Why study sorting Sorting Data Structures and Algorithms for Co nal Linguistics III (IGCL-RA-07)

Çağrı Çöltekin ccoltekin@sfs.uni-tuebingen.de

Winter Semester 2023/24

. Sorting is one of the most studied (and cor mon) problems in o \* It is important to understand strengths and weaknesses of algorithms for

sorting Many problems look like sorting. Learning sorting algorithms will help you solve other problems

 Available implementations are highly optimized (we are not just talking about asymptotic performance guarantees)

. In some (rare) cases, implementing your own sorting algorithm may be

beneficial

swapped = n. = lam(seq)
while swapped:
swapped = False
for i in ramps(n - i):
if seq[i] > seq[i + i]:
seq[i], seq[i + i]/
= seq[i + i], seq[i]
swapped = True swapped = True n = len(seq)

for i in range(i, len(seq)):
 cur = seq[i]
 j = i
 while seq[j - i] > cur\

maile seq[j - 1] > cur\
 and j in range(1,i+1):
 seq[j] = seq[j - 1]
 j == 1
seq[j] = cur

for i in range(1, len(seq)):
 cur = seq[i]
 j = i
 while seq[j - i] > cur\
 and j in range(i,i+i):
 seq[j] = seq[j - i]
 i -= i

j -= 1 seq[j] = cur

Bubble sort

Insertion sort

Insertion sort

i=1 67

Insertion sort demonstration 4

Insertion sort

89 88 12 72 76 93 57

demonstration 2

89 67 88 12 72 76 93 57

\* Insertion sort is one of the simpler sorting algorithm \* It is easy to understand, and reasonably fast for sorting short sequ On longer sequences, it performs worse than more advanced algorithms, like merge sort or quicksort (we will study those later)

image-soct or quarkset; (we win state) under later?

The general idea simple:

assume the elements arrive one by one, and we have a sorted sequence
insert the element to the correct position:

shift all elements larger than the new one to the right
place the new element in its certed place.

Bubble sort

. We start with an 'edu

 Bubble sort is easy to understand, but performs bad – not used in practice . We start from bubble sort, and see the improvements over it

The idea is simple:

compare first two elements, swap if not in order
 shift and compare the next two elements, again swap if needed
 when you reach to the end, repeat the process from the beginning unl
were no swaps in the last iteration

Bubble sort

 $\begin{tabular}{ll} Worst case: $O(n^2)$ & $O(n^2)$ comparisons, $O(n^2)$ swaps \\ * Average case: $O(n^2)$ & $O(n^2)$ comparisons, $O(n^2)$ swaps \\ \end{tabular}$ 

 Best case: O(n) O(n) comparisons, O(1) swaps

Insertion sort

Insertion sort

demonstration 1

• Space complexity: O(1) . There are more concerns than perform

The repetitive algorithm pattern is common

89 67 88 12 72 76 93 57

$$\begin{split} & \text{swapped} = \text{True} \\ & n = \text{len}(\text{seq}) \\ & \text{white swapped:} \\ & \text{swapped} = \text{False} \\ & \text{for i in range}(n-1):} \\ & \text{if seq}(i) > \text{seq}(i+1):} \\ & \text{seq}(i), \text{seq}(i+1) \\ & = \text{seq}(i+1), \text{seq}(i) \\ & \text{swapped} = \text{True} \end{split}$$

 Not practical – it is not used Many swaps
 Bubble sort is in-place in practice

for i in range(i, len(seq)):  $\begin{array}{ll} \operatorname{cur} &= \operatorname{seq}[i] \\ &= i \\ &= i \end{array}$  while  $\operatorname{seq}[j-i] > \operatorname{cur} \setminus \\ &= \operatorname{seq}[j] = \operatorname{seq}[j-i] \\ &= \operatorname{seq}[j] = \operatorname{seq}[j-i] \end{array}$  seq[j] =  $\operatorname{cur} \setminus$ 

for i in range(i, lem(seq)):
 cur = seq[i]
 j = i
 while seq[j - i] > cur\
 and j in range(i,i+i):
 seq[j] = seq[j - i] 89 88 12 72 76 93 57 j -= 1 seq[j] = cur

Insertion sort

88 67 89 12 72 76 93 57

for i in range(i, len(seq)):
 cur = seq[i]
 j = i seq[j] = cur

j = i
while seq[j - i] > cur\
 and j in range(1,i+1):
 seq[j] = seq[j - i]
 j -= i

67 89 12 72 76 93 57

88

for i in range(i, len(seq)):
 cur = seq[i]
 j = i
 while seq[j - i] > cur\
 and j in range(i,i+i):
 seq[j] = seq[j - i]
 j - i

seq[j] = cur

\* Worst case:  $O(n^2)$   $O(n^2)$  comparisons,  $O(n^2)$  swaps or i in range(1, len(seq cur = seq[k] j = i while seq[j - 1] > cur\ for i in range(1, lem(seq)):
 cur = seq[i]
 j = i
 while seq[j - i] > cur\
 and j in range(1,i+1):
 seq[j] = seq[j - i] Average case: O(n²)
O(n²) comparisons, O(n²) swaps Best case: O(n)
O(n) comparisons, O(1) swaps 67 88 89 12 72 76 93 57 Space complexity: O(1) j -= 1 seq[j] = cur In practice, insertion sort is fas than the bubble sort (and also selection sort) Insertion sort Merge sort · Insertion sort is simple · Merge sort is a divide-and-conquer algorithm for sorting . It is efficient for short sequer \* It is relatively easy to understand (once you get your head around recursion) For long sequences it is much worse the merge sort or quicksort (coming next) • It has good asymptotic performance There are many practical cases where merge sort is used • It is in-place Basic idea is divide-and-conquer. . It is online: it can sort items as they arrive - split the sequence - sort the subsequence - merge the sorted lists . It is stable: it does not swap elements with equal keys . It is adaptive: faster if order of elements is closer to the sorted sequ Merge sort Merge sort 89 67 88 12 72 76 93 57 12 57 67 72 76 88 89 93 Merging sequences Complexity of the merge sort 89 67 88 12 72 76 93 57 # s1, s2: sequences to be merged # s: target sequence i, j = 0, 0 n = len(s1) + len(s2) while i + j < n: if j = len(s2) or \ is (len(s1) and of [s] < s2) Keep two indices on both sequences starting from the beginning 72 76 93 57 to complete else: s[i+j] = s2[j] j += i  $O(n) = n \log n$ Merge sort Merge sort: summary \* Straightforward application of divide-and-conquer def merge\_sort(s):
 n = len(s)
 if n <= i: return
 si, s2 = s[:n//2], s[n//2:]
 merge\_sort(s1)
 nerge\_sort(s2)
 nerge(s1, s2, s)</pre> \* Worst case  $O(n\log n)$  complexity (best/average cases are the same)  $\bullet$  Merge sort is not in-place: requires O(n) additional space It is particularly useful for settings with low random-access memory, or sequential access Split the array into two
 Recursively sort both sides - Stop when the input is length 1 Merge sort is stable \* It is a well studied algorithm, there are many variants (in-pla non-recursive) A short divergence to complexity A short divergence to complexity 64 384 4096 1K 1048576 1099511627776 1M 20 971 520 32 212 254 720 1 152 921 504 606 846 976

Insertion sort

Insertion sort

Quicksort

- · Quicksort is another popular divide-and-conquer sorting algorithm . The main difference from the merge sort is that big the part of the work is done before splitting
- Its worse time complexity is O(n<sup>2</sup>), but in practice it performs better than merge sort on average
- . General idea: pick a pivot p, and divide the sequence into three parts as
- L. smaller than a particular element p G larger than a particular element p E equal to a particular element p sort L and G recursively
- · combination is simple concater

Quicksort

12 57 67 72 76 88 89 93



· Simply concat the sorted items less than p

- E items equal to p
  G the sorted items greater than p
- No need for O(n) merging

ABCDE

ABCDE

## Ouicksort

- Similar to the merge sort, quicksort performs O(n) operations at each level in recursion
- \* The overall complexity is proportional to  $\pi \times \xi$ where  $\ell$  is depth of the tre
- The recursion tree of merge sort is balanced, so dej is log n.
- . For quicksort, we do not have a balanced-tree guarantee

ABCD
ABC
ABC
ABC
ABC In the worst case, the depth of the tree can be n, resulting in O(n<sup>2</sup>) complexity

## Ouicksort

- Complexity: O(n log n) average, O(n²) worst
- Despite its worst-case O(n²) complexity, quicksort is faster than merge sort on average (in practice)
- . The algorithm can easily be implemented in-place (in-place version is more
- · Ouicksort is not stable
- Quicksort is one of the m ost-studied algorithms: there are many var properties are well known

### Bucket sort

- . Bucket sort puts elements of the input into a pre-defined number of ordered
- $\star$  Elements in each bucket is sorted (typically using insertion sort)
- . We can than retrieve the sorted elements by visiting each bucket . The bucket sort does not compare elements to each other when deciding which
- bucket to place them
- In special cases, this results in O(n) worst-case complexit

### Radix sort

- . In a large number of cases, we want to sort objects with multiple keys . In such cases, we define the order of key pairs as
- $(k_1, l_1) < (k_2, l_2)$  if  $k_1 < k_2$ , or  $k_1 = k_2$  and  $l_1 < l_2$
- . This definition can be generalized to key tuples of any length . This ordering is known as lexicographic or dictionary order
- for this purpose

89 67 88 12 57 76 93 72

### Quicksort

89 88 76 93

89 88

## At each divide step

 Pick a pivot Recursively call quicksort twice
 L for items less than the pivot
 G for items greater than the pivot

O(n) operations

Quicksort

# def qsort(seq): if len(seq <= 1): return seq</pre>

- · Practical implementations are not very different Common improvements include
  - in-place sorting
     selecting the pivot more carefully

# Quicksort

- \* Worst case of the quicksort is when the input sequence is sorted If the input sequence is (approximately) random, the expected nur elements in each divide is n/2
- . To reduce the probability of worst case, randomized quicksort picks the pivol randomly
- \* Best case happens if we pick the median of the sequence as the pivot, but finding median already requires  $O(n \log n)$  (or O(n), but not very practical)

  • A common approach is picking three values (typically first, middle and last)
- ence, and selecting the 'median of three' as the pivot from the seq

### Sorting algorithms so far, and the lower bound worst average best memory in-place stable

| Algorithm      | worst          | average        | best  | memory | in-place | stable |
|----------------|----------------|----------------|-------|--------|----------|--------|
| Bubble sort    | n <sup>2</sup> | n <sup>2</sup> | n.    | 1      | yes      | yes    |
| Insertion sort | n <sup>2</sup> | n <sup>2</sup> | n     | 1      | yes      | yes    |
| Merge sort     | nlogn          | n log n        | nlogn | n.     | no       | yes    |
| Quicksort      | n2             | n log n        | nlogn | logn   | yes      | no     |

- Can we do better than O(n log n)?
- If our sorting algorithms requires comp turns out to be 'no'
- \* Lower bound of worst-case sorting is  $\Omega(n \log n)$
- In some special cases, linear-time complexity is possible

89 67 88 12 57 76 93 72 64 53 89 54 43 92 47 21 4

- . While placing the elements into the buckets, no comparisons between the keys 43 47 53 54 57 64 67 72 76 88 89 89 92 93 Inside the buckets worst-case O(n²) (insertion sort) . What if we had as many buckets as the keys? - n insertion operations
  - - n retrieval operations
       O(n) sorting time

## Summary

## \* Sorting is an important and well-studied computational problem

- Most sorting algorithms/applications used in practice are highly opti often based on multiple basic algorithms
- Naive sorting algorithms run in O(n²) time \* Lower bound on worst-case sorting time is  $\Omega(n\log n)$  , divide-and-con
- algorithms achieve this Reading: Goodrich, Tamassia, and Goldwasser (2013, chapter 12)
- And a fun way to see sorting in action: https://www.youtube.com/user/AlgoRythmics
- Next
  - Reading: Goodrich, Tamassia, and Goldwasser (2013, chapter 8)

