CSE331 Assignment Manual #1

Sorting Algorithm Analysis and Implementation

1 Introduction

- This document provides comprehensive guidelines regarding the task of coursework: **CSE331: Introduction to Algorithms**.
- The assignment constitutes 10% of the overall grade. Students who demonstrate outstanding performance can be awarded additional bonus marks.
- The goal of this task is the analysis and implementation of sorting algorithms.
- Students are required to implement and analyse 6 conventional comparison-based sorting algorithms, as well as 6 relatively new sorting algorithms, in a comparative study.
- A thorough analysis of the **time complexity** of each algorithm is mandatory. Additionally, students must conduct experiments on various input sequences to compare the **execution time** and **sorting accuracy** of the implemented algorithms.
- The use of Large Language Models (LLMs) is encouraged for brainstorming and code refactoring at a conceptual level. However, the direct use of AI-generated solutions(code) is strictly prohibited.

2 Submission Deadline

The deadline for the coursework submission is 17:59 on 15 April 2025. Submissions must be made in PDF format via Blackboard.

3 Coursework Structure

3.1 Core Requirements

• Conventional Comparison-Based Sorting Algorithms (6 algorithms):

- Implement and analyse the following algorithms: Merge Sort [6], Heap Sort [3], Bubble Sort [4], Insertion Sort [6], Selection Sort [6], and Quick Sort [5].
- Students are required to implement these algorithms from scratch, ensuring a clear understanding and explanation of their design principles.
 - Note: Standard library sorting functions may only be consulted for reference purposes and must not be utilised in the implementation.
- A comprehensive analysis of the **design rationale** and **time complexity** of each algorithm is essential.

• Contemporary Sorting Algorithms (6 algorithms):

- Implement and analyse the following algorithms: Library Sort [1], Tim Sort¹, Cocktail Shaker Sort [6], Comb Sort [2], Tournament Sort [8], and Introsort [7].
- Provide a pseudo code of each contemporary sorting algorithm.
- Provide a comparative discussion regarding the distinct characteristics, advantages, and disadvantages of each algorithm.

• Generation and Evaluation of Input Data:

- Generate a diverse set of input sequences to evaluate and compare the performance of each algorithm.
- Assess the algorithms based on multiple criteria, including execution time, memory consumption, and stability.
- Input sizes must be varied from a (1K-1M) and each test must be executed a minimum of 10 times to calculate and record the mean execution time.

3.2 Report Writing Guidelines

- Language: The report must be composed in English.
- Structure: The report must adhere to the following structure:
 - 1. Problem Statement
 - 2. Basic Sorting Algorithms
 - 3. Advanced Sorting Algorithms
 - 4. Experimental Results and Analysis
- Page Limit: A maximum of <u>eight pages</u>, inclusive of tables and figures, <u>excluding references</u>. Appendices are not accepted.
- Formatting Requirements: A template will be provided. Modification of font size or margins is strictly prohibited.

¹https://mail.python.org/pipermail/python-dev/2002-July/026837.html

• Code and Data Publication: Students are required to publish their source code and datasets on a public repository (<u>URL of the repository</u>(e.g., GitHub) <u>must be included in the submitted report.</u>)

3.3 Evaluation Criteria

- Understanding of the Problem and Algorithm Overview
- Theoretical Analysis
- Experimental Design and Implementation
- Experimental Results and Interpretation
- Report Structure and Presentation

4 Experimental Details

Students are required to generate diverse input sequences to conduct performance evaluations. The following data categories must be included.

- Sorted Data (ascending and descending order)
- Random Data (completely randomly-ordered sequences)
- Reverse Sorted
- Partially Sorted Data (sequences with partially ordered elements)

For each dataset, students must compare the execution time across all implemented sorting algorithms and evaluate the sorting accuracy.

A References

- Overleaf Tutorial: ²
- Example GitHub Repo: ³
- Academic Writing Guide: ⁴

j- style of reference

²https://www.youtube.com/playlist?list=PLHXZ90QGMqxcWWkx2DMnQmj5os2X5ZR73

³https://github.com/jyyulab/MICA

 $^{^4 \}texttt{https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=-m3U-JrbBBg\&list=PLzZ7PPT4KK5qNzQoszfF-BDIj5LOJatu1}$

References

- [1] M. A. Bender, M. Farach-Colton, and M. A. Mosteiro. Insertion sort is o (n log n). *Theory of Computing systems*, 39:391–397, 2006.
- [2] W. Dobosiewicz. An efficient variation of bubble sort. 1980.
- [3] G. E. Forsythe. Algorithms. Communications of the ACM, 7(6):347–349, 1964.
- [4] E. H. Friend. Sorting on electronic computer systems. *Journal of the ACM (JACM)*, 3(3): 134–168, 1956.
- [5] C. A. R. Hoare. Algorithm 64: quicksort. Communications of the ACM, 4(7):321, 1961.
- [6] D. E. Knuth. The Art of Computer Programming: Sorting and Searching, volume 3. Addison-Wesley Professional, 1998.
- [7] D. R. Musser. Introspective sorting and selection algorithms. *Software: Practice and Experience*, 27(8):983–993, 1997.
- [8] A. Stepanov and A. Kershenbaum. Using tournament trees to sort. *Polytechnical Institute of New York, CATT Technical Report*, pages 86–13, 1986.