

1

In worst case, the big-O complexity of merge sort is  $O(n\log(n))$ . It divides the array into two temporary arrays and repeats this process until all temporary arrays only contain one item. This dividing process takes  $\log(n)$  steps. When it merges two temporary arrays in the same level, it needs  $n$  steps to compare the items in these two arrays and put them in sorted order. It has  $\log(n)$  levels, with each level taking  $n$  steps. So the worst-case complexity is  $O(n\log(n))$ .

In best case, the big-O complexity of is  $O(n\log(n))$ . Even if the array is sorted, the dividing process is as same as the worst case and it takes  $\log(n)$  steps. When it merges two temporary arrays originally in sorted order, it needs less running time, roughly  $n/2$  steps. Therefore, the complexity is also  $O(\log(n))$ .

2

In worst case, the big-O complexity of iterative merge sort is  $O(n\log(n))$ . It is obvious that the running time of the outer for loop is  $\log(n)$  because index  $m$  doubles in each iteration until it gets to the size of array. And the inner for loop runs  $n/m$  times, in each iteration the running time of `merge()` is  $2m$ . Therefore, the inner loop takes  $n$  steps and the O complexity is  $O(n\log(n))$ .

In best case, the big-O complexity of iterative merge sort is  $O(n\log(n))$ . Similarly, the running time of the outer for loop is  $\log(n)$ . And the running time of the inner for loop is  $n/2m$ . If the array is sorted, the running time of `merge()` is  $m$  because it only needs to compare all the items in one array with those in the other array. So the inner loop takes  $n/2$  steps and the complexity is still  $O(n\log(n))$ .