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## Announcements

* COVID-19 is really something, huh?
- HW8: No change, still due
- Drop-in Times: we'll switch to online DITs next week
- Workshops: cancelled
- Quiz sections: since topic is final prep, may switch to online format or cancel
- Final review session: keeping, but in online format
- Final exam: still happening; online exam during usual time slot (Thu, Mar 19 2:30-4:20)
- Please ensure you have access to a quiet location with good internet connectivity at that time!
- Lectures: today's lecture finishes the topics that'll be on the final exam
- We'll post pre-recorded videos for next week's 3 lectures
- Fortunately, topics were review + enrichment. Do your best ... or just use the time to finish HW8
* I'm insanely behind on email, but contact us anyway with questions, requests, etc
- We'll announce details related to format, tools, etc on Piazza
- You'll probably need to install Zoom (video conferencing)


## Feedback from Reading Quiz

: How to handle non-numeric keys like $\{\boldsymbol{\infty}, \boldsymbol{Q}, \boldsymbol{\rho}$ \}?

- Map keys to numeric values; exact implementation can vary
- Eg: $\rightarrow 0, \boldsymbol{Q} \rightarrow 1,>2, \rightarrow 3$
*We'll answer these in lecture today:
- What's the runtime of counting sort? Is it $\Theta\left(\mathrm{N}^{2}\right)$ or $\Theta(2 \mathrm{~N})$ ?
- What's a radix?
- How does radix sort maintain stability?
- Can we use radix sort techniques for comparison sorts?


## Lecture Outline

* Generalizing CountingSort
* RadixSort
- LSD RadixSort
- MSD RadixSort


## Comparison-Based Sorting

* Definition: A type of sorting algorithm that determines an element's ordering using comparison operations
- More simply: sorting using only compareTo() type operations
* We determined the best we can do with comparison-based sorting is $\Theta(N \log N)$ time complexity
* Can we do better? What if we don't compare at all?


## Radix: A Definition

* Radix: the number of "characters" in the "alphabet"
- More formally: the number of elements in the domain

| Name | Radix | Characters |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Binary | 2 | 0,1 |
| Decimal | 10 | $0,1,2,3,4,5,6,7,8,9$ |
| Lowercase Latin <br> Alphabet | 26 | $\mathrm{a}, \mathrm{b}, \mathrm{c}, \mathrm{d}, \mathrm{e}, \mathrm{f}, \mathrm{g}, \mathrm{h}, \mathrm{l}, \mathrm{j}, \mathrm{k}, \mathrm{l}, \mathrm{m}, \mathrm{n}, \mathrm{o}, \mathrm{p}, \mathrm{q}, \mathrm{r}, \mathrm{s}, \mathrm{t}, \mathrm{u}, \mathrm{v}, \mathrm{w}, \mathrm{x}, \mathrm{y}, \mathrm{z}$ |
| ASCII | 128 | $\underline{\text { http://www.asciitable.com/ }}$ |
| Unicode | $>137,000$ | $\underline{\text { https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/List of Unicode charac }}$ |
| $\underline{\text { ters }}$ |  |  |

## Reading Review: Generalizing CountingSort

* We want Counting Sort to work for non-unique and/or nonconsecutive keys!
- Count the occurrences for each key value
- Compute each key's starting index using the counts array
- For each [item, key] in the input do:
- Get the destination index by checking the index array for key
- Copy item into the result using this destination index
- Increment the index for key
- Copy items back to initial array (if needed)
* Demo: https://docs.google.com/presentation/d/1FTTxlds-7EqbJ6Md40svCV9zjDL-XxGI00pXp4gXsr8/edit


## (I1) Poll Everywhere

* What is the runtime for CountingSort on an input of N items and an alphabet of size ("radix") R? Treat $R$ as a variable, not a constant.
A. $\Theta(N)$
B. $\Theta(R)$
c. $\Theta(N+R)$
D. $\Theta(N R)$
E. I'm not sure ...


## CountingSort: Performance Analysis

Time Complexity:

CountingSort(a):
map<char, int> counts
foreach key in a:
counts [key]++
map<char, int> indices;
foreach key in counts:
indices[key] =
indices[key - 1] +
indices[key]
foreach (key, item) in a: output[indices[key]] = item;

## CountingSort: Performance Analysis

* CountingSort is stable because it processes then input in order
- No long-distance swaps like SelectionSort or Hoare Partitioning
* Runtime and memory use is $\Theta(N+R)$ !
- $N=$ \# of items, $R=$ radix of alphabet
* We "beat" comparison sorts by avoiding comparisons!
- Aaaacccccctttually ... empirical/performance testing is still needed to compare against QuickSort on real-world inputs
* You have an array of 100 elements, consisting of a city's name and its population. If you want to sort them by population, which algorithm's worst-case runtime as measured in seconds (ie, not asymptotically) is lower / faster?
A. CountingSort
B. QuickSort
c. I'm not sure ...


## CountingSort: Performance Analysis

* Runtime and memory use is $\Theta(N+R)$ !
- $N=\#$ of items, $R=$ radix of alphabet
* But did we actually beat comparison sorts?
- If $\mathrm{N}>=\mathrm{R}$ : performance is reasonable
- If $N$ >> $R$ : $R$ is negligible, performance is great!
- What if $\mathrm{N} \ll \mathrm{R}$ ?
- In other words: When is our alphabet large?
- Integers, strings, ...


## Sorting Cities by Population

* CountingSort builds an array of size ~30,000,000 -- the largest city's population -- to sort the input
*. ... which is a very large and very sparse array
- Most indices are unused because we are sorting only 100 cities!


## Lecture Outline

* Generalizing CountingSort
* RadixSort
- LSD RadixSort
- MSD RadixSort


## RadixSort's Raison D'être

* We want to be able to sort keys that don't belong to a finite alphabet, such as strings
- Strings don't belong to a finite alphabet, but they consist of characters from a finite alphabet!
- Numbers do too
* RadixSort's idea is similar to tries':
- Subdivide the key; it's not an atomic indivisible "whole"?
- Sort each chunk/character/digit independently using CountingSort
* How should we "chunk"? In what order should we process the chunks?


## Least Significant Digit (LSD) RadixSort

* LSD RadixSort: Sort each chunk independently, from rightmost to leftmost
* Example:

Alphabet: $\{1,2,3\}$

| Key | Name |
| :---: | :---: |
| 22 | Stitch |
| 12 | Gantu |
| 31 | Nani |
| 23 | Lilo |
| 11 | David |


| Key | Name |
| :---: | :---: |
| $3 \underline{1}$ | Nani |
| $1 \underline{1}$ | David |
| $2 \underline{2}$ | Stitch |
| $1 \underline{2}$ | Gantu |
| $2 \underline{3}$ | Lilo |


| Key | Name |
| :---: | :---: |
| $\underline{\mathbf{1}} 1$ | David |
| $\underline{\mathbf{1}} 2$ | Gantu |
| $\underline{\mathbf{2}} 2$ | Stitch |
| $\underline{\mathbf{2}} 3$ | Lilo |
| $\underline{\mathbf{3}} 1$ | Nani |

## LSD RadixSort: Correctness

* Does LSD RadixSort create correct results?
- What property of CountingSort enables that?
- Can you give an example of what could go wrong?

| Key | Name |
| :---: | :---: |
| 22 | Stitch |
| 12 | Gantu |
| 31 | Nani |
| 23 | Lilo |
| 11 | David |


| Key | Name | Key | Name |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 31 | Nani | 11 | David |
| 11 | David | 12 | Gantu |
| 22 | Stitch | $\underline{2}$ | Lilo |
| 12 | Gantu | $\underline{2}$ | Stitch |
| 23 | Lilo | $\underline{31}$ | Nani |

## LSD RadixSort Correctness: More Formally

* If the unexamined chunks are different, the examined chunks don't matter!
- A later pass will sort correctly on more significant chunks
* If the unexamined chunks are identical, the keys are already properly ordered
- Since the sort is stable, they will remain so

| $X_{0}$ | $X_{1}$ | $X_{2}$ | $X_{3}$ | $X_{4}$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $\mathrm{Y}_{0}$ | $\mathrm{Y}_{1}$ | $\mathrm{Y}_{2}$ | $\mathrm{Y}_{3}$ | $\mathrm{Y}_{4}$ |
| $\mathrm{Z}_{0}$ | $\mathrm{Z}_{1}$ | $Z_{2}$ | $Z_{3}$ | $Z_{4}$ |
| $\underbrace{\text { Unexamined }}$ |  |  |  |  |
| $\underbrace{}_{\text {Examined }}$ |  |  |  |  |

## LSD RadixSort: Non-equal Key Lengths

* If keys are of unequal length, treat empty spaces as less-than all other chunks in the alphabet/domain
* Example:

Alphabet: $\{1,2,3\}$

| Key | Value |
| :---: | :---: |
| 3 | is |
| 31 | fun! |
| 23 | duper |
| 12 | super |
| 1 | sorting |


| Key | Name |
| :---: | :---: |
| $3 \underline{1}$ | fun! |
| $\cdot \underline{1}$ | sorting |
| $1 \underline{2}$ | super |
| $\cdot \underline{3}$ | is |
| $2 \underline{3}$ | duper |


| Key | Name |
| :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{- 1}$ | sorting |
| $: 3$ | is |
| $\underline{1} 2$ | super |
| $\underline{\mathbf{2}} 3$ | duper |
| $\underline{\mathbf{3}} 1$ | fun! |

## LSD RadixSort: Runtime

* N = \# items, R = radix, L = \# chunks in longest item
- We have to run CountingSort for each chunk
- CountingSort has runtime on the order of $\Theta(N+R)$
- Therefore, LSD RadixSort's runtime: $\boldsymbol{\Theta}(\mathbf{L N}+\mathbf{L R})$


## LSD RadixSort: Summary

* Use CountingSort on each chunk, from right to left
- Now we can sort non-alphabetic keys that consist of alphabetic keys!
*. Performance ( $\mathrm{N}=$ \# items, R = radix, L = \# chunks in longest item):
- Runtime: $\mathbf{O}(\mathrm{LN}+\mathrm{LR})$
- Memory use: $\mathbf{O}(\mathbf{N}+\mathbf{R})$
- Output array: N
- Need L counts array (R) and L starting indices array (R), but can reuse them between chunks
* If R is small (CountingSort's restriction) and L is small (an LSD RadixSort restriction), the runtime isn't shabby!

If only the runtime didn't depend on the longest key
2

## Most Significant Digit (MSD) RadixSort

* By definition, LSD RadixSort examines the least significant chunk first!
- ie, may do more computation than necessary
* MSD RadixSort Idea: similar to LSD, but leftmost to rightmost
- Handles keys that are much longer than the rest, eg:

```
349499234
4589245
132954351638273762
62302213
2934592
432035235
```


## MSD RadixSort: Example

* Suppose we sort each chunk left to right. Will we arrive at the correct result? Why or why not?



## MSD RadixSort: Example

* No! Items that were previously ordered by a more-significant chunk may get swapped!



## MSD RadixSort: Example

* Solution: sort each subproblem separately, rejoin at the end



## MSD RadixSort: Example

* Optimization: don't subdivide or sort already-sorted singletons



## MSD RadixSort: Runtime

* Best-case runtime of MSD RadixSort, expressed in N, R, L?
* What type of input leads to this best-case?
- One CountingSort pass, looking only at the first chunk: $\mathbf{O}(\mathbf{N}+\mathrm{R})$
- Every input has a unique most-significant chunk
* Worst-case runtime of MSD RadixSort, expressed in N, R, L?
- L CountingSort passes to look at every chunk (ie, degenerates to LSD RadixSort): ©(LN + LR)
- Every key is the same or only differs in the least-significant chunk


## MSD RadixSort: Memory

* Memory usage: $\mathbf{O}(\mathbf{N}+\mathbf{R})$
- Output array: N
- Each chunk requires <=R CountingSorts for each subproblem, and each CountingSort requires N+R memory. However, we can reuse that memory between each CountingSort


## MSD RadixSort: Analysis

* Runtime:
- Best case: $\mathbf{O ( N + R )}$
- Worst case: $\boldsymbol{\Theta}(\mathbf{L N}+\mathrm{LR})$
* Memory usage: $\mathbf{O}(\mathbf{N}+\mathbf{R})$
* In practice, long strings are rarely random; they may contain structure
- Eg, HTML has tags: <html>, <p>, <li>
* Structured strings may benefit from specialized sorting algorithms or, minimally, specialized "chunkers"

| Random <br> (sublinear) | Non-random <br> with duplicates <br> (nearly linear) | Worst case <br> (linear) |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 1EI0402 | are | 1DNB377 |
| 1HYL490 | by | 1DNB377 |
| 1ROZ572 | sea | 1DNB377 |
| 2HXE734 | seashe11s | 1DNB377 |
| 2IYE230 | seashe11s | 1DNB377 |
| 2XOR846 | se11s | 1DNB377 |
| 3CDB573 | se11s | 1DNB377 |
| 3CVP720 | she | 1DNB377 |
| 3IGJ319 | she | 1DNB377 |
| 3KNA382 | she17s | 1DNB377 |
| 3TAV879 | shore | 1DNB377 |
| 4CQP781 | sure7y | 1DNB377 |
| 4QGI284 | the | 1DNB377 |
| 4YHV229 | the | 1DNB377 |

- Eg, a HTML-tag-aware chunking


## tl;dr

|  | Time <br> Complexity | Space <br> Complexity |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| CountingSort | $\Theta(N+R)$ | $\Theta(N+R)$ |
| LSD RadixSort | $\Theta(L N+L R)$ | $\Theta(N+R)$ |
| MSD RadixSort | Best: $\Theta(N+R)$ <br> Worst: $\Theta(L N+L R)$ | $\Theta(N+L R)$ |

## And, finally ...

* Thank you for your understanding and patience re: COVID-19
* Thank you for being a great class!
* Good luck on HW8 and the final. Stay in touch!

