From the results we may observe that there is a slight improvement in the code where a priority queue is used. I personally believe that the data used is not significant enough to come to a conclusion. Even on my Larger_test1.txt file that is significantly larger than given test files it is difficult to come to a conclusion. There are too many confounding variables(startup times, cpu scheduler) to display the theoretical improvement of the priority queue. If we were to test this code on a larger data set we would see the efficiency of the priority queue to be O(log V) as compared to the original O(V^2). Both of these algorithms both have the same accuracy and will return the same results.

Tested on the original test files

+	+·	+	+
Test/File & Type	Original Code (s)	Priority Queue (s)	 -
Dijkstra_test1 (List)	1.1622e-05	1.7682e-05	
Dijkstra_test2 (List)	1.2748e-05	1.7758e-05	I
Dijkstra_test3 (List)	3.0767e-05	3.4427e-05	ĺ
+	 	+	+
Dijkstra_test1 (Matrix)	1.4659e-05	1.2769e-05	
Dijkstra_test2 (Matrix)	1.3092e-05	1.2063e-05	
Dijkstra_test3 (Matrix)	2.4455e-05	1.5453e-05	
+	+	-+	+

Tested on the Larger_test1.txt file

++	+
Implementation (List) Execution Time (s)	 +
Priority Queue Implementation 0.000845937 Original Dijkstra 0.00100736	
+++	+

```
1 Priority queue V

ROBLEMS OUTPUT DEBUG CONSOLE TERMANAL PORTS COMMENTS

(base) morganofforgans-flacBook-Pro 3 % make
gw = stide-sil -Mell -Metral -pedantic Dijkstra.cpp edge.cpp Graph.cpp List_Graph.cpp
Tis_Graph.cpp = Duildy.do.cut
List_Graph.cpp = Duildy.do.cut
List_Graph.c
```

