

**Solution:**

(a) The algorithm is defined as follows:

**def** SmallestNumBills( $C, B$ ):

```

1 : if  $C = 0$ :           # Base case where the amount of currency is 0
2 :     return 0
3 : else if  $C < 0$ :       # Base case where the amount of currency is negative
4 :     return  $\infty$ 
5 : else:                  # Try every possible bill
6 :     return 1 + min{SmallestNumBills( $C - B[1], B$ ), ..., SmallestNumBills( $C - B[n], B$ )}
```

The argument  $C$  means the amount of currency,  $B$  is the set of all denominations with cardinality  $n$ , in problem 1's case,  $B[1]$  represents 1,  $B[2]$  represents 4, ...,  $B[8]$  represents 365.

If the bill we choose is larger than the amount of currency, we simply return  $\infty$  to ignore the situation, if  $C$  is 0, there is no choice to draw a bill, so we return 0.

Otherwise, we try every possible bill to make a sequence of decisions, and return the smallest number of bills.

(b) The worst case of this problem is obviously bounded by  $\Theta(C)$ , for example, we only have two denominations, one is 1, and the other is  $C + 1$ . A dynamic programming utilizes a 1-d array, and is defined as follows:

**def** SmallestNumBills( $C, B$ ):

```

1 : for  $i \leftarrow 1$  to  $C$ :
2 :      $N[i] \leftarrow \infty$ 
3 : for  $j \leftarrow 1$  to  $n$ :
4 :      $N[B[j]] \leftarrow 1$ 
5 :  $N[0] \leftarrow 0$ 
6 : for  $i \leftarrow 1$  to  $C$ :
7 :     for  $j \leftarrow 1$  to  $n$ :
8 :         if  $C - B[j] < 0$ :
9 :              $a_j \leftarrow \infty$ 
10 :        else:
11 :             $a_j \leftarrow N[C - B[j]]$ 
12 :         $N[i] \leftarrow 1 + \min\{a_1, \dots, a_n\}$ 
13 : return  $N[C]$ 
```

$N$  is a 1-d array, in which  $N[i]$  records the smallest number of bills to produce an amount of  $i$  currency. So for every possible bill  $B[j]$ ,  $N[B[j]] = 1$ , which means we only need 1 bill to produce  $B[j]$  currency.  $N[0] = 0$ , because 0 indicates no bill. Local variables  $a_1$  to  $a_n$  indicate for every possible bill, the corresponding smallest number of bills to produce an amount of  $C - B[j]$  currency, if the amount becomes negative when the bill is larger than  $C$ , we assign  $\infty$ .

For initialization, the time complexity is  $O(C + n + 1)$ , for the main for-loop, the time complexity is  $O(Cn)$ , because the number of dominations is limited, so  $n$  is a constant, then the total time complexity is  $O(C)$ .

(c)

```

1 Bill = [1, 4, 7, 13, 28, 52, 91, 365]
2
3 def SmallestNumBills(n):
4     N = []
5     N.append(0)
6     for i in range(1, 366):
7         N.append(float("inf"))
8
9     for j in range(len(Bill)):
10        N[Bill[j]] = 1
11
12    if n > 365:
13        for i in range(n-365):
14            N.append(float("inf"))
15
16    A = []
17    for i in range(len(Bill)):
18        A.append(float("inf"))
19
20    for i in range(1, n+1):
21        for j in range(len(Bill)):
22            if i - Bill[j] < 0:
23                A[j] = float("inf")
24            else:
25                A[j] = N[i - Bill[j]]
26        N[i] = 1 + min(A)
27
28    return N[n]
29
30 def SmallestNumBillsGreedy(n):
31     count = 0
32     while n>0:
33         for j in reversed(range(len(Bill))):
34             if n - Bill[j] >= 0:
35                 n -= Bill[j]
36                 count +=1
37                 break
38     return count

```

  

```

1 for i in range(1, 1000):
2     if SmallestNumBillsGreedy(i) != SmallestNumBills(i):
3         print(i)

```

416

Implement both algorithm in part (b) and greedy algorithm, 416 is the smallest number that the results of these two algorithms differ. Since the greedy algorithm will give us 7 bills ( $\{365, 28, 14, 7, 1, 1, 1\}$ ) but the correct result is 5 ( $\{91, 91, 91, 91, 52\}$ ). ■

**Solution:**

Reference

[1] E. Demaine, L. W. Sun, and C. E. Leiserson. "Intro to Algorithms Problem Set 8 Solutions".  
*Massachusetts Institute of Technology*. November 14, 2001.

- Define  $\text{MinLength}(i, j)$  for typesetting the  $i^{th}$  through  $j^{th}$  words as:

$$\text{MinLength}(i, j) = (j - i) + \sum_{k=i}^j l(k) \quad (1)$$

which indicates the minimum length required to fit the  $i^{th}$  through  $j^{th}$  words in a line.

- Define  $\text{LineCost}(i, j)$  for typesetting the  $i^{th}$  through  $j^{th}$  words as:

$$\text{LineCost}(i, j) = \begin{cases} \infty & \text{if } \text{MinLength}(i, j) > L \\ 0 & \text{if } j = n, \text{ which indicates the last line} \\ (L - (j - i) - \sum_{k=i}^j l(k))^3 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \quad (2)$$

which returns  $\infty$  if the  $i^{th}$  through  $j^{th}$  words could not be fitted in a single line, or 0 for the last line, or the slop for any line excluding the last.

- Define the value of the optimal solution in which the total slop (the sum of line slopes excluding the last) is minimized as:

$$C(j) = \min\{C(i - 1) + \text{LineCost}(i, j)\}, \text{ where } 1 \leq i \leq j \quad (3)$$

where  $C(j)$  denotes the value of the optimal solution of typesetting the  $1^{st}$  through  $j^{th}$  words, we need to consider every possible way of line setting to find the optimal solution. Define  $C(0) = 0$  as a base case.

- The algorithm for solving this problem is defined as follows:

We construct a 1-d array to store the values from  $C(0)$  to  $C(n)$ . We calculate the value of each element in  $C$  from bottom to up since for every  $C(j)$ , every  $C(k)$  (where  $0 \leq k < j$ ) is available by the time when  $C(j)$  is being computed.

To record how to divide words into lines, construct another 1-d array,  $P$ , where  $P(k)$  is the value that minimizes  $C(k)$ , or:

$$P(k) = \arg\min(C(k)) = \arg\min\{C(i - 1) + \text{LineCost}(i, k)\}, \text{ where } 1 \leq i \leq k \quad (4)$$

so  $P(k)$  is the  $i$  that minimizes  $C(k)$ .

- So after the arrays  $C$  and  $P$  are obtained,  $C(n)$  is the optimal cost and the optimal solution is to print the  $P(n)^{th}$  to  $n^{th}$  words in the last line, the  $P(P(n) - 1)^{th}$  to  $P(n - 1)^{th}$  words in the second last line, ..., and so forth.

Computing  $\text{LineCost}(i, j)$  takes  $O(j - i + 1)$  time, since we have to add up the length of the  $i^{th}$  to  $j^{th}$  words. But it can be optimized in  $O(1)$  time by constructing a 1-d array,  $L$ , where  $L(i)$  stores the cumulative sum of lengths of the  $1^{st}$  to  $i^{th}$  words.

The time complexity of our algorithm is  $O(n^2)$ , since the main for-loop for computing  $C$  takes  $O(n^2)$  time, this is because we should consider each  $i$  to determine the minimum cost. The space complexity is  $O(n)$  since we constructs three 1-d arrays, namely,  $C, P, L$ .

■

**Solution:**

(a) The original EditRecursive( $S, T$ ) function takes two arguments, string  $S[1\dots m]$  and string  $T[1\dots n]$ , and returns the edit distance of  $S$  and  $T$ .

```
def EditRecursive( $S, T$ ):
    1 : if Length( $S$ ) = 0:      # Base case where  $S$  is empty
    2 :     return Length( $T$ ) (or  $n$ )
    3 : if Length( $T$ ) = 0:      # Base case where  $T$  is empty
    4 :     return Length( $S$ ) (or  $m$ )
    5 : DelCost  $\leftarrow$  EditRecursive( $S[1\dots m - 1], T[1\dots n]$ ) + 1  # Cost of deleting one char in  $S$ 
    6 : InsCost  $\leftarrow$  EditRecursive( $S[1\dots m], T[1\dots n - 1]$ ) + 1  # Cost of inserting one char in  $S$ 
    7 : if  $S[m] = T[n]$ :  # Matched case where the last char in  $S$  matches the last char in  $T$ 
    8 : MatchCost  $\leftarrow$  EditRecursive( $S[1\dots m - 1], T[1\dots n - 1]$ )
    9 : else:          # Mismatched case where the last char in  $S$  mismatches the last char in  $T$ 
    10 : MatchCost  $\leftarrow$  EditRecursive( $S[1\dots m - 1], T[1\dots n - 1]$ ) + 1
    11 : return min{DelCost, InsCost, MatchCost}
```

In EditRecursive( $S, T$ ), line 1 to line 4 solve the problem for two base cases where  $S$  or  $T$  is empty, line 5 is the cost of deleting  $S$ 's last character, line 6 is the cost of inserting a character to the end of  $S$ , line 10 is the cost of substituting  $S[m]$  with  $T[n]$  if  $S[m]$  mismatches  $T[n]$ , and line 8 is the cost of DOING NOTHING if  $S[m]$  matches  $T[n]$ .

Although the above code can handle all 5 cases correctly, I will modify it by considering if we can DO NOTHING first, because DOING NOTHING STRICTLY DOMINATES deletion, insertion, and substitution. This is easy to prove, since if  $S[m]$  matches  $T[n]$ , the edit distance is 0 for substrings  $S[m]$  and  $T[n]$ , we can just consider the edit distance of  $S[m - 1]$  and  $T[n - 1]$ .

Therefore, I will move the statement “ $\text{if } S[m] = T[n]$ ” above, such that we can reduce the number of calls by line 5 (deletion) and line 6 (insertion). The modified algorithm is as follows:

```
def EditRecursive( $S, T$ ):
    1 : if Length( $S$ ) = 0:
    2 :     return Length( $T$ ) (or  $n$ )
    3 : if Length( $T$ ) = 0:
    4 :     return Length( $S$ ) (or  $m$ )
    5 : if  $S[m] = T[n]$ :
    6 :     MatchCost  $\leftarrow$  EditRecursive( $S[1\dots m - 1], T[1\dots n - 1]$ )
    7 :     return MatchCost
    8 : else:
    9 :     DelCost  $\leftarrow$  EditRecursive( $S[1\dots m - 1], T[1\dots n]$ ) + 1
```

---

```

10 :   InsCost ← EditRecursive( $S[1\dots m]$ ,  $T[1\dots n-1]$ ) + 1
11 :   MatchCost ← EditRecursive( $S[1\dots m-1]$ ,  $T[1\dots n-1]$ ) + 1
12 :   return min{DelCost, InsCost, MatchCost}

```

Then we can implement the modified  $\text{EditRecursive}(S, T)$  function to compute the bounded edit distance, and write a function  $\text{BoundedEditDist}(S, T, B)$ , that takes strings  $S, T$ , and a non-negative integer  $B$  ( $B$  is valid if and only if it is non-negative, 0 means  $S$  and  $T$  are exactly the same), and returns either  $\infty$  if the edit distance of  $S$  and  $T$  is greater than  $B$ , or the value of edit distance if it is less than or equal to  $B$ . Note that after each deletion, insertion, or substitution, we should take  $B - 1$  as the third argument of our new recursive call.

```

def BoundedEditDist( $S, T, B$ ):
    1 : if  $\text{Length}(S) = 0$ :
        2 :     if  $\text{Length}(T) > B$ :
            3 :         return  $\infty$ 
        4 :     else:
            5 :         return  $\text{Length}(T)$ 
    6 : if  $\text{Length}(T) = 0$ :
        7 :     if  $\text{Length}(S) > B$ :
            8 :         return  $\infty$ 
        9 :     else:
            10 :        return  $\text{Length}(S)$ 
    11 : if  $S[m] = T[n]$ :
        12 :     MatchCost ← BoundedEditDist( $S[1\dots m-1]$ ,  $T[1\dots n-1]$ ,  $B$ )
        13 :     return MatchCost
    14 : else:
        15 :     DelCost ← BoundedEditDist( $S[1\dots m-1]$ ,  $T[1\dots n]$ ,  $B-1$ ) + 1
        16 :     InsCost ← BoundedEditDist( $S[1\dots m]$ ,  $T[1\dots n-1]$ ,  $B-1$ ) + 1
        17 :     MatchCost ← BoundedEditDist( $S[1\dots m-1]$ ,  $T[1\dots n-1]$ ,  $B-1$ ) + 1
        18 :     return min{DelCost, InsCost, MatchCost}

```

#### Reference

[1] J. Erickson. Algorithm, Chapter 3.7.

(b) I will answer this question for a more general case, such that  $S$  is of length  $m$  and  $T$  is of length  $n$ , and the bound is  $O(mn)$ .

We use a  $(m+1) \times (n+1)$  2-d array,  $\text{Edit}$ , to save the edit distances of substrings of  $S$  and  $T$ , each entry  $\text{Edit}[i, j]$  represents the edit distance of  $S[1\dots i]$  and  $T[1\dots j]$ . Entry  $\text{Edit}[i, 0] = i$  which represents  $i$  deletions to convert  $S[1\dots i]$  to an empty string. Entry  $\text{Edit}[0, j] = j$  which represents  $j$  insertions to convert an empty string to  $T[1\dots j]$ .

The algorithm is as follows:

```

def EditDist( $S, T$ ):
    1 : for  $j \leftarrow 0$  to  $n$ :

```

---

```

2 :   Edit[0,j] ← j:
3 : for i ← 1 to m
4 :   Edit[i,0] ← i:
5 :   for j ← 1 to n:
6 :     ins ← Edit[i,j-1]+1
7 :     del ← Edit[i-1,j]+1
8 :     if S[i] = T[j]:
9 :       match ← Edit[i-1,j-1]
10:    else:
11:      match ← Edit[i-1,j-1]+1
12:    Edit[i,j] ← min{ins,del,match}
13 :return Edit[m,n]

```

The first for-loop takes  $O(n)$  time, the second for-loop takes  $O(mn)$  time, therefore, the algorithm is bounded by  $O(mn)$  time, if  $S$  and  $T$  both have length  $n$ , then it is bounded by  $O(n^2)$  time. ■