Describe recursive backtracking algorithms for the following problems. *Don't worry about running times*.

1. Given an array A[1..n] of integers, compute the length of a *longest increasing subsequence*.

Solution (#1 of ∞): Add a sentinel value $A[0] = -\infty$. Let LIS(i, j) denote the length of the longest increasing subsequence of A[j ... n] where every element is larger than A[i]. This function obeys the following recurrence:

$$\mathit{LIS}(i,j) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } j > n \\ \mathit{LIS}(i,j+1) & \text{if } j \leq n \text{ and } A[i] \geq A[j] \\ \max{\{\mathit{LIS}(i,j+1), 1 + \mathit{LIS}(j,j+1)\}} & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

We need to compute LIS(0, 1).

Solution (#2 of \infty): Add a sentinel value $A[n+1] = -\infty$. Let LIS(i,j) denote the length of the longest increasing subsequence of A[1..j] where every element is smaller than A[j]. This function obeys the following recurrence:

$$\mathit{LIS}(i,j) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } i < 1 \\ \mathit{LIS}(i-1,j) & \text{if } i \geq 1 \text{ and } A[i] \geq A[j] \\ \max \left\{ \mathit{LIS}(i-1,j), 1 + \mathit{LIS}(i-1,i) \right\} & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

We need to compute LIS(n, n + 1).

Solution (#3 of \infty): Let LIS(i) denote the length of the longest increasing subsequence of A[i..n] that begins with A[i]. This function obeys the following recurrence:

$$\mathit{LIS}(i) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } A[j] \leq A[i] \text{ for all } j > i \\ 1 + \max\left\{\mathit{LIS}(j) \mid j > i \text{ and } A[j] > A[i] \right\} & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

(The first case is actually redundant if we define $\max \emptyset = 0$.) We need to compute $\max_i LIS(i)$.

Solution (#4 of \infty): Add a sentinel value $A[0] = -\infty$. Let LIS(i) denote the length of the longest increasing subsequence of A[i ... n] that begins with A[i]. This function obeys the following recurrence:

$$\mathit{LIS}(i) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } A[j] \leq A[i] \text{ for all } j > i \\ 1 + \max\left\{\mathit{LIS}(j) \mid j > i \text{ and } A[j] > A[i] \right\} & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

(The first case is actually redundant if we define $\max \emptyset = 0$.) We need to compute LIS(0) - 1; the -1 removes the sentinel $-\infty$ from the start of the subsequence.

Solution (#5 of \infty): Add sentinel values $A[0] = -\infty$ and $A[n+1] = \infty$. Let LIS(j) denote the length of the longest increasing subsequence of A[1..j] that ends with A[j]. This function obeys the following recurrence:

$$\mathit{LIS}(j) = egin{cases} 1 & \text{if } j = 0 \\ 1 + \max \left\{ \mathit{LIS}(i) \mid i < j \text{ and } A[i] < A[j]
ight\} & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

We need to compute LIS(n+1)-2; the -2 removes the sentinels $-\infty$ and ∞ from the subsequence.

2. Given an array A[1..n] of integers, compute the length of a **longest decreasing subsequence**.

Solution (one of many): Add a sentinel value $A[0] = \infty$. Let LDS(i, j) denote the length of the longest decreasing subsequence of A[j ... n] where every element is smaller than A[i]. This function obeys the following recurrence:

$$\mathit{LDS}(i,j) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } j > n \\ \mathit{LDS}(i,j+1) & \text{if } j \leq n \text{ and } A[i] \leq A[j] \\ \max \left\{ \mathit{LDS}(i,j+1), 1 + \mathit{LIS}(j,j+1) \right\} & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

We need to compute LDS(0, 1).

Solution (clever): Multiply every element of A by -1, and then compute the length of the longest increasing subsequence using the algorithm from problem 1.

3. Given an array A[1..n] of integers, compute the length of a **longest alternating subse**quence.

Solution (one of many): We define two functions:

- Let $LAS^+(i,j)$ denote the length of the longest alternating subsequence of A[j..n]whose first element (if any) is larger than A[i] and whose second element (if any) is smaller than its first.
- Let $LAS^{-}(i, j)$ denote the length of the longest alternating subsequence of A[j ... n]whose first element (if any) is smaller than A[i] and whose second element (if any) is larger than its first.

These two functions satisfy the following mutual recurrences:

$$LAS^{+}(i,j) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } j > n \\ LAS^{+}(i,j+1) & \text{if } j \leq n \text{ and } A[j] \leq A[i] \\ \max \left\{ LAS^{+}(i,j+1), 1 + LAS^{-}(j,j+1) \right\} & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

$$LAS^{-}(i,j) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } j > n \\ LAS^{-}(i,j+1) & \text{if } j \leq n \text{ and } A[j] \geq A[i] \\ \max \left\{ LAS^{-}(i,j+1), 1 + LAS^{+}(j,j+1) \right\} & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

$$\mathit{LAS}^{-}(i,j) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } j > n \\ \mathit{LAS}^{-}(i,j+1) & \text{if } j \leq n \text{ and } A[j] \geq A[i] \\ \max \left\{ \mathit{LAS}^{-}(i,j+1), 1 + \mathit{LAS}^{+}(j,j+1) \right\} & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

To simplify computation, we consider two different sentinel values A[0]. First we set $A[0] = -\infty$ and let $\ell^+ = LAS^+(0,1)$. Then we set $A[0] = +\infty$ and let $\ell^- = LAS^-(0,1)$. Finally, the length of the longest alternating subsequence of A is $\max\{\ell^+, \ell^-\}$.

Solution (one of many): We define two functions:

- Let $LAS^+(i)$ denote the length of the longest alternating subsequence of A[i..n] that starts with A[i] and whose second element (if any) is larger than A[i].
- Let $LAS^{-}(i)$ denote the length of the longest alternating subsequence of A[i..n] that starts with A[i] and whose second element (if any) is smaller than A[i].

These two functions satisfy the following mutual recurrences:

$$\begin{split} \mathit{LAS}^+(i) &= \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } A[j] \leq A[i] \text{ for all } j > i \\ 1 + \max \left\{ \mathit{LAS}^-(j) \mid j > i \text{ and } A[j] > A[i] \right\} & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \\ \mathit{LAS}^-(i) &= \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } A[j] \geq A[i] \text{ for all } j > i \\ 1 + \max \left\{ \mathit{LAS}^+(j) \mid j > i \text{ and } A[j] < A[i] \right\} & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \end{split}$$

We need to compute $\max_{i} \max\{LAS^{+}(i), LAS^{-}(i)\}$.

To think about later:

4. Given an array A[1..n] of integers, compute the length of a longest *convex* subsequence of A.

Solution: Let LCS(i, j) denote the length of the longest convex subsequence of A[i ... n] whose first two elements are A[i] and A[j]. This function obeys the following recurrence:

$$LCS(i, j) = 1 + \max \{LCS(j, k) \mid j < k \le n \text{ and } A[i] + A[k] > 2A[j] \}$$

Here we define $\max \emptyset = 0$; this gives us a working base case. The length of the longest convex subsequence is $\max_{1 \le i < j \le n} LCS(i, j)$.

Solution (with sentinels): Assume without loss of generality that $A[i] \geq 0$ for all i. (Otherwise, we can add |m| to each A[i], where m is the smallest element of A[1..n].) Add two sentinel values A[0] = 2M + 1 and A[-1] = 4M + 3, where M is the largest element of A[1..n].

Let LCS(i, j) denote the length of the longest convex subsequence of A[i ... n] whose first two elements are A[i] and A[j]. This function obeys the following recurrence:

$$LCS(i, j) = 1 + \max \{LCS(j, k) \mid j < k \le n \text{ and } A[i] + A[k] > 2A[j] \}$$

Here we define $\max \emptyset = 0$; this gives us a working base case.

Finally, we claim that the length of the longest convex subsequence of A[1..n] is LCS(-1,0)-2.

Proof: First, consider any convex subsequence S of A[1 ... n], and suppose its first element is A[i]. Then we have A[-1] - 2A[0] + A[i] = 4M + 3 - 2(2M + 1) + A[i] = A[i] + 1 > 0, which implies that $A[-1] \cdot A[0] \cdot S$ is a convex subsequence of A[-1 ... n]. So the longest convex subsequence of A[1 ... n] has length at most LCS(-1,0) - 2.

On the other hand, removing A[-1] and A[0] from any convex subsequence of A[-1..n] laves a convex subsequence of A[1..n]. So the longest subsequence of A[1..n] has length at least LCS(-1,0)-2.

5. Given an array A[1..n], compute the length of a longest **palindrome** subsequence of A.

Solution (naïve): Let LPS(i, j) denote the length of the longest palindrome subsequence of A[i..j]. This function obeys the following recurrence:

$$\mathit{LPS}(i,j) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } i > j \\ 1 & \text{if } i = j \\ \max \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \mathit{LPS}(i+1,j) \\ \mathit{LPS}(i,j-1) \end{array} \right\} & \text{if } i < j \text{ and } A[i] \neq A[j] \\ \max \left\{ \begin{array}{l} 2 + \mathit{LPS}(i+1,j-1) \\ \mathit{LPS}(i+1,j) \\ \mathit{LPS}(i,j-1) \end{array} \right\} & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

We need to compute LPS(1, n).

Solution (with greedy optimization): Let LPS(i, j) denote the length of the longest palindrome subsequence of A[i..j]. Before stating a recurrence for this function, we make the following useful observation.¹

Claim 1. If i < j and A[i] = A[j], then LPS(i, j) = 2 + LPS(i + 1, j - 1).

Proof: Suppose i < j and A[i] = A[j]. Fix an arbitrary longest palindrome subsequence S of A[i..j]. There are four cases to consider.

- If S uses neither A[i] nor A[j], then A[i] S A[j] is a palindrome subsequence of A[i..j] that is longer than S, which is impossible.
- Suppose S uses A[i] but not A[j]. Let A[k] be the last element of S. If k = i, then A[i] A[j] is a palindrome subsequence of A[i..j] that is longer than S, which is impossible. Otherwise, replacing A[k] with A[j] gives us a palindrome subsequence of A[i..j] with the same length as S that uses both A[i] and A[j].
- Suppose S uses A[j] but not A[i]. Let A[h] be the first element of S. If h = j, then A[i] A[j] is a palindrome subsequence of A[i..j] that is longer than S, which is impossible. Otherwise, replacing A[h] with A[i] gives us a palindrome subsequence of A[i..j] with the same length as S that uses both A[i] and A[j].
- Finally, S might include both A[i] and A[j].

In all cases, we find either a contradiction or a longest palindrome subsequence of A[i..j] that uses both A[i] and A[j].

Claim 1 implies that the function LPS satisfies the following recurrence:

$$\mathit{LPS}(i,j) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } i > j \\ 1 & \text{if } i = j \\ \max \left\{ \mathit{LPS}(i+1,j), \ \mathit{LPS}(i,j-1) \right\} & \text{if } i < j \text{ and } A[i] \neq A[j] \\ 2 + \mathit{LPS}(i+1,j-1) & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

We need to compute LPS(1, n).

¹And yes, optimizations like this require a proof of correctness, both in homework and on exams. Premature optimization is the root of all evil.