

## Divide-and-conquer Algorithms

### Binary Search

## Divide-and-Conquer Algorithms

**Divide-and-Conquer:** is an algorithmic technique that solves a computational problem by:

1. Breaking it into *subproblems* that are **smaller instances** of the same type of problem
2. Recursively solving these subproblems
3. Constructing the solution to the problem from the solutions of the subproblems.

## Binary Search

**Search Problem.** Given an array  $A[1..N]$  of integers *sorted in ascending order*, and an integer  $x$ , return **true** if  $x$  is found in  $A$ , and **false** otherwise.

**Naïve Solution.** The straightforward or naïve solution is to start with the first element of  $A$  and compare all elements of the array to  $x$  until we either find  $x$  or we find an element that is larger than  $x$ .

The pseudocode is below.

```
ALGORITHM NaiveSearch(N,A[1..N], x)
begin
  for  $i \leftarrow 1$  to  $N$  do
    if  $x = A[i]$  then return(true);
    if  $x < A[i]$  then return(false);
  end for
  return(false);
end
```

**Worst-Case Complexity of NaiveSearch.** Let  $x \notin A$  and let  $A[N] < x$ . Then Algorithm NaiveSearch (as written above) will take  $2N$  comparisons.

**Proof.** Straightforward. The first comparison in the loop will always be false because no element of  $A$  is equal to  $x$ . The second comparison will always be false because all elements of  $A$  are smaller than  $x$  (by our assumption). Therefore, none of the **return** statements inside the loop will be executed, and thus, the loop will execute  $N$  times. This implies that there execution will involve  $2N$  comparisons.

**Divide-and-Conquer solution.** A better solution is to do the following:

- Compare the middle point of the array  $A[\lceil \frac{N}{2} \rceil]$  to  $x$ .
- If  $A[\lceil \frac{N}{2} \rceil] = x$ , stop and return **true**.
- If  $A[\lceil \frac{N}{2} \rceil] > x$ , then  $x$  can only be found in the first half of  $A$ . Search for  $x$  *recursively* in  $A[1..\lceil \frac{N}{2} \rceil - 1]$ .
- If  $A[\lceil \frac{N}{2} \rceil] < x$ , then  $x$  can only be found in the second half of  $A$ . Search for  $x$  *recursively* in  $A[\lceil \frac{N}{2} \rceil + 1, N]$ .

An algorithm that solves the Search problem using this approach is called Binary Search.

The exact pseudocode is in Figure 1. To solve the problem, BinarySearch algorithm is called as

```
BinarySearch(1,N,N,A[1..N],x)
```

The first two input parameters are the range of indexes in array  $A$  over which the search is to be conducted in the current call.

**Algorithm Correctness.** We prove that the algorithm is correct by induction.

**Base Case.**  $N = 1$ . In this case, the only acceptable call is BinarySearch(1,1,1,A[1..1],x). The first comparison of the algorithm ( $I = J$ ) will be evaluated to true ( $I = 1, J = 1$ ). If  $A[1]$  is indeed  $x$ , the  $A[I] = x$  comparison will evaluate to true and correct answer will be returned. If  $A[1]$  is not  $x$ , then  $A[I] = x$  will evaluate to false and the correct answer will be returned as well.

```

ALGORITHM BinarySearch(I,J, N,A[1..N], x)
begin
  if I = J then    // Base Case
    if A[I] = x then
      return(true)
    else
      return(false)
  else    // inductive case

  c ← ⌈I +  $\frac{J-I}{2}$ ⌉;
  if x = A[c] then
    return(true);
  else
    if x < A[c] then
      return BinarySearch(I, c-1, N, A, x);
    else // x > A[c]
      return BinarySearch(c+1, J, N, A, x);
    end if
  end if

end

```

Figure 1: Algorithm BinarySearch

**Induction Step.** Assume  $N > 1$  and assume that for all  $I, J$  such that  $J - I < N$   $\text{BinarySearch}(I, J, A[1..N], x)$  returns the correct result. Consider the algorithm call  $\text{BinarySearch}(1, N, A[1..N], x)$ .

Because  $N > 1$ , the first comparison,  $I = J$  will evaluate to false. The next statement will discover the midpoint between 1 and  $N$  and assign its value to  $c$ . If  $A[c]$  contains  $x$ , then the followup comparison will evaluate to true and the algorithm will return the correct answer. Otherwise, if  $x$  is smaller than  $A[c]$ , then  $x$  may not be found in any element of the array  $A$  with an index greater than  $c$ , because  $A$  is sorted in ascending order. Therefore, by inductive hypothesis, the call to  $\text{BinarySearch}(1, c-1, A[1..N], x)$  will return the correct answer.

Similarly, if  $x > A[c]$ , then,  $x$  will not be found in elements of  $A$  indexed 1 through  $c - 1$ , and therefor the correct answer will be discovered by the  $\text{BinarySearch}(c+1, J, A[1..N], c)$  call.

**Computational Complexity.** Let us represent the running time of the BinarySearch algorithm in terms of the number of comparison operations that it takes to complete the computation. Let  $T(n)$  be the running time of the algorithm on the input array of size  $n$ . Then, we can write the following relationships:

$$T(1) = 2$$

$$T(n) = T(\lceil \frac{n}{2} \rceil) + 3$$

We can apply the master theorem here:

$$f(n) = 3 = \Theta(1)$$

$$a = 1$$

$$b = 2$$

We have  $f(n) = \Theta(n^{\log_b(a)}) = \Theta(n^{\log_2(1)}) = \Theta(n^0) = \Theta(1)$ .

Therefore,

$$T(n) = \Theta(n^{\log_b(a)} \log_2(n)) = \log_2(n)$$