

Computing the image of Galois representations attached to an elliptic curve

Andrew V. Sutherland (MIT)

December 1, 2009

joint work with Nicholas Katz (Princeton)

Definitions

For an elliptic curve E/K and a prime $\ell \neq \text{char}(K)$, the group $\text{Gal}(\bar{K}/K)$ acts on the ℓ -adic Tate module

$$T_\ell(E) = \varprojlim_n E[\ell^n].$$

This yields a group representation

$$\rho_{E,\ell} : \text{Gal}(\bar{K}/K) \rightarrow \text{Aut}(T_\ell(E)) \cong \text{GL}_2(\mathbb{Z}_\ell).$$

For this talk $K = \mathbb{Q}$.

Surjectivity of $\rho_{E,\ell}$

For E without complex multiplication, $\rho_{E,\ell}$ is usually surjective.

Theorem (Serre)

Let K be a number field and assume E/K does not have CM.

1. The image of $\rho_{E,\ell}$ has finite index in $\mathrm{GL}_2(\mathbb{Z}_\ell)$ for all ℓ .
2. There exists ℓ_0 such that $\mathrm{im} \rho_{E,\ell} = \mathrm{GL}_2(\mathbb{Z}_\ell)$ for all $\ell > \ell_0$.

Conjecturally, there is an ℓ_0 that depends only on K .

For $K = \mathbb{Q}$, it is believed that $\ell_0 = 37$.

For this talk E does not have CM.

Reduction modulo ℓ

We will restrict our attention to $\bar{\rho}_{E,\ell} : \text{Gal}(\bar{K}/K) \rightarrow \text{GL}_2(\mathbb{Z}/\ell\mathbb{Z})$.

Theorem (Serre)

For $K = \mathbb{Q}$ and $\ell > 3$, the map $\rho_{E,\ell}$ is surjective iff $\bar{\rho}_{E,\ell}$ is.

Conjecturally, $\text{im } \bar{\rho}_{E,\ell}$ determines $\text{im } \rho_{E,\ell}$ for all $\ell > 3$.

The theorem fails for $\ell = 2$ and $\ell = 3$ [Elkies], but it then suffices to consider $\rho_{E,\ell} \bmod \ell^k$ for small k (empirically $k \leq 3$).

When is $\bar{\rho}_{E,\ell}$ non-surjective?

If $E[\ell](\mathbb{Q})$ is non-trivial, then $\bar{\rho}_{E,\ell}$ cannot be surjective.
This occurs for $\ell \leq 7$ (and no others [Mazur]).

If E/\mathbb{Q} admits a rational ℓ -isogeny then $\bar{\rho}_{E,\ell}$ is not surjective.
This occurs for $\ell \leq 17$ and $\ell = 37$ (and no others, without CM).

However, $\bar{\rho}_{E,\ell}$ may be non-surjective even when E/\mathbb{Q} has no rational ℓ -isogenies, and $\text{im } \bar{\rho}_{E,\ell}$ may vary in any case.

When is $\bar{\rho}_{E,\ell}$ non-surjective?

If $E[\ell](\mathbb{Q})$ is non-trivial, then $\bar{\rho}_{E,\ell}$ cannot be surjective.
This occurs for $\ell \leq 7$ (and no others [Mazur]).

If E/\mathbb{Q} admits a rational ℓ -isogeny then $\bar{\rho}_{E,\ell}$ is not surjective.
This occurs for $\ell \leq 17$ and $\ell = 37$ (and no others, without CM).

However, $\bar{\rho}_{E,\ell}$ may be non-surjective even when E/\mathbb{Q} has no rational ℓ -isogenies, and $\text{im } \bar{\rho}_{E,\ell}$ may vary in any case.

Classifying the possibilities for $\text{im } \bar{\rho}_{E,\ell} \subseteq \text{GL}_2[\mathbb{Z}/\ell\mathbb{Z}]$ may be viewed as a generalization of Mazur's Theorem.

Distribution of Frobenius traces

For primes p of good reduction, let $a_p = p + 1 - \#E(\mathbb{F}_p)$.

The Čebotarev density theorem implies that for $c \in \mathbb{Z}/\ell\mathbb{Z}$,

$$\text{dens}(a_p \equiv c \pmod{\ell}) = \frac{\#\{A : \text{tr } A = c, A \in \text{im } \bar{\rho}_{E,\ell}\}}{\#\text{im } \bar{\rho}_{E,\ell}}.$$

When $\text{im } \bar{\rho}_{E,\ell}$ is small, these densities can become highly non-uniform (even zero).

The constants appearing in both the Lang-Trotter conjecture and Koblitz' conjecture depend on $\text{dens}(a_p \equiv c \pmod{m})$.

Main results

An algorithm to compute $\text{im } \bar{\rho}_{E,\ell}$ for small ℓ (up to isomorphism).
If $\bar{\rho}_{E,\ell}$ is surjective, the algorithm proves this unconditionally.
Otherwise its output is heuristically correct with high probability
(in principle, this can also be made unconditional).

Main results

An algorithm to compute $\text{im } \bar{\rho}_{E,\ell}$ for small ℓ (up to isomorphism).
If $\bar{\rho}_{E,\ell}$ is surjective, the algorithm proves this unconditionally.
Otherwise its output is heuristically correct with high probability
(in principle, this can also be made unconditional).

- ▶ Very fast, usually well under a millisecond per curve.
- ▶ We have computed $\bar{\rho}_{E,\ell}$ for every E in the Stein-Watkins database (over 100 million curves), for primes $\ell < 60$.

Main results

An algorithm to compute $\text{im } \bar{\rho}_{E,\ell}$ for small ℓ (up to isomorphism).
If $\bar{\rho}_{E,\ell}$ is surjective, the algorithm proves this unconditionally.
Otherwise its output is heuristically correct with high probability
(in principle, this can also be made unconditional).

- ▶ Very fast, usually well under a millisecond per curve.
- ▶ We have computed $\bar{\rho}_{E,\ell}$ for every E in the Stein-Watkins database (over 100 million curves), for primes $\ell < 60$.

Previous work addressed curves of conductor up to 200 [Reverter-Vila], with partial results up to 30000 [Stein].

A probabilistic approach

The action of the Frobenius endomorphism on $E[\ell](\overline{\mathbb{F}}_p)$ corresponds to a matrix $A_p \in \text{im } \bar{\rho}_\ell \subseteq \text{GL}_2(\mathbb{Z}/\ell\mathbb{Z})$.

We have $\text{tr } A_p = a_p \bmod \ell$ and $\det A_p = p \bmod \ell$, hence we know the characteristic polynomial $\lambda^2 - a_p\lambda + p \bmod \ell$.

By varying p , we can “randomly” sample $\text{im } \bar{\rho}_{E,\ell}$.

The Čebotarev density theorem implies equidistribution.

A probabilistic approach

The action of the Frobenius endomorphism on $E[\ell](\overline{\mathbb{F}}_p)$ corresponds to a matrix $A_p \in \text{im } \bar{\rho}_\ell \subseteq \text{GL}_2(\mathbb{Z}/\ell\mathbb{Z})$.

We have $\text{tr } A_p = a_p \bmod \ell$ and $\det A_p = p \bmod \ell$, hence we know the characteristic polynomial $\lambda^2 - a_p\lambda + p \bmod \ell$.

By varying p , we can “randomly” sample $\text{im } \bar{\rho}_{E,\ell}$.

The Čebotarev density theorem implies equidistribution.

Unfortunately, this does not give enough information.

The case $\ell = 2$

$\mathrm{GL}_2(\mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z}) \cong S_3$ has 6 subgroups in 4 conjugacy classes.

For $H \subseteq \mathrm{GL}_2(\mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z})$, let $t_i(H) = \#\{A \in H : \mathrm{tr} A = i\}$.

We consider the possible vectors $t(H) = (t_0(H), t_1(H))$.

1. For $H = \mathrm{GL}_2(\mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z})$ we have $t(H) = (4, 2)$.
2. The subgroup $H \cong \mathbb{Z}/3\mathbb{Z}$ has $t(H) = (1, 2)$.
3. Three conjugate $H \cong \mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z}$ have $t(H) = (2, 0)$
4. The trivial H has $t(H) = (1, 0)$.

1-2 are distinguished from 3-4 by a trace 1 element (easy).

We can distinguish 1 from 2 by comparing frequencies (harder).

We can't distinguish 3 from 4 (impossible).

Using the fixspace of A_p

The Frobenius endomorphism fixes $E(\mathbb{F}_p)[\ell]$, hence we have

$$\text{cok}(A_p - I) \cong E(\mathbb{F}_p)[\ell],$$

when viewed as submodules of $\mathbb{Z}/\ell\mathbb{Z} \times \mathbb{Z}/\ell\mathbb{Z}$.

We can easily compute $E(\mathbb{F}_p)[\ell]$, and this yields additional information about A_p that **cannot** be derived from a_p .

We can now easily distinguish all 4 subgroups when $\ell = 2$.
This generalizes nicely.

Signatures in $\mathrm{GL}_2(\mathbb{Z}/\ell\mathbb{Z})$

For each subgroup H of $\mathrm{GL}_2(\mathbb{Z}/\ell\mathbb{Z})$, we define the *extended signature* of H as the multiset

$$S_H = \{(\det A, \mathrm{tr} A, \mathrm{cok}(A - I)) : A \in H\}.$$

The *signature* s_H is simply the set S_H , ignoring multiplicities. Note that s_H and S_H are invariant under conjugation.

Signatures in $\mathrm{GL}_2(\mathbb{Z}/\ell\mathbb{Z})$

For each subgroup H of $\mathrm{GL}_2(\mathbb{Z}/\ell\mathbb{Z})$, we define the *extended signature* of H as the multiset

$$S_H = \{ (\det A, \mathrm{tr} A, \mathrm{cok}(A - I)) : A \in H \}.$$

The *signature* s_H is simply the set S_H , ignoring multiplicities. Note that s_H and S_H are invariant under conjugation.

Lemma

Let $\ell < 60$ be prime and let G and H be subgroups of $\mathrm{GL}_2(\mathbb{Z}/\ell\mathbb{Z})$ for which the determinant map is surjective.

1. $s_G = s_H \iff S_G = S_H$
2. $S_G = S_H \implies G \cong H$.

The lattice of conjugacy classes in $\mathrm{GL}_2(\mathbb{Z}/\ell\mathbb{Z})$

Up to conjugacy, we may determine $\mathrm{im} \bar{\rho}_{E,\ell}$ identifying its location in the lattice of conjugacy classes of $\mathrm{GL}_2(\mathbb{Z}/\ell\mathbb{Z})$.

We may restrict our attention to the (upwardly closed) subset of classes \mathcal{C}_ℓ for which the determinant map is surjective.

For any signature set s and $H \in \mathcal{C}_\ell$, we say s_H *minimally covers* s if $s \subset s_H$ and for each $G \in \mathcal{C}_\ell$ we have $s \subset s_G \implies s_H \subset s_G$.

Note that if s minimally covered by s_G and s_H , then $s_G = s_H$ and therefore $G \cong H$ (by the lemma).

The algorithm

Given an elliptic curve E/\mathbb{Q} , a prime ℓ , and $\epsilon > 0$, set $s \leftarrow \emptyset$, $k \leftarrow 0$ and for each good prime $p \neq \ell$:

1. Compute $E(\mathbb{F}_p)$ to obtain a_p and $V_p = E(\mathbb{F}_p)[\ell]$.
2. Set $s \leftarrow s \cup (p \bmod \ell, a_p \bmod \ell, V_p)$, and increment k .
3. If s is minimally covered by s_H for some $H \in \mathcal{C}_\ell$ and we have $\delta_H^k < \epsilon$, then output H and terminate.

The algorithm

Given an elliptic curve E/\mathbb{Q} , a prime ℓ , and $\epsilon > 0$, set $s \leftarrow \emptyset$, $k \leftarrow 0$ and for each good prime $p \neq \ell$:

1. Compute $E(\mathbb{F}_p)$ to obtain a_p and $V_p = E(\mathbb{F}_p)[\ell]$.
2. Set $s \leftarrow s \cup (p \bmod \ell, a_p \bmod \ell, V_p)$, and increment k .
3. If s is minimally covered by s_H for some $H \in \mathcal{C}_\ell$ and we have $\delta_H^k < \epsilon$, then output H and terminate.

Here δ_H is the maximum over $G \supsetneq H$ of the probability that the signature of a random element of G lies in s_H , which we take to be zero when $H = \mathrm{GL}_2(\mathbb{Z}/\ell\mathbb{Z})$.

The values of s_H and δ_H for all $H \in \mathcal{C}_\ell$ are precomputed.

Efficient implementation

If $\bar{\rho}_{E,\ell}$ is surjective, we expect the algorithm to terminate in $O(\log \ell)$ iterations (around ten). Otherwise, for $\epsilon = 2^{-n}$, we typically need $O(n)$ iterations (a few hundred).

Efficient implementation

If $\bar{\rho}_{E,\ell}$ is surjective, we expect the algorithm to terminate in $O(\log \ell)$ iterations (around ten). Otherwise, for $\epsilon = 2^{-n}$, we typically need $O(n)$ iterations (a few hundred).

For small p we can quickly compute $\#E(\mathbb{F}_p)$ and determine the structure of $E(\mathbb{F}_p)$ using generic group algorithms.

This is **much** faster than an ℓ -adic approach for $\ell > 2$, and allows us to treat many ℓ simultaneously at almost no cost.

Efficient implementation

If $\bar{\rho}_{E,\ell}$ is surjective, we expect the algorithm to terminate in $O(\log \ell)$ iterations (around ten). Otherwise, for $\epsilon = 2^{-n}$, we typically need $O(n)$ iterations (a few hundred).

For small p we can quickly compute $\#E(\mathbb{F}_p)$ and determine the structure of $E(\mathbb{F}_p)$ using generic group algorithms.

This is **much** faster than an ℓ -adic approach for $\ell > 2$, and allows us to treat many ℓ simultaneously at almost no cost.

Precomputing the s_H and δ_H is non-trivial, but this only needs to be done once for each ℓ .

Computational results for the Stein-Watkins database

Testing 136,663,068 curves E/\mathbb{Q} without CM for all $\ell < 60$ took 12 CPU-hours, using $\epsilon = 2^{-100}$, or about 307 μs per curve.

Approximately 1 in 4 curves had non-surjective $\bar{\rho}_{E,\ell}$ for some ℓ , about 1 in 600 for some $\ell > 3$.

In the surjective cases, an average of 9.2 primes p were used, versus 168.5 primes in the non-surjective case.

The most primes used for any one curve was 2061.

mod ℓ images of Galois for E/\mathbb{Q} without CM

ℓ	$\#H$	δ_H	abelian	all traces	all n	torsion/isogeny	SW curves
2	1	0.500	yes	no	no	$\mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z} \times \mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z}$	1673058
	2	0.500	yes	no	no	$\mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z}$	33352376
	3	0.333	yes	yes	yes	none	128670
3	2	0.250	yes	no	no	$\mathbb{Z}/3\mathbb{Z}$	3519
	4	0.167	yes	yes	no	3-isogeny	74933
	6	0.250	no	no	no	$\mathbb{Z}/3\mathbb{Z}$	354246
	8	0.250	no	yes	yes	none	18642
	12	0.375	no	yes	no	3-isogeny	3165972
5	16	0.167	no	yes	yes	none	53202
	4	0.200	yes	no	no	$\mathbb{Z}/5\mathbb{Z}$	4
	4	0.200	yes	no	no	5-isogeny	4
	8	0.100	yes	yes	no	5-isogeny	3120
	16	0.050	yes	yes	yes	5-isogeny	500
	16	0.250	no	yes	yes	none	512
	20	0.375	no	no	no	$\mathbb{Z}/5\mathbb{Z}$	504
	*	20	0.375	no	no	5-isogeny	520
*	32	0.333	no	yes	yes	none	3480
	40	0.250	no	yes	no	5-isogeny	109970
	48	0.300	no	yes	yes	none	3090
	80	0.417	no	yes	yes	5-isogeny	44272
	96	0.217	no	yes	yes	none	15246

ℓ	$\#H$	δ_H	abelian	all traces	all n	torsion/isogeny	SW curves	
7	18	0.250	no	yes	no	7-isogeny	2	
	36	0.333	no	yes	no	7-isogeny	414	
	42	0.250	no	no	no	7-isogeny	8	
	42	0.417	no	no	no	$\mathbb{Z}/7\mathbb{Z}$	24	
	*	42	0.417	no	no	7-isogeny	24	
	72	0.399	no	yes	yes	none	52	
	84	0.667	no	yes	no	7-isogeny	1194	
	84	0.444	no	yes	no	7-isogeny	12172	
	96	0.357	no	yes	yes	none	112	
	126	0.250	no	yes	yes	7-isogeny	1042	
252	0.438	no	yes	yes	7-isogeny	28922		
11	110	0.450	no	no	no	11-isogeny	2	
	*	110	0.450	no	no	11-isogeny	2	
	220	0.640	no	no	no	11-isogeny	2044	
	240	0.409	no	yes	yes	none	0	
13	288	0.250	no	yes	yes	none	108	
	468	0.375	no	yes	yes	13-isogeny	14	
	*	468	0.375	no	yes	yes	13-isogeny	12
	624	0.667	no	yes	no	13-isogeny	184	
	624	0.444	no	yes	yes	13-isogeny	580	
	936	0.250	no	yes	yes	13-isogeny	3194	
	1872	0.464	no	yes	yes	13-isogeny	3352	
17	1088	0.375	no	yes	yes	17-isogeny	368	
37	15984	0.444	no	yes	yes	37-isogeny	1024	

Future work

This is a work in progress, with much still to be done:

1. Test more curves, analyze the results.
2. Compute mod ℓ^k and mod m Galois images.
3. Consider curves over number fields other than \mathbb{Q} .
4. Look at genus 2 Galois images in $\mathrm{GSp}(4, \mathbb{Z}/\ell\mathbb{Z})$.

Computing the image of Galois representations attached to an elliptic curve

Andrew V. Sutherland (MIT)

December 1, 2009

joint work with Nicholas Katz (Princeton)