

### Predicting the Sieving Effort for theNumber Field Sieve

Willemien EkkelkampCWI, Amsterdam & UL, Leiden



### **Overview**

- **C** Aim of the method
- **C** Number Field Sieve (summary)
- Technical details of the method $\bullet$
- **Examples**



# Goal

- Predict the number of relations needed for factoring <sup>a</sup> given $\bullet$ number  $N$  in practice.
- In practice  $:=$  for a given implementation and for a given  $\bullet$ choice of the parameters in the NFS.
- The prediction should not be based on the number of relations used for factoring <sup>a</sup> number of comparable size.



- Polynomial selection $\bullet$ 
	- $f_1(m) \equiv f_2(m) \equiv 0 \text{(mod } N)$ .
		- $f_1(x)$ : linear polynomial (rational side).
		- $f_2(x)$ : higher degree polynomial (algebraic side).
	- SNFS / GNFS



#### **Sieving**

- Choose a factorbase bound  $(F)$  and a large prime bound  $(L).$
- Locate pairs  $(a, b)$  such that  $\gcd(a, b) = 1$  and such that  $b^{\deg(f_1)}f_1(a/b)$  and  $b^{\deg(f_2)}f_2(a/b)$  both have all their prime factors below  $F$  or at most two prime factors<br>between  $F$  and  $I$  (se salled large primes) between  $F$  and  $L$  (so-called large primes).
- **Line sieving / lattice sieving.**



#### **C** Linear algebra

- Singleton removal.
- **•** Find a set of relations such that the product on both the rational and algebraic side is <sup>a</sup> square.



- **C** Linear algebra
	- **Singleton removal.**
	- Find <sup>a</sup> set of relations such that the product on both therational and algebraic side is <sup>a</sup> square.
- **Square root** 
	- Find the square root of the two products.
	- Factor the number; in case of <sup>a</sup> trivial factorization: continue with the next set.



## Outline of the method

- **Short sieving test.**
- Analysis of the relations from this test.
- Simulate relations (fast):
	- Functions that approximate the underlying distribution of the large primes.
	- Random number generator.
- Remove singletons.
- Stop simulating relations as soon as the number of relations after singleton removal exceeds the number of primes in therelations.



### Short sieving test

- Representative selection.  $\bullet$
- Sieving points should be spread over the entire sieving area.  $\bullet$
- Takes about ten minutes for a 120-digit  $N.$  (explained later)



- line sieving / lattice sieving $\bullet$
- Divide relations into nine sets, based on the number of largeprimes:  $r_ia_j$  for  $i,j\in{0,1,2}.$
- The mutual ratios of their cardinalities determine the ratiosby which we will simulate the relations.



 $r_0a_0$ 

- Count the number of relations in this set.
- $r_1a_0$ 
	- **To avoid expensive prime tests, switch to indices of** primes  $(i_p=\pi(p))$ :
		- look-up table,
		- approximation  $\it i$  $i_p \approx \frac{p}{\log p}$  $+~\frac{p}{\log^2}$  $\mathop{^-} p$  $\, + \,$ 2 $\frac{2p}{\log^3 p}$ . (Panaitopel, 2000)









- $G(x)$  $=i_F-a\log(1$ \_\_\_  $x(1$  $-\;e$  $^i\,F$  $-\,i\,L$  $\boldsymbol{a}$  $(\frac{u}{a})\big), 0 \leq x \leq 1$ 
	- $\sim$  $G(x)$  is the inverse of an exponential distribution function, which approximates the line of data.
	- Result after singleton removal was satisfactory.  $\bullet$



- $r_0a_1$ 
	- Algebraic primes: not all primes can occur, each primethat does occur can have up to  $\deg(f_2)$  different roots.
	- Heuristically the amount of pairs  $\left( prime, root \right)$  with  $F is about equal to the amount of primes<br>between  $E$  and  $I$$ between  $F$  and  $L$ .
	- Same approach as for  $r_1a_0.$



 $r_0a_1$ 





- $r_1a_1$ 
	- **The value of the index on the rational side is assumed to**  be independent of the value of the index on the algebraicside.
	- Combine the approaches of  $r_1a_0$  $_0$  and  $r_0a_1.$



- $r_1a_1$ 
	- The value of the index on the rational side is assumed to be independent of the value of the index on the algebraicside.
	- Combine the approaches of  $r_1a_0$  $_0$  and  $r_0a_1.$
- $r_2a_0$ 
	- Two rational primes  $q_1$  $q_1$  and  $q_2$ ,  $q_1>q_2$ .
	- Observation  $q_1$ : linear distribution.  $\bullet$



 $r_2a_0$ ,  $q_1$ 



 $H_1(x)$  $=i_F+x(i_L-i_F)$ 

> $\bullet$   $H_1(x)$  approximates the inverse of the line of observation.



- $r_2a_0$ ,  $q_2$ 
	- **Exponential distribution.**
	- Average value; based on  $q_2$ -indices <  $q_1.$
	- List of averages  $a_{q_2}$ , where  $a_{q_2}[j]$  contains the average of the first  $j\ q_2$ -indices.

• 
$$
H_2(x) = i_F - a_{q_2}[j] \log(1 - x(1 - e^{\frac{i_F - i_L}{a_{q_2}[j]}}))
$$



 $r_2a_0$ ,  $q_2$ 

First compute  $q_1$ , look up which average value to use  $\bullet$ and compute  $q_2.$ 





 $r_0a_2$ 

- Same approach as used for  $r_2a_0$ .
- $r_1a_2$ 
	- $r_1a_0, \, r_0a_2$
- $r_2a_1$ 
	- $r_2a_0$ ,  $r_0a_1$
- $r_2a_2$ 
	- $r_2a_0$ ,  $r_0a_2$





- Sieve test: average number of relations per pair  $(special \ prime, root).$
- Total number of relations to simulate.



- Sieve test: average number of relations per pair  $(special \ prime, root).$
- Total number of relations to simulate.
- **Select an appropriate interval.**
- Divide this interval in <sup>a</sup> (small) number of sections.



- Sieve test: average number of relations per pair  $(special \ prime, root).$
- Total number of relations to simulate.
- **Select an appropriate interval.**
- Divide this interval in <sup>a</sup> (small) number of sections.
- **Per section select randomly the special primes.**



Same model, add <sup>a</sup> special prime to each relation as follows:

- Sieve test: average number of relations per pair  $(special \ prime, root).$
- Total number of relations to simulate.
- Select an appropriate interval.
- Divide this interval in <sup>a</sup> (small) number of sections.
- **Per section select randomly the special primes.**

This covers the entire interval of special primes, but leavesenough variation in the amount of relations per special prime.



- Goal: find dependencies in <sup>a</sup> matrix.  $\bullet$
- **Stop criterion: the number of relations after singleton**  removal exceeds the number of different primes that occurin the remaining relations.



- Goal: find dependencies in <sup>a</sup> matrix.
- Stop criterion: the number of relations after singleton removal exceeds the number of different primes that occurin the remaining relations.

**Oversquares** 
$$
O_r := \frac{n_r}{n_l + n_F - n_f} \times 100\%
$$
,

- $n_r\!\!:$  number of relations after singleton removal,
- $n_l\colon$  number of different large primes after singleton removal,
- $n_F$ : number of primes in the factorbase  $(\pi(F_{rat}) + \pi(F_{alg})),$
- $n_f\colon$  number of free relations from factorbase elements  $(\frac{1}{g}\pi(\min(F_{rat},F_{alg})).$



- Possible choices for  $O_r$   $(100\,\% ,\,102\,\%)$ .  $\bullet$
- To minimize the resulting matrix,  $O_{r}$  should be larger.



- Possible choices for  $O_r$   $(100\,\% ,\,102\,\%)$ .
- To minimize the resulting matrix,  $O_{r}$  should be larger.
- Lattice sieving / duplicates.
	- Act as if there are no duplicates.
	- Add a certain percentage to the number of necessary relations (Aoki, Franke, Kleinjung, Lenstra, Osvik, 2007).
	- Basic idea: run <sup>a</sup> sieve test and find out which relationshave more than one prime in the special primes interval.
	- If such a relation would be found by more than one lattice, than this gives <sup>a</sup> duplicate relation.



### Experiments

- Type 1: the complete data set for factoring  $N$  is known,<br>aimulate the same number of relations beseed an 0.1  $\%$ simulate the same number of relations based on  $0.1\,\%$  of<br>the relations the relations.
- Type 2: assume only  $0.1\,\%$  is given; simulate relations until  $\alpha \, > \,$  100  $\%$  $O_r \ge 100\,\%$ .



### Experiments

- Type 1: the complete data set for factoring  $N$  is known,<br>aimulate the same number of relations beseed an 0.1  $\%$ simulate the same number of relations based on  $0.1\,\%$  of<br>the relations the relations.
- Type 2: assume only  $0.1\,\%$  is given; simulate relations until  $\alpha \, > \,$  100  $\%$  $O_r \ge 100\,\%$ .
- $0.1\,\%$ ?
	- We started experiments based on  $100\,\%$  data and<br>lowered the percentage until the result after single lowered the percentage until the result after singletonremoval was too far from the real data.
	- In some cases we could go to  $0.01\%$  and still get good<br>results results.
	- Better solution is probably based on using the law of large numbers (work in progress).



#### **C** Parameters





#### **Parameters**



#### **C** Type 1 experiment





#### **C** Timings





#### **Timings**  $\bullet$



#### **C** Type 2 experiment





#### **C** Parameters





#### **Parameters**



#### **C** Type 1 experiment





#### **C** Timings





#### **Timings**  $\bullet$



#### **C** Type 2 experiments





# Experiments: 7,333- (lattice sieving)

#### Parameters $\bullet$





# Experiments: 7,333- (lattice sieving)

#### **C** Experiments





## Implementation

- **CWI line siever**
- Bruce Dodson (lattice sieving) $\bullet$
- Thorsten Kleinjung (lattice sieving) $\bullet$



### Conclusions / future work

- By specifying a model for the large primes in the relations, we can simulate relations efficiently.
- Experiments show that what we find with our simulation andsingleton removal, agrees within  $2\,\%$  with real sieving data.



### Conclusions / future work

- By specifying a model for the large primes in the relations, we can simulate relations efficiently.
- Experiments show that what we find with our simulation andsingleton removal, agrees within  $2\,\%$  with real sieving data.
- Find the correct model for the lattice sieve data sets of Kleinjung.
- **C** Find a theoretical explanation for the occurrence of the various distributions.
- What is the optimal oversquareness for minimizing theresulting matrix.