

Worst time of sequential search (in ordered array and in unordered array)

Example

Sequentialsearch, **unordered**

Find an item x in an unorderedarray I based only on comparisonsof x to elementsof I .

$I[0], I[1], I[2], \dots, I[k - 1], I[k], \dots, I[n - 1]$

OR

Sequentialsearch, **ordered**.

Find an item x in an orderedarray I based only on comparisonsof x to elementsof I .

$I[0] \leq I[1] \leq I[2] \leq \dots \leq I[k - 1] \leq I[k] \leq \dots \leq I[n - 1]$

Note. A search can be successful if the element x that is searchedfor is found, of unsuccessful otherwise In the case of **successfulsearch** in an orderedarray, the sequentialsearchalgorithm**does not take advantageof the order**. In the case of **unsuccessful search** in an orderedarray, the sequentialsearchalgorithm**does take advantageof the order** because it halts after encouteringand elementof I that is larger than x .

Notation

size (I) - number of elementsto be searched

$T(n)$ -

number of comparisonsperformedwhile searchingof an entry in an n - elementarray I .

Worst- case (e.g., successfulsearch for the last element

$x = I[n - 1]$

or unsuccessfulsearch past the last element

$x > I[n - 1]$

- **works both for unorderedand ordered search**) runningtime

$T(n) = n$

Optimality

For an **unordered**array, the sequentialsearch is worst-case optimalin the class of algorithmsthat search by comparisonsof keys.

Proof. Suppose that there is an algorithm S that searches by comparison of keys that is capable of finding an element x in an n -element array performing at less than n comparisons

Here is how you can play an adversary strategy in order to make the algorithm S fail.

1. Give S an array A of n elements that are all greater than 0 and a number 0 to search for.
2. Every time that S compares the given 0 to an element of A , say, to $A[i]$, you answer "Not equal".
3. If S stops and says "0 is not there", you assign 0 to any element $A[j]$ that the algorithm S did not compare 0 to (there must be such an element since there are n elements of A and S made less than n comparisons) and say "Wrong answer, look, $A[j]=0$ ".
4. If the algorithm S stops and says "0 is there", you say "Wrong answer, look, all elements of A are greater than 0".

In any case (3 or 4), S will give a wrong answer. **End of proof.**

For an **ordered** array, the sequential search is **NOT** worst-case optimal in that class. For instance, binary search (that searches by comparison of keys) performs less comparisons in the worst case than sequential search does.