## CoCoALib - Feature #1283

# Printing for (prime) finite fields

11 May 2019 21:53 - John Abbott

Status:	Closed	Start date:	11 May 2019
Priority:	Normal	Due date:	
Assignee:	John Abbott	% Done:	100%
Category:	Improving	Estimated time:	1.01 hour
Target version:	CoCoALib-0.99650 November 2019	Spent time:	1.00 hour
Description		•	
<pre>information). A typical entry is: RingHom(RingWithID(677, "ZZ[x]")&gt; RingWithID(550, "RingWithID(382)[x]") sending (x  &gt; x))</pre>			
RingHom(RingWit	hID(677, "ZZ[x]")> RingWithID(5	50, "RingWithID(	382)[x]") sending (x  > x))
		50, "RingWithID(	382)[x]") sending (x  > x))
Great! So what is th			
Great! So what is th	e characteristic?		

## History

#### #1 - 11 May 2019 21:57 - John Abbott

Consider the following session:

/\*\*/ P ::= ZZ/(5) [x]; /\*\*/ println P; RingWithID(4, "RingWithID(3)[x]") /\*\*/ CoeffRing(P); RingWithID(3, "FFp(5)")

Frankly RingWithID(3)[x] is pretty meaningless to the reader. Surely FFp(5)[x] is more helpful!

What do you think? Should I change the printing?

Note: to be honest I find the RingID almost never helpful (but it almost always printed)

## #2 - 28 May 2019 14:45 - John Abbott

- Status changed from New to In Progress
- % Done changed from 0 to 10

I am aware that in CoCoALib one can create two rings which are essentially "identical", but are not considered as being the same by CoCoALib. An easy example is to create QQ[x] twice. The rings are plainly the same (even same term-ordering), but CoCoALib regards them as distinct, so "mixed ring" errors can easily arise. The user may be puzzled if they print out the same; hence the idea of making the printed form also print the RingID...

However the current approach is quite inconvenient and rather unnatural, so I think we need a better solution. But what? And how?

#### #3 - 25 Sep 2019 14:32 - John Abbott

- Related to Support #1311: THINGS TO DO IN GENOVA September 2019 added

#### #4 - 25 Sep 2019 14:33 - John Abbott

- Assignee set to John Abbott
- % Done changed from 10 to 20

Anna says OK to my "hack". Now I need to document and check everything in.

## #5 - 25 Sep 2019 16:04 - John Abbott

- Status changed from In Progress to Resolved
- % Done changed from 20 to 80

## #6 - 25 Sep 2019 17:13 - John Abbott

- Status changed from Resolved to Closed
- % Done changed from 80 to 100

Where should the documentation go?

## #7 - 10 Oct 2019 18:46 - Anna Maria Bigatti

- Target version changed from CoCoALib-0.99700 to CoCoALib-0.99650 November 2019
- Estimated time set to 1.01 h