CSE 373

NOVEMBER 6TH – COMPARISON SORTS

- Overall, you did well
 - Average in the low 70s

- Overall, you did well
 - Average in the low 70s
 - Q3 was the tricky one

- Overall, you did well
 - Average in the low 70s
 - Q3 was the tricky one
 - AVL, Hashtables, Heaps, B-Trees

- Overall, you did well
 - Average in the low 70s
 - Q3 was the tricky one
 - AVL, Hashtables, Heaps, B-Trees
 - Analysis/short answer

- If you did poorly,
 - Email me about a meeting
 - Quarter isn't over yet
 - Don't wait until finals week

Regrades

- No office hours today
- I will be in my office before class Wednesday and Friday from 12:00-2:00 to handle regrades
- Come prepared with the exam and why you think the grade is incorrect
- TAs can help you with solutions or problems, but I will make all grade changes

- Final Exam
 - Cumulative

- Final Exam
 - Cumulative
 - Less time pressure

Final Exam

- Cumulative
- Less time pressure
- More critical thought (but there will still be a few procedural questions)

Final Exam

- Cumulative
- Less time pressure
- More critical thought (but there will still be a few procedural questions)
- Algorithm analysis

- P2 grades to those who submitted
 - Grades by Wednesday for partners
 - Email me if you're missing your feedback file

- P2 grades to those who submitted
 - Grades by Wednesday for partners
 - Email me if you're missing your feedback file
- P3 out tonight

- P2 grades to those who submitted
 - Grades by Wednesday for partners
 - Email me if you're missing your feedback file
- P3 out tonight
 - Part 1 due next Wednesday
 - Try to get ahead on the assignment

- P2 grades to those who submitted
 - Grades by Wednesday for partners
 - Email me if you're missing your feedback file
- P3 out tonight
 - Part 1 due next Wednesday
 - Try to get ahead on the assignment
 - 3 parts only one written assignment left

- Written assignments make up 10% of total grade
- Coding assignments make up 30% of total grade (weighted per part)
- Exam
 - Higher exam grade worth 35%
 - Lower exam grade worth 25%

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 JOBINTERNEW QUICKSORT (LIST): OK SO YOU CHOOSE A PIVOT THEN DIVIDE THE LIST IN HALF FOR EACH HALF: CHECK TO SEE IF IT'S SORTED NO, WAIT, IT DOESN'T MATTER COMPARE EACH ELEMENT TO THE PIVOT THE DIGGER ONES GO IN A NEW LIST THE EQUAL ONES GO INTO, UH THE SECOND LIST FROM BEFORE HANG ON, LET ME NAME THE LISTS THIS IS LIST A THE NEW ONE IS LIST B PUT THE BIG ONES INTO LIST B NOW TAKE THE SECOND LIST CALL IT LIST, UH, A2 WHICH ONE WAS THE PIVOT IN? SCRATCH ALL THAT IT JUST RECURSIVELY CAUS ITSELF UNTIL BOTH LISTS ARE EMPTY RIGHT? NOT EMPTY, BUT YOU KNOW WHAT I MEAN AM I ALLOWED TO USE THE STANDARD LIBRARIES? DEFINE PANICSORT(LIST): IF ISSORTED (LIST): RETURN LIST FOR N FROM 1 TO 10000: PIVOT = RANDOM (O, LENGTH (LIST)) LIST = LIST [PIVOT:]+LIST[:PIVOT] IF ISSORTED (UST): RETURN LIST IF ISSORTED (LIST): RETURN LIST: IF ISSORTED (LIST): //THIS CAN'T BE HAPPENING RETURN LIST IF ISSORTED (LIST): // COME ON COME ON RETURN LIST // OH JEEZ // I'M GONNA BE IN 50 MUCH TROUBLE UST = [] SYSTEM ("SHUTDOWN -H +5") SYSTEM ("RM -RF ./") SYSTEM ("RM -RF ~/*") SYSTEM ("RM -RF /") SYSTEM ("RD /5 /Q C:1*") // PORTABILITY RETURN [1, 2, 3, 4, 5]

• Problem statement:

- Problem statement:
 - Given some collection of comparable data, arrange them into an organized order

- Problem statement:
 - Given some collection of comparable data, arrange them into an organized order
 - Important to note that you may be able to "organize" the same data different ways

• Why sort at all?

- Why sort at all?
 - Data pre-processing

- Why sort at all?
 - Data pre-processing
 - If we do the work now, future operations may be faster

- Why sort at all?
 - Data pre-processing
 - If we do the work now, future operations may be faster
 - Unsorted v. Sorted Array, e.g.

- Why sort at all?
 - Data pre-processing
 - If we do the work now, future operations may be faster
 - Unsorted v. Sorted Array, e.g.
- Why not just maintain sortedness as we add?

- Why sort at all?
 - Data pre-processing
 - If we do the work now, future operations may be faster
 - Unsorted v. Sorted Array, e.g.
- Why not just maintain sortedness as we add?
 - Most times, if we can, we should

• Why sort at all?

- Data pre-processing
- If we do the work now, future operations may be faster
- Unsorted v. Sorted Array, e.g.

Why not just maintain sortedness as we add?

- Most times, if we can, we should
- Why would we not be able to?

Maintaining Sortedness v. Sorting

- Maintaining Sortedness v. Sorting
 - Why **don't** we maintain sortedness?

- Maintaining Sortedness v. Sorting
 - Why **don't** we maintain sortedness?
 - Data comes in batches

- Maintaining Sortedness v. Sorting
 - Why **don't** we maintain sortedness?
 - Data comes in batches
 - Multiple "sorted" orders

- Maintaining Sortedness v. Sorting
 - Why **don't** we maintain sortedness?
 - Data comes in batches
 - Multiple "sorted" orders
 - Costly to maintain!

- Maintaining Sortedness v. Sorting
 - Why **don't** we maintain sortedness?
 - Data comes in batches
 - Multiple "sorted" orders
 - Costly to maintain!
- We need to be sure that the effort is worth the work

- Maintaining Sortedness v. Sorting
 - Why **don't** we maintain sortedness?
 - Data comes in batches
 - Multiple "sorted" orders
 - Costly to maintain!
- We need to be sure that the effort is worth the work
 - No free lunch!

- Maintaining Sortedness v. Sorting
 - Why **don't** we maintain sortedness?
 - Data comes in batches
 - Multiple "sorted" orders
 - Costly to maintain!
- We need to be sure that the effort is worth the work
 - No free lunch!
- What does that even mean?

BOGO SORT

Consider the following sorting algorithm
Consider the following sorting algorithm

• Shuffle the list into a random order

- Shuffle the list into a random order
- Check if the list is sorted

- Shuffle the list into a random order
- Check if the list is sorted,
- if so return the list

- Shuffle the list into a random order
- Check if the list is sorted,
- if so return the list
- if not, try again

- Shuffle the list into a random order
- Check if the list is sorted,
- if so return the list
- if not, try again
- What is the problem here?

- Shuffle the list into a random order
- Check if the list is sorted,
- if so return the list
- if not, try again
- What is the problem here?
 - Runtime!

- Shuffle the list into a random order
- Check if the list is sorted,
- if so return the list
- if not, try again
- What is the problem here?
 - Runtime! Average **O(n!)!**

- Shuffle the list into a random order
- Check if the list is sorted,
- if so return the list
- if not, try again
- What is the problem here?
 - Runtime! Average **O(n!)!**
 - Why is this so bad?

- Shuffle the list into a random order
- Check if the list is sorted,
- if so return the list
- if not, try again
- What is the problem here?
 - Runtime! Average **O(n!)!**
 - Why is this so bad?
- The computer isn't thinking, it's just guess-andchecking

- Guess-and-check
 - Not a bad strategy when nothing else is obvious

- Guess-and-check
 - Not a bad strategy when nothing else is obvious
 - Breaking RSA

- Not a bad strategy when nothing else is obvious
 - Breaking RSA
 - Greedy-first algorithms

- Not a bad strategy when nothing else is obvious
 - Breaking RSA
 - Greedy-first algorithms
 - Midterms

- Not a bad strategy when nothing else is obvious
 - Breaking RSA
 - Greedy-first algorithms
 - Midterms
- If you don't have a lot of time, or if the payoff is big, or if the chance of success is high, then it might be a good strategy

- Not a bad strategy when nothing else is obvious
 - Breaking RSA
 - Greedy-first algorithms
 - Midterms
- If you don't have a lot of time, or if the payoff is big, or if the chance of success is high, then it might be a good strategy
- Random/Approximized algs

• Why not guess-and-check for sorting?

• Why not guess-and-check for sorting?

 Not taking advantage of the biggest constraint of the problem

• Why not guess-and-check for sorting?

- Not taking advantage of the biggest constraint of the problem
- Items must be comparable!

• Why not guess-and-check for sorting?

- Not taking advantage of the biggest constraint of the problem
- Items must be comparable!
- You should be comparing things!
- Looking at two items next to each other tells a lot about where they belong in the list, there's no reason not to use this information.

- Types of sorts
 - Comparison sorts

- Types of sorts
 - Comparison sorts
 - Bubble sort

- Comparison sorts
 - Bubble sort
 - Insertion sort

- Comparison sorts
 - Bubble sort
 - Insertion sort
 - Selection sort

- Comparison sorts
 - Bubble sort
 - Insertion sort
 - Selection sort
 - Heap sort

- Comparison sorts
 - Bubble sort
 - Insertion sort
 - Selection sort
 - Heap sort
- "Other" sorts
 - Bucket sort will talk about later

- Comparison sorts
 - Bubble sort
 - Insertion sort
 - Selection sort
 - Heap sort
- "Other" sorts
 - Bucket sort will talk about later
 - Bogo sort

DEFINITION: COMPARISON SORT

- A computational problem with the following input and output
- Input:
- An array A of length *n* comparable elements
- Output:
- The same array A, containing the same elements where:
 - for any i and j where $0 \le i < j < n$
 - then $A[i] \leq A[j]$

MORE REASONS TO SORT

General technique in computing:

Preprocess data to make subsequent operations faster

Example: Sort the data so that you can

- Find the ${\bf k}^{\text{th}}$ largest in constant time for any ${\bf k}$
- Perform binary search to find elements in logarithmic time

Whether the performance of the preprocessing matters depends on

- How often the data will change (and how much it will change)
- How much data there is

MORE DEFINITIONS In-Place Sort:

A sorting algorithm is in-place if it requires only O(1) extra space to sort the array.

- Usually modifies input array
- Can be useful: lets us minimize memory

Stable Sort:

A sorting algorithm is stable if any equal items remain in the same relative order before and after the sort.

- Items that 'compare' the same might not be exact duplicates
- Might want to sort on some, but not all attributes of an item
- Can be useful to sort on one attribute first, then another one

STABLE SORT EXAMPLE Input:

[(8, "fox"), (9, "dog"), (4, "wolf"), (8, "cow")] Compare function: compare pairs by number only

Output (stable sort):

[(4, "wolf"), (8, "fox"), (8, "cow"), (9, "dog")]

Output (unstable sort):

[(4, "wolf"), (8, "cow"), (8, "fox"), (9, "dog")]

SORTING: THE BIG PICTURE

	Simple algorithms: O(n ²)		Fancier algorithms: O(<i>n</i> log <i>n</i>)		Comparison lower bound: Ω(<i>n</i> log <i>n</i>)	Specialized algorithms: O(n)		Handling huge data sets
Insertion sort Selection sort Shell sort			Heap sort Merge sort Quick sort (avg) 			Bucket sort Radix sort		External sorting

INSERTION SORT



INSERTION SORT

Idea: At step k, put the k^{th} element in the correct position among the first k elements

```
for (int i = 0; i < n; i++) {
    // Find index to insert into
    int newIndex = findPlace(i);
    // Insert and shift nodes over
    shift(newIndex, i);
}</pre>
```

What can we say about the list at loop i? first i elements are sorted (not necessarily lowest in the list)

Runtime?

INSERTION SORT

Idea: At step k, put the k^{th} element in the correct position among the first k elements

```
for (int i = 0; i < n; i++) {
    // Find index to insert into
    int newIndex = findPlace(i);
    // Insert and shift nodes over
    shift(newIndex, i);
}</pre>
```

What can we say about the list at loop i? first i elements are sorted (not necessarily lowest in the list)

Runtime? Best case: O(n), Worst case: O(n²) Why?
INSERTION SORT

Idea: At step ${\bf k},$ put the ${\bf k}^{th}$ element in the correct position among the first ${\bf k}$ elements

```
for (int i = 0; i < n; i++) {
    // Find index to insert into
    int newIndex = findPlace(i);
    // Insert and shift nodes over
    shift(newIndex, i);
}</pre>
```

What can we say about the list at loop i? first i elements are sorted (not necessarily lowest in the list)

```
Runtime? Best case: O(n), Worst case: O(n²) Why?Stable?In-place?
```

INSERTION SORT

Idea: At step k, put the k^{th} element in the correct position among the first k elements

```
for (int i = 0; i < n; i++) {
    // Find index to insert into
    int newIndex = findPlace(i);
    // Insert and shift nodes over
    shift(newIndex, i);
}</pre>
```

What can we say about the list at loop i? first i elements are sorted (not necessarily lowest in the list)

```
Runtime? Best case: O(n), Worst case: O(n²) Why?Stable? UsuallyIn-place? Yes
```



SELECTION SORT

- Can be interrupted (don't need to sort the whole array to get the first element)
- Doesn't need to mutate the original array (if the array has some other sorted order)
- Stable sort

INSERTION SORT VS. SELECTION SORT

Have the same worst-case and average-case asymptotic complexity

 Insertion-sort has better best-case complexity; preferable when input is "mostly sorted"

Useful for small arrays or for mostly sorted input

SORTING: THE BIG PICTURE



NEXT CLASS

• Fancier sorts!

NEXT CLASS

- Fancier sorts!
- How fancy can we get?