CSC148 Lecture 8

Algorithm Analysis Sorting

 Recall definition of Big-Oh: We say a function f(n) is O(g(n)) if there exists positive constants c,B such that

- $f(n) \le c*g(n)$ for all $n \ge B$
- Let T(n) be the worst-case "running time" of an algorithm on input size n. (In this context, "running time" means the number of steps that the algorithm takes.)

- Loosely speaking, we approximate T(n) by finding a function g(n) such that T(n) is O(g(n)).
- Saying that this is an "approximation" for the running time isn't entirely accurate. Consider the algorithm for summing the numbers from 1 to n that we saw last week.

- The first algorithm, which loops through all the numbers from 1 to n, has time complexity O(n).
- The second algorithm, which uses a formula, has time complexity O(1).
- Is the following statement true: "both algorithms have time complexity O(n^2)"?
- It is! Consider the definition of Big-Oh, and you will see why.

- Clearly neither algorithm takes anywhere near n^2 steps.
- We said that Big-Oh notation is used to approximate T(n), but the last example demonstrates that the notation can lead to inaccurate approximations. What's going on??
- In actuality, Big-Oh notation gives us a convenient way of expressing an upper-bound on the running time of an algorithm.

- Saying that the summation algorithms take O(n^2) time, although true, doesn't convey as much information as we'd like.
- To make our upper-bound as meaningful as possible, we want to make it "tight".
- Intuitively, O(g(n)) is a tight upper-bound for T(n) if g(n) is the smallest and simplest function that satisfies the big-oh criteria.

- For example, O(n) is a tight upper-bound for 6n, but O(n^2) is not.
- More precisely, if for every function h(n) such that T(n) is O(h(n)) it is also true that g(n) is O(h(n)), then we say g(n) is a tight asymptotic bound on T(n).
 - Think carefully about this definition. Why does it capture the intuition described on the previous slide?

Sorting

- Sorting methods that you've seen in 108:
 - Bubble sort
 - Selection Sort
 - Insertion sort
- These sorts all have time complexity O(n^2).
- We'll discuss a new sorting method, called merge sort, that has time complexity O(n log n).

- Merge sort recursively
 - sorts the first half of the list
 - sorts the second half of the list
 - merges the two halves into a newly sorted list
- Lets assume we have a list in which the first and second halves are sorted, but the whole list itself may not be sorted.
- How can we merge the two halves to create a new list that's sorted and contains all the elements of the original list?

• Examples of merge on board.

- Before we can actually use the merge procedure we just discussed, we have to somehow get to the point where the two halves of the list are sorted.
- This is done recursively.
- What is our base case?

• A list containing 1 element is sorted.

- Advantages:
 - O(n log n) time compelxity
 - see discussion on board for why mergesort has this time complexity
- Disadvantages
 - requires additional space for the merged list