

Sean Reilly

Assignment: Section 5.2: 2, 4, 12, 30 (7th edition)

2.

Basis: We are told the first 3 dominoes fall, so  $P(1)$  is true.

Inductive: Assuming the inductive hypothesis that  $P(j)$  is true for any positive integer  $j < k$ , we must show that  $P(k+1)$  is true. If  $k = 2$ , because the first domino falls, we know that the domino three farther down in the arrangement also falls. Namely, the domino in position 4 falls. Since we are told that the dominoes at 2 and 3 fall, we know that  $P(2)$  is true. If  $k > 2$ , then the inductive hypothesis told us that  $P(k-2)$  is true, which means that the dominoes at  $n-2$ ,  $n-1$  and  $n$  position fall. Because when a domino falls, the domino three farther down in the arrangement also falls, we know that the dominoes at the  $n+1$ ,  $n+2$ ,  $n+3$ , which shows that  $P(n)$  is true. So we have proved that  $P(n)$  is true for all positive integers. Because for all possible integer  $n$ , the dominoes at the  $n$ ,  $n+1$  and  $n+2$  position in an infinite arrangement fall, we show that all dominoes in the infinite arrangement fall.

4.

a)  $P(18)$  is true using one 4 cent stamp and 2 7 cent stamps.  $P(19)$  is true using one 7 cent stamp and 3 4 cent stamps.  $P(20)$  is true using 5 4 cent stamps.  $P(21)$  is true using 3 7 cent stamps.

b) The inductive hypothesis  $P(k)$  is that just use 4-cent and 7-cent stamps, we can form  $i$  cents postage for all  $i$  with  $18 \leq i \leq k$ , where we assume that  $k \geq 18$ .

c) Need to prove that  $k+1$  cents postage using only 4 and 7 cent stamps

d) Because  $k \geq 21$  is true you can deduce that  $k+1$  cents of postage is true because we know that  $P(k-3)$  is true

e) Since the basis and inductive step are completed, the statement for every int over 18 is true

12.

Basis:  $P(1)$  implies that  $1 = 2^0$  and  $P(2)$  implies that  $2 = 2^1$

Inductive: Let  $k \geq 1$ , and assume the claim holds for all  $n$  with  $1 \leq n \leq k$ . We wish to show that the claim holds for  $k+1$ .

Case 1:  $k+1$  is even. If  $k+1$  is even, then  $(k+1)/2$  is an integer. Moreover, it is an integer between 1 and  $k$ . By strong inductive hypothesis, the claim holds for  $(k+1)/2$ . This lets us write  $k+1/2 = 2^{a_1} + 2^{a_2} + \dots + 2^{a_m}$ , where  $a_1, \dots, a_m$  are all distinct. Multiplying both sides by 2 yields

$k+1 = 2(2^{a_1} + 2^{a_2} + \dots + 2^{a_m}) = 2^{a_1+1} + 2^{a_2+1} + \dots + 2^{a_m+1}$ . Since  $a_1+1, \dots, a_m+1$  are all distinct (because  $a_1, \dots, a_m$  were all distinct, we have written  $k+1$  as a sum of distinct powers of two. Therefore, this is true.

Case 2:  $k+1$  is odd. Using the strong inductive hypothesis, we may write  $k = 2^{b_1} + 2^{b_2} + \dots + 2^{b_t}$ , where  $b_1, \dots, b_t$  are all distinct. Since  $k+1$  is odd, we know  $k$  is even. This implies that none of the  $b_i$ 's are equal to 0: if one were, then we would have:

$k = 2^0 + (\text{higher powers of } 2) = 1 + (\text{an even number})$ ,

meaning  $k$  would be odd, but it's not. Thus we can write:  $k+1 = 1 + 2^{b_1} + 2^{b_2} + \dots + 2^{b_t} = 2^0 + 2^{b_1} + 2^{b_2} + \dots + 2^{b_t}$ , where  $0, b_1, \dots, b_t$  are all distinct. This means we have written  $k+1$  as a sum of distinct powers of two, so the claim is true (in the case where  $k+1$  is odd). Having proven the inductive step for the cases of  $k+1$  even and  $k+1$  odd, we have that the inductive step holds. Since the base case

holds, and since the inductive step holds, the claim is true for all positive integers  $n$ ; that is, any positive integer  $n$  can be written as a sum of distinct powers of 2.

30.

Base:  $P(0)$  is equivalent to  $a^0 = 1$ , which is true by definition of  $a^0$ .

Inductive: By induction hypothesis,  $a^k = 1$  for all  $k \in \mathbb{N}$  such that  $k \leq n$ . But then  $a^{n+1} = a^n \times a^n / a^{n-1} = 1 \times 1 / 1 = 1$  which implies that  $P(n + 1)$  holds. It follows by induction that  $P(n)$  holds for all  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , and in particular,  $a^n = 1$  holds for all  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ .

Solution: The flaw comes in the inductive step, where we implicitly assume  $n \geq 1$  in order to talk about  $a^{n-1}$  in the denominator (otherwise the exponent is not a nonnegative integer, so we cannot apply the inductive hypothesis). We checked the base case only for  $n = 0$ , so we are not justified in assuming that  $n \geq 1$  when we try to prove the statement for  $n + 1$  in the inductive step. And of course the proposition first breaks precisely at  $n = 1$ .