

# Divide & Conquer

## Problem A

- $O(x)$ , where  $x$  is exponential number
- $O(\log(x))$

## Problem B

- Splitting the data exactly in the middle keeps the work quick, giving you the best speed of  $O(n \log n)$  because the process only repeats  $O(\log n)$  times. If you only split off one item at a time, the process takes too long ( $O(n)$  repeats), making the overall speed much slower.
- No, it isn't sufficient enough to assume that the answer for the sequence is  $\max(ma, mb)$ .
- Yes,  $\text{maxSum}$  of crossing subsequence may give the larger sum than the one in step 3.
- The crossing subsequence must:
  - Start somewhere in the left half (index between  $i$  and  $\text{mid}$ )
  - End somewhere in the right half (index between  $\text{mid}+1$  and  $k$ )
  - Must include both  $\text{numbers}[\text{mid}]$  and  $\text{numbers}[\text{mid}+1]$  (the elements immediately adjacent to the split point)
- In other words, it crosses the midpoint. The beginning index  $\leq \text{mid}$  and the ending index  $\geq \text{mid}+1$ .
- The sum of the maximum subsequence of the original subsequence ( $a_i, \dots, a_k$ ) would be the maximum of three values:
  - The maximum sum found entirely in the left half ( **$m_L$** ).
  - The maximum sum found entirely in the right half ( **$m_R$** ).
  - The maximum crossing sum ( **$m_c$** ).
- **$O(n)$**
- **$T(n) = O(n \log n)$**
- The divide-and-conquer algorithm is slower than Kadane's algorithm for solving the maximum subarray sum problem.
  - The **Divide-and-Conquer** approach has a time complexity of  **$O(n \log n)$**  because it recursively splits the array and performs  $O(n)$  work at each of the  $\log n$  levels to find crossing sums.
  - **Kadane's Algorithm** is faster, with a time complexity of  **$O(n)$**  (linear time), as it only requires a single pass over the array, tracking the current and absolute maximum sums without recursion or re-visiting elements.