

# PRIMES is in coRP

EVAN CHEN

February 22, 2016

## 1 Preliminaries

### 1.1 Modular arithmetic

In middle school you might have encountered questions such as

**Exercise 1.** What is  $3^{2016} \pmod{10}$ ?

You could answer such questions by listing out  $3^n$  for small  $n$  and then finding a pattern, in this case of period 4. However, for large moduli this “brute-force” approach can be time-consuming.

Fortunately, it turns out that one can predict the period in advance.

#### Theorem 2 (Euler’s little theorem)

- (a) Let  $\gcd(a, n) = 1$ . Then  $a^{\phi(n)} \equiv 1 \pmod{n}$ .
- (b) (Fermat) If  $p$  is a prime, then  $a^p \equiv a \pmod{p}$  for every  $a$ .

*Proof.* Part (a) is a special case of Lagrange’s Theorem (see [3, Chapter 1]): if  $G$  is a finite group and  $g \in G$ , then  $g^{|G|}$  is the identity element. Now select  $G = (\mathbb{Z}/n\mathbb{Z})^\times$ . Part (b) is the case  $n = p$ .  $\square$

Thus, in the middle school problem we know in advance that  $3^4 \equiv 1 \pmod{10}$  because  $\phi(10) = 4$ . This bound is sharp for primes:

#### Theorem 3 (Primitive roots)

For every  $p$  prime there’s a  $g \pmod{p}$  such that  $g^{p-1} \equiv 1 \pmod{p}$  but  $g^k \not\equiv 1 \pmod{p}$  for any  $k < p - 1$ . (Hence  $(\mathbb{Z}/p\mathbb{Z})^\times \cong \mathbb{Z}/(p - 1)$ .)

For a proof, see the last exercise of [4].

we will define the following anyways:

**Definition 4.** We say an integer  $n$  (thought of as an exponent) **annihilates** the prime  $p$  if

- $a^n \equiv 1 \pmod{p}$  for every prime  $p$ ,
- or equivalently,  $p - 1 \mid n$ .

#### Theorem 5 (All/nothing)

Suppose an exponent  $n$  does not annihilate the prime  $p$ . Then more than  $\frac{1}{2}p$  of  $x \pmod{p}$  satisfy  $x^n \not\equiv 1 \pmod{p}$ .

*Proof.* Much stronger result is true: in  $x^n \equiv 1 \pmod{p}$  then  $x^{\gcd(n, p-1)} \equiv 1 \pmod{p}$ .  $\square$

## 1.2 Repeated Exponentiation

Even without the previous facts, one can still do:

### Theorem 6 (Repeated exponentiation)

Given  $x$  and  $n$ , one can compute  $x^n \pmod{N}$  with  $O(\log n)$  multiplications mod  $N$ .

The idea is that to compute  $x^{600} \pmod{N}$ , one just multiplies  $x^{512+64+16+8}$ . All the  $x^{2^k}$  can be computed in  $k$  steps, and  $k \leq \log_2 n$ .

## 1.3 Chinese remainder theorem

In the middle school problem, we might have noticed that to compute  $3^{2016} \pmod{10}$ , it suffices to compute it modulo 5, because we already know it is odd. More generally, to understand  $x \pmod{n}$  it suffices to understand  $x$  modulo each of its prime powers.

The formal statement, which we include for completeness, is:

### Theorem 7 (Chinese remainder theorem)

Let  $p_1, p_2, \dots, p_m$  be distinct primes, and  $e_i \geq 1$  integers. Then there is a ring isomorphism given by the natural projection

$$\mathbb{Z}/n \rightarrow \prod_{i=1}^m \mathbb{Z}/p_i^{e_i}.$$

In particular, a random choice of  $x \pmod{n}$  amounts to a random choice of  $x \pmod{p_i^{e_i}}$  for each prime power.

For an example, in the following table (from [5]) we see the natural bijection between  $x \pmod{15}$  and  $(x \pmod{3}, x \pmod{5})$ .

$x \pmod{15}$	$x \pmod{3}$	$x \pmod{5}$	$x \pmod{15}$	$x \pmod{3}$	$x \pmod{5}$
0	0	0	8	2	3
1	1	1	9	0	4
2	2	2	10	1	0
3	0	3	11	2	1
4	1	4	12	0	2
5	2	0	13	1	3
6	0	1	14	2	4
7	1	2			

## 2 The RSA algorithm

This simple number theory is enough to develop the so-called RSA algorithm. Suppose Alice wants to send Bob a message  $M$  over an insecure channel. They can do so as follows.

- Bob selects integers  $d$ ,  $e$  and  $N$  (with  $N$  huge) such that  $N$  is a semiprime and

$$de \equiv 1 \pmod{\phi(N)}.$$

- Bob publishes both the number  $N$  and  $e$  (the **public key**) but keeps the number  $d$  secret (the **private key**).

- Alice sends the number  $X = M^e \pmod{N}$  across the channel.
- Bob computes

$$X^d \equiv M^{de} \equiv M^1 \equiv M \pmod{N}$$

and hence obtains the message  $M$ .

In practice, the  $N$  in RSA is at least 2000 bits long.

The trick is that an adversary cannot compute  $d$  from  $e$  and  $N$  without knowing the prime factorization of  $N$ . So the security relies heavily on the difficulty of factoring.

**Remark 8.** It turns out that we basically don't know how to factor large numbers  $N$ : the best known classical algorithms can factor an  $n$ -bit number in

$$O\left(\exp\left(\frac{64}{9}n \log(n)^2\right)^{1/3}\right)$$

time (“general number field sieve”). On the other hand, with a *quantum* computer one can do this in  $O(n^2 \log n \log \log n)$  time.

### 3 Primality Testing

Main question: if we can't factor a number  $n$  quickly, can we at least check it's prime?

In what follows, we assume for simplicity that  $n$  is **squarefree**, i.e.  $n = p_1 p_2 \dots p_k$  for distinct primes  $p_k$ . This doesn't substantially change anything, but it makes my life much easier.

#### 3.1 Co-RP

Here is the goal: we need to show there is a random algorithm  $A$  which does the following.

- If  $n$  is composite then
  - More than half the time  $A$  says “definitely composite”.
  - Occasionally,  $A$  says “possibly prime”.
- If  $n$  is prime,  $A$  always says “possibly prime”.

If there is a polynomial time algorithm  $A$  that does this, we say that PRIMES is in Co-RP. Clearly, this is a very good thing to be true!

#### 3.2 Fermat

One idea is to try to use the converse of Fermat's little theorem: given an integer  $n$ , pick a random number  $x \pmod{n}$  and see if  $x^{n-1} \equiv 1 \pmod{n}$ . (We compute using repeated exponentiation.) If not, then we know for sure  $n$  is not prime, and we call  $x$  a **Fermat witness** modulo  $n$ .

How good is this test? For most composite  $n$ , pretty good:

##### Proposition 9

Let  $n$  be composite. Assume that there is a prime  $p \mid n$  such that  $n-1$  does not annihilate  $p$ . Then over half the numbers mod  $n$  are Fermat witnesses.

*Proof.* Apply the Chinese theorem then the “all-or-nothing” theorem. □

Unfortunately, if  $n$  doesn't satisfy the hypothesis, then *all* the  $\gcd(x, n) = 1$  satisfy  $x^{n-1} \equiv 1 \pmod{n}$ !

Are there such  $n$  which aren't prime? Such numbers are called **Carmichael numbers**, but unfortunately they exist, the first one is  $561 = 3 \cdot 11 \cdot 17$ .

**Remark 10.** For  $X \gg 1$ , there are more than  $X^{1/3}$  Carmichael numbers.

Thus these numbers are very rare, but they foil the Fermat test.

**Exercise 11.** Show that a Carmichael number is not a semiprime.

### 3.3 Rabin-Miller

Fortunately, we can adapt the Fermat test to cover Carmichael numbers too. It comes from the observation that if  $n$  is prime, then  $a^2 \equiv 1 \pmod{n} \implies a \equiv \pm 1 \pmod{n}$ .

So let  $n - 1 = 2^s t$ , where  $t$  is odd. For example, if  $n = 561$  then  $560 = 2^4 \cdot 35$ . Then we compute  $x^t, x^{2t}, \dots, x^{n-1}$ . For example [2] investigates the case  $n = 561$  and  $x = 245$ :

	mod 561	mod 3	mod 11	mod 17
$x$	245	-1	3	7
$x^{35}$	122	-1	1	3
$x^{70}$	298	1	1	9
$x^{140}$	166	1	1	-4
$x^{280}$	67	1	1	-1
$x^{560}$	1	1	1	1

And there we have our example! We have  $67^2 \equiv 1 \pmod{561}$ , so 561 isn't prime.

So the Rabin-Miller test works as follows:

- Given  $n$ , select a random  $x$  and compute powers of  $x$  as in the table.
- If  $x^{n-1} \not\equiv 1$ , stop,  $n$  is composite (Fermat test).
- If  $x^{n-1} \equiv 1$ , see if the entry just before the first 1 is  $-1$ . If it isn't then we say  $x$  is a **RM-witness** and  $n$  is composite.
- Otherwise,  $n$  is "possibly prime".

How likely is probably?

#### Theorem 12

If  $n$  is Carmichael, then over half the  $x \pmod{n}$  are RM witnesses.

*Proof.* We sample  $x \pmod{n}$  randomly again by looking modulo each prime (Chinese theorem). By the theorem on primitive roots, show that the probability the first  $-1$  appears in any given row is  $\leq \frac{1}{2}$ . This implies the conclusion.  $\square$

**Exercise 13.** Improve the  $\frac{1}{2}$  in the problem to  $\frac{3}{4}$  by using the fact that Carmichael numbers aren't semiprime.

### 3.4 AKS

In August 6, 2002, it was in fact shown that PRIMES is in  $\mathbb{P}$ , using the deterministic AKS algorithm [1]. However, in practice everyone still uses Miller-Rabin since the implied constants for AKS runtime are large.

---

## References

- [1] Agrawal, Manindra; Kayal, Neeraj; Saxena, Nitin (2004). "PRIMES is in P". *Annals of Mathematics* **160** (2): 781-793.
- [2] Bobby Kleinberg, *The Miller-Rabin Randomized Primality Test* <http://www.cs.cornell.edu/courses/cs4820/2010sp/handouts/MillerRabin.pdf>
- [3] Evan Chen, *An Infinitely Large Napkin*. <http://www.mit.edu/~evanchen/napkin.html>
- [4] Evan Chen, *Orders Module A Prime*. <http://www.mit.edu/~evanchen/handouts/ORPR/ORPR.pdf>
- [5] Horner Math Club MathCounts Materials: Problem Set 5.