1. Initialization. Don't forget to do this.

## 2. Memory usage.

(2.1) 32 bytes

- 16 bytes object overhead
- 8 bytes for string reference
- 4 bytes for int
- 4 bytes padding
(2.2) ~ 40n bytes
- $\sim 32 n$ bytes for the $n$ Suffix objects
- $\sim 8 n$ for the array of $n$ references


## 3. String operations.

(3.1) $\Theta\left(n^{4}\right)$

String concatenation takes time proportional to the length of the resulting string, so the running time is $\Theta\left(1+2+3+\ldots+n^{2}\right)=\Theta\left(n^{4}\right)$.
(3.2) $\Theta\left(n^{3}\right)$

String concatenation takes time proportional to the length of the resulting string, so each iteration of the inner loop takes $\Theta(1+2+3+\ldots+n)=\Theta\left(n^{2}\right)$ time, for a total of $\Theta\left(n^{3}\right)$ time. The outer loop, which repeatedly appends string of length $n$, takes $\Theta\left(n+2 n+3 n+\ldots+n^{2}\right)=$ $\Theta\left(n^{3}\right)$ time as well.
(3.3) $\Theta\left(n^{2}\right)$

Appending each character to the end of a StringBuilder takes $\Theta(1)$ amortized time. So, starting from an empty StringBuilder, appending $n^{2}$ characters takes $\Theta\left(n^{2}\right)$ time.

## 4. String sorts.

(4.1) LSD radix sort (after 1 pass)
(4.2) 3-way radix quicksort (after the first partitioning step)
(4.3) LSD radix sort (after 2 passes)
(4.4) MSD radix sort (after the second call to key-indexed counting)
(4.5) MSD radix sort (after the first call to key-indexed counting)

## 5．Graph search．

（5．1） 0254638971
（5．2） 5289361740
（5．3）No．The reverse of the DFS postorder（0471639825）is a topological order． A digraph has a topological order if and only if it has no directed cycle．
（5．4） 0245673918

## 6．Minimum spanning trees．

（6．1） 01020405080100110
（6．2） 10205040800100110

## 7．Shortest paths．

（7．1） 013254
Dijkstra＇s algorithm relaxes the vertices in increasing order of distance from s．
（7．2） 031245
The topological order happens to be unique（because of the path $0 \rightarrow 3 \rightarrow 1 \rightarrow 2 \rightarrow 4 \rightarrow 5$ ）．
（7．3）110，pass 2

## 8．Self－adjusting data structures．

This question was based on a guest lecture in Fall 2021.区区
（8．2）$\boxtimes \square$区 $\boxtimes$
（8．3）$\boxtimes$『
（8．4）Bob Tarjan

## 9．Dynamic programming．

（9．1）A C D H L
The last three letters can be permuted in any order．
（9．2）$\Theta(n)$

## 10. Ternary search tries.

(10.1) I, IN, OF, TIP, TRIE, TRY
(10.2) JADWIN, MATHEY, NASSAU
(10.3)

## 11. Data compression.

(11.1) S P A R S E
(11.2) C C B B C C A D
(11.3) 41428183828580
(11.4) C A B

The compression ratios for $A, B$, and $C$ are $16 / 255,8$, and $8 / 255$, respectively.
(11.5) A B C

The compression ratios for $A, B$, and $C$ are 1.4/8, 1.8/8, and 2/8, respectively.

## 12. Min-weight crossing edge.

(12.1) $0,1,4,5$ or $2,3,6,7$
(12.2) Remove edge $e=v-w$ from the MST. This defines a cut, with the vertices in the connected component containing $v$ on one side and the vertices in the connected component containing $w$ on the other. This cut achieves our goal:

- By construction of the cut, $e$ is a crossing edge.
- No other crossing edge $f$ could have smaller weight because, if it did, we could replace $e$ with $f$ in our MST and obtain a strictly lighter spanning tree - a contradiction.

To construct the cut efficiently:

- Create a new edge-weighted graph $H$ with $V$ vertices, adding all edges in the MST except $e$.
- Run DFS in $H$ from either vertex $v$ or $w$.
- The marked vertices define one side of the cut.

In this application, DFS takes $\Theta(V)$ time because the number of edges in $H$ is $V-2$, not $E$.

Alternative solutions. There are a few variants that also work:

- Run DFS from any vertex-it doesn't need to be $v$ or $w$.
- Use BFS instead of DFS.
- Instead of creating $H$, run DFS in the MST graph, but modify DFS to skip over edge $e$.
- When performing the graph search from either $v$ or $w$, consider only those edges whose weight is strictly less than the weight of $e$. (This might produce a different cut than the approach discussed earlier.)


## 13. Writing seminar preferences.

The key idea is to treat the preferences for each student as an 8-digit number over an alphabet of size $m$. To check for duplicates:

- Sort the $n$ numbers using LSD radix sort.
- Check adjacent entries for duplicates.

Sorting takes $\Theta(m+n)$ time because $R=m$ and the number of characters per string is a constant. Checking adjacent entries takes a total of $\Theta(n)$ time because comparing two strings, each of length 8 , takes $O(1)$ time.

## Partial-credit solutions.

- MSD radix sort. While it makes $\Theta(m+n)$ calls to charAt() in the worst case, it can still take $\Theta(m n)$ time, e.g., if there are $\Theta(n)$ pairs of students with equal preferences lists.
- Compare-base sorting. Mergesort (or heapsort) makes $\Theta(n \log n)$ compares in the worst case. Each compare takes constant time, so the overall running time for sorting is $O(n \log n)$.
- 3-way radix quicksort. All of the partitions might be degenerate, which could lead to $\Theta\left(n^{2}\right)$ time in the worst case. Even probabilistically, the expected running could be $\Theta(n \log n)$ if $\Theta(n)$ students have different first choices.
- Multiway trie. Inserting the $n$ strings into an $R$-way trie uses $\Theta(R n)$ space (and time). In this application, $R=m$, which leads to $\Theta(m n)$ space (and time), not $\Theta(m+n)$.

