#### Problem

Given are the '*explodification*' rules for an atom with a certain amount of neutrons:

- An atom with  $k \leq n$  neutrons will be converted into  $a_k$  units of energy.
- An atom with k > n will be decomposed into parts i, j ≥ 1 with i + j = k, which are then
  recursively explodificated.

Given an atom with a fixed number of neutrons, what is the minimum energy released?

# Observations

Since the decomposition is arbitrary, we have to assume the worst case – for k > n define:

$$a_k := \min_{1 \le i \le k-1} a_i + a_{k-i}.$$

There are upto  $10^5$  queries with k upto  $10^9$ , so we cannot naively compute all values  $a_i$  upto this maximum. Naive computation requires  $O(k^2)$  time for the first k values.

### **Observation 1**

Our first crucial observation is that optimal solutions have a recursive structure. We can write any explodification sequence as a binary tree. This is the first sample, k = 8:



Recall this sample had  $a_{1,...,4} = \{2, 3, 5, 7\}.$ 

### **Observation 1**

For a given query k, imagine recursively following the decomposition  $a_k = a_i + a_{k-i}$  until we end up with a decomposition:

$$a_k = \sum_{j=1}^m a_{i_j}$$
 subj. to  $k = \sum_{j=1}^m i_j$ , with  $i_j \in \{1, \ldots, n\}$ .

So the leaves of the decomposition tree are a collection of indices  $i_j$  that sum to k. Is any decomposition  $(i_j)$  satisfying the right hand side realizable?

No – to actually construct this explodification sequence we need to end with some  $a_x, a_y$  with x + y > n. If  $x + y \le n$ , there is no guarantee that  $a_{x+y} = a_x + a_y$ . (Example: for  $n \gg 1$ , a sequence of all  $a_1$ 's is generally impossible.)

A sequence is *realizable* if it contains two x, y with x + y > n. After that, we can 'add' new atoms  $a_{ij}$  inductively to construct the explodification tree. In fact any 'prefix' of such a sequence is optimal.

# 

### **Faster computation**

Now we can improve the computation of the first k values from  $O(k^2)$  to O(nk):

$$a_k = \min_{1 \le i \le n} a_i + a_{k-i}.$$

Of course this is still not fast enough with k upto  $10^9$ .

# **Observation 2**

Let  $m \in \{1, ..., n\}$  minimize  $a_m/m$ . When a query k is large enough, most of the terms in the decomposition will be  $a_m$ . Indeed, if after removing the two distinguished values  $a_x$ ,  $a_y$  from the sequence we still have m or more values in the tree that are not  $a_m$ , by the pigeonhole principle there must be a subset of them that have indices that sum up to a multiple of m, and we can replace them by  $a_m$ 's to get a decomposition that is not worse.

Hence, any decomposition can be written in such a way that there are at most m + 1 terms that are not  $a_m$ . In fact we can rearrange the sequence to have these terms in the front, and then fill in the gap with  $a_m$ -terms.

## **Full solution**

Let *m* minimize  $a_i/i$  over all  $i \in \{1, ..., n\}$ , and use the O(nk) algorithm from earlier to construct the first (m+1)n terms in time  $O(n^3)$ .

For each query k, find the smallest  $j \ge 0$  such that  $k - jm \in \{1, ..., (m+1)n\}$ , and output with  $a_{k-jm} + j \cdot a_m$ .

Final runtime  $O(n^3 + q)$ . Efficient implementations of e.g.  $O(n^4 + q)$  could also work.

Statistics: 421 submissions, 51 + ? accepted