

# CS243: Discrete Structures

## Mathematical Proof Techniques

Işıl Dillig

## Announcements

- ▶ Homework 2 due next lecture
- ▶ Little harder and longer than previous homework – don't wait until night before

## Introduction

- ▶ In previous lectures, we learned how to construct proofs using logical inference rules
- ▶ Such proofs are extremely formal and rigorous, but, for more complicated proofs, they can be very long and tedious
- ▶ In practice, mathematical proofs tend to be slightly less formal (e.g., can omit labeling names of inference rules)
- ▶ **Today:** Learn about proof-related mathematical concepts and proof strategies

## Mathematical Theorems

- ▶ Important mathematical statements that can be shown to be true are **theorems**
- ▶ Many famous mathematical theorems, e.g., Pythagorean theorem, Fermat's last theorem
- ▶ **Pythagorean theorem:** Let  $a, b$  the length of the two sides of a right triangle, and let  $c$  be the hypotenuse. Then,  $a^2 + b^2 = c^2$
- ▶ **Fermat's Last Theorem:** For any integer  $n$  greater than 2, the equation  $a^n + b^n = c^n$  has no solutions for non-zero  $a, b, c$ .

## Theorems, Lemmas, and Propositions

- ▶ There are many correct mathematical statements, but not all of them called theorems
- ▶ Less important statements that can be proven to be correct are **propositions**
- ▶ Another variation is a **lemma**: minor auxiliary result which aids in the proof of a theorem/proposition
- ▶ **Corollary** is a result whose proof follows immediately from a theorem or proposition

## Conjectures vs. Theorems

- ▶ **Conjecture** is a statement that is suspected to be true by experts but not yet proven
- ▶ **Goldbach's conjecture:** Every even integer greater than 2 can be expressed as the sum of two prime numbers.
- ▶ This conjecture is one of the oldest unsolved problems in number theory
- ▶ Once proven, conjectures become theorems

## Story Behind Fermat's Last Theorem

- ▶ Fermat's last theorem was a conjecture for 360 years until it was finally proven by Andrew Wiles in 1995!
- ▶ Fermat scribbled this "theorem" in the margin of his copy of *Arithmetica*
- ▶ And also remarked: "I have discovered a truly marvelous proof of this, which this margin is too narrow to contain"
- ▶ Unknown if Fermat had a valid proof or what his proof was
- ▶ Finally proven by Wiles in 1995 using advanced results about elliptic curves

## General Strategies for Proving Theorems

Many different strategies for proving theorems:

- ▶ **Direct proof:**  $p \rightarrow q$  proved by directly showing that if  $p$  is true, then  $q$  must follow
- ▶ **Proof by contraposition:** Prove  $p \rightarrow q$  by proving  $\neg q \rightarrow \neg p$
- ▶ **Proof by contradiction:** Prove that the negation of the theorem yields a contradiction
- ▶ **Proof by cases:** Exhaustively enumerate different possibilities, and prove the theorem for each case

In many proofs, one needs to combine several different strategies!

## Direct Proof

- ▶ To prove  $p \rightarrow q$  in a direct proof, first assume  $p$  is true.
- ▶ Then use rules of inference, axioms, previously shown theorems/lemmas to show that  $q$  is also true
- ▶ **Example:** If  $n$  is an odd integer, then  $n^2$  is also odd.
- ▶ **Proof:** Assume  $n$  is odd. By definition of oddness, there must exist some integer  $k$  such that  $n = 2k + 1$ . Then,  $n^2 = 4k^2 + 4k + 1 = 2(2k^2 + 2k) + 1$ , which is odd. Thus, if  $n$  is odd,  $n^2$  is also odd.  $\square$
- ▶ **Observe:** This proof implicitly uses universal generalization and existential instantiation (where?)

## More Direct Proof Examples

- ▶ An integer  $a$  is called a **perfect square** if there exists an integer  $b$  such that  $a = b^2$ .
- ▶ **Example:** Prove that if  $m$  and  $n$  are perfect squares, then  $mn$  is also a perfect square.

## Another Example

- ▶ **Example:** Prove that every odd number is the difference of two perfect squares.

## Proof by Contraposition

- ▶ **Recall:** The contrapositive of  $p \rightarrow q$  is  $\neg q \rightarrow \neg p$
- ▶ **Recall:** A formula and its contrapositive are logically equivalent
- ▶ Hence, if you can prove  $\neg q \rightarrow \neg p$ , have shown  $p \rightarrow q$
- ▶ This makes no difference from a logical point of view, but sometimes the contrapositive is easier to show by direct proof than the original
- ▶ Thus, in proof by contraposition, assume  $\neg q$  and then use axioms, inference rules etc. to show that  $\neg p$  must follow

## Examples of Proof by Contraposition

- ▶ **Prove:** If  $n^2$  is odd, then  $n$  is odd.
- ▶ What is the contrapositive of this statement?
- ▶ **Proof:** Suppose  $n$  is even. Then, there exists integer  $k$  such that  $n = 2k$ .
- ▶ Then,  $n^2 = (2k)^2 = 4k^2 = 2(2k^2)$
- ▶ Thus,  $n^2$  is also even. □

## Another Example

- ▶ **Prove:** If  $n = ab$ , then  $a \leq \sqrt{n}$  or  $b \leq \sqrt{n}$
- ▶ No obvious direct proof, therefore try proof by contraposition.
- ▶ **Note:** It may not always be immediately obvious whether to use direct proof or proof by contraposition. If you try one and it fails, try the other strategy!
- ▶ Over time, you will gain intuition about which proof strategies work well in which situations

## Proof by Contradiction

- ▶ Suppose we want to show that  $p \rightarrow q$  is true
- ▶ The only way  $p \rightarrow q$  can be false if  $p$  is true and  $q$  is false
- ▶ **Proof by contradiction:** Show that  $p \wedge \neg q$  is not possible
- ▶ i.e., assume both  $p$  and  $\neg q$  and show that this yields a contradiction
- ▶ Proof by contradiction is a very widely used proof strategy

## Example

- ▶ Prove by contradiction that "If  $3n + 2$  is odd, then  $n$  is odd."

## Another Example

- ▶ **Recall:** Any **rational number** can be written in the form  $\frac{p}{q}$  where  $p$  and  $q$  are integers and have no common factors.
- ▶ **Example:** Prove by contradiction that  $\sqrt{2}$  is irrational.
- ▶ **Proof:** Suppose  $\sqrt{2}$  was rational. Then,  $\sqrt{2} = \frac{p}{q}$  where  $p, q$  are integers with no common factors.
- ▶ By squaring both sides, we have:  $2 = \frac{p^2}{q^2}$ , i.e.,  $2q^2 = p^2$
- ▶ Since  $p^2$  is even,  $p$  must also be **even** (proved earlier)
- ▶ Hence,  $p = 2k$  for some  $k$ , and  $p^2 = 4k^2 = 2q^2$ .

## Example, cont

- ▶ This implies  $q^2 = 2k^2$ ; thus,  $q^2$  is also **even**
- ▶ Again, if  $q^2$  is even, this means  $q$  is even.
- ▶ But since both  $p$  and  $q$  are even, this means they have a common factor, i.e., 2
- ▶ But this contradicts our assumption! □

## Proof by Cases

- ▶ In some cases, it is very difficult to prove a theorem by applying the same argument in all cases
- ▶ For example, we might need to consider different arguments for negative and non-negative integers
- ▶ **Proof by cases** allows us to apply different arguments in different cases and combine the results
- ▶ Specifically, suppose we want to prove statement  $p$ , and we know that we have either  $q$  or  $r$
- ▶ If we can show  $q \rightarrow p$  and  $r \rightarrow p$ , then we can conclude  $p$

## Proof by Cases, cont.

- ▶ In general, there may be more than two cases to consider
- ▶ Proof by cases says that to show

$$(p_1 \vee p_2 \dots \vee p_k) \rightarrow q$$

it suffices to show:

$$p_1 \rightarrow q$$

$$p_2 \rightarrow q$$

...

$$p_k \rightarrow q$$

## Example

- ▶ Prove that  $|xy| = |x||y|$
- ▶ Here, proof by cases is useful because definition of absolute value depends on whether number is negative or not.
- ▶ There are four possibilities:
  1.  $x, y$  are both non-negative
  2.  $x$  non-negative, but  $y$  negative
  3.  $x$  negative,  $y$  non-negative
  4.  $x, y$  are both negative
- ▶ We'll prove the property by proving these four cases separately

## Proof

- ▶ **Case 1:**  $x, y \geq 0$ . In this case,  $|xy| = xy = |x||y|$
- ▶ **Case 2:**  $x \geq 0, y < 0$ . Here,  $|xy| = -xy = x \cdot (-y) = |x||y|$
- ▶ **Case 3:**  $x < 0, y \geq 0$ . Here,  $|xy| = -xy = (-x) \cdot y = |x||y|$
- ▶ **Case 4:**  $x, y < 0$ . Here,  $|xy| = xy = (-x) \cdot (-y) = |x||y|$
- ▶ Since we proved it for all cases, the theorem is valid.
- ▶ **Caveat:** Your cases must cover **all** possibilities; otherwise, the proof is not valid!
- ▶ **Observe:** The truth table method is essentially an (exhaustive) proof by cases...

## Another Example

- ▶ Prove that  $\max(x, y) + \min(x, y) = x + y$

## Combining Proof Techniques

- ▶ So far, our proofs used a single strategy, but often it's necessary to combine multiple strategies in one proof
- ▶ **Example:** Prove that every rational number can be expressed as a product of two **irrational numbers**.
- ▶ **Proof:** Let's first employ direct proof.
- ▶ Observe that any rational number  $r$  can be written as  $\sqrt{2} \cdot \frac{r}{\sqrt{2}}$
- ▶ We already proved  $\sqrt{2}$  is irrational.
- ▶ If we can show that  $\frac{r}{\sqrt{2}}$  is also irrational, we have a direct proof.

## Combining Proofs, cont.

- ▶ Now, employ proof by contradiction to show  $\frac{r}{\sqrt{2}}$  is irrational.
- ▶ Suppose  $\frac{r}{\sqrt{2}}$  was rational.
- ▶ Then, for some integers  $p, q$ :  $\frac{r}{\sqrt{2}} = \frac{p}{q}$
- ▶ This can be rewritten as  $\sqrt{2} = \frac{rq}{p}$
- ▶ Since  $r$  is rational, it can be written as quotient of integers:

$$\sqrt{2} = \frac{a}{b} \cdot \frac{p}{q} = \frac{ap}{bq}$$

- ▶ But this would mean  $\sqrt{2}$  is rational, a contradiction.  $\square$

## Lesson from Example

- ▶ In this proof, we combined **direct** and **proof-by-contradiction** strategies
- ▶ In more complex proofs, it might be necessary to combine two or even more strategies and prove helper lemmas
- ▶ It is often a good idea to think about how to decompose your proof, what strategies to use in different subgoals, and what helper lemmas could be useful

## If and Only if Proofs

- ▶ Some theorems are of the form " **$P$  if and only if  $Q$** " ( $P \leftrightarrow Q$ )
- ▶ The easiest way to prove such statements is to show  $P \rightarrow Q$  and  $Q \rightarrow P$
- ▶ Therefore, such proofs correspond to two subproofs
- ▶ One shows  $P \rightarrow Q$  (typically labeled  $\Rightarrow$ )
- ▶ Another subproof shows  $Q \rightarrow P$  (typically labeled  $\Leftarrow$ )

## Example

- ▶ Prove "A positive integer  $n$  is odd if and only if  $n^2$  is odd."
- ▶  $\Rightarrow$  We have already shown this using a direct proof earlier.
- ▶  $\Leftarrow$  We have already shown this by a proof by contraposition.
- ▶ Since we have proved both directions, the proof is complete.

## Counterexamples

- ▶ So far, we have learned about how to prove statements are **true** using various strategies
- ▶ But how do we prove that a statement is **false**?
- ▶ To show a statement is false, we provide **counterexamples**
- ▶ A counterexample is a concrete value for which the statement is false
- ▶ What is a counterexample for the claim "The product of two irrational numbers is irrational"?

## Prove or Disprove

Which of the statements below are true, which are false? Prove your answer.

- ▶ For all integers  $n$ , if  $n^2$  is positive,  $n$  is also positive.
- ▶ For all integers  $n$ , if  $n^3$  is positive,  $n$  is also positive.
- ▶ For all integers  $n$  such that  $n \geq 0$ ,  $n^2 \geq 2n$

## Existence and Uniqueness

- ▶ Common math proofs involve showing **existence** and **uniqueness** of certain objects
- ▶ Existence proofs require showing that an object with the desired property exists
- ▶ Uniqueness proofs require showing that there is a unique object with the desired property

## Existence Proofs

- ▶ One simple way to prove existence is to provide an object that has the desired property
- ▶ This sort of proof is called **constructive** proof
- ▶ **Example:** Prove there exists an integer that is the sum of two perfect squares
- ▶ But not all existence proofs have to be constructive – possible to prove existence through other methods such as proof by contradiction or proof by cases
- ▶ Such indirect existence proofs called **nonconstructive proofs**

## Non-Constructive Proof Example

- ▶ Prove: "There exist irrational numbers  $x, y$  s.t.  $x^y$  is rational"
- ▶ We'll prove this using a non-constructive proof (by cases), without providing irrational  $x, y$
- ▶ Consider  $\sqrt{2}^{\sqrt{2}}$ . Either (i) it is rational or (ii) it is irrational
- ▶ **Case 1:** We have  $x = y = \sqrt{2}$  s.t.  $x^y$  is rational
- ▶ **Case 2:** Let  $x = \sqrt{2}^{\sqrt{2}}$  and  $y = \sqrt{2}$ , so both are irrational. Then,  $\sqrt{2}^{\sqrt{2}^{\sqrt{2}}} = \sqrt{2}^2 = 2$ . Thus,  $x^y$  is rational

## Non-Constructive Proofs

- ▶ This proof is non-constructive because it does not give concrete irrational numbers  $x, y$  for which  $x^y$  is rational
- ▶ In classical mathematics/logic, such non-constructive proofs are completely acceptable
- ▶ However, there is a school of mathematicians/logicians who only accept constructive proofs
- ▶ Such people are called **intuitionists** or **constructivists**
- ▶ The branch of logic dealing with only constructive arguments is called **intuitionistic logic**

## Proving Uniqueness

- ▶ Some statements in mathematics assert **uniqueness** of an object satisfying a certain property
- ▶ To prove uniqueness, must first prove **existence** of an object  $x$  that has the property
- ▶ Second, we must show that for any other  $y$  s.t.  $y \neq x$ , then  $y$  does not have the property
- ▶ Alternatively, can show that if  $y$  has the desired property that  $x = y$

## Example of Uniqueness Proof

- ▶ Prove: "If  $a$  and  $b$  are real numbers with  $a \neq 0$ , then there exists a **unique** real number  $r$  such that  $ar + b = 0$ "
- ▶ **Existence:** Using a constructive proof, we can see  $r = -b/a$  satisfies  $ar + b = 0$
- ▶ **Uniqueness:** Suppose there is another number  $s$  such that  $s \neq r$  and  $as + b = 0$ . But since  $ar + b = as + b$ , we have  $ar = as$ , which implies  $r = s$ .

## Summary of Proof Strategies

- ▶ **Direct proof:**  $p \rightarrow q$  proved by directly showing that if  $p$  is true, then  $q$  must follow
- ▶ **Proof by contraposition:** Prove  $p \rightarrow q$  by proving  $\neg q \rightarrow \neg p$
- ▶ **Proof by contradiction:** Prove that the negation of the theorem yields a contradiction
- ▶ **Proof by cases:** Exhaustively enumerate different possibilities, and prove the theorem for each case

## Invalid Proof Strategies

- ▶ **Proof by obviousness:** "The proof is so clear it need not be mentioned!"
- ▶ **Proof by intimidation:** "Don't be stupid – of course it's true!"
- ▶ **Proof by mumbo-jumbo:**  $\forall \alpha \in \theta \exists \beta \in \alpha \diamond \beta \approx \gamma$
- ▶ **Proof by intuition:** "I have this gut feeling.."
- ▶ **Proof by resource limits:** "Due to lack of space, we omit this part of the proof..."
- ▶ **Proof by illegibility:** "sdjkhfiugyhjlaks??fskl; QED."

**Don't use anything like these in CS243!!**