



## Equivalence Relations

A relation on a set  $S$  is an *equivalence relation* if it is reflexive, symmetric, and transitive. When  $(x, y) \in R$ , we say  $x$  is equivalent to  $y$ . For any  $x \in S$ ,  $[x]_R = \{y \in S \mid (x, y) \in R\}$  is the *equivalence class* of  $x$ . Here are important properties of equivalence classes:

1.  $(x, y) \in R \iff [x]_R = [y]_R \iff [x]_R \cap [y]_R \neq \emptyset$
2.  $\cup_{s \in S} [s]_R = S$ .
3. Either  $[x]_R \cap [y]_R = \emptyset$  or  $[x]_R = [y]_R$ .

### Exercises

1. Which of the transitive closures on the previous slide are equivalence relations? For the ones that are, what are its equivalence classes?

2. We defined  $[x]_R$  as  $\{y \in S \mid (x, y) \in R\}$ . Show that this is equivalent to the alternate definition  $[x]_R = \{y \in S \mid (y, x) \in R\}$ .

3. Find the error with the following 'proof' that a symmetric, transitive relation is reflexive:

Let  $R$  be a symmetric, transitive relation on  $S$ , and let  $x \in S$ . Then  $(x, y) \in R$ , so since  $R$  is symmetric, we have  $(y, x) \in R$ . Then because  $R$  is transitive, and  $(x, y), (y, x) \in R$ , we also have  $(x, x) \in R$ , so  $R$  is reflexive.

Give a counterexample to show that this statement is actually false.