

Design and Analysis of Algorithms I

# QuickSort


# Choosing a Good Pivot

### QuickSort: High-Level Description

[ Hoare circa 1961 ]

QuickSort (array A, length n)

- -If n=1 return
- -p = ChoosePivot(A,n)
- -Partition A around p
- -Recursively sort 1<sup>st</sup> part
- -Recursively sort 2<sup>nd</sup> part



some bacon number will decrease time complexity


## The Importance of the Pivot

Q:running time of QuickSort?

A: depends on the quality of the pivot.

s oo of Tei ve

Suppose we implement QuickSort so that ChoosePivot always selects the first element of the array. What is the running time of this algorithm on an input array that is already sorted?



Suppose we run QuickSort on some input, and, magically, every recursive call chooses the median element of its subarray as its pivot. What's the running time in this case?

O Not enough information to answer question

$$\bigcirc \theta(n)$$

 $\theta(n\log n)$ 

$$\bigcirc \theta(n^2)$$

Reason: Let T(n) = running time on arrays of

size n.

Because pivot = median choosePivot

**7**partition

Then : 
$$T(n) \le 2T(n/2) + \theta(n)$$
  
=>  $T(n) = \theta(n \log n)$  [like MergeSort]

#### Random Pivots

<u>Key Question</u>: how to choose pivots?

BIG IDEA: RANDOM PIVOTS!

<u>That is</u>: in every recursive call, choose the pivot randomly. (each element equally likely)

Hope: a random pivot is "pretty good" "often enough".

Intuition: 1.) if always get a 25-75 split, good enough for O(nlog(n))

running time. [this is a non-trivial exercise: prove via recursion tree]

2.) half of elements give a 25-75 split or better

Q: does this really work?

Tim Roughgarden

### Average Running Time of QuickSort

<u>QuickSort Theorem</u>: for every input array of length n, the average running time of QuickSort (with random pivots) is O(nlog(n)).

Note: holds for every input. [no assumptions on the data]

- recall our guiding principles!
- "average" is over random choices made by the algorithm (i.e., the pivot choices )