CSCI-GA.1170-001/002 Fundamental Algorithms

September 9, 2014

Solutions to Problem 1 of Homework 1 (16 (+4) points)

Name: Sahil Goel Due: Tuesday, September 10

A degree-n polynomial P(x) is a function

$$P(x) = a_0 + a_1 x + \dots + a_{n-1} x^{n-1} + a_n x^n = \sum_{i=0}^n a_i x^i$$

(a) (2 points) Express the value P(x) as

$$P(x) = a_0 + a_1 x + \dots + a_{n-2} x^{n-2} + b_{n-1} x^{n-1} = \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} b_i x^i$$

where $b_0 = a_0, \ldots, b_{n-2} = a_{n-2}$. What is b_{n-1} as a function of the a_i 's and x?

Solution:

$$P(x) = a_0 + a_1 x + \dots + a_{n-1} x^{n-1} + a_n x^n = \sum_{i=0}^n a_i x^i - 1$$

$$P(x) = a_0 + a_1 x + \dots + a_{n-2} x^{n-2} + b_{n-1} x^{n-1} = \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} b_i x^i - 2$$

Equating equations 1 and 2, since $a_0 = b_0, a_1 = b_1, ..., a_{n-2} = b_{n-2}$

$$a_{n-1} * x^{n-1} + a_n * x^n = b_{n-1} * x^{n-1}$$

$$b_{n-1} = a_{n-1} + a_n * x$$

$$P(x) = b_0 + b_1 x + \dots + b_{n-2} x^{n-2} + b_{n-1} x^{n-1} = \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} b_i x^i$$

where $a_0 = b_0, a_1 = b_1, ..., a_{n-2} = b_{n-2}$ and $b_{n-1} = a_{n-1} + a_n * x$

(b) (5 points) Using part (a) above write a recursive procedure Eval(A, n, x) to evaluate the polynomial P(x) whose coefficients are given in the array $A[0 \dots n]$ (i.e., $A[0] = a_0$, etc.). Make sure you do not forget the base case n = 0.

Solution: There are 3 solutions to this problem.

- 1. With base case n=0
- 2. With base case n=-1
- 3. With base case n=degree of polynomial (Assumption: if degree of polynomial is accessible

inside the function and initially calling the function as eval(A,x,0)). This is the most optimal solution amongst the three

```
1. Base case n=0
Eval(A,x,n)
if(n==0)
return A[0];
return x^n * A[n] + \text{Eval}(A,x,n-1);
2. Base case n=-1
Eval(A,x,n)
if(n==-1)
return 0;
return x^n * A[n] + \text{Eval}(A,x,n-1);
3. Base case n=degree of polynomial
Call from main(), Eval(A,x,0)
Assumption: Degree of polynomial known inside function
Horner's Rule using recursion
Eval(A,x,n)
if(n==DegreeOfPolynomial)
return A[n];
return A[n] + x * Eval(A, x, n + 1);
```

(c) (3 points) Let T(n) be the running time of your implementation of Eval. Write a recurrence equation for T(n) and solve it in the $\Theta(\cdot)$ notation.

Solution: Assuming calculation of x^n takes O(n) times For the first 2 solutions of 1-(c), the recurrence equation will become

$$T(1) = c_1$$
$$T(n) = T(n-1) + c * n$$

Solving the above recurrence equation

$$T(n) = T(n-2) + c * (n-1) + c * n$$

$$T(n) = T(n-3) + c * (n-2) + c * (n-1) + c * n$$

Solving in the similar manner

$$T(n) = T(1) + c * (n + (n - 1) + (n - 2) + \dots + 1)$$
$$T(n) = c1 + c * ((n)(n + 1)/2)$$

Therefore $T(n) = O(n^2)$

Now calculating the complexity for horner's rule method (iii) Part

$$T(1) = c_1$$
$$T(n) = T(n-1) + c$$

Solving for the recurrence equation above

$$T(n) = T(n-2) + c + c$$

Solving similarly

$$T(n) = n * c$$

Therefore T(n) = O(n) which is much better than $O(n^2)$

(d) (6 points) Assuming n is a power of 2, try to express P(x) as $P(x) = P_0(x) + x^{n/2}P_1(x)$, where $P_0(x)$ and $P_1(x)$ are both polynomials of degree n/2. Assuming the computation of $x^{n/2}$ takes O(n) times, describe (in words or pseudocode) a recursive procedure Eval₂ to compute P(x) using two recursive calls to Eval₂. Write a recurrence relation for the running time of Eval₂ and solve it. How does your solution compare to your solution in part (c)?

Solution: If n is power of 2 P(x) can be split into $P_0(x)$ and $P_1(x)$. For example suppose

$$P(x) = a_0 + a_1 * x + a_2 * x^2 + a_3 * x^3 + a_4 * x^4$$

It could be divided as

$$P(x) = P_0(x) + x^2 * P_1(x)$$

where $P_0(x) = a_0 + a_1 * x + a_2 * x^2$ and $P_1(x) = a_3 * x + a_4 * x^2$

Now both the polynomials are 2 degree polynomials and both can be recursively called to evaluate the value of expression

Here First call to Eval2 is for first half of polynomial i.e. from 0 to n/2 i.e. (l+h)/2. Second call to Eval2 is for second half of polynomial i.e. from (n/2)+1 i.e. ((l+h)/2+1) to h. Recurrence Equation will become:

$$T(1) = c_1$$

since calculation of $x^{n/2}$ takes O(n) time, time consumed in that step is $c_2 * n$

$$T(n) = 2 * T(n/2) + c_2 * n;$$

By substitution

$$T(n) = 2 * (2 * T(n/4) + c_2 * (n/2)) + c_2 * n;$$

 $T(n) = 4 * T(n/4) + 2 * c_2 * n$

Substituting in similar fashion

$$T(n) = n * T(1) + log(n) * n$$
$$T(n) = n * c + log(n) * n$$

Therefore T(n) = O(n * log(n))

(e) (Extra Credit.) Explain how to fix the slow "conquer" step of part (d) so that the resulting solution is as efficient as "expected".

Solution: Slow conquer step i.e. calculation of x^n can be fixed by calculating x^n in log(n) time.

Algorithm for the same will be

POW(x,n)

 $\{ if(n==0) \}$

return 1;

temp=POW(x,n/2);

if(n%2 = = 0);

return temp*temp;

else

return x*temp*temp;

}

Total complexity of algorithm will become O(n)

CSCI-GA.1170-001/002 Fundamental Algorithms

September 9, 2014

Solutions to Problem 2 of Homework 1 (10 Points)

Name: Sahil Goel Due: Tuesday, September 10

For each of the following pairs of functions f(n) and g(n), state whether f is O(g); whether f is O(g); whether f is O(g); whether f is O(g); and whether f is O(g). (More than one of these can be true for a single pair!)

(a)
$$f(n) = 32n^{21} + 2$$
; $g(n) = \frac{n^{22} + 3n + 4}{111} - 52n$.

Solution: f is o(g)

f is O(g)

since $\lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{f(n)}{g(n)} = 0$

(b) $f(n) = \log(n^{21} + 3n)$; $g(n) = \log(n^2 - 1)$.

Solution: f is $\Omega(g)$

f is O(g)

f is $\Theta(g)$

(c) $f(n) = \log(2^n + n^2)$; $g(n) = \log(n^{22})$.

Solution: f is $\omega(g)$

f is $\Omega(g)$

(d) $f(n) = n^3 \cdot 2^n$; $g(n) = n^2 \cdot 3^n$.

Solution: f is o(g)

f is O(g)

(e) $f(n) = (n^n)^3$; $g(n) = n^{(n^3)}$.

Solution: f is o(g)

f is O(g)

CSCI-GA.1170-001/002 Fundamental Algorithms

September 9, 2014

Solutions to Problem 3 of Homework 1 (10 points)

Name: Sahil Goel Due: Tuesday, September 10

The following two functions both take as arguments two n-element arrays A and B:

```
\begin{aligned} \text{Magic-1}(A,B,n) \\ \textbf{For } i &= 1 \textbf{ to } n \\ \textbf{For } j &= 1 \textbf{ to } n \\ \textbf{If } A[i] &\geq B[j] \textbf{ Return FALSE} \\ \textbf{Return TRUE} \end{aligned}
```

```
\begin{aligned} \text{MAGIC-2}(A,B,n) \\ temp &:= A[1] \\ \textbf{For } i = 2 \textbf{ to } n \\ \textbf{If } A[i] &> temp \textbf{ Then } temp := A[i] \\ \textbf{For } j &= 1 \textbf{ to } n \\ \textbf{If } temp &\geq B[j] \textbf{ Return } \text{FALSE} \\ \textbf{Return } \texttt{TRUE} \end{aligned}
```

(a) (2 points) It turns out both of these procedures return TRUE if and only if the same 'special condition' regarding the arrays A and B holds. Describe this 'special condition' in English.

Solution: If every value in the array A is smaller than any of the values in array B then the result is TRUE. In other words, if the maximum of array A elements is smaller than the minimum of array B elements, than the result will be true.

(b) (5 points) Analyze the worst-case running time for both algorithms in the Θ -notation. Which algorithm would you chose? Is it the one with the shortest code (number of lines)?

Solution: In worst case, considering MAGIC-1 code, the outer loop will run n times and the inner loop will run n times for every outer loop.

So total number of steps will be n^2

Hence the worst case complexity of algorithm is $\Theta(n^2)$

In worst case, considering Magic-2 Code, Finding the maximum of array A will take n comparisons i.e. if the element is at the end of array A.

In next step worst case will be when maximum of array A is smaller than every element of B except the last element. It will also take n comparisons.

Total Complexity will become $\Theta(n)$.

More optimal solution is the second code with more lines of code, so it is not the one with shortest lines of code.

(c) (3 points) Does the situation change if we consider the best-case running time for both algorithms?

Solution: Yes the situation changes if we consider the best case running time algorithm for both algorithms because in Magic-1, there will be only one comparison in best case that is when first element of A will be larger than the first element of array B, it will exit and return false.

Whereas in Magic-B, there will be minimum n comparisons to find out the maximum of array A.

Therefore, Magic-1 best case running time is better than Magic-2 best case running time.