Schemes for Deterministic Polynomial Factoring

Gábor Ivanyos [*]   Marek Karpinski [†]   Nitin Saxena [‡]

Abstract

In this work we relate the deterministic complexity of factoring polynomials (over finite fields) to certain combinatorial objects we call m-schemes. We extend the known conditional deterministic subexponential time polynomial factoring algorithm for finite fields to get an underlying m-scheme. We demonstrate how the properties of m-schemes relate to improvements in the deterministic complexity of factoring polynomials over finite fields assuming the generalized Riemann Hypothesis (GRH). In particular, we give the first deterministic polynomial time algorithm (assuming GRH) to find a nontrivial factor of a polynomial of prime degree n where $(n-1)$ is a smooth number.

Keywords: Polynomials, Factoring, Deterministic, Schemes, GRH.

1   Introduction

We consider the classical problem of finding a nontrivial factor of a given polynomial over a finite field. This problem has various randomized polynomial time algorithms – Berlekamp [Ber67], Cantor and Zassenhaus [CZ81], von zur Gathen and Shoup [GS92], Kaltofen and Shoup [KS98] – but its deterministic complexity is a longstanding open problem. In this paper we study the deterministic complexity of the problem assuming the generalized Riemann Hypothesis (GRH). The assumption of GRH in this paper is needed only to find primitive r-th nonresidues in a finite field $\mathbb{F}_q$ which are in turn used to find a root x (if it exists in $\mathbb{F}_q$) of "special" polynomials: $x^r - a$ over $\mathbb{F}_q$ (see [Evd89]).

Assuming GRH, there are many deterministic factoring algorithms known but all of them are exponential-time except on special instances. Rónyai [Ró92] showed under GRH that any polynomial $f(x) \in \mathbb{Z}[x]$, such that $\mathbb{Q}[x]/(f)$ is a Galois extension, can be factored modulo p in deterministic polynomial time except for finitely many primes p. Rónyai's result generalizes previous results by Huang [Hua91], Evdokimov [Evd89] and Adleman, Manders and Miller [AMM77]. Over special finite fields, Bach, von zur Gathen and Lenstra [BGL01] showed that polynomials over finite fields of characteristic p can be factored in deterministic polynomial time if $\phi_k(p)$ is smooth for some integer k, where $\phi_k(x)$ is the k-th cyclotomic polynomial. This result generalizes the previous works of Rónyai [Ró89], Mignotte and Schnorr [MS88], von zur Gathen [vzG87], Camion [Cam83] and Moenck [Moe77].

The line of research that we extend in this paper was started by Rónyai [Ró88]. There it was shown how to use GRH to find a nontrivial factor of a polynomial $f(x)$, where the degree n of $f(x)$ has a small prime factor, in deterministic polynomial time. The basic idea of [Ró88], in the case when n is even, was to go to a ring extension $\mathcal{A}^{(2)} := \mathbb{F}_q[x_1, x_2]/(f(x_1), f_2(x_1, x_2))$ of $\mathcal{A}^{(1)} := \mathbb{F}_q[x_1]/(f(x_1))$, where $f_2(x_1, x_2) := \frac{f(x_2)}{x_2 - x_1}$, and then use the symmetry of $\mathcal{A}^{(2)}$ to

---

[*]Computer and Automation Research Institute of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences, Lágymányosi u. 11, 1111 Budapest, Hungary. E-mail: `Gabor.Ivanyos@sztaki.hu`

[†]Department of Computer Science, University of Bonn, 53117 Bonn, Germany. E-mail: `marek@cs.uni-bonn.de`

[‡]Hausdorff Center for Mathematics, Endenicher Allee 60, 53115 Bonn, Germany. E-mail: `ns@hcm.uni-bonn.de`

decompose $\mathcal{A}^{(2)}$ under GRH. A decomposition of $\mathcal{A}^{(2)}$ gives us a nontrivial factor of $f(x)$ since n is even. [Ró88] showed that this basic idea can be extended to the case when a prime $r|n$ but then the deterministic algorithm finds a nontrivial factor of $f(x)$ in time $poly(\log q, n^r)$. The n^r dependence appears in the complexity estimate because this is roughly the dimension of the algebras, like:

$$\mathbb{F}_q[x_1, \ldots, x_r]/(f(x_1), \ldots, f_r(x_1, \ldots, x_r)) \tag{1}$$

in which the algorithm does computation. Naively, it would seem that this algorithm will take time $poly(\log q, n^n)$ in the worst case (for example when n is a prime). But Evdokimov [Evd94] showed that Rónyai's algorithm can be modified such that it is enough to work with algebras like (1) with $r = \log n$, thus, polynomial factoring can be done deterministically in time $poly(\log q, n^{\log n})$ under GRH.

We extend Evdokimov's algorithm and show that our algorithm has an underlying natural combinatorial structure that we call an m-scheme (a generalization of superschemes introduced by Smith [Smi94]). An *m-scheme on n points* is, roughly speaking, a partition $\mathcal{P}$ of the set $[n]^m$, where $[n]$ denotes the set $\{1, \ldots, n\}$:

$$[n]^m = \cup_{P \in \mathcal{P}} P$$

that satisfies certain "natural" properties (defined in Section 2). There is an abundance of examples of m-schemes in algebraic combinatorics:

- a regular graph on n vertices is an example of a 2-scheme on n points,

- a strongly regular graph on n vertices is an example of a 3-scheme on n points,

- an association scheme (see [Zie]) gives rise to a 3-scheme and vice-versa. See Section 2.2 for these kind of examples.

- n-schemes on n points *always* arise from groups. See Section 2.3 for constructing them from groups and [Smi94] for the converse. This important example suggests that m-schemes can be considered as a generalization of finite groups.

- curiously enough, m-schemes on n points also appear when the $(m-1)$-dimensional Weisfeiler-Lehman method for graph isomorphism is applied to a graph on n vertices, see [CFI92].

The m-schemes that appear in our polynomial factoring algorithm possess a special structure and we believe that their properties can be exploited to get a deterministic and efficient polynomial factoring algorithm (under GRH). We demonstrate that this belief infact works in several cases.

It is a standard result that to solve polynomial factoring it is enough to factor polynomials that split completely over prime fields (see Berlekamp [Ber67, Ber70] and Zassenhaus [Zas69]). Thus, we will assume in this paper that the input polynomial $f(x)$ of degree n has n distinct roots in $\mathbb{F}_p$ for some prime p. Our algorithm for factoring $f(x)$ constructs an r-scheme on the n roots while working in the algebra of Equation (1), over a suitable $\mathbb{F}_q \supseteq \mathbb{F}_p$. We give several results in this work showing how to utilise the properties of these underlying r-schemes to efficiently find a nontrivial factor of $f(x)$.

The paper is organized as follows. We formally define m-schemes in Section 2 and exhibit two important examples. In Section 3 we introduce our framework of the tensor powers $\mathcal{A}^{\otimes m}$ of the algebra $\mathcal{A} := \mathbb{F}_p[x]/(f(x))$ and present our algorithm that constructs an underlying m-scheme, on the n roots of $f(x)$, while working in $\mathcal{A}^{\otimes m}$. In Section 4 we show how to interpret Evdokimov's subexponential algorithm in our framework of m-schemes and give a conjecture about the structure of m-schemes which if true would make our algorithm deterministic polynomial time under GRH. We also prove the conjecture in the important example of m-schemes arising from groups. In Section 5 we show that our framework of m-schemes finds a nontrivial factor of $f(x)$ in deterministic polynomial time under GRH if n is a prime and $(n-1)$ is smooth. In Section 6 we show that the *levels r* (as in Equation (1)) in Evdokimov's algorithm can be reduced to $\frac{\log n}{1.5}$

using properties of m-schemes. In Section 7 we introduce a concept of *primitivity* in m-schemes, inspired from the connectivity of graphs, and give some hints how it could improve the factoring algorithm.

2 Introducing m-schemes

In this section we define special partitions of the set $[n]^m$ that we call m-schemes on n points. These combinatorial objects are closely related to superschemes which were first defined by [Smi94].

2.1 Basic definitions

Let $V = \{v_1, \ldots, v_n\}$ be a set of n distinct elements. For $1 \leq s \leq n$, define the set of s-tuples:

$$V^{(s)} := \{(v_{i_1}, \ldots, v_{i_s}) \in V^s \mid v_{i_1}, \ldots, v_{i_s} \text{ are } s \text{ distinct elements of } V\}.$$

If $s > 1$ there are s projections $\pi_1^s, \ldots, \pi_s^s : V^{(s)} \to V^{(s-1)}$ given as:

$$\pi_i^s : (v_1, \ldots, v_{i-1}, v_i, v_{i+1}, \ldots, v_s) \mapsto (v_1, \ldots, v_{i-1}, v_{i+1}, \ldots, v_s).$$

The symmetric group on s elements Symm_s acts on $V^{(s)}$ in a natural way by permuting the coordinates of the s-tuples. To be more accurate, the action is the following: for $\sigma \in \mathrm{Symm}_s$,

$$(v_1, \ldots, v_i, \ldots, v_s)^\sigma = (v_{1^\sigma}, \ldots, v_{i^\sigma}, \ldots, v_{s^\sigma}).$$

For $1 \leq m \leq n$ an *m-collection* on V is a collection Π of partitions $\mathcal{P}_1, \mathcal{P}_2, \ldots, \mathcal{P}_m$ of $V = V^{(1)}, V^{(2)}, \ldots, V^{(m)}$ respectively. For $1 \leq s \leq m$ we denote by $\equiv_{\mathcal{P}_s}$ the equivalence relation on $V^{(s)}$ corresponding to the partition $\mathcal{P}_s$. We call the equivalence classes of $\equiv_{\mathcal{P}_s}$ *colors at level s*.

We define below some natural properties of collections that are relevant to us. Let $\Pi = \{\mathcal{P}_1, \mathcal{P}_2, \ldots, \mathcal{P}_m\}$ be an m-collection on V.

Compatibility: We say that Π is *compatible* at level $1 < s \leq m$ if $\bar{u}, \bar{v} \in P \in \mathcal{P}_s$ implies that for every $1 \leq i \leq s$ there exists $Q \in \mathcal{P}_{s-1}$ such that $\pi_i^s(\bar{u}), \pi_i^s(\bar{v}) \in Q$. In other words, if two tuples (at level s) have the same color then for every projection the projected tuples (at level $s-1$) have the same color as well. It follows that for a class $P \in \mathcal{P}_s$, the sets $\pi_i^s(P) := \{\pi_i^s(\bar{v}) | \bar{v} \in P\}$, for all $i \in [s]$, are colors in $\mathcal{P}_{s-1}$.

Regularity: We say that Π is *regular* at level $1 < s \leq m$ if $\bar{u}, \bar{v} \in Q \in \mathcal{P}_{s-1}$ implies that for every $1 \leq i \leq s$ and for every $P \in \mathcal{P}_s$,

$$\#\{\bar{u}' \in P \mid \pi_i^s(\bar{u}') = \bar{u}\} = \#\{\bar{v}' \in P \mid \pi_i^s(\bar{v}') = \bar{v}\}$$

We call the tuples in $P \cap (\pi_i^s)^{-1}(\bar{u})$ as π_i^s-*fibers* of $\bar{u}$ in P. So regularity, in other words, means that the cardinalities of the fibers above a tuple depend only on the color of the tuple.

The above two properties motivate the definition of the *subdegree of a color P over a color Q* as $\frac{\#P}{\#Q}$ when Π is compatible and regular at level s and $\pi_i^s(P) = Q$ for some i.

Invariance: An m-collection is *invariant* at level $1 < s \leq m$ if for every $P \in \mathcal{P}_s$, and $\sigma \in \mathrm{Symm}_s$ we have:

$$P^\sigma := \{\bar{v}^\sigma | \bar{v} \in P\} \in \mathcal{P}_s.$$

In other words, the partitions $\mathcal{P}_1, \ldots, \mathcal{P}_m$ are invariant under the action of the corresponding symmetric group.

Homogeneity: We say that the m-collection Π is *homogeneous* if $|\mathcal{P}_1| = 1$.

Symmetry: We say that an m-collection Π is *symmetric* at level s if for every $P \in \mathcal{P}_s$ and $\sigma \in \mathrm{Symm}_s$, we have $P^\sigma = P$.

Antisymmetry: We say that an m-collection Π is *antisymmetric* at level s if for every $P \in \mathcal{P}_s$ and $1 \neq \sigma \in \mathrm{Symm}_s$, we have $P^\sigma \neq P$.

Definition 1. *An m-collection is called compatible, regular, invariant, symmetric, or antisymmetric if it is at every level $1 < s \leq m$ compatible, regular, invariant, symmetric, or antisymmetric respectively.*

An m-collection is called an m-scheme if it is compatible, regular and invariant.

We should remark that the m-schemes that appear in our factoring algorithm are homogeneous and antisymmetric as well. Let us now see some easily describable examples of m-schemes.

2.2 Example: 3-schemes from coherent configurations

Coherent configurations are standard combinatorial objects that have strongly regular graphs as examples (see [Came99]). Recall that a coherent configuration is just a 2-scheme $\{\mathcal{P}_1, \mathcal{P}_2\}$ that also has a composition property:

Composition: For any $P_i, P_j, P_k \in \mathcal{P}_2$ and an $(\alpha, \beta) \in P_k$ the number:

$$\#\{\gamma \in V \mid (\alpha, \gamma) \in P_i \text{ and } (\gamma, \beta) \in P_j\}$$

is independent of which tuple (α, β) in P_k we chose. In other words, the relations P_i and P_j can be "composed" to get a bigger relation that is just a "linear combination" of the relations in $\mathcal{P}_2$.

In the literature a homogeneous coherent configuration is usually called an *association scheme*. In this paper we do not enforce symmetricity or antisymmetricity in the definition of an association scheme. Coherent configurations and 3-schemes are similar notions.

From a coherent configuration $\{\mathcal{P}_1, \mathcal{P}_2\}$ we can define a partition $\mathcal{P}_3$ on the triples such that for any two triples (u_1, u_2, u_3) and (v_1, v_2, v_3) we have:

$(u_1, u_2, u_3) \equiv_{\mathcal{P}_3} (v_1, v_2, v_3)$ if and only if $(u_1, u_2) \equiv_{\mathcal{P}_2} (v_1, v_2)$, $(u_1, u_3) \equiv_{\mathcal{P}_2} (v_1, v_3)$, $(u_2, u_3) \equiv_{\mathcal{P}_2} (v_2, v_3)$.

It follows that for $P \in \mathcal{P}_3$, the cardinality $\#\{u_3 \in V | (u_1, u_2, u_3) \in P\}$ of the π_3^3-fibers of (u_1, u_2) in P is exactly $\#\{u_3 \in V | (u_1, u_3) \in \pi_2^3(P) \text{ and } (u_2, u_3) \in \pi_1^3(P)\}$ and thus regularity at level 3 is equivalent to the composition property of $\{\mathcal{P}_1, \mathcal{P}_2\}$. It is easy to show that $\{\mathcal{P}_1, \mathcal{P}_2, \mathcal{P}_3\}$ also satisfies compatibility and invariance, thus, it is a 3-scheme.

Similarly, a converse can be shown:

Lemma 2. *If $\Pi = \{\mathcal{P}_1, \mathcal{P}_2, \mathcal{P}_3\}$ is a homogeneous 3-scheme then $\{\mathcal{P}_1, \mathcal{P}_2\}$ is an association scheme.*

Proof. By the hypothesis we already have that $\{\mathcal{P}_1, \mathcal{P}_2\}$ is a homogeneous 2-scheme. Thus, we only need to show the composition property. Let $P_i, P_j, P_k \in \mathcal{P}_2$ and let $(\alpha, \beta) \in P_k$. Then by compatibility at level 3 there exists a subset $\mathcal{S} \subseteq \mathcal{P}_3$ such that the set:

$$\{\gamma \in V \mid (\alpha, \gamma) \in P_i, (\gamma, \beta) \in P_j\}$$

can be partitioned as:

$$\sqcup_{P \in \mathcal{S}}\{\gamma \in V \mid (\alpha, \gamma) \in P_i, (\gamma, \beta) \in P_j, (\alpha, \gamma, \beta) \in P\}$$

which again by the compatibility of Π at level 3 is:

$$\sqcup_{P \in \mathcal{S}}\{\gamma \in V \mid (\alpha, \gamma, \beta) \in P\}$$

now by the regularity of Π at level 3 the size of the above sets is simply $\frac{\#P}{\#P_k}$ which is independent of the choice of (α, β). Thus, $\{\mathcal{P}_1, \mathcal{P}_2\}$ has the composition property. $\square$

2.3 Example: orbit schemes

Permutation groups provide a host of examples (see [Smi94]). Let $G \leq \mathrm{Symm}_V$ be a permutation group. The *orbits* of G on the s-tuples ($1 \leq s \leq m \leq n$) give an m-scheme. More formally, define the partition $\mathcal{P}_s$ as: for any two s-tuples $(u_1, \ldots, u_s)$ and $(v_1, \ldots, v_s)$ in $V^{(s)}$, $(u_1, \ldots, u_s) \equiv_{\mathcal{P}_s} (v_1, \ldots, v_s)$ iff $\exists \sigma \in G$, $(\sigma(u_1), \ldots, \sigma(u_s)) = (v_1, \ldots, v_s)$. It is easy to see that these partitions naturally satisfy compatibility, regularity and invariance properties and hence form an m-scheme. We call m-schemes arising in this way *orbit m-schemes*.

The orbit scheme is homogeneous if and only if G is transitive. Furthermore, assume that G is transitive and for some integer $m < n$, $\gcd(m!, |G|) = 1$. Then the corresponding orbit m-scheme is a homogeneous antisymmetric m-scheme. Our attention to this class of examples has been drawn by D. Pasechnik.

At the moment, we are not aware of any other examples of homogeneous antisymmetric m-schemes with $m \to \infty$. The homogeneous antisymmetric m-schemes are the ones that arise in our factoring algorithm and we do believe that their parameters satisfy more stringent conditions than the general m-schemes. For a conjecture along these lines see Section 4.1.

2.4 Difference between various notions of schemes

The term *schemes* arises in the mathematical literature in many contexts. Our m-schemes should not be confused with the notion of *schemes* in algebraic geometry. However, our m-schemes are closely related to *association schemes*, *superschemes* (Smith [Smi94]) and *height t presuperschemes* (Wojdyło [Woj01]). Smith's superschemes are m-schemes that also satisfy a suitable higher dimensional generalization of the composition property. It is not difficult to see that a superscheme on n points is just a n-scheme on n points. Wojdyło's height t presuperscheme consists of the bottom t levels of a superscheme. In particular, a level 0 presuperscheme is just an association scheme. It can be shown that a height t presuperscheme on n-points consists just of the first $(t + 2)$ levels of a $(t + 3)$-scheme on n points.

3 Decomposition of tensor powers of algebras

In this section we describe our polynomial factoring algorithm and simultaneously show how m-schemes appear in the algorithm. Recall that in the input we are given a polynomial $f(x) \in \mathbb{F}_p$ of degree n having distinct roots $\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_n$ in $\mathbb{F}_p$. For any extension field k of $\mathbb{F}_p$ we have the natural associated algebra $\mathcal{A} := k[X]/(f(X))$. Note that $\mathcal{A}$ is a completely split semisimple n-dimensional algebra over the field k, i.e. $\mathcal{A}$ is isomorphic to k^n the direct sum of n copies of the one-dimensional k-algebra k. We interpret $\mathcal{A}$ as the set of functions:

$$V := \{\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_n\} \to k$$

equipped with the pointwise operations. Algorithmically, we have $\mathcal{A}$ by structure constants with respect to some basis $b_1, \ldots, b_n$ (for example, $1, X, \ldots, X^{n-1}$) and the problem of factoring $f(X)$ completely can be viewed as finding an explicit isomorphism from $\mathcal{A}$ to k^n.

How do the factors of $f(X)$ appear in $\mathcal{A}$? They appear as *zero divisors* in $\mathcal{A}$. Recall that a zero divisor is a nonzero element $z(X) \in \mathcal{A}$ such that $y(X)z(X) = 0$ for some nonzero element $y(X) \in \mathcal{A}$. This means that $f(X)|y(X) \cdot z(X)$ which implies (by the nonzeroness of y and z) $gcd(f(X), z(X))$ factors $f(X)$ nontrivially. As gcd of polynomials can be computed by the deterministic polynomial time Euclidean algorithm, we infer that finding a zero divisor in the factor algebra $k[X]/(f(X))$ is – up to polynomial time deterministic reductions – equivalent to finding a nontrivial divisor of $f(X)$. Furthermore, computing an explicit isomorphism with k^n is equivalent to factoring $f(X)$ completely.

How are the ideals of $\mathcal{A}$ related to the roots of $f(x)$? Let I be an ideal of $\mathcal{A}$. The *support of I*, $\mathrm{Supp}(I)$ is defined as

$$\mathrm{Supp}(I) := V \setminus \{v \in V \mid a(v) = 0 \text{ for every } a \in I\}$$

Conversely, for $U \subseteq V$, the ideal $\mathrm{I}(U)$ is defined as:

$$\mathrm{I}(U) := \{b \in \mathcal{A} \mid b(u) = 0 \text{ for every } u \in U\}$$

and $\mathrm{I}^{\perp}(U)$ is the *annihilator* of $\mathrm{I}(U)$:

$$\mathrm{I}^{\perp}(U) := \{a \in \mathcal{A} \mid ab = 0 \text{ for every } b \in \mathrm{I}(U)\}.$$

It can be easily seen that Supp is an inclusion preserving bijection from the ideals of $\mathcal{A}$ to the subsets of V with inverse map $\mathrm{I}^{\perp}$. In view of this correspondence, partial decompositions of $\mathcal{A}$ into sums of pairwise orthogonal ideals correspond to partitions of the set V. Let us formulate the above discussion in a lemma.

Lemma 3. *If $I_1, \ldots, I_t$ are pairwise orthogonal ideals of $\mathcal{A}$ such that $\mathcal{A} = I_1 + \cdots + I_t$ then $V = \mathrm{Supp}(I_1) \sqcup \cdots \sqcup \mathrm{Supp}(I_t)$.*

We now move up to the tensor powers of $\mathcal{A}$ and there we show a way of getting the partitions of $V^{(m)}$. For $m \in [n]$, let $\mathcal{A}^{\otimes m}$ denote the mth tensor power of $\mathcal{A}$. $\mathcal{A}^{\otimes m}$ is also a completely split semisimple algebra; it is isomorphic to k^{n^m}. We again interpret it as the algebra of functions from V^m to k. Note that in this interpretation the rank 1 tensor element $h_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes h_m$ corresponds to a function $V^m \to k$ that maps $(x_1, \ldots, x_m) \mapsto h_1(x_1) \cdots h_m(x_m)$.

The *essential part* $\mathcal{A}^{(m)}$ of $\mathcal{A}^{\otimes m}$ is the ideal consisting of the functions which vanish on all the m-tuples $(v_1, \ldots, v_m)$ with $v_i = v_j$ for some $i \neq j$. Then $\mathcal{A}^{(m)}$ can be interpreted as the algebra of functions $V^{(m)} \to k$. We show below that a basis for $\mathcal{A}^{(m)}$ can be computed easily and then this is the algebra where our factoring algorithm does computations.

Lemma 4. *Given $f(X)$, a polynomial of degree n having n distinct roots in $\mathbb{F}_p$, a basis for $\mathcal{A}^{(m)} = (k[X]/(f(X)))^{(m)}$ over $k \supseteq \mathbb{F}_p$ can be computed by a deterministic algorithm in time $poly(\log p, n^m)$.*

Proof. To see this, consider embeddings μ_i of $\mathcal{A}$ into $\mathcal{A}^{\otimes m}$ $(i = 1, \ldots, m)$ given as $\mu_i(a) = 1 \otimes \ldots \otimes 1 \otimes a \otimes 1 \otimes \ldots \otimes 1$ where a is of course in the i-th place. In the interpretation as functions, $\mu_i(\mathcal{A})$ correspond to the functions on V^m which depend only on the ith element in the tuples. Observe that the set, for $1 \leq i < j \leq m$:

$$\Delta_{i,j}^m = \{b \in \mathcal{A}^{\otimes m} \mid (\mu_i(a) - \mu_j(a))b = 0 \text{ for every } a \in \mathcal{A}\}$$

is the ideal of $\mathcal{A}^{\otimes m}$ consisting of the functions which are zero on every tuple $(v_1, \ldots, v_m)$ with $v_i \neq v_j$. Given a basis for $\mathcal{A}$, a basis for $\Delta_{i,j}^m$ can be computed by solving a system of linear equations in time polynomial in the dimension of $\mathcal{A}^{\otimes m}$ (over k) which is n^m. Finally, notice that $\mathcal{A}^{(m)}$ can be computed as well since it is the annihilator of $\sum_{1 \leq i < j \leq m} \Delta_{i,j}^m$. $\square$

Remark 5. *The algebras $\mathcal{A}^{(m)}$ which we are now going to work with have a simple explicit description, for example, $\mathcal{A}^{(1)}$ is ofcourse $k[X_1]/(f(X_1))$ and $\mathcal{A}^{(2)}$ is nothing but $k[X_1, X_2]/(f(X_1), f_2(X_1, X_2))$ where $f_2(X_1, X_2)$ is a polynomial in $\mathcal{A}^{(1)}[X_2]$ defined as $\frac{f(X_2)}{X_2 - X_1}$. Similarly, we can write down an expression for $\mathcal{A}^{(m)}$ inductively.*

Like the case of $m = 1$, ideals and partial decompositions of $\mathcal{A}^{(m)}$ into pairwise orthogonal ideals correspond to subsets and partitions of the set $V^{(m)}$ respectively. If I is an ideal of $\mathcal{A}^{(m)}$ then we again define the *support of I*, $\mathrm{Supp}(I)$ as:

$$\mathrm{Supp}(I) := V^{(m)} \setminus \{\bar{v} \in V^{(m)} \mid a(\bar{v}) = 0 \text{ for every } a \in I\}$$

Lemma 3 generalizes to:

Lemma 6. *For any $s \leq n$, if $I_{s,1}, \ldots, I_{s,t_s}$ are pairwise orthogonal ideals of $\mathcal{A}^{(s)}$ such that $\mathcal{A}^{(s)} = I_{s,1} + \cdots + I_{s,t_s}$ then $V^{(s)} = \mathrm{Supp}(I_{s,1}) \sqcup \cdots \sqcup \mathrm{Supp}(I_{s,t_s})$.*

Now we will describe our polynomial factoring algorithm that produces m-schemes.

Algorithm Description

Input: a degree n polynomial $f(x)$ having n distinct roots in $\mathbb{F}_p$. Given $1 < m \leq n$ we can wlog assume that we also have the smallest field extension $k \supseteq \mathbb{F}_p$ having s-th nonresidues for all $s \in [m]$ (computing k will take $poly(\log p, m^m)$ time under GRH).

Output: a nontrivial factor of $f(x)$ or a homogeneous, antisymmetric m-scheme on the n points: $V := \{\alpha \in \mathbb{F}_p | f(\alpha) = 0\}$.

Algorithm overview:

We define $\mathcal{A}^{(1)} = \mathcal{A} = k[x]/(f(x))$ and compute $\mathcal{A}^{(s)}$, for all $s \in [m]$, in time $poly(\log p, n^m)$ (by Lemma 4).

Now observe that $Aut_k(\mathcal{A}^{(s)})$ contains Symm_s. To see this, just note that there is an action of Symm_s on $\mathcal{A}^{(s)}$ as a group of algebra automorphism, for $\sigma \in \mathrm{Symm}_s$ this action is the linear extension of:

$$(b_{i_1} \otimes \cdots \otimes b_{i_s})^\sigma = b_{i_{1\sigma}} \otimes \cdots \otimes b_{i_{s\sigma}}.$$

This knowledge of explicit automorphisms of $\mathcal{A}^{(s)}$ can be exploited to efficiently decompose these algebras under GRH (see Theorem 2.3 in [Ró92]). Thus, for all $1 < s \leq m$ we can compute mutually orthogonal $t_s \geq 2$ ideals $I_{s,i}$ of $\mathcal{A}^{(s)}$, such that:

$$\mathcal{A}^{(s)} = I_{s,1} + \ldots + I_{s,t_s}$$

By Lemma 6, the above decomposition induces partitions $\mathcal{P}_s$ for all $1 < s \leq m$ such that:

$$\mathcal{P}_s : \quad V^{(s)} = \mathrm{Supp}(I_{s,1}) \sqcup \cdots \sqcup \mathrm{Supp}(I_{s,t_s})$$

Thus, together with $\mathcal{P}_1 := \{V\}$ we have an m-collection $\Pi := (\mathcal{P}_1, \ldots, \mathcal{P}_m)$ on the set V.

Now we will show how to refine this m-collection to an m-scheme using algebraic operations on the ideals $I_{s,i}$ of $\mathcal{A}^{(s)}$. To do that, we first need a tool to relate lower level ideals $I_{s-1,i}$ to higher level ideals $I_{s,i'}$. For every $1 < s \leq m$, we have s embeddings $\iota_j^s : \mathcal{A}^{\otimes(s-1)} \to \mathcal{A}^{\otimes s}$ sending $b_{i_1} \otimes \cdots \otimes b_{i_{s-1}}$ to $b_{i_1} \otimes \cdots \otimes b_{i_{j-1}} \otimes 1 \otimes b_{i_j} \otimes \cdots b_{i_{s-1}}$. Restricting to $\mathcal{A}^{(s-1)}$ and multiplying the images of ι_j^s by the identity element of $\mathcal{A}^{(s)}$, we obtain algebra embeddings $\mathcal{A}^{(s-1)} \to \mathcal{A}^{(s)}$ denoted also by $\iota_1^s, \ldots, \iota_s^s$. In the function interpretation, $\iota_j^s(\mathcal{A}^{(s-1)})$ is just the set of functions in $\mathcal{A}^{(s)}$ which do not depend on the jth coordinate of tuples.

Compatibility of the m-collection Π at level $1 < s \leq m$ corresponds to: for every pair of ideals $I_{s-1,i}$ and $I_{s,i'}$ in the decomposition of $\mathcal{A}^{(s-1)}$ and $\mathcal{A}^{(s)}$ respectively and for every $j \in \{1, \ldots, s\}$, the ideal $\iota_j^s(I_{s-1,i})I_{s,i'}$ can be assumed to be either zero or $I_{s,i'}$. Otherwise we can efficiently compute a subideal of $I_{s,i'}$, hence, refining $I_{s,i'}$ and the m-collection Π.

Regularity of the m-collection Π at level $1 < s \leq m$ corresponds to: for every pair of ideals $I_{s-1,i}$ and $I_{s,i'}$ in the decomposition of $\mathcal{A}^{(s-1)}$ and $\mathcal{A}^{(s)}$, respectively, and for every $j \in \{1, \ldots, s\}$, $\iota_j^s(I_{s-1,i})I_{s,i'}$ can be assumed to be a free module over $\iota_j^s(I_{s-1,i})$. Otherwise by trying to find a free basis, we can efficiently compute a zero divisor in $I_{s-1,i}$, hence, refining $I_{s-1,i}$ and the m-collection Π.

Compatibility and regularity of Π create a natural connection between the ideals of levels $(s-1)$ and s, for all $1 < s \leq m$. In the case when a pair of ideals $I_{s-1,i}$ and $I_{s,i'}$ in the decomposition of $\mathcal{A}^{(s-1)}$ and $\mathcal{A}^{(s)}$ respectively satisfies $\iota_j^s(I_{s-1,i})I_{s,i'} = I_{s,i'}$: $I_{s,i'}$ is a free module over $\iota_j^s(I_{s-1,i})$ which in other words means that the elements in $I_{s,i'}$ can be viewed as univariate polynomials

with coefficients in $I_{s-1,i}$. The rank of the free module $I_{s,i'}$ over $\iota_j^s(I_{s-1,i})$ can easily be seen to be equal to the subdegree of $\mathrm{Supp}(I_{s,i'})$ over $\mathrm{Supp}(I_{s-1,i})$.

Invariance of the m-collection Π at level $1 < s \le m$ may be assumed, since if for some $\sigma \in \mathrm{Symm}_s$ the decomposition of $\mathcal{A}^{(s)}$ is not σ-invariant, then we can find two ideals $I_{s,i}$ and $I_{s,i'}$ such that $I_{s,i}^\sigma \cap I_{s,i'}$ is neither zero nor $I_{s,i'}$, thus, we can efficiently refine $I_{s,i'}$ and the m-collection Π.

Homogeneity of the m-collection Π corresponds to: the algebra $\mathcal{A}^{(1)} = \mathcal{A}$ is not in a decomposed form.

Antisymmetricity of the m-collection Π at level $1 < s \le m$ corresponds to: for any ideal $I_{s,i}$ at level $1 < s \le m$ and for any $\sigma \in \mathrm{Symm}_s \setminus \{id\}$, we can assume $I_{s,i}^\sigma \ne I_{s,i}$. Otherwise σ is an algebra automorphism of $I_{s,i}$ and hence we can find its subideal efficiently under GRH by [Ró92], thus, refining $I_{s,i}$ and the m-collection Π.

Note that invariance and antisymmetricity at level s entail $s! \mid t_s$.

By the observations above: we can keep applying ideal operations in the algebras $\mathcal{A}^{(s)}$, $s \in [m]$, till either we get a nontrivial factor of $f(x)$ or the underlying m-collection Π becomes a homogeneous, antisymmetric m-scheme on n points. The time taken by our algorithm is clearly $poly(\log p, n^m)$.

Remark 7. *At this point we are able to reprove Ronyai's result [Ró88]: under GRH, we can deterministically find a nontrivial factor of a degree n polynomial over $\mathbb{F}_p$ in time $poly(\log p, n^r)$, where r is the smallest prime divisor of n. The proof is to algorithmically try constructing an r-scheme as above and show by an easy divisibility argument that there exist no homogeneous, antisymmetric r-schemes on n points if r is a divisor of n. This guarantees that our algorithm will be forced to find a nontrivial factor of $f(x)$.*

4 m-schemes in Evdokimov's Algorithm

We saw in the last section how to either find a nontrivial factor of a given $f(x)$ or construct an m-scheme on the n roots of $f(x)$. Our aim is to analyse the "bad case" of the algorithm when we get no nontrivial factor but instead we get an antisymmetric, homogeneous m-scheme. Can the properties of these m-schemes be used to factor $f(x)$? In the rest of the paper we will try to answer that question. Here we start with an exposition of Evdokimov's idea [Evd94] in our framework of m-schemes. We show below that [Evd94] exploited the presence of *matchings* in the m-schemes.

Definition 8. *A color $P \in \mathcal{P}_s$, for $1 < s \le m$, in an m-scheme $\{\mathcal{P}_1, \ldots, \mathcal{P}_m\}$ is called a* matching *if there exist $1 \le i < j \le s$ such that $\pi_i^s(P) = \pi_j^s(P)$ and $|\pi_i^s(P)| = |P|$.*

The presence of matchings can be used to efficiently refine the underlying m-scheme.

Lemma 9. *If the color $P \in \mathcal{P}_s$ is a matching then under GRH we can refine the m-scheme $\Pi = \{\mathcal{P}_1, \ldots, \mathcal{P}_m\}$ deterministically in time $poly(\log p, n^m)$.*

Proof. Following the notation of the above definition, it is obvious that if color P is a matching then both π_i^s and π_j^s are bijections, therefore the map $\pi_i^s(\pi_j^s)^{-1}$ is a permutation of $\pi_j^s(P)$. Furthermore, this permutation is nontrivial as $P \subseteq V^{(s)}$. So in the corresponding orthogonal ideals decomposition of $\mathcal{A}^{(1)}, \ldots, \mathcal{A}^{(m)}$, both the maps ι_i^s and ι_j^s give isomorphisms $I_{s-1,\ell'} \to I_{s,\ell}$, where the ideals $I_{s-1,\ell'}$ and $I_{s,\ell}$ correspond to $\pi_j^s(P)$ and P respectively. This means that the map $(\iota_i^s)^{-1}\iota_j^s$ is a nontrivial automorphism of $I_{s-1,\ell'}$. It follows from [Ró92] that, assuming GRH, we can obtain a proper decomposition of $I_{s-1,\ell'}$ and hence refine the m-scheme Π. $\square$

Now we show the idea of [Evd94] to find a matching in $\log_2 n$ levels.

Lemma 10. *If the m-scheme $\Pi := \{\mathcal{P}_1, \ldots, \mathcal{P}_m\}$ on n points is antisymmetric at the second level, $|\mathcal{P}_1| < n$ and $m \ge \log_2 n$ then there is a matching in $\{\mathcal{P}_1, \ldots, \mathcal{P}_m\}$.*

8

Proof. We will give an effective way of finding a matching given such a Π. Choose $P_1 \in \mathcal{P}_1$ with $d_1 := |P_1| > 1$. It is clear that $Q_2 = P_1^{(2)}$ is a disjoint union of some colors in $\mathcal{P}_2$. Choose a smallest color $P_2 \in \mathcal{P}_2$ with $P_2 \subseteq Q_2$. By the definition of an m-scheme: $\pi_1^2(P_2) = \pi_2^2(P_2) = P_1$. Also, by antisymmetry we can infer that $d_2 := \frac{|P_2|}{|P_1|} < d_1/2$. If $d_2 = 1$ then P_2 is a matching.

If $d_2 > 1$ then we proceed in the following iterative way. Suppose that, for some $2 < s < m$, we have already chosen colors $P_1 \in \mathcal{P}_1, \ldots, P_{s-1} \in \mathcal{P}_{s-1}$ with $\pi_{i-1}^i(P_i) = \pi_i^i(P_i) = P_{i-1}$ and $1 < d_i := \frac{|P_i|}{|P_{i-1}|} < d_{i-1}/2$ for every $2 \leq i \leq s - 1$. Since $d_{s-1} > 1$, the set $Q_s = \{\bar{v} \in V^{(s)} | \pi_{s-1}^s(\bar{v}) \in P_{s-1}, \pi_s^s(\bar{v}) \in P_{s-1}\}$ is nonempty. Let P_s be a smallest class from $\mathcal{P}_s$ with $P_s \subseteq Q_s$. Again antisymmetry implies that $d_s := \frac{|P_s|}{|P_{s-1}|} < d_{s-1}/2$. If $d_s = 1$ then P_s is clearly a matching. Otherwise we proceed to the level $(s+1)$ and further halve the subdegree. This procedure finds a matching in at most $\log_2 d_1 \leq \log_2 n$ rounds. $\square$

From our algorithm in the last section and the above two lemmas it follows that, under GRH, we can completely factor $f(x)$ deterministically in $poly(\log p,\ n^{\log n})$ time. This is the result of Evdokimov [Evd94].

It might be worth noting that in the above Lemma we used antisymmetry (and even invariance) merely at level 2. Indeed, if a compatible and regular m-collection $\{\mathcal{P}_1, \ldots, \mathcal{P}_m\}$ is antisymmetric at level 2 then for every $1 < s \leq m$ and every s-element subset $\{v_1, \ldots, v_s\} \subseteq V$ we have $(v_1, \ldots, v_{s-1}, v_s) \not\equiv_{\mathcal{P}_s} (v_1, \ldots, v_s, v_{s-1})$. (This can be seen by projecting to the last two coordinates.)

4.1   A Conjecture about Matchings

Here we make a conjecture about the structure of homogeneous, antisymmetric 4-schemes and higher schemes. It might seem a bit unmotivated but we show below, interestingly, that it is true in the case of orbit schemes. Note that orbit schemes are the only (infinite) family of 4-schemes we currently know that are homogeneous and antisymmetric.

Conjecture 11. *There exists a constant $m \geq 4$ such that every homogeneous, antisymmetric m-scheme contains a matching.*

It is clear by Lemma 9 that a proof of this conjecture would result in a deterministic polynomial time algorithm for factoring polynomials over finite fields (under GRH).

We will now show that Conjecture 11 holds, with $m = 4$, for the important example of orbit schemes. It is easy to see that the 2-scheme associated to a permutation group G is antisymmetric if and only if $|G|$ is odd. Assume that G is a nontrivial permutation group of odd order on $V = \{1, \ldots, n\}$. Let H be a subgroup minimally containing the stabilizer G_1 of G. Let $B = \text{Orb}(H, 1)$ be the orbit of 1 under the action of H. Then H acts as a primitive permutation group on B. Also, by [Ser96], there is a base of size $s \leq 3$ of H. This is a subset $\{b_1, \ldots, b_s\} \subseteq B$ such that $H_{b_1} \cap \cdots \cap H_{b_s} = N$, where where N is the kernel of the permutation representation of H on B. We assume that this base is irredundant, in particular $K = H_{b_1} \cap \cdots \cap H_{b_{s-1}} > N$. Since $K_{b_s} = N < K$ there exists $b_{s+1} \in \text{Orb}(K, b_s) \setminus \{b_s\}$. In order to simplify notation, we assume $b_1 = 1, b_2 = 2, \ldots, b_{s+1} = s + 1$. The first equality $b_1 = 1$ can be ensured using the transitivity of H on B, while the others can be achieved by renumbering V. From $G_1 < H$ we infer that $N = H_1 \cap \cdots \cap H_t = G_1 \cap \cdots \cap G_t$ holds for every $t \in \{1, \ldots, s+1\}$. Let P be the G-orbit of $(1, \ldots, s+1)$. Since $(1, \ldots, s-1, s)$ and $(1, \ldots, s-1, s+1)$ are in the same orbit, we have $\pi_s^{s+1}(P) = \pi_{s+1}^{s+1}(P)$. Also, since the $(1, \ldots, s)$ and $(1, \ldots, s, s+1)$ both have stabilizer N, the size of the orbits of both tuples coincide with $|G : N|$. These properties imply that P is a matching.

5 Factoring polynomials of smooth prime degree

We saw in Section 3 how to obtain a homogeneous m-scheme on n points from a given polynomial of degree n and we also saw in Lemma 2 that a homogeneous 3-scheme is an association scheme. We now use a recent interesting result of Hanaki and Uno [HU06] about the structure of association schemes, on a *prime* number of points, to factor polynomials when n is a smooth prime number.

Theorem 12. *If $n > 2$ is prime, r is the largest prime factor of $(n-1)$ and $f(x)$ is a degree n polynomial over $\mathbb{F}_p$ then we can find a nontrivial factor of $f(x)$ deterministically in time $poly(\log p, n^r)$ under GRH.*

Proof. Wlog we can assume that $f(x)$ has n distinct roots (α_i's) in $\mathbb{F}_p$. From Section 3 we can again assume that we have constructed a homogeneous antisymmetric $(r+1)$-scheme on n points: $(\mathcal{P}_1, \ldots, \mathcal{P}_{r+1})$. Now from Lemma 2 we know that $(\mathcal{P}_1, \mathcal{P}_2)$ is an antisymmetric association scheme. From [HU06]: $\exists d | (n-1)$, $\forall P \in \mathcal{P}_2$, $\#P = dn$. If $d = 1$ then we have matchings in $\mathcal{P}_2$ and hence by Lemma 9 we can find a nontrivial factor of $f(x)$.

On the other hand if $d > 1$ then the colors in $(\mathcal{P}_2, \ldots, \mathcal{P}_{r+1})$ naturally induce homogeneous antisymmetric r-schemes on d points (for example, restrict the partitions to tuples that have α_1 in the first coordinate). As d has a prime divisor which is at most r there do not exist such schemes by Remark 7.

The time complexity follows from our algorithm overview. $\square$

6 Reducing the number of levels in Evdokimov's algorithm

We saw in Lemma 10 that a homogeneous m-scheme on n points that is antisymmetric at level 2 has a matching below the $\lceil \log_2 n \rceil$-th level. Recall from Section 3 that from a polynomial we can construct an m-scheme that is antisymmetric at every level > 1 and not just at level 2. Are we then guaranteed to get a matching at a level less than $\log n$? We conjecture that there should be a matching at a much smaller level as intuitively antisymmetricity reduces the subdegrees of the colors but we could prove only a constant fraction of $\log n$ upper bound on the number of levels. First we prove a lemma:

Lemma 13. *Let $\Pi = (\mathcal{P}_1, \ldots, \mathcal{P}_4)$ be a homogeneous, antisymmetric 4-scheme on $n > 8$ points. Then there is a color $P \in \mathcal{P}_2$ and its π_3^3-fiber $Q \in \mathcal{P}_3$ such that $\pi_2^3(Q) = \pi_3^3(Q) = P$ and the subdegree of Q over P is less than $\frac{n}{8}$.*

Proof. Clearly, $\mathcal{P}_1$ just has one color, say, $[n]$. If $\mathcal{P}_2$ has more than two colors then by antisymmetry it has at least 4 colors and hence one of the colors $P \in \mathcal{P}_2$ will have subdegree over $[n]$ less than $\frac{n}{4}$. Again by the antisymmetry a π_3^3-fiber $Q \in \mathcal{P}_3$ of P will have subdegree $< \frac{n}{8}$ and $\pi_2^3(Q) = \pi_3^3(Q) = P$.

In the case when $\mathcal{P}_2$ has just two colors - P and its "flipped" color P^T - let us define:

$$Q_1 := \{x \in [n] \mid (1, x) \in P\}$$
$$Q_2 := \{x \in [n] \mid (1, x) \in P^T\}$$

Then obviously Q_1, Q_2 are disjoint sets of size $n_1 := \frac{n-1}{2}$ partitioning $\{2, \ldots, n\}$. Clearly, the image of the colors in $\mathcal{P}_3$ restricting the first coordinate to 1 gives us an antisymmetric partition Γ of the sets $Q_1^{(2)}$, $Q_1 \times Q_2$, $Q_2 \times Q_1$ and $Q_2^{(2)}$; which is an association scheme on $Q_1^{(2)}$ and $Q_2^{(2)}$. By the antisymmetricity of Π, the colors corresponding to $Q_2 \times Q_1$ are just the transpose (i.e. swap the two coordinates) of those corresponding to $Q_1 \times Q_2$. Each color in Γ can be naturally viewed as a $n_1 \times n_1$ zero/one matrix. For example, a color R corresponding to $Q_1 \times Q_2$ can be represented as a matrix whose rows are indexed by Q_1 and whose columns are indexed by Q_2 such that: for

all $(i, j) \in Q_1 \times Q_2$, $R_{i,j} = 1$ if $(i, j) \in R$ and $R_{i,j} = 0$ if $(i, j) \notin R$. Interestingly, in the matrix representation the composition property of Lemma 2 simply means that the linear combinations of the identity matrix I and the colors in the partition of $Q_1 \times Q_1$ (or $Q_2 \times Q_2$) by Γ is a matrix algebra, say $\mathcal{A}_1$ (or $\mathcal{A}_2$).

If $Q_1^{(2)}$ (or $Q_2^{(2)}$) is partitioned by Γ into more than two parts then by antisymmetry there will be ≥ 4 parts which means that one of the parts will have subdegree $< \frac{n}{8}$. This gives us a required π_3^3-fiber $Q \in \mathcal{P}_3$ of a $P \in \mathcal{P}_2$.

So we can assume that $Q_1^{(2)}$ and $Q_2^{(2)}$ are both partitioned into exactly two parts. Say,

- R and R^T are the two matrices representing the partition of $Q_1^{(2)}$ by Γ.

- S and S^T are the two matrices representing the partition of $Q_2^{(2)}$ by Γ.

Note that: $R + R^T = S + S^T = J - I$ where I is the identity matrix and J is the all one matrix of suitable dimensions.

How do the partitions of $Q_1 \times Q_2$ look like? Let U be a matrix in the partition of $Q_1 \times Q_2$ by Γ. If $U = J$ (i.e. Γ partitions $Q_1 \times Q_2$ in a trivial way) then by antisymmetricity $\mathcal{P}_3$ has exactly $3! = 6$ colors each of cardinality $n \cdot \#U = n \cdot n_1^2$. But this is a contradiction as $6 \cdot n \cdot n_1^2$ is not $n(n-1)(n-2)$. Thus, Γ partitions $Q_1 \times Q_2$ into at least 2 colors. Now since by antisymmetricity the number of colors in $\mathcal{P}_3$ has to be a multiple of 6, we deduce that Γ partitions $Q_1 \times Q_2$ into at least 4 colors, say, $\{U_1, \ldots, U_4\}$. By the composition property of Γ, $U_1 U_1^T$ is in $\mathcal{A}_1$. In other words, there are positive integers α, β such that:

$$U_1 U_1^T = \alpha I + \beta(R + R^T)$$
$$= \beta J + (\alpha - \beta)I$$

Thus, if U_1 is a singular matrix then $U_1 U_1^T = \beta J$ implying that U_1 has equal rows. We can repeat the same argument with $U_1^T U_1$ (which is in $\mathcal{A}_2$) and deduce that U_1 has equal columns. Now a zero/one matrix U_1 can have equal rows and equal columns iff $U_1 = J$. This contradiction implies that U_1 is an invertible matrix. But then:

$$\{U_1 U_1^T, U_1 U_2^T, U_1 U_3^T, U_1 U_4^T\}$$

is a set of 4 linearly independent matrices in $\mathcal{A}_1$ which contradicts the fact that $\mathcal{A}_1$ is a matrix algebra of dimension 3. This contradiction implies that one of $Q_1^{(2)}$ or $Q_2^{(2)}$ is partitioned into at least four parts.

Thus, in all the cases the lemma is true. $\square$

From the above lemma we see that at 2 levels higher we get a suitable color with subdegree reduced to a fraction of 2^{-3}. This immediately gives us the following constant-factor improvement to Lemma 10.

Proposition 14. *If the m-scheme $\Pi := \{\mathcal{P}_1, \ldots, \mathcal{P}_m\}$ on n points is antisymmetric at the first three levels, $|\mathcal{P}_1| < n$ and $m \geq \frac{2}{3}\log_2 n$ then there is a matching in $\{\mathcal{P}_1, \ldots, \mathcal{P}_m\}$.*

7 Primitivity of m-schemes and further research

A 2-scheme $\Pi = (\mathcal{P}_1, \mathcal{P}_2)$ on n points can be viewed as a complete directed colored graph on n vertices, where vertices of one color correspond to a $P \in \mathcal{P}_1$ and the edges of one color correspond to a $Q \in \mathcal{P}_2$. If an m-scheme is coming from a polynomial $f(x)$, over k, then we can try to relate graph properties of the m-scheme to the algebraic properties of the ideals defining the m-scheme. It turns out that such m-schemes can be efficiently tested for one such property: connectivity. One can introduce a related notion: primitivity which is actually an extension of the primitivity of association schemes.

Let Π be a homogeneous 2-scheme on the points $[n]$ with $\mathcal{P}_2 = \{P_{2,1}, \ldots, P_{2,t_2}\}$. For every index $i \in \{1, \ldots, t_2\}$ let $G_{2,i}$ denote the undirected graph on $[n]$ whose edges are unordered pairs $\{u, v\}$ where either $(u, v) \in P_{2,i}$ or $(v, u) \in P_{2,i}$. We say that Π is *primitive* if all the graphs $G_{2,1}, \ldots, G_{2,t_2}$ are connected.

Let $I_{2,i} := I^{\perp}(P_{2,i})$ be the ideal of $\mathcal{A}^{(2)}$ corresponding to $P_{2,i}$. We define a subset $S(I_{2,i})$ of $\mathcal{A}^{(1)}$ whose meaning would be clear later:

$$S(I_{2,i}) := \{h \in \mathcal{A}^{(1)} \mid (h \otimes 1 - 1 \otimes h) \in I_{2,i}^{\perp}\}$$

It is easy to see that $k \subseteq S(I_{2,i})$ is a subalgebra of $\mathcal{A}^{(1)}$. The following lemma relates the subalgebras $S(I_{2,i})$ to the notion of primitivity.

Lemma 15. *The dimension of the algebra $S(I_{2,i})$ over k is equal to the number of the connected components of the graph $G_{2,i}$.*

Proof. Let $G_{2,i}$ have c connected components. Observe that $h(x) \in S(I_{2,i})$ iff $(h(x_1) - h(x_2))I_{2,i} = 0$ iff $h(u) = h(v)$ for all $(u, v) \in \mathrm{Supp}(I_{2,i})$. The last condition precisely means that $h(x)$ is constant on the connected components of $G_{2,i}$. It follows that the polynomials $h_j(x)$, for $j \in [c]$, that are 1 on all the vertices in the j-th connected component and 0 on the rest, form a basis of $S(I_{2,i})$. Thus, the dimension of $S(I_{2,i})$ is c. $\square$

The above lemma shows that if for some i the graph $G_{2,i}$ is not connected (say, it has c connected components) then (by solving a system of linear equations) we compute a nontrivial subalgebra $S(I_{2,i})$ of $\mathcal{A}^{(1)}$. This in explicit terms means that if Π was obtained from a polynomial $f(x)$ of degree n then we can compute $g(y)$ of degree c such that $S(I_{2,i}) \cong k[y]/(g(y))$ and:

$$\mathcal{A}^{(1)} \cong (k[y]/(g(y)))[x]/(\tilde{f}(y, x))$$

where, the $\deg_x$ of $\tilde{f}(y, x)$ is $\frac{n}{c}$. Thus, we get two polynomials $g(y)$ and $\tilde{f}(y, x)$ of degrees c and $\frac{n}{c}$ respectively to factor (the latter over the algebra $S(I_{2,i}) \cong k[y]/(g(y))$ rather than over the base field k). If we succeed in finding a nontrivial factor of either of these polynomials then we can find a zero divisor in $\mathcal{A}^{(1)}$ and then a factor of $f(x)$ therefrom. In particular, if $c \leq \sqrt{n}$ then it seems to be worth proceeding with factoring $g(y)$.

We can generalize the notion of primitivity to higher levels as well.

Definition 16. *Let $\Gamma = (\mathcal{P}_1, \ldots, \mathcal{P}_m)$ be a m-scheme. For a $P \in \mathcal{P}_s$ such that $\pi_s^s(P) = \pi_{s-1}^s(P) =: Q \in \mathcal{P}_{s-1}$, we fix $(v_1, \ldots, v_{s-2}) \in \pi_{s-1}^{s-1}(Q)$. We define the graph $G(P, v_1, \ldots, v_{s-2})$ on the vertex set $\{v \in [n] : (v_1, \ldots, v_{s-2}, v) \in Q\}$ with edges $\{u, v\}$ such that either $(v_1, \ldots, v_{s-2}, u, v) \in P$ or $(v_1, \ldots, v_{s-2}, v, u) \in P$. It turns out that connectedness of $G(P, v_1, \ldots, v_{s-2})$ is independent of the choice of the tuple $(v_1, \ldots, v_{s-2})$. We say that Γ is primitive at level s if for every $P \in \mathcal{P}_s$ with $\pi_s^s(P) = \pi_{s-1}^s(P)$, the graph $G(P, \ldots)$ is connected. We say that Γ is* primitive *if it is primitive at all levels $2 \leq s \leq m$.*

Put $I_{s,i} := \mathrm{I}^{\perp}(P)$, $I_{s-1,i'} := \mathrm{I}^{\perp}(Q)$, $I_{s-2,i''} := \mathrm{I}^{\perp}(\pi_{s-1}^{s-1}(Q))$ and define:

$$S(I_{s,i}) := \{h \in I_{s-1,i'} \mid (\iota_s^s(h) - \iota_{s-1}^s(h)) \in I_{s,i}^{\perp}\}$$

One can show that $S(I_{s,i})$ is a subalgebra of $I_{s-1,i'}$ and the number of connected components of $G(P, \ldots)$ is $\frac{\dim_k S(I_{s,i})}{\dim_k I_{s-2,i''}}$. Thus in case of imprimitivity, we can compute a subalgebra "between" $I_{s-2,i''}$ and $I_{s-1,i'}$ by solving a system of linear equations. If $1 < \frac{\dim_k S(I_{s,i})}{\dim_k I_{s-2,i''}} \leq \sqrt{\frac{\dim_k I_{s-1,i'}}{\dim_k I_{s-2,i''}}}$, it seems to be worth proceeding with decomposing the ideal $I_{s-1,i'}$ by finding a zero divisor in the subalgebra $S(I_{s,i})$.

We feel that primitivity imposes strong conditions on the parameters of an m-scheme but we do not know how to exactly use primitivity or imprimitivity and leave that for future research.

Acknowledgements

References

[AMM77] L. Adleman, K. Manders, G. Miller, On taking roots in finite fields; *Proc. 18th FOCS, 1977, 175-178.*

[BGL01] E. Bach, J. von zur Gathen, H. W. Lenstra, Jr., Factoring polynomials over special finite fields; *Finite Fields and Their Applications 7(2001), 5-28.*

[Ber67] E. R. Berlekamp, Factoring polynomials over finite fields; *Bell System Technical Journal 46(1967), 1853-1859.*

[Ber70] E. R. Berlekamp, Factoring polynomials over large finite fields; *Math. Comp., 24, (1970), 713-735.*

[Came99] Peter J. Cameron, Permutation Groups; *LMS Student Text 45. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1999.*

[Cam83] P. Camion, A deterministic algorithm for factorizing polynomials of $\mathbb{F}_q[x]$; *Ann. Discr. Math., 17, (1983), 149-157.*

[CFI92] J. Cai, M. Fürer, N. Immerman, An optimal lower bound on the number of variables for graph identification; *Combinatorica, 12(1992), 389-410.*

[CZ81] D. G. Cantor, H. Zassenhaus, A new algorithm for factoring polynomials over finite fields; *Mathematics of Computation, 36(154), 1981, 587-592.*

[Evd89] S. A. Evdokimov, Factorization of a solvable polynomial over finite fields and the generalized Riemann Hypothesis; *Zapiski Nauchnyck Seminarov LOMI, 176(1989), 104-117.*

[Evd94] S. A. Evdokimov, Factorization of polynomials over finite fields in subexponential time under GRH; *Proc. 1st ANTS, Lecture Notes In Computer Science 877, Springer-Verlag 1994, 209-219.*

[vzG87] J. von zur Gathen, Factoring polynomials and primitive elements for special primes; *Theoretical Computer Science, 52, 1987, 77-89.*

[GS92] J. von zur Gathen, V. Shoup, Computing Frobenius maps and factoring polynomials; *Comput. Complexity, 2(1992), 187-224.*

[HU06] A. Hanaki, K. Uno, Algebraic structure of association schemes of prime order; *J. Algebraic. Combin. 23 (2006), 189-195.*

[Hua91] M. A. Huang, Generalized Riemann Hypothesis and factoring polynomials over finite fields; *J. Algorithms, 12(1991), 464-481.*

[KS98] E. Kaltofen, V. Shoup, Subquadratic-time factoring of polynomials over finite fields; *Math. Comp., 67(1998), 1179-1197.*

[MS88] M. Mignotte, C.-P. Schnorr, Calcul déterministe des racines d"un polynôme dans un corps fini; *Comptes Rendus Académie des Sciences (Paris), 306, (1988), 467-472.*

[Moe77]   R. T. Moenck, On the efficiency of algorithms for polynomial factoring; *Math. Comp., 31, (1977), 235-250.*

[Ró88]   L. Rónyai, Factoring Polynomials over finite fields, *Journal of Algorithms 9, (1988), 391-400.*

[Ró89]   L. Rónyai, Factoring polynomials modulo special primes; *Combinatorica, 9, (1989), 199-206.*

[Ró92]   L. Rónyai, Galois Groups and Factoring Polynomials over Finite Fields, *SIAM J. on Discrete Mathematics 5, (1992), 345–365.*

[Ser96]   Á. Seress, The minimal base size of primitive solvable permutation groups; *J. London Math. Soc. 53, (1996), 243–255.*

[Smi94]   J. D. H. Smith, Association schemes, superschemes, and relations invariant under permutation groups, *European J. Combin. 15(3), (1994), 285-291.*

[Woj01]   J. Wojdyło, An Inextensible Association Scheme Associated with a 4-regular Graph; *Graphs and Combinatorics 17(1), (2001), 185-192.*

[Zas69]   H. Zassenhaus, On Hensel factorization, I; *J. Number Theory, 1(1969), 291-311.*

[Zie]   P.-H. Zieschang, Theory of Association Schemes; *Springer, Berlin, 2005.*