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Abstract
We present the algorithm funnelselet, the first optimal randomized cache-oblivious algorithm for the multiple-selection problem. The algorithm takes as input an unsorted array of $N$ elements and $q$ query ranks $r_1 < \cdots < r_q$, and returns in sorted order the $q$ input elements of rank $r_1, \ldots, r_q$, respectively. The algorithm uses expected and with high probability $O\left(\sum_{i=1}^{q+1} \Delta_i \log \frac{M}{B} + \frac{N}{B}\right)$ I/Os, where $B$ is the external memory block size, $M \geq B^{1+\varepsilon}$ is the internal memory size, for some constant $\varepsilon > 0$, and $\Delta_i = r_i - r_{i-1}$ (assuming $r_0 = 0$ and $r_{q+1} = N + 1$). This is the best possible I/O bound in the cache-oblivious and external memory models. The result is achieved by reversing the computation of the cache-oblivious sorting algorithm funnelsort by Frigo, Leiserson, Prokop and Ramachandran [FOCS 1999], using randomly selected pivots for distributing elements, and pruning computations that with high probability are not expected to contain any query ranks.
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1 Introduction
We present the first randomized cache-oblivious algorithm for the multiple-selection problem. Our result combines ideas from the cache-oblivious sorting algorithm funnelsort with existing multiple-selection algorithms. Many existing time- and comparison-optimal multiple-selection algorithms are already cache oblivious, but they are not optimal with respect to the number of I/Os performed when analyzed in the cache-oblivious model.

Let us start with a brief history of the multiple-selection problem. In 1961, Hoare presented the classic randomized sorting algorithm quicksort, published as Algorithm 64 in the Algorithms column of the Communications of the ACM [15]. Quicksort makes essential use of the randomized algorithm partition (Algorithm 63 [14]), that picks a random element, denoted a pivot, and partitions the elements into those smaller and larger than the pivot. By recursing on each subproblem, quicksort sorts an input of size $N$ in expected $O(N \log N)$ time and comparisons. Hoare observed that if we are only interested in finding the $r$th smallest element in the input, denoted the element of rank $r$, we do not need to sort the input completely. By pruning recursive calls in quicksort not relevant for finding the $r$th smallest element, the resulting algorithm find (Algorithm 65 [16]) achieves expected $O(N)$ time. Chambers [7] generalized this idea to finding $q$ elements of $q$ given ranks $1 \leq r_1 < r_2 < \cdots < r_q \leq N$, in the following denoted the multiple-selection problem, by just skipping all recursive problems not containing any query rank. The expected running time is $O(N \log q)$, but Prodinger [19] proved a tighter expected bound of $O(B + N)$, where $B = \sum_{i=1}^{q+1} \Delta_i \log \frac{N}{\Delta_i}$, with $\Delta_i = r_i - r_{i-1}$, for $1 \leq i \leq q + 1$, assuming $r_0 = 0$ and $r_{q+1} = N + 1$.

1 $\log$ denotes the binary logarithm.
We call \( B \) the entropy of the multiple-selection query \([3]\). Dobkin and Munro \([8]\) achieved matching asymptotic bounds for the worst-base time in the comparison model by using a deterministic linear-time (single) selection algorithm \([4, 20]\) for the partitioning steps.

### 1.1 Model of Computation

In this paper we study the multiple-selection problem in a hierarchical-memory model, where we have an infinite external memory and an internal memory of capacity \( M \) elements, and where data is transferred between the internal and external memory in blocks of \( B \) consecutive elements. A block transfer is called an I/O (input/output operation). The I/O cost of an algorithm is the number of I/Os it performs. Aggarwal and Vitter \([1]\) introduced this as the external-memory model and proved that sorting in this model requires \( \Theta(\frac{N}{B} \log_{M/B} \frac{M}{B}) \) I/Os. The upper bound is, e.g., achieved by \( M/B \)-way mergesort and distributionsort algorithms, where the algorithms exploit knowledge of the parameters \( M \) and \( B \).

Frigo et al. \([12, 13]\) introduced the cache-oblivious model, that essentially is the same as the external-memory model, except that algorithms do not know \( M \) and \( B \), and I/Os are assumed to be performed automatically by an optimal paging algorithm. As a consequence, cache-oblivious algorithms also adapt to multi-level memory hierarchies (under certain conditions \([13]\)). The same paper introduced the cache-oblivious sorting algorithm funnelsort achieving the optimal external-memory I/O bound, assuming a “tall-cache”, \( M = \Omega(B^2) \). Brodal and Fagerberg \([6]\) observed that under the weaker tall-cache assumption \( M \geq B^{1+\varepsilon} \), for a constant \( \varepsilon > 0 \), the optimal I/O bound increases by a factor \( \Theta(1/\varepsilon) \).

Multiple selection was studied in external-memory by Hu et al. \([17]\) and Barbay et al. \([3]\). The algorithms have an I/O cost of \( O(B_{I/O} + \frac{N}{B}) \), where \( B_{I/O} = \frac{B}{\log_{(M/B)}} \). A matching lower bound was sketched in \([3]\) as a reduction from sorting, assuming the multiple-selection algorithm partitions the input elements into the gaps between the queried elements (most algorithms actually solve this problem, that Chambers denoted partial sorting). Hu et al. \([17]\) considered the case where the queried elements can be returned in arbitrary order without partial sorting, and showed that without a tall-cache assumption, this problem can actually be solved asymptotically faster for a small number of queries \( q \).

### 1.2 Results

Our first result is a lower bound for the external-memory multiple-selection problem (and not only for the partial-sorting problem as in the lower bound of Barbay et al. \([3]\)).

**Theorem 1 (Lower bound).** External-memory multiple selection in expectation requires \( \Omega(\frac{N}{B} \log_{M/B} B) \) I/Os.

Note that an external-memory lower bound is also a cache-oblivious lower bound (for any online paging strategy), and that under a tall-cache assumption \( M \geq B^{1+\varepsilon} \), for a constant \( \varepsilon > 0 \), the last term \( O(\frac{N}{B} \log_{M/B} B) = O(\frac{1}{\varepsilon} \cdot \frac{N}{B}) \). The result is obtained by combining the comparison lower bound for the multiple-selection problem by Dobkin and Munro \([8]\) with the general reduction technique of Arge et al. \([2]\), that can derive an I/O-decision-tree lower bound from a comparison-decision-tree lower bound.

Our second result is the cache-oblivious algorithm funnelselect.

**Theorem 2 (Funnelsect upper bound).** There exists a randomized cache-oblivious algorithm solving the multiple-selection problem using \( O(B_{I/O} + \frac{N}{B}) \) I/Os in expectation and with high probability.
Throughout the paper we assume that the input to a multiple-selection algorithm are two sets, \( R = \text{worst-case bounds} \). Note that Barbay \textit{et al.} assume a tall cache, whereas Hu \textit{et al.} do not.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Comparisons</th>
<th>I/Os</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hoare [16]</td>
<td>( 2 \ln 2B + 2N + o(N) )</td>
<td>( O(N/B) )</td>
<td>CO, randomized</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Floyd &amp; Rivest [11]</td>
<td>( N + \min{r, N-r} + o(N) )</td>
<td>( O(N/B) )</td>
<td>CO, randomized</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blum \textit{et al.} [4]</td>
<td>( 5.4305N )</td>
<td>( O(N/B) )</td>
<td>CO, deterministic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schönhage \textit{et al.} [20]</td>
<td>( 3N + o(N) )</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>deterministic, median</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dor &amp; Zwick [9]</td>
<td>( 2.95 + o(N)N )</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>deterministic, median</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 1 Algorithms for selection and multiple selection

- **Single selection**
  - Hoare [16]: \( 2 \ln 2B + 2N + o(N) \) \( O(N/B) \) CO, randomized
  - Floyd & Rivest [11]: \( N + \min\{r, N-r\} + o(N) \) \( O(N/B) \) CO, randomized
  - Blum \textit{et al.} [4]: \( 5.4305N \) \( O(N/B) \) CO, deterministic
  - Schönhage \textit{et al.} [20]: \( 3N + o(N) \) ? deterministic, median
  - Dor & Zwick [9]: \( 2.95 + o(N)N \) ? deterministic, median

- **Multiple selection**
  - Chambers [7, 19]: \( 2 \ln 2B + O(N) \) \( O((B + N)/B) \) CO, randomized
  - Dobkin & Munro [8]: \( 3B + O(N) \) \( O((B + N)/B) \) CO, deterministic
  - Kaligosi \textit{et al.} [18]: \( B + o(B) + O(N) \) \( O((B + N)/B) \) CO, deterministic
  - Hu \textit{et al.} [17]: \( O(N \log(q)) \) \( O(N/B \log_{M/B}(q/B)) \) deterministic
  - Barbay \textit{et al.} [3]: \( B + o(B) + O(N) \) \( O(B_i/q + N/B) \) online, determ., \( M \geq B^{\epsilon+\epsilon} \)
  - \textit{New (Theorem 2)}: \( O(B + N) \) \( O(B_i/q + N/B) \) CO, randomized, \( M \geq B^{\epsilon+\epsilon} \)

At the high level, the result is obtained by the standard approach of recursively partitioning by pivots and pruning computations not containing any query ranks. To achieve good I/O performance in the cache-oblivious model we pipeline the partitioning by essentially reversing the computations done by funnelsort, and replace each merging node by a partitioning node. Since we do not know the ranks of the pivots during the partitioning, we pick the pivots carefully from a random sample such that a concentration bound guarantees approximate ranks of the pivots, so we can truncate computations that with high probability do not contain any query ranks. Table 1 summarizes known and the new results.

### 1.3 Preliminaries and Notation

Throughout the paper we assume that the input to a multiple-selection algorithm are two arrays \( S \) and \( R \), where \( S \) is an unsorted array of \( N \) elements from a totally ordered universe, and \( R \) is a sorted array \( r_1, \ldots, r_q \) of \( q \) distinct query ranks, where \( 1 \leq r_1 < \cdots < r_q \leq N \). Our task is to report an array of the \( q \) order statistics \( S(r_1), \ldots, S(r_q) \), where \( S(r) \) is the \( r \)th smallest element in \( S \), i.e., the element at index \( r \) in an array storing \( S \) after sorting it. If \( x \) is an element and \( S \) a set, we let \( x < S \) denote that \( x < y \) for all \( y \) in \( S \). Unless stated otherwise, we assume that all elements in \( S \) are distinct.

### 1.4 Outline of Paper

In Section 2 we prove the I/O lower bound for multiple selection stated in Theorem 1. In Section 3 we present internal-memory and external-memory algorithms as a warm-up for the cache-oblivious algorithm in Section 4 achieving Theorem 2. In Section 5 we analyze the algorithm. In Section 6, we discuss how to extend the algorithm to partially sort the input, and in Section 7, we discuss how to deal with equal elements. Section 8 concludes with open problems.

### 2 Lower Bound

In this section we prove Theorem 1. Dobkin and Munro [8, Theorem 1] observed that the comparisons done by a comparison-based multiple-selection algorithm must classify the
remaining elements into “gaps” between the selected elements, and by sorting each of these gaps with \( \Delta_i - 1 \) elements using \( \Delta_i \log \Delta_i - O(\Delta_i) \) additional comparisons, one can sort the input. Together with the \( N \log N - O(N) \) lower bound on comparison based sorting, we have

\[
\text{#comparisons for multiple selection} + \sum_{i=1}^{q+1} (\Delta_i \log \Delta_i - O(\Delta_i)) \geq N \log N - O(N),
\]

implying a lower bound of \( B - O(N) \) on the number of comparisons for multiple selection, where \( B = \sum_{i=1}^{q+1} \Delta_i \log \left( \frac{N}{\Delta_i} \right) \). This holds for worst, average, and expected case.

To prove I/O lower bounds on external-memory algorithms, Arge et al. [2] presented a general reduction that converts a comparison lower bound into an I/O lower bound, by converting an I/O-decision tree \( T \) to a standard comparison decision tree \( T_c \). An I/O-decision tree consists of unary I/O-nodes moving \( B \) elements between internal and external memory, and comparison nodes between two elements in internal memory. Their lower bound reduction [2, Corollary 5] relates for any input \( x \), the number of I/Os in \( T \), \( \#I/Os_T(x) \), to the number of comparisons in \( T_c \), \( \#comparisons_{T_c}(x) \), as

\[
\#comparisons_{T_c}(x) \leq N \log B + \#I/Os_T(x) \cdot B \left( 3 + \log \frac{M - B}{B} \right),
\]

(1)

Since the reduction relates comparisons and I/Os for each input instance, the reduction can be used to show worst-case, average-case, and expected-case lower bounds.

Plugging the \( B - O(N) \) comparison lower bound into eq. (1) we get

\[
\sum_{i=1}^{q+1} \Delta_i \log \frac{N}{\Delta_i} - O(N) \leq N \log B + \#I/Os \cdot B \left( 3 + \log \frac{M - B}{B} \right),
\]

implying the following I/O lower bound for multiple selection:

\[
\#I/Os \geq 1 + \frac{1}{\log(B/M)} \cdot \mathcal{B}_{I/O} - O\left( \frac{N}{B} \log_{M/B} B \right) = \Omega\left( \frac{N}{B} \log_{M/B} B \right),
\]

for \( M \geq 2B \) and \( \mathcal{B}_{I/O} = \sum_{i=1}^{q+1} \frac{\Delta_i}{M} \log_{M/B} \frac{N}{\Delta_i} = \frac{R}{\log(M/B)} \). This concludes the proof of Theorem 1.

Aggarwal and Vitter [1, Theorem 3.1] proved that comparison-based external-memory sorting requires \( \Omega\left( \frac{N}{M} \cdot \log_{M/B} \frac{N}{M} \right) \) I/Os. This lower bound also applies to sorting in the cache-oblivious model. Brodal and Fagerberg [6, Corollary 2] showed that for a cache-oblivious sorting algorithm to be asymptotically optimal for all choices of \( M \) and \( B \), a “tall-cache” assumption \( M \geq B^{1+\varepsilon} \) is necessary. Since we can sort \( N \) elements using a multiple-selection algorithm by querying all ranks \( 1, \ldots, N \), a tall-cache assumption is also necessary for matching bounds for multiple selection in the cache-oblivious model.

3 Internal-Memory and External-Memory Multiple Selection

In this section we consider simple internal-memory and external-memory (cache-conscious) algorithms for multiple selection as a warm-up for our cache-oblivous algorithm in Section 4, which borrows ideas from both algorithms.

3.1 Internal Memory

A simple recursive internal-memory algorithm is MultiSelect (Algorithm 1). This is essentially Chamber’s algorithm from 1971 [7], except for the choice of pivot. If there are no
Algorithm 1 Internal-memory multiple selection.

1: procedure MultiSelect(S[1..N], R[1..q])
2: if R ≠ ∅ then
3: P ← median of S (pivot)
4: Partition S into S1 < P < S2
5: r ← |S1| + 1 (the rank of P in S)
6: Partition R into R1 < r < R2
7: MultiSelect(S1, R1)
8: if r ∈ R then
9: Report P
10: MultiSelect(S2, {r − r | r ∈ R2})

Algorithm 2 External-memory multiple selection (multi-way generalization of MultiSelect).

1: procedure MultiSelect_IO(S[1..N], R[1..q])
2: if R ≠ ∅ then
3: Find k−1 ≤ k − 1 pivots P1 < ··· < Pk−1 in S
4: Partition S into S1, . . . , Sk s. t. Pi−1 < Si < Pi (P0 = −∞,Pk = +∞)
5: ri ← i + |S1| + · · · + |Si| (the rank of Pi in S)
6: Partition R into R1, . . . , Rk s. t. ri−1 < R ≤ ri (r0 = 0, rK = N + 1)
7: for i = 1, . . . , k do
8: MultiSelect_IO(Si, {qi − ri−1 | r ∈ Ri})
9: if ri ∈ R then
10: Report Pi

query ranks in R, nothing needs to be reported. Otherwise, pick a pivot P from S, partition S \ {P} into S1 and S2, such that S1 < P < S2, compute the rank r of the pivot P in S, partition R \ {r} into R1 and R2, such that R1 < r < R2, and recurse on the subproblems (S1, R1) and (S2, R2). The pivot P is output before the second recursion if r is a query rank in R (so elements are reported in increasing rank order). This intuitively corresponds to a distributionsort/quicksort, where we truncate recursive calls not containing any query ranks in R.

In Algorithm 1, P is the exact median of S, but we could also have used an approximate median, or a randomly sampled pivot. Chamber’s original algorithm uses a random element from S. Finding the pivot can be done using the deterministic linear-time median finding algorithms by Blum et al. [4] or the randomized algorithms by Hoare [16] or Floyd and Rivest [11]. Prodinger [19] proved that selecting a random pivot leads to expected overall O(B + N) time. Kaligosi et al. [18, Section 2] proved that Algorithm 1 achieves O(B + N) worst-case time, if a linear time median selection algorithm is used.

Algorithm MultiSelect is cache oblivious, since it is designed independently of the memory parameter B and M. All the above median algorithms are based on repeatedly scanning arrays and (analyzed in the cache-oblivious model) require O(N/B) I/Os worst-case and expected, respectively. Since the additional work of MultiSelect can be implemented by repeatedly scanning arrays allocated on a stack, the I/O cost of the algorithm equals the internal computation time divided by the external-memory block size, i.e., O(B/B) I/Os. Our cache-oblivious algorithm from Section 4 improves upon this I/O cost by a factor Θ(\lg \frac{M}{B}).
We now analyze the comparison and I/O cost of MultiSelect\textsubscript{1/0}. Assume creating a \((k, \alpha)\)-partitioning has an (abstract) cost of \(C \cdot N\), where \(C = C(k, \alpha, M, B)\) does not depend on \(N\). For example, when counting comparisons we have \(C = \Theta(\log k)\). The total cost of MultiSelect\textsubscript{1/0} is the sum of the costs of all partitioning steps, i.e., \(C\) times the sum of the sizes of all the subsets partitioned by the algorithm (the white rectangles in Figure 1).
Consider any fixed gap \( \Delta \) between two query ranks. We assume that the right query rank (but not the left) is part of the gap, so that all elements of \( S \) belong to exactly one gap. At each level of the recursion, the gap \( \Delta \) intersects at most two subproblems that need to be partitioned, namely the subproblems containing the query ranks at the boundary of \( \Delta \) (illustrated by the dashed lines in Figure 1). Since subproblems at depth \( d \) of the recursion have size at most \( \alpha^d N \), the total cost we need to charge within gap \( \Delta \) is at most \( C \times \sum_{d=0}^{\infty} \min(\Delta, 2\alpha^d N) \leq C \times \Delta \log_2 \frac{N}{\Delta} + \Delta \). Here we use that \( 2\alpha^d N \) is geometrically decreasing and \( \Delta = 2\alpha^d N \) implies \( d = \log_2 \frac{N}{\Delta} \), i.e., in the sum, \( \Delta \) is the term for the first \( \lfloor \log_2 \frac{N}{\Delta} \rfloor \) levels, whereas the remaining terms are geometrically decreasing, starting with at most \( \Delta \). Summing over all gaps we obtain total cost at most

\[
C \cdot \left( \sum_{i=1}^{q+1} \Delta_i \log_2 \frac{N}{\Delta_i} + \frac{N}{1-\alpha} \right).
\]

Recall that MultiSelect is the special case of MultiSelect\(1/O\) with \( k = 2 \) and \( \alpha = 1/2 \). For comparisons, we have \( C = O(1) \) per processed element in partitioning. By eq. (2), the total number of comparisons in MultiSelect is \( O(B + N) \). For MultiSelect\(1/O\) we have \( k = cM/B \) and \( \alpha = 2/k \), and a cost of \( C = O(1/B) \) I/Os per processed element, so by eq. (2), MultiSelect\(1/O\) has a total cost of \( O(B_{1/O} + \frac{N}{B}) \) I/Os. Alternatively, using the multiway partitioning method of Aggarwal and Vitter [1] with \( k = \sqrt{M/B} \), \( \alpha = 2/k \), and cost \( C = O(1/B) \) for I/Os, we also get a total cost of \( O(B_{1/O} + \frac{N}{B}) \) I/Os from eq. (2).

## 4 Cache-Oblivious Multiple Selection

In this section we present our cache-oblivious multiple-selection algorithm FunnelSelect (Algorithm 4). We first recall funnels for merging (Section 4.1) and then show that they can be used for partitioning (Section 4.2). FunnelSelect performs a single round of such a funnel-based partitioning, splitting the input into \( k \) parts of expected size \( \Theta(N/k) \) using \( k-1 \) pivots, where \( k = \Theta(N^{1/d}) \) and \( d = \max\{1 + 2/\varepsilon, 3\} \) under the tall-cache assumption \( M \geq B^{1+\varepsilon} \). We then deal with each of the \( k \) parts with a non-empty set of rank queries by fully sorting it and returning the sought ranks.

However, to stay within the allowed I/O bound, we have to truncate partitioning, namely whenever neither side of the split is likely to contain a query rank (Section 4.4). To boost the probability of “guessing correctly” which buckets query ranks fall into, we also have to choose pivots judiciously (Section 4.3). Section 5 then proves Theorem 2.

### 4.1 Funnelsort

Since our cache-oblivious multiple-selection algorithm is heavily based on ideas from the optimal cache-oblivious sorting algorithm funnelsort by Frigo et al. [12, Section 4], we briefly recall funnelsort and in particular its \( k \)-merger construction here.\(^2\) Funnelsort uses

\(\text{\footnotesize ESA 2023}\)
A k-merger (see Figure 2) consists of a perfectly balanced binary tree of height \( \lg k \) of binary merger-nodes, where each tree edge contains a buffer that is a sorted array of elements. Each merger-node consumes elements from two child buffers and feeds into its parent output buffer. When invoking a merger-node \( v \), the node \( v \) fills its output buffer by merging the content of its input buffers until either the output buffer is full or one of the input buffers is exhausted. If the input buffer of a child \( w \) is exhausted, we recursively invoke \( w \) to fill its output buffer; then \( v \) continues to fill its output buffer.

The I/O efficiency of funnelsort hinges entirely on a judicious choice of buffer sizes. The buffers connecting the middle levels of binary mergers (between level \( \lceil \lg(k)/2 \rceil \) and one below) can hold \( \lceil k^{d/2} \rceil \) elements each. The construction is recursively applied to a \( k' = 2^{\lceil \lg(k)/2 \rceil} \) \( \sqrt{k} \)-merger forming the top \( \lceil \lg(k)/2 \rceil \) levels and the \( k' \) children each of which is a \( k'' = 2^{\lceil \lg(k)/2 \rceil} \approx \sqrt{k} \)-merger below the middle buffers; following a van-Emde-Boas layout of the binary tree and recursively allocating buffers consecutively in memory in that order.
4.2 Funnels for Partitioning

A key innovation of this paper is the $k$-partitioner, which uses funnels in reverse: instead of merging $k$ runs, we push elements down the funnel while partitioning them around $k-1$ pivots into $k$ buckets. We use the same internal buffer sizes for a $k$-partitioner as in a $k$-merger; each buffer is organized as a queue and maintains an element count. The $k$ output buffers at the bottom of a $k$-partitioner are conceptually unbounded (never full). Note that in partitioning, we always know the number $N$ of elements and can allocate output buffers as linked lists of blocks of size $\Theta(N/k)$. Calling PARTITION (Algorithm 3) on a node $v$ partitions elements around $v$’s pivot and passes them to one of $v$’s children, recursively emptying these whenever they become full. FUNNELPARTITION starts with all elements in the root’s input buffer and then calls PARTITION on the root. After that, FLUSH recursively empties any remaining nonempty buffers.

Figure 2 can be read mutatis mutandi as a $k$-partitioner instead of a $k$-merger: Each node $v_i$ stores a pivot $P_i$ and PARTITION pushes elements towards the leaves. Buffers are consumed from the bottom and filled at the top of the hatched area. Figure 2 shows an overall PARTITION call at $v_8$, where first $v_4$ and then $v_6$ had run full; currently $v_6$ is moving elements from its parent buffer to its child buffers. Note that buffer sizes in Figure 2 are not drawn to scale; Figure 3 gives a more truthful representation.

The main property of $k$-partitioners is given in Lemma 3 below. It is similar to [6, Lemma 1], but we give a self-contained proof here.

Lemma 3 (Funnel lemma). There exists a constant $c \geq 1$ so that the following holds. Let $d \geq 2$ be a constant. The size of a $k$-partitioner (excluding its output buffers) is bounded by $c \cdot k^{(d+1)/2}$. Assume $d \geq 2$ is such that $B^{1+\varepsilon} \leq M/3$ where $\varepsilon = 2/(d-1)$. Partitioning $N \geq k^d$ elements with FUNNELPARTITION around $k-1$ pivots uses $N \log(k)$ comparisons and incurs $O\left(\frac{N}{2^{d+1}}(\log M(k) + 1) + k\right)$ I/Os.
Funnelselect: Cache-Oblivious Multiple Selection

Algorithm 3 Operations on \( k \)-partitioners. The *full()* method returns whether a buffer has capacity for further elements. The *clear()* method removes all current elements from a buffer.

```plaintext
1: procedure FunnelPartition(\([1..N], P[1..k - 1]\))
2:     Sort \( P \)
3:     Build \( k \)-partitioner, using \( P \) as pivots (assigned in in-order to nodes)
4:     \( r \leftarrow \) root node of \( k \)-partitioner
5:     Partition(\( r, S \))
6:     FLUSH(\( r \))
7:     Return \( k \)-partitioner output buffers

8: procedure Partition(\( v, S[1..N] \))
9:     for \( x \in S \) do
10:         if \( x \leq v \cdot \text{pivot} \) then
11:             if \( v \cdot \text{leftBuffer}.\text{full}() \) then
12:                 Partition(\( v \cdot \text{left}, v \cdot \text{leftBuffer} \))
13:                     \( v \cdot \text{leftBuffer}.\text{append}(x) \)
14:                 else
15:                     if \( v \cdot \text{rightBuffer}.\text{full}() \) then
16:                         Partition(\( v \cdot \text{right}, v \cdot \text{rightBuffer} \))
17:                     \( v \cdot \text{rightBuffer}.\text{append}(x) \)
18:                     \( S.\text{clear}() \)
19:     end for

20: procedure FLUSH(\( v \))
21:     if \( v \neq \text{null} \) then
22:         Partition(\( v \cdot \text{left}, v \cdot \text{leftBuffer} \))
23:         FLUSH(\( v \cdot \text{left} \))
24:         Partition(\( v \cdot \text{right}, v \cdot \text{rightBuffer} \))
25:         FLUSH(\( v \cdot \text{right} \))
```

Proof. Let \( h = \lg(k) \); by definition of \( k \), we have \( h \in \mathbb{N} \). The space usage is given recursively by \( s(k) = k' \cdot \lceil k^{4/2} \rceil + s(k') + k' \cdot s(k'')) \) where \( k' = 2^{\lceil \frac{h}{2} \rceil} \) and \( k'' = 2^{\left\lfloor \frac{h}{2} \right\rfloor} \) are the number of leaves in the top funnel and the bottom funnels, respectively. Assuming \( k = 2^d \) for \( i \in \mathbb{N} \), this simplifies to \( s(k) = k^{(d+1)/2} + (k^{1/2} + 1) \cdot s(k^{1/2}) \), which satisfies \( s(k) \leq S(k) \) where we set \( S(k) = c \cdot k^{(d+1)/2} \) for a constant \( c \geq 1 \) that depends on initial conditions; if we use \( s(4) = 2 \cdot 4^{d/2} + 3 \) (space for the buffers and the 3 pivots), \( c \geq 2.2 \) suffices. The bound \( s(k) \leq S(k) \) indeed remains valid even when \( h \) is not a power of 2.

For the analysis of the I/O bound, let \( M \) and \( B \) with \( B^{(d+1)/(d-1)} \leq M/3 \) (“tall-cache assumption”) be given. We follow the recursive construction of the funnel until a \( k \)-partitioner \( F \) satisfies \( S(\hat{k}) \leq M/3 \), i.e., its it fits entirely into (a third of the) internal memory. For that choice, by the tall-cache assumption, the whole \( k \)-partitioner and one block per child and parent buffer fit into internal memory: \( S(\hat{k}) + (\hat{k} + 1)B \leq M \).

Call the edges/buffers connecting \( F \) to its parent and children large (if they exist). For the analysis, imagine removing all large edges; this leaves us with disconnected base trees, which in the \( k \)-partitioner are connected only by the large edges. Note that between any two levels, either none or all edges are large. However, unless \( k = 2^2 \), the height \( h = \lg(\hat{k}) \) of a base tree can vary between \( \overline{h} = \lg(M/(3c))/(d + 1) \) and \( \underline{h} = 2\overline{h} \).
Now consider a call to \texttt{Partition} at the root of a base tree $\hat{F}$ with $\hat{k}$ leaves. Over the course of (recursively) pushing elements down through $\hat{F}$, we incur I/Os for loading the buffers and pivots of $\hat{F}$. Since base trees fit entirely into internal memory, unless there is another call triggered on a child base tree upon a full (large) buffer, we will only load buffers inside the $\hat{k}$-partitioner into memory once, at a total cost of $O(S(\hat{k})/B)$ I/Os; we also need to bring one block for each parent and child buffer into memory, using $O(\hat{k})$ I/Os. We now distinguish two cases.

Case (1): If $\hat{k} = k$, i.e., $\hat{F}$ is the entire $k$-partitioner. Since $\hat{F}$ (as well as one block per input and output buffer) fits into internal memory, we only need to load it once, at a cost of $O(S(k)/B + k)$ I/Os. This is $O(k^{(d+1)/2}/B + k) = O(k^d/B + k) = O(N/B + k) = O(N/B \log_{BM}(k+1) + k)$ as claimed.

Case (2): Otherwise, $\hat{k} < k$. We will argue that the following potential scheme pays for all I/O costs: Whenever an element is inserted into a large buffer, it releases $\Theta(1/B)$ potential.

We first show that charging all elements for this released potential yields the desired bound. Between any two large buffers, one partitioning phase moves an element at least $h$ levels down the tree. Overall, the $N$ elements need to travel at most $h = \lg(k)$ levels down, hence each element can be inserted at most $\lceil h/B \rceil = O(\log_{BM}(k+1))$ times into a large buffer, giving an overall potential of $O(N/B \log_{BM}(k+1)) = O(N/B \log_{BM}(k+1) + k)$ as claimed.

It remains to prove that the released potential exceeds the incurred I/O cost. First observe that we initially have to load each $\hat{F}$ when it is first used; likewise, we have to potentially load each $\hat{F}$ an additional time during the final \texttt{Flush} calls. These two load events sum to $O(S(k)/B + k)$ I/Os, which is $O(N/B + k)$ (as in case (1) above). Additionally, at any point in time during a \texttt{Partition} call on $\hat{F}$, we can get recursive \texttt{Partition} calls on $\hat{F}$’s child base trees in case their buffer becomes full; such a recursive call can evict $\hat{F}$ from the internal memory, and it has to be loaded before \texttt{Partition} resumes on $\hat{F}$, causing additional I/Os. We cannot say when these evictions will happen, but every eviction of $\hat{F}$ implies that a batch of $\beta$ elements have been pushed down from $\hat{F}$’s input buffer to a child’s buffer, where $\beta$ is the size of the buffers below $\hat{F}$. By the recursive funnel construction, $\beta = \Omega(\hat{k}^d)$, so we must have seen a total release of $\Theta(\beta/B) = \Omega(\hat{k}^d/B)$ in potential. Since $\hat{k}$ is the first value with $S(\hat{k}) \leq M/3$, we have $S(2\hat{k}^2) > M/3$, which implies, $M = O(\hat{k}^{d+1})$. By the tall-cache assumption, this implies $B = O(M^{(d+1)/(d+1)}) = O((\hat{k}^{(d+1)/(d+1)})^{(d+1)/(d+1)}) = O(\hat{k}^{d-1})$, so $\hat{k} = O(\hat{k}^d/B)$. Hence, the cost of loading $\hat{F}$ again after an eviction of $O(S(\hat{k})/B + \hat{k}) = O(\hat{k}^d/B)$ I/Os is covered by a release in potential.

On a conceptual level, a $k$-partitioner can be thought of as a cache-oblivious gadget for repeatedly partitioning with (variable) fan-out in $\Omega(M^{1/(d+1)}) \cap O(M^{2/(d+1)})$ that, when applied to $\Omega(M^{d/(d+1)})$ elements, uses $O(1/B)$ I/Os per element and partitioning round. This results from the bounds on $\hat{k}$ in base trees in the proof above.

4.3 Selecting Pivots

For \texttt{funnelselect}, we choose pivots $P_1, \ldots, P_{k-1}$ as follows; see also Figure 4: We first sample each element in the input $S$ with probability $p = 1/\lg N$. The resulting sample $\hat{S}$ is sorted. Finally we select the pivots as the ideal pivots in the sample, using the (expected) sample size $pN$: the $i$th pivot $P_i$ is the $\lfloor (1 + ipN/k) \rfloor$th smallest element of $\hat{S}$. If $\hat{S}$ is too small, i.e., if $|\hat{S}| < (|S| - 1)pN/k$ or $|\hat{S}| > 2pN$, we declare the pivot selection failed and repeat the sampling process.

In Lemma 6 we prove that all pivots are expected “close” to the ideal pivots in $S$. We call
the \( i \)th pivot \( P_i \) “\( \xi \)-bad” if its rank is more than \( \xi \) away from its ideal rank, more formally

\[
P_i \text{ is } "\xi\text{-bad}" \iff |S \cap (-\infty, P_i]| \notin \left[\left\lfloor 1 + \frac{iN}{k} \right\rfloor - \xi, \left\lfloor 1 + \frac{iN}{k} \right\rfloor + \xi\right].
\]

We will call \( P_i \) bad if it is \( \xi \)-bad; otherwise it is good. We call a pivot selection “bad” if any of the pivots is bad, and “good” otherwise. We select \( \xi = \lceil N^{1/2+\delta} \rceil \) for a small constant \( \delta \), where \( 0 < \delta < 1/6 \). Since we assume \( d \geq 3 \), \( k = \Theta(N^{1/d}) \) implies \( N/k = \Omega(N^{2/3}) \), and \( \xi < \frac{1}{2}N/k \) for sufficiently large \( N \). We get the following fact:

**Fact 4 (Good pivots).** If \( \xi < \frac{1}{2}N/k \) and all pivots are good,

(a) no bucket \( S_l \) contains more than \( N/k + 2\xi \leq 2N/k \) elements, and

(b) a query for a rank \( r \) will fall into one of at most two buckets: the \( \lceil (r - \xi)/N \cdot k \rceil \)th or the \( \lceil (r + \xi)/N \cdot k \rceil \)th bucket.

Our analysis makes iterated use of the following Chernoff bound.

**Lemma 5 ([10, Theorem 1.1]).** If \( X_1, \ldots, X_n \) are independent random variables in \([0, 1]\), and \( X = X_1 + \cdots + X_n \), then for all \( t > 0 \) we have

\[
\Pr[X < E[X] - t], \Pr[X > E[X] + t] \leq e^{-2t^2/n}.
\]

**Lemma 6.** The probability that \( P_i \) is \( \xi \)-bad is bounded by \( 2 \exp(-2\xi^2p^2/N) \).

**Proof.** \( P_i \) is bad if its rank in \( S \) is too small (“small bad”) or too big (“big bad”). We first consider too small ranks. By choice, there are \( ipN/k \) elements in \( \bar{S} \) smaller than \( P_i \); if \( P_i \) has small-bad rank, all of these elements must be of rank \( < iN/k - \xi \) in \( S \). That means, from these \( iN/k - \xi - 1 \) smallest elements in \( \bar{S} \), we have chosen at least \( ipN/k \) into \( \bar{S} \). Since each choice is done independently with probability \( p = 1/\lg N \), the number chosen for the sample is \( X \overset{\text{d}}{=} \text{Bin}(iN/k - \xi - 1, p) \), a random variable with binomial distribution and expectation \( E[X] = p(iN/k - \xi - 1) \). We have

\[
\Pr[P_i \text{ “small bad”}] \leq \Pr[X \geq piN/k] \leq \Pr[X > E[X] + p\xi] \leq \exp\left(-\frac{2(p\xi)^2}{iN/k - \xi - 1}\right) \leq \exp\left(-\frac{2\xi^2p^2}{N}\right).
\]

For the “big-bad” case, we must have chosen at most \( ipN/k \) elements from the \( iN/k + \xi + 1 \) smallest elements in \( S \) into \( \bar{S} \). With \( X' \overset{\text{d}}{=} \text{Bin}(iN/k + \xi + 1, p) \), we obtain

\[
\Pr[P_i \text{ “big bad”}] \leq \Pr[X' \leq piN/k] \leq \Pr[X' < E[X'] - p\xi] \leq \exp\left(-\frac{2\xi^2p^2}{N}\right).
\]

By the union bound, \( P_i \) is bad with probability at most \( 2 \exp(-2\xi^2p^2/N) \).
Lemma 7. The probability that the sample is too small to choose $k-1$ pivots is bounded by $\exp(-2(pN/k - 1)^2/N)$.

Proof. For the sample to be too small, we must have selected at most $(k-1)pN/k$ elements into the sample. Since $|\bar{S}| \sim \text{Bin}(N,p)$, we have by Lemma 5

$$P[|\bar{S}| \leq E[|\bar{S}|] - pN/k] \leq \exp\left(-2\frac{(pN/k - 1)^2}{N}\right).$$

Corollary 8. With high probability, the pivot choice is well-defined and all $k-1$ pivots of one sampling round are good.

Proof. By Lemmas 6 and 7 and the union bound, the probability that the sample is too small to choose our pivots or that any $P_i$ is bad is at most

$$2(k-1) \exp(-2\xi^2p^2/N) + \exp(-2(pN/k - 1)^2/N) \leq 2k \exp(-\Omega\left(N^{2/3}/\log^2 N\right)).$$

The inequality follows from $p = 1/\lg(N)$, $\xi = \Omega\left(N^{1/2 + \delta}\right)$, $N/k = \Omega\left(N^{2/3}\right)$, and $\delta < 1/6$. This probability tends to 0 with speed superpolynomial in $N$.

4.4 Truncated Partitioning

The algorithms from Section 3 achieve optimal cost from simply not recursing on subproblems not containing any query rank; after partitioning, it is obvious which subproblems are “query free”. In a cache-oblivious algorithm, we have to truncate partitioning inside the $k$-partitioner.

After $k$-partitioning the input, elements are split into $k$ buckets; let us denote these buckets by $S_1, \ldots, S_k$. By Fact 4(b), when pivots are good, a query rank $r$ will fall in one of two buckets: one in $S(r) = \{S_{\lceil(r-\xi)/N\cdot k\rceil}, S_{\lceil(r+\xi)/N\cdot k\rceil}\}$. Buckets in the set $QF = \{S_1, \ldots, S_k\} \setminus \bigcup_{r \in R} S(r)$ do not contain any query ranks whenever pivots are good; we call these buckets “expected query-free”. Note that this is a property solely of $R$ and $k$ and hence $QF$ can be determined by scanning $R$ before partitioning commences.

When constructing the $k$-partitioner $F$, we check in a depth-first traversal whether all leaves below a binary partitioning node $v$ are in $QF$; if so, we remove $v$ and rewire its parent to send elements directly to an output buffer instead of $v$’s input buffer. The sizes of buffers between partitioning nodes and the PARTITION methods remain unchanged. By generating the output buffers for the leaves of $F$ consecutive in memory, before all internal buffers and reserving $2N/k$ space for each, this truncation operation simply changes one pointer.

4.5 Funnelselect

The overall algorithm FUNNELSELECT is shown in Algorithm 4. It applies one round of truncated $k$-partitioning as described above. For each of the resulting buckets, we then simply invoke an existing I/O-optimal cache-oblivious sorting algorithm and report the sought ranks. This can be done as a stack-based computation, so that no extra I/Os are paid for reporting elements, but instead they are reported while they are in main memory anyways from sorting.

5 Analysis

Theorem 9. Algorithm FUNNELSELECT is cache oblivious and uses $O(B_{I/O} + N^{1/3})$ I/Os to report $q$ query ranks $r_1 < \cdots < r_q$ from an unsorted array of $N$ elements. With high probability it does not fail.
Algorithm 4: Our overall cache-oblivious multiple-selection algorithm.

1: procedure FunnelSelect($S[1..N]$, $R[1..q]$, $\delta$)
2: \hspace{1em} $p \leftarrow 1/\lg N$
3: \hspace{1em} $k \leftarrow 2^{\lceil \lg(N)/d \rceil}$
4: \hspace{1em} $\xi \leftarrow \lfloor N/2^{1/2+\delta} \rfloor$
5: \hspace{1em} Scan $S$, copy each element into the sample $\bar{S}$ i.i.d. with prob. $p$
6: \hspace{1em} if $|\bar{S}| \leq (k - 1)pN/k \lor |\bar{S}| < 2Np \lor |\bar{S}| > 2Np$ then
7: \hspace{2em} return Fail
8: \hspace{1em} Sort $\bar{S}$
9: \hspace{1em} for $i = 1, \ldots, k - 1$ do
10: \hspace{2em} $P_i \leftarrow \bar{S}[[1 + ipN/k]]$ (select pivots from $\bar{S}$)
11: \hspace{1em} Construct $k$-partitioner $F$ using pivots $P_1, \ldots, P_{k-1}$; let $S_1, \ldots, S_k$ be its leaf buckets
12: \hspace{1em} for $r \in R$ do
13: \hspace{2em} $b_1 \leftarrow \lceil (r - \xi)/N \cdot k \rceil$ and $b_2 \leftarrow \lfloor (r + \xi)/N \cdot k \rfloor$
14: \hspace{2em} Mark leaf buckets $S_{b_1}$ and $S_{b_2}$ as expected query free
15: \hspace{2em} for node $v$ in bottom-up traversal of $F$ do
16: \hspace{3em} if both of $v$’s children are marked expected query free then
17: \hspace{4em} Mark $v$ as expected query free
18: \hspace{4em} Delete $v$’s children
19: \hspace{2em} for node $v$ in preorder traversal of $F$ do
20: \hspace{3em} if $v$ marked expected query free then
21: \hspace{4em} Declare $v$’s parent an expected query free output buffer
22: \hspace{4em} Delete $v$
23: \hspace{2em} Partition($F$.root, $S$)
24: \hspace{2em} Flush($F$.root)
25: \hspace{2em} $L_1, \ldots, L_{\hat{k}} \leftarrow$ leaf buckets in $F$
26: \hspace{2em} $\ell \leftarrow 0$
27: \hspace{2em} for $i = 1, \ldots, \hat{k}$ do
28: \hspace{3em} $R' \leftarrow R \cap (\ell, \ell + |L_i|)$
29: \hspace{3em} if $R' \neq \emptyset$ then
30: \hspace{4em} if $L_i$ marked expected query free or $|L_i| > 2N/k$ then
31: \hspace{5em} return Fail
32: \hspace{4em} else
33: \hspace{5em} Sort $L_i$ using an I/O-optimal cache-oblivious sorting algorithm.
34: \hspace{6em} for $r \in R'$ do
35: \hspace{7em} Report $L_i[r - \ell]$
36: \hspace{7em} $\ell \leftarrow \ell + |L_i|$

Proof. Let us first deal with failures. We let the algorithm fail if $|\bar{S}|$ is smaller than $\frac{1}{2} Np$ or larger than $2Np$. From Lemma 5, with high probability, this does not happen. The only other cause for failure are bad pivots; by Corollary 8 with high probability, this also does not happen.

For the I/O cost, we consider the different steps in turn. The I/O cost for computing the pivots consists of $O(N/B)$ I/Os to scan the input to construct the sample $\bar{S}$ of size at most $\bar{N} = 2N/\lg N$. To sort the sample, we can use standard top-down mergesort, yielding $O(\bar{N}/B \cdot \lg(\bar{N}/M)) = O(N/B)$ I/Os for sorting $\bar{S}$ and $O(N/B)$ I/Os to extract the pivots.
from $S$. In total selecting the pivots requires $O(N/B)$ I/Os.

The buffers of $F$ can be built sequentially, using $O(k^{(d+1)/2}/B) = O(N^{(d+1)/2d}/B) = O(N/B)$ I/Os (Lemma 3). Preparing the leaf buffers additionally touches $k = O(N^{1/d})$ positions; if $N^{1/d} > N/B$, then $B > N^{(d-1)/d}$ and by the tall-cache assumption, $M \geq B^{(d+1)/(d-1)} > N^{(d+1)/d}$, so the entire input fits in internal memory and the $k$ accesses are cached. The same applies for truncating the $k$-partitioner; anything touching $O(k)$ random positions incurs $O(N/B)$ I/Os. Marking leaves and nodes as expected query-free can be done by scanning $R$ (which is sorted), hence we use $O(q/B) = O(N/B)$ I/Os.

The key step is the $k$-partitioner. As in the proof of Lemma 3, we define $\hat{k}$ as the level in the recursive construction of the partitioner where the $\hat{k}$-partitioner first fits into internal memory. We overestimate the actual cost by always assuming the smallest $\hat{k} = (M/3c)^{1/(d+1)}$. As shown there, the $k$-partitioner has up to constant factors the same I/O cost as a repeated $\hat{k}$-way external-memory partitioning: $O(1/B)$ I/Os per element and $\hat{k}$-way split. This remains true when truncating the same subtrees in both algorithms. We can hence bound the cost of funnel partitioning as in Section 3 by charging the lengths of segments that are split further (white rectangles in Figure 1) to individual gaps $\Delta$. For $\text{MultiSelect}_{I/O}$, charging a gap $\Delta$ on each level either $\Delta$ or the 2 segments containing its endpoints, whichever is less, was sufficient to cover all partitioning costs. For $\text{FunnelSelect}$, due to marking (up to) two leaf buckets as not query-free for the endpoints, we can have up to 4 segments on any level that still require partitioning. The rest of the analysis is the same, though, and with $C = O(1/B)$, $k = \hat{k}$, and $\alpha = 2/k$, we obtain an upper bound of

$$C \cdot \left( \sum_{i=1}^{q+1} \Delta_i \log_{1/\alpha} \frac{4N}{\Delta_i} + \frac{N}{1 - \alpha} \right) = O(B_{I/O} + N/B),$$

I/Os for partitioning.

The last part of the algorithm, solving subinstances of multiple selection within leaf buckets, could be solved recursively, but as we now show, fully sorting such buckets also fits our desired I/O bound. This improves the failure probability as sorting can be deterministic. A subproblem $L_i$ to recurse on is never declared query-free and hence moves all the $\log k$ levels down the $k$-partitioner. For $N' = |L_i|$, $L_i$ hence contributes $\Theta\left( \frac{N'}{B} \log_M k \right) = \Theta\left( \frac{N'}{B} \log_M B N \right)$ I/Os to the partitioning cost, since $k = \Theta(N^{1/d})$ and under our tall-cache assumption $\log \frac{M}{B} = \Theta(\log M)$. This is an upper bound on the I/O cost of sorting $N'$ elements. Any I/O-efficient cache-oblivious sorting method (such as funnelsort) hence suffices for overall $O(B_{I/O} + \frac{N}{B})$ I/Os.

\textbf{Corollary 10.} There exists a randomized cache-oblivious algorithm solving the multiple-selection problem using expected and with high probability $O(B_{I/O} + \frac{N}{B})$ I/Os.

\textbf{Proof.} $\text{FunnelSelect}$ is formulated as a Monte-Carlo algorithm with worst-case time matching our expected-case time, but which can $\text{FAIL}$ occasionally. Repeating any failed execution turns it into a Las-Vegas algorithm with $O(B_{I/O} + \frac{N}{B})$ expected I/Os; since the failure probability is superpolynomially small, we obtain the same bound with high probability.

\textbf{6 Partial Sorting}

In internal memory, multiple selection would usually rearrange the input in place so that after the call to the multiple-selection algorithm, the sought elements are at indices $r_1, \ldots, r_q$. One would then not even return these elements explicitly. In external memory, this variant is less
desirable, as one would have to pay \( q \) I/Os for accessing the elements by index later. Hence we defined the multiple-selection problem to return the elements of given ranks. However, it can be useful to also obtain the input partitioned around these returned values. Since all our multiple-selection algorithms conceptually follow an inorder traversal of a recursion tree and report sought elements (in sorted order) when they are identified, it is easy to augment the algorithms to produce a partitioned copy of the input array along the way. For funnelselect, we just have to make sure that output buckets are allocated sequentially in memory from left to right. That way we can output all elements falling between two returned pivots.

7 Allowing Identical Elements

In the previous sections we assumed elements to be distinct. A generic way to allow identical elements in the algorithms is by letting the algorithms process pairs \((x, i)\), where \(x\) is the \(i\)th element in the array \(S\), and break comparison ties between identical elements by comparing by their input position. This ensures all elements are considered distinct.

The drawback is that the computations need to process and store all these input positions.

To avoid this overhead, one needs to address the problem directly by the individual algorithms. In the algorithms one needs to handle that multiple elements can be equal to the pivots. In the partitioning steps one needs to keep track of the number of elements equal to the pivots and only partition the elements not equal to pivots. Finally, one need to use this information gathered to handle that a pivot can span a range of ranks and be the answer to multiple query ranks.

8 Conclusion and Open Problems

We presented the first cache-oblivious multiple-selection algorithm that achieves the optimal I/O cost even when taking the (entropy of the) ranks to select into account.

A natural open problem is to find a deterministic cache-oblivious multiple-selection algorithm that achieves the same I/O bound as our randomized algorithm. Another interesting direction to explore is the “online” version of multiple selection studied in [3], where the ranks are given one after the other in arbitrary order and the algorithm has to produce the element of a given rank before the next rank is revealed. Investigating the practical performance of funnelselect is another route to pursue.
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