CSCI 2100 Tutorial 7

CSCI 2100 Teaching Team, Fall 2021

Outline

- Dynamic array vs. linked list
- Dynamic array: space and update cost tradeoff
- An application of the stack

Dynamic Array vs Linked List

A linked list ensures O(1) insertion cost. A dynamic array guarantees O(1) insertion cost after amortization.

However, a dynamic array provides constant-time access to any position, which a linked list cannot achieve.

Dynamic Array vs Linked List

Question:

Design a data structure of O(n) space to store a set **S** of *n* integers to satisfy the following requirements:

- An integer can be inserted in O(1) time.
- We can enumerate all integers in O(n) time.

Answer: Linked list.

Dynamic Array vs Linked List

Question:

Design a data structure of O(n) space to store a set **S** of *n* integers to satisfy the following requirements:

- An integer can be inserted in O(1) amortized time.
- We can enumerate all integers in O(n) time.
- For each $i \in [1, n]$, we can access the *i*-th inserted integer in O(1) time.

Answer: Dynamic array

Outline

- Dynamic array vs. linked list
- Dynamic array: space and update cost tradeoff
- An application of the stack

In the lecture, we expand the array from size *n* to 2*n* when it is full.

What if we expand the array size to 3n instead?

- Initially, size 3 (define $s_1 = 3$)
- 1st expansion: size from s_1 to $s_2 = 3s_1 = 9$.
- 2^{nd} expansion: from s_2 to $s_3 = 3s_2 = 27$.
- *i*-th expansion: from s_i to $s_{i+1} = 3s_i$.

We have $s_i = 3^i$.

...

• The total cost of *n* insertions is bounded by:

$$\left(\sum_{i=1}^{n} O(1)\right) + \sum_{i=1}^{n} O(3^{i+1}) = O(n+3^{h+1})$$

where *h* is the number of expansions.

It must hold that $n \ge s_h \ge 3^h$ (the *h*-th expansion happened because the array of size s_h was full).

Hence, the total cost is O(n).

• Consider what happens in general. When the array is full, expand its size from *n* to αn , for some constant $\alpha > 1$.

• Initially, size 2 (define $s_1 = 2$)

...

- 1st expansion: size from s_1 to $s_2 = [\alpha s_1]$.
- 2nd expansion: from s_2 to $s_3 = \lceil \alpha s_2 \rceil$.
- *i*-th expansion: from s_i to $s_{i+1} = [\alpha s_i]$.

We can prove: $s_i = O(\frac{\alpha^i}{\alpha - 1})$ and $s_i \ge \alpha^i$.

The total cost of *n* insertions is bounded by:

$$\left(\sum_{i=1}^{n} O(1)\right) + \sum_{i=1}^{h} O(\frac{\alpha^{i+1}}{\alpha - 1}) = O\left(n + \frac{\alpha^{h+2}}{(\alpha - 1)^2}\right)$$

where *h* is the number of expansions.

It must hold that $n \ge s_h \ge \alpha^h$ (the *h*-th expansion happened because the array of size s_h was full).

Hence, the total cost is $O\left(n + \frac{\alpha^2}{(\alpha-1)^2}n\right)$, namely, amortized $\cos t = O\left(1 + \frac{\alpha^2}{(\alpha-1)^2}\right)$.

Amortized cost =
$$O\left(1 + \frac{\alpha^2}{(\alpha - 1)^2}\right)$$
.

When α increases, the space consumption goes up, but the insertion cost goes down.

Outline

- Dynamic array vs. linked list
- Dynamic array: space and update cost tradeoff
- An application of the stack

Input: A sentence stored in a sequence of *n* cells. Each cell contains a word or one of the following pairing characters: ",", (,), {, }, <, >

Please design an algorithm to determine whether the paring characters have been matched correctly (in the way we are used to in English).

The following input is a correct sentence:



while the one below is not:

I	say	"	I	like	(red	apple	")	
---	-----	---	---	------	---	-----	-------	---	---	--

Your algorithm should finish in O(n) time.

Using a Stack

The key idea is to use a stack to check whether all the ", (, {, < are closed properly. We will discuss the ideas on the following two examples:



The Algorithm

Sequentially scan the input sentences.

At reading a ", (, <, or {, push it into the stack.

At reading a ",), >, or }, check whether the top of the stack matches the character just read. If so, pop the stack and continue; otherwise, report "incorrect".

After reading all the cells, check whether the stack is empty. If so, report "correct"; otherwise, report "incorrect".

The running time is clearly O(n).