Math 61 Final Exam

JOE PINTO, SR

TOTAL POINTS

40 / 40

QUESTION 1

1 Counting functions **5 / 5**

✓ + 2 pts a: \$\$ 2^8 = 256 \$\$ options total ✓ + 3 pts b: \$\$ 2 \$\$ functions total, by casing on which element of \$\$ Y \$\$ is not in the image

 + 0 pts a: Incorrect count

 + 2 pts b: Correct count, but did not properly justify some steps

 + 1.5 pts b: Incorrect count, but some promising progress.

 + 0 pts b: Incorrect count, as well as several other incorrect statements along the way

QUESTION 2

2 f squared equals the identity **5 / 5**

✓ + 2 pts Injectivity: Let \$\$ x, y \in X \$\$ be such that \$\$ f(x) = f(y) \$\$. Then \$\$ f(f(x)) = f(f(y)) \$\$. Thus \$\$ x = f(f(x)) = f(f(y)) = y \$\$, so that \$\$ x = y \$\$. Hence, for any \$\$ x, y \in X \$\$, if \$\$ f(x) = f(y) \$\$, we have \$\$ x = y \$\$. We conclude \$\$ f \$\$ is injective, as desired.

 + 1 pts Injectivity: Partial progress, but informal or missing some important details

 + 0 pts Injectivity: No serious progress. Arguments that may fall into this category include: trying to use \$\$ f^{-1} \$\$ without justifying \$\$ f \$\$ is invertible, trying to claim \$\$ f \$\$ is the identity function, trying to use the cardinality of \$\$ X \$\$ (e.g. assuming \$\$ |X|< \infty \$\$), showing injectivity of \$\$ f \circ f \$\$ instead of \$\$ f \$\$

✓ + 3 pts Surjectivity: Let \$\$ y \in X \$\$ be arbitrary. Notice \$\$ f(f(y)) = y \$\$. Thus, there exists an \$\$ x \in X \$\$, namely \$\$ $x = f(y)$ \$\$, such that \$\$ $f(x) = y$ \$\$. **Since \$\$ y \in X \$\$ was arbitrary, we see that for all \$\$ y \in X \$\$, there exists an \$\$ x \in X \$\$ such that \$\$ f(x) = y \$\$. Thus, \$\$ f \$\$ is surjective, as desired.**

 + 1.5 pts Surjectivity: Incorrect or missing quantifiers, but argument is correct or almost correct. An informal but (almost) correct argument may also fall into this category.

 + 0 pts Surjectivity: No serious progress. Arguments that may fall into this category include: trying to use \$\$ f^{-1} \$\$ without justifying \$\$ f \$\$ is invertible, trying to claim \$\$ f \$\$ is the identity function, trying to use the cardinality of $$$ $\&$ \times $$$ $\&$ $(e.g.,$ assuming \$\$ |X|< \infty \$\$), showing surjectivity of \$\$ f \circ f \$\$ instead of \$\$ f \$\$

QUESTION 3

3 Equipartitions **5 / 5**

✓ + 5 pts Correct

 + 1 pts Two examples of equipartitions for arbitrary sets with at least two elements.

 + 1 pts Clear explanations in the first part

 + 0.75 pts Explanation of examples is almost clear but definitions are not clearly stated.

 + 0.5 pts Explanation of examples present but is not thorough or otherwise incorrect

 + 1 pts Correctly identifying partition sizes for equipartitions of sets of nine elements

 + 1 pts Correct counting of equipartitions

 + 1 pts Clear explanation of the second part

 + 0.75 pts Explanation of the second part is understandable but skips essential details or does not use enough words to explain the ideas. Well articulated but incorrect explanations can be awarded this score.

 + 0.5 pts Explanation of the second part is included but is not thorough or is otherwise incorrect

 + 0.5 pts Incorrect counting argument but with significant correct steps.

 + 0 pts No content

QUESTION 4

4 ALIVE **5 / 5**

✓ - 0 pts Correct

 - 2 pts 5! total arrangements (by multiplication principle)

 - 1 pts 2 "EVIL" arrangements (AEVIL and EVILA)

 - 2 pts 5! - 2 = 118 arrangements

(inclusion/exclusion)

QUESTION 5

5 Fully splitting tree **5 / 5**

✓ + 5 pts Correct

 + 1 pts Base case or argument accounts for the tree with one vertex

 + 1 pts Decomposing fully splitting trees in the induction step

 + 0.5 pts Builds a fully splitting binary tree in the induction step (but does not address whether or why they are all built this way)

 + 1 pts Correct use of induction hypothesis about fully splitting binary trees

 + 1 pts Counting arguments have accurate numbers and manipulation of equations and/or inequalities

 + 1 pts Clarity

QUESTION 6

6 Solution counting **5 / 5**

✓ - 0 pts Correct

- **1 pts** Use generalized combination (stars and bars)
- **1 pts** Start with 2 "stars" in \$\$x_1\$\$
- **1 pts** Use 3 bars and the remaining 15 stars to get $C(18,3) = 816$

 - 2 pts Remove the 2 bad solutions (2,15,0,0) and (2,0,15,0) to get 814

 - 0 pts Click here to replace this description.

QUESTION 7

7 Minimal spanning tree **5 / 5**

✓ - 0 pts Correct

- **1.5 pts** Incorrect degree for (0,0)
- **1.5 pts** Incorrect degree for (2,2)
- **2 pts** Incorrect weight

QUESTION 8

8 Bipartite **5 / 5**

✓ - 0 pts Correct

 - 2 pts Assumes the graph is *complete* bipartite without justification

 - 2 pts Assumes the bipartition has two sets with specific sizes

 - 0 pts Click here to replace this description.

Problem 1. Suppose X and Y are sets with $|X| = 8$ and $|Y| = 2$.

- 1. How many functions are there from X to Y ?
- 2. How many functions are there from X to Y that are neither injective nor surjective? That is, how many functions are there from X to Y that have the property of being

Each element of X has 2 cloices in where it is mayped to in V.
So there are $2 \times 2 \times 2 \times 2 \times 2 \times 2 \times 2 = 2^8 = 256$ total functions \lfloor . 2. Since $|X|$ 7 | Y | there exists no injective functions from X to Y

5 ince it is impossible for 8 in part if 9 cash map to a unique

since it is impossible for 8 in part coolonging is a shelly less than
 $2^{$

1 Counting functions **5 / 5**

✓ + 2 pts a: \$\$ 2^8 = 256 \$\$ options total

✓ + 3 pts b: \$\$ 2 \$\$ functions total, by casing on which element of \$\$ Y \$\$ is not in the image

- **+ 0 pts** a: Incorrect count
- **+ 2 pts** b: Correct count, but did not properly justify some steps
- **+ 1.5 pts** b: Incorrect count, but some promising progress.
- **+ 0 pts** b: Incorrect count, as well as several other incorrect statements along the way

Problem 2. Suppose $f: X \to X$ is a function that satisfies

$$
f(f(x)) = x
$$

for all $x\in X.$ Show that f is a bijection.

\n- i)
$$
\int_{S^{L}} \text{is injective:}
$$
\n- 5. $\int_{S^{L}} f(a) = f(b)$ for some arbitrary $a, b \in X$
\n- Then, $\int (f(a)) = f(f(b))$
\n- So $a = b$ $Cby \text{ def.} \text{lim } \text{ def. } f(a) = f(b) \text{ implies } a = b$
\n- Since a, b were arbitrary, thus shows that $f(a) = f(b) \text{ implies } a = b$, for all $a, b \in X$, so $f^{-1/3}$ injective:
\n- i) $f^{-1} = \text{supj} \text{erfive:}$
\n

Proof:
\nCase 4
$$
\forall x
$$
, then $f(y) = x \in X$
\nSo then $f(x) = f(f(y)) = y$, so $f^{is-symetric}$,
\nSince for any $y \in X$, there exists an $x \in X$ such that $f(x) = y$.
\nSince $f^{-is} = b f h^{-is} f g^{-is} g$ and surjective, $f^{-is} = a$ bijection
\n $(m \times b x)$

2 f squared equals the identity **5 / 5**

✓ + 2 pts Injectivity: Let \$\$ x, y \in X \$\$ be such that \$\$ f(x) = f(y) \$\$. Then \$\$ f(f(x)) = f(f(y)) \$\$. Thus \$\$ x = $f(f(x)) = f(f(y)) = y$ \$\$, so that \$\$ $x = y$ \$\$. Hence, for any \$\$ x, y \in X \$\$, if \$\$ $f(x) = f(y)$ \$\$, we have \$\$ $x = y$ \$\$. **We conclude \$\$ f \$\$ is injective, as desired.**

 + 1 pts Injectivity: Partial progress, but informal or missing some important details

 + 0 pts Injectivity: No serious progress. Arguments that may fall into this category include: trying to use \$\$ f^{-1} \$\$ without justifying \$\$ f \$\$ is invertible, trying to claim \$\$ f \$\$ is the identity function, trying to use the cardinality of $$x \$ $$$ (e.g. assuming $$x \times x$), showing injectivity of $$x \times x$ instead of $$x \times x$ **✓ + 3 pts Surjectivity: Let \$\$ y \in X \$\$ be arbitrary. Notice \$\$ f(f(y)) = y \$\$. Thus, there exists an \$\$ x \in X \$\$, namely \$\$ x = f(y) \$\$, such that \$\$ f(x) = y \$\$. Since \$\$ y \in X \$\$ was arbitrary, we see that for all \$\$ y \in X \$\$, there exists an \$\$ x \in X \$\$ such that \$\$ f(x) = y \$\$. Thus, \$\$ f \$\$ is surjective, as desired.**

 + 1.5 pts Surjectivity: Incorrect or missing quantifiers, but argument is correct or almost correct. An informal but (almost) correct argument may also fall into this category.

 + 0 pts Surjectivity: No serious progress. Arguments that may fall into this category include: trying to use \$\$ f^{- 1} \$\$ without justifying \$\$ f \$\$ is invertible, trying to claim \$\$ f \$\$ is the identity function, trying to use the cardinality of \$\$ X \$\$ (e.g. assuming \$\$ |X|< \infty \$\$), showing surjectivity of \$\$ f \circ f \$\$ instead of \$\$ f \$\$

Problem 3. If X is a set, an *equipartition* of X is an equivalence relation on X such that every equivalence class has the same size. In other words, E is an equivalence relation on X if $||x||_E = ||y||_E$ for all $x, y \in X$, where $[x]_E = \{z \in X : (x, z) \in E\}.$

- 1. Show that if $|X| \geq 2$, then there are at least two different equipartitions of X.
- 2. Suppose $|X| = 9$. How many equipartitions of X are there? Hint: First, figure out the possibilities for the cardinality of the equivalence classes. Then count the number raza of colocting the elements of the cla

3.21 continued: Then, the possibilities of conducting of the quivilence Then, the result of and 9 each only have 1
Classes are 1,3 or 9. I and 9 each only have 1
district way of Selecting elements in the close. The ways to
Select the elements of χ in to equivilence closers of conducting =3 doesn't matter, so then the total number of equipartitions
 $G: |x| = 9$ is $2 + (\frac{3}{2} \times (\frac{5}{2} \times \frac{3}{2}) = 282$

3 Equipartitions **5 / 5**

✓ + 5 pts Correct

 + 1 pts Two examples of equipartitions for arbitrary sets with at least two elements.

- **+ 1 pts** Clear explanations in the first part
- **+ 0.75 pts** Explanation of examples is almost clear but definitions are not clearly stated.
- **+ 0.5 pts** Explanation of examples present but is not thorough or otherwise incorrect
- **+ 1 pts** Correctly identifying partition sizes for equipartitions of sets of nine elements
- **+ 1 pts** Correct counting of equipartitions
- **+ 1 pts** Clear explanation of the second part

 + 0.75 pts Explanation of the second part is understandable but skips essential details or does not use enough words to explain the ideas. Well articulated but incorrect explanations can be awarded this score.

- **+ 0.5 pts** Explanation of the second part is included but is not thorough or is otherwise incorrect
- **+ 0.5 pts** Incorrect counting argument but with significant correct steps.
- **+ 0 pts** No content

Problem 4. How many ways are there to arrange the letters **ALIVE** in such a way that the word EVIL is not contained in the resulting word (as a *consecutive* string of letters)?

Hotal ways to arrangle ALIVE = 5!
Jotal ways to arrange ALIVE that contains EVIL=2:
10 EVILA $2)A$ EVIL So regulared $\sqrt{3} = \frac{5!}{118}$

4 ALIVE **5 / 5**

- **2 pts** 5! total arrangements (by multiplication principle)
- **1 pts** 2 "EVIL" arrangements (AEVIL and EVILA)
- **2 pts** 5! 2 = 118 arrangements (inclusion/exclusion)

Problem 5. Say that a full binary tree is a *fully splitting binary tree* if every non-terminal node has exactly 2 successors and all terminal nodes are at the same level—that is, the length of the unique simple path from the root to a terminal vertex is always the same. Prove that, for all non-negative integers n , if T is a fully splitting binary tree of height n , then T has $2^{n+1} - 1$ vertices.

by induction: Check true for base case of n=0: Proving if $n=0$, the tree should be a lone root C l vertez). Checkra' $2^{o+1}-1 = 2-1=1$ vertex .

assume the for $n=k$, if for height k, I has 2^{k-1}
assume the first of $n-k$, if for height k, I has 2^{k-1}
pertices (inductive hypothes). We hard to show for hey'll solution
Thas $2^{(k+1)+1} = 2 - 1$ varies. Note that fo Note: 2 $[2^{n+1} + 1 = 2^{k+2} - 1$ vertices, as noganed. So we know the stateward is true for n=0 and if the
Stateward holds for n=k, it holds for n=k+1. So, by ie. A fully splitting the with leight $n \gg 0$ has 2^{n+1} -1 total vertices.

5 Fully splitting tree **5 / 5**

✓ + 5 pts Correct

- **+ 1 pts** Base case or argument accounts for the tree with one vertex
- **+ 1 pts** Decomposing fully splitting trees in the induction step
- **+ 0.5 pts** Builds a fully splitting binary tree in the induction step (but does not address whether or why they are all built this way)
	- **+ 1 pts** Correct use of induction hypothesis about fully splitting binary trees
	- **+ 1 pts** Counting arguments have accurate numbers and manipulation of equations and/or inequalities
	- **+ 1 pts** Clarity

Problem 6. How many solutions are there to the equation

$$
x_1 + x_2 + x_3 + x_4 = 17
$$

where x_1, x_2, x_3 , and x_4 are non-negative integers satisfying $x_1 \ge 2$, $x_2 \le 14$, and $x_3 \le 14$.

0.
$$
x, y2
$$
 let x, z, y then *need* to
\n $x, z \in H$
\n x

6 Solution counting **5 / 5**

- **1 pts** Use generalized combination (stars and bars)
- **1 pts** Start with 2 "stars" in \$\$x_1\$\$
- **1 pts** Use 3 bars and the remaining 15 stars to get C(18,3) = 816
- **2 pts** Remove the 2 bad solutions (2,15,0,0) and (2,0,15,0) to get 814
- **0 pts** Click here to replace this description.

Problem 7. Let G be a graph whose vertices consist of pairs (a, b) where a and b are nonnegative integers less than or equal to 3. Say that there is an edge between (a, b) and (c, d) if either $|a-c|=1$ and $b=d$ or $|b-d|=1$ and $a=c$, where $|x|$ denotes the absolute value of x . In other words, two vertices are connected by an edge if they differ by exactly 1 in one coordinate and agree on the other.

- L 1. What is the degree of $(0,0)$?
- \mathcal{L} 2. What is the degree of $(2,2)$?
- 3. Define the weight of an edge between (a, b) and (c, d) to be the minimum of the numbers a, b, c, d . What is the weight of a minimal spanning tree for the graph G ?

$$
\begin{array}{ll}\n\text{1} & \text{possible} & \text{close} & \text{0,0} \\
\text{1} & \text{1} & \text{1} & \text{1} \\
\text{2} & \text{1} & \text{1} & \text{1} \\
$$

31 M5T: All vertices (0,0) -(1,0) - (2,0) - (3,0) =
$$
\frac{log4+6}{log10+2}
$$

\n31 M5T: $\frac{1}{2}$ (1/2) - (1/3) (2/1) (2/1) (3/2) = $\frac{log10+2}{log10+2}$
\n500log1000
\n600log1005 (0,2) - (1,2) (2,2) (3,2)
\n600log1005 (0,2) - (1,3) - (2,3) (3,3)
\n600log1005 (0,2) - (1,3) - (2,3) (3,3)
\n600log1000
\n600log100
\n6

7 Minimal spanning tree **5 / 5**

- **1.5 pts** Incorrect degree for (0,0)
- **1.5 pts** Incorrect degree for (2,2)
- **2 pts** Incorrect weight

Problem 8. Suppose G is a graph with 17 vertices. Show that if G has at least 9 vertices of Assume G is bipartite with parts U, V and has 17 vertices. If $u \in U$ has degree 9, that means V has at least 9 vertices, by definition of a
bipatiful graph, since u can only form edges with vertices in V. Since Here
are at least 9 vertices in V, there is no more than 8 vertices in V, since G ha $u \sim v \times 100$
17 fotal vertices. We have require at least 8 more various to have
degree 9. These remains of degree 8, since they only can form
 $\frac{u}{m}$ V (an have a maximum of degree 8, since they only can form
edgos with bipartite.

8 Bipartite **5 / 5**

- **2 pts** Assumes the graph is *complete* bipartite without justification
- **2 pts** Assumes the bipartition has two sets with specific sizes
- **0 pts** Click here to replace this description.