

```

Timing summary:
  build initial array & SelectionSort: 0 second(s)
  refill array & MergeSort, 200 times: 1 second(s)

→ gprof ./a.out | more
Flat profile:

Each sample counts as 0.01 seconds.
%   cumulative   self           self         total
time  seconds  seconds   calls   ms/call  ms/call  name
54.64    0.53    0.53  4999800    0.00    0.00  Merge
40.21    0.92    0.39      1   390.00  390.00  SelectionSort
 5.15    0.97    0.05     200    0.25    2.90  MergeSort

%           the percentage of the total running time of the
time        program used by this function.

cumulative  a running sum of the number of seconds accounted
seconds     for by this function and those listed above it.

self        the number of seconds accounted for by this
seconds     function alone.  This is the major sort for this
            listing.

calls       the number of times this function was invoked, if
            this function is profiled, else blank.

self        the average number of milliseconds spent in this
--More--

```

Call graph (explanation follows)

granularity: each sample hit covers 4 byte(s) for 1.03% of 0.97 seconds

index	% time	self	children	called	name
					<spontaneous>
[1]	100.0	0.00	0.97		main [1]
		0.05		200/200	MergeSort [2]
		0.39	0.00	1/1	SelectionSort [4]

			9999600		MergeSort [2]
		0.05	0.53	200/200	main [1]
[2]	59.8	0.05	0.53	200+9999600	MergeSort [2]
		0.53	0.00	4999800/4999800	Merge [3]
			9999600		MergeSort [2]

		0.53	0.00	4999800/4999800	MergeSort [2]
[3]	54.6	0.53	0.00	4999800	Merge [3]

		0.39	0.00	1/1	main [1]
[4]	40.2	0.39	0.00	1	SelectionSort [4]

This table describes the call tree of the program, and was sorted by the total amount of time spent in each function and its children.

Each entry in this table consists of several lines. The line with the index number at the left hand margin lists the current function. The lines above it list the functions that called this function,

```

Timing summary:
  build initial array & SelectionSort: 3 second(s)
  refill array & MergeSort, 200 times: 1 second(s)

→ gprof ./a.out | more
Flat profile:

Each sample counts as 0.01 seconds.
%   cumulative   self           self         total
time  seconds  seconds   calls   s/call   s/call   name
58.01    2.21    2.21         1     2.21     2.21  SelectionSort
40.68    3.76    1.55  9999800     0.00     0.00    Merge
 1.31    3.81    0.05        200     0.00     0.01  MergeSort

%           the percentage of the total running time of the
time        program used by this function.

cumulative  a running sum of the number of seconds accounted
seconds     for by this function and those listed above it.

self        the number of seconds accounted for by this
seconds     function alone.  This is the major sort for this
            listing.

calls       the number of times this function was invoked, if
            this function is profiled, else blank.

self        the average number of milliseconds spent in this
--More--

```

```

^L

Call graph (explanation follows)

granularity: each sample hit covers 4 byte(s) for 0.26% of 3.81 seconds

index % time    self  children    called    name
-----
[1]   100.0     0.00   3.81         1/1      main [1]
      2.21     0.00         1/1      SelectionSort [2]
      0.05     1.55       200/200    MergeSort [3]
-----
[2]   58.0     2.21   0.00         1/1      main [1]
      2.21     0.00         1       SelectionSort [2]
-----
[3]   42.0     0.05   1.55       200+19999600  MergeSort [3]
      0.05     1.55       200+19999600  MergeSort [3]
      1.55     0.00  9999800/9999800  Merge [4]
      1.55     0.00  9999800/9999800  MergeSort [3]
-----
[4]   40.7     1.55   0.00  9999800/9999800  MergeSort [3]
      1.55     0.00  9999800       Merge [4]
-----

This table describes the call tree of the program, and was sorted by
the total amount of time spent in each function and its children.

Each entry in this table consists of several lines.  The line with the
index number at the left hand margin lists the current function.

```

50000

```

→gprof ./a.out | more
Flat profile:

Each sample counts as 0.01 seconds.
%   cumulative   self           self      total
time  seconds    seconds   calls   s/call   s/call   name
68.59    6.31      6.31         1      6.31    6.31  SelectionSort
30.87    9.15      2.84 19999800   0.00    0.00    Merge
0.33    9.18      0.03         200     0.00    0.01    main
0.22    9.20      0.02         200     0.00    0.01  MergeSort

%           the percentage of the total running time of the
time        program used by this function.

cumulative  a running sum of the number of seconds accounted
seconds     for by this function and those listed above it.

self        the number of seconds accounted for by this
seconds     function alone. This is the major sort for this
            listing.

calls       the number of times this function was invoked, if
            this function is profiled, else blank.

--More--

```

```

→gprof ./a.out | more
Flat profile:

Each sample counts as 0.01 seconds.
%   cumulative   self           self      total
time  seconds    seconds   calls   s/call   s/call   name
68.59    6.31      6.31         1      6.31    6.31  SelectionSort
30.87    9.15      2.84 19999800   0.00    0.00    Merge
0.33    9.18      0.03         200     0.00    0.01    main
0.22    9.20      0.02         200     0.00    0.01  MergeSort

%           the percentage of the total running time of the
time        program used by this function.

cumulative  a running sum of the number of seconds accounted
seconds     for by this function and those listed above it.

self        the number of seconds accounted for by this
seconds     function alone. This is the major sort for this
            listing.

calls       the number of times this function was invoked, if
            this function is profiled, else blank.

--More--

```

10000

Time complexity differences

- For the list of 100000 elements, selection sort was called only once, taking up 68.59% of program runtime, while mergesort was called 200 times in less time.
- The biggest reason for this time difference is how other algorithms are implemented. Selection sort uses nested for loops, so the time complexity is always $O(n^2)$, while mergesort recursively sorts the left and right sides of the list, so the time complexity is $O(n \log n)$

Pros and cons

- Mergesort will always be faster because it is implemented recursively instead of with nested loops.
- The main pro of selection sort is how easily it can be implemented.
- Mergesort is better for longer lists, but it is harder to implement

Merge was called 19999800 times for a list with 100000 elements, and merge was called 200 times.

This matches the expectation since merge is called when a sorted array needs to be merged back into a larger sorted array.

Gprof reports the number of times a function is entered, which doesn't work for recursive functions since they call themselves within itself.

