$\mathbb{Q} = \{ r \mid r = \frac{\alpha}{b}; \alpha \in \mathbb{Z}, b \in \mathbb{N} \}$

$\sqrt{\mathbf{2}}$ is irrational — proof by contradiction

 $\sqrt{2} = \frac{\alpha_*}{b}$

ave an impossible situation, i.e., a contradiction

For b_* to be the minimum possible, it must be that a_* and b_* have no common factors

Square both sides to get rid of the square root, then rearrange a little bit

$$a_*^2 = 2b_*^2$$

(with $k \in \mathbb{N}$)

Aha, a_*^2 is even since it is a multiple of 2, so a_* is even and we can say $a_* = 2k \stackrel{4}{\diamond}$

Plug 2k in for a_* above and we get $(2k)^2 = 2b_*^2$ or $b_*^2 = 2k^2$ — this means b_*^2 is even!

Whoops, if a, and b, are both even, they have a common factor of 2

Every even square comes from an even number—and every even number has an even square

Proof: We use an exhaustive (case-by-case) proof

- (a) n is even $\rightarrow n = 2k$ ($k \in \mathbb{Z}$) $\rightarrow n^2 = 2(2k^2) \rightarrow n^2$ is even (divisible by 2)
- (b) $n \text{ is odd } \to n = 2k + 1 \ (k \in \mathbb{Z}) \to n^2 = 2(2k^2 + 2k) + 1 \to n^2 \text{ is odd}$

Here, n must be even or odd (exhaustive)—also, n is general, i.e., no restrictions on n

Given a claim in the form $p \rightarrow q$, we can consider using a direct proof as follows...

Proof. We prove the implication using a direct proof.

- 1. Start by assuming that the statement claimed in p is true
- 2. Restate your assumption in mathematical terms, as necessary
- 3. Use mathematical and logical derivations to relate your above assumptions to q
- 4. Argue that you have shown that q must be true
- 5. End by concluding that q is true

Prove the following claim: if $x, y \in \mathbb{Q}$, then $x + y \in \mathbb{Q}$

Proof. We prove the implication using a direct proof.

- 1. Assume that $x, y \in \mathbb{Q}$, i.e., x and y are rational.
- 2. Then, by definition, there are integers a, c and natural numbers b, d such that x = a/b and y = c/d.
- 3. Then x + y = (ad + bc)/bd.
- 4. Since $ad + bc \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $bd \in \mathbb{N}$, (ad + bc)/bd is rational (by definition).
- 5. Thus, we conclude from steps 3 and 4 that $x + y \in \mathbb{O}$.

Given $x \in \mathbb{R}$; claim P(x): if $4^x - 1$ is divisible by 3, then $4^{x+1} - 1$ is divisible by 3

Proof. We prove the claim using a direct proof.

- 1. Assume that p is true, i.e., $4^x 1$ is divisible by 3.
- 2. This means that $4^x 1 = 3k$ for an integer k; from this, $4^x = 3k + 1$.
- 3. Since $4^{k+1} = 4 \cdot 4^k$, we have $4^{k+1} = 4 \cdot (3k+1) = 12k+4$.

Therefore, $4^{x+1} - 1 = 12k + 3 = 3 \cdot (4k + 1)$, which is a multiple of 3.

- 4. Since $4^{x+1} 1$ is a multiple of 3, we have shown that $4^{x+1} 1$ is divisible by 3.
- 5. Therefore, the statement claimed in g is true.

Given a claim in the form $p \to q$, we can consider using contraposition as follows...

Proof. We prove the implication using contraposition.

- 1. Start by assuming that the statement claimed in q is false
- 2. Restate your assumption in mathematical terms, as necessary
- 3. Use mathematical and logical derivations to relate your above assumptions to p
- 4. Argue that you have shown that p must be false
- 5. End by concluding that p is false

Given claim P(x): integer x is divisible by 3 IF AND ONLY IF x^2 is divisible by 3

(i) We use a direct proof to prove that if x is divisible by 3, then x^2 is divisible by 3.

Assume x is divisible by 3, so x = 3k for some $k \in \mathbb{Z}$.

Squaring both sides, $x^2 = 9k^2 = 3\cdot(3k^2)$, which is also a multiple of 3.

Thus, x^2 is divisible by 3, as was to be shown.

Proof. We prove the claim by proving each implication.

(ii) We use contraposition to prove that if x^2 is divisible by 3, then x is divisible by 3. Assume x is <u>not</u> divisible by 3. There are two cases for x...

Case 1. x = 3k + 1. Here, $x^2 = 3k(3k + 2) + 1$, so 1 more than a multiple of 3.

Case 2. x = 3k + 2. Here, $x^2 = 3(3k^2 + 4k + 1) + 1$, so also 1 more than a multiple of 3.

In both cases, we have shown that x^2 is <u>not</u> divisible by 3, as was to be shown.

Given any claim p, we can always use proof by contradiction to prove p...

Proof. We prove the claim by contradiction.

- 1. Start by assuming that the statement claimed in p is false.
- 2. Restate your assumption in mathematical terms, as necessary.
- 3. Use mathematical and logical derivations to derive a conflicting truth, i.e., a contradiction that must be false.
- 4. End by concluding that the assumption in step 1 is false, so p must be true.

Given claim P(n), we construct a proof by induction to show P(n) holds for all $n \ge n_0$

Proof. We use induction to prove $\forall n \geq n_0 : P(n)$. [We often set $n_0 = 1$.]

- 1. Show that $P(n_0)$ is **T**. [Base case.]
- 2. Show that $P(n) \rightarrow P(n+1)$ for a general $n \ge n_0$. [Induction step.]

Direct proof: Proof by contraposition: Assume P(n) is **T**. Assume P(n+1) is **F**. Show P(n+1) is **T**. Show P(n) is \mathbf{F} .

3. Conclude therefore that P(n) holds for all $n \ge n_0$.

Prove claim $P(n) = "1 + 2 + ... + n = \frac{n(n+1)}{2}$ " using induction

Proof. We use induction to prove $\forall n \geq 1 : P(n)$.

- 1. [Base case] $P(1) = \frac{1}{2}(1)(1+1) = 1$. P(1) is **T**.
- 2. [Induction step] We show $P(n) \rightarrow P(n+1)$ for all $n \ge 1$ via a direct proof.

Assume (induction hypothesis) that P(n) is T.

Prove
$$P(n+1)$$
: 1 + 2 + ... + n + $(n+1)$ = $\frac{(n+1)(n+2)}{2}$.

LHS: 1 + 2 + ... + n + (n+1) = [1 + 2 + ... + n] + (n+1)

plug in the induction hypothesis...
$$= \frac{n(n+1)}{2} + (n+1) = \frac{1}{2} (n+1)(n+1+1).$$

3. By induction, we have proven P(n) for all $n \ge 1$.

prove using the Well-Ordering I Claim 3. $P(n) = n \le 2^n$. Prove $\forall n \ge 1$, P(n) is **T**.

Proof. We prove $\forall n \geq 1 : P(n)$ by contradiction.

Assume there is a counter-example that shows P(n) to be **F**, i.e., $\exists n : n > 2^n$.

Collect all counter-examples into set B.

By the Well-Ordering Principle, set B has minimum element n_* , with $n_* > 2^{n_*}$.

Observe $1 < 2^1$, so $n_* \ge 2$, or $\frac{1}{2} n_* \ge 1$. Next, consider $n_* - 1$: based on our initial

 \rightarrow $n_* - 1 \ge n_* - \frac{1}{2} n_* = \frac{1}{2} n_* > \frac{1}{2} 2^{n_*} = 2^{n_*-1}$

Thus, $n_* - 1 > 2^{n_* \cdot 1}$, but if $n_* - 1 \in B$, it must be smaller than n_* —a contradiction!

Therefore, we have proven that $\forall n \geq 1 : P(n)$ is **T**.

1. [Base case] For Q(4), we have $4^2 \le 2^4$ and $2(4) + 1 \le 16$, both of which are T.

Proof. We use induction to prove $\forall n \geq 4 : Q(n)$.

2. [Induction step] Assume Q(n) is T, i.e., (i) $n^2 \le 2^n$ and (ii) $2n + 1 \le 2^n$.

we strengthen the claim, so we assume more

Notes: ${\rm NEGATION:}\ a \lor b => \neg a \land \neg b; \ a \land b => \neg a \lor \neg b; \ if\ a,\ then\ b = a \to b => a \land \neg b$ CSCI-2200 FOCS F 2022 Crib Sheet Exam 1 Tuesday, October 5, 2022 Hayden Fuller

 $\forall x: (\exists y: 2x-y=0) = T(\text{already know } x); \exists y: (\forall x: 2x-y=0) = F(\text{can't predict } x);$ $\forall x,A(x)=>\exists x: \lnot A(x); \exists x: A(x)=> \forall x\lnot A(x)$

 $\exists y: (\forall x: xy = 0) = T(\mathbf{x} \text{ doesn't matter}, \mathbf{y} = 0)$

LHS (i): $(n+1)^2 = n^2 + 2n + 1 \le 2^n + 2n + 1 \le 2^n + 2^n = 2^{n+1}$.

LHS (ii): $2(n+1) + 1 = 2 + 2n + 1 \le 2^n + 2^n = 2^{n+1}$

Both (i) and (ii) together prove Q(n + 1) is **T**.

We must prove Q(n+1), i.e., (i) $(n+1)^2 \le 2^{n+1}$ and (ii) $2(n+1)+1 \le 2^{n+1}$.

using initial assumption (ii) and the fact that $2 \le 2^n$

Given claim $P(n): n^3 \le 2^n$, prove $\forall n \ge 10$, P(n) is **T** using k-leaping induction

3. By induction, we have proven Q(n) for all $n \ge 4$, which also proves claim P(n).

statement: $p \to q$ converse: $q \to p$ inverse: $\neg p \to \neg q$ contrapositive: $\neg q \to \neg p$ \cup union; \cap intersection; \subseteq proper subset; \subseteq subset(can be equal);

What type of proof is appropriate? Contradiction:

 \mp here is a prime number greater than ab

 $\vec{2}$ is irrational for any integer p>2, given: $a,b,c,n\in\mathbb{N},$ $n>2,^n\!+b^n=c^n$

Contraposition:

Direct:

if n and q are natural numbers, then there exists unique intergers d and r satisfying n = dq + r, There is an even number grater than ab (either ab+1 or ab+2 is even) with $d \in 0 \cup \mathbb{N}$ and $0 \le r \le q$.

Leaping induction:

 $(a+b)^{n-2}$ $= a^n + b^n$, when n is a natural number. $n^2 \le 2^n$ for all n > 4

 $\leq 2^n \text{ for all } n \geq 4$

5 divides 1ⁿ $-6 \text{ for all } n \ge 5$; show 5 divides 1¹ $-6 \text{ and show for } n \ge 5$, if 5 divides 1ⁿ-6, then 5 divides $1 I^{+1} - 6$

Weak induction:

 $11^n - 6$ is divisible by 5 if n is a natural number.

3. By 2-leaping induction, we have proven P(n) for all $n \ge 10$. Consider P(n), the Fundamental Theorem of Arithmetic, which states that for all $n \ge 2$, we can write n as the product of one or more prime numbers

Thus, $P(n) \rightarrow P(n+2)$ is shown to be **T**.

observe that $6 \le n$, $12 \le n^2$, and $8 \le n^3$

For n³ to emerge, if n ≥ 10,

[Induction step] Assume $n^3 \le 2^n$. We must prove P(n+2), i.e., $(n+2)^3 \le 2^{n+2}$.

LHS: $(n + 2)^3 = n^3 + 6n^2 + 12n + 8 \le n^3 + n^2 + n^2 + n^3 + n^3$

 $= 4n^3 \le 4 \cdot 2^n = 2^{n+2}$.

1. [Base cases] For P(10), we have $10^3 \le 2^{10}$, or $1000 \le 1024$, which is T.

Proof. We use 2-leaping induction to prove $\forall n \geq 10 : P(n)$

And for P(11), we have $11^3 \le 2^{11}$, or $1331 \le 2048$, which is **T**.

Claim Q(n) is $P(2) \wedge P(3) \wedge ... \wedge P(n)$, i.e., 2, 3, ..., n are <u>all</u> products of prime numbers

Proof. We prove by induction that Q(n) is **T** for $n \ge 2$.

1. [Base case] Q(2) = P(2), i.e., 2 is a product of prime numbers, which is **T**.

Appears clear how if result is F, the assumption will be F

Appears clear how result follows from assumption

Situation

Proof Method

2. [Induction step] We show $Q(n) \to Q(n+1)$ for all $n \ge 2$ via a direct proof.

We must prove Q(n+1) is T: each of 2, 3, ..., n, n+1 is a product of primes. Assume Q(n) is **T**: each of 2, 3, ..., n is a product of prime numbers.

By our induction hypothesis, Q(n), observe that 2, 3, ..., n are products of primes. Therefore, we need only prove that n+1 is a product of primes—two cases:

Case 1. n+1 is prime. In this case, nothing more to prove.

Case 2. n+1 is not prime, so n+1=kl, where $2\leq k,l\leq n$. From our induction hypothesis, both P(k) and P(l) are ${\bf T}$, which shows k and l to be products of primes.

Disprove something is true for all objects Prove something is true for all objects

Show a counter-example

Show for general object

Prove something does not exist

Prove something exists 3 Disprove an implication

Show a counter-example

Contraposition

Direct proof

Show an example

Contradiction

Contradiction

Prove something is unique

Therefore, $n+1=k\ell$ is a product of primes and Q(n+1) is shown to be **T**. 3. By induction, Q(n) is **T** for all $n \ge 2$. Claim Q(n): (i) Any $2^n \times 2^n$ grid with $n \ge 1$ minus a <u>center</u> square can be L-tiled; and (ii) Any $2^n \times 2^n$ grid with $n \ge 1$ minus a <u>corner</u> square can be L-tiled

Proof. We prove claim Q(n) for all $n \ge 1$ by induction.

- 1. [Base case] Q(1) holds for center and corner squares:
- 2. [Induction step] We prove $Q(n) \to Q(n+1)$ for $n \ge 1$ using a direct proof.

and (ii) Any $2^n \times 2^n$ grid minus a corner square can be L-tiled. Assume Q(n): (i) Any $2^n \times 2^n$ grid minus a center square can be L-tiled;

Prove Q(n+1): (i) Any $2^{n+1} \times 2^{n+1}$ grid minus a center square can be L-tiled; and (ii) Any $2^{n+1} \times 2^{n+1}$ grid minus a corner square can be L-tiled.

(i) For a $2^{n+1} \times 2^{n+1}$ grid missing a center square, ...

(ii) For a $2^{n+1} \times 2^{n+1}$ grid missing a corner square, ...