A short course on Erdős problems in discrete plane: Part I

Alex losevich

March 2020

Alex losevich (University of Rochester) A short course on Erdős problems in discrete

• This video is the first part of a short course on combinatorial geometry of the finite plane over integer modulo a prime.

- This video is the first part of a short course on combinatorial geometry of the finite plane over integer modulo a prime.
- We begin by explaining the basic notions of geometry in this setting and compare it with the concepts from the Euclidean plane.

- This video is the first part of a short course on combinatorial geometry of the finite plane over integer modulo a prime.
- We begin by explaining the basic notions of geometry in this setting and compare it with the concepts from the Euclidean plane.
- In the process, we are going to explore quite a few ideas from areas like abstract algebra, linear algebra, and Fourier analysis.

- This video is the first part of a short course on combinatorial geometry of the finite plane over integer modulo a prime.
- We begin by explaining the basic notions of geometry in this setting and compare it with the concepts from the Euclidean plane.
- In the process, we are going to explore quite a few ideas from areas like abstract algebra, linear algebra, and Fourier analysis.
- We shall introduce these from a completely elementary standpoint, requiring only a solid knowledge of precalculus, and mostly much less.

• Erdős problems in geometry typically involve counting elementary geometric objects satisfying some natural constraints.

- Erdős problems in geometry typically involve counting elementary geometric objects satisfying some natural constraints.
- A typical example that we are going to address in the second part of this mini-course is the following.

- Erdős problems in geometry typically involve counting elementary geometric objects satisfying some natural constraints.
- A typical example that we are going to address in the second part of this mini-course is the following.
- Let P be a collection of n points and \mathcal{L} be a collections of m lines in the plane.

- Erdős problems in geometry typically involve counting elementary geometric objects satisfying some natural constraints.
- A typical example that we are going to address in the second part of this mini-course is the following.
- Let P be a collection of n points and \mathcal{L} be a collections of m lines in the plane.
- What is the largest possible number of **incidences**. defined as the number of elements in the set

$$\{(p,l)\in P\times\mathcal{L}:p\in l\}$$

as a function of *n* and *m*?

• Define $I(P, \mathcal{L})$ denote the number of elements in

 $\{(p, l) \in P \times \mathcal{L} : p \in l\}.$

• Define $I(P, \mathcal{L})$ denote the number of elements in

 $\{(p, l) \in P \times \mathcal{L} : p \in l\}.$

• Since the set we are counting is contained in

 $P \times \mathcal{L} = \{(p, l) \in P \times \mathcal{L}\},\$

we see that $I(P, \mathcal{L}) \leq nm$.

• Define $I(P, \mathcal{L})$ denote the number of elements in

$$\{(p, l) \in P \times \mathcal{L} : p \in l\}.$$

• Since the set we are counting is contained in

$$P \times \mathcal{L} = \{(p, l) \in P \times \mathcal{L}\},\$$

we see that $I(P, \mathcal{L}) \leq nm$.

• But is this estimate realistic? Is it really possible to have every point be on every line and every line pass through every point?

Simple example



Figure: 6 lines, 9 points, 18 incidences



Figure: 6 lines, 9 points, 18 incidences

• In one of lectures of this mini-course we are going to prove the celebrated Szemeredi-Trotter incidence theorem, which says that

$$I(P,\mathcal{L}) \leq C(n+m+(nm)^{\frac{2}{3}}),$$

where recall that n is the number of points in P and m is the number of lines in \mathcal{L} .

• A positive integer is called prime if its only divisors are 1 and itself.

- A positive integer is called prime if its only divisors are 1 and itself.
- For example, 2 is a prime because its only divisors are 1 and 2.

- A positive integer is called prime if its only divisors are 1 and itself.
- For example, 2 is a prime because its only divisors are 1 and 2.
- Similarly, 3, 5 and 7 are primes.

- A positive integer is called prime if its only divisors are 1 and itself.
- For example, 2 is a prime because its only divisors are 1 and 2.
- Similarly, 3, 5 and 7 are primes.
- On the other hand, 8 is not a prime because it is divisible by 4, so 8 has divisors other than 1 and itself.

- A positive integer is called prime if its only divisors are 1 and itself.
- For example, 2 is a prime because its only divisors are 1 and 2.
- Similarly, 3, 5 and 7 are primes.
- On the other hand, 8 is not a prime because it is divisible by 4, so 8 has divisors other than 1 and itself.
- A question to be explored in a later video is, how many prime numbers are there between 2 and x, where x is a large positive integer?

- A positive integer is called prime if its only divisors are 1 and itself.
- For example, 2 is a prime because its only divisors are 1 and 2.
- Similarly, 3, 5 and 7 are primes.
- On the other hand, 8 is not a prime because it is divisible by 4, so 8 has divisors other than 1 and itself.
- A question to be explored in a later video is, how many prime numbers are there between 2 and x, where x is a large positive integer?
- The Prime Number Theorem says that there are ≈ x/log(x) prime numbers in this range and this investigation leads to many problems that lie at the heart of modern mathematics.

• Let's begin by playing the following game. Given an integer, we are going to divide it by 2 and compute the remainder.

- Let's begin by playing the following game. Given an integer, we are going to divide it by 2 and compute the remainder.
- The remainder is either 0 or 1.

- Let's begin by playing the following game. Given an integer, we are going to divide it by 2 and compute the remainder.
- The remainder is either 0 or 1.
- Similarly, for each integer, consider the remainder obtained after dividing each integer by 5. This time around the possible remainders are 0, 1, 2, 3, 4.

- Let's begin by playing the following game. Given an integer, we are going to divide it by 2 and compute the remainder.
- The remainder is either 0 or 1.
- Similarly, for each integer, consider the remainder obtained after dividing each integer by 5. This time around the possible remainders are 0, 1, 2, 3, 4.
- We can play this game with respect to any integer, but we are going to focus on prime numbers for reasons that will become more clear a bit later.

• We now take all the integers, not necessarily positive, and divide them in accordance with the remainder one obtains after dividing each of these integers by a given prime number *p*.

- We now take all the integers, not necessarily positive, and divide them in accordance with the remainder one obtains after dividing each of these integers by a given prime number *p*.
- As we have discussed above, the possible remainders are

$$\{0, 1, 2, \dots, p-1\}$$

and we call this the set of **remainders modulo a prime** *p*.

- We now take all the integers, not necessarily positive, and divide them in accordance with the remainder one obtains after dividing each of these integers by a given prime number *p*.
- As we have discussed above, the possible remainders are

$$\{0, 1, 2, \dots, p-1\}$$

and we call this the set of **remainders modulo a prime** p.

• We define addition on this set of remainders as follows. We add a pair of remainders as we would normally and consider its remainder after dividing by *p*.

• For example, let p = 5. Then the set of remainders is $\{0, 1, 2, 3, 4\}$.

• For example, let p = 5. Then the set of remainders is $\{0, 1, 2, 3, 4\}$.

• Then, for instance,

1+2=3, 2+4=1, 3+4=2.

• For example, let p = 5. Then the set of remainders is $\{0, 1, 2, 3, 4\}$.

• Then, for instance,

$$1+2=3, 2+4=1, 3+4=2.$$

• This is because 2 + 4 = 6 and its remainder after dividing by 5 is 1. And so on!

• For example, let p = 5. Then the set of remainders is $\{0, 1, 2, 3, 4\}$.

• Then, for instance,

$$1+2=3, 2+4=1, 3+4=2.$$

- This is because 2 + 4 = 6 and its remainder after dividing by 5 is 1. And so on!
- We define multiplication on the set of remainders in a similar fashion.

 We say that integers a and b are congruent modulo p, and write a ≡ b mod p, if there exists an integer k such that

$$a-b=kp$$
.

• We say that integers a and b are congruent modulo p, and write $a \equiv b \mod p$, if there exists an integer k such that

$$a-b=kp$$
.

• We say that r is the **canonical remainder** of a after division by p if

 $a \equiv r \mod p$ and $0 \leq r \leq p - 1$.

Multiplicative inverses modulo a prime

• Let *p* be an odd prime and consider the set of canonical remainders modulo *p*:

$$\{0, 1, 2, \ldots, p-1\}.$$

Multiplicative inverses modulo a prime

• Let *p* be an odd prime and consider the set of canonical remainders modulo *p*:

$$\{0, 1, 2, \ldots, p-1\}.$$

• Let us start with the case p = 3 and note that

 $1 \cdot 1 = 1, \ 2 \cdot 2 = 1.$

Multiplicative inverses modulo a prime

• Let *p* be an odd prime and consider the set of canonical remainders modulo *p*:

$$\{0, 1, 2, \ldots, p-1\}.$$

• Let us start with the case p = 3 and note that

$$1 \cdot 1 = 1, \ 2 \cdot 2 = 1.$$

• It follows that every non-zero element in the set of canonical remainders modulo 3 is its own multiplicative inverse.
• Now consider the case p = 5. We have

$$1 \cdot 1 = 1, \ 2 \cdot 3 = 1, \ 3 \cdot 2 = 1, \ 4 \cdot 4 = 1.$$

• Now consider the case p = 5. We have

$$1 \cdot 1 = 1, \ 2 \cdot 3 = 1, \ 3 \cdot 2 = 1, \ 4 \cdot 4 = 1.$$

• Once again, every non-zero element has an inverse, but this time, not every element is its own inverse.

• Now consider the case p = 5. We have

$$1 \cdot 1 = 1, \ 2 \cdot 3 = 1, \ 3 \cdot 2 = 1, \ 4 \cdot 4 = 1.$$

- Once again, every non-zero element has an inverse, but this time, not every element is its own inverse.
- We are going to prove that as long as *p* is a prime, every non-zero element of the set of remainders has a multiplicative inverse.

• Now consider the case p = 5. We have

$$1 \cdot 1 = 1, \ 2 \cdot 3 = 1, \ 3 \cdot 2 = 1, \ 4 \cdot 4 = 1.$$

- Once again, every non-zero element has an inverse, but this time, not every element is its own inverse.
- We are going to prove that as long as *p* is a prime, every non-zero element of the set of remainders has a multiplicative inverse.
- To this end, take a non-zero element *a* of the set of canonical remainders modulo a prime *p* and consider

$$a, 2a, \ldots (p-1)a.$$

Observe that none of the numbers a, 2a, ..., (p − 1)a are 0 modulo p because p is prime.

- Observe that none of the numbers a, 2a, ..., (p − 1)a are 0 modulo p because p is prime.
- Indeed, suppose that $1 \le k \le p-1$, and the remainder of ka after the division by p is 0.

- Observe that none of the numbers a, 2a, ..., (p − 1)a are 0 modulo p because p is prime.
- Indeed, suppose that 1 ≤ k ≤ p − 1, and the remainder of ka after the division by p is 0.
- Then ka = mp for some integer m, but this is impossible because p is prime!

- Observe that none of the numbers a, 2a, ..., (p − 1)a are 0 modulo p because p is prime.
- Indeed, suppose that 1 ≤ k ≤ p − 1, and the remainder of ka after the division by p is 0.
- Then ka = mp for some integer m, but this is impossible because p is prime!
- Our next observation is that the remainders of $a, 2a, \ldots, (p-1)a$ after division by p are all distinct.

- Observe that none of the numbers a, 2a, ..., (p − 1)a are 0 modulo p because p is prime.
- Indeed, suppose that $1 \le k \le p 1$, and the remainder of ka after the division by p is 0.
- Then ka = mp for some integer m, but this is impossible because p is prime!
- Our next observation is that the remainders of a, 2a, ..., (p − 1)a after division by p are all distinct.
- Indeed, if ka ≡ k'a mod p with 1 ≤ k, k' ≤ p − 1, then (k − k')a is a multiple of p, which is, once again impossible since p is prime.

• What did we just prove? We took a non-zero element *a* of the set of remainder modulo a prime *p* and considered the set

$$a, 2a, \ldots (p-1)a,$$

• What did we just prove? We took a non-zero element *a* of the set of remainder modulo a prime *p* and considered the set

$$a, 2a, \ldots (p-1)a,$$

• and determined that these p-1 elements are distinct and non-zero.

• What did we just prove? We took a non-zero element *a* of the set of remainder modulo a prime *p* and considered the set

$$a, 2a, \ldots (p-1)a,$$

- and determined that these p-1 elements are distinct and non-zero.
- This implies that exactly one of them must equal to 1!

• What did we just prove? We took a non-zero element *a* of the set of remainder modulo a prime *p* and considered the set

$$a, 2a, \ldots (p-1)a,$$

- and determined that these p-1 elements are distinct and non-zero.
- This implies that exactly one of them must equal to 1!
- Thus we have shown that every non-zero element of the set of remainders modulo a prime *p* has a multiplicative inverse.

• Denote the set of remainder modulo p by \mathbb{Z}_p .

- Denote the set of remainder modulo p by \mathbb{Z}_p .
- The finite plane over \mathbb{Z}_p , denoted by \mathbb{Z}_p^2 , is the set of **vectors**

 $\{(x_1,x_2): x_j \in \mathbb{Z}_p\}.$

- Denote the set of remainder modulo p by \mathbb{Z}_p .
- The finite plane over \mathbb{Z}_p , denoted by \mathbb{Z}_p^2 , is the set of **vectors**

 $\{(x_1,x_2): x_j \in \mathbb{Z}_p\}.$

• Note that if $x = (x_1, x_2)$ and $y = (y_1, y_2)$ are both in \mathbb{Z}_p^2 , then

$$x + y = (x_1 + y_1, x_2 + y_2) \in \mathbb{Z}_p^2$$

- Denote the set of remainder modulo p by \mathbb{Z}_p .
- The finite plane over \mathbb{Z}_p , denoted by \mathbb{Z}_p^2 , is the set of **vectors**

$$\{(x_1,x_2):x_j\in\mathbb{Z}_p\}.$$

• Note that if $x = (x_1, x_2)$ and $y = (y_1, y_2)$ are both in \mathbb{Z}_p^2 , then

$$x + y = (x_1 + y_1, x_2 + y_2) \in \mathbb{Z}_p^2.$$

• Also observe that if $x = (x_1, x_2) \in \mathbb{Z}_p^2$ and $\alpha \in \mathbb{Z}_p$ (to be referred to as a scalar), then

$$\alpha x = (\alpha x_1, \alpha x_2) \in \mathbb{Z}_p^2.$$

Finite plane-example



• What is a line in a finite plane?

• What is a line in a finite plane?

• Let $x = (x_1, x_2) \in \mathbb{Z}_p^2$ and let $v = (v_1, v_2) \in \mathbb{Z}_p^2 \setminus (0, 0)$.

• What is a line in a finite plane?

• Let
$$x = (x_1, x_2) \in \mathbb{Z}_p^2$$
 and let $v = (v_1, v_2) \in \mathbb{Z}_p^2 \setminus (0, 0)$.

Define the line

$$L_{x,v} = \{x + tv : t \in \mathbb{Z}_p\},\$$

where x shall be referred to as the **starting point** and v the **direction vector**.

• What is a line in a finite plane?

• Let
$$x = (x_1, x_2) \in \mathbb{Z}_p^2$$
 and let $v = (v_1, v_2) \in \mathbb{Z}_p^2 \setminus (0, 0)$.

Define the line

$$L_{x,v} = \{x + tv : t \in \mathbb{Z}_p\},\$$

where x shall be referred to as the starting point and v the direction vector.

• The number of points on $L_{x,v}$, denoted by $|L_{x,v}|$, is equal to p.

• What is a line in a finite plane?

• Let
$$x = (x_1, x_2) \in \mathbb{Z}_p^2$$
 and let $v = (v_1, v_2) \in \mathbb{Z}_p^2 \setminus (0, 0)$.

Define the line

$$L_{x,v} = \{x + tv : t \in \mathbb{Z}_p\},\$$

where x shall be referred to as the **starting point** and v the **direction vector**.

- The number of points on $L_{x,v}$, denoted by $|L_{x,v}|$, is equal to p.
- It is reasonable to ask whether the basic properties of lines and points we learned in high school geometry are still valid in this setting.

March 2020

17 / 30

Lines: example



Figure: A line in \mathbb{Z}_7^2 with x = (0, 1) and v = (1, 2).

March 2020 18 / 30

• Each line is determined by the starting point x and the direction v.

- Each line is determined by the starting point x and the direction v.
- However, it turns out that if v' is a constant (non-zero) multiple of v, then

$$L_{x,v}=L_{x,v'}.$$

- Each line is determined by the starting point x and the direction v.
- However, it turns out that if v' is a constant (non-zero) multiple of v, then

$$L_{x,v}=L_{x,v'}.$$

• Indeed, suppose that v' = av, where $a \neq 0$. Then

$$L_{x,v'} = L_{x,av} = \{x + tav : t \in \mathbb{Z}_p\}.$$

- Each line is determined by the starting point x and the direction v.
- However, it turns out that if v' is a constant (non-zero) multiple of v, then

$$L_{x,v}=L_{x,v'}.$$

• Indeed, suppose that v' = av, where $a \neq 0$. Then

$$L_{x,v'} = L_{x,av} = \{x + tav : t \in \mathbb{Z}_p\}.$$

 As t runs though Z_p, at runs through every element of Z_p exactly once, just like in the proof above of the fact that every non-zero element of Z_p has a multiplicative inverse.

How many lines are there? (continued)

• We now observe that if we replace the starting point x by any other point y on the same line, then

$$L_{x,v}=L_{y,v}.$$

How many lines are there? (continued)

• We now observe that if we replace the starting point x by any other point y on the same line, then

$$L_{x,v}=L_{y,v}.$$

• Indeed, if y is on the same line, y = x + av for some non-zero a. Then

$$L_{y,v} = \{x + av + tv : t \in \mathbb{Z}_p\} = \{x + (a + t)v : t \in \mathbb{Z}_p\}.$$

How many lines are there? (continued)

• We now observe that if we replace the starting point x by any other point y on the same line, then

$$L_{x,v}=L_{y,v}.$$

• Indeed, if y is on the same line, y = x + av for some non-zero a. Then

$$L_{y,v} = \{x + av + tv : t \in \mathbb{Z}_p\} = \{x + (a+t)v : t \in \mathbb{Z}_p\}.$$

 As before, as t runs through Z_p, a + t runs through all the elements of Z_p exactly once.

• We are now ready to count the total number of lines.

- We are now ready to count the total number of lines.
- We have just seen that $L_{x,v}$ and $L_{x',v'}$ constitute the same line if and only if v' is a non-zero multiple of v and the difference between x and x' is a multiple of v.

- We are now ready to count the total number of lines.
- We have just seen that L_{x,v} and L_{x',v'} constitute the same line if and only if v' is a non-zero multiple of v and the difference between x and x' is a multiple of v.
- In other words, every v has (p-1) equivalent directions (multiples of v) and given a v, every x has q equivalent starting points on the same line.

- We are now ready to count the total number of lines.
- We have just seen that $L_{x,v}$ and $L_{x',v'}$ constitute the same line if and only if v' is a non-zero multiple of v and the difference between x and x' is a multiple of v.
- In other words, every v has (p-1) equivalent directions (multiples of v) and given a v, every x has q equivalent starting points on the same line.
- It follows that the total number of different lines is equal to

$$\frac{\# \text{ starting points } \times \# \text{ directions}}{(p-1) \cdot p} = \frac{p^2 \cdot (p^2 - 1)}{p \cdot (p-1)} = p(p+1).$$

 In the Euclidean plane, two lines are either parallel, or they intersect at exactly one point. What about lines in Z²_p?
- In the Euclidean plane, two lines are either parallel, or they intersect at exactly one point. What about lines in Z²_p?
- We have already seen that whether v = v', or v' = av, a ≠ 0, the line is the same.

- In the Euclidean plane, two lines are either parallel, or they intersect at exactly one point. What about lines in Z²_p?
- We have already seen that whether v = v', or v' = av, $a \neq 0$, the line is the same.
- Suppose that $L_{x,v}$ and $L_{x',v}$ intersect. Then

x + av = x' + bv for some $a, b \in \mathbb{Z}_p$.

- In the Euclidean plane, two lines are either parallel, or they intersect at exactly one point. What about lines in Z²_p?
- We have already seen that whether v = v', or v' = av, $a \neq 0$, the line is the same.
- Suppose that $L_{x,v}$ and $L_{x',v}$ intersect. Then

x + av = x' + bv for some $a, b \in \mathbb{Z}_p$.

• This means that x' = x + av - bv = x + (a - b)v, so $x' \in L_{x,v}$.

• The same argument goes through if we consider the intersection of $L_{x,v}$ and $L_{x',av}$, where $a \neq 0$.

- The same argument goes through if we consider the intersection of $L_{x,v}$ and $L_{x',av}$, where $a \neq 0$.
- Thus we see that $L_{x,v}$ and $L_{x',av}$, $a \neq 0$, intersect if and only if $x' \in L_{x,v}$. If $x' \in L_{x,v}$, then $L_{x,v}$ and $L_{x',av}$ are the same line.

- The same argument goes through if we consider the intersection of $L_{x,v}$ and $L_{x',av}$, where $a \neq 0$.
- Thus we see that $L_{x,v}$ and $L_{x',av}$, $a \neq 0$, intersect if and only if $x' \in L_{x,v}$. If $x' \in L_{x,v}$, then $L_{x,v}$ and $L_{x',av}$ are the same line.
- We will now look at the case where there does not exist $a \neq 0$ such that v' = av.

We shall see that for any starting points x and x', the intersection of $L_{x,v}$ and $L_{x',v'}$ consists of exactly one point.

• To see that $L_{x,v}$ and $L_{x',v'}$ intersect at exactly one point if v is not a multiple of v', we consider the equation

$$x+tv=x'+t'v'.$$

• To see that $L_{x,v}$ and $L_{x',v'}$ intersect at exactly one point if v is not a multiple of v', we consider the equation

$$x + tv = x' + t'v'.$$

• More precisely, we must find $t \in \mathbb{Z}_p$ and $t' \in \mathbb{Z}_p$ such that

x-x'=t'v'-tv,

 To see that L_{x,v} and L_{x',v'} intersect at exactly one point if v is not a multiple of v', we consider the equation

$$x + tv = x' + t'v'.$$

• More precisely, we must find $t \in \mathbb{Z}_p$ and $t' \in \mathbb{Z}_p$ such that

$$x-x'=t'v'-tv,$$

where x and x' are fixed vectors in Z²_p and v and v' are fixed vectors in Z²_p \{(0,0)} that are not multiples of one another.

• Note that x - x' is an arbitrary vector in \mathbb{Z}_p^2 in this setup.

- Note that x x' is an arbitrary vector in \mathbb{Z}_p^2 in this setup.
- Also note that we must show that t, t' above are unique because we are trying to prove that there is exactly **one** point of intersection!

- Note that x x' is an arbitrary vector in \mathbb{Z}_p^2 in this setup.
- Also note that we must show that *t*, *t'* above are unique because we are trying to prove that there is exactly **one** point of intersection!
- As a result, we have reduced matters to the following question. Is it true that if v, v' are non-zero vectors in \mathbb{Z}_p^2 that are not multiples of another another, and w is an arbitrary vector in \mathbb{Z}_p^2 , then there exist unique scalars a, a' such that

$$w = av + a'v'?$$

- Note that x x' is an arbitrary vector in \mathbb{Z}_p^2 in this setup.
- Also note that we must show that t, t' above are unique because we are trying to prove that there is exactly **one** point of intersection!
- As a result, we have reduced matters to the following question. Is it true that if v, v' are non-zero vectors in \mathbb{Z}_p^2 that are not multiples of another another, and w is an arbitrary vector in \mathbb{Z}_p^2 , then there exist unique scalars a, a' such that

$$w = av + a'v'?$$

• If the answer is yes, we recover the answer to the question above by taking w = x - x', t' = a, and t = -a.



• In the process of resolving the question we just raised, we introduce the following notion.



- In the process of resolving the question we just raised, we introduce the following notion.
- We say that vectors v and v' form a **basis** of \mathbb{Z}_p^2 if every vector w in \mathbb{Z}_p^2 can be expressed in exactly one way in the form

$$av + a'v'$$
,

where a, a' are scalars.



- In the process of resolving the question we just raised, we introduce the following notion.
- We say that vectors v and v' form a **basis** of \mathbb{Z}_p^2 if every vector w in \mathbb{Z}_p^2 can be expressed in exactly one way in the form

$$av + a'v'$$
,

where a, a' are scalars.

 We claim that v, v' form a basis of Z²_p if and only if v and v' are non-zero vectors that are not multiples of one another.

• We are trying to solve the equation

$$av + a'v' = w,$$

where v, v' and w are given.

• We are trying to solve the equation

$$av + a'v' = w,$$

where v, v' and w are given.

• Rewriting this as a matrix equation, we get

$$\begin{pmatrix} v_1 & v'_1 \\ v_2 & v'_2 \end{pmatrix} \cdot \begin{pmatrix} a \\ a' \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} w_1 \\ w_2 \end{pmatrix}.$$

• We are trying to solve the equation

$$av + a'v' = w,$$

where v, v' and w are given.

• Rewriting this as a matrix equation, we get

$$\begin{pmatrix} v_1 & v'_1 \\ v_2 & v'_2 \end{pmatrix} \cdot \begin{pmatrix} a \\ a' \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} w_1 \\ w_2 \end{pmatrix}.$$

• We can check by a direct calculation that if $v_1v_2' - v_2v_1' \neq 0$, then

 $\begin{pmatrix} v_1 & v_1' \\ v_2 & v_2' \end{pmatrix} \cdot \frac{1}{v_1 v_2' - v_2 v_1'} \begin{pmatrix} v_2' & -v_1' \\ -v_2 & v_1 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix},$

and

۲

 $\begin{pmatrix} v_1 & v_1' \\ v_2 & v_2' \end{pmatrix} \cdot \frac{1}{v_1 v_2' - v_2 v_1'} \begin{pmatrix} v_2' & -v_1' \\ -v_2 & v_1 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix},$

and

۲

۲

 $\frac{1}{v_1v_2'-v_2v_1'} \begin{pmatrix} v_2' & -v_1' \\ -v_2 & v_1 \end{pmatrix} \cdot \begin{pmatrix} v_1 & v_1' \\ v_2 & v_2' \end{pmatrix} \cdot = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}.$

 $\begin{pmatrix} v_1 & v_1' \\ v_2 & v_2' \end{pmatrix} \cdot \frac{1}{v_1 v_2' - v_2 v_1'} \begin{pmatrix} v_2' & -v_1' \\ -v_2 & v_1 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix},$

and

٥

۲

 $\frac{1}{v_1v_2'-v_2v_1'} \begin{pmatrix} v_2' & -v_1' \\ -v_2 & v_1 \end{pmatrix} \cdot \begin{pmatrix} v_1 & v_1' \\ v_2 & v_2' \end{pmatrix} \cdot = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}.$

• We shall refer to $\frac{1}{v_1v_2'-v_2v_1'} \begin{pmatrix} v_2' & -v_1' \\ -v_2 & v_1 \end{pmatrix}$ as the inverse matrix of $\begin{pmatrix} v_1 & v_1' \\ v_2 & v_2' \end{pmatrix}$.

• We are now ready to resolve the question that we posed. We are trying to solve the equation

$$av + a'v' = w,$$

where v, v' and w are given. Rewriting this as a matrix equation, we get

$$\begin{pmatrix} v_1 & v'_1 \\ v_2 & v'_2 \end{pmatrix} \cdot \begin{pmatrix} a \\ a' \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} w_1 \\ w_2 \end{pmatrix}.$$

• We are now ready to resolve the question that we posed. We are trying to solve the equation

$$av + a'v' = w$$

where v, v' and w are given. Rewriting this as a matrix equation, we get

$$\begin{pmatrix} v_1 & v'_1 \\ v_2 & v'_2 \end{pmatrix} \cdot \begin{pmatrix} a \\ a' \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} w_1 \\ w_2 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Multiplying both sides by the inverse matrix, we obtain

$$\begin{pmatrix} \mathsf{a} \\ \mathsf{a}' \end{pmatrix} = \frac{1}{\mathsf{v}_1 \mathsf{v}_2' - \mathsf{v}_2 \mathsf{v}_1'} \begin{pmatrix} \mathsf{v}_2' & -\mathsf{v}_1' \\ -\mathsf{v}_2 & \mathsf{v}_1 \end{pmatrix} \cdot \begin{pmatrix} \mathsf{w}_1 \\ \mathsf{w}_2 \end{pmatrix}.$$

• We just saw that we can solve for the coefficients of *a* and *a'* and the question is thus resolved.

- We just saw that we can solve for the coefficients of *a* and *a'* and the question is thus resolved.
- Recall that this allows us to conclude that if v and v' are direction vectors that are not multiples of one another, then the lines $L_{x,v}$ and $L_{x',v'}$ intersect at exactly one point.

- We just saw that we can solve for the coefficients of *a* and *a'* and the question is thus resolved.
- Recall that this allows us to conclude that if v and v' are direction vectors that are not multiples of one another, then the lines $L_{x,v}$ and $L_{x',v'}$ intersect at exactly one point.
- We now have a reasonably good understanding of what the discrete plane Z²_p is, what lines in this plane look like and how they intersect.

- We just saw that we can solve for the coefficients of *a* and *a'* and the question is thus resolved.
- Recall that this allows us to conclude that if v and v' are direction vectors that are not multiples of one another, then the lines $L_{x,v}$ and $L_{x',v'}$ intersect at exactly one point.
- We now have a reasonably good understanding of what the discrete plane Z²_p is, what lines in this plane look like and how they intersect.

• This puts us in a good position to dive into deeper waters, which we are going to do in the second video of this series.