

## Runtime Analysis:

Although both functions finished quickly, when looked at closely we can see that the `doublerAppend` function finished in mere milliseconds while the `insert` function took 1 whole second. Both times are short, but it's clear that the `append` function is quicker.

	<b>tinyArray</b>	<b>smallArray</b>	<b>mediumArray</b>	<b>largeArray</b>	<b>extraLargeArray</b>
<b>Append</b>	162.9 $\mu$ s	103.6 $\mu$ s	162.6 $\mu$ s	514.4 $\mu$ s	2.6~ ms
<b>Insert</b>	94.4 $\mu$ s	47.4 $\mu$ s	184.3 $\mu$ s	9.1279 ms	1~ s

After running all the different array sizes the pattern, I notice the most is that the `append` function increases at a linear pace as the input is increased while the `insert` function starts to exponentially increase in runtime as the input grows.

The `append` function's scale is  $O(n)$  because it increases at a constant rate because it will only run one more time for every item that's added to the array.

The `insert` function's scale on the other hand is  $O(n^2)$  because it increases exponentially as the input is increased. This is due to the nature of the `unshift` method causing the computer to move every individual item in the new array over every time another item is added. This adds up as the input gets larger.