

# 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  $\neg Q$ .

*Missing steps involving  $\neg Q$  and  $\neg P$  and any previously established facts*

Therefore  $\neg P$ .  $\square$

What type of proof was described in the outline?

- a) ☒ A proof by contrapositive is described in this outline.
- b) ☐ Wait a minute... The proof described in this outline isn't a valid proof technique!
- c) ☐ A direct proof is described in this outline.
- d) ☐ A proof by contradiction is described in this outline.
- e) ☐ A proof by introspection is described in this outline.

### Question 2

Your answer is CORRECT.

Suppose a mathematician wants to prove a statement of the form  $(P \wedge Q) \vee R$ . 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) ☐ Suppose  $\neg P \vee \neg Q \vee \neg R$
- b) ☐ Suppose  $\neg P \vee (\neg Q \wedge \neg R)$
- c) ☐ Suppose  $(\neg P \wedge \neg Q) \vee \neg R$
- d) ☐ Suppose  $(\neg P \wedge \neg Q) \wedge \neg R$
- e) ☒ Suppose  $(\neg P \vee \neg Q) \wedge \neg R$ .

### Question 3

Your answer is CORRECT.

Given two sets  $A$  and  $B$  one can prove  $B \subseteq A$  by...

- a) ☐ First supposing  $x \in A$ , and then showing  $x \in B$ .
- b) ☒ First supposing  $x \in B$ , and then showing  $x \in A$ .
- c) ☐ First supposing  $x \notin A$ , and then showing  $x \in B$ .
- d) ☐ First supposing  $x \in A$ , and then showing  $x \notin B$ .
- e) ☐ First supposing  $x \notin B$ , 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) ☐ First supposing  $x \notin B$ , and then showing  $x \notin A$ .
- b) ☐ First supposing  $x \notin B$ , and then showing  $x \in A$ .
- c) ☒ First supposing  $x \notin A$ , and then showing  $x \notin B$ .
- d) ☐ First supposing  $x \in A$ , and then showing  $x \notin B$ .
- e) ☐ First supposing  $x \notin A$ , and then showing  $x \in B$ .

#### Question 5

Your answer is **INCORRECT**.

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 neither  $x$  nor  $y$  is even. (We will show that  $xy$  is not even.)

This means  $x$  and  $y$  are both odd so that  $x = 2n + 1$  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 not even.  $\square$

Determine the type of proof used.

- a) ☐ A proof by contrapositive was used.
- b) ☐ A proof by contradiction was used.
- c) ☒ A proof by indoctrination was used.
- d) ☐ Wait a minute... This so-called "proof" did not actually show the Proposition was true. Whoever wrote this deserves 0 points.
- e) ☐ A direct proof was used.

#### Question 6

Your answer is **CORRECT**.

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

**Proposition.** The sum of an odd integer and an even integer is odd.

**Proof. (Direct)**

- (1) Suppose  $x, y \in \mathbb{Z}$  are integers.
- (2) We can assume  $x$  is odd and that  $y$  is even.
- (3) Since  $x$  is odd, it follows that  $\exists y \in \mathbb{Z}, x = 2y + 1$ .
- (4) Since  $y$  is even, it follows that  $\exists m \in \mathbb{Z}, y = 2m$ .
- (5) We now have  $x + y = (2y + 1) + y = 3y + 1 = 3(2m) + 1 = 2(3m) + 1$ .
- (6) Because  $x + y$  has the form of an odd number it is odd.  $\square$

Identify the mistake, if any, in this proof.

- a) ☐ There is an error in Line (2) since we do not know which integer is odd or even.
- b) ☐ There is an error in Line (1) since we cannot simply assume  $x, y \in \mathbb{Z}$ .
- c) ☐ There is an error in Line (4) since where the definition of "even" is misapplied.
- d) ☒ There is an error in Line (3) where the variable name "y" is used when this name already refers to a different variable.
- e) ☐ There is an algebraic mistake in Line (5).

### Question 7

Your answer is CORRECT.

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

**Proposition.** If  $A \cup B = B$ , then  $A \subseteq B$ .

**Proof. (Direct)**

- (1) Suppose  $A \cup B = B$ . To prove  $A \subseteq B$  we also let  $x \in A$  and will end the proof by showing  $x \in B$ .
- (2) Because  $B$  is a set  $\emptyset \subseteq B$ .
- (3) Since  $A \subseteq A \cup B$  and  $x \in A$  it follows that  $x \in A \cup B$ .
- (4) Since, by assumption  $A \cup B = B$  it also follows that  $x \in B$ .
- (5) Because  $A \cup B = B$  a Venn diagram shows that  $A \subseteq B$ .
- (6) If  $x \notin B$ , then there would be a contradiction.  $\square$

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 (1) and (2) are not needed. All other lines are needed.
- b) ☐ Only lines (3) and (4) are not needed. All other lines are needed.
- c) ☒ Only lines (2) and (5) are not needed. All other lines are needed.
- d) ☐ Only lines (1) and (5) are not needed. All other lines are needed.
- e) ☐ All lines are needed.

### Question 8

Your answer is CORRECT.

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

$$\forall a, b, c \in [0, \infty), (ab = c) \Rightarrow (a \leq \sqrt{c} \vee b \leq \sqrt{c}).$$

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

- a) ☐ The fact that for real numbers  $x, y$ , if  $x > y$  then  $\sqrt{xy} = \sqrt{x} \cdot \sqrt{y}$ .
- b) ☐ The fact that for real numbers  $x, y$   $\sqrt{x} < \sqrt{y}$ .
- c) ☐ Suppose  $ab = c$  and that both  $a < \sqrt{c}$  and  $b < \sqrt{c}$ .
- d) ☒ Suppose  $ab = c$  and that both  $a > \sqrt{c}$  and  $b > \sqrt{c}$ .

### 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 a term that is negative.

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

- a) ☒ We need only check that the claim is true for one, single natural number.
- b) ☐ We need to show the claim is true for an arbitrary natural larger than 3, saying something like "Let  $n \geq 4$ ."
- c) ☐ Nothing can describe an accurate proof strategy since this proposition is false.