# **Contents**

1	DIS	0B		2
	1.1	Intro .		2
		1.1.1	Some CS70 advice	2
	1.2	Propos	sitional 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
•	DIC	1 1		4
2	DIS			•
	2.1		ion	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	S	7
		4.1.1	Notation	7
		4.1.2	Vocabulary	7
		4.1.3	The holy grail for graph proofs	8
		4.1.4	Relevant Potpourri	8
		7.1.4	Kelevani i otpoutti	o

# 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
- ¬ = 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	all vertices
Walk					
Path	✓	✓			
Tour			✓		
Cycle	<b>√</b> *	✓	✓		
Eulerian Walk		✓		✓	
Eulerian Tour		✓	✓	✓	
Hamiltonian Tour	$\checkmark$	✓	<b>√</b>		✓

(\*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.

The requires condition for an Eulerian walk is that we have exactly 2 vertices of odd degree. (Of course, the case of 0 odd vertices trivially works since we claim from Euler's Theorem that we can find an Eulerian tour which is a stronger statement than an Eulerian walk)

#### **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.

#### 4.1.3 The holy grail for graph proofs

Induct, induct, induct, and induct.

- Think about what you want to induct on (edges or vertices???)
- Base case (read the problem carefully!)
- Prove for *n* by going from  $n \to n-1 \to I.H. \to n$ .
  - **DO NOT** go from n 1 → n directly.
  - Why? Build-up error!
  - Good example of build-up error when trying to prove "if every vertex of a graph has degree at least 2, then there exists a cycle of length 3." Any attempt at induction will give us a false proof but we cannot make square from triangle!
  - It's also a logistical nightmare lol (in the times it might accidentally work). Try generating all 5-vertex trees from all 4-vertex trees yikes.

### 4.1.4 Relevant Potpourri

Some other relevant information.

# **Definition 4.9 (Degree)**

The **degree** of a vertex v denoted deg(v) is defined to be the number of incident edges to v.

# Lemma 2 (Handshake)

$$\sum_{v \in V} \deg(v) = 2|E|.$$

The idea of a degree (with no adjective) is only well-defined for undirected graphs. We see for directed graphs it's a little funky; we need to introduce the concept of indegree and outdegree.

In a directed graph, the number of outgoing edges equals the number of ingoing edges.

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