

Sample LaTeX Document

I can't possibly write a whole tutorial on $\text{T}_{\text{E}}\text{X}$ or $\text{L}^{\text{A}}\text{T}_{\text{E}}\text{X}$ (which is what this document uses). The main purpose of this document is to give you some examples that you can draw on and modify in your assignments. Learning $\text{T}_{\text{E}}\text{X}$ is a lifelong experience, and it continues to grow with its user base. There are, of course, innumerable written and/or video tutorials, e.g., <https://youtu.be/Rsoj2YavveE> and its associated blog, <http://quicklatex.blogspot.com/>. A quick reference for the various symbols is also handy, e.g., <https://reu.dimacs.rutgers.edu/Symbols.pdf>. Of course, just about any question you have about how to do something in $\text{T}_{\text{E}}\text{X}$ can be answered almost instantaneously thanks to the "wisdom of the web"; for example, I forgot the command for displaying the backslash character, needed below, so I just googled "What is the LaTeX symbol for backslash?"

A disadvantage with many (most?) tutorials is that they're too general. They include a lot of stuff you won't need for any assignment in this course, and leave out some things you may find useful. My suggestion, based on personal experience: The best way to learn it is to just jump in and start using it. Try beginning with this document. It illustrates a few things, including math symbols, the theorem environment, the proof environment, the symbolic labeling of theorems and equations, and how to reference them. Study the source file (`latexDemo.tex`) and the typeset version you are now reading, and try to understand their relationship. Leave in the "preamble" that you find in the source `latexDemo.tex` (everything up to and including the `\begin{document}`) and, of course, the `\end{document}`. Otherwise, modify what it says to suit your purposes.

Let's start with the theorem and proof environments.

Theorem 1. (*"Bézout's Lemma"*): *Let $a, b \in \mathbb{Z}$. Then $\exists x, y \in \mathbb{Z}$ such that $\gcd(a, b) = ax + by$.*

Proof. Let

$$d = \min_{x, y \in \mathbb{Z}} \{ax + by \mid ax + by > 0\}.$$

Write $d = ax' + by'$. We first show, for any $x, y \in \mathbb{Z}$, that $d \mid (ax + by)$.

Let $z = ax + by$ for any $x, y \in \mathbb{Z}$. We divide z by d , i.e., write $z = md + r$, where r is the remainder so $0 \leq r < d$. Suppose now that $r > 0$; we will derive a contradiction. We have $z - md = r$, which implies that $ax + by - md = r$. But then,

$$r = ax + by - md = ax + by - m(ax' + by') = a(x - mx') + b(y - my'). \quad (1)$$

What Eq. (1) says is that r is of the form $ax'' + by''$, where as it happens $x'' = x - mx'$ and $y'' = y - my'$. Since d is the minimum such positive number, and we're assuming that r is positive, it follows that $d \leq r$. However, $r < d$, so this is a contradiction. Therefore, r must equal 0. It follows that $z = ax + by = md$, i.e., $d \mid (ax + by)$, as we wished to show.

We now know that d is a common divisor of a and b . We need to show it's the *greatest* common divisor to complete the proof. To see that, suppose $c \mid (ax + by)$, where $ax + by > 0$. Then $c \leq d$, since d is the minimum value that $ax + by$ takes on. Therefore, $d = \gcd(a, b)$. \square

Theorem 1 is useful, for example, since it leads to an extension of the Euclidean algorithm for finding the inverse of a modulo b , or b modulo a , in the event that $\gcd(a, b) = 1$, an important operation in cryptography.

The preamble to this document's source includes a bunch of commands for symbols that will be useful. In particular, we have standard symbols for the natural numbers \mathbb{N} , the integers \mathbb{Z} , the reals \mathbb{R} , the complex numbers \mathbb{C} and so forth. Of great use in this course will be the `\ket`, `\bra`, and `\bracket` commands, which, via expressions like `\ket{\psi}` and the like can be used to form expressions like $|\psi\rangle$ or $|0101\rangle$ or $\langle\varphi|\psi\rangle$ or $\sum_{k=1}^n |k\rangle\langle k|$.

Just to illustrate how you use basic but commonly occurring things like fractions, subscripts, exponents/superscripts, the summation sign, and how to align equalities in an array of equations, here's an old boring (but far from useless) theorem that I expect you know well.

Theorem 2. (*Sum of the numbers from 1 to n*): Let $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and let

$$S_n = \sum_{k=1}^n k.$$

Then $S_n = \frac{n(n+1)}{2}$.

Proof. We prove this by induction on n .

Base case: Let $n = 1$. Then by definition of the sum, we clearly have $S_n = S_1 = 1$. Furthermore, when $n = 1$, we have $\frac{n(n+1)}{2} = \frac{1(1+1)}{2} = 1$, so the relation follows for $n = 1$.

Induction step: Suppose that $S_n = \frac{n(n+1)}{2}$. Let's break down S_{n+1} :

$$\begin{aligned} S_{n+1} &= \sum_{k=1}^{n+1} k \\ &= \sum_{k=1}^n k + (n+1) \\ &= S_n + (n+1) \\ &= \frac{n(n+1)}{2} + (n+1) \\ &= \frac{n(n+1)}{2} + \frac{2(n+1)}{2} \\ &= \frac{(n+2)(n+1)}{2}, \end{aligned}$$

where the fourth equality followed from the induction hypothesis. But $S_{n+1} = \frac{(n+2)(n+1)}{2}$ establishes the original assertion for $n+1$, so we are done. \square

Matrices can be denoted conveniently, as in:

$$\mathbf{H} = \frac{1}{2} \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 1 & -1 & 1 & -1 \\ 1 & 1 & -1 & -1 \\ 1 & -1 & -1 & 1 \end{bmatrix}, \quad \mathbf{C}_{ij} = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \end{bmatrix}.$$

(the first one, \mathbf{H} , being the familiar Hadamard matrix, and \mathbf{C}_{ij} is controlled NOT).