## CSE2023 Discrete Computational Structures

Lecture 7

# Common mistakes in exhaustive proof and proof by cases

- Draw incorrect conclusions from insufficient number of examples
- Need to cover every possible case in order to prove a theorem
- Proving a theorem is analogous to showing a program always produces the desired output
- No matter how many input values are tested, unless all input values are tested, we cannot conclude that the program always produces correct output

## Example

- Is it true that every positive integer is the sum of 18 4<sup>th</sup> powers of integers?
- The 4<sup>th</sup> powers of integers: 0, 1, 16, 81, ...
- Select 18 terms from these numbers and add up to n, then n is the sum of 18 4<sup>th</sup> powers
- Can show that integers up to 78 can be written as the sum as such
- However, if we decided this is enough (or stop earlier), then we come to wrong conclusion as 79 cannot be written this way

#### Example

• What is wrong with this "proof"

"Theorem": If x is a real number, then  $x^2$  is a positive real number

"Proof": Let  $p_1$  be "x is positive" and  $p_2$  be "x is negative", and q be " $x^2$  is positive".

First show  $p_1 \rightarrow q$ , and then  $p_2 \rightarrow q$ . As we cover all possible cases of x, we complete this proof

- We missed the case x=0
- When x=0, the supposed theorem is false
- If p is "x is a real number", then we need to prove results with p<sub>1</sub>, p<sub>2</sub>, p<sub>3</sub> (where p<sub>3</sub> is the case that x=0)

$$((p_1 \lor p_2 \lor p_3) \to q) \leftrightarrow ((p_1 \to q) \land (p_2 \to q) \land (p_3 \to q))$$

#### Existence proof

- A proof of a proposition of the form  $\exists xp(x)$
- Constructive proof: find one element a such that p(a) is true
- Non-constructive proof: prove that  $\exists xp(x)$  is true in some other way, usually using proof by contradiction

## Constructive existence proof

- Show that there is a positive integer that can be written as the sum of cubes of positive integers in two different ways
- By intuition or computation, we find that 1729=10<sup>3</sup>+9<sup>3</sup>=12<sup>3</sup>+1<sup>3</sup>
- We prove this theorem as we show one positive integer can be written as the sum of cubes in two different ways

## Non-constructive existence proof

- Show that there exist irrational numbers x and y such that xy is rational
- We previously show that √2 is irrational
   Consider the number√2 √1. If it is rational, we have two irrational number x and y with x<sup>y</sup> is rational (x=√2, y=√2)
   On the other hand if√2 √2 is not rational, then we let
- $x = \sqrt{2}^{\sqrt{2}}$ ,  $y = \sqrt{2}$ , and thus  $x^y = (\sqrt{2}^{\sqrt{2}})^{\sqrt{2}} = \sqrt{2}^{\sqrt{2}\sqrt{2}} = \sqrt{2}^2 = 2$
- We have not found irrational numbers x and y such that xy is rational
- Rather we show that either the pair  $x=\sqrt{2}$ ,  $y=\sqrt{2}$  or the pair  $x=\sqrt{2}^2$ ,  $y=\sqrt{2}$  have the desired property, but we do not know which of these two pairs works!

#### Uniqueness proof

- Some theorems assert the existence of a unique element with a particular property
- · Need to show
  - Existence: show that an element x with the desired property exists
  - Uniqueness: show that if y≠x, then y does not have the desired property
- Equivalently, show that if x and y both have the desired property, then x=y
- Showing that there is a unique element x such that p(x) is the same as proving the statement

$$\exists x (p(x) \land \forall y ((y \neq x) \rightarrow \neg p(y)))$$

#### Example

- Show that if a and b are real numbers and a≠0, then there is a unique number r such that ar+b=0
- Note that the real number r=-b/a is a solution of ar+b=0. Consequently a real number r exists for which ar+b=0
- Second, suppose that s is a real number such that as+b=0. Then ar+b=as+b. Since a≠0, s must be equal to r. This means if s≠r, as+b≠0

13

## **Proof strategy**

- · Can be challenging
- First analyze what the hypotheses and conclusion mean
- For conditional statements, usually start with direct proof, then indirect proof, and then proof by contradiction

## Forward/backward reasoning

- Direct proof:
  - start with premises, together with axioms and known theorems,
  - we can construct a proof using a sequence of steps that lead to conclusion
- · A type of forward reasoning
- Backward reasoning: to prove q, we find a stement p that we can prove that p→q

- For two distinct positive real numbers x, y, their arithmetic mean is (x+y)/2, and their geometric mean is  $\sqrt{xy}$ . Show that the arithmetic mean is always larger than geometric mean
- To show  $(x+y)/2 > \sqrt{xy}$ , we can work backward by finding equivalent statements

$$(x+y)/2 > \sqrt{xy}$$
  
 $(x+y)^2/4 > xy$   
 $x^2 + 2xy + y^2 > 4xy$   
 $(x-y)^2 > 0$ 

#### Example

- For two distinct real positive real numbers, x and y, (x-y)<sup>2</sup>>0
- Thus,  $x^2$ -2xy+y<sup>2</sup>>0,  $x^2$ +2xy+y<sup>2</sup>>4xy,  $(x+y)^2$ >4xy. So,  $(x+y)/2 > \sqrt{xy}$
- We conclude that if x and y are distinct positive real numbers, then their arithmetic mean is greater than their geometric mean

## Example

- Suppose that two people play a game taking turns removing 1, 2, or 3 stones at a time from a pile that begins with 15 stones. The person who removes the last stone wins the game.
- Show that the first player can win the game no matter what the second play does

## Example

- At the last step, the first player can win if this player is left with a pile with 1, 2, or 3 stones
- The second player will be forced to leave 1, 2 or 3 stones if this player has to remove stones from a pile containing 4 stones
- The first player can leave 4 stones when there are 5, 6, or 7 stones left, which happens when the second player has to remove stones from a pile with 8 stones

19

- That means, there are 9, 10 or 11 stones when the first player makes this move
- Similarly, the first player should leave 12 stones when this player makes the first move
- We can reverse this argument to show that the first player can always makes this move to win (successively leave 12, 8, and 4 stones for 2<sup>nd</sup> player)

## Adapting existing proof

- · Take advantage of existing proofs
- Borrow some ideas used in the existing proofs
- We proved  $\sqrt{2}$  is irrational. We now conjecture that  $\sqrt{3}$  is irrational. Can we adapt previous proof to show this?
- · Mimic the steps in previous proof
- Suppose  $\sqrt{3} = c/d$ , then  $3 = c^2/d^2$ ,  $3d^2 = c^2$
- Can we use this to show that 3 must be a factor of both c and d?

## Example

- We will use some results from number theory (discussed in Chapter 3)
- As 3 is factor of c<sup>2</sup>, it must be a factor of c Thus, 9 is a factor of c<sup>2</sup>, which means 9 is a factor of 3d<sup>2</sup>
- Which implies 3 is a factor d<sup>2</sup>, and 3 is factor of d
- This means 3 is factor of c and d, a contradiction

## Looking for counterexamples

- When confronted with a conjecture, try to prove it first
- If the attempt is not successful, try to find a counterexample
- Process of finding counterexamples often provides insights into problems

- We showed the statement "Every positive integer is the sum of two squares of integers" is false by finding a counterexample
- Is the statement "Every positive integer is the sum of the squares of three integers" true?
- Look for an counterexample:  $1=0^2+0^2+1^2$ ,  $2=0^2+1^2+1^2$ ,  $3=1^2+1^2+1^2$ ,  $4=0^2+0^2+2^2$ ,  $5=0^2+1^2+2^2$ ,  $6=1^2+1^2+2^2$ , but cannot do so for 7

## Example

- The next question is to ask whether every positive integer is the sum of the squares of 4 positive integers
- Some experiments provide evidence that the answer is yes, e.g., 7=1<sup>2</sup>+1<sup>2</sup>+1<sup>2</sup>+2<sup>2</sup>, 25=4<sup>2</sup>+2<sup>2</sup>+2<sup>2</sup>+1<sup>2</sup>, and 87=9<sup>2</sup>+2<sup>2</sup>+1<sup>2</sup>+1<sup>2</sup>
- It turns the conjecture "Every positive integer is the sum of squares of four integers" is true

## Proof strategy in action

- Formulate conjectures based on many types of possible evidence
- Examination of special cases can lead to a conjecture
- · If possible, prove the conjecture
- If cannot find a proof, find a counterexample
- A few conjectures remain unproved
- Fermat's last theorem (a conjecture since 1637 until Andrew Wiles proved it in 1995)

no three positive integers satisfy  $a^n + b^n = c^n$ , n is any integer > 2