

## ⅈ Relative Ranks – Full Documentation

### Table of Contents

1. [Problem Statement](#)
2. [Intuition](#)
3. [Key Observations](#)
4. [Approach](#)
5. [Edge Cases](#)
6. [Complexity Analysis](#)
  - Time Complexity
  - Space Complexity
7. [Alternative Approaches](#)
8. [Test Cases](#)
9. [Final Thoughts](#)

### 1. 🚩 Problem Statement

You're given an array `score` of size `n`, where `score[i]` is the score of the `i`-th athlete in a competition. All scores are unique.

- Rank athletes based on their scores:
  - 1st: "Gold Medal"
  - 2nd: "Silver Medal"
  - 3rd: "Bronze Medal"
  - 4th to `n`th: rank as string of placement number (e.g., "4", "5", ...)

Return an array `answer` where `answer[i]` is the rank of the `i`-th athlete.

## 2. 💡 Intuition

We need to rank athletes based on performance but maintain their original order in the result. A common pattern for such problems is:

- Store original indices.
- Sort by value.
- Assign rankings and map them back to the original indices.

## 3. 🔍 Key Observations

- Sorting scores gives us the order of ranks.
- Mapping scores to their original index helps us retain the input order in the output.
- Only the top 3 ranks have custom labels; the rest are numeric.

## 4. ⚙️ Approach

- Pair scores with indices using `enumerate(score)`.
- Sort the list in descending order of scores.
- Initialize a result array with empty strings of the same size.
- Assign ranks:
  - Index 0: "Gold Medal"
  - Index 1: "Silver Medal"
  - Index 2: "Bronze Medal"
  - Others: string of (rank index + 1)
- Return the result list.

## 5. ⚠️ Edge Cases

- Minimum input size:  $n = 1 \rightarrow$  Should return `["Gold Medal"]`.
- Large scores or input size ( $n = 10^4$ )  $\rightarrow$  Ensure efficient sorting.
- No duplicates  $\rightarrow$  No need to handle tie-breaking.

## 6. □ Complexity Analysis

### Time Complexity

- $O(n \log n)$  for sorting the scores.
- $O(n)$  for assigning ranks.
- ✓ Overall:  $O(n \log n)$

### Space Complexity

- $O(n)$  for storing result and sorted score-index pairs.

## 7. ⚡ Alternative Approaches

- Using a max heap (priority queue):
  - Store negative of scores to simulate max-heap.
  - More complex and less efficient in Python than sorting.
- Counting sort: Not efficient here due to large score range (0 to  $10^6$ ) with only  $n$  elements.

## 8. □ Test Cases

### ✓ Test Case 1

Input: [5, 4, 3, 2, 1]

Output: ["Gold Medal", "Silver Medal", "Bronze Medal", "4", "5"]

### ✓ Test Case 2

Input: [10, 3, 8, 9, 4]

Output: ["Gold Medal", "5", "Bronze Medal", "Silver Medal", "4"]

### ✓ Test Case 3 – Minimum Size

Input: [99]

Output: ["Gold Medal"]

## ✓ Test Case 4 – Large Values

Input: [1000000, 999999, 888888]

Output: ["Gold Medal", "Silver Medal", "Bronze Medal"]

## 9. 🏁 Final Thoughts

- This problem is a classic sorting with index tracking task.
- Efficient and clean solution using `enumerate()` and sorting.
- Ideal for beginners to understand how to retain the original order while ranking or transforming elements.