Introduction to Number Theory and Algorithms

Christian J. Rudder

August 2024

Contents

This page is left intentionally blank.

Prerequisites

Theorem 0.1: Common Derivatives

Power Rule: For $n \neq 0$ $\frac{d}{dx}(x^n) = n \cdot x^{n-1}$. E.g., $\frac{d}{dx}(x^2) = 2x$

Derivative of a Constant: $\frac{d}{dx}(c) = 0$. E.g., $\frac{d}{dx}(5) = 0$

Derivative of ln: $\frac{d}{dx}(\ln x) = \frac{1}{x}$

Derivative of $\log_a$: $\frac{d}{dx}(\log_a x) = \frac{1}{x \ln a}$

Derivative of $\sqrt{x}$: $\frac{d}{dx}(\sqrt{x}) = \frac{1}{2\sqrt{x}}$

Derivative of function $f(x)$: $\frac{d}{dx}(x) = 1$. E.g., $\frac{d}{dx}(5x) = 5$

Derivative of the Exponential Function: $\frac{d}{dx}(e^x) = e^x$

Theorem 0.2: L'Hopital's Rule

Let $f(x)$ and $g(x)$ be two functions. If $\lim_{x \to a} f(x) = 0$ and $\lim_{x \to a} g(x) = 0$, or $\lim_{x \to a} f(x) = \pm\infty$ and $\lim_{x \to a} g(x) = \pm\infty$, then:

$$\lim_{x \to a} \frac{f(x)}{g(x)} = \lim_{x \to a} \frac{f'(x)}{g'(x)}$$

Where $f'(x)$ and $g'(x)$ are the derivatives of $f(x)$ and $g(x)$ respectively.

Theorem 0.3: Exponents Rules

For $a, b, x \in \mathbb{R}$, we have:

$$x^a \cdot x^b = x^{a+b} \text{ and } (x^a)^b = x^{ab}$$

$$x^a \cdot y^a = (xy)^a \text{ and } \frac{x^a}{y^a} = \left(\frac{x}{y}\right)^a$$

Note: The := symbol is short for "is defined as." For example, $x := y$ means x is defined as y.

Definition 0.1: Logarithm

Let $a, x \in \mathbb{R}$, $a > 0$, $a \neq 1$. Logarithm x base a is denoted as $\log_a(x)$, and is defined as:

$$\log_a(x) = y \iff a^y = x$$

Meaning *log* is inverse of the exponential function, i.e., $\log_a(x) := (a^y)^{-1}$.

Tip: To remember the order $log_a(x) = a^y$, think, "base a," as a is the base of our *log* and y.

Theorem 0.4: Logarithm Rules

For $a, b, x \in \mathbb{R}$, we have:

$$\log_a(x) + \log_a(y) = \log_a(xy) \text{ and } \log_a(x) - \log_a(y) = \log_a\left(\frac{x}{y}\right)$$

$$\log_a(x^b) = b\log_a(x) \text{ and } \log_a(x) = \frac{\log_b(x)}{\log_b(a)}$$

Definition 0.2: Permutations

Let n be a positive integer. Then the number of distinct ways to arrange n objects in order is it's *permutation*. Denoted:

$$n! := n \cdot (n-1) \cdot (n-2) \cdot \ldots \cdot 2 \cdot 1$$

Definition 0.3: Combinations

Let n and k be positive integers. Where order doesn't matter, the number of distinct ways to choose k objects from n objects is it's *combination*. Denoted:

$$\binom{n}{k} := \frac{n!}{k!(n-k)!}$$

Where $\binom{n}{k}$ is read as "n choose k.", and $\binom{\cdot}{\cdot}$, the *binomial coefficient*.

Theorem 0.5: Binomial Theorem

Let a and b be real numbers, and n a non-negative integer. The binomial expansion of $(a+b)^n$ is given by:

$$(a+b)^n = \sum_{k=0}^{n} \binom{n}{k} a^{n-k} b^k$$

which expands explicitly as:

$$(a+b)^n = \binom{n}{0} a^n + \binom{n}{1} a^{n-1}b + \binom{n}{2} a^{n-2}b^2 + \cdots + \binom{n}{n-1} ab^{n-1} + \binom{n}{n} b^n$$

where $\binom{n}{k}$ represents the binomial coefficient, defined as:

$$\binom{n}{k} = \frac{n!}{k!(n-k)!}$$

for $0 \leq k \leq n$.

Theorem 0.6: Binomial Expansion of 2^n

For any non-negative integer n, the following identity holds:

$$2^n = \sum_{i=0}^{n} \binom{n}{i} = (1+1)^n.$$

Definition 0.4: Well-Ordering Principle

Every non-empty set of positive integers has a least element.

Definition 0.5: "Without Loss of Generality"

A phrase that indicates that the proceeding logic also applies to the other cases. i.e., For a proposition not to lose the assumption that it works other ways as well.

Theorem 0.7: Pigeon Hole Principle

Let $n, m \in \mathbb{Z}^+$ with $n < m$. Then if we distribute m pigeons into n pigeonholes, there must be at least one pigeonhole with more than one pigeon.

Theorem 0.8: Growth Rate Comparisons

Let n be a positive integer. The following inequalities show the growth rate of some common functions in increasing order:

$$1 < \log n < n < n \log n < n^2 < n^3 < 2^n < n!$$

These inequalities indicate that as n grows larger, each function on the right-hand side grows faster than the ones to its left.

Introduction to Runtime Complexity

1.1 Asymptotic Notation

Asymptotic analysis is a method for describing the limiting behavior of functions as inputs grow infinitely.

Definition 1.1: Asymptotic

Let $f(n)$ and $g(n)$ be two functions. As n grows, if $f(n)$ grows closer to $g(n)$ never reaching, we say that "$f(n)$ is **asymptotic** to $g(n)$."

We call the point where $f(n)$ starts behaving similarly to $g(n)$ the **threshold** n_0. After this point n_0, $f(n)$ follows the same general path as $g(n)$.

Definition 1.2: Big-O: (Upper Bound)

Let f and g be functions. $f(n)$ our function of interest, and $g(n)$ our function of comparison.

Then we say $f(n) = O(g(n))$, "$f(n)$ **is big-O of** $g(n)$," if $f(n)$ grows no faster than $g(n)$, up to a constant factor. Let n_0 be our asymptotic threshold. Then, for all $n \geq n_0$,

$$0 \leq f(n) \leq c \cdot g(n)$$

Represented as the ratio $\dfrac{f(n)}{g(n)} \leq c$ for all $n \geq n_0$. Analytically we write,

$$\lim_{n \to \infty} \frac{f(n)}{g(n)} < \infty$$

Meaning, as we chase infinity, our numerator grows slower than the denominator, bounded, never reaching infinity.

Examples:

(i.) $3n^2 + 2n + 1 = O(n^2)$

(ii.) $n^{100} = O(2^n)$

(iii.) $\log n = O(\sqrt{n})$

Proof 1.1: $\log n = O(\sqrt{n})$

We setup our ratio:

$$\lim_{n \to \infty} \frac{\log n}{\sqrt{n}}$$

Since $\log n$ and $\sqrt{n}$ grow infinitely without bound, they are of indeterminate form $\frac{\infty}{\infty}$. We apply L'Hopital's Rule, which states that taking derivatives of the numerator and denominator will yield an evaluateable limit:

$$\lim_{n \to \infty} \frac{\log n}{\sqrt{n}} = \lim_{n \to \infty} \frac{\frac{d}{dn} \log n}{\frac{d}{dn} \sqrt{n}}$$

Yielding derivatives, $\log n = \frac{1}{n}$ and $\sqrt{n} = \frac{1}{2\sqrt{n}}$. We substitute these back into our limit:

$$\lim_{n \to \infty} \frac{\frac{1}{n}}{\frac{1}{2\sqrt{n}}} = \lim_{n \to \infty} \frac{2\sqrt{n}}{n} = \lim_{n \to \infty} \frac{2}{\sqrt{n}} = 0$$

Our limit approaches 0, as we have a constant factor in the numerator, and a growing denominator. Thus, $\log n = O(\sqrt{n})$, as $0 < \infty$.   ∎

Definition 1.3: Big-Ω: (Lower Bound)

The symbol Ω reads "Omega." Let f and g be functions. Then $f(n) = \Omega(g(n))$ if $f(n)$ grows no slower than $g(n)$, up to a constant factor. I.e., lower bounded by $g(n)$. Let n_0 be our asymptotic threshold. Then, for all $n \geq n_0$,

$$0 \leq c \cdot g(n) \leq f(n)$$

$$0 < \lim_{n \to \infty} \frac{f(n)}{g(n)}$$

Meaning, as we chase infinity, our numerator grows faster than the denominator, approaching 0 asymptotically.

Examples: $n! = \Omega(2^n)$; $\frac{n}{100} = \Omega(n)$; $n^{3/2} = \Omega(\sqrt{n})$; $\sqrt{n} = \Omega(\log n)$

Definition 1.4: Big Θ: (Tight Bound)

The symbol Θ reads "Theta." Let f and g be functions. Then $f(n) = \Theta(g(n))$ if $f(n)$ grows at the same rate as $g(n)$, up to a constant factor. I.e., $f(n)$ is both upper and lower bounded by $g(n)$. Let n_0 be our asymptotic threshold, and $c_1 > 0, c_2 > 0$ be some constants. Then, for all $n \geq n_0$,

$$0 \leq c_1 \cdot g(n) \leq f(n) \leq c_2 \cdot g(n)$$

$$0 < \lim_{n \to \infty} \frac{f(n)}{g(n)} < \infty$$

Meaning, as we chase infinity, our numerator grows at the same rate as the denominator.

Examples: $n^2 = \Theta(n^2)$; $2n^3 + 2n = \Theta(n^3)$; $\log n + \sqrt{n} = \Theta(\sqrt{n})$.

Tip: To review:

- **Big-O:** $f(n) < g(n)$ (Upper Bound); $f(n)$ grows no faster than $g(n)$.

- **Big-Ω:** $f(n) > g(n)$ (Lower Bound); $f(n)$ grows no slower than $g(n)$.

- **Big-Θ:** $f(n) = g(n)$ (Tight Bound); $f(n)$ grows at the same rate as $g(n)$.

Theorem 1.1: Types of Asymptotic Behavior

The following are common relationships between different types of functions and their asymptotic growth rates:

- **Polynomials.** Let $f(n) = a_0 + a_1 n + \cdots + a_d n^d$ with $a_d > 0$. Then, $\underline{f(n) \text{ is } \Theta(n^d)}$.
  E.e., $3n^2 + 2n + 1$ is $\Theta(n^2)$.

- **Logarithms.** $\underline{\Theta(\log_a n) \text{ is } \Theta(\log_b n)}$ for any constants $a, b > 0$. That is, logarithmic functions in different bases have the same growth rate.
  E.g., $\log_2 n$ is $\Theta(\log_3 n)$.

- **Logarithms and Polynomials.** For every $d > 0$, $\underline{\log n \text{ is } O(n^d)}$. This indicates that logarithms grow slower than any polynomial.
  E.g., $\log n$ is $O(n^2)$.

- **Exponentials and Polynomials.** For every $r > 1$ and every $d > 0$, $\underline{n^d \text{ is } O(r^n)}$. This means that exponentials grow faster than any polynomial.
  E.e., n^2 is $O(2^n)$.

1.2   Evaluating Algorithms

When analyzing algorithms, we are interested in two primary factors: time and space complexity.

Definition 2.1: Time Complexity

The **time complexity** of an algorithm is the amount of time it takes to run as a function of the input size. We use asymptotic notation to describe the time complexity of an algorithm.

Definition 2.2: Space Complexity

The **space complexity** of an algorithm is the amount of memory it uses to store inputs and subsequent variables during the algorithm's execution. We use asymptotic notation to describe the space complexity of an algorithm.

Below is an example of a function and its time and space complexity analysis.

Function 2.1: Arithmetic Series - `Fun1(`A`)`

Computes a result based on a length-n array of integers:

Input: A length-n array of integers.
Output: An integer p computed from the array elements.

```
1 Function Fun1(A):
2     p ← 0;
3     for i ← 1 to n − 1 do
4         for j ← i + 1 to n do
5             p ← p + A[i] · A[j];
6         end
7     end
8 return p
```

Time Complexity: For $f(n) := $ `Fun1(`A`)`, $f(n) = \frac{n^2}{2} = O(n^2)$. This is because the function has a nested loop structure, where the inner for-loop runs $n - i$ times, and the outer for-loop runs $n - 1$ times. Thus, the total number of iterations is $\sum_{i=1}^{n-1} n - i = \frac{n^2}{2}$.

Space Complexity: We yield $O(n)$ for storing an array of length n. The variable p is $O(1)$ (constant), as it is a single integer. Hence, $f(n) = n + 1 = O(n)$.

Additional Example: Let $f(n, m) = n^2 m + m^3 + n m^3$. Then, $f(n, m) = O(n^2 m + m^3)$. This is because both n and m must be accounted for. Our largest n term is $n^2 m$, and our largest m term is m^3 both dominate the expression. Thus, $f(n, m) = O(n^2 m + m^3)$.

Proving Algorithms

2.1 Stable Matchings

In proving the correctness of algorithms we introduce the stable matching problem. A combinatorial optimization problem that seeks to find the best possible matching between two sets of elements. When we say "best possible matching," we mean that the matching is stable, and that there is no other matching that is better.

Definition 1.1: Stable Matching

A matching is **stable** if there is no pair of elements that prefer each other over their current match.

Definition 1.2: Unstable Matching

A matching is **unstable** if there is a pair of elements that prefer each other over their current match.

I.e., in verifying a stable matching, if any one pair of elements switch partners, the matching is unstable. If no pairs swap, the matching is stable.

Scenario: *Lunch Time*

Imagine it's lunch time at elementary school, and a group of kids $E = \{$Ena, Eda$\}$ swap lunches with $A = \{$Ava, Adi$\}$. They each have a list of preferences from favorite to least favorite. We visualize the following preferences:

<div>

E's Preference List

	1st	2nd
Ena	Ava	Adi
Eda	Ava	Adi

A's Preference List

	1st	2nd
Ava	Ena	Eda
Adi	Ena	Eda

</div>

Observe the following matchings:

(1.) Pairs, Ena-Ava, Eda-Adi swapped lunches.

<table>
<tr><td colspan="3">E's Preference List</td></tr>
<tr><td></td><td>1st</td><td>2nd</td></tr>
<tr><td>Ena</td><td>Ava</td><td>Adi</td></tr>
<tr><td>Eda</td><td>Ava</td><td>Adi</td></tr>
</table>

<table>
<tr><td colspan="3">A's Preference List</td></tr>
<tr><td></td><td>1st</td><td>2nd</td></tr>
<tr><td>Ava</td><td>Ena</td><td>Eda</td></tr>
<tr><td>Adi</td><td>Ena</td><td>Eda</td></tr>
</table>

This matching is **stable**. Ena and Ava prefer each other's lunches. Eda will ask Ava to trade, and Ava will refuse because she prefers Ena's lunch. Adi does the same with Ena, but they also refuse.

> **Tip:** If it's hard to keep track who is who, here's a possible order to read in: Ena got Ava, and Ena is their 1st choice. Eda got Adi, and Eda is their 2nd choice.

Changing the preference tables,

(2.) Pairs, Ena-Adi, Eda-Ava swapped lunches.

<table>
<tr><td colspan="3">E's Preference List</td></tr>
<tr><td></td><td>1st</td><td>2nd</td></tr>
<tr><td>Ena</td><td>Ava</td><td>Adi</td></tr>
<tr><td>Eda</td><td>Adi</td><td>Ava</td></tr>
</table>

<table>
<tr><td colspan="3">A's Preference List</td></tr>
<tr><td></td><td>1st</td><td>2nd</td></tr>
<tr><td>Ava</td><td>Ena</td><td>Eda</td></tr>
<tr><td>Adi</td><td>Ena</td><td>Eda</td></tr>
</table>

This matching is **unstable**. Ena and Ava would rather eat each other's lunches.

Definition 1.3: Unique Stable Matching

A matching is **uniquely stable** if between two sets of elements, there is only one possible stable matching.

Example: If everyone uniquely prefers each other, there is only one stable matching.

(3.) Pairs, Ena-Ava, Eda-Adi swapped lunches.

<div align="center">

E's Preference List

	1st	2nd
Ena	Ava	Adi
Eda	Adi	Ava

A's Preference List

	1st	2nd
Ava	Ena	Eda
Adi	Eda	Ena

</div>

This matching is a **unique stable matching**. If rather Ena-Adi and Eda-Ava (2nd-choice parings),
then both pairs would end up swapping to their 1st-choice.

2.2 Gale-Shapley Algorithm

We will now introduce the Gale-Shapley algorithm, for which we will prove its correctness, time
complexity, and space complexity.

Theorem 2.1: Gale-Shapley Algorithm

The **Gale-Shapley algorithm** is a method for finding a stable matching between two sets
of elements. It is also known as the **Deferred Acceptance Algorithm**.

Algorithm: Given sets $E = e_1, \ldots, e_n$ and $A = a_1, \ldots, a_n$. Then find a stable matching:

(i.) Each $e_i \in E$ proposes to their most preferred a_j.

(ii.) For each $a_j \in A$:

    (a.) If a_j is free, they accept the proposal.

    (b.) If a_j is already matched, a_j either accepts or rejects. If a_j accepts, the previous
    match is broken.

Each e_i continues to propose to their next most preferred a_j until all e_i are matched.

Claims:

1. At least one stable matching is guaranteed.

2. Unless the table is unique, the proposing will always get their best choice unless it
conflicts with another proposer.

First we will prove the correctness, then implement the algorithm and analyze its time and space
complexity.

Proof 2.1: Gale-Shapley Algorithm

Claim 1: Suppose, for sake of contradiction, that some $a_j \in A$ is not matched upon termination of the algorithm. Then some $e_i \in E$ is also not matched assuming $|E| = |A|$. Then e_i must have not proposed to a_j, contradicting that e_i proposed to all elements of A. Thus, the program only terminates when all e_i are matched.

Claim 2: Suppose E proposes to A with unique first choices. Then all $a_i \in A$ must accept their first proposal. Now suppose $e_i, e_j \in E$ have a conflicting choice a_i. Then a_i gets their preference only in that case.

$\blacksquare$

Function 2.1: Gale-Shapley Algorithm - `GS(E,A)`

Finds a stable matching between two sets of elements:

Input: Two sets, E and A, of equal size.
Output: A stable matching between E and A.

  1 Function *GS(E,A)*:
  2 $M \leftarrow \emptyset$;
  3   **while** *there is some unmatched element in E* **do**
  4 $e \leftarrow$ next unmatched element in E;
  5 $a \leftarrow$ next avalaible preferred choice of e;
  6   **if** *a is not yet matched* **then**
  7   match e and a;
  8   add the pair (e, a) to M;
  9   **end**
 10   **else**
 11   **if** *a prefers e over their current match* **then**
 12   match e and a, replacing the current match;
 13   update M accordingly;
 14   **end**
 15   **end**
 16   **end**
 17   **return** M;
 18 return *Matching M*

Time Complexity: $O(n^2)$ time, where n is the number of elements in E and A. Worst-case, each element in E proposes to each element in A, i.e., $n \cdot n$ combinations to check.

Space Complexity: $O(n^2)$ space, where we store $|E| \cdot |A| = n \cdot n$ pairs.