

TASK DESCRIPTION:

Let A and B are an incrementally ordered arrays of natural numbers and K be some arbitrary natural number. Find an effective algorithm which determines all possible pairs of indexes (i,j) such that $A[i]+B[j]=K$. Prove algorithm's correctness and estimate its complexity.

ALGORITHM WITH LINEAR SEARCH:

```
Pairing1(int [] A, int[] B, int a, int b, int x)
{
    for i:=0 to a do                                //iterative loop
        for j:= 0 to b do                            //iterative loop
            if(A[i]+B[j] == x) then                 // checking condition
                return Pair(i,j);                  //return result
            fi;
        od;
    od;
}
```

Justification of an algorithm's correctness:

The specification of the algorithm Pairing1 becomes a pair $\langle WP, WK \rangle$, where $WP = (A \text{ and } B \text{ are an incrementally ordered arrays of natural number, } a, b, x \text{ are also a natural number, where } a = A' \text{ length} - 1 \text{ and } b = B' \text{'s length} - 1) \text{ and } WK = (A[i]+B[j] = x, \text{ for } i \text{ and } j \text{ are also natural numbers})$.

Stop condition of the algorithm – at the beginning $j=0$ and in each iteration of the for loop variable j is increment by 1, exactly after $b+1$ iteration, $j = b+1$ and the condition (for $j:=0$ to b) is not satisfied in the loop. Thus the inner for loop stops.

At the beginning $i=0$ and in each iteration of the for loop variable i is increment by 1, exactly after $a+1$ iteration, $i = a+1$ and the condition (for $i:=0$ to a) is not satisfied in the loop. Thus the algorithm stops for any data satisfying the initial condition WP .

Partial correctness of the algorithm – for the initial condition $WP = (A \text{ and } B \text{ are an incrementally ordered arrays of natural number, } x \text{ is also a natural number})$ and $WK = (A[i]+B[j] = x, \text{ for } i \text{ and } j \text{ are also natural numbers})$ we get:

```
Pairing1(int [] A, int[] B, int a, int b, int x)    // WP = (A and B are an incrementally ordered arrays
of natural number, x, a, b are natural numbers and a=A's length - 1 and b = B's length - 1)
{
    for i:=0 to a do                                //loop control -----> i=0, when i < A length, i increase by 1
        for j:= 0 to b do                            //loop control -----> j=0, when
j < B length, j increase by 1
            if(A[i]+B[j] == x) then                 // comparing: A[i]+B[j]=x and i<=a
                return Pair(i,j);                  //WK=( A[i]+B[j]=x)
            fi;
        od;
    od;
}
```

Hence the formula $A[i]+B[j] = x$ is an invariant of the loop in the algorithm Pairing1, and if it terminates the comparison, it will return $\text{Pair}(i,j)$ if the end condition $WK=(A[i]+B[j] = x)$ is true.

Because the Pairing1 algorithm is partially correct in terms of specification $\langle WP, WK \rangle$ and we have shown the stop condition for this algorithm, it is also absolutely correct with respect to the considered specification.

Estimation of algorithm's complexity:

Time complexity – assuming that the dominant operation in the Pairing1 is the natural numbers addition and comparison, then $T(a+1, b+1) = a*b = O(n^2)$

Space complexity – the Pairing1 algorithm uses two auxiliary variables i and j independently of the value of the argument a and b, therefore S should be $S(a+1, b+1) = O(1)$.

ALGORITHM COMBINING BINARY AND LINEAR SEARCH:

```
getBound(int[] A, int a, int k)
{
    int first := 0, last := a, result = 0;           //variable initialisation
    while (first <= last) do                          //iterative loop
        int mid:= first+(last--first)/2;
        if (A[mid] == k) then
            result = mid;
            first := mid + 1;
        else if (A[mid] > k) then
            last := mid - 1;
        else then
            first := mid + 1;
            result = first;
        fi;
    od;
    return result;                                   //return result
}

Pairing2(int [] A, int[] B, int a, int b, int x)
{
    int y0 := x - A[0], x0 := x - B[0];             //variable
    int yn := getUpperBound(A, a, y0), xn := getUpperBound(B, b, x0); //initialisation
    for i:=0 to xn do                                //iterative loop for j:= yn to 0 do
        //iterative loop
        if(A[i]+B[j] == x) then                      // checking condition return Pair(i,j);
            //return result
            fi;
        od; od;
    }
}
```

Justification of an algorithm's correctness:

The specification of the algorithm Bound becomes a pair $\langle WP, WK \rangle$, where $WP = (A \text{ is an incrementally ordered arrays of natural number, } k \text{ and } a \text{ are also a natural number and } a = A\text{'s length} - 1)$ and $WK = (\text{result: } A[\text{result}] \geq k > A[\text{result} - 1])$.

Stop condition of the algorithm – at the beginning $\text{first}=0$ and in each iteration of the while loop variable first is increment by 1, exactly after $\text{last}+1$ iteration, $j = \text{last}+1$ and the condition (for $j:=0$ to last) is not satisfied in the loop. Thus the inner for loop stops. Thus the algorithm stops for any data satisfying the initial condition WP.

Partial correctness of the algorithm – for the initial condition $WP = (A \text{ is an incrementally ordered arrays of natural number, } a \text{ and } k \text{ are also a natural number, where } a = A\text{'s length} - 1)$ and $WK = (\text{result: } A[\text{result} + 1] > A[\text{result}] \geq k > A[\text{result} - 1])$ we get:

```
getBound(int[] A, int a, int k)
{
    if (A[mid] == k) then
        result = mid;
        first := mid + 1;
    else if (A[mid] > k) then
```

```

        last := mid - 1;
    else then
        first := mid + 1;
    fi;

    int first := 0, last := a, result = 0;
    while (first <= last) do
        increase by 1
        int mid:= first+(last--first)/2;
        if (A[mid] == k) then
            result = mid;
            first := mid + 1;
        else if (A[mid] > k) then
            last := mid - 1;
        else then
            first := mid + 1;
            result = first;
        result value fi;
    od;
    return result;
}

```

//last = a, where a = A's length --- 1
//loop control -----> first=0, when first< A's length, first
//finding the middle element position of the array
//comparing A[mid] with k, if A[mid]==k
//we temporary keep the result value
// we discard the left side of the array
//comparing A[mid] with k, if A[mid]>k
// we discard the right side of the array
//comparing A[mid] with k, if A[mid]==k
// we discard the left side of the array
//we temporary keep the
// returning result or 0 if there is no result

Hence the formula $A[mid] < A[next]$ and $A[mid] == A[next]$ are the invariant of the loop in the algorithm getBound, and if it terminates the comparison, it will return 0 if there is no result and result if the end condition $WK = (result: A[result] \geq k > A[result - 1])$ is true.

Because the getBound algorithm is partially correct in terms of specification $\langle WP, WK \rangle$ and we have shown the stop condition for this algorithm, it is also absolutely correct with respect to the considered specification.

The specification of the algorithm Pairing2 becomes a pair $\langle WP, WK \rangle$, where $WP = (A \text{ and } B \text{ are an incrementally ordered arrays of natural number, } a, b, x \text{ are also a natural number, where } a = A' \text{ length} - 1 \text{ and } b = B' \text{ length} - 1) \text{ and } WK = (A[i] + B[j] = x, \text{ for } i \text{ and } j \text{ are also natural numbers})$.

Stop condition of the algorithm - at the beginning $j = y_n$ and in each iteration of the for loop variable j is decrement by 1, exactly after $y_n + 1$ iteration, $j = y_n - 1$ and the condition (for $j = y_n$ to 0) is not satisfied in the loop. Thus the inner for loop stops.

At the beginning $i = 0$ and in each iteration of the for loop variable i is increment by 1, exactly after $x_n + 1$ iteration, $i = x_n + 1$ and the condition (for $i = 0$ to x_n) is not satisfied in the loop. Thus the algorithm stops for any data satisfying the initial condition WP .

Partial correctness of the algorithm - for the initial condition $WP = (A \text{ and } B \text{ are an incrementally ordered arrays of natural number, } x \text{ is also a natural number})$ and $WK = (A[i] + B[j] = x, \text{ for } i \text{ and } j \text{ are also natural numbers})$ we get:

```

Pairing2(int [] A, int[] B, int a, int b, int x)
{
    int y0 := x - A[0], x0 := x - B[0];
    highest values    int yn := getUpperBound(A, a, y0), xn := getUpperBound(B, b, x0); //variable initialisation, getting the
    for i:=0 to xn do    bound, // loop control -----> i=0, when i <= A's upper
    i increase by 1
        for j:= yn to 0 do    j // loop control -----> j=B's upper bound, when j
        decrease by 1        >=0,
            if(A[i]+B[j] == x) then // comparing: A[i]+B[j]=x and i<=xn and j<=yn
                return Pair(i,j); //WK=( A[i]+B[j]=x), we can print
            directly i and j here, the formula Pair(i,j) is just for algorithm to be more easier
            to read. fi; od; od;
}

```

Hence the formula $A[i]+B[j] = x$ is an invariant of the loop in the algorithm Pairing1, and if it terminates the comparison, it will return Pair(i,j) if the end condition $WK=(A[i]+B[j] = x)$ is true.

Because the Pairing2 algorithm is partially correct in terms of specification $\langle WP, WK \rangle$ and we have shown the stop condition for this algorithm, it is also absolutely correct with respect to the considered specification.

Estimation of algorithm's complexity:

Time complexity - assuming that the dominant operation in the getBound is the natural numbers comparison, then the number of operation that it has to make is $T(a+1) = O(n)$

Assuming that the dominant operation in the Pairing2 is the natural numbers addition and comparison, then $T(a+1, b+1) = O(a+1) + O(b+1) = O(2n) = O(n)$ with n is the bigger number between a and b .

Space complexity - the get Bound and Pairing2 algorithms use auxiliary variables: first, last, mid, next, g, y0, x0, yn, xn, i and j independently of the value of the argument a and b , therefore S should be $S(a+1, b+1) = O(1)$.