

STRONG GRÖBNER BASES AND LINEAR ALGEBRA IN MULTIVARIATE POLYNOMIAL RINGS OVER EUCLIDEAN DOMAINS

ERHARD AICHINGER

ABSTRACT. We provide a self-contained introduction to Gröbner bases of submodules of $R[x_1, \dots, x_n]^k$, where R is a Euclidean domain, and explain how to use these bases to solve linear systems over $R[x_1, \dots, x_n]$.

1. INTRODUCTION

The computation of Gröbner bases is a broadly applicable method that solves many questions involving polynomials. One such question is solving systems of linear equations over a commutative ring D . Here, for a matrix $A \in D^{r \times s}$ and $b \in D^r$, one would like to compute an $x \in D^s$ with $Ax = b$ (when it exists) and a basis of the module $\ker(A) = \{x \in D^s \mid Ax = 0\}$; then $\{x + k \mid k \in \ker(A)\}$ is the set of solutions of the linear system. When D is a multivariate polynomial ring such as $\mathbb{Z}[x_1, x_2]$ or $\mathbb{Q}[x_1, x_2]$, Gröbner bases are a tool to solve these questions. Being able to solve linear systems over D allows us to determine ideal membership in D (solve $d_1x_1 + \dots + d_nx_n = d$ over D to find out whether d lies in the ideal generated by d_1, \dots, d_n) and to compute least common multiples (solve $x_1 - d_1x_2 = x_1 - d_2x_3 = 0$ for finding x_1 as a common multiple of d_1, d_2), and hence also greatest common divisors when D is a unique factorization domain.

When D is a field, solving linear equations is accomplished by Gauß's algorithm. When $D = \mathbb{Z}$, solving systems of linear diophantine equations can be done computing the Hermite normal form of a matrix. Both cases are contained in the case that $D = R[x_1, \dots, x_n] =: R[\mathbf{x}]$, where R is a Euclidean domain, and in the present note, we explain how to solve linear systems over $R[\mathbf{x}]$. The role of the row echelon form of a matrix (when D is a field) and of the Hermite normal form (when D is a Euclidean domain) will be taken by a matrix whose rows are a Gröbner basis of the module generated by the rows of the matrix. Our approach includes computing Gröbner bases over \mathbb{Z} , allowing us to do linear algebra

Date: June 12, 2024.

Supported by the Austrian Science Fund (FWF):P33878.

over $\mathbb{Z}[x_1, \dots, x_n]$. As every finitely generated ring is isomorphic to a quotient $\mathbb{Z}[x_1, \dots, x_n]$ by an ideal I (which is finitely generated by Hilbert's Basis Theorem), this will allow us to solve linear systems over all finitely generated rings. In fact, the Gröbner basis algorithm presented here (which is a modification of the algorithm given in [Lic12]) will contain both Gauß's algorithm and the Hermite normal form as special instances.

As we do not presuppose any knowledge on Gröbner bases, let us start with a rough description: Given a submodule M of the D -module D^s , a Gröbner basis is a set of generators of M with particularly useful properties. They were introduced by B. Buchberger, who presented an algorithm to compute such bases when $D = k[x_1, \dots, x_n]$ (k a field) and $s = 1$ [Buc65, Buc70] and named them in honour of his supervisor W. Gröbner. Generalizing to $s > 1$ is then straightforward. The case $D = \mathbb{Z}[x_1, \dots, x_n]$ provides additional difficulties, as now diophantine linear equations over \mathbb{Z} are included. For this case, several types of Gröbner bases were introduced. We will use "strong Gröbner bases", and one main source for our development is [Lic12]. The case that $D = R[x_1, \dots, x_n]$ for a Euclidean domain R has been treated in [KRK88]. What our treatment adds to these is that we:

- consider bases of submodules of D^s also for the case $s > 1$,
- provide self-contained proofs of the Gröbner basis criterion Theorem 4.6 and of the uniqueness of reduced strong Gröbner bases,
- explain how reduction and augmentation by S -polynomials can be interleaved in the course of the algorithm, and
- explicitly state how to solve linear systems over D .

The computations will start from a generating set F of a submodule of D^s and compute a set of generators G (a Gröbner basis) with certain desirable properties. The algorithm is a sequence of the following steps, which we illustrate here by examples for the case $D = \mathbb{Z}[x, y]^3$.

- Augmentation: When $f = (10x^2y^2 + y, 0, x)$ and $g = (4x^3y + x^2, 1, 0)$ are in F , then add $h = xf - 2yg = (2x^3y^2 - 2x^2y + xy, -2y, x^2)$ to F . One important property of h is that the leading coefficient 2 of h is smaller than the leading coefficients 10 of f and 4 of g . Such an h is called an *S-polynomial vector* (from "subtraction").
- Reduction: When $f = (10x^2y^2 + y, 0, x)$ and $g = (x - 2y, 1, 0)$ are in F , then replace f by $f' = f - 10xy^2g = (20xy^3 + y, -10xy^2, x)$.

When these simple steps are performed in some proper order, the process will eventually terminate and produce a set of generators G that will have the required properties. Termination is proved using the fact that certain ordered sets have no infinite descending chains. The fact that the final result G has the desired properties uses a central theorem on S -polynomials vectors. For the case that R is a field this theorem goes back to [Buc65] (cf. [Buc76, Theorem 3.3]). It has been adapted to other situations. For the case $R = \mathbb{Z}$, its role is taken by [Lic12, Theorem 10], for Euclidean domains by [KRK88, Theorem 4.1], and in our presentation by Theorem 4.6. From the vast literature on Gröbner bases, we highlight the monographs [CLO92, BW93, AL94, GP02] and the survey paper [BK10]. The mathematical content of the present note builds upon [KRK88, Lic12]; our definition of S -polynomials differs from the one given in [Lic12], was inspired by [Buc84] and is close to [KRK88, Definition CP1]. The proof of Theorem 4.6 was modelled after the proof of Theorem 2.3.10 in [Smi14], and the notation using “expressions with remainders” follows [Eis95]. I am indebted to M. Kauers for sharing the unpublished notes for his course on Gröbner bases at JKU in 2011 with me. The presentation of how to solve linear systems in Theorem 8.2 was inspired by his lectures on linear algebra.

The goal of the present note is to provide a self-contained presentation of as much of Gröbner basis theory as is needed to solve linear systems of over $\mathbb{Z}[x_1, \dots, x_n]$ (or $R[x_1, \dots, x_n]$ for a Euclidean domain R) in Section 8, along with proofs that are ready for the classroom. Some facts on partial orders go beyond the material one commonly presupposes in an undergraduate course. These facts are collected in Section 9. Most of the theory contained in the present note is well known, but has so far been scattered in various research publications, sometimes also with variations in the definitions. We aim at providing one coherent presentation of these beautiful methods.

2. BASIC DEFINITIONS

We write \mathbb{N} for the set of positive integers and \underline{k} for the set $\{1, \dots, k\}$. For a set G , we write $\binom{G}{2}$ for the set of two-element subsets of G .

Definition 2.1. Let R be an integral domain. R is a *Euclidean domain* if there is a well ordered set W and a map $\delta : R \rightarrow W$ such that $\delta(0) \leq \delta(r)$ for all $r \in R$, and for all $a, b \in R$ with $a \neq 0$, we have that $\delta(b) \leq \delta(ab)$ and that there exist $q, r \in R$ such that $b = qa + r$ and $\delta(r) < \delta(a)$.

Let R be a Euclidean domain. For the polynomial ring $R[\mathbf{x}] := R[x_1, \dots, x_n]$, we will consider its module $R[\mathbf{x}]^k$, and we will call the elements of this module

polynomial vectors. For $p \in R[x_1, \dots, x_n]$ and $i \in \underline{k}$, we write pe_i for the vector $(0, \dots, 0, p, 0, \dots, 0)$ with p at place i . For $\alpha \in \mathbb{N}_0^n$, we write \mathbf{x}^α for $x_1^{\alpha_1} \cdots x_n^{\alpha_n}$. The elements of $\{a\mathbf{x}^\alpha e_i \mid a \in R \setminus \{0\}, (\alpha, i) \in \mathbb{N}_0^n \times \underline{k}\}$ are called *term vectors* and the elements of

$$\text{Mon}(n, k) := \{\mathbf{x}^\alpha e_i \mid (\alpha, i) \in \mathbb{N}_0^n \times \underline{k}\}$$

are called *monomial vectors*. We say that the monomial vector $\mathbf{x}^\alpha e_i$ *divides* the monomial vector $\mathbf{x}^\beta e_j$ and write $\mathbf{x}^\alpha e_i \mid \mathbf{x}^\beta e_j$ if $i = j$ and $\alpha_m \leq \beta_m$ for all $m \in \underline{n}$. This holds if and only if there is a monomial \mathbf{x}^γ such that $\mathbf{x}^\gamma \mathbf{x}^\alpha e_i = \mathbf{x}^\beta e_j$. In this case, we will also write $\frac{\mathbf{x}^\alpha e_i}{\mathbf{x}^\beta e_j}$ for \mathbf{x}^γ . We say that the term vector $s = a\mathbf{x}^\alpha e_i$ *divides* the term vector $t = b\mathbf{x}^\beta e_j$ if a divides b in R and $\mathbf{x}^\alpha e_i$ divides $\mathbf{x}^\beta e_j$. In this case we write $s \mid t$, and we write $\frac{t}{s}$ for the term $q\mathbf{x}^\alpha$ with $(q\mathbf{x}^\alpha)s = t$. We can write every element from $R[\mathbf{x}]^k$ as a sum $\sum_{(\alpha, i) \in E} c_{(\alpha, i)} \mathbf{x}^\alpha e_i$, where E is a finite subset of $\mathbb{N}_0^n \times \underline{k}$. A fundamental step working with these polynomial vectors is to *order* the terms in this sum so that we can speak about a *leading term vector*. A requirement for this ordering is that when $\sum_{j=1}^m t_j$ is a sum of terms that are in decreasing order, then so is the sum $\sum_{j=1}^m \mathbf{x}^\alpha t_j$ obtained by multiplying with a monomial \mathbf{x}^α . This is reflected in Condition (3) of the following definition. Condition (2) expresses the requirement that for all monomial vectors m_1, m_2 with $m_1 \mid m_2$, we have $m_1 \leq m_2$.

Definition 2.2. Let $n, k \in \mathbb{N}$, and let \leq be an order on $\text{Mon}(n, k)$. This order \leq is *admissible* if

- (1) \leq is a total ordering;
- (2) for all $\mathbf{x}^\alpha e_i, \mathbf{x}^\beta e_j \in \text{Mon}(n, k)$ with $\mathbf{x}^\alpha e_i \mid \mathbf{x}^\beta e_j$, we have $\mathbf{x}^\alpha e_i \leq \mathbf{x}^\beta e_j$;
- (3) for all $\alpha, \beta, \gamma \in \mathbb{N}_0^n$ and for all $i, j \in \underline{k}$ with $\mathbf{x}^\alpha e_i \leq \mathbf{x}^\beta e_j$, we have $\mathbf{x}^{\alpha+\gamma} e_i \leq \mathbf{x}^{\beta+\gamma} e_j$.

An ordering \leq' on $\mathbb{N}_0^n \times \underline{k}$ is *admissible* if the ordering \leq defined by $\mathbf{x}^\alpha e_i \leq \mathbf{x}^\beta e_j \Leftrightarrow (\alpha, i) \leq' (\beta, j)$ is *admissible*.

One such ordering is the *lexicographic position over term ordering*, where for two distinct (α, i) and $(\beta, j) \in \mathbb{N}_0^n \times \underline{k}$, we have $((\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n), i) <_{\text{lex}} ((\beta_1, \dots, \beta_n), j)$ if $i > j$ or $(i = j$ and $\alpha_l < \beta_l$ for $l := \min\{m \in \underline{k} \mid \alpha_m \neq \beta_m\})$. Other admissible orderings can be defined by choosing a matrix $U \in \mathbb{R}^{n' \times n}$ and a permutation π of \underline{k} such that $\{\gamma \in \mathbb{Q}^n \mid U\gamma = 0\} = \{0\}$ and the first nonzero entry in every column of U is positive. Then one can define an admissible order $\leq_{U, \pi}$ by $(\alpha, i) \leq_{U, \pi} (\beta, j) \Leftrightarrow (U\alpha, \pi(i)) \leq_{\text{lex}} (U\beta, \pi(j))$.

For a finite subset E of $\mathbb{N}_0^n \times \underline{k}$, an admissible ordering \leq of $\mathbb{N}_0^n \times \underline{k}$, a function $c : E \rightarrow R$, and an $f \in R[x_1, \dots, x_n]^k$ with $f \neq 0$ given by $f = \sum_{(\alpha, i) \in E} c_{(\alpha, i)} \mathbf{x}^\alpha e_i$,

we define

$$\text{DEG}(f) := \max_{\leq} \{(\alpha, i) \in \mathbb{N}_0^n \times \underline{k} \mid c_{(\alpha, i)} \neq 0\};$$

$\text{DEG}(0)$ is not defined.

Suppose that $f \neq 0$ and $(\gamma, i) = \text{DEG}(f)$. Then we define

$$\text{LM}(f) := \mathbf{x}^\gamma e_i, \quad \text{LC}(f) := c_{(\gamma, i)}, \quad \text{LT}(f) := c_{(\gamma, i)} \mathbf{x}^\gamma e_i$$

and call them the *leading monomial vector*, the *leading coefficient* and the *leading term vector*, respectively. All of these are undefined for $f = 0$. An important fact is that an admissible ordering on $\mathbb{N}_0^n \times \underline{k}$ is a *well order*, i.e., it is total and has no infinite strictly descending chains. A proof is given in Lemma 9.2. This also implies that for every nonempty subset I of $R[\mathbf{x}]^k \setminus \{0\}$, there is at least one $f \in I$ such that there is no $g \in I$ with $\text{DEG}(g) < \text{DEG}(f)$.

Definition 2.3. Let R be a Euclidean domain, let I be a submodule of $R[x_1, \dots, x_n]^k$, and let \leq be an admissible order of the monomial vectors. Then $G \subseteq I \setminus \{0\}$ is a *strong Gröbner basis* of I with respect to \leq if and only if for every $f \in I \setminus \{0\}$, there is an element $g \in G$ such that $\text{LT}(g) \mid \text{LT}(f)$.

We write $\langle G \rangle$ for the submodule of $R[\mathbf{x}]^k$ generated by G . When G is a strong Gröbner basis of I , then $\langle G \rangle = I$: Suppose that $\langle G \rangle$ is a proper subset of I , and let f be a polynomial vector of minimal degree $\text{DEG}(f)$ in $I \setminus \langle G \rangle$ with respect to the admissible ordering \leq . The existence of such an f – under the assumption $\langle G \rangle \neq I$ – is justified by Lemma 9.2. Taking $g \in G$ such that $\text{LT}(g) \mid \text{LT}(f)$, we compute $f' := f - \frac{\text{LT}(f)}{\text{LT}(g)}g$. If $f' = 0$, then $f = \frac{\text{LT}(f)}{\text{LT}(g)}g$ lies in $\langle G \rangle$. If $f' \neq 0$, then by minimality, f' lies in $\langle G \rangle$, and hence so does $f = f' + \frac{\text{LT}(f)}{\text{LT}(g)}g$, a contradiction.

When R is a Euclidean domain, $\delta : R \rightarrow W$ is the grading function of R and $f \in R[x_1, \dots, x_n]^k \setminus \{0\}$, we define the *degree with δ* of f by

$$\text{DEG}_\delta(f) := (\text{DEG}(f), \delta(\text{LC}(f)));$$

hence $\text{DEG}_\delta(f) \in (\mathbb{N}_0^n \times \underline{k}) \times W$. For a subset I of $R[\mathbf{x}]^k$, we define $\text{DEG}_\delta(I) := \{\text{DEG}_\delta(f) \mid f \in I \setminus \{0\}\}$. On $\mathbb{N}_0^n \times \underline{k} \times W$ we define an order by

$$(2.1) \quad ((\alpha, i), d) \sqsubseteq_\delta ((\beta, j), e) : \iff \mathbf{x}^\alpha \mid \mathbf{x}^\beta, i = j, d \leq e.$$

Then the ordered set $(\mathbb{N}_0^n \times \underline{k} \times W, \sqsubseteq_\delta)$ is isomorphic to the direct product of n copies of (\mathbb{N}_0, \leq) with $(\{1, \dots, k\}, =)$ and (W, \leq) . Therefore the ordered set $(\mathbb{N}_0^n \times \underline{k} \times W, \sqsubseteq_\delta)$ has no infinite descending chains and no infinite antichains (Theorem 9.3(1)).

3. EXISTENCE OF STRONG GRÖBNER BASES

Theorem 3.1. *Let R be a Euclidean domain, let I be a submodule of $R[x_1, \dots, x_n]^k$, and let \leq be an admissible order of the monomial vectors. Then I has a finite strong Gröbner basis with respect to \leq .*

Proof. Let $\text{Min}(\text{DEG}_\delta(I))$ be the set of minimal elements of $\text{DEG}_\delta(I)$ with respect to the ordering \sqsubseteq_δ . Since $\text{Min}(\text{DEG}_\delta(I))$ is an antichain of $(\mathbb{N}_0^n \times \underline{k} \times W, \sqsubseteq_\delta)$, it is finite (cf. Theorem 9.3(2)). Let G be a finite subset of I such that for every $((\alpha, i), d) \in \text{Min}(\text{DEG}_\delta(I))$, there is a $g \in G$ with $(\text{DEG}(g), \delta(\text{LC}(g))) = ((\alpha, i), d)$.

We claim that G is a strong Gröbner basis. To show this, let $f \in I \setminus \{0\}$. Since $(\text{DEG}(f), \delta(\text{LC}(f))) \in \text{DEG}_\delta(I)$, there is an $((\alpha, i), d) \in \text{Min}(\text{DEG}_\delta(I))$ with $((\alpha, i), d) \sqsubseteq_\delta (\text{DEG}(f), \delta(\text{LC}(f)))$. Hence

$$L := \{g \in G \mid \text{DEG}_\delta(g) \sqsubseteq_\delta \text{DEG}_\delta(f)\}$$

is not empty. Let g_1 be an element of L for which $\delta(\text{LC}(g_1))$ is minimal. Since $\text{DEG}_\delta(g_1) \sqsubseteq_\delta \text{DEG}_\delta(f)$, $\text{LM}(g_1)$ divides $\text{LM}(f)$. By the Euclidean property, there are $q, r \in R$ such that $\text{LC}(f) = q \text{LC}(g_1) + r$ with $\delta(r) < \delta(\text{LC}(g_1))$. If $r = 0$, then $\text{LC}(g_1) \mid \text{LC}(f)$ and therefore $\text{LT}(g_1)$ divides $\text{LT}(f)$. Then g_1 is the required element from G . If $r \neq 0$, we let

$$h := f - q \frac{\text{LM}(f)}{\text{LM}(g_1)} g_1.$$

Then $h \in I$ and $\text{LT}(h) = r \text{LM}(f)$. Then there is $g_2 \in G$ such that $\text{DEG}_\delta(g_2) \sqsubseteq_\delta \text{DEG}_\delta(h)$. Hence $\text{LM}(g_2) \mid \text{LM}(h)$ and $\delta(\text{LC}(g_2)) \leq \delta(r)$, and thus $\delta(\text{LC}(g_2)) < \delta(\text{LC}(g_1))$. Since $\delta(\text{LC}(g_2)) < \delta(\text{LC}(g_1)) \leq \delta(\text{LC}(f))$, we have $g_2 \in L$. This g_2 contradicts the minimality of $\text{LC}(g_1)$. Therefore the case $r \neq 0$ cannot occur. \square

4. A CRITERION FOR BEING A STRONG GRÖBNER BASIS

In this section, we prove a criterion (Theorem 4.6) that guarantees that certain sets are strong Gröbner bases. This criterion is then fundamental for constructing these bases in Section 5. Throughout Sections 4 and 5, R will denote a Euclidean domain with grading function δ . We first need a generalization of Euclidean division, i.e., of expressing b as $qa + r$ with $\delta(r) < \delta(a)$, from R to $R[\mathbf{x}]$.

Definition 4.1. Let $G \subseteq R[\mathbf{x}]^k \setminus \{0\}$, and let $f \in R[\mathbf{x}]^k$. We say that $\rho = ((a_i, m_i, g_i)_{i \in \underline{N}}, r)$ is an *expression* of f by G with remainder r if $N \in \mathbb{N}_0$ and for

each $i \in \underline{N}$, we have that $a_i \in R$, m_i is a monomial, $g_i \in G$, $r \in R[\mathbf{x}]^k$ and

$$f = \sum_{i=1}^N a_i m_i g_i + r.$$

An expression is *Euclidean* with respect to the admissible monomial vector ordering \leq if for all $i \in \underline{N}$, we have $\text{LM}(m_i g_i) \leq \text{LM}(f)$, and ($r = 0$ or there is no $g \in G$ such that $\text{DEG}_\delta(g) \sqsubseteq_\delta \text{DEG}_\delta(r)$).

We note that in an expression, $a_i = 0$ is allowed. The name *expression* follows the notation of [Eis95, Definition 15.6]. We will construct such expressions using Euclidean division.

Algorithm 4.2 (Euclidean division).

Input: $f \in R[\mathbf{x}]^k \setminus \{0\}$, $G \subseteq R[\mathbf{x}]^k \setminus \{0\}$, an admissible order \leq of $\mathbb{N}_0^n \times \underline{k}$.

Output: An Euclidean expression $((a_i, m_i, g_i)_{i \in \underline{N}}, r)$ of f by G .

- 1: $r \leftarrow f$
- 2: $\rho \leftarrow ()$
- 3: **while** $r \neq 0$ and $\exists g \in G : \text{DEG}_\delta(g) \sqsubseteq_\delta \text{DEG}_\delta(r)$ **do**
- 4: Find some $q, s \in R$ with $\text{LC}(r) = q \text{LC}(g) + s$ and $\delta(s) < \delta(\text{LC}(g))$.
- 5: $r \leftarrow r - q \frac{\text{LM}(r)}{\text{LM}(g)} g$
- 6: Append $(q, \frac{\text{LM}(r)}{\text{LM}(g)}, g)$ to ρ
- 7: **Return** (ρ, r)

Lemma 4.3. *For each input f, G , Algorithm 4.2 terminates and yields a Euclidean expression of f by G .*

Proof. We first prove termination. We say that $f \in R[\mathbf{x}]^k$ does not guarantee termination if there is an infinite sequence $r_0 = f, r_1, r_2 \dots$ of values of r produced by the algorithm. Among those f that do not guarantee termination, we let L be the set of those f for which $\text{LM}(f)$ is minimal with respect to the admissible ordering \leq . Among the elements of L , we choose f to be of minimal $\delta(\text{LC}(f))$. If in the computation $r_1 = f - q \frac{\text{LM}(f)}{\text{LM}(g)} g$, with $s = \text{LC}(f) - q \text{LC}(g)$, we have $s = 0$, then $\text{LM}(r_1) < \text{LM}(f)$. Then r_1 does not guarantee termination, contradicting the minimality of $\text{LM}(f)$. If $s \neq 0$ and $\delta(s) < \delta(\text{LC}(g))$, we have $\text{LT}(r_1) = s \text{LM}(f)$ and therefore $\delta(\text{LC}(r_1)) = \delta(s) < \delta(\text{LC}(g))$. Since $\text{DEG}_\delta(g) \sqsubseteq_\delta \text{DEG}_\delta(f)$, we have $\delta(\text{LC}(g)) \leq \delta(\text{LC}(f))$. Thus $\delta(\text{LC}(r_1)) < \delta(\text{LC}(f))$. Since r_1 does not guarantee termination, we have a contradiction to the minimality of $\delta(\text{LC}(f))$.

For proving correctness, we observe that throughout the algorithm (ρ, r) is an expression of f by G satisfying the degree bound. When the while-loop is left, then r has the required properties. \square

Expressions with remainder 0 will also be called *representations*. The importance of representations in which only one summand has maximal degree was observed in [Lic12].

Definition 4.4. Let $f \in R[\mathbf{x}]^k \setminus \{0\}$ and $G \subseteq R[\mathbf{x}]^k \setminus \{0\}$. Then $\rho = (a_i, m_i, g_i)_{i \in \underline{N}}$ is a *strong standard representation* of f by G with respect to the monomial vector ordering \leq if $(\rho, 0)$ is an expression of f by G with remainder 0, and in addition,

$$N \geq 1, \text{LM}(m_1 g_1) = \text{LM}(f), \text{ and } \text{LM}(m_i g_i) < \text{LM}(f) \text{ for all } i \in \underline{N} \setminus \{1\}.$$

We will now define S -polynomial vectors; this definition is a slight modification of [KRK88, Definition CP1]. For $\alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{N}_0^n$, we let $\alpha \sqcup \beta := (\max(\alpha_1, \beta_1), \dots, \max(\alpha_n, \beta_n))$. Hence $\mathbf{x}^{\alpha \sqcup \beta}$ is the least common multiple of \mathbf{x}^α and \mathbf{x}^β in $R[\mathbf{x}]$.

Definition 4.5 (S -polynomial vectors). Let $f, g \in R[\mathbf{x}]^k \setminus \{0\}$ with $f \neq g$, and assume that $\text{LT}(f) = a\mathbf{x}^\alpha e_i$ and $\text{LT}(g) = b\mathbf{x}^\beta e_j$. Let

$$\alpha' := (\alpha \sqcup \beta) - \beta \text{ and } \beta' := (\alpha \sqcup \beta) - \alpha.$$

Then $h \in R[\mathbf{x}]^k$ is an S -polynomial vector of the pair (f, g) if one of the following two conditions holds:

- (1) $i = j$, $\delta(a) \geq \delta(b)$ and there exists $q \in R$ such that $\delta(a - qb) < \delta(a)$ and

$$h = \mathbf{x}^{\beta'} f - q\mathbf{x}^{\alpha'} g;$$

- (2) $i \neq j$ and $h = 0$.

The polynomial vector h is an S -polynomial vector of the set $\{f, g\}$ if h is an S -polynomial vector of (f, g) or of (g, f) .

Concerning item (1), we notice that Euclidean division of a by b in R would yield a q that even satisfies $\delta(a - qb) < \delta(b)$, but for our purposes the weaker condition $\delta(a - qb) < \delta(a)$ suffices.

Theorem 4.6. Let \leq be an admissible ordering on $\text{Mon}(n, k)$, and let $G \subseteq R[\mathbf{x}]^k \setminus \{0\}$. We assume that for all $f, g \in G$ with $f \neq g$, there is an S -polynomial vector h of $\{f, g\}$ such that $h = 0$ or h has a strong standard representation. Then G is a strong Gröbner basis with respect to \leq for the submodule I of $R[\mathbf{x}]^k$ that is generated by G .

Proof. Let $f \in I \setminus \{0\}$. We will show that there is $g \in G$ with $\text{LT}(g) \mid \text{LT}(f)$. Since $f \in I$, there is $\rho = (a_i, m_i, g_i)_{i \in \underline{N}}$ such that $f = \sum_{i \in \underline{N}} a_i m_i g_i$. Such a ρ is called a *representation* of f by G . Here, no restriction on $\text{DEG}(m_i g_i)$ is made. We

measure the complexity of a representation $\rho = (a_i, m_i, g_i)_{i \in \underline{N}}$ using the following complexity parameters:

$$C_1(\rho) := \max \{ \text{DEG}(m_i g_i) \mid i \in \underline{N} \}$$

is the maximal degree of $m_i g_i$ appearing in ρ , where the maximum is taken with respect to the admissible ordering of on $\mathbb{N}_0^n \times \underline{k}$. We let

$$I_1(\rho) = \{ i \in \underline{N} \mid \text{DEG}(m_i g_i) = C_1(\rho) \}$$

be the set of those indices for which this maximum is attained. We define

$$C_2(\rho) := \max \{ \delta(\text{LC}(g_i)) \mid i \in I_1(\rho) \}$$

as the maximum of the δ -grades of the leading coefficients of those g_i 's for which $\text{DEG}(m_i g_i)$ is maximal. The set

$$I_2(\rho) := \{ i \in \underline{N} \mid \text{DEG}(m_i g_i) = C_1(\rho) \text{ and } \delta(\text{LC}(g_i)) = C_2(\rho) \}$$

collects those indices from $I_1(\rho)$ for which this maximum of δ -grades are attained. Finally,

$$C_3(\rho) := \#I_2$$

counts the number of elements of I_2 . Now we choose a representation $\rho = (a_i, m_i, g_i)_{i \in \underline{N}}$ of f for which the triple $(C_1(\rho), C_2(\rho), C_3(\rho))$ is minimal with respect to the lexicographic ordering on $(\mathbb{N}_0^n \times \underline{k}) \times W \times \mathbb{N}$, where the order on $\mathbb{N}_0^n \times \underline{k}$ is taken to be the admissible ordering \leq . This means that ρ minimizes C_1 with respect to the admissible order on $\mathbb{N}_0^n \times \underline{k}$, among those that minimize C_1 , ρ minimizes C_2 , and so on. Since all three sets $\mathbb{N}_0^n \times \underline{k}, W, \mathbb{N}$ are well ordered, i.e., totally ordered without infinite descending chains, such a minimizing ρ exists. Since for every permutation of \underline{N} , the representation $\rho' = (a_{\pi(i)}, m_{\pi(i)}, g_{\pi(i)})_{i \in \underline{N}}$ of f has the same complexity parameters as ρ , we may assume

$$(4.1) \quad \text{DEG}(m_1 g_1) \geq \text{DEG}(m_2 g_2) \geq \cdots \geq \text{DEG}(m_N g_N).$$

We now consider several cases:

Case 1: $\#I_1(\rho) = 1$: By the assumption (4.1), we then have $I_1(\rho) = \{1\}$. If $a_1 = 0$, we take the representation $\rho' := (a_i, m_i, g_i)_{i \in \underline{N} \setminus \{1\}}$. Then $C_1(\rho') < C_1(\rho)$, contradicting the minimality of ρ . If $a_1 \neq 0$, then $\text{DEG}(a_1 m_1 g_1) = \text{DEG}(f)$ and $\text{LC}(f) = a_1 \text{LC}(g_1)$. Therefore $\text{LT}(g_1) \mid \text{LT}(f)$.

Case 2: $\#I_1(\rho) \geq 2$: Let $l := \#I_1(\rho)$. Then $\text{LM}(m_1 g_1) = \cdots = \text{LM}(m_l g_l)$, and we may assume without loss of generality that

$$(4.2) \quad \delta(\text{LC}(g_1)) \geq \delta(\text{LC}(g_2)) \geq \cdots \geq \delta(\text{LC}(g_l)).$$

Case 2.1: $g_1 = g_2$: Since $\text{LM}(m_1g_1) = \text{LM}(m_2g_2)$, we then have $m_1 = m_2$. Hence $\rho' := ((a_1 + a_2, m_2, g_2), (a_3, m_3, g_3), \dots, (a_N, m_N, g_N))$ is a representation of f with $C_1(\rho') = C_1(\rho)$. Since $\delta(\text{LC}(g_1)) = \delta(\text{LC}(g_2))$, we also have $C_2(\rho') = C_2(\rho)$. Now $C_3(\rho') = C_3(\rho) - 1 < C_3(\rho)$. Then ρ' contradicts the minimality of ρ .

Case 2.2: $g_1 \neq g_2$: Let

$$\text{LT}(g_1) = a\mathbf{x}^\alpha e_i \text{ and } \text{LT}(g_2) = b\mathbf{x}^\beta e_j.$$

Since $\text{DEG}(m_1g_1) = \text{DEG}(m_2g_2)$, we have $i = j$. By the assumptions, the S -polynomial vector h coming from $\{g_1, g_2\}$ is 0 or has a strong standard representation by G . If $\delta(g_1) > \delta(g_2)$, then h is an S -polynomial vector of the pair (g_1, g_2) . If $\delta(\text{LC}(g_1)) = \delta(\text{LC}(g_2))$ and h is an S -polynomial vector of the pair (g_2, g_1) , we swap the first two entries in the representation ρ and obtain a representation $\tilde{\rho}$ that still satisfies (4.1) and (4.2). This allows us to assume that h is an S -polynomial vector of the pair (g_1, g_2) . Let

$$\alpha' := (\alpha \sqcup \beta) - \beta, \quad \beta' := (\alpha \sqcup \beta) - \alpha,$$

and let γ be such that $\gamma + (\alpha \sqcup \beta) = \text{DEG}(m_1g_1)$. Let $q \in R$ be such that $\delta(a - qb) < \delta(a)$ and

$$h = \mathbf{x}^{\beta'} g_1 - q\mathbf{x}^{\alpha'} g_2.$$

Then

$$\mathbf{x}^\gamma h = m_1g_1 - qm_2g_2,$$

and thus

$$(4.3) \quad m_1g_1 = \mathbf{x}^\gamma h + qm_2g_2.$$

Case 2.2.1: $h = 0$: In this case, $m_1g_1 = qm_2g_2$, and thus

$$\rho' := ((a_1q + a_2, m_2, g_2), (a_3, m_3, g_3), \dots, (a_N, m_N, g_N))$$

is a representation of f that satisfies $C_1(\rho') = C_1(\rho)$.

Case 2.2.1.1: $\delta(\text{LC}(g_1)) > \delta(\text{LC}(g_2))$: Then $C_2(\rho') = \delta(\text{LC}(g_2)) < \delta(\text{LC}(g_1)) = C_1(\rho')$. Thus ρ' contradicts the minimality of ρ .

Case 2.2.1.2: $\delta(\text{LC}(g_1)) = \delta(\text{LC}(g_2))$: Then $C_2(\rho') = \delta(\text{LC}(g_2))$ and $C_3(\rho') = C_3(\rho) - 1$, contradicting the minimality of ρ .

Case 2.2.2: $h \neq 0$: By the assumptions, h has a strong standard representation $(b_i, n_i, h_i)_{i \in \underline{M}}$ with the h_i 's in G . Now from (4.3), we obtain

$$a_1m_1g_1 = \sum_{i \in \underline{M}} a_1b_i(\mathbf{x}^\gamma n_i)h_i + a_1qm_2g_2,$$

and therefore

$$a_1 m_1 g_1 + a_2 m_2 g_2 = \sum_{i \in \underline{M}} a_1 b_i (\mathbf{x}^\gamma n_i) h_i + (a_1 q + a_2) m_2 g_2.$$

We claim that the representation ρ' coming from

$$f = \left(\sum_{i \in \underline{M}} a_1 b_i (\mathbf{x}^\gamma n_i) h_i \right) + (a_1 q + a_2) m_2 g_2 + \sum_{i=3}^N a_i m_i g_i$$

has lower complexity than ρ . We know that $\text{DEG}(h) \leq \text{DEG}(\mathbf{x}^{\beta'} g_1)$ and thus $\text{DEG}(\mathbf{x}^\gamma h) \leq \text{DEG}(m_1 g_1)$. We distinguish cases according to whether this inequality is strict.

Case 2.2.2.1: $\text{DEG}(\mathbf{x}^\gamma h) < \text{DEG}(m_1 g_1)$: Then for all $i \in \underline{M}$, we have $\text{DEG}(\mathbf{x}^\gamma n_i h_i) < \text{DEG}(m_1 g_1)$. Since $\text{DEG}(m_1 g_1) = \text{DEG}(m_2 g_2)$, we therefore have $C_1(\rho') = C_1(\rho)$. If $\delta(\text{LC}(g_1)) > \delta(\text{LC}(g_2))$, we have $C_2(\rho') < C_2(\rho)$, and if $\delta(\text{LC}(g_1)) = \delta(\text{LC}(g_2))$, we have $C_2(\rho') = C_2(\rho)$ and $C_3(\rho') = C_3(\rho) - 1 < C_3(\rho)$, contradicting the minimality of ρ .

Case 2.2.2.2: $\text{DEG}(\mathbf{x}^\gamma h) = \text{DEG}(m_1 g_1)$: Then $\text{DEG}(\mathbf{x}^\gamma n_1 h_1) = \text{DEG}(m_1 g_1)$ and $\text{DEG}(\mathbf{x}^\gamma n_i h_i) < \text{DEG}(m_1 g_1)$ for $i \in \{2, \dots, M\}$. Hence $C_1(\rho') = C_1(\rho)$. Since $\text{LT}(b_1 n_1 h_1) = \text{LT}(h)$, we have $\delta(\text{LC}(h_1)) \leq \delta(b_1 \text{LC}(h_1)) = \delta(\text{LC}(h))$. From the definition of S -polynomial vectors, we have $\delta(\text{LC}(h)) < \delta(\text{LC}(g_1))$, and thus $\delta(\text{LC}(h_1)) < \delta(\text{LC}(g_1))$. If $\delta(\text{LC}(g_1)) > \delta(\text{LC}(g_2))$, we have $C_2(\rho') < C_2(\rho)$, and if $\delta(\text{LC}(g_1)) = \delta(\text{LC}(g_2))$, we have $C_2(\rho') = C_2(\rho)$ and $C_3(\rho') = C_3(\rho) - 1 < C_3(\rho)$, contradicting the minimality of ρ .

Hence in Case 2, we always obtain ρ' with complexity than ρ , showing that the case $\#I_1(\rho) \geq 2$ cannot occur. \square

5. CONSTRUCTION OF STRONG GRÖBNER BASES

In this section, we assume that a submodule I of $R[\mathbf{x}]^k$ is given by a finite set F of generators. (By Hilbert's Basis Theorem, or simply by Theorem 3.1, such a finite F exists.) Our goal is to construct a finite strong Gröbner basis G for $I = \langle F \rangle$. We will proceed by adding polynomials to F in order to obtain a set G such that each 2-element subset of G has an S -polynomial vector with a strong standard representation; then Theorem 4.6 guarantees that we have found a strong Gröbner basis. In one step, we consider one 2-element subset $\{p, q\}$ of F . The augmentation of F using the set $\{p, q\}$ yields a set F' in which either $\{p, q\}$ has an S -polynomial vector that has a strong standard representation, or $\{p, q\}$ still has no strong standard representation in F' , but F' is, in some sense,

larger than F , which also brings us closer to termination. To express this idea of becoming larger, we let W be the codomain of the Euclidean grading function δ . We consider subsets T of $\mathbb{N}_0^n \times \underline{k} \times W$ and we say that such a subset T is *upward closed* if for all $s \in T$ and $t \in \mathbb{N}_0^n \times \underline{k} \times W$ with $s \sqsubseteq_\delta t$, we have $t \in T$. Since $(\mathbb{N}_0^n \times \underline{k} \times W, \sqsubseteq_\delta)$ has no infinite descending chains and no infinite antichains, there is no infinite ascending chain of upward closed subsets of $\mathbb{N}_0^n \times \underline{k} \times W$ with respect to \sqsubseteq (cf. Theorem 9.3(3)). For $G \subseteq R[\mathbf{x}]^k$, we will consider the upward closed set

$$\text{DEG}_\delta(G)\uparrow := \{((\gamma, i), d) \in \mathbb{N}_0^n \times \underline{k} \times W \mid \exists g \in G : \text{DEG}_\delta(g) \sqsubseteq_\delta ((\gamma, i), d)\}.$$

Algorithm 5.1 (Augmentation).

Input: A finite subset G of $R[\mathbf{x}]^k$, a two element subset $\{p, q\}$ of G , and an admissible order \leq of $\mathbb{N}_0^n \times \underline{k}$.

Output: A pair (H, x) , where H is a finite set with $G \subseteq H \subseteq \langle G \rangle$ and $x \in \{0, 1\}$ such that the following hold:

- (1) If $x = 1$, then $\{p, q\}$ has an S -polynomial vector f such that $f = 0$ or f has a strong standard representation by H .
- (2) If $G \neq H$, then $\text{DEG}_\delta(G)\uparrow \subset \text{DEG}_\delta(H)\uparrow$.
- (3) If $G = H$, then $x = 1$.

```

1: function AUGMENT( $G, \{p, q\}$ )
2:    $f \leftarrow$  some  $S$ -polynomial vector of  $\{p, q\}$ 
3:    $x \leftarrow 0$ 
4:   if  $f = 0$  then
5:      $x \leftarrow 1$ 
6:   else if  $\exists g \in G : \text{LT}(g) \mid \text{LT}(f)$  then
7:      $x \leftarrow 1$ 
8:      $f' \leftarrow f - \frac{\text{LT}(f)}{\text{LT}(g)}g$ 
9:     Find a Euclidean expression  $f' = \sum_{i=1}^M a_i m_i g_i + r$  by  $G$ .
10:    if  $r \neq 0$  then
11:       $G \leftarrow G \cup \{r\}$ 
12:    else if  $\exists g \in G : \text{DEG}_\delta(g) \sqsubseteq_\delta \text{DEG}_\delta(f)$  then
13:      Among those  $g \in G$  with  $\text{DEG}_\delta(g) \sqsubseteq_\delta \text{DEG}_\delta(f)$ , pick  $g$  with minimal
       $\delta(\text{LC}(g))$ .
14:      Find  $q \in R$  such that  $\delta(\text{LC}(f) - q \text{LC}(g)) < \delta(\text{LC}(g))$ 
15:       $f' \leftarrow f - q \frac{\text{LM}(f)}{\text{LM}(g)}g$ 
16:       $G \leftarrow G \cup \{f'\}$ 
17:    else
18:       $G \leftarrow G \cup \{f\}$ 

```

19: Return (G, x)

Lemma 5.2. *Algorithm 5.1 is correct.*

Proof. For proving the first output condition, we assume that $x = 1$. We show that then f is an S -polynomial vector of $\{p, q\}$ with the required conditions. If $f = 0$, this is clearly the case. If $\exists g \in G : \text{LT}(g) \mid \text{LT}(f)$, then in the case $r = 0$, $((\frac{\text{LC}(f)}{\text{LC}(g)}, \frac{\text{LM}(f)}{\text{LM}(g)}, g), (a_1, m_1, g_1), \dots, (a_M m_M g_M))$ is a strong standard representation of f by G and in the case $r \neq 0$, we note that $\text{LM}(r) \leq \text{LM}(f') < \text{LM}(f)$ and thus $((\frac{\text{LC}(f)}{\text{LC}(g)}, \frac{\text{LM}(f)}{\text{LM}(g)}, g), (a_1, m_1, g_1), \dots, (a_M m_M g_M), (1, \mathbf{x}^0, r))$ is a strong standard representation.

For proving the second output condition, we assume $G \neq H$. If there exists $g \in G$ with $\text{LT}(g) \mid \text{LT}(f)$ and $r \neq 0$, then since r is the remainder of a Euclidean division, $\text{DEG}_\delta(r) \notin \text{DEG}_\delta(G)\uparrow$, and thus $\text{DEG}_\delta(G)\uparrow \subset \text{DEG}_\delta(G \cup \{r\})\uparrow = \text{DEG}_\delta(H)\uparrow$.

If there is no $g \in G$ with $\text{LT}(g) \mid \text{LT}(f)$, but there is a $g \in G$ such that $\text{DEG}_\delta(g) \sqsubseteq_\delta \text{DEG}_\delta(f)$, then we show that $\text{DEG}_\delta(f') \notin \text{DEG}_\delta(G)\uparrow$. Suppose that there is $g_1 \in G$ with $\text{DEG}_\delta(g_1) \sqsubseteq_\delta \text{DEG}_\delta(f')$. Then $\delta(\text{LC}(g_1)) \leq \delta(\text{LC}(f'))$ and $\text{LM}(g_1) \mid \text{LM}(f')$. Since $\text{LT}(g) \nmid \text{LT}(f)$, we have $\text{LM}(f') = \text{LM}(f)$, and thus $\text{LM}(g_1) \mid \text{LM}(f)$. Furthermore $\text{LC}(f') = \text{LC}(f) - q\text{LC}(g)$ and thus $\delta(\text{LC}(f')) < \delta(\text{LC}(g))$, and from $\text{DEG}_\delta(g) \sqsubseteq_\delta \text{DEG}_\delta(f)$ we obtain $\delta(\text{LC}(g)) \leq \delta(\text{LC}(f))$. Altogether $\delta(\text{LC}(g_1)) \leq \delta(\text{LC}(f')) < \delta(\text{LC}(g)) \leq \delta(\text{LC}(f))$. From this, we obtain $\text{DEG}_\delta(g_1) \sqsubseteq_\delta \text{DEG}_\delta(f)$ and $\delta(\text{LC}(g_1)) < \delta(\text{LC}(g))$, contradicting the minimality of $\delta(\text{LC}(g))$. Thus $\text{DEG}_\delta(f') \notin \text{DEG}_\delta(G)\uparrow$, and therefore $\text{DEG}_\delta(G)\uparrow \subset \text{DEG}_\delta(G \cup \{f'\})\uparrow = \text{DEG}_\delta(H)\uparrow$.

Finally, if $f \neq 0$ and $\exists g \in G : \text{DEG}_\delta(g) \sqsubseteq_\delta \text{DEG}_\delta(f)$ is false, then $\text{DEG}_\delta(f) \notin \text{DEG}_\delta(G)\uparrow$, and thus $\text{DEG}_\delta(G)\uparrow \subset \text{DEG}_\delta(G \cup \{f\})\uparrow = \text{DEG}_\delta(H)\uparrow$.

For proving the third output condition, we assume $G = H$. This happens only if $f = 0$ or if $(f \neq 0, \exists g \in G : \text{LT}(g) \mid \text{LT}(f) \text{ and } r = 0)$ because in all other cases, a polynomial vector gets added to G . In both of these cases, x is set to 1. \square

Algorithm 5.3 (Strong Gröbner Basis).

Input: $F \subseteq R[\mathbf{x}]^k \setminus \{0\}$, an admissible order \leq of $\mathbb{N}_0^n \times \underline{k}$.

Output: $G \subseteq R[\mathbf{x}]^k \setminus \{0\}$ such that is a strong Gröbner basis of $\langle F \rangle$ with respect to the monomial vector ordering \leq .

- 1: $G \leftarrow F$.
- 2: $P \leftarrow \emptyset$.
- 3: **while** $\exists p, q \in G : p \neq q$ and $\{p, q\} \notin P$ **do**
- 4: $(G, x) \leftarrow \text{AUGMENT}(G, \{p, q\})$

```

5:   if  $x = 1$  then
6:   |   |    $P \leftarrow P \cup \{\{p, q\}\}$ 
7:   Return  $G$ 

```

Theorem 5.4. *Algorithm 5.3 terminates on every input and produces a correct result.*

Proof. We first observe that throughout the algorithm, G generates the same submodule as F . Furthermore, each $\{p, q\} \in P$ has an S -polynomial vector f that is 0 or has a strong standard representation. The set $\{p, q\}$ can only be added to P when $x = 1$ and in this case the output condition (1) of AUGMENT guarantees that $\{p, q\}$ has f as required. Hence if the algorithm terminates, all two-element subsets of G have a strong standard representation. Thus by Theorem 4.6, G is then a strong Gröbner basis.

In order to show termination, we let W be the codomain of the Euclidean grading function δ , and we consider the upward closed subset

$$\text{DEG}_\delta(G)\uparrow := \{((\gamma, i), d) \in \mathbb{N}_0^n \times \underline{k} \times W \mid \exists g \in G : \text{DEG}_\delta(g) \sqsubseteq_\delta ((\gamma, i), d)\}$$

of $(\mathbb{N}_0^n \times \underline{k} \times W, \sqsubseteq_\delta)$. Our claim is that in each execution of the while loop, if G_1 and P_1 are the values of G and P when entering the loop and G_2 and P_2 are the values before the next iteration of the loop, we have $\text{DEG}_\delta(G_1)\uparrow \subset \text{DEG}_\delta(G_2)\uparrow$ or $(\text{DEG}_\delta(G_1)\uparrow = \text{DEG}_\delta(G_2)\uparrow$ and $\#\left(\binom{G_2}{2} \setminus P_2\right) < \#\left(\binom{G_1}{2} \setminus P_1\right)$). If $G_1 \neq G_2$, then output condition (2) of AUGMENT yields $\text{DEG}_\delta(G)\uparrow \subset \text{DEG}_\delta(H)\uparrow$. If $G_1 = G_2$, then by output condition (3) of AUGMENT, we have $x = 1$ and thus $P_2 = P_1 \cup \{p, q\}$ and therefore $\#\left(\binom{G_2}{2} \setminus P_2\right) < \#\left(\binom{G_1}{2} \setminus P_1\right)$.

Now suppose that there is an execution of this algorithm that does not terminate. Then we know that from some point onwards, $\text{DEG}_\delta(G)\uparrow$ stays constant, and from this point on, $\#\left(\binom{G}{2} \setminus P\right)$ strictly descends forever, which is impossible. \square

[Lic12, Theorem 11] contains a criterion¹ that generalizes [Buc70, p.377, S.2.], which tells that certain S -polynomial vectors need not be considered. We provide a generalization, which, when dealing with polynomial vectors, needs the rather restrictive assumption that both polynomial vectors f, g have entries only in the same component. When speaking of polynomials instead of polynomial vectors,

¹In the statement of [Lic12, Theorem 11], the assumption $c_1 \in \{-1, +1\}$ is missing. Without adding this assumption, for $p_1 := 2x + 1$ and $p_2 := 4y + 1$, we obtain $\text{SPoly}_2(p_1, p_2) = 2yp_1 - xp_2 = 2y - x$, which has no strong standard representation since $2y$ and x are not divisible by any of $2x$ and $4y$. – In the proof given in [Lic12, Theorem 11], the S -polynomial of p_1, q_1 is computed (incorrectly) as $\text{SPoly}_2(p_1, p_2) = 4yp_1 - 2xp_2 = 4y - 2x$.

we write the leading term of $p \neq 0$ as $\text{lt}(p)$, the leading monomial as $\text{lm}(p)$, and the degree of p , which is an element in \mathbb{N}_0^n , as $\text{deg}(p)$.

Theorem 5.5. *Let $\tilde{f}, \tilde{g} \in R[\mathbf{x}]$, $\alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{N}_0^n$, $i \in \underline{k}$, and $a, u \in R$ such that u is a unit in R , $\text{lt}(\tilde{f}) = a\mathbf{x}^\alpha$ and $\text{lt}(\tilde{g}) = u\mathbf{x}^\beta$. Let $f := \tilde{f}e_i$ and $g := \tilde{g}e_i$. If \mathbf{x}^α and \mathbf{x}^β are coprime monomials (which means that for all $j \in \underline{n}$ we have $\alpha_j = 0$ or $\beta_j = 0$), then $\{f, g\}$ has an S -polynomial vector that is 0 or has a strong standard representation by $\{f, g\}$.*

Proof. Let $\tilde{f}_1 := \tilde{f} - \text{lt}(\tilde{f})$ and $\tilde{g}_1 := \tilde{g} - \text{lt}(\tilde{g})$. Then $h = \mathbf{x}^\beta f - au^{-1}\mathbf{x}^\alpha g$ is an S -polynomial vector of $\{f, g\}$. Suppose $h \neq 0$. We have

$$(5.1) \quad \begin{aligned} h &= \mathbf{x}^\beta f - au^{-1}\mathbf{x}^\alpha g = (\mathbf{x}^\beta \tilde{f} - au^{-1}\mathbf{x}^\alpha \tilde{g})e_i = u^{-1}(u\mathbf{x}^\beta \tilde{f} - a\mathbf{x}^\alpha \tilde{g})e_i \\ &= u^{-1}((\tilde{g} - \tilde{g}_1)\tilde{f} - (\tilde{f} - \tilde{f}_1)\tilde{g})e_i = -u^{-1}\tilde{g}_1 f + u^{-1}\tilde{f}_1 g. \end{aligned}$$

Writing \tilde{g}_1 and \tilde{f}_1 as sums of terms, we obtain a representation of h . We will show now that it is a strong standard representation. If $f_1 = 0$ or $g_1 = 0$, then this representation has only one summand of degree $\text{DEG}(h)$ and is therefore a strong standard representation. Hence let us assume $f_1 \neq 0$ and $g_1 \neq 0$. We observe that $\text{DEG}(\text{lm}(g_1)f) \neq \text{DEG}(\text{lm}(f_1)g)$: Seeking a contradiction, we assume $\text{DEG}(\text{lm}(g_1)f) = \text{DEG}(\text{lm}(f_1)g)$. Then $\text{lm}(g_1)\text{lm}(\tilde{f}) = \text{lm}(f_1)\text{lm}(\tilde{g})$, which means $\text{lm}(g_1)\mathbf{x}^\alpha = \text{lm}(f_1)\mathbf{x}^\beta$. We therefore have $\mathbf{x}^\alpha \mid \text{lm}(f_1)\mathbf{x}^\beta$. By the assumptions on α and β , we then have $\mathbf{x}^\alpha \mid \text{lm}(f_1)$, contradicting $\text{deg}(f_1) < \alpha$.

Therefore, exactly one of $-u^{-1}\tilde{g}_1 f$ and $u^{-1}\tilde{f}_1 g$ has degree $\text{DEG}(-u^{-1}\tilde{g}_1 f + u^{-1}\tilde{f}_1 g)$, which is equal to $\text{DEG}(h)$. Thus by writing \tilde{g}_1 and \tilde{f}_1 as sums of terms, (5.1) produces a strong standard representation of h with respect to $\{f, g\}$. \square

6. EXISTENCE AND UNIQUENESS OF REDUCED STRONG GRÖBNER BASES

The construction given in Section 5 has the shortcoming that during the process, polynomial vectors can never be removed from a basis. Also, once we have found a strong Gröbner basis G of I , then we see from Definition 2.3 that every G' with $G \subseteq G' \subseteq I \setminus \{0\}$ is also a strong Gröbner basis. Hence a strong Gröbner basis of I need not be unique. However, we obtain uniqueness if we require that the Gröbner basis is *reduced*. In this section, we prove the existence and uniqueness of such a reduced Gröbner basis; Section 7 is then devoted to its algorithmic construction.

When R is the Euclidean domain \mathbb{Z} with grading function $\delta(z) := |z|$, then 6 may be expressed by 4 either as $6 = 1 \cdot 4 + 2$ or $6 = 2 \cdot 4 + (-2)$. In order to be able

to prefer one of this expressions, we need to refine the grading function δ . Hence when R is a Euclidean domain with grading function $\delta : R \rightarrow W$, we assume that we additionally have an injective function $\hat{\delta}$ from R into a well ordered set W' with the property $\hat{\delta}(0) \leq \hat{\delta}(a)$ for all $a \in R$ and

$$(6.1) \quad \text{for all } a, b \in R : \delta(a) < \delta(b) \Rightarrow \hat{\delta}(a) < \hat{\delta}(b).$$

Throughout Sections 6 and 7, we assume that R is a Euclidean domain with the functions δ and $\hat{\delta}$ as above. We will need the following simple fact about Euclidean domains.

Lemma 6.1. *Let $a, x \in R \setminus \{0\}$ be such that $\delta(ax) \leq \delta(a)$. Then x is a unit of R .*

Proof. There are $q, r \in R$ with $a = qax + r$ and $\delta(r) < \delta(ax)$. Then $\delta(r) < \delta(a)$. If $r = 0$, then $a = qax$ and thus $qx = 1$ and x is a unit. If $r \neq 0$, then since $r = a(1 - qx)$, we have $\delta(a) \leq \delta(a(1 - qx)) \leq \delta(r)$, a contradiction. \square

Definition 6.2 (Reducibility). We say that $b \in R$ is *reducible* by $A \subseteq R$ if there are $a \in A$ and $q \in R$ such that $\hat{\delta}(b - qa) < \hat{\delta}(b)$. Now let $G \subseteq R[\mathbf{x}]^k \setminus \{0\}$. We say that a term vector $b\mathbf{x}^\alpha e_i$ is *reducible* by G if b is reducible by $\{\text{LC}(g) : \text{LM}(g) \mid \mathbf{x}^\alpha e_i\}$, and that $f \in R[\mathbf{x}]^k \setminus \{0\}$ is *reducible* by G if it contains a term vector that is reducible by G .

A polynomial vector p is *normalized* if $p \neq 0$ and $\hat{\delta}(\text{LC}(p)) \leq \hat{\delta}(u \text{LC}(p))$ for all units u of R . The subset G of $R[\mathbf{x}]^k$ is normalized if every $g \in G$ is normalized.

Definition 6.3. Let G be a strong Gröbner basis of the submodule I of $R[\mathbf{x}]^k$. Then G is a *reduced strong Gröbner basis* of I if for each $g \in G$, g is normalized and g is not reducible by $G \setminus \{g\}$.

From an admissible ordering of the monomial vectors and the function $\hat{\delta}$, one can define a total order on $R[\mathbf{x}]^k$. To this end, we order polynomial vectors p, q as follows: for $p \neq q$, let $\mathbf{x}^\gamma e_i := \text{LM}(p - q)$, let a be the coefficient of $\mathbf{x}^\gamma e_i$ in p , and let b be the coefficient of $\mathbf{x}^\gamma e_i$ in q . Then we say $p <_P q$ if $\hat{\delta}(a) < \hat{\delta}(b)$ and $p \leq_P q$ if $p = q$ or $p <_P q$. The order \leq_P is a well order on $R[\mathbf{x}]^k$ (Lemma 9.4).

Theorem 6.4. *Let I be a submodule of $R[\mathbf{x}]^k$, and let $\text{Min}(\text{DEG}_\delta(I))$ be the set of minimal elements of $\text{DEG}_\delta(I)$ with respect to the ordering \sqsubseteq_δ . For every $((\alpha, i), d) \in \text{Min}(\text{DEG}_\delta(I))$, we choose $g_{\alpha, i, d}$ to be the minimal element in I with respect to \leq_P such that $\text{DEG}_\delta(g_{\alpha, i, d}) = ((\alpha, i), d)$. Then*

$$G := \{g_{\alpha, i, d} \mid ((\alpha, i), d) \in \text{Min}(\text{DEG}_\delta(I))\}$$

is finite, and G is the unique reduced strong Gröbner basis of I .

Proof. As an antichain in the ordered set $(\mathbb{N}_0, \leq)^n \times (\{1, \dots, k\}, =) \times (W, \leq)$, the set $\text{Min}(\text{DEG}_\delta(I))$ is finite (Theorem 9.3(2)), and hence G is finite. As in the proof of Theorem 3.1, we see that G is a strong Gröbner basis.

Now we show that G is reduced. Let $g \in G$. We first show that g is normalized. Supposing that g is not normalized, there is a unit $u \in R$ with $\hat{\delta}(u \text{LC}(g)) < \hat{\delta}(\text{LC}(g))$. Since u is a unit, $\delta(u \text{LC}(g)) = \delta(\text{LC}(g))$. Thus $\text{DEG}_\delta(ug) = \text{DEG}_\delta(g)$, but $ug <_P g$. This contradicts the choice of g . Hence g is normalized.

Next, we show that g is not reducible by $G \setminus \{g\}$. Seeking a contradiction, we suppose that g is reducible by $G \setminus \{g\}$. Then there are a term vector $a\mathbf{x}^\alpha e_i$ in G , $h \in G \setminus \{g\}$ and $q \in R$ such that $\text{LM}(h) \mid \mathbf{x}^\alpha e_i$ and $\hat{\delta}(a - q \text{LC}(h)) < \hat{\delta}(a)$.

Case 1: $a\mathbf{x}^\alpha e_i = \text{LT}(g)$: Let b be a greatest common divisor of $\text{LC}(h)$ and $\text{LC}(g)$ in R . Since R is Euclidean, there exist $u, v \in R$ with $u \text{LC}(h) + v \text{LC}(g) = b$. Thus $\text{LT}(u \frac{\text{LM}(g)}{\text{LM}(h)} h + vg) = b\mathbf{x}^\alpha e_i$. Since G is a strong Gröbner basis of I , there is $h_1 \in G$ with

$$(6.2) \quad \text{LT}(h_1) \mid b\mathbf{x}^\alpha e_i.$$

Since $b\mathbf{x}^\alpha e_i \mid \text{LT}(g)$, we obtain

$$\text{LT}(h_1) \mid \text{LT}(g).$$

Thus $\text{DEG}_\delta(h_1) \sqsubseteq_\delta \text{DEG}_\delta(g)$. Since $\text{DEG}_\delta(g) \in \text{Min}(\text{DEG}_\delta(G))$, we then have $\text{DEG}_\delta(h_1) = \text{DEG}_\delta(g)$. Since G contains only one element f with $\text{DEG}_\delta(f) = ((\alpha, i), \delta(a))$, we have $h_1 = g$. Now by (6.2), we have $\text{LC}(h_1) \mid b$. From the definition of b as a gcd, we have $b \mid \text{LC}(h)$, and thus $\text{LC}(h_1) \mid \text{LC}(h)$ and therefore $\text{LC}(g) \mid \text{LC}(h)$. Hence there is a $q_1 \in R$ such that $\text{LC}(h) = q_1 a$. Therefore,

$$(6.3) \quad \hat{\delta}(a - qq_1 a) < \hat{\delta}(a).$$

By (6.1), we then have $\delta(a - qq_1 a) \leq \delta(a)$, and thus by Lemma 6.1, either $1 - qq_1 = 0$ or $1 - qq_1$ is a unit in R .

Case 1.1: $1 - qq_1 = 0$: Then q_1 is a unit in R and therefore $\text{LC}(h) \mid \text{LC}(g)$. Since $\text{LM}(h) \mid \text{LM}(g)$, we obtain $\text{LT}(h) \mid \text{LT}(g)$ and therefore $\text{DEG}_\delta(h) \sqsubseteq_\delta \text{DEG}_\delta(g)$. From the minimality of $\text{DEG}_\delta(g)$, we obtain $\text{DEG}_\delta(g) = \text{DEG}_\delta(h)$. Since G contains only one element f with $\text{DEG}_\delta(f) = \text{DEG}_\delta(g)$, we have $h = g$, contradicting $h \in G \setminus \{g\}$.

Case 1.2: $1 - qq_1$ is a unit in R : Since g is normalized, we then have $\hat{\delta}(a(1 - qq_1)) \geq \hat{\delta}(a)$, contradicting (6.3).

Case 2: $a\mathbf{x}^\alpha e_i \neq \text{LT}(g)$: Then $\text{DEG}(a\mathbf{x}^\alpha e_i) < \text{DEG}(g)$. Since $\hat{\delta}(a - q \text{LC}(h)) < \hat{\delta}(a)$, we obtain $g - q \frac{\mathbf{x}^\alpha}{\text{LM}(h)} h <_P g$ and $\text{LT}(g - q \frac{\mathbf{x}^\alpha}{\text{LM}(h)} h) = \text{LT}(g)$, and therefore

$\text{DEG}_\delta(g - q \frac{\mathbf{x}^\alpha}{\text{LM}(h)}) = \text{DEG}_\delta(g)$. This contradicts the minimality of g with respect to \leq_P .

This completes the proof that g is not reducible by $G \setminus \{g\}$.

Therefore G is a reduced strong Gröbner basis. The uniqueness follows from the following lemma. \square

Lemma 6.5. *Let I be a submodule of $R[\mathbf{x}]^k$, and let G, H be reduced strong Gröbner bases of I . Then $G = H$.*

Proof. By symmetry, it is sufficient to prove $G \subseteq H$. Let $g \in G$. Since $g \in I$, there is $h \in H$ such that $\text{LT}(h) \mid \text{LT}(g)$, and since $h \in I$, there is $g_1 \in G$ with $\text{LT}(g_1) \mid \text{LT}(h)$. If $g_1 \neq g$, then $\text{LC}(g)$ is reducible by $\text{LC}(g_1)$, contradicting the fact that G is reduced. Thus $g_1 = g$, and therefore $\text{LT}(g) \mid \text{LT}(h) \mid \text{LT}(g)$ and thus $\text{LC}(g)$ and $\text{LC}(h)$ are associated in R . Since both G and H are normalized, we obtain $\text{LC}(g) = \text{LC}(h)$, and thus $\text{LT}(g) = \text{LT}(h)$.

We will now show $g = h$. Seeking a contradiction, we suppose $g \neq h$. Since $\text{LT}(g) = \text{LT}(h)$, we have $\text{DEG}(g - h) < \text{DEG}(g) = \text{DEG}(h)$. Let $a\mathbf{x}^{\alpha_{e_i}} := \text{LT}(g - h)$, let b be the coefficient of $\mathbf{x}^{\alpha_{e_i}}$ in g , and let c be the coefficient of $\mathbf{x}^{\alpha_{e_i}}$ in h . Then $a = b - c$.

Since $g - h \in I$, there is $g_1 \in G$ with $\text{LT}(g_1) \mid \text{LT}(g - h)$. We already know that $\text{LT}(g) = \text{LT}(h)$, and thus $\text{DEG}(g - h) < \text{DEG}(g)$. Therefore $g_1 \neq g$. From $\text{LC}(g_1) \mid b - c$, we obtain $q \in R$ such that $q\text{LC}(g_1) = b - c$ and therefore $c = b - q\text{LC}(g_1)$. Since b is not reducible by $\{\text{LC}(g_1)\}$, we have $\hat{\delta}(b) \leq \hat{\delta}(c)$. Similarly, since $g - h \in I$, there is $h_1 \in H$ with $\text{LT}(h_1) \mid \text{LT}(g - h)$. Since $\text{LT}(g) = \text{LT}(h)$, we have $\text{DEG}(g - h) < \text{DEG}(h)$, and thus $h_1 \neq h$. From $\text{LC}(h_1) \mid \text{LT}(g - h)$, we obtain $q \in R$ with $q\text{LC}(h_1) = b - c$, and thus $b = c + q\text{LC}(h_1)$. Since c is not reducible by $\{\text{LC}(h_1)\}$, we have $\hat{\delta}(b) \geq \hat{\delta}(c)$. Altogether, we have $\hat{\delta}(b) = \hat{\delta}(c)$ and thus $b = c$, leading to the contradiction $a = 0$. Thus $g = h$ and therefore $g \in H$. \square

7. CONSTRUCTION OF REDUCED STRONG GRÖBNER BASES

We let R be a Euclidean domain with grading function δ and an additional function $\hat{\delta}$ as in Section 6. For reducing coefficients, we will suppose that with respect to $\hat{\delta}$, we can perform the following two algorithmic tasks:

- (1) For $a \in R$, we can find a unit u in R such that $\hat{\delta}(ua)$ is minimal in $\{\hat{\delta}(u'a) \mid u' \text{ is a unit of } R\}$.

- (2) For $a, b \in R$, find $q \in R$ such that $\hat{\delta}(b - qa)$ is minimal in $\{\hat{\delta}(b - q'a) \mid q' \in R\}$.

For many Euclidean domains, e.g. for the fields \mathbb{R} or \mathbb{Q} , it is difficult to describe such a function $\hat{\delta}$. However, on a field k , it suffices to assume that $\hat{\delta}$ satisfies $\hat{\delta}(0) < \hat{\delta}(1) < \hat{\delta}(x)$ for all $x \in k \setminus \{0, 1\}$. Then for $a \in k \setminus \{0\}$, $u := a^{-1}$ minimizes $\hat{\delta}(ua)$ and $q := ba^{-1}$ minimizes $\hat{\delta}(b - qa)$. For \mathbb{Z} , we may take $\hat{\delta}(z) := 3|z| - \text{sgn}(z)$, which yields $\hat{\delta}(0) < \hat{\delta}(1) < \hat{\delta}(-1) < \hat{\delta}(2) < \hat{\delta}(-2) < \dots$. Then for $a \in \mathbb{Z} \setminus \{0\}$, $u := \text{sgn}(a)$ minimizes $\hat{\delta}(ua)$ and the unique $q \in \mathbb{Z}$ with $-\frac{a}{2} < b - qa \leq \frac{a}{2}$ minimizes $\hat{\delta}(b - qa)$.

For reducing polynomial vectors, we follow [Lic12] and use reductions that, when they affect the leading term of polynomial, eliminate this leading term in one step. We call such reductions *soft*.

Definition 7.1. The polynomial vector $f \in R[\mathbf{x}]^k \setminus \{0\}$ is *softly reducible* by G if $f - \text{LT}(f)$ is reducible by G or there is $g \in G$ such that $\text{LT}(g) \mid \text{LT}(f)$. A set $G \subseteq R[\mathbf{x}]^k$ is *softly reduced* if no $f \in G$ is softly reducible by $G \setminus \{f\}$.

We will consider the following ordering of finite subsets of $R[\mathbf{x}]^k$. We say that $G_1 \leq_S G_2$ if there is an injective map $\phi : G_1 \rightarrow G_2$ such that $g \leq_P \phi(g)$ for all $g \in G_1$. This ordering is a well partial ordering (Lemma 9.5). One step of a soft reduction is performed in the following algorithm `SOFTLYREDUCE`.

Algorithm 7.2 (Soft reduction).

Input: $G \subseteq R[\mathbf{x}]^k \setminus \{0\}$ such that G is not softly reduced.

Output: $H \subseteq R[\mathbf{x}]^k \setminus \{0\}$ such that

- (1) $\langle H \rangle = \langle G \rangle$,
- (2) Every $g \in G$ has a strong standard representation by H ,
- (3) $H <_S G$

1: **function** `SOFTLYREDUCE`(G)

- 2: Choose $f, h \in F$ and a term $a\mathbf{x}^\alpha e_i$ from f such that $f \neq h$, $\text{LM}(h) \mid \mathbf{x}^\alpha e_i$ and there is $q \in R$ such that $(\mathbf{x}^\alpha e_i = \text{LM}(f)$ and $a - q \text{LC}(h) = 0$) or $(\mathbf{x}^\alpha e_i \neq \text{LM}(f)$ and $\hat{\delta}(a - q \text{LC}(h)) < \hat{\delta}(a)$).
- 3: $r \leftarrow f - q \frac{\mathbf{x}^\alpha e_i}{\text{LM}(h)} h$
- 4: **if** $r = 0$ **then**
- 5: $H \leftarrow G \setminus \{f\}$
- 6: **else**
- 7: $H \leftarrow (G \setminus \{f\}) \cup \{r\}$
- 8: Return H

Lemma 7.3. *Algorithm 7.2 is correct.*

Proof. Clearly, H and G generate the same submodule.

Next, we show that every $g \in G$ has a strong standard representation. Let $g \in G$. If $g \in H$, then $g = 1\mathbf{x}^0g$ is such a representation. If $g \notin H$, then $g = f$ and

$$(7.1) \quad f = q \frac{\mathbf{x}^\alpha e_i}{\text{LM}(h)} h + 1\mathbf{x}^0 r.$$

We first assume $r \neq 0$. If $\text{LT}(f) = a\mathbf{x}^\alpha e_i$, then $\text{DEG}(\frac{\mathbf{x}^\alpha e_i}{\text{LM}(h)} h) = (\alpha, i) = \text{DEG}(f)$ and $\text{DEG}(\mathbf{x}^0 r) = \text{DEG}(r) < \text{DEG}(f)$. If $\text{LT}(f) \neq a\mathbf{x}^\alpha e_i$, then $\text{DEG}(\frac{\mathbf{x}^\alpha e_i}{\text{LM}(h)} h) = (\alpha, i) < \text{DEG}(f)$ and $\text{DEG}(\mathbf{x}^0 r) = \text{DEG}(r) = \text{DEG}(f)$. In both cases (7.1) is a strong standard representation of f by H with remainder 0. If $r = 0$, then $f = q \frac{\mathbf{x}^\alpha e_i}{\text{LM}(h)} h$ is a strong standard representation.

For proving $H <_S G$, we define $\phi : H \rightarrow G$ by $\phi(h) = h$ for $h \in H \setminus \{r\}$, and $\phi(r) = f$ when $r \neq 0$. Since $r <_P f$, the mapping ϕ witnesses $H <_S G$. \square

We also need to normalize polynomial vectors. The following procedure normalizes one vector in G .

Algorithm 7.4 (Normalization).

Input: $G \subseteq R[\mathbf{x}]^k \setminus \{0\}$ such that G contains an element that is not normalized.

Output: $H \subseteq R[\mathbf{x}]^k \setminus \{0\}$, $H \neq \emptyset$ such that

- (1) $\langle H \rangle = \langle G \rangle$,
- (2) Every $g \in G$ has a strong standard representation by H ,
- (3) $H <_P G$.

```

1: function NORMALIZE( $G$ )
2:   Choose  $g \in G$  such that  $g$  is not normalized
3:   Find a unit  $u$  in  $R$  such that  $ug$  is normalized
4:    $H \leftarrow (G \setminus \{g\}) \cup \{ug\}$ 
5:   Return  $H$ 

```

Lemma 7.5. *Algorithm 7.4 is correct.*

Proof. It is clear that H and G generate the same submodule.

Furthermore, $g = u^{-1}\mathbf{x}^0(ug)$ is a strong standard representation of g by H .

We have $ug <_P g$. Hence $\phi(h) := h$ for $h \in H \setminus \{ug\}$ and $\phi(ug) = g$ witnesses $H <_S G$. \square

Theorem 7.6. *Let G be a softly reduced strong Gröbner basis in which every element is normalized. Then G is reduced.*

Proof. Let $g \in G$. We have to show that g is not reducible by $G \setminus \{g\}$. Suppose that g is reducible. Then there are $h \in G \setminus \{g\}$, a term $a\mathbf{x}^{\alpha_{e_i}}$ in g and $q \in R$ such that $\text{LM}(h) \mid \mathbf{x}^{\alpha_{e_i}}$ and $\hat{\delta}(a - q\text{LC}(h)) < \hat{\delta}(a)$. If $a\mathbf{x}^{\alpha_{e_i}} \neq \text{LT}(g)$, then $g - \text{LT}(g)$ is reducible by $\{h\}$, and thus g is softly reducible by $G \setminus \{g\}$. If $a\mathbf{x}^{\alpha_{e_i}} = \text{LT}(g)$, then let $d := \text{gcd}(\text{LC}(g), \text{LC}(h))$. There is a polynomial vector f in the module generated by G such that $\text{LT}(f) = d\mathbf{x}^{\alpha_{e_i}}$ and thus there is $g_1 \in G$ with $\text{LT}(g_1) \mid d\mathbf{x}^{\alpha_{e_i}}$. Since G is softly reduced, we then have $g_1 = g$, and thus $a = \text{LC}(g) = \text{LC}(g_1) \mid \text{LC}(h)$. Then $\text{LC}(g) - q\text{LC}(h)$ is a multiple of a . Since $\hat{\delta}(a - q\text{LC}(h)) < \hat{\delta}(a)$, (6.1) implies $\delta(a - q\text{LC}(h)) \leq \delta(a)$, and thus by Lemma 6.1, there is a unit in R such that $u\text{LC}(g) = \text{LC}(g) - q\text{LC}(h)$. Since g is normalized, $\hat{\delta}(\text{LC}(g)) \leq \hat{\delta}(\text{LC}(g) - q\text{LC}(h))$; this contradicts $\hat{\delta}(\text{LC}(g) - q\text{LC}(h)) < \hat{\delta}(\text{LC}(g))$. \square

In the computation of a strong Gröbner basis, we may interleave the three steps done in AUGMENT, SOFTLYREDUCE and NORMALIZE as we wish. However, at some point, we may for instance enter the while loop with G normalized and softly reduced: then in this course of the while-loop, we have to use the procedure AUGMENT. Note that the while-condition guarantees that we have at least one choice in every execution of the while-loop.

Algorithm 7.7 (Reduced Strong Gröbner Basis).

Input: $F \subseteq R[\mathbf{x}]^k \setminus \{0\}$, an admissible order \leq of $\mathbb{N}_0^n \times \underline{k}$.

Output: $G \subseteq R[\mathbf{x}]^k \setminus \{0\}$ such that G is a reduced strong Gröbner basis of the submodule generated by F with respect to the monomial vector ordering \leq .

```

 $G \leftarrow F$ 
 $P \leftarrow \emptyset$ 
while  $(\exists p, q \in G : p \neq q \text{ and } \{p, q\} \notin P)$  or
     $(G \text{ is not softly reduced})$  or
     $(G \text{ is not normalized})$  do
    Do exactly one out of the possible choices from (1),(2),(3):
    (1)  $(G, x) \leftarrow \text{AUGMENT}(G, \{p, q\})$ 
        if  $x = 1$  then  $P \leftarrow P \cup \{\{p, q\}\}$ 
    (2)  $G \leftarrow \text{SOFTLYREDUCE}(G)$ 
    (3)  $G \leftarrow \text{NORMALIZE}(G)$ 
Return  $G$ 
    
```

Theorem 7.8. *Algorithm 7.7 terminates on every input and produces a correct result.*

Proof. We first show that the algorithm terminates. Seeking a contradiction, we consider an execution that runs forever. In this execution, let G_i be the value of G at the beginning of the i th execution of the while-loop. The output conditions of the three algorithms AUGMENT, SOFTLYREDUCE and NORMALIZE imply that $\text{DEG}_\delta(G_i)\uparrow \subseteq \text{DEG}_\delta(G_{i+1})\uparrow$. Thus there is an $n_1 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for all $i \geq n_1$, we have $\text{DEG}_\delta(G_i)\uparrow = \text{DEG}_\delta(G_{i+1})\uparrow$.

From this point onwards, the assignments to G in lines 11, 16, 18 in AUGMENT (Algorithm 5.1) will not be executed any more because all of these assignments strictly increase $\text{DEG}_\delta(G)\uparrow$ with respect to \subseteq . In other words, G will not be changed any more by AUGMENT, which also follows from output condition (2) of AUGMENT. Hence for all $i \geq n_1$, we have $G_{i+1} \leq_S G_i$. Thus there is $n_2 \in \mathbb{N}$ with $n_2 \geq n_1$ such that for all $i \geq n_2$, $G_{i+1} = G_i$. From this point on, SOFTLYREDUCE and NORMALIZE cannot be called any more because both of them strictly decrease G with respect to \leq_S . Hence, the only remaining possible branches are the cases $f = 0$ and $\exists g \in G : \text{LT}(f) \mid \text{LT}(g)$ in the execution of AUGMENT. In detail, only the assignments contained in line 2 to 9 of AUGMENT can be executed. In both branches $x = 1$ (this can also be seen directly from output condition (3) of AUGMENT), and thus $\#\binom{G_{i+1}}{2} \setminus P_{i+1} < \#\binom{G_i}{2} \setminus P_i$. Hence, starting from the n_2 th execution of the while-loop of Algorithm 7.7, this nonnegative number strictly decreases forever, which is impossible. Hence the algorithm terminates on every input.

From Lemma 9.6, we obtain that throughout the execution of the algorithm, the set $\{f \in R[\mathbf{x}]^k \mid f \text{ has a strong standard representation by } G\}$ increases with respect to \subseteq . By the output conditions of all three procedures AUGMENT, SOFTLYREDUCE and NORMALIZE, $\langle G \rangle = \langle F \rangle$. Therefore, when the while-loop is left, G is softly reduced and G is normalized. Furthermore, every two-element subset $\{p, q\}$ of G lies in P and therefore has an S -polynomial vector that is 0 or has a strong standard representation by G . Thus by Theorem 4.6, G is a strong Gröbner basis of $\langle G \rangle$, and by Theorem 7.6, G is reduced. \square

8. LINEAR ALGEBRA OVER $R[\mathbf{x}]$

Let D be a commutative ring with unit. By $D^{r \times s}$, we denote the set of $r \times s$ -matrices over D . For $A \in D^{r \times s}$, we define $\text{col}(A) = \{Ax \mid x \in D^s\}$ as the *column module* and $\text{row}(A) = \{yA \mid y \in D^r\}$ as the *row module* of A . The set $\ker(A) = \{y \in D^s \mid Ay = 0\}$ is the *kernel* oder *null module* of A . We will now compute bases for these modules in the case $D = R[x_1, \dots, x_n]$, where R is a Euclidean domain. We assume that we have the Euclidean grading function

δ and $\hat{\delta}$ for R as in Section 6. As an additional assumption, we assume that $\hat{\delta}(1)$ is minimal in $\{\hat{\delta}(u) \mid u \text{ is a unit of } R\}$. For a matrix $A \in R[x_1, \dots, x_n]^{r \times s}$ and admissible monomial orders \leq_1, \dots, \leq_s on the monomials of $R[\mathbf{x}]$, we define the *position over term-order* \leq by $\mathbf{x}^\alpha e_i \leq \mathbf{x}^\beta e_j$ if $i > j$ or $(i = j \text{ and } \alpha \leq_i \beta)$. We say that a matrix $H \in R[\mathbf{x}]^{r \times s}$ is the *Gröbner normal form* with respect to (\leq_1, \dots, \leq_s) for A if the rows of H are a reduced strong Gröbner basis of the module $\text{row}(A)$ with respect to \leq , and the rows are ordered in strictly decreasing order with respect to the total order \leq_P defined after Definition 6.3. An example of such a matrix is given in (8.1). The entries of H can be described as follows:

Lemma 8.1. *Let R be a Euclidean domain, let $A \in R[\mathbf{x}]^{r' \times s}$, and let $H = (h_{ij})_{(i,j) \in \underline{r} \times \underline{s}} \in R[\mathbf{x}]^{r \times s}$ be the Gröbner normal form of A . For $i \in \underline{r}$, we define the i th step of H by*

$$S_i = \{h_{t,i} \mid t \in \underline{r}, h_{t,i} \neq 0, \text{ and } h_{t,1} = \dots = h_{t,i-1} = 0\}.$$

The i th fork ideal of $\text{row}(A)$ is the set

$$F_i = \{p \in R[\mathbf{x}] \mid \exists p_{i+1}, \dots, p_s \in k[\mathbf{x}] : \underbrace{(0, \dots, 0)}_{i-1}, p, p_{i+1}, \dots, p_s \in \text{row}(A)\}.$$

Then S_i is a reduced strong Gröbner basis of the ideal F_i of $R[\mathbf{x}]$ with respect to \leq_i .

Proof. Let $p \in F_i$ with $p \neq 0$, and let $\mathbf{v} = \underbrace{(0, \dots, 0)}_{i-1}, p, p_{i+1}, \dots, p_s \in \text{row}(A)$.

Then $\mathbf{v} = p e_i + \sum_{j=i+1}^s p_j e_j$. Let h_1, \dots, h_r be the rows of H . Since $\{h_1, \dots, h_r\}$ is a strong Gröbner basis of $\text{row}(A)$, there is $t \in \underline{r}$ such that $\text{LT}(h_t) \mid \text{LT}(\mathbf{v}) = \text{LT}(p e_i)$. Then $\text{LT}(h_t)$ is of the form $a \mathbf{x}^\alpha e_i$, and therefore $h_{t,i} \in S_i$. Hence h_t can be written as $(0, \dots, 0, h_{t,i}, h_{t,i+1}, \dots, h_{t,s})$ with $\text{LT}(h_t) = \text{lt}(h_{t,i}) e_i$. (Recall from Section 5 that we write $\text{LT}(f)$ when f is a polynomial vector in $R[\mathbf{x}]^k$ and $\text{lt}(f)$ when f is a single polynomial in $R[\mathbf{x}]$.) Hence $\text{lt}(h_{t,i}) \mid \text{lt}(p)$. Thus S_i is a Gröbner basis of F_i .

Now suppose that S_i is not reduced. Then we have $h_{u,i}, h_{v,i} \in S_i$ with $u \neq v$, $q \in R$ and $\alpha \in \mathbb{N}_0^n$ such that $\deg(h_{u,i}) \geq \deg(h_{v,i})$ and $h_{u,i} >_p h_{u,i} - q \mathbf{x}^\alpha h_{v,i}$, where \leq_p is defined from \leq_i for polynomials in analogy to the definition of \leq_P for polynomial vectors in Section 6. Then $h_u >_P h_u - q \mathbf{x}^\alpha h_v$, contradicting the fact that the rows of H are a reduced Gröbner basis. \square

This allows us to solve linear systems over $R[\mathbf{x}]$. As an example, we consider the linear equation $(10y)z_1 + 0z_2 + (4x)z_3 = 4x^3$, where we look for the set of

all solutions $(z_1, z_2, z_3) \in \mathbb{Z}[x, y]^3$. We collect the data from this equation in the matrix

$$A' := \begin{pmatrix} -4x^3 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 10y & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 4x & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$$

and we compute the Gröbner normal form (with respect to the lexicographical ordering with $x > y$ in all columns) of A' as

$$(8.1) \quad H = \begin{pmatrix} 2xy & 0 & x & 0 & -2y \\ 4x & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 10y & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & x^2 \\ 0 & 0 & 2x & 0 & -5y \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Then we can read from this matrix that $(0, 0, x^2)$ is one solution, and the solution module of $(10y)z_1 + 0z_2 + (4x)z_3 = 0$ is generated, as a $\mathbb{Z}[x, y]$ -module, by $(2x, 0, -5y)$ and $(0, 1, 0)$. This is justified by the following theorem, which explains how to solve linear systems in a style that follows [AL94, Chapter 3.8].

Theorem 8.2. *Let R be a Euclidean domain, let $A \in R[\mathbf{x}]^{r \times s}$, let $b \in R[\mathbf{x}]^{r \times 1}$ and let $\leq_{-1}, \leq_0, \leq_1, \dots, \leq_s$ be admissible orders on the monomials of $R[\mathbf{x}]$. Let $H \in R[\mathbf{x}]^{r' \times (r+s+1)}$ be the Gröbner normal form of*

$$A' = \left(\begin{array}{c|c} -b^T & \\ \hline A^T & I_{s+1} \end{array} \right)$$

with respect to the monomial orders $(\underbrace{\leq_{-1}, \dots, \leq_{-1}}_{r \text{ times}}, \leq_0, \leq_1, \dots, \leq_s)$. We write H as

$$H = \begin{pmatrix} B & * & * \\ 0 & v & S \\ 0 & 0 & D \end{pmatrix},$$

where B has exactly r columns, v exactly 1 column and D exactly s columns, and furthermore the last line of B is not the zero-vector, and the last entry of v is not 0. Then we have:

- (1) *The entries of v are a reduced strong Gröbner basis of the ideal*

$$(\text{col}(A) : b) := \{p \in R[\mathbf{x}] \mid pb \in \text{col}(A)\}.$$

of $R[\mathbf{x}]$ with respect to the monomial order \leq_0 .

- (2) The system $Ax = b$ has a solution in $R[\mathbf{x}]^s$ if and only if $v = (1)$. Then the matrix S has exactly one row s_1 , and s_1 is the minimal solution of $Ax = b$ with respect to \leq_P , where \leq_P is the total order on polynomial vectors defined from the admissible order \leq that is the position over term order coming from (\leq_1, \dots, \leq_s) .
- (3) D is in Gröbner normal form and $\text{row}(D) = \ker(A)$.

Proof. (1) We first show that $\{p \in R[\mathbf{x}] \mid pb \in \text{col}(A)\}$ is equal to the $(r+1)$ th fork ideal F_{r+1} of A' . To this end, let $a_1, \dots, a_s \in R[\mathbf{x}]^r$ be the column vectors of A . For proving one inclusion, we assume that $p_{r+1} \in F_{r+1}$. Then there are $p_{r+2}, \dots, p_{r+s+1} \in R[\mathbf{x}]$ such that $(0, \dots, 0, p_{r+1}, p_{r+2}, \dots, p_{r+s+1})$ is in $\text{row}(A')$, and thus there is $(f_0, f_1, \dots, f_s) \in R[\mathbf{x}]^{s+1}$ such that

$$(8.2) \quad (f_0, f_1, \dots, f_s) \cdot A' = (0, \dots, 0, p_{r+1}, p_{r+2}, \dots, p_{r+s+1}).$$

Considering the first r entries of the right hand side of (8.2), we obtain $-f_0b + \sum_{i=1}^s f_i a_i = 0$, and hence $f_0b = \sum_{i=1}^s f_i a_i$, and therefore $f_0b \in \text{col}(A)$. The $(r+1)$ th column of A' is the first unit vector in $R[\mathbf{x}]^{s+1}$. Hence $f_0 = p_{r+1}$, and thus $p_{r+1}b \in \text{col}(A)$ and therefore $p_{r+1} \in (\text{col}(A) : b)$.

Now assume that $p \in (\text{col}(A) : b)$. Then there is $(f_1, \dots, f_s) \in k[\mathbf{x}]^s$ such that $\sum_{i=1}^s f_i a_i = pb$. Therefore the first r columns of $(p, f_1, \dots, f_s) \cdot A'$ are 0, and therefore the $(r+1)$ th entry of $(p, f_1, \dots, f_s) \cdot A'$ is an element of F_{r+1} . Since this entry is p , we have $p \in F_{r+1}$.

By Lemma 8.1, the entries of v are a reduced strong Gröbner basis of $F_{r+1} = (\text{col}(A) : b)$ with respect to \leq_0 .

(2) The system $Ax = b$ has a solution if and only if $b \in \text{col}(A)$, which means $1 \in (\text{col}(A) : b)$. This holds if and only if the reduced Gröbner basis of $(\text{col}(A) : b)$ is $\{1\}$. By item (1), the entries of v are a reduced Gröbner basis of $(\text{col}(A) : b)$. Altogether, $Ax = b$ has a solution in $R[\mathbf{x}]^s$ if and only if $v = (1)$.

(3) It is not hard to show that the rows of D are a reduced strong Gröbner basis of the module

$$E := \{(f_{r+2}, \dots, f_{r+s+1}) \in R[\mathbf{x}]^s \mid (0, \dots, 0, f_{r+2}, \dots, f_{r+s+1}) \in \text{row}(A')\}.$$

We now show $E = \ker(A)$. For \subseteq , we assume $(0, \dots, 0, f_{r+2}, \dots, f_{r+s+1}) \in \text{row}(A')$. Then there is $(g_0, g_1, \dots, g_s) \in R[\mathbf{x}]^{s+1}$ with

$$(8.3) \quad (g_0, g_1, \dots, g_s) \cdot A' = (0, \dots, 0, f_{r+2}, \dots, f_{r+s+1}).$$

Hence $g_0 = 0$ and $(g_1, \dots, g_s) \cdot A^T = 0$, and therefore $(g_1, \dots, g_s) \in \ker(A)$. Since $(g_1, \dots, g_s) = (f_{r+2}, \dots, f_{r+s+1})$, we obtain that $(f_{r+2}, \dots, f_{r+s+1}) \in \ker(A)$.

If $(g_1, \dots, g_s) \in \ker(A)$, then $(0, g_1, \dots, g_s) \cdot A' = (0, \dots, 0, g_1, \dots, g_s)$ and thus $(g_1, \dots, g_s) \in E$. \square

The Gröbner normal form generalizes the row echelon normal form of a matrix A over a field k as computed, e.g., in Mathematica [Wol24] by `RowReduce` [A]. To see this, we set $R := k$ and consider A as a matrix over $R[x_1]$ (in which x_1 never appears). Similarly, it also generalizes the Hermite normal form of a matrix over \mathbb{Z} (with the elements above the pivot elements normalized to minimize their absolute values, and preferring 3 over -3). Here we consider A as a matrix over $\mathbb{Z}[x_1]$, and set $R := \mathbb{Z}$, $\delta(z) := |z|$ and $\hat{\delta}(z) = 3|z| - \text{sgn}(z)$ for all $z \in \mathbb{Z}$ to obtain $\hat{\delta}(0) < \hat{\delta}(1) < \hat{\delta}(-1) < \hat{\delta}(2) < \hat{\delta}(-2) < \dots$. Hence Theorem 6.4 also implies the uniqueness of these normal forms.

9. PARTIAL ORDERS

A partially ordered set (A, ρ) is a set A together with a partial order, i.e., a reflexive, transitive and antisymmetric relation ρ . Often, we write $a \leq b$ or $b \geq a$ for $(a, b) \in \rho$, and $a < b$ or $b > a$ when $(a, b) \in \rho$ and $(b, a) \notin \rho$. We say that a and b are *uncomparable* and write $a \perp b$ if $(a, b) \notin \rho$ and $(b, a) \notin \rho$. The sequence $(a_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ is an *infinite descending chain* in A when $a_i > a_{i+1}$ for all $i \in \mathbb{N}$, and an *infinite antichain* when $a_i \perp a_j$ for all $i, j \in \mathbb{N}$ with $i \neq j$. An order relation \leq on A is a *well partial order* if it has no infinite descending chains and no infinite antichains. It is a *well order* if it is total (i.e., has no distinct uncomparable elements) and has no infinite descending chains. For a subset B of the partially ordered set (A, \leq) , $b \in B$ is *minimal* in B if there is no $b' \in B$ with $b' < b$. The subset B is *upward closed* if for all $b \in B$ and $a \in A$ with $b \leq a$, we have $a \in B$. The product of (A_1, ρ_1) and (A_2, ρ_2) is the set $A_1 \times A_2$ ordered by the relation ρ defined by $((a_1, a_2), (b_1, b_2)) \in \rho \Leftrightarrow (a_1, b_1) \in \rho_1$ and $(a_2, b_2) \in \rho_2$. Our investigation of these orderings is facilitated by Ramsey's Theorem [Ram29] (cf. [Neš95]): Denote the two element subsets of \mathbb{N} by $\binom{\mathbb{N}}{2}$ and let c be a function from $\binom{\mathbb{N}}{2}$ into a finite set. Then there exists an infinite subset T of \mathbb{N} such that c is constant on $\binom{T}{2}$. All results in this section are well known; some are taken from the survey [AA20].

Theorem 9.1 (Dickson's Lemma [Dic13]). *The product of two well partially ordered sets is well partially ordered.*

Proof. Let (A, \leq_A) and (B, \leq_B) be well partially ordered sets, and let $((a_i, b_i))_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ be any sequence from $A \times B$. We colour the two element subsets of \mathbb{N} with one of the nine colours from $\{\leq, >, \perp\}^2$ as follows: when $i < j$ then $C(\{i, j\}) = (\leq, \leq)$

if $a_i \leq a_j$ and $b_i \leq b_j$, $C(\{i, j\}) = (\leq, >)$ if $a_i \leq a_j$ and $b_i > b_j$, \dots . By Ramsey's Theorem there is an infinite subset T of \mathbb{N} such that all two-element subsets of T have the same color c . If this colour c is not (\leq, \leq) , then we find an infinite descending chain or an infinite antichain in either A or B . Hence $c = (\leq, \leq)$. This implies that $((a_i, b_i))_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ is neither an infinite descending chain nor an infinite antichain. \square

Lemma 9.2. *Let \leq_a be an admissible ordering on $\text{Mon}(n, k)$. Then there is no infinite descending chain $m_1 >_a m_2 >_a \dots$ with respect to this ordering.*

Proof. Let $(m_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ be a sequence from $\text{Mon}(n, k)$. We colour two-element subsets $\{i, j\}$ of \mathbb{N} with $i < j$ by $C(\{i, j\}) = 1$ if $m_i \mid m_j$, $C(\{i, j\}) = 2$ if $m_j \mid m_i$ and $m_j \neq m_i$, and $C(\{i, j\}) = 3$ if $m_i \nmid m_j$ and $m_j \nmid m_i$. We use Ramsey's Theorem to obtain an infinite subset T of \mathbb{N} such that all two-element subsets of T have the same colour c . If this colour is 2 or 3, then we obtain an infinite descending chain or an infinite antichain in $\text{Mon}(n, k)$, which is order isomorphic to $(\mathbb{N}_0, \leq)^n \times (\{1, \dots, k\}, =)$, contradicting Theorem 9.1. Hence this colour is 1 and thus there are $i, j \in \mathbb{N}$ with $i < j$ such that $m_i \mid m_j$. Then $m_i \leq_a m_j$. Thus $(m_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ cannot be an infinite descending chain. \square

As another consequence, we obtain that the order relation \sqsubseteq_δ defined in (2.1), which is the order of the direct product of n copies of (\mathbb{N}_0, \leq) with $(\{1, \dots, k\}, =)$ and (W, \leq) has no infinite descending chain and no infinite antichain:

Theorem 9.3. *Let (W, \leq) be a well ordered set, and let \sqsubseteq_δ be the ordering on $\mathbb{N}_0^n \times \underline{k} \times W$ defined in (2.1). Then we have*

- (1) *The order \sqsubseteq_δ is a well partial order.*
- (2) *For every subset D of $\mathbb{N}_0^n \times \underline{k} \times W$, the set $\text{Min}(D)$ of minimal elements of D with respect to \sqsubseteq_δ is finite, and for every $d \in D$ there is $d' \in \text{Min}(D)$ with $d' \sqsubseteq_\delta d$.*
- (3) *There is no infinite ascending chain $D_1 \subset D_2 \subset \dots$ of upward closed subsets of $(\mathbb{N}_0^n \times \underline{k} \times W, \sqsubseteq_\delta)$.*

Proof. (1) $(\mathbb{N}_0^n \times \underline{k} \times W, \sqsubseteq_\delta)$ is order isomorphic to the product of n copies of (\mathbb{N}_0, \leq) with $(\underline{k}, =)$ and (W, \leq) . Since all factors are well partially ordered, Theorem 9.1 implies that \sqsubseteq_δ is a well partial order. (2) Distinct minimal elements of D are all incomparable with respect to \sqsubseteq_δ . Since \sqsubseteq_δ is a well partial order and therefore has no infinite antichains, $\text{Min}(D)$ is finite. Now let $d \in D$. If $\{x \in D \mid x \sqsubseteq_\delta d\}$ has no minimal element, we can construct a sequence $(d_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ with $d \supset_\delta d_1 \supset_\delta d_2 \supset_\delta \dots$ of elements from D ; such sequences do not exist

because \sqsubseteq_δ is a well partial order, and therefore $\{x \in D \mid x \sqsubseteq_\delta d\}$ has a minimal element, which is then also minimal in D . (3) Let $U_1 \subset U_2 \subset \dots$ be an infinite ascending chain of upward closed subsets of $\mathbb{N}_0^n \times \underline{k} \times W$. Then $U := \bigcup_{i \in \mathbb{N}} U_i$ has a finite set of minimal elements $\text{Min}(U)$. Thus there is $k \in \mathbb{N}$ with $\text{Min}(U) \subseteq U_k$, and therefore $U \subseteq U_k$, which yields the contradiction $U_{k+1} \subseteq U_k$. \square

Next, we see that the order \leq_P of polynomial vectors defined before Theorem 6.4 is a well order. For $f = \sum_{(\alpha,i) \in E} c_{(\alpha,i)} \mathbf{x}^\alpha e_i$, we let $[\mathbf{x}^\alpha e_i] f := c_{(\alpha,i)}$ denote the coefficient of \mathbf{x}^α of the i th component of f . Then for $p \neq q$, we have $p <_P q$ if $\hat{\delta}([\text{LM}(p-q)] p) < \hat{\delta}([\text{LM}(p-q)] q)$ and $p \leq_P q$ if $p = q$ or $p <_P q$.

Lemma 9.4. *The relation \leq_P is a well order on $R[\mathbf{x}]^k$.*

Proof. The relation \leq_P is clearly reflexive and antisymmetric. For transitivity, we assume $p <_P q <_P r$. Then $\text{LM}(p-r) = \text{LM}((p-q) + (q-r))$, and thus $\text{DEG}(p-r) \leq \max(\text{DEG}(p-q), \text{DEG}(q-r))$. If $\text{LM}(p-q) = \text{LM}(q-r)$, then $\hat{\delta}([\text{LM}(p-q)] p) < \hat{\delta}([\text{LM}(p-q)] q) < \hat{\delta}([\text{LM}(p-q)] r)$. Hence $[\text{LM}(p-q)](p-r) \neq 0$. Thus $\text{DEG}(p-r) \geq \text{DEG}(p-q)$, and therefore $\text{DEG}(p-r) = \text{DEG}(p-q)$. Now $\hat{\delta}([\text{LM}(p-r)] p) < \hat{\delta}([\text{LM}(p-r)] r)$, and thus $p <_P r$. If $\text{LM}(p-q) \neq \text{LM}(q-r)$, then we first consider the case $\text{DEG}(p-q) < \text{DEG}(q-r)$. Then $\text{DEG}(p-r) = \text{DEG}((p-q) + (q-r)) = \text{DEG}(q-r)$. Since $\text{DEG}(p-q) < \text{DEG}(q-r)$, we have $[\text{LM}(q-r)] p = [\text{LM}(q-r)] q$. Therefore $\hat{\delta}([\text{LM}(q-r)] p) < \hat{\delta}([\text{LM}(q-r)] r)$ and thus $p <_P r$. The case $\text{DEG}(p-q) > \text{DEG}(q-r)$ is similar. Thus \leq_P is transitive. It is easy to see that the ordering \leq_P is total. Now let $(f_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ be an infinite descending chain with respect to \leq_P ; among such chains, choose one for which $\text{DEG}(f_1)$ is minimal. Then we must have $\text{DEG}(f_1) = \text{DEG}(f_i)$ for all $i \in \mathbb{N}$, since otherwise $(f_j)_{j \geq i}$ would contradict the minimality. Thus $\hat{\delta}(\text{LC}(f_i)) \geq \hat{\delta}(\text{LC}(f_{i+1}))$ for all $i \in \mathbb{N}$. This means that there is $n_1 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\hat{\delta}(\text{LC}(f_i)) = \hat{\delta}(\text{LC}(f_{i+1}))$ and therefore $\text{LT}(f_i) = \text{LT}(f_{i+1})$ for all $i \geq n_1$. Then $(f_i - \text{LT}(f_i))_{i \geq n_1}$ is an infinite descending sequence with respect to \leq_P , contradicting the minimality of $\text{DEG}(f_1)$. \square

After stating Definition 7.1, we have ordered finite subsets F, G of $R[\mathbf{x}]^k$ by $F \leq_S G$ if there is an injective $\phi : F \rightarrow G$ with $f \leq_P \phi(f)$ for all $f \in F$.

Lemma 9.5. *The relation \leq_S is a well order on $R[\mathbf{x}]^k$.*

Proof. Reflexivity and transitivity of \leq_S are immediate. For checking that \leq_S is antisymmetric, we assume $F \leq_S G$ and $G \leq_S F$, witnessed by $\phi_1 : F \rightarrow G$ and $\phi_2 : G \rightarrow F$. Then defining $\phi := \phi_2 \circ \phi_1$, we obtain an injective map $\phi : F \rightarrow F$ such that $f \leq \phi(f)$ for all $f \in F$. We claim that $\phi(f) = f$ for all $f \in F$. Let f be

minimal in F with respect to \leq_P such that $f \neq \phi(f)$. Then $f <_P \phi(f)$. Since F is finite, ϕ is surjective, and thus there is $g \in F$ with $\phi(g) = f$. Since $\phi(f) >_P f$, we then have $g \neq f$ and therefore since $g \leq_P \phi(g)$, we have $g <_P f$. Since we also have $g \neq \phi(g)$, the polynomial vector g contradicts the minimality of f . Therefore, ϕ is the identity map on F . Hence from $\phi_2 \circ \phi_1 = \text{id}$, we obtain that for each $f \in F$, we have $f \leq_P \phi_1(f) \leq_P \phi_2(\phi_1(f)) = f$, which implies $\phi_1(f) = f$ for all $f \in F$. Thus ϕ_1 is the identity mapping, which implies $F \subseteq G$. Since F and G have the same number of elements, this implies $F = G$, completing the proof that \leq_S is antisymmetric.

Now let $(F_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ be such that $F_i >_S F_{i+1}$ for all $i \in \mathbb{N}$, and we choose such a chain for which $\#F_1$ is minimal. By this minimality, we then have $\#F_1 = \#F_i$ for all $i \in \mathbb{N}$. Let ϕ_i be an injective mapping from F_{i+1} to F_i with $f \leq \phi_i(f)$ for all $f \in F_{i+1}$. Because of $\#F_i = \#F_{i+1}$, the mapping ϕ_i is bijective, and we have $\phi_i^{-1}(\phi_i(x)) = x \leq_P \phi_i(x)$ for all $x \in F_{i+1}$, and thus $\phi_i^{-1}(y) \leq_P y$ for all $y \in F_i$. Let $\psi_i := \phi_i^{-1} \circ \dots \circ \phi_2^{-1} \circ \phi_1^{-1}$, and fix $g \in F_1$. Then $(\psi_i(g))_{i \in \mathbb{N}_0}$ is a decreasing sequence in $(R[\mathbf{x}]^k, \leq_P)$, and therefore, there is $n_1 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $(\psi_i(g))_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ is constant. Let $G_i := F_i \setminus \{\psi_{i-1}(g)\}$. The mappings $\phi_i \setminus \{(\psi_i(g), \psi_{i-1}(g))\}$ witness that $G_{i+1} \leq_S G_i$ for all $i \in \mathbb{N}$. Hence by the minimality of $\#F_1$, the sequence $(G_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ is constant from some n_2 onwards. Hence from $\max(n_1, n_2)$ onwards, $(F_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ is constant, a contradiction. \square

In proving that S -polynomial vectors that have a strong representation still have a strong representation after applying `SOFTLYREDUCE` or `NORMALIZE`, we have needed the following lemma:

Lemma 9.6. *Let R be a Euclidean domain, let \leq be an admissible term order of R , and let $F, G, H \subseteq R[x_1, \dots, x_n]^k$. We assume that every $f \in F$ has a strong standard representation by G and that every $g \in G$ has a strong standard representation by H . Then every $f \in F$ has a strong standard representation by H .*

Proof. If $f = \sum_{i=1}^N a_i n_i g_i$ is a strong standard representation of f by G and $g_i = \sum_{j=1}^{M_i} b_{i,j} m_{i,j} h_{i,j}$ is a strong standard representation of g_i by H , then $f = \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=1}^{M_i} a_i b_{i,j} (n_i m_{i,j}) h_{i,j}$ is a representation of f by H . To show that it is a strong standard representation, we observe that $\text{DEG}(n_1 m_{1,1} h_{1,1}) = \text{DEG}(n_1) + \text{DEG}(m_{1,1} h_{1,1}) = \text{DEG}(n_1) + \text{DEG}(g_1)$ because $g_1 = \sum_{j=1}^{M_1} b_{1,j} m_{1,j} h_{1,j}$ is a strong standard representation of g_1 by H . Furthermore, we have $\text{DEG}(n_1) + \text{DEG}(g_1) = \text{DEG}(n_1 g_1) = \text{DEG}(f)$ because of the standard representation of f . Similarly, we see that for $(i, j) \neq (1, 1)$, we have $\text{DEG}(n_i m_{i,j} h_{i,j}) < \text{DEG}(f)$. \square

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

I have discussed these topics with a number of colleagues at our university. M. Kauers provided several useful comments on the manuscript. I thank these persons for their help.

REFERENCES

- [AA20] E. Aichinger and F. Aichinger. Dickson’s Lemma, Higman’s Theorem and Beyond: A survey of some basic results in order theory. *Expo. Math.*, 38(4):537–547, 2020. ISSN 0723-0869. URL <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.exmath.2019.05.003>.
- [AL94] W. W. Adams and P. Loustaunau. *An introduction to Gröbner bases*, volume 3 of *Graduate Studies in Mathematics*. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 1994. ISBN 0-8218-3804-0. xiv+289 pp. URL <https://doi.org/10.1090/gsm/003>.
- [BK10] B. Buchberger and M. Kauers. Gröbner basis. *Scholarpedia*, 5(10):7763, 2010. URL http://www.scholarpedia.org/article/Groebner_basis.
- [Buc65] B. Buchberger. *Ein Algorithmus zum Auffinden der Basiselemente des Restklassenringes nach einem nulldimensionalen Polynomideal*. Universität Innsbruck, Mathematisches Institut (Dissertation), 1965. URL <http://www.risc.jku.at/people/buchberger/papers/1965-00-00-A.pdf>.
- [Buc70] B. Buchberger. Ein algorithmisches Kriterium für die Lösbarkeit eines algebraischen Gleichungssystems. *Aequationes Math.*, 4:374–383, 1970.
- [Buc76] B. Buchberger. A theoretical basis for the reduction of polynomials to canonical forms. *ACM SIGSAM Bull.*, 10(3):19–29, 1976.
- [Buc84] B. Buchberger. A critical-pair/completion algorithm for finitely generated ideals in rings. In *Logic and machines: decision problems and complexity (Münster, 1983)*, volume 171 of *Lecture Notes in Comput. Sci.*, pages 137–161. Springer, Berlin, 1984. ISBN 3-540-13331-3. URL https://doi.org/10.1007/3-540-13331-3_39.
- [BW93] T. Becker and V. Weispfenning. *Gröbner bases*, volume 141 of *Graduate Texts in Mathematics*. Springer-Verlag, New York, 1993. ISBN 0-387-97971-9. xxii+574 pp. URL <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4612-0913-3>. A computational approach to commutative algebra, in cooperation with Heinz Kredel.
- [CLO92] D. Cox, J. Little, and D. O’Shea. *Ideals, varieties, and algorithms*. Undergraduate Texts in Mathematics. Springer-Verlag, New York, 1992. ISBN 0-387-97847-X. xii+513 pp. An introduction to computational algebraic geometry and commutative algebra.
- [Dic13] L. E. Dickson. Finiteness of the odd perfect and primitive abundant numbers with n distinct prime factors. *American Journal of Mathematics*, 35(4):413–422, 1913. ISSN 00029327.
- [Eis95] D. Eisenbud. *Commutative algebra*. Springer-Verlag, New York, 1995. ISBN 0-387-94269-6. xvi+785 pp.
- [GP02] G.-M. Greuel and G. Pfister. *A Singular introduction to commutative algebra*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2002. ISBN 3-540-42897-6. xviii+588 pp. URL <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-662-04963-1>. With contributions by Olaf Bachmann, Christoph Lossen and Hans Schönemann, With 1 CD-ROM (Windows, Macintosh, and UNIX).

- [KRK88] A. Kandri-Rody and D. Kapur. Computing a Gröbner basis of a polynomial ideal over a Euclidean domain. *J. Symbolic Comput.*, 6(1):37–57, 1988. ISSN 0747-7171,1095-855X. URL [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0747-7171\(88\)80020-8](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0747-7171(88)80020-8).
- [Lic12] D. Lichtblau. Effective computation of strong Gröbner bases over Euclidean domains. *Illinois J. Math.*, 56(1):177–194, 2012. ISSN 0019-2082,1945-6581. URL <http://projecteuclid.org/euclid.ijm/1380287466>.
- [Neš95] J. Nešetřil. Ramsey theory. In *Handbook of combinatorics, Vol. 2*, pages 1331–1403. Elsevier, Amsterdam, 1995.
- [Ram29] F. P. Ramsey. On a problem of formal logic. *Proceedings London Mathematical Society (2)*, 30:264–286, 1929.
- [Smi14] J. R. Smith. *Introduction to algebraic geometry*. Five Dimensions Press, 2014. ISBN 978-1-5033-8153-7. URL bit.ly/1xYQYqc.
- [Wol24] Wolfram Research, Inc. Mathematica, Version 14.0, 2024. URL <https://www.wolfram.com/mathematica>. Champaign, IL.

ERHARD AICHINGER, INSTITUTE FOR ALGEBRA, JOHANNES KEPLER UNIVERSITY LINZ, 4040 LINZ, AUSTRIA

Email address: erhard@algebra.uni-linz.ac.at