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W. S. Brown's 1971 modular GCD algorithm

For $\mathbb{Z}\left[x_{1}, \ldots, x_{n}\right]$ (Algorithm M)
Compute GCDs modulo several primes $p_{i}$ (see P below); Chinese-remainder the coefficients of the GCDs;
Test if enough primes.

For $\mathbb{Z}_{p}\left[x_{1}, \ldots, x_{n}\right]$ (Algorithm P )
Compute GCDs for several evaluations $x_{n} \leftarrow b_{i}$ (recursively); Interpolate the coefficients of the GCDs;
Test if enough evaluations.

Details of Brown's algorithm

Select appropriate scalar multiples of modular images
$\longrightarrow$ Impose GCD of leading coeffs as leading coeff of GCD, or
$\longrightarrow$ Perform rational recovery on coefficients

Eliminate (finitely many) "unlucky" primes/evaluations
$\longrightarrow$ Use symmetric remainders in range $-\lfloor p / 2\rfloor, \ldots,\lfloor p / 2\rfloor$
$\longrightarrow$ Test first if GCD has not changed (folklore)
and then if it divides input polynomials
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Dobbertin's example

$$
\begin{aligned}
& z:=\left(A^{\wedge} 2 * B^{\wedge} 2 * Z^{\wedge} 2+A^{\wedge} 2 * B^{\wedge} 2+B^{\wedge} 2 * Z^{\wedge} 2+Z^{\wedge} 2+B^{\wedge} 2\right) / Z: \\
& \text { a : }=\left(B^{\wedge} 2 * C^{\wedge} 2 * A^{\wedge} 2+B^{\wedge} 2 * C^{\wedge} 2+C^{\wedge} 2 * A^{\wedge} 2+A^{\wedge} 2+C^{\wedge} 2\right) / A \text { : } \\
& \text { b : }=\left(C^{\wedge} 2 * Z * B^{\wedge} 2+C^{\wedge} 2 * Z+Z * B^{\wedge} 2+B^{\wedge} 2+Z\right) / B: \\
& \text { c }:=\left(Z * A * C^{\wedge} 2+Z * A+A * C^{\wedge} 2+C^{\wedge} 2+A\right) / C: \\
& \mathrm{P}:=\mathrm{Z}^{\wedge} 2 * \mathrm{~A}^{\wedge} 3 * \mathrm{~B}^{\wedge} 2 * \mathrm{C}^{\wedge} 2 *\left(\mathrm{z}^{\wedge} 2 * \mathrm{~b}^{\wedge} 2 * \mathrm{c}^{\wedge} 2\right. \\
& \left.+(a+z+1) \wedge 2 *\left(a+c^{\wedge} 2+1\right)\right): \\
& \mathrm{P}:=\text { expand(P) mod 2; }
\end{aligned}
$$

$P:=A^{2} B^{8} Z^{4} C^{4}+A^{2} B^{2} Z^{4} C^{4}+A^{4} B^{8} Z^{4} C^{4}+\ldots(158$ terms total $)$

Maple V. 4 fails to squarefree decompose $P$ modulo 2.

## Our idea

For $\mathbb{Z}_{p}\left[x_{1}\right]\left[x_{2}, \ldots, x_{n}\right]$, where $p$ is small (Algorithm $\mathrm{M}^{\prime}$ )
Compute GCDs modulo several irreducibles $m_{i}\left(x_{1}\right)$; Chinese-remainder the coefficients of the GCDs;
Test if enough primes.

Notes

1. Dan Grayson points out: modulo $m_{i}\left(x_{1}\right)$ is equivalent to $x_{1} \leftarrow z \in \mathbb{Z}_{p}[z] /\left(m_{i}(z)\right) \supset \mathbb{Z}_{p}$
$\longrightarrow$ FoxBox's extended domain black boxes
2. Unassociated irreducibles $m_{i}\left(x_{1}\right)$ are sufficiently dense $\longrightarrow$ see paper
3. Maple timings establish speed-up better than theory $\longrightarrow$ internal representation of algebraic extension

Conclusions

- Finding "right" generalization can be difficult, but generic algorithms look simple
$-\mathbb{Z}_{p}[y]$ trick applies to Zippel/Ben-Or-Tiwari sparse interpolation
- Generic implementation may reveal subtle bugs/problems
* Generalization to a single generic algorithm for sparse+dense needs to be done

