

Math 3450 - Homework # 3

Equivalence Relations and Well-Defined Operations

1. A set S and a relation \sim on S is given. For each example, check if \sim is (i) reflexive, (ii) symmetric, and/or (iii) transitive. If \sim satisfies the property that you are checking, then prove it. If \sim does not satisfy the property that you are checking, then give an example to show it.

- (a) $S = \mathbb{R}$ where $a \sim b$ if and only if $a \leq b$.

Solution:

(i) Yes, \sim is reflexive. Proof: Let $a \in \mathbb{R}$. Then $a \leq a$. So $a \sim a$.

(ii) No, \sim is not symmetric. Counterexample: $3 \leq 4$, but $4 \not\leq 3$. That is, $3 \sim 4$ but $4 \not\sim 3$.

(iii) Yes, \sim is transitive. Proof: Let $a, b, c \in \mathbb{R}$ and suppose that $a \sim b$ and $b \sim c$. Then $a \leq b$ and $b \leq c$. So $a \leq c$. Thus $a \sim c$.

- (b) $S = \mathbb{R}$ where $a \sim b$ if and only if $|a| = |b|$.

Solution:

(i) Yes, \sim is reflexive. Proof: Let $a \in \mathbb{R}$. Then $|a| = |a|$. So $a \sim a$.

(ii) Yes, \sim is symmetric. Proof: Let $a, b \in \mathbb{R}$ and suppose that $a \sim b$. Then $|a| = |b|$. So $|b| = |a|$. Thus $b \sim a$.

(iii) Yes, \sim is transitive. Proof: Let $a, b, c \in \mathbb{R}$ and suppose that $a \sim b$ and $b \sim c$. Then $|a| = |b|$ and $|b| = |c|$. So $|a| = |c|$. Thus $a \sim c$.

- (c) $S = \mathbb{Z}$ where $a \sim b$ if and only if $a|b$.

Solution:

(i) Yes, \sim is reflexive. Proof: Let $a \in \mathbb{Z}$. Then $a(1) = a$. Hence $a|a$. So $a \sim a$.

(ii) No, \sim is not symmetric. Counterexample: $3|6$, but $6 \nmid 3$.

(iii) Yes, \sim is transitive. Proof: Let $a, b, c \in \mathbb{Z}$. Suppose that $a \sim b$ and $b \sim c$. Then $a|b$ and $b|c$. Thus there exists $k, m \in \mathbb{Z}$ such that $ak = b$ and $bm = c$. Then $c = bm = (ak)m = a(km)$. So $a|c$. Thus $a \sim c$.

- (d) S is the set of subsets of \mathbb{N} where $A \sim B$ if and only if $A \subseteq B$. Some examples of elements of S are $\{1, 10, 199\}$, $\{2, 7, 10\}$, and $\{2, 10, 3, 7\}$. Note that $\{2, 7, 10\} \sim \{2, 10, 3, 7\}$

Solution:

(i) Yes, \sim is reflexive. Proof: $A \subseteq A$ for all $A \in S$.

(ii) No, \sim is not symmetric. Counterexample: $\{3\} \subseteq \{3, 42\}$, but $\{3, 42\} \not\subseteq \{3\}$.

(iii) Yes, \sim is transitive. Proof: Let $A, B, C \in S$ with $A \sim B$ and $B \sim C$. Then $A \subseteq B$ and $B \subseteq C$. We want to show that $A \subseteq C$. Let $x \in A$. Since $A \subseteq B$, we have that $x \in B$. Since $B \subseteq C$ we have that $x \in C$. So $A \subseteq C$ and thus $A \sim C$.

2. Consider the set $S = \mathbb{R}$ where $x \sim y$ if and only if $x^2 = y^2$.

(a) Find all the numbers that are related to $x = 1$. Repeat this exercise for $x = \sqrt{2}$ and $x = 0$.

Solution:

$1 \sim 1$ since $1^2 = 1^2$. We also have $1 \sim (-1)$ since $1^2 = (-1)^2$. There are no other elements related to 1.

$\sqrt{2} \sim \sqrt{2}$ since $(\sqrt{2})^2 = (\sqrt{2})^2$. We also have $\sqrt{2} \sim (-\sqrt{2})$ since $(\sqrt{2})^2 = (-\sqrt{2})^2$. There are no other elements related to $\sqrt{2}$.

$0 \sim 0$ since $0^2 = 0^2$. There are no other elements related to 0.

(b) Prove that \sim is an equivalence relation on S .

Solution:

Proof. Reflexive: We know that $x^2 = x^2$ for all real numbers x . Therefore $x \sim x$ for all real numbers x . So \sim is reflexive.

Symmetric: Let $x, y \in \mathbb{R}$. Suppose that $x \sim y$.

Since $x \sim y$ we have that $x^2 = y^2$.

So $y^2 = x^2$.

Therefore $y \sim x$.

Transitive Let $x, y, z \in \mathbb{R}$. Suppose that $x \sim y$ and $y \sim z$.

Since $x \sim y$ we have that $x^2 = y^2$.

Since $y \sim z$ we have that $y^2 = z^2$.

So $x^2 = y^2 = z^2$.

Therefore $x \sim z$. □

(c) Draw a number line. Draw a picture of the equivalence class of 1. Repeat this for $x = 0$, $x = \sqrt{6}$, $x = -3$.

Solution: Please draw a picture.

(d) Describe the elements of S/\sim .

Solution:

If $x \neq 0$, then the equivalence class of x is $\bar{x} = \{-x, x\}$. The equivalence class of 0 is $\bar{0} = \{0\}$.

3. Consider the set $S = \mathbb{Z}$ where $x \sim y$ if and only if $2|(x + y)$.

(a) List six numbers that are related to $x = 2$.

Solution:

$$2 \sim (-4) \text{ since } 2|(2 + (-4)).$$

$$2 \sim (-2) \text{ since } 2|(2 + (-2)).$$

$$2 \sim (0) \text{ since } 2|(2 + (0)).$$

$$2 \sim (2) \text{ since } 2|(2 + (2)).$$

$$2 \sim (4) \text{ since } 2|(2 + (4)).$$

$$2 \sim (6) \text{ since } 2|(2 + (6)).$$

(b) Prove that \sim is an equivalence relation on S .

Proof. Reflexive: Let $x \in \mathbb{Z}$.

Since $2|2x$ we have that $2|(x + x)$.

So $x \sim x$.

Symmetric: Let $x, y \in \mathbb{Z}$ and suppose that $x \sim y$.

Thus $2|(x + y)$.

So $2|(y + x)$.

So $y \sim x$.

Transitive: Let $x, y, z \in \mathbb{Z}$ and suppose that $x \sim y$ and $y \sim z$.

Therefore $2|(x + y)$ and $2|(y + z)$.

So there exist $k, \ell \in \mathbb{Z}$ such that $2k = x + y$ and $2\ell = y + z$.

Add these equations to get $2k + 2\ell = x + 2y + z$.

Subtract $2y$ from both sides to get $2(k + \ell - y) = x + z$.

Note that $k + \ell - y \in \mathbb{Z}$, because $k, \ell, y \in \mathbb{Z}$ and \mathbb{Z} is closed under addition and subtraction.

So $2|(x + z)$.

So $x \sim z$.

□

- (c) Draw a picture of the set of integers. Next, circle the numbers that are in the equivalence class of -3 .

Solution: Draw a picture and circle these numbers:

$$\dots, -7, -5, -3, -1, 1, 3, 5, 7, \dots$$

- (d) Describe the elements of S/\sim . Draw a picture of several equivalence classes.

Solution: Draw a picture of the following:

$$\begin{aligned}\bar{0} &= \{\dots, -6, -4, -2, 0, 2, 4, 6, \dots\} = \overline{-2} = \bar{2} = \bar{4} = \overline{-4} = \dots \\ \bar{1} &= \{\dots, -7, -5, -3, -1, 1, 3, 5, 7, \dots\} = \overline{-1} = \bar{3} = \overline{-3} = \overline{-5} = \dots\end{aligned}$$

So S/\sim is equal to $\{\bar{0}, \bar{1}\}$. That is, one equivalence class is the set of all odd numbers; the other equivalence class is the set of all even numbers.

4. Show that the operation $\bar{a} \oplus \bar{b} = \overline{a^2 + b^2}$ is a well-defined operation for \mathbb{Z}_n . Here \bar{a}^2 means $\overline{a \cdot a}$. For example, in \mathbb{Z}_4 we have that

$$\bar{2} \oplus \bar{3} = \overline{2 \cdot 2 + 3 \cdot 3} = \overline{4 + 9} = \bar{1}.$$

Proof. 1) Let $\bar{a}, \bar{b} \in \mathbb{Z}_n$ where $a, b \in \mathbb{Z}$.

Then

$$\bar{a} \oplus \bar{b} = \overline{a^2 + b^2} = \overline{a^2 + b^2} = \overline{a^2 + b^2}.$$

Since $a, b \in \mathbb{Z}$ we have that $a^2 + b^2 \in \mathbb{Z}$.

Therefore, $\bar{a} \oplus \bar{b} = \overline{a^2 + b^2} \in \mathbb{Z}_n$.

So \mathbb{Z}_n is closed under the operation \oplus .

2) Suppose that $a_1, a_2, b_1, b_2 \in \mathbb{Z}$ such that $\bar{a}_1 = \bar{a}_2$ and $\bar{b}_1 = \bar{b}_2$. We need to show that $\bar{a}_1 \oplus \bar{b}_1 = \bar{a}_2 \oplus \bar{b}_2$.

From class we had a theorem that says that if $\bar{x} = \bar{y}$ and $\bar{w} = \bar{z}$, then $\overline{x + w} = \overline{y + z}$ and $\overline{x \cdot w} = \overline{y \cdot z}$.

Repeatedly using the above theorem we get the following.

We have that $\overline{a_1 \cdot a_1} = \overline{a_2 \cdot a_2}$ by multiplying the equations $\bar{a}_1 = \bar{a}_2$ and $\bar{a}_1 = \bar{a}_2$.

Similarly, $\overline{b_1 \cdot b_1} = \overline{b_2 \cdot b_2}$ by multiplying the equations $\bar{b}_1 = \bar{b}_2$ and $\bar{b}_1 = \bar{b}_2$.

Adding the two equations above we get that $\overline{a_1 \cdot a_1} + \overline{b_1 \cdot b_1} = \overline{a_2 \cdot a_2} + \overline{b_2 \cdot b_2}$.

Therefore, $\overline{a_1} \oplus \overline{b_1} = \overline{a_2} \oplus \overline{b_2}$.

Thus \oplus is a well-defined operation on \mathbb{Z}_n . □

5. Given two integers a and b , let $\min(a, b)$ denote the minimum (smaller) of a and b . Let n be an integer with $n \geq 2$. Is the operation $\overline{a} \oplus \overline{b} = \overline{\min(a, b)}$ a well-defined operation on \mathbb{Z}_n ?

Solution: This operation is not well-defined. For example, consider $n = 4$. In \mathbb{Z}_4 we have that $\overline{0} = \overline{8}$ and $\overline{1} = \overline{5}$. Thus, for the operation to be well-defined we would need $\overline{0} \oplus \overline{1} = \overline{8} \oplus \overline{5}$. However, $\overline{0} \oplus \overline{1} = \overline{\min(0, 1)} = \overline{0}$ and $\overline{8} \oplus \overline{5} = \overline{\min(8, 5)} = \overline{5}$. But $\overline{0} \neq \overline{5}$ in \mathbb{Z}_4 .

6. (a) Show that the operation $\frac{a}{b} \oplus \frac{c}{d} = \frac{ad}{bc}$ is not a well-defined operation on \mathbb{Q} . (b) Is the operation well-defined on $\mathbb{Q} - \{0\}$?

- (a) Show that the operation $\frac{a}{b} \oplus \frac{c}{d} = \frac{ad}{bc}$ is not a well-defined operation on \mathbb{Q} .

Solution: We have that $\frac{5}{2}, \frac{0}{1} \in \mathbb{Q}$ however $\frac{5}{2} \oplus \frac{0}{1} = \frac{5 \cdot 1}{2 \cdot 0} = \frac{5}{0} \notin \mathbb{Q}$.

Hence \mathbb{Q} is not closed under \oplus and the operation is not well-defined.

- (b) Is the operation well-defined on $\mathbb{Q} \setminus \{0\}$?

Solution: Yes! Here is a proof.

Proof. 1) Let $a, b, c, d \in \mathbb{Z}$ with $a \neq 0, b \neq 0, c \neq 0, d \neq 0$ so that $\frac{a}{b}, \frac{c}{d} \in \mathbb{Q} - \{0\}$.

Since $a \neq 0, b \neq 0, c \neq 0, d \neq 0$ we have that $ad \neq 0$ and $bc \neq 0$.

Thus $\frac{a}{b} \oplus \frac{c}{d} = \frac{ad}{bc} \in \mathbb{Q} - \{0\}$.

Therefore $\mathbb{Q} - \{0\}$ is closed under the operation \oplus .

2) Suppose further that we have $e, f, g, h \in \mathbb{Z}$ with $e \neq 0, f \neq 0, g \neq 0, h \neq 0$ so that $\frac{e}{f}, \frac{g}{h} \in \mathbb{Q} - \{0\}$.

Also assume that $\frac{a}{b} = \frac{e}{f}$ and $\frac{c}{d} = \frac{g}{h}$.

We want to show that $\frac{a}{b} \oplus \frac{c}{d} = \frac{e}{f} \oplus \frac{g}{h}$.

We have that $\frac{a}{b} \oplus \frac{c}{d} = \frac{ad}{bc}$ and $\frac{e}{f} \oplus \frac{g}{h} = \frac{eh}{fg}$.

Since $\frac{a}{b} = \frac{e}{f}$ we have that $af = be$.

Since $\frac{c}{d} = \frac{g}{h}$ we have that $ch = dg$.

Multiplying $af = be$ by $dg = ch$ we get $afdg = bech$.

Rearranging we get $(ad)(fg) = (bc)(eh)$.

Therefore, $\frac{ad}{bc} = \frac{eh}{fg}$.

So $\frac{a}{b} \oplus \frac{c}{d} = \frac{e}{f} \oplus \frac{g}{h}$.

Thus, the operation is well-defined.

□

7. Is the operation $\bar{a} \oplus \bar{b} = \overline{a^b}$ a well-defined operation on \mathbb{Z}_n ?

Solution: There are two issues with this operation.

One issue is as follows. As an example, consider $n = 4$. In \mathbb{Z}_4 we have that $\bar{1} = \bar{5}$. Thus, for the operation to be well-defined we must have that $\bar{2} \oplus \bar{1} = \bar{2} \oplus \bar{5}$. However, $\bar{2} \oplus \bar{1} = \overline{2^1} = \bar{2}$ and $\bar{2} \oplus \bar{5} = \overline{2^5} = \overline{32} = \bar{0}$. And $\bar{2} \neq \bar{0}$ in \mathbb{Z}_4 .

Another issue is when b is a negative integer. For example, in \mathbb{Z}_4 suppose we want to calculate $\bar{2} \oplus \overline{-1}$. What does this mean? The formula says that it is $\overline{2^{-1}}$. But what is that in \mathbb{Z}_4 ? In fact there is no way to make sense of $1/2$ in \mathbb{Z}_4 because there is no multiplicative inverse for $\bar{2}$ in \mathbb{Z}_4 . (Why?) Because there is no $\bar{x} \in \mathbb{Z}_4$ with $\bar{x} \cdot \bar{2} = \bar{1}$. We can check:

$$\bar{0} \cdot \bar{2} = \bar{0} \neq \bar{1}$$

$$\bar{1} \cdot \bar{2} = \bar{2} \neq \bar{1}$$

$$\bar{2} \cdot \bar{2} = \bar{4} = \bar{0} \neq \bar{1}$$

$$\bar{3} \cdot \bar{2} = \bar{6} = \bar{2} \neq \bar{1}$$

Thus there is no way to define $\overline{2^{-1}}$ in \mathbb{Z}_4 .

8. (Constructing the integers from the natural numbers) Let $S = \mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{N}$. Define the relation \sim on S where $(a, b) \sim (c, d)$ if and only if $a+d = b+c$.

(a) Is $(3, 6) \sim (7, 10)$?

Solution: Yes, because $3 + 10 = 6 + 7$.

(b) Is $(1, 1) \sim (3, 5)$?

Solution: No, because $1 + 5 \neq 1 + 3$.

(c) Prove that \sim is an equivalence relation.

Proof. Reflexive: Let $(a, b) \in \mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{N}$.

Then $a + b = b + a$.

So $(a, b) \sim (a, b)$.

Symmetric: Let $(a, b), (c, d) \in \mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{N}$.

Suppose $(a, b) \sim (c, d)$.

We know that $a + d = b + c$, because $(a, b) \sim (c, d)$.

So $c + b = d + a$.

So $(c, d) \sim (a, b)$.

Transitive: Let $(a, b), (c, d), (e, f) \in \mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{N}$.

Suppose that $(a, b) \sim (c, d)$ and $(c, d) \sim (e, f)$.

We know that $a + d = b + c$ and $c + f = d + e$, because $(a, b) \sim (c, d)$ and $(c, d) \sim (e, f)$.

Add these two equations to get $a + c + d + f = b + c + d + e$.

Subtract $c + d$ from both sides to get $a + f = b + e$.

So $(a, b) \sim (e, f)$.

Therefore, \sim is an equivalence relation, because it is reflexive, symmetric, and transitive.

□

(d) List five elements from each of the following equivalence classes:
 $\overline{(1, 1)}$, $\overline{(1, 2)}$, $\overline{(5, 12)}$.

Solution: Some possible answers:

$(2, 2), (3, 3), (4, 4), (5, 5), (47, 47) \in \overline{(1, 1)}$.

$(2, 3), (3, 4), (4, 5), (5, 6), (47, 48) \in \overline{(1, 2)}$.

$(2, 9), (3, 10), (4, 11), (5, 12), (47, 56) \in \overline{(5, 12)}$.

(e) Define the operation $\overline{(a, b)} \oplus \overline{(c, d)} = \overline{(a + c, b + d)}$. Prove that \oplus is well-defined on the set of equivalence classes.

Proof. 1) Consider two equivalence classes $\overline{(a, b)}$ and $\overline{(c, d)}$ where $(a, b), (c, d) \in \mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{N}$.

Then $a + c$ and $b + d$ are both in \mathbb{N} because \mathbb{N} is closed under addition.

Thus, $\overline{(a, b)} \oplus \overline{(c, d)} = \overline{(a + c, b + d)}$ is a valid equivalence class in $\mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{N} / \sim$.

2) Now suppose that $\overline{(a, b)}, \overline{(c, d)}, \overline{(e, f)},$ and $\overline{(g, h)}$ are equivalence classes of $\mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{N} / \sim$.

Further suppose that $\overline{(a, b)} = \overline{(e, f)}$ and $\overline{(c, d)} = \overline{(g, h)}$.

We need to show that $\overline{(a, b)} \oplus \overline{(c, d)} = \overline{(e, f)} \oplus \overline{(g, h)}$.

We have that $a + f = b + e$ since $\overline{(a, b)} = \overline{(e, f)}$.

We also have that $c + h = d + g$ since $\overline{(c, d)} = \overline{(g, h)}$.

Adding these two equations gives $a + f + c + h = b + e + d + g$.

Rearranging gives $(a + c) + (f + h) = (b + d) + (e + g)$.

Therefore, $\overline{(a + c, b + d)} = \overline{(e + g, f + h)}$.

Hence $\overline{(a, b)} \oplus \overline{(c, d)} = \overline{(e, f)} \oplus \overline{(g, h)}$.

The above arguments show that \oplus is a well-defined operation on the equivalence classes of $\mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{N} / \sim$.

□

9. (Constructing the rational numbers from the integers) Let $S = \mathbb{Z} \times (\mathbb{Z} - \{0\})$. Define the relation \sim on S where $(a, b) \sim (c, d)$ if and only if $ad = bc$.

- (a) Is $(1, 5) \sim (-3, -15)$?

Solution: Yes, because $1(-15) = 5(-3)$.

- (b) Is $(-1, 1) \sim (2, 3)$?

Solution: No, because $(-1)(3) \neq 1(2)$.

- (c) Prove that \sim is an equivalence relation.

Proof. Reflexive: Let $(a, b) \in \mathbb{Z} \times (\mathbb{Z} - \{0\})$.

Then $ab = ba$.

So $(a, b) \sim (a, b)$.

Symmetric: Let $(a, b), (c, d) \in \mathbb{Z} \times (\mathbb{Z} - \{0\})$.

Suppose $(a, b) \sim (c, d)$.

We know that $ad = bc$, because $(a, b) \sim (c, d)$.

So $cb = da$.

Hence $(c, d) \sim (a, b)$.

Transitive: Let $(a, b), (c, d), (e, f) \in \mathbb{Z} \times (\mathbb{Z} - \{0\})$.

Suppose $(a, b) \sim (c, d)$ and $(c, d) \sim (e, f)$.

We know that $ad = bc$ and $cf = de$, because $(a, b) \sim (c, d)$ and $(c, d) \sim (e, f)$.

Multiply these two equations to get $adc f = bcde$.

Divide both sides by c and then by d to get $af = be$. (Note that $c, d \neq 0$ because $c, d \in \mathbb{Z} - \{0\}$, so it's okay to divide by c and by d .)

So $(a, b) \sim (e, f)$ since $af = be$.

Therefore, \sim is an equivalence relation, because it is reflexive, symmetric, and transitive.

□

- (d) List five elements from each of the following equivalence classes:
 $\overline{(1, 1)}, \overline{(0, 2)}, \overline{(2, 3)}$.

Solution: Some possible answers:

$(2, 2), (3, 3), (4, 4), (5, 5), (47, 47) \in \overline{(1, 1)}$.

$(0, 1), (0, 2), (0, -1), (0, -2), (0, -47) \in \overline{(0, 2)}$.

$(2, 3), (4, 6), (6, 9), (-2, -3), (-4, -6) \in \overline{(2, 3)}$.

- (e) Define the operation $\overline{(a, b)} \oplus \overline{(c, d)} = \overline{(ad + bc, bd)}$. Prove that \oplus is well-defined on the set of equivalence classes.

Proof. 1) Consider two equivalence classes $\overline{(a, b)}$ and $\overline{(c, d)}$ where $(a, b), (c, d) \in \mathbb{Z} \times (\mathbb{Z} - \{0\})$.

Then $ad + bc \in \mathbb{Z}$ because $a, b, c, d \in \mathbb{Z}$ and the integers are closed under addition and multiplication.

Also, since $b, d \in \mathbb{Z} - \{0\}$ we have that $bd \neq 0$ and so $bd \in \mathbb{Z} - \{0\}$.

Thus $(ad + bc, bd) \in \mathbb{Z} \times (\mathbb{Z} - \{0\})$ and $\overline{(a, b)} \oplus \overline{(c, d)} = \overline{(ad + bc, bd)}$ is a valid equivalence class.

2) Now suppose that $\overline{(a, b)}, \overline{(c, d)}, \overline{(x, y)}$, and $\overline{(w, z)}$ are equivalence classes in $\mathbb{Z} \times (\mathbb{Z} - \{0\}) / \sim$.

Further suppose that $\overline{(a, b)} = \overline{(x, y)}$ and $\overline{(c, d)} = \overline{(w, z)}$.

We need to show that $\overline{(a, b)} \oplus \overline{(c, d)} = \overline{(x, y)} \oplus \overline{(w, z)}$.

That is, we need to show that $[(ad + bc, bd)] = [(xz + yw, yz)]$.

The above is equivalent to showing that $(ad + bc)yz = bd(xz + yw)$.

Let's do this.

Since $\overline{(a, b)} = \overline{(x, y)}$ we have that $ay = bx$.

Since $\overline{(c, d)} = \overline{(w, z)}$ we have that $cz = dw$.

Therefore, using the equations $ay = bx$ and $cz = dw$ we get that

$$\begin{aligned} (ad + bc)yz &= adyz + bcyz \\ &= (ay)(dz) + (cz)(by) \\ &= (bx)(dz) + (dw)(by) \\ &= bd(xz + yw). \end{aligned}$$

Thus, $[(ad + bc, bd)] = [(xz + yw, yz)]$.

Thus, the operation \oplus is well-defined on the equivalence classes of $\mathbb{Z} \times (\mathbb{Z} - \{0\}) / \sim$.

□

- (f) Define the operation $\overline{(a, b)} \odot \overline{(c, d)} = \overline{(ac, bd)}$. Prove that \odot is well-defined on the set of equivalence classes.

Proof. 1) Consider two equivalence classes $\overline{(a, b)}$ and $\overline{(c, d)}$ where $(a, b), (c, d) \in \mathbb{Z} \times (\mathbb{Z} - \{0\})$.

Then $ac \in \mathbb{Z}$ because $a, c \in \mathbb{Z}$ and the integers are closed under multiplication.

Also, since $b, d \in \mathbb{Z} - \{0\}$ we have that $bd \neq 0$ and so $bd \in \mathbb{Z} - \{0\}$.

Thus $(ac, bd) \in \mathbb{Z} \times (\mathbb{Z} - \{0\})$ and $\overline{(a, b)} \odot \overline{(c, d)} = \overline{(ac, bd)}$ is a valid equivalence class.

2) Now suppose that $\overline{(a, b)}, \overline{(c, d)}, \overline{(x, y)}$, and $\overline{(w, z)}$ are equivalence classes in $\mathbb{Z} \times (\mathbb{Z} - \{0\}) / \sim$.

Further suppose that $\overline{(a, b)} = \overline{(x, y)}$ and $\overline{(c, d)} = \overline{(w, z)}$.

We need to show that $\overline{(a, b)} \odot \overline{(c, d)} = \overline{(x, y)} \odot \overline{(w, z)}$.

That is, we need to show that $[(ac, bd)] = [(xw, yz)]$.

The above is equivalent to showing that $(ac)(yz) = (bd)(xw)$.

Let's do this.

Since $\overline{(a, b)} = \overline{(x, y)}$ we have that $ay = bx$.

Since $\overline{(c, d)} = \overline{(w, z)}$ we have that $cz = dw$.

Therefore, using the equations $ay = bx$ and $cz = dw$ we get that

$$(ac)(yz) = (ay)(cz) = (bx)(dw) = (bd)(xw).$$

Thus, $[(ac, bd)] = [(xw, yz)]$.

Therefore, the operation \odot is well-defined on the equivalence classes of $\mathbb{Z} \times (\mathbb{Z} - \{0\}) / \sim$.

□