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**Abstract.**

In this paper, I describe the implementation of two different methods for constructing a heap. These two methods are common, though they typically serve different purposes. The two methods are usually referred to as “max-heapify” and “max-heap-insert” (Cormen, et al.), however this paper will refer to them as “sift-down” and “sift-up” respectively. This paper explains my analysis and observations of these two methods and describes how the methods perform when they are used to build and sort heaps given sets of randomly generated integers.

1. **Introduction and Background**

Heapsort is typically a very fast algorithm with an average and worst case complexity of *O(n lg n)*. The classic implementation of heapsort uses a sift-down approach simply because sift-up is more expensive for heap building. This is because the number of comparisons and swaps that occur during a call to sift-up increases with the depth of the node in the heap, and there are many more “deep” nodes than “shallow” nodes in a heap. However, with the sift-down approach, the number of swaps per call decreases with the depth of the node. Therefore, roughly half the calls to sift-down will have at most one swap, and about one quarter of the calls have at most two swaps (Perlis).

Of course sift-up is still capable of building a heap, and it is a popular choice for heap repair. This paper describes the analysis and demonstration of sift-up as a heap building technique, but also proves why it may not be an ideal candidate for such a task.

The implementation of heapsort and the various techniques of heap building described by this paper were written in C on a Macbook Pro and compiled with gcc (though it should compile on any platform, as it does not require any platform specific libraries). The algorithm for building and sorting a heap is run a total of 8 times, 4 using the sift-up method and 4 using sift-down. For each iteration, the number of elements in the initial array increases by an order of magnitude, starting at 10^k where k is equal to 2 and ending at 10^k where k is equal to 5. The elements of the array are then randomized 10^5 times to ensure truly random permutations.

The metrics gathered from this evaluation include the number of comparisons for each iteration of the algorithm, as well as the time spent on building and sorting the heap. This data is used to compare the sift-up and sift-down implementations of heap construction and heap sorting. Runtime performance was measured using built-in C functions, namely the *time* header file. This is to ensure accurate measurements that are platform agnostic.

1. **Why Not Sloppy Sort?**

There is another technique for heap repair, which this paper does not analyze because it cannot be used to build a heap. This method is called *SloppyHeapSort* and it uses a “sloppy” sift-down approach for heap repair. This procedure is interesting because it reduces the overall number of comparisons by moving particular elements to the bottom of the heap and then calling sift-up on that element until it finds its proper location. The reason this cannot be used for heap construction is that it does not consider the children of the node in question, and it leaves a “hole” in the position from where the element was taken. It simply takes the element in question from its position within the heap, and moves it to the bottom. The algorithm then moves this element up until it finds its home.

1. **Analysis**
2. **Comparisons**

All the element comparisons done by this algorithm reside in the sift-up and sift-down functions. For sift-down, the worst case is when a node has two children; it needs to make an extra comparison to find the larger of the two children. This means each call of this function will make at most 2 comparisons. Additionally, since sift-down is recursive, the number of comparisons it makes on *n* (where *n = 10^k, 2 <= k <= 5*) items is *H(n) = H(m) + 2*, where *m* is the number of items in the recursive call. This leaves roughly *2n/3* nodes in the subheap of size *m* (which is passed in the recursive calls to sift-down). Therefore, if our recurrence is *H(n) = H(2n/3) + 2* and *H(1) = 0*, we can determine that the number of comparisons should be about *O(n lg n).* Figure 1 below shows that the number of comparisons for sift-down is very close to *O (n lg n).*
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