Lecture 6: Expected Running Time of Quick-Sort

(CLRS 7.3-7.4, (C.2))

May 23rd, 2002

1 Quick-sort review

- Last time we discussed quick-sort.
 - Quick-Sort is "opposite" of merge-sort
 - Obtained using divide-and-conquer
- Abstract algorithm
 - Divide A[1...n] into subarrays A' = A[1..q 1] and A'' = A[q + 1...n] such that all elements in A'' are larger than A[q] and all elements in A' are smaller than A[q].
 - Recursively sort A' and A".
 - (nothing to combine/merge. A already sorted after sorting A' and A")
- Pseudo code:

```
PARTITION(A, p, r)
x = A[r]
i = p - 1
FOR j = p TO r - 1 DO
    IF A[j] \leq x THEN
         i = i + 1
         Exchange A[i] and A[j]
     \mathbf{FI}
OD
Exchange A[i+1] and A[r]
RETURN i + 1
QUICKSORT(A, p, r)
IF p < r THEN
     q = PARTITION(A, p, r)
     QUICKSORT(A, p, q - 1)
     QUICKSORT(A, q+1, r)
\mathbf{FI}
```

Sort using Quicksort(A, 1, n)

- Analysis :
 - PARTITION runs in $\Theta(r-p)$ time.
 - If array is always partitioned nicely in two halves (partition returns $q = \frac{r-p}{2}$), we have the recurrence $T(n) = 2T(n/2) + \Theta(n) \Rightarrow T(n) = \Theta(n \lg n)$.
 - But in the worst case, PARTITION always returns q = p (when input is sorted) and in this case we get the recurrence $T(n) = T(n-1) + T(1) + \Theta(n) \Rightarrow T(n) = \Theta(n^2)$ What's maybe even worse is that the worst-case happens when the data is already sorted.
- Quick-sort "often" perform well in practice and last time we started trying to justify this theoretically.
 - We saw that even if all the splits are relatively bad (we looked at the case $\frac{9}{10}n$, $\frac{1}{10}n$) we still get worst-case running time $O(n \log n)$.
 - To justify it further we define average and expected running time.

2 Average and Expected Running Time (Randomized Algorithms)

• We are normally interested in *worst-case* running time of an algorithm, that is, the maximal running time over all input of size n

$$T(n) = \max_{|X|=n} T(X)$$

• We are sometimes interested in analyzing the *average-case* running time of an algorithm, that is, the *expected* value for the running time, over all input of size n

$$T_a(n) = E_{|X|=n}[T(n)] = \sum_{|X|=n} T(X) \cdot Pr[X]$$

- The problem is that we often don't know the probability Pr[X] of getting a particular input X.
 - Sometime we assume that all possible inputs are equally likely, but thats often not very realistic in practice.
- Instead of using average case running time we therefore consider what we call *randomized algorithms*, that is, algorithms that make some random choices during their execution
 - Running time of normal *deterministic* algorithm only depend on he input configuration.
 - Running time of randomized algorithm depend not only on input configuration but also on the random choices made by the algorithm.
 - Running time of a randomized algorithm is not fixed for a given input!
- We are often interested in analyzing the *worst-case expected* running time of a randomized algorithm, that is, the maximal of the average running times for all inputs of size n

$$T_e(n) = \max_{|X|=n} E[T(X)]$$

3 Randomized Quick-Sort

• We could analyze quick-sort assuming that we are sorting numbers 1 through n and that all n! different input configurations are equally likely.

- Average running time would be $T_a(n) = O(n \log n)$.

- The assumption that all inputs are equally likely are not very realistic (data tend to be somewhat sorted).
- We can enforce that all n! permutations are equally likely by randomly permuting the input before the algorithm
 - Most computers have pseudo-random number generator random(1,n) returning "random" number between 1 and n
 - Using pseudo-random number generator we can generate random permutation (all n! permutations equally likely) in O(n) time:

Choose element in A[1] randomly among elements in A[1..n], choose element in A[2] randomly among elements in A[2..n], choose element in A[3] randomly among elements in A[3..n], and so on.

(Note: Just choosing A[i] randomly among elements A[1..n] for all i will not give random permutation!)

• Alternatively we can modify PARTITION sightly and exchange last element in A with random element in A before partitioning

 $\begin{array}{l} \operatorname{RandPartition}(A,p,r) \\ i= \operatorname{Random}(p,r) \\ \operatorname{Exchange} A[r] \text{ and } A[i] \\ \operatorname{RETURN} \operatorname{Partition}(A,p,r) \end{array}$

RandQuicksort(A, p, r)IF p < r THEN q=RandPartition(A, p, r)

RandQuicksort(A, p, q - 1)

RANDQUICKSORT(A, q+1, r)

 \mathbf{FI}

4 Expected Running Time of Randomized Quick-Sort

- Running time of RANDQUICKSORT is dominated by the time spent in PARTITION procedure.
- PARTITION is called n times
 - The pivot element x is not included in any recursive calls.
- One call of PARTITION takes O(1) time plus time proportional to the number of iterations of FOR-loop.

- In each iteration of FOR-loop we compare an element with the pivot element.

∜

If X is the number of comparisons $A[j] \leq x$ performed in PARTITION over the entire execution of RANDQUICKSORT then the running time is O(n + X).

- To analyze the expected running time we need to compute E[X]
 - To compute X we use z_1, z_2, \ldots, z_n to denote the elements in A where z_i is the *i*th smallest element. We also use Z_{ij} to denote $\{z_i, z_{i+1}, \ldots, z_j\}$.
 - Each pair of elements z_i and z_j are compared at most ones (when either of them is the pivot)

$$\downarrow X = \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \sum_{j=i+1}^{n} X_{ij} \text{ where}$$

$$X_{ij} = \begin{cases}
1 & \text{If } z_i \text{ compared to } z_i \\
0 & \text{If } z_i \text{ not compared to } z_i$$

$$\downarrow E[X] = E\left[\sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \sum_{j=i+1}^{n} X_{ij}\right]$$

$$= \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \sum_{j=i+1}^{n} E[X_{ij}]$$

$$= \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \sum_{j=i+1}^{n} Pr[z_i \text{ compared to } z_j]$$

- To compute $Pr[z_i \text{ compared to } z_j]$ it is useful to consider when two elements are *not* compared.

Example: Consider an input consisting of numbers 1 through n.

Assume first pivot it $7 \Rightarrow$ first partition separates the numbers into sets $\{1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6\}$ and $\{8, 9, 10\}$.

In partitioning, 7 is compared to all numbers. No number from the first set will ever be compared to a number from the second set.

In general, once a pivot $x, z_i < x < z_j$, is chosen, we know that z_i and z_j cannot later be compared.

On the other hand, if z_i is chosen as pivot before any other element in Z_{ij} then it is compared to each element in Z_{ij} . Similar for z_j .

In example: 7 and 9 are compared because 7 is first item from $Z_{7,9}$ to be chosen as pivot, and 2 and 9 are not compared because the first pivot in $Z_{2,9}$ is 7.

Prior to an element in Z_{ij} being chosen as pivot, the set Z_{ij} is together in the same partition \Rightarrow any element in Z_{ij} is equally likely to be first element chosen as pivot \Rightarrow the probability that z_i or z_j is chosen first in Z_{ij} is $\frac{1}{j-i+1}$

∜

$$Pr[z_i \text{ compared to } z_j] = \frac{2}{j-i+1}$$

– We now have:

$$E[X] = \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \sum_{j=i+1}^{n} \Pr[z_i \text{ compared to } z_j] \\ = \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \sum_{j=i+1}^{n} \frac{2}{j-i+1} \\ = \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \sum_{k=1}^{n-i} \frac{2}{k+1} \\ < \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \sum_{k=1}^{n-i} \frac{2}{k} \\ = \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} O(\log n) \\ = O(n \log n)$$

• Next time we will see how to make quick-sort run in worst-case $O(n \log n)$ time.