


BBM 101

Introduction to Programming I



$$\begin{array}{r} 51 \\ \times 3 \\ \hline 153 \end{array}$$

NP

4	1	5	8	3	6	7	2	9
9	8	2	5	7	4	1	3	6
7	3	6	1	9	2	4	5	8
1	9	3	6	2	8	5	4	7
8	5	4	9	1	7	2	6	3
2	6	7	4	5	3	9	8	1
6	4	1	7	8	5	3	9	2
5	2	9	3	6	1	8	7	4
3	7	9	2	4	9	6	1	5

Sudoku

Lecture #09 – Development Strategies, Algorithmic Speed



Last time... Testing, debugging, exceptions

Exceptions



```
try:  
    ....  
    ....  
except:  
    ....  
finally:  
    ....
```



Debugging



Lecture Overview

- How to develop a program
- Algorithmic Complexity

Lecture Overview

- **How to develop a program**
- Algorithmic Complexity

Program development methodology: Algorithm first, then Python

1. Define the problem
2. Decide upon an algorithm
3. Translate it into code

Try to do these steps in order

Program development methodology: Algorithm first, then Python

1. Define the problem

- A. Write an Natural Language description of the input and output **for the whole program**. (Do not give details about *how you will compute* the output.)
- B. Create test cases **for the whole program**
 - Input *and* expected output

2. Decide upon an algorithm

3. Translate it into code

Try to do these steps in order

Program development methodology: Algorithm first, then Python

1. Define the problem

2. **Decide upon an algorithm**

A. Implement it in Algorithmic way (e.g. in English)

- Write the recipe **OR** step-by-step instructions

B. Test it using paper and pencil

- Use small but not trivial test cases
- Play computer, animating the algorithm
- Be introspective
 - Notice what you really do
 - May be more or less than what you wrote down
 - Make the algorithm more precise

3. Translate it into code

Try to do these steps in order

Program development methodology: Algorithm first, then Python

1. Define the problem
2. Decide upon an algorithm
- 3. Translate it into code**
 - A. Implement it in Python
 - Decompose it into logical units (functions)
 - For each function:
 - Name it (important and difficult!)
 - Write its documentation string (its specification)
 - Write tests
 - Write its code
 - Test the function
 - B. Test the whole program

Try to do these steps in order

Program development methodology: Algorithm first, then Python


1. Define the problem
2. Decide upon an algorithm
3. Translate it into code

Try to do these steps in order

- It's OK (even common) to back up to a previous step when you notice a problem
- You are incrementally learning about the problem, the algorithm, and the code
- “Iterative development”

Waterfall Development Strategy


- Before the iterative model, we had the waterfall strategy.
- Each step handled once.
- The model had a limited capability and received too many criticisms.
- **Better than nothing!!**
- **Do not dive in to code!!**
- **Please!!**



** From wikipedia waterfall development model*

Iterative Development Strategy

- Software development is a living process.
- Pure waterfall model wasn't enough.
- Iterative development strategy suits best to our needs (for now).




** From wikipedia Iterative development model*

Iterative Development Strategy -2-

Iterative Development

Business value is delivered incrementally in time-boxed cross-discipline iterations.



* From wikipedia Iterative development model

The *Wishful Thinking* approach to implementing a function

- If you are not sure how to implement one part of your function, define a **helper function** that does that task
 - “I wish I knew how to do task X”
 - Give it a name and assume that it works
 - Go ahead and complete the implementation of your function, *using* the helper function (and assuming it works)
 - Later, implement the **helper function**
 - The helper function should have a **simpler/smaller task**

The *Wishful Thinking* approach to implementing a function

- Can you test the original function?
 - Yes, by using a **stub** for the **helper function**
 - Often a lookup table: works for only 5 inputs, crashes otherwise, or maybe just returns the same value every time

Why functions?

There are several reasons:

- Creating a new function gives you an opportunity to name a group of statements, which **makes your program easier to read and debug.**
- Functions **can make a program smaller** by eliminating repetitive code. Later, if you make a change, you only have to make it in one place.
- Dividing a long program into functions allows you to **debug the parts one at a time** and then assemble them into a working whole.
- Well-designed functions are often useful for many programs. Once you write and debug one, **you can reuse it.**

Lecture Overview

- How to develop a program
- **Algorithmic Complexity**

Measuring complexity

- Goals in designing programs
 1. It returns the correct answer on all legal inputs
 2. It performs the computation efficiently
- Typically (1) is most important, but sometimes (2) is also critical, e.g., programs for collision detection, avionic systems, drive assistance etc.
- Even when (1) is most important, it is valuable to understand and optimize (2)

Computational complexity

- How much time will it take a program to run?
- How much memory will it need to run?
- Need to balance minimizing computational complexity with conceptual complexity
 - Keep code simple and easy to understand, but where possible optimize performance

How do we measure complexity?

- Given a function, would like to answer: “How long will this take to run?”
- Could just run on some input and time it.
- Problem is that this depends on:
 1. Speed of computer
 2. Specifics of Programming Language implementation
 3. Value of input
- Avoid (1) and (2) by measuring time in terms of number of basic steps executed

Measuring basic steps

- Use a **random access machine (RAM)** as model of computation
 - Steps are executed sequentially
 - Step is an operation that takes constant time
 - Assignment
 - Comparison
 - Arithmetic operation
 - Accessing object in memory
- For point (3), measure time in terms of size of input

But complexity might depend on value of input?

```
def linearSearch(L, x) :  
    for e in L:  
        if e==x:  
            return True  
    return False
```

- If x happens to be near front of L, then returns True almost immediately
- If x not in L, then code will have to examine all elements of L
- Need a general way of measuring

Cases for measuring complexity

- **Best case:** minimum running time over all possible inputs of a given size
 - For linearSearch – constant, i.e. independent of size of inputs
- **Worst case:** maximum running time over all possible inputs of a given size
 - For linearSearch – linear in size of list
- **Average (or expected) case:** average running time over all possible inputs of a given size
- We will focus on worst case – a kind of **upper bound** on running time

Example

```
def fact(n):  
    answer = 1  
    while n > 1:  
        answer *= n  
        n -= 1  
    return answer
```

- Number of steps
 - 1 (for assignment)
 - 5*n (1 for test, plus 2 for first assignment, plus 2 for second assignment in while; repeated n times through while)
 - 1 (for return)
- $5*n+2$ steps
- But as n gets large, 2 is irrelevant, so basically $5*n$ steps

Example

- What about the multiplicative constant (5 in this case)?
- We argue that in general, multiplicative constants are not relevant when comparing algorithms

Example

```
def sqrtExhaust(x, eps):  
    step = eps**2  
    ans = 0.0  
    while abs(ans**2 - x) >= eps and ans <= max(x, 1):  
        ans += step  
    return ans
```

- If we call this on 100 and 0.0001, will take one billion iterations of the loop
 - Have roughly 8 steps within each iteration

Example

```
def sqrtBi(x, eps):  
    low = 0.0  
    high = max(1, x)  
    ans = (high + low)/2.0  
    while abs(ans**2 - x) >= eps:  
        if ans**2 < x:  
            low = ans  
        else:  
            high = ans  
        ans = (high + low)/2.0  
    return ans
```

- If we call this on 100 and 0.0001, will take thirty iterations of the loop
 - Have roughly 10 steps within each iteration
- 1 billion or 8 billion versus 30 or 300 – it is size of problem that matters

Measuring complexity

- Given this difference in iterations through loop, multiplicative factor (number of steps within loop) probably irrelevant
- Thus, we will focus on measuring the complexity as a function of input size
 - Will focus on the largest factor in this expression
 - Will be mostly concerned with the worst case scenario

Asymptotic notation

- Need a formal way to talk about relationship between running time and size of inputs
- Mostly interested in what happens as size of inputs gets very large, i.e. approaches infinity

Example

```
def f(x):  
    for i in range(1000):  
        ans = i  
    for i in range(x):  
        ans += 1  
    for i in range(x):  
        for j in range(x):  
            ans += 1
```

Complexity is $1000 + 2x + 2x^2$, if each line takes one step

Example

- $1000+2x+2x^2$
- If x is small, constant term dominates
 - E.g., $x = 10$ then 1000 of 1220 steps are in first loop
- If x is large, quadratic term dominates
 - E.g. $x = 1,000,000$, then first loop takes 0.000000005% of time, second loop takes 0.0001% of time (out of 2,000,002,001,000 steps)!

Example

- So really only need to consider the nested loops (quadratic component)
- Does it matter that this part takes $2x^2$ steps, as opposed to say x^2 steps?
 - For our example, if our computer executes 100 million steps per second, difference is 5.5 hours versus 2.25 hours
 - On the other hand if we can find a linear algorithm, this would run in a fraction of a second
 - So multiplicative factors probably not crucial, but order of growth is crucial

Rules of thumb for complexity

- Asymptotic complexity
 - Describe running time in terms of number of basic steps
 - If running time is sum of multiple terms, keep one with the largest growth rate
 - If remaining term is a product, drop any multiplicative constants
- Use “Big O” notation (aka Omicron)
 - Gives an upper bound on asymptotic growth of a function

Complexity classes

- $O(1)$ denotes constant running time
- $O(\log n)$ denotes logarithmic running time
- $O(n)$ denotes linear running time
- $O(n \log n)$ denotes log-linear running time
- $O(n^c)$ denotes polynomial running time (c is a constant)
- $O(c^n)$ denotes exponential running time (c is a constant being raised to a power based on size of input)

Constant complexity

- Complexity independent of inputs
- Very few interesting algorithms in this class, but can often have pieces that fit this class
- Can have loops or recursive calls, but number of iterations or calls independent of size of input

Logarithmic complexity

- Complexity grows as log of size of one of its inputs
- Example:
 - Bisection search
 - Binary search of a list

Logarithmic complexity

```
def binarySearch(alist, item):  
    first = 0  
    last = len(alist)-1  
    found = False  
  
    while first<=last and not found:  
        midpoint = (first + last)//2  
        if alist[midpoint] == item:  
            found = True  
        elif item < alist[midpoint]:  
            last = midpoint-1  
        else:  
            first = midpoint+1  
  
    return found
```

Logarithmic complexity

```
def binarySearch(alist, item):
    first = 0
    last = len(alist)-1
    found = False

    while first<=last and not found:
        midpoint = (first + last)//2
        if alist[midpoint] == item:
            found = True
        elif item < alist[midpoint]:
            last = midpoint-1
        else:
            first = midpoint+1

    return found
```

- Only have to look at loop as no function calls
- Within while loop constant number of steps
- How many times through loop?
 - How many times can one divide indexes to find midpoint?
 - $O(\log(\text{len}(\text{alist})))$

Linear complexity

- Searching a list in order to see if an element is present
- Add characters of a string, assumed to be composed of decimal digits

```
def addDigits(s):  
    val = 0  
    for c in s:  
        val += int(c)  
    return val
```

- $O(\text{len}(s))$

Linear complexity

- Complexity can depend on number of recursive calls

```
def fact(n):  
    if n == 1:  
        return 1  
    else:  
        return n*fact(n-1)
```

- Number of recursive calls?
 - Fact(n), then fact(n-1), etc. until get to fact(1)
 - Complexity of each call is constant
 - $O(n)$

Log-linear complexity

- Many practical algorithms are log-linear
- Very commonly used log-linear algorithm is **merge sort**
- Will return to this

Polynomial complexity

- Most common polynomial algorithms are quadratic, i.e., complexity grows with square of size of input
- Commonly occurs when we have nested loops or recursive function calls

Quadratic complexity

```
def isSubset(L1, L2):  
    for e1 in L1:  
        matched = False  
        for e2 in L2:  
            if e1 == e2:  
                matched = True  
                break  
        if not matched:  
            return False  
    return True
```

Quadratic complexity

```
def isSubset(L1, L2):  
    for e1 in L1:  
        matched = False  
        for e2 in L2:  
            if e1 == e2:  
                matched = True  
                break  
        if not matched:  
            return False  
    return True
```

- Outer loop executed $\text{len}(L1)$ times
- Each iteration will execute inner loop up to $\text{len}(L2)$ times
- $O(\text{len}(L1) * \text{len}(L2))$
- Worst case when L1 and L2 same length, none of elements of L1 in L2
- $O(\text{len}(L1)^2)$

Quadratic complexity

Find intersection of two lists, return a list with each element appearing only once

```
def intersect(L1, L2):
    tmp = []
    for e1 in L1:
        for e2 in L2:
            if e1 == e2:
                tmp.append(e1)
    res = []
    for e in tmp:
        if not(e in res):
            res.append(e)
    return res
```

Quadratic complexity

```
def intersect(L1, L2):
    tmp = []
    for e1 in L1:
        for e2 in L2:
            if e1 == e2:
                tmp.append(e1)
    res = []
    for e in tmp:
        if not(e in res):
            res.append(e)
    return res
```

- First nested loop takes $len(L1)*len(L2)$ steps
- Second loop takes at most $len(L1)$ steps
- Latter term overwhelmed by former term
- $O(len(L1)*len(L2))$

Exponential complexity

- Recursive functions where more than one recursive call for each size of problem
 - Towers of Hanoi
 - Fibonacci series
- Many important problems are inherently exponential
 - Unfortunate, as cost can be high
 - Will lead us to consider approximate solutions more quickly

Exponential Complexity

```
def fib(N) :  
    if N == 1 or N == 0 :  
        return N  
    else :  
        return fib(N-1) + fib(N-2)
```

Exponential Complexity


```
def fib(N):  
    if N == 1 or N == 0:  
        return N  
    else:  
        return fib(N-1) + fib(N-2)
```

- Assuming return statement is constant time
- Recall the recursive tree.
- Complexity of this function is $O(\sim 2^n)$

Factorial Complexity

- The travelling salesperson problem.
- A salesperson has to visit n towns. Each pair of towns is joined by a route of a given length. Find the shortest possible route that visits all the towns and returns to the starting point.

1. Consider city 1 as the starting and ending point.
2. Generate all $(n-1)!$ Permutations of cities.
3. Calculate cost of every permutation and keep track of minimum cost permutation.
4. Return the permutation with minimum cost.



Complexity classes

- $O(1)$ denotes constant running time
- $O(\log n)$ denotes logarithmic running time
- $O(n)$ denotes linear running time
- $O(n \log n)$ denotes log-linear running time
- $O(n^c)$ denotes polynomial running time (c is a constant)
- $O(c^n)$ denotes exponential running time (c is a constant being raised to a power based on size of input)
- $O(n!)$ denotes factorial running time

Comparing complexities


- So does it really matter if our code is of a particular class of complexity?
- Depends on size of problem, but for large scale problems, complexity of worst case makes a difference

Comparing complexities - example


- There are alternative approaches with differing algorithm complexities for doing *sth.* on a list of n elements.
- Now you want to compare them. Assume that computer makes three billion calculations per second. Lets look for the running time of the algorithms.

Complexity	$n=10$	$n=1000$	$n=10^5$	$n=10^{10}$
$O(\log n)$	< 1msec	< 1msec	< 1msec	< 1msec
$O(n)$	< 1msec	< 1msec	< 1msec	< 1 min
$O(n \log n)$	< 1msec	< 1msec	< 1 sec	< 2 min
$O(n^2)$	< 1msec	< 1msec	< 1 min	~1000 year
$O(2^n)$	< 1 sec	<1000 year	<1000 year	<1000 year
$O(n!)$	< 1 sec	<1000 year	>1000 year	>1000 year

Comparing the Complexities




Constant versus Logarithmic



Observations

- A logarithmic algorithm is often almost as good as a constant time algorithm
- Logarithmic costs grow very slowly


Logarithmic versus Linear



Observations

- Logarithmic clearly better for large scale problems than linear
- Does not imply linear is bad, however


Linear versus Log-linear



Observations

- While $\log(n)$ may grow slowly, when multiplied by a linear factor, growth is much more rapid than pure linear
- $O(n \log n)$ algorithms are still very valuable.

Log-linear versus Quadratic





Observations

- Quadratic is often a problem, however.
- Some problems inherently quadratic but if possible always better to look for more efficient solutions

Quadratic versus Exponential

- Exponential algorithms very expensive
 - Right plot is on a log scale, since left plot almost invisible given how rapidly exponential grows
- Exponential generally not of use except for small problems



Warning

- Execution time and the algorithm complexity are different paradigms.
- Running time may differ even if two algorithms have the same algorithm complexity. (Even when their purpose are same)

```
def factIT(n) :  
    answer = 1  
    while n > 0:  
        answer *= n  
        n -= 1  
    return answer
```

```
def factREC(n) :  
    if n == 0:  
        return 1  
    else:  
        return n*factREC(n-1)
```

They have same complexity $O(n)$. But their execution times are different.

Tips

- We know that, $O(2^n)$ algorithm complexity is bad. But, if we sure that n won't be up too high, it won't be matter.
- When we calculate the big-O, we did not care about constant factors.
 - $5n + 37 \rightarrow O(n)$
- But, sometimes improving the constants does matter. (e.g. in game developement; actually, everytime)
 - $5n+37 \rightarrow 5n+10$ (not worthy, but better than nothing)
 - $5n+37 \rightarrow 3n+12$ (better)