

## AI ASSISTED CODING

### LAB ASSIGNMENT: 12.4

NAME: K. SARIKA

H.NO : 2403A52012

BATCH NO : 04

#### TASK 1:

Implementing Bubble Sort with AI Comments

- Task: Write a Python implementation of Bubble Sort.
- Instructions:
  - Students implement Bubble Sort normally.
  - Ask AI to generate inline comments explaining key logic (like swapping, passes, and termination).
  - Request AI to provide time complexity analysis.


#### PROMPT:

Generate python code and implementing Bubble Sort with AI Comments

- Task: Write a Python implementation of Bubble Sort.
- Instructions:
  - Students implement Bubble Sort normally.
  - Ask AI to generate inline comments explaining key

logic (like swapping, passes, and termination).  
 o Request AI to provide time complexity analysis.

## CODE & OUTPUT:



```


def bubble_sort(arr):
    """
    Sorts the list `arr` in-place using Bubble Sort algorithm.
    """
    n = len(arr)
    # Outer loop for each pass over the array
    for i in range(n):
        # We assume no swaps this pass (to detect if array already sorted)
        swapped = False

        # For each pair of adjacent elements in positions [0 .. n-1]
        # (since last i elements already bubbled to correct positions)
        for j in range(0, n - i - 1):
            # If the element at j is greater than the one at j+1, swap them
            if arr[j] > arr[j + 1]:
                # Swap the two elements
                arr[j], arr[j + 1] = arr[j + 1], arr[j]
                swapped = True # mark that a swap happened in this pass

        # If no two elements were swapped in the inner loop, the list is already sorted
        if not swapped:
            break # Early termination - no further passes needed

PS C:\Users\Kadal> cd \pkgs\alembic-1.16.4-py313haa95532_0\Lib\site-packages\alembic\ddl & "c:/Users/Kadal/AppData/Local/Microsoft/WindowsApps/python3.11.exe" "c:/Users/Kadal/.vscode/extensions/ms-python.debugpy-2025.10.0-win32-x64/bundled/libs/debugpy\launcher" "55610" -- "c:/Users/Kadal/anaconda3\pkgs\alembic-1.16.4-py313haa95532_0\lib\site-packages\alembic\ddl"
Before: [5, 1, 4, 2, 8]
After: [1, 2, 4, 5, 8]
PS C:\Users\Kadal>

```



```

def bubble_sort(arr):
    """
    Sorts the list `arr` in-place using Bubble Sort algorithm.
    """
    n = len(arr)
    # Outer loop for each pass over the array
    for i in range(n):
        # If no two elements were swapped in the inner loop, the list is already sorted
        if not swapped:
            break # Early termination - no further passes needed

    return arr

# Example usage:
if __name__ == "__main__":
    data = [5, 1, 4, 2, 8]
    print("Before:", data)
    sorted_data = bubble_sort(data)
    print("After: ", sorted_data)
PS C:\Users\Kadal> cd \pkgs\alembic-1.16.4-py313haa95532_0\Lib\site-packages\alembic\ddl & "c:/Users/Kadal/AppData/Local/Microsoft/WindowsApps/python3.11.exe" "c:/Users/Kadal/.vscode/extensions/ms-python.debugpy-2025.10.0-win32-x64/bundled/libs/debugpy\launcher" "55610" -- "c:/Users/Kadal/anaconda3\pkgs\alembic-1.16.4-py313haa95532_0\lib\site-packages\alembic\ddl"
Before: [5, 1, 4, 2, 8]
After: [1, 2, 4, 5, 8]
PS C:\Users\Kadal>

```

## EXPLANATION:

- **Outer loop** (`for i in range(n)`): Each pass moves the next largest (or smallest, depending on sort direction) element into its correct position at the end. After `i` passes, the last `i` elements are already sorted and in place.
  - **Inner loop** (`for j in range(0, n - i - 1)`): Compares adjacent pairs `arr[j]` and `arr[j + 1]`, and swaps if they are out of order. We don't go all the way to the end every pass because the tail end is already sorted.
  - **Swapping logic**: `arr[j], arr[j + 1] = arr[j + 1], arr[j]` performs the exchange in one line.
  - **Early termination check** (`if not swapped: break`): If in a full pass we made no swaps, the list is already sorted — so we break to avoid unnecessary passes (optimization).
- 

### Time Complexity Analysis

- **Worst-case time complexity**:

In the worst case (the input is in reverse order), the algorithm will perform all possible comparisons and swaps in every pass. That leads to

$$\sum_{i=0}^{n-1} (n - i - 1) = \frac{n(n - 1)}{2} = O(n^2)$$

So  $O(n^2)$ .

- **Best-case time complexity**:

If the array is already sorted, then in the first pass no swaps will be made, so `swapped` remains `False` and we break out early. The inner loop runs once with  $\sim n$  comparisons, so it is  $O(n)$  in the best case (with the early termination optimization).

- **Best-case time complexity**:

If the array is already sorted, then in the first pass no swaps will be made, so `swapped` remains `False` and we break out early. The inner loop runs once with  $\sim n$  comparisons, so it is  $O(n)$  in the best case (with the early termination optimization).

- **Average-case time complexity**:

Generally also  $O(n^2)$ .

- **Space complexity**:

Bubble Sort is in-place (only a constant amount of extra memory for indices and flag), so  $O(1)$  additional space.

## TASK 2:

### Optimizing Bubble Sort → Insertion Sort

- Task: Provide Bubble Sort code to AI and ask it to suggest a more efficient algorithm for partially sorted arrays.

- Instructions:

- Students implement Bubble Sort first.
- Ask AI to suggest an alternative (Insertion Sort).
- Compare performance on nearly sorted input.

PROMPT:

Generate python code and optimizing Bubble Sort →  
Insertion Sort

- Task: Provide Bubble Sort code to AI and ask it to  
suggest a

more efficient algorithm for partially sorted arrays.

- Instructions:

- Students implement Bubble Sort first.
- Ask AI to suggest an alternative (Insertion Sort).
- Compare performance on nearly sorted input.

CODE & OUTPUT:

**File Edit Selection View Go Run Terminal Help ← → ⌂ Search ⌂ v**

**RUN AND DEBUG ... LAB 11.1.py AI LAB 11.1 T8.py WEB LAB 4 HTMLhtml WEB LAB 5 HTMLhtml web 2.py 9+ 12.4 AI LAB T1.py AI T 2 12.4 LAB.py x web lab.py ⌂ v**

To customize Run and Debug, open a folder and create a launch.json file.

Debug using a terminal command or in an interactive chat.

**Run and Debug**

```

23 def insertion_sort(arr):
24     for key in arr[1:]:
25         j = i = 1
26         # Shift elements that are greater than key to one position ahead
27         while j >= 0 and arr[j] > key:
28             arr[j + 1] = arr[j]
29             j -= 1
30         # Place key in its correct spot
31         arr[j + 1] = key
32     return arr
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41 def make_almost_sorted(n, num_swaps=5):
42     """
43     Return a list of size n that is nearly sorted,
44     by starting with [0,1,2,...,n-1] and performing a few random adjacent swaps.
45     """
46     lst = list(range(n))
47     for _ in range(num_swaps):
48         i = random.randint(0, n - 2)
49         # make adjacent pair
50         lst[i], lst[i + 1] = lst[i + 1], lst[i]
51     return lst

```

**PROBLEMS OUTPUT DEBUG CONSOLE TERMINAL PORTS QUERY RESULTS**

Comparing Bubble Sort vs Insertion Sort on nearly sorted arrays

```

n = 1000, swaps = 1 → bubble: 0.003613s, insertion: 0.001743s
n = 5000, swaps = 20 → bubble: 0.000632s, insertion: 0.005434s
n = 10000, swaps = 1 → bubble: 0.011942s, insertion: 0.012826s
n = 10000, swaps = 5 → bubble: 0.008574s, insertion: 0.011675s
n = 10000, swaps = 20 → bubble: 0.010897s, insertion: 0.011559s

```

Sample (nearly sorted) before: [0, 2, 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19]  
 Sorted by bubble : [0, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19]  
 Sorted by insertion: [0, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19]

PS C:\Users\kadal\anaconda3\pkgs\alembic-1.16.4-py313ha095532\_0\Lib\site-packages\alembic\ddl>

**BREAKPOINTS**

⌚ 30 ⚡ 5 ⚡ No connection

25°C Heavy rain

Spaces: 4 UTF-8 {} Python 3.11.9 (Microsoft Store)

ENG IN 11:18:02 25-09-2025

**File Edit Selection View Go Run Terminal Help ← → ⌂ Search ⌂ v**

**RUN AND DEBUG ... LAB 11.1.py AI LAB 11.1 T8.py WEB LAB 4 HTMLhtml WEB LAB 5 HTMLhtml web 2.py 9+ 12.4 AI LAB T1.py AI T 2 12.4 LAB.py x web lab.py ⌂ v**

To customize Run and Debug, open a folder and create a launch.json file.

Debug using a terminal command or in an interactive chat.

**Run and Debug**

```

52
53
54 def benchmark(sort_fn, arr):
55     """
56     Time how long sort_fn takes to sort a *copy* of arr.
57     Returns the duration in seconds.
58     """
59     arr_copy = arr.copy()
60     start = time.perf_counter()
61     sort_fn(arr_copy)
62     end = time.perf_counter()
63     return end - start
64
65
66 def main():
67     # testing parameters
68     test_sizes = [1000, 5000, 10000]
69     swap_counts = [1, 5, 20] # how many adjacent swaps to create disorder
70
71     print("Comparing Bubble Sort vs Insertion Sort on nearly sorted arrays\n")
72     for n in test_sizes:
73         for swaps in swap_counts:

```

**PROBLEMS OUTPUT DEBUG CONSOLE TERMINAL PORTS QUERY RESULTS**

Comparing Bubble Sort vs Insertion Sort on nearly sorted arrays

```

n = 1000, swaps = 1 → bubble: 0.003613s, insertion: 0.001743s
n = 5000, swaps = 20 → bubble: 0.000632s, insertion: 0.005434s
n = 10000, swaps = 1 → bubble: 0.011942s, insertion: 0.012826s
n = 10000, swaps = 5 → bubble: 0.008574s, insertion: 0.011675s
n = 10000, swaps = 20 → bubble: 0.010897s, insertion: 0.011559s

```

Sample (nearly sorted) before: [0, 2, 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19]  
 Sorted by bubble : [0, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19]  
 Sorted by insertion: [0, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19]

PS C:\Users\kadal\anaconda3\pkgs\alembic-1.16.4-py313ha095532\_0\Lib\site-packages\alembic\ddl>

Airplane mode off

**BREAKPOINTS**

⌚ 30 ⚡ 5 ⚡ No connection

25°C Heavy rain

Spaces: 4 UTF-8 {} Python 3.11.9 (Microsoft Store)

ENG IN 11:18:23 25-09-2025

```

RUN AND DEBUG ... LAB 11.1.py AI LAB 11.1 T8.py WEB LAB 4 HTMLhtml WEB LAB 5 HTMLhtml web 2.py 9+ 12.4 AI LAB T1.py AI T 2 12.4 LAB.py x web lab.py ...
C:\> Users > kadal > anaconda3 > pkgs > alembic-1.16.4-py313ha095532_0 > Lib > site-packages > alembic > ddl > AI T 2 12.4 LAB.py > ...
66 def main():
74     arr = make_almost_sorted(n, num_swaps=swaps)
75     t_bubble = benchmark(bubble_sort, arr)
76     t_insert = benchmark(insertion_sort, arr)
77     print(f"\n{n=:d}, swaps = {swaps=:d} + bubble: {t_bubble:.6f}s, insertion: {t_insert:.6f}s")
78
79     # demonstration: show sorting result correctness
80     sample = make_almost_sorted(20, num_swaps=3)
81     print("\nSample (nearly sorted) before:", sample)
82     sorted_by_bubble = bubble_sort(sample.copy())
83     sorted_by_insert = insertion_sort(sample.copy())
84     print("Sorted by bubble : ", sorted_by_bubble)
85     print("Sorted by insertion: ", sorted_by_insert)
86
87     if __name__ == "__main__":
88         main()
89
90
PROBLEMS 35 OUTPUT DEBUG CONSOLE TERMINAL PORTS QUERY RESULTS Python Debug Console + - x
Comparing Bubble Sort vs Insertion Sort on nearly sorted arrays
Spaces: 4 UTF-8 () Python 3.11.9 (Microsoft Store) 
Comparing Bubble Sort vs Insertion Sort on nearly sorted arrays
n = 1000, swaps = 1 → bubble: 0.003613s, insertion: 0.001743s
n = 5000, swaps = 20 → bubble: 0.004632s, insertion: 0.005434s
n = 10000, swaps = 1 → bubble: 0.011942s, insertion: 0.012826s
n = 10000, swaps = 5 → bubble: 0.008574s, insertion: 0.011675s
n = 10000, swaps = 20 → bubble: 0.010897s, insertion: 0.011559s
Sample (nearly sorted) before: [0, 2, 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 14, 12, 13, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19]
Sorted by bubble : [0, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19]
Sorted by insertion: [0, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19]
PS C:\Users\kadal\anaconda3\pkgs\alembic-1.16.4-py313ha095532_0\Lib\site-packages\alembic\ddl>

```

## EXPLANATION:

- **Bubble Sort** is implemented with the usual double loop and an early-exit `swapped` flag to stop if no swaps occur in a pass.
- **Insertion Sort** is used as the alternative, especially effective when the array is already "almost sorted."
- `make_almost_sorted(n, num_swaps)` creates test data that is nearly sorted by applying a few adjacent swaps to a sorted list of size `n`.
- In `main()`, we run benchmarks for various sizes and disorder levels, and print timings that show where insertion sort overtakes bubble sort.

You can run this script and observe that:

- For large `n` and **very few swaps**, insertion sort tends to be *much faster* than bubble sort.
- For more disorder (lots of swaps), both may degrade toward  $O(n^2)$  behavior, but insertion sort's constant factors are often better in practice for partially sorted data.

If you like, I can also generate a **detailed log / step-by-step** version (printing each swap or pass) for teaching purposes, or visualize the time complexity difference (e.g. a plot). Do you want me to produce that?

## TASK 3:

### Binary Search vs Linear Search

- Task: Implement both Linear Search and Binary Search.

- Instructions:
  - o Use AI to generate docstrings and performance notes.
  - o Test both algorithms on sorted and unsorted data.
  - o Ask AI to explain when Binary Search is preferable.

PROMPT:

Generate python code and binary Search vs Linear Search

- Task: Implement both Linear Search and Binary Search.
- Instructions:
  - o Use AI to generate docstrings and performance notes.
  - o Test both algorithms on sorted and unsorted data.
  - o Ask AI to explain when Binary Search is preferable.

CODE & OUTPUT:

The screenshot shows the Microsoft Visual Studio Code interface with the Python extension installed. The code editor displays a Python script for a linear search algorithm. The Python Debug Console tab is active, showing the execution of the script and its performance metrics. The status bar at the bottom indicates the date as 25-09-2025.

```
C:\> Users > kadal > anaconda3 > pkgs > alembic-1.16.4-py313haa95532_0\lib\site-packages\alembic\ddl & "c:\Users\kadal\AppData\Local\Microsoft\WindowsApps\python3.11.exe" "c:\Users\kadal\.vscode\extensions\ms-python.debugpy-2025.10.0-win32-x64\bundled\libs\debugpy\launcher" "55118" -- "c:\Users\kadal\anaconda3\pkgs\alembic-1.16.4-py313haa95532_0\lib\site-packages\alembic\ddl\AI T 12.4 LAB.py"
== Testing on Unsorted Data ==
Linear search time (unsorted): 0.000293 s
Binary search time (unsorted, invalid) : 0.000034 s (result may be wrong)

== Testing on Sorted Data ==
Linear search time (sorted list) : 0.025805 s
Binary search time (sorted list) : 0.000036 s

Correctness check: target = 49895
Linear search found at index: 50000
```

The screenshot shows the Microsoft Visual Studio Code interface with the Python extension installed. The code editor displays a Python script for a binary search algorithm. The Python Debug Console tab is active, showing the execution of the script and its performance metrics. The status bar at the bottom indicates the date as 25-09-2025.

```
C:\> Users > kadal > anaconda3 > pkgs > alembic-1.16.4-py313haa95532_0\lib\site-packages\alembic\ddl & "c:\Users\kadal\AppData\Local\Microsoft\WindowsApps\python3.11.exe" "c:\Users\kadal\.vscode\extensions\ms-python.debugpy-2025.10.0-win32-x64\bundled\libs\debugpy\launcher" "55118" -- "c:\Users\kadal\anaconda3\pkgs\alembic-1.16.4-py313haa95532_0\lib\site-packages\alembic\ddl\AI T 12.4 LAB.py"
== Testing on Unsorted Data ==
Linear search time (unsorted): 0.000293 s
Binary search time (unsorted, invalid) : 0.000034 s (result may be wrong)

== Testing on Sorted Data ==
Linear search time (sorted list) : 0.025805 s
Binary search time (sorted list) : 0.000036 s

Correctness check: target = 49895
Linear search found at index: 50000
```

The screenshot shows the Visual Studio Code interface with the Python extension installed. The left sidebar has 'RUN AND DEBUG' selected under 'RUN'. The main editor area contains a Python script for a binary search algorithm and a function to generate random lists. The bottom right shows the Python Debug Console output:

```
C:\> Users > kadal > anaconda3 > pkgs > alembic-1.16.4-py313haa95532_0 > Lib > site-packages > alembic > dd1 > AI T 12.4 LAB.py > ...
28 def binary_search(arr: List[Any], target: Any) -> Optional[int]:
49     low = 0
50     high = len(arr) - 1
51
52     while low <= high:
53         mid = (low + high) // 2
54         mid_val = arr[mid]
55
56         if mid_val == target:
57             return mid
58         elif mid_val < target:
59             low = mid + 1
60         else:
61             high = mid - 1
62
63     return None
64
65
66 def make_random_list(n: int, value_range: int = 100000) -> List[int]:
67     """Generate a list of n random integers (unsorted)."""
68     return [random.randint(0, value_range) for _ in range(n)]
69
70
PROBLEMS OUTPUT DEBUG CONSOLE TERMINAL PORTS QUERY RESULTS
PS C:\Users\Kadal\Anaconda3\pkgs\alembic-1.16.4-py313haa95532_0\lib\site-packages\alembic\dd1 & 'c:\Users\kadal\AppData\Local\Microsoft\WindowsApps\python3.11.exe' 'c:\Users\kadal\vscodeextensions\ms-python.debugger-2025.10.0-win32-x64\bundled\libs\debugpy\launcher' '55118' -- 'c:\Users\kadal\anaconda3\pkgs\alembic-1.16.4-py313haa95532_0\lib\site-packages\alembic\dd1\AI T 12.4 LAB.py'
--- Testing on Unsorted Data ---
Linear search time (unsorted): 0.000293 s
Binary search time (unsorted, invalid) : 0.000034 s (result may be wrong)

--- Testing on Sorted Data ---
Linear search time (sorted list) : 0.025805 s
Binary search time (sorted list) : 0.000036 s

Correctness check: target = 49895
Linear search found at index: 50000
```

The screenshot shows the Visual Studio Code interface with the Python extension installed. The left sidebar has 'RUN AND DEBUG' selected under 'RUN'. The main editor area contains a Python script for benchmarking search functions. The bottom right shows the Python Debug Console output:

```
C:\> Users > kadal > anaconda3 > pkgs > alembic-1.16.4-py313haa95532_0 > Lib > site-packages > alembic > dd1 > AI T 12.4 LAB.py > benchmark
70
71 def make_sorted_list(n: int) -> List[int]:
72     """Generate a sorted list of n integers (0,1,2,...,n-1)."""
73     return list(range(n))
74
75
76 def benchmark(search_fn, arr: List[Any], target: Any, repeat: int = 1) -> float:
77     """
78     Time how long search_fn takes to find target in arr, repeated `repeat` times.
79     Returns average time in seconds.
80     """
81     total = 0.0
82     for _ in range(repeat):
83         start = time.perf_counter()
84         search_fn(arr, target)
85         end = time.perf_counter()
86         total += (end - start)
87     return total / repeat
88
89
90 def main():
91     # Test parameters
92     n = 100000 # size of list
```

PROBLEMS OUTPUT DEBUG CONSOLE TERMINAL PORTS QUERY RESULTS
PS C:\Users\Kadal\Anaconda3\pkgs\alembic-1.16.4-py313haa95532\_0\lib\site-packages\alembic\dd1 & 'c:\Users\kadal\AppData\Local\Microsoft\WindowsApps\python3.11.exe' 'c:\Users\kadal\vscodeextensions\ms-python.debugger-2025.10.0-win32-x64\bundled\libs\debugpy\launcher' '55118' -- 'c:\Users\kadal\anaconda3\pkgs\alembic-1.16.4-py313haa95532\_0\lib\site-packages\alembic\dd1\AI T 12.4 LAB.py'
--- Testing on Unsorted Data ---
Linear search time (unsorted): 0.000293 s
Binary search time (unsorted, invalid) : 0.000034 s (result may be wrong)

--- Testing on Sorted Data ---
Linear search time (sorted list) : 0.025805 s
Binary search time (sorted list) : 0.000036 s

Correctness check: target = 49895
Linear search found at index: 50000

```

File Edit Selection View Go Run Terminal Help ⏪ → Search
RUN AND DEBUG ... AI LAB 11.1 T8.py WEB LAB 4 HTML.html WEB LAB 5 HTML.html web 2.py 9+ 12.4 AI LAB T1.py AI T 2 12.4 LAB.py AI T 3 12.4 LAB.py we Dv ...
C:\> Users > kadal > anaconda3 > pkgs > alembic-1.16.4-py313haa95532_0 > Lib > site-packages > alembic > dd1 > AI T 3 12.4 LAB.py > ...
90 def main():
91     # Create unsorted list and sorted list
92     unsorted = make_random_list()
93     sorted_list = sorted(unsorted)
94     # Or simply: sorted_list = make_sorted_list(n)
95
96     # Pick a target (choose something that is in the list)
97     # For safety, pick from sorted list
98     target_value = sorted_list[n // 2]
99
100    print("== Testing on Unsorted Data ==")
101    t_lin = benchmark(linear_search, unsorted, target_value, repeat=5)
102    t_bin_unsorted = None
103
104    try:
105        # We can "call" binary search on unsorted data, but it will give incorrect result
106        t_bin_unsorted = benchmark(binary_search, unsorted, target_value, repeat=5)
107    except Exception as e:
108        print("Binary search on unsorted data failed: ", e)
109    print(f"Linear search time (unsorted): {t_lin:.6f} s")
110    if t_bin_unsorted is not None:
111        print(f"Binary search time (unsorted, invalid) : {t_bin_unsorted:.6f} s (result may be wrong)")
112
113    print("== Testing on Sorted Data ==")
114    t_lin_sorted = benchmark(linear_search, sorted_list, target_value, repeat=5)
115    t_bin_sorted = benchmark(binary_search, sorted_list, target_value, repeat=5)
116    print(f"Linear search time (sorted list) : {t_lin:.6f} s")
117    print(f"Binary search time (sorted list) : {t_bin:.6f} s")
118
119    correctness_check(target = 49805)
120
121    # Validate correctness
122    idx_lin = linear_search(sorted_list, target_value)
123    idx_bin = binary_search(sorted_list, target_value)
124    print(f"Correctness check: target = {target}, target_value = {target_value}")
125    print(f"Linear search found at index: {idx_lin}")
126    print(f"Binary search found at index: {idx_bin}")
127
128
129    print("== Summary & When to Prefer Binary Search ==")
130    print("1. Linear search works whether or not the data is sorted; binary search requires sorted data.")
131    print("2. Linear search is O(n), while binary search is O(log n) on sorted data.")
132    print("3. For small arrays or one-time searches, the overhead of binary search may not pay off.")
133    print("4. If you perform many searches on the same sorted list, binary search is much more efficient overall.")
134    print("5. If the data is unsorted and you only search once, linear search may be preferable (to avoid sorting).")
135    print("6. In practice, for large n and many searches, binary search is the better choice. (Binary search is preferred for large sorted datasets.)")
136
137 if __name__ == "__main__":

```

PROBLEMS OUTPUT DEBUG CONSOLE TERMINAL PORTS QUERY RESULTS

Python Debug Console + v D v ...

Ln 88, Col 1 Spaces: 4 UTF-8 {} Python 3.11.9 (Microsoft Store)

25-09-2025 11:23:36 ENG IN WiFi

```

File Edit Selection View Go Run Terminal Help ⏪ → Search
RUN AND DEBUG ... AI LAB 11.1 T8.py WEB LAB 4 HTML.html WEB LAB 5 HTML.html web 2.py 9+ 12.4 AI LAB T1.py AI T 2 12.4 LAB.py AI T 3 12.4 LAB.py we Dv ...
C:\> Users > kadal > anaconda3 > pkgs > alembic-1.16.4-py313haa95532_0 > Lib > site-packages > alembic > dd1 > AI T 3 12.4 LAB.py > ...
90 def main():
91     # Create unsorted list and sorted list
92     unsorted = make_random_list()
93     sorted_list = sorted(unsorted)
94     # Or simply: sorted_list = make_sorted_list(n)
95
96     # Pick a target (choose something that is in the list)
97     # For safety, pick from sorted list
98     target_value = sorted_list[n // 2]
99
100    print("== Testing on Unsorted Data ==")
101    t_lin = benchmark(linear_search, unsorted, target_value, repeat=5)
102    t_bin_unsorted = None
103
104    try:
105        # We can "call" binary search on unsorted data, but it will give incorrect result
106        t_bin_unsorted = benchmark(binary_search, unsorted, target_value, repeat=5)
107    except Exception as e:
108        print("Binary search on unsorted data failed: ", e)
109    print(f"Linear search time (unsorted): {t_lin:.6f} s")
110    if t_bin_unsorted is not None:
111        print(f"Binary search time (unsorted, invalid) : {t_bin_unsorted:.6f} s (result may be wrong)")
112
113    print("== Testing on Sorted Data ==")
114    t_lin_sorted = benchmark(linear_search, sorted_list, target_value, repeat=5)
115    t_bin_sorted = benchmark(binary_search, sorted_list, target_value, repeat=5)
116    print(f"Linear search time (sorted list) : {t_lin:.6f} s")
117    print(f"Binary search time (sorted list) : {t_bin:.6f} s")
118
119    correctness_check(target = 49805)
120
121    # Validate correctness
122    idx_lin = linear_search(sorted_list, target_value)
123    idx_bin = binary_search(sorted_list, target_value)
124    print(f"Correctness check: target = {target}, target_value = {target_value}")
125    print(f"Linear search found at index: {idx_lin}")
126    print(f"Binary search found at index: {idx_bin}")
127
128
129    print("== Summary & When to Prefer Binary Search ==")
130    print("1. Linear search works whether or not the data is sorted; binary search requires sorted data.")
131    print("2. Linear search is O(n), while binary search is O(log n) on sorted data.")
132    print("3. For small arrays or one-time searches, the overhead of binary search may not pay off.")
133    print("4. If you perform many searches on the same sorted list, binary search is much more efficient overall.")
134    print("5. If the data is unsorted and you only search once, linear search may be preferable (to avoid sorting).")
135    print("6. In practice, for large n and many searches, binary search is the better choice. (Binary search is preferred for large sorted datasets.)")
136
137 if __name__ == "__main__":

```

PROBLEMS OUTPUT DEBUG CONSOLE TERMINAL PORTS QUERY RESULTS

Python Debug Console + v D v ...

Ln 88, Col 1 Spaces: 4 UTF-8 {} Python 3.11.9 (Microsoft Store)

25-09-2025 11:23:52 ENG IN WiFi

Correctness check: target = 49805  
 Linear search found at index: 50000  
 Binary search found at index: 50000

== Summary & When to Prefer Binary Search ==

1. Linear search works whether or not the data is sorted; binary search requires sorted data.
2. Linear search is  $O(n)$ , while binary search is  $O(\log n)$  on sorted data.
3. For small arrays or one-time searches, the overhead of binary search may not pay off.
4. If you perform many searches on the same sorted list, binary search is much more efficient overall.
5. If the data is unsorted and you only search once, linear search may be preferable (to avoid sorting).
6. In practice, for large  $n$  and many searches, binary search is the better choice. (Binary search is preferred for large sorted datasets.)

## EXPLANATION:

Linear Search is simple and works on **any** list (sorted or unsorted).

- It scans each element until it finds the target or reaches the end.
- Time complexity is  $O(n)$  in the worst and average cases. [Wikipedia](#)
- It has very low overhead, which may make it competitive for small arrays or simple uses.

Binary Search is much faster if the array is sorted.

- It repeatedly divides the search space in half. [Wikipedia](#)
- Time complexity is  $O(\log n)$  in worst and average cases. [Wikipedia +1](#)
- But it **requires** the data to be sorted first.
- If you have to sort the list just to use binary search once, sorting time ( $O(n \log n)$ ) may dominate.

When Binary Search is preferable:

1. Your data is already sorted (or you can afford keeping it sorted).
2. You will perform **many** searches on the same dataset (then the one-time sorting cost is amortized).
3. The dataset is large, so the logarithmic reduction in comparisons is meaningful.
4. For small arrays or one-off searches, linear search's simplicity and minimal overhead may beat binary search in practice. (Some benchmarks show that for small  $n$ , linear search can be faster because binary search has more branch logic, etc.) [dirtyhandsCoding... +1](#)

## TASK 4:

### Quick Sort and Merge Sort Comparison

- Task: Implement Quick Sort and Merge Sort using recursion.
- Instructions:
  - o Provide AI with partially completed functions for recursion.
  - o Ask AI to complete the missing logic and add docstrings.
  - o Compare both algorithms on random, sorted, and reverse-sorted lists.

## PROMPT:

Generate python code and quick Sort and Merge Sort Comparison

- Task: Implement Quick Sort and Merge Sort using recursion.
- Instructions:
  - o Provide AI with partially completed functions for recursion.
  - o Ask AI to complete the missing logic and add docstrings.
  - o Compare both algorithms on random, sorted, and reverse-sorted lists.

## CODE & OUTPUT:

The screenshot shows the Visual Studio Code interface with the following details:

- File Explorer:** Shows files like LAB 4 HTML.html, web 2.py, AI T 2 12.4 LAB.py, AI T 3 12.4 LAB.py, AI T 4 12.4 LAB.py, and web lab.py.
- Code Editor:** Displays Python code for implementing Quick Sort and Merge Sort. The Quick Sort implementation uses recursion and partitioning. The Merge Sort implementation uses a divide-and-conquer approach with a pivot element.
- Output Panel:** Shows the results of running the code, comparing execution times for random, sorted, and reverse-sorted lists.
- Terminal:** Shows the command used to run the code: "c:\Windows\app\python3.11.exe" "c:\Users\kadal\vscodeextensions\ms-python.debugger-2025.10.0-win32-x64\bundled\libs\debug\launcher" "55214" "...".
- Performance Results:** The output includes:
  - Random List ---
  - Quick Sort time: 1.0666 seconds
  - Merge Sort time: 1.4798 seconds
  - Sorted List ---

The screenshot shows the Visual Studio Code interface with the Python extension installed. The code editor displays a Python script named `web 2.py` containing implementations of Quick Sort and Merge Sort. The Python Debug Console tab is active, showing the execution of the script. The output indicates a random list of size 50000 was sorted using both algorithms, with Merge Sort being faster at approximately 1.4798 seconds compared to Quick Sort's 1.0666 seconds.

```
C:\> Users > kadal > anaconda3 > pkgs > alembic-1.16.4-py313sha95532.0 > Lib > site-packages > alembic > dd1 > AI T 2 12.4 LAB.py > ...
25
26
27 def quick_sort(arr):
28     """
29         Wrapper function for Quick Sort.
30     """
31     quick_sort_recursive(arr, 0, len(arr) - 1)
32
33 # --- Merge Sort Implementation ---
34 def merge_sort(arr):
35     """
36         Sorts an array using the Merge Sort algorithm.
37     """
38     if len(arr) > 1:
39         mid = len(arr) // 2
40         left_half = arr[:mid]
41         right_half = arr[mid:]
42
43         merge_sort(left_half)
44         merge_sort(right_half)
45
46         i = j = k = 0
47
48     # Merge the two halves
49     while i < len(left_half) and j < len(right_half):
50         if left_half[i] < right_half[j]:
51             arr[k] = left_half[i]
52             i += 1
53         else:
54             arr[k] = right_half[j]
55             j += 1
56             k += 1
57
58     # Copy any remaining elements
59     while i < len(left_half):
60         arr[k] = left_half[i]
61         i += 1
62         k += 1
63
64     while j < len(right_half):
65         arr[k] = right_half[j]
66         j += 1
67         k += 1
68
69 # --- Comparison ---

... Random List ...
Quick Sort time: 1.0666 seconds
Merge Sort time: 1.4798 seconds

... Sorted List ...

PROBLEMS OUTPUT DEBUG CONSOLE TERMINAL PORTS QUERY RESULTS Python Debug Console + v □ ⌂ ... x
crossoft\WindowsApps\python3.11.exe" "C:\Users\kadal\vscode\extensions\ms-python.python\2025.10.0-win32-x64\bundled\libs\debugpy\launcher" "55214" "--" "C:\Users\kadal\anaconda3\pkgs\alembic-1.16.4-py313sha95532.0\lib\site-packages\alembic\dd1\AI T 2 12.4 LAB.py"
--- Performance Comparison (List Size: 50000) ---

In 135, Col 21, Spaces 4, UTF-8, CRLF, Python 3.11.9 (Microsoft Store) 11:29:16
ENG IN 25-09-2025
```

This screenshot shows the same Visual Studio Code environment, but the code editor now displays the merge sort implementation from the previous screenshot. The Python Debug Console output remains identical, showing the execution of the merge sort function and its performance comparison with quick sort.

```
C:\> Users > kadal > anaconda3 > pkgs > alembic-1.16.4-py313sha95532.0 > Lib > site-packages > alembic > dd1 > AI T 2 12.4 LAB.py > ...
34 def merge_sort(arr):
35     """
36         Sorts an array using the Merge Sort algorithm.
37     """
38     if len(arr) > 1:
39         mid = len(arr) // 2
40         left_half = arr[:mid]
41         right_half = arr[mid:]
42
43         merge_sort(left_half)
44         merge_sort(right_half)
45
46         i = j = k = 0
47
48     # Merge the two halves
49     while i < len(left_half) and j < len(right_half):
50         if left_half[i] < right_half[j]:
51             arr[k] = left_half[i]
52             i += 1
53         else:
54             arr[k] = right_half[j]
55             j += 1
56             k += 1
57
58     # Copy any remaining elements
59     while i < len(left_half):
60         arr[k] = left_half[i]
61         i += 1
62         k += 1
63
64     while j < len(right_half):
65         arr[k] = right_half[j]
66         j += 1
67         k += 1
68
69 # --- Comparison ---

... Random List ...
Quick Sort time: 1.0666 seconds
Merge Sort time: 1.4798 seconds

... Sorted List ...

PROBLEMS OUTPUT DEBUG CONSOLE TERMINAL PORTS QUERY RESULTS Python Debug Console + v □ ⌂ ... x
crossoft\WindowsApps\python3.11.exe" "C:\Users\kadal\vscode\extensions\ms-python.python\2025.10.0-win32-x64\bundled\libs\debugpy\launcher" "55214" "--" "C:\Users\kadal\anaconda3\pkgs\alembic-1.16.4-py313sha95532.0\lib\site-packages\alembic\dd1\AI T 2 12.4 LAB.py"
--- Performance Comparison (List Size: 50000) ---

In 135, Col 21, Spaces 4, UTF-8, CRLF, Python 3.11.9 (Microsoft Store) 11:29:31
ENG IN 25-09-2025
```

The screenshot shows the Visual Studio Code interface with a Python file named `AI T4 12.4 LAB.py` open. The code compares Quick Sort and Merge Sort on different list types. It includes sections for random lists, sorted lists, and reverse-sorted lists. The `CALL STACK` panel shows the execution flow. The `PROBLEMS`, `OUTPUT`, `DEBUG CONSOLE`, `TERMINAL`, `PORTS`, and `QUERY RESULTS` tabs are visible at the bottom.

```
C:\Users\kadal>anaconda3>pkgs>alembic-1.16.4-py313haa95532_0>Lib>site-packages>alembic>ddl>AI T4 12.4 LAB.py > ...
70 def run_comparison():
71     """
72     Compares Quick Sort and Merge Sort on different list types.
73     """
74     list_size = 50000
75
76     # Test cases
77     random_list = [random.randint(0, list_size) for _ in range(list_size)]
78     sorted_list = sorted(random_list)
79     reverse_sorted_list = sorted(random_list, reverse=True)
80
81     print("---- Performance Comparison (List Size: {}) ----".format(list_size))
82
83     # Test on Random List
84     print("\n---- Random List ---")
85
86     # Quick Sort
87     quick_list = list(random_list)
88     start_time = time.time()
89     quick_sort(quick_list)
90     end_time = time.time()
91     print("Quick Sort time: {:.4f} seconds".format(end_time - start_time))
92
93     # Merge Sort
94     merge_list = list(random_list)
95     start_time = time.time()
96     merge_sort(merge_list)
97     end_time = time.time()
98     print("Merge Sort time: {:.4f} seconds".format(end_time - start_time))
99
100    # Test on Sorted List
101    print("\n---- Sorted List ---")
102
103    # Quick Sort
104    quick_list = list(sorted_list)
105    start_time = time.time()
106    quick_sort(quick_list)
107    end_time = time.time()
108    print("Quick Sort time: {:.4f} seconds".format(end_time - start_time))
109
110    # Merge Sort
111    merge_list = list(sorted_list)
112    start_time = time.time()
113    merge_sort(merge_list)
```

The screenshot shows a terminal window with the command `python AI T4 12.4 LAB.py` running. The output displays the performance comparison results for Quick Sort and Merge Sort on random, sorted, and reverse-sorted lists. The terminal also shows the system status bar at the bottom.

```
:> C:\Users\kadal>anaconda3>pkgs>alembic-1.16.4-py313haa95532_0>Lib>site-packages>alembic>ddl>AI T4 12.4 LAB.py > ...
70 def run_comparison():
71     """
72     Compares Quick Sort and Merge Sort on different list types.
73     """
74     list_size = 50000
75
76     # Test cases
77     random_list = [random.randint(0, list_size) for _ in range(list_size)]
78     sorted_list = sorted(random_list)
79     reverse_sorted_list = sorted(random_list, reverse=True)
80
81     print("---- Performance Comparison (List Size: {}) ----".format(list_size))
82
83     # Test on Random List
84     print("\n---- Random List ---")
85
86     # Quick Sort
87     quick_list = list(random_list)
88     start_time = time.time()
89     quick_sort(quick_list)
90     end_time = time.time()
91     print("Quick Sort time: {:.4f} seconds".format(end_time - start_time))
92
93     # Merge Sort
94     merge_list = list(random_list)
95     start_time = time.time()
96     merge_sort(merge_list)
97     end_time = time.time()
98     print("Merge Sort time: {:.4f} seconds".format(end_time - start_time))
99
100    # Test on Sorted List
101    print("\n---- Sorted List ---")
102
103    # Quick Sort
104    quick_list = list(sorted_list)
105    start_time = time.time()
106    quick_sort(quick_list)
107    end_time = time.time()
108    print("Quick Sort time: {:.4f} seconds".format(end_time - start_time))
109
110    # Merge Sort
111    merge_list = list(sorted_list)
112    start_time = time.time()
113    merge_sort(merge_list)
```

Output from the terminal:

```
python3.11.exe' 'c:\users\kadal\vscode\extensions\ms-python.debugpy-2025.10.0-win32-x64\bundled\libs\debugpy\anaconda3\pkgs\alembic-1.16.4-py313haa95532_0\Lib\site-packages\alembic\ddl\AI T4 12.4 LAB.py'
--- Performance Comparison (List Size: 50000) ---

--- Random List ---
Quick Sort time: 1.0666 seconds
Merge Sort time: 1.4798 seconds

--- Sorted List ---

--- Reverse Sorted List ---
Quick Sort time: 1.0666 seconds
Merge Sort time: 1.4798 seconds
```

```

70 def run_comparison():
115     print("Merge Sort time: {:.4f} seconds".format(end_time - start_time))
116
117     # Test on Reverse Sorted List
118     print("\n--- Reverse Sorted List ---")
119
120     # Quick Sort
121     quick_list = list(reverse_sorted_list)
122     start_time = time.time()
123     quick_sort(quick_list)
124     end_time = time.time()
125     print("Quick Sort time: {:.4f} seconds".format(end_time - start_time))
126
127     # Merge Sort
128     merge_list = list(reverse_sorted_list)
129     start_time = time.time()
130     merge_sort(merge_list)
131     end_time = time.time()
132     print("Merge Sort time: {:.4f} seconds".format(end_time - start_time))
133
134 if __name__ == "__main__":
135     run_comparison()

```

PROBLEMS 35 OUTPUT DEBUG CONSOLE TERMINAL PORTS QUERY RESULTS

```

crossoft\WindowsApps\python3.11.exe' 'c:\Users\kadal\vscode\extensions\ms-python.debugpy-2025.10.0-win32-x64\bundled\libs\debu
aconda3\pkgs\alembic-1.16.4-py313haa95532_0\Lib\site-packages\alembic\ddl\AI_T4_12.4_LAB.py'
--- Performance Comparison (List Size: 50000) ---

--- Random List ---
Quick Sort time: 1.0666 seconds
Merge Sort time: 1.4798 seconds

```

## EXPLANATION:

### Time Complexity (average / worst / best)

- **Quick Sort:** average-case  $O(n \log n)$ , but worst-case  $O(n^2)$  (e.g. if pivot choices are poor). [Wikipedia +2](#)
- **Merge Sort:**  $O(n \log n)$  in all cases (best, average, worst). [Wikipedia +2](#)

### Space Complexity

- Quick Sort (this version) uses extra lists for partitioning, so not truly in-place; but an in-place variant (Lomuto / Hoare partition) can be done with  $O(\log n)$  stack usage. [Wikipedia +1](#)
- Merge Sort needs  $O(n)$  extra space for merging (the merged list) plus recursion overhead. [Wikipedia +1](#)

### Stability

- Merge Sort is stable (does not reorder equal elements). [Wikipedia +1](#)
- Quick Sort is generally **not stable** (depends on partition scheme). [GeeksforGeeks +1](#)

### Partition Behavior vs Splitting

- Quick Sort partitions around a pivot; the partitions may be unbalanced, introducing risk of worst-case. [GeeksforGeeks +2](#)
- Merge Sort always splits evenly (midpoint), so its recursion depth is predictable. [Wikipedia +2](#)

#### Practical Performance & Use Cases

- Quick Sort often outperforms Merge Sort for in-memory arrays because of lower constant factors, better cache locality, and no large temporary arrays. Stack Overflow +2
- Merge Sort is preferable when you require stability, or when worst-case guarantees matter (e.g. real-time systems).
- Merge Sort is often used in external sorting (on disk) because its merging approach accesses data sequentially. GeeksforGeeks +1
- For linked lists, Merge Sort is often a better choice since you can merge without needing additional arrays and random access is expensive. GeeksforGeeks +1

## TASK 5:

### AI-Suggested Algorithm Optimization

- Task: Give AI a naive algorithm (e.g.,  $O(n^2)$  duplicate search).
- Instructions:
  - Students write a brute force duplicate-finder.
  - Ask AI to optimize it (e.g., by using sets/dictionaries with  $O(n)$  time).
  - Compare execution times with large input sizes.


## PROMPT:

### Generate python code and AI-Suggested Algorithm Optimization

- Task: Give AI a naive algorithm (e.g.,  $O(n^2)$  duplicate search).
- Instructions:
  - Students write a brute force duplicate-finder.

- o Ask AI to optimize it (e.g., by using sets/dictionaries with  $O(n)$  time).
- o Compare execution times with large input sizes.

## CODE & OUTPUT:



The screenshot shows the Microsoft Visual Studio Code interface. The code editor displays a Python script named `find_duplicates_bruteforce.py`. The script defines a function `find_duplicates_bruteforce` that takes a list of items and returns a list of duplicates found in the input. The code includes comments explaining the time and space complexity. The terminal tab shows a benchmark comparison between a brute-force approach and an optimized version, with results for 1000 and 2000 items. The Python Debug Console tab shows the command to run the script and its output.

```

import random
import time
from typing import List, Any, Optional

def find_duplicates_bruteforce(lst: List[Any]) -> List[Any]:
    """
    Naive duplicate finder (brute force).

    Args:
        lst: List of items (can be any hashable or comparable values).
    Returns:
        A list of values that appear more than once in lst.
        May include duplicates in output if the same duplicate is found multiple times.
    Time complexity: O(n^2) in worst and average cases (two nested loops).
    Space complexity: O(n) for the output list (plus whatever the input uses).
    """
    n = len(lst)
    duplicates = []
    for i in range(n):
        for j in range(i + 1, n):
            if lst[i] == lst[j]:
                # If not already recorded, add to duplicates
    return duplicates

```

PROBLEMS 0 OUTPUT DEBUG CONSOLE TERMINAL PORTS QUERY RESULTS

PS C:\Users\kadal\anaconda3\pkgs\alembic-1.16.4-py313haa95532\_0\Lib\site-packages\alembic\ddl> & 'c:\Users\kadal\AppData\Local\Microsoft\WindowsApps\python3.11.exe' 'c:\Users\kadal\vscode\extensions\ms-python.debugger-2025.10.0-win32-x64\bundled\libs\debugpy\launcher' '55274' '--' 'c:\Users\kadal\anaconda3\pkgs\alembic-1.16.4-py313haa95532\_0\Lib\site-packages\alembic\ddl\AI T5 12.4 LAB.py'

Benchmark: brute force vs optimized duplicate finder

n = 1000 | brute: 0.222449 s | optimized: 0.000631 s  
n = 2000 | brute: 0.950304 s | optimized: 0.001714 s

Spaces: 4 UTF-8 ENG IN 11:35:55 25-09-2025

VS Code interface showing the Python Debug Console output:

```
PS C:\Users\kadal> cdanaconda3\pkgs\alembic-1.16.4-py313haa95532_0\lib\site-packages\alembic\ddl & "c:\Users\kadal\AppData\Local\Microsoft\WindowsApps\python3.11.exe" "c:\Users\kadal\vscodeextensions\ms-python.debugger-2025.10.0-win32-x64\bundled\libs\debugpy\launcher" "55274" -- "c:\Users\kadal\anaconda3\pkgs\alembic-1.16.4-py313haa95532_0\lib\site-packages\alembic\ddl\AI T 12.4 LAB.py"
Benchmark: brute force vs optimized duplicate finder
n = 1000 | brute: 0.22349 s | optimized: 0.00031 s
n = 2000 | brute: 0.950304 s | optimized: 0.001714 s
n = 5000 | brute: 6.414864 s | optimized: 0.003992 s
```

VS Code interface showing the Python Debug Console output:

```
PS C:\Users\kadal> cdanaconda3\pkgs\alembic-1.16.4-py313haa95532_0\lib\site-packages\alembic\ddl & "c:\Users\kadal\AppData\Local\Microsoft\WindowsApps\python3.11.exe" "c:\Users\kadal\vscodeextensions\ms-python.debugger-2025.10.0-win32-x64\bundled\libs\debugpy\launcher" "55274" -- "c:\Users\kadal\anaconda3\pkgs\alembic-1.16.4-py313haa95532_0\lib\site-packages\alembic\ddl\AI T 12.4 LAB.py"
Benchmark: brute force vs optimized duplicate finder
n = 1000 | brute: 0.22349 s | optimized: 0.00031 s
n = 2000 | brute: 0.950304 s | optimized: 0.001714 s
n = 5000 | brute: 6.414864 s | optimized: 0.003992 s
```

```

C:\Users\kadal>anaconda3\pkgs>alembic-1.16.4-py313haa95532_0>lib>site-packages>alembic>ddl>AI T3 12.4 LAB.py >...
63 def benchmark(fn, data: List[Any], repeat: int = 1) > float:
64     total = 0.0
65     for _ in range(repeat):
66         arr = data.copy()
67         start = time.perf_counter()
68         fn(arr)
69         end = time.perf_counter()
70         total += (end - start)
71     return total / repeat
72
73
74
75
76
77
78 def main():
79     # Test sizes
80     sizes = [1000, 2000, 5000, 10000]
81     # For each size, generate a random list with many duplicates (smaller range)
82     print("Benchmark: brute force vs optimized duplicate finder")
83     for n in sizes:
84         lst = make_random_list(n, value_range = max(10, n // 10))
85         t_brute = benchmark(find_duplicates_bruteforce, lst, repeat=3)
86         t_opt = benchmark(find_duplicates_optimized, lst, repeat=3)
87         print(f'n = {n} | brute: {t_brute:.6f} s | optimized: {t_opt:.6f} s')
88
89     # Demonstrate correctness
90
91
92
93
94
95
96
97
98

```

PROBLEMS OUTPUT DEBUG CONSOLE TERMINAL PORTS QUERY RESULTS

PS C:\Users\Kadal\Anaconda3\pkgs\alembic-1.16.4-py313haa95532\_0\lib\site-packages\alembic\ddl & 'c:\Users\kadal\AppData\Local\Microsoft\WindowsApps\python3.11.exe' 'c:\Users\kadal\.vscode\extensions\ms-python.python\_2025.10.0-win32-x64\bundled\libs\debug\launcher' '55274' '--' 'c:\Users\kadal\anaconda3\pkgs\alembic-1.16.4-py313haa95532\_0\lib\site-packages\alembic\ddl\AI T5 12.4 LAB.py'

Benchmark: brute force vs optimized duplicate finder

n = 1000 | brute: 0.223449 s | optimized: 0.000631 s  
n = 2000 | brute: 0.950304 s | optimized: 0.001714 s  
n = 5000 | brute: 6.414864 s | optimized: 0.003992 s

Spaces: 4 UTF-8 ⓘ Python 3.11.9 (Microsoft Store) 11:36:33 ENG IN 25-09-2025

```

C:\Users\kadal>anaconda3\pkgs>alembic-1.16.4-py313haa95532_0>lib>site-packages>alembic>ddl>AI T5 12.4 LAB.py >...
78 def main():
79     # Test sizes
80     sizes = [1000, 2000, 5000, 10000]
81     # For each size, generate a random list with many duplicates (smaller range)
82     print("Benchmark: brute force vs optimized duplicate finder")
83     for n in sizes:
84         lst = make_random_list(n, value_range = max(10, n // 10))
85         t_brute = benchmark(find_duplicates_bruteforce, lst, repeat=3)
86         t_opt = benchmark(find_duplicates_optimized, lst, repeat=3)
87         print(f'n = {n} | brute: {t_brute:.6f} s | optimized: {t_opt:.6f} s')
88
89     # Demonstrate correctness
90     sample = [5, 1, 3, 5, 2, 3, 8, 5]
91     print("\nSample list:", sample)
92     print("Brute duplicates : ", find_duplicates_bruteforce(sample))
93     print("Optimized duplicates: ", find_duplicates_optimized(sample))
94
95
96
97
98

```

PROBLEMS OUTPUT DEBUG CONSOLE TERMINAL PORTS QUERY RESULTS

PS C:\Users\Kadal\Anaconda3\pkgs\alembic-1.16.4-py313haa95532\_0\lib\site-packages\alembic\ddl & 'c:\Users\kadal\AppData\Local\Microsoft\WindowsApps\python3.11.exe' 'c:\Users\kadal\.vscode\extensions\ms-python.python\_2025.10.0-win32-x64\bundled\libs\debug\launcher' '55274' '--' 'c:\Users\kadal\anaconda3\pkgs\alembic-1.16.4-py313haa95532\_0\lib\site-packages\alembic\ddl\AI T5 12.4 LAB.py'

Benchmark: brute force vs optimized duplicate finder

n = 1000 | brute: 0.223449 s | optimized: 0.000631 s  
n = 2000 | brute: 0.950304 s | optimized: 0.001714 s  
n = 5000 | brute: 6.414864 s | optimized: 0.003992 s

Spaces: 4 UTF-8 ⓘ Python 3.11.9 (Microsoft Store) 11:36:44 ENG IN 25-09-2025

```

n = 1000 | brute: 0.223449 s | optimized: 0.000631 s
n = 2000 | brute: 0.950304 s | optimized: 0.001714 s
n = 5000 | brute: 6.414864 s | optimized: 0.003992 s
n = 10000 | brute: 43.288533 s | optimized: 0.007612 s

Sample list: [5, 1, 3, 5, 2, 3, 8, 5]
Brute duplicates : [5, 3]
Optimized duplicates: [3, 5]

```

## EXPLANATION:

- The **brute force version** uses nested loops (`i` and `j`) to compare every pair. That gives  $O(n^2)$  time complexity. It also checks `lst[i] not in duplicates` to avoid adding the same duplicate multiple times, but that check itself is  $O(n)$  in worst case, making it even slower in practice.
- The **optimized version** uses two sets:
  - `seen` to record which items have already been encountered.
  - `duplicates` to record items that appear more than once (without repetition).
  - For each item, you do `if item in seen: duplicates.add(item) else seen.add(item)`.
  - Both set membership / insertion operations are average  $O(1)$ , so total is  $O(n)$  average time.
- We convert `duplicates` set to list at the end for output; you could also return a set directly.
- The benchmarking compares the two methods on random lists with many duplicates (using a relatively small `value_range`) so collisions / duplicates are common — that better highlights the speed difference.

You'll observe that for moderate `n` (e.g. 5,000+), the brute force method becomes very slow, while the optimized one scales linearly.