

SPMS / Division of Mathematical Sciences

MH1300 Foundations of Mathematics  
2024/2025 Semester 1

MID-TERM EXAM SOLUTIONS

---

QUESTION 1.

(16 marks)

Prove that the cube of any integer is of the form  $9k$ ,  $9k + 1$  or  $9k + 8$  for some integer  $k$ .

**SOLUTION** . Let  $n$  be an integer. Applying the Quotient-Remainder Theorem to  $d = 3$ , we can assume that there is some  $k$  such that  $n = 3k$  or  $n = 3k + 1$  or  $n = 3k + 2$ .

$$n = 3k: \text{ Then } n^3 = (3k)^3 = 27k^3 = 9(3k^3).$$

$$n = 3k + 1: \text{ Then } n^3 = (3k + 1)^3 = 27k^3 + 27k^2 + 9k + 1 = 9(3k^3 + 3k^2 + k) + 1.$$

$$n = 3k + 2: \text{ Then } n^3 = (3k + 2)^3 = 27k^3 + 54k^2 + 36k + 8 = 9(3k^3 + 6k^2 + 4k) + 8.$$



QUESTION 2.

(16 marks)

Prove that for any two positive real numbers  $x$  and  $y$ ,

$$\lfloor xy \rfloor \geq \lfloor x \rfloor \cdot \lfloor y \rfloor.$$

Is the above statement true for all real numbers  $x, y$ ? Justify your answer.

**SOLUTION** . Let  $x > 0$  and  $y > 0$  be positive real numbers. Then note that  $0 \leq \lfloor x \rfloor$  and  $0 \leq \lfloor y \rfloor$  since the floor of a positive real number cannot be negative. By the definition of the floor function, we also have  $\lfloor x \rfloor \leq x$  and  $\lfloor y \rfloor \leq y$ . Multiplying the inequalities together, we have

$$\lfloor x \rfloor \cdot \lfloor y \rfloor \leq xy,$$

and the inequality does not flip around since the terms are all non-negative.

Since  $\lfloor x \rfloor \cdot \lfloor y \rfloor$  is an integer, and  $\lfloor xy \rfloor$  is the largest integer less than or equal to  $xy$ , we conclude that  $\lfloor x \rfloor \cdot \lfloor y \rfloor \leq \lfloor xy \rfloor$ .

The statement is not true for all real numbers. For example, take  $x = y = -\frac{1}{2}$ . Then  $\lfloor xy \rfloor = \lfloor \frac{1}{4} \rfloor = 0$ ,  $\lfloor x \rfloor = \lfloor y \rfloor = -1$ , and the inequality above is false as RHS=1 and LHS = 0. □

### QUESTION 3.

(16 marks)

Determine if the following is true or false. Justify your answer.

For every three integers  $a, b$  and  $x$ , if  $a \bmod 3 = b \bmod 3$  then  $ax \bmod 3 = bx \bmod 3$ .

Is the converse true for all integers  $a, b$  and  $x$ ?

**SOLUTION** . The statement is true, so let us prove it. Let  $a, b$  and  $x$  be integers such that  $a \bmod 3 = b \bmod 3$ . This means that there are integers  $r, k, l$  such that  $a = 3k + r$  and  $b = 3l + r$  where  $0 \leq r < 3$ . Then  $ax = 3kx + rx$  and  $bx = 3lx + rx$ . Since  $rx$  is an integer, we let  $r' = rx \bmod 3$ . In other words, we write  $rx = 3m + r'$  for some integer  $m$  and  $0 \leq r' < 3$ . This means that  $ax = 3kx + 3m + r' = 3(kx + m) + r'$  and  $bx = 3(lx + m) + r'$ . Since  $0 \leq r' < 3$ , we conclude that  $ax$  and  $bx$  have the same remainder when divided by 3.

The converse is false. For example, take  $x = 3, a = 1, b = 2$ . Then  $ax = 3$  and  $bx = 6$ , so they both have the same remainder when divided by 3. However,  $a \bmod 3 = 1$  and  $b \bmod 3 = 2$ . □

### QUESTION 4.

(18 marks)

Prove that for any real number  $x$ ,  $x - \lfloor x \rfloor < \frac{1}{2}$  if and only if  $\lfloor 2x \rfloor = 2\lfloor x \rfloor$ .

**SOLUTION** . Let  $x$  be a real number such that  $x - \lfloor x \rfloor < \frac{1}{2}$ . By the definition of the floor of  $x$ , we have  $\lfloor x \rfloor \leq x$ . Therefore we have  $2\lfloor x \rfloor \leq 2x$ . However, from the assumption, we have  $x - \lfloor x \rfloor < \frac{1}{2}$  which means  $2x - 2\lfloor x \rfloor < 1$ , and thus  $2x < 2\lfloor x \rfloor + 1$ . Together with the inequality above, we obtain  $2\lfloor x \rfloor \leq 2x < 2\lfloor x \rfloor + 1$ . Since  $2\lfloor x \rfloor \in \mathbb{Z}$ , this means that  $\lfloor 2x \rfloor = 2\lfloor x \rfloor$ .

Now conversely suppose that  $\lfloor 2x \rfloor = 2\lfloor x \rfloor$ . This means that  $2\lfloor x \rfloor \leq 2x < 2\lfloor x \rfloor + 1$ , by the definition of floor function. Dividing by 2, we obtain  $x < \lfloor x \rfloor + \frac{1}{2}$  and so  $x - \lfloor x \rfloor < \frac{1}{2}$ . □

**QUESTION 5.****(18 marks)**

Is the following a tautology, contradiction, or neither? Justify your answer.

$$((p \vee q) \rightarrow r) \rightarrow ((p \wedge q) \rightarrow r).$$

**SOLUTION** . It is a tautology. You can do this with either a truth table (DIY), or with logical equivalences. We present the solution with logical equivalences.

$$\begin{aligned}
 & ((p \vee q) \rightarrow r) \rightarrow ((p \wedge q) \rightarrow r) && \text{(Implication rule)} \\
 \equiv & (\neg(p \vee q) \vee r) \rightarrow (\neg(p \wedge q) \vee r) && \text{(Implication rule)} \\
 \equiv & \neg(\neg(p \vee q) \vee r) \vee (\neg(p \wedge q) \vee r) && \text{(De Morgan's law)} \\
 \equiv & ((p \vee q) \wedge \neg r) \vee (\neg(p \wedge q) \vee r) && \text{(De Morgan's law)} \\
 \equiv & ((p \vee q) \wedge \neg r) \vee ((\neg p \vee \neg q) \vee r) && \text{(Commutative law)} \\
 \equiv & ((\neg p \vee \neg q) \vee r) \vee ((p \vee q) \wedge \neg r) && \text{(Distributive law)} \\
 \equiv & [((\neg p \vee \neg q) \vee r) \vee (p \vee q)] \wedge [((\neg p \vee \neg q) \vee r) \vee \neg r] && \text{(Associative and Commutative)} \\
 \equiv & [(\neg p \vee p) \vee ((\neg q \vee q) \vee r)] \wedge [(\neg p \vee \neg q) \vee (r \vee \neg r)] && \text{(Negation laws)} \\
 \equiv & [T \vee (T \vee r)] \wedge [(\neg p \vee \neg q) \vee T] && \text{(Universal Bound laws)} \\
 \equiv & [T \vee T] \wedge [(\neg p \vee \neg q) \vee T] && \text{(Universal Bound laws)} \\
 \equiv & T \wedge T && \text{(Identity or Idempotent law)} \\
 \equiv & T
 \end{aligned}$$

□

**QUESTION 6.**

Let  $\mathbb{Q}$  be the set of rational numbers and  $E$  be the set of even integers. Determine if each of the following is true or false, and justify your answers.

(a)  $\forall x \in \mathbb{Q}, \exists y \in \mathbb{Q}, \exists z \in E, xyz = 3$ . **(8 marks)**

(b)  $\exists x \in E, \exists y \in \mathbb{Q}, \forall z \in E, x + yz = 4$ . **(8 marks)**

**SOLUTION** . (a) The property in the question states that for every rational number  $x$ , we can find some rational number  $y$  and some even integer  $z$  such that  $xyz = 3$ , in other words,  $yz = \frac{3}{x}$ . This is impossible if  $x = 0$ . So the property is false. To prove that the

negation is true, we shall pick  $x = 0$  (which is a rational number). Then no matter what  $y$  and  $z$  are given,  $xyz = 0 \neq 3$ .

(b) The question asks if you can pick an even number  $x$  and a rational number  $y$ , such that no matter what number  $z$  is given, we always have  $x + yz = 4$  is true? On first glance, this may seem impossible because if we pick a value for  $x$  and  $y$ , say for example  $x = 1, y = 2$ , then the values of  $x$  and  $y$  are fixed numbers, and it seems impossible that  $1 + 2z = 4$  can hold for all values of  $z$ .

However, this is actually possible if we choose the right value for  $y$ . If we choose  $y = 0$ , then the equation  $x + yz = x + 0$  will become independent of  $z$ . If we also pick  $x = 4$ , then  $x + yz = 4 + 0 = 4$  will hold for *any* value of  $z$ . Therefore, the statement is true. □