


Algorithmics	Student information	Date	Number of session
	UO:269546	10-03-21	3_2
	Surname: Fernández Arias	 Escuela de Ingeniería Informática Universidad de Oviedo	
	Name: Sara		



## Activity 1. Counting inversions.

file	t O(n <sup>2</sup> )	t O(nlog)	t O(n <sup>2</sup> )/t O(nlogn )	n inversions
Ranking1.txt	52	4	13	14.074.466
Ranking2.txt	168	3	56	56.256.142
Ranking3.txt	628	5	125,6	225.312.650
Ranking4.txt	2240	11	203,6363636	903.869.574
Ranking5.txt	16765	17	986,1764706	3.613.758.061
Ranking6.txt	88970	40	2224,25	14.444.260.441
Ranking7.txt	477398	207	2306,270531	57.561.381.803

For  $O(n^2)$  having that the time obtained for the size of ranking4  $n_1 = 60.000$ ,

60000 43046

Was  $t_1 = 2240$ ms.

Provided that the size of ranking 5 is  $n_2 = 120.000$

120000 89687

The time expected for  $n_2$  will be the following:

Provided that  $k = n_2/n_1 = 120.000/60.000 = 2$

Being that  $T_2 = \frac{f(n_2)}{f(n_1)} \times T_1$ , so  $T_2 = \frac{n_2^2}{n_1^2} \times t_1 = k^2 \times T_1 = 2^2 \times 2240 = 8.969$

The values aren't expected!, actually, the value empirically obtained was almost the double.

For  $O(n \log n)$  I only obtained a value significant enough to be taken into account.

It's the 207ms taken for executing inversions in ranking7.

Having a look at the overall set of values obtained for this complexity, they are expected in the sense that they are significantly smaller and grow slower than the ones of  $O(n^2)$

Algorithmics	Student information	Date	Number of session
	UO:269546	10-03-21	3_2
	Surname: Fernández Arias		
	Name: Sara		