FAST COMPUTATION OF ISOMORPHISMS OF HYPERELLIPTIC CURVES AND EXPLICIT GALOIS DESCENT

REYNALD LERCIER, CHRISTOPHE RITZENTHALER, AND JEROEN SIJSLING

Abstract. We show how to speed up the computation of isomorphisms of hyperelliptic curves by using covariants. We also obtain new theoretical and practical results concerning models of these curves over their field of moduli.

Introduction

Let X_1 and X_2 be two curves of genus $g \geq 2$ over a field k. We wish to quickly determine the (possibly empty) set of isomorphisms between them. The standard strategy mainly consists in interpolating the isomorphisms at Weierstrass or small degree places, depending on whether the characteristic of the field is zero or positive [13]. This yields algorithms of complexity at least $O(g^6)$ in general, and still at least $O(g^2)$ in very favorable cases.

In this article we restrict to hyperelliptic curves with equations $\mathsf{X}_i : y^2 = f_i(x)$ over a field k of characteristic different from 2. The issue can then be rephrased in terms of isomorphisms of degree $2g+2$ polynomials under the Möbius action of $\mathrm{GL}_2(k)$ (see Section 1.5.1). Our first contribution is to show how to compute the set of isomorphisms in a much faster way by combining two new ideas. The first one uses the factorization of the Möbius action into a diagonal matrix times a second matrix whose diagonal coefficients are equal to 1. It allows to perform the computation of the isomorphisms with only univariate polynomial calculations (see Section 1.2). The second idea relies on a classical generalization of invariants, called covariants (see Section 1.3). Using them, we can reduce our search for an isomorphism between f_1 and f_2 to the search of an isomorphism between polynomials of lower degree. This gives us an algorithm for generic hyperelliptic curves of quasi-linear complexity in g (see Section 1.4). In the genus 2 and 3 cases, we analyze the small locus of curves where our strategy fails (see Section 1.5.2). The use of covariants was inspired by [27], where one applies covariants along with a miraculous isomorphism from representation theory to generically reduce the isomorphism question for ternary quartics to that for binary quartics.

In a related direction, thanks to covariants, we get both theoretical and practical results on Galois descent of hyperelliptic curves over their field of moduli. As the terminology suggests, this issue is related with moduli spaces, namely as follows.

The use of invariants allows the construction of the coarse moduli space of smooth curves admitting a suitable representation (*e.g.* hyperelliptic or planar) as a geometric quotient in the sense of Mumford [22]. Such quotients have been calculated explicitly for instance for genus 2 and genus 3 hyperelliptic curves, see [16, 26].

Date: May 16, 2012.

The authors acknowledge support by grant ANR-09-BLAN-0020-01.

Given a field k, the k-points of these quotients correspond to curves whose field of moduli, in the sense of Definition 2.1, equals k (up to a possible purely inseparable extension). This statement is probably well-known but we could not find it in the literature; therefore, the link between these two definitions is given in Section 2.

A natural question is when a curve descends to its field of moduli, that is, when its field of moduli is also a field of definition (and hence the smallest field possible under inclusion). This is not always the case and counterexamples were constructed by Shimura [25] and Earle [9] among others. However, for curves of genus at most 1 this is always the case and a model over the field of moduli can be explicitly constructed. Moreover, in the genus 2 case, although an obstruction to the descent may exist, as shown in [21] and [4], the question of explicit descent to the field of moduli is solved. One of our aims is to obtain similar results in the general hyperelliptic case.

Many theoretical results for the general case can be found in [15]. In practice, though, computing an explicit model of a given curve over its field of moduli can be a very hard task, as explained in Section 2.2.1. Indeed, if for a given *finite* Galois extension, Weil's criterion in [29] often leads to a computational answer, the main difficulty in our context is to work out the finite Galois extension over which a descent isomorphism is defined. As far as we know, there is no easy general way to find it, except when k is finite or when the geometric automorphism group is trivial. Moreover, there is a refinement of the descent question for hyperelliptic curves, namely to ask for a descent to a model of the form $y^2 = f(x)$, which introduces additional difficulties.

The 'magic' of the covariant method is to reduce this problem to lower genus, where a solution may be easier to determine (Theorem 2.8). In genus 1 case, for example, there is always an explicit model over the field of moduli and we can quickly determine a descent isomorphism to this model thanks to the first part of our work. It turns out that in suitable cases, this descent induces a descent of the original hyperelliptic curve to its field of moduli.

We illustrate this descent to the field of moduli for genus 3 hyperelliptic curves with automorphism group $(\mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z})^3$, a case which remained unsolved in [20], see Section 2.3.1. We also look at the case with automorphism group $(\mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z})^2$ for which the field of moduli is not always a field of definition and we prove that we can always find a model over an at most quadratic extension of this field. Finally in Section 2.4, we show that our method can be used to descend families of curves with the example of a dimension 3 family of genus 5 hyperelliptic curves from [10].

We stress that we are merely beginning to exploit the full strength of these new ideas. An article on non-hyperelliptic curves is in progress. We are also developing a general version of Van Rijnswou's algorithms that is much more effective over finite fields and number fields. Finally, we seek to obtain new theoretical and practical descent results by analyzing the influence of twists on covariants.

Notations. In the following, k denotes a field of characteristic p (prime or 0) with algebraic closure K. Hyperelliptic curves are additionally assumed to be smooth, so that when a singular affine model of a curve is given, we actually consider its desingularization. Unless noted otherwise, (iso)morphisms are defined over the base field k. We use the following notation for groups: $\mathbf{C}_n = \mathbb{Z}/n\mathbb{Z}$; $\mathbf{D}_{2n}$ is the dihedral group with $2n$ elements; $\mathbf{U}_6$ is the group with 24 elements defined by $\langle S, T\rangle$ with $S^{12} = T^2 = 1$ and $TST = S^5$; $\mathbf{V}_8$ is the group with 32 elements defined by $\langle S, T\rangle$

with $S^4 = T^8 = (ST)^2 = (S^{-1}T)^2 = 1$; $\mathbf{S}_n$ is the symmetric group over n symbols. Finally, for two 'objects' (polynomials, matrices, etc.) f_1, f_2 over a field k, we will denote $f_1 \sim f_2$ if there exists $\lambda \in k^*$ such that $f_1 = \lambda \cdot f_2$.

1. Isomorphisms between forms and hyperelliptic curves

1.1. **Isomorphisms of binary forms.** Let $n \geq 1$ be an integer, let $V = k^2$ be the k-vector space with basis (x, z) and let $S^n(V)$ be the $(n+1)$-dimensional vector space of homogeneous forms $\sum_{i=0}^{n} a_i x^i z^{n-i}$ of degree n in (x, z). In the sequel, we call an element of $S^n(V)$ a *(binary) form*. When $n = 0$, we let $S^0(V) = k$. Let $G \subset \mathrm{GL}_2(k)$ and let $M \in G$. If a form $f \in S^n(V)$ then $M.f$ is defined by $(M.f)(x, z) = f(M^{-1}(x, z))$, where the action of a matrix on (x, z) is the standard action on ${}^t(x, z)$.

Definition 1.1. Let f_1, f_2 be forms of degree $n \geq 1$ over a field k. We denote $\mathrm{Isom}(f_1, f_2) \subset \mathrm{PGL}_2(k)$ the set of matrices M such that $M.f_1 \sim f_2$. Additionally, we denote $\mathrm{Aut}(f_1) = \mathrm{Isom}(f_1, f_1)$.

If $\mathrm{Isom}(f_1, f_2) \neq \emptyset$, this set is a homogeneous space over $\mathrm{Aut}(f_1)$. In particular $\mathrm{Isom}(f_1, f_2) = M\,\mathrm{Aut}(f_1)$ for any $M \in \mathrm{Isom}(f_1, f_2)$.
Let f be a form of degree n over k. Over K, we can write $f = \prod_{i=1}^{s} (\alpha_i x - \beta_i z)^{n_i}$ where $(\alpha_i, \beta_i) \in K^2 \setminus \{(0,0)\}$ and $n_i \in \mathbb{N}$. We associate to such a form its square-free part $\tilde{f} = \prod_{i=1}^{s} (\alpha_i x - \beta_i z)$, which is defined up to a multiplicative constant. The action of M on f reflects the classical Möbius action of $\mathrm{PGL}_2(K)$ on the roots $(\alpha_i : \beta_i) \in \mathbb{P}^1_K$ of f. In particular, two forms of the same degree are K-isomorphic if and only if there exists an $M \in \mathrm{GL}_2(K)$ mapping the roots of the first form to the roots of the second form (counting multiplicities). Hence

Lemma 1.2. *$\mathrm{Aut}_K(f)$ is finite if and only if $s \geq 3$, i.e. $\deg(\tilde{f}) \geq 3$. Moreover $\mathrm{Aut}_K(f) \subset \mathrm{Aut}_K(\tilde{f})$.*

1.2. **The direct approach.** The classical method to compute isomorphisms between two binary forms f_1, f_2 of degree n over a field k is to find a $\mathrm{PGL}_2(k)$-transformation of $\mathbb{P}^1$ which maps the roots of the first form to the root of the second form. The most time-consuming task is to compute an isomorphism between the splitting fields defined by f_1 and f_2. Even in the most favorable case, that is, a finite field k, the fastest algorithms need at least $O(n^{2,5+o(1)})$ operations in k (see [17])).

We show here that it is actually possible to get rid of this cumbersome ring isomorphism computation, and describe an algorithm of time complexity only quasi-linear in n. This algorithm takes as input $f_1 = \sum_i A_i x^i z^{n-i}$ and $f_2 = \sum_i B_i x^i z^{n-i}$ of equal degree $n \geq 3$ and with at least three distinct roots. It returns matrices representing the elements of $\mathrm{Isom}(f_1, f_2)$.

Firstly, we suppose that A_{n-1} is equal to zero. Note that this is typically not a big restriction, since we may apply linear transformations to f_1. A notable exception is when p divides n. We therefore assume that p is prime to n.

Secondly, determining $\mathrm{Isom}(f_1, f_2)$ is equivalent to determining the matrices $M = (m_{i,j}) \in \mathrm{GL}_2(k)$ such that

$$f_2(m_{11}\,x + m_{12}\,z, m_{21}\,x + m_{22}\,z) = \lambda f_1(x, z) \text{ for some } \lambda \in k^*\,. \tag{1}$$

Thirdly, because of homogeneity, we may suppose that the λ in (1) equals 1 after enlarging k by a radical extension if necessary. Note that though this radical

extension is *a priori* unknown, the details of the algorithm below will show how it can be determined.

Finally, we may suppose that the M in (1) are of the form $M = \left[\begin{smallmatrix} 1/\alpha & \beta/\delta \\ \gamma/\alpha & 1/\delta \end{smallmatrix}\right]$. Of course this may not be true, because a zero may occur on the diagonal of one of these M. However, one can fix this situation by applying a suitable change of variables to f_2.

The equation $f_2(m_{11}\,x + m_{12}\,z, m_{21}\,x + m_{22}\,z) = f_1(x,z)$ now becomes

$$f_2(x + \beta z, \gamma x + z) = f_1(\alpha\, x, \delta z)\,. \tag{2}$$

Equating the coefficients of x^n in both sides of this equation yields $A_n\,\alpha^n = f_2(1,\gamma)\,,$ and we can write α^n in terms of γ. Similarly, the equality of the coefficients of $x^{n-1}\,z$,

$$\beta\,\frac{\partial f_2}{\partial x}(1,\gamma) + \frac{\partial f_2}{\partial z}(1,\gamma) \;= 0$$

enables us to write β in term of γ too. More generally, equating the coefficients of $x^{n-i}\,z^i$, $i = 2,\ldots,n$, where we substitute α^n and β in term of γ yields $n-1$ equations of the form

$$A_n \left(\sum_{j=0}^{i} \binom{i}{j} \left(-\frac{\partial f_2}{\partial z}\right)^j \left(\frac{\partial f_2}{\partial x}\right)^{i-j} \frac{\partial^i f_2}{\partial x^j \partial z^{i-j}} \right)(1,\gamma) = i\,! \left(\frac{\partial f_2}{\partial x}(1,\gamma)\right)^i \left(\frac{\delta}{\alpha}\right)^i f_2(1,\gamma)\,. \tag{3}$$

Note that the left hand side of (3) is actually a polynomial multiple of $f_2(x,z)$ and we can divide both sides by f_2 (see [12, chapter 1, § 15-16] for an elegant explanation). This yields equations of degree $i\,(n-1)$ in γ and of degree i in δ/α.

Now, dividing the square of (3) specialized at $i = 3$ by the cube of (3) specialized at $i = 2$ allows to eliminate the unknown δ/α. We end up with a polynomial of degree $6(n-2)$ in γ. Similarly, when $n > 3$, dividing (3) specialized at $i = 4$ by the square of (3) specialized at $i = 2$ yields a polynomial of degree $4\,(n-2)$ in γ. Taking the gcd, we obtain a polynomial of low degree with root γ. Generically, this gcd is of degree 1.

Under the assumptions made, the algorithm is therefore straightforward. For each possible γ, we compute α, β and δ and check whether the resulting matrix is in $\mathrm{Isom}(f_1, f_2)$.

The computations involved in this algorithm (taking gcds of polynomials of degree $O(n)$, taking nth roots, *etc.*) are all of time complexity quasi-linear in n.

We have implemented the algorithm in MAGMA V2.18-2 and have timed the resulting procedure, `IsGL2EquivFast`, on a laptop (based on a INTEL CORE I7 M620 2.67GHz processor) for irreducible forms of increasing degree, the most favorable case for the native MAGMA routine `IsGL2Equivalent`. We compare with `IsGL2Equivalent`, which implements the classical method, first over the finite field $\mathbb{F}_{10007}$, then over the rationals with coefficients bounded by ± 2. The results are in Table 1; entries '-' stand for computations aborted after 1 hour (see Section 1.4 for the definition of `IsGL2EquivCovariant`).

As concluding remarks, we note first of all that this algorithm is just as suitable for determining K-isomorphisms. Moreover, in the special case of binary quartics, it is just as efficient as the algorithm given in [5].

1.3. **The covariant approach.** Let k be an infinite field of characteristic p and $n > 1$ be an integer.

Field	Method	g										
		1	2	4	8	16	32	64	128	256	512	1024
$\mathbb{F}_{10007}$	`IsGL2Equivalent`	0	0	0	0	0.1	0.2	0.9	6.5	39	242	1560
	`IsGL2EquivFast`	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.1	0.6	3.7	25	165
	`IsGL2EquivCovariant`	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.1	0.5	2.5
$\mathbb{Q}$	`IsGL2Equivalent`	0	0	0.4	15	1150	-	-	-	-	-	-
	`IsGL2EquivFast`	0	0	0	0	0.1	0.2	0.6	3	30	382	5850
	`IsGL2EquivCovariant`	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.2	0.6	3.4	7

TABLE 1. Timings for isomorphisms between forms of degree $2g+2$ (seconds)

Definition 1.3. Let $r \geq 0$ be an integer. A homogeneous polynomial function $C : S^n(V) \to S^r(V)$ of degree d is a *covariant* if there exists $\omega \in \mathbb{Z}$ such that for all $M \in G$ and all $f \in S^n(V)$, we have

$$C(M.f) = \det(M)^{-\omega} \cdot M.C(f)\,.$$

When $r = 0$, such a C is called a (relative) *invariant* and denoted by I.

The integer r is called the *order* of a covariant. If $nd-r$ is odd, then a covariant is necessarily zero. Otherwise the integer ω is unique and called the *weight*. It is equal to $(nd-r)/2$. In the sequel, we often identify C with $C(f)$ for a general form $f \in F(a_0,\ldots,a_n)[x,z]$ where F is the prime field of k. For instance, the identity function $S^n(V) \to S^n(V)$ is a covariant of degree 1 and of order n that we identify with f itself.

Remark 1.4. The determinant factor prevents to add covariants of different weights when $G = \mathrm{GL}_2(K)$. Hence one generally studies the graded algebra $\mathcal{C}_n$ of covariants and $\mathcal{I}_n$ of invariants under the action of $\mathrm{SL}_2(K)$. It is easy to see that the homogeneous elements of $\mathcal{C}_n$ and $\mathcal{I}_n$ actually are all the covariants or invariants under the action of $\mathrm{GL}_2(K)$. Despite this ambiguity, in the rest of the article we work with $G = \mathrm{GL}_2(K)$ instead of $\mathrm{SL}_2(K)$ because, in practice, it can avoid a quadratic extension of k when looking for an isomorphism M between two forms.

There is a large literature on how to generate invariants and covariants starting from f. Gordan's algorithm [11] allows to find a set of generators for the algebras $\mathcal{C}_n$ and $\mathcal{I}_n$ thanks to the use of differential operators, called *h-transvectants* and defined as follows. Given two covariants C_1, C_2 of degree d_1, d_2 and of order r_1, r_2 and $h \geq 1$ an integer, we can create a new covariant, denoted $(C_1, C_2)_h$ usually defined as [23, p. 88]

$$\frac{(r_1-h)!\,(r_2-h)!}{r_1!\,r_2!} \sum_{i=0}^{h} (-1)^i \binom{h}{i} \frac{\partial^h C_1}{\partial x^{h-i}\partial z^i} \frac{\partial^h C_2}{\partial x^i \partial z^{h-i}}\,.$$

In practice, we use the univariate counterpart. Looking at C_1, C_2 has univariate polynomials in x/z, we get [23, Th.5.6]

$$h!\,\frac{(r_1-h)!\,(r_2-h)!}{r_1!\,r_2!} \sum_{i=0}^{h} (-1)^i \binom{r_1-i}{h-i} \binom{r_2-h+i}{i} \frac{d^{h-i}C_1}{dx^{h-i}} \frac{d^i C_2}{dx^i}. \qquad (4)$$

Effective computations of sets of generators when $K = \mathbb{C}$ have been worked out for n up to 10 (see [7, 28, 8, 1, 26, 6, 3, 2]). It has been shown that these computations are still valid for $g = 2$ if $p \neq 2, 3, 5$ [19] and for $g = 3$ if $p \neq 2, 3, 5, 7$ [20] when

replacing $\mathbb{C}$ by an algebraically closed field K of characteristic p.

Our second idea to compute isomorphisms between forms of a given degree is to reduce the question to smaller degree by using covariants. Indeed, the following genuine observation is a simple consequence of the definition itself.

Proposition 1.5. *Let f_1, f_2 be forms of even degree n over a field k. Let C be a covariant of order r for binary forms of degree n, defined over the prime field of k and $c_i = C(f_i) \in S^r(V)$. Then* $\mathrm{Isom}(f_1, f_2) \subset \mathrm{Isom}(c_1, c_2)$.

We illustrate this idea and study its limits with the computation of isomorphisms for forms and hyperelliptic curves in Sections 1.4 and 1.5. As we want c_i of the smallest degree possible and $\mathrm{Isom}(c_1, c_2)$ finite, we want that $\deg(\tilde{c}_i) \geq 3$. Actually, in the sequel, we mostly deal with forms of even degree and hence non-zero covariants are of even order, the smallest degree is then 4.

Consider a binary quartic $q = a_4x^4 + a_3x^3z + a_2x^2z^2 + a_1xz^3 + a_0z^4$ over k with $p \neq 2, 3$. Then we define

$$\begin{aligned} I = I(q) =& 12a_4a_0 - 3a_3a_1 + a_2^2, \\ J = J(q) =& 72a_4a_2a_0 + 9a_3a_2a_1 - 27a_4a_1^2 - 27a_0a_3^2 - 2a_2^3, \end{aligned} \tag{5}$$

as in [5]. The form q has distinct roots if and only if $\Delta = 4I^3 - J^2 \neq 0$. Given $I, J \in K$ such that $\Delta \neq 0$, one can easily reconstruct a form with at least three distinct roots which is K-isomorphic to q. We can take

$$q = x^3z - 27I^3/J^2\ xz^3 - 27I^3/J^2\ z^4 \ \text{ if } \ J \neq 0 \ \text{ and } \ q = x^3z + xz^3 \ \text{ otherwise.} \tag{6}$$

Concerning the geometric automorphisms of binary quartics, we have the following easy result for which we could not find a reference.

Proposition 1.6. *Let q be a binary quartic form with invariants I, J over K. Suppose that $\Delta \neq 0$. Then*

$$\mathrm{Aut}(q) \cong \begin{cases} \mathbf{A}_4 & \text{if } I = 0, \\ \mathbf{D}_8 & \text{if } J = 0, \\ \mathbf{D}_4 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \tag{7}$$

Proof. Let $\Lambda \subset \mathbb{P}^1(K)$ be the set of four roots of q. Using the 3-transitivity of the action of $\mathrm{PGL}_2(K)$ on $\mathbb{P}^1(K)$, we may assume that $\Lambda = \{0, 1, \infty, \lambda\}$ for some $\lambda \in K \backslash \{0, 1\}$. Then the transformation $x \mapsto \lambda/x$ induces the permutation $(0\infty)(1\lambda)$ of Λ. By symmetry, we see that $\mathrm{Stab}(\Lambda) \subset \mathrm{Sym}(\Lambda)$ contains the Viergruppe $\mathbf{D}_4 \subset \mathrm{Sym}(\Lambda)$.

We are reduced to analyzing when $\mathrm{Stab}(\Lambda)$ properly contains $\mathbf{D}_4$. Since the extension $1 \to \mathbf{D}_4 \to \mathbf{S}_4 \to \mathbf{S}_3 \to 1$ is split and all subgroups of $\mathbf{S}_3$ of equal order are conjugate, this is in turn equivalent to determining when $\mathrm{Stab}(\Lambda)$ contains an additional given two- or three-cycle. These cases give rise to the exceptional groups in (7) or order 8 and 12.

First let us see for which λ the permutation (1λ) is in $\mathrm{Stab}(\Lambda)$. In this case, the fractional linear transformation fixes 0 and ∞ and is therefore of the form $x \mapsto cx$. This only gives a new automorphism if $c = -1$, so $\lambda = -1$ and $J = 0$.

In the case where the permutation (01λ) is in $\mathrm{Stab}(\Lambda)$, a slightly more involved calculation gives that $\lambda = \zeta_3 + 1$ for a primitive third root of unity ζ_3, and in that case $I = 0$. □

We will also need in the sequel the following result.

Proposition 1.7. *Let q be a binary quartic form defined over k with distinct roots and let $\mathfrak{q}$ be the form defined by (6). Assume that $I(q) \neq 0$ and $J(q) \neq 0$. Then a K-isomorphism between q and $\mathfrak{q} = z(x^3+b_1xz^2+b_0z^3)$ is defined over any extension of k where q has a root.*

Proof. Let k' be an extension of k where q has a root. By a change of variable defined over k', we can map this root on infinity and hence q onto $q' = zr$ where $r = x^3 + a_1xz^2 + a_0z^3 \in k'[x, z]$. Now since

$$I(q') = -a_1/4, J(q') = -a_0/16, I(\mathfrak{q}) = -b_1/4, J(\mathfrak{q}) = -b_0/16,$$

we get the relation $a_1^3/a_0^2 = b_1^3/b_0^2$. Hence if we define $\lambda = \frac{J(q')I(\mathfrak{q})}{J(\mathfrak{q})I(q')} \in k'$, the k'-isomorphism $M : (x, z) \mapsto (\lambda x, z)$ maps q' onto $\mathfrak{q}$.

□

1.4. **Generic forms of even degree.** We now describe an algorithm that is based on the ideas of Sections 1.2 and 1.3 to compute the isomorphisms between two generic binary forms f_1 and f_2. Our notation is as in 1.2. The following algorithm, denoted `IsGL2EquivCovariant`, returns the matrices $M = (m_{i,j})_{i,j}$ in $\mathrm{PGL}_2(k)$ such that $M.f_1 \sim f_2$ for two forms f_1 and f_2 of same degree $n \geq 3$.

Order loop: For increasing order o starting from 3 to the bound B_{order} do
Degree loop: For increasing degree d starting from 2 to the bound B_{degree} do
- Compute a random covariant C of order o and degree d using transvectants.
- If $\tilde{C}(f_1)$ is of degree at least 3, then compute $\mathrm{Isom}(\tilde{C}(f_1), \tilde{C}(f_2))$ and return the elements which induce isomorphisms between f_1 and f_2.
- Otherwise, repeat for a fixed number B_{singular} of times the following procedure.
  - Compute a new random covariant C' of order o and degree d using transvectants and replace C by the covariant $C + \kappa C'$ for some random κ in the field k.
  - If $\tilde{C}(f_1)$ is of degree at least 3, then compute $\mathrm{Isom}(\tilde{C}(f_1), \tilde{C}(f_2))$ and return the elements which induce isomorphisms between f_1 and f_2.

Failure: Return the result of `IsGL2EquivFast`(f_1, f_2).

For the purpose of computing random covariants, we follow Gordan [11]. Given an order o and a degree d, we construct recursively a covariant $C = (\prod C_{d',o'},\ f)_h$ as a transvectant of some level h of the form f and a product of covariants of intermediate orders o' and degrees d', under the two constraints $d = \sum d'$ and $o = n + \sum o' - 2\,h$.

When n is even, the transvectant of smallest order and degree is $C_{2,4} = (f, f)_{n-2}$. The next simplest transvectant is $C_{3,4} = ((f, f)_{n/2}, f)_{n-2}$, of order 4 and degree 3. For large orders and degrees, covariants must be computed 'on the fly', specialized for f_1 and f_2, since expressions are far too large to be precomputed.

So as to completely specify the algorithm, we have to be more precise about how to compute covariants and how to choose the loop bounds B_{order}, B_{degree} and B_{singular}. A straightforward choice for the loop bounds is $B_{\text{order}} = 4$, $B_{\text{degree}} = 2$ and $B_{\text{singular}} = 0$. With this choice, only the covariant $C_{2,4} = (f, f)_{n-2}$ is tested for

n even and when it turns out that the discriminant of this covariant vanishes, we go back to the method `IsGL2EquivFast`. First note that the covariant $(f,f)_{n-2}$ can be easily computed. Let $c_4\,x^4+c_3\,x^3\,z+c_2\,x^2\,z^2+c_1\,x\,z^3+c_0\,z^4$ denote $\frac{(n!)^2}{(n-2)!}(f,f)_{n-2}$, we have using (4),

$$\begin{array}{rcl}
c_0 & = & \sum_{k=0}^{n-2}(-1)^k\,(n-k)!\,(k+2)!\,a_{n-2-k}\,a_k\\
c_1 & = & \sum_{k=0}^{n-2}(-1)^k\,(n-k)!\,(k+2)!\,((n-1-k)\,a_{n-1-k}\,a_k+(k+1)\,a_{n-2-k}\,a_{k+1})\,,\\
c_2 & = & \frac{1}{2}\sum_{k=0}^{n-2}(-1)^k\,(n-k)!\,(k+2)!\,(\quad(k+2)\,(k+1)\,a_{k+2}\,a_{n-2-k}\\
 & & \qquad\qquad +2\,(n-1-k)\,(k+1)\,a_{k+1}\,a_{n-1-k}\\
 & & \qquad\qquad +(n-k)\,(n-1-k)\,a_k\,a_{n-k}\,)\,,\\
c_3 & = & \sum_{k=0}^{n-2}(-1)^k\,(n-k)!\,(k+2)!\,((n-1-k)\,a_{n-k}\,a_{k+1}+(k+1)\,a_{n-1-k}\,a_{k+2})\,,\\
c_4 & = & \sum_{k=0}^{n-2}(-1)^k\,(n-k)!\,(k+2)!\,a_{n-k}\,a_{k+2}\,.
\end{array}\tag{8}$$

Moreover, this setting is a good option for generic forms as the following proposition shows.

Proposition 1.8. *Let $n\geq 6$ be an even integer and $p\neq 2,3$. Let f be a generic binary form of degree n over k. Then the discriminant of $C_{2,4}(f)$ is non-zero.*

Proof. It is enough to find a single form f of degree n for which $C_{2,4}(f)$ has non-zero discriminant. First let us suppose that p is coprime to $n(n-2)(n-3)(n^2+3n+6)$. We then take $f=x^n+x^{n-1}z-xz^{n-1}-z^n$. Note that this form is in fact non-singular because $f=(x+z)(x^n-z^n)$. We have that

$$C_{2,4}(f)=\frac{4}{n}\cdot x^3z+2\cdot\frac{n^2-n+6}{n^2}\cdot x^2z+\frac{4}{n}\cdot xz^2.$$

This form has discriminant equal to $64(n-3)(n-2)(n^2+3n+6)/n^6$, which is non-zero by hypothesis.

One calculates similarly that for the other values of $p\neq 2,3,5$, one can use the form $x^n+x^{n-1}z+xz^{n-1}-z^n$ instead. Indeed, under these hypotheses on p the numerator of the resulting discriminant $n^4+2n^3+5n^2-12n+36$ is coprime to the previous numerator. To finish the proof, $p=5$ can be excluded using the form $x^n+x^{n-1}z+xz^{n-1}+2z^n$. □

For non-random forms, especially forms of small degree with non-trivial automorphism group, it may be interesting to test other covariants than merely $C_{4,2}$. We then propose the following settings,

$$B_{\text{order}}=\min(8,n),\ B_{\text{degree}}=10\ \text{ and }\ B_{\text{singular}}=10\,.$$

These bounds are constant in order to keep the total time complexity quasi-linear in n. More precisely, the bound B_{order} is chosen to be at most 8 so as to take advantage of the classification work of [20], the bound B_{degree} is chosen to cover all the possible fundamental covariants of degree 8 and with order between 4 and 8 (*cf.* [20, Table 2]), and the bound B_{singular} so as to increase the probability that our covariants, if singular, have distinct points of singularity (so that a linear combination may be non-singular).

Remark 1.9. We may indeed enter the last loop of the algorithm even if the form f has no geometric automorphisms (for instance for the degree 8 form $x^7z+7x^6z^2+7x^5z^3+8x^4z^4+2x^3z^5+10x^2z^6+9xz^7$ over $k=\mathbb{F}_{11}$).

We have programmed the algorithm in MAGMA V2.18-2, on the basis of the first setting. In particular, we have implemented the covariant $C_{4,2}$ using (8), and we

have measured the timings of the resulting procedure, `IsGL2EquivCovariant`, in the same experiments as in Section 1.2. The results are in Table 1. As expected, computing isomorphisms is much faster with the help of covariants, even if the forms are split over k.

1.5. **Application to isomorphisms of hyperelliptic curves.**

1.5.1. *Isomorphisms of forms and of hyperelliptic curves.* A curve X of genus $g \geq 1$ defined over k will be called *hyperelliptic* if X/K allows a separable degree 2 map to $\mathbb{P}^1_K$. The curve X then has a unique involution ι, called the *hyperelliptic involution*, such that $\mathsf{Q} = \mathsf{X}/\langle\iota\rangle$ is of genus 0. This involution is in the center of $\mathrm{Aut}_K(\mathsf{X})$. We call $\overline{\mathrm{Aut}}(\mathsf{X}) = \mathrm{Aut}(\mathsf{X})_K/\langle\iota\rangle$ the *reduced automorphism group* of X.

Let us assume from now on that $p \neq 2$. Then if Q has a rational point, X is birationally equivalent to an affine curve of the form $y^2 = f(x)$ for a separable polynomial f of degree $2g+1$ or $2g+2$. We say that f is a *hyperelliptic polynomial* and that X has a *hyperelliptic equation* if a curve in the isomorphism class of X (over k) can be written in the form above. We denote by X_f such a curve associated to a hyperelliptic polynomial. A hyperelliptic curve automatically has a hyperelliptic equation when k is algebraically closed or a finite field. However, for more general fields and curves of odd genus, this is not necessarily the case (see [20]).

By homogenizing to weighted projective coordinates of weight $(1, g+1, 1)$, we obtain an equation $y^2 = f(x, z)$. Here f is seen as a form of degree $2g+2$, taking into account a 'root' at infinity when $\deg f = 2g+1$. With this convention, the roots of f are the ramification points of the cover X/Q. We will use these conventions for the roots and degree in the sequel when we speak about a hyperelliptic polynomial or the associated form.

If f_1 and f_2 are hyperelliptic polynomials of even degree $2g+2 \geq 6$, then isomorphisms of hyperelliptic curves $y^2 = f_i(x, z)$ are represented by (M, e) with $M = \begin{bmatrix} a & b \\ c & d \end{bmatrix} \in \mathrm{GL}_2(k)$ and $e \in k^*$. To such a couple, one associates the isomorphism $(x, z, y) \mapsto (ax + bz, cx + dz, ey)$. The representation is unique up to the equivalence $(M, e) \equiv (\lambda M, \lambda^{g+1} e)$ for $\lambda \in k^*$. Hence, if $M.f_1 = \mu \cdot f_2$ then the map

$$\begin{array}{rcl} \mathrm{Isom}(f_1, f_2) & \to & (\mathrm{GL}_2(k) \times K^*)/\equiv, \\ M & \mapsto & (M, \pm\sqrt{\mu}) \end{array}$$

is well-defined up to the choice of a sign. It surjects onto $\mathrm{Isom}(\mathsf{X}_{f_1}, \mathsf{X}_{f_2})$, so knowing $\mathrm{Isom}(f_1, f_2)$ is enough to determine $\mathrm{Isom}(\mathsf{X}_{f_1}, \mathsf{X}_{f_2})$ 'up to the hyperelliptic involution'.

1.5.2. *Hyperelliptic curves of genus* 2 *and* 3. The covariant approach requires a covariant with at least three distinct roots, and hence may fail in special cases, which we can specify for small genera. We give some details on the more difficult of the two cases which is the genus 3 case. This problem is naturally stratified by the possible automorphism groups of the curve, which we give in Figure 1, together with normal models and inclusion relations between the strata. We assume here that $p = 0$ or $p > 7$.

The moduli space of hyperelliptic curves of genus 3 is of dimension 5 and can be explicitly described using the Shioda invariants J_2, J_3, …, J_{10} constructed in [26]. These invariants were used to speed up the calculations leading to the proof of the

$\mathrm{Aut}_K(\mathsf{X}_f)$	$\overline{\mathrm{Aut}}_K(\mathsf{X}_f)$	Normal models $\mathsf{X}_f : y^2 = f(x)$
$\mathbf{C}_2$	$\{1\}$	$x(x-1)(x^5+ax^4+bx^3+cx^2+dx+e)$
$\mathbf{D}_4$	$\mathbf{C}_2$	$\begin{cases} x^8+ax^6+bx^4+cx^2+1 & \text{or} \\ (x^2-1)(x^6+ax^4+bx^2+c) \end{cases}$
$\mathbf{C}_4$	$\mathbf{C}_2$	$x(x^2-1)(x^4+ax^2+b)$
$\mathbf{C}_2^3$	$\mathbf{D}_4$	$(x^4+ax^2+1)(x^4+bx^2+1)$
$\mathbf{C}_2 \times \mathbf{C}_4$	$\mathbf{D}_4$	$\begin{cases} (x^4-1)(x^4+ax^2+1) & \text{or} \\ x(x^2-1)(x^4+ax^2+1) \end{cases}$
$\mathbf{D}_{12}$	$\mathbf{D}_6$	$x(x^6+ax^3+1)$
$\mathbf{C}_2 \times \mathbf{D}_8$	$\mathbf{D}_8$	x^8+ax^4+1
$\mathbf{C}_{14}$	$\mathbf{C}_7$	x^7-1
$\mathbf{U}_6$	$\mathbf{D}_{12}$	$x(x^6-1)$
$\mathbf{V}_8$	$\mathbf{D}_{16}$	x^8-1
$\mathbf{C}_2 \times \mathbf{S}_4$	$\mathbf{S}_4$	x^8+14x^4+1



FIGURE 1. Automorphism groups of genus 3 hyperelliptic curves

following proposition, which shows that the locus where the covariant method fails is of codimension 4 in the full moduli space.[1]

Proposition 1.10. *Let $\mathsf{X}_f/K : y^2 = f(x)$ be a genus 3 hyperelliptic curve such that the form f cancels the discriminants of all its quartic covariants. Then* $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathsf{X}_f)$ *contains either* $\mathbf{D}_{12}$, $\mathbf{C}_2 \times \mathbf{D}_8$ *or* $\mathbf{C}_{14}$.

Proof. Construct $C(f) \pm \kappa \cdot I(f) \cdot C'(f)$ such that $\deg(C) = \deg(I) + \deg(C')$, where C and C' run through the 14 fundamental quartic covariants given in [20, Table 2], where $I(f)$ equals either 1 or a Shioda invariant $J_i(f)$, and where κ runs through the integers between 0 and 10. We rewrite the discriminant of these covariants in terms of Shioda invariants and add to them the five Shioda relations [26, Th. 3, p. 1042]. Using MAGMA, we have been able to compute a Gröbner basis of this polynomial system, over $\mathbb{Q}$, for the graded reverse lexicographical (or 'grevlex') order $J_2 < J_3 < \ldots < J_{10}$ with weights 2, 3, ..., 10. Upon removing multiplicities, we obtain a basis with 22 polynomials, of total degree between 8 and 20. One then checks, using the stratum formulas from [20], that the irreducible components of the corresponding subscheme of the moduli space either correspond to families of forms with discriminant zero or to strata of curves X_f such that $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathsf{X}_f)$ contain $\mathbf{D}_{12}$, $\mathbf{C}_2 \times \mathbf{D}_8$ or $\mathbf{C}_{14}$. □

Hence, curves with automorphism group $\mathbf{D}_{12}$, $\mathbf{C}_2 \times \mathbf{D}_8$ or $\mathbf{C}_{14}$ can not have separable quartic covariants. In these cases, using the normal models and Proposition 1.5, one can show that

- if $\mathrm{Aut}(X)$ is equal to $\mathbf{D}_{12}$ or $\mathbf{U}_6$ then the sextic covariant $C_{3,6} = ((f, f)_4, f)_5$ has non zero discriminant;
- if $\mathrm{Aut}(X)$ contains $\mathbf{C}_2 \times \mathbf{D}_8$ or is equal to $\mathbf{C}_{14}$ then there is no order 4 or 6 covariant with three distinct roots.

The number of covariants considered in the proof of Proposition. 1.10, *i.e.* 1253, is not minimal, but the redundancy helped MAGMA during the Gröbner basis computations. Nevertheless, similar computations show that we can easily reduce this number for curves with automorphism group larger than $\mathbf{C}_2$ (and moreover impose conditions on the automorphism groups of the covariants, *cf.* Sections 2.2.2

[1] We refer to http://iml.univ-mrs.fr/~ritzenth/programme/explicit-descent/isocovgenus3.zip for the MAGMA parts of our proofs till the end of this section.

and 2.3.2). For the following genus 3 hyperelliptic curves over K with given automorphism group, at least one of the following quartic covariants has non-zero discriminant

Case $\mathbf{D}_4$: $C_{2,4} = (f, f)_6$, $C_{3,4} = ((f, f)_4, f)_6$, $C_{4,4} = (((f, f)_4, f)_6, f)_4$, $C'_{4,4} = (((f, f)_4, f)_4, f)_6$ or $C_{5,4} = ((((f, f)_4, f)_6, f)_1, f)_7$;
Case $\mathbf{C}_4$: $C_{2,4}$, $C_{3,4}$, $C_{4,4}$ or $C'_{4,4}$;
Case $\mathbf{C}_2^3$: $C_{2,4}$, $C_{3,4}$ or $C_{4,4}$;
Case $\mathbf{C}_2 \times \mathbf{C}_4$: $C_{3,4}$.

Remark 1.11. Similar conclusions hold for genus 2. Specifically, there is no quartic covariant with non-zero discriminant for the curves X_f/K such that $\mathbf{D}_{12} \subset \mathrm{Aut}(\mathsf{X}_f)$ or $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathsf{X}_f) \simeq \mathbf{C}_{10}$. Moreover, when $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathsf{X}_f) \simeq \mathbf{D}_8$ then $(f, f)_4$ has non-zero discriminant, and when $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathsf{X}_f) \simeq \mathbf{D}_4$ then at least one of $(f, f)_4$, $(((f, f)_2, f)_4, f)_4$ or $((((f, f)_2, f)_3, f)_2, f)_6$ has non-zero discriminant.

2. Explicit descent for hyperelliptic curves

2.1. **Field of moduli and fields of definition.** Let X be a curve defined over K of genus $g \geq 1$, let k be a subfield of K, and let F be the prime field of K.

Definition 2.1. The *field of moduli* of X, denoted $\mathbf{M}_\mathsf{X}$, is the subfield of K fixed by $\{\sigma \in \mathrm{Aut}(K),\ \mathsf{X} \simeq {}^\sigma\mathsf{X}\}$.

We now restrict to hyperelliptic curves and we assume that $p \neq 2$. So let $\mathsf{X} = \mathsf{X}_f$ be a hyperelliptic curve over K given by a hyperelliptic polynomial f of even degree n. Our first task is to show that we can get information on $\mathbf{M}_\mathsf{X}$ through the invariants.

Lemma 2.2. *Let I_1, I_2 be two invariants of the same degree for binary forms of degree n. Assume that I_1, I_2 are defined over F and that $I_2(f) \neq 0$. Then $\iota = I_1(f)/I_2(f) \in \mathbf{M}_{\mathsf{X}_f}$.*

Proof. It is enough to prove that for all $\sigma \in \mathrm{Gal}(K/\mathbf{M}_\mathsf{X})$, $\iota^\sigma = \iota$. By definition of $\mathbf{M}_\mathsf{X}$, there exists an isomorphism between X and ${}^\sigma\mathsf{X}$. We have seen that such an isomorphism induces an element $M \in \mathrm{Isom}(f, f^\sigma)$. Therefore

$$\iota^\sigma = \frac{I_1(f^\sigma)}{I_2(f^\sigma)} = \frac{I_1(\lambda \cdot M.f)}{I_2(\lambda \cdot M.f)} = \iota. \qquad \square$$

It is not always practical to work with a fixed quotient of invariants as above, since $I_2(f)$ may be zero. As shown in [20], it is better to work inside a weighted projective space, for elements of which one can define a canonical representative as follows. Let $(I_1 : \ldots : I_m)$ be a $m \geq 2$-uple of invariants of degree d_i of degree n binary forms, and suppose each I_i is defined over F. Let f be a binary form of degree n. Let d be the gcd of the degree d_i of the invariants I_i which value at f is not zero. Then there exists $c_i \in \mathbb{Z}$ with $c_i = 0$ if $I_i(f) = 0$ such that $\sum c_i d_i = d$. We then define $I = \prod_i I_i^{c_i}$. Then the *canonical representative* of $(I_1(f) : \ldots : I_m(f))$ is

$$(\mathfrak{I}_1(f), \ldots, \mathfrak{I}_m(f)) = \left(\frac{I_1(f)}{I(f)^{d_1/d}}, \ldots, \frac{I_m(f)}{I(f)^{d_m/d}} \right) \in \mathbf{M}_\mathsf{X}^m.$$

Proposition 2.3. *Let $(I_1 : \ldots : I_m)$ be a set of generators for $\mathcal{I}_n$ defined over F. Then*

$$\mathbf{M}_\mathsf{X} = F(\mathfrak{I}_1(f), \ldots, \mathfrak{I}_m(f)).$$

Proof. Let $\sigma \in \mathrm{Gal}(K/F(\mathfrak{I}_1(f),\dots,\mathfrak{I}_m(f)))$. Since $(\mathfrak{I}_1(f^\sigma),\dots,\mathfrak{I}_m(f^\sigma)) = (\mathfrak{I}_1(f),\dots,\mathfrak{I}_m(f))$ and $\mathcal{I}_n$ separates the orbits of separable forms [22, p.78], there exists a matrix $M \in \mathrm{GL}_2(K)$ such that $M.f \sim f^\sigma$, hence an isomorphism between X_f and ${}^\sigma\mathsf{X}_f$. □

With our current knowledge of invariants, we are then able to compute $\mathbf{M}_{\mathsf{X}_f}$ for $n = 6, 8, 10$. However in the following applications to descent we will see that we often do not need a complete set of invariants.

Definition 2.4. We say that k is a *field of definition* of X if there exists a curve $\mathcal{X}/k$ such that $\mathcal{X}$ is K-isomorphic to X. The curve $\mathcal{X}/k$ is a model of X over k and we call a geometric isomorphism between the two curves a *descent isomorphism*.

A classical problem is to know what the smallest field of definition of a curve is. Assuming for simplicity that every subfield of K is perfect, if $\mathbf{M}_{\mathsf{X}}$ is a field of definition then it is the smallest field possible, since it is the intersection of all the fields of definition (see [18] or [14, Th.1.5.8]). There might be an obstruction for $\mathbf{M}_{\mathsf{X}}$ to be a field of definition but if there is none we will denote $\mathcal{X}$ a model of X over $\mathbf{M}_{\mathsf{X}}$. In the case of hyperelliptic curves of odd genus, there is a subtlety: $\mathcal{X}$ does not necessarily admit a hyperelliptic equation. However if it does, we will say that X can be *hyperelliptically defined over* $\mathbf{M}_{\mathsf{X}}$ and we denote $\mathfrak{f} \in \mathbf{M}_{\mathsf{X}}[x]$ a hyperelliptic polynomial associated to this model.

One can find in the literature several sufficient conditions for the curve to be hyperelliptically defined over $\mathbf{M}_{\mathsf{X}}$. For instance it is always the case when K is the algebraic closure of a finite field (see [15, Cor.2.11]). Thanks to the work of Huggins [15], over an arbitrary algebraically closed field K, if the reduced automorphism group is non cyclic then the curve can be hyperelliptically defined over its field of moduli. For $g = 2$, it has been proved that if the reduced automorphism group is non-trivial, then the curve can be hyperelliptically defined over its field of moduli [4]. This is still the case for $g = 3$ except for curves with reduced automorphism group isomorphic to $\mathbf{C}_2^2$ (see [20] and Section 2.3.2).

2.2. **Explicit hyperelliptic descent.** Now let X_f be a hyperelliptic curve over K that can be hyperelliptically defined over $\mathbf{M}_{\mathsf{X}}$. We want to find $\mathfrak{f} \in \mathbf{M}_{\mathsf{X}}[x]$ and $A \in \mathrm{GL}_2(K)$ such that $\mathfrak{f} \sim A.f$. The first task is of course to compute $\mathbf{M}_{\mathsf{X}}$. As we have seen, this can be done if we have a set of generators for the invariants of the form f. However, if this is not the case and we have only some invariants $(I_1,\dots,I_m)$ over F with $m \geq 2$, we can always try to hyperelliptically descend X_f over the field k generated by $(\mathfrak{I}_1(f),\dots,\mathfrak{I}_m(f))$. Since $k \subset \mathbf{M}_{\mathsf{X}}$, if this can be achieved, we are done.

2.2.1. *The cocycle approach.* The direct approach relies on the following slightly modified version of Weil's cocycle relations (see [20]).

Lemma 2.5. *X_f can be hyperelliptically defined over k if and only if there exists a finite extension k'/k such that for all $\sigma \in \mathrm{Gal}(K/k)$, there exists $M_\sigma \in \mathrm{GL}_2(k')$ such that $M_\sigma \in \mathrm{Isom}_{k'}(f, f^\sigma)$ and for all $\sigma,\tau \in \mathrm{Gal}(K/k)$, $M_{\tau\sigma} = M_\tau^\sigma M_\sigma$.*

Assume that X_f can be hyperelliptically defined over k and let $\phi : \mathsf{X}_f \to \mathsf{X}_h$ be a descent isomorphism. It induces a matrix $\tilde{A} \in \mathrm{Isom}_K(f,h) \subset \mathrm{PGL}_2(K)$. We can define for all $\sigma \in \mathrm{Gal}(K/k)$, $M_\sigma = (A^{-1})^\sigma A$ for any choice of a representative

$A \in GL_2(K)$ of $\tilde{A}$. It is easy to check that it satisfies all the hypotheses of the lemma. Moreover if A is defined over a Galois extension L/k then $k' \subset L$ and we have for all $\sigma \in \mathrm{Gal}(K/k)$ such that $\sigma_{|L} = \mathrm{id}$ that $M_\sigma = \mathrm{id}$. Conversely, the crucial step to construct such an A is to identify a Galois extension L/k satisfying this property, since in this case one can use an explicit version of Hilbert 90 as in [24, p.159,Prop.3]: for a general matrix $P \in \mathrm{GL}_2(k')$ the matrix

$$A = \sum_{\tau \in \mathrm{Gal}(L/k)} P^\tau M_\tau \tag{9}$$

gives a descent morphism.

Lemma 2.6. *Assume that f is defined over an extension k' of k. If $\mathrm{Aut}_K(f) = \{id\}$ then we can take L to be the Galois closure of k'/k.*

Proof. We have to prove that A can be defined over such an L. Let A' be induced by a descent morphism. Since $A' \in \mathrm{Isom}_K(f, h)$ then for all $\sigma \in \mathrm{Gal}(K/L)$, $((A')^{-1})^\sigma A' \in \mathrm{Isom}_K(f, f^\sigma) = \mathrm{Aut}_K(f)$ hence there exists $\lambda_\sigma \in K^*$ such that $(A')^\sigma = \lambda_\sigma \cdot A'$. One can easily check that the λ_σ satisfy a cocycle relation so there exists $e \in K^*$ such that $\lambda_\sigma = e/e^\sigma$ for all σ. We then define $A = e \cdot A'$ and we are done. □

As far as we know, there is no easy way to determine such an L when the automorphism group is non trivial (see [20] though when k is a finite field). Naively, one would expect to be able to construct the cocycle over the field L_0 over which all isomorphisms between f and its conjugates are defined. Typically, what then happens is the following. Let $\sigma \in \mathrm{Gal}(L_0/k)$ be an element of order n. Then usually no M_σ exists over L_0 such that the cocycle condition $1 = M_{\sigma^n} = M^{\sigma^{n-1}} \cdots M^\sigma \cdot M$ is satisfied. We have to work with matrices of the form λM_σ, where λ belongs to a quadratic extension L of L_0. This enlarges the field and the Galois group, which may in turn give rise to more problems of the same type. Even if this problem can be resolved, the computation of (9) is time-consuming and limited to small degree extensions (less than 50) in practice. We present in the next section a new idea which works extremely well in certain cases to get around these difficulties.

Remark 2.7. In the odd genus case, it turns out that if we only want X_f to have a model over k, instead of a hyperelliptic model, then the cocycle condition is replaced by $M_{\tau\sigma} \sim M_\tau^\sigma M_\sigma$. However, even then, we do not know a general method to address the problem effectively.

2.2.2. *The covariant approach.* Using covariants, we can sometimes reduce the problem of descent for X_f to that for a lower genus curve.

Theorem 2.8. *Assume that there exists a covariant C of order $r \geq 4$ such that $c = C(f)$ is a hyperelliptic polynomial and let $\mathsf{X}_c : y^2 = c(x)$ be the associated curve. Then $\mathbf{M}_{\mathsf{X}_c} \subset \mathbf{M}_{\mathsf{X}_f}$.*
Moreover, if X_c is hyperelliptically defined over $\mathbf{M}_{\mathsf{X}_c}$ then X_f is hyperelliptically defined over an extension of degree at most $\#\mathrm{Aut}_K(c)/\mathrm{Aut}_K(f)$ of $\mathbf{M}_{\mathsf{X}_f}$.
In particular if $\mathrm{Aut}_K(c) = \mathrm{Aut}_K(f)$ and if X_c is hyperelliptically defined over $\mathbf{M}_{\mathsf{X}_c}$ then X_f is hyperelliptically defined over $\mathbf{M}_{\mathsf{X}_f}$.

Proof. Let $\sigma \in \Gamma = \mathrm{Gal}(K/\mathbf{M}_{\mathsf{X}_f})$. Then there exists a K-isomorphism between X_f and ${}^{\sigma}\mathsf{X}_f$ which induces a matrix $M \in \mathrm{Isom}_K(f, f^{\sigma})$. Since we have the inclusion $\mathrm{Isom}_K(f, f^{\sigma}) \subset \mathrm{Isom}_K(c, c^{\sigma})$ by Proposition 1.5, we get a K-isomorphism between X_c and ${}^{\sigma}\mathsf{X}_c$, so $\mathbf{M}_{\mathsf{X}_c} \subset \mathbf{M}_{\mathsf{X}_f}$.
Assume now that X_c can be hyperelliptically defined over $\mathbf{M}_{\mathsf{X}_c}$ as $\mathsf{X}_{\mathfrak{c}}$ with the form $\mathfrak{c} \in \mathbf{M}_{\mathsf{X}_c}[x]$. There exists $A \in \mathrm{Isom}_K(c, \mathfrak{c})$. Let us consider $h = A.f$, that we can assume to be monic. We want to prove that h is defined over an extension of degree at most

$$\ell = \#\operatorname{Aut}_K(c)/\operatorname{Aut}_K(f) = \#\operatorname{Aut}_K(\mathfrak{c})/\operatorname{Aut}_K(h)$$

of $\mathbf{M}_{\mathsf{X}_f} = \mathbf{M}_{\mathsf{X}_h}$. First note that $C(h) \sim A.C(f) \sim \mathfrak{c}$. Let $H \subset \Gamma$ be the subgroup of automorphisms σ such that $h \sim h^{\sigma}$. We even have $h = h^{\sigma}$ as we have assumed that h is monic. So we have to show that $\#\Gamma/H \leq \ell$. In order to do this, note that for all $\sigma \in \Gamma$, $\mathfrak{c}^{\sigma} = \mathfrak{c}$. Hence we can associate to each $\sigma \in \Gamma$ a matrix $M \in \mathrm{Isom}_K(h, h^{\sigma}) \subset \operatorname{Aut}_K(\mathfrak{c})$. Actually, this gives rise to a well-defined class of $\operatorname{Aut}_K(\mathfrak{c})/\operatorname{Aut}_K(h)$. Hence we have defined a map ρ from Γ to $\operatorname{Aut}_K(\mathfrak{c})/\operatorname{Aut}_K(h)$. If $\rho(\sigma) = \rho(\sigma')$ then we have $h^{\sigma} \sim h^{\sigma'}$, hence $\sigma^{-1}\sigma' \in H$. Therefore ρ induces an injective map from Γ/H to $\operatorname{Aut}_K(\mathfrak{c})/\operatorname{Aut}_K(h)$ and we get our result. □

The theorem can be used in a constructive way as soon as one is able to find a covariant whose automorphism group is finite and for which it is known how to define it hyperelliptically over its field of moduli. We give some examples in Sections 2.3 and 2.4.

Remark 2.9. There may be no equality between $\mathbf{M}_{\mathsf{X}_f}$ and $\mathbf{M}_{\mathsf{X}_c}$, even if the automorphism groups of the forms are the same. For instance, the field of moduli of $f = (x^4 + rx^2z^2 + z^4)(x^4 - 3rx^2z^2 + z^4)$, where r is a root of $t^2 + 2t + 16/9 = 0$, is $\mathbb{Q}(r)$. But the field of moduli of $c = (f, f)_6 = 16/49x^4 + 992/441x^2 + 16/49$ is $\mathbb{Q}$. Using the programs of [20], one sees that $\operatorname{Aut}_K(f) = \operatorname{Aut}_K(c) \simeq \mathbf{D}_4$.

2.3. **Application to genus 3 hyperelliptic curves.** In [20], the two first authors give algorithms for reconstructing genus 3 hyperelliptic models from given invariants. These models are defined over the field of moduli, with the notable exception of the dimension 2 stratum $\mathbf{C}_2^3$ and the dimension 3 stratum $\mathbf{D}_4$. As an illustration of our strategy, we see how our method applies in these remaining cases.

2.3.1. *Descent of curves with automorphism group* $\mathbf{C}_2^3$. Let $\mathsf{X}/K : y^2 = f(x)$ be a genus 3 hyperelliptic curve with automorphism group isomorphic to $\mathbf{C}_2^3$. Since the reduced automorphism group is not cyclic, [15] shows that X can be hyperelliptically defined over its field of moduli. In [20], we showed how to construct a hyperelliptic equation for a model over an extension of degree at most 3 of the field of moduli. Using covariants, we can now give a method to get the equation over the field of moduli.
In Section 1.5.2, we have checked that at least one of the quartic covariants in the list $\{C_{2,4}(f),\ C_{3,4}(f),\ C_{4,4}(f)\}$ has a non-zero discriminant. Moreover, by Proposition 1.6, we see that the automorphism group of such a quartic is equal to $\mathbf{D}_4$ if the quartic invariants I and J are both non-zero. Using some formal computations [2], we checked that this is always the case for at least one of the three covariants. Since $\operatorname{Aut}_K(f) \simeq \mathbf{D}_4$ we can use the approach of Theorem 2.8 to find

[2] see the MAGMA scripts http://iml.univ-mrs.fr/~ritzenth/programme/explicit-descent/isocovgenus3.zip.

a hyperelliptic equation $y^2 = \mathfrak{f}(x)$ over the field of moduli. The procedure can actually be applied to a generic element of the family but the result is too large to be written down so here is an example.

Example 2.10. When we evaluate the parametrization formulas given in [20, Appendix A] for the stratum $\mathbf{C}_2^3$ at $t = 0$ and $u = 1$, we find the rational point

$$(j_2 : j_3 : \ldots : j_{10}) = \left(0 : 0 : -\frac{25}{98} : -\frac{25}{98} : -\frac{225}{2744} : -\frac{25}{1372} : -\frac{225}{134456} : \frac{1125}{76832} : \frac{15125}{3764768}\right).$$

in the moduli space. This gives rise to the curve $\mathsf{X} : y^2 = f(x)$ with

$$f(x) = (-32\,\alpha^2 + 420\,\alpha - 2275)/160\ x^8 + (-12\,\alpha^2 + 140\,\alpha - 700)/25\ x^6 + \alpha\ x^4 + x^2 + (16\,\alpha^2 + 280\,\alpha - 2275)/12250$$

over $\mathbb{Q}(\alpha)$, where $\alpha^3 - 35/2\ \alpha^2 + 1925/16\ \alpha - 18375/64 = 0$. By Proposition 2.3, $\mathbf{M}_\mathsf{X} = \mathbb{Q}$.

Let c be the covariant $(f, f)_6$. We find

$$c = (-16\,\alpha^2 + 180\,\alpha - 875)/280\ x^4 + (24\,\alpha^2 - 630\,\alpha + 3150)/1225\ x^2z^2 + (4\,\alpha + 35)/490\ z^4.$$

Thus $I = -75/49$, $J = -2025/343$ and consequently $\mathfrak{c} = x^3\,z + 25/9\ x\,z^3 + 25/9\ z^4$ is $\mathrm{GL}_2(\bar{\mathbb{Q}})$-equivalent to c, defined over $\mathbf{M}_\mathsf{X}$ and $\mathrm{Aut}_{\bar{\mathbb{Q}}}(\mathfrak{c}) \simeq \mathbf{D}_4$. The direct approach of Section 1.2 explicitly finds a $\bar{\mathbb{Q}}$-isomorphism M between c and $\mathfrak{c}$. Its inverse equals $M^{-1} = (m_{i,j})_{i,j}$, where

$$\begin{cases} m_{11} &= 110250\,, \\ m_{12} &= (3360\,\alpha^2 - 58800\,\alpha + 147000)\,\beta^2 - 16800\,\alpha^2 + 147000\,\alpha - 18375\,, \\ m_{21} &= (-2064\,\alpha^2 + 24780\,\alpha - 60900)\,\beta^3 + (-3120\,\alpha^2 + 67200\,\alpha - 375375)\,\beta\,, \\ m_{22} &= (-5840\,\alpha^2 + 74900\,\alpha - 280000)\,\beta^3 + (16880\,\alpha^2 - 173600\,\alpha + 487375)\,\beta\,. \end{cases}$$

Here β satisfies $\beta^4 + (32\,\alpha^2 - 280\,\alpha + 350)/175\ \beta^2 - (176\,\alpha^2 - 1820\,\alpha + 7350)/175 = 0$. We compute the monic form $\mathfrak{f} \sim M.f$,

$$\mathfrak{f} = x^8 + 160\,x^7 - 560\,x^6 - 2800\,x^5 + 64750\,x^4 - 91000\,x^3 + 3010000\,x^2 - 2225000\,x - 9696875\,.$$

So $y^2 = \mathfrak{f}(x)$ is a model of X over $\mathbf{M}_\mathsf{X} = \mathbb{Q}$.

2.3.2. *Descent of curves with automorphism group* $\mathbf{D}_4$. It has been proved in [14, Chap. 5] that there may be an obstruction for a genus 3 hyperelliptic curve over K with automorphism group isomorphic to $\mathbf{D}_4$ to have a model over its field of moduli. In [20], we were able to construct a model of such curves over an extension of degree at most 8 of the field of moduli. Using Theorem 2.8, we can now prove

Proposition 2.11. *Let X_f be a genus 3 hyperelliptic curve over K with automorphism group isomorphic to $\mathbf{D}_4$. Then there exists an explicit model of X over an at most quadratic extension of $\mathbf{M}_\mathsf{X}$.*

Proof. Applying the methods of Proposition 1.10 to the stratum $\mathbf{D}_4$ shows that at least one of the five binary covariants $C_{2,4}(f), C_{3,4}(f), C_{4,4}(f), C'_{4,4}(f), C_{5,4}(f)$ has not only a discriminant different from 0, but also $I(f) \neq 0$ and $J(f) \neq 0$. [3] One then combines Proposition 1.6 and Theorem 2.8. □

We plan to investigate how to apply the theory of twists to the binary quartics used in the application of Theorem 2.8 to give a precise characterization of the obstruction to the descent on the field of moduli.

[3] see the MAGMA scripts http://iml.univ-mrs.fr/~ritzenth/programme/explicit-descent/isocovgenus3.zip.

2.4. **Application to a family of Fuertes-Gonzàlez-Diez in genus 5.** Let k be the degree 3 Galois extension of $\mathbb{Q}$ defined by the irreducible polynomial t^3-3t+1. Let r_1, r_2, r_3 be its roots in k. Then as in [10], we can consider the family

$$y^2 = \prod_{i=4,5,6} (x^4 - 2\,(1 - 2\,\frac{r_3 - r_1}{r_3 - r_2}\,\frac{q_i - r_2}{q_4 - r_1})\,x^2 + 1) \tag{10}$$

of genus 5 hyperelliptic curves, with q_4, q_5, q_6 in $\mathbb{Q}$. It was proved in [10] that the members of the family (10) have field of moduli equal to $\mathbb{Q}$ and automorphism group isomorphic to $\mathbf{C}_2^3$. Moreover, it was claimed in [10] that these curves cannot be hyperelliptically defined over $\mathbb{Q}$, in contradiction with [15]. However, the proof turns out to contain a subtle error. Still, the explicit descent of any of the member of the family was extremely hard.

Using Theorem 2.8, we can, as in Example 2.10, construct an explicit descent for the curves in this family. For this particular family, the descent can even be performed uniformly to yield a general expression in q_4, q_5, q_6. Let $F = k(q_4, q_5, q_6)$ be the rational function field over k in three indeterminates, and define the binary quartic form $f \in F[x, z]$ as the homogenization of the right hand side of (10). Let c be the transvectant $(f, f)_{10}$. Then c is a covariant of order 4 with non-zero discriminant and non-zero $I(c)$ and $J(c)$, hence with automorphism group $\mathbf{D}_4$. The field of moduli of X_c is contained in the field of moduli of X_f which is a subfield of $\mathbb{Q}(q_4, q_5, q_6)$, therefore the quartic $\mathfrak{c}$ as in (6) is defined over $\mathbb{Q}(q_4, q_5, q_6)$ and is $\mathrm{GL}_2(\bar{F})$-equivalent to c.
Now let L be the degree 4 extension of F defined by the dehomogenization of c. From Proposition 1.7, we can explicitly construct an L-isomorphism between c and $\mathfrak{c}$. This transformation gives a descent of the curve corresponding to c, which by Theorem 2.8 also yields a descent of the curve corresponding to f. The resulting expression, though indeed defined over the rationals, is huge and impossible to give here.[4] However, we can give an example for a specialization.

Example 2.12. Take $q_4 = 1$, $q_5 = 2$, $q_6 = 3$. The hyperelliptic equation over $\mathbb{Q}$ is

$$\begin{aligned} y^2 =& 199950247575x^{12} - 296949924611352x^{11} - 66659816245812750x^{10} \\ &- 1542197549550736065 6x^9 + 20056355192455370874 5x^8 \\ &+ 1307920888647724194612 00x^7 + 4414845414918835431725382 0x^6 \\ &- 9718847083908693649803959136x^5 + 9374947292703631283942405 4441x^4 \\ &+ 8633135941788860060765094844365 6x^3 - 7423912080663182513045938205161326x^2 \\ &+ 2495111976411684049395109460415151 84x - 3006656143858472317763973580984260681. \end{aligned}$$

References

[1] L. Bedratyuk. On complete system of invariants for the binary form of degree 7. *Journal of Symbolic Computation*, 42:935, 2007.

[2] A. E. Brouwer and M. Popoviciu. The invariants of the binary decimic. *J. Symbolic Comput.*, 45(8):837–843, 2010.

[3] A. E. Brouwer and M. Popoviciu. The invariants of the binary nonic. *J. Symbolic Comput.*, 45(6):709–720, 2010.

[4] see the MAGMA scripts http://iml.univ-mrs.fr/~ritzenth/programme/explicit-descent/Fuertes-Gonzalez-Diez.zip for the computations above, the finale result and the program to compute the descent of any given specialization.

[4] G. Cardona and J. Quer. Field of moduli and field of definition for curves of genus 2. In *Computational aspects of algebraic curves*, volume 13 of *Lecture Notes Ser. Comput.*, pages 71–83, Hackensack, NJ,, 2005. World Sci. Publ.
[5] J. E. Cremona and T. A. Fisher. On the equivalence of binary quartics. *J. Symbolic Comput.*, 44(6):673–682, 2009.
[6] H. Croeni. *Zur Berechnung von Kovarianten von Quantiken*. PhD thesis, Univ. des Saarlandes, Saarbrücken, 2002.
[7] J. Dixmier. Quelques aspects de la théorie des invariants. *Gaz. Math., Soc. Math. Fr.*, 43:39–64, 1990.
[8] J. Dixmier and D. Lazard. Le nombre minimum d'invariants fondamentaux pour les formes binaires de degré 7. *Portugal. Math.*, 43(3):377–392, 1985/86.
[9] C. Earle. On the moduli of closed riemann surfaces with symmetry. *Ann. of Math. Studies*, 66:119–130, 1971.
[10] Y. Fuertes and G. González-Diez. Fields of moduli and definition of hyperelliptic covers. *Arch. Math. (Basel)*, 86(5):398–408, 2006.
[11] P. Gordan. Beweis, dass jede Covariante und Invariante einer binren Form eine ganze Function mit numerischen Coefficienten einer endlichen Anzahl solcher Formen ist. *Journal fr die reine und angewandte Mathematik*, 69:323–354, 1868.
[12] J. Grace and A. Young. *The algebra of invariants*. Chelsea publishing company, New-York, 1903.
[13] F. Hess. An algorithm for computing isomorphisms of algebraic function fields. In D. A. Buell, editor, *Algorithmic Number Theory, 6th International Symposium, ANTS-VI*, volume 3076 of *Lecture Notes in Comput. Sci.*, pages 263–271. Springer, 2004.
[14] B. Huggins. *Fields of moduli and fields of definition of curves*. PhD thesis, University of California, Berkeley, Berkeley, California, 2005. http://arxiv.org/abs/math.NT/0610247.
[15] B. Huggins. Fields of moduli of hyperelliptic curves. *Math. Res. Lett.*, 14(2):249–262, 2007.
[16] J.-I. Igusa. Arithmetic variety of moduli for genus two. *Ann. Math*, 72:612–649, 1960.
[17] K. S. Kedlaya and C. Umans. Fast modular composition in any characteristic. *Foundations of Computer Science, IEEE Annual Symposium on*, 0:146–155, 2008.
[18] S. Koizumi. The fields of moduli for polarized abelian varieties and for curves. *Nagoya Math. J.*, 48:37–55, 1972.
[19] R. Lercier and C. Ritzenthaler. Invariants and reconstructions for genus 2 curves in any characteristic, 2008. Available in MAGMA 2.15 and later, http://magma.maths.usyd.edu.au/magma/handbook/text/1367.
[20] R. Lercier and C. Ritzenthaler. Hyperelliptic curves and their invariants: geometric, arithmetic and algorithmic aspects. *Eprint arXiv:1111.4152*, 2011.
[21] J.-F. Mestre. Construction de courbes de genre 2 à partir de leurs modules. In *Effective methods in algebraic geometry*, volume 94 of *Prog. Math.*, pages 313–334, Boston, 1991. Birkäuser.
[22] D. Mumford and J. Fogarty. *Geometric invariant theory*, volume 34 of *Ergebnisse der Mathematik und ihrer Grenzgebiete [Results in Mathematics and Related Areas]*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, second edition, 1982.
[23] P. J. Olver. *Classical invariant theory*, volume 44 of *London Mathematical Society Student Texts*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1999.
[24] J.-P. Serre. *Corps locaux*. Hermann, Paris, 1968. Deuxième édition, Publications de l'Université de Nancago, No. VIII.
[25] G. Shimura. On the field of rationality for an abelian variety. *Nagoya Math. J.*, 45:167–178, 1971.
[26] T. Shioda. On the graded ring of invariants of binary octavics. *American J. of Math.*, 89(4):1022–1046, 1967.
[27] S. M. van Rijnswou. *Testing the equivalence of planar curves*. PhD thesis, Technische Universiteit Eindhoven, Eindhoven, 2001.
[28] F. Von Gall. Das vollständige Formensystem der binären Form 7ter Ordnung. *Math. Ann.*, 31:318–336, 1888.
[29] A. Weil. The field of definition of a variety. *American Journal of Mathematics*, 78:509–524, 1956.

DGA MI, La Roche Marguerite, 35174 Bruz, France.

IRMAR, Université de Rennes 1, Campus de Beaulieu, 35042 Rennes, France.
E-mail address: reynald.lercier@m4x.org

Institut de Mathématiques de Luminy, UMR 6206 du CNRS, Luminy, Case 907, 13288 Marseille, France.
E-mail address: ritzenth@iml.univ-mrs.fr

IRMAR, Université de Rennes 1, Campus de Beaulieu, 35042 Rennes, France.
E-mail address: sijsling@gmail.com