

Maciej Zakarczemny (mzakarczemny@pk.edu.pl)

Institut of Matchematics, Faculty of Physis, Mathematics and Computer Science,
Cracow University of Technology

LOWER AND UPPER BOUNDS FOR SOLUTIONS OF THE CONGRUENCE
 $x^m \equiv a \pmod{n}$

DOLNE OSZACOWANIE NA NAJWIĘKSZE I GÓRNE OSZACOWANIE NA
NAJMNIEJSZE ROZWIĄZANIE KONGRUENCJI $x^m \equiv a \pmod{n}$

Abstract

Let n, m be natural numbers with $n \geq 2$. We say that an integer a , $(a, n) = 1$, is the m -th power residue modulo n if there exists an integer x such that $x^m \equiv a \pmod{n}$. Let $C(n)$ denote the multiplicative group consisting of the residues modulo n which are relatively prime to n . Let $s(n, m, a)$ be the smallest solution of the congruence $x^m \equiv a \pmod{n}$ in the set $C(n)$. Let $t(n, m, a)$ be the largest solution of the congruence $x^m \equiv a \pmod{n}$ in the set $C(n)$. We will give an upper bound for $s(n, m, a)$ and a lower bound for $t(n, m, a)$.

Keywords: smallest solution, largest solution, upper bound, lower bound, congruence relation, residue class, n -th degree equation

Streszczenie

Niech n, m będą liczbami naturalnymi, takimi że $n \geq 2$. Powiemy, że liczba całkowita a , $(a, n) = 1$, jest m -tą resztą kwadratową modulo n , jeśli istnieje liczba całkowita x , taka że $x^m \equiv a \pmod{n}$. Niech $C(n)$ będzie grupą moltiplikatywną zawierającą reszty modulo n , względnie pierwsze z n . Oznaczmy przez $s(n, m, a)$ najmniejsze rozwiązanie równania $x^m \equiv a \pmod{n}$ w zbiorze $C(n)$. Oznaczmy przez $t(n, m, a)$ największe rozwiązanie równania $x^m \equiv a \pmod{n}$ w zbiorze $C(n)$. Podamy górne oszacowanie na $s(n, m, a)$ oraz dolne na $t(n, m, a)$.

Słowa kluczowe: najmniejsze rozwiązanie, największe rozwiązanie, górne oszacowanie, dolne oszacowanie, kongruencja, klasa reszt, równanie wielomianowe

1. Introduction

Let n, m be natural numbers with $n \geq 2$. Let a be an integer, with $(a, n) = 1$. By $s(a, n, m)$, $t(a, n, m)$ we denote, correspondingly, the smallest and largest solutions of the congruence $x^m \equiv a \pmod{n}$, where $1 \leq x \leq n - 1$. We will give an upper bound for $s(n, m, a)$ and a lower bound for $t(n, m, a)$. Let $C(n)$ denote the multiplicative group consisting of residues modulo n , which are relatively prime to n (reduced set of residues modulo n).

Let $C_k(n)$ denote the subgroup of $C(n)$ consisting of k -th powers.

Denote $v_k(n) = [C(n) : C_k(n)]$. Let n have prime factorization $n = p_1^{a_1} \cdot p_2^{a_2} \cdot \dots \cdot p_r^{a_r}$, where $a_j \geq 1$. By [2]:

$$v_k(n) = v_k(p_1^{a_1}) \cdot v_k(p_2^{a_2}) \cdot \dots \cdot v_k(p_r^{a_r}),$$

$$v_k(2) = 1, v_k(2^\alpha) = (k, 2)(k, 2^{\alpha-2}), \text{ for } \alpha \geq 2.$$

If p is an odd prime and $\alpha \geq 1$, then $v_k(p^\alpha) = (k, \varphi(p^\alpha))$. Also $v_k(n) \leq 2k^r$.

Definition 1.1. Let

$$1 = g_0(n, k) < g_1(n, k) < \dots < g_{v-1}(n, k), \quad (1)$$

be the smallest positive representatives of the $v = v_k(n)$ cosets of $C_k(n)$.

Definition 1.2. Let

$$w_0(n, k) < w_1(n, k) < \dots < w_{v-1}(n, k) = n - 1, \quad (2)$$

be the largest positive representatives of the $v = v_k(n)$ cosets of $C_k(n)$.

By Norton [2] we have:

Theorem 1.3. If n, k are positive integers $0 \leq i \leq v - 1$, then

$$g_i(n, k) \leq 1 + \frac{n}{\varphi(n)} \left(2^{\omega(n)} \right)^{\frac{3}{2}} \left(\frac{iv}{v-i} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} n^{\frac{1}{2}} \log n, \quad (3)$$

where $\omega(n)$ is the number of distinct prime divisors of n .

See [2].

Corollary 1.4. For each $\varepsilon > 0$

$$g_{v-1}(n, k) = O\left(n^{\frac{1+\varepsilon}{2}}\right), \quad (4)$$

where the implied constant depends only on k, ε and the number of distinct prime factors of n . See [2].

Corollary 1.5. If p, q, r are odd distinct prime numbers and α, β, γ are positive integers, then

$$g_{\nu-1}(n, k) < \begin{cases} 1 + 3\sqrt{2}k\sqrt{n} \log n & \text{if } n = p^\alpha, \\ 1 + 24k\sqrt{n} \log n & \text{if } n = 2p^\alpha, \\ 1 + 8\sqrt{2}k\sqrt{n} \log n & \text{if } n = 2^\alpha, \alpha \geq 2, \\ 1 + 15k^2\sqrt{n} \log n & \text{if } n = p^\alpha q^\beta, \\ 1 + 35\sqrt{2}k^3\sqrt{n} \log n & \text{if } n = p^\alpha q^\beta r^\gamma. \end{cases} \quad (5)$$

Proof. By theorem 1.3.

2. Theorems

The following theorem shows the relationship between $g_i(n, k)$ and $w_{\nu-1-i}(n, k)$.

Theorem 2.1. For $0 \leq i \leq \nu - 1$, we have

$$g_i(n, k) + w_{\nu-1-i}(n, k) = n. \quad (6)$$

Proof. Let us note that

$$n - g_i(n, k) \in g_j(n, k)C_k(n) \quad \text{iff} \quad g_i(n, k) \in (n - g_j(n, k))C_k(n), \quad (7)$$

where $0 \leq i, j \leq \nu - 1$.

We define a permutation $\sigma: \{0, 1, \dots, \nu - 1\} \rightarrow \{0, 1, \dots, \nu - 1\}$ by the relation

$$(n - g_i(n, k))C_k(n) = g_j(n, k)C_k(n) = w_{\sigma(i)}(n, k)C_k(n). \quad (8)$$

Then by definition of $w_{\sigma(i)}(n, k)$ we have

$$n - g_i(n, k) \leq w_{\sigma(i)}(n, k). \quad (9)$$

On the other hand

$$(n - w_{\sigma(i)}(n, k))C_k(n) = (n - g_j(n, k))C_k(n) = g_i(n, k)C_k(n). \quad (10)$$



Hence by definition of $g_i(n, k)$ we get

$$g_i(n, k) \leq n - w_{\sigma(i)}(n, k). \quad (11)$$

Therefore by (9), (11)

$$g_i(n, k) + w_{\sigma(i)}(n, k) = n. \quad (12)$$

Using (1) we obtain

$$w_{\sigma(v-1)}(n, k) < w_{\sigma(v-2)}(n, k) < \dots < w_{\sigma(1)}(n, k) < w_{\sigma(0)}(n, k) = n - 1, \quad (13)$$

hence by (2)

$$\sigma(i) = v - 1 - i, \quad (14)$$

and we are finished.

Using theorem 1.3 and theorem 2.1 we get the following lower bound on $w_i(n, k)$.

Theorem 2.2. If n, k are positive integers $0 \leq i \leq v - 1$, then

$$w_i(n, k) \geq n - 1 - \frac{n}{\varphi(n)} \left(2^{\omega(n)}\right)^{\frac{3}{2}} \left(\frac{(v-1-i)v}{i+1}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} n^{\frac{1}{2}} \log n. \quad (15)$$

Proof. By theorem 2.1 and theorem 1.3.

It follows that

Remark 2.3.

$$n - w_0(n, k) = O\left(n^{\frac{1}{2} + \varepsilon}\right), \quad (16)$$

for each $\varepsilon > 0$, where the implied constant depends only on k, ε and the number of distinct prime factors of n .

Finally, in the proof of the following theorem, we will show how to reduce the problem of finding bounds for $s(a, n, m), t(a, n, m)$ to the problem of finding bounds for $g_i(n, k)$ and $w_i(n, k)$.

Theorem 2.4. Let n, m be natural numbers such that $n \geq 2$. Let a be an integer relatively prime to n , which is m -th power residue modulo n . By $s(a, n, m), t(a, n, m)$ we denote, correspondingly, the smallest and the largest solution of the congruence

$$x^m \equiv a \pmod{n}, \quad (17)$$

where $1 \leq x \leq n - 1$. Then

$$s(a, n, m) \leq 1 + \frac{n}{\varphi(n)} \left(2^{\omega(n)} \right)^{\frac{3}{2}} (\nu(\nu-1))^{\frac{1}{2}} n^{\frac{1}{2}} \log n, \quad (18)$$

$$t(a, n, m) \geq n - 1 - \frac{n}{\varphi(n)} \left(2^{\omega(n)} \right)^{\frac{3}{2}} (\nu(\nu-1))^{\frac{1}{2}} n^{\frac{1}{2}} \log n, \quad (19)$$

where $\nu = \nu_{\frac{\varphi(n)}{(\varphi(n), m)}}(n)$.

Proof. It is sufficient to consider equation $x^m = a$ in the group $C(n)$. Let $k = \frac{\varphi(n)}{(\varphi(n), m)}$. We may assume that there exist $0 \leq i_0, j_0 \leq \nu - 1$ such that

$$s(a, n, m) \in g_{i_0}(n, k) C_k(n), \quad (20)$$

$$t(a, n, m) \in w_{j_0}(n, k) C_k(n), \quad (21)$$

since $s(a, n, m), t(a, n, m) \in C(n)$.

By definition of $g_{i_0}(n, k)$ and $w_{j_0}(n, k)$ we obtain

$$s(a, n, m) \geq g_{i_0}(n, k), \quad (22)$$

$$t(a, n, m) \leq w_{j_0}(n, k). \quad (23)$$

On the other side

$$g_{i_0}(n, k) \in s(a, n, m) C_k(n), \quad (24)$$

$$w_{j_0}(n, k) \in t(a, n, m) C_k(n), \quad (25)$$

hence, there exist $\lambda, \theta \in C(n)$ such that

$$g_{i_0}(n, k) = s(a, n, m) \lambda^k, \quad (26)$$

$$w_{j_0}(n, k) = t(a, n, m) \theta^k. \quad (27)$$

But $(\varphi(n), m) | m$, thus by Euler's theorem we obtain

$$g_{i_0}(n, k)^m = s(a, n, m)^m \lambda^{km} = a \left(\lambda^{\frac{m}{(\varphi(n), m)}} \right)^{\varphi(n)} = a, \quad (28)$$



$$w_{j_0}(n, k)^m = t(a, n, m)^m \theta^{km} = a \left(\theta^{\frac{m}{\varphi(n), m}} \right)^{\varphi(n)} = a, \quad (29)$$

hence $g_{i_0}(n, k)$ and $w_{j_0}(n, k)$ are solutions of the equation $x^m = a$ in the group $C(n)$.

By definition of $s(a, n, m)$, $t(a, n, m)$, we get

$$s(a, n, m) \leq g_{i_0}(n, k), \quad (30)$$

$$t(a, n, m) \geq w_{j_0}(n, k). \quad (31)$$

By (22), (23), (30), (31)

$$s(a, n, m) = g_{i_0}(n, k), \quad (32)$$

$$t(a, n, m) = w_{j_0}(n, k). \quad (33)$$

By theorem 1.3 and theorem 2.2 we get

$$s(a, n, m) = g_{i_0}(n, k) \leq g_{v-1}(n, k) \leq 1 + \frac{n}{\varphi(n)} \left(2^{\omega(n)} \right)^{\frac{3}{2}} (v(v-1))^{\frac{1}{2}} n^{\frac{1}{2}} \log n, \quad (34)$$

$$t(a, n, m) = w_{j_0}(n, k) \geq w_0(n, k) \geq n - 1 - \frac{n}{\varphi(n)} \left(2^{\omega(n)} \right)^{\frac{3}{2}} (v(v-1))^{\frac{1}{2}} n^{\frac{1}{2}} \log n. \quad (35)$$

Corollary 2.5. Under the assumptions of theorem 2.4 we have that

$$s(a, n, m) \leq 1 + \frac{n}{\varphi(n)} \left(2^{\omega(n)} \right)^{\frac{3}{2}} v n^{\frac{1}{2}} \log n, \quad (36)$$

$$t(a, n, m) \geq n - 1 - \frac{n}{\varphi(n)} \left(2^{\omega(n)} \right)^{\frac{3}{2}} v n^{\frac{1}{2}} \log n. \quad (37)$$

Remark 2.6. If $m = \varphi(n)$, then $a = 1$, $k = 1$, $C_1(n) = C(n)$, $v_1 = 1$, $s(1, n, \varphi(n)) = 1$, $t(1, n, \varphi(n)) = n - 1$. In fact, we get optimal bounds using (18) and (19).

Remark 2.7. We may assume that $m | \varphi(n)$. Indeed, let d be a natural number such that

$d \cdot \frac{m}{(\varphi(n), m)} \equiv 1 \pmod{\varphi(n)}$, we have equivalent congruencies

$$x^m \equiv a \pmod{n} \text{ if } x^{(\varphi(n), m)} \equiv a^d \pmod{n}. \quad (38)$$

Thus $s(a, n, m) = s(a^d, n, (\varphi(n), m))$, $t(a, n, m) = t(a^d, n, (\varphi(n), m))$.

Note that the left-hand side of inequalities (18), (19) does not depend on a .

Remark 2.8. Let $n = p^\alpha$, where p is an odd prime and α is a positive integer. We may assume that $m | \varphi(n)$, (see remark 2.7). Then

$$v = v_{\frac{\varphi(n)}{(\varphi(n), m)}}(n) = v_{\frac{\varphi(n)}{m}}(n) = \left(\frac{\varphi(n)}{m}, \varphi(n) \right) = \frac{\varphi(n)}{m}. \quad (39)$$

By corollary 2.5

$$s(a, n, m) \leq 1 + 2\sqrt{2} \frac{n^{\frac{3}{2}} \log n}{m}, \quad t(a, n, m) \geq n - 1 - 2\sqrt{2} \frac{n^{\frac{3}{2}} \log n}{m}. \quad (40)$$

Remark 2.9. Let $n = 2^\alpha$, where α is a positive integer greater or equal 2. We may assume that $m | \varphi(n)$. and $m < \varphi(n) = 2^{\alpha-1}$ (see remarks 2.7 and 2.6). Then

$$v = v_{\frac{\varphi(n)}{(\varphi(n), m)}}(n) = v_{\frac{\varphi(n)}{m}}(n) = \left(\frac{\varphi(n)}{m}, 2 \right) \left(\frac{\varphi(n)}{m}, 2^{\alpha-2} \right) = 2 \frac{\varphi(n)}{m}. \quad (41)$$

By corollary 2.5

$$s(a, n, m) \leq 1 + 4\sqrt{2} \frac{n^{\frac{3}{2}} \log n}{m}, \quad t(a, n, m) \geq n - 1 - 4\sqrt{2} \frac{n^{\frac{3}{2}} \log n}{m}. \quad (42)$$

We will now give an application of theorem 2.4.

Theorem 2.10. Let p be an odd prime number. For the congruence

$$x^{\frac{p-1}{2}} \equiv -1 \pmod{p}, 1 \leq x \leq p-1, \quad (43)$$

we have that:

- 1) the congruence (43) has a solution, i.e. -1 is $\frac{p-1}{2}$ -th power residue modulo p ,
- 2) the smallest solution $s\left(-1, p, \frac{p-1}{2}\right)$ is a prime number,
- 3) $s\left(-1, p, \frac{p-1}{2}\right) \leq 1 + 4 \frac{p}{p-1} p^{\frac{1}{2}} \log p$,



4) the largest solution $t\left(-1, p, \frac{p-1}{2}\right) \geq p-1-4\frac{p}{p-1}p^{\frac{1}{2}}\log p$.

Proof. If g is a primitive root modulo p (such primitive root exists, since p is a prime number),

then $g^{\frac{p-1}{2}} \not\equiv 1 \pmod{p}$ and $g^{p-1} \equiv 1 \pmod{p}$. Hence $g^{\frac{p-1}{2}} \equiv -1 \pmod{p}$ and 1) holds.

If $s\left(-1, p, \frac{p-1}{2}\right)$ were a composite number, it could be expressed as $s\left(-1, p, \frac{p-1}{2}\right) = s = ab$

where $a, b \in \mathbb{N}, a, b > 1$. Note that $a^{\frac{p-1}{2}} \not\equiv -1 \pmod{p}$ and $b^{\frac{p-1}{2}} \not\equiv -1 \pmod{p}$, since s is the smallest solution of the congruence (43). By Fermat's little theorem, we know that

$a^{p-1} \equiv 1 \pmod{p}$ and $b^{p-1} \equiv 1 \pmod{p}$. Hence $a^{\frac{p-1}{2}} \equiv 1 \pmod{p}$ and $b^{\frac{p-1}{2}} \equiv 1 \pmod{p}$.

Thus $s^{\frac{p-1}{2}} \equiv (ab)^{\frac{p-1}{2}} \equiv 1 \pmod{p}$, a contradiction with definition of s .

Therefore the initial assumption, that s is a composite number, must be false. Hence 2) holds.

$$\text{We have } k = \frac{\varphi(p)}{\left(\varphi(p), \frac{p-1}{2}\right)} = 2, v = v_2(p) = (2, \varphi(p)) = 2, \left(2^{\omega(p)}\right)^{\frac{3}{2}} (v(v-1))^{\frac{1}{2}} = 4.$$

Thus 3) and 4) follows by theorem 2.4.

Example 2.11. For the congruence $x^{359} \equiv -1 \pmod{719}$, we have

$$s(-1, 719, 359) = 11, \quad t(-1, 719, 359) = 718, \quad (44)$$

in this case theorem 2.10, says that $s(-1, 719, 359)$ is a prime number and

$$s(-1, 719, 359) \leq 707, \quad t(-1, 719, 359) \geq 12.$$

References

- [1] Nathanson M.B., *Elementary Methods in Number Theory*, Vol. 195, GTM, Springer, New York 2000.
- [2] Norton K.K., *k-th coset representatives modulo n*, Acta Arithmetica, XV, 1969, 161-179.