**Notes**

* Make sure you write a “return” statement in the algorithm section.
* If you invoke known algorithms like Binary Search / etc that require the input to be in a certain state to get a certain result from it… then state that.
* Even if you don’t necessarily invoke a known algorithm from lectures, you still may need to justify why the input **could** fit a known algorithm. I’m not honestly sure why we need to do this if the proof confirmed that the algorithm created for the question works… but you still do. I’m a little lost on this one still and hence can’t give more guidance but hopefully somebody in the future can decipher my regrade request below better and avoid the same pitfall.[[1]](#footnote-1)
  + My re-grade request comment: There were 2 points lost as I did not explain why [state of the input was needed for some algo from lecture]. I do not believe that was needed as no results from [some algo] were used. In fact, if you remove the mentions of [some algo] from my paper, the proof of justification (and the other sections) still holds……
  + TA’s regrade request feedback: This correctness does explain why the algorithm works for different cases and [some properties] with some mathematical logic. But we still expect you to tie the choice of algorithm to the nature of the input. In this problem, we expected students to tie the [state of the input] as to why [some algo] was used and why [some properties] in the input ensures the…

1. Proof DC-1-Fall24 [↑](#footnote-ref-1)