

Sorting

Sorting

Sorting Algorithm	Best Case		Worst Case	
	Swaps	Comparisons	Swaps	Comparisons
Selection Sort Not stable	0 – already sorted	$O(n^2)$ – Still need to check	$O(n)$ – always $n-1$ swaps	$O(n^2)$ – always n
Insertion Sort	0 – already sorted	$O(n)$ – compare $O(n)$ times and break	$O(n^2)$ – reverse order hence constant shifting	$O(n^2)$ – constant comparing
Bubble Sort w/o flag	0 – already sorted	$O(n^2)$ – no flag hence need to check all	$O(n^2)$ – reverse order	$O(n^2)$ – check all
Bubble Sort w/ flag	0 – already sorted	$O(n)$ – early termination with flag	$O(n^2)$ – reverse order	$O(n^2)$ – reverse order or smallest element at the back
Merge Sort Not in-place	0 – all copying, which takes $O(n \log n)$, but no swaps	$\leq O(n \log n)$ – comparisons stop once one sublist is fully copied in	0 – all copying, which takes $O(n \log n)$, but no swaps	$\leq O(n \log n)$ – comparisons stop once one sublist is fully copied in
Quick Sort Not stable	$O(n \log n)$ – $\sim \log n$ levels of $n/2$ swaps	$O(n \log n)$ – $\log n$ levels of n comparisons	$O(n^2)$ – reverse order with $O(n)$ swaps for n levels $O(n)$ – if we are talking about the worst case of an already sorted array, where we have n levels of 1 swap (with itself).	$O(n^2)$ – n levels of comparing n elements
Radix Sort Not in-place	0 – $O(kn)$ copying	0 – non-comparison based sort	0 – $O(kn)$ copying	0 – non-comparison based sort

Radix Sort Optimisation

If we want know the range of numbers to be between $[1, N^3]$, we can actually use radix sort to get an $O(N)$ sort, with fewer 'digits' d and more buckets instead.

Traditionally, we use 10 buckets, requiring close to $3 \log_{10} N$ passes, one for each digit. Each pass places all N elements into the buckets and then extracts them. This results in an $O(N \log N)$ time sort, as $d = O(\log N)$.

We can instead reduce the number of 'digits' till $d = 3$. Each 'digit' of increased size must be able to take N values, in $[0, N-1]$. This means that radix sort now needs N buckets and 3 passes, resulting in an $O(N)$ sort.

Why should we not reduce the number of 'digits' till $d = 1$? If we do so, There are now $b = N^3$ buckets, increasing the time complexity of radix sort. To be precise, the time complexity of radix sort is $O(d(N+b))$. We usually write $O(dN)$ or $O(N)$ when we can be certain that d and b are bounded by some small constant.