

In this handout, we give a formal proof by induction that the SELECT algorithm that we saw in class is correct (for any choice of pivot).

1 Selection

Recall that the k -selection problem is to find the k th smallest number in an array A .

Input: array A of n numbers, and an integer $k \in \{1, \dots, n\}$.

Output: the k -th smallest number in A .

In class, we saw the following algorithm, where CHOOSEPIVOT is a method that chooses a pivot. In class we talked about how to choose the pivot intelligently so that the running time of SELECT was $O(n)$; but in fact the algorithm is correct (that is, returns the correct answer) for any way of choosing a pivot.

For clarity we'll assume all elements are distinct from now on, but the idea generalizes easily.

Algorithm 1: SELECT(A, k)

```
 $n \leftarrow |A|;$ 
if  $k > n$  or  $k < 1$  then
  | throw an error—that input is not allowed;
if  $n == 1$  then
  | return  $A[0]$ ;
 $p \leftarrow \text{CHOOSEPIVOT}(A, n);$ 
 $L \leftarrow \{A[i] \mid A[i] < p\};$ 
 $R \leftarrow \{A[i] \mid A[i] > p\};$ 
if  $|L| = k - 1$  then
  | return  $p$ ;
else if  $|L| > k - 1$  then
  | return SELECT( $L, k$ );
else if  $|L| < k - 1$  then
  | return SELECT( $R, k - |L| - 1$ );
```

In words, what the algorithm is doing is this: in each call to SELECT, we use the pivot value p to partition the array into two parts: all elements smaller than the pivot and all elements larger than the pivot, which we denote L and R , respectively. (This can be done in $O(n)$ time using the PARTITION algorithm discussed in class). Then depending on the size of $|L|$, we either return the pivot value p , or else we recurse on L or R .

2 Formal proof that Select is correct.

Here, we prove formally, by induction, that SELECT is correct. We will use *strong induction*. That is, our inductive step will assume that the inductive hypothesis holds for *all* n between 1 and $j - 1$, and then we'll show that it holds for $n = j$. (Note: you can also do this using regular induction with a slightly more complicated inductive hypothesis; either way is fine).

- **Inductive Hypothesis (for n).** When run on an array A of size n and an integer $k \leq n$, SELECT(A, k) returns the k 'th smallest element of A .

- **Base case** ($n = 1$). When $n = 1$, the requirement $1 \leq k \leq n$ means that $k = 1$; that is, $\text{SELECT}(A, k)$ is supposed to return the smallest element of A . This is precisely what the pseudocode above does when $|A| = 1$, so this establishes the Inductive Hypothesis for $n = 1$.
- **Inductive step.** Let $j \geq 2$, and suppose that the inductive hypothesis holds for all n with $1 \leq n < j$. Our goal is to show that it holds for $n = j$. That is, we would like to show that

When run on an array A of size j and an integer $k \leq j$, $\text{SELECT}(A, k)$ returns the k 'th smallest element of A .

(Informally, we want to show that assuming that SELECT “works” on smaller arrays, then it “works” on an array of length n .)

We do this below:

Suppose that $1 \leq k \leq j$, and that A is an array of length j . There are three cases to consider, depending on $p = \text{CHOOSEPIVOT}(A, j)$. (Notice that in the pseudocode above, p is a value from A , not an index). Let L, R, p be as in the pseudocode above.

- **Case 1.** Suppose that $|L| = k - 1$. Then by the definition of L , there are $k - 1$ elements of A that are smaller than p , so p must be the k 'th smallest. In this case, we return p , which is indeed the k 'th smallest.
- **Case 2.** Suppose that $|L| > k - 1$. Then there are more than $k - 1$ elements of A that are smaller than p , and so in particular the k 'th smallest element of A is the same as the k 'th smallest element of L . Next we will use the inductive hypothesis for $n = |L|$, which holds since $|L| < j$. Since $1 \leq k \leq |L|$, the inductive hypothesis implies that $\text{SELECT}(L, k)$ returns the k 'th smallest element of L . Thus, by returning this we are also returning the k 'th smallest element of A , as desired.
- **Case 3.** Suppose that $|L| < k - 1$. Then there are fewer than $k - 1$ elements that are less than p , which means that the k 'th smallest element of A must be greater than p ; that is, it shows up in R . Now, the k 'th smallest element in A is the same as the $k - |L| - 1$ 'st element in R . (To see this, notice that there are $|L| + 1$ elements smaller than the k 'th that do *not* show up in R . Thus there are $k - (|L| + 1) = k - |L| - 1$ elements in R that are smaller than or equal to the k 'th element). Now we want to apply the inductive hypothesis for $n = |R|$, which we can do since $|R| < j$. Notice that we have $1 \leq k - |L| - 1 \leq |R|$: the first inequality holds because $k > |L| + 1$ by the definition of Case 3, and the second inequality holds because it is the same as $k \leq |L| + |R| + 1 = n$, which is true by assumption. Thus, the inductive hypothesis implies that $\text{SELECT}(R, k - |L| - 1)$ returns the $k - |L| - 1$ 'st element of R . Thus, by returning this we are also returning the k 'th smallest element of A , as desired.

Thus, in each of the three cases, $\text{SELECT}(A, k)$ returns the k 'th smallest element of A . This establishes the inductive hypothesis for $n = j$.

- **Conclusion.** By induction, the inductive hypothesis holds for *all* $n \geq 1$. Thus, we conclude that $\text{SELECT}(A, k)$ returns the k 'th smallest element of A on any array A , provided that $1 \leq k \leq |A|$. That is, SELECT is correct, which is what we wanted to show.