

CSC165, Summer 2014  
Assignment 4  
Weight: 8%  
Due Jul. 4th, 2:00 p.m.

You are allowed to use (i.e., put in your justifications), without proof, the following facts:

- $\forall x \in \mathbb{R}, x^2 \geq 0$
- For  $a, b, c$  real,  $a > 0$ ,  $[b^2 - 4ac < 0] \Rightarrow [\forall x, ax^2 + bx + c > 0]$
- $f(n) = 1/n$  is a decreasing function for  $n > 0$ . In other words,

$$\forall n_1 \in \mathbb{N}, \forall n_2 \in \mathbb{N}, n_2 > n_1 \Rightarrow 1/n_2 < 1/n_1$$

1. Prove or disprove **using a detailed structured proof, justifying every step**:

$$\forall x \in \mathbb{Z}, \forall y \in \mathbb{Z}, [x(x+1) = y(y+1)] \Leftrightarrow [x = y]$$

**Solution:** The statement is **false**.

Proof:

Let  $x_0 = -1, y_0 = 0$

Then  $x_0 \in \mathbb{Z}, y_0 \in \mathbb{Z}$

Then  $x_0(x_0 + 1) = 0 \quad \# \quad x_0 + 1 = 0$

Then  $y_0(y_0 + 1) = 0 \quad \# \quad y_0 = 0$

Then  $x_0(x_0 + 1) = y_0(y_0 + 1) \quad \# \quad$  both equal 0

Then also  $\neg[x_0 = y_0] \quad \# \quad -1 \neq 0$

Then  $[x(x+1) = y(y+1)] \wedge \neg[x = y] \quad \# \quad$  conjunction of two true statements

Then  $\exists x \in \mathbb{Z}, \exists y \in \mathbb{Z}, [x(x+1) = y(y+1)] \wedge \neg[x = y] \quad \# \quad x_0, y_0$  are such  $x, y$

Then  $\exists x \in \mathbb{Z}, \exists y \in \mathbb{Z}, \neg([x(x+1) = y(y+1)] \Rightarrow [x = y]) \quad \# \quad$  implication negation

Then  $\exists x \in \mathbb{Z}, \exists y \in \mathbb{Z}, [\neg([x(x+1) = y(y+1)] \Rightarrow [x = y])] \vee [\neg([x(x+1) = y(y+1)] \Leftrightarrow [x = y])]$

$\# \quad$  True  $\vee$  R is True for any R

Then  $\exists x \in \mathbb{Z}, \exists y \in \mathbb{Z}, \neg([x(x+1) = y(y+1)] \Leftrightarrow [x = y]) \quad \# \quad$  equivalence negation

Then  $\exists x \in \mathbb{Z}, \neg[\forall y \in \mathbb{Z}, [x(x+1) = y(y+1)] \Leftrightarrow [x = y]] \quad \# \quad$  quantifier negation

Then  $\neg[\forall x \in \mathbb{Z}, \forall y \in \mathbb{Z}, [x(x+1) = y(y+1)] \Leftrightarrow [x = y]] \quad \# \quad$  quantifier negation



Note: less detailed arguments that still end with the same conclusion may be fine.

2. Prove or disprove **using a detailed structured proof, justifying every step**:

$$\forall x \in \mathbb{R}, \forall y \in \mathbb{R}, [(x^2y < 0) \wedge (x \neq 0)] \Leftrightarrow [x^{100}y < 0]$$

**Solution:** The statement is **true**.

Proof:

Assume  $x \in \mathbb{R}, y \in \mathbb{R}$

Then  $x^{49} \in \mathbb{R}$  # the reals are closed under multiplication and  $x^{49} = x * x * x * \dots * x$

Also  $x^{49} \neq 0$  #  $\forall x \in \mathbb{R}, x = 0 \Leftrightarrow x^n = 0$

Then  $(x^{49})^2 > 0$  #  $\forall a \in \mathbb{R}, a \neq 0 \Rightarrow a^2 > 0$

Then  $x^{98} > 0$  # algebra

Assume  $(x^2y < 0) \wedge (x \neq 0)$

Then  $x^{98}(x^2y < 0)$  #  $\forall a \in \mathbb{R}, \forall b \in \mathbb{R}, [a > 0, b < 0] \Rightarrow ab < 0$

Then  $x^{100}y < 0$  # algebra/associativity of multiplication

Then  $[(x^2y < 0) \wedge (x \neq 0)] \Rightarrow [x^{100}y < 0]$  # assuming the antecedent leads to the consequent

Assume  $x^{100}y < 0$

Then  $x^{98}(x^2y < 0)$  # algebra/associativity of multiplication

Also  $1/x^{98} > 0$  #  $\forall a \in \mathbb{R}, a > 0 \Rightarrow 1/a > 0$  Then  $(1/x^{98})x^{98}(x^2y) < (1/x^{98})0$  # multiply both sides by the same value

Then  $x^2y < 0$  # algebra

Then  $[x^{100}y < 0] \Rightarrow [(x^2y < 0) \wedge (x \neq 0)]$  # assuming the antecedent leads to the consequent

Then  $[(x^2y < 0) \wedge (x \neq 0)] \Leftrightarrow [x^{100}y < 0]$  # equivalence

Then  $\forall x \in \mathbb{R}, \forall y \in \mathbb{R}, [(x^2y < 0) \wedge (x \neq 0)] \Leftrightarrow [x^{100}y < 0]$  # introduce universal



3. As of Jun.17, I predict that Brazil, Germany, Italy, and Argentina will make it to the semi-finals of the FIFA World Cup. Suppose you have a group of 25 footballers from those four countries. Prove that out of those 25, there is a group of at least 6 footballers who come from the same country. *It is not necessary to use the detailed structured proof format, but you still must justify every step.*

**Solution:** The statement is **true**.

Proof:

Let  $N_c$  be the number of footballers in the group who come from country  $c \in \{\text{Brazil, Italy, Argentina, Germany}\}$

Let  $N$  be the total number of footballers in the group

Assume there is no group of 6 footballers who come from the same country and  $N = 25$

Then  $\forall c \in \text{Brazil, Italy, Argentina, Germany}, N_c \leq 5$  # By assumption, the natural number  $N_c$  is smaller than 6

Then  $N = N_{\text{Brazil}} + N_{\text{Italy}} + N_{\text{Argentina}} + N_{\text{Germany}} \leq 5 + 5 + 5 + 5 = 20$  # Only footballers from the 4 countries are in the group + substitution

But it is not the case that  $25 \leq 20$  # arithmetic, we assumed that  $N = 25$

Contradiction!

Then there is a group of at least 6 footballers who come from the same country # assuming otherwise leads to a contradiction



4. Prove or disprove the following equivalence. If you decide it is true and so need to prove it, do not use a truth table. Justify every step in your derivation using the equivalences in Section 2.17 of the notes.

$$[(\neg Q \wedge P) \vee \neg Q] \Leftrightarrow [(\neg Q \wedge \neg R) \vee (\neg Q \wedge R)]$$

**Solution:** The statement is **true**.

Proof:

$$\begin{aligned} (\neg Q \wedge P) \vee \neg Q &\Leftrightarrow (\neg Q \wedge P) \vee (\neg Q \wedge (P \vee \neg P)) \quad \# \text{ identity laws} \\ &\Leftrightarrow (\neg Q \wedge P) \vee (\neg Q \wedge P) \vee (\neg Q \wedge \neg P) \quad \# \text{ distributive laws} \\ &\Leftrightarrow (\neg Q \wedge P) \vee (\neg Q \wedge \neg P) \quad \# \text{ idempotency laws} \\ &\Leftrightarrow (\neg Q \wedge (P \vee \neg P)) \quad \# \text{ distributive laws} \\ &\Leftrightarrow \neg Q \quad \# \text{ identity laws} \\ &\Leftrightarrow \neg Q \wedge (\neg R \vee R) \quad \# \text{ identity laws} \\ &\Leftrightarrow (\neg Q \wedge \neg R) \vee (\neg Q \wedge R) \quad \# \text{ distributive laws} \end{aligned}$$



5. Let  $R^+$  be the set of positive real numbers. Prove or disprove **using a detailed structured proof, justifying every step**:

$$\exists \epsilon \in \mathbb{R}^+, \forall B \in \mathbb{N}, \forall n \in \mathbb{N}, [n > B] \Rightarrow \left[ \left| \frac{2n^2 + 15n}{n^2} - 2 \right| < \epsilon \right]$$

**Solution:** The statement is **true**.

Proof:

Let  $\epsilon_0 = 16$

Assume  $B \in \mathbb{N}, n \in \mathbb{N}$

Assume  $n > B$

Then  $B \geq 0$  # The smallest natural number is zero

Then  $n \geq 1$  #  $n > B \geq 0$

Then  $\left| \frac{2n^2 + 15n}{n^2} - 2 \right| = \left| \frac{15}{n} \right| = \frac{15}{n} \leq 15$  # algebra,  $\forall n_1 \in \mathbb{N}, \forall n_2 \in \mathbb{N}, n_2 > n_1 \Rightarrow 1/n_2 < 1/n_1$  applied to  $n_1 = 1$

Then  $\left| \frac{2n^2 + 15n}{n^2} - 2 \right| < \epsilon_0$  #  $16 > 15$

Then  $[n > B] \Rightarrow \left| \frac{2n^2 + 15n}{n^2} - 2 \right| < \epsilon_0$  # assuming the antecedent implies the consequent

Then  $\forall B \in \mathbb{N}, \forall n \in \mathbb{N}, [n > B] \Rightarrow \left[ \left| \frac{2n^2 + 15n}{n^2} - 2 \right| < \epsilon \right]$  # introduce universal

Then  $\exists \epsilon \in R^+, \forall B \in \mathbb{N}, \forall n \in \mathbb{N}, [n > B] \Rightarrow \left[ \left| \frac{2n^2 + 15n}{n^2} - 2 \right| < \epsilon \right]$  #  $\epsilon_0 = 16$  is such an  $\epsilon$



6. Assume that  $D \subset \mathbb{N}$  and  $D \neq \emptyset$ . Prove or disprove **using a detailed structured proof, justifying every step**:

$$[\forall x \in D, \exists y \in \mathbb{N}, y < x] \Leftrightarrow [0 \notin D]$$

**Solution:** The statement is **true**.

Proof:

Assume  $0 \in D$

Let  $x_0 = 0$

Then  $x_0 \in D$

Then  $\forall y \in \mathbb{N}, y \geq x_0$  # 0 is the smallest natural number

Then  $\exists x \in D, \forall y \in \mathbb{N}, y \geq x$  #  $x_0$  is such an  $x$

Then  $\neg(\forall x \in D, \exists y \in \mathbb{N}, y < x)$  # quantifier negation

Then  $0 \in D \Rightarrow \neg(\forall x \in D, \exists y \in \mathbb{N}, y < x)$  # assuming the antecedent leads to the consequent

Then  $\forall x \in D, \exists y \in \mathbb{N}, y < x \Rightarrow 0 \notin D$  # contrapositive

Assume  $0 \notin D$

Assume  $x \in D$

Then  $x \neq 0$  #  $0 \notin D$  but  $x \in D$  Let  $y_0 = 0$

Then  $y_0 \in \mathbb{N}$  # definition of naturals

Then  $\forall x \in D, y_0 < x$  # the minimum natural number is 0 and  $0 \notin D$  so  $x \neq 0$

Then  $\exists y \in \mathbb{N}, y < x$  #  $y_0$  is such a  $y$

Then  $\forall x \in D, \exists y \in \mathbb{N}, y < x$  # introduce universal

Then  $[0 \notin D] \Rightarrow [\forall x \in D, \exists y \in \mathbb{N}, y < x]$  # assuming the antecedent implies the consequent

Then  $\forall x \in D, \exists y \in \mathbb{N}, y < x \Leftrightarrow 0 \notin D$  # equivalence

