SORTING AND ASYMPTOTIC COMPLEXITY

Lecture 14
CS2110 – Spring 2013

InsertionSort

2

```
//sort a[], an array of int
for (int i = 1; i < a.length; i++) {
  // Push a[i] down to its sorted position
  //       in a[0..i]
  int temp = a[i];
  int k;
  for (k = i;  0 < k && temp < a[k–1];  k– –)
        a[k] = a[k–1];
   a[k] = temp;
}
```

- Worst-case: $O(n^2)$ (reverse-sorted input)
- Best-case: $O(n)$ (sorted input)
- Expected case: $O(n^2)$
- Expected number of inversions: $n(n–1)/4$

- Many people sort cards this way
- Invariant of main loop: ***a[0..i-1] is sorted***
- Works especially well when input is *nearly sorted*

SelectionSort

```
//sort a[], an array of int
for (int i = 1; i < a.length; i++) {
  int m= index of minimum of a[i..];
  Swap b[i] and b[m];
}
```

Another common way for people to sort cards

Runtime
- Worst-case $O(n^2)$
- Best-case $O(n^2)$
- Expected-case $O(n^2)$



Each iteration, swap min value of this section into a[i]

Divide & Conquer?

4

It often pays to
- Break the problem into smaller subproblems,
- Solve the subproblems separately, and then
- Assemble a final solution

This technique is called *divide-and-conquer*
- Caveat: It won't help unless the *partitioning* and *assembly* processes are inexpensive

Can we apply this approach to sorting?

MergeSort

5

- Quintessential divide-and-conquer algorithm
- Divide array into equal parts, sort each part, then merge
- Questions:
  - Q1: How do we divide array into two equal parts?
    A1: Find middle index: a.length/2
  - Q2: How do we sort the parts?
    A2: Call MergeSort recursively!
  - Q3: How do we merge the sorted subarrays?
    A3: Write some (easy) code

Merging Sorted Arrays A and B into C

6

Picture shows situation after copying{4, 7} from A and {1, 3, 4, 6} from B into C

A[0..i-1] and B[0..j-1] have been copied into C[0..k-1].

C[0..k-1] is sorted.

Next, put a[i] in c[k], because a[i] < b[j].

Then increase k and i.



Merging Sorted Arrays `A` and `B` `into C`

7

- Create array C of size: size of A + size of B
- i= 0; j= 0; k= 0; // initially, nothing copied
- Copy smaller of A[i] and B[j] into C[k]
- Increment i or j, whichever one was used, and k
- When either A or B becomes empty, copy remaining elements from the other array (B or A, respectively) into C

This tells what has been done so far:

A[0..i-1] and B[0..j-1] have been placed in C[0..k-1].

C[0..k-1] is sorted.

`MergeSort` Analysis

8

Outline (code on website)

- Split array into two halves
- Recursively sort each half
- Merge two halves

Merge: combine two sorted arrays into one sorted array

- Rule: always choose smallest item
- Time: O(n) where n is the total size of the two arrays

Runtime recurrence

T(n): time to sort array of size n

$T(1) = 1$

$T(n) = 2T(n/2) + O(n)$

Can show by induction that

T(n) is O(n log n)

Alternatively, can see that T(n) is O(n log n) by looking at tree of recursive calls

`MergeSort` Notes

9

- Asymptotic complexity: O(n log n)
  - Much faster than $O(n^2)$
- Disadvantage
  - Need extra storage for temporary arrays
  - In practice, can be a disadvantage, even though MergeSort is *asymptotically optimal for sorting*
  - Can do MergeSort in place, but *very tricky* (and slows execution significantly)
- Good sorting algorithms that do not use so much extra storage?
  - Yes: QuickSort

`QuickSort`

10

Idea To sort b[h..k], which has an arbitrary value x in b[h]:

h	h+1 ... k
x	?

x is called the pivot

first swap array values around until b[h..k] looks like this:

h ...	j	... k
<= x	x	>= x

Then sort b[h..j-1] and b[j+1..k] —how do you do that?

Recursively!

11

20	31	24	19	45	56	4	65	5	72	14	99

pivot

partition

j

5	14	19	4	**20**	45	56	24	65	72	31	99

Not yet sorted

Not yet sorted

QuickSort QuickSort

4	5	14	19	**20**	24	31	45	56	65	72	99

sorted

In-Place Partitioning

12

Key issues

- How to choose a *pivot*?
- How to *partition* array in place?

Partitioning in place

- Takes O(n) time (next slide)

Choosing pivot

- Ideal pivot: the median, since it splits array in half
- Computing median of unsorted array is O(n), quite complicated

Popular heuristics: Use

- first array value (not good)
- middle array value
- median of first, middle, last, values GOOD!
- Choose a random element

In-Place Partitioning

13

Change b[h..k] from this:



to this by repeatedly swapping array elements:



Do it one swap at a time, keeping the array looking like this. At each step, swap b[j+1] with something



Start with: j= h; t= k;

In-Place Partitioning

14




```
j= h; t= k;
while (j < t) {
   if (b[j+1] <= x) {
      Swap b[j+1] and b[j];   j= j+1;
   } else {
      Swap b[j+1] and b[t];   t= t-1;
   }
}
```

Initially, with j = h and t = k, this diagram looks like the start diagram

Terminates when j = t, so the "?" segment is empty, so diagram looks like result diagram

In-Place Partitioning

15



How can we move all the blues to the left of all the reds?

- Keep two indices, LEFT and RIGHT
- Initialize LEFT at start of array and RIGHT at end of array

  Invariant: *all elements to left of LEFT are blue*
  all elements to right of RIGHT are red
- Keep advancing indices until they pass, maintaining invariant



16



Now neither LEFT nor RIGHT can advance and maintain invariant. We can swap red and blue pointed to by LEFT and RIGHT indices. After swap, indices can continue to advance until next conflict.





- Once indices cross, partitioning is done
- If you replace blue with ≤ **p** and red with ≥ **p**, this is exactly what we need for QuickSort partitioning
- Notice that after partitioning, array is partially sorted
- Recursive calls on partitioned subarrays will sort subarrays
- No need to copy/move arrays, since we partitioned in place

QuickSort procedure

18

```
/** Sort b[h..k]. */
public static void QS(int[] b, int h, int k) {
   if (b[h..k] has < 2 elements) return;
   int j=  partition(b, h, k);
   // We know b[h..j–1] <= b[j] <= b[j+1..k]
   // So we need to sort b[h..j-1] and b[j+1..k]
   QS(b, h, j-1);
   QS(b, j+1, k);
}
```

Base case

Function does the partition algorithm and returns position j of pivot

QuickSort versus MergeSort

19

```
/** Sort b[h..k] */
public static void QS
      (int[] b, int h, int k) {
   if (k – h < 1) return;
   int j=  partition(b, h, k);
   QS(b, h, j-1);
   QS(b, j+1, k);
}
```

```
/** Sort b[h..k] */
public static void MS
      (int[] b, int h, int k) {
   if (k  – h < 1) return;
   MS(b, h, (h+k)/2);
   MS(b, (h+k)/2 + 1, k);
   merge(b, h, (h+k)/2, k);
}
```

One processes the array then recurses.
One recurses then processes the array.

QuickSort Analysis

20

- Runtime analysis (worst-case)
  - Partition can produce this: | p | ≥ p |
  - Runtime recurrence: T(n) = T(n–1) + n
  - Can be solved to show worst-case T(n) is $O(n^2)$
  - Space can be O(n) —max depth of recursion
- Runtime analysis (expected-case)
  - More complex recurrence
  - Can be solved to show *expected* T(n) is O(n log n)
- Improve constant factor by avoiding QuickSort on *small* sets
  - Use InsertionSort (for example) for sets of size, say, ≤ 9
  - Definition of *small* depends on language, machine, etc.

Sorting Algorithm Summary

21

- We discussed
  - InsertionSort
  - SelectionSort
  - MergeSort
  - QuickSort
- Other sorting algorithms
  - HeapSort (will revisit)
  - ShellSort (in text)
  - BubbleSort (nice name)
  - RadixSort
  - BinSort
  - CountingSort

Why so many? Do computer scientists have some kind of sorting fetish or what?

Stable sorts: **Ins, Sel, Mer**

Worst-case O(n log n): **Mer, Hea**

Expected O(n log n): **Mer, Hea, Qui**

Best for nearly-sorted sets: **Ins**

No extra space: **Ins, Sel, Hea**

Fastest in practice: **Qui**

Least data movement: **Sel**

Lower Bound for Comparison Sorting

22

Goal: Determine minimum time *required* to sort *n* items

Note: we want *worst-case*, not *best-case* time

- Best-case doesn't tell us much. E.g. Insertion Sort takes O(n) time on already-sorted input
- Want to know *worst-case time* for *best possible* algorithm

- How can we prove anything about the *best possible* algorithm?
- Want to find characteristics that are common to *all* sorting algorithms
- Limit attention to *comparison-based algorithms* and try to count number of comparisons

Comparison Trees

23

- Comparison-based algorithms make decisions based on comparison of data elements
- Gives a *comparison tree*
- If algorithm fails to terminate for some input, comparison tree is infinite
- Height of comparison tree represents *worst-case number of comparisons* for that algorithm
- Can show: *Any* correct comparison-based algorithm must make at least n log n comparisons in the worst case



Lower Bound for Comparison Sorting

24

- Say we have a correct comparison-based algorithm
- Suppose we want to sort the elements in an array b[]
- Assume the elements of b[] are distinct
- Any permutation of the elements is initially possible
- When done, b[] is sorted
- But the algorithm could not have taken the same path in the comparison tree on different input permutations

Lower Bound for Comparison Sorting

25

How many input permutations are possible? $n! \sim 2^{n \log n}$

For a comparison-based sorting algorithm to be correct, it must have at least that many leaves in its comparison tree

To have at least $n! \sim 2^{n \log n}$ leaves, it must have height at least n log n (since it is only binary branching, the number of nodes at most doubles at every depth)

Therefore its longest path must be of length at least n log n, and that it its worst-case running time

`java.lang.Comparable<T>` Interface

26

`public int compareTo(T x);`

- Return a negative, zero, or positive value
  - negative if **this** is before **x**
  - 0 if **this.equals(x)**
  - positive if **this** is after **x**

Many classes implement **`Comparable`**

- **`String`**, **`Double`**, **`Integer`**, **`Character`**, **`Date`**, …
- Class implements Comparable? Its method compareTo is considered to define that class's *natural ordering*

Comparison-based sorting methods should work with **`Comparable`** for maximum generality