

$f : A \rightarrow B$ is 1:1 iff $f(x_1) = f(x_2)$ implies $x_1 = x_2$.

$f(x_1) = f(x_2)$ implies $x_1 = x_2$.

Hypothesis: $f(x_1) = f(x_2)$. Conclusion $x_1 = x_2$.

Hypothesis implies conclusion.

p implies q .

$p \Rightarrow q$.

Note a statement, $p \Rightarrow q$, is true if whenever the hypothesis p holds, then the conclusion q also holds.

To prove that a statement is true:

- (1) Assume the hypothesis holds.
- (2) Prove the conclusion holds.

Ex: To prove a function is 1:1:

- (1) Assume $f(x_1) = f(x_2)$
 - (2) Do some algebra to prove $x_1 = x_2$.
-

$[p \Rightarrow q]$ is equivalent to $[\forall p, q \text{ holds}]$.

That is, for everything satisfying the hypothesis p , the conclusion q must hold.

A statement is false if the hypothesis holds, but the conclusion need not hold.

Hypothesis does not implies conclusion.

p does not imply q .

$p \not\Rightarrow q$.

That is there exists **a specific case** where the hypothesis holds, but the conclusion does not hold.

To prove that a statement is false:

Find an example where the hypothesis holds, but the conclusion does not hold.

Ex: To prove a function is not 1:1, find specific x_1, x_2 such that $f(x_1) = f(x_2)$, but $x_1 \neq x_2$.

Ex: $f : R \rightarrow R, f(x) = x^2$ is not 1:1
since $f(1) = 1^2 = 1 = (-1)^2 = f(-1)$, but $1 \neq -1$

$\sim [p \Rightarrow q]$ is equivalent to $\sim [\forall p, q \text{ holds}]$.

Thus if $p \Rightarrow q$ is false,

then it is not true that $[\forall p, q \text{ holds}]$.

That is, $\exists p$ such that q does not hold.

If $p \Rightarrow q$ is true, then

its contrapostive $\sim q \Rightarrow \sim p$ is also true.

But its converse, $q \Rightarrow p$ may not be true.

Thm 2.1.1: Pigeonhole Principle (weak form): If you have $n + 1$ objects placed in n boxes, then at least one box will be occupied by 2 or more objects.

Thm 2.1.1: Pigeonhole Principle (weak form): If you have $n + 1$ pigeons in n pigeonholes, then at least one pigeonhole will be occupied by 2 or more pigeons.

Thm 2.1.1: If $f : A \rightarrow B$ is a function and $|A| = n + 1$, and $|B| = n$, then f is not 1:1.

Cor: If $f : A \rightarrow B$ is a function and A is finite and $|A| > |B|$, then f is not 1:1.

Note that the domain must have more elements than the codomain to **guarantee** that f is not 1:1.

Recall the *converse* of $[p \text{ implies } q]$ is $[q \text{ implies } p]$.

Note the converse of a theorem is frequently false as the following example illustrates:

$$c : \{1, \dots, n\} \rightarrow \{1, \dots, n\}, \quad c(k) = 1 \text{ is not } 1 : 1,$$

but domain does not have more elements than the codomain.

$f : A \rightarrow B$ a function which is not 1:1 does not imply $|A| > |B|$.

Contrapositive of $[p \text{ implies } q]$ is $[\sim q \text{ implies } \sim p]$.

The contrapositive of a theorem is true:

Cor: If $f : A \rightarrow B$ is a function which is 1:1, then $|A| \leq |B|$.

Related theorem:

Thm: If $f : A \rightarrow B$ is a function and if $|A| = n = |B|$, then f is 1:1 iff f is onto.

Application 6: Chinese remainder theorem:

Suppose $m, n, a, b \in \mathcal{Z}$, $(m, n) = 1$, $0 \leq a \leq m - 1$, $0 \leq b \leq n - 1$, then $\exists x \geq 0$ such that $x = pm + a = qn + b$ for $p, q \in \mathcal{Z}$.

Moreover can take $p \in \{0, \dots, n - 1\}$.

Thm 2.2.1 Pigeonhole Principle (strong form): Let q_1, q_2, \dots, q_n be positive integers. If $q_1 + q_2 + \dots + q_n - n + 1$ objects are put into n boxes, then for some i the i th box contains at least q_i objects

Proof Outline:

Cor: Pigeonhole Principle (weak form):

Proof. Let $q_i = 2$ for all i .

Cor: If $n(r - 1) + 1$ objects are put into n boxes, then there exists a box containing at least r objects.

Proof: Let $q_i = r$ for all i . Note $nr - n + 1 = n(r - 1) + 1$.

Cor A: If $m_i \in \mathcal{Z}_+$ and if $\frac{m_1 + \dots + m_n}{n} > r - 1$, then there exists an i such that $m_i \geq r$.

Cor A: If $m_i \in \mathcal{Z}_+$ and if $\frac{m_1 + \dots + m_n}{n} \geq r$, then there exists an i such that $m_i \geq r$.

Lemma B: If $\frac{m_1 + \dots + m_n}{n} < r$, then there exists an i s. t. $m_i < r$.

Appl: Suppose you have 20 pairs of shoes in your closet. If you grab n shoes at random, what should n be so that you are guaranteed to have a matching pair of shoes.

Appl: Suppose you have 20 pairs of socks. If you grab n socks at random, what should n be so that you are guaranteed to have a matching pair of shoes.

Appl: Suppose you have 20 pairs of socks. If 7 are black and 13 are white, and if you grab n socks at random, what should n be so that you are guaranteed to have a pair of socks of the same color.

Appl 7: If you have an arbitrary number of apples, bananas and oranges, what is the smallest number of these fruits that one needs to put in a basket in order to guarantee there are at least 8 apples or at least 6 bananas or at least 9 oranges in the basket.

Appl 9: Show that every sequence $a_1, a_2, \dots, a_{n^2+1}$ contains either an increasing or decreasing subsequence of length $n + 1$.

Example ($n = 2$):

$$a_1 = 8, a_2 = 4, a_3 = 10, a_4 = 6, a_5 = 4$$

Need $n + 1$ objects in our subsequence. Suppose $r = n + 1$.

Hence might need $n(r - 1) + 1 = n(n + 1 - 1) + 1 = n^2 + 1$ objects in n boxes in order to obtain at least $r = n + 1$ objects in one of the boxes.

Let $m_k =$ length of largest increasing subsequence beginning with a_k .

$$8 \quad 8, 10 \quad m_1 = 2$$

$$4 \quad 4, 10 \quad 4, 6 \quad 4, 4 \quad m_2 = 2$$

$$10 \quad m_3 = 1 \quad 6 \quad m_4 = 1 \quad 4 \quad m_5 = 1$$

Proof: Let $m_k =$ length of largest increasing subsequence beginning with a_k , $k = 1, \dots, n^2 + 1$.

Suppose there exists an $m_k \geq n + 1$. Then there exists an increasing subsequence of length $m_k \geq n + 1$. Hence there exists an increasing subsequence of length $n + 1$.

Suppose $m_k < n + 1$. Then $m_k = 1, 2, \dots$, or n .

Hence there exists an i such that $m_k = i$ for $n + 1$ a_k 's.

There exists $a_{k_1}, a_{k_2}, \dots, a_{k_{n+1}}$ such that

$$m_{k_1} = m_{k_2} = \dots = m_{k_{n+1}} = i$$

Show $a_{k_1}, a_{k_2}, \dots, a_{k_{n+1}}$ is a decreasing sequence.

Suppose not. Then there exists a j such that $a_{k_j} > a_{k_{j+1}}$.

\exists an increasing subsequence of length i starting at a_{k_j}

There does not exist an increasing subsequence of length $i + 1$ starting at a_{k_j}

\exists an increasing subsequence of length i starting at $a_{k_{j+1}}$

There does not exist an increasing subsequence of length $i + 1$ starting at $a_{k_{j+1}}$

Suppose $a_{k_{j+1}}, a_{h_2}, a_{h_3}, \dots, a_{h_i}$ is an increasing subsequence of length i .

Then $a_{k_j}, a_{k_{j+1}}, a_{h_2}, a_{h_3}, \dots, a_{h_i}$ is an increasing subsequence of length $i + 1$, a contradiction.