

# Day 1 Contest: 2020 Seoul Regionals

Moscow International Workshop 2020

November 28, 2020

## A. Apartment Complex Problem

**Keywords:** trees, DP/LCA.

Let  $S$  be the set of vertices with apartments. If  $a, b \in S$ , and a vertex  $v$  lies on an the  $ab$ -path, then for any other vertex  $u$  either  $\text{dist}(v, a) < \text{dist}(u, a)$  or  $\text{dist}(v, b) < \text{dist}(u, b)$ , thus  $v$  is a good place.

If there are no such  $a, b$ , then all of  $S$  lies in a single connected component  $T$  after erasing  $v$ . In this case, the neighbour  $u$  of  $v$  in  $T$  is closer to each vertex of  $S$ .

The answer is the number of vertices  $v$  such that after removing  $v$  at least two subtrees contain elements of  $S$ . We can find them by rooting the tree at an arbitrary vertex, and counting the number of elements of  $S$  in each subtree with DP.

Equivalently, the answer is the size of the smallest connected subgraph containing all of  $S$ .

**Complexity:**  $O(n)$ .  $O(n \log n)$  is also fine.

## B. Biofuel

**Keywords:** DP/shortest path

We should charge at any intermediate point we visit. Indeed, if we don't charge, then skipping this point is better by triangle inequality.

The key observation is: suppose that  $u$  follows  $v$  in an optimal path. Then the amount of energy we have when leaving  $v$  is either  $W$  or  $\text{dist}(u, v)$ .

Indeed, if  $u$  is the finish point, any excess charging can be skipped so that we finish with zero energy.

If  $c_u \leq c_v$ , then there's no need to charge over  $\text{dist}(v, u)$  before going to  $u$ , since we can charge that amount at  $u$  instead. If we arrive at  $v$  with more than  $\text{dist}(v, u)$  charge, we can instead just skip  $v$ .

If  $c_u \geq c_v$ , then any charge made in  $u$  can be instead made in  $v$ , unless we max out the capacity (then we leave  $v$  with  $W$ ), or we no longer charge at  $u$  (then we can skip  $u$ ).

Now, we only need  $O(\Delta n^2)$  states  $(v, \delta, E)$ , where  $v$  is the current vertex,  $\delta$  is the number of visited vertices,  $E = \text{dist}(v, u)$  for some  $u$ , or  $E = w$  (call these values *possible capacities* at  $v$ ).

The forward transitions are:

- If  $E = \text{dist}(v, u)$ , go to  $(u, \delta + 1, 0)$ , and charge to the smallest possible capacity at  $u$ .
- If  $E < W$ , charge to the next possible capacity.
- If  $E = W$ , try to go to all  $u$ , and charge at  $u$  to the smallest possible capacity larger than  $W - \text{dist}(u, v)$ .

There is a total of  $O(\Delta n^2)$  transitions. The optimal path can be found with DP/Dijkstra in **complexity**  $O(\Delta n^2 + n^2 \log n)$ .

## C. Comparison Issues

**Keywords:** DP/patterns.

Only matches between  $i$  and  $i + 1$  are not predetermined, we can ignore all other matches.

Let  $d'_i$  be  $r_1(i) - r_2(i)$  (without taking the absolute value) ignoring matches with  $i + 1$ . Let  $dp_{i,k}$  be 1 if there is an arrangement of matches such that  $|r_1(j) - r_2(j)| = d_j$  for all  $j < i$ , and  $d'_i = k$ .

$dp_{i,k}$  can be computed with DP. Initially only  $dp_{1,0} = 1$ .

To go forward from  $dp_{i,k} = 1$ , try all outcomes  $s_1, s_2$  in  $\{0, 1\}$  of the two matches between  $i$  and  $i + 1$ , and check that  $|k + s_1 - s_2| = d_i$ . If this is the case, make a transition to  $dp_{i+1, s_2 - s_1}$ .

In the end we must have  $dp_{n, d_n} = 1$  or  $dp_{n, -d_n} = 1$ .

Alternatively, one can show that the sequence  $D$  must satisfy the regexp  $(0^*1[02]^*1)^*0^*$ .

**Complexity:**  $O(n)$ .

## D. Divide Into Thin Rectangles

**Keywords:** constructive, DFS and such.

For  $k > 1$ , any strip  $1 \times k$  or  $k \times 1$  is clearly tilable.

Consider a maximal (=non-extendable) strip  $s$  of length at least 2 on edge of the polyomino. Assume that the strip is horizontal, and only adjacent to cells below it.

Tile and remove  $s$ , and consider all maximal horizontal strips  $s_1, \dots, s_k$  it was adjacent to. Note that removing  $s$  splits the polyomino into  $k$  connected components, since it didn't contain any holes. Thus, we can consider the components of  $s_i$  independently.

If  $s_i$  has length 1, replace it with a maximal vertical strip down from  $s_i$ .

After this,  $s_i$  splits its component into two parts, both of which can be processed recursively.

To see why this procedure never fails, observe the following invariant: for each call with  $s$  and a respective component, all cells with a single neighbour must belong to  $s$ .

The invariant is evidently preserved after any call to  $s_i$ . The only possible issue is when  $s_i$  is vertical and has length 1. But then before the current call, it had a single neighbour, but wasn't in  $s$ , a contradiction.

Each cell will be considered  $O(1)$  times across all subroutines (main recursion, finding maximal strips, etc), thus the **complexity** is  $O(n^2)$ .

## E. Equilibrium of Colors

**Keywords:** dominator tree.

Add a source vertex  $s$ , and create edges from  $s$  to the first  $m$  vertices  $w_1, \dots, w_m$ . Remove all vertices unreachable from  $s$ .

Construct the *dominator tree* of the resulting graph rooted at  $G$ . With induction on the dominator tree we can show that:

- If  $u \neq s$  dominates  $v$ , then  $v$  must share the color with  $u$ .
- If only  $s$  dominates  $v$ , then  $v$  is either one of  $w_1, \dots, w_m$ , or a mixer with a unique color.

Thus, the number of unique colors is the number of children of  $s$  in the dominator tree.

**Complexity:**  $O((n + m + k) \log n)$  or  $O((n + m + k)\alpha(n))$ .

## F. Fluctuation Values

**Keywords:** data structures.

**Solution 1.** Let  $w_{l,r}$  be the sum in the subsegment  $[l, r]$ .

Process all queries and subsegments by increasing of weight, and maintain a two-dimensional data structure of  $a_{l,r}$ , where  $a_{l,r} = w_{l,r}$  if  $w_{l,r}$  below the current threshold, and  $-\infty$  otherwise.

Each query  $(l, r)$  can be answered with a 2D RMQ  $\max_{i \geq l, j \leq r} w_{i,j}$ . This has a sketchy **complexity** of  $O((n^2 + q) \log^2 n)$ , but if 2D Fenwick tree is used, the constant factor should be fairly low.

**Solution 2.** Sort all subsegments  $s_1, \dots, s_{n(n+1)/2}$  by non-decreasing of weight. Maintain RMQ with values  $l_1, \dots, l_{n(n+1)/2}$ , where  $l_i$  is equal to the left endpoint of  $s_i$  if  $s_i$  is "on", and  $-\infty$  otherwise.

We now instead perform a sweep-line by increasing of the right endpoint of segments. For each right endpoint  $r$ :

- Turn "on" all subsegments with right endpoint  $r$ .
- For each query  $l, r, U$  locate the rightmost  $l_i$  such that  $w(s_i) \leq U$  and  $l_i \geq l$ . The first condition turns it into a prefix query, which can be answered in  $O(\log n)$  time with segment tree/treap/Fenwick tree descent.

This solution now has **complexity**  $O((n^2 + q) \log n)$ .

## G. GPS for Robot

**Keywords:** simulation, planar graphs.

Subdivide all segments at pairwise intersections, creating a planar graph. We can now simulate the process directly. To avoid a possibly large number of loops, find the first time  $P$  we return to the starting point, and replace  $t$  with  $t \bmod P$ .

**Complexity:**  $O(n^2 \log n)$  or  $O(n^2)$ .

## H. Height Manipulations

**Keywords:** DP optimization.

For  $j > i$ , let  $S(i, j) = (h_j + h_i) \cdot (j - i)$ . One can see that this is twice the area of the trapezoid below the segment  $(i, h_i) - (j, h_j)$ .

If for  $i < j$  we have  $h_i \leq h_j$ , then  $i$  is never an optimal right point. Similarly, if  $h_i \geq h_j$ , then  $j$  is never an optimal left point.

Removing unoptimal candidates, we have sets  $L$  and  $R$  of left and right candidates.  $L$  is an increasing chain, and  $R$  is a decreasing chain.

For any  $i < j < k < l$  such that  $i, j \in L$ ,  $k, l \in R$  we can establish the *quadrilateral inequality*:  $S(i, k) + S(j, l) > S(i, l) + S(j, k)$ .

In particular, this implies  $\text{opt}(r)$  — the optimal left endpoint position for the right endpoint  $r$  is non-decreasing.

Thus, we can apply D&C to solve the problem in **complexity**  $O(n \log n)$ . Apparently,  $O(n)$  solutions also exist.

## I. Industrial Robots

**Keywords:** math.

Suppose that robots are numbered  $0, \dots, n-1$  and are located at  $x_0, \dots, x_{n-1}$  respectively. The only suitable final arrangements are  $X, X+d, \dots, X+(n-1)d$  or  $X, X-d, \dots, X-(n-1)d$ , for some choice of  $X$ .

In the first case, the maximum distance to arrive at the arrangement is  $\max_{i=0}^{n-1} |x_i - (X + i \cdot d)| = \max_{i=0}^{n-1} |x'_i - X|$ , where  $x'_i = x_i - i \cdot d$ .

By choosing  $X$  optimally at the midpoint between  $\max x'_i$  and  $\min x'_i$ , the distance we get is  $(\max x'_i - \min x'_i)/2$ .

The second arrangement is treated similarly, and the best of two answers should be returned.

**Complexity:**  $O(n)$ .  $O(n \log n)$  is fine too.

## J. Jack the Black

**Keywords:** combinatorial probability.

Each of the  $6 \times 6$  options has probability  $1/36$ , count them straightforwardly.

## K. Kingdoms

**Keywords:** FFT/bitsets.

Given coordinates  $a_i, b_i, c_i$  on three layers, we need to count the number of triples  $(i, j, k)$  such that  $b_j = (a_i + c_k)/2$ . After a suitable shift, assume all coordinates are non-negative.

Consider the polynomial  $A(x) = \sum x^{a_i}$ , and  $B(x)$  and  $C(x)$  defined similarly. If we find  $A(x) \cdot C(x) = D(X) = \sum_i d_i x^i$ , then the answer is  $\sum_j d_{2j} b_j$ .

We can either use FFT to find  $A(x) \cdot C(x)$ , or use bitsets to find the answer as  $\sum_k \text{popcount}((A \ll c_k) \& (2B))$ .

**Total complexity:**  $O(A \log A)$  or  $O(nA/64)$ , where  $A$  is the largest possible coordinate.

## L. Lights On/Off

**Keywords:** Gaussian elimination.

Let  $A_{ij} = 1$  if the switch  $j$  toggles the light  $i$ , and  $V_{ij} = 1$  if we need to toggle the switch  $j$  if we only want the light  $i$  on.

We must have  $AV^T = I$  modulo 2 ( $I$  is the identity matrix), thus  $V = (A^T)^{-1}$ .

The inverse matrix can be found with Gaussian elimination with bitset acceleration.

**Complexity:**  $O(n^3/64)$ .  $O(n^3)$  is fine too.