If the input order is 9 6 7 8 then our queue will be [9,6,7,8] but we dequeue from the front, so the first item to dequeue will be 9, contrary to an example I saw earlier on this forum where 8 was dequeued first.

If the input queue was [9,9,6,7] initially, none of the operations are applicable, because the stack is empty, qinput[0] is not less than qinput[1], and qinput[0] is not greater than qinput[1]. qinput[0] == qinput[1] in this case.

If the qinput was [9] initially, then none of the operations apply because the stack is empty and we can't compare qinput[0] with qinput[1] since qinput[1] is null.

What does it mean for stack_top to be between qinput_front and qoutput_front? It could mean any of the following:
* qinput_front < stack_top < qoutput_front
* qinput_front > stack_top > qoutput_front
* qinput_front <= stack_top <= qoutput_front
* qinput_front >= stack_top >= qoutput_front
* qinput_front < stack_top < qoutput_front OR * qinput_front > stack_top > qoutput_front
* qinput_front <= stack_top <= qoutput_front OR * qinput_front >= stack_top >= qoutput_front

When we swap qoutput with qinput before a pass, qinput should always be empty right? That way we can just do like union(qinput, qoutput) which will make qinput current qoutput, and qoutput will become empty.

Also the sorting algorithm seems to be doing smallest to largest for me.

Example input: 9 6 7 8

qinput: [9,6,7,8]
qoutput: []
stack: []
// qinput[0] > qinput[1], so put 9 into stack.

qinput: [6,7,8]
qoutput: []
stack: [9]
// qinput[0] < qinput[1], so put 6 into qoutput.

qinput: [7,8]
qoutput: [6]
stack: [9]
// qinput[0] < qinput[1], so put 7 into qoutput.

qinput: [8]
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I am also confused on the sorting algorithm. Take for example the integer example on the website.

input: 2 4 5 3 1

Pass 1
input:[2,4,5,3,1]
Subject: Re: Sorting algorithm clarifications
Posted by sbcarp on Sun, 05 Feb 2017 20:22:09 GMT
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Same thing happens to me, it's smallest to largest if I follow the description.
qoutput_front should be qoutput_tail in my examples btw. forgot that the last item added is at the back.

Your pass 1.5 should be [2,4,1] : output since 3 > 1

If you look at the text immediately after the description of the algorithm, it states the assumption that the comparator is implementing "less than". If your comparator implements "greater than", you should get the opposite ordering.