

2. [5 points] *Understanding asymptotic notation*

An alternate definition of Ω , call it Ω^∞ , is defined as follows: $f(n) \in \Omega^\infty(g(n))$ if there exists $c > 0$ such that $f(n) \geq cg(n) \geq 0$ for infinitely many integers $n > 0$. If $f(n) \in \Omega^\infty(g(n))$ then you can't hope to show $f(n) \in O(h(n))$ for any $h(n)$ that grows more slowly than $g(n)$.

(a) Obviously $f(n) \in \Omega(g(n))$ implies $f(n) \in \Omega^\infty(g(n))$. Prove that the other direction is not true, i.e., prove that $f(n) \in \Omega^\infty(g(n))$ *does not imply* $f(n) \in \Omega(g(n))$.

(b) Prove that, for any two non-negative functions $f(n)$ and $g(n)$, either $f(n) \in O(g(n))$ or $f(n) \in \Omega^\infty(g(n))$ (or both) and that the same is not true if we replace Ω^∞ with Ω .

1 point for part (a), 3 points for the first part of (b), 1 points for the counterexample in part (b).

Answer:

- (a) If for some $c > 0$, $f(n) \in \Omega^\infty(g(n))$, then, $f(n) \geq cg(n) \geq 0$
This will hold true for infinite integer values of $n > 0$.

$$\text{Now, if } f(n) \in \Omega(g(n)) \implies f(n) \geq c_1 g(n), \quad c_1 > 0, n \geq n_0.$$

As above inequality holds true for values of $n \geq n_0$, and not all $n > 0$, it is a subset of Ω^∞ case.

Lets prove this with an example.

$$\text{Assume } f(n) = n, g(n) = \frac{n}{\lg n}$$

For this assumption, $f(n) \in \Omega^\infty(g(n))$ for many $n > 0$.

But $f(n) \notin \Omega(g(n))$ for values of $n < 2$.

Hence, $f(n) \in \Omega^\infty(g(n))$ *does not imply* $f(n) \in \Omega(g(n))$.

- (b) $f(n)$ and $g(n)$ are non-negative functions.
 $\therefore f(n) > 0, \quad , g(n) > 0$

Now, there will be some value of c and n_0 ,
for which, either

$$f(n) \geq c_1 g(n) \quad \text{will not grow slower} \quad (1)$$

$$\text{or } f(n) \leq c_1 g(n) \quad \text{will not grow faster} \quad (2)$$

$$\text{Hence, if (1), then } f(n) \in \Omega^\infty(g(n)) \quad (3)$$

$$\text{and if (2), then } f(n) \in O(g(n)) \quad (4)$$

In the rare case that $f(n) = cg(n)$, both (3) and (4) will hold true.

Now, for the same case, if we replace Ω^∞ with $\Omega()$, it does not hold true, as is proven by the example in (a).