Operational notes

Document updated on **August 1, 2022**.

The following colors are **not** part of the final product, but serve as highlights in the editing/review process:

- text that needs attention from the Subject Matter Experts: Mirco, Anna,& Jan
- terms that have not yet been defined in the book
- things that need to be checked only at the very final typesetting stage
  (and it doesn't make sense to do them before)
- text that needs advice from the communications/marketing team: Aaron & Shane
- text that needs to be completed or otherwise edited (by Sylvia)

NB: This PDF only includes the following chapter(s): Arithmetics.

Todo list

MoonMath manual

TechnoBob and the Least Scruples crew

August 1, 2022

Contents

Chapter 3

Arithmetics

S: This chapter talks about different types of arithmetic, so I suggest using "Arithmetics" as the chapter title.

Pluralize chapter title

3.1 Introduction

3.1.1 Aims and target audience

The goal of this chapter is to bring a reader with only basic school-level algebra up to speed in arithmetics. We start with a brief recapitulation of basic integer arithmetics, discussing long division, the greatest common divisor and Euclidean division. After that, we introduce modular arithmetics as **the most important** skill to compute our pen-and-paper examples. We then introduce polynomials, compute their analogs to integer arithmetics and introduce the important concept of Lagrange interpolation.

check if this is already introduced in intro

3.2 Integer arithmetic

In a sense, integer arithmetic is at the heart of large parts of modern cryptography. Fortunately, most readers will probably remember integer arithmetic from school. It is, however, important that you can confidently apply those concepts to understand and execute computations in the many pen-and-paper examples that form an integral part of the MoonMath Manual. We will therefore recapitulate basic arithmetic concepts to refresh your memory and fill any knowledge gaps.

unify addressing the reader

unify addressing the reader

Even though the terms and concepts in this chapter might not appear in the literature on zero-knowledge proofs directly, understanding them is necessary to follow subsequent chapters and beyond: terms like **groups** or **fields** also crop up very frequently in academic papers on zero-knowledge cryptography.

3.2.1 Integers, natural numbers and rational numbers

Integers are also known as **whole numbers**, that is, numbers that can be written without fractional parts. Examples of numbers that are **not** integers are $\frac{2}{3}$, 1.2 and -1280.006.

Throughout this book, we use the symbol $\mathbb{Z}$ as a shorthand for the set of all **integers**:

$$\mathbb{Z} := \{\ldots,-3,-2,-1,0,1,2,3,\ldots\} \tag{3.1}$$

If $a \in \mathbb{Z}$ is an integer, then we write $|a|$ for the **absolute value** of a, that is, the the non-negative value of a without regard to its sign:

$$|4| = 4 \tag{3.2}$$

$$|-4| = 4 \tag{3.3}$$

We use the symbol $\mathbb{N}$ for the set of all positive integers, usually called the set of **natural numbers**. Furthermore, we use $\mathbb{N}_0$ for the set of all non-negative integers. This means that $\mathbb{N}$ does not contain the number 0, while $\mathbb{N}_0$ does:

$$\mathbb{N} := \{1,2,3,\ldots\} \qquad \mathbb{N}_0 := \{0,1,2,3,\ldots\}$$

In addition, we use the symbol $\mathbb{Q}$ for the set of all **rational numbers**, which can be represented as the set of all fractions $\frac{n}{m}$, where $n \in \mathbb{Z}$ is an integer and $m \in \mathbb{N}$ is a natural number, such that there is no other fraction $\frac{n'}{m'}$ and natural number $k \in \mathbb{N}$ with $k \neq 1$ such that the following equation holds:

@jan @anna double check this definition. Is it clear enough? Proper definition requires the concept of equivalance or coprimeness first

$$\frac{n}{m} = \frac{k \cdot n'}{k \cdot m'} \tag{3.4}$$

The sets $\mathbb{N}$, $\mathbb{Z}$ and $\mathbb{Q}$ have a notion of addition and multiplication defined on them. Most of us are probably able to do many integer computations in our head, but this gets more and more difficult as these increase in complexity. We will frequently invoke the SageMath system (2.7.1) for more complicated computations (We define rings and fields later in this book): SB: I would delete lines 12-18 form the Sage example below, unnecessarily confusing at this point

simplify Sage ex.

```
1  sage: ZZ # A sage notation for the integer type
2  Integer Ring
3  sage: NN # A sage notation for the counting number type
4  Non negative integer semiring
5  sage: ZZ(5) # Get an element from the Ring of integers
6  5
7  sage: ZZ(5) + ZZ(3)
8  8
9  sage: ZZ(5) * NN(3)
10 15
11 sage: ZZ.random_element(10**50)
12 54428611290136105088662805064077040080301342920296
13 sage: ZZ(27713).str(2) # Binary string representation
14 110110001000001
15 sage: NN(27713).str(2) # Binary string representation
16 110110001000001
17 sage: ZZ(27713).str(16) # Hexadecimal string representation
18 6c41
```

A set of numbers of particular interest to us is the set of **prime numbers**, which are natural numbers $p \in \mathbb{N}$ with $p \geq 2$ that are only divisible by themself and by 1. All prime numbers apart from the number 2 are called **odd** prime numbers. We use $\mathbb{P}$ for the set of all prime numbers and $\mathbb{P}_{\geq 3}$ for the set of all odd prime numbers. The set of prime numbers $\mathbb{P}$ is an infinite set, and it can be ordered according to size. This means that, for any prime number $p \in \mathbb{P}$, one can always find another prime number $p' \in \mathbb{P}$ with $p < p'$. Consequently, there is no largest prime number. Since prime numbers can be ordered by size, we can write them as follows:

$$2,3,5,7,11,13,17,19,23,29,31,37,41,43,47,53,59,61,67,\ldots \tag{3.5}$$

As the **fundamental theorem of arithmetic** tells us, prime numbers are, in a certain sense, the basic building blocks from which all other natural numbers are composed. To see that, let $n \in \mathbb{N}$ be any natural number with $n > 1$. Then there are always prime numbers $p_1, p_2, \ldots, p_k \in \mathbb{P}$, such that the following equation hold:

To see that

$$n = p_1 \cdot p_2 \cdot \ldots \cdot p_k \tag{3.6}$$

This representation is unique for each natural number (except for the order of the **factors** $p_1, p_2, \ldots, p_k$) and is called the **prime factorization** of n.

Example 1 (Prime Factorization). To see what we mean by the prime factorization of a number, let's look at the number $504 \in \mathbb{N}$. To get its prime factors, we can successively divide it by all prime numbers in ascending order starting with 2:

let's

$$504 = 2 \cdot 2 \cdot 2 \cdot 3 \cdot 3 \cdot 7$$

We can double check our findings invoking Sage, which provides an algorithm for factoring natural numbers:

```
sage: n = NN(19214758032624000)
sage: factor(n)
2^7 * 3^3 * 5^3 * 7 * 11 * 17^2 * 23 * 43^2 * 47
```

The computation from the previous example reveals an important observation: computing the factorization of an integer is computationally expensive, because we have to divide repeatedly by all prime numbers smaller than the number itself until all factors are prime numbers themself. From this, an important question arises: how fast can we compute the prime factorization of a natural number? This question is the famous **integer factorization problem** and, as far as we know, there is currently no known method that can factor integers much faster then the naive approach of just dividing the given number by all prime numbers in ascending order.

"themselves is more common?

On the other hand, computing the product of a given set of prime numbers is fast: you just multiply all factors. This simple observation implies that the two processes "prime number multiplication" on the one side and its inverse process "natural number factorization" have very different computational costs. The factorization problem is therefore an example of a so-called **one-way function**: an invertible function that is easy to compute in one direction, but hard to compute in the other direction. [1]

you

Exercise 1. What is the absolute value of the integers -123, 27 and 0?

Exercise 2. Compute the factorization of 30030 and double check your results using Sage.

Exercise 3. Consider the following equation $4 \cdot x + 21 = 5$. Compute the set of all solutions for x under the following alternative assumptions:

1. The equation is defined over the set of natural numbers.

[1] It should be pointed out, however, that the American mathematician Peter W. Shor developed an algorithm in 1994, which can calculate the prime factorization of a natural number in polynomial time on a quantum computer. The consequence of this is that cryptosystems, which are based on the prime factor problem, are unsafe as soon as practically usable quantum computers become available.

2. The equation is defined over the set of integers.

Exercise 4. Consider the following equation $2x^3 - x^2 - 2x = -1$. Compute the set of all solutions x under the following assumptions:

1. The equation is defined over the set ofnatural numbers.
2. The equation is defined over the set of integers.
3. The equation is defined over the set of rational numbers.

3.2.2 Euclidean Division

As we know from high school mathematics, integers can be added, subtracted and multiplied, and the of these operations result is guaranteed to always be an integer as well. On the contrary, division (in the commonly understood sense) is not defined for integers, as, for example, 7 divided by 3 will not result in an integer. However, it is always possible to divide any two integers if we consider division with a remainder. For example, 7 divided by 3 is equal to 2 with a remainder of 1, since $7 = 2 \cdot 3 + 1$.

This section introduces division with a remainder for integers, usually called **Euclidean division**. It is an essential technique underlying many concepts in this book. The precise definition is as follows:

Let $a \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $b \in \mathbb{Z}$ be two integers with $b \neq 0$. Then there is always another integer $m \in \mathbb{Z}$ and a natural number $r \in \mathbb{N}$, with $0 \leq r < |b|$ such that the following holds:

$$a = m \cdot b + r \tag{3.7}$$

This decomposition of a given b is called **Euclidean division**, where a is called the **dividend**, b is called the **divisor**, m is called the **quotient** and r is called the **remainder**. It can be shown that both the quotient and the remainder always exist and are unique, as long as the divisor is different from 0.

@jan. You wrote: a and b are required to be non-zero in the definition above, so this can just be deleted. ... a can be zero and existence and uniqueness, nonzeroness are not obvious. Do you mean something else?

You wrote:

Notation and Symbols 1. Suppose that the numbers a, b, m and r satisfy equation (3.7). Then we often describe the quotient and the remainder of the Euclidean division as follows:

$$a \text{ div } b := m, \qquad a \text{ mod } b := r \tag{3.8}$$

We also say that an integer a is **divisible** by another integer b if $a \text{ mod } b = 0$ holds. In this case, we also write $b|a$, and call the integer $a \text{ div } b$ the **cofactor** of b in a.

So, in a nutshell, Euclidean division is the process of dividing one integer by another in a way that produces a quotient and a non-negative remainder, the latter of which is smaller than the absolute value of the divisor.

Example 2. Applying Euclidean division and the notation defined in 3.8 to the dividend -17 and the divisor 4, we get the following:

$$-17 \text{ div } 4 = -5, \qquad -17 \text{ mod } 4 = 3 \tag{3.9}$$

$-17 = -5 \cdot 4 + 3$ is the Euclidean division of -17 by 4. The remainder is, by definition, a non-negative number. In this case, 4 does not divide -17, as the reminder is not zero. The truth value of the expression $4|-17$ therefore is FALSE. On the other hand, the truth value of $4|12$ is TRUE, since 4 divides 12, as $12 \text{ mod } 4 = 0$. If we invoke Sage to do the computation for us, we get the following:

```
sage: ZZ(-17) // ZZ(4) # Integer quotient
-5
sage: ZZ(-17) % ZZ(4) # remainder
3
sage: ZZ(4).divides(ZZ(-17)) # self divides other
False
sage: ZZ(4).divides(ZZ(12))
True
```

Remark 1. In 3.8, we defined the notation of a **div** b and a **mod** b in terms of Euclidean division. It should be noted however that many programing languages like Phyton and Sage, implement both the operator $(/)$ as well as the operator $(\%)$ differently. Programers should be aware of this, as the discrepancy between the mathematical notation and the implementation in programing languages might become the source of subtle bugs in implementations of cryptographic primitives.

To give an example consider the the dividend -17 and the divisor -4. Note that in contrast to the previous example 2, we have a negative divisor. According to our definition we have

$$-17 \text{ div } -4 = 5, \qquad -17 \text{ mod } -4 = 3$$

because $-17 = 5\cdot(-4)+3$ is the Euclidean division of -17 and -4 (the remainder is, by definition, a non-negative number). However using the operators $(/)$ and $(\%)$ in Sage we get

```
sage: ZZ(143785).quo_rem(ZZ(17)) # Euclidean Division
(8457, 16)
sage: ZZ(143785) == ZZ(8457)*ZZ(17) + ZZ(16) # check
True
```

Methods to compute Euclidean division for integers are called **integer division algorithms**. Probably the best known algorithm is the so-called **long division**, which most of us might have learned in school.

As long division is the standard method used for pen-and-paper division of multi-digit numbers expressed in decimal notation, the reader should become familiar with it as we use it throughout this book when we do simple pen-and-paper computations. However, instead of defining the algorithm formally, we rather give some examples that will hopefully make the process clear.

In a nutshell, the algorithm loops through the digits of the dividend from the left to right, subtracting the largest possible multiple of the divisor (at the digit level) at each stage; the multiples then become the digits of the quotient, and the remainder is the first digit of the dividend.

Example 3 (Integer Long Division). To give an example of integer long division algorithm, let's divide the integer $a = 143785$ by the number $b = 17$. Our goal is therefore to find solutions to equation 3.7, that is, we need to find the quotient $m \in \mathbb{Z}$ and the remainder $r \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $143785 = m\cdot 17 + r$. Using a notation that is mostly used in Commonwealth countries, we compute as follows:

$$
\begin{array}{r@{\,}l}
 & 8457 \\
17 \,) & \overline{143785} \\
 & \underline{136} \\
 & 77 \\
 & \underline{68} \\
 & 98 \\
 & \underline{85} \\
 & 135 \\
 & \underline{119} \\
 & 16
\end{array}
\tag{3.10}
$$

We therefore get $m = 8457$ as well as $r = 16$ and indeed we have $143785 = 8457 \cdot 17 + 16$, which we can double check invoking Sage:

```
sage: ZZ(12).xgcd(ZZ(5)) # (gcd(a,b),s,t)
(1, -2, 5)
```

Exercise 5 (Integer Long Division). Find an $m \in \mathbb{Z}$ as well as an $r \in \mathbb{N}$ with $0 \leq r < |b|$ such that $a = m \cdot b + r$ holds for the following pairs $(a,b) = (27,5)$, $(a,b) = (27,-5)$, $(a,b) = (127,0)$, $(a,b) = (-1687,11)$ and $(a,b) = (0,7)$. In which cases are your solutions unique?

Exercise 6 (Long Division Algorithm). Write an algorithm that computes integer long division and handling all edge cases properly.

The Extended Euclidean Algorithm One of the most critical parts in this book is the so called modular arithmetic which we will define in 3.3 and its application in the computations of **prime fields** as defined in 4.3.1. To be able to do computations in modular arithmetic, we have to get familiar with the so-called **extended Euclidean algorithm**. We therefore introduce this algorithm here.

The **greatest common divisor** (GCD) of two non-zero integers a and b, is defined as the greatest non-zero natural number d such that d divides both a and b, that is, $d|a$ as well as $d|b$. We write $gcd(a,b) := d$ for this number. Since the natural number 1 divides any other integer, 1 is always a common divisor of any two non-zero integers. However it must not be the greatest.

A common method to compute the greatest common divisor is the so called Eucliden algorithm. However since we don't need that algorithm in this book, we will introduce the Extended Euclidean algorithm which is a method to calculate the greatest common divisor of two natural numbers a and $b \in \mathbb{N}$, as well as two additional integers $s,t \in \mathbb{Z}$, such that the following equation holds:

$$
gcd(a,b) = s \cdot a + t \cdot b \tag{3.11}
$$

The pseudocode in algorithm 1 shows in detail how to calculate the greatest common divisor and the numbers s and t with the extended Euclidean algorithm:

The algorithm is simple enough to be done effectively in pen-and-paper examples, where it is common to write it as a table where the rows represent the while-loop and the columns represent the values of the the array r, s and t with index k. The following example provides a simple execution:

Example 4. To illustrate algorithm 1, we apply it to the numbers $a = 12$ and $b = 5$. Since $12, 5 \in \mathbb{N}$ as well as $12 \geq 5$ all requirements are met and we compute as follows:

Algorithm 1 Extended Euclidean Algorithm

Require: $a, b \in \mathbb{N}$ with $a \geq b$

procedure EXT-EUCLID(a,b)

$r_0 \leftarrow a$

$r_1 \leftarrow b$

$s_0 \leftarrow 1$

$s_1 \leftarrow 0$

$k \leftarrow 1$

while $r_k \neq 0$ **do**

$q_k \leftarrow r_{k-1}$ div r_k

$r_{k+1} \leftarrow r_{k-1} - q_k \cdot r_k$

$s_{k+1} \leftarrow s_{k-1} - q_k \cdot s_k$

$k \leftarrow k+1$

end while

return $gcd(a,b) \leftarrow r_{k-1}$, $s \leftarrow s_{k-1}$ and $t := (r_{k-1} - s_{k-1} \cdot a)$ div b

end procedure

Ensure: $gcd(a,b) = s \cdot a + t \cdot b$

k	r_k	s_k	$t_k = (r_k - s_k \cdot a)$ div b
0	12	1	0
1	5	0	1
2	2	1	-2
3	1	-2	5
4	0		

From this we can see that the greatest common divisor of 12 and 5 is $gcd(12,5) = 1$ and that the equation $1 = (-2) \cdot 12 + 5 \cdot 5$ holds. We can also invoke sage to double check our findings:

```
sage: ZZ(137).gcd(ZZ(64))
1
sage: ZZ(64)** ZZ(137) % ZZ(137) == ZZ(64) % ZZ(137)
True
sage: ZZ(64)** ZZ(137-1) % ZZ(137) == ZZ(1) % ZZ(137)
True
sage: ZZ(1918).gcd(ZZ(137))
137
sage: ZZ(1918)** ZZ(137) % ZZ(137) == ZZ(1918) % ZZ(137)
True
sage: ZZ(1918)** ZZ(137-1) % ZZ(137) == ZZ(1) % ZZ(137)
False
```

Exercise 7 (Extended Euclidean Algorithm). Find integers $s, t \in \mathbb{Z}$ such that $gcd(a,b) = s \cdot a + t \cdot b$ holds for the following pairs $(a,b) = (45,10)$, $(a,b) = (13,11)$, $(a,b) = (13,12)$. What pairs (a,b) are coprime?

Exercise 8 (Towards Prime fields). Let $n \in \mathbb{N}$ be a natural number and p a prime number, such that $n < p$. What is the greatest common divisor $gcd(p,n)$?

Exercise 9. Find all numbers $k \in \mathbb{N}$ with $0 \leq k \leq 100$ such that $gcd(100,k) = 5$.

Exercise 10. Show that $gcd(n,m) = gcd(n+m,m)$ for all $n, m \in \mathbb{N}$.

Coprime Integers Coprime integers are integers that do not have a common prime number as a factor. As we will see in 3.3 those numbers are important for our purposes because in modular arithmetic, computation that involve coprime numbers are substantially different from computations on non-coprime numbers 3.3.

The naive way to decide if two integers are coprime would be to divide both number sucessively by all prime numbers smaller then those numbers to see if they share a common prime factor. However two integers are coprime if and only if their greatest common divisor is 1 and hence computing the *gcd* is the preferred method.

Example 5. Consider example 4 again. As we have seen, the greatest common divisor of 12 and 5 is 1. This implies that the integers 12 and 5 are coprime, since they share no divisor other then 1, which is not a prime number.

Exercise 11. Consider exercise 7 again. Which pairs (a,b) from that exercise are coprime?

3.3 Modular arithmetic

Modular arithmetic is a system of integer arithmetic, where numbers "wrap around" when reaching a certain value, much like calculations on a clock wrap around whenever the value exceeds the number 12. For example, if the clock shows that it is 11 o'clock, then 20 hours later it will be 7 o'clock, not 31 o'clock. The number 31 has no meaning on a normal clock that shows hours.

The number at which the wrap occurs is called the **modulus**. Modular arithmetic generalizes the clock example to arbitrary moduli and studies equations and phenomena that arise in this new kind of arithmetic. It is of central importance for understanding most modern crypto systems, in large parts because modular arithmetic provides the computational infrastructute for algebraic types that have cryptographically useful examples of one-way functions.

Although modular arithmetic appears very different from ordinary integer arithmetic that we are all familiar with, we encourage the interested reader to work through the example and to discover that, once they get used to the idea that this is a new kind of calculations, it will seem much less daunting.

Congruence In what follows, let $n \in \mathbb{N}$ with $n \geq 2$ be a fixed natural number that we will call the **modulus** of our modular arithmetic system. With such an n given, we can then group integers into classes, by saying that two integers are in the same class, whenever their Euclidean division 3.2.2 by n will give the same remainder. We then say that two numbers are **congruent** whenever they are in the same class.

Example 6. If we choose $n = 12$ as in our clock example, then the integers -7, 5, 17 and 29 are all congruent with respect to 12, since all of them have the remainder 5 if we perform Euclidean division on them by 12. In the picture of an analog 12-hour clock, starting at 5 o'clock, when we add 12 hours we are again at 5 o'clock, representing the number 17. On the other hand, when we subtract 12 hours, we are at 5 o'clock again, representing the number -7.

We can formalize this intuition of what congruence should be into a proper definition utilizing Euclidean division (as explained previously in 3.2): Let a, $b \in \mathbb{Z}$ be two integers and $n \in \mathbb{N}$ a natural number, such that $n \geq 2$. Then a and b are said to be **congruent with respect to the modulus** n, if and only if the following equation holds

$$a \bmod n = b \bmod n \tag{3.12}$$

If, on the other hand, two numbers are not congruent with respect to a given modulus n, we call them **incongruent** w.r.t. n.

A **congruence** is then nothing but an equation "up to congruence", which means that the equation only needs to hold if we take the modulus on both sides. In which case we write

$$a \equiv b \pmod{n} \tag{3.13}$$

Exercise 12. Which of the following pairs of numbers are congruent with respect to the modulus 13: $(5,19)$, $(13,0)$, $(-4,9)$, $(0,0)$.

Exercise 13. Find all integers x, such that the congruence $x \equiv 4 \pmod{6}$ is satisfied.

Computational Rules Having defined the notion of a congruence as an equation "up to a modulus", a follow up question is if we can manipulate a congruence similar to an equation. Indeed we can almost apply the same substitution rules to a congruency then to an equation, with the main difference being that for some non-zero integer $k \in \mathbb{Z}$, the congruence $a \equiv b \pmod{n}$ is equivalent to the congruence $k \cdot a \equiv k \cdot b \pmod{n}$ only, if k and the modulus n are coprime 3.2.2. The following list gives a set of useful rules:

Suppose that integers $a_1, a_2, b_1, b_2, k \in \mathbb{Z}$ are given. Then the following arithmetic rules hold for congruencies:

- $a_1 \equiv b_1 \pmod{n} \Leftrightarrow a_1 + k \equiv b_1 + k \pmod{n}$ (compatibility with translation)
- $a_1 \equiv b_1 \pmod{n} \Rightarrow k \cdot a_1 \equiv k \cdot b_1 \pmod{n}$ (compatibility with scaling)
- $gcd(k,n) = 1$ and $k \cdot a_1 \equiv k \cdot b_1 \pmod{n} \Rightarrow a_1 \equiv b_1 \pmod{n}$
- $k \cdot a_1 \equiv k \cdot b_1 \pmod{k \cdot n} \Rightarrow a_1 \equiv b_1 \pmod{n}$
- $a_1 \equiv b_1 \pmod{n}$ and $a_2 \equiv b_2 \pmod{n} \Rightarrow a_1 + a_2 \equiv b_1 + b_2 \pmod{n}$ (compatibility with addition)
- $a_1 \equiv b_1 \pmod{n}$ and $a_2 \equiv b_2 \pmod{n} \Rightarrow a_1 \cdot a_2 \equiv b_1 \cdot b_2 \pmod{n}$ (compatibility with multiplication)

Other rules, such as compatibility with subtraction, follow from the rules above. For example, compatibility with subtraction follows from compatibility with scaling by $k = -1$ and compatibility with addition.

Another property of congruencies, not known in the traditional arithmetic of integers is **Fermat's Little Theorem**. In simple words, it states that, in modular arithmetic, every number raised to the power of a prime number modulus is congruent to the number itself. Or, to be more precise, if $p \in \mathbb{P}$ is a prime number and $k \in \mathbb{Z}$ is an integer, then:

$$k^p \equiv k \pmod{p}, \tag{3.14}$$

If k is coprime to p, then we can divide both sides of this congruence by k and rewrite the expression into the equivalent form

$$k^{p-1} \equiv 1 \pmod{p} \tag{3.15}$$

The following sage code computes example effects of Fermat's little theorem and highlights the effects of the exponent k being coprime and not coprime to p:

```
sage: (ZZ(7)* (ZZ(2)*ZZ(4) + ZZ(21)) + ZZ(11))  % ZZ(6) == (ZZ
   (4) - ZZ(102))  % ZZ(6)
True
sage: (ZZ(7)* (ZZ(2)*ZZ(76) + ZZ(21)) + ZZ(11))  % ZZ(6) == (
   ZZ(76) - ZZ(102))  % ZZ(6)
True
```

Let's compute an example that contains most of the concepts described in this section:

Example 7. Assume that we consider the modulus 6 and that our task is to solve the following congruence for $x \in \mathbb{Z}$

$$7 \cdot (2x+21) + 11 \equiv x - 102 \pmod{6}$$

As many rules for congruencies are more or less same as for integers, we can proceed in a similar way as we would if we had an equation to solve. Since both sides of a congruence contain ordinary integers, we can rewrite the left side as follows: $7 \cdot (2x+21) + 11 = 14x + 147 + 11 = 14x + 158$. We can therefore rewrite the congruence into the equivalent form

$$14x + 158 \equiv x - 102 \pmod{6}$$

In the next step we want to shift all instances of x to left and every other term to the right. So we apply the"compatibility with translation" rules two times. In a first step we choose $k = -x$ and in a second step we choose $k = -158$. Since "compatibility with translation" transforms a congruence into an equivalent form, the solution set will not change and we get

$$\begin{aligned}
14x + 158 \equiv x - 102 \pmod{6} &\Leftrightarrow \\
14x - x + 158 - 158 \equiv x - x - 102 - 158 \pmod{6} &\Leftrightarrow \\
13x \equiv -260 \pmod{6} &
\end{aligned}$$

If our congruence would just be a normal integer equation, we would divide both sides by 13 to get $x = -20$ as our solution. However, in case of a congruence, we need to make sure that the modulus and the number we want to divide by are coprime first – only then will we get an equivalent expression (See rule XXX). So we need to find the greatest common divisor $gcd(13,6)$. Since 13 is prime and 6 is not a multiple of 13, we know that$gcd(13,6) = 1$, so these numbers are indeed coprime. We therefore compute

$$13x \equiv -260 \pmod{6} \Leftrightarrow x \equiv -20 \pmod{6}$$

Our task is now to find all integers x, such that x is congruent to -20 with respect to the modulus 6. So we have to find all x such

$$x \bmod 6 = -20 \bmod 6$$

Since $-4 \cdot 6 + 4 = -20$ we know $-20 \bmod 6 = 4$ and hence we know that $x = 4$ is a solution to this congruence. However, 22 is another solution since $22 \bmod 6 = 4$ as well, and so is -20. In fact, there are infinitely many solutions given by the set

$$\{\ldots,-8,-2,4,10,16,\ldots\} = \{4 + k \cdot 6 \mid k \in \mathbb{Z}\}$$

Putting all this together, we have shown that the every x from the set $\{x = 4 + k \cdot 6 \mid k \in \mathbb{Z}\}$ is a solution to the congruence $7 \cdot (2x+21) + 11 \equiv x - 102 \pmod{6}$. We double ckeck for, say, $x = 4$ as well as $x = 4 + 12 \cdot 6 = 76$ using sage:

```
sage: CRT_list([4,1,3,0], [7,3,5,11])
88
```

Readers who had not been familiar with modular arithmetic until now and who might be discouraged by how complicated modular arithmetic seems at this point, should keep two things in mind. First, computing congruencies in modular arithmetic is not really more complicated than computations in more familiar number systems (e.g. rational numbers), it is just a matter of getting used to it. Second, once we introduce the idea of remainder class representations 3.3, computations become conceptually cleaner and more easy to handle.

Exercise 14. Consider the modulus 13 and find all solutions $x \in \mathbb{Z}$ to the following congruence $5x+4 \equiv 28+2x \pmod{13}$

Exercise 15. Consider the modulus 23 and find all solutions $x \in \mathbb{Z}$ to the following congruence $69x \equiv 5 \pmod{23}$

Exercise 16. Consider the modulus 23 and find all solutions $x \in \mathbb{Z}$ to the following congruence $69x \equiv 46 \pmod{23}$

Exercise 17. Let a,b,k be integers, such that $a \equiv b \pmod{n}$ holds. Show $a^k \equiv b^k \pmod{n}$.

Exercise 18. Let a,n be integers, such that a and n are not coprime. For which $b \in \mathbb{Z}$ does the congruence $a \cdot x \equiv b \pmod{n}$ have a solution x and how does the solution set look in that case?

The Chinese Remainder Theorem We have seen how to solve congruencies in modular arithmetic. However, one question that remains is how to solve systems of congruencies with different moduli? The answer is given by the **Chinese reimainder theorem**, which states that for any $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and coprime natural numbers $n_1, \ldots n_k \in \mathbb{N}$ as well as integers $a_1, \ldots a_k \in \mathbb{Z}$, the so-called **simultaneous congruences**

$$\begin{aligned} x &\equiv a_1 \pmod{n_1} \\ x &\equiv a_2 \pmod{n_2} \\ &\cdots \\ x &\equiv a_k \pmod{n_k} \end{aligned} \tag{3.16}$$

has a solution, and all possible solutions of this congruence system are congruent modulo the product $N = n_1 \cdot \ldots \cdot n_k$.[2] In fact, the following algorithm computes the solution set:

check algorithm floating

Example 8. To illustrate how to solve simultaneous congruences using the Chinese remainder theorem, let's look at the following system of congruencies:

$$\begin{aligned} x &\equiv 4 \pmod{7} \\ x &\equiv 1 \pmod{3} \\ x &\equiv 3 \pmod{5} \\ x &\equiv 0 \pmod{11} \end{aligned}$$

Clearly all moduli are coprime and we have $N = 7 \cdot 3 \cdot 5 \cdot 11 = 1155$, as well as $N_1 = 165$, $N_2 = 385$, $N_3 = 231$ and $N_4 = 105$. From this we calculate with the extended Euclidean algorithm

$$\begin{aligned} 1 &= 2 \cdot 165 + -47 \cdot 7 \\ 1 &= 1 \cdot 385 + -128 \cdot 3 \\ 1 &= 1 \cdot 231 + -46 \cdot 5 \\ 1 &= 2 \cdot 105 + -19 \cdot 11 \end{aligned}$$

[2] This is the classical Chinese remainder theorem as it was already known in ancient China. Under certain circumstances, the theorem can be extended to non-coprime moduli $n_1, \ldots, n_k$ but this is beyond the scope of this book. Interested readers should consult XXX add references

Algorithm 2 Chinese Remainder Theorem

Require: $, k \in \mathbb{Z}$, $j \in \mathbb{N}_0$ and $n_0, \ldots, n_{k-1} \in \mathbb{N}$ coprime
  procedure CONGRUENCE-SYSTEMS-SOLVER($a_0, \ldots, a_{k-1}$)
    $N \leftarrow n_0 \cdot \ldots \cdot n_{k-1}$
    while $j < k$ **do**
      $N_j \leftarrow N/n_j$
      $(\_, s_j, t_j) \leftarrow EXT - EUCLID(N_j, n_j)$ $\triangleright\ 1 = s_j \cdot N_j + t_j \cdot n_j$
    end while
    $x' \leftarrow \sum_{j=0}^{k-1} a_j \cdot s_j \cdot N_j$
    $x \leftarrow x' \bmod N$
    return $\{x + m \cdot N \mid m \in \mathbb{Z}\}$
  end procedure
Ensure: $\{x + m \cdot N \mid m \in \mathbb{Z}\}$ is the complete solution set to 3.16.

so we have $x = 4 \cdot 2 \cdot 165 + 1 \cdot 1 \cdot 385 + 3 \cdot 1 \cdot 231 + 0 \cdot 2 \cdot 105 = 2398$ as one solution. Because $2398 \bmod 1155 = 88$ the set of all solutions is $\{\ldots, -2222, -1067, 88, 1243, 2398, \ldots\}$. We can invoke Sage's computation of the Chinese Remainder Theorem (CRT) to double check our findings:

```
sage: Z6 = Integers(6)
sage: Z6(2) + Z6(5)
1
sage: Z6(7)*(Z6(2)*Z6(4)+Z6(21))+Z6(11) == Z6(4) - Z6(102)
True
```

Remainder Class Representation As we have seen in various examples before, computing congruencies can be cumbersome and solution sets are large in general. It is therefore advantaegous to find some kind of simplification for modular arithmetic.

Fortunately, this is possible and relatively straightforward once we identify each set of numbers with equal remainder with that remainder itself and call it the **remainder class** or **residue class** representation in modulo n arithmetic.

It then follows from the properties of Euclidean division that there are exactly n different remainder classes for every modulus n and that integer addition and multiplication can be projected to a new kind of addition and multiplication on those classes.

Roughly speaking, the new rules for addition and multiplication are then computed by taking any element of the first remainder class and some element of the second, then add or multiply them in the usual way and see which remainder class the result is contained in. The following example makes this abstract description more concrete:

Example 9 (Arithmetic modulo 6). Choosing the modulus $n = 6$, we have six remainder classes of integers which are congruent modulo 6 (they have the same remainder when divided by 6) and when we identify each of those remainder classes with the remainder, we get the following identification:

$$
\begin{aligned}
0 &:= \{\dots,-6,0,6,12,\dots\}\\
1 &:= \{\dots,-5,1,7,13,\dots\}\\
2 &:= \{\dots,-4,2,8,14,\dots\}\\
3 &:= \{\dots,-3,3,9,15,\dots\}\\
4 &:= \{\dots,-2,4,10,16,\dots\}\\
5 &:= \{\dots,-1,5,11,17,\dots\}
\end{aligned}
$$

Now to compute the new addition law of those remainder class representatives, say $2+5$, one chooses arbitrary elements from both classes, say 14 and -1, adds those numbers in the usual way and then looks at the remainder class of the result.

So we get $14+(-1)=13$, and 13 is in the remainder class (of) 1. Hence we find that $2+5=1$ in modular 6 arithmetic, which is a more readable way to write the congruence $2+5 \equiv 1 \pmod 6$.

Applying the same reasoning to all remainder classes, addition and multiplication can be transferred to the representatives of the remainder classes. The results for modulus 6 arithmetic are summarized in the following addition and multiplication tables:

+	0	1	2	3	4	5
0	0	1	2	3	4	5
1	1	2	3	4	5	0
2	2	3	4	5	0	1
3	3	4	5	0	1	2
4	4	5	0	1	2	3
5	5	0	1	2	3	4

·	0	1	2	3	4	5
0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1	0	1	2	3	4	5
2	0	2	4	0	2	4
3	0	3	0	3	0	3
4	0	4	2	0	4	2
5	0	5	4	3	2	1

This way, we have defined a new arithmetic system that contains just 6 numbers and comes with its own definition of addition and multiplication. We call it **modular 6 arithmetic** and write the associated type as $\mathbb{Z}_6$.

To see why such an identification of a remainder class with its remainder is useful and actually simplifies congruence computations a lot, let's go back to the congruence from example 7 again:

$$7\cdot(2x+21)+11 \equiv x-102 \pmod 6 \tag{3.17}$$

As shown in example 7, the arithmetic of congruencies can deviate from ordinary arithmetic: For example, division needs to check whether the modulus and the dividend are coprimes, and solutions are not unique in general.

We can rewrite this congruence as an **equation** over our new arithmetic type $\mathbb{Z}_6$ by **projecting onto the remainder classes**. In particular, since $7 \bmod 6 = 1$, $21 \bmod 6 = 3$, $11 \bmod 6 = 5$ and $102 \bmod 6 = 0$ we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
&7\cdot(2x+21)+11 \equiv x-102 \pmod 6 \text{ over } \mathbb{Z}\\
&\qquad\qquad\qquad\Leftrightarrow\ 1\cdot(2x+3)+5 = x \text{ over } \mathbb{Z}_6
\end{aligned}
$$

We can use the multiplication and addition table above to solves the equation on the right like we would solve normal integer equations:

$$
\begin{aligned}
1\cdot(2x+3)+5 &= x \\
2x+3+5 &= x && \text{\# addition-table: } 3+5=2 \\
2x+2 &= x && \text{\# add 4 and } -x \text{ on both sides} \\
2x+2+4-x &= x+4-x && \text{\# addition-table: } 2+4=0 \\
x &= 4
\end{aligned}
$$

As we can see, despite the somewhat unfamiliar rules of addition and multiplication, solving congruencies this way is very similar to solving normal equations. And, indeed, the solution set is identical to the solution set of the original congruence, since 4 is identified with the set $\{4+6\cdot k \mid k\in\mathbb{Z}\}$.

We can invoke Sage to do computations in our modular 6 arithmetic type. This is particularly useful to double-check our computations:

```
sage: ZZ(6).xgcd(ZZ(5))
(1, 1, -1)
```

Remark 2 (k-bit modulus). In cryptographic papers, we sometimes read phrases like“[...] using a 4096-bit modulus”. This means that the underlying modulus n of the modular arithmetic used in the system has a binary representation with a length of 4096 bits. In contrast, the number 6 has the binary representation 110 and hence our example 9 describes a 3-bit modulus arithmetic system.

Exercise 19. Define $\mathbb{Z}_{13}$ as the the arithmetic modulo 13 analog to example 9. Then consider the congruence from exercise 14 and rewrite it into an equation in $\mathbb{Z}_{13}$.

Modular Inverses As we know, integers can be added, subtracted and multiplied so that the result is also an integer, but this is not true for the division of integers in general: for example, $3/2$ is not an integer anymore. To see why this is, from a more theoretical perspective, let us consider the definition of a multiplicative inverse first. When we have a set that has some kind of multiplication defined on it and we have a distinguished element of that set that behaves neutrally with respect to that multiplication (doesn't change anything when multiplied with any other element), then we can define **multiplicative inverses** in the following way:

Let S be our set that has some notion $a\cdot b$ of multiplication and a **neutral element** $1\in S$, such that $1\cdot a=a$ for all elements $a\in S$. Then a **multiplicative inverse** a^{-1} of an element $a\in S$ is defined as follows:

$$a\cdot a^{-1}=1 \tag{3.18}$$

Informally speaking, the definition of a multiplicative inverse is means that it “cancels” the original element to give 1 when they are multiplied.

Numbers that have multiplicative inverses are of particular interest, because they immediately lead to the definition of division by those numbers. In fact, if a is number such that the multiplicative inverse a^{-1} exists, then we define **division** by a simply as multiplication by the inverse:

$$\frac{b}{a}:=b\cdot a^{-1} \tag{3.19}$$

Example 10. Consider the set of rational numbers, also known as fractions, $\mathbb{Q}$. For this set, the neutral element of multiplication is 1, since $1\cdot a=a$ for all rational numbers. For example, $1\cdot 4=4$, $1\cdot\frac{1}{4}=\frac{1}{4}$, or $1\cdot 0=0$ and so on.

Every rational number $a \neq 0$ has a multiplicative inverse, given by $\frac{1}{a}$. For example, the multiplicative inverse of 3 is $\frac{1}{3}$, since $3 \cdot \frac{1}{3} = 1$, the multiplicative inverse of $\frac{5}{7}$ is $\frac{7}{5}$, since $\frac{5}{7} \cdot \frac{7}{5} = 1$, and so on.

Example 11. Looking at the set $\mathbb{Z}$ of integers, we see that with respect to multiplication the neutral element is the number 1 and we notice that no integer other then 1 or -1 has a multiplicative inverse, since the equation $a \cdot x = 1$ has no integer solutions for $a \neq 1$ or $a \neq -1$.

The definition of multiplicative inverse works verbatim for addition as well where it is called the additive inverse. In the case of integers, the neutral element with respect to addition is 0, since $a + 0 = 0$ for all integers $a \in \mathbb{Z}$. The additive inverse always exist and is given by the negative number $-a$, since $a + (-a) = 0$.

Example 12. Looking at the set $\mathbb{Z}_6$ of residual classes modulo 6 from example 9, we can use the multiplication table to find multiplicative inverses. To do so, we look at the row of the element and then find the entry equal to 1. If such an entry exists, the element of that column is the multiplicative inverse. If, on the other hand, the row has no entry equal to 1, we know that the element has no multiplicative inverse.

For example in $\mathbb{Z}_6$ the multiplicative inverse of 5 is 5 itself, since $5 \cdot 5 = 1$. We can also see that 5 and 1 are the only elements that have multiplicative inverses in $\mathbb{Z}_6$.

Now, since 5 has a multiplicative inverse in modulo 6 arithmetic, we can divide by 5 in $\mathbb{Z}_6$, since we have a notation of multiplicative inverse and division is nothing but multiplication by the multiplicative inverse. For example

$$\frac{4}{5} = 4 \cdot 5^{-1} = 4 \cdot 5 = 2$$

From the last example, we can make the interesting observation that while 5 has no multiplicative inverse as an integer, it has a multiplicative inverse in modular 6 arithmetic.

Tis raises the question which numbers have multiplicative inverses in modular arithmetic. The answer is that, in modular n arithmetic, a number r has a multiplicative inverse, if and only if n and r are coprime. Since $gcd(n,r) = 1$ in that case, we know from the extended Euclidean algorithm that there are numbers s and t, such that

$$1 = s \cdot n + t \cdot r \tag{3.20}$$

If we take the modulus n on both sides, the term $s \cdot n$ vanishes, which tells us that t mod n is the multiplicative inverse of r in modular n arithmetic.

Example 13 (Multiplicative inverses in $\mathbb{Z}_6$). In the previous example, we looked up multiplicative inverses in $\mathbb{Z}_6$ from the lookup-table in Example 9. In real world examples, it is usually impossible to write down those lookup tables, as the modulus is way too large, and the sets occasionally contain more elements than there are atoms in the observable universe.

Now, trying to determine that $2 \in \mathbb{Z}_6$ has no multiplicative inverse in $\mathbb{Z}_6$ without using the lookup table, we immediately observe that 2 and 6 are not coprime, since their greatest common divisor is 2. It follows that equation 3.20 has no solutions s and t, which means that 2 has no multiplicative inverse in Z_6.

The same reasoning works for 3 and 4, as neither of these are coprime with 6. The case of 5 is different, since $gcd(6,5) = 1$. To compute the multiplicative inverse of 5, we use the extended Euclidean algorithm and compute the following:

k	r_k	s_k	$t_k = (r_k - s_k \cdot a)$ div b
0	6	1	0
1	5	0	1
2	1	1	-1
3	0	.	.

We get $s=1$ as well as $t=-1$ and have $1=1\cdot 6-1\cdot 5$. From this, it follows that $-1 \bmod 6 = 5$ is the multiplicative inverse of 5 in modular 6 arithmetic. We can double check using Sage:

```
sage: Z5 = Integers(5)
sage: Z5(3)**(5-2)
2
sage: Z5(3)**(-1)
2
sage: Z5(3)**(5-2) == Z5(3)**(-1)
True
```

At this point, the attentive reader might notice that the situation where the modulus is a prime number is of particular interest, because we know from exercise 8 that in these cases all remainder classes must have modular inverses, since $gcd(r,n)=1$ for prime n and any $r<n$. In fact, Fermat's little theorem provides a way to compute multiplicative inverses in this situation, since in case of a prime modulus p and $r<p$, we get the following:

$$\begin{aligned} r^p &\equiv r \pmod{p} \Leftrightarrow \\ r^{p-1} &\equiv 1 \pmod{p} \Leftrightarrow \\ r\cdot r^{p-2} &\equiv 1 \pmod{p} \end{aligned}$$

This tells us that the multiplicative inverse of a residue class r in modular p arithmetic is precisely r^{p-2}.

Example 14 (Modular 5 arithmetic). To see the unique properties of modular arithmetic when the modulus is a prime number, we will replicate our findings from example 9, but this time for the prime modulus 5. For $n=5$ we have five equivalence classes of integers which are congruent modulo 5. We write this as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &:= \{\ldots,-5,0,5,10,\ldots\} \\ 1 &:= \{\ldots,-4,1,6,11,\ldots\} \\ 2 &:= \{\ldots,-3,2,7,12,\ldots\} \\ 3 &:= \{\ldots,-2,3,8,13,\ldots\} \\ 4 &:= \{\ldots,-1,4,9,14,\ldots\} \end{aligned}$$

Addition and multiplication can be transferred to the equivalence classes, in a way exactly parallel to Example 9. This results in the following addition and multiplication tables:

+	0	1	2	3	4
0	0	1	2	3	4
1	1	2	3	4	0
2	2	3	4	0	1
3	3	4	0	1	2
4	4	0	1	2	3

·	0	1	2	3	4
0	0	0	0	0	0
1	0	1	2	3	4
2	0	2	4	1	3
3	0	3	1	4	2
4	0	4	3	2	1

Calling the set of remainder classes in modular 5 arithmetic with this addition and multiplication $\mathbb{Z}_5$, we see some subtle but important differences to the situation in $\mathbb{Z}_6$. In particular, we see that in the multiplication table, every remainder $r \neq 0$ has the entry 1 in its row and therefore has a multiplicative inverse. In addition, there are no non-zero elements such that their product is zero.

To use Fermat's little theorem in $\mathbb{Z}_5$ for computing multiplicative inverses (instead of using the multiplication table), let's consider $3 \in \mathbb{Z}_5$. We know that the multiplicative inverse is given by the remainder class that contains $3^{5-2} = 3^3 = 3 \cdot 3 \cdot 3 = 4 \cdot 3 = 2$. And indeed $3^{-1} = 2$, since $3 \cdot 2 = 1$ in $\mathbb{Z}_5$.

We can invoke Sage to do computations in our modular 5 arithmetic type to double-check our computations:

```
sage: Zx = ZZ['x'] # integer polynomials with indeterminate x
sage: Zt.<t> = ZZ[] # integer polynomials with indeterminate t
sage: Zx
Univariate Polynomial Ring in x over Integer Ring
sage: Zt
Univariate Polynomial Ring in t over Integer Ring
sage: p1 = Zx([17,-4,2])
sage: p1
2*x^2 - 4*x + 17
sage: p1.degree()
2
sage: p1.leading_coefficient()
2
sage: p2 = Zt(t^23)
sage: p2
t^23
sage: p6 = Zx([0])
sage: p6.degree()
-1
```

Example 15. To understand one of the principal differences between prime number modular arithmetic and non-prime number modular arithmetic, consider the linear equation $a \cdot x + b = 0$ defined over both types $\mathbb{Z}_5$ and $\mathbb{Z}_6$. Since in $\mathbb{Z}_5$ every non-zero element has a multiplicative inverse, we can always solve these equations in $\mathbb{Z}_5$, which is not true in $\mathbb{Z}_6$. To see that, consider the equation $3x + 3 = 0$. In $\mathbb{Z}_5$ we have the following:

$$\begin{aligned}
3x+3 &= 0 && \text{\# add 2 and on both sides}\\
3x+3+2 &= 2 && \text{\# addition-table: } 2+3=0\\
3x &= 2 && \text{\# divide by 3 (which equals multiplication by 2)}\\
2\cdot(3x) &= 2\cdot 2 && \text{\# multiplication-table: } 2\cdot 2=4\\
x &= 4
\end{aligned}$$

So in the case of our prime number modular arithmetic, we get the unique solution $x = 4$. Now consider $\mathbb{Z}_6$:

$$\begin{aligned}
3x+3 &= 0 && \text{\# add 3 and on both sides}\\
3x+3+3 &= 3 && \text{\# addition-table: } 3+3=0\\
3x &= 3 && \text{\# division not possible (no multiplicative inverse of 3 exists)}
\end{aligned}$$

So, in this case, we cannot solve the equation for x by dividing by 3. And, indeed, when we look at the multiplication table of $\mathbb{Z}_6$ (Example 9), we find that there are three solutions $x \in \{1,3,5\}$, such that $3x + 3 = 0$ holds true for all of them.

Exercise 20. Consider the modulus $n = 24$. Which of the integers 7, 1, 0, 805, -4255 have multiplicative inverses in modular 24 arithmetic? Compute the inverses, in case they exist.

Exercise 21. Find the set of all solutions to the congruence $17(2x+5)-4 \equiv 2x+4 \pmod 5$. Then project the congruence into $\mathbb{Z}_5$ and solve the resulting equation in $\mathbb{Z}_5$. Compare the results.

Exercise 22. Find the set of all solutions to the congruence $17(2x+5)-4 \equiv 2x+4 \pmod 6$. Then project the congruence into $\mathbb{Z}_6$ and try to solve the resulting equation in $\mathbb{Z}_6$.

3.4 Polynomial arithmetic

A polynomial is an expression consisting of variables (also called indeterminates) and coefficients that involves only the operations of addition, subtraction and multiplication. All coefficients of a polynomial must have the same type, e.g. being integers or rational numbers etc. To be more precise an *univariate polynomial* is an expression

$$P(x) := \sum_{j=0}^{m} a_j x^j = a_m x^m + a_{m-1} x^{m-1} + \cdots + a_1 x + a_0 \,, \tag{3.21}$$

where x is called the **indeterminate**, each a_j is called a **coefficient**. If R is the type of the coefficients, then the set of all **univariate**[3] **polynomials with coefficients in** R is written as $R[x]$. We often simply use **polynomial** instead of univariate polynomial, write $P(x) \in R[x]$ for a polynomial and denote the constant term a_0 as $P(0)$.

A polynomial is called the **zero polynomial** if all coefficients are zero and a polynomial is called the **one polynomial** if the constant term is 1 and all other coefficients are zero.

Given an univariate polynomial $P(x) = \sum_{j=0}^{m} a_j x^j$ that is not the zero polynomial, we call the non-negative integer $deg(P) := m$ the *degree* of P and define the degree of the zero polynomial to be $-\infty$, where $-\infty$ (negative infinity) is a symbol with the properties that $-\infty + m = -\infty$ and $-\infty < m$ for all non-negative integers $m \in \mathbb{N}_0$. In addition, we write

$$Lc(P) := a_m \tag{3.22}$$

and call it the **leading coefficient** of the polynomial P. We can restrict the set $R[x]$ of **all** polynomials with coefficients in R, to the set of all such polynomials that have a degree that does not exceed a certain value. If m is the maximum degree allowed, we write $R_{\leq m}[x]$ for the set of all polynomials with a degree less than or equal to m.

Example 16 (Integer Polynomials). The coefficients of a polynomial must all have the same type. The set of polynomials with integer coefficients is written as $\mathbb{Z}[x]$. Examples of such polynomials are:

$$\begin{aligned}
&P_1(x) = 2x^2 - 4x + 17 && \# \text{ with } deg(P_1) = 2 \text{ and } Lc(P_1) = 2\\
&P_2(x) = x^{23} && \# \text{ with } deg(P_2) = 23 \text{ and } Lc(P_2) = 1\\
&P_3(x) = x && \# \text{ with } deg(P_3) = 1 \text{ and } Lc(P_3) = 1\\
&P_4(x) = 174 && \# \text{ with } deg(P_4) = 0 \text{ and } Lc(P_4) = 174\\
&P_5(x) = 1 && \# \text{ with } deg(P_5) = 0 \text{ and } Lc(P_5) = 1\\
&P_6(x) = 0 && \# \text{ with } deg(P_6) = -\infty \text{ and } Lc(P_6) = 0\\
&P_7(x) = (x-2)(x+3)(x-5) &&
\end{aligned}$$

[3]in our context the term univariate means that the polynomial contains a single variable only

In particular, every integer can be seen as an integer polynomial of degree zero. P_7 is a polynomial, because we can expand its definition into $P_7(x) = x^3 - 4x^2 - 11x + 30$, which is a polynomial of degree 3 and leading coefficient 1. The following expressions are not integer polynomials:

$$Q_1(x) = 2x^2 + 4 + 3x^{-2}$$
$$Q_2(x) = 0.5x^4 - 2x$$
$$Q_3(x) = 2^x$$

In particular Q_1 is not an integer polynomial, because the expression x^{-2} has a negative exponent, Q_2 is not an integer polynomial because the coefficient 0.5 is not an integer and Q_3 is not an integer polynomial because the indeterminant apears in the exponent of of a coefficient.

We can invoke Sage to do computations with polynomials. To do so, we have to specify the symbol for the inderteminate and the type for the coefficients (For the definition of rings see 4.2). Note, however that Sage defines the degree of the zero polynomial to be -1.

```
sage: Z6 = Integers(6)
sage: Z6x = Z6['x']
sage: Z6x
Univariate Polynomial Ring in x over Ring of integers modulo 6
sage: p1 = Z6x([5,-4,2])
sage: p1
2*x^2 + 2*x + 5
sage: p1 = Z6x([17,-4,2])
sage: p1
2*x^2 + 2*x + 5
sage: Z6x(x-2)*Z6x(x+3)*Z6x(x-5) == Z6x(x^3 + 2*x^2 + x)
True
```

Example 17 (Polynomials over $\mathbb{Z}_6$). Recall the definition of modular 6 arithmetics $\mathbb{Z}_6$ as defined in example 9. The set of all polynomials with indeterminate x and coefficients in $\mathbb{Z}_6$ is symbolized as $\mathbb{Z}_6[x]$. Example of polynomials from $\mathbb{Z}_6[x]$ are:

$$P_1(x) = 2x^2 - 4x + 5 \qquad \text{\# with } deg(P_1) = 2 \text{ and } Lc(P_1) = 2$$
$$P_2(x) = x^{23} \qquad \text{\# with } deg(P_2) = 23 \text{ and } Lc(P_2) = 1$$
$$P_3(x) = x \qquad \text{\# with } deg(P_3) = 1 \text{ and } Lc(P_3) = 1$$
$$P_4(x) = 3 \qquad \text{\# with } deg(P_4) = 0 \text{ and } Lc(P_4) = 3$$
$$P_5(x) = 1 \qquad \text{\# with } deg(P_5) = 0 \text{ and } Lc(P_5) = 1$$
$$P_6(x) = 0 \qquad \text{\# with } deg(P_5) = -\infty \text{ and } Lc(P_6) = 0$$
$$P_7(x) = (x-2)(x+3)(x-5)$$

Just like in the previous example, P_7 is a polynomial. However, since we are working with coefficients from $\mathbb{Z}_6$ now the expansion of P_7 is computed differently, as we have to invoke addition and multiplication in $\mathbb{Z}_6$ as defined in XXX. We get the following:

$$\begin{aligned}
(x-2)(x+3)(x-5) &= (x+4)(x+3)(x+1) && \text{\# additive inverses in } \mathbb{Z}_6\\
&= (x^2+4x+3x+3\cdot 4)(x+1) && \text{\# bracket expansion}\\
&= (x^2+1x+0)(x+1) && \text{\# compuation in } \mathbb{Z}_6\\
&= x^3+x^2+x^2+x && \text{\# bracket expansion}\\
&= x^3+2x^2+x
\end{aligned}$$

Again, we can use Sage to do computations with polynomials that have their coefficients in $\mathbb{Z}_6$ (For the definition of rings see 4.2). To do so, we have to specify the symbol for the indertemi-nate and the type for the coefficients:

```
sage: Zx = ZZ['x']
sage: p1 = Zx([17,-4,2])
sage: p7 = Zx(x-2)*Zx(x+3)*Zx(x-5)
sage: p1(ZZ(2))
17
sage: p7(ZZ(-6)) == ZZ(-264)
True
```

Given some element from the same type as the coefficients of a polynomial, the polynomial can be evaluated at that element, which means that we insert the given element for every ocurrence of the indeterminate x in the polynomial expression.

To be more precise, let $P \in R[x]$, with $P(x) = \sum_{j=0}^{m} a_j x^j$ be a polynomial with a coefficient of type R and let $b \in R$ be an element of that type. Then the **evaluation** of P at b is given as follows:

$$P(b) = \sum_{j=0}^{m} a_j b^j \tag{3.23}$$

Example 18. Consider the integer polynomials from example 16 again. To evaluate them at given points, we have to insert the point for all occurences of x in the polynomial expression. Inserting arbitrary values from $\mathbb{Z}$, we get:

$$\begin{aligned}
&P_1(2) = 2\cdot 2^2 - 4\cdot 2 + 17 = 17\\
&P_2(3) = 3^{23} = 94143178827\\
&P_3(-4) = -4 = -4\\
&P_4(15) = 174\\
&P_5(0) = 1\\
&P_6(1274) = 0\\
&P_7(-6) = (-6-2)(-6+3)(-6-5) = -264
\end{aligned}$$

Note, however, that it is not possible to evaluate any of those polynomial on values of different type. For example, it is not strictly correct to write $P_1(0.5)$, since 0.5 is not an integer. We can verify our computations using Sage:

```
sage: Z6 = Integers(6)
sage: Z6x = Z6['x']
```

```
sage: p1 = Z6x([5,-4,2])
sage: p1(Z6(2)) == Z6(5)
True
```

Example 19. Consider the polynomials with coefficients in $\mathbb{Z}_6$ from example again. To evaluate them at given values from $\mathbb{Z}_6$, we have to insert the point for all occurences of x in the polynomial expression. We get the following:

$$
\begin{aligned}
P_1(2) &= 2 \cdot 2^2 - 4 \cdot 2 + 5 = 2 - 2 + 5 = 5 \\
P_2(3) &= 3^{23} = 3 \\
P_3(-4) &= P_3(2) = 2 \\
P_5(0) &= 1 \\
P_6(4) &= 0
\end{aligned}
$$

```
sage: Zx = ZZ['x']
sage: P = Zx([2,-4,5])
sage: Q = Zx([5,0,-2,1])
sage: P+Q == Zx(x^3 +3*x^2 -4*x +7)
True
sage: P*Q == Zx(5*x^5 -14*x^4 +10*x^3+21*x^2-20*x +10)
True
```

Exercise 23. Compare both expansions of P_7 from $\mathbb{Z}[x]$ and from $\mathbb{Z}_6[x]$ in example 16 and example 19 , and consider the definition of $\mathbb{Z}_6$ as given in example 9. Can you see how the definition of P_7 over $\mathbb{Z}$ projects to the definition over $\mathbb{Z}_6$ if you consider the residue classes of $\mathbb{Z}_6$?

Polynomial arithmetic Polynomials behave like integers in many ways. In particular, they can be added, subtracted and multiplied. In addition, they have their own notion of Euclidean division. Informally speaking, we can add two polynomials by simply adding the coefficients of the same index, and we can multiply them by applying the distributive property, that is, by multiplying every term of the left factor with every term of the right factor and adding the results together.

To be more precise let $\sum_{n=0}^{m_1} a_n x^n$ and $\sum_{n=0}^{m_2} b_n x^n$ be two polynomials from $R[x]$. Then the **sum** and the **product** of these polynomials is defined as follows:

$$\sum_{n=0}^{m_1} a_n x^n + \sum_{n=0}^{m_2} b_n x^n = \sum_{n=0}^{max(\{m_1,m_2\})} (a_n + b_n) x^n \tag{3.24}$$

$$\left(\sum_{n=0}^{m_1} a_n x^n\right) \cdot \left(\sum_{n=0}^{m_2} b_n x^n\right) = \sum_{n=0}^{m_1+m_2} \sum_{i=0}^{n} a_i b_{n-i} x^n \tag{3.25}$$

A rule for polynomial subtraction can be deduced from these two rules by first multiplying the subtrahend with (the polynomial) -1 and then add the result to the minuend.

subtrahend

minuend

Regarding the definition of the degree of a polynomial, we see that the degree of the sum is always the maximum of the degrees of both summands, and the degree of the product is always the degree of the sum of the factors, since we defined $-\infty + m = -\infty$ for every integer $m \in \mathbb{Z}$.

Example 20. To given an example of how polynomial arithmetic works, consider the following two integer polynomials $P, Q \in \mathbb{Z}[x]$ with $P(x) = 5x^2 - 4x + 2$ and $Q(x) = x^3 - 2x^2 + 5$. The sum of these two polynomials is computed by adding the coefficients of each term with equal exponent in x. This gives the following:

$$\begin{aligned}(P+Q)(x) &= (0+1)x^3 + (5-2)x^2 + (-4+0)x + (2+5)\\ &= x^3 + 3x^2 - 4x + 7\end{aligned}$$

The product of these two polynomials is computed by multiplication of each term in the first factor with each term in the second factor. We get the following:

$$\begin{aligned}(P \cdot Q)(x) &= (5x^2 - 4x + 2) \cdot (x^3 - 2x^2 + 5)\\ &= (5x^5 - 10x^4 + 25x^2) + (-4x^4 + 8x^3 - 20x) + (2x^3 - 4x^2 + 10)\\ &= 5x^5 - 14x^4 + 10x^3 + 21x^2 - 20x + 10\end{aligned}$$

```
sage: Z6x = Integers(6)['x']
sage: P = Z6x([2,-4,5])
sage: Q = Z6x([5,0,-2,1])
sage: P+Q == Z6x(x^3 +3*x^2 +2*x +1)
True
sage: P*Q == Z6x(5*x^5 +4*x^4 +4*x^3+3*x^2+4*x +4)
True
```

Example 21. Let us consider the polynomials of the previous example but interpreted in modular 6 arithmetic. So we consider $P, Q \in \mathbb{Z}_6[x]$ again with $P(x) = 5x^2 - 4x + 2$ and $Q(x) = x^3 - 2x^2 + 5$. This time we get the following:

$$\begin{aligned}(P+Q)(x) &= (0+1)x^3 + (5-2)x^2 + (-4+0)x + (2+5)\\ &= (0+1)x^3 + (5+4)x^2 + (2+0)x + (2+5)\\ &= x^3 + 3x^2 + 2x + 1\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}(P \cdot Q)(x) &= (5x^2 - 4x + 2) \cdot (x^3 - 2x^2 + 5)\\ &= (5x^2 + 2x + 2) \cdot (x^3 + 4x^2 + 5)\\ &= (5x^5 + 2x^4 + 1x^2) + (2x^4 + 2x^3 + 4x) + (2x^3 + 2x^2 + 4)\\ &= 5x^5 + 4x^4 + 4x^3 + 3x^2 + 4x + 4\end{aligned}$$

```
sage: Zx = ZZ['x']
sage: A = Zx([-9,0,0,2,0,1])
sage: B = Zx([-1,4,1])
sage: M = Zx([-80,19,-4,1])
sage: R = Zx([-89,339])
sage: A == M*B + R
True
```

Exercise 24. Compare the sum $P+Q$ and the product $P \cdot Q$ from the previous two examples 20 and 21 and consider the definition of $\mathbb{Z}_6$ as given in example 9. How can we derive the computations in $\mathbb{Z}_6[x]$ from the computations in $Z[x]$?

Euklidean Division The arithmetic of polynomials share a lot of properties with the arithmetic of integers and as a consequence the concept of Euclidean division and the algorithm of long division is also defined for polynomials. Recalling the Euclidean division of integers 3.2.2, we know that, given two integers a and $b \neq 0$, there is always another integer m and a natural number r with $r < |b|$ such that $a = m \cdot b + r$ holds.

We can generalize this to polynomials whenever the leading coefficient of the dividend polynomial has a notion of multiplicative inverse. In fact, given two polynomials A and $B \neq 0$ from $R[x]$ such that $Lc(B)^{-1}$ exists in R, there exist two polynomials Q (the quotient) and P (the remainder), such that the following equation holds:

$$A = Q \cdot B + P \tag{3.26}$$

and $deg(P) < deg(B)$. Similarly to integer Euclidean division, both Q and P are uniquely defined by these relations.

Notation and Symbols 2. Suppose that the polynomials A, B, Q and P satisfy equation 3.26. We often use the following notation to describe the quotient and the remainder polynomials of the Euclidean division:

$$A \text{ div } B := Q, \qquad A \text{ mod } B := P \tag{3.27}$$

We also say that a polynomial A is divisible by another polynomial B if $A \text{ mod } B = 0$ holds. In this case, we also write $B|A$ and call B a *factor* of A.

Analogously to integers, methods to compute Euclidean division for polynomials are called **polynomial division algorithms**. Probably the best known algorithm is the so called **polynomial long division** .

algorithm-floating

Algorithm 3 Polynomial Euclidean Algorithm

Require: $A, B \in R[x]$ with $B \neq 0$, such that $Lc(B)^{-1}$ exists in R
  procedure POLY-LONG-DIVISION(A, B)
    $Q \leftarrow 0$
    $P \leftarrow A$
    $d \leftarrow deg(B)$
    $c \leftarrow Lc(B)$
    while $deg(P) \geq d$ **do**
      $S := Lc(P) \cdot c^{-1} \cdot x^{deg(P)-d}$
      $Q \leftarrow Q + S$
      $P \leftarrow P - S \cdot B$
    end while
    return (Q, P)
  end procedure
Ensure: $A = Q \cdot B + P$

This algorithm works only when there is a notion of division by the leading coefficient of B. It can be generalized, but we will only need this somewhat simpler method in what follows.

Example 22 (Polynomial Long Division). To give an example of how the previous algorithm works, let us divide the integer polynomial $A(x) = x^5 + 2x^3 - 9 \in \mathbb{Z}[x]$ by the integer polynomial $B(x) = x^2 + 4x - 1 \in \mathbb{Z}[x]$. Since B is not the zero polynomial and the leading coefficient of B is 1, which is invertible as an integer, we can apply algorithm 1. Our goal is to find solutions to equation XXX, that is, we need to find the quotient polynomial $Q \in \mathbb{Z}[x]$ and the reminder polynomial $P \in \mathbb{Z}[x]$ such that $x^5 + 2x^3 - 9 = Q(x) \cdot (x^2 + 4x - 1) + P(x)$. Using a notation that is mostly used in anglophone countries, we compute as follows:

$$
\begin{array}{r|rrrrrr}
 & & & X^3 & -4X^2 & +19X & -80 \\
\hline
X^2+4X-1 & X^5 & & +2X^3 & & & -9 \\
 & -X^5 & -4X^4 & +X^3 & & & \\
\cline{2-4}
 & & -4X^4 & +3X^3 & & & \\
 & & 4X^4 & +16X^3 & -4X^2 & & \\
\cline{3-5}
 & & & 19X^3 & -4X^2 & & \\
 & & & -19X^3 & -76X^2 & +19X & \\
\cline{4-6}
 & & & & -80X^2 & +19X & -9 \\
 & & & & 80X^2 & +320X & -80 \\
\cline{5-7}
 & & & & & 339X & -89
\end{array}
\tag{3.28}
$$

We therefore get $Q(x) = x^3 - 4x^2 + 19x - 80$ as well as $P(x) = 339x - 89$ and indeed we have $x^5 + 2x^3 - 9 = (x^3 - 4x^2 + 19x - 80) \cdot (x^2 + 4x - 1) + (339x - 89)$, which we can double check invoking Sage:

```
sage: Zx = ZZ['x']
sage: p = Zx(x^2-3)
sage: p.roots()
[]
sage: p.factor()
x^2 - 3
```

Example 23. In the previous example, polynomial division gave a non-trivial (non-vanishing, i.e non-zero) remainder. Of special interest are divisions that don't give a remainder. Such divisors are called factors of the dividend.

For example, consider the integer polynomial P_7 from example 16 again. As we have shown, it can be written both as $x^3 - 4x^2 - 11x + 30$ and as $(x-2)(x+3)(x-5)$. From this, we can see that the polynomials $F_1(x) = (x-2)$, $F_2(x) = (x+3)$ and $F_3(x) = (x-5)$ are all factors of $x^3 - 4x^2 - 11x + 30$, since division of P_7 by any of these factors will result in a zero remainder.

Exercise 25. Consider the polynomial expressions $A(x) := -3x^4 + 4x^3 + 2x^2 + 4$ and $B(x) = x^2 - 4x + 2$. Compute the Euclidean division of A by B in the following types:

1. $A, B \in \mathbb{Z}[x]$
2. $A, B \in \mathbb{Z}_6[x]$
3. $A, B \in \mathbb{Z}_5[x]$

Now consider the result in $\mathbb{Z}[x]$ and in $\mathbb{Z}_6[x]$. How can we compute the result in $\mathbb{Z}_6[x]$ from the result in $\mathbb{Z}[x]$?

Exercise 26. Show that the polynomial $B(x) = 2x^4 - 3x + 4 \in \mathbb{Z}_5[x]$ is a factor of the polynomial $A(x) = x^7 + 4x^6 + 4x^5 + x^3 + 2x^2 + 2x + 3 \in \mathbb{Z}_5[x]$ that is show $B|A$. What is B div A?

Prime Factors Recall that the fundamental theorem of arithmetic 3.6 tells us that every natural number is the product of prime numbers. In this chapter we will see that something similar holds for univariate polynomials $R[x]$, too[4].

The polynomial analog to a prime number is a so called an **irreducible polynomial**, which is defined as a polynomial that cannot be factored into the product of two non-constant polynomials using Euclidean division. Irreducible polynomials are for polynomials what prime numbers are for integer: They are the basic building blocks from which all other polynomials can be constructed. To be more precise, let $P \in R[x]$ be any polynomial. Then there are always irreducible polynomials $F_1, F_2, \ldots, F_k \in R[x]$, such that the following holds:

$$P = F_1 \cdot F_2 \cdot \ldots \cdot F_k \,. \tag{3.29}$$

This representation is unique, except for permutations in the factors and is called the **prime factorization** of P. Moreover each factor F_i is called a **prime factor** of P.

Example 24. Consider the polynomial expression $P = x^2 - 3$. When we interpret P as an integer polynomial $P \in \mathbb{Z}[x]$, we find that this polynomial is irreducible, since any factorization other then $1 \cdot (x^2 - 3)$, must look like $(x-a)(x+a)$ for some integer a, but there is no integers a with $a^2 = 3$.

```
sage: Zx = ZZ['x']
sage: p = Zx(x^7 + 3*x^6 + 3*x^5 + x^4 - x^3 - 3*x^2 - 3*x - 1
    )
sage: p.roots()
[(1, 1), (-1, 4)]
sage: p.factor()
(x - 1) * (x + 1)^4 * (x^2 + 1)
```

On the other hand interpreting P as a polynomial $P \in \mathbb{Z}_6[x]$ in modulo 6 arithmetic, we see that P has two factors $F_1 = (x-3)$ and $F_2 = (x+3)$, since $(x-3)(x+3) = x^2 - 3x + 3x - 3 \cdot 3 = x^2 - 3$.

Points where a polynomial evaluates to zero are called **roots** of the polynomial. To be more precise, let $P \in R[x]$ be a polynomial. Then a root is a point $x_0 \in R$ with $P(x_0) = 0$ and the set of all roots of P is defined as follows:

$$R_0(P) := \{x_0 \in R \mid P(x_0) = 0\} \tag{3.30}$$

The roots of a polynomial are of special interest with respect to it's prime factorization, since it can be shown that for any given root x_0 of P the polynomial $F(x) = (x - x_0)$ is a prime factor of P.

Finding the roots of a polynomial is sometimes called **solving the polynomial**. It is a hard problem and has been the subject of much research throughout history.

It can be shown that if m is the degree of a polynomial P, then P can not have more than m roots. However, in general, polynomials can have less than m roots.

Example 25. Consider the integer polynomial $P_7(x) = x^3 - 4x^2 - 11x + 30$ from example 16 again. We know that its set of roots is given by $R_0(P_7) = \{-3, 2, 5\}$.

On the other hand, we know from example 24 that the integer polynomial $x^2 - 3$ is irreducible. It follows that it has no roots, since every root defines a prime factor.

[4]Strictly speaking this is not true for polynomials over arbitrary types R. However in this book we assume R to be a so called unique factorization domain for which the content of this section holds.

Example 26. To give another example, consider the integer polynomial $P = x^7 + 3x^6 + 3x^5 + x^4 - x^3 - 3x^2 - 3x - 1$. We can invoke Sage to compute the roots and prime factors of P:

```
sage: import hashlib
sage: test = 'e3b0c44298fc1c149afbf4c8996fb92427ae41e4649b934
    ca495991b7852b855'
sage: hasher = hashlib.sha256(b'')
sage: str = hasher.hexdigest()
sage: type(str)
<class 'str'>
sage: d = ZZ('0x'+ str) # conversion to integer type
sage: d.str(16) == str
True
sage: d.str(16) == test
True
sage: d.str(16)
e3b0c44298fc1c149afbf4c8996fb92427ae41e4649b934ca495991b7852b8
    55
sage: d.str(2)
111000111011000001100010001000010100110001111110000011100000101
    00100110101111101111110100110010001001100101101111101110010
    01001000010011110101110010000011110010001100100100110111001
    00110100110010100100100101011001100100011011011110000101001
    01011100001010101
sage: d.str(10)
10298733624955409702953521232258132278979990064819803499337939
    7001115665086549
```

We see that P has the root 1 and that the associated prime factor $(x-1)$ occurs once in P and that it has the root -1, where the associated prime factor $(x+1)$ occurs 4 times in P. This gives the following prime factorization:

$$P = (x-1)(x+1)^4(x^2+1)$$

Exercise 27. Show that if a polynomial $P \in R[x]$ of degree $deg(P) = m$ has less then m roots, it must have a prime factor F of degree $deg(F) > 1$.

Exercise 28. Consider the polynomial $P = x^7 + 3x^6 + 3x^5 + x^4 - x^3 - 3x^2 - 3x - 1 \in \mathbb{Z}_6[x]$. Compute the set of all roots of $R_0(P)$ and then compute the prime factorization of P.

Lagrange interpolation One particularly useful property of polynomials is that a polynomial of degree m is completely determined on $m+1$ evaluation points, which implies that we can uniquely derive a polynomial of degree m from a set S:

$$S = \{(x_0, y_0), (x_1, y_1), \ldots, (x_m, y_m) \mid x_i \neq x_j \text{ for all indices i and j}\} \tag{3.31}$$

Polynomials therefore have the property that $m+1$ pairs of points (x_i, y_i) for $x_i \neq x_j$ are enough to determine the set of pairs $(x, P(x))$ for all $x \in R$. This "few too many" property of polynomials is used in many places, like for example in erasure codes. It is also of importance in snarks and we therefore need to understand a method to actually compute a polynomial from a set of points.

If the coefficients of the polynomial we want to find have a notion of multiplicative inverse, it is always possible to find such a polynomial using a method called **Lagrange interpolation**, which works as follows: Given a set like 3.31, a polynomial P of degree m with $P(x_i) = y_i$ for all pairs (x_i, y_i) from S is given by the following algorithm:

check algorithm floating

Algorithm 4 Lagrange Interpolation

Require: R must have multiplicative inverses
Require: $S = \{(x_0,y_0),(x_1,y_1),\ldots,(x_m,y_m) \mid x_i,y_i \in R, x_i \neq x_j$ for all indices i and j$\}$
  procedure LAGRANGE-INTERPOLATION(S)
    for $j \in (0\ldots m)$ **do**
      $l_j(x) \leftarrow \Pi_{i=0;i\neq j}^{m} \frac{x-x_i}{x_j-x_i} = \frac{(x-x_0)}{(x_j-x_0)} \cdots \frac{(x-x_{j-1})}{(x_j-x_{j-1})} \frac{(x-x_{j+1})}{(x_j-x_{j+1})} \cdots \frac{(x-x_m)}{(x_j-x_m)}$
    end for
    $P \leftarrow \Sigma_{j=0}^{m} y_j \cdot l_j$
    return P
  end procedure
Ensure: $P \in R[x]$ with $deg(P) = m$
Ensure: $P(x_j) = y_j$ for all pairs $(x_j, y_j) \in S$

Example 27. Let us consider the set $S = \{(0,4),(-2,1),(2,3)\}$. Our task is to compute a polynomial of degree 2 in $\mathbb{Q}[x]$ with coefficients from the rational numbers $\mathbb{Q}$. Since $\mathbb{Q}$ has multiplicative inverses, we can use the Lagrange interpolation algorithm from 4, to compute the polynomial.

$$
\begin{aligned}
l_0(x) &= \frac{x-x_1}{x_0-x_1} \cdot \frac{x-x_2}{x_0-x_2} = \frac{x+2}{0+2} \cdot \frac{x-2}{0-2} = -\frac{(x+2)(x-2)}{4} \\
&= -\frac{1}{4}(x^2-4) \\
l_1(x) &= \frac{x-x_0}{x_1-x_0} \cdot \frac{x-x_2}{x_1-x_2} = \frac{x-0}{-2-0} \cdot \frac{x-2}{-2-2} = \frac{x(x-2)}{8} \\
&= \frac{1}{8}(x^2-2x) \\
l_2(x) &= \frac{x-x_0}{x_2-x_0} \cdot \frac{x-x_1}{x_2-x_1} = \frac{x-0}{2-0} \cdot \frac{x+2}{2+2} = \frac{x(x+2)}{8} \\
&= \frac{1}{8}(x^2+2x) \\
P(x) &= 4 \cdot (-\frac{1}{4}(x^2-4)) + 1 \cdot \frac{1}{8}(x^2-2x) + 3 \cdot \frac{1}{8}(x^2+2x) \\
&= -x^2 + 4 + \frac{1}{8}x^2 - \frac{1}{4}x + \frac{3}{8}x^2 + \frac{3}{4}x \\
&= -\frac{1}{2}x^2 + \frac{1}{2}x + 4
\end{aligned}
$$

And, indeed, evaluation of P on the x-values of S gives the correct points, since $P(0) = 4$, $P(-2) = 1$ and $P(2) = 3$. Sage provides the following function:

```
sage: import hashlib
sage: def Hash5(x):
....:     hasher = hashlib.sha256(x)
....:     digest = hasher.hexdigest()
```

```
....:       d = ZZ(digest, base=16)
....:       d = d.str(2)[-4:]
....:       return ZZ(d,base=2)
sage: Hash5(b'')
5
```

Example 28. To give another example more relevant to the topics of this book, let us consider the same set $S = \{(0,4),(-2,1),(2,3)\}$ as in the previous example. This time, the task is to compute a polynomial $P \in \mathbb{Z}_5[x]$ from this data. Since we know from example 14 that multiplicative inverses exist in $\mathbb{Z}_5$, algorithm 4 applies and we can compute a unique polynomial of degree 2 in $\mathbb{Z}_5[x]$ from S. We can use the lookup tables from example 14 for computation in $\mathbb{Z}_5$ and get the following:

$$\begin{aligned}
l_0(x) &= \frac{x-x_1}{x_0-x_1}\cdot\frac{x-x_2}{x_0-x_2} = \frac{x+2}{0+2}\cdot\frac{x-2}{0-2} = \frac{(x+2)(x-2)}{-4} = \frac{(x+2)(x+3)}{1} \\
&= x^2+1 \\
l_1(x) &= \frac{x-x_0}{x_1-x_0}\cdot\frac{x-x_2}{x_1-x_2} = \frac{x-0}{-2-0}\cdot\frac{x-2}{-2-2} = \frac{x}{3}\cdot\frac{x+3}{1} = 2(x^2+3x) \\
&= 2x^2+x \\
l_2(x) &= \frac{x-x_0}{x_2-x_0}\cdot\frac{x-x_1}{x_2-x_1} = \frac{x-0}{2-0}\cdot\frac{x+2}{2+2} = \frac{x(x+2)}{3} = 2(x^2+2x) \\
&= 2x^2+4x \\
P(x) &= 4\cdot(x^2+1)+1\cdot(2x^2+x)+3\cdot(2x^2+4x) \\
&= 4x^2+4+2x^2+x+x^2+2x \\
&= 2x^2+3x+4
\end{aligned}$$

And, indeed, evaluation of P on the x-values of S gives the correct points, since $P(0) = 4$, $P(-2) = 1$ and $P(2) = 3$. We can doublecheck our findings using Sage:

```
sage: import hashlib
sage: Z23 = Integers(23)
sage: def Hash_mod23(x, k2):
....:       hasher = hashlib.sha256(x.encode('utf-8'))
....:       digest = hasher.hexdigest()
....:       d = ZZ(digest, base=16)
....:       d = d.str(2)[-k2:]
....:       d = ZZ(d, base=2)
....:       return Z23(d)
```

Exercise 29. Consider modular 5 arithmetic from example 14 and the set $S = \{(0,0),(1,1),(2,2),(3,2)\}$. Find a polynomial $P \in \mathbb{Z}_5[x]$ such that $P(x_i) = y_i$ for all $(x_i,y_i) \in S$.

Exercise 30. Consider the set S from the previous example. Why is it not possible to apply algorithm 4 to construct a polynomial $P \in \mathbb{Z}_6[x]$, such that $P(x_i) = y_i$ for all $(x_i,y_i) \in S$?

Bibliography

Jens Groth. On the size of pairing-based non-interactive arguments. *IACR Cryptol. ePrint Arch.*, 2016:260, 2016. URL `http://eprint.iacr.org/2016/260`.

P.W. Shor. Algorithms for quantum computation: discrete logarithms and factoring. In *Proceedings 35th Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science*, pages 124–134, 1994. doi: 10.1109/SFCS.1994.365700.

David Fifield. The equivalence of the computational diffie–hellman and discrete logarithm problems in certain groups, 2012. URL `https://web.stanford.edu/class/cs259c/finalpapers/dlp-cdh.pdf`.

Torben Pryds Pedersen. Non-interactive and information-theoretic secure verifiable secret sharing. In Joan Feigenbaum, editor, *Advances in Cryptology — CRYPTO '91*, pages 129–140, Berlin, Heidelberg, 1992. Springer Berlin Heidelberg. ISBN 978-3-540-46766-3. URL `https://fmouhart.epheme.re/Crypto-1617/TD08.pdf`.

Martin Albrecht, Lorenzo Grassi, Christian Rechberger, Arnab Roy, and Tyge Tiessen. Mimc: Efficient encryption and cryptographic hashing with minimal multiplicative complexity. Cryptology ePrint Archive, Report 2016/492, 2016. `https://ia.cr/2016/492`.