

Re: How to prove that a random sort algorithm converges?

## Re: How to prove that a random sort algorithm converges?

---

*Source:* <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.math/2006-05/msg03409.html>

---

- *From:* "Tim Peters" <[tim.one@xxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:tim.one@xxxxxxxxxxxxx)>
  - *Date:* Thu, 18 May 2006 14:40:59 -0400
- 

[James]

Thanks to all who contributed in one way or another. Although I will need sometime to digest your suggestions, there are a few things I learn at the moment:

- (1) There are more than one way to prove the algorithm.

[Tim Peters]

That's true. The way I suggested is the easiest of all those I saw, although it also gives the least information.

- (2) It appears that saying "the algorithm converges is not precise enough". We need to define what is the convergence criterion.

Well, "converges" has no conventional meaning here at all, so you have to define what you mean. Convergence usually applies to iterative numerical algorithms, such as talking about how quickly a root-finding algorithm can be expected to converge to a root to within a given tolerance.

[Dave Seaman]

What's wrong with pointwise convergence? It looks like a perfectly standard example of convergence to me.

Primarily because I think it's non-responsive. The OP said "I am not a

Re: How to prove that a random sort algorithm converges?

Re: How to prove that a random sort algorithm converges?

maths person", and I think it's obvious (although I may be wrong) that he only cares about whether he'll reach the sorted state.

In fact, since there can be only a finite number of