



FIND MEMBERS BY USERNAME OR SKILL



survival07

EDIT

DASHBOARD

MY PROFILE

PAYMENTS

SETTINGS

LOG OUT

COMPETE

DESIGN CHALLENGES

DEVELOPMENT CHALLENGES

DATA SCIENCE CHALLENGES

COMPETITIVE PROGRAMMING

LEARN

GET STARTED

DESIGN

DEVELOPMENT

DATA SCIENCE

COMPETITIVE PROGRAMMING

COMMUNITY

OVERVIEW

TCO

PROGRAMS

FORUMS

STATISTICS

READ ONLY. You are currently reading our old forums. [Click here to participate in our brand new forums! >>](#)

Forums

Select a Forum ▼



[Search](#) | [Watch Thread](#) | [My Post History](#) | [My Watches](#) | [User Settings](#)

View: Flat ([newest first](#)) | [Threaded](#) | [Tree](#)
[Previous Thread](#) | [Next Thread](#)
[\[1 2 \]](#) [NEXT >](#)

[Forums](#) [Development Forums](#) [Marathon Match 124 v1.0](#) [Marathon Match 124](#)
[Chambers generation](#)

Chambers generation | Feedback: (+5/-1) | [\[+\]](#) [\[-\]](#) | [Reply](#)

Mon, Mar 8, 2021 at 10:34 AM BDT

mengue
9 posts

Hi,

I think that no one person must read the generation program to obtain important information about the challenge... the rules should be enough do to the job...

My concern is about the following lines in the Chambers generation program:

```
protected void generate() {  
...  
nextChamber[0] = 0;
```

If you know about that, it appears to me to indicate a nice tip about the start of problem and may be indicate a good way to create a good logic...

To avoid this tip, may be better to change the line to:

```
nextChamber[0] = randomInt(0, maxChambers - 1);
```

What do you think about? Or I am wrong ?

Best regards,

Mengue

Re: Chambers generation (response to [post](#) by [mengue](#)) | Feedback: (+2/-0) | [\[+\]](#) [\[-\]](#) | [Reply](#)

Mon, Mar 8, 2021 at 10:03 PM BDT

ccplus
45 posts

Thanks for a tip about looking at generation code. The code answered the many questions that the problem statement left me with. For example, I wasn't sure that the paths are given in a sorted order. So yeah, from reading the code it's clear that if we go from first point to any other adjacent one, the first path from there is the way back.

Re: Chambers generation (response to [post](#) by **ccplus**) | Feedback: (+2/-0) | [\[+\]](#) [\[-\]](#) | [Reply](#)

[1 edit](#) | Mon, Mar 8, 2021 at 10:21 PM BDT

mengue
9 posts

Yes ccplus!

Exactly that!

But challenger creators should clarify if they will maintain in this way, or change it... (@KaasanErinn, @dimkadimon @kphmd and @JacoCronje).

If keep it => should inform this kind of start of generation to everyone.

If change it => should inform this change on generation to everyone.

Best reagards,

Mengue

Re: Chambers generation (response to [post](#) by **mengue**) | Feedback: (+2/-0) | [\[+\]](#) [\[-\]](#) | [Reply](#)

Mon, Mar 8, 2021 at 10:30 PM BDT

KaasanErinn
31 posts

So, we definitely will not be changing the generation algorithm.

Good catch on the detail, though. Now that it has been posted here, it's free game for anyone that didn't already notice it.

Re: Chambers generation (response to [post](#) by **KaasanErinn**) | Feedback: (+3/-0) | [\[+\]](#) [\[-\]](#) | [Reply](#)

Mon, Mar 8, 2021 at 10:44 PM BDT

ccplus
45 posts

KaasanErinn, but, please, do clarify that in the problem statement, as it's likely that not all of the contestants are going to know this otherwise. And order of paths is the very basic question probably almost everyone gets left with after reading problem statement.

Re: Chambers generation (response to [post](#) by **mengue**) | Feedback: (+2/-0) | [\[+\]](#) [\[-\]](#) | [Reply](#)

Tue, Mar 9, 2021 at 6:02 AM BDT

tuff
37 posts

It was my understanding that posting "tips" or other information that might help people solve the problem better is frowned upon and this conversation should have been via private email. Is that correct?

Re: Chambers generation (response to [post](#) by **tuff**) | Feedback: (+1/-1) | [\[+\]](#) [\[-\]](#) | [Reply](#)

Tue, Mar 9, 2021 at 6:18 AM BDT

KaasanErinn

That would have been better, yes. However, since it's publicly posted, I'm going to leave it for anyone to see.

31 posts

Re: Chambers generation (response to [post](#) by [tuff](#)) | Feedback: (+2/-3) | [\[+\]](#) [\[-\]](#) | [Reply](#)

Tue, Mar 9, 2021 at 8:21 AM BDT

[mengue](#)
9 posts

Hi @tuff,

The problem is that "tip" MUST be public (in my opinion), because problem rules do not talk about that kind of generation... the problem says that you are lost... but (due that) not too lost...

Best regards,

Mengue

Re: Chambers generation (response to [post](#) by [mengue](#)) | Feedback: (+1/-1) | [\[+\]](#) [\[-\]](#) | [Reply](#)


Tue, Mar 9, 2021 at 10:33 AM BDT

[ccplus](#)
45 posts

This is not about sharing a solution, but sharing a problem statement.

Re: Chambers generation (response to [post](#) by [mengue](#)) | Feedback: (+1/-1) | [\[+\]](#) [\[-\]](#) | [Reply](#)

Tue, Mar 9, 2021 at 12:30 PM BDT


[jdmetz](#)
2338 posts

I haven't competed much recently, but 10 years ago when I was competing more actively, I'm pretty sure your post would have been removed and you would have received a warning at least and potentially been banned from competition for sharing this.

I agree the problem statement should clearly explain the problem construction. If it doesn't, the better way to handle it is to discuss with admins / problem setters privately and encourage them to share any details you think are missing rather than pointing them out yourself.

Re: Chambers generation (response to [post](#) by [jdmetz](#)) | Feedback: (+2/-1) | [\[+\]](#) [\[-\]](#) | [Reply](#)

[1 edit](#) | Tue, Mar 9, 2021 at 1:17 PM BDT

[ccplus](#)
45 posts

Well, I asked about the logic behind path numbering around the same time and was ignored, so mengue is my hero for pointing out that the holes in problem statement are answered inside accessible test generation source code.

Re: Chambers generation (response to [post](#) by [jdmetz](#)) | Feedback: (+2/-0) | [\[+\]](#) [\[-\]](#) | [Reply](#)

Tue, Mar 9, 2021 at 1:23 PM BDT

[ccplus](#)
45 posts

The fact that important information about the problem is hidden inside authors code that is accessible is not something that lands equal chance of winning based on skill to both "TopCoder insiders" and "first timers". The chance that a relative newcomer will check out that source code is slim to none. I didn't expect that this was possible.

Re: Chambers generation (response to [post](#) by [ccplus](#)) | Feedback: (+0/-1) | [\[+\]](#) [\[-\]](#) | [Reply](#)

Wed, Mar 10, 2021 at 12:53 PM BDT

[kishore_g84](#)
26 posts

I don't think it is hidden. I have seen this statement in all problems where the visualizer code is present.
"You can also check its source code for an exact implementation of test case generation and score calculation"

Re: Chambers generation (response to [post](#) by [kishore_g84](#)) | Feedback: (+1/-0) | [\[+\]](#) [\[-\]](#) | [Reply](#)

Wed, Mar 10, 2021 at 2:35 PM BDT

[ccplus](#)
45 posts

Yes, you're proving my point here. With >100 marathons under your belt this is straightforward to you.

Re: Chambers generation (response to [post](#) by [kishore_g84](#)) | Feedback: (+3/-0) | [\[+\]](#) [\[-\]](#) | [Reply](#)

Fri, Mar 12, 2021 at 2:41 AM BDT

[tuff](#)
37 posts

Asking all the competitors to reverse engineer an undocumented, uncommented, possibly subject to modification Java program (when they are likely not even competing using Java) before they can fully understand what should have been in the problem statement is really lazy.

Apparently, this has been a policy for some time. It should stop. The problem statement should be complete.

Also putting some useful comments in the tester wouldn't hurt.

[Forums](#) [Development Forums](#) [Marathon Match 124 v1.0](#) [Marathon Match 124](#) [Chambers generation](#)
[Previous Thread](#) | [Next Thread](#)

[1 2] [NEXT >](#)

OTHERS

SITEMAP

ABOUT US

CONTACT US

HELP CENTER

PRIVACY POLICY

TERMS

topcoder is also on

