

Alan G. Labouseur, Ph.D. Alan.Labouseur@Marist.edu

Imagine a data structure containing 9 billion **unordered** names

# 1	Peart
# 2	Schock
# 3	Crump
• · · • · · • · · • · · • · · • · · • · ·	
# 8,999,999,998	White
# 8,999,999,999	Purdie
# 9,000,000,000	Bruford

Imagine a data structure containing 9 billion **unordered** names and we want to locate **one** of them.



Imagine a data structure containing 9 billion **unordered** names



Sometimes we will find the target person early.

Imagine a data structure containing 9 billion **unordered** names



Sometimes we will find the target person early. Sometimes we will find the target person late.

Imagine a data structure containing 9 billion unordered names.

check	#	1			Pe	art
check	#	2			Sc	hock
check	#	3			Cr	rump
•						
•						
•						
check	#	8,9	99,999	9,998	Wh	ite
check	#	8,9	99,999	9,999	Pu	rdie
check	#	9,0	00,00	0,000	Br	uford

This is called Linear Search or Sequential Search

Sometimes we will find the target person early. Sometimes we will find the target person late.

Q: What's the average — or expected — case for *n* items?

Imagine a data structure containing 9 billion unordered names.

check	#	1			Pe	art
check	#	2			Sc	hock
check	#	3			Cr	rump
•						
•						
•						
check	#	8,9	99,999	9,998	Wh	ite
check	#	8,9	99,999	9,999	Ρι	Irdie
check	#	9,0	00,00	0,000	Br	uford

Sometimes we will find the target person early. Sometimes we will find the target person late.

Q: What's the average — or expected — case for *n* items?
A: The expected case is ¹/₂ *n*, which requires examining 4.5B rows in this example.

Imagine a data structure containing 9 billion unordered names.

check	#	1			Pe	art
check	#	2			Sc	hock
check	#	3			Cr	rump
•						
•						
•						
check	#	8,9	99,999	9,998	Wh	ite
check	#	8,9	99,999	9,999	Pu	rdie
check	#	9,0	00,00	0,000	Br	uford

That's O(n). Best case O(1)Worst case O(n)

Average case O(n)

Recurrence: T(n) = T(n-1) + c

Sometimes we will find the target person early. Sometimes we will find the target person late.

Q: What's the average — or expected — case for *n* items? A: The expected case is ½ *n*, which requires examining 4.5B rows in this example.

Imagine a data structure containing 9 billion unordered names.

check	#	1			Pear	t
check	#	2			Scho	ck
check	#	3			Crum	0
•						
•						
•						
check	#	8,9	99,999	9,998	White	9
check	#	8,9	99,999	9,999	Purd	ie
check	#	9,0	00,00	0,000	Bruf	ord

That's O(n).

Best case	O(1)
Worst case	O(<i>n</i>)
Average case	O(<i>n</i>)

Recurrence: T(n) = T(n-1) + c

LIST-SEARCH(L, k)1 x = L.head2 while $x \neq$ NIL and $x.key \neq k$ 3 x = x.next4 return x

To search a list of *n* objects, the LIST-SEARCH procedure takes $\Theta(n)$ time in the worst case, since it may have to search the entire list.

CLRS 3e p.237

Imagine a data structure containing 9 billion unordered names.

check check check	# # #	1 2 3			Pe Sc Cr	art hock ump
• • • • •						
check	#	8,9	99,999	9,998	Wh	ite
check	#	8,9	99,999	9,999	Pu	rdie
check	#	9,0	00,00	0,000	Br	uford

That's O(n).

Best case	O(1)
Worst case	O(<i>n</i>)
Average case	O(<i>n</i>)

Can we do better?

LIST-SEARCH(L, k)1 x = L.head2 while $x \neq$ NIL and $x.key \neq k$ 3 x = x.next4 return x

To search a list of *n* objects, the LIST-SEARCH procedure takes $\Theta(n)$ time in the worst case, since it may have to search the entire list.

CLRS 3e p.237

Searching 9 billion people

What if we could **search** through **sorted** data?

After all, we are good at sorting...

... in $O(n^2)$ time — Selection and Insertion sort

... in $O(n \log_2 n)$ time — Merge sort and Quicksort

Searching 9 billion people

What if we could **search** through **sorted** data?

check check check	# 1 # 2 # 3			Br Cr Pe	uford ump art
check check check	# 8,9 # 8,9 # 9,0	99,999 99,999 00,00),998),999 0,000	Pu So Wh	rdie chock nite

How would you do it? What's your strategy?

Want to play a number guessing game?

Searching 9 billion people

What if we could **search** through **sorted** data?

check check check	# 1 # 2 # 3			Bruforo Crump Peart
•				
check	# 8,9	99,99	9,998	Purdie
check	# 8,9	99,99	9,999	Schock
check	# 9,0	00,00	0,000	White

We could pick from the middle. If that's not our target, then we **exclude** the *lower* or *upper* **half of the data**, depending on whether our target is greater or lesser than the value we picked. Then we pick the middle of the remaining half. Repeat.

Have we seen this before?

Divide and . . .

Take a big problem and divide it into two smaller problems. Take a those problems and divide them into two smaller problems. Take a those problems and divide them into two smaller problems. Take a those problems and divide them into two smaller problems. Take a those problems and divide them into two smaller problems.

Take a those problems and divide them into two smaller problems.

... until the problems get small enough that they are solved.

In this case, it's really just divide.

Let's consider **Binary Search**.













We could pick from the middle. If that's not our target, then we exclude the *lower* or *upper* half of the data, depending on whether our target is greater or lesser than the value we picked. Then we pick the middle of the remaining half. Repeat.



Q: What's the average or — expected — case for *n* rows?

We could pick from the middle. If that's not our target, then we exclude the *lower* or *upper* half of the data, depending on whether our target is greater or lesser than the value we picked. Then we pick the middle of the remaining half. Repeat.



Q: What's the average or — expected — case for *n* rows? A: The expected case is **log**₂ *n*, because we cut it in half each time.

What if we could search through **sorted** data?

check	#	1			Br	uford
check	#	2			Cr	ump
check	#	3			Pe	art
0		0				
•						
•						
check	#	8,9	99,999	9,998	Pu	rdie
check	#	8,9	99,999	,999	Sc	hock
check	#	9,0	00,00	0,000	Wh	ite

We could pick from the middle. If that's not our target, then we exclude the *lower* or *upper* half of the data, depending on whether our target is greater or lesser than the value we picked. Then we pick the middle of the remaining half. Repeat.

Q: What's the average or - expected - case for n rows? A: The expected case is $\log_2 n$. By the way, $\log_2 9B$ is . . . ?

What if we could search through **sorted** data?

check # 2 Crump check # 3 Peart · Peart · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	check	# 1			Br	uford
check # 3 Peart	check	# 2			Cr	ump
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	check	#3			Pe	art
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	•					
\cdot check # 8 000 000 008 Purdie	•					
check # 8 000 000 008 Purdie	•					
	check	# 8,	999,99	9,998	Pu	rdie
check # 8,999,999,999 Schock	check	# 8,	999,99	9,999	Sc	hock
check # 9,000,000,000 White	check	# 9 ,	000,00	0,000	Wh	ite

We could pick from the middle. If that's not our target, then we exclude the *lower* or *upper* half of the data, depending on whether our target is greater or lesser than the value we picked. Then we pick the middle of the remaining half. Repeat.

Q: What's the average or — expected — case for *n* rows? A: The expected case is $\log_2 n$. By the way, $\log_2 9B$ is . . . 33

What if we could search through **sorted** data?

check check check	# # #	1 2 3			Bruford Crump Peart
•					
check	#	8,9	99,999	9,998	Purdie
check	# #	8,9 9,0	99,999 00,00	9,999 0,000	White

Now **that** is a better way! $\sqrt{33 < 4.5B}$

We could pick from the middle. If that's not our target, then we exclude the *lower* or *upper* half of the data, depending on whether our target is greater or lesser than the value we picked. Then we pick the middle of the remaining half. Repeat.

Q: What's the average or — expected — case for *n* rows? A: The expected case is $\log_2 n$. By the way, $\log_2 9B$ is ... 33

What if we could search through **sorted** data?

check check	# #	1 2			Bruford Crump
check	#	3			Peart
•					
check	#	8,9	99,999	9,998	Purdie
check	#	8,9	99,999	9,999	Schock
check	#	9,0	00,00	0,000	White

Binary Search is $O(\log_2 n)$.

Best case	O(1)
Worst case	$O(\log_2 n)$
Average case	$O(\log_2 n)$

Recurrence: $T(n) = T(\frac{n}{2}) + c$

We could pick from the middle. If that's not our target, then we exclude the *lower* or *upper* half of the data, depending on whether our target is greater or lesser than the value we picked. Then we pick the middle of the remaining half. Repeat.

Q: What's the average or — expected — case for *n* rows? A: The expected case is $\log_2 n$.

Binary Search Algorithm





which half of the table should be searched next, and the same procedure can be used again, comparing K to the middle key of the selected half, etc. After at most about $\log_2 N$ comparisons, we will have found the key or we will have established that it is not present. This procedure is sometimes known as "logarithmic search" or "bisection," but it is most commonly called binary search.

Although the basic idea of binary search is comparatively straightforward, the details can be somewhat tricky, and many good programmers have done it wrong the first few times they tried. One of the most popular correct forms of the algorithm makes use of two pointers, l and u, which indicate the current lower and upper limits for the search, as follows:

Algorithm B (Binary search). Given a table of records R_1, R_2, \ldots, R_N whose keys are in increasing order $K_1 < K_2 < \cdots < K_N$, this algorithm searches for a given argument K.

- **B1.** [Initialize.] Set $l \leftarrow 1, u \leftarrow N$.
- B2. [Get midpoint.] (At this point we know that if K is in the table, it satisfies $K_l \leq K \leq K_u$. A more precise statement of the situation appears in exercise 1 below.) If u < l, the algorithm terminates unsuccessfully. Otherwise, set $i \leftarrow \lfloor (l+u)/2 \rfloor$, the approximate midpoint of the relevant table area.
- B3. [Compare.] If $K < K_i$, go to B4; if $K > K_i$, go to B5; and if $K = K_i$, the algorithm terminates successfully.
- **B4.** [Adjust u.] Set $u \leftarrow i 1$ and return to B2.
- **B5.** [Adjust l.] Set $l \leftarrow i + 1$ and return to B2.

Figure 4 illustrates two cases of this binary search algorithm: first to search for the argument 653, which is present in the table, and then to search for 400,

Binary Search Algorithm

Here is an iterative version of Binary Search from the CLRS text.

BINARY-SEARCH(x, T, p, r)low = p1 $high = \max(p, r+1)$ 2 3 while low < high $mid = \lfloor (low + high)/2 \rfloor$ 4 5 if $x \leq T[mid]$ high = mid6 else low = mid + 17 8 return high

x - target
T - collection of data
p - start index
r - stop index

CLRS 3e p.799

Binary Search Algorithm

```
proc BinarySearch(A, start, stop, target)
midPoint = int((start+stop)/2) // round, ceil, floor?
if (start > stop)
    return false
else if (target == A[midPoint])
    return true
else if (target < A[midPoint])
    BinarySearch(A, start, midPoint-1, target)
else // target > A[midPoint] or not there at all
    BinarySearch(A, midPoint+1, stop, target)
end if
end proc
```

Here is a recursive version of Binary Search, with some issues:
(1) There are two exits. That's bad software craftsmanship.
(2) It does not return **where** the target is found, just that it is.
Fix these issues when you program your own version.



```
proc BinarySearch(A, start, stop, target)
midPoint = int((start+stop)/2) // round, ceil, floor?
if (start > stop)
    return false
else if (target == A[midPoint])
    return true
else if (target < A[midPoint])
    BinarySearch(A, start, midPoint-1, target)
else // target > A[midPoint] or not there at all
    BinarySearch(A, midPoint+1, stop, target)
end if
end proc
```

BinarySearch(A, 0, 7, 2)

















BinarySearch(A, 0, 7, 2)
BinarySearch(A, 0, 2, 2)

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
[0]	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]	[6]	[7]

```
proc BinarySearch(A, start, stop, target)
midPoint = int((start+stop)/2) // round, ceil, floor?
if (start > stop)
    return false
else if (target == A[midPoint])
    return true
else if (target < A[midPoint])
    BinarySearch(A, start, midPoint-1, target)
else // target > A[midPoint] or not there at all
    BinarySearch(A, midPoint+1, stop, target)
end if
end proc
```

BinarySearch(A, 0, 7, 2)
BinarySearch(A, 0, 2, 2)











proc BinarySearch(A, start, stop, target)
midPoint = int((start+stop)/2) // round, ceil, floor?
if (start > stop)
 return false
else if (target == A[midPoint])
 return true
else if (target < A[midPoint])
 BinarySearch(A, start, midPoint-1, target)
else // target > A[midPoint] or not there at all
 BinarySearch(A, midPoint+1, stop, target)
end if
end proc

BinarySearch(A, 0, 7, 2) BinarySearch(A, 0, 2, 2) → true



```
proc BinarySearch(A, start, stop, target)
  midPoint = int((start+stop)/2) // round, ceil, floor?
  if (start > stop)
    return false
  else if (target == A[midPoint])
    return true
  else if (target < A[midPoint])
    BinarySearch(A, start, midPoint-1, target) true
  else // target > A[midPoint] or not there at all
    BinarySearch(A, midPoint+1, stop, target)
  end if
end proc
```

BinarySearch(A, 0, 7, 2) → true
BinarySearch(A, 0, 2, 2) → true



```
proc BinarySearch(A, start, stop, target)
midPoint = int((start+stop)/2) // round, ceil, floor?
if (start > stop)
    return false
else if (target == A[midPoint])
    return true
else if (target < A[midPoint])
    BinarySearch(A, start, midPoint-1, target)
else // target > A[midPoint] or not there at all
    BinarySearch(A, midPoint+1, stop, target)
end if
end proc
```

BinarySearch(A, 0, 7, 2) → true
BinarySearch(A, 0, 2, 2) → true



```
proc BinarySearch(A, start, stop, target)
midPoint = int((start+stop)/2) // round, ceil, floor?
if (start > stop)
    return false
else if (target == A[midPoint])
    return true
else if (target < A[midPoint])
    BinarySearch(A, start, midPoint-1, target)
else // target > A[midPoint] or not there at all
    BinarySearch(A, midPoint+1, stop, target)
end if
end proc
```

BinarySearch(A, 0, 7, 2) → true
BinarySearch(A, 0, 2, 2) → true



```
proc BinarySearch(A, start, stop, target)
midPoint = int((start+stop)/2) // round, ceil, floor?
if (start > stop)
    return false
else if (target == A[midPoint])
    return true
else if (target < A[midPoint])
    BinarySearch(A, start, midPoint-1, target)
else // target > A[midPoint] or not there at all
    BinarySearch(A, midPoint+1, stop, target)
end if
end proc
```

Remember the issues:

(1) There are two exits. That's bad software craftsmanship.
 (2) It does not return **where** the target is found, just that it is.
 Fix these issues when you program your own version.