

# Writing Workshop

4a) Suppose  $x, y$  are rational with  $x < y$ . Observe the following computations

$$\begin{array}{rcl} x < y & & x < y \\ +x & +x & +y & +y \\ \hline 2^{-1}(2x) < (y+x)2^{-1} & & 2^{-1}(x+y) < (2y)2^{-1} \\ x < \frac{y+x}{2} & & \frac{x+y}{2} < y \end{array}$$

Since  $x < \frac{x+y}{2} < y$  and  $\frac{x+y}{2}$  is rational ( $x+y$  and 2 are non zero integers), we have found a  $z \in \mathbb{Q}$  where  $x < z < y$ .

b) Suppose  $x, y$  are in  $\mathbb{Q}$  with  $x < y$ . By the previous part, we can find a  $z_1$  such that

$$x < z_1 < y$$

and a  $z_2$

$$x < z_2 < z_1 < y$$

So

$$x < z_1 < \dots < z_2 < z_1 < y$$

It is clear that the set of  $z$  is infinite and a subset of  $S$ . So  $S$  is infinite.

Alt proof: Suppose  $x, y \in \mathbb{Q}$  and  $x < y$ . Suppose  $S$  is finite. By the well ordering principle, it must have a least element or be the empty set. Since we can find a  $z$ , such that

$$x < z < y$$

$S$  is not empty. Consider all the  $z_i$  in our set  $S$ :

$$x < z_i < z_{i-1} < \dots < z_1 < y$$

Let  $z_i$  be that least element. But  $x$  and  $z_i$  are rational and we can find a  $z_{i+1}$ :

$$x < z_{i+1} < z_i$$

So  $z_i$  is not a least element. Contradiction.

Alt proof: Suppose  $f: \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is a linear function  
 $f(x) = ax + b$  with  $a \neq 0$  and  $b \in \mathbb{R}$   
 $f(x_1) = ax_1 + b$  and  $f(x_2) = ax_2 + b$   
 $f(x_1) < f(x_2) \iff ax_1 + b < ax_2 + b \iff ax_1 < ax_2$   
 $\iff x_1 < x_2$  (since  $a > 0$ )



Reflection: The set  $\{x, y\}$  and  $\{z \in S(x, y) \mid x < z < y\}$ . So

4a) This proof was very similar to the one I wrote on the exam but now I specified that  $z$  is rational and provided an explicit statement why.

Ob - Neglected to show one of the implications: the condition of  $\forall x, y \in \mathbb{Q} (x < y \rightarrow \exists z (z \in \mathbb{Q} \wedge x < z < y))$  which was  $z \in \mathbb{Q}$ .

4b) I constructed  $S$  using a repeated algorithm. The with it un-step 1: Finding  $z_1$  such that  $x < z_1 < y$ .

step 2: Finding  $z_2, z_3$  such that  $x < z_2 < z_1 < z_3 < y$

⋮

Although the proof worked, I liked the simpler 1st proof I wrote in this rewrite because it proved something weaker: that a subset of  $S$  was infinite. I believe I can use the idea in later proofs where instead of considering the entirety of a set, I can consider a smaller portion of it.

The alternate proof by contradiction was written because I did not think to use contradiction during the exam. I think it would be a good habit to consider types of proof methods before jumping into a proof.