1.)																										
	e	X	3,)			B	ul	00	le.	So	0 V	+							٠	, E	9		1			
									##Willer																	
			197	-1	-ov	'nι	1/0	١.	for	·													5)		:	
			383								į	.)	nv	um	be	V.	of	<u></u> C	on	a n	ar	150	s in	S		
			((47)				***			-										١.	+1		41			
	14		DC			4	In	.(n).]			<u>></u> .	.().(n.a).			100		×		×		
								*	2	· ·				×							¥.	*5	×	¥	¥	×
		12	145	740			20	*:								54					20					
	Si .	e,																ray								
	9	9	100	op c) III	e a	IIa	, 16	quii	esi	ı-q		npa	11150	3115	(11-	·iiui	nbe	. 01	an	ay i	elei	nen	15).	÷	Ÿ
			,							,	,										0					
							į.	-	2	÷						8					-	-				ii.
								ě	ě		ij	.)	ava	1-0	las	ę	#	o f	S	Ŵ	ap	5	ž			2
	2.	12	350		120	· T		1	10 1									. 17	170	1.20	- 0	25	8			
	12.		195		525		n	(n-1)]		>	. ().(n.)	550		(20)	1.00	**	20	81		*	
	2		0.5	100			10	. (1.		2	*	*		25	÷			383		*1	2	87	*	*	
			*				6	٧.	*	×	*		×			29					*1	*	*	*	*	*
	æ		90		200	4			*:	*			*		18				5,000		**	**	*		*	
		19																d to						×	×	*
		9	comparison, in the worst case, every comparison needs a swap, so the average case is having a swap for half the comparisons.													*										
			16.5																	547	*	*3	÷	×	×	i.

4.) The graphs match the analysis above, especially the interpolated line. It can be seen that the comparisons line has an equations of (n(n-1))/2 and the swaps line has an equations of (n(n-1))/2

