Topics

• Overview of standard Java Collections classes.
  - Iterators, ListIterators
  - Containers and maps in the abstract

• Amortized analysis of implementing lists with arrays.
Data Types in the Abstract

- Most of the time, should not worry about implementation of data structures, search, etc.

- What they do for us—their specification—is important.

- Java has several standard types (in java.util) to represent collections of objects
  - Six interfaces:
    * Collection: General collections of items.
    * List: Indexed sequences with duplication
    * Set, SortedSet: Collections without duplication
    * Map, SortedMap: Dictionaries (key $\mapsto$ value)
  - Concrete classes that provide actual instances: LinkedList, ArrayList, HashSet, TreeSet.
  - To make change easier, purists would use the concrete types only for new, interfaces for parameter types, local variables.
Collection Structures in java.util
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The Collection Interface

- Collection interface. Main functions promised:
  - Membership tests: \( \text{contains} (\in), \text{containsAll} (\subseteq) \)
  - Other queries: size, isEmpty
  - Retrieval: iterator, toArray
  - Optional modifiers: add, addAll, clear, remove, removeAll (set difference), retainAll (intersect)
Side Trip about Library Design: Optional Operations

- Not all Collections need to be modifiable; often makes sense just to get things from them.
- So some operations are optional (add, addAll, clear, remove, removeAll, retainAll)
- The library developers decided to have all Collections implement these, but allowed implementations to throw an exception: 
  
  `UnsupportedOperationException`

- An alternative design would have created separate interfaces:

  ```java
  interface Collection { contains, containsAll, size, iterator, ... }
  interface Expandable extends Collection { add, addAll }
  interface Shrinkable extends Collection { remove, removeAll, ... }
  interface ModifiableCollection extends Collection, Expandable, Shrinkable {
  }
  ```

- You'd soon have lots of interfaces. Perhaps that's why they didn't do it that way.
The List Interface

- Extends Collection
- Intended to represent *indexed sequences* (generalized arrays)
- Adds new methods to those of Collection:
  - **Membership tests**: `indexOf`, `lastIndexOf`.
  - **Retrieval**: `get(i)`, `listIterator()`, `subList(B, E)`.
  - **Modifiers**: `add` and `addAll` with additional index to say *where* to add. Likewise for removal operations. `set` operation to go with `get`.
- **Type** `ListIterator<Item>` extends `Iterator<Item>`:
  - **Adds** `previous` and `hasPrevious`.
  - `add`, `remove`, and `set` allow one to iterate through a list, inserting, removing, or changing as you go.
- **Important Question**: What advantage is there to saying `List L` rather than `LinkedList L` or `ArrayList L`?
Implementing Lists (I): ArrayLists

- The main concrete types in Java library for interface List are ArrayList and LinkedList:

- As you might expect, an ArrayList, A, uses an array to hold data. For example, a list containing the three items 1, 4, and 9 might be represented like this:

  ![Diagram of ArrayList](image)

  - After adding four more items to A, its data array will be full, and the value of data will have to be replaced with a pointer to a new, bigger array that starts with a copy of its previous values.

- Question: For best performance, how big should this new array be?

- If we increase the size by 1 each time it gets full (or by any constant value), the cost of \( N \) additions will scale as \( \Theta(N^2) \), which makes ArrayList look much worse than LinkedList (which uses an IntList-like implementation.)
Amortization: Expanding Vectors

- When using array for expanding sequence, best to *double* the size of array to grow it. Here’s why.
- If array is size $s$, doubling its size and moving $s$ elements to the new array takes time proportional to $2s$.
- In all cases, there is an additional $\Theta(1)$ cost for each addition to account for actually assigning the new value into the array.
- When you add up these costs for inserting a sequence of $N$ items, the *total* cost turns out to proportional to $N$, as if each addition took constant time, even though some of the additions actually take time proportional to $N$ all by themselves!
### Amortization: Expanding Vectors (II)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item #</th>
<th>Resizing Cost</th>
<th>Cumulative Cost</th>
<th>Resizing Cost per Item</th>
<th>Array Size After Insertions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>1.88</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For $2^m + 1$ to $2^{m+1} - 1$, 

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item #</th>
<th>Resizing Cost</th>
<th>Cumulative Cost</th>
<th>Resizing Cost per Item</th>
<th>Array Size After Insertions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$2^m + 1$</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$2^{m+2} - 2$</td>
<td>$\approx 2$</td>
<td>$2^{m+1}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$2^{m+1}$</td>
<td>$2^{m+2}$</td>
<td>$2^{m+3} - 2$</td>
<td>$\approx 4$</td>
<td>$2^{m+2}$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- If we spread out (*amortize*) the cost of resizing, we average at most about 4 time units on each item: “amortized insertion time is 4 units.” Time to add $N$ elements is $\Theta(N)$, *not* $\Theta(N^2)$.
Demonstrating Amortized Time: Potential Method

- To formalize the argument, associate a potential, \( \Phi_i \geq 0 \), to the \( i \)th operation that keeps track of “saved up” time from cheap operations that we can “spend” on later expensive ones. Start with \( \Phi_0 = 0 \).

- Now we pretend that the cost of the \( i \)th operation is actually \( a_i \), the amortized cost, defined

\[
a_i = c_i + \Phi_{i+1} - \Phi_i,
\]

where \( c_i \) is the real cost of the operation. Or, looking at potential:

\[
\Phi_{i+1} = \Phi_i + (a_i - c_i)
\]

- On cheap operations, we artificially set \( a_i > c_i \) so that we can increase \( \Phi \) (\( \Phi_{i+1} > \Phi_i \)).

- On expensive ones, we typically have \( a_i \ll c_i \) and greatly decrease \( \Phi \) (but don’t let it go negative—may not be “overdrawn”).

- We try to do all this so that \( a_i \) remains as we desired (e.g., \( O(1) \) for expanding array), without allowing \( \Phi_i < 0 \).

- Requires that we choose \( a_i \) so that \( \Phi_i \) always stays ahead of \( c_i \).
Application to Expanding Arrays

- When adding to our array, the cost, \( c_i \), of adding element \( \#i \) when the array already has space for it is 1 unit.

- The array does not initially have space when adding items 1, 2, 4, 8, 16,...—in other words at item \( 2^n \) for all \( n \geq 0 \). So,
  - \( c_i = 1 \) if \( i \geq 0 \) and is not a power of 2; and
  - \( c_i = 2i + 1 \) when \( i \) is a power of 2 (copy \( i \) items, clear another \( i \) items, and then add item \( \#i \)).

- So on each operation \( \#2^n \) we’re going to need to have saved up at least \( 2 \cdot 2^n = 2^{n+1} \) units of potential to cover the expense of expanding the array, and we have this operation and the preceding \( 2^{n-1} - 1 \) operations in which to save up this much potential (everything since the preceding doubling operation).

- So choose \( a_0 = 1 \) and \( a_i = 5 \) for \( i > 0 \). Apply \( \Phi_{i+1} = \Phi_i + (a_i - c_i) \), and here is what happens:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>( i )</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>14</th>
<th>15</th>
<th>16</th>
<th>17</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>( c_i )</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( a_i )</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \Phi_i )</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Pretending each cost is 5 never underestimates true cumulative time.