
AN F5 ALGORITHM FOR TROPICAL GRÖBNER BASES IN THE WEYL ALGEBRAS

A PREPRINT

Ari Dwi Hartanto*
Department of Mathematics,
Faculty of Mathematics and Natural Sciences,
Universitas Gadjah Mada, INDONESIA
ari@ugm.ac.id

Katsuyoshi Ohara
Faculty of Mathematics and Physics,
Kanazawa University, JAPAN
ohara@se.kanazawa-u.ac.jp

December 25, 2023

ABSTRACT

A Gröbner basis computation for the Weyl algebra with respect to a tropical term order and by using a homogenization-dehomogenization technique is sufficiently sluggish. A significant number of reductions to zero occur. To improve the computation, a tropical F5 algorithm is developed for this context. As a member of the family of signature-based algorithms, this algorithm keeps track of where Weyl algebra elements come from to anticipate reductions to zero. The total order for ordering module monomials or signatures in this paper is designed as close as possible to the definition of the tropical term order. As in Vaccon et al. (2021), this total order is not compatible with the tropical term order.

Keywords Gröbner basis · signature · syzygy · tropical term order · valuation · Weyl algebra

1 Introduction

The theory of tropical geometry has developed in the past few decades. Some researchers developed this theory in some aspects; for instance, the aspect of theory and its applications (Maclagan and Sturmfels (2015)), a theory of tropical differential algebra (Falkensteiner et al. (2020)), and a theory of tropicalization on D-ideals (Hsiao (2023)). Tropical geometry can be related to the theory of Gröbner basis, especially the computational characterization of tropical variety. A computational theory of tropical Gröbner basis was developed by Chan and Maclagan (Chan and Maclagan (2019)) in 2019. This theory undergoes further development. In Vaccon and Yokoyama (2017) and in Vaccon et al. (2021), Vaccon et.al. presented a tropical F5 algorithm for polynomial rings $K[x_1, \dots, x_n]$. Furthermore, in Hartanto and Ohara, the computational theory of tropical Gröbner basis was extended to the Weyl algebras. A homogenization-dehomogenization technique was used, and the Buchberger algorithm was applied in this computation. We remark that this computational method needs to be enhanced, as too many reductions to zero affect a slow computation. Many of those zero reductions are known as “useless reductions.”

In 2002, Faugère introduced an algorithm called the F5 algorithm (see Faugère (2002)). This algorithm is based on signatures in the form of the leading monomials of the polynomial module representations, and then it is called a signature-based algorithm. It was proven that this algorithm is able to reduce useless reductions. Next, many researchers worked to understand the criterion behind the F5 algorithm and to develop signature-based algorithms. Some results can be seen in: Eder (2008a), Eder (2008b), Eder and Perry (2010), Arri and Perry (2011), G2V (Gao et al. (2010a)), GVW (Gao et al. (2010b)), SB (Roune and Stillman (2012)), and the F5 algorithm in tropical settings (Vaccon and Yokoyama (2017), Vaccon et al. (2021)).

*Corresponding author

In this paper, we present a tropical F5 algorithm to compute a tropical Gröbner basis on the homogenized Weyl algebra $D_n^{(h)}(K)$ over a field K with a valuation. Based on Hartanto and Ohara, once a Gröbner basis $G^{(h)}$ in $D_n^{(h)}(K)$ is obtained, we can perform the dehomogenization process to obtain the corresponding Gröbner basis G in the Weyl algebra $D_n(K)$. As a signature-based algorithm, the tropical F5 algorithm requires a total order on the module $(D_n^{(h)})^N$ for ordering module monomials or signatures. We define a total order \leq_{sign} on module R^N which is almost similar to the definition \leq_{sign} in the paper of Vaccon et al. (2021). In Vaccon et al. (2021), the theory utilizes a vector space filtration. The vector space filtration is mainly used for defining signature of a polynomial. The theory utilizing the vector space filtration requires the commutative property of the used ring, whereas our ring, $D_n^{(h)}(K)$, is non-commutative. However, if we deeply observe the flow of the main theory of their F5 algorithm, especially in the F5 criterion, it actually follows the theory of the F5 algorithm in Arri and Perry (2011) and the tropical F5 algorithm in Vaccon and Yokoyama (2017). In this paper, we develop an F5 algorithm to compute a tropical Gröbner basis in $D_n^{(h)}(K)$ by using a total order \leq_{sign} defined as similar as possible to the definition \leq_{sign} in Vaccon et al. (2021) and by following the flow of the theory in Arri and Perry (2011) and in Vaccon and Yokoyama (2017).

2 Term Ordering and Gröbner bases

For convenience of the readers, we begin with a glance introduction to the Weyl algebras.

2.1 The Weyl algebras over fields with valuations

Let K be a field of characteristic 0. We equip the field K with a valuation which is defined as a function $\text{val} : K^* \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ satisfying $\text{val}(ab) = \text{val}(a) + \text{val}(b)$ and $\text{val}(a + b) \geq \min(\text{val}(a), \text{val}(b))$. For example, in the field of rational functions $\mathbb{Q}(t)$, consider f/g with the Taylor series $at^m + (\text{higher order terms})$. We can define $\text{val}(f/g) := m$, a valuation of f/g . Another example is the p -adic valuation defined in the field \mathbb{Q} , where p is a prime number. For a non-zero rational number q expressed by $q = p^m \frac{a}{b}$, where $m \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ and $a, b \in \mathbb{Z}$, $b \neq 0$ such that p does not divide both a and b , the p -adic valuation of q is $\text{val}(q) := m$.

The Weyl algebra over K , denoted by $D_n(K)$ or by D_n , is the algebra $K\langle x_1, \dots, x_n, \partial_1, \dots, \partial_n \rangle$ which is generated by operators $x_i, \partial_i \in \text{End}_K(K[x])$ given by, respectively, $f(x) \mapsto x_i f(x)$ and $f(x) \mapsto \frac{\partial}{\partial x_i} f(x) := \partial_i f(x)$, $1 \leq i \leq n$. These operators satisfy the following relations:

$$\begin{aligned} x_j x_i - x_i x_j &= 0 \text{ and } \partial_j \partial_i - \partial_i \partial_j = 0 && \text{for } 1 \leq i, j \leq n; \\ \partial_i x_j - x_j \partial_i &= 0 && \text{for } 1 \leq i \neq j \leq n; \\ \partial_i x_i - x_i \partial_i &= 1 && \text{for } 1 \leq i \leq n. \end{aligned}$$

By the canonical K -vector space basis $\{x^\alpha \partial^\beta \mid \alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^n\} \subset D_n(K)$, any operator $f \in D_n(K)$ can be written as a finite sum $f = \sum_{\alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^n} c_{\alpha\beta} x^\alpha \partial^\beta$.

2.2 Tropical term orders and tropical Gröbner bases

We define a K -vector space isomorphism $\Psi : D_n(K) \rightarrow K[x, \xi]$ given by $x^\alpha \partial^\beta \mapsto x^\alpha \xi^\beta$. The notation $K[x, \xi]$ means the polynomial ring $K[x_1, \dots, x_n, \xi_1, \dots, \xi_n]$ with $2n$ indeterminates. For any $f \in D_n(K)$, we call $\Psi(f)$ the *total symbol* of f . We denote \mathcal{M}_ξ and \mathcal{T}_ξ , respectively, the set of all monomials $\{x^\alpha \xi^\beta \mid \alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^n\}$ and the set of all terms $\{cx^\alpha \xi^\beta \mid c \in K^*, \alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^n\}$ in $K[x, \xi]$.

We recall the definition of *tropical term order* \leq on \mathcal{T}_ξ from the paper (in preprint) of Hartanto and Ohara as follows.

Definition 1 Let \preceq be a monomial order on \mathcal{M}_ξ and $w, \omega \in \mathbb{R}^{2n}$ such that $w_i \geq 0$ and $(\max_{1 \leq j \leq n} w_j) < w_{n+i}$, $1 \leq i \leq n$. For $ax^\alpha \xi^\beta, bx^{\alpha'} \xi^{\beta'} \in \mathcal{T}_\xi$, we write:

- (1) $ax^\alpha \xi^\beta < bx^{\alpha'} \xi^{\beta'}$ if and only if:
 - (i) $w \cdot (\alpha, \beta) < w \cdot (\alpha', \beta')$; or
 - (ii) $w \cdot (\alpha, \beta) = w \cdot (\alpha', \beta')$ and $-\text{val}(a) + \omega \cdot (\alpha, \beta) < -\text{val}(b) + \omega \cdot (\alpha', \beta')$; or
 - (iii) $w \cdot (\alpha, \beta) = w \cdot (\alpha', \beta')$ and $-\text{val}(a) + \omega \cdot (\alpha, \beta) = -\text{val}(b) + \omega \cdot (\alpha', \beta')$ and $x^\alpha \xi^\beta \prec x^{\alpha'} \xi^{\beta'}$;
- (2) $ax^\alpha \xi^\beta = bx^{\alpha'} \xi^{\beta'}$ if and only if $\text{val}(a) = \text{val}(b)$ and $(\alpha, \beta) = (\alpha', \beta')$.

If we restrict our ring to $K[x] \subset K[x, \xi]$ and set $w = (\mathbf{0}; \mathbf{1})$ and $\omega = -1 \cdot (u, v)$ for some $u, v \in \mathbb{R}^n$, then \leq is a tropical term order on $K[x]$ with respect to u as in Chan and Maclagan (2019).

Let $f \in D_n$ and $ax^\tau \xi^\sigma \in \mathcal{T}_\xi$ the biggest term of the total symbol $\Psi(f)$ with respect to $<$. The leading term, the leading monomial, and the leading coefficient of $\Psi(f)$, respectively, is defined as $\text{LT}(f) := ax^\tau \xi^\sigma$, $\text{LM}(f) := x^\tau \xi^\sigma$, and $\text{LC}(f) := a$. We then define $\text{LT}(f) := \text{LT}(\Psi(f))$, $\text{LM}(f) := \text{LM}(\Psi(f))$, and $\text{LC}(f) := \text{LC}(\Psi(f))$. For a non-empty subset $G \subseteq D_n(K)$, we define $\text{LM}(G) := \{\text{LM}(g) \mid g \in G\}$.

Definition 2 A non-empty subset $G \subset D_n(K)$ is called a (tropical) Gröbner basis of a left ideal $I \subset D_n(K)$ if $D_n G = I$ and $\langle \text{LM}(G) \rangle = \langle \text{LM}(I) \rangle$.

We introduce a new variable h which commutes with all x_i and ∂_i , and define the homogenized Weyl algebra $D_n^{(h)}(K) := K[h] \langle x_1, \dots, x_n, \partial_1, \dots, \partial_n \rangle$ as a ring extension of $D_n(K)$. The homogenization of $f = \sum_{(\alpha, \beta) \in \mathcal{E}} c_{\alpha\beta} x^\alpha \partial^\beta \in D_n(K)$, $\mathcal{E} \subset \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^n \times \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^n$ is

$$H(f) := \sum_{(\alpha, \beta) \in \mathcal{E}} c_{\alpha\beta} x^\alpha \partial^\beta h^{M-|\alpha|-|\beta|} \in D_n^{(h)}(K)$$

where $M = \max_{(\alpha, \beta) \in \mathcal{E}} (|\alpha| + |\beta|)$ and $|\alpha| := \alpha_1 + \dots + \alpha_n$. The non-commutative relation on $D_n^{(h)}(K)$ is defined by $\partial_i x_i := x_i \partial_i + h^2$ to keep the result homogeneous.

The K -vector space isomorphism Ψ is extended to be

$$\begin{aligned} \Psi_h : D_n^{(h)}(K) &\longrightarrow K[h, x, \xi] \\ h^\gamma x^\alpha \partial^\beta &\mapsto h^\gamma x^\alpha \xi^\beta. \end{aligned}$$

The set of all monomials and the set of all terms of $K[h, x, \xi]$ are denoted by $\mathcal{M}_\xi^{(h)}$ and $\mathcal{T}_\xi^{(h)}$, respectively. For any $g = \sum_{(\gamma, \alpha, \beta) \in \mathcal{E}} c_{\gamma\alpha\beta} h^\gamma x^\alpha \partial^\beta$ for some $\mathcal{E} \subset \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0} \times \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^n \times \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^n$, we define the set $\text{mon}(g) := \{h^\gamma x^\alpha \partial^\beta \mid (\gamma, \alpha, \beta) \in \mathcal{E}, c_{\gamma\alpha\beta} \neq 0\}$ and the support $\text{supp}(g) = \{(\gamma, \alpha, \beta) \in \mathcal{E} \mid c_{\gamma\alpha\beta} \neq 0\}$. The tropical term order \leq on \mathcal{T}_ξ induces the tropical term order \leq_h on $\mathcal{T}_\xi^{(h)}$ as follows.

Definition 3 For $ah^\gamma x^\alpha \xi^\beta, bh^{\gamma'} x^{\alpha'} \partial^{\beta'} \in \mathcal{T}_\xi^{(h)}$, we write:

- (1) $ah^\gamma x^\alpha \xi^\beta <_h bh^{\gamma'} x^{\alpha'} \xi^{\beta'}$ if and only if:
 - (i) $\deg(h^\gamma x^\alpha \xi^\beta) < \deg(h^{\gamma'} x^{\alpha'} \xi^{\beta'})$ or
 - (ii) $\deg(x^\alpha \partial^\beta h^\gamma) = \deg(x^{\alpha'} \partial^{\beta'} h^{\gamma'})$ and $ax^\alpha \partial^\beta < bx^{\alpha'} \partial^{\beta'}$;
- (2) $ah^\gamma x^\alpha \xi^\beta =_h bh^{\gamma'} x^{\alpha'} \xi^{\beta'}$ if and only if $\text{val}(a) = \text{val}(b)$ and $(\alpha, \beta, \gamma) = (\alpha', \beta', \gamma')$.

With respect to $<_h$, we define $\text{LT}_h(f) := \text{LT}_h(\Psi_h(f))$, $\text{LM}_h(f) := \text{LM}_h(\Psi_h(f))$, and $\text{LC}_h(f) := \text{LC}_h(\Psi_h(f))$ for any $f \in D_n^{(h)}(K)$.

In Hartanto and Ohara, we can compute a Gröbner basis of a left ideal $I \subset D_n(K)$ by utilizing the homogenized Weyl algebra $D_n^{(h)}(K)$. Let $\mathcal{F} = \{f_1, \dots, f_N\}$ be a generating set of I . We use the Buchberger algorithm with the input $\{H(f_1), \dots, H(f_N)\}$, where $H(f_i)$ is the homogenization of f_i . Once we obtain a Gröbner basis $G^{(h)} = \{g_1^{(h)}, \dots, g_m^{(h)}\}$ in $D_n^{(h)}(K)$, we can get a Gröbner basis G in $D_n(K)$ by the dehomogenization process, i.e., $G := \{g_{i|_{h=1}}^{(h)} \mid i = 1, \dots, m\}$.

3 Syzygies and Signatures

From now on, the ring $D_n^{(h)}(K)$ is denoted by R_n or just by R if there is no ambiguity. Let $\mathcal{F} = \{f_1, \dots, f_N\}$ be a generating set of a left ideal I in R , and write $\mathcal{F}_k := \{f_1, \dots, f_k\}$, $1 \leq k \leq N$. Let G_k be a Gröbner basis of the left ideal $I_k := R\mathcal{F}_k$ in R . In this paper, we are going to compute Gröbner bases G_i 's increasingly by using an F5 algorithm. We start from the Gröbner basis $G_1 = \{f_1\}$ of I_1 . We then compute a Gröbner basis G_k of I_k by using some information of the previous computed Gröbner bases G_1, \dots, G_{k-1} , $2 \leq k \leq N$.

We assume that f_k 's are ordered increasingly by \leq_h on $\text{LT}_h(f_k)$'s. We also assume that for $2 \leq j \leq N$, the generating set \mathcal{F}_j is such that no term of f_j is divisible by an element of $\text{LM}_h(G_{j-1})$. We can use the tropical division algorithm (Algorithm 1 in Hartanto and Ohara) to divide f_j by G_{j-1} if there is a term of $\Psi_h(f_j)$ which is divisible by an element of $\text{LM}_h(G_{j-1})$.

3.1 Syzygies

Now, consider the module $R^N := \{(a_1, \dots, a_N) \mid a_i \in R, 1 \leq i \leq N\}$ over R . We know that $R^N = \bigoplus_{i=1}^N R\mathbf{e}_i$ is a free module with the canonical basis $\{\mathbf{e}_1, \dots, \mathbf{e}_N\}$. This implies that every $\mathbf{a} \in R^N$ can be uniquely written as $\mathbf{a} = \sum_{i=1}^N a_i \mathbf{e}_i$ for some $a_1, \dots, a_N \in R$. Moreover, it can be uniquely (up to an order of the terms) expressed as $\mathbf{a} = \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{(\gamma, \alpha, \beta)} c_{\gamma, \alpha, \beta} h^\gamma x^\alpha \partial^\beta \mathbf{e}_i$ for some $c_{\gamma, \alpha, \beta} \in K^*$, and $h^\gamma x^\alpha \partial^\beta \in \mathcal{M}^{(h)}$, where $\mathcal{M}^{(h)} := \{h^\gamma x^\alpha \partial^\beta \mid \gamma \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}, \alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^n\} \subset R$. We define a K -vector space isomorphism

$$\begin{aligned} \Phi : R^N &\longrightarrow (K[h, x, \xi])^N \\ h^\gamma x^\alpha \partial^\beta \mathbf{e}_i &\mapsto h^\gamma x^\alpha \xi^\beta \mathbf{e}_i \end{aligned}$$

and write $\mathbb{M}_\xi := \{h^\gamma x^\alpha \xi^\beta \mathbf{e}_i \mid \gamma \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}, \alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^n, 1 \leq i \leq N\}$ and $\mathbb{T}_\xi := \{c h^\gamma x^\alpha \xi^\beta \mathbf{e}_i \mid c \in K^*, \gamma \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}, \alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^n, 1 \leq i \leq N\}$.

A module element $\mathbf{g} = (g_1, \dots, g_N) \in R^N$ is said to be *homogeneous* if g_i is homogeneous for all $1 \leq i \leq N$. The total degrees of g_i 's need not be equal.

Definition 4 Let $\nu : R^N \rightarrow I$ be the surjective R -module homomorphism given by $\mathbf{e}_i \mapsto \mathbf{f}_i$. Any element $\mathbf{a} = (a_1, \dots, a_N)$ in $\ker(\nu)$ is called a *syzygy* of \mathcal{F} . This means that $\sum_{i=1}^N a_i \mathbf{f}_i = 0$. The set of all syzygies of \mathcal{F} is denoted by $\text{Syz}(\mathcal{F})$. Hence, $\text{Syz}(\mathcal{F}) = \ker(\nu)$.

Definition 5 Let $\mathbf{a} = (a_1, \dots, a_N)$ be a syzygy of \mathcal{F} and $i \in \{1, \dots, N\}$ an index such that $a_i \neq 0$ and $a_j = 0$ for all $j > i$. The module monomial $\text{LM}_h(a_i) \mathbf{e}_i \in \mathbb{M}_\xi$ is called the *leading monomial* of the syzygy \mathbf{a} .

We write $\text{LSyz}(\mathcal{F})$ the submodule of $(K[h, x, \xi])^N$ generated by the leading monomials of syzygies of \mathcal{F} . The set $\text{NS}(\text{Syz}(\mathcal{F})) := \mathbb{M}_\xi \setminus \text{LSyz}(\mathcal{F})$ is called the *normal set* of the syzygies of \mathcal{F} .

Example 1 To provide a simple example, let us consider the polynomial ring $\mathbb{Q}[x, y, z]$ over the field \mathbb{Q} with 2-adic valuation. We use the tropical term order \leq_h (restricted to $\mathbb{Q}[x, y, z]$) defined by the weight vectors $w = (1, 1, 1)$, $\omega = (-1, -1, -1)$, and the lexicographical order $<$ with $x \succ y \succ z$. Let $\mathcal{F} = \{\mathbf{f}_1 = z, \mathbf{f}_2 = y, \mathbf{f}_3 = x^2\} \subset \mathbb{Q}[x, y, z]$.

- The module element $\mathbf{a} = (-x^2 + y, -x^2 - z, y + z) \in (\mathbb{Q}[x, y, z])^3$ is a non-homogeneous syzygy since $\nu(\mathbf{a}) = 0$ and $a_1 = -x^2 + y$ is non-homogeneous. The leading monomial of the syzygy \mathbf{a} is $y\mathbf{e}_3$.
- The syzygy $\mathbf{b} = -x^2 \mathbf{e}_2 + y \mathbf{e}_3$ is a homogeneous syzygy since $\nu(\mathbf{b}) = 0$ and both $-x^2$ and y are homogeneous. The leading monomial of the syzygy \mathbf{b} is $y\mathbf{e}_3$.

3.2 Signatures

In the classical signature-based algorithm (see: Eder and Faugère (2017) for example), the (minimal) signature of a polynomial $f \in K[x]$ is defined as the minimal element of the set $\{\text{LM}_{<_m}(f) \mid f \in (K[x])^N, \nu(f) = f\}$ for some total order \leq_m on the set of module monomials of $(K[x])^N$. Usually, the total order \leq_m on $(K[x])^N$ needs to be compatible to the corresponding monomial order on $K[x]$, namely \preceq_m , in the sense that $m_1 \preceq_m m_2$ if and only if $m_1 \mathbf{e}_i \leq_m m_2 \mathbf{e}_i$ for any monomials m_1 and m_2 in $K[x]$ (see: Convention 2.1 (a) in Eder and Faugère (2017)).

Following Vaccon et al. (2021), we are going to define the signature of an operator $f \in R$ to be a module element of \mathbb{M}_ξ instead of a module term of \mathbb{T}_ξ . Therefore, a total order on \mathbb{M}_ξ is needed.

Definition 6 Recall \preceq a monomial order on \mathcal{M}_ξ from Definition 1.

Let $h^\gamma x^\alpha \xi^\beta \mathbf{e}_i, h^{\gamma'} x^{\alpha'} \xi^{\beta'} \mathbf{e}_j \in \mathbb{M}_\xi$. We write $h^\gamma x^\alpha \xi^\beta \mathbf{e}_i \leq_{\text{sign}} h^{\gamma'} x^{\alpha'} \xi^{\beta'} \mathbf{e}_j$ if:

- (1) $i < j$, or
- (2) $i = j$ and $\deg(h^\gamma x^\alpha \xi^\beta) < \deg(h^{\gamma'} x^{\alpha'} \xi^{\beta'})$, or
- (3) $i = j$ and $\deg(h^\gamma x^\alpha \xi^\beta) = \deg(h^{\gamma'} x^{\alpha'} \xi^{\beta'})$ and $w \cdot (\alpha, \beta) < w \cdot (\alpha', \beta')$, or
- (4) $i = j$ and $\deg(h^\gamma x^\alpha \xi^\beta) = \deg(h^{\gamma'} x^{\alpha'} \xi^{\beta'})$ and $w \cdot (\alpha, \beta) = w \cdot (\alpha', \beta')$ and:
 - (a) $h^\gamma x^\alpha \xi^\beta \mathbf{e}_i \notin \text{LSyz}(\mathcal{F})$ and $h^{\gamma'} x^{\alpha'} \xi^{\beta'} \mathbf{e}_i \in \text{LSyz}(\mathcal{F})$, or
 - (b) $h^\gamma x^\alpha \xi^\beta \mathbf{e}_i, h^{\gamma'} x^{\alpha'} \xi^{\beta'} \mathbf{e}_i \in \text{LSyz}(\mathcal{F})$ and $x^\alpha \xi^\beta \preceq x^{\alpha'} \xi^{\beta'}$, or
 - (c) $h^\gamma x^\alpha \xi^\beta \mathbf{e}_i, h^{\gamma'} x^{\alpha'} \xi^{\beta'} \mathbf{e}_i \notin \text{LSyz}(\mathcal{F})$ and $x^\alpha \xi^\beta \preceq x^{\alpha'} \xi^{\beta'}$.

The clauses (2), (3), and (4) in Definition 6 are designed as similar as possible to Definition 3. In detail, the clause (2) and (3) correspond to the clause (i) in Definition 3 and the clause (i) in Definition 1, respectively. In both Definition 6 and Definition 3, we use the same monomial order \prec as a tie-breaker. We recall a remark from Vaccon et al. (2021) with some adjustments for the context in this paper.

Remark 1 The order \prec_{sign} defined in Definition 6 may not satisfy Convention 2.1 (a) in Eder and Faugère (2017): it may happen that $h^\gamma x^\alpha \xi^\beta \prec_h h^{\gamma'} x^{\alpha'} \xi^{\beta'}$, and yet that $h^\gamma x^\alpha \xi^\beta \mathbf{e}_i \succ_{\text{sign}} h^{\gamma'} x^{\alpha'} \xi^{\beta'} \mathbf{e}_i$. This condition will happen if $h^{\gamma'} x^{\alpha'} \xi^{\beta'} \mathbf{e}_i \notin \text{LSyz}(\mathcal{F})$ and $h^\gamma x^\alpha \xi^\beta \mathbf{e}_i \in \text{LSyz}(\mathcal{F})$, or if both lie in or out of $\text{LSyz}(\mathcal{F})$ and $x^{\alpha'} \xi^{\beta'} \prec x^\alpha \xi^\beta$.

We identify some special parts of a module element $\mathbf{f} \in R^N$. For $\mathbf{f} \in R^N$, we define $\text{LT}_{\text{sign}}(\mathbf{f})$ to be the biggest module term of $\Phi(\mathbf{f})$. Moreover, we define $\text{LM}_{\text{sign}}(\mathbf{f})$ to be the module monomial corresponding to $\text{LT}_{\text{sign}}(\mathbf{f})$ and $\text{LC}_{\text{sign}}(\mathbf{f})$ the corresponding coefficient. Here, the subscript “sign” indicates the use of the total order \leq_{sign} .

Proposition 1 Let $\mathbf{s} = a\sigma\mathbf{e}_i + g'\mathbf{e}_i + \sum_{j=1}^{i-1} g_j\mathbf{e}_j$ be a syzygy of \mathcal{F} with leading monomial $\Psi_h(\sigma)\mathbf{e}_i$ and where $\sigma \notin \text{mon}(g')$. Then, $\text{LM}_{\text{sign}}(\mathbf{s}) = \Psi_h(\sigma)\mathbf{e}_i = \text{LM}_h(a\sigma + g')\mathbf{e}_i$.

Proof. It is clear $\text{LM}_h(a\sigma + g')\mathbf{e}_i = \Psi_h(\sigma)\mathbf{e}_i$, by definition of the leading monomial of a syzygy. This means that $\text{LT}_h(g') \prec_h \Psi_h(a\sigma)$.

By Definition 6, $\text{LM}_{\text{sign}}(\mathbf{s}) = \text{LM}_{\text{sign}}((a\sigma + g')\mathbf{e}_i)$. If $\text{LT}_h(g') \prec_h \Psi_h(a\sigma)$ occurs because of total degree (Definition 3) or of the clause (i) in Definition 1, then clearly we have $\text{LM}_{\text{sign}}(\mathbf{s}) = \text{LM}_{\text{sign}}((a\sigma + g')\mathbf{e}_i) = \text{LM}_h(a\sigma + g')\mathbf{e}_i$. Now, assume that $\text{LT}_h(g') \prec_h \Psi_h(a\sigma)$ occurs due to the clause (ii) or (iii) in Definition 1. If all module terms of $\Phi(g'\mathbf{e}_i)$ belong to $\text{NS}(\text{Syz}(\mathcal{F}))$, then by the fact that $\Psi_h(\sigma)\mathbf{e}_i \in \text{LSyz}(\mathcal{F})$ and by Definition 6 (4)(a), we get $\text{LM}_{\text{sign}}((a\sigma + g')\mathbf{e}_i) = \Psi_h(\sigma)\mathbf{e}_i$. If there is a module term of $\Phi(g'\mathbf{e}_i)$ lies in $\text{LSyz}(\mathcal{F})$, then we must have $\text{LM}_{\text{sign}}((a\sigma + g')\mathbf{e}_i) = \Psi_h(\sigma)\mathbf{e}_i$ because both \prec_{sign} and \prec use the same tie-breaker, i.e., \prec . \square

Definition 7 A module element $\mathbf{f} \in R^N$ with $\nu(\mathbf{f}) \neq 0$ is said to be *clean* if the total symbol $\Phi(\mathbf{f})$ has no terms belonging to $\text{LSyz}(\mathcal{F})$.

In the proof of Proposition 3, we reduce iteratively an element of R^N by some syzygies until the corresponding reduction result has no terms belonging to $\text{LSyz}(\mathcal{F})$. We worry about the termination of these reductions due to the involvement of the valuations of coefficients on the term order \leq_h . To ensure that the reductions terminate in finite steps, we provide Algorithm 1 to explain our reductions algorithmically. This algorithm is not a part of our main algorithm (the F5 algorithm) in this paper; rather, it is only used to demonstrate that we can reduce a module element by a subset of $\text{Syz}(\mathcal{F})$. In this algorithm, we use écart function $E(f, g) = \#(\text{supp}(g) \setminus \text{supp}(f))$, where $f, g \in R$.

Algorithm 1: Reduction of a module element by syzygies — REDBYSYZ(\mathbf{g}, i)

Input: A homogeneous $\mathbf{g} = (g_1, \dots, g_N) \in R^N$; and an index $i, 1 \leq i \leq N$, such that $g_i \neq 0$.

Output: $\mathbf{g}' = (g'_1, \dots, g'_N) \in R^N$ such that $\nu(\mathbf{g}') = \nu(\mathbf{g})$ and no module term of $\Phi(g'_i\mathbf{e}_i)$ lies in $\text{LSyz}(\mathcal{F})$

- 1 $S = \{\mathbf{s} = (s_1^{(1)}, \dots, s_i^{(1)}, 0, \dots, 0) \in \text{Syz}(\mathcal{F}) \mid \mathbf{s} \text{ is homogeneous, } \deg(s_i) = \deg(g_i), \text{LC}_h(s_i^{(l)}) = 1\}$
- 2 $T \leftarrow S$
- 3 $P \leftarrow \emptyset$
- 4 $\mathbf{q}^{(0)} \leftarrow \mathbf{g} - (0, \dots, 0, g_{i+1}, \dots, g_N)$
- 5 $\mathbf{r}^{(0)} \leftarrow (0, \dots, 0, g_{i+1}, \dots, g_N)$
- 6 $j \leftarrow 0; a \leftarrow 0$
- 7 **While** $q_i^{(j)} \neq 0$ **do**
- 8 **If** there is no $\mathbf{t} = (t_1, \dots, t_i, 0, \dots, 0) \in T$ with $\text{LM}_h(t_i)\mathbf{e}_i = \text{LM}_h(q_i^{(j)})\mathbf{e}_i$ **then**
- 9 $\mathbf{r}^{(j+1)} \leftarrow \mathbf{r}^{(j)} + \Psi_h^{-1}(\text{LT}_h(q_i^{(j)}))\mathbf{e}_i$
- 10 $\mathbf{q}^{(j+1)} \leftarrow \mathbf{q}^{(j)} - \Psi_h^{-1}(\text{LT}_h(q_i^{(j)}))\mathbf{e}_i$
- 11 $h_{l,j+1} \leftarrow h_{l,j}$ for all $1 \leq l \leq a$
- 12 $T \leftarrow T \cup \{\mathbf{q}^{(j)}\}$
- 13 **else**
- 14 **Choose** $\mathbf{t} = (t_1, \dots, t_i, 0, \dots, 0) \in T$ with $\text{LM}_h(t_i)\mathbf{e}_i = \text{LM}_h(q_i^{(j)})\mathbf{e}_i$ and with $E(q_i^{(j)}, t_i)$ minimal among all such choices.
- 15 **If** $E(q_i^{(j)}, t_i) > 0$ **then**
- 16 $T \leftarrow T \cup \{\mathbf{q}^{(j)}\}$

Property (iii) holds for the stages $\leq j$, we get $-\text{val}(c_j) + \omega \cdot (\alpha, \beta) < -\text{val}(c_k) + \omega \cdot (\alpha, \beta)$. Then, we get $\text{val}(c_j) > \text{val}(c_k)$, and hence, $\text{val}(c) = \text{val}(c_j \cdot c_k^{-1}) > 0$. As a consequence, we get $1 - c \neq 0$.

Note that we have $\mathbf{g} = \mathbf{q}^{(j)} + \left(\sum_{\mathbf{s}^{(l)} \in P_{(j)}} h_{l,j} \mathbf{s}^{(l)} \right) + \mathbf{r}^{(j)}$ and $\mathbf{g} = \mathbf{q}^{(k)} + \left(\sum_{\mathbf{s}^{(l)} \in P_{(k)}} h_{l,k} \mathbf{s}^{(l)} \right) + \mathbf{r}^{(k)}$, where $P_{(k)}$ indicates the set P at stage k . Since $k < j$, we have $P_{(k)} \subseteq P_{(j)}$. Then, for $j + 1$, we get

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{q}^{(j+1)} &= (1 - c)^{-1}(\mathbf{q}^{(j)} - c \mathbf{q}^{(k)}) \\ &= (1 - c)^{-1} \left[\left(\mathbf{g} - \left(\sum_{\mathbf{s}^{(l)} \in P} h_{l,j} \mathbf{s}^{(l)} \right) - \mathbf{r}^{(j)} \right) - c \left(\mathbf{g} - \left(\sum_{\mathbf{s}^{(l)} \in P} h_{l,k} \mathbf{s}^{(l)} \right) - \mathbf{r}^{(k)} \right) \right] \\ &= \mathbf{g} - \left(\sum_{\mathbf{s}^{(l)} \in P} (1 - c)^{-1} (h_{l,j} - c h_{l,k}) \mathbf{s}^{(l)} \right) - (1 - c)^{-1} (\mathbf{r}^{(j)} - c \mathbf{r}^{(k)}) \\ &= \mathbf{g} - \left(\sum_{\mathbf{s}^{(l)} \in P} h_{l,j+1} \mathbf{s}^{(l)} \right) - \mathbf{r}^{(j+1)} \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, Property (i) holds. Since no module term of both $\Phi(r_i^{(j)} \mathbf{e}_i)$ and $\Phi(r_i^{(k)} \mathbf{e}_i)$ belongs to $\text{LSyz}(\mathcal{F})$, Property (ii) clearly holds. By the fact that $\text{val}(-c) > 0 = \text{val}(1)$, we obtain $\text{val}(1 - c) = \min(\text{val}(1), \text{val}(-c)) = \text{val}(1) = 0$. Then, $\text{LT}_h(q_i^{(j+1)}) = {}_h\text{LT}_h((1 - c)^{-1} q_i^{(j)}) <_h \text{LT}_h(q_i^{(j)})$.

Now, look at Line 38 of the algorithm. The i^{th} entry of $\mathbf{q}^{(j)}$ is zero, and all module terms of $\Phi(r_i^{(j)} \mathbf{e}_i)$ lies out of $\text{LSyz}(\mathcal{F})$. Thus, no module term of $\Phi(g'_i \mathbf{e}_i)$ lies in $\text{LSyz}(\mathcal{F})$. By Property (i), we get

$$\nu(\mathbf{g}') = \nu(\mathbf{q}^{(j)} + \mathbf{r}^{(j)}) = \nu\left(\mathbf{g} - \left(\sum_{\mathbf{s}^{(l)} \in P} h_{l,j+1} \mathbf{s}^{(l)} \right)\right) = \nu(\mathbf{g}).$$

(Termination proof) The algorithm will terminate when the condition $q_i^{(j')} = 0$ holds, that is equivalently $\text{supp}(q_i^{(j')}) = \emptyset$. We need to prove that this condition occurs for some positive integer j' . Note that the algorithm only reduces the i^{th} entry of $\mathbf{q}^{(t)}$, i.e., $q_i^{(t)}$, by T iteratively, and we start with $\mathbf{q}^{(0)} := (g_1, \dots, g_i, 0, \dots, 0)$. Observe that this algorithm computes homogeneous operators $q_i^{(t)}$'s of the same degree, namely of degree d . We know that there are only a finite number of possible supports of homogeneous $q \in R$ of total degree d . Therefore, after enough steps, the supports $\text{supp}(q_i^{(t)})$'s for all the possible $\text{LM}_h(q_i^{(t)})$'s have been added to T as the i^{th} entry of $\mathbf{q}^{(t)}$'s. After that, if the minimal of the écart is non-zero, then some $\mathbf{q}^{(j)}$ is added to T . This contradicts the fact that there is some $\mathbf{q}^{(k)}$ added earlier with the same exact support of $q_i^{(k)}$ and the same leading monomial $\text{LM}_h(q_i^{(k)})$, which means that $E(q_i^{(j)}, q_i^{(k)}) = 0$. Then, after that point, all the minimal écart must be 0, and we obtain the inclusion $\text{supp}(q_i^{(j+1)}) \subseteq \text{supp}(q_i^{(j)})$. Moreover, we must have the strict inclusion $\text{supp}(q_i^{(j+1)}) \subsetneq \text{supp}(q_i^{(j)})$ since we vanish $\text{LM}_h(q_i^{(j)}) \mathbf{e}_i$. As the consequence, the remaining steps are finite. We will have $\mathbf{q}^{(j')}$ with $q_i^{(j')} = 0$, or equivalently $\text{supp}(q_i^{(j')}) = \emptyset$, for some positive integer j' . At this point, the process terminates. \square

Remark 2 The output of $\text{REDBYSYZ}(\mathbf{g}, i)$, namely $\mathbf{g}' = (g'_1, \dots, g'_N)$, satisfies $\text{LT}_h(g'_i) \leq_h \text{LT}_h(g_i)$. It is because the supports of g'_i come from g_i (see Line 4 and Line 9 of Algorithm 1) or from syzygies in S used as reducer (see Lines 2,14,19 of Algorithm 1). The corresponding terms must be $\leq_h \text{LT}_h(g_i)$; and if a sum of two terms with the same support (say in the sum $r_i^{(j)} + (-c)r_i^{(k)}$, see Line 36) occurs, then thanks to the sequences of Lemmata in (Section 3, Hartanto and Ohara), the corresponding result is $\leq_h \max(\text{LT}_h(r_i^{(j)}), r_i^{(k)})$. A multiplication by $(1 - c)^{-1}$ in Line 36 does not affect the ordering because $\text{val}((1 - c)^{-1}) = 0$.

Proposition 3 Any module element $\mathbf{g} = (g_1, \dots, g_N) \in R^N$ with $\nu(\mathbf{g}) \neq 0$ can be carried to be a clean module element, namely \mathbf{g}' , such that $\nu(\mathbf{g}') = \nu(\mathbf{g})$.

Proof. If \mathbf{g} is clean, then $\mathbf{g}' = \mathbf{g}$.

Now, assume that \mathbf{g} is not clean. We also assume that \mathbf{g} is homogeneous; otherwise, we can: write $\mathbf{g} = \sum_{k=1}^m \mathbf{q}^{(k)}$ for some homogeneous $\mathbf{q}^k \in R^N$ and integer $m > 1$, do the procedure below for each $\mathbf{q}^{(k)}$ to get clean module elements $\mathbf{q}'^{(k)}$'s, and then add them up to obtain a clean module element $\mathbf{g}' = \sum_{k=1}^m \mathbf{q}'^{(k)}$.

Since \mathbf{g} is not clean, $\Phi(\mathbf{g})$ has at least one term lies in $\text{LSyz}(\mathcal{F})$, namely $a\Psi_h(\sigma)\mathbf{e}_i$ the biggest one, where $a \in K^*$ and $\Psi_h(\sigma) \in \mathcal{M}_\xi^{(h)}$. Applying Algorithm 1, we obtain $\mathbf{g}^{(1)} := \text{REDBYSYZ}(\mathbf{g}, i)$ such that $\nu(\mathbf{g}^{(1)}) = \nu(\mathbf{g})$ and no module term of $\Phi(g_i^{(1)}\mathbf{e}_i)$ lies in $\text{LSyz}(\mathcal{F})$. Next, we apply Algorithm 1 to $\mathbf{g}^{(1)}$ and with argument $i - 1$ to obtain $\mathbf{g}^{(2)} := \text{REDBYSYZ}(\mathbf{g}^{(1)}, i - 1)$. At this point, we have $\nu(\mathbf{g}^{(2)}) = \nu(\mathbf{g}^{(1)}) = \nu(\mathbf{g})$; and for all $i - 1 \leq l \leq n$ with $g_l^{(2)} \neq 0$, no module term of $\Phi(g_l^{(2)}\mathbf{e}_l)$ lies in $\text{LSyz}(\mathcal{F})$. We continue this procedure iteratively for $i - 2, i - 3, \dots, 1$. Finally, we obtain $\mathbf{g}^{(i)} := \text{REDBYSYZ}(\mathbf{g}^{(i-1)}, 1)$ such that $\nu(\mathbf{g}^{(i)}) = \nu(\mathbf{g}^{(i-1)}) = \dots = \nu(\mathbf{g}^{(1)}) = \nu(\mathbf{g})$, and for all $1 \leq l \leq n$ with $g_l^{(i)} \neq 0$, no term of $\Psi_h(g_l^{(i)})$ lies in $\text{LSyz}(\mathcal{F})$. Thus, we get $\mathbf{g}' := \mathbf{g}^{(i)}$ as desired. \square

Corollary 4 Let $s = \alpha\sigma\mathbf{e}_i + f\mathbf{e}_i + \sum_{j=1}^{i-1} g_j\mathbf{e}_j$ be a syzygy of \mathcal{F} with leading monomial $\Psi_h(\sigma)\mathbf{e}_i$ and where $\sigma \notin \text{mon}(f)$. Then, there exists a syzygy $\alpha\sigma\mathbf{e}_i + \mathbf{g}'$ for some clean module element $\mathbf{g}' = g'_i\mathbf{e}_i + \sum_{j=1}^{i-1} g'_j\mathbf{e}_j \in R^N$, $\sigma \notin \text{mon}(g'_i)$, such that $\text{LT}_h(g'_i) <_h \Psi_h(\alpha\sigma)$ and $\text{LM}_{\text{sign}}(\mathbf{g}') <_{\text{sign}} \Phi(\sigma\mathbf{e}_i)$.

Proof. Write $\mathbf{g} = f\mathbf{e}_i + \sum_{j=1}^{i-1} g_j\mathbf{e}_j$. Since $\nu(s) = 0$, then $\nu(\mathbf{g}) \neq 0$. By Proposition 3, we get a clean module element \mathbf{g}' such that $\nu(\mathbf{g}') = \nu(\mathbf{g})$. We observe again the proof of Proposition 3 involving Algorithm 1 to obtain the clean module element $\mathbf{g}' = (g'_1, \dots, g'_N)$. Looking at “ $\mathbf{g}^{(1)} = \text{REDBYSYZ}(\mathbf{g}, i)$,” this reduction step is for obtaining a clean module element $g_i^{(1)}\mathbf{e}_i$ from $f\mathbf{e}_i$. Here, we get $g'_i := g_i^{(1)}$. By Remark 2, we have $\text{LT}_h(g_i^{(1)}) \leq_h \text{LT}_h(f)$. Hence, we have $\text{LT}_h(g'_i) \leq_h \text{LT}_h(f) <_h \Psi_h(\alpha\sigma)$. The proof that $\text{LM}_{\text{sign}}(\mathbf{g}') <_{\text{sign}} \Phi(\sigma\mathbf{e}_i)$ is straightforward because $\alpha\sigma\mathbf{e}_i + \mathbf{g}'$ is a syzygy, and \mathbf{g}' is clean; so that $\alpha\sigma\mathbf{e}_i$ is the only possible module term belonging to $\text{LSyz}(\mathcal{F})$. \square

What we can understand from Corollary 4 is that for every syzygy s with leading monomial $\Psi_h(\sigma)\mathbf{e}_i$, we can always find its corresponding syzygy, say $s' = \alpha\sigma\mathbf{e}_i + \mathbf{g}'$ with leading monomial $\Psi_h(\sigma)\mathbf{e}_i$, such that \mathbf{g}' is clean and $\text{LM}_{\text{sign}}(s') = \Psi_h(\sigma)\mathbf{e}_i$. The last equation, $\text{LM}_{\text{sign}}(s') = \Psi_h(\sigma)\mathbf{e}_i$, is consistent with what we have in Proposition 1.

Let $f \in I \setminus \{0\}$ and $\mathbf{f} \in R^N$ be such that $\nu(\mathbf{f}) = f$. The leading monomial $\text{LM}_{\text{sign}}(\mathbf{f})$ is called a *guessed signature* of f . The guessed signature of f is denoted by $\mathfrak{S}(f)$. The guessed signature of f is not unique.

Now, we are ready to define signatures.

Definition 8 For $f \in I \setminus \{0\}$, we define the *signature* of f to be

$$\mathfrak{s}(f) := \min_{w.r.t. \leq_{\text{sign}}} \{\text{LM}_{\text{sign}}(\mathbf{g}) \mid \mathbf{g} \in R^N \text{ such that } \nu(\mathbf{g}) = f\}$$

Remark 3 In practice — at the initialization part of Algorithm 2, for all $i \in \{1, \dots, N\}$, we set $\mathfrak{s}(f_i) = \mathbf{e}_i$. The module element \mathbf{e}_i is valid as the signature of f_i because $\nu(\mathbf{e}_i) = f_i$ and we have the assumption for \mathcal{F} at the second paragraph of Section 3

From Definition 8, the signature of f is obtained by taking the minimal of leading module monomials of such the \mathbf{g} 's with respect to \leq_{sign} without considering coefficients. As a consequence, for any $c \in K^*$, we have $\mathfrak{s}(f) = \mathfrak{s}(cf)$ as provided in the following proposition.

Proposition 5 Let $f \in I \setminus \{0\}$ and $c \in K^*$. Then, $\mathfrak{s}(cf) = \mathfrak{s}(f)$.

Proof. Let $\mathfrak{s}(f) = \Phi(\sigma\mathbf{e}_i)$ for some $\sigma \in \mathcal{M}_\xi^{(h)}$. This means that there exists $\mathbf{f} \in R^N$ such that: $\text{LM}_{\text{sign}}(\mathbf{f}) = \Phi(\sigma\mathbf{e}_i)$, $\nu(\mathbf{f}) = f$, and there is no $\mathbf{f}' \in R^N$ with $\text{LM}_{\text{sign}}(\mathbf{f}') <_{\text{sign}} \Phi(\sigma\mathbf{e}_i)$ such that $\nu(\mathbf{f}') = f$. On the other hand, let $\mathfrak{s}(cf) = \Phi(\tau\mathbf{e}_k)$. This means that there exists $\mathbf{g} \in R^N$ such that: $\text{LM}_{\text{sign}}(\mathbf{g}) = \Phi(\tau\mathbf{e}_k)$, $\nu(\mathbf{g}) = cf$, and there is no $\mathbf{g}' \in R^N$ with $\text{LM}_{\text{sign}}(\mathbf{g}') <_{\text{sign}} \Phi(\tau\mathbf{e}_k)$ such that $\nu(\mathbf{g}') = cf$. Suppose that $\Phi(\sigma\mathbf{e}_i) \neq \Phi(\tau\mathbf{e}_k)$.

Case-1: if $\Phi(\tau\mathbf{e}_k) <_{\text{sign}} \Phi(\sigma\mathbf{e}_i)$. From $\nu(\mathbf{g}) = cf$ and $\text{LM}_{\text{sign}}(\mathbf{g}) = \Phi(\tau\mathbf{e}_k)$, we get $\nu(c^{-1}\mathbf{g}) = f$ and $\text{LM}_{\text{sign}}(c^{-1}\mathbf{g}) = \Phi(\tau\mathbf{e}_k)$. This contradicts the minimality of $\mathfrak{s}(f)$.

Case-2: if $\Phi(\sigma\mathbf{e}_i) <_{\text{sign}} \Phi(\tau\mathbf{e}_k)$. From $\nu(\mathbf{f}) = f$ and $\text{LM}_{\text{sign}}(\mathbf{f}) = \Phi(\sigma\mathbf{e}_i)$, we get $\nu(c\mathbf{f}) = cf$ and $\text{LM}_{\text{sign}}(c\mathbf{f}) = \Phi(\sigma\mathbf{e}_i)$. This contradicts the minimality of $\mathfrak{s}(cf)$. \square

Proposition 6 The signature of $f \in I \setminus \{0\}$ lies in $\text{NS}(\text{Syz}(\mathcal{F}))$.

Proof. Let $\mathfrak{s}(f) = \Psi_h(\sigma)\mathbf{e}_i$ and $\mathbf{f} \in R^N$ be such that $\text{LM}_{\text{sign}}(\mathbf{f}) = \Psi_h(\sigma)\mathbf{e}_i$ and $\nu(\mathbf{f}) = f$, and there is no $\mathbf{q} \in R^N$ with $\nu(\mathbf{q}) = f$ and $\text{LM}_{\text{sign}}(\mathbf{q}) <_{\text{sign}} \Psi_h(\sigma)\mathbf{e}_i$. Suppose that $\Psi_h(\sigma)\mathbf{e}_i$ belongs to $\text{LSyz}(\mathcal{F})$. Then, there exists $\mathbf{g} = \text{LC}_{\text{sign}}(\mathbf{f})\sigma\mathbf{e}_i + g'\mathbf{e}_i + \sum_{j=1}^{i-1} r_j\mathbf{e}_j \in R^N$ where $g' \in R$, $\sigma \notin \text{mon}(g')$, $\text{LT}_h(g') <_h \text{LC}_{\text{sign}}(\mathbf{f})\Psi_h(\sigma)$, and $r_j \in R$, such that $\nu(\mathbf{g}) = 0$. We have $\nu(\mathbf{f} - \mathbf{g}) = f$, and in the subtraction $\mathbf{f} - \mathbf{g}$, the term $\text{LC}_{\text{sign}}(\mathbf{f})\sigma\mathbf{e}_i$ is vanished.

If $\text{LT}_h(g') <_h \text{LC}_{\text{sign}}(\mathbf{f})\Psi_h(\sigma)$ occurs because of total degree (the clause (i) in Definition 3) or w -weighted total degree (the clause (i) in Definition 1), then by Definition 6, we get $\text{LM}_{\text{sign}}(\mathbf{f} - \mathbf{g}) <_{\text{sign}} \Psi_h(\sigma)\mathbf{e}_i$. This contradicts the minimality of $\mathfrak{s}(f)$.

Now, assume that $\text{LT}_h(g') <_h \text{LC}_{\text{sign}}(\mathbf{f})\Psi_h(\sigma)$ occurs because of the clause (ii) or (iii) in Definition 1. If $\mathbf{f} - \mathbf{g}$ is not clean, then by Proposition 3, we can carry $\mathbf{f} - \mathbf{g}$ to be a clean module element \mathbf{f}' such that $\nu(\mathbf{f}') = \mathbf{f}$. By the assumption that $\Psi_h(\sigma)\mathbf{e}_i \in \text{LSyz}(\mathcal{F})$ and by the definition of \leq_{sign} , all terms of $\Phi(\mathbf{f}')$ are strictly smaller than $\Psi_h(\sigma)\mathbf{e}_i$ with respect to $<_{\text{sign}}$. Hence, $\text{LM}_{\text{sign}}(\mathbf{f}') <_{\text{sign}} \Psi_h(\sigma)\mathbf{e}_i = \mathfrak{s}(f)$. This contradicts the minimality of $\mathfrak{s}(f)$. \square

Proposition 7 *Let $t \in \mathcal{T}^{(h)}$ and $f \in I \setminus \{0\}$. Then,*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathfrak{s}(tf) <_{\text{sign}} \Psi_h(t)\mathfrak{s}(f) &\Leftrightarrow \Psi_h(t)\mathfrak{s}(f) \in \text{LSyz}(\mathcal{F}) \\ \mathfrak{s}(tf) = \Psi_h(t)\mathfrak{s}(f) &\Leftrightarrow \Psi_h(t)\mathfrak{s}(f) \in \text{NS}(\text{Syz}(\mathcal{F})). \end{aligned}$$

Proof. Let $\mathfrak{s}(f) = \Psi_h(\sigma)\mathbf{e}_i$. By the definition of signature, we have $f = \nu(\mathbf{f})$ for some $\mathbf{f} = a\sigma\mathbf{e}_i + \mathbf{f}'\mathbf{e}_i + \sum_{j=1}^{i-1} q_j\mathbf{e}_j \in R^N$, where $a \in K^*$, $\mathbf{f}' \in R$ with $\text{LM}_{\text{sign}}(\mathbf{f}'\mathbf{e}_i) <_{\text{sign}} \Psi_h(\sigma)\mathbf{e}_i$, and $q_j \in R$; and there is no $\mathbf{q} \in R^N$ such that $\nu(\mathbf{q}) = f$ and $\text{LM}_{\text{sign}}(\mathbf{q}) <_{\text{sign}} \Psi_h(\sigma)\mathbf{e}_i$. Here, we have $\nu(t\mathbf{f}) = t\mathbf{f}$ and $\text{LM}_{\text{sign}}(t\mathbf{f}) = \Psi_h(t)\Psi_h(\sigma)\mathbf{e}_i$.

If $\Psi_h(t)\Psi_h(\sigma)\mathbf{e}_i \in \text{LSyz}(\mathcal{F})$, then there exists $\mathbf{g} = a\sigma\mathbf{e}_i + \mathbf{g}'\mathbf{e}_i + \sum_{j=1}^{i-1} r_j\mathbf{e}_j \in R^N$ where $\mathbf{g}' \in R$ with $\text{LT}_h(g') <_h \Psi_h(a\sigma)$, $r_j \in R$, and $\nu(\mathbf{g}) = 0$. Since ν is homomorphism, we get $\nu(t\mathbf{f} - \mathbf{g}) = t\mathbf{f}$. The module term $a\sigma\mathbf{e}_i$ is vanished in the subtraction $t\mathbf{f} - \mathbf{g}$. If $t\mathbf{f} - \mathbf{g}$ is not clean, then we can carry it to be a clean module element \mathbf{f}^* such that $\nu(\mathbf{f}^*) = t\mathbf{f}$. By the hypothesis $\Psi_h(t)\Psi_h(\sigma)\mathbf{e}_i \in \text{LSyz}(\mathcal{F})$ and by the definition of \leq_{sign} , we have that all terms of $\Phi(\mathbf{f}^*)$ are strictly less than $\Psi_h(t)\Psi_h(\sigma)\mathbf{e}_i$ with respect to $<_{\text{sign}}$. Thus, we conclude that $\mathfrak{s}(tf) <_{\text{sign}} \Psi_h(t)\Psi_h(\sigma)\mathbf{e}_i = \Psi_h(t)\mathfrak{s}(f)$.

Now, assume that $\mathfrak{s}(tf) <_{\text{sign}} \Psi_h(t)\mathfrak{s}(f)$, and suppose that $\Psi_h(t)\mathfrak{s}(f) \in \text{NS}(\text{Syz}(\mathcal{F}))$. Let \mathbf{h} be an element of R^N such that $\nu(\mathbf{h}) = t\mathbf{f}$, $\text{LM}_{\text{sign}}(\mathbf{h}) = \mathfrak{s}(tf)$, and there is no $\mathbf{q} \in R^N$ with $\nu(\mathbf{q}) = t\mathbf{f}$ and $\text{LM}_{\text{sign}}(\mathbf{q}) <_{\text{sign}} \text{LM}_{\text{sign}}(\mathbf{h})$. We may assume that both $t\mathbf{f}$ and \mathbf{h} are clean; otherwise, bring it to be clean module elements by using Proposition 3. We have $\nu(t\mathbf{f} - \mathbf{h}) = t\mathbf{f} - t\mathbf{f} = 0$, and hence, $t\mathbf{f} - \mathbf{h}$ is a syzygy. This contradicts the fact that $t\mathbf{f} - \mathbf{h}$ is clean.

The second statement of the lemma follows the first statement. \square

The one-to-one correspondence between $\text{LM}_h(I \setminus \{0\})$ and $\text{NS}(\text{Syz}(\mathcal{F}))$ presented in Proposition 9 plays an important role in the next section. To prove this proposition, we need the following lemma.

Lemma 8 *Let $f, g \in I \setminus \{0\}$ be such that $\mathfrak{s}(f) = \mathfrak{s}(g) = \sigma\mathbf{e}_i$ and $\text{LM}_h(f) \neq \text{LM}_h(g)$. Then, there exist $a, b \in K^*$ such that $\mathfrak{s}(af + bg) <_{\text{sign}} \sigma\mathbf{e}_i$.*

Proof. Since $\mathfrak{s}(f) = \mathfrak{s}(g) = \sigma\mathbf{e}_i$, there exist $\mathbf{f}, \mathbf{g} \in R^N$ such that $\nu(\mathbf{f}) = f$, $\nu(\mathbf{g}) = g$, and $\text{LM}_{\text{sign}}(\mathbf{f}) = \text{LM}_{\text{sign}}(\mathbf{g}) = \sigma\mathbf{e}_i$ is minimal among all such module elements \mathbf{f} and \mathbf{g} . Set $a = \text{LC}_{\text{sign}}(\mathbf{g})$ and $b = -\text{LC}_{\text{sign}}(\mathbf{f})$. Then, $\nu(a\mathbf{f} + b\mathbf{g}) = a\mathbf{f} + b\mathbf{g} \neq 0$ since $\text{LM}_h(f) \neq \text{LM}_h(g)$, and $\text{LT}_{\text{sign}}(a\mathbf{f}) + \text{LT}_{\text{sign}}(b\mathbf{g}) = \mathbf{0}$. We get $\text{LM}_{\text{sign}}(a\mathbf{f} + b\mathbf{g}) <_{\text{sign}} \sigma\mathbf{e}_i$, and hence, $\mathfrak{s}(af + bg) <_{\text{sign}} \sigma\mathbf{e}_i$. \square

Proposition 9 *The function*

$$\begin{aligned} \Omega : \text{LM}_h(I \setminus \{0\}) &\longrightarrow \text{NS}(\text{Syz}(\mathcal{F})) \\ m &\mapsto \min_{\leq_{\text{sign}}} \{\mathfrak{s}(f) \mid f \in I \setminus \{0\} \text{ with } \text{LM}_h(f) = m\} \end{aligned}$$

is bijective.

Proof. Suppose that there exist $m_1, m_2 \in \text{LM}_h(I \setminus \{0\})$ and $\sigma\mathbf{e}_i \in \text{NS}(\text{LSyz}(\mathcal{F}))$ such that $m_1 \neq m_2$ and $\Omega(m_1) = \sigma\mathbf{e}_i = \Omega(m_2)$. Then, there exist $f, g \in I \setminus \{0\}$ such that $\text{LM}_h(f) = m_1$, $\text{LM}_h(g) = m_2$, and $\mathfrak{s}(f) = \mathfrak{s}(g) = \sigma\mathbf{e}_i$ is minimal among all such f and g . By Lemma 8, there exist $a, b \in K^*$ such that $\mathfrak{s}(af + bg) <_{\text{sign}} \sigma\mathbf{e}_i$. Note that $\text{LT}_h(a\mathbf{f} + b\mathbf{g}) = \max(\text{LT}_h(a\mathbf{f}), \text{LT}_h(b\mathbf{g}))$. Assume that $\text{LT}_h(a\mathbf{f} + b\mathbf{g}) = \text{LT}_h(a\mathbf{f})$. We have $\text{LM}_h(a\mathbf{f}) = m_1$. Thus, we have the operator $a\mathbf{f} + b\mathbf{g}$ with $\text{LM}_h(a\mathbf{f} + b\mathbf{g}) = m_1$ and $\Omega(m_1) <_{\text{sign}} \sigma\mathbf{e}_i$, contradicting the choice of such the operator f with $\text{LM}_h(f) = m_1$ such that $\mathfrak{s}(f)$ is minimal.

Now, let $\tau\mathbf{e}_j \in \text{NS}(\text{Syz}(\mathcal{F}))$, and set

$$A = \{m \in \mathcal{M}_\xi^{(h)} \mid \exists g \in I \setminus \{0\}, \text{LM}_h(g) = m, \mathfrak{s}(g) = \tau\mathbf{e}_j\}.$$

This set is not empty since $\text{LT}_h(\tau\mathbf{f}_j)$ belongs to A . Write $t = \min(A)$ with respect to \leq_h . Then, we have an operator $g \in I \setminus \{0\}$ with $\text{LM}_h(g) = t$ and with $\mathfrak{s}(g) = \tau\mathbf{e}_j$. Suppose that $\Omega(t) <_{\text{sign}} \tau\mathbf{e}_j$. Then, there exists $g' \in I \setminus \{0\}$ such that $\text{LM}_h(g') = t$ and $\mathfrak{s}(g') <_{\text{sign}} \tau\mathbf{e}_j$. Since $\text{LM}_h(g) = \text{LM}_h(g') = t$, there exist $a, b \in K^*$ such that $\text{LM}_h(ag + bg') <_h t$. Moreover, since $\mathfrak{s}(g') <_{\text{sign}} \mathfrak{s}(g) = \tau\mathbf{e}_j$, we have $\mathfrak{s}(ag + bg') = \tau\mathbf{e}_j$. Both facts $\text{LM}_h(ag + bg') <_h t$ and $\mathfrak{s}(ag + bg') = \tau\mathbf{e}_j$ contradict the minimality of t . \square

4 \mathfrak{s} -Gröbner bases

Before we discuss the theory of \mathfrak{s} -Gröbner bases, we need to understand the notion of \mathfrak{s} -top reduction and \mathfrak{s} -top-irreducibility.

4.1 \mathfrak{s} -top-reduction

An \mathfrak{s} -top-reduction of a non-zero $f \in I$ by a non-zero $g \in I$ with respect to a given monomial module $\sigma \mathbf{e}_i$ is more specific than the classical reduction. When $\sigma \mathbf{e}_i = \mathfrak{s}(f)$, the \mathfrak{s} -top-reductions preserve the signature from any changes during reductions. As consequence, we can keep track of where an element of I come from.

Definition 9 Let $f, g \in I \setminus \{0\}$, $q \in I$, and $\sigma \mathbf{e}_i \in \mathbb{M}_\xi$. We say that f \mathfrak{s} -top-reduces to q by g with respect to $\sigma \mathbf{e}_i$ if there exists $t \in \mathcal{T}^{(h)}$ such that:

- (i) $\text{LM}_h(tg) = \text{LM}_h(f)$;
- (ii) $\mathfrak{s}(tg) <_{\text{sign}} \sigma \mathbf{e}_i$.

The operator g is called \mathfrak{s} -top-reducer for f with respect to $\sigma \mathbf{e}_i$. In addition, if $\sigma \mathbf{e}_i$ is not specified, then we mean that $\sigma \mathbf{e}_i = \mathfrak{s}(f)$.

Definition 10 We say that $f \in I$ is \mathfrak{s} -top-irreducible with respect to $\sigma \mathbf{e}_i$ if $f = 0$ or there is no \mathfrak{s} -top-reducer $g \in I \setminus \{0\}$ for f with respect to $\sigma \mathbf{e}_i$.

The concept of \mathfrak{s} -top-irreducibility gives rise to the following theorem and its corollary.

Theorem 10 Let $f \in I$ be such that f is \mathfrak{s} -top-irreducible with respect to $\sigma \mathbf{e}_i \in \mathbb{M}_\xi$, and f is of the form $f = \nu((\Psi_h^{-1}(a\sigma) + g)\mathbf{e}_i + \sum_{j=1}^{i-1} q_j \mathbf{e}_j)$ for some $a \in K^*$, $q_i, g \in R$ with $\text{LT}_h(g) <_h a\sigma$ and $\sigma \notin \text{mon}(g)$. Then,

$$f = 0 \quad \text{if and only if} \quad \sigma \mathbf{e}_i \in \text{LSyz}(\mathcal{F}).$$

In addition, if $f \neq 0$, then $\sigma \mathbf{e}_i = \mathfrak{s}(f) = \Omega(\text{LM}_h(f))$.

Proof. (\Rightarrow). If $0 = f = \nu((\Psi_h^{-1}(a\sigma) + g)\mathbf{e}_i + \sum_{j=1}^{i-1} q_j \mathbf{e}_j)$, then $\sigma \mathbf{e}_i \in \text{LSyz}(\mathcal{F})$.

(\Leftarrow). Let $\sigma \mathbf{e}_i \in \text{LSyz}(\mathcal{F})$. Suppose that $f \neq 0$. Let $m = \text{LM}_h(f)$ and $\tau \mathbf{e}_k = \Omega(m)$. Here, we have $\Omega(m) <_{\text{sign}} \sigma \mathbf{e}_i$. From the fact that $\Omega(m) = \tau \mathbf{e}_k$, there exists $q \in I$ such that $\text{LM}_h(q) = m$ and $\mathfrak{s}(q) = \tau \mathbf{e}_k$. Since $\tau \mathbf{e}_k <_{\text{sign}} \sigma \mathbf{e}_i$, q is an \mathfrak{s} -top-reducer for f with respect to $\sigma \mathbf{e}_i$. This contradicts the hypothesis. Thus, we get $f = 0$.

For the second statement, assume that $f \neq 0$. We claim that $\sigma \mathbf{e}_i \in \text{NS}(\text{Syz}(\mathcal{F}))$. To prove this claim, suppose that $\sigma \mathbf{e}_i \in \text{LSyz}(\mathcal{F})$. Let $m = \text{LM}_h(f)$ and $\tau \mathbf{e}_k = \Omega(m)$. Then, there exists $q \in I$ such that $\text{LM}_h(q) = m$ and $\mathfrak{s}(q) = \tau \mathbf{e}_k$. Here, q is an \mathfrak{s} -top-reducer for f with respect to $\sigma \mathbf{e}_i$, contradicting the hypothesis. Thus, we must have $\sigma \mathbf{e}_i \in \text{NS}(\text{Syz}(\mathcal{F}))$.

Since $\sigma \mathbf{e}_i \in \text{NS}(\text{Syz}(\mathcal{F}))$ and $f = \nu((\Psi_h^{-1}(a\sigma) + g)\mathbf{e}_i + \sum_{j=1}^{i-1} q_j \mathbf{e}_j)$, we get $\sigma \mathbf{e}_i = \mathfrak{s}(f)$. Now, suppose that $\sigma \mathbf{e}_i \neq \Omega(\text{LM}_h(f))$. Then, we must have $\Omega(\text{LM}_h(f)) <_{\text{sign}} \sigma \mathbf{e}_i$. There exists $q \in I$ such that $\text{LM}_h(q) = \text{LM}_h(f)$ and $\mathfrak{s}(q) = \Omega(\text{LM}_h(f))$. Since $\Omega(\text{LM}_h(f)) <_{\text{sign}} \sigma \mathbf{e}_i$, q is an \mathfrak{s} -top-reducer for f with respect to $\sigma \mathbf{e}_i$. This contradicts the hypothesis. \square

Corollary 11 A non-zero $f \in I$ is \mathfrak{s} -top-irreducible with respect to $\mathfrak{s}(f)$ if and only if $\mathfrak{s}(f) = \Omega(\text{LM}_h(f))$.

Proof. If $f \neq 0$ and f is \mathfrak{s} -top-irreducible with respect to $\mathfrak{s}(f)$, then by the second statement of Theorem 10, we get $\mathfrak{s}(f) = \Omega(\text{LM}_h(f))$. Conversely, if $\mathfrak{s}(f) = \Omega(\text{LM}_h(f))$, then by the definition of Ω , clearly f is \mathfrak{s} -top-irreducible with respect to $\mathfrak{s}(f)$. \square

For the \mathfrak{s} -top-reduction in Definition 9, we can also say “ f \mathfrak{s} -top-reduces regularly to q by g with respect to $\sigma \mathbf{e}_i$.” Another type of reduction is defined as follows.

Definition 11 Let $f, g \in I \setminus \{0\}$, $q \in I$, and $\sigma \mathbf{e}_i \in \mathbb{M}_\xi$. We say that f \mathfrak{s} -top-reduces singularly to q by g with respect to $\sigma \mathbf{e}_i$ if there exists $t \in \mathcal{T}^{(h)}$ such that:

- (i) $\text{LM}_h(tg) = \text{LM}_h(f)$;
- (ii) $\mathfrak{s}(tg) = \sigma \mathbf{e}_i$.

The operator g is called a *singular \mathfrak{s} -top-reducer* for f with respect to $\sigma \mathbf{e}_i$. If $\sigma \mathbf{e}_i$ is not specified, then we mean that $\sigma \mathbf{e}_i = \mathfrak{s}(f)$.

Let $f, g \in I \setminus \{0\}$ and $q \in I$ be such that f \mathfrak{s} -top-reduces singularly to q by g with respect to $\mathfrak{s}(f)$. It means that there exists $t \in \mathcal{T}^{(h)}$ such that the axioms (i) and (ii) in Definition 11 hold. Let

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{f} &= a \Phi^{-1}(\mathfrak{s}(f)) + (\text{lower module terms w.r.t. } <_{\text{sign}}) \quad \text{and} \\ \mathbf{h} &= b \Phi^{-1}(\mathfrak{s}(tg)) + (\text{lower module terms w.r.t. } <_{\text{sign}}) \end{aligned}$$

be elements of R^N such that $a, b \in K^*$, $\nu(\mathbf{f}) = f$, $\nu(\mathbf{h}) = tg$, $\text{LM}_{\text{sign}}(\mathbf{f}) = \mathfrak{s}(f)$, and $\text{LM}_{\text{sign}}(\mathbf{h}) = \mathfrak{s}(tg) = \mathfrak{s}(f)$. In this reduction, we have $\mathbf{f} - t\mathbf{g} = \mathbf{q}$, and its corresponding module representation is $\mathbf{f} - \mathbf{h} = \mathbf{q}$, where $\mathbf{q} \in R^N$ satisfies $\nu(\mathbf{q}) = q$. Since $\mathfrak{s}(f) = \mathfrak{s}(tg)$, we have either $\text{LM}_{\text{sign}}(\mathbf{q}) = \mathfrak{s}(f)$ or $\text{LM}_{\text{sign}}(\mathbf{q}) <_{\text{sign}} \mathfrak{s}(f)$.

Remark 4 Consider again what we have in the paragraph above.

- (i) The case $\text{LM}_{\text{sign}}(\mathbf{q}) = \mathfrak{s}(f)$ occurs when $a - b \neq 0$. The meaningful of this case is that the reduction process preserves the signature.
- (ii) The case $\text{LM}_{\text{sign}}(\mathbf{q}) <_{\text{sign}} \mathfrak{s}(f)$ occurs when $a - b = 0$. Such the reduction is not allowed in our computation because it will change the signature, and we are not able anymore to track of where the operator q come from.

4.2 \mathfrak{s} -Gröbner bases

In this sub-section, we present a theory of \mathfrak{s} -Gröbner basis. We are going to show that once we have an \mathfrak{s} -Gröbner basis, we automatically also have a Gröbner basis.

Definition 12 A non-empty subset $G \subset I$ is called an \mathfrak{s} -Gröbner basis of I if $RG = I$ and for every \mathfrak{s} -top-irreducible $f \in I \setminus \{0\}$, there exists $g \in G$ and $m \in \mathcal{M}^{(h)}$ such that:

- (i) $\text{LM}_h(mg) = \text{LM}_h(f)$ and
- (ii) $\Psi_h(m)\mathfrak{s}(g) = \mathfrak{s}(f)$.

In particular, we have the following definition.

Definition 13 A non-empty subset $G \subset I$ is called an \mathfrak{s} -Gröbner basis for I in signature $\sigma \mathbf{e}_k$ (up to signature $\sigma \mathbf{e}_k$, resp.) if $RG = I_k$ and for every \mathfrak{s} -top-irreducible $f \in I_k \setminus \{0\}$ with $\mathfrak{s}(f) = \sigma \mathbf{e}_k$ (with $\mathfrak{s}(f) <_{\text{sign}} \sigma \mathbf{e}_k$, resp.), there exists $g \in G$ and $m \in \mathcal{M}^{(h)}$ such that:

- (i) $\text{LM}_h(mg) = \text{LM}_h(f)$ and
- (ii) $\Psi_h(m)\mathfrak{s}(g) = \mathfrak{s}(f)$.

The connection between Definition 12 and Definition 13 is that a non-empty subset $G \subset I$ is an \mathfrak{s} -Gröbner basis of I if G is an \mathfrak{s} -Gröbner basis for I in all signatures.

Proposition 12 If G is an \mathfrak{s} -Gröbner basis, then for any \mathfrak{s} -top-reducible $f \in I \setminus \{0\}$ with respect to $\mathfrak{s}(f)$, there exist $g \in G$ and $m \in \mathcal{M}^{(h)}$ such that:

- (i) $\text{LM}_h(mg) = \text{LM}_h(f)$ and
- (ii) $\mathfrak{s}(mg) = \Psi_h(m)\mathfrak{s}(g) <_{\text{sign}} \mathfrak{s}(f)$.

Proof. Let $f \in I \setminus \{0\}$ be such that \mathfrak{s} -top-reducible with respect to $\mathfrak{s}(f)$. Then, there exists $q \in I \setminus \{0\}$ such that $\text{LM}_h(q) = \text{LM}_h(f)$ and $\mathfrak{s}(q) <_{\text{sign}} \mathfrak{s}(f)$. We choose such the q such that $\mathfrak{s}(q) = \Omega(\text{LM}_h(q))$. By Corollary 11, we get q is \mathfrak{s} -top-irreducible with respect to $\mathfrak{s}(q)$. Since G is an \mathfrak{s} -Gröbner basis, there exist $g \in G$ and $m \in \mathcal{M}^{(h)}$ such that $\text{LM}_h(mg) = \text{LM}_h(q) = \text{LM}_h(f)$ and $\mathfrak{s}(mg) = \Psi_h(m)\mathfrak{s}(g) = \mathfrak{s}(q) <_{\text{sign}} \mathfrak{s}(f)$, as desired. \square

The meaningful of Proposition 12 above is that any non-zero \mathfrak{s} -top-reducible element of I can be \mathfrak{s} -top-reduced by an element of an \mathfrak{s} -Gröbner basis. This fact is important to prove the following proposition.

Proposition 13 If G is an \mathfrak{s} -Gröbner basis of I , then G is a Gröbner basis of I .

Proof. By the definition of \mathfrak{s} -Gröbner basis, we have $RG = I$. Next, we need to prove that $\langle \text{LM}_h(G) \rangle = \langle \text{LM}_h(I) \rangle$. Let $m \in \langle \text{LM}_h(I) \rangle$, and let $f \in I$ be such that $\text{LM}_h(f) = m$. If f is \mathfrak{s} -top-reducible with respect to $\mathfrak{s}(f)$, then by Proposition 12, there exist $g \in G$ and $m_1 \in \mathcal{M}^{(h)}$ such that $\text{LM}_h(m_1g) = \text{LM}_h(f)$ and $\mathfrak{s}(m_1g) <_{\text{sign}} \mathfrak{s}(f)$. If f is \mathfrak{s} -irreducible, then by the definition of \mathfrak{s} -Gröbner basis, there exists $g' \in G$ and $t \in \mathcal{M}^{(h)}$ such that $\text{LM}_h(tg') = \text{LM}_h(f)$ and $\Psi_h(t)\mathfrak{s}(g') = \mathfrak{s}(f)$. From two cases above, we conclude that $m = \text{LM}_h(f)$ lies in $\langle \text{LM}_h(G) \rangle$. Thus, we have $\langle \text{LM}_h(I) \rangle \subseteq \langle \text{LM}_h(G) \rangle$. \square

Proposition 14 Every \mathfrak{s} -Gröbner basis of I contains a finite \mathfrak{s} -Gröbner basis of I .

Proof. Let $G = \{g_i \mid i \in L\}$ be an \mathfrak{s} -Gröbner basis of I , where L is an index set. Define a function

$$\begin{aligned} \Lambda : G &\longrightarrow \mathcal{M}_\xi^{(h)} \times \mathbb{M}_\xi \\ g_i &\mapsto (\text{LM}_h(g_i), \mathfrak{s}(g_i)). \end{aligned}$$

We can write $\Lambda(G) = \text{LM}_h(G) \times \{\mathfrak{s}(g_i) \mid g_i \in G\}$, a subset of the monoid $\mathcal{M}_\xi^{(h)} \times \mathbb{M}_\xi$. Moreover, we know that $\mathcal{M}_\xi^{(h)} \times \mathbb{M}_\xi \cong (\mathcal{M}_\xi^{(h)})^{N+1}$, so the set $\Lambda(G)$ can be viewed as a subset of $(\mathcal{M}_\xi^{(h)})^{N+1}$. From the set $\Lambda(G)$, we can construct $M = (M_1, \dots, M_{N+1})$, where M_k is the monomial ideal generated by monomials in the k^{th} coordinate of $\Lambda(G)$, $1 \leq k \leq N+1$. Here, we have $\Lambda(G) \subseteq M$. By the Dickson lemma, there exists a finite subset $J \subset L$ such that monomials in the k^{th} coordinate of $\Lambda(\{g_j \mid j \in J\})$ generates M_k , $1 \leq k \leq N+1$. Write $G_0 := \{g_j \mid j \in J\}$.

We are going to prove that $G' := G_0 \cup F$ is an \mathfrak{s} -Groebner basis of I . We have taken the union with \mathcal{F} to ensure that G' generates the left ideal I . Let $f \in I$ be \mathfrak{s} -top-irreducible with respect to $\mathfrak{s}(f)$. Since G is an \mathfrak{s} -Gröbner basis, there exist $g_i \in G$ and $m \in \mathcal{M}^{(h)}$ such that $\Psi_h(m)\text{LM}_h(g_i) = \text{LM}_h(mg_i) = \text{LM}_h(f)$ and $\mathfrak{s}(mg_i) = \Psi_h(m)\mathfrak{s}(g_i) = \mathfrak{s}(f)$. If $i \in J$, then it is clear that $g_i \in G'$. Now, assume that $i \in L \setminus J$. Then, since $\Lambda(g_i) \in M$, there exist $j_i \in J$, $u \in \mathcal{M}_\xi^{(h)}$, and $v\mathbf{e}_k \in \mathbb{M}_\xi$ such that $(u, v\mathbf{e}_k) \cdot \Lambda(g_{j_i}) = \Lambda(g_i) = (\text{LM}_h(g_i), \mathfrak{s}(g_i))$.

- If $u = v$, then $m^* := u\Psi_h(m) \in \mathcal{M}_\xi^{(h)}$ satisfies $m^*\text{LM}_h(g_{j_i}) = \text{LM}_h(f)$ and $m^*\mathfrak{s}(g_{j_i}) = \mathfrak{s}(f)$. This case satisfies the \mathfrak{s} -Gröbner basis axioms for f .
- If $u <_h v$, then $m' := u\Psi_h(m) \in \mathcal{M}_\xi^{(h)}$ satisfies $m'\text{LM}_h(g_{j_i}) = \text{LM}_h(f)$ and $m'\mathfrak{s}(g_{j_i}) <_{\text{sign}} \mathfrak{s}(f)$. It contradicts the hypothesis that f is \mathfrak{s} -top-irreducible with respect to $\mathfrak{s}(f)$.
- If $u >_h v$, then there exist $a \in K^*$ and $m' := v\Psi_h(m) \in \mathcal{M}_\xi^{(h)}$ such that the operator $q := f - am'g_{j_i} \in R$ satisfies that $\text{LM}_h(q) = \text{LM}_h(f)$ and $\mathfrak{s}(q) <_{\text{sign}} \mathfrak{s}(f)$. This contradicts the hypothesis that f is \mathfrak{s} -top-irreducible with respect to $\mathfrak{s}(f)$.

Thus, we conclude that G' is an \mathfrak{s} -Groebner basis of I . □

Definition 14 A non-zero \mathfrak{s} -top-irreducible $g \in I$ is said to be *primitive \mathfrak{s} -top-irreducible* if there are no \mathfrak{s} -top-irreducible $g' \in I \setminus \{0\}$ and $m' \in \mathcal{M}^{(h)} \setminus \{1\}$ such that:

- (i) $\text{LM}_h(m'g') = \text{LM}_h(g)$ and
- (ii) $\mathfrak{s}(m'g') = \mathfrak{s}(g)$.

Following the proof of Proposition 14, in practice, we keep a subset of primitive \mathfrak{s} -top-irreducible operators with different leading monomials in computing a finite \mathfrak{s} -Gröbner basis G' . We remark that in that proof, we set the finite \mathfrak{s} -Gröbner basis G' including the set \mathcal{F} . In addition, any redundant operators in G' are not allowed. A redundant operator is defined as follows.

Definition 15 A non-zero operator $f \in I$ is said to be *redundant* to a set $G \subset I$ if there exists an operator $g \in G$ and $t \in \mathcal{T}^{(h)}$ such that $f = tg$ and $\mathfrak{s}(f) <_{\text{sign}} \Psi_h(t)\mathfrak{s}(g)$.

From the definition above, if the operator f is a redundant to G , then the module monomial $\Psi_h(t)\mathfrak{s}(g)$ belongs to $\text{LSyz}(\mathcal{F})$ since $mg - f = 0$ and $\Psi_h(t)\mathfrak{s}(g) >_{\text{sign}} \mathfrak{s}(f)$. An example of a redundant operator can be seen in Example 2.

5 The F5 Tropical Algorithm

5.1 The F5 Criterion

We begin with the definition of normal pairs.

Definition 16 Let $g_1, g_2 \in I \setminus \{0\}$ with $\text{LT}_h(g_1) = ch^\gamma x^\alpha \xi^\beta$ and $\text{LT}_h(g_2) = dh^{\gamma'} x^{\alpha'} \xi^{\beta'}$. Let

$$\begin{aligned} \eta &= (\max(\alpha_1, \alpha'_1), \dots, \max(\alpha_n, \alpha'_n)), & \delta &= (\max(\beta_1, \beta'_1), \dots, \max(\beta_n, \beta'_n)), \\ \mu &= \max(\gamma, \gamma'), & u_1 &= dh^{\mu-\gamma} x^{\eta-\alpha} \partial^{\delta-\beta}, & \text{and} & & u_2 &= ch^{\mu-\gamma'} x^{\eta-\alpha'} \partial^{\delta-\beta'}. \end{aligned}$$

We say that (g_1, g_2) is a *normal pair* if:

- (i) the g_i 's are primitive \mathfrak{s} -irreducible;
- (ii) $\mathfrak{s}(u_i g_i) = \text{LM}_h(u_i) \mathfrak{s}(g_i)$, $i = 1, 2$;
- (iii) $\mathfrak{s}(u_1 g_1) \neq \mathfrak{s}(u_2 g_2)$;
- (iv) $\text{spair}(g_1, g_2) := u_1 g_1 - u_2 g_2$ is not a redundant operator to G .

Remark 5 We remark that if (g_1, g_2) is a normal pair, then we have

$$\mathfrak{s}(\text{spair}(g_1, g_2)) = \max(\mathfrak{s}(u_1 g_1), \mathfrak{s}(u_2 g_2)).$$

Moreover, if $\mathfrak{s}(u_1 g_1) >_{\text{sign}} \mathfrak{s}(u_2 g_2)$, then $u_1 \neq 1$.

The following theorem is an F5 criterion. Unlike in Arri and Perry (2011) and in Vaccon et al. (2021), we do not write explicitly the property: for all $i \in \{1, \dots, N\}$, there exists $g \in G$ such that $\mathfrak{s}(g) = \mathbf{e}_i$. We replace it by the hypothesis of the theorem said that $\mathcal{F} \subseteq G$ and by what we have in Remark 3. Therefore, in principle, this theorem is equivalent to what we have in Vaccon et al. (2021).

Theorem 15 (F5 criterion) *Let $G = \{g \in I \mid g \text{ is } \mathfrak{s}\text{-top-irreducible}\}$ be such that contains the set \mathcal{F} . If for every normal pair $(g_1, g_2) \in G \times G$, there exist $g \in G$ and $m \in \mathcal{M}^{(h)}$ such that mg is \mathfrak{s} -top-irreducible and $\Psi_h(m) \mathfrak{s}(g) = \mathfrak{s}(mg) = \mathfrak{s}(\text{spair}(g_1, g_2))$, then G is an \mathfrak{s} -Gröbner basis of I .*

We can prove that G satisfying the hypothesis of Theorem 15 is an \mathfrak{s} -Gröbner basis of I in an analogous way to the proof of Theorem 4.2 in Vaccon et al. (2021).

Remark 6 (Rewritable Criterion). If two or more normal pairs are such that their S-pairs have the same signature, then we can freely consider just one of them. This is based on the sufficient condition of the F5 criterion above — we only care about the signature $\mathfrak{s}(\text{spair}(g_1, g_2))$, without involving the corresponding S-pair explicitly. Following Arri and Perry (2011), in practice (see Line 5 of Algorithm 3), we remove (f, σ) from P if there exists another operator f' such that $\mathfrak{s}(f') = \sigma$ and $\text{LT}_h(f') <_h \text{LT}(f)$.

Example 2 Let $R = D_2^{(h)}(\mathbb{Q})$ with 3-adic valuation. Define the tropical term order \leq_h by using $w = (1, 1, 2, 2)$, $\omega = (-1, -1, 1, 1)$, and the lexicographic order $<$ with $\partial_x \succ \partial_y \succ x \succ y$. Consider the subset $\mathcal{F} = \{\mathfrak{f}_1 = 2\partial_y + y, \mathfrak{f}_2 = 4xy + 3x^2\}$ where $\mathfrak{s}(\mathfrak{f}_1) = \mathbf{e}_1$ and $\mathfrak{s}(\mathfrak{f}_2) = \mathbf{e}_2$, and set $G := \mathcal{F}$.

- We can check that $(\mathfrak{f}_2, \mathfrak{f}_1)$ is a normal pair. Moreover, we have $\text{spair}(\mathfrak{f}_2, \mathfrak{f}_1) = 6x^2\partial_y - 4xy^2 + 8xh^2$ with $\mathcal{S}(\text{spair}(\mathfrak{f}_2, \mathfrak{f}_1)) = \partial_y \mathbf{e}_2$. We can \mathfrak{s} -top-reduce $\text{spair}(\mathfrak{f}_2, \mathfrak{f}_1)$ by \mathfrak{f}_1 with respect to $\partial_y \mathbf{e}_2$, and the result is $\underline{-4xy^2} - 3x^2y + 8xh^2$. We continue to \mathfrak{s} -top-reduce $\underline{-4xy^2} - 3x^2y + 8xh^2$ by \mathfrak{f}_2 with respect to $\partial_y \mathbf{e}_2$ to obtain $g_2 := 8xh^2$. Here, we have the \mathfrak{s} -top-irreducible operator g_1 with respect to $\mathfrak{s}(g_1) = \partial_y \mathbf{e}_2$.
- Next, we compute $\text{spair}(g_1, \mathfrak{f}_1) = -8xyh^2$ with $\mathcal{S}(\text{spair}(g_1, \mathfrak{f}_1)) = \partial_y^2 \mathbf{e}_2$ and also compute $\text{spair}(g_1, \mathfrak{f}_2) = -24x^2h^2$ with $\mathcal{S}(\text{spair}(g_1, \mathfrak{f}_2)) = \xi_y \partial_y \mathbf{e}_2$.
- Add the operator g_1 to the set G . At this point, we have $G = \{\mathfrak{f}_1, \mathfrak{f}_2, g_1\}$.
- Since $\text{spair}(g_1, \mathfrak{f}_2) = -24x^2h^2 = -3x \cdot g_1$ and

$$\mathfrak{s}(\text{spair}(g_1, \mathfrak{f}_2)) \leq_{\text{sign}} \mathcal{S}(\text{spair}(g_1, \mathfrak{f}_2)) = \xi_y \partial_y \mathbf{e}_2 <_{\text{sign}} -3\xi_x \partial_y \mathbf{e}_2 = -3\xi_x \mathfrak{s}(g_1),$$

$\text{spair}(g_1, \mathfrak{f}_2)$ is redundant to the set G (see Definition 15), and hence, the pair (g_1, \mathfrak{f}_2) is not a normal pair. The operator $\text{spair}(g_1, \mathfrak{f}_1) = -8xyh^2$ \mathfrak{s} -top-reduces to 0 by g_1 with respect to $\mathcal{S}(\text{spair}(g_1, \mathfrak{f}_1)) = \partial_y^2 \mathbf{e}_2$. Here, we get $\partial_y^2 \mathbf{e}_2 \in \text{LSyz}(\mathcal{F})$.

By the computation above, we can see that the set G satisfies the sufficient condition in Theorem 15. Thus, the set G is an \mathfrak{s} -Gröbner basis of the left ideal $R\mathcal{F}$.

5.2 Algorithms

Algorithm 2 computes Gröbner bases G_1, \dots, G_N for the left ideal I_1, \dots, I_N , respectively. Looking at Line 5, the element \mathfrak{f}_j of the generating set \mathcal{F}_j is reduced by the operator parts of the set G_i , an \mathfrak{s} -Gröbner basis of the left ideal $I_i = I_{j-1}$. This reduction uses the tropical division algorithm in the paper of Hartanto and Ohara. If the corresponding

reduction result is 0, then we can skip the computation of \mathfrak{s} -Gröbner basis using Algorithm 3 because $f_j \in I_{j-1}$, which means that G_i is also an \mathfrak{s} -Gröbner basis of I_j . Because of this skipped step, one can see that the index $i \leq j$.

At the beginning of Algorithm 2, we do not have any information about syzygies, and even we do not have principal syzygies $f_i e_j - f_j e_i$ since our ring R is not commutative. What we can do is: collect leading monomials of syzygies during computation in the framework of algorithms (Algorithm 2 and Algorithm 3), starting from the smallest one to the bigger ones. That is the reason why we always take a normal pair in P with minimal (guessed) signature $a\sigma$ (Line 6 of Algorithm 3) as a candidate of either a leading monomial of syzygy or a valid signature; and why at Line 8 of Algorithm 2, we always keep the set of known leading monomials of syzygies S for each iteration $j = 2, \dots, N$. The notation $(f, a\sigma)$ means an operator f with (a guessed) signature $a\sigma$.

In the framework of algorithms, signatures or guessed signatures are saved with coefficients. These coefficients are obtained from the corresponding module elements during the computation process. There is no deep meaning of these coefficients in Algorithm 2 and Algorithm 3 because ordering module terms with respect to \leq_{sign} does not depend on the coefficients. The purpose of writing these coefficients is only for explaining Algorithm 4 regarding to Remark 4.

Now, let us see Algorithm 3. Line 1 computes the set P of all normal pairs (r, g) 's, where $g \in G_{i-1}$. To check the condition (ii), $\mathfrak{s}(u_i g_i) = \text{LM}_h(u_i) \mathfrak{s}(g_i)$, of the definition of normal pair (Definition 16), we apply Proposition 7. The module monomial $\text{LM}_h(u_i) \mathfrak{s}(g_i)$ is called a guessed signature of $u_i g_i$. If $\text{LM}_h(u_i) \mathfrak{s}(g_i)$ is divisible by a known leading monomial of a syzygy in S , then the $\text{LM}_h(u_i) \mathfrak{s}(g_i)$ is a leading monomial of a syzygy, and hence, it does not satisfy the condition (ii) of normal pair. The \mathfrak{s} -top-reduction at Line 7 will also help us to see whether $\sigma := \text{LM}_h(u_i) \mathfrak{s}(g_i)$ belongs to $\text{LSyz}(\mathcal{F})$ or not. If the corresponding reduction result is 0, then σ lies in $\text{LSyz}(\mathcal{F})$. Otherwise, σ is certified as a signature. At Line 4, we remove all elements $(f, a\sigma) \in P$ where σ is divisible by an element of the updated S . We also remove elements of P (see Line 5) which satisfy the rewritable criterion based on Remark 6.

The correctness of this algorithm framework (Algorithm 2 and Algorithm 3) is based on Theorem 15. The termination of Algorithm 3 is guaranteed by Proposition 14 since we only save primitive \mathfrak{s} -irreducible operators which are not redundant elements.

Algorithm 2: Main framework of tropical F5 algorithm

Input: $\mathcal{F} = \{f_1, \dots, f_N\} \subset R$ homogeneous, ordered increasingly by \leq_h on their LT_h
Output: G : a Gröbner basis of the left ideal I generated by \mathcal{F}

```

1  $S \leftarrow \emptyset$ 
2  $G_1 \leftarrow \{(f_1, \mathbf{e}_1)\}$ 
3  $i \leftarrow 1$ 
4 for  $j = 2, \dots, N$  do
5    $r \leftarrow \text{Div}(f_j, \text{op\_part}(G_i))$ 
6   if  $r \neq 0$  then
7      $i \leftarrow i + 1$ 
8      $G_i, S \leftarrow \text{SigGr}((r, \mathbf{e}_i), G_{i-1}, S, j)$ 
9 Return:  $G := \text{op\_part}(G_i)$ 

```

Algorithm 3: SigGr()

Input: $(r, \mathbf{e}_i), G_{i-1}, S, j$
Output: G_i : an \mathfrak{s} -Gröbner basis of the left ideal I_j generated by $\{f_1, \dots, f_j\}$
 S : leading terms of syzygies

```

1  $[P, S] \leftarrow \text{NPairs}(\emptyset, (r, \mathbf{e}_i), G_{i-1}, S)$ 
2  $G_i \leftarrow G_{i-1} \cup \{(r, \mathbf{e}_i)\}$ 
3 while  $P \neq \emptyset$  then
4   Prune  $P$  by  $S$ 
5   Prune  $P$  using rewritable criterion
6   Take  $(f, a\sigma) \in P$  with minimal  $a\sigma$ 
7    $(f, b\sigma) \leftarrow \mathfrak{s}$ -top-reduce( $f, a\sigma, G$ )
8   if  $f \neq 0$  then
9      $[P, S] \leftarrow \text{Update NPairs}(P, (f, b\sigma), G_i, S)$ 
10     $G_i \leftarrow G_i \cup \{(f, b\sigma)\}$ 
11  else
12     $S \leftarrow S \cup \{b\sigma\}$ 
13 Return:  $G_i, S$ 

```

To \mathfrak{s} -top-reduce $(f, a\sigma)$ by G in Line 7 of Algorithm 3, we use Algorithm 4. It is a modification of the tropical division algorithm (provided in the paper of Hartanto and Ohara). In this algorithm, we only allow \mathfrak{s} -top-reducers in G with respect to $a\sigma$ and reducers from the previous computed operators $q_{j'}$'s, $j' < j$ as a reducer of q_j (see Line 6). The termination reason of Algorithm 4 is the same reason of termination of tropical division algorithm, that is, by the fact that the number of supports $\text{supp}(q_j)$'s for operators q_j 's with a fixed degree is finite (see the paper of Hartanto and Ohara). In addition, if there is no a reducer found for q_j , then the algorithm is immediately terminated (see Line 4). The proof that the outputs satisfy (i) and (ii) follows the proof in the tropical division algorithm. Moreover, due to the hypothesis on G — a Gröbner basis up to signature $a\sigma$, the output r is an \mathfrak{s} -top-irreducible operator with respect to $a\sigma$ (Clause (iii) of the algorithm output).

Algorithm 4: \mathfrak{s} -Top-Reduction

Input: $f \in I$ homogeneous, $a \in K^*$, $\sigma \in \mathbb{M}_\varepsilon$ such that $\mathcal{S}(f) = a\sigma$;
 $G = \{g_1, \dots, g_s\} \subset R$ containing homogeneous elements g_i 's of an \mathfrak{s} -Gröbner basis with $\mathfrak{s}(g_i) < a\sigma$.

Output: $H_1, \dots, H_s, r \in R$ satisfying:

- (i) $f = (\sum_{i=1}^s H_i g_i) + r$
- (ii) $\text{LT}_h(H_i g_i) \leq_h \text{LT}_h(f)$;
- (iii) there is no \mathfrak{s} -top-reducer in G for r with respect to $a\sigma$.

```

1  $T \leftarrow G, \quad j \leftarrow 0, \quad q_0 \leftarrow f, \quad h_{1,0} \leftarrow 0, \dots, h_{s,0} \leftarrow 0$ 
2 While  $q_j \neq 0$  do
3   If there is no an  $\mathfrak{s}$ -top-reducer in  $G$  for  $q_j$  w.r.t.  $a\sigma$  AND there is no  $g \in T \setminus G$  with  $\text{LM}_h(g) | \text{LM}_h(q_j)$ 
   then
4     Return:  $r := q_j, \quad H_i = h_{i,j}$  for all  $i$ 
5   else
6     Choose an  $\mathfrak{s}$ -top-reducer  $g \in G$  for  $q_j$  w.r.t.  $a\sigma$  OR an element  $g \in T \setminus G$  with  $\text{LM}_h(g) | \text{LM}_h(q_j)$ ;
     such that  $E(q_j, mg)$  is minimum among all such choices, for some  $m \in \mathcal{M}^{(h)}$  satisfying
      $\text{LM}_h(q_j) = \text{LM}_h(mg)$ .
7      $c = \text{LC}_h(q_j) / \text{LC}_h(mg)$ 
8      $q' \leftarrow q_j - cmg$ 
9     If  $g = g_k$  for some  $1 \leq k \leq s$  then
10       $q_{j+1} \leftarrow q'$ ;
11       $h_{k,j+1} \leftarrow h_{k,j} + cm$ ;
12       $h_{i,j+1} \leftarrow h_{i,j}$  for  $i \neq k$ 
13     If  $g$  was added to  $T$  at some previous iteration of the algorithm, namely  $g = q_k$  for some  $k < j$ , then
14       $q_{j+1} \leftarrow \frac{1}{1-c} q'$ 
15       $h_{i,j+1} \leftarrow \frac{1}{1-c} (h_{i,j} - c h_{i,k})$  for all  $i$ 
16     If  $E(q_j, mg) > 0$  then
17       $T \leftarrow T \cup \{q_j\}$ 
18      $j = j + 1$ 
19 Return  $r := q_j, \quad H_i = h_{i,j}$  for all  $i$ .
```

Proposition 16 When Algorithm 4 outputs the result, we have either $\sigma \in \text{LSyz}(\mathcal{F})$ or $\sigma = \mathfrak{s}(r)$.

Proof. If $f = 0$, then $r = q_0 = f$ (see Line 1 and Line 19). Since $a\sigma$ is a guessed signature of f , we get $\sigma \in \text{LSyz}(\mathcal{F})$.

Now, assume that $f \neq 0$. Since $q_0 = f$, we have $\mathcal{S}(q_0) = a\sigma$. Let $\mathbf{q}^{(0)}$ be a module element of R^N such that $\text{LM}_{\text{sign}}(\mathbf{q}^{(0)}) = a\sigma$ and $\nu(\mathbf{q}^{(0)}) = q_0$.

When $j = 0$ (the first iteration), we have $T \setminus G = \emptyset$, and hence, there are two possibilities about reducers for q_0 : (1) no reducer from T (the argument/condition in Line 3 is true); (2) there is an \mathfrak{s} -top-reducer $g' \in G$ for q_0 w.r.t. $a\sigma$. If Case (1) occurs, then $r = q_0 = f$, $\mathfrak{s}(r) = \sigma$ (by the second statement of Theorem 10), and the process terminates. If Case (2) occurs, then we have $g = g'$ and $m = m'$ for some $m' \in \mathcal{M}^{(h)}$ such that $\text{LM}_h(q_0) = \text{LM}_h(m'g')$. Let $\mathbf{g}^{(0)} \in R^N$ be such that $\text{LT}_{\text{sign}}(\mathbf{g}^{(0)}) = \mathfrak{s}(g)$ and $\nu(\mathbf{g}^{(0)}) = g$. By Line 8 and Line 10, we have $q_1 = q_0 - cmg$, and its corresponding module representation is $\mathbf{q}^{(1)} := \mathbf{q}^{(0)} - cm\mathbf{g}$. Since g is \mathfrak{s} -top-reducer for q_0 with respect to $a\sigma$, we get $\text{LM}_{\text{sign}}(\mathbf{q}^{(1)}) = a\sigma$. We keep this last equation for the next step ($j = 1$).

When $j = 1$, we have $T \setminus G \neq \emptyset$, and hence, we have three possibilities about reducers for q_1 :

- (A) no reducer from T (the argument/condition in Line 3 is true);
- (B) the reducer is an \mathfrak{s} -top-reducer $g' \in G$ for q_1 w.r.t. $a\sigma$; and
- (C) the reducer is an operator $g \in T \setminus G$ ($g = q_0$).

Case (A) is an analogue of Case (1) which result $r = q_1$ and $\mathfrak{s}(r) = \sigma$. Case (B) is analogue of Case (2). Write $g = g'$ and $m = m'$ for some $m' \in \mathcal{M}^{(h)}$ such that $\text{LM}_h(q_1) = \text{LM}_h(m'g')$. Let $\mathbf{g}^{(1)} \in R^N$ be such that

$\text{LT}_{\text{sign}}(\mathbf{g}^{(1)}) = \mathfrak{s}(g)$ and $\nu(\mathbf{g}^{(1)}) = g$. By the algorithm, we have $q_2 = q_1 - cmg$, and its corresponding module representation is $\mathbf{q}^{(2)} := \mathbf{q}^{(1)} - cmg$. Since g is \mathfrak{s} -top-reducer for q_1 with respect to $a\sigma$, we get $\text{LM}_{\text{sign}}(\mathbf{q}^{(2)}) = a\sigma$. For Case (C), write $m = m''$ for some $m'' \in \mathcal{M}^{(h)}$ such that $\text{LM}_h(q_1) = \text{LM}_h(m''g)$. Since $\text{LM}_h(q_1) = \text{LM}_h(mg)$ and both q_1 and g are homogeneous of the same degree, then we must have $m = 1$. By Line 8 and Line 14, we have

$$q_2 = \left(\frac{1}{1-c}\right)(q_1 - cg). \quad (1)$$

By the previous step, we can write $\mathbf{q}^{(1)} = a\Phi^{-1}(\sigma) + (\text{lower module terms})$. Since $g = q_0$, we can write $\mathbf{q}^{(0)} = a\Phi^{-1}(\sigma) + (\text{lower module terms})$. Therefore, the corresponding module representation of (1) is

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{q}^{(2)} &:= \frac{1}{1-c} \left(\mathbf{q}^{(1)} - c\mathbf{q}^{(0)} \right) \\ &= \frac{1}{1-c} \left[(a\Phi^{-1}(\sigma) + (\text{lower module terms})) - c(a\Phi^{-1}(\sigma) + (\text{lower module terms})) \right] \\ &= \frac{1}{1-c} \left[(1-c)a\Phi^{-1}(\sigma) + (\text{lower module terms}) \right] \\ &= a\Phi^{-1}(\sigma) + (\text{lower module terms}). \end{aligned}$$

We get $\text{LM}_{\text{sign}}(\mathbf{q}^{(2)}) = a\sigma$. Thus, Case (B) and Case (C) result an operator q_2 and its corresponding module representation $\mathbf{q}^{(2)}$ with $\text{LM}_{\text{sign}}(\mathbf{q}^{(2)}) = a\sigma$.

In general, for $j > 1$, we have an analogue result. When the process terminates due to Line 4, the result is $r = q_j$ with $\mathfrak{s}(r) = \sigma$. When the argument either in Line 9 or in Line 13 is true, we obtain an operator q_{j+1} and its corresponding module representation $\mathbf{q}^{(j+1)}$ with $\text{LM}_{\text{sign}}(\mathbf{q}^{(j+1)}) = a\sigma$.

The process eventually terminates because G is a finite set of homogeneous operators, and we always take a reducer g with minimal écart function value. For detail explanation, we can refer the paper of Hartanto and Ohara. When the iterations end up with $q_l = 0$ for some l , its corresponding module representation is $\mathbf{q}^{(l)}$ with $\text{LM}_{\text{sign}}(\mathbf{q}^{(l)}) = a\sigma$. This implies that $\sigma \in \text{LSyz}(\mathcal{F})$. \square

5.3 Implementation Results on Risa/Asir CAS

We implemented the algorithms presented in the previous subsection in Risa/Asir Computer Algebra System. Some of the data results can be seen in Table 1. We provide five examples of generating sets \mathcal{F} .

Table 1: Computation Data: Buchberger Algorithm vs Tropical F5 Algorithm

\mathcal{F}	Buchberger Algorithm		Tropical F5 Algorithm	
	#S-pairs	#ReductionsTo0	#NormalPairs	#s-ReductionsTo0
$4x\partial_y + yz$ $z\partial_x + 4y\partial_z$	545	512	100	41
$2z\partial_y + 3y^2$ $3y\partial_x + 2x\partial_z$ $x\partial_y\partial_z + 4y^2\partial_x$	541	509	126	42
$x\partial_x + 6y\partial_y$ $2y\partial_y^2 + 3z\partial_x^2$ $z\partial_x^2 + 4x\partial_z^2 + 6y\partial_z^2$	623	589	243	92
$y\partial_x\partial_y + 6x^2z$ $x^2\partial_y^2 + 3y^2yz$	10,195	10,051	117	18
$3y\partial_y^2 + 2z^2\partial_z$ $2\partial_x^3\partial_z + 3x^2z\partial_y$	5,044	4,944	138	21

Settings: $R = D_3^{(h)}(\mathbb{Q})$ with 3-adic valuation; the tropical term order \leq_h defined by using $w = (1, 1, 1, 2, 2, 2)$, $\omega = (-1, -1, -1, 1, 1, 1)$, and the graded lexicographic order \prec with $\partial_x \succ \partial_y \succ \partial_z \succ x \succ y \succ z$.

From the table above, we can see that all ratios $\text{\#ReductionsTo0}/\text{\#S-pairs}$ by the Buchberger algorithm are greater than $1/2$, and even it is close to 1. It means that there are too many useless reductions to zero in the computation. In

contrast, by the tropical F5 algorithm, the ratios $\#s\text{-ReductionsTo0}/\#\text{NormalPairs}$ are less than $1/2$, and the number of normal pairs considered during the computation is also small enough. Actually, there are many pairs considered during the computation, but many of them are not normal pairs and are eliminated by the syzygy criterion (see Line 4 of Algorithm 3) and the rewriteable criterion (see Line 5 of Algorithm 3) in advance before a s -reduction occurs.

As a conclusion, we can say that we have successfully developed an F5 algorithm for computing tropical Gröbner bases on the Weyl algebras. We perform only a few reductions to zero, comparing the number of useless reductions to zero in the Buchberger Algorithm. However, we remark that recognizing a normal pair in the set of considered pairs needs an effort during the computation. Pruning the set of pairs P by using rewriteable criterion also takes time because we do it for each iteration.

To use the total order \leq_{sign} on the set $\mathbb{M}_{\mathfrak{s}}$, we require information about leading monomials of syzygies. We can get this information during the computation of s -Gröbner basis elements increasingly on signatures. In the other words, at the time we process an S-pair with signature σ , we already had an s -Gröbner basis up to signature σ as well as leading monomials of syzygies that are less than σ . Our assumption on the homogeneous operators f_1, \dots, f_N ordered increasingly on $LT_h(f_i)$'s and giving priority to the ordering indexes of e_i 's and the total degrees (see Clause (1) and (2) of Definition 6) on the definition of \leq_{sign} make compatible with our desire to handle the signature of S-pairs increasingly. Remark 5 also supports this situation in the sense that once we compute a new normal pair, the degree of its signature is always greater than the signature of the generating operators.

Acknowledgment

This research is supported by MEXT Scholarship in Japan and partially by Innovative Asia Program of JICA. In addition, the second author is supported by KAKENHI 21K03291.

References

- Arri, A. and Perry, J. (2011). The F5 criterion revised. *Journal of Symbolic Computation*, 46:1017–1029.
- Chan, A. W. and Maclagan, D. (2019). Groebner bases over fields with valuations. *Mathematics of Computation*, 88:467–483.
- Eder, C. (2008a). A new attempt on the F5 criterion. *Comput. Sci. J. Mold.* 16, pages 4–14.
- Eder, C. (2008b). On the criteria of the F5 algorithm. <https://arxiv.org/abs/0804.2033v4>.
- Eder, C. and Faugère, J.-C. (2017). A survey on signature-based algorithms for computing Gröbner bases. *Journal of Symbolic Computation*, 80:719–784.
- Eder, C. and Perry, J. (2010). F5C: A variant of faugère's F5 algorithm with reduced Gröbner bases. *Journal of Symbolic Computation*, 45:1442–1458.
- Falkensteiner, S., Garai-López, C., Haiech, M., et al. (2020). The fundamental theorem of tropical partial differential algebraic geometry. *ISSAC'20: Proceedings of the 45th International Symposium on Symbolic and Algebraic Computation*, pages 178–185.
- Faugère, J. C. (2002). A new efficient algorithm for computing Gröbner bases without reduction to zero (F5). *ISSAC '02: Proceedings of the 2002 international symposium on Symbolic and algebraic computation*, pages 75–83.
- Gao, S., Guan, Y., and Volny, F. (2010a). A new incremental algorithm for computing Groebner bases. *ISSAC '10: Proceedings of the 2010 International Symposium on Symbolic and Algebraic Computation*, pages 13–19.
- Gao, S., Volny IV, F., and Wang, M. (2010b). A new algorithm for computing Groebner bases. <http://eprint.iacr.org/2010/641>.
- Hartanto, A. D. and Ohara, K. Computing Gröbner bases on weyl algebras over fields with valuations. *in preprint*.
- Hsiao, J.-C. (2023). On the tropicalization on D-ideals. *Communications in Algebra*, 51(3):1201–1216.
- Maclagan, D. and Sturmfels, B. (2015). *Introduction to tropical geometry, Graduate Studies in Mathematics, vol. 161*. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI.
- Roune, B. H. and Stillman, M. (2012). Practical Gröbner basis computation. *ISSAC '12: Proceedings of the 37th International Symposium on Symbolic and Algebraic Computation*, pages 203–210.
- Vaccon, T., Verron, T., and Yokoyama, K. (2021). On affine tropical F5 algorithms. *Journal of Symbolic Computation*, 102:132–152.
- Vaccon, T. and Yokoyama, K. (2017). A tropical F5 algorithm. *ISSAC'17: Proceedings of the 2017 International Symposium on Symbolic and Algebraic Computation*, pages 429–436.