

Project 3

Problem 1:

Approach:

Merge.java: Merge class contains function to merge graph G1 and G2. Using arraylist for nodes, distance and coordinates for each graph then combining both graphs on basis of that no node has duplicate coordinates. (compile Merge.java first to get .class)

kruskal2D.java: Call function in merge.java to get G graph matrix and executes kruskals algorithm (*takes little time to run*)

kruskallinked.java: Call function in merge.java to get G graph matrix and then initializes graph class for linked list implementation. Only edges whose cost is not equal to Integer.MaxValue are added

(Note: To print memory usage uncomment line 68,69 in kruskal2D.java and line 124,125 in kruskallinked.java)

MST tree is printed in the form EdgeNumber(starts from 0) Node Node Distance

Kruskal2D

1988	1676	1990	1013
1989	798	1950	1031
1990	1349	1975	1032
1991	1595	1934	1178
1992	1093	1965	1205
1993	22	96	1208
1994	1397	1936	1252
1995	83	487	1395
1996	487	2000	1395
1997	457	1959	1602
1998	514	1910	2020
1999	517	1916	2034
2000	1893	1999	3703
MST cost is:379604			

Kruskal Linked:

↑	1987	565	1934	999
↓	1988	1676	1990	1013
	1989	798	1950	1031
	1990	1349	1975	1032
	1991	1595	1934	1178
	1992	1093	1965	1205
	1993	22	96	1208
	1994	1397	1936	1252
	1995	83	487	1395
	1996	487	2000	1395
	1997	457	1959	1602
	1998	514	1910	2020
	1999	517	1916	2034
	2000	1893	1999	3703
Total MST Cost is: 379604				

Memory Usage

With adjacency matrix the memory used is around 1.72% of my total memory whereas the memory used with adjacency list is around 1.31%. Memory with linked list is lower because it does not store empty or 0 edges so this saves up the overall memory. With matrix we have empty edges stored which is unnecessary space utilized. Execution with linked list is comparatively faster than matrix. Looking at the percentages it won't look like a much significant difference between the two memory because the graph is quite dense i.e. the number of edges is close or more to the maximal number of edges.