

## Re: Factoring problem, solved

**Source:** <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.math/2005-01/6498.html>

---

*jstevh\_at\_msn.com*

**Date:** 01/22/05

Date: 22 Jan 2005 11:44:18 -0800

Gregory G Rose wrote:

> *In article <1106413314.802408.288300@c13g2000cwb.googlegroups.com>,  
> <jstevh@msn.com> wrote:  
> >More than likely the correct number is greater than 90% factoring,  
and  
> >the heavy recursion of my program hides how well the algorithm  
works.  
>  
> A couple of days ago you were asserting that the  
> 50% number came from Quadratic Residues, and that  
> you'd proved it. Well, either you're wrong now, or  
> your proof was wrong then. We can't tell, because  
> of course all you wrote then was gibberish.  
>*

Bullshit. I started the argument, but didn't finish it in my post, but what I started was quite correct, and not gibberish.

It turns out that quadratic residues do play a role, but actually indicate it works better than I realized at first.

So I'm figuring things out and clarifying as I go along.

I'll go ahead and post the full argument that goes into quadratic residues so that people can see just how crazy Usenet posters who reply to me really are.

Oh, to understand the argument, you HAVE to understand things like "mod" and, of course, even know what a quadratic residue actually is.  
James Harris