



**HAL**  
open science

# A Multi-level Blocking Distinct Degree Factorization Algorithm

Richard P. Brent, Paul Zimmermann

► **To cite this version:**

Richard P. Brent, Paul Zimmermann. A Multi-level Blocking Distinct Degree Factorization Algorithm. Contemporary mathematics, 2008, Finite Fields and Applications, 461, pp.47-58. <inria-00181029v2>

**HAL Id: inria-00181029**

**<https://inria.hal.science/inria-00181029v2>**

Submitted on 24 Oct 2007

**HAL** is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.



HAL Authorization



INSTITUT NATIONAL DE RECHERCHE EN INFORMATIQUE ET EN AUTOMATIQUE

*A Multi-level Blocking Distinct Degree  
Factorization Algorithm*

Richard P. Brent — Paul Zimmermann

N° 6331

October 2007

Thème SYM

 *Rapport  
de recherche*





## A Multi-level Blocking Distinct Degree Factorization Algorithm

Richard P. Brent, Paul Zimmermann

Thème SYM — Systèmes symboliques  
Projet CACAO

Rapport de recherche n° 6331 — October 2007 — 13 pages

**Abstract:** We give a new algorithm for performing the distinct-degree factorization of a polynomial  $P(x)$  over  $\text{GF}(2)$ , using a multi-level blocking strategy. The coarsest level of blocking replaces GCD computations by multiplications, as suggested by Pollard (1975), von zur Gathen and Shoup (1992), and others. The novelty of our approach is that a finer level of blocking replaces multiplications by squarings, which speeds up the computation in  $\text{GF}(2)[x]/P(x)$  of certain *interval polynomials* when  $P(x)$  is sparse.

As an application we give a fast algorithm to search for all irreducible trinomials  $x^r + x^s + 1$  of degree  $r$  over  $\text{GF}(2)$ , while producing a certificate that can be checked in less time than the full search. Naive algorithms cost  $O(r^2)$  per trinomial, thus  $O(r^3)$  to search over all trinomials of given degree  $r$ . Under a plausible assumption about the distribution of factors of trinomials, the new algorithm has complexity  $O(r^2(\log r)^{3/2}(\log \log r)^{1/2})$  for the search over all trinomials of degree  $r$ . Our implementation achieves a speedup of greater than a factor of 560 over the naive algorithm in the case  $r = 24036583$  (a Mersenne exponent).

Using our program, we have found two new primitive trinomials of degree 24036583 over  $\text{GF}(2)$  (the previous record degree was 6972593).

**Key-words:** Amortized complexity, distinct degree factorization, finite field, irreducible trinomial, Mersenne exponent, polynomial factorization, primitive trinomial

## Un algorithme multi-étage pour la factorisation en degrés distincts de polynômes

**Résumé :** Nous proposons un nouvel algorithme pour la factorisation en degrés distincts d'un polynôme  $P(x)$  sur  $\text{GF}(2)$ , via une stratégie multi-étage. Le niveau supérieur remplace des calculs de pged par des multiplications, comme suggéré par Pollard (1975), von zur Gathen et Shoup (1992), et d'autres auteurs. L'originalité de notre approche tient dans un niveau inférieur, qui remplace des multiplications par des carrés, ce qui accélère le calcul de certains *polynômes intervalles* sur  $\text{GF}(2)[x]/P(x)$ , quand  $P(x)$  est creux.

Comme application nous exhibons un algorithme rapide cherchant tous les trinômes irréductibles  $x^r + x^s + 1$  de degré  $r$  sur  $\text{GF}(2)$ , tout en produisant un certificat qui peut être vérifié plus rapidement. Les algorithmes naïfs coûtent  $O(r^2)$  par trinôme, soit  $O(r^3)$  pour tous les trinômes de degré  $r$ . Sous une hypothèse naturelle sur la distribution des facteurs de trinômes, le nouvel algorithme a une complexité  $O(r^2(\log r)^{3/2}(\log \log r)^{1/2})$  pour tester tous les trinômes de degré  $r$ . Notre implantation est 560 fois plus rapide que l'algorithme naïf dans le cas  $r = 24036583$  (exposant de Mersenne).

Avec notre programme, nous avons trouvé deux nouveaux trinômes primitifs de degré 24036583 sur  $\text{GF}(2)$ , le précédent record étant de degré 6972593.

**Mots-clés :** Complexité amortie, corps fini, exposant de Mersenne, factorisation en degrés distincts, factorisation de polynôme, trinôme irréductible, trinôme primitif

# A MULTI-LEVEL BLOCKING DISTINCT DEGREE FACTORIZATION ALGORITHM

## 1. INTRODUCTION

The problem of factoring a univariate polynomial  $P(x)$  over a finite field  $F$  often arises in computational algebra [7, 11, 12]. An important case is when  $F$  has small characteristic and  $P(x)$  has high degree but is *sparse*, that is  $P(x)$  has only a small number of nonzero terms.

To simplify the exposition we restrict attention to the case where  $F = \text{GF}(2)$  and  $P(x)$  is a *trinomial*

$$P(x) = x^r + x^s + 1, \quad r > s > 0,$$

although the ideas apply more generally and should be useful for factoring sparse polynomials over fields of small characteristic.

Our aim is to give an algorithm with good *amortized complexity*, that is, one that works well *on average*. Since we are restricting attention to trinomials, we average over all trinomials of fixed degree  $r$ .

Our motivation is to speed up previous algorithms for searching for irreducible trinomials of high degree [4, 6, 13]. For given degree  $r$ , we want to find all irreducible trinomials  $x^r + x^s + 1$ .

In our examples the degree  $r$  is a *Mersenne exponent*, i.e.,  $2^r - 1$  is a Mersenne prime. In this case an irreducible trinomial of degree  $r$  is necessarily primitive. In general, without the restriction to Mersenne exponents, we would need the prime factorisation of  $2^r - 1$  in order to test primitivity (see e.g., [10]).

We are only interested in Mersenne exponents  $r = \pm 1 \pmod{8}$ , because in other cases Swan's theorem [14, 20, 21] rules out irreducible trinomials of degree  $r$  (except for  $s = 2$  or  $r - 2$ , but these cases are usually easy to handle: for example if  $r = 13466917$  or  $20996011$  we have  $r = 1 \pmod{3}$ , so  $x^r + x^2 + 1$  is divisible by  $x^2 + x + 1$ ).

Mersenne exponents can be found on the GIMPS website [22]. At the time of writing, the five largest known Mersenne exponents  $r$  satisfying the condition  $r = \pm 1 \pmod{8}$  are  $r = 6972593, 24036583, 25964951, 30402457$  and  $32582657$ . In the smallest case  $r = 6972593$ , a primitive trinomial was found by Brent, Larvala and Zimmermann [6] using an efficient implementation of the naive algorithm. However, it was not feasible to consider the larger Mersenne exponents  $r$  using the same algorithm, since the time complexity of this algorithm

---

Mathematical Sciences Institute, Australian National University, Canberra, ACT 0200, Australia,  
Fq8@rpbrent.com.

Centre de Recherche INRIA Nancy - Grand Est, 615 rue du Jardin Botanique, 54600 Villers-lès-Nancy,  
France, Paul.Zimmermann@inria.fr.

is roughly of order  $r^3$ , and the next case  $r = 24036583$  would take about 41 times longer than  $r = 6972593$ . With the new “fast” algorithm described in this paper we have been able to find two primitive trinomials of degree  $r = 24036583$  in less time than the naive algorithm took for  $r = 6972593$ . The speedup over the naive algorithm for  $r = 24036583$  is about a factor of 560.

If  $x^r + x^s + 1$  is reducible then we want to provide an easily-checked *certificate* of reducibility. The certificate can simply be an encoding of an irreducible factor  $f$  of  $x^r + x^s + 1$ . We choose the factor  $f$  of smallest degree  $d > 0$ . In case there are several factors of equal smallest degree  $d$ , we give the one that is least in lexicographic order, e.g.,  $x^3 + x + 1$  is preferred to  $x^3 + x^2 + 1$ .

**1.1. Distinct degree factorization.** Our basic algorithm performs *distinct degree factorization* [8, 10, 11]. That is, if  $P(x)$  has several factors of the same degree  $d$ , the algorithm will produce the product of these factors. The Cantor-Zassenhaus algorithm is used to split this product into distinct factors. This is cheap because the product usually consists of just one irreducible factor or is a product of irreducible factors of small (equal) degree.

In the complexity analysis we only consider the time required to find *one* nontrivial factor (it will be a factor of smallest degree) or output “irreducible”, since that is what is required in the search for irreducible trinomials.

**1.2. Factorization over  $\text{GF}(2)$ .** It is well-known that  $x^{2^d} + x$  is the product of all irreducible polynomials of degree dividing  $d$ . For example,

$$x^{2^3} + x = x(x+1)(x^3+x+1)(x^3+x^2+1).$$

Thus, a simple algorithm to find a factor of smallest degree of  $P(x)$  is to compute  $\text{GCD}(x^{2^d} + x, P(x))$  for  $d = 1, 2, \dots$ . The first time that the GCD is nontrivial, it contains a factor of minimal degree  $d$ . If the GCD has degree  $> d$ , it must be a product of factors of degree  $d$ . If no factor has been found for  $d \leq r/2$ , where  $r = \deg(P(x))$ , then  $P(x)$  must be irreducible.

Some simplifications are possible when  $P(x) = x^r + x^s + 1$  is a trinomial over  $\text{GF}(2)$  with  $r$  or  $s$  odd (otherwise  $P(x)$  is trivially reducible):

- (1) We can skip the case  $d = 1$  because a trinomial can not have a factor of degree 1.
- (2) Since  $x^r P(1/x) = x^r + x^{r-s} + 1$ , we only need consider  $s \leq r/2$ .
- (3) We can assume that  $P(x)$  is square-free.
- (4) By applying Swan’s theorem, we can often show that the trinomial under consideration has an odd number of irreducible factors; in this case we only need check  $d \leq r/3$  before claiming that  $P(x)$  is irreducible.

## 2. COMPLEXITY OF THE ALGORITHM

Note that  $x^{2^d}$  should not be computed explicitly; it is much better to compute  $x^{2^d} \bmod P(x)$  by repeated squaring. The complexity of squaring modulo a trinomial of degree  $r$  is only  $S(r) = O(r)$  bit-operations.

**2.1. Complexity of polynomial multiplication and squaring.** As well as performing GCD computations we need to perform multiplications in  $\text{GF}(2)[x]/P(x)$ , and an important special case is squaring a polynomial modulo  $P(x)$ , so we first consider the bit-complexity of these operations.

Multiplication of polynomials of degree  $r$  over  $\text{GF}(2)$  can be performed in time  $M(r) = O(r \log r \log \log r)$ . We have implemented an algorithm of Schönhage [16] that achieves this bound. The algorithm uses a radix-3 FFT and is different from the better-known Schönhage-Strassen algorithm [17]. We remark that the  $\log \log r$  term in the time-bound for the Schönhage-Strassen algorithm has been reduced by Fürer [9], but it is not clear if a similar idea can be used to improve Schönhage's algorithm [16]. In any event the  $\log \log r$  term comes from the number of levels of recursion and is a small constant for the values of  $r$  that we are considering.

In practice, Schönhage's algorithm is not the fastest unless  $r$  is quite large. We have also implemented classical, Karatsuba and Toom-Cook algorithms that have  $M(r) = O(r^\alpha)$ ,  $1 < \alpha \leq 2$ , since these algorithms are easier to implement and are faster for small  $r$ . Our implementations of the Toom-Cook algorithms TC3 and TC4 are based on recent ideas of Bodrato [1].

For brevity we assume that  $r$  is large and Schönhage's algorithm is used. On a 64-bit machine the crossover versus TC4 occurs near degree  $r = 108000$ .

In the complexity estimates we assume that  $M(r)$  is a sufficiently smooth and well-behaved function.

By *Squaring* we mean squaring a polynomial of degree  $< r$  and reduction mod  $P(x)$ . Squaring in  $\text{GF}(2)[x]/P(x)$  can be performed in time  $S(r) = \Theta(r) \ll M(r)$  (assuming, as usual, that  $P(x)$  is a trinomial). Our algorithm takes advantage of the fact that squaring is much faster than multiplication.

Where possible we use the memory-efficient squaring algorithm of Brent, Larvala and Zimmermann [4], which in our implementation is about 2.2 times faster than the naive squaring algorithm.

**2.2. Complexity of GCD.** For GCDs we use a sub-quadratic algorithm that runs in time  $G(r) = \Theta(M(r) \log r)$ . More precisely,

$$G(2r) = 2G(r) + \Theta(M(r)),$$

so for  $\alpha > 1$ ,

$$M(r) = \Theta(r^\alpha) \Rightarrow G(r) = \Theta(M(r)),$$

and

$$M(r) = \Theta(r \log r \log \log r) \Rightarrow G(r) = \Theta(M(r) \log r).$$

In practice, for  $r \approx 2.4 \times 10^7$  and our implementation on a 2.2 Ghz Opteron,  $S(r) \approx 0.005$  second,  $M(r) \approx 2$  seconds,  $G(r) \approx 80$  seconds, so  $M(r)/S(r) \approx 400$ , and  $G(r)/M(r) \approx 40$ .

**2.3. Avoiding GCD computations.** In the context of integer factorization, Pollard [15] suggested a blocking strategy to avoid most GCD computations and thus reduce the amortized cost; von zur Gathen and Shoup [12] applied the same idea to polynomial factorization.

The idea of blocking is to choose a parameter  $\ell > 0$  and, instead of computing

$$\text{GCD}(x^{2^d} + x, P(x)) \text{ for } d \in [d', d' + \ell),$$

compute

$$\text{GCD}(p_\ell(x^{2^{d'}}, x), P(x)),$$

where the *interval polynomial*  $p_\ell(X, x)$  is defined by

$$p_\ell(X, x) = \prod_{j=0}^{\ell-1} (X^{2^j} + x).$$

In this way we replace  $\ell$  GCDs by one GCD and  $\ell - 1$  multiplications mod  $P(x)$ .

The drawback of blocking is that we may have to backtrack if  $P(x)$  has more than one factor with degree in the interval  $[d', d' + \ell)$ , since the algorithm produces the product of these factors. Thus  $\ell$  should not be too large. The optimal strategy depends on the expected size distribution of factors and the ratio of times for GCDs and multiplications.

**2.4. Multi-level blocking.** Our (apparently new) idea is to use a finer level of blocking to replace most multiplications by squarings, which speeds up the computation in  $\text{GF}(2)[x]/P(x)$  of the above interval polynomials. The idea is to split the interval  $[d', d' + \ell)$  into  $k \geq 2$  smaller intervals of length  $m$  over which

$$(1) \quad p_m(X, x) = \prod_{j=0}^{m-1} (X^{2^j} + x) = \sum_{j=0}^m x^{m-j} s_{j,m}(X),$$

where

$$(2) \quad s_{j,m}(X) = \sum_{0 \leq k < 2^m, w(k)=j} X^k,$$

and  $w(k)$  denotes the *Hamming weight* of  $k$ , that is the number of nonzero bits in the binary representation of  $k$ .

For example, for  $m = 3$ , we have:

$$p_m(X, x) = x^3 + x^2(X^4 + X^2 + X) + x(X^6 + X^5 + X^3) + X^7,$$

where  $s_{0,3}(X) = 1$ ,  $s_{1,3}(X) = X^4 + X^2 + X$ ,  $s_{2,3}(X) = X^6 + X^5 + X^3$ , and  $s_{3,3}(X) = X^7$ .

Note that

$$s_{j,m}(X^2) = s_{j,m}(X)^2 \text{ in } \text{GF}(2)[x]/P(x).$$

Thus,  $p_m(x^{2^d}, x)$  can be computed with cost  $m^2 S(r)$  if we already know  $s_{j,m}(x^{2^{d-m}})$  for  $0 < j \leq m$ . (The constant polynomial  $s_{0,m}(X) = 1$  is computed only once.)

Continuing the example with  $m = 3$ , and assuming that we know  $s_{1,3}(x^{2^{d-3}})$ ,  $s_{2,3}(x^{2^{d-3}})$ , and  $s_{3,3}(x^{2^{d-3}})$ , squaring each of these  $m = 3$  times gives  $s_{1,3}(x^{2^d})$ ,  $s_{2,3}(x^{2^d})$ , and  $s_{3,3}(x^{2^d})$ , from which we can easily get  $p_3(x^{2^d}, x)$  using the sum in Eq. (1).

In this way we replace  $m - 1$  multiplications and  $m$  squarings — if we used the product in Eq. (1) — by  $m^2$  squarings. Each  $s_{j,m}$ ,  $0 < j \leq m$ , requires  $m$  squarings to be shifted from argument  $x^{2^{d-m}}$  to argument  $x^{2^d}$ . The summation in Eq. (1) costs only  $O(mr)$ , which

is negligible. Choosing  $m \approx \sqrt{M(r)/S(r)}$  (about 20 if  $M(r)/S(r) \approx 400$ ), the speedup over single-level blocking is about  $m/2 \approx 10$  (not counting the cost of GCDs).

Von zur Gathen and Gerhard [11, p. 1685] suggested using the same idea with  $m = 2$  (thus reducing the number of multiplications by a factor of two), but did not consider choosing an optimal  $m > 2$ .

At first sight initialization of the polynomials  $s_{j,m}(X)$  for  $X = x$  might appear to be expensive, since the definition (2) involves  $O(2^m)$  terms. However, the polynomials  $s_{j,m}(X)$  satisfy a ‘‘Pascal triangle’’ recurrence relation

$$s_{j,m}(X) = s_{j,m-1}(X^2) + X s_{j-1,m-1}(X^2)$$

with boundary conditions

$$s_{j,m}(X) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } j > m \geq 0, \\ 1 & \text{if } m \geq j = 0. \end{cases}$$

Using this recurrence, it is easy to compute  $s_{j,m}(x) \bmod P(x)$  for  $0 \leq j \leq m$  in time  $O(m^2 r)$ . Thus, the initialization is cheap.

To summarise, we use two levels of blocking:

- (1) The outer level replaces most GCDs by multiplications.
- (2) The inner level replaces most multiplications by squarings.
- (3) The parameter  $m \approx \sqrt{M(r)/S(r)}$  is used for the inner level of blocking.
- (4) A different parameter  $\ell = km$  is used for the outer level of blocking.

For example, suppose  $S = 1/400$ ,  $M = 1$ ,  $G = 40$  (where we have normalised so  $M = 1$ ). We could choose  $\ell = 80$  and  $m = 20$ . With no blocking, the cost for an interval of length 80 is  $80G + 80S = 3200.2$ ; with 1-level blocking the cost is  $G + 79M + 80S = 119.2$ ; with 2-level blocking the cost is  $G + 3M + 1600S = 47.0$ .

**2.5. Sieving out small factors.** We define a *small* factor to be one with degree  $d < \frac{1}{2} \log_2 r$ , so  $2^d < \sqrt{r}$ . The constant  $\frac{1}{2}$  in the definition is arbitrary and could be replaced by any fixed constant in  $(0, 1)$ . A *large* factor is a factor that is not small.

It would be inefficient to find small factors in the same way as large factors. Instead, let  $D = 2^d - 1$ ,  $r' = r \bmod D$ ,  $s' = s \bmod D$ . Then

$$P(x) = x^r + x^s + 1 = x^{r'} + x^{s'} + 1 \bmod (x^D - 1),$$

so we only need compute

$$\text{GCD}(x^{r'} + x^{s'} + 1, x^D - 1).$$

Because  $r', s' < D < \sqrt{r}$ , the cost of finding small factors is negligible (both theoretically and in practice), so can be neglected.

**2.6. Outer level blocking strategy.** The blocksize in the outer level of blocking is  $\ell = km$ . We take a linearly increasing sequence of block sizes

$$k = k_0 j \quad \text{for } j = 1, 2, 3, \dots,$$

where the first interval starts at about  $\log r$  (since small factors will have been found by sieving).

The choice  $k = k_0j$  leads to a quadratic polynomial for the interval bounds; other possibilities are discussed by von zur Gathen and Gerhard [11].

In principle, using the data that we have obtained on the distribution of degrees of smallest factors of trinomials (see §3), and assuming that this distribution is not very sensitive to the degree  $r$ , we could obtain a strategy that is close to optimal. However, the choice  $k_0j$  with suitable  $k_0$  is easy to implement and not too far from optimal. The number of GCD and  $\text{sqr}/\text{mul}$  operations is usually within a factor of 1.5 of the minimum possible in our experiments.

### 3. DISTRIBUTION OF DEGREES OF FACTORS

In order to predict the expected behaviour of our algorithm, we need to know the expected distribution of degrees of smallest irreducible factors. From Swan's theorem [21], we know that there are significant differences between the distribution of factors of trinomials and of all polynomials of the same degree. Our complexity estimates are based on the heuristic assumption that this difference is not too large, in a sense made precise by Hypothesis 3.1.

**Hypothesis 3.1.** *Over all trinomials  $x^r + x^s + 1$  of degree  $r$  over  $\text{GF}(2)$ , the probability  $\pi_d$  that a trinomial has no nontrivial factor of degree  $\leq d$ ,  $1 < d \leq r$ , is at most  $c/d$ , where  $c$  is a constant.*

Hypothesis 3.1 implies that there are at most  $c$  irreducible trinomials of degree  $r$ . This is probably false, as there may well be a sequence of exceptional  $r$  for which the number of irreducible trinomials is unbounded. Thus, we may need to replace the constant  $c$  in Hypothesis 3.1 by a slowly-growing function  $c(r)$ . Nevertheless, in order to give realistic complexity estimates that are in agreement with experiments, we assume below that Hypothesis 3.1 is correct. Under this assumption we use an amortized model to obtain the total complexity over all trinomials of degree  $r$ .

From Hypothesis 3.1, the probability that a trinomial does not have a small factor (as defined in §2.5) is  $O(1/\log r)$ .

Table 1 gives the observed values of  $d\pi_d$  for  $r = 3021377$ ,  $r = 6972593$ , and  $r = 24036583$ . The maximum values for each  $r$  are given in bold. The table shows that the values of  $d\pi_d$  are remarkably stable for small  $d$ , and bounded by 4 for large  $d$  (this is because there are four irreducible trinomials of degree 3021377 and also four of degree 24036583, when we count both trinomials  $x^r + x^s + 1$  and their reciprocals  $x^r + x^{r-s} + 1$ ).

**3.1. Consequences of the hypothesis.** Define  $p_k = \pi_{d-1} - \pi_d$  to be the probability that the smallest nontrivial factor  $f$  of a randomly chosen trinomial has degree  $d = \deg(f)$ . In order to estimate the running time of our algorithm, we use the following Lemma, which gives the expectation  $E_\beta$  of  $d^\beta$ .

**Lemma 3.2.** *If  $\beta > 0$  is constant and Hypothesis 3.1 holds, then*

$$E_\beta := \sum_{d=1}^r d^\beta p_d = \begin{cases} O(1) & \text{if } \beta < 1, \\ O(\log r) & \text{if } \beta = 1, \\ O(r^{\beta-1}) & \text{if } \beta > 1. \end{cases}$$

TABLE 1.  $d\pi_d$  for various degrees  $r$ .

$d$	$r = 3021377$	$r = 6972593$	$r = 24036583$
2	1.333	1.333	1.333
3	1.429	1.429	1.429
4	1.524	1.524	1.524
5	1.536	1.536	1.536
6	1.598	1.598	1.598
7	1.600	1.600	1.600
8	1.667	1.667	1.667
9	1.642	1.642	1.642
10	1.652	1.652	1.652
100	1.763	1.771	1.770
1000	1.783	1.756	1.786
10000	1.946	1.873	1.786
100000	1.986	1.606	1.880
279383	1.480	<b>2.084</b>	1.813
1000000	1.324	1.147	1.831
10000000	–	–	1.664
$r - 1$	<b>4.000</b>	2.000	<b>4.000</b>

*Proof.* We use summation by parts. Note that a trinomial has no factor of degree 1, so  $p_1 = 0$  and  $\pi_0 = \pi_1 = 1$ . Thus

$$\begin{aligned}
 E_\beta &= \sum_{d=1}^r d^\beta p_d = \sum_{d=1}^r d^\beta (\pi_{d-1} - \pi_d) \\
 &= \sum_{d=1}^{r-1} ((d+1)^\beta - d^\beta) \pi_d + \pi_0 - r^\beta \pi_r \\
 &\leq 1 + c \sum_{d=1}^{r-1} \frac{(d+1)^\beta - d^\beta}{d} \quad (\text{by Hypothesis 3.1}) \\
 &\leq 1 + O\left(\sum_{d=1}^{r-1} d^{\beta-2}\right)
 \end{aligned}$$

and the result follows. □

The following Lemma gives a stronger result in the case  $\beta < 1$ .

**Lemma 3.3.** *If  $0 < \beta < 1$ ,  $0 < D \leq r$ , and Hypothesis 3.1 holds, then*

$$\sum_{d=D}^r d^\beta p_d = O(D^{\beta-1}).$$

*Proof.* The proof is similar to that of Lemma 3.2. We end with the upper bound

$$\sum_{d=D}^{r-1} \frac{(d+1)^\beta - d^\beta}{d} + D^\beta \pi_{D-1}.$$

From Hypothesis 3.1,  $\pi_{D-1} = O(1/D)$ , and the sum over  $d$  is  $O(D^{\beta-1})$ , so the result follows.  $\square$

#### 4. EXPECTED COST OF SQR/MUL AND GCD

Recall that the inner level of blocking replaces  $m$  multiplications by  $m^2$  squarings and one multiplication, where the choice  $m \approx \sqrt{M(r)/S(r)}$  makes the total cost of squarings about equal to the cost of multiplications.

For a smallest factor of degree  $d$ , the number of squarings is  $m(d + O(\sqrt{d}))$ , where the  $O(\sqrt{d})$  term follows from our choice of outer-level blocksizes (see §2.6). Averaging over all trinomials of degree  $r$ , the expected number of squarings is

$$O\left(m \sum_{d \leq r/2} (d + O(\sqrt{d})) p_d\right),$$

and from Lemma 3.2 this is  $O(m \log r)$ . Thus, the expected cost of sqr/mul operations per trinomial is

$$\begin{aligned} (3) \quad O\left(S(r) \log r \sqrt{M(r)/S(r)}\right) &= O\left(\log r \sqrt{M(r)S(r)}\right) \\ &= O\left(r(\log r)^{3/2} (\log \log r)^{1/2}\right). \end{aligned}$$

If we used only a single level of blocking, then the cost of multiplications would dominate that of squarings, with an expected cost per trinomial of  $O(\log r M(r)) = O(r(\log r)^2 \log \log r)$ .

(3) is correct as  $r \rightarrow \infty$ . However, in practice, at least for  $r < 6.4 \times 10^7$ , our implementation of Schönhage's FFT-based polynomial multiplication algorithm [16] calls a different multiplication routine (usually TC4) to perform smaller multiplications, rather than recursively calling itself. TC4 has exponent  $\alpha' = \ln(7)/\ln(4) \approx 1.4$ , so the effective exponent for FFT multiplication is  $\alpha = (1 + \alpha')/2 \approx 1.2 > 1$ . In this case, the expected cost of sqr/mul operations per trinomial is

$$(4) \quad O\left(\log r \sqrt{M(r)S(r)}\right) = O(r^{(1+\alpha)/2} \log r) = O(r^{1.1 \dots} \log r)$$

**4.1. Expected cost of GCDs.** Suppose that  $P(x)$  has a smallest factor of degree  $d$ . The number of GCDs required to find the factor, using our (quadratic polynomial) blocking strategy, is at least 1, and  $O(\sqrt{d})$  if  $d$  is large. By Hypothesis 3.1, the expected number of GCDs for a trinomial with *no small factor* is

$$1 + O\left(\sum_{\log_2 r < 2d \leq r} d^{1/2} p_d\right),$$

and by Lemma 3.3 this is

$$1 + O\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{\log r}}\right).$$

Thus the expected cost of GCDs per trinomial is

$$(5) \quad O(G(r)/\log r) = O(M(r)) = O(r \log r \log \log r).$$

(5) is asymptotically less than the expected cost (3) of  $\text{sqr/mul}$  operations. However, if  $M(r) = O(r^\alpha)$  with  $\alpha > 1$ , then the expected cost of GCDs is  $O(r^\alpha/\log r)$ , which is asymptotically greater than the expected cost (4) of  $\text{sqr/mul}$  operations. Note the expected cost of GCDs does not depend on whether we use one or two levels of blocking.

For  $r \approx 2.4 \times 10^7$ , GCDs take about 65% of the time versus 35% for  $\text{sqr/mul}$ .

**4.2. Comparison with previous algorithms.** For simplicity we use the  $\tilde{O}$  notation which ignores log factors. For example,  $M(r) = \tilde{O}(r)$ .

The “naive” algorithm, as implemented by Brent, Larvala and Zimmermann [4] and earlier authors, takes an expected time  $\tilde{O}(r^2)$  per trinomial, or  $\tilde{O}(r^3)$  to cover all trinomials of degree  $r$ .

The single-level blocking strategy and the new algorithm both take expected time  $\tilde{O}(r)$  per trinomial, or  $\tilde{O}(r^2)$  to cover all trinomials of degree  $r$ .

In practice, the new algorithm is faster over the naive algorithm by a factor of about 160 for  $r = 6972593$ , and by a factor of about 560 for  $r = 24036583$ . For  $r = 24036583$ , where  $\text{sqr/mul}$  operations take 35% of the total time in the new algorithm, and the corresponding speedup is about 10, this gives a global speedup of more than 4 over the single-blocking strategy.

**4.3. Some details of our implementation.** We first implemented the 2-level blocking strategy in NTL [18]. To get full efficiency, we rewrote all critical routines and tuned them efficiently on the target processors. Our squaring routine implements the algorithm described in [4], which is more than twice as fast as the corresponding optimized NTL routine for trinomials. Our multiplication routine implements Toom-Cook 3-way, 4-way, and Schönhage’s algorithm [16]. We also improved the basecase multiplication code; more details concerning efficient multiplication in  $\text{GF}(2)[x]$  will be published in [5]. Finally, we implemented a subquadratic GCD routine, since NTL only provides a classical GCD for binary polynomials.

**4.4. Primitive trinomials.** The largest published primitive trinomial is

$$x^{6972593} + x^{3037958} + 1,$$

found by Brent, Larvala and Zimmermann [4] in 2002 using a naive (but efficiently implemented) algorithm.

In March–April 2007, we tested our new program by verifying the published results on primitive trinomials for Mersenne exponents  $r \leq 6972593$ , and in the process produced certificates of reducibility (lists of smallest factors for each reducible trinomial). These are available from the first author’s website [3].

In April–August 2007, we ran our new algorithm to search for primitive trinomials of degree  $r = 24036583$ . This is the next Mersenne exponent, apart from two that are trivial to exclude by Swan’s theorem. It would take about 41 times as long as for  $r = 6972593$  by the naive algorithm, but our new program is 560 times faster than the naive algorithm. Each trinomial takes on average about 16 seconds on a 2.2 Ghz Opteron.

The complete computation was performed in four months, using about 24 Opteron and Core 2 processors located at ANU and INRIA.

We found two new primitive trinomials of (equal) record degree:

$$(6) \quad x^{24036583} + x^{8412642} + 1$$

and

$$(7) \quad x^{24036583} + x^{8785528} + 1.$$

**4.5. Verification.** Allan Steel [19] kindly verified irreducibility of (6)–(7) using Magma [2]. Each verification took about 67 hours on an 2.4 GHz Core 2 processor. Independent verifications using our `irred V3.15` program [4, 6] took about 35 hours on a 2.2 Ghz Opteron. The difference in speed is mainly due to the fast squaring algorithm implemented in `irred`.

Primitivity of (6)–(7) follows from irreducibility provided that the degree 24036583 is a Mersenne exponent. We have not verified this, but rely on computations performed by the GIMPS project [22].

Reducibility of the remaining trinomials of degree 24036583 can be verified using the certificate (or *extended log*, a list of smallest irreducible factors) available from our website [3]. The verification takes less than 10 hours using Magma on a 2.66 Ghz Core 2 processor.

## 5. CONCLUSION

The new double-blocking strategy, combined with fast multiplication and GCD algorithms, has allowed us to find new primitive trinomials of record degree.

The same ideas should work over finite fields  $\text{GF}(p)$  for small prime  $p > 2$ , and for factoring sparse polynomials  $P(x)$  that are not necessarily trinomials: all we need is that the time for  $p$ -th powers (mod  $P(x)$ ) is much less than the time for multiplication (mod  $P(x)$ ).

**Acknowledgements.** We thank Allan Steel for verifying irreducibility of the trinomials (6)–(7), and Marco Bodrato, Pierrick Gaudry and Emmanuel Thomé for their assistance in implementing fast algorithms for multiplication of polynomials over  $\text{GF}[2]$ . ANU and INRIA provided computing facilities. The first author’s research was supported by MASCOS and the Australian Research Council.

## REFERENCES

- [1] M. Bodrato, Towards Optimal Toom-Cook Multiplication for Univariate and Multivariate Polynomials in Characteristic 2 and 0, *Lecture Notes in Computer Science* **4547**, 119–136. Springer, 2007. <http://bodrato.it/papers/#WAIFI2007>
- [2] W. Bosma, and J. Cannon, *Handbook of Magma Functions*, School of Mathematics and Statistics, University of Sydney, 1995. <http://magma.maths.usyd.edu.au/>

- [3] R. P. Brent, Search for primitive trinomials (mod 2), <http://wwwmaths.anu.edu.au/~brent/trinom.html>
- [4] R. P. Brent, S. Larvala and P. Zimmermann, A fast algorithm for testing reducibility of trinomials mod 2 and some new primitive trinomials of degree 3021377, *Math. Comp.* **72** (2003), 1443–1452. <http://wwwmaths.anu.edu.au/~brent/pub/pub199.html>
- [5] R. P. Brent, P. Gaudry, E. Thomé and P. Zimmermann, Efficient Multiplication in  $GF(2)[x]$  (preliminary title), In preparation (2007).
- [6] R. P. Brent, S. Larvala and P. Zimmermann, A primitive trinomial of degree 6972593, *Math. Comp.* **74** (2005), 1001–1002, <http://wwwmaths.anu.edu.au/~brent/pub/pub224.html>
- [7] D. G. Cantor and H. Zassenhaus, A new algorithm for factoring polynomials over finite fields, *Math. Comp.* **36** (1981), 587–592.
- [8] Ph. Flajolet, X. Gourdon and D. Panario, The complete analysis of a polynomial factorization algorithm over finite fields, *J. of Algorithms* **40** (2001), 37–81.
- [9] M. Fürer, Faster integer multiplication, preprint, Feb 19, 2007. <http://www.cse.psu.edu/~furer/Papers/mult.pdf>
- [10] J. von zur Gathen and J. Gerhard, *Modern Computer Algebra*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK, 1999.
- [11] J. von zur Gathen and J. Gerhard, Polynomial factorization over  $F_2$ , *Math. Comp.* **71** (2002), 1677–1698.
- [12] J. von zur Gathen and V. Shoup, Computing Frobenius maps and factoring polynomials, *Computational Complexity* **2** (1992), 187–224. <http://www.shoup.net/papers/>
- [13] T. Kumada, H. Leeb, Y. Kurita and M. Matsumoto, New primitive  $t$ -nomials ( $t = 3, 5$ ) over  $GF(2)$  whose degree is a Mersenne exponent, *Math. Comp.* **69** (2000), 811–814. Corrigenda: *ibid* **71** (2002), 1337–1338.
- [14] A.-E. Pellet, Sur la décomposition d’une fonction entière en facteurs irréductibles suivant un module premier  $p$ , *Comptes Rendus de l’Académie des Sciences Paris* **86** (1878), 1071–1072.
- [15] J. M. Pollard. A Monte Carlo method for factorization, *BIT* **15** (1975), 331–334.
- [16] A. Schönhage, Schnelle Multiplikation von Polynomen über Körpern der Charakteristik 2, *Acta Inf.* **7** (1977), 395–398.
- [17] A. Schönhage and V. Strassen, Schnelle Multiplikation großer Zahlen, *Computing* **7** (1971), 281–292.
- [18] V. Shoup, NTL: A library for doing number theory, Version 5.3.2, <http://www.shoup.net/ntl/>
- [19] A. Steel, personal communications, July 5–9, 2007.
- [20] L. Stickelberger, Über eine neue Eigenschaft der Diskriminanten algebraischer Zahlkörper, *Verhandlungen des ersten Internationalen Mathematiker-Kongresses*, Zürich, 1897, 182–193.
- [21] R. G. Swan, Factorization of polynomials over finite fields, *Pacific J. Math.* **12** (1962), 1099–1106.
- [22] G. Woltman *et al*, GIMPS, The Great Internet Mersenne Prime Search, <http://www.mersenne.org/>



---

Unité de recherche INRIA Lorraine  
LORIA, Technopôle de Nancy-Brabois - Campus scientifique  
615, rue du Jardin Botanique - BP 101 - 54602 Villers-lès-Nancy Cedex (France)

Unité de recherche INRIA Futurs : Parc Club Orsay Université - ZAC des Vignes  
4, rue Jacques Monod - 91893 ORSAY Cedex (France)

Unité de recherche INRIA Rennes : IRISA, Campus universitaire de Beaulieu - 35042 Rennes Cedex (France)

Unité de recherche INRIA Rhône-Alpes : 655, avenue de l'Europe - 38334 Montbonnot Saint-Ismier (France)

Unité de recherche INRIA Rocquencourt : Domaine de Voluceau - Rocquencourt - BP 105 - 78153 Le Chesnay Cedex (France)

Unité de recherche INRIA Sophia Antipolis : 2004, route des Lucioles - BP 93 - 06902 Sophia Antipolis Cedex (France)

---

Éditeur  
INRIA - Domaine de Voluceau - Rocquencourt, BP 105 - 78153 Le Chesnay Cedex (France)  
<http://www.inria.fr>  
ISSN 0249-6399