

1. (18 points) Check which of the following relations between the real numbers \mathbb{R} and the integers \mathbb{Z} are well-defined functions. If it is a well-defined function, say if it is 1-1 and if it is onto. Explain your answers.

(a) The floor function : $f(x)$ is the greatest integer $n \leq x$.

Example: $f(1.1) = 1, f(-3.7) = -4, f(0) = 0$, etc.,

(b) $f(x) = \frac{x}{|x|}$.

(c) (Codomain is also real numbers for this) $f(x) = y$ where y is found by solving the equation $x = y^2$

(a) This is a function because it maps each real number to one and only one integer. It is not one-one. In fact it is a step function, with each interval $[n, n + 1)$ being mapped to n where $n \in \mathbb{Z}$. It is onto because for each integer you can find real numbers above it that map to that integer.

(b) This is not a function because it is not defined on 0. It maps positive real numbers to 1 and negative reals to -1 . It is a function if the domain is $\mathbb{R} - \{0\}$.

(c) This is not a function because, for each x you have two choices for y , namely the positive and negative square roots of x . Also y is not defined for negative values of x .

2. (16 points) Find the range of the following functions, and check if they are onto. Explain.

(a) $f : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}, f(x) = x^3$.

(b) $f : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}, f(x) = e^x$.

Solution:

(a) Range is \mathbb{R} . It is onto because every real number has a cube root.

(b) Range is $(0, \infty)$. So it is not onto. The function never touches or goes below x -axis. e being a positive number, e^x is always positive for both positive and negative real numbers. It is also not zero because $e^x = 0 \implies x = \ln 0$ which is undefined. You can also see this from the definitions of e^x using power series, limits, etc.,

3. (20 points) Prove the following statements if true. Give counterexample if false.

a) The composition of two injective (i.e, 1-1) functions is always injective.

b) A 1-1 function from a set to itself is always onto.

Solution:

- a) True. $f \circ g(x_1) = f \circ g(x_2) \implies f(g(x_1)) = f(g(x_2))$. Since f is 1-1, we must have $g(x_1) = g(x_2)$. But since g is 1-1, we must have $x_1 = x_2$. Therefore, $f \circ g$ is 1-1.
- b) False, The map $f(x) = e^x$ is 1-1 but not onto as we saw above.
4. (15 points) Prove the following: If R is an equivalence relation on a set X and $Y \subseteq X$ is any subset of X then R is also an equivalence relation on Y . Prove also that the equivalence classes of Y are of the form $Y \cap X_i$ where X_i are the equivalence classes of X .

Solution:

Proof: All the 3 properties, reflexive, symmetry, and transitive, will work for Y because the elements of Y are also in X and those properties are satisfied for them when considered as elements of X .

If Y_i is an equivalence class, say $Y_i = (y)$, then Y_i consists of all $u \in Y$ such that uRy . But these elements u are also in the equivalence class $X_i = (y)$ where we look at the *equivalence class of y in X* . So all such u belong to $Y \cap X_i$. So we have proved that $Y_i \subseteq Y \cap X_i$. Now if any element x belongs to Y and X_i then it also belongs to X_i and hence is related to y because $y \in X_i$ as well. So $x \in Y_i$ as well. So we have proved $Y \cap X_i \subseteq Y_i$ and thus the two sets are equal.

5. For the relation R defined on the set of integers \mathbb{Z} by $mRn \iff 7 \text{ divides } m - n$ prove the following:
- a) (10 points) Prove that it is an equivalence relation.
- (b) (6 points) Find the equivalence class of 1. Describe the set using set notation.
- (c) (8 points) How many equivalence classes are there? Describe all of them using set notation.
- (d) (7 points) Show that the equivalence classes are distinct and they cover all integers.

Solution:

a) Reflexive: $\forall m \in \mathbb{Z}, mRm$ because $7|(m - m)$ because $7|0$.

Symmetric: $\forall m, n \in \mathbb{Z}, mRn \implies nRm$ because $7|(m - n) \implies 7|(n - m) = -(m - n)$.

Transitive: $\forall m, n, k \in \mathbb{Z}, mRn, nRk \implies mRk$ because $7|(m - n), 7|(n - k) \implies 7|(m - n + n - k) = m - k$.

(b) $(1) = \{m \in \mathbb{Z} \mid mR1\} = \{m \in \mathbb{Z} \mid 7|(m - 1)\}$. This means all m such that $m - 1 = 7k \implies m = 7k + 1$. So the set is $\{\dots, -13, -6, 1, 8, 15, \dots\}$

(c) and (d) Similar to (1), you will have (0), (2), (3), (4), (5), (6) so totally 7 equivalence classes. These are all disjoint because basically each equivalence class is the set of integers with a remainder equal to 0, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6 and an integer can have only one of these as remainders between 0 and 7, Anything outside of these remainders will be in one of the equivalence classes.

6. (Challenge: Extra credit 10 points) Check if the following relation R defined on the set of rational numbers S whose denominators are not divisible by 3 is reflexive, symmetric, and transitive. Here the fractions are written after canceling off common factors. For example, in a/b , a and b have no common factors, and 3 does not divide b and similarly for c/d and all other fractions:

$$\frac{a}{b}R\frac{c}{d} \iff 3 \text{ divides } ad - bc.$$

Solution:

Reflexive:

$$\frac{a}{b}R\frac{a}{b} \text{ because } ab - ba = 0 \text{ and } 3|0.$$

Symmetric:

$$3 \text{ divides } ad - bc \implies 3 \text{ divides } cb - da = -(ad - bc) \implies \frac{c}{d}R\frac{a}{b}.$$

Transitive:

$$\frac{a}{b}R\frac{c}{d} \text{ and } \frac{c}{d}R\frac{e}{f} \implies 3 \text{ divides } ad - bc \text{ and } 3 \text{ divides } cf - de.$$

Multiply $ad - bc$ by f and $cf - de$ by b . Since 3 divides $ad - bc$ and 3 divides $cf - de$ we have 3 divides $(ad - bc)f$ and 3 divides $(cf - de)b$. This means 3 divides their sum $adf - bcf + bcf - bde = adf - bde = d(af - be)$. This means 3 divides $af - be$ because 3 does not divide d . Therefore we get $\frac{a}{b}R\frac{e}{f}$.

Alternative proof: The condition 3 divides $ad - bc$ is same as saying 3 divides $(a/b) - (c/d)$ because $ad - bc$ is just the numerator of $(a/b) - (c/d)$ and similarly $cd - fe$ is the numerator of $(c/d) - (e/f)$. The key point now is to prove that if 3 divides the numerators of the two fractions $(a/b) - (c/d)$ and $(c/d) - (e/f)$ then it divides the numerator of their sum also. This will be true because 3 does not divide the denominators and is easy to show using algebra. In fact this is true for any two fractions.