

Lab 3: divide-and-conquer, dynamic programming, greedy algorithms and sorting

- Once you are done with the first two questions, it might be helpful to go back to the last question of last week's lab.
1. **Assessing time complexity** For each of the recurrence equations below, give an asymptotic estimate (you may use the master theorem for *most* cases)
 - (a) $T(n) = 2T(n/2) + 3n$
 - (b) $T(n) = 2T(n/2) + 2n^{\log(n)} + \log(n)$
 - (c) $T(n) = 2T(n/4) + \sqrt[3]{n}$
 - (d) $T(n) = 2T(n/4) + \sqrt{n}$
 - (e) $T(n) = 2T(n/4) + n^2$
 - (f) **Challenge:** $T(n) = T(n/3) + 2$
 2. **The change problem** Recall the following algorithmic problem:
 - **Input:** A sequence of integers $c_0 = 1 < c_1 < \dots < c_k$ representing *coin* values and a number a
 - **Output:** An repartition of coins r_0, \dots, r_k such that giving giving back r_i coins of values c_i for all i yields the desired amount a (i.e. $\sum_i r_i c_i = a$)
 - (a) Implement in java the greedy algorithm that we have seen in class: if we try to give back amount a , pick the largest i such that $c_i \leq a$; give back one coin of value c_i and proceed to produce the change of value $a - c_i$.
 - (b) What is the complexity of that algorithm? Can you improve it?
 - (c) Call an answer to an answer *optimal* if it has the minimal amount of coins ($\sum_i r_i$) amongst all answers.

Check that if we use the coin system $c_0 = 1, c_1 = 4, c_2 = 5$, there is an amount such that the greedy algorithm above does not return an optimal answer on the corresponding instance.
 - (d) **Challenge:** prove that if $2c_i \leq c_{i+1}$ for all $i < k$, then the greedy algorithm returns the optimal answer.
 - (e) Using dynamic programming, write a solution that returns an optimal solution for all possible coin systems. What is its complexity? (Hint: you may use a `ArrayList<ArrayList<Integer>>` to compute all of the optimal change allocation for all amounts $\leq n$)
 3. **Quicksort** Consider the quicksort algorithm, whose code is recalled below (taken from the file `Sorts.java` you have access to on canvas; `PivotFun` is an interface allowing to pass a pivot-picking function as argument)

```
public static void quickSortInner(PivotFun getPivot,  
                                  int[] arr,  
                                  int min, int max)
```

```

{
    // If there is at most one element, return immediately
    if(max - min <= 1)
        return;

    // get the position of the pivot according to the pivot policy
    // getPivot, and put that pivot in the middle of the array
    int pivotPos = getPivot.apply(arr,min,max);
    swap(arr, min, pivotPos);

    // reshuffle the array so that we have only elements <= than the pivot
    // before the new pivotPos and only >= elements after
    pivotPos = pivotAround(arr, min, max);

    int postPivot = pivotPos+1;

    // recursively sort above and below the pivot
    quickSortInner(getPivot, arr, min, pivot);
    quickSortInner(getPivot, arr, postPivot, max);
}

public static int pivotAround(int[] arr, int pivotPos, int max)
{
    final int pivot = arr[pivotPos];
    for(int i = pivotPos + 1; i < max; i++)
    {
        if(arr[i] < pivot)
        {
            arr[pivotPos] = arr[i];
            pivotPos++;
            arr[i] = arr[pivotPos];
            arr[pivotPos] = pivot;
        }
    }
    return pivotPos;
}

```

- (a) Argue that if `getPivot(arr,min,max)` always returns `min`, then the worst running time on an input of size n is $\Theta(n^2)$.
- (b) Argue that if `getPivot(arr,min,max)` returns the median of the collection $\{\text{arr}[\text{min}], \dots, \text{arr}[\text{max}-1]\}$, then the running time is $\Theta(n \log(n))$ (assuming that all of the numbers in the array are pairwise distinct)
- (c) **Challenge:** Assume a distribution of inputs on arrays of all size which is invariant under permutations. Show that quick sort runs on average in time $\mathcal{O}(n \log(n))$
- (d) Now assume that the input distribution is no longer invariant under permutations. Do you see a way to get an average running time of $\mathcal{O}(n \log(n))$ using `Random`?

4. **Median selection** The goal of this question is to introduce notions for the

algorithm that picks the median of an array in linear time. **Let's assume for simplicity that all elements of the input array are pairwise distinct**

- (a) Write a naive algorithm to compute the median of an array. What is its asymptotic complexity? (don't try to optimize it)
- (b) Write a function

```
static int[] [] chunk(int[] arr, int chunkSize)
```

that splits an array `arr` into chunks of size `k` and a remaining chunk of size $\leq k$ if there are leftovers. For instance, `chunk({1,2,3,4,5,6,7}, 3)` should return `{{1,2,3},{4,5,6},{7}}`.

- (c) Now, for the sake of the discussion, let us fix an odd constant k . Consider the following procedure `SELECT(A, i)` (assuming that A has size n)
- If A contains a single element, just return that element.
 - Otherwise, first split the array A into chunks of size k .
 - Then sort all of the chunks individually.
 - Then form an array A' of size $\lceil \frac{n}{k} \rceil$ consisting of the median of each chunk.
 - Call `SELECT(A', $\lceil \frac{n}{2k} \rceil$)` and get the median m' of A'
 - If $i \leq \frac{n}{2}$, build an array $A_<$ containing:
 - All elements from chunks whose middle element is $< m'$.
 - The first $\frac{k-1}{2}$ elements of the other chunks
 and return the result of `SELECT(A_<, i)`
 - otherwise build an array A_\geq containing
 - All elements from chunks whose middle element is $\geq m'$.
 - The last $\frac{k-1}{2}$ elements of the other chunks
 and return `SELECT(A_\geq, i - $\lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor$)`.

What is the asymptotic running time of the operations of this algorithm if we omit the recursive calls?

- (d) To simplify matter, assume from now on that all elements of A are pairwise distinct. Give an upper bound on the number of elements of $A_<$ and A_\geq . Deduce that a function $T : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ satisfying the following asymptotically bounds the time complexity of the algorithm.

$$T(n) = T\left(\left\lceil \frac{n}{k} \right\rceil\right) + T\left(\left\lceil \frac{n}{4} \right\rceil\right) + Kn$$

- (e) Deduce that for $k = 5$ we have a linear running time, but not $n = 3$ (hint: over/under-approximate the equation and use the master theorem)
- (f) **Challenge:** Implement this in Java and interface it with the quicksort implementation given on canvas.