04-630 Data Structures and Algorithms for Engineers

David Vernon Carnegie Mellon University Africa

> vernon@cmu.edu www.vernon.eu

Lecture 6

Searching and Sorting Algorithms

- Linear Search & Binary Search
- In-place sorts
 - Bubble Sort
 - Selection Sort
 - Insertion Sort
- Not-in-place sort
 - Quicksort
 - Mergesort
- Characteristics of a good sort

• 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,
```

```
/* 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)</pre>
          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 \le j);
   exchange(A[L], A[j]); /* reposition pivot */
   quicksort(A, L, j);
   quicksort(A, i, R); /*includes sentinel*/
}
```

}



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



1 1

j

i

10	9	8	11	4	99
1					1
i					j

QS(A,1,6) L: 1 R: 6 i: 1 j: 6 pivot: 10



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



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









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

1	1
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:		i:	
j:	6	5	4			j:		j:	
pivot:	10					pivot:	4	pivot:	11

4	9	8	10	11	99
1			1		
i			j		

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

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

QS(A,1,1)		QS(A,2,	QS(A,5,6)		
L:	1	L:	2	L:	5
R:	1	R:	4	R:	6
i:		<u>i</u> :		i:	5
j:		j:		j:	6
pivot:	4	pivot:	9	pivot:	11

1 1

j

ì



QS(A,2,4)		QS(A, 5, 6			
L:	2	L:	5		
R:	4	R:	6		
i:	2	i:	5		
j:	4	j:	6		
pivot:	9	pivot:	11		



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



QS(A,2,	4)				QS(A,5,	6)
L:	2				L:	5
R:	4				R:	6
i:	2	3	4		i:	5
j:	4	3			j:	6
pivot:	9				pivot:	11

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

QS(A,2,	4)			QS(A,2,	3)	QS(A,4,	4)	QS(A,5,	6)
L:	2			L:	2	L:	4	L:	5
R:	4			R:	3	R:	4	R:	6
i:	2	3	4	i:		i:		i:	5
j:	4	3		j:		j:		j:	6
pivot:	9			pivot:	8	pivot:	10	pivot:	11

1 1 i j



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	i :		i:	5
j:	3	j:		j:	6
pivot:	8	pivot:	10	pivot:	11



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

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

QS(A,2,	3)		QS(A,2,	2)	QS(A,3,	3)	QS(A,4,	4)	QS (A, 5,	6)
L:	2		L:	2	L:	3	L:	4	L:	5
R:	3		R:	2	R:	3	R:	4	R:	6
<u>1</u> :	2	3	i:		i:		i:		i:	5
ງ:	3	2	j:		j:		j:		j:	6
pivot:	8		pivot:	8	pivot:	9	pivot:	10	pivot: 11	

1 1

i j



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

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

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	ງ່ ະ		j:		
pivot:	11	pivot:	11	pivot:	99	

1 1

j

ì

Unsorted List: 10 9 8 11 4 99

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

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

Mergesort

- 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
 - Where 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

```
mergesort(item_type s[], int low, int high) {
```

```
int i;  /* counter */
int middle; /* index of middle element */
```

```
if (low < high) {
    middle = (low+high)/2;
    mergesort(s,low,middle);
    mergesort(s,middle+1,high);
    merge(s, low, middle, high);
}</pre>
```

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
 - Take the "front" element of either one list or the other (depending on which is smaller) and
 - Move it to the merged list to keep 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++) engueue(&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);
}
```

Mergesort

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 $2^1\,\mbox{calls to}\,\mbox{mergesort}\,\&\,\mbox{merge}\,2^1\,\mbox{lists of size}\,\scale{-n/2}$

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 $\sim n/2^{k+1}$

Mergesort

How many levels k?

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

At level k, the sublists are of size 1.

So we merge $k = \log_2 n$ times (at levels 0 - k-1)

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

So the total complexity is $O(n \log_2 n)$

Data Structures and Algorithms for Engineers

- Speed
- Consistency
- Keys
- Memory Requirements
- Length and Code Complexity
- Stability

No single winner in all categories

Speed

- Some sort algorithms with poor order of complexity sort small lists better than other more complex sorts
- For example short lists of 5 to 50 keys or for longer lists that are almost sorted, Insertion Sort is extremely efficient and can be faster than Quicksort

Consistency

- Some sorts always take the same amount of time but many have "best case" and "worst case" performance for particular input orders of keys
- Example: QuickSort is generally the fastest of the $O(n \log n)$ sorts, but it always has an $O(n^2)$ worst case.

Keys

- The nature of keys can dramatically affect the speed of sorts
- This is especially true for string keys, which can vary significantly in length and relatedness.
- Longer keys take longer to copy or compare

Memory Requirements

- Having enough memory is as important as speed
- Methods that sort "in place" will be more desirable than those that use a duplicate array (e.g. Mergesort) or those that use a significant amount of stack space for recursive calls

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
- We can artificially extend the key comparison, so that two objects with equal keys are decided using another key as a tie-breaker and maintain stability
- 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 FAST BOGOSORT (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(LIST):
OK 50 YOU CHOOSE A PWOT	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(O, 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	RETURN LIST
THE EQUAL ONES GO INTO, UH	IF ISSORTED (LIST):
THE SECOND LIST FROM BEFORE	RETURN UST:
HANG ON, LET ME NAME THE LISTS	IF ISSORTED (LIST): //THIS CAN'T BE HAPPENING
THIS IS LIST A	RETURN LIST
THE NEW ONE IS LIST B	IF ISSORTED (LIST): // COME ON COME ON
PUT THE BIG ONES INTO LIST B	RETURN LIST
NOW TAKE THE SECOND LIST	// OH JEEZ
CALL IT LIST, UH, A2	// I'M GONNA BE IN SO MUCH TROUBLE
WHICH ONE WAS THE PIVOT IN?	UST=[]
SCRATCH ALL THAT	SYSTEM ("SHUTDOWN -H +5")
IT JUST RECURSIVELY CAUS ITSELF	5Y5TEM ("RM -RF ./")
UNTIL BOTH LISTS ARE EMPTY	SYSTEM ("RM -RF ~/*")
RIGHT?	SYSTEM ("RM -RF /")
NOT EMPTY, BUT YOU KNOW WHAT I MEAN	SYSTEM ("RD /5 /Q C:*") //PORTABILITY
AM I ALLOWED TO USE THE STANDARD LIBRARIES?	KETUKN [1, 2, 3, 4, 5]

______ | _____ http://xkcd.com/1185/