

Problem complexity

are $O(n \lg n)$

Can we do better?

algorithm can run faster

Asymptotically fastest sorting algorithms

□ *kn* lg *n* is an *upper bound* on run time (for some *k*)

complexity -- no algorithm can do better

What is the intrinsic complexity of sorting?

Complexity of a problem is a *lower bound* because no

n lg n

-merge, quick

Fastest possible?

Some problems have an intrinsic



algorithms

- Heap Sort (uses priority queue) Shell Sort (in text)
- Bubble Sort (nice name, slow)
- Radix Sort
- Bin Sort
- Counting Sort

- Stable sorts: Ins, Sel, Mer
- Worst-case O(n log n): Mer, Hea
- Best for nearly-sorted sets: Ins
- No extra space needed: Ins, Sel, Hea
- Fastest in practice: Qui Fastest on uniform integer keys
- O(n): Radix
- Least data movement: Sel

Lower bounds on sorting

- Goal: Determine the minimum time required to sort *n* items (no matter what order they come in)
 - Want worst-case time for the best possible algorithm
- Assumption: sorting algorithm works by comparing pairs of elements
 - in general: that's all you can do







 Lower bound; so we use big-Omega (Ω) instead of big-O



Sorting in Linear Time

Several sorting methods take only linear time

- Counting Sort
 - Sorts integers from a small range: [0..k] where k = O(n)
- Radix Sort
 - The method used by card-sorters
- Sorting time O(dn) where d is the number of "digits"
- Others...

How do they get around the

 $\Omega(n \lg n)$ lower bound?

Don't use comparisons: use keys as numbers to index into arrays

Collection ADTs

- What are the useful abstractions for organizing data in collections?
 - So far: sets, priority queues
- How can they be implemented efficiently?
 So far: lists, arrays, trees
- This lecture: more useful abstractions (but not how to implement them).

Set abstractions

class Set<T> {

3

```
boolean contains(T elem);
```

- Mutable sets: elements can be added and removed from set (the usual approach) void add(T elem)
- Immutable sets: sets don't change. Insertion or union produce new sets
 Set_add(T_elem)
 - Set add(T elem)
 Set union(Set<T> s)
 - Implementable with data structures that share data (e.g., lists, trees), useful when related sets must coexist.

Set abstractions, cont'd

Unordered sets:

- No ordering on elements
- Iterator produces elements in no particular order
- No way to get from one element to next or previous
- The basic abstraction & the most efficient approach if you don't need ordering

Ordered sets:

- Elements are (abstractly!) kept in sorted order, can be iterated in order
- May be able to search within a range
- May be able to find next or previous element in order
- Useful if elements have natural ordering (e.g., dates)
- Usually implemented as trees
- Bags (multisets): can contain same element
 - more than once

Map abstractions

class Map<K, V> {
 V get(K key);

}

- Maintains an association between keys and values
- Every key occurs only once
- Can look up value associated with a key
- Also known as associative arrays, dictionaries (esp. with string keys)
- Java interface: java.util.Map

Map varieties Mutable maps void put(K key, V value) Immutable maps Map put(K key, V value) // non-destructive Unusual, implementable as tree Ordered maps: mappings are ordered by keys Can view a map a set of (key, value) pairs where two pairs are considered "equal" or "less than" if their keys are. Implemented as a tree with key and value at each node. Can use as an index. Example: Collection of employee records might be a set of objects. Might also have several maps as indices: from employee name to record object, from employee number to record object, ...

