$ .

The remaining 6 dequeues take  $6*O(1)$  time. Therefore, in total we have  $8*O(1) + 2*O(1) + 1*O(1) + 6*O(1) + 6*O(1) = 23*O(1) = O(1)$ .

We can see that the last operations (Dequeues) take the longest time. In the worst-case if  $H$  is empty, we might have to pop  $n$  elements from  $T = n*O(1)$  then push those  $n$  elements into  $H = n*O(1)$  then pop  $H = n*O(1)$ . Therefore, no operation in any  $m$ -operation sequence can take more than  $O(n)$  worst-case time.

- (b) Use the accounting method to prove that the amortised time complexity of each operation in a sequence of  $m$  `ENQUEUE` and `DEQUEUE` operations is  $O(1)$ .

To solve this problem, first give a credit scheme indicating how many credits to allocate to each `EnQueue` and `DeQueue` operation. Secondly, state the credit invariant, and thirdly, prove the credit invariant.

Answer: Since we are implementing a queue with 2 stacks, notice that each element will be in 1 stack exactly once i.e. each element will be pushed twice and popped twice. We charge \$1 per push, \$1 per pop and \$1 to check whether a stack is empty or not. Hence, we need to allocate at least \$5 for the `EnQueue` operation. Since  $H$  and  $T$  are initially empty, we have to begin by pushing an element into the queue. We charge \$1 for this. Therefore, the element spent \$1 and stored \$4. We continue to add a series of elements into the queue. Each element will have \$4 credit. Now we perform the `dequeue` operation, first we need to check if  $H$  is empty or not, which costs \$1. Then we have to pop all the elements in  $T$  and push them into  $H$  and then pop  $H$  which costs \$3 in total (pop + push + pop). Hence, it costs \$4 in total to perform the `dequeue` operation. We have enough money since each element has \$4 credit on it from the `enqueue` operation. Therefore, the bank never goes broke.

Credit Invariant: Elements in  $H$  have \$3 stored and elements in  $T$  have \$4 stored.

Prove credit invariant:

Base case: since the stacks are initially empty, the invariant holds.

Inductive step: We have 2 cases: 1) when  $H$  is empty, 2) when  $H$  is not empty.

1) When  $H$  is empty: we have to pop all the elements in  $T$  and push them into  $H$  then pop  $H$ . Each element in  $T$  has \$4 stored on it (\$5 initially, but spent \$1 to push into  $T$ ). Before pushing the elements into  $H$ , we check if  $H$  is empty. In our case, assume  $H$  is empty in inductive step. Therefore, each element spends \$1 to perform `stackEmpty`. Now they have \$3 stored. Now, all the elements are popped from  $T$  and pushed into  $H$ , therefore, each element spends \$1 to pop and \$1 to push. Now, they have \$1 stored. To perform the `DeQueue` operation, each element in  $H$  has to be popped. Hence, each element spends the remaining \$1 they have, therefore, we never go broke.

2) When  $H$  is not empty: while performing the `DeQueue` operation, we simply have to pop  $H$  which costs \$1. Suppose we perform many `EnQueue` operations until  $T$  is full, we continue pushing the elements into  $H$ . This does not cost any additional cost and the credit invariant is maintained. In other words, for a sequence of  $m$  `EnQueue` and `DeQueue` operations, the amortized cost per operation is 4, which is  $O(1)$ .

3. Recall that the doubling method enables the implementation of a stack without placing a limit on the size of the stack, such that the amortized complexity of each operation is  $O(1)$ . Every time the array gets full, a new array is allocated whose size is twice the size of the old array, and the old array is copied to the new array.

- (a) Suppose we change the implementation so that the size of the new array is  $3/2$  times the size of the old array. What is the time complexity of a sequence of  $m$  operations in the worst-case? Justify your answer.

Answer: We need to implement an array is  $3/2$  times the size of the old array. We begin with an empty array. Therefore, the first expansion occurs on an empty array. Now, the array size is  $3/2$ . After a sequence of  $m$  operations, we need to again multiply the size of the array by  $3/2$  to make room for new elements. Now, the array size is  $9/4$  and so on. In general, the total time for a sequence of  $m$  operations is

$$T(m) = m \text{ operations} + m + 3m/2 + 9m/4 + 27m/8 + \dots + m(3/2)^{k-1}$$

$$= m + m(1 + 3/2 + 9/4 + 27/8 + \dots + (3/2)^{k-1})$$

Let  $s = \text{sum of } 1 + 3/2 + 9/4 + \dots$

Therefore,  $T(m) = m + ms > m$

$$T(m) = O(m)$$

Therefore, the worst-case time complexity of a sequence of  $m$  operations is  $O(m)$ .

- (b) Suppose we change the implementation so that the size of the new array is 50 plus the size of the old array. What is the time complexity of a sequence of  $m$  operations in the worst-case? Justify your answer.

Answer: We need to implement an array that expands by a constant  $c = 50$ . We begin with an empty array. Therefore, the first expansion occurs on an empty array.  $0 + c = 50$ . We expand the array by 50. Then after a sequence of  $m$  operations, specifically the 50th push operation on the stack, we need to expand the array by 50 again. Therefore,  $50 + c = 100$ . We can calculate the average cost per push, which is,  $(50 + c)/50 = (50 + 50)/50 = 2$  operations per push. Then after another sequence of  $m$  operations, specifically the 100th push operation on the stack, we need to expand the array by 50 again. Therefore,  $100 + c = 150$ . We can calculate the average cost per push again, which is  $(100 + c + 2c)/c = (100 + 50 + 100)/100 = 2.5$  operations per push. Similarly for 150 pushes,  $(150 + c + 2c + 3c)/150 = (150 + 50 + 100 + 150)/150 = 3$  operations per push and so on. In general, the total time for a sequence of  $m$  operations is

$$T(m) = m + c + 2c + 3c + \dots + c * m/c$$

$$= m + c(1 + 2 + 3 + \dots + m/c)$$

$$= m + c(m/c(m/c + 1))/2$$

$$= m + (m^2/c + m)/2$$

$$= O(m^2).$$

Therefore, the worst-case time complexity of a sequence of  $m$  operations is  $O(m^2)$ .