

## Problem 1. Two Sum

Given an array of integers `nums` and an integer `target`, return *indices of the two numbers such that they add up to `target`*. You may assume that each input would have exactly one solution, and you may not use the same element twice. You can return the answer in any order.

### Example 1:

```
Input: nums = [2,7,11,15], target = 9
Output: [0,1]
Explanation: Because nums[0] + nums[1] == 9, we return [0, 1].
```

### Example 2:

```
Input: nums = [3,2,4], target = 6
Output: [1,2]
```

### Example 3:

```
Input: nums = [3,3], target = 6
Output: [0,1]
```

### Constraints:

- $2 \leq \text{nums.length} \leq 10^4$
- $-10^9 \leq \text{nums}[i] \leq 10^9$
- $-10^9 \leq \text{target} \leq 10^9$
- Only one valid answer exists.

### Follow-up:

Can you come up with an algorithm that is less than  $O(n^2)$  time complexity?

## Solution(s)

### Solution 1: Brute Force

The brute force approach here is an  $O(n^2)$  algorithm using nested **for** loops.

**Data:** A sequence  $(a_i)_{i \in [0, n)}$  of  $n$  integers

**Data:** An integer  $N$

**Result:** The unique unordered pair  $\{j, k\}$  of the indices  $j, k \in [0, n)$  of the two numbers from  $(a_i)_{i \in [0, n)}$  s.t.  $a_j + a_k = N$

```
for  $j \in [0, n)$  do
  for  $k \in (j, n)$  do
    if  $a_j + a_k = N$  then
      return  $\{j, k\}$ 
    end
  end
end
```

The worst case scenario for this algorithm is when the numbers are the last two in the array, in which case the total number of iterations is

$$(n-1) + (n-2) + \cdots + 2 + 1 = \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} i = \frac{n(n-1)}{2} - n = \frac{1}{2}n^2 - \frac{3}{2}n.$$

Therefore, the algorithm has, as stated above,  $O(n^2)$  time complexity.

The major benefit of this algorithm is that it is very easy to understand and to implement. A second benefit is that it has  $O(1)$  space complexity.

### Solution 2

A more efficient approach is as follows:

**Data:** A sequence  $(a_i)_{i \in [0, n)}$  of  $n$  integers

**Data:** An integer  $N$

**Result:** The unique unordered pair  $\{j, k\}$  of the indices  $j, k \in [0, n)$ ,  $j \neq k$ , of the two numbers from  $(a_i)_{i \in [0, n)}$  s.t.  $a_j + a_k = N$

```
 $X \leftarrow \emptyset;$ 
for  $i \in [0, n)$  do
   $x \leftarrow N - a_i;$ 
  if  $x \in \pi_1(X)$  then
    return  $\{\pi_2 \circ \pi_1^{-1}(x), i\}$ 
  else
     $X \leftarrow X \cup \{(a_i, i)\};$ 
  end
end
```

The idea behind the set  $X$  is to keep track of the elements of  $(a_i)_{i \in [0, n)}$  that have been “visited” during the iteration process. At the end of the  $k^{\text{th}}$  iteration,  $k \in [0, n)$ , the elements of  $X$  are just the ordered pairs  $(a_0, 0), (a_1, 1), \dots, (a_k, k)$  of the elements  $a_0, a_1, \dots, a_k \in (a_i)_{i \in [0, n)}$  and their associated indices. The functions  $\pi_\alpha$  are the projection functions on  $X$  which map each  $(a_k, k)$  to the  $\alpha^{\text{th}}$  coordinate:

$$\begin{aligned}\pi_1 &: (x, i_x) \mapsto x \\ \pi_2 &: (x, i_x) \mapsto i_x.\end{aligned}$$

There is a bit of a technical issue with the notion of the inverse  $\pi_1^{-1}$  of the first projection function  $\pi_1$  in that it's possible for there to exist  $j, k \in [0, n)$ ,  $j \neq k$ , that satisfy  $a_j = a_k$ . This would mean that, if  $x = a_j = a_k$ ,  $\pi_1^{-1}$  would map  $x$  to both  $j$  and  $k$ , violating the definition of a function. However, the constraint that there is only one valid answer ensures that if an  $x$  exists that satisfies  $x = N - a_i$  for some  $i \in [0, n)$ , it is unique. A restriction on the range of  $\pi_1$  could be made to make the definition rigorous, however just allowing the abuse of notation with the above understanding seems like the simpler and clearer choice here.

At the  $k^{\text{th}}$  iteration, the idea is to search  $X$  for a the pair  $(x, i_x) \in X$  that satisfies  $x + a_k = N$ , or, equivalently,  $x = N - a_k$ . If no such  $x$  exists, the set  $X$  gets expanded by adding  $(a_k, k)$ , which in essence marks  $a_k$  as having been “visited”. The worst case scenario for this algorithm is when  $N - a_{n-1}$  gives the first match, in which case  $n$  iterations are required. If the search operation can be performed in  $O(1)$  time, the time complexity of this algorithm is therefore  $O(n)$ . Also in this worst case, the set  $x$  will contain  $n - 1$  elements, so the space complexity is  $O(n)$ .

## References

- [1] <https://leetcode.com/problems/two-sum/>
- [2] <https://www.code-recipe.com/post/two-sum>