

# Experiment 3: Matrix Multiplication (Traditional vs Strassen)

---

## Problem Statement

Implement **Traditional Matrix Multiplication** and **Strassen’s Algorithm** using the divide-and-conquer technique.  
Compare their **time complexity, space complexity, and efficiency**.

---

## Theory

### ◇ Traditional Matrix Multiplication

- Follows the definition of matrix multiplication.
  - For each element **(i, j)** in result matrix **C**, compute:  
$$C[i][j] = \sum_{k=1}^n A[i][k] \times B[k][j]$$
  - Requires **n³ multiplications**.
  - Works for all **n × n** matrices.
  - Simple but slow for large **n**.
- 

### ◇ Strassen’s Algorithm

- A **Divide and Conquer** algorithm.
  - Splits each matrix into 4 sub-matrices (of size **n/2 × n/2**).
  - Instead of 8 multiplications, it cleverly reduces them to **7 multiplications + extra additions/subtractions**.
  - Reduces the time complexity from **O(n³) → O(n².81)**.
  - Works only for **square matrices of size 2^k × 2^k**.
- 

## Code Files

- **traditional.cpp** → Implementation of Traditional Matrix Multiplication.
  - **strassen.cpp** → Implementation of Strassen’s Algorithm.
- 

## Time & Space Complexity

Algorithm	Time Complexity	Space Complexity	Notes
Traditional	O(n³)	O(1)	Works for all <b>n × n</b> matrices

---

Algorithm	Time Complexity	Space Complexity	Notes
Strassen	$O(n^{2.81})$	$O(n^2)$ (extra space for sub-matrices)	Works best for large matrices, requires $n = 2^k$

## Pros and Cons

### ☒ Traditional Method

#### Pros

- Simple and easy to implement.
- Works for all matrix sizes (no restrictions).
- Low memory usage.

#### Cons

- Slow for large  $n$  (cubic time complexity).

### ☒ Strassen’s Method

#### Pros

- Faster asymptotically ( $O(n^{2.81})$  vs  $O(n^3)$ ).
- Demonstrates the power of divide-and-conquer.
- Useful for **very large matrices**.

#### Cons

- Only works efficiently for  $2^k \times 2^k$  matrices (needs padding otherwise).
- More complex to implement.
- Requires extra memory for sub-matrices.
- For small matrices, overhead may make it **slower than traditional**.

## Conclusion

- For **small matrices**, the **Traditional method** is more practical.
- For **large matrices**, **Strassen’s Algorithm** is asymptotically faster but requires extra space.
- Strassen’s algorithm is a classic example of how **divide-and-conquer reduces complexity** at the cost of implementation difficulty and memory usage.