CoCoALib - Design \#970

## Weights in ElimMat?

11 Nov 2016 15:13 - Anna Maria Bigatti

|  | In Progress | Start date: | 11 Nov 2016 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Priority: | Normal | Due date: |  |
| Assignee: |  | \% Done: | 10\% |
| Category: | Improving | Estimated time: | 0.00 hour |
| Target version: | CoCoALib-1.0 | Spent time: | 0.30 hour |
| Description <br> (similar for ElimHomogMat) <br> What should ElimMat([2,3], mat([[1,5,2]])); return? (now it is (a)) |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| $\text { (a) } \begin{array}{lll} {[0,} & 1, & 1] \\ {[1,} & 5 & 2] \\ {[0,} & 0, & -1 \end{array}$ |  |  |  |
| (b) | $\begin{array}{lll} 0, & 5, & 2], \\ 1, & 5, & 2], \\ 0, & 0, & -1] \end{array}$ |  |  |
| $\text { (c) } \begin{aligned} & {[0,5,2]} \\ & {[1,0,0]} \\ & {[0,0,} \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |

## History

\#1-11 Nov 2016 15:35-John Abbott
I prefer (c) to (b) perhaps because it is sparser.
(a) and (c) clearly do not give the same term-ordering though they are both clearly elimination orderings for indets 2 and 3.

What will you do if the weights are not given by a single row?
Case (a) clearly extends to any weights matrix; it is not so clear to me how to extend the other approach (just take first non-zero entry in the corresponding column?)

## \#2-11 Nov 2016 15:49-John Abbott

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

I suggest proceeding with definition (a):

- it is already implemented
- it is easy to explain/describe

If we come across an application where definition (a) is inappropriate then we can consider an alternative definition inspired by that application.

