

## CS Assessment

### tinyArray

- Insert: 103  $\mu$ s
- Append: 105  $\mu$ s

### smallArray

- Insert: 116  $\mu$ s
- Append: 116  $\mu$ s

### Medium

- Insert: 215  $\mu$ s
- Append: 169  $\mu$ s

### Large

- Insert: 6 ms
- Append: 601  $\mu$ s

### ExtraLarge

- Insert: 919 ms
- Append: 6 ms

The pattern I see is that the higher the number gets, the slower both functions get, obviously. However, the `doublerInsert` function doesn't scale nearly as well as the `doublerAppend` function. This is because the `doublerInsert` function is shifting every index over one as opposed to the `doublerAppend` function which is just adding a number to the end of the array. The larger the number, the more 'shifts' need to occur in the `doublerInsert` function, thus, causing scaling issues.