

## Lab 11

This lab was conducted to find the time performance difference two MST methods, Kruskal, and Prim. I used the code I made for the two algorithms from my last lab. I randomly generated graph using different values of  $n$ , where  $n$  was the number of vertices. After generating the graphs, I used those to time the different methods in how long it took to find a minimum spanning tree and the cost associated with that tree.

I started the lab by creating a for loop that ran 20 times. This was to calculate the five iterations of each of the four sizes: 500, 1000, 2000, and 4000. I used the variable  $i$  in the loop to use a different seed for each iteration of the test. I generated an adjacency list to hold all the values that were to be used for the graph. I generated the graph first to make sure that both methods were timed fairly using the same information. To determine if the vertices had an edge, I generated a random variable  $x$ . If  $x$  was greater than or equal to 0.5, I created an edge by generating a random number between 1 and  $4n$ . Each iteration used a different seed, thus giving different values to be used for each test run.

When I started the timer, I ran the algorithm for the Kruskal method and kept up with the cost associated with the MST. I then stopped the timer, recorded the time and then did the same thing for the Prim algorithm. After 5 iterations, I took the average time associated with the methods and changed the size of  $n$ . I did this for all sizes, using a different seed for each run to make sure that each graph was different from the others.

What I observed from this lab is that the Prim algorithm was faster than the Kruskal algorithm with the sizes used. Though it was faster, both performed in under a second, with Kruskal being the slowest at almost half a second for the largest size. Both methods are fast at calculating the MST. Below are graphs representing the data I received from this lab.

# MST

| n    | Kruskal  | Prim     | Srand | Cost   |
|------|----------|----------|-------|--------|
| 500  | 0.007757 | 0.001908 | 1     | 128691 |
|      | 0.00703  | 0.001778 | 2     | 120200 |
|      | 0.00879  | 0.001473 | 3     | 122563 |
|      | 0.005205 | 0.00145  | 4     | 120574 |
|      | 0.005809 | 0.00168  | 5     | 124918 |
| 1000 | 0.031306 | 0.007445 | 6     | 243478 |
|      | 0.028775 | 0.007699 | 7     | 253379 |
|      | 0.023844 | 0.007308 | 8     | 246300 |
|      | 0.026665 | 0.007241 | 9     | 248824 |
|      | 0.028133 | 0.007244 | 10    | 230421 |
| 2000 | 0.125151 | 0.035589 | 11    | 478311 |
|      | 0.126289 | 0.036242 | 12    | 497657 |
|      | 0.117492 | 0.035745 | 13    | 486991 |
|      | 0.138786 | 0.036555 | 14    | 504853 |
|      | 0.12484  | 0.036013 | 15    | 477163 |
| 4000 | 0.551575 | 0.169825 | 16    | 961687 |
|      | 0.535907 | 0.166066 | 17    | 947764 |
|      | 0.518579 | 0.165311 | 18    | 947876 |
|      | 0.534716 | 0.164053 | 19    | 977498 |
|      | 0.49584  | 0.166446 | 20    | 976830 |

## AVG

| n    | Kruskal   | Prim      | Cost     |
|------|-----------|-----------|----------|
| 500  | 0.0069182 | 0.0016578 | 123389.2 |
| 1000 | 0.0277446 | 0.0073874 | 244480.4 |
| 2000 | 0.126512  | 0.0360288 | 488995   |
| 4000 | 0.527323  | 0.16634   | 962331   |

