ACM International Collegiate Programming Contest — Training Session I

Maria Keet

Department of Computer Science, University of Cape Town, South Africa
mkeet@cs.uct.ac.za

August 6, 2016

Outline

Outline

Topics of training sessions

I. General strategy for reading the problem and solving it; some algorithms; work on problems
II. Problem-solving paradigms; classifying problems; work on problems
III. More problems and algorithms
IV. Practice contest
V. Focus on team strategy; work on problems
VI. Practice contest

Some useful resources

- UVa Online Judge
- CodeForce
- ICPC archive
- Competitive Programming 3 (v1 is freely available, and still useful)
- Skiena's Algorithm Design Manual (a reference book with lots and lots of algorithms)

Other notes for the training sessions

- I can't help you with coding
- Will assist with
  - Problems solving,
  - Pseudo code, and
  - Team strategy
- Bring laptop (at least some of you)
- For the first few sessions you do not need a team, but it will help if you have one in September

Outline

Approach (1/2)

- Read description

Approach (1/2)

- Read description
- What is the task?

Approach (1/2)

- Read description
- What is the task?
- What is given?
  - data
  - variables
  - constraint
  - examples
- (cont'd on next page...)

Approach (2/2)

- Solve the problem
  - 'essentially solve it'

Approach (2/2)

- Solve the problem
  - 'essentially solve it'
    - input data space
    - recognise underlying core issues
    - similarity with other problems

Approach (2/2)

- Solve the problem
  - 'essentially solve it'
    - input data space
    - recognise underlying core issues
    - similarity with other problems
    - result: a solution on paper, knowing **what** needs to be done

Approach (2/2)

- Solve the problem
  - 'essentially solve it'
    - input data space
    - recognise underlying core issues
    - similarity with other problems
    - result: a solution on paper, knowing **what** needs to be done
  - solve it algorithmically (**how** to do it—e.g., a sort, OSPF, complexity, ...)

Approach (2/2)

- Solve the problem
  - 'essentially solve it'
    - input data space
    - recognise underlying core issues
    - similarity with other problems
    - result: a solution on paper, knowing **what** needs to be done
  - solve it algorithmically (**how** to do it—e.g., a sort, OSPF, complexity, ...)
  - code and test it, i.e., **do it** and verify solution

Types of puzzles/problems

- Can be divided along several dimensions

Types of puzzles/problems

- Can be divided along several dimensions
- Regarding the core problem
  A. maths-y (e.g., probabilities, geometry)
  B. algorithmically/general (still an elegant solution)
  C. seeing patterns, brute force, *ad hoc*

Types of puzzles/problems

- Can be divided along several dimensions
- Regarding the core problem
  A. maths-y (e.g., probabilities, geometry)
  B. algorithmically/general (still an elegant solution)
  C. seeing patterns, brute force, *ad hoc*
- The (im-)balance in the 'what, how, do':
  a. conceptually hard, but (relatively) easier to implement
  b. conceptually (relatively) easy, but laborious to implement
  c. both relatively hard (happens at the finals)
  d. both relatively easy (at least one problem in the regionals)

Team composition (1/2)

- **Your team needs strengths in all three areas (what, how, do)** to have a chance to win
- Your team might be able to get away with maths-y only solving, but more probably with algorithmically, and even better both
- Each member probably won't excel in all three components, but *together* you will

Team composition (1/2)

- **Your team needs strengths in all three areas (what, how, do)** to have a chance to win
- Your team might be able to get away with maths-y only solving, but more probably with algorithmically, and even better both
- Each member probably won't excel in all three components, but *together* you will
- What are *you* good at?
- What are *your team mates* good at?
- What is your team *together* as a whole good at?

Team composition (1/2)

- **Your team needs strengths in all three areas (what, how, do)** to have a chance to win
- Your team might be able to get away with maths-y only solving, but more probably with algorithmically, and even better both
- Each member probably won't excel in all three components, but *together* you will
- What are *you* good at?
- What are *your team mates* good at?
- What is your team *together* as a whole good at?
- And what you together are *not* good at: can you skip it? if not, who will learn enough to fill the gap?

Team composition (2/2)

- Who will do what?
- Dividing tasks aided by a *team manager*, who does (at least):

Team composition (2/2)

- Who will do what?
- Dividing tasks aided by a *team manager*, who does (at least):
  - Keeps track of who is doing what
  - Makes sure problems are not forgotten
  - Keeps track of time

Team composition (2/2)

- Who will do what?
- Dividing tasks aided by a *team manager*, who does (at least):
  - Keeps track of who is doing what
  - Makes sure problems are not forgotten
  - Keeps track of time
- pair solving option:
- pair programming; One person codes, the other ('co-pilot') watches:
- 'fresh eyes'

Team composition (2/2)

- Who will do what?
- Dividing tasks aided by a *team manager*, who does (at least):
  - Keeps track of who is doing what
  - Makes sure problems are not forgotten
  - Keeps track of time
- pair solving option:
  - bouncing off ideas toward solution
  - possibly putting different solved pieces together
- pair programming; One person codes, the other ('co-pilot') watches:
- 'fresh eyes'

Team composition (2/2)

- Who will do what?
- Dividing tasks aided by a *team manager*, who does (at least):
  - Keeps track of who is doing what
  - Makes sure problems are not forgotten
  - Keeps track of time
- pair solving option:
  - bouncing off ideas toward solution
  - possibly putting different solved pieces together
- pair programming; One person codes, the other ('co-pilot') watches:
  - Understands the solution
  - Points out bugs
  - Looks things up for pilot
- 'fresh eyes'

Team composition (2/2)

- Who will do what?
- Dividing tasks aided by a *team manager*, who does (at least):
  - Keeps track of who is doing what
  - Makes sure problems are not forgotten
  - Keeps track of time
- pair solving option:
  - bouncing off ideas toward solution
  - possibly putting different solved pieces together
- pair programming; One person codes, the other ('co-pilot') watches:
  - Understands the solution
  - Points out bugs
  - Looks things up for pilot
- 'fresh eyes'
  - Sometimes you get stuck in a dead-end looking for a solution
  - the third person looks at the problem 'untarnished'

and finally

- Solve 'the easiest' problem first, i.e.,
  - The one easiest *to your team*
  - Looking at what others submit first may, or may not, be a good heuristic to choose what's easiest

and finally

- Solve 'the easiest' problem first, i.e.,
  - The one easiest *to your team*
  - Looking at what others submit first may, or may not, be a good heuristic to choose what's easiest
- Don't submit without doing some testing (recall: time penalty for incorrect submissions!)

and finally

- Solve 'the easiest' problem first, i.e.,
  - The one easiest *to your team*
  - Looking at what others submit first may, or may not, be a good heuristic to choose what's easiest
- Don't submit without doing some testing (recall: time penalty for incorrect submissions!)
- Don't get hung up on one problem for too long, but don't keep jumping between problems without solving any of them either

and finally

- Solve 'the easiest' problem first, i.e.,
  - The one easiest *to your team*
  - Looking at what others submit first may, or may not, be a good heuristic to choose what's easiest
- Don't submit without doing some testing (recall: time penalty for incorrect submissions!)
- Don't get hung up on one problem for too long, but don't keep jumping between problems without solving any of them either
- There is no harm in last-minute attempts (recall: the number of problems solved is more important than time taken)

Outline

Horror dash

- UVa problem 11799
- type: (very) basic algorithmic and easy (in the grand scheme of things of ICPC problems)
- As exercise: use aforementioned methodological steps
- Solve it—at least the 'what'-part—in 15 minutes

Help my brother

- UVa problem 11161
- type: maths, little to code, has a straightforward solution (but possibly TLE) and a more advanced one
- First exercise: understand the problem
  - map the problem space (what is asked for, examples, input space, output, ...)
  - what is needed?

Solution (direction)

- Combinatorics, within discrete mathematics
- In contests—typically easy and quick to code, but 1) finding the formula takes good knowledge of maths, and 2) there may be a snag on performance of the algorithm

Solution (direction)

- Combinatorics, within discrete mathematics
- In contests—typically easy and quick to code, but 1) finding the formula takes good knowledge of maths, and 2) there may be a snag on performance of the algorithm
- This problem: need to use Fibonacci sequences: 0, 1, 1, 2, 3, 5, 8, 13, 21, 34, 55, ..., then take the median
- Brute force for each set?
- Seems inefficient. But how else?

Finalise the solution

- What about finding the largest number in the input, generate a Fibonacci sequence of that length, once, and then reuse that list for finding the answers to the shorter sets?

Finalise the solution

- What about finding the largest number in the input, generate a Fibonacci sequence of that length, once, and then reuse that list for finding the answers to the shorter sets?
- Or is there, perhaps, a way to compute the n-th Fibonacci number (where n is large) efficiently?

Finalise the solution

- What about finding the largest number in the input, generate a Fibonacci sequence of that length, once, and then reuse that list for finding the answers to the shorter sets?
- Or is there, perhaps, a way to compute the n-th Fibonacci number (where n is large) efficiently?
  - Yes! in $O(\log n)$ time using the efficient matrix power (Sect. 9.21 in CP3)

Shopping mall

- SWERC 2013 problem; and of the mini-contest of May 7, 2015
- Type: algorithmic
- Use aforementioned methodological steps and solve first the 'what'-part, then the 'how', and go back to the what, if needed
- Conceptually non-trivial but not extremely hard (if you know the algorithm...); somewhat laborious to implement

Shopping mall: toward a solution

- Task: calculate the shortest path between pairs of locations in the mall

Shopping mall: toward a solution

- Task: calculate the shortest path between pairs of locations in the mall
- What is the input like?

Shopping mall: toward a solution

- Task: calculate the shortest path between pairs of locations in the mall
- What is the input like?
  - N places ($N \leq 200$)
  - M connections ($N - 1 \leq M \leq 1000$)
  - floor level, coordinates x, y of the places
  - type of connection between points: `walking`, `stairs`, `lift`, or `escalator`
  - each connection type has a weight (see text)
  - constraint: same floor is always `walking`
  - actual input to the algorithm: two places, implicitly numbered by the sequence they're presented in the sample input

Shopping mall: toward a solution

- This input data clearly is a graph
- There are many graph processing algorithms
- Need a directed graph (with the restrictions of the problem)
- Hint from the task: *shortest path* between pairs of locations

Shopping mall: toward a solution

- This input data clearly is a graph
- There are many graph processing algorithms
- Need a directed graph (with the restrictions of the problem)
- Hint from the task: *shortest path* between pairs of locations
- Options: which shortest path algorithms?
  - Dijkstra
  - Floyd-Warshall
  - (and Bellman-Ford, and ...)
- What's the difference anyway?

Shopping mall: toward a solution

- What's the difference anyway?
- Dijsktra: *single source* shortest path (Skiena Section 6.3.1)
- Floyd-Warshall for *All-Pairs* Shortest Path (and less code and practically faster cf Dijkstra); e.g.,

Shopping mall: toward a solution

- What's the difference anyway?
- Dijsktra: *single source* shortest path (Skiena Section 6.3.1)
- Floyd-Warshall for *All-Pairs* Shortest Path (and less code and practically faster cf Dijkstra); e.g.,
  - to find the 'center' vertex in a graph (minimizing the longest or average distance to all the other nodes),
  - or when you need to know the longest shortest-path distance over all pairs of vertices from one end to the other.
  - Refer to Skiena Section 6.3.2 for details

Shopping mall: toward a solution

- What's the difference anyway?
- Dijsktra: *single source* shortest path (Skiena Section 6.3.1)
- Floyd-Warshall for *All-Pairs* Shortest Path (and less code and practically faster cf Dijkstra); e.g.,
  - to find the 'center' vertex in a graph (minimizing the longest or average distance to all the other nodes),
  - or when you need to know the longest shortest-path distance over all pairs of vertices from one end to the other.
  - Refer to Skiena Section 6.3.2 for details
- For this problem, either one will do.

Tower of ASCII

- UVa problem 10333
- type: tedious...
- mainly to get you to do elaborate output formatting

Ensuring truth

- UVa problem 11357
- type: looks 'scary', but it isn't
- Systematically work through the description to figure out what is really asked for
- It does help to know a bit of propositional logic, and BNF

Ensuring truth

- UVa problem 11357
- type: looks 'scary', but it isn't
- Systematically work through the description to figure out what is really asked for
- It does help to know a bit of propositional logic, and BNF

$\Rightarrow$ only one clause needs to be satisfied to get TRUE. A clause can be satisfied if for all variables in the clause, its negation is not in the clause too.

Scheduled training dates

- Aug 6: 10:00-16:00
- **Aug 13: 10:00-16:00**
- Aug 27: 10:0-16:00
- Sept 3/10: 10:00-16:00
- Sept 17: 10:00-16:00
- Sept 24: 10:00-16:00 or Oct 1: 10:00-16:00
- Date of the regionals: TBD ("some Saturday between mid Sept and end Oct")