

(8)

Proof of correctness:-

In DP there is implicit inductive proof.

In inductive proof we try to prove something for n and then for $n+1$ by using base case.

In 0/1 knapsack problem, we started with base case (no item).

Inductive step uses equations. The value at i, j is based on the value of smaller i & j .

If item does not fit, take the previous solution

else if it fits (we take or not take)
larger value.

So 0/1 knapsack is an implicit inductive proof.

Greedy	Vs	D.P
Big to small		small to big

Is the 0/1 knap sack algorithm works in polynomial time? NO

$\frac{4}{1000} \rightarrow C$ — second loop executing 1000 times
 $\frac{10000}{10000} \rightarrow h$ — first loop executing 10000 times

$w_1 \quad v_1$
 $w_2 \quad v_2$
 $w_3 \quad v_3$
 \vdots
 $w_{10000} \quad v_{10000}$

linear

$T(n) = \Theta(h \cdot c)$
 ~~$T(n) = \Theta(n^2)$~~

value of C	input size	loop
100	3	100
1000	4	1000
10000	5	10000

So based on input size^{of C} and number of operation performed, it is not polynomial time operation.

(9)

Longest Common Subsequence

S1: a b c d e f g h i j
S2: c d g i

No need to find exact match. we have to write int of character or continuity in sequence.
So c d g i is L.C.S (Not required in continuous).

a b c d e f g h i j
e c d g i

So (e c d g i) is not L.C.S

e g i (Yes)

c d g i (Yes)

Recursive

```
int LCS (i, j)
```

§ if (A[i] == '\0' || B[j] == '\0')

$A = \begin{bmatrix} b & d & \backslash 0 \end{bmatrix}$ return 0;

$B = [a|b|c|d|0]$ else if $(A[i] == B[j])$

return 1 + LCS(i+1, j+1)

else

```
return (LCS(i+1, j), LCS(i, j+1)),
```

