

Linear Time Computation of the Maximal Linear and Circular Sums of Multiple Independent Insertions into a Sequence

RICARDO C. CORRÊA

Universidade Federal Rural do Rio de Janeiro
Departamento de Ciência da Computação
Av. Governador Roberto Silveira S/N
26020-740 Nova Iguaçu, RJ, Brazil
correa@ufrrj.br

PABLO M. S. FARIAS

Universidade Federal do Ceará
Departamento de Computação
Campus do Pici, Bloco 910
60440-554 Fortaleza, CE, Brazil
pmsf@lia.ufc.br

Abstract

The *maximal sum* of a sequence A of n real numbers is the greatest sum of all elements of any linearly contiguous and possibly empty subsequence of A . It can be computed in $O(n)$ time by means of Kadane’s algorithm. Letting $A^{(x \rightarrow p)}$ denote the sequence which results from inserting a real number x just after element $A[p - 1]$, we show how the maximal sum of $A^{(x \rightarrow p)}$ can be computed in $O(1)$ *worst-case* time for any given x and p , provided that an $O(n)$ time preprocessing step has already been executed on A . In particular, this implies that, given m pairs $(x_0, p_0), \dots, (x_{m-1}, p_{m-1})$, we can compute the maximal sums of sequences $A^{(x_0 \rightarrow p_0)}, \dots, A^{(x_{m-1} \rightarrow p_{m-1})}$ optimally in $O(n + m)$ time, improving on the straightforward and suboptimal strategy of applying Kadane’s algorithm to each sequence $A^{(x_i \rightarrow p_i)}$, which takes a total of $\Theta(nm)$ time. We also show that the same time bound is attainable when circular subsequences of $A^{(x \rightarrow p)}$ are taken into account. Our algorithms are easy to implement in practice, and they were motivated by a buffer minimization problem on wireless mesh networks.

1 Introduction

Let a *sequence* of n elements be denoted by $A = \langle A[0], \dots, A[n - 1] \rangle$ and its *size* by $|A| = n$. The aim in this paper is to provide efficient algorithms to answer certain insertion-related queries on a sequence of numbers. For a given sequence A of n real numbers, a query takes as arguments a real number x and an index $p \in \{0, \dots, n\}$, and returns the “score” of sequence $A^{(x \rightarrow p)}$, the latter being the sequence which results from inserting x just after element $A[p - 1]$. By the “score” of a sequence B of real numbers we mean the greatest sum of all elements of any contiguous, possibly empty subsequence S of B . The focus in this paper is on *independent* queries, that is, given a fixed sequence A , we want to answer a number of unrelated queries on the same sequence A .

1.1 Definitions and Results

For $n \in \mathbb{N}$, we use the additive group modulo n to handle the indices of elements of sequences of size n . In this sense, $[i : j]$, where $i \in \{0, \dots, n - 1\}$ and $j \in \{0, \dots, n\}$, denotes the set of indices $\{i, (i + 1) \bmod n, \dots, j\}$. We write $(i : j)$ for the set $[i : j] \setminus \{i\}$. Similarly, $[i : j)$ stands for the sequence obtained by removing j from $[i : j]$. If $i = j$, then $(i : j)$ and $[i : j)$ are the empty set. Let $[i : j]$ be such that $[i : j] \subseteq [0 : n)$. In this case, $A[i : j]$ is a *subsequence* of A constituted by all elements of A indexed by indices in $[i : j]$ and taken in the same relative order as they appear in A . We assume that $A[0]$ succeeds $A[n - 1]$ in this order so that $\langle A[i], \dots, A[n - 1], A[0], \dots, A[j] \rangle$, with $i > j$, is a subsequence of A defined by $[i : j]$. Analogously, $A(i : j)$, $A[i : j)$, and $A(i : j)$ are subsequences of A . The sequence $A[i : i - 1]$ is a *circular shift* of A up to i . If $i = j$, then $A(i : j)$ and $A[i : j)$ are the empty sequence $\langle \rangle$, including if $i = j = n$.

The *concatenation* of sequences A and B of sizes respectively n and m is denoted by $AB = \langle A[0], \dots, A[n-1] \rangle \langle B[0], \dots, B[m-1] \rangle = \langle A[0], \dots, A[n-1], B[0], \dots, B[m-1] \rangle$. The sequence $A[0:p] \langle x \rangle A[p:n]$ which results from the *insertion* of an element x into position $p \in [0:n]$ of A is denoted by $A^{(x \rightarrow p)}$. We may also use the abbreviation A^p when element x is clear by context. If A is a sequence of *real numbers*, then its sum is $\text{sum}(A) = \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} A[i]$, which equals zero if $A = \langle \rangle$. Moreover, the *maximal linear sum* of A , denoted by $\mathcal{MLS}(A)$, is the greatest sum of a subsequence $A[i:j]$, with $0 \leq i \leq j \leq n$, of A . Note that $\mathcal{MLS}(A) \geq 0$ due to the empty subsequence. $\mathcal{MLS}(A^p)$ can be obtained by simply applying the Kadane's linear time algorithm (described in Section 2) to A^p . Denoted by $\mathcal{MCS}(A)$, the *maximal circular sum* of A is defined as the greatest sum of a subsequence $A[i:j]$, with $0 \leq i, j \leq n$, of A . Note that $\mathcal{MCS}(A) \geq \mathcal{MLS}(A)$ since only subsequences $A[i:j]$ with $i \leq j$ are considered in $\mathcal{MLS}(A)$.

Let a *query* be a pair (x, p) , $x \in \mathbb{R}$, and $p \in [0:n]$. We consider in this paper two optimization problems defined on a sequence A of n real numbers and m queries $(x_0, p_0), \dots, (x_{m-1}, p_{m-1})$. The MAXIMAL LINEAR SUMS OF INDEPENDENT INSERTIONS (MLSII) is defined as the problem of determining the maximal linear sums of the resulting sequences $A^{(x_0 \rightarrow p_0)}, \dots, A^{(x_{m-1} \rightarrow p_{m-1})}$. Similarly, the MAXIMAL CIRCULAR SUMS OF INDEPENDENT INSERTIONS (MCSII) problem asks for the maximal circular sums of the resulting sequences. An extension of Kadane's algorithm to solve the MLSII problem takes $\Omega(nm)$ time. In this paper, we give an $O(n+m)$ time algorithm to solve the MLSII problem that handles any number m of queries in a sequence of n numbers, each query concerning an arbitrary insertion position p in the sequence. A second contribution in this paper is an $O(n+m)$ time algorithm to solve the MCSII problem. This second algorithm turned out not to be a straightforward extension of the first one, having demanded several scattered technical observations. In particular, we show that it is related to the problem of finding the minimal sum of a subsequence in some cases.

Our algorithms to solve the MLSII and MCSII problems are divided in two phases. In the first phase, a *preprocessing step* is performed by taking as argument the sequence A and computing the *summary of A* , which consists of an array storing special aggregate information about specific families of subsequences of A . The second phase is a sequence of m *query-answering steps*, each one taking as arguments a query (x_i, p_i) , $i \in [0:m]$, and the summary produced by the preprocessing step to compute $\mathcal{MLS}(A^{(x \rightarrow p)})$, in the linear case, or $\mathcal{MCS}(A^{(x \rightarrow p)})$, in the circular case. The $O(n+m)$ time complexity to solve the MLSII and MCSII problems stems from the fact that the preprocessing step takes $O(n)$ time and the query-answering one takes $O(1)$ time.

1.2 Motivation and Applications

The algorithms proposed in this paper were motivated by a buffer minimization problem in wireless mesh networks, as follows. In a radio network, interference between nearby transmissions prevents simultaneous communication between pairs of nodes which are sufficiently close to each other. One way to circumvent this problem is to use a *time division multiple access* (TDMA) communication protocol. In such a protocol, the communication in the network proceeds by the successive repetition of a sequence of *transmission rounds*, in each of which only noninterfering transmissions are allowed to take place. Such protocols can also be used in the particular case of a *wireless mesh network*, where each node not only communicates data relevant to itself, but also forwards packets sent by other nodes, thus enabling communication between distant parts of the network [1, 2]. In this case, each node stores in a buffer the packets that it must still forward, and the optimization of buffer usage in such networks is a current research topic [3, 4].

In order to analyze the use of buffer space in a given set of m nodes of a network, we represent a sequence of n transmission rounds by an $m \times n$ matrix R , defined as follows: $R[i, j] = +1$ if node i receives a packet at round j ; $R[i, j] = -1$ if at round j node i forwards a packet; and $R[i, j] = 0$ otherwise. The positive value of $R[i, j]$ stands for the additional memory space required by node i to store the packet received at round j , whereas the negative value accounts for the memory space released by node i when a packet is sent. Since the same sequence of rounds is successively repeated in the network, it can be verified that the greatest number of packets that node i will ever need to store simultaneously corresponds to the maximal circular sum of row i of R . The buffer usage for the whole set of m nodes is then given by $\text{score}(R) = \sum_{i=0}^{m-1} \mathcal{MCS}(R_i)$, where, for $i \in [0:m]$, R_i denotes the sequence corresponding to the R 's i th row. This leads us to the following

NP-Hard problem: given a matrix R representing a sequence of transmission rounds, find a permutation R' of the columns of R which minimizes $score(R')$. The algorithms introduced in the present paper provide a valuable tool for the development of heuristics to this problem.

The concept of *maximal sum subsequence* and its generalizations for two dimensions are currently known to have several other applications in practice, for example in Pattern Recognition [5, 6], Data Mining [7], Bioinformatics [8, 9, 10], Health and Environmental Science [11], Medicine [12], and Strategic Planning [13]; consequently, it is plausible that other applications of our algorithms be found in the future.

1.3 Related Work

We are not aware of any previous attempt to solve the main problem tackled in this paper – i.e. computing $\mathcal{MLS}(A^{(x \rightarrow p)})$ and $\mathcal{MCS}(A^{(x \rightarrow p)})$ for any given x and p , for a fixed sequence A . However, there is a large number of works related to subsequence sums. The basic problem of finding a maximal sum subsequence of a sequence A of n numbers was given an optimal and very simple solution by Joseph B. Kadane around 1977. The algorithm, which takes $O(n)$ time, was discussed and popularized by Gries [14] and Bentley [5]. This one-dimensional problem can be generalized for any number d of dimensions. The two-dimensional case consists in finding a maximal sum submatrix of a given $m \times n$ matrix of numbers, and it can be solved in $O(m^2 \cdot n)$ time, with $m \leq n$ [15]. Asymptotically slightly faster algorithms do exist but are reported not to perform well in practice except for very large inputs [6, 11]. More recently, the two-dimensional case has also been explored in the direction of convex but not necessarily rectangular shapes [12, 16]. The problem of computing $\mathcal{MLS}(A[i : j])$, for any given i and j , $0 \leq i \leq j \leq n$, has been tackled in [17], where a two-phase algorithm consisting of a linear preprocessing time plus constant time per query is presented.

Another direction of generalization of the original problem which has been explored is that of finding multiple maximal sum subsequences instead of just one. Finding a set of *all* successive and nonintersecting maximal sum subsequences of A can be done in $O(n)$ sequential time [8], $O(\log n)$ parallel time in the EREW PRAM model [18] and $O(|A|/p)$ parallel time with p processors in the BSP/CGM model [19]. A different problem, concerning the maximization of the *sum* of any set of k nonintersecting subsequences, is considered in [10]. A list of the k *possibly intersecting* maximal sum subsequences of a given sequence of n numbers can be found in optimal $O(n + k)$ time and $O(k)$ space [20].

With motivations from Bioinformatics, a further direction of research concerns problems where one or more measures of subsequences are constrained. For example, algorithms have been devised that compute the greatest sum among all subsequences subject to a length lower bound [21], a length upper bound [9, 22], both length bounds [9] or average bounds [23] (the average of a sequence A being $sum(A)/|A|$). Optimal algorithms have also been devised for the length constrained versions of the multiple maximal sum subsequences [24].

To the best of our knowledge, the column permutation problem defined in the previous subsection has not yet been considered in the literature. The closest related and already studied problem that we know of is the following variation of it for only *one row*: given a sequence A of n real numbers, find a permutation A' of A which minimizes $\mathcal{MLS}(A')$. This problem was found to be solvable in $O(\log n)$ time in the particular case where A has only two distinct numbers [25]; the same paper also mentions that the case where A may have arbitrary numbers can be shown to be strongly NP-hard by reduction from the 3-PARTITION problem. Such a reduction has actually been presented recently, together with an $O(n \log n)$ algorithm which has an approximation factor of 2 for the case of arbitrary input numbers and $3/2$ for the case where the input numbers are subject to certain restrictions [26].

1.4 Structure of the Paper

The remaining of this paper is structured as follows. Section 2 introduces our approach as well as the preprocessing and query-answering algorithms for the linear case. Our preprocessing and query-answering algorithms for the circular case are then presented in Section 3. Section 4 presents our concluding remarks, closing the paper.

2 Linear Case

In this section, we consider the MLSII problem with respect to a sequence A of $n \geq 0$ real numbers and m queries $(x_0, p_0), \dots, (x_{m-1}, p_{m-1})$. We call the *inverse* of A , denoted by A^{-1} , the sequence $\langle A[n-1], \dots, A[0] \rangle$. If $i \in [0 : n]$, $j \in [0 : n]$, and $h \in [i : j]$, then we say that $A[i : h]$ and $A[h : j]$ are respectively a *prefix* and a *suffix* of $A[i : j]$. Let the *maximal suffix sum* of A be defined as $\mathcal{MSS}(A) = \max\{\text{sum}(A[i : n]) : i \in [0 : n]\}$ ($\mathcal{MSS}(A) \geq 0$ since $\text{sum}(A[n : n]) = 0$).

2.1 General Approach

The general approach to handle the multiple insertions fast is better seen as the two-phase algorithm mentioned in the Introduction. In this vein, the *summary* of a sequence, as depicted in Table 1, consists of some scalars and an array storing information about two groups of subsequences of A . Informally speaking, one group contains subsequences of $A[0 : i)$ and $A[i : n]$, for every $i \in [0 : n]$. These are the subsequences which are candidates to be a maximum sum subsequence of $A^{(x \rightarrow i)}$ not including x . The other group is composed by the subsequences of A defined by a concatenation of a suffix of $A[0 : i)$ and a prefix of $A[i : n]$. Note that the sum of a prefix of $A[i : n]$ is also the sum of a suffix of $A^{-1}[0 : n - i)$.

The computation of the summary of A given in Table 1 and illustrated in Fig. 1(a) is performed as follows. For the purpose of capturing subsequences of A in the general expression used in the query-answering step (which is useful in the analysis of the circular case in Section 3), let $q \in [0 : n)$, $r \in [0 : n]$, $q \leq r$, and (x, p) be a query, $p \in [q : r]$. The maximal linear sum of $A^{(x \rightarrow p)}[q : r]$ is given by

$$\mathcal{MLS}(A^{(x \rightarrow p)}[q : r]) = \max\{\mathcal{MLS}(A[q : p]), \mathcal{MLS}(A[p : r]), \mathcal{MSS}(A[q : p]) + x + \mathcal{MSS}(A^{-1}[n - r : n - p])\}. \quad (1)$$

is computed. For instance, the maximum linear sum of the sequence A^p shown in Fig. 1(b) is given by the subsequence including $x = 12$ depicted in the figure, and its value is derived from (1) as

$$\mathcal{MSS}(A[0 : 8]) + 12 + \mathcal{MSS}(A^{-1}[0 : 8]) = 37.$$

Expression (1) is a special case of an algorithm presented in [27].

Scalars defining the maximum sum subsequence	
i^*	= first index
j^*	= last index
MAX	= $\mathcal{MLS}(A[q : r]) = \text{sum}(A[i^* : j^*])$
Array with indices $i \in [q : r]$	
$S[i]$	= $\begin{cases} \max\{\mathcal{MLS}(A[q : i]), \mathcal{MLS}(A[i : r])\}, & \text{if } i \in [i^* : j^*] \\ \mathcal{MSS}(A[q : i]) + \mathcal{MSS}(A^{-1}[n - r : n - i]), & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$

Table 1: Summary of $A[q : r]$, assuming that $q \in [0 : n)$, $r \in [0 : n]$, and $q \leq r$.

In the sequel, we discuss how to perform the preprocessing step in $O(n)$ time, and how the query-answering step can be done in constant time by considering the information in the summary of A .

2.2 Preprocessing Step

The computation of the entries of the summary of A is accomplished in Alg. 2 through sweeps of A having in mind the fact that the prefix of a maximum sum subsequence must be nonnegative. The first part, encapsulated in Alg. 1, is a version of Kadane's algorithm devoted to set a summary (as a global variable)

i	0	1	2	3	i^*	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	j^*	14	15	16
$A[i]$	2	-7	4	-25	12	-1	-8	14	1	-6	-3	5	11	-18	8	10	-
$S[i]$	2	2	4	4	25	22	22	22	17	18	18	18	18	25	25	25	25

(a) A sequence and its summary ($MAX = 25$).

	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
A^p	2	-7	4	-25	12	-1	-8	14	12	1	-6	-3	5	11	-18	8	10
					$\underbrace{\hspace{10em}}_{A[0:p]}$				$\underbrace{\hspace{1em}}_x$	$\underbrace{\hspace{10em}}_{A[p:n]}$							

(b) Sequence resulting from the insertion of $x = 12$ at position $p = 8$. Subsequences $\langle 12, -1, -8, 14 \rangle$ and $\langle 11, 5, -3, -6, 1 \rangle$ are maximum sum suffixes of, respectively, $A[0 : p]$ and $A^{-1}[0 : n - p]$.

Figure 1: Insertion in the linear case.

in such a way that, after the call $MSS(A, q, r)$, $A[i^* : j^*]$ is a maximum sum subsequence with $MAX = sum(A[i^* : j^*])$, $S[q] = 0$, and

$$S[j] = \max\{0, A[j - 1] + S[j - 1]\} = \mathcal{MSS}(A[q : j]), \text{ for all } j \in (q : r).$$

The application of Alg. 1 to the sequence in Fig. 1 with $q = 0$ and $r = 16$ produces

j	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
$S[j]$	0	2	0	4	0	12	11	3	17	18	12	9	14	25	7	15	25

as the state of S , $i^* = 4$, $j^* = 13$, and $MAX = 25$.

Algorithm 1 $MSS(A, q, r)$: Computation of maximum sum subsequence of $A[q : r]$, $q < r$.

```

1:  $i, i^*, j^* \leftarrow q$ 
2:  $MAX, S[q] \leftarrow 0$ 
3: for  $j \in (q : r)$  do
4:    $x \leftarrow A[j - 1] + S[j - 1]$ 
5:   if  $x < 0$  then
6:      $S[j] \leftarrow 0$ 
7:      $i \leftarrow j$ 
8:   else
9:      $S[j] \leftarrow x$ 
10:    if  $x > MAX$  then
11:       $MAX \leftarrow x$ 
12:       $j^* \leftarrow j$ 
13:       $i^* \leftarrow i$ 

```

The second part of Alg. 2 starts at line 2 and finishes at line 5. In this part, maximum suffix sums of A^{-1} are computed by traversing $A[q : r]$ in descending order, leaving S in the state

$$S[j] = \mathcal{MSS}(A[q : j]) + \mathcal{MSS}(A^{-1}[n - r : n - j]).$$

This state for the sequence in Fig 1 is given by

j	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
$S[j]$	2	2	4	4	25	25	25	25	25	25	25	25	25	25	25	25	25

Only the maximum sum subsequence $A[i^* : j^*]$ is considered in the next two parts. In lines 6–10, the state of S is modified in order to satisfy $S[j] = \mathcal{MLS}(A[q : j])$, for all $j \in [i^* : j^*]$. The call $\mathcal{MLS}(A, i, j)$ returns $\mathcal{MLS}(A[i : j])$, computed in linear time through Kadane’s algorithm (the detailed description of $\mathcal{MLS}(A, i, j)$ is omitted since it is obtained from $\mathcal{MSS}(A, i, j)$ by simply replacing the global summary by local scalars and returning the local variable that replaces MAX). Considering again the sequence in Fig. 1, array S is modified so that the elements for $j \in [i^* : j^*]$ become

j	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
$S[j]$	4	12	12	12	17	18	18	18	18

Finally, $\mathcal{MLS}(A[i : r])$ is computed in the last part, lines 11–17. We can therefore state the following result.

Theorem 1 *Algorithm* $\text{SUMMARIZE}(A, q, r)$ *computes the summary of* $A[q : r]$ *in* Tab. 1, $q \in [0 : n]$, $r \in [0 : n]$, *and* $q < r$, *in linear time.*

Algorithm 2 $\text{SUMMARIZE}(A, q, r)$: Computation of the summary of $A[q : r]$, $q < r$.

```

1:  $\mathcal{MSS}(A, q, r)$ 
2:  $b \leftarrow 0$ 
3: for  $j \in (q : r)$  do
4:    $b \leftarrow \max\{0, A[r - j + q] + b\}$ 
5:    $S[r - j + q] \leftarrow S[r - j + q] + b$ 

6:  $S[i^*] \leftarrow \mathcal{MLS}(A, q, i^*)$ 
7:  $f \leftarrow A[i^*]$ 
8: for  $j \in [i^* + 1 : j^*]$  do
9:    $S[j] \leftarrow \max\{f, S[j - 1]\}$ 
10:   $f \leftarrow f + A[j]$ 

11:  $B \leftarrow \mathcal{MLS}(A^{-1}, n - r, n - j^*)$ 
12:  $b \leftarrow A[j^* - 1]$ 
13:  $S[j^* - 1] \leftarrow \max\{S[j^* - 1], b, B\}$ 
14: for  $i \in (i^* + 1 : j^*)$  do
15:    $b \leftarrow b + A[j^* - i + i^*]$ 
16:    $B \leftarrow \max\{b, B\}$ 
17:    $S[j^* - i + i^*] \leftarrow \max\{S[j^* - i + i^*], B\}$ 

```

2.3 Query-answering Step

The maximal linear sum of the sequence $A^{(x \rightarrow p)}$, $x \in \mathbb{R}$, and $p \in [0 : n]$, is determined based on a property of the maximum subsequence sum that is captured by the summary in Tab. 1 as follows.

Lemma 1 *For all* $q \in [0 : n]$, $r \in [0 : n]$, *and* $i \in [q : r]$,

$$MAX = \begin{cases} \mathcal{MSS}(A[q : i]) + \mathcal{MSS}(A^{-1}[n - r : n - i]), & \text{if } i \in [i^* : j^*] \\ \max\{\mathcal{MLS}(A[q : i]), \mathcal{MLS}(A[i : r])\}, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Proof. If $i \in [i^* : j^*]$, let $\hat{i} = \arg \max_{j \in [q : i]} \{sum(A[j : i])\}$ and $\hat{j} = \arg \max_{j \in [i : r]} \{sum(A[i : j])\}$. Notice that $\mathcal{MSS}(A[q : i]) = sum(A[\hat{i} : i])$, that a suffix of $A^{-1}[n - r : n - i]$ is a prefix of $A[i : r]$, and that $\mathcal{MSS}(A^{-1}[n - r : n - i]) = sum(A[i : \hat{j}])$. We claim that $sum(A[\hat{i} : i]) = sum(A[i^* : i])$ and

$sum(A[i : j]) = sum(A[i : j^*])$. For the former claim, we first observe that either $A[i^* : \hat{i}]$ is a prefix of $A[i^* : j^*]$ or $A[\hat{i} : i^*]$ is a prefix of $A[\hat{i} : j]$. We conclude that $sum(A[i^* : \hat{i}]) = sum(A[\hat{i} : i^*]) = 0$ because, otherwise, the maximality of either $sum(A[i^* : j^*])$ or $sum(A[\hat{i} : j])$ would be violated. The reasoning for the latter claim is similar, by considering suffixes of $A[i^* : j^*]$ or $A[\hat{i} : j]$. Therefore, $MAX = sum(A[i^* : i]) + sum(A[i : j^*]) = sum(A[\hat{i} : i]) + sum(A[i : j])$. The case $i \notin [i^* : j^*]$ stems directly from $A[i^* : j^*] \subseteq A[q : i]$ or $A[i^* : j^*] \subseteq A[i : r]$. \square

We finally get the main result for the linear case directly from (1) and the definition of the summary in Tab. 1.

Theorem 2 *Given a summary as defined in Table 1 with $q = 0$ and $r = n$, the query-answering algorithm computes $\mathcal{MLS}(A^{(x \rightarrow p)})$ in $O(1)$ worst-case time for any sequence A , $x \in \mathbb{R}$, and $p \in [0 : n]$ as*

$$\mathcal{MLS}(A^p) = \begin{cases} \max\{S[p], x + MAX\}, & \text{if } p \in [i^* : j^*] \\ \max\{MAX, x + S[p]\}, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Proof. By Lemma 1, the equivalence between the expression for $\mathcal{MLS}(A^p)$ in the theorem and (1) with $q = 0$ and $r = n$ is straightforward. \square

3 Circular Case

We describe in this section our two-phase algorithm for the MCSII problem. As an additional notation, we write \bar{A} to denote the *complement* of A , which is the sequence $\langle -A[n-1], \dots, -A[0] \rangle$. Note that $\bar{A}[n-i-1] = -A[i]$, for all $i \in [0 : n)$, and $\bar{\bar{A}} = A$, as illustrated in Fig. 2. Also, it is worth noting that $A[i^* : j^*]$ is a maximum (minimum) sum subsequence of A if and only if $\bar{A}[n-j^* : n-i^*]$ is a minimum (maximum) sum subsequence of \bar{A} .

3.1 General Approach

We start the discussion of the circular case by stating the circular version of (1). For this purpose, we need to take into account the sequences of the type $A[j : i]$, with $i \in [0 : p)$ and $j \in [p : n)$, along with the subsequences of A considered in (1). Hence, we write the maximum circular sum of A^p as

$$\mathcal{MCS}(A^p) = \max\{\mathcal{MLS}(A[p : p-1]), sum(A) + x + \mathcal{MLS}(\bar{A}[n-p : n-p-1])\}. \quad (2)$$

Inspired by the linear case, the value of $\mathcal{MCS}(A^p)$ is obtained as the maximum of two terms. The first term of (2) corresponds to the maximum sum of the subsequences of the circular shift of A up to p , which clearly encompass exactly the subsequences of A^p not including x . Taking the situation in Fig. 2 as an example, we observe that the maximum sum subsequence of $A[3 : 2]$ is $(12, -1, \dots, 10, 2)$. Slightly trickier is the fact that the subsequences including x are considered in the second term. The idea is to determine the maximum sum of such subsequences as the difference of $sum(A)$ and the minimum subsequence sum of the circular shift of A up to p . This subsequence sum is given by the maximum subsequence sum of the appropriate circular shift of \bar{A} . For the example in Fig. 3, we have

$$sum(A) + 28 + \mathcal{MLS}(\bar{A}[13 : 12]) = 52.$$

The central information employed in (2) is the maximum subsequence sum of circular shifts of a sequence. We discuss next that this information is summarized in Tab. 2. For the sake of illustration, the arrays in the summaries of the sequences in Fig. 2 are given by

i	0	j^*	2	3	i^*	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	$n - i^*$	13	14	$n - j^*$
$S_A[i]$	25	24	24	24	27	24	24	24	20	20	20	20	25	25	25	
$S_{\bar{A}}[i]$	26	26	26	21	21	21	21	21	25	25	25	28	28	25	25	26




Figure 2: A sequence and its complement. In both cases, maximum sum subsequences are highlighted.

Scalars defining the maximum sum subsequence	
i^*	= first index
j^*	= last index
MAX	= $\mathcal{MCS}(A) = \text{sum}(A[i^* : j^*])$
Array with indices $i \in [0 : n)$	
$S_A[i]$	$= \begin{cases} \max \{ \mathcal{MLS}(A[i^* : i]), \mathcal{MLS}(A[i : j^*]), \mathcal{MLS}(A[j^* : i^*]), \\ \mathcal{MLS}(A[i^* : i]) + \mathcal{MLS}(A[i : j^*]) + \text{sum}(A[j^* : i^*]) \}, & \text{if } i \in [i^* : j^*) \\ \text{sum}(A) + S_{\bar{A}}[n - i - 1], & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$

Table 2: Summary of A in the circular case.

3.2 Preprocessing Step

The computation of the array S for A and \bar{A} as defined in Tab. 2 can be accomplished by using appropriate slight modifications of the procedures employed in the linear case. The first thing to do is to compute MAX , i^* , and j^* . In what follows, we do it by means of Alg. 3, which we derived independently, is simple and makes this paper self-contained. However, it should be noted that our algorithm is in essence very similar to one by Mu [22], despite much notational difference, in part due to the latter having been couched in the functional programming paradigm. Moreover, since the circular subsequences of A coincide with the linear subsequences of AA with size at most $|A|$, and since the length constrained maximum sum problem can be solved in linear time by either Lin et al.'s algorithm[9] or Mu's algorithm [22] (see Sect. 1.3), then these algorithms could also be used instead of Alg. 3 to compute MAX , i^* , and j^* .

Alg. 3 begins with an initially empty list L and then performs n successive insertions in this list. Each i th insertion, for all $i \in [0 : n)$ in ascending order, is performed with calls $\text{ACCUMULATE}(L, A[i])$ and $\text{APPEND}(L, A[i])$, which have the following specifications: $\text{ACCUMULATE}(L, A[i])$ first adds $A[i]$ to all current L 's members and then removes, from L , all members that are strictly smaller than $A[i]$; $\text{APPEND}(L, A[i])$ appends $A[i]$ to L with rank i . It turns out that the members that remain in L after any of these insertions are sorted in ascending order of rank and non-ascending order of value. Moreover, the members of L after the i th insertion are suffix sums $s_j = \sum_{k \in [j:i]} A[k]$, $j \in [0 : i]$, and the following properties hold: (P1) the




Figure 3: Sequence resulting from the insertion of $x = 28$ at position $p = 3$ of the sequence in Fig. 2(a). Subsequence $\langle -25 \rangle$ corresponds to the maximum sum subsequence $\langle 25 \rangle$ of the complement in Fig. 2(b).

maximum of these suffix sums is in L and (P2) if s_{j_1} , $j_1 < i$, is a member of L , then $\max\{s_j \mid j \in (j_1 : i)\}$ is also a member of L . As an illustration of such a behavior, the members of L just after the n insertions performed at line 5 for the sequence in Fig. 2(a) is

$$\left[\sum_{k \in [4:15]} A[k] = 25, \sum_{k \in [7:15]} A[k] = 22, \sum_{k \in [14:15]} A[k] = 18, A[15] = 10 \right].$$

The rank of the first member is 4, of the second, 7, and so on. Notice also that the member $\sum_{k \in [2:15]} A[k] = -9$, of rank 2, is not in this state because it has been removed during the insertion of $\sum_{k \in [4:15]} A[k] = 25$, of rank 4.

Clearly, the greatest value (and smallest rank) L 's member in the state left by the n insertions is $\mathcal{MSS}(A[0 : n])$ and is a candidate to be the maximum subsequence sum of A . To enumerate the remaining candidates, the algorithm performs additional operations on the list L , as shown at lines 7–11: for all $i \in [0 : n - 2]$ in ascending order, (I) remove the greatest member if its rank is i , (II) accumulate $A[i]$, and (III) peek the greatest member. The members of L after the execution of the three operations for each i are determined by properties P1 and P2 with respect to the suffix sums $s_j = \sum_{k \in [j:i]} A[k]$, $j \in [0 : n]$. They are in non-ascending order of value and in circular ascending order of rank. As an example, note that the state of L after the execution of line 10 at iteration $i = 0$ is

$$\left[\sum_{k \in [4:0]} A[k] = 27, \sum_{k \in [7:0]} A[k] = 24, \sum_{k \in [14:0]} A[k] = 20, \sum_{k \in [15:0]} A[k] = 12 \right], \quad (3)$$

and that the greatest L 's member in this state is actually the maximum sum of a nonempty subsequence ending at 0.

The implementation of the operations REMOVE, APPEND, and PEEKRANKOFMAXVALUE as constant time functions is straightforward. To devise an efficient implementation of PEEKMAXVALUE, the values of the L 's members are stored indirectly, as follows. List L is associated with the value D that equals the sum of all values appended with a call to APPEND. Additionally, every L 's member v is represented by the pair (its rank, the value $D(v)$ that gives the value of D just before the insertion of v). The constant time execution of the PEEKMAXVALUE operation is trivial by simply returning $D - D(v)$, for the first member v .

Algorithm 3 MAXSUM(A): Computation of the maximum subsequence sum of A with a special queue.

```

1:  $MAX, i^*, j^* \leftarrow 0$ 
2:  $L \leftarrow \emptyset$ 
3: for  $i \leftarrow 0, \dots, n-1$  do
4:   ACCUMULATE( $L, A[i]$ )
5:   APPEND( $L, A[i]$ )
6: CHECKFORNEWMAX( $n-1$ )
7: for  $i \leftarrow 0, \dots, n-2$  do
8:   if PEEKRANKOFMAXVALUE( $L$ ) =  $i$  then
9:     REMOVE( $L$ )
10:  ACCUMULATE( $L, A[i]$ )
11:  CHECKFORNEWMAX( $i$ )

12: procedure CHECKFORNEWMAX( $i$ )
13:   if PEEKMAXVALUE( $L$ ) >  $MAX$  then
14:      $MAX \leftarrow$  PEEKMAXVALUE( $L$ )
15:      $i^* \leftarrow$  PEEKRANKOFMAXVALUE( $L$ )
16:      $j^* \leftarrow i + 1$ 

```

The representation of the state in (3) is

$$D = 1, \quad [(-26, 4), (-23, 7), (-19, 14), (-11, 15)].$$

The ACCUMULATE operation requires a linear time partial traversal of L to preserve its nondecreasing order. However, this operation has amortized constant time complexity since every member is traversed at most once.

Once a maximum sum subsequence is characterized by i^* and j^* , the computation of S_A in linear time is straightforward by means of algorithm MLS. Therefore, we get

Theorem 3 *The preprocessing algorithm computes the summary of A in Tab. 2 in $O(n)$ time for any sequence A of size n .*

3.3 Query-answering Step

The following lemma establishes a property of the summary of A that allows the computation of the maximum subsequence sum of a circular shift of A in the case that this circular shift starts within a maximum sum subsequence of A .

Lemma 2 *If $i \in A[i^* : j^*]$, then*

$$\mathcal{MLS}(A[i : i-1]) = S_A[i].$$

Proof. Since the sum of every suffix of $A[i^* : j^*]$ is nonnegative, then every maximum sum subsequence of $A[i : j^*]$ is itself a suffix of $A[i^* : j^*]$, say $A[\hat{j} : j^*]$. Similarly, let $A[i^* : \hat{i}]$ be a maximum sum subsequence of $A[i^* : i]$. It is worth noting that $A[\hat{j} : \hat{i}] = A[\hat{j} : j^*]A[j^* : i^*]A[i^* : \hat{i}]$. If $A[q : r]$ is a maximum sum subsequence of $A[i : i-1]$, then $[q : r] \subseteq [\hat{j} : \hat{i}]$ or $sum(A[q : \hat{j}]) = 0$ or $sum(A[\hat{i} : r]) = 0$. It turns out that $\mathcal{MLS}(A[i : i-1]) = \mathcal{MLS}(A[\hat{j} : \hat{i}])$, as depicted in Fig. 4. In addition, if $k \in A[j^* : i^*]$, then $sum(A[j^* : k]) \leq 0$ and $sum(A[k : i^*]) \leq 0$. Therefore, the lemma follows.

We finally get the main result for the circular case based on (2) and Lemma 2.




Figure 4: Proof of Lemma 2.

Theorem 4 *Given a summary as defined in Tab. 2, the query-answering algorithm computes $\mathcal{MCS}(A^{(x \rightarrow p)})$ in $O(1)$ time for any sequence A , $x \in \mathbb{R}$, and $p \in [0 : n)$ as*

$$\mathcal{MCS}(A^p) = \begin{cases} \max\{S[p], x + MAX\}, & \text{if } p \in [i^* : j^*) \\ \max\{MAX, x + S[p]\}, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

4 Concluding Remarks

In this paper we have considered the problem of, for a fixed sequence A of n real numbers, answering queries which ask the value of $\mathcal{MLS}(A^{(x \rightarrow p)})$ or $\mathcal{MCS}(A^{(x \rightarrow p)})$ for given $x \in \mathbb{R}$ and $p \in [0 : n]$. We showed that, after an $O(n)$ time preprocessing step has been carried out on A , both kinds of queries can be answered in constant worst-case time. This is both an optimal solution to the problem and a considerable improvement over the naive strategy of answering such queries by means of Kadane’s algorithm (or a variation of it, in the circular case), which takes $\Theta(n)$ time per query. This problem has applications in the context of finding heuristic solutions to an NP-hard problem of buffer minimization in wireless mesh networks. Given the generality of these kinds of queries and the multiplicity of applications of the maximal sum subsequence concept, we would not be surprised to see other applications of our algorithms in the future. An interesting related problem is then that of, given an $m \times n$ matrix A , inserting k size- m columns C_0, \dots, C_{k-1} successively and cumulatively into A in order to minimize $score(A') = \sum_{i=0}^{m-1} \mathcal{MCS}(\langle A'[i, 0], \dots, A'[i, n-1] \rangle)$ for every matrix A' resulting of each insertion. By using the algorithms presented in this paper to insert one column at a time, one can carry out k successive insertions in $O(m(n+1) + m(n+2) + \dots + m(n+k)) = O(k(mn + mk))$ time. However, since the input to the problem has size $O(mn + mk)$, we leave it as an open problem whether substantially more efficient algorithms exist.

Acknowledgment

This work is partially supported by FUNCAP/INRIA (Ceará State, Brazil/France) and CNPq (Brazil) research projects. We are very grateful for the invaluable remarks by the anonymous referee, in special for bringing the algorithms due to Lin et al. [9] and Mu [22], as well as Jeuring’s algorithm (1), to our attention.

References

- [1] I. F. Akyildiz, X. Wang, and W. Wang. Wireless mesh networks: a survey. *Computer Networks*, 47(4):445–487, 2005.
- [2] R. Klasing, N. Morales, and S. Pérennes. On the complexity of bandwidth allocation in radio networks. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 406(3):225–239, 2008.
- [3] F. R. J. Vieira, J. F. de Rezende, V. C. Barbosa, and S. Fdida. Scheduling links for heavy traffic on interfering routes in wireless mesh networks. *Computer Networks*, 56(5):1584–1598, 2012.
- [4] L. B. Le, E. Modiano, and N. B. Shroff. Optimal control of wireless networks with finite buffers. *IEEE/ACM Transactions on Networking*, 20(4):1316–1329, 2012.

- [5] J. Bentley. Programming pearls: algorithm design techniques. *Communications of the ACM*, 27(9):865–873, 1984.
- [6] S. An, P. Peursum, W. Liu, and S. Venkatesh. Efficient algorithms for subwindow search in object detection and localization. In *Proc. of IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 264–271, 2009.
- [7] T. Fukuda, Y. Morimoto, S. Morishita, and T. Tokuyama. Data mining with optimized two-dimensional association rules. *ACM Transactions on Database Systems*, 26(2):179–213, 2001.
- [8] W. L. Ruzzo and M. Tompa. A linear time algorithm for finding all maximal scoring subsequences. In *Proc. of the Seventh International Conference on Intelligent Systems for Molecular Biology*, pages 234–241, 1999.
- [9] Y.-L. Lin, T. Jiang, and K.-M. Chao. Efficient algorithms for locating the length-constrained heaviest segments with applications to biomolecular sequence analysis. *Journal of Computer and System Sciences*, 65(3):570–586, 2002.
- [10] M. Csűrös. Maximum-scoring segment sets. *IEEE/ACM Transactions on Computational Biology and Bioinformatics*, 1(4):139–150, 2004.
- [11] K. Fukuda and T. Takaoka. Analysis of air pollution (PM₁₀) and respiratory morbidity rate using K-maximum sub-array (2-D) algorithm. In *Proc. of the ACM Symposium on Applied Computing*, pages 153–157, 2007.
- [12] M. Thaher and T. Takaoka. An efficient algorithm for the k maximum convex sums. *Procedia Computer Science*, 1(1):1475–1483, 2010.
- [13] W. Lu. Improved SWOT approach for conducting strategic planning in the construction industry. *Journal of Construction Engineering and Management*, 136(12):1317–1328, 2010.
- [14] D. Gries. A note on a standard strategy for developing loop invariants and loops. *Science of Computer Programming*, 2(3):207–214, 1982.
- [15] J. Bentley. Programming pearls: perspective on performance. *Communications of the ACM*, 27(11):1087–1092, 1984.
- [16] M. Thaher and T. Takaoka. Improved algorithms for the k overlapping maximum convex sum problem. *Procedia Computer Science*, 9:754–763, 2012.
- [17] K.-Y. Chen and K.-M. Chao. On the range maximum-sum segment query problem. *Discrete Applied Mathematics*, 155(16):2043–2052, 2007.
- [18] H.-K. Dai and H.-C. Su. A parallel algorithm for finding all successive minimal maximum subsequences. In J. R. Correa, A. Hevia, and M. Kiwi, editors, *Proc. of the Latin American Theoretical Informatics*, volume 3887 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 337–348, 2006.
- [19] C. E. R. Alves, E. N. Cáceres, and S. W. Song. A BSP/CGM algorithm for finding all maximal contiguous subsequences of a sequence of numbers. In W. E. Nagel, W. V. Walter, and W. Lehner, editors, *Proc. of the 12th International Euro-Par Conference*, volume 4128 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 831–840, 2006.
- [20] G. S. Brodal and A. G. Jørgensen. A linear time algorithm for the k maximal sums problem. In L. Kučera and A. Kučera, editors, *Proc. of 32nd International Symposium*, volume 4708 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 442–453, 2007.
- [21] X. Huang. An algorithm for identifying regions of a DNA sequence that satisfy a content requirement. *Computer Applications in the Biosciences (CABIOS)*, 10(3):219–225, 1994.

- [22] S.-C. Mu. Maximum segment sum is back: Deriving algorithms for two segment problems with bounded lengths. In *Proc. of the ACM SIGPLAN Symposium on Partial Evaluation and Semantics-based Program Manipulation*, pages 31–39, 2008.
- [23] C.-H. Cheng, H.-F. Liu, and K.-M. Chao. Optimal algorithms for the average-constrained maximum-sum segment problem. *Information Processing Letters*, 109(3):171–174, 2009.
- [24] G. S. Brodal and A. G. Jørgensen. Selecting sums in arrays. In S.-H. Hong, H. Nagamochi, and T. Fukunaga, editors, *Algorithms and Computation*, volume 5369 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 100–111. 2008.
- [25] T. Li-Hui. Sequencing to minimize the maximum renewal cumulative cost. *Operations Research Letters*, 12(2):117–124, 1992.
- [26] R. C. Corrêa, P. M. S. Farias, and C. P. de Souza. Insertion and sorting in a sequence of numbers minimizing the maximum sum of a contiguous subsequence. *Journal of Discrete Algorithms*, 21:1–10, 2013.
- [27] J. Jeuring. Incremental algorithms on list. In *Proc. SION Computing Science in the Netherlands*, pages 315–335, 1991.