

## Chapter 2 - Analysis of Algorithm Efficiency

- time complexity: how fast an algorithm runs, with input size  $n$   
space complexity: how much space an algorithm requires

$$T(n) \approx c_{op} C(n)$$

$T(n)$ : running time of algorithm

$c_{op}$ : unit time to execute one instruction (clock speed)

$C(n)$ : # of times/steps the **basic operation** is executed (a line of code operated most # of times)

- time complexity focuses on the **order of growth**, not multiplicative constants

order of growth in *increasing* order:

$\log n$ ,  $\sqrt{n}$ ,  $n$ ,  $n \log n$ ,  $n^2$ ,  $n^3$ ,  $2^n$ ,  $n!$

$2^n$  and  $n!$  are referred to as “exponential-growth functions”, only practical for small  $n$ .

- examples of large  $n$  (and basically uncomputable result):
  - $2^n$ : wheat-chessboard problem
  - $n!$ : travel salesman problem (TSP)

- $C_{\text{worst}}(n)$  is an input for which the algorithm runs the *longest* among all possible inputs of size  $n$ .  
 $C_{\text{best}}(n)$  is an input for which the algorithm runs the *fastest* among all possible inputs of size  $n$ .  
 $C_{\text{average}}(n)$  tells an algorithm’s behavior on a typical / random input of size  $n$ .
- Example: Sequential Search

**Algorithm** *SequentialSearch*( $A$ ,  $K$ ):

// Input: Array  $A$  with size  $n$ , search key  $K$

// Output: Index of the first element of  $A$  that matches  $K$ . or -1 if not found

$i = 0$

while  $i < n$ :

    if  $A[i] == K$ :

        return  $i$

$i += 1$

return -1

$C_{\text{worst}}(n) = n$                       if  $K$  is not in the array or target is the last item of array

$C_{\text{best}}(n) = 1$                       if  $K$  is the first element of the array

Suppose the probability that  $K$  is in the array is  $p$ , the probability that  $K$  is at each location  $i$  is  $\frac{p}{n}$  and the probability that  $K$  is not in array is  $(1-p)$ . Then:

$C_{\text{average}} =$  time when  $K$  is in array + time when  $K$  is not in array

$$\begin{aligned} C_{\text{average}} &= [1 \cdot \frac{p}{n} + 2 \cdot \frac{p}{n} + 3 \cdot \frac{p}{n} + \dots + n \cdot \frac{p}{n}] + n \cdot (1-p) \\ &= \frac{p}{n} \cdot (1 + 2 + 3 + \dots + n) + n \cdot (1-p) = \frac{(1+n) \cdot n}{2} \cdot \frac{p}{n} + n \cdot (1-p) = \frac{np+p}{2} + n - np \end{aligned}$$

when  $p = 1$  ( $K$  is in array),  $C_{\text{average}}(n) = \frac{n+1}{2}$ ; when  $p = 0$  ( $K$  is not in array),  $C_{\text{average}}(n) = n$

- $O$  defines the *upper* bound complexity of an algorithm.  $n \in O(n^2)$ 
  - >  $O(g(n))$  contains the set of functions with a smaller/same order of growth of  $g(n)$
  - >  $O(g(n)) \leq g(n)$

$\Omega$  defines the *lower* bound complexity of an algorithm.  $n \in \Omega(1)$

- >  $\Omega(g(n))$  contains the set of functions with a higher/same order of growth of  $g(n)$
- >  $\Omega(g(n)) \geq g(n)$

$\Theta$  defines the *exact* complexity of an algorithm.  $n \in \Theta(n)$

- >  $\Theta(g(n))$  contains the set of functions with a same order of growth of  $g(n)$
- >  $\Theta(g(n)) = g(n)$

- If  $t(n) \in O(g(n))$ , then, there exists some positive constant  $c$  and same non-negative integer  $n_0$  such that  $t(n) \leq c \cdot g(n)$  for all  $n \geq n_0$

If  $t(n) \in \Omega(g(n))$ , then, there exists some positive constant  $c$  and same non-negative integer  $n_0$  such that  $t(n) \geq c \cdot g(n)$  for all  $n \geq n_0$

If  $t(n) \in \Theta(g(n))$ , then, there exists some positive constant  $c_1$  and  $c_2$  and same non-negative int  $n_0$  such that  $c_1 \cdot g(n) \leq t(n) \leq c_2 \cdot g(n)$  for all  $n \geq n_0$  (prove both  $t(n) \in O(g(n))$  and  $t(n) \in \Omega(g(n))$ )

- \* If  $t_1(n) \in O(g_1(n))$  and  $t_2(n) \in O(g_2(n))$ , then  $t_1(n) + t_2(n) \in O(\max\{g_1(n), g_2(n)\})$  **TRUE**  
- proof:

Since  $t_1(n) \in O(g_1(n))$ , there exist some positive constant  $c_1$  and some non-negative integer  $n_1$  such that

$$t_1(n) \leq c_1 g_1(n) \quad \text{for all } n \geq n_1.$$

Similarly, since  $t_2(n) \in O(g_2(n))$ ,

$$t_2(n) \leq c_2 g_2(n) \quad \text{for all } n \geq n_2.$$

Let us denote  $c_3 = \max\{c_1, c_2\}$  and consider  $n \geq \max\{n_1, n_2\}$  so that we can use both inequalities. Adding them yields the following:

$$\begin{aligned} t_1(n) + t_2(n) &\leq c_1 g_1(n) + c_2 g_2(n) \\ &\leq c_3 g_1(n) + c_3 g_2(n) = c_3 [g_1(n) + g_2(n)] \\ &\leq c_3 2 \max\{g_1(n), g_2(n)\}. \end{aligned}$$

Hence,  $t_1(n) + t_2(n) \in O(\max\{g_1(n), g_2(n)\})$ , with the constants  $c$  and  $n_0$  required by the  $O$  definition being  $2c_3 = 2 \max\{c_1, c_2\}$  and  $\max\{n_1, n_2\}$ , respectively. ■

- \* If  $t_1(n) \in O(g_1(n))$  and  $t_2(n) \in O(g_2(n))$ , then  $t_1(n) + t_2(n) \in O(\min\{g_1(n), g_2(n)\})$  **FALSE**  
- counter example:

$n \in O(n), n^2 \in O(n^2); n + n^2 \in O(n^2)$  not  $\min(n, n^2)$  which is  $n$ .

**\* If  $t_1(n) \in \Omega(g_1(n))$  and  $t_2(n) \in \Omega(g_2(n))$ , then  $t_1(n) + t_2(n) \in \Omega(\min\{g_1(n), g_2(n)\})$  TRUE**

- proof:

Since  $t_1(n) \in \Omega(g_1(n))$ , there exist some positive constant  $c_1$  and some nonnegative integer  $n_1$  such that  $t_1(n) \geq c_1 g_1(n)$  for all  $n \geq n_1$ .

Since  $t_2(n) \in \Omega(g_2(n))$ , there exist some positive constant  $c_2$  and some nonnegative integer  $n_2$  such that  $t_2(n) \geq c_2 g_2(n)$  for all  $n \geq n_2$ .

a) Let us denote  $c = c_1 + c_2$  and consider  $n \geq n_0 = \max\{n_1, n_2\}$  so that we can use both inequalities. Adding the two inequalities above yields the following:

$$\begin{aligned} t_1(n) + t_2(n) &\geq c_1 g_1(n) + c_2 g_2(n) \\ &\geq c_1 \min\{g_1(n), g_2(n)\} + c_2 \min\{g_1(n), g_2(n)\} \\ &= (c_1 + c_2) \min\{g_1(n), g_2(n)\} \\ &\geq c \min\{g_1(n), g_2(n)\}. \end{aligned}$$

Hence  $t_1(n) + t_2(n) \in \Omega(\min\{g_1(n), g_2(n)\})$ , with the constants  $c$  and  $n_0$  required by the  $\Omega$  definition being  $c_1 + c_2$  and  $\max\{n_1, n_2\}$ , respectively.

**\* If  $t_1(n) \in \Omega(g_1(n))$  and  $t_2(n) \in \Omega(g_2(n))$ , then  $t_1(n) + t_2(n) \in \Omega(\max\{g_1(n), g_2(n)\})$  TRUE**

- proof:

b) Let us denote  $c = \min\{c_1, c_2\}$  and consider  $n \geq n_0 = \max\{n_1, n_2\}$  so that we can use both inequalities. Adding the two inequalities above yields the following:

$$\begin{aligned} t_1(n) + t_2(n) &\geq c_1 g_1(n) + c_2 g_2(n) \\ &\geq c g_1(n) + c g_2(n) \\ &= c[g_1(n) + g_2(n)] \\ &\geq c \max\{g_1(n), g_2(n)\}. \end{aligned}$$

Hence  $t_1(n) + t_2(n) \in \Omega(\max\{g_1(n), g_2(n)\})$ , with the constants  $c$  and  $n_0$  required by the  $\Omega$  definition being  $\min\{c_1, c_2\}$  and  $\max\{n_1, n_2\}$ , respectively.

**\* If  $t_1(n) \in \Theta(g_1(n))$  and  $t_2(n) \in \Theta(g_2(n))$ , then  $t_1(n) + t_2(n) \in \Theta(\max\{g_1(n), g_2(n)\})$  TRUE**

- proof:

Since both  $O$  and  $\Omega$  are proved above,  $\Theta$  holds as well.

**\* If  $t_1(n) \in \Theta(g_1(n))$  and  $t_2(n) \in \Theta(g_2(n))$ , then  $t_1(n) + t_2(n) \in \Theta(\min\{g_1(n), g_2(n)\})$  FALSE**

- counter example:

$n \in \Theta(n)$ ,  $n^2 \in \Theta(n^2)$ ;  $n + n^2 \in \Theta(n^2)$  not  $\min(n, n^2)$  which is  $n$ .

- To compare order of growth, use division:

- $n^2$  is faster than  $n$ , because  $n^2/n = n$
- $n!$  is faster than  $(n-1)!$ , because  $n!/(n-1)! = n$
- $2^n$  is the same as  $2^{n-1}$ , because  $2^n/2^{n-1} = 2$  (constant)
- $3^n$  is faster than  $2^n$ , because  $3^n/2^n = 1.5^n$
- $\log_2^2 n$  is faster than  $\log_2 n^2$ , because  $\log_2^2 n = \log_2 n \cdot \log_2 n$ , while  $\log_2 n^2 = 2 \log_2 n$

- Mathematical analysis of **non-recursive** algorithms

**Algorithm** *MaxElement*( $A[0...n-1]$ ):

```

maxval = A[0]
for i from [1,n-1]:
    if A[i]>maxval: # basic operation
        maxval = A[i]
return maxval

```

$$C(n) = \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} 1 = 1 + 1 + 1 + \dots + 1 = n - 1 \in \Theta(n)$$

**Algorithm** *UniqueElement*( $A[0...n-1]$ ):

```

for i from [0,n-2]:
    for j from [i+1,n-1]:
        if A[i]==A[j]:
            return False
return True

```

$$C_{\text{worst}}(n) = \sum_{i=0}^{n-2} \sum_{j=i+1}^{n-1} 1 = (n-1) + (n-2) + (n-3) + \dots + 1 = \frac{n(n-1)}{2} \in \Theta(n^2)$$

**Algorithm** *Binary*( $n$ ):

*#find the number of binary digits in n*

```

count = 1
while n>1: # basic operation, operated for log2(n) times
    count += 1
    n //= 2
return count

```

- Mathematical analysis of **recursive** algorithms

**Algorithm** *Factorial*( $n$ ):

```

if n==0: return 1
return F(n-1)*n

```

**Initial:**  $M(0) = 0$

**Recurrent:**  $M(n) = M(n-1)+1$  for  $n>0$

$$M(n) = M(n-1) + 1, M(n-1) = M(n-2) + 1, M(n-2) = M(n-3) + 1 \dots$$

$$M(n) = M(n-1) + 1 = (M(n-2) + 1) + 1 = M(n-2) + 2 = M(n-3) + 3 = \dots = M(n-i) + i$$

Then, let  $i = n$ ,

$$M(n) = M(n-n) + n = M(0) + n = 0+n = n$$

**Algorithm** *TowerofHanoi(n)*:

- 1- move all disk except for last disk to col2
- 2- move last disk to col3
- 3- move all disk except for last disk on top of last disk in col3

**Initial:**  $M(1) = 1$  (only have 1 disk, takes 1 move to move it to another col)

**Recurrent:**  $M(n) = M(n-1) + 1 + M(n-1)$  (move blob to col2, move big disk to col3, move blob to col3)

$$M(n) = 2M(n-1) + 1, M(n-1) = 2M(n-2) + 1, M(n-2) = 2M(n-3) + 1 \dots$$

$$M(n) = 2M(n-1) + 1 = 2(2M(n-2) + 1) + 1 = 4M(n-2) + 2 = 4(2M(n-3) + 1) + 2 = 8M(n-3) + 1 + 2 + 4 \dots$$

$$M(n) = 2^i M(n-i) + 1 + 2 + 4 + \dots + 2^{i-1}$$

Then, let  $i = n-1$ ,

$$M(n) = 1 + 2 + 4 + \dots + 2^{n-1} = \frac{2^n - 1}{2 - 1} = 2^n - 1 \in \Theta(2^n)$$

**Algorithm** *BinRec(n)*:

#find the number of binary digits in  $n$

if  $n==1$ :

return 1

return  $\text{BinRec}(n/2)+1$

**Initial:**  $A(1) = 0$

**Recurrent:**  $A(n) = A(n/2)+1$  for  $n>1$

Let's assume that  $n = 2^k$ , so we have:

**Initial:**  $A(2^0) = 0$

**Recurrent:**  $A(2^k) = A(2^{k-1})+1$  for  $n>1$

$$A(2^k) = A(2^{k-1})+1, A(2^{k-1}) = A(2^{k-2})+1, A(2^{k-2}) = A(2^{k-3})+1 \dots$$

$$A(2^k) = A(2^{k-1}) + 1 = A(2^{k-2}) + 2 = A(2^{k-3}) + 3 = A(2^{k-i}) + i$$

Then, let  $i = k$ ,

$$A(2^k) = A(2^{k-k}) + k = 0 + k = \log_2 n \in \Theta(\log n)$$