

PSO 2 — Week 3: Problems

CS381, Fall 2026

Problem 1. Heaps, continued

Let T be a min-heap storing n distinct keys, with the root at depth 0. You may use the following two results from last week without reproving them:

- (F1) the k -th smallest key of T lies at depth at most $k - 1$;
 - (F2) for any x , all m keys of T smaller than x can be reported in $O(1 + m)$ time.
- (a) Consider the proposed algorithm: run BFS from the root of T and return the k -th node dequeued as the k -th smallest. Determine *exactly* the set of pairs (n, k) with $1 \leq k \leq n$ for which this is correct on every min-heap of n distinct keys. Prove correctness for the pairs in your set, and for every pair outside it exhibit a valid min-heap on which the algorithm fails.
 - (b) Now let T be a d -ary min-heap: every node has at most d children, the tree is complete, and d is not assumed constant. Give the cost of Insert and of ExtractMin as functions of n and d , and say which of the two pays for d and why. Then consider a workload of I inserts and E ExtractMins with $I \geq E$: which d minimizes the total cost, what does the total become, and can you name a situation where the optimal d is not a constant?
 - (c) Given a value x and an integer k , decide whether T contains at least k keys smaller than x , in $O(k)$ time. Note that (F2) alone does not suffice, since m may be far larger than k . Prove correctness and the bound, and say which step removes the dependence on n and which removes the dependence on m .
 - (d) Prove that any algorithm that finds the **maximum** key of T must read the key of *every* leaf, and conclude a bound of the form $\Omega(n)$. Is the bound tight?

Problem 2. Selecting and merging

- (a) You are given an unsorted array $A[1..n]$ of distinct numbers and an integer $k \leq n$. Output the k smallest elements of A in sorted order. Give one algorithm running in $O(n + k \log n)$ and one running in $O(n \log k)$. Is either bound always at least as good as the other? Identify a resource other than time on which the two differ, and a setting in which only the slower one is usable.
- (b) Now the input arrives as a *stream*: you see $A[1], A[2], \dots$ once each, in order, n is not known in advance, and you may store only $O(k)$ elements at a time. Give an algorithm that outputs the k smallest elements in sorted order in $O(n + k \log k)$ total time, beating both bounds in (a). Prove the invariant your algorithm maintains and prove the time bound. A naive accounting gives something worse than $O(n)$ for the non-sorting part, so say carefully why the true cost is linear. You may assume a linear-time selection routine.
- (c) You are given k sorted lists containing n elements in total (the lists need not have equal lengths). Merge them into one sorted list in $O(n \log k)$ time. Prove correctness and analyze the running

time. What does the obvious alternative, merging list 1 with list 2, then that result with list 3, and so on, cost in the worst case?

- (d) (*challenge*) Show that $\Omega(n \log k)$ comparisons are necessary in the worst case for part (c), even when all k lists have the same length n/k .