1. Let p = 43. Let  $a \neq \pm 1$ ,  $a \in Z_p^*$  be a quadratic residue. Find a positive integer k such that  $a^k$  is a square root of  $a \mod p$ . Justify your answer.

Soln: Let  $k = \frac{p+1}{4}$ . Then  $(a^k)^2 = a^{\frac{p+1}{2}} = a^{\frac{p-1}{2}} \cdot a = 1 \cdot a = a \mod p$ . Thus k = 11 solves.

2. Let p be a prime number of the form 4k + 3. Is it always true that a is a quadratic residue if and only if -a is a quadratic non-residue. (Hint: Carefully observe calculations of the previous question!).

Soln: if a is a quadratic non-residue then  $a^{\frac{p-1}{2}} = -1$ . Hence,  $(a^{\frac{p+1}{4}})^2 = -a$ . Thus -a is a quadratic residue. Conversely, if a is a quadratic residue, then  $(-a)^{\frac{p-1}{2}} = a^{\frac{p-1}{2}} \cdot (-1)^{\frac{p-1}{2}} = -1$  (why?). Hence -a is a quadratic non-residue.

3. Find all values of  $a \in Z_{17}^*$  such that  $a^{\frac{n-1}{2}} \mod 17 \neq \left(\frac{a}{17}\right)$ 

Soln: This question was set as an easy "take away".

- 4. Let  $n = p^k m$ ,  $k \ge 2$  with GCD(m, p) = 1, m > 1 odd. Let g be a generator of  $Z_{p^2}^*$ . Let  $a \equiv g \mod p^k$  and  $a \equiv 1 \mod m$ . Is it true that  $a^{\frac{n-1}{2}} \mod n \ne \left(\frac{a}{n}\right)$ ? Prove/disprove. Soln:  $a = (g, 1) \in \mathbf{Z}_{p^k}^* \times \mathbf{Z_m}^*$ . Now  $a^{\frac{n-1}{2}} = (g^{\frac{n-1}{2}} \mod p^k, 1) \in \mathbf{Z}_{p^k}^* \times \mathbf{Z}_m^*$ . On the other hand  $\left(\frac{a}{n}\right)$  can assume values only  $\pm 1$ . Consequently, equality between the two is possible if and only if  $g^{\frac{n-1}{2}} \mod p^k = 1$  (why?). But this would imply that  $g^{\frac{n-1}{2}} = 1 \mod p^2$ . But then o(g) in  $\mathbf{Z}_{p^2}^*$  must divide  $\frac{n-1}{2}$  (Lagrange), This would imply that p(p-1) must divide  $\frac{n-1}{2}$  and thus p must divide n-1, a contradiction as p can't divide both n (as originally assumed) as well as n-1.
- 5. Let r be randomly chosen from  $Z_n^*$  for a given n satisfying conditions of the previous question. Suppose we announce n composite if and only if  $r^{\frac{n-1}{2}} \mod n \neq \left(\frac{r}{n}\right)$ , can we say that the test announce n composite with probablity at least  $\frac{1}{2}$ ? prove/disprove.

Soln: Let  $S_n = \{a \in \mathbf{Z}_n^* : a^{\frac{n-1}{2}} \mod n \equiv \left(\frac{a}{n}\right) \mod n\}$ . It is easy to see that  $S_n$  is a subgroup of  $\mathbf{Z}_n^*$  and that  $a \in \mathbf{Z}_n^*$  fails the test if and only if  $a \in S_n$ . Thus, if  $S_n$  is a proper subgroup of  $\mathbf{Z}_n^*$ , the test announces n composite with probability at least  $\frac{1}{2}$  (why?- Largrange). In the previous question we have seen the existance of one element outside  $S_n$ . Hence,  $S_n$  is indeed a proper subgroup of  $\mathbf{Z}_n^*$ .

6. Let n = p<sub>1</sub>p<sub>2</sub>..p<sub>k</sub> be a Carmichael number. Prove that there exists a ∈ Z<sup>\*</sup><sub>n</sub> such that a<sup>n-1</sup>/<sub>2k</sub> ≠ -1 for all k ≥ 1 such that 2<sup>k</sup> divides (n - 1).
Soln: This question is easier than it was designed to be. Simply setting a = 1 solves! unfortunately(?)
I missed putting the condition a ≠ 1 in the question. Even if the condition was there, you could have

found such a as follows: pick a such that  $a = -1 \mod p_1$  and  $a \equiv 1 \mod p_i$ ,  $1 < i \le k$ . No power of this element can be equal to -1 (why?).

- 7. What will Miller Rabin test return if a is the randomly chosen element for testing compositeness of n, a, n satisfying conditions stated in the previous question? Justify your answer. Soln: Let  $n - 1 = 2^k m$ , m odd. If  $a^m \neq \pm 1$  Miller Rabin will return COMPOSITE; otherwise, Miller Rabin will return PRIME. The reasoning is left to you.
- 8. Let  $(b_1, b_2)$  be a basis for a (two dimensional) lattice  $\mathcal{L}$  with  $||b_1|| \leq ||b_2|| \leq ||b_2 + qb_1||$  for all  $q \in \mathbb{Z}$ . Prove that  $||v|| \geq ||b_2||$  for all  $v \in \mathcal{L}$ ,  $v \notin Span(b_1)$ . (Answer on the reverse side). Soln: See http://athena.nitc.ac.in/~kmurali/Courses/17CompAlgebra/gauss.pdf for a proof.

3

3

3

3

3

3

3

3

## Computational Algebra

9. Let  $(b_1, b_2)$  be a basis for a (two dimensional) lattice  $\mathcal{L}$  with  $||b_1|| = ||b_2||$ . Can we conclude that  $(b_1, b_2)$  is a reduced basis for  $\mathcal{L}$ ? Prove / Provide counter example.

Soln: Consider  $b_1 = \begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ 2 \end{bmatrix}$  and  $b_2 = \begin{bmatrix} 2 \\ 1 \end{bmatrix}$ . It is easy to see that  $b_1 - b_2$ , is a vector in the lattice shorter than both.

10. A prime number of the form  $p = 2^k + 1$  for some positive integer k is called a **Fermat Prime**. (Ex: 3,5,17). Show that if  $2^k + 1$  is prime, then k must be a power of 2. (That is  $p = 2^{2^r} + 1$  for some  $r \ge 0$ .). Hint: When m is odd, (a + b) is a divisor of  $(a^m + b^m)$ .

Soln: Consider a Fermat prime p of the form  $2^{2^t m} + 1$  with m odd. Put  $x = 2^{2^t}$ . Then  $p = x^m + 1$ . Hence (x + 1) must be a divisor of p. As p is prime, m must be 1.

- 11. Consider the following four step algorithm that is claimed to test whether a given n is a Fermat prime: 1. if (n-1) is not a power of 2, return NO. 2. Randomly chose  $a \in \{1, 2, ...(n-1)\}$ . 3. if  $a^{\frac{n-1}{2}} = 1$  return NO. 4. Return YES.
  - 1. Derive an upper bound on the probability that the algorithm announces NO if n is actually a Fermat prime?
  - 2. What is the (worst case) probability that the algorithm announces YES when n is not prime?

Soln:

- 1. Let p be a Fermat prime. Let  $p 1 = 2^t$ . Since  $Z_p^*$  is cyclic of order  $\phi(p 1) = 2^{t-1} = \frac{\phi(p)}{2}$ , with probability  $\frac{1}{2}$ , a random element  $a \in Z_p^*$  is a generator of  $Z_p^*$ , and for such a, the algorithm will not return NO in Step 2 (and hence return YES). (why?).
- 2. If the random element is 1 or -1, clearly the test will return NO except in trivial cases (why?). Consider the case  $n = 9 = 2^3 + 1$ . In this case, every element in  $Z_9^*$  except 1 and -1 will result in the algorithm returning YES. Hence, the probability can be as bad as  $\left(1 - \frac{2}{\phi(n)}\right)$ .

3 + 3

3

3