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- So far, merge sort and heapsort had with $O\left(n \log _{2} n\right)$ the best (worst-case) running time.
- Can we do better?We show: Not with comparison-based approaches!


## A13. Sorting: Lower Bound Crash Course: Binary Trees



- Binary tree: each node has at most two successor nodes.
- Nodes without successors are called leaves (Image: squares).
- The node without a predecessor (at the top) is the root.
- The depth of a leaf is the number of edges from the root to the leaf.

The maximal depth of a leaf in a binary tree with $k$ leaves is at least $\log _{2} k$.

## Abstract Behavior as Tree

Consider an arbitrary comparison-based sorting algorithm $A$.

- Its behavior only depends on the results of key comparisons
- For each key comparison, there are two possibilities how the algorithm proceeds.
- For an input of a given size, we can depict this graphically as a decision tree

- Execution of A corresponds to tracing a simple path from the root down to a leaf.


What does the algorithm have to be able to do?

- Assumption: all input elements distinct.
- Must sort all input sequences of size $n$ correctly.
- We can adapt all algorithms so that they trace from which position to which position they move the elements.
- Then the result is not the sorted array, but the corresponding permutation.
- Since all possible inputs of size $n$ must be sorted correctly, the algorithm must be able to generate all $n$ ! possible permutations.


## Lower Bound I

- Each leaf in the tree corresponds to one permutation.
- For input size $n$, the tree must thus have at least $n$ ! leaves.
- The maximal depth of a leaf in the tree is therefore $\geq \log _{2}(n!)$.
- There is an input of size $n$ with
$\geq \log _{2}(n!)$ key comparisons.


## Lower bound on $\log _{2}(n!)$

- It holds that $n!\geq\left(\frac{n}{2}\right)^{\frac{n}{2}}$
$4!=1 \cdot 2 \cdot \underset{\geq 2}{3} \cdot \underset{\geq 2}{4} \geq 2^{2}$
- $\log _{2}(n!) \geq \log _{2}\left(\left(\frac{n}{2}\right)^{\frac{n}{2}}\right)=\frac{n}{2} \log _{2}\left(\frac{n}{2}\right)$

$$
\begin{aligned}
& =\frac{n}{2}\left(\log _{2} n+\log _{2} \frac{1}{2}\right)=\frac{n}{2}\left(\log _{2} n-\log _{2} 2\right) \\
& =\frac{n}{2}\left(\log _{2} n-1\right)
\end{aligned}
$$

## Theorem

Every comparison-based sorting algorithm requires $\Omega(n \log n)$ many key comparisons. As a result, also the running time is $\Omega(n \log n)$.

Merge sort is asymptotically optimal.

# A13.2 Summary 



Summary

- Every comparison-based sorting algorithm has at least linearithmic running time.

