
Subject: Re: A new container in works: Flex - fast insertion vector

Posted by [mirek](#) on Fri, 21 Sep 2007 07:00:55 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

sergei wrote on Thu, 20 September 2007 19:52luzr wrote on Fri, 21 September 2007 01:34sergei wrote on Thu, 20 September 2007 18:44Have you benched this against Array? Array should be better than Vector in insert/delete (and maybe other things) for large-sized elements (not int, something like large classes).

Sergei, I have designed Array, I am well aware about that

But you can cheat the O numbers only to some degree. Both Array and Vector have basic insertion complexity $O(n)$, while this new beast has something like $O(\sqrt{N})$.

Note also that once you have base Flex implemented, adding ArrayFlex is trivial..

Mirek

$O(\sqrt{N})$? Nice... Are there downsides vs. Vector for this container (besides slightly slower on small-sized containers)?

Sure While `operator[]` is $O(1)$, it is slower than both `Vector::operator[]` and `Array::operator[]` (BTW, `Array::[]` is much slower than `Vector::[]` too).

Also, appending at the end can be slower too.

Quote:

And does it basically require moveable?

I guess that "vector-flavor" will. In fact, I am considering to introduce up to 4 variants with varying characteristics.

Quote:

P.S. Are there any sorted containers in U++, like `set/multiset/map/multimap`? I prefer that over `GetSortOrder`.

No. But that is definitely one of potential uses of this new container. I have already tried to implement sorted array with this and benchmarked it against `set`, for 160 000 String elements, "unique" operation is about 2.5x slower than with `std::set`, while find only scenario is even a bit faster. Note also that `std::set` was using U++ allocator in this test; with vendor allocators it would be slower.

Mirek
