

Characteristics of Sorting Algorithms

	Worst-Case Time	Average-Case Time	Best-Case Time	Worst-Case Space
BubbleSort * more writes to memory than SelectionSort * adaptive * stable * in-place	$O(n^2)$ comparisons $O(n^2)$ swaps	$O(n^2)$ comparisons $O(n^2)$ swaps	$O(n)$ comparisons $O(1)$ swaps	$O(n)$ total $O(1)$ auxiliary
InsertionSort * more writes to memory than SelectionSort * adaptive * stable * in-place * online	$O(n^2)$ comparisons $O(n^2)$ swaps	$O(n^2)$ comparisons $O(n^2)$ swaps	$O(n)$ comparisons $O(1)$ swaps	$O(n)$ total $O(1)$ auxiliary
SelectionSort * double comparisons compared with InsertionSort * not stable but can be modified * not adaptive * in-place	$O(n^2)$ comparisons $O(n)$ swaps	$O(n^2)$ comparisons $O(n)$ swaps	$O(n^2)$ comparisons $O(1)$ swaps	$O(n)$ total $O(1)$ auxiliary
HeapSort * not stable but can be modified * not adaptive * in-place	$O(n \log n)$	$O(n \log n)$	$O(n \log n)$ distinct keys $O(n)$ equal keys	$O(n)$ total $O(1)$ auxiliary

	Worst-Case Time	Average-Case Time	Best-Case Time	Worst-Case Space
MergeSort <i>Divide&Conquer</i> * not adaptive * stable * not in-place in typical implementation (can be for linked lists) * accesses data sequentially and the need of random access is low * used for external sorting	$O(n \log n)$	$O(n \log n)$	$O(n \log n)$ <i>typical</i> $O(n)$ <i>natural variant</i>	$O(n)$ <i>total</i> $O(n)$ <i>auxiliary with arrays</i> $O(1)$ <i>auxiliary with linked lists</i>
QuickSort <i>Divide&Conquer</i> * adaptive * not stable but can be modified (typically not implemented stable) * in-place * with better partition strategy (choosing pivot) worst-case time is rare ! * needs random access	$O(n^2)$ <i>comparisons</i> $O(n^2)$ <i>swaps</i>	$O(n \log n)$	$O(n \log n)$ <i>simple partition</i> $O(n)$ <i>3-way partition with equal keys</i>	$O(n)$ <i>auxiliary (naive)</i> $O(\log n)$ <i>(Sedgewick 1978)</i>