# MHF3202 Exam 2

Oliver Deng

March 28, 2025

#### Question 1: Q1

Let  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , and let  $a_n = (5n)^2$ .

Then  $a_n = (5n)^2 = 25n^2 = 9n^2 + 16n^2 = (3n)^2 + (4n)^2 = b_n^2 + c_n^2$  where  $b_n = 3n$ ,  $c_n = 4n$ , and  $b_n, c_n \in \mathbb{N}$  since multiplying two positive numbers results in another positive number.

So  $a_n$  can be written as the sum of two perfect squares, as desired.

# Question 2: Q3

**Proof:** We prove this by way of induction.

**Base Case:** For n = 2, observe that  $F_0 + F_1 + F_2 = 0 + 1 + 1 = 2 = 3 - 1 = F_4 - 1$ .

So we have our base case.

**Inductive Hypothesis:** Assume that for some fixed  $j > 1 \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $\sum_{k=0}^{j} F_k = F_{j+2} - 1$ .

**Inductive Step:** By the inductive hypothesis,  $\sum_{k=0}^{j} F_k = F_{j+2} - 1$ .

Adding  $F_{j+1}$  to both sides, we get  $\sum_{k=0}^{j} F_k + F_{j+1} = F_{j+1} + F_{j+2} - 1$ .

However,  $F_{j+1} + F_{j+2} = F_{j+3}$  by definition of a Fibonacci number.

Substituting and also reindexing the summation, we get  $\sum_{k=0}^{j+1} F_k = F_{j+3} - 1$  as desired.

So for all j > 1,  $\sum_{k=0}^{j+1} F_k = F_{j+3} - 1$ .

Therefore, by induction, our original claim is proved.

⊜

### Question 3: Q5

**Lemma 0.0.1** Let  $a, b, c \in \mathbb{Z}$ . If  $a \mid b$ , then  $a \mid bc$ .

Let  $a, b, c \in \mathbb{Z}$ , and let  $a \mid b$ .

Then, b = ad for some  $d \in \mathbb{Z}$  by definition of divisibility.

Observe, bc = adc = ae where  $e = dc \in \mathbb{Z}$  by multiplication of integers.

So  $a \mid bc$  by definition of divisibility.

**Proof:** Let  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ .

Then let product of three consecutive natural numbers starting from n be m = n(n+1)(n+2).

First, we show that either  $2 \mid n$  or  $2 \mid n+1$ .

If n is even, then n=2a for some  $a\in\mathbb{N}$  by definition of even numbers and since n>0.

Thus,  $2 \mid n$  by definition of divisibility.

If n is odd, then n = 2b + 1 for some  $b \in \mathbb{N}$  since n > 0.

Then n+1=2b+2=2c for  $c=b+1\in\mathbb{N}$  (since b>0) and  $2\mid n+1$  by definition of divisibility.

So either  $2 \mid n$  or  $2 \mid n+1$ .

Because of this,  $2 \mid m$  by lemma 0.0.1 by replacing c in the lemma with the product of the two factors that are not either n or n + 1.

Now, we show that since n, n + 1, and n + 2 are 3 consecutive numbers, at least one of them must be divisible by 3.

If  $3 \nmid n+2$ , then

$$n + 2 = 3d + e \tag{0.0.1}$$

where  $d \in \mathbb{N}$  and e is either 1 or 2 by the division algorithm.

If e = 2, then subtracting 2 from both sides of equation 0.0.1 results in n = 3d, and  $3 \mid n$  by definition of divisibility.

Similarly, if e = 1, then subtracting 1 from both sides of equation results in n + 1 = 3d, and  $3 \mid n + 1$  by definition of divisibility.

So either 3 | n, 3 | n + 1, or 3 | n + 2.

Because of this,  $3 \mid m$  by lemma 0.0.1 by replacing c in the lemma with the product of the two factors which are not divisible by 3.

Since  $2 \mid m$ , then m = 2k for some  $k \in \mathbb{N}$  and m is even by definition of even numbers.

Then since  $3 \mid m, m = 3j$  for some  $j \in \mathbb{N}$ .

Because m is even, then j must be even since 3 is odd and given an odd natural number, only by multiplying by an even natural number can you get an even natural number as a result.

Since j is even, we can write m = 3(2f) for some  $f \in \mathbb{N}$  by definition of even numbers.

So m = 6f, and  $6 \mid m$  by definition of divisibility.

⊜

# Question 4: Q6

Let  $a, b \in \mathbb{Z}$ .

Suppose by way of contradiction that  $a^2 + 4b - 2 = 0$ .

Then  $a^2 + 4b = 2$ .

If a is odd, then  $a^2$  is odd, and since 4b = (2)2b is an even number, we have a contradiction, since the sum of an odd and an even integer is odd, and 2 is not odd.

If a is even, then a = 2c for some  $c \in \mathbb{Z}$  by definition of even number.

By substitution,  $(2c)^2 + 4b = 2$  and  $4c^2 + 4b = 2$ .

We can write this as  $2 = 4(c^2 + b) = 4d$  for  $d = c^2 + b \in \mathbb{Z}$  by the sum and multiplication of integers.

By definition of divisibility, 4 | 2, which is also a contradiction.

So we have shown that for any arbitrary choice of a and b that  $a^2 + 4b - 2 \neq 0$ .

### Question 5: Q7

We seek to disprove the original claim by direct proof, i.e. we want to show that there exists  $k \in \mathbb{Z}$  such that  $A_k \neq B_k$ .

Consider k = 0.

Observe that  $A_0 = \{x \in \mathbb{Z} : |x| \le 18\} = \{-18, -17, -16, \dots, 16, 17, 18\}.$ 

Also observe that  $B_0 = \{ y \in \mathbb{Z} : y = -2x^2 + 12x - 9, 0 \le x \le 6 \} = \{ -9, 1, 7, 9 \}.$ 

By inspection, we can see that  $18 \in A_0$  but  $18 \notin B_0$ , so  $A_0 \neq B_0$ .

Thus our original claim is disproven.

### Question 6: Q9

- 1. The proof does not give  $\delta$  as given in the hypothesis; it should have given the upper bound of 10 because then you might run into problems with  $\delta$  being too big.
- 2. In case 9.1 the proof does not explain its choice of  $\frac{1}{2}\delta$ . While this doesn't necessarily invalidate the proof, it should either be explained or given as  $\delta$  instead for clarity.
- 3. In case 9.1 the proof does not clearly explain why the set  $\{(a, x) : c < x : d\}$  has infinite cardinality. We thus cannot see that  $S_{\delta}$  has infinite cardinality; that is, unless we show that the proposed set has infinite cardinality by virtue of x being a real number.
- 4. Case 9.2 does not give a correct base case as the "base case" is essentially assuming the inductive hypothesis which invalidates induction. We should instead give a base n=0 and find a way to iterate from there.
- 5. At the end of case 9.2 the proof assumes that you can take  $S = D_n$ . However,  $D_N$  is not necessarily a square, and so we cannot use it to concretely prove the claim. Also, it sets the equality for S instead of  $S_{\delta}$  which is not defined. Instead, the proof should have guaranteed in some way that  $D_N$  was a square, which you can't do by assuming that if the area of a shape is a perfect square then the shape itself is a square (which the proof does). Also, you would need to set  $S_{\delta} = D_N$  instead of S.