Worksheet 5 Review 2

April 13, 2020

Question 1

- **Statement:** $\forall m, n \in \mathbb{Z},\ (\exists k_1 \in \mathbb{Z},\ m = 2k_1 + 1) \wedge (\exists k_2 \in \mathbb{Z},\ n = 2k_2 + 1) \Rightarrow (\exists k_3 \in \mathbb{Z},\ mn = 2k_3 + 1)$

  Proof. Let $m, n \in \mathbb{Z}$. Assume there is an integer k_1 such that $m = 2k_1 + 1$. Assume there is an integer k_2 such that $n = 2k_2 + 1$. Let $k_3 = (2k_1k_2) + k_1 + k_2$.

  We need to prove $mn = 2k_3 + 1$.

  The assumption tells us $m = 2k_1 + 1$ and $n = 2k_2 + 1$.

  By using these facts and then multiplying them together, we can conclude

$$
\begin{aligned}
mn &= (2k_1 + 1)(2k_2 + 1) && (1)\\
&= 4k_1k_2 + 2k_1 + 2k_2 + 1 && (2)\\
&= 2[(2k_1k_2) + k_1 + k_2] + 1 && (3)\\
&= 2k_3 + 1 && (4)
\end{aligned}
$$

  $\square$

  Notes:

- Noticed professor pre-calculates the value of k_3 as roughwork before writing proof
- Noticed professor uses 'That is...' when expanding definition in writing

> ... and assume they are both odd. That is, we assume there exists $k_1, k_2 \in \mathbb{Z}$ such that $m = 2k_1 - 1$ and $n = 2k_2 - 1$.

- Noticed professor uses 'i.e. ...' when expanding definition in writing.

> We need to prove that mn is odd, i.e. there exists k_3 such that $mn = 2k_3 + 1$.

- Noticed professor defines the header for R.H.S of $\Rightarrow$ operator after 'We need to prove that ...'

> We need to prove that mn is odd, i.e. there exists k_3 such that $mn = 2k_3 + 1$.
>
> **Let** $k_3 = 2k_1k_2 - k_1 - k_2 + 1$

Question 2

a. **Predicate Logic:** $\forall m, n \in \mathbb{Z},\ Even(m) \land Odd(n) \Rightarrow m^2 - n^2 = m + n$

   Predicate Logic Expanded: $\forall m, n \in \mathbb{Z},\ (\exists k_1 \in \mathbb{Z},\ m = 2k_1) \land (\exists k_2 \in \mathbb{Z},\ n = 2k_2 + 1) \Rightarrow m^2 - n^2 = m + n$

b. The value of k used for m and n must not be under the same variable.

Question 3

a. $Dom(f, g) : \forall n \in \mathbb{N},\ g(n) \le f(n)$, where $f, g : \mathbb{N} \to \mathbb{R}^{\ge 0}$

Notes:

- **Definition of is Dominated By:** Let $f, g : \mathbb{N} \to \mathbb{R}^{\ge 0}$. We say that g is **is dominated by** f (or f **dominates** g) when for every natural number n, $g(n) \le f(n)$.

b. *Proof.* Let $f(n) = 3n$ and $g(n) = n$.

We need to prove that g is dominated by f, i.e. for every natural number n, $g(n) \le f(n)$.

The header tells us $g(n) = n$ and $f(n) = 3n$.

Starting from $g(n)$, we can conclude

$$g(n) = n \le 3n \tag{1}$$
$$= f(n) \tag{2}$$

□

Correct Solution:

Let $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $f(n) = 3n$ and $g(n) = n$.

We need to prove that g is dominated by f, i.e. for every natural number n, $g(n) \le f(n)$.

The header tells us $g(n) = n$ and $f(n) = 3n$.

Since $n \ge 0$ from the fact $n \in \mathbb{N}$, starting from $g(n)$, we can conclude

$$
\begin{aligned}
g(n) = n &\leq 3n && (1) \\
&= f(n) && (2)
\end{aligned}
$$

Notes:

- Are there proof equivalent of program compliers or unit testing program? Is there a quick proof checklist one can go through to make sure the author avoids common mistakes?

Question 4