

Array size: 5

| | Merge sort runtime | Quick sort (left most pivot) runtime | Quick sort (median pivot) runtime | Quick sort (random pivot) runtime |
|------------|-----------------------|--|---|---|
| Ascending | 1.33 | 1.0 | 1.33 | 1.66 |
| Descending | 1.33 | 1.0 | 1.66 | 1.66 |
| Random | 2.33 | 2.66 | 1.66 | 1.66 |
| Nearly | 1.66 | 1.0 | 1.66 | 1.66 |

Array size: 60

| | Merge sort runtime | Quick sort (left most pivot) runtime | Quick sort (median pivot) runtime | Quick sort (random pivot) runtime |
|------------|-----------------------|--|---|---|
| Ascending | 39.33 | 53.0 | 30.33 | 37.33 |
| Descending | 41.66 | 108.0 | 33.66 | 42.33 |
| Random | 32.0 | 39.0 | 37.66 | 33.0 |
| Nearly | 41.0 | 40.66 | 38.33 | 36.33 |

Array size: 200

| | Merge sort runtime | Quick sort (left most pivot) runtime | Quick sort (median pivot) runtime | Quick sort (random pivot) runtime |
|------------|-----------------------|--|---|---|
| Ascending | 89.66 | 85.67 | 80.33 | 66.66 |
| Descending | 75.0 | 70.0 | 51.33 | 62.33 |
| Random | 16.33 | 17.0 | 41.33 | 39.66 |
| Nearly | 77.33 | 76.0 | 71.0 | 61.33 |

Array size: 1000

| | Merge sort runtime | Quick sort (left most pivot) runtime | Quick sort (median pivot) runtime | Quick sort (random pivot) runtime |
|------------|--------------------|--------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| Ascending | 72.33 | 972.33 | 831.0 | 934.0 |
| Descending | 54.0 | 1120.0 | 466 | 826.33 |
| Random | 77.0 | 58.0 | 80.0 | 79.0 |
| Nearly | 60.33 | 122.66 | 60.0 | 59.66 |

Merge sort

Merge sort is simpler than quick sort and has $O(N \log N)$ time complexity in best, average and worst cases. Merge sort is stable. So this is good if we care about comparisons. Merge sort requires a temp array of size N for merging. So it is in-place. The merge sort algorithm is built recursively. So it can theoretically cause a stack overflow. However, merge sort is a consistently very fast sorting algorithm.

Quick sort

In general, quick sort is the fastest sorting algorithm. It is in-place but unstable. In the worst case, it gives $O(N^2)$ time complexity. But it is unlikely to be worse than $O(N \log N)$. Pivot is the critical factor in quick sort. The speed of this algorithm depends on the pivot. Poor pivot can lead to the worst case of $O(N^2)$. So we have to use a good pivot selection strategy. This is also built recursively. So it can cause a stack overflow.

Finally, according to the above runtime results and previous (practical 01) bubble sort, selection sort and insertion sort runtime results, The merge sort is the fastest sorting algorithm.

| | Pros | Cons | Big-O |
|----------------|--|--|---|
| Bubble sort | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Simple Fast (if already sorted) In-place Stable | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Generally poor in speed. Performs best only with already sorted data. | B: $O(N^2)$ A: $O(N^2)$ W: $O(N^2)$ |
| Insertion sort | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Fast (with semi sorted data) In-place stable | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Complex to implement. Slow when reversed. | B: $O(N)$ A: $O(N^2)$ W: $O(N^2)$ |
| Selection sort | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Simple Only one swap per pass In-place | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> All cases are identical. Unstable | B: $O(N^2)$ A: $O(N^2)$ W: $O(N^2)$ |

| | | | |
|------------|--|---|--|
| Merge sort | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consistently very fast Stable | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not in-place Fairly complex to implement. | B: $O(N \log N)$ A: $O(N \log N)$ W: $O(N \log N)$ |
| Quick sort | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Typically the fastest sorting algorithm. In-place | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Complicated Unstable Could be stack overflowed. | B: $O(N \log N)$ A: $O(N \log N)$ W: $O(N^2)$ |