## Modular Arithmetic

- Addition: O(n)
- Multiplication: O($n^2$) *(naive)*
- Multiplication: O(nlogn) *(FFT)*
- Euclid's Rule: gcd(x, y) = gcd(x mod y, y)
- # of bits in $x^y$ = $y\log_2 x \leq n \cdot 2^n$
- $\frac{n}{2}^{\frac{n}{2}} \leq n! \leq n^n$
- *f*: S → T is 1-to-1 (injective) & onto (surjective) ⇒ $|S| = |T|$
- *f*: S → T is 1-to-1 (injective) ⇒ $|T| \geq |S|$
- $\sum_{i=0}^{\infty} r^i = \frac{1}{1-r}$, if r < 1
- $\sum_{i=0}^{n} i^2 = \frac{n(n+1)(2n+1)}{6}$
- $\sum_{i=0}^{n} \frac{1}{i} = O(\log_2 n)$

## Extended Euclid's GCD(x,y)

O($n^3$); gcd(x,y) = d = x$i$ + y$b$; x ≥ y; # mod x

```
ext-gcd(x,y):
  if y == 0:  return (x, 1, 0)
  else:
    (d, a, b) = ext-gcd(y, x mod y)
    return (d, b, a-x/y·b)
```

| # | X | Y | X/Y | X%Y | # | d | a | b |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. | 26 | 15 | 1 | 11 | 6. | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| 2. | 15 | 11 | 1 | 4 | 5. | 1 | 0 | 1-(3*0) |
| 3. | 11 | 4 | 2 | 3 | 4. | 1 | 1 | 0-(1*1) |
| 4. | 4 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 3. | 1 | -1 | 1-(2*-1) |
| 5. | 3 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 2. | 1 | 3 | -1-(1*3) |
| 6. | 1 | 0 | | | 1. | 1 | -4 | 3-(1*-4) |

## Fermat's Little Theorem

if p is prime, then ∀ 1 ≤ a < p
$a^{p-1} = 1$ mod p

***Proof:*** *Start by listing first p-1 positive multiples of a:*
*S = {a, 2a, 3a, ⋯ (p -1)a}*
*Suppose that ra and sa are the same mod p, ⇒ r = s mod p*
*∴ set S of p-1 multiples of a are distinct and nonzero, that is, they must be congruent to 1, 2, 3, ⋯ p-1 after being sorted.*
*Multiply all congruences together and we find a·2a·3a⋯(p-1)·a = 1·2·3⋯(p-1) (mod p) or better, $a^{(p-1)}$(p-1)! = (p-1)! mod p.*
*Divide both side by (p-1)!* ■

## Primality Testing

$$\text{any } a \to a^{N-1} = 1 \text{ mod } N? \begin{cases} \text{yes} \Rightarrow \text{"prime"} \\ \text{no} \Rightarrow \text{composite} \end{cases}$$

if N is not prime $a^{N-1}$ = 1 mod N ≤ half values of a < N

## Lagrange's Prime Theorem

Let $\pi$(x) be the # of primes *leq* x, then
$\pi(x) \approx \frac{x}{ln(x)}$, or more precisely $\lim_{x\to\infty} \frac{\pi(x)}{(\frac{x}{ln(x)})} = 1$

## Modular Exponentiation

$x^y$ mod N → start with repeated squaring mod N
x mod N → $x^2$ mod N → $(x^2)^2 \cdots x^{log_2 y}$ mod N
each step takes O($\log^2 N$) times to compute and there are $\log_2$y steps, ∴ ∈ O($n^3$),
where n is the # of bits in N

## Formal Limit Proof

$$lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{f(n)}{g(n)} \begin{cases} \geq 0\ (\infty) \Rightarrow f(n) \in \Omega(g(n)) \\ < \infty\ (0) \Rightarrow f(n) \in O(g(n)) \\ = c_{|0<c<\infty} \Rightarrow f(n) \in \Theta(g(n)) \end{cases}$$

## Logarithm Tricks

$\log_b x^p = p\log_b x$
$\frac{ln(x)}{ln(m)} = \log_m x$
$x^{log_b y} = y^{log_b x}$

## Complexity

- $f \in O(g)$ if $f \leq c \cdot g$
- $f \in \Omega(g)$ if $f \geq c \cdot g$
- $f \in \Theta(g)$ if $f \in O(g)$ & $\Omega(g)$

*Hierarchy:*
- Exponential
- Polynomial
- Logarithmic
- Constant

## Master's Theorem

T(n) = aT($\frac{n}{b}$) + O($n^d$), if a >0, $b$>1, $d \geq 0$

$$T(n) = \begin{cases} O(n^d) \text{ if d} > \log_b a \\ O(n^d log_b n) \text{ if d} = \log_b a \\ O(n^{log_b n}) \text{ if d} < \log_b a \end{cases}$$

## Volker Strassen

*faster matrix multiplication...*

$$X = \begin{bmatrix} A & B \\ C & D \end{bmatrix} \times Y = \begin{bmatrix} E & F \\ G & H \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} AE+BG & AF+BH \\ CE+DG & CF+DH \end{bmatrix}$$

∈ O($n^3$) with recurrence T(n)=8T($\frac{n}{2}$)+O($n^2$)
but thanks to Stassen...

$$XY = \begin{bmatrix} P_5+P_4-P_2+P_6 & P_1+P_2 \\ P_3+P_4 & P_1+P_5-P_3+P_7 \end{bmatrix}$$

$P_1$ = A(F-H)  $P_2$ = (A+B)H  $P_3$ = (C+D)E  $P_4$ = D(G-E)
$P_5$ = (A+D)(E+H)  $P_6$ = (B-D)(G+H)  $P_7$ = (A-C)(E+F)
∈ O($n^{log_2 7}$) ≈ O($n^{2.81}$) with recurrence T(n)=7T($\frac{n}{2}$)+O($n^2$)

## Polynomial Multiplication

$A(x) = a_0 + a_1 x + \cdots + a_d x^d \quad B(x) = b_0 + b_1 x + \cdots + b_d x^d$
$C(x)=A(x)\times B(x) = a_0 b_k + a_1 b_{k-1} + \cdots + a_k b_0 = \sum_{i=0}^{k} a_i b_{k-i}$

## Fast Fourier Transform

complex $n^{th}$ roots of unity are given by $\omega = e^{\frac{2\pi i}{n}}, \omega^2, \omega^3, \cdots$
< values > = FFT(< coefficients >, $\omega$)
< coefficients > = $\frac{1}{n}$ FFT(< values >, $\omega^{-1}$) ∈ O(nlogn)
Vandermonde Matrix,

$$M_n(\omega) = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 & 1 & \cdots & 1 \\ 1 & \omega & \omega^2 & \cdots & \omega^{n-1} \\ 1 & \omega^2 & \omega^4 & \cdots & \omega^{2(n-1)} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 1 & \omega^j & \omega^{2j} & \cdots & \omega^{(n-1)j} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 1 & \omega^{(n-1)} & \omega^{2(n-1)} & \cdots & \omega^{(n-1)(n-1)} \end{bmatrix}$$

## Graphs

- ***graph*** – set of nodes & edges between select nodes
- ***tree*** – a connected graph with no cycles
- ***tree edge*** – part of DFS forest
- ***forward edge*** – edge leading from node → non-child descendant
- ***back edge*** – edge leading back to previously visited node
- ***cross edge*** – edge leading to neither descendant nor ancestor

*Given an Edge (u,v):*
- ***tree/forward edge***: *pre(u) < pre(v) < post(v) < post(u)*
- ***back edge***: *pre(v) < pre(u) < post(u) < post(v)*
- ***cross edge***: *pre(v) < post(v) < pre(u) < post(u)*

*Properties:*
- a tree on n nodes has n-1 edges
- any connected undirected graph with |E| = |V|-1 edges is a tree
- a directed graph has a cycle iff its DFS reveals a back edge
- every DAG has at least 1 source & 1 sink
- in a DAG, every edge leads to a vertex with lower post #
- every directed graph is a DAG of its SCCs
- acyclic/linearizability/absence of back edges are all same property
- any path of DAG, vertices appear in increasing linearized order (linearize, topological sort DAG by DFS, then visit vertices in sorted order, updating edges out of each)
- if explore starts at u, it will terminate when all nodes reachable from u have been visited
- node receives highest post order in DFS must lie in source SCC
- if C & C′ are SCCs & ∃ an edge from a node in C → C′ ⇒ highest post order number in C > than C′'s highest post #
- min edges to make graph strongly connected with n-sinks & m-sources→*max(n,m)*

*Linearize (topologically sort from earliest → latest)*
- perform tasks in decreasing order of their post numbers (DFS)
- or find a source, output it, delete it, repeat until empty

*Algorithm to Decompose G into SSCs*
Run DFS on $G^R$, then run DFS on G, every node it reaches is in that SCC, pick next vertex to run DFS from in order of decreasing post #s discovered from DFS ordering on $G^R$

*Shortest/Longest path in a DAG*
Linearize DAG by DFS, visit vertices in sorted order, updating edges out of each. Note for longest paths, just negate all edge lengths.

## Depth First Search

*discovers what nodes are reachable from a vertex ∈ O(|V|+|E|)*

```
explore(G, v):
  v.visit = true
  previsit(v)
  for each edge (v, u) in E:
    if u.visit = false:  explore(G, u)
  postvisit(v)
dfs(G):
  for all v ∈ V: v.visit = false
  for all v ∈ V: if v.visit = false:  explore(G,v)
```

## Breadth First Search

*∈ O(|V|+|E|)*

```
bfs(G, s):
  for all u ∈ V: dist(u) = ∞
    dist(s) = 0
  Q = [s] (queue containing just s)
  while Q is not empty:
    u = eject(Q)
    for all edges (u,v) ∈ E:
      if dist(v) = ∞:
        inject(Q,v)
        dist(v) = dist(u) + 1
```

## Dijkstra's Algorithm

*shortest path algorithm (+ edge weights) $\in O((|V|+|E|)log|V|)$*

```
dijkstra(G, l, s):
  for all u ∈ V:
    dist(u) = ∞
    prev(u) = nil
  dist(s) = 0
  H = makequeue(V) (using dist-values as keys)
  while H is not empty:
    u = deletemin(H)
    for all edges (u,v) ∈ E:
     if dist(v) > dist(u) + l(u,v):
       dist(v) = dist(u) + l(u,v)
       prev(v) = u
       decreasekey(H,v)
```

| Implementation | deletemin | insert/ decreasekey | $\lvert V\rvert \times$ deletemin + $(\lvert V\rvert+\lvert E\rvert)\times$ insert |
|---|---|---|---|
| Array | $O(\lvert V\rvert)$ | $O(1)$ | $O(\lvert V\rvert^2)$ |
| Binary heap | $O(\log\lvert V\rvert)$ | $O(\log\lvert V\rvert)$ | $O((\lvert V\rvert+\lvert E\rvert)\log\lvert V\rvert)$ |
| $d$-ary heap | $O(\frac{d\log\lvert V\rvert}{\log d})$ | $O(\frac{\log\lvert V\rvert}{\log d})$ | $O((\lvert V\rvert\cdot d+\lvert E\rvert)\frac{\log\lvert V\rvert}{\log d})$ |
| Fibonacci heap | $O(\log\lvert V\rvert)$ | $O(1)$ (amortized) | $O(\lvert V\rvert\log\lvert V\rvert+\lvert E\rvert)$ |

## Bellman-Ford Algorithm

*shortest path algorithm (+/- edge weights) $\in O((|V|\cdot|E|)$*

```
bellman_ford(G, l, s):
  for all u ∈ V:
    dist(u) = ∞
    prev(u) = nil
  dist(s) = 0
  repeat |V| - 1 times:
    for all e ∈ E:
      update(e)
update(u,v):
  min{dist(v), dist(u) + l(u,v)}
```

*note: negative cycle exists if any edge distance value is reduced on $|V|^{th}$ iteration*

## Kruskal's Algorithm

*Minimum Spanning Tree Algorithm $\in O(|E|log|V|)$.*

Starts with an empty graph & selects edges from E repeatedly with lightest weight that does not produce a cycle Uses disjoint sets to determine whether a cycle exists in amortized constant time (*see disjoint set data structure*).

## Cut Property

*Suppose edges X are part of a minimum spanning tree G. Pick any subset of nodes S for which X does not cross between S & V-S, & let e be the lightest edge across this partition. Then X U e is part of some MST.*

## Disjoint Set Data Structure

*Directed tree, nodes are elements of the set, each has parent pointer eventually leading to the root of the tree whose parent pointer is itself.*

- a root node with rank k is created merging two trees rank k-1
- any root node of rank k has $\geq 2^k$ nodes in its tree
- if there are n elements there are at most $n/2^k$ nodes of rank k
- trees have height $\leq$ logn - upper-bound on run time of find & union operations
- path compression reduces average time per operation to amortized O(1)

## Prim's Algorithm

*Minimum Spanning Tree algorithm $\in O((|V|+|E|)log|V|)$*

Initialize a tree with a single vertex, chosen arbitrarily from the graph. Grow the tree by one edge: Of the edges that connect the tree to vertices not yet in the tree, find the minimum-weight edge, and transfer it to the tree. Repeat until all vertices are in tree.

## Huffman Encoding

*A prefix-free encoding represented by a full binary tree, generated by a path from root to leaf, interpreting left as 0 & right as 1.*

cost of tree = $\sum_{i=1}^{n} f_i\cdot$(depth of ith symbol in tree)
or cost of tree = sum of frequencies of all leaves and internal nodes except root.

Construct tree greedily: Start with two symbols with smallest frequencies, continue branching upward constructing tree with next two smallest frequencies (consider sums also) until there are none left.

## Horn Formulas

- ***literal*** – x or, its negation, ¬x
- ***clause types***:
  - ***Implication:*** *left side is AND of # positive literals & right side is a single positive literal ($z \wedge w) \Rightarrow u$*
  - ***Pure Negative Clause:*** *consist of OR of # of negative literals ($\bar{u} \vee \bar{v} \vee \bar{y}$)*

Horn's Formula: Set all variables to false. While there is an implication that isn't satisfied: set right-hand variable of implication to true. If all pure negative clauses are satisfied: return the assignment. else return not satisfiable.

## Set Cover

*Choose a selection of sets whose union is B*

Pick set $S_i$ with largest number of uncovered elements. Repeat until all elements in B are covered.

*Note: if B contains n elements and optimal cover consists of k sets, then greedy algorithm will use at most k·ln(n) sets.*

## Dynamic Programming

**Longest Increasing Subsequence:** O($n^2$)

The following algorithm starts at one side of the list and finds the max length of sequences terminating at that given node, recursively following backlinks. Then given all the lengths of paths terminating at that given node choose the max length. Without memoization, this solution would be exponential time.

```
L = {}
for j=1,2,...,n:
    L[j] = 1+max{L[i]:(i,j) in E}
    # The (i,j) represents all the edges that go from
    # node i to node j.
return max(L)
```

**Edit Distance (Spelling Suggestions):** O(nm)

This algorithm works by choosing the min of the options for every combination of letters/empty spaces.

```
S _ N O W Y
S U N N _ Y
for i = 0,1,2,...,m:
    E(i,0) = i
for j = 1,2,...,n:
    E(0,j) = j
for i = 1,2,...,m:
    for j = 1,2,...,n:
        E(i,j) = min{E(i-1,j)+1,E(i,j-1)+1,
        E(i-1,j-1) +diff(i,j)}
return E(m,n)
```

**Knapsack:** O(nW)

Items have a weight and a value, goal being to maximize the value within a given weight. (The amount you can carry in your knapsack)

*with repetition:*

$K(\omega)=\max_{\text{items}}\{K(\omega-\omega_{\text{item}})+v_i\}$ | for 1 → W

*without repetition:*

$K(\omega,j)=max_{\text{items}}\{K(\omega-\omega_j,j-1)+v_j,K(\omega,j-1)\}|_{\text{for 1 → W,j}}$

**Chain Matrix Multiplication:** O($n^3$)

$C(i,j)=\min\{C(i,k)+C(k+1,j)+m_{i-1}\cdot m_k\cdot m_j\}$

**Floyd-Warshall Algorithm for Shortest Paths:** O($|V|^3$)

```
for i=1 to n:
    for j=1 to n:
        dist(i,j,0) = infinity
        for all (i,j) in E:
            dist(i,j,0) = l(i,j)
for k = 1 to n:
    for i = 1 to n:
        for j = 1 to n:
            dist(i,j,k) = min{dist(i,k,k-1)+
                              dist(k,j,k-1),dist(i,j,k-1)}
```

**Traveling Salesman Problem:** O($n^2 2^n$)

```
C({1},1)=0
for s = 2 to n:
    for all subsets S in {1,2,...,n} of size s and has 1:
        C(S,1) = infinity
        for all j in S,j != 1:
            C(S,j) = min{C(S-{j},i)+dij:i in S,i not in j}
return min over j, C({1,...,n},j)+dj1
```

## Linear Programming

*Given a set of variables, we want to assign real values to satisfy set of linear equations/inequalities and maximize/minimize given linear objective function. General rule of linear programs that the optimum is achieved at a vertex of feasible region. Exceptions are if there is no optimum because of 1. infeasibility (constraints so tight it is impossible to satisfy all) or 2. unbounded (constraints are so loose it is possible to achieve arbitrarily high objective value)*

## Properties of Linear Programs

1. To turn a maximization problem into a minimization (or vice versa) multiply the coefficients of the objective function by -1.
2. To turn an inequality constraint like $\sum_{i=1}^{n} a_i x_i \leq b$ into an equation, introduce a new variable s and use, $\sum_{i=1}^{n} a_i x_i + s = b$, $s \geq 0$ (s is known as a slack variable)
3. To change an equality constraint into inequalities rewrite $ax = b$, as $ax \leq b$ and $ax \geq b$
4. Dealing with variable x that is unrestricted in sign, introduce 2 non-negative variables $x^+$, $x^- \geq 0$ & replace x in the constraints by $x^+ - x^-$
5. If a linear program has an unbounded value then its dual must be infeasible.

## Solving Linear Programs with the Simplex method

typically polynomial time, but in worst case, exponential

```
let v be any vertex of the feasible region
while there is a neighbor v' of v with a better value:
    set v = v'
return v
```

## Max Flow Algorithm

Size of the flow is the total quantity sent from s to t, in other words the quantity leaving s. Size of max flow = $\sum$ flows from s to t. $\in$ O($|V||E|^2$) Start with zero flow.

Repeat:

Choose an appropriate path from s to t, and increase flow along the edges of this path as much as possible.

## Max Flow Min Cut Theorem

The size of the maximum flow in a network equals the capacity of the smallest (s,t)-cut, where and (s,t)-cut partitions the vertices into two disjoint groups L and R such that s (start) is in L and t (goal) is in R.

## Proving Optimality of a Linear Program Result, Duality

max $x_1 + 6x_2$

| Inequality | multiplier |
|---|---|
| $x_1 \leq 200$ | $y_1$ |
| $x_2 \leq 300$ | $y_2$ |
| $x_1 + x_2 \leq 400$ | $y_3$ |
| $x_1, x_2 \geq 0$ | |

$(y_1 + y_2)x_1 + (y_2 + y_3)x_2 \leq 200y_1 + 300y_2 + 400y_3$

resulting in,

min $200y_1 + 300y_2 + 400y_3$

$y_1 + y_3 \geq 1$

$y_2 + y_3 \geq 6$

$y_1, y_2, y_3 \geq 0$

Which both result in the same optimum (via simplex) thus proving optimality.

## Zero Sum Games

## Bipartite Matching

example is given a graph with two sets, Girls and Boys where lines between the sets are who likes who. Find a graph where every Boy and Girl is matched up with someone they like. This problem reduces to a maximum-flow problem solvable by linear programming.

## NP-Complete Problems

| Hard problems(NP-complete) | Easy problems (in P) |
|---|---|
| 3SAT | 2SAT, HORN SAT |
| Traveling Salesman Problem | Minimum Spanning Tree |
| Longest Path | Shortest Path |
| 3D Matching | Bipartite Matching |
| Knapsack | Unary Knapsack |
| Independent Set | Independent Set on trees |
| Integer Linear Programming | Linear Programming |
| Rudrata Path | Euler Path |
| Balanced Cut | Minimum Cut |

SAT = Search Algorithm Time

3. optimizing the sum of the multipliers weighted by the primal right-hand sides can be carried out for any LP

Primal LP:

$$\max\ c^T x \quad Ax \leq b \quad x \geq 0$$

Dual LP:

$$\min\ y^T b \quad y^T A \geq c^T \quad y \geq 0$$

ex.

Primal: $\max\ x_1 - 2x_3$

$x_1 - x_2 \leq 1$

$2x_2 - x_3 \leq 1$

$x_1, x_2, x_3 \geq 0$

$\Longleftrightarrow$

Dual: $\min\ y_1 + y_2$

$y_1 \geq 1$

$-y_1 + 2y_2 \geq 0$

$-y_2 \geq -2$

$A = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & -1 & 0 \\ 0 & 2 & -1 \end{bmatrix}$; $x = \begin{bmatrix} x_1 \\ x_2 \\ x_3 \end{bmatrix}$; $b = \begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ 1 \end{bmatrix}$

$c^T = [1\ 0\ -2]$; $y^T = [y_1\ y_2]$

Duality Theorem: if a linear program has a bounded optimum, then so does its dual, & the two optimum values coincide.

Zero Sum Game: (Row gain, column loss)

| | m | t |
|---|---|---|
| e | 3 | -1 |
| s | -2 | 1 |

Row

Column

Row plays w/ mixed strategy $x = (1/2, 1/2)$

$m_{exp}: 3 \cdot \frac{1}{2} + -2 \cdot \frac{1}{2} = \frac{1}{2}$

$t_{exp}: -1 \cdot \frac{1}{2} + 1 \cdot \frac{1}{2} = 0$

(average)

any mixed strategy is a weighted combination of the two pure strategies & therefore cannot beat the better of the two.

i.e. $x_1 = 0, Pr(x_1) = \frac{99}{100} \cdot x_2 = 1, Pr(x_2) = \frac{1}{100}$

$Pr(x_1)x_1 + Pr(x_2)x_2 = \frac{1}{100} < \frac{99}{100}$

for a fixed $x_1, x_2$, the following are equivalent:

$z = \min\{3x_1 - 2x_2, -x_1 + x_2\} \equiv$

$\max z$ (row counts)

$z \leq 3x_1 - 2x_2$

$z \leq -x_1 + x_2$

$x_1 + x_2 = 1;\ x_1, x_2 \geq 0$

columns best response to row's move

row chooses to max z

Min-Max Theorem:

$$\max_x \min_y \sum_{ij} G_{ij} x_i y_j = \min_y \max_x \sum_{ij} G_{ij} x_i y_j$$