

---

## Problem Tutorial: “The queue”

*Subtask 1.*  $N \leq 20$ ,  $w \leq 1000$  — 10 points.

To solve this subtask you just need code exactly what the problem is asking for.

*Subtask 2.*  $N \leq 10000$  — 40 points

You need to optimize the solution of the first subtask to  $O(N^2)$  to solve this subtask.

*Subtask 3.*  $N \leq 500000$  — 50 points

You need to optimize that solution even more using some data structure. In fact, this problem is very similar to the well-known problem with 2 types of query (if you imagine that you have a very big array) :

1. update the value of  $x_{th}$  element to  $y$
2. output the sum of the prefix of the array

You can literally use almost any data structure to solve it. For instance, the author used Fenwick Tree.

## Problem Tutorial: “Apples”

*Subtask 1/2* — 25 points.

These subtasks can be solved using some simple formulas. If you try to simulate for both when  $N = 2$  and when  $N = 3$  manually, you can come up with really formula solution.

*Subtask 3/4* — 75 points

The main difference between subtask 3 and 4 is the value of  $A_1$ . The subtask 3 is designed for people who found the correct solution, but couldn't multiply two long numbers.

Let's try simulate starting from the end when  $N = 3$ :

$$\frac{1}{1} * x, \frac{1}{1} * x, \frac{1}{1} * x$$

$$\frac{1}{2} * x, \frac{1}{2} * x, \frac{4}{2} * x$$

$$\frac{1}{4} * x, \frac{7}{4} * x, \frac{4}{4} * x$$

$$\frac{13}{8} * x, \frac{7}{8} * x, \frac{4}{8} * x$$

$\frac{13}{8} * x = A_1$  and by finding  $x$  you can find all initial values of an array. I hope you noticed a pattern, if not let's try to analyze what's going on: we are iterating from  $N$  to 1, and let  $i$  be the number of iterator. We divide every coefficient except  $i$  by 2. And we replace the coefficient of  $i$  by the new sum of coefficients. You can find out by yourself why it's true.

Because there will be at most  $N = 50$  iterations, denominator will be no more than  $2^{50}$ . You need to be careful when finding  $x$ , cause the multiplication might not fit in the limits of long long. Also don't forget the case when there's no answer.

## Problem Tutorial: “Sappers”

Let's divide our table in half at first. First  $m/2$  columns belong to the  $1_{st}$  sapper and last  $m/2$  columns belong to the  $2_{nd}$  sapper. For the sake of convenience, let the  $n = 3$  and  $m = 4$ , and the number of mines in the first or second half is  $cnt_1$  or  $cnt_2$ , and the overall number of mines is  $k$ . Now we'll prove that it's always possible to achieve the best answer, 0 or 1 when  $k$  is even or odd, unless  $n = 1$  (corner case). Let's analyze what happens if we add cells for each component one by one:

1122	1112	1111	1111	1111	2111	2211
1122	1122	1122	1212	2211	2211	2211
1122	1222	2222	2222	2222	2221	2211

---

At first, the numbers of mines in each part are  $cnt_1$  and  $cnt_2$  respectively. But at the end, the numbers became  $cnt_2$  and  $cnt_1$  respectively. Because each time we either increasing or decreasing the number of mines in each component at most by 1, there will be a moment when the difference is minimum (when difference is at most 1 depending on the parity of  $k$ ).

Note that, when we'll be adding the last row to the  $1_{st}$  component, we'll start adding it starting from the end. Otherwise the component might become not connected. And don't forget the case when  $n$  is 1. For example:

```
1 6
* * *...
```

In this case, the best achievable answer would be 3.

## Problem Tutorial: “Beautiful subsequence”

*Subtask 1* — 9 points.

This subtask can be solved with the brute-force solution: by checking all possible  $2^n$  subsequences of sequence  $a$ .

*Subtask 2* — 9 points.

Check the solution for the third subtask, which is  $O(\min(n, m)^2 * \max(n, m))$ . Or you can solve it by checking all possible  $2^m$  subsequences of sequence  $b$ .

*Subtask 3* — 28 points.

Unlike previous subtasks, in this subtask you need to come up with a much more efficient solution. For now, let's forget the memory limit for this problem, I'll explain how we can reduce our memory usage after. :)

Let's solve it using *dynamic programming*.

$maxLen_{j,i,tp}$ , where  $1 \leq j \leq m, 1 \leq i \leq n, 0 \leq tp \leq 1$ , is equal to the maximum possible length of a *beautiful* sequence which is a subsequence of arrays  $a_1, a_2, \dots, a_i$  and  $b_1, b_2, \dots, b_j$ . The length is odd if  $tp = 1$  or even if  $tp = 0$ . And the last element of a beautiful sequence is equal to  $a_i$ .

$f_{j,i,tp}$ , with same parameters, is equal to the number of distinct *beautiful* sequences of maximum length.

Look at the pseudo code below:

```
for j = 1..m {
    for i = 1..n {
        for tp = 0..1 {
            maxLen[j][i][tp] = maxLen[j - 1][i][tp]
            f[j][i][tp] = f[j - 1][i][tp]
        }
        if b[j] = a[i] {
            good = {0}
            update your dp by checking for the sequence with length 1
            for last = i-1..1 {
                if good[a[last]] = 0 {
                    update your dp from last
                    good[a[last]] = 1
                }
            }
        }
    }
}
```

---

```
    }  
}
```

I hope the code above is clear enough. Using an array *good*[*x*] is a key idea of calculating number of only different sequences.

*Subtask 4* — 54 points.

To solve for full points we need to get rid of the last *for*. We can get rid of it by keeping the maximum lengths of odd/even *beautiful* sequences (with keeping number of different sequences, also).

```
int mx0 = 0, cnt0 = 1  
int mx1 = -inf, cnt1 = 0  
for j = 1..m {  
    for i = 1..n {  
        for tp = 0..1 {  
            maxlen[j][i][tp] = maxlen[j - 1][i][tp]  
            f[j][i][tp] = f[j - 1][i][tp]  
        }  
        if b[j] = a[i] {  
            update(j, i, 0, mx1, cnt1)  
            update(j, i, 1, mx0, cnt0)  
        }  
        if b[j] < a[i] {  
            upd(mx0, cnt0, maxlen[j - 1][i][0], f[j - 1][i][0])  
        }  
        if b[j] > a[i] {  
            upd(mx1, cnt1, maxlen[j - 1][i][1], f[j - 1][i][1])  
        }  
    }  
}
```

That's it! Now the only question is: how to reduce the memory usage. Fortunately, we can get rid of parameter *j*, by creating 2 new arrays (one for the *j* − 1 and one for *j*).

If it's still not clear to you, then take a look at the solution code by downloading the archive of this problem.