

Solution: First, sort the arrays A, B using A as the key, in ascending order. In other words, sort the intervals according to their starting point. This can be done in $O(n \log n)$ time using mergesort or quicksort.

After sorting, divide the intervals into two halves A_l, B_l and A_r, B_r . Suppose we already know the maximum overlap length of these two halves. Then the maximum overlap length of A, B is the maximum of:

- i. The maximum overlap length of (A_l, B_l) .
- ii. The maximum overlap length of (A_r, B_r) .
- iii. The maximum overlap length of two intervals such that one is taken from (A_l, B_l) and the other is taken from (A_r, B_r) .

For case (iii), let $(a_l, b_l) \in (A_l, B_l)$ and $(a_r, b_r) \in (A_r, B_r)$ be the two intervals with maximum overlap length. Then $a_l < a_r$ because the array is sorted. Therefore, the overlap interval must start with a_r . It ends with $\min(b_l, b_r)$. If b_l is maximized, then we only need to search once through (A_r, B_r) to find a maximum $\min(b_l, b_r) - a_r$, which is the maximum overlap length indicated in (iii). Finding a maximum b_l requires $O(|B_l|)$ time, and searching through (A_r, B_r) requires $O(|B_r|)$ time. The sum is $O(|B_l|) + O(|B_r|) \leq O(|B|) = O(n)$ time. Finding the maximum of the three cases above takes $O(1)$ time, so the total cost for the algorithm without recursion is $O(n)$. The base case is when $n = 1$, there is only one interval and no overlap so the algorithm returns 0. The algorithm is on the next page.

```

MAXOVERLAPINTERVALS(A, B):
  sort A,B in ascending order using A as key
   $n \leftarrow A.length$ 
   $\_, (a_i, b_i), (a_j, b_j) \leftarrow \text{RECURSE}(A, B, n)$ 
  return  $(a_i, b_i), (a_j, b_j)$ 

RECURSE(A, B, n):
  if  $n \leq 1$ 
    return 0, nil, nil
   $m \leftarrow \lceil n/2 \rceil$ 
   $lmax, (a_{i,l}, b_{i,l}), (a_{j,l}, b_{j,l}) \leftarrow \text{RECURSE}(A[0:m-1], B[0:m-1], m)$ 
   $rmax, (a_{i,r}, b_{i,r}), (a_{j,r}, b_{j,r}) \leftarrow \text{RECURSE}(A[m:n-1], B[m:n-1], n-m)$ 
   $(a_i, b_i) \leftarrow (0, -\infty)$ 
  for  $k \leftarrow 0$  to  $m-1$ 
    if  $B[k] > b_i$ 
       $(a_i, b_i) \leftarrow (A[k], B[k])$ 
   $crossmax \leftarrow 0$ 
  for  $k \leftarrow m$  to  $n-1$ 
     $overlap \leftarrow \max\{0, \min(b_i, B[k]) - A[k]\}$ 
    if  $overlap > crossmax$ 
       $crossmax \leftarrow overlap$ 
       $(a_j, b_j) \leftarrow (A[k], B[k])$ 
  if  $rmax \geq crossmax$  and  $rmax \geq lmax$ 
    return  $rmax, (a_{i,r}, b_{i,r}), (a_{j,r}, b_{j,r})$ 
  else if  $lmax \geq crossmax$  and  $lmax \geq rmax$ 
    return  $lmax, (a_{i,l}, b_{i,l}), (a_{j,l}, b_{j,l})$ 
  else
    return  $crossmax, (a_i, b_i), (a_j, b_j)$ 

```

The algorithm returns two intervals (a_i, b_i) and (a_j, b_j) . If no intervals overlap, the algorithm returns *nil, nil*. The recurrence relation for RECURSE is $T(n) = 2T(n/2) + O(n)$, which gives $T(n) = O(n \log n)$. The time complexity of sorting is $O(n \log n)$. Therefore, the total time complexity of MAXOVERLAPINTERVALS is $O(1) + O(n \log n) + O(n \log n) = O(n \log n)$. ■

Solution: (a) Let K represent the ranks k_1, k_2, \dots, k_h . We begin by splitting K into two halves, K_l and K_r . We then find the rank $K_r[0]$ element in A and call it m . Then we can divide A into A_l and A_g where $\max(A_l) < m$ and $\min(A_g) \geq m$. Then we subtract everything in K_r by $K_r[0]$ such that K_r starts with 0. Then we can recursively apply the algorithm on A_l, K_l and A_g, K_r and denote the return values as B_l and B_r . The concatenation $B_l B_r$ is the elements of rank K in A since every element in B_r is greater than any element in B_l . The base case is when $h = 1$, $K = \{k_1\}$, therefore the algorithm returns the set of the k_1 th smallest element in A . The algorithm is shown below.

Note: Zero-based indices are used.

```

ELEMENTSOFRANK(A, K, h):
  if h = 0
    return nil
  if h = 1
    b ← K[0]th smallest element in A
    return [b]
  p ← ⌈h/2⌉
  Kl ← K[0 : p - 1]; Kr ← K[p : h - 1]
  q ← Kr[0]
  m ← qth smallest element in A
  Al ← []; Ag ← []
  for each a ∈ A
    if a < m
      add a to Al
    else
      add a to Ag
  for i ← 0 to h - p - 1
    Kr[i] ← Kr[i] - q
  Bl ← ELEMENTSOFRANK(Al, Kl, p)
  Br ← ELEMENTSOFRANK(Ag, Kr, h - p)
  return BlBr //concatenation

```

From the algorithm we can write the recurrence $T(h) = 2T(h/2) + O(n) + O(h)$ and $T(1) = O(n)$ since selection costs $O(n)$. However, there is a lower bound. Consider the recursion tree. The depth of the tree is $\log h$. Although the array A is split randomly during each recursion, it must be true that the sum of the work on each level is $O(n) + O(h) = O(n)$ because only linear operations are involved with A so no matter how A is split the sum is still $O(|A|)$. Therefore the time complexity = work on each level \times number of levels = $O(n \log h)$.

(b) We begin by calculating the mid indices of all four arrays, m_1, m_2, m_3, m_4 .

- If $m_1 + m_2 + m_3 + m_4 < k$, then since all the arrays are sorted, at least one subarray $A_1[1 : m_1], A_2[1 : m_2], A_3[1 : m_3], A_4[1 : m_4]$ can be dismissed. The one with the smallest number at index m_i should be dismissed since it would be filled first. Then we adjust $k \leftarrow k - m_i$ and recurse on the adjusted arrays.
- If $m_1 + m_2 + m_3 + m_4 \geq k$, let n_i be the length of A_i , then similarly the subarray $A_i[m_i : n_i]$ with the largest number at index m_i should be dismissed since reaching it

would require $k > m_1 + m_2 + m_3 + m_4$ which is a contradiction. Then we recurse on k and the adjusted arrays.

The base case is when exactly one array is non-empty, the algorithm returns the k th element of that array.

```

FINDKTHRANK( $A_1, A_2, A_3, A_4, k$ ):
  if exactly one  $A_i$  is non-empty
    return  $A_i[k]$ 
   $n_1 \leftarrow A_1.length; n_2 \leftarrow A_2.length; n_3 \leftarrow A_3.length; n_4 \leftarrow A_4.length$ 
   $m_1 \leftarrow \lceil \frac{n_1}{2} \rceil; m_2 \leftarrow \lceil \frac{n_2}{2} \rceil; m_3 \leftarrow \lceil \frac{n_3}{2} \rceil; m_4 \leftarrow \lceil \frac{n_4}{2} \rceil$ 
  if  $m_1 + m_2 + m_3 + m_4 < k$ 
     $p \leftarrow \min(A_1[m_1], A_2[m_2], A_3[m_3], A_4[m_4])$ 
    for each  $A_i \in \{A_1, A_2, A_3, A_4\}$ 
      if  $A_i$  is empty
        continue
      if  $A_i[m_i] = p$ 
        if  $n_i > 1$ 
           $A_i \leftarrow A_i[m_i + 1 : n_i]$ 
        else
           $A_i \leftarrow []$ 
         $k \leftarrow k - m_i$ 
      break
    return FINDKTHRANK( $A_1, A_2, A_3, A_4, k$ )
  else
     $p \leftarrow \max(A_1[m_1], A_2[m_2], A_3[m_3], A_4[m_4])$ 
    for each  $A_i \in \{A_1, A_2, A_3, A_4\}$ 
      if  $A_i$  is empty
        continue
      if  $A_i[m_i] = p$ 
        if  $m_i > 1$ 
           $A_i \leftarrow A_i[1 : m_i - 1]$ 
        else
           $A_i \leftarrow []$ 
      break
    return FINDKTHRANK( $A_1, A_2, A_3, A_4, k$ )

```

Time complexity analysis: $T(1) = O(1)$ since we only need to retrieve one element from an array. Only one branch of the if-statement is executed, so there is exactly one recursive call in each function call. Let's just assume that each array A_i has exactly n elements which will be strictly larger than the actual situation. Then it takes $\lceil \log n \rceil + 1$ iterations for each A_i to be empty, hence $3(\lceil \log n \rceil + 1) + \lceil \log n \rceil = 4\lceil \log n \rceil + 3$ iterations in total. Only $O(1)$ operations are involved during each iteration. Therefore, an upper bound for the time complexity is $O(\log n)$.

■