

Quicksort sorts a given array $A[l..r]$ using divide and conquer:

quicksort(A, l, r)

// Call first with $l=1, r=n$.

if $l < r$

$j \leftarrow$ partition(A, l, r)

// Elements $\leq A[l]$ will precede

// elements $> A[l]$.

 quicksort(A, l, j)

 quicksort($A, j+1, r$)

+6

1.

partition(A, l, r)

let $B[l..r]$ be a new array

$j \leftarrow l; k \leftarrow r$

for $i \leftarrow l$ to r

 if $A[i] \leq A[l]$

// $A[l]$ is the pivot.

$B[j] \leftarrow A[i]; j \leftarrow j+1$

 else

$B[k] \leftarrow A[i]; k \leftarrow k-1$

copy $B[l..r]$ to $A[l..r]$

return $j-1$

12 / 12

Best case analysis:

Running time proportional to the number of comparisons:

$$\begin{cases} T(n) = T(q) + T(n-q) + n & \text{for some } q \\ T(0) = T(1) = 0 \end{cases} \quad +2$$

In the best case $T(n) \leq T(\lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor) + T(\lceil \frac{n}{2} \rceil) + n$

a) Thus $T(n) = O(n \log n)$ by the master thm. +2

b) Claim: $T(n) \geq n \log_2 n$. Proof by induction: (base case clear)

For $n \geq 2$ we $T(n) \geq q \log_2 q + (n-q) \log_2 (n-q) + n$ +2

$$\geq 2 \cdot \frac{n}{2} \cdot \log_2 \frac{n}{2} + n = n \log_2 n.$$

Since $x \log_2 x$ is convex



a) & b) $\Rightarrow T(n) = \Theta(n \log n)$

For an amount of money X , let $f(X)$ be the minimum number k of coins that make change for X ;

$$+3 \quad f(X) = \min \{ k : \exists i_1, \dots, i_k \text{ s.t. } v(i_1) + \dots + v(i_k) = X \}$$

2

Observe that $f(0) = 0$ and for $X > 0$ we have

$$+3 \quad f(X) = \min \{ f(X - v(i)) + 1 : X \geq v(i), i \in \{1, \dots, n\} \}$$

Namely, if (i_1, \dots, i_k) is optimal for X , then (i_1, \dots, i_{k-1}) is optimal for $X - v(i_k)$. This is the optimal substructure property.

+2

A dynamic programming algorithm:

12

12

introduce arrays $f[1..C]$ and $p[1..C]$; $f[0] \leftarrow 0$

for $X \leftarrow 1$ to C

best $\leftarrow \infty$

for $i \leftarrow 1$ to n

$y \leftarrow X - v(i)$

if $y \geq 0$ and $f[y] + 1 < \text{best}$

best $\leftarrow f[y] + 1$

$p[X] \leftarrow i$

// store the coin type

$f[X] \leftarrow \text{best}$

while $C > 0$

print $p[C]$

$C \leftarrow C - v(p[C])$

+2

Running time is clearly $\Theta(n \cdot C)$

SET-COVER

Instance: collection \mathcal{C} of subsets of S , integer k .

Question: Does there exist members $S_1, \dots, S_k \in \mathcal{C}$

+2 s.t. $S_1 \cup \dots \cup S_k = S$?

3.

In NP: For any yes-instance, and only for them, there exist a certificate (S_1, \dots, S_k) for which the condition $S_1 \cup \dots \cup S_k = S$ can be tested in polynomial time.

+1

6/6

NP-hardness by reduction from VERTEX COVER.

Reduction function

+1 $f: (V, E), k \mapsto (S, \mathcal{C}), k$,

where $S := E$ and $\mathcal{C} := \{E_v : v \in V\}$
the set of edges in E that have v as an endpoint

+1 Clearly $f(V, E, k)$ can be computed in polynomial time.

Equivalence: $(S, \mathcal{C}), k$ is a yes-instance iff

+1 $\exists v_1, \dots, v_k \in V$ s.t. $E_{v_1} \cup \dots \cup E_{v_k} = E$ iff $(V, E), k$ is a yes-instance of VERTEX-COVER.

For $1 \leq i < j < k \leq n$ define

4.

+3 $X_{ijk} = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } A[i] > A[j] > A[k] \text{ (3-inversion)} \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$

The expected number of 3-inversions of A is

12/12

$$\begin{aligned}
 E\left(\sum_{i < j < k} X_{ijk}\right) &= \sum_{i < j < k} E(X_{ijk}) = \sum_{i < j < k} P\{X_{ijk} = 1\} \\
 &= \sum_{i < j < k} 1/3! = \binom{n}{3} / 3! = \frac{n(n-1)(n-2)}{3 \cdot 6}
 \end{aligned}$$

Since all the 3! permutations between $\{i, j, k\}$ and $\{A[i], A[j], A[k]\}$ are equally likely, and only one of them yields a 3-inversion.

+3

Let I be a maximum-size independent set of G .

+2

Assumption implies $|I| \geq |V| \cdot 2/3$ (*)

Let S be the set of vertices of G not matched by M .

5.

1) S is an independent set, since M is a maximal matching.

+3

2) Let T be a minimum vertex-cover of G .

Now $|V \setminus S| \leq 2|T|$, since T must contain at least one endpoint of each edge in M , i.e., at least $1/2$ of the vertices in $V \setminus S$.

+2

12/
12

3) Because the complement of an independent set is a vertex cover, and vice versa, we have $|I| + |T| = |V|$.

+2

Calculation:

$$|V| - |S| \stackrel{2)}{\leq} 2|T|$$

$$\Leftrightarrow |S| \stackrel{3)}{\geq} -2(|V| - |I|) + |V|$$

+3

$$= 2|I| - |V|$$

(*)

$$\geq 2|I| - \frac{3}{2}|I|$$

$$= |I|/2$$

$\therefore |S|$ is a 2-approximation of $|I|$.