

Assignment 1 -Data Structure - 25 Spring

Exercise 1 : Correctness

1. Specification for REVERSE_SEQUENCE

```
1 REV(A, B):
2     # asserts that B is the reverse of A
3     if length(A) == 0 or length(B) == 0:
4         return 1
5     if length(A) != length(B):
6         return 0
7     else:
8         n = length(B)
9         i = 0
10        while(i < n):
11            if A[i] != B[n-i-1]:
12                return 0
13            i = i + 1
14        return 1
```

Contract:

Pc : $|A| = n \ \&\& \ n \% 2 = 0$

Pc' : $|A| = n \ \&\& \ n \% 2 = 0 \ \&\& \ i = 0$

Inv : $0 \leq i \leq n \ \&\& \ \text{REV}(A_0[i : i-1], A[n-i :]) \ \&\& \ \text{REV}(A_0[n-i :], A[i : i-1]) \ \&\& \ A[i : n-1-i] = A_0[i : n-1-i]$

Qc' : $i = \frac{n}{2} \ \&\& \ \text{REV}(A_0, A)$

Qc : $\text{REV}(A_0, A)$

2. Correctness Proof

Checking correctness is to certify the following conditions hold :

1. **Initialization** : Assume **Pc'** holds, we want to show it implies **Inv** hold:

Here, we have no swapping yet, so $A = A_0$

- From **Pc'**, $i = 0$, then, $0 \leq i \leq n$
- From **Pc'**, $i = 0$, then, $\text{REV}(A_0[i : i-1], A[n-i :]) = \text{REV}(A_0[: -1], A[n :])$,
by our definition, since $A[n :]$ is an empty sequence, $\text{REV}(A_0[: -1], A[n]) = 1$
- From **Pc'**, $i = 0$, then, $\text{REV}(A_0[n-i :], A[i : i-1]) = \text{REV}(A_0[n :], A[: -1])$,
similarly, since $A_0[n :]$ is empty, $\text{REV}(A_0[n :], A[: -1]) = 1$
- Since we have no swapping yet, $A[0 : n-1] = A = A_0 = A_0[0 : n-1]$

2. **Maintenance** : Assume **Inv&&B** hold, we want to prove the loop make **Inv** true again

Inv&&B = $\{ 0 \leq i \leq \frac{n}{2} \ \&\& \ \text{REV}(A_0[i : i-1], A[n-i :]) \ \&\& \ \text{REV}(A_0[n-i :], A[i : i-1]) \ \&\& \ A[i : n-1-i] = A_0[i : n-1-i] \}$

Name i_0 the old value of i before a new loop start.

After one loop, $i = i_0 + 1$ and $\text{swap}(A[i_0], A[n-1-i_0])$.

- Since $0 \leq i_0 \leq \frac{n}{2}$, then $0 \leq i_0 + 1 \leq n$, equivalent to $0 \leq i \leq n$.

- $\text{REV}(A_0[i_0-1:], A[n-i_0:]) \ \&\& \ A_0[i_0] == A[n-1-i_0]$ imply $\text{REV}(A_0[i_0:], A[n-1-i_0:])$, equivalent to $\text{REV}(A_0[i-1:], A[n-i:])$
- $\text{REV}(A_0[n-i_0:], A[i_0-1:]) \ \&\& \ A[i_0] == A_0[n-1-i_0]$ imply $\text{REV}(A_0[n-1-i_0:], A[i_0:])$, equivalent to $\text{REV}(A_0[n-i:], A[i-1:])$
- $A[i_0:n-1-i_0] = A_0[i_0:n-1-i_0]$ before the loop, but $A[i_0] \neq A_0[i_0]$ and $A[n-1-i_0] \neq A_0[n-1-i_0]$ after the loop, so that only $A[i:n-1-i] = A_0[i:n-1-i]$ remains

Thus, **Inv** will be true after any loop in the algorithm.

3. **Termination** : Assume **Inv** && (not **B**) hold, we want to show **Qc** hold:

Inv && (not **B**) = $\{n/2 \leq i \leq n \ \&\& \ \text{REV}(A_0[i-1:], A[n-i:]) \ \&\& \ \text{REV}(A_0[n-i:], A[i-1:])$
 $\ \&\& \ A[i:n-1-i] = A_0[i:n-1-i]\}$

When it jumps out from the loops, i occurs to be $n/2$,

and $\text{REV}(A_0[n/2-1:], A[n/2:]) \ \&\& \ \text{REV}(A_0[n/2:], A[n/2-1:])$.

By the property of $\text{REV}(A, B)$, we can obtain $\text{REV}(A_0, A)$.

3. For sequence of odd length:

Yes. The algorithm remains correct when the length of A is odd.

Says n is odd, then $n/2 - 1$ is the last i that will be considered in the loop. $m = n/2$ will jump out the loop, but notice that: $2*m + 1 = n$, $m = n-m-1$, so $A[m] = A[n-m-1]$ trivially. There is no need to swap the same element in a sequence. And the element $A[m]$ will preserve its position, independent with the reverse operation on the whole sequence.

Exercise 2

Exercise 3

1. Define the ADT `DoubleStackOfInt`

```
1 public interface DoubleStackOfInt {
2     void push(int elem) // an integer onto the stack.
3     void pop()          // an integer from the stack.
4     boolean empty()     // checks the stack is empty.
5     int top()           // consult the top element without popping it.
6 }
```

2.

6.

Exercise 4

1. Complexity Analyses

(a). `add(int)` $\Rightarrow O(1)$

```
1 public void add(int newAttack) {
2     if ( newAttack <= 0 ) {
3         throw new RuntimeException("New Attack is not positive.");
4     }
5     attacksQueue.enqueue(newAttack);
6 }
```

The function `add(int)` performs the following operations:

- A conditional check `if(newAttack <= 0)`, runs in $O(1)$;
- An exception throw if the given power is not positive, runs in $O(1)$;
- An operation `enqueue` defined under Queue, in which:

```
1 public void enqueue(int elem) {           // passing parameter --> O(1)
2     Node newnode = new Node(elem);       // the constructor, runs in O(1)
3     if ( head == null && tail == null ) { // simple conditional check --> O(1)
4         head = newnode;                  // if the queue is empty, then
5         tail = newnode;                  // set head and tail to newnode -->O(1)
6     } else {
7         tail.next = newnode;             // otherwise,
8         tail = newnode;                  // update tail and tail.next --> O(1)
9     }
10    count ++;
11    sum += elem;                          // basic arithmetic --> O(1)
12 }
```

so `enqueue` also runs in $O(1)$.

In total, the time complexity of `add(int newAttack)` is **$O(1)$** .

(b). `boolean alive()` $\Rightarrow O(1)$

```
1 public boolean alive() {
2     return !shieldsQueue.isEmpty();
3 }
```

The `boolean alive()` function performs the following operations:

- The operation `isEmpty` defined under Queue, in which:

```
1 public boolean isEmpty() {
2     return head == null && tail == null; //check if both head, tail are null--> O(1)
3 }
```

so `isEmpty` runs in $O(1)$;

- `!` inverts the boolean result from `isEmpty` $\Rightarrow O(1)$;

In total, the time complexity of `boolean alive ()` is **O(1)**.

(c). void addShield(int) ⇒ O(1)

```
1 public void addShield(int newShield) {
2     if ( newShield <= 0 ) {
3         throw new RuntimeException("addShield(): New shield is not positive.");
4     }
5     shieldsQueue.enqueue(newShield);
6 }
```

The `void addShield(int)` function performs the following operations:

- A conditional check `if(newShield <= 0)` , runs in O(1);
- An exception throw if the given shield is not positive, runs in O(1);
- The operation `enqueue` defined under Queue, we already proved its time complexity is O(1);

so in total, the time complexity of `void addShield(int)` is **O(1)**.

(d). boolean repel(int) ⇒ O(S)

```
1 private boolean repel(int anAttack) {
2     if ( anAttack <= 0 ) {
3         throw new RuntimeException("repel(): Attack is not positive");
4     }
5
6     while ( !shieldsQueue.isEmpty() && anAttack > 0 ) {
7
8         int topShield = shieldsQueue.front();
9
10        if ( anAttack > topShield ) {
11            anAttack -= topShield;
12            shieldsQueue.dequeue();
13        } else if ( topShield > anAttack ) {
14            shieldsQueue.setFront(topShield - anAttack);
15            anAttack = 0;
16        } else {
17            shieldsQueue.dequeue();
18            anAttack = 0;
19        }
20    }
21
22    return alive();
23 }
```

The `boolean repel(int)` function performs the following operations:

- A conditional check `if(anAttack <= 0)` , runs in O(1);
- An exception throw if the given power is not positive, runs in O(1);
- A while loop, continues until the shield queue comes to empty or the attack drops to 0. So the worst case will be no shields left, which means the loop circulating S times, that is :
 - **S+1** times conditional check, containing logic negation, `isEmpty` and basic comparison, all in O(1);

- S times update topShield, calling the operation `front` defined under Queue, runs in $O(1)$:

```

1 public int front() {
2     if ( isEmpty() ) { // `isEmpty` runs in  $O(1)$ , already proved
3         throw new RuntimeException("Queue.front(): The queue is empty.");
4     } // exception throw -->  $O(1)$ 
5     return head.data; // return int -->  $O(1)$ 
6 } // IN TOTAL, `front` RUNS IN  $O(1)$ 

```

- S times conditional check, contains basic comparison between int, runs in $O(1)$;
- S times call operation `dequeue` or `setFront`, both run in $O(1)$:

```

1 public int dequeue() {
2     if ( isEmpty() ) { // `isEmpty` runs in  $O(1)$ , already proved
3         throw new RuntimeException("Queue.dequeue(): The queue is empty.");
4     } // exception throw -->  $O(1)$ 
5     int poppedElem = head.data; // initialize int -->  $O(1)$ 
6     if ( head == tail ) { // conditional check with boolean -->  $O(1)$ 
7         head = null;
8         tail = null; // update head and tail -->  $O(1)$ 
9     } else {
10         head = head.next; // move head -->  $O(1)$ 
11     }
12     count --;
13     sum -= poppedElem; // basic arithmetic -->  $O(1)$ 
14     return poppedElem; // return int -->  $O(1)$ 
15 } // IN TOTAL, `dequeue` RUNS IN  $O(1)$ 

```

```

1 public void setFront(int newData) { // passing parameter -->  $O(1)$ 
2     if ( isEmpty() ) { // `isEmpty` runs in  $O(1)$ , already proved
3         throw new RuntimeException("Queue.setFront(): The queue is empty.");
4     } // exception throw -->  $O(1)$ 
5     sum += newData - head.data;
6     head.data = newData; // basic arithmetic -->  $O(1)$ 
7 } // IN TOTAL, `setFront` RUNS IN  $O(1)$ 

```

- Return the boolean value get from `boolean alive()`, which runs in $O(1)$ as we already know;

so in total, the time complexity of `boolean repel(int)` is

$$O(1) + O(1) + (S + 1) \times O(1) + S \times (O(1) + O(1) + O(1)) + O(1) = (2S + 4) \times O(1) = O(2S + 1) = O(S)$$

(e). `boolean repel(AttackStrategy)` $\Rightarrow O(S+A)$

```

1 public boolean repel(AttackStrategy anAttackStrategy) {
2     AttackStrategyImplementation strategy = (AttackStrategyImplementation) anAttackStrategy;
3     if ( strategy.isEmpty() ) {
4         throw new RuntimeException("repel(): Attack Strategy is empty.");
5     }
6     while ( alive() && !strategy.isEmpty() ) {
7         repel( strategy.popAttack() );
8     }
9     return alive();
10 }

```

The `boolean repel(AttackStrategy)` function performs the following operations:

- Reset the input `anAttcakStrategy` as `strategy`, to better access the methods, which runs in $O(1)$;
- A conditional check with `isEmpty`, which runs in $O(1)$;
- An exception throw if the given attack strategy is empty, runs in $O(1)$;
- A while loop, continues until the warrior has no more shields or the enemy has no more attacks. So the worst case will be: when the enemy applies the last attack, the innermost shield of the warrior breaks. In a more specific situation under this case that attack and shield update at different time, the loop circulates **S+A** times, that is:
 - **S+A+1** times conditional check, containing `!`, `boolean alive()` and `isEmpty`, all run in $O(1)$;
 - S+A times call function `popAttack()` defined in `AttackStrategy`, in which:

```
1 public int popAttack() {
2     if ( isEmpty() ) {           // conditional check with `isEmpty` --> O(1)
3         throw new RuntimeException("Attack strategy is empty.");
4     }                           // exception throw --> O(1)
5     return attacksQueue.dequeue(); // return int given by `dequeue` --> O(1)
6 }
```

so `int popAttack()` runs in $O(1)$;

- Return the boolean value get from `boolean alive()`, which runs in $O(1)$ as we already know;

so in total, the time complexity of `boolean repel(AttackStrategy)` is

$$O(1) + O(1) + (S + A + 1) \times O(1) + (S + A) \times O(1) + O(1) = (2S + 2A + 4) \times O(1) = O(2S + 2A + 4) = O(S + A)$$

(f). int shields() \Rightarrow O(1)

```
1 public int shields() {
2     return shieldsQueue.elemNum();
3 }
```

The `int shields()` function performs the following operations:

- Return the int value given by `elemNum`, which is defined under `Queue`,

```
1 public int elemNum() {
2     return count;    // return the value of an attribute --> O(1)
3 }
```

so `elemNum` runs in $O(1)$;

Thus, the time complexity of `int shields()` is **O(1)**.

(g). int remainingPower() \Rightarrow O(1)

```
1 public int remainingPower() {
2     return shieldsQueue.elemSum();
3 }
```

The `int remainingPower()` function performs the following operations:

- Return the int value given by `elemSum`, which is defined under Queue,

```
1 public int elemSum() {  
2     return sum;      // // return the value of an attribute --> 0(1)  
3 }
```

so `elemSum` runs in $O(1)$;

Thus, the time complexity of `int remainingPower()` is **$O(1)$** .

2. Representation Invariant for `Warrior` ADT

$R : \langle \text{head: Node, tail: Node, count: int, sum: int} \rangle$

$\text{Node} : \langle \text{data: int, next: Node} \rangle$

$RI(R) = R$ is acyclic && tail is reachable from head && (tail == null || tail.next == null)

&& count = the number of shields of the warrior ≥ 0

&& sum = the sum of all values of the shields ≥ 0