CSC236 Worksheet 2 Solution

Hyungmo Gu

April 30, 2020

Question 1

- <u>**Statement:**</u> Any full binary tree with at least 1 node has more leaves than internal nodes.

Proof. Let n be the total number of nodes in a full binary tree.

We will prove the statement by complete induction on n.

<u>**Base Case ($n = 1$):**</u>

Let $n = 1$.

We need to prove the full binary tree with 1 total number of nodes has more leaves than internal nodes.

There is only one full binary tree exists with 1 total number of node. That is, the full binary tree with 1 child node and 0 internal nodes.

Then, since we know a node is a leaf if it has no children, and since we know the child node has 0 children, we can write the child node is a leaf node.

Then, because we know the full binary tree has 1 leaf node, and 0 internal node, we can conclude it has more leaves than internal nodes.

<u>**Base Case ($n = 2$):**</u>

Let $n = 2$.

We need to prove the full binary tree with 2 total number of nodes has more leaves than internal nodes.

The definition of full binary tree tells us that a binary tree is a full binary tree if every internal node has two children.

Since we know the tree with 2 total number of nodes has 1 leaf and 1 internal node, using above fact, we can write the tree is not a full binary tree.

Then, by vacuous truth, we can conclude the tree has more leaves than internal nodes.

Base Case ($n = 3$):

Let $n = 3$.

We need to prove the full binary tree with 3 total number of nodes has more leaves than internal nodes.

The definition of full binary tree tells us that a binary tree is a full binary tree if every internal node has two children.

Because we know there are two types of binary trees possible, one is the tree with 2 internal nodes and 1 child and the other is 1 internal node and 2 children, using above fact, we can write the only possible full binary tree with 3 total nodes is 1 internal node and 2 children.

Now, the definition of leaf tells us leaf is a node that has no children.

Because we know by observation that the 2 child nodes don't have children, we can write the full binary tree has 2 leaves.

So, because we know the full binary tree has 1 internal node and 2 leaves, we can conclude the full binary tree has more leaves than internal node.

Inductive Step:

Let $k \geq 1$ be an arbitrary natural number. Assume that for all natural number i satisfying $1 \leq i \leq k$, any full binary trees with i total number of nodes has more leaves than internal nodes.

Let T be an arbitrary full binary tree with $k + 1$ nodes. Let T' be the binary tree obtained by removing 2 leaves from the same parent node.

Let ℓ be the number of leaves of T, and m be the number of internal nodes of T. Similarly, let ℓ' be the number of leaves of T' and m' be the number of internal nodes of T'. We must prove $l > m$.

First, we need to show $\ell' > m'$.

The header tells us that T' is a full binary tree as a result of removing 2 leaves from the parent node of T.

Using this fact, we can calculate T' has

$$k + 1 - 2 = k - 1 \tag{1}$$

nodes.

Then, because we know $1 \leq k - 1 \leq k$, using induction hypothesis, we can write

$$\ell' > m' \tag{2}$$

Second, we need to show $\ell = \ell' + 1$ and $m = m' + 1$.

The total number of both the leaf nodes and the internal nodes increase by 1 when 2 nodes are added to the same leaf node in a full binary tree.

Since 2 nodes added to the same leaf node of T' is T, we can write $\ell = \ell' + 1$ and $m = m' + 1$.

Finally, putting together, because we know $\ell' > m'$, $\ell = \ell' + 1$ and $m = m' + 1$, we can conclude

$$\ell' + 1 > m' + 1 \tag{3}$$
$$\ell > m \tag{4}$$

□

Notes:

- Complete Induction
  * **Statement:** $\forall i \in \mathbb{N},\ \forall n \in \mathbb{N},\ n < i \Rightarrow A(n) \Rightarrow \forall i \in \mathbb{N},\ A(i)$
  * **Statement Alt.:** $\left(\forall n \in \mathbb{N},\ \left[\bigwedge_{k=0}^{k=n-1} P(k)\right] \Rightarrow P(n)\right) \Rightarrow \forall n \in \mathbb{N}, P(n)$

* **Simple Example 1:**

<u>**Statement:**</u> $\forall n \in \mathbb{N},\ n \geq 0 \Rightarrow 10 \mid (n^5 - n)$

We will prove the statement by strong induction on n.

1. Base Case ($n = 0$)

   Let $n = 0$.

   We need to prove $10 \mid (n^5 - n)$ is true when $n = 0$. That is, there exists $k \in \mathbb{Z}$ such that $(n^5 - n) = 10k$.

   Let $k = 0$.

   Starting from the left hand side, using the fact $n = 0$, we can write

   $$(n^5 - n) = 0 \tag{5}$$

   Then, because we know $10k = 0$, we can conclude

   $$(n^5 - n) = 10k \tag{6}$$

2. Base Case ($n = 1$)

Let $n = 1$.

We need to prove $10 \mid (n^5 - n)$ is true when $n = 1$. That is, there exists $k \in \mathbb{Z}$ such that $(n^5 - n) = 10k$.

Let $k = 0$.

Starting from the left hand side, using the fact $n = 0$, we can write

$$\begin{aligned}(n^5 - n) &= 1 - 1 && (7)\\ &= 0 && (8)\end{aligned}$$

Then, because we know $10k = 0$, we can conclude

$$(n^5 - n) = 10k \tag{9}$$

3. Inductive Step

Assume $k \geq 1$. Assume that for all natural number i satisfying $0 \leq i \leq k$, $10 \mid (i^5 - i)$. That is, $\exists d \in \mathbb{Z}$, $(i^5 - i) = 10d$.

We need to prove $\exists \tilde{d} \in \mathbb{Z}$ such that $((k+1)^5 - (k+1)) = 10\tilde{d}$.

Let $\tilde{d} = c + (k-1)^4 + 4 \cdot (k-1)^3 + 8 \cdot (k-1)^2 + 8 \cdot (k-1) + 3$.

Starting from $((k+1)^5 - (k+1))$, using binominal theorem, we can write,

$$
\begin{aligned}
(k+1)^5 - (k+1) &= \Big[(k-1)+2\Big]^5 - \Big[(k-1)+2\Big] && (10)\\
&= \sum_{b=0}^{5} \binom{5}{b} (k-1)^{5-b} \cdot 2^b && (11)\\
&= (k-1)^5 + 10 \cdot (k-1)^4 + 40 \cdot (k-1)^3 + \\
&\quad 80 \cdot (k-1)^2 + 80 \cdot (k-1) + 32 - \Big[(k-1)+2\Big] && (12)\\
&= \Big[(k-1)^5 - (k-1)\Big] + 10 \cdot (k-1)^4 + \\
&\quad 40 \cdot (k-1)^3 + 80 \cdot (k-1)^2 + 80 \cdot (k-1) + 30 && (13)
\end{aligned}
$$

(The reason why $k-1$ is chosen instead of $k-2$ and $k-3$ is because of the last term $2^5 = 32$, i.e $32 - 2 = 30$)

Then, because we know $0 \leq k-1 \leq k$ and $10 \mid (k-1)^5 - (k-1)$ from the header, we can write $\exists c \in \mathbb{Z}$ such that $(k-1)^5 - (k-1) = 10c$, and

$$
\begin{aligned}
(k+1)^5 - (k+1) &= 10c + 10 \cdot (k-1)^4 + 40 \cdot (k-1)^3 + \\
&\quad 80 \cdot (k-1)^2 + 80 \cdot (k-1) + 30 && (14)\\
(k+1)^5 - (k+1) &= 10 \cdot \Big[c + \cdot (k-1)^4 + 4 \cdot (k-1)^3 + \\
&\quad 8 \cdot (k-1)^2 + 8 \cdot (k-1) + 3\Big] && (15)\\
& && (16)
\end{aligned}
$$

Then, because we know $\tilde{d} = c + (k-1)^4 + 4 \cdot (k-1)^3 + 8 \cdot (k-1)^2 + 8 \cdot (k-1) + 3$ from the header, we can conclude

$$
(k+1)^5 - (k+1) = 10\tilde{d} \qquad (17)
$$

Question 2

- **Rough Work:**

Let $P(n)$ be the predicate defined as follows

$P(n)$: Postage of exactly n cents can be made using only 3-cent and 4-cent stamps

We will use complete induction to prove the statement holds for $n \geq 7$.

1. Base Case ($n = 13$)

   Let $n = 13$.

   We need to prove the statement is true for $n = 13$. That is, the postage of exactly 13 cents can be made using only 3-cent and 4-cent.

   Because we know $(3 \cdot 3) + (1 \cdot 4) = 13$, we can conclude the statement holds.

2. Base Case ($n = 14$)

   Let $n = 14$.

   We need to prove the statement is true for $n = 14$. That is, the postage of exactly 14 cents can be made using only 3-cent and 4-cent.

   Because we know $(2 \cdot 3) + (2 \cdot 4) = 14$, we can conclude the statement holds.

3. Base Case ($n = 15$)

   Let $n = 15$.

   We need to prove the statement is true for $n = 15$. That is, the postage of exactly 15 cents can be made using only 3-cent and 4-cent.

   Because we know $(1 \cdot 3) + (3 \cdot 4) = 15$, we can conclude the statement holds.

4. Base Case ($n = 16$)

   Let $n = 16$.

   We need to prove the statement is true for $n = 16$. That is, the postage of exactly 16 cents can be made using only 3-cent and 4-cent.

   Because we know $(4 \cdot 3) + (1 \cdot 4) = 16$, we can conclude the statement holds.

5. Base Case ($n = 17$)

   Let $n = 17$.

   We need to prove the statement is true for $n = 17$. That is, the postage of exactly 17 cents can be made using only 3-cent and 4-cent.

   Because we know $(3 \cdot 3) + (2 \cdot 4) = 17$, we can conclude the statement holds.

6. Inductive Step

Question 3