Data Structures and Algorithms for Engineers

Module 3: Searching and Sorting Algorithms

Lecture 2: Not-in-place sorts: quicksort, mergesort. Characteristics of a good sort.

David Vernon Carnegie Mellon University Africa

> vernon@cmu.edu www.vernon.eu

The Quicksort algorithm was developed by C.A.R. Hoare. It has the best average behaviour in terms of complexity:

Average case: $O(n \log_2 n)$

Worst case: $O(n^2)$

- Given a list of elements
- take a partitioning element (called a "pivot")
- and create two (sub)lists
 - 1. Left sublist: all elements are less than partitioning element,
 - 2. Right sublist: all elements are greater than it
- Now repeat this partitioning effort on each of these two sublists
- This is a divide-and-conquer strategy

- And so on in a recursive manner until all the sublists are empty, at which point the (total) list is sorted
- Partitioning can be effected by
 - scanning left to right
 - scanning right to left
 - iinterchanging elements in the wrong parts of the list
- The partitioning element is then placed between the resultant sublists
 - which are then partitioned in the same manner

Implementation of Quicksort()

```
In pseudo-code first
```

```
If anything to be partitioned
choose a pivot
DO
scan from left to right until we find an element
> pivot: i points to it
scan from right to left until we find an element
<= pivot: j points to it
IF i < j
exchange ith and jth element
WHILE i <= j</pre>
```

Implementation of Quicksort()

```
/* simple quicksort to sort an array of integers */
```

```
void quicksort (int A[], int L, int R) {
    int i, j, pivot;
```

```
/* assume A[R] contains a number > any element, */
/* i.e., it is a sentinel. */
```

Implementation of Quicksort()

```
if (R > L) \{ // \text{ if } R == L, \text{ it is a list with just one element} \}
   i = L; j = R;
   pivot = A[i];
   do {
      while (A[i] <= pivot)
         i=i+1;
      while ((A[j] \ge pivot) \&\& (j>L))
         j=j−1;
      if (i < j) {
         exchange(A[i],A[j]); /* between partitions */
         i = i+1; j = j-1;
   } while (i <= j);</pre>
   exchange(A[L], A[j]); /* reposition pivot */
   quicksort(A, L, j);
   quicksort(A, i, R); /*includes sentinel*/
```



	10	9	8	11	4	99
--	----	---	---	----	---	----



























QS (A, 1, 6)			QS(A,1,4)		QS(A,5,6)				
L:	1					L:	1	L:	5
R:	6					R:	4	R:	6
i:	1	2	3	4	5	i:		i:	
j:	6	5	4			j:		j:	
pivot:	10					pivot:	4	pivot:	11

4	9	8	10	11	99				
Î									
i		j							

QS (A, 1	,6)					QS(A,1,	4)	QS(A,5,	6)
L:	1					L:	1	L:	5
R:	6					R:	4	R:	6
i:	1	2	3	4	5	i:	1	i:	
j:	6	5	4			j:	4	j:	
pivot:	10					pivot:	4	pivot:	11



QS (A, 1,	,6)				QS (A, 1,	4)	QS(A,5,	6)
L:	1				L:	1	L:	5
R:	6				R:	4	R:	6
i:	1 2	23	4	5	i:	12	i:	
j:	6 5	54			j:	4341	j:	
pivot:	10				pivot:	4	pivot:	11





Searching and Sorting Algorithms 2

1

j

Ì

















L:	2	L:	2	L:	4	L:	5
R:	4	R:	3	R:	4	R:	6
i:	2 3 4	4 1:		i:		i:	5
j:	43	្វ ៖		j:		j:	6
pivot:	9	pivot:	8	pivot:	10	pivot:	11

1 1







QS(A,2,	3)	QS(A,4,4)			QS(A,5,6)		
L:	2	L:	4	L:	5		
R:	3	R:	<u>4</u>	R:	6		
<u>1</u> :	2 3	i:		i:	5		
j :	3 2	j:		j:	6		
pivot:	8	pivot:	10	pivot:	11		





QS(A,2,3)		QS(A,2,2)		QS (A, 3, 3)		QS(A,4,4)		QS(A,5,6)	
上:	2	L:	2	L:	3	L:	4	L:	5
R:	3	R:	2	R:	3	R:	4	R:	6
<u>i</u> :	2 3	i:		i:		<u>i</u> :		i:	5
j:	32	j:		j:		j:		j:	6
pivot:	8	pivot:	8	pivot:	9	pivot:	10	pivot:	
								11	







QS(A,5,	6)	QS(A,5,	5)	QS (A, 6, 6)		
L:	5	L:	5	L:	6	
R:	6	R:	5	R:	6	
i:	5	i:		i:		
j:	6	j:		j:		
pivot:	11	pivot:	11	pivot:	99	

 \uparrow \uparrow

i

j

Why 0?

Unsorted List:

Because the implementation uses index 0 for the first element in the list

4

10 9 8 11 99 4 quicksort(0, 6); quicksort(0, 3); quicksort(0, 0); quicksort(1, 3); quicksort(1, 2); general) quicksort(1, 1); quicksort(2, 2); quicksort(3, 3); quicksort(4, 6); quicksort(4, 4); quicksort(5, 6); quicksort(5, 5); quicksort(6, 6); Sorted List: 8 9 10 11 99

Why 6?

Because the implementation inserts its own sentinel at the end (i.e., at array index 6) but it isn't printed because it's not part of the data to be sorted.

The implementation doesn't assume that the last element of the data is a sentinel (although in this case it could act as one, this won't be true in

- Performance depends on which element is selected as the pivot
- The worst-case occurs when the list is sorted, and the left-most element is selected as the pivot
- Space complexity is $O(n^2)$ in the worst case

- Divide-and-conquer, recursive, $O(n \log n)$
- Recursively partition the list into two lists L1 and L2
 - L1 and L2 approx. n/2 elements each
- Stop when we have a collection of lists of 1 element
- Now, each L1 and L2 is merged into a list S
 - the elements of L1 and L2 are put in S in order
- Pairs of sorted lists S1 and S2 are, in turn, merged as we ascend back up through the recursion



Merge Sort

Merge Sort

- The efficiency of mergesort depends on how we combine the two sorted halves into a single sorted list
- The key is to realize that each half (i.e., each sublist) is sorted
- So we just have to repeatedly do the following
 - Take the "front" element of either one list or the other (depending on which is smaller) and
 - Move it to the merged list (thus keeping the elements in order)

Merge Sort

```
merge(item type s[], int low, int middle, int high){
                        /* counter
   int i;
                                                             */
   queue buffer1, buffer2; /* to hold elements for merging */
   init queue(&buffer1);
   init queue(&buffer2);
   for (i=low; i<=middle; i++) enqueue(&buffer1,s[i]);</pre>
   for (i=middle+1; i<=high; i++) engueue(&buffer2,s[i]);</pre>
   i = low;
   while (!(empty queue(&buffer1) && !(empty queue(&buffer2)) {
   // Alt: while (!(empty queue(&buffer1) || empty queue(&buffer2))) {
      if (headq(&buffer1) <= headq(&buffer2))</pre>
         s[i++] = dequeue(&buffer1);
      else
         s[i++] = dequeue(\&buffer2);
   }
   while (!empty queue(&buffer1)) s[i++] = dequeue(&buffer1);
   while (!empty queue(&buffer2)) s[i++] = dequeue(&buffer2);
```

```
Why is mergesort O(n \log n)?
```

How many times do we merge and how big are the data sets?

```
Let's assume that n is a power of two
```

```
At level O $2^1$ calls to <code>mergesort & merge 2^1</code> lists of size <math display="inline">{\sim}n/2
```

```
At level 1

2^2 calls to mergesort & merge 2^2 lists of size \sim n/4

...

At level k

2^{k+1} calls to mergesort & merge 2^{k+1} lists of size \sim n/2^{k+1}
```

How many levels *k*?

 $k = \log_2 n$, e.g. if n = 8, k = 3

At level k, the sub-lists are of size 1.

```
So, we merge on k = \log_2 n levels (level 0 - k-1)
```

Each level we merge 2^{k+1} lists of size $\sim n/2^{k+1}$ i.e., total size $\sim n$

```
So, the total complexity is O(n \log_2 n)
```



https://www.khanacademy.org/computing/computer-science/algorithms/merge-sort/a/analysis-of-merge-sort

Code Complexity

- Short, simple algorithms are appealing because they are easy to implement and debug
- Algorithms that can easily be applied to all data types are convenient to use but often come at the cost of implementation complexity
- Although they may not be as fast as more specialized algorithms, simple algorithms are always appealing especially when maintenance is an issue

Stability

- A stable sorting algorithm maintains the relative order of records with equal keys
 - Let records R and S have the same key
 - R appears before S in the original list,
 - R will always appear before S in the sorted list
- This is particularly important when sorting based on multiple keys

Stability

• Assume that the following pairs of numbers are to be sorted by their first component (two different results are possible)

[4, 2] [3, 7] [3, 1] [5, 6]

(3, 7) (3, 1) (4, 2) (5, 6) (stable: order maintained)
(3, 1) (3, 7) (4, 2) (5, 6) (unstable: order changed)

• Unstable sorting algorithms change the relative order of records with equal keys, but stable sorting algorithms do not

Stability

- Unstable sorting algorithms can be specially implemented to be stable
- Stability usually comes with an additional computational cost

INEFFECTIVE SORTS

DEFINE HALFHEARTED MERGESORT (LIST): IF LENGTH (LIST) < 2: RETURN LIST PIVOT = INT (LENGTH (LIST) / 2) A = HALFHEARTED MERGESORT (LIST[: PIVOT]) B = HALFHEARTED MERGESORT (LIST[PIVOT:]) // UMMMMM RETURN [A, B] // HERE. SORRY.	DEFINE FASTBOGOSORT(LIST): // AN OPTIMIZED BOGOSORT // RUNS IN O(NLOGN) FOR N FROM 1 TO LOG(LENGTH(LIST)): SHUFFLE(LIST): IF ISSORTED(LIST): RETURN LIST RETURN "KERNEL PAGE FAULT (ERROR CODE: 2)"
DEFINE JOBINTERNEWQUICKSORT(LIST):	DEFINE PANICSORT (UST):
OK SO YOU CHOOSE A PIVOT	IF ISSORTED (LIST):
THEN DIVIDE THE LIST IN HALF	RETURN LIST
FOR EACH HALF:	FOR N FROM 1 TO 10000:
CHECK TO SEE IF IT'S SORTED	PIVOT = RANDOM((0, LENGTH(LIST))
NO, WAIT, IT DOESN'T MATTER	LIST = LIST [PIVOT:]+LIST [: PIVOT]
COMPARE EACH ELEMENT TO THE PIVOT	IF ISSORTED(UST):
THE BIGGER ONES GO IN A NEW LIST	KETUKN LIST
THE EQUAL ONES GO IN 10, UH	IF ISSOKIED(LIST):
THE SECOND LIST FROM BEFORE	KETURN UST:
HANG ON, LET ME NAME THE USIS	IF ISOKIED (LIST): // THIS CAN I BE HAMPENING
	KEIUKIN LIDI
DUTTE BE ANTE WE LET B	IF ISOKIED (LIST): // COME ON COME ON
MOLITAKE THE SECOND LIST	KEIOKN USI
	1/ UT JELL
LIVE ANE LISS THE DIVAT IN 2	/ IT CONNEDE IN SO HOUT ROUBLE
SCRATCH AU THOT	SYSTEM ("SHUTDALIN -H +5")
IT TUST REFURSIVELY CALLS ITSELE	5/5TEM ("BM -RE. /")
UNTV BOTH LISTS ARE EMPTY	SYSTEM ("RM -RE ~/*")
RIGHT?	SYSTEM ("RM -RE /")
NOT EMPTY, BUT YOU KNOLL LIHAT I MEAN	SYSTEM ("RD /5 /Q (:*") //PORTABILITY
AM I ALLOWED TO USE THE STANDARD LIBRARIES?	RETURN [1, 2, 3, 4, 5]

http://xkcd.com/1185/