Why study sorting

Sorting Data Structures and Algori nal Linguistics III (IGCL-RA-07)

> Cağrı Cöltekin ccoltekin@sfs.uni-tuebingen.de

Winter Semester 2020/21

. Sorting is one of the most studied (and com mon) problems in o . It is important to understand strengths and weaknesses of algorithms for

sorting Many problems look like sorting. Learning sorting algorithms will help you solve others

* Available implementations are highly optimized (we are not just talking about asymptotic performance guarantees)

. In some (rare) cases, implementing your own sorting algorithm may be

beneficial

Bubble sort

. We start with an 'educational'

- Bubble sort is easy to understand, but performs bad not used in practice
- . We start from bubble sort, and see the improvements over it
- . The idea is simple:
- compare first two elements, swap if not in order
 shift and compare the next two elements, again swap if needed
 when you reach to the end, repeat the process from the beginninger to swaps in the last iteration

- Bubble sort

 - Best case: O(n)
 - O(n) comparisons, O(1) swaps
 - Space complexity: O(1) · There are more concerns than perform
 - The repetitive algorithm pattern is common
 - Many swaps
 Bubble sort is in-place
- $$\begin{split} & \text{swapped} = \text{True} \\ & n = \text{len}(\text{seq}) \\ & \text{white swapped:} \\ & \text{swapped} = \text{False} \\ & \text{for i in range}(n-1):} \\ & \text{if seq}(i) > \text{seq}(i+1):} \\ & \text{seq}(i), \text{seq}(i+1) \\ & = \text{seq}(i+1), \text{seq}(i) \\ & \text{swapped} = \text{True} \end{split}$$
 · Not practical - it is not used in practice

Insertion sort

67

88 12 72 76 93 57

67 89 88 12 72 76 93 57

- Bubble sort
 - 89 67 88 12 72 76 93 57
- swapped = True
 n = lem(seq)
 while swapped:
 swapped = False
 for i in rampe(n i):
 if seq[i] > seq[i + i]:
 seq[i], seq[i + i],
 seq[i + i], seq[i]
 swapped = True

Insertion sort

- * Insertion sort is one of the simpler sorting algorithm It is easy to understand, and reasonably fast for sorting short sequ
- On longer sequences, it performs worse than more advanced algorithms, like merge sort or quicksort (we will study those later)
 - The general idea simple:

 assume the elements arrive one by one, and we have a sorted sequence
 insert the element to the right position:
 - shift all elements larger than the new one to the right
 place the new element in its correct place

Insertion sort monstration

for i in range(i, len(seq)): $\begin{array}{ll} \operatorname{cur} &= \operatorname{seq}[i] \\ &= i \\ &= i \end{array}$ while $\operatorname{seq}[j-i] > \operatorname{cur} \setminus \\ &= \operatorname{seq}[j] = \operatorname{seq}[j-i] \\ &= \operatorname{seq}[j] = \operatorname{seq}[j-i] \end{array}$ seq[j] = $\operatorname{cur} \setminus$ 89 67 88 12 72 76 93 57

Insertion sort

for i in range(i, lem(seq)):
 cur = seq[i]
 j = i
 while seq[j - i] > cur\
 seq[j] = seq[j - i] 89 88 12 72 76 93 57

j -= 1 seq[j] = cur

Insertion sort

Insertion sort

88 67 89 12 72 76 93 57

for i in range(i, len(seq)):
 cur = seq[i]
 j = i

seq[j] = cur

67 89 12 72 76 93 57

Insertion sort

88

for i in range(i, len(seq)):
 cur = seq[i]
 j = i seq[j] = cur

for i in range(i, len(seq)):
 cur = seq[i]
 j = i
 while seq[j - i] > cur\

maile seq[j - 1] > cur\
 and j in range(1,i+1):
 seq[j] = seq[j - 1]
 j == 1
seq[j] = cur

for i in range(1, len(seq)):
 cur = seq[i]
 j = i
 while seq[j - i] > cur\
 and j in range(i,i+i):
 seq[j] = seq[j - i]
 i -= i

j -= 1 seq[j] = cur

Insertion sort * Worst case: $O(n^2)$ $O(n^2)$ comparisons, $O(n^2)$ swaps or i in range(1, len(seq cur = seq[k] j = i while seq[j - 1] > cur\ for i in range(1, lem(seq)):
 cur = seq[i]
 j = i
 while seq[j - i] > cur\
 and j in range(1,i+1):
 seq[j] = seq[j - i] Average case: O(n²)
O(n²) comparisons, O(n²) swaps 67 88 89 12 72 76 93 57 Best case: O(n)
O(n) comparisons, O(1) swaps Space complexity: O(1) j -= 1 seq[j] = cur . In practice, insertion sort is fa than the bubble sort (and also selection sort) Insertion sort Merge sort · Insertion sort is simple * Merge sort is a divide-and-conquer algorithm for sorting It is efficient for short sequenters. \ast It is relatively easy to understand (once you get your head around recursion) For long sequences it is much worse th merge sort or quicksort (coming next) • It has good asymptotic performance There are many practical cases where merge sort is used It is in-place Basic idea is divide-and-conquer: - split the sequence - sort the subsequence - merge the sorted lists . It is stable: it does not swap elements with equal keys . It is adaptive: faster if order of elements is closer to the sorted sequ Merge sort Merge sort 89 67 88 12 72 76 93 57 12 57 67 72 76 88 89 93 Merging sequences Complexity of the merge sort 89 67 88 12 72 76 93 57 # s1, s2: sequences to be merged
s: target sequence
i, j = 0, 0
n = len(st) + len(s2)
while i + j < n:
if s1[i] < s2[j] and i < len(s1)\ Keep two indices on both 72 76 93 57 sequences, starting from the beginning Pick the smallest, place it in the or j == len(s2):: s[i+j] = s1[i] target sequence i += i else: s[i+j] = s2[j] j += i \bullet The algorithm requires $O(\mathfrak{n})$ steps to complete $O(n) = n \log n$ Merge sort Merge sort: summary · Straightforward application of divide-and-conquer def merge_sort(s):
 n = len(s)
 if n <= i: return
 s1 = [:n//2]
 s2 = [n//2:]
 merge_sort(s1)
 merge_sort(s1)
 merge_sort(s2, s2, s) * Worst case $O(n\log n)$ complexity (best/average cases are the same) \bullet Merge sort is not in-place: requires O(n) additional space . Once we have nerge(), the rest is trivial: It is particularly useful for settings with low random-access memory, or sequential access Split the array into two
 Recursively sort both sides
 Stop when the input is length 1 Merge sort is stable It is a well studied algorithm, there are many variants (in-place non-recursive) A short divergence to complexity A short divergence to complexity 64 384 4096 1K 1048576 1099511627776 1M 20 971 520 32 212 254 720 1152 921 504 606 846 976

Insertion sort

Quicksort

- · Quicksort is another popular divide-and-conquer sorting algorithm . The main difference from the merge sort is that big part of the work is done before splitting
- \bullet Its worse time complexity is $O(n^2)$, but in practice it performs better than merge sort on average
- General idea: pick a pivot p, and divide the sequence into three parts as
- L. smaller than a particular element p G. larger than a particular element p E. equal to a particular element p sort L. and G. recursively
- · combination is simple concater

Quicksort



· Simply concat

- L. the sorted items less than a E items equal to p
 G the sorted items greater than p
- No need for O(n) merging

Quicksort

Quicksort

89 67 88 12 57 76 93 72

89 88 76 93

89 88

def qsort(seq):
 if seq == []: return []

At each divide step

Pick a pivot

O(n) operations

· Recursively call quicksort twice L for items less than the pivot
G for items greater than the pivot

· Practical imlementations are not very different Common improvements include in-place sorting
 selecting the pivot more carefully

Ouicksort

- Similar to the merge sort, quicksort performs O(n) operations at each level in recursion
- The overall complexity is proportional to n × ℓ, where ℓ is depth of the tree
- The recursion tree of merge sort is balan depth is log n.
- · For quicksort, we do not have a balanced-tree guarantee
- In the worst case, the depth of the tree can be n, resulting in O(n2) complexity



Ouicksort

- Complexity: O(n log n) average, O(n²) worst Despite its worst-case O(n²) complexity, quicksort is faster than merge sort
- on average (in practice)
- . The algorithm can easily implemented in-place (in-place version is more
- · Quicksort is not stable
- Quicksort is one of the me properties are well known st-studied algorith

Ouicksort

- * Worst case of the quicksort is when the input sequence is sorted If the input sequence is (approximately) random, the expected number of elements in each divide is n/2
- * To reduce the probability of worst case, nundomized quicksort is to picks the
- pivot randomly . Best case happens if we pick the median of the sequence as the pivot, but
- finding median already requires $O(n \log n)$ (or O(n), but not very practical) A common approach is picking three random values from the sequence, and selecting the 'median of three' as the pivot

Sorting algorithms so far, and the lower bound

Algorithm	worst	average	best	memory	in-place	stable
Bubble sort	n ²	n ²	n	1	yes	yes
Insertion sort		n ²	n	1	yes	yes
Merge sort	nlogn	nlogn	nlogn	n.	no	yes
Quicksort	n ²	n log n	$n \log n$	logn	yes	no

- * Can we do better than O(n log n)?
- * If our sorting algorithms requires comparing individ turns out to be 'no'
- * Lower bound of worst-case sorting is $\Omega(n \log n)$
- In some special cases, linear-time complexity can be possible

89 67 88 12 57 76 93 72 64 53 89 54 43 92 47 21 4

Bucket sort

- . Bucket sort puts elements of the input into a pre-defined number of ordered Elements in each bucket is sorted (typically using insertion sort)
- . We can than retrieve the sorted elements by visiting each bucket
- · Note that bucket sort does not compare elements to each other when
- deciding which bucket to place them
- In special cases, this results in O(n) we

Summary

· While placing the elem comparisons between the keys 43 47 53 54 57 64 67 72 76 - n insertion operations - n retrieval operations - O(n) sorting time

* Sorting is an important and well-studied computational problem Most sorting algorithms/applications used in practice are highly opti often based on multiple basic algorithms

* Lower bound on worst-case sorting time is $\Omega(n \log n)$, divide-and-cor

Reading: Goodrich, Tamassia, and Goldwasser (2013, chapter 12)

Naive sorting algorithms run in O(n²) time

And a fun way to see sorting in action:

https://www.youtube.com/user/AlgoRythmics

algorithms achieve this

- Inside the buckets worst-case O(n²) (insertion sort)
- . What if we had as many buckets as the keys?

Radix sort

- . In a large number of cases, we want to sort object using multiple keys
- In such cases, we define the order of key pairs as
 (k₁, l₁) < (k₂, l₂) if k₁ < k₂, or k₁ = k₂ and l₁ < l₂
- · This definition can be generalized to key tuples of any length
- . This ordering is known as lexicographic or dictionary order
- for this purpose
- Next
 - Reading: Goodrich, Tamassia, and Goldwasser (2013, chapter 8)

