







## Better External MergeSort

- Suppose main memory can hold M records.
- Initially read in groups of M records and sort them (*e.g.* with QuickSort).
- Number of passes reduced to log(N/M)

#### Sorting by Comparison: Summary

- · Sorting algorithms that only compare adjacent elements are  $\Theta(N^2)$  worst case – but may be  $\Theta(N)$ best case
- HeapSort and MergeSort  $\Theta(N \log N)$  both best and worst case
- QuickSort  $\Theta(N^2)$  worst case but  $\Theta(N \mbox{ log } N)$  best and average case
- Any comparison-based sorting algorithm is  $\Omega(N \log N)$  worst case
- External sorting: MergeSort with Θ(log N/M) passes

but not quite the end of the story ...

#### **BucketSort**

- If all keys are 1...K
- Have array of K buckets (linked lists)
- Put keys into correct bucket of array - linear time!
- BucketSort is a *stable* sorting algorithm: - Items in input with the same key end up in the same order as when they began
- Impractical for large K...

#### RadixSort

- Radix = "The base of a number system" (Webster's dictionary) alternate terminology: radix is number of bits needed to represent 0 to base-1; can say "base 8" or "radix 3"
- Used in 1890 U.S. census by Hollerith
- Idea: BucketSort on each digit, bottom up.



11

### The Magic of RadixSort

- Input list:
- 126, 328, 636, 341, 416, 131, 328
- · BucketSort on lower digit: 341, 131, 126, 636, 416, 328, 328
- BucketSort result on next-higher digit: 416, 126, 328, 328, 131, 636, 341
- BucketSort that result on highest digit: 126, 131, 328, 328, 341, 416, 636

10

12

#### Inductive Proof that RadixSort Works

- Keys: K-digit numbers, base B - (that wasn't hard!)
- Claim: after ith BucketSort, least significant i digits are sorted.
  - Base case: i=0. 0 digits are sorted.
  - Inductive step: Assume for i, prove for i+1.
  - $\begin{array}{l} \mbox{Consider two numbers: } X, \ Y. \ Say \ X_i \ is \ i^h \ digit \ of \ X: \\ \bullet \ X_{i+1} < Y_{i+1} \ then \ i+1^{th} \ BucketSort \ will \ put \ them \ in \ order \end{array}$ 

    - $X_{i+1} > Y_{i+1}$ , same thing
    - $X_{i+1} Y_{i+1}$ , where using  $X_{i+1} X_{i+1} Y_{i+1}$ , order depends on last i digits. Induction hypothesis says already sorted for these digits because BucketSort is **stable**

Running time of Radixsort

- N items, K digit keys in base B
- How many passes?
- How much work per pass?
- Total time?



	5 <sup>th</sup>	4 <sup>th</sup>	3 <sup>rd</sup>	2nd	1 <sup>st</sup>	
	pass	pass	pass	pass	pass	
String 1	Z	i	p	p	у	
String 2	Z	a	p			NULLs a
String 3	a	n	t	s	K	just like fa
String 4	f	1	a	р	s	

### **Evaluating Sorting Algorithms**

- What factors other than asymptotic complexity could affect performance?
- Suppose two algorithms perform exactly the same number of instructions. Could one be better than the other?

#### **Example Memory Hierarchy Statistics**

Name	Extra CPU cycles used to access	Size
L1 (on chip) cache	0	32 KB
L2 cache	8	512 KB
RAM	35	256 MB
Hard Drive	500,000	8 GB

### The Memory Hierarchy Exploits Locality of Reference

- Idea: *small* amount of *fast* memory
- Keep *frequently* used data in the *fast* memory
- LRU replacement policy
  - Keep recently used data in cache
  - To free space, remove Least Recently Used data

17

15

# So what?

- Optimizing use of cache can make programs way faster
- One TA made RadixSort 2x faster, rewriting to use cache better!
- Not just for sorting

18















• Initial partition causes a lot of cache misses

25

- As subproblems become smaller, they fit into cache
- Good cache performance

# Radix Sort – Very Naughty

- On each BucketSort
  - Sweep through input list cache misses along the way (bad!)

26

 Append to output list – indexed by pseudorandom digit (ouch!)







