

```
/* CS261- Assignment 3 - Part 2: Comparison Questions*/  
/* Name: Sky Wilson  
* Date: 4/21/2105  
*/
```

1) Which of the implementations uses more memory? Explain why.

* The linked list implementation used more memory than the dynamic array implementation. The linked list began getting memory feedback at $n = 16,000$ whereas, the dynamic array didn't get its first memory feedback until $n = 64,000$.

* The linked list utilized more memory than the dynamic array because for one, the linked list had a greater initial overhead due to the pointers that are member variables of the struct `LinkedList` and struct `DLink`'s. So if as n increases, more elements are created that require extra memory for their own respective member pointers. This would also explain why both implementations got memory feedback at different n 's. The linked list would at $n = 16,000$ would have to have memory for the several member pointers that each of the 16,000 link's would require. The dynamic array would not require this extra allotment of memory and so at $n = 16,000$ there would only need to be memory for the elements of the array and their 1 `TYPE` member variable. Even if the linked list only had 1 pointer member, for n elements, you need extra memory for n pointers.

2) Which of the implementations is the fastest? Explain why.

* The dynamic array implementation had the fastest run times.

* The dynamic array's runtime advantage can be attributed to several variables. First, the linked list has guaranteed $O(1)$ on insertion and removal (depending on whether the list is single or doubly linked), the dynamic array has an amortized $O(1)+$ on insertion and removal operations by virtue of the nature of the dynamic array as a structure. However, the dynamic array's allocations and deallocations of memory do not occur every insertion or removal operation, only when $\text{size} = \text{capacity}$ or when $\text{size} = 1/2 \text{ capacity}$ (or some variation). Second, due to the nature of the linked list as a structure, the elements of the linked list do not exist contiguously in memory as they do in the dynamic array. So when performing an insertion or removal operation on a linked list, the positioning of the next element is not a constant distance, and so execution times can be slowed. The dynamic array has the benefit of a cache unit arrangement which optimizes the execution of insertion and removal operations, and the dynamic array's allocations and deallocations of memory occur less frequently than the linked list, resulting in an amortized run time of $O(1)+$. So the relational constraints that make up the dynamic array abstraction, result in faster run times in relation to linked list structures.

3) Would you expect anything to change if the loop performed `remove()` instead of `contains()`? If so, what?

* Using `removeList()` in place of `containsList()` I would expect an increase in the run time of the linked list because in `removeList()`, if the value of the element in question (index i in a loop) is equal to the value being removed, then the next and prev pointers of the list need to be reassigned to their logically respective neighbors (shifted) to represent the removal of an element. Memory would also need to be allocated for a struct `DLink* temp` that is used to reattach the links post removal and then this temp must be freed to remove the value to be removed. The linked list has the benefit not requiring a nested loop within its `containsList()`, however, memory must be allocated to a temp pointer (which

also must be freed) and member pointers of neighbor links must be reassigned to represent the reattachment of the linked list post link removal. For these reasons I would expect the swapping of the `containsList()` and the `removeList()` to increase the run time of this linked list.

* Using `removeList()` in place of `containsList()` I would also expect an increase in the run time of the dynamic array because in `removeList()`, if the value of the element in question (the element used as an argument of the conditional) another loop runs within the initial `n` outside loop. This inner loop runs from the index of the element with the matching value of the value to be removed, until the index of the size of the dynamic array. This inner loop shifts all values from the removed element til the last element in the dynamic array. In the `containsList()` there was a loop that ran `n` times, but even if the conditional within that loop was satisfied, there were no more loops and there was no shifting of elements and values. So by swapping `removeList()` for `containsList()` the dynamic array's runtime increases due to a nested loop within the function and the required shifting of values when a value to be removed is found within the dynamic array.

Course Modules: DATA ST... x linked_list_demo.mp4 x CS261_Assign2_Part2_Timi... x

https://oregonstateuniversity-my.sharepoint.com/personal/wilsonsk_onid_oregonstate_edu/_layouts/15/WopiFrame.aspx?sourcedoc={8FF927EE-70FB-4906-A406-C398934A71A4}&file=CS261_Assign2_Part2_Timing_and_Memo... Search

DEFINITIONS M Inbox (10) - wilsonsk@... DATA STRUCTURES (C... Blackboard Learn College of Engineering... Student Contact Infor... Vim Cheat Sheet MyProgrammingLab |... KeepVid: Download on... WebDev EDUCATION CS261 OSU CS275 Vim Cheat Sheet for Pr...

Excel Online Wilson, Skyler M - ONID CS261_Assign2_Part2_Timing_and_Memory Share Wilson, Skyler M - ONID

FILE HOME INSERT DATA REVIEW VIEW Tell me what you want to do OPEN IN EXCEL

Undo Clipboard Font Alignment Number Tables Cells Editing

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M	N	O	P	Q	R	S	T	U	V	W	X	Y	Z	AA	AB	AC
1				NON FLIP	TIMING						FLIP	TIMING				NON FLIP	MEMORY				FLIP	MEMORY							
2				n	Dyn. Array	LinkedList					Dyn. Array	LinkedList				n	Dyn. Array	LinkedList				Dyn. Array	LinkedList						
3				1000	0 ms	10 ms					1000	0	0			1000	0 KB	0 KB				1000	0	0					
4				2000	20 ms	60 ms					2000	0	0			2000	0 KB	0 KB				2000	0	0					
5				4000	120 ms	210 ms					4000	20	30			4000	0 KB	0 KB				4000	0	0					
6				8000	290 ms	860 ms					8000	100	120			8000	0 KB	0 KB				8000	0	0					
7				16000	1210 ms	3460 ms					16000	380	510			16000	0 KB	0 KB				16000	0	24					
8				32000	4680 ms	9980 ms					32000	1540	2060			32000	0 KB	0 KB				32000	0	524					
9				64000	19640 ms	52040 ms					64000	6160	8170			64000	0 KB	0 KB				64000	28	1524					
10				128000	76730 ms	223650 ms					128000	24670	32820			128000	0 KB	1132 KB				128000	416	3524					
11				256000	282000 ms	689890 ms					256000	98610	223260			256000	0 KB	5144 KB				256000	1168	7524					

FLIP: Dyn. Array VS. LinkedList: RUN TIMES

number of elements (n)	Dyn. Array (ms)	LinkedList (ms)
1000	0	10
2000	20	60
4000	120	210
8000	290	860
16000	1210	3460
32000	4680	9980
64000	19640	52040
128000	76730	223650
256000	282000	689890

FLIP: Dyn. Array VS. LinkedList: MEMORY

number of elements (n)	Dyn. Array (KB)	LinkedList (KB)
1000	0	0
2000	0	0
4000	0	0
8000	0	0
16000	0	0
32000	0	0
64000	0	0
128000	1132	5144
256000	1168	7524



