

CPSC 320: Intermediate Algorithm Design and Analysis  
Assignment #1, due Wednesday May 20<sup>th</sup>, 2015 at 2:15pm in Room x235, Box 42

One mark will be deducted if your solution uses multiple sheets of paper that are not stapled.

- [6] 1. The Stable Matching problem, as discussed in class, assumes that every woman and every man has a fully ordered list of preference. In this and the next problem, we consider the situation where we have  $n$  women and  $n$  men (as before), but where a woman or man may have ties in her/his ranking. For instance, woman  $w_1$  might like man  $m_3$  best, followed by  $m_1$  and  $m_4$  in no particular order (that is, she does not prefer  $m_1$  to  $m_4$ , or  $m_4$  to  $m_1$ ), followed by  $m_2$ . In this case, we will say that  $w_1$  is *indifferent* between  $m_1$  and  $m_4$ . It is of course possible for a woman or a man to be indifferent between more than two people.

A *strong instability* in a perfect matching consists of a woman  $w$  and a man  $m$  such that  $w$  and  $m$  both prefer each other to their current partner. Prove that there always exists a perfect matching with no strong instability by giving an algorithm that finds such a matching. Prove the correctness of your algorithm in a couple of sentences.

- [6] 2. Continuing with the same setup as in the previous question, let us define a *weak instability* as a woman  $w$  with partner  $m$  and a man  $m'$  with a partner  $w'$ , where either

- $m$  prefers  $w'$  to  $w$  and  $w'$  either prefers  $m$  to  $m'$  or is indifferent between these two choices, or
- $w'$  prefers  $m$  to  $m'$  and  $m$  either prefers  $w'$  to  $w$  or is indifferent between these two choices.

Prove that there does not necessarily exist a perfect matching without weak instabilities. Give a (small) example where every perfect matching has a weak instability.

- [12] 3. You are doing stress-testing on various models of glass jars to determine the height from which they can be dropped and still not break. The setup for this experiment, on a particular type of jar, is as follows. You have a ladder with  $n$  rungs, and you want to find the highest rung from which you can drop a copy of the jar and not have it break. We call this the *highest safe rung*.

It might be natural to try binary search: drop a jar from the middle rung, see if it breaks, and then recursively try from rung  $n/4$  or  $3n/4$  depending on the outcome. While this algorithm will require the fewest tests, it may also result in many broken jars.

- (a) How many jars might you end up breaking, in the worst case?

If your primary goal were to conserve jars, on the other hand, you could try a different strategy. Start by dropping a jar from the first rung, then the second rung, etc. In this way, you break at most one jar. Unfortunately, you may also need  $n$  attempts.

So there seems to be a trade-off: the more jars you are willing to break, the fewer tries you will need.

- (b) Your boss is really cheap, but he is also too impatient to let you make  $n$  attempts. So he gives you 2 jars. Describe a strategy for finding the highest safe rung that requires you to drop a jar at most  $f(n)$  times, where  $f(n)$  is a function that is  $o(n)$ . (So, for example,  $f(n) = n/2$  is *not* acceptable.)

(c) Analyze the worst-case number of attempts of your algorithm from part (b).

- [12] 4. Consider the following basic problem: you are given an array  $A$  of size  $n$ , and you want to generate a two-dimensional  $n \times n$  array  $B$  such that

$$B[i, j] = \begin{cases} \sum_{k=i}^j A[k] & \text{when } i \leq j \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}.$$

That is,  $B[i, j]$  contains the sum of the elements from  $A[i]$  to  $A[j]$  (unless  $j < i$ ). Here is a simple algorithm that achieves this:

**Algorithm ComputeMatrix**

```
for i ← 1 to n do
  for j ← 1 to n do
    if i ≤ j then
      B[i,j] ← the sum of the elements A[i], A[i+1], ..., A[j]
    else
      B[i,j] ← 0
```

- [2] (a) Using  $O$  notation, give as close an upper bound as you can for the running time of algorithm **ComputeMatrix**, as a function of  $n$ .
- [8] (b) Although algorithm **ComputeMatrix** is the most natural one to solve the problem, it is not the most efficient. Give a different algorithm to solve this problem whose running time is a factor of  $n$  faster than that of algorithm **ComputeMatrix**.
- [3] (c) Using  $\Theta$  notation, write down the running time of your algorithm from part (b). You **must** justify your answer.
- [1] 5. (Bonus) How long did it take you to complete this assignment (not including any time you spent revising your notes before starting)?