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

**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  $f(n) + o(f(n)) = \Theta(f(n))$ .