

1) Algorithm find_flawed_fuse(fuses)

Input: 'working' or 'broken'

Output: index of the broken fuse

```
for i in range(0, len(fuses)):
    if fuses[i] == 'broken':
        return i
return -1 # if no broken fuse is found
```

⇒ We start from the first fuse (index 0) and check each fuse one by one. If we find a fuse that is 'broken', we return its index. If no broken fuse is found after checking all fuses, we return -1.

⇒ The time complexity of this algorithm is $O(n)$, where n is the # of fuses. This is because in the worst-case scenario, we have to check all the fuses, which requires n operations. Therefore, the time complexity is linear with respect to the size of the input. This algorithm is the decrease and conquer approach as it reduces the problem size by a constant (1) at each step by checking one fuse at a time.

2) Algorithm find_Brightest_Pixel(image)

Input: a 2D grid of pixels

Output: coordinates of the brightest pixel

```
for i in range(1, len(image)-1):
    for j in range(1, len(image[i])-1):
        if (image[i][j] > image[i-1][j] and # top neighbor
            image[i][j] > image[i+1][j] and # bottom neighbor
            image[i][j] > image[i][j-1] and # left neighbor
            image[i][j] > image[i][j+1]): # right neighbor
            return (i, j)
return (-1, -1) # default, cannot find
```

⇒ We start from the top left corner of the image (index (1,1)) and check each pixel one by one. If we find a pixel that is brighter than all of its four immediate neighbours, we return its coordinates. If no such pixel is found after checking all pixels, we return (-1, -1).

⇒ The time complexity of this algorithm is $O(nm)$, where n is the # of rows and m is the # of columns in the image. This is because in the worst case scenario, we have to check all the pixels, which requires nm operations. Therefore, the time complexity is linear with respect to the size of the input. This algorithm follows the decrease and conquer approach as it reduces the problem size by a constant (1) at each step by checking one pixel at a time.

3) Algorithm find-Max-Area (image)

Input: $f(x)$ over the interval $[0, n]$
Output: Interval for maximal total area
max-area = 0
start = 0
end = 0
for i in range(0, len(f) - 1):
 area = 0
 for j in range(i+1, len(f)):
 area += $f[j]$
 if area > max-area:
 max-area = area
 start = i
 end = j
return (start, end)

⇒ We start from the first point (index 0) and check each interval one by one. If we find an interval that produces a larger total area than the current maximal total area, we update the maximal total area and the corresponding interval. If no such interval is found after checking all intervals, we return the interval that produces the maximal total area.

⇒ The time complexity of this algorithm is $O(n^2)$, where n is the # of points in the interval $[0, n]$. This is because in the worst case scenario, we have to check all possible intervals, which requires $n(n-1)/2$ operations.

4) Algorithm min-latency-path (graph, source, destination)

min-latency = infinity
min-path = []
visited = set()
function DFS(node, path, latency):
 if node == destination:
 if latency < min-latency:
 min-latency = latency
 min-path = path
 return
 visited.add(node)
 for neighbor in graph[node]:
 if neighbor not in visited:
 DFS(neighbor, path + [neighbor], latency + graph[node][neighbor])
 visited.remove(node)
DFS(source, [source], 0)
return min-path

⇒ We start from the source node and use DFS to explore all possible paths to the destination node. For each path, we calculate the total latency and update the min latency and the corresponding path if the total latency of the current path is less than the min latency. After exploring all paths, we return the path with the min latency.

⇒ The time complexity of this algorithm is $O(n!)$, where n is the # of nodes in the graph. This is because in the worst case scenario, we have to explore all possible paths, which requires $n!$ operations.

5) Algorithm $\text{max_min_resources}(\text{tasks})$

if $\text{len}(\text{tasks}) == 1$:

return $\text{tasks}[0], \text{tasks}[0]$

$\text{mid} = \text{len}(\text{tasks}) // 2$

$\text{left_max}, \text{left_min} = \text{max_min_resources}(\text{tasks}[:\text{mid}])$

$\text{right_max}, \text{right_min} = \text{max_min_resources}(\text{tasks}[\text{mid}:])$

$\text{max_task} = \text{left_max}$ if $\text{left_max}[1] > \text{right_max}[1]$ else right_max

$\text{min_task} = \text{left_min}$ if $\text{left_min}[1] < \text{right_min}[1]$ else right_min

return $\text{max_task}, \text{min_task}$

=> We start with the list of all tasks and divide it into two halves. We recursively apply the same process to each half until we reach the base case where the list contains only one task. Then, we compare the resource demands of the tasks in each half to find the tasks demanding the max and min resources.

=> The time complexity of this algorithm is $O(n \log n)$, where n is the # of tasks. This is because in each recursive call, we divide the list of tasks into two halves, which results in a logarithmic number of levels, and at each level, we perform a linear # of operations to compare the resource demands of the tasks.