

1.a.

The algorithm suggests that  $T(n) = T(i) + T(n-1-i) + 1$ . By summing this relationship for all the possible random values  $i = 0, 1, \dots, n-1$ , we obtain that in average  $nT(n) = 2(T(0) + T(1) + \dots + T(n-2) + T(n-1)) + n$ . Because  $(n-1)T(n-1) = 2(T(0) + \dots + T(n-2)) + (n-1)$ , the basic recurrence is as follows:  $nT(n) - (n-1)T(n-1) = 2T(n-1) + 1$ , or  $nT(n) = (n+1)T(n-1) + 1$ , or  $\frac{T(n)}{n+1} = \frac{T(n-1)}{n} + \frac{1}{n(n+1)}$ . The telescoping results in the following system of expressions:

$$\begin{array}{rcll} \frac{T(n)}{n+1} & = & \frac{T(n-1)}{n} & + \frac{1}{n(n+1)} \\ \frac{T(n-1)}{n} & = & \frac{T(n-2)}{n-1} & + \frac{1}{(n-1)n} \\ \dots & & \dots & \\ \frac{T(2)}{3} & = & \frac{T(1)}{2} & + \frac{1}{2 \cdot 3} \\ \frac{T(1)}{2} & = & \frac{T(0)}{1} & + \frac{1}{1 \cdot 2} \end{array}$$

Because  $T(0) = 0$ , the explicit expression for  $T(n)$  is:

$$\frac{T(n)}{n+1} = \frac{1}{1 \cdot 2} + \frac{1}{2 \cdot 3} + \dots + \frac{1}{(n-1)n} + \frac{1}{n(n+1)} = \frac{n}{n+1}$$

so that  $T(n) = n$ .

1.b.

The inner loop has linear complexity  $cn$ , but the next called method is of higher complexity  $n \log n$ . Because the outer loop is linear in  $n$ , the overall complexity of this piece of code is  $n^2 \log n$ .

**MARKING:** Award full marks to those who have shown the complete tree or substitutions else mark according to the attempt.

---

2 We divide the array into equal sub-arrays (left and right half). Solve the problem recursively for the two parts. Two cases happen: (i) In both the parts, there is no majority element: in this case it is easy to see that the original array does not have a majority element, (ii) In either of the two parts, the recursive call returns a majority element: let these be  $x$  and  $y$  (in case only one the recursive calls returns a majority element, then  $y$  will not be defined). Now compare  $x$  with all the elements of  $A$  to see if it appears more than half the time { if yes,  $x$  is the answer. Perform the same steps for  $y$ . If neither  $x$  nor  $y$  turn out to be a present more than  $n/2$  times, then the original array cannot have a majority element. The complexity of algorithm comes to  $O(n \log n)$   
procedure GetMajorityElement( $a[1..n]$ )

Assumption Getfrequency is function  $f$  mentioned above

Input: Array  $a$  of objects

Output: Majority element of  $a$

```

if n = 1:      return a[1]
k = floor( n / 2 )
elembsub = GetMajorityElement(a[1...k])
elemrsub = GetMajorityElement(a[k+1...n])
if elembsub = elemrsub:
    return elembsub
lcount = GetFrequency(a[1...n],elembsub)
rcount = GetFrequency(a[k+1...n],elemrsub)
if lcount > k+1:
    return elembsub
else if rcount > k+1:
    return elemrsub
else
    return NO-MAJORITY-ELEMENT

```

**MARKING:** It has to be solved using D&C based algorithm. You can refer to the above-mentioned solution for marking. If someone proposed any sorting-based solution award 2 marks.

---

3.a. Divide:  $O(n)$  • Combine:  $O(n \log n)$  because we sort by y • However, we can: – Sort all points by y at the beginning – Divide preserves the y-order of points Then combine takes only  $O(n)$  • We get  $T(n)=2T(n/2)+O(n)$ , so  $T(n)=O(n \log n)$

3.b. The same idea can be used as for the 2D problem. Sort the points by x, y, and z, giving three arrays X, Y, Z. Partition the points in X into two sets  $X\_L$  and  $X\_R$  based on their sorted x values. Recursively find the closest pair in each of  $X\_L$  and  $X\_R$ , and let  $\tilde{a}$  be the closest distance of pairs either both in  $X\_L$  or both in  $X\_R$ . To deal with the pairs of points where one is in  $X\_L$  and one is in  $X\_R$ , we need a condition similar to what he had for the closest distance in 2D problem. In the 3D problem, we don't have a middle strip of width  $2\tilde{a}$  but rather we have a middle slab of width  $2\tilde{a}$  where the slab extends in directions y and z. But the same idea can be used as before. For each point p in the slab, there can be at most some bounded number of points in its neighborhood, since those points in the slab that are in  $X\_L$  (or  $X\_R$ ) must be spaced at least  $\tilde{a}$  apart. For each point p, **15 such points need to be checked**. Then finding the closest pair with one point in  $X\_L$  and the other in  $X\_R$  can be done in  $O(n)$  time. This algorithm gives the same recurrence for time complexity, and hence the 3D problem can be solved in  $O(n \log n)$  time too.

**MARKING:** It is a very straightforward question if in part (b) student has not found the correct number of points then deduct 1 mark for the same. Rest you can refer to the above-mentioned solution.

---

4.

T[].dist	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
initialize	0	$\infty$	$\infty$	$\infty$	$\infty$	$\infty$	$\infty$
V = 1	0	20	$\infty$	$\infty$	$\infty$	10	25
V = 6	0	20	30	35	40	10	25
V = 2	0	20	30	35	40	10	23
V = 7	0	20	25	35	40	10	23
V = 3	0	20	25	28	40	10	23
V = 4	0	20	25	28	32	10	23
T[].path (final value)	0	1	7	3	4	1	2

	Shortest Path from 1	Cost
1	1	0
2	1 $\rightarrow$ 2	20 = 20
3	1 $\rightarrow$ 2 $\rightarrow$ 7 $\rightarrow$ 3	20 + 3 + 2 = 25
4	1 $\rightarrow$ 2 $\rightarrow$ 7 $\rightarrow$ 3 $\rightarrow$ 4	20 + 3 + 2 + 3 = 28
5	1 $\rightarrow$ 2 $\rightarrow$ 7 $\rightarrow$ 3 $\rightarrow$ 4 $\rightarrow$ 5	20 + 3 + 2 + 3 + 4 = 32
6	1 $\rightarrow$ 6	10 = 10
7	1 $\rightarrow$ 2 $\rightarrow$ 7	20 + 3 = 23

	T[w].dist	T[v].dist + C[v][w]	T[v].dist + C[v][w] < T[w].dist ?
V = 6	W:3 = $\infty$ W:4 = $\infty$ W:5 = $\infty$	10 + 20 = 30 10 + 25 = 35 10 + 30 = 40	True True True
V = 2	W:3 = 30 W:7 = 25	20 + 15 = 35 20 + 3 = 23	False True
V = 7	W:3 = 30	23 + 2 = 25	True
V = 3	W:4 = 35	25 + 3 = 28	True
V = 4	W:5 = 40	28 + 4 = 32	True

MARKING: Full marks will be awarded o the student who has shown all the steps for the following graph. Else deduct marks and award according to the attempt

=====