

and  $c_3n$ , respectively, then we know that the one with complexity  $c_3n$  will be faster than the one with complexity  $c_1n^2 + c_2n$  for sufficiently large  $n$ .

- For small values of  $n$ , either program could be faster (depending on  $c_1, c_2$  and  $c_3$ ).
- If  $c_1=1, c_2=2$  and  $c_3=100$ , then  $c_1n^2 + c_2n \leq c_3n$  for  $n \leq 98$  and  $c_1n^2 + c_2n > c_3n$  for  $n > 98$ . If  $c_1=1, c_2=2$  and  $c_3=1000$ , then  $c_1n^2 + c_2n \leq c_3n$  for  $n \leq 998$ .

• No matter what the values of  $c_1, c_2$  and  $c_3$ , there will be an  $n$  beyond which the program with complexity  $c_3n$  will be faster than the one with complexity  $c_1n^2 + c_2n$ .

Let,  $c_3n > c_1n^2 + c_2n \Rightarrow n(c_1n + c_2 - c_3) < 0$ . If  $n > 0$ ,  $c_1n + c_2 - c_3 < 0$

If  $n < 0$ ,  $c_1n + c_2 - c_3 > 0$ .  $\left[ n > \frac{c_3 - c_2}{c_1} \right] \rightarrow$  No upper bound on  $n$ .

$\left[ n < \frac{c_3 - c_2}{c_1} \right] \rightarrow$  no lower bound on  $n$

- This value of  $n$  will be called the break even point. If the break even point is 0 then the program with complexity  $c_3n$  is always faster (or at least as fast).
- The exact break event point cannot be determined analytically. The programs have to be run on a computer in order to determine the break event point. (This is a practical epistemological claim, not a mathematical impossibility claim)

**Defn:** [Big "oh"]  $f(n) = O(g(n))$  (read as "f of n is big oh of g of n") iff there exist positive constants  $c$  and  $n_0$  such that  $f(n) \leq cg(n)$  for all  $n, n \geq n_0$ .  $\square$

( $f, g$  are non-negative functions)

**Ex-1.15:**  $3n+2 = O(n)$  as  $3n+2 \leq 4n$  for all  $n \geq 2$ .  $3n+3 = O(n)$  as  $3n+3 \leq 4n$  for all  $n \geq 3$ .  $100n+6 \leq 101n$  for  $n \geq 10$ .  $10n^2+4n+2 = O(n^2)$  as  $10n^2+4n+2 \leq 11n^2$  for  $n \geq 5$ .  $1000n^2+100n-6 = O(n^2)$  as  $1000n^2+100n-6 \leq 1001n^2$  for  $n \geq 100$ .  $6*2^n + n^2 = O(2^n)$  as  $6*2^n + n^2 \leq 7*2^n$  for  $n \geq 4$ .

- The statement  $f(n) = O(g(n))$  only states that  $g(n)$  is an upper bound on  $f(n)$  for all  $n, n \geq n_0$ . It doesn't say anything about how good the bound is.  $n = O(n^2), n = O(n^{2.5}), n = O(n^3), n = O(2^n)$ . In order for the statement  $f(n) = O(g(n))$  to be informative,  $g(n)$  should be as small as a function of  $n$  one can come up with for which  $f(n) = O(g(n))$ .