

Handout #6: Basic number theory stuff, used in Shor's algorithm for quantum-computing the factors of an integer

Suppose N is some large number that we wish to factor. We proceed by the following steps:

Step 1: Check to see whether N is even, or is the power of some prime. (There are efficient algorithms for performing both checks.) If N is even, divide it by 2 and factor $N/2$. If N is the power of some prime, there are efficient algorithms for calculating this prime. If N is neither even, nor a prime power, proceed to Step 2.

Step 2: Pick a number $a < N$ at random. Use **Euclid's algorithm** (described below) to find the greatest common divisor of a and N . If $\gcd(a, N) = 1$, proceed to Step 3. If $\gcd(a, N) > 1$, then divide N by it and factor the two resulting numbers.

Step 3: At this point, we have a number $a < N$ that is co-prime to N (i.e., it has no common factors with N that are > 1). Then it is possible to show that the function $f(x) = a^x \bmod N$ is periodic, so that its period r satisfies the equation $a^r \bmod N = 1$. (Proof below.) **We use our quantum computer to find r , by means of the algorithm described in class.**

Step 4: We have now found numbers a and r such that $a^r = kN + 1$, for some integer k . **If we are lucky**, r is even. (Luck is not guaranteed: consider $a = 4$, $N = 63$, $r = 3$.) In that case, we can rewrite this equation as $(a^{r/2} + 1)(a^{r/2} - 1) = kN$, where the two factors on the lhs are integers.

Step 5: We know that at least one of the numbers $(a^{r/2} + 1)$ and $(a^{r/2} - 1)$ shares a factor > 1 with N . We can now use Euclid's algorithm to find the greatest common divisors that N shares with $(a^{r/2} + 1)$ and $(a^{r/2} - 1)$, respectively. **If we are lucky**, one of these will be a number strictly

between 1 and N . (Luck is not guaranteed: consider $a = 14$, $N = 15$, $r = 2$.) This completes the procedure.

How lucky do we need to be, in Steps 4 and 5? Well, if N is neither even nor a prime power, and if a is co-prime to N , then the probability is greater than 50% that the r we find will meet the conditions described in Steps 4 and 5. (That's not supposed to be obvious: consider it a bit of number-theory magic.) Given that this procedure can be performed efficiently, that's plenty high enough.

Euclid's algorithm: Suppose we have two integers x and y , with $y > x$. Then Euclid's algorithm for finding $\gcd(x,y)$ (the greatest common divisor of x and y) is based on the following result:

$$\gcd(x,y) = x \text{ if } y \bmod x = 0;$$

$$\gcd(x,y) = \gcd(x, y \bmod x) \text{ if } y \bmod x > 0.$$

It's obvious how to turn this result into an efficient algorithm for computing $\gcd(x,y)$. The proof of the result is straightforward. If $y \bmod x = 0$, then $y = nx$, for some integer n , so obviously $\gcd(x,y) = x$. If $y \bmod x > 0$, then $y = nx + m$, for some (positive) integers n and m . Let $f = \gcd(x,y)$. Then, since f evenly divides both x and y , it must also evenly divide m . So f is a factor in common to x and $m = y \bmod x$. Suppose that there is some $f' > f$ which is also a factor in common to x and m . Then, since f' would have to evenly divide both x and m , it would also evenly divide y . So it would be a factor in common to x and y , which is impossible, since f is the greatest such factor. Therefore $f = \gcd(x,m)$.

Proof of stuff used in Step 3: First, it's obvious (by the "pigeonhole principle") that there are integers x and y , with $y > x$, such that $a^x \bmod N = a^y \bmod N$. Let y be the smallest integer $> x$ that meets this condition. Let $r = y - x$. Observe that r must be less than N . (Why?)

Suppose that $a^r \bmod N = 1$. Then it follows that $f(x) = a^x \bmod N$ is periodic, with period r : for $f(x + r) = (a^x a^r) \bmod N = (a^x \bmod N)(a^r \bmod N) \bmod N = a^x \bmod N = f(x)$. [Exercise: Show that $\bmod N$ “distributes” in the way just used here: that is, show that for any x, y, N , $xy \bmod N = (x \bmod N)(y \bmod N) \bmod N$.]

So we need to show, given that $a^x \bmod N = a^x a^r \bmod N$, that $a^r \bmod N = 1$. We *cannot* appeal to the result that for any x, y, N , with $x \neq 0$, if $x \bmod N = xy \bmod N$, then $y \bmod N = 1$; for there is no such result. Counterexample: $x = 12, y = 8, N = 21$. We *can* appeal to a weaker result:

Suppose $x \neq 0$, and x and N are co-prime. Then if $x \bmod N = xy \bmod N$, $y \bmod N = 1$.

Proof: Since $x \bmod N = xy \bmod N$, $(xy - x) = x(y - 1)$ must be evenly divisible by N . but x and N share no factors in common. So in fact $(y - 1)$ must be evenly divisible by N . But that is just to say that $y \bmod N = 1$.

Now recall that $a^x \bmod N = a^x a^r \bmod N$. Since a shares no factors with N , a^x likewise shares no factors with N . So $a^r \bmod N = 1$, as needed.