

# CS 173 Lecture 6b: Special Kinds of Relations + Proofs

Definition: A relation  $R$  on  $A$  is partial order if  $R$  is

- (i) reflexive, (ii) antisymmetric, (iii) transitive

$\forall a \in A, aRa$   
 $(a,a) \in R$

$\forall a,b \in A, aRb \wedge bRa \rightarrow a=b$

$\forall a,b,c \in A, aRb \wedge bRc \rightarrow aRc$

Consider divisibility on  $\mathbb{Z}_+ = \{1, 2, 3, \dots\}$   
 Claim: divisibility on  $\mathbb{Z}_+$  is a partial order.

Proof: (i) Let  $a$  be a positive integer.

Since  $a = a \cdot 1$ ,  $a|a$ .

So divisibility on  $\mathbb{Z}_+$  is reflexive.

(ii) Let  $a, b$  be positive integers such that  $a|b$ ,  $b|a$ . We aim to show  $a=b$ .

By definition of divisibility, there exist integers  $k \neq l$  such that  $b = ak$ , and  $a = bl$ . Then  $a = akl$ . So  $kl = 1$ .

Either  $k=l=1$  or  $k=l=-1$ . But since  $b > 0$ ,  $a > 0$ ,  $b = ak$ ,  $k=1$ . So  $b=a$ .

So divisibility on  $\mathbb{Z}_+$  is antisymmetric.

(iii) Let  $a, b, c$  be positive integers such that  $a|b$  and  $b|c$ . By Theorem from Lecture 3a,  $a|c$ . So divisibility on  $\mathbb{Z}_+$  is transitive.

We have shown that this relation is a partial order.  $\square$

A relation  $R$  on  $A$  is a linear order if it is a partial order and every pair  $a, b \in A$  is comparable, i.e., either  $aRb$  or  $bRa$

$(a,b) \in R$

$(b,a) \in R$

Claim: divisibility on  $\mathbb{Z}_+$  is not a linear order.

Proof: We will show that there exist  $a, b \in \mathbb{Z}_+$  such that  $a \nmid b$  and  $b \nmid a$ .

$1 \nmid 2$  and  $2 \nmid 1$

Such that  $a \not\leq b$  are not comparable.

Let  $a=4$ ,  $b=6$ . Then  $4 \nmid 6$  and  $6 \nmid 4$ .

So divisibility on  $\mathbb{Z}_+$  is not a linear order.  $\square$

Claim:  $\leq$  on  $\mathbb{R}$  is a linear order.

Proof? (Verification) (i) reflexivity:  $a \leq a$  for all  $a \in \mathbb{R}$   
(ii) antisymmetry:  $a \leq b$  and  $b \leq a$ , then  $a=b$   
for all  $a, b \in \mathbb{R}$ .

(iii) transitivity:  $a \leq b$ , and  $b \leq c$ , then  $a \leq c$  for all  $a, b, c \in \mathbb{R}$ .

(iv) comparability: For all  $a, b \in \mathbb{R}$ ,  $a \leq b$  or  $b \leq a$ .  $\square$

$R$  on  $A$  is a strict partial order if

(i) irreflexive, (ii) antisymmetric, (iii) transitive.

$\forall a, a \not R a$

$A =$  courses at UIUC  $R = \{(a, b) \in A \times A : a \text{ is a prereq for } b\}$

Claim:  $R$  is a strict partial order.

Proof: (i) No course can be its own prereq, so for all courses  $a$ ,  $a \not R a$ .

(ii) Suppose we have two courses  $a \not\leq b$  such that  $a$  is a prereq for  $b$  and  $b$  is a prereq for  $a$ . This is never true, so the statement  $\forall a, b \in A$   $a R b \ \& \ b R a \rightarrow a=b$  False. is vacuously true.

(iii) If  $a$  is a prereq for  $b$ , and  $b$  is a prereq for  $c$ , one needs to take  $a$  before taking  $c$ .

So prereq relation is a strict partial order.  $\square$

A relation  $R$  on  $A$  is an equivalence relation if it is

(i) reflexive (ii) symmetry (iii) transitivity.

$\forall a, b \in A$   
 $a R b \rightarrow b R a$

$$\underbrace{a \sim b \rightarrow b \sim a}$$

divisibility on  $\mathbb{Z}$  is NOT an eq. relation because it's not symmetric:  $2|4$  but  $4 \nmid 2$ .

i.e.  $\exists a, b \in \mathbb{Z}$  s.t.  $a \sim b \nmid b \sim a$

fix  $k \in \mathbb{Z}$ . Then congruence mod  $k$  is an equivalence relation.

Proof: (i) Reflexive: Let  $a$  be an integer.

$$a \equiv a \pmod{k} \text{ since } k|0$$

$$a - a = 0$$

(ii) Symmetry: Let  $a, b$  be integers

such that  $a \equiv b \pmod{k}$ .

So  $k|(b-a)$ , i.e. there exists

an integer  $l$  s.t.  $b-a = kl$ . So

$a-b = k(-l)$ , so  $k|a-b$ , i.e.

$$b \equiv a \pmod{k}.$$

$$0 \cdot k = 0 \\ \forall k \in \mathbb{Z}$$

(iii) Transitivity: Let  $a, b, c$  be integers

s.t.  $a \equiv b \pmod{k}$ ,  $b \equiv c \pmod{k}$ .

Since  $a \equiv b \pmod{k}$ ,  $k|b-a$  so there

exists  $l \in \mathbb{Z}$  s.t.  $b-a = kl$ , and since

$b \equiv c \pmod{k}$ , there exists  $m \in \mathbb{Z}$  s.t.

$$\underline{c-b = km}. \text{ So } c-a = (c-b) + (b-a)$$

$$= km + kl$$

$$= k(m+l).$$

Thus  $k|c-a$ , i.e.  $a \equiv c \pmod{k}$ .

We have shown that  $\equiv \pmod{k}$  is an eq. rel.  $\square$ .

Recall equivalence classes of integers mod  $k$ .

$$[x] = \{ y \in \mathbb{Z} : x \equiv y \pmod{k} \}.$$

Given any equivalence relation  $R$  on  $A$ , the equivalence classes of  $R$  are:

$$[a] = \{ a, \dots, a \}$$

equivalence classes of  $R$  are:

$$[x] = \{ y \in A : xRy \}.$$

(i)  $[x] = [y]$  iff  $xRy$ .

(ii) if  $[x] = [y]$ , and  $[y] = [z]$ , then  $[x] = [z]$ .