

In this lab you will write a program that uses recursive and iterative sorting algorithms, and analyze their performance on several types of lists.

1. Copy the following three files to your project src folder: `SortsLab.java`, `Sorts.java`, `ListSetup.java`. Compile and run the `SortsLab.java` program on an array of 20 randomly generated integers to verify that all 4 sorting algorithms work.
2. Read through the code of the Insertion, Selection, QuickSort and MergeSort and write a comment block at the beginning of each method explaining what each sort is doing and how it works.
3. To get a rough idea of each algorithm's running time, we modify the program to declare a variable `icount` that keeps track of how many times during the Insertion sort methods execution an array element is compared to another array element. Use proper labeling to display the array before and after sorting along with the `icount`, its running time measure. What did you get for `icount`? \_\_\_\_\_.
4. Repeat this procedure of adding counters by completing the missing code for the Selection, QuickSort, and MergeSort methods and test them on the random-ordered array to verify that the lists are properly sorted. Calculate the `scount`, `qcount`, and `mcount` the number of comparisons between array elements in the selection, quick sort, and merge sort algorithms, and record the data for the four sorts on a list of 20 numbers below.

| Data         | Insertion Sort | Selection Sort | Quick Sort | Merge Sort |
|--------------|----------------|----------------|------------|------------|
| random order |                |                |            |            |

5. Write the portions of missing code to run each sorting method on the same ascending-ordered, and descending-ordered arrays. Compare the running times of the four sorts on arrays of 1000 elements where the data is randomly or already ordered. Be sure to comment out the print calls when you change the size of the arrays. Complete the table below.

| Data             | Insertion Sort | Selection Sort | Quick Sort | Merge Sort |
|------------------|----------------|----------------|------------|------------|
| random order     |                |                |            |            |
| ascending order  |                |                |            |            |
| descending order |                |                |            |            |

6. On one graph in a Google Sheet plot the number of comparisons for each sort on random data. On a second and third graph, repeat for ascending and descending data. Pay particular attention to the scale used for your data.

7. Comment out all sorting calls except the quick sort portions of the program. The quicksort algorithm you've been using selects the first element as the pivot element. Explore how the choice of quicksort's pivot element affects the running time. Modify the method to pivot about the middle element, then a randomly chosen location before proceeding with the splitting. Record the running time measure, `qcount`, for each pivot strategy on a 1000 element arrays.

| Data             | Split first | Split middle | Split random |
|------------------|-------------|--------------|--------------|
| random order     |             |              |              |
| ascending order  |             |              |              |
| descending order |             |              |              |

Which pivot value gives the best running time performance over all? \_\_\_\_\_

8. Counting the number of comparisons disregards movement of elements. For example, a swap requires three moves. The merge sort uses a temporary array and moves elements to and from it. Incorporate another counter into your program to keep track of the number of moves as well as comparisons. Run some data and discuss the results. Does this change your ideas of the efficiency of each sort?
9. Finally discuss which sort you feel is best suited for sorting each type of array we have dealt with. Perhaps consider size of the array also.