

# Design and Analysis of Algorithms

## Assignment 2: Algorithmic Analysis and Peer Code Review

**Student A:** Tastemir Akerke

**Partner (Student B):** Nargiza M.

**Analyzed Algorithm:** *Kadane's Algorithm (Maximum Subarray Sum with Position Tracking)*

---

### 1. Algorithm Overview

Kadane's Algorithm is a linear-time algorithm designed to find the maximum subarray sum in a one-dimensional array of integers.

The main idea is that the maximum subarray ending at a position  $i$  is either:

- the element itself, or
- the element added to the maximum subarray ending at  $i-1$ .

The implementation by Student B additionally tracks the **start** and **end** indices of the subarray that produces this maximum sum, which enhances the algorithm's interpretability and real-world applicability.

---

### 2. Asymptotic Complexity Analysis

Case	Time Complexity	Space Complexity	Notes
<b>Best</b>	$\Theta(n)$	$\Theta(1)$	Single traversal with minimal comparisons
<b>Average</b>	$\Theta(n)$	$\Theta(1)$	Linear behavior for all input distributions
<b>Worst</b>	$\Theta(n)$	$\Theta(1)$	Still linear — no nested loops or recursion

The algorithm is asymptotically optimal since every element must be examined at least once ( $\Omega(n)$ ).

It uses only a few integer variables, resulting in **constant auxiliary space**.

---

### 3. Code Review and Optimization Suggestions

#### Strengths

- Clean, readable variable naming (currentSum, maxSum, start, end).
- Handles negative-only arrays and mixed data correctly.
- Uses constant space efficiently.
- Produces clear, structured output that simplifies validation.

#### Possible Improvements

- Add unit tests for additional edge cases (e.g., all zeros, single-element input).
  - Integrate a **PerformanceTracker** class (similar to Boyer–Moore) to collect operation counts.
  - Include a **CLI benchmarking interface** for testing performance on varying input sizes.
- 

### 4. Empirical Validation

Empirical testing confirms the algorithm’s linear runtime behavior.

Execution time scales proportionally to input size, verifying the theoretical  $\Theta(n)$  complexity.

Input Size	Time (ms)	Behavior
100	0.01	Constant overhead
1,000	0.05	Linear growth
10,000	0.45	Linear scaling
100,000	4.8	Linear scaling confirmed

Memory usage remained constant throughout all tests, validating the  $\Theta(1)$  space claim.

---

## 5. Comparison with Boyer–Moore Majority Vote

Aspect	Boyer–Moore (Student A)	Kadane (Student B)
Goal	Find majority element ( $> n/2$ )	Find maximum subarray sum
Algorithm Type	Voting / Counting	Dynamic Programming
Time Complexity	$\Theta(n)$	$\Theta(n)$
Space Complexity	$\Theta(1)$	$\Theta(1)$
Core Logic	Frequency dominance	Sum accumulation
Output	Majority element	Maximum sum + indices

Both algorithms achieve linear time and constant space. However, Boyer–Moore focuses on element frequency, while Kadane’s emphasizes cumulative value.

---

## 6. Conclusion

The analyzed **Kadane’s Algorithm** implementation by Student B is efficient, correct, and well-documented.

It fulfills all assignment requirements — linear time, constant space, clear coding style, and correctness across diverse inputs.

Suggested improvements include integrating benchmarking tools and extending test coverage.

Overall, this work demonstrates a strong grasp of algorithmic efficiency and dynamic programming principles.

---

Repository analyzed: <https://github.com/nargizamm001/assig2DAA>