# Informal Analysis of Merge Sort

- suppose the running time (the number of operations) of merge sort is a function of the number of elements to sort
  - ▶ let the function be *T*(*n*)
- merge sort works by splitting the list into two sub-lists (each about half the size of the original list) and sorting the sub-lists
  - this takes 2T(n/2) running time
- then the sub-lists are merged
  - this takes O(n) running time
- total running time T(n) = 2T(n/2) + O(n)

- $T(n) \rightarrow 2T(n/2) + O(n)$ 
  - $\approx 2T(n/2) + n$
  - = 2[2T(n/4) + n/2] + n
  - = **4**T(n/4) + **2**n
  - = 4[2T(n/8) + n/4] + 2n
  - = 8*T*(*n*/8) + 3*n*
  - = 8[2T(n/16) + n/8] + 3n
  - = 16T(n/16) + 4n=  $2^{k}T(n/2^{k}) + kn$

*T*(*n*) approaches...

$$T(n) = 2^k T(n/2^k) + kn$$

- for a list of length 1 we know T(1) = 1
  - if we can substitute T(1) into the right-hand side of T(n) we might be able to solve the recurrence
  - we have T(n/2<sup>k</sup>) on the right-hand side, so we need to find some value of k such that

$$n/2^k = 1 \implies 2^k = n \implies k = \log_2(n)$$

$$T(n) = 2^{\log_2 n} T(n/2^{\log_2 n}) + n \log_2 n$$
  
=  $n T(1) + n \log_2 n$   
=  $n + n \log_2 n$   
 $\in n \log_2 n$ 

# Proof for $O(n \log_2 n)$

- $n < n \log_2 n$  for n > 2
- $\therefore n + n \log_2 n < 2n \log_2 n \qquad \text{for } n > 2$

- $\therefore n + n \log_2 n < Mn \log_2 n \qquad \text{for } n > m$ is true for M = 2 and m = 2
- $\therefore n + n \log_2 n \in O(n \log_2 n)$

#### Recursion

#### notes Chapter 8

## Is Merge Sort Efficient?

 consider a simpler (non-recursive) sorting algorithm called insertion sort

```
// to sort an array a[0]..a[n-1] not Java
for i = 0 to (n-1) {
   k = index of smallest element in sub-array a[i]..a[n-1]
   swap a[i] and a[k]
}
```

for $i = 0$ to $(n-1)$ {		not Java
for j = (i+1) to (n-1) { if (a[j] < a[i]) {	find smallest element	1 comparison + 1 assignment
} tmp = a[i]; a[i] = a[k]; }	a[k] = tmp;	3 assignments

$$T(n) = \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \left( \left( \sum_{j=i+1}^{n-1} 2 \right) + 3 \right)$$
  
=  $\left( \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \left( 2(n-1-(i+1)+1) \right) \right) + \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} 3$   
=  $\left( \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} 2(n-i-1) \right) + 3n$   
=  $\left( 2 \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} n \right) - \left( 2 \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} i \right) - \left( 2 \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} 1 \right) + 3n$   
=  $2n^2 - 2 \frac{n(n-1)}{2} - 2n + 3n$   
=  $2n^2 - n^2 + n - 2n + 3n$   
=  $n^2 + 2n \in O(n^2)$ 

## **Comparing Rates of Growth**



## Comments

- big O complexity tells you something about the running time of an algorithm as the size of the input, n, approaches infinity
  - we say that it describes the limiting, or asymptotic, running time of an algorithm
- for small values of n it is often the case that a less efficient algorithm (in terms of big O) will run faster than a more efficient one
  - insertion sort is typically faster than merge sort for short lists of numbers

## Revisiting the Fibonacci Numbers

the recursive implementation based on the definition of the Fibonacci numbers is inefficient

```
public static int fibonacci(int n) {
    if (n == 0) {
        return 0;
    }
    else if (n == 1) {
        return 1;
    }
    int f = fibonacci(n - 1) + fibonacci(n - 2);
    return f;
}
```

- how inefficient is it?
- let *T*(*n*) be the running time to compute the *n*th Fibonacci number
  - ► T(0) = T(1) = 1
  - ► *T*(*n*) is a recurrence relation

$$T(n) = T(n-1) + T(n-2)$$
  
=  $(T(n-2) + T(n-3)) + T(n-2)$   
=  $2T(n-2) + T(n-3)$   
>  $2T(n-2)$   
>  $2(2T(n-4)) = 4T(n-4)$   
>  $4(2T(n-6)) = 8T(n-6)$   
>  $8(2T(n-8)) = 16T(n-8)$   
>  $2^kT(n-2k)$ 

 $T(n) > 2^k T(\underline{n-2k})$ 

- we know T(1) = 1
  - if we can substitute T(1) into the right-hand side of T(n) we might be able to solve the recurrence
  - we have T(n 2k) so we need to find a value for k such that:

$$\underline{n-2k} = 1 \implies 1+2k = n \implies k = (n-1)/2$$
$$T(n) > 2^k T(n-2k) = 2^{(n-1)/2} T(1) = 2^{(n-1)/2} \in O(2^n)$$

a problem easily solved using recursion



- move the stack of *n* disks from A to C
  - can move one disk at a time from the top of one stack onto another stack
  - cannot move a larger disk onto a smaller disk

- legend says that the world will end when a 64 disk version of the puzzle is solved
- several appearances in pop culture
  - Doctor Who
  - Rise of the Planet of the Apes
  - Survior: South Pacific

#### ▶ n = 1



#### move disk from A to C

#### ▶ n = 1



▶ n = 2



#### move disk from A to B

▶ n = 2



#### move disk from A to C

▶ n = 2



#### • move disk from B to C

▶ n = 2



▶ n = 3



#### move disk from A to C

▶ n = 3



#### move disk from A to B

▶ n = 3



#### move disk from C to B

▶ n = 3



#### move disk from A to C

▶ n = 3



#### move disk from B to A

▶ n = 3



#### move disk from B to C

28

▶ n = 3



#### move disk from A to C

▶ n = 3



▶ n = 4



▶ move (n – 1) disks from A to B using C

▶ n = 4



#### move disk from A to C

▶ n = 4



▶ move (n – 1) disks from B to C using A

▶ n = 4



#### • base case n = 1

- 1. move disk from A to C
- recursive case
  - 1. move (n 1) disks from A to B
  - 2. move 1 disk from A to C
  - 3. move (n 1) disks from B to C

```
public static void move(int n,
                         String from,
                         String to,
                         String using) {
  if(n == 1) {
    System.out.println("move disk from " + from + " to " + to);
  }
  else {
    move(n - 1, from, using, to);
    move(1, from, to, using);
    move(n - 1, using, to, from);
  }
```

}