1. Mathematical Proofs

- conditional statements
- sufficient and necessary conditions
- methods of proofs
- disproving statements
- proofs of quantified statements

Statements

a **statement** is a declarative sentence that is true *or* false but not both

examples:

- 3 + 4 = 7
- $5 \cdot 2 3 = 9$
- if x is an integer, then 2x is an even integer

the following sentences are not statements

- Bangkok is a lovely city (it's a matter of opinion)
- 2x 3 = 4 (we do not know what x is)

Conditional statements

for statements P and Q, a **conditional statement** is the statement:

If P, then Q

and is denoted by $P \Rightarrow Q$ (also stated as P implies Q)

example: 'if students obtain a score higher than 80 then they will get an A' truth table

P	Q	$P \Rightarrow Q$
T	T	T
T	F	F
F	T	T
F	F	T

 $P \Rightarrow Q$ is logically equivalent to

- $\neg P \lor Q$ $\neg Q \Rightarrow \neg P$

beware ! $P \Rightarrow Q$ is NOT logically equivalent to $Q \Rightarrow P$

Biconditional statements

the conjunction of a conditional statement and its *converse*:

 $(P \Rightarrow Q) \land (Q \Rightarrow P)$

is called the **biconditional** of P and Q, which is expressed as

 $P \;\; {\rm if} \; {\rm and} \; {\rm only} \; {\rm if} \; Q$

and denoted by $P \Leftrightarrow Q$

truth table



examples:

- x = 2 if and only if 3x = 6
- |x| = 4 if and only if $x^2 = 16$

 $P \Leftrightarrow Q$ is true only when P and Q have the same truth values

Sufficient and Necessary conditions

consider a (true) conditional statement: $P \Rightarrow Q$, we say

- P is **sufficient** for Q
- Q is **necessary** for P
- P only if Q

example: if x = -3 then |x| = 3 (a true conditional statement)

- 'P is sufficient for Q' means the truth of x = -3 is sufficient for concluding the truth of |x| = 3
- 'P only if Q' and 'Q is necessary for P' have the same meaning:
 x = -3 is true only under the condition that |x| = 3 (because if |x| ≠ 3 then x = -3 can't be true)

however, |x| = 3 is not a sufficient condition for x = -3(because if |x| = 3 then x can be either 3 or -3) *i.e.*, the converse of 'if x = -3 then |x| = 3' is false

consider a (true) biconditional statement: $P \Leftrightarrow Q$, we say

 \boldsymbol{P} is sufficient and necessary for \boldsymbol{Q}

example: |x| = 2 if and only if $x^2 = 4$ (a true biconditional statement)

• saying |x| = 2 is equivalent to saying $x^2 = 4$

more examples:

- being at least 18 years old is *necessary* for applying a driver license *i.e.*,
 - if you're a driver, everyone knows you must be at least 18 years old
 - if you're younger than 18 then you can't have a driver license
- if a person holds the title 'Miss Thailand' then that person must be 1) female 2) adult and 3) unmarried

i.e.,

- stating that 'Jenny is Miss Thailand' is *sufficient* to know that she is female and she must be old enough (an adult)
- being unmarried is a *necessary* condition for being Miss Thailand because if a woman is married, she can't apply for this position

Mathematical terminology

- an **axiom** is a math statement that is *self-evidently true* w/o proof
- a **definition** is an *agreement* as to the meaning of a particular term
- a **proof** is a sequence of math arguments demonstrating the truth of given results
- a **theorem** or a **proposition** is any mathematical statement that can be shown to be true using accepted logical and mathematical arguments
- a **lemma** is a true mathematical statement that was proven mainly to help in the proof of some theorem
- a **corollary** is used to refer to a theorem that is easily proven once some other theorem has been proven

Direct proofs

a **direct proof** of $P \Rightarrow Q$ typically consists of these steps:

1. start from assuming P is true then

2. develop a set of logical arguments to conclude ${\boldsymbol{Q}}$

example: show that if $x, y \in \mathbf{R}$ then $x^2 + y^2 \ge |xy|$ Proof. let $x, y \in \mathbf{R}$ and consider $(|x| - |y|)^2$

$$(|x| - |y|)^2 = |x|^2 + |y|^2 - 2|xy|$$

since the LHS is nonnegative, it follows that

$$(|x| - |y|)^2 = x^2 + y^2 - 2|xy| \ge 0$$

and hence $x^2+y^2 \geq 2|xy| \geq |xy|$

Proof by contrapositive

a **contrapositive proof** of a statement $P \Rightarrow Q$ uses the fact that

 $P \Rightarrow Q$ is logically equivalent to $\neg Q \Rightarrow \neg P$

so we can use a direct proof to show that $\neg Q \Rightarrow \neg P$ is true

example: let $x \in \mathbf{R}$. show that if $x^2 + 2x < 0$ then x < 0

Proof. we will show that if $x \ge 0$ then $x^2 + 2x \ge 0$

- if $x \ge 0$ then obviously $2x \ge 0$
- x^2 is always nonnegative

therefore, the sum of x^2 and 2x is nonnegative, finishing the proof

Proof by contradiction

idea: $\neg(P \Rightarrow Q)$ is equivalent to $P \land \neg Q$, so if we do as follows:

- 1. assume P is true (accept all the hypotheses) and Q is false (negate the conclusion)
- 2. try to prove that this leads to a **contradiction**

then we have shown that $\neg(P\Rightarrow Q)$ is false or that $P\Rightarrow Q$ is true

example: show that if n is an even integer then so is n^2

Proof. assume n is even but n^2 is not

since n is even, we can express n = 2k where k is some positive integer

$$n^2 = (2k)^2 = 4k^2 = 2(2k^2)$$

since $2k^2$ is also an integer, n^2 must be also even, which is a contradiction

Proof by induction

principle of mathematical indunction states that

the statement P(n) is true for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ if

- 1. P(1) is true
- 2. for each $k \in \mathbb{N}$, if P(k) is true then P(k+1) is also true

example: show that $\sum_{i=1}^{n} i = n(n+1)/2$ for n = 1, 2, ...

Proof. let P(n) be the statement $\sum_{i=1}^{n} i = n(n+1)/2$

- P(1) is true because $1 = 1 \cdot (1+1)/2$
- assume P(k) is true and show that P(k+1) is true:

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

Mathematical Proofs

Disproving statements

a **conjecture** is any math statement that has *not* been proved or disproved

disproving a conjecture requires only a *single example* to show the conjecture is *false*

such example is called a **counterexample**

example:
$$(x+y)^2 = x^2 + y^2$$
 for all $x, y \in \mathbf{R}$ (conjecture)

x = 1, y = 1 is a counterexample that disproves the conjecture because

$$(1+1)^2 = 4 \neq 1^2 + 1^2 = 2$$

(because the conjecture says the identity holds for all x, y, we just gave a value of x, y that disproves it)

example: let A be a square matrix. if $A^2 = I$ then A = I or -I

the conjecture is false because if we consider

$$A = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{bmatrix}$$

then we can verify that

$$A^2 = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix}$$

hence, $A^2 = I$ does not necessarily imply that A = I or A = -I

but A could be other matrices (at least the counterexample we just gave)

Quantifiers

- the quantifying clause 'for every, for all, for each' is denoted by \forall
- the quantifying clause 'there exists, there is some' is denoted by \exists
- $x \in S$ means 'x is a member of set S' or 'x belongs to S'

examples:

• for every positive real number $x,\ x^3-2x^2+x>0$

$$\forall x \in \mathbf{R}, \ x^3 - 2x^2 + x > 0$$

• there exists a real number x such that $x^2 - 2x = 4$

$$\exists x, \ x^2 - 2x = 4$$

Proofs of quantified statements

statements containing 'for some' or 'there exists' example: prove or disprove ' $\exists A \in \mathbb{R}^{2 \times 2}$, det(A) = 1'

to prove that it's true, we just need to come up with an example of A:

$$A = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ -1 & 1 \end{bmatrix} \text{ and show that } \det(A) = 1$$

hence, the statement is true

example: prove or disprove ' $\exists x \in \mathbf{R}, x^4 + 2x^2 + 1 = 0$ ' if $x \in \mathbf{R}$, then $x^4 \ge 0$ and $x^2 \ge 0$, so $x^4 + 2x^2 + 1 \ge 1$

 $x^4 + 2x^2 + 1$ can't be 0 for any $x \in \mathbf{R}$, so the statement is false

- proving that the statement is true is typically (but not always) *simple*
- disproving the statement may require some effort

statements containing 'for all' or 'for any'

example: prove or disprove ' $\forall x, y \in \mathbf{R}$, $|x + y| \le |x| + |y|$ '

$$(x+y)^{2} = x^{2} + y^{2} + 2xy \le |x|^{2} + |y|^{2} + 2|xy| = (|x|+|y|)^{2}$$

so the statement is true

example: prove or disprove 'AB = BA for any square matrices A, B' disproving it is easy because we can just give an example of A, B:

$$A = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ 2 & 0 \end{bmatrix}, \quad B = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & -1 \\ 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix}$$

and show that $AB = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ 2 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \neq BA = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & -1 \\ 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix}$ (so the statement is false)

- proving the statement is true may require some effort
- disproving the statement is typically *easy* (by giving a counterexample)

Common mistakes

example: show that for any $\alpha \in \mathbf{R}, A \in \mathbf{R}^{n \times n}$, $\det(\alpha A) = |\alpha|^n \det A$ one may show as follows

$$A = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 2 \\ -1 & 3 \end{bmatrix} \implies \det(A) = 5 \text{ and } \det(\alpha A) = \begin{vmatrix} \alpha & 2\alpha \\ -\alpha & 3\alpha \end{vmatrix} = 5\alpha^2$$

so $det(\alpha A) = \alpha^2 det(A)$ as desired

the above argument *cannot* be a proof because we just showed for *one* particular value of A

in fact, we have to show that the statement is true for all square matrices

example: show that for any $x, y \in \mathbf{R}$, $(x+y)^2 \leq 2(x^2+y^2)$

if one writes an argument like this:

$$x^{2} + 2xy + y^{2} \le 2x^{2} + 2y^{2} \implies x^{2} + y^{2} - 2xy \ge 0 \implies (x - y)^{2} \ge 0$$

then it can't be a proof because:

- we can't start a proof from the result we're going to prove !
- each step of argument must be explained with logical reasoning
- a good proof must be clear by itself; always explain with details
- the lastly obtained result must conclude what you want to prove

example of proof: for any $x, y \in \mathbf{R}$, $(x - y)^2$ is always nonnegative

• expanding $(x-y)^2$ gives

$$0 \le (x - y)^2 = x^2 - 2xy + y^2$$

• add
$$x^2 + 2xy + y^2$$
 on both sides

$$x^2 + 2xy + y^2 \le 2x^2 + 2y^2$$

• complete the square and we finish the proof

$$(x+y)^2 \le 2(x^2+y^2)$$

References

G. Chartrand, A. D. Polimeni, and P. Zhang, *Mathematical Proofs: a Transition to Advanced Mathematics*, Addison-Wesley, 2003

T. Sundstrom, Mathematical Reasoning: Writing and Proof, Pearson, 2007

R. J. Rossi, *Theorems, Corollaries, Lemmas, and Methods of Proof*, Wiley-Interscience, 2006