

# Lecture 3: Algorithms and Complexity

#### Bioalgorithms Fall 2013 **Study Chapter 2.1-2.8**

8/29/13 Comp 555 Fall 2013 1

# What is an algorithm?

<u>እ‹በአመረጡብ የመለመጥ በአመረግ የሚመለጥ በአመ</u>

• An algorithm is a sequence of instructions that one must perform in order to solve a wellformulated problem.



Problem: Complexity

Algorithm: Correctness **Complexity** 



### Problem: Buying Textbook with Credit Card

Algorithm #1:

1. Go to the bookstore at the student union.

<del>௵௵௵௵௵௵௵௵௵</del>

- 2. Find the shelf with the tag "COMP 555".
- 3. Take a copy of the book.
- 4. Go to the register.
- 5. Check out using credit card.
- 6. Walk out with book

#### Algorithm #2:

- 1. Go to Amazon.com
- 2. Search for the book entitled "An Introduction to Bioinformatics Algorithms".

<del>௵௵௵௵௵௵௵௵</del>

- 3. Click "Add to shopping cart".
- 4. Click "Proceed to checkout".
- 5. Sign in your account.
- 6. Fill the shipping information.
- 7. Fill in the credit card and billing information.
- 8. Place the order.
- 9. Wait 5-10 days for book to arrive

# Two observations

**MP®@®®®®®®®®®®®®®®®®®** <del>௵௵௵௵௵௵௵௵</del>

- Given a problem, there may be many correct algorithms.
	- They give identical outputs for the same inputs
	- They give the expected outputs for any valid input
- The costs to perform different algorithms may be different.
	- Some are faster (i.e. get the book immediately, or you wait for a week)
	- Some are less expensive



### Correctness

<u>እለውጥ በአመረግ የሚመለውን በአመረግ በ</u>

- An algorithm is correct only if it produces correct result for all input instances.
	- If the algorithm gives an incorrect answer for one or more input instances, it is an incorrect algorithm.
- Coin change problem
	- Input: an amount of money *M* in cents
	- Output: the smallest number of coins
- US coin change problem









# **US Coin Change**

**ℷⅆ℗ⅆ℗ⅆ℗ⅆ℗ⅆ℗ⅆ℗ⅆ℗ⅆ℗ⅆ℗ⅆ℗ⅆ℗ⅆ** 



# **Change Problem**

<del>MPQMPQMPQMPQMPQMPQMPQMPQMP</del> **ՀՊՆՈՒՊՆՈՒՊՆՈՒՊՆՈՒՊՆՈՒՊ** 

> To show an algorithm was incorrect we showed an input for which it produced the wrong result. How do we show that an algorithm is correct?

- Input:
	- an amount of money *M*
	- an array of denominations  $c = (c_1, c_2, ..., c_d)$ in order of decreasing value
- Output: the smallest number of coins



# How to Compare Algorithms?

- Complexity the cost of an algorithm can be measured in either time and space
	- Correct algorithms may have different complexities.
- How do we assign "cost" for time?
- The cost to perform an instruction may vary dramatically.
	- An instruction may be an algorithm itself.
	- The complexity of an algorithm is NOT equivalent to the number of instructions.
- How to analyze an algorithm's complexity
	- An aside: Algorithm "Styles"



# Ex Style: Recursive Algorithms

- Recursion is a technique for describing functions in terms of themselves.
	- These recursive calls are to simpler versions of the original function.
	- The simplest versions, called base cases, are merely declared.
		- Recursive definition:
		- Base case:
- $factorial(n) = n \times factorial(n-1)$  $factorial(1) = 1$
- Easy to analyze
- Thinking recursively…



## Towers of Hanoi

<u>እለውጥ በአመለግ የመልካቸው በአመለግ በ</u>

- There are three pegs and a number of disks with decreasing radii (smaller ones on top of larger ones) stacked on Peg 1.
- Goal: move all disks to Peg 3.
- Rules:
	- When a disk is moved from one peg it must be placed on another peg.
	- Only one disk may be moved at a time, and it must be the top disk on a tower.
	- A larger disk may never be placed upon a smaller disk.





### A single disk tower



## A single disk tower



### A two disk tower









### A three disk tower



















*௵௵௵௵ ႦႶႲჀႶႲჀႶႲჀႶႲჀႶႲჀႶႲჀႶႲჀႶႲჀႶႲჀႶႲჀႶႲ* 







# The problem for N disks becomes

**DUMPUMPUMPUM** 

- A base case of a one-disk move.
- A recursive step for moving n-1 disks.
- To move *n* disks from Peg 1 to Peg 3, we need to
	- Move (*n*-1) disks from Peg 1 to Peg 2
	- Move the *n*th disk from Peg 1 to Peg 3
	- Move  $(n-1)$  disks from Peg 2 to Peg 3
- We move the n-1 stack twice

$$
T(1) = 1
$$
  
 
$$
T(n) = 2T(n-1) + 1 = 2n - 1
$$

Exponential algorithm

– The number of disk moves is

### Towers of Hanoi

- If you play HanoiTowers with . . . it takes . . .
	- $-1$  disk … 1 move
	- 2 disks … 3 moves
	- 3 disks … 7 moves
	- 4 disks … 15 moves
	- 5 disks … 31 moves
- 

– .

– .

- .
- 
- 
- $-20$  disks  $... 1,048,575$  moves  $-32 \text{ disks}$  ...  $4,294,967,295 \text{ moves}$



# Sorting

<del>௴௸௴௸௴௸௴௸௴௸௴௸௴</del>

- A very common problem is to arrange data into either ascending or descending order
	- **Viewing, printing**
	- **Faster to search, find min/max, compute median/mode, etc.**
- Lots of sorting algorithms
	- **From the simple to very complex**
	- **Some optimized for certain situations (lots of duplicates, almost sorted, etc.)**



### **Selection Sort**

<del>ℷℐ℄ℐ℆ℐ℄ℐ</del>℗ℐ℄ℱ℮ℱ℮ℱ℮ℱ℮ℱ℮ℱ℮ℱ℮ℱ℮ℱ℮ℱ℮ℱ℮ℱ℮ℱ℮ℱ℮ℱ℮



8/29/13 32 Comp 555 Fall 2013

#### **Selection sort**



$$
\frac{n(n-1)}{2} - 1
$$
 comparisons  
\n
$$
\frac{n(n-1)}{2} - 1
$$
 comparisons  
\n
$$
\frac{n(n-1)}{2} - 1
$$
 comparisons  
\nfor k in xrange(index+1,last):  
\nif (arr[k] < arr[index]):  
\nindex = k  
\nreturn index

# Year 1202: Leonardo Fibonacci:

- He asked the following question:
	- How many pairs of rabbits are produced from a single pair in one year if every year each pair of rabbits more than 1 year old produces a new pair?



- Here we assume that each pair has one male and one female, and each pair lives long enough to have two litters, and initially we have one pair
- *f*(*n*): the number of "breeding" pairs present at the beginning of year *n*



**MPDMPDMPDMPDMPDMPDMPDMPD** <del>௵௵௵௵௵௵௵௵௵</del>



- Clearly, we have:
	- $f(1) = 1$  (the first pair we have)
	- $f(2) = 1$  (still only the first pair we have because they are just 1 month old. They need to be more than one month old to reproduce)
	- $f(n) = f(n-1) + f(n-2)$  because  $f(n)$  is the sum of the old rabbits from last month  $(f(n-1))$  and the new rabbits reproduced from those *f*(*n*-2) rabbits who are now old enough to reproduce.
	- *f*: 1, 1, 2, 3, 5, 8, 13, 21, 34, 55, …
	- $-$  The solution for this recurre

$$
f(n) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{5}} \left( \left( \frac{1 + \sqrt{5}}{2} \right)^n - \left( \frac{1 - \sqrt{5}}{2} \right)^n \right)
$$





# Is there a "real difference"?

- $10^{1}$
- 10^2 Number of students in computer science department
- 10^3 Number of students in the college of art and science
- 10^4 Number of students enrolled at UNC
- …
- …
- 10^10 Number of stars in the galaxy
- $10^{\circ}20$  Total number of all stars in the universe
- 10^80 Total number of particles in the universe
- 10^100 << Number of moves needed for 400 disks in the Towers of Hanoi puzzle
- Towers of Hanoi puzzle is *computable* but it is NOT feasible.



#### Is there a "real" difference?



# **Asymptotic Notation**

<u>Ⴆⅆ௪௵ⅆ௪௵ⅆ௪௵ⅆ௪௵ⅆ௪௵ⅆ௪௵</u>

- *Order of growth* is the interesting measure:
	- Highest-order term is what counts
		- As the input size grows larger it is the high order term that dominates
- Θ notation:  $\Theta(n^2)$  = "this function grows similarly to  $n^{2}$ .
- Big-O notation:  $O(n^2)$  = "this function grows at least as *slowly* as *n*2".
	- Describes an *upper bound.*



### Big-O Notation

<del>௵௵௵௵௵௵௵௵௵</del>

 $f(n) = O(g(n))$ : there exist positive constants c and  $n_0$  such that  $0 \le f(n) \le cg(n)$  for all  $n \ge n_0$ 

- What does it mean?
	- $-$  If  $f(n)$  =  $O(n^2)$ , then:
		- *f*(*n*) can be larger than *n*2 sometimes, **but…**
		- We can choose some constant  $c$  and some value  $n_0$  such that for **every** value of *n* larger than  $n_0 : f(n) < cn^2$
		- That is, for values larger than  $n_0$ ,  $f(n)$  is never more than a constant multiplier greater than *n*<sup>2</sup>
		- Or, in other words, *f*(*n*) does not grow more than a constant factor faster than *n*2.



Visualization of  $O(g(n))$ 



### **Big-O Notation**

$$
2n2 = O(n2)
$$
  
1,000,000n<sup>2</sup> + 150,000 = O(n<sup>2</sup>)  
5n<sup>2</sup> - 7n + 20 = O(n<sup>2</sup>)  
2n<sup>3</sup> + 2 \neq O(n<sup>2</sup>)  
n<sup>2.1</sup> \neq O(n<sup>2</sup>)



### **Big-O Notation**

**Ⴆⅆℙℚ℩ⅆℙℚ℩ⅆℙℚ℩ⅆℙℚ℩ⅆℙℚ℩ⅆℙℚⅎℙℚ℩ⅆℙℚ** 

• Prove that: 
$$
20n^2 + 2n + 5 = O(n^2)
$$

• Let 
$$
c = 21
$$
 and  $n_0 = 4$ 

• 
$$
21n^2 > 20n^2 + 2n + 5
$$
 for all  $n > 4$ 

 $n^2 > 2n + 5$  for all  $n > 4$ **TRUE** 



#### **O-Notation**

*௵௵௵௵௵௵௵௵* 

- Big-*O* is not a tight upper bound. In other words  $n = O(n^2)$
- Θ provides a tight bound

 $f(n) = \Theta(g(n))$ : there exist positive constants  $c_1, c_2$ , and  $n_0$  such that  $0 \le c_1 g(n) \le f(n) \le c_2 g(n)$  for all  $n \ge n_0$ 

$$
\bullet \ \ n = O(n^2) \neq \Theta(n^2)
$$

$$
\bullet \ \ 200n^2 = O(n^2) = \Theta(n^2)
$$

•  $n^{2.5} \neq O(n^2) \neq \Theta(n^2)$ 



Visualization of  $\Theta(g(n))$ 



# Some Other Asymptotic Functions

• Little *o* – A **non-tight** asymptotic upper bound

$$
- n = o(n^2), n = O(n^2)
$$
  
- 3n<sup>2</sup>  $\neq$  o(n<sup>2</sup>), 3n<sup>2</sup> = O(n<sup>2</sup>)

• Ω – A **lower** bound

The difference between "big-O" and "little-o" is subtle. For  $f(n) = O(g(n))$  the bound  $0 \le f(n) \le c g(n)$ ,  $n > n_0$  holds for *any* c. For  $f(n) = o(g(n))$  the bound  $0 \le f(n) < c$  g(n),  $n > n_0$  holds for *all* c.

 $f(n) = \Omega(g(n))$ : there exist positive constants c and  $n_0$  such that  $f(n) \ge c g(n)$  for all  $n \ge n_0$ 

 $-\eta^2 = \Omega(n)$ 

- ω A **non-tight** asymptotic lower bound
- $f(n) = \Theta(n) \Leftrightarrow f(n) = O(n)$  and  $f(n) = \Omega(n)$



### Visualization of Asymptotic Growth

<u>እምጭምጭምጭምጭምጭምጭምጭምጭምጭምጭምጭምጭምጭምጭምጭምጭምጭም</u>



### Analogy to Arithmetic Operators

<u>እምጭምጭምጭምጭምጭምጭምጭምጭምጭምጭምጭምጭምጭምጭምጭምጭምጭም</u>

$$
f(n) = O(g(n)) \qquad \approx \qquad f \leq g
$$

$$
f(n) = \Omega(g(n)) \qquad \approx \qquad f \ge g
$$

$$
f(n) = O(g(n)) \approx f \le g
$$
  
\n
$$
f(n) = \Omega(g(n)) \approx f \ge g
$$
  
\n
$$
f(n) = \Theta(g(n)) \approx f = g
$$
  
\n
$$
f(n) = o(g(n)) \approx f < g
$$
  
\n
$$
f(n) = \omega(g(n)) \approx f > g
$$
  
\n
$$
Gomp 555
$$

$$
o(g(n)) \qquad \approx \qquad f < g
$$

$$
f(n) = \omega(g(n))
$$
  $\approx$   $f > 0$ 



# Measures of complexity

<u>እለውጥ በአመረግ የሚመለውን በአመረግ በ</u>

- Best case
	- **Super-fast in some limited situation is not very valuable information**
- Worst case
	- **Good upper-bound on behavior**
	- **Never gets worse than this**
- Average case
	- **Averaged over all possible inputs**
	- **Most useful information about overall performance**
	- **Can be hard to compute precisely**



# Complexity

*ႦႶႲ***Ⴠ₥ႲႧ₥ႲႧ₥ႲႧ₥ႲႧ₥ႲႧ₥ႲႧ₥ႲႧ₥Ⴒ**Ⴇ <del>௵௵௺௵௺௵௺௵௺௵௺</del>௺௺

- Time complexity is not necessarily the same as the space complexity
- Space Complexity: how much space an algorithm needs (as a function of *n*)
- Time vs. space



# Next Time

<u>እ‹በዎመ‹በዎመ‹በዎመ‹በዎመ‹በምመ‹በምመ‹በዎመ‹በዎመ‹በዎመ</u> 

- Algorithm "Styles" and design techniques
	- Exhaustive search
	- Greedy algorithms
	- Branch and bound algorithms
	- Dynamic programming
	- Divide and conquer algorithms
	- Randomized algorithms
- Tractable vs intractable algorithms

