VE281 Project 1

Weikai Zhou 518021911039

1. **Performance of Small Cases**

We first studied the performance of small cases, which I choose is between 5 numbers to 25 numbers. For each case, I run 5 times to get the average value. The time needed for each case is shown in the figure below (Figure 1).
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Figure 1. Small cases

From the figure, we can find that MergeSort and QuickSortExtra are significantly slower than other sorts, while other sorts are almost in the same level especially when the case is exceedingly small, e.g. 5 numbers to sort. Generally, std::sort is based on QuickSort, and the time complexity is *O(nlogn)*. But there may be a threshold such that when *n* (the number of values) is small than the threshold, it will adopt InsertionSort so that it can be faster. Because for small cases, some pieces of values are in order and we can achieve *O(n)*. While for QuickSort, compared with InsertionSort, partition is time consuming in small cases.

1. **Performance of General Cases**

We then studied the performance of general cases, which I choose is between 102 numbers to 107 numbers. For each case, I also run 5 times to get the average value. The time needed for each case is shown in the figure below (Figure 2).
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Figure 2.a. General cases in large scale
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Figure 2.b. General cases in detailed scale

From the figure, we know the time needed for BubbleSort, InsertionSort and SelectionSort grows quickly as *n* increases, while for MergeSort, QuickSort and Sort, they grow slowly. This is because the formers are in *O(n2)* while the latter are in *O(nlogn)*. But QuickSortExtra also grows quickly and is even close to *O(n2)* in Figure 2.a. This is due to the reason that it uses extra space and copying elements between the extra and the original space is time consuming. Also, MergeSort is a little bit slower than QuickSortInplace and Sort because it is not in place.