

DATA STRUCTURE

Chapter 4: Queues

Exam-Oriented Problems & Solutions

This booklet contains fourteen exam-oriented problems on the Queues chapter, covering array/linear queue tracing, circular queue tracing, priority queue ordering, heap-based priority queue construction, algorithm design, complexity analysis, and real-world applications (CPU scheduling and BFS). Each problem is followed by a complete, step-by-step solution.

Section A: Array (Linear) Queue — Trace-Based Problems

Problem 1. A linear array-based queue `QUEUE[0..4]` (size $N = 5$) is initially empty, with $FRONT = REAR = -1$. The following operations are performed in order: `enqueue(10)`, `enqueue(20)`, `enqueue(30)`, `dequeue()`, `enqueue(40)`, `dequeue()`, `enqueue(50)`, `enqueue(60)`. Trace the queue after every operation and state what happens on the last operation.

Solution:

Initial state: $FRONT = -1$, $REAR = -1$, `Queue = [ ]`

1) `enqueue(10)`: $FRONT$ becomes 0 (first insertion), $REAR = 0$. `Queue = [10]`

2) `enqueue(20)`: $REAR = 1$. `Queue = [10, 20]`

3) `enqueue(30)`: $REAR = 2$. `Queue = [10, 20, 30]`

4) `dequeue()`: removes `QUEUE[FRONT] = 10`, $FRONT = 1$. `Queue (logical) = [20, 30]`

5) `enqueue(40)`: $REAR = 3$. `Queue = [20, 30, 40]`

6) `dequeue()`: removes 20, $FRONT = 2$. `Queue (logical) = [30, 40]`

7) `enqueue(50)`: $REAR = 4$. `Queue = [30, 40, 50]`. Note $REAR$ has now reached $N - 1 = 4$, so the array is physically full even though only 3 of the 5 slots are logically occupied.

8) `enqueue(60)`: Check $REAR = N - 1 \rightarrow$ condition is true, so "QUEUE OVERFLOW" is reported and 60 cannot be inserted.

Answer: Overflow occurs at the 8th operation, even though only 3 elements (30, 40, 50) are logically present out of a capacity of 5. This is the classic "false overflow" problem of a simple linear array queue — slots 0 and 1 are free but unusable because $REAR$ never moves backward.

Problem 2. For the same operations as Problem 1, what are the final values of $FRONT$ and $REAR$ just before the overflow is detected, and how many usable free slots remain unused?

Solution:

From the trace in Problem 1, just before the failed 8th operation: $FRONT = 2$, $REAR = 4$.

Logical elements present: `QUEUE[2] = 30`, `QUEUE[3] = 40`, `QUEUE[4] = 50` $\rightarrow$ 3 elements.

Physically free slots: `QUEUE[0]` and `QUEUE[1]` (2 slots), left vacant after the two dequeue operations.

Answer: $FRONT = 2$, $REAR = 4$; 2 slots (index 0 and 1) remain unused and unreachable, confirming the wasted space caused by the linear queue design.

Section B: Circular Queue — Trace-Based Problems

Problem 3. A circular queue of size $N = 5$ (indices 0 to 4) uses a COUNT variable to track the number of elements ($FRONT = 0$, $REAR = -1$, $COUNT = 0$ initially). $REAR$ is updated as $REAR = (REAR + 1) \text{ MOD } N$ on insertion, and $FRONT$ as $FRONT = (FRONT + 1) \text{ MOD } N$ on deletion. Perform: enqueue(1), enqueue(2), enqueue(3), enqueue(4), enqueue(5), dequeue(), dequeue(), enqueue(6), enqueue(7). Trace the array, $FRONT$, $REAR$ and $COUNT$ after every operation.

Solution:

enqueue(1): $REAR = (-1+1) \text{ MOD } 5 = 0$. $QUEUE[0] = 1$. $FRONT = 0$, $REAR = 0$, $COUNT = 1$.

enqueue(2): $REAR = 1$. $QUEUE[1] = 2$. $COUNT = 2$.

enqueue(3): $REAR = 2$. $QUEUE[2] = 3$. $COUNT = 3$.

enqueue(4): $REAR = 3$. $QUEUE[3] = 4$. $COUNT = 4$.

enqueue(5): $REAR = 4$. $QUEUE[4] = 5$. $COUNT = 5 = N \rightarrow$ queue is now FULL. Array = [1, 2, 3, 4, 5].

dequeue(): removes $QUEUE[FRONT] = QUEUE[0] = 1$. $FRONT = (0+1) \text{ MOD } 5 = 1$. $COUNT = 4$. Returned value: 1.

dequeue(): removes $QUEUE[1] = 2$. $FRONT = 2$. $COUNT = 3$. Returned value: 2. (Logical queue is now 3, 4, 5 at indices 2, 3, 4; indices 0 and 1 hold stale values but are free for reuse.)

enqueue(6): $REAR = (4+1) \text{ MOD } 5 = 0$. $QUEUE[0] = 6$ (overwrites the stale 1). $COUNT = 4$.

enqueue(7): $REAR = (0+1) \text{ MOD } 5 = 1$. $QUEUE[1] = 7$ (overwrites the stale 2). $COUNT = 5 = N \rightarrow$ FULL again.

Answer: Final array = [6, 7, 3, 4, 5] (index 0 to 4); $FRONT = 2$, $REAR = 1$, $COUNT = 5$. Logical queue front-to-rear = 3, 4, 5, 6, 7. Unlike Problem 1, all 5 slots were successfully reused — the circular queue completed 7 successful insertions in total using only 5 storage locations, avoiding false overflow.

Problem 4. A circular queue of size $N = 8$ currently has $FRONT = 5$ and $REAR = 2$ (the queue has wrapped around). Using the formula $COUNT = (REAR - FRONT + N) \text{ MOD } N + 1$, find the number of elements currently stored in the queue.

Solution:

$$COUNT = (REAR - FRONT + N) \text{ MOD } N + 1$$

$$COUNT = (2 - 5 + 8) \text{ MOD } 8 + 1$$

$$COUNT = (5) \text{ MOD } 8 + 1 = 5 + 1 = 6$$

Answer: The queue currently holds 6 elements.

Section C: Priority Queue Problems

Problem 5. Five tasks arrive with the following priority values (a higher number means higher priority): $A = 3$, $B = 1$, $C = 4$, $D = 2$, $E = 5$. State the order in which the tasks would be served by (a) a descending (max-first) priority queue and (b) an ascending (min-first) priority queue.

Solution:

(a) Descending priority queue serves the highest priority value first: $E (5) \rightarrow C (4) \rightarrow A (3) \rightarrow D (2) \rightarrow B (1)$.

(b) Ascending priority queue serves the lowest priority value first: $B (1) \rightarrow D (2) \rightarrow A (3) \rightarrow C (4) \rightarrow E (5)$.

Answer: (a) E, C, A, D, B (b) B, D, A, C, E

Problem 6. Construct a binary min-heap (array representation, 1-indexed) by inserting the following elements one at a time in the given order: 5, 3, 8, 1, 9, 2. Show the heap array after every insertion, applying the standard "insert at end, then bubble up" algorithm.

Solution:

Insert 5: [5]

Insert 3: append $\rightarrow$ [5, 3]; parent(2)=1, heap[1]=5 > 3 $\rightarrow$ swap $\rightarrow$ [3, 5]

Insert 8: append $\rightarrow$ [3, 5, 8]; parent(3)=1, heap[1]=3 < 8 $\rightarrow$ no swap $\rightarrow$ [3, 5, 8]

Insert 1: append $\rightarrow$ [3, 5, 8, 1]; parent(4)=2, heap[2]=5 > 1 $\rightarrow$ swap $\rightarrow$ [3, 1, 8, 5]; now at index 2, parent(2)=1, heap[1]=3 > 1 $\rightarrow$ swap $\rightarrow$ [1, 3, 8, 5]

Insert 9: append $\rightarrow$ [1, 3, 8, 5, 9]; parent(5)=2, heap[2]=3 < 9 $\rightarrow$ no swap $\rightarrow$ [1, 3, 8, 5, 9]

Insert 2: append $\rightarrow$ [1, 3, 8, 5, 9, 2]; parent(6)=3, heap[3]=8 > 2 $\rightarrow$ swap $\rightarrow$ [1, 3, 2, 5, 9, 8]; now at index 3, parent(3)=1, heap[1]=1 < 2 $\rightarrow$ no swap $\rightarrow$ final: [1, 3, 2, 5, 9, 8]

Answer: Final min-heap array = [1, 3, 2, 5, 9, 8]. The root (index 1) = 1 is the minimum element, confirming the min-heap property is satisfied at every node.

Poly Notes Hub

Section D: Algorithm Design Problems

Problem 7. Write an algorithm to implement a queue using two stacks, and trace it for the operations: enqueue(1), enqueue(2), enqueue(3), dequeue(), enqueue(4), dequeue(), dequeue().

Solution:

Let STACK1 = input stack, STACK2 = output stack.

```
ENQUEUE(x):  
    PUSH(STACK1, x)  
  
DEQUEUE():  
    If STACK2 is empty, then  
        While STACK1 is not empty:  
            PUSH(STACK2, POP(STACK1))  
    If STACK2 is still empty, report UNDERFLOW.  
    Else return POP(STACK2)
```

enqueue(1): STACK1 = [1]

enqueue(2): STACK1 = [1, 2]

enqueue(3): STACK1 = [1, 2, 3]

dequeue(): STACK2 is empty, so move all of STACK1 to STACK2: pop 3 → push, pop 2 → push, pop 1 → push, giving STACK2 = [3, 2, 1] (top = 1); STACK1 = []. Pop STACK2 → returns 1. STACK2 = [3, 2]

enqueue(4): STACK1 = [4]

dequeue(): STACK2 is not empty → pop top → returns 2. STACK2 = [3]

dequeue(): STACK2 is not empty → pop top → returns 3. STACK2 = []

Answer: Dequeue results in order: 1, 2, 3 — exactly the FIFO order in which they were enqueued, confirming correctness. Element 4 remains stored in STACK1, awaiting the next dequeue.

Problem 8. Write an algorithm to reverse the elements of a queue Q using only one auxiliary stack, and trace it on Q = [10, 20, 30, 40] (front to rear).

Solution:

```
REVERSE_QUEUE(Q):  
Step 1: While Q is not empty:  
    PUSH(S, DEQUEUE(Q))  
Step 2: While S is not empty:  
    ENQUEUE(Q, POP(S))
```

Step 1 — empty Q into stack S: dequeue 10 → push (S=[10]); dequeue 20 → push (S=[10,20]); dequeue 30 → push (S=[10,20,30]); dequeue 40 → push (S=[10,20,30,40]). Now Q is empty.

Step 2 — empty S back into Q: pop 40 → enqueue (Q=[40]); pop 30 → enqueue (Q=[40,30]); pop 20 → enqueue (Q=[40,30,20]); pop 10 → enqueue (Q=[40,30,20,10]).

Answer: Reversed queue (front to rear) = 40, 30, 20, 10. The LIFO nature of the stack reverses the FIFO order of the queue.

Problem 9. Write an algorithm that simulates a sequence of ENQUEUE/DEQUEUE operations on an array queue of capacity C and reports the position of the first operation that causes overflow or underflow (if any). Apply it to C = 3 and the operation sequence: E, E, D, E, E, E, D (E = enqueue, D = dequeue).

Solution:

```

VALIDATE(ops[1..k], C):
    count = 0
    For i = 1 to k:
        If ops[i] = ENQUEUE, then
            If count = C, then
                Report "Overflow at operation i" and stop.
            Else count = count + 1
        If ops[i] = DEQUEUE, then
            If count = 0, then
                Report "Underflow at operation i" and stop.
            Else count = count - 1
    Report "All operations valid"

```

i=1 (E): count $0 < 3 \rightarrow$ count = 1

i=2 (E): count $1 < 3 \rightarrow$ count = 2

i=3 (D): count $2 > 0 \rightarrow$ count = 1

i=4 (E): count $1 < 3 \rightarrow$ count = 2

i=5 (E): count $2 < 3 \rightarrow$ count = 3

i=6 (E): count = 3 = C $\rightarrow$ OVERFLOW detected

Answer: Overflow occurs at operation 6 (the third enqueue after the dequeue), since the queue's capacity of 3 is already full at that point.

Section E: Analytical / Complexity Problems

Problem 10. Tabulate the time complexity of enqueue, dequeue, peek and search operations for: (a) a simple array queue, (b) a circular array queue, (c) a linked-list queue, and (d) a priority queue implemented with a binary heap.

Solution:

Implementation	Enqueue	Dequeue	Peek	Search
Simple array queue	$O(1)^*$	$O(1)$	$O(1)$	$O(n)$
Circular array queue	$O(1)$	$O(1)$	$O(1)$	$O(n)$
Linked list queue	$O(1)$	$O(1)$	$O(1)$	$O(n)$
Priority queue (binary heap)	$O(\log n)$	$O(\log n)$	$O(1)$	$O(n)$

* For a simple (non-circular) array queue, enqueue is $O(1)$ per operation, but the structure suffers from false overflow (Problems 1–2), so its effective usable capacity is lower than its actual size.

Problem 11. Using the results of Problems 1 and 3 (both using arrays of size $N = 5$), compare the effective slot utilisation of a linear queue versus a circular queue, and justify why the circular queue is preferred in practice.

Solution:

Linear queue (Problem 1): capacity $N = 5$, but overflow was reported after only 3 net elements remained logically stored (30, 40, 50), with REAR permanently stuck at index 4. Effective utilisation before failure = $3/5 = 60\%$, and 2 slots became permanently unusable for the remainder of the queue's life.

Circular queue (Problem 3): the same capacity $N = 5$ supported a total of 7 successful enqueue operations across the whole sequence (5 initial + 2 more after wrap-around), because freed slots (index 0 and 1) were reused via the MOD N arithmetic. Effective utilisation = 100% of the array at all times.

Answer: The circular queue is preferred because it reuses freed memory locations at the front of the array once elements are dequeued, avoiding the false overflow problem and achieving full (100%) utilisation of the allocated array, whereas a simple linear queue wastes space permanently as REAR advances.

Problem 12. A circular queue is to be built for $N = 6$. Compare the two standard techniques for distinguishing the full and empty conditions — (i) sacrificing one array slot, and (ii) maintaining a separate COUNT variable — in terms of maximum usable capacity and extra memory needed.

Solution:

(i) Sacrificed-slot method: the queue is considered full when $(\text{REAR} + 1) \bmod N = \text{FRONT}$, and empty when $\text{FRONT} = \text{REAR}$. No extra variable is required, but one array slot can never be used for data, so the maximum usable capacity is $N - 1 = 5$ elements out of the 6 allocated.

(ii) COUNT-variable method: an integer COUNT tracks the number of elements directly; the queue is full when $\text{COUNT} = N$ and empty when $\text{COUNT} = 0$. All $N = 6$ slots can be used for data (maximum usable capacity = 6), but this requires one extra integer variable that must be updated on every enqueue and dequeue.

Answer: The sacrificed-slot method loses 1 out of 6 slots (about 16.7% wasted for $N = 6$) but needs no extra variable; the COUNT method uses 100% of the allocated array but needs $O(1)$ extra space for the counter. For small N , the sacrificed slot is a proportionally larger loss, so the COUNT-variable method is generally preferred when memory is tight.

Section F: Application-Based Problems

Problem 13. Three processes P1 (burst time 5), P2 (burst time 3) and P3 (burst time 8) arrive at time 0 and are scheduled using Round Robin with time quantum = 3, using a FIFO ready queue. Trace the ready queue and draw the Gantt chart, then find the completion time of each process.

Solution:

Ready queue initially: [P1, P2, P3]

t = 0 to 3: run P1 for 3 units (quantum). P1 remaining = $5 - 3 = 2$. P1 is re-enqueued. Queue: [P2, P3, P1]

t = 3 to 6: run P2 for 3 units. P2 remaining = $3 - 3 = 0 \rightarrow$ P2 completes at t = 6. Queue: [P3, P1]

t = 6 to 9: run P3 for 3 units. P3 remaining = $8 - 3 = 5$. P3 is re-enqueued. Queue: [P1, P3]

t = 9 to 11: run P1 for its remaining 2 units (less than the quantum) $\rightarrow$ P1 completes at t = 11. Queue: [P3]

t = 11 to 14: run P3 for 3 units. P3 remaining = $5 - 3 = 2$. P3 is re-enqueued. Queue: [P3]

t = 14 to 16: run P3 for its remaining 2 units $\rightarrow$ P3 completes at t = 16.

Gantt Chart:

	P1		P2		P3		P1		P3		P3	
0		3		6		9		11		14		16

Answer: Completion times: P2 = 6, P1 = 11, P3 = 16. This illustrates how the operating system's ready queue (a pure FIFO queue) underlies the Round Robin CPU scheduling algorithm.

Problem 14. An undirected graph has the adjacency lists: $A \rightarrow \{B, C\}$, $B \rightarrow \{A, D\}$, $C \rightarrow \{A, D\}$, $D \rightarrow \{B, C, E\}$, $E \rightarrow \{D\}$. Perform a Breadth-First Search (BFS) starting from vertex A, showing the queue content at each step, and state the final visiting order.

Solution:

Initialise: visited = {A}, queue = [A]

Dequeue A; visit unvisited neighbours B, C (in list order) and enqueue them. visited = {A,B,C}, queue = [B, C]

Dequeue B; neighbours A (visited), D (unvisited) $\rightarrow$ enqueue D. visited = {A,B,C,D}, queue = [C, D]

Dequeue C; neighbours A (visited), D (visited) $\rightarrow$ nothing new enqueued. queue = [D]

Dequeue D; neighbours B (visited), C (visited), E (unvisited) $\rightarrow$ enqueue E. visited = {A,B,C,D,E}, queue = [E]

Dequeue E; neighbour D (visited) $\rightarrow$ nothing new. queue = [] $\rightarrow$ BFS terminates.

Answer: BFS visiting order: A, B, C, D, E. This demonstrates how a queue enforces level-by-level exploration: all neighbours of a node are enqueued before any of their own neighbours are processed.