CS311H: Discrete Mathematics

Mathematical Induction

Instructor: Işıl Dillig

Introduction to Mathematical Induction

- Many mathematical theorems assert that a property holds for all natural numbers, odd positive integers, etc.
- Mathematical induction: very important proof technique for proving such universally quantified statements
- Induction will come up over and over again in other classes:
  - algorithms, programming languages, automata theory, ...

Analogy

- Suppose we have an infinite ladder, and we know two things:
  1. We can reach the first rung of the ladder
  2. If we reach a particular rung, then we can also reach the next rung
- From these two facts, can we conclude we can reach every step of the infinite ladder?
- Answer is yes, and mathematical induction allows us to make arguments like this

Mathematical Induction

- Used to prove statements of the form $\forall x \in \mathbb{Z}^+.\ P(x)$
- An inductive proof has two steps:
  1. Base case: Prove that $P(1)$ is true
  2. Inductive step: Prove $\forall n \in \mathbb{Z}^+.\ P(n) \rightarrow P(n+1)$
- Induction says if you can prove (1) and (2), you can conclude:

$$\forall x \in \mathbb{Z}^+.\ P(x)$$

Inductive Hypothesis

- In the inductive step, need to show:

$$\forall n \in \mathbb{Z}^+.\ P(n) \rightarrow P(n+1)$$

- To prove this, we assume $P(n)$ holds, and based on this assumption, prove $P(n+1)$
- The assumption that $P(n)$ holds is called the inductive hypothesis

Example 1

- Prove the following statement by induction:

$$\forall n \in \mathbb{Z}^+.\ \sum_{i=1}^{n} i = \frac{(n)(n+1)}{2}$$

- Base case: $n = 1$. In this case, $\sum_{i=1}^{1} i = 1$ and $\frac{(1)(1+1)}{2} = 1$; thus, the base case holds.
- Inductive step: By the inductive hypothesis, we assume $P(k)$:

$$\sum_{i=1}^{k} i = \frac{(k)(k+1)}{2}$$

- Now, we want to show $P(k+1)$:

$$\sum_{i=1}^{k+1} i = \frac{(k+1)(k+2)}{2}$$

Example 1, cont.

- First, observe:

$$\sum_{i=1}^{k+1} i = \sum_{i=1}^{k} i + (k+1)$$

- By the inductive hypothesis, $\sum_{i=1}^{k} i = \frac{(k)(k+1)}{2}$; thus:

$$\sum_{i=1}^{k+1} i = \frac{(k)(k+1)}{2} + (k+1)$$

- Rewrite left hand side as:

$$\sum_{i=1}^{k+1} i = \frac{k^2+3k+2}{2} = \frac{(k+1)(k+2)}{2}$$

- Since we proved both base case and inductive step, property holds.

Example 2

- Prove the following statement for all non-negative integers n:

$$\sum_{i=0}^{n} 2^i = 2^{n+1} - 1$$

- Since need to show for all $n \geq 0$, base case is $P(0)$, not $P(1)$!
- Base case ($n = 0$): $2^0 = 1 = 2^1 - 1$
- Inductive step:

$$\sum_{i=0}^{k+1} 2^i = \sum_{i=0}^{k} 2^i + 2^{k+1}$$

Example 2, cont.

$$\sum_{i=0}^{k+1} 2^i = \sum_{i=0}^{k} 2^i + 2^{k+1}$$

- By the inductive hypothesis, we have:

$$\sum_{i=0}^{k} 2^i = 2^{k+1} - 1$$

- Therefore:

$$\sum_{i=0}^{k+1} 2^i = 2^{k+1} - 1 + 2^{k+1}$$

- Rewrite as:

$$\sum_{i=0}^{k+1} 2^i = 2 \cdot 2^{k+1} - 1 + = 2^{k+2} - 1$$

Example 3

- Prove that $2^n < n!$ for all integers $n \geq 4$
-
-
-
-

Example 4

- Prove that $3 \mid (n^3 - n)$ for all positive integers n.
-
-
-
-
-

The Horse Paradox

- Easy to make subtle errors when trying to prove things by induction – pay attention to details!
- Consider the statement: All horses have the same color
- What is wrong with the following bogus proof of this statement?
- $P(n)$: A collection of n horses have the same color
- Base case: $P(1)$ ✓

Bogus Proof, cont.

- Induction: Assume $P(k)$; prove $P(k+1)$
- Consider a collection of $k+1$ horses: $h_1, h_2, \ldots, h_{k+1}$
- By IH, $h_1, h_2, \ldots, h_k$ have the same color; let this color be c
- By IH, $h_2, \ldots, h_{k+1}$ have same color; call this color c'
- Since h_2 has color c and c', we have $c = c'$
- Thus, $h_1, h_2, \ldots, h_{k+1}$ also have same color
- What's the fallacy?

Strengthening the Inductive Hypothesis

- Suppose we want to prove $\forall x \in \mathbb{Z}^+.P(x)$, but proof doesn't go through
- Common trick: Prove a stronger property $Q(x)$
- If $\forall x \in \mathbb{Z}^+.Q(x) \rightarrow P(x)$ and $\forall x \in \mathbb{Z}^+.Q(x)$ is provable, this implies $\forall x \in \mathbb{Z}^+.P(x)$
- In many situations, strengthening inductive hypothesis allows proof to go through!

Example

- Prove the following theorem: "For all $n \geq 1$, the sum of the first n odd numbers is a perfect square."
- We want to prove $\forall x \in \mathbb{Z}^+.P(x)$ where:

$$P(n) = \sum_{i=1}^{n} 2i - 1 = k^2 \text{ for some integer k}$$

- Try to prove this using induction...

Example, cont.

- Let's use a stronger predicate:

$$Q(n) = \sum_{i=1}^{n} 2i - 1 = n^2$$

- Clearly $Q(n) \rightarrow P(n)$
- Now, prove $\forall n \in \mathbb{Z}^+.Q(n)$ using induction!

Strong Induction

- Slight variation on the inductive proof technique is strong induction
- Regular and strong induction only differ in the inductive step
- Regular induction: assume $P(k)$ holds and prove $P(k+1)$
- Strong induction: assume $P(1), P(2), .., P(k)$; prove $P(k+1)$
- Strong induction can be viewed as standard induction with strengthened inductive hypothesis!

Motivation for Strong Induction

- Prove that if n is an integer greater than 1, then it is either a prime or can be written as the product of primes.
- Let's first try to prove the property using regular induction.
- Base case (n=2): Since 2 is a prime number, $P(2)$ holds.
- Inductive step: Assume k is either a prime or the product of primes.
- But this doesn't really help us prove the property about $k+1$!
- Claim is proven much easier using strong induction!

Proof Using Strong Induction

Prove that if n is an integer greater than 1, then it is either a prime or can be written as the product of primes.

- Base case: same as before.
- Inductive step: Assume each of $2, 3, \ldots, k$ is either prime or product of primes.
- Now, we want to prove the same thing about $k+1$
- Two cases: k is either (i) prime or (ii) composite
- If it is prime, property holds.

Proof, cont.

- If composite, $k+1$ can be written as pq where $2 \geq p, q \geq k$
- By the IH, p, q are either primes or product of primes.
- Thus, $k+1$ can also be written as product of primes
- Observe: Much easier to prove this property using strong induction!

A Word about Base Cases

- In all examples so far, we had only one base case
  - i.e., only proved the base case for one integer
- In some inductive proofs, there may be multiple base cases
  - i.e., prove base case for the first k numbers
- In the latter case, inductive step only needs to consider numbers greater than k

Example

- Prove that every integer $n \geq 12$ can be written as $n = 4a + 5b$ for some non-negative integers a, b.
- Proof by strong induction on n and consider 4 base cases
- Base case 1 (n=12): $12 = 3 \cdot 4 + 0 \cdot 5$
- Base case 2 (n=13): $13 = 2 \cdot 4 + 1 \cdot 5$
- Base case 3 (n=14): $14 = 1 \cdot 4 + 2 \cdot 5$
- Base case 4 (n=15): $15 = 0 \cdot 4 + 3 \cdot 5$

Example, cont.

Prove that every integer $n \geq 12$ can be written as $n = 4a + 5b$ for some non-negative integers a, b.

- Inductive hypothesis: Suppose every $12 \leq i \leq k$ can be written as $i = 4a + 5b$.
- Inductive step: We want to show $k+1$ can also be written this way for $k+1 \geq 16$
- Observe: $k + 1 = (k - 3) + 4$
- By the inductive hypothesis, $k - 3 = 4a + 5b$ for some a, b because $k - 3 \geq 12$
- But then, $k+1$ can be written as $4(a+1) + 5b$

Matchstick Example

- The Matchstick game: There are two piles with same number of matches initially
- Two players take turns removing any positive number of matches from one of the two piles
- Player who removes the last match wins the game
- Prove: Second player always has a winning strategy.

Matchstick Proof

- $P(n)$: Player 2 has winning strategy if initially n matches in each pile
- Base case:
- Induction: Assume $\forall j. 1 \leq j \leq k \rightarrow P(j)$; show $P(k+1)$
- Inductive hypothesis:
- Prove Player 2 wins if each pile contains $k+1$ matches

Matchstick Proof, cont.

- Case 1: Player 1 takes $k+1$ matches from one of the piles.
- What is winning strategy for player 2
- Case 2: Player 1 takes r matches from one pile, where $1 \leq r \leq k$
- Now, player 2 takes r matches from other pile
- Now, the inductive hypothesis applies $\Rightarrow$ player 2 has winning strategy for rest of the game