

## **This week's highlights**

- Distinguish between and use as appropriate each of structural induction, mathematical induction, and strong induction
- Evaluate which proof technique(s) is appropriate for a given proposition
- Trace and/or construct a proof by contradiction

## **Lecture videos**

Week 7 Day 1 YouTube playlist

Week 7 Day 2 YouTube playlist

## Wednesday February 17

For which nonnegative integers  $n$  can we make change for  $n$  with coins of value 5 cents and 3 cents?

Restating: We can make change for \_\_\_\_\_, we cannot make change for \_\_\_\_\_, and

\_\_\_\_\_★

### New! Proof by Strong Induction (Rosen 5.2 p337)

To prove that a universal quantification over the set of all integers greater than or equal to some base integer  $b$  holds, pick a fixed nonnegative integer  $j$  and then:

Basis Step: Show the statement holds for  $b, b + 1, \dots, b + j$ .

Recursive Step: Consider an arbitrary integer  $n$  greater than or equal to  $b + j$ , assume (as the **strong induction hypothesis**) that the property holds for **each of**  $b, b + 1, \dots, n$ , and use this and other facts to prove that the property holds for  $n + 1$ .

$\mathbb{N}$	The set of natural numbers	$\{0, 1, 2, 3, \dots\}$
$\mathbb{Z}^{\geq b}$	The set of integers greater than or equal a basis element $b$	$\{b, b + 1, b + 2, b + 3, \dots\}$

**Proof of  $\star$  by mathematical induction** ( $b = 8$ )

**Basis step:** WTS property is true about 8

**Recursive step:** Consider an arbitrary  $n \geq 8$ . Assume (as the IH) that there are nonnegative integers  $x, y$  such that  $n = 5x + 3y$ . WTS that there are nonnegative integers  $x', y'$  such that  $n + 1 = 5x' + 3y'$ . We consider two cases, depending on whether any 5 cent coins are used for  $n$ .

*Case 1:* Assume  $x \geq 1$ . Define  $x' = x - 1$  and  $y' = y + 2$  (both in  $\mathbb{N}$  by case assumption).

$$\begin{aligned} 5x' + 3y' &\stackrel{\text{by def}}{=} 5(x - 1) + 3(y + 2) = 5x - 5 + 3y + 6 \\ &\stackrel{\text{rearranging}}{=} (5x + 3y) - 5 + 6 \\ &\stackrel{\text{IH}}{=} n - 5 + 6 = n + 1 \end{aligned}$$

*Case 2:* Assume  $x = 0$ . Therefore  $n = 3y$ , so since  $n \geq 8$ ,  $y \geq 3$ . Define  $x' = 2$  and  $y' = y - 3$  (both in  $\mathbb{N}$  by

case assumption). Calculating:

$$\begin{aligned} 5x' + 3y' &\stackrel{\text{by def}}{=} 5(2) + 3(y - 3) = 10 + 3y - 9 \\ &\stackrel{\text{rearranging}}{=} 3y + 10 - 9 \\ &\stackrel{\text{IH and case}}{=} n + 10 - 9 = n + 1 \end{aligned}$$

<p><b>Proof of <math>\star</math> by strong induction</b>  <math>(b = 8 \text{ and } j = 2)</math></p> <p><b>Basis step:</b> WTS property is true about 8, 9, 10</p>	<p><b>Recursive step:</b> Consider an arbitrary <math>n \geq 10</math>. Assume (as the IH) that the property is true about each of 8, 9, 10, <math>\dots</math>, <math>n</math>. WTS that there are nonnegative integers <math>x', y'</math> such that <math>n + 1 = 5x' + 3y'</math>.</p>
--	--

### Representing positive integers

**Theorem:** Every positive integer is a sum of (one or more) distinct powers of 2. *binary expansions exist!*

**Proof by strong induction,** with  $b = 1$  and  $j = 0$ .

**Basis step:** WTS property is true about 1.

**Recursive step:** Consider an arbitrary integer  $n \geq 1$ . Assume (as the IH) that the property is true about each of  $1, \dots, n$ . WTS that the property is true about  $n + 1$ .

**Definition** (Rosen p257): An integer  $p$  greater than 1 is called **prime** if the only positive factors of  $p$  are 1 and  $p$ . A positive integer that is greater than 1 and is not prime is called composite.

**Theorem** (Rosen p336): Every positive integer *greater than 1* is a product of (one or more) primes.

**Proof by strong induction,** with  $b = 2$  and  $j = 0$ .

**Basis step:** WTS property is true about 2.

**Recursive step:** Consider an arbitrary integer  $n \geq 2$ . Assume (as the IH) that the property is true about each of  $2, \dots, n$ . WTS that the property is true about  $n + 1$ .

**Case 1:**

**Case 2:**

## Friday February 19

**Definition** (Rosen p. 257): An integer  $p$  greater than 1 is called **prime** means the only positive factors of  $p$  are 1 and  $p$ . A formal definition of the predicate  $Pr$  over the domain  $\mathbb{Z}$  which evaluates to T exactly when the input is prime is:  $Pr(x) = (x > 1) \wedge \forall a ( (a > 0 \wedge F(a, x)) \rightarrow (a = 1 \vee a = x) )$

**New! Proof by Contradiction** (Rosen 1.7 p86)

To prove that a statement  $p$  is true, pick another statement  $r$  and once we show that  $\neg p \rightarrow (r \wedge \neg r)$  then we can conclude that  $p$  is true.

*Informally* The statement we care about can't possible be false, so it must be true.

**Prove or disprove:** There is a least prime number.

**Prove or disprove:** There is a greatest integer.

*Approach 1, De Morgan's and universal generalization:*

*Approach 2, proof by contradiction:*

*Extra examples:* Prove or disprove that  $\mathbb{N}$ ,  $\mathbb{Q}$  each have a least and a greatest element. Prove that there is no greatest prime number.

The **set of rational numbers**,  $\mathbb{Q}$  is defined as

$$\left\{ \frac{p}{q} \mid p \in \mathbb{Z} \text{ and } q \in \mathbb{Z} \text{ and } q \neq 0 \right\} \quad \text{or, equivalently,} \quad \{x \in \mathbb{R} \mid \exists p \in \mathbb{Z} \exists q \in \mathbb{Z}^+ (p = x \cdot q)\}$$

*Extra practice:* Use the definition of set equality to prove that the definitions above give the same set.

**Goal:** The square root of 2 is not a rational number. In other words:  
 $\neg \exists x \in \mathbb{Q} (x^2 - 2 = 0)$

**Attempted proof:** The definition of the set of rational numbers is the collection of fractions  $p/q$  where  $p$  is an integer and  $q$  is a nonzero integer. Looking for a **witness**  $p$  and  $q$ , we can write the square root of 2 as the fraction  $\sqrt{2}/1$ , where 1 is a nonzero integer. Since the numerator is not in the domain, this witness is not allowed, and we have shown that the square root of 2 is not a fraction of integers (with nonzero denominator). Thus, the square root of 2 is not rational.

*The problem in the above attempted proof is that* \_\_\_\_\_

**Proof:**

**Lemma 1:** For every two integers  $p$  and  $q$ , not both zero,  $\gcd\left(\frac{p}{\gcd(p,q)}, \frac{q}{\gcd(p,q)}\right) = 1$ .

**Lemma 2:** For every two integers  $a$  and  $b$ , not both zero, with  $\gcd(a, b) = 1$ , it is not the case that both  $a$  is even and  $b$  is even.

**Lemma 3:** For every integer  $x$ ,  $x$  is even if and only if  $x^2$  is even.

**Greatest common divisor** (Rosen 4.3 p265) Let  $a$  and  $b$  be integers, not both zero. The largest integer  $d$  such that  $d$  is a factor of  $a$  and  $d$  is a factor of  $b$  is called the greatest common divisor of  $a$  and  $b$  and is denoted by  $\gcd(a, b)$ .

## Review quiz questions

1. **Wednesday** Consider the following statement: For  $n > 0$ , the sum of the first  $n$  positive integers, also written as  $\sum_{i=1}^n i$ , is equal to

$$\left( \frac{n \cdot (n + 1)}{2} \right)$$

.

For example, when  $n = 3$ , the statement would mean that  $1 + 2 + 3 = \left( \frac{3 \cdot (3 + 1)}{2} \right)$ .

Consider the following (start to) a proof of this statement:

Basis Step: Choose  $n = 1$  as the basis step. Applying the formula from the original statement, we find that  $\frac{1 \cdot (1 + 1)}{2}$  is equal to 1. Since the total sum of the first positive integer is 1, these are equal and the basis step is complete.

Recursive Step: Consider an arbitrary  $k \geq 1$ . Towards a direct proof, we assume (as the induction hypothesis) that the sum of the first  $k$  positive integers is  $\left( \frac{k \cdot (k + 1)}{2} \right)$ . We want to show that the sum of the first  $k + 1$  positive integers is

$$\left( \frac{(k + 1) \cdot ((k + 1) + 1)}{2} \right)$$

.

[Proof would continue here...]

- (a) In a recursive definition of the function that gives the sum of the first  $n$  positive integers, the domain is
- $\mathbb{N}$
  - $\mathbb{Z}^+$
  - $\mathbb{Z}$
- (b) In a recursive definition of the function that gives the sum of the first  $n$  positive integers, the basis step is
- $\sum_{i=1}^1 i = 1$



- ii.  $\sum_{i=1}^n 1 = n$
  - iii. None of the above.
- (c) In a recursive definition of the function that gives the sum of the first  $n$  positive integers, the recursive step is
- i. If  $n$  is a positive integer,  $\sum_{i=1}^n i = n$
  - ii. If  $n$  is a positive integer,  $\sum_{i=1}^n i = (\sum_{i=1}^{n-1} i) + 1$
  - iii. If  $n$  is a positive integer,  $\sum_{i=1}^{n+1} i = (\sum_{i=1}^n i) + 1$
  - iv. If  $n$  is a positive integer,  $\sum_{i=1}^{n+1} i = (\sum_{i=1}^n i) + n$
  - v. If  $n$  is a positive integer,  $\sum_{i=1}^{n+1} i = (\sum_{i=1}^n i) + (n + 1)$
- (d) The proof technique used here is:
- i. Structural induction
  - ii. Mathematical induction
  - iii. Strong induction
- (e) Which of these is both true, and a useful next step in the proof?
- i. By the induction hypothesis, we know that

$$\left( \frac{(k+1) \cdot ((k+1) + 1)}{2} \right) = \left( \frac{k \cdot (k+1)}{2} \right)$$

- ii. By the induction hypothesis, we know that

$$\left( \frac{(k+1) \cdot ((k+1) + 1)}{2} \right) > \left( \frac{k \cdot (k+1)}{2} \right)$$

- iii. By the induction hypothesis and the definition of the statement we're proving, we know that

$$\left( \frac{k \cdot (k+1)}{2} \right) + k$$

is the sum of the first  $k + 1$  positive integers.

- iv. By the induction hypothesis and the definition of the statement we're proving, we know that

$$\left( \frac{k \cdot (k+1)}{2} \right) + k + 1$$

is the sum of the first  $k + 1$  positive integers.

v. None of the above

2. **Wednesday** Recall that an integer  $p$  greater than 1 is called **prime** if the only positive factors of  $p$  are 1 and  $p$ . Fill in the following blanks in the proof of the **Theorem** (Rosen p336): Every positive integer *greater than 1* is a product of (one or more) primes.

**Proof:** We proceed by BLANK for part (a) .

Basis step: We want to show that the property is about 2. Since 2 is itself prime, it is already written as a product of (one) prime.

Recursive step: Consider an arbitrary integer  $n \geq 2$ . Assume, as the induction hypothesis, that BLANK for part (c) . We want to show that  $n + 1$  can be written as a product of primes. There are two cases to consider:  $n + 1$  is itself prime or it is composite. In the first case, we assume  $n + 1$  is prime and then immediately it is written as a product of (one) prime so we are done. In the second case, we assume that  $n + 1$  is composite so there are integers  $x$  and  $y$  where  $n + 1 = xy$  and each of them is between 2 and  $n$  (inclusive). Therefore, the induction hypothesis applies to each of  $x$  and  $y$  so each of these factors of  $n + 1$  can be written as a product of primes. Multiplying these products together, we get a product of primes that gives  $n + 1$ , as required. Since both cases give the necessary conclusion, the proof by cases for the recursive step is complete.

- (a) The proof technique used here is:
- i. Structural induction
  - ii. Mathematical induction
  - iii. Strong induction
- (b) How many basis steps are used in this proof?

- (c) What is the induction hypothesis?
- i. That  $n$  can be written as a product of (one or more) primes.
  - ii. That each integer between 0 and  $n$  (inclusive) can be written as a product of (one or more) primes.
  - iii. That each integer between 1 and  $n + 1$  (inclusive) can be written as a product of (one or more) primes.
  - iv. That each integer between 2 and  $n$  (inclusive) can be written as a product of (one or more) primes.
  - v. That each integer between 3 and  $n + 1$  (inclusive) can be written as a product of (one or more) primes.

3. **Friday Goals for this question:** recognize that we can prove the same statement in different ways. Trace proofs and justify why they are valid.

By definition, an integer  $n$  is **even** means that there is an integer  $a$  such that  $n = 2a$ ; an integer  $n$  is **odd** means that there is an integer  $a$  such that  $n = 2a + 1$ . Equivalently, an integer  $n$  is **even** means  $n \bmod 2 = 0$ ; an integer  $n$  is **odd** means  $n \bmod 2 = 1$ . Also, an integer is even if and only if it is not odd.

*You can refer to any of the above definitions and claims in your proofs.*

Below are two proofs of the same statement: fill in the blanks with the expressions below.

**Claimed statement:** (a)\_\_\_\_\_

**Proof 1:** Using De Morgan's law for quantifiers, we can rewrite this statement as a universal of the negation of the body of the statement. Towards a proof by universal generalization, let  $x$  be an arbitrary element of  $\mathbb{Z}$ . Then we need to show that

(b)\_\_\_\_\_

We proceed by contradiction to show that

$(x \text{ is odd} \wedge x^2 \text{ is even}) \rightarrow$  (c)\_\_\_\_\_

We assume by direct proof that  $(x \text{ is odd} \wedge x^2 \text{ is even})$ . Then,  $(x^2 \text{ is even})$  follows directly from this assumption, so by definition of conjunction, we must show that  $(x^2 \text{ is not even})$

to complete the proof. From the assumption, we have that ( $x$  is odd). Applying the definition of odd,  $x = 2k + 1$  for some  $k \in \mathbb{Z}$ . Then  $x^2 = 4k^2 + 4k + 1$ . We can rewrite the right hand side to  $2(2k^2 + 2k) + 1$ . This shows that  $x^2$  is odd by the definition of odd, since choosing  $j = 2k^2 + 2k$  gives us  $j \in \mathbb{Z}$  with  $x^2 = 2j + 1$ . Since a number is either even or odd and not both, and  $x^2$  is odd, then it must not be even. This concludes the proof, as we have assumed the negation of the original statement and deduced a contradiction from this assumption.

**Proof 2:**

- |  |  |
|--|--|
| 1. <b>To Show</b> $\forall x \in \mathbb{Z} \neg(x \text{ is odd} \wedge x^2 \text{ is even})$ | Rewriting statement using De Morgan's law for quantifiers  |
| 2. <b>Choose arbitrary</b> $x \in \mathbb{Z}$<br><b>To Show</b> (d)_____                       | By (e)_____  |
| 3. <b>To Show</b> $x \text{ is odd} \rightarrow \neg(x^2 \text{ is even})$                     | Rewrite previous <b>To Show</b> using logical equivalence  |
| 4. <b>Assume</b> $x \text{ is odd}$<br><b>To Show</b> $\neg(x^2 \text{ is even})$              | By (f)_____  |
| 5. <b>To Show</b> $x^2 \text{ is odd}$   | Rewrite previous <b>To Show</b> using definition of even, odd  |
| 6. <b>Use the witness</b> $k$ , an integer,<br>where $x = 2k + 1$                              | By existential definition of $x$ being odd   |
| <b>Choose the witness</b>  |  |
| 7. $j = 2k^2 + 2k$ , an integer<br><b>To Show</b> $x^2 = 2j + 1$                               | Show this new <b>To Show</b> is true to prove the existential definition of $x^2$ being odd                                    |
| 8. <b>To Show</b> $(2k + 1)^2 = 2j + 1$  | Rewrite previous <b>To Show</b> using definition of $k$  |
| 9. <b>To Show</b> $(2k + 1)^2 = 2(2k^2 + 2k) + 1$  | Rewrite previous <b>To Show</b> using definition of $j$  |
| 10. <b>To Show</b> $T$   | By algebra: multiplying out the LHS; factoring the RHS   |
| <b>QED</b>   | Because we got to $T$ only by rewriting <b>To Show</b> to equivalent statements, using valid proof techniques and definitions. |

Consider the following expressions as options to fill in the two proofs above. Give your answer as one of the numbers below for each blank a-c. You may use some numbers for more than one blank, but each letter only uses one of the expressions below.

i. $\exists x \in \mathbb{Z} (x \text{ is odd} \wedge x^2 \text{ is even})$	ix. $(x \text{ is odd} \wedge x^2 \text{ is even})$
ii. $\neg \exists x \in \mathbb{Z} (x \text{ is odd} \wedge x^2 \text{ is even})$	x. $(x \text{ is odd} \wedge x \text{ is not odd})$
iii. $\exists x \in \mathbb{Z} (x \text{ is odd} \wedge x \text{ is even})$	xi. $\neg(x \text{ is odd} \wedge x \text{ is not odd})$
iv. $\neg \exists x \in \mathbb{Z} (x \text{ is odd} \wedge x \text{ is even})$	xii. $x^2 \text{ is even}$
v. $\exists x \in \mathbb{Z} (x^2 \text{ is odd} \wedge x^2 \text{ is even})$	xiii. $x^2 \text{ is odd}$
vi. $\neg \exists x \in \mathbb{Z} (x^2 \text{ is odd} \wedge x^2 \text{ is even})$	xiv. universal generalization
vii. $(x^2 \text{ is even} \wedge x^2 \text{ is not even})$	xv. proof by cases
viii. $\neg(x \text{ is odd} \wedge x^2 \text{ is even})$	xvi. direct proof
	xvii. proof by contraposition
	xviii. proof by contradiction

4. **Friday Goals for this question:** Reason through multiple nested quantifiers. Fluently use the definition and properties of the set of rationals.

Recall the definition of the set of rational numbers,  $\mathbb{Q} = \left\{ \frac{p}{q} \mid p \in \mathbb{Z} \text{ and } q \in \mathbb{Z} \text{ and } q \neq 0 \right\}$ .

We define the set of **irrational** numbers  $\overline{\mathbb{Q}} = \mathbb{R} - \mathbb{Q} = \{x \in \mathbb{R} \mid x \notin \mathbb{Q}\}$ .

(i) $\forall x \in \mathbb{Q} \forall y \in \mathbb{Q} \exists z \in \mathbb{Q} (x + y = z)$	(v) $\forall x \in \overline{\mathbb{Q}} \forall y \in \overline{\mathbb{Q}} \exists z \in \overline{\mathbb{Q}} (x + y = z)$
(ii) $\forall x \in \mathbb{Q} \forall y \in \mathbb{Q} \exists z \in \mathbb{Q} (x + z = y)$	(vi) $\forall x \in \overline{\mathbb{Q}} \forall y \in \overline{\mathbb{Q}} \exists z \in \overline{\mathbb{Q}} (x + z = y)$
(iii) $\forall x \in \mathbb{Q} \forall y \in \mathbb{Q} \exists z \in \mathbb{Q} (x \cdot y = z)$	(vii) $\forall x \in \overline{\mathbb{Q}} \forall y \in \overline{\mathbb{Q}} \exists z \in \overline{\mathbb{Q}} (x \cdot y = z)$
(iv) $\forall x \in \mathbb{Q} \forall y \in \mathbb{Q} \exists z \in \mathbb{Q} (x \cdot z = y)$	(viii) $\forall x \in \overline{\mathbb{Q}} \forall y \in \overline{\mathbb{Q}} \exists z \in \overline{\mathbb{Q}} (x \cdot z = y)$

- (a) Which of the statements above (if any) could be **disproved** using the counterexample  $x = \frac{1}{2}, y = \frac{3}{4}$ ?
- (b) Which of the statements above (if any) could be **disproved** using the counterexample  $x = \sqrt{4}, y = \sqrt{3}$ ?
- (c) Which of the statements above (if any) could be **disproved** using the counterexample  $x = 0, y = 3$ ?

- (d) Which of the statements above (if any) could be **disproved** using the counterexample  $x = \sqrt{2}$ ,  $y = 0$ ?
- (e) Which of the statements above (if any) could be **disproved** using the counterexample  $x = \sqrt{2}$ ,  $y = -\sqrt{2}$ ?

*Hint: we proved in class that  $\sqrt{2} \notin \mathbb{Q}$ . You may also use the facts that  $\sqrt{3} \notin \mathbb{Q}$  and  $-\sqrt{2} \notin \mathbb{Q}$ .*

*Bonus - not to hand in: prove these facts; that is, prove that  $\sqrt{3} \notin \mathbb{Q}$  and  $-\sqrt{2} \notin \mathbb{Q}$ .*