

Adapted From Virginia Williams' lecture notes

Additional credits: Albert Chen, Juliana Cook (2015), Ofir Geri, Sam Kim (2016), Gregory Valiant (2017)

All typos and mistakes are due to Aviad Rubinfeld (2018)

Date: October 2, 2018

1 Introduction

Today we will continue to talk about divide and conquer, and go into detail on how to solve recurrences.

Recall that divide and conquer algorithms divide up a problem into a number of subproblems that are the smaller instances of the same problem, solve those problems recursively, and combine the solutions to the subproblems into a solution for the original problem. When a subproblem size is small enough, the subproblem is solved in a straightforward manner. In the past lectures we have seen two examples of divide and conquer algorithms: MergeSort and Karatsuba's algorithm for integer multiplication.

The running time of divide and conquer algorithms can be naturally expressed in terms of the running time of smaller inputs. Today we will show two techniques for solving these recurrences. The first is called the *master method* to solve these recurrences. This method can only be used when the size of all the subproblems is the same (as was the case in the examples). We will also see a surprising algorithm that does not fall into this category, and how to analyze its running time using another method, the *substitution method*.

2 Recurrences

Stated more technically, a divide and conquer algorithm takes an input of size n and does some operations all running in $O(f(n))$ time for some f and runs itself recursively on $k \geq 1$ instances of size n_1, n_2, \dots, n_k , where $n_i < n$ for all i . To talk about what the runtime of such an algorithm is, we can write a runtime **recurrence**. Recurrences are functions defined in terms of themselves with smaller arguments, as well as one or more base cases. We can define a recurrence more formally as follows:

Let $T(n)$ be the worst-case runtime on instances of size n . If we have k recursive calls on a given step (of sizes n_i) and each step takes time $O(f(n))$, then we can write the runtime as $T(n) \leq c \cdot f(n) + \sum_{i=1}^k T(n_i)$ for some constant c , where our base case is $T(c') \leq O(1)$.

Now let's try finding recurrences for some of the divide and conquer algorithms we have seen.

2.1 Integer Multiplication

Recall the integer multiplication problem, where we are given two n -digit integers x and y and output the product of the two numbers. The long multiplication/grade school algorithm runs in $O(n^2)$ time. In lecture 1 we saw two divide and conquer algorithms for solving this problem. In both of them, we divided each of x and y into two $(n/2)$ -digit numbers in the following way: $x = 10^{\frac{n}{2}}a + b$ and $y = 10^{\frac{n}{2}}c + d$. Then we compute $xy = ac \cdot 10^n + 10^{\frac{n}{2}}(ad + bc) + bd$.

In the first algorithm, which we call *Mult1*, we simply computed the four products ac, ad, bc, bd . Karatsuba found that since we only need the sum of ad and bc , we can save one multiplication operation by noting that $ad + bc = (a + b)(c + d) - ac - bd$.

We now express the running time of these two algorithms using recurrences. Adding two n digit integers is an $O(n)$ operation, since for each position we add at most three digits: the i th digit from each number and possibly a carry from the additions due to the $(i - 1)$ th digits.

Let $T_1(n)$ and $T_2(n)$ denote the worst-case runtime of *Mult1* and Karatsuba, respectively, on inputs of size n . Then, the runtime of *Mult1* can be written as the recurrence

$$T_1(n) = 4T_1\left(\frac{n}{2}\right) + O(n),$$

Algorithm 1: Mult1(x, y)

Split x and y into $x = 10^{\frac{n}{2}}a + b$ and $y = 10^{\frac{n}{2}}c + d$
 $z_1 = \text{Mult1}(a, c)$
 $z_2 = \text{Mult1}(a, d)$
 $z_3 = \text{Mult1}(b, c)$
 $z_4 = \text{Mult1}(b, d)$
return $z_1 \cdot 10^n + 10^{\frac{n}{2}}(z_2 + z_3) + z_4$

Algorithm 2: Karatsuba(x, y)

Split $x = 10^{\frac{n}{2}}a + b$ and $y = 10^{\frac{n}{2}}c + d$
 $z_1 = \text{Karatsuba}(a, c)$
 $z_2 = \text{Karatsuba}(b, d)$
 $z_3 = \text{Karatsuba}(a + b, c + d)$
 $z_4 = z_3 - z_1 - z_2$
return $z_1 \cdot 10^n + z_4 \cdot 10^{\frac{n}{2}} + z_2$

and Karatsuba's runtime can be written as the recurrence

$$T_2(n) = 3T_2\left(\frac{n}{2}\right) + O(n).$$

Note that the constant "hidden" in the $O(n)$ term in T_2 may be greater than in T_1 , but for asymptotic analysis of the running time, these constants are not important.

2.2 MergeSort

Consider the basic steps for algorithm MergeSort(A), where $|A| = n$.

1. If $|A| = 1$, return A .
2. Split A into A_1, A_2 of size $\frac{n}{2}$.
3. Run MergeSort(A_1) and MergeSort(A_2).
4. Merge(A_1, A_2)

Steps 2 and 4 each take time $O(n)$. In step 3, we are splitting the work up into two subproblems of size $\frac{n}{2}$. Therefore, we get the following recurrence:

$$T(n) = 2T\left(\frac{n}{2}\right) + O(n).$$

In the previous lecture, we saw that the running time of MergeSort is $O(n \log n)$. In this lecture we will show how to derive this using the master method.

3 The Master Method

We now introduce a general method, called the *master method*, for solving recurrences where all the subproblems are of the same size. We assume that the input to the master method is a recurrence of the form

$$T(n) = a \cdot T\left(\frac{n}{b}\right) + O(n^d).$$

In this recurrence, there are three constants:

- a is the number of subproblems that we create from one problem, and must be an integer greater than or equal to 1.
- b is the factor by which the input size shrinks (it must hold that $b > 1$).
- d is the exponent of n in the time it takes to generate the subproblems and combine their solutions.

There is another constant “hidden” in the big-O notation. We will introduce it in the proof and see that it does not affect the result.

In addition, we need to specify the “base case” of the recurrence, that is, the runtime when the input gets small enough. For a sufficiently small n (say, when $n = 1$), the worst-case runtime of the algorithm is constant, namely, $T(n) = O(1)$.

We now state the *master theorem*, which is used to solve the recurrences.

Theorem 3.1 (Master Theorem). *Let $T(n) = a \cdot T(\frac{n}{b}) + O(n^d)$ be a recurrence where $a \geq 1, b > 1$. Then,*

$$T(n) = \begin{cases} O(n^d \log n) & \text{if } a = b^d \\ O(n^d) & \text{if } a < b^d \\ O(n^{\log_b a}) & \text{if } a > b^d \end{cases}$$


Remark 1. *In some cases, the recurrence may involve subproblems of size $\lceil \frac{n}{b} \rceil$, $\lfloor \frac{n}{b} \rfloor$, or $\frac{n}{b} + 1$. The master theorem holds for these cases as well. However, we do not prove that here.*

Before we turn to the proof of the master theorem, we show how it can be used to solve the recurrences we saw earlier.

- Mult1: $T(n) = 4T(\frac{n}{2}) + O(n)$.
The parameters are $a = 4, b = 2, d = 1$, so $a > b^d$, hence $T(n) = O(n^{\log_2 4}) = O(n^2)$.
- Karatsuba: $T(n) = 3T(\frac{n}{2}) + O(n)$.
The parameters are $a = 3, b = 2, d = 1$, so $a > b^d$, hence $T(n) = O(n^{\log_2 3}) = O(n^{1.59})$.
- MergeSort: $T(n) = 2T(\frac{n}{2}) + O(n)$.
The parameters are $a = 2, b = 2, d = 1$, so $a = b^d$, hence $T(n) = O(n \log n)$.
- Another example: $T(n) = 2T(\frac{n}{2}) + O(n^2)$.
The parameters are $a = 2, b = 2, d = 2$, so $a < b^d$, hence $T(n) = O(n^2)$.

We see that for integer multiplication, Karatsuba is the clear winner!

Proof of the Master Theorem. Let $T(n) = a \cdot T(\frac{n}{b}) + O(n^d)$ be the recurrence we solve using the master theorem. For simplicity, we assume that $T(1) = 1$ and that n is a power of b . From the definition of big-O, we know that there is a constant $c > 0$ such that for sufficiently large n , $T(n) \leq a \cdot T(\frac{n}{b}) + c \cdot n^d$. The proof of the master theorem will use the recursion tree in a similar way to our analysis of the running time of MergeSort.



The recursion tree drawn above has $\log_b n + 1$ level. We analyze the amount of work done at each level, and then sum over all levels in order to get the total running time. Consider level j . At level j , there are a^j subproblems. Each of these subproblems is of size $\frac{n}{b^j}$, and will take time at most $c \left(\frac{n}{b^j}\right)^d$ to solve (this only considers the work done at level j and does not include the time it takes to solve the subsubproblems). We conclude that the total work done at level j is at most $a^j \cdot c \left(\frac{n}{b^j}\right)^d = cn^d \left(\frac{a}{b^d}\right)^j$.

Writing the running time this way shows us where the terms a and b^d come from: a is the branching factor and measures how the number of subproblems grows at each level, and b^d is the shrinkage in the work needed (per subproblem).

Summing over all levels, we get that the total running time is at most $cn^d \sum_{j=0}^{\log_b n} \left(\frac{a}{b^d}\right)^j$. We now consider each of the three cases.

1. $a = b^d$. In this case, the amount of work done at each level is the same: cn^d . Since there are $\log_b n + 1$ levels, the total running time is at most $(\log_b n + 1)cn^d = O(n^d \log n)$.

2. $a < b^d$. In this case, $\frac{a}{b^d} < 1$, hence, $\sum_{j=0}^{\log_b n} \left(\frac{a}{b^d}\right)^j \leq \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \left(\frac{a}{b^d}\right)^j = \frac{1}{1 - \frac{a}{b^d}} = \frac{b^d}{b^d - a}$. Hence, the total running time is $cn^d \cdot \frac{b^d}{b^d - a} = O(n^d)$.

Intuitively, in this case the shrinkage in the work needed per subproblem is more significant, so the work done in the highest level “dominates” the other factors in the running time.

3. $a > b^d$. In this case, $\sum_{j=0}^{\log_b n} \left(\frac{a}{b^d}\right)^j = \frac{\left(\frac{a}{b^d}\right)^{\log_b n + 1} - 1}{\frac{a}{b^d} - 1}$. Since a, b, c, d are constants, we get that the total work done is $O\left(n^d \cdot \left(\frac{a}{b^d}\right)^{\log_b n}\right) = O\left(n^d \cdot \frac{a^{\log_b n}}{b^{d \log_b n}}\right) = O\left(n^d \cdot \frac{n^{\log_b a}}{n^d}\right) = O(n^{\log_b a})$.

Intuitively, here the branching factor is more significant, so the total work done at each level increases, and the leaves of the tree “dominate”.

□

We conclude with a more general version of the master theorem.

Theorem 3.2 (Master Theorem). *Let $T(n) = a \cdot T\left(\frac{n}{b}\right) + f(n)$ be a recurrence where $a \geq 1$, $b > 1$. Then,*

- *If $f(n) = O(n^{\log_b a - \epsilon})$ for some constant $\epsilon > 0$, $T(n) = \Theta(n^{\log_b a})$.*
- *If $f(n) = \Theta(n^{\log_b a})$, $T(n) = \Theta(n^{\log_b a} \log n)$.*
- *If $f(n) = \Omega(n^{\log_b a + \epsilon})$ for some constant $\epsilon > 0$ and if $af(n/b) \leq cf(n)$ for $c < 1$ and all sufficiently large n , then $T(n) = \Theta(f(n))$.*

4 The Substitution Method

Recurrence trees can get quite messy when attempting to solve complex recurrences. With the substitution method, we can guess what the runtime is, plug it in to the recurrence and see if it works out.

Given a recurrence $T(n) \leq f(n) + \sum_{i=1}^k T(n_i)$, we can guess that the solution to the recurrence is

$$T(n) \leq \begin{cases} d \cdot g(n_0) & \text{if } n = n_0 \\ d \cdot g(n) & \text{if } n > n_0 \end{cases}$$

for some constants $d > 0$ and $n_0 \geq 1$ and a function $g(n)$. We are essentially guessing that $T(n) \leq O(g(n))$.

For our base case we must show that you can pick some d such that $T(n_0) \leq d \cdot g(n_0)$. For example, this can follow from our standard assumption that $T(1) = 1$.

Next we assume that our guess is correct for everything smaller than n , meaning $T(n') \leq d \cdot g(n')$ for all $n' < n$. Using the inductive hypothesis, we prove the guess for n . We must pick some d such that

$$f(n) + \sum_{i=1}^k d \cdot g(n_i) \leq d \cdot g(n), \text{ whenever } n \geq n_0.$$

Typically the way this works is that you first try to prove the inductive step starting from the inductive hypothesis, and then from this obtain a condition that d needs to obey. Using this condition you try to figure out the base case, i.e., what n_0 should be.

5 Selection

The selection problem is to find the k th smallest number in an array A .

Input: array A of n numbers, and an integer $k \in \{1, \dots, n\}$.

Output: the k -th smallest number in A .

One approach is to sort the numbers in ascending order, and then return the k th number in the sorted list. This takes $O(n \log n)$ time, since it takes $O(n \log n)$ time for the sort (e.g. by MergeSort) and $O(1)$ time to return k th number.

5.1 Minimum Element

As always, we ask if we can do better (i.e. faster in big-O terms). In the special case where $k = 1$, selection is the problem of finding the minimum element. We can do this in $O(n)$ time by scanning through the array and keeping track of the minimum element so far. If the current element is smaller than the minimum so far, we update the minimum.

Algorithm 3: SELECTMIN(A)

```
 $m \leftarrow \infty;$ 
 $n \leftarrow \text{length}(A);$ 
for  $i = 1$  to  $n$  do
    if  $A(i) < m$  then
         $m \leftarrow A(i);$ 
return  $m;$ 
```

In fact, this is the best running time we could hope for.

Definition 5.1. A deterministic algorithm is one which, given a fixed input, always performs the same operations (as opposed to an algorithm which uses randomness).

Claim 1. Any deterministic algorithm for finding the minimum has runtime $\Omega(n)$.

Proof of Claim 1. Intuitively, the claim holds because any algorithm for the minimum must look at all the elements, each of which could be the minimum. Suppose a correct deterministic algorithm does not look at $A(i)$ for some i . Then the output cannot depend on $A(i)$, so the algorithm returns the same value whether $A(i)$ is the minimum element or the maximum element. Therefore the algorithm is not always correct, which is a contradiction. So there is no sublinear deterministic algorithm for finding the minimum. \square

So for $k = 1$, we have an algorithm which achieves the best running time possible. By similar reasoning, this lower bound of $\Omega(n)$ applies to the general selection problem. So ideally we would like to have a linear-time selection algorithm in the general case.

6 Linear-Time Selection

In fact, a linear-time selection algorithm does exist. Before showing the linear time selection algorithm, it's helpful to build some intuition on how to approach the problem. The high-level idea will be to try to do a Binary Search over an unsorted input. At each step, we hope to divide the input into two parts, the subset of smaller elements of A , and the subset of larger elements of A . We will then determine whether the k th smallest element lies in the first part (with the “smaller” elements) or the part with larger elements, and recurse on exactly one of those two parts.

How do we decide how to partition the array into these two pieces? Suppose we have a black-box algorithm CHOOSEPIVOT that chooses some element in the array A , and we use this pivot to define the two sets—any $A[i]$ less than the pivot is in the set of “smaller” values, and any $A[i]$ greater than the pivot is in the other part. We will figure out precisely how to specify this subroutine ChoosePivot a bit later, after specifying the high-level algorithm structure. For clarity we'll assume all elements are distinct from now on, but the idea generalizes easily. Let n be the size of the array and assume we are trying to find the k^{th} element.

Algorithm 4: SELECT(A, n, k)

```

if  $n == 1$  then
  | return  $A[1]$ ;
 $p \leftarrow$  CHOOSEPIVOT( $A, n$ );
 $A_{<} \leftarrow \{A(i) \mid A(i) < p\}$ ;
 $A_{>} \leftarrow \{A(i) \mid A(i) > p\}$ ;
if  $|A_{<}| = k - 1$  then
  | return  $p$ ;
else if  $|A_{<}| > k - 1$  then
  | return SELECT( $A_{<}, |A_{<}|, k$ );
else if  $|A_{<}| < k - 1$  then
  | return SELECT( $A_{>}, |A_{>}|, k - |A_{<}| - 1$ );

```

At each iteration, we use the element p to partition the array into two parts: all elements smaller than the pivot and all elements larger than the pivot, which we denote $A_{<}$ and $A_{>}$, respectively.

Depending on what the size of the resulting sub-arrays are, the runtime can be different. For example, if one of these sub-arrays is of size $n - 1$, at each iteration, we only decreased the size of the problem by 1, resulting in total running time $O(n^2)$. If the array is split into two equal parts, then the size of the problem at iteration reduces by half, resulting in a linear time solution. (We assume CHOOSEPIVOT runs in $O(n)$.)

Claim 2. *If the pivot p is chosen to be the minimum or maximum element, then SELECT runs in $\Theta(n^2)$ time.*

Proof. At each iteration, the number of elements decreases by 1. Since running CHOOSEPIVOT and creating $A_{<}$ and $A_{>}$ takes linear time, the recurrence for the runtime is $T(n) = T(n-1) + \Theta(n)$. Expanding this,

$$T(n) \leq c_1n + c_1(n-1) + c_1(n-2) + \dots + c_1 = c_1n(n+1)/2$$

and

$$T(n) \geq c_2n + c_2(n-1) + c_2(n-2) + \dots + c_2 = c_2n(n+1)/2.$$

We conclude that $T(n) = \Theta(n^2)$. □

Claim 3. *If the pivot p is chosen to be the median element, then SELECT runs in $O(n)$ time.*

Proof. Intuitively, the running time is linear since we remove half of the elements from consideration each iteration. Formally, each recursive call is made on inputs of half the size, namely, $T(n) \leq T(n/2) + cn$. Expanding this, the runtime is $T(n) \leq cn + cn/2 + cn/4 + \dots + c \leq 2cn$, which is $O(n)$. □

So how do we design CHOOSEPIVOT that chooses a pivot in linear time? In the following, we describe three ideas.

6.1 Idea #1: Choose a random pivot

As we saw earlier, depending on the pivot chosen, the worst-case runtime can be $O(n^2)$ if we are unlucky in the choice of the pivot at every iteration. As you might expect, it is extremely unlikely to be this unlucky, and one can prove that the *expected* runtime is $O(n)$ provided the pivot is chosen uniformly at random from the set of elements of A . In practice, this randomized algorithm is what is implemented, and the hidden constant in the $O(n)$ runtime is very small.

6.2 Idea #2: Choose a pivot that creates the most “balanced” split

Consider CHOOSEPIVOT that returns the pivot that creates the most “balanced” split, which would be the median of the array. However, this is exactly selection problem we are trying to solve, with $k = n/2$! As long as we do not know how to find the median in linear time, we cannot use this procedure as CHOOSEPIVOT.

6.3 Idea #3: Find a pivot “close enough” to the median

Given a linear-time median algorithm, we can solve the selection problem in linear time (and vice versa). Although ideally we would want to find the median, notice that as far as correctness goes, there was nothing special about partitioning around the median. We could use this same idea of partitioning and recursing on a smaller problem even if we partition around an arbitrary element. To get a good runtime, however, we need to guarantee that the subproblems get smaller quickly. In 1973, Blum, Floyd, Pratt, Rivest, and Tarjan came up with the Median of Medians algorithm. It is similar to the previous algorithm, but rather than partitioning around the exact median, uses a surrogate “median of medians”. We update CHOOSEPIVOT accordingly.

What is this algorithm doing? First it divides A into segments of size 5. Within each group, it finds the median by first sorting the elements with MERGESORT. Recall that MERGESORT sorts in $O(n \log n)$ time. However, since each group has a constant number of elements, it takes constant time to sort. Then it makes a recursive call to SELECT to find the median of C , the median of medians. Intuitively, by partitioning around this value, we are able to find something that is close to the true median for partitioning, yet is ‘easier’ to compute, because it is the median of $g = \lceil n/5 \rceil$ elements rather than n . The last part is as before: once we have our pivot element p , we split the array and recurse on the proper subproblem, or halt if we found our answer.

Algorithm 5: CHOOSEPIVOT(A, n)

```
Split  $A$  into  $g = \lceil n/5 \rceil$  groups  $p_1, \dots, p_g$ ;  
for  $i = 1$  to  $g$  do  
   $p_i \leftarrow \text{MERGESORT}(p_i)$ ;  
 $C \leftarrow \{\text{median of } p_i \mid i = 1, \dots, g\}$ ;  
 $p \leftarrow \text{SELECT}(C, g, g/2)$ ;  
return  $p$ ;
```

We have devised a slightly complicated method to determine which element to partition around, but the algorithm remains correct for the same reasons as before. So what is its running time? As before, we're going to show this by examining the size of the recursive subproblems. As it turns out, by taking the median of medians approach, we have a guarantee on how much smaller the problem gets each iteration. The guarantee is good enough to achieve $O(n)$ runtime.

6.3.1 Running Time

Lemma 6.1. $|A_{<}| \leq 7n/10 + 5$ and $|A_{>}| \leq 7n/10 + 5$.

Proof of Lemma 6.1. p is the median of p_1, \dots, p_g . Because p is the median of $g = \lceil n/5 \rceil$ elements, the medians of $\lceil g/2 \rceil - 1$ groups p_i are smaller than p . If p is larger than a group median, it is larger than at least three elements in that group (the median and the smaller two numbers). This applies to all groups except the remainder group, which might have fewer than 5 elements. Accounting for the remainder group, p is greater than at least $3 \cdot (\lceil g/2 \rceil - 2)$ elements of A . By symmetry, p is less than at least the same number of elements.

Now,

$$\begin{aligned} |A_{>}| &= \# \text{ of elements greater than } p \\ &\leq (n - 1) - 3 \cdot (\lceil g/2 \rceil - 2) \\ &= n + 5 - 3 \cdot \lceil g/2 \rceil \\ &\leq n - 3n/10 + 5 \\ &= 7n/10 + 5. \end{aligned} \tag{1}$$

By symmetry, $|A_{<}| \leq 7n/10 + 5$ as well.

Intuitively, we know that 60% of half of the groups are less than the pivot, which is 30% of the total number of elements, n . Therefore, at most 70% of the elements are greater than the pivot. Hence, $|A_{>}| \approx 7n/10$. We can make the same argument for $|A_{<}|$. \square

The recursive call used to find the median of medians has input of size $\lceil n/5 \rceil \leq n/5 + 1$. The other work in the algorithm takes linear time: constant time on each of $\lceil n/5 \rceil$ groups for MERGESORT (linear time total for that part), $O(n)$ time scanning A to make $A_{<}$ and $A_{>}$.

Thus, we can write the full recurrence for the runtime,

$$T(n) \leq \begin{cases} c_1 n + T(n/5 + 1) + T(7n/10 + 5) & \text{if } n > 5 \\ c_2 & \text{if } n \leq 5. \end{cases}$$

How do we prove that $T(n) = O(n)$? The master theorem does not apply here. Instead, we will prove this using the substitution method.

6.4 Solving the Recurrence of Select using the Substitution Method

For simplicity, we consider the recurrence $T(n) \leq T(n/5) + T(7n/10) + cn$ instead of the exact recurrence of SELECT.

To prove that $T(n) = O(n)$, we guess:

$$T(n) \leq \begin{cases} dn_0 & \text{if } n = n_0 \\ d \cdot n & \text{if } n > n_0 \end{cases}$$

For the base case, we pick $n_0 = 1$ and use the standard assumption that $T(1) = 1 \leq d$. For the inductive hypothesis, we assume that our guess is correct for any $n < k$, and we prove our guess for k . That is, consider d such that for all $n_0 \leq n < k$, $T(n) \leq dn$.

To prove for $n = k$, we solve the following equation:

$$T(k) \leq T(k/5) + T(7k/10) + ck \leq dk/5 + 7dk/10 + ck \leq dk$$

$$9/10d + c \leq d$$

$$c \leq d/10$$

$$d \geq 10c$$

Therefore, we can choose $d = \max(1, 10c)$, which is a constant factor. The induction is completed. By the definition of big-O, the recurrence runs in $O(n)$ time.

6.5 Issues when using the Substitution Method

Now we will try out an example where our guess is incorrect. Consider the recurrence $T(n) = 2T(\frac{n}{2}) + n$ (similar to MergeSort). We will guess that the algorithm is linear.

$$T(n) \leq \begin{cases} dn_0 & \text{if } n = n_0 \\ d \cdot n & \text{if } n > n_0 \end{cases}$$

We try the inductive step. We try to pick some d such that for all $n \geq n_0$,

$$n + \sum_{i=1}^k dg(n_i) \leq d \cdot g(n)$$

$$n + 2 \cdot d \cdot \frac{n}{2} \leq dn$$

$$n(1 + d) \leq dn$$

$$n + dn \leq dn$$

$$n < 0,$$

However, the above can never be true, and there is no choice of d that works! Thus our guess was incorrect.

This time the guess was incorrect since MergeSort takes superlinear time. Sometimes, however, the guess can be asymptotically correct but the induction might not work out. Consider for instance $T(n) \leq 2T(n/2) + 1$.

We know that the runtime is $O(n)$ so let's try to prove it with the substitution method. Let's guess that $T(n) \leq cn$ for all $n \geq n_0$.

First we do the induction step: We assume that $T(n/2) \leq cn/2$ and consider $T(n)$. We want that $2 \cdot cn/2 + 1 \leq cn$, that is, $cn + 1 \leq cn$. However, this is impossible.

This doesn't mean that $T(n)$ is not $O(n)$, but in this case we chose the wrong linear function. We could guess instead that $T(n) \leq cn - 1$. Now for the induction we get $2 \cdot (cn/2 - 1) + 1 = cn - 1$ which is true for all c . We can then choose the base case $T(1) = 1$.