#### CSE 331 Final Exam Preparation

This is in no way a substitute for exam preparation, mearly a compilation of all the key talking points.

Chandra Neppalli

May 3, 2021

#### Counter Example

Best proof to use to disprove universally true propositions.

## Counter Example

Best proof to use to *disprove* universally true propositions.

Ex: Every day is a Wednesday, where a counter example would be Monday is not Wednesday.

#### Contradiction

Best proof to use if you want to assert something is true.

#### Contradiction

Best proof to use if you want to assert something is true.

Assume what you want to prove is false, then show this leads to a contradiction.

#### Contradiction

Best proof to use if you want to assert something is true.

Assume what you want to prove is false, then show this leads to a contradiction.

Therefore, the original assumption has to be true.

## Contraposition

Best proof for proving causality. Define two propositions E and F.

## Contraposition

Best proof for proving causality. Define two propositions E and F.

If you want to prove that  $E \to F$ , it might be more doable to prove  $\neg F \to \neg E$ , as they are both logically equivalent.

#### Contraposition

Best proof for proving causality. Define two propositions E and F.

If you want to prove that  $E \to F$ , it might be more doable to prove  $\neg F \to \neg E$ , as they are both logically equivalent.

This is especially useful if the **scope** of F is smaller than the scope of E.

#### Direct Proof

If the proof is simple, consider directly proving it.

#### Direct Proof

If the proof is simple, consider directly proving it.

Remember though, that you must maintain W.L.O.G, that your proof can never be too specific and must be arbitrary.

### Proof by Induction

Proof by Induction is a really nice proof technique when you reduce your proof to a known correct base case.

### Proof by Induction

Proof by Induction is a really nice proof technique when you reduce your proof to a known correct base case.

If proof needs to be correct for all numbers  $\in \mathbb{N}$ , and each step is dependant on the previous step, then *every* step can be reduced to a definitive base case that is easy to directly prove.

This is useful for proving an algorithm with a loop terminates.

This is useful for proving an algorithm with a loop terminates.

This is useful for proving an algorithm with a loop terminates.

• 
$$P(0) = I$$

This is useful for proving an algorithm with a loop terminates.

- P(0) = I
- P(i) is an accumulator. This means that P(i+1) > P(i)

This is useful for proving an algorithm with a loop terminates.

- P(0) = I
- P(i) is an accumulator. This means that P(i+1) > P(i)
- $\forall i, P(i) \leq k$

This is useful for proving an algorithm with a loop terminates.

Let P(i) denote an integer such that:

- P(0) = I
- P(i) is an accumulator. This means that P(i+1) > P(i)
- $\forall i, P(i) \leq k$

From these 3 properties, the number of iterations is bounded by  $k-\mathit{l}+1$ 

This is useful for proving an algorithm with a loop terminates.

Let P(i) denote an integer such that:

- P(0) = I
- P(i) is an accumulator. This means that P(i+1) > P(i)
- $\forall i, P(i) \leq k$

From these 3 properties, the number of iterations is bounded by k-l+1

Note: This isn't a runtime analysis, rather a proof that the algorithm terminates.

## Greedy Stays Ahead

This technique is used to prove that a greedy algorithm returns an optimal solution.

### Greedy Stays Ahead

This technique is used to prove that a greedy algorithm returns an optimal solution.

At every step of a greedy algorithm, it will stay at least as far as the optimal solution at that step.

## Greedy Stays Ahead

This technique is used to prove that a greedy algorithm returns an optimal solution.

At every step of a greedy algorithm, it will stay at least as far as the optimal solution at that step.

HW4 "Attack on Alarms" and Interval Scheduling are examples of problems with greedy solutions.

#### Introduction

Let's say there are two groups: Group A and Group B.

#### Introduction

Let's say there are two groups: Group A and Group B.

How do we generate a **stable** matching between each member of the two groups efficiently?

#### Introduction

Let's say there are two groups: Group A and Group B.

How do we generate a **stable** matching between each member of the two groups efficiently?

Moreover, what is a **stable** matching?

A perfect matching is a bijective matching between A and B.

A **perfect matching** is a bijective matching between A and B.

**Every member** in group A is matched with exactly one member in group B.

A **perfect matching** is a bijective matching between A and B.

**Every member** in group A is matched with exactly one member in group B.

Conversely, every member in group B is matched with  $\boldsymbol{exactly}$  one member in group A.

A **perfect matching** is a bijective matching between A and B.

**Every member** in group A is matched with exactly one member in group B.

Conversely, every member in group B is matched with **exactly** one member in group A.

With n members in each group, there are n! perfect matchings.

### Instability

For a particular matching, define a member m from group A and n from group B such that (m, n) is not in the matching.

#### Instability

For a particular matching, define a member m from group A and n from group B such that (m, n) is not in the matching.

If m prefers n over their current matching and n prefers m over their current matching, the entire match is an instability.

A stable matching is a perfect matching with no instability.

A stable matching is a perfect matching with no instability.

It therefore follows that the number of stable matchings is *at most* the number of perfect matchings, or *n*!

A stable matching is a perfect matching with no instability.

It therefore follows that the number of stable matchings is *at most* the number of perfect matchings, or *n*!

The Gale Shapely Algorithm is an  $O(n^3)$  time algorithm that can output a stable matching.

A stable matching is a perfect matching with no instability.

It therefore follows that the number of stable matchings is *at most* the number of perfect matchings, or *n*!

The Gale Shapely Algorithm is an  $O(n^3)$  time algorithm that can output a stable matching.

With the right data structures, the runtime can be reduced to  $O(n^2)$ .

A stable matching **is** a perfect matching with no instability.

It therefore follows that the number of stable matchings is *at most* the number of perfect matchings, or *n*!

The Gale Shapely Algorithm is an  $O(n^3)$  time algorithm that can output a stable matching.

With the right data structures, the runtime can be reduced to  $O(n^2)$ .

Even though the runtime isn't linear, because the input size is  $2n^2 \to \Theta(n^2)^1$ , the runtime **with respect** to the input size is O(N), or linear time.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup>This comes from n Group A members and n Group B members with their 2n preference lists

#### Code:

```
Initially all m \in M and w \in W are free
While there is a man m who is free and hasn't proposed to every
woman
      Choose such a man m
      Let w be the highest-ranked woman in m's
            preference list to whom m has not yet proposed
      If w is free then
            (m, w) become engaged
      Else w is currently engaged to m'
            If w prefers m' to m then
                  m remains free
            Else w prefers m to m'
                  (m, w) become engaged
                  m' becomes free
            Endif
      Endif
```

Endwhile

Return the set S of engaged pairs.