• When you think of induction, one of the best analogies to think about is **ladder**. When you climb up the ladder, you have to step on the lower step and need to go up based on it. After we climb up the several steps, we can go up further by **assuming** that the step you are stepping on exists. With the terms we have covered in class we can make such analogies.

- When you think of induction, one of the best analogies to think about is **ladder**. When you climb up the ladder, you have to step on the lower step and need to go up based on it. After we climb up the several steps, we can go up further by **assuming** that the step you are stepping on exists. With the terms we have covered in class we can make such analogies.
- Base Case: The first step in the ladder you are stepping on

- When you think of induction, one of the best analogies to think about is **ladder**. When you climb up the ladder, you have to step on the lower step and need to go up based on it. After we climb up the several steps, we can go up further by **assuming** that the step you are stepping on exists. With the terms we have covered in class we can make such analogies.
- **Base Case:** The first step in the ladder you are stepping on
- **Induction Hypothesis:** The steps you are assuming to exist

- When you think of induction, one of the best analogies to think about is **ladder**. When you climb up the ladder, you have to step on the lower step and need to go up based on it. After we climb up the several steps, we can go up further by **assuming** that the step you are stepping on exists. With the terms we have covered in class we can make such analogies.
- Base Case: The first step in the ladder you are stepping on
- **Induction Hypothesis:** The steps you are assuming to exist
  - Weak Induction: The step that you are currently stepping on

- When you think of induction, one of the best analogies to think about is **ladder**. When you climb up the ladder, you have to step on the lower step and need to go up based on it. After we climb up the several steps, we can go up further by **assuming** that the step you are stepping on exists. With the terms we have covered in class we can make such analogies.
- Base Case: The first step in the ladder you are stepping on
- **Induction Hypothesis:** The steps you are assuming to exist
  - Weak Induction: The step that you are currently stepping on
  - **Strong Induction:** The steps that you have stepped on before including the current one

- When you think of induction, one of the best analogies to think about is **ladder**. When you climb up the ladder, you have to step on the lower step and need to go up based on it. After we climb up the several steps, we can go up further by **assuming** that the step you are stepping on exists. With the terms we have covered in class we can make such analogies.
- Base Case: The first step in the ladder you are stepping on
- **Induction Hypothesis:** The steps you are assuming to exist
  - Weak Induction: The step that you are currently stepping on
  - **Strong Induction:** The steps that you have stepped on before including the current one
- **Inductive Step:** Going up further based on the steps we assumed to exist

• Inductive proof is composed of **Three** major parts:

- Inductive proof is composed of **Three** major parts:
- **Base Case:** One or more particular cases that represent the most basic case. (e.g. n=1 to prove a statement in the range of positive integer)

- Inductive proof is composed of **Three** major parts:
- **Base Case:** One or more particular cases that represent the most basic case. (e.g. n=1 to prove a statement in the range of positive integer)
- **Induction Hypothesis:** Assumption that we would like to be based on. (e.g. Let's assume that P(k) holds)

- Inductive proof is composed of **Three** major parts:
- **Base Case:** One or more particular cases that represent the most basic case. (e.g. n=1 to prove a statement in the range of positive integer)
- **Induction Hypothesis:** Assumption that we would like to be based on. (e.g. Let's assume that P(k) holds)
- **Inductive Step:** Prove the next step based on the induction hypothesis. (i.e. Show that Induction hypothesis P(k) implies P(k+1))

- Inductive proof is composed of **Three** major parts:
- **Base Case:** One or more particular cases that represent the most basic case. (e.g. n=1 to prove a statement in the range of positive integer)
- **Induction Hypothesis:** Assumption that we would like to be based on. (e.g. Let's assume that P(k) holds)
- **Inductive Step:** Prove the next step based on the induction hypothesis. (i.e. Show that Induction hypothesis P(k) implies P(k+1))

When you write down the solutions using induction, it is always a great idea to think about this template.

- This part was already covered in our main lecture but here we'll again study it explicitly.
- However, it is always a good idea to keep this in mind regarding the differences between weak induction and strong induction.

- This part was already covered in our main lecture but here we'll again study it explicitly. However, it is always a good idea to keep this in mind regarding the differences between weak induction and strong induction.
- The difference between weak induction and strong induction only appears in induction hypothesis.

- This part was already covered in our main lecture but here we'll again study it explicitly. However, it is always a good idea to keep this in mind regarding the differences between weak induction and strong induction.
- The difference between weak induction and strong induction only appears in **induction hypothesis**.
- In weak induction, we only assume that particular statement holds at k<sup>th</sup> step,

- This part was already covered in our main lecture but here we'll again study it explicitly. However, it is always a good idea to keep this in mind regarding the differences between weak induction and strong induction.
- The difference between weak induction and strong induction only appears in **induction hypothesis**.
- In weak induction, we only assume that particular statement holds at k<sup>th</sup> step,
- while in strong induction, we assume that the particular statement holds at all the steps from the base case to k<sup>th</sup> step.

• Prove the following statement is true for all integers n. The statement P(n) can be expressed as bellow.

$$\sum_{i=1}^{n} i = \frac{n(n+1)}{2}$$

• Prove the following statement is true for all integers n. The statement P(n) can be expressed as bellow.

$$\sum_{i=1}^{n} i = \frac{n(n+1)}{2}$$

Base Case: Prove that the statement holds when *n*= 1.

- Prove the following statement is true for all integers n. The statement P(n) can be expressed as bellow.  $\sum_{i=1}^{n} i = \frac{n(n+1)}{2}$
- Base Case: Prove that the statement holds when *n* = 1.
- **Induction Hypothesis:** Assume that the statement holds when n = k.

- Prove the following statement is true for all integers n. The statement P(n) can be expressed as bellow.
  - $\sum_{i=1}^{n} i = \frac{n(n+1)}{2}$
- Base Case: Prove that the statement holds when *n* = 1.
- **Induction Hypothesis:** Assume that the statement holds when n = k.
- **Inductive Step:** Prove that the statement hold when n = k+1 using the above assumption.

- Prove the following statement is true for all integers n. The statement P(n) can be expressed as bellow.
- $\sum_{i=1}^{n} i = \frac{n(n+1)}{2}$
- **Base Case:** Prove that the statement holds when n = 1.
- **Induction Hypothesis:** Assume that the statement holds when n = k.
- **Inductive Step:** Prove that the statement hold when n = k+1 using the above assumption.
- In the exam, many of you will have to struggle in this part. Please pay close attention to how this suggested inductive step uses induction hypothesis for reasoning.

 Prove by induction that every integer greater than or equal to 2 can be factored into primes.
 The statement P(n) is that an integer n greater than or equal to 2 can be factored into primes.

- Prove by induction that every integer greater than or equal to
   2 can be factored into primes. The statement P(n) is that an integer n greater than or equal to 2 can be factored into primes.
- **Base Case:** Prove that the statement holds when n = 2 We are proving P(2).

- Prove by induction that every integer greater than or equal to 2 can be factored into primes. The statement P(n) is that an integer n greater than or equal to 2 can be factored into primes.
- **Base Case:** Prove that the statement holds when n = 2 We are proving P(2).
- 2 itself is a prime number, so the prime factorization of 2 is 2. Trivially, the statement *P*(2) holds.

- Prove by induction that every integer greater than or equal to 2 can be factored into primes. The statement P(n) is that an integer n greater than or equal to 2 can be factored into primes.
- **Base Case:** Prove that the statement holds when n = 2 We are proving P(2).
- 2 itself is a prime number, so the prime factorization of 2 is 2. Trivially, the statement P(2) holds.
- **Induction Hypothesis:** Assume that for all integers less than or equal to k, the statement holds. *Note:* In the previous example, the assumption was only about the case when n = k.

- Prove by induction that every *integer greater than or equal to 2* can be *factored into primes*. The statement *P*(*n*) is that an integer *n greater than or equal to 2* can be *factored into primes*.
- **Base Case:** Prove that the statement holds when n = 2 We are proving P(2).
- 2 itself is a prime number, so the prime factorization of 2 is 2. Trivially, the statement P(2) holds.
- **Induction Hypothesis:** Assume that for all integers less than or equal to k, the statement holds. *Note:* In the previous example, the assumption was only about the case when n = k.
- **Inductive Step:** Consider the number k+1.

- Prove by induction that every *integer greater than or equal to 2* can be *factored into primes*. The statement *P*(*n*) is that an integer *n greater than or equal to 2* can be *factored into primes*.
- **Base Case:** Prove that the statement holds when n = 2 We are proving P(2).
- 2 itself is a prime number, so the prime factorization of 2 is 2. Trivially, the statement P(2) holds.
- **Induction Hypothesis:** Assume that for all integers less than or equal to k, the statement holds. *Note:* In the previous example, the assumption was only about the case when n = k.
- **Inductive Step:** Consider the number k+1.
- *Case 1:* k+1 is a prime number. When k+1 is a prime number, the number is a prime factorization of itself. Therefore, the statement P(k+1) holds.

- Prove by induction that every *integer greater than or equal to 2* can be *factored into primes*. The statement P(n) is that an integer n *greater than or equal to 2* can be *factored into primes*.
- **Base Case:** Prove that the statement holds when n = 2 We are proving P(2).
- 2 itself is a prime number, so the prime factorization of 2 is 2. Trivially, the statement P(2) holds.
- **Induction Hypothesis:** Assume that for all integers less than or equal to k, the statement holds. *Note:* In the previous example, the assumption was only about the case when n = k.
- **Inductive Step:** Consider the number *k*+1.
- *Case 1:* k+1 is a prime number. When k+1 is a prime number, the number is a prime factorization of itself. Therefore, the statement P(k+1) holds.
- Case 2: k+1 is not a prime number.

- Prove by induction that every *integer greater than or equal to 2* can be *factored into primes*. The statement *P*(*n*) is that an integer *n greater than or equal to 2* can be *factored into primes*.
- **Base Case:** Prove that the statement holds when n = 2 We are proving P(2).
- 2 itself is a prime number, so the prime factorization of 2 is 2. Trivially, the statement *P*(2) holds.
- **Induction Hypothesis:** Assume that for all integers less than or equal to k, the statement holds. *Note:* In the previous example, the assumption was only about the case when n = k.
- **Inductive Step:** Consider the number k+1.
- *Case 1:* k+1 is a prime number. When k+1 is a prime number, the number is a prime factorization of itself. Therefore, the statement P(k+1) holds.
- Case 2: k+1 is not a prime number.
- We know that k+1 is a composite, so  $k+1 = p \times q(p, q \in Z^+)$ .

- Prove by induction that every *integer greater than or equal to 2* can be *factored into primes*. The statement *P*(*n*) is that an integer *n greater than or equal to 2* can be *factored into primes*.
- **Base Case:** Prove that the statement holds when n = 2 We are proving P(2).
- 2 itself is a prime number, so the prime factorization of 2 is 2. Trivially, the statement *P*(2) holds.
- **Induction Hypothesis:** Assume that for all integers less than or equal to k, the statement holds. *Note:* In the previous example, the assumption was only about the case when n = k.
- **Inductive Step:** Consider the number k+1.
- *Case 1:* k+1 is a prime number. When k+1 is a prime number, the number is a prime factorization of itself. Therefore, the statement P(k+1) holds.
- *Case 2*: *k*+1 is not a prime number.
- We know that k+1 is a composite, so  $k+1 = p \times q(p, q \in Z^+)$ .
- Intuitively, we can conclude that p and q are less than or equal to k+1.

- Prove by induction that every *integer greater than or equal to 2* can be *factored into primes*. The statement *P*(*n*) is that an integer *n greater than or equal to 2* can be *factored into primes*.
- **Base Case:** Prove that the statement holds when n = 2 We are proving P(2).
- 2 itself is a prime number, so the prime factorization of 2 is 2. Trivially, the statement *P*(2) holds.
- **Induction Hypothesis:** Assume that for all integers less than or equal to k, the statement holds. *Note:* In the previous example, the assumption was only about the case when n = k.
- **Inductive Step:** Consider the number *k*+1.
- *Case 1:* k+1 is a prime number. When k+1 is a prime number, the number is a prime factorization of itself. Therefore, the statement P(k+1) holds.
- *Case 2*: *k*+1 is not a prime number.
- We know that k+1 is a composite, so  $k+1 = p \times q(p, q \in Z^+)$ .
- Intuitively, we can conclude that p and q are less than or equal to k+1.
- From the induction hypothesis stated above, for all integers less than or equal to *k*, the statement holds, which means both *p* and *q* can be expressed as prime factorizations.
- In this sense, because k+1 is a product of p and q, by multiplying the prime factorizations of p and q, we can get the prime factorization for k+1 as well.

- Prove by induction that every *integer greater than or equal to 2* can be *factored into primes*. The statement *P*(*n*) is that an integer *n greater than or equal to 2* can be *factored into primes*.
- **Base Case:** Prove that the statement holds when n = 2 We are proving P(2).
- 2 itself is a prime number, so the prime factorization of 2 is 2. Trivially, the statement *P*(2) holds.
- **Induction Hypothesis:** Assume that for all integers less than or equal to k, the statement holds. *Note:* In the previous example, the assumption was only about the case when n = k.
- **Inductive Step:** Consider the number k+1.
- *Case 1:* k+1 is a prime number. When k+1 is a prime number, the number is a prime factorization of itself. Therefore, the statement P(k+1) holds.
- Case 2: k+1 is not a prime number.
- We know that k+1 is a composite, so  $k+1 = p \times q(p, q \in Z^+)$ .
- Intuitively, we can conclude that p and q are less than or equal to k+1.
- In this sense, because k+1 is a product of p and q, by multiplying the prime factorizations of p and q, we can get the prime factorization for k+1 as well.
- From the induction hypothesis stated above, for all integers less than or equal to k, the statement holds, which means both p and q can be expressed as prime factorizations.

- Prove by induction that every *integer greater than or equal to 2* can be *factored into primes*. The statement *P(n)* is that an integer *n greater than or equal to 2* can be *factored into primes*.
- **Base Case:** Prove that the statement holds when n = 2 We are proving P(2).
- 2 itself is a prime number, so the prime factorization of 2 is 2. Trivially, the statement *P*(2) holds.
- **Induction Hypothesis:** Assume that for all integers less than or equal to k, the statement holds. *Note:* In the previous example, the assumption was only about the case when n = k.
- **Inductive Step:** Consider the number k+1.
- *Case 1:* k+1 is a prime number. When k+1 is a prime number, the number is a prime factorization of itself. Therefore, the statement P(k+1) holds.
- Case 2: k+1 is not a prime number.
- We know that k+1 is a composite, so  $k+1 = p \times q(p, q \in Z^+)$ .
- Intuitively, we can conclude that p and q are less than or equal to k+1.
- In this sense, because k+1 is a product of p and q, by multiplying the prime factorizations of p and q, we can get the prime factorization for k+1 as well.
- From the induction hypothesis stated above, for all integers less than or equal to *k*, the statement holds, which means both *p* and *q* can be expressed as prime factorizations.
- Therefore, the statement that every integer greater than or equal to 2 can be factored into primes holds for all such integers.

• The common mistake in this question you might do is to prove the Case 2 in the inductive step without using induction hypothesis by dividing the cases further into even number and odd number, etc.

- The common mistake in this question you might do is to prove the Case 2 in the inductive step without using induction hypothesis by dividing the cases further into even number and odd number, etc.
- It works, but does not fit into the notion of inductive proof that we wanted you to learn. For inductive step in inductive proof, you must reason your argument based on induction hypothesis you yourself state.

• There are several reasonable questions that might appear while reading the proof above.

- There are several reasonable questions that might appear while reading the proof above.
- **Question 1:** Why is it sufficient to prove only n=2 as a base case for this question?

- There are several reasonable questions that might appear while reading the proof above.
- **Question 1:** Why is it sufficient to prove only *n*=*2* as a base case for this question?
- In this question, generally most questions using strong induction, for each step, as stated in the induction hypothesis, we assume that the statement holds for all previous steps. To prove P(3) works, we assume P(2) works; to prove P(4) works, we assume P(2), P(3) work.

- There are several reasonable questions that might appear while reading the proof above.
- **Question 1:** Why is it sufficient to prove only *n*=*2* as a base case for this question?
- In this question, generally most questions using strong induction, for each step, as stated in the induction hypothesis, we assume that the statement holds for all previous steps. To prove P(3) works, we assume P(2) works; to prove P(4) works, we assume P(2), P(3) work.
- In this sense, prove only the case of n=2 is sufficient enough.

- There are several reasonable questions that might appear while reading the proof above.
- **Question 1:** Why is it sufficient to prove only n=2 as a base case for this question?
- In this question, generally most questions using strong induction, for each step, as stated in the induction hypothesis, we assume that the statement holds for all previous steps. To prove P(3) works, we assume P(2) works; to prove P(4) works, we assume P(2), P(3) work.
- In this sense, prove only the case of n=2 is sufficient enough.
- **Question 2.** Still, for prime numbers which do not have 2 as their factors, don't we need to prove their cases separately?

- There are several reasonable questions that might appear while reading the proof above.
- **Question 1:** Why is it sufficient to prove only n=2 as a base case for this question?
- In this question, generally most questions using strong induction, for each step, as stated in the induction hypothesis, we assume that the statement holds for all previous steps. To prove P(3) works, we assume P(2) works; to prove P(4) works, we assume P(2), P(3) work.
- In this sense, prove only the case of n=2 is sufficient enough.
- **Question 2.** Still, for prime numbers which do not have 2 as their factors, don't we need to prove their cases separately?
- Not really; those numbers are dealt in the **Case 1** in the inductive step.

- There are several reasonable questions that might appear while reading the proof above.
- **Question 1:** Why is it sufficient to prove only n=2 as a base case for this question?
- In this question, generally most questions using strong induction, for each step, as stated in the induction hypothesis, we assume that the statement holds for all previous steps. To prove P(3) works, we assume P(2) works; to prove P(4) works, we assume P(2), P(3) work.
- In this sense, prove only the case of n=2 is sufficient enough.
- **Question 2.** Still, for prime numbers which do not have 2 as their factors, don't we need to prove their cases separately?
- Not really; those numbers are dealt in the **Case 1** in the inductive step.
- If you try to prove all these possible prime number cases, you need to do so with brute-force scheme, which means you need to prove the statement on every single prime number greater than 2.

- Template of Inductive Proof
- **Base Case:** Prove the most basic case.

- Template of Inductive Proof
- **Base Case:** Prove the most basic case.
- *Induction Hypothesis:* Assume that the statement holds for some k or for all numbers less than or equal to k.

- Template of Inductive Proof
- **Base Case:** Prove the most basic case.
- *Induction Hypothesis:* Assume that the statement holds for some k or for all numbers less than or equal to k.
- *Inductive Step:* Prove the statement holds for the next step based on induction hypothesis.

- Template of Inductive Proof
- **Base Case:** Prove the most basic case.
- *Induction Hypothesis:* Assume that the statement holds for some k or for all numbers less than or equal to k.
- *Inductive Step:* Prove the statement holds for the next step based on induction hypothesis.
- Checklist
- Check whether you proved all necessary base cases! Base case is not necessarily one case (sometimes more than one).

- Template of Inductive Proof
- **Base Case:** Prove the most basic case.
- *Induction Hypothesis:* Assume that the statement holds for some k or for all numbers less than or equal to k.
- *Inductive Step:* Prove the statement holds for the next step based on induction hypothesis.

#### Checklist

- Check whether you proved all necessary base cases!
   Base case is not necessarily one case (sometimes more than one).
- Check you marked three components of inductive proof correctly.

- Template of Inductive Proof
- **Base Case:** Prove the most basic case.
- *Induction Hypothesis:* Assume that the statement holds for some k or for all numbers less than or equal to k.
- *Inductive Step:* Prove the statement holds for the next step based on induction hypothesis.

#### Checklist

- Check whether you proved all necessary base cases!
   Base case is not necessarily one case (sometimes more than one).
- Check you marked three components of inductive proof correctly.
- Check you used induction hypothesis appropriately for inductive step.

http://www.mathblog.dk/strong-induction/

- I have stolen this example from <a href="Hammack">Hammack</a> since I think it brilliantly shows when strong induction is better to use. But lets first see what happens if we try to use weak induction on the following:
- Proposition: if  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , then  $12|(n^4 n^2)$

• Proposition: if  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , then  $12 | (n^4 - n^2)$ 

#### **Weak Induction**

• **Base case:** we need to prove that  $12|(1^4-1^2)=12|(1-1)=0$ , which is divisible by 12 by definition.

• Proposition: if  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , then  $12 | (n^4 - n^2)$ 

#### **Weak Induction**

- **Base case:** we need to prove that  $12|(1^4-1^2)=12|(1-1)=0$ , which is divisible by 12 by definition.
- **Induction step:** We assume that the  $12|(k^4-k^2)$  is true such that  $(n^4-n^2)=12a$  for some **a belongs to N**.

• Proposition: if  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , then  $12 | (n^4 - n^2)$ 

#### **Weak Induction**

- **Base case:** we need to prove that  $12|(1^4-1^2)=12|(1-1)=0$ , which is divisible by 12 by definition.
- **Induction step:** We assume that the  $12|(k^4-k^2)$  is true such that  $(n^4-n^2)=12a$  for some *a belongs to N*.

We then need to show that  $((k+1)^4-(k+1)^2)=12b$  for some *b* belongs to *N*.

• Proposition: if  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , then  $12 | (n^4 - n^2)$ 

#### **Weak Induction**

- **Base case:** we need to prove that  $12|(1^4-1^2)=12|(1-1)=0$ , which is divisible by 12 by definition.
- **Induction step:** We assume that the  $12|(k^4-k^2)$  is true such that  $(n^4-n^2)=12a$  for some *a belongs to N*.
- We then need to show that  $((k+1)^4-(k+1)^2)=12b$  for some *b* belongs to *N*.

$$(k+1)^4 - (k+1)^2 = k^4 + 4k^3 + 6k^2 + 4k + 1 - (k^2 + 2k + 1) =$$
  
 $(k^4 - k^2) + 4k^3 + 6k^2 + 2k = 12a + 4k^3 + 6k^2 + 2k$ 

• Proposition: if  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , then  $12|(n^4 - n^2)$ 

#### **Weak Induction**

- **Base case:** we need to prove that  $12|(1^4-1^2)=12|(1-1)=0$ , which is divisible by 12 by definition.
- **Induction step:** We assume that the  $12|(k^4-k^2)$  is true such that  $(n^4-n^2)=12a$  for some *a belongs to N*.

We then need to show that  $((k+1)^4-(k+1)^2)=12b$  for some b belongs to N.

$$(k+1)^4 - (k+1)^2 = k^4 + 4k^3 + 6k^2 + 4k + 1 - (k^2 + 2k + 1) = (k^4 - k^2) + 4k^3 + 6k^2 + 2k = 12a + 4k^3 + 6k^2 + 2k$$

How do we proceed from there? I don't have a clue.
 If you can show me how to continue of this road I would be glad to hear it.

• Proposition: if  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , then  $12|(\mathsf{n^4} - \mathsf{n^2})$ 

#### **Strong Induction**

• The weak induction method failed. However, we can show that n = k-5 implies that the statement is true for k+1, so we need to expand the base case to include everything up to n = 6.

• Proposition: if  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , then  $12|(n^4 - n^2)$ 

#### **Strong Induction**

• The weak induction method failed. However, we can show that n = k-5 implies that the statement is true for k+1, so we need to expand the base case to include everything up to n = 6.

#### Base case:

n = 1: 
$$12|(1^4 - 1^2) = 12|(1 - 1) = 0 = 0*12$$
  
n = 2:  $12|(2^4 - 2^2) = 12|16-12 = 12 = 1*12$   
n = 3:  $12|(3^4 - 3^2) = 12|(81 - 9) = 72 = 6*12$   
n = 4:  $12|(4^4 - 4^2) = 12|(256 - 16) = 240 = 20 * 12$   
n = 5:  $12|(5^4 - 5^2) = 12|(625 - 25) = 600 = 50*12$   
n = 6:  $12|(6^4 - 6^2) = 12|(1296 - 36) = 1260 = 105*12$ 

So far it fits really well.

• Proposition: if  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , then  $12|(n^4 - n^2)$ 

- The weak induction method failed. However, we can show that n = k-5 implies that the statement is true for k+1, so we need to expand the base case to include everything up to n = 6.
- Base case:

```
n = 1: 12|(1^4 - 1^2) = 12|(1-1) = 0 = 0*12

n = 2: 12|(2^4 - 2^2) = 12|16-12 = 12 = 1*12

n = 3: 12|(3^4 - 3^2) = 12|(81 - 9) = 72 = 6*12

n = 4: 12|(4^4 - 4^2) = 12|(256-16) = 240 = 20 * 12

n = 5: 12|(5^4 - 5^2) = 12|(625-25) = 600 = 50*12

n = 6: 12|(6^4 - 6^2) = 12|(1296-36) = 1260 = 105*12
```

- So far it fits really well.
- Induction Step: let k is greater or equal to 6 belongs to N, and assume that 12|(m<sup>4</sup>-m<sup>2</sup>) for (1 less than equal to m less than equal to k), now we need to prove that 12|((k+1)<sup>4</sup>-(k+1)<sup>2</sup>) is true as well.

• Proposition: if  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , then  $12 | (n^4 - n^2)$ 

- The weak induction method failed. However, we can show that n = k-5 implies that the statement is true for k+1, so we need to expand the base case to include everything up to n = 6.
- Base case:

```
n = 1: 12|(1^4 - 1^2) = 12|(1-1) = 0 = 0*12

n = 2: 12|(2^4 - 2^2) = 12|16-12 = 12 = 1*12

n = 3: 12|(3^4 - 3^2) = 12|(81 - 9) = 72 = 6*12

n = 4: 12|(4^4 - 4^2) = 12|(256-16) = 240 = 20 * 12

n = 5: 12|(5^4 - 5^2) = 12|(625-25) = 600 = 50*12

n = 6: 12|(6^4 - 6^2) = 12|(1296-36) = 1260 = 105*12
```

- So far it fits really well.
- Induction Step: let k is greater or equal to 6 belongs to N, and assume that  $12|(m^4-m^2)$  for (1 less than equal to m less than equal to k), now we need to prove that  $12|((k+1)^4-(k+1)^2)|$  is true as well.
- Let us define l=k-5 for which we assume the proposition to be true such that  $(l^4-l^2)=12a$  for some value of a. We need to show that  $12|((l+6)^4-(l+6)^2)$  is true. So let us try with a direct approach!

• Proposition: if  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , then  $12 | (n^4 - n^2)$ 

- The weak induction method failed. However, we can show that n = k-5 implies that the statement is true for k+1, so we need to expand the base case to include everything up to n = 6.
- Base case:

```
n = 1: 12|(1^4 - 1^2) = 12|(1-1) = 0 = 0*12

n = 2: 12|(2^4 - 2^2) = 12|16-12 = 12 = 1*12

n = 3: 12|(3^4 - 3^2) = 12|(81 - 9) = 72 = 6*12

n = 4: 12|(4^4 - 4^2) = 12|(256-16) = 240 = 20 * 12

n = 5: 12|(5^4 - 5^2) = 12|(625-25) = 600 = 50*12

n = 6: 12|(6^4 - 6^2) = 12|(1296-36) = 1260 = 105*12
```

- So far it fits really well.
- Induction Step: let k is greater or equal to 6 belongs to N, and assume that  $12|(m^4-m^2)$  for (1 less than equal to m less than equal to k), now we need to prove that  $12|((k+1)^4-(k+1)^2)|$  is true as well.
- Let us define l=k-5 for which we assume the proposition to be true such that  $(l^4-l^2)=12a$  for some value of a. We need to show that  $12|((l+6)^4-(l+6)^2)$  is true. So let us try with a direct approach!
- $(l+6)^4$ – $(l+6)^2$ =  $(l^4+24l^3+180l^2+864l+1296)$ – $(l^2+12l+36)$  =  $(l^4$ – $l^2$ )+24 $l^3$ +180 $l^2$ +852l+1260 = 12a+12(2 $l^3$ +15 $l^2$ +71l+105)

• Proposition: if  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , then  $12 | (n^4 - n^2)$ 

- The weak induction method failed. However, we can show that n = k-5 implies that the statement is true for k+1, so we need to expand the base case to include everything up to n = 6.
- Base case:

```
\begin{array}{lll} n=1; & 12|(1^4-1^2)=12|(1-1)=0=0*12\\ n=2; & 12|(2^4-2^2)=12|16-12=12=1*12\\ n=3; & 12|(3^4-3^2)=12|(81-9)=72=6*12\\ n=4; & 12|(4^4-4^2)=12|(256-16)=240=20*12\\ n=5; & 12|(5^4-5^2)=12|(625-25)=600=50*12\\ n=6; & 12|(6^4-6^2)=12|(1296-36)=1260=105*12 \end{array}
```

- So far it fits really well.
- Induction Step: let k is greater or equal to 6 belongs to N, and assume that  $12|(m^4-m^2)$  for  $(1 \text{ less than equal to } m \text{ less than$
- Let us define l=k-5 for which we assume the proposition to be true such that  $(l^4-l^2)=12a$  for some value of a. We need to show that  $12|((l+6)^4-(l+6)^2)$  is true. So let us try with a direct approach!
- $(l+6)^4-(l+6)^2=(l^4+24l^3+180l^2+864l+1296)-(l^2+12l+36)=(l^4-l^2)+24l^3+180l^2+852l+1260=12a+12(2l^3+15l^2+71l+105)$
- So in order to prove it for n = k+1 = 7 we need n = k-5 = 1 to prove it, but that is handled in the base case, same goes for all the n = 8,9,10,11,12 and then we start to rely on the fact that we can prove n = 8 through the induction step.

- Please do not forget to read the book Chapter and the provided links for further reading about Mathematical Inductions.
- <a href="http://www.purplemath.com/modules/inductn3.htm">http://www.purplemath.com/modules/inductn3.htm</a>
- <a href="http://www.mathcentre.ac.uk/resources/uploaded/mathcentre-proof2.pdf">http://www.mathcentre.ac.uk/resources/uploaded/mathcentre-proof2.pdf</a>
- http://home.scarlet.be/math/volledige\_inductie.htm
- https://cims.nyu.edu/~kiryl/teaching/aa/review1.pdf
- http://www.math.illinois.edu/~ajh/213/inductionsampler.pdf
- http://web.maths.unsw.edu.au/~jim/proofsch8.pdf
- <a href="https://www.mathsisfun.com/algebra/mathematical-induction.html">https://www.mathsisfun.com/algebra/mathematical-induction.html</a>
- <a href="http://www.socialresearchmethods.net/kb/dedind.php">http://www.socialresearchmethods.net/kb/dedind.php</a>
- <a href="http://deborahgabriel.com/2013/03/17/inductive-and-deductive-approaches-to-research">http://deborahgabriel.com/2013/03/17/inductive-and-deductive-approaches-to-research</a>

/