

# Efficient computation of BSD invariants in genus 2

Raymond van Bommel\*

1 March 2022

**Abstract.** Recently, all Birch and Swinnerton-Dyer invariants, except for the order of  $\text{III}$ , have been computed for all curves of genus 2 contained in the L-functions and Modular Forms Database [LMFDB]. This report explains the improvements made to the implementation of the algorithm described in [vBom19] that were needed to do the computation of the Tamagawa numbers and the real period in reasonable time. We also explain some of the more technical details of the algorithm, and give a brief overview of the methods used to compute the special value of the  $L$ -function and the regulator.

**Keywords:** Birch-Swinnerton-Dyer conjecture, Jacobians, Curves

**Mathematics Subject Classification (2010):** 11G40, 11G10, 11G30, 14H40.

## 1 Introduction

The Birch and Swinnerton-Dyer conjecture has an extensive computational history. The conjecture has originally been conceived by Birch and Swinnerton-Dyer based on computational findings on elliptic curves. Later, it has been generalised by Tate to the case of abelian varieties over general number fields. We formulate the version for principally polarised abelian varieties over  $\mathbb{Q}$  here.

**Conjecture 1** (BSD for abelian varieties over  $\mathbb{Q}$ , [BiSw65, Tate66]). *Let  $A/\mathbb{Q}$  be a principally polarised abelian variety of dimension  $d$  and algebraic rank  $r$ . Let  $L(A, s)$  be its  $L$ -function,  $R$  its regulator,  $\text{III}$  its Tate-Shafarevich group and  $\Omega$  its real period. For each prime number  $p$ , let  $c_p$  be the Tamagawa number of  $A$  at  $p$ . Then  $L(A, s)$  has a zero of order  $r$  at  $s = 1$  and*

$$\lim_{s \rightarrow 1} (s - 1)^{-r} L(A, s) = \frac{R \cdot \Omega \cdot |\text{III}| \cdot \prod_p c_p}{|A(\mathbb{Q})_{\text{tors}}|^2}.$$

---

\*Raymond van Bommel has been supported by the Simons Collaboration on Arithmetic Geometry, Number Theory, and Computation (Simons Foundation grant 550033).

Since the group  $\text{III}$  is very hard to compute in general, it has been common to verify the conjecture “up to squares”. For this, one computes the other terms numerically, and check that the value of  $|\text{III}|$  conjectured by the formula is a square or two times a square, according to what the machinery of Poonen and Stoll, [PoSt99], predicts.

For example, this has been done in the paper [FLSSSW] by Flynn, Leprévost, Schaefer, Stein, Stoll and Wetherell for a collection of 32 Jacobians of hyperelliptic curves of genus 2 with small conductor. For these computations modular methods were used. In [vBom19], the author developed an algorithm to compute Tamagawa numbers and real periods without depending on modularity.

The current goal is to compute all these BSD-invariants for the curves of genus 2 in the [LMFDB], and the curves of higher genus that will appear in the future in the [LMFDB]. The Tamagawa numbers had already been computed for all but 54 of the genus 2 curves in the database. For the other 54 curves, and for most of the real periods, the algorithms developed in [vBom19] did not give a result within a reasonable amount of time.

Given that there are more than 66 000 curves of genus in the [LMFDB], the computation of a Tamagawa number or real period should ideally take at most a few seconds for most of the curves, and only more than an hour in very exceptional cases. In this report, we will explain the improvements that have been made to achieve this. Moreover, this report will also serve as a more extensive documentation of the algorithms, explaining more details of the computation than the description in [vBom19].

**Notation.** Throughout this text, let  $C$  over  $\mathbb{Q}$  be a smooth projective curve, let  $p$  be a prime number and let  $\mathcal{C} / \mathbb{Z}_{(p)}$  be a regular model of  $C$  over  $\mathbb{Z}_{(p)}$ . Let  $J$  be the Jacobian of  $C$ .

**Acknowledgements.** We would like to thank Michael Stoll for sharing his code for the computation of Mordell-Weil groups, and his extensive explanation of this code. Moreover, we thank Edgar Costa for his explanation of the machinery used to compute special values of  $L$ -functions.

## 2 Tamagawa numbers

First, we recall the approach in [vBom19] to compute the Tamagawa numbers of  $J$ . Let  $\mathcal{C}^{\text{hens}}$  be a regular model over the strict henselisation of  $\mathbb{Z}_{(p)}$ , and let  $I$  be the set of components in the special fibre of  $\mathcal{C}^{\text{hens}}$ . The idea is to compute the component group of a Néron model of  $J$  using the exact sequence

$$0 \rightarrow \text{im } \bar{\alpha} \rightarrow \ker \bar{\beta} \rightarrow \varphi_J(\overline{\mathbb{F}}_p) \rightarrow 0$$

of  $\text{Gal}(\overline{\mathbb{F}_p}/\mathbb{F}_p)$ -modules, where:

- $\bar{\alpha}$  is the linear map  $\mathbb{Z}^I \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}^I$  given by

$$\Gamma \mapsto \sum_{\Gamma' \in I} \langle \Gamma, \Gamma' \rangle \cdot \Gamma', \quad \text{for } \Gamma \in I,$$

- $\bar{\beta}$  is the linear map  $\mathbb{Z}^I \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$  given by

$$\Gamma \mapsto \text{multiplicity}(\Gamma), \quad \text{for } \Gamma \in I,$$

- $\varphi_J$  is the component group of the special fibre of a Néron model of  $J$ ,
- $\text{Gal}(\overline{\mathbb{F}_p}/\mathbb{F}_p)$  acts in the natural way on  $I$  and  $\mathbb{Z}^I$ .

So our task is to compute the Galois action on the set  $I$ . In order to explain how we do this computation and which problem arises when doing that, let us first briefly explain how `Magma` currently computes and represents a regular model.

## 2.1 Regular models in `Magma`

In `Magma`, a regular model consists of several patches and transition maps between some of these patches. Other relevant data that is stored are sets of non-regular points, points where components in the special fibre of the model intersect, multiplicities of these components, and intersection numbers.

The input of the algorithm is a smooth projective curve defined over a number field  $K$  and a prime ideal  $\mathfrak{p}$  of  $\mathcal{O}_K$ , the prime at which the model must become regular. The algorithm implemented by Steve Donnelly will repeatedly blow-up non-regular components in the special fibre (only implemented in case  $K = \mathbb{Q}$ ) and, in case there are no such components, it will blow up non-regular points (implemented for any number field). Each time a blow-up is done, some new patches with transition maps to and from the old patch are created. This process will continue until the model is regular.

In some cases, the points that need to be blown up are not defined over  $\mathcal{O}_K/\mathfrak{p}$ . In this case, the number field  $K$  is extended and the algorithm is restarted with this new number field as base field. Also in the end, when we want to compute the set of geometric components of the regular model, the number field needs to be extended.

## 2.2 Outline of algorithm to compute the Galois action

We start with a curve  $C$  over  $\mathbb{Q}$  and consider any flat model over  $\mathbb{Z}_{(p)}$  by taking the same equations (after possibly rescaling them). The first patches will be defined

over  $\mathbb{Z}_{(p)}$ . First we compute the components occurring in these patches and the action of Frobenius, by applying Frobenius on the ideal defining such a component. Then we proceed to look at the non-regular points.

Let  $P$  be a non-regular point in the special fibre of one of these patches, then all its Galois conjugates are also non-regular. Suppose  $P$  is defined over  $\mathbb{F}_{p^\ell}$  for some  $\ell \geq 1$ , and we blow-up in  $P$ . Then the special fibre of the new patches that arise from blowing up  $P$ , can be defined over  $\mathbb{F}_{p^\ell}$ .

Let  $\text{Comp}_P$  be the set of components that lie above the non-regular point  $P$ . Then Frobenius sends components in  $\text{Comp}_P$  to components in  $\text{Comp}_{\text{Frob}(P)}$ . For our purpose, it is not of importance to compute which component of  $\text{Comp}_P$  is exactly mapped to which component of  $\text{Comp}_{\text{Frob}(P)}$ . For us it suffices to find a combinatorially equivalent description of the set of components together with an action of Frobenius, and their intersection numbers.

Frobenius gives an isomorphism  $\text{Comp}_P \rightarrow \text{Comp}_{\text{Frob}(P)}$ , and the components of these disjoint sets never intersect. Instead of computing  $\text{Comp}_{\text{Frob}(P)}$  our algorithm just creates  $\ell$  copies of  $\text{Comp}_P$ , and let Frobenius map a component to the corresponding component in the next copy, for the first  $\ell - 1$  copies. For the  $\ell$ -th copy the action of Frobenius is computed differently. For this, we compute the action of  $\text{Frob}^\ell$  on  $\text{Comp}_P$ , when we handle the new patches that we got after blowing up  $P$ .

The intersections of the components in  $\text{Comp}_P$  with components  $p_1, \dots, p_s$  that already existed are computed using the existing code in **Magma**. A component  $\text{Frob}(p') \in \text{Comp}_{\text{Frob}(P)}$  intersects  $p_i$  exactly with the same multiplicity as the corresponding component  $p' \in \text{Comp}_P$  and  $\text{Frob}^{-1}(p_i)$ .

The algorithm then continues recursively, in the same way the regular model is constructed, keeping track of all the intersection numbers and the action of Frobenius. To summarise our recursive algorithm:

**Algorithm 2.** *Input: patch  $\mathcal{P}$  whose special fibre is defined over  $\mathbb{F}_{p^\ell}$ .*

*Output: combinatorial description of all (previously non-existing) components in the special fibre  $\mathcal{P}_p$  and those arising after repeatedly blowing up non-regular points in  $\mathcal{P}_p$ , together with the action of  $\text{Frob}^\ell$  and the intersection numbers.*

**Step 1** Find equations for the new components in the special fibre  $\mathcal{P}_p$ , and compute the action of  $\text{Frob}^\ell$  on these components.

**Step 2** Loop through all Galois orbits of non-regular points. Execute steps 3 to 7 for each orbit.

*Notation for steps 3 to 7:  $P$  is non-regular and  $\mathbb{F}_{p^{\ell \cdot m}}$  is the field generated by the coordinates of  $P$ .*

- Step 3** Recursively compute the action of  $\text{Frob}^{\ell \cdot m}$  on the set of previously non-existing components  $\text{Comp}_P$  contained in those patches obtained after blowing up  $P$ .
- Step 4** Compute the intersection of the components in  $\text{Comp}_P$  with each other and with the components considered in step 1.
- Step 5** Create  $m - 1$  more copies of  $\text{Comp}_P$  for  $\text{Comp}_{\text{Frob}^{\ell}(P)}$ ,  $\text{Comp}_{\text{Frob}^{2\ell}(P)}$ , et cetera.
- Step 6** The action of  $\text{Frob}^{\ell}$  is the identity  $\text{Comp}_{\text{Frob}^{\ell \cdot i}(P)} \rightarrow \text{Comp}_{\text{Frob}^{\ell \cdot (i+1)}(P)}$  for  $i = 0, \dots, m - 2$ . For  $i = m - 1$ , the action is given by the action computed in step 3.
- Step 7** The intersection of components contained in  $\text{Comp}_{\text{Frob}^{\ell \cdot i}(P)}$  and components contained in  $\text{Comp}_{\text{Frob}^{\ell \cdot j}(P)}$  is 0 for distinct  $i, j \in \{0, \dots, m - 1\}$ . The intersection number of a component  $p \in \text{Comp}_{\text{Frob}^{\ell \cdot i}(P)}$  for  $i = 1, \dots, m - 1$  with a component  $q$  considered in step 1, equals the intersection number of  $\text{Frob}^{-i \cdot \ell}(p)$  and  $\text{Frob}^{-i \cdot \ell}(q)$ .

The improvement in comparison with the previous implementation is the more systematic implementation of Step 5, 6 and 7. In our previous implementation, we did some guess for the action of Frobenius. This turned out to be unnecessary, as all the combinatorial data can just be copied.

## 2.3 Problem arising during the algorithm

One problem that arises in our algorithm is the following. When we blow-up our point  $P$  with coordinates in  $\mathbb{F}_{p^\ell}$ , the special fibre of the new patches is not necessarily defined over  $\mathbb{F}_{p^\ell}$  even though it could have been. This is due to the choice we have when parametrising the blow-up and is illustrated in the following example.

**Example 3.** Suppose  $K = \mathbb{Q}[a]/(a^4 + a + 1)$  and  $\mathfrak{p} = 2\mathcal{O}_K$ . Consider the affine curve given by  $y^2 = 2(x^2 + x + 1)$  in  $\mathbb{A}^2$  over  $\mathcal{O}_{K, \mathfrak{p}}$ . It has two Galois conjugate non-regular points  $(\bar{a}^5, 0)$  and  $(\bar{a}^{10}, 0)$  in the special fibre, with coordinates in  $\mathbb{F}_4$ . Let us do a blow-up in  $(\bar{a}^5, 0)$ . We rewrite the equation as

$$y^2 = 2x'^2 + (4a^5 + 2)x' + (4a^3 - 4a),$$

where  $x' = x - a^5$ . To get one of the charts of the blow-up, we ‘substitute’  $y = tx'$  and  $2 = sx'$ . We get the equation

$$t^2x'^2 = s^2x'^3 + (2a^5 + 1)sx'^2 + (a^3 - a)s^2x'^2$$

which after dividing by  $x'^2$  gives the following equations for the blow-up:

$$t^2 = s^2x' + (2a^5 + 1)s + (a^3 - a)s^2, \quad sx' = 2.$$

Now we see that the special fibre is not defined over  $\mathbb{F}_4$ , as  $\bar{a}^3 - \bar{a} \notin \mathbb{F}_4$ .

We know two possible solutions for this problem:

1. Blow-up Galois conjugated points at the same time (e.g.  $(\bar{a}^5, 0)$  and  $(\bar{a}^{10}, 0)$  in the previous example). This ensures all schemes stay defined over  $\mathbb{Z}_{(p)}$ . We choose not to take this route as the blow-up becomes significantly more complicated to represent when blowing up multiple points at the same time.
2. Make sure that for each  $d$  dividing  $[K : \mathbb{Q}]$  there is a subfield  $K_d \subset K$  of absolute degree  $d$ . In this way, if a non-regular point in the special fibre is defined over  $\mathbb{F}_{p^d}$ , all equations for the blow-up can be taken to lie inside  $K_d$  and the special fibre of the blow-up will be defined over  $\mathbb{F}_{p^d}$ .

In the next section, we explain what should be kept in mind when constructing number fields as in **2.**, and how it has been implemented in our algorithm.

## 2.4 Construction of a suitable extension

Our goal is now to construct an extension  $K$  of  $\mathbb{Q}$  such that  $p$  is inert in  $K$  and for any  $d \mid [K : \mathbb{Q}]$  there is a subextension  $K_d \subset K$  of degree  $d$ . There are of course many ways to do that, but one thing to keep in mind, is that we would like to avoid the situation where the coefficients for equations for the number field get too large to do any meaningful computation with them. The other thing to keep in mind is, that we would like our construction to work in steps: we would like to be able to first extend  $\mathbb{Q}$  to  $K$  and later extend  $K$  to a bigger number field  $L$  still having the desired properties as extension of  $\mathbb{Q}$ .

Our first attempt was to only consider abelian extensions, i.e. subextensions of cyclotomic fields. They typically have very small defining equations. However, the problem is, that the existence of such fields (with  $p$  inert) is not guaranteed and they became hard to find in practice.

So we decided to use the following strategy. First, consider the prime factorisation  $d = p_1^{e_1} \cdot \dots \cdot p_k^{e_k}$ . We construct fields  $K_{p_i^{e_i}}$  for all  $i = 1, \dots, k$ , and then construct the field  $K_d$  as a compositum of these fields.

In order to construct  $K_{p_i^{e_i}}$  we work inductively, we first construct  $K_{p_i}$ , and then  $K_{p_i^2}$  as an extension of  $K_{p_i}$ , et cetera. In this way, the existence of all required subfields is immediately guaranteed. Moreover, if we already have a partial extension  $\mathbb{Q} \subset K$  and we need extend  $K$  further, then we can find the subfields  $K_{p_i^{e_i}}$  from  $K$  and extend these further as necessary.

To keep the defining equations for our number fields small, we apply a reduction algorithm every step. This has been implemented in `Magma` under the name

**OptimisedRepresentation.** For this function, it is important that the ring of integers of  $K$  is computable, which is a property we would like to have anyway for the computation of a regular model. A big bottleneck in the computation of the ring of integers is the factorisation of the discriminant of  $K$ , therefore we would like to keep this small.

Hence, we use the following strategy to find the extension  $K_{p_i^{e_i}}$  of  $K_{p_i^{e_i-1}}$ . We first fix the extension modulo  $p$ , as we want  $p$  to remain inert in  $K$ , i.e. we extend  $K_{p_i^{e_i-1}}$  taking the root of some yet to be determined polynomial  $f \in K_{p_i^{e_i-1}}[x]$  and we fix  $f$  modulo  $p$ . To get a good candidate, we do a random walk among all possible such  $f$ , adding multiples of  $p$  times a polynomial, to find one with small discriminant.

In practice this worked for all curves of genus 2 contained in [LMFDB], except for one case, where we loosened the subfield existence condition. In principle, you don't need the subfield  $K_d$  for any divisor  $d$ , just for the one which occur in the regular model computations. This can simplify the computation.

Future improvement to this part of the algorithm could be made if one implements a better algorithm to find 'small' field extensions.

## 2.5 Implementation

The algorithm has been implemented by the author in **Magma**, changing partly the way regular models are constructed. The computation of the Galois action on the component group took a negligible amount of time after a suitable regular model was constructed. Most time was spent on the construction of a regular model.

For the curves in [LMFDB] having the most complicated regular models, the computation of a regular model now took slightly longer than before, but still finished in a few minutes. In one case, the number field had to be extended so much, that the computation of the ring of integers became infeasible, and we loosened the conditions on this number field, as also noted in the previous subsection.

## 3 Real periods

An algorithm to compute real periods is described in [vBom19, Algorithm 13]. In order to compute the real periods for more than 66 000 hyperelliptic curves of genus 2 contained in [LMFDB] some optimisations had to be done:

1. The same computation should not be done many times. To achieve this,

new datastructures have been constructed to store all rings, ideals and other relevant objects that are needed multiple times during the computation. This in particular prevents the recomputation of Gröbner bases as these are also stored by `Magma` with an ideal.

2. Van Wamelen’s algorithm to compute the period lattice only works for hyperelliptic curves with a simplified Weierstraß model of odd degree. We moved to Pascal Molin and Christian Neurohr’s implementation that computes the Riemann surface associated to any curve ([MN19, Neu18]). This also had advantages for the hyperelliptic case as it allowed us to take simpler (even degree) models, which typically give rise to simpler regular models.
3. In Step 6 of [vBom19, Algorithm 13], for  $p^g$  differentials it is tested whether or not they vanish on the special fibre. This should not be necessary and in principle be a linear algebra problem. This is explained in more detail in subsection 3.3.
4. The Gröbner basis computations over  $\mathbb{Z}$  took most of the time in this algorithm. In some cases, even the computation of the function field over  $\mathbb{Q}$  of one of the patches of the regular model was taking a lot of time. In subsection 3.2, it is explained how this is being circumvented.

Moreover, we will consider some other ideas that could be used to improve this code even further in the future.

### 3.1 Computation of the order of vanishing of a function

First, we will briefly explain how the order of vanishing of a function is computed. Currently, `Magma` represents the patches of a regular model using equations with at most 3 variables with coefficients in the ring of integers of the number field we are working over. We illustrate the computation of the order of vanishing with an example.

**Example 4.** Consider the scheme given by the equation  $y^2 = x^2 - 2x - 2$  in  $\mathbb{A}_{\mathbb{Z}}^2$ . We take  $p = 2$ . We want to compute the order of vanishing of the function 2 on the component given by the vanishing of  $x + y$  and 2. In other words, we want to compute the multiplicity of that component in the special fibre.

We start with the ideal  $I = (x + y, 2) \subset \mathbb{Z}[x, y]$  and notice that 2 lies in it, so the order of vanishing is at least 1. Then we compute

$$I_2 = I^2 + (y^2 - x^2 + 2x + 2) = (x^2 + y^2 + 2, 2x + 2, 2y + 2, 4).$$

Even though 2 does not lie in  $I_2$ , we see that the ideal quotient

$$(I_2 : (2)) = (x + 1, y + 1, 2) \not\subset I.$$

In other words: 2 when multiplied with some unit lands in  $I_2$  and 2 vanishes with order at least 2. We proceed to compute

$$\begin{aligned} I_3 &= I^3 + (y^2 - x^2 + 2x + 2) \\ &= (x^2 + 2x + 3y^2 + 6, 2xy + 2x + 2y^2 + 2y, 4x + 4, 4y + 4, 8) \end{aligned}$$

and

$$(I_3 : (2)) = (x^2 + y^2 + 2, xy + x + y^2 + y, 2x + 2, 2y + 2, 4),$$

which is easily seen to be contained in  $I$ . Hence, the vanishing order of the function 2 is exactly 2.

So in order to compute the order of vanishing, we make use of the following proposition.

**Proposition 5.** *Let  $R$  be a commutative ring. Let  $J$  be an ideal of  $R$ , and let  $I$  be a prime ideal of  $R$  containing  $J$ . Let  $n$  be an integer. Then an element  $f \in R$  maps to an element in  $I^n \cdot (R/J)_I \subset (R/J)_I$  if and only if the ideal quotient  $(I^n + J : (f))$  is not contained in  $I$ .*

*Proof.* Omitted. □

The ideal quotient and membership of ideals can be checked using Gröbner basis machinery. This has been implemented in `Magma` and other packages in the case  $R$  is a polynomial ring over a field or a polynomial ring over  $\mathbb{Z}$ .

In case we are working over a ring of integers  $\mathcal{O}_K$  which is not  $\mathbb{Z}$ , we can represent  $\mathcal{O}_K$  as a finitely type algebra over  $\mathbb{Z}$ . For the computation of the real period, the field extensions that are necessary when computing a regular model are not chosen as in subsection 2.4, but they are chosen in such a way that  $\mathcal{O}_K$  is monogenic. In this way, we can proceed with the Gröbner basis calculations at the cost of adding just one extra variable. This is how we get an algorithm to compute the order of vanishing of a polynomial.

In general, a function will be of the form  $\frac{f}{g}$ , where  $f$  and  $g$  can be written as polynomials with integer coefficients. The order is then computed as the difference between the order of  $f$  and  $g$ .

### 3.2 How to avoid difficult computations in characteristic 0

In Example 4, all the calculations could have been done over  $\mathbb{Z}/4\mathbb{Z}$  instead of  $\mathbb{Z}$ , as we already know in advance that 4 has a strictly higher order of vanishing than 2. In fact, we replaced the current algorithm to compute the multiplicity of a component

with this new algorithm working over  $\mathbb{Z}/p^2\mathbb{Z}$ , leading to big speed-ups in some difficult cases.

In general, when we consider a polynomial  $f$  and we want to determine whether  $f$  vanishes with order at least  $r$  in a component with multiplicity  $m$ , it suffices to do all computations over  $\mathbb{Z}/p^{\lfloor r/m \rfloor + 1}\mathbb{Z}$ . In this way, we can avoid Gröbner basis computations over  $\mathbb{Z}$ , which take significantly more time.

Another big improvement came from a slight modification of the ideals  $I_n$ , as described in Example 4. A priori we were computing  $I_n$  as  $I_n = I^n + (\text{patch equations})$  and then computing a Gröbner basis. In our new implementation we defined ideals  $I_n^{\text{modified}}$  and  $J_n$  as follows:

$$J_n = \begin{cases} I & \text{if } n = 1, \\ I_{n-1}^{\text{modified}} \cdot I + (\text{patch equations}) & \text{else,} \end{cases}$$

$$I_n^{\text{modified}} = \begin{cases} I & \text{if } n = 1, \\ J_n + \langle x \in \text{GB}(I_{n-1}^{\text{modified}}) : (J_n : (x)) \not\subseteq I \rangle & \text{else,} \end{cases}$$

where GB gives a Gröbner basis of an ideal. Basically we add a bunch of elements to  $I_n^{\text{modified}}$  which are not contained themselves in  $I_n$ , but which do vanish with order  $n$  at  $I$ .

The following example illustrates the advantage of this approach.

**Example 6.** Consider the patch equations

$$y^{100} - x^{100} + 2x + 2 = 0, \quad xz - 2 = 0$$

inside the ring  $\frac{\mathbb{Z}}{2^{18}\mathbb{Z}}[x, y, z]$  equipped with the graded reverse lexicographic order. Now we look at the component in the special fibre given by  $I = (x + y, z, 2)$ . Then the direct computation of a Gröbner basis for  $I_{18}$  took 43.5 seconds, while the inductive computation of  $I_{18}^{\text{modified}}$  only took 2.32 seconds. Moreover, the former Gröbner basis has 61 elements, while the latter only has 30 elements.

Previously, we computed a function field for each patch of the regular model. This function field was used to represent differentials on this patch. The computation of this function field is quite expensive. In the following example, it did not seem to finish within 24 hours.

**Example 7.** Consider the curve 1328.a.84992.1, given by

$$y^2 + (x + 1)y = 4x^5 + 9x^4 + 16x^3 + 13x^2 + 8x + 1.$$

The regular model that **Magma** computes at 2 for this curve, has a patch given by two equations. One of these equations has 428 terms and is of degree 56. The computation of a function field over  $\mathbb{Q}$  for this patch did not finish in 24 hours.

However, in practice, we do not need this function field. Except for the first patches, all patches are defined using three variables  $x, y$ , and  $z$ , and two equations  $f = g = 0$ . For all practical purposes, we can just represent the differentials as  $h \cdot dx$ , where  $h \in K(x, y, z)$ , where  $K$  is the number field over which the patch is defined. If we somehow end up with a differential of the shape  $h' \cdot dy$  or  $h' \cdot dz$ , we can use the equations  $df = dg = 0$  and linear algebra over  $K(x, y, z)$  to write them as  $h \cdot dx$ . In this way, the computation of the function field can be avoided.

### 3.3 How to avoid checking $p^g$ differentials

In Step 6 of [vBom19, Algorithm 13], a candidate basis  $\omega_1, \dots, \omega_g$  for the global sections of the canonical sheaf  $\omega_{\mathcal{C}/\mathbb{Z}(p)}$  is considered. For each linear combination  $\sum_j c_j \omega_j$  with the  $c_j \in \{0, \dots, p-1\}$  not all equal to zero, it is tested whether  $\sum_j c_j \omega_j$  vanishes on the special fibre, so that  $\frac{1}{p} \sum_j c_j \omega_j$  can replace one of the current candidate basis elements.

For big values of  $p$ , the checking of  $p^g - 1$  differentials can take a lot of time. Of course, it would suffice to actually check just  $\frac{p^g - 1}{p - 1}$  of these differentials, but for  $g \geq 2$ , this could still be a big number.

If  $D$  is a component of the special fibre  $\mathcal{C}_p$ , then  $\mathcal{O}_{\mathcal{C}, D}$  is a discrete valuation ring whose residue field  $\mathbb{F}_D$  is a function field over a finite field. So in principle, checking whether  $\sum_j c_j \omega_j$  is vanishing on  $D$  is a  $\mathbb{F}_p$ -linear algebra problem inside  $\mathbb{F}_D$ , which could be solved much more efficiently.

If we write  $\omega_j = \frac{f_j}{g_j} d$  for polynomials  $f_j, g_j$  and  $d$  is a generator for  $\omega_{\mathcal{C}/\mathbb{Z}(p)}$ , as in [vBom19, Lemma 12], then we would need to determine the residue class of  $\frac{f_j}{g_j}$  inside  $\mathbb{F}_D$ . The problem that we now encounter is that both  $f_j$  and  $g_j$  could vanish on  $D$  with the same order  $n > 0$ . We could try to check if  $f_j - h \cdot g_j$  vanishes on  $F$  with order greater than  $n$ , where  $h$  ranges over lifts of elements in  $\mathbb{F}_D$ , but then we still need to check  $|\mathbb{F}_D|$  elements, which is exactly what we wanted to avoid. Although the vanishing of  $g_j$  on  $D$  sometimes happens, it seemed that in most cases there were a bunch of components for which this does not happen. Therefore, we decided to only use a linear algebra approach on those components on which  $g_j$  does not vanish. We then check in the end if the differential we found really vanishes on the whole special fibre.

**Remark 8.** An alternative approach would be to try to repeatedly divide a uniformiser out of  $f_j$  and  $g_j$  until they both have order 0. However, the difficulty with this approach is, that we are doing our computations over  $\mathbb{Z}/p^e\mathbb{Z}$  for some exponent  $e$ , and we cannot divide by the nilpotent uniformiser in that case.

Instead of doing linear algebra in the different function fields  $\mathbb{F}_D$ , we opted for an

easier approach, which works in almost all of the cases. We precompute a finite set  $S$  of (not necessarily rational) random closed points in the special fibre. We then check for which of the tuples  $(c_j)$  the sum  $\sum_c c_j \omega_j$  vanishes on each point in  $S$ .

For each point  $s \in S$  we precompute the residue classes of  $f_j$  and  $g_j$  inside the residue field  $\mathbb{F}_s$  at  $s$ . In case the residue class of  $g_j$  inside  $\mathbb{F}_s$  is zero, for some  $j$ , we are out of luck and discard the point  $s$ . Otherwise, we can compute the class of  $\frac{f_j}{g_j}$  in time polynomial in  $\log(p)$ .

For each point  $s \in S$ , we get a linear condition on the  $c_j$ 's, and in most cases these linear equations have a 0- or 1-dimensional solution space. In almost all cases for which this approach failed, the prime  $p$  was small, and the old method of trying all  $p^g - 1$  differentials is quick enough.

### 3.4 Possible ideas for improvements

Let  $D$  be a component of the special fibre of  $\mathcal{C}$ . We propose two ideas that could help in the task of finding the order of vanishing of a function  $f$  at  $D$ .

The first idea is to try to fix the defect described in Remark 8. For example, if we know that an integer is  $4 \pmod{12}$  and we divide it by 2, we cannot tell its value modulo 12, but we do know for sure that it is  $2 \pmod{6}$ . In the same way, we can reduce the modulus when we divide by a uniformiser to solve the problem described in Remark 8.

The second idea comes from a comparison with methods used in real analysis. If you want to see if a  $C^\infty$  function which vanishes in a point  $P$ , is vanishing twice, you usually compute its derivative and check if that is vanishing. Of course, this does not work in characteristic  $p$ , but the Hasse derivative could work, see for example [Gol03, sect. 1.3]. If there are methods to compute the Hasse derivative more efficiently than the Gröbner basis computations that we are currently doing, this could lead to much smaller runtimes.

## 4 Other BSD invariants

There have also been recent computations of other Birch and Swinnerton-Dyer invariants of Jacobians of genus 2 curves to the [LMFDB]. In this section, we summarise them.

The leading coefficients for the  $L$ -functions of these Jacobians have been computed using methods developed by Bober, Booker, Costa, Lee, Platt and Sutherland, to

appear in [BBCLPS], which builds upon work of Booker, see [Boo06]. The code developed by Costa and Platt is available at [CoP119].

Generators for the Mordell-Weil group of the Jacobians have been computed using code of Stoll. This is an improvement of the old `j-points` code. There are several ideas involved:

- the 2-Selmer group of the Jacobian and the 2-Selmer set of the  $\text{Pic}^1$  of the curve are used to bound the rank, see [Sto01, Creu18],
- the method of visualisation of elements of  $\text{III}$  is used to improve these bounds, see [CrMa00, Bru04, BrFl06],
- 2-power isogenous abelian surfaces are computed and they are used to even further improve on the upper bound for the rank bound,
- a modified naive height function is used, which has a smaller difference with the canonical height, reducing the size of the required search space, see [MüSt16, part IV],
- saturations are computed more efficiently than before, which is also described in [MüSt16, part IV].

With this code, we have been able to compute generators for almost all Mordell-Weil groups of genus 2 curves in the [LMFDB]. For the few for which we did not directly find generators, we found generators for an abelian surface isogenous to the Jacobian. The following example is the one for which it was most difficult to find a generator.

**Example 9.** The Jacobian for the genus 2 curve `900617.a.900617.1` given by

$$y^2 + (x^2 + x)y = x^5 - 65x^4 + 224x^3 + 30x^2 + x$$

is isogenous to the Jacobian of the genus 2 curve given by

$$y^2 = -1110x^6 - 2790x^5 - 9315x^4 + 11160x^3 + 18315x^2 - 9540x - 12765.$$

On the latter Jacobian, we were able to find a generator of the rank 1 Mordell-Weil group of canonical height 16.281246 using the code of Stoll. We then computed the image of this point under the isogeny, and used the modified height bound and improved saturation, to prove that we found a generator of canonical height 65.124982 on the Jacobian of `900617.a.900617.1`.

For the computation of the regulators from the set of generators of the Mordell-Weil group, we used an algorithm which is based on an approach to decompose the height in different local contributions using Arakelov theory, see also [Hol12, Mü14, BHM20].

## References

- [BiSw65] B. J. Birch, H. P. F. Swinnerton-Dyer. Notes on elliptic curves. II. *J. Reine Angew. Math.* **218** (1965), 79–108.
- [BBCLPS] Jonathan W. Bober, Andrew R. Booker, Edgar Costa, Min Lee, David J. Platt, Andrew Sutherland, *Computing motivic L-functions*, in preparation.
- [vBom19] Raymond van Bommel, Numerical verification of the Birch and Swinnerton-Dyer conjecture for hyperelliptic curves of higher genus over  $\mathbb{Q}$  up to squares. *Exp. Math.* (2019), doi:10.1080/10586458.2019.1592035.
- [BHM20] Raymond van Bommel, David Holmes, J. Steffen Müller, Explicit arithmetic intersection theory and computation of Néron-Tate heights. *Math. Comp.* **89** (2020), no. 321, 395–410.
- [Boo06] Andrew R. Booker, Artin’s conjecture, Turing’s method, and the Riemann hypothesis. *Exp. Math.* **15** (2006), no. 4, 385–408.
- [Bru04] Nils Bruin, Nils, Visualising Sha[2] in abelian surfaces. *Math. Comp.* **73** (2004), no. 247, 1459–1476.
- [BrFl06] N. Bruin, E. V. Flynn, Exhibiting SHA[2] on hyperelliptic Jacobians. *J. Number Theory* **118** (2006), no. 2, 266–291.
- [CoPl19] Edgar Costa and David Platt, *A generic L-function calculator for motivic L-functions*, available at <https://github.com/edgarcosta/lfunctions>, 2019
- [CrMa00] John E. Cremona, Barry Mazur, Visualizing elements in the Shafarevich-Tate group. *Experiment. Math.* **9** (2000), no. 1, 13–28.
- [Creu18] Brendan Creutz, Improved rank bounds from 2-descent on hyperelliptic Jacobians. *Int. J. Number Theory* **14** (2018), no. 6, 1709–1713.
- [FLSSSW] E. V. Flynn, F. Leprévost, E. F. Schaefer, W. A. Stein, M. Stoll, J. Wetherell, Empirical evidence for the Birch and Swinnerton-Dyer conjectures for modular Jacobians of genus 2 curves. *Math. Comp.* **70** (2001), no. 236, 1675–1697.
- [Gol03] David M. Goldschmidt, *Algebraic functions and projective curves*. Graduate Texts in Mathematics, 215. Springer-Verlag, New York, 2003.
- [Hol12] David Holmes, Computing Néron-Tate heights of points on hyperelliptic Jacobians. *J. Number Theory* **132** (2012), no. 6, 1295–1305.
- [LMFDB] The LMFDB Collaboration, *The L-functions and Modular Forms Database*. <https://www.lmfdb.org>.
- [MN19] Pascal Molin, Christian Neurohr, Computing period matrices and the Abel-Jacobi map of superelliptic curves. *Math. Comp.* **88** (2019), no. 316, 847–888.
- [Mül14] J. Steffen Müller, Computing canonical heights using arithmetic intersection theory. *Math. Comp.* **83** (2014), no. 285, 311–336.
- [MüSt16] Jan Steffen Müller, Michael Stoll, Canonical heights on genus-2 Jacobians. *Algebra Number Theory* **10** (2016), no. 10, 2153–2234.

- [Neu18] Christian Neurohr, Efficient integration on Riemann surfaces & applications. *PhD thesis* (2018), <http://oops.uni-oldenburg.de/3607/1/neueff18.pdf>.
- [PoSt99] B. Poonen, M. Stoll, The Cassels-Tate pairing on polarized abelian varieties. *Ann. of Math.* **150** (1999), no. 3, 1109–1149.
- [Sto01] Michael Stoll, Implementing 2-descent for Jacobians of hyperelliptic curves. *Acta Arith.* **98** (2001), no. 3, 245–277.
- [Tate66] J. Tate, On the conjectures of Birch and Swinnerton-Dyer and a geometric analog. *Séminaire Bourbaki, Vol. 9* (1964–1966), Exp. No. 306, 415–440, Soc. Math. France, Paris, 1995.