

# 7. Sorting I

---

Simple Sorting

## 7.1 Simple Sorting

---

Selection Sort, Insertion Sort, Bubblesort [Ottman/Widmayer, Kap. 2.1, Cormen et al, Kap. 2.1, 2.2, Exercise 2.2-2, Problem 2-2

# Problem

**Input:** An array  $A = (A[1], \dots, A[n])$  with length  $n$ .

**Output:** a permutation  $A'$  of  $A$ , that is sorted:  $A'[i] \leq A'[j]$  for all  $1 \leq i \leq j \leq n$ .

# Algorithm: IsSorted( $A$ )

**Input:** Array  $A = (A[1], \dots, A[n])$  with length  $n$ .

**Output:** Boolean decision “sorted” or “not sorted”

```
for  $i \leftarrow 1$  to  $n - 1$  do  
  if  $A[i] > A[i + 1]$  then  
    return “not sorted”;  
return “sorted”;
```

# Observation

IsSorted( $A$ ): “not sorted”, if  $A[i] > A[i + 1]$  for any  $i$ .

⇒ idea:

```
for  $j \leftarrow 1$  to  $n - 1$  do  
  if  $A[j] > A[j + 1]$  then  
     $\text{swap}(A[j], A[j + 1]);$ 
```

# Give it a try

5 ↔ 6   2   8   4   1   ( $j = 1$ )

5   6 ↔ 2   8   4   1   ( $j = 2$ )

5   2   6 ↔ 8   4   1   ( $j = 3$ )

5   2   6   8 ↔ 4   1   ( $j = 4$ )

5   2   6   4   8 ↔ 1   ( $j = 5$ )

5   2   6   4   1   8

- Not sorted! 😞.
- But the greatest element moves to the right  
⇒ new idea! 😊

# Try it out

5	6	2	8	4	1
5	6	2	8	4	1
5	2	6	8	4	1
5	2	6	8	4	1
5	2	6	4	8	1
5	2	6	4	1	8
2	5	6	4	1	8
2	5	6	4	1	8
2	5	4	6	1	8
2	5	4	1	6	8
2	5	4	1	6	8
2	5	4	1	6	8
2	4	5	1	6	8
2	4	1	5	6	8
2	4	1	5	6	8
2	1	4	5	6	8
1	2	4	5	6	8

$(j = 1, i = 1)$   
 $(j = 2)$   
 $(j = 3)$   
 $(j = 4)$   
 $(j = 5)$   
 $(j = 1, i = 2)$   
 $(j = 2)$   
 $(j = 3)$   
 $(j = 4)$   
 $(j = 1, i = 3)$   
 $(j = 2)$   
 $(j = 3)$   
 $(j = 1, i = 4)$   
 $(j = 2)$   
 $(i = 1, j = 5)$

- Apply the procedure iteratively.
- For  $A[1, \dots, n]$ , then  $A[1, \dots, n - 1]$ , then  $A[1, \dots, n - 2]$ , etc.

# Algorithm: Bubblesort

**Input:** Array  $A = (A[1], \dots, A[n])$ ,  $n \geq 0$ .

**Output:** Sorted Array  $A$

```
for  $i \leftarrow 1$  to  $n - 1$  do  
  for  $j \leftarrow 1$  to  $n - i$  do  
    if  $A[j] > A[j + 1]$  then  
       $\text{swap}(A[j], A[j + 1]);$ 
```



# Analysis


Number key comparisons  $\sum_{i=1}^{n-1} (n - i) = \frac{n(n-1)}{2} = \Theta(n^2)$ .

Number swaps in the worst case:  $\Theta(n^2)$

What is the worst case?

If  $A$  is sorted in decreasing order.

# Selection Sort



- Selection of the smallest element by search in the unsorted part  $A[i..n]$  of the array.
- Swap the smallest element with the first element of the unsorted part.
- Unsorted part decreases in size by one element ( $i \rightarrow i + 1$ ). Repeat until all is sorted. ( $i = n$ )

# Algorithm: Selection Sort

**Input:** Array  $A = (A[1], \dots, A[n])$ ,  $n \geq 0$ .

**Output:** Sorted Array  $A$

**for**  $i \leftarrow 1$  **to**  $n - 1$  **do**

$p \leftarrow i$

**for**  $j \leftarrow i + 1$  **to**  $n$  **do**

**if**  $A[j] < A[p]$  **then**

$p \leftarrow j$ ;


    swap( $A[i], A[p]$ )

# Analysis

Number comparisons in worst case:  $\Theta(n^2)$ .

Number swaps in the worst case:  $n - 1 = \Theta(n)$

# Insertion Sort



- Iterative procedure:  
 $i = 1 \dots n$
- Determine insertion position for element  $i$ .
- Insert element  $i$  array block movement potentially required

# Insertion Sort

What is the disadvantage of this algorithm compared to sorting by selection?

Many element movements in the worst case.

What is the advantage of this algorithm compared to selection sort?

The search domain (insertion interval) is already sorted. Consequently: binary search possible.

# Algorithm: Insertion Sort

**Input:** Array  $A = (A[1], \dots, A[n])$ ,  $n \geq 0$ .

**Output:** Sorted Array  $A$

**for**  $i \leftarrow 2$  **to**  $n$  **do**

$x \leftarrow A[i]$

$p \leftarrow \text{BinarySearch}(A, 1, i - 1, x)$ ; // Smallest  $p \in [1, i]$  with  $A[p] \geq x$

**for**  $j \leftarrow i - 1$  **downto**  $p$  **do**

$A[j + 1] \leftarrow A[j]$

$A[p] \leftarrow x$

# Analysis

Number comparisons in the worst case:


$$\sum_{k=1}^{n-1} a \cdot \log k = a \log((n-1)!) \in \Theta(n \log n).$$

Number swaps in the worst case  $\sum_{k=2}^n (k-1) \in \Theta(n^2)$




# Different point of view

Sorting node:




# Different point of view



- Like selection sort [and like Bubblesort]

# Different point of view



■ Like insertion sort

# Conclusion

In a certain sense, Selection Sort, Bubble Sort and Insertion Sort provide the same kind of sort strategy. Will be made more precise. <sup>8</sup>

---

<sup>8</sup>In the part about parallel sorting networks. For the sequential code of course the observations as described above still hold.

# Shellsort (Donald Shell 1959)

Intuition: moving elements far apart takes many steps in the naive methods from above

Insertion sort on subsequences of the form  $(A_{k \cdot i})$  ( $i \in \mathbb{N}$ ) with decreasing distances  $k$ . Last considered distance must be  $k = 1$ .

Worst-case performance critically depends on the chosen subsequences

- Original concept with sequence  $1, 2, 4, 8, \dots, 2^k$ . Running time:  $\mathcal{O}(n^2)$
- Sequence  $1, 3, 7, 15, \dots, 2^{k-1}$  (Hibbard 1963).  $\mathcal{O}(n^{3/2})$
- Sequence  $1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 8, \dots, 2^p 3^q$  (Pratt 1971).  $\mathcal{O}(n \log^2 n)$

# Shellsort

9	8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	0	
2	8	7	6	5	4	3	9	1	0	insertion sort, $k = 7$
2	1	7	6	5	4	3	9	8	0	
2	1	0	6	5	4	3	9	8	7	
2	1	0	3	5	4	6	9	8	7	insertion sort, $k = 3$
2	1	0	3	5	4	6	9	8	7	
2	1	0	3	5	4	6	9	8	7	
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	insertion sort, $k = 1$

## 8. Sorting II

---

Mergesort, Quicksort

## 8.1 Mergesort

---

[Ottman/Widmayer, Kap. 2.4, Cormen et al, Kap. 2.3],




# Mergesort

Divide and Conquer!

- Assumption: two halves of the array  $A$  are already sorted.
- Minimum of  $A$  can be evaluated with two comparisons.
- Iteratively: merge the two presorted halves of  $A$  in  $\mathcal{O}(n)$ .

# Merge



# Algorithm Merge( $A, l, m, r$ )

**Input:** Array  $A$  with length  $n$ , indexes  $1 \leq l \leq m \leq r \leq n$ .  
 $A[l, \dots, m]$ ,  $A[m + 1, \dots, r]$  sorted

**Output:**  $A[l, \dots, r]$  sorted

```
1  $B \leftarrow$  new Array( $r - l + 1$ )
2  $i \leftarrow l$ ;  $j \leftarrow m + 1$ ;  $k \leftarrow 1$ 
3 while  $i \leq m$  and  $j \leq r$  do
4   if  $A[i] \leq A[j]$  then  $B[k] \leftarrow A[i]$ ;  $i \leftarrow i + 1$ 
5   else  $B[k] \leftarrow A[j]$ ;  $j \leftarrow j + 1$ 
6    $k \leftarrow k + 1$ ;
7 while  $i \leq m$  do  $B[k] \leftarrow A[i]$ ;  $i \leftarrow i + 1$ ;  $k \leftarrow k + 1$ 
8 while  $j \leq r$  do  $B[k] \leftarrow A[j]$ ;  $j \leftarrow j + 1$ ;  $k \leftarrow k + 1$ 
9 for  $k \leftarrow l$  to  $r$  do  $A[k] \leftarrow B[k - l + 1]$ 
```

# Correctness

Hypothesis: after  $k$  iterations of the loop in line 3  $B[1, \dots, k]$  is sorted and  $B[k] \leq A[i]$ , if  $i \leq m$  and  $B[k] \leq A[j]$  if  $j \leq r$ .

Proof by induction:

*Base case:* the empty array  $B[1, \dots, 0]$  is trivially sorted.

*Induction step* ( $k \rightarrow k + 1$ ):

- wlog  $A[i] \leq A[j]$ ,  $i \leq m, j \leq r$ .
- $B[1, \dots, k]$  is sorted by hypothesis and  $B[k] \leq A[i]$ .
- After  $B[k + 1] \leftarrow A[i]$   $B[1, \dots, k + 1]$  is sorted.
- $B[k + 1] = A[i] \leq A[i + 1]$  (if  $i + 1 \leq m$ ) and  $B[k + 1] \leq A[j]$  if  $j \leq r$ .
- $k \leftarrow k + 1, i \leftarrow i + 1$ : Statement holds again.

# Analysis (Merge)


## *Lemma 12*

*If: array  $A$  with length  $n$ , indexes  $1 \leq l < r \leq n$ .  $m = \lfloor (l+r)/2 \rfloor$  and  $A[l, \dots, m]$ ,  $A[m+1, \dots, r]$  sorted.*

*Then: in the call of  $\text{Merge}(A, l, m, r)$  a number of  $\Theta(r-l)$  key movements and comparisons are executed.*

Proof: straightforward (Inspect the algorithm and count the operations.)

# Mergesort



Split

Split

Split

Merge

Merge

Merge

# Algorithm (recursive 2-way) Mergesort( $A, l, r$ )

**Input:** Array  $A$  with length  $n$ .  $1 \leq l \leq r \leq n$

**Output:**  $A[l, \dots, r]$  sorted.

**if**  $l < r$  **then**

```
 $m \leftarrow \lfloor (l + r) / 2 \rfloor$  // middle position  
Mergesort( $A, l, m$ ) // sort lower half  
Mergesort( $A, m + 1, r$ ) // sort higher half  
Merge( $A, l, m, r$ ) // Merge subsequences
```

# Analysis

Recursion equation for the number of comparisons and key movements:

$$T(n) = T\left(\left\lceil \frac{n}{2} \right\rceil\right) + T\left(\left\lfloor \frac{n}{2} \right\rfloor\right) + \Theta(n) \in \Theta(n \log n)$$



# Algorithm StraightMergesort( $A$ )

**Avoid recursion:** merge sequences of length 1, 2, 4, ... directly

**Input:** Array  $A$  with length  $n$

**Output:** Array  $A$  sorted

$length \leftarrow 1$

**while**  $length < n$  **do** // Iterate over lengths  $n$

$r \leftarrow 0$

**while**  $r + length < n$  **do** // Iterate over subsequences

$l \leftarrow r + 1$

$m \leftarrow l + length - 1$

$r \leftarrow \min(m + length, n)$

        Merge( $A, l, m, r$ )

$length \leftarrow length \cdot 2$

# Analysis

Like the recursive variant, the straight 2-way mergesort always executes a number of  $\Theta(n \log n)$  key comparisons and key movements.


# Natural 2-way mergesort

Observation: the variants above do not make use of any presorting and always execute  $\Theta(n \log n)$  memory movements.

How can partially presorted arrays be sorted better?

❗ Recursive merging of previously sorted parts (*runs*) of  $A$ .

# Natural 2-way mergesort



# Algorithm NaturalMergesort( $A$ )

**Input:** Array  $A$  with length  $n > 0$

**Output:** Array  $A$  sorted

**repeat**

$r \leftarrow 0$

**while**  $r < n$  **do**

$l \leftarrow r + 1$

$m \leftarrow l$ ; **while**  $m < n$  **and**  $A[m + 1] \geq A[m]$  **do**  $m \leftarrow m + 1$

**if**  $m < n$  **then**

$r \leftarrow m + 1$ ; **while**  $r < n$  **and**  $A[r + 1] \geq A[r]$  **do**  $r \leftarrow r + 1$

            Merge( $A, l, m, r$ );

**else**

$r \leftarrow n$

**until**  $l = 1$

# Analysis

Is it also asymptotically better than StraightMergesort on average?

⚠ No. Given the assumption of pairwise distinct keys, on average there are  $n/2$  positions  $i$  with  $k_i > k_{i+1}$ , i.e.  $n/2$  runs. Only one iteration is saved on average.

Natural mergesort executes in the worst case and on average a number of  $\Theta(n \log n)$  comparisons and memory movements.

## 8.2 Quicksort

---

[Ottman/Widmayer, Kap. 2.2, Cormen et al, Kap. 7]

# Quicksort

What is the disadvantage of Mergesort?

Requires additional  $\Theta(n)$  storage for merging.

How could we reduce the merge costs?

Make sure that the left part contains only smaller elements than the right part.


How?

Pivot and Partition!



# Use a pivot

1. Choose a (an arbitrary) **pivot**  $p$
2. Partition  $A$  in two parts, one part  $L$  with the elements with  $A[i] \leq p$  and another part  $R$  with  $A[i] > p$
3. Quicksort: Recursion on parts  $L$  and  $R$



# Algorithm Partition( $A, l, r, p$ )

**Input:** Array  $A$ , that contains the pivot  $p$  in  $A[l, \dots, r]$  at least once.

**Output:** Array  $A$  partitioned in  $[l, \dots, r]$  around  $p$ . Returns position of  $p$ .

**while**  $l \leq r$  **do**

**while**  $A[l] < p$  **do**

$l \leftarrow l + 1$

**while**  $A[r] > p$  **do**

$r \leftarrow r - 1$

    swap( $A[l], A[r]$ )

**if**  $A[l] = A[r]$  **then**

$l \leftarrow l + 1$

**return**  $l-1$

# Algorithm Quicksort( $A, l, r$ )

**Input:** Array  $A$  with length  $n$ .  $1 \leq l \leq r \leq n$ .

**Output:** Array  $A$ , sorted in  $A[l, \dots, r]$ .

**if**  $l < r$  **then**

    Choose pivot  $p \in A[l, \dots, r]$

$k \leftarrow \text{Partition}(A, l, r, p)$

    Quicksort( $A, l, k - 1$ )

    Quicksort( $A, k + 1, r$ )

# Quicksort (arbitrary pivot)

2 4 5 6 8 3 7 9 1

2 1 3 6 8 5 7 9 4

1 2 3 4 5 8 7 9 6

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 9 8

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

# Analysis: number comparisons

**Worst case.** Pivot = min or max; number comparisons:

$$T(n) = T(n - 1) + c \cdot n, T(1) = 0 \quad \Rightarrow \quad T(n) \in \Theta(n^2)$$

# Analysis: number swaps

Result of a call to partition (pivot 3):

2 1 3 6 8 5 7 9 4

- ① How many swaps have taken place?
- ② 2. The maximum number of swaps is given by the number of keys in the smaller part.

# Analysis: number swaps

## Thought experiment

- Each key from the smaller part pays a coin when it is being swapped.
- After a key has paid a coin the domain containing the key decreases to half its previous size.
- Every key needs to pay at most  $\log n$  coins. But there are only  $n$  keys.

**Consequence:** there are  $\mathcal{O}(n \log n)$  key swaps in the worst case.

# Randomized Quicksort

Despite the worst case running time of  $\Theta(n^2)$ , quicksort is used practically very often.

Reason: quadratic running time unlikely provided that the choice of the pivot and the pre-sorting are not very disadvantageous.

Avoidance: randomly choose pivot. Draw uniformly from  $[l, r]$ .



# Analysis (randomized quicksort)

Expected number of compared keys with input length  $n$ :

$$T(n) = (n - 1) + \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^n (T(k - 1) + T(n - k)), \quad T(0) = T(1) = 0$$

Claim  $T(n) \leq 4n \log n$ .

Proof by induction:

**Base case** straightforward for  $n = 0$  (with  $0 \log 0 := 0$ ) and for  $n = 1$ .

**Hypothesis:**  $T(n) \leq 4n \log n$  for some  $n$ .

**Induction step:**  $(n - 1 \rightarrow n)$

# Analysis (randomized quicksort)

$$\begin{aligned}T(n) &= n - 1 + \frac{2}{n} \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} T(k) \stackrel{H}{\leq} n - 1 + \frac{2}{n} \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} 4k \log k \\&= n - 1 + \sum_{k=1}^{n/2} 4k \underbrace{\log k}_{\leq \log n - 1} + \sum_{k=n/2+1}^{n-1} 4k \underbrace{\log k}_{\leq \log n} \\&\leq n - 1 + \frac{8}{n} \left( (\log n - 1) \sum_{k=1}^{n/2} k + \log n \sum_{k=n/2+1}^{n-1} k \right) \\&= n - 1 + \frac{8}{n} \left( (\log n) \cdot \frac{n(n-1)}{2} - \frac{n}{4} \left( \frac{n}{2} + 1 \right) \right) \\&= 4n \log n - 4 \log n - 3 \leq 4n \log n\end{aligned}$$

# Analysis (randomized quicksort)

## *Theorem 13*

*On average randomized quicksort requires  $\mathcal{O}(n \cdot \log n)$  comparisons.*

# Practical Considerations

Worst case recursion depth  $n - 1$ <sup>9</sup>. Then also a memory consumption of  $\mathcal{O}(n)$ .

Can be avoided: recursion only on the smaller part. Then guaranteed  $\mathcal{O}(\log n)$  worst case recursion depth and memory consumption.

---

<sup>9</sup>stack overflow possible!

# Quicksort with logarithmic memory consumption

**Input:** Array  $A$  with length  $n$ .  $1 \leq l \leq r \leq n$ .

**Output:** Array  $A$ , sorted between  $l$  and  $r$ .

**while**  $l < r$  **do**

    Choose pivot  $p \in A[l, \dots, r]$

$k \leftarrow \text{Partition}(A, l, r, p)$

**if**  $k - l < r - k$  **then**

        Quicksort( $A[l, \dots, k - 1]$ )

$l \leftarrow k + 1$

**else**

        Quicksort( $A[k + 1, \dots, r]$ )

$r \leftarrow k - 1$

The call of Quicksort( $A[l, \dots, r]$ ) in the original algorithm has moved to iteration (tail recursion!): the if-statement became a while-statement.

# Practical Considerations.

- Practically the pivot is often the median of three elements. For example:  $\text{Median3}(A[l], A[r], A[\lfloor l + r/2 \rfloor])$ .
- There is a variant of quicksort that requires only constant storage. Idea: store the old pivot at the position of the new pivot.
- Complex divide-and-conquer algorithms often use a trivial ( $\Theta(n^2)$ ) algorithm as base case to deal with small problem sizes.

## 8.3 Appendix

---

Derivation of some mathematical formulas

$$\log n! \in \Theta(n \log n)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \log n! &= \sum_{i=1}^n \log i \leq \sum_{i=1}^n \log n = n \log n \\ \sum_{i=1}^n \log i &= \sum_{i=1}^{\lfloor n/2 \rfloor} \log i + \sum_{\lfloor n/2 \rfloor + 1}^n \log i \\ &\geq \sum_{i=2}^{\lfloor n/2 \rfloor} \log 2 + \sum_{\lfloor n/2 \rfloor + 1}^n \log \frac{n}{2} \\ &= (\underbrace{\lfloor n/2 \rfloor}_{>n/2-1} - 2 + 1) + (\underbrace{n - \lfloor n/2 \rfloor}_{\geq n/2})(\log n - 1) \\ &> \frac{n}{2} \log n - 2. \end{aligned}$$



$$[n! \in o(n^n)]$$

$$\begin{aligned} n \log n &\geq \sum_{i=1}^{\lfloor n/2 \rfloor} \log 2i + \sum_{i=\lfloor n/2 \rfloor + 1}^n \log i \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^n \log i + \left\lfloor \frac{n}{2} \right\rfloor \log 2 \\ &> \sum_{i=1}^n \log i + n/2 - 1 = \log n! + n/2 - 1 \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} n^n &= 2^{n \log_2 n} \geq 2^{\log_2 n!} \cdot 2^{n/2} \cdot 2^{-1} = n! \cdot 2^{n/2-1} \\ \Rightarrow \frac{n!}{n^n} &\leq 2^{-n/2+1} \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} 0 \Rightarrow n! \in o(n^n) = \mathcal{O}(n^n) \setminus \Omega(n^n) \end{aligned}$$

[Even  $n! \in o((n/c)^n) \forall 0 < c < e$  ]

Konvergenz oder Divergenz von  $f_n = \frac{n!}{(n/c)^n}$ .

Ratio Test

$$\frac{f_{n+1}}{f_n} = \frac{(n+1)!}{\left(\frac{n+1}{c}\right)^{n+1}} \cdot \frac{\left(\frac{n}{c}\right)^n}{n!} = c \cdot \left(\frac{n}{n+1}\right)^n \rightarrow c \cdot \frac{1}{e} \leq 1 \text{ if } c \leq e$$

because  $\left(1 + \frac{1}{n}\right)^n \rightarrow e$ . Even the series  $\sum_{i=1}^n f_n$  converges / diverges for  $c \leq e$ .

$f_n$  diverges for  $c = e$ , because (Stirling):  $n! \approx \sqrt{2\pi n} \left(\frac{n}{e}\right)^n$ .

# [ Ratio Test]

Ratio test for a sequence  $(f_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ : If  $\frac{f_{n+1}}{f_n} \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow \infty]{} \lambda$ , then the sequence  $f_n$  and the series  $\sum_{i=1}^n f_i$

- converge, if  $\lambda < 1$  and
- diverge, if  $\lambda > 1$ .

# [ Ratio Test Derivation ]

Ratio test is implied by Geometric Series

$$S_n(r) := \sum_{i=0}^n r^i = \frac{1 - r^{n+1}}{1 - r}.$$

converges for  $n \rightarrow \infty$  if and only if  $-1 < r < 1$ .

Let  $0 \leq \lambda < 1$ :

$$\begin{aligned} & \forall \varepsilon > 0 \exists n_0 : f_{n+1}/f_n < \lambda + \varepsilon \forall n \geq n_0 \\ \Rightarrow & \exists \mu > 0, \exists n_0 : f_{n+1}/f_n \leq \mu < 1 \forall n \geq n_0 \end{aligned}$$

Thus

$$\sum_{n=n_0}^{\infty} f_n \leq f_{n_0} \cdot \sum_{n=n_0}^{\infty} \mu^{n-n_0} \quad \text{konvergiert.}$$

(Analogously for divergence)