

EECS2011 Assignment 01

Araf A Alam

218124347

Sept. 30, 2022

Q1)

Efficiency for each:

A) Array (like the Java array)

(a) Search for an element. -> SLOW

The bigger the array, the more time it will take to search the array. Time complexity of $O(n)$.

(b) Get the middle element, i.e., with the list size being n , return the $\lfloor n/2 \rfloor$ -th element in the list. -> FAST

Time complexity of $O(1)$. No loops are needed, always a constant number of operations.

(c) Insert a new element at the beginning of the list. -> SLOW

Need to move all the elements of the array forward by one if the beginning is not null. $O(n)$. However, it's $O(1)$ and extremely fast if the array is empty initially. But we consider the worst-case scenario in this case.

(d) Insert a new element at the end of the list. -> FAST

Time complexity of $O(1)$, just add the new element to the list, `arr[arr.length + 1] = new;`

(e) Delete an element from the beginning of the list. -> SLOW

Time complexity of $O(n)$. Need to move all the elements of the array down to overwrite the deleted index. But if we were allowed to just leave the first index as NULL, then it would be FAST as we can just set `arr[0]` to NULL and forget about it.

(f) Delete an element from the end of the list. -> FAST

Time complexity of $O(1)$, just delete the last element, `arr[n] = NULL` where n is the length of the array.

B) singly-linked list, with "next" only, and with "head" only.

(a) Search for an element. -> SLOW

Time complexity of $O(n)$.

(b) Get the middle element, i.e., with the list size being n , return the $\lfloor n/2 \rfloor$ -th element in the list. -> SLOW

Time complexity of $O(n)$.

(c) Insert a new element at the beginning of the list. -> FAST

Time complexity of $O(1)$. A simple linked list insertion, always a constant # of operations.

(d) Insert a new element at the end of the list. -> SLOW

Time complexity of $O(n)$ since we don't have a "tail."

(e) Delete an element from the beginning of the list. -> FAST

Time complexity of $O(1)$. Just set the second element as the head.

(f) Delete an element from the end of the list. -> SLOW

Time complexity of $O(n)$ since we don't have a "tail."

C. singly-linked list, with "next" only, and with "head" and "tail".

(a) Search for an element. -> SLOW

Time complexity of $O(n)$.

(b) Get the middle element, i.e., with the list size being n , return the $\lfloor n/2 \rfloor$ -th element in the list. -> SLOW

Time complexity of $O(n)$.

(c) Insert a new element at the beginning of the list. -> FAST

Time complexity of $O(1)$. A simple linked list insertion, always a constant # of operations.

(d) Insert a new element at the end of the list. -> FAST

Time complexity of $O(1)$. Just insert as the next of the tail, then assign as tail.

(e) Delete an element from the beginning of the list. -> FAST

Time complexity of $O(1)$. Just set the second element as the head.

(f) Delete an element from the end of the list. -> SLOW

Time complexity of $O(n)$ since we don't have a "prev" that we can use to assign the tail after.

D. reverse singly-linked list, with "prev" only, and with "tail" only.

(a) Search for an element. -> SLOW

Time complexity of $O(n)$.

(b) Get the middle element, i.e., with the list size being n , return the $\lfloor n/2 \rfloor$ -th element in the list. -> SLOW

Time complexity of $O(n)$.

(c) Insert a new element at the beginning of the list. -> SLOW

Assuming the beginning of the list is where head would be. Time complexity of $O(n)$.

(d) Insert a new element at the end of the list. -> FAST

Time complexity of $O(1)$, just set `newNode.prev` to the node at tail and set `newNode` as tail.

(e) Delete an element from the beginning of the list. -> SLOW

Assuming the beginning of the list is where head would be. Time complexity of $O(n)$.

(f) Delete an element from the end of the list. -> FAST

Time complexity of $O(1)$, set the second `lastNode.prev` as the new tail.

E. doubly-linked list with "next" and "prev", and with "head" and "tail".

(a) Search for an element. -> SLOW

Time complexity of $O(n)$.

(b) Get the middle element, i.e., with the list size being n , return the $\lfloor n/2 \rfloor$ -th element in the list. -> SLOW

Time complexity of $O(n)$.

(c) Insert a new element at the beginning of the list. -> FAST

Time complexity of $O(1)$. If `currentNode` is the head, set `currentNode.next.prev` as `newNode`.
Set the `newNode` as head. `newNode.prev = NULL`; `newNode.next = currentNode.next`;

(d) Insert a new element at the end of the list. -> FAST

Time complexity of $O(1)$, similar process as above, but reversed for the end.

(e) Delete an element from the beginning of the list. -> FAST

Time complexity of $O(1)$. If `currentNode` is the head, `currentNode.next.prev = NULL`;
`currentNode.next = head`;

(f) Delete an element from the end of the list. -> FAST

Time complexity of $O(1)$, similar process as above, reversed.

F. circular singly-linked list, with "next" only, and with "tail" only.

(a) Search for an element. -> SLOW

Time complexity of $O(n)$.

(b) Get the middle element, i.e., with the list size being n , return the $\lfloor n/2 \rfloor$ -th element in the list. -> SLOW

Time complexity of $O(n)$.

(c) Insert a new element at the beginning of the list. -> FAST

Time complexity of $O(1)$. -> `currentNode = tailNode.next`; `tailNode.next = newNode`;
`newNode.next = currentNode`;

(d) Insert a new element at the end of the list. -> FAST

Time complexity of $O(1)$. New node that is set as the new tail and points to the first node in the list. Also, the old tail node's next is the new node.

(e) Delete an element from the beginning of the list. -> FAST

Time complexity of $O(1)$. `currentNode = lastNode.next`; `lastNode.next = currentNode.next`.

(f) Delete an element from the end of the list. -> SLOW

Time complexity of $O(n)$ since there's no "prev." We have to loop through the whole array to point to the last node if we delete the last element.

G. circular doubly-linked list, with "next" and "prev", and with "tail" only.

(a) Search for an element. -> SLOW

Time complexity of $O(n)$.

(b) Get the middle element, i.e., with the list size being n , return the $\lfloor n/2 \rfloor$ -th element in the list. -> SLOW

Time complexity of $O(n)$.

(c) Insert a new element at the beginning of the list. -> FAST

Time complexity of $O(1)$. Similar process as with a circular singly-linked list plus assigning the "prev" as it should be assigned. Space complexity is still $O(1)$ but with one more const.

(d) Insert a new element at the end of the list. -> FAST

Time complexity of $O(1)$. Similar process as with a circular singly-linked list plus assigning the "prev" as it should be assigned.

(e) Delete an element from the beginning of the list. -> FAST

Time complexity of $O(1)$. Similar process as with a circular singly-linked list plus assigning the "prev" as it should be assigned.

(f) Delete an element from the end of the list. -> FAST

Time complexity of $O(1)$. If `currentNode` is the first node in the list: `currentNode.prev = lastNode.prev; lastNode.prev.next = currentNode;`

Q2) Description of my algorithm

The time complexity of my algorithm is $O(n + n)$. However, in the best-case scenario, the time complexity is $O(1)$, that is whenever the array is empty.

My algorithm originally checks to see if the array is empty, and returns a \emptyset if that's so.

Then in a for-loop, adds all the values appearing before 1 to the stack, and stops at 1 and breaks the loop.

Inside of another for loop, int i starts counting from after the index of 1 and up until the length of the array plus the size of the stack, represented by 'totalSize.' The size of the stack changes throughout this loop so that's something to keep in mind.

In this loop, we check if the value at `arr[i]` is equal to the 'value' we're looking for, if so, then increment our 'value' and loop again. If not, check to see if the 'value' is the last value in the stack, if so, we increment our 'value' but decrement 'i' since we may still need to check to see if `arr[i]` contains the next value in the list. If the previous step also fails, then we add the current index of `arr[i]` to the stack and increment the 'totalSize' and loop again. If all of the above fails, we break the loop and come to the conclusion that we've already found the maximum number of values that can be sorted.

External resources: None

Plagiarized: No way >_<