程序代写代做 CS编程辅导

Monash University
Faculty of Information Technology
Semester 2, 2022

FIT2014
ns for Tutorial 1
ages and Logic

1. We must show [illegible] OMES then $w \in \overline{\text{ODD-ODD}}$.

Suppose $w \in$ PAI[illegible] ere is a string x such that *either* $w = x\overleftarrow{x}$ *or* $w = xy\overleftarrow{x}$, where $\overleftarrow{x}$ denotes th[illegible] $\{$a, b$\}$ is a single letter.

Suppose $w = x\overleftarrow{x}$. The numbers of a's and b's in $x\overleftarrow{x}$ are both even, since each is twice the number in x. So $w \in \overline{\text{ODD-ODD}}$.

Now suppose $w = xy\overleftarrow{x}$. Whichever letter in $\{$a, b$\}$ is *not* y must appear an even number of times in w, by the same argument we have used previously. So that letter does not appear an odd number of times in w. So $w \in \overline{\text{ODD-ODD}}$.

WeChat: cstutorcs

Alternative argument for the second case, pointed out by an FIT2014 student in 2013:

Now suppose $w = xy\overleftarrow{x}$. Since the length of w is odd, then it cannot have both an odd number of a's and an odd number of b's (else its length would be even). So $w \in \overline{\text{ODD-ODD}}$.

Assignment Project Exam Help

2. (a) We prove it by constructing the truth table of each. It can be convenient to do this in stages.

P	Q	R	$Q \wedge R$	$P \vee (Q \wedge R)$
F	F	F	F	F
F	F	T	F	F
F	T	F	F	F
F	T	T	T	T
T	F	F	F	T
T	F	T	F	T
T	T	F	F	T
T	T	T	T	T

P	Q	R	$P \vee Q$	$P \vee R$	$(P \vee Q) \wedge (P \vee R)$
F	F	F	F	F	F
F	F	T	F	T	F
F	T	F	T	F	F
F	T	T	T	T	T
T	F	F	T	T	T
T	F	T	T	T	T
T	T	F	T	T	T
T	T	T	T	T	T

Email: tutorcs@163.com
QQ: 749389476
https://tutorcs.com

The right-hand columns of each table are identical, so the two expressions (at the tops of those columns) are logically equivalent.

(b)

$$\begin{aligned}
P \wedge (Q \vee R) &= \neg\neg P \wedge (\neg\neg Q \vee \neg\neg R) \\
&= \neg\neg P \wedge \neg(\neg Q \wedge \neg R) \qquad \text{(by one of De Morgan's Laws)} \\
&= \neg(\neg P \vee (\neg Q \wedge \neg R)) \qquad \text{(by the other of De Morgan's Laws)} \\
&= \neg((\neg P \vee \neg Q) \wedge (\neg P \vee \neg R)) \qquad \text{(by part (a) of this question)} \\
&= \neg(\neg(P \wedge Q) \wedge \neg(P \wedge R)) \qquad \text{(by De Morgan, twice)} \\
&= \neg\neg(P \wedge Q) \vee \neg\neg(P \wedge R) \qquad \text{(by De Morgan, one last time)} \\
&= (P \wedge Q) \vee (P \wedge R)
\end{aligned}$$

Here we have used equality to stand for logical equivalence, which is normal.

3.

$$\begin{aligned}
(P_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge P_n) \Rightarrow C &= \neg(P_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge P_n) \vee C \\
&= (\neg P_1 \vee \cdots \vee \neg P_n) \vee C,
\end{aligned}$$

程序代写代做 CS编程辅导

using De Morgan's Law.

Remark:

A disjunction of the form $\neg P_1 \lor \cdots \lor \neg P_n \lor C$, where $P_1, \ldots, P_n, C$ are each variables that can be True or False, is c[illegible]hese play a big role in the theory of logic programming.

4.

(a) $\neg\text{Judith} \lor \neg\text{Mar}$[illegible]

(b) $(\text{Judith} \lor \text{Marga}$[illegible]$\text{garet})$

(c) $\text{Judith} \lor \text{Marga}$[illegible]

(d) $(\neg\text{Judith} \lor \neg\text{Ma}$[illegible]$\text{Katherine}) \land (\neg\text{Margaret} \lor \neg\text{Katherine})$

(e) $(\text{Judith} \lor \text{Margaret} \lor \text{Katherine}) \land (\neg\text{Judith} \lor \neg\text{Margaret}) \land (\neg\text{Judith} \lor \neg\text{Katherine}) \land (\neg\text{Margaret} \lor \neg\text{Katherine})$

(f) $(\text{Judith} \lor \text{Margaret}) \land (\text{Judith} \lor \text{Katherine}) \land (\text{Margaret} \lor \text{Katherine})$

(g) $\neg\text{Judith} \lor \neg\text{Margaret} \lor \neg\text{Katherine}$

WeChat: cstutorcs

(h) $(\neg\text{Judith} \lor \neg\text{Margaret} \lor \neg\text{Katherine}) \land (\text{Judith} \lor \text{Margaret}) \land (\text{Judith} \lor \text{Katherine}) \land (\text{Margaret} \lor \text{Katherine})$

(i) $\text{Judith} \land \text{Margaret} \land \text{Katherine}$

(j) $\neg\text{Judith} \land \neg\text{Margaret} \land \neg\text{Katherine}$

Assignment Project Exam Help

5. Suggested approach:

1. Write the sentence as a conjunction of two smaller sentences.
2. In this case, you can write each of the two smaller sentences naturally using implication.
3. Then write each implication $A \Rightarrow B$ in the form $\neg A \lor B$.
4. Use Boolean algebra, as needed, to get the expression into CNF.

Email: tutorcs@163.com

QQ: 749389476

Following this approach:

1. Rewriting our original sentence as a conjunction of smaller sentences:

https://tutorcs.com

$$\begin{aligned} &(\text{if the graph is a tree, then it's bipartite and has a leaf}) \\ \land\ &(\text{if it's not a tree, then it has a vertex of degree} \geq 2) \end{aligned}$$

2. The two smaller sentences can each be written as a logical implication:

if the graph is a tree, then it's bipartite and has a leaf	$\text{Tree} \Rightarrow (\text{Bipartite} \land \text{Leaf})$
if it's not a tree, then it has a vertex of degree ≥ 2	$\neg\,\text{Tree} \Rightarrow \text{Internal}$

So we can rewrite our original sentence further:

$$(\text{Tree} \Rightarrow (\text{Bipartite} \land \text{Leaf})) \land (\neg\,\text{Tree} \Rightarrow \text{Internal})$$

3. Writing each implication $A \Rightarrow B$ in the form $\neg A \lor B$ turns our sentence into

$$(\neg\,\text{Tree} \lor (\text{Bipartite} \land \text{Leaf})) \land (\neg\neg\,\text{Tree} \lor \text{Internal})$$

4. We're nearly there. The first clause needs to be expanded using the Distributive Law. The second clause just needs a tiny bit of simplification: cancellation of the double negative.

$$(\neg\,\text{Tree} \lor \text{Bipartite}) \land (\neg\,\text{Tree} \lor \text{Leaf}) \land (\text{Tree} \lor \text{Internal})$$

程序代写代做 CS编程辅导

6. (a) The Enrolment Rule specifies a set of conditions that must all hold. So we can begin by expressing it as a conjunction of three simpler conditions, each corresponding to one of the three parts of the Enrolment Rule:

(at least one o[illegible]IT1051, FIT1053, ENG1003, ENG1013, FIT1040 $\wedge$ FIT1029 is required)
$\wedge$ (at least one o[illegible], MTH1035, ENG1005 is required)
$\wedge$ (CSE2303 is p[illegible]

Each of the three pa[illegible]sed as a *disjunction* of simpler propositions:

$$\begin{aligned} & (\mathrm{FIT1045} \vee \mathrm{FIT1048} \vee \mathrm{FIT1051} \vee \mathrm{FIT1053} \vee \mathrm{ENG1003} \vee \mathrm{ENG1013} \vee (\mathrm{FIT1040} \wedge \mathrm{FIT1029})) \\ \wedge\ & (\mathrm{MAT1830} \vee \mathrm{MTH1030} \vee \mathrm{MTH1035} \vee \mathrm{ENG1005}) \\ \wedge\ & (\neg\, \mathrm{CSE2303}) \end{aligned}$$

WeChat: cstutorcs

We're almost there! The second part here is ok, as it's a disjunction of four literals. The third part is also ok, since it's just a single literal (being the negation of CSE2303). But the first part is not ok for CNF yet. It's a disjunction, but it's not quite a disjunction *of literals*. Rather, it's a disjunction of six literals and another expression. Fortunately, we can expand this into a conjunction of two parts, using the Distributive Law. It currently has the form $A \vee (B \wedge C)$, where A is a disjunction of six literals and B and C are literals. The Distributive Law tells us that this is equivalent to $(A \vee B) \wedge (A \vee C)$, which is in CNF. So our whole expression is equivalent to

Assignment Project Exam Help
Email: tutorcs@163.com

$$\begin{aligned} & (\mathrm{FIT1045} \vee \mathrm{FIT1048} \vee \mathrm{FIT1051} \vee \mathrm{FIT1053} \vee \mathrm{ENG1003} \vee \mathrm{ENG1013} \vee \mathrm{FIT1040}) \\ \wedge\ & (\mathrm{FIT1045} \vee \mathrm{FIT1048} \vee \mathrm{FIT1051} \vee \mathrm{FIT1053} \vee \mathrm{ENG1003} \vee \mathrm{ENG1013} \vee \mathrm{FIT1029}) \\ \wedge\ & (\mathrm{MAT1830} \vee \mathrm{MTH1030} \vee \mathrm{MTH1035} \vee \mathrm{ENG1005}) \\ \wedge\ & (\neg\, \mathrm{CSE2303}) \end{aligned}$$

QQ: 749389476

This is now in CNF.

https://tutorcs.com

(b) The question only asked for three disjuncts, but to cover many of the possibilities, here's a complete DNF expression equivalent to the above CNF expression:

$$\begin{aligned} & (\mathrm{FIT1045} \wedge \mathrm{MAT1830} \wedge \neg\, \mathrm{CSE2303}) \\ \vee\ & (\mathrm{FIT1045} \wedge \mathrm{MTH1030} \wedge \neg\, \mathrm{CSE2303}) \\ \vee\ & (\mathrm{FIT1045} \wedge \mathrm{MTH1035} \wedge \neg\, \mathrm{CSE2303}) \\ \vee\ & (\mathrm{FIT1045} \wedge \mathrm{ENG1005} \wedge \neg\, \mathrm{CSE2303}) \\ \vee\ & (\mathrm{FIT1048} \wedge \mathrm{MAT1830} \wedge \neg\, \mathrm{CSE2303}) \\ \vee\ & (\mathrm{FIT1048} \wedge \mathrm{MTH1030} \wedge \neg\, \mathrm{CSE2303}) \\ \vee\ & (\mathrm{FIT1048} \wedge \mathrm{MTH1035} \wedge \neg\, \mathrm{CSE2303}) \\ \vee\ & (\mathrm{FIT1048} \wedge \mathrm{ENG1005} \wedge \neg\, \mathrm{CSE2303}) \\ \vee\ & (\mathrm{FIT1051} \wedge \mathrm{MAT1830} \wedge \neg\, \mathrm{CSE2303}) \\ \vee\ & (\mathrm{FIT1051} \wedge \mathrm{MTH1030} \wedge \neg\, \mathrm{CSE2303}) \\ \vee\ & (\mathrm{FIT1051} \wedge \mathrm{MTH1035} \wedge \neg\, \mathrm{CSE2303}) \\ \vee\ & (\mathrm{FIT1051} \wedge \mathrm{ENG1005} \wedge \neg\, \mathrm{CSE2303}) \\ \vee\ & (\mathrm{FIT1053} \wedge \mathrm{MAT1830} \wedge \neg\, \mathrm{CSE2303}) \\ \vee\ & (\mathrm{FIT1053} \wedge \mathrm{MTH1030} \wedge \neg\, \mathrm{CSE2303}) \end{aligned}$$

程序代写代做 CS编程辅导

$\vee$ (FIT1053 $\wedge$ MTH1035 $\wedge \neg$ CSE2303)
$\vee$ (FIT1053 $\wedge$ ENG1005 $\wedge \neg$ CSE2303)
[illegible] AT1830 $\wedge \neg$ CSE2303)
[illegible] ITH1030 $\wedge \neg$ CSE2303)
[illegible] ITH1035 $\wedge \neg$ CSE2303)
[illegible] NG1005 $\wedge \neg$ CSE2303)
[illegible] AT1830 $\wedge \neg$ CSE2303)
[illegible] ITH1030 $\wedge \neg$ CSE2303)
[illegible] ITH1035 $\wedge \neg$ CSE2303)
$\vee$ (ENG1013 $\wedge$ ENG1005 $\wedge \neg$ CSE2303)
$\vee$ (FIT1040 $\wedge$ FIT1029 $\wedge$ MAT1830 $\wedge \neg$ CSE2303)
$\vee$ (FIT1040 $\wedge$ FIT1029 $\wedge$ MTH1030 $\wedge \neg$ CSE2303)
$\vee$ (FIT1040 $\wedge$ FIT1029 $\wedge$ MTH1035 $\wedge \neg$ CSE2303)
$\vee$ (FIT1040 $\wedge$ FIT1029 $\wedge$ ENG1005 $\wedge \neg$ CSE2303)

WeChat: cstutorcs

This expression can be obtained from the CNF expression by applying the Distributive Law. Each disjunct is a conjunction of:

Assignment Project Exam Help

- one of the seven propositions in the list FIT1045, FIT1048, FIT1051, FIT1053, ENG1003, ENG1013, FIT1040 $\wedge$ FIT1029 (with FIT1040 $\wedge$ FIT1029 treated as a single proposition), AND
- one of the four propositions in the list MAT1830, MTH1030, MTH1035, ENG1005, AND
- the single proposition $\neg$CSE2303.

Email: tutorcs@163.com

QQ: 749389476

The question only asks for three disjuncts, so you can give any three of the above disjuncts.

There are also some more complicated ways of writing DNF expressions equivalent to the CNF expression from (a).

https://tutorcs.com

(c) 28 disjuncts, if the above approach is used. There are more complicated expressions with more disjuncts. But there should not be any correct expressions with fewer than 28 disjuncts.

7.

$$\begin{aligned}&(a \vee b) \wedge (\neg a \vee \neg b) \wedge \\ &(a \vee c \vee d) \wedge (\neg a \vee \neg c) \wedge (\neg a \vee \neg d) \wedge (\neg c \vee \neg d) \wedge \\ &(b \vee c \vee e) \wedge (\neg b \vee \neg c) \wedge (\neg b \vee \neg e) \wedge (\neg c \vee \neg e) \wedge \\ &(d \vee e) \wedge (\neg d \vee \neg e).\end{aligned}$$

8.

i. **taller(father(max), max)** $\wedge \neg$ **taller(father(max), father(claire))**

ii. $\exists X$ **taller(X, father(claire))**

iii. $\forall X \exists Y$ **taller(X, Y)**

iv. $\forall X$ **(taller(X, claire)** $\rightarrow$ **taller(X, max))**

程序代写代做 CS编程辅导

9.

(a) $\exists n \, \forall y : y \in L \Rightarrow |y| < n$
or
$\exists n \, \forall y \in L : |y| <$

(b) $\forall n \, \exists y : y \in L \wedge$
or
$\forall n \, \exists y \in L : |y| >$

Supplementary exercises

10.

WeChat: cstutorcs

1. $\mathbf{S_A} = \mathbf{B} \wedge \neg \mathbf{C}$
2. $\mathbf{S_B} = \mathbf{A} \rightarrow \mathbf{C}$
3. $\mathbf{S_C} = \neg \mathbf{C} \wedge (\mathbf{A} \vee \mathbf{B})$

Assignment Project Exam Help

4. Yes, since

$$(\mathbf{S_A} \wedge \mathbf{S_B} \wedge \mathbf{S_C}) \rightarrow (\mathbf{B} \wedge \neg \mathbf{A} \wedge \neg \mathbf{C})$$

is a tautology.

Email: tutorcs@163.com

11. If you apply the Distributive Law to the expression, then you obtain a large disjunction in which each disjunct contains

QQ: 749389476

- one literal from Harry, Ron, Hermione, Ginny (four options);
- one literal from ¬ Hagrid, Norberta (two options);
- either Fred ∧ George or ¬Fred ∧ ¬George (two options);
- and expanding the fourth "row" of the original expression gives:

https://tutorcs.com

$$\begin{aligned}
& (\neg\text{Voldemort} \wedge \neg\text{Voldemort} \wedge \neg\text{Bellatrix}) \\
\vee\ & (\neg\text{Voldemort} \wedge \neg\text{Bellatrix} \wedge \neg\text{Dolores}) \\
\vee\ & (\neg\text{Voldemort} \wedge \neg\text{Dolores} \wedge \neg\text{Bellatrix}) \\
\vee\ & (\neg\text{Voldemort} \wedge \neg\text{Dolores} \wedge \neg\text{Dolores}) \\
\vee\ & (\neg\text{Bellatrix} \wedge \neg\text{Voldemort} \wedge \neg\text{Bellatrix}) \\
\vee\ & (\neg\text{Bellatrix} \wedge \neg\text{Bellatrix} \wedge \neg\text{Dolores}) \\
\vee\ & (\neg\text{Bellatrix} \wedge \neg\text{Dolores} \wedge \neg\text{Bellatrix}) \\
\vee\ & (\neg\text{Bellatrix} \wedge \neg\text{Dolores} \wedge \neg\text{Dolores}).
\end{aligned}$$

But some of these simplify, and others are duplicates and can be omitted, leading to:

$$\begin{aligned}
& (\neg\text{Voldemort} \wedge \neg\text{Bellatrix}) \\
\vee\ & (\neg\text{Voldemort} \wedge \neg\text{Bellatrix} \wedge \neg\text{Dolores}) \\
\vee\ & (\neg\text{Voldemort} \wedge \neg\text{Dolores}) \\
\vee\ & (\neg\text{Bellatrix} \wedge \neg\text{Dolores}).
\end{aligned}$$

程序代写代做 CS编程辅导

This in turn simplifies to:

$$(\neg\text{Voldemort} \wedge \neg\text{Bellatrix})$$
$$\neg\text{Voldemort} \wedge \neg\text{Dolores})$$
$$\neg\text{Bellatrix} \wedge \neg\text{Dolores}).$$

So there are th

Observe that each o[...] CNF expression in the question contains variables that do not appear in any [...] that the choices we make, when forming disjuncts using the Distributive Law [...] he total number of disjuncts is $4 \times 2 \times 2 \times 3 = 48$. Each of these 48 disjuncts has six literals. It is clear that the DNF expression is much bigger than the CNF expression.

This answer is not unique, in the sense that there are other DNF expressions equivalent to the original CNF expression that have different sizes. One way to get such expressions is to not do all the simplifications mentioned above, so that the DNF expression obtained would be even larger.

WeChat: cstutorcs

12.

Assignment Project Exam Help

$$\begin{aligned}
& (\text{Leonard} \vee \text{Cedric} \vee \text{Arthur}) \wedge (\text{Leonard} \vee \text{Cedric} \vee \text{Bill}) \\
\wedge\ & (\text{Leonard} \vee \text{Arthur} \vee \text{Bill}) \wedge (\text{Cedric} \vee \text{Arthur} \vee \text{Bill}) \\
\wedge\ & (\neg\text{Leonard} \vee \neg\text{Cedric} \vee \neg\text{Arthur}) \wedge (\neg\text{Leonard} \vee \neg\text{Cedric} \vee \neg\text{Bill}) \\
\wedge\ & (\neg\text{Leonard} \vee \neg\text{Arthur} \vee \neg\text{Bill}) \wedge (\neg\text{Cedric} \vee \neg\text{Arthur} \vee \neg\text{Bill})
\end{aligned}$$

Email: tutorcs@163.com

13.

(a) $L_{B,n} \vee L_{W,n} \vee L_{U,n}$

QQ: 749389476

(b) If $L_{B,n}$ is true, then it's ok for vertex $n+1$ to be Black (since it then joins the black chain that includes vertex n, which must be ok as the position up to vertex n is legal). It could also be Uncoloured, since adding a new uncoloured vertex next to an existing vertex can never make a legal position illegal. But vertex $n+1$ cannot be White, as it is then in a chain of its own which has no Uncoloured neighbour.

Similarly, if $L_{W,n}$ is true, then vertex $n+1$ can be White or Uncoloured, but it cannot be Black.

Lastly, if $L_{U,n}$ is true, then vertex $n+1$ can be in any of the three states, since if it is coloured then it forms a chain of one vertex that already has an uncoloured neighbour, namely vertex n.

https://tutorcs.com

(c) If $A_{B,n}$ is true, then vertex $n+1$ can be Uncoloured, since that never hurts legality. But it cannot be Black or White. If it were Black, then it would join the Black chain that contains vertex n but does not yet have an uncoloured neighbour, so the position would remain almost legal but it wouldn't be legal. If vertex n were White, it would become a single-vertex chain with no uncoloured neighbour, so the position would be illegal. (Furthermore, the Black chain containing vertex n would not have an uncoloured neighbour, giving another reason for illegality, so the position is now not even *almost* legal.)

The same holds true for $A_{W,n}$: vertex $n+1$ can be Uncoloured, but not Black or White.

$A_{U,n}$ is impossible, since an almost legal position must have its final vertex coloured.

(d)

$L_{B,n+1}$ can be expressed as

$$(L_{B,n} \vee L_{U,n}) \wedge V_{B,n+1}.$$

程序代写代做 CS编程辅导

$L_{W,n+1}$ can be expressed as

$$(L_{W,n} \lor L_{U,n}) \land V_{W,n+1}.$$

$L_{U,n+1}$ can be expre[illegible]

$$[illegible]_{U,n} \lor A_{B,n} \lor A_{W,n}) \land V_{U,n+1}.$$

$A_{B,n+1}$ can be expre[illegible]

$$[illegible] \lor A_{B,n}) \land V_{B,n+1}.$$

$A_{W,n+1}$ can be expressed as

$$(L_{B,n} \lor A_{W,n}) \land V_{W,n+1}.$$

WeChat: cstutorcs

14. (a)

$$\forall X\,\forall Y \;:\; (\mathbf{vertex}(X) \land \mathbf{vertex}(Y) \land \mathbf{edge}(X,Y) \Rightarrow (\mathbf{chosen}(X) \lor \mathbf{chosen}(Y)))$$

Assignment Project Exam Help

(b)

$$\forall X\,\forall Y \;:\; (\mathbf{vertex}(X) \land \mathbf{vertex}(Y) \Rightarrow \mathbf{edge}(X,Y))$$

Email: tutorcs@163.com

(c) Denote the set of edges of a graph G by $E(G)$. So the set of edges of $\overline{G}$ is denoted by $E(\overline{G})$.

We prove that, for any set U of vertices of G, this set U is a vertex cover of G if and only if $V \setminus U$ is a clique in $\overline{G}$.

QQ: 749389476

U is a vertex cover of G

$\iff$ Every edge of G has at least one of its endpoints in U

$\iff$ For every pair of vertices u, v, if they're adjacent in G then $u \in U$ or $v \in U$

$\iff$ $\forall u\,\forall v \;:\; uv \in E(G) \Rightarrow (u \in U \lor v \in U)$

$\iff$ $\forall u\,\forall v \;:\; \neg(uv \in E(G)) \lor (u \in U \lor v \in U)$ (rewriting $P \Rightarrow Q$ as $\neg P \lor Q$)

$\iff$ $\forall u\,\forall v \;:\; uv \notin E(G)) \lor (u \in U \lor v \in U)$

$\iff$ $\forall u\,\forall v \;:\; uv \in E(\overline{G})) \lor (u \in U \lor v \in U)$ (using definition of $\overline{G}$)

$\iff$ $\forall u\,\forall v \;:\; uv \in E(\overline{G})) \lor \neg(\neg(u \in U) \land \neg(v \in U))$ (by de Morgan's Law)

$\iff$ $\forall u\,\forall v \;:\; uv \in E(\overline{G})) \lor \neg(u \notin U \land v \notin U)$

$\iff$ $\forall u\,\forall v \;:\; uv \in E(\overline{G})) \lor \neg(u \in V \setminus U \land v \in V \setminus U)$ (using definition of $V \setminus U$)

$\iff$ $\forall u\,\forall v \;:\; \neg(u \in V \setminus U \land v \in V \setminus U) \lor uv \in E(\overline{G}))$ (just re-ordering; unnecessary; purely cosmetic)

$\iff$ $\forall u\,\forall v \;:\; (u \in V \setminus U \land v \in V \setminus U) \Rightarrow uv \in E(\overline{G}))$ (rewriting $\neg A \lor B$ as $A \Rightarrow B$)

$\iff$ Every pair of vertices in $V \setminus U$ is adjacent in $\overline{G}$

$\iff$ $V \setminus U$ is a clique of $\overline{G}$

https://tutorcs.com

It follows that the mapping $U \mapsto V \setminus U$, which takes the *set* complement[1] of U within the entire vertex set V, is a bijection from vertex covers of size k in G to cliques of size $n-k$ in $\overline{G}$.

(d)

$$\text{size of smallest vertex cover in } G \quad = \quad n \;-\; \text{size of largest clique in } \overline{G}.$$

[1] *not* to be confused with the *graph* complement, $G \mapsto \overline{G}$.