COMP2054-ADE:

ADE Lec04a: The Big-Oh family

Lecturer: Andrew Parkes andrew.parkes 'at' Nottingham.ac.uk

http://www.cs.nott.ac.uk/~pszajp/

Relatives of Big-Oh

A close family:

big-Oh 'O'

• big-Omega Ω'

big-Theta 'Θ'

little-oh 'o'

 note this is not in the main text-book but is required for the module

little-omega 'ω'

 Not required, as not used a lot, though mention it for completeness

Big-Omega: Definition

Definition: Given functions f(n) and g(n), we say that

$$f(n)$$
 is $\Omega(g(n))$

if there are (strictly) positive constants \boldsymbol{c} and $\boldsymbol{n_0}$ such that

$$f(n) \ge c g(n)$$
 for all $n \ge n_0$

Big-Omega: Definition

Definition: Given functions f(n) and g(n), we say that

$$f(n)$$
 is $\Omega(g(n))$

if there are (strictly) positive constants \boldsymbol{c} and $\boldsymbol{n_0}$ such that

$$f(n) \ge c g(n)$$
 for all $n \ge n_0$

- Spot the difference from big-Oh?
- "greater than" rather than "less than"
- Note that need c > 0, and we not allowed c=0
- Note that c must be constant (cannot depend on n)

• Show n is $\Omega(n)$ Need c > 0, n0 such that n >= c n forall n >= n0 Try c = 1 n >= n forall n >= n0 Pick n0=1. DONE.

• Show n^2 is $\Omega(n)$ Need c > 0, n0 such that $n^2 > = c n forall n > = n0$ Try c = 1n >= 1 forall n >= n0Pick n0=1Also works if try c=2 $n \ge 2$ for all $n \ge n0$ n0 = 2DONE.

• Show n^3 - n is $\Omega(n^3)$ Need c > 0, n0 such that $n^3 - n > = c n^3$ forall n > = n0Try c = 1 $n^3 - n >= n^3$ forall n >= n0- n > = 0 forall n > = n0**FAILS** Try c = 1 / 2 $2 n^3 - 2 n >= n^3$ forall $n >= n^0$ $n^2 >= 2$ forall n >= n0n0 = 2 DONE.

```
• Is it true that: 1 is \Omega(n) ?
Need c > 0, n0 such that
    1 > = c n forall n > = n0
Note: No need for c to be integer
Try c = ... FAILS
Instead use c > 0 to get
   (1/c) >= n \text{ forall } n >= n0
FAILS as eventually n > (1/c)
FAILS.
1 is NOT \Omega(n)
```

COMP2054-ADE: Big-Oh family

c = 1/n is NOT allowed – need c constant

Big-Omega Examples

- We have
 - n is $\Omega(1)$
 - n is $\Omega(n)$
 - n is not $\Omega(n^2)$
- This is "the opposite of Big-Oh"
- f(n) is Ω(g(n)) says that "f(n) grows at least as fast as g(n) at large n"
- Compared to
 - f(n) is O(g(n)) says that "f(n) grows no faster than g(n) at large n"

Big-Omega properties

- Similarly to big-Oh, Big-Omega is
 - Reflexive
 - NOT symmetric
 - Transitive

• Exercise (offline): Prove these.

Linking big-Oh and Big-Omega

- Suppose that we are give "f is O(g)"
- What can we say about big-Omega?

Linking big-Oh and Big-Omega

- Suppose that we are give "f is O(g)"
 - We know there exist c n_0 such that $f(n) \le c g(n) \quad \forall n \ge n_0$
 - We can assume c > 0 (Why?). Hence
 - $g(n) \ge \left(\frac{1}{c}\right) f(n) \quad \forall n \ge n_0$
 - Hence, g is $\Omega(f)$.
- That is: $f \in O(g) \rightarrow g \in \Omega(f)$
- Similarly: $f \in \Omega(g) \rightarrow g \in O(f)$.
- Note: similar to: $x <= y \rightarrow y >= x$

Usage of big-Omega

- Once familiar with big-Oh then big-Omega is very similar but "upside down". Same rules apply:
 - Multiplication rule still applies
 - Can still drop smaller terms
- E.g. $n^3 n$ is $\Omega(n^3)$
- ' Ω ' expresses "grows as least as fast as"
- 'O' expresses "grows at most as fast as"

'Paradox' of big-Omega

- "Can still drop smaller terms"
- E.g. $n^3 n$ is $\Omega(n^3)$

- Note that this might seem counterintuitive
 - thinking "big Omega does `at least' and so need the smallest term" is incorrect!
 - instead think of the large n behaviour being dominated by the n³, and that this grows at least as fast as n³.

Omega Usage

- A standard usage might be to capture a limitation on the best one can hope for, e.g. "The best case for algorithm X is $\Omega(n^3)$ and so it will not scale well"
- However, if the worst case behaviour of an algorithm is a 'bizarre' or 'partially unknown' function of n, then one might say, e.g. "The worst case for algorithm X is not precisely known but we know it is $\Omega(n^3)$ and $O(n^4)$ "
- Gives a lot more flexibility than doing ratios.

Big-Theta: Definition

Definition: Given functions f(n) and g(n), we say that f(n) is $\Theta(g(n))$

if there are positive constants c^{\prime} , $c^{\prime\prime}$ and $n_0^{}$ such that

```
f(n) \le c' g(n) f(n) \ge c'' g(n) for all n \ge n_0
```

- What does this say about the growth rate of f(n)?
- How does it connect to O and Omega?

Big-Theta

Definition: Given functions f(n) and g(n), we say that f(n) is $\Theta(g(n))$

if there are positive constants c^{\prime} , $c^{\prime\prime}$ and $n_0^{}$ such that

$$f(n) \le c' g(n)$$

 $f(n) \ge c'' g(n)$

for all $n \geq n_0$

- f(n) is $\Theta(g(n))$ if and only if f(n) is O(g(n)) and also f(n) is $\Omega(g(n))$
- Example: 2n+1 is $\Theta(n)$
- Θ expresses "grows 'exactly' as fast as"

EXERCISE

Consider the function:

```
f(n) = n if n is even 
 2n if n is odd 
 What is its big-Omega behaviour? 
 Clearly is \Omega(n). 
 Just take c=1 n0=1 then 
 f(n) >= 1 n forall n >= 1
```

EXERCISE

Consider the function:

```
f(n) = n if n is even
2n if n is odd
```

What is its big-Theta behaviour?

Clearly is $\Theta(n)$. As is both O(n) and $\Omega(n)$.

But note that there is not a single value for ratio f(n)/n.

- $\Theta(n)$ expresses the growth rate is linear but does not tightly sandwich the specific values.
- This is very useful in CS!
- Sometimes people can really mean Big-Theta when they say Big-Oh

Big-Theta is reflexive and transitive

• Trivial as both O and Ω are.

Is Big-Theta symmetric?

• If $f \in \Theta(g)$ then it is (automatically and always) true that $g \in \Theta(f)$

 Exercise (offline): (Follows quickly from previous results).

0 is an equivalence relation

- Any relation that is
 - Reflexive & Symmetric & Transitive
- is an "equivalence relation"
 - Roughly speaking: it behaves like a "equality":
 - ⊕(g(n)) is "the equivalence class of all functions whose large n behaviour is bounded above and below by constants times g(n)"
- It is reasonable to write " $f = \Theta(g)$ "
 - (pedantically, arguably, could be " $\{f\} = \Theta(g)$ " but dropping " $\{\}$ " on singleton sets is a common abuse of notation. But also it is somewhat of an abuse as it is not a set inequality, rather it is an "equivalence relation", i.e. closer to " $\{f\} = \Theta(g)$ ")
 - "Reasonable" is not same as "recommended" ©

BREAK

Next lecture "little-oh"