

EE2302 Foundations of Information Engineering

Assignment 10 (Solution)

1. Totally, there are **four** possible Cayley's tables, as shown below:

<i>*</i>	<i>e</i>	<i>a</i>	<i>b</i>	<i>c</i>
<i>e</i>	<i>e</i>	<i>a</i>	<i>b</i>	<i>c</i>
<i>a</i>	<i>a</i>	<i>e</i>	<i>c</i>	<i>b</i>
<i>b</i>	<i>b</i>	<i>c</i>	<i>e</i>	<i>a</i>
<i>c</i>	<i>c</i>	<i>b</i>	<i>a</i>	<i>e</i>

<i>*</i>	<i>e</i>	<i>a</i>	<i>b</i>	<i>c</i>
<i>e</i>	<i>e</i>	<i>a</i>	<i>b</i>	<i>c</i>
<i>a</i>	<i>a</i>	<i>e</i>	<i>c</i>	<i>b</i>
<i>b</i>	<i>b</i>	<i>c</i>	<i>a</i>	<i>e</i>
<i>c</i>	<i>c</i>	<i>b</i>	<i>e</i>	<i>a</i>

<i>*</i>	<i>e</i>	<i>a</i>	<i>b</i>	<i>c</i>
<i>e</i>	<i>e</i>	<i>a</i>	<i>b</i>	<i>c</i>
<i>a</i>	<i>a</i>	<i>b</i>	<i>c</i>	<i>e</i>
<i>b</i>	<i>b</i>	<i>c</i>	<i>e</i>	<i>a</i>
<i>c</i>	<i>c</i>	<i>e</i>	<i>a</i>	<i>b</i>

<i>*</i>	<i>e</i>	<i>a</i>	<i>b</i>	<i>c</i>
<i>e</i>	<i>e</i>	<i>a</i>	<i>b</i>	<i>c</i>
<i>a</i>	<i>a</i>	<i>c</i>	<i>e</i>	<i>b</i>
<i>b</i>	<i>b</i>	<i>e</i>	<i>c</i>	<i>a</i>
<i>c</i>	<i>c</i>	<i>b</i>	<i>a</i>	<i>e</i>

There are **two** distinct groups, since the last three tables are the same.

- In the third table, if we swap the roles of *a* and *b*, then we obtain the second table.
- In the fourth table, if we swap the roles of *a* and *c*, then we obtain the second table.

2. There are four subgroups, namely, $\langle \{0\}, + \rangle$, $\langle \{0,3\}, + \rangle$, $\langle \{0,2,4\}, + \rangle$, \mathbb{Z}_6 , where the operation $+$ is addition modulo 6.

Remark: $\langle \{0,1\}, + \rangle$ is *not* a subgroup because $1 + 1 = 2$, which does not belong to $\{0, 1\}$, violating the closure property. Intuitively, a group (or subgroup) must have some kind of symmetry. You should be able to see that $\{0, 3\}$ is somewhat symmetric in

$$\{0, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5\}.$$

The elements 0 and 3 are marked in bold to highlight the “symmetry”. The same applies to $\{0, 2, 4\}$ as follows:

$$\{0, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5\}.$$

3. a) Multiplication table:

\circ	<i>e</i>	<i>r</i>	<i>r</i>²	<i>f</i>	<i>rf</i>	<i>r</i>²<i>f</i>
<i>e</i>	<i>e</i>	<i>r</i>	<i>r</i> ²	<i>f</i>	<i>rf</i>	<i>r</i> ² <i>f</i>
<i>r</i>	<i>r</i>	<i>r</i> ²	<i>e</i>	<i>rf</i>	<i>r</i> ² <i>f</i>	<i>f</i>
<i>r</i>²	<i>r</i> ²	<i>e</i>	<i>r</i>	<i>r</i> ² <i>f</i>	<i>f</i>	<i>rf</i>
<i>f</i>	<i>f</i>	<i>r</i> ² <i>f</i>	<i>rf</i>	<i>e</i>	<i>r</i> ²	<i>r</i>
<i>rf</i>	<i>rf</i>	<i>f</i>	<i>r</i> ² <i>f</i>	<i>r</i>	<i>e</i>	<i>r</i> ²
<i>r</i>²<i>f</i>	<i>r</i> ² <i>f</i>	<i>rf</i>	<i>f</i>	<i>r</i> ²	<i>r</i>	<i>e</i>

b) No, it is not an Abelian group. It is because the multiplication table is not symmetric across the diagonal, i.e., the operation is not commutative. For example, $r \circ f = rf$ but $f \circ r = r^2f$, which are not equal.

4.

a) There are eight of them:

$\begin{array}{ c c } \hline 1 & 2 \\ \hline 3 & 4 \\ \hline \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{ c c } \hline 3 & 1 \\ \hline 4 & 2 \\ \hline \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{ c c } \hline 4 & 3 \\ \hline 2 & 1 \\ \hline \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{ c c } \hline 2 & 4 \\ \hline 1 & 3 \\ \hline \end{array}$
e	r	rr	rrr
$\begin{array}{ c c } \hline 2 & 1 \\ \hline 4 & 3 \\ \hline \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{ c c } \hline 4 & 2 \\ \hline 3 & 1 \\ \hline \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{ c c } \hline 3 & 4 \\ \hline 1 & 2 \\ \hline \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{ c c } \hline 1 & 3 \\ \hline 2 & 4 \\ \hline \end{array}$
f	rf	$rrf = frr$	$rrrf = fr$

b) The order of rf is 2. It can be seen that $rf rf = e$

c) No. It is easy to check that $fr = rrrf \neq rf$.

d) Ten subgroups: $\{e\}, \{e, rr\}, \{e, f\}, \{e, rf\}, \{e, rrrf\}, \{e, rrf\},$
 $\{e, r, rr, rrr\}, \{e, rr, rf, rrrf\}, \{e, f, rr, rrf\}, \{e, r, rr, rrr, f, rf, rrf, rrrf\}.$