



Plantilla de prueba UNAL

Sebastián Echavarría sechavarriam@unal.edu.co

May 18, 2021

Prueba de fuentes regulares

Prueba de fuentes regulares

Prueba de nuevas familias de fuente Ancizar

Familias de texto normales Ancizar

- ▶ Texto normal
- ▶ TEXTO NORMAL MAYÚSCULAS
- ▶ **Texto en negrilla**
- ▶ **TEXTO NEGRILLA MAYÚSCULAS**
- ▶ *Texto en cursiva*
- ▶ *TEXTO EN CURSIVA MAYÚSCULAS*
- ▶ TEXTO EN VERSALITAS
- ▶ TEXTO EN VERSALITAS MAYÚSCULAS

Nuevas Familias de Texto

SANS Y SERIF FUENTE SEPARADA

SansBlackItalic

SansBlackItalic

SansBlack

SansExtraboldItalic

SansExtrabold

SansLightItalic

SansLight

SerifExtraboldItalic

SerifExtrabold

SerifLightItalic

SerifLight

Texto de prueba

$$\int_{\Omega}^{\infty} f(x) d\mu \quad (1)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \phi^h &= \min_{\phi \in \mathbb{R}^{n_l}} \left\{ \left\| \mathbf{r}(w, \mathbf{b}, \phi) \right\|_2 \right\} \\ &= \min_{\phi \in \mathbb{R}^{n_l}} \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^{n_s} \sqrt{w_i \mathbf{r}_i^2} \right\} = \min_{\phi \in \mathbb{R}^{n_l}} \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^{n_s} w_i \mathbf{r}_i^2 \right\}. \quad (2) \end{aligned}$$

There Is No Largest Prime Number

THE PROOF USES REDUCTIO AD ABSURDUM.

Theorem

There is no largest prime number.

Proof.

1. Suppose p were the largest prime number.
2. Consider the number $p + 1$.
3. $p + 1$ is not prime, because it is divisible by p .
4. But $p + 1$ is greater than p , thus divisible by some prime number not in the first p numbers. □

There Is No Largest Prime Number

THE PROOF USES REDUCTIO AD ABSURDUM.

Theorem

There is no largest prime number.

Proof.

1. Suppose p were the largest prime number.
2. Let q be the product of the first p numbers.
3. q is not prime, since it is divisible by all the first p numbers.
4. But $q + 1$ is greater than 1, thus divisible by some prime number not in the first p numbers. □

There Is No Largest Prime Number

THE PROOF USES REDUCTIO AD ABSURDUM.

Theorem

There is no largest prime number.

Proof.

1. Suppose p were the largest prime number.
2. Let q be the product of the first p numbers.
3. Then $q + 1$ is not divisible by any of them.
4. But $q + 1$ is greater than 1, thus divisible by some prime number not in the first p numbers. □

There Is No Largest Prime Number

THE PROOF USES REDUCTIO AD ABSURDUM.

Theorem

There is no largest prime number.

Proof.

1. Suppose p were the largest prime number.
2. Let q be the product of the first p numbers.
3. Then $q + 1$ is not divisible by any of them.
4. But $q + 1$ is greater than 1, thus divisible by some prime number not in the first p numbers. □

The proof used *reductio ad absurdum*.