

Kummer Theory for Elliptic Curves

Sebastiano Tronto

joint work with Davide Lombardo

2020-02-06

Let K be a number field; let $\alpha \in K^\times$ not a root of unity.

Let K be a number field; let $\alpha \in K^\times$ not a root of unity.

- Consider the splitting field L of $X^n - \alpha$

Let K be a number field; let $\alpha \in K^\times$ not a root of unity.

- Consider the splitting field L of $X^n - \alpha$
- L contains the n -th cyclotomic extension $K(\zeta_n)$

Let K be a number field; let $\alpha \in K^\times$ not a root of unity.

- Consider the splitting field L of $X^n - \alpha$
- L contains the n -th cyclotomic extension $K(\zeta_n)$
- $L | K$ and $L | K(\zeta_n)$ are Galois

The degree $[L : K(\zeta_n)]$ is very close to n .

The degree $[L : K(\zeta_n)]$ is very close to n .

For explicit computations:

The degree $[L : K(\zeta_n)]$ is very close to n .

For explicit computations:

- Properties of $K(\zeta_n) | K$ (does K intersect $\mathbb{Q}(\zeta_n)$?)

The degree $[L : K(\zeta_n)]$ is very close to n .

For explicit computations:

- Properties of $K(\zeta_n) | K$ (does K intersect $\mathbb{Q}(\zeta_n)$?)
- Divisibility properties of α in K (is it an n -th power?)

The degree $[L : K(\zeta_n)]$ is very close to n .

For explicit computations:

- Properties of $K(\zeta_n) | K$ (does K intersect $\mathbb{Q}(\zeta_n)$?)
- Divisibility properties of α in K (is it an n -th power?)
- Relations between $\sqrt[n]{\alpha}$ and ζ_n

Kummer Theory for Elliptic Curves

E elliptic curve over a number field K ; let $P \in E(K)$ not torsion.

Kummer Theory for Elliptic Curves

E elliptic curve over a number field K ; let $P \in E(K)$ not torsion.

- There are n^2 points $Q_1, \dots, Q_{n^2} \in E(\overline{K})$ such that $nQ_i = P$

$$n^{-1}P := \{Q_1, \dots, Q_{n^2}\}$$

E elliptic curve over a number field K ; let $P \in E(K)$ not torsion.

- There are n^2 points $Q_1, \dots, Q_{n^2} \in E(\overline{K})$ such that $nQ_i = P$

$$n^{-1}P := \{Q_1, \dots, Q_{n^2}\}$$

- Consider $L := K(n^{-1}P)$

E elliptic curve over a number field K ; let $P \in E(K)$ not torsion.

- There are n^2 points $Q_1, \dots, Q_{n^2} \in E(\overline{K})$ such that $nQ_i = P$

$$n^{-1}P := \{Q_1, \dots, Q_{n^2}\}$$

- Consider $L := K(n^{-1}P)$
- L contains the n -th torsion field $K(E[n])$

E elliptic curve over a number field K ; let $P \in E(K)$ not torsion.

- There are n^2 points $Q_1, \dots, Q_{n^2} \in E(\overline{K})$ such that $nQ_i = P$

$$n^{-1}P := \{Q_1, \dots, Q_{n^2}\}$$

- Consider $L := K(n^{-1}P)$
- L contains the n -th torsion field $K(E[n])$
- $L | K$ and $L | K(E[n])$ are Galois

Classical	Elliptic Curves
\mathbb{G}_m	E
roots of unity $\zeta_n \in \mu_n$	torsion points $T \in E[n]$
$K(\zeta_n)$	$K(E[n])$
$\alpha \in K^\times$ not root of unity	$P \in E(K)$ not torsion
$\{\beta \in \bar{K}^\times \mid \beta^n = \alpha\}$	$\{Q \in E(\bar{K}) \mid nQ = P\}$
$K(\sqrt[n]{a}, \zeta_n)$	$K(n^{-1}P)$
$[K(\sqrt[n]{a}, \zeta_n) : K(\zeta_n)] \sim n$	$[K(n^{-1}P) : K(E[n])] \sim n^2$

Theorem

Assume that $\text{End}_K(E) = \mathbb{Z}$. There is an explicit constant C , depending only on P and on the torsion Galois representations associated with E , such that

$$\frac{n^2}{[K(n^{-1}P) : K(E[n])]} \quad \text{divides} \quad C$$

for all $n \geq 1$.

Theorem

Assume that $\text{End}_K(E) = \mathbb{Z}$. There is an explicit constant C , depending only on P and on the torsion Galois representations associated with E , such that

$$\frac{n^2}{[K(n^{-1}P) : K(E[n])]} \quad \text{divides} \quad C$$

for all $n \geq 1$.

Previously known with a non-explicit constant.

Main result - idea of proof

Elementary field theory gives

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{n^2}{[K(n^{-1}P) : K(E[n])]} = \\ &= \prod_{\substack{\ell|n \\ \ell \text{ prime}}} \underbrace{\frac{\ell^{2e_\ell}}{[K(\ell^{-e_\ell}P) : K(E[\ell^{e_\ell}])]} }_{A_\ell(n)} \cdot \underbrace{[K(\ell^{-e_\ell}P) \cap K(E[n]) : K(E[\ell^{e_\ell}])]}_{B_\ell(n)} \end{aligned}$$

where $e_\ell = v_\ell(n)$.

Main result - idea of proof

Elementary field theory gives

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{n^2}{[K(n^{-1}P) : K(E[n])]} = \\ &= \prod_{\substack{\ell|n \\ \ell \text{ prime}}} \underbrace{\frac{\ell^{2e_\ell}}{[K(\ell^{-e_\ell}P) : K(E[\ell^{e_\ell}])]} }_{A_\ell(n)} \cdot \underbrace{[K(\ell^{-e_\ell}P) \cap K(E[n]) : K(E[\ell^{e_\ell}])]}_{B_\ell(n)} \end{aligned}$$

where $e_\ell = v_\ell(n)$.

We call $A_\ell(n)$ the ℓ -adic failure and $B_\ell(n)$ the adelic failure.

Goals:

- Show that $A_\ell(n)$ is bounded as a function of n

Goals:

- Show that $A_\ell(n)$ is bounded as a function of n
- $A_\ell = 1$ for almost all primes

Goals:

- Show that $A_\ell(n)$ is bounded as a function of n
- $A_\ell = 1$ for almost all primes
- Same for B_ℓ

Goals:

- Show that $A_\ell(n)$ is bounded as a function of n
- $A_\ell = 1$ for almost all primes
- Same for B_ℓ
- Everything explicitly!

Proof idea - ℓ -adic failure

Assume that E has no CM and fix a prime ℓ .

Proof idea - ℓ -adic failure

Assume that E has no CM and fix a prime ℓ .

- Write $P = \ell^{d_\ell} Q + T$ in $E(K)$, with T torsion and d_ℓ maximal

Proof idea - ℓ -adic failure

Assume that E has no CM and fix a prime ℓ .

- Write $P = \ell^{d_\ell} Q + T$ in $E(K)$, with T torsion and d_ℓ maximal

Theorem (Jones, Rouse (2007))

Assume $\ell > 2$. If $d_\ell = 0$ and the ℓ -adic Galois representation associated with E is surjective, then $A_\ell(n) = 1$ for every $n > 1$.

Assume that E has no CM and fix a prime ℓ .

- Write $P = \ell^{d_\ell} Q + T$ in $E(K)$, with T torsion and d_ℓ maximal

Theorem (Jones, Rouse (2007))

Assume $\ell > 2$. If $d_\ell = 0$ and the ℓ -adic Galois representation associated with E is surjective, then $A_\ell(n) = 1$ for every $n > 1$.

- Serre's open image theorem \implies finitely many primes left

Proof idea - ℓ -adic failure (an example)

Problem: d_ℓ may increase when we work over $K(E[\ell^e])$

Proof idea - ℓ -adic failure (an example)

Problem: d_ℓ may increase when we work over $K(E[\ell^e])$

Example

The curve

$$E/\mathbb{Q}: \quad y^2 + y = x^3 - 216x - 1861 \quad (\text{Cremona } 17739g1)$$

has a point

$$P = \left(\frac{23769}{400}, \frac{3529853}{8000} \right) \in E(\mathbb{Q})$$

with $d_3 = 0$.

However, there is a point $Q \in \mathbb{Q}(E[3])$ such that $P = 3Q$.

Proof idea - ℓ -adic failure

Using Galois cohomology, we bound A_ℓ in terms of:

- the divisibility parameter d_ℓ
- “how much” ρ_{ℓ^∞} is not surjective

Using Galois cohomology, we bound A_ℓ in terms of:

- the divisibility parameter d_ℓ
- “how much” ρ_{ℓ^∞} is not surjective

Proposition

There is an explicit integer c_ℓ , depending only on the ℓ -adic Galois representation associated with E , such that $A_\ell(n)$ divides $\ell^{4c_\ell+2d_\ell}$ for every $n > 1$.

Proof idea - adelic failure

Let $e_\ell = v_\ell(n)$ and $r = n/\ell^{e_\ell}$.

Proof idea - adelic failure

Let $e_\ell = v_\ell(n)$ and $r = n/\ell^{e_\ell}$.

$$B_\ell(n) = [K(\ell^{-e_\ell}P) \cap K(E[n]) : K(E[\ell^{e_\ell}])]$$

Proof idea - adelic failure

Let $e_\ell = v_\ell(n)$ and $r = n/\ell^{e_\ell}$.

$$B_\ell(n) = [K(\ell^{-e_\ell}P) \cap K(E[n]) : K(E[\ell^{e_\ell}])]$$

- One can show that

$$B_\ell(n) = \underbrace{[K(\ell^{-e_\ell}P) \cap K(E[r])]}_F : \underbrace{[K(E[\ell^{e_\ell}]) \cap K(E[r])]}_M$$

Let $e_\ell = v_\ell(n)$ and $r = n/\ell^{e_\ell}$.

$$B_\ell(n) = [K(\ell^{-e_\ell}P) \cap K(E[n]) : K(E[\ell^{e_\ell}])]$$

- One can show that

$$B_\ell(n) = \underbrace{[K(\ell^{-e_\ell}P) \cap K(E[r])]}_F : \underbrace{[K(E[\ell^{e_\ell}]) \cap K(E[r])]}_M$$

- If $M = K$ then $B_\ell(n) = 1$

$$M := K(E[\ell^{e_\ell}]) \cap K(E[r])$$

Theorem (Campagna, Stevenhagen (2019))

There is a finite and explicit set of primes S , depending only on E , such that if $\ell \notin S$, then $M = K$.

$$M := K(E[\ell^{e_\ell}]) \cap K(E[r])$$

Theorem (Campagna, Stevenhagen (2019))

There is a finite and explicit set of primes S , depending only on E , such that if $\ell \notin S$, then $M = K$.

For the other primes:

$$M := K(E[\ell^{e_\ell}]) \cap K(E[r])$$

Theorem (Campagna, Stevenhagen (2019))

There is a finite and explicit set of primes S , depending only on E , such that if $\ell \notin S$, then $M = K$.

For the other primes:

- There is a finite extension $\tilde{K} \mid K$, depending only on S , such that working over \tilde{K} we have $\tilde{M} = \tilde{K}$

$$M := K(E[\ell^{e_\ell}]) \cap K(E[r])$$

Theorem (Campagna, Stevenhagen (2019))

There is a finite and explicit set of primes S , depending only on E , such that if $\ell \notin S$, then $M = K$.

For the other primes:

- There is a finite extension $\tilde{K} \mid K$, depending only on S , such that working over \tilde{K} we have $\tilde{M} = \tilde{K}$
- We have the bound

$$B_\ell(n) \mid \ell^{2c_\ell + 3v_\ell([\tilde{K}:K])}$$

- 1 Split the “failure of maximality” in ℓ -adic and adelic failures

Proof idea - summary

- ① Split the “failure of maximality” in ℓ -adic and adelic failures
- ② For most primes things are nice and $A_\ell = B_\ell = 1$
(direct application of older results)

- ① Split the “failure of maximality” in ℓ -adic and adelic failures
- ② For most primes things are nice and $A_\ell = B_\ell = 1$
(direct application of older results)
- ③ For the other primes, things don't go too bad
(some extra work to do)

Theorem

Assume that $\text{End}_K(E) = \mathbb{Z}$. There is an explicit constant C , depending only on P and on the torsion Galois representations associated with E such that

$$\frac{n^2}{[K(n^{-1}P) : K(E[n])]} \quad \text{divides} \quad C$$

for all $n \geq 1$.

Thank you for your attention!