

Practice Mode

Contest scoreboard | Sign in

Qualification Round 2016

A. Counting Sheep

B. Revenge of the Pancakes

C. Coin Jam

D. Fractiles

Contest Analysis

Questions asked



Submissions

Counting Sheep

7pt Not attempted 26558/29356 users correct (90%)

8pt Not attempted 25729/26216 users correct (98%)

Revenge of the Pancakes

10pt Not attempted 22527/23686 users correct (95%)

10pt Not attempted 21383/22147 users correct (97%)

Coin Jam

10pt Not attempted 13361/15342 users correct (87%)

20pt Not attempted 6297/9111 users correct (69%)

Fractiles

10pt Not attempted 8250/9708 users correct (85%)
25pt Not attempted

2356/4955 users correct (48%)

Top Scores	
Lewin	100
Endagorion	100
xiaowuc1	100
xyz111	100
HellKitsune123	100
seanwentzel	100
ivan.popelyshev	100
burunduk3	100
Nicolas16	100
ctunoku	100

Contest Analysis

Overview | Problem A | Problem B | Problem C | Problem D

Fractiles: Analysis

This problem is more about analyzing an existing algorithm than writing a new one. Once you understand how more complex artwork depends on the original sequence, you can solve the problem with a short piece of code.

The first thing to notice is that if the original sequence is all Ls, the artwork will be all Ls, no matter what the value of **C** is. If we choose some set of tiles that all turn out to be Ls for some original sequence other than all Ls, then our solution is invalid, because we won't be able to tell whether the artwork was based on that original sequence or on an original sequence of all Ls. This means we have to come up with a set of positions to check out such that for any original sequence besides all Ls, we will see at least one G.

Small dataset

In the Small dataset, since we can check as many tiles as the length of the original sequence, we may be tempted to try to reconstruct it in full. And while this is possible (we'll get there in a moment), there is an easier alternative. The simplest solution, as it turns out, is to always output the integers 1 through \mathbf{K} . It can be easily proved that it works with the following two-case analysis. Let us call the original sequence O, and let A_i be the artwork of complexity i for a fixed O.

- 1. Suppose that O starts with an L. Let us prove that each A_i starts with O. This is trivially true for $A_1 = O$. Now, if A_i starts with O, it also starts with an L, and since the transformation maps that first L into a copy of O, A_{i+1} starts with O. By induction, each A_i starts with O. Then, by checking positions 1 through K, we are checking a copy of the original sequence O, so if there are any Gs in O, we will see a G.
- 2. Suppose instead that O starts with a G. Let us prove that each A_i starts with a G. This is trivially true for $A_1 = O$. Now, if A_i starts with a G, then A_{i+1} also starts with a G, since the transformation maps that G at the start of A_i to G at the start of G at the start of G induction, each G is tarts with G. Then, since we are checking position 1, we will see a G.

Since we will see at least one G for any original sequence that is not all Ls, and only Ls for the original sequence that is all Ls, we have answered the question successfully. Notice that this also proves that there is no impossible case in the Small dataset.

The proofs above hint at another possible solution for the Small dataset that gets enough information from the tiles to know the entire O. We will explain it not only because it is interesting, but also because it is a stepping stone towards a solution for the Large dataset.

We have seen that position 1 of any A_i is always equal to position 1 of O. Is there any position in A_i that is always equal to position

2 of *O*? It turns out that there is, and the same is true for any position of *O*.

Consider position 2 of O as an example. It is position 2 in $A_1 = O$. When A_2 is produced from A_1 , the tile at position 2 of A_1 determines which tiles will appear at positions $\mathbf{K} + 1$ through $\mathbf{K} + \mathbf{K}$ of A_2 . In particular, the second of those tiles, the tile at position $\mathbf{K} + 2$ of A_2 , is the same as the tile at position 2 of 2. Then, it follows that position 2 of 2 generates positions 2 of 2 derivatives 2 of 2 generates positions 2 of 2 derivatives 2 of 2 generates positions 2 of 2 derivatives 2 of 2 derivatives 2 of 2 derivatives 2 of 2 derivatives 2 derivati

Large dataset

The reasoning that we just used to find fixed points will help us solve the Large. Each position in A_i generates **K** positions in A_{i+1} . So, indirectly, each position in A_i also generates \mathbf{K}^2 positions in A_{i+2} , \mathbf{K}^3 positions in A_{i+3} , and so on. Let us say that a position in A_{i+d} is a descendant of a position p in A_i if it was generated from a position in A_{i+d-1} generated from a position in A_{i+d-2} ... generated from position p in A_i . Notice that a G in any given position of any A_i implies a G in all descendant positions. However, if there is an L in position p of A_i , a descendant position $(p-1)^*\mathbf{K}+d$ (with $1 \le d \le \mathbf{K}$) of A_{i+1} will be equal to position d of d. So, position d of d are Ls. If we take this further, we arrive at a key insight: any position of any d is an L if and only if a particular set of positions in d are Ls.

We can find those positions by thinking about the orders in which the descendants at each level were produced. For instance, for K=3, position 8 of A_3 is descendant number 2 of position 3 of A_2 , which in turn is descendant number 3 of position 1 of A_1 . That means that position 8 of A_3 is L if and only if positions 2, 3 and 1 of O are all Ls. So, just by looking at position 8 of A_3 , we know whether the original sequence had a G in at least one of those three positions.

Generalizing this, if we start at position p_1 of $A_1 = O$, and take its p_2 -th descendant in A_2 , and then take its p_3 -th descendant in A_3 , and so on, until taking the $p_{\mathbf{C}}$ -th descendant in $A_{\mathbf{C}}$, we have a single position that tells us whether the original sequence has a G in positions $p_1, p_2, ..., p_C$. And, conversely, for any position in $A_{\mathbf{C}}$, we can find a corresponding sequence of **C** positions that lead to it. So, each position we check on $A_{\mathbf{C}}$ can cover up to \mathbf{C} positions of O, and will cover exactly C positions if we make the right choice. Since we need to cover all K positions of the original sequence, that means the impossible cases are exactly those where **S*C** < **K** — that is, where getting **C** positions out of every one of our **S** tile choices is still not enough. For the rest, we can assign a list of positions [1, 2, ..., C] to tile choice 1, [C+1, C+2, ..., 2C] to tile choice 2, and so on until we get to K. If the last tile choice has a list shorter than C, we can fill it up with copies of any integer between 1 and **K**. Now all we need to do is match each of these lists to a position in $A_{\mathbb{C}}$, which we can do by following the descendant path (descendants of position p are

always positions $(p - 1)^*K+1$ through $(p - 1)^*K+K)$. This simple Python code represents this idea:

```
def Solve(k, c, s):
    if c*s < k:
        return [] # returns an empty list for impossible
    tiles = []
    # the list for the last tile choice is filled with
    # i is the first value of the list of the current
    for i in xrange(1, k + 1, c):
        p = 1
        # j is the step in the current list [i, i+1, ...
        for j in xrange(c):
            # the min fills the last tile choice's list with
            p = (p - 1) * k + min(i + j, k)
            tiles.append(p)
        return tiles</pre>
```

All problem statements, input data and contest analyses are licensed under the Creative Commons Attribution License.

© 2008-2017 Google Google Home - Terms and Conditions - Privacy Policies and Principles

Powered by



Google Cloud Platform