# ON NUMBERS ANALOGOUS TO THE CARMICHAEL NUMBERS

## BY

## H. C. WILLIAMS

1. Introduction. A base a pseudoprime is an integer n such that

(1) 
$$a^{n-1} \equiv 1 \pmod{n}.$$

A Carmichael number is a composite integer *n* such that (1) is true for all *a* such that (a, n) = 1. It was shown by Carmichael [1] that, if *n* is a Carmichael number, then *n* is the product of k (>2) distinct primes  $p_1, p_2, p_3, \ldots, p_k$  and  $p_i - 1 | n - 1$  ( $i = 1, 2, 3, \ldots, k$ ). The smallest such number is  $561 = 3 \cdot 11 \cdot 17$ .

The Lucas functions  $V_n(P, Q)$ ,  $U_n(P, Q)$  are defined as

$$V_n(P, Q) = \alpha^n + \beta^n,$$
  
$$U_n(P, Q) = (\alpha^n - \beta^n)/(\alpha - \beta),$$

where  $\alpha$ ,  $\beta$  are the zeros of  $x^2 - Px + Q$ , and P, Q are coprime integers. We also define  $\Delta$  to be the discriminant  $P^2 - 4Q$  of the above quadratic function. The following theorem concerning Lucas functions is well known.

THEOREM 1. If p is an odd prime and  $p \neq Q$ , then

 $U_{\delta(p)}(P, Q) \equiv 0 \pmod{p},$ 

where  $\delta(p) = p - \epsilon(p)$ ,  $\epsilon(p) = (\Delta | p)$ , and  $(\Delta | p)$  is the Legendre symbol.

Rotkiewicz [4] considered a composite integer n such that

 $U_{n-\epsilon(n)}(P, Q) \equiv 0 \pmod{n}$ 

to be a type of pseudoprime with respect to the Lucas functions. Here  $\epsilon(n)$  is defined to be the value of the Jacobi symbol  $(\Delta \mid n)$ . We shall concern ourselves here with those odd composite integers n which possess, for a given value of  $\Delta$ , the property (A) below.

(A)  

$$\begin{cases}
\text{For all integers } P, Q \text{ such that} \\
(P, Q) = 1, P^2 - 4Q = \Delta, \quad (n, Q\Delta) = 1, \\
\text{we have} \\
U_{n-\epsilon(n)}(P, Q) \equiv 0 \pmod{n}.
\end{cases}$$

In view of the preceding remarks, we see that such integers are analogous to

Received by the editors, in revised form, January 13, 1977

Carmichael numbers; in fact, it can be shown that if  $\Delta = 1$  and *n* satisfies (A), then *n* is a Carmichael number. In this paper we shall characterize and develop some properties of those integers which satisfy (A) for any given  $\Delta$ .

2. **Preliminary results.** In order to establish some properties of the numbers we are seeking, it is necessary to first make some preliminary observations.

We first note that

(2)  
$$2^{n-1}V_{k}(P,Q) = \sum_{r=0}^{[k/2]} {\binom{k}{2r}} P^{k-2r} (P^{2}-4Q)^{r}$$
$$2^{n-1}U_{k}(P,Q) = \sum_{r=0}^{[k/2]} {\binom{k}{2r+1}} P^{k-2r-1} (P^{2}-4Q)^{r}.$$

If, for a fixed  $\Delta$ , we define the polynomials  $T_k(x)$  and  $S_k(x)$  by the formulas

$$T_{k}(x) = \sum_{r=0}^{\lfloor k/2 \rfloor} {k \choose 2r+1} x^{k-2r-1} \Delta^{r},$$
  
$$S_{k}(x) = \sum_{r=0}^{\lfloor k/2 \rfloor} {k \choose 2r} x^{k-2r} \Delta^{r},$$

then we have

(3) 
$$2^{n-1}U_k(P, Q) = T_k(P),$$
$$2^{n-1}V_k(P, Q) = S_k(P),$$

when  $P^2 - 4Q = \Delta$ . We also have the result

$$T_{k+m}(x) = 2S_m(x)T_k(x) - (x^2 - \Delta)^m T_{k-m}(x)$$

and from this it follows easily by induction that if  $m \mid k$ ,

$$T_k(x) = T_m(x)Q_{k,m}(x),$$

where  $Q_{k,m}(x)$  is a polynomial in x with integer coefficients.

Before proceeding any further we require the following simple lemma.

LEMMA 1. If P, Q are any two integers such that  $P^2 - 4Q = \Delta$ , then for any odd integer m, where  $(m, \Delta) = 1$ , there exist integers P', Q' such that  $P' \equiv P$ ,  $Q' \equiv Q \pmod{m}$ ,  $P'^2 - 4Q' = \Delta$ , and (P', Q') = 1.

**Proof.** Select some integer d such that  $(d, \Delta) = 2^i (0 \le i \le 2)$ , where the value of *i* is determined by

$$d \equiv P + 2Q - 2 \pmod{4}.$$

Solve

$$(4) \qquad \qquad 2mK \equiv d - P \pmod{\Delta}$$

for K. If 2 | P, then  $4 | \Delta$  and  $K \equiv (d - P)/2 \equiv (Q + 1) \pmod{2}$ . Put  $P^1 = P + 2Km$ ,

Q' = Q + Km(P + mK). We see that  $P'^2 - 4Q' = \Delta$  and it suffices to show that (P', Q') = 1. If q is a prime and  $q \mid (P', Q')$ , then q must be odd; for, if q = 2, then  $2 \mid \Delta$ ,  $2 \mid P$ , and  $Q' \equiv 2Q + 1 \pmod{2}$ . If q is odd, then  $q \mid \Delta$ , and by (4)  $q \mid d$ , which, by selection of d, is impossible.

Finally, it should be noted that if X is any integer, then

$$T_{\delta(p)}(X) \equiv 0 \pmod{p}$$

where p is any odd prime such that  $(p, (X^2 - \Delta)) = 1$ . This result follows easily from Theorem 1, (3), and Lemma 1.

3. Some results concerning the Lucas functions. The rank of apparition modulo *m* of the Lucas sequence  $\{U_k(P, Q)\}$  is defined to be the least positive value of *k* such that  $m \mid U_k(P, Q)$ . We denote this value of *k* by  $\omega(m; P, Q)$ . If  $m \mid U_r(P, Q)$ , then  $\omega(m; P, Q) \mid r$ ; hence,  $\omega(p; P, Q) \mid \delta(p)$  when *p* is a prime.

For a fixed discriminant  $\Delta$  and a fixed odd prime p, let the function  $\psi(d)$ , where  $d \mid \delta(p)$ , be the number of distinct values of P modulo p such that  $\omega(p; P, Q) = d$ . In the following theorem we evaluate  $\psi(d)$ .

THEOREM 2. If d > 1,  $\psi(d) = \phi(d)$ , where  $\phi(x)$  is Euler's totient function.

**Proof.** If  $\epsilon(p) = 0$ , the theorem follows easily. Suppose  $\epsilon(p) \neq 0$  and put  $\delta = \delta(p)$ . If  $d < \delta$ , let the polynomial congruence

(5) 
$$T_d(x) \equiv 0 \pmod{p}$$

have j solutions. Referring to the remarks at the beginning of this section and Lemma 1, we see that

$$\sum_{h\mid d}\psi(h)=j$$

Since  $T_d(x)$  is a polynomial of degree d-1 with leading coefficient d we have  $j \le d-1$ . Also

(6) 
$$T_{\delta}(x) \equiv 0 \pmod{p}$$

has exactly  $\delta - 1$  solutions (mod p). For, if  $\epsilon(p) = 1$ , (6) is satisfied by any x except the two values of x which satisfy  $x^2 \equiv \Delta \pmod{p}$ ; if  $\epsilon(p) = -1$ , (6) is satisfied by any value of x since there is no x such that  $x^2 \equiv \Delta \pmod{p}$ .

Now

$$T_{\delta}(x) = T_{d}(x)Q_{\delta,d}(x);$$

Thus, if (5) has *j* solutions, then

(7) 
$$Q_{\delta,d}(x) \equiv 0 \pmod{p}$$

has  $\delta - 1 - j$  solutions. Since the degree of  $Q_{\delta,d}(x)$  is  $\delta - d$  and its leading coefficient is prime to p, (7) can have no more than  $\delta - d$  solutions. If j < d - 1, then  $\delta - 1 - j > \delta - d$ ; consequently, j = d - 1.

H. C. WILLIAMS

Putting

$$\chi(h) = \psi(h) \ (h \neq 1), \qquad \chi(1) = 1,$$

we get

$$\sum_{h\mid d}\chi(h)=d;$$

by Möbius inversion  $\chi(d) = \phi(d)$ .

COROLLARY. If  $\Delta$  is any fixed discriminant, p is any odd prime, and d(>1) is any divisor of  $\delta(p)$ , there exist integers P, Q such that (P, Q) = 1,  $P^2 - 4Q = \Delta$ , and  $\psi(p; P, Q) = d$ .

Define

$$C_k(P, Q) = \frac{\partial}{\partial P} U_k(P, Q)$$
$$D_k(P, Q) = \frac{\partial}{\partial Q} U_k(P, Q).$$

Since  $U_k(P, Q)$  is a polynomial in P and Q with integer coefficients, so are  $C_k(P, Q)$  and  $D_k(P, Q)$ .

We will assume here that P, Q are fixed and write  $U_k$  for  $U_k(P, Q)$ ,  $C_k$  for  $C_k(P, Q)$  etc.

Since

$$U_{k+1} = PU_k - QU_{k-1},$$

we get differentiation

(8) 
$$C_{k+1} = PC_k + U_k - QC_{k-1}$$
$$D_{k+1} = PD_k - QD_{k-1} - U_{k-1}.$$

By induction we can show that

(9) 
$$D_k = -C_{k-1}.$$

Also, by differentiating the second formula of (2) with respect to P and Q and putting k = p (an odd prime,  $(p, \Delta Q) = 1$ ), we get

$$\Delta C_p \equiv -P\epsilon(p) \pmod{p}$$
$$\Delta D_p \equiv 2\epsilon(p) \pmod{p}.$$

Using (8) and (9) together with the fact that

$$U_p \equiv \epsilon(p) \pmod{p},$$

we have

$$\Delta C_{p+1} \equiv -2Q\epsilon(p) \pmod{p}$$

[March

and if  $\epsilon(p) = 1$ ,

1977]

 $Q\Delta C_{p-1} \equiv -P \pmod{p}$ .

It follows that

$$PC_{\delta} + 2QD_{\delta} \equiv 0 \pmod{p}$$

and  $p \neq C_{\delta}$ , where  $\delta = \delta(p)$ .

By using Taylor's Expansion, we see that

 $U_{\delta}(P+2Kp, Q+Mp) \equiv U_{\delta}(P, Q) + p[2KC_{\delta}(D, Q) + MD_{\delta}(P, Q)] \pmod{p^2}.$ 

If  $p^2 | U_{\delta}(P, Q)$ , select a value for K such that  $p \neq K$  and put  $M = KP + pK^2$ . Then if P' = P + 2Kp, Q' = Q + Mp, we have  $P'^2 - 4Q' = \Delta$ . Now if

 $4Qu \equiv P \pmod{p}$ ,

then since  $p \neq \Delta$ ,

 $1 - uP \neq 0 \pmod{p},$  $K(1 - uP) \neq 0 \pmod{p}$ 

and

$$K \not\equiv 2uM \pmod{p};$$

hence,  $p^2 \neq U_{\delta}(P', Q')$ . By using Lemma 1, we can show that for any  $\Delta$  there exists a pair of integers P'', Q'' such that (P'', Q'') = 1,  $P''^2 - 4Q'' = \Delta$ , (p, Q'') = 1, and  $p^2 \neq U_{\delta}(P'', Q'')$ .

Since  $\omega(p; P'', Q'') = \omega(p; P, Q)$  when  $P'' \equiv P$ ,  $Q'' \equiv Q \pmod{p}$  and  $\omega(p; P, Q) | \delta(p)$ , we deduce from Theorem 2 the fact that, for any given  $\Delta$ , any odd prime  $p((p, \Delta) = 1)$ , and d any divisor of  $\delta(p) (d > 1)$ , there exist integers P'', Q'' such that  $p \neq Q''$ , (P'', Q'') = 1,  $P'' - 4Q'' = \Delta$ ,  $\omega(p; P'', Q'') = d$ ,  $\omega(p^2; P'', Q'') > d$ .

By using the Law of Repetition of Lucas Functions, we have

THEOREM 3. For any given  $\Delta$ , any odd prime  $p((p, \Delta) = 1)$ , and d any divisor of  $\delta(p)$  (d > 1), there exist integers P'', Q'' such that  $p \neq Q''$ , (P'', Q'') = 1,  $P''^2 - 4Q'' = \Delta$ , and  $\omega(p^k, P'', Q'') = p^{k-1}d$ .

4. Characterization of integers with property (A). In this section we will find the forms of those integers which possess the property (A) for a given fixed  $\Delta$ . In order to do this we first require two lemmas. We give these lemmas here in a form somewhat stronger than we need to obtain the results of this section; however, we will need the stronger results in section 5.

LEMMA 2. If r,  $\Delta$ ,  $\eta$  are three given integers such that r is odd,  $(r, \Delta) = 1$ ,  $|\eta| = 1$  (we restrict  $\eta$  to be 1 when r is a perfect square and if  $\Delta \equiv 1 \pmod{3}$ , we restrict  $\eta$ 

10

to be -1 when  $r = 3t^2$ ), then there exists a pair of integers y,  $\gamma$  such that

$$y^2 \equiv 4\gamma + \Delta \pmod{r}$$

and  $(\gamma \mid r) = \eta$ , where  $(\gamma \mid r)$  is the Jacobi symbol.

Proof. Let

$$r=\prod_{i=0}^{k}q_{i}^{\beta_{i}}$$

where  $q_i$  ( $i = 1, 2, 3, \dots, k$ ) are distinct odd primes and  $q_1$  is the least of these k primes. Select  $\eta_1, \eta_2, \eta_3, \dots, \eta_k$  such that  $|\eta_i| = 1$  for  $i = 1, 2, 3, \dots, k$  (restrict  $\eta_1$  to be -1 if  $q_1 = 3$  and  $\Delta \equiv 1 \pmod{3}$ ) and

$$\prod_{i=1}^{k} \eta_i^{\beta_i} = \eta.$$

It is well known that if q is a prime and  $q \neq \Delta$ , then there are q-1 solutions (x, y) of

(10) 
$$y^2 - x^2 \equiv \Delta \pmod{q}$$

and at least q-3 of these have  $x \neq 0 \pmod{q}$ . Thus, if q > 3, there exist y and  $\lambda$  such that

(11) 
$$y^2 \equiv 4\lambda + \Delta \pmod{q}$$

and  $(\lambda \mid q) = +1$ . If q = 3 and  $\Delta \equiv -1 \pmod{3}$  we see that  $y \equiv 0$ ,  $\lambda \equiv 1 \pmod{3}$  is a solution of (11) with  $(\lambda \mid q) = +1$ .

If for each y (mod q) there were a value of x (mod q) such that (10) held, there would be at least 2q-2 solutions of (10) with  $x \neq 0 \pmod{q}$ . Since 2q-2 > q-1, there must be values of y and  $\lambda$  such that (11) is satisfied and  $(\lambda \mid q) = -1$ .

It follows that for each  $q_i$  which divides r there must exist a pair of integers  $(y_i, \lambda_i)$  such that

$$y_i^2 \equiv 4\lambda_i + \Delta \pmod{q_i}$$

and  $(\lambda_i | q_i) = \eta_i$ . We can then find integers  $Y_i$  and  $\gamma_i$  such that

$$Y_i^2 \equiv 4\gamma_i + \Delta \pmod{q_i^{\beta_i}}$$

and  $\gamma_i \equiv \lambda_i \pmod{q_i}$ . By the Chinese Remainder Theorem, there exist integers  $\gamma$  and y such that  $y \equiv Y_i$ ;  $\gamma \equiv \gamma_i \pmod{q_i^{\beta_i}}$  (i = 1, 2, 3, ..., k). Thus we have

$$y^2 \equiv 4\gamma + \Delta \pmod{r}$$

and  $(\gamma \mid r) = \eta$ .

LEMMA 3. Let  $r, m, \Delta, \eta$  be given integers such that r is odd,  $(r, m\Delta) = 1$ ,  $|\eta| = 1$   $(\eta = 1$  when r is a perfect square;  $\eta = -1$  when  $\Delta = 1 \pmod{3}$  and  $r = 3t^2$ ). If  $P^2 - 4Q = \Delta$ , there exists a pair of integers P', Q' such that  $P'^2 - 4Q' = \Delta$ ,  $P' \equiv P$ .  $Q' \equiv Q \pmod{m}$  and  $(Q' | r) = \eta$ .

**Proof.** Let  $\gamma$  and y be selected such that  $(\gamma \mid r) = \eta$ 

$$y^2 \equiv 4\gamma + \Delta \pmod{r}$$

Select K such that

 $2mK + P \equiv y \pmod{r}.$ 

If we put

$$P' = P + 2mK,$$
  
$$O' = O + Km(P + mK).$$

we have  $P'^2 - 4Q' = \Delta$ ,  $P' \equiv P$ ,  $Q' \equiv Q \pmod{m}$  and  $Q' \equiv \gamma \pmod{r}$ .

COROLLARY. Let  $r, \Delta$ , m be three integers such that r is odd and  $(r, m\Delta) = 1$ . If  $P^2 - 4Q = \Delta$ , there exists a pair of integers P', Q' such that  $P'^2 - 4Q' = \Delta$ ,  $P' \equiv P$ ,  $Q' \equiv Q \pmod{m}$  and (Q', r) = 1.

We are now able to prove our main theorem.

THEOREM 4. If for a fixed  $\Delta$ , n possesses property (A), then n is the product of k distinct primes  $p_1, p_2, p_3, \ldots, p_k$  and

$$p_i - \epsilon(p_i) \mid n - \epsilon(n)$$
  $(i = 1, 2, 3, \dots, k).$ 

**Proof.** Let p be any odd prime divisor of n and let  $n = p^{\alpha}r$ , where (r, p) = 1. Find P, Q such that (P, Q) = 1,  $P^2 - 4Q = \Delta$ ,  $\omega(p^{\alpha}; P, Q) = p^{\alpha^{-1}}\delta(p)$ . By the Corollary of Lemma 3, there exist P', Q', such that  $P'^2 - 4Q' = \Delta$ , P' = P,  $Q' \equiv Q \pmod{p^{\alpha}}$  and (Q', r) = 1; also, by Lemma 1, we can find P'', Q'' such that  $P''^2 - 4Q'' = \Delta$ ,  $P'' \equiv P'$ ,  $Q'' \equiv Q' \pmod{n}$  and (P'', Q'') = 1. Since  $(n, Q''\Delta) = 1$  and  $P'' \equiv P$ ,  $Q'' \equiv Q \pmod{p^{\alpha}}$ , we have

$$U_{n-\epsilon(n)}(P'',Q'') \equiv 0 \pmod{n}$$

and

$$\omega(p^{\alpha}; P'', Q'') = p^{\alpha-1}\delta(p);$$

hence,

$$p^{\alpha-1}\delta(p) \mid p^{\alpha}r - \epsilon$$

where  $|\epsilon| = 1$ . We see that  $\alpha = 1$  and the theorem follows.

If  $n = p_1 p_2$ , we must have  $\epsilon(n) = \epsilon(p_1) \epsilon(p_2)$  and if  $\epsilon_i = \epsilon(p_i)$ ,

$$p_1 - \epsilon_1 \mid p_1 p_2 - \epsilon_1 \epsilon_2, \qquad p_2 - \epsilon_2 \mid p_1 p_2 - \epsilon_1 \epsilon_2.$$

.

March

That is  $p_1 - \epsilon_1 | p_2 - \epsilon_2$  and  $p_2 - \epsilon_2 | p_1 - \epsilon_1$ ; hence,  $p_1 - \epsilon_1 = p_2 - \epsilon_2$ . If we assume  $p_1 < p_2$ , we have  $\epsilon_1 - \epsilon_2 = -2$ , i.e.  $\epsilon_1 = -1$ ,  $\epsilon_2 = 1$  and  $p_1 = p_2 - 2$ .

Thus, *n* can be the product of two primes and satisfy property (A) for a fixed  $\Delta$  if and only if

$$n=p_1p_2,$$

where

$$p_1 = p_2 - 2;$$
  $(\Delta \mid p_1) = -1$  and  $(\Delta \mid p_2) = +1.$ 

For example, if  $\Delta = 5$ ,  $p_1 = 17$ ,  $p_2 = 19$ , then  $n = 17 \cdot 19$  satisfies (A).

Integers with property (A) and k > 2 can frequently be found by using a modification of the method of Chernick [2]. For example, let k = 3 and prescribe values for  $\epsilon_1$ ,  $\epsilon_2$ ,  $\epsilon_3$ . If d satisfies the congruence

(10) 
$$d(\epsilon_1 r_2 r_3 + \epsilon_2 r_1 r_3 + \epsilon_3 r_1 r_2) + \epsilon_1 \epsilon_2 r_3 + \epsilon_1 \epsilon_3 r_2 + \epsilon_2 \epsilon_3 r_1 \equiv 0 \pmod{r_1 r_2 r_3}$$

for values of  $r_1$ ,  $r_2$ ,  $r_3$  such that  $(\Delta \mid dr_i - \epsilon_i) = \epsilon_i$  (i = 1, 2, 3) and  $dr_1 + \epsilon_1$ ,  $dr_2 + \epsilon_2$ ,  $dr_3 + \epsilon_3$  are distinct primes, then

$$n = (dr_1 + \epsilon_1)(dr_2 + \epsilon_2)(dr_3 + \epsilon_3)$$

has property (A).

If we have  $\Delta = 8$  and put  $\epsilon_1 = -1$ ,  $\epsilon_2 = \epsilon_3 = 1$ , we must have  $p_1 = dr_1 - 1$ ,  $p_2 = dr_2 + 1$ ,  $p_3 = dr_3 + 1$  and  $(2 | p_i) = \epsilon_i$ . Let  $p_1 \equiv 3$ ,  $p_2 \equiv p_3 \equiv 7 \pmod{8}$ . We get d = 2d'' and

$$d''r_1 \equiv 2, \qquad d''r_2 \equiv d''r_3 \equiv 3 \pmod{4};$$

hence, putting  $r_1 = 2$ ,  $r_2 = 3$ ,  $r_3 = 7$ , we have  $d'' \equiv 1 \pmod{4}$  and by (10),  $d'' \equiv -4 \pmod{21}$ . When d'' = 17, we get  $p_1 = 67$ ,  $p_2 = 103$ ,  $p_3 = 239$  and  $n = p_1 p_2 p_3$  has property (A) for  $\Delta = 8$ . In fact, this number has property (A) for  $\Delta = 8m^2$  for any *m* such that (m, n) = 1.

5. Some further remarks. Recently Lehmer [3] has considered the problem of the existence of strong Carmichael mumbers. These are integers which satisfy the following congruence

$$a^{(n-1)/2} \equiv (a \mid n) \pmod{n}$$

for all a such that (a, n) = 1. In [3] it is shown that there are no strong Carmichael numbers. In this section we will find a result analogous to that of Lehmer.

The result in the theory of Lucas functions which is analogous to

$$a^{(p-1)/2} \equiv (a \mid p) \pmod{p},$$

where p is an odd prime and (a, p) = 1, is given in the following theorem.

140

THEOREM 5. If  $\epsilon = (\Delta \mid p)$ , then

$$U_{(p-\epsilon)/2}(P, Q) \equiv 0 \pmod{p} \quad when \quad (Q \mid p) = 1$$

and

$$V_{(p-\epsilon)/2}(P, Q) \equiv 0 \pmod{p}$$
 when  $(Q \mid p) = -1$ .

We say that an odd integer n satisfies property (B) for a given  $\Delta$  if

(B) For all P, Q such that  $P^2 - 4Q = \Delta$ , (P, Q) = 1 and  $(n, \Delta Q) = 1$  we have

$$U_{(n-\epsilon(n))/2}(P,Q) \equiv 0 \pmod{n}$$

whenever  $(Q \mid n) = +1$  and

$$V_{(n-\epsilon(n))/2}(P, Q) \equiv 0 \pmod{n}$$

whenever  $(Q \mid n) = -1$ .

We will show that there are no odd composite integers satisfying (B) and we will do this by first characterizing all those odd composite integers n which satisfy property (C) below.

(C) for all P, Q such that  $P^2 - 4Q = \Delta$ , (P, Q) = 1,  $(n, \Delta Q) = 1$ , and  $(Q \mid n) = -1$ , we have

$$V_{(n-\epsilon(n))/2}(P, Q) \equiv 0 \pmod{n}.$$

THEOREM 6. If n (odd, composite) is not a perfect square or if  $n \neq 15$  whenever  $\Delta \equiv 4 \pmod{15}$ , then n can not satisfy (C).

**Proof.** Suppose that some odd *n* satisfies (C) and that *n* is not a perfect square. Let *p* be any prime divisor of *n* and let  $n = p^{\alpha}r$  where (r, p) = 1.

Put  $\theta = \theta(p) = 1$  if  $r = 3t^2$  and  $\Delta \equiv 1 \pmod{3}$ ; otherwise, put  $\theta = 0$ . Find P, Q such that (P, Q) = 1,  $P^2 - 4Q = \Delta$ ,  $\omega(p^{\alpha}; P, Q) = \kappa\delta(p)p^{\alpha-1}$ , where  $\kappa = 1 - \theta/2$ ; then  $(Q \mid p) = (-1)^{\theta-1}$ . We now find P', Q' such that  $P'^2 - 4Q' = \Delta$  and  $P' \equiv P, Q' \equiv Q \pmod{p^{\alpha}}, (Q' \mid r) = (-1)^{\alpha(\theta-1)+1}$ . From these we can determine P'', Q'' such that (P'', Q'') = 1, (n, Q'') = 1,  $P''^2 - 4Q'' = \Delta$ ,  $\omega(p^{\alpha}; P'', Q'') = \kappa p^{\alpha-1}\delta(p)$ ,  $(Q' \mid n) = (Q \mid p)^{\alpha}(Q' \mid r) = (-1)^{2\alpha(\theta-1)+1} = -1$ .

Now since  $p^{\alpha} \mid n$ ,

$$V_{(n-\epsilon(n))/2}(P'',Q'') \equiv 0 \pmod{p^{\alpha}};$$

hence

$$U_{n-\epsilon(n)}(P'',Q'') \equiv 0 \pmod{p^{\alpha}}$$

and  $\kappa\delta(p)p^{\alpha-1} | n - \epsilon(n)$ . We conclude that  $\alpha = 1$  and by repeating the above argument on all primes which divide *n*, we see that *n* must be a product of distinct primes. It follows that, if  $\theta = 1$  for some prime *p* which divides *n*, then n/p = 3. Also  $(\Delta | 3) = 1$  and  $(p - \epsilon(p))/2 | 3p - \epsilon(p)$ ; hence, we must have p = 5 and  $\epsilon(5) = +1$ . Since  $(\Delta | 5) = (\Delta | 3) = 1$ , (Q | 3) = -1, and (Q | 5) = +1, we also must have  $\Delta \equiv 4 \pmod{15}$ . Thus, if  $n \neq 15$  whenever  $\Delta \equiv 4 \pmod{15}$ , we see

1977]

that  $\theta(p)$  must be zero for each prime p which divides n and consequently  $\delta(p) | n - \epsilon(n)$ .

Let n = pr, where p is a prime and  $p \neq 3$  and select P, Q such that (P, Q) = 1,  $P^2 - 4Q = \Delta$ ,  $\omega(p; P, Q) = \delta(p)/2$ . We can then find P'', Q'' such that (P'', Q'') = 1, (n, Q'') = 1,  $P''^2 - 4Q = \Delta$ ,  $\omega(p; P'', Q'') = \delta(p)/2$ ,  $(Q'' \mid n) = -1$ .

Since

$$V_{(n-\epsilon(n))/2}(P'',Q'') \equiv 0 \pmod{p}$$

and  $p \not\prec (V_m(P'', Q''), U_m(P'', Q''))$  for any *m*, we see that  $\omega(p; P'', Q'') \not\prec (n - \epsilon(n)/2)$ . However,  $\omega(p; P'', Q'') = \delta(p)/2$  and  $\delta(p) \mid n - \epsilon(n)$ ; hence,  $\delta(p)/2 \mid (n - \epsilon(n))/2$ , which is a contradiction.

In the following theorem we obtain our result.

THEOREM 7. There are no odd composite integers which satisfy (B) for any  $\Delta$ .

**Proof.** If *n* satisfies (B) for some  $\Delta$ , it must satisfy (A) for that same  $\Delta$ . Hence *n* is the product of distinct primes and not a perfect square. Since *n* must also satisfy (C) we see that *n* can only be 15 when  $\Delta \equiv 4 \pmod{15}$ ; however, in this case, we do not have  $\delta(5) \mid 15 - \epsilon(15)$ .

Another problem of some interest is that of whether there exists a Carmichael number *n* which possesses property (A) for some  $\Delta$  such that  $(\Delta \mid n) = -1$ . It is not difficult to show that if such numbers  $\Delta$  and *n* exist, *n* must be the product of an odd number of distinct primes  $p_1, p_2, p_3, \ldots, p_k$ ,  $\epsilon(p_i) = -1$  $(i = 1, 2, 3, \ldots, k)$ , and  $p_i + 1 \mid n+1$ ,  $p_i - 1 \mid n-1$  for  $i = 1, 2, 3, \ldots, k$ . For suppose  $p \mid n$  and  $\epsilon(p) = +1$ , then  $p-1 \mid n+1$  and  $p-1 \mid n-1$ , which means that p = 3. If *q* is any other prime divisor of *n*, then  $\epsilon(q) = -1$ ,  $q+1 \mid n+1$  and  $q-1 \mid n-1$ . If  $3 \mid n$ , this is impossible; hence,  $\epsilon(p) = -1$  for any  $p \mid n$ . Since  $\epsilon(n) = -1 = \epsilon_n(p_1) \epsilon(p_2) \cdots \epsilon(p_n) = (-1)^k$ , *k* must be odd.

It is not known to the author whether any such numbers exist. It can be shown, however, that if n is such a number,  $k \ge 5$ . To show this it suffices to show that  $k \ne 3$ . Suppose k = 3 and  $n = p_1 p_2 p_3$  with  $p_1 < p_2 < p_3$ . We have

$$p_1p_2 - 1 \equiv 0 \pmod{p_3 - 1}$$
  
 $-p_1p_2 + 1 \equiv 0 \pmod{p_3 + 1};$ 

hence,  $(p_3^2-1)/2$  is a divisor of  $p_1p_2-1$ . Since  $p_3 > p_2$ ,  $p_1$ , we have  $p_3^2+1=2p_1p_2$ . It is also true that  $p_2p_3-1$  is divisible by  $(p_1^2-1)/2$  and  $p_1p_3-1$  is divisible by  $(p_2^2-1)/2$ . Thus,

$$\frac{p_2p_3-1}{(p_1^2-1)/2} > \frac{p_1p_3-1}{(p_2^2-1)/2} > \frac{p_1p_2-1}{(p_3^2-1)/2}$$

and each of these three numbers is an integer. Since

$$p_1p_3 \neq p_2^2, p_1p_2 - 1 \ge 3(p_2^2 - 1)/2, p_2p_3 - 1 \ge 4(p_1^2 - 1)/2$$

https://doi.org/10.4153/CMB-1977-025-9 Published online by Cambridge University Press

142

1977]

#### CARMICHAEL NUMBERS

and

$$p_1p_2 + p_2p_3 + p_3p_1 - 3 \ge (p_3^2 - 1)/2 + 3(p_2^2 - 1)/2 + 4(p_1^2 - 1)/2.$$

Since

$$p_1p_2 + p_2p_3 + p_3p_1 \le p_1^2 + p_2^2 + p_3^2$$

we have

$$2(p_1^2+p_2^2+p_3^2) \ge p_3^2+3p_1^2+4p_1^2-2;$$

hence,

$$p_3^2 + 1 \ge p_2^2 + 2p_1^2 - 1 > p_2^2 + p_1^2 \ge 2p_1p_2,$$

which is impossible.

### References

1. R. D. Carmichael. A new number theory function, Bull. Amer. Math. Soc., 19 (1910), pp. 232-238.

2. Jack Chernick, On Fermat's simple theorem, Bull. Amer. Math. Soc., 45 (1939), pp. 269-274.

3. D. H. Lehmer, Strong Carmichael numbers, J. Aust. Math. Soc., Ser. A, 21 (1976) pp. 508-510.

4. A Rotkiewicz, On the pseudoprimes with respect to the Lucas sequences, Bull. Acad. Polon. Sci. Sér. Sci. Math. Astronom. Phys., 21 (1973), pp. 793-797.

University of Manitoba. Winnipeg, Man. R3T 2N2