

- Measures how runtime scales with input size
-

$O(1)$ \Rightarrow Constant time

- Accessing an array by index
- Access a hash table

$O(\log n)$ \Rightarrow Logarithmic time
 \Rightarrow Runtime increases slowly as input grows

- Binary search on sorted array
- Performing operations on a balanced binary tree

$O(n) \Rightarrow$ Linear time

\Rightarrow Runtime grows with input as each element is touched once

• Finding min, max elements in an unsorted array

• Checking if an element exists in an unsorted array

$O(n \log n) \Rightarrow$ Linearithmic time

\Rightarrow Runtime of most efficient sorting algorithms (merge sort, quick sort, heap)

$O(x^2) \Rightarrow$ Quadratic time

- Bubble sort
- Nested loops

$O(n^3) \Rightarrow$ Cubic time

- Naive matrix multiplication
 - Triple nested loops
-

$O(2^n) \Rightarrow$ Exponential time

- Recursive algorithms
-

$O(n!) \Rightarrow$ Factorial time

- Permutation-generation problems

↳ Very inefficient for trivial input size

Important to note that big-O is not everything \Rightarrow its important to consider how algorithms work in the memory/rest. of the system

Array Access

Although accessing a 2D array is $O(n^2)$, accessing by rows is faster than accessing by columns!

Reading row-wise maximises sequential access \Rightarrow More cache friendly

Linked list vs Array

- Both are linear time

- Accessing an array is faster

\hookrightarrow Array elements are closer together

\hookrightarrow Linked-list nodes are often scattered in memory