## MAT 312/AMS 351: Applied Algebra Solutions to Problem Set 2 (18pts)

**1.4 5; 3pts** Show that no integer of the form 8n+7 is a sum of three squares (of integers).

Suppose  $n, a, b, c \in \mathbb{Z}$  are such that  $a^2 + b^2 + c^2 = 8n + 7$  and so

$$a^2 + b^2 + c^2 \equiv 7 \mod 8$$

Since  $a, b, c \equiv 0, \pm 1, \pm 2, \pm 3, 4 \mod 8$ ,

 $a^2, b^2, c^2 \equiv 0, 1, 4, 9, 16 \equiv 0, 1, 4, 1, 0 \mod 8 \implies a^2 + b^2 + c^2 \equiv 0, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6 \mod 8.$ 

This contradicts the first equation, and so no integer of the form 8n+7 is a sum of three squares.

**1.4 6; 3pts** Let p be a prime number. Show that the equation  $x^2 = [1]_p$  has just two solutions in  $\mathbb{Z}_p$ .

Suppose  $a \in \mathbb{Z}$  and  $a^2 \equiv 1 \mod p$ . Thus, p divides

$$a^2 - 1 = (a - 1)(a + 1).$$

Since p is prime, it follows that p divides either a-1 (in which case  $[a]_p = [1]_p$ ) or a+1 (in which case  $[a]_p = -[1]_p$ ). Thus, the only possible solutions of  $x^2 = [1]_p$  in  $\mathbb{Z}_p$  are  $x = \pm [1]_p$  and these are indeed solutions. If p > 2,  $[1]_p \neq -[1]_p$  and so these two solutions are distinct. If p = 2,  $[1]_p = -[1]_p$  and so these two solutions are the same.

**1.4 7; 3pts** Let p be a prime number. Show that  $(p-1)! \equiv -1 \mod p$ .

If p=2, this just says that  $1 \equiv -1 \mod 2$ . So, we assume that p>2. Every number *i* appearing in the product

$$(p-1)! \equiv 1 \cdot 2 \cdot \ldots \cdot (p-1)$$

is relatively prime to p and thus has an inverse  $i_p^{-1} \mod p$  by Theorem 1.4.3, which also appears somewhere in this product. By 1.4 6, this inverse  $i_p^{-1}$  is different from i unless i=1 or i=p-1 (in which case  $i \equiv -1 \mod p$ ). We can thus multiply every factor i appearing in (p-1)!, other than 1 and p-1, with its inverse  $i_p^{-1} \mod p$  and throw the two out of the product (because  $i \cdot i_p^{-1} \equiv 1 \mod p$ ). We are then left only with  $1 \cdot (p-1)$ , which is congruent to  $-1 \mod p$ . This establishes the claim. **1.5 3; 4pts** Find the smallest positive integer whose remainder when divided by 11 is 8, which has the last digit 4, and is divisible by 27.

We need to solve the system

$$\begin{cases} x \equiv 8 \mod 11 \\ x \equiv 4 \mod 10 \\ x \equiv 0 \mod 27 \end{cases}$$

The first equation means that x=8+11k for some  $k\in\mathbb{Z}$ . So, we need to find k such that

$$8+11k \equiv 4 \mod 10, \qquad k \equiv -4.$$

By the Chinese Remainder Theorem, the unique mod  $11 \cdot 10$  solution of the first two equations above is thus

$$x \equiv 8 + 11(-4) = -36 \mod 110.$$

In order to satisfy the third equation, we then need to find  $m \in \mathbb{Z}$  so that

$$-36+110m \equiv 0 \mod 27, \qquad 2m \equiv 9 \mod 27.$$

Since  $14 \cdot 2 \equiv 1 \mod 27$ , multiplying the last equation by 14 gives

 $m \equiv 14.9 \equiv 18 \mod 27$ ,  $x \equiv -36 + 110.18 = 1944 \mod 110.29$ .

By the Chinese Remainder Theorem, the smallest positive integer that works is thus 1944

Alternatively,  $1 \cdot 11 - 1 \cdot 10 = 1$ . As stated in the book, this implies that

$$1 \cdot 11 \cdot 4 - 1 \cdot 10 \cdot 8 = -36$$

is the mod 110 solution of the first pair of equations. Euclid's algorithm gives

(1):  $\mathbf{110} = 4 \cdot \mathbf{27} + \mathbf{2}$   $gcd(\mathbf{27}, \mathbf{110}) = \mathbf{1} \stackrel{(2)}{=} \mathbf{27} - 13 \cdot \mathbf{2}$ (2):  $\mathbf{27} = 13 \cdot \mathbf{2} + \mathbf{1}$   $\stackrel{(1)}{=} \mathbf{27} - 13 \cdot (\mathbf{110} - 4 \cdot \mathbf{27}) = 53 \cdot \mathbf{27} - 13 \cdot \mathbf{110}.$ (3):  $\mathbf{2} = 2 \cdot \mathbf{1} + 0$ 

Thus,  $53 \cdot 27 - 13 \cdot 110 = 1$ . As stated in the book, this implies that

$$53 \cdot 27 \cdot (-36) - 13 \cdot 110 \cdot 0 = -51516 \equiv 1944 \mod 110 \cdot 29.$$

The smallest positive integer that works is thus 1944

## Problem A (2+3pts)

A museum has a collection of blue, green, and red chameleons. When two chameleons of different colors meet, they both turn into the third color (if a blue and green meet, for example, they both turn red). The collection initially contains B blue, G green, and R red chameleons (B, G, R are nonnegative integers).

(a) Suppose all chameleons eventually turn the same color. Show that

$$(B-G)(G-R)(R-B) = 0 \mod 3.$$

(b) Suppose the above condition holds. Show that there exists a sequence of meetings so that all chameleons eventually turn the same color.

(a) When two chameleons of different colors meet (say, blue and green), their numbers go down by 1 (say, B and G become B-1 and G-1) and the number of the third color goes up by 2 (say, R becomes R+2). Thus, the three differences B-G, G-R, and R-B change by a multiple of 3 (3 times 0 or  $\pm 1$ ), i.e. they are *constant mod 3* and so is their product. If all chameleons eventually turn the same color, two of the numbers B, G, R become 0 and thus the product above becomes 0. Since it is constant mod 3, it was 0 mod 3 to begin with.

(b) If the product of B-G, G-R, and R-B is divisible by 3, then 3 divides one of these factors (because 3 is prime). By symmetry, we can assume that B-G=3k for some  $k \in \mathbb{Z}^{\geq 0}$  (in particular, B > G). If  $G \neq 0$ , we can have each of the greens meet one of the blues so that all of the greens disappear. Thus, we can assume that G = 0 and B = 3k for some  $k \in \mathbb{Z}^{\geq 0}$ . If R = 0, then all chameleons are already of one color (blue) and there is nothing to prove. Otherwise, we show by induction on k that there exists a sequence of meetings so that all chameleons eventually turn red. There is nothing to prove in the base k = 0 case (when all chameleons are red to begin with). Suppose such a sequence exists whenever B=3k for some  $k\in\mathbb{Z}^{\geq 0}$ , G=0, and R>0. We show that this is also the case if B=3(k+1), G=0, and R>0. In this case, we first have a blue and a red chameleon meet to reduce B and R by 1 and make G=2; since  $k \ge 0$ , there are still at least 2 blues. We then have 2 of the blues and the 2 greens meet to produce 4 reds, thus taking the number of blues to B=3k, the number of greens back to G=0, and the number of reds to -1+4=3 higher than what we had started with. By the inductive assumption, there exists a sequence of meetings so that all chameleons eventually turn red from this new situation and thus there exists such a sequence from the initial one (since we are able to get to this new situation from the original one). By induction, this implies that such a sequence exists for all k.

## Alternative Proof. Let

$$S = \left\{ \min\{\{|B - G|, |G - R|, |R - B|\} \cap 3\mathbb{Z}^{\ge 0}\} : \text{achievable } (B, G, R)\}.$$

By the proof of (a) and the first sentence in the first proof of (b), at least one of |B-G|, |G-R|, and |R-B| is divisible by 3 (i.e. lies in  $3\mathbb{Z}$ ) and so

$$\min\left\{\left\{|B-G|,|G-R|,|R-B|\right\} \cap 3\mathbb{Z}^{\geq 0}\right\} \in 3\mathbb{Z}^{\geq 0} \subset \mathbb{Z}^{\geq 0}$$

is a well-defined nonnegative integer for every combination (B, G, R) achievable from the given starting triple. Thus, S is a nonempty subset of  $\mathbb{Z}^{\geq 0}$ . By the Well-Ordering Principle, S then contains a minimal element  $s_0 \in 3\mathbb{Z}^{\geq 0}$ . If  $s_0 = 0$ , then two of the three numbers, say B and G, are the same. The blue and green chameleons can then meet and turn into reds, leaving only one color.

Suppose  $s_0 > 0$  (and thus  $s_0 \ge 3$ ) and is achieved by  $s_0 = B - G$  for some triple (B, G, R). Since  $s_0 > 0$ , either G > 0 or R > 0 (or both). If R > 0, a blue and a red can meet turning into 2 greens. This decreases B by 1, increases G by 2, and thus decreases  $|G - R| = s_0 \in 3\mathbb{Z}^+$  by 3. However, this contradicts the assumption that  $s_0 \in S$  is the minimal possible value for all achievable triples (B, G, R). If G > 0 (and thus  $B = G + s_0 \ge 4$ ), a blue and a green can meet turning into 2 reds. After that, another blue can meet with a red turning into 2 blues. These two meetings decrease B by 2, increase G by -1+2, and thus decrease  $|G-R| = s_0 \in 3\mathbb{Z}^+$  by 3. This again contradicts the assumption that  $s_0 \in S$  is the minimal. We conclude that  $s_0 = 0$  and so the conclusion of the last sentence of the previous paragraph applies.