

you would expect that if team a beats team b and team b beats team c then team a should also beat team c.

This is not the case for Pac 12 football (in 2019)



Relations And Graphs

Announcements

We're having the final exam in-person :O

Please fill out [this form](#) so we can plan logistics.

We have a second room available for students who have a reason not to be in the giant lecture hall.

Those in the giant lecture hall will sit every other seat.

Relations

Relations

A (binary) relation from A to B is a subset of $A \times B$

A (binary) relation on A is a subset of $A \times A$

Wait what?

\leq is a relation on \mathbb{Z} .

" $3 \leq 4$ " is a way of saying "3 relates to 4" (for the \leq relation)

$(3,4)$ is an element of the set that defines the relation.

Relations, Examples

It turns out, they've been here the whole time

$<$ on \mathbb{R} is a relation

i.e. $\{(x, y) : x < y \text{ and } x, y \in \mathbb{R}\}$.

$=$ on Σ^* is a relation

i.e. $\{(x, y) : x = y \text{ and } x, y \in \Sigma^*\}$

For your favorite function f , you can define a relation from its domain to its co-domain *or \mathbb{R}*

i.e. $\{(x, y) : f(x) = y\}$

" x when squared gives y " is a relation *on \mathbb{R}*

i.e. $\{(x, y) : x^2 = y, x, y \in \mathbb{R}\}$

Relations, Examples

Fix a universal set \mathcal{U} .

\subseteq is a relation. What's it on?

$$\mathcal{U} = \{1, 2\}$$
$$\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{U}) = \{\emptyset, \{1\}, \{2\}, \{1, 2\}\}$$

$\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{U})$

The set of all subsets of \mathcal{U}

$$\emptyset \subseteq \{2\}$$
$$\{1\} \subseteq \{1, 2\}$$

More Relations

$$R_1 = \{(a, 1), (a, 2), (b, 1), (b, 3), (c, 3)\}$$

Is a relation (you can define one just by listing what relates to what)

Equivalence mod 5 is a relation.

$$\{(x, y) : x \equiv y \pmod{5}\}$$

We'll also say "x relates to y if and only if they're congruent mod 5"

Properties of relations

What do we do with relations? Usually we prove properties about them.

Symmetry

A binary relation R on a set S is "symmetric" iff
for all $a, b \in S$, $[(a, b) \in R \rightarrow (b, a) \in R]$

= on Σ^* is symmetric, for all $a, b \in \Sigma^*$ if $a = b$ then $b = a$.

\subseteq is not symmetric on $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{U})$ – $\{1,2,3\} \subseteq \{1,2,3,4\}$ but $\{1,2,3,4\} \not\subseteq \{1,2,3\}$

Transitivity

A binary relation R on a set S is "transitive" iff
for all $a, b, c \in S$, $[(a, b) \in R \wedge (b, c) \in R \rightarrow (a, c) \in R]$

= on Σ^* is transitive, for all $a, b, c \in \Sigma^*$ if $a = b$ and $b = c$ then $a = c$.

\subseteq is transitive on $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{U})$ – for any sets A, B, C if $A \subseteq B$ and $B \subseteq C$ then $A \subseteq C$.

\in is not a transitive relation – $1 \in \{1,2,3\}$, $\{1,2,3\} \in \mathcal{P}(\{1,2,3\})$ but $1 \notin \mathcal{P}(\{1,2,3\})$.

Warm up

Show that $a \equiv b \pmod{n}$ if and only if $b \equiv a \pmod{n}$

$$a \equiv b \pmod{n} \leftrightarrow n \mid (b - a) \leftrightarrow nk = b - a \text{ (for } k \in \mathbb{Z}) \leftrightarrow$$

$$n(-k) = a - b \text{ (for } -k \in \mathbb{Z}) \leftrightarrow n \mid (a - b) \leftrightarrow b \equiv a \pmod{n}$$

This was a proof that the relation $\{(a, b) : a \equiv b \pmod{n}\}$ is symmetric!

It was actually overkill to show if and only if. Showing just one direction turns out to be enough!

$a - n = (q - 1)n + (a \% n)$. Observe that $q - 1$ is an integer, and that this is the form of the division theorem for $(a - n) \% n$. Since the division theorem guarantees a unique integer, $(a - n) \% n = (a \% n)$

What about transitivity?

$$x|y, y|z$$
$$x|z$$

3. GCD proof [12 points]

Let x, y, z be arbitrary integers such that $x|y$ and $y|z$. For the following questions, if the statement is true, write a proof. If it is false, disprove it (you will provide a counterexample in that case).

(b) Is it true that $x|z$? **Solution:**

Yes. By definition of divides, we know there is some integer k such that $y = kx$. Similarly, there is some integer j such that $z = jy$. From here we note that $z = j(kx)$. Since integers closed under multiplication we know that $j \cdot k$ is an integer thus $z = (jk)x$ for some integer $j \cdot k$ so by definition of divides $x|z$.

This was a proof that divides is a transitive relation!

More Properties of relations

What do we do with relations? Usually we prove properties about them.

Antisymmetry

A binary relation R on a set S is "antisymmetric" iff
for all $a, b \in S$, $[(a, b) \in R \wedge a \neq b \rightarrow (b, a) \notin R]$

\leq is antisymmetric on \mathbb{Z}

Reflexivity

A binary relation R on a set S is "reflexive" iff
for all $a \in S$, $[(a, a) \in R]$

\leq is reflexive on \mathbb{Z}

\leq

You've proven antisymmetry too!

(a) Prove that if $a \mid b$ and $b \mid a$, where a and b are integers, then $a = b$ or $a = -b$.

Solution:

Suppose that $a \mid b$ and $b \mid a$, where a, b are integers. By the definition of divides, we have $a \neq 0, b \neq 0$ and $b = ka, a = jb$ for some integers k, j . Combining these equations, we see that $a = j(ka)$.

Then, dividing both sides by a , we get $1 = jk$. So, $\frac{1}{j} = k$. Note that j and k are integers, which is only possible if $j, k \in \{1, -1\}$. It follows that $b = -a$ or $b = a$.

Antisymmetry

A binary relation R on a set S is "antisymmetric" iff for all $a, b \in S$, $[(a, b) \in R \wedge a \neq b \rightarrow (b, a) \notin R]$

You showed \mid is antisymmetric on \mathbb{Z}^+ in section 5.

for all $a, b \in S$, $[(a, b) \in R \wedge (b, a) \in R \rightarrow a = b]$ is equivalent to the definition in the box above

The box version is easier to understand, the other version is usually easier to prove.

Try a few of your own

Decide whether each of these relations are Reflexive, symmetric, antisymmetric, and transitive.

\subseteq on $\mathcal{P}(U)$

\geq on \mathbb{Z}

$>$ on \mathbb{R}

$|$ on \mathbb{Z}^+

$|$ on \mathbb{Z}

$\equiv (\text{mod } 3)$ on \mathbb{Z}

5/10 10/5
x/x
-5/5 5/-5

Symmetry: for all $a, b \in S, [(a, b) \in R \rightarrow (b, a) \in R]$

Antisymmetry: for all $a, b \in S, [(a, b) \in R \wedge a \neq b \rightarrow (b, a) \notin R]$

Transitivity: for all $a, b, c \in S, [(a, b) \in R \wedge (b, c) \in R \rightarrow (a, c) \in R]$

Reflexivity: for all $a \in S, [(a, a) \in R]$

R, A, T
not antisymmetric

R, S, T

Try a few of your own

Symmetry: for all $a, b \in S$, $[(a, b) \in R \rightarrow (b, a) \in R]$

Antisymmetry: for all $a, b \in S$, $[(a, b) \in R \wedge a \neq b \rightarrow (b, a) \notin R]$

Transitivity: for all $a, b, c \in S$,
 $[(a, b) \in R \wedge (b, c) \in R \rightarrow (a, c) \in R]$

Reflexivity: for all $a \in S$, $[(a, a) \in R]$

Decide whether each of these relations are Reflexive, symmetric, antisymmetric, and transitive.

\subseteq on $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{U})$ reflexive, antisymmetric, transitive

\geq on \mathbb{Z} reflexive, antisymmetric, transitive

$>$ on \mathbb{R} antisymmetric, transitive

$|$ on \mathbb{Z}^+ reflexive, antisymmetric, transitive

$|$ on \mathbb{Z} reflexive, transitive

$\equiv \pmod{3}$ on \mathbb{Z} reflexive, symmetric, transitive

How Do symmetry and antisymmetry relate?

There are relations that are neither symmetric nor antisymmetric.

For example $R = \{(1,2), (2,1), (1,3)\}$

$(1,2), (2,1)$ say you can't be antisymmetric.

$(1,3)$ [without $(3,1)$] says you can't be symmetric.

But you can only be both if the implications are vacuous.

A relation like $\{(1,1), (2,2), (3,3)\}$ is vacuously symmetric AND antisymmetric. Such relations are rarely seen though. Once you have x, y where $x \neq y$ and $(x, y) \in R$ the relation cannot be both.

Two Prototype Relations

A lot of fundamental relations follow one of two prototypes:

Equivalence Relation

A relation that is reflexive, symmetric, and transitive is called an "equivalence relation"

Partial Order Relation

A relation that is reflexive, antisymmetric, and transitive is called a "partial order"

Equivalence Relations

Equivalence relations “act kinda like equals”

$\equiv \pmod{n}$ is an equivalence relation.

\equiv on compound propositions is an equivalence relation.

Fun fact: Equivalence relations “partition” their elements.

An equivalence relation R on S divides S into sets S_1, \dots, S_k such that.

$\forall s (s \in S_i \text{ for some } i)$

$\forall s, s' (s, s' \in S_i \text{ for some } i \text{ if and only if } (s, s') \in R)$

$S_i \cap S_j = \emptyset$ for all $i \neq j$

You WILL write equivalence relations!

equals

```
public boolean equals(Object obj)
```

Indicates whether some other object is "equal to" this one.

The `equals` method implements an equivalence relation on non-null object references:

- It is *reflexive*: for any non-null reference value `x`, `x.equals(x)` should return `true`.
- It is *symmetric*: for any non-null reference values `x` and `y`, `x.equals(y)` should return `true` if and only if `y.equals(x)` returns `true`.
- It is *transitive*: for any non-null reference values `x`, `y`, and `z`, if `x.equals(y)` returns `true` and `y.equals(z)` returns `true`, then `x.equals(z)` should return `true`.
- It is *consistent*: for any non-null reference values `x` and `y`, multiple invocations of `x.equals(y)` consistently return `true` or consistently return `false`, provided no information used in `equals` comparisons on the objects is modified.
- For any non-null reference value `x`, `x.equals(null)` should return `false`.

Partial Orders

{1}

{3, 4, 5}

Partial Orders "behave kinda like less than or equal to"

In the sense that they put things in order

But it's only kinda like less than – it's possible that some elements can't be compared.

| on \mathbb{Z}^+ is a partial order

\subseteq on $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{U})$ is a partial order

x is a prerequisite of (or-equal-to) y is a partial order on CSE courses

Why Bother?

If you prove facts about all equivalence relations or all partial orders, you instantly get facts in lots of different contexts.

If you learn to recognize partial orders or equivalence relations, you can get **a lot** of intuition for new concepts in a short amount of time.

Why now? We'll want relations over the next few weeks (and it's a convenient way to review proving implications, for all statements, and so on)



Graphs



Directed Graphs

$$G = (V, E)$$

V is a set of vertices (an underlying set of elements)


E is a set of edges (ordered pairs of vertices; i.e. connections from one to the next).

Path v_0, v_1, \dots, v_k such that $(v_i, v_{i+1}) \in E$

Simple Path: path with all v_i distinct

Cycle: path with $v_0 = v_k$ (and $k > 0$)

Simple Cycle: simple path plus edge (v_k, v_0) with $k > 0$



Directed Graphs

$$G = (V, E)$$

V is a set of vertices (an underlying set of elements)


E is a set of edges (ordered pairs of vertices; i.e. connections from one to the next).

Path v_0, v_1, \dots, v_k such that $(v_i, v_{i+1}) \in E$

Simple Path: path with all v_i distinct

Cycle: path with $v_0 = v_k$ (and $k > 0$)

Simple Cycle: simple path plus edge (v_k, v_0) with $k > 0$



Directed Graphs

$$G = (V, E)$$

V is a set of vertices (an underlying set of elements)


E is a set of edges (ordered pairs of vertices; i.e. connections from one to the next).

Path v_0, v_1, \dots, v_k such that $(v_i, v_{i+1}) \in E$

Simple Path: path with all v_i distinct

Cycle: path with $v_0 = v_k$ (and $k > 0$)

Simple Cycle: simple path plus edge (v_k, v_0) with $k > 0$



Directed Graphs

$$G = (V, E)$$

V is a set of vertices (an underlying set of elements)


E is a set of edges (ordered pairs of vertices; i.e. connections from one to the next).


Path v_0, v_1, \dots, v_k such that $(v_i, v_{i+1}) \in E$

Simple Path: path with all v_i distinct

Cycle: path with $v_0 = v_k$ (and $k > 0$)

Simple Cycle: simple path plus edge (v_k, v_0) with $k > 0$





Lecture-Only Content

Relations and Graphs



More Relations and Graphs

The rest of this deck is a little more on:

Relations, specifically combining them together

Graphs, specifically representing relations as graphs.

We're going to go through it *very* fast. We won't have homework or exam questions on anything in this section of the deck.

But it is stuff you should see at least once because it might come back in future classes.

Combining Relations

Given a relation R from A to B

And a relation S from B to C ,

The relation $S \circ R$ from A to C is

$$\{(a, c) : \exists b[(a, b) \in R \wedge (b, c) \in S]\}$$

Yes, I promise it's $S \circ R$ not $R \circ S$ – it makes more sense if you think about relations $(x, f(x))$ and $(x, g(x))$

But also don't spend a ton of energy worrying about the order, we almost always care about $R \circ R$, where order doesn't matter.

Combining Relations


To combine relations, it's a lot easier if we can see what's happening.

We'll use a representation of a directed graph

Representing Relations

To represent a relation R on a set A , have a vertex for each element of A and have an edge (a, b) for every pair in R .



Let A be $\{1,2,3,4\}$ and R be $\{(1,1), (1,2), (2,1), (2,3), (3,4)\}$



Combining Relations

If $S = \{(2, 2), (2, 3), (3, 1)\}$ and $R = \{(1, 2), (2, 1), (1, 3)\}$



Compute $S \circ R$ i.e. every pair (a, c) with a b with $(a, b) \in R$ and $(b, c) \in S$



Combining Relations

If $S = \{(2, 2), (2, 3), (3, 1)\}$ and $R = \{(1, 2), (2, 1), (1, 3)\}$

Compute $S \circ R$ i.e. every pair (a, c) with a b with $(a, b) \in R$ and $(b, c) \in S$



Combining Relations

Let R be a relation on A .

Define R^0 as $\{(a, a) : a \in A\}$

$$R^k = R^{k-1} \circ R$$

$(a, b) \in R^k$ if and only if there is a path of length k from a to b in R .

We can find that on the graph!

More Powers of R .

For two vertices in a graph, a can reach b if there is a path from a to b .

Let R be a relation on the set A . The connectivity relation R^* consists of all pairs (a, b) such that a can reach b (i.e. there is a path from a to b in R)

$$R^* = \bigcup_{k=0}^{\infty} R^k$$

Note we're starting from 0 (the textbook makes the unusual choice of starting from $k = 1$).

What's the point of R^*

R^* is also the “reflexive-transitive closure of R .”

It answers the question “what's the minimum amount of edges I would need to add to R to make it reflexive and transitive?”

Why care about that? The transitive-reflexive closure can be a summary of data – you might want to precompute it so you can easily check if a can reach b instead of recomputing it every time.

Relations and Graphs

Describe how each property will show up in the graph of a relation.

Reflexive

Symmetric

Antisymmetric

Transitive

Relations and Graphs

Describe how each property will show up in the graph of a relation.

Reflexive

Every vertex has a "self-loop" (an edge from the vertex to itself)

Symmetric

Every edge has its "reverse edge" (going the other way) also in the graph.

Antisymmetric

No edge has its "reverse edge" (going the other way) also in the graph.

Transitive

If there's a length-2 path from a to b then there's a direct edge from a to b