

Warm up

Show that finding the minimum of an unordered list requires $\Omega(n)$ comparisons

Find Min, Lower Bound Proof

Show that finding the minimum of an unordered list requires $\Omega(n)$ comparisons

Suppose (toward contradiction) that there is an algorithm for Find Min that does fewer than $\frac{n}{2} = \Omega(n)$ comparisons.

This means there is at least one "uncompared" element We can't know that this element wasn't the min!



Homeworks

- HW4 due 11pm Thursday, February 27, 2020
 - Divide and Conquer and Sorting
 - Written (use LaTeX!)
 - Submit BOTH a pdf and a zip file (2 separate attachments)
- Midterm: March 4 (two weeks away!)
- Regrade Office Hours
 - Fridays 2:30pm-3:30pm (Rice 210)

Today's Keywords

- Sorting
- Linear time Sorting
- Counting Sort
- Radix Sort
- Maximum Sum Continuous Subarray

CLRS Readings

• Chapter 8

Sorting, so far

- Sorting algorithms we have discussed:
 - Mergesort $O(n \log n)$ Optimal!
 - Quicksort $O(n \log n)$ Optimal!
- Other sorting algorithms (will discuss):
 - Bubblesort $O(n^2)$
 - Insertionsort $O(n^2)$
 - Heapsort $O(n \log n)$ Optimal!

Speed Isn't Everything

Important properties of sorting algorithms:

- Run Time
 - Asymptotic Complexity
 - Constants
- In Place (or In-Situ)
 - Done with only constant additional space
- Adaptive
 - Faster if list is nearly sorted
- Stable
 - Equal elements remain in original order
- Parallelizable
 - Runs faster with multiple computers

Mergesort

• Divide:

- Break *n*-element list into two lists of n/2 elements
- Conquer:
 - If n > 1: Sort each sublist recursively
 - If n = 1: List is already sorted (base case)

• Combine:

- Merge together sorted sublists into one sorted list

$\frac{\text{Run Time?}}{\Theta(n \log n)}$

Optimal!

In Place?	Adaptive?	Stable?
No	No	Yes!
		(usually)

Merge

- **Combine:** Merge sorted sublists into one sorted list
- We have:
 - 2 sorted lists (L_1 , L_2)
 - 1 output list (L_{out})

```
 \begin{array}{ll} \mbox{While } (L_1 \mbox{ and } L_2 \mbox{ not empty}): & & \\ \mbox{If } L_1[0] \leq L_2[0]: & & \\ L_{out}. \mbox{append}(L_1. \mbox{pop}()) & & \\ \mbox{Else:} & & \\ \mbox{Lout}. \mbox{append}(L_1. \mbox{pop}()) & \\ \mbox{L}_{out}. \mbox{append}(L_1) & & \\ \mbox{L}_{out}. \mbox{append}(L_2) & & \\ \end{array} \right.
```

Mergesort

• Divide:

- Break *n*-element list into two lists of n/2 elements
- Conquer:
 - If n > 1: Sort each sublist recursively
 - If n = 1: List is already sorted (base case)

• Combine:

- Merge together sorted sublists into one sorted list

$\frac{\text{Run Time?}}{\Theta(n \log n)}$

Optimal!

In Place?Adaptive?Stable?Parallelizable?NoNoYes!Yes!(usually)(usually)



• Divide:

- Break *n*-element list into two lists of n/2 elements

Parallelizable: Allow different machines to work on each sublist

• Conquer:

- If n > 1:
 - Sort each sublist recursively
- If n = 1:
 - List is already sorted (base case)
- Combine:
 - Merge together sorted sublists into one sorted list

Mergesort (Sequential)



Run Time: $\Theta(n \log n)$

Mergesort (Parallel)



Run Time: $\Theta(n)$

Quicksort

Idea: pick a partition element, recursively sort two sublists around that element

- Divide: select an element *p*, Partition(*p*)
- Conquer: recursively sort left and right sublists
- Combine: Nothing!

 $\frac{\text{Run Time?}}{\Theta(n \log n)}$ (almost always)
Better constants
than Mergesort

In Place?	Adaptive?	Stable?	Parallelizable?
kinda	No!	No	Yes!
Jses stack for	ſ		
ecursive calls	S		

Bubble Sort

Idea: March through list, swapping adjacent elements if out of order, repeat until sorted

8	5	7	9	12	10	1	2	4	3	6	11
5	8	7	9	12	10	1	2	4	3	6	11
5	7	8	9	12	10	1	2	4	3	6	11
5	7	8	9	12	10	1	2	4	3	6	11

Bubble Sort

Idea: March through list, swapping adjacent elements if out of order, repeat until sorted

Run Time?

 $\Theta(n^2)$

Constants worse than Insertion Sort



Kinda

"Compared to straight insertion [...], bubble sorting requires a more complicated program and takes about twice as long!" – Donald Knuth

Bubble Sort is "almost" Adaptive

Idea: March through list, swapping adjacent elements if out of order

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	----	----	----

Only makes one "pass"

2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	1
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	----	----	----	---

After one "pass"

2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	1	12
---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	----	----	---	----

Requires n passes, thus is $O(n^2)$

Bubble Sort

Stable?

 Idea: March through list, swapping adjacent elements if out of order, repeat until sorted

In Place?

 $\begin{array}{c}
\frac{\operatorname{Run Time?}}{\Theta(n^2)} \\
\operatorname{Constants worse} \\
\text{than Insertion Sort} \\
\underline{\operatorname{Parallelizable?}} \\
\end{array}$

Yes! Kinda Yes Not really

Adaptive?

"the bubble sort seems to have nothing to recommend it, except a catchy name and the fact that it leads to some interesting theoretical problems" –Donald Knuth, The Art of Computer Programming



Insertion Sort

Idea: Maintain a sorted list prefix, extend that prefix by "inserting" the next element



Insertion Sort

• Idea: Maintain a sorted list prefix, extend that prefix by "inserting" the next element

Run Time?

 $\Theta(n^2)$

(but with very small

constants)

Great for short lists!

<u>In Place?</u> <u>Adaptive?</u> Yes! Yes

Insertion Sort is Adaptive

Idea: Maintain a sorted list prefix, extend that prefix by "inserting" the next element





Only one comparison needed per element! Runtime: O(n)

Insertion Sort

• Idea: Maintain a sorted list prefix, extend that prefix by "inserting" the next element

Run Time?

 $\Theta(n^2)$

(but with very small

constants)

Great for short lists!

In Place?Adaptive?Stable?Yes!YesYes

Insertion Sort is Stable

 Idea: Maintain a sorted list prefix, extend that prefix by "inserting" the next element



The "second" 10 will stay to the right

Insertion Sort

 Idea: Maintain a sorted list prefix, extend that prefix by "inserting" the next element $\frac{\text{Run Time?}}{\Theta(n^2)}$ (but with very small constants) Great for short lists!

In Place?	Adaptive?	Stable?	Parallelizable?
Yes!	Yes	Yes	No

"All things considered, it's actually a pretty good sorting algorithm!" –Nate Brunelle Can sort a list as it is received, i.e., don't need the entire list to begin sorting

Online?

Yes



• Idea: Build a Heap, repeatedly extract max element from the heap to build sorted list Right-to-Left











 Idea: Build a Heap, repeatedly extract max element from the heap to build sorted list Rightto-Left $\frac{\text{Run Time?}}{\Theta(n \log n)}$ Constants worse
than Quick Sort













• Idea: Build a Heap, repeatedly extract max element from the heap to build sorted list Rightto-Left

<u>In Place?</u> <u>Adaptive?</u> <u>Stable?</u> Yes! No HW4 EC

Run Time? Θ(n log n) Constants worse than Quick Sort Parallelizable? No

Sorting, so far

- Sorting algorithms we have discussed:
 - Mergesort $O(n \log n)$ Optimal!
 - Quicksort $O(n \log n)$ Optimal!
- Other sorting algorithms (will discuss):
 - Bubblesort $O(n^2)$
 - Insertionsort $O(n^2)$
 - Heapsort $O(n \log n)$ Optimal!

Sorting in Linear Time

- Cannot be comparison-based
- Need to make some sort of assumption about the contents of the list
 - Small number of unique values
 - Small range of values
 - Etc.

• Idea: Count how many things are less than each element

$$L = \begin{bmatrix} 3 & 6 & 6 & 1 & 3 & 4 & 1 & 6 \\ 1 & 2 & 3 & 4 & 5 & 6 & 7 & 8 \end{bmatrix}$$

1.Range is [1, k] (here [1,6]) make an array C of size k populate with counts of each value

For i in L: ++C[L[i]]

2.Take "running sum" of *C* to count things less than each value For i = 1 to len(*C*): C[i] = C[i - 1] + C[i]



Idea: Count how many things are less than each element

$$L = \begin{bmatrix} 3 & 6 & 6 & 1 & 3 & 4 & 1 & 6 \\ 1 & 2 & 3 & 4 & 5 & 6 & 7 & 8 \end{bmatrix} C = \begin{bmatrix} 2 & 2 & 4 & 5 & 5 & 7 \\ 1 & 2 & 3 & 4 & 5 & 6 \\ Last item of value 6 \\ goes at index 8 \end{bmatrix}$$

For each element of L (last to first): Use C to find its proper place in BDecrement that position of C

For
$$i = \operatorname{len}(L)$$
 downto 1:

$$B\left[C[L[i]]\right] = L[i]$$

$$C[L[i]] = C[L[i]] - 1$$

• Idea: Count how many things are less than each element

$$L = \begin{bmatrix} 3 & 6 & 6 & 1 & 3 & 4 & 1 & 6 \\ 1 & 2 & 3 & 4 & 5 & 6 & 7 & 8 \end{bmatrix} C = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 2 & 4 & 5 & 5 & 7 \\ 1 & 2 & 3 & 4 & 5 & 6 \\ Last item of value 1 \end{bmatrix}$$

goes at index 2

For each element of *L* (last to first): Use *C* to find its proper place in *B* Decrement that position of C

For
$$i = \operatorname{len}(L)$$
 downto 1:

$$B\left[C[L[i]]\right] = L[i]$$

$$C[L[i]] = C[L[i]] - 1$$



Run Time: O(n + k)Memory: O(n + k)

- Why not always use counting sort?
- For 64-bit numbers, requires an array of length $2^{64} > 10^{19}$
 - 5 GHz CPU will require > 116 years to initialize the array
 - 18 Exabytes of data
 - Total amount of data that Google has (?)

One Exabyte = 10^{18} bytes 1 million terabytes (TB) 1 billion gigabytes (GB)

100,000 x Library of Congress (print)

12 Exabytes



https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Utah_Data_Center

Radix Sort

 Idea: Stable sort on each digit, from least significant to most significant

103	801	401	323	255	823	999	101	113	901	555	512	245	800	018	121
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15

Place each element into a "bucket" according to its 1's place

800	801 401 101 901 121	512	103 323 823 113		255 555 245			018	999
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9

Radix Sort

 Idea: Stable sort on each digit, from least significant to most significant

Place each element into a "bucket" according to its 10's place



Radix Sort

 Idea: Stable sort on each digit, from least significant to most significant

Place each element into a "bucket" according to its 100's place

Run Time: O(d(n + b)) d = digits in largest valueb = base of representation



Maximum Sum Continuous Subarray Problem

The maximum-sum subarray of a given array of integers A is the interval [a, b] such that the sum of all values in the array between a and b inclusive is maximal.

Given an array of n integers (may include both positive and negative values), give a $O(n \log n)$ algorithm for finding the maximum-sum subarray.

Divide and Conquer $\Theta(n \log n)$



Divide and Conquer $\Theta(n \log n)$



Divide and Conquer $\Theta(n \log n)$

Return the Max of Left, Right, Center

