

## CSCI3160: Regular Exercise Set 2

Prepared by Yufei Tao

**Problem 1 (Faster Algorithm for Finding the Number of Crossing Inversions).** Let  $S_1$  and  $S_2$  be two disjoint sets of  $n$  integers. Assume that  $S_1$  is stored in an array  $A_1$ , and  $S_2$  in an array  $A_2$ . Both  $A_1$  and  $A_2$  are sorted in ascending order. Design an algorithm to find the number of such pairs  $(a, b)$  satisfying all of the following conditions: (i)  $a \in S_1$ , (ii)  $b \in S_2$ , and (iii)  $a > b$ . Your algorithm must finish in  $O(n)$  time (we gave an  $O(n \log n)$ -time algorithm in the class).

**Solution.** Merge  $A_1$  and  $A_2$  into one sorted list  $A$ , which takes  $O(n)$  time. Scan the elements of  $A$  in ascending order. In the meantime, maintain the number  $t$  of elements that (i) originate from  $A_2$ , and (ii) have already been scanned so far: this can be done by setting  $t$  to 0 in the beginning, and incrementing it each time an element originating from  $A_2$  is scanned. Furthermore, also maintain a counter  $c$  as follows:  $c = 0$  in the beginning; every time an element originating from  $A_1$  is seen, increase  $c$  by the current value of  $t$ . The final  $c$  at the end of the algorithm is the number of crossing inversions

**Problem 2 (Faster Algorithm for Finding the Number of Inversions).** Given an array  $A$  of  $n$  integers, design an algorithm to find the number of inversions in  $O(n \log n)$  time.

**Solution.** We will solve a more challenging problem: besides reporting the number of inversions, the algorithm also needs to sort  $A$  in ascending order. Break  $A$  at the middle into two arrays  $A_1$  and  $A_2$  each with at most  $\lceil n/2 \rceil$  elements. Recursively, find the number  $c_1$  of inversions in  $A_1$  and the number  $c_2$  of inversions in  $A_2$ . At this moment, both  $A_1$  and  $A_2$  have been sorted. We can then apply the algorithm in Problem 1 to find the number of crossing inversions in  $O(n)$  time. Finally, merge  $A_1$  and  $A_2$  into a sorted array using  $O(n)$  time. It is rudimentary to verify that the running time is  $O(n \log n)$ .

**Problem 3.** Give an  $O(n \log n)$ -time algorithm to solve the dominance counting problem discussed in the class.

**Solution.** We will solve a more challenging problem: besides reporting the dominance counts, the algorithm should also sort  $P$  in ascending order.

As discussed in the class, our original algorithm divides  $P$  into two halves  $P_1$  and  $P_2$  using a vertical line  $\ell$ , and then recurse on  $P_1$  and  $P_2$  respectively. Upon returning from the recursion, the points of  $P_1$  and  $P_2$  have been sorted by y-coordinate. We still need to find, for each point  $p_2 \in P_2$ , the number of points  $p_1 \in P_1$  that are dominated by  $p_2$ . Next we show that this can be done in  $O(n)$  time. Merge  $P_1$  and  $P_2$  into one sorted list  $P$ , where the points are sorted in ascending order by y-coordinate. Scan  $P$ . In the meantime, maintain the number  $t$  of points that (i) originate from  $P_1$ , and (ii) have already been scanned so far. Every time a point  $p_2$  originating from  $P_2$  is seen, the number of points  $p_1 \in P_1$  dominated by  $p_2$  is precisely the current value of  $t$ . To complete the algorithm, return the sorted list of  $P$ . The overall time complexity now becomes  $O(n \log n)$ .

**Problem 4 (Section 4.1 of the Textbook).** Let  $A$  be an array of  $n$  integers ( $A$  is not necessarily sorted). Each integer in  $A$  may be positive or negative. Given  $i, j$  satisfying  $1 \leq i \leq j \leq n$ , define *sub-array*  $A[i : j]$  as the sequence  $(A[i], A[i + 1], \dots, A[j])$ , and the *weight* of  $A[i : j]$  as

$A[i] + A[i + 1] + \dots + A[j]$ . For example, consider  $A = (13, -3, -25, 20, -3, -16, -23, 18)$ ;  $A[1 : 4]$  has weight 5, while  $A[2 : 4]$  has weight  $-8$ .

1. Give an algorithm to find a sub-array of with the largest weight, among all sub-arrays  $A[i : j]$  with  $j = n$ . Your algorithm must finish in  $O(n)$  time.
2. Give an algorithm to find a sub-array with the largest weight in  $O(n \log n)$  time (among *all* the possible sub-arrays).

**Solution.** Subproblem 1: Scan the elements of  $A$  from  $A[n]$  to  $A[1]$ . At any time, maintain the sum  $s$  of the elements already scanned: at the beginning  $s = 0$ ; after scanning an element  $A[i]$ , add  $A[i]$  to  $s$ . Every time we finish doing so for element  $A[i]$ , the current value  $s$  is precisely the weight of  $A[i : n]$ . In this way, we obtain the weights of all sub-arrays  $A[n : n]$ ,  $A[n - 1 : n]$ , ...,  $A[1 : n]$  (in this order) in  $O(n)$  time. The maximum weight can then be found easily.

Subproblem 2: Break  $A$  into two halves: array  $A_1$  which contains the first  $\lceil n/2 \rceil$  elements, and array  $A_2$  which contains the rest. Recursively, find the sub-array of  $A_1$  with the largest weight, and then the sub-array of  $A_2$  with the largest weight. It remains to consider the “crossing” sub-arrays  $A[i : j]$  where  $i \leq \lceil n/2 \rceil$  and  $j > \lceil n/2 \rceil$ . In particular, we want to find the “best” crossing sub-array, i.e., the one with the maximum weight. Then, the sub-array to output can be decided easily from the three sub-arrays aforementioned.

We say that a sub-array  $A_1[i : j]$  is *right grounded* if  $j = \lceil n/2 \rceil$ , and a sub-array  $A_2[i : j]$  is *left grounded* if  $i = 1$ . A crucial observation is that the “best” crossing sub-array must be the concatenation of

- the right grounded sub-array in  $A_1$  with the maximum weight, and
- the left grounded sub-array in  $A_2$  with the maximum weight.

From Subproblem 1, we know that each of the above two grounded sub-arrays can be found in  $O(n)$  time.

Therefore, if  $f(n)$  is the time of solving the problem on an array of length  $n$ , it holds that  $f(n) \leq 2 \cdot f(\lceil n/2 \rceil) + O(n)$ , which gives  $f(n) = O(n \log n)$ .

**Problem 5.** In the class, we explained how to multiply two  $n \times n$  matrices in  $O(n^{2.81})$  time when  $n$  is a power of 2. Explain how to ensure the running time for any value of  $n$ .

**Solution.** If  $n$  is not a power of 2, let  $m$  be the smallest power of 2 that is larger than  $n$ . If  $A, B$  are the  $n \times n$  input matrices, obtain an  $m \times m$  matrix  $A'$  by padding  $m - n$  dummy rows and columns to  $A$  containing only 0 values, and similarly, an  $m \times m$  matrix  $B'$  from  $B$ . Calculate  $A'B'$  in  $O(m^{2.81}) = O((2n)^{2.81}) = O(n^{2.81})$  time. Then, the matrix  $AB$  can be obtained by discarding the last  $m - n$  rows and columns from the matrix  $A'B'$ .