

## ON THE CONNECTION BETWEEN THE RANK OF APPARITION OF A PRIME $p$ IN FIBONACCI SEQUENCE AND THE FIBONACCI PRIMITIVE ROOTS

PÉTER KISS and BUI MINH PHONG  
Teachers Training College, Eger, Hungary

Let the number  $g$  be a primitive root (mod  $p$ ). If  $x = g$  satisfies the congruence

$$(1) \quad x^2 \equiv x + 1 \pmod{p},$$

then the  $g$  is called *Fibonacci Primitive Root*. D. Shanks [1] and D. Shanks, L. Taylor [2] dealt with the condition of existence of the Fibonacci Primitive Roots and they proved a few theorems.

In connection with the Fibonacci sequence

$$F_0 = 1, \quad F_1 = 1, \quad F_2 = 1, \quad F_3 = 2, \dots (F_n = F_{n-1} + F_{n-2}),$$

the natural number  $a = a(p)$  is called by D. Jarden [3] the rank of apparition of  $p$  if  $F_a$  is divisible by  $p$  and  $F_i$  is not divisible by  $p$  in case  $i < a$ .

In this article, we shall deal with the connections between the rank of apparition of prime  $p$  in the Fibonacci sequence and the Fibonacci Primitive Roots. We shall prove the following theorems:

**Theorem 1.** The congruence  $x^2 \equiv x + 1 \pmod{p}$  is solvable if and only if  $p - 1$  is divisible by  $a(p)$  or  $p = 5$ .

**Theorem 2.** If  $p = 10k \pm 1$  is a prime number and there exist two Fibonacci Primitive Roots (mod  $p$ ) or no Fibonacci Primitive Root exists, then  $a(p) < p - 1$ .

**Theorem 3.** There is exactly one Fibonacci Primitive Root (mod  $p$ ) if and only if  $a(p) = p - 1$  or  $p = 5$ .

D. Shanks [1] proved that if (1) is solvable then  $p = 5$  or  $p = 10k \pm 1$ . But D. H. Halton [4] proved that  $F_{p-(5/p)}$  is divisible by the prime  $p$  ( $p \neq 5$ ), where  $(5/p)$  is the Legendre's symbol, and it is well known that if  $p = 10k \pm 1$ , then  $(5/p) = 1$ , therefore  $F_{p-1}$  is divisible by  $p$ . So it is enough to prove the following lemma for the verification of the first part of Theorem 1:

**Lemma 1.** If  $F_n$  is divisible by number  $p$ , then  $n$  is divisible by the rank  $a(p)$  of  $p$  and if  $n$  is divisible by  $a(p)$ , then  $F_n$  is divisible by  $p$ .

Let  $a = a(p)$  and  $n = a \cdot m + r$ , where  $0 < r \leq a$ . N. N. Vorobev proved that  $F_{b+c} = F_b \cdot F_{c+1} + F_{b-1} \cdot F_c$  ([5], p. 10) and  $F_{b \cdot c}$  is divisible by  $F_b$  for every natural numbers  $b$  and  $c$  ([5], p. 29). For this reason  $p$  is a divisor of  $F_{a \cdot m}$  and if  $p$  is a divisor of  $F_n$ , then

$$F_n = F_{am+r} = F_{am} \cdot F_{r+1} + F_{am-1} \cdot F_r \equiv F_{am-1} \cdot F_r \equiv 0 \pmod{p}.$$

But  $F_{am}$  and  $F_{am-1}$  are neighboring numbers of the Fibonacci sequence, for that very reason  $F_{am-1}$  is prime to  $F_{am}$  (see [5], p. 30). So  $p$  is not a divisor of  $F_{am-1}$  because  $p$  is a divisor of  $F_{am}$  and  $F_r \equiv 0 \pmod{p}$ . From this follows  $a = r$  by reason of definition of  $a = a(p)$ . Thus  $n$  is divisible by  $a = a(p)$ . Should it happen that  $n$  is divisible by  $a = a(p)$ , then, due to the Vorobev's previous theorem,  $F_n$  is divisible by  $F_{a(p)}$  and so  $F_n$  is divisible by  $p$ , too. With this we proved the Lemma 1 and from this follows the proof of the first part of Theorem 1.

If  $p - 1$  is divisible by  $a(p)$ , then by reason of Lemma 1  $F_{p-1}$  is divisible by  $p$ . From this follows that  $(5/p) = 1$ . Namely, if  $(5/p) = -1$ , then  $F_{p+1}$  is divisible by  $p$ , too, and so  $F_p = F_{p+1} - F_{p-1}$  also is divisible by  $p$ . But  $F_i$  and  $F_{i+1}$  are relatively prime for every natural number  $i$ , therefore  $(5/p) = 1$ . From this follows that  $p = 10k \pm 1$  and so the congruence (1) is solvable. It completes the proof of Theorem 1.

Before the proof of Theorem 2 and Theorem 3, we shall prove two Lemmas.

**Lemma 2.** If the congruence  $x^2 \equiv x + 1 \pmod{p}$  is solvable,  $p \neq 5$  and the two roots are  $g_1, g_2$ , then  $g_1 - g_2 \not\equiv 0 \pmod{p}$ .

**Lemma 3.** If  $x$  is a solution of the congruence  $x^2 \equiv x + 1 \pmod{p}$ , then

$$x^k \equiv F_k \cdot x + F_{k-1} \pmod{p}$$

for every natural exponent  $k$ .

Let us prove the Lemma 2 first. If (1) has solutions  $g_1$  and  $g_2$ , then  $g_1 + g_2 \equiv 1 \pmod{p}$  and  $g_2 \equiv 1 - g_1 \pmod{p}$ , respectively (see [1]). Let us suppose that  $g_1 - g_2 \equiv 0 \pmod{p}$ , that is

$$(2) \quad 2g_1 \equiv 1 \pmod{p}.$$

$g_1$  is a root of (1) and so  $g_1^2 \equiv g_1 + 1 \pmod{p}$ . Let us add this congruence to (2). Then we get  $g_1^2 + g_1 \equiv 2 \pmod{p}$  and from this  $4g_1^2 + 4g_1 \equiv 8 \pmod{p}$  and  $(2g_1 + 1)^2 \equiv 9 \pmod{p}$ , respectively. From the later congruence we get  $2g_1 + 1 \equiv 3$  or  $2g_1 + 1 \equiv -3 \pmod{p}$  and from these subtracting the congruence (2) we get  $5 \equiv 0$  or  $1 \equiv 0 \pmod{p}$ . But these are true only if  $p = 5$  according to  $p > 1$ , which proves the Lemma 2. In case  $p = 5$  really  $g_1 - g_2 \equiv 0 \pmod{p}$  because  $g_1 = 3$  and  $g_2 = 1 - g_1 = -2 \equiv g_1 \pmod{5}$ .

We shall carry out the proof of the Lemma 3 by induction over  $k$ . In the cases  $k = 1$  and  $k = 2$  indeed

$$x = x + 0 = F_1 \cdot x + F_0 \quad \text{and} \quad x^2 \equiv x + 1 = F_2 \cdot x + F_1 \pmod{p}.$$

After this if  $k > 2$  and the statement is true for exponents smaller than  $k$ , then

$$\begin{aligned} x^k &= x^2 \cdot x^{k-2} \equiv (x + 1) \cdot x^{k-2} = x^{k-1} + x^{k-2} \equiv F_{k-1} \cdot x + F_{k-2} + F_{k-2} \cdot x + F_{k-3} \\ &= F_k \cdot x + F_{k-1} \pmod{p} \end{aligned}$$

which proves Lemma 3.

Now let us suppose that  $p = 10k \pm 1$ . In this case by reason of [1], (1) is solvable. If both roots  $g_1$  and  $g_2$  are primitive  $\pmod{p}$ , then, according to Lemma 3 (using for every primitive root  $g^{(p-1)/2} \equiv -1 \pmod{p}$ )

$$g_1^{(p-1)/2} \equiv F_{(p-1)/2} \cdot g_1 + F_{(p-1)/2-1} \equiv -1 \pmod{p}$$

$$g_2^{(p-1)/2} \equiv F_{(p-1)/2} \cdot g_2 + F_{(p-1)/2-1} \equiv -1 \pmod{p}.$$

The difference of the congruences gives:  $F_{(p-1)/2}(g_1 - g_2) \equiv 0 \pmod{p}$  and from this follows by reason of Lemma 2 ( $p \neq 5$ ) that  $F_{(p-1)/2} \equiv 0 \pmod{p}$  which by reason of Lemma 1 proves the first part of Theorem 2.

Let us suppose that neither  $g_1$  nor  $g_2$  is primitive root  $\pmod{p}$  and  $g_1$  belongs to the exponent  $n_1$  and  $g_2$  belongs to the  $n_2$ . Then  $n_1$  and  $n_2$  are divisors of  $p - 1$  ( $n_1, n_2 < p - 1$ ) and

$$(3) \quad g_1^{n_1} \equiv 1, \quad g_2^{n_2} \equiv 1 \pmod{p}.$$

If  $n_1 = n_2 = n$ , then similarly to the previous cases, using the congruences (3) and the Lemma 3, we get  $F_n \equiv 0 \pmod{p}$  and so  $n$  is divisible by  $a(p)$ , that is  $a(p) \leq n < p - 1$ .

If  $n_1 \neq n_2$ , then we can suppose that  $n_1 > n_2$ . But  $g_1 \cdot g_2 \equiv -1 \pmod{p}$  (see [1]) for this reason, using the congruences (3),

$$g_1^{n_2} \equiv g_1^{n_1} \cdot g_2^{n_2} = (g_1 \cdot g_2)^{n_2} \equiv (-1)^{n_2} \pmod{p}.$$

$g_1$  belongs to the exponent  $n_1 \pmod{p}$  and  $n_1 > n_2$ , so  $n_2$  must be an odd number and  $g_1^{n_2} \equiv -1 \pmod{p}$ . In this case  $g_1^{2n_2} \equiv 1 \pmod{p}$  and from this follows that  $n_1$  is a divisor of  $2n_2$ . But  $2n_2 < 2n_1$ , so  $n_1 = 2n_2$  and

$$(4) \quad g_2^{n_1} = g_2^{2n_2} \equiv 1 \pmod{p}.$$

According to congruences (3) and (4) and Lemma 3:

$$g_1^{n_1} \equiv F_{n_1} \cdot g_1 + F_{n_1-1} \equiv 1 \pmod{p}$$

$$g_2^{n_1} \equiv F_{n_1} \cdot g_2 + F_{n_1-1} \equiv 1 \pmod{p}$$

and from this we get, as above, using Lemma 2:  $F_{n_1} \equiv 0 \pmod{p}$  and so by reason of Lemma 1  $n_1$  is divisible by  $a(p)$ . Thus  $a(p) \leq n_1 < p - 1$  which proves the second part of Theorem 2.

Theorem 3 is true in the case  $p = 5$  (see [1]), therefore we can suppose further on that  $p \neq 5$ . Let it be now  $a(p) = p - 1$ . In this case, by reason of Theorem 1, the congruence (1) is solvable. There is exactly one primitive root  $\pmod{p}$  between the two roots because otherwise  $a(p) < p - 1$  would follow according to Theorem 2.

And conversely, if congruence (1) is solvable, one of the roots is primitive and the other is not (mod  $p$ ), that is  $n_1 = p - 1$ , then it follows from the foregoing that  $n_2 = (p - 1)/2$  and  $n_2$  is an odd number. Let us suppose that  $a(p) < p - 1$  as opposed to Theorem 3 and let  $q$  denote the least common multiple of  $n_2$  and  $a(p)$ .  $q$  is divisible by  $n_2$  and  $a(p)$  therefore

$$1 \equiv g_2^q \equiv F_q \cdot g_2 + F_{q-1} \equiv F_{q-1} \pmod{p}$$

(because  $p$  is a divisor of  $F_q$  according to Lemma 1). Using this congruence we get

$$g_1^q \equiv F_q \cdot g_1 + F_{q-1} \equiv F_{q-1} \equiv 1 \pmod{p}.$$

From this follows  $q = p - 1$  because  $n_2$  and  $a(p)$  are divisors of  $p - 1$  and  $g_1$  is a primitive root (mod  $p$ ). But  $q = p - 1$  is an even number and  $n_2$  is odd, therefore  $a(p)$  is an even number.

N. N. Vorobev proved that for every natural number  $n$   $F_{n+1}^2 = F_n \cdot F_{n+2} + (-1)^n$  ([5], p. 11). Let us use this equation for the case  $n = a(p) - 1$ , it derives

$$F_{a(p)-1} \cdot F_{a(p)+1} = F_{a(p)}^2 + (-1)^{a(p)}.$$

But, on the one hand,  $a(p)$  is an even number, on the other hand,

$$F_{a(p)+1} = F_{a(p)} + F_{a(p)-1} \equiv F_{a(p)-1} \pmod{p},$$

so  $F_{a(p)-1}^2 \equiv 1 \pmod{p}$ . From this  $F_{a(p)-1} \equiv -1 \pmod{p}$  follows because in the case  $F_{a(p)-1} \equiv 1 \pmod{p}$   $g_1$  cannot be a primitive root (mod  $p$ ) by reason of

$$(5) \quad g_1^{a(p)} \equiv F_{a(p)} \cdot g_1 + F_{a(p)-1} \equiv F_{a(p)-1} \equiv 1 \pmod{p}$$

and the condition  $a(p) < p - 1$ . From the latter it follows that, similarly to (5),

$$g_1^{a(p)} \equiv -1 \pmod{p}.$$

But  $g_1$  is a primitive root (mod  $p$ ) and  $a(p) < p - 1$  therefore  $a(p) = (p - 1)/2 = n_2$ . However,  $a(p) = n_2$  is impossible, for  $a(p)$  is even and  $n_2$  is an odd number, so the condition  $a(p) < p - 1$  is impossible. Then  $a(p) = p - 1$ , which completes the proof of Theorem 3.

The reverse of Theorem 2 follows from Theorem 3 as well: If the congruence  $x^2 \equiv x + 1 \pmod{p}$  is solvable and  $a(p) < p - 1$ , then both roots are primitive (mod  $p$ ) or neither of them is primitive. The point is that in this case, by reason of Theorem 3, there cannot be exactly one primitive root.

#### REFERENCES

1. D. Shanks, "Fibonacci Primitive Roots," *The Fibonacci Quarterly*, Vol. 10, No. 2 (April 1972), pp. 163–168, 181.
2. D. Shanks and L. Taylor, "An Observation of Fibonacci Primitive Roots," *The Fibonacci Quarterly*, Vol. 11, No. 2 (April 1973), pp. 159–160.
3. D. Jarden, *Recurring Sequences*, Publ. by Riveon Lematematika, Jerusalem, Israel, 1958.
4. J. H. Halton, "On the Divisibility Properties of Fibonacci Numbers," *The Fibonacci Quarterly*, Vol. 4, No. 3 (Oct. 1966), pp.
5. N. N. Vorobev, *Fibonacci Numbers*, Pergamon Press, Oxford, 1961.

★★★★★