

In-place associative integer sorting

A. Emre CETIN

email: aemre.cetin@gmail.com

March 13, 2019

Abstract

A novel integer sorting technique is proposed replacing bucket sort, distribution counting sort and address calculation sort family of algorithms. It requires only constant amount of additional memory. The technique is inspired from one of the ordinal theories of “serial order in behavior” and explained by the analogy with the three main stages in the formation and retrieval of memory in cognitive neuroscience namely (i) *practicing*, (ii) *storing* and (iii) *retrieval*.

1 Introduction

Nervous system is considered to be closely related and described with the “serial order in behavior” in cognitive neuroscience [1,2] with three basic theories which cover almost all *abstract data types* used in computer science. These are [3],

Chaining theory is the extension of stimulus-response (reflex chain) theory, where each response can become the stimulus for the next. From an information processing perspective, comparison based sorting algorithms that sort the lists by making a series of decisions relying on comparing keys can be classified under chaining theory. Each comparison becomes the stimulus for the next. Hence, keys themselves are associated with each other. Some important examples are quick sort [4], shell sort [5], merge sort [6] and heap sort [7].

Positional theory assumes order is stored by associating each element with its position in the sequence. The order is retrieved by using each position to cue its associated element.

This is the method by which conventional (Von Neumann) computers store and retrieve order, through routines accessing separate addresses in memory. Content-based sorting algorithms where decisions rely on the contents of the keys can be classified under this theory. Each key is associated with a position depending on its content. Some important examples are distribution counting sort [8, 9], address calculation sort [10–15], bucket sort [16, 17] and radix sort [16–19].

Ordinal theory assumes order is stored along a single dimension, where that order is defined by relative rather than absolute values on that dimension. Order can be retrieved by moving along the dimension in one or the other direction. This theory need not assume either the item-item nor position-item associations of the previous theories.

One of the ordinal theories of serial order in behavior is that of Shiffrin and Cook [20] which suggests a model for short-term forgetting of item and order information of the brain. The model does not assume either item-item (chaining theory) nor position-item (positional theory) associations. It assumes associations between elements and a “node”, but only the nodes are associated with one another. By moving inwards from nodes representing the start and end of the sequence, the associations between nodes allow the order of items to be reconstructed [3].

The main difficulties of all distributive sorting algorithms is that, when the keys are distributed using a hash function according to their content, several keys may be clustered around a loci, and several keys may be mapped to the same location. These problems are solved by inherent three basic steps of associative sort namely (i) *practicing*, (ii) *storing* and (iii) *retrieval* which are the three main stages in the formation and retrieval of memory in cognitive neuroscience:

- (i) Encoding or registration: receiving, processing and combining of received information.
- (ii) Storage: creation of a permanent record of the encoded information.
- (iii) Retrieval, recall or recollection: calling back the stored information in response to some cue for use in a process or activity.

As in the ordinal model of Shiffrin and Cook, it is assumed that associations are between the keys in the list space and the nodes in an imaginary linear subspace that spans a predefined interval of range of keys. The imaginary subspace can be defined anywhere on the list space $S[0 \dots n - 1]$ provided that its boundaries do not cross over

that of the list. The range of the interval that the imaginary subspace spans is upper bounded with the number of keys n but may be smaller and can be located anywhere making the technique in-place, i.e., beside the input list, only a constant amount of memory locations are used for storing counters and indices. Furthermore, this definition reveals the asymptotic power of the technique with increasing n with respect to the range of keys, as well.

An association between a key and the imaginary subspace is created by a node using a monotone bijective hash function that maps the keys in the predefined interval to the imaginary subspace. The process of creating a node by mapping a distinct key to the imaginary subspace is “practicing a distinct key of an interval”. Since imaginary subspace is defined on the list space, this is just swapping. Once a node is created, the redundancy due to the association between the key and the position of the node releases the word allocated for the key in the physical memory except one bit which tags the word as a node for interrogation. All the bits of the node except the tag bit can be cleared and used to encode any information. Hence, they are the “record” of the node and the information encoded into a record is the “cue” by which cognitive neuro-scientists try to describe how the brain recalls the next item in the order during retrieval. For instance, it will be foreknown from the tag bit that a node has already been created while another occurrence of that particular key is being practiced giving the opportunity to count other occurrences. The process of counting other occurrences of a particular key is “practicing all the keys of an interval”, i.e., rehearsing used by cognitive neuro-scientists to describe how the brain manipulates the sequence before storing in short (or long) term memory. On the other hand, the tag bit discriminates the word as node and the position of the node lets the key be retrieved back from the imaginary subspace using the inverse hash function.

Practicing does not need to alter the value of other occurrences, i.e., only the first occurrence is altered while being practiced from where a node is created. All other occurrences of that particular key remain in the list space but become meaningless. Hence they are “idle keys”. On the other hand, practicing does not need to alter the position of idle keys as well, unless another distinct key creates a node exactly at the position of an idle key while being practiced. In such a case, the idle key is moved to the former position of the key that creates the new node. This makes associative sort unstable, i.e., equal

keys may not retain their original relative order. However, an imaginary subspace can create other subspaces and associations using the idle keys that were already practiced by manipulating either their position or value or both. Hence, a part of linear algebra and related fields of mathematics can be applied on subspaces to solve such problems.

Once all the keys in the predefined interval are practiced, the nodes that are dispersed in the imaginary subspace with relative order are clustered in a systematic way, i.e., the gaps between the nodes are closed to a direction in order. This is the *storing* phase of associative sort where the received, processed and combined information to construct the sorted permutation of the practiced interval is stored in the short-term memory. When the nodes are moved towards a direction, it is not possible to retain the association between the imaginary subspace and list space. However, the record of a node can be further used to encode the absolute position of that node as well, or maybe the relative position or how much that node is moved relative to its absolute or relative position during storing. Unfortunately, this requires that a record is enough to store both the position of the node and the number of idle keys practiced by that node. However, as explained earlier, further associations can be created using the idle keys that were already practiced by manipulating either their position or value or both. Hence, if the record is enough, it can store both the positional information and the number of idle keys. If not, an idle key can be associated accompanying the node to supply additional space for it for the positional information.

Finally, the sorted permutation of the practiced interval is constructed in the list space, using the stored information in the short-term memory. This is the *retrieval* phase of associative sort that depends on the information encoded into the record of a node. If the record is enough, it stores both the position of the node and the number of idle keys. If not, an associated idle key accompanying the node stores the position of the node while the record holds the number of idle keys. The positional information cues the recall of the key using the inverse hash function. This is “key retrieval” from imaginary subspace. Hence, the retrieved key can be copied on the list space as much as it occurs.

Hence, moving through nodes that represent the start and end of practiced keys as well as retaining their relative associations with each other even when their positions are altered by cuing allow the order of keys to be constructed in linear time in-place.

The adjective “associative” derived from two facts where the first one mentioned above is that describes the technique. The second one is that, although associative sort replaces all derivatives of the content based sorting algorithms such as distribution counting sort [8, 9], address calculation sort [10–15] and bucket sort [16, 17] on a RAM, it seems to be more efficient on a “content addressable memory” (CAM) known as “associative memory” which in one word time find a matching segment in tag portion of the word and reaches the remainder of the word [21]. In the current version of associative sort developed on a RAM, the nodes of the imaginary subspace (tagged words) and the keys of the list space (untagged words) are processed sequentially which will be a matter of one word time for a CAM to retrieve previous or next tagged or untagged word.

The technique seems to be efficient and applicable for other problems, as well, such as hashing, searching, element distinction, succinct data structures, gaining space, etc. For instance, there are several space gaining techniques available and widely used in the literature for in-place and minimum space algorithms [22–25]. However, as known to the author, all these in-place and minimum space algorithms have a dedicated explicit technique that is used only for space gaining purpose. On the contrary, gaining space is an inherent step of associative sort which improves its performance and can be used explicitly.

From complexity point of view, associative sort shows similar characteristics with bucket sort and distribution counting sort. Hence, it can be thought of as *in-place associative bucket sort* or *in-place associative distribution counting sort*. Distribution counting sort is seldom discussed in the literature although it has been around more than 50 years since proposed by Seward [8] in 1954 and by Feurzig [9] in 1960, independently, and known to be the method that makes radix sort possible on digital computer. It is known to be very powerful when the keys have small range. Given n integers keys $S[0 \dots n - 1]$ each in the range $[0, m - 1]$, its time-complexity is $\mathcal{O}(n + m)$ and requires $n + m$ additional space for a stable and m for an unstable sort. Hence, distribution counting sort becomes efficient and practical when $m = \mathcal{O}(n)$ defining its time-space trade-offs. On the other hand, bucket sort is a generalization of distribution counting sort. In fact, if each bucket has size 1, then bucket sort degenerates to distribution counting sort. However, the variable bucket size allows it to use $\mathcal{O}(n)$ memory instead of $\mathcal{O}(m + n)$ memory. Its average case time complexity is $\mathcal{O}(n + m)$ and if $m = \mathcal{O}(n)$, then it becomes $\mathcal{O}(n)$. Its worst case

time complexity is $\mathcal{O}(n^2)$.

With this introductory information, the contribution of this study is,

A practical sorting algorithm that sorts n integers keys $S[0 \dots n-1]$ each in the range $[0, m-1]$ using $\mathcal{O}(1)$ extra space in $\mathcal{O}(n+m)$ time for the worst, $\mathcal{O}(m)$ time for the average (uniformly distributed keys) and $\mathcal{O}(n)$ time for the best case. The ratio $\frac{m}{n}$ defines the efficiency (time-space trade-offs) of the algorithm letting very larges lists to be sorted in-place. The algorithm is simple and practical replacing bucket sort, distribution counting sort and address calculation sort family of algorithms improving the space requirement to only $\mathcal{O}(1)$ extra words.

Practical comparisons with quick sort showed that when $\frac{m}{n} \approx 2$ performances are same for uniformly distributed keys. When $\frac{m}{n} \approx \frac{1}{10}$ associative sort becomes 3 times faster than quick sort and slightly better than radix sort. Further decreasing the ratio to $\frac{m}{n} \approx \frac{1}{100}$, associative sort becomes more than 2 times faster than radix sort. When the distribution is exponential, associative sort shows better performance up to $\frac{m}{n} \approx 10$ when compared with quick sort.

Bucket sort is 2 times faster than associative sort for $\frac{m}{n} = 1$. When $\frac{m}{n} = \frac{1}{10}$ bucket sort is still slightly better. However, associative sort becomes faster when $\frac{m}{n} < \frac{1}{10}$.

Even omitting its space efficiency for a moment, associative sort asymptotically outperforms all content based sorting algorithms when n is large relative to m .

2 Definitions

Given a *list* S of n *elements*, $S[0], S[1], \dots, S[n-1]$ each have an integer *key*, the problem is to sort the elements of the list according to their integer keys. To prevent repeating statements like “key of the element $S[i]$ ”, $S[i]$ is used to refer the key. The notations used throughout the study are:

- (i) Universe of integer keys is assumed $\mathbb{U} = [0 \dots 2^w - 1]$ where w is the fixed word length.
- (ii) Maximum and minimum keys of a list are, $\max(S) = \max(a|a \in S)$ and $\min(S) = \min(a|a \in S)$, respectively. Hence, range of the keys is, $m = \max(S) - \min(S) + 1$.
- (iii) The notation $B \subset A$ is used to indicated that B is a proper subset of A .
- (iv) For two lists S_1 and S_2 , $\max(S_1) < \min(S_2)$ implies $S_1 < S_2$.

Universe of Keys. When a key is first practiced, a node is created releasing w bits of the key free. One bit is used to tag the word as a node. Hence, it is reasonable to doubt that the tag bit limits the universe of keys because all the keys should be untagged and in the range $[0, 2^{w-1} - 1]$ before being practiced. But, we can,

- (i) partition S into 2 disjoint sublists $S_1 < 2^{w-1} \leq S_2$ in $\mathcal{O}(n)$ time with well known in-place partitioning algorithms as well as stably with [24],
- (ii) shift all the keys of S_2 by -2^{w-1} , sort S_1 and S_2 associatively and shift S_2 by 2^{w-1} .

There are other methods to overcome this problem. For instance,

- (i) sort the sublist $S[0 \dots (n/\log n) - 1]$ using the optimal in-place merge sort [26],
- (ii) compress $S[0 \dots (n/\log n) - 1]$ by Lemma 1 of [23] generating $\Omega(n)$ free bits,
- (iii) sort $S[(n/\log n) \dots n - 1]$ associatively using $\Omega(n)$ free bits as tag bits,
- (iv) uncompress $S[0 \dots (n/\log n) - 1]$ and merge the two sorted sublists in-place in linear time by [26].

Number of Keys. If practicing a distinct key lets us to use $w - 1$ bits to practice other occurrences of that key, we have $w - 1$ free bits by which we can count up to 2^{w-1} occurrences including the first key that created the node. Hence, it is reasonable to doubt again that there is another restriction on the size of the lists, i.e., $n \leq 2^{w-1}$. But a list can be divided into two parts in $\mathcal{O}(1)$ time and those parts can be merged in-place in linear time by [26] after sorted associatively.

Hence, for the sake of simplicity, it will be assumed that $n \leq 2^{w-1}$ and all the keys are in the range $[0, 2^{w-1} - 1]$ throughout the study.

3 Basics of Associative Sort

Given n *distinct* integer keys $S[0 \dots n - 1]$ each in the range $[u, v]$, if $m = n$, the sorted permutation of the list can be represented with two parameters ($2 \log \mathbb{U}$ bits) one of which is the initial address of the sequential memory separated for the list (accessed by $S[0]$) in the RAM and the other is the $\delta = u$. The i th key of the sorted list can be calculated by $S[i] = i + \delta$ and the actual value at i th location is meaningless for this calculation. Hence, if S is the sorted permutation, then there is a bijective relation between each key and its position, i.e., $i = S[i] - \delta$. From contradiction, if S is not the sorted permutation,

$i \neq S[i] - \delta$ implies that the key $S[i]$ is not at its exact location. Its exact location can be calculated with $j = S[i] - \delta$. Therefore, this monotone injective hash function that maps the keys to $j \in [0, n - 1]$ can sort the list in $\mathcal{O}(n)$ time using $\mathcal{O}(1)$ constant space. This is cycle leader permutation where S is re-arranged by following the cycles of a permutation π . First $S[0]$ is sent to its final position $\pi(0)$ (calculated by $j = S[i] - \delta$). Then the element that was in $\pi(0)$ is sent to its final position $\pi(\pi(0))$. The process proceeds in this way until the cycle is closed, that is until the key to position 0 is found which means the association $0 = S[0] - \delta$ is constructed between the first key and its position. Then the iterator is increased to continue with the key of $S[1]$. At the end, when all the cycles of $S[i]$ for $i = 0, 1, \dots, n - 1$ are processed, all the keys are moved to their exact position and the association $i = S[i] - \delta$ is constructed between the keys and their positions, i.e., the sorted permutation of the list is obtained.

If we look at this approach closer, we can interpret the technique entirely different. That is, we are indeed creating an imaginary subspace $Im[0 \dots n - 1]$ over $S[0 \dots n - 1]$ where the relative basis of this imaginary subspace coincides with that of the list space in the physical memory. The imaginary subspace spans a predefined interval of the range of keys depending on n . Since $m = n$, it spans the entire range of keys. The association between the list space and the imaginary subspace is created by a node using the monotone bijective hash function $i = S[i] - \delta$ that maps a particular key to the imaginary subspace. When a node is created for a particular key, the redundancy due to the association between the key and the position of the node releases the word allocated for the key in the physical memory. Hence, we can clear the node ($S[i] = 0$) and set its tag bit, for instance its most significant bit (MSB) to discriminate it as a node, and use the remaining $w - 1$ bits of the node for any other purpose. When we want the key back to list space from imaginary subspace, we can use the inverse of hash function and get the key back by $S[i] = i + \delta$ to the list space. However, we don't use free bits of a node for other purposes in this case because it is known that all the keys are distinct and hence only one key will be practiced at a location creating a node. Therefore, instead of tagging the word as node using its MSB, we use the key itself to tag the word "implicitly" as node, since if a key is mapped to the imaginary subspace, then it will always satisfy the monotone bijective hash function $i = S[i] - \delta$. Hence, the keys are "implicitly practiced" in this case.

Mathematically, consider a list of n *distinct* integer keys $S[0 \dots n - 1]$ each in the range

$[0, \mathbb{U}]$ and stored sequentially in the RAM. Let \mathbb{U} denote the field of positive integers including 0 and consider the elements of the list as a set of 3-tuples $\mathbf{x} = [i, S[i], 1]$ of integers forming a vector space over \mathbb{U} denoted by \mathbb{U}^3 . Hence, $S[0 \dots n - 1]$ is a 3-dimensional vector space over \mathbb{U} and any element of the list is represented by 3 integer components where the first one in $[0, n - 1]$ represents the index, i.e., the position of the element in the list, the second one in $[0, \mathbb{U}]$ represents the element (either a key or a node) stored at that position, and the third one is a dummy constant.

Now, consider an imaginary subspace $Im[0 \dots n - 1]$ which is a vector space over a given interval of range of keys of S as a set of 3-tuples $\mathbf{x} = [i', S[i'], 1]$ of integers. This time, the second component is a subset of keys in $[a, b]$ with $b - a < n$. It should be noted that, for a list of keys where $m = b - a + 1 = n$, the number of keys is equal to the range of keys, hence the imaginary subspace spans the entire range of keys.

A bijective linear mapping from the list space to the imaginary subspace can be defined as,

$$\begin{bmatrix} i' \\ S[i'] \\ 1 \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 & -\delta \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} i \\ S[i] \\ 1 \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} S[i] - \delta \\ S[i] \\ 1 \end{bmatrix} \quad (3.1)$$

where $\delta = \min(S)$. Eqn. 3.1 tells us that when a key is mapped into the imaginary subspace, its new position will be $i' = S[i] - \delta$ in both the imaginary subspace and the list space while its value is unchanged, i.e., $S[i'] = S[i]$. From algorithm point of view, this is equivalent to swapping $S[i]$ with $S[i']$. The linear mapping in Eqn.3.1 does not have an inverse. This is expectable when we consider that after swapping $S[i]$ with $S[i']$ there is no way to know where $S[i']$ was before. However, when we look at the right side of this equation closer, we immediately see the redundancy between the new position of a key ($S[i] - \delta$) and its value ($S[i]$) provided that δ is known. This redundancy is the fact that makes cycle leader permutation possible. Therefore, cycle leader permutation is a special case of associative sort.

This mathematical definition gives us other opportunities. For instance, we can define our transformation matrix as,

$$\begin{bmatrix} i' \\ S[i'] \\ 1 \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 & -\delta \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} i \\ S[i] \\ 1 \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} S[i] - \delta \\ 0 \\ 1 \end{bmatrix} \quad (3.2)$$

which says that w bits of a key that is mapped into the imaginary subspace at i' can be cleared and used for any other purpose because it can be retrieved back to any location (for instance to j) by,

$$\begin{bmatrix} i' \\ S[i'] \\ 1 \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & j \\ 1 & 0 & \delta \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} S[i] - \delta \\ 0 \\ 1 \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} j \\ S[i] \\ 1 \end{bmatrix} \quad (3.3)$$

provided that $\delta = \min(S)$ is known.

Imaginary subspace can be defined anywhere on the list space $S[0 \dots n - 1]$ provided that its boundaries does not cross over that of the list space. An imaginary subspace can be defined as $Im[a \dots b]$ with $b - a < n$. Two supplementary definitions should be given:

- (i) The relative basis of the subspace over the list space. This is defined by the statement $Im[a \dots b]$ over $S[u \dots v]$ which strictly implies that $v - u = b - a$.
- (ii) The interval of range of keys spanned by $Im[a \dots b]$. But, it is immediate that $Im[a \dots b]$ can span any subset $S_1 \subset S$ where each key is in $[\delta, \delta + b - a]$ with $\delta \in S$.

Furthermore, an imaginary subspace of a small interval that is created casually anywhere on the list space can be moved with all its nodes to a given direction (left or right) with respect to the list space provided that the monotone bijective hash function that associates the subspace and the list space is shifted as much as the subspace is shifted relative to the list space. This is “subspace shifting”.

Node is an association (interconnection) between the imaginary subspace and the list space. It is created by mapping a key from the list space into the imaginary subspace during practicing. A monotone bijective hash function is used for the mapping. The necessary requirements that a particular key of the list space can be mapped into an imaginary subspace creating a node are,

- (i) The key should be in the interval of the range of keys spanned by the imaginary subspace.
- (ii) There should not be a node already created by another occurrence of that particular key.

Practicing is the process of encoding the necessary information required to recollect the sorted permutation of the practiced, i.e., received, processed and combined interval. An

individual iteration over the list can practice only the distinct keys disregarding other occurrences in the predefined interval of the imaginary subspace creating nodes exactly equal to the number of distinct keys in that interval. Such an iteration is “practicing distinct keys of an interval”. On the other hand, an iteration can practice all the keys of the list that are in the predefined interval of the imaginary subspace. For instance, if the number of distinct keys in a given interval that create a node is n_d and the number of total occurrences other than those particular distinct keys is n_c , then n_d nodes are created practicing (counting) other n_c keys that become idle, hence become meaningless. Such an iteration is “practicing all the keys of an interval” and one can inquiry the existence and number of occurrences of a given value in that interval in $\mathcal{O}(1)$ time.

Storing is the process of creating permanent records in the short-term memory in a systematic and organized way where the received, processed and combined information during practicing is encoded into the records of the nodes to cue the recall of the necessary information that will be used to construct the sorted permutation of the practiced interval.

Retrieval is the reverse of storing. The sorted permutation of the practiced interval is constructed using the stored information in the short-term memory. On the other hand, getting the key from the imaginary subspace back to the list space is key retrieval where the positional information stored in the record of a node cues the recall of the key using the inverse hash function.

4 Sorting n Integer Keys

In this section, the associative sorting technique which is based on the three basic steps namely (i) practicing, (ii) storing and (iii) retrieval will be introduced.

Using $w - 1$ bits (record) of a node released while a particular key is being practiced, other occurrences of that particular key can be counted. Unfortunately, we need $\log n$ bits of the record to encode the absolute position of the node during storing. Hence, it is reasonable to doubt that we can count up to $2^{w-1-\log n}$ including the first occurrence that created the node. Fortunately, this is not the case. We can count using all $w - 1$ bits of the record, and while the nodes are being stored at the beginning of the list (short-term memory), we can get an idle key immediately after a node that has practiced at least $2^{w-1-\log n}$ keys and write the absolute position of that node over the idle key as the cue.

In this case, the record of the node stores only the number of idle keys practiced by that node. But this time, we encounter another serious problem of all distributive sorting algorithms. Depending on the distribution of the keys, the nodes that are created during practicing are dispersed over the imaginary subspace. If the nodes are clustered to the beginning, how an idle key can be inserted immediately after a particular node if there is another node immediately before and after that particular node during storing? The answer is in the pigeonhole principle. Pigeonhole principle says that,

Corollary 4.1. *Given n integer keys $S[0 \dots n-1]$, the maximum number of distinct keys that may occur contemporary in S at least $2^{w-1-\log n}$ times is,*

$$\lceil \frac{n}{2^{w-1-\log n}} \rceil \quad (4.1)$$

Hence, if the size of the list is say $n = 2^{w-1}$, the maximum number of *distinct* keys that may occur contemporary in S at least 1 time is n . But the node itself represents the first occurrence which creates it. Therefore,

Corollary 4.2. *The maximum number of nodes that each can practice at least $2^{w-1-\log n}$ keys and hence need an idle key immediately after itself during storing is equal to,*

$$\epsilon = \lceil \frac{n/2}{2^{w-1-\log n}} \rceil \quad (4.2)$$

and upper bounded by $n/2$.

This means that,

Corollary 4.3. *If the keys are practiced to $Im[\epsilon, n-1]$ over $S[\epsilon, n-1]$ where ϵ is calculated by Eqn.4.2, then there will be ϵ keys at the beginning of the list either idle or out of the practiced interval which will prevent collisions while inserting idle keys immediately after the nodes that practiced at least $2^{w-1-\log n}$ keys.*

Hence,

Theorem 4.4. *Given $n \leq 2^{w-1}$ integer keys each in the range $[0, 2^{w-1} - 1]$, all the keys in a given range $[a, b]$ where $b - a < n - \epsilon$ can be sorted associatively at the beginning of the list in $\mathcal{O}(n)$ time using $\mathcal{O}(1)$ constant space.*

Proof. The proof has three basic steps of associative sort:

- (i) Practice all the keys of the interval $[a, b]$ with $b - a < n - \epsilon$ into $Im[\epsilon \dots n - 1]$ over $S[\epsilon \dots n - 1]$.
- (ii) Store the nodes at the beginning of the list (short term memory) in order. If at least $2^{w-1-\log n}$ idle keys are practiced by a particular node, find the nearest idle key searching to the right and move it immediately after that node and write the absolute position of the node over the idle key by modifying it. Otherwise, i.e., if less than $2^{w-1-\log n}$ idle keys are practiced by a particular node, encode the absolute position of the node into $\log n$ bits of its record where the remaining $w - 1 - \log n$ bits store the number of idle keys.
- (iii) Retrieve the encoded information from the short term memory processing the records backwards to construct the sorted permutation of the practiced interval. If MSB of a record is 1, then it is a node and its record stores both the absolute position of that node and the number of idle keys practiced by that node. Otherwise, i.e., if MSB of a record is 0, then it is indeed an idle key brought immediately after a node that has practiced at least $2^{w-1-\log n}$ idle keys. Hence, read the absolute position of the node from the idle key and decode the number of idle keys from the record of the node (predecessor of idle key).

□

4.1 Practicing Phase

Given n integer keys $S[0 \dots n - 1]$ each in the range $[u, v]$, the partial monotone bijective hash function that practices the keys in $[a, b]$ with $b - a < n - \epsilon$ into the imaginary subspace $Im[\epsilon \dots n - 1]$ over $S[\epsilon \dots n - 1]$ is,

$$j = S[i] - a + \epsilon \quad \text{if} \quad S[i] - a \leq b - a \quad (4.3)$$

However, we should consider an algorithm that sorts in each step (or recursion) the keys of $S_1 \subset S$ each in the predefined interval. If we find $\delta = \min(S)$ and substitute $a = \delta$ and $b - a = n - \epsilon - 1$, the monotone bijective hash function defined in Eqn.4.3 can be written as follows which can practice the keys in the range $[\delta, \delta + n - \epsilon - 1]$ into the imaginary subspace $Im[\epsilon \dots n - 1]$ over $S[\epsilon \dots n - 1]$,

$$j = S[i] - \delta + \epsilon \quad \text{if} \quad S[i] - \delta + \epsilon < n \quad (4.4)$$

Algorithm A. Practice all the keys of the interval $[\delta, \delta + n - \epsilon - 1]$ into the imaginary subspace $Im[\epsilon \dots n - 1]$ over $S[\epsilon \dots n - 1]$ using Eqn. 4.4. It is assumed that the minimum of the list $\delta = \min(S)$ is known and ϵ is calculated by Eqn. 4.2.

- A1.** initialize $i = 0$;
- A2.** if $S[i] < \delta$, then $S[i]$ is an idle key of an interval that has already been sorted. Hence, increase i and repeat this step;
- A3.** if MSB of $S[i]$ is 1, then $S[i]$ is a node. Hence, increase i and goto step A2;
- A4.** if $S[i] - \delta + \epsilon \geq n$, then $S[i]$ is a key of S_2 that is out of the practiced interval. Hence, increase n'_d that counts the number of keys of S_2 , update $\delta' = \min(\delta', S[i])$, increase i and goto to step A2;
- A5.** otherwise, $S[i]$ is a key to be practiced. Hence, calculate $j = S[i] - \delta + \epsilon$;
- A6.** if MSB of $S[j]$ is 0, then $S[j]$ is the first key that will create the node at j . Move $S[j]$ to $S[i]$, clear $S[j]$ and set its MSB to 1 making it a node. If $j \leq i$ increase i . Increase n_d that counts the number of distinct keys (nodes), and goto step A2;
- A7.** otherwise, $S[j]$ is a node that has already been created. Hence, clear MSB of $S[j]$, increase $S[j]$ (number of idle keys) and set its MSB back to 1. Increase i and n_c that counts the number of total idle keys over all distinct keys and goto step A2;

Associative Linked Lists Instead of practicing all the keys in an interval into $Im[\epsilon \dots n - 1]$ over $S[\epsilon \dots n - 1]$ as in Algorithm A, one can practice only the distinct keys in an interval, for instance $[\delta, \delta + n/2 - 1]$ into $Im[n/2 \dots n - 1]$ over $S[n/2 \dots n - 1]$, writing each created node's position to the previously created node's record. Hence, an associative linked list is obtained in $\mathcal{O}(n)$ time that can answer range queries such as: "Which are the keys in the range $[\delta, \delta + n/2 - 1]$?" in $\mathcal{O}(n_d)$ time. Furthermore, if a secondary imaginary subspace $Im[0 \dots n/2 - 1]$ is created which does not overlap with the primary one, then *all* the idle keys of the same interval can be practiced and mapped to the secondary imaginary subspace. This constructs a further association between the subspaces through matching node positions with respect to each subspace basis. As a result, while answering range queries using the primary subspace, the number of keys can be queried with $\mathcal{O}(1)$ secondary subspace access. When finished, all the keys mapped to the imaginary subspaces can be retrieved back and the queries can continue with another interval of interest.

4.2 Storing Phase

Practicing creates n_d nodes and n_c idle keys. This means n_d keys of S_1 are mapped into the imaginary subspace creating nodes that are dispersed with relative order in $Im[\epsilon \dots n - 1]$ over $S[\epsilon \dots n - 1]$ depending on the statistical distribution of the keys. On the other hand, n_c idle keys of S_1 are distributed disorderly together with n'_d keys of S_2 in the list space.

In storing phase, the nodes are clustered in a systematic way, i.e., the gaps between the nodes of the imaginary subspace are closed to a direction without altering their relative order with respect to each other. When the nodes are moved towards a direction in order, it is not possible to retain the association between the nodes and the keys. Furthermore, we cannot freely use $\log n$ bits of a record of the node to encode its absolute position because the node has practiced other occurrences (idle keys) and if the number of the idle keys occupies more than $w - 1 - \log n$ bits, it would not be possible to encode the absolute position of the node into the record. But, the maximum number of nodes that will need an idle key immediately after itself during storing is equal to,

$$\epsilon = \lceil \frac{n/2}{2^{w-1-\log n}} \rceil \quad (4.5)$$

Hence, by mapping the keys to $Im[\epsilon \dots n - 1]$ over $S[\epsilon \dots n - 1]$, we create a recovery area exactly equal to ϵ which prevents collisions during storing and lets us to bring an idle key immediately after a particular node that has practiced at least $2^{w-1-\log n}$ idle keys.

Algorithm B. Store the encoded information of the practiced interval in the short term memory. If at least $2^{w-1-\log n}$ idle keys are practiced by a particular node, find the nearest idle key on the right side searching forward and move it immediately after that particular node and write the absolute position of the node over the idle key by modifying it. Hence, the absolute position of the node can be recalled from the idle key during retrieval. In such a case, the record of the node preceding the idle key in the short term memory only stores the number of idle keys. Otherwise, i.e., if less than $2^{w-1-\log n}$ idle keys are practiced by a particular node, encode the absolute position of the node into $\log n$ free bits of the record together with the bits (other than the tag bit) that keep the number of idle keys.

B1. initialize $i = \epsilon$, $j = 0$, $k = n_d$, and $\epsilon' = 0$ which will count the exact number of nodes that have practiced at least $2^{w-1-\log n}$ idle keys;

- B2.** if MSB of $S[i]$ is 0, then $S[i]$ is either an idle key or a key of S_2 that is out of the practiced interval. Hence, increase i and repeat this step;
- B3.** otherwise, $S[i]$ is a node. Hence, get the number of practiced idle keys into s ;
- B4.** if $s + 1 \leq 2^{w-1-\log n}$, then encode the absolute position i ($\log n$ bits) of the node into s , move $S[j]$ to $S[i]$, and write s to $S[j]$. Increase i and j and decrease k . If $k = 0$ exit, otherwise goto step B2;
- B5.** otherwise, i.e., if $s + 1 > 2^{w-1-\log n}$, then swap $S[i]$ with $S[j]$. Find one of n_c idle keys on the right starting a search from $S[p]$ where p is either equal to $j + 1$ if this is the first time that a search is started or equal to the last idle key position found in the previous search. Move $S[j + 1]$ to this safe location ($S[p]$) and write the absolute position i of the node over $S[j + 1]$. Increase i and ϵ' by one and j by two and decrease k by one. If $k = 0$ exit, otherwise goto step B2;

4.3 Retrieval Phase

Storing clusters n_d nodes and ϵ' idle keys at $S[0 \dots n_d + \epsilon' - 1]$ with the necessary information required to construct the sorted permutation of the practiced interval. Hence, $S[0 \dots n_d + \epsilon' - 1]$ can be thought of as a short term memory where the encoded information of the practiced interval is stored. On the other hand, $n_c - \epsilon'$ idle keys of S_1 and n'_d keys of S_2 are distributed disorderly together at $S[n_d + \epsilon' \dots n - 1]$.

In retrieval phase, the stored information is retrieved from the short term memory $S[0 \dots n_d + \epsilon' - 1]$ to construct the sorted permutation of S_1 , i.e., the practiced interval. The short term memory encodes $n_d + n_c$ keys of S_1 with $n_d + \epsilon'$ permanent records. It is important to note that, if the number of occurrences of a particular key is n_i , then there are $n_i - 1$ idle keys in the list. But the node itself represents the key that is mapped into the imaginary subspace through itself. Hence, it is immediate from this definition that the nodes in the short term memory $S[0 \dots n_d + \epsilon' - 1]$ can be processed from right to left backwards and the keys practiced by each node can be expanded over $S[0 \dots n_d + n_c - 1]$ sequentially right to left backwards without collision. At this point, we have two options: sequential or recursive version. But before proceeding, the retrieval phase will be introduced;

Algorithm C. Retrieve the encoded information from $n_d + \epsilon'$ records of the short term memory $S[0 \dots n_d + \epsilon' - 1]$ to construct sorted permutation of $n_d + n_c$ keys of S_1 . Process

the records from right to left backwards and expand the keys over $S[0 \dots n_d + n_c - 1]$ sequentially right to left backwards.

C1. initialize $i = n_d + \epsilon' - 1$ and $p = n_d + n_c - 1$;

C2. check MSB of $S[i]$;

(i) if MSB of $S[i]$ is 1, then it is a node. Hence, decode from the record of the node the number of idle keys practiced by the node to k (does not include the key that create the node) and absolute position of the node to j and decrease i by one;

(ii) otherwise, $S[i]$ is an idle key brought immediately after a node. Hence, get the absolute position of the node from the idle key to j and get the number of idle keys practiced by the node from its record at $S[i - 1]$ to k (does not include the key that create the node) and decrease i by two;

C3. retrieve the key from the imaginary subspace: absolute position j of the node cues the recall of the key using the inverse hash function. Then copy the key to $S[p - k \dots p]$, decrease p by $k + 1$ and goto step C2;

Sequential Version After *storing* the encoded information into the short term memory, $n_c - \epsilon'$ idle keys of S_1 and n'_d keys of S_2 are distributed disorderly together at $S[n_d + \epsilon' \dots n - 1]$. If we partition $S[n_d + \epsilon' \dots n - 1]$ selecting the pivot equal to δ , then idle keys are clustered after the short term memory. Therefore, Algorithm C can immediately be used to retrieve. Hence, the structure of the sequential version becomes;

Algorithm D. In each iteration, construct sorted permutation of $n_d + n_c$ keys of S_1 at the beginning of the list.

D1. find $\min(S)$ and $\max(S)$;

D2. initialize ϵ using Eqn. 4.2, $\delta = \min(S)$, $\delta' = \max(S)$ and reset counters;

D3. practice all the keys in the interval $[\delta, \delta + n - \epsilon - 1]$ using Algorithm A;

D4. store encoded information of the practiced interval using Algorithm B;

D5. in-place partition $S[n_d + \epsilon' \dots n - 1]$ clustering $n_c - \epsilon'$ idle keys at the beginning;

D6. retrieve the sorted permutation of the practiced interval using Algorithm C;

D7. if $n'_d = 0$ exit. Otherwise set $S = S[n_d + n_c \dots n - 1]$, $n = n'_d$, $\delta = \delta'$, $\delta' = \max(S)$, reset counters, calculate ϵ using Eqn. 4.2 and goto step D3.

Remark 4.1. $\min(S)$ and $\max(S)$ need not be found in step D1. Instead, if $\delta = 0$ and $\delta' = \max(\mathbb{U})$ the algorithm sorts the keys in the range $[0, n - \epsilon - 1]$ during the first iteration (or recursion). However, if there is not any key in this interval, Algorithm A finds $\delta' = \min(S)$ in step D3 in $\mathcal{O}(n)$ time, and continues with the keys in $[\delta', \delta' + n - \epsilon - 1]$.

Remark 4.2. Sequential version of associative sort technique is on-line in the sense that after each step D6, $n_d + n_c$ keys are added to the sorted permutation at the beginning of the list and ready to be used.

A Different Approach. Instead of using Eqn. 4.2 to calculate the maximum value of ϵ , there is another approach to solve the same problem possibly more efficiently;

- (i) practice all the keys in the interval $[\delta, \delta + n - 1]$ by mapping them into $Im[0 \dots n - 1]$ over $S[0 \dots n - 1]$. However, during practicing, if the number of idle keys practiced by a particular node reaches exactly $2^{w-1-\log n}$, then increase ϵ' which counts the exact number of nodes that has practiced at least $2^{w-1-\log n}$ idle keys;
- (ii) retrieve the keys in $S[n - \epsilon' \dots n - 1]$ back to the list space;
- (iii) shift subspace to the right by ϵ' ;
- (iv) store encoded information of the practiced interval using Algorithm B;
- (v) partition $S[n_d + \epsilon' \dots n - 1]$ clustering $n_c - \epsilon'$ idle keys to the beginning;
- (vi) retrieve the sorted permutation of the practiced interval using Algorithm C;
- (vii) if $n'_d = 0$ exit. Otherwise set $S = S[n_d + n_c \dots n - 1]$, $n = n'_d$, $\delta = \delta'$, $\delta' = \max(S)$, reset counters and goto step (i).

In this case, instead of using the maximum value of ϵ , its exact value ϵ' is counted and used which may improve the overall efficiency.

Recursive Version Saving n_d , ϵ' and δ in stack space, we can recursively call Algorithm A and Algorithm B with two parameters; (i) $S = S[n_d + \epsilon' \dots n - 1]$ and (ii) $\min(S) = \delta'$. The second parameter prevents searching the minimum of the list in each level of recursion. Although the exact number of keys of S_2 is n'_d , the number of keys of S in the new recursion is $n = n'_d + n_c - \epsilon'$ where $n_c - \epsilon'$ of them are idle keys of S_1 and meaningless while sorting S_2 . However, these idle keys increase the interval of range of keys spanned by the imaginary subspace improving the overall time complexity in each level of recursion. The recursion can continue until no any key exists in S_2 . In the last recursion, retrieval phase can begin to construct the sorted permutation of $n_d + n_c$ keys of S_1 from $n_d + \epsilon'$ records

stored at the short term memory $S[0 \dots n_d + \epsilon' - 1]$ and expand over $S[0 \dots n - 1]$ sequentially right to left backwards. Each level of recursion should return the total number of keys expanded on the list to the higher level to let it know where it will start to expand its interval.

Complexity of the algorithm depends on the range and the number of keys. In each iteration (or recursion) the algorithm is capable of sorting keys that satisfy $S[i] - \delta + \epsilon < n$ where ϵ is defined by Eqn. 4.2 and upper bounded by $n/2$. Hence, at worst case ($n = 2^{w-1}$), the keys that satisfy $S[i] - \delta < n/2$ are sorted in the first pass. This means that, given uniformly distributed $n = 2^{w-1}$ integer keys $S[0 \dots n - 1]$ each in the range $[0, n - 1]$, the complexity is the recursion $T(n) = T(\frac{n}{2}) + \mathcal{O}(n)$ yielding $T(n) = \mathcal{O}(n)$.

Best Case Complexity. Given n integer keys $S[0 \dots n - 1]$, if $n - 1$ keys satisfy $S[i] - \delta < n/2$, then these keys are sorted in $\mathcal{O}(n)$ time. In the next step, there is one key left which implies sorting is finished. As a result, time complexity of the algorithm is lower bounded by $\Omega(n)$ in the best case.

Worst Case Complexity. Given n integer keys $S[0 \dots n - 1]$ and $m = \beta n$, if there is only 1 key available in practiced interval at each iteration (or recursion) until the last, in any j th step, the only key s that will be sorted satisfies $s < \frac{jn - (j-1)}{2}$ which implies that the last alone key satisfies $s < \frac{jn - (j-1)}{2} \leq \beta n$ from where we can calculate j by $j \leq \frac{2\beta n - 1}{n - 1}$. In this case, the time complexity of the algorithm is,

$$\mathcal{O}(n) + \mathcal{O}(n - 1) + \dots + \mathcal{O}(n - j) = (j + 1)\mathcal{O}(n) - \mathcal{O}(j^2) < (2\beta + 1)\mathcal{O}(n) \quad (4.6)$$

Therefore, the algorithm is upper bonded by $(2\beta + 1)\mathcal{O}(n) = \mathcal{O}(2m + n)$ in worst case.

Average Case Complexity. Given n integer keys $S[0 \dots n - 1]$, if $m = \beta n$ and the keys are uniformly distributed, this means that $\frac{n}{2\beta}$ keys satisfy $S[i] < \frac{n}{2}$. Therefore, the algorithm is capable of sorting $\frac{n}{2\beta}$ keys in $\mathcal{O}(n)$ time during first pass. This will continue until all the keys are sorted. The sum of sorted keys in each iteration can be represented with the series,

$$\frac{n}{2\beta} + \frac{n(2\beta - 1)}{4\beta^2} + \frac{n(2\beta - 1)^2}{8\beta^3} + \dots + \frac{n(2\beta - 1)^{k-1}}{2^k \beta^k} + \dots \quad (4.7)$$

It is reasonable to think that the sorting ends when one term is left which means the sum of k terms of this series is equal to $n - 1$, from where we can calculate the number of

iteration or dept of recursion k which is valid when $\beta > \frac{1}{2}$,

$$\frac{1}{n} = \frac{(2\beta - 1)^{k-1}}{(2\beta)^k} \quad (4.8)$$

It is seen from Eqn. 4.8 that when $m = n$, i.e., $\beta = 1$, number of iteration or dept of recursion becomes $k = \log n$. It is known that each step takes $\mathcal{O}(n)$ time. Therefore, the time complexity of the algorithm is,

$$\mathcal{O}(n) \left(\frac{(2\beta - 1)}{2\beta} + \frac{(2\beta - 1)^2}{(2\beta)^2} + \dots + \frac{(2\beta - 1)^{k-1}}{(2\beta)^{k-1}} \right) \quad (4.9)$$

from where we can obtain by defining $x = \frac{(2\beta-1)}{2\beta}$,

$$\mathcal{O}(n)(1 + x + x^2 + x^3 + \dots + x^{k-1}) = \mathcal{O}(n) \left(\frac{1}{1-x} - \frac{x^{k-1}}{1-x} \right) < 2\beta \mathcal{O}(n) \quad (4.10)$$

which means that the algorithm is upper bounded by $2\beta \mathcal{O}(n)$ or $2\mathcal{O}(m)$ in the average case.

5 Conclusions

In this study, in-place associative integer sorting technique is introduced. Using the technique, the main difficulties of distributive sorting algorithms are solved by its inherent three basic steps namely (i) *practicing*, (ii) *storing* and (iii) *retrieval* which are three main stages in the formation and retrieval of memory in cognitive neuroscience. The technique is very simple and straightforward and around 30 lines of C code is enough.

The technique sorts the keys using $\mathcal{O}(1)$ extra space in $\mathcal{O}(n + m)$ time for the worst, $\mathcal{O}(m)$ time for the average (uniformly distributed keys) and $\mathcal{O}(n)$ time for the best case. It shows similar characteristics with bucket sort and distribution counting sort and hence can be thought of as *in-place associative bucket sort* or *in-place associative distribution counting sort*. However, it is time-space efficient than both. The ratio $\frac{m}{n}$ defines the efficiency (time-space trade-offs) letting very large lists to be sorted in-place. Furthermore, the dependency of the efficiency on the distribution of the keys is $\mathcal{O}(n)$ which means it replaces all the methods based on address calculation, that are known to be very efficient when the keys have known (usually uniform) distribution and require additional space more or less proportional to n . Hence, associative sort asymptotically outperforms all content based sorting algorithms when $\frac{m}{n} = c$ and c is the efficiency constant defined by the sorting algorithm that is compared with it regardless of how large is the list.

The technique seems to be very flexible, efficient and applicable for other problems, as well, such as membership and range queries, hashing, searching, element distinction, succinct data structures, gaining space, etc. For instance, gaining space is an inherent step of associative sort which improves its performance and can be used explicitly, as well.

The only drawback of the algorithm is that it is unstable. But, an imaginary subspace can create other subspaces and associations using the idle keys that were already practiced by manipulating either their position or value or both. Hence, different techniques can be developed on subspaces to solve other problems such as stability.

References

- [1] K.S. Lashley, "The problem of serial order in behavior", in *Cerebral Mechanisms in Behavior*, ed. LA Jeffress, John Wiley & Sons, 1966.
- [2] K.S. Lashley, "In search of the engram", *IEEE Transactions on Electronic Computer*, Vol. EC-15, no. 4, 1966.
- [3] R.N.A. Henson, "Short-term memory for serial order: The start-end model", *Cognitive Psychology*, Vol. 36, pp. 73 - 137, 1998.
- [4] C.A.R Hoare, "Quicksort", *Comput. J.*, Vol. 5, pp. 10 - 16, 1962.
- [5] D.L. Shell, "A High Speed Sorting Procedure", *Communications of ACM*, Vol. 2, pp. 30 - 32, 1959.
- [6] A. Burnetas, D. Solow, R. Agrawal, "An analysis and implementation of an efficient in-place bucket sort", *Acta Informatica*, Vol. 34, pp. 687 - 700, 1997.
- [7] J. Williams, "Heapsort", *Communications of the ACM*, Vol. 7, pp. 347 - 348.
- [8] H.H. Seward, *Information Sorting in the Application of Electronic Digital Computers to Business Operations*, Master's thesis, MIT Digital Computer Laboratory, Report R-232, Cambridge, 1954.
- [9] W. Feurzig, "Algorithm 23, mathsort", *Commun. ACM*, Vol. 3, pp. 601 - 602, 1960.
- [10] E.J. Isaac, R.C. Singleton, "Sorting by address calculation", *Journal of the ACM*, Vol. 3, pp. 169 - 174, 1956.

- [11] M.E. Tarter, R.A. Kronmal, “Non-uniform key distribution and address calculation sorting”, Proc. ACM Nat’l Conf. 21, 1966.
- [12] I. Flores, “Computer time for address calculation sorting”, Journal of the ACM, Vol. 7, pp. 389 - 409, 1960.
- [13] B. Jones, “A variation on sorting by address calculation”, Communications of the ACM , Vol. 13, pp. 105 - 107, 1970.
- [14] G. Gupta, “Sorting by hashing and inserting”, Proc. ACM Annual Computer Science Conf. 17, pp. 409 - 409, 1989.
- [15] F. Suraweera, J.M. Al-Anzy, “Analysis of a modified address calculation sorting algorithm”, Comput. J. Vol. 31, pp. 561 - 563, 1988.
- [16] H.M. Mahmoud, Sorting, A Distribution Theory, John Wiley and Sons, 2000.
- [17] T.H. Cormen, C.E. Leiserson, R.L. Rivest, C. Stein, Introduction to Algorithms, The MIT Press, 2001.
- [18] D.E. Knuth, The Art of Computer Programming, Volume 3: Sorting and Searching, Addison-Wesley, 1973.
- [19] R. Sedgwick, Algorithms in C, Parts 1-4: Fundamentals, Data Structures, Sorting, Searching, Addison-Wesley, 1997.
- [20] R. Shiffrin, J. Cook, “Short-term forgetting of item and order information”, Journal of Verbal Learning and Verbal Behavior, Vol. 17, pp. 189 - 218, 1978.
- [21] A.G. Hanlon, “Content-addressable and associative memory systems”, IEEE Transactions on Electronic Computer, Vol. EC-15, pp. 509 - 521, 1966.
- [22] A. Andersson, T. Hagerup, S. Nilsson, R. Raman, “Sorting in linear time?”, Journal of Computer and System Sciences, Vol. 57, pp. 74 - 93, 1998.
- [23] G. Franceschini, S. Muthukrishnan, M. Patrascu, “Radix sorting with no extra space”, ESA’07 Proc. 15th annual European conference on Algorithms, pp. 194 - 205, 2007.

- [24] J. Katajainen, T. Pasanen, “Stable minimum space partitioning in linear time”, BIT Numerical Mathematics, Vol. 32, pp. 580 - 585, 1992.
- [25] J. Katajainen, T. Pasanen, “Sorting Multisets Stably in Minimum Space”, Acta Informatica, Vol. 31, no. 4, pp. 301 - 313, 1994.
- [26] J. Salowe, W. Steiger, “Simplified stable merging tasks”, Journal of Algorithms, Vol. 8, pp. 557 - 571, 1987.