# MATH 220 Practice Midterm 2 — September, 2024, Duration: 50 minutes This test has 5 questions on X pages, for a total of 50 points.

First Name:	Last Name:
Student Number:	Section:
Signature:	

Question:	1	2	3	4	5
Points:					
Total:					/50

10 Marks

- 1. Negate each of the following and prove or disprove the original statement:
  - (a) For all  $x \in \mathbb{Z}$ , there exists  $y \in \mathbb{Z}$ , such that there exists  $z \in \mathbb{Z}$ , such that xy > z implies x + y < z".

**Solution:** The negation is "There exists  $x \in \mathbb{Z}$  such that for all  $y \in \mathbb{Z}$ , there exists  $z \in \mathbb{Z}$  such that xy > z and  $z \le x + y$ .

*Proof.* Let  $x \in \mathbb{Z}$ . Choose y = 0 and z = -1. Notice the hypothesis xy > z is false, so the result holds.

(b) For all  $x \in \mathbb{N}$ , for all  $y \in \mathbb{N}$  such that x < y, there exists  $a, b \in \mathbb{Z}$  such that  $ax + by < \left|\frac{x}{y}\right|$ 

**Solution:** The negation is "There exists  $x \in \mathbb{N}$  such that there exists  $y \in \mathbb{N}$  such that x < y such that for all  $a, b \in \mathbb{Z}$ ,  $ax + by \ge \left|\frac{x}{y}\right|$ 

*Proof.* Let  $x, y \in \mathbb{N}$ . Choose a, b = -1 and hence the result holds.

10 Marks | 2.

2. Let  $n, k \in \mathbb{N}$ . Prove that if for all  $m \in \mathbb{Z}$ ,  $m^k \neq n$ , then  $n^{1/k}$  is irrational.

## **Solution:**

*Proof.* Let  $n, k \in \mathbb{N}$ . We prove the contrapositive. Assume  $n^{1/k}$  is rational, so  $n^{1/k} = \frac{a}{b}$  for some coprime  $a \in \mathbb{Z}$  and  $b \in \mathbb{N}$ . Notice  $n = \frac{a^k}{b^k}$ . Since n is an integer, we know b = 1 so  $n = a^k$  and thus the results follows.

10 Marks

- 3. The Archimedean property of the reals guarantees that for all  $x, y \in \mathbb{R}$  where x > 0, there exists  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  such that nx > y.
  - (a) Let  $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^+$ . Prove that there exists  $m \in \mathbb{N}$  such that  $(m-1)x \leq y < mx$ .

## **Solution:**

*Proof.* Let  $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^+$ . By the Archimedean property of the reals, we know there exists  $m \in \mathbb{N}$  such that mx > y. Now choose m to be the smallest possible m such that mx > y. It follows that  $(m-1)x \leq y$  as otherwise we would have (m-1)x = mx which is impossible since  $x \neq 0$ . Thus,  $(m-1)x \leq y < mx$  as required.

(b) Using (a), prove that for all  $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^+$  such that x < y, there exists  $q \in \mathbb{Q}$  such that x < q < y. (Hint: Consider y - x and also notice  $1 \in \mathbb{R}^+$ )

#### **Solution:**

*Proof.* Let  $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^+$ . By the Archimedean property of the reals, we know there exists  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  such that n(y-x) > 1. From part (a), we also know there exists  $m \in \mathbb{N}$  such that  $(m-1) \le nx < m$ . Hence,

$$1 < n(y - x)$$

$$1 + nx < ny$$

$$1 + (m - 1) \le 1 + nx < ny$$

$$m < ny$$

$$nx < m < ny$$

$$x < \frac{m}{n} < y$$

Since  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , it follows  $\frac{m}{n} \in \mathbb{Q}$  so there exists  $q \in \mathbb{Q}$  such that x < q < y as required.

(c) Assume that  $\sqrt{2}$  is irrational. Using  $\sqrt{2}$ , prove that for all  $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^+$  such that x < y, there exists  $z \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \mathbb{Q}$  such that x < z < y. You may assume that irrational numbers added to and multiplied by rational numbers are still irrational. (Hint: From part (b), we have that there exists  $p, q \in \mathbb{Q}$  such that x )

## **Solution:**

*Proof.* Let  $x,y \in \mathbb{R}^+$  and assume that  $\sqrt{2}$  is irrational. Notice,  $\frac{\sqrt{2}}{2}$  is also irrational and  $\frac{\sqrt{2}}{2} < 1$ . From part (b), we know there exists  $p,q \in \mathbb{Q}$  such that  $x . Choose <math>\alpha = p + \frac{\sqrt{2}}{2}(q-p)$ . Then, q-p>0 since q>p, so  $\alpha>p$ . But also, since  $\frac{\sqrt{2}}{2} < 1$ ,  $\alpha . Since <math>\alpha$  is irrational and x , we have that for all <math>x, y, there exists  $z \in \mathbb{R} \setminus \mathbb{Q}$  such that x < z < y as required.

10 Marks

4. (a) Let  $A = \{-1, 2, \frac{1}{2}\}$ . Prove by induction that if 1 is written as a product  $1 = p_1 p_2 p_3 \dots p_n$  where  $p_i \in A$ , then n is even.

#### Solution:

*Proof.* Let A be as stated. We proceed with mathematical induction on the number of  $p_i \in A$  that are being multiplied together.

- For the base case, notice  $1 \notin A$  so  $1 \neq p_1$ . The base case holds.
- Assume that if for all i such that  $1 \le i \le k$ ,  $1 = p_1 p_2 p_3 \dots p_k$  is only possible when k is even. For k + 1, we proceed with a proof by cases.
  - Assume  $p_{k+1} = \frac{1}{p_i}$  for some i such that  $1 \le i \le k$ . Then,  $p_i p_{k+1} = 1$  and thus we are left with  $p_1 p_2 \dots p_{i-1} p_{i+1} \dots p_k$ , which has a length of k-1 and thus by our assumption, k-1 is even or 1 cannot be written as a product  $1 = p_1 p_2 \dots p_{i-1} p_{i+1} \dots p_k$ . In both cases, we have k+1 is even or 1 cannot be written as a product  $1 = p_1 p_2 \dots p_{k+1}$
  - Assume  $p_{k+1} \neq \frac{1}{p_i}$  for all i such that  $1 \leq i \leq k$ . We split this into another proof by cases.
    - \* If  $p_{k+1} = -1$ , then we know for all i such that  $1 \le i \le k$ ,  $p_i \ne -1$  so  $p_1 p_2 \dots p_{k+1} < 0$  and hence cannot be 1.
    - \* If  $p_{k+1} = 2$ , then for all  $1 \le i \le k$ ,  $p_i = 2$  or -1, so  $|p_1 p_2 \dots p_{k+1}| \ge 2$  and thus  $p_1 p_2 \dots p_{k+1} \ne 1$ .
    - \* If  $p_{k+1} = \frac{1}{2}$ , then for all  $1 \le i \le k$ ,  $p_i = \frac{1}{2}$  or -1, so  $0 < |p_1 p_2 \dots p_{k+1}| \le \frac{1}{2}$  and thus  $p_1 p_2 \dots p_{k+1} \ne 1$ .

Since we have that this product is equal to 1 in none of the cases, our inductive step still holds.

Since both the base case and the inductive step hold, by the principle of mathematical induction, the result holds for all  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ .

(b) Prove or disprove that the same applies for  $B = \{-1, \pm 2, \pm \frac{1}{2}\}.$ 

# Solution:

Disproof. Let B be as stated. Notice  $1 = -1 \cdot -2 \cdot \frac{1}{2}$  so  $1 = p_1 p_2 p_3$  where  $p_1, p_2, p_3 \in B$  but 3 is not even, so the same does not apply for B.

10 Marks

5. (a) Prove that for all  $\delta > 0$ , there exists  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  such that  $\frac{1}{\frac{\pi}{2} + 2\pi n} < \delta$  and likewise, there exists  $m \in \mathbb{N}$  such that  $\frac{1}{\frac{-\pi}{2} + 2\pi m} < \delta$  (Hint: Archimedean property of the reals)

# Solution:

*Proof.* Let  $\delta > 0$ . Notice  $2\pi, \frac{1}{\delta} - \frac{\pi}{2} \in \mathbb{R}$  and by the Archimedean property of the reals, we know there exists  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  such that

$$2\pi n > \frac{1}{\delta} - \frac{\pi}{2}$$
$$\frac{\pi}{2} + 2\pi n > \frac{1}{\delta}$$

so  $\frac{1}{\frac{\pi}{2}+2\pi n}<\delta$  as required. Similarly, notice  $2\pi,\frac{1}{\delta}+\frac{\pi}{2}\in\mathbb{R}$  and by the Archimedean property of the reals, we know there exists  $m\in\mathbb{N}$  such that

$$2\pi m > \frac{1}{\delta} + \frac{\pi}{2}$$
$$\frac{-\pi}{2} + 2\pi m > \frac{1}{\delta}$$

so  $\frac{1}{\frac{-\pi}{2} + 2\pi m} < \delta$  as required.

(b) Hence prove that the limit  $\lim_{x\to 0} \sin\left(\frac{1}{x}\right) = L$  does not exist.

## **Solution:**

*Proof.* Let  $L \in \mathbb{R}$ . Notice L = 1 or  $L \neq 1$ .

- If L=1, let  $\varepsilon=1$ ,  $\delta>0$ , and choose  $x=\frac{1}{\frac{-\pi}{2}+2\pi n}$  such that  $x<\delta$ . Notice x=|x| and x>0 so we have  $0<|x|<\delta$ . Observe that  $\left|\sin\left(\frac{1}{x}\right)-1\right|=\left|\sin\left(\frac{\pi}{2}+2\pi n\right)-1\right|=|-1-1|=2\geq\varepsilon$ .
- If  $L \neq 1$ , let  $\varepsilon = |1 L|$ ,  $\delta > 0$  and choose  $x = \frac{1}{\frac{\pi}{2} + 2\pi n}$  such that  $x < \delta$ , and notice x = |x| and x > 0 so we have  $0 < |x| < \delta$ . Observe that  $\left|\sin\left(\frac{1}{x}\right) L\right| = \left|\sin\left(\frac{\pi}{2} + 2\pi n\right) L\right| = |1 L| \ge \varepsilon$

It follows that the limit  $\lim_{x\to 0} \sin\left(\frac{1}{x}\right) = L$  does not exist.