



**Subject: Design and Analysis  
of Algorithms (01CT0512)**

**Viva interview**

**Aim: Scaler Ai Interview Result**

**Date: 28-11-2025**

**Enrollment No: 92301733054**

Free AI Mock Interview: Pract x    Scaler Companion x    +

companion.scaler.com/interview/dsa-interview--y9dgcv/401397df-959f-4516-855c-263db745fed4/feedback

SCALER DSA Interview

Thank you for interviewing with us

## Your Final Rating: Strong Reject

### Feedback

#### Final Decision

Strong Reject

#### Evaluation Parameters Ratings

- Problem-Solving Ability: 1 out of 5
- Coding Skills: 1 out of 5
- Data Structures & Algorithm Knowledge: 1 out of 5
- Communication & Collaboration: 1 out of 5
- Debugging & Iteration: 1 out of 5

#### Detailed Feedback on Evaluation Parameters

##### Problem-Solving Ability

###### Notes

- The candidate did not attempt to lay out a clear approach for either problem.
- There were no visible steps showing decomposition of either problem into subproblems.
- The candidate did not articulate the need for searching or exploration for the island problem.
- For the second problem, the candidate never articulated a dynamic programming, greedy, or any structured approach.
- At several points, the candidate admitted to not knowing how to proceed.
- There was minimal evidence of applying algorithmic thinking or analysis.

###### Good Parts

- The candidate made some attempts (however vague) to interact with the questions.

###### Not Good Parts

- The candidate left answers at a high level and never detailed logical steps.
- There was no demonstration of systematic exploration of possibilities or edge cases.
- The candidate should break down problems and lay out stepwise approaches for such problems, even if not coding an answer immediately.

##### Coding Skills

###### Notes

- Code provided for the first problem was severely incomplete and syntactically invalid.
- The candidate did not write any code for the second problem.
- There was no demonstration of understanding correct C++ syntax or logic.
- Did not show ability to translate logic into working code.
- Used ambiguous and nonsensical statements in place of variable names or logic.
- Did not attempt to dry run or debug any code.



**Subject: Design and Analysis  
of Algorithms (01CT0512)**

**Viva interview**

**Aim: Scaler Ai Interview Result**

**Date: 28-11-2025**

**Enrollment No: 92301733054**

#### Good Parts

- Created a minimal function frame in C++ for the first problem.

#### Not Good Parts

- Did not implement even a simple or brute-force solution for either question.
- Use of inconsistent and undefined code elements (e.g., 'arr[i,j]', improper for-loops).
- Did not discuss or display correct iteration mechanics in code.
- Should attempt at least a simple solution and debug incrementally for such problems.

#### Data Structures & Algorithm Knowledge

##### Notes

- No discussion of DFS/BFS, DP, or use of relevant data structures (e.g., vectors for visited cells).
- Did not explain or consider algorithmic tradeoffs.
- No attempt to consider optimized, suboptimal, or brute force approaches.
- Lacked indication of familiarity with canonical solutions for classic problems.
- Incorrect variable references and terminology for standard data structures.
- Answers did not reflect understanding of grid or sequence-based algorithm strategies.

#### Good Parts

- Brief mention of using a "vector" for marking, though not expanded.

#### Not Good Parts

- Lack of concrete ideas for marking cells, neighbor traversal, or updating states.

##### Notes

- Candidate responses were often ambiguous and contained nonstandard terminology.
- Communication was not directly related to algorithms or problem details.
- Did not ask clarifying questions, nor restated problem to check understanding.
- At times, responses became nonsensical or off-topic.
- Did not demonstrate collaborative thinking or explain ideas for potential improvement.
- Some answers (e.g. references to "texture" or "toxane") were incoherent in context.



#### Good Parts

- Remained engaged in the interview process for both questions.

#### Not Good Parts

- Should use precise, concise language to share even tentative ideas.
- Should clarify confusion and ask for help or hints more constructively.
- Avoid non sequitur or irrelevant statements during problem discussion.

#### Debugging & Iteration

##### Notes

- Did not make attempts to iterate or improve answers in response to hints.
- Never dry ran or validated any code or logic.
- When unsure, did not attempt to guess, check, or try partial solutions.
- Did not leverage feedback to incrementally refine approach.
- Never demonstrated finding or fixing of logical or syntactical issues.

