

# Analysis: Energy Stones

### Test set 1 (Visible)

For this test set, it is guaranteed that  $S_i = S_j$  for all  $i, j$ . For simplicity, we will assume that we never eat a stone with zero energy. Consider two energy stones  $i$  and  $j$  that will be eaten back-to-back. If  $L_i > L_j$  then we should eat  $i$  before  $j$ . This is because stone  $i$  loses energy faster than  $j$ , so taking it first will result in a smaller overall loss of energy.

Thus, no matter which set of energy stones are eaten, that set should be eaten in non-increasing value of  $L_i$ . So we should first sort the stones by  $L_i$  and then the only decision to be made is which stones should be eaten and which should not be eaten. This reduces the problem to a [0/1 Knapsack](#) problem. This can be solved with [dynamic programming](#).

Define  $\text{max\_energy}(\text{time}, i)$  as the maximum total energy that can be achieved given the current time and considering only the suffix of energy stones sorted in decreasing  $L_i$  from  $i$  to  $N$ . The recurrence relation for this function considers two cases. Either take the  $i$ -th energy stone (with its energy adjusted by the time), or do not take it. So,  $\text{max\_energy}(\text{time}, i)$  is the maximum of:

- $\text{max\_energy}(\text{time} + S_i, i+1) + \max(0, E_i - L_i \cdot \text{time})$
- $\text{max\_energy}(\text{time}, i+1)$

The maximum possible time is the sum of all  $S_i$  because an optimal strategy might eat all the stones and will not use any time waiting. Call this  $\text{sum}(S)$ . The time complexity of this approach can be described as  $O(N \times \text{sum}(S))$ . This is fast enough for both test sets. However, sorting energy stones by  $L_i$  is incorrect for Test set 2.

### Test set 2 (Hidden)

We will need to find a different way to order the energy stones to solve Test set 2. As before, consider two energy stones  $i$  and  $j$  assuming that we can take both  $i$  and  $j$  without either going to zero energy. We know that  $S_i$  might not equal  $S_j$ . However, there is an ordering for taking both  $i$  and  $j$  that is always optimal. Observe that  $S_i L_j$  is the total loss of energy if  $i$  is used first. Likewise,  $S_j L_i$  is the loss if  $j$  is used first. Thus, if  $S_i L_j < S_j L_i$  then taking  $i$  first leads to a smaller overall loss of energy. It may not be obvious that we should always take  $i$  before  $j$  even if it leads to a smaller loss of energy. This is because there may be other stones between  $i$  and  $j$  in some potential ordering. However, if  $i$  and  $j$  are adjacent in some ordering, then we will achieve more energy by swapping them if  $S_i L_j > S_j L_i$ . Applying this rule iteratively will eventually sort the stones. Therefore, this rule defines an ordering on our energy stones.

Formally, suppose for a contradiction, we have an optimal solution that eats  $X$  stones in the order  $P_1, P_2, \dots, P_X$ , where each stone gives Duda a positive amount of energy, but there exists an  $i$  such that  $S_{P_i} L_{P_{i+1}} > S_{P_{i+1}} L_{P_i}$ . If we swap the order we eat these two stones, we gain exactly  $S_{P_i} L_{P_{i+1}}$  more energy and lose at most  $S_{P_{i+1}} L_{P_i}$  (we may lose less than that, if the stone's energy drops to zero).

Since we assumed that  $S_{P_i} L_{P_{i+1}} > S_{P_{i+1}} L_{P_i}$ , this would increase the amount of energy Duda gains, which contradicts the assumption that this is an optimal solution.

Thus, we can use the dynamic programming solution from Test set 1 to solve Test set 2 with the same time complexity.

The reader may have noticed that this sort order is equivalent to comparing fractions; it is the same as sorting by  $S_i/L_i$ . However, one must be careful when  $L_i=0$ .