

Objectives

- Design a divide-and-conquer algorithm for a given computational problem
- Justify the correctness of an algorithm
- Perform asymptotic complexity analysis of the run time
- Design and execute benchmarks for an algorithm

Overview

For this assignment, you will apply the divide-and-conquer strategy to create an algorithm that solves the selection problem.

The Problem

The problem that you will be solving is called the **SELECTION** problem.

SELECTION

Input A sequence of $n \geq 2$ numbers and an integer k , $1 \leq k \leq n$

Output The k^{th} smallest number in the sequence.

For example, if we are given the sequence $[5, 1, 6, 7, 3, 4, 8]$ and $k = 3$, we would return 4, because 4 is the 3rd smallest number, after 1 and 3.

The simplest way to solve this problem is to sort the sequence (or at least the first k elements) and take the element at index $k - 1$. This will take $O(n \log n)$ time. The time can be reduced to $O(kn)$ or $O(k \log n)$ if we only partially sort.

Your goal is to create an even faster algorithm using a divide-and-conquer strategy. **Hint:** If you select a pivot value, you can partition the array into the j numbers smaller than the pivot and the $n - j$ numbers that are larger than the pivot.

Deliverables

Complete a lab report containing the following:

- A paragraph describing the approach you will use to solve the problem. Provide at least 2 illustrations that explain the approach.
- High-level pseudocode for an algorithm that uses that rule to solve the computational problem for any input
- An explanation and justification for why your algorithm is correct (1-3 paragraphs)
- A table of your test cases, the answers you expect, and the answers returned by running your implementation of the algorithm.
- The derivation of a recurrence relation describing the run time in terms of the number of points n . (Show your work!) You may assume that the random pivot divides the elements in half each time.
- A solution to the recurrence relation (show your work). Ideally, you will get a run time in terms of $O(n)$ in asymptotic notation.
- A table and graph from benchmarking different lists with different sizes and values of k . Benchmark your implementation versus an approach that sorts the numbers and picks the element at index $k - 1$.

If the benchmarks do not support your theoretically-derived run time and/or do not provide evidence that the run time of your algorithm grows more slowly than the sorting approach, this may indicate a flaw in your implementation.

- Include code and report together in a pdf of a Jupyter notebook.

(or else as an appendix containing all of your source code and test cases.)

Submit your report to Canvas in PDF format (make sure source code is included).

Rubric

| | | Full Credit | Partial Credit | No Credit |
|--|-----|---|---|--|
| In class participation Lab report writing and presentation quality | 5% | | | |
| | 10% | | | |
| Solution Approach Description | 10% | Approach is well-described, with all necessary details to implement and/or to explain to someone else | Approach is decently described with most details necessary to implement. Explanation may be unclear in places | The description is insufficient to implement or explain to others. |
| Algorithm, as described in Pseudocode | 10% | Algorithm is correct for all allowed inputs | Algorithm is correct for most inputs | Algorithm is incorrect for many inputs |
| Justification of Correctness | 10% | Uses techniques described in class to provide a solid and convincing argument that the algorithm is correct. | Provides a somewhat convincing argument that the algorithm is correct | Argument contains one or more serious flaws |
| Asymptotic run-time analysis | 10% | Analysis is correct for the provided pseudocode | Analysis contains minor flaws | Analysis is significantly flawed |
| Algorithm Implementation | 10% | Implementation is both faithful to the pseudocode and correct | Implementation is mostly faithful to the pseudocode and/or correct for most inputs | Implementation is not faithful to the pseudocode or not correct for common inputs |
| Test Cases | 10% | Test cases consider a range of problem sizes, complexities, classes, and edge cases | Limited number of test cases only testing obvious or simple cases | Only the examples |
| Benchmarking | 10% | Benchmark experiments were set up and implemented correctly. | Benchmark experiments, implementations, or results are mostly correct. | Benchmark experiments, implementations, or results are flawed. |
| Algorithmic Runtime | 10% | Runtime is asymptotically <i>faster</i> than $O(k \log n)$, as determined by both empirical results and theoretical analysis | Runtime is asymptotically <i>faster</i> than $O(n \log n)$ | Runtime is asymptotically equal-to or slower-than $O(n \log n)$ brute-force search |
| Submitted correctly | 5% | | | |