

## Contents

<b>1</b>	<b>DIS 0B</b>	<b>2</b>
1.1	Intro . . . . .	2
1.1.1	Some CS70 advice . . . . .	2
1.2	Propositional Logic . . . . .	2
1.3	Proofs . . . . .	2
1.3.1	Direct proof . . . . .	3
1.3.2	Contraposition . . . . .	3
1.3.3	Contradiction . . . . .	3
1.3.4	Cases . . . . .	3
<b>2</b>	<b>DIS 1A</b>	<b>4</b>
2.1	Induction . . . . .	4
2.1.1	(Weak) Induction . . . . .	4
2.1.2	Strengthening the Hypothesis . . . . .	4
2.1.3	Strong Induction . . . . .	4
2.1.4	Weak vs Strong . . . . .	4
<b>3</b>	<b>DIS 1B</b>	<b>5</b>
3.1	Stable Matching . . . . .	5
3.1.1	The Propose and Reject Algorithm . . . . .	5
3.1.2	Stability . . . . .	5
3.1.3	Optimality . . . . .	5
3.1.4	Potpourri . . . . .	6

# 1 DIS 0B

## 1.1 Intro

- My OH is Monday 1-2 and Tuesday 3-4 in Cory 212.
- Email is first.last@
- 3rd year cs + math major
- hobbies?

### 1.1.1 Some CS70 advice

- Goal: enhance problem solving techniques/approach
- Don't fall behind on content, catching up will not be fun
- problems, problems, more problems
- Ask lots of questions (imperative for strong foundation)
- Don't stress, we're in this ride together

## 1.2 Propositional Logic

Relevant notation:

- $\wedge$  = and
- $\vee$  = or
- $\neg$  = not
- $\implies$  = implies
- $\exists$  = there exists
- $\forall$  = forall
- $\mathbb{N}$  = natural numbers  $\{0, 1, \dots\}$
- $a|b$  =  $a$  divides  $b$

$P \implies Q$  is an example of an implication. We can read this as "If  $P$ , then  $Q$ ." An implication is false only when  $P$  is true and  $Q$  is false. If  $P$  is false, the implication is vacuously true.

### Definition 1.1 (Contrapositive)

If  $P \implies Q$  is an implication, then the implication  $\neg Q \implies \neg P$  is known as the **contrapositive**.

An important identity is that  $P \implies Q \equiv \neg Q \implies \neg P$ .

## 1.3 Proofs

Induction will be in its own section.

Different methods.

**1.3.1 Direct proof**

Want to show  $P \implies Q$  by assuming  $P$  and logically concluding  $Q$ .

**1.3.2 Contraposition**

Want to show  $P \implies Q$  by equivalently proving  $\neg Q \implies \neg P$ .

**1.3.3 Contradiction**

Want to show  $P$ . We do this by assuming  $\neg P$  and concluding  $R \wedge \neg R$ .

Why? Idea is that if we can show the implication  $\neg P \implies (R \wedge \neg R)$  is True, this is the same as showing  $\neg P \implies F$  is True. The contraposition gives  $T \implies P$ .

**1.3.4 Cases**

Break up a problem into multiple cases i.e. odd vs even.

## 2 DIS 1A

### 2.1 Induction

Goal of induction is to show  $\forall n P(n)$ .

#### 2.1.1 (Weak) Induction

- Prove  $P(0)$  is true (or relevant base cases), then  $\forall n \in \mathbb{N} (P(n) \implies P(n+1))$ .
- Induction dominoes analogy!
- Sometimes you might have multiple base cases (Problem about  $4x + 5y$  in Notes 3)

#### 2.1.2 Strengthening the Hypothesis

Sometimes proving  $P(n) \implies P(n+1)$  is not straightforward with induction. In such a scenario, we can try to introduce a (stronger) statement  $Q(n)$ . We want to construct  $Q$  such that  $Q(n) \implies P(n)$ . Inducting on  $Q$  proves  $P$ .

#### 2.1.3 Strong Induction

- Prove  $P(0)$  is true (or relevant base cases), then  $\forall n ((P(0) \wedge P(1) \wedge \dots \wedge P(n)) \implies P(n+1))$ .
- Dominoes analogy, but emphasis on the difference between weak and strong induction (assuming middle domino works vs everything from start to middle).

#### 2.1.4 Weak vs Strong

A common point of confusion is when one should use strong induction in lieu of weak induction. Strong induction **always** works whenever weak induction works. However, there may be scenarios in which the induction hypothesis to prove  $n = k + 1$  requires more information than just  $n = k$ . A scenario like this requires strong induction.

## 3 DIS 1B

### 3.1 Stable Matching

Cool application of induction.

#### 3.1.1 The Propose and Reject Algorithm

Suppose jobs proposes to candidates.

- both jobs and candidates have a list of preferences
- every day a job that doesn't have a deal with a candidate will propose to the next best candidate on its preference list
- every candidate will tentatively "waitlist" the offer from the job (put it on a string)
- if a candidate has multiple offers, they will choose the one they prefer the most
- the algorithm ends when every candidate has a job on their "waitlist" (all these WLs becomes acceptances)

(walk through q1 of dis as a class to visualize this)

#### 3.1.2 Stability

**Definition 3.1 (Rogue Couple)**

A job-candidate pair  $(J, C)$  is denoted as a **rogue couple** if they prefer each other over their final assignment in a stable matching instance.

**Definition 3.2 (Unstable)**

A matching that has at least one rogue couple is considered **unstable**.

Conversely, a **stable** matching is one that has no rogue couples.

Some tricky vocab stuff like stable matching instance.

**Lemma 1 (Improvement)** *If a candidate has a job offer, then they will always have an offer from a job at least as good as the one they have right now.*  $\square$

Matchings produced by the algorithm are always **stable**.

#### 3.1.3 Optimality

The propose and reject algorithm is proposer *optimal* and receiver *pessimal*.

**Definition 3.3 (optimal)**

A pairing is optimal for a group if each entity is paired with who it most prefers while maintaining stability.

Can be thought of a (well that's the best I could do) analogy.

**Definition 3.4 (pessimal)**

A pairing is pessimal for a group if each entity is paired with who it least prefers while maintaining stability.

Can be thought of a (well it can't get worse than this) analogy.

**3.1.4 Potpourri**

It is possible that there exists a stable matching instance that is neither job optimal nor candidate pessimal.

Consider the following preferences

Jobs	Preferences	Candidates	Preferences
<i>A</i>	$1 > 2 > 3$	1	$B > C > A$
<i>B</i>	$2 > 3 > 1$	2	$C > A > B$
<i>C</i>	$3 > 1 > 2$	3	$A > B > C$

The matching above can generate (at least) 3 stable matching instances

$$S = \{(A,1), (B,2), (C,3)\}$$

$$T = \{(A,3), (B,1), (C,2)\}$$

$$U = \{(A,2), (B,3), (C,1)\}.$$

We see

- $S$  is job-optimal/candidate-pessimal (result of running propose and reject with jobs proposing to candidates)
- $T$  is candidate-optimal/job-pessimal (result of running propose and reject with candidates proposing to jobs)
- $U$  is neither optimal nor pessimal for both candidates and jobs ( $S$  and  $T$ ) corroborate that.