

On the evaluation of modular polynomials

Andrew V. Sutherland

Massachusetts Institute of Technology

ANTS X — July 10, 2012

`http://math.mit.edu/~drew`

Introduction

Let ℓ be a prime and let \mathbb{F}_q be a finite field (assume q is prime).

Problem: Given an elliptic curve E/\mathbb{F}_q , identify any and all curves E'/\mathbb{F}_q that are ℓ -isogenous to E .

This problem arises in many applications, and it is often the computationally dominant step.

Introduction

Let ℓ be a prime and let \mathbb{F}_q be a finite field (assume q is prime).

Problem: Given an elliptic curve E/\mathbb{F}_q , identify any and all curves E'/\mathbb{F}_q that are ℓ -isogenous to E .

This problem arises in many applications, and it is often the computationally dominant step.

Solution: Compute the polynomial

$$\phi_\ell(Y) = \Phi_\ell(j(E), Y),$$

and find its roots in \mathbb{F}_q . Here $\Phi_\ell \in \mathbb{Z}[X, Y]$ is the classical modular polynomial that parameterizes pairs of ℓ -isogenous elliptic curves.

If ℓ is at all large, say $\ell = \Omega(\log q)$, the hard part is computing ϕ_ℓ . Finding its roots is easy by comparison.

The Modular Polynomial $\Phi_\ell(X, Y)$

$\Phi_\ell \in \mathbb{Z}[X, Y]$ is symmetric, with degree $\ell + 1$ in both X and Y .
Its total size is $O(\ell^3 \log \ell)$ bits.

ℓ	coefficients	largest	average	total
127	8258	7.5kb	5.3kb	5.5MB
251	31880	16kb	12kb	48MB
503	127262	36kb	27kb	431MB
1009	510557	78kb	60kb	3.9GB
2003	2009012	166kb	132kb	33GB
3001	4507505	259kb	208kb	117GB
4001	8010005	356kb	287kb	287GB
5003	12522512	454kb	369kb	577GB
10009	50085038	968kb	774kb	4.8TB

Size of $\Phi_\ell(X, Y)$

The Modular Polynomial $\Phi_\ell(X, Y)$

$\Phi_\ell \in \mathbb{Z}[X, Y]$ is symmetric, with degree $\ell + 1$ in both X and Y .
Its total size is $O(\ell^3 \log \ell)$ bits.

ℓ	coefficients	largest	average	total
127	8258	7.5kb	5.3kb	5.5MB
251	31880	16kb	12kb	48MB
503	127262	36kb	27kb	431MB
1009	510557	78kb	60kb	3.9GB
2003	2009012	166kb	132kb	33GB
3001	4507505	259kb	208kb	117GB
4001	8010005	356kb	287kb	287GB
5003	12522512	454kb	369kb	577GB
10009	50085038	968kb	774kb	4.8TB

Size of $\Phi_\ell(X, Y)$

But for $\ell = 10009$ and $q \approx 2^{256}$, the size of ϕ_ℓ is just 320KB!
Even with $\log q \approx \ell = 10009$ it is under 20MB.

Point-counting at 2500 digits

“... Despite this progress, computing modular polynomials remains the stumbling block for new point counting records. Clearly, to circumvent the memory problems, one would need an algorithm that directly obtains the polynomial specialised in one variable.”

INRIA Project-Team TANC Report

Computing Φ_ℓ with the CRT

Strategy: compute $\Phi_\ell \bmod p$ for sufficiently many primes p and use the CRT to compute Φ_ℓ (or $\Phi_\ell \bmod q$).

- ▶ For suitable primes p we can compute $\Phi_\ell \bmod p$ in time $O(\ell^2 \log^3 p \log p)$ using isogeny volcanoes [BLS 2011].
- ▶ Assuming the GRH, we can efficiently find sufficiently many such primes with $\log p = O(\log \ell)$.
- ▶ "Sufficiently many" is $O(\ell)$.

Henceforth we assume the GRH.

Computing Φ_ℓ with the CRT

Strategy: compute $\Phi_\ell \bmod p$ for sufficiently many primes p and use the CRT to compute Φ_ℓ (or $\Phi_\ell \bmod q$).

- ▶ For suitable primes p we can compute $\Phi_\ell \bmod p$ in time $O(\ell^2 \log^3 p \log p)$ using isogeny volcanoes [BLS 2011].
- ▶ Assuming the GRH, we can efficiently find sufficiently many such primes with $\log p = O(\log \ell)$.
- ▶ "Sufficiently many" is $O(\ell)$.

Uses $O(\ell^3 \log^3 \ell \log \ell)$ expected time and $O(\ell^3 \log \ell)$ space.

Using the explicit CRT, we can directly compute $\Phi_\ell \bmod q$ using $O(\ell^2(n + \log \ell))$ space, where $n = \log q$.

But the size of ϕ_ℓ is $O(\ell n)$.

Computing $\phi_\ell(Y)$ with the CRT (naïve approach)

Strategy: lift $j(E)$ from \mathbb{F}_q to \mathbb{Z} , compute $\Phi_\ell(X, Y) \bmod p$ and evaluate

$$\phi_\ell(Y) = \Phi_\ell(j(E), Y) \bmod p$$

for sufficiently many primes p . Obtain $\phi_\ell \bmod q$ via the explicit CRT.

Uses $O(\ell^2 \log^{3+\epsilon} p)$ expected time for each p , and $O(\ell^2 \log p)$ space.

Computing $\phi_\ell(Y)$ with the CRT (naïve approach)

Strategy: lift $j(E)$ from \mathbb{F}_q to \mathbb{Z} , compute $\Phi_\ell(X, Y) \bmod p$ and evaluate

$$\phi_\ell(Y) = \Phi_\ell(j(E), Y) \bmod p$$

for sufficiently many primes p . Obtain $\phi_\ell \bmod q$ via the explicit CRT.

Uses $O(\ell^2 \log^{3+\epsilon} p)$ expected time for each p , and $O(\ell^2 \log p)$ space.

However, “sufficiently many” is now $O(\ell n)$, where $n = \log q$.

Total expected time is $O(\ell^3 n \log^{3+\epsilon} \ell)$, using $O(\ell n + \ell^2 \log \ell)$ space.

This approach is **not very useful**:

- ▶ If n is large (e.g. $n \approx \ell$), it takes way too long (quartic in ℓ).
- ▶ If n is small (e.g. $n \approx \log \ell$), it doesn't save any space.

Computing $\phi_\ell(Y)$ with the CRT (Algorithm 1)

Strategy: lift $j, j^2, j^3, \dots, j^{\ell+1}$ from \mathbb{F}_q to \mathbb{Z} and then compute

$$\phi_\ell(Y) = \sum c_{ik} j^i Y^k \pmod{p}$$

for sufficiently many primes p , where $\Phi_\ell = \sum c_{ik} X^i Y^k$.
Obtain $\phi_\ell \pmod{q}$ via the explicit CRT.

Computing $\phi_\ell(Y)$ with the CRT (Algorithm 1)

Strategy: lift $j, j^2, j^3, \dots, j^{\ell+1}$ from \mathbb{F}_q to \mathbb{Z} and then compute

$$\phi_\ell(Y) = \sum c_{ik} j^i Y^k \pmod{p}$$

for sufficiently many primes p , where $\Phi_\ell = \sum c_{ik} X^i Y^k$.
Obtain $\phi_\ell \pmod{q}$ via the explicit CRT.

Now “sufficiently many” is $O(\ell + n)$.

For $n = O(\ell \log \ell)$, uses $O(\ell^3 \log^{3+\epsilon} \ell)$ expected time and $O(\ell^2 \log \ell)$ space (under GRH).

For $n = \Omega(\ell \log \ell)$, the space bound is optimal.

This algorithm can also evaluate the partial derivatives of Φ_ℓ needed to construct normalized equations for \tilde{E} (important for SEA).

Computing $\phi_\ell(Y)$ with the CRT (Algorithm 2)

Strategy: lift $j(E)$ from \mathbb{F}_q to \mathbb{Z} and for sufficiently many primes p compute $\phi_\ell \bmod p$ as follows:

1. For each of $\ell + 2$ j -invariants y_i , compute $z_i = \prod_k (j(E) - j_k)$, where the j_k range over $\ell + 1$ neighbors of y_i in $G_\ell(\mathbb{F}_p)$.
2. Interpolate $\phi_\ell(Y) \in \mathbb{F}_p$ as the unique polynomial of degree $\ell + 1$ for which $\phi_\ell(y_i) = z_i$.

Obtain $\phi_\ell \bmod q$ via the explicit CRT.

Computing $\phi_\ell(Y)$ with the CRT (Algorithm 2)

Strategy: lift $j(E)$ from \mathbb{F}_q to \mathbb{Z} and for sufficiently many primes p compute $\phi_\ell \bmod p$ as follows:

1. For each of $\ell + 2$ j -invariants y_i , compute $z_i = \prod_k (j(E) - j_k)$, where the j_k range over $\ell + 1$ neighbors of y_i in $G_\ell(\mathbb{F}_p)$.
2. Interpolate $\phi_\ell(Y) \in \mathbb{F}_p$ as the unique polynomial of degree $\ell + 1$ for which $\phi_\ell(y_i) = z_i$.

Obtain $\phi_\ell \bmod q$ via the explicit CRT.

For $n = O(\ell^c)$, uses $O(\ell^3(n + \log \ell) \log^{1+\epsilon} \ell)$ expected time and $O(\ell n + \ell \log \ell)$ space (under GRH).

For $n = O(\log^{2-\epsilon} q)$ the algorithm is faster than computing Φ_ℓ .
For $n = \Omega(\log \ell)$ the space bound is optimal.

Genus 1 point counting in large characteristic

Algorithms to compute $\#E(\mathbb{F}_q) = q + 1 - t$.

Algorithm	Time	Space
Totally naive	$O(e^{2n+\epsilon})$	$O(n)$
Slightly less naive	$O(e^{n+\epsilon})$	$O(n)$
Baby-step giant-step	$O(e^{n/4+\epsilon})$	$O(e^{n/4+\epsilon})$
Pollard kangaroo	$O(e^{n/4+\epsilon})$	$O(n^2)$
Schoof	$O(n^5 \text{llog } n)$	$O(n^3)$
SEA*	$O(n^4 \log^3 n \text{llog } n)$	$O(n^3 \log n)$
SEA (Φ_ℓ precomputed)	$O(n^4 \text{llog } n)$	$O(n^4)$

*Complexity estimates for SEA-based algorithms are heuristic expected times.

Genus 1 point counting in large characteristic

Algorithms to compute $\#E(\mathbb{F}_q) = q + 1 - t$.

Algorithm	Time	Space
Totally naive	$O(e^{2n+\epsilon})$	$O(n)$
Slightly less naive	$O(e^{n+\epsilon})$	$O(n)$
Baby-step giant-step	$O(e^{n/4+\epsilon})$	$O(e^{n/4+\epsilon})$
Pollard kangaroo	$O(e^{n/4+\epsilon})$	$O(n^2)$
Schoof	$O(n^5 \text{llog } n)$	$O(n^3)$
SEA*	$O(n^4 \log^3 n \text{llog } n)$	$O(n^3 \log n)$
SEA (Φ_ℓ precomputed)	$O(n^4 \text{llog } n)$	$O(n^4)$
SEA with Algorithm 1	$O(n^4 \log^2 n \text{llog } n)$	$O(n^2 \log n)$
Amortized	$O(n^4 \text{llog } n)$	$O(n^2 \log n)$

*Complexity estimates for SEA-based algorithms are heuristic expected times.

Alternative modular polynomials

In practice, the modular polynomials Φ_ℓ are not used in SEA. There are alternatives (due to Atkin, Müller, and others) that are smaller by a large constant factor (100x to 1000x is typical).

The isogeny-volcano approach of [BLS 2010] can compute many types of (symmetric) modular polynomials derived from modular functions other than $j(z)$, but these do not include the modular polynomials commonly used with SEA.

Alternative modular polynomials

In practice, the modular polynomials Φ_ℓ are not used in SEA. There are alternatives (due to Atkin, Müller, and others) that are smaller by a large constant factor (100x to 1000x is typical).

The isogeny-volcano approach of [BLS 2010] can compute many types of (symmetric) modular polynomials derived from modular functions other than $j(z)$, but these do not include the modular polynomials commonly used with SEA.

They do include modular polynomials Φ_ℓ^f derived from the Weber function $f(z)$, but these have never (?) been used with SEA before.

Provided $\text{End}(E)$ has discriminant $D \equiv 1 \pmod{8}$ with $3 \nmid D$, the polynomial $\phi_\ell^f(Y) = \Phi_\ell^f(f(E), Y)$ parameterizes ℓ -isogenies from E .

This condition is easily checked (without knowing D).
If it fails, powers of f , or other modular functions may be used.

The Weber function

The Weber f -function is defined by

$$f(\tau) = \frac{\eta((\tau + 1)/2)}{\zeta_{48}\eta(\tau)},$$

and satisfies $j(\tau) = (f(\tau)^{24} - 16)^3 / f(\tau)^{24}$.

The coefficients of Φ_ℓ^f are roughly 72 times smaller.
This means we need 72 times fewer primes.

The polynomial Φ_ℓ^f is roughly 24 times sparser.
This means we need 24 times fewer interpolation points.

Overall, we get nearly a **1728-fold speedup** using Φ_ℓ^f .

Modular polynomials for $\ell = 11$

Classical:

$$\begin{aligned} & X^{12} + Y^{12} - X^{11}Y^{11} + 8184X^{11}Y^{10} - 28278756X^{11}Y^9 + 53686822816X^{11}Y^8 \\ & - 61058988656490X^{11}Y^7 + 42570393135641712X^{11}Y^6 - 17899526272883039048X^{11}Y^5 \\ & + 4297837238774928467520X^{11}Y^4 - 529134841844639613861795X^{11}Y^3 + 27209811658056645815522600X^{11}Y^2 \\ & - 374642006356701393515817612X^{11}Y + 296470902355240575283200000X^{11} \\ & \dots 8 \text{ pages omitted} \dots \\ & + 3924233450945276549086964624087200490995247233706746270899364206426701740619416867392454656000 \dots 000 \end{aligned}$$

Atkin:

$$\begin{aligned} & X^{12} - X^{11}Y + 744X^{11} + 196680X^{10} + 187X^9Y + 21354080X^9 + 506X^8Y + 830467440X^8 \\ & - 11440X^7Y + 16875327744X^7 - 57442X^6Y + 208564958976X^6 + 184184X^5Y + 1678582287360X^5 \\ & + 1675784X^4Y + 9031525113600X^4 + 1867712X^3Y + 32349979904000X^3 - 8252640X^2Y + 74246810880000X^2 \\ & - 19849600XY + 98997734400000X + Y^2 - 8720000Y + 5841107200000 \end{aligned}$$

Weber:

$$X^{12} + Y^{12} - X^{11}Y^{11} + 11X^9Y^9 - 44X^7Y^7 + 88X^5Y^5 - 88X^3Y^3 + 32XY$$

Elliptic curve point counting record

Task	Total CPU Time
Compute ϕ_ℓ^f	32 days
Find a root \tilde{j}	995 days
Compute g_ℓ	3 days
Compute $\pi \bmod g_\ell, E$	326 days
Find λ_ℓ	22 days

$\phi_\ell^f(Y) = \Phi_\ell^f(j(E), Y)$ was computed for ℓ from 5 to 11681.
Exactly 700 of 1400 were found to be Elkies primes.
Atkin primes were not used.

The largest ϕ_ℓ^f was under 20MB in size and took about two hours to compute using 1 core.

Modular polynomial evaluation record

For $\ell = 100019$ and $q = 2^{86243} - 1$ we computed $\phi_\ell^f(Y) = \Phi_\ell^f(j(E), Y)$.

This is much larger than one would need to set a 25,000 digit point-counting record.

The size of ϕ_ℓ^f is about **1 GB**.

Modular polynomial evaluation record

For $\ell = 100019$ and $q = 2^{86243} - 1$ we computed $\phi_\ell^f(Y) = \Phi_\ell^f(j(E), Y)$.

This is much larger than one would need to set a 25,000 digit point-counting record.

The size of ϕ_ℓ^f is about **1 GB**.

For comparison:

- ▶ The size of $\Phi_\ell^f \bmod q$ is about **2 TB**.

Modular polynomial evaluation record

For $\ell = 100019$ and $q = 2^{86243} - 1$ we computed $\phi_\ell^f(Y) = \Phi_\ell^f(j(E), Y)$.

This is much larger than one would need to set a 25,000 digit point-counting record.

The size of ϕ_ℓ^f is about **1 GB**.

For comparison:

- ▶ The size of $\Phi_\ell^f \bmod q$ is about **2 TB**.
- ▶ The size of $\Phi_\ell \bmod q$ is about **50 TB**.

Modular polynomial evaluation record

For $\ell = 100019$ and $q = 2^{86243} - 1$ we computed $\phi_\ell^f(Y) = \Phi_\ell^f(j(E), Y)$.

This is much larger than one would need to set a 25,000 digit point-counting record.

The size of ϕ_ℓ^f is about **1 GB**.

For comparison:

- ▶ The size of $\Phi_\ell^f \bmod q$ is about **2 TB**.
- ▶ The size of $\Phi_\ell \bmod q$ is about **50 TB**.
- ▶ The size of Φ_ℓ is more than **10 PB**.

Improved space complexity of computing horizontal isogenies

The algorithm of [Bisson-S 2011] for computing the endomorphism ring of an elliptic curve E/\mathbb{F}_q runs in $L[1/2, \sqrt{3}/2]$ expected time and uses $L[1/2, 1/\sqrt{3}]$ space (under GRH).

The space complexity can now be improved to $L[1/2, 1/\sqrt{12}]$.

A similar improvement applies to algorithms for computing horizontal isogenies of large degree [Jao-Soukharev ANTS IX].