

## Chapter 2: The Integers' Solutions

Saif Mohammed

October 18, 2024

**Exercise 3.** Prove that the set of all linear combinations of  $a$  and  $b$  are precisely the multiples of  $\gcd(a, b)$ .

*Solution.* Let  $d = \gcd(a, b)$  and  $c = ax + by$  for  $c, x, y \in \mathbb{Z}$ . We prove  $c$  is a multiple of  $d$ .

Let  $a = da'$  and  $b = db'$ . So  $c = ax + by = d(a'x + b'y)$ . Hence,  $d \mid c$ .

We now prove the converse: if  $c$  is a multiple of  $d$ , then it is a linear combination of  $a$  and  $b$ .

Let  $c = dc'$ . We know  $d$  is the least positive linear combination of  $a$  and  $b$ . So

$$\begin{aligned} d &= am + bn && [\text{for } m, n \in \mathbb{Z}] \\ \implies dc' &= amc' + bnc' \\ \implies c &= a(mc') + b(nc'). \end{aligned}$$

Hence, we proved  $c$  is a linear combination of  $a$  and  $b$ . □

**Exercise 4.** Two numbers are said to be relatively prime if their gcd is 1. Prove that  $a$  and  $b$  are relatively prime if and only if every integer can be written as a linear combination of  $a$  and  $b$ .

*Solution.* Suppose  $a$  and  $b$  are relatively prime. We know that  $ax + by = \gcd(a, b) = 1$  for some  $x, y \in \mathbb{Z}$ . As every integer is a multiple of 1, then by **(3)**, every integer can be written as a linear combination of  $a$  and  $b$ .

Now, we prove the converse: if every integer can be written as a linear combination of  $a$  and  $b$ , then  $\gcd(a, b) = 1$ .

As 1 is the least positive integer and we know that  $\gcd(a, b)$  must be the least positive linear combination, we can conclude that  $\gcd(a, b) = 1$ . □

**Exercise 5.** Prove Theorem 2.6. That is, use induction to prove that if the prime  $p$  divides  $a_1 a_2 \cdots a_n$ , then  $p$  divides  $a_i$ , for some  $i$ .

*Solution.* If  $p \mid a_1$ , then the statement is trivially true. Now suppose if  $p \mid a_1 a_2 \cdots a_k$ , then  $p \mid a_i$  for some  $i$ . Now for  $p \mid a_1 a_2 \cdots a_{k+1}$ , if we bring out a  $a_{k+1}$ , then there can happen two cases.

**Case 1:**  $p \mid a_{k+1}$ . If so, then the statement is obviously true.

**Case 2:**  $p \nmid a_{k+1}$ . If so, then we can say  $p \mid a_1 a_2 \cdots a_k$ . And by the induction hypothesis, there is  $a_i$  for some  $i$  such that  $p \mid a_i$ .

Hence, the theorem is proved.

[Note: In each case, any  $a_n$  not necessarily the same with other  $a_n$ 's. So,  $a_1$  of the base case,  $a_1, a_2, \dots, a_k$  of the induction hypothesis, and  $a_1, a_2, \dots, a_k$  of the inductive step are not necessarily are the same numbers.]  $\square$

**Exercise 7.** (a) A natural number greater than 1 that is not prime is called **composite**. Show that for any  $n$ , there is a run of  $n$  consecutive composite numbers. *Hint:* Think factorial.

(b) Therefore, there is a string of 5 consecutive composite numbers starting where?

*Solution.* Left for later.  $\square$

**Exercise 9.** Notice that  $\gcd(30, 50) = 5 \gcd(6, 10) = 5 \cdot 2$ . In fact, this is always true; prove that if  $a \neq 0$ , then  $\gcd(ab, ac) = a \cdot \gcd(b, c)$ .

*Solution.*  $\gcd(ab, ac) = abx + acy = a(bx + cy)$  for some  $x, y \in \mathbb{Z}$ . Now  $\gcd(b, c)$  is multiple of any linear combination of  $b$  and  $c$ , so

$$\gcd(b, c) \mid bx + cy \implies a \cdot \gcd(b, c) \mid a(bx + cy) \implies a \cdot \gcd(b, c) \mid \gcd(ab, ac).$$

Again, for some  $x', y' \in \mathbb{Z}$   $\gcd(b, c) = bx' + cy' \implies a \cdot \gcd(b, c) \implies abx' + acy'$ . As  $\gcd(ab, ac)$  is multiple of any linear combination of  $ab$  and  $ac$ , so

$$\gcd(ab, ac) \mid abx' + acy' \implies \gcd(ab, ac) \mid a \cdot \gcd(b, c)$$

Because  $a \cdot \gcd(b, c) \mid \gcd(ab, ac)$  and  $\gcd(ab, ac) \mid a \cdot \gcd(b, c)$ , it can be concluded that  $\gcd(ab, ac) = a \cdot \gcd(b, c)$ .  $\square$

**Exercise 10.** Suppose that two integers  $a$  and  $b$  have been factored into primes as follows:

$$a = p_1^{n_1} p_2^{n_2} \cdots p_r^{n_r}$$

and

$$b = p_1^{m_1} p_2^{m_2} \cdots p_r^{m_r},$$

where the  $p_i$ 's are primes, and the exponents  $m_i$  and  $n_i$  are non-negative integers. It is the case that

$$\gcd(a, b) = p_1^{s_1} p_2^{s_2} \cdots p_r^{s_r},$$

where  $s_i$  is the smaller of  $n_i$  and  $m_i$ . Show this with  $a = 360 = 2^3 3^2 5^1$  and  $b = 900 = 2^2 3^2 5^2$ . Now prove this fact in general.

*Solution.* For  $r = 1$ ,  $a = p_1^{n_1}$  and  $b = p_1^{m_1}$ , where WLOG,  $n_1 > m_1 = s_1$ . We can rewrite  $a = p_1^{s_1} p_1^{n_1-s_1}$  and so  $\gcd(a, b) = p_1^{s_1} \cdot \gcd(p_1^{n_1-s_1}, 1) = p_1^{s_1}$ .

Let up to  $r = k$  this holds. Now for  $r = k + 1$ , there are two cases. WLOG,  $n_{k+1} > m_{k+1} = s_{k+1}$ .

$$\begin{aligned} \gcd(a, b) &= p_{k+1}^{s_{k+1}} \cdot \gcd(p_1^{n_1} p_2^{n_2} \cdots p_k^{n_k}, p_1^{m_1} p_2^{m_2} \cdots p_k^{m_k} p_{k+1}^{m_{k+1}-s_{k+1}}) \\ &= p_{k+1}^{s_{k+1}} \cdot \gcd(p_1^{n_1} p_2^{n_2} \cdots p_k^{n_k}, p_1^{m_1} p_2^{m_2} \cdots p_k^{m_k}) \quad [\text{no common divisor exists between} \\ &\quad \text{a prime and other primes.}] \\ &= p_1^{s_1} p_2^{s_2} \cdots p_k^{s_k} p_{k+1}^{s_{k+1}} \quad [\text{by induction hypothesis.}] \end{aligned}$$

□

**Exercise 11.** The least common multiple of natural numbers  $a$  and  $b$  is the smallest positive common multiple of  $a$  and  $b$ . That is, if  $m$  is the least common multiple of  $a$  and  $b$ , then  $a \mid m$  and  $b \mid m$ , and if  $a \mid n$  and  $b \mid n$  then  $n \geq m$ . We will write  $\text{lcm}(a, b)$  for the least common multiple of  $a$  and  $b$ . Find  $\text{lcm}(20, 114)$  and  $\text{lcm}(14, 45)$ . Can you find a formula for the lcm of the type given for the gcd in the previous exercise?

*Solution.* If  $a = p_1^{n_1} p_2^{n_2} \cdots p_r^{n_r}$  and  $b = p_1^{m_1} p_2^{m_2} \cdots p_r^{m_r}$ , then we claim that

$$\text{lcm}(a, b) = p_1^{l_1} p_2^{l_2} \cdots p_r^{l_r}$$

where  $l_i$  is the largest of  $n_i$  and  $m_i$ .

Now we prove that. Let  $c = p_1^{l_1} p_2^{l_2} \cdots p_r^{l_r}$ . As  $l_i$  is the largest of  $n_i$  and  $m_i$ , it is always larger than or equal to the corresponding power of factorization of either  $a$  or  $b$ . So  $a \mid c$  and  $b \mid c$ .

Now let's take another common multiple of  $a$  and  $b$ ,  $d = p_1^{w_1} p_2^{w_2} \cdots p_r^{w_r}$ . So

$$a \mid d \implies p_i^{n_i} \mid p_i^{w_i} \implies n_i \mid w_i \implies n_i \leq w_i$$

and

$$b \mid d \implies p_i^{m_i} \mid p_i^{w_i} \implies m_i \mid w_i \implies m_i \leq w_i$$

It follows that  $w_i$  is larger than or equal to the the largest of  $n_i$  and  $m_i$ . That is,  $w_i \geq l_i$ . Hence,  $c \mid d \implies c \leq d$ . Thus, we can conclude  $c$  is indeed the lcm of  $a$  and  $b$ . □

**Exercise 12.** Show that if  $\gcd(a, b) = 1$ , then  $\text{lcm}(a, b) = ab$ . In general, show that

$$\text{lcm}(a, b) = \frac{ab}{\gcd(a, b)}.$$

*Solution.* For  $a = p_1^{n_1} p_2^{n_2} \cdots p_r^{n_r}$  and  $b = p_1^{m_1} p_2^{m_2} \cdots p_r^{m_r}$ , we know,

$$\text{lcm}(a, b) = p_1^{l_1} p_2^{l_2} \cdots p_r^{l_r} \quad [l_i \text{ is the largest of } m_i \text{ and } n_i.] \quad (1)$$

$$\text{and } \text{gcd}(a, b) = p_1^{s_1} p_2^{s_2} \cdots p_r^{s_r} \quad [s_i \text{ is smallest of } m_i \text{ and } n_i.] \quad (2)$$

Let  $m_i \geq n_i$  for some  $i \in \mathbb{N}$ . So  $l_i = m_i$  and  $s_i = n_i$ . Hence,  $p_i^{l_i} \cdot p_i^{s_i} = p_i^{m_i} \cdot p_i^{n_i}$ . Similarly, we can show that for  $m_i \leq n_i$ ,  $p_i^{l_i} \cdot p_i^{s_i} = p_i^{m_i} \cdot p_i^{n_i}$ . It follows that if we multiply (1) and (2), then  $p_i^{m_i}$  and  $p_i^{n_i}$  both exists for any  $i \in \mathbb{N}$  as factors of the product. By rearranging them, we can write

$$\begin{aligned} \text{lcm}(a, b) \cdot \text{gcd}(a, b) &= p_1^{n_1} p_2^{n_2} \cdots p_r^{n_r} \cdot p_1^{m_1} p_2^{m_2} \cdots p_r^{m_r} \\ &\implies \text{lcm}(a, b) \cdot \text{gcd}(a, b) = ab \\ &\implies \text{lcm}(a, b) = \frac{ab}{\text{gcd}(a, b)}. \end{aligned}$$

□

**Exercise 13.** Prove that if  $m$  is a common multiple of both  $a$  and  $b$ , then  $\text{lcm}(a, b) \mid m$ .

*Solution.* Let  $l = \text{lcm}(a, b)$ . Let's assume that  $l \nmid m$ . So,  $m = l \cdot k + r$ , where  $k \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $0 < r < l$ . Here,  $a \mid m$  and  $b \mid m$  and also  $a \mid l$  and  $b \mid l$ , so  $a \mid r$  and  $b \mid r$ .

So we see that  $r$  is a common multiple of  $a$  and  $b$ , which is less than  $l$ , but this is not possible because  $l$  is the least common multiple of  $a$  and  $b$ . Therefore,  $l \mid m \implies \text{lcm}(a, b) \mid m$ . □