

Dokumentaatio

junyuan.fang@tuni.fi

H292042

Tietorakenteen valinta:

```
//Place
struct Place{
    Name name_;
    PlaceType type_;
    Coord xy_;
};
unordered_map<PlaceID, Place> placeUnOrMap_;

//Area
struct Area{
    AreaID area_ID_;
    Name name_;
    vector<Coord> coords_;
    Area * parent_=nullptr;
    vector<Area*> subArea_;
};
unordered_map<AreaID, Area> areaUnOrMap_;
```

Unordered_map sopii työmme, koska ”alkion poisto”, ”tietyn etsintä”, ”lisäysmuualle” on keskimäärin $\Theta(1)$ tai pahimmillaan $O(n)$, jonka tapahtuva todennäköisyys on todella pieni.

Toteutuksessa käytetyt STL funtiot, ja niiden asympotoottinen notaatio

Unordered_map:

- find, keskimäärin $\Theta(1)$ tai pahimmillaan $O(n)$
- empty, $O(1)$
- erase, keskimäärin $\Theta(1)$ tai pahimmillaan $O(n)$
- size, $O(1)$
- clear, keskimäärin $\Theta(1)$ tai pahimmillaan $O(n)$
- insert, keskimäärin $\Theta(1)$ tai pahimmillaan $O(n)$

Vector: back, $O(1)$

- pushback, amortisoitu $\Theta(1)$ tai pahimmillaan $O(n)$
- size, $O(1)$
- clear, $O(n)$

sort(): $O(n \log(n))$

// Estimate of performance: $O(1)$

// Short rationale for estimate: Only used size() to return int. and its complexity is $O(1)$

```
int place_count();
```

```

// Estimate of performance:  $O(n)$ 
// Short rationale for estimate: because unordered_map's clear() is
 $O(n)$ 
void clear_all();

// Estimate of performance:  $O(n)$ 
// Short rationale for estimate: for-loop dominate the time
std::vector<PlaceID> all_places();

// Estimate of performance: in average  $\theta(1)$ , worst  $O(n)$ 
// Short rationale for estimate: complexity depends on unordered_map's
find() and size(), and both are  $\theta(1)$ 
bool add_place(PlaceID id, Name const& name, PlaceType type, Coord xy);

// Estimate of performance: in average  $\theta(1)$ , Worst case:  $O(n)$ 
// Short rationale for estimate: complexity depends on unordered_map's
find()
std::pair<Name, PlaceType> get_place_name_type(PlaceID id);

// Estimate of performance: in average  $\theta(1)$ , Worst case:  $O(n)$ 
// Short rationale for estimate: complexity depends on unordered_map's
find()
Coord get_place_coord(PlaceID id);

// We recommend you implement the operations below only after
implementing the ones above

// Estimate of performance:  $O(n \log(n))$ 
// Short rationale for estimate: same as sort()'s complexity and
unordered_map's find() in average is  $\theta(1)$ 
std::vector<PlaceID> places_alphabetically();

// Estimate of performance:  $O(n \log(n))$ 
// Short rationale for estimate: same as sort()'s complexity and
unordered_map's find() in average is  $\theta(1)$ 
std::vector<PlaceID> places_coord_order();

// Estimate of performance:  $O(n*m) / O(n)$ 
// Short rationale for estimate: m is string's length, because strings
area short so we assume  $m = \text{constant}$ 
std::vector<PlaceID> find_places_name(Name const& name);

// Estimate of performance:  $O(n)$ 
// Short rationale for estimate: one for-loop

```

```

std::vector<PlaceID> find_places_type(PlaceType type);

// Estimate of performance: in average  $\theta(1)$ , Worst case:  $O(n)$ 
// Short rationale for estimate: complexity depends on unordered_map's
find(). Because we find it from datastructure then we change it
bool change_place_name(PlaceID id, Name const& newname);

// Estimate of performance: in average  $\theta(1)$ , Worst case:  $O(n)$ 
// Short rationale for estimate: complexity depends on unordered_map's
find(). Because we find it from datastructure then we change it
bool change_place_coord(PlaceID id, Coord newcoord);

// We recommend you implement the operations below only after
implementing the ones above

// Estimate of performance: in average  $\theta(1)$ , Worst case:  $O(n)$ 
// Short rationale for estimate: complexity depends on unordered_map's
find() and insert()
bool add_area(AreaID id, Name const& name, std::vector<Coord> coords);

// Estimate of performance: in average  $\theta(1)$ , Worst case:  $O(n)$ 
// Short rationale for estimate: no for loop, and unordered_map's find()
dominate the time
Name get_area_name(AreaID id);

// Estimate of performance: in average  $\theta(1)$ , Worst case:  $O(n)$ 
// Short rationale for estimate: no for loop, and unordered_map's find()
dominate the
std::vector<Coord> get_area_coords(AreaID id);

// Estimate of performance:  $O(n)$ 
// Short rationale for estimate: one for-loop for using push_back(), and
pushback() is amortized  $\theta(1)$ 
std::vector<AreaID> all_areas();

// Estimate of performance:  $O(n)$ 
// Short rationale for estimate: one for-loop for using push_back(), and
pushback() is amortized  $\theta(1)$ 
bool add_subarea_to_area(AreaID id, AreaID parentid);

// Estimate of performance:  $O(n)$ 
// Short rationale for estimate: while-loop increase the time complexity
std::vector<AreaID> subarea_in_areas(AreaID id);

```

```

// Non-compulsory operations

// Estimate of performance:  $O(1)$ 
// Short rationale for estimate: there we only change the "flag"'s value
so is constant
void creation_finished();

// Estimate of performance:  $O(n)$ 
// Short rationale for estimate: Depth First Traversal is  $O(n + m)$ ,
where n is the number of nodes, and m is the number of edges.
std::vector<AreaID> all_subareas_in_area(AreaID id);

// Estimate of performance:  $O(n)$ 
// Short rationale for estimate: there was one for loop, and a sort()
function in the for-loop. Should be  $O(n * m \log(m))$ , but  $m \leq 3$  and it's small
we assume it is a constant
std::vector<PlaceID> places_closest_to(Coord xy, PlaceType type);

// Estimate of performance: in average  $\theta(1)$ ,  $O(n)$ 
// Short rationale for estimate: because we only used unordered_map's
erase()
bool remove_place(PlaceID id);

// Estimate of performance:  $O(n^2)$ , but perftest's result is  $\theta(1)$ 
// Short rationale for estimate: there are one while-loop inside another
while-loop. it depends what kind of data we have. In worst case first one's
and second one's while-loop size will be  $n-1$ , if data's size is n.
// but our "return" will interrupt it, so it will never be  $(n-1)^2$ 
(except they do not have the common area)

AreaID common_area_of_subareas(AreaID id1, AreaID id2);_type

```

Private:

```

// Helping "all_subareas_in_area". Pre-order-tree-walk through subarea
and add them to "vector<AreaID>":
// Depth First Traversal is  $O(n + m)$ , where n is the number of nodes,
and m is the number of edges.
void PRE_WALK_SUB(Area* recentArea, vector<AreaID>& ID);

// Helping "places_closest_to" and "sort3element" compare a's and b's
distance from coord xy
// return true if a's distance from xy is shorter than b
// Coord's "<" was reloaded (from "datastructure.hh" in rows 64-71)

```

```
//O(1)
bool aShorterB(const PlaceID& a, const PlaceID& b, const Coord& xy);

//Helping "places_closest_to", sorting 3(or less than 3) elements in
the "vector<PlaceID>"
//Coord's "<" was reloaded(from "datastructure.hh" in rows 64-71)
//O(nlog(n)). But actually it is theta(1) because n is constant 0-3. So
this one will not effect "places_closest_to"'s complexity
void sort3element(vector<PlaceID>& placeVec, const Coord& xy);
```