BILL START RECORDING

<□▶ <□▶ < □▶ < □▶ < □▶ < □▶ < □ > ○ < ○

An Early Idea on Factoring: Jevons' Number

In the 1870s William Stanley Jevons wrote of the difficulty of factoring. We paraphrase Solomon Golomb's paraphrase:

Jevons observed that there are many cases where an operation is easy but it's inverse is hard. He mentioned encryption and decryption. He mentioned multiplication and factoring. He anticipated RSA!

In the 1870s William Stanley Jevons wrote of the difficulty of factoring. We paraphrase Solomon Golomb's paraphrase:

Jevons observed that there are many cases where an operation is easy but it's inverse is hard. He mentioned encryption and decryption. He mentioned multiplication and factoring. He anticipated RSA!

Jevons thought factoring was hard (prob correct!) and that a certain number would **never** be factored (wrong!). Here is a quote:

In the 1870s William Stanley Jevons wrote of the difficulty of factoring. We paraphrase Solomon Golomb's paraphrase:

Jevons observed that there are many cases where an operation is easy but it's inverse is hard. He mentioned encryption and decryption. He mentioned multiplication and factoring. He anticipated RSA!

Jevons thought factoring was hard (prob correct!) and that a certain number would **never** be factored (wrong!). Here is a quote:

Can the reader say what two numbers multiplied together will produce

$\mathbf{8,616,460,799}$

I think it is unlikely that anyone aside from myself will ever know.

J = 8,616,460,799

▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲ 臣▶ ▲ 臣▶ ― 臣 … のへぐ

J = 8,616,460,799

We can now factor J easily. Was Jevons' comment stupid? **Discuss**

1. Jevons lived 1835-1882 (He drowned while swimming at 46.)

*ロ * * @ * * ミ * ミ * ・ ミ * の < や

J = 8,616,460,799

We can now factor J easily. Was Jevons' comment stupid? **Discuss**

1. Jevons lived 1835-1882 (He drowned while swimming at 46.)

2. Jevons did not predict computers.

J = 8,616,460,799

We can now factor J easily. Was Jevons' comment stupid? **Discuss**

1. Jevons lived 1835-1882 (He drowned while swimming at 46.)

2. Jevons did not predict computers. Should he have?

J = 8,616,460,799

We can now factor J easily. Was Jevons' comment stupid? **Discuss**

1. Jevons lived 1835–1882 (He drowned while swimming at 46.)

- 2. Jevons did not predict computers. Should he have?
- 3. Jevons did not predict math would help.

J = 8,616,460,799

We can now factor J easily. Was Jevons' comment stupid? **Discuss**

1. Jevons lived 1835–1882 (He drowned while swimming at 46.)

- 2. Jevons did not predict computers. Should he have?
- 3. Jevons did not predict math would help. Should he have?

J = 8,616,460,799

We can now factor J easily. Was Jevons' comment stupid? **Discuss**

1. Jevons lived 1835–1882 (He drowned while swimming at 46.)

- 2. Jevons did not predict computers. Should he have?
- 3. Jevons did not predict math would help. Should he have?
- 4. Lehmer factored J in 1903 using math and computation.

J = 8,616,460,799

We can now factor J easily. Was Jevons' comment stupid? **Discuss**

- 1. Jevons lived 1835–1882 (He drowned while swimming at 46.)
- 2. Jevons did not predict computers. Should he have?
- 3. Jevons did not predict math would help. Should he have?
- 4. Lehmer factored J in 1903 using math and computation.
- 5. Golomb in 1996 showed that, given the math **of his day**, Jevons' number could be factored by hand.

J = 8,616,460,799

We can now factor J easily. Was Jevons' comment stupid? **Discuss**

- 1. Jevons lived 1835–1882 (He drowned while swimming at 46.)
- 2. Jevons did not predict computers. Should he have?
- 3. Jevons did not predict math would help. Should he have?
- 4. Lehmer factored J in 1903 using math and computation.
- 5. Golomb in 1996 showed that, given the math **of his day**, Jevons' number could be factored by hand.
- 6. Student: Why didn't Jevons just Google Factoring Quickly

J = 8,616,460,799

- 1. Jevons lived 1835–1882 (He drowned while swimming at 46.)
- 2. Jevons did not predict computers. Should he have?
- 3. Jevons did not predict math would help. Should he have?
- 4. Lehmer factored J in 1903 using math and computation.
- 5. Golomb in 1996 showed that, given the math **of his day**, Jevons' number could be factored by hand.
- Student: Why didn't Jevons just Google Factoring Quickly Bill: They didn't have the Web back then. Or Google.

J = 8,616,460,799

- 1. Jevons lived 1835–1882 (He drowned while swimming at 46.)
- 2. Jevons did not predict computers. Should he have?
- 3. Jevons did not predict math would help. Should he have?
- 4. Lehmer factored J in 1903 using math and computation.
- 5. Golomb in 1996 showed that, given the math **of his day**, Jevons' number could be factored by hand.
- 6. Student: Why didn't Jevons just Google Factoring Quickly
 Bill: They didn't have the Web back then. Or Google.
 Student: How did they live?

J = 8,616,460,799

- 1. Jevons lived 1835–1882 (He drowned while swimming at 46.)
- 2. Jevons did not predict computers. Should he have?
- 3. Jevons did not predict math would help. Should he have?
- 4. Lehmer factored J in 1903 using math and computation.
- 5. Golomb in 1996 showed that, given the math **of his day**, Jevons' number could be factored by hand.
- 6. Student: Why didn't Jevons just Google Factoring Quickly Bill: They didn't have the Web back then. Or Google. Student: How did they live? Bill: How indeed!

J = 8,616,460,799

*ロ * * @ * * ミ * ミ * ・ ミ * の < や

We apply a method of Fermat (in the 1600's) to the problem of factoring J.

J = 8,616,460,799

We apply a method of Fermat (in the 1600's) to the problem of factoring J.

To factor J find x, y such that

$$J = x^2 - y^2 = (x - y)(x + y)$$

So we must narrow our search for x, y.

Use Mods. Which Mod?

$$J = 8,616,460,799$$

J ends in 99. Hence

Use Mods. Which Mod?

$$J = 8,616,460,799$$

J ends in 99. Hence

$$J \equiv 99 \equiv -1 \pmod{100}$$
.

Use Mods. Which Mod?

$$J = 8,616,460,799$$

J ends in 99. Hence

$$J \equiv 99 \equiv -1 \pmod{100}$$
.

▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲ 臣▶ ▲ 臣▶ ― 臣 … のへぐ

Ah-ha. -1 is small! Mod 100 might be useful.

J = 8,616,460,799

$$J = x^2 - y^2$$

J = 8,616,460,799

$$J = x^2 - y^2$$

$$J \equiv x^2 - y^2 \pmod{100}$$

J = 8,616,460,799

$$J = x^2 - y^2$$

$$J \equiv x^2 - y^2 \pmod{100}$$

$$99 \equiv x^2 - y^2 \pmod{100}$$

J = 8,616,460,799

$$J = x^2 - y^2$$

$$J \equiv x^2 - y^2 \pmod{100}$$

$$99 \equiv x^2 - y^2 \pmod{100}$$

$$y^2 + 99 \equiv x^2 \pmod{100}$$

J = 8,616,460,799

$$J = x^2 - y^2$$

$$J \equiv x^2 - y^2 \pmod{100}$$

$$99 \equiv x^2 - y^2 \pmod{100}$$

$$y^2 + 99 \equiv x^2 \pmod{100}$$

$$y^2 \equiv x^2 - 99 \pmod{100}$$

・ロト・西ト・西ト・西ト・日・シック

J = 8,616,460,799

$$J = x^2 - y^2$$

$$J \equiv x^2 - y^2 \pmod{100}$$

$$99 \equiv x^2 - y^2 \pmod{100}$$

$$y^2 + 99 \equiv x^2 \pmod{100}$$

$$y^2 \equiv x^2 - 99 \pmod{100}$$

$$y^2 \equiv x^2 + 1 \pmod{100}$$

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆三▶ ◆三▶ ○三 のへぐ

J = 8,616,460,799

$$J = x^2 - y^2$$

$$J \equiv x^2 - y^2 \pmod{100}$$

$$99 \equiv x^2 - y^2 \pmod{100}$$

$$y^2 + 99 \equiv x^2 \pmod{100}$$

$$y^2 \equiv x^2 - 99 \pmod{100}$$

 $y^2 \equiv x^2 + 1 \pmod{100}$

Golomb's Works Mod 100

$$x^2 + 1 \equiv y^2 \pmod{100}$$

All squares mod 100:

 $\{00, 01, 04, 09, 16, 21, 24, 25, 29, 36, 41, 44, 49\} \cup$

 $\{56, 61, 64, 69, 76, 81, 84, 89, 96\}$

The only pairs which differ by 1 are (00,01) and (24,25). So either:

1. $x^2 \equiv 0$, so x mod $100 \in \{10, 20, 30, 40, 50, 60, 70, 80, 90\}$, OR

2. $x^2 \equiv 24$, so x mod $100 \in \{18, 32, 68, 82\}$.

So

 $x \mod 100 \in \{10, 18, 20, 30, 32, 40, 50, 60, 68, 70, 80, 90\}$

ション ふゆ アメリア メリア しょうくしゃ

More Restrictions on *x*

Since
$$J = x^2 - y^2$$
, $x^2 = J + y^2$, so
 $x \ge \left\lceil \sqrt{J} \right\rceil = 92824$

▲□▶▲□▶▲目▶▲目▶ 目 のへで

More Restrictions on *x*

Since
$$J = x^2 - y^2$$
, $x^2 = J + y^2$, so
 $x \ge \left\lceil \sqrt{J} \right\rceil = 92824$

Since
$$J = x^2 - y^2$$
, $x^2 - J = y^2$, hence

$$x^2 - J = y^2$$
 a square

▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲目▶ ▲目▶ 目 のへの

We seek x, y such that $J = x^2 - y^2$.



We seek x, y such that $J = x^2 - y^2$.

1) x mod 100 \in {10, 18, 20, 30, 32, 40, 50, 60, 68, 70, 80, 82, 90}

We seek x, y such that $J = x^2 - y^2$.

1) x mod 100 \in {10, 18, 20, 30, 32, 40, 50, 60, 68, 70, 80, 82, 90}

*ロト *昼 * * ミ * ミ * ミ * のへぐ

2) *x* ≥ 92824

We seek x, y such that $J = x^2 - y^2$.

1) x mod 100 \in {10, 18, 20, 30, 32, 40, 50, 60, 68, 70, 80, 82, 90}

2) *x* ≥ 92824

3) $x^2 - J$ is a square.
Golomb Factors Jevons' Number: $x^2 \ge J$

1. $x \pmod{100} \in \{10, 18, 20, 30, 32, 40, 50, 60, 68, 80, 82, 90\}.$

ション ふゆ アメリア メリア しょうくしゃ

- 2. $x \ge \left\lceil \sqrt{J} \right\rceil = 92824.$
- 3. $x^2 J = y^2$, a square.

Golomb Factors Jevons' Number: $x^2 \ge J$

1. $x \pmod{100} \in \{10, 18, 20, 30, 32, 40, 50, 60, 68, 80, 82, 90\}.$

2.
$$x \ge |\sqrt{J}| = 92824$$
.
3. $x^2 - J = y^2$, a square.

X	$y = (x^2 - J)^{1/2}$
92830	973.7
92832	1148.6
92840	1674.7
92850	2159.1
92860	2553.1
92868	2829.2
92880	3199

▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲三▶ ▲三▶ 三三 - のへぐ

Golomb Factors Jevons' Number: $x^2 \ge J$

1. $x \pmod{100} \in \{10, 18, 20, 30, 32, 40, 50, 60, 68, 80, 82, 90\}.$

2.
$$x \ge \left| \sqrt{J} \right| = 92824.$$

3. $x^2 - J = y^2$, a square.

X	$y = (x^2 - J)^{1/2}$
92830	973.7
92832	1148.6
92840	1674.7
92850	2159.1
92860	2553.1
92868	2829.2
92880	3199

AH-HA! We take x = 92880, y = 3199.

$$92880^{2} - 3199^{2} = 8,616,460,799$$

(92880 - 3199)(92880 + 3199) = 8,616,460,799
(89681)(96079) = 8,616,460,799 $\xrightarrow{}$

▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲ 臣▶ ▲ 臣▶ ― 臣 … のへぐ

Did Jevons ask any mathematicians about this?

Did Jevons ask any mathematicians about this?

1. Jevons worked in logic and knew De Morgan.

Did Jevons ask any mathematicians about this?

- 1. Jevons worked in logic and knew De Morgan.
- 2. Jevons argued with Hermann von Helmholtz about non-Euclidean Geometry.

Did Jevons ask any mathematicians about this?

- 1. Jevons worked in logic and knew De Morgan.
- 2. Jevons argued with Hermann von Helmholtz about non-Euclidean Geometry.
- 3. **Upshot** He was in contact with math people and could have found a number theorist to ask. But he seems not to have.

Did Jevons ask any mathematicians about this?

- 1. Jevons worked in logic and knew De Morgan.
- 2. Jevons argued with Hermann von Helmholtz about non-Euclidean Geometry.
- 3. **Upshot** He was in contact with math people and could have found a number theorist to ask. But he seems not to have.

Did Jevons know about the work of Charles Babbage?

Did Jevons ask any mathematicians about this?

- 1. Jevons worked in logic and knew De Morgan.
- 2. Jevons argued with Hermann von Helmholtz about non-Euclidean Geometry.
- 3. **Upshot** He was in contact with math people and could have found a number theorist to ask. But he seems not to have.
- Did Jevons know about the work of Charles Babbage?
 - 1. Charles Babbage and Ada Lovelace were early computer scientists who worked together. (Calling them **computer scientists** is whiggish history.)

Did Jevons ask any mathematicians about this?

- 1. Jevons worked in logic and knew De Morgan.
- 2. Jevons argued with Hermann von Helmholtz about non-Euclidean Geometry.
- 3. **Upshot** He was in contact with math people and could have found a number theorist to ask. But he seems not to have.
- Did Jevons know about the work of Charles Babbage?
 - 1. Charles Babbage and Ada Lovelace were early computer scientists who worked together. (Calling them **computer scientists** is whiggish history.)
 - Charles Babbage also worked in Theology and wrote The Ninth Bridgewater Treatise. Jevons intended to write The Tenth Bridgewater Treatise.

Did Jevons ask any mathematicians about this?

- 1. Jevons worked in logic and knew De Morgan.
- 2. Jevons argued with Hermann von Helmholtz about non-Euclidean Geometry.
- 3. **Upshot** He was in contact with math people and could have found a number theorist to ask. But he seems not to have.
- Did Jevons know about the work of Charles Babbage?
 - 1. Charles Babbage and Ada Lovelace were early computer scientists who worked together. (Calling them **computer scientists** is whiggish history.)
 - Charles Babbage also worked in Theology and wrote The Ninth Bridgewater Treatise. Jevons intended to write The Tenth Bridgewater Treatise.
 - 3. **Upshot** He knew who Babbage was and could have asked his opinion. But he seems not to have.

▲□▶▲圖▶▲≣▶▲≣▶ ■ のへの

 Jevons could have asked mathematicians about the Jevons' Number, but didn't.

▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲目▶ ▲目▶ - 目 - のへで

 Jevons could have asked mathematicians about the Jevons' Number, but didn't.

▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲三▶ ▲三▶ 三三 - のへぐ

2. Jevons could have asked computer scientists (Babbage, Lovelace) about the Jevons' Number, but didn't.

- Jevons could have asked mathematicians about the Jevons' Number, but didn't.
- 2. Jevons could have asked computer scientists (Babbage, Lovelace) about the Jevons' Number, but didn't.
- 3. Jevons thought that since he couldn't have factored the Jevons' Numbers if it was just given to him, nobody could.

▲ロ ▶ ▲ □ ▶ ▲ □ ▶ ▲ □ ▶ ▲ □ ▶ ● ○ ○ ○

- Jevons could have asked mathematicians about the Jevons' Number, but didn't.
- 2. Jevons could have asked computer scientists (Babbage, Lovelace) about the Jevons' Number, but didn't.
- 3. Jevons thought that since he couldn't have factored the Jevons' Numbers if it was just given to him, nobody could.

▲ロ ▶ ▲ □ ▶ ▲ □ ▶ ▲ □ ▶ ▲ □ ▶ ● ○ ○ ○

He was wrong

- Jevons could have asked mathematicians about the Jevons' Number, but didn't.
- 2. Jevons could have asked computer scientists (Babbage, Lovelace) about the Jevons' Number, but didn't.
- 3. Jevons thought that since he couldn't have factored the Jevons' Numbers if it was just given to him, nobody could.

ション ふゆ アメリア メリア しょうくしゃ

He was wrong

A lesson for us all!

Eric's Opinion

Eric, one of the 2020 TA's, when proof reading these slides, said the following:

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆ 臣▶ ◆ 臣▶ ○臣 ○ のへぐ

Eric's Opinion

Eric, one of the 2020 TA's, when proofreading these slides, said the following:

1. Reasonable that he didn't realize that computers would get so much better.

▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲目▶ ▲目▶ 三日 - のへの

Eric's Opinion

Eric, one of the 2020 TA's, when proofreading these slides, said the following:

- 1. Reasonable that he didn't realize that computers would get so much better.
- Foolish since J = 8,616,460,799 isn't THAT big. Someone with enough determination could divide J by 2,3,..., [√J]. This is only [√J] = 92825 trial divisions. Leave it to you to see if this is reasonable to finish in (say) 1 year.

Eric's Opinion of Jevons

Eric is double majoring in Math and Economics.



Eric is double majoring in Math and Economics.

When he proofread these slides he emailed me:

I've heard of Jevons before because he's also an economist. I am not surprised that he claimed J could not be factored, because the Modus Operandi of 19th century economists is to make bold predictions that are totally wrong.

ション ふゆ アメリア メリア しょうくしゃ

Conjecture Jevons was arrogant. Likely true.

Conjecture Jevons was arrogant. Likely true. **Conjecture** We have the arrogance of hindsight.

▲ロト ▲ 同 ト ▲ 国 ト → 国 - の Q ()

Conjecture Jevons was arrogant. Likely true. **Conjecture** We have the arrogance of hindsight.

It's easy for us to say

What a moron! He should have asked a Number Theorist

Conjecture Jevons was arrogant. Likely true. **Conjecture** We have the arrogance of hindsight.

- It's easy for us to say
- What a moron! He should have asked a Number Theorist

What was he going to do, Google Number Theorist ?

Conjecture Jevons was arrogant. Likely true. **Conjecture** We have the arrogance of hindsight.

- It's easy for us to say
- What a moron! He should have asked a Number Theorist
 - What was he going to do, Google Number Theorist ?

It's easy for us to say

Conjecture Jevons was arrogant. Likely true. **Conjecture** We have the arrogance of hindsight.

It's easy for us to say

What a moron! He should have asked a Number Theorist

What was he going to do, Google Number Theorist ?

It's easy for us to say

What a moron! He should have asked a Babbage or Lovelace

Conjecture Jevons was arrogant. Likely true. **Conjecture** We have the arrogance of hindsight.

It's easy for us to say

What a moron! He should have asked a Number Theorist

What was he going to do, Google Number Theorist ?

It's easy for us to say

What a moron! He should have asked a Babbage or Lovelace

We know about the role of computers to speed up calculations, but it's reasonable it never dawned on him.

Conjecture Jevons was arrogant. Likely true. **Conjecture** We have the arrogance of hindsight.

It's easy for us to say

What a moron! He should have asked a Number Theorist

What was he going to do, Google Number Theorist ?

It's easy for us to say

What a moron! He should have asked a Babbage or Lovelace

We know about the role of computers to speed up calculations, but it's reasonable it never dawned on him.

Conclusion

- His arrogance: assumed the world would not change much.
- Our arrogance: knowing how much the world did change.

Factoring Algorithms

<ロト < 置 > < 置 > < 置 > < 置 > の < @</p>

We only consider algorithms that, given N, find a non-trivial factor of N.

▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲ 臣▶ ▲ 臣▶ ― 臣 … のへぐ

- We only consider algorithms that, given N, find a non-trivial factor of N.
- We measure the run time as a function of lg N which is the length of the input. We may use L for this.

*ロ * * @ * * ミ * ミ * ・ ミ * の < や

- We only consider algorithms that, given N, find a non-trivial factor of N.
- We measure the run time as a function of lg N which is the length of the input. We may use L for this.
- ▶ We count +, -, ×, ÷ as ONE step. A more refined analysis would count them as (lg x)² steps where x is the largest number you are dealing with.

- We only consider algorithms that, given N, find a non-trivial factor of N.
- We measure the run time as a function of lg N which is the length of the input. We may use L for this.
- ▶ We count +, -, ×, ÷ as ONE step. A more refined analysis would count them as (lg x)² steps where x is the largest number you are dealing with.

We leave out the O-of but always mean O-of
Recall Factoring Algorithm Ground Rules

- We only consider algorithms that, given N, find a non-trivial factor of N.
- We measure the run time as a function of lg N which is the length of the input. We may use L for this.
- ▶ We count +, -, ×, ÷ as ONE step. A more refined analysis would count them as (lg x)² steps where x is the largest number you are dealing with.
- We leave out the O-of but always mean O-of
- We leave out the *expected time* but always mean it. Our algorithms are randomized.

▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲ 臣▶ ▲ 臣▶ ― 臣 … のへぐ

1. Input(N)

<□▶ <□▶ < □▶ < □▶ < □▶ < □▶ < □ > ○ < ○

 Input(N)
For x = 2 to ⌊N^{1/2}⌋ If x divides N then return x (and jump out of loop!).

*ロ * * @ * * ミ * ミ * ・ ミ * の < や

This takes time $N^{1/2} = 2^{L/2}$.

 Input(N)
For x = 2 to ⌊N^{1/2}⌋ If x divides N then return x (and jump out of loop!).

This takes time $N^{1/2} = 2^{L/2}$.

Goal Do much better than time $N^{1/2}$.

 Input(N)
For x = 2 to ⌊N^{1/2}⌋ If x divides N then return x (and jump out of loop!).

This takes time $N^{1/2} = 2^{L/2}$.

Goal Do much better than time $N^{1/2}$. **How Much Better?** Ignoring (1) constants, (2) the lack of proofs of the runtimes, and (3) cheating a byte, we have:

 Input(N)
For x = 2 to ⌊N^{1/2}⌋ If x divides N then return x (and jump out of loop!).

This takes time $N^{1/2} = 2^{L/2}$.

Goal Do much better than time $N^{1/2}$. **How Much Better?** Ignoring (1) constants, (2) the lack of proofs of the runtimes, and (3) cheating a byte, we have:

• Easy:
$$N^{1/2} = 2^{L/2}$$
.

 Input(N)
For x = 2 to ⌊N^{1/2}⌋ If x divides N then return x (and jump out of loop!).

This takes time
$$N^{1/2} = 2^{L/2}$$
.

Goal Do much better than time $N^{1/2}$. **How Much Better?** Ignoring (1) constants, (2) the lack of proofs of the runtimes, and (3) cheating a byte, we have:

ション ふぼう メリン メリン しょうくしゃ

• Easy:
$$N^{1/2} = 2^{L/2}$$
.

• Pollard-Rho Algorithm: $N^{1/4} = 2^{L/4}$.

 Input(N)
For x = 2 to ⌊N^{1/2}⌋ If x divides N then return x (and jump out of loop!).

This takes time
$$N^{1/2} = 2^{L/2}$$
.

Goal Do much better than time $N^{1/2}$. **How Much Better?** Ignoring (1) constants, (2) the lack of proofs of the runtimes, and (3) cheating a byte, we have:

ション ふぼう メリン メリン しょうくしゃ

• Easy:
$$N^{1/2} = 2^{L/2}$$
.

- Pollard-Rho Algorithm: $N^{1/4} = 2^{L/4}$.
- Quad Sieve: $N^{1/L^{1/2}} = 2^{L^{1/2}}$.

 Input(N)
For x = 2 to ⌊N^{1/2}⌋ If x divides N then return x (and jump out of loop!).

This takes time
$$N^{1/2} = 2^{L/2}$$
.

Goal Do much better than time $N^{1/2}$. **How Much Better?** Ignoring (1) constants, (2) the lack of proofs of the runtimes, and (3) cheating a byte, we have:

• Easy:
$$N^{1/2} = 2^{L/2}$$
.

- Pollard-Rho Algorithm: $N^{1/4} = 2^{L/4}$.
- Quad Sieve: $N^{1/L^{1/2}} = 2^{L^{1/2}}$.

• Number Field Sieve (best known): $N^{1/L^{2/3}} = 2^{L^{1/3}}$.

BILL STOP RECORDING

<□▶ <□▶ < □▶ < □▶ < □▶ < □▶ < □ > ○ < ○