Ans: to the Que! No:2 are one getting I Implementation! It to don't in too I'm do grant Go Tot the time complexity will be the necessary director is given on the 2 as T(2) = 02
T(0) = invalid imput T(1) =1 T(m) = T(m-1) + T(m-2) + O(1) () one tadalition = OU) tuo substraction = 0(2) = 2 + (m-1) +1 (T-T(m-1) = approximate T(n-2 T(n-1) = =) 2:(2+(m-2)+1)+1 T(n-2) = 2(2(2T(n-3)+1)+1)+1=> 2 + (nx1) => 2^m

ue are getting I veneren ve call the hundron. above thus we will get a times of 1 [From (n-1) to (m-m) So the time complexity will be O(n). the necunsive Lunction is giving on us a 2 as its againmultiplication. Thus, the time complexity will be T(5)=2.2.2,2.2 中国+1 tegri bilarrice (D) I 00 = 90002 25 April (1) 1. DO (UO+ CS-MT+ (1-M)T - CO)T + (b) = 26+ 100 14. (1-10) TE = T(m) = 2 2 + 1 11. 1 T(n) = 2n 7 mooriggs = → 2.(2+(x-2)+1)+1 > 2~ $=0(2^{n})$. t(n+)=) 2(2(2T(n-3)+1)+1)+1 (IXM) + MC (

implementation-2 (C-M=m gos mos to su nont big omega some some out on not thream a so nco (=> 0(1) (mm), (m) 3d n (=2 => O() big 0: O(w) + O(1) + (a) O(1) => 0(n) + 0(1)> 0(m) For loop is iterating on times = 0(n) For example: n=5 thus iteration! (00 - OD) (2-1) (2-2) (3-2) - 2 (3-1) (4-2) - 3(4-1) 0T= (n-2) most interation: m=3 T=(n-2) =3 n=5

Thus we I can say n=(n-2) - norbotenomed mi as a nesult don on the time complexity will (1)0 € ! OLV be ob, /Anni. (10) E . Coliv (U) 3 (W) + (W) 3 + (B) (W) (1/0+ (v)) 0 E

(M)A

Problem 41

initializing
$$= 0(1)$$
 iteration $= 0(1)$
First ion losp $= 0(n)$
Second $= 0(n)$
thind $= 0(n)$

Thus, all are the off
$$\chi(x) = 0$$
 (m) $\chi(x) = 0$ (m) $\chi(x) = 0$ (m) $\chi(x) = 0$

| First For 100P | 2nd For loop | 3nd Fon 100P | total 1 |
|----------------|--------------|--------------|------------|
| 1 | 4 | 8 | 8 |
| 3 | 9 ~2- | 27 ~> | 27 =>m3 |
| N | ~ | | |

From above he can see every loop is in multiplication dona thus lind time complexity nxnxn = 0 (n3)

Ans to the ques no :3

The difference between dibonacci I and 2 algorithm is aleasly showed after generating the time compredity graphs. We can see that fill b m=15 on 16 both ago rithm worked in comptant tim (OU)). After male there is a difference. The med line (Libo-1) has increasied suddenly. Thus we can say till (14-16) both algorithm work same time on gone through approx came amount at iteration. But after that the necursive algo showed some dissimilarity wel because necessive algo gone throw same number twice sometimes. For example,

(4-1) (4-2) (3-1) (3-2) (2-1) (2-2)

But in literable algo the loop gone through a times only thus the \$6 bb big D is not more than on. As imput increases we can see red time is increasing where blue stay as a its previous position.