

## COM S 311 HW 1

Thomas Haddy  
 Section 9 @ 11:00 Th  
 TA: Trent Muhr  
 1/25/18

1. Let the Fibonacci numbers be defined recursively as follows:

$$F_0 = 0$$

$$F_1 = 1$$

$$F_n = F_{n-1} + F_{n-2}$$

Prove  $P(n)$ , the following property of Fibonacci numbers:

$$F_1^2 + F_2^2 + F_3^2 + \dots + F_n^2 = F_n \cdot F_{n+1}, \forall n \geq 1$$

Proof:

$$\text{Base: Let } n=1, F_1=1 \rightarrow F_1^2=1, F_1 \cdot F_{1+1} = 1 \cdot (1+0) = 1$$

Since  $F_1^2=1$  and  $F_n \cdot F_{n+1}$  are equal,  $P(1)$  holds true.

Inductive Hypothesis: Assume  $P(k): F_1^2 + F_2^2 + \dots + F_k^2 = F_k \cdot F_{k+1}$ ,  $\forall k \geq 1$ . Prove  $P(k+1): F_1^2 + F_2^2 + \dots + F_k^2 + F_{k+1}^2 = F_{k+1} \cdot F_{k+2}$ ,  $\forall k \geq 1$ .

$$\text{Inductive step: } [F_1^2 + F_2^2 + \dots + F_k^2] + F_{k+1}^2 = F_{k+1} \cdot F_{k+2}$$

$$F_k \cdot F_{k+1} + F_{k+1}^2 = F_{k+1} \cdot F_{k+2} \text{ by I.H.}$$

$$F_{k+1} [(F_k + F_{k+1})] = F_{k+1} \cdot F_{k+2}$$

$$F_{k+1} \cdot F_{k+2} = F_{k+1} \cdot F_{k+2} \text{ by recursive def. of Fibonacci numbers}$$

Therefore by mathematical induction, since  $P(1)$ ,  $P(k)$ , and  $P(k+1)$  are true,  $P(n)$  is true  $\forall n \geq 1$ .

2. a) Defining  $n(T)$ : The vertices of  $T$  are the root of  $T$  and the vertices of the two subtrees  $T_1$  and  $T_2$ . The number of the nodes in a tree  $T$  is  $n(T)$ , where

Base:  $n(T) = 1$  if  $T$  consists of only a root  $r$

Recursive step:  $n(T) = 1 + n(T_1) + n(T_2)$  if  $T = T_1 \circ T_2$

Defining  $h(T)$ : The height of  $T$  is  $h(T)$ .

Base: if  $T$  is a single node, then  $h(T) = 1$

Recursive step: if  $T$  consists of root  $r$  and subtrees  $T_1$  and  $T_2$ , then  
 $h(T) = 1 + \max(h(T_1), h(T_2))$

Proof: For every FBT  $T$ , prove  $n(T) \geq 2h(T) - 1$

Base: Let  $T$  consist of 1 node that is the root.

So  $n(T) = 1$  and  $h(T) = 1 \rightarrow 2(1) - 1 = 1$ . So  $1 \geq 1$ .

Therefore the base case holds true.

Inductive Hypothesis: Let  $T_1$  and  $T_2$  be two FBT's with heights  $h_1$  and  $h_2$ . Assume that  $n(T_1) \geq 2h_1 - 1$  and  $n(T_2) \geq 2h_2 - 1$ . Also, assume  $h_1 \geq h_2$ .

Inductive Step: Let  $T$  be a new tree with  $r$  as a root and  $T_1$  and  $T_2$  being left and right subtrees. Let  $h$  be its height. Prove that  $n(T) \geq 2h(T) - 1$ .

So,  $n(T) = n(T_1) + n(T_2) + 1$  by rec. step of  $n(T)$

$n(T) \geq (2h_1 - 1) + (2h_2 - 1) + 1$  by I. H.

$n(T) \geq 2h_1 + 2h_2 - 1$

$n(T) \geq 2(h_1 + h_2) - 1$

$n(T) \geq 2h(T) - 1$  by rec. def. of  $h(T)$

Therefore, every FBT  $T$ ,  $n(T) \geq 2h(T) - 1$  is true.



2. b) Defining  $n(T)$ : same as part a)

Defining  $i(T)$ : The number of internal nodes in  $T$ .

Base: if  $T$  is a single root  $r$ , then  $i(T) = 0$

Recursive step:  $i(T) = 1 + i(T_1) + i(T_2)$  if  $T$  consists of root  $r$  and subtrees  $T_1$  and  $T_2$ .

Proof: For every FBT  $T$ , prove  $i(T) = (n(T) - 1) / 2$

Base: Consider a FBT having a single node. So  $i(T) = 0$ .

$$n(T) = 1 \rightarrow (1 - 1) / 2 = 0. \quad 0 = (1 - 1) / 2 = 0 \quad \checkmark$$

Therefore the base case holds true.

~~Inductive Hypothesis~~

Inductive Hypothesis: Let  $T_1$  and  $T_2$  be 2 FBT's.

Assume that  $i(T_1) = (n(T_1) - 1) / 2$  and  $i(T_2) = (n(T_2) - 1) / 2$ .

Inductive Step: Consider the FBT  $T$  with a new root, whose children are the roots of  $T_1$  and  $T_2$ . Prove the following:

$$i(T) = i(T_1) + i(T_2) + 1 \text{ by } \text{rec. def. of } i(T)$$

$$i(T) = \frac{n(T_1) - 1}{2} + \frac{n(T_2) - 1}{2} + 1 \text{ by I.H.}$$

$$2i(T) = n(T_1) - 1 + n(T_2) - 1 + 1$$

$$2i(T) = [n(T_1) + n(T_2) + 1] - 2$$

$$2i(T) = n(T) - 2 \text{ by rec. def. of } n(T)$$

$$i(T) = \frac{n(T) - 1}{2}$$

Therefore, every FBT  $T$ ,  $i(T) = \frac{n(T) - 1}{2}$  is true

3. Proof:

Base: Let the  $i^{\text{th}}$  iteration be 0.  $a^n = x_0^{m_0} \cdot y_0$  where  $x_0 = a, m_0 = n$ , and  $y_0 = 1$ . So  $a^n = a^n \cdot 1 \rightarrow a^n = a^n \checkmark$   
Therefore, the base case holds true.

Inductive Hypothesis: Assume  $\forall k, a^n = x_k^{m_k} \cdot y_k$ .  
Prove  $a^n = x_{k+1}^{m_{k+1}} \cdot y_{k+1}$  where  $k+1$  is the next iteration.

Inductive Step: There will be 2 cases to prove  $P(k+1)$  holds and that is if  $m$  is odd or even.

Case 1: ( $m$  is odd)

$x_{k+1} = x^2, m_{k+1} = (m-1)/2, y_{k+1} = x$  by looking at program

$$a^n = x_{k+1}^{m_{k+1}} \cdot y_{k+1}$$

$$a^n = x^2 \cdot x^{(m-1)/2 \cdot m_k} \cdot x \cdot y_k$$

$$a^n = a^n \cdot x^{2[(m-1)/2]} \cdot x \text{ by I.H.}$$

So the next iteration is what we expect by sub.

$$a^{n+1} = a^n \cdot x_{k+1}^{m_{k+1}} \cdot y_{k+1} \rightarrow a^{n+1} = a^{n+1}$$

Case 2: ( $m$  is even)

$x_{k+1} = x^2, m_{k+1} = m/2, y_{k+1} = 1$  by looking at program

$$a^n = x_{k+1}^{m_{k+1}} \cdot y_{k+1}$$

$$a^n = x^2 \cdot x^{(m/2) \cdot m_k} \cdot 1 \cdot y_k \rightarrow a^n = a^n \cdot x^{2(m/2)} \cdot 1 \text{ by I.H.}$$

$$a^{n+1} = a^n \cdot x^m \rightarrow a^{n+1} = a^{n+1}$$

Therefore,  $\forall i, a^n = x_i^{m_i} \cdot y_i$  holds true.



4. Base: Let  $i=0$  for the  $0^{\text{th}}$  iteration,

$\text{left}=0, \text{right}=n$  where  $n$  is the length of array and  $n \geq 1$

So  $0 \leq 1 \checkmark$  Therefore the base case holds true.

Inductive Hypothesis: Assume  $\text{left}_k \leq \text{right}_k$  where  $k$  is the  $k^{\text{th}}$  iteration. Also assume there is a  $T$  in the array such that two ints in the array equal  $T$ . Prove  $\text{left}_{k+1} \leq \text{right}_{k+1}$ .

Inductive Step: This will need to be split into 3 cases where  $k+1$  yields true,  $\text{left}++$ , or  $\text{right}--$ .

Case 1: ( $x=T$ ) Assume  $\text{left}_k \leq \text{right}_k$ . So on the next iteration the  $\text{left}$  and  $\text{right}$  variables will be unchanged and therefore equal to its previous iteration.

So  $\text{left}_k = \text{left}_{k+1}$  and  $\text{right}_k = \text{right}_{k+1}$ . This means that  $\text{left}_{k+1} \leq \text{right}_{k+1}$ .

Case 2: ( $x < T$ ) Assume  $\text{left}_k \leq \text{right}_k$ . If  $\text{left} = \text{right}$  from the  $k^{\text{th}}$  iteration, then on the  $k+1^{\text{th}}$  iteration where  $x < T$ ,  $\text{left}$  becomes  $\text{left} > \text{right}$  but this case never happens due to the I.H. which states we assume  $T$  exists.

So  $\text{left}$  is never  $> \text{right}$ . If  $\text{left} < \text{right}$  from the  $k^{\text{th}}$  iteration, then on the  $k+1^{\text{th}}$  iteration where  $x < T$ ,  $\text{left}++$  so  $\text{left}$  is either  $\text{left} \leq \text{right}$ .

Case 3: ( $x > T$ ) Assume  $\text{left}_k \leq \text{right}_k$ . If  $\text{left} = \text{right}$  from the  $k^{\text{th}}$  iteration, then at  $k+1^{\text{th}}$  iteration where  $x > T$ ,  $\text{right}$  would become  $< \text{left}$  but this never happens because the I.H. states there exists a  $T$ . So  $\text{right}$  is never  $< \text{left}$ . If  $\text{right} > \text{left}$  from the  $k^{\text{th}}$  iteration, then on the  $k+1^{\text{th}}$  iteration where  $x > T$ ,  $\text{right}--$  so  $\text{right}$  is either  $\text{right} \geq \text{left}$ .

4. (Cont.)

Therefore since all 3 cases are true along with the base case, we can say that  $\text{left}_{k+1} \leq \text{right}_{k+1}$  for  $\forall k \geq 0$  assuming there exists a  $T$  such that  $x = T$ .

Proof p2: Prove  $\exists$  indices  $l$  and  $j$  s.t.  $a[l] + a[j] = T$ , then  $\text{left} \leq l \leq j \leq \text{right}$ . Assume  $a[l]$  and  $a[j] > 0$

Base: Let  $i = 0$  for the  $0^{\text{th}}$  iteration.

$\text{left} = 0, l \geq 0, j \geq 0, \text{right} = n-1, n \geq 1$ .

So  $0 \leq 0 \leq 0 \leq 0 \leq 0 \checkmark$

Therefore the base case holds true.

Inductive Hypothesis: Assume  $\text{left}_k \leq l_k \leq j_k \leq \text{right}_k$  and there exists a  $T$ .

Prove that  $\text{left}_{k+1} \leq l_{k+1} \leq j_{k+1} \leq \text{right}_{k+1}$ .

Also assume

that  $\text{left}_{k+1} \leq \text{right}_{k+1}$  from the last proof.

Inductive Step: Assuming the array contains distinct integers all  $> 0$ , we have 3 cases to look at assuming  $T$  exists:  $x = T$ ,  $x < T$ , and  $x > T$ .



4. (Cont.)

Case 1: ( $x = T$ ) Assume  $\text{left}_k \leq l \leq j \leq \text{right}_k$ . So the next iter., assuming the elements in the array are distinct, would be  $\text{left}_{k+1} \leq l \leq j \leq \text{right}_{k+1}$ . Left at most would equal  $k+1$  and right would also be at least  $k+1$ .  $l$  and  $j$  would be unchanged on the next iteration so

$$\text{left}_{k+1} \leq l \leq j \leq \text{right}_{k+1}.$$

Case 2: ( $x < T$ ) By the I.H.,  $\exists T$  and  $\text{left}_k \leq l \leq j \leq \text{right}_k$ . So on the  $k+1^{\text{th}}$  iter.,  $\text{left}++$  and  $a[\text{left}]$  and since the elements are distinct,  $l++ \leq j$  and  $\text{left}_{k+1} \leq \text{right}_{k+1}$ . Putting it together,  $\text{left}_{k+1} \leq l \leq j \leq \text{right}_{k+1}$ .

Case 3: ( $x > T$ ) By the I.H.,  $\exists T$  and  $\text{left}_k \leq l \leq j \leq \text{right}_k$ . So on the  $k+1^{\text{th}}$  iter.,  $\text{right}--$  and  $j--$  and since the elements are distinct which means  $k+1 \leq l \leq j$  assuming its sorted.  $\text{left}_{k+1}$  at most  $= k+1$  and  $\text{right}_{k+1}$  at least  $= k+1$  so putting it together:

$$\text{left}_{k+1} \leq l \leq j \leq \text{right}_{k+1}$$

Therefore since all of the cases and base hold true, we can say  $\text{left} \leq l \leq j \leq \text{right}$ .