Therefore, $k_{m}=k_{n}$, and we have the relation

$$
p_{m}(z)=z^{m-n} p_{n}(z)=z^{m-n}\left(k_{n} z^{n}+l_{n}\right)
$$

We have assumed, until now, that the sequence $p_{2}(0), p_{3}(0), \cdots$ contained a nonzero term. If this is not the case, the last result still holds with $n=1$, as may be seen from (4) in the same way as before.

Now we have, if $m \geqq n, m^{\prime} \geqq n, m \neq m^{\prime}$,

$$
\int_{-\pi}^{+\pi} f(\theta) e^{i\left(m-m^{\prime}\right) \theta}\left|k_{n} z^{n}+l_{n}\right|^{2} d \theta=0, \quad z=e^{i \theta}
$$

Whence, except on a set of measure zero, we have

$$
\begin{equation*}
f(\theta)=\text { const. }\left|k_{n} z^{n}+l_{n}\right|^{-2} \tag{11}
\end{equation*}
$$

$$
z=e^{i \theta}
$$

We conclude the proof with the obvious remark that the polynomials $1, z, z^{2}, \cdots, z^{n-1}$ are orthogonal on the unit circle $|z|=1$ with the weight function (11).
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# A FACTORIZATION THEOREM APPLIED TO <br> A TEST FOR PRIMALITY* 

D. H. LEHMER

Certain tests for primality based on the converse of Fermat's theorem and its generalizations have been devised and applied by the writer during the past ten years. $\dagger$ Perhaps the most useful test for the investigation of a large number $N$ of no special form may be given as follows: $\ddagger$

Theorem 1. If $N$ divides $a^{N-1}-1$ but is relatively prime to $a^{(N-1) / p}$ -1 , where $p$ is a prime, then all the possible factors of $N$ are of the form $p^{\alpha} x+1$, if $N-1$ is divisible by $p^{\alpha},(\alpha \geqq 1)$.

Strictly speaking this is not a test for primality since the theorem merely gives a restriction on the factors of $N$. If $p^{\alpha}>N^{1 / 2}$ then, obviously, $N$ is a prime. If $p^{\alpha}$ is only fairly large, the theorem gives

[^0]
[^0]:    * Presented to the Society, February 26, 1938.
    $\dagger$ This Bulletin, vol. 33 (1927), pp. 327-340; vol. 34 (1928), pp. 54-56; vol. 35 (1929), pp. 349-350; vol. 38 (1932), pp. 383-384; vol. 39 (1933), pp. 105-108; Annals of Mathematics, (2), vol. 31 (1930), pp. 419-448; Journal of the London Mathematical Society, vol. 10 (1935), pp. 162-165; American Mathematical Monthly, vol. 43 (1936), pp. 347-354.
    $\ddagger$ This Bulletin, vol. 33 (1927), p. 331.

