

Introduction to Sorting

What have we learned so far?

- The “cams” operator is:
 - compare-and-maybe-swap.
- We’ve shown that in order to comparison-sort an array of N elements, we require *at least*:
 - $N \log N$ cams.
- If we use reduction to simplify our problem, there are two choices to be made:
 - Equal (or quasi-equal) partitions vs. head/tail partition;
 - Work before recursion vs. work after recursion.

Now, things are going to get a bit more complicated...

- There's another way to divide the problem up—can you think how?
- There's only two helpful ways to divide a collection into 1 and $N-1$ elements (they are essentially the same)
- But what about dividing into k sub-arrays?
 - e.g. merge-sort: we put elements $iN/k \dots (i+1)N/k - 1$ into the i^{th} sub-array.
 - Any other ideas?
- How about dividing such that the i^{th} , $k+i^{\text{th}}$, $2k+i^{\text{th}}$, etc. form the i^{th} sub-array?
 - Could this make any difference?

The *five* possibilities

	Work then solve	Solve then work	Growth (~)
Equi- partition	Quick sort	Merge sort	$N \log N$
Slice	?	Shell sort	$\sim N^{1.5}$
Head-tail partition	Selection Sort	Insertion Sort*	$N^2/2$

* The number of comparisons for Insertion Sort is $\min(N+X, N^2/2)$ where X is # of inversions

$N \log N$ vs. $1/2 N^2$

- Is there ever a possibility that $1/2 N^2$ is less than $N \log N$?
 - Keep in mind that $N \log N$ is the minimum possible number of comparisons.
 - If we are using logs to base 2, then if $N = 4$, $\log_2 N = 2$ and $N \log_2 N$ is 8. $1/2 N^2 = 8$.
 - So, for $2 \leq N \leq 4$, $1/2 N^2 \leq N \log_2 N$.
 - Yes—between $N = 2$ and $N = 4$

When to terminate the recursion

- So, we terminate the recursion (for the equi-partitioned case) when $N = 4^*$ and we cut over to insertion sort.
- We use insertion sort because, in the event that the sub-array is already partially sorted, it takes linear time, i.e. $N + X$ where X is the number of “inversions”.

* the actual number will depend on benchmarking

Inversions

- An inversion is when two elements of a collection are out of order.
- If a collection of length N is random (i.e. no imposed order), then each element can be compared to $(N-1)/2$ other elements.
- Such a pair of elements is inverted randomly true or false, so that means on average such a collection has $N(N-1)/4$ inversions.

Swap

- There are 2 forms of swap on an array a of length N :
 - $\text{swap}(a, i)$ —
 - this form exchanges elements i and $i-1$.
 - It is a “stable” swap but...
 - it can only “fix” one inversion.
 - $\text{swap}(a, i, j)$ —
 - this form allows a swap of two non-adjacent elements;
 - It is an “unstable” swap;
 - It can “fix” anything up to $N-1$ inversions (although the average number is $N/4$).

There are some more things to think about...

- Memory usage (extra to elements):
 - None: $O(1)$?
 - “In-place”: $O(\log N)$?
 - Linear: $O(N)$?
- Stability:
 - neighbor swaps or long-distance swaps?
- Comparison vs. Swap
 - Except for primitives, *swap* is always faster than *compare*
- Worst-case scenarios.