

# Discrete Structures-2025: Tutorial-8

## Relations and Partial Orderings

(1) Let  $\mathcal{A}$  be the set of all nonempty finite subsets of  $\mathbb{Z}$ . For every finite subset  $S \subseteq \mathbb{Z}$ ,  $\min(S)$  is defined as the smallest element among all elements of  $S$ . Define a relation

$$T = \{(X, Y) \mid X, Y \in \mathcal{A} \text{ such that } \min(X) = \min(Y)\}$$

- (a) Prove that  $T$  is an equivalence relation.
- (b) For every  $X \in \mathcal{A}$ , provide a precise definition of the equivalence class with respect to the equivalence relation  $T$ .

(2) Let  $f : A \rightarrow B$  be a function from  $A$  to  $B$  and  $S$  be an equivalence relation on  $B$ . Define a relation  $T = \{(x, y) \mid x, y \in A \text{ such that } (f(x), f(y)) \in S\}$ .

- (a) Prove that  $T$  be an equivalence relation
- (b) How do you define the equivalence class containing an element  $x$ ?

(3) Let  $\mathcal{A}$  be the set of all nonempty finite subsets of  $\mathbb{Z}$ . Consider the following two relations

- (a)  $T_1 = \{(X, Y) \mid X, Y \in \mathcal{A} \text{ such that } \min(X) \leq \min(Y)\}$ .
- (b)  $T_2 = \{(X, Y) \mid X, Y \in \mathcal{A} \text{ such that } X = Y \text{ or } \min(X) < \min(Y)\}$ .

Is  $T_1$  a partial order? If yes, then prove it. Otherwise, disprove it. Is  $T_2$  a partial order? If yes, then prove it. Otherwise disprove it.

(4) Let  $\mathcal{B}$  be the set of all functions from  $\mathbb{R}$  to  $\mathbb{R}$ . Consider the following relations on  $\mathcal{B}$  as follows.

- (a)  $S_1 = \{(f, g) \mid \text{for all } a \in \mathbb{R}, f(a) \leq g(a)\}$ .
- (b)  $S_2 = \{(f, g) \mid f(0) \leq g(0)\}$ .
- (c)  $S_3 = \{(f, g) \mid f(0) = g(0)\}$ .

Which of the relations  $S_1, S_2, S_3$  is/are equivalence relation(s)? Which of these relations  $S_1, S_2, S_3$  is/are partial order(s)? For each of them, give formal proofs.

(5) Prove that if a relation  $S$  on a set  $A$  is antisymmetric, then any subset of  $S' \subseteq S$  is also an antisymmetric relation on  $A$ .

(6) A relation  $S$  on  $A$  is irreflexive if for every  $x \in A$ ,  $(x, x) \notin S$ . Suppose that  $R_1$  and  $R_2$  are reflexive relations on a set  $A$ . Prove that  $R_1 \oplus R_2 = (R_1 \cup R_2) - (R_1 \cap R_2)$  is irreflexive relation.