

ON THE MORDELL-WEIL RANK AND 2-SELMER GROUP OF A FAMILY OF ELLIPTIC CURVES

PANKAJ PATEL, DEBOPAM CHAKRABORTY AND JAITRA CHATTOPADHYAY

ABSTRACT. We consider the parametric family of elliptic curves over \mathbb{Q} of the form $E_m : y^2 = x(x - n_1)(x - n_2) + t^2$, where n_1, n_2 and t are particular polynomial expressions in an integral variable m . In this paper, we investigate the torsion group $E_m(\mathbb{Q})_{\text{tors}}$, a lower bound for the Mordell-Weil rank $r(E_m)$ and the 2-Selmer group $\text{Sel}_2(E_m)$ under certain conditions on m . This extends the previous works done in this direction, which are mostly concerned with the Mordell-Weil ranks of various parametric families of elliptic curves.

1. INTRODUCTION

Number theory is primarily concerned with Diophantine equations and their integral or rational solutions. It is difficult, in general, to determine whether a given Diophantine equation has any solution at all or not. A famous example is that of Fermat's Last Theorem which remained unresolved for more than three hundred years before Wiles ([11] and [12]) proved the existence of no integral solutions using very sophisticated techniques of modern mathematics. In 1900 Hilbert asked the question, famously known as the "Hilbert's tenth problem", whether there exists an algorithm that can decide within finitely many steps if a given Diophantine equation has solutions in \mathbb{Z} . In 1970, Matiyasevich [7] answered this negatively. Along a similar line, Mordell observed that the arithmetic behaviour of the points on a curve is quite closely related to the *genus* of it and conjectured that a curve over \mathbb{Q} of genus at least 2 can have at most finitely many rational points. This conjecture of Mordell was confirmed assertively in 1983 by Faltings.

Among the class of Diophantine equations, elliptic curves occupies a central position and the study of their rational points has been an important theme among number theorists. An elliptic curve E over \mathbb{Q} is an equation of the form $y^2 = f(x)$, where $f(X) \in \mathbb{Q}[X]$ is a cubic polynomial having distinct roots in \mathbb{C} , together with a rational point \mathcal{O} . The set of rational points on E is denoted by $E(\mathbb{Q})$ and one can define a binary operation, called addition of points on $E(\mathbb{Q})$, that makes $E(\mathbb{Q})$ into an abelian group. It is a fundamental result in the theory of the arithmetic of elliptic curves that $E(\mathbb{Q})$ is a finitely generated abelian group and thus by the structure theorem of finitely generated abelian groups, we have

$$E(\mathbb{Q}) \simeq E(\mathbb{Q})_{\text{tors}} \oplus \mathbb{Z}^r,$$

for some integer $r \geq 0$. Here $E(\mathbb{Q})_{\text{tors}}$ is called the torsion group of E and the integer r , also referred to as $r(E)$, is called the Mordell-Weil rank of E .

The computation of the Mordell-Weil ranks of elliptic curves is an important area of research in number theory due to its influence in several problems seemingly unrelated to elliptic curves. A celebrated example of such nature is the congruent number elliptic curve $E : y^2 = x^3 - n^2x$ for positive integers n . The rank $r(E)$ determines whether n can be realized as the area of a rational-sided right-angled triangle or,

2020 *Mathematics Subject Classification*: Primary 11G05, Secondary 11G30.

Key words and phrases: Elliptic curves, Mordell-Weil group, Selmer group.

We confirm that all the data are included in the article.

m	$m^4 - 1$	$m^4 - 1 - 4m^2$	$m^4 - 1 + 4m^2$	$r(E_m)$	$s_2(E_m)$
6	$5 \cdot 7 \cdot 37$	1439	1151	2	4
12	$13 \cdot 11 \cdot 5 \cdot 29$	$19 \cdot 1061$	$101 \cdot 211$	3	3
30	$17 \cdot 29 \cdot 31 \cdot 53$	$11 \cdot 73309$	$19 \cdot 42821$	3	3
42	$41 \cdot 43 \cdot 1765$	$59 \cdot 101 \cdot 521$	$229 \cdot 13619$	≥ 2	4
60	$13 \cdot 59 \cdot 61 \cdot 277$	$229 \cdot 56531$	$31 \cdot 139 \cdot 3011$	4	4
462	$5 \cdot 461 \cdot 463 \cdot 42689$	45557487359	45559194911	≥ 2	≥ 5

TABLE 1. Factorization of $\text{disc}(E_m)$ and $r(E_m)$

equivalently, the existence of a triplet in arithmetic progression with common difference n , where all three terms are perfect squares (cf. [4]). In [2, Theorem 1], Brown and Myers introduced the curve $E : y^2 = x^3 - x + m^2$ over \mathbb{Q} and proved that the curve has a trivial torsion group, and the Mordell-Weil rank is at least 2. The precise statement is as follows.

Theorem 1.1 (cf. [2], Theorem 1). *Let $m \geq 0$ be an integer, and let E_m be the elliptic curve with equation $y^2 = x^3 - x + m^2$. Then the following hold.*

- (1) *If $m \geq 1$, then $E_m(\mathbb{Q})_{\text{tors}} = \{\mathcal{O}\}$.*
- (2) *If $m \geq 2$, the $r(E_m(\mathbb{Q})) \geq 2$, with $P = (0, m)$ and $Q = (-1, m)$ being two independent points.*
- (3) *There are infinitely many values of m for which $r(E_m(\mathbb{Q})) \geq 3$.*

Later on, through the works of various authors (cf. [1], [3], [5], [6]), the Mordell-Weil group of certain variants of the aforementioned elliptic curve were explored. In a series of two papers (cf. [9] and [10]), Tadic studied similar elliptic curves over function fields. In this article, we delved into a somewhat more general elliptic curve $E : y^2 = x(x - n_1)(x - n_2) + t^2$ for certain integers n_1, n_2 , and t , and look into both the Mordell-Weil rank and the 2-Selmer rank of the same curve. We first specify certain choices for n_1, n_2 and t in the following remark.

Remark 1.1. *We choose an even integer m such that $m \pm 1$ are twin primes, and $m^2 + 1$ is square-free. For every such integer m , we denote $n_1 = (m^2 + 1)^2, n_2 = -(m^2 - 1)^2$, and $t = 2m(m^4 - 1)$. This gives a unique representation for the elliptic curve $y^2 = x(x - n_1)(x - n_2) + t^2$, which is suitable for both the Mordell-Weil rank computation as well as the 2-Selmer rank computation. The representation is as follows.*

$$E_m : y^2 = x(x - (m^2 + 1)^2)(x + (m^2 - 1)^2) + (2m(m^4 - 1))^2 = (x - (m^4 - 1))(x + (m^4 - 1))(x - 4m^2).$$

The discriminant of E_m is $2^6 \cdot (m^4 - 1)^2 \cdot (m^4 - 1 - 4m^2)^2 \cdot (m^4 - 1 + 4m^2)^2$.

In what follows, we adhere to the following notations throughout the paper.

Notation.

- For any $\alpha \in \mathbb{Q}^*$, its canonical image in $\mathbb{Q}^*/(\mathbb{Q}^*)^2$ is denoted by $[\alpha]$. Also, for $[\alpha_1], \dots, [\alpha_t] \in \mathbb{Q}^*/(\mathbb{Q}^*)^2$, the subgroup of $\mathbb{Q}^*/(\mathbb{Q}^*)^2$ generated by these elements is denoted by $\langle [\alpha_1], \dots, [\alpha_t] \rangle$.
- Here m denotes an even positive integer such that both $m + 1$ and $m - 1$ are prime numbers and $m^2 + 1$ is square-free.
- By p_i (resp. q_i and r_i), we denote all the prime factors of $m^4 - 1$ (resp. all prime factors of $m^4 - 1 - 4m^2$ and $m^4 - 1 + 4m^2$).
- An arbitrary place is denoted by $\ell \leq \infty$. Similarly, $z \in \mathbb{Q}_\ell$ is written as $z = u \cdot \ell^t$, where $u \in \mathbb{Z}_\ell^*$. In that case, the ℓ -adic valuation of z is $v_\ell(z) = t$.
- For a prime number ℓ , the symbol $\left(\frac{a}{\ell}\right)$ stands for the Legendre symbol of $a \pmod{\ell}$.

- By $r(E)$ and $s_2(E)$, we denote respectively the Mordell-Weil rank and the 2-Selmer rank of an elliptic curve E .
- For an elliptic curve E and a point $(x, y) \in E(\mathbb{Q})$, we denote its canonical image in $E(\mathbb{Q})/2E(\mathbb{Q})$ by (\bar{x}, \bar{y}) .

The main result of this paper is as follows.

Theorem 1.2. *Let $E_m : y^2 = x(x - (m^2 + 1)^2)(x + (m^2 - 1)^2) + (2m(m^4 - 1)^2)$ where m is an even integer such that $m \pm 1$ are primes, and $m^2 + 1$ is squarefree. Then $E_m(\mathbb{Q})_{\text{tors}} \simeq \mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z} \times \mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z}$ and $r(E_m) \geq 2$. Moreover, $s_2(E_m) \geq w$, where w denotes the number of prime factors p of $m^4 - 1$ satisfying $\left(\frac{p}{q_i}\right) = \left(\frac{p}{r_j}\right) = 1$ if $p \equiv 1 \pmod{4}$, and $\left(\frac{p}{q_i}\right) = \left(\frac{-p}{r_i}\right) = 1$ if $p \equiv 3 \pmod{4}$, where q_i (resp. r_j) varies over all the prime factors of $m^4 - 1 - 4m^2$ (resp. over all the prime factors of $m^4 - 1 + 4m^2$).*

Remark 1.2. *We note that, if ℓ is a prime factor of $m^2 + 1$, then $-1 \equiv m^2 \pmod{\ell}$ implies that $\left(\frac{-1}{\ell}\right) = \left(\frac{m^2}{\ell}\right) = 1$. Therefore, we have $\ell \equiv 1 \pmod{4}$. Again, since both $m - 1$ and $m + 1$ are prime numbers, we conclude that exactly one of them is of the form $4k + 3$. Hence only one of all the prime factors of $m^4 - 1$ is of the form $4k + 3$.*

Corollary 1.1. *Let $E_m : y^2 = x(x - (m^2 + 1)^2)(x + (m^2 - 1)^2) + (2m(m^4 - 1)^2)$ where m is an even integer such that $m \pm 1$ are primes, and $m^2 + 1$ is squarefree. Moreover, if both $(m^4 - 1 - 4m^2)$ and $(m^4 - 1 + 4m^2)$ are prime numbers, the 2-Selmer rank $s_2(E_m) = w + 1$, where w denotes the number of prime factors of $m^4 - 1$.*

Remark 1.3. *One can immediately note from Corollary 1.1 that if both $(m^4 - 1 - 4m^2)$ and $(m^4 - 1 + 4m^2)$ are prime numbers, the Mordell-Weil rank $r(E_m) \geq 3$ if the number of prime factors of $m^2 + 1$ is even. Now, $r(E_m) \geq 2$ always and $s_2(E_m)$ is odd in this case from Corollary 1.1. Assuming the Shafarevich-Tate group $\text{III}(E_m)$ is finite, and noting that $r(E_m) \leq s_2(E_m)$, we can conclude $r(E_m) \geq 3$.*

2. THE TORSION GROUP $E_m(\mathbb{Q})_{\text{tors}}$

As mentioned in Remark 1.1, we note that E_m can be described as $E_m : y^2 = (x - m_1)(x - m_2)(x - m_3)$, where $m_1 = m^4 - 1$, $m_2 = 1 - m^4$, and $m_3 = 4m^2$. It is a basic fact that a rational point (x, y) on any elliptic curve is of order 2 if and only if $y = 0$. Thus we can immediately notice that

$$\{\mathcal{O}, (m_1, 0), (m_2, 0), (m_3, 0)\} \subseteq E_m[2],$$

where $E_m[2]$ is the 2-torsion subgroup of $E_m(\mathbb{Q})_{\text{tors}}$.

We know that for any prime ℓ of good reduction, $E_m(\mathbb{Q})_{\text{tors}}$ injects into $E_m(\mathbb{F}_\ell)$. By our hypotheses, since both $m - 1$ and $m + 1$ are prime numbers, we have $m \equiv 0 \pmod{3}$. Thus 3 does not divide the discriminant $2^6 \cdot (m^4 - 1)^2 \cdot (m^4 - 1 - 4m^2)^2 \cdot (m^4 - 1 + 4m^2)^2$ and therefore 3 is a prime of good reduction. Moreover, we can directly check that over the finite field \mathbb{F}_3 with 3 elements, we have $|E_m(\mathbb{F}_3)| = 4$. Since $E_m[2] \subseteq E_m(\mathbb{Q})_{\text{tors}}$, we conclude that

$$E_m(\mathbb{Q})_{\text{tors}} = \{\mathcal{O}, (m_1, 0), (m_2, 0), (m_3, 0)\} \simeq \mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z} \times \mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z}.$$

3. LOWER BOUND OF $r(E_m)$

We now prove that $r(E_m) \geq 2$ by establishing that the points $P_1 = (0, t)$ and $P_2 = (n_1, t)$ are \mathbb{Z} -linearly independent.

If P_1 and P_2 are \mathbb{Z} -linearly dependent, then we have $m_1P_1 + m_2P_2 = \mathcal{O}$ for some $m_1, m_2 \in \mathbb{Z}$. This implies that modulo $2E_m(\mathbb{Q})$, we have either $P_1 \in 2E_m(\mathbb{Q})$ or $P_2 \in 2E_m(\mathbb{Q})$ or $P_1 + P_2 \in 2E_m(\mathbb{Q})$.

Case - 1. $P_1 \in 2E_m(\mathbb{Q})$. Then we have $P_1 = 2Q_1$ for some $Q_1 \in E_m(\mathbb{Q})$. Let $Q_1 = (a, b)$ and let $a = \frac{r}{s}$, where $r, s \in \mathbb{Z}$ with $s > 0$ and $\gcd(r, s) = 1$. Then, using the duplication formula (cf. [8]), we get

$$r^4 - 2n_1n_2s^2r^2 - 8t^2s^3r + s^4(4(n_1 + n_2)t^2 + n_1^2n_2^2) = 0.$$

It follows that $s \mid r^4$ and since $\gcd(r, s) = 1$, we conclude that $s = 1$. Therefore, $a = \frac{r}{s} = r \in \mathbb{Z}$ and consequently, $b \in \mathbb{Z}$. By the Lutz-Nagell theorem, it follows that $Q_1 \in E_m(\mathbb{Q})_{\text{tors}}$. Since we have $E_m(\mathbb{Q})_{\text{tors}} = E_m[2]$, we obtain that Q_1 is a point of order at most 2. That is, $2Q_1 = \mathcal{O}$. Hence $P_1 = 2Q_1 = \mathcal{O}$, a contradiction. Thus we conclude that $P_1 \notin 2E_m(\mathbb{Q})$.

Case - 2. $P_2 \in 2E_m(\mathbb{Q})$. Then we have $P_2 = 2Q_2$ for some $Q_2 \in E_m(\mathbb{Q})$. Let $Q_2 = (a', b')$ and let $a' = \frac{d}{e}$, where $d, e \in \mathbb{Z}$ with $e > 0$ and $\gcd(d, e) = 1$. Again, by proceeding as in Case 1, we obtain

$$(1) \quad n_1e(4d^3 - 4(n_1 + n_2)ed^2 + 4n_1n_2e^2d + 4e^3t^2) = d^4 - 2n_1n_2e^2d^2 - 8t^2e^3d + e^4(4(n_1 + n_2)t^2 + n_1^2n_2^2).$$

Since the left hand side of equation 1 is divisible by e , so is the right hand side and therefore, we have $e \mid d^4$. But $\gcd(d, e) = 1$ implies that $e = 1$. Hence $a' = \frac{d}{e} = d \in \mathbb{Z}$. Therefore, $b' \in \mathbb{Z}$ and hence $Q_2 \in E_m(\mathbb{Q}) = E_m[2]$. Consequently, we have $P_2 = 2Q_2 = \mathcal{O}$, a contradiction. Hence we conclude that $P_2 \notin 2E_m(\mathbb{Q})$.

Case - 3. $P_1 + P_2 \in 2E_m(\mathbb{Q})$. A simple calculation quickly yields that $P_1 + P_2 = (n_2, -t)$. Therefore, we must have $(n_2, -t) = 2Q_3$ for some $Q_3 \in E_m(\mathbb{Q})$. Again, proceeding similarly as in Case 1 and Case 2, we conclude that $2Q_3 = \mathcal{O}$, which implies that $P_1 + P_2 = (n_2, -t) = \mathcal{O}$, a contradiction. Therefore, $P_1 + P_2 \notin 2E_m(\mathbb{Q})$.

This proves that $P_1 = (0, t)$ and $P_2 = (n_1, t)$ are two \mathbb{Z} -linearly independent points on $E_m(\mathbb{Q})$ and hence $r(E_m) \geq 2$. This completes the proof.

4. AN INVESTIGATION OF THE 2-SELMER RANK $\text{Sel}_2(E_m)$

The 2-Selmer group of the elliptic curve $E_m : y^2 = (x - (m^4 - 1))(x + (m^4 - 1))(x - 4m^2)$ over \mathbb{Q} is denoted by $\text{Sel}_2(E_m)$ and the 2-Selmer rank of E_m , denoted by $s_2(E_m)$, is defined by $|\text{Sel}_2(E_m)| = 2^{2+s_2(E_m)}$. As noted earlier, the discriminant of E_m is $64 \cdot (m^4 - 1)^2 \cdot (m^4 - 1 - 4m^2)^2 \cdot (m^4 - 1 + 4m^2)^2$. Let S denote the set consisting of all finite places at which E_m has bad reductions, the infinite places, and the rational prime 2. We define

$$(2) \quad \begin{aligned} \mathbb{Q}(S, 2) &= \{[b] \in \mathbb{Q}^*/(\mathbb{Q}^*)^2 : \text{ord}_\ell(b) \equiv 0 \pmod{2} \text{ for all primes } \ell \notin S\} \\ &= \langle [\pm 2], [\pm p_i], [\pm q_i], \dots, [\pm r_i] \rangle \end{aligned}$$

where p_i, q_i and r_i ranges over distinct prime factors of $(m^4 - 1)$, $(m^4 - 1 - 4m^2)$, and $(m^4 - 1 + 4m^2)$ respectively. By the method of 2-descent (see [8] Proposition X.1.4), there exists an injective group homomorphism

$$\phi : E_m(\mathbb{Q})/2E_m(\mathbb{Q}) \longrightarrow \mathbb{Q}(S, 2) \times \mathbb{Q}(S, 2)$$

defined by

$$\phi(\bar{x}, \bar{y}) = \begin{cases} ([x - (m^4 - 1)], [x + (m^4 - 1)]) & \text{if } x \neq \pm(m^4 - 1), \\ ([2(m^4 - 1)(m^4 - 1 - 4m^2)], [2(m^4 - 1)]) & \text{if } x = m^4 - 1, \\ ([-2(m^4 - 1)], [2(m^4 - 1)(m^4 - 1 + 4m^2)]) & \text{if } x = -(m^4 - 1), \\ ([1], [1]) & \text{if } (x, y) = \mathcal{O}, \end{cases}$$

where \mathcal{O} is the fixed base point. If $([b_1], [b_2])$ is a pair which is not in the image of the cosets of the torsion points of $E_m(\mathbb{Q})$, then $([b_1], [b_2])$ is the image of a point $P = (\bar{x}, \bar{y}) \in E_m(\mathbb{Q})/2E_m(\mathbb{Q})$ if and only if the following equations

$$(3) \quad b_1 z_1^2 - b_2 z_2^2 = -2 \cdot (m^4 - 1),$$

$$(4) \quad b_1 z_1^2 - b_1 b_2 z_3^2 = -(m^4 - 1 - 4m^2),$$

$$(5) \quad b_1 b_2 z_3^2 - b_2 z_2^2 = -(m^4 - 1 + 4m^2)$$

have a solution $(z_1, z_2, z_3) \in \mathbb{Q}^* \times \mathbb{Q}^* \times \mathbb{Q}^*$. We note that (5) is obtained by subtracting (4) from (3), and is only included here due to its use later in this work. The image of $E_m(\mathbb{Q})/2E_m(\mathbb{Q})$ under the 2-descent map ϕ is contained in a subgroup of $\mathbb{Q}(S, 2) \times \mathbb{Q}(S, 2)$ known as the 2-Selmer group $\text{Sel}_2(E_m/\mathbb{Q})$, which fits into the exact sequence

$$(6) \quad 0 \longrightarrow E_m(\mathbb{Q})/2E_m(\mathbb{Q}) \longrightarrow \text{Sel}_2(E_m/\mathbb{Q}) \longrightarrow \text{III}(E_m/\mathbb{Q})[2] \longrightarrow 0.$$

Remark 4.1. *We note that the choice of $([b_1], [b_2]) \in \text{Sel}_2(E)$ for any $([b_1], [b_2]) \in \mathbb{Q}(S, 2) \times \mathbb{Q}(S, 2)$ is the same as the four elements in the equivalence class represented by the image of $([b_1], [b_2])$ in $\mathbb{Q}(S, 2) \times \mathbb{Q}(S, 2)/\phi(E_m(\mathbb{Q})_{\text{tors}})$. Hence, without loss of generality, we can assume $b_1 b_2 \not\equiv 0 \pmod{4}$ adding to the conditions mentioned in Lemma 4.1 while looking for possible $([b_1], [b_2]) \in \text{Sel}_2(E_m)$. This is because $\phi(E(\mathbb{Q})_{\text{tors}})$ contains (b_1, b_2) such that both b_1, b_2 are even square-free integers.*

We start with local solutions to the homogeneous spaces defined by (3) and (4). For a prime number ℓ , we denote an ℓ -adic solution for (3) and (4) as $z_i = u_i \cdot \ell^{t_i}$ for $i = 1, 2, 3$ where $u_i \in \mathbb{Z}_\ell^*$. We note that this implies that the ℓ -adic valuation $v_\ell(z_i) = t_i$.

Lemma 4.1. *Suppose equation (3) and equation (4) have a solution $(z_1, z_2, z_3) \in \mathbb{Q}_\ell \times \mathbb{Q}_\ell \times \mathbb{Q}_\ell$ for some odd prime number ℓ . Then*

- (i) $v_\ell(z_1) = -t < 0$ if and only if $v_\ell(z_2) = -t < 0$ for some integer t .
- (ii) $v_\ell(z_1) = -t < 0$ implies $v_\ell(z_3) = -t < 0$ for some integer t .
- (iii) $v_\ell(z_3) = -t < 0$ implies $v_\ell(z_1) = -t < 0$ for some integer t unless $b_1 b_2 \equiv 0 \pmod{\ell^2}$ and $m^4 - 1 \equiv 0 \pmod{\ell}$. That is, ℓ varies over the set of primes p_i 's, in which case, $v_\ell(z_3) = -1, v_\ell(z_1) \geq 0$ is a possibility.

Proof. To Prove (i), first we assume that $v_\ell(z_1) = -t < 0$ and let $v_\ell(z_2) = t_2$. Then equation (3) becomes

$$b_1(u_1 \ell^{-t})^2 - b_2(u_2 \ell^{t_2})^2 = -2(m^4 - 1).$$

This implies $b_1 u_1^2 - b_2 u_2^2 \ell^{2(t+t_2)} = 2\ell^{2t}(m^4 - 1)$. If $t + t_2 > 0$, then we have $b_1 u_1^2 \equiv 0 \pmod{\ell^2}$ and since u_1 is a unit in \mathbb{Z}_ℓ , we conclude that $b_1 \equiv 0 \pmod{\ell^2}$ which is a contradiction to the fact that b_1 is square-free. Again, if $t + t_2 < 0$, then equation (3) becomes

$$b_1 u_1^2 \ell^{-2(t+t_2)} - b_2 u_2^2 = -2(m^4 - 1)\ell^{2t-2(t+t_2)},$$

which implies that $b_2 u_2^2 \equiv 0 \pmod{\ell^2}$. Now, $u_2 \in \mathbb{Z}_\ell^*$ implies that $b_2 \equiv 0 \pmod{\ell^2}$, a contradiction to the fact that b_2 is square-free. Thus we conclude that $v_\ell(z_2) = -t$. Using a similar argument, we can also establish that if $v_\ell(z_2) = -t < 0$, then $v_\ell(z_1) = -t$ as well.

To prove (ii), we assume that $v_\ell(z_1) = -t < 0$ and let $v_\ell(z_3) = t_3$. Then equation (4) translates into

$$b_1 u_1^2 - b_1 b_2 u_3^2 \ell^{2(t+t_3)} = -\ell^{2t}(m^4 - 1 - 4m^2).$$

If $t + t_3 > 0$, then we have $b_1 u_1^2 \equiv 0 \pmod{\ell^2}$ and consequently, $b_1 \equiv 0 \pmod{\ell^2}$, a contradiction to the fact that b_1 is square-free. Thus $t + t_3 < 0$ and by writing $t_3 = -t - k$ for some $k > 0$, we obtain from equation (4) that $b_1 b_2 \equiv 0 \pmod{\ell^{2k}}$. Since both b_1 and b_2 are square-free, we conclude that $k \leq 1$.

If $k = 1$, then we have $\ell^2 \mid b_1 b_2$ and since both b_1 and b_2 are square-free, we have $\ell \mid b_1$ and $\ell \mid b_2$. Then from equation (4), we obtain

$$b_1 u_1^2 - \frac{b_1 b_2}{\ell^2} u_3^2 = -\ell^{2t}(m^4 - 1 - 4m^2).$$

Since ℓ divides both b_1 and the right hand side of the above equation, we conclude that $\frac{b_1 b_2}{\ell^2} \equiv 0 \pmod{\ell}$. That is, $\ell^3 \mid b_1 b_2$ which contradicts the fact that both b_1 and b_2 are square-free. Hence $k = 1$ is impossible to hold and therefore, $k = 0$. In other words, $v_\ell(z_3) = -t$.

To prove (iii), assume that $v_\ell(z_3) = -t_3 < 0$. That is, $z_3 = u_3 \cdot \ell^{-t_3}$ where $u_3 \in \mathbb{Z}_\ell^*$. If $v_\ell(z_1) = -t_1 < -t_3$, then from (4), we get

$$b_1 u_1^2 - b_1 b_2 u_3^2 \ell^{2(t_1 - t_3)} = -(m^4 - 1 - 4m^2) \cdot \ell^{2t_1} \implies b_1 \equiv 0 \pmod{\ell^2}, \text{ a contradiction.}$$

Now suppose $v_\ell(z_1) = t_1 > -t_3$. Then again from (4), we get

$$b_1 u_1^2 \ell^{2(t_1 + t_3)} - b_1 b_2 u_3^2 = -(m^4 - 1 - 4m^2) \cdot \ell^{2t_3} \implies b_1 b_2 \equiv 0 \pmod{\ell^2}.$$

Hence, $b_1 b_2 \not\equiv 0 \pmod{\ell^2}$ implies $v_\ell(z_1) > v_\ell(z_3)$ is also not possible. That is, $v_\ell(z_3) = v_\ell(z_1)$. Also, $b_1 b_2 \equiv 0 \pmod{\ell^2}$ implies ℓ divides both b_1, b_2 . This in turn implies that $t_3 \geq 2$ or $(m^4 - 1 - 4m^2) \equiv 0 \pmod{\ell}$ are not possible, as both cases then imply $b_1 b_2 \equiv 0 \pmod{\ell^3}$, a contradiction. Equation (5) under the assumption $v_\ell(z_1) > v_\ell(z_3)$ now looks like

$$\frac{b_1 b_2}{\ell^2} u_3^2 - b_2 z_2^2 = -(m^4 - 1 + 4m^2) \implies (m^4 - 1 + 4m^2) \not\equiv 0 \pmod{\ell}.$$

This is because $b_2 \equiv 0 \pmod{\ell}$ and $v_\ell(z_2) < 0$ is not possible from part (1) of this result as $v_\ell(z_1) > v_\ell(z_3) = -1$. Noting that b_1, b_2 are square-free combinations of the prime factors of $(m^4 - 1)$, $(m^4 - 1 - 4m^2)$ and $(m^4 - 1 + 4m^2)$ and ℓ divides both b_1 and b_2 in this case, we conclude the proof. \square

The following lemma reduces the potential size of $\text{Sel}_2(E_m)$ by excluding certain choices of b_1 and b_2 due to the lack of local solution of (3) and (4) for each prime $\ell \leq \infty$.

Lemma 4.2. *Let $([b_1], [b_2]) \in \mathbb{Q}(S, 2) \times \mathbb{Q}(S, 2)$. Then $([b_1], [b_2]) \notin \text{Sel}_2(E_m)$ if*

- (i) $b_2 < 0$ due to no solution of (3) and (5) over \mathbb{Q}_∞ .
- (ii) $b_2 \equiv 0 \pmod{q_i}$ due to no solution of (3) and (4) over \mathbb{Q}_{q_i} .
- (iii) $b_1 \equiv 0 \pmod{r_i}$ due to no solution of (3) and (4) over \mathbb{Q}_{r_i} .
- (iv) $v_{p_i}(b_1 b_2) = 1$ due to no solution of (3) and (4) over \mathbb{Q}_{p_i} .
- (v) $b_1 b_2 \equiv 2 \pmod{4}$ due to no solution of (3) and (4) over \mathbb{Q}_2 .

Proof. (i) For $b_2 < 0$, we note that if $b_1 > 0$, then $-2(m^4 - 1) > 0$ from (3), a contradiction. Similarly, for $b_1 < 0$, we get $-(m^4 - 1 + 4m^2) > 0$ from (5), again a contradiction. Thus $b_2 < 0$ implies that $([b_1], [b_2]) \notin \text{Sel}_2(E_m)$.

(ii) Let us assume $b_2 \equiv 0 \pmod{q_i}$. If $v_{q_i}(z_j) = -t < 0$ for all $j \in \{1, 2, 3\}$, then from (3) we get

$$b_1 u_1^2 - b_2 u_2^2 = -2(m^4 - 1) q_i^{2t} \implies b_1 \equiv 0 \pmod{q_i}.$$

But then from (4), one can get the following contradiction.

$$b_1 u_1^2 - b_1 b_2 u_3^2 = -(m^4 - 1 - 4m^2) q_i^{2t} \implies b_1 \equiv 0 \pmod{q_i^2}.$$

Now if $v_{q_i}(z_j) \geq 0$ for all $j \in \{1, 2, 3\}$, equation (4) again implies that either $b_1 \equiv 0 \pmod{q_i}$ or $v_{q_i}(z_1) > 0$ holds. Either of which then implies $2(m^4 - 1) \equiv 0 \pmod{q_i}$ from (3), a contradiction as $\gcd(2(m^4 - 1), (m^4 - 1 - 4m^2)) = 1$. Therefore, $b_2 \equiv 0 \pmod{q_i}$ implies that $([b_1], [b_2]) \notin \text{Sel}_2(E_m)$.

- (iii) Assume that $b_1 \equiv 0 \pmod{r_i}$. If $v_{r_i}(z_j) = -t < 0$ for all $j \in \{1, 2, 3\}$, then from equation (3), we obtain

$$b_1 u_1^2 - b_2 u_2^2 = -2r_i^{2t}(m^4 - 1),$$

which implies that $b_2 \equiv 0 \pmod{r_i}$. Again, from equation (5), we obtain $b_1 b_2 u_3^2 - b_2 u_2^2 = -r_i^{2t}(m^4 - 1 + 4m^2)$. From this and $b_1 \equiv b_2 \equiv 0 \pmod{r_i}$, we have $b_2 \equiv 0 \pmod{r_i^2}$, a contradiction.

Again, if $v_{r_i}(z_j) = t \geq 0$ for all $j \in \{1, 2, 3\}$, then from equation (5), we obtain

$$b_1 b_2 (u_3 r_i^t)^2 - b_2 (u_2 r_i^t)^2 = -(m^4 - 1 + 4m^2).$$

Now, r_i divides the right hand side of the above equation which is square-free under our hypotheses. Hence the r_i -adic valuation of the left hand side of the equation is 1. Since $b_1 \equiv 0 \pmod{r_i}$, we must have either $b_2 \equiv 0 \pmod{r_i}$ or $t > 0$. Now using equation (3), we see that that in either case we have $b_1 z_1^2 - b_2 z_2^2 \equiv 0 \pmod{r_i}$. That is, $r_i \mid 2(m^4 - 1)$, a contradiction. Consequently, $b_1 \equiv 0 \pmod{r_i}$ implies that $([b_1], [b_2]) \notin \text{Sel}_2(E_m)$.

- (iv) Assume that $v_{p_i}(b_1 b_2) = 1$. Since b_1 and b_2 are square-free, we have that p_i divides exactly one of b_1 and b_2 . We deal only with the case $p_i \mid b_1$ as the other case follows exactly a similar line of argument.

Now, of $v_{p_i}(z_j) = -t < 0$ for all $j \in \{1, 2, 3\}$, then equation (3) yields

$$b_1 u_1^2 - b_2 u_2^2 = -2p_i^{2t}(m^4 - 1),$$

which implies that $p_i \mid b_2$, a contradiction. Again, if $v_{p_i}(z_j) = t > 0$ for all $j \in \{1, 2, 3\}$, then equation (4) yields $p_i \mid (m^4 - 1 + 4m^2)$, a contradiction. Consequently, $v_{p_i}(b_1 b_2) = 1$ implies that $([b_1], [b_2]) \notin \text{Sel}_2(E_m)$.

- (v) Without loss of any generality, let us assume that b_1 is odd and b_2 is even. Then $v_2(z_j) = -t < 0$ for all $j \in \{1, 2, 3\}$ implies $b_1 \equiv 0 \pmod{2}$ from equation (3), a contradiction. Also, if $v_2(z_j) \geq 0$, then from equation (5), we get

$$b_1 b_2 z_3^2 - b_2 z_2^2 = -(m^4 - 1 + 4m^2) \equiv 0 \pmod{2},$$

a contradiction as m is an even integer. Hence $b_1 b_2 \equiv 2 \pmod{4}$ implies that $([b_1], [b_2]) \notin \text{Sel}_2(E_m)$. This completes the proof of Lemma 4.2. □

Lemma 4.3. *Let $([b_1], [b_2]) \in \mathbb{Q}(S, 2) \times \mathbb{Q}(S, 2)$ be such that $([b_1], [b_2]) \in \text{Sel}_2(E_m)$. Then*

(i) *if $b_1 b_2 \equiv 0 \pmod{p_i^2}$ then $\left(\frac{-b_1 b_2 / p_i^2}{p_i}\right) = 1$. Otherwise, $\left(\frac{b_1}{p_i}\right) = \left(\frac{b_2}{p_i}\right)$.*

(ii) *if $b_1 \equiv 0 \pmod{q_i}$, then $\left(\frac{b_2}{q_i}\right) = \left(\frac{2}{q_i}\right)$. Otherwise, $\left(\frac{b_2}{q_i}\right) = 1$.*

(iii) *if $b_2 \equiv 0 \pmod{r_i}$, then $\left(\frac{b_1}{r_i}\right) = \left(\frac{2}{r_i}\right)$. Otherwise, $\left(\frac{b_1}{r_i}\right) = 1$.*

(iv) *the congruence relation $b_1 \equiv 1 \pmod{4}$ holds.*

Proof. (i) If $b_1 b_2 \equiv 0 \pmod{p_i^2}$, we note that $v_{p_i}(z_j) \geq 0$ for all $j \in \{1, 2, 3\}$ is not possible from equation (4). Hence $v_{p_i}(z_j) < 0$. Now from Lemma 4.1, we get either $v_{p_i}(z_j) = -t < 0$ for all $j \in \{1, 2, 3\}$

or $v_{p_i}(z_3) = -1$ and $v_{p_i}(z_j) \geq 0$ for $j \in \{1, 2\}$. Now, if $v_{p_i}(z_j) = -t < 0$ for all $j \in \{1, 2, 3\}$, then equation (4) implies $b_1 \equiv 0 \pmod{p_i^2}$, a contradiction. Therefore, the only possible case left is $v_{p_i}(z_3) = -1$ and $v_{p_i}(z_j) \geq 0$ for $j \in \{1, 2\}$. Noting that $m^4 - 1 \equiv 0 \pmod{p_i}$, equation (4) yields $\frac{b_1 b_2}{p_i^2} u_3^2 \equiv (m^4 - 1 - 4m^2) \equiv -4m^2 \pmod{p_i}$. Consequently, we have $\left(\frac{-b_1 b_2 / p_i^2}{p_i}\right) = 1$.

Now, if $b_1 b_2 \not\equiv 0 \pmod{p_i^2}$, one can easily note that $v_{p_i}(z_j) < 0$ for all $j \in \{1, 2, 3\}$, or, $v_{p_i}(z_1) = v_{p_i}(z_2) = 0$ are the only possibilities. Then from equation (3), we have $\left(\frac{b_1}{p_i}\right) = \left(\frac{b_2}{p_i}\right)$ in both the cases.

- (ii) If $b_1 \equiv 0 \pmod{q_i}$, we see that $v_{q_i}(z_2) > 0$ is impossible, because that forces $v_{q_i}(z_1) \geq 0$ as well and thus the left hand side of equation (3) is divisible by q_i . This is a contradiction because the right-hand side of equation (3) is not divisible by q_i . If $v_{q_i}(z_2) = 0$, then from (3), we obtain

$$b_1 z_1^2 - b_2 u_2^2 = -2(m^4 - 1) \implies -b_2 u_2^2 \equiv -8m^2 \pmod{q_i} \implies \left(\frac{b_2}{q_i}\right) = \left(\frac{2}{q_i}\right).$$

Now $v_{q_i}(z_1) = -t < 0$ implies $v_{q_i}(z_j) = -t < 0$ for all $j \in \{1, 2, 3\}$. But then

$$b_1 u_1^2 - b_2 u_2^2 = -2(m^4 - 1) \cdot q_i^{2t} \implies b_2 \equiv 0 \pmod{q_i},$$

a contradiction from Lemma 4.2.

Now, let us assume $b_1 \not\equiv 0 \pmod{q_i}$. Then from (4), one can note that $v_{q_i}(z_1) \leq 0$, and $v_{q_i}(z_3) \leq 0$. From Lemma 4.1, this implies either $v_{q_i}(z_1) = v_{q_i}(z_3) = 0$ or $v_{q_i}(z_j) = -t$ for some $t > 0$ and $j \in \{1, 2, 3\}$. Both these conditions then imply $\left(\frac{b_2}{q_i}\right) = 1$. Hence, the result follows.

- (iii) Assuming $b_2 \equiv 0 \pmod{r_i}$, if $v_{r_i}(z_1) > 0$, then from Lemma 4.1 it follows that $v_{r_i}(z_2) \geq 0$. Therefore, the left-hand side of equation (3) is divisible by r_i , whereas the right-hand side is not a contradiction. Consequently, we have $v_{r_i}(z_1) \leq 0$. If $v_{r_i}(z_1) = -t < 0$, then from Lemma 4.1 it follows that $v_{r_i}(z_j) = -t$ for all $j \in \{1, 2, 3\}$. Therefore, equation (3) yields

$$b_1 u_1^2 - b_2 u_2^2 = -2(m^4 - 1)r_i^{2t}.$$

But then $b_2 \equiv 0 \pmod{r_i}$ implies that $b_1 \equiv 0 \pmod{r_i}$. This is a contradiction to (3) of Lemma 4.2. Hence, $v_{q_i}(z_1) = 0$, and then from (3), it follows that $\left(\frac{b_1}{r_i}\right) = \left(\frac{-2(m^4-1)}{r_i}\right) = \left(\frac{8m^2}{r_i}\right) = \left(\frac{2}{r_i}\right)$.

Now let us assume $b_2 \not\equiv 0 \pmod{r_i}$. Then similar to the previous case, equation (5) and Lemma 4.1 yield that either $v_{r_i}(z_2) = v_{r_i}(z_3) = 0$, or $v_{r_i}(z_j) = -t > 0$ for all $j \in \{1, 2, 3\}$. Either way, that implies $\left(\frac{b_1}{r_i}\right) = 1$. Hence the result follows.

- (iv) Assume that $([b_1], [b_2]) \in \text{Sel}_2(E_m)$. If $v_2(z_i) < 0$ for all $i \in \{1, 2, 3\}$, then from equation (3), we obtain

$$b_1 u_1^2 - b_2 u_2^2 = -2(m^4 - 1) \cdot 2^{2t} \implies b_1 - b_2 \equiv 0 \pmod{4}.$$

Putting that in equation (4), we get $b_1(u_1^2 - b_2 u_2^2) \equiv b_1(1 - b_1) \equiv 0 \pmod{4}$, from where it follows that $b_1 \equiv b_2 \equiv 1 \pmod{4}$.

If $v_2(z_1) > 0$, then the left-hand side of equation (3) is divisible by 4, but the right-hand side is not. This, in turn, implies that $v_2(z_1) = v_2(z_2) = 0$ is the only possibility. But $v_2(z_1) = v_2(z_2) = 0$ implies $b_1 - b_2 \equiv -2(m^4 - 1) \equiv 2 \pmod{4}$ which implies either $b_1 \equiv 1 \pmod{4}, b_2 \equiv 3 \pmod{4}$ or $b_1 \equiv 3 \pmod{4}, b_2 \equiv 1 \pmod{4}$. We now prove that the later one is not a possibility. If $v_2(z_3) > 0$, then from equation (4), it follows that $b_1 \equiv 1 \pmod{4}$. Also, if $v_2(z_3) = 0$, then again equation (4) yields $1 \equiv b_1 z_1^2 - b_1 b_2 z_3^2 \equiv 0 \pmod{4}$, a contradiction. Consequently, we must have $b_1 \equiv 1 \pmod{4}$.

□

5. PROOF OF THEOREM 1.2

First, we notice that the first part of Theorem 1.2 follows from the discussion of Section 2 and Section 3. Now, we claim that $\langle([p_i], [p_i])\rangle \subseteq \text{Sel}_2(E_m)$ if $p_i \equiv 1 \pmod{4}$, and $\left(\frac{p_i}{q_j}\right) = \left(\frac{p_i}{r_k}\right) = 1$. Also, $\langle([-p_i], [p_i])\rangle \subseteq \text{Sel}_2(E_m)$ if $p_i \equiv 3 \pmod{4}$, and $\left(\frac{p_i}{q_j}\right) = \left(\frac{-p_i}{r_k}\right) = 1$. In both cases, q_j and r_k vary over all prime factors of $(m^4 - 1 - 4m^2)$ and $(m^4 - 1 + 4m^2)$ respectively. We only prove the case $\langle([p_i], [p_i])\rangle \subseteq \text{Sel}_2(E_m)$ for $p_i \equiv 1 \pmod{4}$ due to its similarity with the proof of the case $p_i \equiv 3 \pmod{4}$.

Remark 5.1. *The Jacobian of the intersection of equation (3) and equation (4) for $(b_1, b_2) = (p_i, p_i)$ with $p_i \equiv 1 \pmod{4}$ is*

$$(7) \quad \begin{pmatrix} 2 \cdot p_i \cdot z_1 & -2 \cdot p_i \cdot z_2 & 0 \\ 2 \cdot p_i \cdot z_1 & 0 & -2 \cdot p_i^2 \cdot z_3 \end{pmatrix}$$

which one can easily observe has rank 2 modulo ℓ whenever $\ell \neq 2, p_i$. Hence, except for those ℓ 's, the topological genus becomes the same as the arithmetic genus, which is 1 by the degree-genus formula, and Hasse-Weil bound for a genus one curve can be used for all but those finitely many primes. For $\ell \neq p_i$, $\ell \geq 5$, Hasse bound guarantees a non-trivial solution $(z_1, z_2, z_3) \in \mathbb{F}_\ell \times \mathbb{F}_\ell \times \mathbb{F}_\ell$ of (3) and (4) modulo ℓ . One can immediately note that all three of z_1, z_2, z_3 being zero modulo ℓ is not possible as $\ell \neq 2, p_i$. Now $z_1 \equiv z_2 \equiv 0 \pmod{\ell}$ implies ℓ^2 divides $2(m^4 - 1)$, a contradiction. Similarly, $z_1 \equiv z_3 \equiv 0 \pmod{\ell}$ implies $-(m^4 - 1 - 4m^2) \equiv 0 \pmod{\ell} \implies \ell = q_i$, contradiction again. By suitably fixing two of z_1, z_2 and z_3 , one can now convert equations (3) and (4) into one single equation of one variable with a simple root over \mathbb{F}_ℓ . That common solution can then be lifted to \mathbb{Q}_ℓ via Hensel's lemma.

Now we prove that if $([p_i], [p_i]) \in \mathbb{Q}(S, 2) \times \mathbb{Q}(S, 2)$ is such that $p_i \equiv 1 \pmod{4}$ and $\left(\frac{p_i}{q_j}\right) = \left(\frac{p_i}{r_k}\right) = 1$, then $(p_i, p_i) \in \text{Sel}_2(E_m)$. As already mentioned in Remark 5.1 above, we only prove the existence of the local solution of equation (3) and equation (4) for the primes $\ell = 2, 3$, and p_i .

For $\ell = 2$, we note from Lemma 4.3 that $p_i \equiv 1, 5 \pmod{8}$. For $p_i \equiv 1 \pmod{8}$, we note that $(u_1, 1, 1)$ is a solution to a single variable version of (3) and (4) with $v_2(z_j) < 0$, where $u_1^2 \equiv 1 \pmod{8}$. This solution can then be lifted to \mathbb{Q}_2 via Hensel's lemma. Similarly, if $p_i \equiv 5 \pmod{8}$, then $(u_1, 1, 1)$ is again a solution to a single-variable version of (3) and (4) with $v_2(z_j) = 0$ for all $j \in \{1, 2, 3\}$ with $u_1^2 \equiv 1 \pmod{8}$. This solution again can be lifted to \mathbb{Q}_2 via Hensel's lemma.

For $\ell = 3$, we first note that $m \equiv 0 \pmod{3}$. This implies that neither of b_1 or b_2 are divisible by 3. We now produce simple solutions (z_1, z_2, z_3) for equation (3) and equation (4) with two constant components below. In this way, we can treat equation (3) and equation 4 as equations of one variable and note that those simple solutions can be lifted to \mathbb{Q}_3 via Hensel's lemma. For the case $p_i \equiv 1 \pmod{3}$, choose $v_3(z_j) < 0$, and $(u_1, 1, 1)$ is a solution that can be lifted, where $u_1^2 \equiv 1 \pmod{3}$. For the case $p_i \equiv 2 \pmod{3}$, choose $v_3(z_j) \geq 0$, and $(u_1, 0, 1)$ is a solution that can be lifted, where $u_1^2 \equiv 1 \pmod{3}$.

For $\ell = p_i$, taking the queue from the previous cases, we produce solutions that can be lifted to \mathbb{Q}_{p_i} . We note that $b_1 b_2 \equiv 0 \pmod{p_i^2}$, and $\left(\frac{-b_1 b_2 / p_i^2}{p_i}\right) = 1$, agreeing with Lemma 4.3. Then under the assumption $v_{p_i}(z_3) = -1$ and $v_{p_i}(z_j) \geq 0$ for $j \in \{1, 2\}$, $(0, 0, u_3)$ is a simple solution for equation (4) and equation 5 that can be lifted to \mathbb{Q}_{p_i} , where $\left(\frac{-b_1 b_2}{p_i^2}\right) \cdot u_3^2 \equiv 4m^2 \pmod{p_i}$. The existence of such u_3 is guaranteed as $\left(\frac{-b_1 b_2 / p_i^2}{p_i}\right) = 1$.

This concludes the proof as we have shown that solution for equation (3) and equation (4) exists in \mathbb{Q}_ℓ for every prime number ℓ when $(b_1, b_2) = (p_i, p_i)$ with $p_i \equiv 1 \pmod{4}$. Because one can trivially observe that a real solution exists for equation (3) and equation (4) too, we can conclude for all $\ell \leq \infty$, local

solutions for equation (3) and equation (4) exist. Hence $([p_i], [p_i]) \in \text{Sel}_2(E_m)$. This completes the proof of Theorem 1.2. \square

6. PROOF OF COROLLARY 1.1

It is given that $m^4 - 1 \pm 4m^2$ are prime numbers. Let $m^4 - 1 - 4m^2 = q$ and $m^4 - 1 + 4m^2 = r$. Noting that $q \equiv -r \equiv 4m^2 \pmod{p_i}$, one can see that $\left(\frac{p_i}{q}\right) = \left(\frac{p_i}{r}\right) = 1$ for $p_i \equiv 1 \pmod{4}$ whereas $\left(\frac{p_j}{q}\right) = \left(\frac{-p_j}{r}\right) = 1$ for $p_j \equiv 3 \pmod{4}$. Hence, from Lemma 4.3 and Theorem 1.2, we can conclude that $\{([p_i], [p_i]), ([-p_0], [p_0])\} \in \text{Sel}_2(E_m)$ where $p_i \equiv 1 \pmod{4}$, and $p_0 \equiv 3 \pmod{4}$.

We now note that $q \equiv r \equiv 7 \pmod{8}$, and consequently, $\left(\frac{2}{q}\right) = \left(\frac{2}{r}\right) = 1$. Hence, from Lemma 4.3, $([-q], [1])$ and $([1], [r])$ satisfy necessary properties for potential elements in $\text{Sel}_2(E_m)$. We now prove that $(-q, 1) \in \text{Sel}_2(E_m)$. This will be sufficient to show that $(1, r) \in \text{Sel}_2(E_m)$. This is because $(-q, r) \in \text{Sel}_2(E_m)$ always, due to being the image of the torsion point $(4m^2, 0)$, and hence $(1, r) = (-q, 1) \cdot (-q, r) \in [(-q, 1)]$.

An approach similar to Remark 5.1 shows that it is enough to prove that for $(-q, 1)$, equation (3) and equation (4) have solutions over \mathbb{Q}_l for $l = 2, 3$ and q . We first note that $q \equiv -1 \pmod{8}$, and without loss of generality one can assume $m \equiv 0 \pmod{3}$ since both $m + 1$ and $m - 1$ are prime numbers, $q = m^4 - 1 - 4m^2 \equiv -1 \pmod{3}$ also. This, in turn, shows $(u_1, 1, 1)$ is a solution of equation (3) and equation (4) with $v_2(z_i) = -t < 0$, that can be lifted to \mathbb{Q}_2 via Hensel's lemma, where $u_1 \not\equiv 0 \pmod{2}$. In a similar way, one can show that $(u_1, 1, 1)$ is a solution of equation (3) and equation (4) with $v_2(z_i) = -t < 0$, that can be lifted to \mathbb{Q}_3 , where $u_1 \not\equiv 0 \pmod{3}$ too. For $l = q$, we note that $(0, u_2, 0)$ with $u_2^2 \equiv 8m^2 \pmod{q}$ is a solution to equation (3) and equation (5), that can be lifted to \mathbb{Q}_q . Hence, we can conclude $([-q], [1]) \in \text{Sel}_2(E_m)$.

We have proved that $\langle ([p_i], [p_i]), ([-p_0], [p_0]), ([-q], [1]) \rangle \subseteq \text{Sel}_2(E_m)$. In fact, Lemma 4.3 asserts that the inclusion is not strict, i.e., $\langle ([p_i], [p_i]), ([-p_0], [p_0]), ([-q], [1]) \rangle = \text{Sel}_2(E_m)$. Noting that p_i varies over all $4k + 1$ prime factors of $m^4 - 1$, and p_0 is the only $4k + 3$ factor of $m^4 - 1$, now the result follows. \square

Acknowledgements. *The authors are grateful to their respective institutions for providing excellent facilities to carry out this research. The research of the first author is supported by UGC (Grant no. 211610060298) and he sincerely acknowledges the financial support.*

REFERENCES

- [1] A. Antoniewicz, *On a family of elliptic curves*, Zeszyty Naukowe Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego. Universitatis Iagellonicae Acta Mathematica, **1285** (2005), 21-32.
- [2] E. Brown, and B. T. Myers, *Elliptic curves from Mordell to Diophantus and back*, The American mathematical monthly, **109** (2002), 639-649.
- [3] K. Chakraborty, and R. Sharma, *On a family of elliptic curves of rank at least 2*, Czechoslovak Mathematical Journal, **72** (2022), 681-693.
- [4] K. Conrad, *The congruent number problem*, The Harvard College Mathematics Review, **2**(2008), 58-74.
- [5] E. V. Eikenberg, *Rational points on some families of elliptic curves*, University of Maryland, College Park (2004).
- [6] A. Juyal and S. D. Kumar, *On the family of elliptic curves $y^2 = x^3 - m^2x + p^2$* , Proceedings-Mathematical Sciences, **128** (2018), 1-11.
- [7] Y. V. Matiyasevich, *Hilbert's Tenth Problem*, MIT Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1993.
- [8] J. H. Silverman, 2009. *The arithmetic of elliptic curves*, **106** (2009), pp. xx+513). New York: Springer.
- [9] P. Tadić, *The rank of certain sub-families of elliptic curve $Y^2 = X^3 - X + T^2$* , sf Annales Mathematicae et Informaticae, bf 40 (2012), 145-153.
- [10] P. Tadić, P., *On the family of elliptic curve $Y^2 = X^3 - T^2X + 1$* , Glasnik Matem-aticki, **47** (2012), 81-93.
- [11] R. Taylor and A. Wiles, *Ring-theoretic properties of certain Hecke algebras*, Ann. of Math., **141** (1995), 553- 572.
- [12] A. Wiles, *Modular elliptic curves and Fermat's last theorem*, Ann. of Math., **141** (1995), 443-551.

(Pankaj Patel and Debopam Chakraborty) DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, BITS-PILANI, HYDERABAD CAMPUS, HYDERABAD, INDIA

(Jaitra Chattopadhyay) DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, SIKSHA BHAVANA, VISVA-BHARATI, SANTINIKETAN - 731235, WEST BENGAL, INDIA

Email address, Pankaj Patel: `p20200452@hyderabad.bits-pilani.ac.in`

Email address, Debopam Chakraborty: `debopam@hyderabad.bits-pilani.ac.in`

Email address, Jaitra Chattopadhyay: `jaitra.chattopadhyay@visva-bharati.ac.in`; `chat.jaitra@gmail.com`