



**PARUL UNIVERSITY - FACULTY OF ENGINEERING & TECHNOLOGY**  
**Department of Applied Science & Humanities**  
**3rd Semester B. Tech (CSE, IT)**  
**Discrete Mathematics (203191206)**  
**UNIT-3B Proofs and Technique**

- Formally, a **theorem** is a statement that can be shown to be true. In mathematical writing, the term theorem is usually reserved for a statement that is considered at least somewhat important.
- Less important theorems sometimes are called **propositions**.
- A theorem may be the universal quantification of a conditional statement with one or more premises and a conclusion.
- We demonstrate that a theorem is true with a **proof**. A proof is a valid argument that establishes the truth of a theorem.
- The statements used in a proof can include **axioms** (or **postulates**), which are statements we assume to be true the premises, if any, of the theorem, and previously proven theorems.
- A less important theorem that is helpful in the proof of other results is called a **lemma** (plural *lemmas* or *lemmata*).
- A **corollary** is a theorem that can be established directly from a theorem that has been proved.
- A **conjecture** is a statement that is being proposed to be a true statement, usually on the basis of some partial evidence, a heuristic argument, or the intuition of an expert.

**Direct Proof:**

A direct proof shows that a conditional statement  $p \rightarrow q$  is true by showing that if  $p$  is true, then  $q$  must also be true, so that the combination  $p$  true and  $q$  false never occurs.

**Definition:** The integer  $n$  is *even* if there exists an integer  $k$  such that  $n = 2k$ , and  $n$  is *odd* if there exists an integer  $k$  such that  $n = 2k + 1$ .

**Example:** Give a direct proof of the theorem “If  $n$  is an odd integer, then  $n^2$  is odd.”

**Solution:** Note that this theorem states  $\forall n (P(n) \rightarrow Q(n))$ , where  $P(n)$  is “ $n$  is an odd integer” and  $Q(n)$  is “ $n^2$  is odd.” As we have said, we will follow the usual convention in mathematical proofs by showing that  $P(n)$  implies  $Q(n)$ , and not explicitly using universal instantiation. To begin a direct proof of this theorem, we assume that the hypothesis of this conditional statement is true, namely, we assume that  $n$  is odd. By the definition of an odd integer, it follows that  $n = 2k + 1$ , where  $k$  is some integer. We want to show that  $n^2$  is also odd. We can square both sides of the equation  $n = 2k + 1$  to obtain a new equation that expresses  $n^2$ . When we do this, we find that  $n^2 = (2k + 1)^2 = 4k^2 + 4k + 1 = 2(2k^2 + 2k) + 1$ . By the definition of an odd integer, we can conclude that  $n^2$  is an odd integer (it is one more than twice an integer). Consequently, we have proved that if  $n$  is an odd integer, then  $n^2$  is an odd integer.

**Proof by Contraposition**

Proofs of theorems of this type that are not direct proofs, that is, that do not start with the premises and end with the conclusion, are called **indirect proofs**.

An extremely useful type of indirect proof is known as **proof by contraposition**.

Proofs by contraposition make use of the fact that the conditional statement  $p \rightarrow q$  is equivalent to its contrapositive,  $\neg q \rightarrow \neg p$ .

**Question:** Prove that if  $n$  is an integer and  $3n + 2$  is odd, then  $n$  is odd.

**Solution:** We first attempt a direct proof. To construct a direct proof, we first assume that  $3n + 2$  is an odd integer. This means that  $3n + 2 = 2k + 1$  for some integer  $k$ . Can we use this fact to show that  $n$  is odd? We see that  $3n + 1 = 2k$ , but there does not seem to be any direct way to conclude that  $n$  is odd. Because our attempt at a direct proof failed, we next try a

proof by contraposition. The first step in a proof by contraposition is to assume that the conclusion of the conditional statement “If  $3n + 2$  is odd, then  $n$  is odd” is false; namely, assume that  $n$  is even. Then, by the definition of an even integer,  $n = 2k$  for some integer  $k$ . Substituting  $2k$  for  $n$ , we find that  $3n + 2 = 3(2k) + 2 = 6k + 2 = 2(3k + 1)$ . This tells us that  $3n + 2$  is even (because it is a multiple of 2), and therefore not odd. This is the negation of the premise of the theorem. Because the negation of the conclusion of the conditional statement implies that the hypothesis is false, the original conditional statement is true. Our proof by contraposition succeeded; we have proved the theorem “If  $3n + 2$  is odd, then  $n$  is odd.”

**Definition:** The real number  $r$  is *rational* if there exist integers  $p$  and  $q$  with  $q \neq 0$  such that  $r = p/q$ .

A real number that is not rational is called *irrational*.

**Question:** Prove that the sum of two rational numbers is rational. (Note that if we include the implicit quantifiers here, the theorem we want to prove is “For every real number  $r$  and every real number  $s$ , if  $r$  and  $s$  are rational numbers, then  $r + s$  is rational.”)

**Solution:** We first attempt a direct proof. To begin, suppose that  $r$  and  $s$  are rational numbers. From the definition of a rational number, it follows that there are integers  $p$  and  $q$ , with  $q \neq 0$ , such that  $r = p/q$ , and integers  $t$  and  $u$ , with  $u \neq 0$ , such that  $s = t/u$ . Can we use this information to show that  $r + s$  is rational? The obvious next step is to add  $r = p/q$  and  $s = t/u$ ,

$$\text{to obtain } r + s = \frac{p}{q} + \frac{t}{u} = \frac{pu + qt}{qu}$$

Because  $q \neq 0$  and  $u \neq 0$ , it follows that  $qu \neq 0$ . Consequently, we have expressed  $r + s$  as the ratio of two integers,  $pu + qt$  and  $qu$ , where  $qu \neq 0$ . This means that  $r + s$  is rational. We have proved that the sum of two rational numbers is rational; our attempt to find a direct proof succeeded.

### **Proofs by Contradiction:**

The statement  $r \wedge \neg r$  is a contradiction whenever  $r$  is a proposition, we can prove that  $p$  is true if we can show that  $\neg p \rightarrow (r \wedge \neg r)$  is true for some proposition  $r$ . Proofs of this type are called **proofs by contradiction**.

**Question:** Show that at least four of any 22 days must fall on the same day of the week.

**Solution:** Let  $p$  be the proposition “At least four of 22 chosen days fall on the same day of the week.” Suppose that  $\neg p$  is true. This means that at most three of the 22 days fall on the same day of the week. Because there are seven days of the week, this implies that at most 21 days could have been chosen, as for each of the days of the week, at most three of the chosen days could fall on that day. This contradicts the premise that we have 22 days under consideration.

That is, if  $r$  is the statement that 22 days are chosen, then we have shown that

$$\neg p \rightarrow (r \wedge \neg r).$$

Consequently, we know that  $p$  is true. We have proved that at least four of 22 chosen days fall on the same day of the week.

**Question:** Show that the statement “Every positive integer is the sum of the squares of two integers” is false.

**Solution:** To show that this statement is false, we look for a counterexample, which is a particular integer that is not the sum of the squares of two integers. It does not take long to find a counterexample, because 3 cannot be written as the sum of the squares of two integers. To show this is the case, note that the only perfect squares not exceeding 3 are  $0^2 = 0$  and  $1^2 = 1$ . Furthermore, there is no way to get 3 as the sum of two terms each of which is 0 or 1. Consequently, we have shown that “Every positive integer is the sum of the squares of two integers” is false.

## Proof Methods and Strategy

**EXHAUSTIVE PROOF** Some theorems can be proved by examining a relatively small number of examples. Such proofs are called **exhaustive proofs**, or **proofs by exhaustion** because these proofs proceed by exhausting all possibilities. An exhaustive proof is a special type of proof by cases where each case involves checking a single example.

**Question:** Prove that  $(n + 1)^3 \geq 3^n$  if  $n$  is a positive integer with  $n \leq 4$ .

**Solution:** We use a proof by exhaustion. We only need verify the inequality  $(n + 1)^3 \geq 3^n$  when  $n = 1, 2, 3$ , and  $4$ . For  $n = 1$ , we have  $(n + 1)^3 = 2^3 = 8$  and  $3^n = 3^1 = 3$ ; for  $n = 2$ , we have  $(n + 1)^3 = 3^3 = 27$  and  $3^n = 3^2 = 9$ ; for  $n = 3$ , we have  $(n + 1)^3 = 4^3 = 64$  and  $3^n = 3^3 = 27$ ; and for  $n = 4$ , we have  $(n + 1)^3 = 5^3 = 125$  and  $3^n = 3^4 = 81$ . In each of these four cases, we see that  $(n + 1)^3 \geq 3^n$ . We have used the method of exhaustion to prove that  $(n + 1)^3 \geq 3^n$  if  $n$  is a positive integer with  $n \leq 4$ .

**PROOF BY CASES:** A proof by cases must cover all possible cases that arise in a theorem.

**Question:** Prove that if  $n$  is an integer, then  $n^2 \geq n$ .

**Solution:** We can prove that  $n^2 \geq n$  for every integer by considering three cases, when  $n = 0$ , when  $n \geq 1$ , and when  $n \leq -1$ . We split the proof into three cases because it is straightforward to prove the result by considering zero, positive integers, and negative integers separately.

*Case (i):* When  $n = 0$ , because  $0^2 = 0$ , we see that  $0^2 \geq 0$ . It follows that  $n^2 \geq n$  is true in this case.

*Case (ii):* When  $n \geq 1$ , when we multiply both sides of the inequality  $n \geq 1$  by the positive integer  $n$ , we obtain  $n \cdot n \geq n \cdot 1$ . This implies that  $n^2 \geq n$  for  $n \geq 1$ .

*Case (iii):* In this case  $n \leq -1$ . However,  $n^2 \geq 0$ . It follows that  $n^2 \geq n$ .

Because the inequality  $n^2 \geq n$  holds in all three cases, we can conclude that if  $n$  is an integer, then  $n^2 \geq n$ .

## Existence Proofs:

A theorem of this type is a proposition of the form  $\exists xP(x)$ , where  $P$  is a predicate. A proof of a proposition of the form  $\exists xP(x)$  is called an **existence proof**. There are several ways to prove a theorem of this type.

Sometimes an existence proof of  $\exists xP(x)$  can be given by finding an element  $a$ , called a **witness**, such that  $P(a)$  is true.

This type of existence proof is called **constructive**. It is also possible to give an existence proof that is **nonconstructive**; that is, we do not find an element  $a$  such that  $P(a)$  is true, but rather prove that  $\exists xP(x)$  is true in some other way.

**Question:** Show that there is a positive integer that can be written as the sum of cubes of positive integers in two different ways.

**Solution:** After considerable computation (such as a computer search) we find that  $1729 = 10^3 + 9^3 = 12^3 + 1^3$ . Because we have displayed a positive integer that can be written as the sum of cubes in two different ways, we are done.

## Proof Strategies

**FORWARD PROOF:** Whichever method you choose, you need a starting point for your proof. To begin a direct proof of a conditional statement, you start with the premises. Using these premises, together with axioms and known theorems, you can construct a proof using a sequence of steps that leads to the conclusion. This type of reasoning, called **forward reasoning**.

**BACKWARD PROOF:** Forward reasoning is often difficult to use to prove more complicated results, because the reasoning needed to reach the desired conclusion may be far from obvious. In such cases it may be helpful to use **backward reasoning**.

**Question:** Given two positive real numbers  $x$  and  $y$ , their **arithmetic mean** is  $(x + y)/2$  and their **geometric mean** is  $\sqrt{xy}$ . When we compare the arithmetic and geometric means of pairs of distinct

positive real numbers, we find that the arithmetic mean is always greater than the geometric mean. [For example, when  $x = 4$  and  $y = 6$ , we have  $5 = (4 + 6) / 2 > \sqrt{4 \cdot 6} = \sqrt{24}$ .] Can we prove that this inequality is always true?

**Solution:** To prove that  $(x + y)/2 > \sqrt{xy}$  when  $x$  and  $y$  are distinct positive real numbers, we can work backward. We construct a sequence of equivalent inequalities. The equivalent inequalities are

$$(x + y)/2 > \sqrt{xy}$$

$$(x + y)^2/4 > xy$$

$$(x + y)^2 > 4xy,$$

$$x^2 + 2xy + y^2 > 4xy,$$

$$x^2 - 2xy + y^2 > 0,$$

$$(x - y)^2 > 0.$$

Because  $(x - y)^2 > 0$  when  $x \neq y$ , it follows that the final inequality is true. Because all these inequalities are equivalent, it follows that  $(x + y)/2 > \sqrt{xy}$  when  $x \neq y$ . Once we have carried out this backward reasoning, we can easily reverse the steps to construct a proof using forward reasoning. We now give this proof. Suppose that  $x$  and  $y$  are distinct positive real numbers. Then  $(x - y)^2 > 0$  because the square of a nonzero real number is positive. Because  $(x - y)^2 = x^2 - 2xy + y^2$ , this implies that  $x^2 - 2xy + y^2 > 0$ . Adding  $4xy$  to both sides, we obtain  $x^2 + 2xy + y^2 > 4xy$ . Because  $(x + y)^2 = x^2 + 2xy + y^2$ , this means that  $(x + y)^2 > 4xy$ .

Dividing both sides of this equation by 4, we see that  $(x + y)^2/4 > xy$ . Finally, taking square roots of both sides (which preserves the inequality because both sides are positive) yields  $(x + y)/2 > \sqrt{xy}$ . We conclude that if  $x$  and  $y$  are distinct positive real numbers, then their arithmetic mean  $(x + y)/2$  is greater than their geometric mean  $\sqrt{xy}$ .