

# CSCA48 SUMMER 2017

## WEEK 12 - COMPLEXITY

Brian Harrington

University of Toronto Scarborough

July 24-26, 2017



UNIVERSITY OF  
**TORONTO**  
SCARBOROUGH

# COMPLEXITY

- First attempts to analyze an algorithm: not great
- Want a way to analyze algorithms that is:
  - Independent of machine/implementation/language
  - Easy to directly compare
  - Focused on “big picture” (large values)

# ASYMPTOTIC UPPER BOUND (BIG-OH)

- given  $f(n)$  and  $g(n)$
- $f(n) \in O(g(n))$  iff:
  - There exists constants  $c$  and  $b$  such that
  - for  $n$  larger than  $b$
  - $f(n) \leq c * g(n)$
- This means:
  - we can find values for  $c$  and  $b$ , such that
  - we can multiply  $g(n)$  by  $c$
  - and eventually (after reaching  $n = b$ , it will dominate  $f(n)$ )

# ASYMPTOTIC UPPER BOUND (BIG-OH)

- Back to our selection sort example
- $selection\_sort(n) = 14n^2 + 16n$
- Show that  $insertion\_sort(n) \in O(n^2)$ 
  - Need to find  $b$  and  $c$
  - $c = 15$
  - $14n^2 + 16n \leq 15n^2$  for  $n \geq ?$
- What if we over-under counted?
- Need to find a different  $b$  and  $c$ , but will still be  $\in O(n^2)$

# ASYMPTOTIC UPPER BOUND (BIG-OH)

- In practice:
  - Come up with worst possible input for algorithm
  - Analyze steps for that input
  - Only care about largest term in expression
- Let's practice!

## BREAK

## INEFFECTIVE SORTS

```

DEFINE HALFHEARTEDMERGESORT(LIST):
  IF LENGTH(LIST) < 2:
    RETURN LIST
  PIVOT = INT(LENGTH(LIST) / 2)
  A = HALFHEARTEDMERGESORT(LIST[:PIVOT])
  B = HALFHEARTEDMERGESORT(LIST[PIVOT:J])
  // UMMMMMM
  RETURN [A,B] // HERE.. SORRY.

```

```

DEFINE FASTBOGOSORT(LIST):
  // AN OPTIMIZED BOGOSORT
  // RUNS IN  $O(N \log N)$ 
  FOR N FROM 1 TO LOG(LENGTH(LIST)):
    SHUFFLE(LIST):
    IF ISSORTED(LIST):
      RETURN LIST
  RETURN "KERNEL PAGE FAULT (ERROR CODE: 2)"

```

```

DEFINE JOBININTERVIEWQUICKSORT(LIST):
  OK SO YOU CHOOSE A PIVOT
  THEN DIVIDE THE LIST IN HALF
  FOR EACH HALF:
    CHECK TO SEE IF IT'S SORTED
    NO, WAIT, IT DOESN'T MATTER
    COMPARE EACH ELEMENT TO THE PIVOT
    THE BIGGER ONES GO IN A NEW LIST
    THE EQUAL ONES GO INTO, UH
    THE SECOND LIST FROM BEFORE
    HANG ON, LET ME NAME THE LISTS
    THIS IS LIST A
    THE NEW ONE IS LIST B
    PUT THE BIG ONES INTO LIST B
    NOW TAKE THE SECOND LIST
    CALL IT LIST, UH, A2
    WHICH ONE WAS THE PIVOT IN?
    SCRATCH ALL THAT
    IT JUST RECURSIVELY CALLS ITSELF
    UNTIL BOTH LISTS ARE EMPTY
    RIGHT?
    NOT EMPTY, BUT YOU KNOW WHAT I MEAN
    AM I ALLOWED TO USE THE STANDARD LIBRARIES?

```

```

DEFINE PANICSORT(LIST):
  IF ISSORTED(LIST):
    RETURN LIST
  FOR N FROM 1 TO 10000:
    PIVOT = RANDOM(0, LENGTH(LIST))
    LIST = LIST[PIVOT:] + LIST[:PIVOT]
  IF ISSORTED(LIST):
    RETURN LIST
  IF ISSORTED(LIST):
    RETURN LIST
  IF ISSORTED(LIST): // THIS CAN'T BE HAPPENING
    RETURN LIST
  IF ISSORTED(LIST): // COME ON COME ON
    RETURN LIST
  // OH JEEZ
  // I'M GONNA BE IN SO MUCH TROUBLE
  LIST = []
  SYSTEM("SHUTDOWN -H +5")
  SYSTEM("RM -RF /")
  SYSTEM("RM -RF ~/*")
  SYSTEM("RM -RF /")
  SYSTEM("RD /5 /Q C:\*") // PORTABILITY
  RETURN [1, 2, 3, 4, 5]

```

# SELECTION SORT

- Simple
- In-place
- Idea:
  - for each index  $i$  in  $L$ :  
go through  $L[i:]$  to find  
item that belongs at  $L[i]$
- When is selection sort most efficient?
- When is insertion sort least efficient?

# INSERTION SORT

- Simple
- In-place (requires little/no extra memory)
- Idea:
  - for each index  $i$  in  $L$ :  
insert the item at  $L[i]$  into the  
correct place in  $L[:i]$
- When is insertion sort most efficient?
- When is insertion sort least efficient?



# QUICKSORT

- Classic “Divide and conquer” recursion
- Select item from L to be `pivot`
- split L into L1, L2, L3
- L1 - items < pivot  
L2 - items = pivot  
L3 - items > pivot
- S1 = quicksort(L1)  
S3 = quicksort(L3)
- return S1 + L2 + S3

# COMPLEXITY OF QUICKSORT

- What is worst possible input?
- Depends on how you choose your `pivot`

# MERGESORT

- split L into L1 and L2
- recursively sort L1 and L2
- merge L1 and L2
- mergesort(L) :
  - if len(L) < 2, return L
  - split L into L1 and L2
  - S1 = mergesort(L1)
  - S2 = mergesort(L2)
  - S = merge(S1, S2)
  - return S
- Merging can be very efficient using linked lists

# COMPLEXITY OF MERGE SORT

- $\log(n)$  “levels”
- each item visited once per level
- Therefore  $O(n * \log(n))$

# HEAPSORT

- put each element in L into a heap
- get them back out one at a time
- `heapsort(L) :`

```
    for next_item in L
        my_heap.insert(next_item)
    S = []
    while(not my_heap.is_empty())
        s.append(my_heap.remove_min())
    return S
```
- Can actually be done in-place

# COMPLEXITY OF HEAPSORT

- $n$  insertions +  $n$  remove\_mins
- each insertion requires (at worst) one swap for each level of the tree
- each remove\_min requires (at worst) one swap for each level of the tree
- we have an efficient Heap implementation that results in a complete tree
- a complete tree of  $n$  nodes has at most  $\log(n)$  levels
- Therefore  $O(n * \log(n) + n * \log(n)) = O(n * \log(n))$