

# Analysis: Merge Cards

## Test Set 1

In the  $i$ -th round, Panko will have  $N - i$  choices. In total, there are  $(N - 1)!$  possibilities. Using an exhaustive approach, the expected value can be computed by definition.

## Test Set 2

After each round, the number on each card equals to the sum of a subarray of  $\mathbf{A}$ . In the last round, there are  $N - 1$  cases:

- $A_1, A_2 + A_3 + \dots + A_N$
- $A_1 + A_2, A_3 + A_4 + \dots + A_N$
- $\vdots$
- $A_1 + A_2 + \dots + A_i, A_{i+1} + A_{i+2} + \dots + A_N$
- $\vdots$
- $A_1 + A_2 + \dots + A_{N-1}, A_N$

The last round contributes a fixed number,  $A_1 + A_2 + \dots + A_N$ , to the answer. But in each case, the part contributed by the previous rounds is actually the sum of the answers of two variants of the original problem:

- Replace  $\mathbf{A}$  by  $A_1, A_2, \dots, A_i$
- Replace  $\mathbf{A}$  by  $A_{i+1}, A_2, \dots, A_N$

This part is then a weighted average of those  $N - 1$  sums. However, each case is equally likely to occur. To reach a specific case in the last round, Panko has to avoid exactly one choice in each of the previous rounds. Thus arithmetic mean can be used here.

There are  $O(N^2)$  different subproblems. The answer of each of subproblem can be computed in  $O(N)$  by [dynamic programming](#). The overall time complexity is then  $O(N^3)$ .

## Test Set 3

The above solution can be optimized to achieve  $O(N^2)$  time complexity by maintaining the prefix sums and suffix sums of the answers to the subproblems. But there is a faster approach that the  $O(N^2)$  part is in precomputation instead of having  $O(N^2)$  per test.

Let  $\text{solve}_N(A_1, A_2, \dots, A_N)$  be a function that takes the  $N$  numbers written on the cards as parameters and returns the expected total score. It can be expressed as the average of  $N - 1$  numbers. Each corresponds to a different choice in the first round. In particular, they are:

- $A_1 + A_2 + \text{solve}_{N-1}(A_1 + A_2, A_3, \dots, A_i, A_{i+1}, \dots, A_{N-1}, A_N)$
- $A_2 + A_3 + \text{solve}_{N-1}(A_1, A_2 + A_3, \dots, A_i, A_{i+1}, \dots, A_{N-1}, A_N)$
- $\vdots$
- $A_i + A_{i+1} + \text{solve}_{N-1}(A_1, A_2, A_3, \dots, A_i + A_{i+1}, \dots, A_{N-1}, A_N)$
- $\vdots$
- $A_{N-1} + A_N + \text{solve}_{N-1}(A_1, A_2, A_3, \dots, A_i, A_{i+1}, \dots, A_{N-1} + A_N)$

By using mathematical induction with  $\text{solve}_2(\mathbf{A}_1, \mathbf{A}_2) = \mathbf{A}_1 + \mathbf{A}_2$  as the base case, it can be shown that  $\text{solve}_N(\mathbf{A}_1, \mathbf{A}_2, \dots, \mathbf{A}_N)$  is a linear combination of  $\mathbf{A}_1, \mathbf{A}_2, \dots, \mathbf{A}_N$ , which means  $\text{solve}_N(\mathbf{A}_1, \mathbf{A}_2, \dots, \mathbf{A}_N) = k_{N,1} \times \mathbf{A}_1 + k_{N,2} \times \mathbf{A}_2 + \dots + k_{N,N} \times \mathbf{A}_N$  where  $k_{i,j}$  are constants. If all  $k_{i,j}$  are precomputed, the answer for each test can be computed in time complexity  $O(N)$ .

Starting from  $k_{2,1} = k_{2,2} = 1$ ,  $k_{i,j}$  can be computed in increasing order of  $i$ . The transition formulas can be obtained by transforming the formula of  $\text{solve}_N(\mathbf{A}_1, \mathbf{A}_2, \dots, \mathbf{A}_N)$ . For example, the transition formula of  $k_{N,1}$  can be obtained by replacing  $\text{solve}_{N-1}(\dots)$  and  $\text{solve}_N(\dots)$  by the expressions with  $k_{i,j}$ , then comparing the coefficients of the  $\mathbf{A}_1$  term.

The  $j$ -th card will become either (part of) the  $(j - 1)$ -th card or (part of) the  $j$ -th card after a round. Correspondingly, only the coefficients of the  $k_{i-1,j-1}$  term, the  $k_{i-1,j}$  term and the constant term can be non-zero in the transition formula of  $k_{i,j}$ . By grouping the like terms, the number of terms in each transition formula is reduced to at most 3. Then the overall time complexity becomes  $O(N^2)$ .

The error analysis is straightforward since  $\mathbf{A}_i$  cannot be negative. It should not be a problem in most of the implementations.