DETECTING PERFECT POWERS
BY FACTORING INTO COPRIMES
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ABSTRACT. This paper presents an algorithm that, given an integer \( n > 1 \), finds the largest integer \( k \) such that \( n \) is a \( k \)th power. A previous algorithm by the first author took time \( b^{1+o(1)} \), where \( b = \log n \); more precisely, time \( b \exp(O(\sqrt{\log \log b}) \); conjecturally, time \( b \log b)^O(1) \). The new algorithm takes time \( b \log b)^O(1) \). It relies on relatively complicated subroutines—specifically, on the first author’s fast algorithm to factor integers into coprimes—but it allows a proof of the \( b \log b)^O(1) \) bound without much background; the previous proof of \( b^{1+o(1)} \) relied on transcendental number theory.

The computation of \( k \) is the first step, and occasionally the bottleneck, in many number-theoretic algorithms: the Agrawal-Kayal-Saxena primality test, for example, and the number-field sieve for integer factorization.

Here is an algorithm that, given an integer \( n > 1 \), finds the largest integer \( k \) such that \( n \) is a \( k \)th power:

1. For each prime power \( q \) such that \( 2^q \leq n \), write down a positive integer \( r_q \) such that if \( n \) is a \( q \)th power then \( n = r_q^q \).
2. Find a finite coprime set \( P \) of integers larger than 1 such that each of \( n, r_2, r_3, r_4, r_5, r_7, \ldots \) is a product of powers of elements of \( P \). (In this paper, “coprime” means “pairwise coprime.”)
3. Factor \( n \) as \( \prod_{p \in P} p^{\alpha_p} \), and compute \( k = \gcd\{n_p : p \in P\} \).

It is easy to see that the algorithm is correct. Say \( n \) is an \( \ell \)th power. Take any prime power \( q \) dividing \( \ell \). Then \( n \) is a \( q \)th power, so \( n = r_q^q \); but \( r_q \) is a product \( \prod_{p \in P} p^{\alpha_p} \) for some exponents \( \alpha_p \), so \( n \) is a product \( \prod_{p \in P} p^{\alpha_p} \). Factorizations over \( P \) are unique, so \( n_p = a_p \) for each \( p \). Thus \( q \) divides \( \gcd\{n_p : p \in P\} = k \). This is true for all \( q \), so \( \ell \) divides \( k \). Conversely, \( n \) is certainly a \( k \)th power.

Take, for example, \( n = 49787136 < 2^{26} \). Compute approximations

\[
\begin{align*}
    r_2 &= 7056 \approx n^{1/2} \\
    r_3 &= 368 \approx n^{1/3} \\
    r_4 &= 84 \approx n^{1/4} \\
    r_5 &= 35 \approx n^{1/5} \\
    r_7 &= 13 \approx n^{1/7} \\
    r_8 &= 9 \approx n^{1/8} \\
    r_9 &= 7 \approx n^{1/9} \\
    r_{10} &= 5 \approx n^{1/11} \\
    r_{11} &= 4 \approx n^{1/13} \\
    r_{12} &= 3 \approx n^{1/16} \\
    r_{17} &= 3 \approx n^{1/17} \\
    r_{19} &= 3 \approx n^{1/19} \\
    r_{23} &= 2 \approx n^{1/23} \\
    r_{25} &= 2 \approx n^{1/25} \\
    r_{16} &= 3 \approx n^{1/16}
\end{align*}
\]
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where \( \approx \) means “within 0.6.” Factor \( \{49787136, 7056, 368, 84, 35, 13, 9, 7, 5, 4, 3, 2\} \) into coprimes: each of these numbers is a product of powers of elements of \( P = \{2, 3, 5, 7, 13, 23\} \). In particular, \( n = 2^8 3^4 5^0 7^4 13^0 23^0 \), so \( k = \gcd\{8, 4, 0, 4, 0, 0\} = 4 \).

In other words, \( n \) is a 4th power, and is not an \( \ell \)th power for \( \ell > 4 \).

As discussed below, the literature already shows how to perform each step of this algorithm in time \( b(\log b)^{O(1)} \), where \( b = \log n \). Computing \( n^{1/k} \), which is used by some applications, also takes time \( b(\log b)^{O(1)} \).

**Details of Step 1.** Here is one of several standard ways to handle Step 1.

Given \( n \) and \( q \), use binary search and Newton’s method to compute a floating-point number guaranteed to be within \( 2^{-32} \) of \( n^{1/q} \), as explained in [4] Sections 8 and 10. The algorithms of [4] rely on FFT-based integer multiplication; see [6] Sections 2–4.

Define \( r_q \) as an integer within \( 2^{-32} \) of this floating-point number. If no such integer exists, define \( r_q = 1 \).

Each \( r_q \) has \( O(b/q) \) bits. Together the \( r_q \)’s have \( \sum_{q \leq \log n} O(b/q) = O(b \log \log b) \) bits by Mertens’s theorem. The algorithms of [4] take time \( (\log b)^{O(1)} \) per bit.

Another standard way to handle Step 1 is to define \( r_q \) as an integer 2-adically close to \( n^{1/q} \), as explained in [4] Section 21.

One can change the bound \( 2^{-32} \). We caution the reader that the two numerical examples in this paper use different bounds. A smaller bound requires a high-precision computation of \( n^{1/q} \) but—for typical distributions of \( n \)—is more likely to produce \( r_q = 1 \), reducing the load on subsequent steps of the algorithm. The typical behavior of the algorithm is discussed below in more detail.

**Details of Step 2.** Given a finite set of positive integers, the algorithm of [5] Section 18 computes the “natural coprime base” for that set. The algorithm takes time \( s(\log s)^{O(1)} \) where \( s \) is the number of input bits. The algorithm relies on FFT-based multiplication, division, and gcd; see [6] Sections 17 and 22.

Use this algorithm to compute the “natural coprime base” \( P \) for \( \{n, r_2, \ldots\} \). Together \( n, r_2, \ldots \) have \( O(b \log \log b) \) bits, so this takes time \( b(\log b)^{O(1)} \).

**Details of Step 3.** Given a finite coprime set \( P \) of integers larger than 1, and given a positive integer that has a factorization over \( P \), the algorithm of [5] Section 20] finds that factorization. The algorithm takes time \( s(\log s)^{O(1)} \) where \( s \) is the number of input bits. The algorithm relies on FFT-based arithmetic.

Use this algorithm to factor \( n \) over \( P \). Together \( n \) and \( P \) have \( O(b \log \log b) \) bits, so this takes time \( b(\log b)^{O(1)} \).

**Competition.** Previous work by the first author in [4] had already shown that \( k \) could be computed in time \( b^{1+o(1)} \). The algorithm of [4] computes \( r_q \) for prime numbers \( q \), and then computes several increasingly precise approximations to \( r_q^\prime \), stopping when an approximation demonstrates that \( r_q^\prime \neq n \).

The run-time bound for the algorithm in this paper has two advantages over the run-time bound for the algorithm in [4]:

- The new bound is smaller. The old bound was \( b \exp(O(\sqrt{\log b \log \log b})) \); the new bound is \( b(\log b)^{O(1)} \).
- The new proof requires considerably less background. The new proof relies on the first author’s results in [5] on factoring into coprimes, but the old proof relied on deep results in transcendental number theory.
The old algorithm is conjectured to take time \( b(\log b)^{O(1)} \), as discussed in [4, Section 15], but this conjecture seems very difficult to prove.

**Performance in the typical case.** For most values of \( n \), computing a floating-point number within \( 2^{-32} \) of \( n^{1/2} \) reveals immediately that \( n \) is not a square, because the floating-point number is not within \( 2^{-32} \) of an integer.

Similarly, for almost all values of \( n \), computing reasonably precise floating-point approximations to \( n^{1/2}, n^{1/3}, \ldots \) reveals immediately that \( k = 1 \). Here one can define “reasonably precise” as, e.g., “within \( 2^{-32}/b \).” For example, take \( n = 3141592653589793238462643383 \), and compute

\[
\begin{align*}
56049912163979.286992550892 & \approx n^{1/2}, & r_2 = r_4 = r_8 = r_{16} = r_{32} = r_{64} = 1; \\
146591887.5615232630107 & \approx n^{1/3}, & r_3 = r_9 = r_{27} = r_{81} = 1; \\
315812.9791837632319 & \approx n^{1/5}, & r_5 = r_{25} = 1; \\
8475.4793001649371 & \approx n^{1/7}, & r_7 = r_{49} = 1; \\
316.0391590557065 & \approx n^{1/11}, & r_{11} = 1; \\
130.3663105302392 & \approx n^{1/13}, & r_{13} = 1; \\
41.4456928612363 & \approx n^{1/17}, & r_{17} = 1; \\
28.0038933071808 & \approx n^{1/19}, & r_{19} = 1; \\
15.6865795173630 & \approx n^{1/23}, & r_{23} = 1; \\
8.8751884186190 & \approx n^{1/29}, & r_{29} = 1; \\
7.7091205087505 & \approx n^{1/31}, & r_{31} = 1; \\
5.5356192737976 & \approx n^{1/37}, & r_{37} = 1; \\
4.684488605433 & \approx n^{1/41}, & r_{41} = 1; \\
4.3598204254547 & \approx n^{1/43}, & r_{43} = 1; \\
3.8463229122474 & \approx n^{1/47}, & r_{47} = 1; \\
3.3022819333873 & \approx n^{1/51}, & r_{53} = 1; \\
2.9245118649948 & \approx n^{1/59}, & r_{59} = 1; \\
2.8234034999139 & \approx n^{1/61}, & r_{61} = 1; \\
2.5727952305908 & \approx n^{1/67}, & r_{67} = 1; \\
2.4394043898716 & \approx n^{1/71}, & r_{71} = 1; \\
2.3805279554537 & \approx n^{1/73}, & r_{73} = 1; \\
2.2876766537899 & \approx n^{1/79}, & r_{79} = 1; \\
2.1443267449321 & \approx n^{1/81}, & r_{83} = 1; \\
2.0368391790628 & \approx n^{1/89}, & r_{89} = 1;
\end{align*}
\]

where now \( \approx \) means “within \( 2^{-40} \).” Evidently \( k = 1 \).

For these typical values of \( n \), there is no difference between the algorithm in this paper and the algorithm of [4]. All the time is spent computing approximate roots. Doing better means computing fewer roots—see [4, Section 22]—or computing the roots more quickly; these improvements apply equally to both algorithms.

For the other values of \( n \)—the atypical integers that are close to squares, cubes, etc.—the algorithms behave differently. It is not easy to analyze, or experiment with, the actual worst-case behavior of the algorithms, because it is not easy to find integers that are simultaneously close to many powers. We leave this as a challenge for the reader.

**History.** Bach, Driscoll, and Shallit in [2] introduced a quadratic-time algorithm to factor integers into coprimes. The obvious algorithm takes cubic time.
Bach and Sorenson in [3] published various algorithms to detect perfect powers, i.e., to check whether \( k > 1 \). One algorithm takes time \( O(b^3) \). Another algorithm is conjectured to take time \( O(b^2/(\lg b)^2) \) for most, but not all, \( n \)’s.

The second and third authors of this paper observed in early 1994 that they could compute \( k \) in time \( O(b^2(\lg \lg b)^2) \) by factoring \( n, r_2, \ldots \) into coprimes with the Bach-Driscoll-Shallit algorithm; recall that \( n, r_2, \ldots \) together have \( O(b \lg \lg b) \) bits. This line of work was abandoned several months later when the first author announced that \( k \) could be computed in time \( b^{1+o(1)} \) by the increasingly-precise-approximations-to-\( r_q \) method.

The first author later pointed out that this line of work deserved to be revived, since he had found an essentially-linear-time algorithm—see [5]—to factor integers into coprimes.
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