

Sorting Algorithms

The 3 sorting methods discussed here all have wild signatures. For example,

```
public static <E extends Comparable<? super E>>void BubbleSort(E[] array )
```

The underlined portion is a *type bound*. This says that the generic type E used as the base type of the array must implement or extend a superclass that implements, the Comparable interface (which says that E has a compareTo(E) method. See the discussion in Weiss of wildcards and type bounds,p. 151-154.

In less generic examples you probably don't need this. If you are writing BubbleSort to sort strings its signature could just be

```
public static void BubbleSort(String[] array)
```

BubbleSort

BubbleSort makes repeated passes through the array, interchanging successive elements that are out of order. When no changes are made in a pass the array is sorted.

```
public static <E extends Comparable<? super E>>void BubbleSort(E[] array ) {  
    boolean sorted = false;  
    int highest = array.length-1;  
    while (!sorted) {  
        sorted = true;  
        for (int i = 0; i < highest; i++) {  
            if (array[i].compareTo(array[i+1]) > 0) {  
                E buffer = array[i];  
                array[i] = array[i+1];  
                array[i+1] = buffer;  
                sorted = false;  
            }  
        }  
        highest -= 1;  
    }  
}
```

Original data

| | | | | | | |
|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|
| 33 | 12 | 45 | 17 | 23 | 52 | 24 |
| 12 | 33 | 17 | 23 | 45 | 24 | 52 |
| 12 | 17 | 23 | 33 | 24 | 45 | 52 |
| 12 | 17 | 23 | 24 | 33 | 45 | 52 |
| 12 | 17 | 23 | 24 | 33 | 45 | 52 |

Each row shows the result of a pass through the previous row, flipping consecutive elements that are out of order.

The first pass through the list does $(n-1)$ comparisons. That pass puts the largest element into its proper location at the last spot in the list, so the next pass does $(n-2)$ comparisons. Altogether we do at most

$$(n-1)+(n-2)+\dots+1 = n(n-1)/2$$

comparisons. For each comparison we do at most 1 interchange, which takes 3 assignment statements. This means BubbleSort is worst-case $O(n^2)$.

Note that the best case for BubbleSort is when the data is already sorted; only one pass is then needed and the running time is $O(n)$. Of course, if you knew the data was already sorted there wouldn't be a lot of point in calling BubbleSort ...

SelectionSort

SelectionSort finds the smallest element and puts it at position 0, the smallest remaining element and puts it at position 1, etc.


```
public static <E extends Comparable<? super E>>void
    SelectionSort(E[] array ) {
    for (int i=0; i < array.length-1; i++ ) {
        // find the index of the smallest remaining element
        int small = i;
        for (int j = i+1; j < array.length; j++) {
            if (array[j].compareTo(array[small]) < 0)
                small = j;
        }
        // put the smallest remaining element at position i
        E buffer = array[i];
        array[i] = array[small];
        array[small]= buffer;
    }
}
```

Original data

| | | | | | | |
|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|
| 33 | 12 | 45 | 17 | 23 | 52 | 24 |
|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|

| | | | | | | |
|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|
| 12 | 33 | 45 | 17 | 23 | 52 | 24 |
|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|

| | | | | | | |
|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|
| 12 | 17 | 45 | 33 | 23 | 52 | 24 |
|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|

| | | | | | | |
|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|
| 12 | 17 | 23 | 33 | 45 | 52 | 24 |
|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|

| | | | | | | |
|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|
| 12 | 17 | 23 | 24 | 45 | 52 | 33 |
|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|

| | | | | | | |
|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|
| 12 | 17 | 23 | 24 | 33 | 52 | 45 |
|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|

| | | | | | | |
|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|
| 12 | 17 | 23 | 24 | 33 | 45 | 52 |
|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|

The element put in its final location is in blue.

Selection sort does $(n-1)$ passes. The first one does $(n-1)$ comparisons; the second $(n-2)$ comparisons, and so forth. There are a total of

$$(n-1) + (n-2) + (n-3) + \dots + 1 = n(n-1)/2$$

comparisons. This is very similar to BubbleSort, only instead of interchanging elements of the array, which takes 3 assignments, here each comparison results in at most one integer assignment. Both are worst-case $O(n^2)$, but in specific examples SelectionSort usually runs somewhat faster.

Question: Suppose you use SelectionSort on an array of size n that is already sorted. How many comparisons will the sorting algorithm do?

- A. None
- B. 1
- C. $O(n)$
- D. $O(n^2)$

Answer D: $O(n^2)$.

Unlike BubbleSort, SelectionSort doesn't have a quick way out if the data is already sorted; it always does $n*(n-1)/2$ comparisons.

InsertionSort

InsertionSort maintains a sorted portion of the array (the front) and inserts elements from the unsorted portion into it.

```
public static <E extends Comparable<? super E>>void
    InsertionSort(E[] array ) {
    for (int p = 1; p < array.length; p++) {
        // p is the start of the unsorted portion
        E item = array[p];
        int j ;
        for ( j=p; j > 0 && item.compareTo(array[j-1]) < 0; j--)
            array[j] = array[j-1];
        array[j]= item;
    }
}
```

Original data

| | | | | | | |
|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|
| 33 | 12 | 45 | 17 | 23 | 52 | 24 |
|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|

| | | | | | | |
|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|
| 12 | 33 | 45 | 17 | 23 | 52 | 24 |
|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|

| | | | | | | |
|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|
| 12 | 33 | 45 | 17 | 23 | 52 | 24 |
|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|

| | | | | | | |
|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|
| 12 | 17 | 33 | 45 | 23 | 52 | 24 |
|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|

| | | | | | | |
|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|
| 12 | 17 | 23 | 33 | 45 | 52 | 24 |
|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|

| | | | | | | |
|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|
| 12 | 17 | 23 | 33 | 45 | 52 | 24 |
|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|

| | | | | | | |
|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|
| 12 | 17 | 23 | 24 | 33 | 45 | 52 |
|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|

The sorted portion of the array is in blue.

It is easy to see that InsertionSort is no worse than $O(n^2)$ -- the outer loop runs n times, and the inner loop also takes at most n steps -- n steps done n times gives a total of n^2 steps.

The worst case is when the data is reverse-sorted (biggest to smallest); the first pass does 1 comparison, the second 2, and so forth.

Altogether this does $1+2+3+\dots+(n-1) = n(n-1)/2$ comparisons.

Question: Suppose you use InsertionSort on an array of size n that is already sorted. How many comparisons will the sorting algorithm do?

- A. None
- B. 1
- C. $O(n)$
- D. $O(n^2)$

Answer C: $O(n)$

If the data is already sorted, each pass does only one comparison and one assignment statement, so the algorithm runs in $O(n)$ steps.

InsertionSort is a good choice if you have a small amount of data to sort; it tends to be faster than the other simple sorts and is easy to implement.

If you want to sort data the size of the NY phone book, InsertionSort is a terrible choice. There are sorting algorithms that are $O(n \cdot \log(n))$, which is vastly better than $O(n^2)$ when n is large.