

■ Reverse Pairs Problem Documentation

■ Table of Contents

1. [Problem Statement](#)
2. [Intuition](#)
3. [Key Observations](#)
4. [Approach](#)
5. [Edge Cases](#)
6. [Complexity Analysis](#)
 - [Time Complexity](#)
 - [Space Complexity](#)
7. [Alternative Approaches](#)
8. [Test Cases](#)
9. [Final Thoughts](#)

1. Problem Statement

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

A reverse pair is defined as 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 similar to counting inversions in an array, but with a specific condition: $\text{nums}[i] > 2 * \text{nums}[j]$. A brute-force solution would require checking all possible pairs — which becomes inefficient for large arrays. Instead, we use merge sort, which not only sorts the array but also helps count valid reverse pairs while merging.

3. Key Observations

- When two subarrays are sorted, the number of reverse pairs between them can be found efficiently using two pointers.
- Sorting the array helps because we can skip many comparisons once we find a number that violates the condition.

4. Approach

We use a divide-and-conquer strategy with the help of merge sort:

- Divide the array into two halves recursively.
- Conquer by counting:
 - The number of reverse pairs in the left half.
 - The number of reverse pairs in the right half.
 - The number of reverse pairs between the left and right halves.
- Merge the two sorted halves and return the total count.

During the merge step:

- Use two pointers to efficiently count valid pairs where $\text{nums}[i] > 2 * \text{nums}[j]$.
- Merge the sorted halves to maintain order for higher-level comparisons.

5. Edge Cases

- All elements are equal \rightarrow no reverse pair.
- Sorted in ascending order \rightarrow no reverse pair.
- Sorted in descending order \rightarrow maximum reverse pairs.
- Array of size 1 \rightarrow no reverse pair.

6. Complexity Analysis

□ Time Complexity

- $O(n \log n)$

Merge sort divides the array in $\log n$ levels and does $O(n)$ work at each level.

▣ Space Complexity

- $O(n)$

Due to the temporary arrays used in the merge step.

7. Alternative Approaches

- Brute Force (Nested Loops)
 - Check all pairs (i, j) and count if $\text{nums}[i] > 2 * \text{nums}[j]$.
 - Time: $O(n^2)$, not suitable for large n .
- Binary Indexed Tree (Fenwick Tree) or Segment Tree
 - Compress coordinates and track counts efficiently.
 - Requires advanced data structures and is more complex to implement.

8. Test Cases

Test case 1

nums = [1,3,2,3,1]

Expected Output: 2

Test case 2

nums = [2,4,3,5,1]

Expected Output: 3

Test case 3

nums = [5,4,3,2,1]

Expected Output: Multiple pairs (6 total)

Test case 4

nums = [1,2,3,4,5]

Expected Output: 0

Test case 5

nums = [1]

Expected Output: 0

9. Final Thoughts

- This problem is an excellent application of merge sort beyond just sorting.
- It demonstrates how we can use divide-and-conquer to count pairs satisfying complex conditions.
- For interviews and coding rounds, this pattern is useful for problems involving pairwise comparison with a condition.
- A Segment Tree-based approach may be needed if more frequent updates or range queries are involved.