Peak Finding In Arrays
1D:

Definition:
Let A be an array of size n.
Let A_{i-1}, A_i and A_{i+1}, ($i<n$; $(A_{i-1}, A_i, A_{i+1}) \in A$) be any three subsequent items in A.
Let A_0, A_1 be the first and the second items in the array, respectively.
Let A_{n-1}, A_n be the second to last, and the last items in the array, respectively.
An item A_i is a peak iff $A_i \geqslant A_{i-1} \wedge A_i \geqslant A_{i+1}$.
A_0 is a peak if $A_0 \geqslant A_1$.
A_n is a peak if $A_n \geqslant A_{n-1}$.

Wouldn't these two only be true if the array has exactly two elements? Also that would mean that the second one is exactly the same as the first one.

Theorem 1: An array has at least one peak.

Proof: (*By induction*)
Let P(n) = "an array of size n has at least one peek".

Base case: P(1) => an array of size 1 has one element, which therefore is a peak. => Base case holds.
Inductive step: Assume P(n) is true. => $\exists$ A of size n that has a peak.
Assume P(n+1) by adding an element k into the array A creating a new array A'. There are three possibilities:

a) an element is added to the end of the array A'
b) an element is added to the beginning of the array A'
c) an element is added somewhere in the array A' that is not beginning nor end.

Let's analyze each of the cases.
In the a) case, there are two possibilities. A'_0 was a peak, or A'_0 was not a peak.

1) If A'_0 was a peak and $A'_0 \geqslant k$, then A'_0 is still a peak, since $A'_0 \geqslant A'_1 \wedge A'_0 \geqslant k$; otherwise k will be the new peak.
2) If A'_0 was not a peak, then k will be a peak if $A'_0 \leqslant k$. Otherwise k would not be the peak, but, by P(n), A' would have a peak of A.

In the b) case, there are two possibilities. A'_n was a peak, or A'_n was not a peak.

3) If A'_n was a peak and $A'_n \geqslant k$, then A'_n is still a peak, since $A'_n \geqslant A'_{n-1} \wedge A'_n \geqslant k$; otherwise k will be the new peak.
4) If A'_n was not a peak, then k will be a peak if $A'_n \leqslant k$. Otherwise k would not be the peak, but, by P(n), A' would have a peak of A.

The c) case is a little bit more complicated. Let's assume that k is inserted between A'_i and A'_{i+1}. Then there are a couple of possibilities, but the rules from the previous two cases apply:

1) If $k \geqslant A'_i \wedge k \geqslant A'_{i+1}$, k will be a peak.
2) If $k \leqslant A'_i$, and A'_i was a peak, it will remain a peak. If A'_i was not a peak, then, by P(n), A' would have a peak of A.

=> P(n+1) holds.

Algorithms' asymptotic complexity:
Greedy approach: Worst case, T(n) = $\Theta(n)$
Recursive approach:
Worst case, T(n) = T(n/2) + $\Theta(1)$.