

## Proof of a Biconditional

Recall that biconditionals are statements of the form:

$$\forall x(P(x) \leftrightarrow Q(x))$$

The strategy is to prove such statements is to prove an implication in both directions. I.e. prove  $\forall x(P(x) \rightarrow Q(x)) \wedge \forall x(Q(x) \rightarrow P(x))$ .

$$\begin{aligned}\forall x(P(x) \leftrightarrow Q(x)) &\equiv \forall x(P(x) \rightarrow Q(x) \wedge Q(x) \rightarrow P(x)) \\ &\equiv \forall x(P(x) \rightarrow Q(x)) \wedge \forall x(Q(x) \rightarrow P(x))\end{aligned}$$

## Proof by Cases

Proof by cases is the strategy of:

1. Breaking your assumption(s) into smaller cases.

Be careful to make sure that your cases are **exhaustive** (cover all of the possible scenarios). It's ok if they have overlap though.

2. Proving that the claim holds in all of these cases.

$$\text{Formally: } (P \vee Q) \rightarrow R \equiv (P \rightarrow R) \wedge (Q \rightarrow R).$$

## 5 numbers: Proof by Cases

Suppose that  $x_1, \dots, x_5$  are real numbers such that  $x_1 \leq x_2 \leq x_3 \leq x_4 \leq x_5$  and  $x_1 + x_2 + x_3 + x_4 + x_5 = 50$ . Prove that  $x_1 + x_2 \leq 20$ .

## Proof by Counterexample

For all real numbers  $a, b, c$ , if  $|a + c| = |b + c|$ , then  $|a| = |b|$ .

This claim is false. Disprove!