Algorithms & Complexity, Spring 2026

Recursion
Backtracking

Recap

- HW0 due tonight
  - ↳ office hours after class
- Next readings: posted, & a bit shorter
  - ↳ Dynamic programming
- Week after - will switch to new book
  - ↳ Greedy approximations
- HW1: Recursion
  - ↳ Posted tomorrow

Last Time: Runtimes for recursive algorithms

$$T(n) = r\,T\left(\frac{n}{c}\right) + f(n)$$

↷ # of rec calls

What it means:



Then, turn into summation



Figure 1.9. A recursion tree for the recurrence $T(n) = r\,T(n/c) + f(n)$

$$T(n) = rT\left(\frac{n}{c}\right) + f(n)$$

level i:
r^i nodes,
each doing
$f\left(\frac{n}{c^i}\right)$ operations

depth $= L$

$$\frac{n}{c^L} = 1 \Rightarrow L = \log_c n$$

$$T(n) = \sum_{i=0}^{L=\log_c n} r^i f\left(\frac{n}{c^i}\right)$$

Is this a geom series?

Master Theorem: Classify by looking at recurrence more quickly

Combining the three cases above gives us the following "master theorem".

Theorem 1 *The recurrence*

$$\begin{aligned} T(n) &= aT(n/b) + cn^k \\ T(1) &= c, \end{aligned}$$

where a, b, c, and k are all constants, solves to:

$$\begin{aligned} T(n) &\in \Theta(n^k) \text{ if } a < b^k \\ T(n) &\in \Theta(n^k \log n) \text{ if } a = b^k \\ T(n) &\in \Theta(n^{\log_b a}) \text{ if } a > b^k \end{aligned}$$

descending geom series ratio = 1

ascending geom series

THEOREM 2 **MASTER THEOREM** Let f be an increasing function that satisfies the recurrence relation

$$f(n) = af(n/b) + cn^d$$

whenever $n = b^k$, where k is a positive integer, $a \geq 1$, b is an integer greater than 1, and c and d are real numbers with c positive and d nonnegative. Then

$$f(n) \text{ is } \begin{cases} O(n^d) & \text{if } a < b^d, \\ O(n^d \log n) & \text{if } a = b^d, \\ O(n^{\log_b a}) & \text{if } a > b^d. \end{cases}$$

$c = 1$

$$\sum_{i=1}^{d} c^i$$

Proof: geom series

Non-Master: $T(n) = T(\frac{n}{2}) + T(\frac{n}{3}) + n^2$

Why? 2 rec calls
↳ different sizes

Tree:



Takeaway:

- Many ways to tackle recurrences
- In this class, divide & conquer (& perhaps linear inhomogeneous) will be most common
- Many other techniques exist
  - ↳ see supplemental reading if curious, but most will fall into categories like you read

A note on MoM

Goal is to eliminate a constant fraction of the optors.

How? (Can't sort!)

Idea: Split into tiny pieces & hope median is good enough.

Here:

Turning into code





```
MomSelect(A[1..n], k):
  if n ≤ 25   ⟨⟨or whatever⟩⟩
      use brute force
  else
      m ← ⌈n/5⌉
      for i ← 1 to m
          M[i] ← MedianOfFive(A[5i−4..5i])   ⟨⟨Brute force!⟩⟩
      mom ← MomSelect(M[1..m], ⌊m/2⌋)        ⟨⟨Recursion!⟩⟩
      r ← Partition(A[1..n], mom)
      if k < r
          return MomSelect(A[1..r−1], k)     ⟨⟨Recursion!⟩⟩
      else if k > r
          return MomSelect(A[r+1..n], k−r)   ⟨⟨Recursion!⟩⟩
      else
          return mom
```

First example of non-Master theorem!

Can always guarantee at least $\frac{3n}{10}$ are eliminated.



So:

$M(n) \leq$

Then solving:

Why $\frac{n}{5}$ blocks?



Try $n/3$ blocks:



Result: $M(n) \leq$

Backtracking : N Queens

Issue:

representation!



Figure 2.1. Gauss's first solution to the 8 queens problem, represented by the array $[5, 7, 1, 4, 2, 8, 6, 3]$

His choice :

How to solve?

Structured brute force, set up recursively

Main tricky bit!



Figure 2.3. The complete recursion tree of Gauss and Laquière's algorithm for the 4 queens problem.

```
PLACEQUEENS(Q[1..n], r):
  if r = n + 1
      print Q[1..n]
  else
      for j ← 1 to n
          legal ← TRUE
          for i ← 1 to r − 1
              if (Q[i] = j) or (Q[i] = j + r − i) or (Q[i] = j − r + i)
                  legal ← FALSE
          if legal
              Q[r] ← j
              PLACEQUEENS(Q[1..n], r + 1)        ⟨⟨Recursion!⟩⟩
```

Figure 2.2. Gauss and Laquière's backtracking algorithm for the n queens problem.

Runtime

Game Trees:

a way to model moves in 2-player games

Assume:

- No randomness so the game is just 2 people taking turns

Ex:

- "Perfect" players:
  Makes rational decisions, + if there is a move to get them to a win state, they do it!

Idea: Track current state of the game, as play occurs

Tic-tac-toe:

1st player: play an X



2nd player puts O

1st player again

⋮

leaves: full, or someone wins:



vs



A state is good for player 1 if they either have won, or could move to a bad state for player 2.

and bad if they have lost, or if all possible moves lead to a state that is good for player 2.

Think from the bottom up:

Downsides: Game trees are HUGE!

Tic-tac-to: over 200,000 leaves.

People can still "predict":
we're good at inferring state/strategy intuitively

Computers have to search.
Hence - took 60 years to get a decent computer chess player! Need "heuristics" (aka guesses) to make it work.

Game theory – a bit more complicated. Here, we assume clear win vs. lose

Game theory suggests more subtle possibilites, as well as simultaneous moves & "randomness".

Example: Odds and Evens

Consider the simple game called **odds and evens**. Suppose that player 1 takes evens and player 2 takes odds. Then, each player simultaneously shows either one finger or two fingers. If the number of fingers matches, then the result is *even*, and player 1 wins the bet ($2). If the number of fingers does not match, then the result is *odd*, and player 2 wins the bet ($2). Eac player has two possible strategies: show one finger or show two fingers. The *payoff matrix* shown below represents the payo to player 1.

Payoff Matrix

Strategy		Player 2: 1	Player 2: 2
Player 1	1	2	-2
	2	-2	2

Even if we know all results, outcome is unclear!

Text Segmentation

↳ Leads well into next reading

Fix a "language", so can recognize "words".

Ex: - English text
- Genetic data
⋮

So: IsWord(s) is given, & O(1) time.

Aside: reasonable?

Backtracking:

Fix suffix to decide on.



To solve Splittable[i..n]:

Code:

```
SPLITTABLE(A[1..n]):
  if n = 0
      return TRUE
  for i ← 1 to n
      if ISWORD(A[1..i])
          if SPLITTABLE(A[i+1..n])
              return TRUE
  return FALSE
```

Runtime:

Issue w/ passing arrays:

Passing by index/ptr/global/etc

Given an index i, find a segmentation of the suffix $A[i..n]$.

Formalize an (ugly?) recurson:

$$Splittable(i) = \begin{cases} \text{TRUE} & \text{if } i > n \\ \bigvee_{j=i}^{n} \big(\text{IsWord}(i,j) \wedge Splittable(j+1)\big) & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

And then translate to code:

```
⟨⟨Is the suffix A[i..n] Splittable?⟩⟩
SPLITTABLE(i):
  if i > n
      return TRUE
  for j ← i to n
      if ISWORD(i, j)
          if SPLITTABLE(j + 1)
              return TRUE
  return FALSE
```

Why?!

It's already exponential anyway, right?

Observation:

```
⟨⟨Is the suffix A[i..n] Splittable?⟩⟩
SPLITTABLE(i):
  if i > n
      return TRUE
  for j ← i to n
      if ISWORD(i, j)
          if SPLITTABLE(j + 1)
              return TRUE
  return FALSE
```

Consider stack point of view, + all of these function calls:

So: For any $k \in [1..n]$, might be calling Splittable(k) many times!

Question: Can its value change?
(ie is it a pure function?)

Potential Improvement

Once you calculate Splittable(k) once, store it.

Then, can just look it up in a data structure! S[1..n]

Here:

Then:

```
⟨⟨Is the suffix A[i..n] Splittable?⟩⟩
SPLITTABLE(i):
  if i > n
      return TRUE
  for j ← i to n
      if ISWORD(i, j)
          if SPLITTABLE(j + 1)
              return TRUE
  return FALSE
```

Change:

Better yet:

- Splittable(n) is trivial
- Splittable(n-1) only needs Splittable(n)
- Splittable(n-2) only needs n-1 & n-2



So: memoize & fill in backwards!

At end: return Splittable[1]