

Data Structures

Asymptotic Complexity 4

Mostafa S. Ibrahim

Teaching, Training and Coaching since more than a decade!

Artificial Intelligence & Computer Vision Researcher

PhD from Simon Fraser University - Canada

Bachelor / Msc from Cairo University - Egypt

Ex-(Software Engineer / ICPC World Finalist)



Worst-Case Analysis

- Sometimes, the total number of steps in a function $f()$ can vary **significantly** based on the input
- $O()$ is intended to be an **upper bound**.
- In other words; focusing on the **worst case**
 - That is why we find the **largest term**, C , and use it
 - This is perfect most of the time
 - But it can be **misleading**

Average-Case Analysis

- This type computes the expected order.
- It involves **probability** and considers **different cases**
 - It is usually harder to analyze
- Sometimes we need it because the $O()$ is actually much bigger than the actual performance
 - An example for that is *Quick sort algorithm*
- There is also the **best-case analysis**, but this is less useful
 - Imagine an algorithm that may do $O(n)$ or $O(n^3)$ depending on the conditions
 - Its best case is $O(n)$

Amortized Analysis



- What is the time complexity of append?
- It depends on how Python is implemented behind the scenes
- Let's assume **CPython**

```
def f1(n):          #  $O(n)$   
    lst = []  
    for i in range(n):  
        lst.append([i]) #  $O(1)$   
  
def f2(n):          #  $O(n)$   
    lst = [0] * n  
    for i in range(n):  
        lst[i] = i
```

Amortized Analysis

- What is time complexity of that append function with the capacity trick?
 - Seems for some N steps, we have $O(1)$
 - Then suddenly we do $O(N)$ steps **for a single append**
 - And so on
 - Most of the steps are fast, and single step will be slow - and this pattern repeats
 - If you think from the average perspective, this means after N steps, we have $O(N)$ in total
 - This is what we call amortized analysis
 - Let's avoid more details beyond that
- Take home message
 - Consider this thinking when operations vary
 - C/C++ helps you understand the complexity/design in more detail
 - It is important to know the time complexity of built-in data-structures

List

Operation	Average Case	 Amortized Worst Case
Copy	$O(n)$	$O(n)$
Append[1]	$O(1)$	$O(1)$
Pop last	$O(1)$	$O(1)$
Pop intermediate[2]	$O(n)$	$O(n)$
Insert	$O(n)$	$O(n)$
Get Item	$O(1)$	$O(1)$
Set Item	$O(1)$	$O(1)$
Delete Item	$O(n)$	$O(n)$
Iteration	$O(n)$	$O(n)$
Get Slice	$O(k)$	$O(k)$
Del Slice	$O(n)$	$O(n)$
Set Slice	$O(k+n)$	$O(k+n)$
Extend[1]	$O(k)$	$O(k)$
 Sort	$O(n \log n)$	$O(n \log n)$
Multiply	$O(nk)$	$O(nk)$
x in s	$O(n)$	
min(s), max(s)	$O(n)$	
Get Length	$O(1)$	$O(1)$

collections.deque

- [Copied from wiki](#)
- A deque (**double-ended queue**) is represented internally as a doubly linked list.
 - Well, a list of arrays rather than objects, for greater efficiency.
- Both ends are accessible, but even *looking at* the middle is slow, and adding to or removing from the middle is slower still.

Operation	Average Case	Amortized Worst Case
Copy	$O(n)$	$O(n)$
append	$O(1)$	$O(1)$
appendleft	$O(1)$	$O(1)$
pop	$O(1)$	$O(1)$
popleft	$O(1)$	$O(1)$
extend	$O(k)$	$O(k)$
extendleft	$O(k)$	$O(k)$
rotate	$O(k)$	$O(k)$
remove	$O(n)$	$O(n)$

Set

Operation	Average case	Worst Case	notes
$x \text{ in } s$	$O(1)$	$O(n)$	
Union $s t$	$O(\text{len}(s)+\text{len}(t))$		
Intersection $s \& t$	$O(\min(\text{len}(s), \text{len}(t)))$	$O(\text{len}(s) * \text{len}(t))$	replace "min" with "max" if t is not a set
Multiple intersection $s1 \& s2 \& \dots \& s_n$		$(n-1) * O(l)$ where l is $\max(\text{len}(s1), \dots, \text{len}(s_n))$	
Difference $s - t$	$O(\text{len}(s))$		
$s.\text{difference_update}(t)$	$O(\text{len}(t))$		
Symmetric Difference $s \wedge t$	$O(\text{len}(s))$	$O(\text{len}(s) * \text{len}(t))$	
$s.\text{symmetric_difference_update}(t)$	$O(\text{len}(t))$	$O(\text{len}(t) * \text{len}(s))$	

Dict

Operation	Average case	Worst Case	notes
x in s	$O(1)$	$O(n)$	
Union s t	$O(\text{len}(s) + \text{len}(t))$		
Intersection s&t	$O(\min(\text{len}(s), \text{len}(t)))$	$O(\text{len}(s) * \text{len}(t))$	replace "min" with "max" if t is not a set
Multiple intersection s1&s2&...&sn		$(n-1) * O(l)$ where l is $\max(\text{len}(s1), \dots, \text{len}(sn))$	
Difference s-t	$O(\text{len}(s))$		
s.difference_update(t)	$O(\text{len}(t))$		
Symmetric Difference s^t	$O(\text{len}(s))$	$O(\text{len}(s) * \text{len}(t))$	
s.symmetric_difference_update(t)	$O(\text{len}(t))$	$O(\text{len}(t) * \text{len}(s))$	

Don't worry

- During the course, we will study how to implement hash tables (used for set/dict) and linked lists (used for deque)
- Then you will easily realize the reason for these time complexities
- For the list, you have to think in terms of arrays (fixed)
 - For example, to delete an element we can either:
 - 1) Create a new array and copy the old data, which is $O(n)$
 - 2) Or shift to the right all the elements after the deleted element
 - [1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9]. Delete 6. Shift right [7, 8, 9]
 - It's still $O(n)$, $O(n)$ but more efficient
 - The same logic for insert
 - Shift the subarray left (if the subarray is selected specifically) then add the value $\Rightarrow O(n)$

Tip

- Python order confuses beginners, as many things happens behind the scenes
- Do your best to guess how something is implemented
- If number in list:
 - `print('found')`
- This looks like an uncomplicated piece of code, but behind the scenes, Python will loop through the whole list
 - Which is $O(n)$
- C++/Java programmers are not tricked, as they see all of the operations

“Acquire knowledge and impart it to the people.”

“Seek knowledge from the Cradle to the Grave.”