

LinkedList	ArrayList
Get(i) cost $O(N)$, use doubly linked list.	Get(i) cost $O(1)$, use array
remove() cost $O(1)$	Remove cost $O(N)$
Add() cost $O(1)$	Add() cost $O(N)$
Higher memory consumption	Lower memory consumption
Implement List interface	
Maintain elements insertion order	
Non-synchronized, could be synchronized by Collections.synchronizedList	
Fail-fast	

Explain

1) Get: ArrayList maintains index based system for its elements as it uses array data structure implicitly which makes it faster for searching.

LinkedList implements doubly linked list which requires the traversal through all the elements for searching.

2) Remove & Add: LinkedList's each element maintains two pointers which points to the both neighbor elements. Hence removal only requires change in the pointer location in the two neighbor nodes of the node which is going to be removed. While In ArrayList all the elements need to be shifted to fill out the space created by removed element.

3) Memory Overhead: ArrayList maintains indexes and element data while LinkedList maintains element data and two pointers for neighbor nodes.

When to use LinkedList and ArrayList?

If there is a requirement of frequent addition and deletion in application then LinkedList is a best choice.

If there are less add and remove operations and more search operations requirement, ArrayList would be your best bet.

Array	ArrayList
Stores primitive data types and also objects	Stores only objects
Defined in Java language itself as a fundamental data structure	Belongs to collections framework
Fixed size	Resizable. Elements can be added or removed
Stores similar data of one type	Can store heterogeneous data types
It is not a class	It is a class with many methods
Cannot be synchronized	Can be obtained a synchronized version
Elements retrieved with for loop	Can be retrieved with for loop and iterators
Elements accessible with index number	Accessing methods like get() etc. are available
Can be multidimensional	—

HashSet	TreeSet
Add, remove, contains, size cost $O(1)$	Add remove contains size cost $O(\log N)$
Not maintain insertion order	Maintain ascending order
Not allow duplicate elements	
Use HashSet firstly and then add elements to TreeSet is faster than use TreeSet directly	
Non-synchronized and not thread-safe	

List VS Set VS Map Interfaces

1) Duplicity:

List allows duplicate elements. Any number of duplicate elements can be inserted into the list without affecting the same existing values and their indexes.

Set doesn't allow duplicates. Set and all of the classes which implements Set interface should have unique elements.

Map stored the elements as key & value pair. Map doesn't allow duplicate keys while it allows duplicate values.

2) Null values:

List allows any number of null values.

Set allows single null value at most.

Map can have single null key at most and any number of null values.

3) Order:

List and all of its implementation classes maintains the insertion order.

Set doesn't maintain any order; still few of its classes sort the elements in an order such as `LinkedHashSet` maintains the elements in insertion order.

Similar to Set Map also doesn't stores the elements in an order, however few of its classes does the same. For e.g. `TreeMap` sorts the map in the ascending order of keys and `LinkedHashMap` sorts the elements in the insertion order, the order in which the elements got added to the `LinkedHashMap`.

4) Commonly used classes:

List: [`ArrayList`](#), [`LinkedList`](#) etc.

Set: [`HashSet`](#), [`LinkedHashSet`](#), [`TreeSet`](#), `SortedSet` etc.

Map: [`HashMap`](#), [`TreeMap`](#), `WeakHashMap`, [`LinkedHashMap`](#), `IdentityHashMap` etc.

5) When to use List, Map, Set?

1. If you do not want to have duplicate values in the database then Set should be your first choice as all of its classes do not allow duplicates.
2. If there is a need of frequent search operations based on the index values then List (`ArrayList`) is a better choice.
3. If there is a need of maintaining the insertion order then also the List is a preferred collection interface.
4. If the requirement is to have the key & value mappings in the database then Map is your best bet.

HashMap	Hashtable
Non synchronized and not thread safe , could be synchronized by Collections.synchronizedMap(hashMap)	Synchronized and thread safe
Allow one null key and any null value	Not allow null key and value
Use iterator to iterator	Use enumerator to iterator like vector
Iterator is Fail-fast : if is structurally modified at any time after the iterator is created in any way except the iterator's own remove method, the iterator will throw ConcurrentModification Exception.	Enumerator is Not fail-fast
Faster , less memory is single threat environment because of unsynchronized	Slower , more memory
Subclass of AbstractMap class	Subclass of Dictionary class(Obsolete)
Insertion Order is not guaranteed	
Implements Map interface	
Put and Get methods cost constant time assuming that the objects are distributed uniformly across the bucket.	
Works on the principle of Hashing	

When to use HashMap and Hashtable?

- 1. Single Threaded Application:** HashMap should be preferred over Hashtable for the non-threaded applications. In simple words, use HashMap in unsynchronized or single threaded applications.
- 2. Multi-Threaded Application:** We should avoid using Hashtable, as the class is now obsolete in latest Jdk 1.8. Oracle has provided a better replacement of Hashtable named ConcurrentHashMap. For multithreaded application prefer ConcurrentHashMap instead of Hashtable.

Binary Search Tree	Heap
Guarantee order of left and right part	Guarantee order of higher level and lower level
Cost $O(\log N)$ in searching and insertion	Cost $O(1)$ in search min/max, $O(\log N)$ in insertion
If want to sort elements then use BST	
If care more about min or max then use heap	

HashMap	TreeMap
No guarantee order	Sorted according to the natural ordering of keys according to the compareTo() method
Get/Put/Remove/contains $O(1)$	$O(\log N)$
Map Interface	Map, SortedMap, NavigableMap Interfaces
One null key and any null value allowed	Only values
Fail-fast	
Bucket	Red-black tree
Not synchronized	

HashTable	Binary Tree
Complicate to implement	Easy to implement
Add, get, remove cost $O(1)$	Add get remove cost $O(\log N)$
No orders	BST has orders

Quick Sort	Merge Sort
Worst case $O(N^2)$, AVE $O(N \log N)$	$O(N \log N)$
Cost more compares but less space	Cost less compares but more space
Shuffle is important, faster	Needn't shuffle, slower

Stack	Queue
Insert to end and remove from end	Insert to end and remove from head
Use one pointer "Top"	Use two pointers "Front", "Rear"
No space wastage	Have space wastage
Cost $O(1)$ in add and remove	