

Marian Willard and Caroline Danzi
 Gregory Gelfond
 CSE 464 Algorithms
 4 March 2016

Selection Sort

Pseudo code

```

1  public ssort(int[] nums){
2      if(nums.length < 2){
3          return nums
4      }
5      for i = 0 to nums.length{
6          min = minimum(nums, i)
7          swap(nums, i, min)
8      }
9      return nums
10 }
```

1. Function Specifications

ssort: If `nums` is any sequence of integers, then `ssort(nums)` will return the sequence `nums` with its elements sorted in ascending order.

minimum: If `nums` is any sequence of integers, then `minimum(nums, i)` returns the index of the smallest element in the interval `[i, nums.length)`, where `i` is a legal index into the array `nums`. The smallest element is defined as an integer `x` such that `x` is less than all other integers in the sequence from index `i` to the last element of the sequence.

swap: If `nums` is any sequence of integers and `i` and `j` are legal indices into `nums`, then `swap(nums, i, j)` puts the element at index `i` in index location `j` and the element that was at index location `j` into the index location `i`.

2. Loop Conditions for the loop at line 5

Termination condition: The loop terminates when `i` equals the length of the sequence. Since the length of the sequence is always finite, the loop will always terminate.

Loop invariant: the elements in `nums` on the interval `[0, i)` are correctly sorted and are less than or equal to the elements in the legal index range `[i, nums.length)`.

3. Sketch of the Proof of Correctness

Assumptions: The functions `minimum` and `swap` have been shown to function as specified above.

Claim: For any sequence of integers `nums`, `ssort(nums)` will modify `nums` so that the elements are sorted in ascending order.

Proof:

If the sequence has length less than or equal to 1, the sequence is trivially sorted. Otherwise:

- 1) The loop terminates when `i` (the current index) is equal to the length of the array. Since the sequence is always finite, the loop will always terminate.
- 2) Prove the loop invariant: *The elements in `nums` on the interval $[0, i)$ are correctly sorted in ascending order.*
 - a) Prior to entering the loop: `i = 0`, so the interval $[0, i)$ is empty (has length 0). A sequence of length 0 is trivially sorted, so the invariant is true before entering the loop body.
 - b) Assume the invariant is true after every iteration `k`, where $0 \leq k \leq i$.
 - c) Consider iteration `k + 1`: All elements on the range $[0, i-1)$ are correctly sorted from the previous iteration `k`. On line 6, we find the index of the minimum element in the index range $[i, \text{nums.length})$. On line 7 we then swap the element at this position with the element at `i`, thus ensuring that at index `i` we have the smallest element remaining in the unsorted range. This element will be greater than all preceding elements in the range $[0, i)$ and less than all those following in the range $[i+1, \text{nums.length})$.
- 3) From (1), the loop terminates when `i` equals the length of the array. From (2) we see that the elements in the range $[0, i)$ are correctly sorted. Thus, when the loop terminates and `i = nums.length`, the elements on the interval $[0, \text{nums.length})$ will be correctly sorted. Since the range $[0, \text{nums.length})$ is the entire array, the claim is true.

4. Analysis of Computational Complexity

Selection sort has a worst-case computational complexity of $O(n^2)$, where `n` is the length of the sequence to sort. In our implementation, we used arrays to represent the sequences. This allowed for constant-time element lookup, as opposed to linear time (which is common for data structures such as linked lists). Thus, the swap function could be performed in constant time.

In the `ssort` function, there is a loop that iterates over all elements in the sequence, so this action is performed in linear time. Additionally, there is a loop in the function `minimum` that iterates over all elements in the range $[i, \text{nums.length})$. The loop in `minimum` is bounded by $O(n)$ as well. So for every iteration of the outer loop, we are performing an operation that takes at worst $O(n)$ time. Thus, the total worst-case performance time for the entire selection sort algorithm is $O(n*n) = O(n^2)$ time (quadratic time).

Merge Sort

Note: Merge sort was invented by John Von Neumann (source: Wolfram MathWorld).

Pseudo Code

```

define msort(int[] nums) {
    if(nums.length > 1) {
        int mid = nums.length / 2
        left = nums[0..mid]
        right = nums[mid..nums.length]
a       msort(left)
b       msort(right)
c       merge(nums, left, right)
    }
}

define merge(int[] nums, int[] left, int[] right) {
    int i = 0
    int j = 0
    int x = 0

1       loop until all the elements in left or all the elements in
        right are fully copied to nums:
            if left[i] < right[j]:
                nums[x] = left[i]
                i++
            else
                nums[x] = right[j]
                j++
            x++

2       while left still has elements:
            nums[x] = left[i]
            i++
            x++

3       while right still has elements:
            nums[x] = right[j]
            j++
            x++
}

```

1. Function Specifications

`msort`: For any sequence of integers `nums`, `msort (nums)` will modify `nums` so that its elements are sorted in ascending order.

`merge`: For sequences of integers `nums`, `left`, and `right`, where `left` and `right` are sorted in ascending order, `merge (nums, left, right)` will modify `nums` to contain the elements of both `left` and `right` sorted in ascending order.

2. Loop Conditions

- 1) *Termination*: The loop terminates when either all the elements from `left` are copied to `nums` or all the elements from `right` are copied to `nums`. This is indicated by `i = left.length` or `j = right.length`. Since either `i` or `j` is increased by one each time through the loop, the loop will always terminate.

Loop invariant: `nums` contains all the elements of `left` in the index range `[0, i)` and all the elements of `right` in the index range `[0, j)` sorted in ascending order.

- 2) *Termination*: The loop terminates when the pointer `i` equals `left.length`. Since `i` is increased by one each time through the loop, the loop will always terminate.

Loop invariant: The elements in `left` from `[0, i)` appear in `nums` in the same order they appear in `left`.

- 3) *Termination*: The loop terminates when the pointer `j` equals `right.length`. Since `j` is increased by one each time through the loop, the loop will always terminate.

Loop invariant: The elements in `right` from indices `[0, j)` appear in `nums` in the same order that they appear in `right`.

3. Sketch of the Proof of Correctness

Prove the claim:

Φ_{msort} : For any sequence of integers `nums`, `msort (nums)` will modify `nums` so that its elements are sorted in ascending order.

Proof by Induction on the length of the sequence `nums`:

Assumptions: `merge` has been shown to function correctly as specified above.

Base case: If the length of the sequence is less than or equal to 1, the sequence is trivially sorted.

Inductive Hypothesis: For any sequence of integers `nums` of length $\leq N$ where N is a natural number, `msort (nums)` functions as specified in Φ .

Prove for a sequence of integers of length $N + 1$: Consider sequence of length $N + 1$

- 1) In the line marked a, we recursively sort the left half of the sequence, which has a length that is less than or equal to $(N + 1) / 2$
- 2) In the line marked b, we recursively sort the right half of the sequence, which has a length that is less than or equal to $(N + 1) / 2$
- 3) Since $(N + 1) / 2$ is less than N , from our assumption we know that the left and right halves of the sequence will be correctly sorted. Then, on the line marked c we know from the claim for merge that the left and right halves will be correctly merged into a sorted sequence, thus satisfying the claim that msort correctly sorts a sequence of integers.

4. Analysis of Computational Complexity

The computational complexity of merge sort is $O(n \log n)$, where n represents the length of the sequence. At every step of the recursion, we decrease the input size by a factor of two, so this part of the algorithm is $O(\log n)$. The merge function is linear because we traverse the entirety of the search space - the length of left plus the length of right - once. Since $\log n$ merges are executed, and each merge takes $O(n)$ time, so the overall computation complexity is $O(n * \log n)$.