Primality Testing

Antonio Carzaniga

Faculty of Informatics Università della Svizzera italiana

December 12, 2008

Outline

- Basic modular arithmetic
- Fermat's little theorem
- Probabilistic primality testing

Primality Test

■ **Problem:** given an *ℓ*-bit integer *n*, find whether *n* is *prime*

Primality Test

■ **Problem:** given an *ℓ*-bit integer *n*, find whether *n* is *prime*

Naïve solution

NAÏVE-PRIMALITY(n)1for i = 2 to $\lfloor \sqrt{n} \rfloor$ 2if $n = 0 \mod i$ 3return FALSE4return TRUE

Primality Test

■ **Problem:** given an *ℓ*-bit integer *n*, find whether *n* is *prime*

Naïve solution

NAÏVE-PRIMALITY(n) 1 for i = 2 to $\lfloor \sqrt{n} \rfloor$ 2 if $n = 0 \mod i$ // i.e., i divides n3 return FALSE 4 return TRUE

This algorithm is intractable because it has a running time

$$T(\ell) = \Theta(\sqrt{n}) = \Theta(2^{\ell/2})$$

• exactly \sqrt{n} steps if *n* is prime

- Main idea: we use *Fermat's little theorem* as a "yes/no" test
 - more accurately, we have a "maybe/no" test
 - "no"—n is composite
 - "maybe"—50/50 chance that n is prime

Main idea: we use *Fermat's little theorem* as a "yes/no" test

- more accurately, we have a "maybe/no" test
- "no"—n is composite
- "maybe"—50/50 chance that n is prime
- we repeat the test k times, and if all the k tests say "maybe," then we conclude that n is prime

Main idea: we use *Fermat's little theorem* as a "yes/no" test

- more accurately, we have a "maybe/no" test
- "no"—n is composite
- "maybe"—50/50 chance that n is prime
- we repeat the test k times, and if all the k tests say "maybe," then we conclude that n is prime
- there is a chance that we are wrong, but that chance vanishes exponentially with k

Main idea: we use *Fermat's little theorem* as a "yes/no" test

- more accurately, we have a "maybe/no" test
- "no"—n is composite
- "maybe"—50/50 chance that n is prime
- we repeat the test k times, and if all the k tests say "maybe," then we conclude that n is prime
- there is a chance that we are wrong, but that chance vanishes exponentially with k
- Ingredients
 - simple *modular arithmetic*

Last night I started working on my lecture at 20:00, and it took me 7 hours to finish it

Question: at what time did I finish my lecture?

Last night I started working on my lecture at 20:00, and it took me 7 hours to finish it

Question: at what time did I finish my lecture?

finish-time = 3

Last night I started working on my lecture at 20:00, and it took me 7 hours to finish it

Question: at what time did I finish my lecture?

 $finish-time = 3 \equiv 20 + 7 \pmod{24}$

Last night I started working on my lecture at 20:00, and it took me 7 hours to finish it

Question: at what time did I finish my lecture?

 $finish-time = 3 \equiv 20 + 7 \pmod{24}$

Question: what if it took me 37 hours?

Last night I started working on my lecture at 20:00, and it took me 7 hours to finish it

Question: at what time did I finish my lecture?

 $finish-time = 3 \equiv 20 + 7 \pmod{24}$

Question: what if it took me 37 hours?

 $9 \equiv 20 + 37 \pmod{24}$

Definition: "x is equivalent to y, modulo N"

 $x \equiv y \pmod{N} \iff N \text{ divides } (x - y) \text{ or } (y - x)$

Simple exercises

▶ $? \equiv 45 + 45 \pmod{60}$

Simple exercises

▶ $30 \equiv 45 + 45 \pmod{60}$

- ▶ $30 \equiv 45 + 45 \pmod{60}$
- ? ≡ 201 (mod 60)

- ▶ $30 \equiv 45 + 45 \pmod{60}$
- ▶ $21 \equiv 201 \pmod{60}$

- ▶ $30 \equiv 45 + 45 \pmod{60}$
- 21 ≡ 201 (mod 60)
- ▶ $? \equiv 4717382910421 \pmod{10}$

- ▶ $30 \equiv 45 + 45 \pmod{60}$
- 21 ≡ 201 (mod 60)
- ▶ $1 \equiv 4717382910421 \pmod{10}$

- ▶ $30 \equiv 45 + 45 \pmod{60}$
- 21 ≡ 201 (mod 60)
- ▶ $1 \equiv 4717382910421 \pmod{10}$
- ▶ $? \equiv 4717382910421 \pmod{9}$

- ▶ $30 \equiv 45 + 45 \pmod{60}$
- 21 ≡ 201 (mod 60)
- ▶ $1 \equiv 4717382910421 \pmod{10}$
- ▶ $4 \equiv 4717382910421 \pmod{9}$

- ▶ $30 \equiv 45 + 45 \pmod{60}$
- 21 ≡ 201 (mod 60)
- ▶ $1 \equiv 4717382910421 \pmod{10}$
- ▶ $4 \equiv 4717382910421 \pmod{9}$
- ? ≡ 4717382910421 (mod 3)

- ▶ $30 \equiv 45 + 45 \pmod{60}$
- 21 ≡ 201 (mod 60)
- ▶ $1 \equiv 4717382910421 \pmod{10}$
- ▶ $4 \equiv 4717382910421 \pmod{9}$
- ▶ $1 \equiv 4717382910421 \pmod{3}$

- ▶ $30 \equiv 45 + 45 \pmod{60}$
- 21 ≡ 201 (mod 60)
- ▶ $1 \equiv 4717382910421 \pmod{10}$
- ▶ $4 \equiv 4717382910421 \pmod{9}$
- ▶ $1 \equiv 4717382910421 \pmod{3}$
- $\blacktriangleright ? \equiv 2976146201360 + 10436201964293 \pmod{3}$

An equivalence relation

 $x \equiv y \pmod{m}$

An equivalence relation

 $x \equiv y \pmod{m}$

■ In the modulo-*m* world, all integers are in *m* equivalence classes

► e.g.,

$$2 \equiv 5 \equiv 8 \cdots \equiv -1 \equiv -4 \equiv \cdots \pmod{3}$$

An equivalence relation

 $x \equiv y \pmod{m}$

■ In the modulo-*m* world, all integers are in *m* equivalence classes

e.g.,

$$2 \equiv 5 \equiv 8 \cdots \equiv -1 \equiv -4 \equiv \cdots \pmod{3}$$

Values in the same equivalence classes are *interchangeable* in arithmetic operations

►
$$x \equiv x' \pmod{m}$$
 $\land y \equiv y' \pmod{m}$ $\Rightarrow x + y \equiv x' + y' \pmod{m}$

 $x \equiv x' \pmod{m} \land y \equiv y' \pmod{m} \Rightarrow xy \equiv x'y' \pmod{m}$

 $\blacksquare x \equiv r_x \pmod{m} \implies x + y \equiv r_x + y \pmod{m}$

• $x \equiv r_x \pmod{m} \implies x + y \equiv r_x + y \pmod{m}$ **Proof:**

• $x \equiv r_x \pmod{m} \implies x + y \equiv r_x + y \pmod{m}$ **Proof:**

• $x = q_x m + r_x$, from the hypothesis

$\blacksquare x \equiv r_x \pmod{m} \implies x + y \equiv r_x + y \pmod{m}$

Proof:

- $x = q_x m + r_x$, from the hypothesis
- $\blacktriangleright \quad \text{let } y = q_y m + r_y$

 $\blacksquare x \equiv r_x \pmod{m} \implies x + y \equiv r_x + y \pmod{m}$

Proof:

- $x = q_x m + r_x$, from the hypothesis
- $let y = q_y m + r_y$
- $x + y = q_x m + r_x + q_y m + r_y = (q_x + q_y)m + r_x + r_y$

 $\blacksquare x \equiv r_x \pmod{m} \implies x + y \equiv r_x + y \pmod{m}$

Proof:

• $x = q_x m + r_x$, from the hypothesis

$$let y = q_y m + r_y$$

 $x + y = q_x m + r_x + q_y m + r_y = (q_x + q_y)m + r_x + r_y \equiv r_x + r_y \pmod{m}$

 $\blacksquare x \equiv r_x \pmod{m} \implies x + y \equiv r_x + y \pmod{m}$

Proof:

• $x = q_x m + r_x$, from the hypothesis

$$let y = q_y m + r_y$$

 $x + y = q_x m + r_x + q_y m + r_y = (q_x + q_y)m + r_x + r_y \equiv r_x + r_y \pmod{m}$

 $\blacksquare x \equiv r_x \pmod{m} \land 0 \le r_x < m \quad \Rightarrow \quad xy \equiv r_x y \pmod{m}$
$\blacksquare x \equiv r_x \pmod{m} \implies x + y \equiv r_x + y \pmod{m}$

Proof:

• $x = q_x m + r_x$, from the hypothesis

$$let y = q_y m + r_y$$

 $x + y = q_x m + r_x + q_y m + r_y = (q_x + q_y)m + r_x + r_y \equiv r_x + r_y \pmod{m}$

$$x \equiv r_x \pmod{m} \land 0 \le r_x < m \implies xy \equiv r_xy \pmod{m}$$

Proof:

 $\blacksquare x \equiv r_x \pmod{m} \implies x + y \equiv r_x + y \pmod{m}$

Proof:

• $x = q_x m + r_x$, from the hypothesis

$$let y = q_y m + r_y$$

 $x + y = q_x m + r_x + q_y m + r_y = (q_x + q_y)m + r_x + r_y \equiv r_x + r_y \pmod{m}$

$$\blacksquare x \equiv r_x \pmod{m} \land 0 \le r_x < m \implies xy \equiv r_xy \pmod{m}$$

Proof:

• $x = q_x m + r_x$, from the hypothesis

 $\blacksquare x \equiv r_x \pmod{m} \implies x + y \equiv r_x + y \pmod{m}$

Proof:

• $x = q_x m + r_x$, from the hypothesis

$$let y = q_y m + r_y$$

 $x + y = q_x m + r_x + q_y m + r_y = (q_x + q_y)m + r_x + r_y \equiv r_x + r_y \pmod{m}$

$$\blacksquare x \equiv r_x \pmod{m} \land 0 \le r_x < m \quad \Rightarrow \quad xy \equiv r_xy \pmod{m}$$

Proof:

• $x = q_x m + r_x$, from the hypothesis

$$let y = q_y m + r_y$$

 $\blacksquare x \equiv r_x \pmod{m} \implies x + y \equiv r_x + y \pmod{m}$

Proof:

• $x = q_x m + r_x$, from the hypothesis

$$let y = q_y m + r_y$$

 $x + y = q_x m + r_x + q_y m + r_y = (q_x + q_y)m + r_x + r_y \equiv r_x + r_y \pmod{m}$

$$\blacksquare x \equiv r_x \pmod{m} \land 0 \le r_x < m \quad \Rightarrow \quad xy \equiv r_xy \pmod{m}$$

Proof:

• $x = q_x m + r_x$, from the hypothesis

$$let y = q_y m + r_y$$

• $xy = (q_xm + r_x)(q_ym + r_y) = (q_xq_y)m^2 + (q_xr_y + q_yr_x)m + r_xr_y$

 $\blacksquare x \equiv r_x \pmod{m} \implies x + y \equiv r_x + y \pmod{m}$

Proof:

• $x = q_x m + r_x$, from the hypothesis

$$let y = q_y m + r_y$$

 $x + y = q_x m + r_x + q_y m + r_y = (q_x + q_y)m + r_x + r_y \equiv r_x + r_y \pmod{m}$

$$\blacksquare x \equiv r_x \pmod{m} \land 0 \le r_x < m \quad \Rightarrow \quad xy \equiv r_x y \pmod{m}$$

Proof:

• $x = q_x m + r_x$, from the hypothesis

$$let y = q_y m + r_y$$

► $xy = (q_x m + r_x)(q_y m + r_y) = (q_x q_y)m^2 + (q_x r_y + q_y r_x)m + r_x r_y \equiv r_x r_y$ (mod m)

Simple exercises

Simple exercises

? ≡ 483921097 × 891720476436 (mod 10)

Simple exercises

▶ $2 \equiv 7 \times 6 \equiv 483921097 \times 891720476436 \pmod{10}$

- Simple exercises
 - ▶ $2 \equiv 7 \times 6 \equiv 483921097 \times 891720476436 \pmod{10}$
 - ▶ $? \equiv 483921097 + 891720476436 \pmod{5}$

Simple exercises

- ▶ $2 \equiv 7 \times 6 \equiv 483921097 \times 891720476436 \pmod{10}$
- $3 \equiv 2 + 1 \equiv 483921097 + 891720476436 \pmod{5}$

- Simple exercises
 - ▶ $2 \equiv 7 \times 6 \equiv 483921097 \times 891720476436 \pmod{10}$
 - $3 \equiv 2 + 1 \equiv 483921097 + 891720476436 \pmod{5}$
 - $? \equiv 483921097 \times 891720476436 \pmod{9}$

Simple exercises

- ▶ $2 \equiv 7 \times 6 \equiv 483921097 \times 891720476436 \pmod{10}$
- $3 \equiv 2 + 1 \equiv 483921097 + 891720476436 \pmod{5}$
- $3 \equiv 7 \times 3 \equiv 483921097 \times 891720476436 \pmod{9}$

Simple exercises

- ▶ $2 \equiv 7 \times 6 \equiv 483921097 \times 891720476436 \pmod{10}$
- $3 \equiv 2 + 1 \equiv 483921097 + 891720476436 \pmod{5}$
- $3 \equiv 7 \times 3 \equiv 483921097 \times 891720476436 \pmod{9}$
- ▶ $? \equiv 86544127367 \times 61922483628096 \pmod{3}$

- Simple exercises
 - ▶ $2 \equiv 7 \times 6 \equiv 483921097 \times 891720476436 \pmod{10}$
 - $3 \equiv 2 + 1 \equiv 483921097 + 891720476436 \pmod{5}$
 - $3 \equiv 7 \times 3 \equiv 483921097 \times 891720476436 \pmod{9}$
 - $0 \equiv 86544127367 \times 0 \equiv 86544127367 \times 61922483628096 \pmod{3}$

- Simple exercises
 - ▶ $2 \equiv 7 \times 6 \equiv 483921097 \times 891720476436 \pmod{10}$
 - $3 \equiv 2 + 1 \equiv 483921097 + 891720476436 \pmod{5}$
 - $3 \equiv 7 \times 3 \equiv 483921097 \times 891720476436 \pmod{9}$
 - $0 \equiv 86544127367 \times 0 \equiv 86544127367 \times 61922483628096 \pmod{3}$

■ The *multiplicative inverse* (mod *N*) of *a* is an integer *x* such that

 $ax \equiv 1 \pmod{N}$

■ The *multiplicative inverse* (mod *N*) of *a* is an integer *x* such that

 $ax \equiv 1 \pmod{N}$

■ The *multiplicative inverse* (mod *N*) of *a* is an integer *x* such that

 $ax \equiv 1 \pmod{N}$

Examples

▶ $1 \times ? \equiv 1 \pmod{10}$

■ The *multiplicative inverse* (mod *N*) of *a* is an integer *x* such that

 $ax \equiv 1 \pmod{N}$

Examples

▶ $1 \times 1 \equiv 1 \pmod{10}$

■ The *multiplicative inverse* (mod *N*) of *a* is an integer *x* such that

 $ax \equiv 1 \pmod{N}$

- ▶ $1 \times 1 \equiv 1 \pmod{10}$
- 7×? ≡ 1 (mod 10)

■ The *multiplicative inverse* (mod *N*) of *a* is an integer *x* such that

 $ax \equiv 1 \pmod{N}$

- ▶ $1 \times 1 \equiv 1 \pmod{10}$
- ▶ $7 \times 3 \equiv 1 \pmod{10}$

■ The *multiplicative inverse* (mod *N*) of *a* is an integer *x* such that

 $ax \equiv 1 \pmod{N}$

- ▶ $1 \times 1 \equiv 1 \pmod{10}$
- ▶ $7 \times 3 \equiv 1 \pmod{10}$
- 3×? ≡ 1 (mod 10)

■ The *multiplicative inverse* (mod *N*) of *a* is an integer *x* such that

 $ax \equiv 1 \pmod{N}$

- ▶ $1 \times 1 \equiv 1 \pmod{10}$
- ▶ $7 \times 3 \equiv 1 \pmod{10}$
- ▶ $3 \times 7 \equiv 1 \pmod{10}$

■ The *multiplicative inverse* (mod *N*) of *a* is an integer *x* such that

 $ax \equiv 1 \pmod{N}$

- ▶ $1 \times 1 \equiv 1 \pmod{10}$
- ▶ $7 \times 3 \equiv 1 \pmod{10}$
- ▶ $3 \times 7 \equiv 1 \pmod{10}$
- 9×? ≡ 1 (mod 10)

■ The *multiplicative inverse* (mod *N*) of *a* is an integer *x* such that

 $ax \equiv 1 \pmod{N}$

- ▶ $1 \times 1 \equiv 1 \pmod{10}$
- ▶ $7 \times 3 \equiv 1 \pmod{10}$
- ▶ $3 \times 7 \equiv 1 \pmod{10}$
- ▶ $9 \times 9 \equiv 1 \pmod{10}$

■ The *multiplicative inverse* (mod *N*) of *a* is an integer *x* such that

 $ax \equiv 1 \pmod{N}$

- ▶ $1 \times 1 \equiv 1 \pmod{10}$
- ▶ $7 \times 3 \equiv 1 \pmod{10}$
- ▶ $3 \times 7 \equiv 1 \pmod{10}$
- ▶ $9 \times 9 \equiv 1 \pmod{10}$
- $4 \times ? \equiv 1 \pmod{10}$

■ The *multiplicative inverse* (mod *N*) of *a* is an integer *x* such that

 $ax \equiv 1 \pmod{N}$

Examples

- ▶ $1 \times 1 \equiv 1 \pmod{10}$
- ▶ $7 \times 3 \equiv 1 \pmod{10}$
- ▶ $3 \times 7 \equiv 1 \pmod{10}$
- ▶ $9 \times 9 \equiv 1 \pmod{10}$
- ▶ $4 \times ? \equiv 1 \pmod{10}$

4 does not have an inverse (modulo 10)

■ For all *a*, *a* has a multiplicative inverse (modulo *N*) if and only if gcd(*a*, *N*) = 1

Proof:

let a⁻¹ denote a's inverse (modulo N), then there is an integer q such that

 $aa^{-1} = qN + 1$

■ For all *a*, *a* has a multiplicative inverse (modulo *N*) if and only if gcd(*a*, *N*) = 1

Proof:

let a⁻¹ denote a's inverse (modulo N), then there is an integer q such that

 $aa^{-1} = qN + 1$

dividing both sides by gcd(a, N), we get

$$\frac{aa^{-1}}{\gcd(a,N)} = \frac{qN}{\gcd(a,N)} + \frac{1}{\gcd(a,N)}$$

For all *a*, *a* has a multiplicative inverse (modulo *N*) if and only if gcd(a, N) = 1

Proof:

let a⁻¹ denote a's inverse (modulo N), then there is an integer q such that

 $aa^{-1} = qN + 1$

dividing both sides by gcd(a, N), we get

$$\frac{aa^{-1}}{\gcd(a,N)} = \frac{qN}{\gcd(a,N)} + \frac{1}{\gcd(a,N)}$$

since gcd(a, N) divides both a and N, then the first two fractions are integers, so the last fraction, 1/gcd(a, N), must also be an integer, which requires that gcd(a, N) = 1

Summary on Modulo Arithmetic

In additions and multiplications (modulo N) we can *always* replace x with r if $x \equiv r \pmod{N}$

Summary on Modulo Arithmetic

- In additions and multiplications (modulo N) we can *always* replace x with r if $x \equiv r \pmod{N}$
 - for simplicity, we always use the (unique) r < N as the representative of its equivalence class

Summary on Modulo Arithmetic

- In additions and multiplications (modulo N) we can *always* replace x with r if $x \equiv r \pmod{N}$
 - for simplicity, we always use the (unique) r < N as the representative of its equivalence class
- Each *a* relatively prime to *N* has a *multiplicative inverse* (modulo *N*) that we denote as a^{-1}

$$aa^{-1} \equiv 1 \pmod{N}$$
 if $gcd(a, N) = 1$

Fermat's Little Theorem

Fermat's Little Theorem

If *P* is *prime*, then for all $1 \le a \le P - 1$

 $a^{P-1} \equiv 1 \pmod{P}$

Fermat's Little Theorem

If *P* is *prime*, then for all $1 \le a \le P - 1$

$$a^{P-1} \equiv 1 \pmod{P}$$

Proof:

• let
$$S = \{1, 2, \dots, P - 1\}$$
 and $0 < a < P$
If *P* is *prime*, then for all $1 \le a \le P - 1$

$$a^{P-1} \equiv 1 \pmod{P}$$

- let $S = \{1, 2, \dots, P 1\}$ and 0 < a < P
- multiplying the elements of S by a (mod P) yields a permutation of S;

If *P* is *prime*, then for all $1 \le a \le P - 1$

$$a^{P-1} \equiv 1 \pmod{P}$$

- let $S = \{1, 2, \dots, P 1\}$ and 0 < a < P
- ► multiplying the elements of S by a (mod P) yields a permutation of S; i.e., for each y ∈ S there is exactly one element x ∈ S such that ax ≡ y (mod P)

If *P* is *prime*, then for all $1 \le a \le P - 1$

$$a^{P-1} \equiv 1 \pmod{P}$$

Proof:

- let $S = \{1, 2, \dots, P 1\}$ and 0 < a < P
- multiplying the elements of S by a (mod P) yields a permutation of S; i.e., for each y ∈ S there is exactly one element x ∈ S such that ax ≡ y (mod P)

Proof:

by contradiction, suppose ∃x' ≠ x such that ax ≡ y (mod P) and ax' ≡ y (mod P)

If *P* is *prime*, then for all $1 \le a \le P - 1$

$$a^{P-1} \equiv 1 \pmod{P}$$

Proof:

- let $S = \{1, 2, \dots, P 1\}$ and 0 < a < P
- multiplying the elements of S by a (mod P) yields a permutation of S; i.e., for each y ∈ S there is exactly one element x ∈ S such that ax ≡ y (mod P)

- ▶ by contradiction, suppose $\exists x' \neq x$ such that $ax \equiv y \pmod{P}$ and $ax' \equiv y \pmod{P}$ (mod P)
- since P is prime, then gcd(a, N) = 1, therefore a has a multiplicative inverse a⁻¹ (modulo P)

If *P* is *prime*, then for all $1 \le a \le P - 1$

$$a^{P-1} \equiv 1 \pmod{P}$$

Proof:

- let $S = \{1, 2, \dots, P 1\}$ and 0 < a < P
- multiplying the elements of S by a (mod P) yields a permutation of S; i.e., for each y ∈ S there is exactly one element x ∈ S such that ax ≡ y (mod P)

- by contradiction, suppose ∃x' ≠ x such that ax ≡ y (mod P) and ax' ≡ y (mod P)
- since P is prime, then gcd(a, N) = 1, therefore a has a multiplicative inverse a⁻¹ (modulo P)
- ▶ so, multiplying $ax \equiv y \pmod{P}$ and $ax' \equiv y \pmod{P}$ by a^{-1} , we have $x \equiv y \pmod{P}$ and $x' \equiv y \pmod{P}$, which means that $x \equiv x' \pmod{P}$, which is a contradiction

If *P* is *prime*, then for all $1 \le a \le P - 1$

$$a^{P-1} \equiv 1 \pmod{P}$$

Proof: (continued)

- let $S = \{1, 2, \dots, P 1\}$ and 0 < a < P
- multiplying the elements of S by a (mod P) yields a permutation of S; i.e., for each y ∈ S there is exactly one element x ∈ S such that ax ≡ y (mod P)

If *P* is *prime*, then for all $1 \le a \le P - 1$

$$a^{P-1} \equiv 1 \pmod{P}$$

Proof: (continued)

- let $S = \{1, 2, \dots, P-1\}$ and 0 < a < P
- multiplying the elements of S by a (mod P) yields a permutation of S; i.e., for each y ∈ S there is exactly one element x ∈ S such that ax ≡ y (mod P)

$$\{1, 2, \dots, P-1\} = \{a, 2a, \dots, (P-1)a\} \pmod{P}$$

If *P* is *prime*, then for all $1 \le a \le P - 1$

$$a^{P-1} \equiv 1 \pmod{P}$$

Proof: (continued)

- let $S = \{1, 2, \dots, P-1\}$ and 0 < a < P
- multiplying the elements of S by a (mod P) yields a permutation of S; i.e., for each y ∈ S there is exactly one element x ∈ S such that ax ≡ y (mod P)

$$\{1, 2, \dots, P-1\} = \{a, 2a, \dots, (P-1)a\} \pmod{P}$$

multiplying together all the elements on each side, we get

$$(P-1)! \equiv a^{P-1}(P-1)! \pmod{P}$$

If *P* is *prime*, then for all $1 \le a \le P - 1$

$$a^{P-1} \equiv 1 \pmod{P}$$

Proof: (continued)

- let $S = \{1, 2, \dots, P 1\}$ and 0 < a < P
- multiplying the elements of S by a (mod P) yields a permutation of S; i.e., for each y ∈ S there is exactly one element x ∈ S such that ax ≡ y (mod P)

$$\{1, 2, \dots, P-1\} = \{a, 2a, \dots, (P-1)a\} \pmod{P}$$

multiplying together all the elements on each side, we get

$$(P-1)! \equiv a^{P-1}(P-1)! \pmod{P}$$

► (P - 1)! also has a multiplicative inverse, so

$$1 \equiv a^{P-1} \pmod{P}$$

If *P* is *prime*, then for all $1 \le a \le P - 1$

 $a^{P-1} \equiv 1 \pmod{P}$

If *P* is *prime*, then for all $1 \le a \le P - 1$

 $a^{P-1} \equiv 1 \pmod{P}$

■ This suggests a test: given N

▶ $a^{N-1} \not\equiv 1 \pmod{N}$

If *P* is *prime*, then for all $1 \le a \le P - 1$

 $a^{P-1} \equiv 1 \pmod{P}$

■ This suggests a test: given N

• $a^{N-1} \not\equiv 1 \pmod{N}$, then we must conclude that N is *composite*

If *P* is *prime*, then for all $1 \le a \le P - 1$

 $a^{P-1} \equiv 1 \pmod{P}$

■ This suggests a test: given N

• $a^{N-1} \not\equiv 1 \pmod{N}$, then we must conclude that N is composite

► $a^{N-1} \equiv 1 \pmod{N}$

If *P* is *prime*, then for all $1 \le a \le P - 1$

 $a^{P-1} \equiv 1 \pmod{P}$

■ This suggests a test: given N

• $a^{N-1} \not\equiv 1 \pmod{N}$, then we must conclude that N is *composite*

• $a^{N-1} \equiv 1 \pmod{N}$, we can not say much

If *P* is *prime*, then for all $1 \le a \le P - 1$

 $a^{P-1} \equiv 1 \pmod{P}$

- This suggests a test: given N
 - $a^{N-1} \not\equiv 1 \pmod{N}$, then we must conclude that N is *composite*
 - $a^{N-1} \equiv 1 \pmod{N}$, we can not say much
- However, another lemma gives us a way to measure the probability that a *composite N* passes the test

■ If $a^{N-1} \not\equiv 1 \pmod{N}$ for some a < N relatively prime to N, then $a^{N-1} \not\equiv 1 \pmod{N}$ holds for at least half the choices of a

- If $a^{N-1} \not\equiv 1 \pmod{N}$ for some a < N relatively prime to N, then $a^{N-1} \not\equiv 1 \pmod{N}$ holds for at least half the choices of a
- I.e., if there is one a that "exposes" N as a composite, by failing the test of Fermat's little theorem, then at least half of the choices of a expose N as a composite

- If $a^{N-1} \not\equiv 1 \pmod{N}$ for some a < N relatively prime to N, then $a^{N-1} \not\equiv 1 \pmod{N}$ holds for at least half the choices of a
- I.e., if there is one a that "exposes" N as a composite, by failing the test of Fermat's little theorem, then at least half of the choices of a expose N as a composite

- If $a^{N-1} \not\equiv 1 \pmod{N}$ for some a < N relatively prime to N, then $a^{N-1} \not\equiv 1 \pmod{N}$ holds for at least half the choices of a
- I.e., if there is one a that "exposes" N as a composite, by failing the test of Fermat's little theorem, then at least half of the choices of a expose N as a composite

- ▶ fix *a* such that $a^{N-1} \not\equiv 1 \pmod{N}$ (hypothesis)
- for each b < N that passes the test b^{N-1} ≡ 1 (mod N), there is a "twin" value c = ab, that fails the test

- If $a^{N-1} \not\equiv 1 \pmod{N}$ for some a < N relatively prime to N, then $a^{N-1} \not\equiv 1 \pmod{N}$ holds for at least half the choices of a
- I.e., if there is one a that "exposes" N as a composite, by failing the test of Fermat's little theorem, then at least half of the choices of a expose N as a composite

- ▶ fix *a* such that $a^{N-1} \not\equiv 1 \pmod{N}$ (hypothesis)
- for each b < N that passes the test b^{N-1} ≡ 1 (mod N), there is a "twin" value c = ab, that fails the test. In fact,

$$c^{N-1} = (ab)^{N-1} = a^{N-1}b^{N-1} \not\equiv 1 \pmod{N}$$

- If $a^{N-1} \not\equiv 1 \pmod{N}$ for some a < N relatively prime to N, then $a^{N-1} \not\equiv 1 \pmod{N}$ holds for at least half the choices of a
- I.e., if there is one a that "exposes" N as a composite, by failing the test of Fermat's little theorem, then at least half of the choices of a expose N as a composite

Proof:

- ▶ fix *a* such that $a^{N-1} \not\equiv 1 \pmod{N}$ (hypothesis)
- for each b < N that passes the test b^{N-1} ≡ 1 (mod N), there is a "twin" value c = ab, that fails the test. In fact,

$$c^{N-1} = (ab)^{N-1} = a^{N-1}b^{N-1} \not\equiv 1 \pmod{N}$$

two distinct b < N and b' < N, with b ≠ b', that pass the test have distinct "twins" ab and ab'</p>

- If $a^{N-1} \not\equiv 1 \pmod{N}$ for some a < N relatively prime to N, then $a^{N-1} \not\equiv 1 \pmod{N}$ holds for at least half the choices of a
- I.e., if there is one a that "exposes" N as a composite, by failing the test of Fermat's little theorem, then at least half of the choices of a expose N as a composite

Proof:

- ▶ fix *a* such that $a^{N-1} \not\equiv 1 \pmod{N}$ (hypothesis)
- for each b < N that passes the test b^{N-1} ≡ 1 (mod N), there is a "twin" value c = ab, that fails the test. In fact,

$$c^{N-1} = (ab)^{N-1} = a^{N-1}b^{N-1} \not\equiv 1 \pmod{N}$$

two distinct b < N and b' < N, with b ≠ b', that pass the test have distinct "twins" ab and ab'; proof: by contradiction, assume ab ≡ ab', then multiply by a⁻¹ (mod N), you immediately get a contradiction

If a^{N-1} ≠ 1 (mod N) for some a < N relatively prime to N, then at least half the choices of a are such that a^{N-1} ≠ 1 (mod N).

If a^{N-1} ≠ 1 (mod N) for some a < N relatively prime to N, then at least half the choices of a are such that a^{N-1} ≠ 1 (mod N).

If a^{N-1} ≠ 1 (mod N) for some a < N relatively prime to N, then at least half the choices of a are such that a^{N-1} ≠ 1 (mod N).

Probabilistic test

choose a < N and relatively prime to N (easy)</p>

If a^{N-1} ≠ 1 (mod N) for some a < N relatively prime to N, then at least half the choices of a are such that a^{N-1} ≠ 1 (mod N).

- choose a < N and relatively prime to N (easy)</p>
- ▶ if $a^{N-1} \not\equiv 1 \pmod{N}$

If a^{N-1} ≠ 1 (mod N) for some a < N relatively prime to N, then at least half the choices of a are such that a^{N-1} ≠ 1 (mod N).

- choose a < N and relatively prime to N (easy)</p>
- if $a^{N-1} \not\equiv 1 \pmod{N}$, then we conclude that N is *composite*

If a^{N-1} ≠ 1 (mod N) for some a < N relatively prime to N, then at least half the choices of a are such that a^{N-1} ≠ 1 (mod N).

- choose a < N and relatively prime to N (easy)</p>
- if $a^{N-1} \not\equiv 1 \pmod{N}$, then we conclude that N is composite
- if $a^{N-1} \equiv 1 \pmod{N}$

If a^{N-1} ≠ 1 (mod N) for some a < N relatively prime to N, then at least half the choices of a are such that a^{N-1} ≠ 1 (mod N).

- choose a < N and relatively prime to N (easy)</p>
- if $a^{N-1} \not\equiv 1 \pmod{N}$, then we conclude that N is *composite*
- if $a^{N-1} \equiv 1 \pmod{N}$, N is prime with probability 1/2

If a^{N-1} ≠ 1 (mod N) for some a < N relatively prime to N, then at least half the choices of a are such that a^{N-1} ≠ 1 (mod N).

- choose a < N and relatively prime to N (easy)</p>
- if $a^{N-1} \not\equiv 1 \pmod{N}$, then we conclude that N is *composite*
- if $a^{N-1} \equiv 1 \pmod{N}$, N is prime with probability 1/2
- Repeat the test k times, with different choices of a, and if N passes all k tests, then we can say that N is prime with probability 1 2^{-k}

• How do we compute $a^N \pmod{M}$?

remember that N may be a huge number here

- How do we compute $a^N \pmod{M}$?
 - remember that N may be a huge number here
- *Idea*: think of the binary representation of *N*. E.g.,

$$N = 1189 = 2^{10} + 2^7 + 2^5 + 2^2 + 1 = 10010100101_{two}$$

- How do we compute $a^N \pmod{M}$?
 - remember that N may be a huge number here
- *Idea*: think of the binary representation of *N*. E.g.,

$$N = 1189 = 2^{10} + 2^7 + 2^5 + 2^2 + 1 = 10010100101_{\text{two}}$$

so $a^N = a^{2^{10}} \cdot a^{2^7} \cdot a^{2^5} \cdot a^{2^2} \cdot a^1$
Modular Exponentiation

- How do we compute $a^N \pmod{M}$?
 - remember that N may be a huge number here
- *Idea*: think of the binary representation of *N*. E.g.,

$$N = 1189 = 2^{10} + 2^7 + 2^5 + 2^2 + 1 = 10010100101_{\text{two}}$$

so $a^N = a^{2^{10}} \cdot a^{2^7} \cdot a^{2^5} \cdot a^{2^2} \cdot a^1$
Exp-MoD (a, N, M) // computes $a^N \mod M$

1
$$x = 1$$

2 while $N > 0$
3 if $N \equiv 1 \mod 2$
4 $x = xa \mod M$
5 $a = a^2 \mod M$
6 $N = \lfloor N/2 \rfloor$
7 return x

If a^{N-1} ≠ 1 (mod N) for some a < N relatively prime to N, then at least half the choices of a are such that a^{N-1} ≠ 1 (mod N).

- If a^{N-1} ≠ 1 (mod N) for some a < N relatively prime to N, then at least half the choices of a are such that a^{N-1} ≠ 1 (mod N).
 - ▶ i.e., if there is at least one "witness" then...

- If a^{N-1} ≠ 1 (mod N) for some a < N relatively prime to N, then at least half the choices of a are such that a^{N-1} ≠ 1 (mod N).
 - ▶ i.e., *if there is at least one "witness" then...*
- There may be composites N such that no a would fail the test

- If a^{N-1} ≠ 1 (mod N) for some a < N relatively prime to N, then at least half the choices of a are such that a^{N-1} ≠ 1 (mod N).
 - ▶ i.e., *if there is at least one "witness" then...*
- There may be composites N such that no a would fail the test
- Indeed, there are such numbers (e.g., *N* = 561)
 - called Carmichael numbers
 - infinitely many, but extremely rare
 - ▶ their prevalence within the first *N* integers vanishes with $N \rightarrow \infty$
 - there is a more refined test that detects Carmichael (composite) numbers