

CS 170

# Efficient Algorithms and Intractable Problems

## Lecture 4: Divide and Conquer III

Nika Haghtalab   and   John Wright

EECS, UC Berkeley

# Recap of last lecture

Matrix Multiplication:

Strassen's algorithm

Similar to Karatsuba, we reduce the number of subproblems from 8 to 7.

(Median) Selection

We saw that a good pivot selection gives us  $O(n)$

## **This lecture**


- Continue with Median selection
  - Formalize the discussion of pivots and prove  $O(n)$  runtime
- One last example of Divide and Conquer: the Closest Pair problem

(Median) Selection

# Recap: The $k$ -select Problem

Input: Given an array  $S$  of  $n$  numbers and  $k \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$ ,

Output: Find the  $k$ th smallest element of  $S$ .



Some special cases:

$\text{SELECT}(S, 1)$ : Minimum element of the array

$\text{SELECT}(S, n)$ : Maximum element of the array

$\text{SELECT}(S, \lceil \frac{n}{2} \rceil)$ : Median element of the array

# Recap: Big Question

Can we perform Median selection  
(or any other  $k$ -select generally)  
in  $O(n)$ ?

# Recap: Divide and Conquer for **SELECT**(S, $k$ )

We want to divide the problem to subproblems. How?

- Given a “**pivot**”  $v$ . Split the array into three pieces

|   |    |   |    |   |    |    |    |   |   |   |
|---|----|---|----|---|----|----|----|---|---|---|
| 2 | 36 | 5 | 21 | 8 | 13 | 11 | 20 | 5 | 4 | 1 |
|---|----|---|----|---|----|----|----|---|---|---|



Given “**pivot**”

|   |   |   |
|---|---|---|
| 2 | 4 | 1 |
|---|---|---|

|   |   |
|---|---|
| 5 | 5 |
|---|---|

|    |    |   |    |    |    |
|----|----|---|----|----|----|
| 36 | 21 | 8 | 13 | 11 | 20 |
|----|----|---|----|----|----|

$S_L$ : Elements less  
than the pivot

$S_v$ : Elements  
equal to the pivot

$S_R$ : Elements larger  
than the pivot

**SELECT**(S,  $k$ ):

- If  $k \leq \text{len}(S_L)$ : Return **SELECT**( $S_L$ ,  $k$ )
- If  $\text{len}(S_L) < k \leq \text{len}(S_L) + \text{len}(S_v)$ : Return  $v$ .
- If  $\text{len}(S_L) + \text{len}(S_v) < k$ : Return **SELECT**( $S_R$ ,  $k - \text{len}(S_L) - \text{len}(S_v)$ )

# Recap: The Recurrence Relation

**SELECT**( $S, k$ ):

- If  $k \leq \text{len}(S_L)$ : Return **SELECT**( $S_L, k$ )
- If  $\text{len}(S_L) < k \leq \text{len}(S_L) + \text{len}(S_v)$ : Return  $v$ .
- If  $\text{len}(S_L) + \text{len}(S_v) < k$ : Return **SELECT**( $S_R, k - \text{len}(S_L) - \text{len}(S_v)$ )

$$T(n) = \begin{cases} T(\text{len}(S_L)) + O(n) & \text{if } k \leq \text{len}(S_L) \\ T(\text{len}(S_R)) + O(n) & \text{if } \text{len}(S_L) + \text{len}(S_v) < k \\ O(n) & \text{if } \text{len}(S_L) < k \leq \text{len}(S_L) + \text{len}(S_v) \end{cases}$$


$$T(n) \leq T(\max\{\text{len}(S_L), \text{len}(S_R)\}) + O(n)$$

The lengths of  $S_L$  and  $S_R$  depend on the choice of the pivot.

Let's formalize what is a "good" pivot

# Thought Exercise: "Good" Enough Pivot

Let's pretend that the pivot we picked is always **between the  $\frac{n}{4}$ th smallest and  $\frac{3n}{4}$ th smallest element!** What is the runtime of **SELECT**(S, k)?



If pivot at  $\frac{n}{2} \Rightarrow |S_L| = |S_R| = \frac{n}{2} \Rightarrow T(n) \leq T(\frac{n}{2}) + O(n)$

**Discuss**

Assuming that the pivot is between the  $\frac{n}{4}$ th smallest and  $\frac{3n}{4}$ th smallest element, what's the maximum  $\text{len}(S_L)$  and  $\text{len}(S_R)$ ?

$$\text{len}(S_L) \geq \frac{n}{4} \Rightarrow \text{len}(S_R) \leq \frac{3n}{4}$$

$$\leq \frac{3n}{4}$$

vice versa for ~~(S\_L)~~  $\Rightarrow$

$$|S_R| \geq \frac{n}{4} \Rightarrow |S_L| \leq \frac{3n}{4}$$

Write down the recurrence relationship in this case:

$$T(n) \leq T\left(\frac{3n}{4}\right) + O(n)$$

# Thought Exercise: “Good” Enough Pivot

Let's pretend that the pivot we picked is always **between the  $\frac{n}{4}$ th smallest and  $\frac{3n}{4}$ th smallest element!** What is the runtime of **SELECT**(S, k)?

$S_L$

$S_v$

$S_R$

$a=1$   $b=4/3$   $n^d \Rightarrow d=1$

So the runtime can be expressed by  $T(n) \leq T\left(\frac{3n}{4}\right) + O(n)$

What's the runtime?

- $a = 1, b = 4/3, d = 1, a < b^d$
- $O(n)$  runtime.

## The Master Theorem

Suppose  $T(n) = a \cdot T\left(\frac{n}{b}\right) + O(n^d)$ . Then

$$T(n) = \begin{cases} O(n^d) & \text{if } a < b^d \\ O(n^d \log(n)) & \text{if } a = b^d \\ O(n^{\log_b(a)}) & \text{if } a > b^d \end{cases}$$

# In the Tree Method

Let's repeat the runtime analysis with the tree method: If in every round we got a "good" pivot, then we multiply the size by  $\leq 3/4$ .


Single node at layer  $i$  of size  $n \left(\frac{3}{4}\right)^i$ .

Total contribution at layer  $i$  is  $\leq c \cdot n \left(\frac{3}{4}\right)^i$ .

What is the total amount of work in all layers?

$$T(n) \leq \sum_{i=0}^{\log_{4/3}(n)} c n \left(\frac{3}{4}\right)^i \in O(n)$$

$$T(n) \leq T\left(\frac{3n}{4}\right) + \underline{\underline{C \cdot n}}$$



# Summarizing Our Thoughts

Any pivot that's kind of in the middle is a good enough pivot

- Call Pivots between the  $\frac{n}{4}$ th smallest and  $\frac{3n}{4}$ th smallest elements “good” pivots
- There are more than half of the elements in the array are “good” pivots
- If we pick a random element, we have 50% chance of getting a “good” pivot

We don't need a “good” pivot at every round.

- We just need to get “good” pivots often enough
- Every time we have a “good” pivot, the problem size shrinks to  $\frac{3}{4}$  of the last one.


If we pick a random element as pivot, the expected runtime is fast!

There is randomized algorithm that  
solves **SELECT**( $S, k$ ) in expected runtime of  $O(n)$ !

This algorithm is called QuickSelect and selects a uniformly  
random pivot on every turn.


# Randomized Algorithms and Expected Runtime

We typically think about runtime of an Alg on the **worst possible** problem instance.



Randomized Algorithms:

1. Write down the algorithm description.
2. Adversary sees the description and picks a bad instance.
3. Run the algorithm and throw the dice.



The adversary (choice of bad problem instance) doesn't depend on the randomness.

The running time is a **random variable**.

- It makes sense to talk about **expected running time**.

# Expected Running Time and Divide and Conquer

We are interested in **expected runtime**.

$$\mathbb{E}[T(n)]$$

averages over runtimes  $T(i)$  based on the probability of getting a subproblem of size  $i$ .

$\mathbb{E}[T(n)]$  is small when large size  $i$  has very low probability of happening


# Trees Revisited

In reality, in some rounds we are using **bad** pivots and in some rounds we are using “**good**” pivots.

Whenever we get a “**good**” pivot, we multiply the problem size by  $\leq 3/4$ .

In some steps, we don't get a good pivot.

Divide the tree method to phases, indicating when the problem size shrinks by  $3/4$ .



# Trees Revisited

Partition layers to “phases”:

- Phase  $i$  include layers  $[s_i, s_{i+1})$ .
- $s_{i+1}$ : layer when the problem size first becomes  $\leq \frac{3}{4}$  problem size of layer  $s_i$ .


**Lemma**

In phase  $i$ , problem size  $\leq \left(\frac{3}{4}\right)^i n$

**Lemma**

Total runtime:

$$T(n) \leq \sum_{i=0}^{\log_{4/3}(n)} \text{len}(\text{Phase}_i) c n \left(\frac{3}{4}\right)^i$$



# Length of a Phase

The **length** of  $Phase_i$  :

- Random variable
- Eqv. how many tries it gets to shrink the problem size to  $\frac{3}{4}$
- **Length of phase**  $\leq$  No. of random pivots until we get a “good” pivot in phase  $i$ .

## Lemma

Total runtime:

$$T(n) \leq \sum_{i=0}^{\log_{4/3}(n)} \underbrace{\text{len}(Phase_i)}_{\text{Random variable}} c n \left(\frac{3}{4}\right)^i$$

Random variable

## Discuss

Every time we choose a pivot at random, with probability 50%, it is a “good”. So,  $\Pr[\text{len}(Phase_i) = 1] \leq 0.5$ .

What is  $\Pr[\text{len}(Phase_i) = 2]$ ?  $\frac{1}{4} = \frac{1}{2}^2$

What is  $\Pr[\text{len}(Phase_i) = 3]$ ?  $\frac{1}{8}$

What is  $\Pr[\text{len}(Phase_i) = m]$ ?  $\frac{1}{2^m}$

$\Pr[m-1 \text{ tries not good pivot then try good pivot}] \leq$

$$\left(\frac{1}{2}\right)^{m-1} \cdot \left(\frac{1}{2}\right)^1 = \left(\frac{1}{2}\right)^m$$

For ease, assume no element is repeated.  
Remove this assumption at home!



# Expected Phase Length

We want to compute the expected phase length  $\mathbb{E}[\text{len}(\text{Phase}_i)]$

$$\mathbb{E}[\text{len}(\text{Phase}_i)] = \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} m \Pr[\text{len}(\text{Phase}_i) = m]$$

$\leq \left(\frac{1}{2}\right)^m$

Compute  $\mathbb{E}[\text{len}(\text{Phase}_i)]$ ?

**Discuss**

$$\leq \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} m \left(\frac{1}{2}\right)^m = S$$

$$\frac{S}{2} = \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} m \left(\frac{1}{2}\right)^{m+1} = \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} (m+1) \left(\frac{1}{2}\right)^{m+1} - \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} \left(\frac{1}{2}\right)^{m+1}$$

$$S = \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} m \left(\frac{1}{2}\right)^m$$

$$\frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{4} + \frac{1}{8} + \dots = 1$$

$$\frac{S}{2} = S - 1$$

$$\Downarrow$$

$$S = 2$$

# Computing the Expected Runtime

Total expected runtime

$$\mathbb{E}[T(n)] \leq \mathbb{E} \left[ \sum_{i=0}^{\log_{4/3}(n)} \text{len}(\text{Phase}_i) \, c \, n \left( \frac{3}{4} \right)^i \right]$$

$$= c \, n \sum_{i=0}^{\log_{4/3}(n)} \mathbb{E}[\text{len}(\text{Phase}_i)] \left( \frac{3}{4} \right)^i$$

$$\leq c \, n \sum_{i=0}^{\log_{4/3}(n)} 2 \left( \frac{3}{4} \right)^i \in O(n)$$

**Recall**

$$T(n) \leq \sum_{i=0}^{\log_{4/3}(n)} \text{len}(\text{Phase}_i) \, c \, n \left( \frac{3}{4} \right)^i$$

**Recall**

$$\mathbb{E}[\text{len}(\text{Phase}_i)] \leq 2$$

# More on **SELECT**( $S, k$ )


We gave a **randomized** algorithm, with *expected*  $O(n)$  runtime.

There is also a cool **deterministic** algorithm, whose runtime is always  $O(n)$ .

→ It requires a more involved pivot selection mechanism

→ We won't talk about it in class.

# The Big Picture of Divide and Conquer



First divide the problem to subproblems  
→ Subproblems are solved recursively

Non-trivial Divide Step:  
QuickSelect, Strassen's, Karatsuba

Then combine the subproblems solutions to provide the answer to the big problem.

Next: An example of non-trivial combine step

# ClosestPair

Input: Given  $n$  points on the plane  $S = \{p_i = (x_i, y_i) \mid i = 1, \dots, n\}$


Output: Closest pair of points  $(p_i, p_j)$ .

Naïve Algorithm:

- Compute all  $(p_i, p_j)$  distances, and output the pair with closest distance.
- $O(n^2)$  pairs, so  $O(n^2)$  runtime.

Can we do better?

Can we get  $O(n \ln(n))$ ?



# Divide


Since we are shooting for  $O(n \ln(n))$ , we might as well make two sorted lists according to the x-axis and y-axis at the beginning.

How should we divide?

- Divide on x-axis, along the *median*!
- Split the list (keep it sorted)

We have two subproblems

- $S_L = \{p_6, p_7, p_2, p_8, p_5\}$
- $S_R = \{p_9, p_{10}, p_4, p_1, p_3\}$



# Where is the closest pair?


We should solve the two subproblems recursively:

- $\text{ClosestPair}(S_L) = (p_6, p_2)$  and  $\text{ClosestPair}(S_R) = (p_1, p_3)$
- One of these could be the closest pair in  $S$
- Or, the closest pair crosses the median!

Checking for pairs across median naively:

→ Try every pair that crosses the median.

→  $\frac{n}{2} \times \frac{n}{2} \in \Theta(n^2)$




# Idea 1

Let  $d$  be the min of two distances  $\text{ClosestPair}(S_L)$  and  $\text{ClosestPair}(S_R)$

Then restrict attention to the strip of width  $d$  on each side of the median

This is not good enough

- In the worst-case, all points can be in this strip  $\rightarrow$  Still take  $\Theta(n^2)$ .



# Better Idea

Any point  $p$  in this strip, needs to be measured only against points in region  $R$ .

Purple region R:  $2d \times d$  on the other side of the median from where  $p$  is  
—  $d$  higher than  $p$  to  $d$  lower than  $p$


Anything outside of purple region: Either

→ 1) distance  $\geq d$  from  $p$

[2] it's at claim same side of the median

There are  $O(1)$  points in  $R$ !

↳ Caught by subproblems



# Divide and Conquer Algorithm

Let's believe in this claim that every  $p$  in strip needs to be measured against only  $O(1)$  other points. What is the algorithm and runtime?



ClosestPair( $\{p_i = (x_i, y_i) \mid i = 1, \dots, n\}$ )

1.  $(p_L, p'_L) \leftarrow \text{ClosestPair}(p_1, \dots, p_{n/2})$   
2.  $(p_R, p'_R) \leftarrow \text{ClosestPair}(p_{n/2+1}, \dots, p_n)$  }  $2T\left(\frac{n}{2}\right)$

3.  $d \leftarrow \min\{\text{dist}(p_L, p'_L), \text{dist}(p_R, p'_R)\}$

4. Compute points in the strip

5. For any point in the strip, compare the point to the  $O(1)$  relevant points described in previous slide. Update minimum distance pair if needed. }  $O(n)$

Write pseudo-code  
(esp. steps 4-5)  
Start with sorted  
arrays, both x and y

$$T(n) = 2T\left(\frac{n}{2}\right) + O(n) \in O(n \log(n))$$


Via Master Theorem

# Proof that $O(1)$ points are in Region R

## Claim

There are  $\leq 8$  points in  $R$ !

$$d \geq \sqrt{\left(\frac{d}{2}\right)^2 + \left(\frac{d}{2}\right)^2}$$




Region R

Proof: Divide region R to 8 squares, if size  $\frac{d}{2} \times \frac{d}{2}$ .

Assume there are more than 8 points in R.

- Pigeon hole: One square has more than 1 point
  - The diameter of these squares is less than  $d$ , so these points have distance  $< d$  to each other
  - They are both on the same side of the median too.
- Contradicts that  $d$  was defined as the smallest distance between a pair of points on either side of the median!



# More on ClosestPair( $S, k$ )

We gave a **deterministic** algorithm, with runtime  $O(n \log(n))$ .

There is also a cool **randomized** algorithm, whose expected runtime is  $O(n)$ .

→ It requires a more involved divide and conquer analysis

→ We won't talk about it in class.

# Wrap up

In the first two weeks of class, we saw many examples of Divide and Conquer

Integer and Matrix Multiplication

(Median) Selection

Closest Pair

Solving recurrences

Master theorem

Divide and Conquer

→ Is a powerful method

→ Both the divide and combine steps can be versatile

**Next Class and Topic:**

Graph Problems and Algorithms



Prof. John Wright