

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 array of n integers `nums`, a 132 pattern is a subsequence of three integers `nums[i]`, `nums[j]`, and `nums[k]` such that:

- $i < j < k$
- `nums[i] < nums[k] < nums[j]`

Return `True` if there is a 132 pattern in `nums`, otherwise, return `False`.

Example 1

- Input: `nums = [1, 2, 3, 4]`
- Output: `False`
- Explanation: There is no 132 pattern.

Example 2

- Input: `nums = [3, 1, 4, 2]`
- Output: `True`
- Explanation: The pattern `[1, 4, 2]` follows 132 order.

Example 3

- Input: `nums = [-1, 3, 2, 0]`
- Output: `True`
- Explanation: Multiple valid patterns: `[-1, 3, 2]`, `[-1, 3, 0]`, `[-1, 2, 0]`.

Constraints

- `n == nums.length`
- `1 <= n <= 2 * 105`
- `-109 <= nums[i] <= 109`

2. Intuition

The goal is to identify three numbers in the array following the **132 pattern** constraint efficiently.

- A **brute-force approach** checking all triplets (i, j, k) is **too slow** ($O(n^3)$ complexity).
- A **more optimal approach** is to track potential `nums[k]` using a **monotonic stack** and iterate in **reverse order**.

3. Key Observations

- We need three numbers where:
 - `nums[i] < nums[k] < nums[j]`
 - `i < j < k`
- If we iterate **backward**, we can maintain the largest valid `nums[k]` efficiently using a **monotonic decreasing stack**.
- The `nums[k]` value must be **less than** `nums[j]` **but greater than** `nums[i]`, which can be efficiently tracked using a **stack**.

4. Approach

We use a monotonic decreasing stack to track elements from right to left:

1. Initialize variables:
 - `stack = []` (monotonic decreasing stack)
 - `third = -∞` (potential `nums[k]`)
2. Iterate from right to left:
 - If `nums[i] < third`, return `True` (we found a valid pattern).
 - While stack is non-empty and `stack[-1] < nums[i]`, update `third = stack.pop()` (ensuring it remains the largest possible `nums[k]`).
 - Push `nums[i]` onto the stack.
3. Return `False` if no pattern is found.

5. Edge Cases

Case Type	Example	Expected Output	Reason
Minimum Input	<code>[1]</code>	False	Only one element, cannot form a pattern.
All Increasing	<code>[1, 2, 3, 4, 5]</code>	False	No valid <code>nums[k]</code> satisfying <code>nums[i] < nums[k] < nums[j]</code> .
All Decreasing	<code>[5, 4, 3, 2, 1]</code>	False	No valid 132 pattern possible.
Negative Values	<code>[-1, 3, 2, 0]</code>	True	Multiple valid patterns exist.
Duplicates	<code>[3, 3, 3, 3, 3]</code>	False	All elements are the same, no pattern possible.
Large Input	<code>[10⁵, ..., 1]</code>	False	Fully decreasing, so no 132 pattern.

6. Complexity Analysis

Time Complexity

- $O(n)$ – Each element is pushed and popped from the stack **at most once**.

Space Complexity

- $O(n)$ – In the worst case, all elements are stored in the stack.

7. Alternative Approaches

Brute Force ($O(n^3)$)

- Iterate through all triplets (i, j, k) .
- Compare each $nums[i]$, $nums[j]$, $nums[k]$ for the 132 pattern.
- Time Complexity: $O(n^3)$ (too slow for large inputs).

Using Two Arrays ($O(n^2)$)

- Precompute the minimum $nums[i]$ up to index j .
- Use a nested loop to find $nums[k]$ satisfying the pattern.
- Time Complexity: $O(n^2)$, still inefficient.

8. Test Cases

```
def test_find132pattern():
    sol = Solution()
    assert sol.find132pattern([1, 2, 3, 4]) == False
    assert sol.find132pattern([3, 1, 4, 2]) == True
    assert sol.find132pattern([-1, 3, 2, 0]) == True
    assert sol.find132pattern([3, 3, 3, 3]) == False
    assert sol.find132pattern([1, 0, 1, -4, -3]) == False
    assert sol.find132pattern([9, 11, 8, 9, 10, 7, 8]) == True
    assert sol.find132pattern([10, 20, 30, 40]) == False
    assert sol.find132pattern([3, 5, 0, 3, 4]) == True
    print("All test cases passed!")
test_find132pattern()
```

9. Final Thoughts

- The **monotonic stack approach** efficiently detects the **132 pattern** in **$O(n)$ time**.
- The solution works well even for large inputs ($n \approx 2 \times 10^5$).
- Alternative approaches like **brute force** and **nested loops** are too slow.
- This is an excellent example of using **stacks** to solve **sequence-based** problems efficiently.