Asymptotic Behavior of Functions

Textbook Reading:

Section 3.1, pp. 81-92.

Asymptotic Behavior of Functions

$$f(n) = 100n + 50$$
 and $g(n) = n^2 - n$

Algorithm A has worst-case complexity f(n) and algorithm B worst-case complexity g(n). Which is the faster algorithm?

Answer

- Algorithm A.
- For all n ≥ 102, f(n) is smaller than g(n) and for very large n, it is a lot smaller.
- Small values of n < 102, for which both f(n) and g(n) are at most 10150, are not important, since computers these days can perform billions of calculations per second.
- What matters is the number of computations that need to be performed as n becomes large.

Asymptotic Order

Let N denote the natural numbers, R+the positive reals.

Our notion of order is restricted to the set \mathcal{F} of functions

$$f(n): \mathbb{N} \to \mathbb{R}^+$$

Asymptotic Notation

```
Big Oh O(g(n))
Theta \Theta(g(n))
Omega \Omega(g(n))
Little oh o(g(n))
Asymptotically equivalent \sim g(n)
```

Big Oh
$$f(n) \in O(g(n))$$

Given a function $g(n) \in \mathcal{T}$, we define O(g(n)) to be the set of all functions $f(n) \in \mathcal{T}$ having the property that there exist positive constants c and n_0 such that for all $n \ge n_0$,

$$f(n) \le cg(n)$$
, for all $n \ge n_0$,

PSN. For the example, f(n) = 100n + 50 and $g(n) = n^2 - n$, show that $f(n) \in O(g(n))$.

Is this definition meaningful. For example is

$$n^2 - n \in O(100n + 50)$$
.

Why not just chose a really, really huge constant c? Surely,

PSN. Show this isn't true.

Comparing orders

We have shown that $100n + 50 \in O(n^2 - n)$, but $n^2 - n \notin O(100n + 50)$.

We say that 100n + 50 has **smaller order** than $n^2 - n$.

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

Given a function $g(n) \in \mathcal{T}$, we define $\Omega(g(n))$ to be the set of all functions $f(n) \in F$ having the property that there exist positive constants c and n_0 such that for all $n \ge n_0$,

$$f(n) \ge cg(n)$$
, for all $n \ge n_0$,

Theta $f(n) \in \Theta(g(n))$

Given a function $g(n) \in \mathcal{T}$, we define $\Theta(g(n))$ to be the set of all functions $f(n) \in \mathcal{T}$ having the property that there exist positive constants c_1 and c_2 and n_0 such that for all $n \ge n_0$,

 $c_1 g(n) \le f(n) \le c_2 g(n)$, for all $n \ge n_0$,

Same order

f(n) and g(n) have the **same order** iff $f(n) \in \Theta(g(n))$.

"Same order" is an **equivalence relation**. For convenience denote the relation by Θ , *i.e.*, $f \Theta g \Leftrightarrow f(n) \in \Theta(g(n))$.

This allows us to formally define the order of a function as the equivalence class it belongs to, where we choose the function in the class having the "simplest" form to represent the class.

Θ is and equivalence relation

Reflexive: $f \Theta f$

 $c_1 f(n) \le f(n) \le c_2 f(n)$, for all $n \ge n_0$, for $c_1 = c_2 = n_0 = 1$

Symmetric: $f \Theta g \Rightarrow g \Theta f$

 $f \Theta g \Rightarrow \exists c_1, c_2, n_0 \text{ such that } c_1 g(n) \le f(n) \le c_2 g(n), \text{ for all } n \ge n_0$ $\Rightarrow (1/c_2) f(n) \le g(n) \le (1/c_1) f(n), \text{ for all } n \ge n_0 \Rightarrow g \Theta f$

Transitive: $f \Theta g$ and $g \Theta h \Rightarrow f \Theta h$

 $f \Theta g \Rightarrow \exists c_1, c_2, n_0$ such that $c_1 g(n) \leq f(n) \leq c_2 g(n)$, for all $n \geq n_0$ $g \Theta h \Rightarrow \exists d_1, d_2, n_0$ such that $d_1 h(n) \leq g(n) \leq d_2 h(n)$, for all $n \geq n_1$ $\Rightarrow c_1 d_1 h(n) \leq f(n) \leq c_2 d_2 h(n)$, for all $n \geq \max\{n_0, n_1\}$ $\Rightarrow f \Theta h$

logarithms

PSN. Show that $\log_a n$ and $\log_b n$ have the same order independent of the choice of bases a and b.

Sometimes = is used instead of \in . For example, instead of saying f(n) belongs to O(g(n)), denoted $f(n) \in O(g(n))$, we can say f(n) is O(g(n)), denoted f(n) = O(g(n)).

Comparing orders

Theorem 3.1.2 The Ratio Limit Theorem

Let f(n), $g(n) \in F$. If the limit of the ratio f(n)/g(n) exists as n tends to infinity, then f and g are comparable. Moreover, assuming $L = \lim_{n \to \infty} f(n)/g(n)$ exists, then the following results hold.

1.
$$0 < L < \infty \Rightarrow f(n) \in \Theta(g(n))$$
.

2.
$$L = 0 \Rightarrow O(f(n)) \subset O(g(n))$$

3.
$$L = \infty \Rightarrow O(g(n)) \subset O(f(n))$$

f and g have the same order.

f has a smaller order than g.

f has a larger order than g.

PSN. Using the Ratio Limit Theorem, show that worst-case complexity of Binary Search has smaller order than the worst-case complexity of Linear Search, i.e.,

$$O(\log_2 n) \subset O(n)$$
.

Hint: Apply L'Hôpital's Rule

L'Hôpital's Rule: Suppose $\lim_{n\to\infty} f(n)$ and $\lim_{n\to\infty} g(n)$ are both 0 or both ∞ . Then

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{f(n)}{g(n)} = \lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{f'(n)}{g'(n)}.$$

little oh $f(n) \in o(g(n))$

We say that f(n) is "little oh" of g(n), denoted $f(n) \in o(g(n))$, if

$$\lim_{n\to\infty}\frac{f(n)}{g(n)}=0.$$

By the Ratio Limit Theorem

$$f(n) \in o(g(n)) \Rightarrow f(n) \in O(g(n))$$

Strongly Asymptotic Behavior

We say that f(n) is **strongly asymptotic** to g(n), denoted $f(n) \sim g(n)$, if

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{f(n)}{g(n)} = 1.$$

By the Ratio Limit Theorem

$$f(n) \sim g(n) \Rightarrow f(n) \in \Theta(g(n))$$

Insertionsort Complexities

Proposition. The complexities of *Insertionsort,* assuming a uniform distribution for the average complexity, satisfy

$$B(n) \sim n$$
 $W(n) \sim \frac{n^2}{2}$ $A(n) \sim \frac{n^2}{4}$

Using formula for B(n), W(n), A(n) for Insertion Sort

Best-Case: B(n) = n - 1

$$\lim_{n \to \infty} \frac{n-1}{n} = \lim_{n \to \infty} \left(1 - \frac{1}{n} \right) = 1 + 0 = 1$$

Worst-Case: $W(n) = \frac{n^2}{2} - \frac{n}{2}$

$$\lim_{n \to \infty} \frac{\frac{n^2}{2} - \frac{n}{2}}{\frac{n^2}{2}} = \lim_{n \to \infty} (1 - \frac{1}{n}) = 1 + 0 = 1$$

Average: $A(n) = \frac{n^2}{4} + \frac{3n}{4} - \frac{1}{2}$

$$\lim_{n \to \infty} \frac{\frac{n^2}{4} + \frac{3n}{4} - \frac{1}{2}}{\frac{n^2}{4}} = \lim_{n \to \infty} (1 + \frac{3}{n} - \frac{2}{n^2}) = 1 + 0 + 0 = 1$$

Use of Big Oh vs. Theta

- In the literature big oh is used more extensively then other asymptotic notation. This is because we can say that algorithms like Linear Search and Insertion Sort have computing times O(n) and $O(n^2)$, respectively, because they have these computing times for all inputs of size n.
- Linear Search has computing times ranging from 1 to n, which is O(n) for any input of size n, so it would be incorrect to say it has computing time O(n). We would need to say that it has computing time O(n) in the worst-case.
- The assumption when saying Linear Search has computing time O(n) is that this is sharp, i.e., it has worst-case complexity $\Theta(n)$.

O(1) in real life

