Escola de Artes, Ciências e Humanidades - USP Profa Dra. Karla Lima email:ksampaiolima@usp.br

#### Ementa da disciplina:

- 1 O que é uma prova?
  - Proposições
  - Axiomas
  - Deduções Lógicas
  - Exemplos de provas
- 2 Indução Simples
- > 3 Indução Forte
- > Trabalho 1

#### Ementa da disciplina:

- 4 Teoria dos Números I
  - Divisibilidade
  - Aritmetica Modular
- > 5 Teoria dos Números II
  - > Alguns teoremas
- ▶ 6 Relações
- > Trabalho 2

#### Ementa da disciplina:

- > 7 Somatórios, Aproximações e Assintótica
- > 8 Recorrências
- > Trabalho 3
- Prova Final

#### Avaliação e Bibliografia:

- Trabalhos + Avaliação Final
- > Bibliografia
- Mathematics for Computer Science, Eric Lehman and Tom Leighton, 2004

What is a Proof?

#### What is a Proof?

Jury trial. Truth is ascertained by twelve people selected at random.

Word of God. Truth is ascertained by communication with God, perhaps via a third party.

Experimental science. The truth is guessed and the hypothesis is confirmed or refuted by experiments.

Inner conviction. "My program is perfect. I know this to be true."

#### What is a Proof?

Mathematics its own notion of "proof". In mathematics, a proof is a verification of a proposition by a chain of logical deductions from a base set of axioms.

# 1.1 Propositions

A proposition is a statement that is either true or false.

# 1.1 Propositions

A proposition is a statement that is either true or false.

Proposition 1. 2 + 3 = 5

# 1.1 Propositions

A proposition is a statement that is either true or false.

Proposition 1. 2 + 3 = 5

**Proposition 2.**  $\forall n \in \mathbb{N}$   $n^2 + n + 41$  is a prime number.

# 1.1 Propositions

**Proposition 2.**  $\forall n \in \mathbb{N}$   $n^2 + n + 41$  is a prime number.

" $n^2 + n + 41$  is a prime number"

# 1.1 Propositions

**Proposition 2.**  $\forall n \in \mathbb{N}$   $n^2 + n + 41$  is a prime number.

" $n^2 + n + 41$  is a prime number"

```
n n^2 + n + 41 prime or composite?

0 41 prime
1 43 prime
2 47 prime
3 53 prime
... (all prime)
20 461 prime
39 1601 prime
```

# 1.1 Propositions

**Proposition 2.**  $\forall n \in \mathbb{N}$   $n^2 + n + 41$  is a prime number.

```
n n^2 + n + 41 prime or composite?
     41
                prime
1 43
                prime
2 47
                prime
3 53
                prime
...
            (all prime)
20 461
              prime
39
     1601
                prime
```

when n = 40, we get  $n^2 + n + 41 = 40^2 + 40 + 41 = 41 \cdot 41$ , which is not prime.

# 1.1 Propositions

**Proposition 3.**  $a^4 + b^4 + c^4 = d^4$  has no solution when  $a, b, c, d \in \mathbb{N}^+$ .

# 1.1 Propositions

**Proposition 3.**  $a^4 + b^4 + c^4 = d^4$  has no solution when  $a, b, c, d \in \mathbb{N}^+$ .

Here  $\mathbb{N}^+$  denotes the *positive* natural numbers,  $\{1,2,3,\ldots\}$ . In 1769, Euler conjectured that this proposition was true. But the it was proven false 218 years later by Noam Elkies at the liberal arts school up Mass Ave. He found the solution a=95800, b=217519, c=414560, d=422481. We could write his assertion symbolically as follows:

# 1.1 Propositions

**Proposition 3.**  $a^4 + b^4 + c^4 = d^4$  has no solution when  $a, b, c, d \in \mathbb{N}^+$ .

Here  $\mathbb{N}^+$  denotes the *positive* natural numbers,  $\{1,2,3,\ldots\}$ . In 1769, Euler conjectured that this proposition was true. But the it was proven false 218 years later by Noam Elkies at the liberal arts school up Mass Ave. He found the solution a=95800, b=217519, c=414560, d=422481. We could write his assertion symbolically as follows:

$$\exists a, b, c, d \in \mathbb{N}^+ \quad a^4 + b^4 + c^4 = d^4$$

# 1.1 Propositions

**Proposition 4.**  $313(x^3+y^3)=z^3$  has no solution when  $x,y,z\in\mathbb{N}^+$ .

# 1.1 Propositions

**Proposition 4.**  $313(x^3 + y^3) = z^3$  has no solution when  $x, y, z \in \mathbb{N}^+$ .

This proposition is also false, but the smallest counterexample has more than 1000 digits. This counterexample could never have been found by a brute-force computer search!

# 1.1 Propositions

**Proposition 4.**  $313(x^3 + y^3) = z^3$  has no solution when  $x, y, z \in \mathbb{N}^+$ .

This proposition is also false, but the smallest counterexample has more than 1000 digits. This counterexample could never have been found by a brute-force computer search!

The symbols  $\forall$  ("for all") and  $\exists$  ("there exists") are called *quantifiers*.

# 1.1 Propositions

**Proposition 7.**  $\forall n \in \mathbb{Z} \quad (n \ge 2) \Rightarrow (n^2 \ge 4)$ 

# 1.1 Propositions

**Proposition 7.** 
$$\forall n \in \mathbb{Z} \quad (n \ge 2) \Rightarrow (n^2 \ge 4)$$

This is an example of an *implication*, a proposition of the form  $P \Rightarrow Q$ .

# 1.1 Propositions

**Proposition 7.** 
$$\forall n \in \mathbb{Z} \quad (n \geq 2) \Rightarrow (n^2 \geq 4)$$

This is an example of an *implication*, a proposition of the form  $P \Rightarrow Q$ .

the implication  $P \Rightarrow Q$  is true when P is

false or Q is true.

# 1.1 Propositions

**Proposition 7.** 
$$\forall n \in \mathbb{Z} \quad (n \ge 2) \Rightarrow (n^2 \ge 4)$$

This is an example of an *implication*, a proposition of the form  $P \Rightarrow Q$ .

P	Q	$P \Rightarrow Q$
T	T	T
T	F	F
F	T	T
F	F	T

# 1.1 Propositions

"If pigs fly, then you will understand the Chernoff Bound."

# 1.1 Propositions

"If pigs fly, then you will understand the Chernoff Bound."

This is an example of an *implication*, a proposition of the form  $P \Rightarrow Q$ .

# 1.1 Propositions

"If pigs fly, then you will understand the Chernoff Bound."

This is an example of an *implication*, a proposition of the form  $P \Rightarrow Q$ .

P	Q	$P \Rightarrow Q$
T	T	T
T	F	F
F	T	T
F	F	T

# 1.1 Propositions

**Proposition 8.** 
$$\forall n \in \mathbb{Z} \quad (n \geq 2) \Leftrightarrow (n^2 \geq 4)$$

A proposition of the form  $P \Leftrightarrow Q$  is read "P if and only if Q".

P	Q	$P \Rightarrow Q$	$Q \Rightarrow P$	$P \Leftrightarrow Q$
$\overline{T}$	T	T	T	T
T	F	F	T	F
F	T	T	F	F
F	F	T	T	T

# 1.1 Propositions

**Proposition 8.**  $\forall n \in \mathbb{Z} \quad (n \ge 2) \Leftrightarrow (n^2 \ge 4)$ 

P	Q	$P \Rightarrow Q$	$Q \Rightarrow P$	$P \Leftrightarrow Q$
T	T	T	T	T
T	F	F	T	F
F	T	T	F	F
F	F	T	T	T

$$n = 3$$
  $n = 1$   $n = -3$ 

### 1.2 Axioms

An axiom is a proposition that is assumed to be true, because you believe it is somehow reasonable. Here are some examples:

**Axiom 1.** If a = b and b = c, then a = c.

### 1.2 Axioms

An *axiom* is a proposition that is assumed to be true, because you believe it is somehow reasonable. Here are some examples:

A set of axioms is *consistent* if no proposition can be proved both true and false.

### 1.2 Axioms

An *axiom* is a proposition that is assumed to be true, because you believe it is somehow reasonable. Here are some examples:

A set of axioms is *consistent* if no proposition can be proved both true and false.

A set of axioms is *complete* if every proposition can be proved or disproved.

#### 1.3 Logical Deductions

Logical deductions or *inference rules* are used to combine axioms and true propositions in order to form more true propositions.

One fundamental inference rule is *modus ponens*. This rule says that if P is true and  $P \Rightarrow Q$  is true, then Q is also true. Inference rules are sometimes written in a funny notation. For example, modus ponens is written:

#### 1.3 Logical Deductions

Logical deductions or *inference rules* are used to combine axioms and true propositions in order to form more true propositions.

One fundamental inference rule is *modus ponens*. This rule says that if P is true and  $P \Rightarrow Q$  is true, then Q is also true. Inference rules are sometimes written in a funny notation. For example, modus ponens is written:

$$P \Rightarrow Q$$

$$Q$$

#### 1.3 Logical Deductions

Logical deductions or *inference rules* are used to combine axioms and true propositions in order to form more true propositions.

One fundamental inference rule is *modus ponens*. This rule says that if P is true and  $P \Rightarrow Q$  is true, then Q is also true. Inference rules are sometimes written in a funny notation. For example, modus ponens is written:

$$P \Rightarrow Q$$

$$Q$$

#### 1.3 Logical Deductions

Modus ponens is closely related to the proposition

$$(P \land (P \Rightarrow Q)) \Rightarrow Q.$$

"if P and  $P \Rightarrow Q$  are true, then Q is true"

tautology,

#### 1.3 Logical Deductions

$$((P\Rightarrow Q)\land (Q\Rightarrow R))\Rightarrow (P\Rightarrow R) \text{ and } ((P\Rightarrow Q)\land \neg Q)\Rightarrow \neg P$$

$$P \Rightarrow Q$$

$$Q \Rightarrow R$$

$$P \Rightarrow R$$

$$P \Rightarrow Q$$

$$\neg Q$$

$$\neg P$$

### 1.4 Examples of Proofs

#### 1.4.1 A Tautology

**Theorem 9.** *The following proposition is a tautology:* 

$$(X \Rightarrow Y) \Leftrightarrow (\neg Y \Rightarrow \neg X)$$

### 1.4 Examples of Proofs

#### 1.4.1 A Tautology

**Theorem 9.** *The following proposition is a tautology:* 

$$(X \Rightarrow Y) \Leftrightarrow (\neg Y \Rightarrow \neg X)$$

"If you are wise, then you attend recitation."

### 1.4 Examples of Proofs

#### 1.4.1 A Tautology

**Theorem 9.** *The following proposition is a tautology:* 

$$(X \Rightarrow Y) \Leftrightarrow (\neg Y \Rightarrow \neg X)$$

"If you are wise, then you attend recitation."

"If you do not attend recitation, then you are not wise."

### 1.4 Examples of Proofs

#### 1.4.1 A Tautology

**Theorem 9.** *The following proposition is a tautology:* 

$$(X \Rightarrow Y) \Leftrightarrow (\neg Y \Rightarrow \neg X)$$

*Proof.* We show that the left side is logically equivalent to the right side for every setting of the variables X and Y.

### 1.4 Examples of Proofs

#### 1.4.1 A Tautology

**Theorem 9.** *The following proposition is a tautology:* 

$$(X \Rightarrow Y) \Leftrightarrow (\neg Y \Rightarrow \neg X)$$

X	Y	$X \Rightarrow Y$	$\neg Y \Rightarrow \neg X$
T		T	T
T		F	F
F	T	T	T
F	F	T	T

### 1.4 Examples of Proofs

#### 1.4.1 A Tautology

**Theorem 9.** *The following proposition is a tautology:* 

$$(X \Rightarrow Y) \Leftrightarrow (\neg Y \Rightarrow \neg X)$$

$$\begin{array}{c} P \Rightarrow Q \\ \hline \neg Q \Rightarrow \neg P \end{array} \qquad \begin{array}{c} \neg Q \Rightarrow \neg P \\ \hline P \Rightarrow Q \end{array}$$

### 1.4 Examples of Proofs

#### 1.4.2 A Proof by Contradiction

In logical terms, indirect proof relies on the following inference rule:

$$\neg P \Rightarrow \text{false}$$
 $P$ 

### 1.4 Examples of Proofs

#### 1.4.2 A Proof by Contradiction

In logical terms, indirect proof relies on the following inference rule:

$$\neg P \Rightarrow \text{false}$$
 $P$ 

$$\begin{array}{c|c} P & (\neg P \Rightarrow \mathsf{false}) \Rightarrow P \\ \hline T & T \\ F & T \end{array}$$

### 1.4 Examples of Proofs

1.4.2 A Proof by Contradiction

**Theorem 10.**  $\sqrt{2}$  is an irrational number.