## 18.337 PSET 3, Spring 2023

Due on Gradescope Wednesday 11:59pm 3/15/2023

Version 1.2 Sun March 5

## Problem 1

Suppose that  $f(A, B, C, D) = \operatorname{tr}(AB + CD)^{-1}$  taking four  $n \times n$  matrices as inputs and a scalar output.

- (1) Draw the DAG for this computation.
- (2) Fill in the edges with operators that take derivatives. For example the operator for the derivative of  $X \to X^{-1}$  can be written as a)  $dX \to X^{-1} dX X^{-1}$  or b)  $-X^{-1} \otimes X^{-1}$  or you can define your own notation. The operator for tr X could be a)  $dX \to \operatorname{tr} dX$  or b)  $dX \to I \cdot dX$  (using the matrix dot product  $A \cdot B \equiv \operatorname{tr}(A^T B)$ .
- (3) Following the paradigm for forward mode automatic differentiation write down the gradient of f(A, B, C, D) with respect to A, i.e. write down a matrix G such that  $f(A + dA, B, C, D) \approx f(A, B, C, D) + G \cdot dA$ .
  - (4) Check your answer numerically, take a screenshot or just copy code.
  - (5) (A little tricky) Show how to use reverse mode differentiation to obtain the same answer as in (3).

## Problem 2

The length of the longest increasing subsequence of a permutation p of length n (or any sequence for that matter) is the largest number k such that  $p[i_1] < p[i_2] < \ldots < p[i_k]$  for  $i_1 < \ldots < i_k$ . For example, if p = [2, 3, 1, 5, 4], we have increasing subsequences 2, 3, 5 and also 2, 3, 4 but there is no increasing subsequence of length 4 so k = 3.

- (1) Write your first program that computes the length of the longest increasing subsequence of a permutation. Call it lis Use any method you like: devise your own or look online. Run your program on randperm(n) (you will need the Random.jl package)
- (2) Compare your program with patiencesort1 in <a href="https://github.com/mitmath/18337/blob/master/hw3/patiencesort1.jlusing@btimeSaysomethingaboutthetime">https://github.com/mitmath/18337/blob/master/hw3/patiencesort1.jlusing@btimeSaysomethingaboutthetime and allocations and show that you understand the comparison. Perhaps try a permutation of size 100 and a permutation of size 1000.
- (3) Write a new routine patiencesort2 that replaces the line whichpile =  $1 + sum \dots$  with a call to searchsortedfirst.

What can you say about timing now? Can you explain why?

(4) The searchsortedfirst uses a binary search algorithm. Write your own linear time algorithm. Around for what sized permutations is the linear time algorithm faster than the binary search?

Here is one possible linear algorithm:

```
function my_searchsortedfirst(pt, a)
for i in 1:length(pt) #length(pt)
    if a < pt[i] return i end</pre>
```

end
 return length(pt)+1
end

- (5) Write a loop and gather t = 10,000 samples of random permutations of size  $n = 6^6$  and measure the time. (Preallocate a vector of length 10,000 and store the results there)
  - (6) replace randperm(n) with rand(n). Is this faster? Argue that statistically the answer is the same.
  - (7) Make sure you have as many threads as you can get, and parallelize the search with threads.
- (8) Use the file https://github.com/mitmath/18337/blob/master/hw3/parallelhistogram.jl to compare with theory. Just use this as a blackbox there is a so-called Fredholm determinant approach that draws the exact limiting curve when  $n \to \infty$ .
- (9) (Optional) Speed contest, go crazy, reduce allocations, use a GPU, use a distributed memory machine, see how much data you can get in, say, 3 minutes. The winner will get a prize. Tell us what you did. Anything goes. (Judges will use whatever subjective criteria they wish.)