

Analysis of Algorithms

BLG 335E

Project 3 Report

BEYZA TRK 1502220704

turkbe22@itu.edu.tr

Faculty of Computer and Informatics Engineering

Department of Computer Engineering

Date of submission: DATE HERE

1. Implementation

1.1. Data Insertion

After constructing binary search tree (BST) and red-black tree (RBT), I compared the efficiency when storing the given VideoGames.csv data set. As I inserted the data, I updated the cumulative sales for each publisher that is already in the tree. For the red-black tree, I used the color and parent attribute.

According to my total time measurement in microseconds, the Red-Black Tree performed faster than the Binary Search Tree because of its self-balancing structure.

```
Binary Search Tree insertion time:0.251  
Red Black Tree insertion time:0.149
```

Figure 1.1: Insertion time

1.2. Search Efficiency

When I performed 50 random searches in an unsorted Binary Search Tree and Red-Black Tree, the recorded search time was 0 ns. My timer precision was not high enough to measure such tiny time intervals, so the result rounded down to 0 ns. When I performed random searches on sorted trees, time increased slightly.

```
Result for 50 random searches unsorted:0  
Result for 50 random searches sorted:6e-05
```

Figure 1.2: Search time for RBT

```
Result for 50 random searches unsorted:0  
Result for 50 random searches sorted:0.0047
```

Figure 1.3: Search time for BST

1.3. Best-Selling Publishers at the End of Each Decade

I printed a list of the best seller publishers at the end of each decade (1990, 2000, 2010, 2020) for both Binary Search Tree (BST) and Red-Black Tree (RBT). For RBT, pre-order traversal displays node depth and color. I used dashes to indicate the depth of the node as given output sample. Best seller and display of the RBT are as follows.

```

End of the 1990 Year
Best seller in North America: Nintendo - 160.02 million
Best seller in Europe: Nintendo - 30.03 million
Best seller rest of the World: Nintendo - 5.65 million
End of the 2000 Year
Best seller in North America: Nintendo - 334.75 million
Best seller in Europe: Nintendo - 101.97 million
Best seller rest of the World: Nintendo - 15.76 million
End of the 2010 Year
Best seller in North America: Nintendo - 722.26 million
Best seller in Europe: Nintendo - 350.91 million
Best seller rest of the World: Electronic Arts - 89.2 million
End of the 2020 Year
Best seller in North America: Nintendo - 814.43 million
Best seller in Europe: Nintendo - 418.36 million
Best seller rest of the World: Electronic Arts - 126.82 million

```

Figure 1.4: Best Seller Publishers

```

(BLACK) Imagic
-(BLACK) Data Age
--(RED) BMG Interactive Entertainment
---(BLACK) Answer Software
----(BLACK) Activision
----- (RED) 989 Studios
----- (BLACK) 3DO
----- (RED) 20th Century Fox Video Games
----- (BLACK) 10TACLE Studios
----- (RED) 1C Company
----- (BLACK) 2D Boy
----- (RED) 5pb
----- (BLACK) 505 Games
----- (RED) 49Games
----- (BLACK) 989 Sports
----- (RED) 7G//AMES
----- (BLACK) ASCII Entertainment
----- (BLACK) ASC Games
----- (RED) AQ Interactive
----- (RED) Acclaim Entertainment
----- (BLACK) ASK
----- (RED) ASCII Media Works
----- (RED) Abylight
----- (BLACK) Ackstudios
----- (RED) Accolade
----- (RED) Acquire
----- (RED) Agetec
----- (BLACK) Adeline Software
----- (BLACK) Activision Value
----- (RED) Activision Blizzard
----- (BLACK) Agatsuma Entertainment

```

Figure 1.5: Preorder Print of RBT

1.4. Final Tree Structure

Binary Search Tree becomes unbalanced if sorted data is inserted, it behaves like a linked-list. Height becomes $O(n)$ which causes inefficiency for search and insert operations. However Red-Black tree maintains its balance whether the data sorted or unsorted. Coloring the nodes and rotations keep the height of tree close to $O(\log n)$. This balanced structure ensures efficient and consistent performance for insertion and search operations.

1.5. Write Your Recommendation

Based on my time measurements for both search and insert operations, I recommend using Red-Black Tree for managing the dataset. Unlike the Binary Search Tree, complexity does not depend on input's order because of RBT's self-balancing structure. While BST can degrade to $O(n)$, RBT maintains consistent $O(\log n)$ time complexity.

1.6. Ordered Input Comparison

For unsorted input the search time rounded to 0 ns, due to CPU caching optimizations for both Red-Black Tree and Binary Search Tree. For sorted input, BST search time increased to 0.0047 ns because tree became into linked list structure, it lost its efficiency $O(\log n)$ to $O(n)$. Unlike BST, RBT's search time increased slightly to 6e-05 ns. RBT consistently performs $O(\log n)$ complexity because of its balanced structure.

Table 1.1: Search Time Comparison Between BST and RBT

Tree Structure	Unsorted Search Time (ns)	Sorted Search Time (ns)
Binary Search Tree (BST)	0	0.0047
Red-Black Tree (RBT)	0	6e-05