

# CSE 250

## Data Structures

Dr. Eric Mikida

[epmikida@buffalo.edu](mailto:epmikida@buffalo.edu)

208 Capen Hall

**Runtime Analysis - Examples**

# Announcements

- PA1 is out, due on Sunday
  - Autolab will be up by tonight

# Recap of Runtime Complexity

## Big- $\Theta$

- Growth functions are in the **same** complexity class
- If  $f(n) \in \Theta(g(n))$  then an algorithm taking  $f(n)$  steps is as "exactly" as fast as one that takes  $g(n)$  steps.

## Big-O

- Growth functions in the **same or smaller** complexity class.
- If  $f(n) \in O(g(n))$ , then an algorithm that takes  $f(n)$  steps is *at least as fast* as one taking  $g(n)$  (but it may be even faster).

## Big- $\Omega$

- Growth functions in the **same or bigger** complexity class
- If  $f(n) \in \Omega(g(n))$ , then an algorithm that takes  $f(n)$  steps is *at least as slow* as one that takes  $g(n)$  steps (but it may be even slower)

# Recap of Runtime Complexity

## Big- $\Theta$ – Tight Bound

- Growth functions are in the **same** complexity class
- If  $f(n) \in \Theta(g(n))$  then an algorithm taking  $f(n)$  steps is as "exactly" as fast as one that takes  $g(n)$  steps.

## Big-O – Upper Bound

- Growth functions in the **same or smaller** complexity class.
- If  $f(n) \in O(g(n))$ , then an algorithm that takes  $f(n)$  steps is *at least as fast* as one taking  $g(n)$  (but it may be even faster).

## Big- $\Omega$ – Lower Bound

- Growth functions in the **same or bigger** complexity class
- If  $f(n) \in \Omega(g(n))$ , then an algorithm that takes  $f(n)$  steps is *at least as slow* as one that takes  $g(n)$  steps (but it may be even slower)

# Common Runtimes (in order of complexity)

**Constant Time:**  $\Theta(1)$

**Logarithmic Time:**  $\Theta(\log(n))$

**Linear Time:**  $\Theta(n)$

**Quadratic Time:**  $\Theta(n^2)$

**Polynomial Time:**  $\Theta(n^k)$  for some  $k > 0$

**Exponential Time:**  $\Theta(c^n)$  (for some  $c \geq 1$ )

# Common Runtimes (in order of complexity)

Constant Time:  $\Theta(1)$

$$T(n) = c$$

Logarithmic Time:  $\Theta(\log(n))$

$$T(n) = c \log(n)$$

Linear Time:  $\Theta(n)$

$$T(n) = c_1 n + c_0$$

Quadratic Time:  $\Theta(n^2)$

$$T(n) = c_2 n^2 + c_1 n^1 + c_0$$

Polynomial Time:  $\Theta(n^k)$  for some  $k > 0$

$$T(n) = c_k n^k + \dots + c_1 n + c_0$$

Exponential Time:  $\Theta(c^n)$  (for some  $c \geq 1$ )

$$T(n) = c^n$$

# Constants vs Asymptotics

Given the following pseudocode:

```
for (i ← 0 until n) { /* do work */ }
```

If the `/* do work */` portion of the code originally takes 10 steps...

But we optimize it to now take 7 steps...

Our total runtime goes from  $10n$  steps to  $7n$  steps: 30% faster!

...but still  $\Theta(n)$

# c and $n_0$

Compare the two runtimes:

$$T_1(n) = 100n$$

$$T_2(n) = n^2$$

- $100n \in O(n^2)$  ( $T_2$  is the slower runtime)
- ...but consider if  $c_{high} = 1, n_0 = 100$
- Until our input size reaches 100 or more,  $T_2$  is the **faster** runtime



# Takeaways

**Asymptotically slower runtimes *can* be better in real-world situations.**

- An algorithm with runtime  $T_2$  is better on small inputs
- An algorithm with runtime  $T_2$  might be easier to implement/maintain
- An algorithm with runtime  $T_1$  might not exist

# Takeaways

**Asymptotically slower runtimes *can* be better in real-world situations.**

- An algorithm with runtime  $T_2$  is better on small inputs
- An algorithm with runtime  $T_2$  might be easier to implement/maintain
- An algorithm with runtime  $T_1$  might not exist

*(sometimes this is provable...see CSE 331)*

# Takeaways

The important thing is learning the tools to *reason* about the different algorithms and *why* you might choose one over the other!

# Takeaways

The important thing is learning the tools to *reason* about the different algorithms and *why* you might choose one over the other!

**...But for this class, we can assume that if  $T_2(n)$  is in a bigger complexity class, then  $T_1(n)$  is better/faster/stronger.**

**Now some examples...**  
**...and common pitfalls**

# Bubble Sort

```
1 bubblesort(seq: Seq[Int]):  
2   n ← seq length  
3   for i ← n-2 to 0, by -1:  
4     for j ← i to n-1:  
5       if seq(j+1) < seq(j):  
6         swap seq(j) and seq(j+1)
```

What is the runtime complexity class for bubblesort?

# Bubble Sort

```
1 bubblesort(seq: Seq[Int]):  
2   n ← seq length  
3   for i ← n-2 to 0, by -1:  
4     for j ← i to n-1:  
5       if seq(j+1) < seq(j):  
6         swap seq(j) and seq(j+1)
```

What is the runtime complexity class for bubblesort?

How many steps does it take?

# Bubble Sort

```
1 bubblesort(seq: Seq[Int]):  
2   n ← seq length  
3   for i ← n-2 to 0, by -1:  
4     for j ← i to n-1:  
5       if seq(j+1) < seq(j):  
6         swap seq(j) and seq(j+1)
```

What is the runtime complexity class for bubblesort?

How times does it execute lines 5 and 6?



# Bubble Sort

```
1 bubblesort(seq: Seq[Int]):
```

```
2   n ← seq length
```

```
3   for i ← n-2 to 0, by -1:
```

```
4     for j ← i to n-1:
```

```
5       if seq(j+1) < seq(j):
```

```
6         swap seq(j) and seq(j+1)
```

This loop has 1 iteration when  $i = n-2$

...2 iterations when  $i = n-3$

...3 iterations when  $i = n-4$

...

n-1 iterations when  $i = 0$

What is the runtime complexity class for bubblesort?

How times does it execute lines 5 and 6?

# Bubble Sort

```
1 bubblesort(seq: Seq[Int]):
```

```
2   n ← seq length
```

```
3   for i ← n-2 to 0, by -1:
```

```
4     for j ← i to n-1:
```

```
5       if seq(j+1) < seq(j):
```

```
6         swap seq(j) and seq(j+1)
```

This loop has 1 iteration when  $i = n-2$

...2 iterations when  $i = n-3$

...3 iterations when  $i = n-4$

...

n-1 iterations when  $i = 0$

What is the runtime complexity class for bubblesort?

How times does it execute lines 5 and 6?  $1 + 2 + 3 + 4 + 5 \dots + n-1$

# Helpful Summation Rules

$$1. \sum_{i=j}^k c = (k - j + 1)c$$

$$2. \sum_{i=j}^k (cf(i)) = c \sum_{i=j}^k f(i)$$

$$3. \sum_{i=j}^k (f(i) + g(i)) = \left(\sum_{i=j}^k f(i)\right) + \left(\sum_{i=j}^k g(i)\right)$$

$$4. \sum_{i=j}^k (f(i)) = \left(\sum_{i=\ell}^k (f(i))\right) - \left(\sum_{i=\ell}^{j-1} (f(i))\right) \text{ (for any } \ell < j)$$

$$5. \sum_{i=j}^k f(i) = f(j) + f(j + 1) + \dots + f(k - 1) + f(k)$$

$$6. \sum_{i=j}^k f(i) = f(j) + \dots + f(\ell - 1) + \left(\sum_{i=\ell}^k f(i)\right) \text{ (for any } j < \ell \leq k)$$

$$7. \sum_{i=j}^k f(i) = \left(\sum_{i=j}^{\ell} f(i)\right) + f(\ell + 1) + \dots + f(k) \text{ (for any } j \leq \ell < k)$$

$$8. \sum_{i=1}^k i = \frac{k(k+1)}{2}$$

$$9. \sum_{i=0}^k 2^i = 2^{k+1} - 1$$

10.  $n! \leq c_s n^n$  is a tight upper bound (Sterling: Some constant  $c_s$  exists)

# Bubble Sort

```
1 bubblesort(seq: Seq[Int]):
```

```
2   n ← seq length
```

```
3   for i ← n-2 to 0, by -1:
```

```
4     for j ← i to n-1:
```

```
5       if seq(j+1) < seq(j):
```

```
6         swap seq(j) and seq(j+1)
```

This loop has 1 iteration when  $i = n-2$

...2 iterations when  $i = n-3$

...3 iterations when  $i = n-4$

...

n-1 iterations when  $i = 0$

What is the runtime complexity class for bubblesort?

How times does it execute lines 5 and 6?

$$1 + 2 + 3 + 4 + 5 \dots + n-1 = (n) * (n - 1) / 2 = \mathbf{O(n^2)}$$

# Bubble Sort

```
1 bubblesort(seq: Seq[Int]):  
2   n ← seq length  
3   for i ← n-2 to 0, by -1:  
4     for j ← i to n-1:  
5       if seq(j+1) < seq(j):  
6         swap seq(j) and seq(j+1)
```

**Note:** We can ignore the exact number of steps required by a portion of the algorithm, as long as we know its complexity...

# Bubble Sort

```
1 bubblesort(seq: Seq[Int]):  
2   n ← seq length  
3   for i ← n-2 to 0, by -1:  
4     for j ← i to n-1:  
5       if seq(j+1) < seq(j):  
6         swap seq(j) and seq(j+1)
```

Lines 5-6 are executed exactly  $n-1$  times, but we can treat this as  $O(n)$  steps for the inner loop...or can we...?

**Note:** We can ignore the exact number of steps required by a portion of the algorithm, as long as we know its complexity...

# Bubble Sort

```
1 bubblesort(seq: Seq[Int]):  
2   n ← seq length  
3   for i ← n-2 to 0, by -1:  
4     for j ← i to n-1:  
5       if seq(j+1) < seq(j):  
6         swap seq(j) and seq(j+1)
```

Lines 5-6 are executed exactly  $n-1$  times, but we can treat this as  $O(n)$  steps for the inner loop...or can we...?

**Note:** We can ignore the exact number of steps required by a portion of the algorithm, as long as we know its complexity...

**Can we safely say this algorithm is  $\Theta(n^2)$ ?**

# Bubble Sort

```
1 bubblesort(seq: Seq[Int]):  
2   n ← seq length  
3   for i ← n-2 to 0, by -1:  
4     for j ← i to n-1:  
5       if seq(j+1) < seq(j):  
6         swap seq(j) and seq(j+1)
```

What is the complexity of this step?

**Note:** We can ignore the exact number of steps required by a portion of the algorithm, as long as we know its complexity...

**Can we safely say this algorithm is  $\Theta(n^2)$ ?**



# Bubble Sort

```
1 bubblesort(seq: Seq[Int]):  
2   n ← seq length  
3   for i ← n-2 to 0, by -1:  
4     for j ← i to n-1:  
5       if seq(j+1) < seq(j):  
6         swap seq(j) and seq(j+1)
```

What is the complexity of this step?  
Do not assume function calls take  $O(1)$  time!

**Note:** We can ignore the exact number of steps required by a portion of the algorithm, as long as we know its complexity...

**Can we safely say this algorithm is  $\Theta(n^2)$ ?**

# Searching Sequences

```
def indexOf[T](seq: Seq[T], value: T, from: Int): Int = {  
  for(i <- from until seq.length) {  
    if(seq(i).equals(value)) { return i }  
  }  
  return -1  
}
```

What is the complexity?

# Searching Sequences

```
def indexOf[T](seq: Seq[T], value: T, from: Int): Int = {  
  for(i <- from until seq.length) {  
    if(seq(i).equals(value)) { return i }  
  }  
  return -1  
}
```

What is the complexity?  $O(n)$

# Searching Sequences

```
def count[T](seq: Seq[T], value: T): Int = {  
  var count = 0;  
  var i = indexOf(seq, value, 0)  
  while(i != -1) {  
    count += 1;  
    i = indexOf(seq, value, i+1)  
  }  
  return count  
}
```

**What is the complexity?**

# Searching Sequences

```
def count[T](seq: Seq[T], value: T): Int = {  
  var count = 0;  
  var i = indexOf(seq, value, 0)  
  while(i != -1) {  
    count += 1;  
    i = indexOf(seq, value, i+1)  
  }  
  return count  
}
```

What is the complexity?  $O(n)$ ?

# Searching Sequences

```
def count[T](seq: Seq[T], value: T): Int = {  
  var count = 0;  
  var i = indexOf(seq, value, 0)  
  while(i != -1) {  
    count += 1;  
    i = indexOf(seq, value, i+1)  
  }  
  return count  
}
```

What is the complexity?  $O(n)$ ? What about this line?

# Searching Sequences

```
def count[T](seq: Seq[T], value: T): Int = {  
  var count = 0;  
  var i = indexOf(seq, value, 0)  
  while(i != -1) {  
    count += 1;  
    i = indexOf(seq, value, i+1)  
  }  
  return count  
}
```

What is the complexity?  $O(n)$ ? What about this line? How many while iterations?

# Searching Sequences

```
def count[T](seq: Seq[T], value: T): Int = {  
  var count = 0;  
  var i = indexOf(seq, value, 0)  
  while(i != -1) {  
    count += 1;  
    i = indexOf(seq, value, i+1)  
  }  
  return count  
}
```

What is the complexity? Each element is only checked once, so  $O(n)$ .



# Searching Sorted Sequences

- Assuming  $O(1)$  access to elements ('random access')
  - Divide the set of elements in half by taking the "middle" element,  $m$ 
    - If  $m$  is greater than what we are looking for, search the lower half
    - If  $m$  is less than what we are looking for, search the right half
    - Repeat until you've found the element or you can't divide in half

# Searching Sorted Sequences

- Assuming  $O(1)$  access to elements ('random access')
  - Divide the set of elements in half by taking the "middle" element,  $m$ 
    - If  $m$  is greater than what we are looking for, search the lower half
    - If  $m$  is less than what we are looking for, search the right half
    - Repeat until you've found the element or you can't divide in half

*If you have  $n$  elements, how many times can you divide  $n$  in half?*

# Searching Sorted Sequences

- Assuming  $O(1)$  access to elements ('random access')
  - Divide the set of elements in half by taking the "middle" element,  $m$ 
    - If  $m$  is greater than what we are looking for, search the lower half
    - If  $m$  is less than what we are looking for, search the right half
    - Repeat until you've found the element or you can't divide in half

*If you have  $n$  elements, how many times can you divide  $n$  in half?*

*$\log(n)$*

# Searching Sorted Sequences

- Assuming  $O(1)$  access to elements ('random access')
  - Divide the set of elements in half by taking the "middle" element,  $m$ 
    - If  $m$  is greater than what we are looking for, search the lower half
    - If  $m$  is less than what we are looking for, search the right half
    - Repeat until you've found the element or you can't divide in half

*If you have  $n$  elements, how many times can you divide  $n$  in half?*

*$\log(n)$*

**Therefore the runtime of this search algorithm is  $O(\log(n))$**