

MACHINE LEARNING FOR MODULI SPACE OF GENUS TWO CURVES AND AN APPLICATION TO ISOGENY BASED CRYPTOGRAPHY

E. SHASKA AND T. SHASKA

ABSTRACT. We use machine learning to study the moduli space of genus two curves and more specifically distribution of fine moduli points and detecting if a genus two curve has (n, n) -split Jacobian.

We show that there are very few rational moduli points with small weighted height and (n, n) -split Jacobian for $n = 2, 3, 5$. Moreover, using a K-Neighbors Classifier we are able to detect splitting with an accuracy of 99.9%. This shows that artificial neural networks and machine learning techniques could be quite reliable on arithmetic questions in the moduli space of genus two curves and can possibly be used to applications in isogeny based cryptography.

1. INTRODUCTION

This paper is a first attempt to use machine learning to study the moduli space \mathcal{M}_g of algebraic curves of genus $g \geq 2$. We focus on the simplest case when the genus is $g = 2$ and curves are defined over \mathbb{Q} , since we are interested in arithmetic properties of the moduli space \mathcal{M}_2 , rational points of \mathcal{M}_2 , and in particular on fine moduli points (i.e, those rational points for which exists a curve C defined over the rationals).

We create a database of isomorphism classes of genus two curves defined over \mathbb{Q} which are uniquely determined by points in the weighted projective space $\mathbb{WP}_{2,4,6,10}$ given by classical invariants of binary sextics J_2, J_4, J_6, J_{10} . To determine uniquely a point in $\mathbb{WP}_{2,4,6,10}$ we normalize each point \mathbf{p} by the absolute weighted greatest common divisor $\lambda := \overline{\text{wgcd}}(\mathbf{p})$, by multiplying $\frac{1}{\lambda} \star \mathbf{p}$. This assures that these moduli points are as small as possible, or reduced via Reduction B, in the terminology of [30]. The data is stored in a Python dictionary where the key is the triple of absolute invariants (t_1, t_2, t_3) as defined in Eq. (7). Since these triples uniquely determine the moduli points, this assures that there is no redundancy in our data. In all our methods the keys (t_1, t_2, t_3) are not used in any training, but only for graphical purposes. The training is done only with points $\mathbf{p} \in \mathbb{WP}_{2,4,6,10}$.

Most of this paper is on creating the training dataset, which is based mostly on methods described in previous work of the authors; [4–6, 13, 16, 29]. Data points are ordered by their weighted moduli height as defined in [18]. For every point $\mathbf{p} \in \mathbb{WP}_{2,4,6,10}$ we compute the absolute weighted moduli height $\mathfrak{H}(\mathbf{p})$ of \mathbf{p} , its automorphism group $\text{Aut}(\mathbf{p})$, the conic $Q := \mathbf{p} / \text{Aut}(\mathbf{p})$ and determine whether the

Date: August 16, 2024.

2020 Mathematics Subject Classification. Primary: 68T07; Secondary: 68T20, 68Q32.

Key words and phrases. Stability, binary forms, weighted heights.

point is a fine moduli point (i.e, it is defined over its field of moduli) or a coarse moduli point depending whether the conic Q has or not a rational point.

Our first problem is to determine the distribution of fine moduli points in the moduli space and to see what happens to the number of fine points as the weighted moduli height grows to infinity.

The second problem that is considered is to use machine learning to determine if a point $\mathbf{p} \in \mathbb{WP}_{2,4,6,10}$ has split Jacobian. Genus two curves with (n, n) -split Jacobians have been the focus of study for a long time starting with Jacobi, Hermite, Goursat, Fricke, Brioschi, and in the last few decades by Frey, Kani, Shaska, Kumar, et al. For n odd, the locus of genus 2 curves with (n, n) -split Jacobian, denoted by Shaska in [21, 22] by \mathcal{L}_n , is a 2-dimensional irreducible locus in the moduli space of genus 2 curves \mathcal{M}_2 . The case when n is even is considered in [17]. When $n = 2$ the covering is Galois and that implies that the genus two curve has an extra involution. Such curves were studied from Jacobi and many authors since; see [35] for a modern treatment.

Let us now consider only the cases when n is odd. The equation of \mathcal{L}_n were first computed by Shaska in his thesis (2001) in [22] and papers published in [12, 26]. A general method was given for all n in [21] and [22]. In 2015, Kumar confirmed such computational via a different approach; see [11].

With the recent developments on isogeny based cryptography such curves have received new attention. There are many papers on trying to decide if a genus two curve has (n, n) -split Jacobian for small n . In [20] was shown that detecting if a Jacobian is (n, n) -split can speed computation of isogenies considerably. How do you detect of a genus two curve is in \mathcal{L}_n ? For small n we can just plug the invariants of the curve in the equation of \mathcal{L}_n , even though many authors seem unaware of how to obtain such equations. For larger n computing such equations is impractical which suggests a machine learning method could be much more feasible. Since \mathcal{L}_n are rational surfaces, there must be a way to generate rational points in \mathcal{L}_n . Hence, even without knowing explicitly the equation of \mathcal{L}_n , we can create a training dataset and use such data to train some machine learning model.

After experimenting with many methods of unsupervised and supervised learning we were able to detect the splitting using K-neighbours Classifier with an accuracy of 99.94% when $n = 2, 3, 5$. There is no reason to believe that this accuracy will go down for higher n . Our experiments were run for randomly generated dataset of 50 000 points for each locus \mathcal{L}_n , $n = 2, 3, 5$. It seems as with more computational resources such results can be easily extended to larger n . It remains to be seen how such experiments can be performed over a field of positive characteristic.

On the first problem: distribution of fine moduli points we were less successful. The reason was that there are very few fine points for moduli points of weighted height ≤ 3 . We can generate randomly such points, using for example the locus \mathcal{L}_2 , but they would be rather useless if we are trying to study the distribution of fine points in \mathcal{M}_2 . Moreover, we are more interested in fine moduli points which are in $\mathcal{M}_2 \setminus \mathcal{L}_2$. In order to do meaningful experiments it seems that we need to have a larger dataset (say up to weighted height $\mathfrak{H}_k \leq 5$) which requires computational resources which are not available to us. Due to these experiments, we were able to discover some interesting results. For example we showed that there are no rational points $\mathbf{p} \in \mathcal{L}_2$ with weighted height $\mathfrak{H}_k(\mathbf{p}) < 3/2$, or that there are exactly 34 such points with $\mathfrak{H}_k(\mathbf{p}) < 3$. For \mathcal{L}_3 we showed that there are no rational points with

weighted height $\mathfrak{H}_k < 2$ and there are 46 such points with $2 \leq \mathfrak{H}_k(\mathfrak{p}) < 3$. Such results would have been difficult to notice without machine learning techniques, which highlights exactly the way Machine Learning is the most likely to be used in mathematics: detecting a pattern and then trying to prove it by brute force or other classical methods.

2. PRELIMINARIES

Since this is intended for non experts in machine learning we briefly give a basic setup. We also provide basic definitions of weighted projective spaces and weighted heights, since all our computations are done in the weighted space.

2.1. Neural networks. Let k be a field. A **neuron** is a function $f : k^n \rightarrow k$ such that for every $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, \dots, x_n)$ we have

$$f(\mathbf{x}) = \sum_{i=1}^n w_i x_i + b,$$

where $b \in k$ is a constant called **bias**. We can generalize neurons to tuples of neurons via $F : k^n \rightarrow k^n$

$$\mathbf{x} \rightarrow (f_1(\mathbf{x}), \dots, f_n(\mathbf{x}))$$

for any given set of weights $\mathfrak{w}_0, \dots, \mathfrak{w}_n$. Then F is a function written as $F(\mathbf{x}) = W \cdot \mathbf{x} + \beta$, for some $\beta \in k^n$ and W an $n \times n$ matrix with integer entries. A (non-linear) function $g : k^n \rightarrow k^n$ is called an **activation function** while a **network layer** is a function $L : k^n \rightarrow k^n$, such that.

$$\mathbf{x} \rightarrow g(W \cdot \mathbf{x} + \beta)$$

for some some activation function g . A **neural network** is the composition of many layers. The i -th layer

$$\begin{aligned} \dots &\longrightarrow k^n \xrightarrow{L_i} k^n \longrightarrow \dots \\ \mathbf{x} &\longrightarrow L_i(\mathbf{x}) = g_i(W^i \mathbf{x} + \beta^i), \end{aligned}$$

where g_i , W^i , and β^i are the activation, matrix, and bias for this layer.

2.2. Weighted greatest common divisors. Let $\mathbf{x} = (x_0, \dots, x_n) \in \mathbb{Z}^{n+1}$ be a tuple of integers, not all equal to zero. A set of **weights** is the ordered tuple $\mathfrak{w} = (q_0, \dots, q_n)$, where q_0, \dots, q_n are positive integers. A *weighted integer tuple* is a tuple $\mathbf{x} = (x_0, \dots, x_n) \in \mathbb{Z}^{n+1}$ such that to each coordinate x_i is assigned the weight q_i . We multiply weighted tuples by scalars $\lambda \in \mathbb{Q}$ via

$$\lambda \star (x_0, \dots, x_n) = (l^{q_0} x_0, \dots, l^{q_n} x_n)$$

For an ordered tuple of integers $\mathbf{x} = (x_0, \dots, x_n) \in \mathbb{Z}^{n+1}$, whose coordinates are not all zero, the **weighted greatest common divisor with respect to the set of wts \mathfrak{w}** is the largest integer d such that

$$d^{q_i} \mid x_i, \text{ for all } i = 0, \dots, n.$$

We will call a point $\mathfrak{p} \in \mathbb{P}_{\mathfrak{w}}^n(\mathbb{Q})$ **normalized** if $\text{wgcd}(\mathfrak{p}) = 1$.

2.3. Weighted projective spaces and moduli space of binary forms. For any integer $m \geq 1$, let μ_m denote the group of m -th roots of unity generated by ξ_m , which is assumed to be contained in k . Consider the action of $k^* = k \setminus \{0\}$ on $\mathbb{A}_k^{n+1} \setminus \{(0, \dots, 0)\}$ given by

$$(1) \quad \lambda \star (x_0, \dots, x_n) = (\lambda^{q_0} x_0, \dots, \lambda^{q_n} x_n), \text{ for } \lambda \in k^*.$$

Define the **weighted projective space**, denoted by $\mathbb{W}\mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{w}}^n(k)$, to be the quotient space \mathbb{V}_k^{n+1}/k^* of this action, which is a geometric quotient since k^* is a reductive group. An element $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{W}\mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{w}}^n(k)$ is denoted by $\mathbf{x} = [x_0 : \dots : x_n]$ and its i -th coordinate by $x_i(\mathbf{x})$.

2.4. Heights on weighted projective spaces. For any point $\mathbf{p} = [x_0 : \dots : x_n] \in \mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{w},k}^n$ we can assume, without loss of generality, that $\mathbf{p} = [x_0 : \dots : x_n] \in \mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{w},k}^n(\mathcal{O}_k)$. Let $\mathbf{w} = (q_0, \dots, q_n)$ be a set of weights and $\mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{w},k}^n$ the weighted projective space over a number field k . Let $\mathbf{p} \in \mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{w},k}^n$ a point such that $\mathbf{p} = [x_0, \dots, x_n]$. We define the **weighted multiplicative height** of \mathbf{p} as

$$(2) \quad \mathfrak{H}_k(\mathbf{p}) := \prod_{v \in M_k} \max \left\{ |x_0|_v^{\frac{n_v}{q_0}}, \dots, |x_n|_v^{\frac{n_v}{q_n}} \right\}.$$

The **absolute weighted height** of $\mathbf{p} \in \mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{w},\mathbb{Q}}^n$ is the function $\mathfrak{H} : \mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{w},\mathbb{Q}}^n \rightarrow [1, \infty)$,

$$\mathfrak{H}(\mathbf{p}) = \mathfrak{H}_k(\mathbf{p})^{1/[k:\mathbb{Q}]},$$

where $\mathbf{p} \in \mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{w},k}^n$, for any k which contains $\mathbb{Q}(\overline{\text{wgcd}}(\mathbf{p}))$. The **absolute (logarithmic) weighted height** on $\mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{w},\mathbb{Q}}^n$ is the function $\mathfrak{s} : \mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{w},\mathbb{Q}}^n \rightarrow [0, \infty)$

$$\mathfrak{s}(\mathbf{p}) = \log \mathfrak{H}_k(\mathbf{p}) = \frac{1}{[k:\mathbb{Q}]} \mathfrak{H}_k(\mathbf{p}).$$

where again $\mathbf{p} \in \mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{w},k}^n$, for any k which contains $\mathbb{Q}(\overline{\text{wgcd}}(\mathbf{p}))$.

Let $\mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{w},k}$ be a well-formed weighted projective space and $\mathbf{x} = [x_0 : \dots : x_n] \in \mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{w},k}(k)$. Assume \mathbf{x} normalized (i.e. $\text{wgcd}_k(\mathbf{x}) = 1$). Clearly $\text{wgcd}(\mathbf{x}) | \text{gcd}(x_0, \dots, x_n)$ and therefore $\text{wgcd}(\mathbf{x}) \leq \text{gcd}(x_0, \dots, x_n)$. Let \mathbf{x} be absolutely normalized. Then $\text{gcd}(x_0, \dots, x_n) = 1$. If $\mathbf{x} = [x_0 : \dots : x_n]$ is a normalized point then by definition of the height

$$\mathfrak{H}_k(\mathbf{x}) = \max_{i=0}^n \{ |x_i|^{\frac{1}{q_i}} \}$$

Assume now that $\mathbf{x} = [\lambda^{q_0} x_0 : \dots : \lambda^{q_n} x_n]$ such that $\lambda = \text{wgcd}(\lambda^{q_0} x_0 : \dots : \lambda^{q_n} x_n)$.

Denote by s the index where $\min_j \{ |\lambda^{q_i} x_j|^{\frac{1}{q_j}} \} = \lambda \min_j \{ |x_j|^{\frac{1}{q_j}} \}$ is obtained. Then

$$(3) \quad \frac{1}{\lambda(x_s)^{1/q_s}} \star \mathbf{x} = \left[\frac{x_0}{x_s^{q_0/q_s}} : \dots : 1 : \dots : \frac{x_n}{x_s^{q_n/q_s}} \right] =: \mathbf{y}$$

where 1 is in the s position. Simplify all coordinates in Eq. (3). Multiplying \mathbf{y} by $(x_s)^{\frac{1}{q_s}}$ we have $(x_s)^{\frac{1}{q_s}} \star \mathbf{y} = [x_0 : \dots : x_n]$, which is now a normalized point. Hence

$$\mathfrak{H}_k(\mathbf{x}) = \frac{\max_{i=0}^n \{ |\lambda^{q_i} x_i|^{\frac{1}{q_i}} \}}{\min_{i=0}^n \{ |\lambda^{q_i} x_i|^{\frac{1}{q_i}} \}}$$

Notice that $\mathfrak{H}_k(\mathbf{x})$ is given by $\mathfrak{H}_k(\mathbf{x}) = \frac{\max_i |x_i|^{\frac{1}{q_i}}}{\min_j |x_j|^{\frac{1}{q_j}}}$. When $\mathbf{x} = [x_0 : \dots : x_n] \in \mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{w}}(\mathbb{Q})$ is an absolutely normalized point, then $\text{gcd}(x_0, \dots, x_n) \leq \mathfrak{H}_k(\mathbf{x})$.

3. ABELIAN SURFACES AND THEIR ISOGENIES

Here we provide the basic setup of isogenies of Abelian varieties; see [9] for details. Let \mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B} be abelian varieties over a field k . We denote the \mathbb{Z} -module of homomorphisms $\mathcal{A} \mapsto \mathcal{B}$ by $\text{Hom}(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B})$ and the ring of endomorphisms $\mathcal{A} \mapsto \mathcal{A}$ by $\text{End } \mathcal{A}$. It is more convenient to work with the \mathbb{Q} -vector spaces

$$\text{Hom}^0(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}) := \text{Hom}(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}) \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} \mathbb{Q},$$

and $\text{End}^0 \mathcal{A} := \text{End } \mathcal{A} \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} \mathbb{Q}$. A homomorphism $f : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{B}$ is called an **isogeny** if $\text{Im } f = \mathcal{B}$ and $\ker f$ is a finite group scheme. If an isogeny $\mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{B}$ exists we say that \mathcal{A} and \mathcal{B} are isogenous. The degree of an isogeny $f : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{B}$ is the degree of the function field extension

$$\deg f := [K(\mathcal{A}) : f^*K(\mathcal{B})].$$

It is equal to the order of the group scheme $\ker(f)$.

The group of \bar{k} -rational points has order

$$\#(\ker f)(\bar{k}) = [K(\mathcal{A}) : f^*K(\mathcal{B})]^{sep},$$

where $[K(\mathcal{A}) : f^*K(\mathcal{B})]^{sep}$ is the degree of the maximally separable extension in $K(\mathcal{A})/f^*K(\mathcal{B})$. f is a **separable isogeny** if and only if $\# \ker f(\bar{k}) = \deg f$. The basic principle on any isogeny based cryptosystem is based on the fact that for any Abelian variety \mathcal{A}/k there is a one to one correspondence between the finite subgroup schemes $\mathcal{K} \leq \mathcal{A}$ and isogenies $f : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{B}$, where \mathcal{B} is determined up to isomorphism. Moreover, $\mathcal{K} = \ker f$ and $\mathcal{B} = \mathcal{A}/\mathcal{K}$.

If \mathcal{A} and \mathcal{B} are isogenous then $\text{End}^0(\mathcal{A}) \cong \text{End}^0(\mathcal{B})$. The following is often called the fundamental theorem of Abelian varieties:

Theorem 1 (Poincare-Weil). *Let \mathcal{A} be an Abelian variety. Then \mathcal{A} is isogenous to*

$$\mathcal{A}_2^{n_1} \times \mathcal{A}_2^{n_2} \times \cdots \times \mathcal{A}_r^{n_r},$$

where (up to permutation of the factors) \mathcal{A}_i , for $i = 1, \dots, r$ are simple, non-isogenous, Abelian varieties. Moreover, up to permutations, the factors $\mathcal{A}_i^{n_i}$ are uniquely determined up to isogenies.

If \mathcal{A} is a absolutely simple Abelian variety then every endomorphism not equal 0 is an isogeny.

3.0.1. *Computing isogenies between Abelian varieties.* Fix a field k and let \mathcal{A} be an Abelian variety over k . Let H denote a finite subgroup of \mathcal{A} . From the computational point of view we have the following problems:

- (1) Compute all Abelian varieties \mathcal{B} over k such that there exists an isogeny $\mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{B}$ whose kernel is isomorphic to H .
- (2) Given \mathcal{A} and H , determine $\mathcal{B} := \mathcal{A}/H$ and the isogeny $\mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{B}$.
- (3) Given two Abelian varieties \mathcal{A} and \mathcal{B} , determine if they are isogenous and compute a rational expression for an isogeny $\mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{B}$.

3.1. **Torsion points and dual isogenies.** The most classical example of an isogeny is the scalar multiplication by n map $[n] : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}$. The kernel of $[n]$ is a group scheme of order $n^{2 \dim \mathcal{A}}$. We denote by $\mathcal{A}[n]$ the group $\ker[n](\bar{k})$. The elements in $\mathcal{A}[n]$ are called **n -torsion points** of \mathcal{A} .

Let $f : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{B}$ be a degree n isogeny. Then there exists an isogeny $\hat{f} : \mathcal{B} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}$ such that

$$f \circ \hat{f} = \hat{f} \circ f = [n].$$

The isogeny \hat{f} is called the **dual** of f .

Theorem 2. *Let \mathcal{A}/k be an Abelian variety, $p = \text{char } k$, and $\dim \mathcal{A} = g$.*

- i) *If $p \nmid n$, then $[n]$ is separable, $\#\mathcal{A}[n] = n^{2g}$ and $\mathcal{A}[n] \cong (\mathbb{Z}/n\mathbb{Z})^{2g}$.*
- ii) *If $p \mid n$, then $[n]$ is inseparable. Moreover, there is an integer $0 \leq i \leq g$ such that*

$$\mathcal{A}[p^m] \cong (\mathbb{Z}/p^m\mathbb{Z})^i, \text{ for all } m \geq 1.$$

If $i = g$ then \mathcal{A} is called **ordinary**. If $\mathcal{A}[p^s](\bar{K}) = \mathbb{Z}/p^{ts}\mathbb{Z}$ then the abelian variety has **p -rank t** . If $\dim \mathcal{A} = 1$ (elliptic curve) then it is called **supersingular** if it has p -rank 0. An abelian variety \mathcal{A} is called **supersingular** if it is isogenous to a product of supersingular elliptic curves.

3.2. Supersingular Isogeny Diffie-Helman (SIDH). Let $\mathcal{A} = \text{Jac}(\mathcal{C})$, where \mathcal{C} is a genus $g \geq 2$ curve defined over a field k with $\text{char } k = p$, for $p \neq 2$. We pick $p = m \cdot n - 1$ where $(m, n) = 1$. Then $\mathcal{A}[m]$ and $\mathcal{A}[n]$ have dimension $2g$. Pick bases

$$\{P_1, \dots, P_{2g}\} \text{ for } \mathcal{A}[m] \quad \text{and} \quad \{Q_1, \dots, Q_{2g}\} \text{ for } \mathcal{A}[n]$$

Alice randomly generates

$$\begin{aligned} R_1 &= \sum_{i=1}^{2g} [x_{1,i}]P_i, \\ R_2 &= \sum_{i=1}^{2g} [x_{2,i}]P_i, \\ &\dots, \\ R_{2g-1} &= \sum_{i=1}^{2g} [x_{2g-1,i}]P_i, \end{aligned}$$

and a maximal subgroup $\mathcal{K}_A = \langle R_1, \dots, R_{2g-1} \rangle$. Then she computes the isogeny $\phi_A : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}/\mathcal{K}_A =: \mathcal{A}_A$. Alice generates a public key $(\mathcal{A}_A, \phi_A(Q_1), \dots, \phi_A(Q_{2g}))$. Bob randomly generates

$$\begin{aligned} S_1 &= \sum_{i=1}^{2g} [x_{1,i}]Q_i, \\ S_2 &= \sum_{i=1}^{2g} [x_{2,i}]Q_i, \\ &\dots \\ S_{2g-1} &= \sum_{i=1}^{2g} [x_{2g-1,i}]Q_i \end{aligned}$$

and a maximal subgroup $\mathcal{K}_B = \langle S_1, \dots, S_{2g-1} \rangle$. Then he computes the isogeny

$$\phi_B : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}/\mathcal{K}_B =: \mathcal{A}_B.$$

Bob generates a public key $(\mathcal{A}_B, \phi_B(P_1), \dots, \phi_B(P_{2g}))$.

3.2.1. *Key exchange:* Using $\phi_B(P_1), \dots, \phi_B(P_{2g})$, Alice generates

$$R'_1 = \sum_{i=1}^{2g} [x_{1,i}] \phi_B(P_i),$$

$$R'_2 = \sum_{i=1}^{2g} [x_{2,i}] \phi_B(P_i),$$

...

$$R'_{2g-1} = \sum_{i=1}^{2g} [x_{2g-1,i}] \phi_B(P_i)$$

and creates $\mathcal{K}'_A = \langle R'_1, \dots, R'_{2g-1} \rangle$, a maximal subgroup of $\mathcal{A}_B[n]$ and the isogeny

$$\phi'_A : \mathcal{A}_B \rightarrow \mathcal{A}_B / \mathcal{K}'_A =: \mathcal{A}_{BA}.$$

Using $\phi_A(Q_1), \dots, \phi_A(Q_{2g})$, Bob generates

$$S'_1 = \sum_{i=1}^{2g} [x_{1,i}] \phi_A(Q_i),$$

$$S'_2 = \sum_{i=1}^{2g} [x_{2,i}] \phi_A(Q_i),$$

...

$$S'_{2g-1} = \sum_{i=1}^{2g} [x_{2g-1,i}] \phi_A(Q_i),$$

and creates $\mathcal{K}'_B = \langle S'_1, \dots, S'_{2g-1} \rangle$, a maximal subgroup of $\mathcal{A}_A[m]$ and the isogeny

$$\phi'_B : \mathcal{A}_A \rightarrow \mathcal{A}_A / \mathcal{K}'_B =: \mathcal{A}_{AB}.$$

Lemma 1. *We have that $\phi'_B \circ \phi_A = \phi'_A \circ \phi_B$. Moreover, $\mathcal{A}_{AB} = \mathcal{A}_{BA}$.*

Let \mathcal{C} be a genus 2 curve and $\psi : \mathcal{C} \rightarrow E_1$ be a maximal degree n covering which does not factor through an isogeny. Then, there is another elliptic curve $E_2 := \text{Jac } \mathcal{C} / E_1$ such that $\text{Jac } \mathcal{C}$ is isogenous via a degree n^2 isogeny to the product $E_1 \times E_2$. We say that $\text{Jac } \mathcal{C}$ is (n, n) -**decomposable** or (n, n) -**split**. The locus of curves with (n, n) -decomposable Jacobians is a 2-dimensional irreducible locus in \mathcal{M}_2 . Such loci for small $n = 2, 3, 5$ are computed in [12, 21, 22, 26, 35].

$\text{Jac } (\mathcal{C})$ is a geometrically simple Abelian variety if and only if it is not (n, n) -split for some $n > 1$. In other words, if $\text{Jac } (\mathcal{C})$ is split over k , then there exists an integer $n \geq 2$ such that $\text{Jac } (\mathcal{C})$ is (n, n) -split.

4. MODULI SPACE \mathcal{M}_2 OF GENUS 2 CURVES

The moduli space of genus 2 curves defined over k is isomorphic to $\mathbb{W}\mathbb{P}_{(2,4,6,10),k}^3$. Moreover, the invariant J_{10} of degree 10 is the discriminant of the sextic and therefore $J_{10} \neq 0$. Thus, the morphism $\mathbb{W}\mathbb{P}_{(2,4,6,10),k}^3 \rightarrow \mathbb{W}\mathbb{P}_{(1,2,3,5),k}^3$, given by

$$(4) \quad [x_0 : x_1 : x_2 : x_3] \rightarrow [y_0 : y_1 : y_2 : y_3] = [x_0^2 : x_1^2 : x_2^2 : x_3^2]$$

is an isomorphism. Since we want to design a model where the incoming features will be a genus two curve, then equivalently this means a point $[x_0 : x_1 : x_2 :$

$x_3] \in \mathbb{WP}_{(1,2,3,5)}$. Equivalently the input could be the equation of the curve, but this poses no issue for $g = 2$ since we can easily compute invariants. However, even though the space $\mathbb{WP}_{(1,2,3,5)}$ seems nicer to deal with, from the computational point of view we rather store points in the form (J_2, J_4, J_6, J_{10}) than $(J_2^2, J_4^2, J_6^2, J_{10}^2)$. Hence, our database will consist of points of $\mathbb{WP}_{(2,4,6,10)}$.

There is also an issue to address when it comes to finding the "smallest" representatives for the equivalence class $[x_0 : x_1 : x_2 : x_3]$. Theoretically this is handled in [2], but that would require computing weighted greatest common divisors and that could be very costly for large coordinates x_0, \dots, x_3 . Since $q = 1 \cdot 2 \cdot 3 \cdot 5 = 30$, the Veronese embedding is

$$(5) \quad [J_2 : J_4 : J_6 : J_{10}] \longrightarrow [J_2^{30} : J_4^{15} : J_6^{10} : J_{10}^6] = \left[\frac{J_2^{30}}{J_{10}^6} : \frac{J_4^{15}}{J_{10}^6} : \frac{J_6^{10}}{J_{10}^6} : 1 \right]$$

So the triple

$$(6) \quad i_1 = \frac{J_2^{30}}{J_{10}^6}, \quad i_2 = \frac{J_4^{15}}{J_{10}^6}, \quad i_3 = \frac{J_6^{10}}{J_{10}^6}$$

uniquely determines the equivalence class of a genus 2 curve over the algebraic closure of k .

Our initial intention was to create a dictionary with keys (i_1, i_2, i_3) , but these numbers blow up very quickly which makes significant computations impossible. If the rational numbers have a significant number of decimal places, their exact representation might be lost when converted to floating-point format. There is another set of invariants defined by Igusa in [10],

$$(7) \quad t_1 = \frac{J_2^5}{J_{10}}, \quad t_2 = \frac{J_4^5}{J_{10}^2}, \quad t_3 = \frac{J_6^5}{J_{10}^3}$$

which are defined everywhere in the moduli space. They were used in some computations in [34], and are lower degrees than those in Eq. (6). For relation among different kind of invariants see [14, 15] among many other places.

We will use these invariants instead. Our Python dictionary will be keyed on ordered triples (t_1, t_2, t_3) , which are $\text{GL}_2(\bar{k})$ -invariants, hence every entry in the dictionary corresponds to the unique isomorphism class of genus 2 curves defined over \mathbb{Q} .

	Entry	Value	Type	Description
0	(x, y, z)	(t_1, t_2, t_3)	float32	absolute invariants
1	\mathbf{p}	$[J_2, J_4, J_6, J_{10}]$	int	normalized moduli point
2	$\bar{\mathbf{p}}$		int	absolutely normalized point
3	wh	$\mathfrak{H}_k(\mathbf{p})$	float32	weighted height
4	awh	$\mathfrak{H}(\mathbf{p})$	float32	absolute weighted height
5	gcd	$\text{gcd}(\mathbf{p})$	float32	gcd of \mathbf{p}
6	label1	T/F	Boolean	True=fine, False=coarse
7	$[m, n]$	$\text{Aut}(\mathbf{p})$	[int, int]	Gap Identity
8	label2	$\mathbf{p} \in \mathcal{L}_3$	Boolean	
9	label3	$\mathbf{p} \in \mathcal{L}_5$	Boolean	
10	label4	$\mathbf{p} \in \mathcal{L}_7$	Boolean	

We will describe later how to normalize points $\mathbf{p} = [a, b, c, d]$ in $\mathbb{WP}_{(2,4,6,20)}$.

4.1. Genus two curves with extra automorphisms. The set of points with extra automorphisms is a 2-dimensional irreducible subvariety of the moduli space corresponding exactly to points $p \in \mathbb{WP}_{(2,4,6,10)}$ which satisfying $J_{30}(p) = 0$. This locus has two 1-dimensional loci corresponding to points with automorphism group D_4 and D_6 ; for details see [14, 15, 21, 23–25, 27–30, 35].




FIGURE 1. \mathcal{L}_2 surface and 1-dimensional subloci of \mathcal{L}_2 : curves with automorphism group D_4 or D_6

4.2. Genus two curves with (n, n) -split Jacobians. Genus two curves with (n, n) -split Jacobians have been studied thoroughly during the last two decades and have been getting again some attention lately due to their use in isogeny based cryptography; see [12, 21, 22, 26, 28, 29, 29] among others. This extends the database from [3].

As in [22], we denote the locus of genus 2 curves with (n, n) -split Jacobian by \mathcal{L}_n . For n odd, it is a 2-dimensional irreducible locus in \mathcal{M}_2 . Here we will describe how to create a database of points in \mathcal{L}_n for $n = 5, 7, 11$.

A degree n covering $C \rightarrow E$, where C is a genus two curve and E an elliptic curve, induces a degree n covering $\phi : \mathbb{P}^1 \rightarrow \mathbb{P}^1$ with ramification

$$\left(2^{\frac{n-1}{2}}, 2^{\frac{n-1}{2}}, 2^{\frac{n-1}{2}}, 2^{\frac{n-3}{2}}, 2\right)$$

The unramified points in the fibers of the first four branch points are the Weierstrass points of the genus 2 curve.

Denote by $F_i(x)$, $i = 1, \dots, 4$ the polynomial over the branch point q_i , which has as roots points of ramification index 2. Hence, $\deg F_1 = \deg F_2 = \deg F_3 = \frac{n-1}{2}$, and $\deg F_4 = \frac{n-3}{2}$. We fix a coordinate on the lower \mathbb{P}^1 by letting $q_1 = 0$, $q_2 = \infty$, and $q_3 = 1$ and on the upper \mathbb{P}^1 by $w_1 = 0$, $w_1 = 1$, and $w_3 = \infty$. Then

$$\phi(x) = x \left(\frac{F_1(x)}{F_2(x)} \right)^2, \quad \phi(x) - 1 = (x - 1) \left(\frac{F_3(x)}{F_2(x)} \right)^2,$$

Cases when $n = 3$ and $n = 5$ are special cases. When $n = 3$ the fibers of q_1 , q_2 , q_3 , and q_5 are identical, so we have extra symmetries permuting these branch points. When $n = 5$ then the fibers of q_4 and q_5 are identical so we have an extra involution permuting q_4 and q_5 . The first general case is when $n = 7$ which is somewhat simpler since we don't have to worry about such extra symmetries, but of course everything becomes computational more challenging when n gets bigger. Next we provide formulas how to generate rational points in the moduli space of genus two




FIGURE 2. Ramification type and Weierstrass points

curves, such that Jacobians are (n, n) -split for $n = 2, 3, 5, 7$. For justification and proofs of such formulas one can check [12, 22, 26, 35].

4.2.1. $(3, 3)$ -split: This case was studied in [22] and summarized in [26]. Let C be a genus 2 curve with $(3, 3)$ split Jacobian. Then from [29, Theorem 4] C has equation

$$(8) \quad y^2 = (v^2x^3 + uvx^2 + vx + 1)(4v^2x^3 + v^2x^2 + 2vx + 1)$$

for $\Delta = v(v - 27)(4u^3 - u^2v - 18uv + 4v^2 + 27v) \neq 0$. Its moduli point is

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{p} &= [2v^4\alpha, 4v^7\beta, 4v^{10}\gamma, -16v^{17}(v - 27)\delta^3] \\ &= [2v\alpha, 4v\beta, 4v\gamma, -16v^2(v - 27)\delta^3] \end{aligned}$$

since $v \neq 0$ and $\alpha, \beta, \gamma, \delta$ are

$$\alpha = 4u^2 - 12uv + 3v^2 + 252u - 54v - 405$$


$$\begin{aligned} \beta &= u^4v - 24u^4 - 66u^3v + 9u^2v^2 + 1188u^3 + 297u^2v + 138uv^2 - 36v^3 - 8424uv \\ &\quad + 945v^2 + 14580v \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \gamma &= 2u^6v^2 - 8u^5v^3 + 2u^4v^4 - 40u^6v + 106u^5v^2 + 495u^4v^3 - 204u^3v^4 + 18u^2v^5 - 144u^6 \\ &\quad + 1476u^5v - 18756u^4v^2 + 4280u^3v^3 - 1038u^2v^4 + 564uv^5 - 72v^6 + 160704u^4v \\ &\quad + 4464u^3v^2 + 75024u^2v^3 - 33480uv^4 + 3186v^5 - 104004u^3v - 1353996u^2v^2 + 315252uv^3 \\ &\quad - 4032v^4 + 3669786uv^2 - 622323v^3 - 2821230v^2 \end{aligned}$$

$$\delta = 4u^3 - u^2v - 18uv + 4v^2 + 27v$$

Notice that for rational values of u, v we get rational points $\mathbf{p} \in \mathcal{L}_3$. This provides an easy way to generate a database of points fine points in \mathcal{L}_3 . However, if we simply want to generalize rational points in \mathcal{L}_3 , not necessarily fine moduli points, we have to use parameters r_1, r_2 which provide a birational parametrization of \mathcal{L}_3 , but not necessarily genus 2 curves defined over \mathbb{Q} ; see [26] for details.

In [23] was studied the intersection $\mathcal{L}_2 \cap \mathcal{L}_3$. Such points $\mathbf{p} \in \mathcal{L}_2 \cap \mathcal{L}_3$ have Jacobians which are $(2, 2)$ -split and $(3, 3)$ -split and rational points in such genus 2 curves were determined. In [29] are given other examples of genus 2 curves with many elliptic subcovers (Jacobian splits in more than one way). Recently

FIGURE 3. \mathcal{L}_3 surface

curves with (3, 3)-split have been suggested by Flynn for genus two isogeny based cryptography; see [8].

4.2.2. (5, 5)-split: This case was studied in detail in [12]. The parametric family of genus two curves in the locus \mathcal{L}_5 is given by

$$(9) \quad C : \quad y^2 = x(x-1) (a_3x^3 + a_2x^2 + a_1x + a_0)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} a_0 &= -b^4(2b^3a + 4b^3 - 2zab^2 + 7b^2a^2 + 8zb^2 + 4b^2 + 16ab^2 + 16zba + 6a^3b + 8ba \\ &\quad + 2za^2b + 12zb + 16ba^2 + 13za^2 + za^4 + 6za^3 + 4z + 12ya) \\ a_1 &= -b^2(12b^3 + 12b^4a + 32zba - 6a^4b^2 + 44b^2a^3 + 6ba^2 + 24ab^2 + 10a^3b + 44b^3a^2 + 2ba \\ &\quad + 52b^3a + 61b^2a^2 - 12ba^5 - 7za^2 - 2za + 12zb - 4a^6 + 12b^4 - a^4 - 40za^3b^2 - 16zb^3a^2 \\ &\quad - 12za^5 + 36zb^2 - 18za^3 - 26za^4 + 56zab^2 + 4azb^3 + 2za^2b^2 - 20za^3b + 28za^2b \\ &\quad + 2za^6 + 24zb^3 + 4zba^5 - 4a^5 - 32za^4b) \\ a_2 &= 5b^2a^6 + 20b^2a^5 + 8ba^6 - 61b^4a^2 - 18b^5a - 56b^4a + 4zba + 5a^4b^2 - 18b^2a^3 - 24zb^4 \\ &\quad - 14zb^4a - 4ab^2 + 8b^3a^4 + 2b^3a^5 - 54b^3a^3 - 70b^3a^2 - 24b^3a - 14b^2a^2 + 4a^4b + 10ba^5 \\ &\quad - 6za^7 + 64za^3b^3 + 38za^4b^2 + 54za^3b^2 + 12zb^3a^2 - 14za^6b - 10zb^2a^5 - 4za^7b - 4a^6zb^2 \\ &\quad + 32a^2b^4z + 2a^7b - za^8 - 36zb^3 - 12za^5 - 12zb^2 - 4za^4 - 28zab^2 - 64azb^3 - 5za^2b^2 \\ &\quad + 16za^2b + 28za^4b - 4zba^5 - 13za^6 - 12b^5 - 12b^4 + 34za^3b) \\ a_3 &= (2a + 1)(za^4 - 2a^3b + 4za^3 + 6za^3b - 4ba^2 + 12za^2b^2 + 10za^2b - 9b^2a^2 + 5za^2 \\ &\quad - 2ba + 2za - 8ab^2 - 12b^3a + 8azb^3 - 4b^3 - 4zb - 4b^4 - 12zb^2 - 8zb^3) \end{aligned}$$

As mentioned above, there is an involution permuting branch points q_4 and q_5 . Moreover, a, b , and z satisfy the equation

$$(10) \quad f(a, b, z) := (1 + 2a)z^2 + (-a^2 - 2ab - 2a + 2b)z + 2ab + b^2 = 0$$

see [12, Thm. 2] for details.

Equation of \mathcal{L}_5 : Computing the equation of \mathcal{L}_5 sounds as an easy exercise in elimination theory: compute $i_1(t, s), i_2(t, s), i_3(t, s)$ and eliminate t and s . This will give an affine equation $f(i_1, i_2, i_3) = 0$. Then get the projective equation, substitute i_1, i_2, i_3 in terms of J_2, J_4, J_6, J_{10} .

The main problem with the above approach is that the degree of rational functions i_1, i_2, i_3 in terms of t and s are very large, which makes the elimination of t and s practically impossible.

In [12] was given the following approach in the computation of \mathcal{L}_5 . Let

$$u = \frac{2a(ab + b^2 + b + a + 1)}{b(a + b + 1)}, \quad v = \frac{a^3}{b(a + b + 1)}, \quad w = \frac{(z^2 - z + 1)^3}{z^2(z - 1)^2}$$

They are invariants of a group action on $k(a, b, z)$. Since the modular invariants J_2, J_4, J_6, J_{10} are invariants of any permutation of fibers, they can be expressed in terms of u, v, w . Moreover,

$$k(\mathcal{L}_5) = k(u, v, w),$$

where the equation of w in terms of u, v is

$$(11) \quad c_2 w^2 + c_1 w + c_0 = 0$$

with c_0, c_1, c_2 as follows:

$$(12) \quad \begin{aligned} c_2 &= 64v^2(u - 4v + 1)^2 \\ c_1 &= -4v(-272v^2u - 20vu^2 + 2592v^3 - 4672v^2 + 4u^3 + 16v^3u^2 - 15vu^4 \\ &\quad - 96v^2u^2 + 24v^2u^3 + 2u^5 - 12u^4 + 92vu^3 + 576vu - 128v^4 - 288v^3u) \\ c_0 &= (u^2 + 4vu + 4v^2 - 48v)^3 \end{aligned}$$

Notice that the surface in u, v, w is a septic surface and more difficult to get a parametrization of it. However, expressing $i_1(u, v, w), i_2(u, v, w), i_3(u, v, w)$ together with the (11) gives us a system of equations which is easier to handle and possible to eliminate u, v , and w . In [12] was shown that $k(u, v, w) = k(\mathcal{L}_5)$.

Remark 1. *The equation of \mathcal{L}_5 was computed in [12] by the above method and using resultants to eliminate u and v . Since it is too long it was not displayed in the paper, but in a webpage that no longer is available. Due to regular and repeated requests for this equation, we intend to display it on our groups's webpage, even though it is exactly its impracticality of usage due to its length which motivates this paper.*

4.2.3. *Cases for $n \geq 7$.* Both cases $n = 3$ and $n = 5$ are special cases due to their ramification structure. For example, for $n = 3$ the fibers $\phi^{-1}(q_i)$, for $i = 1, 2, 3$ and $\phi^{-1}(q_5)$ are the same and for $n = 5$ the fibers $\phi^{-1}(q_4)$ and $\phi^{-1}(q_5)$ are the same. This fact induces extra symmetries and therefore a group action as shown in the computation of these spaces.

The first case which is a general case (i.e. the ramification structure is the same as large n) is the case $n = 7$. Its computation is much more involved; see [21] for computations of some of its degenerate loci. There are other ways how to generate

rational points in \mathcal{L}_n , even though not general points. The general ramification for $n > 7$ has four cases (called degenerate cases in [12, 26]). These cases give 4 curves in \mathcal{L}_n and two of these curves are genus zero curves. Hence, a rational parametrization of these curves would provide rational points in \mathcal{L}_n . However, any model based only on these points would be suited only for this curve and not the whole \mathcal{L}_n space. In [1, 23, 29] was considered the cases of intersection between different \mathcal{L}_n . In general, computing the \mathcal{L}_n locus requires Groebner bases and such methods are inefficient as n increases, which makes the machine learning methods even more appealing.

Remark 2. *Occasionally we receive requests for explicit equations of \mathcal{L}_n , for $n = 3$ and $n = 5$. Such equations are weighted hypersurfaces in $\mathbb{W}\mathbb{P}_{2,4,6,10}$. For rational points in such hypersurfaces and especially considering them over finite fields see [19, 33]*

5. NUMBER OF POINTS IN $\mathbb{P}_{\mathfrak{w}}(\mathbb{Q})$ WITH BOUNDED WEIGHTED HEIGHT

In this section we want to estimate the number of points in a weighted projective space. Since our main application is the moduli space of hyperelliptic curves, we focus on the binary forms. Let \mathcal{R}_d be the ring of invariants of degree $d \geq 3$ binary forms and $\xi = (\xi_0, \dots, \xi_n)$ be a generating of \mathcal{R}_d with wts $\mathfrak{w} = (q_0, \dots, q_n)$. Let $\mathbb{P}_{\mathfrak{w}}^n$ denote the weighted projective space over \mathbb{C} (say $\mathbb{P}_{\mathfrak{w}, \mathbb{C}}^n$) and $\mathbb{P}_{\mathfrak{w}}^n(\mathbb{Q})$ the set of points with rational coordinates. Notice that for each $\mathfrak{p} \in \mathbb{P}_{\mathfrak{w}}^n(\mathbb{Q})$ we can assume $\mathfrak{p} = [x_0, \dots, x_n]$, where $x_i \in \mathbb{Z}$, for all $i = 0, \dots, n$.

Fix $h \in \mathbb{R}^{\geq 0}$ and let

$$B_h := \{\mathfrak{p} \in \mathbb{P}_{\mathfrak{w}}^n \mid \mathfrak{H}(\mathfrak{p}) \leq h\},$$

$$C_h := \{\mathfrak{p} \in \mathbb{P}_{\mathfrak{w}}^n \mid h - 1 < \mathfrak{H}(\mathfrak{p}) \leq h\},$$

Let $F_d : [0, \infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}^{\geq 0}$ be the function which denotes the cardinality of B_h and $G_d : [1, \infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}^{\geq 0}$ the cardinality of C_h . Then,

$$G_d(h) = F_d(h) - F_d(h - 1).$$

From Northcott's theorem for weighted heights (see [2, Theorem 1]) $F_d(h)$ and $G_d(h)$ are well defined.

Theorem 3. *Let $\mathfrak{w} = (q_0, \dots, q_n)$ and $\mathbb{W}\mathbb{P}_{\mathfrak{w}, \mathbb{Q}}^n$ a well-formed weighted projective space. The number of points in $\mathbb{W}\mathbb{P}_{\mathfrak{w}, \mathbb{Q}}^n$ with height less or equal to a number h is*

$$F_d(h) \leq \sum_{i=0}^n \left(h^{q_{n-i}} \cdot \prod_{j=0}^{n-i} (2h^{q_j} + 1) \right)$$

Proof. Assume $\mathfrak{H}(\mathfrak{p}) \leq h$. For each $i = 0, \dots, n$ we have

$$|x_i|^{\frac{1}{q_i}} \leq h \implies |x_i| \leq h^{q_i}$$

Hence, there are $2h^{q_i} + 1$ choices for x_i . Moreover, we can normalize one of the coordinates so it is always positive. We can do that for the highest power, which by our ordering is q_n . Then there will be only $h^{q_n} + 1$ choices for that coordinate. Hence, our total number is bounded by

$$(h^{q_n} + 1) \cdot \prod_{i=0}^{n-1} (2h^{q_i} + 1)$$

Since we are counting stable points in the moduli space of binary forms, then at least one of the coordinates must be nonzero; see [7]. Assume $x_n \neq 0$. Then there are h^{q_n} choices for x_n and the number of such forms is less than

$$h^{q_n} \cdot \prod_{j=0}^{n-1} (2h^{q_j} + 1).$$

If $x_n = 0$ then by the same argument there are

$$h^{q_{n-1}} \cdot \prod_{j=0}^{n-2} (2h^{q_j} + 1).$$

and so on. Adding up all the cases we have

$$F_d(h) \leq \sum_{i=0}^n \left(h^{q_{n-i}} \cdot \prod_{j=0}^{n-i} (2h^{q_j} + 1) \right)$$

This completes the proof. \square

Notice that the above method counts as different moduli points tuples $\lambda \star (x_0, \dots, x_n)$ as long as $\max\{|\lambda^{q_i} x_i|^{1/q_i}\} \leq h$. Formula is precise only for $h = 1$ as it will be seen in computations with binary sextics. Consider for example $[1 : 0 : 0 : 0]$ and $[2 : 0 : 0 : 0]$ in $\mathbb{P}_{(1,2,3,5)}$. They are the same point but counted separately by the above formula when $h > \sqrt{2}$.

Next we use the results of the above two sections to study the moduli space \mathcal{M}_2 of genus 2 curves. \mathcal{M}_2 has been the focus of investigation for a long time due to its particular place in the algebraic geometry of curves and its applications to hyperelliptic curve cryptography. In particular we want to compare our result to those in [3, 15, 30]. We will continue to use the terminology as above.

Let \mathcal{H}_g denote the moduli space of genus $g \leq 2$ hyperelliptic curves defined over k . Since every genus g hyperelliptic curve corresponds to a binary form of degree $2g + 2$ we have an embedding

$$\phi : \mathcal{H}_g \hookrightarrow B_{2g+2}$$

The image $\phi\mathcal{H}_g$ does not intersect with the locus $\Delta = 0$. So \mathcal{H}_g is isomorphic to $\mathbb{W}\mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{w}}^n \setminus \{\Delta = 0\}$.

Lemma 2. *The number of points in \mathcal{H}_g with weighted moduli height $\leq h$*

$$h^{q_n} \cdot \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \left(h^{q_{n-i}} \cdot \prod_{j=0}^{n-i} (2h^{q_j} + 1) \right)$$

Proof. The invariant with the highest degree is the discriminant of the binary form. Since this binary form correspond to a hyperelliptic curve, the discriminant is not zero. Hence, $x_{q_n} \neq 0$. Then, there are only h^{q_n} choices for x_{q_n} ; see the proof of Theorem 3. This completes the proof. \square

Next we focus on our special case when $g = 2$. In this case, as mentioned above, the weights are $\mathbf{w} = (2, 4, 6, 10)$ and the invariants $J_2, J_4, J_6,$ and J_{10} . We can count the points in $\mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{w}}(\mathbb{Q})$ using the above approach and having in mind that $J_{10} \neq 0$.

TABLE 1. Points of bounded height in \mathcal{B}_6

h	# of points in B_6
1	40
2	24 862
3	1 781 202
4	39 251 668
5	440 104 780
6	3 195 496 050
7	17 146 927 462
8	73 657 853 512
9	266 816 523 888
10	844 626 323 110

Lemma 3. *The number of points in $\mathbb{WP}_{(1,2,3,5)}$ with weighted moduli height $\leq h$*

$$\begin{aligned}
 F_6(h) &\leq h^5(2h^3 + 1)(2h^2 + 1)(2h + 1) + h^3(2h^2 + 1)(2h + 1) + h^2(2h + 1) + h \\
 &= h(8h^{10} + 4h^9 + 4h^8 + 6h^7 + 2h^6 + 6h^5 + 3h^4 + 2h^3 + 3h^2 + h + 1)
 \end{aligned}$$

Moreover, there are exactly 27 genus 2 curves with weighted moduli height $\mathfrak{H} = 1$.

Proof. The invariant with the highest degree is the discriminant of the binary form. Since this binary form correspond to a hyperelliptic curve, the discriminant is not zero. Hence, $x_{q_n} \neq 0$. Then, there are only h^{q_n} choices for x_{q_n} ; see the proof of Theorem 3. This completes the proof. \square

In Table 2 we display all points $\mathfrak{p} \in \mathbb{WP}_{(1,2,3,5)}^3(\mathbb{Q}) \setminus \{J_{10} = 0\}$ with weighted moduli heights $h = 1$.

TABLE 2. Moduli points $\mathfrak{p} = [J_2 : J_4 : J_6 : J_{10}]$ with height $\mathfrak{H} = 1$

#	\mathfrak{p}	#	\mathfrak{p}	#	\mathfrak{p}
1	[0, -1, 0, 1]	10	[1, 0, 1, 1]	19	[0, 1, 1, 1]
2	[0, 1, 0, 1]	11	[1, -1, -1, 1]	20	[1, 0, 1, -1]
3	[0, -1, 1, 1]	12	[1, 1, -1, 1]	21	[1, -1, -1, -1]
4	[0, 0, 0, 1]	13	[1, 1, 1, -1]	22	[1, 1, -1, -1]
5	[0, 0, 1, -1]	14	[1, -1, 1, -1]	23	[1, -1, 0, -1]
6	[0, 0, 1, 1]	15	[1, 1, 1, 1]	24	[1, 1, 0, -1]
7	[1, 0, -1, 1]	16	[1, 0, -1, -1]	25	[1, 1, 0, 1]
8	[1, 0, 0, -1]	17	[0, -1, 1, -1]	26	[1, -1, 0, 1]
9	[1, 0, 0, 1]	18	[0, 1, 1, -1]	27	[1, -1, 1, 1]

It is worth noting that sometimes, for different reasons, we use the weighted projective spaces which are not well formed, even though every weight projective space is isomorphic to a well formed one; see [18]. However, these counting functions $F_d(h)$ and $G_d(h)$ do not take the same values on such spaces. Consider for example the isomorphism in Eq. (4). The weighted height of a point in $\mathbb{WP}_{(1,2,3,5)}$ is the square of the weighted height of a point in $\mathbb{WP}_{(2,4,6,10)}$.

Lemma 4. *In the case of binary sextics the value of $G_6(h)$ in $\mathbb{WP}_{(1,2,3,4)}$ is*

$$(13) \quad G_{\mathbb{WP}_{(1,2,3,5)}}(h) = 88h^{10} - 400h^9 + 1176h^8 - 2256h^7 + 3038h^6 - 2862h^5 \\ + 1879h^4 - 812h^3 + 215h^2 - 28h + 2$$

Moreover, for the Veronese embedding $\phi : \mathbb{WP}_{(2,4,6,10)} \rightarrow \mathbb{WP}_{(1,2,3,5)}$ as in Eq. (4) we have

$$\mathfrak{H}_{\mathbb{WP}_{(2,4,6,10)}}(\mathfrak{p}) = (\mathfrak{H}_{\mathbb{WP}_{(1,2,3,5)}}(\phi(\mathfrak{p})))^{\frac{1}{2}}$$

which implies that

$$G_{\mathbb{WP}_{(1,2,3,5)}}(1) = G_{\mathbb{WP}_{(2,4,6,10)}}(1)$$

Proof. The proof is an immediate consequence of the above lemma, definition of the weighted height, and the isomorphism in Eq. (4). \square

Corollary 1. *The number of points in $\mathbb{WP}_{(2,4,6,10)}(\mathbb{Q})$ with weighted height $\leq \mathfrak{H}$ is*

$$F_{\mathbb{WP}_{(2,4,6,10)}}(h) = F_{\mathbb{WP}_{(1,2,3,5)}}(h^2)$$

Now we have a rough estimate on the number of points in $\mathbb{WP}_{(2,4,6,10)}$, which is our main focus of study.

6. A DATABASE OF GENUS TWO CURVES

Now that we know how to generate rational points in \mathcal{L}_n , we would like to see if we can generate some random data in \mathcal{M}_2 and train a model that answer arithmetic properties of $\mathfrak{p} \in \mathcal{M}_2$, including whether $\mathfrak{p} \in \mathcal{L}_n$. Our data will have points from \mathcal{L}_n , for $n = 2, 3, 5, 7$ and all points of weighted moduli height $\mathfrak{H} \leq 3$.

6.1. Creating the database. An entry in the dictionary looks like:

$$(x, y, z) : (\mathfrak{p}, \mathfrak{H}(\mathfrak{p}), \text{Fine}, \text{Aut}(\mathfrak{p}), \mathfrak{p} \in \mathcal{L}_3, \mathfrak{p} \in \mathcal{L}_5, \mathfrak{p} \in \mathcal{L}_7)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \mathfrak{p} &= [J_2, J_4, J_6, J_{10}] \text{ weighted moduli point} \\ \mathfrak{H} &= \text{absolute weighted height} \\ \text{Fine} &= \text{True/False} \\ \text{Aut} &= \text{Automorphism group } \text{Aut}(\mathfrak{p}) \\ \text{flag} &= (3, 3) - \text{split Jacobian} \\ \text{flag} &= (5, 5) - \text{split Jacobian} \\ \text{flag} &= (7, 7) - \text{split Jacobian} \end{aligned}$$

where the key (x, y, z) is the triple of absolute invariants (i_1, i_2, i_3) . Notice that the automorphism group basically determines if the corresponding point is in the \mathcal{L}_2 locus or not. Other then the curve $y^2 = x(x^5 - 1)$, all curves with $|\text{Aut}(\mathfrak{p})| > 2$ are in the \mathcal{L}_2 locus and they are fine moduli points.

6.1.1. All points with weighted height ≤ 2 . First we compute all points \mathfrak{p} with weighted height $\mathfrak{H}(\mathfrak{p}) \leq 2$. From our estimates in the previous section there are ≤ 39251668 points in $\mathbb{WP}_{2,4,6,10}$.

6.1.2. Generating points in the locus \mathcal{L}_2 . Unfortunately there aren't many points from \mathcal{L}_2 with weighted height ≤ 2 ; see Table 3. However, we can generate many other rational points in \mathcal{L}_2 by using the birational (u, v) - parametrization in [35].

6.1.3. *Generating points in the locus \mathcal{L}_3 .* We use the Eq. (8) and for each (u, v) -value compute the moduli point in terms of Igusa invariants. Using this method we get fine moduli points. If we want random rational points in \mathcal{L}_3 (not necessarily fine) we can use the birational (r_1, r_2) -parametrization as in [26].

6.1.4. *Generating points in the locus \mathcal{L}_5 .* The cubic surface in Eq. (10) is quadratic in z and therefore rational, by a result of Clebsch. Hence $a, b \in k(t, s)$ for some parameters t and s . Thus invariants $J_2, J_4, J_6, J_{10} \in k(t, s)$. Giving random values to t and s generates rational points in \mathcal{L}_5 .

Notice that for all $z = s \neq 0, 1$, the curve $f(a, b, s)$ is a genus zero curve for which we can get a parametrization $(a(t), b(t))$. Hence, we get the desired parametrization in t, s for the surface.

Example 1. For $s = 2$ we get $a = -\frac{8}{t^2+2t-2}$ and $b = -\frac{2(t^2-2t-2)}{t^2+2t-2}$ and now can randomly pick $t \in \mathbb{Q}$ such that the denominator is $\neq 0$.

For $s = 1/2$ we get $a = \frac{16}{t^2-4t-8}$ and $b = -\frac{t^2+4t-8}{2(t^2-4t-8)}$.

We get the following algorithm.

Algorithm 1 Algorithm to generate n rational points in $\mathfrak{p} \in \mathcal{L}_5$ with $\mathfrak{H}(p) \leq h$.

Input: Integer n .

Output: A list of n rational points in \mathcal{L}_5

Generate a list of random rational numbers $S = \{s_1, \dots, s_r\}$, for $r = 10$

for each number i in $1, \dots, r$ **do**

 Randomly pick a rational number $s \in \mathbb{Q}$

 Parametrize $f(a, b, s) = 0$ in a parameter t

 Generate $n/10$ rational points $(s, a(t), b(t))$

 For each $(s, a(t), b(t))$ compute $\mathfrak{p}_{s,t} = (J_2, J_4, J_6, J_{10})$

end for

return The set of points $\{\mathfrak{p}_{s,t}\}$

6.2. **Normalizing the data.** Our data is given in terms of tuples of Igusa invariants. There are two main ways of normalizing the data using two functions *MinIgusaTuple* () and *MinAbsIgusaTuple* (). We briefly explain the differences between the two.

Let $\mathfrak{p} = [x_0 : x_1 : x_2 : x_3] \in \mathbb{WP}_{2,4,6,10}(\mathbb{Q})$. Without loss of generality we can assume that its coordinates $x_0, \dots, x_3 \in \mathbb{Z}$. A weighted moduli point is called **normalized** if $\text{wgcd}(x_0, \dots, x_3) = 1$ and **absolutely normalized** if $\text{wgcd}(x_0, \dots, x_3) = 1$.

The function *MinIgusaTuple* (\mathfrak{p}) converts any point \mathfrak{p} to a normalized point. The function *MinAbsIgusaTuple* (\mathfrak{p}) converts any point \mathfrak{p} to an absolutely normalized point. The algorithm to do this involves integer factorization which makes it inefficient for our data with large coordinates J_2, J_4, J_6, J_{10} .

There have been attempts to find a polynomial time algorithm for determining the weighted greatest common divisor of a tuple. The following elementary result shows that this can't be done.

Lemma 5. *Let $\mathbf{x} = (x_0, \dots, x_n) \in \mathbb{Z}^{n+1}$. Then $\text{wgcd}(\mathbf{x}) \mid \text{gcd}(x)$. Determining the weighted greatest common divisor of a tuple is at best equivalent to integer factorization. Equivalently, normalizing in a weighted projective space is equivalent to integer factorization.*

Proof. The first part comes from the definition of weighted greatest common divisor. For the second part, take the tuple $\mathbf{x} = (d, \dots, d)$. Then $\text{gcd}(\mathbf{x}) = d$ and to find the $\text{wgcd}(\mathbf{x})$ we need to know all prime factors of d . \square

It is worth noticing that for most of our database, which includes points of weighted heights ≤ 5 the gcd of tuples does not have prime factors or it has small primes as factors so the normalizing can be done rather quickly.

6.3. Distribution of fine points in the moduli space. There are two types of points in the weighted moduli space $\mathbb{WP}_{(2,4,6,10)}$, namely *fine points* and *coarse points*. Fine points are those points such that their field of moduli is a field of definition, while the rest of points are called coarse points.

We also classify fine points in two classes, those with extra automorphisms and those which have automorphism group isomorphic to the cyclic group of order 2.

Let $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{w}}^n(\mathbb{Q})$. Can we find a binary form $f \in V_d$, defined over \mathbb{Q} , such that $\mathbf{x} = [f]$. The answer is in general negative. Points for which we can answer positively the above question are called **fine moduli points**, otherwise \mathbf{x} has a non-trivial obstruction and we will call it a **coarse point**. The problem of determining which points are fine points is referred to as field of moduli versus field of definition problem in arithmetic of moduli spaces of curves; see [15] among many others.




FIGURE 4. Distribution of points with extra automorphisms

Let us now see what is the distribution of fine points with automorphisms in our database (red points). From a computational point of view it is quite hard to do this simply by brute force for our database which has about 500 000 points. Instead we will use the above models to see what information we can gather and then prove our results (if any) via brute force computationally. By taking a random sample and graphing all red points we get the picture Fig. 4.

Red points seem to be very scarce around the origin of the coordinate system and secondly there are no green points (fine points with trivial automorphism group). Somewhat to be expected by people who have extensive computational experience with the moduli space of genus 2 curves, but not any obvious reason for it.

6.3.1. *Coarse moduli points in \mathcal{M}_2 .* Let us first go over some of the conditions that a point $\mathbf{p} \in \mathbb{WP}_{(2,4,6,10)}$ is a fine moduli point. Let $\mathbf{p} \in \mathbb{WP}_{(2,4,6,10)}$ be a rational point. Then a genus 2 curve \mathcal{X} is defined over \mathbb{Q} if and only if the conic $Q = \mathcal{X}/w$ has a rational point, where w is the hyperelliptic involution. From [14, Lem. 3.1] the conic Q is isomorphic to the diagonal conic

$$Q' : x_1^2 - \gamma x_2^2 - \Lambda_6 x_3^2 = 0,$$

where γ and Λ_6 are determined in terms of Igusa invariants as in [14]. This conic has a rational point if and only if there exist rational numbers $\alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{Q}$ such that

$$\alpha^2 + (\Lambda_6 \sigma) \beta^2 = \gamma.$$

where $\Lambda_6, \sigma, \gamma$ are given explicitly in [14] in terms of Siegel modular forms or equivalently in terms of the invariants J_2, J_4, J_6, J_{10} . A random point $\mathbf{p} \in \mathbb{WP}_{(2,4,6,10)}$ generates random values for $\Lambda_6, \sigma, \gamma$, which can not be written as a sum of squares of two rational numbers α and β . Hence we have the following.

Lemma 6. *A generic point in \mathcal{M}_2 is a coarse point.*

We graph below all points for weighted height $\mathfrak{H}_k(p) \leq 3$. Blue points are overwhelming as expected from the above Lemma.




FIGURE 5. Graph of rational points of weighted height $\mathfrak{H}_k \leq 2$

The graphs above led us to check if our models are not working correctly or if this is truly the case. We got the following results.

Lemma 7. *There are no rational points $\mathbf{p} \in \mathcal{L}_2$ with weighted height $\mathfrak{H}_k(\mathbf{p}) < 3/2$.*

The proof is a brute force approach. We check all points $\mathbf{p} \in \mathbb{WP}_{(2,4,6,10)}$ of weighted height $\mathfrak{H}_k(\mathbf{p}) \leq 3/2$. There are, however, many rational points for weighted height $2 < \mathfrak{H}_k(\mathbf{p}) \leq 3$. \mathcal{L}_2 has at least these rational points

Lemma 8. *There are no rational points $p \in \mathcal{L}_3$ with weighted height $\mathfrak{H}_k(\mathbf{p}) < 2$. Moreover, these are the rational points for weighted height $2 < \mathfrak{H}_k(\mathbf{p}) \leq 3$.*

Proof. The proof is a brute force approach. We check all points $\mathbf{p} \in \mathbb{WP}_{(2,4,6,10)}$ of weighted height $\mathfrak{H}_k(\mathbf{p}) \leq 3$. \square

It is still interesting to generate a large database and graphically see the distribution of red points (fine points with extra automorphisms) and green points (fine points with automorphism group of order 2). Overall, it seems as for small weighted height the fine points are very scarce.

Surprisingly there is only one red dot in all these graphs. These graphs were obtained using the sequential method and the existing red dot was no surprise

#	\mathbf{p}	#	\mathbf{p}	#	\mathbf{p}
1	[4, -14, 2, 1]	2	[2, -11, 5, 1]	3	[-2, -8, 14, 1]
4	[-2, 16, -14, 1]	5	[2, 13, -3, 1]	6	[4, 16, 0, 2]
7	[4, -8, 16, 2]	8	[0, -3, 27, 2]	9	[-4, 4, 28, 2]
10	[-4, -9, 30, 3]	11	[2, 4, 54, 3]	12	[-2, 13, 57, 3]
13	[-3, -15, 42, 6]	14	[4, -9, 42, 6]	15	[0, -15, 45, 8]
16	[-4, -8, 56, 8]	17	[3, -15, 48, 10]	18	[-3, -15, -48, -10]
19	[4, -8, -56, -8]	20	[0, -15, -45, -8]	21	[3, -15, -42, -6]
22	[-4, -9, -42, -6]	23	[2, 13, -57, -3]	24	[-2, 4, -54, -3]
25	[4, -9, -30, -3]	26	[-4, 16, 0, -2]	27	[4, 4, -28, -2]
28	[0, -3, -27, -2]	29	[-4, -8, -16, -2]	30	[-2, 13, 3, -1]
31	[2, 16, 14, -1]	32	[2, -8, -14, -1]	33	[-2, -11, -5, -1]
34	[-4, -14, -2, -1]				

TABLE 3. Some rational points of height ≤ 3 in \mathcal{L}_2

#	\mathbf{p}	#	\mathbf{p}	#	\mathbf{p}
1	[6, 18, 27, 2]	2	[-6, -18, 45, 2]	3	[3, 18, 0, 4]
4	[-3, -18, 36, 4]	5	[5, -26, 56, 4]	6	[-3, 27, 315, 4]
7	[-5, 58, -76, 4]	8	[-5, 31, -49, 4]	9	[5, 29, -9, 4]
10	[-2, -18, 39, 6]	11	[-2, -18, 165, 6]	12	[2, 18, -15, 6]
13	[-8, -80, 429, 8]	14	[-8, 49, -101, 8]	15	[8, -47, -59, 8]
16	[-1, -18, 60, 12]	17	[8, 36, 69, 12]	18	[-1, -45, 105, 12]
19	[-8, -36, 123, 12]	20	[-5, 67, -55, 12]	21	[1, 18, -48, 12]
22	[1, 63, -15, 12]	23	[5, -65, -15, 12]	24	[6, 36, 36, 16]
25	[-6, -36, 108, 16]	26	[8, -63, 3, 24]	27	[-4, -36, 102, 24]
28	[-8, 81, -171, 24]	29	[4, 36, -6, 24]	30	[5, -59, 16, 32]
31	[5, -68, 100, 32]	32	[-3, -36, 108, 32]	33	[-3, -27, 504, 32]
34	[-5, 61, -132, 32]	35	[3, 36, -36, 32]	36	[9, 54, 108, 36]
37	[-9, -54, 216, 36]	38	[-2, -36, 132, 48]	39	[-2, -72, 336, 48]
40	[3, 18, 0, 4]	41	[-3, -18, 36, 4]	42	[-2, -18, 39, 6]
43	[2, 18, -15, 6]	44	[-1, -18, 60, 12]	45	

TABLE 4. Rational points of height ≤ 3 in \mathcal{L}_3

because that is a very special genus 2 curve and well known, namely the curve with $J_2 = J_4 = J_6 = 0$ which correspond to the single moduli point \mathbf{p} with $\text{Aut}(\mathbf{p}) \cong C_{10}$.

Hence, if the graphs are accurate it would mean that there is no point of \mathcal{L}_2 in our database for weighted height ≤ 2 (all points in \mathcal{L}_2 are red points). Hence, these graphs were a strong enough reason for us to go through all the cases for $\mathfrak{H}_k(p) \leq 3$ and check computationally if there are points in \mathcal{L}_3 or \mathcal{L}_5 .

Remark 3. *There are no rational points with weighted moduli height $\mathfrak{H}_k < 2$ in the loci \mathcal{L}_5 .*

7. DETERMINING IF A POINT HAS SPLIT JACOBIAN

Our next task will be to use machine learning to determine if a genus 2 curve has (n, n) split Jacobian for relatively small n . This has become an interesting problem to cryptographers lately; see [20]. Below we give a quick overview of what we obtained from running different machine learning models.

7.1. Preprocessing. We convert the dictionary into a pandas DataFrame (df2) and then split the tuple columns into separate columns and convert boolean columns to binary. Then we select specific columns ('J2', 'J4', 'J6', 'J10', 'Weighted-Height') as the feature matrix X. Before performing a given model, we normalize the data using MinMaxScaler to scale data between 0 and 1.

7.2. Unsupervised Learning.

7.2.1. Autoencoder. We implemented an autoencoder using TensorFlow and Keras to obtain a latent representation of the data. The autoencoder consists of an input layer with 64 neurons, followed by two hidden layers with 32 and 64 neurons, respectively, using ReLU activation functions. We compiled the model using the Adam optimizer and mean squared error loss. The model was trained on the normalized feature matrix with a specified number of epochs and batch size. Then we added Batch Normalization and Dropout layers to improve training stability and prevent overfitting. We also added early stopping with a patience of 5 epochs to monitor the validation loss and stop training when it stops improving.

Observing the performance throughout epochs, we noted a sudden increase in validation loss compared to training loss suggested potential overfitting and instability in the model's performance. To address this issue, several adjustments were made to the autoencoder. These included increasing model complexity with additional layers and implementing dropout regularization to mitigate overfitting. The learning rate was set to 0.001 to facilitate smoother convergence during training, while the patience for early stopping was increased to 10 epochs for better monitoring of validation loss.

Additionally, the Adam optimizer was explicitly defined with the adjusted learning rate to further optimize the training process. These adjustments aimed to enhance the stability and effectiveness of the autoencoder in capturing essential features of the data while minimizing overfitting.

7.2.2. K-means Clustering on latent representation. After obtaining the latent representation from the autoencoder, we applied K-Means clustering to identify inherent patterns in the data. Setting the number of clusters to 2, we fitted the K-Means clustering model and assigned cluster labels to each data point.

The model would classify in one cluster all points from \mathcal{L}_2 , but not all the points in that space. So, we tried to make some improvements to the model. We performed hyperparameter tuning for K-Means using grid search (GridSearchCV). This allows us to find the best number of clusters based on the latent representation. After finding the best hyperparameters, we initialize a new K-Means model (kmeans-best) with the optimal number of clusters.

We fit the K-means-best model on the latent representation and obtain cluster labels. Then we apply PCA for further dimensionality reduction to visualize the clusters in 2D. Finally, we plot the clusters in a 2D scatter plot using PCA.

The model performed better with number of clusters equal to 5, and the points belonging to clusters 1, 2, 3, 4 were all points from \mathcal{L}_2 space. But still the model would not perform very high accuracy, classifying only 15 442 points in \mathcal{L}_2 out of 48 684 in total.

7.2.3. *Gaussian Mixture Model (GMM) on latent representation.* In addition to K-Means, we explored Gaussian Mixture Model (GMM) clustering to further understand the underlying data distribution. GMM classified 15831 points in one cluster, all belonging to \mathcal{L}_2 space.

We evaluated the performance of GMM clustering and compared it with the results obtained from K-Means.

7.2.4. *K-means Clustering on original data.* We applied K-Means clustering directly on the original data to explore its clustering performance without using the latent representation obtained from the autoencoder. However, the accuracy of K-Means clustering on the original data was found to be very low, reaching only 14%. This suggests that the model struggled to identify meaningful clusters in the dataset.

7.2.5. *Gaussian Mixture Model (GMM) on original data.* We also investigated the performance of Gaussian Mixture Model (GMM) clustering on the original data. Surprisingly, GMM performed significantly better on the original data compared to the latent representation obtained from the autoencoder. It achieved an accuracy of 94%, indicating its effectiveness in capturing the underlying data distribution directly from the original feature space.

7.2.6. *Evaluation Measure.* To assess the quality of clustering, we employed the adjusted Rand score as our evaluation metric. The adjusted Rand score measures the similarity between true cluster assignments and the clustering results, accounting for chance agreement. Higher scores indicate better clustering performance. We got these results:

- Adjusted Rand score for K-Means using autoencoder: 0.43
- Adjusted Rand score for K-Means on original data: 0.15
- Adjusted Rand score for GMM using autoencoder: 0.44
- Adjusted Rand score for GMM on original data: 0.94

These ARI scores provide insights into the effectiveness of each clustering algorithm in capturing meaningful patterns in the dataset. The significantly higher ARI score for GMM on the original data underscores its superior performance compared to K-Means and even GMM using the latent representation obtained from the autoencoder.

7.3. **Supervised learning.** K-Neighbors Classifier is a non-parametric method used for classification and regression tasks. It operates by assigning the class membership of an instance based on the majority class among its k nearest neighbors in the feature space. The accuracy of K-Neighbors classifier in classifying L_2 points in one group was 99.9%.

Supervised learning models exhibited superior performance in classifying curves into the L_2 space. K-Neighbors Classifier classified the points with the highest accuracy, 99.9%.

To evaluate the performance of supervised models we used the F1 score, which is a measure of a models accuracy that considers both the precision and recall of the model. It is the harmonic mean of precision and recall, and it ranges from 0 to 1, where 1 indicates perfect precision and recall, and 0 indicates the worst possible precision and recall.

F1 Score for Logistic Regression was 0.3123, suggesting that the logistic regression model has relatively low performance in terms of both precision and recall. It may indicate that the model struggles to correctly classify positive instances while minimizing false positives.

F1 Score for Random Forest was 0.7087, which indicates that the random forest model performs reasonably well, achieving a good balance between precision and recall.

F1 Score for Multinomial Naive Bayes was very low, 0.1719. This score suggests that the multinomial Naive Bayes model has poor performance, with both precision and recall being low.

F1 Score for k-Nearest Neighbors was 0.9994. This score indicates very high performance for the k-nearest neighbors' model, with near-perfect precision and recall. It suggests that the model is highly accurate in classifying positive instances while minimizing false positives and false negatives.

8. CLOSING REMARKS

The results from our models are somewhat intriguing. We enter data which are points in a weighted space, but the current methods of machine learning treat this data as points in \mathbb{R}^n . The high accuracy that we obtain for detecting split Jacobians is rather interesting, since we never use the Euclidean coordinates (t_1, t_2, t_3) of the data. These coordinates are used only for graphing purposes, which bring another interesting question? Is there any meaningful way to graph points in a weighted space? In other words, can we understand the geometry of the weighted moduli space?

From the other point of view, there are many scenarios when the input features of a machine learning model might be characterized by different values from some set I . This brings up the question if it makes sense to define artificial neural networks over graded vector spaces, One can think of many scenarios where neural networks defined over graded vector spaces can make a lot os sense from the applications point of view. This suggests that artificial neural networks defined over graded spaces might be interesting mathematically, but also from the applications point of view. The reader can check [31] where such networks are suggested.

During our computations we noticed some interesting properties of spaces \mathcal{L}_n . For example, all \mathcal{L}_n , for $n = 2, 3, 5$ do not have rational points of weighted height ≤ 2 . Using equations of \mathcal{L}_n we were able to verify this. It provides an example how machine learning can be used effective as important tool in AI-assisted proofs.

To the best of our knowledge this is the first time that a machine learning model is being used to study the geometry of weighted projective spaces. It is very interesting to notice that even though our data is given as rational points in a weighted projective space, the model seems to recognize the geometry of the Euclidean space \mathbb{R}^3 . Can a model be build specifically for the geometry of weighted projective spaces $\mathbb{WP}_{w, \mathbb{R}}^n$? Will it perform with much better accuracy and possibly

much faster than models over \mathbb{R}^n ? We intend to address some of these questions in [32].

With necessary adjustments, these results can be extended to curves defined over fields of characteristic 2. A further invariant of order eight, usually denoted by J_8 , is needed in this case. A detailed study of weighted hypersurfaces \mathcal{L}_n over \mathbb{F}_q would be required to fully understand the isogeny graph for Jacobian surfaces, but this will be the scope of a coming project.

REFERENCES

- [1] L. Beshaj, A. Elezi, and T. Shaska, *Isogenous components of Jacobian surfaces*, Eur. J. Math. **6** (2020), no. 4, 1276–1302. MR4185170 ↑13
- [2] L. Beshaj, J. Gutierrez, and T. Shaska, *Weighted greatest common divisors and weighted heights*, J. Number Theory **213** (2020), 319–346. MR4091944 ↑8, 13
- [3] L. Beshaj, R. Hidalgo, S. Kruk, A. Malmendier, S. Quispe, and T. Shaska, *Rational points in the moduli space of genus two*, Higher genus curves in mathematical physics and arithmetic geometry, 2018, pp. 83–115. MR3782461 ↑9, 14
- [4] A. Clingher, A. Malmendier, and T. Shaska, *Six line configurations and string dualities*, Comm. Math. Phys. **371** (2019), no. 1, 159–196. MR4015343 ↑1
- [5] ———, *Geometry of Prym varieties for certain bielliptic curves of genus three and five*, Pure Appl. Math. Q. **17** (2021), no. 5, 1739–1784. MR4376094 ↑1
- [6] ———, *On isogenies among certain Abelian surfaces*, Michigan Math. J. **71** (2022), no. 2, 227–269. MR4484238 ↑1
- [7] Elira Curri, *On the stability of binary forms and their weighted heights*, Albanian J. Math. **16** (2022), no. 1, 3–23. MR4448533 ↑14
- [8] E. V. Flynn and Yan Bo Ti, *Genus two isogeny cryptography*, Post-quantum cryptography, 2019, pp. 286–306. MR3989010 ↑11
- [9] Gerhard Frey and Tony Shaska, *Curves, Jacobians, and cryptography*, Algebraic curves and their applications, 2019, pp. 279–344. MR3916746 ↑5
- [10] Jun-ichi Igusa, *Arithmetic variety of moduli for genus two*, Ann. of Math. (2) **72** (1960), 612–649. MR0114819 ↑8
- [11] Abhinav Kumar, *Hilbert modular surfaces for square discriminants and elliptic subfields of genus 2 function fields*, Res. Math. Sci. **2** (2015), Art. 24, 46. MR3427148 ↑2
- [12] K. Magaard, T. Shaska, and H. Völklein, *Genus 2 curves that admit a degree 5 map to an elliptic curve*, Forum Math. **21** (2009), no. 3, 547–566. MR2526800 ↑2, 7, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13
- [13] A. Malmendier and T. Shaska, *The Satake sextic in elliptic fibrations on $K3$* (201609), available at [1609.04341](https://arxiv.org/abs/1609.04341). ↑1
- [14] ———, *A universal genus-two curve from Siegel modular forms*, SIGMA Symmetry Integrability Geom. Methods Appl. **13** (2017), Paper No. 089, 17. MR3731039 ↑8, 9, 19
- [15] ———, *From hyperelliptic to superelliptic curves*, Albanian J. Math. **13** (2019), no. 1, 107–200. MR3978315 ↑8, 9, 14, 18
- [16] A. Obus and T. Shaska, *Superelliptic curves with many automorphisms and CM Jacobians*, 2020. ↑1
- [17] N. Pjero, M. Ramasaço, and T. Shaska, *Degree even coverings of elliptic curves by genus 2 curves*, Albanian J. Math. **2** (2008), no. 3, 241–248. MR2492097 ↑2
- [18] S. Salami and T. Shaska, *Local and global heights on weighted projective varieties and Vojta’s conjecture*, arXiv preprint arXiv:2204.01624 (2022). ↑1, 15
- [19] Sajad Salami and Tony Shaska, *Vojta’s conjecture on weighted projective varieties* (2024), available at [2309.10300](https://arxiv.org/abs/2309.10300). ↑13
- [20] Maria Corte-Real Santos, Craig Costello, and Sam Frengley, *An algorithm for efficient detection of (n, n) -splittings and its application to the isogeny problem in dimension 2*, 2022. <https://eprint.iacr.org/2022/1736>. ↑2, 21
- [21] T. Shaska, *Curves of genus 2 with (N, N) decomposable Jacobians*, J. Symbolic Comput. **31** (2001), no. 5, 603–617. MR1828706 ↑2, 7, 9, 12
- [22] ———, *Curves of genus two covering elliptic curves*, ProQuest LLC, Ann Arbor, MI, 2001. Thesis (Ph.D.)—University of Florida. MR2701993 ↑2, 7, 9, 10

- [23] ———, *Genus 2 curves with $(3, 3)$ -split Jacobian and large automorphism group*, Algorithmic number theory (Sydney, 2002), 2002, pp. 205–218. MR2041085 ↑9, 10, 13
- [24] ———, *Computational aspects of hyperelliptic curves*, Computer mathematics, 2003, pp. 248–257. MR2061839 ↑9
- [25] ———, *Determining the automorphism group of a hyperelliptic curve*, Proceedings of the 2003 International Symposium on Symbolic and Algebraic Computation, 2003, pp. 248–254 (electronic). MR2035219 (2005c:14037) ↑9
- [26] ———, *Genus 2 fields with degree 3 elliptic subfields*, Forum Math. **16** (2004), no. 2, 263–280. MR2039100 ↑2, 7, 9, 10, 13, 17
- [27] ———, *Some special families of hyperelliptic curves*, J. Algebra Appl. **3** (2004), no. 1, 75–89. MR2047637 ↑9
- [28] ———, *Genus two curves covering elliptic curves: a computational approach*, Computational aspects of algebraic curves, 2005, pp. 206–231. MR2182041 ↑9
- [29] ———, *Genus two curves with many elliptic subcovers*, Comm. Algebra **44** (2016), no. 10, 4450–4466. MR3508311 ↑1, 9, 10, 13
- [30] ———, *Reduction of superelliptic Riemann surfaces* **776** (2022), 227–247. MR4375119 ↑1, 9, 14
- [31] ———, *Artificial neural networks on graded vector spaces* (2024), available at [2407.19031](https://arxiv.org/abs/2407.19031). ↑23
- [32] ———, *Geometric learning for weighted spaces*, 2024. in progress. ↑24
- [33] T. Shaska, *Weighted varieties over finite fields*, 2024. in preparation. ↑13
- [34] T. Shaska and L. Beshaj, *The arithmetic of genus two curves*, Information security, coding theory and related combinatorics, 2011, pp. 59–98. MR2963126 ↑8
- [35] T. Shaska and H. Völklein, *Elliptic subfields and automorphisms of genus 2 function fields*, Algebra, arithmetic and geometry with applications (West Lafayette, IN, 2000), 2004, pp. 703–723. MR2037120 ↑2, 7, 9, 10, 16

COMPUTER SCIENCE AND ENGINEERING, OAKLAND UNIVERSITY, ROCHESTER, MI, 48309
Email address: elirashaska@oakland.edu

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS AND STATISTICS, OAKLAND UNIVERSITY, ROCHESTER, MI, 48309
Email address: shaska@oakland.edu