time complexity April 9, 2025

Homework 1

Spring 2025 COSC 31: Algorithms

1. We represent a degree n polynomial, $p(x) = a^0 + a_1x + a_2x^2 + a_nx^n$, by an array, A[0...n], where $A[i] = a_i$ for each index $i \in \{0, 1, ..., n\}$. In this problem, your goal is to design an algorithm EvaluatePolynomial(A, x) that takes such an array A (which represents a polynomial p) and a number x as input, and computes p(x).

For this problem,

(a) Design an algorithm SimpleEvaluatePolynomial(A, x), which performs at most O(n) multiplications and O(n) additions.

Answer

Algorithm SimpleEvaluatePolynomial

Function SimpleEvaluatePolynomial(A, x):

```
egin{aligned} q \leftarrow 1 \ p \leftarrow A[0] \ & 	ext{for } i \leftarrow 1 	ext{ to } n 	ext{ do} \ & | q \leftarrow q \cdot x \ & p \leftarrow p + q \cdot A[i] \ & 	ext{end} \ & 	ext{return } p \end{aligned}
```

Analysis: The simple algorithm above does 2n multiplications and n additions. For each iteration of the loop, two multiplications are done, $A[i] \cdot q$ and $q \cdot n$. Ignoring the constants we have at most O(n) multiplications and O(n) additions

(b) Design an algorithm EfficientEvaluatePolynomial(A, x), which performs at most n multiplications and n additions.

Answer

Using the Horner's method, the polynomial can be written nested form as shown below

$$p(x) = a_0 + a_1 x + a_2 x^2 + \dots + a_n x^n$$

$$p(x) = a_0 + x(a_1 + x(a_2 + x(a_3 + a_x) \dots))$$

Example the following polynomial $p(x) = 3x^3 + 2x^2 + x + 1$ can be nested follows:

$$p(x) = x(1 + x(2 + 3x)) + 1$$

To evaluate p(x) in the example above, we can start by evaluating the term 2 + 3x where is the 3 corresponds to A[n]

Algorithm EfficientEvaluatePolynomial

Function EfficientEvaluatePolynomial (A, x):

$$\begin{array}{l} p \leftarrow A[n] \\ \textbf{for } i \leftarrow n-1 \ \textbf{to} \ 0 \ \textbf{do} \\ \mid \ p \leftarrow p \cdot x + A[i] \\ \textbf{end} \\ \textbf{return} \ p \end{array}$$

Analysis: The above efficient algorithm doesn at most n multiplications and n additions, where each iteration of the loop does a 1 multiplication and 1 addition

2. Prove that $f(n) = \Omega(g(n))$ if and only if $g(n) = \mathcal{O}(f(n))$

Answer

This means $f(n) = \Omega(g(n)) \iff g(n) = \mathcal{O}(f(n))$

Starting with $f(n) = \Omega(g(n)) \Rightarrow g(n) = \mathcal{O}(f(n))$, we have that $f(n) = \Omega(g(n))$ if

$$\exists n_0, c > 0, \forall n > n_0 : f(n) \ge c \cdot g(n) \tag{1}$$

This can be re-arranged as follows:

$$\exists n_0, c > 0, \forall n > n_0 : \frac{1}{c} \cdot f(n) \ge g(n)$$
(2)

We see that statement(2) follows the definition of $g(n) = \mathcal{O}(f(n))$, hence $f(n) = \Omega(g(n)) \Rightarrow g(n) = \mathcal{O}(f(n))$

To show $g(n) = \mathcal{O}(f(n)) \Rightarrow f(n) = \Omega(g(n))$, we have $g(n) = \mathcal{O}(f(n))$ if

$$\exists n_0', c' > 0, \forall n > n_0' : g(n) \le c' \cdot f(n) \tag{3}$$

This can be re-arranged as follows:

$$\exists n'_0, c' > 0, \forall n > n'_0 : \frac{1}{c'} \cdot g(n) \le f(n)$$
 (4)

We see that statement(4) follows the definition of $f(n) = \Omega(g(n))$, hence $g(n) = \mathcal{O}(f(n)) \Rightarrow f(n) = \Omega(g(n))$

Therefore, $f(n) = \Omega(g(n)) \iff g(n) = \mathcal{O}(f(n)).$

3. Prove that $\log_a n = \Theta(\log_b)n$ for all a, b > 1.

Answer

To show that $\log_a n = \Theta(\log_b n)$ for all a, b > 1, we must prove that:

$$\log_a n = \mathcal{O}(\log_b n)$$
 and $\log_a n = \Omega(\log_b n)$

Using the change of base formula:

$$\log_a n = \frac{\log_b n}{\log_b a} = \frac{1}{\log_b a} \cdot \log_b n$$

Big-O proof: We want to show that:

$$\exists n_0, c > 0, \forall n > n_0 : \log_a n \le c \cdot \log_b n$$

Let $c = \frac{1}{\log_b a}$, and $n_0 = 1$. Then for all n > 1:

$$\log_a n = \frac{1}{\log_b a} \cdot \log_b n \le c \cdot \log_b n$$

So $\log_a n = \mathcal{O}(\log_b n)$.

Big-Omega proof: We want to show that:

$$\exists n_0, c > 0, \forall n > n_0 : \log_a n \ge c \cdot \log_b n$$

Again, let $c = \frac{1}{\log_b a}$ and choose $n_0 = 1$. Then for all n > 1:

$$\log_a n = \frac{1}{\log_b a} \cdot \log_b n \ge c \cdot \log_b n$$

So $\log_a n = \Omega(\log_b n)$.

Since both bounds hold, we conclude:

$$\log_a n = \Theta(\log_b n)$$

- 4. Exponentials are of different orders
 - (a) Prove that $2^n = \mathcal{O}(3^n)$

Answei

 $2^n = \mathcal{O}(3^n)$ if $\exists n_0, c > 0, \forall n_0 > n : 2^n \leq c \cdot 3^n$. The inequality can be re-arranged as follows:

$$2^n \le c \cdot 3^n \equiv \left(\frac{2}{3}\right)^n \le c$$

As $0 < \left(\frac{2}{3}\right)^n < 1$, $\forall n$. Consider a sufficiently large n_0 e.g, $n_0 = 10^5$, and c = 1, we see that $\left(\frac{2}{3}\right)^{10^5} < 1$ hence $2^n = \mathcal{O}(3^n)$.

(b) Prove that $3^n \neq \mathcal{O}(2^n)$

Answer

Suppose not, that's $3^n = \mathcal{O}(2^n)$, then we have that $\exists n_0, c > 0, \forall n_0 > n : 3^n \leq c \cdot 2^n$. The inequality can be re-arranged as follows

$$3^n \le c \cdot 2^n \equiv \left(\frac{3}{2}\right)^n \le c$$

Consider, $n_0 = 3, c = 1$, we see that $1.5^3 > 1$ hence the contradiction that for $\forall n, \left(\frac{3}{2}\right)^n \le c$.

Therefore, $3^n \neq \mathcal{O}(2^n)$.

- 5. For each pair of functions (f(n), g(n)) below, you must state and prove the strongest possible relationship between them
 - (a) $6^{\lg n}$ and $5^{\lg n}$

Answer

The strongest possible relationship is:

$$6^{\lg n} = \omega(5^{\lg n})$$

This is because for sufficiently large n, $6^{\lg n}$ grows strictly faster than $5^{\lg n}$. More formally, we see that:

$$\lim_{n \to \infty} \frac{g(n)}{f(n)} = \lim_{n \to \infty} \left(\frac{5}{6}\right)^{\lg n} = 0$$

which satisfies the condition for the little-omega definition.

(b) f(n) and n^2 , where f is defined as follows: f(n) = 6n if n is even; else $f(n) = 5n^2$

Answer

We have

$$f(n) = \begin{cases} 6n & \text{if } n \mod 2 = 0\\ 5n^2 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

 $f(n) = \mathcal{O}(g(n))$. This means $\exists n_0, c > 0, \forall n > n_0 : f(n) \le c \cdot n^2$.

Case 1), For f(n) = 6n, consider $n_0 = 6$, and c = 1, we see that $6 \cdot 6 \le 1 \cdot 6^2$ which is true, and holds for a sufficiently large n.

Case 2), For $f(n) = 5n^2$, consider $n_0 = 1$, and c = 6, we see that $5 \cdot 1^2 \le 6 \cdot 1^2$. Therefore, both cases $f(n) = \mathcal{O}(g(n))$

 $f(n) \neq \Omega(g(n))$ globally for f(n). Suppose for the sake of contradiction, $f(n) = \Omega(g(n))$, we have $\exists n_0, c > 0, \forall n > n_0 : f(n) \geq c \cdot g(n)$. Consider, f(n) = 6n where $n_0 = 7, c = 1$, we see that $6 \cdot 7 < 1 \cdot 7^2$, hence the contradiction. Therefore $f(n) \neq \Omega(g(n))$, and $f(n) \neq \Theta(g(n))$.

$$f(n)\neq o(g(n)) \text{ because } \lim_{n\to\infty}\frac{f(n)}{g(n)} \text{ varies, that's } \lim_{n\to\infty}\frac{6n}{n^2}=0, \text{ but } \lim_{n\to\infty}\frac{5n^2}{n^2}=1.$$

As shown above, the strongest relation is $f(n) = \mathcal{O}(g(n))$.

6. **Time Complexity Determination**: Express the time complexity of the following program fragment as a Big-Theta asymptotic, in terms of n. You must also prove that your answer is correct.

Answer

Time complexity is $\Theta(n^3)$. We see that for each $k, s \leftarrow s + i - j \cdot k$ has $\Theta(1)$ which executed j

times for j^{th} iteration of the second loop.

$$T(n) = \sum_{i=1}^{n} \sum_{j=1}^{i} \Theta(1) \cdot j$$
 (5)

$$=\sum_{i=1}^{n}\Theta\left(\frac{i^2+i}{2}\right)\tag{6}$$

$$= \frac{1}{2} \left(\sum_{i=1}^{n} \Theta(i^2) + \sum_{i=1}^{n} \Theta(i) \right)$$
 (7)

$$= \frac{1}{2} \cdot \left(\frac{n(n+1)(2n+1)}{6} + \frac{n(n+1)}{2} \right) \tag{8}$$

$$= \left(\frac{2n^3 + 3n^2 + n}{12}\right) + \left(\frac{n^2 + n}{4}\right) \tag{9}$$

$$= \frac{2n^3 + 3n^2 + n + 3n^2 + 3n}{12} \tag{10}$$

$$=\frac{2n^3+6n^2+4n}{12}\tag{11}$$

(12)

To see that $T(n) = \mathcal{O}(n^3)$, we can see that:

$$T(n) = \frac{2n^3 + 6n^2 + 4n}{12} \tag{13}$$

$$\leq \frac{2n^3 + 6n^3 + 4n^3}{12} \tag{14}$$

$$= \frac{12}{12} \cdot n^3 \tag{15}$$

$$= n^3 \tag{16}$$

Therefore, $T(n) = \mathcal{O}(n^3)$ for some n_0 and c such that $n_0 = 1$ and c = 1. To see that $T(n) = \Omega(n^3)$, we can see that:

$$T(n) = \frac{2n^3 + 6n^2 + 4n}{12} \tag{17}$$

$$\geq \frac{2n^3}{12} \tag{18}$$

$$=\frac{1}{6}n^3$$
 (19)

Therefore, $T(n) = \Omega(n^3)$ for some n_0 and c such that $n_0 = 1$ and $c = \frac{1}{6}$, hence $T(n) = \Theta(n^3)$.

7. Suppose there are n players with IDs 1, 2, ..., n. Every possible pair (i, j) of players competed and the results are recorded in an $n \times n$ matrix A. In particular, in the match between i and j, if i won against j, then A[i, j] is set to 1 and A[j, i] is set to 0; on the other hand, if the match resulted in a tie, both A[i, j] and A[j, i] are set to 0. For each i, since i does not compete with self, A[i, i] has no meaning and its value can be anything. We call a player i a super athlete if i won against every other player. Here is a simple algorithm to identify a super athlete, if one exists.

Algorithm super-athlete

```
Input: A positive integer n and an n \times n matrix A, as described above.

Output: The index i of a super athlete, or \bot if no super athlete exists.

1 for i \leftarrow 1 to n do

2 | if all entries in the ith row of matrix A, leaving out the entry A[i,i], are 1 then

3 | return i

4 | end

5 end

6 return \bot
```

(a) Prove that there is at most one super athlete?

Answer

For a player at row i, and player any j where $1 \le j \le$ and $i \ne j$, if A[i,j] = 1, then A[j,i] = 0 because there can only be one winner in a match, therefore, there is at most one supper player.

(b) In the algorithm above, Line 4 involves reading all entries of row i, with the exception of the ith entry of that row. Thus, Line 4 involves reading n-1 entries of the matrix. Since Line 4 can be executed up to n times, the algorithm might read up to $\Theta(n^2)$ matrix entries. Design a cleverer algorithm that reads at most O(n) entries of the matrix

(c) Argue why your algorithm is correct. (You should argue both that the output is correct and that it reads at most $\mathcal{O}(n)$ entries of the matrix.)

Answer

For the optimized we do two inspections, 1) to identify the likely super players, 2) verify if the likely super player is indeed a super player or not.

In the first loop for the algorithm in part b), we keep track of some player at row super, we then check if A[super, i] = 0 for $1 \le i \le n$ and $i \ne super$, and update super to i if the condition is satisfied. We do so because we know that super has beaten players in the rows super + 1 to i - 1 hence they can't be super players. If A[super, i] = 1 we continue to inspect, until we find next player who has beaten super. Therefore, we have $\mathcal{O}(n)$ iterations.

Having identified a potential super player, we can verify if player at row *super* is a super player in the second loop. If some column m, A[super, m] = 0 then we return \bot , otherwise return player at row *super*. Similarly, we have super - 1 iterations where the worst case is super = n hence we have $\mathcal{O}(n)$ for the second loop.

overall, the program has $2 \cdot \mathcal{O}(n)$ time complexity, and we can ignore the constant 2 so the time complexity is $\mathcal{O}(n)$.