

A).Analysis of memory allocation and running time in original MP5 implementation:

1.Check the Running Time of the original mp5 implementation

```
## abcd@cyhh mp6 % time ./mp6 tests/source.png ../mp5/mp5_pngs/ 400 5 mosaic.png
## Loading Tile Images... (4730/4730)... 4479 unique images loaded
## Populating Mosaic: setting tile (399, 532)
## Drawing Mosaic: resizing tiles (213200/213200)
## Saving Output Image... Done
## ./mp6 tests/source.png ../mp5/mp5_pngs/ 400 5 mosaic.png 4.90s user 1.19s
system 9% cpu 1:05.55 total
```

2.Check the Space Utilization of the original mp5 implementation

```
## valgrind ./mp6 tests/source.png ../mp5/mp5_pngs/ 400 5 mosaic .png
## Loading Tile Images...(4730/4730)...4479 unique images loadedPopulating Mosaic;
setting tile (399, 532)Drawing Mosaic: resizing tiles (213200/213200)
## saving Output Image...Done
```

HEAP SUMMARY:

```
## in use at exit: 5,461,692,867 bytes in 4 480 blockstotal heap usage: 738,217 allocs,
733,737 frees,5,460 , 578,627 bytes allocated
```

LEAK SUMMARY:

```
## definitely lost: 16 bytes in 1 blocks
## indirectly lost: 5,461,692,851 bytes in 4,479 blocks
## possibly lost: bytes in blocks
## still reachable: 0 bytes in 0 blocks
## suppressed: 0 bytes in 0 blocks
```

B)What I have done to improve the memory utilization :

When it comes to the too much space utilization, I think it is mainly due to the storage of the pixels of the tileimage for every block of the source image in the original mp5 implementation. And it is also a great number of space utilization after using the pointers for each block of the source image. So, I think of the data structure of hash table to store the key of each tileimage for each block of source image because each pointer occupies 8 bytes while each unsigned short occupies 2 bytes. Therefore, I modified function “mapTiles”. I designed a hash table, matching

index number to pointers of tile images, and replaced pointers in myImages with index numbers. Specifically, every tile image is assigned an unsigned short int number, from 0 to total number of tile images. The hash table is declared as a member variable in class "MosaicCanvas".

Then in function "mapTiles", the returned MosaicCanvas has an unsigned short int representing which tile image at each block of source image and has a hash table matching these unsigned short ints to pointers to tile images.

C) Analysis of memory allocation and running time after optimization:

1. Check the Running Time of the optimized MP6 implementation

```
## abcd@cyhh mp6 % time ./mp6 tests/source.png ../mp5/mp5_pngs/ 400 5 mosaic.png
## Loading Tile Images... (4730/4730)... 4479 unique images loaded
## Populating Mosaic: setting tile (399, 532)
## Drawing Mosaic: resizing tiles (213200/213200)
## Saving Output Image... Done
## ./mp6 tests/source.png ../mp5/mp5_pngs/ 400 5 mosaic.png 4.99s user 1.19s
system 20% cpu 30.557 total
```

*** So, by comparison, the time consumption has increased a little unexpectedly

2. Check the Space Utilization of the optimized MP6 implementation

```
## valgrind ./mp6 tests/source.png ../mp5/mp5_pngs/ 400 5 mosaic .png
## Loading Tile Images...(4730/4730)...4479 unique images loadedPopulating Mosaic;
setting tile (399, 532)Drawing Mosaic: resizing tiles (213200/213200)
## saving Output Image...Done
```

HEAP SUMMARY:

```
## in use at exit: 4,460,579,651 bytes in 4 480 blockstotal heap usage: 738,217 allocs,
733,737 frees,5,460 , 578,627 bytes allocated
```

LEAK SUMMARY:

```
## definitely lost: 16 bytes in 1 blocks
## indirectly lost: 4,460,579,651 bytes in 4,479 blocks
## possibly lost: bytes in blocks
## still reachable: 0 bytes in 0 blocks
## suppressed: 0 bytes in 0 blocks
```

**** So, by comparison, the memory utilization has decreased by 2113216 bytes

**** The memory space has decreased, which means the optimization is good

```

(base) abcd@cyhh mp6 % time ./mp6 tests/source.png ../mp5/mp5_pngs/ 400 5 mosaic.png
Loading Tile Images... (4730/4730)... 4479 unique images loaded
Populating Mosaic: setting tile (399, 532)
Drawing Mosaic: resizing tiles (213200/213200)
Saving Output Image... Done
./mp6 tests/source.png ../mp5/mp5_pngs/ 400 5 mosaic.png  4.93s user 1.24s system 10% cpu 1:00.05 total

(base) abcd@cyhh mp6 % time ./mp6 tests/source.png ../mp5/mp5_pngs/ 400 5 mosaic.png
Loading Tile Images... (4730/4730)... 4479 unique images loaded
Populating Mosaic: setting tile (399, 532)
Drawing Mosaic: resizing tiles (213200/213200)
Saving Output Image... Done
./mp6 tests/source.png ../mp5/mp5_pngs/ 400 5 mosaic.png  4.99s user 1.19s system 20% cpu 30.557 total

```

D) Analysis of the running time of the drawing mosaic image

Drawing a mosaic image has an $O(w \cdot h \cdot w' \cdot h')$ running time, because it firstly loops through all small blocks of source image from left to right, up to down, which takes $O(w \cdot h)$ time, then for each block, it also loops through all pixels of tile images from left to right, up to down, which takes $O(w' \cdot h' \cdot w' \cdot h')$ eventually.