# PRINTABLE VERSION

Quiz 5

# You scored 88.89 out of 100

Question 1
Your answer is CORRECT.
An outline for a proof of an implication $P \Rightarrow Q$ is provided below:
Proposition. $P\Rightarrow Q$
Proof. Suppose $\neg P$ .
Missing steps involving $\neg P$ and $\neg Q$ and any previously established facts  Therefore $\neg Q$ . $\square$
What type of proof was described in the outline?
a) Wait a minute The proof described in this outline isn't a valid proof technique!
b) A direct proof is described in this outline.
c) A proof by introspection is described in this outline.
d) A proof by contradiction is described in this outline.
e) A proof by contrapositive is described in this outline.
Question 2
Your answer is CORRECT.
Suppose a mathematician wants to prove a statement of the form $P$ . However, they wish to do so using a proof by contradiction. Of the following options which could be used as a first step in this proof?
a) $\bigcirc$ Suppose $\neg P \land Q$ .
b) ○ Suppose ¬Q
c) $\bigcirc$ Suppose $\neg P \lor \neg Q$ .
d) $\bigcirc$ Suppose $\neg P \land \neg Q$ .
e) $\odot$ Suppose $\neg P$ .
Question 3
Your answer is CORRECT.
Given two sets $A$ and $B$ one can prove $B\subseteq A$ by
a) $\bigcirc$ First supposing $x \in A$ , and then showing $x \notin B$ .
b) $\bigcirc$ First supposing $x \notin B$ , and then showing $x \in A$ .
c) $\bigcirc$ First supposing $x \in A$ , and then showing $x \in B$ .
d) $\bigcirc$ First supposing $x \notin A$ , and then showing $x \in B$ .
e) $\bigcirc$ First supposing $x \in B$ , and then showing $x \in A$ .
Question 4
Your answer is CORRECT.
Given two sets $A$ and $B$ one can prove $B\subseteq A$ by
a) $\bigcirc$ First supposing $x \notin A$ , and then showing $x \in B$ .

**b)**  $\odot$  First supposing  $x \notin A$ , and then showing  $x \notin B$ . c)  $\bigcirc$  First supposing  $x \notin B$ , and then showing  $x \in A$ . **d)**  $\bigcirc$  First supposing  $x \notin B$ , and then showing  $x \notin A$ . e)  $\bigcirc$  First supposing  $x \in A$ , and then showing  $x \notin B$ . **Question 5** Your answer is CORRECT. A lovely little proof is presented below: Proposition. If the product of two integers is even, then at least one of the integers is even. Proof. Suppose  $x, y \in \mathbb{Z}$  and xy is even, but that neither x nor y is even. This means x and y are both odd, and so x = 2n + 1 and y = 2m + 1 for integers n, m. It follows that xy = (2n+1)(2m+1) = 4nm + 2n + 2m + 1 = 2(2nm+n+m) + 1 which is odd since (2nm+n+m)Therefore xy is both even and odd.  $\Rightarrow \Leftarrow$ Determine the type of proof used. a) A direct proof was used. A proof by indoctrination was used. c) A proof by contradiction was used. d) A proof by contrapositive was used. e) Wait a minute... This so-called "proof" did not actually show the Proposition was true. Whoever wrote this deserves 0 points. **Ouestion 6** Your answer is CORRECT. A proposition and an attempt at its proof are presented below. Proposition. If 15 /a then 3 /a or 5 /a. Proof. (Contrapositive) (1) Suppose the conclusion is false. That is, suppose  $\neg (3 \not | a \text{ or } 5 \not | a.)$ . (2) This means 5|a| and 3|a|, and we want to show 15|a|. (3) By definition of divides this means 5 = ma and 3 = na for some  $m, n \in \mathbb{Z}$ , and it also means we want to show 15 = ka for some  $k \in \mathbb{Z}$ . (4) Since 5 is prime and 5 = ma, it follows that a = 5 or a = 1. (5) Since 3 is prime and 3 = na, it follows that a = 3 or a = 1. (6) The only possibility is for a=1 and so we can use k=15 to conclude  $15=ka=15\cdot 1$ .  $\square$ Identify the mistake, if any, in this proof. a) There is a mistake in Line (4). 5 is not prime. **b)** There is a mistake in Line (6). The value of a could also be a = 0. c)  $\bigcirc$  There is a mistake in Line (2). The statement (3 /|a or 5 /|a) was not correctly negated. d) There is a mistake in Line (5). The statement 3 is not prime. e) There is a mistake in Line (3) where the definition of divides is incorrectly used. Question 7

#### Your answer is INCORRECT.

A proposition and an attempt at its proof are presented below.

Proposition.  $\forall n \in \mathbb{N}, n(n+1)$  is even.

## Proof. (Direct)

(1) Let  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ . We will use cases to prove the proposition.

Case 1: n is even.

- (2) In this case we have n = 2m for some  $m \in \mathbb{N}$ .
- (3) Because n is even, it follows that when n is divided by 2, there is no remainder.
- (4) n being even implies n+1 is odd.
- (5) It now follows that  $n(n+1) = (2m)(2m+1) = 2 \cdot (m(2m+1))$  which has the form of an even number.
- (6) Therefore n(n+1) is even, proving the proposition in this case.

Case 2: n is odd.

- (7) In this case we have  $n = 2\ell + 1$  for some  $\ell \in \mathbb{Z}$ .
- (8) If n is not odd then it is even and Case 1 applies.
- (9) It follows that  $n(n+1) = (2\ell+1)(2\ell+1+1) = (2\ell+1)(2\ell+2) = 2(2\ell+1)(\ell+1)$
- (10) Because the expression above has the form of an even number, n(n+1) is even.
- (11) If n(n+1) is odd, then there is a contradiction.
- (12) This completes the proof.  $\square$

One or more lines in this proof are not needed -- the proof works perfectly well without them (in fact, it works better without them). Which lines are not needed?

- a) Only lines (3),(4),(8), and (11) are not needed. All other lines are needed.
- b) Only line (8) is not needed. All other lines are needed.
- c) Only lines (4) and (11) are not needed. All other lines are needed.
- d) All lines are needed.
- e) Only lines (3) and (11) are not needed. All other lines are needed.

#### **Question 8**

#### Your answer is CORRECT.

Suppose we want to write a direct proof of the proposition below:

 $\forall x \in \mathbb{Z}, x^3 - x \text{ is a multiple of 3.}$ 

Which of the following statements or properties do we need to use when composing this proof?

- a)  $\bigcirc$  A case where  $x \in R Z$ .
- **b)**  $\bigcirc$  A case where x = 2k is even, and x = 2k is plugged into  $x^3 x$ .
- c) The definition of rational number.
- d) The definition of rational number.

### **Question 9**

#### Your answer is CORRECT.

A proposition is stated below. Take a few moments to carefully read it, and make sure you understand what, exactly, it claims to be true.

The recursively defined sequence  $a_n = a_{n-1} - 1$  with initial conditions  $a_0 = \pi$  has negative terms for all  $n \ge 4$ .

Of the following options, which one best describes what needs to be done in order to prove this claim?

a) This can only be proved by paying someone else to do it for me.

- $\mathbf{b}$ )  $\bigcirc$  We need only check that the claim is true for one, single natural number.
- e)  $\odot$  We need to show the claim is true for an abitrary natural larger than 3, saying something like "Let  $n \geq 4$ ."