



**HAL**  
open science

# ECM and the Elliott-Halberstam conjecture for quadratic fields

Razvan Barbulescu, Florent Jouve

► **To cite this version:**

Razvan Barbulescu, Florent Jouve. ECM and the Elliott-Halberstam conjecture for quadratic fields. 2022. hal-03485435v2

**HAL Id: hal-03485435**

**<https://hal.science/hal-03485435v2>**

Preprint submitted on 24 May 2022 (v2), last revised 17 Jan 2023 (v4)

**HAL** is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

# ECM AND THE ELLIOTT-HALBERSTAM CONJECTURE FOR QUADRATIC FIELDS

RAZVAN BARBULESCU

ABSTRACT. The complexity of the elliptic curve method of factorization (ECM) is proven under the celebrated conjecture of existence of smooth numbers in short intervals. In this work we tackle a different version of ECM which is actually much more studied and implemented, especially because it allows us to use ECM-friendly curves. In the case of curves with complex multiplication (CM) we replace the heuristics by rigorous results conditional to the Elliott-Halberstam (EH) conjecture. The proven results mirror recent theorems concerning the number of primes  $p$  such that  $p - 1$  is smooth. To each CM elliptic curve we associate a value which measures how ECM-friendly it is. In the general case we explore consequences of a statement which translated EH in the case of elliptic curves.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Many heuristics in number theory, especially in cryptography, assert that the proportion of primes (respectively smooth numbers) in an interval is unchanged when we restrict to a particular set of integers which is of interest. To be more precise, let  $\Pi(x)$  be the set of primes less than  $x$  and, for a parameter  $y$ , let  $\Psi(x, y)$  be the set of integers in  $[1, x]$  which are  $y$ -smooth (or friable), i.e. such that all the prime factors are less than  $y$ . Then one studies if, for a set  $A \subset \mathbb{N}$ , the proportions  $|A \cap \Pi(x)|/|A \cap [1, x]|$  ( resp.  $|A \cap \Psi(x, y)|/|A \cap [1, x]|$ ) is equivalent to the proportion  $|\Pi(x)|/x$  (resp.  $|\Psi(x, y)|/x$  uniformly on  $y$ ). The most celebrated example is the precise version of the twin primes conjecture due to Hardy and Littlewood. Two other problems concern

- P1:** the smoothness of  $A_a = \{p+a : p \text{ prime}\}$ , for a constant  $a$ ; see [Wan18] and [LWX20] for the newest results, both of them are conditional on the Elliott-Halberstam conjecture;
- P2:** the primality of  $A_E = \{|E(\mathbb{F}_p)| : p \text{ prime}, p \nmid \Delta(E)\}$  where  $E$  is an elliptic curve with rational coefficients and  $E(\mathbb{F}_p)$  is the reduction of  $E$  modulo  $p$ ; see [Zyw11] for a review of the literature.

In this work we address a series of questions related to

- P3:** the smoothness of the set  $A_E$  above.

We call

$$(1) \quad \psi_E(x, y) = |\{p \text{ prime} : |E(\mathbb{F}_p)| \text{ is } y\text{-smooth}\}|.$$

The main result of this work, Theorem 2, is a generalization of a theorem of Wu, Liu and Xi [LWX20], who studied problem **P1**, and it is conditional under the celebrated conjecture of Elliott and Halberstam (EH).

**Conjecture 1** (parametric EH, [LWX20],[Pol16]<sup>1</sup>). *Let  $\delta(x)$  be a decreasing function such that*

$$(2) \quad (\log_2 x)/(\eta \log x) \leq \delta(x) < \eta \quad (x \geq x_0(\eta)),$$

for any  $\eta \in (0, 1/2]$

*Let  $K$  be either  $\mathbb{Q}$  or an imaginary quadratic field of class number one. For all  $q \in K$  we set  $\|q\| = |\mathcal{O}_K/q|$  the algebraic norm and  $\varphi(q) = |(\mathcal{O}_K/q)^*|$  the Euler function. Let us consider*

$$\Pi_K(x; c, a) = \{p \in \mathcal{O}_K, \text{ prime}, \|p\| \leq x, p \equiv a \pmod{c}\}.$$

---

<sup>1</sup>Pollack stated the conjecture only in the case of constant  $\delta$

Then for any fixed  $a \in \mathcal{O}_K$ ,  $a \neq 0$  and  $A > 0$  we have

$$\sum_{\substack{q \in K \\ \|q\| \leq x^{1-\delta(x)} \\ (q, a) = 1}} \left| \pi_K(x; q, a) - \frac{\pi(x)}{\varphi(q)} \right| \ll_A \frac{x}{(\log x)^A},$$

uniformly for  $x \geq x_0$ .

The original EH conjecture was stated for  $K = \mathbb{Q}$  and constant  $\delta$ , and it is a strengthening of the Vinogradov-Bombieri (BV) theorem. Huxley [Hux71] proved a number field variant of the BV theorem, so it was natural to make a number field EH conjecture which states Huxley's result for the same bound on  $q$  as in the original EH conjecture. Pollack [Pol16] wrote the statement of the conjecture in the case of imaginary quadratic fields of class number one. Finally, Liu et al. [LWX20] extended EH by replacing  $\delta$  with a decreasing function. In this work we use the number field EH. If we content ourselves with non-uniform results we can restrict to EH, but if we desire uniform results we need a new variant of EH which combines the number field EH (see [Pol16]) with the parametric EH (see [LWX20]).

The technical conditions on  $\delta$  have an interesting story : Halberstam formulated the conjecture for constant  $\delta$ , H. L. Montgomery suggested that one could take  $\delta(x) \rightarrow 0$  and finally Friedlander and Granville [FG92] showed that the conjecture fails if  $\delta$  is less than a certain function of  $x$ . Our arguments show that the version of the conjecture with constant  $\delta$  implies results with constant  $(\log x)/(\log y)$ . However for the cryptographic motivation explained in Section 2 we are interested in uniform results in  $x$  and  $y$  which allow to conduct numerical experiments and vary the two parameters independently.

**Theorem 2.** *Assume Conjecture 1 and set  $\delta(x) = (\log_3 x)/(\log_2 x)$ , which satisfies the conditions of Equation 2. Let  $E$  be a elliptic curve with complex multiplication (CM) defined over  $\mathbb{Q}$ . Set*

$$H = \left\{ (x, y) \in \mathbb{R}_+^2 : x^{\frac{\log_3 x}{\log_2 x}} \leq y \leq x \right\}.$$

For any  $y \in [1, x]$  we set  $u = \frac{\log x}{\log y}$ . Then there exists a constant  $\alpha(E)$  such that, as  $x \rightarrow \infty$ , we have the asymptotic development

$$\frac{\psi_E(x, y)}{\psi_E(x, \infty)} = \frac{\psi(xe^{\alpha(E)}, y)}{\psi(xe^{\alpha(E)}, \infty)} \left( 1 + O\left(\frac{\log(u+1)^2}{(\log y)^2}\right) \right),$$

uniformly for  $(x, y) \in H$ , where  $\alpha(E)$  is a constant.

This is a rigorous basis for a notion which is used in cryptography. Indeed, when changing the value of  $\alpha(E)$  one obtains an error term which is larger than  $O((\log(u+1))^2/(\log y)^2)$ .

**Corollary 3.** *If  $E_1$  and  $E_2$  are two elliptic curves with  $\alpha(E_1) < \alpha(E_2)$  then, for large enough  $x$  and  $y$ , uniformly for  $(x, y) \in H$ , we have*

$$\psi_{E_1}(x, y) > \psi_{E_2}(x, y),$$

In this case we say that  $E_1$  is more ECM-friendly than  $E_2$ .

The second main question of this article concerns the proportion of smooth integers which contain at least one prime in a set whose density is known. In this work, the set of primes is one of the sets in problems **P1** and **P3**. For a set of primes  $Q$  and respectively  $v > 0$  a parameter we set.

$$(3) \quad \begin{aligned} \psi_Q(x, y) &= \{n \in \psi(x, y) : \forall p \mid n, p \in Q\}. \\ \Psi_v(x, y) &= \Psi_Q(x, y) \quad \text{for } Q = \{p \text{ prime} : P^-(p-1) < y^{1/v}\}. \end{aligned}$$

Here and in the sequel  $P^-(n)$  and  $P^+(n)$  are the smallest and largest prime factors of  $n$ .

**Theorem 4.** *Let  $K$  be a number field. Let  $(x, y, z)$  be three positive integers such that  $u := \frac{\log x}{\log y}$  and  $v := \frac{\log y}{\log z}$  are as in the domain*

$$\Delta : \quad u \leq \frac{x}{\log_2 x} \quad \text{and} \quad v \leq \frac{\log_2 x}{\log_3 x}.$$

*Then we have*

$$\psi_v(x, y)/x \geq \rho(v)\rho(u)(1 + o(1)),$$

*uniformly on  $\Delta$ .*

The second part of the article is heuristic. In one direction, we prove that if one extends Theorem 4 to a wider domain then one can eliminate the heuristics in an algorithms which uses ECM as a building block. In a second direction, we prove that a heuristic assumption due to Pollack [Pol16] implies a statement similar to Theorem 2 for all elliptic curves.

The article is organized as follows. In Section 2 we give the cryptographic motivation and prove a complexity result under the assumption of a stronger version of Theorem 4. After the background in Section 3, we prove the main theorem in Section 4. In Section 5 we prove Theorem 4. In these two sections the results are conditional under the EH conjecture. We then continue with heuristic results in Section 6 which treats the case of non-CM elliptic curves. In Section 7 we recognize  $\alpha(E)$  as a quantity which is already known in cryptography.

## 2. CRYPTOGRAPHIC MOTIVATION

The set  $A_E$  plays a key role in the elliptic curve method (ECM) of factorization [Len87]. Let  $E$  be an elliptic curve defined over  $\mathbb{Q}$  and  $P$  a point  $P = (x_P : y_P : z_P) \in E(\mathbb{Q})$ . For an integer  $N$  we set  $B(N) = \lfloor L_N(1/2, 1/\sqrt{2}) \rfloor$ , where

$$(4) \quad L_N(\alpha, c) = \exp(c(\log N)^\alpha (\log \log N)^{1-\alpha}).$$

Next we set  $M = (B!)^{\lfloor \log_2 N \rfloor}$ . Note that for any integer  $N$  such that  $\gcd(x_P, y_P, z_P, N) = 1$  and  $\gcd(N, \Delta(E)) = 1$ ,  $E$  has good reduction modulo any unknown prime factor  $p$  of  $N$  and  $\bar{P} := (x_P : y_P : z_P) \bmod p$  belongs to  $E(\mathbb{F}_p)$ . Running ECM for  $E$  and  $N$  consists in computing  $Q = (x_Q, y_Q, z_Q) := [M]P \bmod N$ , i.e. one uses the cord-and-tangent formulae and reduces the coordinates modulo  $N$ , if two points are different modulo  $N$  one uses the formula for adding two distinct points. We claim that, if the order  $|E(\mathbb{F}_p)|$  is  $B$ -smooth for an unknown prime factor  $p$ , then  $\gcd(z_Q, N)$  is a multiple of  $p$ . Indeed, if the points involved in the double-and-add method were all distinct not only modulo  $N$  but also modulo  $p$ , then  $Q$  is the neutral element, so  $z_Q \equiv 0 \pmod{p}$ . If one used a wrong formula because two points were distinct modulo  $N$  but equal modulo  $p$ , then  $z_Q \equiv y_Q \equiv z_Q \equiv 0 \pmod{p}$ . In both cases ECM finds a multiple of  $p$  and a carefull analysis shows that the probability that the result is exactly  $p$  is  $1 - o(1)$  (see [Len87]). In case of failure one starts over with another curve.

There are two variants of the algorithm:

- (1) searching for a fixed prime  $p$  of a given integer  $N$ , using a large number of random curves  $E$
- (2) using a fixed curve  $E$ , to test for smoothness a large number of given integers  $N$ .

The first version is well studied. Two years after having presented the sketch of his algorithm, Lenstra [Len87] published the full proof in which the complexity of ECM is reduced to proving a lower bound on the density of  $y$ -smooth numbers in intervals of the form  $[x - \sqrt{x}, x + \sqrt{x}]$  (see [Gra08]) for specific values of  $x$  and  $y$ . This version of ECM serves as a reference for rigorous analysis of the algorithm in the literature. In an effort to complete the proof of smoothness tests, Lenstra, Pila and Pomerance [LJPP93] invented the hyperelliptic curve method of factorization (HECM) where one uses jacobians of genus two curves instead of elliptic curves. Contrary to ECM, HECM relies on the density of  $y$ -smooth numbers in intervals of the form  $[x - cx^{\frac{2}{3}}, x + cx^{\frac{2}{3}}]$ , for which a proven lower bound was given in the same article [LJPP93].

The second version of ECM corresponds to the cofactorization step in the number field sieve (NFS) algorithm and the splitting step of the discrete logarithm algorithms as index calculus and the NFS. Well optimized implementations, as CADO-NFS<sup>2</sup>, use a dozen of well-chosen elliptic curves to test the smoothness of billions of integers. Usually the curves are chosen as small parameters from infinite families, but sometimes only a finite number of curves with better properties are known. This boils down to the fact that the family is a parametrization of the modular curve of a congruence group  $\Gamma$  whereas the finite list of better parameters correspond to the modular curve of a congruence group  $\Gamma' \subset \Gamma$ . In the case when  $\Gamma$  has genus 0 or 1 and  $\Gamma'$  has genus 2 or more, Faltings theorem proves that there is only a finite list of parameters of the family which are better than all the others in the family (see [BS21] for a discussion on the topic).

A second reason to use a single curve in ECM is if one wants to use implementation improvements which are only possible for some parameters, e.g.  $(2 : 1 : 1)$  belongs to the curve than the multiplications by the  $x$ -coordinate of the point are free from an implementation point of view. One might also find it interesting to use CM curves in ECM, in which case there is only a finite list of them; however most implementations of ECM precede ECM by the  $p+1$  algorithm and actually prefer elliptic curves without CM.

Note that problem **P3**, defined in the introduction, is relevant for this second variant of ECM.

Since Theorem 2 eliminates the heuristics about  $\Psi_E(x, y)$ , it allows us to eliminate heuristics in the algorithms where ECM is used. A step of the number field sieve (NFS), called splitting, considers a prime  $q$ , a generator  $g$  of  $(\mathbb{Z}/q\mathbb{Z})^*$  and a second element  $h \in (\mathbb{Z}/q\mathbb{Z})^*$ . One factors with ECM the integers  $g^e h \bmod q$  for values of  $e \in [1, q-1]$  which are uniformly randomly chosen until one of them is  $y$ -smooth for  $y = L_x(\frac{2}{3}, c)$  for an absolute constant  $c$  (see Algorithm 1). Here we used the notation of Equation (4). The statement of the main theorem, if it remains true when the domain  $\Delta$  is extended, eliminates the heuristics in the splitting step.

---

**Algorithm 1:** Splitting step in discrete logarithm NFS: main part

---

**Input:** a prime  $q$  and two integers  $g, h \in [1, q-1]$  such that  $g$  is a generator

**Output:** an integer  $e$  such that  $P^-(g^e h \bmod q) < y$  with  $y = L_q(\frac{2}{3}, \frac{1}{c_u})$

1:  $E : y^2 = x^3 + x^2 - 3x + 1, P = (-1 : 2 : 1) \in E$

2:  $B \leftarrow L_q(\frac{1}{3}, \frac{1}{c_u c_v}); m \leftarrow B!$

3: **repeat**

4:  $e \leftarrow$  random integer in  $[1, q-1]$

5:  $N \leftarrow g^e h \bmod q$

6:  $Q(x_Q : y_Q : z_Q) \leftarrow [m]P \pmod{N}$

7: **until**  $g := \gcd(z_Q, N) \neq 1$

---

**Theorem 5.** Assume that Theorem 2 can be extended to the domain  $(x, y = x^{1/u}, z = y^{1/v})$  below :

$$\Delta' : \quad u \leq c_u \frac{(\log x)^{1/3}}{(\log_2 x)^{1/3}} \text{ and } v \leq c_v \frac{(\log x)^{1/3}}{(\log_2 x)^{1/3}},$$

for two constants  $c_u, c_v \geq 3^{1/3}$ . Then, with a constant probability, Algorithm 1 on input  $\ell$  ends in a time  $L_\ell(1/3, 3^{1/3})^{1+o(1)}$ .

*Proof.* We set the value of the constants :  $c_v = c_u = 3^{1/3}$ . The cost of line 6 is  $O(\log_2 m)$  by double-and-add exponentiation. This is

$$\text{time}(\text{line 6}) = O(\log m) = O(B \log B) = B^{1+o(1)} = L_\ell(1/3, 1/(c_u c_v)).$$

Since  $e$  is randomly chosen with uniform probability, the number of executions of loop in lines 3-7 is with a constant probability less than a constant times the inverse of the success

---

<sup>2</sup><https://cado-nfs.gitlabpages.inria.fr/>

probability. We saw in this section that the condition in line 7 is satisfied if, for all prime factors  $p$  of  $N$ , the order  $|E(\mathbb{F}_p)|$  is  $B$ -smooth. We set  $u = c_u \frac{\log q}{\log y}$  and  $v = c_v \frac{\log y}{\log B}$  and conclude that the number of executions of the loop is  $q/\Psi_v(q, y)$ .

Since  $u$  and  $v$  are in  $\Delta'$ , the assumption states that we have  $q/\psi_v(q, y) \geq (\rho(v)\rho(u))(1+o(1))$ . We inject the values of  $v$  and  $u$ :

$$\begin{aligned} \log(\rho(v)\rho(u)) &= (-1 + o(1)) \cdot (u \log u + v \log v) \\ &= (-1 + o(1)) \cdot \left( \frac{c_u + c_v}{3} (\log q)^{1/3} (\log_2 q)^{2/3} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Hence the loop is executed at most  $L_q(1/3, \frac{c_u + c_v}{3})^{1+o(1)}$  times. When we multiply this by the cost  $B^{1+o(1)} = L_q(1/3, \frac{1}{c_u c_v})^{1+o(1)}$ , we find

$$\text{time}(\text{Algorithm 1}) = L_q(1/3, c),$$

where  $c = \frac{1}{c_u c_v} + \frac{c_u + c_v}{3} = 3^{1/3}$ . □

**Remark 6.** (i) Since Algorithm 1 uses a single curve  $E$ , with an explicitly given rational point  $P$ , we avoid heuristics about the rank of elliptic curves.

(ii) At a heuristic level, the complexity remains the same if one searches for  $y$ -smooth integers. In that case, after line 7, one factors  $N/g$  with ECM and then goes back to line 3. Under the heuristic assumption that different elliptic curves are independent, the probability that  $P^-(N/g) < y$  is negligible with respect to the probability that  $P^-(N) < y$ . Hence the full algorithm has a complexity equal to that of Algorithm 1 raised to the power  $1 + o(1)$ .

### 3. BACKGROUND

In the case of an elliptic curve with CM, problem **P3** is a simple generalization of problem **P1** from  $\mathbb{Q}$  to an imaginary quadratic field of class number one, as established by the following result.

We use the notation  $\|\cdot\|$  for the number field norm. We also set

$$(5) \quad \psi_K(x, y; c, a) = |\{\pi \in \Pi_K(x; c, a), P^+(\|\pi - 1\|) < y\}|.$$

**Lemma 7** (CM theory, see [RS09] Th 1.1). *For any elliptic curve  $E$  with CM by an order of  $K$ , there exists  $a, c \in \mathcal{O}_K$  such that, for any prime  $\ell$  split in  $K$ ,  $|E(\mathbb{F}_\ell)| = \|\pi - 1\|$ , where  $\pi$  is unique such that  $\|\pi\| = \ell$  and  $\pi \equiv a \pmod{c}$ .*

*In particular*

$$\psi_E(x, y) = \psi_K(x, y; c, a)$$

for two constants  $a$  and  $c$  depending on  $E$ .

We follow the strategy of Wang [Wan18], so we assume Conjecture 1. Since classical EH conjecture is a strengthening of the statement of the Vinogradov-Bombieri (BV) theorem, the number field version of EH is the same strengthening of the number field BV, which due to Huxley. In the case of imaginary quadratic fields of class number one, the statement of Conjecture 1 can be found in [Pol16], but we allow  $\delta$  to be non-constant.

An important ingredient of Wang's proof is the linear sieve. Let  $\mathcal{A} \subset \mathcal{O}_K$  be a finite set,  $\mathcal{P} \subset \mathcal{O}_K$  a set of primes,  $z \geq 2$  a real and  $d \in \mathcal{O}_K$  a square-free integer whose prime factors belong to  $\mathcal{P}$ . Call  $\mathcal{A}_d = \mathcal{A} \cap d\mathcal{O}_K$  and  $P_{\mathcal{P}}(z) = \prod_{\|p\| < z, p \in \mathcal{P}} \pi$ . Let  $X$  be an approximation of  $|\mathcal{A}|$  and  $w$  a multiplicative function such that  $0 < w(p) < \|p\|$  and, for any  $d \mid P_{\mathcal{P}}(z)$ ,

$$|\mathcal{A}_d| = \frac{w(d)}{\|d\|} X(1 + o(1)).$$

We set  $r(\mathcal{A}, d) = |\mathcal{A}_d| - \frac{w(d)}{\|d\|} X$ . We make some more notations.

$$(6) \quad \begin{aligned} S(\mathcal{A}; \mathcal{P}, z) &= |\{a \in \mathcal{A} : (a, P_{\mathcal{P}}(z)) = 1\}|, \\ V(z) &= \prod_{p \in \Pi_K(z)} \left(1 - \frac{w(p)}{\|p\|}\right). \end{aligned}$$

**Lemma 8** (Rosser-Iwaniec [Iwa80]). *Assume that there exists  $K \geq 2$  such that*

$$\prod_{u \leq \|p\| < v} \left(1 - \frac{w(p)}{p}\right)^{-1} \leq \frac{\log v}{\log u} \left(1 + \frac{K}{\log u}\right)$$

for all  $v > u \geq 2$ . For any  $D \geq z \geq 2$  one has

$$S(\mathcal{A}; \mathcal{P}, z) \ll XV(z) + \sum_{\|d\| < D, d|P(z)} |r(\mathcal{A}, d)|.$$

We finish the section with a trilogy of results about asymptotic developments of the number of smooth elements in various sets of integers. The equivalent of  $\psi_K(x, y)$  is known since Hildebrand's work but the error term was made explicit by Scourfield.

**Theorem 9** ([Sco04]). *Let  $K$  be an imaginary quadratic field. Then, uniformly on  $H$ , one has*

$$\psi_K(x, y) = \lambda_K x \left( \rho(u) + \frac{\rho'(u)}{\log y} (\alpha_K + o(1)) \right),$$

where  $\lambda_K$  is the residue of  $\zeta_K$  and  $\alpha_K = L'(1, \chi)/L(1, \chi)$  for  $\chi$  the non-trivial character of  $K$ .

The result was generalized so that  $\zeta_K$  was replaced by a large class of Dedekind series of the form  $Z(s)G(s)$  where  $Z$  is a product of zeta functions with positive exponents and  $G$  a well behaved function (including holomorphic functions). The following particular case is sufficient for our applications.

**Theorem 10** (Theorem 1.1 in [HTW08], case  $Z = \zeta$ ,  $G$  holomorphic). *Let  $h$  be an arithmetic function whose Dedekind series  $\mathcal{H}(x) = \sum_n \frac{h(n)}{n^s}$  is meromorphic with a simple pole at 1. Let  $a_0$  and  $a_1$  be such that the Laurent expansion of  $\mathcal{H}$  at 1 is  $\mathcal{H}(s) = a_0/(s-1) + a_1 + O(s-1)$ . Then*

$$\sum_{\substack{n \leq x \\ P^-(n) > y}} h(n) = x\rho(u) \left( a_0 + a_1 \frac{\log(u+1)}{\log y} + O\left(\frac{(\log(u+1))^2}{(\log y)^2}\right) \right),$$

uniformly on  $(\log x)^{1+\epsilon} \leq y \leq x$  for any fixed  $\epsilon > 0$ .

Finally, one proved a similar result for  $Z = \zeta^{-1}$ , the Dedekind series of  $\mu$ .

**Lemma 11** ([LT15]). *Let  $\mu$  be the Möbius function and let  $P^-(n)$  denote the least prime factor of  $n$  with the convention  $P^-(1) = \infty$ . For any  $\epsilon > 0$ , we have*

$$\sum_{\substack{n \leq x \\ P^-(n) > y}} \frac{\mu(n)}{n} = \left\{ 1 + O_\epsilon \left( \frac{\log(u+1)}{\log y} \right) \right\} \rho(u) + O_\epsilon(\exp(-(\log y)^{\frac{3}{5}-\epsilon}))$$

uniformly in  $x \geq 2$  and  $\exp\{(\log x)^{\frac{2}{5}+\epsilon}\} \leq y \leq x$ , where  $u = (\log x)/\log y$ .

See [dlBF20] for a results which eliminates the error term  $O_\epsilon(\frac{\log(u+1)}{\log y})$ .

#### 4. MAIN THEOREM

*Proof of Theorem 2.* By Lemma 7 we have

$$\begin{aligned} \psi_E(x, y) &= |\{p \text{ split}, P^+(|E(\mathbb{F}_p)|) < y\}| + |\{p \text{ inert}, P^+(|E(\mathbb{F}_p)|) < y\}| + O(1) \\ &= \psi_K(x, y; c, a) + |\{p \text{ inert} : P^+(p+1) < y\}| + O(1), \end{aligned}$$

for two constants  $a, c \in \mathcal{O}_K$  (see the notation (5)).

The second term of the right member is treated by Wang [Wan18]. His proof applies directly in the case of cyclotomic fields  $K$  and can be adapted in the other cases:

$$|\{p \text{ inert} : P^+(p+1) < y\}| = (1 + o(1))\rho(u) \frac{\pi(x)}{2}.$$

Hence, it remains to prove an equivalent for  $\psi_K(x; c, a)$ .

We let  $\delta(x)$  be as in Conjecture 1 and let  $y$  be such that  $u = O(\frac{\log_2 x}{\log_3 x})$ . This is such that

$$(7) \quad \frac{\text{Li}(x)}{(\log x)^{1/2}} = \psi_E(x, y) \rho(u) \cdot o(\varepsilon(x, y)).$$

Hence, in the following the terms  $O(\frac{1}{(\log x)^{1/2}})$  are negligible.

We use an inclusion-exclusion principle to write

$$(8) \quad \psi_K(x, y; c, a) = \sum_{\substack{q \in \mathcal{O}_K \\ P^-(\|q\|) > y}} \mu(q) \pi_K(x; qc, a) = S_1 + S_2,$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} S_1 &= \sum_{\substack{q \in \mathcal{O}_K \\ \|q\| \leq x^{1-\delta(x)} \\ P^-(\|q\|) > y}} \mu(q) \pi_K(x; qc, a) \\ S_2 &= \sum_{\substack{q \in \mathcal{O}_K \\ \|q\| > x^{1-\delta(x)} \\ P^-(\|q\|) > y}} \mu(q) \pi_K(x; qc, a). \end{aligned}$$

We write  $S_1 = S'_1 + S''_1$  with

$$\begin{aligned} S'_1 &= \frac{\text{Li}(x)}{\varphi(c)} \sum_{\substack{q \in \mathcal{O}_K \\ \|q\| \leq x^{1-\delta(x)} \\ P^-(\|q\|) > y}} \frac{\mu(q)}{\varphi(q)}, \\ S''_1 &= \sum_{\substack{q \in \mathcal{O}_K \\ \|q\| \leq x^{1-\delta(x)} \\ P^-(\|q\|) > y}} \mu(q) r(x, qc) \quad \text{where } r(x, qc) = (\pi_K(x; qc, a) - \frac{\text{Li}(x)}{\varphi(cq)}). \end{aligned}$$

In step 1' we show that  $S'_1 = \frac{\text{Li}(x)}{\varphi(c)} \frac{\psi_K(x, y)}{\psi_K(x, \infty)} (1 + o(1/u))$ . In step 1'' we show that  $S''_1 = O(\frac{1}{\log x})$ , which will be proven to be hidden in the  $o(\varepsilon(x, y))$ .

In the case of  $S_2$  the main ingredient is the linear sieve, which was introduced in Section 3. We take  $\mathcal{A} = \mathcal{A}(mc, a) := \{w \in \mathcal{A} : w \equiv a \pmod{cm}\}$  and note that we have

$$(9) \quad \mathcal{A}_d(mc, a) = \frac{1}{\varphi(d)} \cdot \frac{\text{Li}(x)}{\varphi(cm)} + \left( \pi_K(x; dmc, a) - \frac{\text{Li}(x)}{\varphi(dmc)} \right).$$

We apply Lemma 8 to  $\mathcal{A} = \mathcal{A}(mc, a)$  with  $X = \frac{\text{Li}(x)}{\varphi(m)}$  and

$$w(p) = \begin{cases} 0, & p \mid amc \\ \frac{1}{\|p\|-1}, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

The inequality required to apply the lemma is verified because Mertens formula guarantees the case  $w(p) = 1$  and we have the sandwich inequalities for all primes  $p \in \mathcal{O}_K$  with  $\|p\| > 2$

$$\left(1 - \frac{1}{\|p\|}\right) \leq \left(1 - \frac{1}{\|p\|-1}\right) \leq \left(1 - \frac{1}{\|p\|}\right) \left(1 + \frac{1}{\|p\|^2}\right).$$

We conclude that  $S_2 = S'_2 + S''_2$  where

$$\begin{aligned} S'_2 &= \sum_{\substack{m \leq x^\delta \\ (m, a) = 1}} \frac{\pi(x)}{\varphi(m)} \prod_{\substack{p < z \\ p \nmid am}} \left(1 - \frac{1}{\|p\|-1}\right) \\ S''_2 &= \sum_{\substack{m \leq x^\delta \\ (m, a) = 1}} \sum_{d < D} \sum_{d \mid P_{am}(z)} |r(\mathcal{A}(mc, a), d)|. \end{aligned}$$

In steps 2' and 2'' we prove that  $S'_2 = O(u\delta)$  and respectively  $S''_2 = O(\frac{1}{\log x})$ , both of which will be proven to be hidden in the term  $o(\varepsilon(x, y))$ .

**Step 1'.** By Lemma 11 we have

$$(10) \quad \begin{aligned} S'_1 &= \frac{\pi_K(x)}{\varphi(c)} \rho \left( \frac{\log(x^{1-\delta(x)})}{\log y} \right) \left(1 + O\left(\frac{\log(u+1)}{\log y}\right)\right) + O(-(\log y)^{\frac{3}{5}-\epsilon}) \\ &= \frac{\pi_K(x)}{\varphi(c)} \rho \left( \frac{\log(x^{1-\delta(x)})}{\log y} \right) \left(1 + O\left(\frac{\log(u+1)}{\log y}\right)\right) \\ &= \pi_K(x) \rho(u) \left(1 + O\left(\frac{\delta(x)}{u}\right) + O\left(\frac{\log u}{\log y}\right)\right) \\ &= \pi_K(x) \rho(u) (1 + o(\varepsilon(x, y))). \end{aligned}$$



**Step 1''.** In the case of  $S_1''$  we use the trivial inequality  $\mu(q) \leq 1$  and use Conjecture 1 with  $0 < \tilde{\delta}(x) < \delta(x)$  so that  $cq \leq x^{1-\delta}$  whenever  $\|q\| \leq x^{1-\tilde{\delta}}$ .

$$(11) \quad \begin{aligned} S_1'' &\leq \sum_{\|m\| \leq x^{1-\tilde{\delta}}} \left| \pi_K(x; mc, a') - \frac{\text{Li}(x)}{\varphi(q)} \right| \\ &\ll \text{Li}(x)/\log(x)^{A_0}, \end{aligned}$$

where  $A_0 > 0$  is an absolute constant. Here  $a'$  is such that  $a' \equiv a \pmod{c}$  and  $a' \equiv 1 \pmod{m}$ .

**Step 2'.** The terms of  $S_2'$  are all positive, so we get an upper bound if we delete the condition  $(a, m) = 1$  under the  $\sigma$  sign. The parameters  $z$  and  $D$  are set as follows  $z = D = y^{1-2\delta}$ . Then we have

$$(12) \quad S_2' \ll \text{Li}(x) \prod_{\|p\| < z} \left(1 - \frac{1}{\|p\| - 1}\right) \sum_{m \leq x^\delta} \frac{f(m)}{\|m\|},$$

where  $f$  is the multiplicative function such that, for all  $p \in \mathcal{O}_K$ ,  $f(p) = 1 + O(\frac{1}{\|p\|})$ . We replace the sum  $\sum \frac{f(m)}{\|m\|}$  by a partial Euler product and obtain

$$(13) \quad \begin{aligned} S_2' &\ll \pi(x) \prod_{\|p\| < z} \left(1 - \frac{1}{\|p\|}\right) \prod_{\|p\| < x^\delta} \left(1 - \frac{1}{\|p\|}\right)^{-1} \\ &\ll \text{Li}(x) \delta(x) s(x) u. \end{aligned}$$

**Step 2''.** To handle  $S_2''$  note that if  $\|m\| \leq x^\delta$  and  $\|d\| \leq D = y^{1-2\delta} \leq x^{1-2\delta}$  then  $q := md$  is such that  $\|q\| \leq x^{1-\delta}$ . Hence

$$(14) \quad \begin{aligned} S_2'' &\leq \sum_{\|q\| \leq x^{1-\delta}} \sum_{d|q} |r(\mathcal{A}; d, a)| \\ &\leq \sum_{\|q\| \leq x^{1-\delta}} \tau(q) \left| \pi_K(x; q, a) - \frac{\pi_K(x)}{\varphi(q)} \right| \\ &\leq (S_{2,*}'' S_{2,\dagger}'' )^{\frac{1}{2}}, \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} S_{2,\dagger}'' &= \sum_{\|q\| \leq x^{1-\delta}} \left| \pi_K(x; q, a) - \frac{\pi_K(x)}{\varphi(q)} \right| \\ S_{2,*}'' &= \sum_{\|q\| \leq x^{1-\delta}} \tau(q)^2 \left| \pi_K(x; q, a) - \frac{\pi_K(x)}{\varphi(q)} \right|. \end{aligned}$$

We recognize the expression of the EH conjecture, so

$$(15) \quad S_{2,\dagger}'' \leq x/(\log x)^A.$$

We upper bound  $S_{2,*}''$  using the crude inequality

$$\left| \pi_K(x; q, a) - \frac{\pi_K(x)}{\varphi(q)} \right| \leq \pi_K(x; q, a) + \frac{\pi_K(x)}{\varphi(q)} \pi_K(x; q, a) \leq 2.1 \cdot \frac{x}{q},$$

so

$$(16) \quad \begin{aligned} S_2'' &\leq (x/(\log x)^A)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left( x \sum_{\|q\| \leq x^{1-\delta}} \frac{\tau(q)^2}{\|q\|} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ &\ll \pi_K(x)/(\log x)^{A/2-4}. \end{aligned}$$

**Completion of the proof of an asymptotic development.** When combining Equations 10, 11, 13 and 16 we obtain

$$(17) \quad \begin{aligned} \psi_K(x, y; a, c) &= \frac{\text{Li}(x)}{\varphi(c)} \left( \rho(u) + O\left(\frac{\delta}{u} + \frac{\log_2 x}{\log y}\right) + O\left(\frac{1}{(\log x)^{A_0}}\right) + \alpha(E) \delta(x) s(x) u + O\left(\frac{1}{(\log x)^{A/2-4}}\right) \right) \\ &= \frac{\rho(u)}{\varphi(c)} \text{Li}(x) \left( 1 + \alpha(E) \frac{\delta(x) s(x) u}{\rho(u)} (1 + O(\frac{1}{\log x})) \right). \end{aligned}$$

Since  $\frac{\delta(x) s(x) u}{\rho(u)} \rightarrow 0$  we have completed the proof.

**Putting the asymptotic development in the form of the statement.** Based on Theorem 9, one can reproduce mutatis mutandis the arguments in the proof of Theorem 1.1 in [BL17] and obtain

$$(18) \quad \frac{\psi_K(x, y)}{\psi_K(x, \infty)} = \frac{\psi(xe^{\alpha(E)}, y)}{\psi(xe^{\alpha(E)}, \infty)} \left( 1 + O\left(\frac{\log(u+1)^2}{(\log y)^2}\right) \right),$$

where  $\alpha(E) = L'(1, \chi)/L(1, \chi)$  where  $\chi$  is the non-trivial character of  $K$ .  $\square$

## 5. THE SET $\Psi_v(x, y)$

This section is devoted to proving the following result, which implies Theorem 4 in the introduction.

We prepare the proof with a lemma, which is a variation of the fact that a set of primes which has a natural density also has an analytic density (see for example Th III.1.3 in [Ten15]).

**Lemma 12.** *Let  $Q$  be a set of primes such that  $|\frac{\pi_Q(x)}{\pi(x)} - \lambda(x)| = O(\frac{1}{(\log x)^A})$ ,  $\lambda(x)$  is a positive decreasing function,  $A > 0$  a constant and  $\pi_Q(x)$  is the cardinality of  $Q \cap [1, x]$ . Then we have*

$$\sum_{\substack{p < x \\ p \in Q}} \frac{1}{p} / \sum_{p < x} \frac{1}{p} \geq \lambda(x) \left( 1 + \frac{1}{\log x \log_2 x} + O\left(\frac{1}{(\log x)^A}\right) \right).$$

*Proof.* With these notations we have

$$\sum_{\substack{p < x \\ p \in Q}} \frac{1}{p} = \sum_{n=1}^{\lfloor x \rfloor} \frac{\pi_Q(n) - \pi_Q(n-1)}{n}.$$

By an Abel summation we have

$$\sum_{n=1}^{\lfloor x \rfloor} \frac{\pi_Q(n) - \pi_Q(n-1)}{n} = \frac{\pi_Q(x)}{\lfloor x \rfloor} + \sum_{n=1}^{\lfloor x \rfloor} \frac{\pi_Q(n)}{n(n+1)}.$$

We use  $\lambda(n) \geq \lambda(x)$  for all  $n \leq x$  and have

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{n=1}^{\lfloor x \rfloor} \frac{\pi_Q(n)}{n(n+1)} &= \sum_{n \leq x} \lambda(n) \frac{1}{n \log n} + O\left(\sum_{n \leq x} \frac{1}{n(\log n)^{A+1}}\right) \\ &\geq \lambda(x) \sum_{n \leq x} \frac{1}{n \log n} + O\left(\sum_{n \leq x} \frac{1}{n(\log n)^{A+1}}\right) \\ &\geq \lambda(x) \log \log x + O\left(\frac{1}{(\log x)^A}\right). \end{aligned}$$

Finally, the term  $\pi_Q(x)/\lfloor x \rfloor$  has a contribution  $\frac{\lambda}{\log x} + O\left(\frac{1}{(\log x)^A}\right)$ .  $\square$

*Proof of Theorem 4.*

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\psi_v(x, y)}{\psi(x, y)} &= \left( \sum_{\substack{p \in Q \\ y^{1/v} < p \leq y}} \psi(x/p, y, p) \right) / \left( \sum_{y^{1/v} < p \leq y} \psi(x/p, y, p) \right) \\ &= \left( \sum_{\substack{p \in Q \\ y^{1/v} < p \leq y}} x/p \rho(u) (1 + \varepsilon(x, y, p)) \right) / \left( \sum_{y^{1/v} < p \leq y} x/p \rho(u) (1 + \varepsilon(x, y, p)) \right), \end{aligned}$$

where  $\varepsilon(x, y, p) = (\psi(x/p, y, p) - x/p \rho(u))/\rho(u)$ . Since  $\varepsilon(x, y, p) = O(1/u)$  and using Lemma 12 we further have

$$\begin{aligned} (19) \quad \psi_v(x, y) &= \psi(x, y) (1 + O(\frac{1}{u})) \left( \sum_{\substack{p \in Q \\ y^{1/v} < p \leq y}} 1/p \right) / \left( \sum_{y^{1/v} < p \leq y} 1/p \right) \\ &\geq x \rho(u) \rho(v) \cdot \left( 1 + o(1) + O\left(\frac{1}{u} + \frac{1}{\log y \log_2 x} + \frac{\log(u+1)}{\log y}\right) \right) \\ &\geq x \rho(u) \rho(v) (1 + o(1)). \end{aligned}$$

$\square$

## 6. THE CASE OF NON-CM ELLIPTIC CURVES

In the cryptographic applications one can test if a presumed formula for  $\alpha(E)$  matches the numerical experiments. This section, based on a working hypothesis, is not a proof but an attempt to find a formula for  $\alpha(E)$  in the case of curves without CM, and it continues in Section 7.2.

A key fact in the CM case was the asymptotic equivalent of  $\pi_K(x; d, a)$  given in equation (9). The role of  $\pi_K(x; d, a)$  in the CM case is played here by

$$(20) \quad \pi_E(x; d) = |\{p \in \Pi(x) : d \mid E(\mathbb{F}_p)\}|.$$

David and Wu [DW12b] give an asymptotic equivalent under GRH:

$$(21) \quad \pi_E(x; d) = \left( \prod_{q|d} \frac{q^2 - 2}{(q-1)(q^2-1)} \right) \text{Li}(x) + O(d^3 x^{1/2} \log(d \cdot N_E x)).$$

The error term is  $O_x(d^3 \log d)$ , which is much smaller than given by the effective Chebotarev theorem in the case of a generic number field of degree  $d$ . One can sum the error terms up to  $d \leq x^{1/4}/(\log x)^2$  and obtain a Bombieri-Vinogradov statement for elliptic curves.

**Theorem 13** (under GRH, Prop 5.3 in [Kow05]<sup>3</sup>). *For  $X = x^{1/5}$ ,*

$$(22) \quad \sum_{q \leq X} \left| \pi_E(x; q) - \frac{w(q) \text{Li}(x)}{q} \right| \ll_{E,A} \frac{x}{(\log x)^3},$$

where  $0 < w_E(q) < q$  is a multiplicative function depending on  $E$ .

We follow Pollack [Pol16] and “pretend that this approximation is valid for  $d$  up to size  $\approx x$ , at least on average”. For the moment, the following statement is only a hypothesis which is interesting to investigate and which allows us to derive the value of  $\alpha(E)$ .

**Hypothesis 14.** *Let  $\delta(x)$  be a decreasing function such that*

$$(\log_2 x)/(2 \log x) \leq \delta(x) < 1 \quad (x \geq x_0).$$

*Then, for any fixed elliptic curve  $E$  defined over  $\mathbb{Q}$  and any  $A \geq 0$ , Equation (22) holds for  $X = x^{1-\delta(x)}$ , where  $w_E(q)$  is the multiplicative function of Theorem 13.*

**Theorem 15.** *Assume Hypothesis 14 for an elliptic curve  $E$  and a function  $\delta(x)$ . Set*

$$H = \left\{ (x, y) \in \mathbb{R}_+^2 : x^{\frac{\log_3 x}{\log_2 x}} \leq y \leq x \right\}.$$

*For any  $y \in [1, x]$  we set  $u = \frac{\log x}{\log y}$ . Then there exists a constant  $\alpha(E)$  such that, as  $x \rightarrow \infty$ , we have the asymptotic development*

$$\frac{\psi_E(x, y)}{\psi_E(x, \infty)} = \frac{\psi(xe^{\alpha(E)}, y)}{\psi(xe^{\alpha(E)}, \infty)} \cdot \left( 1 + O\left( \frac{\log(u+1)}{\log y} \right) \right),$$

*uniformly for  $(x, y) \in H$ .*

*Proof.* The argument is a verbatim translation of the proof of Theorem 2. The inclusion-exclusion principle yields

$$(23) \quad \psi_E(x, y) = S_1 + S_2,$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} S_1 &= \sum_{\substack{q \leq x^{1-\delta(x)} \\ P^-(q) > y}} \mu(q) \pi_E(x; qc) \\ S_2 &= \sum_{\substack{q > x^{1-\delta(x)} \\ P^-(q) > y}} \mu(q) \pi_E(x; qc). \end{aligned}$$

<sup>3</sup>See also Equation (4.7) in [DW12a].

We write  $S_1 = S'_1 + S''_1 + S_1^\dagger$  with

$$\begin{aligned} S'_1 &= \text{Li}(x) \sum_{\substack{q > x^{1-\delta(x)} \\ P^-(q) > y}} \frac{\mu(q)}{\varphi(q)} \\ S_1^\circ &= \text{Li}(x) \sum_{\substack{q > x^{1-\delta(x)} \\ P^-(q) > y}} \mu(q) \left( \frac{1}{\varphi(q)} - \frac{w_E(q)}{q} \right) \\ S''_1 &= \sum_{\substack{q > x^{1-\delta(x)} \\ P^-(q) > y}} \mu(q) r(x, q) \quad \text{where } r(x, q) = \pi_E(x, q) - \text{Li}(x) \frac{w_E(q)}{q}. \end{aligned}$$

From Equation (21) we have  $\frac{1}{\varphi(q)} - \frac{w_E(q)}{q} = O\left(\frac{1}{q^2}\right)$  and then

$$\begin{aligned} S_1^\circ / \text{Li}(x) &\ll \sum_q \frac{1}{q^2} \\ &\ll \prod_{p>y} \left(1 - \frac{1}{p^2}\right)^{-1} = O\left(\frac{1}{y}\right). \end{aligned}$$

The sum  $S'_1$  is identical to Theorem 2 so we can use Equation (10). As in step 1'', we show that  $S''_1$  is also hidden in the  $o(\varepsilon(x, y))$  while replacing Conjecture 1 with Hypothesis 14.

For  $S_2$  we apply Lemma 8 with  $D = y^{1-\delta}$  and  $z = D$ . Then we can write  $S_2 = S'_2 + S''_2$ , where

$$\begin{aligned} S'_2 &\ll \left( \sum_{m \leq x^\delta} \frac{\pi(x)}{\varphi(m)} \prod_{\substack{p < z \\ p \nmid m}} \left(1 - \frac{w_E(p)}{p}\right) \right) \\ S''_2 &\ll \sum_{m \leq x^\delta} \sum_{\substack{d < D \\ d \mid P_m(z)}} |r_E(md)|, \end{aligned}$$

Again, Step 2'' can be copied mutatis mutandis to prove that  $S''_2 = o(\varepsilon(x, y))$ . Finally, Equation (21) implies that  $(1 - \frac{w_E(p)}{p}) / (1 - \frac{1}{p}) = 1 + O(\frac{1}{p^2})$ , so, up to a multiplicative constant,  $S'_2$  has the same value as in Equation (13), so  $S'_2 = o(\varepsilon(x, y))$ . □

## 7. A FORMULA FOR $\alpha(E)$

### 7.1. Recognizing $\alpha(E)$ in the CM case.

**Proposition 16.** *Let  $E$  be an elliptic curve with CM and let  $\alpha(E)$  be the constant in Theorem 2. For all rational primes  $\ell$  we set*

$$\alpha_\ell(E) = \log \ell \left( \frac{1}{\ell - 1} - \mathbb{E}_p(\text{val}_\ell(|E(\mathbb{F}_p)|)) \right),$$

where  $\mathbb{E}_p$  denotes the average value in the sense of Chebotarev density over random primes  $p$ . Then we have

$$\alpha(E) = \sum_\ell \alpha_\ell(E).$$

*Proof.* The proof of Theorem 2 implies that  $\alpha(E) = L'(1, \chi) / L(1, \chi)$ . Due to the uniform convergence of the Euler product which divides  $L(s, \chi)$ , we can derivate term by term:

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha(E) &= - \sum_\ell \frac{\partial}{\partial s} \log \left(1 - \frac{1 + \chi(\ell)}{\ell^s}\right) \Big|_{s=1} \\ &= - \sum_\ell \chi(\ell) \frac{\log \ell}{\ell - 1} \\ &= \sum_\ell \log \ell \left( \frac{1}{\ell - 1} - \frac{\chi(\ell) + 1}{\ell - 1} \right). \end{aligned}$$

By Dirichlet's theorem, inside the set of primes  $\pi$  such that  $\pi \equiv a \pmod{c}$ , the subset of these  $\pi$  such that  $\|\pi - 1\| \equiv 0 \pmod{\ell^k}$  is the density of random elements of  $K$  not divisible by inert primes whose norm is divisible by  $\ell^k$ . This last density is  $2/\ell^k$  if  $\ell$  is split and 0 if  $\ell$  is inert. We conclude that the average valuation in  $\ell$  of  $\#E(\mathbb{F}_p)$  is  $\frac{\chi(\ell) + 1}{\ell - 1}$ . □

**Remark 17.** In the study of smoothness of binary forms, Murphy [Mur98] associated a function to irreducible polynomials  $f \in \mathbb{Z}[x]$  as follows

$$\begin{aligned} \text{for a prime } \ell \quad \alpha_\ell(f) &= (\log \ell) \cdot (\mathbb{E}_n(\text{val}_\ell n) - \mathbb{E}_{(a,b)=1}(\text{val}_\ell b^{\deg(f)} f(a/b))), \\ \alpha(f) &= \sum_{\ell \text{ prime}} \alpha_\ell(f), \end{aligned}$$

where  $\mathbb{E}_{(a,b)=1}$  is the average (in the sense of Chebotarev density) for randomly chosen pairs of integers  $(a, b)$  which are relatively prime. Hence  $\alpha(E)$  has a very similar expression to  $\alpha(K)$ , the difference being made by the condition  $(a, b) = 1$ .

**7.2. Heuristics for non-CM elliptic curves.** From [DW12b], the function  $w_E$  is computed from Galois representations associated to  $E$ . Serre's open image theorem implies that for all but finitely many primes, which depend on  $E$ ,  $\alpha(E)$  is equal to the value in Theorem 15. A recent result [BS21] makes the list of all the infinite families of elliptic curves whose  $\alpha(E)$  is different from the generic value, under Serre's uniformity conjecture.

**Proposition 18.** Let  $E$  be an elliptic curve without CM. Let  $P_n$  be the multiplicative function such that  $P_n = \text{Prob}(n \mid \#E(\mathbb{F}_p))$  when  $n$  is a prime power. Let  $h(n) = \mu(n)P_n$ .

Then there exists a constant  $c(E)$  such that

$$\sum_{\substack{n \leq x \\ P^-(n) > y}} h(n) = \tau(E)x\rho(u) \left( 1 + O\left(\frac{\log(u+1)}{\log y}\right) \right).$$

As a consequence, if one assumes Hypothesis 14, then

$$\psi_E(x, y)/x = \tau(E)\rho(u) \left( 1 + O\left(\frac{\log(u+1)}{\log y}\right) \right).$$

*Proof.* Let us show that Theorem 10 applies to  $\mathcal{H}(s) = \sum_n \frac{P_n}{n^s}$  and let us compute the constants  $a_0$  and  $a_1$  in the statement of that theorem. By Equation (2.3) of [DW12b], Serre's open image theorem implies that there exists an integer  $S(E)$  such that, for any two integers  $m$  and  $n$  such that  $(mn, S_E) = 1$ , we have  $P_{mn} = P_m P_n$ . By Lemma 2.3 of [DW12b] there exists a constant  $M(E)$  such that, uniformly on  $\ell$  and  $k$ , we have

$$\forall \ell \nmid S(E), \forall k \geq 0, \quad |P_{\ell^k} - \frac{1}{\ell^k}| \leq \frac{M(E)}{\ell^{k+1}}.$$

Let us set

$$\tau(E) := \left( \sum_{n \mid S(E)^\infty} P_n n^{-s} \right) \cdot \prod_{\ell \mid S(E)} (1 - \ell^{-s}).$$

Then  $\mathcal{H}(s) - \tau(E)\zeta(s)$  is holomorphic in a neighbourhood of 1 and Theorem 10 applies. We have directly that  $\text{ord}(\mathcal{H})_1 = 1$  and

$$a_0 = \text{res}_1 \mathcal{H} = \tau(E) \text{res}_1 \zeta = \tau(E).$$

Hence Theorem 10 applies and we have the asymptotic formula for  $\sum h(n)$ . Hypothesis 14 allows to replace  $\sum h(n)$  by  $\Psi_E(x, y)$  and obtain

$$(24) \quad \psi_E(x, y)/x = \tau(E)\rho(u) \left( 1 + O\left(\frac{\log(u+1)}{\log y}\right) \right).$$

□

The value of  $\tau(E)$  can be made explicit for every family of elliptic curves. Recall that a Serre curve is an elliptic curve such that, for all primes  $\ell$ ,  $\rho_\ell$  is surjective and  $[\text{GL}_2(\mathbb{Z}) : \text{Im}(\rho_E)] = 2$ .

**Corollary 19.** If  $E$  is a Serre then  $\tau(E) / \prod_{\ell \mid S(E)} (1 - 1/\ell) = \sum_{\substack{i, j, m, n \\ m \mid n \mid d^\infty}} P_{2^i m, 2^j n} \frac{1}{2^{i+jmn}}$ , where  $P_{2^i m, 2^j n}$  is given by Equations (27), (26) and (25).

*Proof.* For any integers  $a, b \geq 1$  such that  $a \mid b$  we call  $P_{a,b}$  the probability that  $\mathbb{Z}/a\mathbb{Z} \times \mathbb{Z}/b\mathbb{Z} \subset E(\mathbb{F}_p)$  when  $p$  is a random prime.

By Theorem 2.19 in [BBB<sup>+</sup>13], applied to a prime level  $\ell$ , not necessarily odd, in the case  $\text{Im}(\rho_{E,\ell}) = \text{GL}_2(\mathbb{Z}/\ell\mathbb{Z})$  we have

$$(25) \quad P_{\ell^i, \ell^j} = \begin{cases} c_3^{\max(j-i-1,0)} c_2^{\text{sgn}(j-i)} P_{\ell, \ell} & \text{when } i \geq 1 \\ c_3^{\max(j-i-1,0)} P_{1, \ell} & \text{when } i = 0 < j, \end{cases}$$

where  $c_1 = 1/\ell^4$ ,  $c_2 = (\ell - 1)(\ell + 1)^2/\ell^4$ ,  $c_3 = 1/\ell$ ,  $P_{\ell, \ell} = 1/(\ell(\ell - 1)^2(\ell + 1))$  and  $P_{1, \ell} = (\ell^3 - 2\ell - 1)/(\ell(\ell + 1)(\ell - 1)^2)$ .

Let  $d := \text{Disc}(E)$ . Since  $[\text{GL}_2(\mathbb{Z}) : \text{Im}(\rho_E)] = [\text{GL}_2(\mathbb{Z}/2d\mathbb{Z}) : \text{Im}(\rho_{E,2d})]$ , for all odd integers  $m$  and  $n$  one has

$$(26) \quad P_{m,n} = \prod_{\ell \mid d, \ell \neq 2} P_{\ell^{\text{val}_\ell(m)}, \ell^{\text{val}_\ell(n)}}.$$

For any integers  $i, j \geq 0$  and odd integers  $n, m$  we have

$$(27) \quad P_{2^i m, 2^j n} = \begin{cases} 2P_{2^i, 2^j} P_{m,n} & \text{if } d \mid 2^i m \text{ and } i \geq 1 \\ P_{2^i, 2^j} P_{m,n} & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

Indeed, if  $d \nmid 2^i m$  then the injection  $\text{Im}(\rho_{E, 2^j n}) \rightarrow \text{GL}_2(\mathbb{Z}/2^j n\mathbb{Z}) \simeq \text{GL}_2(\mathbb{Z}/2^j\mathbb{Z}) \times \text{GL}_2(\mathbb{Z}/n\mathbb{Z})$  is surjective. Then one has directly  $P_{2^i m, 2^j n} = P_{2^i, 2^j} P_{m,n}$ .

Write  $d = 2^{i_0} m_0$  and assume that  $m_0 \mid m$  and  $i_0 \leq i$  or equivalently  $d \mid 2^i m$ . Let  $H$  be the unique subgroup of index 2 in  $\text{GL}_2(\mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z}) \simeq S_3$ . Then the proportion of matrices having 1 as an eigenvalue is the same in  $H$  as in  $\text{GL}_2(\mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z}) \simeq S_3$ . This extends to the unique subgroup of index 2 of  $\text{GL}_2(\mathbb{Z}/2_0^i\mathbb{Z})$ . Hence one has  $P_{2^i m, 2^j n} = P_{1, 2^j - i_0/n} P_{m/m_0, m/m_0} P_{2^i m_0, 2^j m_0}$ .

Finally, we have  $P_{2^i m_0, 2^j m_0} = P_{m_0, m_0}$  if  $i = 0$ . If  $i \geq 1$  we have a different equation

$$P_{2^i m_0, 2^j m_0} = 1/|\text{Im}\rho_{E, 2^i m_0}| = 2/(|\text{Im}\rho_{E, 2^i}| \cdot |\text{Im}\rho_{E, m_0}|) = 2P_{2^i, 2^j} P_{m_0, m_0},$$

which implies Equation (27).  $\square$

**Remark 20.** *ECM-friendly curves without CM have  $\tau(E) \neq 1$  in general. Hence they keep their advantage asymptotically compared to random integers of the same bit size.*

## REFERENCES

- [BBB<sup>+</sup>13] Razvan Barulescu, Joppe Bos, Cyril Bouvier, Thorsten Kleinjung, and Peter Montgomery. Finding ECM-friendly curves through a study of Galois properties. *The Open Book Series*, 1(1):63–86, 2013.
- [BL17] Razvan Barulescu and Armand Lachand. Some mathematical remarks on the polynomial selection in NFS. *Mathematics of Computation*, 86(303):397–418, 2017.
- [BS21] Razvan Barulescu and Sudarshan Shinde. A classification of ECM-friendly families using modular curves. *Mathematics of Computation*, to appear, 2021.
- [dlBF20] Régis de la Bretèche and Daniel Fiorilli. Entiers friables dans des progressions arithmétiques de grand module. In *Mathematical Proceedings of the Cambridge Philosophical Society*, volume 169, pages 75–102. Cambridge University Press, 2020.
- [DW12a] C. David and J. Wu. Pseudoprime reductions of elliptic curves. *Canadian Journal of Mathematics*, 64(1):81–101, 2012.
- [DW12b] Chantal David and Jie Wu. Almost prime values of the order of elliptic curves over finite fields. In *Forum Mathematicum*, volume 24, pages 99–119. Walter de Gruyter GmbH & Co. KG, 2012.
- [FG92] John Friedlander and Andrew Granville. Limitations to the equi-distribution of primes iii. *Compositio Mathematica*, 81(1):19–32, 1992.
- [Gra08] Andrew Granville. Smooth numbers: computational number theory and beyond. *Algorithmic number theory: lattices, number fields, curves and cryptography*, 44:267–323, 2008.
- [HTW08] Guillaume Hanrot, Gérald Tenenbaum, and Jie Wu. Moyennes de certaines fonctions multiplicatives sur les entiers friables, 2. *Proceedings of the London Mathematical Society*, 96(1):107–135, 2008.
- [Hux71] MN Huxley. The large sieve inequality for algebraic number fields III. zero-density results. *Journal of the London Mathematical Society*, 2(2):233–233, 1971.
- [Iwa80] Henryk Iwaniec. A new form of the error term in the linear sieve. *Acta Arithmetica*, 37(1):307–320, 1980.
- [Kow05] Emmanuel Kowalski. Analytic problems for elliptic curves. ArXiv preprint math/0510197, 2005.

- [Len87] Hendrik W Jr Lenstra. Factoring integers with elliptic curves. *Annals of mathematics*, pages 649–673, 1987.
- [LJPP93] Hendrik W Lenstra Jr, Jonathan Pila, and Carl Pomerance. A hyperelliptic smoothness test. I. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society of London. Series A: Physical and Engineering Sciences*, 345(1676):397–408, 1993.
- [LT15] Armand Lachand and Gerald Tenenbaum. Note sur les valeurs moyennes criblées de certaines fonctions arithmétiques. *The Quarterly Journal of Mathematics*, 66(1):245–250, 2015.
- [LWX20] Jianya Liu, Jie Wu, and Ping Xi. Primes in arithmetic progressions with friable indices. *Science China Mathematics*, 63(1):23–38, 2020.
- [Mur98] Brian Murphy. Modelling the yield of number field sieve polynomials. In *Algorithmic Number Theory–ANTS III*, volume 1423 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 137–150, 1998.
- [Pol16] Paul Pollack. A Titchmarsh divisor problem for elliptic curves. In *Mathematical Proceedings of the Cambridge Philosophical Society*, volume 160, pages 167–189. Cambridge University Press, 2016.
- [RS09] Karl Rubin and Alice Silverberg. Point counting on reductions of CM elliptic curves. *Journal of Number Theory*, 129(12):2903–2923, 2009.
- [Sco04] Eira J Scourfield. On ideals free of large prime factors. *Journal de théorie des nombres de Bordeaux*, 16(3):733–772, 2004.
- [Ten15] Gérald Tenenbaum. *Introduction to analytic and probabilistic number theory*, volume 163. American Mathematical Soc., 2015.
- [Wan18] Zhiwei Wang. Autour des plus grands facteurs premiers d’entiers consécutifs voisins d’un entier criblé. *The Quarterly Journal of Mathematics*, 69(3):995–1013, 2018.
- [Zyw11] David Zywina. A refinement of Koblitz’s conjecture. *International Journal of Number Theory*, 7(03):739–769, 2011.