

# Section 05: Solutions

---

## 1. GCD

- (a) Calculate  $\gcd(100, 50)$ .

**Solution:**

50

- (b) Calculate  $\gcd(17, 31)$ .

**Solution:**

1

- (c) Find the multiplicative inverse of 6 (mod 7).

**Solution:**

6

- (d) Does 49 have an multiplicative inverse (mod 7)?

**Solution:**

It does not. Intuitively, this is because  $49x$  for any  $x$  is going to be  $0 \pmod{7}$ , which means it can never be 1.

## 2. Extended Euclidean Algorithm

- (a) Find the multiplicative inverse  $y$  of 7 mod 33. That is, find  $y$  such that  $7y \equiv 1 \pmod{33}$ . You should use the extended Euclidean Algorithm. Your answer should be in the range  $0 \leq y < 33$ .

**Solution:**

First, we find the gcd:

$$\gcd(33, 7) = \gcd(7, 5)$$

$$= \gcd(5, 2)$$

$$= \gcd(2, 1)$$

$$= \gcd(1, 0)$$

$$= 1$$

$$33 = \boxed{7} \cdot 4 + 5 \quad (1)$$

$$7 = \boxed{5} \cdot 1 + 2 \quad (2)$$

$$5 = \boxed{2} \cdot 2 + 1 \quad (3)$$

$$2 = 1 \cdot 2 + 0 \quad (4)$$

$$\quad \quad \quad (5)$$

Next, we re-arrange equations (1) - (3) by solving for the remainder:

$$1 = 5 - \boxed{2} \cdot 2 \tag{6}$$

$$2 = 7 - \boxed{5} \cdot 1 \tag{7}$$

$$5 = 33 - \boxed{7} \cdot 4 \tag{8}$$

$$\tag{9}$$

Now, we backward substitute into the boxed numbers using the equations:

$$\begin{aligned} 1 &= 5 - \boxed{2} \cdot 2 \\ &= 5 - (7 - \boxed{5} \cdot 1) \cdot 2 \\ &= 3 \cdot \boxed{5} - 7 \cdot 2 \\ &= 3 \cdot (33 - \boxed{7} \cdot 4) - 7 \cdot 2 \\ &= 33 \cdot 3 + 7 \cdot -14 \end{aligned}$$

So,  $1 = 33 \cdot 3 + \boxed{7} \cdot -14$ . Thus,  $33 - 14 = 19$  is the multiplicative inverse of 7 mod 33.

(b) Now, solve  $7z \equiv 2 \pmod{33}$  for all of its integer solutions  $z$ .

**Solution:**

If  $7y \equiv 1 \pmod{33}$ , then

$$2 \cdot 7y \equiv 2 \pmod{33}.$$

So,  $z \equiv 2 \times 19 \pmod{33} \equiv 5 \pmod{33}$ . This means that the set of solutions is  $\{5 + 33k \mid k \in \mathbb{Z}\}$ .

### 3. Euclid's Lemma<sup>1</sup>

(a) Show that if an integer  $p$  divides the product of two integers  $a$  and  $b$ , and  $\gcd(p, a) = 1$ , then  $p$  divides  $b$ .

**Solution:**

Suppose that  $p \mid ab$  and  $\gcd(p, a) = 1$  for integers  $a$ ,  $b$ , and  $p$ . By Bezout's theorem, since  $\gcd(p, a) = 1$ , there exist integers  $r$  and  $s$  such that

$$rp + sa = 1.$$

Since  $p \mid ab$ , by the definition of divides there exists an integer  $k$  such that  $pk = ab$ .

By multiplying both sides of  $rp + sa = 1$  by  $b$  we have,

$$rpb + s(ab) = b$$

$$rpb + s(pk) = b$$

$$p(rb + sk) = b$$

Since  $r$ ,  $b$ ,  $s$ ,  $k$  are all integers,  $(rb + sk)$  is also an integer. By definition we have  $p \mid b$ .

(b) Show that if a prime  $p$  divides  $ab$  where  $a$  and  $b$  are integers, then  $p \mid a$  or  $p \mid b$ . (Hint: Use part (a))

**Solution:**

<sup>1</sup>these proofs aren't much longer than proofs you've seen so far, but it can be a little easier to get stuck – use these as a chance to practice how to get unstuck if you do!

Suppose that  $p \mid ab$  for prime number  $p$  and integers  $a, b$ . There are two cases.

Case 1:  $\gcd(p, a) = 1$

In this case,  $p \mid b$  by part (a).

Case 2:  $\gcd(p, a) \neq 1$

In this case,  $p$  and  $a$  share a common positive factor greater than 1. But since  $p$  is prime, its only positive factors are 1 and  $p$ , meaning  $\gcd(p, a) = p$ . This says  $p$  is a factor of  $a$ , that is,  $p \mid a$ .

In both cases we've shown that  $p \mid a$  or  $p \mid b$ .

## 4. Have we derived yet?

Each of the following proofs has some mistake in its reasoning - identify that mistake.

- (a) *Proof.* If it is sunny, then it is not raining. It is not sunny. Therefore it is raining. □

**Solution:**

Let  $p$  be the proposition that it is sunny and  $r$  be the proposition that it is not raining. We know  $p \rightarrow \neg r$  and  $\neg p$ . Using this, the proof shows the inverse  $\neg p \rightarrow r$ . However, the inverse is not equivalent to the implication, so we cannot infer the inverse from the given statement.

- (b) Prove that if  $x + y$  is odd, either  $x$  or  $y$  is odd but not both.

*Proof.* Suppose without loss of generality that  $x$  is odd and  $y$  is even.

Then,  $\exists k \ x = 2k + 1$  and  $\exists m \ y = 2m$ . Adding these together, we can see that  $x + y = 2k + 1 + 2m = 2k + 2m + 1 = 2(k + m) + 1$ . Since  $k$  and  $m$  are integers, we know that  $k + m$  is also an integer. So, we can say that  $x + y$  is odd. Hence, we have shown what is required. □

**Solution:**

Looking at this logically, let's let  $p$  be the proposition that  $x + y$  is odd and  $r$  be the proposition that either  $x$  or  $y$  is odd but not both. This proof shows  $r \rightarrow p$  instead of  $p \rightarrow r$ .

This proof is incorrect because we have assumed the conclusion. Remember, the converse is not equivalent to the implication.

- (c) Prove that  $2 = 1$ . (.)

*Proof.* Let  $a, b$  be two equal, non-zero integers. Then,

$$\begin{array}{ll} a = b & \\ a^2 = ab & \text{[Multiply both sides by a]} \\ a^2 - b^2 = ab - b^2 & \text{[Subtract } b^2 \text{ from both sides]} \\ (a - b)(a + b) = b(a - b) & \text{[Factor both sides]} \\ a + b = b & \text{[Divide both sides by } a - b \text{]} \\ b + b = b & \text{[Since } a = b \text{]} \\ 2b = b & \text{[Simplify]} \\ 2 = 1 & \text{[Divide both sides by b]} \end{array}$$

□

**Solution:**

In line 5, we divided by  $a - b$ . Since  $a = b$ ,  $b - a = 0$ . Therefore, this was dividing by 0. Dividing by 0 is an undefined operation (!) so this was an invalid step in the proof.

(d) Prove that  $\sqrt{3} + \sqrt{7} < \sqrt{20}$

*Proof.*

$$\begin{aligned}\sqrt{3} + \sqrt{7} &< \sqrt{20} \\ (\sqrt{3} + \sqrt{7})^2 &< 20 \\ 3 + 2\sqrt{21} + 7 &< 20 \\ 19.165 &< 20\end{aligned}$$

It is true that  $19.165 < 20$ , hence, we have shown that  $\sqrt{3} + \sqrt{7} < \sqrt{20}$  □

**Solution:**

Like part (b), here too, we have assumed the conclusion was true. In this case, instead of showing that this statement is true, we have shown this statement  $\rightarrow T$ . Remember, this does not necessarily mean that  $p$  is true! If you think back to the truth table for the implication  $p \rightarrow q$ , the implication becomes a vacuous truth if  $q$  is true: we know nothing about the truth value of  $p$ .