



Motivation:

Use possibly erroneous predictions from ML models to improve provably correct algorithms in classic algorithmic settings.

Two models of predictions:

Positional Setting

a_i	510	82	208	813	67	491
p_i	5	2	3	6	1	4
$\widehat{p_i}$	6	1	4	5	3	4

Given predicted ranking of each item.

Error Measure of Predictors

 $\eta_i^{\Delta} := |\hat{p}(i) - p(i)|$

 $\eta_i^l := |\{j \in [n] : \hat{p}(j) \le \hat{p}(i) \land p(j) > p(i)\}|$ $\eta_i^r := |\{j \in [n] : \hat{p}(j) \ge \hat{p}(i) \land p(j) < p(i)\}|$

> Comparison Complexity of Proposed Algorithms Dirty-Clean Sort: $O\left(\sum_{i=1}^{n} \log\left(\eta_i + 2\right)\right)$

Displacement Sort: $O\left(\sum_{i=1}^{n} \log\left(\eta_i^{\Delta} + 2\right)\right)$ Double-Hoover Sort: $O\left(\sum_{i=1}^{n} \log\left(\min\left\{\eta_{i}^{l}, \eta_{i}^{r}\right\} + 2\right)\right)$

Dirty-Clean Sort:

Insert items into a Binary Search Tree in randomized order. For each item, insertion contains three phases:

1. **Dirty Search**: trace root-to-leaf path using dirty comparisons.

2. Verification: go up by clean comparisons to find the first correct subtree.

3. Clean Search: insert the item back to BST following clean comparisons.

Sorting with Predictions

Xingjian Bai, Christian Coester xingjian.bai@sjc.ox.ac.uk, christian.coester@cs.ox.ac.uk



Dirty Comparisons Setting



Given a faster and dirty comparison between each pair of items.

 $\eta_i = |\{j : (a_i < a_j) \neq (a_i \hat{<} a_j)\}|$

Classic Entropic Bound: O(n log n)



1. Two "Hoovers", L and R, have exponentially increasing strengths to "suck in" items: $\delta=1, 2, 4, \text{ and so on}$. 2. At strength δ , the hoovers suck in items that can be inserted within $\log(\delta)$ comparisons. 3. To insert an item, a hoover conducts a binary search to locate the inserting position.

SUOS 2 # 10

Double-Hoover Sort:



Experimental Results:



Drug efficiency testing Draw conclusions from social experiments (any scenarios with faster rough comparisons available!)

