SQUFOF (an unfinished manuscript)

Daniel Shanks
written about 1982

Abstract

Hugh Williams found this manuscript in Dan Shanks' office after his death. It describes SQUFOF and was unfinished exactly as shown. The references were given in the form [2] by Shanks and guessed by Wagstaff. This version was typed in LaTeX by Wagstaff in June, 2003.

1 Introduction

This algorithm is called SQUFOF, which stands for Square Form Factorization. It is based upon the theory of real quadratic fields, including the concept of the infrastructure of such fields [12]. The final sentence in [12] alludes to such an algorithm but it was not developed at that time.

In January 1975, I gave a talk [14] entitled, "Analysis and Improvement of the Continued Fraction Method of Factorization." The powerful method referred to is that of Brillhart and Morrison which was just about to appear in the Lehmer Jubilee issue of *Math. Comp.* [8]. We abbreviate their algorithm BRIMOR. Its appearance in that issue was particularly appropriate since it is based upon the much earlier, pre-computer method of Lehmer and Powers [6]. In this introduction, I will give

1. A brief sketch of BRIMOR,

2. The three salient points in my critique of BRIMOR [14],

3. An account of how the development of SQUFOF was resumed, after a six-month delay, because of the pathological response the BRIMOR made when it was used to factor the composite

(1) $$N_0 = 2^{60} + 2^{30} - 1.$$

This last episode, with its mildly comic aspects, then leads us directly to the algorithm SQUFOF for factoring integers N.

1

Before I launch into this developmental account of SQUFOF, it seems desirable to list its several characteristics as follows:

A. It is an $O(N^{1/4})$ algorithm.

B. Essentially all numbers in the arithmetic are half-precision, specifically, they are $< 2\sqrt{N}$.

C. It has a very simple, short program.

D. Very little memory is needed.

E. Its theory is based upon that of the periods of reduced binary quadratic forms of discriminant $4N$.

After we have SQUFOF before us, it will be appropriate to return to these five characteristics and give them a detailed commentary.

Briefly, this is BRIMOR. N is a large odd number to be factored. Its square root is expanded in a regular continued fraction:

$$(2) \qquad \sqrt{N} = q_0 + \cfrac{1}{q_1+} \cfrac{1}{q_2+} \cfrac{1}{q_3+} \cdots.$$

The q_n are positive integers with

$$(3) \qquad q_0 = [\sqrt{N}],$$

and subsequent q_n, together with the associated integers P_n and Q_n, are evaluated by the starting values:

$$(4) \qquad Q_0 = 1, \qquad P_1 = q_0, \qquad Q_1 = N - q_0^2$$

and the recurrences

$$(5) \qquad q_n = \left[\frac{q_0 + P_n}{Q_n} \right],$$

$$(6) \qquad P_{n+1} = q_n Q_n - P_n, \qquad Q_{n+1} = Q_{n-1} + q_n(P_n - P_{n+1}).$$

These formulas are well-known, but since we need the same P_n and Q_n in SQUFOF, we record them at once and let them serve both purposes.

Also well-known are A_n and B_n with

$$(7) \qquad A_0 = 1, \qquad B_0 = 0, \qquad A_1 = q_0, \qquad B_1 = 1,$$

and the recurrences

(8) $$A_{n+1} = A_n q_n + A_{n-1}, \qquad B_{n+1} = B_n q_n + B_{n-1}.$$

The key relationship for BRIMOR is

(9) $$(-1)^n Q_n = A_n^2 - B_n^2 N.$$

The A_n and B_n grow exponentially; we reduce A_n modulo N:

(10) $$\overline{A}_n \equiv A_n \pmod{N},$$

ignore the B_n, and have

(11) $$(-1)^n Q_n \equiv \overline{A}_n^2 \pmod{N}.$$

Since

(12) $$P_n, Q_n < 2\sqrt{N}, \qquad \overline{A}_n < N,$$

the former are half-precision numbers while the latter are full-precision.

With a fixed set of trial-divisor primes $p_1 = 2, p_2 = 3, \ldots, p_k$, ($k$ dependent on N), BRIMOR factors those Q_n that it can, discards the others, and saves $\overline{A}_n$ for each factored Q_n. The index is increased until BRIMOR can assemble subsets of these Q_n into products that are perfect squares:

(13) $$\prod_{\text{some } n} (-1)^n Q_n = Q^2,$$

and if

(14) $$A = \prod_{\text{same } n} \overline{A}_n,$$

we have

(15) $$N | Q^2 - A^2 = (Q - A)(Q + A).$$

If

(16) $$N \nmid (Q - A) \text{ and } N \nmid (Q + A),$$

we call Q^2 a *proper square* and the GCD

(17) $$D = (Q - A, N)$$

is a proper divisor of N. If (16) is not satisfied, Q^2 is an *improper square* and BRIMOR assembles another square and tries again. If the reader wants a fuller account of BRIMOR, then he should read [8].

For that which follows, we single out four features of BRIMOR: two are "peculiar" and two are "disappointing."

(i) It seems peculiar that while most of the arithmetic is half-precision since it involves the P_n and Q_n in (12), that which involves $\overline{A}_n$ is full-precision or multi-precision. Further, these larger numbers $\overline{A}_n$ must also be stored.

(ii) Secondly, the condition (16) as to whether a particular Q^2 is proper or not remains completely mysterious here and is only determined after the fact by computing the D in (17). The authors of BRIMOR [8] are pragmatic. Inasmuch as the whole thing is automatic, it does no harm if the machine finds a few improper squares prior to a proper square. In fact, it alone might even know that it did so. The factor arrives; that is what we want. Still, a mathematician *wants* to know what is happening. And if one encounters a very long sequence of improper squares, he may even *need* to know.

BRIMOR is a powerful algorithm for factoring large N—say, those above 40 decimals—and if $N = f_1 f_2$ with both factors large, it is the fastest algorithm known at this time. Nonetheless, two principal features are disappointing. (iii) Most of the time is spent in trial-and-error division of the Q_n by the p_i. This does seem rather crude in contrast with the sophistication of the rest of the algorithm. (iv) Secondly, much memory is needed to store the large parity matrix $a_{ni} \bmod 2$, which records the parity of the exponent of each $p_i^{a_{ni}}$ that divides each of the factored Q_n. These are needed in assembling the Q_n into squares Q^2. Obviously, space is money, and much space makes it harder for the routine to squeeze onto a time-sharing computer.

These four features of BRIMOR set the stage for my talk [14] mentioned above. In [14] we use the very same P_n and Q_n that are in BRIMOR, but we interpret them as the coefficients of binary quadratic forms, and do not use the language of continued fractions. This change of view makes the theory of real quadratic fields available to us, both the classical theory and the modern additions, and this gives us some new insights that do not appear when we confine ourselves to the theory of continued fractions. The two main conclusions that [14] thereby obtained concern the two "peculiar" features given above:

1.) The A_n are *not needed at all*. We need not compute them (8), reduce them (10), store them, multiply them (14), or use them in (17). This seems very surprising, since (15) is the heart of BRIMOR, and a Q without an A in (15) looks like a question without an answer. Nonetheless,

4

it is true, the A_n are not needed.

2.) We *can predict a priori* whether a given square (13) is proper or not, and if the number of factors on the left of (13) is not too large, it is quite feasible to do so.

So the alternative viewpoint in [14] satisfactorily clarifies both of the peculiar features in BRIMOR. In the title of [14] appears the word "Improvement." If we need not compute the A_n, and can bypass the improper squares that fail (16), there is some saving in time, and since the full-precision $\overline{A}_n$ need not be stored, there is also saving in memory. (Of course, other operations are needed to take their place, and these would have to be taken into account.) But the practitioners of BRIMOR said that these savings would be relatively small since

(a) Most of the time is taken in factoring the Q_n by the p_i, and

(b) Most of the space is taken by the parity matrix a_{ni} mod 2, and therefore the proposed, potential savings in time and space would be relatively small.

Thus, my proposed "improvements," based upon an analysis of the two peculiar features of BRIMOR, were frustrated by the two disappointing features of BRIMOR. I had not proposed, in [14], to alter these two latter, and there they stood, like twin dragons, guarding the gate and resistant to progress.

So [14] has not yet been published, the "improvements" it suggested have not been programmed, and some months went by. Now we come to the funny part.

A man, name unknown to me, came up with the following implausible conjecture: If M_{p_1} and M_{p_2} are successive Mersenne primes, their arithmetic mean is also a prime. While that is true for $(7 + 31)/2 = 19$, $(31 + 127)/2 = 79$, etc., Brillhart and friends examined the 19-digit $N_0 = (M_{31} + M_{61})/2 = 2^{60} + 2^{30} - 1$, given in (1), and found that it failed a Fermat test since

$$13^{N_0-1} \not\equiv 1 \pmod{N_0}.$$

Therefore, it is composite, but when they tried to factor N_0 by BRIMOR it gave them 114 successive improper squares. The procedure in such a case is to halt execution and begin again with kN_0 for some small multiplier k. No further pathology was encountered and they did factor N_0.

Let us define *practical failure* and *absolute failure*. In a case such as the foregoing, there is no point in continuing execution since there may well be thousands of improper squares still to come, and it is faster to simply restart with kN. When there is such an *excessive* number of improper squares, we say that we have a practical failure. If the period of the continued fraction is very short, say, for such N as $N = M^2 + 1$, there may be no proper

square *at all*. We call that an absolute failure, and the remedy is the same: restart with kN. SQUFOF also has such absolute failures but it does not have practical failures.

Brillhart asked me if my [14] could explain why N_0 causes a practical failure and whether, perhaps, it could even be an absolute failure. The answer to the first question is, "yes," that is easy to understand. We have an early Q_n that is exceptionally small (relative to $\sqrt{N}$). Specifically, $Q_2 = 5$, and, as will be seen below, this leads to an immense number of improper squares. In fact, *any*

$$(18) \qquad N = M^2 + M - 1$$

with a very large M will behave the same way; the specific $M = 2^{30}$ is not the problem. The quadratic has the discriminant 5 and that is where $Q_2 = 5$ is coming from. More generally, any

$$(19) \qquad N = M^2 + a \text{ or } N = M^2 + M + a$$

with M large and the discriminant small will behave the same way. Luckily, most N are not of this type—nonetheless, such numbers are often of specific interest to number-theorists.

Concerning Brillhart's second question, I felt that the answer would be, "no"—N_0 does not lead to absolute failure, but to prove this I had only a hand-held HP-65 with its very small memory (100 steps in the program). Obviously, one cannot put the huge BRIMOR on such a machine. But one can put on the simple algorithm in (4)–(6) for computing the Q_n and P_n, and *simply wait* for a Q_n that is a *proper square*. The first such is

$$(20) \qquad Q_{162146} = 28185^2.$$

By the criterion alluded to above, *which simplifies greatly* when the square in (13) contains *only one factor*, we know, *at once*, that Q_{162146} is a proper square square, and that earlier square Q_n that had appeared, including

$$(21) \qquad \begin{array}{ll} Q_{50194} = 28063^2, & Q_{63516} = 22065^2, \\ Q_{69730} = 28919^2, & Q_{149926} = 10131^2, \end{array}$$

were improper squares. No A_n were computed, but, as stated above, they are not needed. So, from (20), and without the corresponding A_{162146}, we do factor the 19-digit N_0 as

$$(22) \qquad N_0 = 139001459 \cdot 8294312261$$

even though the HP-65 only computes with 10-digit numbers. The two factors in (22) are prime and further details are given below after we have SQUFOF before us.

6

Note the course of events: the twin dragons could not enter the HP-65 since they were too large. In their absence, the elimination of the A_n, and the determination of the propriety of the Q's, are no longer marginal possibilities. Now they come to the front as essential features of the new algorithm.

Obviously, we must go to larger indices n to find $(-1)^n Q_n$ that are *already* squares rather than those of the Q_n in (13) that are *assembled* into squares. But it might be said (qualitatively) that we can afford to do so, since we merely compute the Q_n and P_n by the very simple (4)–(6), and completely omit all of the complex logistic in BRIMOR. The crucial quantitative questions are these:

α) What is the *mean* index-difference Δn between successive square $(-1)^n Q_n$?

β) What is the probability P that these squares are proper squares?

We shall see that if N has $1 + k$ distinct prime factors, then

$$(23) \qquad \Delta n = 1.77491 \, \frac{N^{1/4}}{2^k}$$

is the answer to α) where the constant is

$$(24) \qquad 1.77491\ldots = (\log 8) \, \frac{2 + \sqrt{2}}{4} = 3(\log 2) \, \frac{2 + \sqrt{2}}{4}.$$

The answer to β) is

$$(25) \qquad P = \frac{2^k - 1}{2^k},$$

so that the *probable* Δn between *proper* squares is

$$(26) \qquad \Delta n = 1.77491 \, \frac{N^{1/4}}{2^k - 1}.$$

This clearly relates to the first characteristic of SQUFOF listed above, namely:

A.) It is an $O(N^{1/4})$ algorithm.

This shows that SQUFOF is a practical algorithm; we will return to all five characteristics later.

2 SQUFOF without a list

SQUFOF has many possible variants, the one to be selected depends largely on the size of N and the size of the computer available. For simplicity, I will give the basic algorithm first, and defer the variants, such as the "fast return," "fast list-test," "odd discriminant," etc., until later.

The P_n and Q_n generated by (4)–(6) have the invariant

$$(27) \qquad N = P_n^2 + Q_{n-1}Q_n \qquad \text{(all } n\text{).}$$

Therefore, the quadratic form

$$(28) \qquad F_n = (-1)^{n-1}Q_{n-1}x^2 + 2P_n xy + (-1)^n Q_n y^2$$

has the discriminant $4N$. We abbreviate F_n by writing its coefficients in Gauss's notation with the factor 2 suppressed:

$$(29) \qquad F_n = \left((-1)^{n-1}Q_{n-1}, P_n, (-1)^n Q_n\right).$$

So we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
F_1 &= (Q_0, P_1, -Q_1), & F_2 &= (-Q_1, P_2, Q_2), \\
F_3 &= (Q_2, P_3, -Q_3), & F_4 &= (-Q_3, P_4, Q_4), \quad \text{etc.}
\end{aligned}
$$

The F_n constitute the *principal period of reduced forms* of discriminant $4N$, namely, from (4), those generated by

$$(30) \qquad F_1 = (1, q_0, q_0^2 - N).$$

F_n is periodic and for some *even* π, we would have

$$(31) \qquad F_\pi = (q_0^2 - N, q_0, 1),$$

the reversal of F_1. Then

$$F_{\pi+1} = (1, q_0, q_0^2 - N) = F_1, \qquad \text{etc.}$$

It is convenient to rename F_π as F_0 and begin the period with F_0, not F_1.

To save space and time, consider the forms strung together in this fashion:

$$
\begin{array}{ccc}
-Q_1 & & \\
 & P_1 & \leftarrow F_0 \\
 & \quad 1 & \\
 & P_1 & \leftarrow F_1 \\
-Q_1 & & \\
 & P_2 & \leftarrow F_2 \\
 & \quad Q_2 & \\
 & P_3 & \leftarrow F_3 \\
-Q_3 & & \\
 & \vdots & \\
A & B & C
\end{array}
$$

and store the successive forms in only three registers: A, B, C. Begin with F_0 in (A, B, C). Compute P_1 and $-Q_1$ for F_1 and store them in B, A, leaving C intact. Compute P_2 and Q_2 for F_2 and store them in B, C, leaving A intact, etc.

We are looking for a *square form* . This is a form F_n with

(32)
$$(-1)^n Q_n = S^2,$$

a perfect square. The index n must be even. The A_n have not been computed and are not needed since, by the *reverse sequence* to be defined presently, F_n leads us to a positive factor of N:

(33)
$$0 < f < N, \qquad f \mid N.$$

The probability that f is a *proper* factor, that is, that $f > 1$, is given in (25).

In Section 4, we define the *list* (in two different variants). Then we will have:

$$f \text{ is a proper factor,}$$
$$S^2 \text{ is a proper square,}$$

if S is not in the list. We are deliberately postponing the list for clarity of exposition, and because SQUFOF *without* a list does have utility, and is an even simpler algorithm.

So suppose

(34)
$$F = F_n = (-Q, P, S^2)$$

and consider the form

(35)
$$F^{-1/2} = (-S, P, SQ).$$

9

We explain the notation later. It has the same discriminant but may not be reduced. We reduce it by

$$(36) \qquad R_0 = P + S \left[\frac{q_0 - P}{S} \right],$$

$$(37) \qquad S_{-1} = S, \qquad S_0 = (N - R_0^2)/S,$$

$$(38) \qquad G_0 = (-S_{-1}, R_0, S_0).$$

Then G_0 is a reduced form equivalent to $F^{-1/2}$. It generates the reverse sequence:

$$(39) \qquad G_n = ((-1)^{m-1} S_{m-1}, R_m, (-1)^m S_m)$$

by exactly the same formulas:

$$(5a) \qquad s_m = \left[\frac{q_0 + R_m}{S_m} \right]$$

$$(6a) \qquad R_{m+1} = s_m S_m - R_m, \qquad S_{m+1} = S_{m-1} + s_m (R_m - R_{m+1}).$$

In the reverse sequence, we are looking for a *symmetry point*, given by the condition

$$(40) \qquad R_m = R_{m+1}.$$

We then have

$$
\begin{array}{ccc}
-S_{m-1} & & S_{m-1} \\
\quad R_m & & \quad R_m \\
\qquad S_m \quad \text{or} \quad -S_m & & \\
\quad R_m & & \quad R_m \\
-S_{m-1} = -S_{m+1} & & S_{m+1} = S_{m-1}
\end{array}
$$

The condition (40) will be met for an index m approximately equal to $n/2$ for the n in (34) if n is sufficiently large. The reader need not worry about the vagueness of this

$$(41) \qquad m \approx n/2$$

since we are not using it operationally to find (40). Further, we later have a measure called the *infrastructure distance* for which the length of $S_m - S_0$ is exactly $1/2$ of the length of $Q_n - Q_0$.

10

By (6a), $R_m = s_m S_m/2$, and the invariant $N = R_m^2 + S_{m-1}S_m$ gives us

(42) $$N = S_m \left(S_{m-1} + S_m \frac{s_m^2}{4} \right).$$

If S_m is odd, it is the asserted factor f. If S_m is even, $S_m/2$ is the asserted factor f. See: no A_n!

Now consider an example.

$$N_1 = 13290059, \qquad q_0 = \left[\sqrt{N} \right] = 3645,$$

$$F_0 = (-4034, 3645, 1),$$

$$F = F_{52} = (-5107, 3628, 5^2)$$

is the first square form. So

$$F^{-1/2} = (-5, 3628, 25535)$$

and $$G_0 = (-5, 3643, 3722).$$

Then $$G_{25} = (571, 3119, -6238),$$

$$G_{26} = (-6238, 3119, 571),$$

$m = 25 \approx \frac{1}{2}52$, $R_{25} = R_{26} = 3119$, $f = 3119$ and

$$N_1 = 3119 \cdot 4261.$$

Since the factors are prime, $k = 1$. The first square, Q_{52}, is already proper, and by (25) and (26) we may characterize N_1 as a slightly lucky example.

A digression: N_1 is an appropriate first example since it is given in both [8] and [6]. Further [6], it is a factor of the 55-th term of the aliquot series for 276. Since [9], p. 218, aliquot series usually grow fairly rapidly, they produce larger and larger N and require stronger and stronger factorization methods. When Henri Cohen was still a microbiologist in Berkeley, he told me that he had used up much machine time in computing amicable numbers and in extending [1] the notorious aliquot series for 276. I told him to show it to Lehmer. The recent developments in factorization were just beginning and I knew that Lehmer could not resist extending 276 still further. Richard Guy soon organized an international factorization cartel and all of my new methods, including SQUFOF and my earlier [11] CLASNO, were extensively exercised in following this and that aliquot sequence into the wild blue yonder, [4], [3].

Now consider $N_2 = 42854447$. We have $F_0 = (-4331, 6546, 1)$, $F_{316} = (-6022, 5093, 53^2)$. Absent a list, we do not know if 53^2 is proper, but its reverse sequence gives us $f = 1$ and so we find, after the fact, that it is not. *All* versions of SQUFOF save the last square form and q_0, and so we can return to F_n and continue. We find, close by,

$$F_{332} = (-3382, 6515, 11^2)$$

but its reverse sequence also gives $f = 1$ and so Q_{332} is also improper. Then

$$F_{380} = (-11134, 6401, 13^2),$$

$G_0 = (-13, 6554, 2347)$, $G_{172} = (-2633, 4423, 8846)$, $R_{172} = R_{173} = 4423$, $f = 4423$, and $N_2 = 4423 \cdot 9689$. The reader may recognize these factors as primes and so $k = 1$ again and, by (26), N_2 is a somewhat unlucky example. In the next section, we will return to its improper Q_{316} and Q_{332}.

When I gave my HP-67 SQUFOF to Lenstra his first example was

$$N_3 = 11213 \cdot 19937 = 223553581,$$

and he was surprised to find that $f = 11213$ came back almost at once, (namely, $n = 6$, $m = 2$.) He assumed that there must be a trick. In fact, since he had just multiplied the two factors, the multiplier 19937 would still be in the register called LASTX. If we prefaced SQUFOF with a few steps that examined LASTX, this cofactor 19937, and then f, would have been found at once. However, there was no such preface; N_3 is simply a lucky example. We will return to luck and to other interesting N after we have developed the theory.

3 The Ambiguous Periods and their Infrastructure

We return to N_2 and determine why Q_{332} and Q_{316} were improper. From $F_{332} = F$ above we have

$$G_0 = (-11, 6537, 11098).$$

Then $G_{152} = (-4331, 6546, 1)$, $G_{153} = (1, 6546, -4331)$, $m = 152$, and $S_{152} = 1 = f$. But G_{153} is merely F_0 read backwards. Now the recursions (5), (6) or (5a), (6a) are *reversible* and may be used for n (or m) either increasing or decreasing. It follows that G_0 is merely F_{153} read backwards, and in this G_m sequence, we are merely retracing our steps to the symmetry point $S_{152} = Q_0 = 1$. We verify that in Table I which gives some of the

Table I. Principal period F_n for N_2

n	F_n			d_n
	$(-1)^{n-1}Q_{n-1}$	P_n	$(-1)^nQ_n$	
0	-4331	6546	1	0.0000000
1	1	6546	-4331	5.2930050
2	-4331	6447	298	7.7298729
3	298	6367	-7771	9.8682646
4	-7771	1404	5261	10.0861182
5	5261	3857	-5318	10.7625349
6	-5318	1461	7657	10.9895336
7	7657	6196	-583	12.7864371
73	3146	5585	-3707	95.7405234
142	-5507	6524	53	182.3677642
153	11098	6537	-11	195.1542013
252	-12731	6521	26	295.8354933
316	-6022	5093	53^2	364.7355284
325	1682	6471	-583	377.5219655
332	-3382	6515	11^2	390.3084026
364	-1279	6525	218	425.2186554
380	-11134	6401	13^2	446.5023708
405	2113	6513	-206	471.3639976
443	5266	4423	-4423	519.0866787
444	-4423	4423	5266	519.9077373
481	5137	6465	-206	566.8093597
506	-7942	6443	13^2	591.6709865
634	-7711	6531	26	742.3378641
886	-4331	6546	1	1038.1733570

forms in the principal period: those for $n = 0$ through 7, followed by others of interest. The period is $\pi = 886$, and, since $F_{886} = F_0$ is F_1 read backwards, we have a second symmetry point at $n = 443 = 886/2$ where we find $Q_{443} = 4423$.

For $F = F_{332}$, the operation $F^{-1/2}$ jumps backwards "about half-way" to F_{153} and turns around to become G_0. The reader may protest, as in (41), that

$$153/332 \approx 1/2$$

is not very accurate, and so we direct his attention to the *infrastructure distances* d_n between Q_0 and Q_n that are listed in Table I. Here,

(43) $$d_{153} = d_{332}/2$$

is exact.

We define

$$(44) \qquad d_n = \log \frac{A_n + B_n\sqrt{N}}{\sqrt{Q_n}}$$

in terms of the A_n and B_n in (7), (8), and we note, from (9), that

$$(45) \qquad (-1)^n Q_n = \text{Norm}\left(A_n + B_n\sqrt{N}\right).$$

Further, since Q_π is the first occurrence of $(-1)^n Q_n = +1$ after Q_0, we have

$$(46) \qquad d_\pi = R = \log \epsilon,$$

where ϵ is the fundamental unit of norm $+1$. Thus, the (narrow) regulator R of $Q(\sqrt{N})$ equals the distance d_π, and d_n is a useful generalization of R. In all versions of SQUFOF here, we *do not* compute A_n or d_n. We use them here merely to illustrate the infrastructure of the quadratic field $Q(\sqrt{N})$. See my [12] and Lenstra's recent [7].

In Table I, besides (43), note

$$d_{316} = 2d_{142}, \qquad d_{506} = 2d_{252}.$$

$$(47) \qquad R = d_n + d_{\pi-n}, \text{ e.g., for } n = 252, 380, 405, 443,$$

$$d_7 = d_{153} - d_{142}, \quad d_{325} = d_{153} + d_{142}, \quad d_{380} = 2d_{634} - R.$$

Finally, what do you make of this:

$$(48) \qquad d_{73} \approx 2d_{481} - R \qquad \text{(not quite equal)},$$

$$3146x^2 + 2 \cdot 5585xy - 3707y^2 = 103^2 \qquad \text{for } x = y = 1?$$

We will return to (47) and (48).

The first improper square for N_2 behaves a little differently. For F_{316}, we have

$$G_0 = (-53, 6524, 5507)$$

$G_{141} = (4331, 6546, -1)$, $G_{142} = (-1, 6546, 4331)$. These forms are *not* in F_n, since F_n is in the *principal genus* and therefore

$$((-1)^n Q_n | p) = +1$$

for $p = 4423, 9689$, and for all n. But $(-1|4423) = -1$ and G_{141} cannot be an F_n.

Table II. Nonprincipal period $\overline{F}_n$ for N_2

n	$\overline{F}_n$			$\overline{d}_n$
	$(-1)^{n-1}\overline{Q}_{n-1}$	$\overline{P}_n$	$(-1)^n\overline{Q}_n$	
0	-2633	4423	8846	0.0000000
1	8846	4423	-2633	0.8210586
2	-2633	6109	2102	2.5303631
3	2102	6503	-269	5.3574448
18	-1402	6531	143	28.0969841
93	3718	6443	-361	124.9868675
173	2347	6544	-13	223.2511854
421	8711	6545	-2	519.0866787
422	-2	6545	8711	523.6836397
842	-2633	4423	8846	1038.173357

If we change the signs of both end-coefficients in Table I, we obtain *a second period of reduced forms* for $Q(\sqrt{N_2})$. Let us write it as $-F_n$, and then our new G_0 is merely $-F_{142}$ read backwards.

Finally, the proper F_{380} led us to a period of reduced forms that is neither F_n nor $-F_n$. Call it $\overline{F}_n$ and write $\overline{Q}_n$, $\overline{P}_n$, $\overline{d}_n$. Now examine Table II.

For the proper F_{380}, we see that G_0 is $\overline{F}_{173}$ read backwards. Since the symmetry points of $\pm F_n$ are ± 1 and ∓ 4423, obviously the present $+8846$ and -2 lie elsewhere. It is also clear that a fourth period $-\overline{F}_n$ will have -8846 and $+2$. The period now, $\overline{\pi} = 842$, is a little different than $\pi = 886$, but $\overline{d}_{\overline{\pi}} = d_\pi = R$ remains the same.

Note that

(49)
$$\overline{d}_{173} = d_{380}/2,$$

and, for a later option called "fast return," note that

(50)
$$\overline{d}_{18} = (d_{380} - d_{332})/2,$$

so that a

(51)
$$G_0 = (-143, 6531, 1402),$$

which we construct later, is very close to the symmetry point -8846 in $-\overline{F}_n$. We return to $\overline{d}_n$ later.

The four periods $\pm F_n$ and $\pm \overline{F}_n$ are called the *ambiguous periods* $\mathcal{A}$ by Gauss. They are those with symmetry points, at which we find two

15

successive forms

$$(A, B, C), \qquad (C, B, A).$$

Any two forms (A, B, C) and (C, B, A) are *inverses* under Gauss's operation *composition*, c.f. Appendix 1 of [11], and, in any $\mathcal{A}$, if an (A, B, C) is in $\mathcal{A}$, so is its inverse. The name for the $\mathcal{A}$ comes from Latin meaning "facing (or going) both ways." Under composition, the product of any two forms in one $\mathcal{A}$ is a form in the principal period F_n, when it is reduced. In the example above, the four $\mathcal{A}$, including F_n itself, are the four square-roots of F_n. The operation $F^{-1/2}$ in (35), when applied to a square-form F, therefore gives us a G_0 which is the *inverse square-root* of F under composition. It will take us into some $\mathcal{A}$, possibly F itself. We now see that this quadratic form formulation is much richer than the continued-fraction formulation described above for BRIMOR. In that algorithm, we *never* leave F_n, and, if N is large, we almost never even reach the *second* symmetry point in F_n— that unequal to the $Q_0 = 1$ with which we start. So $Q_0 = 1$ is BRIMOR's only symmetry point, and SQUFOF's method of avoiding the A_n is not possible in BRIMOR.

In SQUFOF, we work only in the $\mathcal{A}$ (unlike CLASNO [11] where we may encounter any equivalence class). Nonetheless, let us round out our N_2 picture as follows: From Table II we construct

$$F = -\overline{F}_{93} = (-3718, 6443, 361)$$

which is a square-form *not* in F_n. This is possible since $-\overline{F}_n$, like F_n, is in the principal genus mentioned above. We apply (35) and (38) to F and get

$$H_0 = (-19, 6538, 5737),$$

it being convenient here to write H_0 instead of G_0. Then

$$H_{878} = H_0 \quad \text{at the same distance } R$$

but H_m *never encounters a symmetry point*, since H_m is not an $\mathcal{A}$. In particular, the inverse of H_0, namely $H_0^{-1} = (5737, 6538, -19)$ and then $H_1^{-1} = (-19, 6534, 8489), \ldots$ are not in H_m. Likewise, $-H_m$ and $-H_m^{-1}$ give distinct, nonambiguous periods. So now we have 8 periods of reduced forms:

$$\pm F_n, \quad \pm \overline{F}_n, \quad \pm H_m, \quad \pm H_m^{-1}.$$

In SQUFOF, we allow *any* odd N with $1 + k$ distinct prime divisors for $k > 0$. But the theory is simplest if

(52) $\qquad\qquad N \equiv -1 \pmod 4 \quad \text{and } N \text{ square-free}$

16

since our discriminant $4N$ is then a fundamental discriminant, and our periods map directly into the equivalence classes of the real quadratic field $Q(\sqrt{N})$. In such a field the rational primes fall into three sets p, q and r, according as

$$(4N|p) = +1, \quad (4N|q) = -1), \quad \text{or} \quad (4N|r) = 0.$$

Then, the Kronecker symbol $(4N|n)$ gives the well-known

(53) $$L(1,\chi) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty}(4N|n)\frac{1}{n} = \frac{hR}{2\sqrt{N}},$$

where h is the narrow class number.

For simplicity, in the discussion that follows, we largely confine ourselves to N that satisfy (52).

Our N_2 satisfies (52) and has the ramified primes:

$$r = 2, 4423, 9689 \quad \text{(only)},$$

the splitting primes:

$$p = 11, 13, 19, 29, 31, 37, 53, \ldots$$

and inert primes:

$$q = 3, 5, 7, 17, 23, 41, 43, \ldots.$$

Then

$$
\begin{aligned}
L(1,\chi) &= 1 - \tfrac{1}{3} - \tfrac{1}{5} - \tfrac{1}{7} + \tfrac{1}{9} + \tfrac{1}{11} + \tfrac{1}{13} + \tfrac{1}{15} - \cdots \\
&= \tfrac{3}{4} \cdot \tfrac{5}{6} \cdot \tfrac{7}{8} \cdot \tfrac{11}{10} \cdot \tfrac{13}{12} \cdot \tfrac{17}{18} \cdot \tfrac{19}{18} \cdots. \\
&= 0.63435435\ldots = \frac{hR}{2\sqrt{N_2}},
\end{aligned}
$$

and our $R = 1038.173357$ gives $h = 8$. Thus, our 8 periods contain all of the periods of reduced forms for N_2.

There will be 2^{1+k} $\mathcal{A}$ and therefore 2^{2+k} symmetry points $\pm S$. The factor f given by the reverse sequences G_m will be *improper* at *only four* of these points, namely, at

$$\pm S = \pm 1, \pm 2,$$

and we must *design the list* to avoid these four. For all other symmetry points, f is proper, and so the ratio

$$P = \frac{\text{Proper symmetry points}}{\text{All symmetry points}} = \frac{2^{k+2} - 4}{2^{k+2}} = \frac{2^k - 1}{2^k},$$

17

as in (25).

The Q_n in F_n, and likewise the end-coefficients in any of the periods, are divisible by p primes (to any power) but are not divisible by any q primes. If (52) holds, the r primes can divide to the first power only. Thus in Table I,

$$Q_6 = 13 \cdot 19 \cdot 31, \quad Q_7 = Q_{325} = 11 \cdot 53, \quad Q_{252} = 2 \cdot 13, \quad Q_{142} = 53.$$

A second way in which SQUFOF theory is richer than BRIMOR's is this: The latter regards the $p = 13$ in Q_6 and that in Q_{252} as the *same prime*. Similarly, the $p = 53$ in Q_7, Q_{325} and Q_{142}. But from the point of view of $Q(\sqrt{N})$, or that of composition, p is a *splitting prime* and there are *two different* prime ideals of norm p. If $p|Q_n$, (27) gives us

$$(54) \qquad\qquad\qquad P_n^2 \equiv N \quad (\text{mod } p).$$

We reduce P_n as

$$(55) \qquad\qquad P_n \equiv \pm a_p \quad (\text{mod } p) \quad \text{with} \quad (0 < a_p < p/2).$$

We can now distinguish between the two different p according as

$$(56) \qquad\qquad P_n \equiv +a_p \quad \text{or} \quad P_n \equiv -a_p \quad (\text{mod } p).$$

Let us adopt the convention that the prime be written as p in the first case and $\bar{p}$ in the second case. For example, since

$$1461 \equiv 5 \quad \text{and} \quad 6521 \equiv -5 \quad (\text{mod } 13),$$

13 divides Q_6 in Table I while $\overline{13}$ divides Q_{252}. The r primes do not split; there is only one, and we write it r. The factorizations above now become
(57)
$$Q_6 = 13{\cdot}\overline{19}{\cdot}31, \quad Q_7 = 11{\cdot}\overline{53}, \quad Q_{325} = 11{\cdot}53, \quad Q_{252} = 2{\cdot}\overline{13}, \quad Q_{142} = 53.$$

BRIMOR makes no distinction between p and $\bar{p}$ and would compute, e.g.,

$$\begin{aligned} (-Q_7) \cdot (-Q_{325}) &= 11^2 \cdot 53^2, \\ Q_6 \cdot Q_{252} &= 2 \cdot 13^2 \cdot 19 \cdot 31. \end{aligned}$$

But the prime ideals 53 and $\overline{53}$, etc., are not equal, and in the composition of forms, which is closely related to ideal multiplication, we have, instead, the rules

$$(58) \qquad\qquad p \cdot p = p^2, \quad \bar{p} \cdot \bar{p} = \bar{p}^2, \quad \text{but} \quad p \cdot \bar{p} = 1.$$

Similarly, if (52) holds,

(59) $$r \cdot r = 1.$$

Thus, if we compose F_7 and F_{325}, from (57), and prior to any needed reduction, we would obtain the form

(60) $$(-Q, P, 11^2)$$

for some $P \equiv +3$, not $-3 \pmod{11}$. If (60) is reduced, we must have $P = 6515$ and therefore $Q = 3382$. This is, in fact, F_{332}. We may write

(61) $$F_7 \cdot F_{325} = F_{332},$$

and we note, from (47) and (43), that

(62) $$d_7 + d_{325} = d_{332}.$$

From (45) we had

$$
\begin{aligned}
-583 &= \text{Norm}\left(A_7 + B_7\sqrt{N}\right), \\
-583 &= \text{Norm}\left(A_{325} + B_{325}\sqrt{N}\right), \\
11^2 &= \text{Norm}\left(A_{332} + B_{332}\sqrt{N}\right).
\end{aligned}
$$

The cancellation $53 \cdot \overline{53} = 1$ in composition is reflected in the product of principal ideals:

(63) $$\left(A_7 + B_7\sqrt{N}\right)\left(A_{325} + B_{325}\sqrt{N}\right) = 53\left(A_{332} + B_{332}\sqrt{N}\right).$$

Therefore,

$$\frac{A_7 + B_7\sqrt{N}}{\sqrt{583}} \cdot \frac{A_{325} + B_{325}\sqrt{N}}{\sqrt{583}} = \frac{A_{332} + B_{332}\sqrt{N}}{\sqrt{121}},$$

which, by (44), gives (62).

Let any two principal forms:

$$F_l = (a_l, b_l, c_l), \quad F_m = (a_m, b_m, c_m),$$

be composed and give a form

(64) $$F = (a, b, c)$$

19

where c, as in (60), is the product of the p's, $\bar{p}$'s, and r's in c_l and c_m according to the rules (58) and (59). There are three cases. If

(65) $$|c| < \sqrt{N},$$

there will be a reduced form in the principal period

$$F_n = (a_n, b_n, c_n)$$

with $c_n = c$. In this case, as in (61), we may write

$$F_l \cdot F_m = F_n$$

and have $d_l + d_m = d_n$. All the examples in (43) and (47) are in this case since

$$\sqrt{N} = 6546.33\ldots.$$

If

(66) $$2\sqrt{N} < |c|,$$

there is *no such* F_n, and when (64) is reduced to, say, F_k we have instead

(66a) $\quad d_l + d_m = d_k + $ a small, computable correction.

We will show presently how to compute this correction. If

(67) $$\sqrt{N} < |c| < 2\sqrt{N},$$

we have a *no-man's land*: there may be such an F_n, or there may not be such an F_n. If there is, then $d_l + d_m = d_n$, as before. As an example, let $F_l = F_m = F_{481}$ in Table I. Then

$$6546.33 < c = 103^2 < 13092.66.$$

If there were a reduced form:

(67a) $$F_n = (a, b, 10609),$$

it would be at $d_n = 2(566.8093597) - R = 95.4453620$. *There is no such reduced form.* When reduced, we obtain F_{73} instead very close to this distance. See (48).

Let us contrast two cases involving F_6 that are *not* shown in Table I. By (57),

$$F_6 \cdot F_{252} = (-Q, P, 2 \cdot \overline{19} \cdot 31)$$

with $P \equiv -2 \pmod{19}, \equiv +4 \pmod{31}$. Since $2 \cdot 19 \cdot 31 = 1178 < \sqrt{N}$, (65) holds and we *predict* that

$$F_n = (-4031, 6173, 1878)$$

will be in the principal period at $d_n = d_6 + d_{252}$. In fact, one finds $F_{260} = F_n$ at this distance. Now try

(68) $$F_6 \cdot F_{506} = (-Q, P, \overline{13} \cdot \overline{19} \cdot 31)$$

with $P \equiv -5 \pmod{13}, \equiv -2 \pmod{19}, \equiv +4 \pmod{31}$. Here, $c = 7657 = Q_6$, but with 13 replaced by $\overline{13}$. Now, (67) holds, and there may, or may not, be a principal form (68) at $d_n = d_6 + d_{506}$. This time,

$$F_6 \cdot F_{506} = F_n = (-3694, 3817, 7657)$$

is found for $n = 514$ at this distance.

We note, in passing, that we will deduce (23) from the probability distribution that (64) will appear as a reduced form F_n, with $(-1)^n Q_n = c$, at the distance $d_n = d_l + d_m$. This probability is 1 if (65) holds, 0 if (66) holds, and decreases monotonically from 1 to 0 if (67) holds. *A priori*, our last $c = 7657$ was more likely to appear than was the $c = 103^2$ above. (Nonetheless, one easily notes the much larger $|c| = 12731$, etc., in Table I.)

From Table I, the reader can now make many predictions. Thus: At what distances d_n will one find

$$(-1)^n Q_n = -11^3 \quad \text{or} \quad \overline{13} \cdot \overline{109} \quad \text{or} \quad -2 \cdot 11 \cdot 149?$$

Or, again, although F_{72} is not shown in Table I, predict $d_{72} = 94.4929093$. (Hint: Use (6) to determine whether 11 or $\overline{11}$ and 13 or $\overline{13}$ divides Q_{72}.)

Let us now contrast these predictions with the continued fraction theory in BRIMOR. There are a few N, such as $N = M^2 + 1$, where the pattern of the Q_n is obvious. There are a few others [10], [13], such as $N = S_k = (2^k + 3)^2 - 8$, where the pattern is complicated, but still discernible. But for most large N, the Q_n appear to be almost random and completely unpredictable. Similarly, it is very mysterious in BRIMOR whether a Q^2 is proper or not. All this occurs if one does not distinguish p and $\overline{p}$.

But with this distinction, we see that there is a great deal of predictable inner structure within the principal period. It also occurs in the other periods and is called the *infrastructure* in [12]. We will use it to design the *list*, and later the *fast return* for SQUFOF.

Since the infrastructure is still relatively new, it should be informative and interesting to briefly mention four background topics.

1. Lagrange (long before Gauss) gave a complete theory of the reduction and equivalence of binary quadratic forms. But he regarded $Ax^2 + Bxy + Cy^2$ and $Ax^2 - Bxy + Cy^2$ as equivalent since they represent the same numbers. In contrast, Gauss called them improperly equivalent, not properly equivalent (unless they are ambiguous). This distinction between proper and improper equivalence seems almost trifling, or pedantic, when one first reads it in, say, Dickson's book [2]. Yet, it is all-important. Without this distinction, the class number comes out wrong, composition collapses, the class group disappears, and so do equations like (53). The distinction between p and $\overline{p}$ above is very closely related, and we see, again, that without it the whole structure largely collapses.

2. In my original talk [12], I defined the distance by

$$(69) \qquad d_n = \log\left(A_n + B_n\sqrt{N}\right)$$

instead of (44), and used a "ramification factor" and a "reduction factor" to correct, when needed, such relations as those in (47) and (66a). Since $A_n + B_n\sqrt{N}$ grows exponentially with n, while $\sqrt{Q_n}$ is bounded, the difference between (69) and (44) is relatively small when n is large; e.g., in Table I we would have $d_{443} = 523.28\ldots$ instead of $519.09\ldots$. The definition (69) is workable, but that in (44) is simpler and more elegant. For something we call "distance," we would like the distance to the midpoint, such as d_{443} above, to equal $R/2$. But it does not with (69). So, shortly after [12], I changed the definition to that in (44) but I did not publish it.

Lenstra, independently therefore, made essentially the same change [7]. (Originally, he differed by a factor of 2.) Simultaneously, he considerably simplified the treatment that I had given [12] for the reduction factor. He gives (in our notation)

$$(70) \qquad d_n - d_{n-1} = \frac{1}{2}\log\left|\frac{\sqrt{N} + P_n}{\sqrt{N} - P_n}\right|$$

whether F_n is reduced or not. That (70) is consistent with (44) follows from the identities

$$\frac{A_n + B_n\sqrt{N}}{\sqrt{Q_n}} = \frac{A_{n-1} + B_{n-1}\sqrt{N}}{\sqrt{Q_{n-1}}} \cdot \frac{\sqrt{N} + P_n}{\sqrt{Q_nQ_{n-1}}}$$

and

$$\frac{(\sqrt{N} + P_n)^2}{Q_nQ_{n-1}} = \frac{\sqrt{N} + P_n}{\sqrt{N} + P_n}.$$

We illustrate (70) with two examples. We gave a hint above to be used in computing d_{72}. But (70) gives us

$$d_{72} = d_{73} - \frac{1}{2}\log\frac{\sqrt{N} + 5585}{\sqrt{N} - 5585}$$

at once. Next, return to (48), (66a) and (67a). By composition, the latter is

(71) $$F_{481} \cdot F_{481} = (3146, 8731, 10609)$$

and is not reduced. We reduce it by, first, $(10609, -8731, 3146)$ and then F_{73} in Table I. Then, one verifies that

$$2d_{481} - R + \frac{1}{2}\log\left|\frac{\sqrt{N} - 8731}{\sqrt{N} + 8731}\right| + \frac{1}{2}\log\left|\frac{\sqrt{N} + 5585}{\sqrt{N} - 5585}\right| = d_{73}.$$

The fact that $2d_{481} - R$ differs from d_{73} by only $0.295\ldots$ is reflected in the fact that 10609 is represented by F_{73} with the small variables $x = y = 1$ in (48).

3. With some exceptions, such as the aforementioned $N = M^2 + 1$ or $N = S_k$, the regular continued fractions for most large $\sqrt{N}$ with large periods π tend to approximately obey the known probabilistic laws, c.f. [5]. These are the laws of Khintchine, Gauss-Kuzmin and Lévy. In our notation, the latter approximation can be written as

$$\log\left(A_n + B_n\sqrt{N}\right) \approx \frac{\pi^2}{12\log 2}n,$$

and therefore, for large n,

(72) $$d_n \approx \frac{\pi^2}{12\log 2}n.$$

Thus, the approximation
$$153/332 \approx 1/2$$

that we mentioned prior to (43), and its error, is a reflection of the approximation, and error, in (72). For large n, we will usually find that (72) is roughly correct. For example, our N_2 has eight periods: 2 with $\pi = 886$, 2 with $\pi = 842$, and 4 with $\pi = 878$. The average is 871, and we do find that

$$871 \cdot \frac{\pi^2}{12\log 2} = 1033.5 \approx R = 1038.2.$$

23

We may call the distance in (70) the *length* of the form F_n. Some forms are "long" and some are "short." The mean length is

$$1.18657 = \frac{\pi^2}{12 \log 2}$$

by (72). If Q_{n-1} or Q_n is very small relative to $\sqrt{N}$, then F_n must be long.

4. The key operation in SQUFOF is (35), wherein we compute an (inverse) square-root of F_n. This is trivially accomplished since S^2 is a perfect square. Gauss proved that *any* form F in the principal genus has a square-root f such that

$$f \cdot f \text{ (under composition and reduction) } = F.$$

His constructive proof gives a remarkable algorithm for computing f. (This is simplified in my algorithm GATESR [13]. But GATESR is of no use to us here since it requires the complete factorization of N, and, if we knew that, we obviously would not need SQUFOF.)

But the S^2 in (34) is the *value* of a form (28) with $x = 0$ and $y = 1$. If, for any F_n in (28), its value is a square for certain values of x and y, then one can easily construct an equivalent form (probably not reduced) that is a square-form (34). For example, in our much-mentioned F_{73} in (48), $x = y = 1$ gives $S^2 = 103^2$, and F_{73} is equivalent to (71). Then

(73) $$F^{-1/2} \to G_0 = (-103, 6465, 10274)$$

is $-\overline{F}_{32}$ read backwards. $\overline{F}_{32}$ is not shown in Table II but would be at $\overline{d}_{32} = 47.7226810 = d_{481} - \frac{1}{2}R$. So (73) would factor N_2 very quickly.

This variation on SQUFOF was suggested by R. de Vogelaire when I first spoke on SQUFOF in [15]. He calls it the "fat" SQUFOF. One tries small pairs (x, y) in F_n to see if it has a small square value. I know of no one who has actually tried it, or who analyzed its relative efficiency. For N_2, it appears to be of value, since F_{73} is encountered long before the first *explicit* proper square-form F_{380}. Of course, one would want to know that (71) is also proper. In the next section, we turn to construction of the list.

This paper is a long one, and, for brevity, we refer the reader to Lenstra's [7] for a more thorough, theoretical treatment of the infrastructure.

4 The lists (two types)

We have two versions of the list: the first we call the Queue, or the Necessary and Sufficient List; the second is the Sufficient List, or the Cheap List. First lists first!

In the foregoing analysis of N_2 we saw that the improper square-forms F_{316} and F_{332} arose from $F_{142}^2 = F_{316}$ and $F_{153}^2 = F_{332}$ and appear at the distances

$$d_{316} = 2d_{142} \quad \text{and} \quad d_{332} = 2d_{153}.$$

Here, F_{142}^2 and F_{153}^2 are already reduced and these squares can be predicted to occur in F_n as soon as we encounter $Q_{142} = 53$ and $Q_{153} = 11$. We generalize this.

In (32) above, we had the test:

$$Q_{2l} = S^2 \text{ ?}$$

for every l. We now add the test:

(74) $$Q_n < L = 2\sqrt{2\sqrt{N}} \text{ ?}$$

for every n. If (74) does not hold (the usual case when N is large), we continue. If Q_n is *odd* and (74) holds, we make the further test:

(75) $$Q_n < \tfrac{1}{2}L \text{ ?}$$

If Q_n is even and (74) holds, or if Q_n is odd and (75) holds, then (66) *does not hold* and F_n^2 *may* appear as an improper square-form. If, in addition, (65) holds, then F_n^2 will appear as an improper square-form.

The queue algorithm is this: If Q_n is even, and (74) holds, put the pair

(76) $$Q_n/2, \quad P_n \bmod Q_n/2 \geq 0$$

into the queue. If Q_n is odd, and (75) holds, put the pair

(77) $$Q_n, \quad P_n \bmod Q_n \geq 0$$

into the queue. If we call N a full-precision number, the numbers in (76)–(77) are quarter-precision and we can pack either pair into one half-precision number. For example,in my SQUFOF program for an HP-41C, $N < 10^{20}$, the word-length is 10^{10}, and either pair packs into one word as follows.

Return to N_2 in Table I. We have $L = 228.85$ At $n = 142$, 153 and 252 we place numbers into the queue as follows:

n	Queue
142	53.00005
153	11.00003
252	13.00008

Here, the second number in the pair is divided by 10^5 and added to the first number. Note that

$$\tfrac{5}{53} < \tfrac{1}{2}, \quad \tfrac{3}{11} < \tfrac{1}{2}, \quad \tfrac{8}{13} > \tfrac{1}{2}$$

tells us, at once, that the primes dividing the corresponding Q_n are 53, 11 and $\overline{13}$.

Next we come to the square-form F_{316}. Since $P_{316} = 5093 \equiv 5 \pmod{53}$, F_{316} gives us 53.00005 which is at the top of the queue. We have kept no record as to specifically how it got there: that is, we no longer know (at $n = 316$) whether it came from a

(78) $\qquad\qquad (-1)^n Q_n = 53 \text{ or } -53 \text{ or } 106 \text{ or } -106$

at $d_n = \tfrac{1}{2}d_{316}$ in F_n. But that is irrelevant since, in any case, the G_0 for F_{316} will lead us to one of the four symmetry points $\pm S = \pm 1$ or ± 2, and therefore to an improper factor $f = 1$ or 2. Obviously, whichever is correct in (78), $(-1)^{n+1}Q_n$ will be at the same distance below -1 in $-F_n$. Further, by the computation of forms and (59), $\pm Q_n/2$ or $\pm 2Q_n$ will be at $\overline{d}_n = \overline{d}_{421} + \tfrac{1}{2}d_{316}$ in $\overline{F}_n$ or $-\overline{F}_n$ (see Table II) according as Q_n is even or odd. Therefore, in any of the four cases, F_{316} must be improper. We save its 53.00005 in a register LIS called "last improper square-form" and continue.

We must digress briefly since we have not yet defined $\overline{d}_n$. There are two ways to do that. Lenstra [7] ... [sic]

References

[1] H. Cohen. On amicable and sociable numbers. *Math. Comp.*, 24:423–429, 1970.

[2] L. E. Dickson. *History of the Theory of Numbers, Volume III, Quadratic and Higher Forms.* Carnegie Institute of Washington, Reprinted by Chelsea Publishing Company, New York, 1971, 1923.

[3] R. K. Guy. Aliquot sequences. In *Number Theory and Algebra*, pages 111–118. Academic Press, 1977.

[4] R. K. Guy and J. L. Selfridge. What drives an aliquot sequence? *Math. Comp.*, 29:101–107, 1975.

[5] A. Ya. Khinchin. *Continued Fractions.* Univ. of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1964.

[6] D. H. Lehmer and R. E. Powers. On factoring large numbers. *Bull. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 37:770–776, 1931.

[7] H. W. Lenstra, Jr. On the calculation of regulators and class numbers of quadratic fields. In J. V. Armitage, editor, *Journées Arithmétiques, 1980*, volume 56 of *Lecture Notes Series*, pages 123–150. London Math. Soc., 1982.

[8] M. A. Morrison and J. Brillhart. A method of factoring and the factorization of F_7. *Math. Comp.*, 29:183–205, 1975.

[9] D. Shanks. *Solved and Unsolved problems in Number Theory*. Chelsea Publishing Company, New York, Third edition, 1964.

[10] D. Shanks. On Gauss's class number problem. *Math. Comp.*, 23:151–163, 1969.

[11] D. Shanks. Class number, a theory of factorization, and genera. In *1969 Number Theory Institute, Stony Brook, N.Y.*, volume 20 of *Proc. Sympos. Pure Math.*, pages 415–440. Amer. Math. Soc., 1971.

[12] D. Shanks. The infrastructure of a real quadratic field and its applictions. In *Proceedings of the 1972 Number Theory Conference, Boulder*, pages 217–224, 1972.

[13] D. Shanks. Five number-theoretic algorithms. In *Proceedings of the Second Manitoba Conference on Numerical Mathematics (Univ. Manitoba, Winnipeg, Man., 1972)*, number VII in Congressus Numerantium, pages 51–70, Winnipeg, Man., 1973. Utilitas Math.

[14] D. Shanks. Analysis and improvement of the continued fraction method of factorization. Abstract 720-10-43. *Amer. Math. Soc. Notices*, 22:A–68, 1975.

[15] D. Shanks. Square forms factorization. Lecture, before 1975.