

A quasi-optimal lower bound for skew polynomial multiplication

Qiyuan Chen^{a,b}

^aKLMM, Academy of Mathematics and Systems Science, Chinese Academy of Sciences

^bSchool of Mathematical Sciences, University of Chinese Academy of Sciences
Beijing, China
chenqiyuan@amss.ac.cn

Ke Ye^{a,b*}

^aKLMM, Academy of Mathematics and Systems Science, Chinese Academy of Sciences

^bSchool of Mathematical Sciences, University of Chinese Academy of Sciences
Beijing, China
keyk@amss.ac.cn

ABSTRACT

We establish a lower bound for the complexity of multiplying two skew polynomials. The lower bound coincides with the upper bound conjectured by Caruso and Borgne in 2017, up to a log factor. We present algorithms for three special cases, indicating that the aforementioned lower bound is quasi-optimal. In fact, our lower bound is quasi-optimal in the sense of bilinear complexity. In addition, we discuss the average bilinear complexity of simultaneous multiplication of skew polynomials and the complexity of skew polynomial multiplication in the case of towers of extensions.

CCS CONCEPTS

• **Theory of computation** → **Algebraic complexity theory**.

KEYWORDS

skew polynomial multiplication, computational complexity, lower bound, average bilinear complexity, étale algebra, Kummer extension, Artin extension, tower of extensions

ACM Reference Format:

Qiyuan Chen^{a,b} and Ke Ye^{a,b}. 2024. **A quasi-optimal lower bound for skew polynomial multiplication**. In *International Symposium on Symbolic and Algebraic Computation 2024 (ISSAC 2024)*, July 16–19, 2024, Raleigh, USA. ACM, New York, NY, USA, 8 pages. <https://doi.org/XXXXXXX.XXXXXXX>

1 INTRODUCTION

The skew polynomial ring is a non-commutative analogue of the usual polynomial ring. It is the special case of the Ore algebra first studied in [14]. Because of its highly non-trivial algebraic and computational properties, the ring of skew polynomials plays a crucial role in diverse fields of mathematics.

*Corresponding author.

Permission to make digital or hard copies of part or all of this work for personal or classroom use is granted without fee provided that copies are not made or distributed for profit or commercial advantage and that copies bear this notice and the full citation on the first page. Copyrights for third-party components of this work must be honored. For all other uses, contact the owner/author(s).

ISSAC 2024, July 16–19, 2024, Raleigh, USA

© 2024 Copyright held by the owner/author(s).

ACM ISBN XXXXXXXX.XXXXXXX.

<https://doi.org/XXXXXXX.XXXXXXX>

For instance, quaternion algebras and cyclic algebras are quotients of skew polynomial rings [10, 12]; the connection between matrix algebras and skew polynomial rings can be used to design fast algorithms for matrix multiplication [11]; it is just realized in recent years that skew polynomial rings over finite fields provide us new models in coding theory [2, 3, 17]. Due to aforementioned applications in complexity theory and coding theory, various operations of skew polynomials are extensively studied in the literature as well, including multiplication [5, 8, 9], factorization [6, 8], Gröbner bases [13] and interpolation [15, 16].

As an algebra, the most important and fundamental operation on skew polynomial rings is the multiplication. We recall that given a k -algebra \mathcal{A} of dimension r and a k -linear automorphism σ of \mathcal{A} , the skew polynomial ring $\mathcal{A}[x, \sigma]$ consists of polynomials with coefficients in \mathcal{A} , whose multiplication is skewed by σ , i.e., $xa = \sigma(a)x$, $a \in \mathcal{A}$. We denote by $C_{\tilde{k}}(\mu_d)$ the number of arithmetic operations over \tilde{k} required to compute the product of two degree d skew polynomials in $\mathcal{A}[x, \sigma]$. The first fast algorithm of skew polynomial multiplication is proposed in [8], which has complexity $C_{\tilde{k}}(\mu_d) = O(dr^2 + d^2r)$. Algorithms presented in [15, 16] improve the upper bound to $\tilde{O}(d^{(\omega+1)/2}r)$, where ω denotes the exponent of matrix multiplication. Based on the quasi-optimal bound [1] for the multiplication of linear differential operators, it is conjectured in [5] that $C_{\tilde{k}}(\mu_d) = \tilde{O}(d \min(d, r)^{\omega-2}r)$. An upper bound is also obtained in [5]:

$$C_{\tilde{k}}(\mu_d) = \begin{cases} \tilde{O}(dr^{\omega-1}), & d \geq r \\ \tilde{O}(d^{\omega-2}r^2), & d < r \end{cases}, \quad (1)$$

which coincides with the conjectured upper bound when $d \geq r$. As far as we aware, it is the best upper bound in the literature when $d \geq r^{2/(5-\omega)}$. However, if $d < r^{2/(5-\omega)}$, the bound $\tilde{O}(d^{(\omega+1)/2}r)$ in [15, 16] is better. By exploiting the mod- r sparsity $R \leq r$ of the support of the product, [9] proposes a Las Vegas algorithm of complexity $\tilde{O}(\max(d, r)rR^{\omega-2})$, which outperforms existing algorithms if $d \geq \min(r^{2/(5-\omega)}, r^{2/(\omega+1)}R^{(2\omega-4)/(\omega+1)})$. Lastly, we remark that although the upper bound of skew polynomial multiplication has been studied extensively in the past two decades, the lower bound is still far from being understood.

Contributions

This paper is concerned with the computational complexity of skew polynomial multiplication. The primary goal is twofold:

- (1) we establish a lower bound of $C_{\tilde{r}}(\mu_d)$ in Theorem 12, which coincides with the conjectured upper bound $\tilde{O}(d \min(d, r)^{\omega-2} r)$ in [5], up to a log factor;
- (2) we present in Section 5 fast algorithms for low degree ($d \leq r$) skew polynomial multiplication in several special cases, which cost $\tilde{O}(d^{\omega-1} r)$ arithmetic operations. This indicates that our lower bound is quasi-optimal.

In particular, our lower bound together with the algorithm presented in [5] implies that if $d \geq r$, then $C_{\tilde{r}}(\mu_d)$ is completely determined (up to a log factor):

$$C_{\tilde{r}}(\mu_d) = \tilde{O}(dr^{\omega-1}) = \Omega(dr^{\omega-1}).$$

Additionally, in Proposition 16, we establish an upper bound of the average bilinear complexity of simultaneously multiplying several pairs of low degree skew polynomials.

2 PRELIMINARIES

In this section, we record some notations, definitions and basic facts from complexity theory and algebra, which are necessary for the rest of this paper.

2.1 Notations for complexity

Given functions $f, g : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$, we denote $f(n) = O(g(n))$ if there exists some constant $C > 0$ such that

$$f(n) \leq Cg(n)$$

for sufficiently large n . We denote $f(n) = \tilde{O}(g(n))$ if there exists some constant $C, \tau > 0$ such that

$$f(n) \leq C(\log(n))^\tau g(n)$$

for sufficiently large n . Moreover, we write $f(n) = \Omega(g(n))$ if there exists some constant $C > 0$ such that

$$f(n) \geq Cg(n)$$

for sufficiently large n .

2.2 Bilinear complexity

For convenience, we collect some basic facts about the bilinear complexity. The standard reference for this subsection is [4].

Definition 1. Let \mathcal{R} be a commutative ring and let $\mathbb{U}, \mathbb{V}, \mathbb{W}$ be finitely generated free \mathcal{R} -modules. The bilinear complexity (or rank) of a \mathcal{R} -bilinear map $f : \mathbb{U} \times \mathbb{V} \rightarrow \mathbb{W}$, denote by $\text{rank}_{\mathcal{R}}(f)$, is the smallest positive integer r to ensure the existence of $\alpha_j \in \text{Hom}(\mathbb{U}, \mathcal{R}), \beta_j \in \text{Hom}(\mathbb{V}, \mathcal{R})$ and $w_j \in \mathbb{W}, 1 \leq j \leq r$, such that

$$f(u, v) = \sum_{j=1}^r \alpha_j(u) \beta_j(v) w_j, \quad (u, v) \in \mathbb{U} \times \mathbb{V}.$$

We denote by $C_{\mathcal{R}}(f)$ the total number of arithmetic operations required to compute f over \mathcal{R} . In the literature, $C_{\mathcal{R}}(f)$ is called the *total complexity* of f . It is obvious that

$$\text{rank}_{\mathcal{R}}(f) \leq C_{\mathcal{R}}(f). \quad (2)$$

Let \mathcal{S} be a commutative ring containing \mathcal{R} as a sub-ring. For each free \mathcal{R} -module \mathbb{U} , we denote $\mathbb{U}^{\mathcal{S}} := \mathbb{U} \otimes_{\mathcal{R}} \mathcal{S}$. Similarly, if $f : \mathbb{U} \times \mathbb{V} \rightarrow \mathbb{W}$ is a \mathcal{R} -bilinear map, then we denote by $f^{\mathcal{S}} : \mathbb{U}^{\mathcal{S}} \times \mathbb{V}^{\mathcal{S}} \rightarrow \mathbb{W}^{\mathcal{S}}$ the \mathcal{S} -bilinear map obtained by extending f naturally. By definition, we have

$$\text{rank}_{\mathcal{S}}(f^{\mathcal{S}}) \leq \text{rank}_{\mathcal{R}}(f). \quad (3)$$

If there exist finitely generated free \mathcal{R} -modules $\mathbb{U}', \mathbb{V}', \mathbb{W}'$, \mathcal{R} -bilinear map $f' : \mathbb{U}' \times \mathbb{V}' \rightarrow \mathbb{W}'$ and \mathcal{R} -linear maps $\varphi_1 : \mathbb{U} \rightarrow \mathbb{U}', \varphi_2 : \mathbb{V} \rightarrow \mathbb{V}'$ and $\varphi_3 : \mathbb{W}' \rightarrow \mathbb{W}$ such that $f = \varphi_3 \circ f' \circ (\varphi_1 \times \varphi_2)$, then we say that f is a *restriction of f'* , denoted by $f \leq f'$. Clearly, $f \leq f'$ implies

$$\text{rank}_{\mathcal{R}}(f) \leq \text{rank}_{\mathcal{R}}(f'). \quad (4)$$

2.3 Exponent of matrix multiplication

Let \mathcal{R} be a commutative ring. We denote by $\langle m, n, p \rangle_{\mathcal{R}}$ the \mathcal{R} -bilinear map of multiplying an $m \times n$ matrix with an $n \times p$ matrix over \mathcal{R} . The *exponent of matrix multiplication* over \mathcal{R} is

$$\omega(\mathcal{R}) := \inf\{\tau \in \mathbb{R} : C_{\mathcal{R}}(\langle n, n, n \rangle_{\mathcal{R}}) = O(n^\tau)\}.$$

The same proof of Corollary 15.18 in [4] leads to:

LEMMA 2. For any commutative k -algebra \mathcal{R} , $\omega(\mathcal{R}) = \omega(k)$.

Because of Lemma 2, we simply abbreviate $\omega(\mathcal{R})$ by ω . The proof of Theorem 15.11 in [4] can be extended to show:

THEOREM 3. If there exist positive integers $e_i, h_i, l_i, 1 \leq i \leq s$, such that $\text{rank}_{\mathcal{R}} \left(\bigoplus_{i=1}^s \langle e_i, h_i, l_i \rangle_{\mathcal{R}} \right) \leq \tau$, then $\sum_{i=1}^s (e_i h_i l_i)^{\omega/3} \leq \tau$.

2.4 Étale algebra and Galois algebra

Let k be a field and let \mathcal{A} be a finite étale k -algebra, i.e., \mathcal{A} is a finite product of finite separable field extensions of k .

THEOREM 4 (PRIMITIVE ELEMENT THEOREM). [7, Proposition 4.1] If k is an infinite field and \mathcal{A} is a finite étale k -algebra, then there exists $a \in \mathcal{A}$ such that $\mathcal{A} = k[a]$.

Assume further that σ is an automorphism of \mathcal{A} such that $\mathcal{A}^\sigma = k$ and the cyclic group $\langle \sigma \rangle$ generated by σ has order $r = \dim_k \mathcal{A} > 1$. We say that \mathcal{A} is a $\langle \sigma \rangle$ -Galois algebra [12, Section 18. B]. Examples of $\langle \sigma \rangle$ -Galois algebras include:

- **totally split k -algebra:** $\mathcal{A} = k^r$ and σ is defined by the cyclic left shift $(a_1, \dots, a_{r-1}, a_r) \mapsto (a_2, \dots, a_r, a_1)$.
- **Kummer extension:** $\mathcal{A} = k(a)$ and σ is defined by $a \mapsto \zeta a$, where $\zeta \in k$ is a primitive r -th root of unity and $a^r \in k$.
- **Artin extension:** $\mathcal{A} = k(a)$ and σ is defined by $a \mapsto a + 1$, where $\text{char}(k) = r$ and $a^r - a \in k$.

2.5 Skew polynomial ring

Let \mathcal{A} be a $\langle \sigma \rangle$ -Galois algebra. The *skew polynomial ring* $\mathcal{A}[x, \sigma]$ is the ring whose underlying group is $\mathcal{A}[x]$ and the multiplication is defined by $xx^d = x^d x = x^{d+1}, xa = \sigma(a)x$ for $d \in \mathbb{N}, a \in \mathcal{A}$. Since $r > 1$, $\mathcal{A}[x, \sigma]$ is a non-commutative graded k -algebra. We denote by $\mathcal{A}[x, \sigma]_d$ (resp. $\mathcal{A}[x, \sigma]^d$) the subspace consisting of polynomials of degree d (resp. at most d). For ease of reference, we record two basic properties of $\mathcal{A}[x, \sigma]$ below.

LEMMA 5. [5, Lemma 1.4] *The map $\varphi : \mathcal{A}[x, \sigma] \rightarrow \text{End}_{\bar{k}}(\mathcal{A})$ sending $\sum_i a_i x^i$ to $\sum_i a_i \sigma^i$ is a surjective homomorphism of \bar{k} -algebras whose kernel is $(x^r - 1)$.*

LEMMA 6. [5, Proposition 2.7] *Let $p_1, \dots, p_m \in \bar{k}[x]$ be pairwise coprime and let $p = \prod_{j=1}^m p_j$. The natural map:*

$$\mathcal{A}[x, \sigma]/p(x^r) \rightarrow \mathcal{A}[x, \sigma]/p_1(x^r) \times \cdots \times \mathcal{A}[x, \sigma]/p_m(x^r)$$

is a \bar{k} -algebra isomorphism.

Let $\bar{k}^{r \times r}$ be the algebra of $r \times r$ matrices over \bar{k} . The following is a direct consequence of [12, Proposition 30.6].

LEMMA 7. *If \bar{k} is algebraically closed, then $\mathcal{A}[x, \sigma]/(x^r - c) \simeq \bar{k}^{r \times r}$ for any nonzero $c \in \bar{k}$.*

3 LOWER BOUND

Since $\mathcal{A}[x, \sigma]$ is a \bar{k} -algebra, the multiplication map μ on $\mathcal{A}[x, \sigma]$ is \bar{k} -bilinear. For each $d \in \mathbb{N}$, we denote by μ_d the restriction of μ on polynomials of degree at most d . According to (2), we have $\text{rank}_{\bar{k}}(\mu_d) \leq C_{\bar{k}}(\mu_d)$. The goal of this section is to prove that $\text{rank}_{\bar{k}}(\mu_d) = \Omega(\min(d, r)^{\omega-2} dr)$, which also provides a lower bound for $C_{\bar{k}}(\mu_d)$.

LEMMA 8. *If $d \geq r$ and \bar{k} is algebraically closed, then $\text{rank}_{\bar{k}}(\mu_d) \geq dr^{\omega-1}$.*

PROOF. Without loss of generality, we may assume that $r|d$ and $\text{char}(\bar{k}) \nmid (r/d)$. Let $\zeta \in \bar{k}$ be a primitive d/r -th root of unity. We denote $\mathcal{R} := \mathcal{A}[x, \sigma]/(x^d - 1)$. Lemmas 6 and 7 applied to $p(x) = x^{d/r} - 1$ and $p_j(x) = x - \zeta^j, 1 \leq j \leq d/r$ implies that

$$\mathcal{R} \simeq \bigoplus_{j=1}^{d/r} \mathcal{A}[x, \sigma]/(x^r - \zeta^j) \simeq \bigoplus_{j=1}^{d/r} \bar{k}^{r \times r}.$$

Assume $\mu_{\mathcal{R}}$ is the multiplication map on \mathcal{R} . Let $\varphi_1 : \mathcal{R} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}[x, \sigma]^d$ be the map defined by $\sum_{j=0}^{d-1} a_j x^j + (x^d - 1) \mapsto \sum_{j=0}^{d-1} a_j x^j$ and let φ_2 be the restriction to $\mathcal{A}[x, \sigma]^{2d}$ of the quotient map $\mathcal{A}[x, \sigma] \rightarrow \mathcal{R}$. Then we have $\mu_{\mathcal{R}} = \varphi_2 \circ \mu_d \circ (\varphi_1 \times \varphi_1)$. By (4) and Theorem 3, we may conclude that $dr^{\omega-1} \leq \text{rank}_{\bar{k}}(\mu_d)$. \square

LEMMA 9. *If \bar{k} is an infinite field, then there exist $g, p \in \bar{k}[t]$ of degrees r and $r-1$ respectively, such that $\mathcal{A}[x, \sigma] \simeq \bar{k}\langle A, X \rangle/I$ as \bar{k} -algebras, where $\bar{k}\langle A, X \rangle$ is the non-commutative polynomial ring in variables A, X over \bar{k} and I is the two-sided ideal generated by $g(A)$ and $XA - p(A)X$.*

PROOF. By Theorem 4, there exists $a \in \mathcal{A}$ such that $\mathcal{A} = \bar{k}[a]$. Thus one can find $p \in \bar{k}[t]$ of degree at most $(r-1)$ such that $p(a) = \sigma(a)$. Let $g \in \bar{k}[t]$ be the minimal polynomial of a . We claim that g and p are the desired polynomials. Indeed, the \bar{k} -linear map $q : \bar{k}\langle A, X \rangle \rightarrow \mathcal{A}[x, \sigma]$ induced by $A^i \rightarrow a^i, X^j \rightarrow x^j$ is surjective since $\mathcal{A} = \bar{k}[a]$. It is obvious that $I \subseteq \ker(q)$ thus q descends to $\psi' : \bar{k}\langle A, X \rangle/I \rightarrow \mathcal{A}[x, \sigma]$. Next we define $\psi : \mathcal{A}[x, \sigma] \rightarrow \bar{k}\langle A, X \rangle/I$ by \bar{k} -linearly extending $\psi(a^i) = A^i, \psi(x^j) = X^j$. It is straightforward to verify that ψ is a \bar{k} -algebra homomorphism and it is the inverse of ψ' . \square

LEMMA 10. *If \bar{k} is an infinite field and $d \leq r/3$, then $\text{rank}_{\bar{k}}(\mu_d) \geq d^{\omega-1}r$.*

PROOF. By the isomorphism ψ in the proof of Lemma 9, we have $\text{rank}_{\bar{k}}(\mu_d) = \text{rank}_{\bar{k}}(T_d)$, where T_d is the restriction to $\psi(\mathcal{A}[x, \sigma]^d) = \text{span}_{\bar{k}}\{A^j X^k : 0 \leq j \leq r-1, 0 \leq k \leq d\} \subseteq \bar{k}\langle A, X \rangle/I$ of the multiplication on $\bar{k}\langle A, X \rangle/I$.

Since \bar{k} is a field, the functor $\otimes_{\bar{k}} \mathcal{A}$ is exact. Therefore we have a short exact sequence of free \mathcal{A} -modules:

$$0 \rightarrow I^{\mathcal{A}} \rightarrow \bar{k}\langle A, X \rangle^{\mathcal{A}} = \mathcal{A}\langle A, X \rangle \rightarrow (\bar{k}\langle A, X \rangle/I)^{\mathcal{A}} \rightarrow 0.$$

This induces an \mathcal{A} -module isomorphism $(\bar{k}\langle A, X \rangle/I)^{\mathcal{A}} \cong \mathcal{A}\langle A, X \rangle/I^{\mathcal{A}}$, which is in fact an \mathcal{A} -algebra isomorphism.

Next we consider the \mathcal{A} -linear map $\rho : \mathcal{A}\langle A, X \rangle/I^{\mathcal{A}} \rightarrow \bar{\mathcal{A}}^{r \times r}$ induced by $A^i \rightarrow \alpha^i, X^j \rightarrow \beta^j$ where $0 \leq i \leq r-1$ and $j \in \mathbb{N}$, where $\alpha = \text{diag}(a, \sigma(a), \dots, \sigma^{r-1}(a))$ and

$$\beta = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & \cdots & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \cdots & 1 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 \end{bmatrix}. \quad (5)$$

We notice that $I^{\mathcal{A}}$ is the ideal of $\mathcal{A}\langle A, X \rangle$ generated by $g(A)$ and $XA - p(A)X$, where $g, p \in \bar{k}[t]$ are polynomials as in Lemma 9. Moreover, matrices α, β satisfy $g(\alpha) = \beta\alpha - p(\alpha)\beta = 0$. Thus ρ is a \mathcal{A} -algebra homomorphism. Moreover, ρ is an \mathcal{A} -module isomorphism from $(\psi(\mathcal{A}[x, \sigma]^d))^{\mathcal{A}}$ to $\bar{\mathcal{A}}^{r \times r}$. We denote the inverse of this isomorphism by $\rho' : \bar{\mathcal{A}}^{r \times r} \rightarrow (\psi(\mathcal{A}[x, \sigma]^{r-1}))^{\mathcal{A}}$.

By construction, $(r, r, r)_{\mathcal{A}}$ coincides with $\rho \circ T_d^{\mathcal{A}} \circ (\rho' \times \rho')$ on $\mathbb{U}^d \times \mathbb{U}^d$ where $\mathbb{U}^d = \rho((\psi(\mathcal{A}[x, \sigma]^d))^{\mathcal{A}})$. By a direct calculation, \mathbb{U}^d consists of $P = (P_{jk}) \in \bar{\mathcal{A}}^{r \times r}$ such that $P_{jk} = 0$ if either $k-j \geq d-1$ or $-1 \geq k-j \geq d-r-1$. Hence $\mathbb{U}^{d \lceil d/2 \rceil} = \beta^{-\lceil d/2 \rceil} \mathbb{U}^d$ consists of $Q = (Q_{jk}) \in \bar{\mathcal{A}}^{r \times r}$ such that $Q_{jk} = 0$ if either $k-j \geq \lceil d/2 \rceil$ or $-\lceil d/2 \rceil \geq k-j \geq \lceil d/2 \rceil - r - 1$. In particular, $\mathbb{U}^{d \lceil d/2 \rceil} = \beta^{-\lceil d/2 \rceil} \mathbb{U}^d$ contains all block diagonal matrices where each block is of size $\lceil d/4 \rceil \times \lceil d/4 \rceil$. Moreover, we observe that $PQ = \beta^{\lceil d/2 \rceil} (\beta^{-\lceil d/2 \rceil} P) (Q \beta^{-\lceil d/2 \rceil}) \beta^{\lceil d/2 \rceil}$. Thus we obtain

$$\langle \lceil d/4 \rceil, \lceil d/4 \rceil, \lceil d/4 \rceil \rangle^{\oplus \lceil 4r/d \rceil} \leq (r, r, r)_{\mathcal{A}}|_{\mathbb{U}^d \times \mathbb{U}^d} \leq T_d^{\mathcal{A}}.$$

Theorem 3 and (3) imply $d^{\omega-1}r \leq \text{rank}_{\mathcal{A}}(T_d^{\mathcal{A}}) \leq \text{rank}_{\bar{k}}(T_d)$. \square

We notice that if $d = Cr$ for some $1 > C > 1/3$, then we clearly have

$$\text{rank}_{\bar{k}}(\mu_d) \geq \text{rank}_{\bar{k}}(\mu_{\lfloor r/3 \rfloor}) \geq \lfloor r/3 \rfloor^{\omega-1} r \geq \frac{1}{9} d^{\omega-1} r.$$

This leads to the corollary that follows.

COROLLARY 11. *If \bar{k} is an infinite field and $d < r$, then $\text{rank}_{\bar{k}}(\mu_d) \geq \Omega(d^{\omega-1}r)$.*

Finally, we are ready to establish the lower bound for the complexity of skew polynomial multiplication over an arbitrary field \bar{k} .

THEOREM 12. *Let \bar{k} be a field (not necessarily algebraically closed) and let \mathcal{A} be a $\langle \sigma \rangle$ -Galois algebra. We have*

$$C_{\bar{k}}(\mu_d) \geq \text{rank}_{\bar{k}}(\mu_d) = \Omega(d \min\{d, r\}^{\omega-2} r),$$

where μ_d is the bilinear map of multiplying degree- d skew polynomials and $C_{\bar{k}}(\mu_d)$ is the total complexity of μ_d .

PROOF. The inequality follows from (2). Let \bar{k} be the algebraic closure of k . Then $\mathcal{A}[x, \sigma]^{\bar{k}} = \mathcal{A}^{\bar{k}}[x, \sigma^{\bar{k}}]$ is the skew polynomial ring defined by the $\langle \sigma^{\bar{k}} \rangle$ -Galois algebra $\mathcal{A}^{\bar{k}}$. Moreover, by (3) we have $\text{rank}_{\bar{k}}(\mu_d) \geq \text{rank}_{\bar{k}}(\mu_d^{\bar{k}})$. Lastly, Lemma 8 and Corollary 11 imply $\text{rank}_{\bar{k}}(\mu_d^{\bar{k}}) = \Omega(d \min\{d, r\}^{\omega-2}r)$. \square

As a consequence of Theorem 12 and the upper bound (1), we may conclude that when $d \geq r$, both $\text{rank}_{\bar{k}}(\mu_d)$ and $C_{\bar{k}}(\mu_d)$ are completely determined, up to a log factor.

COROLLARY 13. *If $d \geq r$, then there exist constant numbers $C_1, C_2, \tau > 0$ such that*

$$C_1 d r^{\omega-1} \leq \text{rank}_{\bar{k}}(\mu_d) \leq C_{\bar{k}}(\mu_d) \leq C_2 d (\log d)^{\tau} r^{\omega-1}.$$

4 AVERAGE BILINEAR COMPLEXITY

In this section, we discuss the average bilinear complexity of simultaneously multiplying skew polynomials. Let N be a positive integer. We recall that the bilinear map of multiplying skew polynomials of degree at most d is denoted by μ_d . Thus the bilinear map that simultaneously multiplies N pairs of skew polynomials of degree at most d is $\mu_d^{\oplus N}$. We define the average bilinear complexity of $\mu_d^{\oplus N}$ by $\text{A-rank}_{\bar{k}}(N) := \text{rank}_{\bar{k}}(\mu_d^{\oplus N})/N$.

For each integer $2 - r \leq k \leq r$, the k -th diagonal of $P = (P_{ij}) \in k^{r \times r}$ is the sequence $P^{(k)} := (P_{i, i+k-1})_{i=\max\{1, 2-k\}}^{\min\{r, r+1-k\}}$.

LEMMA 14. *Let $m \geq 0$ and $2 - r \leq k_1, k_2 \leq r - m$ be fixed integers. Suppose P_1, P_2 are $r \times r$ matrices such that $P_i^{(s)} = 0$ whenever $s < k_i$ or $s > k_i + m$, $i = 1, 2$. Then one can compute $P_1 P_2$ by $\tilde{O}(m^{\omega-1}r)$ arithmetic operations. Moreover, the bilinear complexity of multiplying such matrices is also $\tilde{O}(m^{\omega-1}r)$.*

PROOF. Let $\beta \in k^{r \times r}$ the permutation matrix defined in (5). On the one hand, there are integers n_1, n_2 such that $\beta^{n_1} P_1$ and $P_2 \beta^{n_2}$ are of the form $Q + Q'$, where Q is $\lceil m/2 \rceil$ -banded and $Q' = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ E & 0 \end{bmatrix}$ for some $E \in \mathcal{A}^{\lceil m/2 \rceil \times \lceil m/2 \rceil}$. It is clear that we can multiply such matrices by $O(m^{\omega-1}r)$ arithmetic operations. On the other hand, we have $P_1 P_2 = \beta^{-n_1} [(\beta^{n_1} P_1)(P_2 \beta^{n_2})] \beta^{-n_2}$. Thus $P_1 P_2$ can be computed by $\tilde{O}(m^{\omega-1}r)$ operations as well. The upper bound for bilinear complexity can be obtained similarly. \square

According to the proof of Lemma 10, $\mu_d^{\mathcal{A}}$ is also the restriction of the multiplication of matrices of the same form as those in Lemma 14. Thus we obtain the following corollary.

COROLLARY 15. $\text{rank}_{\mathcal{A}}(\mu_d^{\mathcal{A}}) = \tilde{O}(d^{\omega-1}r)$.

PROPOSITION 16. *Let k be an infinite field and let \mathcal{A} be an r -dimensional $\langle \sigma \rangle$ -Galois algebra over k . For $d \ll r$ and $N = \Omega(r)$, we have $\text{A-rank}_{\bar{k}}(N) = \tilde{O}(d^{\omega-1}r)$.*

PROOF. Since $\mathcal{A} = k[a] \simeq k[t]/(g(t))$, where g is the minimal polynomial of a . By [4, Exercise 15.6], we have

$$\langle \lceil r/2 \rceil \rangle \leq \mu_{\mathcal{A}} \leq \langle 2r - 1 \rangle,$$

where $\mu_{\mathcal{A}}$ is the multiplication on \mathcal{A} and $\langle m \rangle$ denotes the component-wise multiplication on k^m , $m \in \mathbb{N}$. Thus we have

$$\langle \lceil r/2 \rceil \rangle \otimes_{\bar{k}} \mu_d \leq \mu_{\mathcal{A}} \otimes_{\bar{k}} \mu_d$$

as k -bilinear maps. Let $s := \text{rank}_{\mathcal{A}}(\mu_d^{\mathcal{A}})$. Then $\mu_d^{\mathcal{A}} \leq \langle s \rangle^{\mathcal{A}}$ as \mathcal{A} -bilinear maps. We recall [4, Subsection 15.3] that for any k -bilinear map T , $T^{\mathcal{A}} = T \otimes_{\bar{k}} \mathcal{A}$ and as k -bilinear maps. Moreover, for any \mathcal{A} -bilinear maps $S \leq S'$, it also holds that $S \leq S'$ as k -bilinear maps. Therefore, we obtain

$$\mu_d^{\oplus \lceil r/2 \rceil} = \langle \lceil r/2 \rceil \rangle \otimes_{\bar{k}} \mu_d \leq \mu_{\mathcal{A}} \otimes_{\bar{k}} \mu_d \leq \mu_{\mathcal{A}} \otimes_{\bar{k}} \langle s \rangle \leq \langle s(2r-1) \rangle$$

as k -bilinear maps, from which the desired upper bound of $\text{A-rank}_{\bar{k}}(N)$ follows from Corollary 15. \square

5 QUASI-OPTIMAL ALGORITHMS

In this section, we present quasi-optimal algorithms to compute the product of degree $d \ll r$ skew polynomials, for $\langle \sigma \rangle$ -Galois algebras listed in Subsection 2.4. As before, we assume without loss of generality that $d < r/3$. Moreover, as discussed in [9, Subsection 2.1.2], we may assume that $|k| > 3r$.

5.1 Totally split algebra

Let $\mathcal{A} = k^r$ and let σ be the cyclic left shift as in Subsection 2.4. We denote by $\{e_i\}_{i=1}^r$ the canonical basis of k^r . The map φ in Lemma 5 can be viewed as a surjective k -algebra homomorphism

$$\varphi : \mathcal{A}[x, \sigma] \rightarrow k^{r \times r} \quad (6)$$

induced by $e_i \mapsto \alpha_i$ and $x \mapsto \beta$, where α_i is the matrix whose elements are all zero, except the (i, i) -th one, which is one and β is the matrix defined in (5). We remark that given $P \in k^{r \times r}$ and $m \in \mathbb{Z}$, both $\beta^m P$ and $P \beta^m$ are obtained by re-arranging elements of P . We observe that there is a k -linear map $\psi : k^{r \times r} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}[x, \sigma]$ such that $\psi \circ \varphi = \text{id}_{\mathcal{A}[x, \sigma]^{r-1}}$ where φ is the map in (6).

Algorithm 1: low degree skew polynomial multiplication for totally split algebra

Input: $f_1, f_2 \in \mathcal{A}[x, \sigma]^d$

Output: $f_1 f_2$

- 1 Compute $P_1 = \varphi(f_1)$ and $P_2 = \varphi(f_2)$;
 - 2 Compute $P = P_1 P_2$;
 - 3 Compute $f = \psi(P)$;
 - 4 Return f .
-

PROPOSITION 17. *Let k be a field and let $\mathcal{A} = k^r$ be a totally split extension of k . For $d < r/3$, Algorithm 1 computes the multiplication of elements in $\mathcal{A}[x, \sigma]^d$ by $\tilde{O}(d^{\omega-1}r)$ arithmetic operations, where σ is the automorphism of \mathcal{A} induced by $(a_1, \dots, a_{r-1}, a_r) \mapsto (a_2, \dots, a_r, a_1)$.*

PROOF. Since φ is a k -algebra homomorphism, we have $\psi(\varphi(f_1)\varphi(f_2)) = \psi \circ \varphi(f_1 f_2) = f_1 f_2$. Thus Algorithm 1 indeed computes $f_1 f_2$. As for the cost of Algorithm 1, we notice that for

$$f(x) = \sum_{i=0}^{r-1} \sum_{j=0}^d c_i x^j \in \mathcal{A}[x, \sigma]^d, \text{ computing } \varphi(f) \text{ costs } O(dr)$$

operations. Next $\varphi(f)$ is an $r \times r$ matrix of the same form as those in Lemma 14, thus the multiplication of such matrices costs $\tilde{O}(d^{\omega-1}r)$ operations. Lastly, given $P = (P_{ij}) \in k^{r \times r}$, $\psi(P) = \sum_{i=0}^{r-1} (\sum_{j=0}^{r-1} P_{ij} e_i) x^{j-i \pmod{r}}$ by definition. Thus $\psi(P)$ costs no arithmetic operations and Algorithm 1 costs $\tilde{O}(d^{\omega-1}r)$ operations. \square

5.2 Kummer extension

Let $\mathcal{A} = k(a)$ be a degree- r Kummer extension of k and let σ be defined as in Subsection 2.4. By definition, there exists some $c \in k$ such that the minimal polynomial of a is $t^r - c$. We also pick and fix a r -th primitive root of unity ζ . We denote by I_1, I_2 the two-sided ideals of $k\langle X, A \rangle$ generated by $XA - \zeta AX$ and $A^r - c$, respectively. By the same argument as in the proof of Lemma 9, there is a k -algebra isomorphism

$$\psi : \mathcal{A}[x, \sigma] \rightarrow k\langle X, A \rangle / (I_1 + I_2) \quad (7)$$

defined by $x \mapsto X$ and $a \mapsto A$.

LEMMA 18. *Let I_3 be the two-sided ideal of $k\langle X, A \rangle$ generated by $X^r - 1$ and $A^r - 1$. The k -linear map $\varphi : k\langle X, A \rangle / (I_1 + I_3) \rightarrow k^{r \times r}$ induced by $A^i \mapsto \alpha^i, X^j \mapsto \beta^j$ is a k -algebra isomorphism. Here $\alpha = \text{diag}(\zeta^k)^{r-1}_{k=0}$ and β is the permutation matrix defined in (5).*

PROOF. A direct computation implies that $\alpha\beta = \zeta\beta\alpha, \alpha^r = I_r$ and $\beta^r = I_r$. Hence φ is well-defined and is a k -algebra homomorphism. It is surjective since $\{\alpha^i\beta^j : 0 \leq i, j \leq r-1\}$ is a k -basis of $k^{r \times r}$. Moreover, $\{A^i X^j : 0 \leq i, j \leq r-1\}$ is a k -basis of $k\langle X, A \rangle / (I_1 + I_3)$, thus φ is injective. \square

Since $I_1 = (XA - \zeta AX)$ is homogeneous, $k\langle X, A \rangle / I_1$ is bi-graded. We denote $\deg_X(F)$ (resp. $\deg_A(F)$) the degree of X (resp. A) in $f \in k\langle X, A \rangle$. We say that F has bi-degree $(\deg_X(F), \deg_A(F))$. Given $d, e \in \mathbb{N}$, we denote $(k\langle X, A \rangle / I_1)^{d,e} := \text{span}_k\{X^i A^j : 0 \leq i \leq d, 0 \leq j \leq e\}$. Let π_3 the natural quotient map $k\langle X, A \rangle / I_1 \rightarrow k\langle X, A \rangle / (I_1 + I_3)$.

Algorithm 2: multiplication in $(k\langle X, A \rangle / I_1)^{d,e}$

Input: $F_1, F_2 \in (k\langle X, A \rangle / I_1)^{d,e}$

Output: $F_1 F_2$

- 1 Compute $d_1 = \deg_X(F_1), e_1 = \deg_A(F_1),$
 $d_2 = \deg_X(F_2), e_2 = \deg_A(F_2);$
 - 2 Compute $G_1 = \pi_3(F_1)$ and $G_2 = \pi_3(F_2);$
 - 3 Compute $M_1 = \varphi(G_1)$ and $M_2 = \varphi(G_2);$
 - 4 Compute $M = M_1 M_2;$
 - 5 Compute $G = \varphi^{-1}(M);$
 - 6 Find $F \in (k\langle X, A \rangle / I_1)^{d_1+d_2, e_1+e_2}$ such that $\pi_3(F) = G;$
 - 7 Return $F.$
-

LEMMA 19. *Let k be a field containing a primitive r -th root of unity and let $d, e < r/3$ be positive integers. Algorithm 2 computes the multiplication of two elements in $(k\langle X, A \rangle / I_1)^{d,e}$ by $\tilde{O}(d^{\omega-1}r)$ arithmetic operations.*

PROOF. We first prove that $F = F_1 F_2$. By definition, $F_1 F_2$ has bi-degree $(d_1 + d_2, e_1 + e_2)$. Since π_3 and φ are k -algebra homomorphisms and φ is an isomorphism, $\pi_3(F_1 F_2) = \varphi^{-1}(\varphi(\pi_3(F_1))\varphi(\pi_3(F_2))) = G$. Hence $F_1 F_2$ is a solution for Step 6 in Algorithm 2. Thus it suffices to prove that it is also unique. Indeed, if $\pi_3(F') = \pi_3(F) = G$ for some $F, F' \in (k\langle X, A \rangle / I_1)^{d_1+d_2, e_1+e_2}$, then $F' - F \in (I_1 + I_3) / I_1$. Since a nonzero element in $(I_1 + I_3) / I_1$ has bi degree (l, m) where $\min\{l, m\} \geq r > \max\{3d, 3e\} > \max\{d_1 + d_2, e_1 + e_2\}$, we obtain $F' = F$.

Next we analyze the complexity. Clearly, the cost of the first three steps of Algorithm 2 is $O(dr)$. Since $F_1, F_2 \in (k\langle X, A \rangle / I_1)^{d, r-1}$, we may deduce from the definition of φ in Lemma 18 that matrices M_1, M_2 in Step 4 are of the same form as those in Lemma 14. Thus $M = M_1 M_2$ can be computed by $\tilde{O}(d^{\omega-1}r)$ arithmetic operations. Step 5 is equivalent to determining $\mu_{ij} \in k$ such that $M = \sum_{i=0}^{2d} \sum_{j=0}^{2e} \mu_{ij} \alpha^i \beta^j$, where α and β are matrices given in Lemma 18. By definition of α and β , it is sufficient to find polynomials $f_1, \dots, f_{2d+1} \in k[t]$ of degree at most $2e$ such that

$$f_k(\zeta^l) = M_{l+k}, \quad 0 \leq l \leq r-1, 1 \leq k \leq 2d+1. \quad (8)$$

Here $l+k$ is understood as $l+k-r$ if $l+k > r$. Since $2e+1 < r$, the interpolation problem (8) in general has no solution. However, the correctness of Algorithm 2 ensures that (8) is solvable. Hence we can compute f_k 's by polynomial interpolation at $2e+1$ points $\zeta^i, 0 \leq i \leq 2e$. Each interpolation can be done by a fast Fourier transform, which costs $\tilde{O}(e)$ arithmetic operations [4, Theorem 2.6]. Thus, the cost of Step 5 is $\tilde{O}(de)$ arithmetic operations. It is obvious that Step 6 only costs $O(dr)$ operations.

Lastly, since $d, e < r$, the above analysis implies that the total cost of Algorithm 2 is $\tilde{O}(d^{\omega-1}r)$. \square

Let π_2 be the natural quotient map $k\langle X, A \rangle / I_1 \rightarrow k\langle X, A \rangle / I_1 + I_2$. We denote

$$\mathcal{A}[x, \sigma]^{d,e} := \text{span}_k\{x^i a^j : 0 \leq i \leq d, 0 \leq j \leq e\}.$$

In particular, we have $\mathcal{A}[x, \sigma]^{d, r-1} = \mathcal{A}[x, \sigma]^d$.

PROPOSITION 20. *Let k be a field containing a primitive r -th root of unity ζ and let $\mathcal{A} = k(a)$ be a degree- r Kummer extension of k . For $d < r/3$, Algorithm 3 computes the multiplication of elements in $\mathcal{A}[x, \sigma]^d$ by $\tilde{O}(d^{\omega-1}r)$ arithmetic operations, where σ is the automorphism of \mathcal{A} induced by $a \mapsto \zeta a$.*

PROOF. The correctness of Algorithm 3 follows from the facts that π_2 is a k -algebra homomorphism and that ψ is a k -algebra isomorphism. It is obvious that the cost of Step 5 in Algorithm 3 is $\tilde{O}(d^{\omega-1}r)$, while the total cost of other steps is $O(dr)$. Thus Algorithm 3 costs $\tilde{O}(d^{\omega-1}r)$ arithmetic operations. \square

5.3 Artin extension

Assume that k is a field of characteristic $r > 0$. Let $\mathcal{A} = k(a)$ be a degree- r Artin extension of k and let σ be defined as in Subsection 2.4. By definition, the minimal polynomial of a

Algorithm 3: low degree skew polynomial multiplication for Kummer extension

Input: $f_1, f_2 \in \hat{k}[x, \sigma]^d$
Output: $f_1 f_2$

- 1 Compute $H_1 = \psi(f_1)$ and $H_2 = \psi(f_2)$;
- 2 Find $F_1, F_2 \in (K[X, A]/I_1)^{d, r-1}$ such that $\pi_2(F_1) = H_1$ and $\pi_2(F_2) = H_2$;
- 3 Find $F_{11}, F_{12}, F_{13} \in (K[X, A]/I_1)^{d, \lfloor r/3 \rfloor}$ such that $F_1 = F_{11} + A^{\lfloor r/3 \rfloor} F_{12} + A^{2\lfloor r/3 \rfloor} F_{13}$;
- 4 Find $F_{21}, F_{22}, F_{23} \in (K[X, A]/I_1)^{d, \lfloor r/3 \rfloor}$ such that $F_2 = F_{21} + A^{\lfloor r/3 \rfloor} F_{22} + A^{2\lfloor r/3 \rfloor} F_{23}$;
- 5 For $1 \leq i, j \leq 3$, compute $G_{ij} = F_{1i} F_{2j}$ \triangleright Algorithm 2;
- 6 Compute $F = \sum_{i=1}^3 \sum_{j=1}^3 A^{(i-1)\lfloor r/3 \rfloor} G_{ij} A^{(j-1)\lfloor r/3 \rfloor}$;
- 7 Compute $f = \psi^{-1}(\pi_2(F))$;
- 8 Return f .

is $t^r - t - c \in \hat{k}[t]$ for some $c \in \hat{k}$. Suppose that J_1, J_2 are the two-sided ideals of $\hat{k}\langle X, A \rangle$ generated by $XA - (A+1)X$ and $A^r - A - c$ respectively. Similar to the case of Kummer extension discussed in Subsection 5.2, we have a \hat{k} -algebra isomorphism

$$\psi : \mathcal{A}[x, \sigma] \rightarrow \hat{k}\langle X, A \rangle / (J_1 + J_2) \quad (9)$$

defined by $x \mapsto X$ and $a \mapsto A$. As in Subsection 5.2, given $d, e \in \mathbb{N}$, we use $\mathcal{A}[x, \sigma]^d$, $\mathcal{A}[x, \sigma]^{d,e}$ and $(\hat{k}\langle X, A \rangle / J_1)^{d,e}$ to denote the \hat{k} -subspaces spanned by low degree elements.

LEMMA 21. *Let J_3 be the two-sided ideal generated by $X^r - 1$ and $A^r - A$. The map $\varphi : \hat{k}\langle X, A \rangle / (J_1 + J_3) \rightarrow \hat{k}^{r \times r}$ defined by $A^i \rightarrow \alpha^i, X^j \rightarrow \beta^j$ is a \hat{k} -algebra isomorphism, where $\alpha = \text{diag}(k)_{k=0}^{r-1}$ and β is the permutation matrix defined in (5).*

PROOF. A direct computation shows that $\beta\alpha = (\alpha+1)\beta$, $\beta^r = I_r$ and $\alpha^r = \alpha$. This implies that φ is a well-defined \hat{k} -algebra homomorphism. Moreover, φ is bijective since $\{X^i A^j : 0 \leq i, j \leq r-1\}$ and $\{\beta^i \alpha^j : 0 \leq i, j \leq r-1\}$ are \hat{k} -bases of $\hat{k}\langle X, A \rangle$ and $\mathbb{k}^{r \times r}$, respectively. \square

Let $\pi_3 : \hat{k}\langle X, A \rangle / J_1 \rightarrow \hat{k}\langle X, A \rangle / (J_1 + J_3)$ be the natural quotient map. Given $F \in \hat{k}\langle X, A \rangle / J_1$, we denote by $(\deg_X(F), \deg_A(F))$ the bi-degree of F . By the same proof as that for Lemma 19, we obtain the lemma that follows.

LEMMA 22. *Let \hat{k} be a field of characteristic $r > 0$ and let $d, e < r/3$ be positive integers. Algorithm 4 computes the multiplication of two elements in $(\hat{k}\langle X, A \rangle / J_1)^{d,e}$ by $\tilde{O}(d^{\omega-1}r)$ arithmetic operations.*

Next we discuss the cost of rewriting $\sum_{i=0}^d \sum_{j=0}^{r-1} \lambda_{ij} X^i A^j$ in $(\hat{k}\langle X, A \rangle / J_1)^{d, r-1}$ in the form $\sum_{i=0}^d \sum_{j=0}^{r-1} \mu_{ij} A^j X^i$. We remark that in the case of Kummer extension discussed in Subsection 5.2, it is easy to see that rewriting $\sum_{i=0}^d \sum_{j=0}^{r-1} \lambda_{ij} X^i A^j \in (\hat{k}\langle X, A \rangle / I_1)^{d, r-1}$ as $\sum_{i=0}^d \sum_{j=0}^{r-1} \mu_{ij} A^j X^i$ costs $\tilde{O}(dr)$ arithmetic operations, since $\mu_{ij} = \lambda_{ij} \zeta^{ij}$ by $XA = AX$. However, the rewriting procedure becomes more complicated in the case of Artin extension, since $XA = AX + X$ in $\hat{k}\langle X, A \rangle / J_1$.

Algorithm 4: multiplication on $(\hat{k}\langle X, A \rangle / J_1)^{d,e}$

Input: $F_1, F_2 \in (\hat{k}\langle X, A \rangle / J_1)^{d,e}$
Output: $F_1 F_2$

- 1 Compute $d_1 = \deg_X(F_1)$, $e_1 = \deg_A(F_1)$,
 $d_2 = \deg_X(F_2)$, $e_2 = \deg_A(F_2)$;
- 2 Compute $G_1 = \pi_3(F_1)$ and $G_2 = \pi_3(F_2)$;
- 3 Compute $M_1 = \varphi(G_1)$ and $M_2 = \varphi(G_2)$;
- 4 Compute $M = M_1 M_2$;
- 5 Compute $G = \varphi^{-1}(M)$;
- 6 Find $F \in (\hat{k}\langle X, A \rangle / J_1)^{d_1+d_2, e_1+e_2}$ such that $\pi_3(F) = \varphi^{-1}(G)$;
- 7 Return F .

Algorithm 5: Exchange X and A in $(\hat{k}\langle X, A \rangle / J_1)^{d, r-1}$

Input: $F = \sum_{i=0}^d \sum_{j=0}^{r-1} \lambda_{ij} X^i A^j \in (\hat{k}\langle X, A \rangle / J_1)^{d, r-1}$
Output: $\mu_{ij} \in \hat{k}$ such that $F = \sum_{i=0}^d \sum_{j=0}^{r-1} \mu_{ij} A^j X^i$

- 1 Compute $M = \varphi(\pi_3(F))$ \triangleright fast polynomial evaluation;
- 2 Compute μ_{ij} from M \triangleright fast polynomial interpolation;
- 3 Return μ_{ij} .

LEMMA 23. *Given $F = \sum_{i=0}^d \sum_{j=0}^{r-1} \lambda_{ij} X^i A^j$ in $\hat{k}\langle X, A \rangle / J_1$, Algorithm 5 computes $\mu_{ij} \in \hat{k}$, $0 \leq i \leq d$, $0 \leq j \leq r-1$ such that $F = \sum_{i=0}^d \sum_{j=0}^{r-1} \mu_{ij} A^j X^i$ by $\tilde{O}(dr)$ arithmetic operations. Similarly, if $F = \sum_{i=0}^d \sum_{j=0}^{r-1} \mu_{ij} z^j y^i \in (\hat{k}\langle X, A \rangle / J_1)^{d, r-1}$ is given, then one can rewrite F as $\sum_{i=0}^d \sum_{j=0}^{r-1} \lambda_{ij} y^i z^j$ by $\tilde{O}(rd)$ arithmetic operations as well.*

PROOF. By symmetry, it is sufficient to prove the first part. We observe that $F = \sum_{i=0}^d \sum_{j=0}^{r-1} \lambda_{ij} X^i A^j = \sum_{i=0}^d X^i (\sum_{j=0}^{r-1} \lambda_{ij} A^j)$. Thus, nonzero elements in $M = \varphi(\pi_3(F))$ are simply evaluations of polynomials $f_0, \dots, f_d \in \hat{k}[t]$ at points $0, 1, \dots, r-1$. Here $f_i(t) = \sum_{j=0}^{r-1} \lambda_{ij} t^j$, $0 \leq i \leq d$. By [4, Corollary 3.20], evaluations of each f_i can be completed by $\tilde{O}(r)$ operations. Hence the cost of Step 1 is $\tilde{O}(dr)$.

By Lemma 21, φ is an isomorphism, thus μ_{ij} 's can be determined by solving $M = \sum_{i=0}^d \sum_{j=0}^{r-1} \mu_{ij} \alpha^j \beta^i$, where α, β are matrices defined in Lemma 21. Therefore, μ_{ij} 's can be obtained by interpolating $d+1$ polynomials of degree at most $r-1$ at points $0, \dots, r-1$. According to [4, Corollary 3.22], each polynomial interpolation can be done by $\tilde{O}(dr)$ operations. The cost of Step 2 is $\tilde{O}(dr)$ and this completes the proof. \square

Let $\pi_2 : \hat{k}\langle X, A \rangle / J_1 \rightarrow \hat{k}\langle X, A \rangle / (J_1 + J_2)$ be the natural projection. By the same argument as in the proof of Proposition 20, we obtain the counterpart of Proposition 20 for Artin extensions.

PROPOSITION 24. *Let \hat{k} be a field of characteristic r and let $\mathcal{A} = \hat{k}(a)$ be an Artin extension of \hat{k} . For $d < r/3$, Algorithm 6 computes the multiplication of elements in $\mathcal{A}[x, \sigma]^d$ by $\tilde{O}(d^{\omega-1}r)$ arithmetic operations, where σ is the automorphism of \mathcal{A} induced by $a \mapsto a+1$.*

Algorithm 6: low degree skew polynomial multiplication for Artin extension

- Input:** $f_1, f_2 \in \mathcal{A}[x, \sigma]^d$
Output: $f_1 f_2$
- 1 Compute $G_1 = \psi(f_1)$ and $G_2 = \psi(f_2)$;
 - 2 Find F_1 and F_2 in $(\mathbb{k}\langle X, A \rangle / J_1)^{d, r-1}$ such that $\pi_2(F_1) = G_1$ and $\pi_2(F_2) = G_2$;
 - 3 Find $F_{11}, F_{12}, F_{13} \in (\mathbb{k}\langle X, A \rangle / J_1)^{d, \lfloor r/3 \rfloor}$ such that $F_1 = F_{11} + A^{\lfloor r/3 \rfloor} F_{12} + A^{2\lfloor r/3 \rfloor} F_{13}$ \triangleright Algorithm 5;
 - 4 Find $F_{21}, F_{22}, F_{23} \in (\mathbb{k}\langle X, A \rangle / J_1)^{d, \lfloor r/3 \rfloor}$ such that $F_2 = F_{21} + A^{\lfloor r/3 \rfloor} F_{22} + A^{2\lfloor r/3 \rfloor} F_{23}$ \triangleright Algorithm 5;
 - 5 For $1 \leq i, j \leq 3$, compute $G_{ij} = F_{1i} F_{2j}$ \triangleright Algorithm 4;
 - 6 For $1 \leq i, j \leq 3$, rewrite $A^{(i-1)\lfloor r/3 \rfloor} G_{ij}$ as
$$\sum_{s=0}^d \sum_t \theta_{st} X^s A^t \quad \triangleright \text{Algorithm 5};$$
 - 7 Compute $F = \sum_{i=1}^3 \sum_{j=1}^3 A^{(i-1)\lfloor r/3 \rfloor} G_{ij} A^{(j-1)\lfloor r/3 \rfloor}$;
 - 8 Compute $f = \psi^{-1}(\pi_2(F))$;
 - 9 Return f .

5.4 Tower of Galois algebras

This subsection is devoted to generalize Propositions 17, 20 and 24. Namely, we prove that the lower bound established in Section 3 is quasi-optimal for a $\langle \sigma \rangle$ -Galois algebra \mathcal{A}_2 over \mathbb{k} , if there exists a tower $\mathbb{k} \subseteq \mathcal{A}_1 \subseteq \mathcal{A}_2$ such that either \mathcal{A}_1/\mathbb{k} or $\mathcal{A}_2/\mathcal{A}_1$ is one of the three types discussed in Subsections 5.1–5.3.

Let $\mathbb{k} \subseteq \mathcal{A}_1 \subseteq \mathcal{A}_2$ be a tower of finite dimensional étale \mathbb{k} -algebras. We denote $r_1 := \dim_{\mathbb{k}} \mathcal{A}_1$ and $r_2 := \dim_{\mathbb{k}} \mathcal{A}_2$. Assume further that σ is an automorphism of \mathcal{A}_2 such that $\sigma|_{\mathcal{A}_1}$ is also an automorphism of \mathcal{A}_1 and that both \mathcal{A}_1 and \mathcal{A}_2 are $\langle \sigma \rangle$ -Galois algebra.

For $i = 1, 2$, we denote by $\mu_d^{(i)}$ the \mathbb{k} -bilinear map of multiplying two elements in $\mathcal{A}_i[x, \sigma]^d$. Moreover, we notice that σ^{r_1} is an automorphism of \mathcal{A}_2 and $\sigma^{r_1}|_{\mathcal{A}_1} = \text{id}_{\mathcal{A}_1}$. Thus $\mathcal{A}_2[x, \sigma^{r_1}]^d$ is an algebra over \mathcal{A}_1 . We denote the \mathcal{A}_1 -bilinear map of multiplying two elements in $\mathcal{A}_2[x, \sigma^{r_1}]^d$ by $\mu_d^{(1,2)}$.

Moreover, we assume that each automorphism of \mathcal{A} can be computed by $\tilde{O}(r)$ arithmetic operations in \mathbb{k} . This is a direct consequence of the availability assumption for representational data in [9, Assumption H].

LEMMA 25. *Let $\mathbb{k}, \mathcal{A}_1, \mathcal{A}_2, \sigma, \mu_d^{(1)}, \mu_d^{(2)}$ and $\mu_d^{(1,2)}$ be as above. Then we have $C_{\mathbb{k}}(\mu_d^{(2)}) = \tilde{O}\left(r_1^3 C_{\mathcal{A}_1}\left(\mu_{\lfloor d/r_1 \rfloor}^{(1,2)}\right)\right)$. If moreover $\mathcal{A}_2 = \mathcal{A}_1[a]$ for some $a \in \mathcal{A}_1$, then $C_{\mathbb{k}}(\mu_d^{(2)}) = O\left(\left(\frac{r_2}{r_1}\right)^2 C_{\mathbb{k}}(\mu_d^{(1)})\right)$.*

PROOF. Given $f_1, f_2 \in \mathcal{A}_2[x, \sigma]^d$, we re-write

$$f_1 = \sum_{k=0}^{r_1-1} x^k g_k(x^{r_1}), \quad f_2 = \sum_{l=0}^{r_1-1} h_l(x^{r_1}) x^l$$

for some $g_0, \dots, g_{r_1-1}, h_0, \dots, h_{r_1-1} \in \mathcal{A}_2[x, \sigma^{r_1}]^{d/r_1}$. According to our assumption, one can find g_j 's and h_j 's by $\tilde{O}(dr_1)$

arithmetic operations, since the re-writing can be done by re-arranging terms and computing automorphisms.

We notice that $f_1 f_2 = \sum_{k=0}^{r_1-1} \sum_{l=0}^{r_1-1} x^k g_k(x^{r_1}) h_l(x^{r_1}) x^l$. Since $f_k, g_l \in \mathcal{A}_2[x, \sigma^{r_1}]^{d/r_1}$, it costs $C_{\mathcal{A}_1}\left(\mu_{\lfloor d/r_1 \rfloor}^{(1,2)}\right)$ arithmetic operations in \mathcal{A}_1 to compute $f_k g_l$. Each operation in \mathcal{A}_1 has complexity $\tilde{O}(r_1)$ over \mathbb{k} , thus the total complexity of computing $f_1 f_2$ is $\tilde{O}\left(r_1^3 C_{\mathcal{A}_1}\left(\mu_{\lfloor d/r_1 \rfloor}^{(1,2)}\right)\right)$.

For the second part, we may re-write

$$f_1 = \sum_{k=0}^{r_2/r_1-1} a^k g_k(x), \quad f_2 = \sum_{l=0}^{r_2/r_1-1} h_l(x) a^l$$

for some $g_0, \dots, g_{r_2/r_1-1}, h_0, \dots, h_{r_2/r_1-1} \in \mathcal{A}_1[x, \sigma]^d$. By the same argument as before, this re-writing again only costs $\tilde{O}(r_2 d/r_1)$ operations in \mathbb{k} . We observe that each $f_k(x) g_l(x)$ is a product of two elements in $\mathcal{A}_1[x, \sigma]^d$. Thus it costs $C_{\mathbb{k}}(\mu_d^{(1)})$ arithmetic operations in \mathbb{k} . Since $f_1 f_2$ is the sum of $a^k g_k(x) h_l(x) a^l$, computing $f_1 f_2$ costs $O\left(\left(\frac{r_2}{r_1}\right)^2 C_{\mathbb{k}}(\mu_d^{(1)})\right)$. \square

PROPOSITION 26. *Assume that \mathcal{A}_1 is a field and $d = \Omega(r_1)$. If $\mathcal{A}_2/\mathcal{A}_1$ is a totally split algebra (resp. Kummer extension or Artin extension), then $C_{\mathbb{k}}(\mu_d^{(2)}) = \tilde{O}\left(d^{\omega-1} r_2 r_1^{3-\omega}\right)$.*

PROOF. A direct application of Propositions 17, 20 and 24 to Lemma 25 leads to the desired conclusion. \square

Similarly, we also have the proposition that follows.

PROPOSITION 27. *If \mathcal{A}_1/\mathbb{k} is a totally split algebra (resp. Kummer extension or Artin extension) and $d = O(r_1)$, then $C_{\mathbb{k}}(\mu_d^{(2)}) = \tilde{O}(d^{\omega-1} r_1^{-1} r_2^2)$.*

CONCLUSION

In this paper, we establish the inequality

$$\text{rank}_{\mathbb{k}}(\mu_d) \geq d \min\{d, r\}^{\omega-2} r,$$

where $\text{rank}_{\mathbb{k}}(\mu_d)$ is the bilinear complexity of multiplying two skew polynomials in $\mathcal{A}[x, \sigma]$ of degree at most d and \mathcal{A} is a $\langle \sigma \rangle$ -Galois algebra over \mathbb{k} of dimension r . More importantly, this provides us a lower bound for the total complexity $C_{\mathbb{k}}(\mu_d)$ of skew polynomial multiplication since $C_{\mathbb{k}}(\mu_d) \geq \text{rank}_{\mathbb{k}}(\mu_d)$. We prove the quasi-optimality of this lower bound by presenting algorithms for special cases, including totally split algebras, Kummer extensions, Artin extensions and towers of these algebras. The complexity of our algorithms coincides with the conjectured upper bound in [5], which equals to our lower bound up to a log factor. We also prove that

$$\text{A-rank}_{\mathbb{k}}(N) = \tilde{O}(d^{\omega-1} r).$$

Here $\text{A-rank}_{\mathbb{k}}(N)$ denotes the average of the bilinear complexity of simultaneously multiplying $N = \Omega(r)$ pairs of skew polynomials in $\mathcal{A}[x, \sigma]$ of degree at most $d \ll r$.

For the future work, although our quasi-optimal lower bound together with the algorithm in [5] completely determines (up to a log factor) $C_{\mathbb{k}}(\mu_d)$ for $d \geq r$, the upper bound

of degree $d \ll r$ skew polynomial multiplication is still unknown in general. Namely, we do not know if there exists an algorithm of complexity $\tilde{O}(d^{\omega-1}r)$ that computes the multiplication of elements in $\tilde{\mathcal{A}}[x, \sigma]^d$ ($d \ll r$) for any r -dimensional $\langle \sigma \rangle$ -Galois algebra $\tilde{\mathcal{A}}$. Moreover, results in this paper imply that if $d \ll r$, then

$$\text{A-rank}_R(N) = \tilde{O}(d^{\omega-1}r), \quad d^{\omega-1}r \leq \text{rank}_R(\mu_d).$$

By definition, we also have $\text{A-rank}_R(N) \leq \text{rank}_R(\mu_d)$. However, it is unknown whether the equality holds.

REFERENCES

- [1] Alexandre Benoit, Alin Bostan, and Joris van der Hoeven. 2012. Quasi-optimal Multiplication of Linear Differential Operators. In *2012 IEEE 53rd Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science*. 524–530. <https://doi.org/10.1109/FOCS.2012.57>
- [2] Delphine Boucher and Felix Ulmer. 2009. Coding with skew polynomial rings. *Journal of Symbolic Computation* 44, 12 (2009), 1644–1656. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jsc.2007.11.008> Gröbner Bases in Cryptography, Coding Theory, and Algebraic Combinatorics.
- [3] D. Boucher and F. Ulmer. 2014. Linear codes using skew polynomials with automorphisms and derivations. *Designs, Codes and Cryptography* 70, 3 (2014), 405–431. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10623-012-9704-4>
- [4] Peter Bürgisser, Michael Clausen, and Mohammad A Shokrollahi. 2013. *Algebraic complexity theory* (2nd ed.). Vol. 315. Springer Science & Business Media. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-662-03338-8>
- [5] Xavier Caruso and Jérémy Le Borgne. 2017. Fast Multiplication for Skew Polynomials. In *Proceedings of the 2017 ACM on International Symposium on Symbolic and Algebraic Computation (Kaiserslautern, Germany) (ISSAC '17)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 77–84. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3087604.3087617>
- [6] Xavier Caruso and Jérémy Le Borgne. 2017. A new faster algorithm for factoring skew polynomials over finite fields. *Journal of Symbolic Computation* 79 (2017), 411–443. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jsc.2016.02.016>
- [7] Uriya A. First and Zinovy Reichstein. 2017. On the number of generators of an algebra. *Comptes Rendus Mathématique* 355, 1 (2017), 5–9. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.crma.2016.11.015>
- [8] M. Giesbrecht. 1998. Factoring in Skew-polynomial Rings over Finite Fields. *Journal of Symbolic Computation* 26, 4 (1998), 463–486. <https://doi.org/10.1006/jsc.1998.0224>
- [9] Mark Giesbrecht, Qiao-Long Huang, and Éric Schost. 2020. Sparse multiplication for skew polynomials. In *Proceedings of the 45th International Symposium on Symbolic and Algebraic Computation (Kalamata, Greece) (ISSAC '20)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 194–201. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3373207.3404023>
- [10] Philippe Gille and Tamás Szamuely. 2017. *Quaternion algebras*. Cambridge University Press, 1–18.
- [11] Qiao-Long Huang, Ke Ye, and Xiao-Shan Gao. 2024. Skew-polynomial-sparse matrix multiplication. *Journal of Symbolic Computation* 121 (2024), 102240. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jsc.2023.102240>
- [12] Max-Albert Knus. 1998. *The book of involutions* (1 ed.). Vol. 44. American Mathematical Society, Providence, R.I.
- [13] Roberto La Scala and Viktor Levandovskyy. 2013. Skew polynomial rings, Gröbner bases and the letterplace embedding of the free associative algebra. *Journal of Symbolic Computation* 48 (2013), 110–131. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jsc.2012.05.003>
- [14] Oystein Ore. 1933. Theory of non-commutative polynomials. *Annals of mathematics* (1933), 480–508. <https://doi.org/10.2307/1968173>
- [15] Sven Puchinger and Antonia Wachter-Zeh. 2016. Sub-quadratic decoding of Gabidulin codes. In *IEEE International Symposium on Information Theory (ISIT)*, 2554–2558.
- [16] Sven Puchinger and Antonia Wachter-Zeh. 2018. Fast operations on linearized polynomials and their applications in coding theory. *Journal of Symbolic Computation* 89 (2018), 194–215. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jsc.2017.11.012>
- [17] Danilo Silva and Frank R. Kschischang. 2009. Fast encoding and decoding of Gabidulin codes. In *2009 IEEE International Symposium on Information Theory*. 2858–2862. <https://doi.org/10.1109/ISIT.2009.5205272>