

## Mathematical Logic

### An overview of Proof methods

Chiara Ghidini

FBK-IRST, Trento, Italy

September 28, 2014

In these slides we present an overview of the basic proof techniques adopted in mathematics and computer science to prove theorems.

We consider:

- 1 direct proof
- 2 proof by "reductio ad absurdum", or, indirect proof
- 3 proof under hypothesis
- 4 proof by cases
- 5 proof of a universal statement
- 6 proof of an existential statement
- 7 proof of a universal implication
- 8 proof by induction

#### Theorem

*the fact  $A$  is true*

#### Schema of a direct proof (example).

- from axiom  $A_1$  it follows that  $A_2$ ,
- from axiom  $B_1$  it follows  $B_2$ ,
- from  $A_2$  and  $B_2$  it follows  $C$
- from  $C$  we can conclude that either  $C_1$  or  $C_2$ , then
- from  $C_1$  it follows that  $A$
- and also from  $C_2$  it follows that  $A$ .

So we can conclude that  $A$  is true. □

#### Remark

- Axioms ( $A_1$  and  $B_1$ ) are facts that are accepted to be true without a proof.
- from axioms we can infer other facts (e.g.,  $A_2$ ,  $B_2$ )
- from inferred facts we can infer other facts (e.g.,  $C$ )
- from a fact we can infer some alternative facts (e.g., either  $C_1$  or  $C_2$ ),
- alternatives can be treated separately, to prove the theorem. In this case we have to show that it is true in all the possible alternatives (see proof by cases).

**Theorem**

*The sum of two even integers is always even.*

**Proof.**

- Let  $x$  and  $y$  two arbitrary even numbers.  
They can be written as

$$x = 2a \text{ and } y = 2b$$

**Theorem**

*The sum of two even integers is always even.*

**Proof.**

- Let  $x$  and  $y$  two arbitrary even numbers.  
They can be written as

$$x = 2a \text{ and } y = 2b$$

- Then the sum  $x + y = 2a + 2b = 2(a + b)$

**Theorem**

*The sum of two even integers is always even.*

**Proof.**

- Let  $x$  and  $y$  two arbitrary even numbers.  
They can be written as

$$x = 2a \text{ and } y = 2b$$

- Then the sum  $x + y = 2a + 2b = 2(a + b)$
- From this it is clear that 2 is a factor of  $x + y$ .

**Theorem**

*The sum of two even integers is always even.*

**Proof.**

- Let  $x$  and  $y$  two arbitrary even numbers.  
They can be written as

$$x = 2a \text{ and } y = 2b$$

- Then the sum  $x + y = 2a + 2b = 2(a + b)$
- From this it is clear that 2 is a factor of  $x + y$ .

So, the sum of two even integers is always an even number.



## Proof by “reductio ad absurdum”

### Theorem

*It is the case that A is true*

### By reductio ad absurdum.

Suppose that A is not the case, then by reasoning, you try to reach an impossible situation. □

## Example of proof by “reductio ad absurdum”

### Theorem

*$\sqrt{2}$  is not a rational number*

### Proof.

- 1 Suppose that  $\sqrt{2}$  is a rational number

## Example of proof by “reductio ad absurdum”

### Theorem

*$\sqrt{2}$  is not a rational number*

### Proof.

- 1 Suppose that  $\sqrt{2}$  is a rational number
- 2 then there are two coprime integers  $n$  and  $m$  such that  $\sqrt{2} = n/m$  ( $n/m$  is an irreducible fraction)

### Theorem

*$\sqrt{2}$  is not a rational number*

### Proof.

- 1 Suppose that  $\sqrt{2}$  is a rational number
- 2 then there are two coprime integers  $n$  and  $m$  such that  $\sqrt{2} = n/m$  ( $n/m$  is an irreducible fraction)
- 3 which means that  $2 = n^2/m^2$

## Example of proof by “reductio ad absurdum”

### Theorem

$\sqrt{2}$  is not a rational number

### Proof.

- 1 Suppose that  $\sqrt{2}$  is a rational number
- 2 then there are two coprime integers  $n$  and  $m$  such that  $\sqrt{2} = n/m$  ( $n/m$  is an irreducible fraction)
- 3 which means that  $2 = n^2/m^2$
- 4 which implies that  $n^2 = 2 * m^2$ .



## Example of proof by “reductio ad absurdum”

### Theorem

$\sqrt{2}$  is not a rational number

### Proof.

- 1 Suppose that  $\sqrt{2}$  is a rational number
- 2 then there are two coprime integers  $n$  and  $m$  such that  $\sqrt{2} = n/m$  ( $n/m$  is an irreducible fraction)
- 3 which means that  $2 = n^2/m^2$
- 4 which implies that  $n^2 = 2 * m^2$ .
- 5 This implies that  $n$  is an even number and there exists  $k$  such that  $n = 2 * k$ .



## Example of proof by “reductio ad absurdum”

### Theorem

$\sqrt{2}$  is not a rational number

### Proof.

- 1 Suppose that  $\sqrt{2}$  is a rational number
- 2 then there are two coprime integers  $n$  and  $m$  such that  $\sqrt{2} = n/m$  ( $n/m$  is an irreducible fraction)
- 3 which means that  $2 = n^2/m^2$
- 4 which implies that  $n^2 = 2 * m^2$ .
- 5 This implies that  $n$  is an even number and there exists  $k$  such that  $n = 2 * k$ .
- 6 From  $n^2 = 2m^2$  (step 4), we obtain that  $(2 * k)^2 = 2 * m^2$



## Example of proof by “reductio ad absurdum”

### Theorem

$\sqrt{2}$  is not a rational number

### Proof.

- 1 Suppose that  $\sqrt{2}$  is a rational number
- 2 then there are two coprime integers  $n$  and  $m$  such that  $\sqrt{2} = n/m$  ( $n/m$  is an irreducible fraction)
- 3 which means that  $2 = n^2/m^2$
- 4 which implies that  $n^2 = 2 * m^2$ .
- 5 This implies that  $n$  is an even number and there exists  $k$  such that  $n = 2 * k$ .
- 6 From  $n^2 = 2m^2$  (step 4), we obtain that  $(2 * k)^2 = 2 * m^2$
- 7 which can be rewritten in  $m^2 = 2 * k^2$ .



## Example of proof by “reductio ad absurdum”

### Theorem

$\sqrt{2}$  is not a rational number

### Proof.

- 1 Suppose that  $\sqrt{2}$  is a rational number
- 2 then there are two coprime integers  $n$  and  $m$  such that  $\sqrt{2} = n/m$  ( $n/m$  is an irreducible fraction)
- 3 which means that  $2 = n^2/m^2$
- 4 which implies that  $n^2 = 2 * m^2$ .
- 5 This implies that  $n$  is an even number and there exists  $k$  such that  $n = 2 * k$ .
- 6 From  $n^2 = 2m^2$  (step 4), we obtain that  $(2 * k)^2 = 2 * m^2$
- 7 which can be rewritten in  $m^2 = 2 * k^2$ .
- 8 Similarly to above this means that  $m^2$  is even, and that  $m$  is even.



## Example of proof by “reductio ad absurdum”

### Theorem

$\sqrt{2}$  is not a rational number

### Proof.

- 1 Suppose that  $\sqrt{2}$  is a rational number
- 2 then there are two coprime integers  $n$  and  $m$  such that  $\sqrt{2} = n/m$  ( $n/m$  is an irreducible fraction)
- 3 which means that  $2 = n^2/m^2$
- 4 which implies that  $n^2 = 2 * m^2$ .
- 5 This implies that  $n$  is an even number and there exists  $k$  such that  $n = 2 * k$ .
- 6 From  $n^2 = 2m^2$  (step 4), we obtain that  $(2 * k)^2 = 2 * m^2$
- 7 which can be rewritten in  $m^2 = 2 * k^2$ .
- 8 Similarly to above this means that  $m^2$  is even, and that  $m$  is even.
- 9 but this contradicts the hypothesis that  $n$  and  $m$  are coprime, and is therefore impossible.



## Example of proof by “reductio ad absurdum”

### Theorem

$\sqrt{2}$  is not a rational number

### Proof.

- 1 Suppose that  $\sqrt{2}$  is a rational number
- 2 then there are two coprime integers  $n$  and  $m$  such that  $\sqrt{2} = n/m$  ( $n/m$  is an irreducible fraction)
- 3 which means that  $2 = n^2/m^2$
- 4 which implies that  $n^2 = 2 * m^2$ .
- 5 This implies that  $n$  is an even number and there exists  $k$  such that  $n = 2 * k$ .
- 6 From  $n^2 = 2m^2$  (step 4), we obtain that  $(2 * k)^2 = 2 * m^2$
- 7 which can be rewritten in  $m^2 = 2 * k^2$ .
- 8 Similarly to above this means that  $m^2$  is even, and that  $m$  is even.
- 9 but this contradicts the hypothesis that  $n$  and  $m$  are coprime, and is therefore impossible.
- 10 Therefore  $\sqrt{2}$  is not a rational number



## Proof under hypothesis

### Theorem

if  $A$  then  $B$

### Schema 1: Direct proof.

If  $A$  is true, then  $A_1$  is also true, then  $\dots A_n$  is true, and therefore  $B$  is true.



**Theorem***if  $A$  then  $B$* **Schema 1: Direct proof.**

If  $A$  is true, then  $A_1$  is also true, then ...  $A_n$  is true, and therefore  $B$  is true. □

**Schema 2: Proof by reductio ad absurdum.**

Suppose that  $B$  is not the case, then  $B_1$  is the case, then ... , then  $B_n$  is the case, and therefore  $A$  is not the case □

**Theorem***If  $A \cup B = A$  then  $B \subseteq A$* **Direct Proof.**

- Suppose that  $A \cup B = A$ , then □

**Theorem***If  $A \cup B = A$  then  $B \subseteq A$* **Direct Proof.**

- Suppose that  $A \cup B = A$ , then
- $x \in B$  implies that  $x \in A \cup B$ . □

**Theorem***If  $A \cup B = A$  then  $B \subseteq A$* **Direct Proof.**

- Suppose that  $A \cup B = A$ , then
- $x \in B$  implies that  $x \in A \cup B$ .
- This implies that  $x \in A$ . □

## Theorem

If  $A \cup B = A$  then  $B \subseteq A$

## Direct Proof.

- Suppose that  $A \cup B = A$ , then
- $x \in B$  implies that  $x \in A \cup B$ .
- This implies that  $x \in A$ ,
- and therefore  $B \subseteq A$ .



## Theorem

If  $A \cup B = A$  then  $B \subseteq A$

## Proof by reductio ad absurdum.

- Suppose that  $B \not\subseteq A$



## Theorem

If  $A \cup B = A$  then  $B \subseteq A$

## Proof by reductio ad absurdum.

- Suppose that  $B \not\subseteq A$
- This implies that there exists  $x \in B$  such that  $x \notin A$ .



## Theorem

If  $A \cup B = A$  then  $B \subseteq A$

## Proof by reductio ad absurdum.

- Suppose that  $B \not\subseteq A$
- This implies that there exists  $x \in B$  such that  $x \notin A$ .
- This implies that  $x \in A \cup B$  such that  $x \notin A$ ,



## Theorem

If  $A \cup B = A$  then  $B \subseteq A$

## Proof by reductio ad absurdum.

- Suppose that  $B \not\subseteq A$
- This implies that there exists  $x \in B$  such that  $x \notin A$ .
- This implies that  $x \in A \cup B$  such that  $x \notin A$ ,
- and therefore  $A \cup B \neq A$ .



## Theorem

If  $A$  then  $B$

## Proof.

If  $A$  then either  $A_1$  or  $A_2$  or ... or  $A_n$ . Then, let us consider all the cases one by one

- if  $A_1$ , then ... then  $B$
- if  $A_2$ , then ... then  $B$
- ...
- if  $A_n$ , then ... then  $B$

So in all the cases we managed to proof the same conclusion  $B$ .  
This implies that the theorem is correct.



## Example of proof by cases

## Theorem

If  $n$  is an integer then  $n^2 \geq n$ .

## Proof.

If  $n$  is an integer then we have three cases:

- 1  $n = 0$ ,
  - 2  $n > 0$ ,
  - 3  $n < 0$
- 1  $n = 0$ , then  $n^2 = 0$ , and therefore  $n^2 \geq n$ .

Since in all the cases we have conclude that  $n^2 \geq n$  we can conclude that the theorem is correct.



## Example of proof by cases

## Theorem

If  $n$  is an integer then  $n^2 \geq n$ .

## Proof.

If  $n$  is an integer then we have three cases:

- 1  $n = 0$ ,
  - 2  $n > 0$ ,
  - 3  $n < 0$
- 1  $n = 0$ , then  $n^2 = 0$ , and therefore  $n^2 \geq n$ .
- 2  $n \geq 1$ , then by multiplying the inequality for a positive integer  $n$ , we have that  $n^2 \geq n$ .

Since in all the cases we have conclude that  $n^2 \geq n$  we can conclude that the theorem is correct.





## Theorem

If  $n$  is an integer then  $n^2 \geq n$ .

## Proof.

If  $n$  is an integer then we have three cases:

- 1  $n = 0$ ,
  - 2  $n > 0$ ,
  - 3  $n < 0$
- 1  $n = 0$ , then  $n^2 = 0$ , and therefore  $n^2 \geq n$ .
  - 2  $n \geq 1$ , then by multiplying the inequality for a positive integer  $n$ , we have that  $n^2 \geq n$ .
  - 3 if  $n \leq -1$ , then since  $n^2$  is always positive we have that  $n^2 \geq n$ .

Since in all the cases we have conclude that  $n^2 \geq n$  we can conclude that the theorem is correct.  $\square$

## Theorem

The property  $A$  holds for all  $x$ .<sup>a</sup>

<sup>a</sup>In symbols,  $\forall xA(x)$ .

## Proof Schema.

Consider a generic element  $x$  and try to show that it satisfies property  $A$ .

In doing that you are not allowed to make any additional assumptions on the nature of  $x$ . If you make some extra assumption on  $x$ , say for instance that  $x$  has the property  $B$ , then you have proved a different theorem which is "for every  $x$ , if  $x$  has the property  $B$  then it has the property  $A$ ".  $\square$

## Theorem

For any integer  $a$ , if  $a$  is odd then  $a^2$  is also odd.

## Proof (direct proof in this case).

- 1 If  $a$  is odd, then  $a = 2m + 1$  for some integer  $m$  (By definition)

 $\square$ 

## Theorem

For any integer  $a$ , if  $a$  is odd then  $a^2$  is also odd.

## Proof (direct proof in this case).

- 1 If  $a$  is odd, then  $a = 2m + 1$  for some integer  $m$  (By definition)
- 2 Then  $a^2 = (2m + 1)^2 = 4m^2 + 4m + 1 = 2(2m^2 + 2m) + 1$

 $\square$

**Theorem**

For any integer  $a$ , if  $a$  is odd then  $a^2$  is also odd.

**Proof (direct proof in this case).**

- 1 If  $a$  is odd, then  $a = 2m + 1$  for some integer  $m$  (By definition)
- 2 Then  $a^2 = (2m + 1)^2 = 4m^2 + 4m + 1 = 2(2m^2 + 2m) + 1$
- 3 Let  $z = 2m^2 + 2m$ .  $z$  is an integer (trivial proof because of the fact that  $m$  is an integer).

**Theorem**

For any integer  $a$ , if  $a$  is odd then  $a^2$  is also odd.

**Proof (direct proof in this case).**

- 1 If  $a$  is odd, then  $a = 2m + 1$  for some integer  $m$  (By definition)
- 2 Then  $a^2 = (2m + 1)^2 = 4m^2 + 4m + 1 = 2(2m^2 + 2m) + 1$
- 3 Let  $z = 2m^2 + 2m$ .  $z$  is an integer (trivial proof because of the fact that  $m$  is an integer).
- 4 Then  $a^2 = 2z + 1$  for an integer  $z$ , which means, by definition, that  $a^2$  is an odd number.

**Theorem**

There is an  $x$  that has a property  $A$ .<sup>a</sup>

<sup>a</sup>In symbols,  $\exists x.A(x)$

**Schema 1: Constructive proof.**

- 1 Construct a special element  $x$  (usually by means of a procedure (a set of steps))
- 2 Show that  $x$  has the property  $A$

**Theorem**

There is an  $x$  that has a property  $A$ .<sup>a</sup>

<sup>a</sup>In symbols,  $\exists x.A(x)$

**Schema 1: Constructive proof.**

- 1 Construct a special element  $x$  (usually by means of a procedure (a set of steps))
- 2 Show that  $x$  has the property  $A$

**Schema 2: Non Constructive proof (reductio ad absurdum).**

Assume that there is no such an  $x$  such that the property  $A$  holds for  $x$  and try to reach an inconsistent (absurd) situation.



**Theorem**

*There is an integer  $n > 5$  such that  $2^n - 1$  is a prime number.*

**Proof (constructive).**

- 1 Examine all integers  $n > 5$ .

**Theorem**

*There is an integer  $n > 5$  such that  $2^n - 1$  is a prime number.*

**Proof (constructive).**

- 1 Examine all integers  $n > 5$ .
- 2  $n = 6$ .  $2^6 - 1 = 64 - 1 = 63$ . NO!

**Theorem**

*There is an integer  $n > 5$  such that  $2^n - 1$  is a prime number.*

**Proof (constructive).**

- 1 Examine all integers  $n > 5$ .
- 2  $n = 6$ .  $2^6 - 1 = 64 - 1 = 63$ . NO!
- 3  $n = 7$ .  $2^7 - 1 = 128 - 1 = 127$ . YES!



- Disproving universal statements reduces in proving an existential one.

Don't try to construct a general argument when a single specific counterexample would be sufficient!

**Example**

For every rational number  $q$ , there is a rational number  $r$  such that  $qr = 1$

- Disproving universal statements reduces in proving an existential one.

Dont try to construct a general argument when a single specific counterexample would be sufficient!

#### Example

For every rational number  $q$ , there is a rational number  $r$  such that  $qr = 1$

This statement is false. In fact 0 has no inverse.

- Disproving an existential statement needs proving a universal one.

#### Example

There is an integer  $k$  such that  $k^2 + 2k + 1 < 0$

This statement is false. Indeed it can be proved that  $k^2 + 2k + 1 \geq 0$

- Disproving an existential statement needs proving a universal one.

#### Example

There is an integer  $k$  such that  $k^2 + 2k + 1 < 0$

#### Theorem

For all  $x$ , if  $x$  has a property  $A$ , then  $x$  has the property  $B$ .<sup>a</sup>

<sup>a</sup>In symbols,  $\forall x(A(x) \rightarrow B(x))$ .

#### Proof.

The proof is a combination of the proof method for universal statements, and the proof for implication statements.

Take an arbitrary  $x$  that satisfies the property  $A$ . then show, either with a direct proof or by reductio ad absurdum, that if  $x$  has property  $A$ , then  $x$  has property  $B$  as well.  $\square$

## Theorem

For all  $x$ , if  $x$  has a property  $A$ , then  $x$  has the property  $B$ .<sup>a</sup>

<sup>a</sup>In symbols,  $\forall x(A(x) \Rightarrow B(x))$ .

## Proof.

The proof is a combination of the proof method for universal statements, and the proof for implication statements.

Take an arbitrary  $x$  that satisfies the property  $A$ . then show, either with a direct proof or by reductio ad absurdum, that if  $x$  has property  $A$ , then  $x$  has property  $B$  as well.  $\square$

## Remark

If there is no such  $x$  that has a property  $A$ , the theorem  $\forall x(A(x) \Rightarrow B(x))$  is true. For instance the statement

"For every number  $x$  (if  $x > y$  for all  $y$ , then  $y = 23$ )"

is a theorem.

The proof consists in showing that there is no  $x$  which is greater than all the numbers.

The simplest and most common form of mathematical induction infers that a statement involving a natural number  $n$  holds for all values of  $n$ .

The proof consists of two steps:

- 1 The basis (**base case**): prove that the statement holds for the first natural number  $n$ . Usually,  $n = 0$  or  $n = 1$ .
- 2 The **inductive step**: prove that, if the statement holds for some natural number  $n$ , then the statement holds for  $n + 1$ .

The hypothesis in the inductive step that the statement holds for some  $n$  is called the **inductive hypothesis**.

## Proof by induction: example

## Theorem

$$0 + 1 + \dots + x = \frac{x(x+1)}{2} \quad [x \text{ Natural Number}]$$

## proof

**Base case** Show that the statement holds for  $n = 0$ .

$$0 = \frac{0(0+1)}{2}$$

**Inductive step** Show that if the statement holds for  $n$ , then it holds for  $n + 1$ .

Assume that  $0 + 1 + \dots + n = \frac{n(n+1)}{2}$ , we have to show that

$$0 + 1 + \dots + n + (n+1) = \frac{(n+1)((n+1)+1)}{2}$$

## Proof by induction: example - cont'd

- 1  $0 + 1 + \dots + n + (n+1) = \frac{n(n+1)}{2} + (n+1)$  from the inductive hypothesis

$$\textcircled{1} 0 + 1 + \dots + n + (n+1) = \frac{n(n+1)}{2} + (n+1) \text{ from the inductive hypothesis}$$

$$\textcircled{2} \text{ Algebraically, } \frac{n(n+1)}{2} + (n+1) = \frac{n(n+1) + 2(n+1)}{2}$$

$$\textcircled{1} 0 + 1 + \dots + n + (n+1) = \frac{n(n+1)}{2} + (n+1) \text{ from the inductive hypothesis}$$

$$\textcircled{2} \text{ Algebraically, } \frac{n(n+1)}{2} + (n+1) = \frac{n(n+1) + 2(n+1)}{2}$$

$$\textcircled{3} = \frac{n^2 + n + 2n + 2}{2}$$

$$\textcircled{1} 0 + 1 + \dots + n + (n+1) = \frac{n(n+1)}{2} + (n+1) \text{ from the inductive hypothesis}$$

$$\textcircled{2} \text{ Algebraically, } \frac{n(n+1)}{2} + (n+1) = \frac{n(n+1) + 2(n+1)}{2}$$

$$\textcircled{3} = \frac{n^2 + n + 2n + 2}{2}$$

$$\textcircled{4} = \frac{(n+1)(n+2)}{2}$$

$$\textcircled{1} 0 + 1 + \dots + n + (n+1) = \frac{n(n+1)}{2} + (n+1) \text{ from the inductive hypothesis}$$

$$\textcircled{2} \text{ Algebraically, } \frac{n(n+1)}{2} + (n+1) = \frac{n(n+1) + 2(n+1)}{2}$$

$$\textcircled{3} = \frac{n^2 + n + 2n + 2}{2}$$

$$\textcircled{4} = \frac{(n+1)(n+2)}{2}$$

$$\textcircled{5} = \frac{(n+1)(n+1+1)}{2}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
 1 \quad & 0 + 1 + \dots + n + (n+1) = \frac{n(n+1)}{2} + (n+1) \text{ from the inductive hypothesis} \\
 2 \quad & \text{Algebraically, } \frac{n(n+1)}{2} + (n+1) = \frac{n(n+1) + 2(n+1)}{2} \\
 3 \quad & = \frac{n^2 + n + 2n + 2}{2} \\
 4 \quad & = \frac{(n+1)(n+2)}{2} \\
 5 \quad & = \frac{(n+1)(n+1+1)}{2} \\
 6 \quad & = \frac{(n+1)((n+1)+1)}{2}
 \end{aligned}$$

## Example of set defined by induction

## Definition

We inductively define a set  $P$  of strings, built starting from the Latin alphabet, as follows:

**Base**  $\langle a \rangle, \langle b \rangle, \dots, \langle z \rangle \in P$

**Step 1** if  $x \in P$  then  $\text{concat}(x, x) \in P$

**Step 2** if  $x, y \in P$ , then  $\text{concat}(x, y, x) \in P$

**Closure** nothing else is in  $P$

where  $\text{concat}(\langle x_1 \dots x_n \rangle, \langle y_1 \dots y_n \rangle) = \langle x_1 \dots x_n y_1 \dots y_n \rangle$ .

## Main idea

Prove a statement of the form  
for all  $x$ ,  $x$  has the property  $A$

when  $x$  is an element of a set which is inductively defined.

Definition (Inductive definition of  $A$ )

The set  $A$  is inductively defined as follows:

**Base:**  $a_1 \in A, a_2 \in A, \dots, a_n \in A$

**Step 1:** if  $y_1 \dots y_{k_1} \in A$ , then  $S_1(y_1, \dots, y_{k_1}) \in A$

**Step 2:** if  $y_1 \dots y_{k_2} \in A$ , then  $S_2(y_1, \dots, y_{k_2}) \in A$

$\vdots$

**Step  $m$ :** if  $y_1 \dots y_{k_m} \in A$ , then  $S_m(y_1, \dots, y_{k_m}) \in A$

**Closure:** Nothing else is contained in  $A$

## Example of proof by induction on sets defined by induction.

## Theorem

For any  $x \in P$ ,  $x$  is a palindrome, i.e.,  $x = \langle x_1 \dots x_n \rangle \in P$  and for all  $1 \leq k \leq n$ ,  $x_k = x_{n-k+1}$ .

## Proof.

**Base case** We have to prove that  $x$  is palindrome for all strings in the Base set.

If  $x$  belongs to  $P$  because of the base case definition, then it is either  $\langle a \rangle$  or  $\dots \langle z \rangle$ , then it is of the form  $x = \langle x_1 \rangle$ , then  $n = 1$  and for all  $k \leq 1 \leq 1$ , i.e., for  $k = 1$  we have that  $x_1 = x_{1-1+1}$ .

**Inductive step** Show that if the statement holds for a certain  $P$ , then it holds also for  $P$  enriched by the strings at steps 1 and 2.

**Step 1.** If  $x \in P$  because of step 1, then  $x$  is of the form  $\text{concat}(y, y)$ , for some  $y \in P$ . From the definition of "concat",  $x$  is of the form  $\langle y_1 \dots y_{n/2} y_1 \dots y_{n/2} \rangle$ , where  $\langle y_1 \dots y_{n/2} \rangle \in P$  (i.e., is palindrome).

By induction for all  $1 \leq k \leq n/2$ ,  $y_k = y_{n/2-k+1}$ .

This implies that, for all  $1 \leq k \leq n$ , if  $k \leq n/2$ , then

$$x_k = y_k = y_{n/2-k+1} = x_{n/2+n/2-k+1} = x_{n-k+1}.$$

# Example of proof by induction on sets defined by induction.

## Proof.

**Inductive step** Show that if the statement holds for a certain  $P$ , then it holds also for  $P$  enriched by the strings at steps 1 and 2.

**Step 2.** If  $x \in P$  because of step 2, then  $x$  is of the form  $\text{concat}(z, y, z)$ , for some  $z, y \in P$ . From the definition of "concat",  $x$  is of the form  $\langle z_1 \dots z_l y_1 \dots y_h z_1 \dots z_l \rangle$ , where  $\langle z_1 \dots z_l \rangle \in P$  and  $\langle y_1 \dots y_h \rangle \in P$  (i.e., are palindrome).

By induction for all  $1 \leq k \leq l$ ,  $z_k = z_{l-k+1}$  and for all  $1 \leq k \leq h$ ,

$$y_k = y_{h-k+1}.$$

This implies that for all  $1 \leq k \leq n$  we have that:

**Case 1** if  $k \leq l$ , then  $x_k = z_k = z_{l-k+1} = x_{l+h+l-k+1} = x_{n-k+1}$ .

**Case 2** if  $l+1 \leq k \leq l+1+h/2$ , then

$$x_k = y_{k-l} = y_{h-k+l+1} = x_{h-k+l+l+1} = x_{n-k+1}.$$

