# **Discrete Mathematics Assignment 2**

Nirjhar Nath BMC202239 nirjhar@cmi.ac.in

## Problem 1:

Let w be any binary string of length k. For  $n \ge k$ , count the number of binary strings of length n that do not contain w as a subsequence.

## Solution 1:

Let f(n, k) denote the required number of binary strings of length n, that do not contain w as a subsequence. Suppose the first bit of w is b, then if n begins with b, the required number of binary strings is equal to the number of binary strings of length n - 1 (first bit removed) that contains w - b (b removed) as a subsequence; and if n begins with  $\overline{b}$  (if b = 0, then  $\overline{b} = 1$  and if b = 1, then  $\overline{b} = 0$ ), the required number of binary strings is equal to the binary strings of length n - 1 (first bit removed) that contains w as a subsequence. Therefore, we have the following recurrence relation:

$$f(n,k) = f(n-1,k-1) + f(n-1,k)$$

We claim that

$$f(n,k) = \binom{n}{0} + \binom{n}{1} + \binom{n}{2} + \dots + \binom{n}{k-1}$$
(1)

We prove it by induction on n + k. We have the following base cases. For n + k = 2, we have f(1, 1) = 1. For n + k = 3, we have f(2, 1) = 1. For n + k = 4, we have f(3, 1) = 1 and f(2, 2) = 3, all of which satisfy equation (1). Suppose that equation (1) is true upto all n + k - 1. Then we have,

$$f(n,k) = f(n-1,k-1) + f(n-1,k)$$

$$= \left( \binom{n-1}{0} + \binom{n-1}{1} + \dots + \binom{n-1}{k-2} \right) + \left( \binom{n-1}{0} + \binom{n-1}{1} + \dots + \binom{n-1}{k-1} \right)$$

$$= \binom{n-1}{0} + \left( \binom{n-1}{0} + \binom{n-1}{1} \right) + \dots + \left( \binom{n-1}{k-2} + \binom{n-1}{k-1} \right)$$

$$= \binom{n}{0} + \binom{n}{1} + \binom{n}{2} + \dots + \binom{n}{k-1}$$

and we are done. Therefore, the number of binary strings of length n that do not contain w as a subsequence is given by

$$f(n,k) = \binom{n}{0} + \binom{n}{1} + \binom{n}{2} + \dots + \binom{n}{k-1}$$

#### Problem 2:

Show that the  $n^{\text{th}}$  Catalan number  $\frac{1}{n+1}\binom{2n}{n}$  counts the binary strings of length 2n that do not contain any of the following strings as subsequences:

$$1^{n+1}, 1^n 0, 1^{n-1} 0^2, \dots, 1^i 0^{n+1-i}, \dots, 10^n, 0^{n+1}$$

#### Solution 2:

Call a binary string *bad* if it contains one of the given strings as subsequence. We will find a bijection between bad strings and non-balanced parentheses, where 0's can be replaced with open parentheses "(" and 1's can be replaced with closed parentheses ")".

Consider a bad string of length 2n. Assume, to the contrary, that the parentheses expression corresponding to this binary string is balanced. Since the string is bad, so it

contains a subsequence of the form  $1^{i}0^{n+1-i}$ . Now since the parentheses expression is balanced, so for the *i* closing parentheses (corresponding to 1), there are *i* open parentheses (corresponding to 1) before it. And similarly for the (n + 1 - i) open parentheses, there are (n+1-i) closed parentheses after it. This results to a total of 2i+2(n+1-i) = 2n+2parentheses which is greater than 2n, a contradiction.

Conversely, we begin with a non-balanced parentheses expression of size 2n. Thus, at any index k, the number of closed parentheses, at indices  $\leq k$ , is greater than or equal to the number of open parentheses, i.e., at any index k in the corresponding binary string representation, the number of 1's, at indices  $\leq k$ , is greater than or equal to the number of 0's. We shall prove that this results in a bad string. Suppose at some index, the number of 1's up to that index from the left is i, then there are at most (i-1) number of 1's to the left of that index and so there are at least n - (i-1) = n + 1 - i number of 0's to the right of that index. Thus, we have the string  $1^i 0^{n+1-i}$  as a subsequence of this string and hence it is a bad string.

Thus, we have proved the claimed bijection and since the number of non-balanced parentheses expressions of length 2n (which is also the same as the number of balanced parentheses expressions of length 2n; just interchanging positions of 0's with 1's and vice versa) is equal to the  $n^{\text{th}}$  Catalan number  $\frac{1}{n+1}\binom{2n}{n}$ , so we are done.

## Problem 3:

Solve the following recurrence relation by relating it to a problem solved in class (or otherwise):

$$a_0 = 1$$
  
 $a_n = na_{n-1} + (-1)^n$  for  $n \ge 1$ .

#### Solution 3:

Consider the exponential generating function of the given recurrence. It is given by

$$\varphi(x) = \sum_{n \ge 0} a_n \frac{x^n}{n!}$$

where  $a_n = n! \times \text{coefficient of } x^n \text{ in } \varphi(x)$ . Now, we have,

$$\varphi(x) = a_0 + \sum_{n \ge 1} a_n \frac{x^n}{n!}$$
  
=  $1 + \sum_{n \ge 1} (na_{n-1} + (-1)^n) \frac{x^n}{n!}$   
=  $1 + x \sum_{n \ge 1} a_{n-1} \frac{x^{n-1}}{(n-1)!} + \sum_{n \ge 1} (-1)^n \frac{x^n}{n!}$   
=  $1 + x \sum_{n \ge 0} a_n \frac{x^n}{n!} + (e^{-x} - 1)$   
=  $x\varphi(x) + e^{-x}$ 

Rearranging, we have

$$\varphi(x) = \frac{e^{-x}}{1-x}$$

The series expansion of  $e^{-x}$  is given by

$$e^{-x} = 1 - \frac{x}{1!} + \frac{x^2}{2!} - \frac{x^3}{3!} + \cdots$$

and that of  $\frac{1}{1-x}$  is given by

$$\frac{1}{1-x} = x + x^2 + x^3 + \cdots$$

The coefficient of  $x^k$  in the expansion of  $\frac{1}{1-x}$  is 1 and that of  $x^{n-k}$  in the expansion of  $e^{-x}$  is  $\frac{(-1)^k}{k!}$ , and multiplying both the coefficients and taking sum over all  $k \ge 0$ , we get the coefficient of  $x^n$  in  $\varphi(x)$ . Therefore,

$$a_n = n! \sum_{k \ge 0} \frac{(-1)^k}{k!}$$

which is equal to  $D_n$ , the number of derangements on n elements.

## Problem 4:

Give a combinatorial proof for the principle of inclusion exclusion

$$\left|\bigcap_{i=1}^{n} \overline{A_i}\right| = \sum_{I} (-1)^{|I|} |A_I|$$

by first moving all the negative terms in the summation to the LHS so that the equation assumes the form A = B, where both A and B are now sums of positive terms. Then define suitable sets whose sizes are these positive terms and give a bijective correspondence that will prove the equation.

#### Solution 4:

Consider a set elements (say A), each possessing a subset of properties [n]. Let  $A_I$  denote the set of elements having all the properties of I for any subset  $I \subseteq [n]$ .

Let  $S := \{(a, J) \mid a \in A, J \subseteq \text{set of properties of } a\}$ . Call a pair (a, J) even or odd according as |J| is even or odd.

Observe that for a fixed subset  $I \subseteq [n]$ , (a, I) is a legitimate pair if and only if  $a \in A_I$ . For any  $a \in A$ , let  $s_a$  be its smallest property. Then the mapping  $f : S \to S$  defined by

$$f(a, J) = \begin{cases} (a, J \cup s_a), \text{ if } s_a \notin J \\ (a, J \setminus s_a), \text{ if } s_a \in J \end{cases}$$

is a parity changing involution defined everywhere expect on pairs  $(a, \phi)$  with  $a \in A$  having no property. Then the number of odd pairs of S is equal to the number of even pairs of S which are not of the above form. Let  $\mathcal{P}$  be the set of pairs  $(a, \phi)$  for which a has no property. Thus, moving all the negative terms in the summation to the LHS and keeping the positive terms in the RHS, we get

$$\sum_{|I| \text{ odd}} |A_I| + |\mathcal{P}| = \sum_{|I| \text{ even}} |A_I|$$

Clearly, the number of pairs  $(a, \phi)$  for which a has no property is equal to the set of elements of A having no property. Therefore,

$$|\mathcal{P}| = \left| \bigcap_{i=1}^{n} \overline{A_i} \right|$$

and hence,

$$\sum_{|I| \text{ odd}} |A_I| + \left| \bigcap_{i=1}^n \overline{A_i} \right| = \sum_{|I| \text{ even}} |A_I|$$

This gives the required formula

$$\left|\bigcap_{i=1}^{n} \overline{A_i}\right| = \sum_{I} (-1)^{|I|} |A_I|$$

## Problem 5:

Solve the recurrence relation  $a_r + 3a_{r-1} + 2a_{r-2} = f(r)$  where f(r) = 1 for r = 2 and f(r) = 0 otherwise. Assume the boundary conditions  $a_0 = a_1 = 0$ . Solution 5:

Consider the generating function of the given recurrence. It is given by

$$\varphi(x) = \sum_{n \ge 0} a_n x^n$$

Now,  $f(2) = 1 \implies a_2 + 3a_1 + 2a_0 = 1 \implies a_2 = 1$ . Also, for  $r \ge 2$ , it is given that  $f(r) = a_r + 3a_{r-1} + 2a_{r-2} = 0$ .

Using the values of  $a_0, a_1, a_2$  and  $a_n$  for  $n \ge 3$  in the generating function, we have

$$\varphi(x) = x^{2} + \sum_{n \ge 3} (-3a_{n-1} - 2a_{n-2})x^{n}$$
  
$$= x^{2} - 3\sum_{n \ge 3} a_{n-1}x^{n} - 2\sum_{n \ge 3} a_{n-2}x^{n}$$
  
$$= x^{2} - 3x\sum_{n \ge 3} a_{n-1}x^{n-1} - 2x^{2}\sum_{n \ge 3} a_{n-2}x^{n-2}$$
  
$$= x^{2} - 3x\sum_{n \ge 0} a_{n-1}x^{n-1} - 2x^{2}\sum_{n \ge 0} a_{n-2}x^{n-2}$$
  
$$= x^{2} - 3x\varphi(x) - 2x^{2}\varphi(x)$$

Rearranging terms, we have

$$\varphi(x) = \frac{x^2}{1+3x+2x^2} = \frac{x^2}{(1+x)(1+2x)} = x^2 \left[\frac{-1}{1+x} + \frac{2}{1+2x}\right]$$

The series expansion of  $\frac{1}{1+x}$  is given by

$$\frac{1}{1+x} = \frac{1}{1-(-x)} = 1 + (-x) + (-x)^2 + (-x)^3 + \cdots$$

and that of  $\frac{1}{1+2x}$  is given by

$$\frac{1}{1+2x} = \frac{1}{1-(-2x)} = 1 + (-2x) + (-2x)^2 + (-2x)^3 + \cdots$$

The coefficient of  $x^{n-2}$  in  $\frac{-1}{1+x}$  is  $-(-1)^{n-2} = -(-1)^n$  and the coefficient of  $x^{n-2}$  in  $\frac{2}{1+2x}$  is  $2(-2)^{n-2} = 2^{n-1}(-1)^n$ . Therefore, we have

$$a_n = -(-1)^n + 2^{n-1}(-1)^n = (2^{n-1} - 1)(-1)^n$$
 for  $n \ge 2$ 

## Problem 6:

. . . .

Gossip is spread among r people via telephone. In a phone call between two people A and B, they exchange all the gossip they have heard so far. Let  $a_r$  denote the minimum number of phone calls so that all the gossip will be known to everyone. Show that  $a_2 = 1, a_3 = 3, a_4 = 4$ . Then show that  $a_r \leq a_{r-1} + 2$ . Finally, show that for  $n \geq 4$ ,  $a_r \leq 2r - 4$ .

## Solution 6:

For r = 2, one call is required and enough to share all the gossip, i.e.,  $a_2 = 1$ . To show that  $a_3 = 3$ , assume there are three people  $P_1$ ,  $P_2$  and  $P_3$ . Let  $P_1$  and  $P_2$  share their gossip via one phone call, then if  $P_2$  and  $P_3$  share their gossip via one more phone call, then  $P_2$  and  $P_3$  get to know all the gossip. Now one more phone call, either between  $P_1$ and  $P_2$  or  $P_1$  and  $P_3$ , is required and enough for all the gossip to be known to everyone. So,  $a_3 = 3$ . Now to show that  $a_4 = 4$ , assume there are four people  $P_1$ ,  $P_2$ ,  $P_3$  and  $P_4$ . Let  $P_1$  and  $P_2$  share their gossip via one phone call and  $P_3$  and  $P_4$  share their gossip via another phone call. Then  $P_1$  and  $P_3$  can make a call and  $P_2$  and  $P_4$  can make another phone call so that the gossip is known to everyone. This gives  $a_4 \leq 4$ . We shall prove than in all other possibilities (here the order  $P_1, P_2, P_3, P_4$  is not important), the number of phone calls is  $\geq 4$ . Suppose  $P_1$  and  $P_2$  share their gossip and one of them (say  $P_2$ ) shares it with  $P_3$ , then if  $P_3$  shares it with  $P_1$ , then  $P_4$  needs to know all the gossip of  $P_1, P_2, P_3$  via at least one phone call and then for  $P_4$  to pass on his gossip to others, he needs to make a number of calls exceeding 4, so we stop. Suppose  $P_3$  shares the gossip with  $P_4$  instead of  $P_1$ , then  $P_3$  and  $P_4$  get to know all the gossip, so to pass the gossip to  $P_1$  and  $P_2$ , they need to make at least two more calls, exceeding 4. Thus,  $a_4 = 4$ .

Suppose a set of people  $P_1, P_2, \ldots, P_{r-1}$  need a minimum of  $a_{r-1}$  phone calls (with  $P_1$  making the first call) so that everyone knows all the gossip. Then, if a new person  $P_r$  is included, we can start with  $P_r$  making a phone call with  $P_1$ , and then the phone calls among the r-1 people continues so that everyone  $(P_1, P_2, \ldots, P_{r-1})$  knows all gossip in  $a_{r-1}$  phone calls. Now for  $P_r$  to know all the gossip, any one of  $P_1, P_2, \ldots, P_{r-1}$  can make a call with  $P_r$  and share the gossip. So,  $a_r \leq a_{r-1} + 2$ .

We show that  $a_r \leq 2r - 4$  by induction. We have,  $a_4 = 4 = 2 \times 4 - 4$ . Assuming that  $a_r \leq 2r - 4$  is true for some  $r \geq 4$ , then by the previous result, we have

$$a_{r+1} \le a_r + 2 \le 2r - 4 + 2 = 2(r+1) - 4$$

and hence by induction, we have established that  $a_r \leq 2r - 4$  for  $n \geq 4$ .