

Today we explore solving power congruences. We warm up with a bunch of examples:

1.  $x^{18} \equiv 4 \pmod{17}$ .

Chris: By Fermat's Little Theorem, we have  $x^{16} \equiv 1 \pmod{17}$  or  $x \equiv 0 \pmod{17}$ . The latter clearly can't be a solution to the given congruence, so we deduce that  $x^{18} \equiv x^2 \equiv 4 \pmod{17}$ , whence  $x \equiv \pm 2 \pmod{17}$ .

2.  $x^3 \equiv 4 \pmod{17}$ . We could just check every possible solution, or...

Ben:  $x^3 \equiv 4 \equiv -64 \pmod{17}$  so then  $x \equiv -4 \pmod{17}$

Akhil + Alex: From before,  $(\pm 2)^{18} \equiv 4 \pmod{17}$ . So then  $((\pm 2)^6)^3 \equiv 4 \pmod{17}$ , so  $x = (\pm 2)^6 \equiv 13 \pmod{17}$ .

Max:  $x^3 \equiv 4 \pmod{17} \implies x^6 \equiv 16 \pmod{17} \equiv -1 \pmod{17} \implies x^{18} \equiv (x^6)^3 \equiv (-1)^3 = -1 \equiv 16 \pmod{17}$  so  $x \equiv \pm 4$ . But then +4 doesn't work, so  $x \equiv -4 \equiv 13 \pmod{17}$ .

Question (Kimberly): Why isn't  $x^{18} \equiv x^1 \pmod{17}$ ? Because we can't add/subtract 17 *in the exponent*, only in coefficients and constants. But in exponents, you *can* add/subtract by  $\varphi(n)$ .

We return to example 2 and point out there's yet another approach we can take. Max found that by raising both sides to the 6th, we obtain a congruence for  $x^2$ , which is easier to solve. But what we really want is  $x$ , not  $x^2$ . Is there some other power we can raise both sides of the congruence to to get  $x$ ? Yes!

$$x \equiv x^{32} \cdot x \equiv x^{33} \equiv (x^3)^{11} \equiv 4^{11} \pmod{17}.$$

But notice that  $4^2 \equiv -1 \pmod{17}$ , so  $4^{11} \equiv (-1)^5 4 \equiv -4 \pmod{17}$ .

3.  $x^5 \equiv 4 \pmod{17}$ .

Konnor+Oliver: Raise both sides to the 13th power:

$$x^{5 \cdot 13} = x^{65} = x^{1+64} \equiv x \equiv 4^{13} \pmod{17}.$$

And  $4^{13} = (4^2)^6 \cdot 4 = (-1)^6 \cdot 4 \equiv 4 \pmod{17}$ , thus  $x \equiv 4 \pmod{17}$ .

Question (Alex): Is there always a solution to  $x^a \equiv b \pmod{p}$ ?

4.  $x^2 \equiv 6 \pmod{7}$

Miranda: Cube both sides:

$$1 \equiv (x^2)^3 \equiv 6^3 \equiv (-1)^3 = -1 \pmod{7}.$$

Aaah! Contradiction! Right away this tells us there can't be a solution to this congruence. The issue with our approach is that 2 and  $7 - 1 = 6$  are not relatively prime, so we cannot find a good exponent (i.e. one that produces just  $x$ ).

5.  $x^5 \equiv 11 \pmod{35}$ .

Mia:  $x^{\varphi(35)} \equiv 1 \pmod{35}$ , and  $\varphi(35) = \varphi(5 \cdot 7) = (5-1)(7-1) = 24$ , so  $x^{24} \equiv 1 \pmod{35}$ .

Jeff: Raise both sides to the 5th:

$$(x^5)^5 = x^{1+24} \equiv x \equiv 11^5 \pmod{35}.$$

It therefore remains only to compute  $11^5 \pmod{35}$ :

$$11^5 \equiv 11 \cdot (11^2)^2 \equiv 11 \cdot (105 + 16)^2 \equiv 11 \cdot 16^2 \equiv 11 \cdot (245 + 11) \equiv 11^2 \equiv 16 \pmod{35}.$$

As a result,  $x \equiv 16 \pmod{35}$ .

Question (Kimberly): Okay, but how do you find the right exponent to raise both sides to? What is the formulaic/general approach?

The General Approach: Given  $x^e \equiv y \pmod{N}$ . Want to solve for  $x$ .

Step 0: Reduce  $e \pmod{\varphi(N)}$ .\*

Step 1: Want to find an exponent,  $d$ , such that  $de \equiv 1 \pmod{\varphi(N)}$ .

(Miranda) If  $(e, \varphi(N)) = 1$ , by Bézout's Theorem there exists some  $k, d$  such that  $ed + k\varphi(N) = 1$  so then  $ed \equiv 1 \pmod{\varphi(N)}$ . We can use the Euclidean Algorithm to solve for  $d$ .

Step 2: Then  $x^{de} \equiv x^{1+k\varphi(N)} \equiv x \equiv y^d \pmod{N}$ .

Step 3: Reduce  $y^d \pmod{N}$ . How do we do this efficiently? First compute,  $y^2 \pmod{N}$ . Then compute  $y^4 = (y^2)^2 \pmod{N}$ , by squaring the previous result. Square again to get  $y^8$ , etc. Now we can express  $d$  in binary (i.e. as a sum of distinct powers of 2), which means we can express  $y^d$  in terms of the powers of  $y$  we'd computed. Moreover, this process takes  $\ll \log d$  computations.

Examples of binary notation:  $13 = 8 + 4 + 1$ .  $168 = 128 + 32 + 8$ . Can do this by always taking the largest power of 2 possible (greedy algorithm).

\*Note that for this process to be *guaranteed* to work, we need  $(e, \varphi(N)) = 1$ . However, as Konnor pointed out, even when this doesn't happen (as in Example 1) the method still might lead to a solution!

Next time we will see how this is used to great effect in the RSA encryption algorithm.