论题 2-1 作业

姓名: 陈劭源 学号: 161240004

1 [TC] Problem 2-1

- **a.** For every sublist of length k, insertion sort can sort it in $\Theta(k^2)$ worst-case time, and there are n/k sublists, so these sublists can be sorted by insertion sort in $\Theta(k^2)n/k = \Theta(nk)$ worst-case time.
- **b.** Apply the divide-and-conquer approach. Divide these sublists into two groups, each containing n/(2k) sublists, and merge these sublists recursively, and finally merge the two groups. Let m denote the number of the sublists, i.e. n/k, and T(m) denote the total running time of merging m sublists. The "divide", "conquer" and "combine" steps take a running time of $\Theta(1)$, 2T(m/2), $\Theta(km)$, so the recurrence is

$$T(m) = \begin{cases} \Theta(1) & m = 1 \\ 2T(m/2) + \Theta(km) & m > 1 \end{cases}.$$

Solve this recurrence, we obtain $T(m) = \Theta(km \lg(m)) = \Theta(n \lg(n/k))$.

- c. A standard merge sort takes a running time of $\Theta(n \lg n)$. When $k = \Theta(\lg(n))$, $\Theta(nk + n \lg(n/k)) = \Theta(n \lg n)$. For every $k = \omega(\lg n)$, $\Theta(nk + n \lg(n/k)) = \Theta(nk) = \omega(n \lg n)$. Therefore, the largest value of k is $\Theta(\lg n)$.
- d. It mainly depends on the constant factors of merge sort and insertion sort when n is sufficiently large. Theoretically speaking, let c_1 be the constant factor of merge sort, c_2 be the constant factor of insertion sort. We can rewrite the total running time as $T = c_1 nk + c_2 n \lg(n/k)$. We should now minimize T with respect to k. Since $T'_k = nc_1 (nc_2)/(k \ln 2)$, $k = c_2/(c_1 \ln 2)$ is a minimum point of T. However, the constant factors are machine- and implementation-dependent, so we can determine k by experiment in practice.

2 [TC] Problem 2-2

- **a.** $\langle A'[1], A'[2], \dots, A'[n] \rangle$ is a permutation of $\langle A[1], A[2], \dots, A[n] \rangle$.
- **b.** At the start of each iteration, the subarray A[j..A.length] consists of the elements originally in A[j..A.length], and A[j] is the smallest item of A[j..A.length].

Initialization Prior to the first iteration of this loop, we have j = A.length. Therefore, the subarray A[j..A.length] consists only one element, and it is the original element in A[j..A.length], and, of course, it is the smallest item of A[j..A.length].

Maintenance In each iteration, we compare A[j] with A[j-1]. If $A[j] \ge A[j-1]$, we do nothing. Because A[j] is the smallest item of A[j..A.length], A[j-1] is the smallest item of A[j-1..A.length]. It A[j] > A[j-1]

1

A[j-1], we exchange A[j] with A[j-1]. Because A[j] is the smallest item of A[j.A.length], A[j-1] is the smallest item of A[j-1.A.length] after exchanging, and A[j-1.A.length] consists of the elements originally from A[j-1.A.length]. Summarizing, the invariant still holds after an iteration.

Termination Finally, we get j = i. Therefore, the subarray A[i..A.length] consists of the elements originally in A[i..A.length], and A[i] is the smallest item of A[i..A.length], and that is what we want.

c. At the start of each iteration, A[1..i] contains the i smallest elements of A[1..A.length], in sorted order, and A[i+1..A.length] are the rest of the elements.

Initialization Prior to the first iteration, we have i = 1, and A[1..i] contains only one element, in sorted order, trivially. Moreover, A[i+1..A.length] are the rest of the elements obviously.

Maintenance After each iteration, A[i+1..A.length] consists of the elements originally in A[i+1..A.length], and A[i+1] is the smallest item of A[i+1..A.length]. Since A[1..i] are the i smallest elements of A[1..A.length], A[i+1] is greater than or equal to every element in A[1..i], but less than or equal to every element in A[i+2..A.length]. Therefore, A[1..i+1] contains the i+1 smallest elements of A[1..A.length] in sorted order, and A[i+2..A.length] is the rest of the elements, i.e. the loop invariant still holds.

Termination Finally we get i = A.length, therefore A[1..A.length] contains the A.length smallest elements of A[1..A.length] in sorted order. Hence, the algorithm is correct.

d. Whatever the original sequence is, lines 3-4 will always be executed n(n-1)/2 times, where n is the number of the elements of the original sequence. Therefore the worst-case running time of bubble sort is $\Theta(n^2)$, as much as the worst-case running time of insertion sort.

3 [TC] Problem 2-3

- $\boldsymbol{a}. \ \Theta(n).$
- **b.** Given the coefficients a_0, a_1, \dots, a_n and a value for x:
 - 1 y = 0
 - 2 for i = 0 to n
 - 3 t = 1
 - 4 **for** j = 1 **to** i
 - 5 t = t * x
 - $6 y = y + a_i * t$

The running time of this algorithm is $\theta(n^2)$, worse than Horner's rule.

c. Initialization Prior to the first iteration, we have y = 0 and i = n, so the loop invariant trivially holds. Maintenance Assume, prior the tth iteration, we have $i = i_t$ and $y = y_t$. After the iteration and incrementing i, we get $i_{t+1} = i_t - 1$ and

$$y_{t+1} = a_{i_t} + x * y_t = a_{i_t} + x * \sum_{k=0}^{n-(i_t+1)} a_{k+i_t+1} x^k$$

$$= a_{i_t} + \sum_{k=0}^{n - (i_{t+1} + 2)} a_{k+i_{t+1} + 2} x^{k+1} = a_{i_{t+1} + 1} + \sum_{k=1}^{n - (i_{t+1} + 1)} a_{k+i_{t+1} + 1} x^k$$

$$= \sum_{k=0}^{n - (i_{t+1} + 1)} a_{k+i_{t+1} + 1} x^k,$$

therefore the invariant still holds.

Termination At termination, we have i = -1. Substituting i for -1 in invariant, we obtain

$$y = \sum_{k=0}^{n} a_k x^k.$$

d. We have proved that the algorithm is partially correct. Note that the algorithm will be terminated after n+1 loops, so the algorithm is totally correct.

4 [TC] Problem 2-4

- a. (2,1), (3,1), (8,6), (8,1), (6,1).
- **b.** $\langle n, n-1, \dots 1 \rangle$. n(n-1)/2.
- c. Assume there are I(n) inversions in the input array, then the running time of insertion sort is $\Theta(n+I(n))$. Proof: In page 26, t_j stands for the number of times the **while** loop test is executed for that value of j. Every time we execute the **while** loop, we insert A[j] into the correct position, and exactly $t_j 1$ inversions are eliminated. Finally, all the inversions are eliminated, and the array is sorted in order. Substituting $\sum_{j=2}^{n} (t_j 1)$ for I(n) and rewriting the formula, we get

$$T(n) = an + bI(n) + c$$
,

therefore the running time of insertion sort is $\Theta(n+I(n))$.

- d. Let c be an integer representing the number of inversions.
 - 1 c = 0
 - 2 MODIFIED-MERGE-SORT(A, 1, A.length)

MODIFIED-MERGE-SORT(A, p, r)

- 1 if p < r
- q = |(p+r)/2|
- 3 MODIFIED-MERGE-SORT(A, p, q)
- 4 MODIFIED-MERGE-SORT(A, q + 1, r)
- 5 MODIFIED-MERGE(A, p, q, r)

```
{\tt Modified\text{-}Merge}(A,p,q,r)
```

```
1 n_1 = q - p + 1
 2 n_2 = r - q
 3 Let L[1..n_1 + 1] and R[1..n_2 + 1] be new arrays
 4 for i = 1 to n_1
         L[i] = A[p+i-1]
 5
 6 for j = 1 to n_2
       R[j] = A[q+j]
 7
 8 L[n_1+1] = \infty
 9 R[n_2+1] = \infty
10 i = 1
11 j = 1
12
    for k = p to r
         if L[i] \leq R[i]
13
14
             A[k] = L[i]
             i = i + 1
15
16
         else
17
             A[k] = R[j]
              // Add the number of inversions (A[i], R[j]), (A[i+1], A[j]) \cdots (A[q], A[j]) to c
```

5 [TC] Problem 3-2

18

19

| \boldsymbol{A} | B | 0 | 0 | Ω | ω | Θ |
|------------------|-------------------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| $- \lg^k n$ | n^{ε} | yes | yes | no | no | no |
| n^k | c^n | yes | yes | no | no | no |
| \sqrt{n} | $n^{\sin n}$ | no | no | no | no | no |
| $\overline{2^n}$ | $2^{n/2}$ | no | no | yes | yes | no |
| $n^{\lg c}$ | $c^{\lg n}$ | yes | no | yes | no | yes |
| $\lg(n!)$ | $\lg(n^n)$ | yes | no | yes | no | yes |

c = c + (q - i + 1)

j = j + 1

6 [TC] Problem **3-3**

a. List:

Equivalence classes: $\{2^{2^{n+1}}\}$, $\{2^{2^n}\}$, $\{(n+1)!\}$, $\{n!\}$, $\{n2^n\}$, $\{e^n\}$, $\{2^n\}$, $\{(\frac{3}{2})^n\}$, $\{(\lg n)^{\lg n}, n^{\lg \lg n}\}$, $\{(\lg n)!\}$, $\{\sqrt{2}^{\lg n}\}$, $\{n^3\}$, $\{n^2, 4^{\lg n}\}$, $\{n\lg n\}$, $\{n, 2^{\lg n}\}$, $\{2^{\sqrt{2\lg n}}\}$, $\{\lg^2 n\}$, $\{\lg(n!)\}$, $\{\sqrt{\lg n}\}$, $\{\ln n\}$, $\{\ln n\}$, $\{2^{\lg^* n}\}$, $\{\lg^* (\lg n), \lg^* n\}$, $\{\lg (\lg^* n)\}$, $\{1, n^{1/\lg n}\}$.

b.
$$f(n) = (2^{2^{n+2}})^{\sin n}$$

7 [TC] Problem 3-4

- **a.** False. Take f(n) = n, $g(n) = n^2$, f(n) = O(g(n)), but $g(n) \neq O(f(n))$.
- **b.** False. Take f(n) = n, $g(n) = n^2$, $f(n) + g(n) = n + n^2 = \Theta(n^2) \neq \Theta(\min(f(n), g(n))) = \Theta(n)$.
- c. True. Since f(n) = O(g(n)), there exists positive constant c > 1 such that for all sufficiently large n, $1 \le f(n) \le cg(n)$ holds. Therefore, $\lg(f(n)) \le \lg c + \lg(g(n))$. Take $c' = \lg c + 1$, then $0 \le \lg(f(n)) \le c' \lg(g(n))$ for all sufficiently large n. Hence, $\lg(f(n)) = O(\lg(g(n)))$.
- **d.** False. Take $f(n) = n \lg n$, $g(n) = \lg(n!)$, f(n) = O(g(n)), however, $2^{f(n)} = n^n \neq O(2^{g(n)}) = O(n!)$.
- *e*. False. Take f(n) = 1/n, then $(f(n))^2 = 1/n^2$, however, $\lim_{n \to \infty} f(n)/(f(n))^2 = +\infty$, that means, f(n) could not be asymptotically upper-bounded by $(f(n))^2$.
- f. True. By transpose symmetry we know this is true.
- **g.** False. Take $f(n) = 4^n$, then $\Theta(f(n/2)) = \Theta(2^n)$, however $4^n \neq \Theta(2^n)$.
- **h.** True. By the definition of o-notation, for any positive constant c, there exists a positive integer n_0 , for any integer $n > n_0$, $0 \le o(f(n)) \le cf(n)$ holds. For sufficiently large positive integer n, $f(n) \le f(n) + o(f(n)) \le (1+c)f(n)$, therefore $f(n) + o(f(n)) = \Theta(f(n))$.