CS 70 Discrete Mathematics and Probability Theory
Fall 2012 Vazirani Note 5

Modular Arithmetic

One way to think of modular arithmetic is that it limits numbers to a predefined range $\{0,1,\ldots,N-1\}$, and wraps around whenever you try to leave this range — like the hand of a clock (where $N = 12$) or the days of the week (where $N = 7$).

Example: Calculating the day of the week. Suppose that you have mapped the sequence of days of the week (Sunday, Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday, Thursday, Friday, Saturday) to the sequence of numbers $(0,1,2,3,4,5,6)$ so that Sunday is 0, Monday is 1, etc. Suppose that today is Thursday (=4), and you want to calculate what day of the week will be 10 days from now. Intuitively, the answer is the remainder of $4+10 = 14$ when divided by 7, that is, 0 —Sunday. In fact, it makes little sense to add a number like 10 in this context, you should probably find *its* remainder modulo 7, namely 3, and then add this to 4, to find 7, which is 0.

What if we want to continue this in 10 day jumps? After 5 such jumps, we would have day $4+3\cdot 5 = 19$, which gives 5 modulo 7 (Friday).

This example shows that in certain circumstances it makes sense to do arithmetic within the confines of a particular number (7 in this example), that is, to do arithmetic by always finding the remainder of each number modulo 7, say, and repeating this for the results, and so on. As well as being efficient in the sense of keeping intermediate values as small as possible, this actually has several important applications, including error-correcting codes and cryptography, as we shall see later.

To define things more formally, for any integer m (such as 7) we say that x and y are *congruent modulo m* if they differ by a multiple of m, or in symbols,

$$x = y \bmod m \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad m \text{ divides } (x-y).$$

For example, $29 = 5 \bmod 12$ because $29-5$ is a multiple of 12. We can also write $22 = -2 \bmod 12$. Equivalently, x and y are congruent modulo m iff they have the same remainder modulo m. Notice that "congruent modulo m" is an *equivalence relation*: it partitions the integers into m equivalence classes $0,1,2,\ldots,m-1$.

When computing modulo m, it is often convenient to reduce any intermediate results $\bmod m$ to simplify the calculation, as we did in the example above. This is justified by the following claim:

Theorem 5.1: If $a = c \bmod m$ and $b = d \bmod m$, then $a+b = c+d \bmod m$ and $a\cdot b = c\cdot d \bmod m$.

Proof: We know that $c = a+k\cdot m$ and $d = b+\ell\cdot m$, so $c+d = a+k\cdot m+b+\ell\cdot m = a+b+(k+\ell)\cdot m$, which means that $a+b = c+d \bmod m$. The proof for multiplication is similar and left as an exercise. □

What this theorem tells us is that we can always reduce any arithmetic expression modulo m into a natural number smaller than m. As an example, consider the expresion $(13+11)\cdot 18 \bmod 7$. Using the above

Theorem several times we can write:

$$\begin{aligned}(13+11)\cdot 18 &= (6+4)\cdot 4 \bmod 7\\ &= 10\cdot 4 \bmod 7\\ &= 3\cdot 4 \bmod 7\\ &= 12 \bmod 7\\ &= 5 \bmod 7.\end{aligned}$$

In summary, we can always do calculations modulo m by reducing intermediate results modulo m.

Inverses

Addition and multiplication $\bmod m$ is easy. To add two numbers a and b modulo m, we just add the numbers and then subtract m if necessary to reduce the result to a number between 0 and $m-1$. Multiplication can be similarly carried out by multiplying a and b and then calculating the remainder when the result is divided by m. Subtraction is equally easy. This is because subtracting b modulo m is the same as adding $-b = m-b \bmod m$.

What about division? This is a bit harder. Over the reals, dividing by a number x is the same as multiplying by $y = 1/x$. Here y is that number such that $x\cdot y = 1$. Of course we have to be careful when $x = 0$, since such a y does not exist. Similarly, when we wish to divide by $x \bmod m$, we need to find $y \bmod m$ such that $x\cdot y = 1 \bmod m$; then dividing by x modulo m will be the same as multiplying by y modulo m. Such a y is called the *multiplicative inverse* of x modulo m. In our present setting of modular arithmetic, can we be sure that x has an inverse mod m, and if so, is it unique (modulo m) and can we compute it?

As a first example, take $x = 8$ and $m = 15$. Then $2x = 16 = 1 \bmod 15$, so 2 is a multiplicative inverse of 8 mod 15. As a second example, take $x = 12$ and $m = 15$. Then the sequence $\{ax \bmod m : a = 0,1,2,\dots\}$ is periodic, and takes on the values $\{0,12,9,6,3\}$ (check this!). Thus 12 *has no multiplicative inverse mod* 15.

So when *does* x have a multiplicative inverse modulo m? The answer is: iff $\gcd(m,x) = 1$. This condition means that x and m share no common factors (except 1), and is often expressed by saying that x and m are *relatively prime*. Moreover, when the inverse exists it is unique.

Theorem 5.2: Let m,x be positive integers such that $\gcd(m,x) = 1$. Then x has a multiplicative inverse modulo m, and it is unique (modulo m).

Proof: Consider the sequence of m numbers $0,x,2x,\dots(m-1)x$. We claim that these are all distinct modulo m. Since there are only m distinct values modulo m, it must then be the case that $ax = 1 \bmod m$ for exactly one a (modulo m). This a is the unique multiplicative inverse.

To verify the above claim, suppose that $ax = bx \bmod m$ for two distinct values a,b in the range $0 \le a,b \le m-1$. Then we would have $(a-b)x = 0 \bmod m$, or equivalently, $(a-b)x = km$ for some integer k (possibly zero or negative). But since x and m are relatively prime, it follows that $a-b$ must be an integer multiple of m. This is not possible since a,b are distinct non-negative integers less than m. □

Actually it turns out that $\gcd(m,x) = 1$ is also a *necessary* condition for the existence of an inverse: i.e., if $\gcd(m,x) > 1$ then x has no multiplicative inverse modulo m. You might like to try to prove this using a similar idea to that in the above proof.

Since we know that multiplicative inverses are unique when $\gcd(m,x) = 1$, we shall write the inverse of x as $x^{-1} \bmod m$. But how do we compute x^{-1}, given x and m? For this we take a somewhat roundabout route. First we shall consider the problem of computing the greatest common divisor $\gcd(a,b)$ of two given integers a and b.

Computing the Greatest Common Divisor

The *greatest common divisor* of two natural numbers x and y, denoted $\gcd(x,y)$, is the largest natural number that divides them both. (Recall that 0 divides no number, and is divided by all.) How does one compute the gcd? By *Euclid's algorithm*, perhaps the first algorithm ever invented:

```
algorithm gcd(x,y)
  if y = 0 then return(x)
  else return(gcd(y,x mod y))
```

Note: This algorithm assumes that $x \geq y \geq 0$ and $x > 0$.

Theorem 5.3: The algorithm above correctly computes the gcd of x and y in time $O(n)$, where n is the total number of bits in the input (x,y).

Proof: Correctness is proved by (strong) induction on y, the smaller of the two input numbers. For each $y \geq 0$, let $P(y)$ denote the proposition that the algorithm correctly computes $\gcd(x,y)$ for all values of x such that $x \geq y$ (and $x > 0$). Certainly $P(0)$ holds, since $\gcd(x,0) = x$ and the algorithm correctly computes this in the `if`-clause. For the inductive step, we may assume that $P(z)$ holds for all $z < y$ (the inductive hypothesis); our task is to prove $P(y)$. The key observation here is that $\gcd(x,y) = \gcd(y, x \bmod y)$ — that is, replacing x by $x \bmod y$ does not change the gcd. This is because a divisor d of y also divides x if and only if it divides $x \bmod y$ (divisibility by d is not affected by adding or subtracting multiples of d, and y *is* a multiple of d). Hence the `else`-clause of the algorithm will return the correct value provided the recursive call `gcd(y,x mod y)` correctly computes the value $\gcd(y, x \bmod y)$. But since $x \bmod y < y$, we know this is true by the inductive hypothesis. This completes our verification of $P(y)$, and hence the induction proof.

Now for the $O(n)$ bound on the running time. It is obvious that the arguments of the recursive calls become smaller and smaller (because $y \leq x$ and $x \bmod y < y$). The question is, how fast? We shall show that, in the computation of $\gcd(x,y)$, after two recursive calls the first (larger) argument is smaller than x by at least a factor of two (assuming $x > 0$). There are two cases:

1. $y \leq \frac{x}{2}$. Then the first argument in the next recursive call, y, is already smaller than x by a factor of 2, and thus in the next recursive call it will be even smaller.

2. $x \geq y > \frac{x}{2}$. Then in two recursive calls the first argument will be $x \bmod y$, which is smaller than $\frac{x}{2}$.

So, in both cases the first argument decreases by a factor of at least two every two recursive calls. Thus after at most $2n$ recursive calls, where n is the number of bits in x, the recursion will stop (note that the first argument is always a natural number). □

Note that the second part of the above proof only shows that the *number of recursive calls* in the computation is $O(n)$. We can make the same claim for the running time if we assume that each call only requires constant time. Since each call involves one integer comparison and one mod operation, it is reasonable to claim that its running time is constant. In a more realistic model of computation, however, we should really make the time for these operations depend on the size of the numbers involved: thus the comparison would require $O(n)$ elementary (bit) operations, and the mod (which is really a division) would require $O(n^2)$ operations, for a total of $O(n^2)$ operations in each recursive call. (Here n is the maximum number of bits in x or y, which is just the number of bits in x.) Thus in such a model the running time of Euclid's algorithm is really $O(n^3)$.

Back to Multiplicative Inverses

Let's now return to the question of computing the multiplicative inverse of x modulo m. For any pair of numbers x,y, suppose we could not only compute $\gcd(x,y)$, but also find integers a,b such that

$$d = \gcd(x,y) = ax + by. \tag{1}$$

(Note that this is not a modular equation; and the integers a,b could be zero or negative.) For example, we can write $1 = \gcd(35,12) = -1 \cdot 35 + 3 \cdot 12$, so here $a = -1$ and $b = 3$ are possible values for a,b.

If we could do this then we'd be able to compute inverses, as follows. Apply the above procedure to the numbers m,x; this returns integers a,b such that

$$1 = \gcd(m,x) = am + bx.$$

But this means that $bx = 1 \bmod m$, so b is a multiplicative inverse of x modulo m. Reducing b modulo m gives us the unique inverse we are looking for. In the above example, we see that 3 is the multiplicative inverse of 12 mod 35.

So, we have reduced the problem of computing inverses to that of finding integers a,b that satisfy equation (1). Now since this problem is a generalization of the basic gcd, it is perhaps not too surprising that we can solve it with a fairly simple extension of Euclid's algorithm. The following algorithm *extended-gcd* takes as input a pair of natural numbers $x \geq y$ as in Euclid's algorithm, and returns a triple of integers (d,a,b) such that $d = \gcd(x,y)$ and $d = ax + by$:

```
algorithm extended-gcd(x,y)
  if y = 0 then return(x, 1, 0)
  else
    (d, a, b) := extended-gcd(y, x mod y)
    return((d, b, a - (x div y) * b))
```

Note that this algorithm has the same form as the basic gcd algorithm we saw earlier; the only difference is that we now carry around in addition the required values a,b. You should hand-turn the algorithm on the input $(x,y) = (35,12)$ from our earlier example, and check that it delivers correct values for a,b.

Let's now look at why the algorithm works. In the base case ($y = 0$), we return the gcd value $d = x$ as before, together with values $a = 1$ and $b = 0$ which satisfy $ax + by = d$. If $y > 0$, we first recursively compute values (d,a,b) such that $d = \gcd(y, x \bmod y)$ and

$$d = ay + b(x \bmod y). \tag{2}$$

Just as in our analysis of the vanilla algorithm, we know that this d will be equal to $\gcd(x,y)$. So the first component of the triple returned by the algorithm is correct.

What about the other two components? Let's call them A and B. What should their values be? Well, from the specification of the algorithm, they must be integers that satisfy

$$d = Ax + By. \tag{3}$$

To figure out what A and B should be, we need to rearrange equation (2), as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} d &= ay + b(x \bmod y) \\ &= ay + b(x - \lfloor x/y \rfloor y) \\ &= bx + (a - \lfloor x/y \rfloor b)y. \end{aligned}$$

(In the second line here, we have used the fact that $x \bmod y = x - \lfloor x/y \rfloor y$ — check this!) Comparing this last equation with equation (3), we see that we need to take $A = b$ and $B = a - \lfloor x/y \rfloor b$. This is exactly what the algorithm does, so we have concluded our proof of correctness.

Since the extended gcd algorithm has exactly the same recursive structure as the vanilla version, its running time will be the same up to constant factors (reflecting the increased time per recursive call). So once again the running time on n-bit numbers will be $O(n)$ arithmetic operations, and $O(n^3)$ bit operations. Combining this with our earlier discussion of inverses, we see that for any x, m with $\gcd(m, x) = 1$ we can compute $x^{-1} \bmod m$ in the same time bounds.