Sorting Data Structures and Algori nal Linguistics III (IGCL-RA-07)

> Cağrı Cöltekin ccoltekin@sfs.uni-tuebingen.de

Winter Semester 2022/23

Why study sorting

. Sorting is one of the most studied (and con mon) problems in o * It is important to understand strengths and weaknesses of algorithms for sorting

Many problems look like sorting. Learning sorting algorithms will help you solve other problems

 Available implementations are highly optimized (we are not just talking about asymptotic performance guarantees)

. In some (rare) cases, implementing your own sorting algorithm may be

beneficial

Bubble sort

- We start with an 'edu

- Bubble sort is easy to understand, but performs bad not used in practice . We start from bubble sort, and see the improvements over it
- The idea is simple:

- compare first two elements, swap if not in order
 shift and compare the next two elements, again swap if needed
 when you reach to the end, repeat the process from the beginning unle
 were no swaps in the last iteration

Bubble sort

89 67 88 12 72 76 93 57

Bubble sort

- $\begin{tabular}{ll} Worst case: $O(n^2)$ & $O(n^2)$ comparisons, $O(n^2)$ swaps \\ * Average case: $O(n^2)$ & $O(n^2)$ comparisons, $O(n^2)$ swaps \\ \end{tabular}$

- Best case: O(n)
- O(n) comparisons, O(1) swaps
- Space complexity: O(1) . There are more concerns than perform
- Many swaps
 Bubble sort is in-place
- The repetitive algorithm pattern is common

$$\begin{split} & \text{swapped} = \text{True} \\ & n = \text{len}(\text{seq}) \\ & \text{white swapped:} \\ & \text{swapped} = \text{False} \\ & \text{for i in range}(n-1):} \\ & \text{if seq}(i) > \text{seq}(i+1):} \\ & \text{seq}(i), \text{seq}(i+1) \\ & = \text{seq}(i+1), \text{seq}(i) \\ & \text{swapped} = \text{True} \end{split}$$

· Not practical - it is not used

in practice

Insertion sort * Insertion sort is one of the simpler sorting algorithm * It is easy to understand, and reasonably fast for sorting short sequ

Insertion sort

67

On longer sequences, it performs worse than more advanced algorithms, like merge sort or quicksort (we will study those later)

The general idea simple:

 assume the elements arrive one by one, and we have a sorted sequence
 insert the element to the correct position: shift all elements larger than the new one to the right
 place the new element in its correct place

monstration

Insertion sort

for i in range(i, len(seq)): $\begin{array}{ll} \operatorname{cur} &= \operatorname{seq}[i] \\ &= i \\ &= i \end{array}$ while $\operatorname{seq}[j-i] > \operatorname{cur} \setminus \\ &= \operatorname{seq}[j] = \operatorname{seq}[j-i] \\ &= \operatorname{seq}[j] = \operatorname{seq}[j-i] \end{array}$ seq[j] = $\operatorname{cur} \setminus$ 89 67 88 12 72 76 93 57

89 88 12 72 76 93 57

for i in range(i, len(seq)):
 cur = seq[i]
 j = i
 while seq[j - i] > cur\ maile seq[j - 1] > cur\
 and j in range(1,i+1):
 seq[j] = seq[j - 1]
 j == 1
seq[j] = cur

Insertion sort

89 88 12 72 76 93 57

for i in range(i, lem(seq)):
 cur = seq[i]
 j = i
 while seq[j - i] > cur\
 seq[j] = seq[j - i]

j -= 1 seq[j] = cur

Insertion sort

Insertion sort

67 89 88 12 72 76 93 57

for i in range(1, len(seq)):
 cur = seq[i]
 j = i
 while seq[j - i] > cur\
 and j in range(i,i+i):
 seq[j] = seq[j - i]
 i -= i j -= 1 seq[j] = cur

Insertion sort

88

67 89 12 72 76 93 57

for i in range(i, len(seq)):
 cur = seq[i]
 j = i

seq[j] = cur

67 89 12 72 76 93 57

88

for i in range(i, len(seq)):
 cur = seq[i]
 j = i

seq[j] = cur

Insertion sort Insertion sort * Worst case: $O(n^2)$ $O(n^2)$ comparisons, $O(n^2)$ swaps or i in range(1, len(seq cur = seq[k] j = i while seq[j - 1] > cur\ for i in range(1, lem(seq)):
 cur = seq[i]
 j = i
 while seq[j - i] > cur\
 and j in range(1,i+1):
 seq[j] = seq[j - i] Average case: O(n²)
O(n²) comparisons, O(n²) swaps 67 88 89 12 72 76 93 57 Best case: O(n)
O(n) comparisons, O(1) swaps Space complexity: O(1) j -= 1 seq[j] = cur In practice, insertion sort is fas than the bubble sort (and also selection sort) Insertion sort Merge sort · Insertion sort is simple · Merge sort is a divide-and-conquer algorithm for sorting . It is efficient for short sequer * It is relatively easy to understand (once you get your head around recursion) For long sequences it is much worse the merge sort or quicksort (coming next) • It has good asymptotic performance There are many practical cases where merge sort is used • It is in-place Basic idea is divide-and-conquer. . It is online: it can sort items as they arrive - split the sequence - sort the subsequence - merge the sorted lists . It is stable: it does not swap elements with equal keys . It is adaptive: faster if order of elements is closer to the sorted sequ Merge sort Merge sort 89 67 88 12 72 76 93 57 12 57 67 72 76 88 89 93 Merging sequences Complexity of the merge sort 89 67 88 12 72 76 93 57 # s1, s2: sequences to be merged # s: target sequence i, j = 0, 0 n = len(s1) + len(s2) while i + j < n: if j = len(s2) or \ is (len(s1) and of [s] < s2) Keep two indices on both sequences starting from the beginning 72 76 93 57 to complete else: s[i+j] = s2[j] j += i $O(n) = n \log n$ Merge sort Merge sort: summary * Straightforward application of divide-and-conquer def merge_sort(s):
 n = len(s)
 if n <= i: return
 si, s2 = s[:n//2], s[n//2:]
 merge_sort(s1)
 nerge_sort(s2)
 nerge(s1, s2, s)</pre> * Worst case $O(n\log n)$ complexity (best/average cases are the same) \bullet Merge sort is not in-place: requires O(n) additional space It is particularly useful for settings with low random-access memory, or sequential access Split the array into two
 Recursively sort both sides - Stop when the input is length 1 Merge sort is stable . It is a well studied algorithm, there are many variants (in-place non-recursive) A short divergence to complexity A short divergence to complexity 64 384 4096 1K 1048576 1099511627776 1M 20 971 520 32 212 254 720 1 152 921 504 606 846 976

Quicksort

- · Quicksort is another popular divide-and-conquer sorting algorithm . The main difference from the merge sort is that big the part of the work is
- done before splitting Its worse time complexity is O(n²), but in practice it performs better than merge sort on average
- . General idea: pick a pivot p, and divide the sequence into three parts as
- L. smaller than a particular element p G larger than a particular element p E equal to a particular element p sort L and G recursively

· combination is simple concater

Quicksort

12 57 67 72 76 88 89 93 76 88 89 93

· Simply concat

- the sorted items less than p E items equal to p
 G the sorted items greater than p
 - No need for O(n) merging

ABCDE

ABCDE ABCD
ABCD
ABC
ABC
ABC
ABC

Ouicksort

- Similar to the merge sort, quicksort performs O(n) operations at each level in recursion
- * The overall complexity is proportional to $\pi \times \xi$
- where ℓ is depth of the tre The recursion tree of merge sort is balanced, so dej
- is log n. . For quicksort, we do not have a balanced-tree
- guarantee In the worst case, the depth of the tree can be n, resulting in O(n²) complexity

Ouicksort

- Complexity: O(n log n) average, O(n²) worst
- Despite its worst-case O(n²) complexity, quicksort is faster than merge sort on average (in practice) . The algorithm can easily be implemented in-place (in-place version is more
- · Ouicksort is not stable
- Quicksort is one of the m st-studied algorithms: th properties are well known

Bucket sort

- . Bucket sort puts elements of the input into a pre-defined number of ordered
- \star Elements in each bucket is sorted (typically using insertion sort)
- . We can than retrieve the sorted elements by visiting each bucket
- . The bucket sort does not compare elements to each other when deciding which bucket to place them
- In special cases, this results in O(n) worst-case complexit

Radix sort

- . In a large number of cases, we want to sort objects with multiple keys
- . In such cases, we define the order of key pairs as $(k_1, l_1) < (k_2, l_2)$ if $k_1 < k_2$, or $k_1 = k_2$ and $l_1 < l_2$
- * This definition can be generalized to key tuples of any length . This ordering is known as lexicographic or dictionary order
- for this purpose

Quicksort

At each divide step 89 67 88 12 57 76 93 72 89 88 76 93

89 88

Pick a pivot

Recursively call quicksort twice
 L for items less than the pivot
 G for items greater than the pivot

O(n) operations

Quicksort

 $\begin{array}{ll} \operatorname{def} \operatorname{qsort}(\operatorname{seq})\colon & \text{if } \operatorname{lan}(\operatorname{seq} = 1)\colon \operatorname{return} \operatorname{seq} \\ & \text{if } \operatorname{lan}(\operatorname{seq} <= 1)\colon \operatorname{return} \operatorname{seq} \operatorname{if} \operatorname{x} < \operatorname{seq}[-1]) \setminus \mathscr{F} < \operatorname{pr} \\ & \text{for } \operatorname{x} \operatorname{in} \operatorname{seq} \operatorname{if} \operatorname{x} = \operatorname{seq}[-1]) \setminus \mathscr{F} > \operatorname{pr} \\ & + \operatorname{qsort}(\operatorname{fix} \operatorname{for} \operatorname{x} \operatorname{in} \operatorname{seq} \operatorname{if} \operatorname{x}) = \operatorname{seq}[-1]) \cdot \mathscr{F} > \operatorname{pr} \\ \end{array}$

- · Practical implementations are not very different Common improvements include
 - in-place sorting
 selecting the pivot more carefully

Quicksort

- * Worst case of the quicksort is when the input sequence is sorted If the input sequence is (approximately) random, the expected nur elements in each divide is n/2
- . To reduce the probability of worst case, randomized quicksort picks the pivol randomly
- * Best case happens if we pick the median of the sequence as the pivot, but
- finding median already requires O(n log n) (or O(n), but not very practical)

 A common approach is picking three values (typically first, middle and last) ence, and selecting the 'median of three' as the pivot from the seq

Sorting algorithms so far, and the lower bound

zugomm	110434	merange	L-C-FC	memory	m-pance	SLUL M
Bubble sort	n ²	n ²	n	1	yes	yes
Insertion sort		n ²	n	1	yes	yes
Merge sort	nlogn	nlogn	nlogn	n.	no	yes
Quicksort	n ²	$n \log n$	$n \log n$	logn	yes	no

- Can we do better than O(n log n)?
- If our sorting algorithms requires of turns out to be 'no'
- * Lower bound of worst-case sorting is $\Omega(n \log n)$
- In some special cases, linear-time complexity can be possible

89 67 88 12 57 76 93 72 64 53 89 54 43 92 47 21 4



- n insertion operations
- n retrieval operations
 O(n) sorting time

Summary

* Sorting is an important and well-studied computational problem

- Most sorting algorithms/applications used in practice are highly opti often based on multiple basic algorithms
- Naive sorting algorithms run in O(n²) time
- * Lower bound on worst-case sorting time is $\Omega(n\log n)$, divide-and-conquer
- algorithms achieve this Reading: goodrich2013
- And a fun way to see sorting in action
- https://www.youtube.com/user/AlgoRythmics Next

 - Reading: goodrich2013

