

Q127: Boats to Save People

1. Problem Understanding

- You're given:
 - an array `people[]` of weights
 - unlimited boats
 - each boat can carry at most 2 people
 - total weight inside a boat must be \leq limit
 - Goal: Find the minimum number of boats needed.
 - This is a classic greedy pairing problem.
-

2. Constraints

- $1 \leq N \leq 5 * 10^4$
 - $1 \leq \text{people}[i] \leq \text{limit} \leq 3 * 10^4$
 - Every person must be placed in a boat
 - At most 2 people per boat
 - Order does not matter
-

3. Edge Cases

- $N = 1 \rightarrow \text{answer} = 1$
 - Everyone too heavy to pair \rightarrow each gets its own boat
 - Perfect pairs exist \rightarrow minimum boats
 - All weights identical
 - Very light + very heavy pairing scenario
-

4. Examples

Example 1

$N = 2$, limit = 3

people = [1, 2]

Output:

1

Pair (1, 2)

Example 2

$N = 4$, limit = 5

people = [3, 5, 3, 4]

Possible pairs:

(5)

(4)

(3)

(3)

Output:

4

5. Approaches

Approach 1: Try All Pairings (Brute Force: TLE)

Idea:

- Try every combination of two people to place into boats.
- ✗ Why it fails
 - $O(N^2)$ or worse
 - N up to 50k → impossible

Complexity (Time & Space):

- ⌚ Time Complexity
 - $O(N^2)$ or worse
- 💾 Space Complexity
 - $O(1)$

Approach 2: Greedy (Two-Pointer Technique) Optimal

Idea:

- We want to place heavy people first, and try to pair them with the lightest person available.
- Why it works?
 - If the heaviest cannot pair with the lightest, they cannot pair with anyone.
 - If the heaviest can pair with the lightest, it reduces boat count.
- This greedy rule ensures minimal boats.

Steps:

- Sort the array
- Use two pointers:
 - i at start (lightest)
 - j at end (heaviest)
- While $i \leq j$:
 - If $people[i] + people[j] \leq limit$
 - pair them → $i++$, $j--$
 - Else
 - send heavy alone → $j--$
 - Increment boats count

Java Code:

```

public int numRescueBoats(int[] people, int limit) {
    Arrays.sort(people);
    int i = 0, j = people.length - 1;
    int boats = 0;

    while (i <= j) {
        if (people[i] + people[j] <= limit) {
            i++; // lightest used
            j--; // heaviest used
        } else {
            j--; // heaviest goes alone
        }
        boats++;
    }



    return boats;
}

```

Intuition Behind the Approach:

- The key observation:
 - The heaviest person must be placed in a boat now.
 - If they can be paired with the lightest, it's optimal to do so.
 - If not, pairing them with anyone heavier is impossible → they go alone.
- By always using the least possible space per boat and maximizing pairing,
- we guarantee minimum boats.
- This matches the greedy strategy of "minimize waste per step."

Complexity (Time & Space):

-  Time Complexity
 - Sorting → $O(N \log N)$
 - Two-pointer scan → $O(N)$
 - Total:
 - $O(N \log N)$
-  Space Complexity
 - $O(1)$ extra (sorting in-place, no extra arrays)

6. Justification / Proof of Optimality

- The greedy strategy is optimal because pairing the heaviest person with anyone heavier cannot work.
- If the heaviest can pair with the lightest, it's always optimal to pair them, as:
 - It "saves" one person
 - It avoids wasting a boat
- Sorting + two pointers ensures we try the best possible pairing at each step.
- This is the solution used in major interview problems.

7. Variants / Follow-Ups

- Boats with capacity for 3 people
 - Boats with variable weight limits
 - Each boat can take unlimited people but max total weight K (bin packing light version)
 - Grouping students into taxis (same logic)
 - Pairing problems in greedy optimization
-

8. Tips & Observations

- Always pair heavy with lightest first
 - If they cannot pair, heavy MUST go alone
 - Sort only once
 - Use two pointers, not nested loops
 - When $i == j$, that one person requires a boat
 - Never skip pairing opportunities; greedy is optimal
-

Q128: Subarray Product Less Than K

1. Problem Understanding

- You are given:
 - an array `nums[]`
 - an integer `k`
 - You must return how many contiguous subarrays have a product $< k$.
 - A subarray must be continuous.
-

2. Constraints

- $1 \leq n \leq 3 * 10^4$
 - $1 \leq \text{nums}[i] \leq 1000$
 - $0 \leq k \leq 10^6$
 - Time must be better than $O(N^2)$ (since N is 30k)
-

3. Edge Cases

- $k \leq 1 \rightarrow \text{answer} = 0$
 - Because product of positive integers ≥ 1 cannot be < 1 .
 - All elements $> k \rightarrow$ only single elements $< k$ count
 - All elements $= 1 \rightarrow$ every subarray counts
-

4. Examples

Example 1

Input

4

10 5 2 5

100

Output

8

Explanation

The 8 subarrays that have product less than 100 are: [10], [5], [2], [5], [10, 5], [5, 2], [2, 5], [5, 2, 5]

Note that [10, 5, 2] is not included as the product of 100 is not strictly less than k.

Example 2

Input

3

1 2 3

0

Output

0

Explanation

No subarray is possible with product less than K.

5. Approaches

Approach 1: Brute Force (Nested Loops)

Idea:

- Check every possible subarray, compute product, count if $< k$.
- ✗ Why it fails
 - Worst case:
 - 30,000 elements
 - 450 million subarrays
 - Too slow

Complexity (Time & Space):

- 🕒 Time Complexity
 - $O(N^2)$
- 💾 Space Complexity
 - $O(1)$

Approach 2: Sliding Window (Optimal)

Idea:

- Since all $\text{nums}[i] > 0$:
 - Expanding the window increases product
 - Shrinking the window decreases product
- So we use a sliding window:
 - Use left and right pointers
 - Maintain product of current window
 - If $\text{product} < k$, then:
 - all subarrays ending at right and starting from $[\text{left}..\text{right}]$ are valid
 - $\text{count} += (\text{right} - \text{left} + 1)$
 - Otherwise shrink from left
- This works because for each right, every subarray inside the window is valid.

Steps:

- Initialize:
 - $\text{product} = 1$
 - $\text{left} = 0$
 - $\text{count} = 0$
- For each right from $0 \rightarrow n-1$:
 - multiply product with $\text{nums}[\text{right}]$
 - while $\text{product} \geq k$:
 - divide product by $\text{nums}[\text{left}]$ and move left
 - now $\text{product} < k$, so:
 - add $(\text{right} - \text{left} + 1)$ to count
 - (these are valid subarrays ending at right)

Java Code:

```
public int numSubarrayProductLessThanK(int[] nums, int k) {
    if (k <= 1) return 0;

    int left = 0;
    int count = 0;
    long product = 1;

    for (int right = 0; right < nums.length; right++) {
        product *= nums[right];

        while (product >= k) {
            product /= nums[left];
            left++;
        }

        count += (right - left + 1);
    }
}
```

```
    return count;
}
```

Intuition Behind the Approach:

- Every time we expand our window by including `nums[right]`,
- the only reason product could become $\geq k$ is because the window is too large.
- Shrinking from the left gradually reduces product until the window is valid again.
- Once valid:
 - Every subarray ending at right is valid:
 - `[left..right]`
 - `[left+1..right]`
 - `[left+2..right]`
 - ...
 - `[right..right]`
 - $\text{Count} = (\text{right} - \text{left} + 1)$
- Since each element enters and leaves the window once, total operations are linear.
- It is a classic sliding-window two-pointer trick.

Complexity (Time & Space):

- ⌚ Time Complexity
 - Sliding window $\rightarrow O(N)$
 - Because each element is multiplied once and divided once.
 - 📄 Space Complexity
 - $O(1)$
 - Only variables used.
-

6. Justification / Proof of Optimality

- Sliding window works because:
 - All numbers are positive
 - Increasing window increases product
 - Decreasing window decreases product
 - Therefore, window is monotonic and expanding/shrinking is valid.
 - This gives the optimal solution.
-

7. Variants / Follow-Ups

- Subarray sum $< k$ (same logic)
 - Subarray averages $< k$
 - Subarray with product $\leq k$
 - Count of subarrays with at most K distinct elements
 - Longest subarray with product $< k$
 - All follow the sliding-window pattern.
-

8. Tips & Observations

- If $k \leq 1$, return 0 immediately
 - Use long for product (prevent overflow)
 - Never reset product—always shrink window naturally
 - Positive numbers guarantee monotonic window behavior
 - $(\text{right} - \text{left} + 1)$ is the key formula to count subarrays
-

Q129: Pair in array with difference k

1. Problem Understanding

- You're given an array `nums` and an integer `k`.
 - A `k`-diff pair is defined as a pair $(\text{nums}[i], \text{nums}[j])$ such that:
 - $i \neq j$
 - $\text{nums}[i] - \text{nums}[j] == k$
 - Pairs must be unique, meaning (1,3) counted once even if elements repeat multiple times.
-

2. Constraints

- $1 \leq n \leq 10000$
 - $0 \leq k \leq 10^7$
 - $1 \leq \text{nums}[i] \leq 10^7$
-

3. Edge Cases

- When $k < 0$: No pair possible because difference cannot be negative.
 - When $k == 0$: We are looking for numbers that appear at least twice.
 - Duplicate elements must not create duplicate pairs.
 - Large numbers but manageable constraints.
-

4. Examples

Example 1

Input: `nums = [3, 1, 4, 1, 5]`, `k = 2`

Output: 2

Pairs: (1,3), (3,5)

Example 2

Input: `nums = [1, 3, 1, 5, 4]`, `k = 0`

Output: 1

Pair: (1,1) since 1 appears twice.

5. Approaches

Approach 1: Using HashSet + HashMap (Most Efficient)

Idea:

- For $k > 0$:
 - If a number x exists, check if $x + k$ also exists.
- For $k == 0$:
 - Count numbers that occur at least twice.
- Use set/hashmap to ensure uniqueness.

Steps:

- If $k < 0 \rightarrow$ return 0.
- Build a frequency map of all numbers.
- If $k == 0 \rightarrow$ count numbers with frequency ≥ 2 .
- If $k > 0 \rightarrow$ for each number x , check if $x + k$ exists.
- Count such unique pairs.

Java Code:

```
public static int findPairs(int[] nums, int k) {
    if(k < 0) return 0;

    HashMap<Integer, Integer> map = new HashMap<>();
    for(int x : nums) map.put(x, map.getOrDefault(x, 0) + 1);

    int count = 0;

    if(k == 0){
        for(int key : map.keySet()){
            if(map.get(key) >= 2) count++;
        }
    } else {
        for(int key : map.keySet()){
            if(map.containsKey(key + k)) count++;
        }
    }

    return count;
}
```

💡 Intuition Behind the Approach:

- A difference k basically means:
- Find pairs where second number is exactly k more than the first.
- HashMap allows $O(1)$ lookup to check whether the "partner element" exists.
- Using keys avoids double counting duplicates.

Complexity (Time & Space):

- 🕒 Time Complexity
 - $O(n)$
 - Because:
 - Building hashmap $\rightarrow O(n)$
 - Iterating keys $\rightarrow O(n)$
 - Each lookup $\rightarrow O(1)$
- 💾 Space Complexity
 - $O(n)$
 - Because hashmap stores frequencies of up to n elements.

Approach 2: Sorting + Two Pointers

Idea:

- Sort the array.
- Use two pointers i and j and ensure:
 - $\text{nums}[j] - \text{nums}[i] == k$
 - $i \neq j$
- Skip duplicates to maintain unique pairs.

Steps:

- Sort array.
- Keep two pointers:
 - If difference $< k \rightarrow$ move j .
 - If difference $> k \rightarrow$ move i .
 - If equal \rightarrow record pair, move both and skip duplicates.

Java Code:

```
public static int findPairs(int[] nums, int k) {
    Arrays.sort(nums);
    int i = 0, j = 1, count = 0;
    int n = nums.length;

    while(i < n && j < n){
        if(i == j){
            j++;
            continue;
        }
    }
```

```

        int diff = nums[j] - nums[i];

        if(diff < k){
            j++;
        } else if(diff > k){
            i++;
        } else {
            count++;
            int a = nums[i];
            int b = nums[j];
            while(i < n && nums[i] == a) i++;
            while(j < n && nums[j] == b) j++;
        }
    }



    return count;
}

```

Intuition Behind the Approach:

- Sorting groups equal elements together → easy to skip duplicates.
- The difference increases automatically as j moves right.
- Two pointers ensure linear scanning instead of nested loops.

Complexity (Time & Space):

-  Time Complexity
 - $O(n \log n)$
 - Because of sorting.
 - Two-pointer scan is $O(n)$.
-  Space Complexity
 - $O(1)$ or $O(n)$ depending on sorting implementation.

Approach 3: Brute Force (For Understanding Only)

Idea:

- Compare each pair (i,j) using nested loops.
- Use a set to ensure unique pairs.

Java Code:

```

public static int findPairs(int[] nums, int k) {
    HashSet<String> set = new HashSet<>();
    int n = nums.length;

    for(int i=0;i<n;i++){
        for(int j=i+1;j<n;j++){
            if(nums[i] - nums[j] == k){
                int a = nums[j];
                int b = nums[i];
            }
        }
    }

    return set.size();
}

```

```

        set.add(a + "#" + b);
    }
    if(nums[j] - nums[i] == k){
        int a = nums[i];
        int b = nums[j];
        set.add(a + "#" + b);
    }
}
}



return set.size();
}

```

Intuition Behind the Approach:

- Straightforward checking of all possible pairs.
- Using a string key avoids counting a pair twice.

Complexity (Time & Space):

-  Time Complexity
 - $O(n^2)$
 - Because all pairs are checked.
-  Space Complexity
 - $O(n)$ due to set storing unique pairs.

6. Justification / Proof of Optimality

- Approach 1 is optimal because hash lookups allow instant pairing.
- Sorting approach is also good but slower.
- Brute force is only for understanding.

7. Variants / Follow-Ups

- Count unordered k-diff pairs → modify condition to $\text{abs}(\text{nums}[i] - \text{nums}[j]) == k$.
- Return the pairs themselves, not just count.
- Handle extremely large inputs (stream-based frequency counting).

8. Tips & Observations

- When $k == 0$, the problem becomes count duplicates.
- Avoid overcounting: sets/maps are crucial.
- Difference pairs are directional; (a,b) is same as (b,a) if difference fixed.

Q130: Maximum width jump

1. Problem Understanding

- You are given an array `nums`.
 - A ramp is a pair (i, j) such that:
 - $i < j$
 - $nums[i] \leq nums[j]$
 - The width is:
 - $width = j - i$
 - Your task is to find the maximum width among all valid ramps.
 - If no ramp exists, return 0.
-

2. Constraints

- $2 \leq n \leq 50000$
 - Values up to $5 * 10^4$
 - Must use $O(n)$ or $O(n \log n)$ approach.
-

3. Edge Cases

- Strictly decreasing array \rightarrow no ramp \rightarrow return 0
 - Multiple valid ramps; pick max width
 - Duplicate values help (since \leq condition)
-

4. Examples

```
Example 1
nums = [6, 0, 8, 2, 1, 5]
max ramp = (1, 5) because nums[1]=0 <= nums[5]=5
width = 5 - 1 = 4
Output 4
Example 2
nums = [9, 8, 1, 0, 1, 9, 4, 0, 4, 1]
max ramp = (2, 9) => 1 <= 1
width = 7
Output 7
```

5. Approaches

Approach 1: Monotonic Decreasing Stack + Backward Scan (Optimal $O(n)$)

Idea:

- Build a stack of indices where values are strictly decreasing.
- These are the best possible left-side candidates.
- Traverse from right ($j = n-1$ to 0):

- While the top of the stack forms a valid ramp:
 - compute width
 - pop (we already found the best j for that index)

Java Code:

```
public static int maxWidthRamp(int[] nums) {
    Stack<Integer> st = new Stack<>();

    for (int i = 0; i < nums.length; i++) {
        if (st.isEmpty() || nums[i] < nums[st.peek()]) {
            st.push(i);
        }
    }

    int ans = 0;



    for (int j = nums.length - 1; j >= 0; j--) {
        while (!st.isEmpty() && nums[st.peek()] <= nums[j]) {
            ans = Math.max(ans, j - st.peek());
            st.pop();
        }
    }

    return ans;
}
```

Intuition Behind the Approach:

- A left index with a bigger value than previous ones is useless → skip
- Stack keeps only good smallest-left candidates
- Scanning from right ensures maximum width

Complexity (Time & Space):

-  Time Complexity
 - $O(n)$ because:
 - each index is pushed once
 - each popped at most once
-  Space Complexity
 - $O(n)$

Approach 2: Sorting + Two Pointers

Idea:

- Create pairs (value, index)
- Sort by value (if tie → index)
- Now all $\text{value}[i] \leq \text{value}[j]$ is guaranteed in sorted order.
- Use two pointers to maintain:

- minLeftIndex
- currentRightIndex

Steps:

- Create arr = [(nums[i], i)] pairs
- Sort arr by value increasing
- Maintain:
 - minIndex = $+\infty$
 - For each pair (value, index):
 - answer = max(answer, index - minIndex)
 - update minIndex
- This is true two-pointers, because:
 - sorted array \rightarrow left \leq right automatically
 - only track minimal index so far as left pointer
 - current index acts as right pointer

Java Code:

```
public static int maxWidthRamp(int[] nums) {

    int n = nums.length;

    // arr[i] = {nums[i], i}  $\rightarrow$  store (value, originalIndex)
    int[][] arr = new int[n][2];

    // Fill the pair array
    for (int i = 0; i < n; i++) {
        arr[i][0] = nums[i]; // value
        arr[i][1] = i;      // index
    }

    // Sort by value (ascending).
    // After sorting, for any two pairs a and b:
    // a[0] <= b[0] ensures nums[left] <= nums[right]
    Arrays.sort(arr, (a, b) -> a[0] - b[0]);

    int minIndex = Integer.MAX_VALUE; // track smallest index seen so far
    int ans = 0;                      // maximum width ramp

    // Iterate over sorted pairs (value, index)
    for (int[] p : arr) {

        int idx = p[1]; // original index of current element

        // If current index is smaller  $\rightarrow$  becomes new left boundary
        if (idx < minIndex) {
            minIndex = idx;
        }

        // idx > minIndex  $\rightarrow$  we found a valid ramp: minIndex < idx AND
```

```

nums[minIndex] <= nums[idx]
    else {
        // width = rightIndex - leftIndex
        ans = Math.max(ans, idx - minIndex);
    }
}

return ans;
}

```

Intuition Behind the Approach:

- Sorting by value ensures $\text{nums}[\text{left}] \leq \text{nums}[\text{right}]$
- Only check whether the index order also matches ($\text{leftIndex} < \text{rightIndex}$)
- Maintain the smallest left index so far (this becomes the left pointer)
- Current element acts as right pointer
- This becomes a clean, stable 2-pointer system on sorted value-index pairs.

Complexity (Time & Space):

- ⌚ Time Complexity
 - $O(n \log n)$ due to sorting
- 📁 Space Complexity
 - $O(n)$

Approach 3: Brute Force ($O(n^2)$, not recommended)

Idea:

- Try every (i, j) pair from right to left.

Java Code:

```

public static int maxWidthRamp(int[] nums) {
    int ans = 0;
    int n = nums.length;

    for (int i = 0; i < n; i++) {
        for (int j = n - 1; j > i; j--) {
            if (nums[i] <= nums[j]) {
                ans = Math.max(ans, j - i);
                break;
            }
        }
    }



    return ans;
}

```


Intuition Behind the Approach:

- Simple but too slow.

Complexity (Time & Space):

-  Time Complexity
 - $O(n^2)$
 -  Space Complexity
 - $O(1)$
-

6. Justification / Proof of Optimality

- Monotonic stack gives best performance: $O(n)$
 - Sorting + two pointers is clean and intuitive: $O(n \log n)$
 - Brute force is useful only for understanding.
-

7. Variants / Follow-Ups

- Count number of valid ramps
 - Return the pair itself
 - Reverse condition: find (i, j) such that $\text{nums}[i] \geq \text{nums}[j]$
 - 2D variant in matrices
-

8. Tips & Observations

- Monotonic structures drastically reduce search space
 - Sorting transforms ramp condition into simple index comparison
 - Always check decreasing patterns — they usually suggest stacks
-

Q131: Maximum Consecutive Ones 2

1. Problem Understanding

- You are given a binary array `nums` and an integer `k`.
 - You may flip at most `k` zeroes to ones. Find the maximum length of a contiguous subarray that contains only 1s after at most `k` flips.
-

2. Constraints

- $1 \leq \text{nums.length} \leq 10^5$
- $0 \leq \text{nums}[i] \leq 1$
- $0 \leq k \leq \text{nums.length}$
- Need an $O(n)$ or $O(n \log n)$ solution for large `n`.

3. Edge Cases

- $k == 0$: standard maximum consecutive ones (no flips).
 - $k \geq \text{count}(0s)$: you can flip all zeros \rightarrow answer = n .
 - All zeros or all ones arrays.
 - $n = 1$.
 - Very large k relative to n .
-

4. Examples

Example 1

Input: $n=11, k=2$

nums = [1,1,1,0,0,0,1,1,1,1,0]

Output: 6

Explanation: flip two zeros to get [1,1,1,0,0,1,1,1,1,1,1] \rightarrow longest 6.

Example 2

Input: $n=4, k=4$

nums = [0,0,0,1]

Output: 4

Explanation: flip all zeros \rightarrow [1,1,1,1].

5. Approaches

Approach 1: Sliding Window / Two Pointers (Optimal, $O(n)$)

Idea:

- Maintain a window $[l, r]$ that contains at most k zeros. Expand r and when zeros exceed k , move l until zeros $\leq k$. Track the maximum window length.

Steps:

- Initialize $l = 0, \text{zeros} = 0, \text{ans} = 0$.
- For r from 0 to $n-1$:
 - If $\text{nums}[r] == 0 \rightarrow \text{zeros}++$.
 - While $\text{zeros} > k$: if $\text{nums}[l] == 0 \rightarrow \text{zeros}--; l++$.
 - Update $\text{ans} = \max(\text{ans}, r - l + 1)$.
- Return ans .

Java Code:

```
public static int longestOnes(int[] nums, int k) {  
    int l = 0;  
    int zeros = 0;  
    int ans = 0;
```

```



    for (int r = 0; r < nums.length; r++) {
        if (nums[r] == 0) zeros++;
        while (zeros > k) {
            if (nums[l] == 0) zeros--;
            l++;
        }
        ans = Math.max(ans, r - l + 1);
    }
    return ans;
}

```

Intuition Behind the Approach:

- We want the largest contiguous block with $\leq k$ zeros — that is exactly a variable-length window constrained by a count.
- Expanding r increases candidate length; contracting l maintains feasibility.
- Each index enters and leaves the window at most once \rightarrow linear time.

Complexity (Time & Space):

-  Time Complexity
 - $O(n)$ — each r moves once; l moves at most n times.
 - Why: the while loop increments l only when zero count exceeds k ; total increments across entire scan $\leq n$.
-  Space Complexity
 - $O(1)$ — only counters and pointers.

Approach 2: Prefix Sum of Zero Indices + Binary Search ($O(n \log n)$)

Idea:

- Store indices of all zeros.
- To build a window that flips at most k zeros, use the zero-list to quickly compute the farthest right boundary.
- For each zero-index, find the $(k+1)$ -th zero to the right \rightarrow defines max window

Steps:

- Build `zeroIdx` list of positions where `nums[i] == 0`.
- If `zeroIdx.size() <= k` \rightarrow you can flip all zeros \rightarrow answer = n .
- Otherwise, for each i :
 - Let `leftZero = zeroIdx[i]`
 - Let `rightZero = zeroIdx[i + k]`
 - The max window is between previous zero and next zero boundaries.

Java Code:

```

public static int longestOnesPrefix(int[] nums, int k) {
    ArrayList<Integer> zeros = new ArrayList<>();

```

```

for (int i = 0; i < nums.length; i++) {
    if (nums[i] == 0) zeros.add(i);
}

if (zeros.size() <= k) return nums.length;

int ans = 0;

for (int i = 0; i + k < zeros.size(); i++) {
    int leftZero = zeros.get(i);
    int rightZero = zeros.get(i + k);

    int leftBoundary = (i == 0) ? 0 : zeros.get(i - 1) + 1;
    int rightBoundary = (i + k == zeros.size() - 1) ? nums.length - 1 :
zeros.get(i + k + 1) - 1;

    ans = Math.max(ans, rightBoundary - leftBoundary + 1);
}



return ans;
}

```

Intuition Behind the Approach:

- The array becomes divided by zeros.
- Flipping k consecutive zeros means we take a window between the (i-1)-th zero and (i+k+1)-th zero.
- Zero positions give perfect left/right window boundaries.

Complexity (Time & Space):

-  Time Complexity
 - Collecting zeros: $O(n)$
 - Looping over zeros: $O(z)$ where z = number of zeros
 - Total: $O(n)$
-  Space Complexity
 - $O(z)$ to store zero indices.

Approach 3: Brute Force ($O(n^2)$, For understanding only)

Idea:

- For each start i , expand j and count zeros, stop when zeros exceed k , update maximum length.

Java Code:

```

public static int longestOnesBrute(int[] nums, int k) {
    int ans = 0;

    for (int i = 0; i < nums.length; i++) {
        int zeros = 0;

```

```

        for (int j = i; j < nums.length; j++) {
            if (nums[j] == 0) zeros++;
            if (zeros > k) break;

            ans = Math.max(ans, j - i + 1);
        }
    }



    return ans;
}

```

Intuition Behind the Approach:

- Expands every possible window — explores all choices.
- Too slow for large input but good for conceptual understanding.

Complexity (Time & Space):

-  Time Complexity
 - $O(n^2)$
 - Why: nested loops.
-  Space Complexity
 - $O(1)$.

6. Justification / Proof of Optimality

- Sliding window is the optimal solution because it naturally models “at most k bad items”.
- Prefix-zero-index solution is useful when analyzing zero boundaries or performing k-group constraints.
- Brute force only for learning correctness pattern.

7. Variants / Follow-Ups

- Flip exactly k zeros, not at most.
- Longest substring with at most k replacements (string version).
- Max consecutive ones with cost-per-flip scenarios.
- Generalized to non-binary arrays using $\text{sum} \leq k$ constraints.

8. Tips & Observations

- Anytime you hear “flip at most k items” → sliding window with a count.
- Zeros act as boundaries; analyzing their positions gives alternate solutions.
- When k is 0, the sliding window collapses to simple consecutive ones counting.

Q132: Max Number of K-Sum Pairs

1. Problem Understanding

- We are given an array `nums` and an integer `k`.
 - You can perform operations where you remove two numbers whose sum is exactly `k`.
 - Return the maximum number of operations you can perform.
-

2. Constraints

- $1 \leq \text{nums.length} \leq 100000$
 - $1 \leq \text{nums}[i] \leq 10^9$
 - $0 \leq k \leq 10^9$
 - Large input \rightarrow must aim for $O(n)$ or $O(n \log n)$ solutions.
-

3. Edge Cases

- All numbers greater than `k` \rightarrow no pairs.
 - `k = 0` edge half-case (pairs must be identical numbers).
 - Frequent duplicates.
 - Large values \rightarrow only integer arithmetic needed.
 - Only one valid pair existing.
-

4. Examples

Example 1

`nums = [1,2,3,4]`, `k = 5` \rightarrow output = 2
(1+4), (2+3)

Example 2

`nums = [3,1,3,4,3]`, `k = 6` \rightarrow output = 1
Only possible pair: (3,3)

5. Approaches

Approach 1: Brute Force ($O(n^2)$)

Idea:

- For each element, search for its complement `k - nums[i]`.
- If found and not used, remove both.
- Continue until no more pairs.

Java Code:

```

public static int maxOperations(int[] nums, int k) {
    int n = nums.length;
    boolean[] used = new boolean[n];
    int ops = 0;

    for (int i = 0; i < n; i++) {
        if (used[i]) continue;
        for (int j = i + 1; j < n; j++) {
            if (!used[j] && nums[i] + nums[j] == k) {
                used[i] = used[j] = true;
                ops++;
                break;
            }
        }
    }
    return ops;
}

```

Intuition Behind the Approach:

- Directly check all pairs.
- Works but extremely slow for large inputs.

Complexity (Time & Space):

- ⌚ Time Complexity
 - $O(n^2)$ because every pair of indices is checked.
- 📁 Space Complexity
 - $O(n)$ for the used[] array.

Approach 2: Sorting + Two Pointers ($O(n \log n)$)

Idea:

- Sort the array.
- Use two pointers (l, r):
- If $\text{nums}[l] + \text{nums}[r] == k \rightarrow$ count operation, move both.
- If $\text{sum} < k \rightarrow$ move left.
- If $\text{sum} > k \rightarrow$ move right.

Java Code:

```

public static int maxOperations(int[] nums, int k) {
    Arrays.sort(nums);
    int l = 0, r = nums.length - 1, ops = 0;

    while (l < r) {
        int sum = nums[l] + nums[r];
        if (sum == k) {
            ops++;
        }
    }
}

```

```

        l++;
        r--;
    } else if (sum < k) {
        l++;
    } else {
        r--;
    }
}
return ops;
}

```

Intuition Behind the Approach:

- Sorting helps control the sum direction.
- Two pointers efficiently find matching pairs.

Complexity (Time & Space):

- ⌚ Time Complexity
 - $O(n \log n)$ due to sorting.
 - Two-pointer scan is $O(n)$.
- 💾 Space Complexity
 - $O(1)$ ignoring sorting space.

Approach 3: HashMap Counting (Optimal $O(n)$)

Idea:

- Use a frequency map:
 - For each number x , its required partner is $k - x$.
 - If partner exists in map:
 - Use one from map \rightarrow count operation.
 - Else:
 - Store current number in map.
- Very efficient since each element is processed once.

Java Code:

```

public static int maxOperations(int[] nums, int k) {
    HashMap<Integer, Integer> map = new HashMap<>();
    int ops = 0;

    for (int x : nums) {
        int need = k - x;

        if (map.containsKey(need) && map.get(need) > 0) {
            ops++;
            map.put(need, map.get(need) - 1);
        } else {
            map.put(x, map.getOrDefault(x, 0) + 1);
        }
    }
    return ops;
}

```



```
    }  
  }  
  return ops;  
}
```

Intuition Behind the Approach:

- For each number, try to find its partner immediately.
- If partner previously seen → form pair.
- Else store number.
- Map ensures constant-time lookup → very fast.

Complexity (Time & Space):

- ⌚ Time Complexity
 - $O(n)$
 - Each element inserted or matched exactly once.
- 📁 Space Complexity
 - $O(n)$ in worst case (no pairs).

6. Justification / Proof of Optimality

- Brute force is too slow for $n = 10^5$.
- Sorting+two-pointers is good, clean, commonly used.
- HashMap is optimal, used in almost all top solutions.
- HashMap approach avoids sorting and matches pairs instantly.

7. Variants / Follow-Ups

- Count unique pairs instead of removing.
- Print actual pairs instead of count.
- Generalize to k-sum using hashing.
- Use multiset/map instead of hashmaps in languages like C++.

8. Tips & Observations

- Any problem where you match “two numbers summing to k” strongly suggests:
 - HashMap
 - Frequency count
 - Two pointers after sorting
- Removing elements = choosing pairs; HashMap excels at this.

Q133: Count Pair Sum

1. Problem Understanding

- You are given two sorted, distinct-element arrays arr1 (size m) and arr2 (size n).
 - You must count how many pairs (a from arr1, b from arr2) satisfy:
 - $a + b == x$
 - Return only count, not the pairs.
-

2. Constraints

- $1 \leq m, n \leq 5 * 10^4$
 - Arrays are sorted
 - Elements are distinct inside each array
 - $1 \leq x \leq 2 * 10^5$
 - Overall operations must ideally be $O(m + n)$ or $O(m \log n)$.
-

3. Edge Cases

- All values smaller than x → result may be 0.
 - All values greater than x → result may be 0.
 - All pairs valid only once (distinct arrays guarantee no duplicates in each array).
 - Very large arrays → brute force will TLE.
-

4. Examples

```
Example 1:  
arr1 = [1,2,4,5]  
arr2 = [3,5,7,8]  
x = 9  
Pairs → (1,8), (2,7), (4,5) → count = 3.
```

```
Example 2:  
arr1 = [1,2,3]  
arr2 = [4,5,6,7,8]  
x = 8  
Pairs → (1,7), (2,6), (3,5) → count = 3.
```

5. Approaches

Approach 1: Brute Force (Nested Loops) — $O(m * n)$

Idea:

- Check all $m*n$ pairs and count those with sum x.

Java Code:

```

public static int countPairs(int[] arr1, int[] arr2, int x) {
    int count = 0;
    for (int a : arr1) {
        for (int b : arr2) {
            if (a + b == x) count++;
        }
    }
    return count;
}

```

Intuition Behind the Approach:

- Straightforward brute-force checking of all possibilities.
- Simple to write, but too slow for large inputs.

Complexity (Time & Space):

- ⌚ Time Complexity
 - $O(m * n)$
 - Why: Each element of arr1 is paired with each element of arr2.
- 📁 Space Complexity
 - $O(1)$.

Approach 2: Binary Search on Second Array — $O(m \log n)$

Idea:

- For each a from arr1:
 - Look for $x - a$ in arr2 using binary search.

Java Code:

```

public static int countPairs(int[] arr1, int[] arr2, int x) {
    int count = 0;
    for (int a : arr1) {
        int target = x - a;
        int lo = 0, hi = arr2.length - 1;
        while (lo <= hi) {
            int mid = lo + (hi - lo) / 2;
            if (arr2[mid] == target) {
                count++;
                break;
            } else if (arr2[mid] < target) {
                lo = mid + 1;
            } else {
                hi = mid - 1;
            }
        }
    }
}



```

```
    return count;
}
```

Intuition Behind the Approach:

- Since arr2 is sorted, binary search helps locate the matching pair in $\log n$ time.

Complexity (Time & Space):

-  Time Complexity
 - $O(m \log n)$
 - Why: For each of m elements, binary search takes $\log n$.
-  Space Complexity
 - $O(1)$.

Approach 3: HashSet Approach — $O(m + n)$ (Better than binary search if arrays weren't sorted)

Idea:

- Store all elements of arr2 in a HashSet, then for each a check if $(x - a)$ exists.

Java Code:



```
public static int countPairs(int[] arr1, int[] arr2, int x) {
    HashSet<Integer> set = new HashSet<>();
    for (int b : arr2) set.add(b);

    int count = 0;
    for (int a : arr1) {
        if (set.contains(x - a)) count++;
    }
    return count;
}
```

Intuition Behind the Approach:

- Hashing gives $O(1)$ lookup for each pair check.

Complexity (Time & Space):

-  Time Complexity
 - $O(m + n)$
 - Why: Build hash set $\rightarrow O(n)$, loop arr1 $\rightarrow O(m)$.
-  Space Complexity
 - $O(n)$ for the hash set.

Approach 4: Two Pointers (Optimal) — $O(m + n)$

Idea:

- Since both arrays are sorted:
 - Use pointer $i = 0$ on `arr1` (smallest values)
 - Use pointer $j = n-1$ on `arr2` (largest values)
- Move pointers based on `arr1[i] + arr2[j]`:
 - If `sum == x` → `count++`, move both
 - If `sum < x` → need bigger sum → `i++`
 - If `sum > x` → need smaller sum → `j--`

Java Code:

```
public static int countPairs(int[] arr1, int[] arr2, int x) {
    int i = 0;
    int j = arr2.length - 1;
    int count = 0;



    while (i < arr1.length && j >= 0) {
        int sum = arr1[i] + arr2[j];

        if (sum == x) {
            count++;
            i++;
            j--;
        } else if (sum < x) {
            i++; // need larger sum
        } else {
            j--; // need smaller sum
        }
    }
    return count;
}
```

Intuition Behind the Approach:

- Sorted arrays allow a linear scan from opposite ends.
- You always eliminate one pointer depending on sum, guaranteeing no missed pairs.

Complexity (Time & Space):

-  Time Complexity
 - $O(m + n)$
 - Why: Each pointer moves monotonically across its array once.
-  Space Complexity
 - $O(1)$.

6. Justification / Proof of Optimality

- Fully uses sorted property.
- Inspects each element at most once.
- Eliminates impossible sums quickly.

- Best complexity achievable under given constraints.
 - Thus Two-Pointer is the optimal approach.
-

7. Variants / Follow-Ups

- Return the pairs instead of count.
 - Arrays unsorted → sort + two pointers OR use hashset.
 - Duplicate elements present → handle frequency counts.
 - K arrays sum → similar expansion as K-sum problems.
-

8. Tips & Observations

- When both arrays sorted → two-pointer is usually optimal for sum problems.
 - Hashing is best when arrays not sorted.
 - Avoid brute force for $n = 50,000$.
-

Q134: Maximum Consecutive Ones

1. Problem Understanding

- You are given a binary array `arr` of size n .
 - Your task is to find the maximum number of consecutive 1s in the array.
-

2. Constraints

- $1 \leq n \leq 10^5$
 - $0 \leq \text{arr}[i] \leq 1$
 - Need an $O(n)$ final solution.
-

3. Edge Cases

- All zeros → answer is 0
 - All ones → answer is n
 - Single element array
 - Alternating 1s and 0s
 - Large n → brute force may be slow
-

4. Examples

```
Example 1
Input: [1, 0, 1, 1]
```

Output: 2

Example 2

Input: [1, 1, 1]

Output: 3

5. Approaches

Approach 1: Brute Force ($O(n^2)$)

Idea:

- Check every index i , and count how many consecutive 1s start from there.

Java Code:

```
public static int maxConsecutiveOnes(int[] arr) {
    int n = arr.length;
    int ans = 0;



    for (int i = 0; i < n; i++) {
        int count = 0;
        for (int j = i; j < n; j++) {
            if (arr[j] == 1) count++;
            else break;
        }
        ans = Math.max(ans, count);
    }

    return ans;
}
```

 **Intuition Behind the Approach:**

- For each position, simulate starting a consecutive-ones streak.
- Very slow because we repeatedly scan the same segments.

Complexity (Time & Space):

-  Time Complexity
 - $O(n^2)$
 - Because at each i , inner loop expands until a zero or end.
-  Space Complexity
 - $O(1)$
 - Only counters.

Approach 2: Linear Scan with Reset (Optimal & Clean) — $O(n)$

Idea:

- Traverse the array once:
 - Maintain a currentCount of continuous ones
 - Reset it when you hit a 0
 - Track the maximum streak in ans

Java Code:

```
public static int maxConsecutiveOnes(int[] arr) {
    int ans = 0;
    int count = 0;



    for (int x : arr) {
        if (x == 1) {
            count++;
            ans = Math.max(ans, count);
        } else {
            count = 0;
        }
    }

    return ans;
}
```

Intuition Behind the Approach:

- Consecutive ones naturally form segments.
- Whenever you see a zero, a segment ends → reset count.
- Always update maximum during the scan.

Complexity (Time & Space):

-  Time Complexity
 - $O(n)$ — every element processed once.
-  Space Complexity
 - $O(1)$ — constant counters.

6. Justification / Proof of Optimality

- The brute force simulates all possible consecutive streaks, which is unnecessary.
- The optimal linear scan captures the nature of the problem: ones form continuous blocks that can be counted in one pass.
- Given $n \leq 10^5$, the linear scan is required and the best solution.

7. Variants / Follow-Ups

- Count maximum consecutive 0s
- Count maximum consecutive 1s with at most one flip (follow-up variant)
- Count longest subarray of equal elements

8. Tips & Observations

- Most "consecutive ones" problems use either:
 - Simple counter, or
 - Sliding window if flipping or skipping is allowed.
 - Resetting counters at boundaries is a common pattern.
-