

Solution for Problem 2 of HW 1.

Proving the correctness of the algorithm. Yes it is correct.

Let's first discuss what this algorithm is not about. It is not about setting  $i$  and  $j$  to all possible combinations between 1 and  $n$ , each time comparing the two length- $n$  substrings of  $x$  and  $y$  starting from positions  $i$  and  $j$ , to see if the substrings are equal. That approach would try  $\Theta(n^2)$  pairs of starting positions, possibly making  $\Theta(n)$  comparisons for each pair, and so would only establish an  $O(n^3)$  running time, not the  $O(n)$  (linear) time bound claimed.

At the high level, the given algorithm does choose *some*  $i, j$  pairs ( $i$  and  $j$  between 1 and  $n$ ), and for each pair it does compare the two substrings of  $x$  and  $y$  starting from those positions. Of course, if those substrings match for  $n$  characters, then the algorithm has discovered that  $\alpha$  is a circular shift of  $\beta$ . Since that is the only way the algorithm declares that one of the strings is a circular shift of the other, if the algorithm declares that  $\alpha$  is a circular shift of  $\beta$ , it actually is one. So the needed thing to prove is the converse: We assume that  $\alpha$  is a circular shift of  $\beta$ , and prove that the algorithm will declare this to be so.

The key is to concentrate on the lexicographically-smallest, length- $n$  substring of  $x$  (and hence also of  $y$ ). Call that substring  $\alpha^*$  and let  $i^*$  be its leftmost starting position in  $x$ , and let  $j^*$  be its leftmost starting position in  $y$ . Clearly, both  $i^*$  and  $j^*$  are in the range 1 to  $n$ .

Whenever  $i$  is incremented, it is after the algorithm finds that the  $n$ -length-substring of  $y$  starting at  $j$  is lexicographically smaller than the  $n$ -length substring of  $x$  starting at  $i$ . That is then a constructive demonstration that  $i$  is not equal to  $i^*$  (assuming that  $\alpha$  is a circular shift of  $\beta$ ). Moreover, if  $i$  is set to  $i + k$  in an iteration, then each  $n$ -length substring of  $y$  starting at a position between  $j$  and  $j + k - 1$  is lexicographically smaller than the respective  $n$ -length substring starting at a position between  $i$  and  $i + k - 1$ . Hence none of the indices between (the unincremented)  $i$  and  $i + k - 1$  can be  $i^*$ . The same analysis holds when  $j$  is set to  $j + k$ . It follows that if one string is a circular shift of the other, then neither  $i$  nor  $j$  can be set beyond  $i^*$  or  $j^*$  respectively. Hence neither can be set beyond  $n$ . But the algorithm only declares that  $\alpha$  is not a circular shift of  $\beta$  when one of  $i$  or  $j$  is set beyond  $n$ . Hence, if it terminates, the algorithm will terminate by declaring that  $\alpha$  is a circular shift of  $\beta$ . Further, the algorithm must terminate, because in any iteration that does  $k$  comparisons, the algorithm either terminates or increments either  $i$  or  $j$  by  $k$ , and neither can go beyond  $n$ . This finishes the

proof of correctness.

For the time analysis, again note that in any iteration that does  $k$  comparisons, either  $i$  or  $j$  get incremented by  $k$ . The algorithm terminates when both  $i$  and  $j$  have been set to  $n + 1$ , or before that, so the algorithm can make at most  $2n$  comparisons. Comparisons are the primitive operations, since the total number of operations done in the algorithm is proportional to the number of comparisons. Hence the algorithm runs in  $O(n)$  time.