```
Pseudoprimes
 According to Fermat's liftle theorem, if n is
 prime and bez then
              b^n \equiv b \pmod{n}.
 The contrapositive of this statement says
  that
      "if b" \( b \) (mod n) for some integer b, then n is composite."
 This is true (why?)
  How about the converse of Fermat's
  little theorem? It is not always true.
  In other words, there are composite numbers n such that b^n \equiv b \pmod{n}
  is true for some bEI.
ex: Let n=341=11.31.
     By FLT (Fermat's Little Theorem)
         2^{10} = 1 \pmod{1}
2^{340} = (2^{10})^{34} = 1 \pmod{1}
     A/so, 2^{340} = (25)^{68} = (32)^{68} = 1 \pmod{31}
```

```
2340 = (mod 11.31)
         2340 = 1 (mod 341)
      => 23H1 = 2 (mod 341)
      but 341 is not prime.
Definition: Let bEZT and n be a composite
          positive integer. It b'a b (mod h)
           then n is called a pseudoprime
           to base b.
Note that, If ged (b, n) = 1, then we get
(by Corollary 4.5.1)
              b^{n-1} \equiv 1 \pmod{n}
ex: 341 is a pseudoprime to base 2 (as seen
    in the above example)
    561 = 3.11.17 [3 a pseudoprime as
            2560 = 1 (mod 561)
    and 645 is a pseudoprime as
            2644 = ( (mod 645)
There are infinitely many pseudoprimes to
any base b we wish to prove it for b=2.
First, a lemma
```

```
Lemma 6.1: Let d, n & Zt.
            If d \ln + hen (2^{d} - 1) \mid (2^{n} - 1).
Proof: exercise
Theorem: There are infinitely many
          pseudoprimes to base 2.
Proof: We'll show that if n is an odd
     pseudoprime to base 2 then m = 2 -1
     is also a pseudoprime to base 2
     We already have a pseudoprime to base
     2, which is 341. (Therefore, once we prove
     this theorem, we can say that 23th/1 is
     also a pseudoprime.)
Thus we can find an increasing sequence
     also a pseudoprime.)
     of pseudoprimes n, n, n, n, -. such that
               n_{k+1} = 2^{n_k} - 1 + k = 1, 2, 3, --
     with n, = 341.
     Okay, let's start!
     Let n be an odd pseudoprime to base 2.
     Then, n is composite and
              2"-1 = 1 (mod n).
     Then, n= dt ter some dt EZ with
```

1<d,t<n. We proceed to show that m=2n-1 is a pseudoprime. For this, we need to show that m is composite, and that $2^{m-1} \equiv 1 \pmod{m}$. First, let's prove that m is composite. Since d(n, by Lemma b.1, we've $(2^{n}-1)(2^{n}-1).$ Also, 1 < d < n, so $1 < 2^{n}-1.$ $2^{n}-1 (=m)$ is composite. Next, let's prove that $2^{m-1} \equiv 1 \pmod{m}$. We've $2^{n-1} \equiv 1 \pmod{n}$ $2^{m-1}-1=2^{kn}-1$ Mow, 2ⁿ-1 divides 2^{kn}-1 (by Lemma 6-) -. 2^{m-1} = 1 (mod m)

Hence, m is a pseudoprime to base 2. It we can show that 2" = 1 (mod n) and that b" \neq 1 (mod n) for some integer
b then it follows that n is composite
hence n is a pseudoprime to base 2. ex: We know 341 is a pseudoprime to base 2. Let's check whether it's pseudoprime to base 7 $7^3 = 343 \equiv 2 \pmod{341}$ $2^{10} = 1024 = 1 \pmod{341}$ $7^{340} = (7^3)^{1/3} = 2^{1/3} = 7$ $2^{3}.7 = 56 \neq 1 \pmod{341}$ · 341 is not a pseudoprime to base 7 Moreover, by the contrapositive of Fermat's little theorem, 34/ is composite. Carmichael Numbers There are composite integers that satisfy the condition

bn-1= 1 (mod n) for all b with gcdcb, n)=1. In other wards, n is a pseudoprime to each b that satisfy god (6, n) = 1. Such integers are called Carmichael numbers or absolute pseudoprimes. ex! Let's show that 561 is a Carmichael number. 561 = 3.11.17 Let b be s.t. god (b, 561)=1 Then, it follows that 9cd(b, 3) = 9cd(b, 11) = gcd(b, 17) = 1. Then, from Permat's little theorem, we've $b^2 = 1 \pmod{3}$ $b^{10} \equiv 1 \pmod{u}$ 616 = 1 (mod 17) -: 6560 = (b2)280 = ((mod 3) $b^{560} = (b^{10})^{56} = 1 \pmod{11}$ $b^{560} = (b^{16})^{35} \equiv (\pmod{17})$ Then, by Corollary 4.9.1, 6560 = 1 (mod 561)

Hence 6560 = 1 (mod 561)

for all b with gcd (6561) = 1. Carmichael conjectured, in 1912, that there are infinitely many Carmichael numbers. It was proved by Alford Granville, and Pomerance in 1992 after 80 years.