

No Collaborators

Problem Set 3

3-1 a) ^{major} Non parts of the pseudocode needs to be changed. This is true since all of INSERT, DELETE, + successor just rely on accessing clusters, summaries, + their elements none of which directly rely on the cluster size nor number of clusters. We do have to rewrite how $\text{low}(x)$ + $\text{high}(x)$ work by making it

$$\text{low}(x) = x \bmod u^{2/3} \quad \text{high}(x) = \lfloor \frac{x}{u^{2/3}} \rfloor$$

$$\text{index}(i, j) = i u^{2/3} + j$$

~~Otherwise~~ the ~~the~~ other than the above, there are no other places which relied on \sqrt{u} elements/cluster so we are good.

INSERT: V_{summary} contains $u^{1/3}$ elements + V_{cluster} has $u^{2/3}$ elements so at each step we either do $T(u) = T(u^{1/3}) + O(1)$ or $T(u) = T(u^{2/3}) + O(1)$. The latter is the worst case which gives us $O(\lg \lg u) = O(\lg \lg u)$ which is the same as when had \sqrt{u} elements/cluster.

DELETE: Again we either ~~recurse~~ do a ~~full~~ non-trivial delete on V_{cluster} or V_{summary} so we have the same recursion as the one in INSERT $\Rightarrow O(\lg \lg u)$ same as original.

SUCCESSOR: Same, we do either successor on V_{cluster} or $V_{\text{summary}} \Rightarrow O(\lg \lg u)$.

But we have a ^{slightly} higher constant factor since without rewriting we would have $\lg \lg u > \lg \lg u$, but in the long run the performance is the same.

6) INSERT(V, x)!

```

1  if V.min = None: V.min = V.max = x; return
2  if x < V.min: swap x ↔ V.min
3  if x > V.max: swap x ↔ V.max
4  if V.cluster[high(x)].min = None:
5      Insert(V, summary, high(x))
6      Insert(V, summary, high(x))
7  Insert(V.cluster[high(x)], low(x))

```

the INSERT operation

This is pretty much the same as in A only maintaining the minimum except the O(1) operation for swapping ^{the previous} maximum ^{element} with x when need be. Otherwise we proceed as normal hence the routine is still $O(\lg u)$.

DELETE(V, x)

```

1  x = V.min;
2  i = V.summary.min;
3  if i = None: V.min = V.max = None; return
4  x = V.min = index(i, V.cluster[i].min)
5  if i = None:
6      if x = V.max: V.min = V.max = None; return
7      else V.min = V.max; return
8  x ≠ V.min = index(i, V.cluster[i].min)
9  if x = V.max:
10     i = V.summary.max;
11     if i = None:
12         if x = V.min: V.min = V.max = None; return
13         else V.max = V.min; return
14     x = V.max = index(i, V.cluster[i].max)
15 Delete(V.cluster[high(x)], low(x))
16 if V.cluster[high(x)].min = None:
17     Delete(V.summary, high(x))

```

We also need to add lines 2-6 to make sure we don't try to insert V.min nor V.max

Tree becomes empty

only one element remaining, the max which is in its own field

empty tree

only previous min is remaining

This is pretty much the same as the code presented in the lecture notes except with a few modifications. First if $v.summary.min$ is none when $x = v.min$, this doesn't rule out the possibility that we have another element, $v.max$, which isn't in the tree & we check this in line 6 when x was not the only element in our structure. Second we do the analogous case for when $x = v.max$ in lines 9-16 & the logic is exactly the same. The rest is exactly from the pseudocode in the lecture notes, this means that the two calls to delete in lines 17 & 19 work in the same fashion & the additional checks when maximum field is not in the tree contribute constant time $\Rightarrow O(\lg u)$.

SUCCESSOR(v, x):

```

1 if  $x < v.min$ : return  $v.min$ 
2 if  $x > v.max$ : return none
3  $i = high(x)$ 
4 if  $low(x) < v.cluster[i].max$ :
5      $j = Successor(v.cluster[i], low(x))$ 
6 else:  $i = Successor(v.summary, high(x))$ 
        $j = v.cluster[i].min$ 
7     if  $i = none$ 
8         return  $v.max$ 
9     else
10        return  $j = v.cluster[i].min$ 
11 return  $index(i, j)$ 

```

Exactly the same pseudocode but the checks for $x < v.min$ & $x > v.max$ in lines 1-2 & the check for no successor in line 7 which means we return the max. These add constant time hence our runtime is still $O(\lg u)$.