# **Algorithms and Data Structures**

# **Big O Properties & Examples of Big O**

X X



#### **Learning goals**

- Properties of Big O
- Know how to determine the runtime
- Complexity classes

### **PROPERTIES**

Be  $f, g, h, f_i, g_i: X \to \mathbb{R}, c \geq 0$ .

- **1** Constants:  $f \in \mathcal{O}(cq)$  is equivalent to  $f \in \mathcal{O}(q)$ . In particular: *f*  $\in$   $\mathcal{O}(c)$  is equivalent to *f*  $\in$   $\mathcal{O}(1)$  (Constant runtime)
- **2** Transitivity: If  $f \in \mathcal{O}(g)$  and  $g \in \mathcal{O}(h)$  then  $f \in \mathcal{O}(h)$
- **3** Products:  $f_1 \in \mathcal{O}(g_1)$  and  $f_2 \in \mathcal{O}(g_2) \Rightarrow f_1 f_2 \in \mathcal{O}(g_1 g_2)$
- **4** Sums:  $f_1 \in \mathcal{O}(g_1)$  and  $f_2 \in \mathcal{O}(g_2) \Rightarrow f_1 + f_2 \in \mathcal{O}(|g_1| + |g_2|)$

### **PROPERTIES / 2**

Particularly important for determining the runtime of an algorithm:

- If a function is the sum of several functions, the fastest growing function determines the order of the sum of functions.
- **•** If *f* is a product of several factors, constants can be neglected.

#### **Example 1:**

The complexity of the function  $f(n) = n \log n + 3 \cdot n^3$  can be determined quickly: the fastest growing function is 3 · *n* 3 , multiplicative constants can be neglected. So

$$
f(n)\in\mathcal{O}(n^3)
$$

### **OTHER EXAMPLES**

**Example 2:**

$$
f(n) = 10 \log(n) + 5(\log(n))^3 + 7n + 3n^2 + 6n^3
$$

- The fastest growing summand is 6*n* 3
- Constants can be neglected
- $\Rightarrow$  *f*(*n*)  $\in$  *O*(*n*<sup>3</sup>)

#### **Example 3:**

$$
g(n) = n^2 \cdot \exp(n)
$$

$$
\bullet\Rightarrow g(n)\in\mathcal{O}(n^2\cdot\exp(n))
$$

X X X

How fast a function runs depends on the different statements that are executed.

 $total\_time = time(s \text{tatement}_1) + time(s \text{tatement}_2) + ... + time(s \text{tatement}_k)$ 

If each statement is a simple base operation, the time for each statement is constant and the total runtime is also constant:  $\mathcal{O}(1)$ . ( X

#### **If-else**

```
if (cond) {
 block1 # sequence of statements
} else {
  block2 # sequence of statements
}
```
- Either block1 **or** block2 is executed
- The worst case is the slower one of the two options:

max(*time*(*block*1), *time*(*block*2))

X  $\times$   $\times$ 

### **Loops**

```
for (i in 1:n) {
  block # sequence of statements
}
```
- We consider *n* as part of our input size (e.g., number of elements in a list).
- The loop is executed *n* times.
- $\bullet$  If we assume that the statements are  $\mathcal{O}(1)$ , then the total runtime is:  $n \cdot \mathcal{O}(1) = \mathcal{O}(n)$ .

**XX** 

#### **Nested loops**

```
for (i in 1:n) {
  for (j in 1:m) {
    block # sequence of statements
  }
}
```


- Let *m*, *n* be part of our input size (e.g. number of rows/columns of a matrix).
- The outer loop is executed *n* times.
- At each iteration of *i* the inner loop is executed *m* times.
- Thus the statements are executed *n* · *m* times in total and the complexity is O(*n* · *m*).

#### **Statements with function calls**

- When a statement calls a function, the complexity of the function must be included in the calculation.
- This also holds for loops:

```
for (i in 1:n) {
  g(i)
}
```

```
If g \in \mathcal{O}(n), the runtime of the loop is \mathcal{O}(n^2).
```
X X X

**Example 4:** Bubble sort algorithm

The bubble sort is an algorithm that sorts the elements of a (numeric) vector of length *n* in ascending order.

```
for (k \in n:2) {
  for (i \text{ in } 1: (k - 1)) {
    if (x[i] > x[i + 1]) {
      # swap elements
       s = x[i]x[i] = x[i + 1]x[i + 1] = s}
  }
}
```


<http://teerexie.blogspot.com/>

X  $\times$   $\times$ 

- The inner loop depends on the outer loop and is executed  $i = n - 1$ , then  $i = n - 2$ , ... and finally  $i = 1$  times.
- According to the sum of natural numbers (Carl Friedrich Gauss) the inner loop is executed  $\sum_{i=1}^{n-1} i = \frac{(n-1)n}{2} = \frac{n^2-n}{2}$  $\frac{-n}{2}$  times.
- The operations in the if statement are operations with constant runtime.

The total runtime is therefore

$$
\frac{n^2-n}{2}\cdot \mathcal{O}(1)=\mathcal{O}\left(\frac{n^2-n}{2}\right)=\mathcal{O}(n^2)
$$

**Example 5:** The multiplication of two matrices  $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$ ,  $\mathbf{B} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times p}$ has a runtime of O(*mpn*):

- $\bullet$  *m*  $\cdot$  *p* scalar products
- For each scalar product: *n* multiplications and *n* − 1 additions
- $\bullet \rightarrow m \cdot p \cdot (n + (n 1))$  operations



[https://commons.wikimedia.org/wiki/File:](https://commons.wikimedia.org/wiki/File:Matrix_multiplication_diagram_2.svg)

[Matrix\\_multiplication\\_diagram\\_2.svg](https://commons.wikimedia.org/wiki/File:Matrix_multiplication_diagram_2.svg)

 $\overline{\mathbf{C}}$ 

The Coppersmith-Winograd algorithm allows matrix multiplication of two  $n \times n$  matrices in  $\mathcal{O}(n^{2.373})$ . A lower bound for the complexity of the matrix multiplication is  $n^2$ , since each of the  $n^2$  elements of the output matrix must be generated.

 $\times$   $\times$ 

More about [Computational complexity of mathematical operations](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Computational_complexity_of_mathematical_operations)

```
multiplyMatrices = function(n) {
 A = matrix(runit(n^2), n, n)B = matrix(runit(n^2), n, n)return(A %*% B)
```
X X X



}

If possible: Avoid matrix multiplication!

```
n = 1000A = matrix(runit(n), n, n)B = matrix(runit(n), n, n)y = c(runit(n))
```

```
system.time(A %*% B %*% y)
## user system elapsed
## 0.72 0.00 0.73
```

```
system.time(A \frac{9}{2} \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{2## user system elapsed
## 0.00 0.00 0.03
```
 $\times$   $\times$ 

```
n = 1000A = matrix(rnorm(n), n, n) + diag(1, nrow = n)b = rnorm(n)
```

```
# solving Ax = b
system.time(solve(A) \frac{9}{2} *\frac{9}{2} b) # A^{-1} \frac{9}{2} *\frac{9}{2} b
## user system elapsed
## 0.96 0.01 0.05
```

```
system.time(solve(A, b)) # direct solution of the LES
## user system elapsed
## 0.0 0.2 0.0
```
DХ  $\times\overline{\times}$ 

### **Example 6:**

In mathematics one is interested in the estimation of error terms for approximations.

Using Taylor's theorem a *m*-times differentiable function *f* at point  $x = x_0$  can be defined as follows:

$$
f(x) = f(x_0) + \frac{f'(x_0)}{1!}(x - x_0) + \frac{f'(x_0)}{2!}(x - x_0)^2 + ... + \frac{f^{(m)}(x_0)}{m!}(x - x_0)^m
$$
  
+  $\mathcal{O}(|x - x_0|^{m+1}), \quad x \to x_0.$ 

- $\bullet$  The more *x* approaches  $x_0$ , the better the Taylor polynomial approximates *f* at point *x*.
- The higher the order *m* of the Taylor polynomial, the better the approximation for  $x \to x_0$ .

X X

For example, consider the exponential function as **Taylor series**

$$
\exp(x) = \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \frac{x^i}{i!}
$$

 $\exp(x)$  approximated at the point  $x = 0$ 

$$
exp(x) = 1 + x + \frac{x^2}{2!} + \mathcal{O}(x^3)
$$
 for  $x \to 0$ 

In this way, it becomes clear that the error does not become greater than  $M \cdot x^3$  when *x* approaches 0.



#### **Example 7:**

The complexity of the **binary search** is visualized by a tree representation.



x x

For an array of length *n*, the search tree has a height of log<sub>2</sub>(n). After a maximum of  $\log_2(n)$  comparisons, the searched element is found. The complexity of the binary search is O(log *n*).

### **Example 8:**

The **Fibonacci sequence** is a series of numbers where each number is the sum of the two preceding ones, starting with 1. The sequence thus begins as: 1, 1, 2, 3, 5, 8, 13, 21, 34, ...

```
fib = function(n) {
  if (n \leq 2L)return(1L)
  return(fib(n - 2) + fib(n - 1))}
```

```
fib_table = microbenchmark(fib(5), fib(10), fib(20), fib(21), times = 500L)
print(xtable(summary(fib_table), digits = 0), booktabs=TRUE,
    caption.placement="top", size="\\fontsize{8pt}{9pt}\\selectfont")
```


 $\times$   $\times$ 

*Fibonacci*( $n$ )  $\in$   $\mathcal{O}(2^n)$  (exponential runtime)

**Informal proof:**

Fibonacci(n) = Fibonacci(n - 1) + Fibonacci(n - 2)  

$$
\underbrace{\qquad \qquad \text{Fibonacci}(n - 2)}_{\text{T}(n-2)}
$$

This results in a runtime of  $T(n) = T(n-1) + T(n-2) + O(1)$  for  $n > 1$ .

The function is executed twice in each step.

$$
T(n) = T(n-1) + T(n-2)
$$
  
=  $T(n-2) + T(n-3) + T(n-3) + T(n-4) = ...$ 







By simply "counting" the nodes of this recursion tree you can determine the exact number of operations.

 $\rightarrow$  Worst case runtime  $\mathcal{O}(2^n)$ .

**Variations of Fibonacci(n): Iterative**

```
fib2 = function(n) {
  a = 0; b = 1if (n \leq 2)return(1)
  for (i in seq_len(n-1L)) {
    tmp = b; b = a + b; a = tmp}
  return(b)
}
```
This is  $\mathcal{O}(n)$  (if we, incorrectly, assume addition is constant in n).

X  $\times\overline{\times}$ 

fib2\_table = microbenchmark(fib2(10), fib2(20), fib2(40), fib2(80),  $fib2(160)$ , times =  $5000L$ )

```
print(xtable(summary(fib2_table), digits = 0), booktabs=TRUE,
    caption.placement="top", size="\\fontsize{8pt}{9pt}\\selectfont")
```


Time measurement becomes imprecise since "for loops" are not that slow in R due to JIT compilation. Hence we are using doubles here as a lazy trick to generate large fibonacci numbers. An alternative to generate large integers would be to use the int64 package.

 $\times$   $\times$ 

**Variations of Fibonacci(n): In** C

```
library(inline)
fib3 = cfunction(signature(n="integer"), language="C",
         convention=".Call", body = 'int nn = INTEGR(n)[0];SEXP res;
         PROTECT(res = allocVector(INTSXP, 1));
         INTEGER(res)[0] = 1;
         int a = 0; int b = 1;
         for (int i=0; i <nn-1; i++) {
         int tmp = b:
         b = a + b;
         a = \text{tmp};
         }
         INTEGR(res)[0] = b;
         UNPROTECT(1);
         return res;
         ')
```
X  $\overline{\mathbf{x}\ \mathbf{x}}$ 

See how ugly the C interface is?

fib3\_table = microbenchmark(fib3(20L), fib3(40L),times = 5000L)

print(xtable(summary(fib3\_table), digits = 0), booktabs=TRUE, caption.placement="top", size="\\fontsize{8pt}{9pt}\\selectfont")



This is both  $\mathcal{O}(n)$  ... See the difference? Actually, you do not see anything as the function is so fast, we would need to calculate with bigints to really see the  $\mathcal{O}(n)!$   $\times$   $\times$ 

**Variations of Fibonacci(n):** C++**-version**

```
library(Rcpp)
fib4 = cppFunction('int fibonacci(const int x) {
         if (x \leq 2) return(1);
         return (fibonacci(x - 1)) + fibonacci(x - 2);
}
'
```
 $\times$   $\times$ 

Much nicer C++-Interface with Rcpp.

**Variations of Fibonacci(n): Matrix power-exponentiation**

```
library(expm)
fib5 = function(n) {
  A = matrix(c(1, 1, 1, 0), 2, 2)B = A\% \hat{m}B[1, 2]
}
```
 $\overline{\mathsf{x}}$  $\overline{x}$ 

How does **fib5()** work?

$$
\mathbf{A} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \quad \mathbf{A}^2 = \begin{pmatrix} 2 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \quad \mathbf{A}^3 = \begin{pmatrix} 3 & 2 \\ 2 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \quad \mathbf{A}^4 = \begin{pmatrix} 5 & 3 \\ 3 & 2 \end{pmatrix}
$$

$$
\mathbf{A}^5 = \begin{pmatrix} 8 & 5 \\ 5 & 3 \end{pmatrix} \quad \mathbf{A}^6 = \begin{pmatrix} 13 & 8 \\ 8 & 5 \end{pmatrix} \quad \mathbf{A}^7 = \begin{pmatrix} 21 & 13 \\ 13 & 8 \end{pmatrix} \quad \dots
$$

#### **Matrix power-exponentiation**

What does A %<sup>2</sup>% n do? Computes the n-th power of a matrix corresponding to  $n-1$  matrix multiplications ( $A^n$ only computes element wise powers). The algorithm uses  $\mathcal{O}(log_2(k))$  matrix multiplications.

**Exponentiation by squaring:**

$$
x^n = \begin{cases} x(x^2)^{\frac{n-1}{2}} & \text{if n is odd} \\ (x^2)^{\frac{n}{2}} & \text{if n is even} \end{cases}
$$

$$
\begin{array}{c}\n\circ \\
\times \\
\hline\n\circ \\
\hline\n\circ \\
\hline\n\circ\n\end{array}
$$

#### **Exponentiation by squaring**

Implemented as a recursive algorithm:

```
exp.by.squaring = function(x, n) {
  if(n<0) {
    return(exp.by.squaring(1 / x, -n))
  \} else if(n==0){
    return(1)
  } else if(n==1){
    return(x)
  } else if(n%%2 == 0){
    return(exp.by.squaring(x^2, n/2))
  } else {
    return(x * exp. by. squaring(x^2, (n-1)/2))
  }
}
exp.by.squaring(2,5)
## [1] 32
```
X  $\times\overline{\times}$ 

**Example 9:** The **Traveling Salesman Problem** (TSP) is the problem of planning a route through all locations in such a way that

- The entire route is as short as possible.
- $\bullet$  The first location is equal to the last location.



X X

Left: Route through places in Germany

([https://de.wikipedia.org/wiki/Problem\\_des\\_Handlungsreisenden](https://de.wikipedia.org/wiki/Problem_des_Handlungsreisenden)) Right: Weighted graph (<https://www.chegg.com/>)

Exact algorithms with long runtime exist

- Brute force search (Calculate lengths of all possible round trips and choose shortest): O(*n*!)
- Dynamic Programming (Held-Karp algorithm):  $\mathcal{O}(n^22^n)$

and heuristic algorithms with shorter runtime, which do not guarantee an optimal solution, e.g.

Nearest-Neighbor heuristics:  $\mathcal{O}(n^2)$ 

The TSP problem is **NP-complete**.

 $\times$   $\times$ 

### **COMPLEXITY CLASSES**

In theoretical computer science, problems are divided into complexity classes. For an input size *n* a distinction is made between

- **P**: Problems solvable in polynomial runtime ( $\mathcal{O}(n^k)$ ,  $k \geq 1$ )
- **NP** (**N**on-deterministic **P**olynomial time): Problems from **P** and problems that cannot be solved in polynomial time; NP problems can only be solved with a non-deterministic turing machine in an acceptable time (hence the name)
- **NP-complete**: All problems from NP can be traced back to this problem

It has not yet been proven that  $P \neq NP$  holds.