## STICHTING MATHEMATISCH CENTRUM 2e BOERHAAVESTRAAT 49 AMSTERDAM

ZW 1953 - 001

On Mersenne numbers and Poulet numbers

H.J.A. Duparc



1953

## On Mersenne numbers and Poulet numbers

## H.J.A. Duparc.

Definition. A Mersenne number is a number  $m = 2^{p} - 1$ , where p is prime. Definition. A Mersenne prime is a number  $m = 2^{p} - 1$ , which is prime.

Obviously every Mersenne prime is a Mersenne number.

Definition. A Poulet number (or pseudo prime) is a composite number m which satisfies  $2^{m-1} \equiv 1 \pmod{m}$ .

Definition. A super-Poulet number is a composite number all divisors of which are either prime or Poulet numbers.

Obviously every non prime divisor of a super-Poulet number is a super-Poulet number.

Theorem 1. Every Mersenne number is either a Poulet number or a prime. Proof. Let  $m = 2^{p}$  1 be a composite Mersenne number. Since p is prime we have

$$p | 2^{p-1} - 1 | 2^p - 2 = m - 1,$$

hence

$$m = 2^{p} - 1 | 2^{m-1} - 1.$$

Theorem 2. Every composite Mersenne number is a super-Poulet number. Proof. Let  $m = 2^{\frac{r}{2}} - 1$  be a composite Mersenne number and let  $m_1$  be an arbitrary divisor of m. We prove  $2^{m_1-1} \equiv 1 \pmod{m_1}$ .

We now prove this last relation by induction. We found in theorem 1 that  $2^{m-1} \equiv 1 \pmod{m}$  and may assume this property proved for every divisor r of m with  $n > m_1$ , i.e.  $2^{n-1} \equiv 1 \pmod{n}$ . Now let  $m_2$  be a divisor of m such that  $\frac{m_2}{m_1} = q$  is prime. Since  $q \mid m = 2^p - 1$ , and since  $p \mid p \mid m_2 \mid m_1 = 2^p - 1$ , hence  $m_2 \mid m_2 \mid m_2 \mid m_1 = 2^p - 1$ , so we get  $2^{m_1} = 1 \pmod{m_2}$ , By induction we have  $2^{m_1} \equiv 1 \pmod{m_2}$ , so we get  $2^{m_1} \equiv 1 \pmod{m_2}$ ,

hence  $2^{m_1-1} \equiv 1 \pmod{m_1}$ , which proves the theorem.

Theorem 3. If m is prime or pseudo prime, then  $M = 2^m - 1$  is prime or pseudo prime.

Proof. From  $2^{m-1} \equiv 1 \pmod{m}$  it follows

$$M = 2^{m}-1 \mid 2^{2^{m-1}}-1-1 \mid 2^{2^{m}-2}-1 = 2^{M-1}-1,$$

which proves the assertion.

Corollary. From this theorem it follows for primes m that every Mersenne number  $M = 2^{m} - 1$  is either prime or pseudo prime.

Further it is not true that if m is a super-Poulet number also  $\mathbb{M}=2^m-1$  is a super-Poulet number. If we take  $m=2^{11}-1=2047=23.89$ , then from theorem 2 it follows that m is a super-Poulet number. However  $\mathbb{M}=2^{2047}-1$  is not a super-Poulet number for consider the number  $d=47(2^{89}-1)$ , then  $d(2^{23}-1)(2^{89}-1)$ , so d divides  $\mathbb{M}$ , but  $d(2^{39}-1)$ , since  $2^{89}-1 \neq 2^{47}(2^{89}-1)-1-1$ , for

$$47(2^{89}-1)-1 \equiv 46 \not\equiv 0 \pmod{89}$$
.

We now prove the following

Theorem 4. Consider the sequence

$$m_h = 2^{m_{h-1}} - 1$$
 (h = 1,2,...),

where mo is prime. Then two cases are possible:

- 1°. There exists a positive integer k such that  $m_{k-1}$  is prime,  $m_k$  is no prime. Then all  $m_h$  with  $0 \le h \le k-1$  are prime and all  $m_h$  with  $h \ge k$  are pseudo prime.
- $2^{\circ}$ . No such integer k can be found. Then all elements of the sequence are prime.
- <u>Proof.</u> 1°. Suppose that for a positive integer k we have  $\mathbf{m}_{k-1}$  prime,  $\mathbf{m}_k$  not prime. Then obviously  $\mathbf{m}_h$  is prime if  $0 \le h \le k-1$ . Since  $\mathbf{m}_k$  is not prime, by theorem 2 the number  $\mathbf{m}_k$  is a pseudo prime and by theorem 3 all  $\mathbf{m}_h$  with  $h \ge k$  are prime or pseudo prime. Since  $\mathbf{m}_k$  is composite obviously all  $\mathbf{m}_h$  with  $h \ge k$  are composite, hence all  $\mathbf{m}_h$  with  $h \ge k$  are pseudo primes.
- $2^{\circ}$ . If no integer k can be found for which  $m_k$  is composite, all element of the sequence are prime.

Remark. I do not know whether a prime  $m_0$  can be found for which case  $2^{\circ}$  holds.

The case  $1^{\circ}$  occurs for instance for  $m_{\circ} = 11$ ; then k = 1, for  $2^{11}-1 = 23.89$  is composite. Hence by the theorem 4 we find Theorem 5. There are infinitely many Poulet numbers.

Finally by the remark to theorem 3 we see that if  $m_h$  is a super-Poulet number, the number  $m_{h+1}$  is not necessarily so, for if  $m_0=11$ , then  $m_1$  is a super-Poulet number, but  $m_2$  is not.