Assignment .	4
1-0-	

Dated:

Section 1997 To the Section 1997								
1.a)	+	0	1	2	3	4	The state of	
	0	0	1	2	3	4		
	1	1	2	3	4	0		
	2	2	3	4	0	1	Mark Burney	
	3	3	4	0	1	2		
	4	4	0	1	2	3	A STATE OF THE STA	
								12

×	0	1	2	3	4	
0	0	0	0	0	0	inverse of:
1	0	1	2	3	4	1: 1
2	0	2	4	1	3	2: 3
3	0	3	1	4	2	3: 2
4	0	4	3	2	1	7: 4

- b) i)  $5x + 23 \equiv 6 \pmod{47}$   $5x \equiv -17 \pmod{47}$   $5x \equiv 30 \pmod{47}$   $x \equiv 6 \pmod{47}$ 
  - ii)  $92 + 80 \equiv 2 \pmod{81}$   $9x \equiv -78 \pmod{81}$   $9z \equiv 3 \pmod{81}$  $3x \equiv 1 \pmod{81}$

since Il is a multiple of 3, ho solution of a exists

```
Dated:
```

Dated:

iii) 
$$30x + 3y = 0 \pmod{57}$$

$$30x + 5(n + 15x) = 0 \pmod{57}$$

$$30x + 12 + 2x = 0 \pmod{57}$$

$$32x = -12 \pmod{57}$$

$$32x = -12 \pmod{57}$$

$$32x = 25 \pmod{57}$$

$$1 = 3(25) + 12$$

$$1 = 3(25) -337 \pmod{57}$$

$$1 = 3(25) \pmod{57}$$

$$1 = 3(25) \pmod{57}$$

$$22x = 1 \pmod{57}$$

$$22x = 1 \pmod{57}$$

$$37 = ((22) + 15)$$

$$22 = 1(15) + 7$$

$$15 = 2(7) + 1$$

$$1 = 15 - 2(7)$$

$$1 = 3(37) - 5(22)$$

$$1 = 3(22) \pmod{57}$$

$$1 = 32(22) \pmod{57}$$

$$1 = 32(22) \pmod{57}$$

$$1 = 32(22) \pmod{57}$$

$$1 = 32(22) \pmod{57}$$

```
Dated:
    4 = 4+13 (32) (mod 37)
     y = 13 (mod 37)
c) (5688, 2010)
   (1668, 2010)
   (1668, 342)
   (3000, 342)
   (300, 42)
    (6, 42)
    (6,0) - 6 = gcd.
d) 52; +15 k =3
    52; + 15 k =+
   52 = 3(15)+7
    15 = 2(7) +1
              1 = 15 - 2(7)
              1 = 7(15) -2(52)
              52(-2) + 15 (7) =1
              52(-6) + 15(21) = 3
                1= -6
                k = 21
```

2) 31 = 1(21) +10

21 = 2(10) +1

$$1 = 21 - 2(10)$$

$$1 = 3(21) - 2(31)$$

b) 31 a + 21 b = 1010

31(-2) + 21(3) = 1

31(-2020) + 21(3030) = 1010

31(-2020+(21×18)) + 21(3030-(51×18)) = 1010

31

31(17) + 21(23) = 1010

17 31-cent coins + 23 21-cent coins.

c) there's in other possible solution where the amounts of coins orient negative

3. k = 1 3 - prime k = 2 7 - prime k = 3 31 - prime k = 4 211 - prime k = 5 2311 - prime k = 6 30031 - not prime.

we orient always guaranteed a prime number, however, the proof is still valid because, if not prime, then the product must it must be a product of primes however that a not possible should not be passible because it isn't draigible by any number on the list.

Therefore the contradiction holds.