# FIBONACCI SEQUENCE MODULO m 

A. P. SHAH<br>Gujarat University, Ahmedabad 9, India

Wall [1] has discussed the period $k(m)$ of Fibonacci sequence modulo $m$. Here we discuss a somewhat related question of the existence of a complete residue system mod $m$ in the Fibonacci sequence.

We say that a positive integer $m$ is defective if a complete residue system mod $m$ does not exist in the Fibonacci sequence.

It is clear that not more than $\mathrm{k}(\mathrm{m})$ distinct residues mod m can exist in the Fibonacci sequence, so that we have:

Theorem 1. If $k(m)<m$, then $m$ is defective.
Theorem 2. If $m$ is defective, so is every multiple of $m$.
Proof. Suppose tm is not defective. Then for every $\mathrm{r}, 0 \leq \mathrm{r} \leq \mathrm{m}-$ 1, there exists a Fibonacci number $u_{n}$ (which, of course, depends on $r$ ) for which $u_{n} \equiv r(\bmod t m)$. But then $u_{n} \equiv r(\bmod m)$, so that $m$ is not defective.

Remark: The converse is not true; i. e., if $m$ is a composite defective number, it does not follow that some proper divisor of $m$ is defective. For example, 12 is defective, but none of $2,3,4$ and 6 is.

Theorem 3. For $r \geq 3$ and $m$ odd, $2^{r} m$ is defective.
Proof. The Fibonacci sequence $(\bmod 8)$ is

$$
1,1,2,3,5,0,5,5,2,7,1,0,1,1,2,3,5, \cdots .
$$

The sequence is periodic and $\mathrm{k}(8)=12$. It is seen that the residues 4 and 6 do not occur. This proves that 8 is defective. Since for $r \geq 3,2{ }^{r} m$ is a multiple of 8 , the theorem follows from Theorem 2.

Theorem 4. If a prime $\mathrm{p} \equiv \pm 1(\bmod 10)$, then p is defective.
Proof. For $p \equiv \pm 1(\bmod 10), k(p)(p-1)([1])$, and hence $k(p) \leq p$ $-1<\mathrm{p}$. Therefore by Theorem 1, p is defective.

Theorem 5. If a prime $\mathrm{p} \equiv 13$ or $17(\bmod 20)$, then p is defective. Proof. Let $u_{n}$ denote the $n^{\text {th }}$ Fibonacci number. Since [1] for $p \equiv$ $\pm 3(\bmod 10), \mathrm{k}(\mathrm{p}) \mid 2(\mathrm{p}+1)$, it is clear that all the distinct residues of p that (Received February 1967) 139 occur in the Fibonacci sequence are to be found in the set $\left\{u_{1}, u_{2}, u_{3}, \cdots\right.$, $\left.u_{2}\left(p^{+}\right)\right\}$. We shall prove that for each $t, 1 \leq t \leq 2(p+1)$,

$$
\begin{equation*}
u_{t} \equiv 0 \quad \text { or } \quad u_{t} \equiv \pm u_{r}(\bmod p) \tag{5.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

for some $r$, where $1 \leq r \leq(p-1) / 2$.
Granting for the moment that (5.1) has been proved, it follows that all the distinct residues of $p$ occurring in the Fibonacci sequence are to be found in the set

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left\{0, \pm u_{1}, \pm u_{2}, \pm u_{3}, \cdots, \pm u_{m}\right\} \tag{5.2}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $m=(p-1) / 2$; or, since $u_{1}=u_{2}=1$, the set (5.2) may be replaced by

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left\{0, \pm 1, \pm u_{3}, \pm u_{4}, \cdots, \pm u_{m}\right\} \tag{5.3}
\end{equation*}
$$

But this set contains at most $2(\mathrm{~m}-1)+1=\mathrm{p}-2$ distinct elements. Thus the number of distinct residues of $p$ occurring in the Fibonacci sequence is not more than $p-2$. Therefore $p$ is defective.

Proof of (5.1). It is easily proved inductively that for $0 \leq r \leq p-1$,

$$
\begin{equation*}
u_{p-r} \equiv(-1)^{r+1} u_{r+1} \quad(\bmod p) \tag{5.4}
\end{equation*}
$$

and that for $1 \leq r \leq p+1$

$$
\begin{equation*}
u_{p+1+r} \equiv-u_{r} \quad(\bmod p) \tag{5.5}
\end{equation*}
$$

We note that since $p \equiv \pm 3(\bmod 10), p \mid u_{p+1}, u_{p} \equiv-1(\bmod p) \quad[2$, Theorem 180]. (5.4) and (5.5) are valid for all such primes. Replacing $r$ by ( $p-1$ )/2 $-s$ in (5.4), we get for $0 \leq s \leq(p-1) / 2$.

$$
\begin{equation*}
u_{h+s} \equiv(-1)^{s^{+1}} u_{h-s}(\bmod p), \text { where } h=(p+1) / 2 \tag{5.6}
\end{equation*}
$$

In particular, we note that $p \mid u_{m}$ for $m=(p+1) / 2, p+1,3(p+1) / 2$ and $2(p+1)$.
(5.5) and (5.6) clearly imply (5.1). This completes the proof. Combining Theorems 4 and 5, we have

Theorem 6. If a prime $\mathrm{p} \equiv 1,9,11,13,17$ or $19(\bmod 20)$, then p is defective.

Remarks: This implies that if p is a non-defective odd prime, then p $=5$ or $\mathrm{p} \equiv 3$ or $7(\bmod 20)$. While it is easily seen that $2,3,5$ and 7 are non-defective, the author has not been able to find any other non-defective primes.

From Theorems 2 and 6, we have
Theorem 7. If $\mathrm{n}>1$ is non-defective, then n must be of the form n $-2^{\mathrm{t}} \mathrm{m}$, m odd, where $\mathrm{t}=0$, 1 , or 2 and all prime divisors of m (if any) are either 5 or $\equiv 3$ or $7(\bmod 20)$. Finally, we prove

Theorem 8. If a prime $p \equiv 3$ or $7(\bmod 20)$, then a necessary and sufficient condition for $p$ to be non-defective is that the set

$$
\left\{0, \pm 1, \pm 3, \pm 4, \cdots, \pm u_{h}\right\},
$$

where $h=(p+1) / 2$, is a complete residue system mod $p$.
Proof. The formulae (5.5) and (5.6) still remain valid. However, for primes $p \equiv 3(\bmod 4)$, we cannot prove that $p \mid u_{h}\left(\right.$ in fact, $\left.p / u_{h}\right)$. So thatall distinct residues of $p$ occurring in the Fibonacci sequence must be found in the set

$$
\left\{0, \pm 1, \pm u_{3}, \pm u_{4}, \cdots, \pm u_{h}\right\} .
$$

Since this set contains only $p$ numbers, it can possess all the $p$ distinct residues of $p$ if and only if is a complete residue system mod $p$.

The author wishes to express his gratitude to Professor A. M. Vaidya for suggesting the problem and for his encouragement and help in the preparation of this note.
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