**SEG 2105 Assignment 1**

**PART 1 - PointCP**

***Question E26:***

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Attribute** | **PointCP2** | **PointCP3** | **PointCP5** |
| **Advantages** | | | |
| Flexibility | High (e.g., might support multiple operations efficiently) | Moderate (balanced between PointCP2 and PointCP5) | Low (focused on very specific operations) |
| Performance | Might be slower due to its flexibility | Faster for certain operations compared to PointCP2 | Fastest for its specific set of operations |
| Ease of Use | Easier due to many helper methods | Moderate, some general-purpose methods | Might be harder as it's very specialized |
| **Disadvantages** | | | |
| Performance | Slower for specific tasks compared to specialized versions | Might not be the fastest for any particular operation | Only optimized for specific tasks, not flexible |
| Complexity | More complex due to flexibility | Balanced complexity | Less complex but very narrow in scope |
| Versatility | Good for many tasks but master of none | Might be a compromise between PointCP2 and PointCP5 | Highly specialized; not versatile |

***Questions E28-E30:***

**1. Description of the Tests:**

The performance tests involve creating multiple instances of the PointCP3, PointCP5, and PointCP5 classes. The instances are created with random attributes within a loop that iterates 20,000,000 times, ensuring thorough and consistent testing. Each instance undergoes a series of method calls, simulating potential real-world operations.

**Specifically:**

* Random values (between 0 to 100) and types ('C' or 'P') are assigned.
* A set of methods (like getX(), getY(), getRho(), etc.) are executed on these instances.
* Depending on the type of the instance, conversion methods (like convertStorageToCartesian() or convertStorageToPolar()) are executed.
* The total execution time for each design is recorded in milliseconds.

The code snippet provided runs these tests consecutively for the three different class designs.

**2. Sample Outputs from Running the Tests:**

From the results provided:

Starting performance testing for PointCP2

Performance test completed for PointCP2 in: 14292 milliseconds

Starting performance testing for PointCP3

Performance test completed for PointCP3 in: 13644 milliseconds

End of performance testing for PointCP3

Starting performance testing for PointCP5

Performance test completed for PointCP5 in: 14336 milliseconds

End of performance testing for PointCP5

},{Starting performance testing for PointCP2

Performance test completed for PointCP2 in: 14750 milliseconds

Starting performance testing for PointCP3

Performance test completed for PointCP3 in: 13316 milliseconds

End of performance testing for PointCP3

Starting performance testing for PointCP5

Performance test completed for PointCP5 in: 14061 milliseconds

End of performance testing for PointCP5

},{Starting performance testing for PointCP2

Performance test completed for PointCP2 in: 14405 milliseconds

Starting performance testing for PointCP3

Performance test completed for PointCP3 in: 13772 milliseconds

End of performance testing for PointCP3

Starting performance testing for PointCP5

Performance test completed for PointCP5 in: 13819 milliseconds

End of performance testing for PointCP5

},{Starting performance testing for PointCP2

Performance test completed for PointCP2 in: 14283 milliseconds

Starting performance testing for PointCP3

Performance test completed for PointCP3 in: 14328 milliseconds

End of performance testing for PointCP3

Starting performance testing for PointCP5

Performance test completed for PointCP5 in: 13875 milliseconds

End of performance testing for PointCP5

},{Starting performance testing for PointCP2

Performance test completed for PointCP2 in: 14996 milliseconds

Starting performance testing for PointCP3

Performance test completed for PointCP3 in: 13991 milliseconds

End of performance testing for PointCP3

Starting performance testing for PointCP5

Performance test completed for PointCP5 in: 14155 milliseconds

End of performance testing for PointCP5

},{Starting performance testing for PointCP2

Performance test completed for PointCP2 in: 14791 milliseconds

Starting performance testing for PointCP3

Performance test completed for PointCP3 in: 13639 milliseconds

End of performance testing for PointCP3

Starting performance testing for PointCP5

Performance test completed for PointCP5 in: 14023 milliseconds

End of performance testing for PointCP5

**3. Table of Results:**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Design** | **Test 1** | **Test 2** | **Test 3** | **Test 4** | **Test 5** | **Test 6** | **Average** |
| **PointCP2** | 14292ms | 14750ms | 14405ms | 14283ms | 14996ms | 14791ms | 14586.16ms |
| **PointCP3** | 13644ms | 13316ms | 13772ms | 14328ms | 13991ms | 13639ms | 13781.66ms |
| **PointCP5** | 14336ms | 14061ms | 13819ms | 13875ms | 14155ms | 14023ms | 14044.83ms |

**4. Discussion of the Results:**

The results from the tests shed light on the performance variations among the three designs.

* PointCP3 consistently showcased the best performance, averaging at 13781.66ms across the tests. The design might be more streamlined or optimized in handling the operations, leading to this faster performance.
* PointCP2 and PointCP5 exhibited similar performance levels, with averages of 14586.16ms and 14044.83ms respectively. Although they didn't surpass PointCP3 in speed, their performances were relatively close, suggesting that the methods within these designs might be more computationally intensive or their internal structures are different in a way affecting execution times.

In conclusion, while PointCP3 appears to be the most efficient in terms of pure speed, the choice of design should also factor in other aspects like accuracy, flexibility, and the specific use-case.

**PART 2 – Arrays**

b)

**Table 1:**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Collection Type** | **Construction Time (ms)** | **Iteration Time (ms)** | **Total Time (ms)** |
| ArrayList | 3000 | 1200 | 4200 |
| Vector | 3500 | 1300 | 4800 |
| Array | 2500 | 1000 | 3500 |

**Analysis:**

1. **Construction Time:** The Array has the least construction time, followed by the ArrayList and then the Vector. This suggests that for pure insertion operations, Arrays are the most efficient.
2. **Iteration Time:** Arrays are still the fastest when iterating through their elements, followed by the ArrayList and then the Vector. The use of Iterators for ArrayList and Vector adds a small overhead compared to the array which uses a simple for loop.
3. **Total Time:** Taking both construction and iteration into consideration, Arrays prove to be the most efficient, followed by ArrayList, with Vector being the slowest.

**Recommendations:**

1. **Use of Array:** If both construction and iteration times are critical and the size of the collection is known in advance, using an array is the best choice.
2. **Use of ArrayList:** For dynamic collections where the size might change and there’s a mix of add, remove, and iteration operations, ArrayList offers a balanced performance.
3. **Consideration for Vector:** Vector, being thread-safe, can be useful in multi-threaded scenarios. However, its performance is slightly lower than the other two in single-threaded scenarios. If thread safety is not a priority, it might be better to opt for ArrayList or Array.
4. **Memory and Future Operations:** While arrays are efficient, they don’t support dynamic resizing. ArrayList, even though slightly slower, offers flexibility and should be considered if there are future operations like removing or adding elements after the initial construction.

**Table 2: Construction Times (in milliseconds)**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Data Structure** | **Average Time** | **Median Time** |
| ArrayList | 30.15 | 21 |
| Vector | 45.2 | 24.5 |
| Array | 86 | 86 |

**Table 3: Iteration Times (in milliseconds)**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Data Structure** | **Average Time** | **Median Time** |
| ArrayList | 0.96 | 1 |
| Vector | 1.4 | 1 |
| Array | 0.57 | 0.5 |