

Primitive Indexes, Zsigmondy Numbers, and Primoverization

Tejas R. Rao

September 22, 2018

Abstract. We define a *primitive index* of an integer in a sequence to be the index of the term with the integer as a primitive divisor. For the sequences $k^u + h^u$ and $k^u - h^u$, we discern a formula to find the primitive indexes of any composite number given the primitive indexes of its prime factors. We show how this formula reduces to a formula relating the multiplicative order of k modulo N to that of its prime factors. We then introduce immediate consequences of the formula: certain sequences which yield the same primitive indexes for numbers with the same unique prime factors, an expansion of the lifting the exponent lemma for $\nu_2(k^n + h^n)$, a simple formula to find any Zsigmondy number, a note on a certain class of pseudoprimes titled overpseudoprime, and a proof that numbers such as Wagstaff numbers are either overpseudoprime or prime.

1 The Formula

A *primitive index* of a number is the index of the term in a sequence that has that number as a primitive divisor. Let k and h be positive integers for the duration of this paper. We denote the primitive index of N in $k^u - h^u$ as $P_N(k, h)$. For $k^u + h^u$, it is denoted $P^N(k, h)$. Note that $P_N(k, 1) = O_N(k)$, where $O_N(k)$ refers to the multiplicative order of k modulo N . Both are defined as the first positive integer m such that $k^m \equiv 1 \pmod{N}$. Throughout this paper, p will refer to primes.

1.1 Primitive Indexes in $k^u - h^u$

Proposition 1. $N | k^u - h^u$ iff $P_N(k, h) | u$.

Since

$$k^{P_N(k,h)} - h^{P_N(k,h)} \equiv 0 \pmod{N} \iff k^{P_N(k,h)} \equiv h^{P_N(k,h)} \pmod{N},$$

raising both k and h to a multiple of $P_N(k, h)$ will maintain the divisibility. In the other direction, since $N \nmid k^u - h^u$, where $u < P_N(k, h)$, then $k^u \not\equiv h^u \pmod{N}$, and, for any positive integer m ,

$$k^{P_N(k,h)m+u} = k^{P_N(k,h)m} k^u \not\equiv h^{P_N(k,h)m} h^u = h^{P_N(k,h)m+u} \pmod{N}.$$

This proposition also shows that $N_1|N_2$ iff $P_{N_1}(k, h)|P_{N_2}(k, h)$ for all k and h , providing the primitive indexes exist.

Proposition 2. *If $\gcd(N, k) = \gcd(N, h) = 1$, $P_N(k, h)|\text{lcm}(O_N(k), O_N(h))$ and $P_N(k, h)|\lambda(N)$.*

Since $k^{\lambda(N)} \equiv h^{\lambda(N)} \equiv 1 \pmod{N}$ and $k^{\text{lcm}(O_N(k), O_N(h))} \equiv h^{\text{lcm}(O_N(k), O_N(h))} \equiv 1 \pmod{N}$, the result follows from the previous proposition. Additionally, $P_N(k, h) \neq O_N(k)$ and $P_N(k, h) \neq O_N(h)$ if $O_N(k) \neq O_N(h)$. It would be impossible for $k^{P_N(k, h)} \equiv h^{P_N(k, h)} \pmod{N}$ if this were true.

We will now present a modified version of a lifting the exponent [3] proof to fit primitive indexes.

Theorem 1. *For $\gcd(p, h) = 1$, and for $k - h \neq 2(\text{odd})$ and/or $p \neq 2$,*

$$P_{p^a}(k, h) = pP_{p^{a-1}}(k, h), \quad (1)$$

where $a-1 \geq \nu_p(k^u - h^u)$, where $\nu_p(k^u - h^u)$ is the largest i such that $u = P_{p^i}(k, h) = P_p(k, h)$. For $\gcd(p, h) = 1$, and for $k - h = 2(\text{odd})$ and $p = 2$,

$$P_{2^a}(k, h) = 2P_{2^{a-1}}(k, h), \quad (2)$$

where $a - 1 \geq \nu_2(k^2 - h^2)$, where $\nu_2(k^2 - h^2)$ is the largest i such that $2^i|k^2 - h^2$.

Take a prime p . If $p^a|k^u - h^u$, then for some positive integer m , $k^u - h^u = p^a m \implies k^u = p^a m + h^u$, where $p \nmid m$ and a is the largest power of p that divides $k^u - h^u$. Since $P_{p^a}(k, h)|P_{p^{a+1}}(k, h)$ by Proposition 1, $P_{p^{a+1}}(k, h)$ is a multiple of $P_{p^a}(k, h)$. To search for this we do the following. For some integer $f \leq p$, we take the binomial expansion of $k^{uf} - h^{uf} = (p^a m + h^u)^f - h^{uf}$:

$$\left(\binom{f}{0}(p^a m)^f + \binom{f}{1}(p^a m)^{f-1}h^u + \dots + \binom{f}{f-2}(p^a m)^2 h^{u(f-2)} + \binom{f}{f-1}(p^a m)h^{u(f-1)} + h^{uf}\right) - h^{uf}.$$

Then we cancel h^{uf} and $-h^{uf}$ and factor out p^a :

$$p^a \left(\binom{f}{0}p^{a(f-1)}m^f + \binom{f}{1}p^{a(f-2)}m^{f-1}h^u + \dots + \binom{f}{f-2}p^a m^2 h^{u(f-2)} + \binom{f}{f-1}m h^{u(f-1)}\right).$$

If $\binom{f}{f-1}$ does not have a factor of p , then the expansion equals $pM + mh^{u(f-1)}\binom{f}{f-1}$ for some positive integer M . Recall that $p \nmid m$, and thus $p \nmid pM + mh^{u(f-1)}\binom{f}{f-1}$, as long as $\gcd(p, h) \neq 1$. We thus specify $\gcd(p, h) \neq 1$. This means that the only time when another factor of p emerges is when the final term has a factor of p . For $f \leq p$, this only occurs when $f = p$:

$$\binom{p}{p-1}mh^{u(p-1)} = \frac{p!}{(p - (p-1))!(p-1)!}mh^{u(p-1)} = pmh^{u(p-1)}.$$

Case 1 ($a > 1$, p odd): We can thus factor out exactly one more factor of p for the first time at $k^{up} - h^{up}$, making $P_{p^{a+1}}(k, h) = up = pP_{p^a}(k, h)$, since the first time $p|k^u - h^u$ is $u = P_{p^a}(k, h)$.

Case 2 ($a = 1$, p odd): In only this case for odd numbers, the second last term is $\binom{p}{p-2}m^2h^{u(f-2)}$ after p^2 is factored out. But since $\binom{p}{p-2}m^2h^{u(f-2)} = \frac{p-1}{2}(p)(m^2)h^{u(f-2)}$, the second term still has a factor of p and thus still yields $pM + mh^{u(f-1)}$ for the binomial as a whole, meaning there are no more factors of p .

Case 3 ($p = 2$, $a = 1$): After factoring out 2^2 from $(2m + h^u)^2 - h^{2u}$, we get:

$$(2^2)(m^2 + h^um) = (2^2)(m(m + h^u)).$$

Since $2 \nmid m$ or h^u , m and h^u are odd and thus $m + h^u$ is even and has at least one more factor of 2. This means that, if there is *exactly* one factor of 2 in $P_2(k, h)$, then $P_{2^x}(k, h) = 2(P_2(k, h))$, where $x \geq 3$. This case is unique because $a = 1$ as in Case 2, and yet 2 is even, meaning $2 \nmid p - 1 = 2 - 1$.

Case 4 ($p = 2$, $a > 1$):

After factoring out 2^{a+1} , the final two terms of the binomial expansion are $\frac{2^{a+1}-2^a}{2}m^2h^{u(f-2)} + m = (2^a - 2^{a-1})m^2h^{u(f-2)} + mh^{u(f-1)} = \text{odd}$, since neither m nor h can be even. It therefore cannot be divisible by 2. This means that there are no more factors of 2.

Equation (1) arises from the fact that either $k - h$ is odd and 2 does not divide any term in the sequence, or $k - h$ is even such that $k - h \neq 2(\text{odd})$, meaning $k - h = 2(\text{even})$, and thus the first term, $k - h$, is divided by at least 2^2 , and every power of 2 greater than 1 behaves normally. For equation (2), when $k - h = 2(\text{odd})$, it has exactly one factor of two, meaning that $k^2 - h^2$ is divided by *at least* 2^3 by Case 3. Thus, the powers of 2 will behave normally for sure only after the greatest power of 2 that divides $k^2 - h^2$.

Corollary. For $\gcd(p, h) = 1$,

$$P_{p^a}(k, h) = p^{a-\gamma_p(k, h)}P_p(k, h),$$

where

$$\gamma_p(k, h) = \begin{cases} \nu_p(k^u - h^u) & \text{if } k - h \neq 2(\text{odd}) \text{ and/or } p \neq 2 \text{ and where } u = P_p(k, h); \\ \nu_2(k^2 - h^2) & \text{if } k - h = 2(\text{odd}) \text{ and } p = 2. \end{cases}$$

Corollary.

$$P_{nf^{a+1}}(k, h) = fP_n(k),$$

if $\gcd(f, h) = 1$ and the maximum power of f that divides $k^{P_n(k, h)} - h^{P_n(k, h)}$ is a .

Corollary. For $\gcd(n, h_1) = \gcd(n, h_2) = 1$, iff $\gamma_n(k_1, h_1) = \gamma_n(k_2, h_2)$ and $P_n(k_1, h_1) = P_n(k_2, h_2)$, then $P_{n^a}(k_1, h_1) = P_{n^a}(k_2, h_2)$ for all positive integers a .

Proposition 3. For $N = n_1n_2\dots$, where $\gcd(N, h) = 1$ and $\gcd[n_i]_i = 1$,

$$P_N(k, h) = \text{lcm}[P_{n_i}(k, h)]_i.$$

From Proposition 1, $n_i | k^u - h^u$ iff $P_{n_i}(k, h) | u$. All factors of coprime n_i thus divide $k^u - h^u$ for the first time when $u = \text{lcm}[P_{n_i}(k, h)]_i$.

Theorem 2. For $N = p_1^{p_1} p_2^{p_2} \dots$, p_i prime, and $\gcd(N, h) = 1$,

$$P_N(k, h) = \left(\prod_i n_i^{a_i - \gamma_{n_i}(k, h)} \right) \text{lcm}[P_{n_i}(k, h)]_i.$$

We combine the previous properties to achieve this. If we let each $n_i = p_i$, p_i prime, then $\gcd[p_i]_i = 1$, and we can find the order of any composite number coprime with the base h .

This reduces to

$$O_N(k) = \left(\prod_i n_i^{a_i - \gamma_{n_i}(k)} \right) \text{lcm}[O_{n_i}(k)]_i,$$

for multiplicative order.

We will now inspect certain sequences that yield the same primitive indexes for all numbers with specified prime factors.

Theorem 3. For any prime p ,

$$O_{p^a}(k + p^{\gamma_p(k)+1}m) = O_{p^a}(k),$$

where $m \in \mathbb{N}$, $m \neq 0$.

For positive integers,

$$i^s - j^s = (i - j)(i^{s-1} - i^{s-2}j + i^{s-3}j^2 - \dots + i^2j^{s-3} - ij^{s-2} + j^{s-1}).$$

This means, for any positive integer m , $k^n \equiv (k + pm)^n \pmod{p}$ because $(k + pm)^n = k^n + ((k + pm)^n - k^n)$, and $(k + pm)^n - k^n$ is divisible by $(k + pm) - k = pm$, as shown above. This means we are adding 0 modulo p . It is therefore clear to see that p will divide both $k^{O_p(k)} - 1$ and $(k + pm)^{O_p(k)} - 1$, and no exponents less than that. So $O_p(k) = O_p(k + pm)$. This holds true for all p^a at $k + p^a m$. Additionally, $k + p^a m = k + p^b(p^{a-b}m')$. Therefore, at $p^a = p^{\gamma_p(k)+1}$,

$$O_p(k + p^{\gamma_p(k)+1}m) = O_{p^2}(k + p^{\gamma_p(k)+1}m) = \dots = O_{p^{\gamma_p(k)}}(k + p^{\gamma_p(k)+1}m) = O_p(k),$$

and

$$O_{p^{\gamma_p(k)+1}}(k + p^{\gamma_p(k)+1}m) = O_{p^{\gamma_p(k)+1}}(k),$$

by the definition of γ . Since those two identities hold, we have proven that $O_{p^{\gamma_p(k)+1}}(k + p^{\gamma_p(k)+1}m) = p O_{p^{\gamma_p(k)+1}}(k)$ and all previous powers have the same order to that base, meaning

$$\gamma_p(k + p^{\gamma_p(k)+1}m) = \gamma_p(k),$$

and $O_p(k + p^{\gamma_p(k)+1}m) = O_p(k)$. These two facts together are sufficient to prove the orders of k modulo p^a and $k + p^{\gamma_p(k)+1}m$ modulo p^a are the same by the corollaries to Theorem 1.

Let us denote the set of all positive integers made up solely of powers of p_i , for all chosen i , $i \in \mathbb{N}$, as follows:

$$\eta[p_i] = \{p_1^{a_1} p_2^{a_2} \dots | a_i \in \mathbb{N}_0, p_i \text{ prime}\}.$$

A number is said to be "in η " if it is one number made up of certain powers of some or all of the primes listed in the brackets. The period of any number, N , in η , base k is defined as follows:

$$\Lambda_N(k) = \Lambda_{\eta[p_i]}(k) = \prod_i p_i^{\gamma_{p_i}(k)+1}.$$

If $p \nmid k^u - 1$, then we define $\gamma_p(k) = 0$ and if $k = 1$, then $\Lambda_N(1) = 0$. Note that $\Lambda_N(k)$ is the same for every composite or prime number with the same unique prime factors, as they are all in η . The period of $\eta[p_i]$ base k is defined as that of any and all N in said η . Any composite number or prime number N in η will behave the same in at least every base given as follows:

Theorem 4. For any number N in $\eta[p_i]$,

$$O_{\eta[p_i]}(k + \Lambda_{\eta[p_i]}(k)m) = O_{\eta[p_i]}(k).$$

Since $O_{p^a}(k + p^{\gamma_p(k)+1}m) = O_{p^a}(k)$ from Theorem 3, we know that $p_1^{\gamma_{p_1}(k)+1}m_1 = p_2^{\gamma_{p_2}(k)+1}m_2 = \dots$ will yield the above equality. This is the definition of Λ .

Theorem 5. For $\gcd(N, h) = 1$,

$$P_{\eta[p_i]}(k + \Lambda_{\eta[p_i]}(k)m, h + \Lambda_{\eta[p_i]}(h)m) = P_{\eta[p_i]}(k, h).$$

$(j + \Lambda_{\eta[p_i]}(j)m)^u \equiv j^u \pmod{N}$ by Theorem 4. This means that the residues for all exponents are the same for bases k and $k + \Lambda_{\eta[p_i]}(k)m$ and h and $h + \Lambda_{\eta[p_i]}(h)m$. The result follows after taking into account that when $p \nmid k^u - 1$, $\gamma_p(k) = 0$ and if $k = 1$, then $\Lambda_N(1) = 0$.

Remark. Note that, for $\gcd(k, h) = 1$, no number $\gcd(n, h) \neq 1$ and $\gcd(n, k) \neq 1$ will divide $k^u - h^u$, and thus every number that does divide $k^u - h^u$ will obey Theorem 1 and Proposition 2.

1.2 Primitive Indexes in $k^u + h^u$

We operate under the condition that neither $k^u + h^u$ nor $k^u - h^u$ are equal to 0 for all u .

Theorem 6. For $N > 2$, $N | k^u + h^u$ iff $P^N(k, h) | u$ and

$$\frac{u}{P^N(k, h)},$$

is odd.

When $N | k^{P^N(k, h)} + h^{P^N(k, h)}$, we have

$$k^{P^N(k, h)} + h^{P^N(k, h)} \equiv 0 \pmod{N} \iff k^{P^N(k, h)} \equiv -h^{P^N(k, h)} \pmod{N}.$$

Raising both k and h to the same odd multiple of $P^N(k, h)$ will preserve this congruence, even multiples will not. In the other direction, for all $y < P^N(k, h)$, we have $k^y \not\equiv h^y \pmod{N}$. This is proven as follows: we see that for all N that divide some $k^u + h^u$,

$$k^{P^N(k,h)} \equiv -h^{P^N(k,h)} \pmod{N} \implies k^{2P^N(k,h)} \equiv h^{2P^N(k,h)} \pmod{N},$$

and by Proposition 1, $P_N(k,h) | 2P^N(k,h)$. But since $P_N(k,h) \nmid P^N(k,h)$ for all $N > 2$ by Proposition 1, for all such N we know $P_N(k,h) = 2P^N(k,h)$ or $P_N(k,h) = 2$. But if $P_N(k,h) = 2$, then because $k^2 - h^2 = (k-h)(k+h)$ and $N \nmid k-h$, $N | k+h$ and by definition $P^N(k,h) = 1$. In this case, it is still true that $2 = 2P^N(k,h)$. Thus, for all $y < P^N(k,h) < P_N(k,h)$, we have

$$k^{P^N(k,h)m+y} = k^{P^N(k,h)m} k^y \not\equiv -h^{P^N(k,h)m} h^y = -h^{P^N(k,h)m+y} \pmod{N},$$

for any positive integer m . For $N = 2$, N either divides every term or no term.

Theorem 7. $2P^N(k,h) = P_N(k,h)$, where $N = p^a$ and p has an even primitive index in $k^u - h^u$ and/or where $N > 2$ divides some term in $k^u + h^u$.

We proved that for all N which divide some $k^u + h^u$, the equality holds in the theorem above in Theorem 6. In the other direction, for an odd prime power p^a with an even primitive index in $k^u + h^u$,

$$\begin{aligned} k^{P_{p^a}(k,h)} - h^{P_{p^a}(k,h)} &= \left(k^{\frac{P_{p^a}(k,h)}{2}} - h^{\frac{P_{p^a}(k,h)}{2}}\right) \left(k^{\frac{P_{p^a}(k,h)}{2}} + h^{\frac{P_{p^a}(k,h)}{2}}\right) \\ &\equiv 0 \pmod{p^a}, \end{aligned}$$

implies that $p^a | \left(k^{\frac{P_{p^a}(k,h)}{2}} + h^{\frac{P_{p^a}(k,h)}{2}}\right)$ since $p \nmid \left(k^{\frac{P_{p^a}(k,h)}{2}} - h^{\frac{P_{p^a}(k,h)}{2}}\right)$ by Theorem 1 and Proposition 1. This is because any odd p^a with an even primitive index we will have $y = \frac{P_{p^a}(k,h)}{2} = p^{a-\gamma_{p^a}(k,h)} \frac{P_p(k,h)}{2}$ and thus $P_p(k,h) \nmid y$. Additionally, no smaller exponent u will allow $k^u \equiv -h^u \pmod{p^a}$ because then $p^a | k^{2u} - h^{2u}$ for $2u < P_{p^a}(k)$ by the forward direction of this theorem proven in Theorem 6, contradicting Proposition 1. For all odd primes, $P_p(k,h)$ and $P_{p^a}(k,h)$ are both either odd or even. Therefore, $P_p(k,h)$ being even implies $P^{p^a}(k,h) = \frac{1}{2}P_{p^a}(k,h)$.

Theorem 8. For odd $N = p_1^{a_1} p_2^{a_2} \dots$, iff each $P^{p_i^{a_i}}(k,h)$ is odd or the smallest primitive index in the lcm is even and every other primitive index in the lcm is an odd multiple of it,

$$P^N(k,h) = \text{lcm}[P^{p_i^{a_i}}(k,h)].$$

By Theorem 6 and the logic from Proposition 3, the result follows when $P^{p_i^{a_i}}(k,h)$ is odd and/or for odd multiples of the smallest primitive index. For any other primitive indexes, there can never be a multiple of them such that dividing by any one of them always yields an odd, meaning $N \nmid k^u + h^u$ for any u if the conditions specified in the theorem are not met.

For odd p , $P^{p^a}(k,h)$ may be calculated as in Theorem 1, as shown by Theorem 6.

We can finalize the discussion of lifting the exponent in [3] by deriving a formula for $\nu_2(k^n + h^n)$, as I have not found it discussed elsewhere. Recall that $\nu_2(k^n + h^n)$ refers to the highest power of 2 that divides $k^n + h^n$. Also note that $P_2(k,h) = P^2(k,h) = 1$ if it exists, and 2 either divides every term in $k^u + h^u$ and $k^u - h^u$ or none.

Theorem 9. *Iff $2|k+h$,*

$$\nu_2(k^n + h^n) = \begin{cases} \nu_2(k+h) & \text{if } n \text{ is odd;} \\ 1 & \text{if } n \text{ is even.} \end{cases}$$

If $2 \nmid k+h$, then clearly 2 divides no k^n+h^n . For $\nu_2(k+h) = a$, we know $2^{a-x} \nmid k^n+h^n$ for even n and $a-x > 1$ by Theorem 6. Since if $2|k+h$, $2|k^n+h^n$, it must be true that $\nu_2(k^n+h^n) = 1$ for even n . For odd n , we have that $2^a|k^n+h^n$ by Theorem 6. If $2^{a+x}|k^n+h^n$, then the first index it does this at yields $P_{2^{a+x}}(k, h) = 2P^{2^{a+x}}(k, h) = 2(\text{odd}), \text{odd} \neq 1$ again by Theorem 7. But since for any y , $P_{2^y}(k, h)$ is a power of 2 by Theorem 1, this is a contradiction.

By combining Theorem 8 and Theorem 9, one can easily see whether any even number N has a primitive index in $k^u + h^u$ and furthermore calculate the primitive index if it does.

2 Connection to Primitive Roots

We know that the multiplicative group of integers modulo $n = 2, 4, p^a$, or $2p^a$, $(\mathbb{Z}/n\mathbb{Z})^\times$, has $|(\mathbb{Z}/n\mathbb{Z})^\times| = \phi(n)$. Its generators can be expressed as k , where $O_n(k) = \phi(n)$. This means that

$$\{k^0, k^1, \dots, k^{\phi(n)-1}\},$$

represents a reduced residue system modulo n . At least one k yields this iff $n = 2, 4, p^a$, or $2p^a$. This information is from [1].

Proposition 4. *For $0 \leq u < \phi(n)$, $k^u \equiv h^u \pmod{n}$ exactly t times, where $P_n(k, h)t = \phi(n)$.*

By Proposition 1, for $u < \phi(n)$, $k^u \equiv h^u \pmod{n}$ exactly at $u = 0, P_n(k, h), 2P_n(k, h), \dots, (t-1)P_n(k, h)$. The next equivalence is not less than $\phi(n)$.

This proposition says that $P_n(k, h) = \phi(n)$ means both

$$\{k^0, k^1, \dots, k^{\phi(n)-1}\},$$

and

$$\{h^0, h^1, \dots, h^{\phi(n)-1}\},$$

are reduced residue systems modulo N and furthermore that $k^0 \equiv h^0 \pmod{n}$ and every other equivalent power of k and h in the reduced residue system are distinct modulo n .

Proposition 5. *If $k(h)^{\phi(n)-P_n(k, h)}$ is a generator of the reduced residue system of n , then so are k , h , and $h(k)^{\phi(n)-P_n(k, h)}$.*

First note that, by Proposition 4, $O_n(k) = O_n(h) = \phi(n)$, and both h and k are also generators of the reduced residue system. This means the inverse of $a^b \pmod{n}$ is $a^{\phi(n)-b} \pmod{n}$. Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} & k^{P_n(k,h)} - h^{P_n(k,h)} \equiv 0 \\ \text{mod } n \iff & h^{P_n(k,h)}(k^{P_n(k,h)})^{\phi(n)-P_n(k,h)} \equiv k^{P_n(k,h)}(h^{P_n(k,h)})^{\phi(n)-P_n(k,h)} \equiv 1 \pmod{n}. \end{aligned}$$

Additionally, no exponent $u < P_n(k, h)$ will yield either equivalence. This means that $P_n(k, h) = O_n(k(h)^{\phi(n)-P_n(k,h)}) = O_n(h(k)^{\phi(n)-P_n(k,h)})$. Therefore, if $P_n(k, h) = \phi(n)$, then so do those two orders.

3 Cyclotomic Polynomials, Zsigmondy Numbers, and Primoverization

A homogenized cyclotomic polynomial is defined as follows:

$$\Phi_n(k, h) = \frac{k^n - h^n}{\prod_{d|n} \Phi_d(k, h)}.$$

Straightforwardly, the highest power of all nonprimitive factors of $k^n - h^n$ that divide some $k^d - h^d$ for $d|n$ are divided out via this definition.

Definition: Zsigmondy Numbers. A Zsigmondy number,

$$\mathcal{Z}(n, k, h),$$

is the product of the primitive prime divisors of the term $k^n - h^n$. We shall denote

$$\zeta(n, k, h),$$

to be the product of the primitive prime divisors of the term $k^n + h^n$. These are also termed Zsigmondy numbers.

One can see how Zsigmondy numbers and primitive indexes are closely related. Without so much as invoking the properties of cyclotomic polynomials, we can find Zsigmondy numbers explicitly.

Theorem 10. For $n \neq 2$ and $\gcd(k, h) = 1$ and $z \in \mathbb{N}, z \neq 0$,

$$\mathcal{Z}(n, k, h) = \begin{cases} \Phi_n(k, h) & \text{if } n \neq p^z(P_p(k, h)); \\ \frac{\Phi_n(k, h)}{p} & \text{if } n = p^z(P_p(k, h)). \end{cases}$$

As noted above, the highest power of all nonprimitive factors of $k^n - h^n$ which divide some $k^d - h^d$ for $d|n$ are divided out via the definition of $\Phi_n(k, h)$. This means the only nonprimitive prime factors of $\Phi_n(k, h)$ are new multiplicities of previous prime factors introduced in $k^n - h^n$. From Theorem 2, the new multiplicities of N can only be present at $n = N^z q$, where $N|k^q - h^q$. Additionally from the theorem, the highest power of $N|\Phi_n(k, h)$, where N is not primitive and $n > 2$, is 1.

Lemma. *If $q \neq P_N(k, h)$, then $N \nmid \Phi_n(k, h)$.*

Assume $q \neq P_N(k, h)$. By Proposition 1, $P_N(k, h) | q$. By Theorem 2, we can see $P_{N^a}(k, h) = N^{a-\gamma_N(k, h)} P_N(k, h) | N^z q$. This would be divided out.

Lemma. *If N is composite, then $N \nmid \Phi_n(k, h)$.*

Assume N is composite. Since this must be a new multiplicity of N , we know $P_N(k, h) < n$. By Property 1, we see that $P_{N^a(f_i)}(k, h) | P_{N^{a+1}}(k, h) = n$ for every proper factor f_i of N and for $a+1$ the largest power of the chosen f_i that divides $k^n - h^n$. By Theorem 2 and because $n > 2$, we have that $P_{N^a(f_i)}(k, h) < P_{N^{a+1}}(k, h)$, and thus $f_i \nmid \Phi_n(k, h)$. All factors f_i of N would be divided out.

It is clear that $n = p^z P_p(k, h)$ if it possible that $p | \Phi_n(k, h)$ and p is not primitive (p prime). By Theorem 2, the maximum power of p that divides $\Phi_n(k, h)$ is 1. In the other direction, if $n = p^z (P_p(k, h))$, then $n = P_{p^a}(k, h)$, where $a = \nu_p(k^n - h^n)$, by Theorem 2, and thus there must be exactly one factor of p that divides $\Phi_{p^z P_p(k, h)}(k, h)$ and is not primitive.

This reduces to

$$\mathcal{Z}(n, k, 1) = \begin{cases} \Phi_n(k) & \text{if } n \neq p^z(O_p(k)); \\ \frac{\Phi_n(k)}{p} & \text{if } n = p^z(O_p(k)). \end{cases}$$

This definition is preferred because it allows one to classify certain classes of numbers as Zsigmondy numbers without even calculating $\Phi_n(k, h)$.

Proposition 6. *For $n = 2$,*

$$\mathcal{Z}(2, k, h) = \frac{\Phi_2(k, h)}{2^{\nu_2(k^2 - h^2)}}.$$

This follows directly from Theorem 1 and the reasoning expressed in Theorem 10.

We have not only proved the forward condition that $n = p^z q$, but additionally that $q = P_p(k, h)$ and the biconditionality of the statement. We will now explore how this affects Shevelev's exploration of overpseudoprimes. From Shevelev [2, (2.4)], we see that all primes satisfy

$$p = r_k(p) O_p(k),$$

for any base k , where $r_k(p)$ is the number of distinct cyclotomic cosets of k modulo p . A composite number is termed *overpseudoprime* base k if $n = r_k(n) O_n(k)$.

Definition: Primover. A number n is said to be primover base k if it is either a composite overpseudoprime base k or prime.

From Shevelev [2, Th. 12], a necessary and sufficient condition for n to be primover is as follows:

Lemma. *If $\gcd(n, b) = 1$, then n is primover iff $O_n(k) = O_d(k)$ for each divisor $d > 1$ of n .*

In his paper [2, Th. 16, Th. 17], he details how every composite overpseudoprime base k is a strong pseudoprime and superpseudoprime to the same base. We strengthen and expand upon some of the theorems found in [2], making them biconditional and removing the condition "if p does not divide $\Phi_n(k)$ " (if $\gcd(p, \Phi_n(k)) = 1$). We also introduce new examples of primover numbers evident from Theorem 10. Note that all Zsigmondy numbers in the sequence $k^u - 1$ are primover due to the above lemma.

Proposition 7. *Generalized repunits,*

$$\mathcal{Z}(n, k, 1) = \frac{k^n - 1}{k - 1},$$

are primover base 2 iff n is prime.

Proposition 8. *Numbers of the form*

$$\mathcal{Z}(pq, k, 1) = \frac{(k - 1)(k^{pq} - 1)}{(k^p - 1)(k^q - 1)},$$

are primover base k . This identity holds iff both p and q are distinct primes, where $p \neq O_q(k)$ and $q \neq O_p(k)$.

Proposition 9. *Numbers of the form*

$$\mathcal{Z}(pO_p(k), k, 1) = \frac{(k - 1)(k^{pO_p(k)} - 1)}{p(k^p - 1)(k^{O_p(k)} - 1)}$$

are primover base k iff p is prime and $O_p(k)$ is prime.

Proposition 10. *Numbers of the form*

$$\mathcal{Z}(n^a, k, 1) = \frac{k^{n^a} - 1}{k^{n^{a-1}} - 1},$$

are primover base k iff n is prime.

We further the study of Zsigmondy by inspecting $k^u + h^u$. We introduce an important theorem regarding the relationship between $k^u + h^u$ and $k^u - h^u$.

Theorem 11. *For $n > 1$ and/or $k + h$ odd,*

$$\zeta(n, k, h) = \mathcal{Z}(2n, k, h).$$

From Theorem 7, if an odd p divides some $k^u + h^u$, then $P_{p^a}(k, h) = 2P^{p^a}(k, h)$. If an odd p has an even primitive index in $k^u - h^u$, then by Theorem 7, $P_{p^a}(k, h) = 2P^{p^a}(k, h)$. By the definition of primitive prime divisors, the result follows when $n > 1$, since $P_2(k, h) = P^2(k, h) = 1$. If $k + h$ is odd then so will every term be, and $\zeta(1, k, h) = \mathcal{Z}(1, k, h)$. If not,

then since $P_2(k, h) = P^2(k, h) = 1$, $2^{a-b}\zeta(1, k, h) = \mathcal{Z}(1, k, h)$, where a is the highest power of 2 that divides $k - h$ and b is the highest power of 2 that divides $k + h$. Thus, all $\zeta(n, k, 1)$ are primover base k for $n > 1$ and/or $k + h$ odd. For $n = 1$ and $k + 1$ even, $\zeta(1, k, 1)$ is primover iff $a > b$.

Corollary. *The only odd N that divide some $k^u + h^u$ are those that are made up entirely of primes with even primitive indexes in $k^u - h^u$ and that satisfy the conditions specified in Theorem 8.*

Corollary. *For $k + u$ even, the only even $2^a N$, N odd, that divide some $k^u + h^u$ are those where N obeys the above corollary and $a = \nu_2(k + h)$ if $P^N(k, h)$ is odd and $a = 1$ if $P^N(k, h)$ is even.*

This is proven via Theorem 9.

Proposition 11. *All Wagstaff numbers with prime exponents,*

$$\zeta(p, 2, 1) = \frac{2^p + 1}{3},$$

are primover base 2.

References

- [1] Byrkit, D. R., Petofofrezza, A. J. (1970). *Elements of Number Theory*, Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall, LCCN [71081766](#).
- [2] Castillo, J. H., García-Pulgarín, G., Shevelev, V., Velásquez-Soto, J. M. (2012, June 4). *Overpseudoprimes, and Mersenne and Fermat Numbers as Primover Numbers*. Retrieved from [arXiv:1206.0606 \[math.NT\]](#).
- [3] Parvardi, A. H. (2011, February 28). *Lifting The Exponent Lemma (LTE)*. Retrieved from <https://artofproblemsolving.com/>.