

# Number Theory

October 22, 2019

## 1 Euclid's Algorithm

**Theorem 1.1** (Division Algorithm). *Given  $a, b \in \mathbb{Z}, b > 0$ , we can determine  $\exists q, r \in \mathbb{Z}$  s.t.  $a = qb + r$  with  $0 \leq r < b$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $S = \{a - nb : n \in \mathbb{Z}\}$ .  $S$  contains some non-negative integer. Let  $r$  be the least such integer, say  $a - qb$ . Then  $a = qb + r$ , so STP  $r < b$ .

Suppose  $b \leq r$ . Then  $0 < r - b = a - (q + 1)b \in S$ , and  $r - b < r$ .  $\nmid$  (choice of  $r$ ) □

If  $r = 0$ , i.e. if  $a = qb$  for some  $q \in \mathbb{Z}$ , then we write  $b|a$  and say “ $b$  **divides**  $a$ ” or “ $b$  is a **divisor** of  $a$ ”. If  $r \neq 0$ , then we instead write  $b \nmid a$  and say “ $b$  does **not divide**  $a$ ”.

Given  $a_1, \dots, a_n \in \mathbb{Z}$  not all 0, let  $I = \{\lambda_1 a_1 + \dots + \lambda_n a_n : \lambda_i \in \mathbb{Z}\}$ . Observe if  $a, b \in I, \ell, m \in \mathbb{Z}$ , then  $\ell a + mb \in I$ .

**Theorem 1.2.**  $I = d\mathbb{Z} = \{dm : m \in \mathbb{Z}\}$  for some  $d > 0$

*Proof.*  $I$  contains some positive integer. Let  $d > 0$  be the least such. Then clearly  $I \supseteq d\mathbb{Z}$ .

Conversely, let  $a \in I$  and apply **1.1** to obtain  $a = qd + r$  for some  $q, r \in \mathbb{Z}, 0 \leq r < d$ . Then  $r = a - qd \in I \implies r = 0$ , so  $d\mathbb{Z} \supseteq I$

$\therefore I = d\mathbb{Z}$  □

Note that  $a_i \in I \forall i$ , so  $d|a_i \forall i$ . Conversely, if  $c|a_i \forall i$  then  $c$  divides every element of  $I$ , so in particular  $c|d$ .

We write  $d = \gcd(a_1, \dots, a_n) = (a_1, \dots, a_n)$ , and say  $d$  is the **greatest common divisor** of the  $a_i$ .

**Corollary 1.3** (Bézout). *Let  $a, b \in \mathbb{Z}$ ,  $a, b$  not both 0. Then  $\exists x, y \in \mathbb{Z}$  s.t.  $ax + by = c \iff (a, b)|c$ .*

The division algorithm gives an efficient method for computing  $(a, b)$ .

**Theorem 1.4** (Euclid's Algorithm). *Suppose  $a > b > 0$ . Then:*

$$\begin{array}{ll} a = q_1 b + r_1 & 0 \leq r_1 < b \\ b = q_2 r_1 + r_2 & 0 \leq r_2 < r_1 \\ r_1 = q_3 r_2 + r_3 & 0 \leq r_3 < r_2 \\ \vdots & \\ r_{k-2} = q_k r_{k-1} + r_k & r_k \neq 0 \\ r_{k-1} = q_{k+1} r_k (+0) & \end{array}$$

and  $r_k = (a, b)$

*Proof.* We have  $r_k | r_{k-1} \implies \dots \implies r_k | a, r_k | b \implies r_k | (a, b)$ , so  $r_k \leq (a, b)$ . Note also that any  $m$  s.t.  $m | a$  and  $m | b$  also divides  $r_k$ . In particular,  $(a, b) | r_k$ , and thus  $(a, b) \leq r_k$ , hence  $r_k = (a, b)$ .  $\square$

Additionally, by working back up the algorithm, we can obtain a representation  $(a, b) = \lambda a + \mu b$  where  $\lambda, \mu \in \mathbb{Z}$

An integer  $n > 1$  is **prime** if its only positive divisors are 1 and  $n$ . Otherwise, we say  $n$  is **composite**.

**Corollary 1.5.** *Let  $p$  be a prime,  $a, b \in \mathbb{Z}$ . Then  $p | ab \iff p | a$  or  $p | b$*

*Proof.* It is clear that if  $p | a$  or  $p | b$ , then  $p | ab$ . Conversely, suppose  $p | ab$  but  $p \nmid a$ . Then  $(a, p) \neq p$ . By definition,  $(a, p) | p \implies (a, p) \in \{1, p\}$ , so  $(a, p) = 1$ . Now by **1.3** we can find  $x, y \in \mathbb{Z}$  s.t.  $1 = ax + by \implies b = b(ax + py) = x(ab) + (by)p$ , so  $p | b$ .  $\square$

**Theorem 1.6** (The Fundamental Theorem of Arithmetic). *Every integer  $n > 1$  can be written as a product of primes uniquely up to reordering*

*Proof.* We have existence by strong induction.

For uniqueness,  $n$  is the least integer with two distinct such representations, say  $n = p_1 \dots p_s = q_1 \dots q_r$  for  $p_i, q_j$  primes.

Then  $p_1 | q_1 \dots q_r \implies p_1 | q_j$  for some  $j$ . WLOG  $j = 1$ . Since  $p_1 > 1$  as 1 is non-primes,  $n/p_1 < n$ , and  $n/p_1 = p_2 \dots p_s = q_2 \dots q_r$  can be written in two distinct ways as a product of primes.  $\nmid$  (choice of  $n$ )  $\square$

If  $m = \prod_{i=1}^k p_i^{\alpha_i}, n = \prod_{i=1}^k p_i^{\beta_i}$  where  $p_i$  are distinct primes,  $\alpha_i, \beta_i \geq 0$ , then  $(m, n) = \prod_{i=1}^k p_i^{\gamma_i}$  with  $\gamma_i = \min\{\alpha_i, \beta_i\}$ . However, if  $m, n$  are large, it is much more "efficient" to compute the gcd via Euclid's algorithm.

An algorithm with input  $N > 0$  is said to run in **polynomial time** if it takes at most  $c(\log N)^k$  elementary operations to complete, where  $c, k > 0$  are constants independent of  $N$ . If the algorithm takes inputs  $N_1, N_2, \dots, N_s$ , the polynomial time means  $c(\max \log N_i)^k$ .

Examples of polynomial time algorithms:

- Adding and multiplying integers
- The gcd of two numbers via Euclid's algorithm

- Testing of primality

On the other hand, factoring a number into prime factors does not have a polynomial time algorithm, and it is conjectured that one does not exist. For instance, if  $N = p \cdot q$  with  $p, q$  primes of  $\sim 50$  digits each, to do trial division up to  $\sqrt{N}$  at a rate of  $2^9$  divisions per second, it would take approximately  $\sqrt{10^{100}}/2^9$  seconds, or about  $6 \times 10^{39}$  years. However, we can compute the gcd in milliseconds using Euclid's algorithm.

**Theorem 1.7.** *There are infinitely many primes. i.e.  $\pi(x) \rightarrow \infty$  as  $x \rightarrow \infty$*

*Proof.* Fix  $N > 1$ , let  $p$  be the largest prime  $\leq N$ . Let  $q$  be a prime factor of  $M = (2 \times 3 \times 5 \times \dots \times p) + 1$ . Then  $q > N$  since  $q \notin \{2, 3, \dots, p\}$ , but  $N$  was arbitrary.  $\square$

## 2 Congruences

Let  $n \geq 1$  be an integer. We write  $a \equiv b \pmod{n}$  if  $n|a - b$ . This defines an equivalence relation on  $\mathbb{Z}$ , and we will write  $\mathbb{Z}/n\mathbb{Z}$  for the equivalence classes induced by this relation, which are  $a + n\mathbb{Z}$  for  $0 \leq a < n$ . It is easy to check that  $(a + n\mathbb{Z}) + (b + n\mathbb{Z}) = (a + b + n\mathbb{Z})$  and that  $(a + n\mathbb{Z}) \times (b + n\mathbb{Z}) = (ab + n\mathbb{Z})$  are well defined operations, i.e  $n\mathbb{Z}$  is an ideal, and  $\mathbb{Z}/n\mathbb{Z}$  is the quotient ring.

**Lemma 2.1.** *Let  $a \in \mathbb{Z}$ . Then the following are equivalent:*

1.  $(a, n) = 1$
2.  $\exists b \in \mathbb{Z}$  s.t.  $ab \equiv 1 \pmod{n}$
3. The equivalence class of  $a$  generates the group  $(\mathbb{Z}/n\mathbb{Z}, +)$

*Proof.*

- (1)  $\implies$  (2):  $(a, n) = 1 \implies \exists b, c \in \mathbb{Z}$  s.t.  $ab + cn = 1$  by **1.3**, and hence  $ab \equiv 1 \pmod{n}$ .
- (2)  $\implies$  (1):  $ab \equiv 1 \pmod{n} \iff ab - 1 = kn$  for some  $k \in \mathbb{Z}$ , and so by **1.3**  $(a, n) = 1$ .
- (2)  $\iff$  (3):  $ab \equiv 1 \pmod{n} \iff 1 \in \langle a \rangle \leq \mathbb{Z}/n\mathbb{Z} \iff \langle a \rangle = \mathbb{Z}/n\mathbb{Z}$

$\square$

We write  $(\mathbb{Z}/n\mathbb{Z})^\times$  for the set of **units** (the elements with a multiplicative inverse) of  $\mathbb{Z}/n\mathbb{Z}$ . By **2.1**,  $(\mathbb{Z}/n\mathbb{Z})^\times$  contains precisely those classes  $a + n\mathbb{Z}$  such that  $(a, n) = 1$ . Note that if  $n > 1$  then  $\mathbb{Z}/n\mathbb{Z}$  is a field precisely when  $n$  is prime.

Let **Euler's  $\varphi$  function** be  $\varphi(n) := |(\mathbb{Z}/n\mathbb{Z})^\times|$  for  $n > 1$ , and let  $\varphi(1) = 1$ . Observe that  $\varphi(p) = p - 1$  for  $p$  prime. Moreover,  $\varphi$  is a multiplicative function:  $(m, n) = 1 \implies \varphi(mn) = \varphi(m)\varphi(n)$ .

**Corollary 2.2.** *Let  $G$  be a cyclic group of order  $n \geq 1$ . Then  $\varphi(n) = |\{g \in G : \text{ord}(g) = n\}|$ , the number of generators of  $G$ .*

**Theorem 2.3** (Euler-Fermat). *IF  $(a, n) = 1$ ,  $a, n \in \mathbb{Z}$ , then  $a^{\varphi(n)} \equiv 1 \pmod{n}$*

*Proof.* By Lagrange's Theorem, the order of  $a$  in the group  $(\mathbb{Z}/n\mathbb{Z})^\times$  divides the order of  $(\mathbb{Z}/n\mathbb{Z})^\times$ , which is  $\varphi(n)$   $\square$

**Theorem 2.4** (Fermat's Little Theorem). *If  $a, p \in \mathbb{Z}$  and  $p$  is prime, then  $a^p \equiv a \pmod{p}$ .*

*Proof.* If  $p|a$ , then this holds trivially. If  $p \nmid a$ ,  $(a, p) = 1$  and so by **2.3** we have  $a^{\varphi(p)} \equiv a^{p-1} \equiv 1 \pmod{p}$   $\square$

## Multiple Congruences

Can we find all  $x \in \mathbb{Z}$  s.t.  $x \equiv 4 \pmod{7}$  and  $x \equiv 5 \pmod{12}$ ?

Suppose we can find  $u, v \in \mathbb{Z}$  s.t.  $\begin{cases} u \equiv 1 \pmod{7}; & u \equiv 0 \pmod{12} \\ v \equiv 0 \pmod{7}; & v \equiv 1 \pmod{12} \end{cases}$ . Then we can write down

that  $x = 4u + 5v$ . Since  $(7, 12) = 1$ , by **1.3** there are some  $m, n \in \mathbb{Z}$  with  $7m + 12n = 1$ , and from Euclid's algorithm we can determine these to be  $m = -5, n = 3$ . Then we can find  $u = 12n = 1 - 7m; v = 7m = 1 - 12n$ , and substitution gives  $u = 36, v = -35$ , and so a solution to the original problem is  $4 \times 36 - 5 \times 35 = -31$ . Now the lowest common multiple of 7 and 12 is 84, and so our solution set is:  $\{x \in \mathbb{Z} : x \equiv -31 \pmod{84}\}$ .

We can in fact generalise this process:

**Theorem 2.5** (Chinese Remainder Theorem). *Let  $m_1, \dots, m_k$  be pairwise coprime positive integers, and let  $M = \prod_{i=1}^k m_i$ . Then given any integers  $a_1, \dots, a_k$  there is a solution  $x$  to the system of congruences:*

$$\begin{aligned} x &\equiv a_1 \pmod{m_1} \\ x &\equiv a_2 \pmod{m_2} \\ &\vdots \\ x &\equiv a_k \pmod{m_k} \end{aligned}$$

*Moreover, this solution is unique modulo  $M$ .*

Note that if  $x$  satisfies this system of equations, then so does  $x + tM$  for any  $t \in \mathbb{Z}$ , and so the complete set of solutions is  $x + M\mathbb{Z}$ .

*Proof.*

Uniqueness: If  $x, y$  satisfy the system, then  $m_i|x - y$  for all  $i = 1, \dots, k$ . Since no prime divides any two of the  $m_i$ ,  $M|x - y$  and hence  $x \equiv y \pmod{M}$ .

Existence: Write  $M_i = \frac{M}{m_i} = \prod_{j \neq i} m_j$  for each  $i = 1, 2, \dots, k$ . Since  $(m_i, m_j) = 1 \forall i \neq j$ ,  $(m_i, M_i) = 1$  for all  $i = 1, 2, \dots, k$ . Therefore, for each  $i = 1, 2, \dots, k$  we can find  $b_i \in \mathbb{Z}$  such that  $M_i b_i \equiv 1 \pmod{m_i}$  and  $M_i b_i \equiv 0 \pmod{m_j}$  for  $j \neq i$ . Then  $x = \sum_{i=1}^k a_i b_i M_i$  solves the system of congruences.  $\square$

If  $m_1, \dots, m_k$  are pairwise coprime, and  $M = \prod m_i$ , then map  $\theta : \mathbb{Z}/M\mathbb{Z} \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}/m_1\mathbb{Z} \times \dots \times \mathbb{Z}/m_k\mathbb{Z}$ , taking  $x \pmod{M} \mapsto (x \pmod{m_1}, \dots, x \pmod{m_k})$  is an isomorphism of rings. To see this, note that if  $m_i|M$  then  $x \pmod{m_i}$  is determined by  $x \pmod{M}$  which implies that  $\theta$  is well-defined. It is a homomorphism by the properties of  $+, \times$  in  $\mathbb{Z}/n\mathbb{Z}$ , and **2.5** implies that  $\theta$  is a bijection. In particular, if  $n = p_1^{\alpha_1} \dots p_k^{\alpha_k}$  for distinct primes  $p_i$ , then  $\mathbb{Z}/n\mathbb{Z} \cong \mathbb{Z}/p_1^{\alpha_1}\mathbb{Z} \times \dots \times \mathbb{Z}/p_k^{\alpha_k}\mathbb{Z}$ .

**Corollary 2.6.** *If  $m_1, \dots, m_k$  are pairwise coprime and  $M = \prod_{i=1}^k m_i$  and  $a_1, \dots, a_k \in \mathbb{Z}$  are such that  $(a_i, m_i) = 1$  for each  $i = 1, 2, \dots, k$ , then there is a solution to the system of congruences in **2.5**, and any such solution is in fact coprime to  $M$ .*

*Proof.* **2.5** gives us a solution, say  $x \in \mathbb{Z}$ . Suppose  $(x, M) > 1$ . Then there is a prime  $p$  such that  $p|x$  and  $p|M$  simultaneously.  $p$  prime, so WLOG suppose that  $p$  divides  $m_1$ . Since  $x \equiv a_1 \pmod{m_1}$ , we must have  $p|a_1$ , and so  $p|(a_1, m_1) \nmid$ .  $\square$

**Corollary 2.7.** *If  $m_1, \dots, m_k$  are pairwise coprime with  $M = \prod_{i=1}^k m_i$ , then  $\varphi(M) = \varphi(m_1) \cdot \dots \cdot \varphi(m_k)$*

A **multiplicative function** is a function  $f : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$  such that, for all  $m, n \in \mathbb{N}$  coprime,  $f(mn) = f(m)f(n)$ . A function  $f : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$  is said to be **totally multiplicative** if for all  $m, n \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $f(m, n) = f(m)f(n)$ .

Some multiplicative functions are:

- $\varphi(m)$
- $\tau(n)$  = the number of positive divisors of  $n$
- $\sigma(n)$  = the sum of the positive divisors of  $n$
- $\sigma_k(n) = \sum_{d|n} d^k$ , so that  $\sigma_0(n) = \tau(n), \sigma_1(n) = \sigma(n)$ .

None of these are totally multiplicative however.

**Lemma 2.8.** *Let  $f$  be a multiplicative function. Then so is  $g$ , where  $g(n) = \sum_{d|n} f(d)$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $m, n \in \mathbb{N}, (m, n) = 1$ . Then the divisors of  $mn$  are precisely the integers of the form  $d_1 d_2$  where  $d_1|m, d_2|n$  and  $(d_1, d_2) = 1$ . This means that we can write down

$$\begin{aligned} g(mn) &= \sum_{d|mn} f(d) \\ &= \sum_{d_1|m} \sum_{d_2|n} f(d_1 d_2) \\ &= \sum_{d_1|m} \sum_{d_2|n} f(d_1) f(d_2) \\ &= \sum_{d_1|m} f(d_1) \sum_{d_2|n} f(d_2) \\ &= g(m)g(n) \end{aligned}$$

$\square$

Then if we let  $f(n) = n^k$  for some  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ . Then  $g(n) = \sum_{d|n} d^k = \sigma_k(n)$ . Later on, we shall see that we can recover  $f$  from  $g$  via Möbius inversion.

**Theorem 2.9.**

1. *If  $p$  is a prime and  $m \in \mathbb{N}$  then  $\varphi(p^m) = p^{m-1}(p-1) = p^m \left(1 - \frac{1}{p}\right)$*
2.  $\forall n \in \mathbb{N}, \varphi(n) = n \cdot \prod_{p|n} \left(1 - \frac{1}{p}\right)$
3.  $\sum_{d|n} \varphi(d) = n$

*Proof.*

1.

$$\begin{aligned}\varphi(p^m) &= |\{1 \leq a \leq p^m : (a, p^m) = 1\}| \\ &= p^m - p^{m-1} \\ &= p^m \left(1 - \frac{1}{p}\right)\end{aligned}$$

2. Let  $n = \prod_{i=1}^k p_i^{\alpha_i}$  for  $p_i$  distinct primes,  $\alpha_i \geq 1$ . Then:

$$\begin{aligned}\varphi(n) &= \prod_{i=1}^k \varphi(p_i^{\alpha_i}) \\ &= \prod_{i=1}^k p_i^{\alpha_i} \left(1 - \frac{1}{p_i}\right) \\ &= n \cdot \prod_{p|n} \left(1 - \frac{1}{p}\right)\end{aligned}$$

3.  $\varphi$  is multiplicative and so is  $n \mapsto n$ , so it suffices to check that both sides agree when  $n$  is a prime power. Let  $p$  be a prime  $m \in \mathbb{N}$ . Then:

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{d|p^m} \varphi(d) &= \varphi(1) + \varphi(p) + \dots + \varphi(p^m) \\ &= 1 + (p-1) + (p^2-p) + \dots + (p^m - p^{m-1}) \\ &= p^m\end{aligned}$$

□

Polynomials over  $\mathbb{Z}/n\mathbb{Z}$  can have varying numbers of solutions, e.g.:

1.  $x^2 + 2 \equiv 0 \pmod{5}$  has no solutions
2.  $x^3 + 1 \equiv 0 \pmod{7}$  has three solutions
3.  $x^2 - 1 \equiv 0 \pmod{8}$  has four solutions

Let  $R \in \{\mathbb{Z}, \mathbb{Q}, \mathbb{Z}/n\mathbb{Z}\}$  be a ring. Then we define  $R[x]$  to be the ring of polynomials with coefficients in  $R$ , with addition and multiplication given in the usual way.

**WARNING:** Two polynomials are *equal* if their coefficients are all equal, however the map from  $R[x]$  to the set of all functions  $R \rightarrow R$  is not necessarily injective. For instance, if  $R = \mathbb{Z}/p\mathbb{Z}$  for some prime  $\mathbb{Z}$ , then under this map  $x^p - x$  is the zero function by Fermat's little theorem.

**Theorem 2.10** (Division Algorithm for Polynomials). *Let  $f, g \in R[x]$ , and suppose that the leading coefficient of  $g$  is a unit (i.e. has a multiplicative inverse) in  $R$ . Then  $\exists q, r \in R[x]$  such that  $f = q \cdot g + r$  where  $\deg r < \deg g$ .*

*Proof.* We prove this by induction on  $n = \deg f$ . If  $\deg f < \deg g$ , then just take  $q = 0, r = f$ . Otherwise,  $f(x) = ax^n + \dots; g(x) = bx^m + \dots$  for  $a, b \neq 0, n \geq m, b = c^{-1}$  for some  $c \in R$ .

Then define  $f'(x) = f(x) - acx^{n-m}g(x)$  has degree  $< n$ . By the induction hypothesis, there is some  $q, r \in R[x]$  such that  $f'(x) = q(x)g(x) + r(x)$ , with  $\deg r < \deg g$ .

But now  $f(x) = (q(x) + acx^{n-m})g(x) + r(x)$ , and we are done. □

**Theorem 2.11** (Remainder Theorem). *let  $f \in R[x], \alpha \in R$ . Then there is some  $q \in R[x]$  such that:*

$$f(x) = (x - \alpha)q(x) + f(\alpha)$$

*Proof.* By 2.10 with  $g(x) = x - \alpha$ , there is some  $q \in R[x]$  and  $r \in R$  such that  $f(x) = (x - \alpha)q(x) + r$ . But now  $f(\alpha) = r$ , and the required equality holds.  $\square$

A (non-zero) ring  $R$  is said to be an **integral domain** if it doesn't have any zero divisors, i.e.  $ab = 0 \iff a = 0$  or  $b = 0$ . Note that  $\mathbb{Z}$  and  $\mathbb{Q}$  are integral domains, whilst  $\mathbb{Z}/n\mathbb{Z}$  is an integral domain if and only if  $n$  is prime (if  $n = pq$  is a proper factorization, then  $pq = 0$  in  $\mathbb{Z}/n\mathbb{Z}$ ).

**Theorem 2.12.** *Let  $R$  be an integral domain, and let  $f \in R[x]$  be a non-zero polynomial of degree  $n \geq 0$ . Then  $f$  has at most  $n$  roots in  $R$ .*

**Theorem 2.13** (Lagrange). *Let  $p$  be a prime, and let  $f(x) = a_n x^n + \dots + a_1 x + a_0 \in \mathbb{Z}[x]$  be a polynomial of degree  $n$  such that  $p \nmid p$ . Then the congruence  $f(x) \equiv 0 \pmod{p}$  has at most  $n$  distinct solutions.*

*Of 2.12.* By induction on  $n$ . Check  $n = 0$  - trivial.

Suppose  $n > 0$ . If  $f$  has no roots then we're done. Otherwise there exists  $\alpha \in R$  such that  $f(\alpha) = 0$ , and so by the remainder theorem,  $f(x) = (x - \alpha)q(x)$  with  $\deg q < \deg f = n$ . So by the induction hypothesis, we know that  $q$  has at most  $n - 1$  roots. But if  $\beta \in R$  is such that  $f(\beta) = 0$ , then  $0 = (\beta - \alpha)q(\beta)$ , and since  $R$  is an integral domain, we must have  $\beta = \alpha$  or  $q(\beta) = 0$ , and so  $f$  has at most  $n$  roots.  $\square$

**Example:** Let  $p$  be a prime,  $G = \mathbb{Z}/p\mathbb{Z}$ , and let  $f(x) = x^{p-1} - 1 - \prod_{\alpha \in G} (x - \alpha)$ . Observe that  $\alpha = 1, 2, \dots, p-1$ , then  $f(\alpha) = \alpha^{p-1} - 1 \equiv 0 \pmod{p}$ , so  $f$  has at least  $p-1$  roots.

But  $\deg f < p-1$  because the coefficient of  $x^{p-1} = 0$ . This means that  $f$  must be the zero polynomial, and hence  $0 = f(0) = -1 - (p-1)! \pmod{p}$ , and we have Wilson's theorem, that  $(p-1)! \equiv -1 \pmod{p}$ .

Example: Consider  $(\mathbb{Z}/7\mathbb{Z})^\times$ .

$3 \in (\mathbb{Z}/7\mathbb{Z})^\times$  since  $3 \cdot 5 \equiv 1 \pmod{7}$ ,  $3^6 \equiv 1 \pmod{7}$ , so 3 generates  $(\mathbb{Z}/7\mathbb{Z})^\times$ , and  $(\mathbb{Z}/7\mathbb{Z})^\times$  is cyclic.

**Theorem 2.14.** *If  $p$  is a prime, then  $G = (\mathbb{Z}/p\mathbb{Z})^\times$  is cyclic and of order  $p-1$ .*

*Proof.*  $|G| = \varphi(p) = p-1 = \sum_{d|p-1} \varphi(d)$

By Lagrange's Theorem,  $|G| = \sum_{a||G|} N_a$  where  $N_a = |\{g \in G : \text{ord}(g) = d\}|$ . Suppose  $G$  is not cyclic, so  $G$  does not contain an element of order  $p-1$ , so  $N_{p-1} = 0 < \varphi(p-1)$ , and so there must be some  $d$  for which  $N_d > \varphi(d)$ . Let  $\alpha$  be an element of order for such a  $d$ . Then  $\langle \alpha \rangle \leq G$  is cyclic of order  $d$ , so it has precisely  $\varphi(d)$  elements of order  $d$ . Since  $N_d > \varphi(d)$ ,  $\exists \beta \notin \langle \alpha \rangle$  s.t.  $\text{ord}(\beta) = d$ . This implies that the polynomial  $x^d - 1$  has  $d+1$  roots, namely  $1, \alpha, \dots, \alpha^{d-1}, \beta$  **2.12**.  $\square$

A positive integer is said to be a **primitive root modulo  $n$**  if  $\langle g \rangle = (\mathbb{Z}/n\mathbb{Z})^\times$ . Hence 2.14 says that primitive roots exist modulo  $p$  for all primes  $p$ .

For instance, take  $p = 19$ , and let  $d = \text{ord}(2)$  in  $(\mathbb{Z}/19\mathbb{Z})^\times$ . Then  $d|\varphi(19) = 18$ , so  $d = 18$  or  $d|6$  or  $d|9$ .  $2^6 = 64 \not\equiv 1 \pmod{19}$ , and  $2^9 = 512 \not\equiv 1 \pmod{19}$ , so  $d = 18$ , and 2 is a primitive root modulo 19.

There are many open problems concerning primitive roots:

1. Artin's Primitive Root Conjecture:

Given  $g \geq 1$  does there exist infinitely many primes  $p$  such that  $g$  is a primitive root modulo  $p$ . We do know that there are infinitely many primes for which one of  $\{2, 3, 5\}$  is a primitive root.

2. How large is the smallest primitive root modulo  $p$ ?

We can prove that it is  $\leq cp^{1/4+\epsilon}$  for some constant  $c > 0$  and for any  $\epsilon > 0$ . However, conditional on the Generalised Riemann Hypothesis (GRH), it is  $\leq c \log^6 p$  for constant  $c > 0$

Now consider  $(\mathbb{Z}/8\mathbb{Z})^\times = \{\pm 1, \pm 3\}$ . All of these have order 1 or 2, and hence  $(\mathbb{Z}/8\mathbb{Z})^\times$  is not cyclic. In fact, let  $\theta : (\mathbb{Z}/2^k\mathbb{Z})^\times \rightarrow (\mathbb{Z}/8\mathbb{Z})^\times$  map  $x \pmod{2^k}$  onto  $x \pmod{8}$ . Since  $(a, 2^k) = 1 \iff (a, 8) = 1$ ,  $\theta$  is surjective. Hence, for  $k \geq 3$  we have that  $(\mathbb{Z}/2^k\mathbb{Z})^\times$  is not cyclic, since a generator would map to a generator.

**Theorem 2.15.** *If  $p > 2$ ,  $(\mathbb{Z}/p^k\mathbb{Z})^\times$  is cyclic for  $k \geq 1$ .*

**Lemma 2.16.** *Let  $p > 2, k \geq 1, y \in \mathbb{Z}$ . Then*

1. *If  $x \equiv 1 + p^k y \pmod{p^{k+1}}$ , then  $x^p \equiv 1 + p^{k+1} y \pmod{p^{k+2}}$*
2.  *$(1 + yp)^{p^k} \equiv 1 + p^{k+1} y \pmod{p^{k+2}}$*

*Proof.*

$$1. x^p = (1 + p^k y)^p = \sum_{j=0}^p \binom{p}{j} (p^k y)^j = 1 + p^{k+1} y + \dots + p^{pk} y^p.$$

For  $2 \leq j \leq p-1$ ,  $p|\binom{p}{j}$ , so  $\binom{p}{j} (p^k y)^j \equiv 0 \pmod{p^{2k+2}}$ , and so  $\equiv 0 \pmod{p^{k+2}}$ .

Since  $p \geq 2, pk \geq k+2$ , so  $p^{pk} y^p \equiv 0 \pmod{p^{k+2}}$ , and therefore  $x^p \equiv 1 + p^{k+1} y \pmod{p^{k+2}}$

2. Let  $x = 1 + py$  and apply part 1  $k$  times.

□

**Lemma 2.17.** *Let  $p > 2, k \geq 1$ . If  $g$  is a primitive root  $\pmod{p}$ , and  $g^{p-1} \not\equiv 1 \pmod{p^2}$ , then  $g$  generates  $(\mathbb{Z}/p^k\mathbb{Z})^\times$  for all  $k \geq 1$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $d = \text{ord } g$  as a member of  $(\mathbb{Z}/p^k\mathbb{Z})^\times$ . Note that  $\varphi(p^k) = p^{k-1}(p-1)$ , and so  $d|p^{k-1}(p-1)$ .

If  $g$  is not a generator of  $(\mathbb{Z}/p^k\mathbb{Z})^\times$ , then one of the following holds:

1.  $d|p^{k-2}(p-1)$
2.  $d = p^{k-1}e$  where  $e|p-1, e \neq p-1$

We tackle each of these cases individually, and will see that they cannot be the case:



1. We thus have  $g^{p^{k-2}(p-1)} \equiv 1 \pmod{p^k}$ . We've already seen that  $g^{p-1} \equiv 1 \pmod{p}$  and  $g^{p-1} \not\equiv 1 \pmod{p^2}$ , and so there exists some  $y \not\equiv 0$  such that  $x := g^{p-1} = 1 + py$ .

Then we have  $x^{p^{k-2}} \equiv 1 + p^{k-1}y \pmod{p^k} \implies g^{p^{k-2}(p-1)} \equiv 1 + p^{k-1}y \pmod{p^k} \not\equiv 1 \pmod{p^k} \nmid$ .

2. Here, we have  $g^{p^{k-1}e} \equiv 1 \pmod{p^k}$ . Fermat tells us that  $g^p \equiv g \pmod{p}$ , and so  $g^{p^{k-1}} \equiv g \pmod{p} \implies g^{p^{k-1}e} \equiv g^e \pmod{p}$ . However,  $e < p$ , and so this is not  $1 \pmod{p}$ , and hence  $g^{p^{k-1}e} \not\equiv 1 \pmod{p^k} \nmid$ .

Hence the only case left is that  $g$  is a generator of  $(\mathbb{Z}/p^k\mathbb{Z})^\times$ .  $\square$

*Proof of 2.15.* Let  $g$  be a primitive root modulo  $p$ . If  $g^{p-1} \not\equiv 1 \pmod{p^2}$ , then  $(\mathbb{Z}/p^k\mathbb{Z})^\times = \langle g \rangle \forall k \geq 1$ .

Otherwise,  $g^p \equiv g \pmod{p^2}$ . Let  $h = (1+p)g$ , so that  $h^p \equiv (1+p)^p g^p \equiv g \pmod{p^2}$ . Observe that  $g \not\equiv h \pmod{p^2}$ , as  $g$  is a primitive root modulo  $p$ , so that  $(g, p) = 1$ .

So  $h^p \not\equiv h \pmod{p^2}$ , and so  $\langle h \rangle = (\mathbb{Z}/p^k\mathbb{Z})^\times \forall k \geq 1$ .  $\square$

**2.16** fails for  $p = 2$  because of the  $k = 1$  case in 1. However, it does hold if  $p = 2, k \geq 2$ . In particular,  $(1+4)^{2^{k-1}} \equiv 1 + 2^{k+1} \pmod{2^{k+2}}$ . So we have  $(\mathbb{Z}/2^k\mathbb{Z})^\times = \langle -1, 5 \rangle \cong \mathbb{Z}/2^{k-2}\mathbb{Z} \times \mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z}$  for  $k \geq 3$ .