

W08 – Lists

Overview

- I completed all the Iterative Implementations of the List manipulator class
 - I provided time and space complexities as well.
- Extensions: I completed some of the recursive implementations (up to GetFromBack)

Implementation

Iterative Methods

All the iterative methods have constant space complexity as they often only store a set number of nodes and other variables, regardless of list size.

Size

Worst Time Complexity: $O(n)$ Linear – The list has to be iterated through once.

Worst Size Complexity: $O(1)$ Constant

Contains

Worst Time Complexity: $O(n)$ Linear – As the linked list is unordered each element has to be examined in turn. Worst case occurs if the searched for element isn't in, or at the end of the list.

Worst Size Complexity: $O(1)$ Constant

Count

Worst Time Complexity: $O(n)$ Linear – Every element in the list has to be examined to check if it matches the provided element. That means regardless of element being searched for the entire list has to be examined.

Worst Size Complexity: $O(3)$ Constant

ConvertToString

Worst Time Complexity: $O(n)$ Linear – Linked list has to be iterated through once in order to get strings of each object.

Worst Size Complexity: $O(2)$ Constant

GetFromFront

To check if an index is outside the current ListNode, I could have used the size method to check at the beginning, however this would give a linear time even in cases where the index is zero,

because the size method has linear time. In my implementation, the `InvalidIndexException` is only thrown if the end of the list reached.

Worst Time Complexity: $O(n)$ Linear – If index is more longer than the length of the `ListNode` or at the end then every element of the `ListNode` has to be iterated through before an exception is thrown.

Worst Size Complexity: $O(2)$ Constant

GetFromBack

I chose to use the position from the back to calculate the equivalent position from the front and use the `GetFromFront` method.

Worst Time Complexity: $O(n)$ Linear – the size method is always called so the minimum time is linear. `GetFromFront` also has a linear time complexity, so at worst the entire list has to be iterated through twice.

Worst Size Complexity: $O(1)$ Constant

DeepEquals

Worst Time Complexity: $O(n)$ Linear – Each list is iterated through one element at a time, at the same time.

Worst Size Complexity: $O(1)$ Constant

DeepCopy

Worst Time Complexity: $O(n)$ Linear – The list is iterated through once in order to copy each element.

Worst Size Complexity: $O(1)$ Constant

ContainsDuplicates

To minimise comparisons while iterating through the list I only compared an element to the elements that came after it. This leads to $n(n-1)/2$ comparisons being made instead of n^2 comparisons.

Worst Time Complexity: $O(n^2)$ Quadratic – at most there can be $n(n-1)/2$ comparisons being made by the method. This simplifies down to n^2 . This occurs if there isn't a duplicate or if only the last 2 elements in the linked list are duplicates.

Worst Size Complexity: $O(1)$ Constant

Append

A node iterates through the linked list until it reaches the tail. It then points the tail to the head of the other list.

Worst Time Complexity: $O(n)$ Linear – The entire linked list has to be iterated through in order to append one list onto the other.

Worst Size Complexity: $O(1)$ Constant

Flatten

When implementing this method I initially called the append method in order to append each inner linked list to the new list. However this would mean iterating through each of the inner list each time a new list is appended, so instead I chose to store the tail node of the new linked list each time the new list was appended.

Worst Time Complexity: $O(n)$ Linear – By storing the tail of the new list, each list added to the new list is only iterated through once.

Worst Size Complexity: $O(n)$ Constant

IsCircular

In order to check if a linked list was circular, and not cyclic, each node has to be compared to each of the nodes before it. I chose to do this by having a node (henceforth the current node) iterate through the list keeping count of many nodes it has traversed. Then a follower node will iterate through until it matches the current node and keep count of how many nodes it has traversed. If the follower node has traversed a different number of nodes in order reach the same node, that must means the list has a cycle. If the follower and current node match at the head that means the list is circular.

Worst Time Complexity: $O(n^2)$ Quadratic – Each element is compared to each element before it. This means $n(n-1)/2$ comparisons are being made so Quadratic time. The worst case occurs only if the last element forms a cycle with itself or there isn't a cycle.

Worst Size Complexity: $O(1)$ – The current node, the follower node and their respective counts need to be stored.

ContainsCycles

This method is identical to *isCircular*, but will also return true if the cycle is anywhere other than the head of the list.

Worst Time Complexity: $O(n^2)$ – the method is identical except for its logic of when it should return false/true.

Worst Size Complexity: $O(1)$ Constant

Sort

Worst Time Complexity: $O(n^2)$ Quadratic – Bubble sort has a worst case complexity of n^2 if the list is in the exact opposite order it is meant to be in (e.g. ascending instead of descending)

Worst Size Complexity: $O(1)$ Constant

Map

Worst Time Complexity: $O(n)$ Linear – Each variable is iterated through once.

Worst Size Complexity: $O(1)$ Constant

Reduce:

Worst Time Complexity: $O(n)$ Linear – each node is iterated through once in order to add to the sum variable.

Worst Size Complexity: $O(1)$ Constant

Recursive Implementations

Size

Worst Time Complexity: $O(n)$ Linear – each element is examined once, n times.

Worst Size Complexity: $O(n)$ Linear – the entire list is stored in memory.

Contains

Worst Time Complexity: $O(n)$ Linear – each node is examined once n times.

Worst Size Complexity: $O(n)$ Linear

Count

Worst Time Complexity: $O(n)$ Linear – each element has to be examined once.

Worst Size Complexity: $O(n)$ Linear

ConvertToString

Worst Time Complexity: $O(n)$ Linear

Worst Size Complexity: $O(n)$ Linear

GetFromFront

Worst Time Complexity: $O(n)$ Linear

Worst Size Complexity: $O(n)$ Linear

GetFromBack

Worst Time Complexity: $O(n)$ Linear

Worst Size Complexity: $O(n)$ Linear

Difficulties

For many of my methods I didn't use tried not to use the head node, this was because I assumed that if I made another variable (e.g. currentNode) equal to it and then changed the node that currentNode was referencing, the reference would also change in head node. I now know that is not that case however.