
CSE 143 Java

Program Efficiency &
Introduction to Complexity Theory

2/18/2003

(c) 2001-2003, University of Washington

14-1

GREAT IDEAS IN COMPUTER SCIENCE

ANALYSIS OF ALGORITHMIC COMPLEXITY

2/18/2003

(c) 2001-2003, University of Washington

14-2

Overview

- Topics
 - Measuring time and space used by algorithms
 - Machine-independent measurements
 - Costs of operations
 - Comparing algorithms
 - Asymptotic complexity – $O()$ notation and complexity classes
- Reading:
 - Textbook: Ch. 21

2/18/2003

(c) 2001-2003, University of Washington

14-3

Comparing Algorithms

- Example: We've seen two different list implementations
 - Dynamic expanding array
 - Linked list
- Which is "better"?
- How do we measure?
 - Stopwatch? Why or why not?

2/18/2003

(c) 2001-2003, University of Washington

14-4

Program Efficiency & Resources

- Goal: Find way to measure "resource" usage in a way that is independent of particular machines/implementations
- Resources
 - Execution time
 - Execution space
 - Network bandwidth
 - others
- We will focus on execution time
 - Basic techniques/vocabulary apply to other resource measures

2/18/2003

(c) 2001-2003, University of Washington

14.5

Example

- What is the running time of the following method?

```
// Return the sum of the elements in array.
double sum(double[] rainMeas) {
    double ans = 0.0;
    for (int k = 0; k < rainMeas.length; k++) {
        ans = ans + rainMeas[k];
    }
    return ans;
}
```

- How do we analyze this?

2/18/2003

(c) 2001-2003, University of Washington

14.6

Analysis of Execution Time

1. First: describe the *size* of the problem in terms of one or more parameters
 - For sum, size of array makes sense
 - Often size of data structure, but can be magnitude of some numeric parameter, etc.
2. Then, count the number of steps needed as a function of the problem size
 - Need to define what a "step" is.
 - First approximation: one simple statement
 - More complex statements will be multiple steps

2/18/2003

(c) 2001-2003, University of Washington

14.7

Cost of operations: Constant Time Ops

- Constant-time operations: each take one abstract time "step"
 - Simple variable declaration/initialization (double sum = 0.0;)
 - Assignment of numeric or reference values (var = value;)
 - Arithmetic operation (+, -, *, /, %)
 - Array subscripting (a[index])
 - Simple conditional tests (x < y, p != null)
 - Operator *new* itself (not including constructor cost)
 - Note: *new* takes significantly longer than simple arithmetic or assignment, but its cost is independent of the problem we're trying to analyze
- Note: watch out for things like method calls or constructor invocations that look simple, but are expensive

2/18/2003

(c) 2001-2003, University of Washington

14.8

Cost of operations: Zero-time Ops

- Compiler can sometimes pay the whole cost of setting up operations
 - Nothing left to do at runtime
- Variable declarations without initialization

```
double[] overdrafts;
```
- Variable declarations with compile-time constant initializers

```
static final int maxButtons = 3;
```
- Casts (of reference types, at least)

```
... (Double) checkBalance
```

2/18/2003

(c) 2001-2003, University of Washington

14-9

Sequences of Statements

- Cost of
S1; S2; ... Sn
is sum of the costs of S1 + S2 + ... + Sn

2/18/2003

(c) 2001-2003, University of Washington

14-10

Conditional Statements

- The two branches of an if-statement might take different times. What to do??

```
if (condition) {  
    S1;  
} else {  
    S2;  
}
```
- Hint: Depends on analysis goals
 - "Worst case": the longest it could possibly take, under any circumstances
 - "Average case": the expected or average number of steps
 - "Best case": the shortest possible number of steps, under some special circumstance
- Generally, worst case is most important to analyze

2/18/2003

(c) 2001-2003, University of Washington

14-11

Analyzing Loops

- Basic analysis
 1. Calculate cost of each iteration
 2. Calculate number of iterations
 3. Total cost is the product of these

Caution -- sometimes need to add up the costs differently if cost of each iteration is not roughly the same
- Nested loops
 - Total cost is number of iterations or the outer loop times the cost of the inner loop
 - same caution as above

2/18/2003

(c) 2001-2003, University of Washington

14-12

Method Calls

- Cost for calling a function is cost of...
 - cost of **evaluating** the arguments (constant or non-constant)
 - + cost of actually **calling** the function (constant overhead)
 - + cost of **passing** each parameter (normally constant time in Java for both numeric and reference values)
 - + cost of **executing** the function body (constant or non-constant?)

```
System.out.print(thisLineNumber);  
System.out.println("Answer is " + Math.sqrt(3.14159));
```

- Terminology note: "evaluating" and "passing" an argument are two different things!

2/19/2003

(c) 2001-2003, University of Washington

14-13

Exact Complexity Function

- Careful analysis of an algorithm leads to an algebraic formula
- The "exact complexity function" gives the number of steps as a function of the problem size
- What can we do with it:
 - Predict running time in a particular case (given n, given type of computer)?
 - Predict comparative running times for two different n (on same type of computer)?
 - ***** Get a general feel for the potential performance of an algorithm
 - ***** Compare predicted running time of two different algorithms for the same problem (given same n)

2/19/2003

(c) 2001-2003, University of Washington

14-14

A Graph is Worth A Bunch of Words

- Graphs are a good tool to illustrate, study, and compare complexity functions



- Fun math review for you
 - How do you graph a function?
 - What are the shapes of some common functions? For example, ones mentioned in these slides or the textbook.

2/19/2003

(c) 2001-2003, University of Washington

14-15

Exercise

- Analyze the running time of printMultTable

- Pick the problem size
- Count the number of steps

```
// print multiplication table with  
// n rows and columns  
void printMultTable(int n) {  
    for (int k=0; k <= n; k++) {  
        printRow(k, n);  
    }  
}
```

```
// print row r with length n of a  
// multiplication table  
void printRow(int r, int n) {  
    for (int k = 0; k <= r; k++) {  
        System.out.print(r * k + " ");  
    }  
    System.out.println();  
}
```

2/19/2003

(c) 2001-2003, University of Washington

14-16

Comparing Algorithms

- Suppose we analyze two algorithms and get these times (numbers of steps):

- Algorithm 1: $37n + 2n^2 + 120$
- Algorithm 2: $50n + 42$

How do we compare these? What really matters?

- Answer: In the long run, the thing that is most interesting is the cost as the problem size n gets large
 - What are the costs for $n=10$, $n=100$; $n=1,000$; $n=1,000,000$?
 - Computers are so fast that how long it takes to solve small problems is rarely of interest

2/19/2003

(c) 2001-2003, University of Washington

14-17

Orders of Growth

- Examples:

N	$\log_2 N$	$5N$	$N \log_2 N$	N^2	2^N
8	3	40	24	64	256
16	4	80	64	256	65536
32	5	160	160	1024	$\sim 10^9$
64	6	320	384	4096	$\sim 10^{19}$
128	7	640	896	16384	$\sim 10^{38}$
256	8	1280	2048	65536	$\sim 10^{76}$
10000	13	50000	10^5	10^8	$\sim 10^{3010}$

2/19/2003

(c) 2001-2003, University of Washington

14-18

Asymptotic Complexity

- Asymptotic: Behavior of complexity function as problem size gets large
 - Only thing that really matters is higher-order term
 - Can drop low order terms and constants
- The asymptotic complexity gives us a (partial) way to answer "which algorithm is more efficient"
 - Algorithm 1: $37n + 2n^2 + 120$ is proportional to n^2
 - Algorithm 2: $50n + 42$ is proportional to n
- Graphs of functions are handy tool for comparing asymptotic behavior



2/19/2003

(c) 2001-2003, University of Washington

14-19

Big-O Notation

- Definition: If $f(n)$ and $g(n)$ are two complexity functions, we say that

$$f(n) = O(g(n))$$
 (pronounced $f(n)$ is $O(g(n))$ or is order $g(n)$)
 if there is a constant c such that

$$f(n) \leq c \cdot g(n)$$
 for all sufficiently large n

2/19/2003

(c) 2001-2003, University of Washington

14-20

Exercises

- Prove that $5n+3$ is $O(n)$
- Prove that $5n^2 + 42n + 17$ is $O(n^2)$

2/18/2003

(c) 2001-2003, University of Washington

14-21

Implications

- The notation $f(n) = O(g(n))$ is *not* an equality
- Think of it as shorthand for
 - “ $f(n)$ grows at most like $g(n)$ ” or
 - “ f grows no faster than g ” or
 - “ f is bounded by g ”
- $O()$ notation is a *worst-case* analysis
 - Generally useful in practice
 - Sometimes want *average-case* or *expected-time* analysis if worst-case behavior is not typical (but often harder to analyze)

2/18/2003

(c) 2001-2003, University of Washington

14-22

Complexity Classes

- Several common complexity classes (problem size n)
 - Constant time: $O(k)$ or $O(1)$
 - Logarithmic time: $O(\log n)$ [Base doesn't matter. Why?]
 - Linear time: $O(n)$
 - “ $n \log n$ ” time: $O(n \log n)$
 - Quadratic time: $O(n^2)$
 - Cubic time: $O(n^3)$
 - ...
 - Exponential time: $O(k^n)$
- $O(n^k)$ is often called *polynomial time*

2/18/2003

(c) 2001-2003, University of Washington

14-23

Rule of Thumb

- If the algorithm has polynomial time or better: practical
 - typical pattern: examining all data, a fixed number of times
- If the algorithm has exponential time: impractical
 - typical pattern: examine *all combinations* of data
- What to do if the algorithm is exponential?
 - Try to find a different algorithm
 - Some problems can be proved not to have a polynomial solution
 - Other problems don't have known polynomial solutions, despite years of study and effort.
 - Sometimes you settle for an approximation:
 - The correct answer most of the time, or
 - An almost-correct answer all of the time

2/18/2003

(c) 2001-2003, University of Washington

14-24

Big-O Arithmetic

- For most commonly occurring functions, comparison can be enormously simplified with a few simple rules of thumb.
- Memorize complexity classes in order from smallest to largest: $O(1)$, $O(\log n)$, $O(n)$, $O(n \log n)$, $O(n^2)$, etc.
- Ignore constant factors
 $300n + 5n^4 + 6 + 2^n = O(n + n^4 + 2^n)$
- Ignore all but highest order term
 $O(n + n^4 + 2^n) = O(2^n)$

2/19/2003

(c) 2001-2003, University of Washington

14-25

Analyzing List Operations (1)



- We can use $O()$ notation to compare the costs of different list implementations
- Operation Dynamic Array Linked List
 - Construct empty list
 - Size of the list
 - isEmpty
 - clear

2/19/2003

(c) 2001-2003, University of Washington

14-26

Analyzing List Operations (2)

- Operation Dynamic Array Linked List
 - Add item to end of list
 - Locate item (contains, indexOf)
 - Add or remove item once it has been located

2/19/2003

(c) 2001-2003, University of Washington

14-27

Wait! Isn't this totally bogus??

- Write better code!!
 - More clever hacking in the inner loops
(assembly language, special-purpose hardware in extreme cases)
- Moore's law: Speeds double every 18 months
 - Wait and buy a faster computer in a year or two!



- But ...

2/19/2003

(c) 2001-2003, University of Washington

14-28

How long is a Computer-Day?

- If a program needs $f(n)$ microseconds to solve some problem, what is the largest single problem it can solve in one full day?
- One day = $1,000,000 \cdot 24 \cdot 60 \cdot 60 = 10^6 \cdot 24 \cdot 36 \cdot 10^2 = 10^6 \cdot 25 \cdot 36 \cdot 10^2 = 10^6 \cdot 900 \cdot 10^2 = 9 \cdot 10^9$
- To calculate, set $f(n) = 9 \cdot 10^9$ and solve for n in each case

$f(n)$	n such that $f(n) = \text{one day}$
n	$9 \cdot 10^{10}$
$5n$	$2.5 \cdot 10^{10}$
$n \log_2 n$	$3 \cdot 10^9$
n^2	$3 \cdot 10^5$
n^3	$4 \cdot 10^3$
2^n	36

2/18/2003

(c) 2001-2003, University of Washington

14-29

Speed Up The Computer by 1,000,000

- Suppose technology advances so that a future computer is 1,000,000 fast than today's.
- In one day there are now = $9 \cdot 10^9 \cdot 10^3$ ticks available
- To calculate, set $f(n) = 9 \cdot 10^{9+3}$ and solve for n in each case

$f(n)$	original n for one day	new n for one day
n	$9 \cdot 10^{10}$???????????
$5n$	$2.5 \cdot 10^{10}$???????????
$n \log_2 n$	$3 \cdot 10^9$	etc.
n^2	$3 \cdot 10^5$	
n^3	$4 \cdot 10^3$	
2^n	36	



2/18/2003

(c) 2001-2003, University of Washington

14-30

How Much Does 1,000,000-faster Buy?

- Divide the new max n by the old max n , to see how much more we can do in a day

$f(n)$	n for 1 day	million x , n for 1 day
n	9×10^{10}	million times larger
$5n$	2×10^{10}	million times larger
$n \log_2 n$	3×10^9	60,000 times larger
n^2	3×10^5	1,000 times larger
n^3	4×10^3	100 times larger
2^n	36	+20 larger

2/18/2003

(c) 2001-2003, University of Washington

14-31

Practical Advice For Speed Lovers

- First pick the right algorithm and data structure
 - Implement it carefully, insuring correctness
- Then optimize for speed – but only where it matters
 - Constants do matter in the real world
 - Clever coding can speed things up, but result can be harder to read, modify
- Current state-of-the-art approach: Use measurement tools to find hotspots, then tweak those spots.

"Premature optimization is the root of all evil" – Donald Knuth

2/18/2003

(c) 2001-2003, University of Washington

14-32

*"It is easier to make a
correct program efficient
than to make an efficient
program correct"*

— Edsger Dijkstra

2/19/2003

(c) 2001-2003, University of Washington

14-33

Summary

- Analyze algorithm sufficiently to determine complexity
- Compare algorithms by comparing asymptotic complexity
- For large problems an asymptotically faster algorithm will always trump clever coding tricks

"Premature optimization is the root of all evil"

— Donald Knuth

2/19/2003

(c) 2001-2003, University of Washington

14-34

Computer Science Note

- Algorithmic complexity theory is one of the key intellectual contributions of Computer Science
- Typical problems
 - What is the worst/average/best-case performance of an algorithm?
 - What is the best complexity bound for all algorithms that solve a particular problem?
- Interesting and (in many cases) complex, sophisticated math
 - Probabilistic and statistical as well as discrete
- Still some key open problems
 - Most notorious: $P \stackrel{?}{=} NP$

2/19/2003

(c) 2001-2003, University of Washington

14-35