



# *Algorithms*

CS 341



Lap Chi Lau

# Preface

---

**Disclaimer** Much of the information on this set of notes is transcribed directly/indirectly from the lectures of CS 341 during Spring 2021 as well as other related resources. I do not make any warranties about the completeness, reliability and accuracy of this set of notes. Use at your own risk.

I couldn't create a good set of notes from Winter 2020 (the term I was in), so I decided to create a set of notes based on Prof. Lau's version. The notes is solely based on his written course notes, not his videos, not his PPTs. Because I am familiar with the concepts, I might skip lots of details in the notes. Please use this set of notes at your own risk.

The main focus of the course is on the design and analysis of efficient algorithms, and these are fundamental building blocks in the development of computer science. We will cover

- divide and conquer and solving recurrence,
- simple graph algorithms using BFS and DFS,
- greedy algorithms,
- dynamic programming,
- bipartite matching,
- NP-completeness and reductions.

The idea of reduction can also be found in CS 365 and CS 360.

For any questions, send me an email via <https://notes.sibeliusp.com/contact>.

You can find my notes for other courses on <https://notes.sibeliusp.com/>.

---

*Sibeliusp Peng*

# Contents

---

<b>Preface</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>1 Introduction</b>	<b>3</b>
1.1 Two Classical Problems . . . . .	3
1.2 Time Complexity . . . . .	3
1.3 Computation models . . . . .	4
1.4 3SUM . . . . .	4
<b>2 Divide and Conquer</b>	<b>6</b>
2.1 Merge Sort . . . . .	6
2.2 Master Theorem . . . . .	6

# Introduction

---

To introduce you to the course, different instructors use different examples. **Stinson** uses 3SUM problem. During Fall 2019, Lubiw & Blais (and possible for several future offerings) develop algorithms for **merging two convex hulls**, which is quite interesting. However, in Winter 2020, the motivating example was **max subarray problem**, which was studied already in **CS 136**, maybe not in **CS 146**. Now let's dive into Spring 2021 offering.

## 1.1 Two Classical Problems

We are given an undirected graph with  $n$  vertices and  $m$  edges, where each edge has a non-negative cost. The **traveling salesman problem** asks us to find a minimum cost tour to visit every vertex of the graph at least once (visit all cities). The **Chinese postman problem** asks us to find a minimum cost tour to visit every edge of the graph at least once (visit all streets).

A naive algorithm to solve the TSP is to enumerate all permutations and return the minimum cost one. This takes  $O(n!)$  time which is way too slow. By using dynamic programming, we can solve it in  $O(2^n)$  time, and this is essentially the best known algorithm that we know of.

We will prove this problem is “NP-complete”, and probably efficient algorithms for this problem do not exist. However, people may design some approximation algorithms, which will be covered in CS 466 and CO 754.

Surprisingly, the Chinese postman problem, which looks very similar, can be solved in  $O(n^4)$ , using techniques from graph matching.

## 1.2 Time Complexity

How do we define the time complexity of an algorithm?

Roughly speaking, we count the number of operations that the algorithm requires. One may count exactly how many operations. The precise constant is probably machine-dependent and may be also difficult to work out. So, the standard practice is to use asymptotic time complexity to analyze algorithms.

### Asymptotic Time Complexity

Given two functions  $f(n), g(n)$ , we say

- (upper bound, big- $O$ )  $g(n) = O(f(n))$  if  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{g(n)}{f(n)} \leq c$  for some constant  $c$  (independent of  $n$ ).
- (lower bound, big- $\Omega$ )  $g(n) = \Omega(f(n))$  if  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{g(n)}{f(n)} \geq c$  for some constant  $c$ .
- (same order, big- $\Theta$ )  $g(n) = \Theta(f(n))$  if  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{g(n)}{f(n)} = c$  for some constant  $c$ .
- (loose upper bound, small- $o$ )  $g(n) = o(f(n))$  if  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{g(n)}{f(n)} = 0$ .
- (loose lower bound, small- $\omega$ )  $g(n) = \omega(f(n))$  if  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{g(n)}{f(n)} = \infty$ .

## Worst Case Complexity

We say an algorithm has time complexity  $O(f(n))$  if it requires at most  $O(f(n))$  primitive operations for all inputs of size  $n$  (e.g.,  $n$  bits,  $n$  numbers,  $n$  vertices, etc). By adopting the asymptotic time complexity, we are ignoring the leading constant and lower order terms.

## “Good” Algorithms

For most optimization problems, such as TSP, there’s a straightforward exponential time algorithm. For those problems, we are interested in designing a polytime algorithm for it.

## 1.3 Computation models

Note that this section often appears in the short answer questions from in-person midterms, in order to trick the student...

When we say that we have an  $O(n^4)$ -time algorithm, we need to be more precise about what are the primitive operations that we assume. In this course, we usually assume the **word-RAM** model, in which we assume that we can access an arbitrary position of an array in constant time, and also that each word operation (such as addition, read/write) can be done in constant time. This model is usually good in practice, because the problem size can usually be fit in the main memory, and so the word size is large enough and each memory access can be done in more or less the same time.

For problems like computing the determinant, we usually consider the bit-complexity, i.e., how many bit operations involved in the algorithm. So please pay some attention to these assumptions when we analyze the time complexity of an algorithm, especially for numerical problems. That said, the word-complexity and bit-complexity usually don’t make a big difference in this course (e.g., at most a  $\log(n)$  factor) and so we just use the word-RAM model.

However, in some past midterms, the questions might trick you on this. Also, it does make a difference when we analyze an algorithm in terms of the input size. Read the trial division example in Section 7.4.1 of [CO 487](#).

## 1.4 3SUM

### 3SUM

We are given  $n + 1$  numbers  $a_1, a_2, \dots, a_n$  and  $c$  and we would like to determine if there are  $i, j, k$  such that  $a_i + a_j + a_k = c$ .

**Algorithm 1** Enumerate all triples and check whether its sum is  $c$ . Time:  $O(n^3)$ .

**Algorithm 2** Observe that  $a_i + a_j + a_k = c$  can be rewritten as  $c - a_i - a_j = a_k$ . We can enumerate all pairs  $a_i + a_j$  and check whether  $c - a_i - a_j$  is equal to some  $a_k$ .

To do this efficiently, we can first sort the  $n$  numbers so that  $a_1 \leq a_2 \leq \dots \leq a_n$ . Then checking whether  $c - a_i - a_j = a_k$  for some  $k$  via binary search in  $O(\log n)$ . So the total complexity is

$$O(\underbrace{n \log n}_{\text{sorting}} + \underbrace{n^2 \log n}_{\text{binary search for each pair}}) = O(n^2 \log n).$$

**Algorithm 3** We can rewrite the condition:  $a_i + a_j = c - a_k$ . Suppose again that we sort  $n$  numbers so that  $a_1 \leq a_2 \leq \dots \leq a_n$ . The idea is that given this sorted array and the number  $b := c - a_k$ , we can check whether there are  $i, j$  such that  $a_i + a_j = b$ . In other words, the 2-SUM problem can be solved in  $O(n)$  time given the sorted array. If this is true, we then get an  $O(n^2)$ -time algorithm for 3-SUM, by trying  $b := c - a_k$  for each  $1 \leq k \leq n$ . That is, we reduce the 3-SUM problem to  $n$  instances of the 2-SUM problem.

---

**Algorithm 1: 2-SUM**

---

```

1  $L := 1, R := n$  // left index and right index
2 while  $L \leq R$  do
3   if  $a_L + a_R = c$  then
4     DONE
5   else if  $a_L + a_R > c$  then
6      $R \leftarrow R - 1$ 
7   else
8      $L \leftarrow L + 1$ 
```

---

**Proof of correctness** If there are no  $i, j$  such that  $a_i + a_j = b$ , then we won't find them. Now suppose  $a_i + a_j = b$  for some  $i \leq j$ . Since the algorithm runs until  $L = R$ , there is an iteration such that  $L = i$  or  $R = j$ . WLOG, suppose that  $L = i$  happens first, and  $R > j$ ; the other case is symmetric. As long as  $R > j$ , we have  $a_i + a_R > a_i + a_j = b$ , and so we will decrease  $R$  until  $R = j$ , and so the algorithm will find this pair.  $\square$

**Time Complexity**  $O(n)$  because  $R - L$  decrease by one in each iteration, so the algorithm will stop within  $n - 1$  iterations.

## Divide and Conquer

---

### 2.1 Merge Sort

Sorting is a fundamental algorithmic task, and merge sort is a classical algorithm using the idea of divide and conquer. This divide and conquer approach works if there is a nice way to reduce an instance of the problem to smaller instances of the same problem. The merge sort algorithm can be summarized as follows:

---

**Algorithm 2:** Merge sort

---

```

1 Function Sort( $A[1, n]$ ):
2   if  $n = 1$  then
3     return
4   Sort( $A[1, \lceil \frac{n}{2} \rceil]$ )
5   Sort( $A[\lceil \frac{n}{2} \rceil + 1, n]$ )
6   merge( $A[1, \lceil \frac{n}{2} \rceil], A[\lceil \frac{n}{2} \rceil + 1, n]$ )

```

---

The correctness of the algorithm can be proved formally by a standard induction. We focus on analyzing the running time. We can draw a recursion tree as shown in the course note. Then the asymptotic complexity of merge-sort is  $O(n \log n)$ . This complexity can also be proved by induction, by using the “guess and check” method.

### 2.2 Master Theorem

By drawing the recursion tree and discussing by cases, we can derive the master theorem:

#### Master Theorem

If  $T(n) = aT\left(\frac{n}{b}\right) + n^c$  for constants  $a > 0, b > 1, c \geq 0$ , then

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

## Single subproblem

This is common in algorithm analysis. For example,

- $T(n) = T\left(\frac{n}{2}\right) + 1$ , we have  $T(n) = O(\log n)$ , binary search.
- $T(n) = T\left(\frac{n}{2}\right) + n$ , we have  $T(n) = O(n)$ , geometric sequence.
- $T(n) = T(\sqrt{n}) + 1$ , we have  $T(n) = O(\log \log n)$ , counting levels.

(In level  $i$ , the subproblem is of size  $n^{2^{-i}}$ . When  $i = \log \log n$ , it becomes  $n^{\frac{1}{\log n}} = O(1)$ .)

## Non-even subproblems

We will see one interesting example later.

- $T(n) = T\left(\frac{2n}{3}\right) + T\left(\frac{n}{3}\right) + n$ . We have  $T(n) = O(n \log n)$ .
- $T(n) = T\left(\frac{n}{2}\right) + T\left(\frac{n}{4}\right) + n$ . We have  $T(n) = O(n)$ .

## Exponential time

$T(n) = 2T(n-1) + 1$ . We have  $T(n) = O(2^n)$ . Can we improve the runtime if we have  $T(n) = T(n-1) + T(n-2) + 1$ ? This is the same recurrence as the Fibonacci sequence. Using “computing roots of polynomials” from **MATH 249**, it can be shown that

$$T(n) = O\left(\left(\frac{1+\sqrt{5}}{2}\right)^n\right) = O(1.618^n),$$

faster exponential time.

Consider the maximum independent set problem:

### Maximum independent set

Given  $G = (V, E)$ . We want to find a maximum subset of vertices  $S \subseteq V$  such that there are no edges between every pair of vertices  $u, v \in S$ .

A naive algorithm is to enumerate all subsets, taking  $\Omega(2^n)$  time. Now consider a simple variant.

Pick a vertex  $v$  with maximum degree.

- If  $v \notin S$ , delete  $v$  and reduce the graph size by one.
- If  $v \in S$ , we choose  $v$ , and then we know that all neighbors of  $v$  cannot be chosen, and so we can delete  $v$  and all its neighbors, so that the graph size is reduced by at least two.

So  $T(n) \leq T(n-1) + T(n-2) + O(n)$ , and it is strictly smaller than  $O(2^n \cdot n)$ .