## Lecture 3: Efficient Sorts

## Mergesort

Quicksort
Analysis of Algorithms

## Sorting Applications

## Applications

- Sort a list of names.
- Organize an MP3 library.
- obvious applications
- Display Google PageRank results.
- Find the median.

Find the closest pair

- Binary search in a database
- Identify statistical outliers

Find duplicates in a mailing list.

- Data compression.
- Computer graphics.
- Computational biology.
- Supply chain management
- Simulate a system of particles

〔 non-obvious applications
problems become easy once

- items are in sorted order

Book recommendations on Amazon

- Load balancing on a parallel computer.

Two great sorting algorithms.

- Full scientific understanding of their properties has enabled us to
- hammer them into practical system sorts.
- Occupies a prominent place in world's computational infrastructure.
- Quicksort honored as one of top 10 algorithms for science and engineering of $20^{\text {th }}$ century.

Mergesort.

- Java Arrays sort for type object.
- Java collections sort.
- Perl stable, Python stable.

Quicksort.

- Java Arrays sort for primitive types.
- $C$ qsort, Unix, $9^{++}$, Visual $C_{++}$, Perl, Python.


## Estimating the Running Time

Total running time is sum of cost $\times$ frequency for all of the basic ops.

- Cost depends on machine, compiler.
- Frequency depends on algorithm, input

Cost for sorting.

- $A=\#$ function calls.
- B = \# exchanges
. C = \# comparisons.
- Cost on a typical machine $=35 \mathrm{~A}+11 \mathrm{~B}+4 C$.

Frequency of sorting ops.

- $N=\#$ elements to sort
- Selection sort: $A=1, B=N-1, C=N(N-1) / 2$.


Estimating the Running Time
Big Oh Notation
(i) Analyze asymptotic growth as a function of input size N .
(ii) For medium $N$, run and measure time.
(iii) For large $N$, use (i) and (ii) to predict time.

Asymptotic growth rates.

- Estimate as a function of input size $N$.
$-N, N \log N, N^{2}, N^{3}, 2 N, N!$
- Ignore lower order terms and leading coefficients.
- Ex. $6 N^{3}+17 N^{2}+56$ is asymptotically proportional to $N^{3}$

Big Theta, Oh, and Omega notation.
. $\Theta\left(\mathrm{N}^{2}\right)$ means $\left\{\mathrm{N}^{2}, 17 \mathrm{~N}^{2}, \mathrm{~N}^{2}+17 \mathrm{~N}^{1.5}+3 \mathrm{~N}, \ldots\right\}$

- ignore lower order terms and leading coefficients
- $O\left(N^{2}\right)$ means $\left\{N^{2}, 17 N^{2}, N^{2}+17 N^{1.5}+3 N, N^{1.5}, 100 N, \ldots\right\}$
- $\Theta\left(N^{2}\right)$ and smaller
- use for upper bounds
- $\Omega\left(N^{2}\right)$ means $\left\{N^{2}, 17 N^{2}, N^{2}+17 N^{1.5}+3 N, N^{3}, 100 N^{5}, \ldots\right\}$
$-\Theta\left(N^{2}\right)$ and larger
- use for lower bounds

Never say: insertion sort makes at least $O\left(N^{2}\right)$ comparisons.

## Estimating the Running Time

Insertion sort is quadratic.

- $\mathrm{N}^{2} / 4$ - $\mathrm{N} / 4$ comparisons on average.
- $\Theta\left(N^{2}\right)$.

On arizona: 1 second for $N=10,000$.

- How long for $N=100,000$ ? 100 seconds (100 times as long)
- $N=1$ million? 2.78 hours (another factor of 100 )
- $N=1$ billion?

317 years (another factor of $10^{6}$ )

Why It Matters

| Run time in nanoseconds --> |  | $1.3 \mathrm{~N}^{3}$ | $10{ }^{2}$ | $47 \mathrm{~N} \log _{2} \mathrm{~N}$ | 48 N |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Time to solve a problem of size | 1000 | 1.3 seconds | 10 msec | 0.4 msec | 0.048 msec |
|  | 10,000 |  | 1 second | 6 msec | 0.48 msec |
|  | 100,000 | $8 \mathrm{k} 5 \mathrm{~d}$ |  | 78 msec | 4.8 msec |
|  | million | 448 ¢ears | 88888hours ${ }^{\text {c }}$ | 0.94 seconds | 48 msec |
|  | 10 million | 841maternes | 818 \% weeks\% | 11 seconds | 0.48 seconds |
| Max size problem solved in one | second | 920 | 10,000 | 1 million | 21 million |
|  | minute | 3,600 | 77,000 | 49 million | 1.3 billion |
|  | hour | 14,000 | 600,000 | 2.4 trillion | 76 trillion |
|  | day | 41,000 | 2.9 million | 50 trillion | 1,800 trillion |
| N multiplied by 10, time multiplied by |  | 1,000 | 100 | 10+ | 10 |


| Seconds | Equivalent |
| :---: | :---: |
| 1 | 1 second |
| 10 | 10 seconds |
| $10^{2}$ | 1.7 minutes |
| $10^{3}$ | 17 minutes |
| $10^{4}$ | 2.8 hours |
| $10^{5}$ | 1.1 days |
| $10^{6}$ | 1.6 weeks |
| $10^{7}$ | 3.8 months |
| $10^{8}$ | 3.1 years |
| $10^{9}$ | 3.1 decades |
| $10^{10}$ | 3.1 centuries |
| $\ldots$ | forever |
| $10^{17}$ | age of <br> universe |


| Meters Per <br> Second | Imperial <br> Units | Example |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $10^{-10}$ | $1.2 \mathrm{in} /$ decade | Continental drift |
| $10^{-8}$ | $1 \mathrm{ft} /$ year | Hair growing |
| $10^{-6}$ | $3.4 \mathrm{in} /$ day | Glacier |
| $10^{-4}$ | $1.2 \mathrm{ft} /$ hour | Gastro-intestinal tract |
| $10^{-2}$ | $2 \mathrm{ft} /$ minute | Ant |
| 1 | $2.2 \mathrm{mi} /$ hour | Human walk |
| $10^{2}$ | $220 \mathrm{mi} /$ hour | Propeller airplane |
| $10^{4}$ | $370 \mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{min}$ | Space shuttle |
| $10^{6}$ | $620 \mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{sec}$ | Earth in galactic orbit |
| $10^{8}$ | $62,000 \mathrm{mi} / \mathrm{sec}$ | $1 / 3$ speed of light |


| Powers <br> of 2 | $2^{10}$ | thousand |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | $2^{20}$ | million |
|  | $2^{30}$ | billion |

Mergesort (divide-and-conquer)

- Divide array into two halves.
- Recursively sort each half.
- Merge two halves to make sorted whole.


| $\mathbf{A}$ | $\mathbf{G}$ | $\mathbf{H}$ | $\mathbf{I}$ | $\mathbf{L}$ | $\mathbf{M}$ | $\mathbf{O}$ | $\mathbf{R}$ | $\mathbf{S}$ | $\mathbf{T}$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

Reference: More Programming Pear/s by Jon Bentley

## Mergesort Implementation in Java

```
public static void mergesort(Comparable[] a, int low, int high)
    Comparable temp[] = new Comparable[a.length]
    for (int i = 0; i < a.length; i++) temp[i] = a[i];
        mergesort(temp, a, low, high);
private static void mergesort(Comparable[] from, Comparable[] to,
    if (high <= low) return;
    int mid = (low + high) / 2;
    mergesort(to, from, low, mid)
    mergesort(to, from, mid+1, high);
    int p = low, q = mid+1;
    for(int i = low; i <= high; i++) {
        if (q > high) to[i] = from[p++];
        else if (p > mid) 
        else if (less(from[q], from[p])) to[i] = from[q++];
        else to[i] = from[p++];
    }
}
```

\}

## Mergesort Analysis

Stability? Yes, if underlying merge is stable.
How much memory does array implementation of mergesort require?

- Original input = N
- Auxiliary array for merging $=\mathrm{N}$.
- Local variables: constant.
- Function call stack: $\log _{2} \mathrm{~N}$
- Total $=2 \mathrm{~N}+\mathrm{O}(\log \mathrm{N})$.

How much memory do other sorting algorithms require?

- $\mathrm{N}+\mathrm{O}(1)$ for insertion sort, selection sort, bubble sort.
- In-place $=N+O(\log N)$.

How long does mergesort take?

- Bottleneck = merging (and copying).
- merging two files of size $N / 2$ requires $\leq N$ comparisons

$T(N)=$ comparisons to mergesort $N$ elements
- assume $N$ is a power of 2
- assume merging requires exactly $N$ comparisons

|  | 0 |  | if $N=1$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $T(N)=$ | $\underbrace{2 T(N / 2)}_{\text {sorting both halves }}$ | $+\underset{s}{N}$ | otherwise |

including already sorted

Claim. $T(N)=N \log _{2} N$.

- Note: same number of comparisons for ANY file
- We'll give several proofs to illustrate standard techniques.



## Mathematical Induction

Mathematical induction.
. Powerful and general proof technique in discrete mathematics.

- To prove a theorem true for all integers $k \geq 0$
- base case: prove it to be true for $N=0$
- induction hypothesis: assuming it is true for arbitrary N
- induction step: show it is true for $\mathrm{N}+1$

Claim: $0+1+2+3+\ldots+N=N(N+1) / 2$ for all $N \geq 0$.
Proof: (by mathematical induction)

- Base case ( $\mathrm{N}=0$ ).

$$
-0=0(0+1) / 2 .
$$

- Induction hypothesis: assume $0+1+2+\ldots+N=N(N+1) / 2$
. Induction step: $0+1+\ldots+N+N+1=(0+1+\ldots+N)+N+1$

$$
=N(N+1) / 2+N+1
$$

$$
=(N+2)(N+1) / 2
$$

Claim. If $T(N)$ satisfies this recurrence, then $T(N)=N \log _{2} N$.
$T(N)=\left\{\begin{array}{cc}0 & \text { if } N=1 \\ \underbrace{2 T(N / 2)}_{\text {sorting both halves }}+\underbrace{N}_{\text {merging }} & \text { otherwise }\end{array}\right.$

Proof. (by induction on N )

- Base case: $N=1$.
- Inductive hypothesis: $T(N)=N \log _{2} N$.
- Goal: show that $T(2 N)=2 N \log _{2}(2 N)$.

```
T(2N)=2T(N)+2N
    =2N\mp@subsup{log}{2}{2}N+2N
    = 2N(\mp@subsup{\operatorname{log}}{2}{}(2N)-1)+2N
```


Q. What if $N$ is not a power of 2?
Q. What if merging takes at most N comparisons instead of exactly N ?
A. $T(N)$ satisfies following recurrence.

$$
T(N) \leq \begin{cases}0 & \text { if } N=1 \\ \underbrace{T(\lceil N / 2\rceil)}_{\text {solve left half }}+\underbrace{T(\lfloor N / 2\rfloor)}_{\text {solve right half }}+\underbrace{N}_{\text {merging }} & \text { otherwise }\end{cases}
$$

Claim. $\quad T(N) \leq N\left\lceil\log _{2} N\right\rceil$.
Proof. Challenge for the bored.

## Mergesort: Practical Improvements

Eliminate recursion. Bottom-up mergesort. Sedgewick Program 8.5
Stop if already sorted.

- Is biggest element in first half $\leq$ smallest element in second half?
- Helps for nearly ordered lists.

Insertion sort small files.
. Mergesort has too much overhead for tiny files.

- Cutoff to insertion sort for < 7 elements.

Use sentinels.

- Two of four statements in inner loop are bounds checking.
. "Superoptimization requires mindbending recursive switchery."


## Sorting By Different Fields

Design challenge: enable sorting students by email or section.

## // sort by email

Student. setSortKey (Student. EMAIL)
ArraySort.mergesort (students, 0, N-1);
// then by precept
Student. setSortKey (Student. SECTION) ;
ArraySort.mergesort (students, $0, \mathrm{~N}-1$ ) ;

> 1 Anand Dharan adharan 1 Ashley Evans amevans 1 Alicia Myers amyers 1 Arthur Shum ashum 1 Amy Trangsrud atrangsr 1 Bryant Chen bryantc 1 Charles Alden calden 1 Cole Deforest cde 1 David Astle dastle 1 Elinor Keith ekeith 1 Kira Hohensee hohensee 5

```
public class Student implements Comparable {
    private String first, last, email;
    private int section;
    public final static int FIRST = 0;
    public final static int LAST = 1;
    public final static int EMAIL = 2;
    public final static int SECTION = 3;
    private static int sortKey = SECTION;
    public static void setSortKey(int k) { sortKey = k; }
    public int compareTo(Object x) {
        Student a = this;
        Student b = (Student) x;
        if (sortKey == FIRST) return a.first.compareTo(b.first)
        else if (sortKey == LAST) return a.last.compareTo(b.last);
        else if (sortKey == EMAIL) return a.email.compareTo(b.email);
        else return a.section - b.section;
    }
}
```

data members (one for each student)
classwide variables (shared by all students)

Computational complexity. Framework to study efficiency of algorithms for solving a particular problem $X$.
Machine model. Count fundamental operations.
Upper bound. Cost guarantee provided by some algorithm for $X$. Lower bound. Proven limit on cost guarantee of any algorithm for $X$. Optimal algorithm. Algorithm with best cost guarantee for $X$.

$$
\text { lower bound } \hat{\sim} \text { upper bound }
$$

Example: sorting.

- Machine model = \# comparisons on random access machine.
- Upper bound $=N \log _{2} N$ from mergesort.
- Lower bound $=\mathrm{N} \log _{2} \mathrm{~N}-\mathrm{N} \log _{2} e$
- Optimal algorithm = mergesort.
applies to any comparison-based algorithm (see cOS 226)


## Decision Tree



## Comparison Based Sorting Lower Bound

Theorem. Any comparison based sorting algorithm must use $\Omega\left(\mathrm{N} \log _{2} \mathrm{~N}\right)$ comparisons.

Proof. Worst case dictated by tree height $h$.

- N! different orderings.
- One (or more) leaves corresponding to each ordering.
- Binary tree with N! leaves must have height

```
h}\geq\mp@subsup{\operatorname{log}}{2}{(N!
log}2(N/e\mp@subsup{)}{}{N}\quad\Leftarrow\mathrm{ Stirling's formula
```



What if we don't use comparisons? Stay tuned for radix sort.

Running time estimates:

- Home pc executes $10^{8}$ comparisons/second.
- Supercomputer executes $10^{12}$ comparisons/second.

| Insertion Sort ( $\mathrm{N}^{2}$ ) |  |  |  | Mergesort ( $N \log N$ ) |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| computer | thousand | million | billion | thousand | million | billion |
| home | instant | 2.8 hours | 317 years | instant | 1 sec | 18 min |
| super | instant | 1 second | 1.6 weeks | instant | instant | instant |

Lesson 1: good algorithms are better than supercomputers.

## Quicksort.

$\Rightarrow$. Partition array so that:

- some pivot element a [m] is in its final position
- no larger element to the left of $m$
- no smaller element to the right of $m$

| Q | U | I | C | K | S | O | R | T | I | S | C | O | O | L |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

## Quicksort

## Quicksort.

$\Rightarrow$. Partition array so that:

- some pivot element a $[\mathrm{m}]$ is in its final position
- no larger element to the left of $m$
- no smaller element to the right of $m$

partitioned array


## Quicksort

## Quicksort.

- Partition array so that:
- some pivot element a [m] is in its final position
- no larger element to the left of $m$
- no smaller element to the right of $m$
$\Rightarrow$. Sort each "half" recursively.


| $C$ | $C$ | $I$ | $I$ | $K$ | $L$ | $O$ | $O$ | $O$ | $Q$ | $R$ | $S$ | $S$ | $T$ | $U$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

$\nabla$
sort each piece

Quicksort: Java Implementation

## Quicksort

- Partition array so that:
- some pivot element a [m] is in its final position
- no larger element to the left of $m$
- no smaller element to the right of $m$
. Sort each "half" recursively.

```
public static void quicksort(Comparable[] a, int L, int R) {
    if (R <= L) return
    int m = partition(a, L, R)
    quicksort(a, L, m-1);
    quicksort(a,m,m, R);
}
```

How do we partition in-place efficiently? $\square$

```
static int partition(Comparable[] a, int L, int R) {
```

static int partition(Comparable[] a, int L, int R) {
int i = L - 1;
int i = L - 1;
int j = R;
int j = R;
while(true) {
while(true) {
while (less(a[++i],a[R])) \& find item on left to swap
while (less(a[++i],a[R])) \& find item on left to swap
while (less(a[++i],a[R])) \& find item on left to swap
while (less(a[++i],a[R])) \& find item on left to swap
if (j == L) break;
if (j == L) break;
if (i >= j) break; }\Leftarrow\mathrm{ check if pointers cross
if (i >= j) break; }\Leftarrow\mathrm{ check if pointers cross
exch(a, i, j);
exch(a, i, j);
swap
swap
}
}
exch(a, i, R); \& swap with partitioning element
exch(a, i, R); \& swap with partitioning element
exch(a, i, R); \& return index where crossing occurs
exch(a, i, R); \& return index where crossing occurs
}

```

\section*{Quicksort Example}


Partitioning

\section*{Quicksort: Worst Case}

Number of comparisons in worst case is quadratic.
. \(\mathrm{N}+(\mathrm{N}-1)+(\mathrm{N}-2)+\ldots+1=\mathrm{N}(\mathrm{N}+1) / 2\)

Worst-case inputs.
. Already sorted!
- Reverse sorted.

What about all equal keys or only two distinct keys?
- Many textbook implementations go quadratic.
. Sedgewick partitioning algorithm stops on equal keys.
- Stay tuned for 3-way quicksort.

Quicksort: Average Case
Average case running time.
- Roughly \(2 \mathrm{~N} \ln \mathrm{~N}\) comparisons. proof on next slide
- Assumption: file is randomly shuffled.
- Equivalent assumption: pivot on random element.

\section*{Remarks.}
- \(39 \%\) more comparisons than mergesort.
- Faster than mergesort in practice because of lower cost of other high-frequency instructions.
- Worst case still proportional to \(N^{2}\) but more likely that you are struck by lightning and meteor at same time.
- Caveat: many textbook implementations have best case \(N^{2}\) if duplicates, even if randomized!

Theorem. The average number of comparisons \(C_{N}\) to quicksort a random file of N elements is about \(2 \mathrm{~N} \ln \mathrm{~N}\).
- The precise recurrence satisfies \(C_{0}=C_{1}=0\) and for \(N \geq 2\) :
\[
\begin{aligned}
C_{N} & =N+1+\frac{1}{N} \sum_{k=1}^{N}\left(c_{k}+C_{N-k}\right) \\
& =N+1+\frac{2}{N} \sum_{k=1}^{N} c_{k-1}
\end{aligned}
\]
- Multiply both sides by N and subtract the same formula for \(\mathrm{N}-1\) :
\[
N C_{N}-(N-1) C_{N-1}=N(N+1)-(N-1) N+2 C_{N-1}
\]
- Simplify to:
\[
N C_{N}=(N+1) C_{N-1}+2 N
\]

\section*{Quicksort: Average Case}
- Divide both sides by \(N(N+1)\) to get a telescoping sum:
\[
\begin{aligned}
\frac{C_{N}}{N+1} & =\frac{C_{N-1}}{N}+\frac{2}{N+1} \\
& =\frac{C_{N-2}}{N-1}+\frac{2}{N}+\frac{2}{N+1} \\
& =\frac{C_{N-3}}{N-2}+\frac{2}{N-1}+\frac{2}{N}+\frac{2}{N+1} \\
& =\vdots \\
& =\frac{C_{2}}{3}+\sum_{k=3}^{N} \frac{2}{k+1}
\end{aligned}
\]
- Approximate the exact answer by an integral:
\[
\frac{C_{N}}{N+1} \approx \sum_{k=1}^{N} \frac{2}{k} \approx \int_{k=1}^{N} \frac{2}{k}=2 \ln N
\]
- Finally, what we want: \(\quad C_{N} \approx 2(N+1) \ln N \approx 1.39 N \log _{2} N\).

\section*{Sorting Analysis Summary}

Running time estimates:
- Home pc executes \(10^{8}\) comparisons/second.
- Supercomputer executes \(10^{12}\) comparisons/second.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\multicolumn{3}{c}{ Insertion Sort \(\left(N^{2}\right)\)} & \multicolumn{3}{c|}{ Mergesort ( \(N \log N)\)} \\
\hline computer & thousand & million & billion & thousand & million & billion \\
\hline home & instant & 2.8 hours & 317 years \\
\hline super & instant & 1 second & 1.6 weeks & instant & 1 sec & 18 min \\
\hline instant & instant & instant \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|}
\hline thousand & million & billion \\
\hline instant & 0.3 sec & 6 min \\
\hline instant & instant & instant \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Lesson 1: good algorithms are better than supercomputers.
Lesson 2: great algorithms are better than good ones.

\section*{Median of sample.}
- Best choice of pivot element = median.

Samplesort.
- Basic algorithm = quicksort.
- Sort a relatively large random sample from the array.
- Use sorted elements as pivots.
- Pivots are (probabilistically) good estimates of true medians.

Bentley-McIlroy.
- Original motivation: improve qsort function in \(C\).
- Basic algorithm = quicksort.
. Partition on Tukey's ninther: Approximate median-of-9.
- used median-of-3 elements, each of which is median-of-3
- idea borrowed from statistics, useful in many disciplines
. 3-way quicksort to deal with equal keys.
stay tuned

Reference: Engineering a Sort Function by Jon L. Bentley and M. Douglas McIIroy.

\section*{System Sorts}

Java's Arrays. sort library function for arrays.
- Uses Bentley-McIlroy quicksort implementation for objects.
- Uses mergesort for primitive types.

Starting index is inclusive,
ending index is exclusive
http://java. sun.com//2se/ 1.4.2/docs/api/
. To access library, need following line at beginning of program.
import java.util.Arrays

Why the difference for objects and primitive types?

\section*{Breaking Java's System Sort}

Is it possible to make system sort go quadratic?
- No, for mergesort.
- Yes, for deterministic quicksort. so, why are most system sorts deterministic?

McIlroy's devious idea.
- Construct malicious input WHILE running system quicksort in response to elements compared.
- If \(p\) is partition element, commit to \(x<p, y<p\), but don't commit to any order on \(x, y\) until \(x\) and \(y\) are compared.

\section*{Consequences}
- Confirms theoretical possibility.
- Algorithmic complexity attack: you enter linear amount of data; server performs quadratic amount of work.
- Blows function call stack and crashes program.
- more disastrous

Reference: McIlory. A Killer Adversary for Quicksort.

\section*{Internal sorts.}
. Insertion sort, selection sort, bubblesort, shellsort, shaker sort.
. Quicksort, mergesort, heapsort.
- Samplesort, introsort.
- Solitaire sort, red-black sort, splaysort, psort, . . . .

External sorts. Poly-phase mergesort, cascade-merge, oscillating sort

\section*{Radix sorts.}
- Distribution, MSD, LSD.
. 3-way radix quicksort

\section*{Parallel sorts.}
- Bitonic sort, Batcher even-odd sort.
- Smooth sort, cube sort, column sort.
```

