

Algorithm	insertion	deletion	element access
Linked list	$O(1)$	$O(1)$	$O(n)$
Arrays	$O(n)$	$O(n)$	$O(1)$
Dynamic Arrays	$O(1)$ at the end	$O(1)$ at the end	$O(1)$

Heap	bubble-up	bubble-down	heapify
	$O(\log n)$	$O(\log n)$	$\Theta(n)$

Algorithm	Runtime
Quick Select	Average Case $\Theta(n)$ Worst Case: $\Theta(n^2)$
Randomized Quick Select	Expected: $\Theta(n)$ Worst Case: $\Theta(n^2)$
Medians of Five Quick Select	Worst Case $\Theta(n)$

Sort	Running time	Analysis
Selection Sort	$\Theta(n^2)$	worst-case
Insertion Sort	$\Theta(n^2)$	worst-case
Bubble Sort	$\Theta(n^2)$	worst-case
Merge Sort	$\Theta(n \log n)$	worst-case
Heap Sort	$\Theta(n \log n)$	worst-case
Quick Sort	$\Theta(n \log n)$	average-case (worst case $\Theta(n^2)$)
Randomized Quick Sort	$\Theta(n \log n)$	expected (worst case $\Theta(n^2)$)
Medians of Five Quick Sort	$\Theta(n \log n)$	worst-case
Heap Sort	$O(n \log n)$	average-case

Trees	Search	Insert	Delete	Note
Binary Search Tree	$\Theta(h)$	$\Theta(h)$	$\Theta(h)$	h (height of the tree): Worst-case $\Theta(n)$, Best-case $\Theta(\log n)$, Average-case $\Theta(\log n)$
AVL Tree	$\Theta(h)$	$\Theta(h)$	$\Theta(h)$	h : $\Theta(\log n)$
2-3 Tree (B Tree)	$\Theta(h)$	$\Theta(h)$	$\Theta(h)$	h : $O(\log n / \log d * \log d) = O(\log n)$

Hashing	Search	Insert	Delete
Linear Probing	$1/(1 - \alpha)^2$	$1/(1 - \alpha)^2$	$1/(1 - \alpha)$
Double Hashing	$1/(1 - \alpha)$	$1/(1 - \alpha)$	$1/\alpha * \log(1/(1 - \alpha))$
Cuckoo Hashing	1	$\alpha/(1 - 2\alpha)^2$	1
Extendible Hashing	CPU time: $\Theta(\log S)$ Page faults: 1	$\Theta(S)$ without directory grow/shrink, otherwise $\Theta(2^d)$ Page faults: 1 or 2	same as Insert

Advantages of Balances Search Trees	Advantages of Hash table
$O(\log n)$ worst-case operation cost	$O(1)$ cost, but only on average
Does not require any assumptions, special functions, or known properties of input distribution	Flexible load factor parameters
No wasted space	Cuckoo hashing achieves $O(1)$ worst-case for search & delete
Never need to rebuild the entire structure	
Both approaches can be adopted to minimize page faults	Both approaches can be adopted to minimize page faults

Search	Runtime
Binary Search	Worst Case $O(\log n)$ Best Case $O(1)$ Average Case $O(\log n)$
Interpolation Search	$O(\log \log n)$ on average (keys uniformly distributed) worst case $O(n)$
Gallop Search	$O(\log m)$ comparisons (m: location of k in A)
Skip List	Expected Space: $O(n)$ Expected height $O(\log n)$ Search, Insert, Delete: $O(\log n)$
Range Search on BST	$O(\log n + k)$ k: number of reported items

Multi-Dimensional Data	Build initial tree	Range Search	Note
Quadtree	worst-case $\Theta(\#nodes) = \Theta(nh)$	worst-case $O(nh)$	height $\in \Theta(\log_2 (d_{max}/d_{min}))$
Kd-trees (d dimensional)	$O(n \log n)$	$O(n^{1-1/d} + k)$	Storage: $O(n)$
Range Tree (d dimensional)	$O(n (\log n)^{d-1})$	$O((\log n)^d + k)$	Storage: $O(n (\log n)^{d-1})$

	Brute-Force	KMP	Boyer-Moore	Suffix trees
Preprocessing	/	$O(m)$	$O(m + \Sigma)$	$O(n^2)$
Search time	$O(nm)$	$O(n)$	$O(n)$ often better	$O(m)$
Extra space	/	$O(m)$	$O(m + \Sigma)$	$O(n)$

Algorithm	Property	Extra data	Runtime
REL	Variable-width, multiple-character encoding	Nothing	
Huffman	Variable-width, single-character	Compressed Trie	build decoding trie: $O(S + \Sigma \log \Sigma)$
MTF	Adaptive, transform to smaller integers, Must be followed by variable-width integer encoding	Initial order dictionary	
LZW	Adaptive, fixed-width, multiple-character encoding, Augments dictionary with repeated substrings	Nothing (<i>decoder will make a same dictionary by Text</i>)	
BWT	Block compression method, must be followed by MTF	Nothing	Encoding: $O(n^2)$ Decoding: $O(n^2)$