

# Tabulating Carmichael numbers $n = Pqr$ with $P$ small

Andrew Shallue and Jonathan Webster

Illinois Wesleyan University and Butler University, USA  
ashallue@iwu.edu, jwebste@butler.edu

ANTS 2022, University of Bristol

# Outline

- 1 Definitions
- 2 Problem and Motivation
- 3 Previous work
- 4 New work

# Table of Contents

1 Definitions

2 Problem and Motivation

3 Previous work

4 New work

# Fermat's Little Theorem

## Theorem (Fermat)

*If  $p$  is prime, then  $a^p \equiv a \pmod{p}$ .*

## Theorem (Contrapositive of FLT)

*If  $a^n \not\equiv a \pmod{n}$ , then  $n$  is composite.*

# Fermat's Little Theorem

## Theorem (Fermat)

*If  $p$  is prime, then  $a^p \equiv a \pmod{p}$ .*

## Theorem (Contrapositive of FLT)

*If  $a^n \not\equiv a \pmod{n}$ , then  $n$  is composite.*

## Definition (Carmichael number)

A Carmichael number is a composite integer  $n$  satisfying  $a^n \equiv a \pmod{n}$  for any  $a$ .

[AGP] There are infinitely many.

# Korselt's Criterion

## Theorem (Korselt's Criterion)

*A composite number  $n$  is a Carmichael number if and only if  $n$  is squarefree and  $(p - 1) \mid (n - 1)$  for all prime divisors  $p$  of  $n$ .*

# Korselt's Criterion

## Theorem (Korselt's Criterion)

*A composite number  $n$  is a Carmichael number if and only if  $n$  is squarefree and  $(p - 1) | (n - 1)$  for all prime divisors  $p$  of  $n$ .*

## Example

The number  $3 \cdot 11 \cdot 17 = 561$  is a Carmichael number.

- $2 | 560$
- $10 | 560$
- $16 | 560$

The example is the smallest Carmichael number.

One may find a tabulation of Carmichael numbers in the OEIS.

The list begins as

561, 1105, 1729, 2465, 2821, 6601, 8911, 10585, 15841, 29341, 41041,  
46657, 52633, 62745, 63973, 75361, 101101, 115921, 126217, 162401,  
172081, 188461, 252601, 278545, 294409, 314821, 334153, 340561,  
399001, 410041, 449065, 488881, 512461, ...



# Table of Contents

1 Definitions

2 Problem and Motivation

3 Previous work

4 New work

## Problem

*Given bound  $B$ , tabulate all Carmichael numbers up to  $B$ .*

## Problem

*Given an integer  $P$  (called a pre-product), determine the finite list of prime-pairs  $(q, r)$  such that  $Pqr$  is Carmichael.*

## Problem

*Determine the computational complexity of either tabulation problem.*

# Main result

## Theorem

*The number of  $D\Delta$  pairs used to tabulate all Carmichael numbers of the form  $Pqr$  with  $P < X$  is  $O(X^2(\ln X)^2)$ .*

To turn the above into a time complexity measured in arithmetic operations, multiply by the cost of primality.

# Main result

## Theorem

*The number of  $D\Delta$  pairs used to tabulate all Carmichael numbers of the form  $Pqr$  with  $P < X$  is  $O(X^2(\ln X)^2)$ .*

To turn the above into a time complexity measured in arithmetic operations, multiply by the cost of primality.

For a comparison with previous work, fix a pre-product  $P < X$  with  $d - 2$  unique prime factors.

- Using the  $CD$  method of Pinch, tabulating Carmichaels with pre-product  $P$  requires  $O(P^{2-\frac{1}{d-2}} \ln P)$  inner-loop calls.
- Using the  $D\Delta$  method, the average number of inner-loop calls is instead  $O(P(\ln P)^2)$ .

# Comparison

Main ideas:

- replace a loop over an interval with a loop over divisors,
- keep average time and space cost low via an incremental sieve

# Comparison

Main ideas:

- replace a loop over an interval with a loop over divisors,
- keep average time and space cost low via an incremental sieve

Advantages of the new result:

- Remove the dependence on  $d$ .
- Extend the range of pre-products considered “small”
- Enables a hybrid method: size of interval vs. count of divisors.

# Motivation

Let  $C(x)$  be the count of Carmichael numbers up to  $x$ .

## Theorem (Harman 2005)

*There exists  $\beta > 0.33$  such that  $C(x) > x^\beta$  (for sufficiently large  $x$ ).*

## Conjecture (Erdős)

*For every  $\epsilon > 0$ , there exists  $x$  such that  $C(x) > x^{1-\epsilon}$ .*

## Fact (Pinch, 2006)

$C(x) > x^{0.34}$  for  $x = 10^{18}$ .

Question: For which integer  $x$  is  $C(x) > x^{0.5}$ ?

## Constructing pseudoprimes

More speculatively, could we get lucky and find a Baillie-PSW pseudoprime?

Unlikely, but techniques for tabulation sometimes apply to other constructions.

Notable that our new method constructs much larger Carmichaels, since it efficiently finds all completions for a given pre-product.

### Example

1344142858883969679083454629833201 is Carmichael, found with pre-product 999983



# Table of Contents

- 1 Definitions
- 2 Problem and Motivation
- 3 Previous work**
- 4 New work

## Pinch's Tabulations $n < B$

In 1993, Richard Pinch published the modern tabulation method. He used it for the following tabulations:

# Pinch's Tabulations $n < B$

In 1993, Richard Pinch published the modern tabulation method. He used it for the following tabulations:

- 1993:  $n < 10^{15}$
- 1998:  $n < 10^{16}$
- 2005:  $n < 10^{17}$
- 2006:  $n < 10^{18}$
- 2007:  $n < 10^{21}$

## How do you tabulate?

We construct  $n = p_1 p_2 \dots p_d$  in factored form with  $d > 2$  prime factors.

We let

$$P = \prod_{i=1}^{d-2} p_i, q = p_{d-1}, \text{ and } r = p_d$$

so that  $n = Pqr$  is a Carmichael number.

## How do you tabulate?

We construct  $n = p_1 p_2 \dots p_d$  in factored form with  $d > 2$  prime factors.

We let

$$P = \prod_{i=1}^{d-2} p_i, q = p_{d-1}, \text{ and } r = p_d$$

so that  $n = Pqr$  is a Carmichael number.

There are two cases to consider:

- $P$  is “large” - sieve for  $q$ , search for  $r$  in an arithmetic progression
- $P$  is “small” - find  $q$  and  $r$  at the same time

$P$  is “small”

### Theorem (Proposition 2 of Pinch)

There are integers  $2 \leq D < P < C$  such that, putting  $\Delta = CD - P^2$ , we have

$$q = \frac{(P-1)(P+D)}{\Delta} + 1, \quad (1)$$

$$r = \frac{(P-1)(P+C)}{\Delta} + 1, \quad (2)$$

$$P^2 < CD < P^2 \left( \frac{p_{d-2} + 3}{p_{d-2} + 1} \right). \quad (3)$$

### Corollary

There are only finitely many Carmichael numbers of the form  $Pqr$  for a given  $P$ .

## CD method - Asymptotic cost

Double nested loop on interval  $[P^2, P^2 \left( \frac{p_{d-2}+3}{p_{d-2}+1} \right)]$ .

With  $L_P$  as interval length, cost per  $D$  is  $L_P/D$ .

The actions inside the inner loop are cheap.

### Theorem

*Fix a pre-product  $P$ . Then all valid  $C, D$  pairs may be created in time  $O(L_P \ln P) = O(P^{2-\frac{1}{d-2}} \ln P)$ .*

When  $d = 3$ ,  $O(L_P \ln P) = O(P \ln P)$ .

# Table of Contents

- 1 Definitions
- 2 Problem and Motivation
- 3 Previous work
- 4 New work**



## “Small” - Shallue/Webster case

Generate  $D, \Delta$  pairs to find  $q$  and  $r$ .

Input: The interval  $[P - 1, 2P - 1]$  with prime factorizations

**for**  $2 \leq D < P$  **do**

**for**  $\Delta$  *divisors of*  $(P - 1)(P + D)$  **do**

        Check  $C = (P^2 + \Delta)/D$  is integral

        Check  $q = \frac{(P-1)(P+D)}{\Delta} + 1$  is a prime

        Check  $r = \frac{(P-1)(P+C)}{\Delta} + 1$  is an integral prime

        Check  $n = Pqr$  passes Korselt's Criterion

**end**

**end**

## Generate $D, \Delta$ pairs

Can this work? We need to establish two things.

- The expected number of times the inner loop is entered is asymptotically fewer.
- The cost of obtaining the list of divisors is not expensive

## Generate $D, \Delta$ pairs

Can this work? We need to establish two things.

- The expected number of times the inner loop is entered is asymptotically fewer.
- The cost of obtaining the list of divisors is not expensive

Both of these are met:

- $\tau((P - 1)(P + D))$  is often smaller than  $L_P/D$ .
- Sieve of Eratosthenes may be modified to factor numbers.

## $D\Delta$ method - Asymptotic cost

### Theorem

The cost of tabulating all Carmichael number of the form  $Pqr$  for  $P < X$  is  $O(X^2(\ln X)^2)$ .

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{P < X} \sum_{D=2}^{P-1} \tau((P-1)(P+D)) &< \left( \sum_{P < X} \tau(P-1) \right) \left( \sum_{D < X} \tau(P+D) \right) \\ &< \left( \sum_{P < X} \tau(P) \right) \left( \sum_{D < 2X} \tau(D) \right) \\ &= 2X^2(\ln X)^2 + O(X^2 \ln X). \end{aligned}$$

The average cost per  $P$  is  $O(P(\ln P)^2)$ .

## $D\Delta$ method - example

### Example

Let  $P = 5 \cdot 19 \cdot 23 \cdot 29 = 63365$ , then there are four Carmichael numbers of the form  $Pqr$ . They are

- ①  $P \cdot 683 \cdot 2545783 = 110177147679985$
- ②  $P \cdot 2297 \cdot 36037 = 5245163907985$
- ③  $P \cdot 37 \cdot 137 = 321197185$
- ④  $P \cdot 70168253 \cdot 254447257 = 1131326282391998510665$ .

The third number is the smallest Carmichael number with exactly six prime factors. Generating these four numbers requires checking about 9 million  $D\Delta$  pairs or about 2.8 billion  $CD$  pairs.

## What about $d = 3$ ?

The new  $D\Delta$  method is better if  $d > 3$ . For  $d = 3$ :

- $CD$  method - costs  $O(P \ln P)$ .
- $D\Delta$  method - average cost  $O(P(\ln P)^2)$ .

Timing tests verify that the  $CD$  method is faster. We employ a hybrid approach:

For each  $D$ , compare  $\tau((P - 1)(P + D))$  versus  $L_p/D$ .

# Hybrid - Example

## Example

Let  $P = 65003$  a prime, the resulting Carmichael numbers are

- 1  $P \cdot 384226823 \cdot 1387549787527 = 34655299431568422859575163$
- 2  $P \cdot 260009 \cdot 149569603 = 2527930457246474281$
- 3  $P \cdot 4485139 \cdot 1443304409 = 420791778351741348553$
- 4  $P \cdot 4255030921 \cdot 605229266867 = 167400226720595416380338521$
- 5  $P \cdot 2145067 \cdot 123503801 = 17220850085262054001$
- 6  $P \cdot 11960369 \cdot 628504339 = 488636899246608538273$
- 7  $P \cdot 845027 \cdot 27300841 = 1499615814744258121$
- 8  $P \cdot 3073667 \cdot 36326833 = 7258013177193134833$
- 9  $P \cdot 260009 \cdot 845027 = 14282109784670729$
- 10  $P \cdot 845027 \cdot 1950061 = 107115466344644941$

The average value of  $\tau((P-1)(P+D)/2)$  is around 45 and  $\lfloor L_P/D \rfloor = 45$  when  $D = 2827$ .

## Faster $d = 3$ case - heuristic

### Conjecture

*When  $P$  is a prime, all Carmichael numbers of the form  $Pqr$  may be found in time  $O(P \ln \ln P)$ . As a corollary, all Carmichael numbers up to  $B$  with three prime factors may be tabulated in time  $O(B^{2/3})$ .*

Use  $D\Delta$  method when  $D$  is small and  $CD$  method when  $D$  is large.

Crossover on average:  $D = \frac{P}{(\ln P)^2}$

With average value of  $\tau$ , get:

$$\sum_{D=2}^{\frac{P}{(\ln P)^2}} (\ln P)^2 + \sum_{D=\frac{P}{(\ln P)^2}}^{P-1} 2P/D = P + 2P \ln \ln P = O(P \ln \ln P).$$



# Timings - $CD$ versus $D\Delta$

Pre-product bound	$D\Delta$ (seconds)	$CD$ (seconds)	Hybrid (seconds)
$10 \cdot 10^4$	21	81	10
$20 \cdot 10^4$	92	553	50
$30 \cdot 10^4$	231	1730	124
$40 \cdot 10^4$	430	3778	233
$50 \cdot 10^4$	697	7017	395
$60 \cdot 10^4$	983	11455	568
$70 \cdot 10^4$	1425	17281	795
$80 \cdot 10^4$	1898	23806	1072
$90 \cdot 10^4$	2425	33288	1386

## Timings for $P$ a prime

Prime pre-product bound	$D\Delta$ (sec)	$CD$ (sec)	Hybrid (sec)
$10 \cdot 10^4$	9	1	1
$20 \cdot 10^4$	36	6	3
$30 \cdot 10^4$	83	15	8
$40 \cdot 10^4$	151	26	14
$50 \cdot 10^4$	237	41	22
$60 \cdot 10^4$	348	60	31
$70 \cdot 10^4$	470	80	41
$80 \cdot 10^4$	619	103	53
$90 \cdot 10^4$	738	125	64
$100 \cdot 10^4$	939	159	81
$110 \cdot 10^4$	1170	193	97
$120 \cdot 10^4$	1328	221	110

# Future/Continuing Work

- Complete a tabulation for pre-products  $P < 10^8$ .
- Complete a Carmichael tabulation up to  $10^{24}$ .

# Future/Continuing Work

- Complete a tabulation for pre-products  $P < 10^8$ .
- Complete a Carmichael tabulation up to  $10^{24}$ .

Thank you!