

Algorithms for the universal decomposition algebra*

ROMAIN LEBRETON

Laboratoire d'Informatique
École Polytechnique
Palaiseau - France

ÉRIC SHOST

Computer Science Department
University of Western Ontario
London - Canada

ALGO seminar, Rocquencourt

June 11, 2012

*. This document has been written using the GNU $\text{T}_{\text{E}}\text{X}_{\text{MACS}}$ text editor (see www.texmacs.org).

Presentation

Let k be a field of characteristic 0 or sufficiently large.

We fix $f = X^n + \sum_{i=1}^n (-1)^i f_i X^{n-i} \in k[X]$ separable of degree n .

We note $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n$ its roots.

Symmetric variety of roots of f

$$\mathbb{V}_{\mathcal{I}, \bar{k}} = \{(\alpha_{\sigma(1)}, \dots, \alpha_{\sigma(n)}) \mid \sigma \in \mathfrak{S}_n\}$$

Ideal of symmetric relations

$$\mathcal{I} = \langle E_i(X_1, \dots, X_n) - f_i \rangle_{i=1, \dots, n} \subseteq k[X_1, \dots, X_n]$$

\leftrightarrow

The **universal decomposition algebra** is $\mathbb{A} := k[X_1, \dots, X_n]/\mathcal{I}$, its degree is $\delta := n!$.

For all $P \in \mathbb{A}$, let's denote its characteristic polynomial

$$\mathcal{X}_{P, \mathbb{A}}(T) := \prod_{\sigma \in \mathfrak{S}_n} (T - P(\alpha_{\sigma(1)}, \dots, \alpha_{\sigma(n)})) \in k[T].$$

State of the art : absolute resolvents

Absolute Lagrange's resolvent :

$$L_P(T) := \prod_{\sigma \in \mathfrak{S}_n / \text{Stab } P} (T - P(\alpha_{\sigma(1)}, \dots, \alpha_{\sigma(n)})) \in k[T].$$

We have $\mathcal{X}_P = (L_P)^{\#\text{Stab } P}$.

Symbolic methods for the computation of absolute resolvents :

- by resultants [LAGRANGE], [SOICHER, '81], [GIUSTI *et al.*, '88], [LEHOBEY, '97]
- by symmetric functions [LAGRANGE], [VALIBOUZE, '88], [CASPERSON, MCKAY, '94];
- by Groebner bases [GIUSTI *et al.*, '88], [ARNAUDIÈS, VALIBOUZE, '93];
- by invariants [BERWICK, '29], [FOULKES, '31].

↪ Little is known about complexity. Algorithm with at least quadratic complexity $\Omega(\delta^2)$.

State of the art : universal decomposition algebra

Triangular representation

Cauchy modules $C_i \in k[X_1, \dots, X_i]$
for $1 \leq i \leq n$.

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{A}_1 &= k[X_1]/(C_1) \\ &\vdots \\ \mathbb{A}_j &= k[X_1, \dots, X_j]/(C_1, \dots, C_j) \\ &\vdots \\ \mathbb{A} = \mathbb{A}_n &= k[X_1, \dots, X_n]/(C_1, \dots, C_n) \end{aligned}$$

Univariate representation

Minimal polynomial Q of a primitive
linear form Λ . Parametrizations $(S_i)_{1 \leq i \leq n}$.

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{A} &\simeq k[T]/(Q) \\ X_i &\longmapsto S_i(T) \\ \Lambda &\longleftarrow T \end{aligned}$$

Cost of the representation of \mathbb{A} :

$o(\delta)$ by the recursive formula :

$$C_{i+1} = \frac{(C_i(X_1, \dots, X_i) - C_i(X_1, \dots, X_{i+1}))}{X_i - X_{i+1}}$$

with $C_1 := f(X_1)$.

$\tilde{O}(\delta^3)$ by FGLM or RUR algorithm
[FAUGÈRE et al., '93], [ROUILLIER, '99]

$\tilde{O}(\delta^2)$ by geometric resolution
[GIUSTI et al., '01], [HEINTZ et al., '00]

$\tilde{O}(\delta^{1.69})$ by modular composition
[POTEAUX, SCHOST, '11]

State of the art : universal decomposition algebra

Triangular representation

Cauchy modules $C_i \in k[X_1, \dots, X_i]$
for $1 \leq i \leq n$.

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{A}_1 &= k[X_1]/(C_1) \\ &\vdots \\ \mathbb{A}_j &= k[X_1, \dots, X_j]/(C_1, \dots, C_j) \\ &\vdots \\ \mathbb{A} = \mathbb{A}_n &= k[X_1, \dots, X_n]/(C_1, \dots, C_n) \end{aligned}$$

Univariate representation

Minimal polynomial Q of a primitive
linear form Λ . Parametrizations $(S_i)_{1 \leq i \leq n}$.

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{A} &\simeq k[T]/(Q) \\ X_i &\longmapsto S_i(T) \\ \Lambda &\longleftarrow T \end{aligned}$$

Cost of arithmetic operations in \mathbb{A} :

- multiplication

$\tilde{O}(\delta)$ [BOSTAN et al., 2011],
not implemented, significant constant

- division (when possible)

no quasi-optimal algorithm

$\tilde{O}(\delta)$, simple and efficient

$\tilde{O}(\delta)$, simple and efficient

Our contribution

Let $\mathbb{A}_m = \mathbb{A} \cap k[X_1, \dots, X_m]$ and $\delta_m = \frac{n!}{(n-m)!}$ its degree.

Theorem. *One can compute a primitive linear form $\Lambda \in \mathbb{A}_m$ and the univariate representation $\mathfrak{P} = (Q, S_1, \dots, S_m) \in k[Z_m]^{m+1}$ with*

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathbb{A}_m = k[X_1, \dots, X_m]/\mathcal{I} & \simeq & k[Z_m]/Q(Z_m) \\ X_i & \mapsto & S_i(Z_m) \\ \Lambda & \leftarrow & Z_m \end{array}$$

with a Las Vegas algorithm of expected cost $\mathcal{O}(n^{(\omega+1)/2} m M(\delta_m))$.

Theorem. *For all $P \in \mathbb{A}_m$, the characteristic polynomial $\mathcal{X}_{P, \mathbb{A}_m} \in k[T]$ costs*

$$\mathcal{O}(n^{(\omega+1)/2} m M(\delta_m))$$

arithmetic operations in k .

Applications

- Computation of \mathcal{X}_P
 - ↪ Symbolic computation of absolute Lagrange's resolvent in time $\tilde{O}(\delta_m)$;
- Computation of $\mathbb{A} \simeq k[T]/Q(T)$
 - ↪ Change of representation in time $\tilde{O}(\delta)$
 - ↪ Division in \mathbb{A} in time $\tilde{O}(\delta)$
 - ↪ Efficient algorithms for trace, minimal polynomial computations...
 - ↪ Dynamic splitting field, [DELLA DORA *et al.*, 1985]
 - ↪ Effective invariant theory

Outline of the talk

Newton sums methods:

- i. Computation of \mathcal{X}_Λ for a linear form $\Lambda \in \mathbb{A}_m$
- ii. Change of representation : Up and Down
- iii. Univariate representation of \mathbb{A}_m
- iv. Benchmarks

Resultant methods:

- i. Computation of \mathcal{X}_P for any $P \in \mathbb{A}_m$
- ii. Benchmarks
- iii. Generalizations

Newton sums

Definition. Let $g \in k[X]$ monic and β_1, \dots, β_n all its root in a suitable extension. Then the i -th *Newton sum* of g is

$$S_i(g) := \sum_{\ell=1}^n (\beta_\ell)^i \in k.$$

The *Newton representation* of g is $(S_i(g))_{0 \leq i \leq n}$.

Proposition. The conversion from and to the Newton representation can be done in time $\mathcal{O}(M(n))$.

Lemma. Multiplication in the Newton representation:

$$S_i(fg) = S_i(f) + S_i(g).$$

Characteristic polynomial of linear forms

Definition. Let $f, g \in k[T]$ such that $f = \prod_{i=1, \dots, r} (T - \alpha_i)$, $g = \prod_{j=1, \dots, s} (T - \beta_j)$ in \bar{k} . Then

$$f \oplus g := \prod_{1 \leq i \leq r, 1 \leq j \leq s} (T - (\alpha_i + \beta_j)) \in k[T]$$

$$\text{(resp.) } f \otimes g := \prod_{1 \leq i \leq r, 1 \leq j \leq s} (T - (\alpha_i \cdot \beta_j)) \in k[T]$$

Proposition. If $\deg f, \deg g \leq n$, then $f \otimes g$ and $f \oplus g$ can be computed in time $\mathcal{O}(M(n^2))$.

Proof. One has

$$S_i(f \otimes g) = S_i(f) S_i(g)$$

and

$$\sum_{i \in \mathbb{N}} \frac{S_i(f \oplus g)}{i!} T^i = \left(\sum_{i \in \mathbb{N}} \frac{S_i(f)}{i!} T^i \right) \left(\sum_{i \in \mathbb{N}} \frac{S_i(g)}{i!} T^i \right).$$

□

Characteristic polynomial of linear forms

Our goal: Let $\Lambda = \lambda_1 X_1 + \cdots + \lambda_n X_n \in \mathbb{A}_n$, compute

$$\mathcal{X}_\Lambda(T) := \prod_{\sigma \in \mathfrak{S}_n} (T - (\lambda_1 \alpha_{\sigma(1)} + \cdots + \lambda_n \alpha_{\sigma(n)})).$$

Examples:

- $f \otimes (X - \lambda) = \prod_{i=1}^n (T - \lambda \alpha_i) = \mathcal{X}_{\lambda X_1, \mathbb{A}_1}$
- If $\mathcal{R} = \{\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n\}$, then

$$\begin{aligned} f \oplus f &= \prod_{\alpha, \beta \in R} (T - (\alpha + \beta)) \\ &= \prod_{\alpha \neq \beta \in R} (T - (\alpha + \beta)) \prod_{\alpha \in R} (T - 2\alpha) \\ &= \mathcal{X}_{X_1+X_2, \mathbb{A}_2} \cdot \mathcal{X}_{2X_1, \mathbb{A}_2} \end{aligned}$$

Characteristic polynomial of linear forms

Formula from [CASPERSON, MCKAY, '94]:

$$\mathcal{X}_{X_1+\dots+X_m} = \prod_{h=1}^m ((\mathcal{X}_{X_1+\dots+X_{m-h}}) \oplus (f \otimes (T - h)))^{(-1)^{h+1}}$$

Proposition. (Generalization)

- One has

$$\mathcal{X}_{\Lambda_j, \mathbb{A}_j}(T) = \frac{\mathcal{X}_{\Lambda_{j-1}, \mathbb{A}_{j-1}}(T) \oplus (f \otimes (T - \lambda_j))}{\prod_{i=1}^{j-1} \mathcal{X}_{\Lambda_{j-1} + \lambda_j X_i, \mathbb{A}_{j-1}}(T)}, \quad (1)$$

where $\Lambda_j = \lambda_1 X_1 + \dots + \lambda_j X_j \in \mathbb{A}_j$.

- The associated recursive algorithm **NewtonSums** computes $\mathcal{X}_{\Lambda, \mathbb{A}_m}$ in time $\mathcal{O}(2^n M(\delta_m))$.

Advantages: Algorithm in the Newton representation, handle multiplicities, memoization

Drawback: Factor 2^n

Parametrizations

Relation characteristic polynomial / univariate representation :

- minimal polynomial : $Q_j(T) = \mathcal{X}_{\Lambda_j}(T)$;
- parametrizations :

Lemma. Let $K := k[T_1, \dots, T_n]$ and $\Lambda := T_1 X_1 + \dots + T_n X_n \in K[X_1, \dots, X_n]$.
Then $\mathcal{X}_\Lambda \in k[T, T_1, \dots, T_n]$ and

$$X_i = -\left(\frac{\partial \mathcal{X}_\Lambda}{\partial T_i}\right) / \left(\frac{\partial \mathcal{X}_\Lambda}{\partial T}\right) \text{ in } \mathbb{A}_K.$$

In practice, we use tangent numbers $K := k[\varepsilon]/(\varepsilon^2)$ to compute derivatives :

- If $\Lambda^\varepsilon := (\lambda_1 + \varepsilon) X_1 + \lambda_2 X_2 + \dots + \lambda_n X_n$ then $\mathcal{X}_{\Lambda^\varepsilon} = \mathcal{X}_\Lambda + \varepsilon \frac{\partial \mathcal{X}_\Lambda}{\partial T_1}$.

Outline of the talk

Newton sums methods:

- i. Computation of \mathcal{X}_Λ for a linear form $\Lambda \in \mathbb{A}_m$
- ii. Change of representation : Up and Down
- iii. Univariate representation of \mathbb{A}_m
- iv. Benchmarks

Resultant methods:

- i. Computation of \mathcal{X}_P for any $P \in \mathbb{A}_m$
- ii. Benchmarks
- iii. Generalizations

Lift-up and push-down

Goal: Compute efficiently $\text{Up: } \mathbb{A}_n = k[X_1, \dots, X_n]/(C_1, \dots, C_n) \longrightarrow k[Z_n]/(Q_n(Z_n))$ and $\text{Down} = \text{Up}^{-1}$.

Elementary change of representation:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathbb{A}_i[X_{i+1}]/(C_{i+1}) & \simeq & \mathbb{A}_{i+1} \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ \text{up}_i: k[Z_i, X_{i+1}]/(Q_i(Z_i), C_{i+1}(Z_i, X_{i+1})) & \longrightarrow & k[Z_{i+1}]/(Q_{i+1}) \end{array} .$$

Example:

$$\text{Up: } \mathbb{A}_3 = (k[Z_1]/C_1)[X_2, X_3]/(C_2, C_3) \longrightarrow_{\text{up}_1} (k[Z_2]/Q_2)[X_3]/(C_3) \longrightarrow_{\text{up}_2} k[Z_3]/(Q_3)$$

with $n = 3$, $Z_1 = X_1$.

Lift-up and push-down

Goal: Compute efficiently $\text{Up}: \mathbb{A}_n = k[X_1, \dots, X_n]/(C_1, \dots, C_n) \longrightarrow k[Z_n]/(Q_n(Z_n))$ and $\text{Down} = \text{Up}^{-1}$.

Elementary change of representation:

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 k[Z_i, X_{i+1}]/(Q_i(Z_i), C_{i+1}(Z_i, X_{i+1})) & \longrightarrow & k[Z_{i+1}]/(Q_{i+1}) \\
 \text{up}_i: & & \\
 \begin{array}{ccc}
 Z_i & \longmapsto & Z_{i+1} - \lambda_{i+1} S_{i+1,i+1}(Z_{i+1}) \\
 X_{i+1} & \longmapsto & S_{i+1,i+1}(Z_{i+1})
 \end{array}
 \end{array}$$

Algorithm up_i :

Input: $P \in k[Z_i, X_{i+1}]$

Output: $\text{up}_i(P) \in k[Z_{i+1}]/(Q_{i+1})$

1. Compute $\tilde{P}(Z_i, X_{i+1}) = P(Z_i - \lambda_{i+1} X_{i+1}, X_{i+1}) \in (k[X_{i+1}]/f(X_{i+1}))[Z_i]$ $M(n)M(\delta_i)$
2. Substitute $X_{i+1} \leftarrow S_{i+1,i+1}(Z_{i+1})$ in $\tilde{P}(Z_i, X_{i+1})$ $n M(\delta_{i+1})$

Lift-up and push-down

Goal: Compute efficiently $\text{Up}: \mathbb{A}_n \longrightarrow k[Z_n]/(Q_n(Z_n))$ and its converse map $\text{Down} = \text{Up}^{-1}$.

Proposition.

1. Given Q_i, Q_{i+1} and $S_{i+1, i+1}$, we can apply up_i in time $\mathcal{O}(M(n) M(\delta_{i+1}))$.
2. Given $(Q_i, S_{i, i})_{2 \leq i \leq n}$, we can apply Up in time $\mathcal{O}(M(n) n M(\delta))$.

Example:

$$\text{Up}: \mathbb{A}_3 = (k[Z_1]/C_1)[X_2, X_3]/(C_2, C_3) \longrightarrow_{\text{up}_1} (k[Z_2]/Q_2)[X_3]/(C_3) \longrightarrow_{\text{up}_2} k[Z_3]/(Q_3)$$

with $n = 3, Z_1 = X_1$.

Univariate representation of \mathbb{A}_m

Algorithm - UnivRepNewtonSums

Input :

- $f \in k[T]$
- a primitive linear form $\Lambda := X_1 + \lambda_2 X_2 + \dots + \lambda_n X_n$ of \mathbb{A}

Output :

- a univariate representation $\mathfrak{P}_i = (Q_i, S_1, \dots, S_n)$ of \mathbb{A} .

Algorithm :

- Use **NewtonSums** to get for $2 \leq i \leq n$:
 - the minimal polynomials Q_i $\rightsquigarrow \mathcal{O}(2^n M(\delta))$
 - the last parametrizations $S_{i,i}$ of \mathbb{A}_i $\rightsquigarrow \mathcal{O}(2^n M(\delta))$
- Get the other parametrizations: $S_i(Z_n) = \text{Up}(X_i)$ $\rightsquigarrow \mathcal{O}(M(n) n M(\delta))$

Benchmarks

Advantage:

- Good timings:

Univariate representation of \mathbb{A}_n						
n		4	5	6	7	8
Time (sec)	Gröbner (F4) + FGLM	0.001	0.03	5.8	1500	>6h
	NewtonSums	0.005	0.05	0.52	6.8	100

with MAGMA 2.17-1 over $k = \mathbb{F}_p$ with p prime number of 28 bits.

Drawbacks:

- Complexity of **UnivRepNewtonSums** not quasi-optimal: $\mathcal{O}(2^n M(\delta))$.
- **NewtonSums** does not compute \mathcal{X}_P for general $P \in \mathbb{A}$.

Outline of the talk

Newton sums methods:

- i. Computation of \mathcal{X}_Λ for a linear form $\Lambda \in \mathbb{A}_m$
- ii. Change of representation : Up and Down
- iii. Univariate representation of \mathbb{A}_m
- iv. Benchmarks

Resultant methods:

- i. Computation of \mathcal{X}_P for any $P \in \mathbb{A}_m$
- ii. Benchmarks
- iii. Generalizations

Computation of \mathcal{X}_P for any $P \in \mathbb{A}$

Based on the **resultant approach** to compute resolvents:

- $R_n := T - P(X_1, \dots, X_n) \in k[X_1, \dots, X_n, T]$
- For $i = n - 1, \dots, 0$, $R_i := \text{Res}_{X_{i+1}}(C_{i+1}, R_{i+1}) \in k[X_1, \dots, X_i, T]$
- $\mathcal{X}_P = R_0 \in k[T]$.

Mathematically,

$$\text{Res}_{X_{i+1}}: \mathbb{A}_i[T][X_{i+1}] \times \mathbb{A}_i[T][X_{i+1}] \longrightarrow \mathbb{A}_i[T].$$

Multiplication in \mathbb{A}_i in time $\tilde{O}(\delta_m)$ + resultant algorithm on general ring

↪ Computation of \mathcal{X}_P for any $P \in \mathbb{A}_m$ in time $\tilde{O}(\delta_m)$

↪ Not practical

Computation of \mathcal{X}_P for any $P \in \mathbb{A}$

Algorithm - ResultantCharPol

Input : $P \in \mathbb{A}$

Output : $\mathcal{X}_{P,\mathbb{A}}$

Algorithm :

1. $G_n := \text{Up}_{n-1}(Y - P)$

$$G_n \in (k[Z_{n-1}]/Q_{n-1})[Y][Z_n]$$

2. for $i = n - 1 \dots 1$ do

$$C'_{i+1} := \text{Up}_i(C_{i+1})$$

$$C'_{i+1} \in (k[Z_i]/Q_i)[X_{i+1}][Y]$$

$$G'_i := \text{Res}_{X_{i+1}}(C'_{i+1}, G_{i+1})$$

$$G'_i \in (k[Z_i]/Q_i)[Y]$$

$$G_i := \text{down}_{i-1}(G'_i)$$

$$G_i \in (k[Z_{i-1}]/Q_{i-1})[Y][Z_i]$$

3. return $G_i := \text{down}_{i-1}(G'_i)$

$$G_0 \in k[Y]$$

Cost of **ResultantCharPol**: $\mathcal{O}(n^{(\omega+1)/2} n M(\delta))$

Computation of \mathcal{X}_P for any $P \in \mathbb{A}$

Algorithm - UnivRepResultant

Input :

- $f \in k[T]$;
- a primitive linear form $\Lambda := X_1 + \lambda_2 X_2 + \dots + \lambda_n X_n$ of \mathbb{A} ;

Output :

- a univariate representation $\mathfrak{P}_i = (Q_i, S_1, \dots, S_n)$ of \mathbb{A} .

Algorithm :

- For $2 \leq i \leq n$, use **ResultantCharPol** to get :

- the minimal polynomials Q_i

$$\mathcal{O}(n^{(\omega+1)/2} n M(\delta))$$

- the last parametrizations $S_{i,i}$ of \mathbb{A}_i

$$\mathcal{O}(n^{(\omega+1)/2} n M(\delta))$$

- Get the other parametrizations: $S_i(Z_n) = \text{Up}(X_i)$

$$\mathcal{O}(M(n) n M(\delta_n))$$

Benchmarks

MAGMA 2.17-1 over $k = \mathbb{F}_p$ with p prime number of 28 bits.

Characteristic polynomial for any $P \in \mathbb{A}$						
n		4	5	6	7	8
Time (sec)	Traces in $k[Z]/Q(Z)$ [SHOUP, '99]*	0.001	0.01	0.23	6.8	200
	ResultantCharPol*	0.03	0.24	2.6	46	1100

Characteristic polynomial for $P \in \mathbb{A}$ linear						
n		4	5	6	7	8
Time (sec)	NewtonSums	0.001	0.015	0.12	1.54	23
	Traces in $k[Z]/Q(Z)$ [SHOUP, '99]*	0.001	0.005	0.10	2.9	83
	ResultantCharPol*	0.03	0.24	2.6	46	1100

(*) Requires the precomputation of a univariate representation

Benchmarks

MAGMA 2.17-1 on one core of a Intel Xeon @2.27GHz, 74Gb of RAM over $k = \mathbb{F}_p$ with p prime number of 28 bits.

n		5	6	7	8
Time (sec)	Up*	0.008	0.1	2	40
	Down*	0.01	0.1	1.4	25
	Univariate \times *	40 μs	0.5 ms	0.006	0.06
	Univariate \div *	0.002	0.03	0.29	4.5
	MAGMA triangular \times	0.003	0.09	4	170
	MAGMA triangular \div	0.1	28	>30 min	>6 h

(*) Requires the precomputation of a univariate representation

Outline of the talk

Newton sums methods:

- i. Computation of \mathcal{X}_Λ for a linear form $\Lambda \in \mathbb{A}_m$
- ii. Change of representation : Up and Down
- iii. Univariate representation of \mathbb{A}_m
- iv. Benchmarks

Resultant methods:

- i. Computation of \mathcal{X}_P for any $P \in \mathbb{A}_m$
- ii. Benchmarks
- iii. Generalizations

Generalizations

Generalization: Adapt the situation to $G \subseteq \mathfrak{S}_n$.

Galoisian ideals:

$$\mathcal{I}_G = \{R \in k[X_1, \dots, X_n] \mid \forall \sigma \in G, R(\alpha_{\sigma(1)}, \dots, \alpha_{\sigma(n)}) = 0\}$$

Remark. If $G = \text{Gal}(f)$, then $k[X_1, \dots, X_n]/\mathcal{I}_G$ is a decomposition field of f .

Triangular sets of Galoisian ideals:

- [ORANGE, RENAULT, VALIBOUZE, '03]
- [LEDERER, '04]
- [RENAULT, YOKOYAMA, '06 '08]
- [ORANGE, RENAULT, YOKOYAMA, '09]

Generalizations

From triangular sets to univariate representation:

- Resultant approach is general
- **Up** and **Down** still in good complexity, due to $\forall i, f(X_i) = 0$

Applications:

- Computation of relative resolvents

$$L_{P,G}(T) := \prod_{\sigma \in G // \text{Stab } P} (T - P(\alpha_{\sigma(1)}, \dots, \alpha_{\sigma(n)})) \in k[T],$$

where $P \in k[X_1, \dots, X_n]^G$.

- Faster arithmetics in decomposition fields

Conclusion

Theoretical results:

- first quasi-linear algorithm for univariate representation in \mathbb{A}_m ;
- first quasi-linear algorithm for characteristic polynomial in \mathbb{A}_m ;
- Complexity improvement for the symbolic computation of absolute resolvents.

Practical results:

- MAGMA code;
- better timings for univariate representation of \mathbb{A} , Up, Down;
- as a result, better timings for arithmetic operations in \mathbb{A} , characteristic polynomial...

Thank you for your attention ;-)