

# Problem Set 03

Mostafa Touny

## Contents

<b>Exercises</b>	<b>2</b>
Ex. 3.1 . . . . .	2
Ex. 3.2 . . . . .	2
Ex. 2 . . . . .	2
<b>Problems</b>	<b>2</b>
Prob. 3.1 . . . . .	2
a . . . . .	2
b . . . . .	2

## Exercises

### Ex. 3.1

Done.

### Ex. 3.2

Skipped; I don't understand the problem.

### Ex. 2

Skipped; I don't understand the problem.

## Problems

### Prob. 3.1

psuedo-code changes; compare new complexity with old one

**a**

**Psuedo-code.** No Changes at all. Note the sequence  $2^9 \rightarrow 2^3 \rightarrow 2^1$ , up to the base case of  $u = 2$  as before, starting with total data of size  $2^9 = 512$ .

**Complexity.** Similarly  $\mathcal{O}(\lg \lg u)$ . We follow the same reasoning on the master method but on the case of a cluster size  $u^{1/3}$ . We gain  $\lg_b a = \lg_3 1 = 0$ , or more accurately  $\lg_b a = \lg_{4/3} 1 = 0$ , whereby  $\lceil m/3 \rceil \leq 3m/4$ . Thus, Reaching exactly the same complexity.

**b**

#### Psuedo-code Changes

vEB-TREE-MIN No Changes.

vEB-TREE-MAX No Changes.

vEB-TREE-MEMBER(V, x) No Changes.

vEB-TREE-SUCCESSOR(V, x) No Changes.

vEB-TREE-PREDOCESSOR(V, x) Symmetric, Skipped.

vEB-EMPTY-TREE-INSERT(V, x) No Changes.

Intuitively, We apply the same trick of swapping V.min. Complexity is the same, as we only re-ordered a constant-complexity code block.

```
vEB-TREE-INSERT(V, x)
  if V.min == NIL
    vEB-EMPTY-TREE-INSERT(V, x)
  else
    if x < V.min
      exchange x with V.min
    if x > V.max
      exchange x with V.max
    if V.u > 2
```

```

    if vEB-TREE-MINIMUM(V.cluster[high(x)] == NIL
        vEB-TREE-INSERT(V.summary, high(x))
        vEB-EMPTY-TREE-INSERT(V.cluster[high(x)], low.x)
    else
        vEB-TREE-INSERT(V.cluster[high(x)], low.x)

```

Intuitively, We apply the same trick of updating `V.min` and assigning `x` to a new value before the delete operation. In this case, there's no need to check for `summary` as `V.max` will be already set to either `V.min` or the suitable `index` value. Complexity is the same for exactly the same reasoning

```

vEB-TREE-DELETE(V, x)
.
..
else
    if x == V.min
        first-cluster = vEB-TREE-MINIMUM(V.summary)
        x = index(first-cluster, vEB-TREE-MINIMUM(V.cluster[first-cluster]))
        V.min = x
    elseif x == V.max
        last-cluster = vEB-TREE-MAXIMUM(V.summary)
        x = index(high(x), vEB-TREE-MAXIMUM(V.cluster[high(x)]))
        V.max = x

vEB-TREE-DELETE(V.cluster[high(x)], low(x))

if vEB-TREE-MINIMUM(V.cluster[high(x)]) == NIL
    vEB-TREE-DELETE(V.summary, high.x)

```

Algorithm's correctness are not proved. We relied only on our intuition. Not comfortable the new modification is simpler and yet offers the same complexity; Why not illustrated in this way by the author?