

## ■ Reverse Pairs – Full Documentation

### 1. Problem Statement

Given an integer array `nums`, return the number of *reverse pairs* in the array.

A reverse pair is a pair  $(i, j)$  such that:

- $0 \leq i < j < \text{nums.length}$
- $\text{nums}[i] > 2 * \text{nums}[j]$

### 2. Intuition

This problem is a variation of counting inversions, which can be efficiently solved using a modified merge sort algorithm. The core idea is to:

- Divide the array into smaller parts,
- Count valid reverse pairs across the two halves,
- Then merge them back in sorted order.

### 3. Key Observations

- A brute-force  $O(n^2)$  approach would time out for large inputs (up to 50,000).
- During merge sort, for each element in the left half, we can count how many elements in the right half satisfy the condition  $\text{nums}[i] > 2 * \text{nums}[j]$ .
- Sorting the two halves enables efficient searching and merging.

### 4. Approach

- Divide and Conquer using Merge Sort:
  - Recursively split the array.
  - Count reverse pairs across subarrays.

- Use two pointers to count valid pairs before merging.
- Merge Step:
  - Merge two sorted halves.
  - Maintain order to allow efficient comparison.

## 5. Edge Cases

- Array with all elements the same (e.g.,  $[2, 2, 2]$ ) → No reverse pairs.
- Array sorted in descending order → Maximum reverse pairs.
- Array of length 1 → No pairs.
- Large integers or negatives → Ensure  $2 * \text{nums}[i]$  doesn't overflow.

## 6. Complexity Analysis

□ Time Complexity:

- $O(n \log n)$ , where  $n$  is the length of the array.
- Each merge sort step divides the array and counts in linear time.

□ Space Complexity:

- $O(n)$ , for the temporary array used in merging.

## 7. Alternative Approaches

- Binary Indexed Tree / Segment Tree:
  - Can be used with coordinate compression.
  - More complex and usually less efficient for this particular problem.
- Brute-force  $O(n^2)$ :
  - Compare all pairs; not efficient for large input.

## 8. Test Cases

Input	Output	Explanation
[1,3,2,3,1]	2	Pairs: (1,4) and (3,4)
[2,4,3,5,1]	3	Pairs: (1,4), (2,4), and (3,4)
[5,4,3,2,1]	4	Pairs: (0,3), (0,4), (1,4), (2,4)
[1,1,1,1,1]	0	No pair satisfies $\text{nums}[i] > 2 * \text{nums}[j]$
[1]	0	Single element $\rightarrow$ no pairs

## 9. Final Thoughts

- This problem teaches efficient problem-solving using modified merge sort.
- It highlights how sorting can help solve complex comparison-based problems.
- Understanding this solution builds a foundation for tackling other inversion-counting problems.