

## Administrative

- Assignment 1
  - Proof should tell a clear story
  - Proof by induction: follow the steps outlined in class
- (see the notes)
- Assignment 2?
- Assignment 3 out today (start early!)
- Latex?
- My view on homework...

### **Divide and Conquer**

Divide: Break the problem into smaller sub-problems

**Conquer**: Solve the sub-problems. Generally, this involves waiting for the problem to be small enough that it is trivial to solve (i.e. 1 or 2 items)

**Combine**: Given the results of the solved sub-problems, combine them to generate a solution for the complete problem

# Divide and Conquer: some thoughts



Dividing the problem in half frequently does the job

May have to get creative about how the data is split

Splitting tends to generate run times with log *n* in them



Divide and conquer

One approach:

- Pretend like you have a working version of your function, but it only works on smaller subproblems
- If you split up the current problem in some way (e.g. in half) and solved those sub-problems, how could you then get the solution to the larger problem?

## **Divide and Conquer: Sorting**

How should we split the data?

What are the sub-problems we need to solve?

How do we combine the results from these subproblems?

Merç	geSort	
ME	$\operatorname{erge-Sort}(A)$	
1	if $length[A] == 1$	
2	return A	
3	else	
4	$q \leftarrow \lfloor length[A] / 2 \rfloor$	
5	create arrays $L[1q]$ and $R[q + 1 lengt$	h[A]]
6	copy $A[1q]$ to L	
7	copy $A[q+1 length[A]]$ to R	
8	$LS \leftarrow \text{Merge-Sort}(L)$	
9	$RS \leftarrow \text{Merge-Sort}(R)$	
10	return Merge(LS, RS)	



Merge	Merge
L: 1 3 5 8 R: 2 4 6 7 MERCE(L, R) 1 create array B of length $length[L] + length[R]$ 2 $i - 1$ 3 $j - 1$ 4 for $k - 1$ to $length[B]$ 5 if $j > length[R]$ or $(i \le length[L]$ and $L[i] \le R[j]$ ) 6 $B[k] - L[i]$ 7 $i - i + 1$ 8 else 9 $B[k] - R[j]$ 10 $j - j + 1$ 11 return B	L: 1 3 5 8 R: 2 4 6 7 B: MERCE(L, R) 1 create array B of length length[L] + length[R] 2 $i \leftarrow -1$ 3 $j \leftarrow -1$ 4 for $k \leftarrow 1$ to length[R] or $(i \le length[L] \text{ and } L[i] \le R[j])$ 5 $if j > length[R] or (i \le length[L] \text{ and } L[i] \le R[j])6 B[k] \leftarrow L[i]7 i \leftarrow i + 18 else9 B[k] \leftarrow R[j]10 j \leftarrow j + 111 return B$

































Merge	
Running time?	
$\begin{array}{llllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllll$	
5 <b>if</b> $j > length[R]$ or $(i \leq length[L]$ and $L[i] \leq$	R[j])
$6  B[k] \leftarrow L[i]$	
7 $i \leftarrow i+1$	
8 else	
9 $B[k] \leftarrow R[j]$	
10 $j \leftarrow j+1$	
11 return B	

Merg	e	
Running	time? Θ(n) - linear	•••
$\begin{array}{ccccc} {\rm Merc} \\ 1 & {\rm c} \\ 2 & i \\ 3 & j \\ 4 & {\rm fr} \\ 5 \\ 6 \\ 7 \\ 8 \\ 9 \\ 10 \\ 11 & {\rm r} \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{l} \operatorname{SE}(L,R) \\ \operatorname{reate} \operatorname{array} \operatorname{B} \operatorname{of} \operatorname{length} \operatorname{length}[L] + \operatorname{length}[R] \\ \leftarrow 1 \\ \leftarrow 1 \\ \operatorname{or} k \leftarrow 1 \operatorname{to} \operatorname{length}[B] \\ \operatorname{if} j > \operatorname{length}[R] \operatorname{or} (i \leq \operatorname{length}[L] \operatorname{and} L[i] \leq R[j]) \\ & B[k] \leftarrow L[i] \\ & i \leftarrow i + 1 \\ \\ \operatorname{else} \\ B[k] \leftarrow R[j] \\ & j \leftarrow j + 1 \end{array}$	

















A function that is defined with respect to itself on smaller inputs

$$T(n) = 2T(n/2) + n$$

$$T(n) = 16T(n/4) + n$$

$$T(n) = 2T(n-1) + n^2$$

# Why are we interested in recurrences?

Computational cost of divide and conquer algorithms

$$T(n) = aT(n/b) + D(n) + C(n)$$

- a subproblems of size n/b
- *D(n)* the cost of dividing the data
- *C(n)* the cost of recombining the subproblem solutions

In general, the runtimes of most recursive algorithms can be expressed as recurrences

### The challenge

Recurrences are often easy to define because they mimic the structure of the program

But... they do not directly express the computational cost, i.e.  $n, n^2, ...$ 

We want to remove self-recurrence and find a more understandable form for the function



### **Substitution method**

Guess the form of the solution Then prove it's correct by induction

T(n) = T(n/2) + d

Halves the input then constant amount of work Guesses?



#### Proof?

 $T(n) = T(n/2) + d = O(\log_2 n)$ ?

Ideas?



$$T(n) = T(n/2) + d$$
Assume  $T(k) = O(\log_2 k)$  for all  $k < n$   
Show that  $T(n) = O(\log_2 n)$ 
From our assumption,  $T(n/2) = O(\log_2 n)$ :  
 $O(g(n)) = \left\{ f(n): \text{ there exists positive constants } c \text{ and } n \text{ such that} \\ 0 \le f(n) \le cg(n) \text{ for all } n \ge n_0 \right\}$ 
i.e. some constant c such that  $T(n) \le c \log_2 n$   
i.e. some constant c such that  $T(n) \le c \log_2 n$   
From the definition of big-O:  $T(n/2) \le c \log_2(n/2)$   
How do we now prove  $T(n) = O(\log n)$ ?
$$T(n) = O(\log n)$$

#### **Base case?**

For an inductive proof we need to show two things:

- Assuming it's true for k < n show it's true for n
- Show that it holds for some base case

What is the base case in our situation?

$$T(n) = \begin{cases} \Theta(1) & \text{if } n \text{ is small} \\ T(n/2) + d & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

$$T(n) = T(n-1) + n$$
  
Guess the solution?

- At each iteration, does a linear amount of work (i.e. iterate over the data) and reduces the size by one at each step
- O(n<sup>2</sup>)

Assume  $T(k) = O(k^2)$  for all k < n• again, this implies that  $T(n-1) \le c(n-1)^2$ Show that  $T(n) = O(n^2)$ , i.e.  $T(n) \le cn^2$  :::











# **Changing variables**

 $T(n) = 2T(\sqrt{n}) + \log n$ 

Guesses? We can do a variable change: let  $m = \log_2 n$ (or  $n = 2^m$ )

 $T(2^m) = 2T(2^{m/2}) + m$ Now, let S(m)=T(2<sup>m</sup>)

$$S(m) = 2S(m/2) + m$$



<u>cost</u>

cn<sup>2</sup>

T(n/4)







 $T(n) = 3T(n/4) + n^2$ 

cn<sup>2</sup>

T(n/4)

















T(n) = 2T(n/2) + n if $f(n) = O(n^{\log_a a - \varepsilon})$ for $\varepsilon > 0$ , then $T(n) = \Theta(n^{\log_a a})$ if $f(n) = \Theta(n^{\log_a a})$ , then $T(n) = \Theta(n^{\log_a a} \log n)$ if $f(n) = \Omega(n^{\log_a a \varepsilon})$ for $\varepsilon > 0$ and $af(n/b) \le cf(n)$ for $c < 1$ then $T(n) = \Theta(f(n))$	
a = 2 b = 2 $f(n) = n$ $n^{\log_b a} = n^{\log_2 2}$ $= n^1$	
is $n = O(n^{1-\varepsilon})$ ? is $n = \Theta(n^1)$ ? is $n = \Omega(n^{1+\varepsilon})$ ? <b>Case 2:</b> $\Theta(n \log n)$	





$T(n) = \sqrt{2}T(n/2) + \log n$ if $f(n) = O(n^{\log_b a - \varepsilon})$ for $\varepsilon > 0$ , then $T(n) = \Theta(n^{\log_b a})$ if $f(n) = \Theta(n^{\log_b a})$ , then $T(n) = \Theta(n^{\log_b a} \log n)$ if $f(n) = \Omega(n^{\log_b a + \varepsilon})$ for $\varepsilon > 0$ and $af(n/b) \le cf(n)$ for $c < 1$ then $T(n) = \Theta(f(n))$	
a = $\sqrt{2}$ b = 2 f(n) = logn = $n^{\log_b a}$ = $n^{\log_2 \sqrt{2}}$ = $\sqrt{n}$	
is $\log n = O(n^{1/2-\varepsilon})$ ? is $\log n = \Theta(n^{1/2})$ ? is $\log n = \Omega(n^{1/2+\varepsilon})$ ? <b>Case 1:</b> $\Theta(\sqrt{n})$	

$\begin{split} T(n) &= 4T(n/2) + n \\ & \text{if } f(n) = O(n^{\log_n a - \varepsilon}) \text{ for } \varepsilon > 0, \text{ then } T(n) = \Theta(n^{\log_n a}) \\ & \text{if } f(n) = \Theta(n^{\log_n a}), \text{ then } T(n) = \Theta(n^{\log_n a} \log n) \\ & \text{if } f(n) = \Omega(n^{\log_n a \varepsilon}) \text{ for } \varepsilon > 0 \text{ and } af(n/b) \le cf(n) \text{ for } c < 1 \\ & \text{ then } T(n) = \Theta(f(n)) \end{split}$	
a = 4 b = 2 $f(n) = n$ $n^{\log_b a} = n^{\log_2 4}$ $= n^2$	
is $n = O(n^{2-\varepsilon})$ ? is $n = \Theta(n^2)$ ? is $n = \Omega(n^{2+\varepsilon})$ ? <b>Case 1:</b> $\Theta(n^2)$	

