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## The Divide and Conquer Paradigm

Outline:
General Idea
Review of Merge Sort
Why does it work?
Importance of balance
Importance of super-linear growth
Some interesting applications
Closest points
Integer Multiplication
Finding \& Solving Recurrences

## HW4 - Empirical Run Times



Plot Time vs $n$
Fit curve to it (e.g., with Excel)
Note: Higher degree polynomials fit better...

Plotting Time/(growth rate) vs $n$ may be more sensitive should be flat, but small $n$ may be unrepresentative of asymptotics
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## Algorithm Design Techniques

## Divide \& Conquer

Reduce problem to one or more sub-problems of the same type
Typically, each sub-problem is at most a constant fraction of the size of the original problem
e.g. Mergesort, Binary Search, Strassen's Algorithm,

Quicksort (kind of)

## Merge Sort

MS(A: array[I..n]) returns array[I..n] \{ If $(\mathrm{n}=\mathrm{I})$ return $\mathrm{A}[\mathrm{I}]$;
New U:array[I:n/2] = MS(A[I..n/2]);
New L:array[I:n/2] = MS(A[n/2+1..n]);
Return(Merge(U,L));
\}


Merge(U,L: array[I..n]) \{
New C: array[1..2n];
a=l; b=I;
For $i=I$ to $2 n$
$\mathrm{C}[\mathrm{i}]=$ "smaller of $\mathrm{U}[\mathrm{a}], \mathrm{L}[\mathrm{b}]$ and correspondingly $\mathrm{a}++$ or $\mathrm{b}++$ ";
Return C;
\}

## Why Balanced Subdivision?

Alternative "divide \& conquer" algorithm:
Sort n-I
Sort last I
Merge them
$T(n)=T(n-I)+T(I)+3 n$ for $n \geq 2$
$T(I)=0$
Solution: $3 n+3(n-1)+3(n-2) \ldots=\Theta\left(n^{2}\right)$

## Mergesort (review)

Mergesort: (recursively) sort 2 half-lists, then merge results.
$T(n)=2 T(n / 2)+c n, n \geq 2$
$T(I)=0$
Solution: $O(n \log n)$ (details later)


## Another D\&C Approach

Suppose we've already invented DumbSort, taking time $\mathrm{n}^{2}$
Try Just One Level of divide \& conquer:
DumbSort(first $n / 2$ elements)
DumbSort(last $n / 2$ elements)
Merge results
Time: $2(\mathrm{n} / 2)^{2}+\mathrm{n}=\mathrm{n}^{2} / 2+\mathrm{n} \ll \mathrm{n}^{2}$
Almost twice as fast!

## Another D\&C Approach, cont.

Moral I: "two halves are better than a whole"
Two problems of half size are better than one full-size problem, even given the $O(n)$ overhead of recombining, since the base algorithm has super-linear complexity.

Moral 2: "If a little's good, then more's better" two levels of D\&C would be almost 4 times faster, 3 levels almost 8 , etc., even though overhead is growing. Best is usually full recursion down to some small constant size (balancing "work" vs "overhead").

## Another D\&C Approach, cont.

## Moral 3: unbalanced division less good:

$(.1 n)^{2}+(.9 n)^{2}+n=.82 n^{2}+n$
The $18 \%$ savings compounds significantly if you carry recursion to more levels, actually giving $\mathrm{O}(\mathrm{nlogn})$, but with a bigger constant. So worth doing if you can't get $50-50$ split, but balanced is better if you can.
This is intuitively why Quicksort with random splitter is good badly unbalanced splits are rare, and not instantly fatal.
$(I)^{2}+(n-I)^{2}+n=n^{2}-2 n+2+n$
Little improvement here.

## Closest pair of points: 1 Dimensional Version

Given $n$ points on the real line, find the closest pair


Closest pair is adjacent in ordered list

Time $O(n \log n)$ to sort, if needed

Plus $\mathrm{O}(\mathrm{n})$ to scan adjacent pairs

## Closest Pair of Points

Closest pair. Given $n$ points in the plane, find a pair with smallest Euclidean distance between them.

Fundamental geometric primitive.

- Graphics, computer vision, geographic information systems, molecular modeling, air traffic control.
- Special case of nearest neighbor, Euclidean MST, Voronoi.
${ }^{1}$ fast closest pair inspired fast algorithms for these problems
Brute force. Check all pairs of points $p$ and $q$ with $\Theta\left(n^{2}\right)$ comparisons.
1-D version. $O(n \log n)$ easy if points are on a line.
Assumption. No two points have same $\times$ coordinate.

```
to make presentation cleaner
```


## Closest Pair of Points: First Attempt

Divide. Sub-divide region into 4 quadrants.
Obstacle. Impossible to ensure $n / 4$ points in each piece.

Divide. Sub-divide region into 4 quadrants.


Closest Pair of Points

Algorithm.

- Divide: draw vertical line $L$ so that roughly $\frac{1}{2} n$ points on each side.



## Algorithm.

- Divide: draw vertical line $L$ so that roughly $\frac{1}{2} n$ points on each side.
- Conquer: find closest pair in each side recursively.


Algorithm.

- Divide: draw vertical line $L$ so that roughly $\frac{1}{2} n$ points on each side.
- Conquer: find closest pair in each side recursively.
- Combine: find closest pair with one point in each side. $\leftarrow$ seems like $\theta\left(n^{2}\right)$
- Return best of 3 solutions.



## Closest Pair of Points

Find closest pair with one point in each side, assuming that distance $<\delta$.


## Closest Pair of Points

Find closest pair with one point in each side, assuming that distance $<\delta$.

- Observation: only need to consider points within $\delta$ of line L.
- Sort points in $2 \delta$-strip by their y coordinate.



## Closest Pair of Points

Def. Let $s_{i}$ be the point in the $2 \delta$-strip, with the $\mathrm{i}^{\text {th }}$ smallest y -coordinate.

Claim. If $|i-j|>8$, then the distance between $s_{i}$ and $s_{j}$ is $>\delta$.
Pf.

- No two points lie in same $\frac{1}{2} \delta$-by- $\frac{1}{2} \delta$ box.
- only 8 boxes

$\delta$

Find closest pair with one point in each side, assuming that distance $<\delta$.

- Observation: only need to consider points within $\delta$ of line L.
- Sort points in $2 \delta$-strip by their y coordinate.
- Only check distances of those within 8 positions in sorted list!



## Closest Pair Algorithm

Closest-Pair $\left(p_{1}, \ldots, p_{n}\right)$ \{
if(n <= ??) return ??
Compute separation line $L$ such that half the points are on one side and half on the other side.
$\delta_{1}=$ Closest-Pair(left half)
$\delta_{2}=$ Closest-Pair(right half)
$\delta=\min \left(\delta_{1}, \delta_{2}\right)$
Delete all points further than $\delta$ from separation line $L$
Sort remaining points $p[1] \ldots \mathrm{p}[\mathrm{m}]$ by y -coordinate.
for $\mathrm{i}=1$..m
k = 1
while $i+k<=m \& \& p[i+k] \cdot y<p[i] \cdot y+\delta$
$\delta=\min (\delta$, distance between $p[i]$ and $p[i+k])$;
k++;
return $\delta$

## Closest Pair of Points

## Going From Code to Recurrence

Carefully define what you're counting, and write it down!
"Let $\mathrm{C}(\mathrm{n})$ be the number of comparisons between sort keys used by MergeSort when sorting a list of length $n \geq$ I"
In code, clearly separate base case from recursive case, highlight recursive calls, and operations being counted.
Write Recurrence(s)

## Going From Code to Recurrence

Carefully define what you're counting, and write it down!
"Let $D(n)$ be the number of pairwise distance comparisons
in the Closest-Pair Algorithm when run on $\mathrm{n} \geq \mathrm{I}$ points"
In code, clearly separate base case from recursive case, highlight recursive calls, and operations being counted. Write Recurrence(s)


Total time: proportional to C(n)
(loops, copying data, parameter passing, etc.)

$$
C(n)= \begin{cases}0 & \text { if } n=1 \\
2 C(n / 2)+(n-1) & \text { if } n>1 \\
\text { Recursive calls } & \begin{array}{l}
\text { One compare per } \\
\text { element added to } \\
\text { merged list, except } \\
\text { the last. }
\end{array}\end{cases}
$$

## The Recurrence



Running time.

$$
D(n) \leq\left\{\begin{array}{cc}
0 & n=1 \\
2 D(n / 2)+7 n & n>1
\end{array}\right\} \Rightarrow D(n)=O(n \log n)
$$

BUT - that's only the number of distance calculations
What if we counted comparisons?

## Closest Pair of Points: Analysis

Running time.

$$
C(n) \leq\left\{\begin{array}{cl}
0 & n=1 \\
2 C(n / 2)+O(n \log n) & n>1
\end{array}\right\} \Rightarrow C(n)=O\left(n \log ^{2} n\right)
$$

Q. Can we achieve $O(n \log n)$ ?
A. Yes. Don't sort points from scratch each time.

- Sort by $x$ at top level only.
- Each recursive call returns $\delta$ and list of all points sorted by $y$
- Sort by merging two pre-sorted lists.

$$
T(n) \leq 2 T(n / 2)+O(n) \Rightarrow \mathrm{T}(n)=O(n \log n)
$$

### 5.5 Integer Multiplication

## Divide-and-Conquer Multiplication: Warmup

To multiply two $n$-digit integers:

- Multiply four $\frac{1}{2} n$-digit integers.
- Add two $\frac{1}{2} n$-digit integers, and shift to obtain result.
$x=2^{n / 2} \cdot x_{1}+x_{0}$
$y=2^{n / 2} \cdot y_{1}+y_{0}$
$x y=\left(2^{n / 2} \cdot x_{1}+x_{0}\right)\left(2^{n / 2} \cdot y_{1}+y_{0}\right)$
$=2^{n} \cdot x_{1} y_{1}+2^{n / 2} \cdot\left(x_{1} y_{0}+x_{0} y_{1}\right)+x_{0} y_{0}$
10101001
00100011
$\mathrm{T}(n)=\underbrace{4 T(n / 2)}_{\text {recursive calls }}+\underbrace{\Theta(n)}_{\text {add, shift }} \Rightarrow \mathrm{T}(n)=\Theta\left(n^{2}\right)$
$\dagger$
assumes $n$ is a power of 2

Add. Given two $n$-digit integers $a$ and $b$, compute $a+b$. - $O(n)$ bit operations.

Multiply. Given two $n$-digit integers $a$ and $b$, compute $a \times b$

- The "grade school" method: $\Theta\left(n^{2}\right)$ bit operations.


Key trick: 2 multiplies for the price of 1:


## Karatsuba Multiplication

To multiply two n-digit integers:

- Add two $\frac{1}{2} n$ digit integers.
- Multiply three $\frac{1}{2} n$-digit integers.
- Add, subtract, and shift $\frac{1}{2} n$-digit integers to obtain result.

```
x=2 2n/2}\cdot\mp@subsup{x}{1}{}+\mp@subsup{x}{0}{
    = 2 2
xy = 2 2}\cdot\mp@subsup{2}{1}{}\mp@subsup{y}{1}{}+\mp@subsup{2}{}{n/2}\cdot(\mp@subsup{x}{1}{}\mp@subsup{y}{0}{}+\mp@subsup{x}{0}{}\mp@subsup{y}{1}{})+\mp@subsup{x}{0}{}\mp@subsup{y}{0}{
```



Theorem. [Karatsuba-Ofman, 1962] Can multiply two $n$-digit integers in $O\left(n^{1.585}\right)$ bit operations.


```
Sloppy version:T(n)\leq3T(n/2)+O(n)
=>T(n)=O(n}\mp@subsup{n}{}{\mp@subsup{\operatorname{log}}{2}{}3})=O(\mp@subsup{n}{}{1.585}
```


## Recurrences

Where they come from, how to find them (above)

Next: how to solve them

## Multiplication - The Bottom Line

Naïve:
$\Theta\left(n^{2}\right)$
Karatsuba: $\quad \Theta\left(n^{1.59 \ldots}\right)$
Amusing exercise: generalize Karatsuba to do 5 size $\mathrm{n} /$ 3 subproblems $=>\Theta\left(n^{1.46 \ldots}\right)$
Best known: $\Theta(n \log n \log \log n)$
"Fast Fourier Transform"
but mostly unused in practice (unless you need really big numbers - a billion digits of $\pi$, say)
High precision arithmetic IS important for crypto

## Mergesort (review)

Mergesort: (recursively) sort 2 half-lists, then merge results.
$T(n)=2 T(n / 2)+c n, n \geq 2$
$T(I)=0$
Solution: $\Theta(n \log n)$ (details laty)
now


Solve: $T(I)=c$

$$
T(n)=2 T(n / 2)+c n
$$



|  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 0 | $1=2^{0}$ | n | $\mathrm{cn}^{\text {a }}$ |
| 1 | $2=2^{1}$ | n/2 | 2cn/2 |
| 2 | $4=2^{2}$ | n/4 | $4 \mathrm{cn} / 4$ |
| $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ |  |  |
| i | ${ }^{2}$ | n/21 | $2^{\prime} \mathrm{c} / 2^{\prime}$ |
| k-1 | $2^{k \times 1}$ | $\mathrm{n} / 2^{k-1}$ | $2^{k \times 1} \mathrm{~cm} / 2^{k}$ |
| k | $2^{k}$ | $\mathrm{n} / 2^{\mathrm{k}}=1$ | $2^{k} \mathrm{~T}$ (1) |

Total Work: $\mathrm{c} \mathrm{n} \log _{2} \mathrm{n}$ (add last col)
 41

Solve: $T(I)=c$

$$
T(n)=3 T(n / 2)+c n
$$



Total Work: $\mathrm{T}(\mathrm{n})=\sum_{i=0}^{k} 3^{i} \mathrm{cn} / 2^{i}$ $\qquad$ 43

Solve: $T(I)=c$

$$
T(n)=4 T(n / 2)+c n
$$



| Level | Num | sire | Work |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 0 | $1=4^{0}$ | n | cn |
| 1 | $4=41$ | n/2 | 4cm/2 |
| 2 | $16=4^{2}$ | n/4 | $16 \mathrm{cr} / 4$ |
| ... | ... | ... | ... |
| i | 4 | n/2 | $4^{1} \mathrm{c}$ n/2 |
| $\ldots$ | $4{ }^{4 k-1}$ | $\mathrm{n} / 2^{\mathrm{k}-1}$ | ${ }^{\text {k/1 }} \mathrm{c} / 2^{k-1}$ |
| k | $4^{k}$ | $n / 2^{K}=1$ | $4^{k} \mathrm{~T}(1)$ |

Total Work: $\mathrm{T}(\mathrm{n})=\sum_{i-0}^{k} 4^{i} c n / 2^{i}=O\left(n^{2}\right)$ $\qquad$

Solve: $T(I)=c$

$$
T(n)=3 T(n / 2)+c n \quad \text { (cont.) }
$$

$$
\begin{array}{rlr}
T(n) & =\sum_{i=0}^{k} 3^{i} c n / 2^{i} & \\
& =c n \sum_{i=0}^{k} 3^{i} / 2^{i} & \sum_{i=0}^{k} x^{i}= \\
& =c n \sum_{i=0}^{k}\left(\frac{3}{2}\right)^{i} & \frac{x^{k+1}-1}{x-1} \\
& =c n \frac{\left(\frac{3}{2}\right)^{k+1}-1}{\left(\frac{3}{2}\right)-1} & (x \neq 1)
\end{array}
$$

Solve: $T(I)=c$

$$
\begin{aligned}
\mathrm{T}(\mathrm{n}) & =3 \mathrm{~T}(\mathrm{n} / 2)+\mathrm{cn} \\
= & 2 c n\left(\left(\frac{3}{2}\right)^{k+1}-1\right) \\
& <2 \operatorname{cn}\left(\frac{3}{2}\right)^{k+1} \\
= & 3 \operatorname{cn}\left(\frac{3}{2}\right)^{k} \\
= & 3 \operatorname{cn} \frac{3^{k}}{2^{k}}
\end{aligned}
$$

## Divide and Conquer Master Recurrence

If $T(n)=a T(n / b)+n^{k}$ for $n>b$ then

| if $a>b^{k}$ then $T(n)$ is $\Theta\left(n^{\log _{b} a}\right)$ | [many subproblems $=>$ <br> leaves dominate] |
| :--- | :--- |
| if $a<b^{k}$ then $T(n)$ is $\Theta\left(n^{k}\right)$ | [few subproblems $=>$ <br> top level dominates] |
| if $a=b^{k}$ then $T(n)$ is $\Theta\left(n^{k} \log n\right)$ | [balanced $=>$ all $\log n$ <br> levels contribute] |

True even if it is $\lceil n / b\rceil$ instead of $n / b$.

Solve: $T(I)=c$

$$
\begin{array}{ll}
\mathrm{T}(\mathrm{n})=3 \mathrm{~T}(\mathrm{n} / 2)+\mathrm{cn} & \text { (cont.) } \\
=3 c n \frac{3^{\log _{2} n}}{2^{\log _{2} n}} & \\
=3 c n \frac{3^{\log _{2} n}}{n} & a^{\log _{b} n} \\
=3 c 3^{\log _{2} n} & =\left(b^{\log _{b} a}\right)^{\log _{b} n} \\
=3 c\left(n^{\log _{2} 3}\right) & =\left(b^{\log _{b} n}\right)^{\log _{b} a} \\
=O\left(n^{1.59 \ldots}\right) & =n^{\log _{b} a} \\
\hline
\end{array}
$$

## D \& C Summary

## Idea:

"Two halves are better than a whole" if the base algorithm has super-linear complexity.
"If a little's good, then more's better"
repeat above, recursively
Analysis: recursion tree or Master Recurrence Applications: Many.

Binary Search, Merge Sort, (Quicksort), Closest points, Integer multiply,...

