

Order Notation

O -notation:

$f(n) \in O(g(n))$ if **there exist** constants $c > 0$ and $n_0 > 0$ such that $0 \leq f(n) \leq cg(n)$ for all $n \geq n_0$.

Here the complexity of f is **not higher** than the complexity of g .

Ω -notation:

$f(n) \in \Omega(g(n))$ if **there exist** constants $c > 0$ and $n_0 > 0$ such that $0 \leq cg(n) \leq f(n)$ for all $n \geq n_0$.

Here the complexity of f is **not lower** than the complexity of g .

Θ -notation:

$f(n) \in \Theta(g(n))$ if **there exist** constants $c_1, c_2 > 0$ and $n_0 > 0$ such that $0 \leq c_1g(n) \leq f(n) \leq c_2g(n)$ for all $n \geq n_0$.

Here f and g have the **same complexity**.

Order Notation (cont.)

o -notation:

$f(n) \in o(g(n))$ if **for all** constants $c > 0$, there exists a constant $n_0 > 0$ such that $0 \leq f(n) \leq cg(n)$ for all $n \geq n_0$.

Here f has **lower complexity** than g .

ω -notation:

$f(n) \in \omega(g(n))$ if **for all** constants $c > 0$, there exists a constant $n_0 > 0$ such that $0 \leq cg(n) \leq f(n)$ for all $n \geq n_0$.

Here f has **higher complexity** than g .

Exercises

- ① Let $f(n) = n^2 - 7n - 30$. Prove from first principles that $f(n) \in O(n^2)$.
- ② Let $f(n) = n^2 - 7n - 30$. Prove from first principles that $f(n) \in \Omega(n^2)$.
- ③ Suppose $f(n) = n^2 + n$. Prove from first principles that $f(n) \notin O(n)$.

Techniques for Order Notation

Suppose that $f(n) > 0$ and $g(n) > 0$ for all $n \geq n_0$. Suppose that

$$L = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{f(n)}{g(n)}.$$

Then

$$f(n) \in \begin{cases} o(g(n)) & \text{if } L = 0 \\ \Theta(g(n)) & \text{if } 0 < L < \infty \\ \omega(g(n)) & \text{if } L = \infty. \end{cases}$$

Exercises Using the Limit Method

- ① Compare the growth rate of the functions $(\ln n)^2$ and $n^{1/2}$.

- ② Use the limit method to compare the growth rate of the functions n^2 and $n^2 - 7n - 30$.

Additional Exercises

- ① Compare the growth rate of the functions $(3 + (-1)^n)n$ and n .

- ② Compare the growth rates of the functions $f(n) = n |\sin \pi n/2| + 1$ and $g(n) = \sqrt{n}$.

Relationships between Order Notations

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

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

$$f(n) \in o(g(n)) \Leftrightarrow g(n) \in \omega(f(n))$$

$$f(n) \in \Theta(g(n)) \Leftrightarrow f(n) \in O(g(n)) \text{ and } f(n) \in \Omega(g(n))$$

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

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

Algebra of Order Notations

“Maximum” rules: Suppose that $f(n) > 0$ and $g(n) > 0$ for all $n \geq n_0$.

Then:

$$O(f(n) + g(n)) = O(\max\{f(n), g(n)\})$$

$$\Theta(f(n) + g(n)) = \Theta(\max\{f(n), g(n)\})$$

$$\Omega(f(n) + g(n)) = \Omega(\max\{f(n), g(n)\})$$

“Summation” rules: Suppose I is a **finite** set. Then

$$O\left(\sum_{i \in I} f(i)\right) = \sum_{i \in I} O(f(i))$$

$$\Theta\left(\sum_{i \in I} f(i)\right) = \sum_{i \in I} \Theta(f(i))$$

$$\Omega\left(\sum_{i \in I} f(i)\right) = \sum_{i \in I} \Omega(f(i))$$

Some Common Growth Rates (in increasing order)

polynomial $\Theta(1)$

$$\Theta(\log n)$$

$$\Theta(\sqrt{n})$$

$$\Theta(n)$$

$$\Theta(n^2)$$

$$\Theta(n^c)$$

$$\Theta\left(n^{\sqrt{n} \log_2 n}\right) \text{ (graph isomorphism)}$$

$$\Theta\left(e^{c(\log n)^{1/3}(\log \log n)^{2/3}}\right) \text{ (number field sieve)}$$

exponential $\Theta(1.1^n)$

$$\Theta(2^n)$$

$$\Theta(e^n)$$

$$\Theta(n!)$$

$$\Theta(n^n)$$

Sequences

Arithmetic sequence:

$$\sum_{i=0}^{n-1} (a + di) = na + \frac{dn(n-1)}{2} \in \Theta(n^2).$$

Geometric sequence:

$$\sum_{i=0}^{n-1} ar^i = \begin{cases} a \frac{r^n - 1}{r - 1} \in \Theta(r^n) & \text{if } r > 1 \\ na \in \Theta(n) & \text{if } r = 1 \\ a \frac{1 - r^n}{1 - r} \in \Theta(1) & \text{if } 0 < r < 1. \end{cases}$$

Sequences (cont.)

Arithmetic-geometric sequence:

$$\sum_{i=0}^{n-1} (a + di)r^i = \frac{a}{1-r} - \frac{(a + (n-1)d)r^n}{1-r} + \frac{dr(1-r^{n-1})}{(1-r)^2}$$

provided that $r \neq 1$.

Harmonic sequence:

$$H_n = \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{i} \in \Theta(\log n)$$

More precisely, it is possible to prove that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} (H_n - \ln n) = \gamma,$$

where $\gamma \approx 0.57721$ is **Euler's constant**.

Logarithm Formulae

$$\textcircled{1} \log_b xy = \log_b x + \log_b y$$

$$\textcircled{2} \log_b x/y = \log_b x - \log_b y$$

$$\textcircled{3} \log_b 1/x = -\log_b x$$

$$\textcircled{4} \log_b x^y = y \log_b x$$

$$\textcircled{5} \log_b a = \frac{1}{\log_a b}$$

$$\textcircled{6} \log_b a = \frac{\log_c a}{\log_c b}$$

$$\textcircled{7} a^{\log_b c} = c^{\log_b a}$$

Miscellaneous Formulae

$$n! \in \Theta(n^{n+1/2}e^{-n})$$

$$\log n! \in \Theta(n \log n)$$

Another useful formula is

$$\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{i^2} = \frac{\pi^2}{6},$$

which implies that

$$\sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{i^2} \in \Theta(1).$$

A sum of powers of integers when $c \geq 1$:

$$\sum_{i=1}^n i^c \in \Theta(n^{c+1}).$$

Two General Strategies for Loop Analysis

Sometimes a O -bound is sufficient. However, we often want a precise Θ -bound. Two general strategies are as follows:

- Use Θ -bounds **throughout the analysis** and thereby obtain a Θ -bound for the complexity of the algorithm.
- Prove a O -bound and a **matching** Ω -bound **separately** to get a Θ -bound. Sometimes this technique is easier because arguments for O -bounds may use simpler upper bounds (and arguments for Ω -bounds may use simpler lower bounds) than arguments for Θ -bounds do.

Techniques for Loop Analysis

Identify **elementary operations** that require constant time (denoted $\Theta(1)$ time).

The complexity of a loop is expressed as the **sum** of the complexities of each iteration of the loop.

Analyze independent loops **separately**, and then **add** the results: use “maximum rules” and simplify whenever possible.

If loops are nested, start with the **innermost loop** and proceed outwards. In general, this kind of analysis requires evaluation of **nested summations**.

Elementary Operations in the Unit Cost Model

For now, we will work in the **unit cost model**, where we assume that arithmetic operations such as $+$, $-$, \times and integer division take time $\Theta(1)$.

This is a reasonable assumption for integers of **bounded size** (e.g., integers that fit into one word of memory).

If we want to consider the complexity of arithmetic operation on integers of arbitrary size, we need to consider **bit complexity**, where we express the complexity as a function of the length of the integers (as measured in bits).

We will see some examples later, such as **multiprecision multiplication**.

Example of Loop Analysis

Algorithm: *LoopAnalysis1*($n : integer$)

```

(1)  $sum \leftarrow 0$ 
(2) for  $i \leftarrow 1$  to  $n$ 
    do { for  $j \leftarrow 1$  to  $i$ 
        do {  $sum \leftarrow sum + (i - j)^2$ 
             $sum \leftarrow \lfloor sum/i \rfloor$ 
        }
    }
(3) return ( $sum$ )
  
```

Θ -bound analysis

(1)	$\Theta(1)$
(2)	Complexity of inner for loop: $\Theta(i)$ Complexity of outer for loop: $\sum_{i=1}^n \Theta(i) = \Theta(n^2)$
(3)	$\Theta(1)$
<hr/>	
total	$\Theta(1) + \Theta(n^2) + \Theta(1) = \Theta(n^2)$

Example of Loop Analysis (cont.)

Proving separate O - and Ω -bounds

We focus on the two nested **for** loops (i.e., (2)).

The total number of iterations is $\sum_{i=1}^n i$, with $\Theta(1)$ time per iteration.

Upper bound:

$$\sum_{i=1}^n O(i) \leq \sum_{i=1}^n O(n) = O(n^2).$$

Lower bound:

$$\sum_{i=1}^n \Omega(i) \geq \sum_{i=n/2}^n \Omega(i) \geq \sum_{i=n/2}^n \Omega(n/2) = \Omega(n^2/4) = \Omega(n^2).$$

Since the upper and lower bounds **match**, the complexity is $\Theta(n^2)$.

Another Example of Loop Analysis

Algorithm: *LoopAnalysis2*($A : \text{array}; n : \text{integer}$)

$max \leftarrow 0$

for $i \leftarrow 1$ **to** n

do $\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{for } j \leftarrow i \text{ to } n \\ \text{do } \left\{ \begin{array}{l} sum \leftarrow 0 \\ \text{for } k \leftarrow i \text{ to } j \\ \text{do } \left\{ \begin{array}{l} sum \leftarrow sum + A[k] \\ \text{if } sum > max \\ \text{then } max \leftarrow sum \end{array} \right. \end{array} \right. \end{array} \right.$

return (max)

Another Example of Loop Analysis (cont.)

Θ -bound analysis The innermost loop (**for** k) has complexity $\Theta(j - i + 1)$.
The next loop (**for** j) has complexity

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{j=i}^n \Theta(j - i + 1) &= \Theta \left(\sum_{j=i}^n (j - i + 1) \right) \\ &= \Theta(1 + 2 + \cdots + (n - i + 1)) \\ &= \Theta((n - i + 1)(n - i + 2)).\end{aligned}$$

The outer loop (**for** i) has complexity

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{i=1}^n \Theta((n - i + 1)(n - i + 2)) &= \Theta \left(\sum_{i=1}^n (n - i + 1)(n - i + 2) \right) \\ &= \Theta(1 \times 2 + 2 \times 3 + \cdots + n(n + 1)) \\ &= \Theta(n^3/3 + n^2 + 2n/3) \quad \text{from Maple} \\ &= \Theta(n^3).\end{aligned}$$

Another Example of Loop Analysis (cont.)

Proving an Ω -bound

Consider two loop structures:

L_1	L_2
$i = 1, \dots, n/3$	$i = 1, \dots, n$
$j = 1 + 2n/3, \dots, n$	$j = i + 1 \dots, n$
$k = 1 + n/3, \dots, 1 + 2n/3$	$k = i \dots, j$

It is easy to see that $L_1 \subset L_2$. L_2 is loop structure of the given algorithm.

There are $(n/3)^3 = n^3/27$ iterations in L_1 and n^3 iterations in L_3 .

Therefore the number of iterations in L_2 is $\Omega(n^3)$.

Yet Another Example of Loop Analysis

Algorithm: *LoopAnalysis3*($n : integer$)

$sum \leftarrow 0$

for $i \leftarrow 1$ **to** n

do $\left\{ \begin{array}{l} j \leftarrow i \\ \textbf{while } j \geq 1 \\ \quad \textbf{do } \left\{ \begin{array}{l} sum \leftarrow sum + i/j \\ j \leftarrow \lfloor \frac{j}{2} \rfloor \end{array} \right. \end{array} \right.$

return (sum)