7 Quicksort

The quicksort algorithm has a worst-case running time of $\Theta(n^2)$ on an input array of $n$ numbers. Despite this slow worst-case running time, quicksort is often the best practical choice for sorting because it is remarkably efficient on the average: its expected running time is $\Theta(n \lg n)$, and the constant factors hidden in the $\Theta(n \lg n)$ notation are quite small. It also has the advantage of sorting in place (see page 17), and it works well even in virtual-memory environments.

Section 7.1 describes the algorithm and an important subroutine used by quicksort for partitioning. Because the behavior of quicksort is complex, we start with an intuitive discussion of its performance in Section 7.2 and postpone its precise analysis to the end of the chapter. Section 7.3 presents a version of quicksort that uses random sampling. This algorithm has a good expected running time, and no particular input elicits its worst-case behavior. Section 7.4 analyzes the randomized algorithm, showing that it runs in $\Theta(n^2)$ time in the worst case and, assuming distinct elements, in expected $O(n \lg n)$ time.

7.1 Description of quicksort

Quicksort, like merge sort, applies the divide-and-conquer paradigm introduced in Section 2.3.1. Here is the three-step divide-and-conquer process for sorting a typical subarray $A[p..r]$:

Divide: Partition (rearrange) the array $A[p..r]$ into two (possibly empty) subarrays $A[p..q-1]$ and $A[q+1..r]$ such that each element of $A[p..q-1]$ is less than or equal to $A[q]$, which is, in turn, less than or equal to each element of $A[q+1..r]$. Compute the index $q$ as part of this partitioning procedure.

Conquer: Sort the two subarrays $A[p..q-1]$ and $A[q+1..r]$ by recursive calls to quicksort.
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Combine: Because the subarrays are already sorted, no work is needed to combine them: the entire array \( A[p..r] \) is now sorted.

The following procedure implements quicksort:

\[
\text{QUICKSORT}(A, p, r) \\
1 \quad \text{if } p < r \\
2 \quad \quad q = \text{PARTITION}(A, p, r) \\
3 \quad \quad \text{QUICKSORT}(A, p, q - 1) \\
4 \quad \quad \text{QUICKSORT}(A, q + 1, r)
\]

To sort an entire array \( A \), the initial call is \( \text{QUICKSORT}(A, 1, A.length) \).

Partitioning the array

The key to the algorithm is the \text{PARTITION} procedure, which rearranges the subarray \( A[p..r] \) in place.

\[
\text{PARTITION}(A, p, r) \\
1 \quad x = A[r] \\
2 \quad i = p - 1 \\
3 \quad \text{for } j = p \text{ to } r - 1 \\
4 \quad \quad \text{if } A[j] \leq x \\
5 \quad \quad \quad i = i + 1 \\
6 \quad \quad \text{exchange } A[i] \text{ with } A[j] \\
7 \quad \text{exchange } A[i + 1] \text{ with } A[r] \\
8 \quad \text{return } i + 1
\]

Figure 7.1 shows how \text{PARTITION} works on an 8-element array. \text{PARTITION} always selects an element \( x = A[r] \) as a pivot element around which to partition the subarray \( A[p..r] \). As the procedure runs, it partitions the array into four (possibly empty) regions. At the start of each iteration of the \textbf{for} loop in lines 3–6, the regions satisfy certain properties, shown in Figure 7.2. We state these properties as a loop invariant:

At the beginning of each iteration of the loop of lines 3–6, for any array index \( k \),

1. If \( p \leq k \leq i \), then \( A[k] \leq x \).
2. If \( i + 1 \leq k \leq j - 1 \), then \( A[k] > x \).
3. If \( k = r \), then \( A[k] = x \).
Figure 7.1 The operation of PARTITION on a sample array. Array entry $A[r]$ becomes the pivot element $x$. Lightly shaded array elements are all in the first partition with values no greater than $x$. Heavily shaded elements are in the second partition with values greater than $x$. The unshaded elements have not yet been put in one of the first two partitions, and the final white element is the pivot $x$. (a) The initial array and variable settings. None of the elements have been placed in either of the first two partitions. (b) The value 2 is "swapped with itself" and put in the partition of smaller values. (c)-(d) The values 8 and 7 are added to the partition of larger values. (e) The values 1 and 8 are swapped, and the smaller partition grows. (f) The values 3 and 7 are swapped, and the smaller partition grows. (g)-(h) The larger partition grows to include 5 and 6, and the loop terminates. (i) In lines 7–8, the pivot element is swapped so that it lies between the two partitions.

The indices between $j$ and $r - 1$ are not covered by any of the three cases, and the values in these entries have no particular relationship to the pivot $x$.

We need to show that this loop invariant is true prior to the first iteration, that each iteration of the loop maintains the invariant, and that the invariant provides a useful property to show correctness when the loop terminates.
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Figure 7.2 The four regions maintained by the procedure PARTITION on a subarray \(A[p..r]\). The values in \(A[p..i]\) are all less than or equal to \(x\); the values in \(A[i+1..j-1]\) are all greater than \(x\), and \(A[r] = x\). The subarray \(A[i..r-1]\) can take on any values.

**Initialization:** Prior to the first iteration of the loop, \(i = p - 1\) and \(j = p\). Because no values lie between \(p\) and \(i\) and no values lie between \(j + 1\) and \(j - 1\), the first two conditions of the loop invariant are trivially satisfied. The assignment in line 1 satisfies the third condition.

**Maintenance:** As Figure 7.3 shows, we consider two cases, depending on the outcome of the test in line 4. Figure 7.3(a) shows what happens when \(A[j] > x\); the only action in the loop is to increment \(j\). After \(j\) is incremented, condition 2 holds for \(A[j-1]\) and all other entries remain unchanged. Figure 7.3(b) shows what happens when \(A[j] \leq x\); the loop increments \(i\), swaps \(A[i]\) and \(A[j]\), and then increments \(j\). Because of the swap, we now have that \(A[i] \leq x\), and condition 1 is satisfied. Similarly, we also have that \(A[j-1] > x\), since the item that was swapped into \(A[j-1]\) is, by the loop invariant, greater than \(x\).

**Termination:** At termination, \(j = r\). Therefore, every entry in the array is in one of the three sets described by the invariant, and we have partitioned the values in the array into three sets: those less than or equal to \(x\), those greater than \(x\), and a singleton set containing \(x\).

The final two lines of PARTITION finish up by swapping the pivot element with the leftmost element greater than \(x\), thereby moving the pivot into its correct place in the partitioned array, and then returning the pivot’s new index. The output of PARTITION now satisfies the specifications given for the divide step. In fact, it satisfies a slightly stronger condition: after line 2 of QUICKSORT, \(A[q]\) is strictly less than every element of \(A[q+1..r]\).

The running time of PARTITION on the subarray \(A[p..r]\) is \(\Theta(n)\), where \(n = r - p + 1\) (see Exercise 7.1-3).

**Exercises**

**7.1-1**
Using Figure 7.1 as a model, illustrate the operation of PARTITION on the array \(A = (13, 19, 9, 5, 12, 8, 7, 4, 21, 2, 6, 11)\).
Figure 7.3 The two cases for one iteration of procedure PARTITION. (a) If $A[j] > x$, the only action is to increment $j$, which maintains the loop invariant. (b) If $A[j] \leq x$, index $i$ is incremented, $A[i]$ and $A[j]$ are swapped, and then $j$ is incremented. Again, the loop invariant is maintained.

### 7.1-2
What value of $q$ does PARTITION return when all elements in the array $A[p..r]$ have the same value? Modify PARTITION so that $q = \lfloor (p + r)/2 \rfloor$ when all elements in the array $A[p..r]$ have the same value.

### 7.1-3
Give a brief argument that the running time of PARTITION on a subarray of size $n$ is $O(n)$.

### 7.1-4
How would you modify QUICKSORT to sort into nonincreasing order?

### 7.2 Performance of quicksort

The running time of quicksort depends on whether the partitioning is balanced or unbalanced, which in turn depends on which elements are used for partitioning. If the partitioning is balanced, the algorithm runs asymptotically as fast as merge
sort. If the partitioning is unbalanced, however, it can run asymptotically as slowly as insertion sort. In this section, we shall informally investigate how quicksort performs under the assumptions of balanced versus unbalanced partitioning.

Worst-case partitioning

The worst-case behavior for quicksort occurs when the partitioning routine produces one subproblem with \( n - 1 \) elements and one with 0 elements. (We prove this claim in Section 7.4.1.) Let us assume that this unbalanced partitioning arises in each recursive call. The partitioning costs \( \Theta(n) \) time. Since the recursive call on an array of size 0 just returns, \( T(0) = \Theta(1) \), and the recurrence for the running time is

\[
T(n) = T(n-1) + T(0) + \Theta(n) = T(n-1) + \Theta(n)
\]

Intuitively, if we sum the costs incurred at each level of the recursion, we get an arithmetic series (equation (A.2)), which evaluates to \( \Theta(n^2) \). Indeed, it is straightforward to use the substitution method to prove that the recurrence \( T(n) = T(n-1) + \Theta(n) \) has the solution \( T(n) = \Theta(n^2) \). (See Exercise 7.2-1.)

Thus, if the partitioning is maximally unbalanced at every recursive level of the algorithm, the running time is \( \Theta(n^2) \). Therefore the worst-case running time of quicksort is no better than that of insertion sort. Moreover, the \( \Theta(n^2) \) running time occurs when the input array is already completely sorted—a common situation in which insertion sort runs in \( O(n) \) time.

Best-case partitioning

In the most even possible split, \textsc{Partition} produces two subproblems, each of size no more than \( n/2 \), since one is of size \( \lceil n/2 \rceil \) and one of size \( \lfloor n/2 \rfloor - 1 \). In this case, quicksort runs much faster. The recurrence for the running time is then

\[
T(n) = 2T(n/2) + \Theta(n)
\]

where we tolerate the sloppiness from ignoring the floor and ceiling and from subtracting 1. By case 2 of the master theorem (Theorem 4.1), this recurrence has the solution \( T(n) = \Theta(n \log n) \). By equally balancing the two sides of the partition at every level of the recursion, we get an asymptotically faster algorithm.

Balanced partitioning

The average-case running time of quicksort is much closer to the best case than to the worst case, as the analyses in Section 7.4 will show. The key to understand-
Figure 7.4 A recursion tree for QUICKSORT in which PARTITION always produces a 9-to-1 split, yielding a running time of $O(n \lg n)$. Nodes show subproblem sizes, with per-level costs on the right. The per-level costs include the constant $c$ implicit in the $\Theta(n)$ term.

The key to understanding why is to understand how the balance of the partitioning is reflected in the recurrence that describes the running time.

Suppose, for example, that the partitioning algorithm always produces a 9-to-1 proportional split, which at first blush seems quite unbalanced. We then obtain the recurrence

$$T(n) = T(9n/10) + T(n/10) + cn ,$$

on the running time of quicksort, where we have explicitly included the constant $c$ hidden in the $\Theta(n)$ term. Figure 7.4 shows the recursion tree for this recurrence. Notice that every level of the tree has cost $cn$, until the recursion reaches a boundary condition at depth $\log_{10} n = \Theta(\lg n)$, and then the levels have cost at most $cn$. The recursion terminates at depth $\log_{10/9} n = \Theta(\lg n)$. The total cost of quicksort is therefore $O(n \lg n)$. Thus, with a 9-to-1 proportional split at every level of recursion, which intuitively seems quite unbalanced, quicksort runs in $O(n \lg n)$ time— asymptotically the same as if the split were right down the middle. Indeed, even a 99-to-1 split yields an $O(n \lg n)$ running time. In fact, any split of constant proportionality yields a recursion tree of depth $\Theta(\lg n)$, where the cost at each level is $O(n)$. The running time is therefore $O(n \lg n)$ whenever the split has constant proportionality.
Figure 7.5  (a) Two levels of a recursion tree for quicksort. The partitioning at the root costs \( n \) and produces a "bad" split: two subarrays of sizes 0 and \( n - 1 \). The partitioning of the subarray of size \( n - 1 \) costs \( n - 1 \) and produces a "good" split: subarrays of size \((n - 1)/2 - 1\) and \((n - 1)/2\). (b) A single level of a recursion tree that is very well balanced. In both parts, the partitioning cost for the subproblems shown with elliptical shading is \( \Theta(n) \). Yet the subproblems remaining to be solved in (a), shown with square shading, are no larger than the corresponding subproblems remaining to be solved in (b).

Intuition for the average case

To develop a clear notion of the randomized behavior of quicksort, we must make an assumption about how frequently we expect to encounter the various inputs. The behavior of quicksort depends on the relative ordering of the values in the array elements given as the input, and not by the particular values in the array. As in our probabilistic analysis of the hiring problem in Section 5.2, we will assume for now that all permutations of the input numbers are equally likely.

When we run quicksort on a random input array, the partitioning is highly unlikely to happen in the same way at every level, as our informal analysis has assumed. We expect that some of the splits will be reasonably well balanced and that some will be fairly unbalanced. For example, Exercise 7.2-6 asks you to show that about 80 percent of the time \textsc{partition} produces a split that is more balanced than 9 to 1, and about 20 percent of the time it produces a split that is less balanced than 9 to 1.

In the average case, \textsc{partition} produces a mix of "good" and "bad" splits. In a recursion tree for an average-case execution of \textsc{partition}, the good and bad splits are distributed randomly throughout the tree. Suppose, for the sake of intuition, that the good and bad splits alternate levels in the tree, and that the good splits are best-case splits and the bad splits are worst-case splits. Figure 7.5(a) shows the splits at two consecutive levels in the recursion tree. At the root of the tree, the cost is \( n \) for partitioning, and the subarrays produced have sizes \( n - 1 \) and 0: the worst case. At the next level, the subarray of size \( n - 1 \) undergoes best-case partitioning into subarrays of size \((n - 1)/2 - 1\) and \((n - 1)/2\). Let's assume that the boundary-condition cost is 1 for the subarray of size 0.