

# An Efficient Deterministic Primality Test: Proof

Joseph M. Shunia

May 2024

**Theorem 1.** *Let  $n \in \mathbb{Z}^+$  be a Carmichael number. Hence,  $n = p_1 p_2 \cdots p_m$  is odd, composite, and squarefree, where the  $p_i$  are distinct odd prime factors.*

*Let  $r \in \mathbb{Z}^+$  be the least odd prime such that  $r \nmid n(n-1)$ .*

*Consider the polynomial  $f(x) := (x+1)^n - x^n - 1 \in \mathbb{Z}[x]$ .*

*Let  $(x^r - 2, n)$  be the ideal generated by  $x^r - 2$  and  $n$  in the polynomial ring  $\mathbb{Z}[x]$ .*

*Suppose  $x^n \not\equiv x \pmod{(x^r - 2, n)}$ . Then*

$$f(x) \not\equiv 0 \pmod{(x^r - 2, n)}.$$

*Proof.* The assumption  $r \nmid n(n-1)$  implies that  $r \nmid n$  and  $r \nmid (n-1)$ . First, we will show why this is necessary.

Suppose  $r \mid n$ , therefore  $r = p$  where  $p \mid n$ . Then

$$x^n \equiv 2 \pmod{(x^r - 2, p)} \implies (x+1)^n \equiv 3 \pmod{(x^r - 2, p)}.$$

Hence, we have trivially

$$(x+1)^n - x^n - 1 \equiv 0 \pmod{(x^r - 2, p)}$$

Next, suppose  $r \mid (n-1)$ . Then  $r \mid (p-1)$  for some  $p \mid n$ , and since  $p$  is prime,  $(p-1) = \phi(p)$ . Leading to

$$x^n \equiv x \pmod{(x^r - 2, p)} \implies (x+1)^n \equiv x+1 \pmod{(x^r - 2, p)}.$$

Again, we have trivially

$$(x+1)^n - x^n - 1 \equiv 0 \pmod{(x^r - 2, p)}.$$

We will finish the proof by showing  $f(x) \equiv 0 \pmod{(x^r - 2, n)}$  leads to a contradiction under the given conditions.

Assume, for the sake of contradiction, that

$$f(x) \equiv (x+1)^n - x^n - 1 \equiv 0 \pmod{(x^r - 2, n)}.$$

Since the congruence holds mod  $(x^r - 2, n)$ , it must also hold mod  $(x^r - 2, p)$  for each prime factor  $p$  of  $n$ . Otherwise,  $n$  could not divide  $f(x)$ . Thus, for all primes  $p \mid n$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} f(x) &\equiv (x+1)^n - x^n - 1 \equiv (x+1)^p - x^p - 1 \equiv 0 \pmod{(x^r - 2, p)} \\ &\iff (x+1)^n - x^n \equiv (x+1)^p - x^p \equiv 1 \pmod{(x^r - 2, p)} \end{aligned}$$

From this, we deduce

$$\left((x+1)^{n/p} - x^{n/p}\right)^p \equiv 1 \pmod{(x^r - 2, p)} \implies (x+1)^{n/p} - x^{n/p} \equiv 1 \pmod{(x^r - 2, p)}$$

Leading to

$$(x+1)^{n/p} - x^{n/p} \equiv (x+1)^n - x^n \equiv (x+1)^p - x^p \equiv 1 \pmod{(x^r - 2, p)}$$

This also implies

$$\zeta_p \equiv (x+1)^{n/p} - x^{n/p} \pmod{(x^r - 2, p)},$$

where  $\zeta_p$  is a  $p$ th root of unity modulo  $(x^r - 2, p)$ .

By the Chinese Remainder Theorem (CRT), since the congruences hold mod  $(x^r - 2, p)$  for each prime factor  $p$  of  $n$ , they also hold mod  $(x^r - 2, n)$ . Thus, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \zeta_n &\equiv (x+1)^{n/n} - x^{n/n} \pmod{(x^r - 2, n)} \\ &\equiv (x+1)^1 - x^1 \pmod{(x^r - 2, n)} \\ &\equiv (x+1) - x \pmod{(x^r - 2, n)} \\ &\equiv 1 \pmod{(x^r - 2, n)}. \end{aligned}$$

This is consistent with the possibility

$$\zeta_p \equiv 1 \pmod{(x^r - 2, p)}.$$

Then, for each  $p$ , we must consider the following mutually exclusive cases:

- (i)  $x^p \equiv x^{n/p} \pmod{(x^r - 2, p)} \iff (x+1)^p \equiv (x+1)^{n/p} \pmod{(x^r - 2, p)},$
- (ii)  $x^n \equiv x^p \pmod{(x^r - 2, p)} \iff (x+1)^n \equiv (x+1)^p \pmod{(x^r - 2, p)}.$

Each case, taken individually, allows for  $f(x) \equiv 0 \pmod{(x^r - 2, p)}$ . These cases are mutually exclusive, since satisfying both (i) and (ii) leads to

$$x^{n/p} \equiv x^p \equiv x^n \pmod{(x^r - 2, p)},$$

implying that  $p = r$  and  $r \mid n$ , contradicting the theorem.

Now, suppose cases (i), (ii) are both false. If  $x^n \equiv \zeta_p x \pmod{(x^r - 2, p)}$ , where  $\zeta_p$  is a non-trivial  $p$ -th root of unity modulo  $(x^r - 2, p)$ , then  $(x+1)^n \equiv \zeta_p (x+1) \pmod{(x^r - 2, p)}$ . This is possible because the polynomial ring  $\mathbb{Z}[x]/(x^r - 2, p)$  is isomorphic to the direct product of fields  $\mathbb{F}_p[x]/(x - \alpha_1) \times \cdots \times \mathbb{F}_p[x]/(x - \alpha_r)$ , where the  $\alpha_i$  are the roots of  $x^r - 2$  in an algebraic closure of  $\mathbb{F}_p$ . In some of these fields, there may exist non-trivial  $p$ -th roots of unity, allowing for this. However, we showed above that  $\zeta_n \equiv 1 \pmod{(x^r - 2, n)}$ , so this would imply  $x^n \equiv \zeta_n x \equiv x \pmod{(x^r - 2, n)}$ , contradicting the assumption in the theorem that  $x^n \not\equiv x \pmod{(x^r - 2, n)}$ .

Finally, suppose either case is true for all primes  $p \mid n$ . For  $n$ , the two cases (i) and (ii) collapse to a single case, since  $p$  is replaced by  $n$  in the exponents when lifting via the CRT:

$$x^n \equiv x \pmod{(x^r - 2, n)} \iff (x+1)^n \equiv x+1 \pmod{(x^r - 2, n)}$$

However, this is a contradiction, since again,  $x^n \not\equiv x \pmod{(x^r - 2, n)}$  by assumption in the theorem. Therefore  $f(x) \not\equiv 0 \pmod{(x^r - 2, n)}$ . This completes the proof.  $\square$