

CSC165 Week 7

Larry Zhang, October 21, 2014

an informal, anonymous **survey** of your learning experience so far

<http://goo.gl/forms/AyC01bEk7g>

EXCLUSIVE FOR TUESDAY EVENING SECTION!

today's outline

- proof by cases
- review of proofs

- algorithms

proof by cases

proof by cases

- **split** your argument into different cases
- prove the conclusion **for each** case

$\forall n \in \mathbb{N}, n^2 + n$ is even

thoughts

$$n^2 + n = n(n + 1)$$



Proof:

$\forall n \in \mathbb{N}, n^2 + n$ is even

one more practice

Define predicate $T(n)$ by

$$\forall n \in \mathbb{N}, \quad T(n) \Leftrightarrow \exists i \in \mathbb{N}, n = 7i + 1$$

Prove:

$$S1 : \forall n \in \mathbb{N}, T(n) \Rightarrow T(n^2)$$

Disprove:

$$S2 : \forall n \in \mathbb{N}, T(n^2) \Rightarrow T(n)$$

$$\forall n \in \mathbb{N}, \quad T(n) \Leftrightarrow \exists i \in \mathbb{N}, n = 7i + 1$$

thoughts Prove: $S1 : \forall n \in \mathbb{N}, T(n) \Rightarrow T(n^2)$

$$n = 7i + 1$$

$$n^2 = 7k + 1$$

$$\forall n \in \mathbb{N}, \quad T(n) \Leftrightarrow \exists i \in \mathbb{N}, n = 7i + 1$$

Proof:

$$\text{Prove: } S1 : \forall n \in \mathbb{N}, T(n) \Rightarrow T(n^2)$$

Define predicate $T(n)$ by

$$\forall n \in \mathbb{N}, \quad T(n) \Leftrightarrow \exists i \in \mathbb{N}, n = 7i + 1$$

Prove:

$$S1 : \forall n \in \mathbb{N}, T(n) \Rightarrow T(n^2)$$



Disprove:

$$S2 : \forall n \in \mathbb{N}, T(n^2) \Rightarrow T(n)$$

uniqueness (math prerequisite)

if m and n are natural numbers, with $n \neq 0$, then there is **exactly one** pair natural numbers (q, r) such that:

$$m = qn + r, \quad n > r \geq 0$$

divide m by n , the **quotient** and **remainder** are **unique**

$$\forall n \in \mathbb{N}, \quad T(n) \Leftrightarrow \exists i \in \mathbb{N}, n = 7i + 1$$

thoughts Disprove: $S_2 : \forall n \in \mathbb{N}, T(n^2) \Rightarrow T(n)$

$$\neg S_2 :$$

$$\forall n \in \mathbb{N}, \quad T(n) \Leftrightarrow \exists i \in \mathbb{N}, n = 7i + 1$$

Disproof: Disprove: $S2 : \forall n \in \mathbb{N}, T(n^2) \Rightarrow T(n)$

a review of proof patterns

patterns of inference

what's known

what can be inferred

Two categories of inference rules

→ **introduction**: smaller statement \Rightarrow larger statement

→ **elimination**: larger statement \Rightarrow smaller statement

negation introduction

assume A

...

contradiction

conjunction introduction

A

c is red

c is fast

B

c is red and fast

disjunction introduction

A

(nothing here)

c is red

(nothing)

c is red or fast

c is fast or red

it's a boy or a girl

implication introduction

assume A

...

B

assume $\neg B$

...

$\neg A$

equivalence introduction

$A \Rightarrow B$

$B \Rightarrow A$

$n \text{ odd} \Rightarrow n^2 \text{ odd}$

$n^2 \text{ odd} \Rightarrow n \text{ odd}$

universal introduction

assume $a \in D$

...

$P(a)$

assume a generic car c

...

c is red

all cars are red

existential introduction

$P(a)$

c is red

c is a car

$a \in D$

there exists a car
that is red

negation elimination

$\neg\neg A$

“the car is not red”
is false

the car is red

negation elimination

A

$\neg A$

there are 51 balls

there are not 51 balls

contradiction!

conjunction elimination

$A \wedge B$

the car is red and fast

the car is red

the car is fast

disjunction elimination

$A \vee B$

$\neg A$

it's a boy or a girl

it's not a boy

it's a girl

implication elimination

$A \Rightarrow B$

A

If you work hard, you
get A+

You work hard

You get A+

implication elimination

$A \Rightarrow B$

$\neg B$

If you work hard, you
get A+

You don't get A+

You don't work hard

equivalence elimination

$A \Leftrightarrow B$

$n \text{ odd} \Leftrightarrow n^2 \text{ odd}$

$n \text{ odd} \Rightarrow n^2 \text{ odd}$

$n^2 \text{ odd} \Rightarrow n \text{ odd}$

universal elimination

$\forall x \in D, P(x)$

$a \in D$

all cars are red

X is a car

X is red

existential elimination

$\exists x \in D, P(x)$

$\exists n \in N, n \text{ divides } 32$

Let $m \in N$ such that m divides 32

how to be good at proofs



- become familiar with these patterns, by **lots of practice.**
- recognize these patterns in your proof, use the manipulation rules to get closer to your target

Chapter 4

Algorithm Analysis and Asymptotic Notation

Computer scientists talk like...

"The worst-case runtime of bubble-sort is $O(n^2)$."

"I can sort it in $O(n \log n)$."

*"That's too slow, make it **linear-time**."*

*"That problem cannot be solved in **polynomial time**."*

compare two sorting algorithms

bubble sort

merge sort

demo at <http://www.sorting-algorithms.com/>

Observations



“running time”: what do we really mean?

- It does **NOT** mean how many **seconds** are spent in running the algorithm.
- It means **the number of steps** that are taken by the algorithm.
- So, the running time is **independent of the hardware** on which you run the algorithm.
- It only depends on the algorithm itself.

but, sometimes we don't really care about the number of steps...

- what we really care: how the number of steps **grows** as the size of input **grows**
- we **don't care** about the **absolute** number of steps
- we care about: "*when input size **doubles**, the running time **quadruples***"
- so, **$0.5n^2$** and **$700n^2$** are **no different!**
- **constant factors do NOT matter!**

**constant factor does not matter,
when it comes to growth**

$$T_1(n) = 0.5 n^2$$

$$T_2(n) = 700 n^2$$

$$\frac{T_1(2n)}{T_1(n)} = \frac{0.5 (2n)^2}{0.5 n^2} = \frac{2n^2}{0.5n^2} = 4$$

$$\frac{T_2(2n)}{T_2(n)} = \frac{700 (2n)^2}{700 n^2} = \frac{2800 n^2}{700 n^2} = 4$$

we care about **large** input sizes

- we don't need to study algorithms in order to sort **two** elements, because different algorithms make no difference
- we care about algorithm design when the input size **n** is very large
- so, **n^2** and **n^2+n+2** are no different, because when n is really large, **$n+2$** is negligible compared to **n^2**
- ***only the highest-order term matters***

low-order terms don't matter

$$T_1(n) = n^2 \qquad T_2(n) = n^2 + n + 2$$

$$T_1(10000) = 100,000,000$$

$$T_2(10000) = 100,010,002$$

difference $\approx 0.01\%$

summary of running time

- we count the number of steps
- constant factors don't matter
- only the highest-order term matters

*so, the followings are **no different**...*

$$n^2 \quad 2n^2 + 3n \quad \frac{n^2}{165} + 1130n + 3.14159$$

so we can say, they are all **$O(n^2)$**

$O(n^2)$ is called asymptotic notation

$O(n^2)$ is called asymptotic upper-bound

“growing no faster than n^2 ”

$\Omega(n^2)$ is called asymptotic lower-bound

“growing no slower than n^2 ”

will be discussed in more detail later

asymptotic notation

It is a **simplification** of the “real” running time

- *it does not tell the whole story about how fast a program runs in real life.*
 - ◆ ***in real world applications, constant factor matters! hardware matters! implementation matters!***
- *this simplification makes possible the development of the whole **theory of computational complexity.***
 - ◆ ***HUGE idea!***

a quick note

In CSC165, sometimes we use **asymptotic notations** such as **$O(n^2)$** , and sometimes, when we want to be more accurate, we use the **exact forms**, such as **$3n^2 + 2n$**

It depends on what the question asks.

**analyse the time complexity
of a program**

linear search

```
def LS(A, x):  
    """ Return index i, x == A[i].  
        Otherwise, return -1 """  
    1. i = 0  
    2. while i < len(A):  
    3.     if A[i] == x:  
    4.         return i  
    5.     i = i + 1  
    6. return -1
```

What's the running time of this program?

linear search

```
def LS(A, x):  
    """ Return index i, x == A[i].  
        Otherwise, return -1 """  
    1. i = 0  
    2. while i < len(A):  
    3.     if A[i] == x:  
    4.         return i  
    5.     i = i + 1  
    6. return -1
```

Count time complexity

LS([2, 4, 6, 8], 4)

linear search

```
def LS(A, x):  
    """ Return index i, x == A[i].  
        Otherwise, return -1 """  
    1. i = 0  
    2. while i < len(A):  
    3.     if A[i] == x:  
    4.         return i  
    5.     i = i + 1  
    6. return -1
```

Count time complexity

LS([2, 4, 6, 8], **6**)

linear search

```
def LS(A, x):  
    """ Return index i, x == A[i].  
        Otherwise, return -1 """  
1. i = 0  
2. while i < len(A):  
3.     if A[i] == x:  
4.         return i  
5.     i = i + 1  
6. return -1
```

what is the running time
of **LS(A, x)**
if the first index where **x** is
found is **k**
i.e., **A[k] == x**

linear search

```
def LS(A, x):  
    """ Return index i, x == A[i].  
        Otherwise, return -1 """  
    1. i = 0  
    2. while i < len(A):  
    3.     if A[i] == x:  
    4.         return i  
    5.     i = i + 1  
    6. return -1
```

Count time complexity
LS([2, 4, 6, 8], **99**)

linear search

```
def LS(A, x):  
    """ Return index i, x == A[i].  
        Otherwise, return -1 """
```

```
1. i = 0  
2. while i < len(A):  
3.     if A[i] == x:  
4.         return i  
5.     i = i + 1  
6. return -1
```

what is the running time
of **LS**(A, x)

if **x** is not in **A** at all

let **n** be the size of **A**

takeaway

- program running time varies with inputs
- there is a worst case in which the running time is the longest

worst-case time complexity

$t_P(x)$: running time of program P with input x

the worst-case time complexity of P
with input $x \in I$ of size n

$$W_P(n) = \max\{ t_P(x) \mid x \in I \wedge \text{size}(x) = n \}$$

worst-case: performance in the worst situation, what we typically do in CSC165

best-case: performance in the best situation, not very interesting, rarely studied

average-case: the expected performance under random inputs following certain probability distribution, will study in CSC263

next week

- more on asymptotic notations
- more algorithm analyses