Proof techniques:

- · Direct proof
- · Disproof by counterexample
- · Proof by contradiction
- · Proof by contrapositive
- · Biconditional proof
- · Proof by induction

Book: Chapter 1.5

YESTERDAY TODAY

Proof by contradiction

- You want to prove "p".
- You assume that p is false (not p)
- You deduce something absurd (false).
- Thus, the assumption "not p" cannot be true. Therefore, p needs to be true.

Example: there is no largest real number strictly smaller than 1.
negation: there is an
$$x \in \mathbb{R}$$
, $x < 1$, that is the largest real
number smaller than 1.
 $\rightarrow Let's$ call this number 14
 $\rightarrow H < 1$
 $Y \times \in \mathbb{R}$, $x < 1$: $x \leq 14$
Consider $y = \frac{11+1}{2}$. Then $M < 1 \Rightarrow M + H < 1 + 14$
 $\Rightarrow H < \frac{1+11}{2}$
So $M < y < 1$. Contradiction: M is not $\frac{1}{2}$ is larger!

Proof by contrapositive

- You want to prove "if p, then q"
- Remember: p-sq and ~q-s~p are equivalent.
- Instead, you prove "if not q, then not p"

Example:
$$(\forall x, y \in IR)(x, y > 0)(x^2 + y^2) => x + y > 1)$$

contra positive: $(\forall x, y \in IR)(x, y > 0)(x + y \leq 1) => x^2 + y^2 \leq 1)$

Let x,y ER, x,y >0

$$x+y \leq 1$$

 $\Rightarrow (x+y)^{2} \leq 1^{2}$
 $\Rightarrow x^{2}+2xy + y^{2} \leq 1$
 $\Rightarrow x^{2}+2xy + y^{2} - 2xy \leq 1 - 2xy$
 $\Rightarrow x^{2}+y^{2} \leq 1 - 2xy \wedge 1 - 2xy \leq 1$
 $a \leq b$
 $2xy \gg 0$
 $b \leq c$

QED

Biconditional proof

• To prove "if and only if" theorems

• Recall: p <>> q is short for (p->q) ~ (q->p)

• We prove "if p, then q" AND "if q, then p"

Example: VXEZ: X is a multiple of 3 (=) X is a multiple of 3 (=] VXEZ : XIS a multiple of 3 => x2 is a multiple of 3 xis a multiple of 3. Then x=3k, for nome kEI Then $x^2 = (3k)^2 = 9k^2 = 3(3k^2)$ => x² is a multiple of 3 => $\forall x \in \mathbb{Z}$: x^2 is a multiple of $3 = 3 \times is a$ multiple of 3contra positive : $\forall x \in \mathbb{Z}$: x is not a multiple of 3=> x^2 is not a multiple of 3

Checklist (proofs)

- Do you understand why, if asked to prove something for all elements of a set, it is sufficient to start the proof by picking an arbitrary element?
- Do you understand why it is sufficient to disprove a "for all" statement to find a single counter-example?
- Are you comfortable proving statements of the form "if p, then q", by assuming p that is true, and showing that q follows?
- Do you know that to prove p <-> q, you need to prove both p->q and q->p?
- Are you comfortable using the different proof techniques (contrapositive, contradiction, disproof by counterexample, direct proof, biconditional)?