

226 (minimum sum segment) Given a list of integers, possibly including negatives, write a program to find

- (a)✓ the minimum sum of any nonempty segment (sublist of consecutive items).
- (b) the nonempty segment whose sum is minimum.
- (c) the minimum sum of any segment, including empty segments.

After trying the question, scroll down to the solution.

- (a)✓ the minimum sum of any nonempty segment (sublist of consecutive items).

§ As it says in the textbook Subsection 5.2.3, we define

$$\begin{aligned} P &= s' = \downarrow i: 0,.. \#L \cdot \downarrow j: i+1,.. \#L+1 \cdot \Sigma L [i;..j] \\ A k &= s = (\downarrow i: 0,..k \cdot \downarrow j: i+1,..k+1 \cdot \Sigma L [i;..j]) \wedge c = (\downarrow i: 0,..k \cdot \Sigma L [i;..k]) \end{aligned}$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned} P &\Leftarrow s := \infty. c := \infty. A 0 \Rightarrow A'(\#L) \\ A 0 \Rightarrow A'(\#L) &\Leftarrow \textbf{for } k := 0;.. \#L \textbf{ do } k: 0,.. \#L \wedge A k \Rightarrow A'(k+1) \textbf{ od} \\ k: 0,.. \#L \wedge A k \Rightarrow A'(k+1) &\Leftarrow c := c \downarrow 0 + L k. s := s \downarrow c \end{aligned}$$

Proof: First refinement:

$$\begin{aligned} s := \infty. c := \infty. A 0 &\Rightarrow A'(\#L) && \text{replace } A 0 \text{ and } A'(\#L) \\ = s := \infty. c := \infty. & \\ s = (\downarrow i: 0,..0 \cdot \downarrow j: i+1,..1 \cdot \Sigma L [i;..j]) \wedge c &= (\downarrow i: 0,..0 \cdot \Sigma L [i;..0]) \\ \Rightarrow s' = (\downarrow i: 0,.. \#L \cdot \downarrow j: i+1,.. \#L+1 \cdot \Sigma L [i;..j]) \wedge c' &= (\downarrow i: 0,.. \#L \cdot \Sigma L [i;.. \#L]) \\ &&& \text{minimum of an empty bunch is } \infty \\ = s := \infty. c := \infty. s = \infty \wedge c = \infty &\Rightarrow P \wedge c' = (\downarrow i: 0,.. \#L \cdot \Sigma L [i;.. \#L]) \\ &&& \text{substitution law twice; } P \text{ does not mention } s \text{ or } c \\ = \infty = \infty \wedge \infty = \infty &\Rightarrow P \wedge c' = (\downarrow i: 0,.. \#L \cdot \Sigma L [i;.. \#L]) \\ \Rightarrow P & \end{aligned}$$

Middle refinement: no proof needed.

Last refinement:

$$\begin{aligned} k: 0,.. \#L \wedge A k &\Rightarrow A'(k+1) && \text{expand } A k \text{ and } A'(k+1) \\ = k: 0,.. \#L \wedge s = (\downarrow i: 0,..k \cdot \downarrow j: i+1,..k+1 \cdot \Sigma L [i;..j]) \wedge c = (\downarrow i: 0,..k \cdot \Sigma L [i;..k]) & \\ \Rightarrow s' = (\downarrow i: 0,..k+1 \cdot \downarrow j: i+1,..k+2 \cdot \Sigma L [i;..j]) \wedge c' = (\downarrow i: 0,..k+1 \cdot \Sigma L [i;..k]) & \text{context} \\ = k: 0,.. \#L \wedge s = (\downarrow i: 0,..k \cdot \downarrow j: i+1,..k+1 \cdot \Sigma L [i;..j]) \wedge c = (\downarrow i: 0,..k \cdot \Sigma L [i;..k]) & \\ \Rightarrow s' = s \downarrow (c \downarrow 0 + L k) \wedge c' = c \downarrow 0 + L k & \\ \Leftarrow c' = c \downarrow 0 + L k \wedge s' = s \downarrow (c \downarrow 0 + L k) & \\ = c := c \downarrow 0 + L k. s := s \downarrow c & \end{aligned}$$

- (b) the nonempty segment whose sum is minimum.

§ Let $m;..n$ be the nonempty segment ending at or before k whose sum is minimum (corresponding to s), and let $h;..k$ be the nonempty segment ending at k whose sum is minimum (corresponding to c). Then

```

s := ∞. c := ∞.
for k := 0;..#L
  do if c ≤ 0 then c := c + L k else c := L k. h := k fi.
  if s ≤ c then ok else s := c. m := h. n := k fi od

```

- (c) the minimum sum of any segment, including empty segments.

§ To allow empty segments, we define

$$\begin{aligned} P &= s' = \downarrow i: 0,.. \#L+1 \cdot \downarrow j: i,.. \#L+1 \cdot \Sigma L [i;..j] \\ A k &= s = (\downarrow i: 0,..k+1 \cdot \downarrow j: i,..k+1 \cdot \Sigma L [i;..j]) \wedge c = (\downarrow i: 0,..k+1 \cdot \Sigma L [i;..k]) \end{aligned}$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned} P &\Leftarrow s := 0. c := 0. A 0 \Rightarrow A'(\#L) \\ A 0 \Rightarrow A'(\#L) &\Leftarrow \textbf{for } k := 0;.. \#L \textbf{ do } k: 0,.. \#L \wedge A k \Rightarrow A'(k+1) \textbf{ od} \\ k: 0,.. \#L \wedge A k \Rightarrow A'(k+1) &\Leftarrow c := (c + L k) \downarrow 0. s := s \downarrow c \end{aligned}$$

The first and last refinements need proof; the middle refinement does not need proof.