- Please submit your answers to all questions.
- We will mark your answers to 3 questions.
- We will provide you with full solutions to all questions.
- 1. Prove or disprove: If R and S are two equivalence relations on a set A, then  $R \cup S$  is also an equivalence relation on A.

*Proof.* This statement is false. For a counterexample we can take  $A = \{1, 2, 3\}$  and the relations  $R = \{(1, 1), (2, 2), (3, 3), (1, 2), (2, 1)\}$  and  $S = \{(1, 1), (2, 2), (3, 3), (1, 3), (3, 1)\}$ . We see that the relations R and S are equivalence relations, but

 $R \cup S = \{(1,1), (2,2), (3,3), (1,2), (2,1), (1,3), (3,1)\}$  is not an equivalence relation since  $(2,1), (1,3) \in R \cup S$ , but  $(2,3) \notin R \cup S$ , that is,  $R \cup S$  is not transitive.

2. Define a relation on  $\mathbb{Z}$  as aRb if  $3 \mid (5a - 8b)$ . Is R an equivalence relation? Justify your answer.

*Proof.* We need to check whether this relation is reflexive, symmetric, and transitive.

**Reflexive:** We see that this relation is reflexive since for any  $a \in \mathbb{Z}$ , we have (5a - 8a) = 3(-a), which implies  $3 \mid (5a - 8a)$ , that is, aRa.

**Symmetric:** Let  $a, b \in \mathbb{Z}$  and assume aRb. Then we see  $3 \mid (5a - 8b)$ , and so 5a - 8b = 3k for some  $k \in \mathbb{Z}$ . Then

5b-8a = (-3b-3a) - (5a-8b) = 3(-b-a-k). Since  $(-b-a-k) \in \mathbb{Z}$  we see that  $3 \mid (5b-8a)$ . Therefore R is symmetric.

**Transitive:** Let  $a, b, c \in \mathbb{Z}$  and assume aRb and bRc. Then we see  $3 \mid (5a-8b)$  and  $3 \mid (5b-8c)$ , so that 5a-8b=3k and 5b-8c=3n for some  $k, n \in \mathbb{Z}$ . Then 5a-8c=(5a-8b)+3b+(5b-8c)=3(k+b+n). Since  $(k+b+n) \in \mathbb{Z}$  we see that  $3 \mid (5a-8c)$ . Therefore R is transitive.

- 3. Determine whether the following relations are reflexive, symmetric and transitive.
  - 1. On the set X of all functions  $\mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ , we define the relation:

fRg if there exists  $x \in \mathbb{R}$  such that f(x) = g(x).

2. Let R be a relation on  $\mathbb{Z}$  defined by:

$$xRy \text{ if } xy \equiv 0 \pmod{4}.$$

- *Proof.* 1. It is reflexive, symmetric but not transitive. For example, let f, g and h such that f(x) = 0, g(x) = x and h(x) = 1. We have fRg and gRh but it is not true that fRh.
  - 2. (a) We see that  $(1,1) \notin R$ , since  $1 \cdot 1 = 1 \not\equiv 0 \pmod{4}$ . Therefore, the relation is not reflexive.
    - (b) This relation is symmetric since if  $xy \equiv 0 \pmod{4}$ , then  $yx = xy \equiv 0 \pmod{4}$ , that is, if  $(x, y) \in R$ , then  $(y, x) \in R$ .
    - (c) This relation is not transitive. For a counterexample, we can take, a = 1, b = 4, c = 1. Then, we see that  $(1, 4), (4, 1) \in \mathbb{R}$ , whereas,  $(1, 1) \notin \mathbb{R}$ .

4. Let A be a non-empty set and  $S \subseteq \mathcal{P}(A)$  and  $\mathcal{T} \subseteq \mathcal{P}(A)$  partitions of A. Show that  $\mathcal{R}$  defined as

$$\mathcal{R} = \{ S \cap T : S \in \mathcal{S}, \ T \in \mathcal{T} \} \setminus \{ \emptyset \}$$

is a partition of A.

*Proof.* The set  $\mathcal{R}$  is a set of non-empty subsets of A by definition. Let  $x \in A$ . Since  $\mathcal{S}$  and  $\mathcal{T}$  are partitions, there exists  $S \in \mathcal{S}$  and  $T \in \mathcal{T}$  such that  $x \in S$  and  $x \in T$ . This entails that  $x \in S \cap T$  and  $S \cap T \in \mathcal{R}$ .

Let  $U_1, U_2 \in \mathcal{R}$ . By definition  $U_1 = S_1 \cap T_1$  for  $S_1 \in \mathcal{S}$  and  $T_1 \in \mathcal{T}$  and  $U_2 = S_2 \cap T_2$  for  $S_2 \in \mathcal{S}$  and  $T_2 \in \mathcal{T}$ . Then  $U_1 \cap U_2 = S_1 \cap T_1 \cap S_2 \cap T_2 = (S_1 \cap S_2) \cap (T_1 \cap T_2)$ . From there, either  $S_1 = S_2$  and  $T_1 = T_2$ , in which case  $U_1 = U_2$ . Or we have  $S_1 \cap S_2 = \emptyset$  or  $T_1 \cap T_2 = \emptyset$ , which entails that  $U_1 \cap U_2 = \emptyset$ .

In the end,  $\mathcal{R}$  is a partition of A.

5. Let E be a non-empty set and  $x \in E$  be a fixed element of E. Consider the relation R on  $\mathcal{P}(E)$  defined as

$$ARB \iff (x \in A \cap B) \lor (x \in \overline{A} \cap \overline{B}),$$

where for any set  $S \subseteq E$ , we write  $\overline{S} = E \setminus S$  for the complement of S in E. Prove or disprove that R an equivalence relation.

*Proof.* Let us prove that R is an equivalence relation.

- Reflexivity: Let  $A \in \mathcal{P}(E)$ . Then  $(x \in A) \lor (x \in \overline{A})$  which we can rewrite as  $(x \in A \cap A) \lor (x \in \overline{A} \cap \overline{A})$ . Hence, ARA.
- Symmetry: The symmetry is immediate from the symmetry of the intersection of sets.

• Transitivity: Let  $A, B, C \in \mathcal{P}(E)$  and assume that ARB and BRC so that

$$\left( (x \in A \cap B) \lor (x \in \overline{A} \cap \overline{B}) \right) \land \left( (x \in B \cap C) \lor (x \in \overline{B} \cap \overline{C}) \right).$$

Now we can study 4 cases in turn:

- Case 1:  $(x \in A \cap B) \land (x \in B \cap C)$ . Then  $x \in A \cap B \cap C$  so  $x \in A \cap C$  so ARC.
- Case 2:  $(x \in A \cap B) \land (x \in \overline{B} \cap \overline{C})$ , which entails that  $x \in B \cap \overline{B}$  so this case never happens.
- Case 3:  $(x \in \overline{A} \cap \overline{B}) \land (x \in B \cap C)$ . This case does not happen for the same reason as above.
- Case 4:  $(x \in \overline{A} \cap \overline{B}) \land (x \in \overline{B} \cap \overline{C})$ . From there  $x \in \overline{A} \cap \overline{C}$  and so *ARC*.

6. Suppose that  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $\mathbb{Z}_n$  is the set of equivalence class of congruent modulo n on  $\mathbb{Z}$  (in Sections 101 and 103, this was called  $\mathbb{Z}/n\mathbb{Z}$ ). In this question we will call an element  $[u]_n$  invertible if it has a multiplicative inverse.

Now, define a relation R on  $\mathbb{Z}_n$  by xRy iff xu = y for some invertible  $[u]_n \in \mathbb{Z}_n$ .

- (a) Show that R is a equivalence relation.
- (b) Compute the equivalence classes of this relation for n = 6.

*Hint: First find the invertible elements in*  $\mathbb{Z}_6$ 

*Proof.* To prove (a), we have to show that R is reflexive, symmetric and transitive.

- (reflexive) We have xRx since  $[a]_n[1]_n = [a]_n$  for all  $n \in \mathbb{Z}$ .
- (symmetric) Suppose xRy, that is xu = y for some  $u \in \mathbb{Z}_n$  which admits a multiplicative inverse. Write  $v \in \mathbb{Z}_n$  to be a inverse of u, i.e.  $uv = [1]_n$ . Then we have  $yv = xuv = x[1]_n = x$  and thus yRx.
- (transitive) Suppose xRy and yRz, that is xu = y and yv = z with u, v both admitting multiplicative inverse. Then we have xuv = yv = z. Write u' for the multiplicative inverse of u and v' for that of v. Then we see that  $uvv'u' = u[1]_n u' = uu' = [1]_n$  and thus uv admits a multiplicative inverse. Therefore, we have xRz.

For (b), we first note that the set of elements in  $\mathbb{Z}_6$  with a multiplicative inverses are  $U = \{[1]_6, [5]_6\}$ . Thus we may list the equivalence classes defined by R:

• We see that

$$\begin{split} [[0]_6] &= \{ [y]_6 \in \mathbb{Z}_6 \colon [y]_6 = [0]_6 [u]_6 \text{ for some invertible } [u]_6 \in \mathbb{Z}_6 \} \\ &= \{ [0]_6 u : u \in U \} = \{ [0]_6 \}. \end{split}$$

Then similarly,

- $[[1]_6] = \{ [1]_6 u : u \in U \} = \{ [1]_6, [5]_6 \}.$
- $[[2]_6] = \{ [2]_6 u : u \in U \} = \{ [2]_6, [4]_6 \}.$
- $[[3]_6] = \{[3]_6u : u \in U\} = \{[3]_6\}.$