Lecture 4

CSE 331

Read the syllabus CAREFULLY! Syllabus Quiz



Office hours (OH) finalized

ACTIONS -

TA Office Hour Schedule

Hi all,

We have finalized TA office hours. An (i) after a TA name means an *in-person* office hour and a (v) after a TA name means that the office hour is virtualonly on zoom. This same information can be found in our syllabus.

All in-person TA office hours that do not mention a specific location in the list below will be in Salvador lounge. Locations may change in the third week. Please keep an eye on this post and check this post to know the correct location before you go to a TA office hour.

- Mondays
 - 9-10am, Rrucha (i)
 - · 1-2pm, Zachary (i)
 - · 2-3pm, Korey (i)

First Week OH

- TAs will discuss the following
 - Proof by Induction, Proof by Contradiction
 - Proof idea, proof details
- Go ask you proof questions!

Separate Proof idea/proof details

</> Note

Notice how the solution below is divided into proof idea and proof details part. THIS IS IMPORTANT: IF YOU DO NOT PRESENT A PROOF IDEA, YOU WILL NOT GET ANY CREDIT EVEN IF YOUR PROOF DETAILS ARE CORRECT.

Proof Idea

As the hint suggests there are two ways of solving this problem. (I'm presenting both the solutions but of course you only need to present one.)

We begin with the approach of reducing the given problem to a problem you have seen earlier. Build the following complete binary tree: every internal node in the tree represents a "parent" RapidGrower while its two children are the two RapidGrowers it divides itself into. After *s* seconds this tree will have height *s* and the number of RapidGrowers in the container after *s* seconds is the number of leaf nodes these complete binary tree has, which we know is 2^s. Hence, the claim is correct.

The proof by induction might be somewhat simpler for this problem if you are not comfortable with reduction. In this case let R(s) be the number of RapidGrowers after *s* seconds. Then we use induction to prove that $R(s) = 2^s$ while using the fact that $2 \cdot 2^s = 2^{s+1}$.

Proof Details

We first present the reduction based proof. Consider the complete binary tree with height *s* and call it T(s). Further, note that one can construct T(s + 1) from T(s) by attaching two children nodes to all the leaves in T(s). Notice that the newly added children are the leaves of T(s + 1). Now assign the root of T(0) as the original RapidGrower in the container. Further, for any internal node in T(s) ($s \ge 0$), assign its two children to the two RapidGrowers it divides itself into. Then note that there is a one to one correspondence between the RapidGrowers after *s* seconds and the leaves of T(s). Then we use the well-known fact (cite your 191/250 book here with the exact place where one can find this fact): T(s) has 2^s leaves, which means that the number of RapidGrowers in the container after *s* seconds is 2^s , which means that the claim is correct.

Solutions to HW 0 out



What is a proof?

The goal of this question is to present a gentle start to proofs. In particular, the idea is to highlight a common mistake students make while writing proofs.

The Problem

Consider the following "proof":

Questions/Comments?



Inductive hypothesis: Assume that P(n-1) = (n-1)!

Inductive step: Note that $P(n) = n^*P(n-1) = n^*(n-1)! = n!$

What are the issues with the above "proof"?



Proof by contradiction for Q1(a)

Assume for contradiction there is an example where number of perfect matchings depends on the identities of the metand women.

Let n =1 and consider two cases (1) M = {BP} and W = {JA} (2) M = {BBT} and W = {AJ} You can only assume things about the example directly implied by it being a counter-example

In both cases the number of perfect matchings is 1 = 1!

Hence contradiction.

There is NO contradiction

What are the issues with the above proof?

Matching Employers & Applicants

Input: Set of employers (E) Set of applicants (A) Preferences

Output: An assignment of applicants to employers that is "stable"

For every x in A and y in E such that x is **not** assigned to y, either

(i) y prefers *every* accepted applicant to x; or

(ii) x prefers her employer to y

Questions to think about



8) Can an applicant have 0 jobs?



Stable Marriage Problem

n men

Each with a preference list

n women

Match/marry them in a "stable" way

On matchings



Mal

Wash

Simon







JOSS WHEDON'S





Inara





Zoe

Kaylee

A valid matching



Not a matching



Perfect Matching



Preferences





































Instability

E 2 3

E E

۵. 😒 🌾



Work things out on paper