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## General context

The main application target for this talk is

- the computation of discrete logarithms
- ... in large or medium characteristic finite fields
- ... using using the Number Field Sieve or its variants.

More specifically, we present a practical improvement to the linear algebra step of NFS-DL.
Throughout the talk, we consider the DLP problem in a subgroup of prime order $\ell$ within $\mathbb{F}_{p}^{*}$.

## Relations in NFS



## Relations in NFS



NFS collects many "good pairs" $(a, b)$ such that:

- the integer $a-b m$ is smooth: product of small primes;
- the ideal $a-b \alpha$ is a product of small prime ideals.


## Combining relations

NFS-DL can combine together (multiply) many ( $a-b x$ ).

- See what happens multiplicatively on both sides;
- Gain knowledge about logarithms in our subgroup of order $\ell$.

First task:

- Which kind of objects are we looking at on both sides ?
- Which knowledge do we get ?

Prelude: introduce virtual logs and Schirokauer maps.

## Multiplying things

Fact 1: being smooth is a multiplicative property
If $a_{0}-b_{0} m$ and $a_{1}-b_{1} m$ are smooth, so is $\left(a_{0}-b_{0} m\right) \cdot\left(a_{1}-b_{1} m\right)$. Same on the other side.


$$
\downarrow x \mapsto x^{(p-1) / \ell}
$$

our subgroup of order $\ell$ within $\mathbb{F}_{p}^{*}$
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## Taking out powers

Our two subgroups of smooth things are important.

$$
\text { Fact 2: } \ell \text {-th powers map to } 1 \text { eventually }
$$

What are exactly the subgroups of interest on both sides ?

$$
\{\text { smooth things }\} /\{\text { smooth things }\}^{\ell} .
$$

- vector spaces (fact 1 );
- defined over $\mathbb{F}_{\ell}$ (fact 2 );
- finite dimensional:
- smooth rationals (mod $\ell$-th powers) determined by ...
- smooth algebraic numbers (mod $\ell$-th powers) determined by


## Describing smooth elements

## Smooth rationals (mod $\ell$-th powers): $\Sigma_{r}$

They are simply determined by valuations at small primes mod $\ell$.

- A bound on "small primes" is set beforehand.
- Units in $\mathbb{Z}$ are just $\pm 1$ : trivial modulo $\ell$-th powers.

Smooth algebraic numbers (mod $\ell$-th powers): $\Sigma_{a}$

- Need valuations at small prime ideals mod $\ell$.
- Torsion units are harmless;
- But non-torsion units lead to (finite-dimensional) ambiguity.
- The map $\Sigma_{a} \rightarrow\left\{\nu_{p}(\cdot) \bmod \ell\right\}$ is not injective.
- Fix: use $\Sigma_{a} \rightarrow\left\{\nu_{\mathfrak{p}}(\cdot) \bmod \ell\right\}+\{$ Schirokauer maps $\}$.


## The log map

NFS-DL lifts the log to a linear form coming from smooth things.

$$
\begin{gathered}
\Sigma_{r} \times \Sigma_{a} \subset \mathbb{F}_{\ell}^{\# \mathcal{F}_{r}+\# \mathcal{F}_{a}+\text { unit rank }} \\
\downarrow \\
\text { subgroup of } \mathbb{F}_{p}^{*}(\bmod \ell \text {-th powers }) \\
\mid x \mapsto x^{(p-1) / \ell} \\
\text { our subgroup of order } \ell \\
\mid x \mapsto \log x \\
\mathbb{F}_{\ell}
\end{gathered}
$$
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Linear form $\Phi$


## The log map
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Our concern: the presence of Schirokauer maps in the relations.
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## The linear system

We have many relations = rows of a matrix $M$. We want to solve

$$
M w=0
$$

The solution vector is the set of virtual logarithms.

- By construction, a non-zero solution exists.
- If we have sufficiently many relations, it is unique.
- In practice, it may happen the set of solutions of $M w=0$ has dimension slightly more than 1 , generated by:
- The good $\Phi$;
- plus some small hamming weight vectors, quite harmless.

Bottom line: any non-zero solution to $M w=0$ is good to go.

## Relations with SM

## Why are Schirokauer maps here ?

- Because they are a key part of a coordinate system for $\Sigma_{a}$.


## Why are Schirokauer maps annoying ?

- extra coordinates in each row of $M$ (number = unit rank);
- full-size integers mod $\ell$, much larger than valuations.

[^0]
## What does the matrix look like?

The matrix $M$ is large and sparse.

- $N$ rows and columns;
- Want to solve $M w=0$ over $\mathbb{F}_{\ell}$, with roughly 200-bit $\ell$;
- d dense columns (Schirokauer maps; same size as $\ell$ );
- Other coefficients (typically $c \approx 100$ per row) are all $<10$.

We use sparse linear algebra techniques.

- Touching the matrix is forbidden (want to avoid densification);
- Rely only on the matrix times vector operation.



## SM overhead for doing $v \rightarrow M \times v$

## Coefficients of $v$ are integers $\bmod \ell$.

## Cost for each coefficient of $M \times v$

- about 100 multiplications (tiny coeff of $\mathrm{M} \times$ coeff of $v$ ) (more than $90 \%$ of the time, tiny means $\pm 1$ );
- about $d$ multiplications (SM coeff $\times$ coeff of $v$ );
- about $100+d$ additions;
- one reduction modulo $\ell$.
- The multiplications by SM coeffs are not negligible in practice.
- Because of them, some alternative representation formats are hampered or ineffective (RNS), or we have to take into account conversion costs.


## Related linear algebra problems

- Factoring : solve $w \times$

$$
=0 \text { over } K=\mathbb{F}_{2}
$$

- FFS of old : solve
- NFS-DL : solve

$$
\times w=0 \text { over } K=\mathbb{F}_{\ell} \text { (obsolete) }
$$

$$
\times w=0 \text { over } K=\mathbb{F}_{\ell}
$$

## Sad thing

The SM columns would be harmless if we were to solve $w M=0$. For NFS-DL, not.

- no such thing as a "partial solution" which we can complete.
- for the p180 record, significant cost from SM columns.


## Homogeneous vs inhomogeneous

We can as well write:

$$
M \times w=\left(\square M_{0} \square b \times w=0\right.
$$

$M_{0}$ sparse of size $N \times(N-d)$. Dense SM block $b$ of size $N \times d$.

- We look for one solution vector $w$ : size $N \times 1$.
$\Rightarrow$ a priori knowledge that a solution space exists.
- NOTE: if $d=1$, this amounts to solving $M_{0} w_{0}=b$. $\Rightarrow$ knowledge that $b \in \operatorname{Im}\left(M_{0}\right)$. Can pad $M_{0}$ to square.

How does sparse LA do this ? How to expand to $d>1$ ?
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## Several sparse algorithms

Solving sparse linear systems over finite fields (hence exact) often done with the following black-box algorithms:

- Lanczos algorithm (1950);
- Wiedemann algorithm (1986);
- their block variants: Block Lanczos (Montgomery, 1995), Block Wiedemann (Coppersmith, 1994).

Desired properties: complexity, parallelization, distribution.

## Wiedemann algorithm

Let $x$ and $y$ be an arbitrary vectors in $K^{N}$.
The Wiedemann algorithm computes $\left(a_{i}\right)_{i}$, with $a_{i}=x^{T} M^{i} y \in K$.
Rational reconstruction on $A(X)=\sum_{i=0}^{2 N} a_{i} X^{i}$
Find $F(X)$ and $G(X)$ such that:

$$
\begin{gathered}
A(X) F(X)=G(X)+O\left(X^{2 N}\right) \\
\operatorname{deg} F \leq N \quad \operatorname{deg} G<N
\end{gathered}
$$

The $N$ zero coefficients in the middle of the RHS rewrite as:

$$
\forall k \in[0, N-1], \quad x^{T} M^{k} \widehat{F}(M) y=0
$$

Unless disaster occurs, this means $\widehat{F}(M) y=0$.

## Wiedemann algorithm

## Wiedemann for inhomogeneous system:

To solve $M w=b$, Wiedemann sets $y=b$, and $x$ random.
We hope that $\widehat{F}$ has non-zero constant coefficient: $\widehat{F}=1-X Q$.
This implies $M \cdot(Q(M) b)=b$. Found solution $w=Q(M) b$.

## Wiedemann for homogeneous system:

Simple strategy: set $y=M z$. Then $M \cdot(\widehat{F}(M) z)=0$.
Found solution $w=\widehat{F}(M) z$.
(alternatively, compute $F$ from $A(X) \bmod X$ )
Bottom line: non-block Wiedemann adapts to both.
Correctness ? In order to defend against degeneracy mishaps, preconditioning might be required.
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## Block Wiedemann

Invented by Coppersmith (1994), for the factoring context.
Replace black box by matrix times block of vectors.
The black box (BB) becomes a block black box (BBB).

- Replace $x$ and $y$ by vector blocks $\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \in K^{N \times n}$.
- Expect that fewer black box calls are required.
- Very well adapted to the $K=\mathbb{F}_{2}$ case.

Good distribution opportunities;
Can also be used for DLP with $K=\mathbb{F}_{\ell}$.

## Block Wiedemann

Let $\mathbf{x}$ and $\mathbf{y}$ be an arbitrary vector blocks in $K^{N \times n}$.
Compute $\left(\mathbf{a}_{i}\right)_{i}$, with $\mathbf{a}_{i}=\mathbf{x}^{T} M^{i} \mathbf{y} \in K^{n \times n}$.

## Hermite-Padé approximation on $\mathbf{A}(X)=\sum_{i=0}^{2 N / n} \mathbf{a}_{i} X^{i}$

Find $\mathbf{F}(X)$ and $\mathbf{G}(X)$ such that:

$$
\begin{gathered}
\mathbf{A}(X) \mathbf{F}(X)=\mathbf{G}(X)+O\left(X^{2 N / n}\right) \\
\operatorname{deg} \mathbf{F} \leq N / n \quad \operatorname{deg} \mathbf{G}<N / n
\end{gathered}
$$

Algorithms: Beckermann-Labahn (1994), T. (2001).
The $N / n$ zero coefficients in the middle of the RHS rewrite as:

$$
\forall k \in[0, N / n-1], \quad \mathbf{x}^{T} M^{k} \text { THING }=0
$$

Means THING is orthogonal to $n \times N / n$ columns of $\left\{\left(M^{T}\right)^{k} \mathbf{x}\right\}$.
Unless disaster occurs, this means THING $=0$.

## What is this THING ?

The Hermite-Padé approximation computes $\mathbf{F} \in K[X]^{n \times n}$.

- As in the non-block case, $\widehat{\mathbf{F}}$ is related to the min.poly. of $M$.
- Actually $\operatorname{det} \widehat{\mathbf{F}}$ is "close to" $\mu_{M}$.

Let $\mathbf{F}=\left(F_{i, j}\right)_{1 \leq i, j \leq n}$ and columns of $\mathbf{y}$ be $\left(y_{1} \ldots y_{n}\right)$. column 1 of THING $=\widehat{F_{1,1}}(M) y_{1}+\cdots+\widehat{F_{n, 1}}(M) y_{n}$,
column 2 of THING $=\widehat{F_{1,2}}(M) y_{1}+\cdots+\widehat{F_{n, 2}}(M) y_{n}$,

Conclusion: THING is made of $n$ distinct expressions, all evaluating to zero.

## Columns of F

$$
\text { column } 1 \text { of THING }=\widehat{F_{1,1}}(M) y_{1}+\cdots+\widehat{F_{n, 1}}(M) y_{n} .
$$

## Solving $M w=0$ :

- take $\mathbf{y}=M \mathbf{z}$ for a random $z$.
- each column of THING gives a solution.
- needs $N / n$ extra BBB calls.

Correctness: same as non-block, but harder.
In practice, we only want a select number of solutions. Use this many columns of $\mathbf{F}$.

- For RSA-768, maybe fetching 512 solutions was overkill. (not embarrassing, since computational excess is negligible).
- DLP: one will be good enough. Better not do more. Because of SM, we have our $d$ annoying dense columns.
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## Homogeneous vs inhomogeneous

Recall that in the non-block case, for $d=1$, we can solve the inhomogeneous linear system, then the SM column disappears.
Can we do the same in the block case ?

## SMs within y

Assumption from now on $n \geq d$.

- First $d$ columns of $\mathbf{y}$ are chosen as $\mathbf{b}$.
- Last $n-d$ chosen as $M \mathbf{z}$ for a random $\mathbf{z} \in K^{N \times(n-d)}$.
- Erase the $d$ dense columns in $M$. Call that $M_{0}$ From now on, $M_{0}$ is $N \times N$, but has $d$ zero columns.

Run Block Wiedemann on this.

- expect smaller cost for each matrix times vector operation;
- exact same cost everywhere else, provided that we are able to work with any column of $\widehat{\mathbf{F}}$.


## Writing down solutions

How can we use one of the THING $=0$ equations ?

$$
\text { column } 1 \text { of THING }=\widehat{F_{1,1}}\left(M_{0}\right) y_{1}+\cdots+\widehat{F_{n, 1}}\left(M_{0}\right) y_{n} .
$$

For $i \leq d$, let $\widehat{F_{i, 1}}=c_{i}+X Q_{i}$; for $i>d$, let $\widehat{F_{i, 1}}=Q_{i}$

$$
0=c_{1} b_{1}+\cdots+c_{d} b_{d}+M_{0} \cdot\left(\sum_{i} Q_{i}\left(M_{0}\right) z_{i}\right)
$$

## Deriving a solution to $M w=0$

Set $N-d$ first columns of $w$ to be those of $\sum_{i} Q_{i}\left(M_{0}\right) z_{i}$; Set $d$ last columns to be $\left(c_{1}, \ldots c_{d}\right)$.

- Overhead from SM columns is eliminated, provided $n \geq d$.
- Implemented in CADO-NFS since nov. 2014.


## Change in cost

Cost impact analyzed by Joux and Pierrot.

- Assume $c$ non-zero coefficients per row in $M_{0}$, and $d$ SMs.
- Take $\mathrm{SM} \times v_{j}$ to cost $\beta$ times more than $m_{i j} v_{j}$.

With SMs in the matrix:

$$
3(c+\beta d) N^{2}+\kappa n^{2} N \log ^{2} N
$$

- $\mathbf{A}(X): 3 N / n$ BBB calls: $3(c+\beta d) N^{2}$, or $n$-fold distributed.
- $\mathbf{F}(X): \kappa n^{2} N \log ^{2} N$ for some $\kappa$.

Now with SMs in $\mathbf{y}$ : $3 c N^{2}+\kappa \min (n, d)^{2} N \log ^{2} N$

- $\mathbf{A}(X): 3 N / n$ BBB calls: $3 c N^{2}$, or $n$-fold distributed.
- $\mathbf{F}(X)$ : same, but recall we want $n \geq d$.
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## Is that new ?

## Short answer: NO.

MATHEMATICS OF COMPUTATION
VOLUME 62, NUMBER 205
VOLUME 62, NUMBER 205
JANUARY 1994, PAGES 333-350

## SOLVING HOMOGENEOUS LINEAR EQUATIONS OVER $G F(2)$ VIA BLOCK WIEDEMANN ALGORITHM

## DON COPPERSMITH

Inhomogeneous equations. We developed this algorithm for homogeneous equations, because that is the case of interest for integer factorization. For the inhomogeneous system of equations $B \mathbf{w}=\mathbf{b}$, where $\mathbf{b}$ is a block of at most $n$ vectors, variants that can be tried include the following:

1. Set the first few columns of $\mathbf{y}$ equal to $\mathbf{b}$, and calculate the rest of $\mathbf{y}$ as Bz . Then hope that in the equation

$$
\mathbf{x}_{\mu}^{\mathrm{T}} B^{j-d^{\prime}} \sum_{\nu, k} f_{l, \nu}^{(t, k)} B^{d^{\prime}-k} \mathbf{y}_{\nu}=0
$$

the coefficients of $B^{0} \mathbf{y}_{\nu}$ form an invertible matrix, allowing one to solve for $\mathbf{y}$ in terms of vectors in the image of $B$.

> Longer answer: let's see why.

## What Coppersmith is doing

Coppersmith aims at solving $\mathbf{M w}=\mathbf{b}$.
In effect this means $d$ independent one-vector systems.
Claim: this solves a harder problem. Ours is an easy by-product.
How does Coppersmith do this ? As we do.

- First $d$ columns of $\mathbf{y}$ are chosen as $\mathbf{b}$.
- Last $n-d$ chosen as $M \mathbf{z}$ for some $\mathbf{z} \in K^{N \times(n-d)}$.

To solve $\mathbf{M w}=\mathbf{b}$, we need to be able to force:

- one solution with $\left(c_{1}, \ldots, c_{d}\right)=(1,0, \ldots, 0)$,
- one solution with $\left(c_{1}, \ldots, c_{d}\right)=(0,1,0, \ldots, 0)$, etc.


## Can we force $\left(c_{1}, \ldots, c_{d}\right)$ ?

Our proposed approach uses one single column of $\widehat{\mathbf{F}}$.
This won't do for $\mathbf{M w}=\mathbf{b}$. Have only one $\left(c_{1}, \ldots, c_{d}\right)$ choice. BUT we may combine the columns linearly.

- If $\left[X^{0}\right] \mathbf{F}_{\{1 \ldots d\} \times\{1 \ldots n\}}$ has rank $d$, then we can force any value for $\left(c_{1}, \ldots, c_{d}\right)$.
- More generally, the set of possible $\left(c_{1}, \ldots, c_{d}\right)$ is a vector space, and it can be covered.
- If we don't mind which $\left(c_{1}, \ldots, c_{d}\right)$ value we get, easy.

Cost: once for $\mathbf{F}$ is computed, cost for each vector in $w$ is same as ours for one.

## Conclusion

- Solving inhomogeneous linear systems with block Wiedemann has small overhead.
- Key is to put the right hand side in the starting vectors.
- For NFS-DL, SM columns do NOT have to go in the matrix.
- The same applies to block Lanczos (but less appealing anyway).

Implementation is more or less straightforward.
Must handle $\mathbf{F}_{\{1 \ldots d\} \times\{1 \ldots n\}}$ and $\mathbf{F}_{\{d+1 \ldots n\} \times\{1 \ldots n\}}$ properly.
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