

(c) If  $f(n)$  denotes the number  $k$  of binary digits in  $n$ , then it follows from the above formulas for  $k$  that  $f(n) = O(\log n)$ . Also notice that the same relation holds if  $f(n)$  denotes the number of base- $b$  digits, where  $b$  is any fixed base. On the other hand, suppose that the base  $b$  is not kept fixed but is allowed to increase, and we let  $f(n, b)$  denote the number of base- $b$  digits. Then we would want to use the relation  $f(n, b) = O(\frac{\log n}{\log b})$ .

(d) We have:  $\text{Time}(n \cdot m) = O(\log n \cdot \log m)$ , where the left hand side means the number of bit operations required to multiply  $n$  by  $m$ .

(e) In Exercise 6, we can write:  $\text{Time}(n!) = O((n \log n)^2)$ .

(f) In Exercise 7, we have:

$$\text{Time}\left(\sum a_i x^i \cdot \sum b_j x^j\right) = O\left(n_1 n_2 ((\log m)^2 + \log(\min(n_1, n_2)))\right).$$

In our use, the functions  $f(n)$  or  $f(n_1, n_2, \dots, n_r)$  will often stand for the amount of time it takes to perform an arithmetic task with the integer  $n$  or with the set of integers  $n_1, n_2, \dots, n_r$  as input. We will want to obtain fairly simple-looking functions  $g(n)$  as our bounds. When we do this, however, we do not want to obtain functions  $g(n)$  which are much larger than necessary, since that would give an exaggerated impression of how long the task will take (although, from a strictly mathematical point of view, it is not incorrect to replace  $g(n)$  by any larger function in the relation  $f = O(g)$ ).

Roughly speaking, the relation  $f(n) = O(n^d)$  tells us that the function  $f$  increases approximately like the  $d$ -th power of the variable. For example, if  $d = 3$ , then it tells us that doubling  $n$  has the effect of increasing  $f$  by about a factor of 8. The relation  $f(n) = O(\log^d n)$  (we write  $\log^d n$  to mean  $(\log n)^d$ ) tells us that the function increases approximately like the  $d$ -th power of the number of binary digits in  $n$ . That is because, up to a constant multiple, the number of bits is approximately  $\log n$  (namely, it is within 1 of being  $\log n / \log 2 = 1.4427 \log n$ ). Thus, for example, if  $f(n) = O(\log^3 n)$ , then doubling the number of bits in  $n$  (which is, of course, a much more drastic increase in the size of  $n$  than merely doubling  $n$ ) has the effect of increasing  $f$  by about a factor of 8.

Note that to write  $f(n) = O(1)$  means that the function  $f$  is bounded by some constant.

**Remark.** We have seen that, if we want to multiply two numbers of about the same size, we can use the estimate  $\text{Time}(k\text{-bit} \cdot k\text{-bit}) = O(k^2)$ . It should be noted that much work has been done on increasing the speed of multiplying two  $k$ -bit integers when  $k$  is large. Using clever techniques of multiplication that are much more complicated than the grade-school method we have been using, mathematicians have been able to find a procedure for multiplying two  $k$ -bit integers that requires only  $O(k \log k \log \log k)$  bit operations. This is better than  $O(k^2)$ , and even better than  $O(k^{1+\epsilon})$  for any  $\epsilon > 0$ , no matter how small. However, in what follows we shall always