

01204211 Discrete Mathematics
Lecture 8: Mathematical Induction 3

Jittat Fakcharoenphol

September 8, 2015

Review: Mathematical Induction

Suppose that you want to prove that property $P(n)$ is true for every natural number n .

Suppose that we can prove the following two facts:

Base case: $P(1)$

Inductive step: For any $k \geq 1$, $P(k) \Rightarrow P(k + 1)$

The **Principle of Mathematical Induction** states that $P(n)$ is true for every natural number n .

The assumption $P(k)$ in the inductive step is usually referred to as **the Induction Hypothesis**.

The Induction Hypothesis

Theorem 1

For any integer $n \geq 1$, $\frac{1}{1^2} + \frac{1}{2^2} + \frac{1}{3^2} + \cdots + \frac{1}{n^2} < 2$.

Proof.

The statement $P(n)$ that we want to prove is

$$\frac{1}{1^2} + \frac{1}{2^2} + \frac{1}{3^2} + \cdots + \frac{1}{n^2} < 2.$$

Case case: For $n = 1$, the statement is true because $1 < 2$.

Inductive step: For $k \geq 1$, let's assume $P(k)$ and we prove that $P(k+1)$ is true.

The induction hypothesis is: $\frac{1}{1^2} + \frac{1}{2^2} + \frac{1}{3^2} + \cdots + \frac{1}{k^2} < 2$.

We want to show $P(k+1)$, i.e.,

$$\frac{1}{1^2} + \frac{1}{2^2} + \frac{1}{3^2} + \cdots + \frac{1}{k^2} + \frac{1}{(k+1)^2} < 2.$$

Then...



Strengthening the Induction Hypothesis (1)

- Is the assumption

$$\frac{1}{1^2} + \frac{1}{2^2} + \frac{1}{3^2} + \cdots + \frac{1}{k^2} < 2.$$

“strong” enough to prove

$$\frac{1}{1^2} + \frac{1}{2^2} + \frac{1}{3^2} + \cdots + \frac{1}{k^2} + \frac{1}{(k+1)^2} < 2 \quad ?$$

Why?

- To prove $P(k+1)$, we need a “gap” between the LHS and 2, so that we can add $1/(k+1)$ without blowing up the RHS.

Strengthening the Induction Hypothesis (2)

- ▶ Let's see a few values of the sum:

- ▶ $1/1 = 1$.
- ▶ $1/1 + 1/4 = 1.25$.
- ▶ $1/1 + 1/4 + 1/9 \approx 1.361$.
- ▶ $1/1 + 1/4 + 1/9 + 1/16 \approx 1.4236$.
- ▶ $1/1 + 1/4 + 1/9 + 1/16 + 1/25 \approx 1.4636$.

Yes, there is a gap. But how large?

- ▶ We need the gap to be large enough to insert $1/(k+1)^2$.
- ▶ After a “mysterious” moment, we observe that

$$\frac{1}{1^2} + \frac{1}{2^2} + \frac{1}{3^2} + \cdots + \frac{1}{n^2} \leq 2 - \frac{1}{n}.$$

Strengthening the Induction Hypothesis (3)

Theorem 2

For any integer $n \geq 1$, $\frac{1}{1^2} + \frac{1}{2^2} + \frac{1}{3^2} + \cdots + \frac{1}{n^2} \leq 2 - \frac{1}{n}$.

Proof.

(... the beginning is left out ...)

Inductive step: For $k \geq 1$, assume that $\frac{1}{1^2} + \frac{1}{2^2} + \cdots + \frac{1}{k^2} \leq 2 - \frac{1}{k}$.

Adding $1/(k+1)^2$ on both sides, we get

$$\frac{1}{1^2} + \frac{1}{2^2} + \cdots + \frac{1}{k^2} + \frac{1}{(k+1)^2} \leq 2 - \frac{1}{k} + \frac{1}{(k+1)^2} = 2 - \left(\frac{1}{k} - \frac{1}{(k+1)^2} \right).$$

Since $1/k - 1/(k+1) = 1/(k(k+1))$, we have that

$$1/(k+1) = 1/k - 1/(k(k+1)) < 1/k - 1/(k+1)^2.$$

Therefore, we conclude that

$$\frac{1}{1^2} + \frac{1}{2^2} + \cdots + \frac{1}{k^2} + \frac{1}{(k+1)^2} \leq 2 - \left(\frac{1}{k} - \frac{1}{(k+1)^2} \right) \leq 2 - \frac{1}{k+1},$$


as required. □

A Lesson learned

- ▶ Is a stronger statement easier to prove?
- ▶ In this case, the statement is indeed stronger, but the induction hypothesis gets stronger as well. Sometimes, this works out nicely.


L-shaped tiles (1)

A 4x4 area with a hole in the middle can be tiled with L-shaped tiles.



L-shaped tiles (2)

This is true for 2×2 area, 8×8 area, even 16×16 area.



This motivates us to try to prove that it is possible to use L-shaped tiles to tile a $2^n \times 2^n$ area.

Proving the fact?

Theorem 3

For integer $n \geq 1$, an area of size $2^n \times 2^n$ with one hole in the middle can be tiled with L-shaped tiles.

Proof: We prove by induction on n .

Base case: For $n = 1$, $2^1 \times 2^1$ area with a hole in the middle can be tiled.


Inductive step: Assume that for $k \geq 1$, an $2^k \times 2^k$ area with a hole in the middle can be tiled. We shall prove the statement for $n = k + 1$, i.e., that an $2^{k+1} \times 2^{k+1}$ area with one hole in the middle can be tiled.

(cont. on the next page)

Proving the fact?


Proof: (cont.)

Let's see the Induction Hypothesis and the goal:



With the current form of the Induction Hypothesis, this is probably the way to use it. But it seems hard to go further with this approach....

Let's try a different approach



The last step seems nice, because it shows how we can solve the problem in the $2^{k+1} \times 2^{k+1}$ area with 4 problems in the $2^k \times 2^k$ areas. But do you see an issue with this approach regarding the Induction Hypothesis?

Current Inductive Hypothesis: Assume that for $k \geq 1$, an $2^k \times 2^k$ area with “a hole in the middle” can be tiled.


A Stronger Inductive Hypothesis: Assume that for $k \geq 1$, an $2^k \times 2^k$ area with **one hole** can be tiled.

A stronger statement

Theorem: For integer $n \geq 1$, an area of size $2^n \times 2^n$ with one hole can be tiled with L-shaped tiles.

Proof: We prove by induction on n .

Base case: For $n = 1$, $2^1 \times 2^1$ area with one hole can be tiled; there are 4 cases shown below.



Inductive step: Assume that for $k \geq 1$, an $2^k \times 2^k$ area with one hole can be tiled. We shall prove the statement for $n = k + 1$, i.e., that an $2^{k+1} \times 2^{k+1}$ area with one hole can be tiled.

(Try to finish it in homework.)

Proof of the Principle of Mathematical Induction

Theorem 4

If $P(1)$ and for any integer $k \geq 1$, $P(k) \Rightarrow P(k + 1)$, then $P(n)$ for all natural number n .

Proof.

We prove by contradiction. Assume that $P(n)$ is not true for some natural number n . Let m be the smallest positive integer such that $P(m)$ is false. If $m = 1$, we get a contradiction because we know that $P(1)$ is true; therefore, we know that $m > 1$.

Since m is smallest and $m > 1$, then $P(m - 1)$ must be true.

However, because for any integer $k \geq 1$, $P(k) \Rightarrow P(k + 1)$, we can conclude that $P(m)$ must be true. Again, we reach a contradiction.

Therefore, $P(n)$ is true for every positive integer n . □

Is this proof correct?

The Well-Ordering Property

- ▶ The proof of the Principle of Mathematical Induction depends on the following axiom of natural numbers \mathbb{N} :

The Well-Ordering Property: Any nonempty subset $S \subseteq \mathbb{N}$ contains the smallest element.

- ▶ Previously, we use the well-ordering property of natural numbers to prove the Principle of Mathematical Induction, but it turns out that we can use the induction to prove the well-ordering property as well. Therefore, we can take one as an axiom, and use it to prove the other.