Mathematical Reasoning (Part 1)

1

Mathematical Reasoning terms

- Theorem = statement that can be shown to be true
- proof = sequence of statements that show that the theorem is true
- axiom, postulates = assumptions, hypothesis
- rules of inference = rules used to draw conclusion for each step of a proof
- fallacies = incorrect reasoning
- lemma = simple theorem (used in the proof of a bigger theorem)

Mathematical Reasoning terms (cont.)

- Corollary = a proposition that can be established directly from a theorem
- conjecture = statement that has unknown truth value
- an argument is valid if whenever all hypothesis are true, the conclusion is also true (p->q for example)
 - but a hypothesis can be false, i.e. valid does not mean correct

Rules of inference

- These are tautology that we can use in a proof
- Example: tautology $(p \land (p \rightarrow q)) \rightarrow q$

Modus ponens (law of detachment)

 $\frac{p}{p \to q}$ $\therefore q$

addition	$p \rightarrow (p \lor q)$
simplification	$(p \land q) \rightarrow p$
conjunction	$[(p) \land (q)] \rightarrow (p \land q)$
Modus ponens	$[p \land (p \rightarrow q)] \rightarrow q$
Modus tollens	$[\neg q \land (p \rightarrow q)] \rightarrow \neg p$
Hypothetical syllogism	$[(p \to q) \land (q \to r)] \to (p \to r)$
Disjunctive syllogism	$[(p \lor q) \land \neg p] \to q$

Example of logical proof

• Show that sendmail \rightarrow finishwork \neg sendmail \rightarrow sleepearly sleepearly \rightarrow wakeupgood

leads to the conclusion that

 \neg *finishwork* \rightarrow *wakeupgood*

See the board :)

Show that $\neg sunny \land cold$ $swim \rightarrow sunny$ $\neg swim \rightarrow canoe$ $canoe \rightarrow backearly$

leads to the conclusion that

۲

backearly

See the board :)

Rules of inference for quantifier

U instantiation	$\forall x P(x) \rightarrow P(C)$ if $C \in U$
U generalization	$P(C)$ for an arbitrary $C \in U \rightarrow \forall X P(X)$
E instantiation	$\exists x P(x) \rightarrow P(C)$ for some element $C \in U$
E generalization	$P(C)$ for some element $C \in U \rightarrow \exists X P(X)$

Rules of inference for quantifier (example)

Show that $X \in discrete math class$ $\forall x [comstudent(x)]$ $Don \in discrete math class$

leads to the conclusion that

٠

comstudent (Don)

See the board :)

Method of proving theorem in the form p->q

- Direct proof
 - assume p true
 - show q is true
- Indirect proof
 - is a direct prove of $\neg q \rightarrow \neg p$
- Vacuous proof
 - show that p is false

Method of proving theorem in the form p->q (cont.)

- Trivial proof
 - show q is true
- Contradiction proof
 - assume the negation of we are proving is true, then find any contradicting statements
 - e.g. to prove p, we must assume $\neg p$ to be true

Method of proving theorem in the form p->q (cont2.)

- Proof by cases
 - to prove $(p_1 \lor p_2 \lor \ldots \lor p_n) \to q$, we can, instead, prove that $(p_1 \to q) \land (p_2 \to q) \land \ldots (p_n \to q)$

- to prove
$$p \leftrightarrow q$$
, we can prove $(p \rightarrow q) \land (q \rightarrow p)$

- to prove $p_1 \leftrightarrow p_2 \leftrightarrow \ldots \leftrightarrow p_n$, we can prove

$$(p_1 \rightarrow p_2) \land (p_2 \rightarrow p_3) \land \dots \land (p_n \rightarrow p_1)$$

Proving theorem with quantifier

• To prove $\exists X P(X)$

- just find an x that works = constructive proof

- can prove by other means, such as contradiction
- To prove $\forall x P(x)$
 - usually it is proving that it is false
 - just show an x where P(x) is false = counter example

Important prove example: Halting problem

- There is no program that, given a program and an input, can determine if that program terminates
- Prove by contradiction:
- assume $P \longrightarrow H$ I \longrightarrow "halt" or "loop"
- Let K be another machine such that

- if H(P,P) halts, K(P) loops and vice versa

 Then we replace P by K for both machine H and K -> we see contradiction

Mathematical Reasoning (Part 2)

Mathematical Induction, proving $\forall x P(x)$

We do it by:

- show that the base case is true
 Inductive hypothesis
- assume P(x) is true, and use this assumption to show that P(x+1) is true

Math. Induction, why does it work?!

- Assume we know the base case and $P(x) \rightarrow P(x+1)$ are true
- Let's assume that there is some x that makes P(x) false. That x must be a member of a set (let's say set S) which holds all x that P (x) is false.
 - Then there is a least element k of the set S
 - hence, k-1 is surely not in S and therefore P(k-1) must be true
 - by the first assumption, P(k) must also be true.... But this is contradiction.

Math induction example:

<u>Prove:</u> 1+3+5+... = n*n (increment for 2n-1 each time)

- Base case: n=1: yes, LHS =RHS
- Assume:
- Show:

<u>Prove</u>: $n < 2^n$

- Base case: $1 < 2^1$
- Assume: $n < 2^n$
- Show that: $(n + 1) < 2^{(n+1)}$

$$\underline{\operatorname{Prove}}: \sum_{j=0}^{n} ar^{j} = \frac{ar^{n+1} - a}{r-1}$$

- Base case: j=0
- Assume:.....
- Show that:

Prove:
$$1 + \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{3} + \dots + \frac{1}{2^n} \ge 1 + \frac{n}{2}$$

- Base case: $1 \ge 1 + 0/2$ •
- Assume:.... ۲
- Show that: $1 + \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{3} + \dots + \frac{1}{2^{n+1}} \ge 1 + \frac{n+1}{2}$ •



<u>Prove</u>: chessboard $2^n * 2^n$ with 1 square removed can be tiled using L-shape pieces

- Base case:
- Assume:
- Show that:

Second principle of Math Induction

- Base case
- Assume that P(next to base case) to P(n) are true
- show that P(n+1) is true
- Example: prove that any integer n (>1) is a product of prime
 - base case: P(2) yes, 2 is a product of prime
 - Assume: P(k) for all $k \le n$
 - show P(n+1)

Recursive (or inductive) definition

• Something that repeatedly call itself...but with smaller input, until the call ends at the base case

$$-: a_{n+1} = 2a_n$$

- : factorial
$$f(n+1) = (n+1)f(n)$$
, $f(0) = 1$

- : fibonacci f(0) = 0, f(1)=1, f(n) = f(n-1) + f(n-2)

Set with recursive definition



Well-formed formula (what's it got to do with recursion?)

- x is a well-formed formula if x is a numeral or a variable
- (f+g), (f-g), (f*g), (f/g), (f exp g) are well-formed formulae if f and g are.

- X and 5 are well-formed, so is x+5

- T,F and p where p is a propositional variable, are well-formed
- if p and q are well-formed, so is

$\neg p, p \land q, p \lor q, p \rightarrow q, p \leftrightarrow q$

Well-known recursive algorithms

- Linear search: search(a,i,j,x) -
 - if a[i] = x then return 1
 - else if i=j then return 0
 - else search(a,i+1,j,x)
- Binary search: bisearch(a,i,j,x)
 - k = floor((i+j)/2)
 - if x=a[k] then return 1
 - else if $(x \le a[k] and i \le k)$ then bisearch(a,i,k-1,x)
 - else if $(x \ge a[k] and j \ge k)$ then bisearch(a,k+1,j,x)
 - else return 0

Recursion and iteration

- Fac(n) = n*fac(n-1) ->recursion
- x:=1; for(int k=1,k<=n,k++){x = x*k} -> iteration
- iteration needs less computation (see fibonacci)
 - recursion requires many additions
 - while iteration requires only few additions z:=x+y; x=y; y=z;

Mathematical Reasoning (Part 3)

Introduction to program verification

To prove that a program is correct

- show that the correct answer is obtained if the program terminates.
 (partial correctness) with respect to initial and final assertions
- show that the program always terminates



To be correct-> whenever p is true, q must also be true. This notation represents the partial correctness

Rules about program correctness

$[(p\{S_1\}q) \land (q\{S_2\}r)] \rightarrow p\{S_1;S_2\}r$

$[(p \land condition \{S\}q) \land (p \land \neg condition) \rightarrow q] \rightarrow p\{if - condition, then - S\}q$

 $[(p \land condition \{S_1\}q) \land (p \land \neg condition \{S_2\}q] \rightarrow p\{if - condition, then - S_1, else - S_2\}q$

Loop invariant

Loop invariant

$(p \land condition\{S\}p) \rightarrow$ $p\{while - condition - S\}(\neg condition \land p)$