

# Finite fields and functional reconstructions

Ray D. Sameshima

2016/09/23 ~ 2016/10/15 10:35



# Contents

<b>0</b>	<b>Preface</b>	<b>5</b>
0.1	References . . . . .	5
0.2	Set theoretical gadgets . . . . .	5
0.2.1	Numbers . . . . .	5
0.2.2	Algebraic structures . . . . .	6
0.3	Haskell language . . . . .	6
<b>1</b>	<b>Basics</b>	<b>9</b>
1.1	Finite field . . . . .	9
1.1.1	Rings . . . . .	9
1.1.2	Fields . . . . .	10
1.1.3	An example of finite rings $\mathbb{Z}_n$ . . . . .	10
1.1.4	Bézout's lemma . . . . .	11
1.1.5	Greatest common divisor . . . . .	11
1.1.6	Extended Euclidean algorithm . . . . .	13
1.1.7	Coprime . . . . .	16
1.1.8	Corollary (Inverses in $\mathbb{Z}_n$ ) . . . . .	16
1.1.9	Corollary (Finite field $\mathbb{Z}_p$ ) . . . . .	17
1.1.10	A map from $\mathbb{Q}$ to $\mathbb{Z}_p$ . . . . .	19
1.1.11	Reconstruction from $\mathbb{Z}_p$ to $\mathbb{Q}$ . . . . .	21
1.1.12	Chinese remainder theorem . . . . .	24
1.2	Polynomials and rational functions . . . . .	26
1.2.1	Notations . . . . .	26
1.2.2	Polynomials and rational functions . . . . .	26
1.2.3	As data, coefficients list . . . . .	27
1.3	Haskell implementation of univariate polynomials . . . . .	28
1.3.1	A polynomial as a list of coefficients . . . . .	28
1.3.2	Difference analysis . . . . .	31

<b>2</b>	<b>Functional reconstruction</b>	<b>35</b>
2.1	Univariate polynomials . . . . .	35
2.1.1	Newton's polynomial representation . . . . .	35
2.1.2	Towards canonical representations . . . . .	36
2.1.3	Simplification of our problem . . . . .	36
2.1.4	Haskell implementation . . . . .	38
2.2	Univariate rational functions . . . . .	43
2.2.1	Thiele's interpolation formula . . . . .	43
2.2.2	Towards canonical representations . . . . .	44
2.2.3	Haskell implementation . . . . .	44
2.3	Multivariate polynomials . . . . .	52
2.3.1	Foldings as recursive applications . . . . .	52
2.3.2	Experiment, binary case . . . . .	53
2.3.3	Haskell implementation TBA . . . . .	56
2.4	Multivariate rational functions . . . . .	56
2.4.1	The canonical normalization . . . . .	56
2.4.2	An auxiliary $t$ . . . . .	56
2.4.3	Experiment, without above simplification . . . . .	57

# Chapter 0

## Preface

### 0.1 References

1. Scattering amplitudes over finite fields and multivariate functional reconstruction (Tiziano Peraro)  
<https://arxiv.org/pdf/1608.01902.pdf>
2. Haskell Language  
[www.haskell.org](http://www.haskell.org)
3. [http://qiita.com/bra\\_cat\\_ket/items/205c19611e21f3d422b7](http://qiita.com/bra_cat_ket/items/205c19611e21f3d422b7)  
(Japanese tech support sns)
4. The Haskell Road to Logic, Maths and Programming (Kees Doets, Jan van Eijck)  
<http://homepages.cwi.nl/~jve/HR/>
5. Introduction to numerical analysis (Stoer Josef, Bulirsch Roland)

### 0.2 Set theoretical gadgets

#### 0.2.1 Numbers

Here is a list of what we assumed that the readers are familiar with:

1.  $\mathbb{N}$  (Peano axiom:  $\emptyset, \text{suc}$ )
2.  $\mathbb{Z}$
3.  $\mathbb{Q}$

4.  $\mathbb{R}$  (Dedekind cut)
5.  $\mathbb{C}$

### 0.2.2 Algebraic structures

1. Monoid:  $(\mathbb{N}, +)$ ,  $(\mathbb{N}, \times)$
2. Group:  $(\mathbb{Z}, +)$ ,  $(\mathbb{Z}, \times)$
3. Ring:  $\mathbb{Z}$
4. Field:  $\mathbb{Q}$ ,  $\mathbb{R}$  (continuous),  $\mathbb{C}$  (algebraic closed)

## 0.3 Haskell language

From "A Brief, Incomplete and Mostly Wrong History of Programming Languages":<sup>1</sup>

1990 - A committee formed by Simon Peyton-Jones, Paul Hudak, Philip Wadler, Ashton Kutcher, and People for the Ethical Treatment of Animals creates Haskell, a pure, non-strict, functional language. Haskell gets some resistance due to the complexity of using monads to control side effects. Wadler tries to appease critics by explaining that "a monad is a monoid in the category of endofunctors, what's the problem?"



Figure 1: Haskell's logo, the combinations of  $\lambda$  and monad's bind  $>>=$ .

Haskell language is a standardized purely functional declarative statically typed programming language.

In declarative languages, we describe "what" or "definition" in its codes, however imperative languages, like C/C++, "how" or "procedure".

<sup>1</sup> <http://james-iry.blogspot.com/2009/05/brief-incomplete-and-mostly-wrong.html>

Functional languages can be seen as 'executable mathematics'; the notation was designed to be as close as possible to the mathematical way of writing.<sup>2</sup>

Instead of loops, we use (implicit) recursions in functional language.<sup>3</sup>

```
> sum :: [Int] -> Int
> sum []      = 0
> sum (i:is) = i + sum is
```

---

<sup>2</sup> Algorithms: A Functional Programming Approach (Fethi A. Rabhi, Guy Lapalme)

<sup>3</sup>Of course, as a best practice, we should use higher order function (in this case **foldr** or **foldl**) rather than explicit recursions.





# Chapter 1

## Basics

We have assumed living knowledge on (axiomatic, i.e., ZFC) set theory, algebraic structures.

### 1.1 Finite field

Ffield.lhs

<https://arxiv.org/pdf/1608.01902.pdf>

```
> module Ffield where  
  
> import Data.Ratio  
> import Data.Maybe  
> import Data.Numbers.Primes
```

#### 1.1.1 Rings

A ring  $(R, +, *)$  is a structured set  $R$  with two binary operations

$$(+)\ ::\ R\ \rightarrow\ R\ \rightarrow\ R \tag{1.1}$$

$$(*)\ ::\ R\ \rightarrow\ R\ \rightarrow\ R \tag{1.2}$$

satisfying the following 3 (ring) axioms:

1.  $(R, +)$  is an abelian, i.e., commutative group, i.e.,

$$\forall a, b, c \in R, (a + b) + c = a + (b + c) \quad (\text{associativity for } +) \quad (1.3)$$

$$\forall a, b \in R, a + b = b + a \quad (\text{commutativity}) \quad (1.4)$$

$$\exists 0 \in R, \text{ s.t. } \forall a \in R, a + 0 = a \quad (\text{additive identity}) \quad (1.5)$$

$$\forall a \in R, \exists (-a) \in R \text{ s.t. } a + (-a) = 0 \quad (\text{additive inverse}) \quad (1.6)$$

2.  $(R, *)$  is a monoid, i.e.,

$$\forall a, b, c \in R, (a * b) * c = a * (b * c) \quad (\text{associativity for } *) \quad (1.7)$$

$$\exists 1 \in R, \text{ s.t. } \forall a \in R, a * 1 = a = 1 * a \quad (\text{multiplicative identity}) \quad (1.8)$$

3. Multiplication is distributive w.r.t addition, i.e.,  $\forall a, b, c \in R$ ,

$$a * (b + c) = (a * b) + (a * c) \quad (\text{left distributivity}) \quad (1.9)$$

$$(a + b) * c = (a * c) + (b * c) \quad (\text{right distributivity}) \quad (1.10)$$

### 1.1.2 Fields

A field is a ring  $(\mathbb{K}, +, *)$  whose non-zero elements form an abelian group under multiplication, i.e.,  $\forall r \in \mathbb{K}$ ,

$$r \neq 0 \Rightarrow \exists r^{-1} \in \mathbb{K} \text{ s.t. } r * r^{-1} = 1 = r^{-1} * r. \quad (1.11)$$

A field  $\mathbb{K}$  is a finite field iff the underlying set  $\mathbb{K}$  is finite. A field  $\mathbb{K}$  is called infinite field iff the underlying set is infinite.

### 1.1.3 An example of finite rings $\mathbb{Z}_n$

Let  $n(> 0) \in \mathbb{N}$  be a non-zero natural number. Then the quotient set

$$\mathbb{Z}_n := \mathbb{Z}/n\mathbb{Z} \quad (1.12)$$

$$\cong \{0, \dots, (n-1)\} \quad (1.13)$$

with addition, subtraction and multiplication under modulo  $n$  is a ring.<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Here we have taken an equivalence class,

$$0 \leq k \leq (n-1), [k] := \{k + n * z | z \in \mathbb{Z}\} \quad (1.14)$$

### 1.1.4 Bézout's lemma

Consider  $a, b \in \mathbb{Z}$  be nonzero integers. Then there exist  $x, y \in \mathbb{Z}$  s.t.

$$a * x + b * y = \gcd(a, b), \quad (1.19)$$

where  $\gcd$  is the greatest common divisor (function), see §1.1.5. We will prove this statement in §1.1.6.

### 1.1.5 Greatest common divisor

Before the proof, here is an implementation of  $\gcd$  using Euclidean algorithm with Haskell language:

```
> -- Euclidian algorithm.
> myGCD :: Integral a => a -> a -> a
> myGCD a b
>   | b < 0 = myGCD a (-b)
> myGCD a b
>   | a == b = a
>   | b > a = myGCD b a
>   | b < a = myGCD (a-b) b
```

#### Example, by hands

Let us consider the  $\gcd$  of 7 and 13. Since they are primes, the  $\gcd$  should be 1. First it binds  $a$  with 7 and  $b$  with 13, and hit  $b > a$ .

$$\text{myGCD } 7 \ 13 == \text{myGCD } 13 \ 7 \quad (1.20)$$

Then it hits main line:

$$\text{myGCD } 13 \ 7 == \text{myGCD } (13-7) \ 7 \quad (1.21)$$

---

with the following operations:

$$[k] + [l] := [k + l] \quad (1.15)$$

$$[k] * [l] := [k * l] \quad (1.16)$$

This is equivalent to take modular  $n$ :

$$(k \bmod n) + (l \bmod n) := (k + l \bmod n) \quad (1.17)$$

$$(k \bmod n) * (l \bmod n) := (k * l \bmod n). \quad (1.18)$$

In order to go to next step, Haskell evaluate  $(13 - 7)$ ,<sup>2</sup> and

$$\text{myGCD } (13-7) \ 7 \ == \ \text{myGCD } 6 \ 7 \quad (1.22)$$

$$\quad \quad \quad == \ \text{myGCD } 7 \ 6 \quad (1.23)$$

$$\quad \quad \quad == \ \text{myGCD } (7-6) \ 6 \quad (1.24)$$

$$\quad \quad \quad == \ \text{myGCD } 1 \ 6 \quad (1.25)$$

$$\quad \quad \quad == \ \text{myGCD } 6 \ 1 \quad (1.26)$$

Finally it ends with 1:

$$\text{myGCD } 1 \ 1 \ == \ 1 \quad (1.27)$$

As another example, consider 15 and 25:

$$\text{myGCD } 15 \ 25 \ == \ \text{myGCD } 25 \ 15 \quad (1.28)$$

$$\quad \quad \quad == \ \text{myGCD } (25-15) \ 15 \quad (1.29)$$

$$\quad \quad \quad == \ \text{myGCD } 10 \ 15 \quad (1.30)$$

$$\quad \quad \quad == \ \text{myGCD } 15 \ 10 \quad (1.31)$$

$$\quad \quad \quad == \ \text{myGCD } (15-10) \ 10 \quad (1.32)$$

$$\quad \quad \quad == \ \text{myGCD } 5 \ 10 \quad (1.33)$$

$$\quad \quad \quad == \ \text{myGCD } 10 \ 5 \quad (1.34)$$

$$\quad \quad \quad == \ \text{myGCD } (10-5) \ 5 \quad (1.35)$$

$$\quad \quad \quad == \ \text{myGCD } 5 \ 5 \quad (1.36)$$

$$\quad \quad \quad == \ 5 \quad (1.37)$$

### Example, by Haskell

Let us check simple example using Haskell:

```
*Ffield> myGCD 7 13
1
*Ffield> myGCD 7 14
7
*Ffield> myGCD (-15) (20)
5
*Ffield> myGCD (-299) (-13)
13
```

---

<sup>2</sup> Since Haskell language adopts lazy evaluation, i.e., call by need, not call by name.

The final result is from

```
*Ffield> 13*23
299
```

### 1.1.6 Extended Euclidean algorithm

Here we treat the extended Euclidean algorithm, this is a constructive solution for Bézout's lemma.

As intermediate steps, this algorithm makes sequences of integers  $\{r_i\}_i$ ,  $\{s_i\}_i$ ,  $\{t_i\}_i$  and quotients  $\{q_i\}_i$  as follows. The base cases are

$$(r_0, s_0, t_0) := (a, 1, 0) \quad (1.38)$$

$$(r_1, s_1, t_1) := (b, 0, 1) \quad (1.39)$$

and inductively, for  $i \geq 2$ ,

$$q_i := \text{quot}(r_{i-2}, r_{i-1}) \quad (1.40)$$

$$r_i := r_{i-2} - q_i * r_{i-1} \quad (1.41)$$

$$s_i := s_{i-2} - q_i * s_{i-1} \quad (1.42)$$

$$t_i := t_{i-2} - q_i * t_{i-1}. \quad (1.43)$$

The termination condition<sup>3</sup> is

$$r_k = 0 \quad (1.44)$$

for some  $k \in \mathbb{N}$  and

$$\gcd(a, b) = r_{k-1} \quad (1.45)$$

$$x = s_{k-1} \quad (1.46)$$

$$y = t_{k-1}. \quad (1.47)$$

#### Proof

By definition,

$$\gcd(r_{i-1}, r_i) = \gcd(r_{i-1}, r_{i-2} - q_i * r_{i-1}) \quad (1.48)$$

$$= \gcd(r_{i-1}, r_{i-2}) \quad (1.49)$$

---

<sup>3</sup> This algorithm will terminate eventually, since the sequence  $\{r_i\}_i$  is non-negative by definition of  $q_i$ , but strictly decreasing. Therefore,  $\{r_i\}_i$  will meet 0 in finite step  $k$ .

and this implies

$$\gcd(a, b) =: \gcd(r_0, r_1) = \cdots = \gcd(r_{k-1}, 0), \quad (1.50)$$

i.e.,

$$r_{k-1} = \gcd(a, b). \quad (1.51)$$

Next, for  $i = 0, 1$  observe

$$a * s_i + b * t_i = r_i. \quad (1.52)$$

Let  $i \geq 2$ , then

$$r_i = r_{i-2} - q_i * r_{i-1} \quad (1.53)$$

$$= a * s_{i-2} + b * t_{i-2} - q_i * (a * s_{i-1} + b * t_{i-1}) \quad (1.54)$$

$$= a * (s_{i-2} - q_i * s_{i-1}) + b * (t_{i-2} - q_i * t_{i-1}) \quad (1.55)$$

$$=: a * s_i + b * t_i. \quad (1.56)$$

Therefore, inductively we get

$$\gcd(a, b) = r_{k-1} = a * s_{k-1} + b * t_{k-1} =: a * s + b * t. \quad (1.57)$$

This prove Bézout's lemma.

■

## Haskell implementation

Here I use lazy lists for intermediate lists of  $qs, rs, ss, ts$ , and pick up (second) last elements for the results.

Here we would like to implement the extended Euclidean algorithm. See the algorithm, examples, and pseudo code at:

[https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Extended\\_Euclidean\\_algorithm](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Extended_Euclidean_algorithm)

```
> exGCD' :: Integral n => n -> n -> ([n], [n], [n], [n])
> exGCD' a b = (qs, rs, ss, ts)
>   where
>     qs = zipWith quot rs (tail rs)
>     rs = takeBefore (==0) r'
>     r' = steps a b
```

```

> ss = steps 1 0
> ts = steps 0 1
> steps a b = rr
>   where rr@(_:rs) = a:b: zipWith (-) rr (zipWith (*) qs rs)
>
> takeBefore :: (a -> Bool) -> [a] -> [a]
> takeBefore _ [] = []
> takeBefore p (l:ls)
>   | p l      = []
>   | otherwise = l : (takeBefore p ls)

```

Here we have used so called lazy lists, and higher order function<sup>4</sup>. The gcd of  $a$  and  $b$  should be the last element of second list  $rs$ , and our targets  $(s, t)$  are second last elements of last two lists  $ss$  and  $ts$ . The following example is from wikipedia:

```

*Ffield> exGCD' 240 46
([5,4,1,1,2],[240,46,10,6,4,2],[1,0,1,-4,5,-9,23],[0,1,-5,21,-26,47,-120])

```

Look at the second lasts of  $[1,0,1,-4,5,-9,23]$ ,  $[0,1,-5,21,-26,47,-120]$ , i.e., -9 and 47:

```

*Ffield> gcd 240 46
2
*Ffield> 240*(-9) + 46*(47)
2

```

It works, and we have other simpler examples:

```

*Ffield> exGCD' 15 25
([0,1,1,2],[15,25,15,10,5],[1,0,1,-1,2,-5],[0,1,0,1,-1,3])
*Ffield> 15 * 2 + 25*(-1)
5
*Ffield> exGCD' 15 26
([0,1,1,2,1,3],[15,26,15,11,4,3,1],[1,0,1,-1,2,-5,7,-26],[0,1,0,1,-1,3,-4,15])
*Ffield> 15*7 + (-4)*26
1

```

Now what we should do is extract gcd of  $a$  and  $b$ , and  $(s, t)$  from the tuple of lists:

---

<sup>4</sup> Naively speaking, the function whose inputs and/or outputs are functions is called a higher order function.

```

> -- a*x + b*y = gcd a b
> exGcd a b = (g, x, y)
>   where
>     (_,r,s,t) = exGCD' a b
>     g = last r
>     x = last . init $ s
>     y = last . init $ t

```

where the underscore `_` is a special symbol in Haskell that hits every pattern, since we do not need the quotient list. So, in order to get `gcd` and  $(s, t)$  we don't need quotients list.

```

*Ffield> exGcd 46 240
(2,47,-9)
*Ffield> 46*47 + 240*(-9)
2
*Ffield> gcd 46 240
2

```

### 1.1.7 Coprime

Let us define a binary relation as follows:

```

coprime :: Integral a => a -> a -> Bool
coprime a b = (gcd a b) == 1

```

### 1.1.8 Corollary (Inverses in $\mathbb{Z}_n$ )

For a non-zero element

$$a \in \mathbb{Z}_n, \quad (1.58)$$

there is a unique number

$$b \in \mathbb{Z}_n \text{ s.t. } ((a * b) \bmod n) = 1 \quad (1.59)$$

iff  $a$  and  $n$  are coprime.

#### Proof

From Bézout's lemma,  $a$  and  $n$  are coprime iff

$$\exists s, t \in \mathbb{Z}, a * s + n * t = 1. \quad (1.60)$$



Therefore

$$a \text{ and } n \text{ are coprime} \Leftrightarrow \exists s, t \in \mathbb{Z}, a * s + n * t = 1 \quad (1.61)$$

$$\Leftrightarrow \exists s, t' \in \mathbb{Z}, a * s = 1 + n * t'. \quad (1.62)$$

This  $s$ , by taking its modulo  $n$  is our  $b = a^{-1}$ :

$$a * s = 1 \pmod{n}. \quad (1.63)$$

■

### 1.1.9 Corollary (Finite field $\mathbb{Z}_p$ )

If  $p$  is prime, then

$$\mathbb{Z}_p := \{0, \dots, (p-1)\} \quad (1.64)$$

with addition, subtraction and multiplication under modulo  $n$  is a field.

#### Proof

It suffices to show that

$$\forall a \in \mathbb{Z}_p, a \neq 0 \Rightarrow \exists a^{-1} \in \mathbb{K} \text{ s.t. } a * a^{-1} = 1 = a^{-1} * a, \quad (1.65)$$

but since  $p$  is prime, and

$$\forall a \in \mathbb{Z}_p, a \neq 0 \Rightarrow \text{gcd } a \text{ } p == 1 \quad (1.66)$$

so all non-zero element has its inverse in  $\mathbb{Z}_p$ .

■

#### Example and implementation

Let us pick 11 as a prime and consider  $\mathbb{Z}_{11}$ :

Example  $\mathbb{Z}_{\{11\}}$

```
*Ffield> isField 11
True
*ffield> map (exGcd 11) [0..10]
[(11,1,0),(1,0,1),(1,1,-5),(1,-1,4),(1,-1,3)
,(1,1,-2),(1,-1,2),(1,2,-3),(1,3,-4),(1,-4,5)
,(1,1,-1)
]
```

This list of three-tuple let us know the candidate of inverse. Take the last one,  $(1, 1, -1)$ . This is the image of `exGcd 11 10`, and

$$1 = 10 * 1 + 11 * (-1) \quad (1.67)$$

holds. This suggests -1 is a candidate of the inverse of 10 in  $\mathbb{Z}_{11}$ :

$$10^{-1} = -1 \pmod{11} \quad (1.68)$$

$$= 10 \pmod{11} \quad (1.69)$$

In fact,

$$10 * 10 = 11 * 9 + 1. \quad (1.70)$$

So, picking up the third elements in tuple and zipping with nonzero elements, we have a list of inverses:

```
*Ffield> map (('mod' 11) . (\(_,_,x)->x) . exGcd 11) [1..10]
[1,6,4,3,9,2,8,7,5,10]
*Ffield> zip [1..10] it
[(1,1),(2,6),(3,4),(4,3),(5,9),(6,2),(7,8),(8,7),(9,5),(10,10)]
```

Let us generalize these flow into a function<sup>5</sup>:

```
> inverses :: Int -> Maybe [(Int, Int)]
> inverses n
>   | isField n = Just lst -- isPrime n
>   | otherwise = Nothing
>   where
>     lst' = map (('mod' n) . (\(_,_,c)->c) . exGcd n) [1..(n-1)]
>     lst = zip [1..] lst'
```

The function `inverses` returns a list of nonzero number with their inverses if  $p$  is prime.

---

<sup>5</sup> From <https://hackage.haskell.org/package/base-4.9.0.0/docs/Data-Maybe.html>:

The `Maybe` type encapsulates an optional value. A value of type `Maybe a` either contains a value of type `a` (represented as `Just a`), or it is empty (represented as `Nothing`). Using `Maybe` is a good way to deal with errors or exceptional cases without resorting to drastic measures such as `error`.

Now we define `inversep`,<sup>6</sup> whose 1st input is the base  $p$  of our ring(field) and 2nd input is an element in  $\mathbb{Z}_p$ .

```
> inversep' :: Int -> Int -> Maybe Int
> inversep' p a = do
>   l <- inverses p
>   let a' = (a 'mod' p)
>   return (snd $ l !! (a'-1))

*Ffield> inverses' 11
Just [(1,1),(2,6),(3,4),(4,3),(5,9),(6,2),(7,8),(8,7),(9,5),(10,10)]
```

However, this is not efficient, and we refactor it as follows:<sup>7</sup>

```
> inversep :: Int -> Int -> Maybe Int
> inversep p a = let (_,x,y) = exGcd p a in
>   if isPrime p then Just (y 'mod' p)
>   else Nothing

map (inversep' 10007) [1..10006]
(12.99 secs, 17,194,752,504 bytes)
map (inversep 10007) [1..10006]
(1.74 secs, 771,586,416 bytes)
```

### 1.1.10 A map from $\mathbb{Q}$ to $\mathbb{Z}_p$

Let  $p$  be a prime. Now we have a map

$$- \text{ mod } p : \mathbb{Z} \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}_p; a \mapsto (a \text{ mod } p), \quad (1.71)$$

and a natural inclusion (or a forgetful map)<sup>8</sup>

$$\iota : \mathbb{Z}_p \hookrightarrow \mathbb{Z}. \quad (1.73)$$

---

<sup>6</sup> Here we have used `do`-notation, a syntactic sugar for use with monadic expressions. From <https://wiki.haskell.org/Monad>:

Monads in Haskell can be thought of as composable computation descriptions.

<sup>7</sup> Note that, here we use our Haskell code as a script, and we have not compile it. Hopefully after compile our code, it become much faster.

<sup>8</sup> By introducing this forgetful map, we can use

$$\times : (\mathbb{Z}, \mathbb{Z}) \rightarrow \mathbb{Z} \quad (1.72)$$

of normal product on  $\mathbb{Z}$ .

Then we can define a map

$$- \text{ mod } p : \mathbb{Q} \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}_p \quad (1.74)$$

by<sup>9</sup>

$$q = \frac{a}{b} \mapsto (q \text{ mod } p) := ((a \times i(b^{-1} \text{ mod } p)) \text{ mod } p). \quad (1.75)$$

### Example and implementation

An easy implementation is the followings:<sup>10</sup>

A map from  $\mathbb{Q}$  to  $\mathbb{Z}_p$ .

```
> modp :: Ratio Int -> Int -> Int
> q 'modp' p = (a * (bi 'mod' p)) 'mod' p
>   where
>     (a,b) = (numerator q, denominator q)
>     bi = fromJust $ inversep p b
```

Let us consider a rational number  $\frac{3}{7}$  on a finite field  $\mathbb{Z}_{11}$ :

Example: on  $\mathbb{Z}_{11}$

Consider  $(3 \% 7)$ .

```
*Ffield Data.Ratio> let q = 3 % 7
*Ffield Data.Ratio> 3 'mod' 11
3
*Ffield Data.Ratio> 7 'mod' 11
7
*Ffield Data.Ratio> inverses 11
Just [(1,1),(2,6),(3,4),(4,3),(5,9),(6,2),(7,8),(8,7),(9,5),(10,10)]
```

For example, pick 7:

```
*Ffield Data.Ratio> 7*8 == 11*5+1
True
```

---

<sup>9</sup> This is an example of operator overloadings.

<sup>10</sup> The backquotes makes any binary function infix operator. For example,

$$\text{add } a \text{ } b == a \text{ 'add' } b \quad (1.76)$$

Therefore, on  $\mathbb{Z}_{11}$ ,  $(7^{-1} \bmod 11)$  is equal to  $(8 \bmod 11)$  and

$$\frac{3}{7} \in \mathbb{Q} \mapsto (3 \times (7^{-1} \bmod 11) \bmod 11) \quad (1.77)$$

$$= (3 \times 8) \bmod 11 \quad (1.78)$$

$$= 24 \bmod 11 \quad (1.79)$$

$$= 2 \bmod 11. \quad (1.80)$$

Haskell returns the same result

```
*Ffield Data.Ratio> q `modp` 11
2
```

and consistent.

### 1.1.11 Reconstruction from $\mathbb{Z}_p$ to $\mathbb{Q}$

Consider a rational number  $q$  and its image  $a \in \mathbb{Z}_p$ .

$$a := q \bmod p \quad (1.81)$$

The extended Euclidean algorithm can be used for guessing a rational number  $q$  from the images  $a := q \bmod p$  of several primes  $p$ 's.

At each step, the extended Euclidean algorithm satisfies eq.(1.52).

$$a * s_i + p * t_i = r_i \quad (1.82)$$

Therefore

$$r_i = a * s_i \bmod p \Leftrightarrow \frac{r_i}{s_i} \bmod p = a. \quad (1.83)$$

Hence  $\frac{r_i}{s_i}$  is a possible guess for  $q$ . We take

$$r_i^2, s_i^2 < p \quad (1.84)$$

as the termination condition for this reconstruction.

### Haskell implementation

Let us first try to reconstruct from the image  $(\frac{1}{3} \bmod p)$  of some prime  $p$ . Here we have chosen three primes

```

Reconstruction Z_p -> Q
*Ffield> let q = (1%3)
*Ffield> take 3 $ dropWhile (<100) primes
[101,103,107]

```

The images are basically given by the first elements of second lists ( $s_0$ 's):

```

*Ffield> q 'modp' 101
34
*Ffield> let try x = exGCD' (q 'modp' x) x
*Ffield> try 101
([0,2,1,33],[34,101,34,33,1],[1,0,1,-2,3,-101],[0,1,0,1,-1,34])
*Ffield> try 103
([0,1,2,34],[69,103,69,34,1],[1,0,1,-1,3,-103],[0,1,0,1,-2,69])
*Ffield> try 107
([0,2,1,35],[36,107,36,35,1],[1,0,1,-2,3,-107],[0,1,0,1,-1,36])

```

Look at the first hit of termination condition eq.(1.84),  $r_4 = 1$  and  $s_4 = 3$ . They give us the same guess  $\frac{1}{3}$ , and that the reconstructed number.

From the above observations we can make a simple "guess" function:

```

> guess :: (Int, Int)      -- (q 'modp' p, p)
>      -> (Ratio Int, Int)
> guess (a, p) = let (_,rs,ss,_) = exGCD' a p in
>   (select rs ss p, p)
>   where
>     select :: Integral t => [t] -> [t] -> t -> Ratio t
>     select [] _ _ = 0%1
>     select (r:rs) (s:ss) p
>       | s /= 0 && r^2 <= p && s^2 <= p = (r%s)
>       | otherwise = select rs ss p

```

We have put a list of big primes as follows.

```

> -- Hard code of big primes.
> bigPrimes :: [Int]
> bigPrimes = dropWhile (< 897473) $ takeWhile (<978948) primes

```

We choose 3 times match as the termination condition.

```

> matches3 :: Eq a => [a] -> a
> matches3 (a:bb@(b:c:cs))
>   | a == b && b == c = a
>   | otherwise       = matches3 bb

```

Finally, we can check our gadgets.

What we know is a list of  $(q \bmod p)$  and prime  $p$  for several (big) primes.

```
*Ffield> let q = 10%19
*Ffield> let knownData = zip (map (modp q) bigPrimes) bigPrimes
*Ffield> matches3 $ map (fst . guess) knownData
10 % 19
```

The following is the function we need, its input is the list of tuple which first element is the image in  $\mathbb{Z}_p$  and second element is that prime  $p$ .

```
> reconstruct :: [(Int,Int)] -> Ratio Int
> reconstruct aps = matches3 $ map (fst . guess) aps
```

Here is a naive test:

```
> let qs = [1 % 3, 10 % 19, 41 % 17, 30 % 311, 311 % 32
            , 869 % 232, 778 % 123, 331 % 739]
> let modmap q = zip (map (modp q) bigPrimes) bigPrimes
> let longList = map modmap qs
> map reconstruct longList
[1 % 3, 10 % 19, 41 % 17, 30 % 311, 311 % 32
, 869 % 232, 778 % 123, 331 % 739]
> it == qs
True
```

As another example, we have slightly involved function:

```
> matches3' :: Eq a => [(a, t)] -> (a, t)
> matches3' (a0@(a,_):bb@((b,_):(c,_):cs))
>   | a == b && b == c = a0
>   | otherwise       = matches3' bb
```

Let us start from smaller prime, say 101. And see the first good guess, Haskell tells us that in order to reconstruct  $\frac{331}{739}$ , we should take three primes start from 614693:

```
*Ffield> let q = (331%739)
(0.01 secs, 44,024 bytes)
*Ffield> let smallerprimes = dropWhile (<100) $ takeWhile (<978948) primes
(0.01 secs, 39,968 bytes)
*Ffield> let knownData = zip (map (modp q) smallerprimes) smallerprimes
```

```
(0.01 secs, 39,872 bytes)
*Ffield> matches3' $ map guess knownData
(331 % 739,614693)
(17.64 secs, 12,402,878,080 bytes)
```

### 1.1.12 Chinese remainder theorem

From wikipedia<sup>11</sup>

There are certain things whose number is unknown. If we count them by threes, we have two left over; by fives, we have three left over; and by sevens, two are left over. How many things are there?

Here is a solution with Haskell:

```
*Ffield> let lst = [n|n<-[0..], mod n 3==2, mod n 5==3, mod n 7==2]
*Ffield> head lst
23
```

We define an infinite list of natural numbers that satisfy

$$n \bmod 3 = 2, n \bmod 5 = 3, n \bmod 7 = 2. \quad (1.85)$$

Then take the first element, and this is the answer.

#### Claim

The statement for binary case is the following. Let  $n_1, n_2 \in \mathbb{Z}$  be coprime, then for arbitrary  $a_1, a_2 \in \mathbb{Z}$ , the following a system of equations

$$x = a_1 \bmod n_1 \quad (1.86)$$

$$x = a_2 \bmod n_2 \quad (1.87)$$

have a unique solution modular  $n_1 * n_2$ <sup>12</sup>.

<sup>11</sup> [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Chinese\\_remainder\\_theorem](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Chinese_remainder_theorem)

<sup>12</sup> Note that, this is equivalent that there is a unique solution  $a$  in

$$0 \leq a < n_1 \times n_2. \quad (1.88)$$



**Proof**

(existence) With §1.1.6, there are  $m_1, m_2 \in \mathbb{Z}$  s.t.

$$n_1 * m_1 + n_2 * m_2 = 1. \quad (1.89)$$

Now we have

$$n_1 * m_1 = 1 \pmod{n_2} \quad (1.90)$$

$$n_2 * m_2 = 1 \pmod{n_1} \quad (1.91)$$

that is

$$m_1 = n_1^{-1} \pmod{n_2} \quad (1.92)$$

$$m_2 = n_2^{-1} \pmod{n_1}. \quad (1.93)$$

Then

$$a := a_1 * n_2 * m_2 + a_2 * n_1 * m_1 \pmod{(n_1 * n_2)} \quad (1.94)$$

is a solution.

(uniqueness) If  $a'$  is also a solution, then

$$a - a' = 0 \pmod{n_1} \quad (1.95)$$

$$a - a' = 0 \pmod{n_2}. \quad (1.96)$$

Since  $n_1$  and  $n_2$  are coprime, i.e., no common divisors, this difference is divisible by  $n_1 * n_2$ , and

$$a - a' = 0 \pmod{(n_1 * n_2)}. \quad (1.97)$$

Therefore, the solution is unique modular  $n_1 * n_2$ .

■

**Generalization**

Given  $a \in \mathbb{Z}_n$  of pairwise coprime numbers

$$n := n_1 * \cdots * n_k, \quad (1.98)$$

a system of equations

$$a_i = a \pmod{n_i}_{i=1}^k \quad (1.99)$$

have a unique solution

$$a = \sum_i m_i a_i \pmod n, \quad (1.100)$$

where

$$m_i = \left( \frac{n_i}{n} \pmod{n_i} \right) \frac{n}{n_i} \Big|_{i=1}^k. \quad (1.101)$$

## 1.2 Polynomials and rational functions

The following discussion on an arbitrary field  $\mathbb{K}$ .

### 1.2.1 Notations

Let  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  be positive. We use multi-index notation:

$$\alpha = (\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n) \in \mathbb{N}^n. \quad (1.102)$$

A monomial is defined as

$$z^\alpha := \prod_i z_i^{\alpha_i}. \quad (1.103)$$

The total degree of this monomial is given by

$$|\alpha| := \sum_i \alpha_i. \quad (1.104)$$

### 1.2.2 Polynomials and rational functions

Let  $\mathbb{K}$  be a field. Consider a map

$$f : \mathbb{K}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{K}; z \mapsto f(z) := \sum_{\alpha} c_{\alpha} z^{\alpha}, \quad (1.105)$$

where

$$c_{\alpha} \in \mathbb{K}. \quad (1.106)$$

We call the value  $f(z)$  at the dummy  $z \in \mathbb{K}^n$  a polynomial:

$$f(z) := \sum_{\alpha} c_{\alpha} z^{\alpha}. \quad (1.107)$$

We denote

$$\mathbb{K}[z] := \left\{ \sum_{\alpha} c_{\alpha} z^{\alpha} \right\} \quad (1.108)$$

as the ring of all polynomial functions in the variable  $z$  with  $\mathbb{K}$ -coefficients.

Similarly, a rational function can be expressed as a ratio of two polynomials  $p(z), q(z) \in \mathbb{K}[z]$ :

$$\frac{p(z)}{q(z)} = \frac{\sum_{\alpha} n_{\alpha} z^{\alpha}}{\sum_{\beta} d_{\beta} z^{\beta}}. \quad (1.109)$$

We denote

$$\mathbb{K}(z) := \left\{ \frac{\sum_{\alpha} n_{\alpha} z^{\alpha}}{\sum_{\beta} d_{\beta} z^{\beta}} \right\} \quad (1.110)$$

as the field of rational functions in the variable  $z$  with  $\mathbb{F}$ -coefficients. Similar to fractional numbers, there are several equivalent representation of a rational function, even if we simplify with gcd. However there still is an overall constant ambiguity. To have a unique representation, usually we put the lowest degree of term of the denominator to be 1.

### 1.2.3 As data, coefficients list

We can identify a polynomial

$$\sum_{\alpha} c_{\alpha} z^{\alpha} \quad (1.111)$$

as a set of coefficients

$$\{c_{\alpha}\}_{\alpha}. \quad (1.112)$$

Similarly, for a rational function, we can identify

$$\frac{\sum_{\alpha} n_{\alpha} z^{\alpha}}{\sum_{\beta} d_{\beta} z^{\beta}} \quad (1.113)$$

as an ordered pair of coefficients

$$(\{n_{\alpha}\}_{\alpha}, \{d_{\beta}\}_{\beta}). \quad (1.114)$$

However, there still is an overall factor ambiguity even after gcd simplifications.

### 1.3 Haskell implementation of univariate polynomials

Here we basically follow some part of §9 of ref.4, and its addendum<sup>13</sup>.

Univariate.lhs

```
> module Univariate where
> import Data.Ratio
> import Polynomials
```

#### 1.3.1 A polynomial as a list of coefficients

Let us start instance declaration, which enable us to use basic arithmetics:

```
-- Polynomials.hs
-- http://homepages.cwi.nl/~jve/rcrh/Polynomials.hs

module Polynomials where

default (Integer, Rational, Double)

-- polynomials, as coefficients lists
instance (Num a, Ord a) => Num [a] where
  fromInteger c = [fromInteger c]
  -- operator overloading
  negate []      = []
  negate (f:fs) = (negate f) : (negate fs)

  signum [] = []
  signum gs
    | signum (last gs) < (fromInteger 0) = negate z
    | otherwise = z

  abs [] = []
  abs gs
    | signum gs == z = gs
    | otherwise      = negate gs
```

---

<sup>13</sup> See <http://homepages.cwi.nl/~jve/HR/PolAddendum.pdf>

### 1.3. HASKELL IMPLEMENTATION OF UNIVARIATE POLYNOMIALS 29

```

fs      + []      = fs
[]       + gs      = gs
(f:fs) + (g:gs) = f+g : fs+gs

fs      * []      = []
[]       * gs      = []
(f:fs) * gg@(g:gs) = f*g : (f .* gs + fs * gg)

delta :: (Num a, Ord a) => [a] -> [a]
delta = ([1,-1] *)

shift :: [a] -> [a]
shift = tail

p2fct :: Num a => [a] -> a -> a
p2fct [] x = 0
p2fct (a:as) x = a + (x * p2fct as x)

comp :: (Eq a, Num a, Ord a) => [a] -> [a] -> [a]
comp _ [] = error ".."
comp [] _ = []
comp (f:fs) g0@(0:gs) = f : gs * (comp fs g0)
comp (f:fs) gg@(g:gs) = ([f] + [g] * (comp fs gg))
                        + (0 : gs * (comp fs gg))

deriv :: Num a => [a] -> [a]
deriv [] = []
deriv (f:fs) = deriv1 fs 1
  where
    deriv1 [] _ = []
    deriv1 (g:gs) n = n*g : deriv1 gs (n+1)

```

Note that the above operators are overloaded, say  $(*)$ ,  $f*g$  is a multiplication of two numbers but  $fs*gg$  is a multiplication of two list of coefficients. We can not extend this overloading to scalar multiplication, since Haskell type system takes the operands of  $(*)$  the same type

$$(*) :: \text{Num } a \Rightarrow a \rightarrow a \rightarrow a \quad (1.115)$$

```
> -- scalar multiplication
```

```

> infixl 7 .*
> (.) :: Num a => a -> [a] -> [a]
> c .* []      = []
> c .* (f:fs) = c*f : c .* fs

```

Now the (dummy) variable is given as

```

> -- z of f(z), variable
> z :: Num a => [a]
> z = [0,1]

```

A polynomial of degree  $R$  is given by a finite sum of the following form:

$$f(z) := \sum_{i=0}^R c_i z^i. \quad (1.116)$$

Therefore, it is natural to represent  $f(z)$  by a list of coefficient  $\{c_i\}_i$ . Here is the translator from the coefficient list to a polynomial function:

```

> p2fct :: Num a => [a] -> a -> a
> p2fct [] x = 0
> p2fct (a:as) x = a + (x * p2fct as x)

```

This gives us<sup>14</sup>

```

*Univariate> take 10 $ map (p2fct [1,2,3]) [0..]
[1,6,17,34,57,86,121,162,209,262]
*Univariate> take 10 $ map (\n -> 1+2*n+3*n^2) [0..]
[1,6,17,34,57,86,121,162,209,262]

```

---

<sup>14</sup> Here we have used lambda, or so called anonymous function. From <http://learnyouahaskell.com/higher-order-functions>

To make a lambda, we write a `\` (because it kind of looks like the greek letter lambda if you squint hard enough) and then we write the parameters, separated by spaces.

For example,

$$f(x) := x^2 + 1 \quad (1.117)$$

$$f := \lambda x. x^2 + 1 \quad (1.118)$$

are the same definition.

### 1.3.2 Difference analysis

We do not know in general this canonical form of the polynomial, nor the degree. That means, what we can access is the graph of  $f$ , i.e., the list of inputs and outputs. Without loss of generality, we can take

$$[0..] \quad (1.119)$$

as the input data. Usually we take a finite sublist of this, but we assume it is sufficiently long. The outputs should be

$$\text{map } f \text{ } [0..] = [f \ 0, f \ 1 \ \dots] \quad (1.120)$$

For example

```
*Univariate> take 10 $ map (\n -> n^2+2*n+1) [0..]
[1,4,9,16,25,36,49,64,81,100]
```

Let us consider the difference sequence

$$\Delta(f)(n) := f(n+1) - f(n). \quad (1.121)$$

Its Haskell version is

```
> -- difference analysis
> difs :: (Integral n) => [n] -> [n]
> difs [] = []
> difs [_] = []
> difs (i:jj@(j:js)) = j-i : difs jj
```

This gives

```
*Univariate> difs [1,4,9,16,25,36,49,64,81,100]
[3,5,7,9,11,13,15,17,19]
*Univariate> difs [3,5,7,9,11,13,15,17,19]
[2,2,2,2,2,2,2,2]
```

We claim that if  $f(z)$  is a polynomial of degree  $R$ , then  $\Delta(f)(z)$  is a polynomial of degree  $R-1$ . Since the degree is given, we can write  $f(z)$  in canonical form

$$f(n) = \sum_{i=0}^R c_i n^i \quad (1.122)$$

and

$$\Delta(f)(n) := f(n+1) - f(n) \quad (1.123)$$

$$= \sum_{i=0}^R c_i \{(n+1)^i - n^i\} \quad (1.124)$$

$$= \sum_{i=1}^R c_i \{(n+1)^i - n^i\} \quad (1.125)$$

$$= \sum_{i=1}^R c_i \{i * n^{i-1} + O(n^{i-2})\} \quad (1.126)$$

$$= c_R * R * n^{R-1} + O(n^{R-2}) \quad (1.127)$$

where  $O(n^{i-2})$  is some polynomial(s) of degree  $i - 2$ .

This guarantees the following function will terminate in finite steps<sup>15</sup>; `difLists` keeps generating difference lists until the difference get constant.

```
> difLists :: (Integral n) => [[n]] -> [[n]]
> difLists [] = []
> difLists xx@(xs:xss) =
>   if isConst xs then xx
>   else difLists $ difs xs : xx
>   where
>     isConst (i:jj@(j:js)) = all (==i) jj
>     isConst _ = error "difLists: lack of data, or not a polynomial"
```

Let us try:

```
*Univariate> difLists [[-12,-11,6,45,112,213,354,541,780,1077]]
[[6,6,6,6,6,6,6]
,[16,22,28,34,40,46,52,58]
,[1,17,39,67,101,141,187,239,297]
,[-12,-11,6,45,112,213,354,541,780,1077]
]
```

The degree of the polynomial can be computed by difference analysis:

```
> degree' :: (Integral n) => [n] -> Int
> degree' xs = length (difLists [xs]) -1
```

For example,

---

<sup>15</sup> If a given lists is generated by a polynomial.



### 1.3. HASKELL IMPLEMENTATION OF UNIVARIATE POLYNOMIALS33

```
*Univariate> degree [1,4,9,16,25,36,49,64,81,100]
2
*Univariate> take 10 $ map (\n -> n^2+2*n+1) [0..]
[1,4,9,16,25,36,49,64,81,100]
*Univariate> degree $ take 10 $ map (\n -> n^5+4*n^3+1) [0..]
5
```

Above `degree`' function can only treat finite list, however, the following function can compute the degree of infinite list.

```
> degreeLazy :: (Eq a, Num a) => [a] -> Int
> degreeLazy xs = helper xs 0
>   where
>     helper as@(a:b:c:_) n
>       | a==b && b==c = n
>       | otherwise   = helper (difs as) (n+1)
```

Note that this lazy function only sees the first two elements of the list (of difference). So first take the lazy `degreeLazy` and guess the degree, take sufficient finite sublist of output and apply `degree`'. Here is the hybrid version:

```
> degree :: (Num a, Eq a) => [a] -> Int
> degree xs = let l = degreeLazy xs in
>   degree' $ take (l+2) xs
```



## Chapter 2

# Functional reconstruction

The goal of a functional reconstruction algorithm is to identify the monomials appearing in their definition and the corresponding coefficients.

From here, we use  $\mathbb{Q}$  as our base field, but every algorithm can be computed on any field, e.g., finite field  $\mathbb{Z}_p$ .

### 2.1 Univariate polynomials

#### 2.1.1 Newtons' polynomial representation

Consider a univariate polynomial  $f(z)$ . Given a sequence of distinct values  $y_n|_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ , we evaluate the polynomial form  $f(z)$  sequentially:

$$f_0(z) = a_0 \quad (2.1)$$

$$f_1(z) = a_0 + (z - y_0)a_1 \quad (2.2)$$

$$\vdots$$

$$f_r(z) = a_0 + (z - y_0)(a_1 + (z - y_1)(\cdots + (z - y_{r-1})a_r) \quad (2.3)$$

$$= f_{r-1}(z) + (z - y_0)(z - y_1) \cdots (z - y_{r-1})a_r, \quad (2.4)$$

where

$$a_0 = f(y_0) \quad (2.5)$$

$$a_1 = \frac{f(y_1) - a_0}{y_1 - y_0} \quad (2.6)$$

$$\vdots$$

$$a_r = \left( \left( (f(y_r) - a_0) \frac{1}{y_r - y_0} - a_1 \right) \frac{1}{y_r - y_1} - \cdots - a_{r-1} \right) \frac{1}{y_r - y_{r-1}} \quad (2.7)$$

It is easy to see that,  $f_r(z)$  and the original  $f(z)$  match on the given data points, i.e.,

$$f_r(n) = f(n), 0 \leq n \leq r. \quad (2.8)$$

When we have already known the total degree of  $f(z)$ , say  $R$ , then we can terminate this sequential trial:

$$f(z) = f_R(z) \quad (2.9)$$

$$= \sum_{r=0}^R a_r \prod_{i=0}^{r-1} (z - y_i). \quad (2.10)$$

In practice, a consecutive zero on the sequence  $a_r$  can be taken as the termination condition for this algorithm.<sup>1</sup>

### 2.1.2 Towards canonical representations

Once we get the Newton's representation

$$\sum_{r=0}^R a_r \prod_{i=0}^{r-1} (z - y_i) = a_0 + (z - y_0)(a_1 + (z - y_1)(\cdots + (z - y_{R-1})a_R)) \quad (2.11)$$

as the reconstructed polynomial, it is convenient to convert it into the canonical form:

$$\sum_{r=0}^R c_r z^r. \quad (2.12)$$

This conversion only requires addition and multiplication of univariate polynomials. These operations are reasonably cheap, especially on  $\mathbb{Z}_p$ .

### 2.1.3 Simplification of our problem

Without loss of generality, we can put

$$[0..] \quad (2.13)$$

as our input list. We usually take its finite part but we assume it has enough length. Corresponding to above input,

$$\text{map } f \text{ } [0..] = [f \ 0, f \ 1, ..] \quad (2.14)$$

---

<sup>1</sup> We have not proved, but higher power will be dominant when we take sufficiently big input, so we terminate this sequence when we get a consecutive zero in  $a_r$ .

of `f :: Ratio Int -> Ratio Int` is our output list.

Then we have slightly simpler forms of coefficients:

$$f_r(z) := a_0 + z * (a_1 + (z - 1) (a_2 + (z - 2) (a_3 + \dots + (z - r + 1) a_r))) \quad (2.15)$$

$$a_0 = f(0) \quad (2.16)$$

$$a_1 = f(1) - a_0 \quad (2.17)$$

$$= f(1) - f(0) =: \Delta(f)(0) \quad (2.18)$$

$$a_2 = \frac{f(2) - a_0}{2} - a_1 \quad (2.19)$$

$$= \frac{f(2) - f(0)}{2} - (f(1) - f(0)) \quad (2.20)$$

$$= \frac{f(2) - 2f(1) + f(0)}{2} \quad (2.21)$$

$$= \frac{(f(2) - f(1)) - (f(1) - f(0))}{2} =: \frac{\Delta^2(f)(0)}{2} \quad (2.22)$$

$\vdots$

$$a_r = \frac{\Delta^r(f)(0)}{r!}, \quad (2.23)$$

where  $\Delta$  is the difference operator in eq.(1.121):

$$\Delta(f)(n) := f(n + 1) - f(n). \quad (2.24)$$

In order to simplify our expression, we introduce a falling power:

$$(x)_0 := 1 \quad (2.25)$$

$$(x)_n := x(x - 1) \cdots (x - n + 1) \quad (2.26)$$

$$= \prod_{i=0}^{n-1} (x - i). \quad (2.27)$$

Under these settings, we have

$$f(z) = f_R(z) \quad (2.28)$$

$$= \sum_{r=0}^R \frac{\Delta^r(f)(0)}{r!} (x)_r, \quad (2.29)$$

where we have assume

$$\Delta^{R+1}(f) = [0, 0, \dots]. \quad (2.30)$$

**Example**

Consider a polynomial

$$f(z) := 2 * z^3 + 3 * z, \quad (2.31)$$

and its out put list

$$[f(0), f(1), f(3), \dots] = [0, 5, 22, 63, 140, 265, \dots] \quad (2.32)$$

This polynomial is 3rd degree, so we compute up to  $\Delta^3(f)(0)$ :

$$f(0) = 0 \quad (2.33)$$

$$\Delta(f)(0) = f(1) - f(0) = 5 \quad (2.34)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta^2(f)(0) &= \Delta(f)(1) - \Delta(f)(0) \\ &= f(2) - f(1) - 5 = 22 - 5 - 5 = 12 \end{aligned} \quad (2.35)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta^3(f)(0) &= \Delta^2(f)(1) - \Delta^2(f)(0) \\ &= f(3) - f(2) - \{f(2) - f(1)\} - 12 = 12 \end{aligned} \quad (2.36)$$

so we get

$$[0, 5, 12, 12] \quad (2.37)$$

as the difference list. Therefore, we get the falling power representation of  $f$ :

$$f(z) = 5(x)_1 + \frac{12}{2}(x)_2 + \frac{12}{3!}(x)_3 \quad (2.38)$$

$$= 5(x)_1 + 6(x)_2 + 2(x)_3. \quad (2.39)$$

**2.1.4 Haskell implementation****Newton interpolation formula**

First, the falling power is naturally given by recursively:

```
> infixr 8 ^- -- falling power
> (^-) :: (Integral a) => a -> a -> a
> x ^- 0 = 1
> x ^- n = (x ^- (n-1)) * (x - n + 1)
```

Assume the differences are given in a list

$$\mathbf{xs} = [f(0), \Delta(f)(0), \Delta^2(f)(0), \dots]. \quad (2.40)$$

Then the implementation of the Newton interpolation formula is as follows:

```

> newtonC :: (Fractional t, Enum t) => [t] -> [t]
> newtonC xs = [x / factorial k | (x,k) <- zip xs [0..]]
>   where
>     factorial k = product [1..fromInteger k]

```

Consider a polynomial

$$f\ x = 2x^3 + 3x \quad (2.41)$$

Let us try to reconstruct this polynomial from output list. In order to get the list `[x_0, x_1 ..]`, take `difLists` and pick the first elements:

```

> let f x = 2*x^3+3*x
> take 10 $ map f [0..]
[0,5,22,63,140,265,450,707,1048,1485]
> difLists [it]
[[12,12,12,12,12,12,12]
, [12,24,36,48,60,72,84,96]
, [5,17,41,77,125,185,257,341,437]
, [0,5,22,63,140,265,450,707,1048,1485]
]
> reverse $ map head it
[0,5,12,12]

```

This list is the same as eq.(2.37) and we get the same expression as eq.(2.39)  $5(x)_1 + 6(x)_2 + 2(x)_3$ :

```

> newtonC it
[0 % 1,5 % 1,6 % 1,2 % 1]

```

The list of first differences, i.e.,

$$[f(0), \Delta(f)(0), \Delta^2(f)(0), \dots] \quad (2.42)$$

can be computed as follows:

```

> firstDifs :: (Eq a, Num a) => [a] -> [a]
> firstDifs xs = reverse $ map head $ difLists [xs]

```

Mapping a list of integers to a Newton representation:

```

> list2npol :: (Integral a) => [Ratio a] -> [Ratio a]
> list2npol = newtonC . firstDifs

```

```

*NewtonInterpolation> take 10 $ map f [0..]
[0,5,22,63,140,265,450,707,1048,1485]
*NewtonInterpolation> list2npol it
[0 % 1,5 % 1,6 % 1,2 % 1]

```

Therefore, we get the Newton coefficients from the output list.

### Stirling numbers of the first kind

We need to map Newton falling powers to standard powers to get the canonical representation. This is a matter of applying combinatorics, by means of a convention formula that uses the so-called Stirling cyclic numbers

$$\begin{bmatrix} n \\ k \end{bmatrix} \quad (2.43)$$

Its defining relation is,  $\forall n > 0$ ,

$$(x)_n = \sum_{k=1}^n (-1)^{n-k} \begin{bmatrix} n \\ k \end{bmatrix} x^k, \quad (2.44)$$

and

$$\begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix} := 1. \quad (2.45)$$

From the highest order,  $x^n$ , we get

$$\begin{bmatrix} n \\ n \end{bmatrix} = 1, \forall n > 0. \quad (2.46)$$

We also put

$$\begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ 1 \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ 2 \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ 3 \end{bmatrix} = \dots = 0, \quad (2.47)$$

and

$$\begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} 2 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} 3 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix} = \dots = 0. \quad (2.48)$$

The key equation is

$$(x)_n = (x)_{n-1} * (x - n + 1) \quad (2.49)$$



and we get

$$(x)_n = \sum_{k=1}^n (-)^{n-k} \begin{bmatrix} n \\ k \end{bmatrix} x^k \quad (2.50)$$

$$= x^n + \sum_{k=1}^{n-1} (-)^{n-k} \begin{bmatrix} n \\ k \end{bmatrix} x^k \quad (2.51)$$

$$(x)_{n-1} * (x - n + 1) = \sum_{k=1}^{n-1} (-)^{n-1-k} \left\{ \begin{bmatrix} n-1 \\ k \end{bmatrix} x^{k+1} - (n-1) \begin{bmatrix} n-1 \\ k \end{bmatrix} x^k \right\} \quad (2.52)$$

$$= \sum_{l=2}^n (-)^{n-l} \begin{bmatrix} n-1 \\ l-1 \end{bmatrix} x^l + (n-1) \sum_{k=1}^{n-1} (-)^{n-k} \begin{bmatrix} n \\ k \end{bmatrix} x^k \quad (2.53)$$

$$= x^n + (n-1)(-)^{n-1}x + \sum_{k=2}^{n-1} (-)^{n-k} \left\{ \begin{bmatrix} n-1 \\ k-1 \end{bmatrix} + (n-1) \begin{bmatrix} n-1 \\ k \end{bmatrix} \right\} x^k \quad (2.54)$$

$$= x^n + \sum_{k=1}^{n-1} (-)^{n-k} \left\{ \begin{bmatrix} n-1 \\ k-1 \end{bmatrix} + (n-1) \begin{bmatrix} n-1 \\ k \end{bmatrix} \right\} x^k \quad (2.55)$$

Therefore,  $\forall n, k > 0$ ,

$$\begin{bmatrix} n \\ k \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} n-1 \\ k-1 \end{bmatrix} + (n-1) \begin{bmatrix} n-1 \\ k \end{bmatrix} \quad (2.56)$$

Now we have the following canonical, power representation of reconstructed polynomial

$$f(z) = f_R(z) \quad (2.57)$$

$$= \sum_{r=0}^R \frac{\Delta^r(f)(0)}{r!} (x)_r \quad (2.58)$$

$$= \sum_{r=0}^R \frac{\Delta^r(f)(0)}{r!} \sum_{k=1}^r (-)^{r-k} \begin{bmatrix} r \\ k \end{bmatrix} x^k, \quad (2.59)$$

So, what shall we do is to sum up order by order.

Here is an implementation, first the Stirling numbers:

```
> stirlingC :: Integer -> Integer -> Integer
> stirlingC 0 0 = 1
> stirlingC 0 _ = 0
> stirlingC n k = (n-1)*(stirlingC (n-1) k) + stirlingC (n-1) (k-1)
```

This definition can be used to convert from falling powers to standard powers.

```
> fall2pol :: (Integral a) => a -> [a]
> fall2pol 0 = [1]
> fall2pol n = 0 -- No constant term.
>               : [(-1)^(n-k) * stirlingC n k | k<-[1..n]]
```

We use `fall2pol` to convert Newton representations to standard polynomials in coefficients list representation. Here we have uses `sum` to collect same order terms in list representation.

```
> npol2pol :: (Integral a) => [Ratio a] -> [Ratio a]
> npol2pol xs = sum [ [x] * map fromInteger (fall2pol k)
>                      | (x,k) <- zip xs [0..]
>                      ]
```

#### **list2pol: from output list to canonical coefficients**

Finally, here is the function for computing a polynomial from an output sequence:

```
> list2pol :: (Integral a) => [Ratio a] -> [Ratio a]
> list2pol = npol2pol . list2npol
```

Here are some checks on these functions:

Reconstruction as curve fitting

```
*NewtonInterpolation> list2pol $ map (\n -> 7*n^2+3*n-4) [0..100]
[(-4) % 1,3 % 1,7 % 1]
```

```
*NewtonInterpolation> list2pol [0,1,5,14,30]
[0 % 1,1 % 6,1 % 2,1 % 3]
```

```
*NewtonInterpolation> map (\n -> n%6 + n^2%2 + n^3%3) [0..4]
[0 % 1,1 % 1,5 % 1,14 % 1,30 % 1]
```

```
*NewtonInterpolation> map (p2fct $ list2pol [0,1,5,14,30]) [0..8]
[0 % 1,1 % 1,5 % 1,14 % 1,30 % 1,55 % 1,91 % 1,140 % 1,204 % 1]
```

First example shows that from the sufficiently long output list, we can reconstruct the list of coefficients. Second example shows that from a given outputs, we have a list coefficients. Then use these coefficients, we define

the output list of the function, and they match. The last example shows that from a limited (but sufficient) output information, we reconstruct a function and get extra outputs outside from the given data.

## 2.2 Univariate rational functions

We use the same notion, i.e., what we can know is the output-list of a univariate rational function, say  $f :: \text{Int} \rightarrow \text{Ratio Int}$ :

$$\text{map } f \text{ [0..]} == [f \ 0, f \ 1 \ ..] \quad (2.60)$$

### 2.2.1 Thiele's interpolation formula

We evaluate the polynomial form  $f(z)$  as a continued fraction:

$$f_0(z) = a_0 \quad (2.61)$$

$$f_1(z) = a_0 + \frac{z}{a_1} \quad (2.62)$$

$$\vdots$$

$$f_r(z) = a_0 + \frac{z}{a_1 + \frac{z-1}{a_2 + \frac{z-2}{a_{r-2} + \frac{\vdots}{a_{r-1} + \frac{z-r+1}{a_r}}}}}, \quad (2.63)$$

where

$$a_0 = f(0) \quad (2.64)$$

$$a_1 = \frac{1}{f(1) - a_0} \quad (2.65)$$

$$a_2 = \frac{1}{\frac{2}{f(2) - a_0} - a_1} \quad (2.66)$$

$$\vdots$$

$$a_r = \frac{1}{\frac{2}{\frac{3}{\vdots} - a_{r-1}} - a_{r-2}} \quad (2.67)$$

$$= \left( \left( (f(r) - a_0)^{-1} r - a_1 \right)^{-1} (r-1) - \dots - a_{r-1} \right)^{-1} 1 \quad (2.68)$$

### 2.2.2 Towards canonical representations

In order to get a unique representation of canonical form

$$\frac{\sum_{\alpha} n_{\alpha} z^{\alpha}}{\sum_{\beta} d_{\beta} z^{\beta}} \quad (2.69)$$

we put

$$d_{\min r'} = 1 \quad (2.70)$$

as a normalization, instead of  $d_0$ . However, if we meet 0 as a singular value, then we can shift s.t. the new  $d_0 \neq 0$ . So without loss of generality, we can assume  $f(0)$  is not singular, i.e., the denominator of  $f$  has a nonzero constant term.

### 2.2.3 Haskell implementation

Here we the same notion of

[https://rosettacode.org/wiki/Thiele%27s\\_interpolation\\_formula](https://rosettacode.org/wiki/Thiele%27s_interpolation_formula)

and especially

[https://rosettacode.org/wiki/Thiele%27s\\_interpolation\\_formula#C](https://rosettacode.org/wiki/Thiele%27s_interpolation_formula#C)

### Claim

We claim, without proof<sup>2</sup>, that the Thiele coefficients are given by

$$a_0 := f(0) \quad (2.71)$$

$$a_n := \rho_{n,0} - \rho_{n-2,0}, \quad (2.72)$$

where  $\rho$  is so called the reciprocal difference:

$$\rho_{n,i} := 0, n < 0 \quad (2.73)$$

$$\rho_{0,i} := f(i), i = 0, 1, 2, \dots \quad (2.74)$$

$$\rho_{n,i} := \frac{n}{\rho_{n-1,i+1} - \rho_{n-1,i}} + \rho_{n-2,i+1} \quad (2.75)$$

These preparation helps us to write the following codes:

Thiele's interpolation formula

Reciprocal difference rho, using the same notation of

[https://rosettacode.org/wiki/Thiele%27s\\_interpolation\\_formula#C](https://rosettacode.org/wiki/Thiele%27s_interpolation_formula#C)

```
> rho :: [Ratio Int] -- A list of output of f :: Int -> Ratio Int
>      -> Int -> Int -> Ratio Int
> rho fs 0 i = fs !! i
> rho fs n _
>   | n < 0 = 0
> rho fs n i = (n*den)%num + rho fs (n-2) (i+1)
>   where
>     num = numerator next
>     den = denominator next
>     next = (rho fs (n-1) (i+1)) - (rho fs (n-1) i)
```

Note that (%) has the following type,

(%) :: Integral a => a -> a -> Ratio a

```
> a fs 0 = fs !! 0
> a fs n = rho fs n 0 - rho fs (n-2) 0
```

---

<sup>2</sup> See the ref.5, Theorem (2.2.2.5) in 2nd edition.

**Example**

Now let us consider a simple example which is given by the following Thiele coefficients

$$a_0 = 1, a_1 = 2, a_2 = 3, a_3 = 4. \quad (2.76)$$

The function is now

$$f(x) := 1 + \frac{x}{2 + \frac{x-1}{3 + \frac{x-2}{4}}} \quad (2.77)$$

$$= \frac{x^2 + 16x + 16}{16 + 6x} \quad (2.78)$$

Using Maxima, we can verify this:

```
(%i25) f(x) := 1+(x/(2+(x-1)/(3+(x-2)/4)));
(%o25) f(x):=x/(2+(x-1)/(3+(x-2)/4))+1
(%i26) ratsimp(f(x));
(%o26) (x^2+16*x+16)/(16+6*x)
```

Let us come back Haskell, and try to get the Thiele coefficients of

```
*Univariate> let func x = (x^2 + 16*x + 16)%(6*x + 16)
*Univariate> let fs = map func [0..]
*Univariate> map (a fs) [0..]
[1 % 1,2 % 1,3 % 1,4 % 1,*** Exception: Ratio has zero denominator]
```

This is clearly unsafe, so let us think more carefully. Observe the reciprocal differences

```
*Univariate> let fs = map func [0..]
*Univariate> take 5 $ map (rho fs 0) [0..]
[1 % 1,3 % 2,13 % 7,73 % 34,12 % 5]
*Univariate> take 5 $ map (rho fs 1) [0..]
[2 % 1,14 % 5,238 % 69,170 % 43,230 % 53]
*Univariate> take 5 $ map (rho fs 2) [0..]
[4 % 1,79 % 16,269 % 44,667 % 88,413 % 44]
*Univariate> take 5 $ map (rho fs 3) [0..]
[6 % 1,6 % 1,6 % 1,6 % 1]
```

So, the constancy of the reciprocal differences can be used to get the depth of Thiele series:

```
> tDegree :: [Ratio Int] -> Int
> tDegree fs = helper fs 0
>   where
>     helper fs n
>       | isConstants fs' = n
>       | otherwise      = helper fs (n+1)
>     where
>       fs' = map (rho fs n) [0..]
>     isConstants (i:j:_) = i==j -- 2 times match
> -- isConstants (i:j:k:_) = i==j && j==k
```

Using this `tDegree` function, we can safely take the (finite) Thiele sequence.

### Another example

From the equation (3.26) of ref.1,

```
*Univariate> let h t = (3+6*t+18*t^2)/(1+2*t+20*t^2)
*Univariate> let hs = map h [0..]
*Univariate> tDegree hs
4
```

So we get the Thiele coefficients

```
*Univariate> map (a hs) [0..(tDegree hs)]
[3 % 1, (-23) % 42, (-28) % 13, 767 % 14, 7 % 130]
```

Plug these in the continued fraction, and simplify with Maxima

```
(%i35) h(t) := 3+t/((-23/42)+(t-1)/((-28/13)+(t-2)/((767/14)+(t-3)/(7/130))));
(%o35) h(t):=t/((-23)/42+(t-1)/((-28)/13+(t-2)/(767/14+(t-3)/(7/130)))+3
(%i36) ratsimp(h(t));
(%o36) (18*t^2+6*t+3)/(1+2*t+20*t^2)
```

Finally we make a function `thieleC` that returns the Thiele coefficients:

```
> thieleC :: [Ratio Int] -> [Ratio Int]
> thieleC lst = map (a lst) [0..(tDegree lst)]

*Univariate> thieleC hs
[3 % 1, (-23) % 42, (-28) % 13, 767 % 14, 7 % 130]
```

We need a convertor from this Thiele sequence to continuous form of rational function.

```
> nextStep [a0,a1] (v:_) = a0 + v/a1
> nextStep (a:as) (v:vs) = a + (v / nextStep as vs)
>
> -- From thiele sequence to (rational) function.
> thiele2ratf :: Integral a => [Ratio a] -> (Ratio a -> Ratio a)
> thiele2ratf as x
>   | x == 0 = head as
>   | otherwise = nextStep as [x,x-1 ..]
```

The following example shows that, the given output lists `hs`, we can interpolate the value between our discrete data.

```
*Univariate> let h t = (3+6*t+18*t^2)%(1+2*t+20*t^2)
*Univariate> let hs = map h [0..]
*Univariate> take 5 hs
[3 % 1,27 % 23,87 % 85,183 % 187,45 % 47]
*Univariate> let as = thieleC hs
*Univariate> as
[3 % 1,(-23) % 42,(-28) % 13,767 % 14,7 % 130]
*Univariate> let th x = thiele2ratf as x
*Univariate> map th [0..5]
[3 % 1,27 % 23,87 % 85,183 % 187,45 % 47,69 % 73]
*Univariate> th 0.5
3 % 2
```

### Haskell representation for rational functions

We represent a rational function by a tuple of coefficient lists, say,

$$(ns,ds) :: ([Ratio Int],[Ratio Int]) \quad (2.79)$$

Here is a translator from coefficients lists to rational function.

```
> lists2ratf :: (Integral a) =>
>   ([Ratio a],[Ratio a]) -> (Ratio a -> Ratio a)
> lists2ratf (ns,ds) x = (p2fct ns x)/(p2fct ds x)

*Univariate> let frac x = lists2ratf ([1,1%2,1%3],[2,2%3]) x
*Univariate> take 10 $ map frac [0..]
```



```

[1 % 2,11 % 16,1 % 1,11 % 8,25 % 14,71 % 32,8 % 3,25 % 8,79 % 22,65 % 16]
*Univariate> let ffrac x = (1+(1%2)*x+(1%3)*x^2)/(2+(2%3)*x)
*Univariate> take 10 $ map ffrac [0..]
[1 % 2,11 % 16,1 % 1,11 % 8,25 % 14,71 % 32,8 % 3,25 % 8,79 % 22,65 % 16]

```

Simply taking numerator and denominator polynomials.

The following `canonicalizer` reduces the tuple-rep of rational function in canonical form, i.e., the coefficient of the lowest degree term of the denominator to be  $1^3$ .

```

> canonicalize :: (Integral a) =>
>   ([Ratio a],[Ratio a]) -> ([Ratio a],[Ratio a])
> canonicalize rat@(ns,ds)
>   | dMin == 1 = rat
>   | otherwise = (map (/dMin) ns, map (/dMin) ds)
>   where
>     dMin = firstNonzero ds
>     firstNonzero [a] = a -- head
>     firstNonzero (a:as)
>       | a /= 0 = a
>       | otherwise = firstNonzero as

```

```

*Univariate> canonicalize ([1,1%2,1%3],[2,2%3])
([1 % 2,1 % 4,1 % 6],[1 % 1,1 % 3])
*Univariate> canonicalize ([1,1%2,1%3],[0,0,2,2%3])
([1 % 2,1 % 4,1 % 6],[0 % 1,0 % 1,1 % 1,1 % 3])
*Univariate> canonicalize ([1,1%2,1%3],[0,0,0,2%3])
([3 % 2,3 % 4,1 % 2],[0 % 1,0 % 1,0 % 1,1 % 1])

```

What we need is a translator from Thiele coefficients to this tuple-rep. Since the list of Thiele coefficients is finite, we can naturally think recursively.

Before we go to a general case, consider

$$f(x) := 1 + \frac{x}{2 + \frac{x-1}{3 + \frac{x-2}{4}}} \quad (2.80)$$

---

<sup>3</sup> Here our data point start from 0, i.e., the output data is given by `map f [0..]`, 0 is not singular, i.e., the denominator should have constant term and that means non empty. Therefore, the function `firstNonzero` is actually `head`.

When we simplify this expression, we should start from the bottom:

$$f(x) = 1 + \frac{x}{2 + \frac{x-1}{4 * 3 + x - 2}} \quad (2.81)$$

$$= 1 + \frac{x}{2 + \frac{x-1}{x+10}} \quad (2.82)$$

$$= 1 + \frac{x}{\frac{2 * (x+10) + 4 * (x-1)}{x+10}} \quad (2.83)$$

$$= 1 + \frac{x}{\frac{6x+16}{x+10}} \quad (2.84)$$

$$= \frac{1 * (6x+16) + x * (x+10)}{6x+16} \quad (2.85)$$

$$= \frac{x^2 + 16x + 16}{6x+16} \quad (2.86)$$

Finally, if we need, we take its canonical form:

$$f(x) = \frac{1 + x + \frac{1}{16}x^2}{1 + \frac{3}{8}x} \quad (2.87)$$

In general, we have the following Thiele representation:

$$a_0 + \frac{z}{a_1 + \frac{z-1}{a_2 + \frac{z-2}{\vdots \frac{z-r+1}{a_{r-1} + \frac{z-r+1}{a_r}}}}} \quad (2.88)$$

The base case should be

$$a_{r-1} + \frac{z-r+1}{a_r} = \frac{a_r \times a_{r-1} - r + 1 + z}{a_r} \quad (2.89)$$

and induction step should be

$$a_{n-1}(z) = a_n + \frac{z - n}{a_{n+1}(z)} \quad (2.90)$$

$$= \frac{a_n a_{n+1}(z) + z - n}{a_{n+1}(z)} \quad (2.91)$$

$$= \frac{a_n * \text{num}(a_{n+1}(z)) + \text{den}(a_{n+1}(z)) * (z - n)}{\text{num}(a_{n+1}(z))} \quad (2.92)$$

where

$$a_{n+1}(z) = \frac{\text{num}(a_{n+1}(z))}{\text{den}(a_{n+1}(z))} \quad (2.93)$$

is a canonical representation of  $a_{n+1}(z)$ <sup>4</sup>.

Thus, the implementation is the followings.

```
> thiele2coef :: (Integral a) =>
>   [Ratio a] -> ([Ratio a],[Ratio a])
> thiele2coef as = canonicalize $ t2r as 0
>   where
>     t2r [an,an'] n = ([an*an'-n,1],[an'])
>     t2r (a:as)    n = ((a .* num) + ([-n,1] * den), num)
>     where
>       (num, den) = t2r as (n+1)
```

From the first example,

```
*Univariate> let func x = (x^2+16*x+16)%(6*x+16)
*Univariate> let funcList = map func [0..]
*Univariate> tDegree funcList
3
*Univariate> take 5 funcList
[1 % 1,3 % 2,13 % 7,73 % 34,12 % 5]
*Univariate> let aFunc = thieleC funcList
*Univariate> aFunc
[1 % 1,2 % 1,3 % 1,4 % 1]
*Univariate> thiele2coef aFunc
([1 % 1,1 % 1,1 % 16],[1 % 1,3 % 8])
```

From the other example, equation (3.26) of ref.1,

---

<sup>4</sup> Not necessary being a canonical representation, it suffices to express  $a_{n+1}(z)$  in a polynomial over polynomial form.

```

*Univariate> let h t = (3+6*t+18*t^2)%(1+2*t+20*t^2)
*Univariate> let hs = map h [0..]
*Univariate> take 5 hs
[3 % 1,27 % 23,87 % 85,183 % 187,45 % 47]
*Univariate> let th x = thiele2ratf as x
*Univariate> map th [0..5]
[3 % 1,27 % 23,87 % 85,183 % 187,45 % 47,69 % 73]
*Univariate> as
[3 % 1,(-23) % 42,(-28) % 13,767 % 14,7 % 130]
*Univariate> thiele2coef as
([3 % 1,6 % 1,18 % 1],[1 % 1,2 % 1,20 % 1])

```

**lists2rat: from output lists to canonical coefficients**

Finally, we get

```

> lists2rat :: (Integral a) => [Ratio a] -> ([Ratio a], [Ratio a])
> lists2rat = thiele2Coef . thieleC

```

as the reconstruction function from the output sequence.

```

*Univariate> let h t = (3+6*t+18*t^2)%(1+2*t+20*t^2)
*Univariate> lists2rat $ map h [0..]
([3 % 1,6 % 1,18 % 1],[1 % 1,2 % 1,20 % 1])

```

## 2.3 Multivariate polynomials

### 2.3.1 Foldings as recursive applications

Consider an arbitrary multivariate polynomial

$$f(z_1, \dots, z_n) \in \mathbb{F}[z_1, \dots, z_n]. \quad (2.94)$$

First, fix all the variable but 1st and apply the univariate Newton's reconstruction:

$$f(z_1, z_2, \dots, z_n) = \sum_{r=0}^R a_r(z_2, \dots, z_n) \prod_{i=0}^{r-1} (z_1 - y_i) \quad (2.95)$$

Recursively, pick up one "coefficient" and apply the univariate Newton's reconstruction on  $z_2$ :

$$a_r(z_2, \dots, z_n) = \sum_{s=0}^S b_s(z_3, \dots, z_n) \prod_{j=0}^{s-1} (z_2 - x_j) \quad (2.96)$$

The terminate condition should be the univariate case.

### 2.3.2 Experiment, binary case

Let us take a polynomial from the denominator in eq.(3.23) of ref.1.

$$f(z_1, z_2) = 3 + 2z_1 + 4z_2 + 7z_1^2 + 5z_1z_2 + 6z_2^2 \quad (2.97)$$

In Haskell, first, fix  $z_2 = 0, 1, 2$  and identify  $f(z_1, 0), f(z_1, 1), f(z_1, 2)$  as our univariate polynomials.

```
*Multivariate> let f z1 z2 = 3+2*z1+4*z2+7*z1^2+5*z1*z2+6*z2^2
*Multivariate> let fs z = map ('f' z) [0..]
*Multivariate> let llst = map fs [0,1,2]
*Multivariate> map degree llst
[2,2,2]
```

Fine, so the canonical form can be

$$f(z_1, z) = c_0(z) + c_1(z)z_1 + c_2(z)z_1^2. \quad (2.98)$$

Now our new target is three univariate polynomials  $c_0(z), c_1(z), c_2(z)$ .

```
*Multivariate> list2pol $ take 10 $ fs 0
[3 % 1,2 % 1,7 % 1]
*Multivariate> list2pol $ take 10 $ fs 1
[13 % 1,7 % 1,7 % 1]
*Multivariate> list2pol $ take 10 $ fs 2
[35 % 1,12 % 1,7 % 1]
```

That is

$$f(z, 0) = 3 + 2z + 7z^2 \quad (2.99)$$

$$f(z, 1) = 13 + 7z + 7z^2 \quad (2.100)$$

$$f(z, 2) = 35 + 12z + 7z^2. \quad (2.101)$$

From these observation, we can determine  $c_2(z)$ , since it already a constant sequence.

$$c_2(z) = 7 \quad (2.102)$$

Consider  $c_1(z)$ , the sequence is now enough to determine  $c_1(z)$ :

```
*Multivariate> degree [2,7,12]
1
*Multivariate> list2pol [2,7,12]
[2 % 1,5 % 1]
```

i.e.,

$$c_1(z) = 2 + 5z. \quad (2.103)$$

However, for  $c_1(z)$

```
*Multivariate> degree [3, 13, 35]
*** Exception: difLists: lack of data, or not a polynomial
CallStack (from HasCallStack):
  error, called at ./Univariate.lhs:61:19 in main:Univariate
```

so we need more numbers. Let us try one more:

```
*Multivariate> list2pol $ take 10 $ map ('f' 3) [0..]
[69 % 1,17 % 1,7 % 1]
*Multivariate> degree [3, 13, 35, 69]
2
*Multivariate> list2pol [3,13,35,69]
[3 % 1,4 % 1,6 % 1]
```

Thus we have

$$c_0(z) = 3 + 4z + 6z^2 \quad (2.104)$$

and these fully determine our polynomial:

$$f(z_1, z_2) = (3 + 4z_2 + 6z_2^2) + (2 + 5z_2)z_1 + 7z_1^2. \quad (2.105)$$

As another experiment, take the denominator.

```
*Multivariate> let g x y = 1+7*x + 8*y + 10*x^2 + x*y+9*y^2
*Multivariate> let gs x = map (g x) [0..]
*Multivariate> map degree $ map gs [0..3]
[2,2,2,2]
```

So the canonical form should be

$$g(x, y) = c_0(x) + c_1(x)y + c_2(x)y^2 \quad (2.106)$$

Let us look at these coefficient polynomial:

```

*Multivariate> list2pol $ take 10 $ gs 0
[1 % 1,8 % 1,9 % 1]
*Multivariate> list2pol $ take 10 $ gs 1
[18 % 1,9 % 1,9 % 1]
*Multivariate> list2pol $ take 10 $ gs 2
[55 % 1,10 % 1,9 % 1]
*Multivariate> list2pol $ take 10 $ gs 3
[112 % 1,11 % 1,9 % 1]

```

So we get

$$c_2(x) = 9 \quad (2.107)$$

and

```

*Multivariate> map (list2pol . (take 10) . gs) [0..4]
[[1 % 1,8 % 1,9 % 1]
,[18 % 1,9 % 1,9 % 1]
,[55 % 1,10 % 1,9 % 1]
,[112 % 1,11 % 1,9 % 1]
,[189 % 1,12 % 1,9 % 1]
]
*Multivariate> map head it
[1 % 1,18 % 1,55 % 1,112 % 1,189 % 1]
*Multivariate> list2pol it
[1 % 1,7 % 1,10 % 1]
*Multivariate> list2pol $ map (head . list2pol . (take 10) . gs) [0..4]
[1 % 1,7 % 1,10 % 1]

```

Using index operator (!!),

```

*Multivariate> list2pol $ map (!! 0) . list2pol . (take 10) . gs [0..4]
[1 % 1,7 % 1,10 % 1]
*Multivariate> list2pol $ map (!! 1) . list2pol . (take 10) . gs [0..4]
[8 % 1,1 % 1]
*Multivariate> list2pol $ map (!! 2) . list2pol . (take 10) . gs [0..4]
[9 % 1]

```

Finally we get

$$c_0(x) = 1 + 7x + 10x^2, c_1(x) = 8 + x, (c_2(x) = 9,) \quad (2.108)$$

and

$$g(x, y) = (1 + 7x + 10x^2) + (8 + x)y + 9y^2 \quad (2.109)$$

### 2.3.3 Haskell implementation TBA

## 2.4 Multivariate rational functions

### 2.4.1 The canonical normalization

Our target is a pair of coefficients  $(\{n_\alpha\}_\alpha, \{d_\beta\}_\beta)$  in

$$\frac{\sum_\alpha n_\alpha z^\alpha}{\sum_\beta d_\beta z^\beta} \quad (2.110)$$

A canonical choice is

$$d_0 = d_{(0, \dots, 0)} = 1. \quad (2.111)$$

Accidentally we might face  $d_0 = 0$ , but we can shift our function and make

$$d'_0 = d_s \neq 0. \quad (2.112)$$

### 2.4.2 An auxiliary $t$

Introducing an auxiliary variable  $t$ , let us define

$$h(t, z) := f(tz_1, \dots, tz_n), \quad (2.113)$$

and reconstruct  $h(t, z)$  as a univariate rational function of  $t$ :

$$h(t, z) = \frac{\sum_{r=0}^R p_r(z) t^r}{1 + \sum_{r'=1}^{R'} q_{r'}(z) t^{r'}} \quad (2.114)$$

where

$$p_r(z) = \sum_{|\alpha|=r} n_\alpha z^\alpha \quad (2.115)$$

$$q_{r'}(z) = \sum_{|\beta|=r'} n_\beta z^\beta \quad (2.116)$$

are homogeneous polynomials.

Thus, what we shall do is the (homogeneous) polynomial reconstructions of  $p_r(z)|_{0 \leq r \leq R}$ ,  $q_{r'}(z)|_{1 \leq r' \leq R'}$ .



**A simplification**

Since our new targets are homogeneous polynomials, we can consider, say,

$$p_r(1, z_2, \dots, z_n) \quad (2.117)$$

instead of  $p_r(z_1, z_2, \dots, z_n)$ , reconstruct it using multivariate Newton's method, and homogenize with  $z_1$ .

**2.4.3 Experiment, without above simplification**

```

*Univariate> f x y = (3+2*x+4*y+7*x^2+5*x*y+6*y^2)*(1+7*x+8*y+10*x^2+x*y+9*y^2)
*Univariate> let h t x y = f (t*x) (t*y)
*Univariate> let h10s = map (\t -> h t 1 0) [0..]
*Univariate> let h11s = map (\t -> h t 1 1) [0..]
*Univariate> let h12s = map (\t -> h t 1 2) [0..]
*Univariate> let h13s = map (\t -> h t 1 3) [0..]
*Univariate> canonicalizer $ thiele2ratf $ thieleC h10s
([3 % 1,2 % 1,7 % 1],[1 % 1,7 % 1,10 % 1])
*Univariate> canonicalizer $ thiele2ratf $ thieleC h11s
([3 % 1,6 % 1,18 % 1],[1 % 1,15 % 1,20 % 1])
*Univariate> canonicalizer $ thiele2ratf $ thieleC h12s
([3 % 1,10 % 1,41 % 1],[1 % 1,23 % 1,48 % 1])
*Univariate> canonicalizer $ thiele2ratf $ thieleC h13s
([3 % 1,14 % 1,76 % 1],[1 % 1,31 % 1,94 % 1])
*Univariate> degree [2,6,10,14]
1
*Univariate> list2pol [2,6,10,14]
[2 % 1,4 % 1]
*Univariate> degree [7,18,41,76]
2
*Univariate> list2pol [7,18,41,76]
[7 % 1,5 % 1,6 % 1]
*Univariate> degree [7,15,23,31]
1
*Univariate> list2pol [7,15,23,31]
[7 % 1,8 % 1]
*Univariate> degree [10,20,48,94]
2
*Univariate> list2pol [10,20,48,94]
[10 % 1,1 % 1,9 % 1]

```

```

*Univariate> let h01s = map (\t -> h t 0 1) [0..]
*Univariate> let h11s = map (\t -> h t 1 1) [0..]
*Univariate> let h21s = map (\t -> h t 2 1) [0..]
*Univariate> let h31s = map (\t -> h t 3 1) [0..]
*Univariate> canonicalizer $ thiele2ratf $ thieleC h01s
([3 % 1,4 % 1,6 % 1],[1 % 1,8 % 1,9 % 1])
*Univariate> canonicalizer $ thiele2ratf $ thieleC h11s
([3 % 1,6 % 1,18 % 1],[1 % 1,15 % 1,20 % 1])
*Univariate> canonicalizer $ thiele2ratf $ thieleC h21s
([3 % 1,8 % 1,44 % 1],[1 % 1,22 % 1,51 % 1])
*Univariate> canonicalizer $ thiele2ratf $ thieleC h31s
([3 % 1,10 % 1,84 % 1],[1 % 1,29 % 1,102 % 1])
*Univariate> list2pol [4,6,8,10]
[4 % 1,2 % 1]
*Univariate> list2pol [6,18,44,84]
[6 % 1,5 % 1,7 % 1]
*Univariate> list2pol [8,15,22,29]
[8 % 1,7 % 1]
*Univariate> list2pol [9,20,51,102]
[9 % 1,1 % 1,10 % 1]
*Univariate> let h20s = map (\t -> h t 2 0) [0..]
*Univariate> let h21s = map (\t -> h t 2 1) [0..]
*Univariate> let h22s = map (\t -> h t 2 2) [0..]
*Univariate> let h23s = map (\t -> h t 2 3) [0..]
*Univariate> canonicalizer $ thiele2ratf $ thieleC h20s
([3 % 1,4 % 1,28 % 1],[1 % 1,14 % 1,40 % 1])
*Univariate> canonicalizer $ thiele2ratf $ thieleC h21s
([3 % 1,8 % 1,44 % 1],[1 % 1,22 % 1,51 % 1])
*Univariate> canonicalizer $ thiele2ratf $ thieleC h22s
([3 % 1,12 % 1,72 % 1],[1 % 1,30 % 1,80 % 1])
*Univariate> canonicalizer $ thiele2ratf $ thieleC h23s
([3 % 1,16 % 1,112 % 1],[1 % 1,38 % 1,127 % 1])
*Univariate> list2pol [4,8,12,16]
[4 % 1,4 % 1]
*Univariate> list2pol [28,44,72,112]
[28 % 1,10 % 1,6 % 1]
*Univariate> list2pol [14,22,30,38]
[14 % 1,8 % 1]
*Univariate> list2pol [40,51,80,127]
[40 % 1,2 % 1,9 % 1]

```

```

*Univariate> canonicalizer $ thiele2ratf $ map (\t -> h t 3 0) [0..]
^C^[A^[B^[AInterrupted.
^?*Univariate> canonicalizer $ thiele2ratf $ thieleC $ map (\t -> h t 3 0) [0..

<interactive>:51:65: error:
    parse error (possibly incorrect indentation or mismatched brackets)
*Univariate> canonicalizer $ thiele2ratf $ thieleC $ map (\t -> h t 3 0) [0..]
([3 % 1,6 % 1,63 % 1],[1 % 1,21 % 1,90 % 1])
*Univariate> canonicalizer $ thiele2ratf $ thieleC $ map (\t -> h t 3 1) [0..]
([3 % 1,10 % 1,84 % 1],[1 % 1,29 % 1,102 % 1])
*Univariate> canonicalizer $ thiele2ratf $ thieleC $ map (\t -> h t 3 2) [0..]
([3 % 1,14 % 1,117 % 1],[1 % 1,37 % 1,132 % 1])
*Univariate> canonicalizer $ thiele2ratf $ thieleC $ map (\t -> h t 3 3) [0..]
([3 % 1,18 % 1,162 % 1],[1 % 1,45 % 1,180 % 1])
*Univariate> list2pol [6,10,14,18]
[6 % 1,4 % 1]
*Univariate> list2pol [63,84,117,162]
[63 % 1,15 % 1,6 % 1]
*Univariate> list2pol [21, 29,37,45]
[21 % 1,8 % 1]
*Univariate> list2pol [ 90,102,132,180]
[90 % 1,3 % 1,9 % 1]
*Univariate> canonicalizer $ thiele2ratf $ thieleC $ map (\t -> h t 0 0) [0..]
*** Exception: Univariate.lhs:(370,7)-(373,35): Non-exhaustive patterns in function t2r

*Univariate>
*Univariate> canonicalizer $ thiele2ratf $ thieleC $ map (\t -> h t 0 1) [0..]
([3 % 1,4 % 1,6 % 1],[1 % 1,8 % 1,9 % 1])
*Univariate> canonicalizer $ thiele2ratf $ thieleC $ map (\t -> h t 0 2) [0..]
([3 % 1,8 % 1,24 % 1],[1 % 1,16 % 1,36 % 1])
*Univariate> canonicalizer $ thiele2ratf $ thieleC $ map (\t -> h t 0 3) [0..]
([3 % 1,12 % 1,54 % 1],[1 % 1,24 % 1,81 % 1])
*Univariate> list2pol [2,4,6]
[2 % 1,2 % 1]
*Univariate> list2pol [7,28,63]
*** Exception: difLists: lack of data, or not a polynomial
CallStack (from HasCallStack):
  error, called at Univariate.lhs:61:19 in main:Univariate
*Univariate> canonicalizer $ thiele2ratf $ thieleC $ map (\t -> h t 4 0) [0..]
([3 % 1,8 % 1,112 % 1],[1 % 1,28 % 1,160 % 1])

```

```

*Univariate> canonicalizer $ thiele2ratf $ thieleC $ map (\t -> h t 4 1) [0..]
([3 % 1,12 % 1,138 % 1],[1 % 1,36 % 1,173 % 1])
*Univariate> canonicalizer $ thiele2ratf $ thieleC $ map (\t -> h t 4 2) [0..]
([3 % 1,16 % 1,176 % 1],[1 % 1,44 % 1,204 % 1])
*Univariate> canonicalizer $ thiele2ratf $ thieleC $ map (\t -> h t 4 3) [0..]
([3 % 1,20 % 1,226 % 1],[1 % 1,52 % 1,253 % 1])
*Univariate> list2pol [8,12,16,20]
[8 % 1,4 % 1]
*Univariate> list2pol [112,138,176,226]
[112 % 1,20 % 1,6 % 1]
*Univariate> list2pol [28,36,44,52]
[28 % 1,8 % 1]
*Univariate> list2pol [160,176,204,253]
*** Exception: difLists: lack of data, or not a polynomial
CallStack (from HasCallStack):
  error, called at Univariate.lhs:61:19 in main:Univariate
*Univariate> list2pol [160,173,204,253]
[160 % 1,4 % 1,9 % 1]
*Univariate> list2pol [7,28,63,112]
[7 % 1,14 % 1,7 % 1]
*Univariate> list2pol [10,40,90,160]
[10 % 1,20 % 1,10 % 1]
*Univariate>

```