# **Analyze the worst-case time complexity of operations mostSimilarValue and printByLevels.**

# **MostSimilarValue**

@Override **public** Integer mostSimilarValue (Integer value) {  
 **if** (contains (value)) **return** value;  
 **return** similar (**root**, value, 0);  
}  
  
**private** Integer similar(Node comparator, Integer value, Integer s0) {  
 **if**(comparator.**key**>value && comparator.**left** != **null**)  
 **if**(Math.*abs*(comparator.**key** - value) >= Math.*abs*(comparator.**left**.**key** - value))  
 **return** similar(comparator.**left**,value, comparator.**left**.**key**);  
 **else  
 return** similar(comparator.**left**, value, comparator.**key**);  
  
 **else if**(comparator.**key**<value && comparator.**right** != **null** )  
 **if**(Math.*abs*(comparator.**right**.**key** - value) >= Math.*abs*(comparator.**key** - value))  
 **return** similar(comparator.**right**, value, comparator.**key**);  
 **else  
 return** similar(comparator.**right**, value, comparator.**right**.**key**);  
 **return** s0;  
}

* Searching in a BST starts at the root and yields a recursive algorithm.
* This process is binary, thus **search is O ()**.
* A BST has **O (h)** worst-case runtime complexity, where h is the height of the tree. Since s binary search tree with n nodes has a minimum of **O ()** levels, it takes at least **O ()** comparisons to find a particular node.
* Unfortunately, a binary search tree can degenerate to a linked list, effectively reducing the search time to **O (n)**. That is the worst-case scenarios for a BST and it involves a completely unbalanced tree, which degenerates into a single-linked list. This presents a challenge since we do not get the "halving at every step" characteristic that gives a Binary Search Tree its power.

# **PrintByLevels**

The exercise instructions describe a **Level order traversal that** processes the nodes level by level. The method would traverse the root, and then its children, then its grandchildren, and so on. Unlike the other traversal methods, it seems that ***a recursive version does not exist.***

The possible implementation I read about, is similar to the non-recursive preorder traversal algorithm. The only difference is that a stack is replaced with a FIFO queue. But since we are not allowed to use such data structures. I will content myself with **O ().**

* PrintLevel () takes **O (N)** time where N is the number of nodes in the tree. So time complexity of ***printByLevels ()*** is **O (N)** + **O (N-1)** + **O (N-2)** +... + **O (1)** which is **O ()**.

@Override **public void** printByLevels(){ *//using Breadth First Search traversal.* **int** h = depthTree(**root**);  
 **for** (**int** i=1; i<=h; i++){  
 System.***out***.print(**"Depth "**+(i-1)+**" :"**);  
 printLevel(**root**, i);  
 System.***out***.println(**"\n"**);  
 }  
}

**private int** depthTree(Node root) {  
 **if** (root == **null**) **return** 0;  
 **else** {  
 **int** left = depthTree(root.**left**);  
 **int** right = depthTree(root.**right**);  
 **if** (left > right) **return**(left+1);  
 **else return**(right+1);  
 }  
}  
  
**private void** printLevel(Node root , **int** level) {  
 **if** (root == **null**) **return**;  
 **if** (level == 1) System.***out***.print(root.**key** + **" "**);  
 **else if** (level > 1) {  
 printLevel(root.**left**, level-1);  
 printLevel(root.**right**, level-1);  
 }  
}

***I could have done this*:** Using a Queue, which significantly lowers the Time Complexity to **O (N)** where **N** is number of nodes in the binary tree.

@Override **public void** printByLevels(){ *//using Breadth First Search traversal.* **if**(**root** == **null**) **return**;  
 Queue<Node> q =**new** LinkedList<>();  
 q.add(**root**);  
 **while**(**true**){  
 **int** nodeCount = q.size();  
 **if**(nodeCount == 0) **break**;  
 **while**(nodeCount > 0) {  
 Node node = q.peek();  
 System.***out***.print(node.**key** + **" "**);  
 q.remove();  
 **if**(node.**left** != **null**) q.add(node.**left**);  
 **if**(node.**right** != **null**) q.add(node.**right**);  
 nodeCount--;  
 }  
 System.***out***.println();  
 }  
}

# **Proposed Data structure**

In order to achieve, O (1) for insert/remove right and insert/remove left, I chose to implement  
**a doubly linked list**, since it allows convenient access in the obvious way by storing two pointers. To comply with the operations needed, the DLL implementation differs from the text book solution. The insert/remove methods make use of the head and tail node to execute the concept.

In that regard, the assignment also describes a *find minimum method that should not surpass worst-case O (N)*.

A straight forward implementation would compare the nodes until reaching the end to make sure the minimum value is found. However, to surpass this theoretical limit, I read through encoding methods and discovered that by adding a **Key** to my nested **Node** class I can retain information about the min value and *intuitively link the other node values in a scheme that would allow me in the event of a remove operation to recalculate the min value in O (1) time.*

Now, the solution is not perfect, but since our input is limited to positive integers, the **find min** operation should execute correctly.