



1.

For each of my timing methods, I first filled a queue with  $N$  items. For the `findMin()` method, I just recorded the amount of time required to run the method on the priority queue. For the `deleteMin()` method, I recorded the time it took to delete an item from the queue, and then added another random string to the queue outside of the timing to preserve the queue size  $N$ . I did the same for the `add()` method, deleting an item after every add to maintain the queue size.

2. Both `add()` and `findMin()` are constant time operations  $O(c)$ . This is fairly obvious for the `findMin()` method, as it just returns the item in array index 0, but it doesn't seem to fit for the `add()` method. The reason is because the running time of `add` depends on the relative ordering of the new item being added. The time will only be  $O(\log(N))$  if the new item is the new minimum of the set. Instead, because 75% of the items in the queue are in the bottom 2 rows of the tree, the `add` method only requires on average 1-3 swaps up the tree, making it run in a constant average time.  $O(c)$

3. The first application for a priority queue using a heap I thought of was for an emergency room wait list. When a nurse diagnoses a new patient, she can add the patient to the queue with a relative urgency value. The higher urgency values would be placed further up on the queue, while lower urgency patients could wait a little bit longer. This is kind of similar to how wait lists for emergency rooms already go, but I don't know if they use a system similar to a priority queue.
4. I spent about 3 hours on this assignment.