

5. For problem 3:

Time and Space Complexity Analysis

1. Constructor: Election()

Time Complexity: $O(1)$

Space Complexity: $O(1)$

Explanation: This constructor simply initializes a HashMap and a PriorityQueue, both of which are empty at the start. These operations take constant time and space, as no input or dynamic data processing is involved during construction.

2. initializeCandidates(List<String> candidates)

Time Complexity: $O(n)$

Space Complexity: $O(n)$

Explanation: This method begins by clearing any existing data from the HashMap and PriorityQueue, which takes constant time since both are reset. It then iterates over the list of n candidate names. Each candidate is added to the HashMap in $O(1)$ time and to the heap in $O(\log n)$ time. Since there are n insertions into the heap, the total time is $O(n \log n)$. Some heap implementations optimize bulk additions and achieve $O(n)$ via heapify, but under general assumptions, we consider the worst-case complexity to be $O(n \log n)$. The space complexity is linear because both the HashMap and PriorityQueue store n candidate entries.

3. setTotalVotes(int p)

Time Complexity: $O(1)$

Space Complexity: $O(1)$

Explanation: Simple assignment operation - performs a simple variable assignment to store the total number of votes, which is a constant-time and constant-space operation.

4. castVote(String candidate)

Time Complexity: $O(\log n)$

Space Complexity: $O(1)$

Explanation: Casting a vote involves updating the candidate's vote count in the HashMap, which takes $O(1)$ time. To maintain the correct order in the PriorityQueue, the candidate is removed and reinserted or the heap is re-balanced by offering a new instance, which typically takes $O(\log n)$. The space usage remains constant, as no additional storage is created per vote beyond temporary objects or reused references.

5. castRandomVote()

Time Complexity: $O(n)$ for worst case, $O(1)$ average case

Space Complexity: $O(1)$

Explanation: It converts the set of candidate names from the HashMap into a list to facilitate random access. This conversion step takes $O(n)$ time in the worst case. However, if the list is cached or reused, it could be considered $O(1)$ on average. Selecting a random index and accessing it are both constant-time operations. Finally, it calls castVote, which takes $O(\log n)$,

but the dominating factor here remains the initial conversion to a list. Since no permanent data structures are created or expanded, the space complexity is constant.

6. rigElection(String candidate)

Time Complexity: $O(n \log n)$

Space Complexity: $O(1)$

Explanation: This method resets all vote counts to zero by iterating over the HashMap, which takes $O(n)$ time. It clears the heap entirely ($O(n)$), and then re-inserts the rigged candidate and a few others with manipulated vote counts. Each re-insertion into the PriorityQueue takes $O(\log n)$, and while the number of such insertions may be small (constant), the overall complexity is still dominated by the $O(n \log n)$ nature of heap operations across all entries. No additional persistent storage is created, so space usage remains constant beyond the original structures.

7. getTopKCandidates(int k)

Time Complexity: $O(n \log n)$

Space Complexity: $O(n)$

Explanation: To retrieve the top k candidates, this method leverages Java streams to sort all candidates based on vote count. Sorting the n candidates takes $O(n \log n)$ time using TimSort. The result is then limited to the top k, which is a constant or bounded operation, and mapped into a new collection, which takes $O(n)$ in the worst case. The sorting step is the dominant factor, and a new list is generated, hence the space complexity is linear.

8. auditElection()

Time Complexity: $O(n \log n)$

Space Complexity: $O(n)$

Explanation: This method is functionally similar to getTopKCandidates, except it prints the top candidates instead of returning them. It still requires sorting the entire candidate list, which takes $O(n \log n)$, and builds intermediate stream structures, contributing to an $O(n)$ space requirement. As with the previous method, the complexity is driven by the sorting operation.