## Basic Algorithms, Assignment 7 Solutions

1. Determine an LCS of 10010101 and 010110110.

Solution: We create an eight by eight array giving C[m, n], the length of the LCS between the first m of the first sequence and the first n of the second sequence.

Here is array. The sequences are placed on top and on the left for convenience. The numbering starts at 0 so that the row zero and column zero are all zeroes.

-	-	0	1	0	1	1	0	1	1	0
		0								
1	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
0	0	1	1	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
0	0	1	1	2	2	2	3	3	3	3
1	0	1 1 1	2	2	3	3	3	4	4	4
0	0	1 1	2	3	3	3	4	4	4	5
1	0	1	2	3	4	4	4	5	5	5
0	0	1	2	3	4	4	5	5	5	6
1	0	1	2	3	4	5	5	6	6	6

So the length is 6. Start at the bottom right and walk until hitting the edge. At (i,j) go diagonal left if C[i,j] = C[i-1,j-1] + 1; if not go left or up, whichever is C[i,j]. (We'll go left if they both are.) This gives

-	_	0	1	0	1	1	0	1	1	0
-	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
0	0	1	1	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
0	0 0 0 0 0 0	1	1	2	2	2	3	3	3	3
1	0	0	<b>2</b>	2	3	3	3	4	4	4
0	0	1	2	3	3	3	4	4	4	5
1	0	1	2	3	4	4	4	5	5	5
0	0	1	2	3	4	4	<b>5</b>	<b>5</b>	5	6
1	0 0	1	2	3	4	5	5	6	6	6

The places where you go diagonally left are the same in both sequences and these give the common sequence **010101**. Note that there is no uniqueness to the sequences themselves.

-	-	0	1	0	1	1	0	1	1	0
							0			
1	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
0	0	1	1	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
0	0	1	1	2	2	2	3	3	3	3
1	0	0	<b>2</b>	2	3	3	3	4	4	4
0	0	1	2	<b>3</b>	<b>3</b>	3	4	4	4	5
1	0	1	2	3	4	4	4	5	5	5
0							<b>5</b>			6
1	0	1	2	3	4	5	5	6	6	6

2. Write all the parenthesizations of ABCDE. Associate them in a natural way with (setting n = 5) the terms P(i)P(5 - i), i = 1, 2, 3, 4 given in the recursion for P(n).

Solution: Splitting 1-4 gives P(1)P(4)=5 parenthesizations:

$$A(B(C(DE))), A(B((CD)E)), A((BC)(DE)), A((B(CD))E), A(((BC)D)E)$$

Splitting 4-1 gives P(4)P(1)=5 parenthesizations:

$$(A(B(CD)))E, (A((BC)D))E, ((AB)(CD))E, (((AB)C)D)E, ((A(BC))D)E$$

Splitting 2-3 gives P(2)P(3)=2 parenthesizations:

Splitting 3-2 gives P(3)P(2)=2 parenthesizations:

- 3. Let  $x_1, \ldots, x_m$  be a sequence of distinct real numbers. For  $1 \leq i \leq m$  let INC[i] denote the length of the longest increasing subsequence ending with  $x_i$ . Let DEC[i] denote the length of the longest decreasing subsequence ending with  $x_i$ .
  - (a) Find an efficient method for finding the values INC[i],  $1 \le i \le n$ . (You should find INC[i] based on the previously found INC[j],  $1 \le j < i$ . Your algorithm should take time  $O(n^2)$ .) Solution: The longest increasing subsequence ending in  $x_i$  is either simply  $x_i$  or it is obtained by appending  $x_i$  to some subse-

quence ending in  $x_j$  where j < i. One can do that if and only if  $x_j < x_i$ . So we should take INC[i] to be 1  $(x_i$  itself) plus the

- maximum of the INC[j], j < i, for which  $x_j < x_i$ . However, if there are no such j (for example, when i = 1) the default value should be 1. Each INC[i] then takes a single loop which is time O(n) and so the total time is  $O(n^2)$ . (Of course, DEC[i] can be found similarly.)
- (b) Let LIS denote the length of the longest increasing subsequence of  $x_1, \ldots, x_m$ . Show how to find LIS from the values INC[i]. Similarly, let DIS denote the length of the longest decreasing subsequence of  $x_1, \ldots, x_m$ . Show how to find DIS from the values DEC[i].
  - Solution: LIS is simply the maximum of all INC[i],  $1 \le i \le n$ , as the subsequence has to end somewhere. Similarly, DIS is simply the maximum of all DEC[i],  $1 \le i \le n$ .
- (c) Suppose i < j. Prove that it is impossible to have INC[i] = INC[j] and DEC[i] = DEC[j].
  - Solution: Suppose  $x_i < x_j$ . Then  $INC[j] \ge INC[i] + 1$  since you can take the maximal increasing sequence ending at  $x_i$  and append  $x_j$ . (That may not be optimal, but INC[j] is at least that length.)
  - Similarly, suppose  $x_i > x_j$ . Then  $DEC[j] \ge DEC[i] + 1$  since you can take the maximal decreasing sequence ending at  $x_i$  and append  $x_j$ .
- (d) Deduce the following celebrated results (called the Monotone Subsequence Theorem) of Paul Erdős and George Szekeres: Let m = ab + 1. Then any sequence  $x_1, \ldots, x_m$  of distinct real numbers either LIS > a or DIS > b. (Idea: Assume not and look at the pairs (INC[i], DEC[i]).)
  - Solution: If  $LIS \leq a$  and  $DIS \leq b$  then there are only ab possibilities for the pair (INC[i], DEC[i]), but from the previous part we have ab + 1 distinct pairs!
- 4. Find an optimal parenthesization of a matrix-chain product whose sequence of dimensions is 5, 10, 3, 12, 5, 50, 6. Solution:
- The matrix chain product of  $A_1A_2A_3...A_n$  can be broken down to  $(A_1...A_k)(A_{k+1}...A_n)$ . To find an optimal parenthesization for n matrices, we find the subset of k matrices, where k < n. And then compose them altogether.
- In our algorithm, we have two matrices, one to record the minimum number of operations it takes and the other to record the parenthesization.

```
\begin{split} & Matrix[i][j] = 0 \, (i=j) \\ & Matrix[i][j] = minm[i][k] + m[k+1][j] + p_{i-1}p_kp_j \\ & Result[i][j] = k+1 \text{ which gives min values to } Matrix[i][j] \end{split}
```

## MATRIX-CHAIN-ORDER()

$$\begin{split} & \text{for}(t=1;\,t< p;\,t++) \\ & \text{for}(i=0;\,i< p-t;\,i++) \\ & \text{for}(k=i;k< i+t;k++) \\ & \text{matrix}[i][i+t] = \text{matrix}[i][k] + \text{matrix}[k+1][i+t] + \text{size}[i] * \text{size}[k+1] * \text{size}[i+t] \\ & \text{result}[i][i+t] = k+1; \end{split}$$

Matrix[i][j] as following

Result[i][j] as following

Therefore the optimal parenthesization is (AB)((CD)(EF))

For example, Matrix[2][5] gives the optimal matrix chain product of CDEF. The optimal choice comes from the minimum of C(DEF), (CD)(EF), (CDE)F. Take C(DEF) for example. It divides into subproblem C and DEF. C is given by Matrix[2][2], which is 0 since C

is itself. DEF is given by Matrix[3][5], which is 1860. C is a matrix of 3\*12. The result of DEF is a matrix of 12\*6. Therefore,  $p_{i-1}p_kp_j$  equals 3\*12\*6=216. The number of operations taken to get C(DEF) is therefore 1860+216=2076. We can also get (CD)(EF) and (CDE)F with the same manner. They are 1770 and 1830. As a result, we take 1770 for Matrix[2][5] and 4 for k+1, which is recorded in Result[2][5].

## 5. Some exercises in logarithms:

- (a) Write  $\lg(4^n/\sqrt{n})$  in simplest form. What is its asymptotic value. Solution:  $n \lg(4) \frac{1}{2} \lg(n) = 2n \frac{\lg n}{2}$ .
- (b) Which is bigger,  $5^{313340}$  or  $7^{271251}$ ? Give reason. (You can use a calculator.)

Solution: The numbers themselves are too big for calculators but compare their lgs, which are around 727000 and 761000 respectively so the second is bigger.

- (c) Simplify  $n^2 \lg(n^2)$  and  $\lg^2(n^3)$ . Solution:  $2n^2 \lg(n)$  and  $(3 \lg n)^2 = 9 \lg^2 n$ .
- (d) Solve (for x) the equation  $e^{-x^2/2} = \frac{1}{n}$ . Solution:  $-\frac{x^2}{2} = \lg(1/n) = -\lg n$  so  $\frac{x^2}{2} = \lg n$  so  $x^2 = 2\lg n$  so  $x = \sqrt{2}\sqrt{\ln n}$ .
- (e) Write  $\log_n 2^n$  and  $\log_n n^2$  in simple form. Solution: The first is that x for which  $n^x = 2^n$  so  $x \lg(n) = n$  so  $x = \frac{n}{\ln(n)}$  is the answer. For the second the answer is 2.
- (f) What is the relationship between  $\lg n$  and  $\log_3 n$ ? Solution:  $\log_3 n = \frac{\lg n}{\lg 3}$ . As  $\lg(3) \sim 1.5$  is a constant they are "the same" in  $\Theta$ -land.
- (g) Assume i < n. How many times need i be doubled before it reaches (or exceeds) n?

  Solution: If we double x times we reach  $i2^x$  so we need  $i2^x \ge n$ , or  $2^x \ge \frac{n}{i}$  or  $x \ge \lg(\frac{n}{i})$ . As x need be an integer the precise number of times is  $\lceil \lg(\frac{n}{i}) \rceil$ .
- (h) Write  $\lg[n^ne^{-n}\sqrt{2\pi n}]$  precisely as a sum in simplest form. What is it asymptotic to as  $n\to\infty$ ? What is interesting about the bracketed expression?

Solution: This is Stirling's Formula and is asymptotic to n!. Precisely

$$\lg[n^n e^{-n} \sqrt{2\pi n}] = n \lg n - n \lg e + \frac{1}{2} \lg(2\pi) + \frac{1}{2} \lg n$$

which is asymptotic to  $n \lg n$ .