70: Discrete Math and Probability Theory

Programming + Microprocessors $\equiv$ Superpower!

What are your super powerful programs/processors doing?
Logic and Proofs!
Induction $\equiv$ Recursion.

What can computers do?
Work with discrete objects.
Discrete Math $\implies$ immense application.

Computers learn and interact with the world?
E.g. machine learning, data analysis, robotics, ...
Probability!

The truth: My hopes and dreams.

You learn to think more clearly and more powerfully.

..And to deal precisely clearly with uncertainty itself.

And to tell the truth.

Truth?? Is there truth? Evidence to decisions. What are values?

Mathematical Reasoning is as close to truth as there is.

It has a certain context.

And it is (maybe) good to understand at least one context where it is solid.

And the context vast consequences.

Probability Unit

- How can we predict unknown future events (e.g., gambling profit, next week rainfall, traffic congestion, …)?
  - Constructive Models: Model the overall system (including the sources of uncertainty).
    - For modeling uncertainty, we'll develop probabilistic models and techniques for analyzing them.
  - Deductive Models: Extract the "trend" from the previous outcomes (e.g., linear regression).



Learning.

Veritassium on Khan

Confusion is the sweat of learning.

Confusion is the sweat of discovery.

Metacogition.



Fig. 1. Final recall (a) after repeatedly studying a text in four study periods (SSSS condition), reading a text in three study periods and then recalling it in one retrieval period (SSSR condition), or reading a text in one study period and then repeatedly recalling it in three retrieval periods (SRRR condition). Judgments of learning (b) were made on a 7-point scale, where 7 indicated that students believed they would remember material very well. The data presented in these graphs are adapted from Experiment 2 of Roediger and Karpicke (2006b). The pattern of students' metacognitive judgments of learning (predicted recall) was exactly the opposite of the pattern of students' actual long-term retention.

Learning styles.

How to search google.
"Learning styles"
"Learning styles debunked."

Actually: scholar.google.com.

CS70: Notes, lectures, discussions, vitamins, homeworks.

An effective student is...

Smart, rich,

and beautiful.

All memes. The last one is not a meme.
First one, learning is inherent. You are all capable.
Second, background, background, etc. The material is doable.

What I think.

Confident, motivated,

has integrity.

Known knowns..

There are the known knowns, known unknowns, and unknown unknowns.

The last one is what always gets you.

In learning, one goes from unknown unknowns, to known unknowns, to known knowns.

The middle one is stressful and where most of the time is spent.

Confidence is not pretending you know.
Its being comfortable with what you don't know.
In order to get there.

Dogs don't have rights cuz..

They don't know infinity.

First grade

$1, 2, 3, 4, \ldots, 120$

Peano's axioms. There is always a successor.

$+3$ means move to successor and another and another, or 3 times.

Metric. (distance.) There is mapping $f : \mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{N} \to \mathbb{N}$
Obeys triangle inequality: $f(i, j) + f(j, k) \geq f(i, k)$

11 is one ten, and one one.

Computer science: efficient representation of a number.
Algorithms: how to add.
Place value: democratizes arithmetic.

3×5?

$\times$ means add 3 times.
$5 + 5 + 5$
10 is moving over 5 from 5
The next number one can use the one's place.

How to interact with staff..

My advice to TA's.

When a student asks questions, probe to see where they are. And then move them forward.

E.g., Avoid long explanations with nodding students. You must checkin meaningfully.

What should you do?
Where does your understanding get iffy?
Explain what you understand, then say what you don't.

Advice from (former) TA's

Dinstiguished Almunus (DA) Megan:
I read the notes until I could reproduce the proofs myself.

DA Lili:
When I took the course, I tried my best to attend every discussion and ask questions whenever I was confused!

Head TA Richard:
"carefully review the homework solutions after they are released and understand them to the point of being able to replicate them without needing to reference them."

Known knowns..

There are the known knowns, known unknowns, and unknown unknowns.

The last one is what get's you.

In learning, one goes from unknown unknowns, to known unknowns, to known knowns.

The middle one is stressful and where most of the time is spent.

Mini-vitamins.

1) Mini-vitamins.
 Do before lecture.
  But, it's before it's taught!
   Read the notes.
    Ya do it in English class! or should maybe?
   Rao lectures follow them closely.
    Ask any professor:
     watching after you know something is far more useful.
2) Mini-vitamins.
 Do before section.
 TAs: they don't even know the basic definitions to do the worksheet.
3) Discussion.
 Will not cover everything on sheet.
 May not present any solutions.
 Opportunity for guided practice.

Warning: you might not like it. But you will learn more.

See this paper, for example and a good discussion.

Please do not take it out on your TA's.

Admin

Course Webpage: **http://www.eecs70.org/**

Explains policies, has office hours, homework, midterm dates, etc.

One midterm, final.
 midterm.

Questions $\Longrightarrow$ Ed:
 Logistics, etc.
 Content Support: other students!
  Plus Ed Stem

Weekly Post.

It's weekly.
Read it!!!!
 Announcements, logistics, critical advice.

Wason's experiment:1

Suppose we have four cards on a table:

- 1st about Alice, 2nd about Bob, 3rd Charlie, 4th Donna.
- Card contains person's destination on one side, and mode of travel.
- Consider the theory: "If a person travels to Chicago, they flies."
- Suppose you see that Alice went to Baltimore, Bob drove, Charlie went to Chicago, and Donna flew.

Alice	Bob	Charlie	Donna
Baltimore	drove	Chicago	flew

- Which cards must you flip to test the theory?

Answer: (A), (B), (C), (D). Later.

CS70: Lecture 1. Outline.

Today: Note 1. Note 0 is background. Do read it.

The language of proofs!

1. Propositions.
2. Propositional Forms. (Formula.)
3. Implication.
4. Truth Tables
5. Quantifiers
6. More De Morgan's Laws

Propositions: Statements that are true or false.

$\sqrt{2}$ is irrational	**Proposition**	True
2+2 = 4	**Proposition**	True
2+2 = 3	**Proposition**	False
826th digit of pi is 4	**Proposition**	False
Jesse Eisenberg is a good actor	**Not Proposition**	
Any even >2 is sum of 2 primes	**Proposition**	False
$4+5$	**Not Proposition.**	
$x+x$	**Not a Proposition.**	
Alice travelled to Chicago	**Proposition.**	False
I love you.	**Hmmm.**	Its complicated.

Again: "value" of a proposition is ... True or False

Propositional Forms.

Put propositions together to make another...

Conjunction ("and"): $P \wedge Q$

"$P \wedge Q$" is True if both P and Q are True . Else False .

Disjunction ("or"): $P \vee Q$

"$P \vee Q$" is True if at least one P or Q is True . Else False .

Negation ("not"): $\neg P$

"$\neg P$" is True if P is False . Else False .

Examples:

$\neg$ "$(2+2=4)$" – a proposition that is ... False

"$2+2=3$" $\wedge$ "$2+2=4$" – a proposition that is ... False

"$2+2=3$" $\vee$ "$2+2=4$" – a proposition that is ... True

Put them together..

Propositions:

P_1 - Person 1 rides the bus.
P_2 - Person 2 rides the bus.
....

But we can't have either of the following happen; That either person 1 or person 2 ride the bus and person 3 or 4 ride the bus. Or that person 2 or person 3 ride the bus and that either person 4 rides the bus or person 5 doesn't.

Propositional Form:
$\neg(((P_1 \vee P_2) \wedge (P_3 \vee P_4)) \vee ((P_2 \vee P_3) \wedge (P_4 \vee \neg P_5)))$

Can person 3 ride the bus?
Can person 3 and person 4 ride the bus together?

This seems ...complicated.

We can program!!!!

We need a way to keep track!

Truth Tables for Propositional Forms.

"$P \wedge Q$" is True if both P and Q are True .

P	Q	$P \wedge Q$
T	T	T
T	F	F
F	T	F
F	F	F

"$P \vee Q$" is True if $\geq$ one of P or Q is True .

P	Q	$P \vee Q$
T	T	T
T	F	T
F	T	T
F	F	F

Check: $\wedge$ and $\vee$ are commutative.

One use for truth tables: Logical Equivalence of propositional forms!

Example: $\neg(P \wedge Q)$ logically equivalent to $\neg P \vee \neg Q$. Same Truth Table!

P	Q	$\neg(P \vee Q)$	$\neg P \wedge \neg Q$
T	T	F	F
T	F	F	F
F	T	F	F
F	F	T	T

DeMorgan's Law's for Negation: distribute and flip!

$\neg(P \wedge Q) \equiv \neg P \vee \neg Q$ $\qquad$ $\neg(P \vee Q) \equiv \neg P \wedge \neg Q$

Quick Questions

P	Q	$P \wedge Q$
T	T	T
T	F	F
F	T	F
F	F	F

P	Q	$P \vee Q$
T	T	T
T	F	T
F	T	T
F	F	F

Is $(T \wedge Q) \equiv Q$? Yes? No?

Yes! Look at rows in truth table for $P = T$.

What is $(F \wedge Q)$? F or False.

What is $(T \vee Q)$? T

What is $(F \vee Q)$? Q

Distributive?

$P \wedge (Q \vee R) \equiv (P \wedge Q) \vee (P \wedge R)$?

Simplify: $(T \wedge Q) \equiv Q$, $(F \wedge Q) \equiv F$.

Cases:

P is True .
LHS: $T \wedge (Q \vee R) \equiv (Q \vee R)$.
RHS: $(T \wedge Q) \vee (T \wedge R) \equiv (Q \vee R)$.

P is False .
LHS: $F \wedge (Q \vee R) \equiv F$.
RHS: $(F \wedge Q) \vee (F \wedge R) \equiv (F \vee F) \equiv F$.

$P \vee (Q \wedge R) \equiv (P \vee Q) \wedge (P \vee R)$?

Simplify: $T \vee Q \equiv T$, $F \vee Q \equiv Q$. ...

Foil 1:
$(A \vee B) \wedge (C \vee D) \equiv (A \wedge C) \vee (A \wedge D) \vee (B \wedge C) \vee (B \wedge D)$?

Foil 2:
$(A \wedge B) \vee (C \wedge D) \equiv (A \vee C) \wedge (A \vee D) \wedge (B \vee C) \wedge (B \vee D)$?

Implication.

$P \implies Q$ interpreted as

If P, then Q.

True Statements: P, $P \implies Q$.
Conclude: Q is true.

Examples:

Statement: If you stand in the rain, then you'll get wet.
P = "you stand in the rain"
Q = "you will get wet"
Statement: "Stand in the rain"
Can conclude: "you'll get wet."

Statement:
If a right triangle has sidelengths $a \leq b \leq c$, then $a^2 + b^2 = c^2$.

P = "a right triangle has sidelengths $a \leq b \leq c$",
Q = "$a^2 + b^2 = c^2$".

Non-Consequences/consequences of Implication

The statement "$P \implies Q$"

only is False if P is True and Q is False .

False implies nothing
P False means Q can be True or False
Anything implies true.
P can be True or False if Q is True

If chemical plant pollutes river, fish die.
If fish die, did chemical plant pollute river?

Not necessarily.

$P \implies Q$ and Q are True does not mean P is True

Be careful!

Instead we have:
$P \implies Q$ and P are True *does* mean Q is True .

The chemical plant pollutes river. Can we conclude fish die?

Implication and English.

$P \implies Q$
Poll.

- If P, then Q.
- Q if P.
  Just reversing the order.
- P only if Q.
  Remember if P is true then Q must be true.
  this suggests that P can only be true if Q is true.
  since if Q is false P must have been false.
- P is sufficient for Q.
  This means that proving P allows you
  to conclude that Q is true.
  Example: Showing $n > 4$ is sufficient for showing $n > 3$.
- Q is necessary for P.
  For P to be true it is necessary that Q is true.
  Or if Q is false then we know that P is false.
  Example: It is necessary that $n > 3$ for $n > 4$.

Truth Table: implication.

P	Q	$P \implies Q$
T	T	T
T	F	F
F	T	T
F	F	T

P	Q	$\neg P \vee Q$
T	T	T
T	F	F
F	T	T
F	F	T

$\neg P \vee Q \equiv P \implies Q$.

These two propositional forms are logically equivalent!

Contrapositive, Converse

- **Contrapositive** of $P \implies Q$ is $\neg Q \implies \neg P$.
  - If the plant pollutes, fish die.
  - If the fish don't die, the plant does not pollute.
    (contrapositive)
  - If you stand in the rain, you get wet.
  - If you did not stand in the rain, you did not get wet.
    (not contrapositive!) converse!
  - If you did not get wet, you did not stand in the rain.
    (contrapositive.)

  Logically equivalent! Notation: $\equiv$. Recall: $(X \implies Y) \equiv (\neg X \vee Y)$
  $P \implies Q \equiv \neg P \vee Q \equiv Q \vee \neg P \equiv \neg(\neg Q) \vee \neg P \equiv \neg Q \implies \neg P$.
- **Converse** of $P \implies Q$ is $Q \implies P$.
  If fish die the plant pollutes.
  Not logically equivalent!
- **Definition:** If $P \implies Q$ and $Q \implies P$ is P if and only if Q or $P \iff Q$.
  (Logically Equivalent: $\iff$.)

Variables.

Propositions?

- $\sum_{i=1}^{n} i = \frac{n(n+1)}{2}$.
- $x > 2$
- n is even and the sum of two primes

No. They have a free variable.

We call them **predicates**, e.g., $Q(x) =$ "x is even"
Same as boolean valued functions from 61A!

- $P(n) =$ "$\sum_{i=1}^{n} i = \frac{n(n+1)}{2}$."
- $R(x) =$ "$x > 2$"
- $G(n) =$ "n is even and the sum of two primes"
- Remember Wason's experiment!
  $F(x) =$ "Person x flew."
  $C(x) =$ "Person x went to Chicago
- $C(x) \implies F(x)$. Theory from Wason's.
  If person x goes to Chicago then person x flew.

Next: Statements about boolean valued functions!!

Quantifiers..

There exists quantifier:

$(\exists x \in S)(P(x))$ means "There exists an x in S where $P(x)$ is true."

For example:

$$(\exists x \in \mathbb{N})(x = x^2)$$

Equivalent to "$(0 = 0) \vee (1 = 1) \vee (2 = 4) \vee \ldots$"

Much shorter to use a quantifier!

For all quantifier;
$(\forall x \in S)\ (P(x))$. means "For all x in S, $P(x)$ is True ."

Examples:

"Adding 1 makes a bigger number."

$(\forall x \in \mathbb{N})\ (x + 1 > x)$

"the square of a number is always non-negative"

$(\forall x \in \mathbb{N})(x^2 >= 0)$

Wait! What is $\mathbb{N}$?

Quantifiers: universes.

Proposition: "For all natural numbers n, $\sum_{i=1}^{n} i = \frac{n(n+1)}{2}$."

Proposition has **universe**: "the natural numbers".

Universe examples include..

- $\mathbb{N} = \{0, 1, \ldots\}$ (natural numbers).
- $\mathbb{Z} = \{\ldots, -1, 0, \ldots\}$ (integers)
- $\mathbb{Z}^+$ (positive integers)
- $\mathbb{R}$ (real numbers)
- Any set: $S = \{Alice, Bob, Charlie, Donna\}$.
- See note 0 for more!

Other proposition notation(for discussion):
"$d|n$" means d divides n
or $\exists k \in \mathbb{Z}, n = kd$.
$2|4$? True.
$4|2$? False.

Back to: Wason's experiment:1

Theory: "If a person travels to Chicago, he/she/they flies."

Alice to Baltimore, Bob drove, Charlie to Chicago, and Donna flew.

Which cards do you need to flip to test the theory?

$Chicago(x)$ = "x went to Chicago." $Flew(x)$ = "x flew"

Statement/theory: $\forall x \in \{A, B, C, D\}, Chicago(x) \implies Flew(x)$

$Chicago(A)$ = False . Do we care about $Flew(A)$?
No. $Chicago(A) \implies Flew(A)$ is true.
since $Chicago(A)$ is False ,

$Flew(B)$ = False . Do we care about $Chicago(B)$?
Yes. $Chicago(B) \implies Flew(B) \equiv \neg Flew(B) \implies \neg Chicago(B)$.
So $Chicago(Bob)$ must be False .

$Chicago(C)$ = True . Do we care about $Flew(C)$?
Yes. $Chicago(C) \implies Flew(C)$ means $Flew(C)$ must be true.

$Flew(D)$ = True . Do we care about $Chicago(D)$?
No. $Chicago(D) \implies Flew(D)$ is true if $Flew(D)$ is true.

Only have to turn over cards for Bob and Charlie.

More for all quantifiers examples.

- "doubling a number always makes it larger"

  $(\forall x \in N)\ (2x > x)$ **False** **Consider** $x = 0$

  Can fix statement...

  $(\forall x \in N)\ (2x \geq x)$ **True**

- "Square of any natural number greater than 5 is greater than 25."

  $(\forall x \in N)(x > 5 \implies x^2 > 25)$.

  Idea alert: Restrict domain using implication.

Later we may omit universe if clear from context.

Quantifiers..not commutative.

- In English: "there is a natural number that is the square of every natural number".

  $(\exists y \in \mathbb{N})\ (\forall x \in \mathbb{N})\ (y = x^2)$ False

- In English: "the square of every natural number is a natural number."

  $(\forall x \in \mathbb{N})(\exists y \in \mathbb{N})\ (y = x^2)$ True

Quantifiers....negation...DeMorgan again.

Consider

$$\neg(\forall x \in S)(P(x)),$$

English: there is an x in S where $P(x)$ does not hold.

That is,

$$\neg(\forall x \in S)(P(x)) \iff \exists(x \in S)(\neg P(x)).$$

What we do in this course! We consider claims.

Claim: $(\forall x)\ P(x)$ "For all inputs x the program works."
For False , find x, where $\neg P(x)$.
Counterexample.
Bad input.
Case that illustrates bug.
For True : prove claim. Next lectures...

Negation of exists.

Consider

$$\neg(\exists x \in S)(P(x))$$

English: means that there is no $x \in S$ where $P(x)$ is true. English: means that for all $x \in S$, $P(x)$ does not hold.

That is,

$$\neg(\exists x \in S)(P(x)) \iff \forall(x \in S)\neg P(x).$$

Which Theorem?

Theorem: $(\forall n \in \mathbb{N})\ n \geq 3 \implies \neg(\exists a,b,c \in \mathbb{N})\ (a^n + b^n = c^n)$

Which Theorem?

Fermat's Last Theorem!

Remember Special Triangles: for $n = 2$, we have 3,4,5 and 5,7, 12 and ...

1637: Proof doesn't fit in the margins.

1993: Wiles ...(based in part on Ribet's Theorem)

DeMorgan Restatement:
Theorem: $\neg(\exists n \in \mathbb{N})\ (\exists a,b,c \in \mathbb{N})\ (n \geq 3 \implies a^n + b^n = c^n)$

Summary.

Propositions are statements that are true or false.

Propositional forms use $\wedge, \vee, \neg$.

Propositional forms correspond to truth tables.

Logical equivalence of forms means same truth tables.

Implication: $P \implies Q \iff \neg P \vee Q$.

Contrapositive: $\neg Q \implies \neg P$
Converse: $Q \implies P$

Predicates: Statements with "free" variables.

Quantifiers: $\forall x\ P(x)$, $\exists y\ Q(y)$

Now can state theorems! And disprove false ones!

DeMorgans Laws: "Flip and Distribute negation"
$\neg(P \vee Q) \iff (\neg P \wedge \neg Q)$
$\neg \forall x\ P(x) \iff \exists x\ \neg P(x)$.

Next Time: proofs!