

# Assignment 3: Efficiency and Experimentation

Assigned: Wednesday, September 10, 2014  
Due: Thursday, September 18, 2014, 11:59 p.m.  
Type: Team

## Problem Overview

This assignment is a departure from previous assignments inasmuch as its focus is not on program construction, but is instead on experimentation, analysis, critical thinking, and applying the scientific method. The provided resources for this assignment are the following.

- `A3.jar` — A jar file containing the `TimingLab` class for which you have to experimentally determine the big-Oh running time of a method, and the `SortingLab` class for which you have to experimentally determine the sorting algorithms implemented in various methods.
- `TimingLabClient.java` — Source code of a Java class that illustrates basic use of the `TimingLab` class. *This class is for illustration only.* You can modify it for your own purposes or you can use it as an example to create a similar class for your own purposes.
- `SortingLabClient.java` — Source code of a class that illustrates basic calls to public methods of `SortingLab`. *This class is for illustration only.* You can modify it for your own purposes or you can use it as an example to create a similar class for your own purposes.

There are two parts to this assignment. Each has its own deliverable and is to be done independently of the other.

## Part A: Experimental Discovery of Running Time

You must develop and perform a repeatable experimental procedure that will allow you to empirically discover the big-Oh time complexity of the `timeTrial(int N)` method in the `TimingLab` class. The parameter `N` represents the *problem size*. Thus, by iteratively calling `timeTrial` with successively larger values of `N`, you can collect timing data that is useful for characterizing the method's time complexity.

The constructor `TimingLab(int key)` will create a `TimingLab` object whose `timeTrial` method is tailored specifically to the given key value. You will use your group number in Canvas as the key required by the constructor. For example, group 42 would invoke the constructor `TimingLab(42)` and group 23 would invoke the constructor `TimingLab(23)`. This will create two distinct objects whose `timeTrial` methods would (potentially) have different time complexities.

You are guaranteed that no matter what key value is used, the associated time complexity will be proportional to  $N^k$  for some positive integer  $k$ . Thus, you can take advantage of the following property of polynomial time complexity functions  $T(N)$ .

$$T(N) \propto N^k \implies \frac{T(2N)}{T(N)} \propto \frac{(2N)^k}{N^k} = \frac{2^k N^k}{N^k} = 2^k \quad (1)$$

This property tells us that as  $N$  is successively doubled, the ratio of the method's running time on the current problem size to the method's running time on the previous problem size (i.e.,  $T(2N)/T(N)$ ) converges to a numerical constant, call it  $R$ , that is equal to  $2^k$ , and thus  $k = \log_2 R$ .

As an example, consider the data shown in Table 1. Each row in this table records data for a given run of some method being timed. The first column ( $N$ ) records the problem size, the second column (Time) records the time taken for the method to run on this problem size, the third column ( $R$ ) is the ratio discussed above (i.e.,  $\text{Time}_i / \text{Time}_{i-1}$ ), and the third column ( $k$ ) is  $\log_2 R$ . From Property 1 and Table 1 we can hypothesize that the method being timed has  $O(N^4)$  time complexity.

Table 1: Running-time data and calculations

| N   | Time     | R     | k    |
|-----|----------|-------|------|
| 8   | 0.04     | —     | —    |
| 16  | 0.08     | 2.25  | 1.17 |
| 32  | 0.84     | 10.37 | 3.37 |
| 64  | 7.59     | 9.03  | 3.18 |
| 128 | 113.56   | 14.97 | 3.91 |
| 256 | 1829.28  | 16.11 | 4.01 |
| 512 | 29689.21 | 16.23 | 4.02 |

You are required to use `System.nanoTime()` to generate timing data like that shown in Table 1. Running time values must be expressed in seconds.

To document your work you must write a lab report that fully describes the experiment used to discover the big-Oh time complexity of the given method. The lab report must discuss the experimental procedure (what you did), data collection (all the data you gathered), data analysis (what you did with the data), and interpretation of the data (what conclusions you drew from the data). The lab report must be well written, it must exhibit a high degree of professionalism, and it must be structured like the provided sample. Your experiment must be described in enough detail that it could be reproduced by someone else.

## Part B: Experimental Identification of Sorting Algorithms

You must develop and perform a repeatable experimental procedure that will allow you to empirically discover the sorting algorithms implemented by the five methods of the `SortingLab` class — `sort1`, `sort2`, `sort3`, `sort4`, `sort5`. The five sorting algorithms implemented are merge sort, randomized quicksort, non-randomized quicksort, selection sort, and insertion sort.

Insertion sort, selection sort, and merge sort are implemented exactly as described in lecture and the associated note set. Quicksort has two implementations, randomized and non-randomized. Both implementations choose the pivot in the same way: the pivot is always the left-most element (i.e., `a[left]`) of the current partition. Both algorithms also use the same algorithm for the partitioning operation (although it is slightly different than the one presented in lecture). The two implementations are different, however in the following way. The randomized quicksort implementation makes the worst case probabilistically unlikely by randomly permuting the the array elements before the quicksort algorithm begins. The non-randomized quicksort exposes the algorithm's worst case by never shuffling the array elements.

To generate timing data you are required to use `System.nanoTime()`. Running time values must be expressed in seconds. Although timing data will be an important part of your experimental procedure, it will (likely) not be sufficient to distinguish between merge sort and randomized quicksort. To do this you should think about *stability*.

The constructor `SortingLab(int key)` will create a `SortingLab` object whose sort method implementations are tailored specifically to the given key value. You will use your group number in Canvas as the

key required by the constructor. For example, group 42 would invoke the constructor `SortingLab(42)` and group 23 would invoke the constructor `SortingLab(23)`, creating two distinct objects whose sort methods would have different implementations.

To document your work you must write a lab report that fully describes the experiments used to discover the the sorting algorithm associated with each of the five sort methods. The lab report must discuss the experimental procedure (what you did), data collection (all the data you gathered), data analysis (what you did with the data), and interpretation of the data (what conclusions you drew from the data). The lab report must be well written, it must exhibit a high degree of professionalism, and it must be structured like the provided sample. Your experiment must be described in enough detail that it could be reproduced by someone else.

## Teamwork and Grading

You are required to complete this assignment in teams of two, as assigned in Canvas. Each person must contribute to each part of the assignment in roughly equal amounts. Two rubrics (*Experimentation Rubric* and *Written Communication Rubric*, both available on Canvas) will be used to score each lab report. Marks of Little/No Ability, Basic, Intermediate, and Advanced are worth 1, 2, 3, and 4 points respectively. The lab report scores will account for 90% of your assignment grade. The remaining 10% will come from your attendance and participation in two **mandatory** lab sessions for this assignment: Tuesday, September 16 and Thursday, September 18. An official University excuse will be required for missing either lab. **If you are not present for both labs without an approved excuse, you will earn zero points for the assignment.** Table 2 shows a sample assignment scoring with a final numeric grade calculated.

## Assignment Submission

To submit your work, you must upload a single zip file per group to Canvas. This zip file must contain two PDF documents, one being the lab report for Part A and the other being the lab report for Part B. Submissions made within the 24 hour period after the published deadline will be assessed a late penalty of 15 points. No submissions will be accepted more than 24 hours after the published deadline.

Table 2: Sample assignment scoring.

|                                  | Mark               | Score        |
|----------------------------------|--------------------|--------------|
| <b>Part A: Experiment Rubric</b> |                    | <b>3.125</b> |
| Experimental Design              | Advanced           | 4            |
| Data Collection                  | Intermediate       | 3            |
| Data Analysis                    | Intermediate/Basic | 2.5          |
| Interpretation                   | Intermediate       | 3            |
| <b>Part A: Writing Rubric</b>    |                    | <b>3.2</b>   |
| Content                          | Intermediate       | 3            |
| Organization                     | Advanced           | 4            |
| Style                            | Basic              | 2            |
| Grammar                          | Intermediate       | 3            |
| Figures and Tables               | Advanced           | 4            |
| <b>Part B: Experiment Rubric</b> |                    | <b>3.625</b> |
| Experimental Design              | Advanced           | 4            |
| Data Collection                  | Intermediate       | 4            |
| Data Analysis                    | Intermediate/Basic | 2.5          |
| Interpretation                   | Intermediate       | 4            |
| <b>Part B: Writing Rubric</b>    |                    | <b>3.2</b>   |
| Content                          | Intermediate       | 3            |
| Organization                     | Advanced           | 4            |
| Style                            | Basic              | 2            |
| Grammar                          | Intermediate       | 3            |
| Figures and Tables               | Advanced           | 4            |
| Tue 16 Sep attendance            | Present            | 5            |
| Thu 18 Sep attendance            | Present            | 5            |
| <b>Total Score</b>               |                    | <b>85.5</b>  |