# Math 3101 HW # 2

# Mario L. Gutierrez Abed

(1) Prove that  $1 + 2 + ... + n = \frac{n(n+1)}{2}$ .

### **Proof:**

For the base case (n = 1) we have

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

Next, assume that the equation holds for n = k:

$$1 + 2 + \dots + k = \frac{k(k+1)}{2}$$
.

We then want to show that it also holds for n = k + 1:

$$1 + 2 + \dots + k + k + 1 = \frac{(k+1)(k+2)}{2}$$
.

But 1 + 2 + ... + k is exactly  $\frac{k(k+1)}{2}$ .

Hence

$$\frac{k(k+1)}{2} + k + 1 = \frac{k(k+1)+2(k+1)}{2} = \frac{k^2+k+2k+2}{2}$$
$$= \frac{k^2+3k+2}{2} = \frac{(k+1)(k+2)}{2}.$$

Thus, it follows by induction that  $1 + 2 + ... + n = \frac{n(n+1)}{2}$ .

(2) Find integers r, s such that gcd(45, 33) = r 45 + s 33.

### Solution:

We have

$$45 = 33 \cdot 1 + 12$$
$$33 = 12 \cdot 2 + 9$$
$$12 = 9 \cdot 1 + 3$$
$$9 = 3 \cdot 3 + 0$$

Hence

$$gcd(45, 33) = gcd(45, 33) = gcd(33, 12) = gcd(12, 9) = gcd(9, 3) = 3.$$

Now we go backwards

$$3 = 12 + (-1)(9)$$

$$= 12 + (-1)[33 + (-2)(12)]$$

$$= (-1)(33) + 3(12)$$

$$= (-1)(33) + 3[45 + (-1)(33)]$$

$$= (3)(45) + (-4)(33).$$

Hence,

$$\gcd(45, 33) = 3 = r \cdot 45 + s \cdot 33 = (3)(45) + (-4)(33) \Longrightarrow r = 3, s = -4.$$

(3) Let a, b be integers. It was proven in class that if gcd(a, b) = 1 then there exist integers r, s such that ra + sb = 1. Prove that the converse is also true. Namely prove that if r, s are integers such that ra + sb = 1 then gcd(a, b) = 1.

## Proof:

Let  $a, b, r, s \in \mathbb{Z}$  such that ra + sb = 1. Assume a, b are not relatively prime. Then there exists a  $t \neq 1$  that a and b share as a factor. But this means that there is  $j, k \in \mathbb{Z}$  such that a = tj, b = tk. We then have

$$ra + sb = 1$$
  
 $\Rightarrow rtj + stk = 1$   
 $\Rightarrow t(rj + sk) = 1$   
 $\Rightarrow rj + sk = 1/t$ .

But 1/t < 1 while r, j, s, and k are all integers. We know that integers are well defined and closed under addition and multiplication, meaning that it's impossible to add and multiply integers and end up with a fraction that's not an integer.  $(\Rightarrow \Leftarrow)$ 

This contradiction tells us that if r, s are integers such that ra + sb = 1 then a and b must necessarily be relatively prime, i.e. gcd(a, b) = 1.

(4) Let  $a, b, c \in \mathbb{Z}$ . Prove without using the fundamental theorem of arithmetic that if gcd(a, b) = 1 and  $a \mid b \mid c$ , then we must have that  $a \mid c$ .

#### Proof:

Let  $a, b, c \in \mathbb{Z}$ . If  $a \mid b c$ , there exists  $d \in \mathbb{Z}$  such that a d = b c. Also since gcd(a, b) = 1, there are integers c and c such that c and c are c and c such that c and c such that c and c and c are c and c and c and c are c and c and c and c are c and c are c and c and c are c are c and c are c are c and c are c are c and c are c and c are c are c and c are c are c and c are c are c are c and c are c and c are c and c are c are c and c are c are c are c and c are c are c are c are c are c are c and c are c are c are c and c are c are

Now, multiplying by c we have

$$(ar+sb)c=c \implies arc+sbc=c$$
.

But b c = a d, so

$$a r c + s a d = c \implies a(r c + s d) = c$$
  
 $\implies a | c.$ 

(5) Give the multiplication table for  $U(12) = \{1, 5, 7, 11\}$ , the group of elements of  $\mathbb{Z}_{12}$  which are invertible relative to multiplication.

#### Solution:

×	1	5	7	11
1	1	5	7	11
5	5	1	11	7
7	7	11	1	5
11	11	7	5	1



(6) Write out the Cayley table for the group  $\mathbb{Z}_2 \times \mathbb{Z}_2 = \{(0, 0), (0, 1), (1, 0), (1, 1)\}.$ 

# Solution:

+	(0,0)	(0, 1)	(1,0)	(1, 1)
(0,0)	(0,0)	(0, 1)	(1, 0)	(1, 1)
(0, 1)	(0, 1)	(0,0)	(1, 1)	(1, 0)
(1,0)	(1,0)	(1, 1)	(0,0)	(0, 1)
(1, 1)	(1, 1)	(1, 0)	(0, 1)	(0,0)

