Contents

1	DIS	0B		2
	1.1	Intro .		2
		1.1.1	Some CS70 advice	2
	1.2	Propos	itional 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
2	DIS	1A		4
	2.1	Inducti	on	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
3	DIS	1B		5
	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
4	DIS	2A		7
	4.1	Graphs		7
		4.1.1	Notation	7
		4.1.2	Vocabulary	7

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
- \(\text{\text{or}} = \text{or} \)
- $\neg = not$
- \implies = implies
- \exists = there exists
- \forall = forall
- \mathbb{N} = natural numbers $\{0, 1, \ldots\}$
- a|b = a divides b

 $P \Longrightarrow Q$ 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 **contrapositve**.

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 $\neg P \implies (R \land \neg R)$ 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 $\forall nP(n)$.

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 $\forall n ((P(0) \land P(1) \land \cdots \land P(n)) \implies P(n+1))$.
- 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.*

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		
A	1 > 2 > 3		
В	2 > 3 > 1		
C	3 > 1 > 2		

Candidates	Preferences		
1	B > C > A		
2	C > A > B		
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.

Also some other important facts that can be seen (from discussion worksheet questions):

- There is at least one candidate that will receive only one proposal (that too on the last day)
- We can upper bound the number of days needed by P&R algorithm to $(n-1)^2 + 1 = n^2 2n + 2$ (think about why)
- As a consequence of above, we can upper bound the number of rejections needed by P&R algorithm to $(n-1)^2 = n^2 2n + 1$ rejections.

4 DIS 2A

4.1 Graphs

4.1.1 Notation

- V denotes set of vertices (points)
- E denotes set of edges (lines)
- |V| denotes size of set of vertices i.e number of vertices; |E| similarly
- Graph G with vertices V and edges E is denoted G = (V, E).

4.1.2 Vocabulary

Definition 4.1 (Path)

A path is a sequence of edges. In CS70, we assume a path is *simple* which means no repeated vertices.

Definition 4.2 (Cycle)

A **cycle** is a simple path that starts and ends at the same vertex.

Definition 4.3 (Walk)

A walk is any arbitrary connected sequence of edges.

Definition 4.4 (Tour)

A tour is a walk that starts and end at the same vertex.

Definition 4.5 (Connected)

A graph is **connected** if there exists a path between any two distinct vertices.

Definition 4.6 (Eulerian Walk)

An Eulerian walk is a walk covering all edges without repeating any.

Definition 4.7 (Eulerian Tour)

An Eulerian tour is an Eulerian walk that starts and ends at the same vertex.

To summarize,

	no repeated vertices	no repeated edges	start = end	all edges
Walk				
Path	✓	✓		
Tour			✓	
Cycle	√ *	✓	✓	
Eulerian Walk		✓		✓
Eulerian Tour		√	✓	√

(*except for start and end vertices)

Theorem 4.1 (Euler's Theorem)

An undirected graph G has an Eulerian tour iff G is connected and all its vertices have even degree.

Definition 4.8 (Bipartite)

A graph is considered bipartite if V can be partitioned into two sets L and R where $V = L \cup R$ such that there are no edges between vertices in L and no edges between vertices in R.

We will discuss trees, planarity, coloring, and hypercubes in the next discussion.