

## Math 445 Homework 2

Due Wednesday, Sept. 17

5. Show, by induction, that for every  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $f(n) = \frac{1}{2}n^4 + \frac{1}{3}n^3 + \frac{1}{6}n$  is an integer.

(Note, however, that it is *not* a multiple of  $n$  !)

We proceed by induction. For  $n = 1$ ,  $f(1) = \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{3} + \frac{1}{6} = 1$ , which is an integer. This gives us our base case. We now assume that  $f(n)$  is an integer and compute

$$\begin{aligned} f(n+1) &= \frac{1}{2}(n+1)^4 + \frac{1}{3}(n+1)^3 + \frac{1}{6}(n+1) = \\ &= \frac{1}{2}(n^4 + 4n^3 + 6n^2 + 4n + 1) + \frac{1}{3}(n^3 + 3n^2 + 3n + 1) + \frac{1}{6}(n+1) = \\ &= \left(\frac{1}{2}n^4 + \frac{1}{3}n^3 + \frac{1}{6}n\right) + \frac{1}{2}(4n^3 + 6n^2 + 4n + 1) + \frac{1}{3}(3n^2 + 3n + 1) + \frac{1}{6}(1) = \\ &= f(n) + \frac{1}{2}(4n^3) + \left(\frac{1}{2} \cdot 6 + \frac{1}{3} \cdot 3\right)n^2 + \left(\frac{1}{2} \cdot 4 + \frac{1}{3} \cdot 3\right)n + \left(\frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{3} + \frac{1}{6}\right) = \\ &= f(n) + 2n^3 + 4n^2 + 3n + 1, \end{aligned}$$

which is the sum of  $f(n)$ , an integer, and  $2n^3 + 4n^2 + 3n + 1$ , an integer. So  $f(n+1)$  is an integer, and so by induction,  $f(n)$  is an integer for every  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ . Note, however, that  $f(2) = f(1) + 2 + 4 + 3 + 1 = 11$ , which is not a multiple of 2....

6. Show that  $8321 = 53 \times 157$  is a strong pseudoprime to the base 2.  
[Do the calculations by hand....]

To show that 8321 is a strong pseudoprime to the base 2, we compute:

$$8321 - 1 = 8320 = 2 \cdot 4160 = 2 \cdot 4 \cdot 1040 = 2^3 \cdot 4 \cdot 260 = 2^5 \cdot 4 \cdot 65 = 2^7 \cdot 65.$$

So we first compute  $2^{65} \bmod 8321$ , noting that  $65 = 64 + 1 = 2^6 + 1$ , so we start squaring:

$$\begin{aligned} 2^2 &= 4, 2^4 = 4^2 = 16, 2^8 = 16^2 = 256, \text{ and } 2^{16} = 256^2 = 65536 = 8321 \cdot 7 + 7289 \equiv 7289 \\ &\bmod 8321. \text{ Then } 2^{32} \equiv 7289^2 = 53129521 = 8321 \cdot 6384 + 8257 \equiv 8257 \equiv -64 \bmod 8321, \\ &\text{and then } 2^{64} \equiv (-64)^2 = 4096 \bmod 8321, \text{ so } 2^{65} = 2^{64} \cdot 2^1 \equiv 4096 \cdot 2 = 8192 \equiv \\ &-129 \bmod 8321. \end{aligned}$$

This is neither 1 nor  $-1$ , so we start squaring:

$$\begin{aligned} 2^{130} &\equiv (-129)^2 = 16641 = 8321 \cdot 1 + 8320 \equiv 8320 \equiv -1 \bmod 8321. \text{ So that didn't take} \\ &\text{long; } 2^{260} \equiv (-1)^2 = 1 \text{ so the sequence of repeated squares reaches } -1 \text{ just before} \\ &\text{it reaches 1, and it reaches 1 (by the time the squarings reach raising 2 to the 8320,} \\ &\text{so 8321 passes the Miller-Rabin test for the base 2. But since } 8321 = 53 \cdot 157 \text{ is not} \\ &\text{prime, it is a strong pseudoprime to the base 2.} \end{aligned}$$

7. Show that  $\gcd(ab, n)$  divides  $[\gcd(a, n)][\gcd(b, n)]$ .

(There are at least 3 distinct proofs, depending on how you characterize gcd's?)

Proof #1, using  $(a, n) =$  product of prime powers, where we always choose the smaller exponent found in  $a$  and  $n$ ; or, symbolically, if  $a = \prod p_i^{\epsilon_i}$  and  $b = \prod p_i^{\delta_i}$ , then  $(a, b) = \prod p_i^{\gamma_i}$ , where  $\gamma_i = \min\{\epsilon_i, \delta_i\}$ . Then:

If we write  $a = \prod p_i^{\epsilon_i}$  and  $b = \prod p_i^{\delta_i}$ ,  $n = \prod p_i^{\eta_i}$ , then  $(a, n) = \prod p_i^{\gamma_i}$ , with  $\gamma_i = \min\{\epsilon_i, \eta_i\}$ ,  $(b, n) = \prod p_i^{\theta_i}$ , with  $\theta_i = \min\{\delta_i, \eta_i\}$ , and, since  $ab = \prod p_i^{\epsilon_i + \delta_i}$ ,  $(ab, n) = \prod p_i^{\phi_i}$ , with  $\phi_i = \min\{\epsilon_i + \delta_i, \eta_i\}$ .

But then to show that  $\prod p_i^{\phi_i} = (ab, n)|(a, n)(b, n) = \prod p_i^{\gamma_i + \theta_i}$ , it is enough to show that  $\phi_i \leq \gamma_i + \theta_i$  for every  $i$ , that is,  $\min\{\epsilon_i + \delta_i, \eta_i\} \leq \min\{\epsilon_i, \eta_i\} + \min\{\delta_i, \eta_i\}$ , i.e.,  $\min(x + y, z) \leq \min(x, z) + \min(y, z)$  for any  $x, y, z \geq 0$ . But if either of the terms on the rightside is  $z$ , then  $\min(x + y, z) \leq z \leq \min(x, z) + \min(y, z)$  (the first by definition of min, the second since one of the numbers is  $z$  and the other is  $\geq 0$ ). But if the terms on the right side are  $x$  and  $y$ , then  $\min(x + y, z) \leq x + y \leq \min(x, z) + \min(y, z)$ , as desired. This establishes our argument, so  $(ab, n)|(a, n)(b, n)$ , as desired.

Proof #2:  $(a, n)$  is the largest integer that can be expressed as  $(a, n) = ax + ny$  for  $x, y \in \mathbb{Z}$ . similarly, we may write  $(b, n) = bu + nv$ . So  $(a, n)(b, n) = (ax + ny)(bu + nv) = (ab)(xu) + n(ybu + axv + yv)$  and so can be expressed as an integer-linear combination of  $ab$  and  $n$ . But  $(ab, n)$  divides any number that can be so expressed, so  $(ab, n)|(a, n)(b, n)$ , as desired.

Proof #3:  $(a, n)|a$ , so  $(a, n)|ab$ , and  $(a, n)|n$ , so together these give  $(a, n)|(ab, n)$  (by the definition of  $(ab, n)$ ). So we can write  $(ab, n) = x(a, n)$ . To show that  $(ab, n)|(a, n)(b, n)$  then, it is enough to show that  $x|(b, n)$  (since then  $(ab, n) = (a, n)x|(a, n)(b, n)$ ). But to show this, it is enough to show that  $x|b$  and  $x|n$ . But:  $(ab, n)|n$ , so  $x(a, n)|n$ , so  $x|n$ . Further,  $k(m, n) = (km, kn)$ , since  $(m, n)|m, n$ , so  $k(m, n)|km, kn$ , so  $k(m, n)|(km, kn)$ , while  $k(m, n)$  can be expressed as a  $\mathbb{Z}$ -linear combination of  $km$  and  $kn$ , so  $(km, kn)|k(m, n)$ . So:

$x(a, n) = (ab, n) = ((a, n)\frac{a}{(a, n)}b, (a, n)\frac{n}{(a, n)}) = (a, n)(\frac{a}{(a, n)}b, \frac{n}{(a, n)})$ , we have  $x = (b\frac{a}{(a, n)}, \frac{n}{(a, n)})$ . So  $x|b\frac{a}{(a, n)}$  and  $x|\frac{n}{(a, n)}$ . But since  $(\frac{a}{(a, n)}, \frac{n}{(a, n)}) = 1$ , we can express  $1 = \frac{a}{(a, n)}u + \frac{n}{(a, n)}v$ , so  $b = \frac{a}{(a, n)}bu + \frac{n}{(a, n)}bv$ , and then  $x|b$  since it divides factors of both terms in the sum.

So  $x|b$  and  $x|n$ , so  $x|(b, n)$ , so  $(ab, n) = (a, n)x|(a, n)(b, n)$ , as desired.

8. (NZM, Problem 2.4.9) [For a pseudoprime, failing the Miller-Rabin test finds proper factors.]

Show that if  $x^2 \equiv 1 \pmod{n}$  and  $x \not\equiv \pm 1 \pmod{n}$ , then  $1 < (x - 1, n) < n$  and  $1 < (x + 1, n) < n$ .

If  $x^2 \equiv 1 \pmod{n}$  and  $x \not\equiv \pm 1 \pmod{n}$ , then we have  $n|x^2 - 1 = (x - 1)(x + 1)$ , but  $n \nmid x - 1$  (since  $x \not\equiv 1 \pmod{n}$ ) and  $n \nmid x + 1$  (since  $x \not\equiv -1 \pmod{n}$ ). But if  $(n, x - 1) = 1$ , then since  $n|(x - 1)(x + 1)$  we have  $n|x + 1$ , a contradiction. [E.g., problem #7 says  $n = (x^2 - 1, n)|(x - 1, n)(x + 1, n) = (x + 1, n)$ , so  $n|(x + 1)$ .] So  $(n, x - 1) > 1$ . Similarly, if  $(n, x + 1) = 1$ , then since  $n|(x - 1)(x + 1)$  we have  $n|x - 1$ , a contradiction. So  $(n, x + 1) > 1$ .  $(n, x - 1) \geq n$  implies  $(n, x - 1) = n$  (the gcd of two numbers cannot exceed the numbers), which in turn implies  $n|x - 1$  (since  $(a, b)|b$ ), a contradiction. So  $(n, x - 1) < n$ . Similarly,  $(n, x + 1) < n$ . So we have  $1 < (n, x - 1) < n$  and  $1 < (n, x + 1) < n$ , as desired.