

1) Suppose that  $R$  is a partial order on  $A$ ,  $B_1 \subseteq A$ ,  $B_2 \subseteq A$  and

$$\forall x \in B_1[\exists y \in B_2(xRy)] \quad \text{and} \quad \forall x \in B_2[\exists y \in B_1(xRy)].$$

- (a) Prove that if  $x \in A$  is an upper bound of  $B_1$ , then  $x$  is also an upper bound of  $B_2$ . [The converse is also true, and the proof would very similar, but you don't have to do it.]

*Proof.* Let  $x$  be an upper bound for  $B_1$  and  $a \in B_2$ . Then, by assumption, there is  $b \in B_1$  such that  $aRb$ . Now, since  $x$  is an upper bound of  $B_1$  and  $b \in B_1$ , we get  $bRx$ . Since  $R$  is transitive [as  $R$  is a partial order], we get  $aRx$ . Hence,  $x$  is an upper bound for  $B_2$ .  $\square$

- (b) Prove that if  $B_1$  and  $B_2$  are disjoint, then  $B_1$  has no maximal element. [Again, the same would hold for  $B_2$ , but you don't have to do it.]

*Proof.* Suppose  $x$  is a maximal element of  $B_1$ . Then,  $x \in B_1$  by definition, and so there is  $y \in B_2$  such that  $xRy$  [by assumption]. But, since  $y \in B_2$ , there exists  $z \in B_1$  such that  $yRz$ . But this implies that  $xRz$  [by transitivity]. But since  $x$  is maximal and  $z \in B_1$ , we must have  $zRx$ . Since  $R$  is antisymmetric, we have that  $x = z$ . But then, since  $yRz$ , we have  $yRx$ . Since also we had  $xRy$ , we get  $x = y$ , which is a contradiction since  $x \in B_1$ ,  $y \in B_2$  and  $B_1 \cap B_2 = \emptyset$ .  $\square$

2) Let  $\mathcal{F}$  and  $\mathcal{G}$  be partitions of  $A$  and let

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{H} &= \{Z \in \mathcal{P}(A) \mid Z \neq \emptyset \text{ and } \exists X \in \mathcal{F}[\exists Y \in \mathcal{G}(Z = X \cap Y)]\} \\ &= \{X \cap Y \mid X \cap Y \neq \emptyset, X \in \mathcal{F} \text{ and } Y \in \mathcal{G}\}. \end{aligned}$$

Prove that  $\mathcal{H}$  is also a partition of  $A$ .

*Proof.* First, note that by definition, no element of  $\mathcal{H}$  is empty.

Now, let  $a \in A$ . Since  $\mathcal{F}$  is a partition, there is  $X \in \mathcal{F}$  such that  $a \in X$ . Similarly, since  $\mathcal{G}$  is also a partition, we have that there is  $Y \in \mathcal{G}$  such that  $a \in Y$ . Hence,  $a \in X \cap Y$  and  $X \cap Y \in \mathcal{H}$ .

Finally, suppose that  $Z, W \in \mathcal{H}$  with  $Z \cap W \neq \emptyset$ . Since they are in  $\mathcal{H}$ , there are  $X_1, X_2 \in \mathcal{F}$  and  $Y_1, Y_2 \in \mathcal{G}$  such that  $Z = X_1 \cap Y_1$  and  $W = X_2 \cap Y_2$ . Since  $Z \cap W \neq \emptyset$ , let  $a \in Z \cap W = X_1 \cap Y_1 \cap X_2 \cap Y_2$ . In particular,  $a \in X_1 \cap X_2$  and since  $\mathcal{F}$  is a partition, we get  $X_1 = X_2$ . Similarly, since  $a \in Y_1 \cap Y_2$  and  $\mathcal{G}$  is a partition, we get  $Y_1 = Y_2$ . Thus,  $Z = X_1 \cap Y_1 = X_2 \cap Y_2 = W$ .  $\square$

3) Let  $A$  be a non-empty set,  $f : A \rightarrow A$ . Prove that if  $f$  is either a partial order or an equivalence relation, then  $f$  is the identity function  $i_A$ .

*Proof.* We need to show that for all  $a \in A$ ,  $f(a) = a$ , i.e.,  $(a, a) \in f$ . Since either a equivalence relation or a partial order is reflexive, we get that  $(a, a) \in f$ .  $\square$

4) Let  $f : A \rightarrow B$  be an *invertible* function [i.e.,  $f^{-1} : B \rightarrow A$ ] and  $R$  be an equivalence relation on  $B$ . Prove that  $S = f^{-1} \circ R \circ f$  is an equivalence relation on  $A$ .

**[Hint:** You can use, without proof, the following:  $(a, a') \in S$  if there are  $b, b' \in B$  such that  $(a, b) \in f$ ,  $(b, b') \in R$  and  $(b', a') \in f^{-1}$ .]

*Proof.* [Reflexive.] Let  $a \in A$ . Then,  $(a, f(a)) \in f$ . Since  $f(a) \in B$  and  $R$  is reflexive,  $(f(a), f(a)) \in R$ . Now, since  $(a, f(a)) \in f$ , we have that  $(f(a), a) \in f^{-1}$ . Thus,  $(a, a) \in S$ .

[Symmetric] Suppose that  $(a, a') \in S$ . Then, there are  $b, b' \in B$  such that  $(a, b) \in f$ ,  $(b, b') \in R$  and  $(b', a') \in f^{-1}$ . But, this means that  $(b, a) \in f^{-1}$  and  $(a', b') \in f$ . Also, since  $R$  is symmetric, we have that  $(b', b) \in R$ . So,  $(a', a) \in S$ .

[Transitive.] Suppose that  $(a, a'), (a', a'') \in S$ . Then, there are  $b, b', b'', b''' \in B$  such that  $(a, b), (a', b'') \in f$ ,  $(b, b'), (b'', b''') \in R$  and  $(b', a'), (b''', a'') \in f^{-1}$ . So,  $b = f(a)$ ,  $b'' = f(a')$ ,  $bRb'$ ,  $b''Rb'''$ ,  $b' = f(a')$  and  $b''' = f(a'')$ . But then,  $b' = f(a') = b''$ , and so  $bRb''$  [as  $bRb'$ ]. Since  $R$  is transitive [and  $b''Rb'''$ ], we have  $bRb'''$ , i.e.,  $(b, b''') \in R$ . So, we have  $(a, b) \in f$ ,  $(b, b''') \in R$  and  $(b''', a'') \in f^{-1}$ , and so  $(a, a'') \in S$ .  $\square$

5) Prove that for all integers  $n \geq 1$  we have

$$\sum_{i=1}^n (2i+1)3^i = n3^{n+1}.$$

*Proof.* We prove it by induction on  $n$ .

[Base case.] For  $n = 1$  we have:

$$(2 \cdot 1 + 1) \cdot 3 = 9 = 1 \cdot 3^{1+1}.$$

[Induction step.] Assume now that for some  $n \geq 1$  we have

$$\sum_{i=1}^n (2i + 1)3^i = n3^{n+1}.$$

Then,

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i=1}^{n+1} (2i + 1)3^i &= \left[ \sum_{i=1}^n (2i + 1)3^i \right] + (2(n + 1) + 1)3^{n+1} \\ &= n3^{n+1} + (2n + 3)3^{n+1} \\ &= (n + 2n + 3)3^{n+1} \\ &= (n + 1) \cdot 3 \cdot 3^{n+1} \\ &= (n + 1)3^{n+2}. \end{aligned}$$

□

**6)** Prove that for all  $n \geq 0$  we have

$$\frac{2}{n!} \leq 3^{2-n}.$$

*Proof.* We prove it by induction on  $n$ .

[Base cases.] For  $n = 0$  we have  $2/0! = 2 \leq 9 = 3^{2-0}$ . For  $n = 1$ , we have  $2/1! = 2 \leq 3 = 3^{2-1}$ . For  $n = 2$ , we have  $2/2! = 1 \leq 1 = 3^0$ .

[Induction step.] Assume that for some  $n \geq 2$  we have  $2/n! \leq 3^{n-2}$ . Then,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{2}{(n+1)!} &= \frac{2}{n!} \cdot \frac{1}{n+1} && [(n+1)! = (n+1) \cdot n] \\ &\leq 3^{2-n} \cdot \frac{1}{n+1} && [\text{by IH}] \\ &\leq 3^{2-n} \cdot \frac{1}{3} && [\text{as } n \geq 2] \\ &\leq 3^{2-n-1} = 3^{2-(n+1)}. \end{aligned}$$

□

7) Consider the sequence  $a_0, a_1, a_2, \dots$  given by the recursive formula:

$$a_0 = 1$$

$$a_1 = 1$$

$$a_n = a_{n-1} + 2a_{n-2}, \text{ for } n \geq 2.$$

Prove that for all  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , we have that  $a_n = (2^{n+1} + (-1)^n)/3$ .

*Proof.* We prove it by induction on  $n$ .

[Base cases.] We have  $a_0 = 1 = (2^1 + (-1)^0)/3$ . Also,  $a_1 = 1 = (2^2 + (-1)^1)/3$ .

[Induction step.] Assume now that from some  $n \geq 1$  we have that for all  $k \in \{0, 1, \dots, n\}$  that  $a_k = (2^{k+1} + (-1)^k)/3$ . Then,

$$\begin{aligned} a_{n+1} &= a_n + 2 \cdot a_{n-1} \\ &= \frac{2^{n+1} + (-1)^n}{3} + 2 \cdot \frac{2^n + (-1)^{n-1}}{3} \\ &= \frac{[2^{n+1} + (-1)^n] + 2 \cdot [2^n + (-1)^{n-1}]}{3} \\ &= \frac{2 \cdot 2^{n+1} + (-1)^n + 2 \cdot (-1)^{n-1}}{3} \\ &= \frac{2^{n+2} + (-1)^{n-1}[-1 + 2]}{3} \\ &= \frac{2^{n+2} + (-1)^{n-1}}{3} \\ &= \frac{2^{n+2} + (-1)^{n+1}}{3}. \end{aligned}$$

□