# **Disprove of a Proof of Euler's Formula**

## Author:

## Sigrid M.-L. Obenland

#### Abstract

In 1991, Gilbert Strang published a proof of Euler's formula using polar coordinates in Calculus, Wellesley-Cambridge, p. 389. In the following we show that this alleged proof is not valid.

#### Comments

The so-called proof uses the fact that all complex numbers can be expressed in polar coordinates. It is assumed that  $e^{ix} = r(\cos \theta + i \sin \theta)$  at least for some r and  $\theta$ .

No assumptions are made for x, r and  $\theta$ , especially for the relationship between x on one side and r and  $\theta$  on the other side

In the following, the derivative of x for the assumed equation will be calculated. The derivative of  $e^{ix}$  with respect to x is  $ie^{ix}$ . Calculating the derivative with respect to x for r (cos  $\theta + \iota \sin \theta$ ) yields the following equation:

 $ie^{ix} = (dr/dx) (\cos \theta + i \sin \theta) + (d\theta/dx) ir (\cos \theta + i \sin \theta)$ 

Using the assumption for  $e^{ix}$  as given above, this yields the equation:

 $ie^{ix} = (dr/dx) (\cos \theta + i \sin \theta) + (d\theta/dx) i e^{ix}$ 

Making the right and the left side of the equation equal can be achieved by setting:

(dr/dx) = 0 and  $(d\theta/dx) = 1$ .

Integrating the latter assumption yields a linear relationship between x and  $\theta$ , which can be written as:

 $\theta = x + C$ , with C being a constant.

While the former assumption holds true, the latter assumption is obviously incorrect, as demonstrated in the following by figure 1.

Figure 1



In figure 1, each unit  $\Delta x$  on the x-axis is associated with an angle  $\theta$  in arc measure on the arc of the circle with radius r and its corresponding secant (shown in red).

From figure 1 it becomes obvious, that the secants and, thus, the angles are not in a linear relationship with x, since each secant has different length. Even if a constant C is introduced into the secant between x = 9 and x = 10, only the secants between x = 8 and x = 9 as well as between x = 9 and x = 10 can be made of equal length. The rest of the secants still remains different. Accordingly, it is obvious that a linear relationship between x and  $\theta$  does not exist, and therefore, the alleged proof of Euler's formula in polar coordinates does not hold.