COMP1927 Sort Detective Report

By Shan Wang(z5119666), Mo Li(z5089148)

Experimental Design

There are two aspects to our analysis:

- Determine that the sort programs are actually correct
- Measure their performance over a range of inputs

Correctness Analysis

To determine correctness, we tested each program on the following kinds of input (Sample)

| Data1 | Data2 | Data3 | Data4 | Data5 | Data6 |
|---|------------------------------------|--|---|--|---------------------------------------|
| (ascending order with no repeat keys) | (ascending order with repeat keys) | (descending order with no repeat keys) | (descending order with repeat keys) | (random order with no repeat keys) | (random order with repeat keys) |
| 1 ghh | 1 rte | 90 shd | 78 dbd | 53 hsd | 66 adf |
| 2 hjh | 1 jhj | 87 fgg | 66 has | 76 dfs | 53 asd |
| 3 hgh | 1 ffd | 83 fgj | 66 ghh | 92 jtr | 85 gre |
| 5 uio | 2 eet | 76 prr | 66 rfv | 74 ert | 73 hjj |
| 6 otr | 2 tty | 71 edf | 48 tgb | 65 ioo | 76 rty |
| 9 hjk | 8 qul | 47 hkj | 45 yhn | 12 nnr | 66 ety |
| 14 sdf | 13 dsf | 34 fsf | 44 ujm | 47 wet | 23 jjj |
| 17 dfg | 13 yiu | 30 uki | 35 edc | 7 htd | 53 wep |
| 20 wwe | 13 ghj | 23 dgg | 34 sdg | 18 dfd | 34 sdg |
| 22 qwe | 15 uuu | 19 gjh | 34 ert | 78 qwe | 53 trh |
| 23 sdf | 15 rer | 14 qwb | 34 qwr | 57 rtt | 75 wdv |
| 28 erw | 15 ryy | 11 bnm | 15 kdl | 24 uyt | 67 rgh |
| 33 adt | 15 ytu | 6 gfg | 15 jhd | 77 edw | 53 ygv |
| 55 dfg | 15 opp | 1 aop | 3 dsf | 3 egm | 3 tfc |
| 90 rww | 45 asf | 0 rwe | 3 sdd | 11 ohc | 44 edd |

We chose these inputs because it covered different conditions, for example, it already sorted in ascending order, and already sorted in ascending order with repeat keys, and in descending order, and in descending order with repeat keys, and in random order. Firstly, we can test if it works. Secondly, the output shows if these programs work properly, such as if these programs sort all numbers correctly and if it drops some numbers and if it gives more numbers.

Expectation

The expectation is the number of these keys is correct, and after sorting, keys should in ascending order.

Performance Analysis

Execution time & Adaptability

Time

In our performance analysis, we measured how each program's execution time varied as the size and initial sortedness of the input varied.

Adaptability

We also investigated the adaptability of the sorting programs by comparing the time used in sorting ascending, descending and random order numbers when the number of keys is equal.

We used given generator 'gen' to generate different amount of numbers in ascending, descending and random order and record execution time.

(Table to record execution time)

| Order | sortA | sortA | sortA | sortB | sortB | sortB |
|---------|----------|-------------|--------------|----------|-------------|--------------|
| #lines | random/s | ascending/s | descending/s | random/s | ascending/s | descending/s |
| 10 | | | | | | |
| 100 | | | | | | |
| 1,000 | | | | | | |
| 5,000 | | | | | | |
| 10,000 | | | | | | |
| 20,000 | | | | | | |
| 50,000 | | | | | | |
| 80,000 | | | | | | |
| 100,000 | | | | | | |
| 999,999 | | | | | | |

We used these test cases because we want to find variation between numbers of keys and time. Therefore, we can work out the complexity of each program. And the reason why the maximum number of lines is 999,999 is that there is a limit on the size of the input each program can process (1,000,000 lines).

Because of the way timing works on Unix/Linux, it was necessary to repeat the same test multiple times (which is not shown on the table above).

We were able to use up to quite large test cases without storage overhead because (a) we had a data generator that could generate consistent inputs to be used for multiple test runs, (b) we had already demonstrated that the program worked correctly, so there was no need to check the output.

Expectation

We expect we can draw a line graph to observe and figure out the complexity of each program.

Stability

We also investigated the stability of the sorting programs by the following kinds of input data.

(Sample)

| Data1 | Data 2 | Data 3 |
|----------|-------------|--------------|
| (Random) | (Ascending) | (Descending) |
| 6 ааа | 1 aaa | 9 aaa |
| 4 aaa | 1 bbb | 9 bbb |
| 17 aaa | 1 ccc | 9 ccc |
| 8 aaa | 2 aaa | 8 aaa |
| 6 bbb | 2 bbb | 8 bbb |
| 32 aaa | 2 ccc | 8 ccc |
| 56 aaa | 2 ddd | 7 aaa |
| 7 aaa | 2 eee | 7 bbb |
| 4 bbb | 2 fff | 7 ccc |
| 3 aaa | 3 aaa | 7 ddd |
| 2 aaa | 4 aaa | 7 eee |
| 42 aaa | 5 aaa | 6 aaa |
| 5 aaa | 5 bbb | 5 aaa |
| 6 ccc | 5 ccc | 4 aaa |
| 8 bbb | 6 aaa | 4 bbb |

We used these test cases because we can check if the sorted data has the same order as the original data when they have the same key. If it is stable then when key is same, 'aaa' should appear before 'bbb', 'bbb' before 'ccc' extra.

Expectation

If the program is unstable, there must be at least one example that data after sorting is not like the principle mentioned above. If the program is stable, then we need to do more test to prove it. For instance, all keys are same.

Experimental Results

Correctness Experiments

The output of sortA shows that it sorts correctly. However, sortB is incorrect, it doesn't work if the input data contains more than two repeated keys, for example

| Works | Doesn't work |
|-------|--------------|
| 1 sdf | 1 sdf |
| 1 hdf | 1 hdf |
| 2 jsd | 2 jsd |
| 3 kjs | 1 kjs |

Therefore, we test stability of sortB by change some inputs to no more than 2 repeat numbers. Furthermore, when test execution time, we used 'gen' to generate no repeat numbers.

Performance Experiments

For sortA, we observed that it is unstable. Moreover, the complexity of random order sorting is $O(n^2)$, ascending order is $O(n^2)$, descending order is $O(n^2)$. Therefore, sortA is non-adaptive.

These observations indicate that the algorithm underlying the program is unstable and non-adaptive.

For sortB, we observed that it is unstable. Furthermore, the complexity of random order sorting is O(n), ascending order is $O(n^2)$, descending order is $O(n^2)$. Thus, sortB is adaptive.

These observations indicate that the algorithm underlying the program is unstable and adaptive.

Conclusions

On the basis of our experiments and our analysis above, we believe that

- SortA implements the *Oblivious bubble sort* sorting algorithm
- SortB implements the Quick sort median of three sorting algorithm

Appendix

Properties of these sort

| | complexity | | Stable | Adaptive |
|-----------------------------------|--------------|--------------|--------|----------|
| | Best | Worst | | |
| Oblivious bubble sort | O(n^2) | O(n^2) | N | N |
| Bubble sort with early exit | O(n) | O(n^2) | Υ | Υ |
| Vanilla insertion sort | O(n) | O(n^2) | Υ | Υ |
| Insertion sort with binary search | O(n) | O(nlogn) | Υ | Υ |
| Vanilla selection sort | O(n^2) | O(n^2) | N | N |
| Quadratic selection sort | O(n*sqrt(n)) | O(n*sqrt(n)) | N | N |
| Merge sort | O(nlogn) | O(nlogn) | Υ | N |
| Vanilla quick sort | O(nlogn) | O(n^2) | N | Can be Y |
| Quick sort median of three | O(n) | O(n^2) | N | Υ |
| Randomized quick sort | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Shell sort powers of two | O(nlogn) | O(n(logn)^2) | N | Υ |
| Shell sort Sedgewick | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Bogo sort | O(n) | infinity | N | N |

Execution time

| Order | sortA | sortA | sortA | sortB | sortB | sortB |
|---------|----------|-------------|--------------|----------|-------------|--------------|
| #lines | random/s | ascending/s | descending/s | random/s | ascending/s | descending/s |
| 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 100 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 1,000 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 5,000 | 0.1 | 0.04 | 0.1 | 0 | 0.03 | 0.04 |
| 10,000 | 0.44 | 0.18 | 0.45 | 0.01 | 0.14 | 0.14 |
| 20,000 | 1.75 | 0.8 | 1.8 | 0.02 | 0.55 | 0.55 |
| 50,000 | 10.8 | 4.5 | 11 | 0.04 | 3.4 | 3.4 |
| 80,000 | 28 | 11.7 | 28.5 | 0.06 | 8.5 | 8.5 |
| 100,000 | 45.6 | 18.1 | 43.7 | 0.1 | 13.5 | 13.5 |
| 999,999 | N/A | N/A | N/A | 1.1 | N/A | N/A |

Line charts of sortA and sortB



