## Honors Data Structures Pheoretical Assignment 1

Mark Kiricher, UNI: mm & 2253

Problem 1:

For the Sunction f(n) = 2n2-3n+2, we know that it's polynomial and that the highest power of n is 2. Therefore, we'd expect there to be some polynomial functions with highest power 2 that could be used as an upper and a lower bound around fln). Since the coefficient of in front of n' is 2 we can try to set the lower Coundary function to to n' and the upper boundary function to the 3n'. This is plansible because we know that kn' grows with the Same rate for any k = const; k \in IRt. Phus, we'd expect Alle sons for higher values of & the same growth rate to be scaled higher and, analogously, for & smaller &'s -> lawer. So here we have g(n) = n' according to the definition of Big-F. Now we need to find c, c, and no that satisfy: 0 ≤ Cng(n) ≤ f(n) ≤ Cig(n) for the zno => For  $g(n) = n^2$ :  $0 \le C_n n^2 \le f(n) \le C_2 n^2$ for then.

If we take Wap into account the above logic and set:  $C_1 = \frac{1}{2}$ ;  $C_2 = 3$ , then if we marrage to find a const. No.,

we'll have our desired result.

(!)  $n^2 \le f(n) \le (3) n^2$  $n^2 \le 2n^2 - 3n + 2 \le 3n^2 = 2n^2 - 3n + 2 \le 3n^2$ 

From the last set of guadratic inequalities, it isn't hard to see that if we choose some random no which is relatively large thike 100 for example), we'll satisfy the condition. However, if we try to get the minimal possible ho in order to find where exactly does fin) get in between eag(n) and eng(n):

1) 
$$n^2 - 3n + 2 \ge 0$$
 =>  $n^2 - 2n - n + 2 \ge 0$  =>  $n(n-2) \ge 0$  =>  $(n-1)(n-2) \ge 0$  =>  $n \in (-\infty; -1] \cup [2; +\infty)$ 

2) 
$$n^2 + 3n - 2 \ge 0 \Rightarrow (n^2 + 3n + \frac{9}{4}) - \frac{9}{4} - 2 \ge 0$$

=> 
$$\left(n + \frac{3}{2}\right)^2 - \frac{17}{4} \ge 0$$
 =>  $\left(n + \frac{3}{2}\right)^2 - \left(\frac{\sqrt{17}}{2}\right)^2 \ge 0$ 

$$= 2 \left( n + \frac{3}{2} - \frac{\sqrt{17}}{2} \right) \left( n + \frac{3}{2} + \frac{\sqrt{17}}{2} \right) \geq 0 = 2 n \in \left( -\infty; -\frac{\sqrt{17}}{2} - \frac{3}{2} \right) \sqrt{\frac{\sqrt{17} - \frac{3}{2}}{2}} = 2$$

$$\sqrt{17} - 3 < \sqrt{25} - 3 = \frac{5 - 3}{2} = \frac{2}{2} = 1 < 2$$

That would satisfy the condition. However, since we found a set of working  $(c_n, c_2, n)$  constants then we proved that 4 indeed, our  $g(n) = n^2 = \sqrt{\frac{\theta(g(n))}{\theta(n^2)}}$ 

Problem 2.  $P_{d}(n) = \sum_{i=1}^{d} a_{i} n^{i}$  $\sum_{i=1}^{n} a_{i} n^{i} = a_{0} n^{0} + a_{1} n^{i} + a_{2} n^{i} + \dots + a_{n} n^{d} =$  $= a_0 + a_1 n + a_2 n^2 + - \cdot + a_d n^d$ We need to prove that the above expression is Pa(n) = O(n2) for kEIN and kid The above would be true if we find a value for c, and n, where c, n = C,g(n) > pa (n) where c, and no are Now, since we know that ad > 0 and a: 20 for if IN. and if [0; d-1], we can transform the above inequality: c.n = 1 If we "unfold" poln): C. N' = 1. Since we know that k ≥ d, we can get a factor of letter no from both the vectors nominator and denominator: C. nd x n Nd (a. + a. + ad. + ad) Now to prove that the numerator function dominates the denominator one. we can take the limit in finity 1

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{C_1 x^d \times n^{k-d}}{x^d + \frac{a_1}{n^{d-1}} + \cdots + \frac{a_{d-1}}{n} + a_d}$$

$$= C_1 \lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{n}{\frac{\alpha_0}{n^d} + \frac{\alpha_1}{n^{d-1}}} = C_1$$

$$= C_1 \lim_{n\to\infty} \left( \frac{1}{n} + \frac{1}{n} \right)$$

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \left( \frac{\alpha_0}{n} + \frac{1}{n} + \frac{1}{n} \right) + \lim_{n\to\infty} \left( \frac{\alpha_1}{n^{1/2}} + \frac{1}{n} + \frac{1}{n} \right)$$

$$= C_1 \qquad \lim_{n\to\infty} (n^{k-d}) = \frac{C_1 \quad \lim_{n\to\infty} (n^{k-d})}{\alpha_d}$$

$$= \frac{C_1 \quad \lim_{n\to\infty} (n^{k-d})}{\alpha_d}$$

denominator one, i.e. every c. works! => Since every c. denominator one, i.e. every be some arbitrarily large works, then there'll definitely be some arbitrarily large No value for which the condition is satisfied since the difference between the day numerator & denominator will eventually -> + >>

To case: 
$$k = d$$
:  $\frac{C_1}{a_d}$   $\lim_{n \to \infty} (n^{k-d}) = \frac{C_1}{a_d}$   $\lim_{n \to \infty} (n^{d-d}) = \frac{C_1}{a_d}$ 

$$=\frac{C_1}{a_1}\lim_{n\to\infty}n^2=\frac{C_1}{a_1}\lim_{n\to\infty}\frac{1}{1}=\frac{C_1}{a_2}$$

need to evaluate the sunction and then take the limit and not simultaneously

Now, we want to find a value for  $C_1$ , where the limit satisfies the condition  $\frac{C_1}{P_0(h)} \ge 1$ 

Thus, if we take No arbitrarily large, i.e. assume that No > ~, then any c, ≥ 1 will work and the condition will be satisfied. If we instead, fix a value for No:

 $\frac{c_{1} \cdot v_{0}}{a_{0} + a_{1} \cdot v_{0} + a_{1} \cdot v_{0}} = \frac{v_{0} \cdot v_{0}}{v_{0} \cdot v_{0}} \times \frac{c_{1}}{v_{0}} \times \frac{c_{1}}{v_{0}} = \frac{v_{0} \cdot v_{0}}{v_{0}} \times \frac{c_{1}}{v_{0}} \times$ 

We want the last expression to be  $\geq 1$ , which is equivalent to:  $C_1 \geq \frac{a_0}{N_0} + \frac{a_1}{A^2} + \frac{a_2}{A^2} + \frac{a_3}{A^2} + \frac{a_4}{N_0} +$ 

which is obviously correct for some arbitrarily large value, because on the right side of the inequality we just have constants and the sum of several constant terms is always going to be a constant. There fore, there will want always exist a bigger constant because the set of real/natural numbers is infinite!

=> In case 2, also [Pa(n) = O(nt)

Problem 3

Firstly, we can recognize that 256 is a constant and thus, does not grow for any  $n \in IR$ . The function (2/N) we can see that as N progresses to increase, it gets smaller and, more precisely,  $\lim_{N\to\infty} (2/N) = 0$ . For any other function, begindes those two, we have  $\lim_{N\to\infty} f(N) = +\infty$ 

In the next step, we'll prove that log N is has a slower growth rate than VN

If we take the lim:  $\lim_{N\to\infty} \frac{\log N}{N^{\frac{1}{2}}} = \lim_{N\to\infty} \frac{1/N}{2} = \frac{1}{N^{\frac{1}{2}}}$ 

 $=\lim_{N\to\infty}\frac{1}{N}=\lim_{N\to\infty}\frac{2\sqrt{N}}{N}=\lim_{N\to\infty}\frac{2}{\sqrt{N}}=0$ 

=> log N gets dominated by N'2

Next up, it's trivial to see that ISM grows faster than

in: ling 5N = ling VN) = +00

After that, we can argue that Nlog N grows faster than

5N:  $\lim_{N\to\infty} \frac{1000}{5N} = \lim_{N\to\infty} \frac{\log N}{5} = +\infty$ 

Farlier, we saw that log N grows slower than N'2 and it's trivial that N'2 grows slower than N

=> log N grows slower than N => [Nlog N grows slower than N2]

The last polynomial function in the set of given functions is 18N3. Since it's highest power is 3,

and N's is 2, it's obvious that 18N's grows slower than N'

Next, we have the expenential functions and the factorial. First, we'll argue that the factorial one is the slowest. Let's have an arbitrary constant little let.

Now, if we examine the function k' and try to compare it to n!, we can observe that however big the kis, at each "step" l' gets multiplied by k and n! gets multiplied by a bigger number than it was multiplied before that Thus, there will come a moment when n! will surpass k' and it will continue growing in a faster rate the than k' since at this point n will have become bigger than k.

Po give a more formal proof to the above:

If we assume that  $\frac{n!}{\ell^n} \to \infty$  for  $n \to \infty$ ,

then we know that  $\log\left(\frac{n!}{\ell n}\right) > \infty$  because  $\log(\infty) = \infty$ 

Now  $\log\left(\frac{n!}{kn}\right) = \log(n!) - \log(kn) =$ 

 $= \log \left( \bigcap_{i=1}^{n} i \right) - n \log k = \left[ \log 1 + \log 2 + \log 3 + \dots + \log n \right]$   $- n \log k =$ 

 $= \left( \sum_{i=1}^{n} \log i \right) - n \log k$  . Now, since we know that n

gets large, we can assume that at some point it

will surpass k the

Mary Jakes Green

Now as we continue to increase n we only add another logk to the part that we subtract but add log (n+1) to the sum. Plus, the sum will at the some point, become arbitrarily large as n becomes large.

And, even more rigorously: We want to prove that

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{n} \log i}{n \log k} = \infty ; \text{ We clearly know that }$$

$$\lim_{i=1}^{n} \log i \Rightarrow \lim_{i=1}^{n} \log i \Rightarrow \lim_{i=1}^{n} \log i$$

Now, for all if [[1]; n], we know that:

$$log(i) \ge log(\frac{n}{2}) = log(n) - log(2) = log(n) - 1$$

$$= \sum_{i=\lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor}^{n} \log i \ge \frac{n}{2} \log(n) - \frac{n}{2} = \sum_{i=1}^{n} \log i > \frac{n \log(n) - n}{2}$$

Now: 
$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \left( \frac{\frac{1}{2} \log(n) - \frac{n}{2}}{n \log k} \right) = \lim_{n\to\infty} \left( \frac{\frac{1}{2} \log(n) - \frac{1}{2}}{\log k} \right) =$$

$$= \lim_{n \to \infty} \left( \frac{\log(n)}{2 \log k} - \frac{1}{2 \log k} \right) = +\infty$$

Now, we just need to order the exponential functions. The we can see that 2" = 2 = 2" and since 2 is just a constant, we can conclude that the growth rate of 2" and 2" is the same

Now, comparing  $2^n$  and  $4^n$ :  $4^n = (2^2)^n = 2^{2n} = 2^n \times 2^n$ If we assume that  $2^n$  and  $4^n$  have the same growth that rate, then there should exist a constant  $c \in IR^+$  such that  $4^n \le c 2^n$  for all  $n \ge n$ , for some

However:  $\frac{4}{2}^{n} \le c 2^{n}$   $2^{n} \times 2^{n} \le c 2^{n} / : 2^{n}$ 

2" < C -> this is obviously a contradiction, because a connot be a constant to support satisfy the inequality for all n.

=> /4 grows slower than 2"

Lastly,  $\binom{2}{N} = 2N^{-1}$  has a slower "growth" rate than  $256 = 256N^{\circ} = > -6$  Finally:

 $\binom{2}{N}$  <  $256 < \log N < \sqrt{N} < 5N < N \log N <$   $< N^{2} < 18N^{3} < 2^{N} = 2^{N+1} < 4^{N} < n^{1}$ 

Problem 4

a) We know that T(1) = 2; T(2) = 4; T(3) = 16.

=> We can encounter the following recurrive sequence.  $T(n) = [T(n-1)]^2$ . This is because we know that "each subsequent year, the tribute was squared"

T(n) =  $[T(n-1)]^2 = [T(n-2)]^2$  =  $[T(n-2)]^4$ 

 $T(n-2) = [T(n-3)]^{2} = T(n) = [T(n-3)]^{2}^{\frac{1}{2}} = [T(n-3)]^{8}$ 

e) We can prove a stronger relation through induction:

WHILE T(n-k)] 2k

Base case: k = 0:  $T(n) = T(n-0)^2 = T(n)^2 \vee k = 1$ :  $T(n-1) = [T(n-1)]^2 = [T(n-1)]^2 \vee V$ 

Induction step: Let's assume that the induction claim is true for me a fixed number & where & F No and & & [0; n-2]

=> We need to prove that the induction claim
is true for (k+1).

We have: MMMMMMMMM  $T(n) = [T(n-k)]^2$ From the problem we know that  $T(n-k) = [T(n-k)]^2$ 

 $= [T(n - (k+1))]^{2}$   $= [T(n - (k+1))]^{2}$   $= [T(n - (k+1))]^{2}$   $= [T(n - (k+1))]^{2}$ 

= 
$$[T(n-(k+1))]^{2k+1}$$
  
=>  $[T(n-(k+1))]^{2k+1}$   
=> We proved the induction!  
=> We know that the following is true:  
 $[T(n)] = [T(n-k)]^{2k}$   
 $for le [0, n-1], k \in \mathbb{N}_0$   
1) If we let  $l = n-1$ :  
 $[T(n)] = [T(n-(n-1))]^{2n-1} = leg(n-n-1) = leg($ 

Problem 5.

a) We see that the Must loop will run for m iterations. The inner loop will run for:

- . 23 times the first time
- · 22 times the second time
- · 21 times the third time

· 2 times the 22nd time

· I time the 23rd time

· O times the 24th time \$ & onwards.

or If  $n \ge 23$ , the whole code piece will  $n \times (\sum_{i=n}^{23} i) = n \times (\frac{23 \times 24}{2}) =$ 

6) The outer loop will run for 2 iterations. The inner loop will run for:

· l=0: # 0 iterations

· k=1: (n-1); terations and then the outer

Millertham allumations loop breaks because

k=n-1 > n for n >

- =) The different code snippet will do  $2(n^2-1)$  iterations and  $o(2n^2-2) = O(n^2)$ , because the 2's are constants!
- c) We have 2 options every time the function is ran:

T: NEC : terminate

II: N>C: divide n by c and call the function again.

Let's choose a fixed constant & FIN for which ck > N > c . We know that such constant exists, because this is the same as saying: h is between a number and a number ligger than it.

In order to reach the base case, in should become less than or equal to c. Since we divide in by e each step and in starts at a value for which we ck then after:

· 1 step: neck-1

· 2 steps: NEC 6-2

· i steps: n < c k-i

We want  $N = C = C^{\uparrow}$ ; Then if we set i = k-1:  $N = C^{k-(k+1)} = C^{k-k+1} = C^{\dagger} = C$  will happen after (k-1) steps. Walkluser will happen

 $k-1 = \log_e(c^{k-1})$  <  $\log_e n \leq \log_e c^k = k$ => Phe little algorithm's complexity is  $\log_e n$ . However, since the base of the algorithm is irrelevant the algorithm has complexity  $O(\log_e n) = O(\log_e n)$