

Discrete Mathematics Notes Part 3

Miagao

Contents

| | |
|--|----|
| 8 Properties of Relations | 2 |
| 8.1 Relations on Sets | 2 |
| Inverse Relations | 4 |
| Directed Graph of a Relation | 5 |
| N -ary Relations and Relational Databases | 6 |
| 8.2 Properties of Relations | 7 |
| Reflexivity, Symmetry, and Transitivity | 7 |
| Properties of Relations on Infinite Sets | 8 |
| The Transitive Closure of a Relation | 11 |
| 8.3 Equivalence Relations | 12 |
| The Relation Induced by a Partition | 12 |
| Definition of an Equivalence Relation | 12 |
| Equivalence Classes of an Equivalence Relation | 13 |
| Congruence Modulo n | 15 |
| A Definition for Rational Numbers | 16 |
| 8.4 Modular Arithmetic with Applications to Cryptography | 17 |
| Properties of Congruence Modulo n | 18 |
| Modular Arithmetic | 18 |
| Extending the Euclidean Algorithm | 19 |
| Finding an Inverse Modulo n | 19 |
| RSA Cryptography | 19 |

8 Properties of Relations

8.1 Relations on Sets

- This section will review relations from Chapter 1.
- Recall that an element of one set may be related to another by a relation R as long as they satisfy its definition.

Example: Less-than Relation


A relation L from \mathbb{R} to \mathbb{R} is defined as follows:

For all real numbers x and y ,

$$x L y \Leftrightarrow x < y$$

- $53 L 67?$
 - True, $53 < 67$.
- $141 L 141?$
 - False, $141 = 141$.
- $12 L -1?$
 - False, $12 > -1$.

Additionally, L may be graphed as a subset of $\mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}$, the Cartesian plane using its rule, $x < y$.



Example: Congruence Modulo 2 Relation

A relation E from \mathbb{Z} to \mathbb{Z} is defined as follows:

For every $(m, n) \in \mathbb{Z} \times \mathbb{Z}$,

$m E n \Leftrightarrow m - n$ is even

- Prove that if n is any odd integer, then $n E 1$.

Proof:

Suppose n is any odd integer.

By definition of odd, $n = 2k + 1$ for some integer k .

By definition of E , $n E 1$ if, and only if, $n - 1$ is even.

By substitution,

$$2k + 1 E 1 \Leftrightarrow 2k + 1 - 1 \text{ is even}$$

As said earlier, k is an integer, so by extension, $2k$ is even by definition of even.

- Therefore, $n E 1$.
- Notably, integers m and n are only related by E if, and only if,

$$m \bmod 2 = n \bmod 2$$

- This means that m and n are **congruent modulo 2**.

This may also apply to modulo relations other than 2. For example, if T is defined from \mathbb{Z} to \mathbb{Z} as follows:

For all integers m and n

$m T n \Leftrightarrow 3 \mid (m - n)$

then m and n are **congruent modulo 3** by the relation T .

Inverse Relations

Definition:

Let R be relation from A to B . The inverse relation R^{-1} may be defined as follows:

$$R^{-1} = \{(y, x) \in B \times A \mid (x, y) \in R\}$$

- Or, more formally,

$$\begin{aligned}\forall x \in A \text{ and } y \in B, \\ (y, x) \in B \times A \Leftrightarrow (x, y) \in R\end{aligned}$$

- The arrow diagram for an inverse relation may be found by reversing the direction of the arrows.

Example: Finite Relation Inverse

Given $A = \{2, 3, 4\}$ and $B = \{2, 6, 8\}$,

let R be the *divides* relation from A to B defined as follows:

For every ordered pair $(x, y) \in A \times B$,

$$x R y \Leftrightarrow x \mid y$$

- What are the ordered pairs of R and R^{-1} ?

$$R = \{(2, 2), (2, 6), (2, 8), (3, 6), (4, 8)\}$$

$$R^{-1} = \{(2, 2), (6, 2), (8, 2), (6, 3), (8, 4)\}$$

Inverses for finite relations are easy to express explicitly because all values of R can be listed before being reversed.

Example: Infinite Relation Inverse


Let R be a relation from \mathbb{R} to \mathbb{R} defined as follows:

For every ordered pair $(x, y) \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}$

$$x R y \Leftrightarrow y = 2|x|$$

- If the graph of R^{-1} are drawn on the Cartesian plane, will it be a function?
 - Using R 's definition, R^{-1} may be expressed as a function of y .

$$R^{-1} = \{(y, x) \in \mathbb{R} \mid x = 2|y|\}$$



- Given this, the following tables may be procured:

| x | y |
|----|---|
| 0 | 0 |
| 1 | 2 |
| -1 | 2 |
| 2 | 4 |
| -2 | 4 |

| y | x |
|---|----|
| 0 | 0 |
| 2 | 1 |
| 2 | -1 |
| 4 | 2 |
| 4 | -2 |

- From the table above, it can be seen that R^{-1} has two x -values for each $y > 0$. For instance, both $(2, 1)$ and $(2, -1)$ are in R^{-1} , so it is not a function.

Directed Graph of a Relation

Definition:

A **relation on a set A** is a relation from A to A .

- In this case, if a relation R is defined on set A , then the relation's arrow diagram may also be expressed as a **directed graph**.
- Elements related to themselves are expressed as a loop.

Example: Directed Graph of a Relation


Let set $A = \{3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8\}$

Let a relation R be defined on set A as follows:

For every $x, y \in A$,

$$x R y \Leftrightarrow 2 \mid (x - y)$$

- A directed graph can be created as follows:



Notice how every vertex in the directed graph connects to itself. This means that every element in A is related to itself by R . By extension, all vertices are only connected to vertices with the same parity.

N -ary Relations and Relational Databases

- Particular relations formed from Cartesian products of n sets, known as N -ary relations, are the mathematical basis for relational database theory.

Definition:

Given the sets A_1, A_2, \dots, A_n , the **n -ary relation** on

$A_1 \times A_2 \times \dots \times A_n$ is a subset of $A_1 \times A_2 \times \dots \times A_n$. The following special cases are defined as the following:

- 2-ary is **binary**.
- 3-ary is **tertiary**.
- 4-ary is **quaternary**.

In a database, these n -ary relations can be thought of as tables with n columns with the headers A_1, A_2, \dots, A_n .

8.2 Properties of Relations

Reflexivity, Symmetry, and Transitivity

Definition:

Let R be a relation on set A .

1. R is **reflexive** \Leftrightarrow for all $x \in A$, $x R x$.
2. R is **symmetric** \Leftrightarrow for every $x, y \in A$, if $x R y$, then $y R x$.
3. R is **transitive** \Leftrightarrow for all $x, y, z \in A$, if $x R y$ and $y R z$, then $x R z$.


- Relating this back to directed graphs for relations, these properties may be identified graphically:
 1. The reflexive property may be shown by loops on every vertex.
 2. The symmetric property may be shown by connections between two vertices always being through opposite parallel edges.
 3. The transitive property may be shown by there being no *incomplete directed triangles*.
- Logically, the following negations may be used to disprove them:
 1. R is **not reflexive** $\Leftrightarrow \exists x \in A$ such that $(x, x) \notin R$.
 2. R is **not symmetric** $\Leftrightarrow \exists x, y \in A$ such that if $(x, y) \in R$, then $(y, x) \notin R$.
 3. R is **not transitive** $\Leftrightarrow \exists x, y, z \in A$ such that if $(x, y) \in R$ and $(y, z) \in R$, then $(x, z) \notin R$.

Example: Properties of Relations on Finite Sets

Let $A = \{0, 1, 2, 3\}$ and R, S , and T be defined as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}R &= \{(0, 0), (0, 1), (0, 3), (1, 0), (1, 1), (2, 2), (3, 0), (3, 3)\} \\S &= \{(0, 0), (0, 2), (0, 3), (2, 3)\} \\T &= \{(0, 1), (2, 3)\}\end{aligned}$$


- Is R reflexive, symmetric, and/or transitive?
 - We can create a simple graph representing R .




- R is reflexive because there is a loop on each vertex in the directed graph.
- R is also symmetric because for each connection from one vertex to another, there is a second connection from the second vertex to the first.
- However, R is not transitive because there is no complete directed triangle on the directed graph (no directed edge from 1 to 3).

Example: Properties of Relations on Finite Sets continued

- Is S reflexive, symmetric, and/or transitive?
 - Similar to the first example, creating a directed graph makes this easier.



- S is not reflexive because the only vertex with a loop is 0.
- S is not symmetric because when there are connections between vertices, it is only from one vertex to another.
- S is transitive because there is one case where a vertex is both directly and transitively connected to a vertex ($0 \rightarrow 2 \rightarrow 3$ and $0 \rightarrow 3$)
- Is T reflexive, symmetric, and/or transitive?
 - Again, we will create a directed graph to represent T .



- T is not reflexive because no vertices on the graph are connected to themselves via a loop.
- T is not symmetric because when there are connections between vertices, it is only from one vertex to another.
- T is not transitive because there only exists two edges in the graph.

Properties of Relations on Infinite Sets

- For proving relation properties on infinite sets, we have to refer back to their definitions
 - Recall that to prove that a relation is symmetric, we must prove

$$\forall x, y \in A, x R y \Rightarrow y R x$$

- For instance, to prove an *equality* relation on the set of all real numbers, we have to prove

$$\forall x, y \in \mathbb{R}, x = y \Rightarrow y = x$$

- While these examples are intuitive, generalizing from the generic particular is often necessary to prove properties.

Example: Equality Relation

Let R be a relation defined on \mathbb{R} as follows:

For all real numbers x and y ,

$$x R y \Leftrightarrow x = y$$

- Is R reflexive?
 - Yes. x is equal to itself, meaning that $x R x$.
- Is R symmetric?
 - Yes. Equality is symmetric; $x = y \Rightarrow y = x$. Thus,
 $x R y \Rightarrow y R x$.
- Is R transitive?
 - Yes. Equality is transitive; $x = y$ and $y = z \Rightarrow x = z$. Thus,
 $x R y \wedge y R z \Rightarrow x R z$

Example: Properties of Congruence Modulo 3

Let a relation T be defined on \mathbb{Z} as follows:

For all integers m and n ,

$$m T n \Leftrightarrow 3 \mid (m - n)$$

- Is T reflexive?
 - **Proof:**
Suppose m is a *particular but arbitrarily chosen* integer such that $m T m$. By definition of T ,
$$3 \mid (m - m) = 3 \mid 0$$
By definition of divisibility, 3 divides 0 because $0 = 0 \cdot 3$.
 - Thus, T is reflexive.
- Is T symmetric?
 - **Proof:**
Suppose m and n are *particular but arbitrarily chosen* integers such that $m T n$.
By definition of T ,
$$3 \mid (m - n)$$
By definition of divisibility, $m - n = 3k$ for some integer k .
$$m - n = 3k \text{ for some integer } k$$
$$n - m = 3(-k) \text{ for some integer } k \text{ by algebra}$$
$$\mathbb{Z} \text{ is closed under multiplication, so } -k \text{ is an integer.}$$
$$\text{Therefore, by definition of divisibility, } 3 \mid (n - m).$$
 - Thus, T is symmetric.

Example: Properties of Congruence Modulo 3 continued

- Is T transitive?

► **Proof:**

Suppose m , n , and p are *particular but arbitrarily chosen* integers such that $m \equiv n \pmod{3}$ and $n \equiv p \pmod{3}$.
By definition of T ,

$$3 \mid (m - n) \text{ and } 3 \mid (n - p)$$

By definition of divisibility, $m - n = 3r$ and $n - p = 3s$ for some integers r and s .

$$(m - n) + (n - p) = 3r + 3s \text{ by adding both together}$$

$$m - p = 3(r + s) \text{ by algebra}$$

$(r + s)$ is an integer because \mathbb{Z} is closed under addition.

Therefore, by definition of divisibility, $3 \mid (m - p)$.

► Thus, T is transitive.

The Transitive Closure of a Relation

Definition:

The **transitive closure** of R , denoted R' , is a relation on set A that satisfies the following three properties:

1. R^t is **transitive**.
2. $R \subseteq R^t$.
3. Given S , another transitive relation containing R , $R^t \subseteq S$.

Example: Transitive Closure of a Relation

Let $A = \{0, 1, 2, 3\}$.


Let relation R be defined on A as follows:

$$R = \{(0, 1), (1, 2), (2, 3)\}$$

- What is the transitive closure of R ?
 - Given the **second property** of transitive closures defined earlier:

$$\{(0, 1), (1, 2), (2, 3)\} \subseteq R^t$$


- First, a directed graph for R may be constructed.



- Now we can look for potential edges that can be added to create R^t .
 - From vertex 0, we know that we can add edges to vertex 2 and 3 because vertex 0 has indirect connections to them.
 - Additionally, we can add an edge from vertex 1 to 3 because it is transitively connected to it through vertex 2.
 - Thus, we can say that R^t equals

$$R^t = \{(0, 1), (0, 2), (0, 3), (1, 2), (1, 3), (2, 3)\}$$

- This works because we know that the previous ordered pairs are at least in R^t . However, this relation is transitive, thus it equals R^t .



8.3 Equivalence Relations

The Relation Induced by a Partition

- Recall that a **partition** of a set is a collection of mutually disjoint sets whose union is the original set.

Definition:

Given a partition of set A , the **relation induced by the partition**, R , is defined on A as follows:

For every $x, y \in A$,

$x R y \Leftrightarrow$ There is a subset A_i of the partition such that both x and y are in A_i .

Example: Relation Induced by the Partition

Let $A = \{0, 1, 2, 3, 4\}$. A partition of A is as follows:

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

- What is the relation R induced by this partition?
 - We can evaluate the ordered pairs in R by analyzing the contents of each set in the partition.*
 - According to the contents of the first set:

$$0 R 0$$

$$0 R 3$$

$$0 R 4$$

$$3 R 0$$

$$3 R 3$$

$$3 R 4$$

$$4 R 0$$

$$4 R 3$$

$$4 R 4$$

- Additionally, according to the contents of the other sets:

$$1 R 1$$

$$2 R 2$$

- Therefore,

$$R = \{(0, 0), (0, 3), (0, 4), (3, 0), (3, 3), (3, 4), (4, 0), (4, 3), (4, 4), (1, 1), (1, 2)\}$$

Theorem 8.3.1:

Let A be a set with a partition and let R be the relation induced by the partition. Then R is reflexive, symmetric, and transitive.

Definition of an Equivalence Relation

Definition:

Let A be a set and R be a relation on A . R is an **equivalence relation**, if, and only if, R is reflexive, symmetric, and transitive.

Example: An Equivalence Relation on a Set of Subsets

Let X be the set of all nonempty subsets of $\{1, 2, 3\}$. Then,

$$X = \{\{1\}, \{2\}, \{3\}, \{1, 2\}, \{1, 3\}, \{2, 3\}, \{1, 2, 3\}\}$$

- Define a relation R on X as follows:

For every A and B in X ,

$A R B \Leftrightarrow$ The least element in A equals the least element in B .

- *Prove that R has all three properties.*

- **Prove that R is reflexive:**

- Suppose that A is a nonempty subset of $\{1, 2, 3\}$.
- Logically, the least element of A should always equal the least element of A .
- Therefore, $A R A$.
- R is reflexive.

- **Prove that R is symmetric:**

- Suppose that A and B are nonempty subsets of $\{1, 2, 3\}$ such that $A R B$.
- If $A R B$, then the least element of A equals the least element in B .
- This implies that the least element in B equals the last element of A .
- So, in this case, $B R A$.
- R is symmetric.

- **Prove that R**

- Suppose that A , B , and C are nonempty subsets of $\{1, 2, 3\}$ such that $A R B$ and $B R C$.
- By definition of R , the least element of A equals the least element in B , and the least element in B equals the least element in C .
- As a result, the least element of A must equal the least element in C .
- Hence, $A R C$.
- R is transitive.

Because R is reflexive, symmetric, and transitive, it is an equivalence relation.

Equivalence Classes of an Equivalence Relation

Definition:

Suppose that R is an equivalence relation on a set A . For each element a in A , the **equivalence class of a** , denoted $[a]$ and called the **class of a** for short, is the set of all elements $x \in A$ such that $x R a$.

$$[a] = \{x \in A \mid x R a\}$$

- Procedurely,

for every $x \in A, x \in [a] \Leftrightarrow x R a$


- The notation $[a]_R$ may be used to specify an equivalence class of a for a particular relation R .

Example: Equivalence Classes of a Relation Given as a Set of Ordered Pairs

Let $A = \{0, 1, 2, 3, 4\}$ and define relation R on A as follows:

$$R = \{(0, 0), (0, 4), (1, 1), (1, 3), (2, 2), (3, 1), (3, 3), (4, 0), (4, 4)\}$$

Additionally, the directed graph is as follows:



- What are the distinct equivalence classes of R ?

$$[0] = \{x \in A \mid x R 0\} = \{0, 4\}$$

$$[1] = \{x \in A \mid x R 1\} = \{1, 3\}$$

$$[2] = \{x \in A \mid x R 2\} = \{2\}$$

$$[3] = \{x \in A \mid x R 3\} = \{1, 3\}$$

$$[4] = \{x \in A \mid x R 4\} = \{0, 4\}$$

Removing duplicate sets, the distinct equivalence classes are as follows:

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

Example: Equivalent Classes of the Identity Relation

Let A be any set and define a relation R on A as follows:

For every $x, y \in A$

$$x R y \Leftrightarrow x = y$$

R is also an equivalence relation.

- What are the distinct equivalence classes of R ?

$$[a] = \{x \in A \mid x R a\}$$

$$[a] = \{x \in A \mid x = a\} \text{ by definition of } R$$

$$[a] = \{a\}$$

Given this definition, the classes for all elements in A are all distinct equivalence classes of R .

Lemma 8.3.2:

Suppose R is an equivalence relation on set A , and a and b are elements of A .

$$a R b \Rightarrow [a] = [b]$$

Lemma 8.3.3:

If R is an equivalence relation on set A , and a and b are elements of A , then

$$[a] \cap [b] = \emptyset \text{ or } [a] = [b]$$

Theorem 8.3.4:

Given equivalence relation R on set A , the distinct equivalence classes of R altogether are equivalent to A 's partition.

Congruence Modulo n

Example: Equivalence Classes of Congruence Modulo 3

Let R be the congruence modulo 3 relation on \mathbb{Z} , or

$$m R n \Leftrightarrow 3 \mid (m - n)$$

- What are the equivalence classes of R ?

► For each integer a ,

$$[a] = \{x \in \mathbb{Z} \mid x R a\}$$

$$[a] = \{x \in \mathbb{Z} \mid 3 \mid (x - a)\} \text{ by definition of } R$$

$$[a] = \{x \in \mathbb{Z} \mid (x - a) = 3k \text{ for some integer } k\} \text{ by definition of divisibility}$$

$$[a] = \{x \in \mathbb{Z} \mid x = 3k + a\}$$

► It should follow that there are three equivalence classes of R .

$$[0] = \{x \in \mathbb{Z} \mid x = 3k \text{ for some integer } k\}$$

$$[1] = \{x \in \mathbb{Z} \mid x = 3k + 1 \text{ for some integer } k\}$$

$$[2] = \{x \in \mathbb{Z} \mid x = 3k + 2 \text{ for some integer } k\}$$

Definition:

Suppose R is an equivalence relation on set A and S is an equivalence class for R . A **representative** of the class S is an element a such that $[a] = S$.

Definition:

Let m and n be integers and let d be a positive integer. m is said to be **congruent to n modulo d** , shown as

$$m \equiv n \pmod{d} \Leftrightarrow d \mid (m - n)$$

Example: Evaluating Congruencies

Determine the truth values of the following congruencies:

$$12 \equiv 7 \pmod{5}$$

$$6 \equiv -8 \pmod{4}$$

$$3 \equiv 3 \pmod{7}$$

- The first congruency is true.

$$\begin{aligned} 12 - 7 &= 5 \\ &= 5 \cdot 1 \\ \therefore 5 &\mid (12 - 7) \end{aligned}$$

- The second congruency is false.

$$\begin{aligned} 6 - (-8) &= 14 \\ \therefore 5 &\nmid (6 - (-8)) \end{aligned}$$

- The third congruency is true.

$$\begin{aligned} 3 - 3 &= 0 \\ &= 7 \cdot 0 \\ \therefore 7 &\mid (3 - 3) \end{aligned}$$

A Definition for Rational Numbers

- When expressed as fractions, the same rational number can be expressed using different numerators and denominators

$$\frac{6}{7} = \frac{12}{14}$$

- Yet, they could represent the different tuples $(6, 7)$ and $(12, 14)$.
- Algebraically, it follows that

$$\frac{a}{b} = \frac{c}{d} \Leftrightarrow ad = bc$$

Example: Rational Numbers As Equivalence Classes

Let A be the set of all ordered pairs of integers excluding pairs whose second element is zero.

$$A = \mathbb{Z} \times (\mathbb{Z} - \{0\})$$

Additionally, let R be a relation on A as follows:

For all pairs (a, b) and $(c, d) \in A$,

$$(a, b) R(c, d) \Leftrightarrow ad = bc$$

- Prove that R is transitive.

Suppose (a, b) , (c, d) , and (e, f) are *particular but arbitrarily chosen* elements of A such that $(a, b) R(c, d)$ and $(c, d) R(e, f)$.

By definition of R ,

$$(1) \quad ad = bc$$

$$(2) \quad cf = de$$

Because the second elements for all tuples in A are nonzero, both sides of (1) and (2) may be multiplied by f and b , respectively.

$$(1') \quad adf = bcf$$

$$(2') \quad bcf = bde$$

Now, (1') and (2') are equal to the same thing. Thus,

$$adf = bde$$

$$af = be \text{ because } d \neq 0$$

Therefore, by definition of R , $(a, b) R(e, f)$.

R is transitive.

8.4 Modular Arithmetic with Applications to Cryptography

Cryptography refers to study of learning techniques to mask messages. **Encryption** transforms **plaintext** into **ciphertext**, which is largely unreadable without using **decryption**. Methods of encryption are known as **ciphers**.

- For example, the **Caesar cipher** encrypts messages by doing an alphanumeric shift that wraps back to the beginning.
 - ▶ Thus, given numerical represents of ciphertext C and plaintext M :

$$C = (M + 3) \bmod 26$$

- ▶ Each letter in the Latin alphabet may be associated with a number according to their position.
- Ciphers that shift are easy to crack

Properties of Congruence Modulo n

Theorem 8.4.1:

Let a , b , and n be any integers for $n > 1$. These statements are all equivalent to each other:

- $n \mid (a - b)$.
- $a \equiv b \pmod{n}$.
- $a = b + kn$ for some integer k .
- a and b have the same nonnegative remainder when divided by n .
- $a \pmod{n} = b \pmod{n}$.

- Recall the quotient-remainder theorem

$$a = nq + r \text{ for } 0 \leq r < n$$

- Consequently, there are exactly n integers that satisfy the constraint, and, by extension, n possible remainders.

Definition:

foo

Theorem 8.4.2:

Given an integer n for $n > 1$, congruence modulo n is an equivalence relation on \mathbb{Z} . The distinct equivalence classes of the set are

[]

Modular Arithmetic

A core principle of congruence modulo n is that performing operations closed under \mathbb{Z} before reducing via modulo n is the exact same as performing modulo n on the operands.

Theorem 8.4.3:

Given integers a , b , c , d , and n for $n > 1$, suppose that

$$a \equiv c \pmod{n}$$

Corollary 8.4.4:

Given integers a , b , and n for $n > 1$,

- When modular arithmetic is applied to large numbers, such as in RSA cryptography, computations use two particular properties of exponents

$$x^{2a} = (x^2)^a \text{ for all real numbers } x \text{ and } a \text{ for } x \geq 0.$$

$$x^{a+b} = x^a x^b \text{ for all real numbers } x, a \text{ and } b \text{ for } x \geq 0.$$

Example: Computing a demonic modulo n

Solve $144^4 \pmod{713}$.

Extending the Euclidean Algorithm

Definition:

An integer d is a **linear combination of integers** a and b if, and only if, there exist integers s and t such that $as + bt = d$.

Theorem 8.4.5:

For all nonzero integers a and B , if $d = \gcd(a, b)$, then there exist integers s and t such that $as + bt = d$.

Example: Expressing a GCD as a Linear Combination

Finding an Inverse Modulo n

Definition:

Given any integer a and positive integer n , if there exists an integer s such that $as \equiv 1 \pmod{n}$, then s is **an inverse for a modulo n** .

Definition:

Integers a and b are **relatively prime**, if and only if, $\gcd(a, b) = 1$.

Corollary 8.4:

Example: Expressing 1 as a Linear Combination of Relatively Prime Integers

Show that 660 and 43 are relatively prime. Additionally, find a corresponding linear combination equal to 1.

Corollary 8.4.7:

idk.

RSA Cryptography