

## 1 Divisibility Induction

Prove that for all  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  with  $n \geq 1$ , the number  $n^3 - n$  is divisible by 3. (**Hint:** recall the binomial expansion  $(a + b)^3 = a^3 + 3a^2b + 3ab^2 + b^3$ )

**Solution:** Base Case:  $n = 1$ .  $1^3 - 1 = 0$ , 0 is divisible by 3.

Assume that for  $n \leq k$ , where  $k \geq 1$ ,  $k^3 - k$  is divisible by 3.

Now consider  $n = k + 1$ . We want to show that  $(k + 1)^3 - (k + 1)$  is also divisible by 3.

$$(k + 1)^3 - (k + 1) = k^3 + 3k^2 + 3k + 1 - k - 1 = k^3 + 3k^2 + 2k = (k^3 - k) + 3k^2 + 3k$$

By the Inductive Hypothesis, we know the part in parentheses is divisible by 3 and the rest has a factor of 3, so the whole term is divisible by 3.

## 2 Make It Stronger

Let  $x \geq 1$  be a real number. Use induction to prove that for all positive integers  $n$ , all of the entries in the matrix

$$\begin{pmatrix} 1 & x \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}^n$$

are  $\leq xn$ . (Hint 1: Find a way to strengthen the inductive hypothesis! Hint 2: Try writing out the first few powers.)

**Solution:** Before starting the proof, writing out the first few powers reveals a telling pattern:

$$\begin{aligned} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & x \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}^1 &= \begin{pmatrix} 1 & x \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \\ \begin{pmatrix} 1 & x \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}^2 &= \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 2x \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \\ \begin{pmatrix} 1 & x \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}^3 &= \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 3x \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \end{aligned}$$

It appears (and we shall soon prove) that the upper left and lower right entries are always 1, the lower left entry is always 0, and the upper right entry is  $xn$ . We shall take this to be our inductive hypothesis.

**Proof:** We prove that

$$\begin{pmatrix} 1 & x \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}^n = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & nx \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}.$$

This claim clearly also proves the original claim in the question, since all elements of this matrix are  $\leq xn$  (since  $x \geq 1$ ). Hence, we prove this stronger claim.

- Base case (n=1):  $P(1)$  asserts that  $\begin{pmatrix} 1 & x \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}^1 = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & x \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$ . The base case is true.
- Inductive Hypothesis: Assume for arbitrary  $k \geq 1$ ,  $P(k)$  is correct:  $\begin{pmatrix} 1 & x \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}^k = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & xk \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$ .
- Inductive Step: Prove the statement for  $n = k + 1$ ,

$$\begin{pmatrix} 1 & x \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}^{k+1} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & xk \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & x \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 1+0 & xk+x \\ 0+0 & 0+1 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & x(k+1) \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}.$$

By the principle of induction, our proposition is therefore true for all  $n \geq 1$ , so all entries in the matrix will be less than or equal to  $xn$ .

### 3 Binary Numbers

Prove that every positive integer  $n$  can be written in binary. In other words, prove that we can write

$$n = c_k \cdot 2^k + c_{k-1} \cdot 2^{k-1} + \dots + c_1 \cdot 2^1 + c_0 \cdot 2^0,$$

where  $k \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $c_k \in \{0, 1\}$ .

#### **Solution:**

Prove by strong induction on  $n$ . (Note that this is the first discussion where the students use strong induction, so it is important that this problem be done in an interactive way that shows them how simple induction gets stuck.)

The key insight here is that if  $n$  is divisible by 2, then it is easy to get a bit string representation of  $(n + 1)$  from that of  $n$ . However, if  $n$  is not divisible by 2, then  $(n + 1)$  will be, and its binary representation will be more easily derived from that of  $(n + 1)/2$ . More formally:

- Base Case:  $n = 1$  can be written as  $1 \times 2^0$ .
- Inductive Step: Assume that the statement is true for all  $1 \leq m \leq n$ , where  $n$  is arbitrary. Now, we need to consider  $n + 1$ . If  $n + 1$  is divisible by 2, then we can apply our inductive hypothesis to  $(n + 1)/2$  and use its representation to express  $n + 1$  in the desired form.

$$\begin{aligned} (n + 1)/2 &= c_k \cdot 2^k + c_{k-1} \cdot 2^{k-1} + \dots + c_1 \cdot 2^1 + c_0 \cdot 2^0 \\ n + 1 &= 2 \cdot (n + 1)/2 = c_k \cdot 2^{k+1} + c_{k-1} \cdot 2^k + \dots + c_1 \cdot 2^2 + c_0 \cdot 2^1 + 0 \cdot 2^0. \end{aligned}$$

Otherwise,  $n$  must be divisible by 2 and thus have  $c_0 = 0$ . We can obtain the representation of  $n + 1$  from  $n$  as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} n &= c_k \cdot 2^k + c_{k-1} \cdot 2^{k-1} + \cdots + c_1 \cdot 2^1 + 0 \cdot 2^0 \\ n + 1 &= c_k \cdot 2^k + c_{k-1} \cdot 2^{k-1} + \cdots + c_1 \cdot 2^1 + 1 \cdot 2^0 \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, the statement is true.

Here is another alternate solution emulating the algorithm of converting a decimal number to a binary number.

- Base Case:  $n = 1$  can be written as  $1 \times 2^0$ .
- Inductive Step: Assume that the statement is true for all  $1 \leq m \leq n$ , for arbitrary  $n$ . We show that the statement holds for  $2^k$ . Let  $2^m$  be the largest power of 2 such that  $n \geq 2^m$ . Thus,  $n < 2^{m+1}$ . We examine the number  $n - 2^m$ . Since  $n - 2^m < n + 1$ , the inductive hypothesis holds, so we have a binary representation for  $n - 2^m$ . Also, since  $n < 2^{m+1}$ ,  $n - 2^m < 2^m$ , so the largest power of 2 in the representation of  $n - 2^m$  is  $2^{m-1}$ . Thus, by the inductive hypothesis,

$$n - 2^m = c_{m-1} \cdot 2^{m-1} + c_{m-2} \cdot 2^{m-2} + \cdots + c_1 \cdot 2^1 + c_0 \cdot 2^0,$$

and adding  $2^m$  to both sides gives

$$n = 2^m + c_{m-1} \cdot 2^{m-1} + c_{m-2} \cdot 2^{m-2} + \cdots + c_1 \cdot 2^1 + c_0 \cdot 2^0,$$

which is a binary representation for  $n$ . Thus, the induction is complete.

Another intuition is that if  $x$  has a binary representation,  $2x$  and  $2x + 1$  do as well: shift the bits and possibly place 1 in the last bit. The above induction could then have proceeded from  $n$  and used the binary representation of  $\lfloor n/2 \rfloor$ , shifting and possibly setting the first bit depending on whether  $n$  is odd or even.

Note: In proofs using simple induction, we only use  $P(n)$  in order to prove  $P(n + 1)$ . Simple induction gets stuck here because in order to prove  $P(n + 1)$  in the inductive step, we need to assume more than just  $P(n)$ . This is because it is not immediately clear how to get a representation for  $P(n + 1)$  using just  $P(n)$ , particularly in the case that  $n + 1$  is divisible by 2. As a result, we assume the statement to be true for all of  $1, 2, \dots, n$  in order to prove it for  $P(n + 1)$ .