

# CSC165H1 Problem Set 2

Wei CUI

February 5, 2018

## 1 AND vs. IMPLIES

(a) WTP:  $\forall n \in \mathbb{N}, n > 15 \Rightarrow n^3 - 10n^2 + 3 \geq 165$

Proof: Let  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , and assume  $n > 15$ , WTP:  $n^3 - 10n^2 + 3 > 165 \vee n^3 - 10n^2 + 3 = 165$

$$\begin{aligned} n &> 15 && \text{(by assumption)} \\ n^3 &> 15n^2 && \text{(since } n > 15, \text{ then } n^2 > 0) \\ n^3 - 10n^2 &> 5n^2 \\ n^3 - 10n^2 + 3 &> 5n^2 + 3 \\ n^3 - 10n^2 + 3 &> 5n^2 + 3 > 1128 > 165 && \text{(since } n > 15, \text{ then } 5n^2 + 3 > 1128) \end{aligned}$$

Therefore,  $n^3 - 10n^2 + 3 > 165$

Therefore,  $n^3 - 10n^2 + 3 > 165 \vee n^3 - 10n^2 + 3 = 165$  holds

Thus,  $\forall n \in \mathbb{N}, n > 15 \Rightarrow n^3 - 10n^2 + 3 \geq 165$

(b) We want to disprove:  $\forall n \in \mathbb{N}, n > 15 \wedge n^3 - 10n^2 + 3 \geq 165$ , which is equivalent to prove its negation:  $\exists n \in \mathbb{N}, n \leq 15 \vee n^3 - 10n^2 + 3 < 165$

Proof: Take  $n = 1$  Then  $n = 1 \leq 15$

Therefore  $\exists n \in \mathbb{N}, n \leq 15 \vee n^3 - 10n^2 + 3 < 165$

Therefore  $\forall n \in \mathbb{N}, n > 15 \wedge n^3 - 10n^2 + 3 \geq 165$  is False.

## 2 Ceiling function

(a) Translate into predicate logic:  $\forall n, m \in \mathbb{N}, n < m \Rightarrow \lceil \frac{m-1}{m} \cdot n \rceil = n$

Proof: Let  $n, m \in \mathbb{N}$ , and assume  $n < m$ , WTS:  $\lceil \frac{m-1}{m} \cdot n \rceil = n$

$$\begin{aligned}
\left\lceil \frac{m-1}{m} \cdot n \right\rceil &= \left\lceil \left(1 - \frac{1}{m}\right) \cdot n \right\rceil \\
\left\lceil \left(1 - \frac{1}{m}\right) \cdot n \right\rceil &= \left\lceil -\frac{n}{m} + n \right\rceil \\
\left\lceil -\frac{n}{m} + n \right\rceil &= \left\lceil -\frac{n}{m} \right\rceil + n \quad (\text{since } n, m \in \mathbb{N}, \text{ then } n \in \mathbb{Z} \text{ and } -\frac{n}{m} \in \mathbb{R} \text{ and by Fact 2}) \\
\left\lceil -\frac{n}{m} \right\rceil + n &= n \quad (\text{since } n < m \text{ and by the definition of ceiling function})
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore  $\left\lceil \frac{m-1}{m} \cdot n \right\rceil = n$

Therefore  $\forall n, m \in \mathbb{N}, n < m \Rightarrow \left\lceil \frac{m-1}{m} \cdot n \right\rceil = n$

(b) Define a predicate  $IsMultipleOf50(n)$ :  $\exists q \in \mathbb{Z}, n = 50q$ , where  $n \in \mathbb{N}$

Translate into predicate logic:  $\forall n \in \mathbb{N}, nextFifty(n) \geq n \wedge IsMultipleOf50(nextFifty(n)) \wedge (\forall x \in \mathbb{N}, x \geq n \wedge IsMultipleOf50(x) \Rightarrow x \geq nextFifty(n))$

Proof: Let  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , WTS:  $nextFifty(n) \geq n \wedge IsMultipleOf50(nextFifty(n)) \wedge (\forall x \in \mathbb{N}, x \geq n \wedge IsMultipleOf50(x) \Rightarrow x \geq nextFifty(n))$

At first, we want to show:  $nextFifty(n) \geq n$

$$\begin{aligned}
\left\lceil \frac{n}{50} \right\rceil &\geq \frac{n}{50} && (\text{by the definition of ceiling function}) \\
50 \cdot \left\lceil \frac{n}{50} \right\rceil &\geq 50 \cdot \frac{n}{50} = n \\
nextFifty(n) &\geq n
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore  $nextFifty(n) \geq n$  is true

Next, we want to show that:  $IsMultipleOf50(nextFifty(n))$ , which is:  $\exists q \in \mathbb{Z}, nextFifty(n) = 50q$

Take  $q = \left\lceil \frac{n}{50} \right\rceil$  (since by the definition of ceiling function, then  $q = \left\lceil \frac{n}{50} \right\rceil \in \mathbb{Z}$ )

$$nextFifty(n) = 50 \cdot \left\lceil \frac{n}{50} \right\rceil = 50q$$

Therefore  $IsMultipleOf50(nextFifty(n))$  is true

Finally, we want to prove:  $\forall x \in \mathbb{N}, x \geq n \wedge IsMultipleOf50(x) \Rightarrow x \geq nextFifty(n)$

Let  $x \in \mathbb{N}$

Assume  $x \geq n$

Assume  $IsMultipleOf50(x)$ , which is:  $\exists q \in \mathbb{Z}, x = 50q$

Let  $q$  be such value, WTS:  $x \geq nextFifty(n)$ , which is:  $x = 50q \geq 50 \cdot \left\lceil \frac{n}{50} \right\rceil$

$$\begin{aligned}
x = 50q &\geq n && \text{(by our assumption)} \\
q &\geq \frac{n}{50} \geq \left\lceil \frac{n}{50} \right\rceil && \text{(since } q \in \mathbb{Z}) \\
50q &\geq 50 \cdot \left\lceil \frac{n}{50} \right\rceil \\
x = 50q &\geq 50 \cdot \left\lceil \frac{n}{50} \right\rceil = \text{nextFifty}(n)
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore  $x \geq \text{nextFifty}(n)$

Therefore  $\forall x \in \mathbb{N}, x \geq n \wedge \text{IsMultipleOf50}(x) \Rightarrow x \geq \text{nextFifty}(n)$

Thus  $\forall n \in \mathbb{N}, \text{nextFifty}(n) \geq n \wedge \text{IsMultipleOf50}(\text{nextFifty}(n)) \wedge (\forall x \in \mathbb{N}, x \geq n \wedge \text{IsMultipleOf50}(x) \Rightarrow x \geq \text{nextFifty}(n))$ .

### 3 Divisibility

(a) WTP:  $\forall n \in \mathbb{N}, n \leq 2300 \Rightarrow (49|n \Leftrightarrow 50 \cdot (\text{nextFifty}(n) - n) = \text{nextFifty}(n))$

Proof: Let  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , and assume  $n \leq 2300$ , WTS:  $49|n \Leftrightarrow 50 \cdot (\text{nextFifty}(n) - n) = \text{nextFifty}(n)$

At first, we prove " $\Rightarrow$ " direction,

Assume  $49|n$ , which is:  $\exists q \in \mathbb{Z}, n = 49q$ , WTS:  $50 \cdot (\text{nextFifty}(n) - n) = \text{nextFifty}(n)$

$$\begin{aligned}
\left\lceil \frac{50-1}{50} \cdot q \right\rceil &= q && \text{(since } n = 49q \leq 2300, \text{ then } q < 50 \text{ and by Q2(a))} \\
49 \left\lceil \frac{49d}{50} \right\rceil &= 49d \\
50 \left\lceil \frac{49d}{50} \right\rceil - 49d &= \left\lceil \frac{49d}{50} \right\rceil \\
\text{nextFifty}(n) - n &= \frac{\text{nextFifty}(n)}{50} && \text{(since } n = 49d) \\
50 \cdot (\text{nextFifty}(n) - n) &= \text{nextFifty}(n)
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore  $49|n \Rightarrow 50 \cdot (\text{nextFifty}(n) - n) = \text{nextFifty}(n)$

Next, we prove " $\Leftarrow$ " direction,

Assume  $50 \cdot (\text{nextFifty}(n) - n) = \text{nextFifty}(n)$ , WTP:  $49|n$ , which is:  $\exists q \in \mathbb{Z}, n = 49d$

Take  $q = \left\lceil \frac{n}{50} \right\rceil$  (since by the definition of ceiling function, then  $q \in \mathbb{Z}$ )

$$\begin{aligned}
50 \cdot (\text{nextFifty}(n) - n) &= \text{nextFifty}(n) && \text{(by our assumption)} \\
50 \cdot \text{nextFifty}(n) - 50n &= \text{nextFifty}(n) \\
49 \cdot \text{nextFifty}(n) &= 50n \\
49 \left\lceil \frac{n}{50} \right\rceil &= n \\
n &= 49q
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore,  $49|n \Leftrightarrow 50 \cdot (\text{nextFifty}(n) - n) = \text{nextFifty}(n)$

Therefore,  $\forall n \in \mathbb{N}, n \leq 2300 \Rightarrow (49|n \Leftrightarrow 50 \cdot (\text{nextFifty}(n) - n) = \text{nextFifty}(n))$

(b) Disprove:  $\forall n \in \mathbb{N}, 49|n \Leftrightarrow 50 \cdot (\text{nextFifty}(n) - n) = \text{nextFifty}(n)$

It is equivalent to prove its negation:  $\exists n \in \mathbb{N}, (49|n \wedge 50 \cdot (\text{nextFifty}(n) - n) \neq \text{nextFifty}(n)) \vee (50 \cdot (\text{nextFifty}(n) - n) = \text{nextFifty}(n) \wedge 49 \nmid n)$

Proof: Take  $n = 2450 \in \mathbb{N}$ , since  $n = 49 \times 50$ , then  $49|n$  is true

Next,  $\text{nextFifty}(n) = 50 \cdot \lceil \frac{n}{50} \rceil = 50 \lceil \frac{2450}{50} \rceil = 50 \times 49 = 2450$ ,

then  $50 \cdot (\text{nextFifty}(n) - n) = 50 \cdot (2450 - 2450) = 0 \neq 2450 \neq \text{nextFifty}(n)$

Therefore,  $50 \cdot (\text{nextFifty}(n) - n) \neq \text{nextFifty}(n)$

Therefore,  $49|n \wedge 50 \cdot (\text{nextFifty}(n) - n) \neq \text{nextFifty}(n)$

Therefore,  $(49|n \wedge 50 \cdot (\text{nextFifty}(n) - n) \neq \text{nextFifty}(n)) \vee (50 \cdot (\text{nextFifty}(n) - n) = \text{nextFifty}(n) \wedge 49 \nmid n)$  holds

Thus, we have proven its negation.

## 4 Functions.

(a) " $f$  is bounded" in predicate logic:  $\exists k \in \mathbb{R}, \forall x \in \mathbb{N}, f(x) \leq k$

(b) Define a predicate  $Bounded(f) : \exists k \in \mathbb{R}, \forall x \in \mathbb{N}, f(x) \leq k$ , where  $f : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{\geq 0}$ .

Translate into predicate logic:  $\forall f_1, f_2 : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{\geq 0}, Bounded(f_1) \wedge Bounded(f_2) \Rightarrow Bounded(f_1 + f_2)$

Proof: Let  $f_1, f_2 : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{\geq 0}$ , and assume  $Bounded(f_1) \wedge Bounded(f_2)$ , which is:

$\exists k_1 \in \mathbb{R}, \forall x \in \mathbb{N}, f_1(x) \leq k_1$

$\exists k_2 \in \mathbb{R}, \forall x \in \mathbb{N}, f_2(x) \leq k_2$

Let  $k_1, k_2$  be such values, WTP:  $Bounded(f_1 + f_2)$ , which is:  $\exists k_3 \in \mathbb{R}, \forall x \in \mathbb{N}, f_1(x) + f_2(x) \leq k_3$

Let  $x \in \mathbb{N}$ . Take  $k_3 = k_1 + k_2$  (since  $k_1, k_2 \in \mathbb{R}$ , then  $k_3 \in \mathbb{R}$ )

$$f_1(x) \leq k_1 \quad \text{(by our assumption)}$$

$$f_2(x) \leq k_2 \quad \text{(by our assumption)}$$

$$f_1(x) + f_2(x) \leq k_1 + k_2$$

$$f_1(x) + f_2(x) \leq k_3$$

Therefore,  $\exists k_3 \in \mathbb{R}, \forall x \in \mathbb{N}, f_1(x) + f_2(x) \leq k_3$

Therefore, if  $f_1$  and  $f_2$  is bounded, then  $f_1 + f_2$  is bounded.

(c) Prove:  $\forall f_1, f_2 : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{\geq 0}, \text{Bounded}(f_1 + f_2) \Rightarrow \text{Bounded}(f_1) \wedge \text{Bounded}(f_2)$

Proof: Let  $f_1, f_2 : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{\geq 0}$ , and assume  $\text{Bounded}(f_1 + f_2)$ , which is:  $\exists k_3 \in \mathbb{R}, \forall x \in \mathbb{N}, f_1(x) + f_2(x) \leq k_3$ , let  $k_3$  be such value, WTP:  $\text{Bounded}(f_1) \wedge \text{Bounded}(f_2)$ , which is:

$\exists k_1 \in \mathbb{R}, \forall x \in \mathbb{N}, f_1(x) \leq k_1$

$\exists k_2 \in \mathbb{R}, \forall x \in \mathbb{N}, f_2(x) \leq k_2$

Let  $x \in \mathbb{N}$ , and take  $k_1 = k_2 = k_3$  (since  $k_3 \in \mathbb{R}$ , then  $k_1, k_2 \in \mathbb{R}$ )

$$f_1(x) + f_2(x) \leq k_3 \quad (\text{by our assumption})$$

$$f_1(x) \leq k_3 - f_2(x)$$

$$f_1(x) \leq k_3 \quad (\text{since } f_2 : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{\geq 0}, \text{ then } \forall x \in \mathbb{N}, f_2(x) \geq 0)$$

$$f_1(x) \leq k_1 \quad (\text{since } k_3 = k_1)$$

Therefore,  $\exists k_1 \in \mathbb{R}, \forall x \in \mathbb{N}, f_1(x) \leq k_1$

Similarly,

$$f_1(x) + f_2(x) \leq k_3 \quad (\text{by our assumption})$$

$$f_2(x) \leq k_3 - f_1(x)$$

$$f_2(x) \leq k_3 \quad (\text{since } f_1 : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{\geq 0}, \text{ then } \forall x \in \mathbb{N}, f_1(x) \geq 0)$$

$$f_2(x) \leq k_2 \quad (\text{since } k_3 = k_2)$$

Therefore,  $\exists k_2 \in \mathbb{R}, \forall x \in \mathbb{N}, f_2(x) \leq k_2$

Therefore,  $\text{Bounded}(f_1) \wedge \text{Bounded}(f_2)$  holds

Thus,  $\forall f_1, f_2 : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{\geq 0}, \text{Bounded}(f_1 + f_2) \Rightarrow \text{Bounded}(f_1) \wedge \text{Bounded}(f_2)$