

Wiggle Sort II

Given an unsorted array `nums`, reorder it such that `nums[0] ≤ nums[2] ≤ nums[1] ≤ nums[3] ≤ ...`.

Example:

(1) Given `nums = [1, 5, 1, 1, 6, 4]`, one possible answer is `[1, 4, 1, 5, 1, 6]`.

(2) Given `nums = [1, 3, 2, 2, 3, 1]`, one possible answer is `[2, 3, 1, 3, 1, 2]`.

Note:

You may assume all input has valid answer.

Follow Up:

Can you do it in $O(n)$ time and/or in-place with $O(1)$ extra space?

Credits:

Special thanks to [@dietpepsi](#) for adding this problem and creating all test cases.

Solution 1

This post is mainly about what I call "virtual indexing" technique (I'm sure I'm not the first who came up with this, but I couldn't find anything about it, so I made up a name as well. If you know better, let me know).

Solution

```
void wiggleSort(vector<int>& nums) {
    int n = nums.size();

    // Find a median.
    auto midptr = nums.begin() + n / 2;
    nth_element(nums.begin(), midptr, nums.end());
    int mid = *midptr;

    // Index-rewiring.
    #define A(i) nums[(1+2*(i)) % (n|1)]

    // 3-way-partition-to-wiggly in O(n) time with O(1) space.
    int i = 0, j = 0, k = n - 1;
    while (j <= k) {
        if (A(j) > mid)
            swap(A(i++), A(j++));
        else if (A(j) < mid)
            swap(A(j), A(k--));
        else
            j++;
    }
}
```

Explanation

First I find a median using `nth_element`. That only guarantees $O(n)$ **average** time complexity and I don't know about space complexity. I might write this myself using $O(n)$ time and $O(1)$ space, but that's not what I want to show here.

This post is about what comes **after** that. We can use **three-way partitioning** to arrange the numbers so that those *larger than* the median come first, then those *equal to* the median come next, and then those *smaller than* the median come last.

Ordinarily, you'd then use one more phase to bring the numbers to their final positions to reach the overall wiggle-property. But I don't know a nice $O(1)$ space way for this. Instead, I embed this right into the partitioning algorithm. That algorithm simply works with indexes 0 to $n-1$ as usual, but sneaky as I am, I rewire those indexes where I want the numbers to actually end up. The partitioning-algorithm doesn't even know that I'm doing that, it just works like normal (it just uses `A(x)` instead of `nums[x]`).

Let's say `nums` is `[10, 11, ..., 19]`. Then after `nth_element` and ordinary

partitioning, we might have this (15 is my median):

```
index:    0  1  2  3  4  5  6  7  8  9
number:   18 17 19 16 15 11 14 10 13 12
```

I rewire it so that the first spot has index 5, the second spot has index 0, etc, so that I might get this instead:

```
index:    5  0  6  1  7  2  8  3  9  4
number:   11 18 14 17 10 19 13 16 12 15
```

And 11 18 14 17 10 19 13 16 12 15 is perfectly wiggly. And the whole partitioning-to-wiggly-arrangement (everything after finding the median) only takes $O(n)$ time and $O(1)$ space.

If the above description is unclear, maybe this explicit listing helps:

Accessing $A(0)$ actually accesses `nums[1]` .
Accessing $A(1)$ actually accesses `nums[3]` .
Accessing $A(2)$ actually accesses `nums[5]` .
Accessing $A(3)$ actually accesses `nums[7]` .
Accessing $A(4)$ actually accesses `nums[9]` .
Accessing $A(5)$ actually accesses `nums[0]` .
Accessing $A(6)$ actually accesses `nums[2]` .
Accessing $A(7)$ actually accesses `nums[4]` .
Accessing $A(8)$ actually accesses `nums[6]` .
Accessing $A(9)$ actually accesses `nums[8]` .

Props to [apolloydy's solution](#), I knew the partitioning algorithm already but I didn't know the name. And apolloydy's idea to partition to reverse order happened to make the index rewiring simpler.

written by [StefanPochmann](#) original link [here](#)

Solution 2

Solution

Roughly speaking I put the smaller half of the numbers on the even indexes and the larger half on the odd indexes.

```
def wiggleSort(self, nums):
    nums.sort()
    half = len(nums)::2
    nums::2, nums[1::2] = nums[:half][::-1], nums[half:][::-1]
```

Alternative, maybe nicer, maybe not:

```
def wiggleSort(self, nums):
    nums.sort()
    half = len(nums)::2 - 1
    nums::2, nums[1::2] = nums[half::-1], nums[:half:-1]
```

Explanation / Proof

I put the smaller half of the numbers on the even indexes and the larger half on the odd indexes, both from right to left:

Example nums = [1,2,...,7]	Example nums = [1,2,...,8]
Small half: 4 . 3 . 2 . 1	Small half: 4 . 3 . 2 . 1 .
Large half: . 7 . 6 . 5 .	Large half: . 8 . 7 . 6 . 5
-----	-----
Together: 4 7 3 6 2 5 1	Together: 4 8 3 7 2 6 1 5

I want:

- Odd-index numbers are larger than their neighbors.

Since I put the larger numbers on the odd indexes, clearly I already have:

- Odd-index numbers are larger than **or equal to** their neighbors.

Could they be "equal to"? That would require some number M to appear both in the smaller and the larger half. It would be the largest in the smaller half and the smallest in the larger half. Examples again, where S means some number smaller than M and L means some number larger than M.

Small half: M . S . S . S	Small half: M . S . S . S .
Large half: . L . L . M .	Large half: . L . L . L . M
-----	-----
Together: M L S L S M S	Together: M L S L S L S M

You can see the two M are quite far apart. Of course M could appear more than just

twice, for example:

Small half:	M . M . S . S	Small half:	M . S . S . S .
Large half:	. L . L . M .	Large half:	. L . M . M . M

Together:	M L M L S M S	Together:	M L S M S M S M

You can see that with seven numbers, three M are no problem. And with eight numbers, four M are no problem. Should be easy to see that in general, with n numbers, $\text{floor}(n/2)$ times M is no problem. Now, if there were more M than that, then my method would fail. But... it would also be impossible:

- If n is even, then having more than $n/2$ times the same number clearly is unsolvable, because you'd have to put two of them next to each other, no matter how you arrange them.
- If n is odd, then the only way to successfully arrange a number appearing more than $\text{floor}(n/2)$ times is if it appears exactly $\text{floor}(n/2)+1$ times and you put them on all the even indexes. And to have the wiggle-property, all the other numbers would have to be larger. But then we wouldn't have an M in both the smaller and the larger half.

So if the input has a valid answer at all, then my code will find one.

written by [StefanPochmann](#) original link [here](#)

Solution 3

```
void wiggleSort(vector<int>& nums) {  
    vector<int> sorted(nums);  
    sort(sorted.begin(), sorted.end());  
    for (int i=nums.size()-1, j=0, k=i/2+1; i>=0; i--)  
        nums[i] = sorted[i&1 ? k++ : j++];  
}
```

Sort and then write the smaller half of the numbers on the even indexes and the larger half of the numbers on the odd indexes, both from the back. Example:

Small half:	4 . 3 . 2 . 1 . 0 .
Large half:	. 9 . 8 . 7 . 6 . 5
<hr/>	
Together:	4 9 3 8 2 7 1 6 0 5

So write `nums` from the back, interweaving `sorted[0..4]` (indexed by `j`) and `sorted[5..9]` (indexed by `k`).

For more explanation/proof, see [my equivalent Python solution](#).

written by [StefanPochmann](#) original link [here](#)

From [LeetCoder](#).