



On Strong Pseudoprimes to Several Bases

Gerhard Jaeschke

Mathematics of Computation, Vol. 61, No. 204 (Oct., 1993), 915-926.

Stable URL:

<http://links.jstor.org/sici?&sici=0025-5718%28199310%2961%3A204%3C915%3AOSPTSB%3E2.0.CO%3B2-G>

Mathematics of Computation is currently published by American Mathematical Society.

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/about/terms.html>. JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use provides, in part, that unless you have obtained prior permission, you may not download an entire issue of a journal or multiple copies of articles, and you may use content in the JSTOR archive only for your personal, non-commercial use.

Please contact the publisher regarding any further use of this work. Publisher contact information may be obtained at <http://www.jstor.org/journals/ams.html>.

Each copy of any part of a JSTOR transmission must contain the same copyright notice that appears on the screen or printed page of such transmission.

JSTOR is an independent not-for-profit organization dedicated to creating and preserving a digital archive of scholarly journals. For more information regarding JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

ON STRONG PSEUDOPRIMES TO SEVERAL BASES

GERHARD JAESCHKE

ABSTRACT. With ψ_k denoting the smallest strong pseudoprime to all of the first k primes taken as bases we determine the exact values for ψ_5 , ψ_6 , ψ_7 , ψ_8 and give upper bounds for ψ_9 , ψ_{10} , ψ_{11} . We discuss the methods and underlying facts for obtaining these results.

1. PRIMALITY TESTS BY MEANS OF STRONG PSEUDOPRIMES

Computer algebra systems, as for instance AXIOM [2], use strong pseudoprimes for testing primality of integers. The advantage of such tests is that they are very efficient. The disadvantage is that they are only probabilistic tests when the integers are not restricted to certain intervals. To make such tests deterministic for integers in prescribed intervals, one has to know the exact number of necessary so-called “strong pseudoprimality tests”. For this purpose we introduce the numbers ψ_1 , ψ_2 , ... for which we compute lower and upper bounds. These numbers are defined and discussed in this section; in §2 we derive some facts which are the basis for finding bounds for the numbers ψ_k . In §3 we discuss the methods which led to our results.

In view of Fermat’s “Little Theorem” we know that n is *certainly* not a prime when we have $b^{n-1} \not\equiv 1 \pmod{n}$ for an integer b with $1 < b < n - 1$. That is, if n is prime, then

$$(1) \quad b^{n-1} \equiv 1 \pmod{n}.$$

An odd composite number n for which (1) holds is called a “pseudoprime to base b ” (we write $\text{psp}(b, n)$). Usually, for a composite n there exist small bases b such that (1) is violated, but there are numbers n which are pseudoprimes to every base b coprime with n . These are called “Carmichael numbers”. Therefore, a stronger criterion than (1) is needed for testing primality which leads to the concept of “strong pseudoprime to base b ”. When $n = 1 + 2^h d$ with d odd, $h > 0$, and when n is a composite number, then n is called a “strong pseudoprime to base b ” if either

$$(2a) \quad b^d \equiv 1 \pmod{n}$$

or

$$(2b) \quad b^{2^h d} \equiv -1 \pmod{n}$$

Received by the editor May 23, 1990 and, in revised form, October 28, 1991 and August 14, 1992.

1991 *Mathematics Subject Classification*. Primary 11A15.

©1993 American Mathematical Society
0025-5718/93 \$1.00 + \$.25 per page

for an integer k satisfying $0 \leq k < h$. We write $\text{spsp}(b, n)$ if and only if n is a strong pseudoprime to base b . From [3] we know that there are 4842 strong pseudoprimes to base 2 which are less than $25 \cdot 10^9$, but there does not exist any integer below this limit that is simultaneously a strong pseudoprime to all the bases 2, 3, 5, 7, 11. The last fact can be used for a fast primality test for numbers $n < 25 \cdot 10^9$, as is easily seen.

Now we turn to the definition of the integers ψ_k mentioned above. Let q_1, \dots, q_k be the first k primes. Then ψ_k is the smallest positive integer n such that n is a strong pseudoprime to all the bases q_1, \dots, q_k . Thus, if $n < \psi_k$, then only k strong primality tests are needed in order to find out whether n is prime or not. This shows the importance of knowing strong pseudoprimes to several bases.

From the paper [3] we obtain the following facts:

$$\begin{aligned}\psi_1 &= 2047, \\ \psi_2 &= 1373653, \\ \psi_3 &= 25326001, \\ \psi_4 &= 3215031751, \\ \psi_5 &> 25 \cdot 10^9.\end{aligned}$$

In this note we state some additional results, namely:

$$\begin{aligned}\psi_5 &= 2152302898747 = 6763 \cdot 10627 \cdot 29947, \\ \psi_6 &= 3474749660383 = 1303 \cdot 16927 \cdot 157543, \\ \psi_7 &= 341550071728321 = 10670053 \cdot 32010157, \\ \psi_8 &= 341550071728321 = 10670053 \cdot 32010157, \\ \psi_9 &\leq 41234316135705689041 = 4540612081 \cdot 9081224161, \\ \psi_{10} &\leq 1553360566073143205541002401 \\ &= 22754930352733 \cdot 68264791058197, \\ \psi_{11} &\leq 56897193526942024370326972321 \\ &= 137716125329053 \cdot 413148375987157.\end{aligned}$$

In order to obtain a lower bound l_k for ψ_k , one has to show the nonexistence of strong pseudoprimes to the bases q_1, \dots, q_k less than l_k . The upper bounds for the ψ_k are obtained by constructing strong pseudoprimes to the bases q_1, \dots, q_k . How this is performed will be discussed in §§3 and 4.

2. FOUNDATIONS OF THE ALGORITHM

In this section we formulate some statements which form the basis for the algorithm in §3, where bounds for the numbers ψ_k have to be computed. The first statement requires the concept “signature of the prime p to the bases a_1, \dots, a_w ”. Let $l_a(p)$ denote the smallest positive exponent x such that $a^x \equiv 1 \pmod{p}$, where $\gcd(a, p) = 1$. Such an integer always exists by Fermat’s theorem. Obviously, one has $p \equiv 1 \pmod{l_a(p)}$. Let us further denote by $\Delta(g)$ the exponent of the greatest power of 2 that divides the integer g . Then $\Delta(l_a(p))$ is called the “signature of p to base a ”. More generally, if

$$\nu = (a_1, \dots, a_w), \quad \gcd(a_i, p) = 1 \quad \text{for } i = 1, \dots, w,$$

we define

$$\sigma_p^\nu = (\Delta(l_{a_1}(p)), \dots, \Delta(l_{a_w}(p)))$$

and call this w -tuple the “signature of p to the bases a_1, \dots, a_w ”. Finally, we write

$$\text{psp}((a_1, \dots, a_w), n) \quad \text{or} \quad \text{spsp}((a_1, \dots, a_w), n),$$

respectively, if and only if n is a pseudoprime or strong pseudoprime, respectively, to all the bases a_1, \dots, a_w . By means of these notions we formulate the first fact concerning strong pseudoprimes.

Proposition 1. Let $n = p_1 \cdots p_t$ with different primes p_1, \dots, p_t . Further let $\nu = (a_1, \dots, a_w)$ with different integers a_1, \dots, a_w greater than 1 such that $\gcd(a_i, p_j) = 1$ for all $i = 1, \dots, w$; $j = 1, \dots, t$. Under these assumptions $\text{spsp}(\nu, n)$ holds if and only if $\text{psp}(\nu, n)$ is valid and all p_j , $j = 1, \dots, t$, have the same signature to all of the bases a_1, \dots, a_w , i.e., $\sigma_{p_1}^\nu = \cdots = \sigma_{p_t}^\nu$.

Proof. This statement is an immediate consequence of the following equivalences:

$$a^{2^k d} \equiv -1 \pmod{n} \Leftrightarrow \Delta(l_a(p_i)) = k + 1 \quad \text{for all } p_i | n \text{ and } \text{psp}(a, n)$$

and

$$a^d \equiv 1 \pmod{n} \Leftrightarrow \Delta(l_a(p_i)) = 0 \quad \text{for all } p_i | n \text{ and } \text{psp}(a, n),$$

where $n = 1 + 2^h d$, d odd, $0 \leq k < h$, and $\gcd(a, n) = 1$. \square

Proposition 1 serves on the one hand for constructing strong pseudoprimes to several bases by multiplying primes which have identical signatures, and on the other hand for proving the nonexistence of such strong pseudoprimes below some given limit.

Example. For $\nu = (11, 13, 17)$ we have

$$\sigma_{1531}^\nu = \sigma_{2551}^\nu = \sigma_{3571}^\nu = (0, 0, 0),$$

and since $\text{psp}(\nu, n)$ holds for $n = 1531 \cdot 2551 \cdot 3571$, we also have $\text{spsp}(\nu, n)$.

Proposition 2. Let a_1, \dots, a_w be different primes. Then for primes $p \equiv 3 \pmod{4}$ with p not dividing a_1, \dots, a_w the signature $\sigma_p^{(a_1, \dots, a_w)}$ depends only on the residue class of $p \pmod{4a_1 \cdots a_w}$.

Proof. For $p \equiv 3 \pmod{4}$ we evidently have $\Delta(l_a(p)) \in \{0, 1\}$, and if $\sigma_p^{(a_1, \dots, a_w)} = (b_1, \dots, b_w)$, then

$$b_i = 0 \quad \text{if } \left(\frac{a_i}{p}\right) = 1, \quad b_i = 1 \quad \text{if } \left(\frac{a_i}{p}\right) = -1.$$

Thus, $\sigma_p^{(a_1, \dots, a_w)}$ depends only on the quadratic residue character of the $a_i \pmod{p}$. By the law of quadratic reciprocity it then follows

$$\Delta(l_{a_i}(p)) = \Delta(l_{a_i}(q)) \quad \text{for } p \equiv q \pmod{4a_i},$$

hence the assertion of the proposition. \square

Example. Let $\nu = (2, 3, 5, 7, 11)$. We want to find all primes $p \equiv 3 \pmod{4}$ which have the signature $\sigma_p^\nu = (0, 1, 0, 0, 1)$. So we have to solve the system

$$\left(\frac{2}{p}\right) = \left(\frac{5}{p}\right) = \left(\frac{7}{p}\right) = 1 \quad \text{and} \quad \left(\frac{3}{p}\right) = \left(\frac{11}{p}\right) = -1.$$

This is equivalent to solving the system of congruences

$$\begin{aligned} p &\equiv 7 \pmod{8}, \\ p &\equiv 7 \pmod{12}, \\ p &\equiv 11, 19 \pmod{20}, \\ p &\equiv 3, 19, 27 \pmod{28}, \\ p &\equiv 3, 15, 23, 27, 31 \pmod{44}, \end{aligned}$$

which yields 30 classes mod 9240:

$$p \equiv 31, 199, 559, 1039, \dots, 8959 \pmod{9240}.$$

By means of Proposition 2 exactly the primes in each of these 30 classes are the desired primes.

For primes $p \equiv 1 \pmod{4}$ we have no corresponding statement. But here the following proposition can be useful.

Proposition 3. *For primes p, q it is true that*

$$\Delta(p-1) = \Delta(q-1) \text{ and } \sigma_p^{(a)} = \sigma_q^{(a)} \text{ imply } \left(\frac{a}{p}\right) = \left(\frac{a}{q}\right).$$

Proof. This follows from

$$\sigma_p^{(a)} = \Delta(p-1) \Leftrightarrow \left(\frac{a}{p}\right) = -1. \quad \square$$

Example. By Proposition 3 it is easy to determine all primes $p \equiv 5 \pmod{8}$ which have the signature $\sigma_p^{(2,3,5)} = (2, 2, 2)$. These are exactly the primes $p \equiv 53, 77 \pmod{120}$. But each of the signatures $\sigma_p^{\nu} = (2, 2, 0)$ and $(2, 2, 1)$ for $\nu = (2, 3, 5)$ does not depend only on residue classes mod 120, as we shall see below. We find by Proposition 3 that

$$\sigma_p^{(2,3,5)} = (2, 2, \Delta) \text{ with } \Delta \in \{0, 1\} \text{ for } p \equiv 29, 101 \pmod{120}.$$

For these p we have (using the 4th power residue character symbol)

$$\left(\frac{5}{p}\right)_4 \equiv 5^{(p-1)/4} \pmod{p};$$

hence, in view of $(\frac{5}{p}) = 1$,

$$\begin{aligned} \left(\frac{5}{p}\right)_4 = 1 &\text{ implies } \sigma_p^{(2,3,5)} = (2, 2, 0), \\ \left(\frac{5}{p}\right)_4 = -1 &\text{ implies } \sigma_p^{(2,3,5)} = (2, 2, 1). \end{aligned}$$

Both p -types occur in each of the residue classes 29, 101 mod 120:

$$\sigma_{29}^{(2,3,5)} = \sigma_{701}^{(2,3,5)} = (2, 2, 1), \quad \sigma_{149}^{(2,3,5)} = \sigma_{101}^{(2,3,5)} = (2, 2, 0).$$

For an efficient determination of large strong pseudoprimes to several bases we use later on

Proposition 4. *If p and $q = 2p - 1$ are primes, and if b is an odd integer with $\gcd(b, p) = \gcd(b, q) = 1$, then we have*

$$\text{psp}(b, pq) \text{ if and only if } \left(\frac{q}{b}\right) = 1.$$

Proof. Under the above assumptions we have

$$b^{pq-1} \equiv 1 \pmod{pq} \Leftrightarrow b^{p-1} \equiv 1 \pmod{q}.$$

But with $p - 1 = \frac{q-1}{2}$ and $q \equiv 1 \pmod{4}$ we obtain the assertion by the law of quadratic reciprocity. \square

Remark. For $b = 2$ we simply have

$$\text{psp}(2, p(2p - 1)) \Leftrightarrow p \equiv 1 \pmod{4}$$

under the assumption that $p, 2p - 1$ are primes.

3. ALGORITHM

In this section we start by describing the general procedure for determining all strong pseudoprimes n to given bases, where n is bounded by a prescribed limit g and has a given number t of prime factors. We continue by applying this procedure to special cases, which yield the results presented in §1.

In all the following discussions we can restrict ourselves to squarefree integers, in view of Proposition 4 in [3] and the fact the congruences $2^{p-1} \equiv 1 \pmod{p^2}$ and $3^{p-1} \equiv 1 \pmod{p^2}$ do not hold simultaneously for any prime p below $3 \cdot 10^9$ [3].

Let q_i denote the i th prime, and let $\nu = (q_1, \dots, q_w)$. If a large integer g is given and t is a small positive integer ≥ 2 , then we want to solve the following problem:

Find all strong pseudoprimes $\leq g$ to the bases q_1, \dots, q_w that have t different prime factors.

Case 1. We start by assuming $t \geq 3$.

Phase 1. We determine all $(t-1)$ -tuples (p_1, \dots, p_{t-1}) with primes p_1, \dots, p_{t-1} such that

- (A) $q_w < p_1 < \dots < p_{t-1}$,
- (B) $\sigma_{p_1}^\nu = \dots = \sigma_{p_{t-1}}^\nu$,
- (C) $p_1 \cdots p_{t-2} p_{t-1}^2 < g$.

We call the $(t-1)$ -tuples satisfying (A), (B), (C) “feasible $(t-1)$ -tuples”.

Phase 2. For each feasible $(t-1)$ -tuple (p_1, \dots, p_{t-1}) we proceed as follows. We choose one of the primes q_1, \dots, q_w as b .

Step 1. We compute $\eta = \text{lcm}(l_b(p_1), \dots, l_b(p_{t-1}))$.

Step 2. If $\gcd(\eta, p_1 \cdots p_{t-1}) > 1$, then the $(t-1)$ -tuple (p_1, \dots, p_{t-1}) is ignored. Otherwise, compute the multiplicative inverse c of $p_1 \cdots p_{t-1} \pmod{\eta}$, i.e., $c = (p_1 \cdots p_{t-1})^{-1} \pmod{\eta}$.

Step 3. For each prime $y \leq g/(p_1 \cdots p_{t-1})$ with $y \equiv c \pmod{\eta}$ we test whether $\text{spsp}(\nu, p_1 \cdots p_{t-1}y)$ holds or not.

Case 2. We now assume that $t = 2$. For each prime $p < \sqrt{g}$ we first compute

$$\lambda_p = \text{lcm}(2, l_{q_1}(p), \dots, l_{q_w}(p)).$$

Then all products $P = p(1 + k\lambda_p)$ are computed for $k = 1 + (p-1)/\lambda_p, \dots, [(g-p)/p\lambda_p]$, where $1 + k\lambda_p$ must be prime. For each product P we test whether $\text{spsp}(\nu, P)$ holds or not.

Improvements of the algorithm. A central problem of this algorithm is the following. Given $\nu = (q_1, \dots, q_w)$ and a prime p , find all primes q smaller than a given limit with $q > p$ and $\sigma_q^\nu = \sigma_p^\nu$. In order to do this efficiently, we apply Propositions 2 and 3.

If, for example, $p \equiv 3 \pmod{4}$, then p has a binary signature

$$\sigma_p^\nu = (\Delta_1, \dots, \Delta_w) \quad \text{with } \Delta_i \in \{0, 1\} \text{ for } i = 1, \dots, w.$$

Then by Proposition 2 *all* primes $q \equiv 3 \pmod{4}$ with $(q_i/p) = (q_i/q)$, $i = 1, \dots, w$, satisfy $\sigma_q^\nu = \sigma_p^\nu$. But there might be primes $q \equiv 1 \pmod{4}$ which have a binary signature σ_q^ν . In order to find these q , we observe that

$$(QR) \quad \left(\frac{q_i}{q} \right) = 1 \quad \text{for } i = 1, \dots, w$$

must hold; since this condition is not sufficient (cf. example after Proposition 3), these q are only *candidates* for $\sigma_q^\nu = \sigma_p^\nu$.

Altogether, this means that the desired q -values belong to

$$2^{2-w} \prod_{i=2}^w (q_i - 1) \text{ residue classes mod } 8 \cdot \prod_{i=2}^w q_i.$$

The residue classes defined by (QR) can be ignored in many cases, since we know in advance (i.e., independently of p) which primes q below a given limit satisfy (QR). So we know that

(F1) there are only 9 primes $q < 10^6$, $q \equiv 1 \pmod{4}$, with binary signature $\sigma_q^{(2, 3, 5, 7, 11)}$:

$$q = 148201, 170809, 196681, 238681, 735529, \\ 737641, 921001, 924361, 988681$$

and

(F2) there exist only 4 primes $q < 10^7$, $q \equiv 1 \pmod{4}$, with binary signature $\sigma_q^{(2, 3, 5, 7, 11, 13, 17)}$:

$$q = 4179289, 7140169, 7781929, 8971561.$$

If, for instance, we have to determine all primes $q < 1000000$ with $\sigma_q^{(2, \dots, 11)} = \sigma_{31}^{(2, \dots, 11)}$, then by (F1) only the primes $q < 1000000$ in the 30 classes mod 9240 in the example after Proposition 2 solve the problem.

Another example shall be discussed for a prime $p \not\equiv 3 \pmod{4}$, where we make use of Proposition 3. Let $w = 7$, that is $\nu = (2, 3, 5, 7, 11, 13, 17)$ and $p = 97$. Determine all primes $q < 300000$ with $\sigma_q^\nu = \sigma_{97}^\nu$. The maximal element in $\sigma_{97}^\nu = (4, 4, 5, 5, 4, 5, 5)$ is 5. Thus, by Proposition 3 we determine all primes $q \equiv 33 \pmod{64}$ that satisfy

$$\left(\frac{3}{q} \right) = \left(\frac{11}{q} \right) = 1 \quad \text{and} \quad \left(\frac{5}{q} \right) = \left(\frac{7}{q} \right) = \left(\frac{13}{q} \right) = \left(\frac{17}{q} \right) = -1,$$

which yields 1440 classes mod 16336320. We find 12 primes q with $97 < q < 300000$ in these classes, only two of which satisfy $\sigma_q^\nu = \sigma_{97}^\nu$: $q = 257953, 271393$.

Further, we find 9 primes $q \equiv 1 \pmod{64}$, $q < 300000$, from the equation

$$\left(\frac{3}{q}\right) = \left(\frac{5}{q}\right) = \left(\frac{7}{q}\right) = \left(\frac{11}{q}\right) = \left(\frac{13}{q}\right) = \left(\frac{17}{q}\right) = 1,$$

but none of them satisfies $\sigma_q^\nu = \sigma_{97}^\nu$. Therefore, the above 2 primes solve the problem.

In step 3 of phase 2 we can achieve a great reduction of the number of primality tests by applying Propositions 2 and 3. Let $\nu = (2, 3, 5, 7, 11, 13, 17)$, $g = 341550071728321$, $p = 307$, $q = 1987$. Then step 3 of phase 2 consists in computing all

$$r \leq 559909889 \quad \text{with } r \equiv 5227 \pmod{33762}$$

and testing r for primality and for $\sigma_r^\nu = \sigma_{307}^\nu$. Therefore, 16584 such tests have to be performed. When we use Proposition 2 and solve the systems

$$\left(\frac{2}{r}\right) = \left(\frac{2}{307}\right), \dots, \left(\frac{13}{r}\right) = \left(\frac{13}{307}\right), \quad r \equiv 3 \pmod{4}$$

and

$$\left(\frac{2}{r}\right) = \left(\frac{3}{r}\right) = \dots = \left(\frac{17}{r}\right) = q, \quad r \equiv 1 \pmod{4},$$

we only have 304 r -values as test-candidates.

Applications. We apply the algorithm to the following two special cases for w, g :

$$(SC1) \quad w_1 = 5, \quad g_1 = 3474749660383,$$

$$(SC2) \quad w_2 = 7, \quad g_2 = 341550071728321.$$

It will be shown that there exists only one strong pseudoprime $n < g_1$ to the bases 2, 3, 5, 7, 11, and no strong pseudoprime $n < g_2$ to the bases 2, 3, 5, 7, 11, 13, 17.

Further, we present all strong pseudoprimes $\leq 10^{12}$ to the bases 2, 3, 5 in Table 1 on the next page (see also Table 7 in [3]). It should be noted that Table 1 contains (in contrast to the results in [3]) two numbers being not of the form $(n+1)(kn+1)$, namely $77475820141 = 176041 \cdot 440101$ and $183413388211 = 370891 \cdot 494521$.

(SC1). Let $\nu = (2, 3, 5, 7, 11)$.

(a) $t \geq 5$.

Define N_p to be the set of all primes $q > p$ with $\sigma_q^\nu = \sigma_p^\nu$. If $f_{p,k}$ denotes the k th element of N_p in ascending order, then we compute for each $p \leq 317$ the values $f_{p,1}, \dots, f_{p,4}$ and obtain

$$\min p \cdot \prod_{k=1}^4 f_{p,k} = 19 \cdot \prod_{k=1}^4 f_{19,k} > g_1,$$

so that no spsp(ν, n) exists with $n \leq g_1$ and which has more than 4 factors.

(b) $t = 4$.

When $t = 4$, phase 1 of the algorithm yields 1557 feasible triplets (p_1, p_2, p_3) .

TABLE 1. List of all strong pseudoprimes $< 10^{12}$ to the bases 2, 3, 5

number	factorisation	spsp-base			
		7	11	13	17
25326001	2251 • 11251	0	0	0	0
161304001	7333 • 21997	0	1	0	0
960946321	11717 • 82013	0	0	0	0
1157839381	24061 • 48121	0	0	0	0
3215031751	151 • 751 • 28351	1	0	0	0
3697278427	30403 • 121609	0	0	0	1
5764643587	37963 • 151849	0	0	1	0
6770862367	41143 • 164569	0	0	0	1
14386156093	397 • 4357 • 8317	0	0	0	0
15579919981	88261 • 176521	0	1	0	0
18459366157	67933 • 271729	0	0	0	0
19887974881	81421 • 244261	0	0	0	0
21276028621	103141 • 206281	0	0	1	0
27716349961	117721 • 235441	0	0	0	0
29118033181	120661 • 241321	0	1	0	0
37131467521	111253 • 333757	0	0	0	0
41752650241	117973 • 353917	0	1	1	0
42550716781	145861 • 291721	0	0	0	0
43536545821	147541 • 295081	0	0	0	0
44732778751	105751 • 423001	0	0	0	0
44778481441	122173 • 366517	0	0	0	1
48354810571	331 • 2971 • 49171	0	1	1	0
52139147581	161461 • 322921	0	0	0	0
53700690781	163861 • 327721	0	0	0	0
56209415767	118543 • 474169	0	0	0	0
57698562127	120103 • 480409	0	0	0	0
67403434561	149893 • 449677	0	1	0	0
73796984161	156841 • 470521	0	0	1	0
74190097801	151 • 2551 • 192601	0	0	0	0
75285070351	137191 • 548761	0	0	0	1
75350936251	137251 • 549001	0	0	0	0
77475820141	176041 • 404101	0	0	0	0
79696887661	199621 • 399241	0	0	0	0
83828294551	1231 • 6151 • 11071	0	0	0	0
88473676747	148723 • 594889	0	0	1	0
88974090367	149143 • 596569	0	0	0	0
98515393021	221941 • 443881	0	1	1	0
111737197441	149491 • 747451	0	0	0	0
114247549027	169003 • 676009	0	1	0	0
118670087467	172243 • 688969	1	0	0	0
126223730461	251221 • 502441	0	0	0	0
134670080641	211873 • 635617	0	0	0	0
135586888951	184111 • 736441	0	0	1	0
136136947201	139457 • 976193	0	0	0	0
148600530541	272581 • 545161	0	0	0	0
150401047441	146581 • 1026061	0	0	0	0
156677923729	177019 • 885091	0	0	0	0
157615339681	229213 • 687637	0	0	0	0
167259489409	182899 • 914491	0	0	0	0
174460968067	208843 • 835369	0	0	0	0
183413388211	370891 • 494521	0	0	0	0
187403492251	216451 • 865801	0	0	0	0
216291665041	175781 • 1230461	0	0	0	0
218215348801	269701 • 809101	0	0	0	0
218673063181	330661 • 661321	0	0	0	1
234311749201	182957 • 1280693	0	0	0	0

TABLE 1 (continued)

number	factorisation	spsp-base			
		7	11	13	17
240438464197	245173 • 980689	0	0	0	0
244970876021	202061 • 1212361	0	0	0	0
245291853691	1171 • 10531 • 19891	0	1	1	1
247945488451	248971 • 995881	0	0	0	0
252505670761	355321 • 710641	0	0	1	0
272447722207	260983 • 1043929	0	0	0	0
291879706861	382021 • 764041	0	1	0	0
295545735181	221941 • 1331641	0	0	0	0
307768373641	392281 • 784561	1	0	0	0
315962312077	281053 • 1124209	1	0	0	0
331630652449	257539 • 1287691	0	0	0	0
342221459329	261619 • 1308091	0	0	0	0
353193975751	297151 • 1188601	0	0	0	0
354864744877	297853 • 1191409	1	0	0	0
362742704101	301141 • 1204561	0	0	0	0
398214876001	364333 • 1092997	0	0	0	0
405439595861	259949 • 1559689	0	0	0	0
407979839041	368773 • 1106317	0	0	0	0
431229929521	182131 • 2367691	0	0	0	0
457453568161	390493 • 1171477	1	0	0	1
490883439061	495421 • 990841	0	0	0	0
503691743521	409753 • 1229257	0	0	0	1
505130380987	355363 • 1421449	0	0	0	0
528929554561	419893 • 1259677	1	0	0	1
546348519181	522661 • 1045321	1	0	1	0
549866444221	524341 • 1048681	0	0	0	0
591090138721	443881 • 1331641	0	0	0	0
602248359169	347059 • 1735291	1	0	0	0
641498618881	462421 • 1387261	0	0	0	0
659937299407	406183 • 1624729	0	0	0	0
688529415421	586741 • 1173481	0	1	0	0
712614969307	422083 • 1688329	0	0	0	0
729421133761	493093 • 1479277	0	1	0	0
733224429367	428143 • 1712569	0	0	1	0
736775510329	383869 • 1919341	0	0	0	0
741881186287	430663 • 1722649	0	1	0	0
744049848481	498013 • 1494037	0	0	0	0
774840343681	508213 • 1524637	0	0	0	0
842638521121	529981 • 1589941	0	0	0	0
851402588401	412651 • 2063251	0	0	0	0
853196213761	349121 • 2443841	0	0	0	0
863370140641	536461 • 1609381	0	0	0	0
908201935681	550213 • 1650637	0	0	0	0
966299321527	491503 • 1966009	0	0	0	0
997031384161	576493 • 1729477	0	0	0	0

It is easy to see that we only need to consider triplets with $p_1 \leq 1361$, $p_2 \leq 6427$, $p_3 \leq 36269$. In phase 2 we took $b = 3$. So we obtained 178 quadruples (p_1, p_2, p_3, p_4) which satisfy $3^{p_1 p_2 p_3 p_4 - 1} \equiv 1 \pmod{p_1 p_2 p_3}$, but no $\text{spsp}(\nu, p_1 p_2 p_3 p_4)$ was detected.

(c) $t = 3$.

Here, phase 1 yields 42233 feasible pairs (p_1, p_2) , where p_1, p_2 could be restricted to $p_1 \leq 15139$, $p_2 \leq 516991$. In phase 2 we took $b=2$ and found 261

triplets (p_1, p_2, p_3) with $2^{p_1 p_2 p_3 - 1} \equiv 1 \pmod{p_1 p_2}$, only one $\text{spsp}(\nu, p_1 p_2 p_3)$ with $p_1 p_2 p_3 < g_1$ was detected. This integer is

$$\tilde{n} = 2152302898747 = 6763 \cdot 10627 \cdot 29947.$$

Now, it is easy to verify that

$$g_1 = 3474749660383 = 1303 \cdot 16927 \cdot 157543$$

is a strong pseudoprime to the bases 2, 3, 5, 7, 11, 13, which means that $\psi_5 \leq \tilde{n}$ and $\psi_6 \leq g_1$.

(d) $t = 2$.

At first we compute for all primes $p < \sqrt{g_1}$ (that is $p < 1864068$) the value λ_p as defined above. We further define $\mu_p = (p-1)/\lambda_p$ and τ_k to be the number of primes p with $13 \leq p < 1864068$ and $\mu_p = k$. It turns out that

$$\tau_k = 0 \text{ for } k \geq 6, \quad \tau_5 = 7, \quad \tau_4 = 47, \quad \tau_3 = 242, \quad \tau_1 + \tau_2 = 139238.$$

This means that for nearly all p our search for primes q with $\text{spsp}(\nu, pq)$ is restricted to

$$q = 1 + k \cdot \frac{p-1}{2} \quad \text{with } 3 \leq k \leq \frac{2g_1}{p(p-1)}.$$

For small values of p this search is very time-consuming (for instance if $p < 10000$ then the number of k -values to be checked is > 69000). Therefore, we used another procedure to perform this job when $p < 10000$. For each such p we calculated

$$h = \gcd(2^{p-1} - 1, 3^{p-1} - 1, 5^{p-1} - 1)$$

and factored h (this is easy, since h usually has many small prime factors). When h has a factor $q > p$, then we tested pq for strong pseudoprimality to the bases 2, 3, 5, 7, 11.

Since no pair $pq < g_1$ with $\text{spsp}(\nu, pq)$ was detected, we have the results $\psi_5 = 2152302898747$ and $\psi_6 = 3474749660383$.

(SC2). Let $\nu = (2, 3, 5, 7, 11, 13, 17)$.

(a) $t \geq 5$.

Analogous to the case (SC1) we compute for each $p \leq 797$ the values $f_{p,1}, \dots, f_{p,4}$ and obtain

$$\min p \cdot \prod_{k=1}^4 f_{p,k} = 131 \cdot \prod_{k=1}^4 f_{131,k} > g_2,$$

so that no $\text{spsp}(\nu, n)$ exists with $n \leq g_2$ and which has more than 4 factors.

(b) $t = 4$.

When $t = 4$, phase 1 of the algorithm yields 1902 feasible triplets (p_1, p_2, p_3) . In phase 2 we took $b = 2$. So we obtained 231 quadruples (p_1, p_2, p_3, p_4) which satisfy $2^{p_1 p_2 p_3 p_4 - 1} \equiv 1 \pmod{p_1 p_2 p_3}$, but no $\text{spsp}(\nu, p_1 p_2 p_3 p_4)$ was detected.

(c) $t = 3$.

Here, phase 1 yields 154953 feasible pairs (p_1, p_2) . In phase 2 we put $b = 2$ and found 265 triplets (p_1, p_2, p_3) with $2^{p_1 p_2 p_3 - 1} \equiv 1 \pmod{p_1 p_2}$, but no $\text{spsp}(\nu, p_1 p_2 p_3)$ with $p_1 p_2 p_3 < g_2$ was detected.

(d) $t = 2$.

We compute $\lambda_p = \text{lcm}(2, l_2(p), \dots, l_{17}(p))$ for each $p < 18481073$. We define

τ_k to be the number of primes p with $19 \leq p < 18481073$ and $\mu_p = k$. It turns out that

$$\tau_k = 0 \text{ for } k \geq 6, \quad \tau_5 = 1, \quad \tau_4 = 15, \quad \tau_3 = 207, \quad \tau_1 + \tau_2 = 1179824.$$

Again, for nearly all p our search for primes q with $\text{spsp}(\nu, pq)$ is restricted to

$$q = 1 + k \cdot \frac{p-1}{2} \quad \text{with } 3 \leq k \leq \frac{2g_2}{p(p-1)}.$$

Here we factored

$$h = \gcd(2^{p-1} - 1, 3^{p-1} - 1, 5^{p-1} - 1)$$

for all $p < 120000$. It turned out that there is no $\text{spsp}(\nu, pq)$ for $pq < g_2$, but $g_2 = 10670053 \cdot 32010157$ itself is a strong pseudoprime to the bases 2, 3, 5, 7, 11, 13, 17, 19. This means that $\psi_7 = \psi_8 = g_2$.

4. UPPER BOUNDS FOR $\psi_9, \psi_{10}, \psi_{11}$

In order to find upper bounds for $\psi_9, \psi_{10}, \psi_{11}$, we started an extensive search for numbers of the forms

- (H1) $p(2p-1)$ with $p, 2p-1$ prime,
(H2) $p(3p-2)$ with $p, 3p-2$ prime

which are strong pseudoprimes to the bases 2, 3, 5, 7, 11, 13, 17, 19, 23. In the case of (H1) we used Proposition 4: $\left(\frac{2p-1}{b}\right) = 1$ for $b = 3, 5, 7, 11$ and $p \equiv 1 \pmod{4}$ yield together 15 residue classes mod 4620:

$$\begin{aligned} p \equiv 1, 181, 421, 481, 841, 1321, 1741, 1861, 2161, 2521, 3121, \\ 3781, 3841, 3961, 4381 \pmod{4620}. \end{aligned}$$

It turns out that for $p = 4540612081$ the number

$$n = p(2p-1) = 41234316135705689041$$

is an $\text{spsp}(\nu, n)$ for $\nu = (2, 3, 5, 7, 11, 13, 17, 19, 23)$. This n yields the upper bound for ψ_9 stated in §1.

In the case of (H2) we solve the system

$$\begin{aligned} p &\equiv 13 \pmod{24}, \\ \left(\frac{b}{p}\right) &= \left(\frac{b}{3p-2}\right) = -1 \quad \text{for } b = 5, 7, 11, 13, 17, 19, 23 \end{aligned}$$

and obtain 400 residue classes mod 892371480. For each p in these classes we test strong pseudoprimality to the bases 2, 3, 5, 7, 11, 13, 17, 19, 23, 29, 31. So we find

$$\begin{aligned} \text{spsp}((2, \dots, 29), p(3p-2)) &\text{ for } p = 22754930352733, \\ \text{spsp}((2, \dots, 31), p(3p-2)) &\text{ for } p = 137716125329053. \end{aligned}$$

These two numbers yield the upper bounds for ψ_{10}, ψ_{11} stated in §1.

5. OTHER BASES THAN THE FIRST PRIMES

If we use only the first k primes as bases, then ψ_k is the limit up to which primality tests are correct by performing k strong primality tests. When we

take instead k arbitrary primes as bases, it is evident that the above ‘correctness limit’ may be increased considerably. But generally these bases are very large and not easy to find. We give a short survey on the magnitude of the correctness limit for up to 3 bases, when these are chosen conveniently.

Let $\nu = (b_1, \dots, b_w)$, b_i prime for $i = 1, \dots, w$, and define

$$\chi_\nu = \min\{n \mid \text{spsp}(\nu, n)\}.$$

Then we find for $w = 1$

$$\max_{b < 1000000} \chi_b = \chi_{377687} = 5329,$$

whereas $\chi_2 = 2047$. For $w = 2$ we find

$$\max_{b_1, b_2 < 100} \chi_{(b_1, b_2)} = \chi_{(31, 73)} = 9080191,$$

whereas $\chi_{(2, 3)} = 1373653$. We further computed

$$\max_{b < 300000} \chi_{(2, b)} = \chi_{(2, 299417)} = 19471033.$$

For $w = 3$ we find

$$\max_{b_1, b_2, b_3 < 100} \chi_{(b_1, b_2, b_3)} = \chi_{(2, 7, 61)} = 4759123141,$$

whereas $\chi_{(2, 3, 5)} = 25326001$. For $w = 4$ we have

$$\max_{b < 5000000} \chi_{(2, 3, 5, b)} = \chi_{(2, 3, 5, 4086253)} = 736775510329.$$

Recently, I found $\chi_{(2, 13, 23, 1662803)} > 10^{12}$, meaning that up to 10^{12} only four strong pseudoprimality tests are necessary for proving primality.

Remark. All computations have been performed on an IBM 3081 at Heidelberg Scientific Center.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

I thank the referee for his valuable suggestions in the improvement of this paper. With respect to Table 1, I should mention Richard Schroepel’s computing all strong pseudoprimes up to 10^{11} to the bases 2, 3, and 5, which was based on an output of Richard Pinch, who computed all odd base-2 pseudoprimes up to this limit.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. J. Brillhart, J. Tonascia, and P. Weinberger, *On the Fermat quotient*, Computers in Number Theory, Academic Press, London, 1971, pp. 213–222.
2. R. D. Jenks and R. F. Sutor, *AXIOM*, The Scientific Computation System, Springer-Verlag, Berlin-Heidelberg-New York, 1992.
3. C. Pomerance, J. L. Selfridge, and S. S. Wagstaff, Jr., *The pseudoprimes to $25 \cdot 10^9$* , Math. Comp. **35** (1980), 1003–1026.