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#### Abstract

Let $\mathbb{F}_{q}$ be a finite field with $q$ elements with prime power $q$ and let $r>1$ be an integer with $q \equiv 1(\bmod r)$. In this paper, we present a refinement of the Cipolla-Lehmer type algorithm given by H. C. Williams, and subsequently improved by K. S. Williams and K. Hardy. For a given $r$-th power residue $c \in \mathbb{F}_{q}$ where $r$ is an odd prime, the algorithm of H . C. Williams determines a solution of $X^{r}=c$ in $O\left(r^{3} \log q\right)$ multiplications in $\mathbb{F}_{q}$, and the algorithm of K. S. Williams and K. Hardy finds a solution in $O\left(r^{4}+r^{2} \log q\right)$ multiplications in $\mathbb{F}_{q}$. Our refinement finds a solution in $O\left(r^{3}+r^{2} \log q\right)$ multiplications in $\mathbb{F}_{q}$. Therefore our new method is better than the previously proposed algorithms independent of the size of $r$, and the implementation result via SAGE shows a substantial speed-up compared with the existing algorithms.
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## 1 Introduction

Let $r>1$ be an integer and $q$ be a power of a prime. Finding $r$-th root (or finding a root of $X^{r}=c$ ) in finite field $\mathbb{F}_{q}$ has many applications in computational number theory and in many other related topics. Some such examples include point halving and point compression on elliptic curves [15], where square root computations are needed. Similar applications for high genus curves require $r$-th root computations also.

Among several available root extraction methods of the equation $X^{r}-c=0$, there are two well known algorithms applicable for arbitrary integer $r>1$; the Adleman-Manders-Miller algorithm [1], a straightforward generalization of the Tonelli-Shanks square root algorithm [16, 18] to the case of $r$-th root extraction, and the Cipolla-Lehmer algorithms [7, 11]. Due to the cumbersome extension field arithmetic needed for the Cipolla-Lehmer algorithm, one usually prefers the Tonelli-Shanks or the Adleman-Manders-Miller, and other related researches [2, 3, 10] exist to improve the Tonelli-Shanks.

The efficiency of the Adleman-Manders-Miller algorithm heavily depends on the exponent $\nu$ of $r$ satisfying $r^{\nu} \mid q-1$ and $r^{\nu+1} \nmid q-1$, which becomes quite slow if $\nu \approx \log q$. Even in the case of $r=2$, it had been observed in [14] that, for a prime $p=9 \times 2^{3354}+1$, running the Tonelli-Shanks algorithm using various software such as Magma, Mathematica and Maple cost roughly 5 minutes, 45 minutes, 390 minutes, respectively while the Cipolla-Lehmer costs under 1 minute in any of the above softwares. It should be mentioned that such extreme cases (of $p$ with $p-1$ divisible by high powers of 2 ) may happen in some cryptographic applications.

For example, one of the NIST suggested curve [15] P-224: $y^{2}=x^{3}-3 x+b$ over $\mathbb{F}_{p}$ uses a prime $p=2^{224}-2^{96}+1$.

A generalization to $r$-th root extraction of the Cipolla-Lehmer square root algorithm is proposed by H. C. Williams [19] and the complexity of the proposed algorithm is $O\left(r^{3} \log q\right)$ multiplications in $\mathbb{F}_{q}$. A refinement of the algorithm in [19] was given by K. S. Williams and K. Hardy [20] where the complexity is reduced to $O\left(r^{4}+r^{2} \log q\right)$ multiplications in $\mathbb{F}_{q}$. For the case of the square root, a new Cipolla-Lehmer type algorithm based on the Lucas sequence was given by Müller [14]. A similar result for the case $r=3$ was also obtained by Cho et al. [5], and a possible generalization to the $r$-th root extraction of Müller's square root algorithm was given in [6].

In this paper, we present a new Cipolla-Lehmer type algorithm for $r$-th root extractions in $\mathbb{F}_{q}$ whose complexity is $O\left(r^{3}+r^{2} \log q\right)$ multiplications in $\mathbb{F}_{q}$, which improves previously proposed results in [19, 20]. We also compare our algorithm with those in [19, 20] using the software SAGE, and show that our algorithm performs consistently better than those in [19, 20, as is expected from the theoretical complexity estimation. In [19] and [20], only the case where $r$ is an odd prime was considered but we will give the general arguments (i.e., no restriction on $r$ ) here.

The remainder of this paper is organized as follows: In Section 2, we briefly summarize the Cipolla-Lehmer algorithm, and introduce the works of H. C. Williams 19 and K. S. Williams and K. Hardy [20]. In Section 3, we present our refinement of the Cipolla-Lehmer algorithm. In Section 4, we give the complexity analysis of our algorithm and show the result of SAGE implementations of the three algorithms (in [19, [20, and ours). Finally, in Section 5, we give the concluding remarks.

## 2 Cipolla-Lehmer Algorithm in $\mathbb{F}_{q}$

Let $q$ be a prime power and $\mathbb{F}_{q}$ be a finite field with $q$ elements. Let $c \neq 0 \in \mathbb{F}_{q}$ be an $r$-th power residue in $\mathbb{F}_{q}$ for an integer $r>1$ with $q \equiv 1(\bmod r)$. We restrict $r$ as an odd prime in this section.

### 2.1 H. C. Williams' algorithm

Let $b \in \mathbb{F}_{q}$ be an element such that $b^{r}-c$ is not an $r$-th power residue in $\mathbb{F}_{q}$. Such $b$ can be found after $r$ random trials of $b$. (See pp.479-480 in [20] for further explanation.) Then the polynomial $X^{r}-\left(b^{r}-c\right)$ is irreducible over $\mathbb{F}_{q}$ and there exists $\theta \in \mathbb{F}_{q^{r}}-\mathbb{F}_{q}$ such that $\theta^{r}=b^{r}-c$. Let $\omega=\theta^{q-1}=\left(b^{r}-c\right)^{\frac{q-1}{r}}$. Then we have $\omega^{r}=1$ where $\omega$ is a primitive $r$-th root because $b^{r}-c$ is not an $r$-th power in $\mathbb{F}_{q}$.

For all $0 \leq i \leq r-1$, using $q \equiv 1(\bmod r)$, one has $\theta^{q^{i}}=\theta \cdot \theta^{q^{i}-1}=\theta \cdot\left(\theta^{q-1}\right)^{1+q+\cdots+q^{i-1}}=$ $\theta \omega^{i}$, which implies $(b-\theta)^{q^{i}}=b-\theta^{q^{i}}=b-\omega^{i} \theta$. Letting $\alpha=b-\theta$, one has

$$
\begin{equation*}
\alpha^{\sum_{j=0}^{r-1} q^{j}}=(b-\theta)^{1+q+q^{2}+\cdots+q^{r-1}}=\prod_{i=0}^{r-1}\left(b-\omega^{i} \theta\right)=b^{r}-\theta^{r}=c . \tag{1}
\end{equation*}
$$

Thus one may find an $r$-th root of $c$ by computing $\alpha^{\frac{\sum_{j=0}^{r-1} q^{j}}{r}} \in \mathbb{F}_{q}[\theta]=\mathbb{F}_{q}[X] /\left\langle X^{r}-\left(b^{r}-c\right)\right\rangle$.
Proposition 1. [H. C. Williams]
Suppose that $c \neq 0$ is an $r$-th power in $\mathbb{F}_{q}$. Let $\theta^{r}=b^{r}-c$ with $\theta \in \mathbb{F}_{q^{r}}$ and $b \in \mathbb{F}_{q}$ such that
$b^{r}-c$ is not an $r$-th power in $\mathbb{F}_{q}$. Then letting $\alpha=b-\theta$,

$$
\alpha^{\frac{\sum_{j=0}^{r-1} q^{j}}{r}} \in \mathbb{F}_{q}
$$

is an r-th root of $c$.
The usual 'square and multiply method' (or 'double and add method' if one uses a linear recurrence relation) requires roughly $\log \frac{\sum_{j=0}^{r-1} q^{j}}{r} \approx r \log q$ steps for the evaluation of $\alpha^{\frac{\sum_{j=0}^{r-1} q^{j}}{r}}$, and therefore the complexity of the algorithm of H . C. Williams is $O\left(r^{3} \log q\right)$ multiplications in $\mathbb{F}_{q}$. H. C. Williams' result can be expressed in Algorithm $\mathbb{1}$ using the recurrence relation technique of Section 2.2 .

```
Algorithm 1 H. C. Williams' \(r\)-th root algorithm [19
Input: An \(r\)-th power residue \(c\) in \(\mathbb{F}_{q}\)
Output : \(x \in \mathbb{F}_{q}\) satisfying \(x^{r}=c\)
    do Choose a random \(b \in \mathbb{F}_{q}\) until \(b^{r}-c\) is not an \(r\)-th power residue.
    \(M \leftarrow \frac{1+q+\cdots+q^{r-1}}{r}\)
    \(A \leftarrow(b,-1,0, \ldots, 0) \quad / / A\) is a coefficient vector of \(\alpha=b-\theta\). //
    \(A \leftarrow \operatorname{RecurrenceRelation}(A, M) \quad / / A\) is a coefficient vector of \(\alpha^{M}\). //
    \(x \leftarrow\) corresponding element of \(A \quad / / x=\alpha^{M} / /\)
    return \(x\)
```

Note that $\alpha=b+\theta$ is used in the original paper [19, while our presentation is based on 20] where it uses $\alpha=b-\theta$. We followed [20] because it is more convenient to deal with general $r$ which is not necessarily odd prime. For example, if one uses $\alpha=b+\theta$ as in [19], then the case of even $r$ (such as $r=2$ ) cannot be covered. Detailed explanations will be given in Section 3,

### 2.2 Recurrence relation

Given $\sum_{i=0}^{r-1} a_{i} \theta^{i} \in \mathbb{F}_{q}[\theta]$, define $a_{i}(j) \in \mathbb{F}_{q}(0 \leq i \leq r-1,1 \leq j)$ as

$$
\begin{equation*}
\sum_{i=0}^{r-1} a_{i}(j) \theta^{i}=\left(\sum_{i=0}^{r-1} a_{i} \theta^{i}\right)^{j} \tag{2}
\end{equation*}
$$

In particular, one has $a_{i}(1)=a_{i}$ for all $0 \leq i \leq r-1$. Then one has

$$
\begin{aligned}
\sum_{i=0}^{r-1} a_{i}(m+n) \theta^{i} & =\left(\sum_{i=0}^{r-1} a_{i}(m) \theta^{i}\right)\left(\sum_{j=0}^{r-1} a_{j}(n) \theta^{j}\right) \\
& =\sum_{l=0}^{r-1}\left(\sum_{j=0}^{l} a_{j}(m) a_{l-j}(n)\right) \theta^{l}+\left(b^{r}-c\right) \sum_{l=0}^{r-2}\left(\sum_{j=l+1}^{r-1} a_{j}(m) a_{l+r-j}(n)\right) \theta^{l},
\end{aligned}
$$

which implies

$$
\begin{equation*}
a_{l}(m+n)=\sum_{j=0}^{l} a_{j}(m) a_{l-j}(n)+\left(b^{r}-c\right) \sum_{j=l+1}^{r-1} a_{j}(m) a_{l+r-j}(n) \tag{3}
\end{equation*}
$$

for all $0 \leq l \leq r-1$. When $l=r-1$, the second summation in the equation (3) does not happen so that one has $a_{r-1}(m+n)=\sum_{j=0}^{r-1} a_{j}(m) a_{r-1-j}(n)$. This recurrence relation is summarized in Algorithm 2,

```
Algorithm 2 RecurrenceRelation \((A, M)\)
Input: A coefficient vector \(A=\left(a_{0}, a_{1}, \cdots, a_{r-1}\right)\) of \(a=\sum_{i=0}^{r-1} a_{i} \theta^{i} \in \mathbb{F}_{q}[\theta]\) and \(M \in \mathbb{Z}^{+}\)
Output: A coefficient vector of \(a^{M} \in \mathbb{F}_{q}[\theta]\)
    Write \(M=\sum M_{i} 2^{i}\) where \(M_{i} \in\{0,1\}\).
    \(\left(B_{0}, B_{1}, \cdots, B_{r-1}\right) \leftarrow\left(a_{0}, a_{1}, \cdots, a_{r-1}\right)\)
    for \(k\) from \(\lfloor\log M\rfloor-1\) downto 0 do
        \(\left(A_{0}, A_{1}, \cdots, A_{r-1}\right) \leftarrow\left(B_{0}, B_{1}, \cdots, B_{r-1}\right)\)
        for \(i\) from 0 to \(r-1\) do
        \(B_{i} \leftarrow \sum_{j=0}^{i} A_{j} A_{i-j}+\left(b^{r}-c\right) \sum_{j=i+1}^{r-1} A_{j} A_{r+i-j}\)
        if \(M_{k}=1\) then
            \(\left(A_{0}, A_{1}, \cdots, A_{r-1}\right) \leftarrow\left(B_{0}, B_{1}, \cdots, B_{r-1}\right)\)
            for \(i\) from 0 to \(r-1\) do
                \(B_{i} \leftarrow \sum_{j=0}^{i} A_{j} a_{i-j}+\left(b^{r}-c\right) \sum_{j=i+1}^{r-1} A_{j} a_{r+i-j}\)
return \(\left(B_{0}, \cdots, B_{r-1}\right)\)
```


### 2.3 An improvement of K. S. Williams and K. Hardy

Williams and Hardy [20] improved the algorithm of H. C. Williams by reducing the loop length to $\log q$ as follows. Write $\alpha^{\frac{\sum_{j=0}^{r-1} q^{j}}{r}}($ where $\alpha=b-\theta$ ) as

$$
\begin{equation*}
\alpha^{\frac{\sum_{j=q^{j}}^{r-1}}{r}}=E_{1}^{\frac{q-1}{r}} \cdot E_{2}, \tag{4}
\end{equation*}
$$

where

$$
E_{1}=\alpha^{(q-1)^{r-2}}, \quad E_{2}=\alpha^{\frac{q^{r}-1}{r(q-1)}-\frac{(q-1)^{r-1}}{r}} .
$$

By noticing that the exponent $\frac{q^{r}-1}{r(q-1)}-\frac{(q-1)^{r-1}}{r}$ of $E_{2}$ is a polynomial of $q$ with integer coefficients and using the binomial theorem, one has the following expression of $E_{1}$ and $E_{2}$ as

$$
\begin{align*}
E_{1} & =\prod_{i=0}^{r-2} X_{i} \quad \text { with } X_{i}=\left(b-\omega^{i} \theta\right)^{(-1)^{r-i}\binom{r-2}{i}},  \tag{5}\\
E_{2} & =\prod_{i=1}^{r-1} Y_{i} \quad \text { with } Y_{i}=\left(b-\omega^{r-i-1} \theta\right)^{\frac{1-(-1)^{i}\binom{(-1}{i}}{r}} . \tag{6}
\end{align*}
$$

Thus we have the following result of Williams and Hardy.
Proposition 2. [Williams-Hardy]
(1) Under same assumption as in Proposition 1, $E_{1}^{\frac{q-1}{r}} \cdot E_{2}$ is an $r$-th root of $c$, where

$$
E_{1}=\alpha^{(q-1)^{r-2}}, \quad E_{2}=\alpha^{\frac{q^{r}-1}{r(q-1)}-\frac{(q-1)^{r-1}}{r}} .
$$

$$
E_{1}=\prod_{i=0}^{r-2}\left(b-\omega^{i} \theta\right)^{(-1)^{r-i}\binom{r-2}{i}}, \quad E_{2}=\prod_{i=1}^{r-1}\left(b-\omega^{r-i-1} \theta\right)^{\frac{1-(-1)^{i}\left(r_{i}^{-1}\right)}{r}} .
$$

```
Algorithm 3 Williams-Hardy \(r\)-th root algorithm [20]
Input: An \(r\)-th power residue \(c\) in \(\mathbb{F}_{q}\)
Output : \(x \in \mathbb{F}_{q}\) satisfying \(x^{r}=c\)
    do Choose a random \(b \in \mathbb{F}_{q}\) until \(b^{r}-c\) is not an \(r\)-th power residue.
    \(\omega \leftarrow\left(b^{r}-c\right)^{\frac{q-1}{r}}\), where \(\theta^{r}=b^{r}-c\).
    \(E_{1} \leftarrow 1, E_{2} \leftarrow 1\)
    for \(i\) from 1 to \(r-1\) do
        \(X_{i} \leftarrow\left(b-\omega^{i-1} \theta\right)^{(-1)^{r-i+1}\binom{r-2}{i-1}}, \quad Y_{i} \leftarrow\left(b-\omega^{r-i-1} \theta\right)^{\frac{1-(-1)^{i}\binom{r-1}{i}}{r}}\)
        \(E_{1} \leftarrow E_{1} \cdot X_{i}, E_{2} \leftarrow E_{2} \cdot Y_{i}\)
    \(A \leftarrow\) coefficient vector of \(E_{1}\)
    \(A \leftarrow \operatorname{RecurrenceRelation}\left(A, \frac{q-1}{r}\right)\)
    \(E_{1}^{\prime} \leftarrow\) corresponding element of \(A\) in \(\mathbb{F}_{q}[\theta]\)
    \(x \leftarrow E_{1}^{\prime} \cdot E_{2}\)
    return \(x\)
```

The complexity of computing each of $X_{i}$ in the equation (5) is of $O(\log q)+O(r)+O\left(r^{2} \log \binom{r-2}{i}\right)$ multiplications in $\mathbb{F}_{q}$. Hence all $X_{i}$ can be computed in $O\left(r \log q+r^{4}\right) \mathbb{F}_{q}$-multiplications. Since the $O(r)$ multiplications of all $X_{i}(0 \leq i \leq r-2)$ in $\mathbb{F}_{q^{r}}$ need $O\left(r^{3}\right)$ multiplications in $\mathbb{F}_{q}$, the total complexity of computing $E_{1}$ (as a polynomial of $\theta$ degree at most $r-1$ ) is $O\left(r \log q+r^{4}\right.$ ) $\mathbb{F}_{q^{-}}$-multiplications. Similarly the complexity of computing $E_{2}$ is also $O\left(r \log q+r^{4}\right) \mathbb{F}_{q^{-}}$ multiplications. For a detailed explanation, see [20]. Since the exponentiation $E_{1}^{\frac{q-1}{r}}$ (using the recurrence relation) needs $O\left(r^{2} \log \frac{q-1}{r}\right)=O\left(r^{2} \log q\right)$ multiplications in $\mathbb{F}_{q}$ and since the multiplication of two elements $E_{1}^{\frac{q-1}{r}}$ and $E_{2}$ needs $O(r)$ multiplications in $\mathbb{F}_{q}$ (because only the constant term of the $\theta$ expansion is needed), the total cost of computing an $r$-th root of $c$ using the algorithm of K. S. Williams and K. Hardy [20] is $O\left(r^{2} \log q+r^{4}\right)$.

## 3 Our New $r$-th Root Algorithm

In this section, we give an improved version of the Cipolla-Lehmer type algorithm by generalizing the method of [20]. Our new algorithm is applicable for all $r>1$ with $q \equiv 1(\bmod r)$. Throughout this section, we assume that $r$ is not necessarily a prime. Thus $\omega=\theta^{q-1}=$ $\left(b^{r}-c\right)^{\frac{q-1}{r}}$ may not be a primitive $r$-th root of unity even if $b^{r}-c$ is not an $r$-th power in $\mathbb{F}_{q}$. Consequently a more stronger condition is needed for the primitivity of $\omega$. That is, $\omega$ is a primitive $r$-th root of unity if and only if $\omega^{\frac{r}{p}} \neq 1$ for every prime $p \mid r$, which holds if and only if $\left(b^{r}-c\right)^{\frac{q-1}{p}} \neq 1$ for every prime $p \mid r$. From now on, we will assume that $\left(b^{r}-c\right)^{\frac{q-1}{p}} \neq 1$ for every prime $p \mid r$ and therefore $\omega$ is a primitive $r$-th root of unity.

Let $\alpha \in \mathbb{F}_{q^{r}}$. Then, by extracting $r$-th roots from the following simple identity

$$
\alpha^{r}\left(1 \cdot \alpha \cdot \alpha^{1+q} \cdots \alpha^{1+q+q^{2}+\cdots+q^{r-2}}\right)^{q}=\left(1 \cdot \alpha \cdot \alpha^{1+q} \cdots \alpha^{1+q+q^{2}+\cdots+q^{r-2}}\right) \alpha^{1+q+\cdots+q^{r-1}},
$$

one may expect that $\alpha\left(1 \cdot \alpha \cdot \alpha^{1+q} \cdots \alpha^{1+q+q^{2}+\cdots+q^{r-2}}\right)^{\frac{q-1}{r}}$ equals $\alpha^{\frac{1+q+\cdots+q^{r-1}}{r}}$ up to $r$-th roots of unity. In fact, they are exactly the same element in $\mathbb{F}_{q}$ and can be verified as follows;

$$
\begin{align*}
\alpha^{\frac{1+q+\cdots+q^{r-1}}{r}} & =\alpha^{\frac{\sum_{i=0}^{r-1} q^{i}}{r}}=\alpha \cdot \alpha^{\frac{\left(\sum_{i=0}^{r-1} q^{i}\right)-r}{r}}  \tag{7}\\
& =\alpha \cdot \alpha^{\frac{\sum_{i=0}^{r-1}\left(q^{i}-1\right)}{r}}=\alpha \cdot \alpha^{\frac{(q-1) \sum_{i=1}^{r-1} \sum_{j=0}^{i-1} q^{j}}{r}}  \tag{8}\\
& =\alpha \cdot\left(\alpha^{\sum_{i=1}^{r-1} \sum_{j=0}^{i-1} q^{j}}\right)^{\frac{q-1}{r}}  \tag{9}\\
& =\alpha \cdot\left(1 \cdot \alpha \cdot \alpha^{1+q} \cdots \alpha^{1+q+q^{2}+\cdots+q^{r-2}}\right)^{\frac{q-1}{r}} \tag{10}
\end{align*}
$$

Proposition 3. [Main Theorem]
Let $q \equiv 1(\bmod r)$ with $r>1$ and let $\left(b^{r}-c\right)^{\frac{q-1}{p}} \neq 1$ for all prime divisors $p$ of $r$. Then letting $\alpha=b-\theta$ where $\theta^{r}=b^{r}-c$,

$$
\alpha \cdot\left(1 \cdot \alpha \cdot \alpha^{1+q} \cdots \alpha^{1+q+q^{2}+\cdots+q^{r-2}}\right)^{\frac{q-1}{r}}
$$

is an r-th root of $c$.
Based on the above simple result, we may present a new $r$-th root algorithm (Algorithm 4) of complexity $O\left(r^{2} \log q+r^{3}\right)$ with given information of the prime factors of $r$. It should be mentioned that our proposed algorithm is general in the sense that $r$ can be any (composite) positive integer $>1$ satisfying $q \equiv 1(\bmod r)$, while $r$ was assumed to be an odd prime both in [19] and [20].

Both in [19] and [20], $b$ was chosen so that $\omega=\left(b^{r}-c\right)^{\frac{q-1}{r}} \neq 1$, and since $r$ is prime, $\omega$ is automatically a primitive $r$-th root. This property guarantees the validity of the equation (1), namely

$$
\begin{equation*}
(b-\theta)(b-\omega \theta)\left(b-\omega^{2} \theta\right) \cdots\left(b-\omega^{r-1} \theta\right)=b^{r}-\theta^{r}=c \tag{11}
\end{equation*}
$$

However if $r$ is composite, then $\omega=\left(b^{r}-c\right)^{\frac{q-1}{r}}$ is not a primitive $r$-th root in general. In fact, letting $s>1$ be the least positive integer satisfying $\omega^{s}=1$, the degree of the irreducible polynomial of $\theta$ (where $\theta^{r}=b^{r}-c$ ) is $s$ because

$$
\theta^{q^{s}-1}=\left(\theta^{q-1}\right)^{q^{s-1}+q^{s-2}+\cdots+q+1}=\omega^{q^{s-1}+q^{s-2}+\cdots+q+1}=\omega^{s}
$$

and one has

$$
\begin{equation*}
(b-\theta)(b-\omega \theta) \cdots\left(b-\omega^{r-1} \theta\right)=\left\{(b-\theta)(b-\omega \theta) \cdots\left(b-\omega^{s-1} \theta\right)\right\}^{\frac{r}{s}}=\left(b^{s}-\theta^{s}\right)^{\frac{r}{s}} \neq c \tag{12}
\end{equation*}
$$

if $s<r$. Therefore the methods of [19] and [20] do not work for a composite $r$ unless one assumes the primitivity of $\omega$.

Also, even if one assumes the primitivity of $\omega=\left(b^{r}-c\right)^{\frac{q-1}{r}}$, one still has some problems both in [19] and [20], which will be explained in the following remarks.
Remark 1. In [19], $\alpha=b+\theta$ was used (instead of $b-\theta$ ) under the assumption of $\theta^{r}=c-b^{r}$ with $\left(c-b^{r}\right)^{\frac{q-1}{r}} \neq 1$. If we choose $\alpha=b+\theta$ following [19], then we get

$$
\begin{equation*}
(b+\theta)(b+\omega \theta) \cdots\left(b+\omega^{r-1} \theta\right)=b^{r}-(-\theta)^{r}=b^{r}+(-1)^{r+1} \theta^{r} \tag{13}
\end{equation*}
$$

Therefore if $r$ is odd prime (as was originally assumed in [19]), one has $b^{r}+\theta^{r}=c$ and the $r$-th root algorithm is essentially same to the case $\alpha=b-\theta$. However when $r$ is even (for example, when $r=2$ ), the original method in [19] cannot be used because $b^{r}+(-1)^{r+1} \theta^{r}=b^{r}-\theta^{r} \neq c$.

```
Algorithm 4 Our new \(r\)-th root algorithm
Input: An \(r\)-th power residue \(c\) in \(\mathbb{F}_{q}\)
Output : \(x \in \mathbb{F}_{q}\) satisfying \(x^{r}=c\)
    do Choose a random \(b \in \mathbb{F}_{q}\) until \(\left(b^{r}-c\right)^{\frac{q-1}{r}}\) is a primitive \(r\)-th root of unity.
    \(\omega \leftarrow\left(b^{r}-c\right)^{\frac{q-1}{r}}, \alpha \leftarrow b-\theta\) where \(\theta^{r}=b^{r}-c\).
    \(P \leftarrow \alpha, A \leftarrow \alpha, W \leftarrow 1\)
    for \(i=1\) to \(r-2\) do \(\quad / / A, P \in \mathbb{F}_{q}[\theta]\) and \(W \in \mathbb{F}_{q} / /\)
        \(W \leftarrow W \omega, V \leftarrow b-W \theta \quad / / W=\omega^{i}, V=b-\omega^{i} \theta=\alpha^{q^{i}} / /\)
        \(A \leftarrow A V, P \leftarrow P A \quad / / A=\alpha^{1+q+\cdots+q^{i}}, P=\alpha \cdot \alpha^{1+q} \cdots \alpha^{1+q+\cdots+q^{i}} / /\)
    \(B \leftarrow\) coefficient vector of \(P\)
    \(B \leftarrow\) RecurrenceRelation \(\left(B, \frac{q-1}{r}\right)\)
    \(P \leftarrow\) corresponding element of \(B\) in \(\mathbb{F}_{q}[\theta]\)
    \(x \leftarrow \alpha \cdot P \quad / / x \in \mathbb{F}_{q} / /\)
    return \(x\)
```

Remark 2. The algorithm in [20] needs $E_{1}$ and $E_{2}$ satisfying $\alpha^{\frac{\sum_{j=0}^{r-1} q^{j}}{r}}=E_{1}^{\frac{q-1}{r}} \cdot E_{2}$. However for composite $r, E_{2}$ cannot be well-defined in some cases, since the exponent $\frac{1-(-1)^{i}\binom{r-1}{i}}{r}$ in the equation (6) is not an integer in general. That is, the property $(-1)^{i}\binom{r-1}{i} \equiv 1(\bmod r)$ only holds when $r$ is prime. Therefore the algorithm in [20] fails to give the answer when $r$ is composite such as $r=4,6,9, \cdots$. (i.e., when $r=4$, one has $E_{2}=\alpha^{q^{2}-\frac{1}{2} q}$ so the coefficient $\frac{1}{2}$ of $q$ in the exponent is not an integer and one cannot compute $E_{2}$.) The problem of $E_{2}$ being undefined is unavoidable even if one assumes the primitivity of $\omega$.

## 4 Complexity Analysis and Comparison

### 4.1 Complexity analysis

An initial step of the proposed algorithm requires one to find a primitive $r$-th root $\omega$ in $\mathbb{F}_{q}$. When $r$ is prime, one only needs to find $b$ satisfying $\omega=\left(b^{r}-c\right)^{\frac{q-1}{r}} \neq 0,1$ and the probability that a random $b$ satisfies the required property is $\frac{1}{r}+O\left(q^{-\frac{1}{4}}\right)$ (20] pp.480) under the assumption of $r \leq q^{\frac{1}{4}}$. When $r$ is composite, one further needs to check whether $\omega^{\frac{r}{p}} \neq 1$ for every prime divisor $p$ of $r$. Since the complexity estimation $O\left(r^{3} \log q\right)$ in [19] and $O\left(r^{2} \log q+r^{4}\right)$ in 20] still hold if one assumes that a primitive root $\omega=\left(b^{r}-c\right)^{\frac{q-1}{r}}$ is already given, we will also assume that a primitive root $\omega$ is given in our estimation for a fair comparison.

At each $i$-th step of the for-loop of our proposed algorithm, step 5 needs $1 \mathbb{F}_{q}$ multiplication. In step 6 , the computation $A V$ needs $1 \mathbb{F}_{q^{r}}$ multiplication which, in fact, can be executed with $2 r \mathbb{F}_{q}$ multiplications because $V=b-\omega^{i} \theta$ is linear in $\theta$. The computation $P A$ needs $1 \mathbb{F}_{q^{r}}$ multiplication which can be executed with $r^{2} \mathbb{F}_{q}$ multiplications. Therefore, at the end of the for-loop, one needs at most $(r-2)\left(1+2 r+r^{2}\right)<(r+1)^{3} \mathbb{F}_{q}$ multiplications (of order $O\left(r^{3}\right)$ ). Since the exponentiation $P^{\frac{q-1}{r}}$ (in steps 7-9) needs $O\left(r^{2} \log q\right) \mathbb{F}_{q}$ multiplications, the total cost of our proposed algorithm is $O\left(r^{3}+r^{2} \log q\right)$ multiplications in $\mathbb{F}_{q}$. On the other hand, the cost of Algorithm 119 is $O\left(r^{2} \log \frac{q^{r}-1}{r}\right)=O\left(r^{3} \log q\right)$, and the cost of Algorithm 3 [20] is $O\left(r^{4}+r^{2} \log q\right)$ where $O\left(r^{4}\right)$ comes from the cost of computing $E_{1}$ and $E_{2}$ in steps 4-6 of

Algorithm [3. The theoretical estimation shows that our proposed algorithm is better than Algorithm 3 as $r$ gets larger.

Finally, when $r=2$, the for-loop can be omitted in our algorithm so that one only needs to compute $P \cdot P^{\frac{q-1}{2}}$ which is exactly same to the original Cipolla-Lehmer algorithm.

### 4.2 Implementation results

 and our proposed one. The implementation was performed on Intel Core i7-4770 3.40GHz with 8GB memory.

Table 1: Running time (in seconds) for $r$-th root algorithms

| $r$ | 3 | 4 | 43 | 101 | 211 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Algorithm [1] [19] | 0.467 | fail | 2026.962 | Interr. | Interr. |
| Algorithm [3] [20 | 0.254 | fail | 53.849 | 535.043 | 3956.433 |
| Our proposed algorithm | 0.253 | 0.355 | 48.359 | 256.601 | 1098.401 |

For convenience, we used prime fields $\mathbb{F}_{p}$ with size about 2000 bits. Average timings of the $r$-th root computations for 5 different inputs of $r$-th power residue $c \in \mathbb{F}_{p}$ are computed for the primes $r=3,43,101,211$. As one can see in the table, our proposed algorithm performs better than the algorithms in [19] and [20]. The table also shows that our algorithm gets dramatically faster than other algorithms as $r$ gets larger. For example, when $r=101$, our algorithm is roughly 2 times faster than Algorithm 3, and when $r=211$, our algorithm is 4 times faster than Algorithm 3. For $r=101,211$, the SAGE computation were interrupted after 3 hours for Algorithm 1 .

## 5 Conclusions

We proposed a new Cipolla-Lehmer type algorithm for $r$-th root extractions in $\mathbb{F}_{q}$. Our algorithm has the complexity of $O\left(r^{3}+r^{2} \log q\right)$ multiplications in $\mathbb{F}_{q}$, which improves the previous results of $O\left(r^{3} \log q\right)$ in [19] and of $O\left(r^{4}+r^{2} \log q\right)$ in [20. Our algorithm is applicable for any integer $r>1$, whereas the previous algorithms are effective only for odd prime $r$. Software implementations via SAGE also show that our proposed algorithm is consistently faster than the previously proposed algorithms, and becomes much more effective as $r$ gets larger.
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