

TUTORIAL 7.5 — Series

1

(a)

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \pi^{1-3n} \\ &= \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{\pi}{\pi^{3n}} \\ &= \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \pi \left(\frac{1}{\pi^3} \right)^n \end{aligned}$$

The above is a geometric series with common ratio $\frac{1}{\pi^3}$. Since $\left| \frac{1}{\pi^3} \right| \leq 1$, the series converges.

The first couple of terms are: $\left\{ \frac{1}{\pi^2}, \frac{1}{\pi^5}, \frac{1}{\pi^8} \right\}$.

Re-indexing: $\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{\pi^2} \left(\frac{1}{\pi^3} \right)^n$, where $a = \frac{1}{\pi^2}$ and $r = \frac{1}{\pi^3}$

$\frac{a}{1-r} = \frac{1/\pi^2}{1-1/\pi^3}$ converges to $\frac{\pi}{\pi^3-1}$, approximately 0.1047.

$\implies \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \pi^{1-3n}$ converges to approximately 0.1047.

(b)

$$\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{3+4^n}{5^n}$$

Applying ratio test:

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left| \frac{a_{n+1}}{a_n} \right| = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left| \left(\frac{3+4^{n+1}}{5^{n+1}} \right) \left(\frac{5^n}{3+4^n} \right) \right| = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left| \frac{3+4^{n+1}}{5(3+4^n)} \right| = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left| \frac{3/4^n + 4}{5(3/4^n + 1)} \right| = \frac{4}{5}$$

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left| \frac{a_{n+1}}{a_n} \right| \leq 1$$

Hence, the series is absolutely convergent.

2 More proofs about p and q

Type $Ty := AA || BB$

$p, q : Ty \rightarrow \mathbb{B}$

$\vdash (\forall x : Ty. p(x) \rightarrow \neg q(x)) \rightarrow$
 $(\exists x : Ty. p(x)) \rightarrow$
 $p(AA) \rightarrow$
 $\exists y : Ty. q(y)$

By impl-elim on goal:

- 1) $\forall x : Ty. p(x) \rightarrow \neg q(x)$
- 2) $\exists x : Ty. \neg p(x)$
- 3) $p(AA)$

$\vdash \exists y : Ty. q(y)$

Ty	p	q
AA	T	F
BB	F	T/F

The implication allows $q(BB)$ to be false while allowing all assumptions to be true. Hence, by counterexample the goal is false.

3 Proofs are contrary to fun

Type Ty

$foo : Ty$

$p, q : Ty \rightarrow \mathbb{B}$

$\vdash (\forall w : Ty. p(w) \implies \forall x : Ty. \neg q(x)) \implies$
 $(\exists y : Ty. q(y)) \implies$
 $p(foo) \implies$
 $(\forall z : Ty. q(z))$

By impl-elim on goal:

- 1) $\forall w : Ty (p(w) \implies \forall x : Ty. \neg q(x))$
- 2) $\exists y : Ty. q(y)$
- 3) $p(foo)$

$\vdash \forall z : Ty. q(z)$

By forall-elim on 1 using $w = foo$

- 4) $p(foo) \implies \forall x : Ty. \neg q(x)$

By impl-elim on 4 using 3

- 5) $\forall x : Ty. \neg q(x)$

By exists-elim on 2:

- 6) $y : Ty$
- 7) $q(y)$

By forall-elim on 5 using $x = y$

- 8) $\neg q(y)$

Assumption 5 contradicts 8, therefore the goal is false.

4 Simple proofs can be sick

Type person, location, liquid

visited: (person, location) $\rightarrow \mathbb{B}$

sick: person $\rightarrow \mathbb{B}$

ooj: liquid (old orange juice)

beach: location

drank: (person, liquid) $\rightarrow \mathbb{B}$

Marat: person

1. Everyone who drank old orange juice got sick.
 $\forall p : \text{person} . \text{drank}(p, \text{ooj}) \implies \text{sick}(p)$

2. Everyone who drank old orange juice went to the beach.

$\forall p : \text{person} . \text{drank}(p, \text{ooj}) \implies \text{visited}(p, \text{beach})$

3. Marat did not get sick.

$\neg \text{sick}(\text{Marat})$

4. To prove that the three statements imply that Marat did not go to the beach:

p	$\text{sick}(p)$	$\text{visited}(p, \text{beach})$	$\text{drank}(p, \text{ooj})$
Marat	F	T	F

The above environment illustrates a case where all assumptions hold, yet the goal is not satisfied. Therefore, by counterexample, the statements are insufficient to prove the goal.

Submitted by Yashashwin Karthikeyan on March 28, 2024.