

BBM 205 Discrete Mathematics
Hacettepe University

Lecture 12a: Computational Complexity

Lale Özkahya

Resources:

Kenneth Rosen, “Discrete Mathematics and App.”
<http://www.cs.cmu.edu/~15251/schedule.html>

Poll

What is the running time of this algorithm?
Choose the tightest bound.

```
def twoFingers(s):  
    lo = 0  
    hi = len(s)-1  
    while (lo < hi):  
        if (s[lo] != 0 or s[hi] != 1):  
            return False  
        lo += 1  
        hi -= 1  
    return True
```

$O(1)$

$O(\log n)$

$O(n^{1/2})$

$O(n)$

$O(n \log n)$

$O(n^2)$

$O(n^3)$

$O(2^n)$

What have we done so far?

What will we do next?

What have we done so far?

- > Introduction to the course

“Computer science is no more about computers than astronomy is about telescopes.”

- > Strings and Encodings

- > Formalization of computation/algorithm

Deterministic Finite Automata

Turing Machines

What have we done so far?

> The study of computation

Computability/Decidability

- Most problems are **undecidable**.
- Some very interesting problems are **undecidable**.

But many interesting problems are **decidable**!

What is next?

> The study of computation

Computability/Decidability



Computational Complexity (*Practical Computability*)

- How do we define computational complexity?
- What is the right level of abstraction to use?
- How do we analyze complexity?
- What are some interesting problems to study?
- What can we do to better understand the complexity of problems?

⋮

Why is computational complexity important?

Why is computational complexity important?

complexity ~ practical computability

Simulations (e.g. of physical or biological systems)

- tremendous applications in science, engineering, medicine,...

Optimization problems

- arise in essentially every industry

Social good

- finding efficient ways of helping others

Artificial intelligence

list goes on

Security, privacy, cryptography

- applications of computationally hard problems

·
·
·

Why is computational complexity important?

[ABOUT](#)[PROGRAMS](#)[MILLENNIUM PROBLEMS](#)[PEOPLE](#)[PUBLICATIONS](#)[EUCLID](#)[EVENTS](#)

Millennium Problems

Yang-Mills and Mass Gap

Experiment and computer simulations suggest the existence of a "mass gap" in the solution to the quantum versions of the Yang-Mills equations. But no proof of this property is known.

Riemann Hypothesis

The prime number theorem determines the average distribution of the primes. The Riemann hypothesis tells us about the deviation from the average. Formulated in Riemann's 1859 paper, it asserts that all the 'non-obvious' zeros of the zeta function are complex numbers with real part $1/2$.

P vs NP Problem

It is easy to check that a solution to a problem is correct, is it also easy to solve the problem? This is the essence of the P vs NP question. Typical of the NP problems is that of the Hamiltonian Path Problem: given N cities to visit, how can one do this without visiting a city twice? If you give me a solution, I can easily check that it is correct. But I cannot so easily find a solution.

Navier-Stokes Equation

This is the equation which governs the flow of fluids such as water and air. However, there is no proof for the most basic questions one can ask: do solutions exist, and are they unique? Why ask for a proof? Because a proof gives not only certitude, but also understanding.

Hodge Conjecture

The answer to this conjecture determines how much of the topology of the solution set of a system of algebraic equations can be defined in terms of further algebraic equations. The Hodge conjecture is known in certain special cases, e.g., when the solution set has dimension less than four. But in dimension four it is unknown.

Poincaré Conjecture

In 1904 the French mathematician Henri Poincaré asked if the three dimensional sphere is characterized as the unique simply connected three manifold. This question, the Poincaré conjecture, was a special case of Thurston's geometrization conjecture. Perelman's proof tells us that every three manifold is built from a set of standard pieces, each with one of eight well-understood geometries.

Birch and Swinnerton-Dyer Conjecture

Supported by much experimental evidence, this conjecture relates the number of points on an elliptic curve mod p to the rank of the group of rational points. Elliptic curves, defined by cubic equations in two variables, are fundamental mathematical objects that arise in many areas: Wiles' proof of the Fermat Conjecture, factorization of numbers into primes, and cryptography, to name three.




1 million dollar question

(or maybe 6 million dollar question)

Goals for this week

Goals for the week

1. What is the right way to study complexity?

- 
- using the right language and level of abstraction
 - upper bounds vs lower bounds
 - polynomial time vs exponential time

2. Appreciating the power of algorithms.

- analyzing some cool (recursive) algorithms

What is the right **language** and **level of abstraction** for studying computational complexity?

What is the meaning of:

“The (asymptotic) complexity of algorithm A is $O(n^2)$.”

We have to be careful



Size matters

Value matters

Model matters

Size matters



sorting bazillion numbers \gg sorting 2 numbers.

Running time of an algorithm depends on **input length**.

$$n = \text{input length/size}$$

n is usually: # bits in a binary encoding of input.
sometimes: explicitly defined to be something else.



GREAT IDEA # 1

Running time of an algorithm is a function of **n**.

(But what is **n** going to be mapped to?)

We have to be careful

Size matters



Value matters

Model matters

Value matters

Not all inputs are created equal!

Among all inputs of length n :

- some might take 2 steps
- some might take bazillion steps.



GREAT IDEA # 2

Running time of an algorithm is a worst-case function of **n**.

n \mapsto # steps taken by the worst input
of length **n**

Value matters

Why worst-case?

We are not dogmatic about it.

- Can study “average-case” (random inputs)

- Can try to look at “typical” instances.

- Can do “smoothed analysis”.

...

BUT worst-case analysis has its advantages:

- An ironclad guarantee.
- Hard to define “typical” instances.
- Random instances are often not representative.
- Often much easier to analyze.

We have to be careful

Size matters



Value matters



Model matters

Model matters

TM, C, Python, JAVA, CA all equivalent:

With respect to *decidability*, model does not matter.

The same is not true with respect to *complexity*!

Model matters

$$L = \{0^k 1^k : k \geq 0\}$$

How many steps required to decide L ?

Facts:

$O(n \log n)$ is the best for 1-tape TMs.

$O(n)$ is the best for 2-tape TMs.

Model matters

$$L = \{0^k 1^k : k \geq 0\}$$

A function in Python:

of steps

```
def twoFingers(s):
```

```
    lo = 0 .....
```

```
    hi = len(s)-1 .....
```

```
    while (lo < hi): .....
```

```
        if (s[lo] != 0 or s[hi] != 1): .....
```

```
            return False .....
```

```
        lo += 1 .....
```

```
        hi -= 1 .....
```

```
    return True .....
```

3? 4? 5?

Seems like
 $O(n)$

Model matters


$$L = \{0^k 1^k : k \geq 0\}$$

hi -= 1

Initially **hi** = $n-1$

How many bits to store **hi** ? $\sim \log_2 n$

If $n-1$ is a power of 2:

 **hi** = 1 0 0 0 0 0 ... 0
hi = 0 1 1 1 1 1 ... 1 $\sim \log_2 n$ steps

Model matters

$$L = \{0^k 1^k : k \geq 0\}$$

A function in Python:

of steps

```
def twoFingers(s):
```

```
    lo = 0 .....
```

```
    hi = len(s)-1 .....
```

```
    while (lo < hi): .....
```

```
        if (s[lo] != 0 or s[hi] != 1): .....
```

```
            return False .....
```

```
        lo += 1 .....
```

```
        hi -= 1 .....
```

```
    return True .....
```

3? 4? 5?

log n ?

$O(n \log n)$?

Model matters

$$L = \{0^k 1^k : k \geq 0\}$$

if ($s[\text{lo}] \neq 0$ **or** $s[\text{hi}] \neq 1$):

Initially $\text{lo} = 0$, $\text{hi} = n-1$

Does it take n steps to go from $s[0]$ to $s[n-1]$?

Model matters

$$L = \{0^k 1^k : k \geq 0\}$$

A function in Python:

of steps

```
def twoFingers(s):
```

```
    lo = 0 .....
```

```
    hi = len(s)-1 .....
```

```
    while (lo < hi): .....
```

```
        if (s[lo] != 0 or s[hi] != 1): .....
```

```
            return False .....
```

```
        lo += 1 .....
```

```
        hi -= 1 .....
```

```
    return True .....
```

n ??

log n ?

$O(n^2)$?



GREAT IDEA # 3

Computational model does matter for running time.

Model matters



Which model is the best model?

No such thing.

- Be clear about what the model is!
- Be clear about what constitutes a step in the model.



GREAT IDEA # 4

All reasonable deterministic models are polynomially equivalent.

Model matters

Which model does this correspond to ?

```
def twoFingers(s):
```

```
    lo = 0
```

```
    hi = len(s)-1
```

```
    while (lo < hi):
```

```
        if (s[lo] != 0 or s[hi] != 1):
```

```
            return False
```

```
        lo += 1
```

```
        hi -= 1
```

```
    return True
```

3? 4? 5?

$O(n)$

Model matters



The Random-Access Machine (RAM) model

Good combination of reality/simplicity.

+ , - , / , * , < , > , etc.

e.g. $245 * 12894$

takes 1 step

memory access

e.g. $A[94]$

takes 1 step

Actually:

Assume arithmetic operations take 1 step IF
numbers are bounded by $\text{poly}(n)$.

Unless specified otherwise, we use this model.
(more on this next lecture)

Putting great ideas # 1, # 2 and # 3 together

Defining running time



With a specific **computational model** in mind:

Definition:

The running time of an algorithm A is a **function**

$$T_A : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$$

defined by

$$T_A(n) = \max_{\substack{\text{instances } I \\ \text{of size } n}} \{\# \text{ steps } A \text{ takes on } I\}$$

worst-case

Write $T(n)$ when A is clear from context.

Need one more level of abstraction

There is a TM that decides PALINDROME in time

$$T(n) = \frac{1}{2}n^2 + \frac{3}{2}n + 1.$$

Analogous to
“too many significant digits”.



Need one more level of abstraction

Comparing running times of two different algorithms:

$$T_A(n) = \frac{1}{2}n^2 + \frac{3}{2}n + 1$$

$$T_B(n) = \frac{1}{4}n^2 + 100n^{1.5} + 1000n - 42$$

Which one is better?



GREAT IDEA/ABSTRACTION # 5

The CS way to compare functions:

$$O(\cdot)$$

$$\Omega(\cdot)$$

$$\Theta(\cdot)$$

$$\leq$$

$$\geq$$

$$=$$

Big O

Our notation for \leq when comparing functions.

The right level of abstraction!

“Sweet spot”

- coarse enough to suppress details like *programming language, compiler, architecture,...*
- sharp enough to make comparisons between different *algorithmic approaches*.

Big O



Informal: An upper bound that ignores **constant factors** and ignores **small n** .

For $f, g : \mathbb{N}^+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$

$f(n) = O(g(n))$ roughly means


$f(n) \leq g(n)$ up to a constant factor
and ignoring small **n** .

Big O



Formal Definition:


For $f, g : \mathbb{N}^+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$, we say $f(n) = O(g(n))$ if there exist constants $C, n_0 > 0$ such that for all $n \geq n_0$, we have $f(n) \leq Cg(n)$.
(C and n_0 cannot depend on n .)



Big O

$$f(n) = 3n^2 + 10n + 30$$

$$g(n) = n^2$$



Big O

Note on notation:

People usually write: $4n^2 + 2n = O(n^2)$

Another valid notation: $4n^2 + 2n \in O(n^2)$

Big O

Common Big O classes and their names

Constant: $O(1)$

Logarithmic: $O(\log n)$

Square-root: $O(\sqrt{n}) = O(n^{0.5})$

Linear: $O(n)$

Loglinear: $O(n \log n)$

Quadratic: $O(n^2)$

Polynomial: $O(n^k)$ (for some constant $k > 0$)

Exponential: $O(2^{n^k})$ (for some constant $k > 0$)

n vs log n

How much smaller is $\log n$ compared to n ?

n	log n
2	1
8	3
128	7
1024	10
1,048,576	20
1,073,741,824	30
1,152,921,504,606,846,976	60

~ 1 quintillion

n vs 2^n

How much smaller is n compared to 2^n ?

2^n	n
2	1
8	3
128	7
1024	10
1,048,576	20
1,073,741,824	30
1,152,921,504,606,846,976	60

Exponential running time

If your algorithm has exponential running time
e.g. $\sim 2^n$



No hope of being practical.

Some exotic functions

1

n

2^n

$\log^* n$

$n \log n$

3^n

$\log \log n$

n^2

$n!$

$\log n$

n^3

n^n


\sqrt{n}

$n^{O(1)}$

2^{2^n}

$n / \log n$

$n^{\log n}$

$2^{2^{2^{\cdot^{\cdot^{\cdot^2}}}}}$


n times

Big Omega



$O(\cdot)$ is like \leq

$\Omega(\cdot)$ is like \geq

$O(\cdot)$

Informal: An upper bound that ignores **constant factors** and ignores **small n**.

$\Omega(\cdot)$

Informal: A lower bound that ignores **constant factors** and ignores **small n**.

$$f(n) = \Omega(g(n)) \iff g(n) = O(f(n))$$

Big Omega




Formal Definition:

For $f, g : \mathbb{N}^+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$, we say $f(n) = \Omega(g(n))$ if there exist constants $c, n_0 > 0$ such that

for all $n \geq n_0$, we have $f(n) \geq cg(n)$.

(c and n_0 cannot depend on n .)



Big Omega

Some Examples:

$$10^{-10}n^4 \text{ is } \Omega(n^3)$$

$$0.001n^2 - 10^{10}n - 10^{30} \text{ is } \Omega(n^2)$$

$$n^{0.0001} \text{ is } \Omega(\log n)$$

Theta

$O(\cdot)$ is like \leq

$\Omega(\cdot)$ is like \geq

$\Theta(\cdot)$ is like $=$

Theta



Formal Definition:

For $f, g : \mathbb{N}^+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$, we say $f(n) = \Theta(g(n))$ if
 $f(n) = O(g(n))$ and $f(n) = \Omega(g(n))$.

Equivalently:

There exist constants c, C, n_0 such that
for all $n \geq n_0$, we have $cg(n) \leq f(n) \leq Cg(n)$.

Theta

Some Examples:

$0.001n^2 - 10^{10}n - 10^{30}$ is $\Theta(n^2)$

$1000n$ is $\Theta(n)$

$0.00001n$ is $\Theta(n)$

Putting everything together

Now we really understand what this means:

“The (asymptotic) complexity of algorithm A is $O(n^2)$.”
(which means $T_A(n) = O(n^2)$.)


Make sure you are specifying:

- **the computational model**
 - > what constitutes a *step* in the model
- **the length of the input**

Goals for the week

1. What is the right way to study complexity?

- using the right language and level of abstraction



- upper bounds vs lower bounds

- polynomial time vs exponential time

2. Appreciating the power of algorithms.

- analyzing some cool (recursive) algorithms

Upper bounds vs lower bounds

GREAT IDEA # 6

Intrinsic complexity of a problem
(upper bounds vs lower bounds)


Intrinsic complexity of a problem



The **intrinsic complexity** of a computational problem:

Asymptotic complexity of the most efficient algorithm solving it.

Intrinsic complexity



Intrinsic complexity



If you give an algorithm that solves a problem

→ upper bound on the intrinsic complexity

How do you show a lower bound on intrinsic complexity?

Argue against all possible algorithms that solves the problem.

The dream: Get a matching upper and lower bound.
i.e., nail down the intrinsic complexity.

Example

$$L = \{0^k 1^k : k \geq 0\}$$

```
def twoFingers(s):  
    lo = 0  
    hi = len(s)-1  
    while (lo < hi):  
        if (s[lo] != 0 or s[hi] != 1):  
            return False  
        lo += 1  
        hi -= 1  
    return True
```

In the RAM model:

$$O(n)$$

Could there be
a faster algorithm?

e.g. $O(n/\log n)$

Example



$$L = \{0^k 1^k : k \geq 0\}$$

Fact: Any algorithm that decides L must use $\geq n$ steps.

Proof: Proof is by contradiction.

Suppose there is an algorithm **A** that decides L in $< n$ steps.

Consider the input $I = 0^k 1^k$ (I is a YES instance)

When **A** runs on input I , there must be some index j such that **A** never reads $I[j]$.

Let I' be the same as I , but with j 'th coordinate reversed.
(I' is a NO instance)

When **A** runs on I' , it has the same behavior as it does on I .

But then **A** cannot be a decider for L . *Contradiction.* \square

Example

This shows the intrinsic complexity of L is $\Omega(n)$.


But we also know the intrinsic complexity of L is $O(n)$.

The dream achieved. Intrinsic complexity is $\Theta(n)$.



Goals for the week

1. What is the right way to study complexity?

- using the right language and level of abstraction
- upper bounds vs lower bounds
-  - polynomial time vs exponential time

2. Appreciating the power of algorithms.

- analyzing some cool (recursive) algorithms

Polynomial time vs Exponential time



GREAT IDEA # 7

There is something magical about polynomial time.

What is efficient in theory and in practice ?

In practice:

$O(n)$ Awesome! Like really awesome!

$O(n \log n)$ Great!

$O(n^2)$ Kind of efficient.

$O(n^3)$ Barely efficient. (???)

$O(n^5)$ Would not call it efficient.

$O(n^{10})$ Definitely not efficient!

$O(n^{100})$ WTF?

What is efficient in theory and in practice ?

In theory:

Polynomial time

Efficient.

Otherwise

Not efficient.

What is efficient in theory and in practice ?

- Poly-time is not meant to mean “efficient in practice”.
- Poly-time: extraordinarily better than brute force search.
- Poly-time: mathematical insight into problem's structure.
- Robust to notion of what is an *elementary step*, *what model we use*, *reasonable encoding of input*, *implementation details*.
- Nice closure property: Plug in a poly-time alg. into another poly-time alg. \rightarrow poly-time

What is efficient in theory and in practice ?

Brute-Force Algorithm: Exponential time

*what we care
about most
in 15-251*

*usually the “magic”
happens here*



Algorithmic Breakthrough: Polynomial time

*what we care
about more
in 15-451*



Blood, sweat, and tears: Linear time

What is efficient in theory and in practice ?

Summary: Poly-time vs not poly-time
is a qualitative difference, not a quantitative one.