

hw1.md - Grip

Homework 1

By Anthony DeDominic <dedominica@my.easternct.edu>

Consecutive Integer Check GCD (Bruteforce) Algorithm

	GCD(int,int)	Recursive Depth	GCD
worst	GCD(17711 , 19035)	17711	1
best	GCD(1033 , 16906)	1033	1
average	??	7283	??

Initial Analysis

The worst case time complexity of the bruteforce algorithm is linearly proportional to the $\min(N, M)$; where N is an integer and M is another integer as defined [here](#). The worst case being when $\text{GCD}(N,M) = 1$. This is because the algorithm goes from the smallest of the two numbers and recursively counts downwards, by a factor of 1, from the starting value of $\min(N, M)$ until it reaches the base case of 1 which will always divide N and M completely with no remainders. In general, this algorithm will perform faster when the $\min()$ is small, $\max()$ will not change anything assuming GCD will equal 1 for $\text{GCD}(N,M)$.

Time Complexity

Like explained above, this algorithm's best and worst number pairs appear to be directly influenced by the smallest of the two numbers. This is a linear relationship since the decreasing factor is only 1.

$O(\min(N,M))$

Function Used

```
gcd_count gcd_brute(int large, int small, int gcd, int count) {  
  
    if (large % gcd == 0 && small % gcd == 0) {  
  
        return (gcd_count) {gcd, count};  
    }  
  
    return gcd_brute(large, small, gcd-1, count+1);  
}
```

Euclidean GCD Algorithm

	GCD(int, int)	Recursive Depth	GCD
worst	GCD(9955 , 12581)	15	1
best	GCD(1331 , 9331)	4	1
average	??	8	??

Initial Analysis

This algorithm uses significantly less operations to complete. This is due in fact that the decreasing factor is $(\max(N,M) / \max(N,M) \% \min(N,M))$. this value is much larger than ~ 1 , which is the decreasing factor for the Consecutive Integer Check algorithm. Unlike the other above algorithm, it will complete faster on average when the difference between $\max()$ and $\min()$ is either very far apart or very close; in the burteforce method, closeness of said difference is irrelevant. this will allow the algorithm to fall nearer to the base case of 1 faster.

NOTE that this assumes $\text{GCD}(N,M) = 1$ which would be the worst case

Time Complexity

Where the bruteforce method has a linear time complexity, this algorithm appears to have a logirithmic complexity. doing $\log(\min(N,M), 10) * C$ gets me numbers very close to the amount of iterations these gcd algorithms had to run through.

$O(\log_{10}(\min(N,M)))$

Function Used

```
gcd_count gcd_eculid(int large, int small, int count) {  
  
    if (small == 0) {  
  
        return (gcd_count) {large, count};  
    }  
  
    return gcd_eculid(small, large % small, count+1);  
}
```