

Assignment 2 — Algorithmic Analysis and Peer Code Review

Pair 3: Linear Array Algorithms

Student A: Zhanassyl Sherkenov — Boyer–Moore Majority Vote Algorithm

Student B: Valeriy Fedorenko — Kadane’s Algorithm (Maximum Subarray Sum)

GITHUB:

A: https://github.com/KovyColor/DAA_assignment_2.git

B: https://github.com/ValiCoder/AlgDesign_new/tree/feature/kadane-algorithm/src

1. Introduction

This report presents the collaborative analysis and peer review for **Pair 3** of the *Algorithmic Analysis and Peer Code Review* assignment.

Each student implemented and analyzed one linear-time array algorithm:

- **Student A:** *Boyer–Moore Majority Vote* — detects the majority element in a single pass.
- **Student B:** *Kadane’s Algorithm* — finds the contiguous subarray with the maximum sum.

Both algorithms run in **$O(n)$** time and use **$O(1)$** space. The goal is to analyze their logic, efficiency, and implementation design.

2. Algorithm Overviews

2.1 Boyer–Moore Majority Vote (Student A)

Purpose: Identify an element that appears more than $\lfloor n / 2 \rfloor$ times in an array.

Idea:

- Maintain a *candidate* and a *count*.
- Increment the count for matching elements and decrement for others.
- When the count drops to zero, update the candidate.
- Verify the candidate at the end.

2.2 Kadane’s Algorithm (Student B)

Purpose: Find the contiguous subarray with the maximum possible sum.

Idea:

- Track the best sum ending at each index.
- Decide whether to extend the current subarray or start a new one.
- Keep global and local maxima updated at every step.

Implementation Highlights:

- **Two methods:** findMaxSubarraySum() (sum only) and findMaximumSubarray() (sum + indices).
- **Benchmarking system** with CSV export and averaged multiple runs.
- **Command-line interface (CLI)** for flexible testing.
- **Exception handling** for empty arrays or invalid inputs.
- **Professional Maven structure** and clean class separation.

3. Theoretical Complexity Analysis

Algorithm	Best Case	Average Case	Worst Case	Space	Key Feature
Boyer–Moore	$\Omega(n)$	$\Theta(n)$	$O(n)$	$O(1)$	One-pass frequency tracking
Kadane’s	$\Omega(n)$	$\Theta(n)$	$O(n)$	$O(1)$	One-pass subarray sum maximization

Explanation:
Both iterate through the array exactly once, performing a fixed number of operations per element. Each uses only a handful of scalar variables → **linear time + constant space**.

4. Peer Code Review

4.1 Review of Boyer–Moore (by Valeriy Fedorenko)

Strengths:

- Clear separation between selection and verification phases.
- Efficient and memory-safe.
- Uses an independent *PerformanceTracker* class.

Suggestions:

- Handle empty/null inputs explicitly.
- Use clearer variable names (*candidate*, *count* → *majorityCandidate*, *counter*).
- Add a visualization or index-based variant.

4.2 Review of Kadane’s Algorithm (by Zhanassyl Sherkenov)

Strengths:

- Two complementary versions: one for sum only, one with indices.
- Excellent benchmarking with CSV export and time averaging.
- Clean OOP structure and well-documented code.
- Robust input validation and clear exceptions.

Suggestions:

- Consider integrating **JMH** for micro-benchmark precision.

- Guard against potential integer overflow with very large arrays.
- Extend test cases for special patterns (all zeros, alternating signs, etc.).

5. Empirical Validation

Performance measured for input sizes $n = 100, 1\,000, 10\,000, 100\,000$.

n	Boyer–Moore (ms)	Kadane (ms)	Comparisons (B-M)	Comparisons (Kadane)
100	0.02	0.05	201	199
1 000	0.18	0.31	2 001	1 999
10 000	1.51	1.52	20 001	19 999
100 000	6.48	13.1	200 001	199 999

Kadane’s Algorithm — Extra Metrics

- **CSV Export:** Automatic benchmark logging.
- **Multiple Runs:** Averaged times for stability.
- **Memory Usage:** Constant $O(1)$ across all n .

Observation:

Both demonstrate strictly linear growth. Kadane’s shows slightly higher constant factors due to extra arithmetic and boundary tracking, but retains $O(n)$ efficiency.



6. Comparative Analysis

Criteria	Boyer–Moore	Kadane’s
Goal	Majority element detection	Maximum subarray sum
Core Approach	Candidate counter update	Dynamic local sum tracking
Passes	1 (+ verification)	1
Memory	2 ints	3 ints
Trend	Linear	Linear
Code Structure	Single class	Multi-package project
Benchmarking	Basic timing	CSV export + CLI
Use Cases	Voting systems	Finance & signal analysis

7. Conclusion

Both algorithms are **optimal $O(n)$** solutions with **constant space**. Boyer–Moore efficiently identifies majority elements, while Kadane’s finds the maximum contiguous subarray sum — both achieved in one pass with minimal memory footprint.

Key Achievements of Kadane’s Implementation (Student B):

-  Optimal $O(n)$ time
-  $O(1)$ space

- ☒ Clean modular design
- ☒ Advanced benchmarking & CSV output
- ☒ Error handling and test coverage
- ☒ Professional project structure

Both contributions demonstrate mastery of linear-time design and practical performance analysis in algorithm engineering.
