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Algorithm: Definitions

- A finite set of precise instructions for performing a computation or for solving a problem.
- A specific set of instructions for carrying out a procedure or solving a problem, usually with the requirement that the procedure terminates at some point.
- A procedure for solving a mathematical problem in a finite number of steps that frequently involves repetition of an operation.
- A step-by-step procedure for solving a problem or accomplishing some end especially by a computer.
- A logical arithmetical or computational procedure that if correctly applied ensures the solution of a problem.
- A finite set of unambiguous instructions performed in a prescribed sequence to achieve a goal, especially a mathematical rule or procedure used to compute a desired result.
Algorithm: Definitions

- A word used by programmers when they do not want to explain what they did.

- A word used by those whose program failed to justify what they did.
Algorithm

Synonym

- Method, Procedure, Program, Process, Recipe, Routine, Solution, Technique, Mechanism, Scheme, Way, Design, Plan, Strategy, Construction, ...

Etymology

- Alteration of Middle English *algorisme*;
- from Old French & Medieval Latin *algorismus*;
- from Arabic *al-khuwarizmi*;
- from the name of the 9th-century Persian Mathematician *Al-Khowârizmi* who was the first (?) to formalize the rules for the four basic arithmetic operations.
The Ultimate Algorithmic Problem!?!

**Question**
- What do we need to solve problems?

**Attributes**
1. Talent?
2. Intuition?
3. Luck?
4. Experience?
5. Hard work?

**Answer**
- Apply some combination of these five attributes!!!
Some Heuristics to Solve Problems

1. Search for a pattern
2. Draw a figure
3. Formulate an equivalent problem
4. Modify the problem
5. Choose effective notation
6. Exploit symmetry
7. Divide into cases
8. Work backward
9. Argue by contradiction
10. Pursue parity
11. Consider extreme cases
12. Generalize
Algorithms: Online Videos

What is an algorithm?
- https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Da5TOXcWLSg
- https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=6hfOvs8pY1k
- https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=CvSOaYi89B4&feature=youtu.be

Why algorithms are called algorithms?
- https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=oRkNaF0QvnI
Three Ancient Algorithms

The Babylonian Multiplication Algorithm
- Introduced around 3700 years ago

The Euclid’s Greatest Common Divisor Algorithm
- Introduced around 2300 years ago

The Sieve of Eratosthenes to Find Prime Numbers Algorithm
- Introduced around 2200 years ago
The Babylonian Multiplication Algorithm

Although there are some evidences of early multiplication algorithms in Egypt (around 1700-2000 BC) the oldest algorithm is widely accepted to have been found on a set of Babylonian clay tablets that date to around 1600-1800 BC.

Their true significance only came to light in 1972 when computer scientist & mathematician Donald E. Knuth published the first English translations of various Cuneiform mathematical tablets.

The Babylonians had developed a nice way to explain an algorithm by examples as the algorithm itself was being defined.

The tablets also appear to have been an early form of instruction manual.
The Euclid’s Greatest Common Divisor Algorithm

The Euclid’s Greatest Common Divisor Algorithm

The Euclidian algorithm is a procedure used to find the greatest common divisors (GCD) of two positive integers.

It was first described by Euclid in his manuscript the Elements written around 300 BC.

It is a very efficient computation that is still used today by computers in some form or other.
The Sieve of Eratosthenes Algorithm

The Sieve of Eratosthenes is an ancient algorithm for finding all prime numbers up to any given limit.

It is attributed to the Greek mathematician Eratosthenes of Cyrene and was “invented” around 200 BC.

The algorithm iteratively marks as composite (i.e., not prime) the multiples of each prime, starting with the first prime number, 2.

The “less efficient” method sequentially tests each candidate number for divisibility by previously found prime.
Algorithms — Properties

Correctness
- For all valid inputs

Termination
- Does not run forever on some inputs

Complexity – Efficiency
- As a function of the input size
- Worst-Case and/or Average-Case

Scalability
- “Similar” structure and efficiency for any input size

Limitations
- For the algorithm and for the problem

Optimality
- Optimal or near-optimal or approximately optimal solutions
Cost and Complexity

Cost
- How much resources does the algorithm require?
  - Usually time and space (memory)

Complexity
- As a function of the input size
  - Usually an integer $n > 0$
  - Usually a monotonic non-decreasing function

Terminology
- Complexity is often called \textit{running-time} because time is the dominating cost
Worst Case and Average Case Complexity

**Worst case**
- $T(n)$ is a **worst case complexity**:
  - If among all inputs of size $n$ the worst case complexity is $T(n)$

**Average case**
- $T(n)$ is an **average case complexity**:
  - If the average complexity over all length $n$ inputs is $T(n)$
  - Averaging based on some distribution of the inputs (usually the uniform distribution)
Bounds

**Upper Bound**
- A function $f(n)$ such that $T(n) \leq f(n)$ for all $n$

**Lower bound**
- A function $g(n)$ such that $T(n) \geq g(n)$ for all $n$

**Tight bound**
- A function $h(n)$ such that $T(n) \approx h(n)$ for all $n$
Performance Evaluation of Algorithms

**Theoretical analysis**
- All possible inputs
- Independent of hardware/software implementation
- Based on a high level language

**Experimental Study**
- Some typical input
- Depends on hardware/software implementation
- Based on a real program
Growth of Functions

Objective
- Develop a language to express that Algorithm A is better than or worse than or equivalent to Algorithm B

Technique
- Define a "\( \leq \)" relation between functions measuring the growth of functions

Robustness
- Being independent of the hardware/software environment: Turing machines, classroom models, today computers, and super-computers

An important property
- Constants that can be affected by changing the environment should be ignored
## Examples of Function Growth

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Running Time</th>
<th>1 second</th>
<th>1 minute</th>
<th>1 hour</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$400n$</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>150,000</td>
<td>9,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$2n^2$</td>
<td>707</td>
<td>5,477</td>
<td>42,426</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$n^4$</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$2^n$</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Maximum size of a problem that can be solved in one second, one minute, and one hour, for various running times measured in microseconds.
## Examples of Function Growth

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Running Time</th>
<th>New Maximum Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$400n$</td>
<td>$256m$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$2n^2$</td>
<td>$16m$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$n^4$</td>
<td>$4m$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$2^n$</td>
<td>$m + 8$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Increase in the maximum size of a problem that can be solved with a certain complexity, by using a computer that is **256 times faster** than the previous one.
- Each entry is given as a function of $m$, the previous maximum problem size.
### The “$O$, $\Omega$, $\Theta$, $o$, $\omega$” Notation

#### Big-Oh

$f(n) = O(g(n))$ if $f(n)$ asymptotically less than or equal to $g(n)$

#### Big-Omega

$f(n) = \Omega(g(n))$ if $f(n)$ asymptotically greater than or equal to $g(n)$

#### Big-Theta

$f(n) = \Theta(g(n))$ if $f(n)$ asymptotically equal to $g(n)$

#### Little-oh

$f(n) = o(g(n))$ if $f(n)$ asymptotically strictly less than $g(n)$

#### Little-omega

$f(n) = \omega(g(n))$ if $f(n)$ asymptotically strictly greater than $g(n)$
Big-Oh, Big-Omega, and Big-Theta

\( f(n) = O(g(n)) \)
- There exist a real constant \( c > 0 \) and an integer constant \( n_0 > 0 \) such that \( f(n) \leq cg(n) \) for every integer \( n \geq n_0 \)

\( f(n) = \Omega(g(n)) \)
- There exist a real constant \( c > 0 \) and an integer constant \( n_0 > 0 \) such that \( f(n) \geq cg(n) \) for every integer \( n \geq n_0 \)

\( f(n) = \Theta(g(n)) \)
- There exist two real constants \( c', c'' > 0 \) and an integer constant \( n_0 > 0 \) such that \( c''g(n) \leq f(n) \leq c'g(n) \) for every integer \( n \geq n_0 \)
## Big-Oh and Big-Omega

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>$f(n) = O(g(n))$</th>
<th>$g(n) = O(f(n))$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$g(n)$ grows faster</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$f(n)$ grows faster</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>same growth</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>$f(n) = \Omega(g(n))$</th>
<th>$g(n) = \Omega(f(n))$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$g(n)$ grows faster</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$f(n)$ grows faster</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>same growth</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Growth of Functions**

\[ f(n) = O(g(n)) \iff g(n) = \Omega(f(n)) \]

**Assume** \( f(n) = O(g(n)) \)

- By the definition of \( O \), there exist \( c > 0 \) and \( n_0 > 0 \) such that \( f(n) \leq cg(n) \) for every \( n \geq n_0 \)
- It follows that \( g(n) \geq \left( \frac{1}{c} \right) f(n) \) for every \( n \geq n_0 \)
- Since \( 1/c > 0 \), by the definition of \( \Omega \), \( g(n) = \Omega(f(n)) \)

**Assume** \( g(n) = \Omega(f(n)) \)

- By the definition of \( \Omega \), there exist \( c > 0 \) and \( n_0 > 0 \) such that \( g(n) \geq cf(n) \) for every \( n \geq n_0 \)
- It follows that \( f(n) \leq \left( \frac{1}{c} \right) g(n) \) for every \( n \geq n_0 \)
- Since \( 1/c > 0 \), by the definition of \( O \), \( f(n) = O(g(n)) \)
\[ f(n) = \Theta(g(n)) \iff \left( f(n) = O(g(n)) \text{ and } f(n) = \Omega(g(n)) \right) \]

**Assume** \( f(n) = \Theta(g(n)) \)

- By the definition of \( \Theta \), there exist \( c', c'' > 0 \) and \( n_0 > 0 \) such that \( c'' g(n) \leq f(n) \leq c' g(n) \) for every \( n \geq n_0 \)
- By the definition of \( O \), \( f(n) = O(g(n)) \) for \( c = c' \) and \( n_0 \)
- By the definition of \( \Omega \), \( f(n) = \Omega(g(n)) \) for \( c = c'' \) and \( n_0 \)

**Assume** \( f(n) = O(g(n)) \) and \( f(n) = \Omega(g(n)) \)

- By the definition of \( O \), there exist \( c_1 > 0 \) and \( n_1 > 0 \) such that \( f(n) \leq c_1 g(n) \) for every \( n \geq n_1 \)
- By the definition of \( \Omega \), there exist \( c_2 > 0 \) and \( n_2 > 0 \) such that \( f(n) \geq c_2 g(n) \) for every integer \( n \geq n_2 \)
- Therefore, for \( n_0 \geq \max\{n_1, n_2\} \), it follows that \( c_2 g(n) \leq f(n) \leq c_1 g(n) \) for every \( n \geq n_0 \)
- By the definition of \( \Theta \), \( f(n) = \Theta(g(n)) \) for \( c' = c_1, \ c'' = c_2 \), and \( n_0 \)
**O, Ω, Θ as Relations**

Θ is an equivalence relation

- **Reflexive:** \( f(n) = \Theta(f(n)) \)
- **Symmetric:** \( (f(n) = \Theta(g(n))) \Leftrightarrow (g(n) = \Theta(f(n))) \)
- **Transitive:** \( f(n) = \Theta(g(n)) \land g(n) = \Theta(h(n)) \Rightarrow (f(n) = \Theta(h(n))) \)

O, Ω, are reflexive relations

- \( f(n) = O(f(n)) \)
- \( f(n) = \Omega(f(n)) \)

O, Ω, are not symmetric relations

- \( f(n) = O(g(n)) \) does not imply that \( g(n) = O(f(n)) \)
- \( f(n) = \Omega(g(n)) \) does not imply that \( g(n) = \Omega(f(n)) \)

O, Ω, are transitive relations

- \( f(n) = O(g(n)) \land g(n) = O(h(n)) \Rightarrow f(n) = O(h(n)) \)
- \( f(n) = \Omega(g(n)) \land g(n) = \Omega(h(n)) \Rightarrow f(n) = \Omega(h(n)) \)
Growth of Functions

\section*{\textit{n}^2 \textit{vs.} \textit{n}}

\[ n = O(n^2) \text{ and } n^2 = \Omega(n) \]

- Observe that \( n \leq n^2 \) for integer \( n \geq 1 \) (\( n < n^2 \) for integer \( n > 1 \))
- Therefore, for \( c = 1 \) and \( n_0 = 1 \), the definition of \( O \) implies that \( n = O(n^2) \) and the definition of \( \Omega \) implies that \( n^2 = \Omega(n) \)

\[ n^2 \neq O(n) \text{ and } n \neq \Omega(n^2) \]

- Observe that if \((1/c) < n\) for a constant \( c > 0 \), then by multiplying both sides of the inequality by \( cn \), it follows that \( n < cn^2 \)
- Therefore, \( n < cn^2 \) for every real constant \( c > 0 \) and integer \( n \geq n_1 > (1/c) \)
- As a result, there are no real constant \( c > 0 \) and integer \( n_0 \) such that \( n \geq cn^2 \) for every integer \( n \geq n_0 \)
- Consequently, the definitions of \( O \) and \( \Omega \) cannot be applied to get \( n^2 = O(n) \) or \( n = \Omega(n^2) \)
Examples

“Ignore” constants

- $3n = \Theta(n/2)$
- $1000000n = \Theta(n/100000)$
- $n \log_2 n/100000 = \Omega(10000000n)$
- $\log_2(n) = \Theta(\log_{10}(n))$

Polynomials

- $a_d n^d + a_{d-1} n^{d-1} + \cdots + a_1 n + a_0 = \Theta(n^d)$
  * for constants $a_0, a_1, \ldots, a_d$ and $a_d > 0$
- **Example:** $5n^3 + 1000n^2 - 345n + 7 = \Theta(n^3)$
Observations

Eliminating constants

- For any real constant $c$ and $\psi \in \{O, \Omega, \Theta\}$:
  - $\psi(cf(n)) = \psi(f(n))$
  - $\psi(f(n)/c) = \psi(f(n))$
  - $\psi(c) = \psi(1)$

Addition, multiplication, and $\text{max}$ rules

- For $\psi \in \{O, \Omega, \Theta\}$:
  - $\psi(f(n)) + \psi(g(n)) = \psi(f(n) + g(n))$
  - $\psi(f(n)) \cdot \psi(g(n)) = \psi(f(n) \cdot g(n))$
  - $\psi(f(n)) + \psi(g(n)) = \psi(\text{max} \{f(n), g(n)\})$
Little-oh and Little-omega

\( f(n) = o(g(n)) \)

- If \( \lim_{n \to \infty} \frac{f(n)}{g(n)} = 0 \):
  - For any constant \( c > 0 \) there exists an integer constant \( n_0 > 0 \) such that \( f(n) \leq cg(n) \) for every integer \( n \geq n_0 \)

\( f(n) = \omega(g(n)) \)

- If \( \lim_{n \to \infty} \frac{f(n)}{g(n)} = \infty \):
  - For any constant \( c > 0 \) there exists an integer constant \( n_0 > 0 \) such that \( f(n) \geq cg(n) \) for every integer \( n \geq n_0 \)
Propositions

$o$ and $\omega$

- $f(n) = o(g(n)) \iff g(n) = \omega(f(n))$
- $f(n) = o(g(n)) \land g(n) = o(h(n)) \Rightarrow f(n) = o(h(n))$
- $f(n) = \omega(g(n)) \land g(n) = \omega(h(n)) \Rightarrow f(n) = \omega(h(n))$

$o$ vs. $O$

- $f(n) = o(g(n)) \Rightarrow f(n) = O(g(n))$
- $f(n) = O(g(n)) \nRightarrow f(n) = o(g(n))$

$\omega$ vs $\Omega$

- $f(n) = \omega(g(n)) \Rightarrow f(n) = \Omega(g(n))$
- $f(n) = \Omega(g(n)) \nRightarrow f(n) = \omega(g(n))$
Examples

**Polynomials**

- \( n^3 = \omega(n^2) \)
- \( 10^{100} n = o(n^2 / 10^{100}) \)
- \( 1 + n + n^2 + n^3 + \cdots + n^{k-1} = o(n^k) \)

**The logarithmic function**

- \( \log_2 n = o(n) \)
- \( n \log_2 n = \omega(n) \)

**The sqrt function**

- \( \log_2 n = o(\sqrt{n}) \)
- \( n = \omega(\sqrt{n}) \)

**Beyond polynomial function**

- \( n^k = o(2^n) \) for any integer \( k \geq 0 \)
- \( 2^n = o(3^n) = o(4^n) = \cdots = o(k^n) \)
- \( n^n = \omega(n!) = \omega(2^n) \)
## Hierarchy of Functions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Function Type</th>
<th>Growth Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>constant</td>
<td>$1$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>log star</td>
<td>$\log^* n$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>loglog</td>
<td>$\log \log n$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>logarithmic</td>
<td>$\log n$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>poly-logarithmic</td>
<td>$\log^k n$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sub-linear</td>
<td>$n^\varepsilon$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>linear</td>
<td>$n$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>above-linear</td>
<td>$n \log n$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>quadratic</td>
<td>$n^2$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cubic</td>
<td>$n^3$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>polynomial</td>
<td>$n^k$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>super-polynomial</td>
<td>$n^{\log n}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>exponential</td>
<td>$2^n$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>factorial</td>
<td>$n!$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>super-exponential</td>
<td>$n^n$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>exponential tower</td>
<td>$2^{2^{\cdots^{2^n}}}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$n$ powers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Prefix-Sum Problem

Input
- An array \( A = [A[1], A[2], \ldots, A[n]] \) with \( n \geq 1 \) real numbers

Output
- An array \( S = [S[1], S[2], \ldots, S[n]] \) such that for all \( 1 \leq i \leq n \),
  \[
  S[i] = \sum_{j=1}^{i} A[j]
  \]

Example
- \( A = [13, 34, -8, -55, -5, 21, \ldots] \)
- \( S = [13, 47, 39, -16, -21, 0 \ldots] \)

Optimization goal
- Minimize the number of additions between the array numbers
The Prefix-Sum Problem

A By Definition Algorithm

Algorithm

prefix-sum \((A)\)

\[
\begin{align*}
&\text{for } i = 1 \text{ to } n \text{ do} \\
&S[i] := 0 \\
&\text{for } i = 1 \text{ to } n \text{ do} \\
&\quad \text{for } j = 1 \text{ to } i \text{ do} \\
&\quad \quad S[i] := S[i] + A[j]
\end{align*}
\]

Correctness

- By definition

Complexity

- \(1 + 2 + \cdots + n = \frac{n(n+1)}{2}\) additions in the inner loop
- \(\Theta(n^2)\) complexity
A By Induction Algorithm

Algorithm

prefix-sum(A)

\[
\]

for \( i = 2 \) to \( n \) do

\[
S[i] := S[i - 1] + A[i]
\]

Correctness

- Induction hypothesis, for \( 1 \leq i \leq n - 1 \), after iteration \( i - 1 \):

\[
S[i - 1] = \sum_{j=1}^{i-1} A[j]
\]

- By Induction for \( 2 \leq i \leq n \), after iteration \( i \):

\[
S[i] = S[i - 1] + A[i] = \sum_{j=1}^{i-1} A[j] + A[i] = \sum_{j=1}^{i} A[j]
\]
The Prefix-Sum Problem

A By Induction Algorithm

Algorithm

prefix-sum(A)


for \( i = 2 \) to \( n \) do


Complexity

- \( n - 1 \) additions in the loop
- \( \Theta(n) \) complexity
Evaluating a Polynomial

**Input**
- Real numbers $c$ and $a_0, a_1, \ldots, a_n$ such that $a_n \neq 0$

**Output**
- The value of the polynomial $P(x)$ for $x = c$:
  \[ P(x) = a_n x^n + a_{n-1} x^{n-1} + \cdots + a_1 x + a_0 \]

**Example**
- $a_4 = 5$, $a_3 = 0$, $a_2 = -7$, $a_1 = 3$, $a_0 = -11$, and $c = 2$
- $P(x) = 5x^4 - 7x^2 + 3x - 11$
- $P(2) = 5 \cdot 2^4 - 7 \cdot 2^2 + 3 \cdot 2 - 11 = 47$

**Optimization goal**
- Minimize the number of operations between real numbers
  - multiplications and additions and subtractions
A By Definition Algorithm

Algorithm

Polynomial-Evaluation\((P(x), c)\)

\[
P(c) = a_0
\]

for \(i = 1\) to \(n\) do

\[
a = a_i
\]

for \(j = 1\) to \(i\) do

\[
a = a \cdot c
\]

\[
P(c) = P(c) + a
\]

return \((P(c))\)

Correctness

- By definition
A By Definition Algorithm

Complexity

- \( i \) multiplications in the \( i^{th} \) iteration of the inner loop
- \( 1 + 2 + \cdots + n = \frac{n(n+1)}{2} \) multiplications overall
- \( n \) additions in the outer loop
- Total number of operations:
  \[
  \frac{n(n+1)}{2} + n = \frac{n^2 + n}{2} + \frac{2n}{2} = \frac{n^2 + 3n}{2} = \frac{1}{2}n^2 + \frac{3}{2}n
  \]
- \( \Theta(n^2) \) overall complexity.
A Prefix-Sum Algorithm

Idea
- Compute $c, c^2, c^3, \ldots, c^n$ all the powers of $c$ using the efficient prefix-sum method

Algorithm

**Polynomial-Evaluation**($P(x), c$)

- $P(c) = a_0$
- $cc = 1$
- for $i = 1$ to $n$ do
  - $cc = cc \cdot c$ (*$cc = c^i$*)
  - $P(c) = P(c) + a_i \cdot cc$ (*$P(c) = a_i c^i + a_{i-1} c^{i-1} + \cdots + a_1 c + a_0$*)
- return($P(c)$) (*$P(c) = a_n c^n + a_{n-1} c^{n-1} + \cdots + a_1 c + a_0$*)

Correctness
- By induction
A Prefix-Sum Algorithm

Complexity

- 2 multiplications in the $i^{th}$ iteration of the loop
- 1 addition in the $i^{th}$ iteration of the loop
- Total of $3n$ operations: $2n$ multiplications and $n$ additions
- $\Theta(n)$ overall complexity
The Horner’s Algorithm

Idea

\[ P(x) = (\cdots ((a_n x + a_{n-1}) x + a_{n-2}) x + \cdots ) x + a_0 \]

Example I

\[ 4x^3 + 3x^2 + 2x + 1 = ((4x + 3)x + 2)x + 1 \]

Example II

\[ 5x^4 − 7x^2 + 3x − 11 = (((5x + 0)x − 7)x + 3)x − 11 \]
The Horner’s Algorithm

Algorithm

- **Polynomial-Evaluation** \((P(x), c)\)

  \[
P(c) = a_n \\
\text{for } i = n - 1 \text{ downto } 0 \text{ do} \\
P(c) = P(c) \cdot c + a_i \\
\]

  (* \( P(c) = a_n c^{n-i} + a_{n-1} c^{n-i-1} + \cdots + a_{i+1} c + a_i \) *)

  return \((P(c))\)

  (* \( P(c) = a_n c^n + a_{n-1} c^{n-1} + \cdots + a_1 c + a_0 \) *)

Correctness

- **By Induction**
The Horner’s Algorithm

Example II

Input: Evaluate $P(x) = 5x^4 - 7x^2 + 3x - 11$ for $c = 2$

* In the above polynomial $a_3 = 0$

Running the algorithm

$P_4(x) = a_4 = 5$
$P_3(x) = P_4(x) \cdot c + a_3 = 5 \cdot 2 + 0 = 10$
$P_2(x) = P_3(x) \cdot c + a_2 = 10 \cdot 2 - 7 = 13$
$P_1(x) = P_2(x) \cdot c + a_1 = 13 \cdot 2 + 3 = 29$
$P(x) = P_1(x) \cdot c + a_0 = 29 \cdot 2 - 11 = 47$
The Prefix-Sum Problem

The Horner’s Algorithm

Complexity

- 1 multiplication in the $i^{th}$ iteration of the loop
- 1 addition in the $i^{th}$ iteration of the loop
- Total of $2n$ operations: $n$ multiplications and $n$ additions
- $\Theta(n)$ overall complexity
A Dictionary Search Problem

**Input**
- A key \( K \)

**Output**
- Does \( K \) appear in \( A \)? **YES** or **NO**
  - If **YES**: The first index \( i \) such that \( A[i] = K \)
  - If **NO**: The largest index \( i \) such that \( A[i] < K \) or \( i = 0 \) if \( K < A[1] \)

**Method**
- **Comparisons** between \( K \) and the keys in the array

**Complexity**
- Number of comparisons
A Search Game

Game
- **Player 1**: Selects an integer $x$ in the range $[1..n]$
- **Player 2**: Searches for $x$ only with **comparisons** of the type $x \leq i$ for some $1 \leq i \leq n$

Players Goal
- **Player 1** tries to **maximize** the number of **comparisons** until Player 2 finds the value of $x$
- **Player 2** tries to **minimize** the number of **comparisons** until finding the value of $x$

Complexity: number of comparisons
- In the worst case or in the average case
- As a function of $n$
The Two Models are “Equivalent”

**Equivalence**
- $x \leq i$ is “equivalent” to $K \leq A[i]$
- Algorithms can be “converted” from one model to another while preserving the complexity

**Convenience**
- It is “easier” to design algorithms in the search game model
- It is “easier” to prove bounds and limitations on algorithms in the search game model
Sequential Search

Algorithm outline

- Assume a search for $x$ in the range $[1..n]$
- Throughout the algorithm, maintain a lower bound $\ell$ on $x$ such that $\ell \leq x \leq n$
- Initially, $\ell = 1$
- In each round, compare $x$ with the lower bound $\ell$
  - If $x > \ell$ then increment $\ell$ by 1
  - If $x \leq \ell$ then return $\ell$
**Sequential Search**

**Example**

**Input:** \( n = 10 \) and \( x = 7 \) \( \Rightarrow \) \( (* x \in [1..10] *) \)

**Search procedure:**

- Q1: \( x \leq 1 \) \( \Rightarrow \) A1: NO \( (* x \in [2..10] *) \)
- Q2: \( x \leq 2 \) \( \Rightarrow \) A2: NO \( (* x \in [3..10] *) \)
- Q3: \( x \leq 3 \) \( \Rightarrow \) A3: NO \( (* x \in [4..10] *) \)
- Q4: \( x \leq 4 \) \( \Rightarrow \) A4: NO \( (* x \in [5..10] *) \)
- Q5: \( x \leq 5 \) \( \Rightarrow \) A5: NO \( (* x \in [6..10] *) \)
- Q6: \( x \leq 6 \) \( \Rightarrow \) A6: NO \( (* x \in [7..10] *) \)
- Q7: \( x \leq 7 \) \( \Rightarrow \) A7: YES \( (* x \in [7..7] *) \)

**Output:** \( x = 7 \)

**Complexity:** 7 comparisons

Amotz Bar-Noy (Brooklyn College)
Sequential Search

Algorithm Pseudocode

Sequential-Search \((n, x)\)

\[
\ell = 0 \\
\text{repeat} \\
\quad \ell = \ell + 1 \\
\text{until } x \leq \ell \quad (* \text{comparison} *) \\
\text{return } \ell
\]
Sequential Search

Correctness
- By induction, $\ell \leq x \leq n$ after $\ell - 1$ comparisons with a NO answer

Termination
- If $x \leq \ell$ then necessarily $x = \ell$ because by the induction hypothesis $x \geq \ell$
- Eventually $x \leq n$
Sequential Search

**Worst case complexity**
- \( n \) comparisons in the worst case when \( x = n \)
- Possible \( n - 1 \) comparisons since there is no need for the last question when \( x = n \)

**Best case complexity**
- Only 1 comparison when \( x = 1 \)

**Average case complexity**
- \((n + 1)/2\) comparisons on average for a random \( x \) selected with a uniform distribution from the range \([1..n]\):

\[
\frac{1}{n} \left( 1 + 2 + \cdots + n \right) = \frac{1}{n} \cdot \frac{n(n + 1)}{2} = \frac{n + 1}{2}
\]
Binary Search

Algorithm outline

- Assume a search for $x$ in the range $[1..n]$
- Throughout the algorithm, maintain a range $[\ell..u]$ such that $\ell \leq x \leq u$
- Initially, $\ell = 1$ and $u = n$
- In each round, compare $x$ with the middle of the range $m = \left\lfloor \frac{u + \ell}{2} \right\rfloor$
- If $x \leq m$ then update $u = m$
- If $x > m$ then update $\ell = m + 1$
- Terminate when $\ell = u$
- Return $x = \ell = u$
Binary Search – Example

- **Input:** \( n = 128 \) and \( x = 50 \) \( \Rightarrow \) \( (* x \in [1..128] *) \)

- **Search procedure:**
  - Q1: \( x \leq 64 \) \( \Rightarrow \) A1: YES \( (* x \in [1..64] *) \)
  - Q2: \( x \leq 32 \) \( \Rightarrow \) A2: NO \( (* x \in [33..64] *) \)
  - Q3: \( x \leq 48 \) \( \Rightarrow \) A3: NO \( (* x \in [49..64] *) \)
  - Q4: \( x \leq 56 \) \( \Rightarrow \) A4: YES \( (* x \in [49..56] *) \)
  - Q5: \( x \leq 52 \) \( \Rightarrow \) A5: YES \( (* x \in [49..52] *) \)
  - Q6: \( x \leq 50 \) \( \Rightarrow \) A6: YES \( (* x \in [49..50] *) \)
  - Q7: \( x \leq 49 \) \( \Rightarrow \) A7: NO \( (* x \in [50..50] *) \)

- **Output:** \( x = 50 \)

- **Complexity:** \( 7 = \log_2(128) \) comparisons
Binary Search

Algorithm Pseudocode

Binary-Search \((n,x)\)

\[
\ell = 1 \\
u = n \\
\text{while } \ell < u \\
m = \left\lfloor \frac{u + \ell}{2} \right\rfloor \\
\text{if } x \leq m \text{ (* comparison *)} \\
\quad \text{then } u = m \\
\quad \text{else } \ell = m + 1 \\
\text{return } \ell
\]
Binary Search

**Notations**
- Let $u_j$ and $\ell_j$ be the values of $u$ and $\ell$ after iteration $j$ of the algorithm.
- Let $\Delta_j = u_j - \ell_j + 1$ be the size of the range $[\ell_j..u_j]$.
- Initially $\ell_0 = 1$, $u_0 = n$, and $\Delta_0 = n$.

**Observation**
- $\Delta_{j+1} \leq \left\lceil \frac{\Delta_j}{2} \right\rceil$ for $j \geq 0$.

**Corollary**
- $\Delta_k = 1$ for $k = \lceil \log_2 n \rceil$.
Dictionary Search

Binary Search – Correctness and Complexity

Correctness
- By induction, always $\ell \leq x \leq u$
- At the end, $\Delta = 1$ and therefore $\ell = u$ which implies that $x = \ell = u$

Complexity
- There are at most $\lceil \log_2 n \rceil$ iterations and one comparison per iteration
- Therefore, the worst-case complexity is $\lceil \log_2 n \rceil$
- If $n$ is not a power of 2, then for some $x$ there are only $\lfloor \log_2 n \rfloor$ iterations
- Therefore, the average-case complexity is approximately $\log_2 n$
## Binary-Search vs. Sequential-Search

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Binary-Search</th>
<th>Sequential-Search</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Best-Case</strong></td>
<td>$\lfloor \log_2 n \rfloor$</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Worst-Case</strong></td>
<td>$\lceil \log_2 n \rceil$</td>
<td>$n - 1$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average-Case</strong></td>
<td>$\approx \log_2 n$</td>
<td>$\approx \frac{n+1}{2}$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Adversary Player I

Goal

- Maximize the number of comparisons until Player 2 finds $x$

Strategy

- **Player 1** Does not select $x$ at the beginning of the game. Instead, it maintains a set of candidates $S$ for $x$
- Given a search question:
  - $S(Y)$ – the set of candidates if the answer is **YES**
  - $S(N)$ – the set of candidates if the answer is **NO**
- The adversary answer rule:
  - **YES** if $|S(Y)| \geq |S(N)|$
  - **NO** if $|S(Y)| < |S(N)|$
Adversary Player I

Example: A possible algorithm

**Input:** $n = 34$ (* $x \in [1..34]$ *)

**Search:**

- Q1: $x \leq 13 \Rightarrow A1: NO$ (* $x \in [14..34]$ *)
- Q2: $x \leq 26 \Rightarrow A2: YES$ (* $x \in [14..26]$ *)
- Q3: $x \leq 18 \Rightarrow A3: NO$ (* $x \in [19..26]$ *)
- Q4: $x \leq 23 \Rightarrow A4: YES$ (* $x \in [19..23]$ *)
- Q5: $x \leq 20 \Rightarrow A5: NO$ (* $x \in [21..23]$ *)
- Q6: $x \leq 22 \Rightarrow A6: YES$ (* $x \in [21..22]$ *)
- Q7: $x \leq 21 \Rightarrow A7: YES$ (* $x \in [21..21]$ *)

**Output:** $x = 21$
Adversary Player I

Example: Binary-Search

- **Input:** \( n = 34 \) \( (* \ x \in [1..34] *) \)
- **Search:**
  - Q1: \( x \leq 17 \) \( \Rightarrow \) A1: YES \( (* \ x \in [1..17] *) \)
  - Q2: \( x \leq 9 \) \( \Rightarrow \) A2: YES \( (* \ x \in [1..9] *) \)
  - Q3: \( x \leq 5 \) \( \Rightarrow \) A3: YES \( (* \ x \in [1..5] *) \)
  - Q4: \( x \leq 3 \) \( \Rightarrow \) A4: YES \( (* \ x \in [1..3] *) \)
  - Q5: \( x \leq 2 \) \( \Rightarrow \) A5: YES \( (* \ x \in [1..2] *) \)
  - Q6: \( x \leq 1 \) \( \Rightarrow \) A6: YES \( (* \ x \in [1..1] *) \)
- **Output:** \( x = 1 \)

**Observation**

- With Binary-Search the search always ends up with \( x = 1 \)
**Theorem**

There exists $1 \leq x \leq n$ for which the **Adversary Player 1** forces **Player 2** to ask at least $\lceil \log_2 n \rceil$ comparisons

**Proof**

- Assume that **Player 2** asks $k$ comparisons to find $x$
- Let $S_i$ be the set of candidates after $i$ comparisons
- In particular, $|S_0| = n$ and $|S_k| = 1$
- $S = S(Y) \cup S(N)$ implies that $|S_{i+1}|/|S_i| \geq (1/2)$ for $1 \leq i \leq k - 1$
- $\lceil \log_2 n \rceil$ rounds are required to decrease $n$ to 1 by halving
- Therefore, $k \geq \lceil \log_2 n \rceil$
Remarks

Worst case
- The $\lceil \log_2 n \rceil$ lower bound is a worst case bound.
- No algorithm can guarantee less comparisons for all values of $x$.

Average case
- It is possible to prove an $\Omega(\log n)$ average case lower bound.

Other search models
- The theorem holds for a “stronger” Player 2 – one that may ask any YES/NO questions. For example,
  * Is $x$ even?
  * Is $x$ a prime number?
  * Is $x \in \{1, 2, 3, 5, 8, 13, 21, 34\}$?
Searching with “Clues”

**Clue**
- **Player 1** selects only even numbers 2, 4, 6, 8, \ldots between 1 and an even \( n \)

**A modified Binary Search**
- The search domain is 1, 2, \ldots, \( n/2 \)
- Instead of asking “if \( x \leq i \)”, **Player 2** asks “if \( x \leq 2i \)” and then considers the answer as if it was the answer to “if \( x \leq i \)”
- When the search outputs \( x = i \) the modified search outputs 2\( i \)

**Complexity**
- \( \lceil \log_2(n/2) \rceil \approx \log_2(n/2) = \log_2(n) - 1 \) comparisons
- The saving is only 1 comparison although the clue “eliminated” about half of the candidates!
Searching with “Clues”

**Clue**
- **Player 1** selects only even numbers 2, 4, 6, 8, \ldots between 1 and an even \( n \).

**Example**
- \( n = 32 = 2 \cdot 16 \) and \( x = 20 = 2 \cdot 10 \)
- The possible 16 values for \( x \) are 2, 4, 6, \ldots, 32 and the search domain is 1, 2, \ldots, 16

**Running the algorithm**
- Question 1: \( x \leq (2 \cdot 8 = 16) \)? because \( 8 = \lfloor (1 + 16)/2 \rfloor \)
- Question 2: \( x \leq (2 \cdot 12 = 24) \)? because \( 12 = \lfloor (9 + 16)/2 \rfloor \)
- Question 3: \( x \leq (2 \cdot 10 = 20) \)? because \( 10 = \lfloor (9 + 12)/2 \rfloor \)
- Question 4: \( x \leq (2 \cdot 9 = 18) \)? because \( 9 = \lfloor (9 + 10)/2 \rfloor \)
- \( x = 20 \) found with \( 4 = \log_2 16 = \log_2 31 - 1 \) comparisons
Searching with “Clues”

Clue
- **Player 1** selects only square numbers $1, 4, 9, 16, \ldots$ between 1 and a square number $n$

A modified Binary Search
- The search domain is $1, 2, \ldots, \sqrt{n}$
- Instead of asking “if $x \leq i$”, **Player 2** asks “if $x \leq i^2$” and then considers the answer as if it was the answer to “if $x \leq i$”
- When the search outputs $x = i$ the modified search outputs $i^2$

Complexity
- $\left\lceil \log_2(\sqrt{n}) \right\rceil \approx \log_2(\sqrt{n}) = \frac{1}{2} \log_2(n)$ comparisons
- The saving is only half of the comparisons although the clue “eliminated” almost all the candidates!
Searching with “Clues”

Clue
- **Player 1** selects only square numbers 1, 4, 9, 16, \ldots between 1 and a square number \( n \)

Example
- \( n = 256 = 16^2 \) and \( x = 100 = 10^2 \)
- The possible 16 values for \( x \) are 1, 4, 9, \ldots, 256 and the search domain is 1, 2, \ldots, 16

Running the algorithm
- Question 1: \( x \leq (8^2 = 64)? \) because \( 8 = \lfloor (1 + 16)/2 \rfloor \)
- Question 2: \( x \leq (12^2 = 144)? \) because \( 12 = \lfloor (9 + 16)/2 \rfloor \)
- Question 3: \( x \leq (10^2 = 100)? \) because \( 10 = \lfloor (9 + 12)/10 \rfloor \)
- Question 4: \( x \leq (9^2 = 81)? \) because \( 9 = \lfloor (9 + 10)/10 \rfloor \)
- \( x = 100 \) found with \( 4 = \log_2 16 = (1/2) \log_2 256 \) comparisons
Dictionary Search

Searching with “Clues”

Clue
- **Player 1** selects only powers of 2 numbers 2, 4, 8, 16, \ldots between 2 and a power of 2 number \( n \)

A modified Binary Search
- The search domain is 1, 2, \ldots, \( \log_2 n \)
- Instead of asking “if \( x \leq i \)”, **Player 2** asks “if \( x \leq 2^i \)” and then considers the answer as if it was the answer to “if \( x \leq i \)”
- When the search outputs \( x = i \) the modified search outputs \( 2^i \)

Complexity
- \( \lceil \log_2 (\log_2 (n)) \rceil \approx \log_2 (\log_2 (n)) \) comparisons
- For \( n = 2^{32} = 4294967296 \) the saving is from 32 to 5 comparisons although there are only 32 candidates!
**Searching with “Clues”**

**Clue**
- **Player 1** selects only powers of 2 numbers 2, 4, 8, 16, ... between 2 and a power of 2 number \( n \)

**Example**
- \( n = 65536 = 2^{16} \) and \( x = 1024 = 2^{10} \)
- The possible 16 values for \( x \) are 2, 4, 8, ..., 65536 and the search domain is 1, 2, ..., 16

**Running the algorithm**
- Question 1: \( x \leq (2^8 = 256)? \) 8 = \( \lceil (1 + 16)/2 \rceil \)
- Question 2: \( x \leq (2^{12} = 4096)? \) 12 = \( \lceil (9 + 16)/2 \rceil \)
- Question 3: \( x \leq (2^{10} = 1024)? \) 10 = \( \lceil (9 + 12)/10 \rceil \)
- Question 4: \( x \leq (2^9 = 512)? \) 9 = \( \lceil (9 + 10)/10 \rceil \)
- \( x = 1024 \) found with 4 = \( \log_2 16 = \log_2 \log_2 65536 \) comparisons
Searching with “Clues”

**Clue**
- **Player 1** selects only primes 2, 3, 5, 7, … not larger than \( n \)

**A modified Binary Search**
- The search domain is 1, 2, …, \( \pi(n) \) where \( \pi(n) \) is the number of primes between 2 and \( n \)
- Instead of asking “if \( x \leq i \)”, **Player 2** asks “if \( x \leq p_i \)” where \( p_i \) is the \( i^{th} \) prime and then considers the answer as if it was the answer to “if \( x \leq i \)”
- When the search outputs \( x = i \) the modified search outputs \( p_i \)

**Complexity**
- \( \log_2 \left( \frac{n}{\ln(n)} \right) \approx \log_2(n) - \log_2 \log_2(n) \) comparisons because there are approximately \( n/\ln(n) \) primes between 2 and \( n \)
- There are 78498 primes between 2 and 1000000. The clue saves only 3 comparisons, because \( \left\lfloor \log_2(1000000) \right\rfloor = 20 \) and \( \left\lfloor \log_2(78498) \right\rfloor = 17 \)
Dictionary Search

Searching with “Clues”

Clue
- **Player 1** selects only primes 2, 3, 5, 7, \ldots not larger than \( n \)

Example
- \( n = 53 \) and \( x = 29 \)
- The possible 16 values for \( x \) are
  - 2, 3, 5, 7, 11, 13, 17, 19, 23, 29, 31, 37, 41, 43, 47, 53
- and the search domain is 1, 2, \ldots, 16

Running the algorithm
- Question 1: \( x \leq (p_8 = 19)? \) \( 8 = \lfloor (1 + 16)/2 \rfloor \)
- Question 2: \( x \leq (p_{12} = 37)? \) \( 12 = \lfloor (9 + 16)/2 \rfloor \)
- Question 3: \( x \leq (p_{10} = 29)? \) \( 10 = \lfloor (9 + 12)/10 \rfloor \)
- Question 4: \( x \leq (p_9 = 23)? \) \( 9 = \lfloor (9 + 10)/10 \rfloor \)
- \( x = 29 \) found with \( 4 \approx \log_2(53) - \log_2 \log_2(53) \) comparisons
Searching an Unbounded Domain

**Game**
- **Player 1**: Selects any positive integer $x$
- **Player 2**: Searches for $x$ with comparisons $x \leq i$ for some integer $i$

**Adversary Player 1**
- Always answers **NO**
- **Player 2** will never find $x$!

**Player 2 Goal**
- Find $x$ with as minimum possible comparisons as a function of $x$
- Ask "**few**" comparisons when $x$ is small and ask "**more**" comparisons when $x$ is large
Searching an Unbounded Domain

Sequential search

- Sequential search finds $x$ with exactly $x$ comparisons.

The doubling technique

- A strategy that finds $x$ with approximately $2 \log_2(x)$ comparisons.

A more sophisticated doubling technique

- A strategy that finds $x$ with approximately $\log_2(x) + 2 \log_2 \log_2(x)$ comparisons.

Optimal solution

- A strategy that finds $x$ with approximately $\log_2(x) + \log_2 \log_2(x) + \log_2 \log_2 \log_2(x) + \cdots$ comparisons.
Dictionary Search

The Doubling Technique

Strategy

- **Phase 1:** Ask the following comparisons until the answer is YES:
  
  \[ x \leq 1? \quad x \leq 2? \quad x \leq 4? \quad x \leq 8? \quad \cdots \quad x \leq 2^j? \quad \cdots \]

- Assume \(2^{k-1} < x \leq 2^k\)

- **Phase 2:** Apply binary search on the domain
  
  \([2^{k-1} + 1..2^k]\)

Complexity

- \(k + 1\) comparisons are asked in **Phase 1**

- The number of comparisons asked in **Phase 2** is
  
  \[\left\lfloor \log_2(2^k - (2^{k-1} + 1) + 1) \right\rfloor = \left\lfloor \log_2(2^{k-1}) \right\rfloor = k - 1\]

- Total number of comparisons:
  
  \[(k + 1) + (k - 1) = 2k = 2 \left\lceil \log_2(x) \right\rceil\]
The Doubling Technique – Example

- **Input:** \( x = 50 \)
- **Search procedure:**
  - Q1: \( x \leq 1 \Rightarrow A1: \text{NO} (* x \in [2..\infty] *) \).
  - Q2: \( x \leq 2 \Rightarrow A2: \text{NO} (* x \in [3..\infty] *) \).
  - Q3: \( x \leq 4 \Rightarrow A3: \text{NO} (* x \in [5..\infty] *) \).
  - Q4: \( x \leq 8 \Rightarrow A4: \text{NO} (* x \in [9..\infty] *) \).
  - Q5: \( x \leq 16 \Rightarrow A5: \text{NO} (* x \in [17..\infty] *) \).
  - Q6: \( x \leq 32 \Rightarrow A6: \text{NO} (* x \in [33..\infty] *) \).
  - Q7: \( x \leq 64 \Rightarrow A7: \text{YES} (* x \in [33..64] *) \).
  - Q8: \( x \leq 48 \Rightarrow A8: \text{NO} (* x \in [49..64] *) \).
  - Q9: \( x \leq 56 \Rightarrow A9: \text{YES} (* x \in [49..56] *) \).
  - Q10: \( x \leq 52 \Rightarrow A10: \text{YES} (* x \in [49..52] *) \).
  - Q11: \( x \leq 50 \Rightarrow A11: \text{YES} (* x \in [49..50] *) \).
  - Q12: \( x \leq 49 \Rightarrow A12: \text{NO} (* x \in [50..50] *) \).
- **Output:** \( x = 50 \)
- **Complexity:** \( 12 = \lceil 2 \log_2 50 \rceil \) comparisons
The Sorting Problem

**Keys**
- Entities from a **well ordered** domain

**Comparisons**
- Between two keys $K_1$ and $K_2$
  
  $K_1 < K_2$? $K_1 \leq K_2$? $K_1 = K_2$?

**Input**
- An unsorted array of $n$ keys $A[1], A[2], \ldots, A[n]$

**Output**

**Goal**
- Minimize number of comparisons between keys
Complexity of the Sorting Problem

**Lower bound**
- $\Omega(n \log n)$ comparisons are required by any algorithm

**Upper bounds**
- $O(n^2)$ comparisons with “simple” algorithms
- $O(n \log n)$ comparisons with more “sophisticated” algorithms

**Tight bound**
- $\Theta(n \log n)$ overall complexity

**Models**
- Bounds are for both worst case and average case complexity
Some Sorting Algorithms

**Simple algorithms**
- **Bubble-Sort:** \( \Theta(n^2) \) worst & average case
- **Insertion-Sort:** \( \Theta(n^2) \) worst & average case

**Efficient deterministic sorting algorithms**
- **Merge-Sort:** \( \Theta(n \log n) \) worst & average case
- **Heap-Sort:** \( \Theta(n \log n) \) worst & average case
- **Balanced-Tree-Sort:** \( \Theta(n \log n) \) worst & average case

**Efficient randomized sorting algorithms**
- **Quick-Sort:** \( \Theta(n \log n) \) average case; \( \Theta(n^2) \) worst case
- **Binary-Tree-Sort:** \( \Theta(n \log n) \) average case; \( \Theta(n^2) \) worst case
Bubble Sort

Input
- An unsorted array of $n$ keys $A[1], A[2], \ldots, A[n]$

Ideas
- Find the minimum $n - 1$ times
- Compare and exchange only adjacent keys

Implementation
- **Bubble-Sort**($A[1], \ldots, A[n]$)
  
  for $i = 1$ to $n - 1$
  
  for $j = n$ downto $i + 1$
  
  
  then $A[j] \leftrightarrow A[j - 1]$
Example

- Initial array: [8, 21, 1, 3, 2, 13, 5]
- After round 1: [1, 8, 21, 2, 3, 5, 13]
- After round 2: [1, 2, 8, 21, 3, 5, 13]
- After round 3: [1, 2, 3, 8, 21, 5, 13]
- After round 4: [1, 2, 3, 5, 8, 21, 13]
- After round 5: [1, 2, 3, 5, 8, 13, 21]
- Final sorted array: [1, 2, 3, 5, 8, 13, 21]
### Example

**Initial array**

| 34, 89, 13, 55, 21 |

**Round 1**

- 21 < 55 \(\Rightarrow\) [34, 89, 13, **21**, 55]
- 13 < 21 \(\Rightarrow\) [34, 89, **13**, 21, 55]
- 13 < 89 \(\Rightarrow\) [34, **13**, 89, 21, 55]
- 13 < 34 \(\Rightarrow\) [**13**, 34, 89, 21, 55]

**Round 2**

- 21 < 55 \(\Rightarrow\) [13, 34, 89, **21**, 55]
- 21 < 89 \(\Rightarrow\) [13, 34, **21**, 89, 55]
- 21 < 34 \(\Rightarrow\) [13, **21**, 34, 89, 55]

**Round 3**

- 55 < 89 \(\Rightarrow\) [13, 21, 34, **55**, 89]
- 34 < 55 \(\Rightarrow\) [13, 21, **34**, 55, 89]

**Round 4**

- 55 < 89 \(\Rightarrow\) [13, 21, 34, **55**, 89]

**Sorted array**

[13, 21, 34, 55, 89]
Bubble Sort: Correctness and Complexity

Correctness

- By induction, for $1 \leq i \leq n - 1$, after round $i$:
  - $A[i] \leq A[j]$ for all $i < j \leq n$

Complexity

- For $1 \leq i \leq n - 1$, in round $i$: exactly $n - i$ comparisons.
- The total number of comparisons is always

$$
(n - 1) + (n - 2) + \cdots + 1 = \frac{n(n - 1)}{2} = \Theta(n^2)
$$
Merge-Sort

Input
- An unsorted array of $n$ keys $A[1], A[2], \ldots, A[n]$

Divide and Conquer
- For $n \geq 2$ and $q = \left\lfloor \frac{n+1}{2} \right\rfloor$ recursively sort the sub-arrays $A[1..q]$ and $A[q+1..n]$
- **Merge** the sub-arrays $A[1..q]$ and $A[q+1..n]$ into a **sorted** array $A[1..n]$

Amotz Bar-Noy (Brooklyn College)
The Merge Procedure

Global array

- $A[1], A[2], \ldots, A[n]$

Procedure

- **Merge**($p, q, r$)
  - $1 \leq p \leq q < r \leq n$
  - Merge the two sorted sub-arrays
    - $A[p] \leq \cdots \leq A[q]$ and $A[q + 1] \leq \cdots \leq A[r]$
    - into a sorted sub-array $A[p] \leq \cdots \leq A[r]$

Complexity

- Number of comparisons is at most $(r - p)$

Implementation

- [https://www.tutorialspoint.com/data_structures_algorithms/merge_sort_algorithm.htm](https://www.tutorialspoint.com/data_structures_algorithms/merge_sort_algorithm.htm)
The Recursive Merge-Sort Procedure

Initial recursive call

- Merge-Sort(1, n)

Recursive procedure

- Merge-Sort(p, r)
  - if \( r > p \) then
    - \( q = \left\lfloor \frac{p+r}{2} \right\rfloor \) (* \( p \leq q < q + 1 \leq r \) *)
    - Merge-Sort(p, q)
    - Merge-Sort(q + 1, r)
    - Merge(p, q, r)
Merge-Sort – Correctness

Proof

- By induction on $r - p$
- Case $r = p$ the array is sorted trivially
- Case $p \leq q < r$, the induction hypothesis holds:
  - For sub-array $A[p..q]$ since $q - p < r - p$
  - For sub-array $A[q + 1..r]$ since $r - (q + 1) < r - p$
- The inductive step is correct due to the correctness of procedure Merge
MergeSort – Complexity

Notation

- $T(n)$ - upper bound on the number of comparisons for an array with $n$ keys.

Recursive formula

- $T(1) = 0$
- $T(n) \leq T(\lceil n/2 \rceil) + T(\lfloor n/2 \rfloor) + (n - 1)$

Solution

- $T(n) = \Theta(n \log(n))$
Merge-Sort – Complexity for $n = 2^k$

**Bottom-Up evaluation**

\[
\begin{align*}
T(1) &= 0 \\
T(2) &= 2 \cdot T(1) + (2 - 1) = 1 \\
T(4) &= 2 \cdot T(2) + (4 - 1) = 5 \\
T(8) &= 2 \cdot T(4) + (8 - 1) = 17 \\
T(16) &= 2 \cdot T(8) + (16 - 1) = 49 \\
T(32) &= 2 \cdot T(16) + (32 - 1) = 129
\end{align*}
\]

**Guess**

\[ T(n) \leq n \log_2 n - (n - 1) \]
Guessing by Unfolding the Recursion

Top-Down evaluation

\[ T(2^k) \leq 2T(2^{k-1}) + (2^k - 1) \]
\[ = 2T(2^{k-1}) + (1 \cdot 2^k - 1) \]
\[ \leq 2(2T(2^{k-2}) + (2^{k-1} - 1)) + (2^k - 1) \]
\[ = 4T(2^{k-2}) + (2 \cdot 2^k - 3) \]
\[ \leq 4(2T(2^{k-3}) + (2^{k-2} - 1)) + (2 \cdot 2^k - 3) \]
\[ = 8T(2^{k-3}) + (3 \cdot 2^k - 7) \]
\[ \vdots \]
\[ = 2^i T(2^{k-i}) + (i \cdot 2^k - (2^i - 1)) \]
\[ \vdots \]
\[ = 2^k T(2^0) + (k \cdot 2^k - (2^k - 1)) \]
\[ = n \log_2 n - (n - 1) \]
Proof By Induction for \( n = 2^k \)

**Theorem**

\[ T(n) \leq n \log_2 n - (n - 1) \]

**Induction base**

\( n = 1: T(1) \leq 0 = 1 \cdot 0 - 0 = 1 \log_2 1 - (1 - 1) \)

**Induction hypothesis**

\[ T(n/2) \leq (n/2) \log_2 (n/2) - (n/2 - 1) \]

\[ = (n/2)(\log_2 n - 1) - (n/2 - 1) \]

\[ = (n/2) \log_2 n - (n - 1) \]

**Inductive step**

\[ T(n) \leq 2T(n/2) + (n - 1) \]

\[ \leq 2((n/2) \log_2 n - (n - 1)) + (n - 1) \]

\[ = n \log_2 n - (n - 1) \]
Merge-Sort – Complexity for $n \neq 2^k$

**Bottom-Up evaluation**

\[
\begin{align*}
T(1) &= 0 \\
T(2) &\leq T(1) + T(1) + (2 - 1) = 1 \\
T(3) &\leq T(2) + T(1) + (3 - 1) = 3 \\
T(4) &\leq T(2) + T(2) + (4 - 1) = 5 \\
T(5) &\leq T(3) + T(2) + (5 - 1) = 8 \\
T(6) &\leq T(3) + T(3) + (6 - 1) = 11 \\
T(7) &\leq T(4) + T(3) + (7 - 1) = 14 \\
T(8) &\leq T(4) + T(4) + (8 - 1) = 17 \\
T(9) &\leq T(5) + T(4) + (9 - 1) = 21
\end{align*}
\]
Merge-Sort – Complexity for $n \neq 2^k$

Guess

- $T(n) \leq n \lceil \log_2 n \rceil - (2^\lceil \log_2 n \rceil - 1)$

Verification

- $T(1) = 0 = 1 \lceil \log_2 1 \rceil - (2^\lceil \log_2 1 \rceil - 1)$
- $T(2) \leq 1 = 2 \lceil \log_2 2 \rceil - (2^\lceil \log_2 2 \rceil - 1)$
- $T(3) \leq 3 = 3 \lceil \log_2 3 \rceil - (2^\lceil \log_2 3 \rceil - 1)$
- $T(4) \leq 5 = 4 \lceil \log_2 4 \rceil - (2^\lceil \log_2 4 \rceil - 1)$
- $T(5) \leq 8 = 5 \lceil \log_2 5 \rceil - (2^\lceil \log_2 5 \rceil - 1)$
- $T(6) \leq 11 = 6 \lceil \log_2 6 \rceil - (2^\lceil \log_2 6 \rceil - 1)$
- $T(7) \leq 14 = 7 \lceil \log_2 7 \rceil - (2^\lceil \log_2 7 \rceil - 1)$
- $T(8) \leq 17 = 8 \lceil \log_2 8 \rceil - (2^\lceil \log_2 8 \rceil - 1)$
- $T(9) \leq 21 = 9 \lceil \log_2 9 \rceil - (2^\lceil \log_2 9 \rceil - 1)$
Ceilings of Logarithms

Observations

- \( \lceil \log_2(k + 1) \rceil = \lceil \log_2 k \rceil \) for \( k \neq 2^h \)
- \( \lceil \log_2(k + 1) \rceil = \lceil \log_2 k \rceil + 1 \) for \( k = 2^h \)
- \( \lceil \log_2(2k) \rceil = \lceil \log_2 k \rceil + 1 \)
- \( \lceil \log_2(2k + 1) \rceil = \lceil \log_2 k \rceil + 1 \) for \( k \neq 2^h \)
- \( \lceil \log_2(2k + 1) \rceil = \lceil \log_2 k \rceil + 2 \) for \( k = 2^h \)
Proof for $n = 2k$

**Theorem**

$$T(n) \leq n \lceil \log_2 n \rceil - (2^\lceil \log_2 n \rceil - 1)$$

**Inductive step**

$$T(n) \leq 2T(k) + (n - 1)$$
$$\leq 2(k \lceil \log_2 k \rceil - (2^\lceil \log_2 k \rceil - 1)) + (n - 1)$$
$$= 2k \lceil \log_2 k \rceil + n - 2 \cdot 2^\lceil \log_2 k \rceil + 2 - 1$$
$$= n(\lceil \log_2 k \rceil + 1) - (2^{\lceil \log_2 k \rceil + 1} - 1)$$
$$= n \lceil \log_2 n \rceil - (2^\lceil \log_2 n \rceil - 1)$$
Proof for $n = 2k + 1$ and $k \neq 2^h$

**Theorem**

\[ T(n) \leq n \lceil \log_2 n \rceil - (2^{\lceil \log_2 n \rceil} - 1) \]

**Inductive step**

\[
\begin{align*}
T(n) & \leq T(k + 1) + T(k) + (n - 1) \\
& \leq ((k + 1) \lceil \log_2 (k + 1) \rceil - (2^{\lceil \log_2 (k+1) \rceil} - 1)) \\
& \quad + (k \lceil \log_2 k \rceil - (2^{\lceil \log_2 k \rceil} - 1)) + (n - 1) \\
& = (2k + 1) \lceil \log_2 k \rceil + n - 2 \cdot 2^{\lceil \log_2 k \rceil} + 1 \\
& = n(\lceil \log_2 k \rceil + 1) - (2^{\lceil \log_2 k \rceil + 1} - 1) \\
& = n \lceil \log_2 n \rceil - (2^{\lceil \log_2 n \rceil} - 1)
\end{align*}
\]
Proof for $n = 2k + 1$ and $k = 2^h$

**Theorem**

$$T(n) \leq n \lceil \log_2 n \rceil - (2^{\lceil \log_2 n \rceil} - 1)$$

**Inductive step**

$$T(n) \leq T(k + 1) + T(k) + (n - 1)$$

$$\leq ((k + 1) \lceil \log_2(k + 1) \rceil - (2^{\lceil \log_2(k+1) \rceil} - 1))$$

$$+ (k \lceil \log_2 k \rceil - (2^{\lceil \log_2 k \rceil} - 1)) + (n - 1)$$

$$= (k + 1)(h + 1) - (2k - 1) + kh - (k - 1) + 2k$$

$$= (2k + 1)h + 3$$

$$= n(h + 2) - (2n - 3)$$

$$= n \lceil \log_2 n \rceil - (2^{\lceil \log_2 n \rceil} - 1)$$

**Observation**

$$2^{\lceil \log_2 n \rceil} = 2^{\lceil \log_2(2k+1) \rceil} = 2^{h+2} = 4k = 2n - 2$$
Sort in Linear Time

Idea
- Sort **without** comparisons by using memory locations

Complexity
- Often $o(n \log n)$ and even $O(n)$ for sorting an array of $n$ keys

A contradiction?
- A **different** model
- A **bounded** range for the keys is assumed
Bucket Sort

Input

- Keys belong to a **bounded** domain of size $k$:
  - Without loss of generality the keys are $1, 2, \ldots, k$

Idea

- For each key between 1 and $k$, **count** the number of times it appears in $A$ and then **rearrange** $A$

Complexity

- $\Theta(n + k)$
- $O(n)$ for $k = O(n)$
## Bucket Sort

### Implementation


- for $i = 1$ to $k$ do
  - $B[i] = 0$  
  (* prepare $k$ empty buckets *)
- for $j = 1$ to $n$ do
  (* fill the buckets *)
- $j = 0$
- for $i = 1$ to $k$ do
  - while $B[i] > 0$ do
    - $j = j + 1$
    - $A[j] = i$  
    - $B[i] = B[i] - 1$  
  (* spill all the buckets *)
- (* spill bucket $i$ *)

### Complexity

$$\Theta(k) + \Theta(n) + \Theta(n + k) = \Theta(n + k)$$
Solving Array Problems

**Model**
- The input is an array containing \( n \) numbers
- Sometimes the input includes several arrays with the same or different sizes

**Goal**
- **Efficiently** do something with the array(s) and/or find something that is based on some or all the numbers in the array(s)
- Determine if the complexity of the most efficient solution is \( \Theta(1) \), \( \Theta(\log(n)) \), \( \Theta(n) \), \( \Theta(n \log(n)) \), or \( \Theta(n^2) \)
Sorted Arrays Vs. Unsorted Arrays

**Arbitrary arrays**
- Can the problem be solved by inspecting only $\Theta(1)$ numbers avoiding more involved procedures?

**Sorted arrays**
- Can a binary-search like procedure solve the problem with complexity $\Theta(\log n)$ instead of a possible “trivial” solution that scans the array and examines all the $n$ numbers?

**Unsorted arrays**
- Is it possible to solve the problem with complexity $\Theta(n)$ avoiding sorting the array?
- If sorting is required, can it be done with a $\Theta(n)$ sorting algorithm?
- Will sorting the array yield a solution with complexity $\Theta(n \log n)$ instead of a possible “trivial” $\Theta(n^2)$ solution that examines all pairs of numbers?