CSC165H1 WINTER 2018: PROBLEM SET 3

BY: ERIC KOEHLI, JACOB CHMURA, CONOR VEDOVA

Date: March 14, 2018.

1. Special numbers

define $F_n = 2^{2^n} + 1$. Prove that

$$\forall n \in \mathbb{N}, F_n - 2 = \prod_{i=0}^{n-1} F_i$$

From the definition above, it follows that (1): $F_n - 2 = 2^{2^n} + 1 - 2 = 2^{2^n} - 1$.

Proof. Let P(n) be the statement $F_n - 2 = \prod_{i=0}^{n-1} F_i$, where $n \in \mathbb{N}$. We will show that P(n) is true for all natural numbers by induction on n.

Base Case:

Let n = 0. Then,

$$F_0 - 2 = 2^{2^0} + 1 - 2$$
$$= 2^1 - 1$$
$$= 1$$

On the other hand, when a products lower bound is greater than it's upper bound, the product is empty. Therefore,

$$\prod_{i=0}^{0-1} F_i = 1 = F_0 - 2$$

This shows that P(0) is true.

Inductive Step:

Let $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and assume that P(k) is true. That is, $\forall k \in \mathbb{N}, F_k - 2 = \prod_{i=0}^{k-1} F_i$. We want to show that P(k+1) is true, that is,

$$F_{k+1} - 2 = \prod_{i=0}^{k} F_i$$

From the LHS we have,

$$F_{k+1} - 2 = 2^{2^{k+1}} + 1 - 2$$

$$= (2^{2^k})^2 - 1$$

$$= (2^{2^k} - 1)(2^{2^k} + 1)$$
(By (1))
$$= (F_k - 2)(2^{2^k} + 1)$$

$$= \left(\prod_{i=0}^{k-1} F_i\right) \cdot F_k$$

$$= \prod_{i=0}^k F_i$$

Thus P(k+1) follows from P(k), and this completes the induction step. Having proved steps 1 and 2, we can conclude by the Axiom of Induction that P(n) is true for all natural numbers n.

2. Sequences

Define $a_0 = 1$, and for all natural numbers n,

$$a_{n+1} = \frac{1}{\frac{1}{a_n} + 1}$$

- (a) $a_0 = 1$, $a_1 = \frac{1}{2}$, $a_2 = \frac{1}{3}$, $a_3 = \frac{1}{4}$
- (b) Since the numerator of the sequence is constant, we can put 1 in the numerator. As n increases, the denominator is increasing by one, and since we are starting at n = 0, we can write $a_n = \frac{1}{n+1}$.

Prove that for all natural numbers n,

$$a_n = \frac{1}{n+1}$$

Proof. Let P(n) be the statement $a_n = \frac{1}{n+1}$. We will show that P(n) is true for all natural numbers n.

Base Case:

Let n = 0. Then

$$a_0 = \frac{1}{0+1} = 1$$

and $a_0 = 1$ by definition. This shows that P(0) is true.

Inductive Step:

Let $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and assume that P(k) is true. That is, for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$, $a_k = \frac{1}{k+1}$. We want to show that P(k+1) is true. That is,

$$a_{k+1} = \frac{1}{k+2}$$

Starting from the recursive definition, we have

(By the induction hypothesis)

$$a_{k+1} = \frac{1}{\frac{1}{a_k} + 1}$$

$$= \frac{1}{\frac{1}{\frac{1}{k+1}} + 1}$$

$$= \frac{1}{k+1+1}$$

$$= \frac{1}{k+2}$$

Thus P(k+1) follows from P(k), and this completes the induction step. Having proved steps 1 and 2, we can conclude by the Axiom of Induction that P(n) is true for all natural numbers n.

Define $a_{k,0} = k$, and for all natural numbers n,

$$a_{k,n+1} = \frac{k}{\frac{1}{a_{k,n}} + 1}$$

- (c) $a_{2,0} = 2$, $a_{2,1} = \frac{4}{3}$, $a_{2,2} = \frac{8}{7}$, $a_{2,3} = \frac{16}{15}$, and $a_{3,0} = 3$, $a_{3,1} = \frac{9}{4}$, $a_{3,2} = \frac{27}{13}$, $a_{3,3} = \frac{81}{40}$
- (d) Prove that for all natural numbers k and n, that,

$$k > 1 \Rightarrow a_{k,n} = \frac{k^{n+1}}{\sum_{i=0}^{n} k^i}$$

Proof. Let $k \in \mathbb{N}$. Assume that k > 1. Let P(n) be the statement

$$a_{k,n} = \frac{k^{n+1}}{\sum_{i=0}^{n} k^i}$$

where $n \in \mathbb{N}$. We will show that P(n) is true for all natural numbers k > 1, n, by Mathematical Induction on n.

Base Case:

Let n = 0. In this case, we have

$$a_{k,0} = \frac{k^1}{\sum_{i=0}^0 k^i} = \frac{k}{k^0} = k$$

This is the same result as the definition of $a_{k,0}$, so P(0) is satisfied.

Inductive Step:

Let $t \in \mathbb{N}$ and assume that P(t) is true. That is, we assume

$$a_{k,t} = \frac{k^{t+1}}{\sum_{i=0}^{t} k^i}$$

and we want to show that P(t+1) is true. That is,

$$a_{k,t+1} = \frac{k^{t+2}}{\sum_{i=0}^{t+1} k^i}$$

By the recursive definition,

(By induction hypothesis)

$$a_{k,t+1} = \frac{k}{\frac{1}{a_{k,t}} + 1}$$

$$= \frac{k}{\frac{\sum_{i=0}^{t} k^{i}}{k^{t+1}} + 1}$$

$$= \frac{k}{\frac{\sum_{i=0}^{t} k^{i} + k^{t+1}}{k^{t+1}}}$$

$$= \frac{k \cdot k^{t+1}}{\sum_{i=0}^{t} k^{i} + k^{t+1}}$$

$$= \frac{k^{t+2}}{\sum_{i=0}^{t+1} k^{i}}$$

Thus P(t+1) follows from P(t), and this completes the induction step. Since we fixed k to be an arbitrary natural number greater than 1 prior to the induction, it must be the case that the result holds for all natural numbers k greater than 1. Having proved steps 1 and 2, we can now conclude by the Axiom of Induction that P(n) is true for all natural numbers k > 1 and n.

3. Properties of Asymptotic Notation

(a) Define
$$Sum_f(n) = \sum_{i=0}^n f(i) = f(0) + f(1) + \dots + f(n)$$
.
Prove that for all $f: \mathbb{N} \to \mathbb{R}^{\geqslant 0}, f \in O(n) \implies Sum_f \in O(n^2)$

Proof. Let $f: \mathbb{N} \to \mathbb{R}^{\geq 0}$ and assume that $f \in O(n)$. That is, $\exists c_0, n_0 \in \mathbb{R}^+, \forall n \in \mathbb{N}, n \geq n_0 \implies f(n) \leq c_0 \cdot n$

Want to show that the sum of the arbitrary function f is in $O(n^2)$. That is, $Sum_f(n) \in O(n^2)$. Or, in expanded form,

$$\exists c_1, n_1 \in \mathbb{R}^+, \forall n \in \mathbb{N}, n \ge n_1 \implies Sum_f(n) \le c_1 \cdot n^2$$

Let c_0, n_0 be such that $f \in O(n)$ for these values. Let $c_1 = \sum_{i=0}^{n_0-1} f(i) + c_0$ and $n_1 = \max(n_0, 1)$. Let $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and assume $n \ge n_1$. We know that $n \ge n_1 \ge n_0$. So, it follows that $f(n) \le c \cdot n$. Using this, let's analyze the following sum:

$$\sum_{i=0}^{n} f(i) = \sum_{i=0}^{n_0 - 1} f(i) + \sum_{i=n_0}^{n} f(i)$$

$$\leq \sum_{i=0}^{n_0 - 1} f(i) + \sum_{i=n_0}^{n} c_0 n$$

$$= \sum_{i=0}^{n_0 - 1} f(i) + (n - n_0) \cdot c_0 n$$

$$= \sum_{i=0}^{n_0 - 1} f(i) - c_0 n n_0 + c_0 n^2$$

Since for any $k \in \mathbb{R}^{\geqslant 0}$ and $n \geq 1$, $k \leq k \cdot n^2$, which holds by the way n_1 was chosen,

(Because
$$f(n) \ge 0$$
)
$$\sum_{i=0}^{n_0-1} f(i) \le (\sum_{i=0}^{n_0-1} f(i)) \cdot n^2$$

So,

$$\sum_{i=0}^{n_0-1} f(i) - c_0 n n_0 + c_0 n^2 \le \left(\sum_{i=0}^{n_0-1} f(i)\right) \cdot n^2 - c_0 n n_0 + c_0 n^2$$

$$(\text{since } -c_0 n n_0 \le 0)$$

$$\le \left(\sum_{i=0}^{n_0-1} f(i)\right) \cdot n^2 + c_0 n^2$$

$$= \left(\sum_{i=0}^{n_0-1} f(i)\right) + c_0\right) \cdot n^2$$

$$= c_1 \cdot n^2$$

So, it follows that $Sum_f(n) \leq c_1 \cdot n^2$. Therefore, $Sum_f(n) \in O(n^2)$

(b) Prove that for all natural numbers n,

$$\sum_{i=1}^{2^n} \frac{1}{i} \ge \frac{n}{2}$$

Proof. Let P(n) be the statement above, where $n \in \mathbb{N}$. We will prove that P(n) is true for all natural numbers by mathematical induction.

Base Case:

Let n = 0. Then we have,

$$\sum_{i=1}^{2^0} \frac{1}{i} = \sum_{i=1}^{1} \frac{1}{i} = 1 \ge \frac{0}{2} = \frac{n}{2}$$

This shows that P(0) is true.

Inductive Step:

Let $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and assume that P(k) is true. That is,

$$\sum_{i=1}^{2^k} \frac{1}{i} \ge \frac{k}{2}$$

We want to show that P(k+1) is true. That is,

$$\sum_{i=1}^{2^{k+1}} \frac{1}{i} \ge \frac{k+1}{2}$$

Analyzing the left hand side,

$$\sum_{i=1}^{2^{k+1}} \frac{1}{i} = \sum_{i=1}^{2^k} \frac{1}{i} + \frac{1}{2^k + 1} + \frac{1}{2^k + 2} + \dots + \frac{1}{2^k + 2^k}$$
$$\ge \frac{k}{2} + \frac{1}{2^k + 1} + \frac{1}{2^k + 2} + \dots + \frac{1}{2^k + 2^k}$$

(By induction Hypothesis)

Now to proceed with the proof, it will be shown that $\frac{1}{2^{k}+1} + \frac{1}{2^{k}+2} + \dots + \frac{1}{2^{k}+2^{k}} \ge \frac{1}{2}$. Notice, $\frac{1}{2^{k}+1} + \frac{1}{2^{k}+2} + \dots + \frac{1}{2^{k}+2^{k}} \ge \frac{1}{2^{k}+2^{k}} + \frac{1}{2^{k}+2^{k}} + \dots + \frac{1}{2^{k}+2^{k}}$, since $\frac{1}{2^{k}+k}$ is the smallest element of the summation.

With this fact in mind:

$$\sum_{i=1}^{2^{k+1}} \ge \frac{k}{2} + \frac{1}{2^k + 1} + \frac{1}{2^k + 2} + \dots + \frac{1}{2^k + 2^k}$$

$$\ge \frac{k}{2} + \frac{1}{2^k + 2^k} + \frac{1}{2^k + 2^k} + \dots + \frac{1}{2^k + 2^k}$$

$$= \frac{k}{2} + 2^k \cdot \frac{1}{2^k + 2^k}$$

$$= \frac{k}{2} + \frac{1(2^k)}{2 \cdot 2^k}$$

$$= \frac{k}{2} + \frac{1}{2}$$

$$= \frac{k+1}{2}$$

Thus P(k+1) follows from P(k), and this completes the induction step. Having proved steps 1 and 2, we can conclude by the Principle of Mathematical Induction that P(n) is true for all natural numbers n.

(c) Disprove The following claim:

$$\forall f, g : \mathbb{N} \to \mathbb{R}^{\geq 0}, f(n) \in O(g(n)) \implies Sum_f(n) \in O(n \cdot g(n)).$$

We will prove the negation of the statement:

$$\exists f,g: \mathbb{N} \to \mathbb{R}^{\geq 0}, f(n) \in O(g(n)) \land Sum_f(n) \notin O(n \cdot g(n))$$

Proof. Let
$$f(n) = \frac{1}{n}$$
 and $g(n) = \frac{1}{2 \cdot n}$

First showing $f \in O(g)$:

$$\exists c_0, n_0 \in \mathbb{R}^+, \forall n \in \mathbb{N}, n \geq n_0 \implies \frac{1}{n} \leq c_0 \cdot \frac{1}{2 \cdot n}$$

Let $n_0 = 0$ and $c_0 = 2$ Let $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Assume $n \ge n_0$ Then $\forall n$:

$$f(n) = \frac{1}{n}$$

$$\leq \frac{1}{n}$$

$$= 2 \cdot \frac{1}{2 \cdot n}$$

$$= c_0 \cdot g(n)$$

So by definition, $f \in O(g)$.

Now we will show the following by negating the definition of Big-Oh:

$$Sum_f(n) \notin O(n \cdot g(n))$$
:

$$\forall c_1, n_1 \in \mathbb{R}^{\geq 0}, \exists n \in \mathbb{N}, n \geq n_1 \land Sum_f(n) > c_1 \cdot n \cdot g(n)$$

Let $c_1, n_1 \in \mathbb{R}^{\geq 0}$

Take $n = max(2^{\lceil c_1 \rceil} + 2, 2^{n_1})$ Then it follows that $n \ge 2^{n_1} \ge n_1$, and the first part of the *and* is satisfied.

Also,
$$n > 2^{\lceil c_1 \rceil} \implies log_2 n > \lceil c_1 \rceil \ge c_1$$
. So $log_2 n > c_1(1)$

Importantly, by the way that n was chosen, it must be a power of two. It follows that $log_2n \in \mathbb{N}$. (2)

From (b) we know that for all natural numbers t:

$$\sum_{i=1}^{2^t} \frac{1}{i} \ge \frac{t}{2}$$

Change of variable: Let $t = log_2 n$. By (2) we know that $t \in \mathbb{N}$ and we have:

$$\sum_{i=1}^{n} \frac{1}{i} \ge \frac{\log_2 n}{2}$$

Now we can see that the left side of the inequality is just $Sum_f(n)$, so it follows that:

$$Sum_f(n) \ge \frac{log_2 n}{2}$$

$$= g(n) \cdot n \cdot log_2 n$$

$$((By (1), log_2 n > c_1)$$

$$> g(n) \cdot n \cdot c_1$$

So, $n \ge n_1 \wedge Sum_f(n) > c_1 \cdot n \cdot g(n)$. Therefore, $Sum_f(n) \notin O(n \cdot g(n))$.

Together, we have proven $\exists f, g : \mathbb{N} \to \mathbb{R}^{\geq 0}, f(n) \in O(g(n)) \land Sum_f(n) \notin O(n \cdot g(n))$. Since the negation of the original is proven, the original statement is disproven.