

1. Prove that for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$\sum_{k=1}^n \frac{1}{(k+1)(k+2)} = \frac{n}{2(n+2)}. \quad (1)$$

Proof by induction. For the base case $n = 1$, the equation (1) holds.

$$\text{LHS} = \sum_{k=1}^1 \frac{1}{(k+1)(k+2)} = \frac{1}{2 \cdot 3} = \frac{1}{6}; \quad \text{RHS} = \frac{n}{2(n+2)} = \frac{1}{2(3)} = \frac{1}{6}.$$

For the induction case, suppose the equality (1) holds for some n . Then for $n + 1$, using the induction hypothesis,

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

which is the statement for $n + 1$. Since both the base case and induction case hold, by induction (1) holds for all n .

2. Recall the axioms of a field $(\mathcal{F}, +, \times)$. For any $x, y, z \in \mathcal{F}$,

[A1.]	(Commutativity of Addition)	$x + y = y + x.$
[A2.]	(Associativity of Addition)	$x + (y + z) = (x + y) + z.$
[A3.]	(Additive Identity)	$(\exists 0 \in \mathcal{F}) (\forall t \in \mathcal{F}) 0 + t = t.$
[A4.]	(Additive Inverse)	$(\exists -x \in \mathcal{F}) x + (-x) = 0.$
[M1.]	(Commutativity of Multiplication)	$xy = yx.$
[M2.]	(Associativity of Multiplication)	$x(yz) = (xy)z.$
[M3.]	(Multiplicative Identity)	$(\exists 1 \in \mathcal{F}) 1 \neq 0 \text{ and } (\forall t \in \mathcal{F}) 1t = t.$
[M4.]	(Multiplicative Inverse)	If $x \neq 0$ then $(\exists x^{-1} \in \mathcal{F}) (x^{-1})x = 1.$
[D.]	(Distributivity)	$x(y + z) = xy + xz.$

Using only the field axioms, show that if $a, b, c \in \mathcal{F}$ and $a \neq 0$ then there is at most one solution x to $ax + b = c$. Justify every step of your argument using just the axioms listed here. Do not quote any formulas from the text.

We suppose that there are two solutions, call them y and z and argue they must be the same number. They both satisfy $ay + b = c$ and $az + b = c$

$ay + b = az + b$	Both expressions equal c , thus they equal each other.
$(ay + b) + (-b) = (az + b) + (-b)$	By the existence of additive inverse (A4), there is $-b$. Post add it to both sides.
$(ay) + (b + (-b)) = (az) + (b + (-b))$	By associativity of addition (A3).
$(ay) + 0 = (az) + 0$	By property of additive inverse (A4).
$0 + (ay) = 0 + (az)$	By commutativity of addition (A1).
$ay = az$	By property of additive identity (A3).
$a^{-1}(ay) = a^{-1}(az)$	Since $a \neq 0$, by existence of multiplicative inverse (M4), there is a^{-1} . Pre multiply both sides.
$(a^{-1}a)y = (a^{-1}a)z$	By associativity of multiplication (M2).
$1 \cdot y = 1 \cdot z$	By property of multiplicative inverse (M4).
$y = z$	By property of multiplicative identity (M3).

We conclude that the two solutions are equal. Thus there is at most one solution to this equation.

3. Determine whether the following statements are true or false. If true, give a proof. If false, give a counterexample.

- (a) STATEMENT: Let $f : A \rightarrow B$ and $E, G \subset A$. Then $f(E \cap G) = f(E) \cap f(G)$.
 FALSE. Let $A = B = \mathbf{R}$, $f(x) = x^2$, $E = (-2, 1]$ and $G = [1, 2)$. Then $E \cap G = \emptyset$ so $f(E \cap G) = \emptyset$ but $f(E) = f(G) = [1, 4)$ so that $f(E) \cap f(G) = [1, 4)$.
- (b) STATEMENT. Let $(\mathbf{N}, s(\cdot))$ be a number system satisfying the Peano Axioms. Then the successor function $s(x)$ is onto.
 FALSE. The Peano Axiom **N3** “1 is not the successor of an element of \mathbf{N} ” tells us that 1 is not in the range of s , thus s is not onto.
- (c) STATEMENT. $A = \{x \in \mathbf{R} : (\forall s > 1)(\exists t < s)(t \leq x < s)\} = (-\infty, 1]$.
 TRUE. In terms of set equality $A = \bigcap_{s>1} \bigcup_{t<s} [t, s) = \bigcap_{s>1} (-\infty, s) = (-\infty, 1]$.
 We can also argue that $A \subset (-\infty, 1]$ and $(-\infty, 1] \subset A$.
 For the first, let $y \in A$. Since for all $s > 1$ we have there is some $t < s$ so that $t \leq y < s$ says $y < s$ for all $s > 1$. Thus $y \leq 1$ or $y \in (-\infty, 1]$. For the second, if $z \in (-\infty, 1]$ then $z \leq 1$. But this says for all $s > 1$ we have $z < s$. By taking $t = x$ there is $t < s$ such that $t \leq z < s$. Thus $z \in A$.

4. (a) Determine whether the cube root of 7 is irrational.

$x = \sqrt[3]{7}$ is irrational. Argue by contradiction. Suppose that x were rational

$$x = \frac{p}{q}$$

where p and q are integers without a common factor. Then $x^3 = 7$ or

$$p^3 = 7q^3$$

Thus $7|p^3$. Since 7 is prime, $7|p$ so $p = 7k$ for some integer k . Hence

$$7^3 k^3 = 7q^3$$

or

$$q^3 = 7^2 k^3.$$

Thus $7|q^3$. Since 7 is prime, $7|q$. We have reached a contradiction: 7 is a common factor of both p and q . Thus the statement must have been true: $\sqrt[3]{7}$ is irrational.

- (b) Recall that the rational numbers are defined to be the set of equivalence classes $\mathbb{Q} = S/\sim$ where $S = \left\{ \frac{a}{b} : a, b \in \mathbb{Z}, b \neq 0 \right\}$ is the set of symbols (pairs of integers) and the symbols are equivalent if they represent the same fraction: $\frac{a}{b} \sim \frac{c}{d}$ iff $ad = bc$.

We denote the equivalence class, the “fraction” by $\left[\frac{a}{b} \right]$ to distinguish it from a symbol from S . Addition and multiplication of rationals, for example, is defined on equivalence classes by

$$\left[\frac{m}{n} \right] + \left[\frac{r}{t} \right] = \left[\frac{mt + nr}{nt} \right], \quad \left[\frac{m}{n} \right] \cdot \left[\frac{r}{t} \right] = \left[\frac{mr}{nt} \right].$$

Show that the distributive axiom $x(y + z) = xy + xz$ holds for all x, y and z in the rational numbers.

Choose representatives of the three rational numbers

$$x = \left[\frac{p}{q} \right], \quad y = \left[\frac{a}{b} \right], \quad z = \left[\frac{r}{s} \right]$$

where p, q, a, b, r, s are integers where q, b, s are nonzero. Then using the definitions of addition and multiplication

$$\begin{aligned} x(y + z) &= \left[\frac{p}{q} \right] \left(\left[\frac{a}{b} \right] + \left[\frac{r}{s} \right] \right) = \left[\frac{p}{q} \right] \left(\left[\frac{as + br}{bs} \right] \right) = \left[\frac{p(as + br)}{q(bs)} \right] = \left[\frac{qp(as + br)}{q^2(bs)} \right] \\ &= \left[\frac{(pa)(qs) + (qb)(pr)}{(qb)(qs)} \right] = \left[\frac{pa}{qb} \right] + \left[\frac{pr}{qs} \right] = \left[\frac{p}{q} \right] \left[\frac{a}{b} \right] + \left[\frac{p}{q} \right] \left[\frac{r}{s} \right] = xy + xz \end{aligned}$$

5. A subset of the real numbers is given by $E = \left\{ \frac{n^2}{2n^2 - 1} : n \in \mathbb{N} \right\}$.

Find the greatest lower bound $\ell = \text{glb } E$ and prove your result.

We claim that the greatest lower bound is $\ell = \frac{1}{2}$. To see that it is a lower bound, for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$ we have

$$\frac{n^2}{2n^2 - 1} \geq \frac{n^2 - \frac{1}{2}}{2n^2 - 1} = \frac{1}{2}.$$

To see that there is no greater lower bound, choose $m > \frac{1}{2}$ to show m is not a lower bound. By the Archimedean Property of the reals, there is $n_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that

$$\frac{1}{n_0} < \sqrt{2m - 1}.$$

For such n_0 we have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{n_0^2}{2n_0^2 - 1} &= \frac{n_0^2 - \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{2}}{2n_0^2 - 1} = \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{2(2n_0^2 - 1)} \\ &\leq \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{2(2n_0^2 - n_0^2)} = \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{2n_0^2} < \frac{1}{2} + \left(m - \frac{1}{2} \right) = m. \end{aligned}$$

Thus an element of E is less than m so that m is not a lower bound. Thus $\ell = \frac{1}{2}$ is the greatest lower bound.