INDIANA UNIVERSITY AT SOUTH BEND

1700 MISHAWAKA AVENUE P.O. BOX 7111 SOUTH BEND, INDIANA 46634 A7077

LIBERAL ARTS AND SCIENCES

Northside Hall TEL: (219) 237-4214 FAX: (219) 237-4538

July 25, 1991

Neil Sloane ATT Bell Labs, Room 2C-376 600 Mountain Avenue Murray Hill, NJ 07974

Dear Mr. Sloane:

I am responding to your letter of June 23, 1991, a copy of which is enclosed. The work I have been doing involves minimizing the cost of search in ordered arrays with variable probe costs. Almost all the sequences that have turned up in this work are *derived from* recursively defined, two-variable sequences having one or the other of the two forms shown below. In each formula, P(k) is a strictly positive, strictly increasing "penalty" function defined on positive integers k. The variables n and t are non-negative integers.

(1)
$$S(n, t) = \min_{1 \le r \le n} \{ P(r+t) n + S(r-1, t) + S(n-r, r+t) \},$$

 $S(0, t) = 0 \text{ for all } t \ge 0.$

(2)
$$M(n, t) = \min_{1 \le r \le n} \{ P(r + t) + \max \{ M(r - 1, t), M(n - r, r + t) \} \},$$

 $M(0, t) = 0 \text{ for all } t \ge 0.$

What I'm actually looking for is formulas for the one-variable sequences S(n,0) and M(n,0) for $n \ge 1$. Examples of these sequences for various choices of P(k) are given on the next page.

The way these sequences arise is that we suppose we are searching an array of length n whose entries are "no" and "yes". If an array entry is "yes", then all entries to its right are "yes" as well, so in general the array consists of a string of "no"s followed by a string of "yes"s. The problem is to find the location of the first "yes" (if there is one). We also assume that probing the k-th location in the array requires an amount of time given by P(k). This arises in a problem in filter design, where it is necessary to estimate how many variables will be needed to solve a certain linear programming problem, and where it is desirable to have as few variables as possible. This means trying out different numbers of variables and geting "no" or "yes" answers; "trying a number of variables" means trying to solve a linear programming problem using only that many variables, which typically takes an amount of time proportional to the number of variables.

A7078 $P(k) = 2^k$

<u>n</u>	<u>s(n,0)</u>	M(n,0)	n	S(n,0)	M(n,0)	<u>n</u>	S(n,0)	M(n,0)
1	1	1	1	2	2	1	1	1
2	4	3	2	8	6	2	4	3
3	10	5	3	22	12	3	13	8
4	19	7	4	50	24	4	45	30
5	31	9	5	110	48	5	197	144
6	47	12	6	226	96	6	1069	840
7	68	15	7	464	192	7	6981	5760
8	92	19	8	938	384	8	53207	45360
9	120	23	9	1888	768	9	462313	403200
10	153	26	10	3794	1536	10	4500208	3991680
11	190	29	11	7598	3072	11	48454894	43545600
12	232	32	12	15208	6144	12	5.714E08	5.189E08
13	279	35	13	30438	12288	13	7.321E09	6.706E09
14	332	38	14	60890	24576	14	1.012E11	9.341E10
15	392	41	15	121792	49152	15	1.503E12	1.395E12
16	454	45	16	243606	98304	16	2.383E13	2.223E13
17	521	49	17	487238	196608	17	4.018E14	3.766E14
18	593	53	18	974488	393216	18	7.182E15	6.758E15
19	670	57	19	1948998	786432	19	1.356E17	1.280E17
20	753	62	20	3898034	1572864	20	2.697E18	2.555E18

as the most interesting of the sequences.

Trivially M(n,0) = 3.2 for n > 1.

Trivially M(n,0) = n! + (n-1)! for n>1.

Optimal cost of search tree. SIAC 17 1213 88. 8 N

 $(1.234E05 = 1.234 \times 10^5)$

The problems I have worked on all involve selecting a penalty function and then trying to find an "optimal" search strategy for finding the first "yes" in the array. There are two ways to decide whether one strategy is better than another: the first compares the *expected* amounts of time required by the two strategies; the second compares the *maximum* amounts of time required. In the notation used above, S(n,0) is the expected amount of time required by an optimal strategy in the expected value sense to find the first "yes" in an array of length n. Similarly, M(n,0) is the maximum amount of time required by an optimal strategy in the "minimax" sense. All this is explained in more detail in the reprint and preprint I have enclosed.

The reprint shows that when P(k) = k, the sequence S(n, 0) is asymptotic with $\frac{1}{2}(n+1)^2 \lg (n+1)$, but I was not able to get an asymptotic formula for the much tamer looking sequence M(n, 0). A colleague and I have worked on this quite a bit, and we cannot "capture" that sequence. If the sequence is familiar to you, or if you can see what its asymptotic behavior is, we would very much like to hear from you!

The preprint I have enclosed shows that when $P(k) = 2^k$, the sequence S(n, 0) is $\Theta(2^k)$, where as usual, $f(n) = \Theta(g(n))$ iff there exist positive constants A and B such that for all large n, $A|g(n)| \le |f(n)| \le B|g(n)|$. Also, we have an *exact* formula for M(n, 0) in this case:

(*)
$$M(n, 0) = P(n) + P(n-1)$$
 for all $n > 1$, $M(1, 0) = P(1)$.

In fact, formula (*) is valid for every penalty function P(k) that satisfies the inequality

$$P(k) \ge P(k-2) + P(k-3)$$
 for all $k \ge 3$.

This includes P(k) = k! and all penalty functions of the form $P(k) = b^k$ in which the constant b exceeds 1.325 (the approximate root of $b^3 = b + 1$). Finally, when P(k) = k!, the sequence S(n, 0) is asymptotic to n!, or, if more precision is desired, to n! + 2(n-1)! + 3(n-2)! + 4(n-3)!.

As I indicated, the most interesting and puzzling of these sequences is M(n,0) when P(k)=k. Computer calculations suggest that for all large n it is bounded above by $C n \lg n$ for some constant C in the vicinity of 0.8, but we have not been able to prove this, nor have we found a good lower bound formula for M(n,0).

I hope you find one or more of these sequences sufficiently interesting to include them in your book. If I can answer any further questions, I will be happy to do so.

Sincerely,

William J. Knight

Um Knight

Scan Knight 29