

Lecture Notes

Keshav Ramamurthy

February 11, 2026

Contents

1		2
2		2
3 Modular Practice		2
3.1 (a)		2
3.2 (b)		2
3.3 (c)		2
3.4 (d)		2
3.5 (e)		3
4 Wilson's Theorem		3

1**2**

3 Modular Practice

3.1 (a)

notice

$$9x + 5 \equiv 7 \pmod{13} \rightarrow 9x \equiv 7 - 5 \pmod{13} \rightarrow 9x \equiv 2 \pmod{13}$$

then, notice that $9 \cdot 3 \equiv 27 \equiv 1 \pmod{13}$, so multiplying by 3 on both sides yields

$$9 \cdot 3 \cdot x \equiv 2 \cdot 3 \pmod{13} \rightarrow [x \equiv 6 \pmod{13}]$$

3.2 (b)

notice

$$3x + 12 \equiv 4 \pmod{21} \rightarrow 3x \equiv -8$$

then, we have that

$$3x \equiv 13 \pmod{21}$$

then, since the lhs is divisible by 3, notice that since the rhs is 13 mod 21, that this is equivalent to

$$21w + 13 \equiv 1 \pmod{3}$$

because the rhs and lhs have different parities mod 3, there are no solutions \square

3.3 (c)

let's write the systems first

$$5x + 4y \equiv 0 \pmod{7}$$

$$2x + y \equiv 4 \pmod{7}$$

notice that $y \equiv 4 - 2x \pmod{7}$, and that thus we can substitute that into the top equation yielding

$$5x + 4(4 - 2x) \equiv 0 \pmod{7} \rightarrow -3x + 16 \equiv 0 \pmod{7} \rightarrow 3x \equiv 16 \pmod{7} \rightarrow 3 \cdot 5 \cdot x \equiv 16 \cdot 5 \pmod{7}$$

This reduces to $x \equiv 3 \pmod{7}$ yielding $y \equiv 4 - 2x \equiv 5 \pmod{7}$

3.4 (d)

Notice

$$(13)^{2023} = (12 + 1)^{2023} \equiv (0 + 1)^{2023} \equiv 1^{2023} \equiv 1 \pmod{7}$$

3.5 (e)

By Fermat's little theorem, since 11 is prime, we have that

$$7^{11-1} = 7^{10} \equiv 1 \pmod{11}$$

Then,

$$7^{62} \equiv 7^{60}7^2 \equiv (7^{10})^6 7^2 \equiv 7^2 \equiv 5 \pmod{11}$$

4 Wilson's Theorem

Let us first show that if p is prime, that this holds. Then, we will prove the other direction. We'll first show every residue $r \pmod{p}$ except 0 has an inverse mod p . Notice if r has an inverse

$$\exists r^{-1} \in (\mathbb{Z}/p\mathbb{Z})^\times \mid rr^{-1} \equiv 1 \pmod{p}$$

We know that every number $r \in (\mathbb{Z}/p\mathbb{Z})^\times$ has an inverse by Bezout's identity, since $\gcd(r, p) = 1$. We claim that that the pairs

$$(1, 1), (p - 1, p - 1) (r_1, r_1^{-1}), (r_2, r_2^{-1}), (r_3, r_3^{-1}), \dots, (r_{\frac{p-3}{2}}, r_{\frac{p-3}{2}}^{-1})$$

contain all the numbers in $(\mathbb{Z}/p\mathbb{Z})^\times$ exactly once(except for 1 and $p - 1$)

Notice for any residue r , that it's inverse must be unique, as if r had two inverses i_1^{-1}, i_2^{-1} , then we'd have that

$$ri_1^{-1} \equiv ri_2^{-1} \equiv 1 \rightarrow r(i_1^{-1} - i_2^{-1}) \equiv 0 \rightarrow i_1^{-1} = i_2^{-1}$$

which is false my contradiction. However, it's inverse may not be distinct from r , so let's examine the case that $r \cdot r \equiv 1 \pmod{p}$

Notice this turns into

$$r^2 - 1 \equiv 0 \pmod{p} \rightarrow r \equiv 1, -1 \pmod{p}$$

So, two of our pairs are $(1, 1)$ and $(p - 1, p - 1)$, but the rest are distinct, which then contain $(\mathbb{Z}/p\mathbb{Z})^\times$

Thus, if every residue r must have a unique inverse, and an inverse exists for every residue, they have to pair up and contain all the numbers in $(\mathbb{Z}/p\mathbb{Z})^\times$ Now, notice that

$$(p - 1)! \equiv \prod_{i=1}^{p-1} i \equiv \prod_{i=1}^{\frac{p-3}{2}} (r_i r_i^{-1}) \cdot 1 \cdot (p - 1) \equiv (1)^{\frac{p-3}{2}} \cdot 1 \cdot -1 \equiv -1 \pmod{p} \quad \square$$