

## Algorithms in Number Theory

Jonathan L.F. King

University of Florida, Gainesville FL 32611-2082, USA  
15 April, 2022 (at 08:50)

### Iterated Lightning-bolt (Euclidean algorithm)

Fix integers  $J_0$  and  $J_1$ , and set  $D := \text{GCD}(J_0, J_1)$ . A pair  $(S, T)$  of integers is “a **Bézout pair** for  $J_0, J_1$ ” if

$$1a: \quad SJ_0 + TJ_1 = D.$$

Bézout's lemma says: *There always exists a Bézout pair.* (Alternative term:  $S$  and  $T$  are **Bézout multipliers**.)

A Bézout pair  $(S, T)$  is not unique; it is (except in the boring  $J_0=0=J_1$  case) part of a one-parameter family

$$1b: \quad S_{\langle k \rangle} := S + \left[ k \cdot \frac{J_1}{D} \right] \quad \text{and}$$

$$T_{\langle k \rangle} := T - \left[ k \cdot \frac{J_0}{D} \right],$$

of Bézout pairs  $(S_{\langle k \rangle}, T_{\langle k \rangle})$ , for each  $k \in \mathbb{Z}$ .

1c: *Exercise.* Prove that (1b) describes *all* the Bézout pairs for  $J_0, J_1$ . □

**GCD of several integers.** Given a list of integers,  $\vec{J} = (J_0, J_1, \dots, J_L)$ , use

$$2a: \quad \text{GCD}(J_0, J_1, \dots, J_L) \text{ or } \text{GCD}(\vec{J})$$

to denote the greatest common divisor,  $D$ , of the list. Our goal is to simultaneously compute  $D$  and a Bézout-tuple  $\vec{s} := (S_0, \dots, S_L)$  such that

$$2b: \quad \sum_{\ell=0}^L [S_{\ell} \cdot J_{\ell}] = D.$$

We'll accomplish this with  $L$  applications of LBolt:

$$D \stackrel{\text{note}}{=} \text{GCD}(\dots \text{GCD}(\text{GCD}(J_0, J_1), J_2) \dots, J_L).$$

**Algorithm:** From integers  $\vec{J} = (J_0, J_1, \dots, J_{L-1}, J_L)$ , set

$$C := \text{GCD}(J_0, J_1, \dots, J_{L-1}) \quad \text{and}$$

$$D := \text{GCD}(J_0, J_1, \dots, J_{L-1}, J_L) \stackrel{\text{note}}{=} \text{GCD}(C, J_L).$$

Apply LBolt  $L-1$  times to produce integers  $v_0, \dots, v_{L-1}$  with  $\sum_{\ell=0}^{L-1} [v_{\ell} \cdot J_{\ell}] = C$ , and an  $L^{\text{th}}$  time to produce  $\alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{Z}$  with  $\alpha C + \beta J_L = D$ . Then

$$2c: \quad S_0 := \alpha v_0, \quad S_1 := \alpha v_1, \quad \dots, \quad S_{L-1} := \alpha v_{L-1}, \\ S_L := \beta,$$

gives a tuple  $\vec{s}$  satisfying (2b).

**Proof.** From the above defns of  $\vec{v}$ , and of  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} D &= \alpha C + \beta J_L = \left[ \alpha \cdot \sum_{\ell=0}^{L-1} [v_{\ell} \cdot J_{\ell}] \right] + \beta J_L \\ &= \left[ \sum_{\ell=0}^{L-1} \alpha v_{\ell} \cdot J_{\ell} \right] + \beta J_L. \end{aligned} \quad \spadesuit$$

**Shorthand.** Given two equal-length tuples of numbers,  $\vec{a} = (a_0, a_1, \dots, a_N)$  and  $\vec{c} = (c_0, c_1, \dots, c_N)$ , define their **dot product** to be

$$\vec{a} \bullet \vec{c} := \sum_{n=0}^N a_n \cdot c_n.$$

**Worked LBolt.** Consider  $\vec{J} := (525, 150, 350, 210)$ . Using 3 applications of LBolt, we will compute a Bézout tuple  $\vec{s}^3$  such that  $\vec{s}^3 \bullet \vec{J} = \text{GCD}(\vec{J})$ .

We LBolt to compute gcd and multipliers:

$$\begin{aligned} D_1 &:= \text{GCD}(J_0, J_1) = \text{GCD}(525, 150) = 75; \\ (\alpha, \beta) &:= (1, -3). \end{aligned}$$

Setting  $\vec{s}^1 := (1, -3)$ , then,  $\vec{s}^1 \bullet (525, 150) = 75$ .

Apply the algorithm again to produce

$$\begin{aligned} D_2 &:= \text{GCD}(D_1, J_2) = \text{GCD}(75, 350) = 25; \\ (\alpha, \beta) &:= (5, -1). \end{aligned}$$

Multiply  $\alpha \cdot \vec{s}^1 \stackrel{\text{note}}{=} (5, -15)$ , then adjoin  $\beta$ , to produce  $\vec{s}^2 := (5, -15, -1)$ . So now  $\vec{s}^2 \bullet (525, 150, 350) = 25$ .

A third application of LBolt gives

$$\begin{aligned} D_3 &:= \text{GCD}(D_2, J_3) = \text{GCD}(25, 210) = 5; \\ (\alpha, \beta) &:= (17, -2). \end{aligned}$$

Multiply  $\alpha \cdot \vec{s}^2 \stackrel{\text{note}}{=} (85, -255, -17)$ , then adjoin  $\beta$ , to produce  $\vec{s}^3 := (85, -255, -17, -2)$ .

The upshot is that

$$\begin{aligned} \vec{s}^3 \bullet \vec{J} &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \vec{s}^3 \bullet (525, 150, 350, 210) \\ &= 5 = \text{GCD}(\vec{J}), \end{aligned}$$

as desired.

**Remark.** Each of the three Bézout  $(\alpha, \beta)$  pairs is actually part of a 1-parameter family specified by (1b). It follows that the above  $\vec{s}^3$  is just one member of a

3-parameter family of (integer) 4-tuples  $\vec{s}$  that satisfy  $\vec{s}^3 \bullet \vec{J} = \text{GCD}(\vec{J})$ .

In other words, there is an injective (i.e, 1-to-1) function  $f: \mathbb{Z} \times \mathbb{Z} \times \mathbb{Z} \rightarrow \mathbb{Z} \times \mathbb{Z} \times \mathbb{Z} \times \mathbb{Z}$  with the property that

$$f(a, b, c) \bullet \vec{J} = \text{GCD}(\vec{J}),$$

for each triple  $a, b, c$  of integers. □

### Solving a linear congruence

Having fixed a *modulus*  $M \in \mathbb{Z}_+$ , as well as a *coefficient* and *target*  $B, T \in \mathbb{Z}$ , our goal is to find all solutions  $x$  to

$$3: \quad B \cdot x \equiv_M T, \quad \text{where } x \in [0..M].$$

Our algorithm has three **STEPS**.

This congruence has a solution IFF there exists a *pair*  $(x, k)$  solving eqn

$$3*: \quad B \cdot x + M \cdot k = T, \quad \text{where } x, k \in \mathbb{Z}.$$

Evidently  $D := \text{GCD}(B, M)$  divides LhS(3\*). Hence if  $T \nmid D$ , then (3\*) has no soln-pair. Whence

**STEP A:** If  $D := \text{GCD}(B, M)$  fails to divide  $T$ , then (3) has no soln. Else, define

$$\beta := \frac{B}{D}, \quad \mu := \frac{M}{D} \quad \text{and} \quad \tau := \frac{T}{D}$$

and study this “reduced congruence”:

$$4: \quad \beta \cdot y \equiv_\mu \tau, \quad \text{where } y \in [0.. \mu].$$

We have gained that  $\beta \perp \mu$ .

**STEP B:** Use LBolt to compute a mod- $\mu$  multiplicative-inverse,  $I$ , of  $\beta$ ; so  $I \cdot \beta \equiv_\mu 1$ . Thus

$$y \equiv_\mu I \cdot \beta \cdot y \equiv_\mu I \cdot \tau.$$

Let  $y_0$  be the unique value in  $[0.. \mu)$  st.  $y_0 \equiv_\mu I \cdot \tau$ .

This  $y_0$  is in the *unique* mod- $\mu$  residue class solving (4). But mod- $M$ , this residue class splits into  $D$  many residue classes. So here is the last step:

**STEP C:** The  $D$  many solutions to (3) are

$$x = y_0, y_1, y_2, y_3, \dots, y_{D-2}, y_{D-1},$$

where  $y_k := y_0 + [k\mu]$ .

**A worked example.** I use an arrow over a letter to abbreviate a sequence, e.g

$$\vec{b} := (b_0, b_1, b_2, \dots).$$

We consider

$$35x \equiv_{21} 55.$$

Let’s apply **STEP A**. Since  $\text{GCD}(35, 21) \stackrel{\text{note}}{=} 7$  does not divide 55, the above congruence has no soln. [The same computation shows that congr.  $21x \equiv_{35} 55$  has no solution.]

**A congruence with solns.** Consider congruence

$$3': \quad 33 \cdot x \equiv_{114} 18, \quad \text{where } x \in [0..114].$$

For **STEP A**, we compute just the  $\vec{r}$  and  $\vec{q}$  columns:

$n$	$r_n$	$q_n$
0	114	—
1	33	3
2	15	2
3	3	5
4	0	$\infty$

Since  $D := \text{GCD}(33, 114) \stackrel{\text{note}}{=} 3$  divides the target, 18, we divide each of the numbers in (3') by  $D=3$  to obtain the reduced congruence

$$4': \quad 11 \cdot y \equiv_{38} 6, \quad \text{where } y \in [0..38].$$

For **STEP B**, we compute (using  $\vec{q}$ ) just<sup>1</sup> the  $\vec{t}$  column. (Note: We have  $\vec{q}$  from the previous table.)

$n$	$r_n$	$q_n$	$s_n$	$t_n$
0	38	—	1	0
1	11	3	0	1
2	5	2	1	-3
3	1	5	-2	7
4	0	$\infty$	11	-38

So the mod-38 reciprocal of 11 is 7. From **STEP B**, then,

$$y \equiv_{38} 7 \cdot 6 = 42 \equiv_{38} 4.$$

So we set  $y_0 := 4$ .

<sup>1</sup>We do not need to compute  $\vec{s}$  nor  $\vec{r}$ . Of course, the new  $\vec{r}$  is just the old  $\vec{r}$  divided by  $D$ . I have grayed-out the superfluous columns.

Finally, **STEP C** tells us that these three,

$$4, \quad 4 + 38 \stackrel{\text{note}}{=} 42, \quad 42 + 38 \stackrel{\text{note}}{=} 80$$

are the  $D=3$  many solutions to  $(3')$ .

**Checking.** We calculate:

$$\begin{aligned} 33 \cdot 4 &= 132 &= 1 \cdot 114 + 18; \\ 33 \cdot 42 &= 1386 &= 12 \cdot 114 + 18; \\ 33 \cdot 80 &= 2640 &= 23 \cdot 114 + 18. \end{aligned}$$

*Copasetic!*

Filename: Problems/NumberTheory/nt-algorithms.latex  
As of: Thursday 24Sep2009. Typeset: 15Apr2022 at 08:50.