We are usually not interested in exact running times, but only in an asymtotic classification of the running time, that ignores constant factors and constant additive offsets.

- We are usually interested in the running times for large values of n. Then constant additive terms do not play an important role.
- An exact analysis (e.g. *exactly* counting the number of operations in a RAM) may be hard, but wouldn't lead to more precise results as the computational model is already quite a distance from reality.
- A linear speed-up (i.e., by a constant factor) is always possible by e.g. implementing the algorithm on a faster machine.
- Running time should be expressed by simple functions.

Formal Definition

Let f denote functions from $\mathbb N$ to $\mathbb R^+.$

- $\mathcal{O}(f) = \{g \mid \exists c > 0 \ \exists n_0 \in \mathbb{N}_0 \ \forall n \ge n_0 : [g(n) \le c \cdot f(n)]\}$ (set of functions that asymptotically grow not faster than f)
- $\Omega(f) = \{g \mid \exists c > 0 \ \exists n_0 \in \mathbb{N}_0 \ \forall n \ge n_0 \colon [g(n) \ge c \cdot f(n)]\}$ (set of functions that asymptotically grow not slower than f)
- $\Theta(f) = \Omega(f) \cap \mathcal{O}(f)$ (functions that asymptotically have the same growth as f)
- ► $o(f) = \{g \mid \forall c > 0 \exists n_0 \in \mathbb{N}_0 \forall n \ge n_0 : [g(n) \le c \cdot f(n)]\}$ (set of functions that asymptotically grow slower than f)
- ► $\omega(f) = \{g \mid \forall c > 0 \exists n_0 \in \mathbb{N}_0 \forall n \ge n_0 : [g(n) \ge c \cdot f(n)]\}$ (set of functions that asymptotically grow faster than f)

There is an equivalent definition using limes notation (assuming that the respective limes exists). f and g are functions from \mathbb{N} to \mathbb{R}^+ .

•
$$g \in \mathcal{O}(f)$$
: $0 \le \lim_{n \to \infty} \frac{g(n)}{f(n)} < \infty$
• $g \in \Omega(f)$: $0 < \lim_{n \to \infty} \frac{g(n)}{f(n)} \le \infty$
• $g \in \Theta(f)$: $0 < \lim_{n \to \infty} \frac{g(n)}{f(n)} < \infty$
• $g \in o(f)$: $\lim_{n \to \infty} \frac{g(n)}{f(n)} = 0$
• $g \in \omega(f)$: $\lim_{n \to \infty} \frac{g(n)}{f(n)} = \infty$

- Note that for the version of the Landau notation defined here, we assume that *f* and *g* are positive functions.
- There also exist versions for arbitrary functions, and for the case that the limes is not infinity.



5 Asymptotic Notation

Abuse of notation

- 1. People write f = O(g), when they mean $f \in O(g)$. This is **not** an equality (how could a function be equal to a set of functions).
- 2. People write $f(n) = \mathcal{O}(g(n))$, when they mean $f \in \mathcal{O}(g)$, with $f : \mathbb{N} \to \mathbb{R}^+$, $n \mapsto f(n)$, and $g : \mathbb{N} \to \mathbb{R}^+$, $n \mapsto g(n)$.
- 3. People write e.g. h(n) = f(n) + o(g(n)) when they mean that there exists a function $z : \mathbb{N} \to \mathbb{R}^+, n \mapsto z(n), z \in o(g)$ such that $h(n) \leq f(n) + z(n)$.

	2. In this context $f(n)$ does not mean the	3. This is particularly useful if you do not
	function f evaluated at n , but instead	want to ignore constant factors. For ex-
	it is a shorthand for the function itself	ample the median of n elements can
	(leaving out domain and codomain and	be determined using $\frac{3}{2}n + o(n)$ compar-
	only giving the rule of correspondence	isons.
	of the function).	

EADS © Ernst Mayr, Harald Räcke 5 Asymptotic Notation

Abuse of notation

4. People write $\mathcal{O}(f(n)) = \mathcal{O}(g(n))$, when they mean $\mathcal{O}(f(n)) \subseteq \mathcal{O}(g(n))$. Again this is not an equality.



Lemma 3

Let f, g be functions with the property $\exists n_0 > 0 \ \forall n \ge n_0 : f(n) > 0$ (the same for g). Then

- $c \cdot f(n) \in \Theta(f(n))$ for any constant c
- $\mathcal{O}(f(n)) + \mathcal{O}(g(n)) = \mathcal{O}(f(n) + g(n))$
- $\mathcal{O}(f(n)) \cdot \mathcal{O}(g(n)) = \mathcal{O}(f(n) \cdot g(n))$
- $\mathcal{O}(f(n)) + \mathcal{O}(g(n)) = \mathcal{O}(\max\{f(n), g(n)\})$

The expressions also hold for Ω . Note that this means that $f(n) + g(n) \in \Theta(\max\{f(n), g(n)\})$.

Comments

- Do not use asymptotic notation within induction proofs.
- For any constants a, b we have log_a n = Θ(log_b n). Therefore, we will usually ignore the base of a logarithm within asymptotic notation.
- ► In general $\log n = \log_2 n$, i.e., we use 2 as the default base for the logarithm.