CoCoALib - Feature \#961
New function: ReducedGBasis
03 Nov 2016 08:50 - Anna Maria Bigatti

| Status: | Closed | Start date: | 03 Nov 2016 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Priority: | Normal | Due date: |  |  |
| Assignee: | Anna Maria Bigatti | \% Done: | 100\% |  |
| Category: | New Function | Estimated time: | 6.00 hours |  |
| Target version: | CoCoALib-0.99550 spring 2017 | Spent time: | 4.55 hours |  |
| Description |  |  |  |  |
| Supposing we already have GBasis and later we compute ReducedGBasis, should we replace the TidyGens field? One should think so, but there are bad (non-homogeneous) examples like ( $x-y^{\wedge} 100, y-z-1$ ). |  |  |  | ns field? |
| Related issues: |  |  |  |  |
| Related to CoCoALib - Feature \#957: New function: HasGBasis |  |  | Closed | 27 Oct 2016 |
| Related to CoCoALib - Feature \#1016: ReducedGBasis for RingWeyl (and other no... |  |  | Closed | 02 Mar 2017 |
| Related to CoCoA-5-Slug \#405: ReducedGBasis not memorized in an ideal |  |  | Closed | 09 Oct 2013 |

## History

\#1-23 Nov 2016 08:34 - Anna Maria Bigatti

- \% Done changed from 0 to 70

I realized, after trying to implement it, that CoCoALib myDoGBasis already does it!!
In fact the only operation non done was to make it monic (for historical CoCoA-4 communication).
Now I made it monic, so that GBasis is actually identical to ReducedGBasis.
Is this a good idea or not?

## \#2-23 Nov 2016 08:35-Anna Maria Bigatti

- Status changed from New to In Progress
- Target version changed from CoCoALib-0.99560 to CoCoALib-0.99550 spring 2017


## \#3-02 Dec 2016 09:13 - Anna Maria Bigatti

the GBasis is not reduced if the ring is not commutative
(ideal( $\mathrm{x}, \mathrm{dx}$ ) is homogeneous, so the algorithm does not expect degree drops)
For the moment I fixed this in CoCoA-5, but I should set the right flag inside cocoalib.

## \#4-12 Jan 2017 15:12-Anna Maria Bigatti

- Related to Feature \#957: New function: HasGBasis added


## \#5-02 Mar 2017 11:24-John Abbott

I prefer to have two distinct functions GBasis and ReducedGBasis because:

- the name ReducedGBasis gives a guarantee for the future... the caller knows that it should return a result with known properties
- the name GBasis gives the caller a potentially weaker guarantee, and would allow us (as developers) the freedom to return non reduced bases ( e.g. with integer coeffs rather than made monic)

Also I think someone reading code which uses ReducedGBasis knows that the result should be "nice".

## \#6-02 Mar 2017 13:46 - Anna Maria Bigatti

John Abbott wrote:

I prefer to have two distinct functions GBasis and ReducedGBasis because:
done.
Should pass it to cocoa-5.

## \#7-29 Mar 2017 18:21-Anna Maria Bigatti

- Status changed from In Progress to Closed
- \% Done changed from 70 to 100

In conclusion: all done for the commutative case.
To do for non-commutative case (new issue).
Closing this one.

## \#8-29 Mar 2017 18:22 - Anna Maria Bigatti

- Related to Feature \#1016: ReducedGBasis for RingWeyl (and other non-commutative rings) added


## \#9-21 Apr 2017 11:09-Anna Maria Bigatti

- Status changed from Closed to Resolved

Found bug in interreduction.

ReducedGBasis(ideal( $\left.x^{\star} y, y^{\wedge} 3+x, y^{\wedge} 3\right)$ );
(thanks to strange error in GroebnerFan! https://cocoa.dima.unige.it/redmine/issues/780\#note-6)
Fixing it.

## \#10-21 Apr 2017 15:14 - Anna Maria Bigatti

Subtle.... I think there were two problems: I fixed one (now repeating the cycle if a new LPP is found during interreduction), but the bug is still there. Now I think the problem is a dangling iterator (aaaargh!).

## \#11-21 Apr 2017 15:32-Anna Maria Bigatti

I checked the example in https://cocoa.dima.unige.it/redmine/issues/418.
I convinced myself that this cannot happen in the final interreduction of a GB computation, i.e. no new LPP can appear at this stage (its a GB!!). So my earlier suspicion was wrong.

Also the suspiction of a dangly iterator was wrong: it just happened that, in the unlikely event that the first poly in the GB has to be removed, the
second is skipped by the ++it in the for loop. I put the increment in the right place of the cycle, and it works.

## \#12-21 Apr 2017 17:08-Anna Maria Bigatti

- Status changed from Resolved to Closed


## \#13-27 Apr 2017 14:56-Anna Maria Bigatti

- Related to Slug \#405: ReducedGBasis not memorized in an ideal added

