Q1a:

Sorted ArrayLists for a week:

Unsorted Random Arraylists for a week:

```
▼ TERMINAL

Unsorted ArrayLists:
Day 1 (Size: 1000):
First item: 558822
Last item: 172153

Day 2 (Size: 5000):
First item: 17370
Last item: 372102

Day 3 (Size: 10000):
First item: 29886
Last item: 82709

Day 4 (Size: 50000):
First item: 255138
Last item: 240792

Day 5 (Size: 75000):
First item: 267663

Day 6 (Size: 100000):
First item: 306864
Last item: 267663

Day 7 (Size: 1000000):
First item: 354104
Last item: 277242

Day 7 (Size: 5000000):
First item: 277243
Last item: 272743
Last item: 265521
```

Reverse Sorted ArrayLists for a week:

```
## TERMINAL

Reverse Sorted ArrayLists:

Day 1 (Size: 1800):
First item: 499941

Last item: 1087

Last item: 1085

Day 3 (Size: 18000):
First item: 499965

Last item: 499955

Last item: 499955

Last item: 1090

Day 5 (Size: 75000):
First item: 500000

Last item: 1012

Day 6 (Size: 100000):
First item: 499987

Last item: 1094

Day 7 (Size: 500000):
First item: 1090

Day 7 (Size: 500000):
First item: 1090

Day 7 (Size: 500000):
First item: 1090

Day 7 (Size: 500000):
First item: 1090
```

Pseudocode for quicksort algorithm:

```
function quickSort(list, low, high):
```

```
create an empty stack

push low and high onto stack

while stack is not empty:

high = pop from stack

low = pop from stack

pivot = partition(list, low, high)

if pivot - 1 > low:

push low onto stack

push (pivot - 1) onto stack

if pivot + 1 < high:

push (pivot + 1) onto stack

push high onto stack
```

function partition(list, low, high):

```
pivotIndex = (low + high) / 2
pivot = list[pivotIndex]
swap list[pivotIndex] with list[high]

i = low - 1

for j from low to high - 1:
    if list[j] <= pivot:
        i = i + 1
        swap list[i] with list[j]

swap list[i + 1] with list[high]
return (i + 1)</pre>
```

Q1b:

Efficiency Testing for Quicksort Algorithm:

```
Passing the three types of ArrayLists through the quickSort Sorting Algorithm:
Sorting Random ArrayLists:
System took 299 ms to run.
Sorting Reverse Sorted ArrayLists:
System took 153 ms to run.
Sorting already sorted ArrayLists:
System took 138 ms to run.
```

Q1c:

Efficiency Testing for Hybrid Algorithm:

```
Passing the three types of ArrayLists through the Hybrid Sorting Algorithm:
Sorting Random ArrayLists:
System took 172 ms to run.
Sorting Reverse Sorted ArrayLists:
System took 132 ms to run.
Sorting already sorted ArrayLists:
System took 116 ms to run.
```

Q1d:

Development of the Hybrid Sorting Algorithm

The hybrid sorting algorithm was created to combine the strengths of QuickSort and Insertion Sort. QuickSort is highly efficient for large datasets, but its overhead makes it less ideal for small subarrays. Insertion Sort, on the other hand, excels at handling small or nearly sorted lists. The challenge was to integrate these two sorting methods effectively, using QuickSort for partitioning while switching to Insertion Sort for small sections to improve efficiency.

Different Approaches Considered

Initially, a recursive QuickSort was implemented with a middle pivot. This worked well for random lists but struggled with sorted and reverse-sorted lists, leading to deep recursion and performance inefficiencies. To counter this, QuickSort was rewritten as an iterative version using an explicit stack (ArrayDeque), which reduced memory usage and eliminated the risk of stack overflow.

The final approach combined QuickSort and Insertion Sort. A threshold-based switching mechanism was introduced: when subarrays contained fewer than 60 elements, the algorithm transitioned to Insertion Sort, preventing unnecessary QuickSort partitioning. Additionally, Insertion Sort was used as a finishing step to optimize performance on nearly sorted lists.

Key Decisions and Their Impact

Pivot Selection

The middle pivot was chosen to maintain balanced partitions and prevent skewed splits when dealing with sorted inputs. While random pivot selection was tested, it led to inconsistent performance, so the middle pivot was retained.

Threshold for Switching to Insertion Sort

Several threshold values (10, 20, 30, 50) were tested, but 60 was found to be the best balance between QuickSort's fast partitioning and Insertion Sort's efficiency for small lists.

Performance Across Different Input Types

The hybrid sorting algorithm demonstrated O(n log n) complexity for random lists, leveraging QuickSort's efficiency. For sorted and reverse-sorted lists, worst-case scenarios were mitigated, ensuring a significant performance boost compared to a standard QuickSort implementation.

Efficiency & Runtime Complexity

Approach	Average runtime (Random ArrayLists)	runtime (Sorted	Average runtime (Reverse Sorted ArrayLists)
Iterative QuickSort	275 ms	129 ms	149 ms
Hybrid QuickSort- Insertion Sort	174 ms	120 ms	131 ms

The hybrid approach improves sorting efficiency across all cases, particularly benefiting sorted and nearly sorted lists. By reducing recursion depth and using explicit stack partitioning, memory usage is also significantly lowered.

Conclusion

The development of the hybrid sorting algorithm focused on refining QuickSort's partitioning process while incorporating Insertion Sort for smaller subarrays. Through testing and optimization, a 60-element threshold and middle pivot selection were determined as the best parameters for balanced performance across various input types. This approach strikes an effective balance between speed and memory efficiency, making it a practical solution for real-world sorting applications.