On cycles of pairing-friendly abelian varieties

Based on joint work with Craig Costello and Michael Naehrig

Maria Corte-Real Santos ENS Lyon and CNRS

Motivation

Pairing-based proof systems

• Our motivation comes from non-interactive zero-knowledge proofs.

Pairing-based proof systems

- Our motivation comes from non-interactive zero-knowledge proofs.
- based zk-SNARKs with *recursive composition* of proofs.

• In 2014, Ben-Sasson, Chiesa, Tromer and Virza realised efficient pairing-

Pairing-based proof systems

- Our motivation comes from non-interactive zero-knowledge proofs.
- based zk-SNARKs with *recursive composition* of proofs.
- The core ingredient are cycles of pairing-friendly elliptic curves.



• In 2014, Ben-Sasson, Chiesa, Tromer and Virza realised efficient pairing-

Pairing-friendly cycles of elliptic curves

Definition [Ben-Sasson, Chiesa, Tromer, Virza '14]

such that

and E, E' are pairing-friendly.

A (2-)cycle of pairing-friendly elliptic curves is a pair of elliptic curves E/\mathbb{F}_p and E'/\mathbb{F}_q

$q = \#E(\mathbb{F}_p)$ and $p = \#E'(\mathbb{F}_q)$



Pairing-friendly cycles of elliptic curves

Definition [Ben-Sasson, Chiesa, Tromer, Virza '14]

such that

and *E*, *E'* are pairing-friendly.

A (2-)cycle of pairing-friendly elliptic curves is a pair of elliptic curves E/\mathbb{F}_p and E'/\mathbb{F}_q

$q = \#E(\mathbb{F}_p)$ and $p = \#E'(\mathbb{F}_q)$





Main example of a cycle

Example: 2-cycle of Miyaji, Nakabayashi and Takano (MNT) curves

(k, k') = (4, 6)







• MNT cycles known prior to pairing-based proof popularity [Karabina, Teske '08]

- MNT cycles known prior to pairing-based proof popularity [Karabina, Teske '08] • Since then, no new 2-cycle constructions have been found

- MNT cycles known prior to pairing-based proof popularity [Karabina, Teske '08] • Since then, no new 2-cycle constructions have been found
- Several negative/impossibility results

- MNT cycles known prior to pairing-based proof popularity [Karabina, Teske '08] • Since then, no new 2-cycle constructions have been found
- Several negative/impossibility results

Chiesa, Chia, Weidner '19

- MNT cycles known prior to pairing-based proof popularity [Karabina, Teske '08] • Since then, no new 2-cycle constructions have been found
- Several negative/impossibility results
 - Chiesa, Chia, Weidner '19
 - Bellés-Muñoz, Jiménez Urroz, Silva '23

- MNT cycles known prior to pairing-based proof popularity [Karabina, Teske '08] • Since then, no new 2-cycle constructions have been found
- Several negative/impossibility results
 - Chiesa, Chia, Weidner '19
 - Bellés-Muñoz, Jiménez Urroz, Silva '23
- Chiesa, Chia, Weidner explored \bullet



... but Hasse interval shackles this!

- MNT cycles known prior to pairing-based proof popularity [Karabina, Teske '08] • Since then, no new 2-cycle constructions have been found
- Several negative/impossibility results
 - Chiesa, Chia, Weidner '19
 - Bellés-Muñoz, Jiménez Urroz, Silva '23
- Chiesa, Chia, Weidner explored

To overcome these impossibility results, previous works relax *pairing-friendly* or look at 2-chains.



... but Hasse interval shackles this!



(Short) Preliminaries

An **elliptic curve** *E* over finite field \mathbb{F}_q ($q = p^{\bullet}, p \neq 2, 3$) is a smooth curve

 $E: y^2 = x^3 + ax + b,$



Elliptic Curves for Cryptography An elliptic curve *E* over finite field \mathbb{F}_q ($q = p^{\bullet}, p \neq 2, 3$) is a smooth curve $E: y^2 = x^3 + ax + b,$ Q Elliptic curves form a group $E(\mathbb{F}_q)$ under addition of point



Elliptic Curves for Cryptography An elliptic curve *E* over finite field \mathbb{F}_q ($q = p^{\bullet}, p \neq 2, 3$) is a smooth curve $E: y^2 = x^3 + ax + b,$ Elliptic curves form a group $E(\mathbb{F}_q)$ under addition of point



Elliptic Curves for Cryptography An elliptic curve *E* over finite field \mathbb{F}_q ($q = p^{\bullet}, p \neq 2, 3$) is a smooth curve $E: y^2 = x^3 + ax + b,$ Elliptic curves form a group $E(\mathbb{F}_q)$ under addition of point



An elliptic curve *E* over finite field \mathbb{F}_q ($q = p^{\bullet}, p \neq 2, 3$) is a smooth curve $E: y^2 = x^3 + ax + b$,

where $a, b \in \mathbb{F}_q$.

Elliptic curves form a group $E(\mathbb{F}_q)$ under **addition of points**. Identity is denoted \mathcal{O} .

- An **elliptic curve** *E* over finite field \mathbb{F}_q ($q = p^{\bullet}, p \neq 2,3$) is a smooth curve $E: y^2 = x^3 + ax + b$,
- where $a, b \in \mathbb{F}_q$. Elliptic curves form a group $E(\mathbb{F}_q)$ under **addition of points**. Identity is denoted \mathcal{O} . Another useful operation is **scalar multiplication**:
 - For $a \in \mathbb{Z}$ and point $P \in E(\mathbb{F}_q)$, [a]P = P + ... + P
- $P = P + \dots + P$ a

- An elliptic curve *E* over finite field \mathbb{F}_q ($q = p^{\bullet}, p \neq 2, 3$) is a smooth curve $E: y^2 = x^3 + ax + b$,
- where $a, b \in \mathbb{F}_q$.
- Elliptic curves form a group $E(\mathbb{F}_q)$ under **addition of points**. Identity is denoted \mathcal{O} . Another useful operation is scalar multiplication:
 - For $a \in \mathbb{Z}$ and point $P \in E(\mathbb{F}_a)$, [a]P = P + ... + P
- The order of the point is the smallest positive $n \in \mathbb{Z}$ such that $[n]P = \emptyset$. $E(\mathbb{F}_q)[n]$ is the subgroup of *n*-torsion points (points whose order divides *n*).

a

- An elliptic curve *E* over finite field \mathbb{F}_q ($q = p^{\bullet}, p \neq 2, 3$) is a smooth curve $E: y^2 = x^3 + ax + b$,
- where $a, b \in \mathbb{F}_q$.
- Elliptic curves form a group $E(\mathbb{F}_q)$ under **addition of points**. Identity is denoted \mathcal{O} . Another useful operation is scalar multiplication:
 - For $a \in \mathbb{Z}$ and point $P \in E(\mathbb{F}_a)$, [a]P = P + ... + P
- The order of the point is the smallest positive $n \in \mathbb{Z}$ such that $[n]P = \emptyset$ An elliptic curve is supersingular if $E(\overline{\mathbb{F}}_{a})$ has no points of order p, otherwise ordinary.

a



Elliptic curves E

Elliptic curves E

Principally polarised abelian varieties A

A pairing is a non-degenerate bilinear map





(additive) group • of prime order ℓ $e: G_1 \times G_2 \to G_T$ (multiplicative) group of prime order ℓ

A pairing is a non-degenerate bilinear map

- **Non-degenerate:** $e(P_1, P_2) = 1_{G_T}$ for all $P_2 \in G_2$ if and only if $P_1 = 0_{G_1}$ $e(P_1, P_2) = 1_{G_T}$ for all $P_1 \in G_1$ if and only if $P_2 = 0_{G_2}$ **Bilinear:** For all $P_1, Q_1 \in G_1$ and $P_2, Q_2 \in G_2$ we have
 - $e(P_1 + Q_1, P_2) = e(P_1, P_2)e(Q_1, P_2)$ and $e(P_1, P_2 + Q_2) = e(P_1, P_2)e(P_1, Q_2)$

Pairings

$e: G_1 \times G_2 \to G_T$

Pairings

 $e: E(\mathbb{F}_{p^u})[\ell] \times$

For an elliptic curve, the ℓ -Weil pairing (for prime ℓ with ℓ -torsion defined over \mathbb{F}_{p^u}) is the pairing

$$\langle E(\mathbb{F}_{p^u})[\mathscr{C}] \to \mu_{\mathscr{C}} \subseteq \mathbb{F}_{p^{uk}}^{\times}$$

where k is the embedding degree with respect to ℓ : the smallest natural number k such that $\ell \mid (p^u)^k - 1$.

Pairings

For an elliptic curve, the ℓ -Weil pairing (for prime ℓ with ℓ -torsion defined over $\mathbb{F}_{p^{\mu}}$) is the pairing

 $e: E(\mathbb{F}_{p^u})[\ell] \times$

For security, we need the DLP to be hard in $\mathbb{F}_{p^{uk}}^{\times}$ so we want to maximise the embedding degree (while the pairing still be efficiently computable).

We also need ℓ to be large enough so that the ECDLP is hard in $E(\mathbb{F}_{p^u})[\ell]$; best attack is generic and runs in $O(\sqrt{l})$.

$$(E(\mathbb{F}_{p^u})[\ell] \to \mu_{\ell} \subseteq \mathbb{F}_{p^{uk}}^{\times}$$

where k is the embedding degree with respect to ℓ : the smallest natural number k such that $\ell \mid (p^u)^k - 1$.

Pairings

For an elliptic curve, the ℓ -Weil pairing (for prime ℓ with ℓ -torsion defined over \mathbb{F}_{p^u}) is the pairing

 $e: E(\mathbb{F}_{p^u})[\ell] \times$

where k is the embedding degree with respect to ℓ : the smallest natural number k such that $\ell \mid (p^u)^k - 1$.

Paring friendly with respect to q

$$\langle E(\mathbb{F}_{p^u})[\mathscr{C}] \to \mu_{\mathscr{C}} \subseteq \mathbb{F}_{p^{uk}}^{\times}$$



Elliptic curves

We can generalise the ℓ -Weil pairing for principally polarised abelian varieties.

Principally polarised abelian varieties

Elliptic curves

We can generalise the ℓ -Weil pairing for principally polarised abelian varieties.

Embedding Degree

Principally polarised abelian varieties

Elliptic curves

We can generalise the ℓ -Weil pairing for principally polarised abelian varieties.

Embedding Degree

Principally polarised abelian varieties

Cryptographic Exponent

For large enough ℓ , the *cryptographic exponent* c_A of *A* is such that $(p^u)^{c_A} = p^r$, with *r* the smallest integer such that $\ell \mid p^r - 1$.

Elliptic curves

We can generalise the ℓ -Weil pairing for principally polarised abelian varieties.

Embedding Degree

When u > 1, r can be smaller than uk

Principally polarised abelian varieties



Cryptographic Exponent

For large enough ℓ , the *cryptographic exponent* c_A of *A* is such that $(p^u)^{c_A} = p^r$, with *r* the smallest integer such that $\ell \mid p^r - 1$.

Elliptic curves

We can generalise the ℓ -Weil pairing for principally polarised abelian varieties.

Embedding Degree

Principally polarised abelian varieties

Cryptographic Exponent

For large enough ℓ , the cryptographic exponent c_A of *A* is such that $(p^u)^{c_A} = p^r$, with *r* the smallest integer such that $\ell \mid p^r - 1$.

> Captures the ratio between the field of definition of *A* and where the ℓ -Weil pairing is defined.


Abelian varieties

Elliptic curves

We can generalise the ℓ -Weil pairing for principally polarised abelian varieties.

Embedding Degree

Remark: the larger the cryptographic exponent is, the smaller p^u can be chosen, making arithmetic in the field of definition more efficient while still ensuring DLP security in the finite field group.

Principally polarised abelian varieties

Cryptographic Exponent

For large enough ℓ , the *cryptographic exponent* c_A of A is such that $(p^u)^{c_A} = p^r$, with r the smallest integer such that $\ell \mid p^r - 1$.

The Ideal Situation

A 2-cycle of two prime order elliptic curves, both of which have (the same) embedding degree that balances the ECDLP and DLP securities of all groups involved.

degree that balances the ECDLP and DLP securities of all groups involved.



degree that balances the ECDLP and DLP securities of all groups involved.







degree that balances the ECDLP and DLP securities of all groups involved.





degree that balances the ECDLP and DLP securities of all groups involved.

| Security level | 80 | 112 | 128 |
|-------------------------------------|------|------|------|
| Req. ext. field size | 1184 | 3012 | 3968 |
| Dream cycles $p \approx q$ | 160 | 224 | 256 |
| MNT reality $p \approx q$ | 296 | 753 | 992 |







Overview

Our generalisation

We instead consider pairing-friendly cycles of abelian varieties. We say

q, p (respectively).

Differences:

(i) A and B can be abelian varieties of any dimension (ii) A and B can be defined over extension fields (iii) p and q need only divide the respective group orders of B and A

- A/\mathbb{F}_{p^u} and B/\mathbb{F}_{q^v}
- form a cycle if $q | #A(\mathbb{F}_{p^u})$ and $p | #B(\mathbb{F}_{q^v})$ and A, B are pairing-friendly with respect to



High-level strategy

varieties

1) A and B are simple: i.e., not isomorphic to a product of lower dimensional abelian

- varieties
- 2) A is supersingular of dimension $g \ge 1$: exploiting existing constructions of Pujolàs, Ritzenthaler, Smith '09)

1) A and B are simple: i.e., not isomorphic to a product of lower dimensional abelian

supersingular pairing-friendly abelian varieties of dimension ≥ 1 (e.g., Galbraith,

- varieties
- 2) A is supersingular of dimension $g \ge 1$: exploiting existing constructions of Pujolàs, Ritzenthaler, Smith '09)

1) A and B are simple: i.e., not isomorphic to a product of lower dimensional abelian

supersingular pairing-friendly abelian varieties of dimension ≥ 1 (e.g., Galbraith,

3) $A(\mathbb{F}_{p^u})$ is of prime order q: alongside supersingularity, this implies $q \equiv 1 \mod p$, which means that B is pairing-friendly with respect to p; but, this forces $c_B = 1$.

- 1) A and B are simple: i.e., not isomorphic to a product of lower dimensional abelian varieties
- 2) A is supersingular of dimension $g \ge 1$: exploiting existing constructions of supersingular pairing-friendly abelian varieties of dimension ≥ 1 (e.g., Galbraith, Pujolàs, Ritzenthaler, Smith '09)
- 3) $A(\mathbb{F}_{p^u})$ is of prime order q: alongside supersingularity, this implies $q \equiv 1 \mod p$, which means that B is pairing-friendly with respect to p; but, this forces $c_B = 1$.
- 4) *B* is of dimension 1: as $c_B = 1$, having *B* as an elliptic curve allows the most straightforward construction of a cycle with most efficient arithmetic.

- varieties
- 2) A is supersingular of dimension $g \ge 1$: exploiting existing constructions of Pujolàs, Ritzenthaler, Smith '09)
- 4) B is of dimension 1: as $c_B = 1$, having B as an elliptic curve allows the most straightforward construction of a cycle with most efficient arithmetic.

1) A and B are simple: i.e., not isomorphic to a product of lower dimensional abelian

supersingular pairing-friendly abelian varieties of dimension ≥ 1 (e.g., Galbraith,

3) $A(\mathbb{F}_{p^u})$ is of prime order q: alongside supersingularity, this implies $q \equiv 1 \mod p$, which means that B is pairing-friendly with respect to p; but, this forces $c_R = 1$.

To counter: find large *v* such that *v* is the smallest integer with $B[p] \subseteq B(\mathbb{F}_{q^{v}})$



Supersingular?

Security



Supersingular?

Security

High-dimensional abelian varieties?



Supersingular?

Security

High-dimensional abelian varieties?

Within the SNARK ecosystem?



Towards optimal cycles

Recall: An optimal cycle for λ -bit security would be one where

- $p \approx q \approx 2^{2\lambda}$
- Likewise for the *p*-Weil pairing of *B*

• q-Weil pairing of A map into an extension field large enough to achieve λ -bits of security against state-of-the-art DLP attacks.



Towards optimal cycles

Recall: An optimal cycle for λ -bit security would be one where

- $p \approx q \approx 2^{2\lambda}$
- Likewise for the *p*-Weil pairing of *B*

with an "optimal" B... but there is not negative result saying they cannot exist.

• q-Weil pairing of A map into an extension field large enough to achieve λ -bits of security against state-of-the-art DLP attacks.

This work: Give constructions of A where $p \approx 2^{2\lambda}$ is indeed as small as possible. With our choices and restrictions, we cannot pair this





Constructions

Constructions Let's focus on two constructions...

First construction



First construction

 $p \equiv 2 \mod 3$, u = 2u' with u' even such that $q = p^u - p^{u/2} + 1$ is prime

- supersingular elliptic curve defined over \mathbb{F}_{p^u} A/Ŀ
- $#A(\mathbb{F}_{p^u}) = q$
- cryptographic exponent $c_A = 3$ w.r.t. *q*

Proposition 2 gives the explicit construction.

p > 3 prime, *u* even such that $q = p^{u} + p^{u/2} + 1$ is prime

supersingular elliptic \bullet curve defined over \mathbb{F}_{a^2}

•
$$p \mid \#B(\mathbb{F}_{q^2})$$

cryptographic exponent $c_B = 1$ w.r.t. p

Proposition 5 gives the explicit construction.

 B/F_{2}



$$p = 2^{160} - 44159$$
$$\mathbb{F}_{p^2} = \mathbb{F}_p(\alpha) \text{ with } \alpha^2 = 3$$
$$\mathbb{F}_{p^4} = \mathbb{F}_{p^2}(\beta) \text{ with } \beta^2 = \alpha$$



Example #1

 $q = p^4 - p^2 + 1 \approx 2^{640}$

Summary of constructions

| Target security | MNT cycle | | | | This work | | | | | |
|--------------------|-----------|-----|-------|----------|-----------|-----|---------|-----|---------------|---------|
| | p | q | p^k | $q^{k'}$ | dim(A) | p | p^{u} | q | $(p^u)^{c_A}$ | q^{v} |
| 80 | 298 | 298 | 1192 | 1788 | 1 | 160 | 640 | 640 | 1920 | 1280 |
| 112 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 128 | | | | | | | | | | |

Second construction

Let $g = 2^{\ell}$ with $\ell \ge 0$. Let u = 2u' with u' odd and $q = p^{ug} - p^{ug/2} + 1$ prime.

- supersingular abelian variety over \mathbb{F}_{p^u} of dimension g $A/F_{D^{u}}$
- $#A(\mathbb{F}_{p^u}) = q$
- cryptographic exponent $c_A = 3 \cdot 2^{g-1}$ w.r.t. *q*

Theorem 4 gives the explicit construction. In particular, there is a natural identification of $A(\mathbb{F}_{p^u})$ with a subgroup of $E(\mathbb{F}_{p^{ur}})$ with r = 2g and *E* as in Proposition 1. Relies heavily on work by Rubin and Silverberg.



Second construction

Let $g = 2^{\ell}$ with $\ell \ge 0$. Let u = 2u' with u' odd and $q = p^{ug} - p^{ug/2} + 1$ prime.

- supersingular abelian variety over \mathbb{F}_{p^u} of dimension g $A/F_{D^{u}}$
- $\#A(\mathbb{F}_{p^u}) = q$
- cryptographic exponent $c_A = 3 \cdot 2^{g-1}$ w.r.t. *q*

Theorem 4 gives the explicit construction. In particular, there is a natural identification of $A(\mathbb{F}_{p^u})$ with a subgroup of $E(\mathbb{F}_{p^{ur}})$ with r = 2g and *E* as in Proposition 1. Relies heavily on work by Rubin and Silverberg.



Second construction

Let $g = 2^{\ell}$ with $\ell \ge 0$. Let u = 2u' with u' odd and $q = p^{ug} - p^{ug/2} + 1$ prime.

- supersingular abelian variety over \mathbb{F}_{p^u} of dimension g
- $#A(\mathbb{F}_{p^u}) = q$
- cryptographic exponent $c_A = 3 \cdot 2^{g-1}$ w.r.t. q

Theorem 4 gives the explicit construction. In particular, there is a natural identification of $A(\mathbb{F}_{p^u})$ with a subgroup of $E(\mathbb{F}_{p^{ur}})$ with r = 2g and E as in Proposition 1. Relies heavily on work by Rubin and Silverberg.

As before....

p > 3 prime, *u* even such that $q = p^{ug} - p^{ug/2} + 1$ is prime

- supersingular elliptic curve defined over \mathbb{F}_{q^2}
- $p \mid \#B(\mathbb{F}_{q^2})$
- cryptographic exponent $c_B = 1$ w.r.t. p

Proposition 5 gives the explicit construction.

 B/\mathbb{F}







Example #2

 $q = p^4 - p^2 + 1 \approx 2^{640}$

Summary of constructions

| Target | MNT cycle | | | | This work | | | | | |
|----------|-----------|-----|-------|----------|-----------|------------|------------|------------|---------------|--------------|
| security | р | q | p^k | $q^{k'}$ | dim(A) | р | p^{u} | q | $(p^u)^{c_A}$ | q^{v} |
| 80 | 298 | 298 | 1192 | 1788 | 1 2 | 160 160 | 640 320 | 640 640 | 1920 1920 | 1280 1280 |
| | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | |

Summary of constructions

| Target security | MNT cycle | | | | This work | | | | | |
|--------------------|-----------|-----|-------|----------|-------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------|-----------------------|----------------------|
| | р | q | p^k | $q^{k'}$ | dim(A) | р | p^{u} | q | $(p^u)^{c_A}$ | q^{v} |
| 80 | 298 | 298 | 1192 | 1788 | 1 2 | 160 160 | 640 320 | 640 640 | 1920 1920 | 1280 1280 |
| 112 | 753 | 753 | 3012 | 4517 | 1 2 | 224 377 | 1792 754 | 1792 1508 | 5376 4512 | 3584 3012 |
| 128 | 992 | 992 | 3966 | 5948 | 1 2 4 | 2048 1024 512 | 2048 1024 512 | 2048 2048 2048 | 6144 6144 12288 | 4096 4096 4096 |

condition:

For finding such relaxed 2-cycles, Costello and Korpal study the following necessary

For finding such *relaxed* 2-cycles, Costello and Korpal study the following necessary condition:

Definition: Primes with (k, k')**-order reciprocity**

The prime numbers p and q have (k, k')-order reciprocity if

- $\operatorname{ord}_q(p) = k$
- $\operatorname{ord}_p(q) = k'$



For finding such *relaxed* 2-cycles, Costello and Korpal study the following necessary condition:

Definition: Primes with (k, k')**-order reciprocity**

The prime numbers p and q have (k, k')-order reciprocity if

- $\operatorname{ord}_q(p) = k$
- $\operatorname{ord}_p(q) = k'$

(k, k') will correspond to the embedding degrees.


Example:

• The prime pair (p,q) = (620461, 15493) is such that (k, k') = (12, 12)



Example:

- The prime pair (p, q) = (620461, 15493) is such that (k, k') = (12, 12)
- We cannot have $q = \#E(\mathbb{F}_p)$ and $p = \#E'(\mathbb{F}_q)$. Indeed, the Hasse bound for E'/\mathbb{F}_q is $15246 \le \#E'(\mathbb{F}_q) \le 15742$.



Example:

- The prime pair (p, q) = (620461, 15493) is such that (k, k') = (12, 12)
- We cannot have $q = \#E(\mathbb{F}_p)$ and $p = \#E'(\mathbb{F}_q)$. Indeed, the Hasse bound for E'/\mathbb{F}_q is $15246 \le \#E'(\mathbb{F}_q) \le 15742$. Allowing cofactors and/or extension fields? Still doesn't quite work:
- - $hq = \#E(\mathbb{F}_p)$ and $h'p = \#E'(\mathbb{F}_{q^2})$
 - Such an *E* exists with h = 40, but no multiple of *p* in the Hasse interval for E'/\mathbb{F}_{q^2}



Example:

- The prime pair (p, q) = (620461, 15493) is such that (k, k') = (12, 12)
- We cannot have $q = \#E(\mathbb{F}_p)$ and $p = \#E'(\mathbb{F}_q)$. Indeed, the Hasse bound for E'/\mathbb{F}_q is $15246 \le \#E'(\mathbb{F}_q) \le 15742$.
- Allowing cofactors and/or extension fields? Still doesn't quite work:
 - $hq = \#E(\mathbb{F}_p)$ and $h'p = \#E'(\mathbb{F}_{q^2})$
 - Such an *E* exists with h = 40, but no multiple of *p* in the Hasse interval for E'/\mathbb{F}_{q^2} •
- We need higher dimensions:

 - $E/\mathbb{F}_p: y^2 = x^3 + 30984x + 426966$ ordinary, $\#E(\mathbb{F}_p) = 40 \cdot q$

• $C/\mathbb{F}_a: y^2 = x^6 + 6611x^5 + 13858x^4 + 6818x^3 + 5652x^2 + 10423x + 1795$ ordinary, $\#J_C(\mathbb{F}_a) = 383 \cdot p$



In light of this, they pose some open questions:

In light of this, they pose some open questions:

1. Is (620461,15493) the only prime pair with (12,12)-order reciprocity?



In light of this, they pose some open questions:

- 1. Is (620461, 15493) the only prime pair with (12, 12)-order reciprocity?
- 2. Are there any fixed values of (k, k') with min(k, k') > 4 for which that are an infinite number of primes with (k, k')-order reciprocity?



In light of this, they pose some open questions:

- 1. Is (620461, 15493) the only prime pair with (12, 12)-order reciprocity?
- 2. Are there any fixed values of (k, k') with min(k, k') > 4 for which that are an infinite number of primes with (k, k')-order reciprocity?
- 3. Are there any fixed values of (k, k') with min(k, k') > 2 for which that are no primes with (k, k')-order reciprocity?



Conclusions

- We generalise the definition of cycles of pairing-friendly elliptic curves.
- We make certain choices to restrict our attention to a subset of possible cycles.
- We exhibit the interest of this framework by presenting new constructions.

Conclusions

- We generalise the definition of cycles of pairing-friendly elliptic curves.
- We make certain choices to restrict our attention to a subset of possible cycles.
- We exhibit the interest of this framework by presenting new constructions.

- Can we relax some of these restrictions to find better cycles?
- How do these cycles perform in practice?

Conclusions

- We generalise the definition of cycles of pairing-friendly elliptic curves.
- We make certain choices to restrict our attention to a subset of possible cycles.
- We exhibit the interest of this framework by presenting new constructions.
- Can we relax some of these restrictions to find better cycles?
- How do these cycles perform in practice?



Published at CRYPTO 2024 (eprint 2024/869)