### **Amazon Interviewer:**

Hi Can, welcome back. We'll do a DSA problem framed in an Amazon fulfillment context. Please think aloud. Ready?

### Candidate (Excellent):

Ready. I'll summarize the problem after you present it, then ask clarifying questions and proceed.

# Interviewer — Problem Statement (Amazon context)

At an Amazon fulfillment center, a picker's handheld scanner records a sequence of scanned **SKU IDs** as they walk past bins. For a specific customer order, we also have a **requirement**: each SKU in the order and how many units are needed.

- You're given:
  - o scans: an array of SKU IDs (strings or integers) in the order they were scanned.
  - required: a dictionary sku -> quantity (all quantities ≥ 1).

**Task:** Find the **shortest contiguous segment** of scans that contains **at least** the required quantity for **every** SKU in required.

Return the segment as **zero-based indices** [start, end]. If no such segment exists, return [-1, -1].

### **Examples**

1.

```
scans = ["A", "D", "B", "C", "A", "B", "C", "A"]
required = {"A":2, "B":1, "C":1}
Output: [4, 7]
Why: The segment ["A", "B", "C", "A"] (indices 4...
```

**Why:** The segment ["A", "B", "C", "A"] (indices 4..7) contains A×2, B×1, C×1, and its length is 4. Earlier valid segment 0..4 (["A", "D", "B", "C", "A"]) has length 5, so [4,7] is shorter.

2.

```
scans = ["x","y","z"]
required = {"x":1, "y":1, "z":1}
Output: [0, 2] (the entire array)
```

3.

```
scans = ["p","q"]
required = {"p":1, "q":2}
Output: [-1, -1] (not enough q)
```

### **Constraints**

- $1 \le len(scans) \le 2 * 10^5$
- $1 \le len(required) \le 10^5$
- Each required[sku] ≥ 1
- IDs are hashable (string or int)

### **Candidate** — **Problem Summary**:

We're given a scan sequence and a multiset of required SKUs with counts. We need the **shortest contiguous subarray** that covers all required counts (≥ per SKU). If none exists, return [-1, -1]. Indices are zero-based. Constraints suggest we need around **O(n)** or **O(n log n)**; given the contiguity requirement, a **linear sliding window** sounds promising.

Did I capture this correctly?

### Interviewer:

Perfect.

## Candidate — Clarifying Questions:

- 1. If required is empty (no items needed), should I return a zero-length segment like [0, -1] or [-1, -1]?
- 2. If multiple shortest segments exist, any one is acceptable?
- 3. scans can contain SKUs not in required; these are allowed inside the segment, correct?

### Interviewer:

1. Treat required as non-empty for this interview (each quantity ≥ 1).

- 2. Yes, any shortest segment is fine.
- 3. Correct—extra SKUs may appear; they don't invalidate the window.

# **Candidate** — Approach Exploration

## Brute force (reject):

Enumerate all subarrays and check coverage  $\rightarrow 0 (n^2)$  windows and each check involves counting  $\rightarrow$  too slow for 2e5.

### Chosen Pattern (used because it fits and optimizes):

**Pattern #1 — Sliding Window** with two pointers and frequency maps.

## Why it fits:

We're looking for a **shortest contiguous** segment that satisfies a **per-window constraint** ("window coverage ≥ required counts"). Sliding window lets us expand to reach feasibility, then **shrink greedily** to minimal length.

# How it works (with the example integrated):

## Example 1

```
scans = ["A","D","B","C","A","B","C","A"]
required = {"A":2, "B":1, "C":1}
```

#### Initialize state

- left\_index = 0
- best\_start\_index = -1, best\_end\_index = -1, best\_window\_length = +∞
- required\_counts = {"A":2,"B":1,"C":1}
- required\_types = 3 (distinct required SKUs)
- window\_counts = {} (all 0)
- satisfied\_types = 0

### Expand right\_index from 0 to end:

```
1. right=0 \to "A" window_counts["A"]=1 (<2) \to satisfied_types=0 \to not feasible.
```

```
2. right=1 \rightarrow "D"
    Not required \rightarrow ignore for satisfaction \rightarrow not feasible.
3. right=2 \rightarrow "B"
    window_counts["B"]=1 meets B\times1 \rightarrow satisfied_types=1 \rightarrow not feasible yet.
4. right=3 \rightarrow "C"
    window_counts["C"]=1 meets C\times 1 \rightarrow \text{satisfied\_types}=2 \rightarrow \text{not feasible yet} (A needs 2).
5. right=4 \rightarrow "A"
    window_counts["A"]=2 meets A\times2 \rightarrow satisfied_types=3 (= required_types) \rightarrow feasible
    window [0..4].
    Shrink from left to minimize:
        ○ left=0 is "A" \rightarrow dropping would make A 2\rightarrow1 (<2) \Rightarrow stop shrinking.
             Record best: [0,4] (length 5).
6. right=5 \rightarrow "B"
        o window_counts["B"]=2
             Still feasible. Try shrinking:
        ○ left=0 is "A" \rightarrow A would become 2\rightarrow1 \Rightarrow break feasibility \Rightarrow stop.
             Best remains [0, 4].
7. right=6 \rightarrow "C"
        o window_counts["C"]=2
             Still feasible. Try shrinking:
        ○ left=0 "A" \rightarrow would break \Rightarrow stop.
             Best unchanged.
8. right=7 \rightarrow "A"
    window_counts["A"]=3. Shrink aggressively while staying feasible:
        ○ Drop left=0 "A": A 3\rightarrow 2 (still \geq 2) \Rightarrow feasible \rightarrow left=1
        ○ Drop left=1 "D": not required \Rightarrow feasible \rightarrow left=2
        o Drop left=2 "B": B 2→1 (still ≥1) \Rightarrow feasible \rightarrow left=3

    Drop left=3 "C": C 2→1 (still ≥1) ⇒ feasible → left=4

        ○ Next would be dropping left=4 "A": A 2\rightarrow 1 (<2) \Rightarrow stop.
             Now the minimal feasible window ending at right=7 is [4,7] (length 4).
```

```
Update best to [4,7].
```

Final answer: [4,7].

Key idea: expand right to become feasible, then move left to trim extraneous items while keeping the window feasible, updating the best answer whenever we're feasible.

# Candidate — Pseudocode

```
required_counts = frequency map from required (sku -> needed_count)
need_kinds = number of keys in required_counts
window_counts = empty map (sku -> count in window)
covered_kinds = 0
left
                = 0
best_start, best_end, best_length = -1, -1, +inf
for right in range(len(scans)):
    sku = scans[right]
    add sku to window_counts
    if sku in required and window_counts[sku] just reached required_counts[sku]:
        covered kinds += 1
   while covered kinds == need kinds:
        # Feasible: try to shrink from the left
        if right - left + 1 < best_length:</pre>
            best_length = right - left + 1
            best_start, best_end = left, right
        left_sku = scans[left]
        remove left_sku from window_counts
        if left_sku in required and window_counts[left_sku] just dropped below
required_counts[left_sku]:
            covered_kinds -= 1
        left += 1
return [best_start, best_end]
```

**Pattern Callout:** Using **Sliding Window (#1)** because we need a shortest **contiguous** segment satisfying per-window frequency constraints.

#### Interviewer:

Looks good. Please implement with meaningful variable names and explanatory comments.

# Candidate — Code (Python, descriptive names + comments)

```
from collections import Counter
from math import inf
from typing import List, Dict, Tuple, Hashable
def shortest_cover_segment(scans: List[Hashable], required: Dict[Hashable, int])
-> List[int]:
    Find the shortest [start, end] segment of `scans` that covers all required
SKUs with
    at least the specified counts. Return [-1, -1] if not possible.
    Sliding Window (expand right, shrink left) with frequency maps.
   Time: O(n) average, each index enters/leaves the window at most once.
    Space: O(U) where U is number of distinct SKUs seen in the window.
    if not scans or not required:
        # Per interview, required is non-empty; returning [-1,-1] for safety if
empty.
        return [-1, -1]
    required_counts: Dict[Hashable, int] = dict(required)
    needed_kinds: int = len(required_counts)
    window_counts: Counter = Counter()
    covered_kinds: int = 0
    best_start: int = -1
    best_end: int = -1
    best_length: int = float('inf')
    left: int = 0
    for right, sku in enumerate(scans):
        # include current sku in the window
```

```
window_counts[sku] += 1
        # If this sku is required and we just satisfied its required count,
increment covered_kinds
        if sku in required_counts and window_counts[sku] == required_counts[sku]:
            covered_kinds += 1
        # If all required kinds are covered, try to shrink from the left to get a
minimal window
        while covered_kinds == needed_kinds and left <= right:</pre>
            current_window_length = right - left + 1
            if current_window_length < best_length:</pre>
                best_length = current_window_length
                best_start = left
                best_end = right
            left_sku = scans[left]
            window_counts[left_sku] -= 1
            # If left_sku is required and we just fell below its needed count, we
lose coverage
            if left_sku in required_counts and window_counts[left_sku] <</pre>
required_counts[left_sku]:
                covered kinds -= 1
            # Move left pointer forward to continue shrinking
            left += 1
    return [best_start, best_end]
```

### Interviewer:

Great. Let's dry-run the primary example and then run a quick test harness.

# **Candidate** — Dry Run (Example 1)

```
scans = ["A","D","B","C","A","B","C","A"]
required = {"A":2, "B":1, "C":1}
```

Expand until right=4 (second "A"): now A×2, B×1, C×1 → feasible at [0..4] (length 5).

- Shrink fails immediately because dropping the left "A" breaks A×2. Best is [0, 4].
- Continue expanding to the end; each time we regain plenty of A's, shrinking removes non-required "D" and older items.
- Final minimal window discovered: [4,7] of length 4 (["A", "B", "C", "A"]).

**Result:** [4, 7].

# Candidate — Tests (expected outputs in comments)

```
def _tests():
    print(shortest_cover_segment(
        ["A", "D", "B", "C", "A", "B", "C", "A"],
        {"A":2, "B":1, "C":1})) # [4, 7]
    print(shortest_cover_segment(
        ["x", "y", "z"],
        {"x":1, "y":1, "z":1})) # [0, 2]
    print(shortest_cover_segment(
        ["p", "q"],
        {"p":1, "q":2})) # [-1, -1]
    print(shortest_cover_segment(
        ["a", "b", "a", "b", "c"],
        {"a":1, "c":1})) # [2, 4] or [0,4], shortest is [2,4]
    print(shortest_cover_segment(
        ["a", "a", "b", "b", "c", "c"],
        {"a":2, "b":2, "c":2})) # [0, 5] (entire array)
# _tests()
```

### Interviewer:

Explain your time and space complexity with reasoning, not just big-O symbols.

### Candidate — Complexity (with reasoning)

### Time Complexity:

The right pointer advances from 0 to n-1 (n steps). The left pointer only moves forward and never resets—each index is removed from the window at most once. The inner while loop therefore advances left at most n total times across the run. All map updates and comparisons are O(1) average (hash map).

**Total:** ~**O**(n) average time.

### Space Complexity:

required\_counts holds at most the number of distinct required SKUs; window\_counts holds at most the number of distinct SKUs present in the current window. In the worst case, this is O(U), where  $U \le n$ .

**Total extra space: O(U)** (commonly summarized as **O(n)** in the worst case, but practically bounded by the unique SKUs).

## Interviewer (targeted follow-ups):

- 1. What if some required counts are larger than the total occurrences in scans?
- 2. How do you ensure we always return the **shortest** feasible window?
- 3. If we also needed the **count** of shortest windows (how many distinct minimal segments), how might you extend this?

### Candidate:

- The algorithm will simply never reach covered\_kinds == needed\_kinds, so best\_start stays
   and we return [-1, -1].
- 2. We update the best answer **only** when the window is **currently feasible**, and then we **shrink greedily** from the left as far as possible before expanding again. That produces the minimal window for each right, and we track the global minimum over time.
- 3. To count minimal segments: when we shrink a feasible window, if the new window length equals the best length, increment a counter; if the new window is shorter, reset the counter to 1 and update the best. Be careful to distinguish equal-length windows starting at different positions.

### Interviewer — Wrap-up:

Excellent session. You led with a clear summary, asked precise clarifications, chose **Sliding Window (Pattern #1)** because it truly fit, articulated the feasibility/shrinking invariant, wrote clean code with meaningful variable names and comments, and provided dry runs, tests, and well-reasoned complexity. This meets Amazon's bar.

# Ratings

• Coding: 4/4

• Problem Solving: 4/4

• Communication: 4/4