Jessie JR A. Guarino   
CPE-301;  
Lab activity 1; prelim; dsal32e;

**Part 1 array**

The way Ive written it is to be able to be easily translate the logic in other languages as much as possible, specifically cpp. I also did not want to rely on python’s built-in functions that are too optimized already as well as python’s inherent convenient syntax. The scope of part 1 only needs “an element” to be added and deleted. However, I expanded the scope that the input will cover multiple duplicated elements as I wanted to refresh my leetcode solving skills. The following texts documents my intuitions while solving the problem stated.

On the deletion part, there were two lists that I am working with: the referenced list, and the intended value/s to be deleted.

**Approach 1: Brute force**

My initial approach has a time complexity of . Which was to iterate through both arrays, finding match for every other value and delete it. However, by only limiting myself with the use of loops and python’s pop method which reduces the original array’s size, the resulting array has some values that were unintentionally removed.

index = 0

for arrayValue in array:

# search for matching values

# bruteforce

for deleteValue in cacheDeleteValues:

if arrayValue == deleteValue:

array.pop(index)

index +=1

The way I solved it was marking what indices that matches the value in the array and then deleting it after while respecting the current array size.

One thing I made sure before deleting things is to remove duplicates from the marked indices. I got an idea from the following reference [1]. The resulting implementation is shown below:

# marking where in the array that has the value in delete

markIndex = []

for aaa in range(len(array)):

# another search for matching values

# in delete\_values

# bruteforce

for bbb in range(len(delete\_values)):

if array[aaa] == delete\_values[bbb]:

markIndex.append(aaa)

# sanitize the marked indices

# by removing duplicates

tempDuplicates = []

for iii in range(len(markIndex)):

# store if next value in array is not equal to current

if iii+1 != len(markIndex) and markIndex[iii] != markIndex[iii+1]:

tempDuplicates.append(markIndex[iii])

# store the last element regardless

elif iii+1 == len(markIndex):

tempDuplicates.append(markIndex[iii])

markIndex.clear()

markIndex = tempDuplicates

Another way is to first sort out the array first to enable us to easily remove duplicates and deleting them as we go through the array. Further reducing the number of operations and memory usage. However, I wouldn’t want to touch the code any more than that.

**Approach 2: Hashing**

Another intuition I always and most frequently resort to is through hashmaps. Firstly, we need to remove duplicates in the list of delete values the same way we did from the first approach. And we can then hash those. A simple key and value may work so I wouldn’t have to think about be any offsets.

deleteHash = {}

for iii in delete\_values:

deleteHash[iii] = iii

One of the key differences that I made here is that I’m two days in trying to solve what indices to pop. I have asked chatgpt other ways to solve the problem and a few solutions came: the first one was to create a temporary list to store which indices are not present in the hash. I do not want to increase the memory, so no. The second one was to loop through the array backwards so that we wouldn’t mind the offsets we need to subtract to the iterator. The following code presents the initial problematic error indices.

deleteCount = 0

total = len(array)

iii = 0

while iii < total:

# make sure its safe to access an unknown key, use any string or just keep it as None

if (deleteHash.get(array[iii]) == array[iii]):

array.pop(iii - deleteCount)

deleteCount += 1

total -=1

iii +=1

And the fix for that:

iii = len(array) - 1

while(iii >= 0):

if deleteHash.get(array[iii]) is not None:

array.pop(iii)

iii -=1

And that concludes the deletion part for the part 1. I hope with this much work I get to see more of competitive programming principles so I can get back here in the future and just see the difference on how I perceive things. Or better yet, be able to solve this with lesser time and space complexity.

The rest of the part 1 is as straight forward as it is. The scope, again, I expanded it to not only include an element but a list of elements (affecting the addition and deletion in an array). The code below shows the full implementation of the first part:

def addNewElementAtTheEnd(array, add\_these):

""" name treated as

param: array list

param: add\_these list

return: void

adds elements at the end of the array

"""

# make sure that addThese is a list

tempAddThese = []

for iii in add\_these:

tempAddThese.append(iii)

add\_these = tempAddThese

# add the elements in add\_these to the end of array

for jjj in add\_these:

array.append(jjj)

def deleteElements(array, delete\_values):

""" name treated as

param: array list

param: delete\_values list

return: void

deletes elements in the array

that matches with the value/s of the delete\_values

"""

# makes sure delete\_values is a list

cacheDeleteValues = []

for iii in delete\_values:

cacheDeleteValues.append(iii)

delete\_values.clear()

delete\_values = cacheDeleteValues

# marking where in the array that has the value in delete

markIndex = []

for aaa in range(len(array)):

# another search for matching values

# in delete\_values

# bruteforce

for bbb in range(len(delete\_values)):

if array[aaa] == delete\_values[bbb]:

markIndex.append(aaa)

# sanitize the marked indices

# by removing duplicates

tempDuplicates = []

for iii in range(len(markIndex)):

# store if next value in array is not equal to current

if iii+1 != len(markIndex) and markIndex[iii] != markIndex[iii+1]:

tempDuplicates.append(markIndex[iii])

# store the last element regardless

elif iii+1 == len(markIndex):

tempDuplicates.append(markIndex[iii])

markIndex.clear()

markIndex = tempDuplicates

# deletion of the marked indices

deleteCount = 0

for iii in range(len(markIndex)):

array.pop(markIndex[iii] - deleteCount)

deleteCount +=1

def deleteElementsHash(array, delete\_values):

""" name treated as

param: array list

param: delete\_values list

return: void

deletes elements in the array

that matches with the value/s of the delete\_values

"""

# makes sure delete\_values is a list

cacheDeleteValues = []

for iii in delete\_values:

cacheDeleteValues.append(iii)

delete\_values.clear()

delete\_values = cacheDeleteValues

# sort the delete\_values from less to bigger value

delete\_values.sort() # this is may take quite long to write

# and it deserves a separate discussion/activity

# so lets just resort with this

# remove duplicates

# same as with the approach 1

tempSanitized = []

iii = 0

while (iii < len(delete\_values)):

# store if next value in array is not equal to current

if iii+1 != len(delete\_values) and delete\_values[iii] != delete\_values[iii+1] :

tempSanitized.append(delete\_values[iii])

# store the last element regardless

elif iii+1 == len(delete\_values):

tempSanitized.append(delete\_values[iii])

iii +=1

delete\_values.clear()

delete\_values = tempSanitized

# create a hash

# eg. 1:1, 2:2, 25:25

deleteHash = {}

for iii in delete\_values:

deleteHash[iii] = iii

"""

print("===========\ndeleteHash\nkey\tvalue")

for key, value in deleteHash.items():

print(key, "\t", value)

"""

# deletion

# loop through the array backwards

# if the current value does not exist in the hashed deletevalues,

# pop it

iii = len(array) - 1

while(iii >= 0):

if deleteHash.get(array[iii]) is not None:

array.pop(iii)

iii -=1

def printAllElements(array):

""" name treated as

param: array list

return: void

prints all elements in a list

"""

print("[", end='')

index = 0

while index < len(array):

print(array[index], end='')

print("]\n" \

if (index+1 == len(array)) \

else (", "), end='')

index +=1

orig\_array = [1,2,3,4,5,6,7,1,2,3,4,5]

orig\_arrayhash = [1,2,3,4,5,6,7,1,2,3,4,5]

add\_array = [75,457,78]

add\_arrayhash = [346, 657, 123]

delete = [4,1,2,3,1,4, 234, 75]

deletehash = [4,1,2,1,4]

#########################################

# operations

addNewElementAtTheEnd(orig\_array, add\_array)

addNewElementAtTheEnd(orig\_arrayhash, add\_arrayhash)


deleteElements(orig\_array, delete)

deleteElementsHash(orig\_arrayhash, deletehash)

printAllElements(orig\_array)

printAllElements(orig\_arrayhash)

**# the output**



**Part 2: Linked list**

I don’t know how to implement it in python as it does not have pointers. I don’t know how to reference the addresses of I searched the internet on how to implement linked list, and multiple sources uses the nodes as objects. The instructions from the board also seems straightforward and it is the same way as it is implemented in many online sources. The following sections shows my attempt with minimal help.

I approached it first by the interface, and then the implementation after. I initially wanted to initialize the linked list with variable-length arguments.

pogi = Linkedlist(10,29,3,4)

However, that has proven itself difficult after going through this in multiple sittings. For now, I want it to keep it simple and the following code is yet my best attempt. Thanks to a youtube video [2], I have a brief overview how to work with linked list using OOP. After going through the video two or three times, I tried practicing, imitating and recalling how to implement it in python. When appending new values, the way it is supposed to store what values and indices aren’t clear based from the logic of my code.

class Node:

def \_\_init\_\_(self):

self.value = None

self.next = None

class Linkedlist:

def \_\_init\_\_(self):

self.head = Node()

def add(self, value):

self.head.value = value

index = 0

while self.head.next is not None:

index +=1

self.head.next = index

def printlist(self):

pass

pogi = Linkedlist()

pogi.add(10)

pogi.printlist()

I gave up, so going again through the video, what I didn’t account for was to initialize another node object when adding something to the end of the linked list. The following code may be considered as 1:1 copy from the video. Some methods like set and get, and the size or length of the linked list arent implemented because Im tinatamad. I made some comments here and there to make the code speak some sense when read. Especially at the deleteThis method, I didn’t add any branch inside the while loop like what he did in the video (for just a minor optimization; assuming the compiler and/orinterpreter didn’t account for that).

class Node:

def \_\_init\_\_(self, value=None):

self.value = value

self.next = None

class Linkedlist:

def \_\_init\_\_(self):

self.head = Node()

def add(self, value):

"""

param: value

appends only an element to the end

returns void

"""

new\_node = Node(value) # initialize the value first with a new node

current = self.head # makes the context that

# we are handling the current node

# while also initialize the next node regardless

while current.next is not None:

current = current.next

current.next = new\_node

def printlist(self):

"""

prints things the list

returns void

"""

# store it in cache then traverse to the next node

tempCache = []

current\_node = self.head

while current\_node.next is not None:

current\_node = current\_node.next

tempCache.append(current\_node.value)

print(tempCache)

def deleteThis(self, index):

"""

param: index

deletes the index specified

returns void

"""

current\_node = self.head

# go to the node

current\_index = 0

last\_node = current\_node

while current\_index-1 != index:

last\_node = current\_node

current\_node = current\_node.next

current\_index +=1

# after arriving here, delete

last\_node.next = current\_node.next

# operations

pogi = Linkedlist()

pogi.printlist()

# add multiple, then print

buffers = [0,1,2,3,4]

for bbb in buffers:

pogi.add(bbb)

pogi.printlist()


# deletion

pogi.deleteThis(2)

pogi.deleteThis(0)

pogi.printlist()

**Output**

****

What’s surprising is that the index does not start at 0 in the deleteThis method. That’s why there must be -1 for on the condition of the while loop to offset the index and terminate the loop earlier than what it written from the video.

To have the capacity to initialize some values the same way I first approached it, I could just make a wrapper for the Linkedlist class to have that kind of interface so I won’t need to change the internal parts of the Linkedlist class.

pogi = Linkedlist(10,29,3,4)

My initial attempt only makes use of functions. However, it takes more memory which is a bit expensive.

def LinkedlistProper(\*values):

if len(values) == 0:

return Linkedlist();

else:

temp = Linkedlist()

for iii in values:

temp.add(iii)

return temp

As much as I don’t want to change the init method, what I did was just add this method in the Linkedlist class instead.

def \_\_init\_\_(self, \*values):

self.head = Node()

self.initializer(\*values)

def initializer(self, \*values):

"""

param: \*values

pass some values here to initialize the first values

"""

if len(values) != 0:

for iii in values:

self.add(iii)

And now I can use this code modifications when using the data structure

# operations

pogi = Linkedlist(123,345,456)

pogi.printlist()

# add multiple, then print

buffers = [0,1,2,3,4]

for bbb in buffers:

pogi.add(bbb)

pogi.printlist()


# deletion

pogi.deleteThis(2)

pogi.deleteThis(0)

pogi.printlist()

**OUTPUT:**



The deletion is also be subjected to some sort of a more compact interface. And the same strategy can also be used which was to wrap things. All in all, there aren’t any optimization problems that I can see for now given the constraints of the instruction. I created a doubly linked list despite it being outside of the scope from the lab act. I prefer to learn things by my own solution, in which case I didn’t do earlier. The following code shows the breakdown of a linked list (hard coded) implementation that I based from the video [3].

class Node():

def \_\_init\_\_(self, value = None):

self.value = value

self.head = None

self.tail = None

pogi1 = Node(1) # head : none address: 000 tail : none;

pogi2 = Node(2) # head : none address: 123 tail: none

# set previous tail to current address

pogi1.tail = pogi2

print("pogi1.tail: ", pogi1.tail) # head : none address: 000 tail: 123

# set address to previous

pogi2.head = pogi1

print("pogi2.head", pogi2.head) # head : 000 address: 123 tail: none

~~However, we cannot implement some things the way we implemented it from the first part of the lab act (backwards deletion) as what we have is a singly linked list albeit being dynamic in nature. All in all, there aren’t any optimization problems that I can see for now given the constraints of the instruction. But I want to be a rebel, so here’s my attempt to implement a doubly linked list.~~

~~From the existing codebase,~~

**References:**

[1] <https://www.geeksforgeeks.org/cpp-program-to-remove-duplicates-from-sorted-array/>

[2] <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=JlMyYuY1aXU&t=3s>

[3] <https://youtu.be/6sBsF13n5ig?t=203>

**Appendix**

* The source codes are available at <https://github.com/Jeo0/dsa-practice-documentation>