

```

bool linearsearch(int arr[], int size, int target) {
    for (int i=0; i<size; i++) {
        if (arr[i] == target) {
            return true;
        }
    }
    return false;
}

```

Iterative insertion sort

```

void iterativeSort(int arr[], int n) {
    for (int i = 1; i < size; i++) {
        int key = arr[i];
        int j = i - 1;
        while (j >= 0 && arr[j] > key) {
            arr[j + 1] = arr[j];
            j = j - 1;
        }
        arr[j + 1] = key;
    }
}

```

Recursive insertion sort

```

void recursiveInsertionSort(int arr[], int n) {
    if (n <= 1)
        return;
    recursiveInsertionSort(arr, n - 1);
    int last = arr[n - 1];
    int j = n - 2;

```

while ($j \geq 0$ & $a[n[j] > last]$) {

$a[n[j+1]] = a[n[j]]$;

$j = j + 1$;

$a[n[j+1]] = last$;

(i) It is an online sorting also because it sorts a list as it receives new elements one by one.

(ii) Merge Sort:- Doesn't sort list online. It first divides list into smaller subsets, sorts those recursively.

(iii) Quick Sort:- Doesn't sort list online. It chooses a pivot element & partitions list into sublists. So the full list must be present.

Ans 3	Name / Time Complexity	Best Case	Average	Worst Case	Space Complexity
		T.C	CASE T.C	P.C	
(i)	Bubble Sort	$O(n)$	$O(n^2)$	$O(n^2)$	$O(1)$
(ii)	Selection Sort	$O(n^2)$	$O(n^2)$	$O(n^2)$	$O(1)$
(iii)	Insertion Sort	$O(n)$	$O(n^2)$	$O(n^2)$	$O(1)$
(iv)	Merge Sort	$O(n \log n)$	$O(n \log n)$	$O(n \log n)$	$O(n)$
(v)	Quick Sort	$O(n \log n)$	$O(n \log n)$	$O(n^2)$	$O(n \log n)$
(vi)	Heap Sort	$O(n \log n)$	$O(n \log n)$	$O(n \log n)$	$O(f)$
(vii)	Counting Sort	$O(n+k)$	$O(n+k)$	$O(n+k)$	$O(n+k)$
(viii)	Radix Sort	$O(kn)$	$O(kn)$	$O(kn)$	$O(d+n)$

	Name of Sorting	Inplace	Stable	Online
1	Bubble Sort	✓	✓	x
2	Selection Sort	✓	x	x
3	Insertion Sort	✓	✓	✓
4	Merge Sort	x	✓	x
5	Quick Sort	x	x	x
6	Heap Sort	✓	x	✓
7	Counting Sort	x	✓	x
8	Radix Sort	x	✓	x

Q5

Recursive binary search

```

int binarysearch(int arr[], int low, int high, int key)
{
    if (low < high) {
        int mid = low + (high - low) / 2;
        if (arr[mid] == key)
            return mid;
        else if (arr[mid] < target)
            return binarysearch(arr, mid+1, high, key);
        else
            return binarysearch(arr, low, mid - 1, key);
    }
    return -1;
}

```

Iterative Binary Search

```

int binarysearch( int arr[], int size, int key)
{
    int low = 0, high = size - 1;
    while ( low <= high ) {
        int mid = low + (high - low) / 2;
    }
}

```

```

if arr[mid] == target)
    return mid;
else if (arr[mid] < target)
    low = mid + 1;
else
    high = mid - 1;
return -1;
    
```

Linear Search :-

Time Complexity :- $O(n)$

Space Complexity :- $O(1)$

Binary Search (Recursive)

Time Complexity = $O(\log n)$

Space Complexity = $O(\log n)$

Binary Search (Iterative)

Time Complexity = $O(\log n)$

Space Complexity = $O(1)$

Q6 In each step of binary search, the algorithm divides the search in half, effectively reducing the size of problem to half! Therefore the recurrence relation

$$T(n) = T(n/2) + O(1)$$

with base case

$$T(1) = O(1)$$

Q7

void findpairwithsum(int a[], int size, int k, int &index1, int &index2)

sort(A, A+size);

int left = 0, right = size - 1;

while (left < right) {

int sum = A[left] + A[right],

if (sum == k)

{ index1 = left; }

index2 = right;

return;

else if (sum < k) {

left++;

else {

right--;

index1 = -1;

index2 = -1;

Time Complexity = $O(n \log n) + O(n)$

Simplifies to $O(n \log n)$

Ans 8 Quicksort is a popular choice due to its average time complexity $O(n \log n)$ & good performance on a wide range of inputs. It's efficient, in place & often outperforms other algs in sorting making it suitable for most scenarios.

Ans 9 Counting the number of inversions in an array
 is a measure of how far the array is from being sorted

Now let's count number of inversions

Divide the array into two halves

Recursively count inversions in each half

During merge step, count no of inversions

Array :- {7, 21, 31, 8, 10, 1, 20, 6, 4, 5}

Step 1: Divide array into two halves.

Left : {7, 21, 31, 8, 10} | Right : {1, 20, 6, 4, 5}

Step 2: Recursively Count

In left half :

Left : {7, 21, 31} | Right : {8, 10}

Inversions : (8, 7), (10, 8) \rightarrow 2 inversions

In right half :

Left : {1, 20} | Right : {6, 4, 5}

Inversions : (6, 1), (6, 4), (6, 5) \rightarrow 3 inversions

Step 3: Merge Sorted halves & count

Total inversions :- 2 (left half) + 3 (right half) +
 16 (merge step) = 21 inversions

Ans 10 Best Case Scenario

\rightarrow Occurs when the chosen pivot divides the array into two nearly equal halves in each partition

Time Complexity (O(n log n))

Worst - Case Complexity :- Occurs when the chosen pivot is either the smallest or largest element in array in each partition step

Result in partitioning step dividing the array into one subarray with $n-1$ elements & another with 0.

Time complexity is $O(n^2)$

Ans 1:

Merge sort

$$\text{Best Case } T(n) = 2T(n/2) + O(n)$$

$$\text{Worst Case } T(n) = 2T(n/2) + O(n)$$

Quicksort

$$\text{Best Case: } T(n) = 2T(n/2) + O(n)$$

$$\text{Worst Case: } T(n) = T(n-1) + O(n)$$

Similarities:

- ① Both have same recurrence relation in best case scenario: $T(n) = 2T(n/2) + O(n)$. Because both divide into two halves

Difference

- 1) In worst case scenario merge sort has $O(n \log n)$ & quicksort has $O(n^2)$
- 2) Merge Sort is stable but quicksort Not.
- 3) Space Complexity of merge sort is $O(n)$ and for quick sort it is $O(\log n)$

Q12

```
Void stableSelectionSort ( int arr[], int n ) {
    for ( int i = 0; i < n - 1; i++ ) {
        int minIndex = i;
        for ( int j = i + 1; j < n; j++ ) {
            if ( arr[j] < arr[minIndex] ) {
                minIndex = j;
            }
        }
        int temp = arr[i];
        arr[i] = arr[minIndex];
        arr[minIndex] = temp;
    }
}
```

```

int minValue = arr[minIndex];
while (minIndex > i) {
    arr[minIndex] = arr[minIndex - 1];
    minIndex--;
}
arr[i] = minValue;

```

Aus 13 When dealing with a dataset that exceeds the available physical memory, we need to resort to external sorting algorithms.

Algorithm choice :-

One of the most suitable external sorting algorithms for this scenario is Merge Sort.

Reason

(i) Efficient use of Memory

(ii) Minimization of I/O

(iii) Stable Sorting

1 Internal Sorting

Algorithms that operate entirely within the computer main memory. These algorithms assume that the entire set fits into memory at once allowing for fast random access.

2 External Sorting

Necessary when dataset is too large to fit entirely into memory & must be stored on external devices. These algorithms divide the datasets into smaller chunks that can fit into memory, sort these chunks internally.