



|  |  |  |            |   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|--|--|--|------------|---|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
|  | There is no particular relationship between the two concepts   |  |            |   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Best Case, Worst Case and Expected Case actually describe the big O or big Theta time for particular scenarios whereas these asymptotic notations describe the upper, lower and tight bounds for the runtime |  |            |   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |            |   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | <b>Space complexity</b>  |  |            |   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Memory or space required by an algorithm   | to create an array - if it is unidimensional, $O(N)$ space complexity; for a 2-D array, $O(N^2)$                               |            |   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Stack space in recursive calls counts too. Each call adds a level to the stack and takes up actual memory.   | However, just because you have $N$ calls does not mean it will take $O(N)$ time: check the example on Page 41 for more details |            |   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |            |   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | <b>Drop the constants</b>  |  |            |   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | $O(2N)$ is actually $O(N)$   |  |            |   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |            |   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | <b>Drop the non-dominant terms</b>   |  |            |   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | $O(N^2 + N)$ becomes $O(N^2)$  |  |            |   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | $O(N + \log N)$ becomes $O(N)$   |  |            |   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | $O(5 \cdot 2^N + 1000N^{100})$ becomes $O(2^N)$  |  |            |   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | $O(x!) > O(2^x) > O(x^2) > O(x \log x) \dots > O(x)$   |  |            |   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |            |   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | <b>Multi-Parts algorithms: add versus multiply</b>   |  |            |   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Add:   | Non-nested chunk of work A and B   | $O(A + B)$ | "DO THIS THEN WHEN YOU ARE ALL DONE, DO THAT" |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |





|  |            |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|--|------------|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
|  | Example 10 | O(root(N)) as the for loop does constant time and runs in O(root(N)) time  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Example 11 | O(N) as the recursive process calls from N to N-1 to N-2 and so on until 1   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Example 12 | <b>Approach 1:</b> We make a tree for an example string say 'abcd' and we see that we brand 4 times at the root , then 3 times, then 2 times, and then 1 time. this gives us 4*3*2*1 leaf nodes. We could say n! leaf nodes for n length string. So, total nodes would be n * n! as each leaf node is attached to a path with n nodes. Also, string concatenation will also take O(n) time. Thus, the final time complexity in worst case would be O(n * n * n!) =. O((n + 2) !)   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |            | <b>Approach 2:</b> At level 6, we have 6! / 0! nodes; at level 5 we have 6! / 1! nodes; at level 4 we have 6!/2! nodes...at level 0, we have 6!/6! nodes. so, the total nodes in the tree in terms of n can be : n!(1/0! + 1/1! + 1/2! + 1/3! ....+ 1/n!). Now, the term in the bracket can be defined in terms of Euler's number: n! * e whose value is around 2.718. The constant e can be dropped further. Thus, the time complexity would be O(n! * n) where n is due to permutation; thus, time complexity: O((n+1)!) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Example 13 | We have to use the earlier pattern for recursive calls: O (branches^depth) = O(2^N).   | We can also get tighter runtime as O(1.6^N) if we consider that there might be just one call instead of 2 at the bottom of call stack sometimes. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Example 14 | From previous example, we deduce that fib(n) taken 2^nn time. And, we have fib(1) + fib(2) + fib(3) + ....fib(n) = 2^1 + 2^2 + 2^3 .....+2^nn = 2^(n+1) - 2, thus we can say that the run time is approx. 2^nn   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Example 15 | Now, here in this program we are doing memoization due to which the amount of work reduces to looking up fib(i - 1) and fib(i - 2) values in memo array at each call fib(i). Thus, we are doing a constant amount of work n times in n calls, hence time complexity: O(n)  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Example 16 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |