

CSc 335 Special Session on Strong Induction

February 21 2024

The only difference between

weak: Prove $\phi(n)$ by assuming $\phi(n-1)$
(equiv: $\phi(n+1)$ by assuming $\phi(n)$)
and

strong: Prove $\phi(n)$ by assuming
 $\bigwedge_{i=0}^{n-1} \phi(i)$

(ie $\phi(0) \wedge \phi(1) \wedge \dots \wedge \phi(n-1)$)
(equiv: $\phi(n+1)$ by assuming $\bigwedge_{i=0}^n \phi(i)$)

induction is the IH

That is: for weak induction we use just $\phi(n-1)$ to prove $\phi(n)$ while for strong induction we may use any or all of $\phi(0), \phi(1), \dots, \phi(n-1)$ to prove $\phi(n)$.

Example: we show by strong induction that for every integer $n \geq 4$, n can be decomposed as a sum of 2's and 5's. That is; one need only have a stash of \$2 and \$5 bills to make change for any whole number of dollars ≥ 4 . \checkmark

For completeness, we shall also give a proof using weak induction.

So: let us consider the 2-5 problem, to be solve using strong induction. From above, we see right away that we should focus on the divide & conquer part first: how can we use the hypothesis

$$\bigwedge_{i=4}^{n-1} Q(i)$$

where $Q(i)$ is "change can be made for \$i using just \$2 and \$5 bills"

to show that $Q(n)$ is true? Since we are told $n \geq 4$, we start by examining $n = 4, 5, \dots$ — looking for a way to make use of the strong induction hypothesis. (SIH)

$$\begin{array}{lll} n=4 & \longrightarrow & 2 + 2 \quad (\text{no use of SIH}) \\ n=5 & \longrightarrow & 5 \quad (\text{no use of SIH}) \end{array}$$

$$n=6 \rightarrow \overline{4} + 2 \quad \text{use } Q(4)$$

$$n=7 \rightarrow \overline{5} + 2 \quad \text{use } Q(5)$$

$$n=8 \rightarrow \begin{array}{l} 4 + 4 \quad \text{use } Q(4) \\ \text{[OR]} \\ 2 + 6 \quad \text{use } Q(6) \end{array}$$

$$n=9 \rightarrow \begin{array}{l} 4 + (9-4) \quad \text{use } Q(5) \\ \text{[OR]} \\ 2 + (9-2) \quad \text{use } Q(7) \end{array}$$

$$n=10 \rightarrow \begin{array}{l} \overline{4} + (10-4) \quad \text{use } Q(4) \\ \text{OR} \\ 2 + (10-2) \quad \text{use } Q(8) \end{array}$$

Possibly
useful
decompositions

$$\begin{array}{l} \text{OR} \\ \overline{6} + (10-6) \quad \text{use } Q(4) \\ \text{OR} \\ 8 + (10-8) \quad \text{use } Q(8) \end{array}$$

It appears that we can use any of

These decompositions - why not choose what appears to be simplest — ie — the decomposition of $n > 5$ into 2 and $n-2$? (Note that we could use 4 and $n-4$ for $n > 8$ — resulting in a 4-case basis step $n = 4, 5, 6, 7$)

But if we use 2 and $n-2$, we need only a 2-case basis step $n = 4, 5$

As you can see, yet other - worse? - choices are possible)

What then does the argument look like?

Basis: show the 4 and 5 cases directly
SIH: . . .

SIS: Suppose $n \geq 6$. Then n
can be decomposed as $2 + (n-2)$
where $n-2 \geq 4$. The '2' requires
no additional analysis, and the
 $n-2$ case holds by the SIH.

Clearly, if change for $n-2$ can
be made using \$2 and \$5,
then change for n can similarly
be made as

\$2 + [change for $n-2$ using
just \$2 and \$5]

With this analysis in hand, you should go ahead and write the associated Scheme program to solve the 2-5 problem.

But before you do, let's ask whether our current solution idea yields a 'good' (as opposed to merely correct) solution.

Can you see (write a proof!) that the solution we have sketched always uses the max possible number of 2s?

Would a more balanced mix of 2's and 5's be preferable?

So there is another exercise for you: figure out how to do so, and prove that your solution has this balanced property (while still being correct).

Now: what about a solution by weak induction? It is interesting to note that anything provable by strong induction is also provable by weak induction, and conversely!

Here is one idea for a weak induction:

$n \geq 4$ is either even or odd. If it is even, then $n = 2m$ for some

m — so change can be made using m \$2 bills.

If n is odd, then

$n = 2m + 1$ for some m .

But $2m + 1 = (2m - 4) + 5$

and $2m - 4$ is even —

make change using \$2 for $2m - 4$, and throw on a fiver.

Done!

Again, how about writing the program? And again, can you say anything about the number of \$2 and \$5 used?

OK — so what about an example where it seems that strong induction is much easier to use than weak induction?

② Most of the Fundamental Theorem of Arithmetic — Strong Induction Practice

We have the Fundamental Theorem of Arithmetic as follows:

Every integer $n \geq 2$ can be written uniquely as a product of powers of primes.

we'll ignore 'uniquely',
even 'uniquely up to
ordering of the factors'

$$\begin{aligned} 100 &= 2 \times 2 \times 5 \times 5 \\ &= 5 \times 5 \times 2 \times 2 \\ &= 2 \times 5 \times 5 \times 2 \\ &\dots \end{aligned}$$

In fact, if we allow $p^0 = 1$, then we can say "every integer $n \geq 1$ can be written as a product of powers of primes"

How can we deploy strong induction to prove this?

Given: $n > 1$. Either n is prime or n is not prime. If n is prime, then n itself is already a product of primes

$$n = \prod_{i=1}^1 i \quad \text{"a one-term product"}$$

If n is not prime, then we know that n is composite - i.e. - n has factors p and q

$$n = p * q$$

By the SIH, both p and q

are products of primes. So

Then n is a product of primes

$$n = \overbrace{\text{prod of primes}}^p \cdot \overbrace{\text{prod of primes}}^q$$

Basis step: $n=2$, which is a prime.

We could start at $n=1$ — in this case, the basis step is

that — for any prime p —

$1 = p^0$, which indeed is a product of ^{powers of} primes!

What about a weak induction for this problem?

The issue is that $n \geq 2$

Never decomposes as

$(n-1) * \text{something else}$

So how would the weak induction hypothesis help?

Another suggested hw: can you give a weak induction proof for this problem?