

CSC236 Fall 2018

Assignment #1: induction

due September 28th, 3 p.m.

The aim of this assignment is to give you some practice with various flavours of induction. For each question below you will present a proof by induction. For full marks you need to make it clear to the reader that the base case(s) is/are verified, that the inductive step follows for each element of the domain (typically the natural numbers), where the inductive hypothesis is used, and that it is used in a valid case.

Your assignment must be **typed** to produce a PDF document **a1.pdf** (hand-written submissions are not acceptable). You may work on the assignment in groups of 1 or 2, and submit a single assignment for the entire group on [MarkUs](#)

1. Recall **bipartite graphs**. Consider the following definitions:

bipartite graph: Undirected graph $G = (V, E)$ is **bipartite** if and only if there exist V_1, V_2 such that $V = V_1 \cup V_2$, $V_1 \cap V_2 = \emptyset$, and every edge in E has one endpoint in V_1 and the other in V_2 .

P(n): Every bipartite graph on n vertices has no more than $n^2/4$ edges.

- (a) Assume $P(234)$. Can you use this¹ to prove that $P(235)$ follows? Explain why, or why not.
- (b) Assume $P(235)$. Can you use this² to prove that $P(236)$ follows? Explain why or why not.
- (c) Use what you've learned from the previous two answers to construct a proof by simple induction that: $\forall n \in \mathbb{N}, P(n)$. **Note:** There are proofs of this claim that are not by simple induction, **but** those proofs will receive no marks. **Hint:** You probably need to strengthen the claim in order to devise a successful inductive hypothesis. If this seems mysterious, revisit the previous two answers...

2. Define function f as follows:

$$f(n) = \begin{cases} 3 & \text{if } n = 0 \\ [f(\lfloor \log_3 n \rfloor)]^2 + f(\lfloor \log_3 n \rfloor) & \text{if } n > 0 \end{cases}$$

Define predicate $P(n)$: " $f(n)$ is a multiple of 4."

- (a) Assume $P(3)$. Can you use this³ to prove $P(29)$? Explain why or why not.
- (b) Assume $P(4)$. Can you use this⁴ to prove $P(29)$? Explain why or why not.
- (c) Use complete induction to prove $\forall n \in \mathbb{N}, n > 0 \Rightarrow P(n)$.

¹If you say yes, $P(234)$ must be a necessary part of your proof.

²If you say yes, $P(235)$ must be a necessary part of your proof.

³If you say yes, $P(3)$ must be a necessary part of your proof.

⁴If you say yes, $P(4)$ must be a necessary part of your proof.

3. Use the Principle of Well-Ordering to derive a contradiction that proves there are no positive integers x, y, z such that:

$$5x^3 + 50y^3 = 3z^3$$

You may assume, without proof, that if a prime number p divides a perfect cube n^3 , then p also divides n .

4. Define \mathcal{T} as the smallest set of strings that satisfies:

- $"*" \in \mathcal{T}$
- if $t_1, t_2 \in \mathcal{T}$ then their parenthesized concatenation $(t_1 t_2) \in \mathcal{T}$.

Some examples: $"**"$, $"(**)"$, $"(**(**))"$ are all in \mathcal{T} .

Now read over these four Python functions:

```
def left_count(s: str) -> int:
    """
    Return the number of "(" in s
    """
    return s.count("(")

def double_count(s: str) -> int:
    """
    Return the number of "(" plus number of ")", including possible
    overlaps.
    """
    return (len([s[i:] for i in range(len(s)) if s[i:].startswith("(")])
            + len([s[:i] for i in range(len(s) + 1) if s[:i].endswith(")")])))

def left_surplus(s: str, i: int) -> int:
    """
    Return the number of "(" minus the number of ")"
    in s[:i]
    """
    return s.count("(", 0, i) - s.count(")", 0, i)

def max_left_surplus(s: str) -> int:
    """
    Return the maximum left surplus for all prefixes of s.
    """
    return max([left_surplus(s, i) for i in range(len(s))] + [0])
```

- (a) Use structural induction on \mathcal{T} to prove:

$$\forall t \in \mathcal{T}, \text{left_count}(t) \leq 2^{\text{max_left_surplus}(t)} - 1$$

[hint, September 25:] You may assume, without proof, that if $t_1, t_2 \in \mathcal{T}$, then

$$\text{max_left_surplus}((t_1 t_2)) = \max(\text{max_left_surplus}(t_1), \text{max_left_surplus}(t_2)) + 1$$

- (b) Use structural induction on \mathcal{T} to prove: [edit:] error fixed September 9

$$\forall t \in \mathcal{T}, \text{double_count}(t) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } t = "*" \\ \text{left_count}(t) - 1 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$