

CPSC 320: TUTORIAL 3

1. Let A be an array of n distinct integers. In this problem, we are interested in finding the longest increasing subsequence of A . That is, we want to find elements $A[i_1], A[i_2], \dots, A[i_t]$ such that $i_1 < i_2 < \dots < i_t$, $A[i_1] < A[i_2] < \dots < A[i_t]$, and t is as big as possible.

For instance, if $A = (1, 9, 17, 5, 8, 6, 4, 7, 12, 3)$, then both $(1, 9, 17)$ and $(1, 5, 6, 7, 12)$ are increasing subsequences. Note that the subsequence given by the greedy algorithm, that is the subsequence $(1, 9, 17)$, is not the longest one.

In order to find the longest increasing subsequence in the array, you can compute for each position i the length $L[i]$ of the longest subsequence that ends with element $A[i]$.

- Give a recurrence relation that expresses $L[i]$ as a function of $L[j]$ for values of j that are smaller than i . Hints: you need to consider the position of the previous element of the longest increasing subsequence.
 - Write pseudo-code for an algorithm that finds the longest increasing subsequence of an array with n elements.
 - What are the space and time complexities of your algorithm? How do these compare to a brute-force approach?
2. Given an unlimited number of coins with denominations x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n , and an amount A , find the minimum number of coins needed to make the amount A or output “impossible” if amount A cannot be made. Your algorithm should run in time $O(nA)$. Why doesn’t greedy work?
 3. Consider the binary operator $@$ defined by the following “addition” table:

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| @ | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| 1 | 2 | 2 | 1 |
| 2 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
| 3 | 1 | 3 | 3 |

Note that $@$ is not associative, and that it is not commutative either (for instance $1 @ 2 = 2$, but $2 @ 1 = 3$).

Design an efficient algorithm that takes in an expression $x_1 @ x_2 @ x_3 @ \dots @ x_n$, where each x_i is either 1, 2 or 3, and determines if it is possible to insert parentheses in that expression so it evaluates to 1. For instance, your algorithm should return YES for $2 @ 2 @ 2 @ 2 @ 1$, since $(2 @ (2 @ 2)) @ (2 @ 1) = 1$.

Analyze the running time and space of your algorithm.