

1. **[5 points]** When analyzing the performance of algorithms, what is the *doubling hypothesis*? Estimate the runtime growth rate function form and the specific values for:

Problem Size	Time (in arbitrary units)
16	33
32	132
64	396
128	1584

- 1) Doubling hypothesis is a quick to estimate runtime growth rate, specifically the base b in a power-law relationship **(3 points)**. It is obtained by calculating the ratio between $a(2N)^b$ and $a(N)^b$ and then compute $b = \log_2 \text{ratio}$. While it can not identify the logarithmic factor a .
 - 2) $\text{Ratio1} = (132/33) = 4$; $\text{ratio2} = (396/132) = 3$; $\text{ratio3} = (1584/396) = 4$ **(1 point)**, so the ratio is converged at 4. $b = \log_2 \text{ratio} = \log_2 4 = 2$. Then the growth rate function can be denoted as $O(n^2)$ **(1 point)**.
2. **[3+1 points]** Propose (i.e., write pseudo-code) an “efficient” solution for the 3-sum problem? What is the best case computational complexity and compare it to the worst case computational complexity?
- 1) **(3 points)** Sort the N numbers, and then for each pair of number $a[i]$ and $a[j]$, binary search **(2 points)** for $(a[i] + a[j])$
 - 2) **(1 point)** The key is to identify the best case and worst case for the binary search in the algorithm. For the binary search, worst case is $O(\log n)$, and best case is $O(1)$. Therefore, for the 3-sum problem, the worst case is $O(n^2 \log n)$, and best case is $O(n^2)$.
3. **[5 points]** Here is the Pseudocode for the solution to the Towers of Hanoi problem. Trace the (**order and value**) function calls.

```

solveTowers(count, source, destination, spare)
    if (count is 1)
        Move a disk directly from source to destination
    else
    {
        solveTowers(count - 1, source, spare, destination)
        solveTowers(1, source, destination, spare)
        solveTowers(count - 1, spare, destination, source)
    }

```

- 1) Label the pegs A, B, C; let n be the total number of disks; number the disks from 1 (smallest, topmost) to n (largest, bottom-most)
- 2) Move $n-1$ disks from source to auxiliary, so they are out of the way; move the n th disk from source to target; move the $n-1$ disks so that we left on auxiliary onto target.
- 3) <http://interactivepython.org/runestone/static/pythonds/Recursion/TowerofHanoi.html>

- | |
|---------------------------------------|
| 4) 1. count 1 moving disk from A to B |
| 2. count 2 moving disk from A to C |
| 3. count 1 moving disk from B to C |
| 4. count 3 moving disk from A to B |
| 5. count 1 moving disk from C to A |
| 6. count 2 moving disk from C to B |
| 7. count 1 moving disk from A to B |

4. **[1+1+1+3 points]** (i) If you are told that for $A(x)$, if you increase x by a factor of 10, the value of A goes up by a factor of 1000, what can you say about the functional form of $A(x)$? (ii) Can low-order terms in an algorithm's growth-rate function can be ignored? Why? (iii) What is the runtime in the worst case, for binary search? (iv) Arrange the following functions based upon increasing growth-rate function (i.e. $f(A) > f(B)$, implies A has a higher growth-rate function). NOTE: There may be functions that are equal to each other.

(i) N^2 (ii) 2^N (iii) $N \cdot \log_2 N$ (iv) $N \cdot \log_3 N$ (v) $\log_3 N$ (vi) N (vii) N^3

- 1) (1 point) $A(x) = x^3$
- 2) (1 point) Intuitively, the lower-order terms of an asymptotically positive function can be ignored in determining asymptotically tight bounds because they are insignificant for large n . A tiny fraction of the highest-order term is enough to dominate the lower-order terms.
- 3) (1 point) $\log(N)$
- 4) (3 points) $2^N > N^3 > N^2 > N \cdot \log_2 N > N \cdot \log_3 N > N > \log_3 N$