

# Algebraic Tools for Computing Polynomial Loop Invariants

Erdenebayar BAYARMAGNAI <sup>a,1</sup>      Fatemeh MOHAMMADI <sup>a,b,1</sup>  
 erdenebayar.bayarmagnai@kuleuven.be      fatemeh.mohammadi@kuleuven.be

Rémi PRÉBET <sup>b,1</sup>  
 remi.prebet@kuleuven.be

<sup>a</sup>*Department of Computer Science, KU Leuven, Leuven, Belgium*

<sup>b</sup>*Department of Mathematics, KU Leuven, Leuven, Belgium*

*December 19, 2024*

## Abstract

Loop invariants are properties of a program loop that hold both before and after each iteration of the loop. They are often used to verify programs and ensure that algorithms consistently produce correct results during execution. Consequently, generating invariants becomes a crucial task for loops. We specifically focus on polynomial loops, where both the loop conditions and the assignments within the loop are expressed as polynomials. Although computing polynomial invariants for general loops is undecidable, efficient algorithms have been developed for certain classes of loops. For instance, when all assignments within a while loop involve linear polynomials, the loop becomes solvable. In this work, we study the more general case, where the polynomials can have arbitrary degrees.

Using tools from algebraic geometry, we present two algorithms designed to generate all polynomial invariants within a given vector subspace, for a branching loop with nondeterministic conditional statements. These algorithms combine linear algebra sub-routines with computations on polynomial ideals. They differ depending on whether the initial values of the loop variables are specified or treated as parameters. Additionally, we present a much more efficient algorithm for generating polynomial invariants of a specific form, applicable to all initial values. This algorithm avoids expensive ideal computations.

## 1 Introduction

Loop invariants are properties that hold both before and after each loop iteration in a program. When a loop invariant takes the form of a polynomial equation or a polynomial inequality, it is called a polynomial invariant of the loop. In this paper, we focus exclusively on polynomial equation invariants, which we refer to simply as polynomial invariants. These play a crucial role in automating program verification, helping to ensure that algorithms consistently yield correct results during execution. In particular, several well-established safety verification methods, such as the Floyd-Hoare inductive assertion technique [Flo93]

and the termination verification via standard ranking functions technique [MP12], rely on loop invariants to verify correctness, enabling full automation of the verification process.

In this paper, we specifically study polynomial loops, where the expressions in assignments are polynomials in program variables. Additionally, we consider only the case where the loop guard contains inequations, which are defined as the negation of an equation. More precisely, let  $\mathbf{a} = (a_1, \dots, a_n) \in \mathbb{C}^n$ , and let  $\mathbf{h} = (h_1, \dots, h_s)$  and  $F = (f_1, \dots, f_n)$  be two sequences of polynomials in  $\mathbb{C}[x_1, \dots, x_n]$ , where the  $x_i$ 's represent *program variables* and the  $a_i$ 's are the *initial values* of the loop. Then,  $\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{h}, F)$  denotes the loop:

$$\boxed{\begin{array}{l} (x_1, \dots, x_n) = (a_1, \dots, a_n) \\ \mathbf{while} \ h_1 \neq 0, \dots, h_s \neq 0 \ \mathbf{do} \\ \quad \begin{pmatrix} x_1 \\ x_2 \\ \vdots \\ x_n \end{pmatrix} \xleftarrow{F} \begin{pmatrix} f_1 \\ f_2 \\ \vdots \\ f_n \end{pmatrix} \\ \mathbf{end \ while} \end{array}}$$

When no  $\mathbf{h}$  is considered, we write  $\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{a}, 1, F)$ , as this corresponds to an infinite loop. Finally, we simply write  $\mathcal{L}$  when the corresponding loop is clear from the context.

In the following, consider a polynomial loop  $\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{h}, F)$ . We begin by defining the main object of interest to be computed in this paper.

**Definition 1.1.** *The set  $I_{\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{h}, F)} \subset \mathbb{C}[x_1, \dots, x_n]$  of all polynomial invariants for  $\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{h}, F)$  is called the invariant ideal of  $\mathcal{L}$ .*

The set defined above is thus called, as it is known (at least from [RCK04]) to be an ideal of  $\mathbb{C}[x_1, \dots, x_n]$ . Thanks to the Hilbert basis theorem, one can hope to compute a finite basis for this ideal to completely describe this invariant ideal. However, as recently shown in [MMK24], this task is at least as hard as the Skölem problem, whose decidability has remained widely open for almost a century. Instead, in this paper, we aim to compute this invariant ideal partially, in the sense of the following definition.

**Definition 1.2.** *Let  $E$  be a finite-dimensional vector subspace of  $\mathbb{C}[x_1, \dots, x_n]$ . Then, the polynomial invariants of  $\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{h}, F)$  in  $E$  are denoted by  $I_{\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{h}, F), E}$ .*

Note that this restricted set of polynomial invariants is a vector subspace of the finite-dimensional vector subspace  $E$  of  $\mathbb{C}[x_1, \dots, x_n]$ . Thus, we can reduce many routines to linear algebra problems and compute a vector basis for  $I_{\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{h}, F), E}$ . A classic choice for  $E$  in the literature is the set of polynomials of degree bounded by some chosen constant. Making this degree large enough allows one to expect some polynomial invariant to be in  $E$ , while controlling the dimension of the problem.

**Related works.** Over the past two decades, the computation of polynomial invariants for loops has been extensively studied, see e.g. [ABK<sup>+</sup>22, dOBP17, HOPW18, Kar76,

[Kov08](#), [Kov23](#), [RCK04](#), [RCK07a](#), [RCK07b](#)]. For general loops, this problem is undecidable [[HOPW23](#)]. Therefore, special emphasis has been placed on certain families of loops, especially those in which the assertions are all linear or can be reduced to linear assertions.

A common approach for generating polynomial invariants entails creating a system of recurrence relations from a loop, obtaining a closed formula for this recurrence relation, and then computing polynomial invariants by removing the loop counter from the obtained closed formula (as in [[KM76](#)]). Note that it is straightforward to find such recursive formulas from a polynomial invariant. However, the reverse process is only feasible under very strong assumptions, as detailed in [[ABK<sup>+</sup>22](#)]. Specifically, one needs to identify polynomial relations among program variables, which is a challenging task.

When each assignment within the loop is a linear function, Michael Karr introduced a pioneering algorithm for computing all linear invariants [[Kar76](#)]. Subsequent studies, such as [[MOS04b](#)] and [[RCK07a](#)], have extended this algorithm to compute all polynomial invariants of bounded degree, and more recently, in [[HOPW18](#), [MKSV24](#)], to compute the whole invariant ideal.

Another class of loops for which invariants have been successfully computed is the family of solvable loops. These loops are characterized by polynomial assignments that are either inherently linear or can be transformed into linear forms through a change of variables, as elaborated in [[dOBP16](#)] and [[Kov08](#)]. The techniques for generating all polynomial invariants of solvable loops are discussed in [[dOBP16](#), [RCK04](#)]. In [[dOBP16](#)], solvable loops are transformed into linear loops, while in [[RCK04](#)] the authors rely on forward propagation and fixed-point computation. The methodology proposed in [[Kov08](#)] is specifically tailored for the special case of P-solvable loops, which is later extended in [[HJK17](#)].

Challenges persist when dealing with loops featuring non-linear or unsolvable assignments, as discussed in [[ABK<sup>+</sup>22](#), [CJJK14](#), [CK24](#), [SSM04](#)]. These methods generate polynomial invariants of a given degree; however, while they are sound, they do not guarantee completeness, meaning that invariants may be missed.

In [[MOS04a](#)], Müller-Olm and Seidl employ ideas similar to ours in Algorithm 1, with the notable difference that, through our geometric approach for computing the invariant set, we have established a better stopping criterion by comparing the equality of radical ideals rather than the ideals themselves. They also impose algebraic conditions on the initial values and subsequently compute polynomial invariants that must apply to all initial values satisfying these constraints, meaning some invariants applicable to all but finitely many initial values may be overlooked. In contrast, Algorithm 4 yields polynomial invariants that depend on the initial values, addressing a much broader problem, which, to our knowledge, has not been previously tackled. Moreover, Algorithm 5, which tackles cases with fixed initial values, is significantly faster than Algorithm 3 and its counterpart in [[MOS04a](#)]. Additionally, Algorithm 6 generates all general invariants of a specific form whenever they exist, enabling us to generate invariants produced in [[ABK<sup>+</sup>22](#)].

Finally, [[CFGG20](#)] considers polynomial invariants as inequalities using tools like Putinar’s Positivstellensatz. However, this presents a different problem, involving semi-algebraic sets  $X$  where  $F(X) \subseteq X$ . However, polynomial invariants do not necessarily satisfy this

property.

**Our contributions.** In this work, we consider the problem of fully generating the set  $I_{\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{h}, F), E}$  of all polynomial invariants in a given vector space  $E$ , for loops with polynomial maps of arbitrary degrees and inequations as guards. In Section 2, we introduce invariant sets and use them to develop Algorithm 2 for verifying polynomial invariants. In Section 3, building on the results of Section 2, we design two algorithms (Algorithms 3 and 5) to compute a basis for  $I_{\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{h}, F), E}$ , depending on whether  $\mathbf{a}$  is fixed or not. These results and algorithms are further extended to branching loops with nondeterministic conditional statements. In Section 4, we design a tailored Algorithm 6, which is much more efficient for finding all polynomial invariants of the form  $f(x_1, \dots, x_n) - f(a_1, \dots, a_n)$ . In particular, this algorithm avoids any computation on polynomial ideals. In Section 5, we relate the termination of loops with inequalities in the guards to polynomial invariants, and derive some necessary or sufficient conditions. Section 6, includes an implementation of our main algorithms, along with experimental results.

**Extended version.** This paper is an extended version of the short paper [BMP24] published in the proceedings of the ISSAC 2024 conference. It provides additional details, extended results, and introduces new results. Specifically, we present Algorithm 4 in Section 3.1, which computes an explicit description of the polynomial invariants depending on initial values. Furthermore, in Section 3.3, we extend the algorithms previously introduced to handle branching loops with nondeterministic conditional statements and inequations in their guards, whereas earlier work focused on single-path loops without guard conditions. In Section 4, we significantly extend [BMP24, Proposition 4.1] and develop Algorithm 6 for computing all general polynomial invariants of a specific form up to a given degree for branching loops. This new algorithm is independent of the algorithms from Section 3 and avoids expensive ideal computations. Finally, in Section 6, we compare the new Algorithm 6 with Polar [MSBK22] and present new benchmarks of an optimized implementation of Algorithm 5.

## 2 Identifying polynomial invariants

In this section, we present a method for identifying polynomial invariants by introducing invariant sets. As we will see later, these are naturally related to polynomial invariants. We denote the field of complex numbers by  $\mathbb{C}$ . Throughout the paper,  $\mathbf{x}$  denotes  $x_1, \dots, x_n$ , and  $\mathbb{C}[\mathbf{x}]$  the polynomial ring in these variables.

### 2.1 The invariant set

We start with the central technical object introduced in this paper.

**Definition 2.1.** *Let  $F : \mathbb{C}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^n$  be a map and  $X$  be a subset of  $\mathbb{C}^n$ . The invariant set  $S_{(F, X)}$  of  $(F, X)$  is defined as:*

$$S_{(F, X)} = \{x \in X \mid \forall m \in \mathbb{N}, F^m(x) \in X\},$$

where  $F^0(x) = x$  and  $F^m(x) = F(F^{m-1}(x))$  for any  $m > 1$ .

Let us first establish an effective description of invariant sets. This will allow us to derive an algorithm for the particular case of algebraic varieties.

**Lemma 2.2.** *Let  $X$  and  $F$  be as above. Then  $S_{(F,X)}$  is the largest  $Y \subset X$  such that  $F(Y) \subset Y$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $x \in S_{(F,X)}$ . By definition, we have  $F^m(F(x)) = F^{m+1}(x) \in X$  for any  $m \geq 0$ . Thus,  $F(x) \in S_{(F,X)}$  for every  $x \in S_{(F,X)}$ , i.e.  $F(S_{(F,X)}) \subset S_{(F,X)}$ . Conversely, let  $Y \subset X$  such that  $F(Y) \subset Y$ . Thus, for any  $m \geq 0$ , we have  $F^{(m)}(Y) \subset Y \subset X$ . Hence,  $Y \subset S_{(F,X)}$  which completes the proof.  $\square$

We now consider the case where the above  $X$  and  $F$  are respectively an algebraic variety and a polynomial map. Thanks to algebraic-geometry algorithmic tools, we can develop an effective method for incrementally computing invariant sets. First, we fix some terminology from algebraic geometry and refer to [CLO13, Kem93] for further details.

Let  $S$  be a set of polynomials in  $\mathbb{C}[\mathbf{x}]$ . Then, the *algebraic variety*  $\mathbf{V}(S)$  associated to  $S$  is the common zero set in  $\mathbb{C}^n$  of the polynomials in  $S$ . In particular,  $\mathbf{V}(S) = \mathbf{V}(\langle S \rangle)$ , where  $\langle S \rangle$  is the ideal generated by  $S$ . Conversely, the *defining ideal* of a subset  $Y \subset \mathbb{C}^n$  is the set of polynomials in  $\mathbb{C}[\mathbf{x}]$  that vanish on  $Y$ . The algebraic variety associated to the ideal  $I(Y)$  is called the *Zariski closure* of  $Y$ . A map  $F : \mathbb{C}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^m$  is called a *polynomial map*, if there exist  $f_1, \dots, f_m$  in  $\mathbb{C}[\mathbf{x}]$ , such that  $F(x) = (f_1(x), \dots, f_m(x))$  for all  $x \in \mathbb{C}^n$ . For simplicity, we will henceforth refer to polynomial maps and their associated polynomials interchangeably.

In the following, we fix  $F : \mathbb{C}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^m$  to be a polynomial map and  $X \subset \mathbb{C}^m$  an algebraic variety. The following lemma is folklore in algebraic geometry. We provide a proof here as we could not find a suitable reference.

**Lemma 2.3.** *Assume that  $X = \mathbf{V}(g_1, \dots, g_k)$  and  $F = (f_1, \dots, f_m)$ . Then*

$$F^{-1}(X) = \mathbf{V}(g_1(f_1, \dots, f_m), \dots, g_k(f_1, \dots, f_m)) \subset \mathbb{C}^n.$$

*In particular,  $F^{-1}(X) \subset \mathbb{C}^n$  is an algebraic variety.*

*Proof.* By definition,

$$F^{-1}(X) = \{x \in \mathbb{C}^n \mid \forall 1 \leq i \leq k, g_i(f_1(x), \dots, f_m(x)) = 0\}.$$

Let  $h_i = g_i(f_1, \dots, f_m) \in \mathbb{C}[\mathbf{x}]$ , for all  $1 \leq i \leq k$ . Then  $F^{-1}(X) = \mathbf{V}(h_1, \dots, h_k)$ , and so  $F^{-1}(X)$  is an algebraic variety.  $\square$

We now present an effective method to compute invariant sets of polynomial maps on algebraic varieties using an iterative outer approximation that converges to the goal. The method is effective because the sequence eventually stabilizes, which is easy to detect. We will denote  $(F^m)^{-1}$  as  $F^{-m}$ .

**Proposition 2.4.** Let  $X_0 = X$  and, for all  $m \in \mathbb{N}$ , let  $X_m = \bigcap_{i=0}^m F^{-i}(X)$ . Then, the following hold:

- (a)  $S_{(F,X)} \subset X_{m+1} \subset X_m$  for all  $m \geq 0$ ;
- (b) there exists  $N \in \mathbb{N}$  such that  $X_N = X_m$  for all  $m > N$ ;
- (c) if  $X_N = X_{N+1}$  for some  $N$ , then  $X_N = X_m$  for all  $m > N$ ;
- (d) the invariant set  $S_{(F,X)}$  is exactly  $X_N$ .

*Proof.* (a) The second inclusion is straightforward from the definition as

$$X_{m+1} = X_m \cap F^{-(m+1)}(X) \subseteq X_m.$$

We now proceed to prove that  $S_{(F,X)} \subseteq X_m$  for all  $m$ , by induction. By definition,  $S_{(F,X)}$  is a subset of  $X = X_0$  which proves the base case. Now, let  $m > 0$  and assume that  $S_{(F,X)} \subseteq X_{m-1}$ . Then, by Lemma 2.2,

$$F(S_{(F,X)}) \subset S_{(F,X)} \subset X_{m-1}.$$

Hence, by the induction assumption  $S_{(F,X)} \subset F^{-1}(X_{m-1}) \cap X_0 = X_m$ .

(b) From (a), we have the following descending chain

$$X_0 \supseteq \cdots \supseteq X_m \supseteq X_{m+1} \supseteq \cdots,$$

which are algebraic varieties by Lemma 2.3. Then, by [Har13, Proposition 1.2],

$$I(X_0) \subseteq \cdots \subseteq I(X_m) \subseteq I(X_{m+1}) \subseteq \cdots.$$

Since  $\mathbb{C}[x_1, \dots, x_n]$  is a Noetherian ring, there exists  $N \in \mathbb{N}$  such that  $I(X_N) = I(X_m)$  for all  $m > N$ . Therefore,

$$X_N = \mathbf{V}(I(X_N)) = \mathbf{V}(I(X_m)) = X_m \text{ for all } m \geq N.$$

(c) For such an integer  $N$ , the following allows us to conclude directly

$$X_{N+2} = X \cap F^{-1}(X_{N+1}) = X \cap F^{-1}(X_N) = X_{N+1}.$$

(d) Let  $N$  be as above and  $x \in X_N$ . Then,  $F^N(F(x)) = F^{N+1}(x) \in X$ , since  $X_N = X_{N+1}$ . Hence,  $F(X_N) \subset X_N$ , and as  $S_{(F,X)}$  is contained in  $X_N$ , by (a), the inclusion is an equality by Lemma 2.2.  $\square$

*Remark 1.* By Theorem 2.4.(d), the invariant set  $S_{(F,X)}$  is an algebraic variety, since each  $X_i$  is an algebraic variety.

We now present Algorithm 1 for computing the invariant set associated with an algebraic variety and a polynomial map described by sequences of multivariate polynomials. We restrict ourselves to *rational* coefficients, since this covers the target applications, and we need to work in a computable field for effectiveness. We first define the subroutines involved in this algorithm.

- the procedure `Compose` takes as input two sequences of polynomials  $\mathbf{g} = (g_1, \dots, g_k)$  and  $F = (f_1, \dots, f_n)$  in  $\mathbb{Q}[\mathbf{x}]$  and outputs a sequence of polynomials  $(h_1, \dots, h_k)$ , such that  $h_i = g_i(f_1, \dots, f_n)$  for all  $i$ .
- the procedure `InRadical` takes as input a sequence  $\tilde{\mathbf{g}}$  and a set  $S$  both in  $\mathbb{Q}[\mathbf{x}]$  and decides if all the polynomials in  $\tilde{\mathbf{g}}$  belong to the *radical* of the ideal generated by  $S$ . This can be done following, for example, [CLO13, Chap. 4, §2, Proposition 8].

---

**Algorithm 1** InvariantSet

---

**Input:** Two sequences  $\mathbf{g}$  and  $F = (f_1, \dots, f_n)$  in  $\mathbb{Q}[\mathbf{x}]$ .

**Output:** List of polynomials whose common zero-set is  $S_{(F, \mathbf{V}(\mathbf{g}))}$ .

- 1:  $S \leftarrow \{\mathbf{g}\}$ ;
  - 2:  $\tilde{\mathbf{g}} \leftarrow \text{Compose}(\mathbf{g}, F)$ ;
  - 3: **while** `InRadical`( $\tilde{\mathbf{g}}, S$ ) == `False` **do**
  - 4:      $S \leftarrow S \cup \{\tilde{\mathbf{g}}\}$ ;
  - 5:      $\tilde{\mathbf{g}} \leftarrow \text{Compose}(\tilde{\mathbf{g}}, F)$ ;
  - 6: **end while**
  - 7: **return**  $S$ ;
- 

We now prove the termination and correctness of Algorithm 1.

**Theorem 2.5.** *On input two sequences  $\mathbf{g} = (g_1, \dots, g_k)$  and  $F = (f_1, \dots, f_n)$  of polynomials in  $\mathbb{Q}[\mathbf{x}]$ , Algorithm 1 terminates and outputs a sequence of polynomials whose vanishing set is the invariant set  $S_{(F, \mathbf{V}(g_1, \dots, g_k))}$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $S_0 = \mathbf{g}$ , and for  $m \geq 1$ , let  $S_m$  be the set contained in  $S$  after completing  $m$  iterations of the **while** loop. Similarly, let  $\tilde{\mathbf{g}}_0 = \mathbf{g}$ ,  $\tilde{\mathbf{g}}_1 = \mathbf{g}(F)$ , and  $\tilde{\mathbf{g}}_{m+1}$  be the sequence contained in  $\tilde{\mathbf{g}}$  after  $m$  iterations.

Let  $m \geq 0$ , and let  $X_m$  be as in Proposition 2.4. By construction,  $S_m = \{\tilde{\mathbf{g}}_0, \dots, \tilde{\mathbf{g}}_m\}$ , that is  $S_m = \{\mathbf{g}, \mathbf{g}(F), \dots, \mathbf{g}(F^m)\}$ , and so by Lemma 2.3,

$$X_m = \bigcap_{i=0}^m F^{-i}(\mathbf{V}(\mathbf{g})) = \bigcap_{i=0}^m \mathbf{V}(\mathbf{g}(F^i)) = \mathbf{V}(S_m).$$

By Proposition 2.4.(b), there exists  $N \in \mathbb{N}$  such that  $X_N = X_{N+1}$ , that is  $\mathbf{V}(S_N) = \mathbf{V}(S_{N+1})$ . This means that the polynomial  $\tilde{\mathbf{g}}_{N+1} = \mathbf{g}(F^{N+1})$  vanishes on  $\mathbf{V}(S_N)$ , or equivalently by the Hilbert's Nullstellensatz [CLO13, Chap 4, §1, Theorem 2], that  $\tilde{\mathbf{g}}_{N+1}$  belongs to  $\sqrt{I(S_N)}$ .

Hence, Algorithm 1 terminates after  $N$  iterations of the **while** loop and outputs  $S_N$ . In particular, by Proposition 2.4.(d),  $S_{(F,X)} = X_N = \mathbf{V}(S_N)$ , which proves the correctness of Algorithm 1.  $\square$

**Proposition 2.6.** *Using the notation of Proposition 2.4, let  $N$  be the smallest integer such that  $X_N = X_{N+1}$ . Let  $d_{\mathbf{g}}$  and  $d_F$  denote bounds on the degree of the polynomials in  $\mathbf{g}$  and  $F$ , respectively, which are the inputs to Algorithm 1. Then, Algorithm 1 satisfies the following:*

- (a) *the **while** loop terminates after exactly  $N$  iterations;*
- (b) *it performs at most  $k \cdot (d_{\mathbf{g}} \cdot d_F^N)^{O(n^2)}$  arithmetic operations in  $\mathbb{Q}$ .*

*Proof.* The claim in (a) was proved in the proof of Theorem 2.5.

Now, let us prove (b). To estimate the arithmetic complexity of Algorithm 1 in terms of the number of iterations of the loop, we need to evaluate the cost of one iteration. As before, let  $\tilde{\mathbf{g}}_0 = \mathbf{g}$ ,  $\tilde{\mathbf{g}}_1 = \mathbf{g}(F)$ , and  $\tilde{\mathbf{g}}_{m+1}$  be the sequence contained in  $\tilde{\mathbf{g}}$  after  $m$  iterations. We saw that for all  $m \geq 0$ , after  $m$  iterations, the variable  $S$  contains  $S_m = \{\tilde{\mathbf{g}}_0, \dots, \tilde{\mathbf{g}}_m\}$ .

Fix  $m \geq 1$ . First observe that

$$d_m = \deg(\tilde{\mathbf{g}}_m) \leq d_{\mathbf{g}} \cdot d_F^m,$$

which also bounds the degrees of the polynomials in  $S_m$ . In particular,  $(d_m)_m$  is a non-decreasing sequence.

Hence, using the naive algorithm for sparse multivariate multiplication (see, e.g., [vL13]), one can show that the call to **Compose**, with input  $\tilde{\mathbf{g}}_m$  and  $F$ , requires at most  $k \cdot (d_{\mathbf{g}} \cdot d_F^m)^{O(n)}$  operations in  $\mathbb{Q}$ . It remains to bound the cost of the call to **InRadical**, with input  $\tilde{\mathbf{g}}_{m+1}$  and  $S_m$ .

Let  $g$  be in the radical of the ideal generated by  $S_m$ . According to [Kol88, Corollary 1.7], there exists  $r \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $f_1, \dots, f_m \in \mathbb{Q}[\mathbf{x}]$  such that  $g^r = \sum_{i=1}^m \tilde{\mathbf{g}}_i f_i$  with  $r \leq d_m^n$  and  $\deg(\tilde{\mathbf{g}}_i f_i) \leq (1 + \deg(g))d_m^n$ . Hence, by fixing the degree of these  $f_i$ 's and considering their coefficients as unknowns, one can reduce the radical membership test to the existence of a solution to a linear system of equations. More precisely, testing if the polynomials in  $\tilde{\mathbf{g}}_{m+1}$  belong to the radical of the ideal generated by  $S_m$  is reduced to solving  $k$  linear systems, each of size at most  $(d_{\mathbf{g}} \cdot d_F^m)^{O(n^2)}$ .

Again, using classic algorithms, constructing and solving such a system can be done in a number of arithmetic operations polynomial in its size. In conclusion, the number of arithmetic operations performed during the  $m$ -th iteration can be bounded by  $k \cdot (d_{\mathbf{g}} \cdot d_F^m)^{O(n^2)}$ .

Summing over all iterations, one obtains the claimed result. Indeed, the cost of the final iteration dominates all preceding ones.  $\square$

*Remark 2.* In practice, the radical membership test is performed using Gröbner basis algorithms, as outlined in [CLO13, Chap 4, §2, Proposition 8]. While the worst-case complexity



for these algorithms is doubly exponential in the number of variables [MM82], these bounds are only reached in very specific cases. In practice, as discussed in [VZGG13, §21.7], these algorithms are efficient and benefit from ongoing research [EF17] and efficient implementations [BES21].

*Remark 3.* The complexity estimate in Proposition 2.6 is partial, as it depends on the quantity  $N$ , which is intrinsic to the algorithm and may not satisfy reasonable bounds with respect to the input size. In the general case, the best bound in the literature is given in [NY99, Theorem 6], which bounds the length of the strictly descending chain of algebraic varieties defined by polynomials of bounded degree. This is the geometric counterpart of [Sei72]. However, these bounds exhibit growth behavior similar to Ackermann's function (which is not primitive recursive) and have been proven to be sharp in [MS92]. We also refer to [Pas20] for a more recent treatment of this problem. However, under certain assumptions on the polynomial map  $F$ , primitive recursive bounds on  $N$  and the complexity of Algorithm 1 can be derived. See [NY99, Theorem 5] for an example.

We conclude by noting that these worst-case bounds are rare in our applications. The experimental section demonstrates that the algorithm is practically applicable to loops from the literature.

## 2.2 Testing polynomial invariants

Now that we have an algorithm to compute invariant sets, we provide a criterion for identifying polynomial invariants using the invariant set, based on carefully chosen data. This will lead to an algorithm for checking whether a given polynomial is invariant. Since the guard  $[h_1 \neq 0, \dots, h_s \neq 0]$  is equivalent to  $[h_1 \times \dots \times h_s \neq 0]$ , we can consider polynomial loops with a single inequation in the guard condition. Recall that  $I_{\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{a}, h, F)}$  denotes the set of all polynomial invariants of  $\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{a}, h, F)$ .

**Proposition 2.7.** *Let  $h, g$  and  $F = (f_1, \dots, f_n)$  be polynomials in  $\mathbb{C}[\mathbf{x}]$ . Let  $z$  be a new indeterminate and  $F_0(\mathbf{x}, z) = (F(\mathbf{x}), zh(\mathbf{x}))$ . Let  $\mathbf{a} \in \mathbb{C}^n$  and  $X = \mathbf{V}(zg) \subset \mathbb{C}^{n+1}$ . Then,  $g(\mathbf{x}) \in I_{\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{a}, h, F)}$  if, and only if,  $(\mathbf{a}, 1) \in S_{(F_0, X)}$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $\mathbf{a}_0 = \mathbf{a}$  and  $\mathbf{a}_l = F(\mathbf{a}_{l-1})$ , for  $l \geq 1$ . Note that by construction,  $F_0^l(\mathbf{a}, 1) = (\mathbf{a}_l, h(\mathbf{a}_0) \cdot \dots \cdot h(\mathbf{a}_{l-1}))$ , and thus

$$(zg) \circ F_0^l(\mathbf{a}, 1) = h(\mathbf{a}_0) \cdot \dots \cdot h(\mathbf{a}_{l-1})g(\mathbf{a}_l). \quad (1)$$

Let  $k \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{+\infty\}$  be the number of iteration after which  $\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{a}, h, F)$  terminates. First, assume that  $g(\mathbf{x}) \in I_{\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{a}, h, F)}$ . Then,

$$\text{for } 1 \leq l < k + 1, \quad g(\mathbf{a}_l) = 0 \quad \text{and, if } k < +\infty, \quad h(\mathbf{a}_k) = 0.$$

Hence,  $F_0^l(\mathbf{a}, 1) \in X$ , for any  $l \geq 0$ , by (1), that is  $(\mathbf{a}, 1) \in S_{(F_0, X)}$ .

Conversely, if  $(\mathbf{a}, 1) \in S_{(F_0, X)}$  then, by (1),  $h(\mathbf{a}_0) \cdot \dots \cdot h(\mathbf{a}_{l-1})g(\mathbf{a}_l) = 0$  for all  $l \geq 0$ . This means that  $g(\mathbf{a}_l) = 0$  for all  $l \leq k$ , as  $h(\mathbf{a}_l) \neq 0$  by definition of  $k$ . In other words,  $g(\mathbf{x}) = 0$  is a polynomial invariant of  $\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{a}, h, F)$ .  $\square$

Algorithm 2 below, which checks whether a given polynomial is invariant, directly follows from Proposition 2.7.

---

**Algorithm 2** CheckPI

---

**Input:**  $g, \mathbf{h} = (h_1, \dots, h_k)$  and  $F = (f_1, \dots, f_n)$  in  $\mathbb{Q}[\mathbf{x}]$ ;  
 $\mathbf{a} = (a_1, \dots, a_n) \in \mathbb{Q}^n$ .

**Output:** True if  $g \in I_{\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{h}, F)}$ ; False else.

- 1:  $h \leftarrow h_1 \cdot \dots \cdot h_k$ ;
  - 2:  $F_0 \leftarrow (F, zh)$ ;
  - 3:  $\{P_1, \dots, P_m\} \leftarrow \text{InvariantSet}(zg, F_0)$ ;
  - 4: **if**  $P_1(\mathbf{a}, 1) = \dots = P_m(\mathbf{a}, 1) = 0$  **then**
  - 5:     **return** True;
  - 6: **else**
  - 7:     **return** False;
  - 8: **end if**
- 

**Theorem 2.8.** *On input a sequence  $\mathbf{a} = (a_1, \dots, a_n) \in \mathbb{Q}^n$ , polynomials  $g, \mathbf{h} = (h_1, \dots, h_k)$ , and  $F = (f_1, \dots, f_n) \in \mathbb{C}[\mathbf{x}]$ , Algorithm 2 outputs True if  $g \in I_{\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{h}, F)}$ , and False otherwise.*

*Moreover, if  $d_F, d_{\mathbf{h}}$  and  $d_g$  bound the degrees of respectively  $F, \mathbf{h}$  and  $g$ , then the number of required arithmetic operations in  $\mathbb{Q}$  is bounded by*

$$(\max\{d_F, kd_{\mathbf{h}}\}^N \cdot d_g)^{O(n^2)},$$

where  $N$  is defined in Proposition 2.6, as the number of loop iterations performed in the call to *InvariantSet*.

*Proof.* Let  $X = V(zg)$ . By Theorem 2.5, the invariant set  $S_{(F_0, X)}$  is the vanishing set of polynomials  $P_1, \dots, P_m$ . Thus, by Proposition 2.7,  $g = 0$  is a polynomial invariant of  $\mathcal{L}$  if and only if  $P_1(\mathbf{a}, 1) = \dots = P_m(\mathbf{a}, 1) = 0$ .

Besides, the arithmetic complexity of the algorithm is dominated by the call to *InvariantSet*, on input  $zg$  and  $F_0 = (F, zh)$ . Then, according to Proposition 2.6, one can directly conclude from the straightforward bounds on the degrees of these inputs.  $\square$

*Remark 4.* Algorithm 2 is an ad-hoc application of Algorithm 1, so their behavior is similar. However, it is important to note that the problem solved by Algorithm 2 is closely related to the ‘‘Zeroness Problem for polynomial automata’’ studied in [BDSW17]. The authors showed this problem is complete for the complexity class of problems solvable in time growing similarly to Ackermann’s function, highlighting its inherent computational difficulty. However, under certain assumptions on  $F$ , a primitive recursive bound was established in [BDSW17, Theorem 5] and [NY99, Theorem 5].

**Example 1.** The following linear loop  $\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{a}, 1, F)$  is taken from [HOPW18]. In this example, we omit inequations in the guard for clarity in the output.

```

 $(x_1, x_2) = (a_1, a_2)$ 
while true do
   $\begin{pmatrix} x_1 \\ x_2 \end{pmatrix} \xleftarrow{F} \begin{pmatrix} 10x_1 - 8x_2 \\ 6x_1 - 4x_2 \end{pmatrix}$ 
end while

```

Let us check using Algorithm 2 whether the following polynomial

$$g = x_1^2 - x_1x_2 + 9x_1^3 - 24x_1^2x_2 + 16x_1x_2^2$$

is an invariant of  $\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{a}, 1, F)$ , when  $(a_1, a_2) = (0, 1)$ . Let  $X = \mathbf{V}(g)$ . First, `InvariantSet`( $g, F$ ) computes the invariant set of  $F = (10x_1 - 8x_2, 6x_1 - 4x_2)$  and  $X$  through the following steps:

- initially,  $S$  is set to  $\{g\}$ , and  $\tilde{g} = \text{Compose}(g, F)$  that is

$$\tilde{g} = 360x_1^3 - 1248x_1^2x_2 + 40x_1^2 + 1408x_1x_2^2 - 72x_1x_2 - 512x_2^3 + 32x_2^2;$$

- computing a Gröbner basis for the ideal generated by  $g$  and  $1 - t\tilde{g}$ , the call `InRadical`( $\tilde{g}, S$ ) returns `False`;
- the set  $S$  is then updated to  $\{g, \tilde{g}\}$  and  $\tilde{g}$  is recomputed as `Compose`( $\tilde{g}, F$ ):

$$7488x_1^3 - 26880x_1^2x_2 + 832x_1^2 + 31744x_1x_2^2 - 1600x_1x_2 - 12288x_2^3 + 768x_2^2;$$

- finally one checks that `InRadical`( $\tilde{g}, S$ ) yields `True`.

Thus, `InvariantSet`( $g, F$ ) outputs the first two computed polynomials  $g(x_1, x_2)$ , and  $g(F(x_1, x_2))$ , whose common zero set is then  $S_{(F, X)}$ . Since  $g(F(0, 1)) = -480$ , on input  $g$  and  $F$ , the output of Algorithm 2 is `False`. Therefore,  $g$  is not a polynomial invariant of  $\mathcal{L}((0, 1), 1, F)$ .

### 3 Generating polynomial invariants

In this section, we present various algorithms for generating polynomial invariants, depending on whether the initial values of the loops are specified or treated as variables, and we extend our results to branching loops.

#### 3.1 Loops with parametric initial values

We begin with a criterion for identifying polynomial invariants in a vector subspace  $E$  of  $\mathbb{C}[\mathbf{x}]$ , defined by its generators. This extends the criterion of Proposition 2.7 to an ansatz for such invariants.

**Proposition 3.1.** Let  $F = (f_1, \dots, f_n)$  and  $h$  be polynomials in  $\mathbb{C}[\mathbf{x}]$ . Let  $E$  denote the vector subspace of  $\mathbb{C}[\mathbf{x}]$  spanned by  $g_1(\mathbf{x}), \dots, g_m(\mathbf{x})$ . Let  $\mathbf{y} = (y_1, \dots, y_m)$  be new indeterminates and

$$g(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) = y_1 g_1(\mathbf{x}) + \dots + y_m g_m(\mathbf{x}) \in \mathbb{C}[\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}].$$

Additionally, let  $z$  be a new indeterminate, and define  $X = V(zg) \subset \mathbb{C}^{n+m+1}$  and  $F_m(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}, z) = (F(\mathbf{x}), \mathbf{y}, zh(\mathbf{x}))$ . Then, for any  $\mathbf{a} \in \mathbb{C}^n$ ,

$$I_{\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{a}, h, F), E} = \{g(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{b}) \mid (\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}, 1) \in S_{(F_m, X)}\}.$$

*Proof.* Let  $G(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) = (F(\mathbf{x}), \mathbf{y})$  and fix  $\mathbf{a} \in \mathbb{C}^n$ . Note that  $g(G^l(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})) = g(F^l(\mathbf{x}), \mathbf{y})$ , so for any  $\mathbf{b} \in \mathbb{C}^m$  we have

$$g(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{b}) \in I_{\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{a}, h, F)} \iff g(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) \in I_{\mathcal{L}((\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}), h, G)}.$$

By Proposition 2.7, the latter is equivalent to  $(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}, 1) \in S_{(F_m, X)}$ .  $\square$

The set of polynomial invariants of  $\mathcal{L}$  in  $E$  is itself a finite-dimensional vector space, as is  $E$ . Consequently, we show below that  $I_{\mathcal{L}, E}$  can be parameterized by a system of linear equations whose coefficients depend polynomially on the initial values.

Let  $\mathbf{h} = (h_1, \dots, h_k)$ ,  $\mathbf{g} = (g_1, \dots, g_m)$ , and  $F = (f_1, \dots, f_n)$  be polynomials in  $\mathbb{C}[\mathbf{x}]$ , and let  $E$  be the vector space generated by  $\mathbf{g}$ . Below, we present the algorithm `ComputeMatrix`, which computes a matrix  $A$  with polynomial entries such that for any  $\mathbf{a} \in \mathbb{C}^n$ , Equation (2) below is satisfied.

In Algorithm 3, the procedure `Matrix` takes as input a sequence of polynomials  $\tilde{P}_1, \dots, \tilde{P}_N$  in  $\mathbb{Q}[\mathbf{x}, y_1, \dots, y_m]$  such that  $\tilde{P}_1, \dots, \tilde{P}_N$  are linear in the variables  $\mathbf{y}$ , and outputs a polynomial matrix  $A$  with coefficients in  $\mathbb{Q}[\mathbf{x}]$  such that  $[\tilde{P}_1, \dots, \tilde{P}_N]^t = A \cdot [y_1, \dots, y_m]^t$ .

---

**Algorithm 3** `ComputeMatrix`

---

**Input:** Three sequences  $\mathbf{g} = (g_1, \dots, g_m)$ ,  $\mathbf{h} = (h_1, \dots, h_k)$  and  $F = (f_1, \dots, f_n)$  in  $\mathbb{Q}[\mathbf{x}]$ .

**Output:** A polynomial matrix  $A$  satisfying (2).

- 1:  $g \leftarrow y_1 g_1 + \dots + y_m g_m$ ;
  - 2:  $h \leftarrow h_1 \cdot \dots \cdot h_k$ ;
  - 3:  $F_m \leftarrow (F, \mathbf{y}, zh)$ ;
  - 4:  $(\tilde{P}_1(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}, z), \dots, \tilde{P}_N(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}, z)) \leftarrow \text{InvariantSet}(zg, F_m)$ ;
  - 5:  $(\tilde{P}_1(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}), \dots, \tilde{P}_N(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})) \leftarrow (\tilde{P}_1(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}, 1), \dots, \tilde{P}_N(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}, 1))$
  - 6:  $A \leftarrow \text{Matrix}(\tilde{P}_1(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}), \dots, \tilde{P}_N(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}))$ ;
  - 7: **return**  $A$ ;
- 

**Theorem 3.2.** Let  $F = (f_1, \dots, f_n)$ ,  $\mathbf{h} = (h_1, \dots, h_s)$ , and  $\mathbf{g} = (g_1, \dots, g_m)$  be polynomials in  $\mathbb{Q}[\mathbf{x}]$ , and let  $E$  denote the vector space spanned by  $\mathbf{g}$ . Given  $\mathbf{g}$ ,  $\mathbf{h}$ , and  $F$  as input, Algorithm 3 outputs a polynomial matrix  $A$  such that for any  $\mathbf{a} \in \mathbb{C}^n$ ,

$$I_{\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{h}, F), E} = \left\{ \sum_{i \leq m} b_i g_i(\mathbf{x}) \mid (b_1, \dots, b_m) \in \ker A(\mathbf{a}) \right\}, \quad (2)$$

where  $\ker A(\mathbf{a})$  is the right kernel of  $A$ , whose entries are evaluated at  $\mathbf{a}$ .

Moreover, if  $d_{\mathbf{g}}, d_{\mathbf{h}}$  and  $d_F$  are bounds on the degrees of respectively  $\mathbf{g}, \mathbf{h}$  and  $F$ , then the number of required arithmetic operations in  $\mathbb{Q}$  is at most

$$(\max\{d_F, kd_{\mathbf{h}}\}^N \cdot d_{\mathbf{g}})^{O(n^2+m^2)},$$

where  $N$  is defined in Proposition 2.6, as the number of loop iterations performed in the call to `InvariantSet`.

*Proof.* Let  $y_1, \dots, y_m$  be new indeterminates,  $h = h_1 \cdot \dots \cdot h_k$ , and define  $g, F_m$ , and  $X$  as in Proposition 3.1. Then, by Proposition 2.5, on input  $(zg, F_m)$ , `InvariantSet` computes polynomials  $P_1, \dots, P_N \in \mathbb{Q}[\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}, z]$  whose common vanishing set is  $S_{(F_m, X)}$ . Let  $\tilde{P}_j(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) = P_j(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}, 1)$  for every  $j \in \{1, \dots, N\}$ , then by the construction of `InvariantSet` in Algorithm 1,

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{P}_j &= P_j(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}, 1) = (zg) \circ \left( F^j(\mathbf{x}), \mathbf{y}, h(F^0(\mathbf{x})) \cdot \dots \cdot h(F^{j-1}(\mathbf{x})) \right) \\ &= h(F^0(\mathbf{x})) \cdot \dots \cdot h(F^{j-1}(\mathbf{x})) \cdot g(F^j(\mathbf{x}), \mathbf{y}) \end{aligned}$$

Thus, the  $\tilde{P}_j$ 's are linear in the  $y_i$ 's, and there exists a matrix  $A$  of size  $N \times m$  with coefficients in  $\mathbb{Q}[\mathbf{x}]$  such that  $[\tilde{P}_1 \cdots \tilde{P}_N]^t = A \cdot [y_1 \cdots y_m]^t$ . Then, we are done for the correction, as by Proposition 3.1, for any  $\mathbf{a} \in \mathbb{C}^n$ ,

$$I_{\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{a}, h, F), E} = \{g(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{b}) \mid \tilde{P}_1(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}) = \dots = \tilde{P}_N(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}) = 0\}.$$

The complexity estimate is straightforward, and similar to Theorem 2.8, as the cost is dominated by the call to `InvariantSet`.  $\square$

*Remark 5.* Note that for any polynomial matrix  $A$  that satisfies (2), any row-equivalent matrix  $B$  also satisfies (2). This provides some flexibility in potentially reducing the output of `ComputeMatrix`.

**Example 2.** Consider the loop  $\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{a}, 1, F)$  from Example 1. In [HOPW18], some polynomial invariants are computed for specific initial values to verify the non-termination of the linear loop with the guard “ $2x_2 - x_1 \geq -2$ ”. In our analysis, we extend this validation by computing *all* polynomial invariants up to degree 2 for *arbitrary* initial values. Since  $(\mathbf{x})_{\leq 2} = (1, x_1, x_2, x_1^2, x_1x_2, x_2^2)$  is a basis for  $\mathbb{C}[x_1, x_2]_{\leq 2}$ , the input for Algorithm 3 is then  $(F, 1, (\mathbf{x})_{\leq 2})$ . In the following, we detail the execution of Algorithm 3.

The first step consists of running `InvariantSet` on input

$$\begin{aligned} F_6 &= (10x_1 - 8x_2, 6x_1 - 4x_2, y_1, \dots, y_6, z) \text{ and} \\ g &= z \cdot (y_1 + y_2x_1 + y_3x_2 + y_4x_1^2 + y_5x_1x_2 + y_6x_2^2), \end{aligned}$$

where the  $z$  and  $y_i$ 's are new variables. The output is five polynomials  $P_1, \dots, P_5$  in  $\mathbb{Q}[x_1, x_2, y_1, \dots, y_6, z]$  whose common zero set is  $S_{(F_6, X)} \subset \mathbb{C}^8$ . Finally, the polynomials  $\tilde{P}_i = P(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}, 1)$ , where  $1 \leq i \leq 5$ , define a linear system with unknowns  $y_1, \dots, y_6$ , given by the following matrix  $A$ .

$$\begin{bmatrix} x_1^2 & x_1x_2 & x_2^2 & x_1 & x_2 & 1 \\ (10x_1 - 8x_2)^2 & (10x_1 - 8x_2)(6x_1 - 4x_2) & (6x_1 - 4x_2)^2 & 10x_1 - 8x_2 & 6x_1 - 4x_2 & 1 \\ (52x_1 - 48x_2)^2 & (52x_1 - 48x_2)(36x_1 - 32x_2) & (36x_1 - 32x_2)^2 & 52x_1 - 48x_2 & 36x_1 - 32x_2 & 1 \\ (232x_1 - 224x_2)^2 & (232x_1 - 224x_2)(168x_1 - 160x_2) & (168x_1 - 160x_2)^2 & 232x_1 - 224x_2 & 168x_1 - 160x_2 & 1 \\ (976x_1 - 960x_2)^2 & (976x_1 - 960x_2)(720x_1 - 704x_2) & (720x_1 - 704x_2)^2 & 976x_1 - 960x_2 & 720x_1 - 704x_2 & 1 \end{bmatrix}$$

Now, we provide a novel explicit description of the set of polynomial invariants depending on initial values by solving the parametric linear system of equations output by `ComputeMatrix`. We rely on a method described in [Sit92], which incrementally constructs constructible sets in the parameter space, where the set of solutions can be explicitly computed. The following proposition is a reformulation of [Sit92, Theorem 4.1] in our context.

**Proposition 3.3** ([Sit92, Theorem 4.1]). *Let  $A(\mathbf{x})$  be an  $r \times m$  polynomial matrix whose entries lie in  $\mathbb{Q}[\mathbf{x}]$ . Then, there exists an algorithm `ParametricSol` that computes lists of polynomial equations and inequations defining constructible subsets  $S_1, \dots, S_k$  of  $\mathbb{C}^n$  and matrices  $Z_1(\mathbf{x}), \dots, Z_k(\mathbf{x})$  whose entries lie in  $\mathbb{Q}(\mathbf{x})$ , such that*

1.  $\mathbb{C}^n = S_1 \cup \dots \cup S_k$  and  $k \leq \binom{m+r}{r}$ ;
2. for every  $i \in \{1, \dots, k\}$  and any  $\mathbf{a} \in S_i$ , the columns of  $Z_i(\mathbf{a})$  form a basis of  $\ker A(\mathbf{a})$ .

*Proof.* For clarity, we briefly describe an adapted version of the proof from [Sit92] and the underlying algorithm. For any  $s \leq \min\{r, m\}$ , choose a non-singular  $s \times s$  submatrix  $M(\mathbf{x})$  of  $A$ . Without loss of generality, write

$$A(\mathbf{x}) = \begin{bmatrix} M(\mathbf{x}) & M'(\mathbf{x}) \\ N(\mathbf{x}) & N'(\mathbf{x}) \end{bmatrix} \quad \text{and} \quad Z(\mathbf{x}) = \begin{bmatrix} -K(\mathbf{x})M(\mathbf{x}) \\ I_{n-s} \end{bmatrix},$$

where  $K(\mathbf{x})$  is the inverse of  $M(\mathbf{x})$  and  $I_{n-s}$  is the  $(n-s) \times (n-s)$  identity matrix. Note that, since the inverse of  $M(\mathbf{x})$  can be computed from its determinant and minors, the entries of  $K(\mathbf{x})$  lie in  $\mathbb{Q}(\mathbf{x})$ . Let  $S$  be the constructible set defined as the locus where all  $s+1$  minors of  $A$  vanish but  $\det(M(\mathbf{x})) \neq 0$ . Then, for any  $\mathbf{a} \in S$ , the columns of  $Z(\mathbf{a})$  form a vector basis of  $\ker A(\mathbf{a})$ . Taking each such  $S$  and  $Z$  for every possible square submatrix of  $A(\mathbf{x})$ , we obtain the output claimed in the proposition. The number of such choices, gives the claimed bound on  $k$ .  $\square$

In Algorithm 4 below, we extend `ComputeMatrix` by one step. For polynomials  $h$  and  $F = (f_1, \dots, f_n)$  in  $\mathbb{C}[\mathbf{x}]$ , we compute polynomials that define constructible sets  $S_1, \dots, S_k$  covering  $\mathbb{C}^n$ , along with lists of polynomials  $T_1, \dots, T_k \subset \mathbb{C}(\mathbf{y})[\mathbf{x}]$ , such that for each  $i \in \{1, \dots, k\}$  and any  $\mathbf{a} \in S_i$ ,

$$\{f(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{a}) \mid f \in T_i\} \text{ is a vector basis for } I_{\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{h}, F), E}. \quad (3)$$

forms a vector space basis for  $I_{\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{h}, F), E}$ . We adopt the following notation:

$$[g_1, \dots, g_m] \cdot (Z^1, \dots, Z^k) := ([g_1, \dots, g_m] \times Z^1, \dots, [g_1, \dots, g_m] \times Z^k).$$

---

**Algorithm 4** TuncatedClass

---

**Input:** Three sequences  $\mathbf{g} = (g_1, \dots, g_m)$ ,  $\mathbf{h} = (h_1, \dots, h_k)$  and  $F = (f_1, \dots, f_n)$  in  $\mathbb{Q}[\mathbf{x}]$ .

**Output:** Polynomials defining  $S_1, \dots, S_k$  covering  $\mathbb{C}^n$  and lists of polynomials  $T_1, \dots, T_k \subset \mathbb{C}(\mathbf{y})[\mathbf{x}]$  satisfying (3).

- 1:  $A \leftarrow \text{ComputeMatrix}(\mathbf{g}, \mathbf{h}, F)$ ;
  - 2:  $((Q_1, \dots, Q_k), (Z^1, \dots, Z^k)) \leftarrow \text{ParametricSol}(A)$ ;
  - 3:  $(T_1, \dots, T_k) \leftarrow [g_1, \dots, g_m] \cdot (Z^1, \dots, Z^k)$ ;
  - 4: **return**  $((Q_1, \dots, Q_k), (T_1, \dots, T_k))$ ;
- 

**Theorem 3.4.** Let  $\mathbf{g} = (g_1, \dots, g_m)$ ,  $\mathbf{h} = (h_1, \dots, h_k)$  and  $F = (f_1, \dots, f_n)$  be polynomials in  $\mathbb{Q}[\mathbf{x}]$ . Let  $E$  be the vector space spanned by  $\mathbf{g}$ . On input  $\mathbf{g}, \mathbf{h}$  and  $F$ , Algorithm 4 outputs polynomials defining constructible sets  $S_1, \dots, S_k$  of  $\mathbb{C}^n$  and lists of polynomials  $T_1, \dots, T_k \subset \mathbb{C}(\mathbf{y})[\mathbf{x}]$  such that

1.  $\mathbb{C}^n = S_1 \cup \dots \cup S_k$ ;
2. For every  $i \in \{1, \dots, k\}$  and any  $\mathbf{a} \in S_i$ ,  $\{f(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{a}) \mid f \in T_i\}$  is a vector space basis for  $I_{\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{h}, F), E}$ .

Moreover, if  $N$  is the number defined in Theorem 3.2, then  $k \leq \binom{m+N}{N}$ .

*Proof.* According to Theorem 3.2, on input  $(\mathbf{g}, \mathbf{h}, F)$ , ComputeMatrix computes a polynomial  $N \times m$  matrix  $A$  such that for any  $\mathbf{a} \in \mathbb{Q}^n$ ,

$$I_{\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{h}, F), E} = \left\{ \sum_{i \leq m} b_i g_i \mid (b_1, \dots, b_m) \in \ker A(\mathbf{a}) \right\}.$$

By Proposition 3.3, the columns of  $Z_i(\mathbf{a})$  form a basis for  $\ker A(\mathbf{a})$  for any  $i$  and any  $\mathbf{a} \in S_i$ , hence  $\{f(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{a}) \mid T_i\}$  is a basis for  $I_{\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{h}, F), E}$ .  $\square$

In the following example, we continue Example 2 to classify polynomial invariants up to degree 2 with respect to initial values.

**Example 3.** From the output of Example 2, we proceed by computing an explicit basis for the corresponding vector space of  $I_{\mathcal{L}, \mathbb{Q}[\mathbf{x}]_{\leq 2}}$ . Let  $A$  be the matrix from Example 2. First, we compute all the maximal minors of  $A$  and observe that all are zero when  $3x_1^2 - 7x_1x_2 + 4x_2^2 = 0$ . Therefore, the dimension of  $\ker A(a_1, a_2)$  is 1 if and only if  $3a_1^2 - 7a_1a_2 + 4a_2^2 \neq 0$ . For these initial values,  $\ker A(a_1, a_2)$  is generated by

$$(0, (3a_1 - 4a_2)^2, -(3a_1 - 4a_2)^2, -9(a_1 - a_2), 24(a_1 - a_2), -16(a_1 - a_2)).$$

We compute all the minors and find a basis for each case, leading us to identify the following four distinct cases based on the dimensions and minors. For  $(a_1, a_2)$  satisfying the conditions  $Q_i$  for  $i = 1, \dots, 4$ ,

$$Q_1 = \{a_1 = 0, a_2 = 0\}, \quad Q_2 = \{a_1 = a_2, a_1 \neq 0\},$$

$$Q_3 = \{3a_1 = 4a_2, a_1 \neq 0\}, \quad Q_4 = \{3a_1 \neq 4a_2, a_1 \neq a_2\},$$

the columns of the following matrices  $Z^i$  form a vector basis for  $\ker A(a_1, a_2)$ :

$$Z^1 = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix}, \quad Z^2 = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 \\ -1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 & -1 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix},$$

$$Z^3 = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 3 & 0 & 0 \\ -4 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & -3 & 0 \\ 0 & 16 & -3 \\ 0 & -16 & 4 \end{bmatrix}, \quad Z^4 = \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ (3a_1 - 4a_2)^2 \\ -(3a_1 - 4a_2)^2 \\ -9(a_1 - a_2) \\ 24(a_1 - a_2) \\ -16(a_1 - a_2) \end{bmatrix}.$$

Let  $T_i$  be  $[1, x_1, x_2, x_1^2, x_1x_2, x_2^2] \times Z^i$  for each  $i$ . The output of Algorithm 4 is the pair composed of  $(Q_1, Q_2, Q_3, Q_4)$  and  $(T_1, T_2, T_3, T_4)$ , which provides the following description:

Initial values	Basis of $I_{2,\mathcal{L}}$
$S_1 = \{(0, 0)\}$	$T_1 = \{x_1, x_2, x_1x_2, x_1^2, x_2^2\}$
$S_2 = \{(a, a) \mid a \in \mathbb{C}^*\}$	$T_2 = \{x_1 - x_2, x_1^2 - x_1x_2, -x_1x_2 + x_2^2\}$
$S_3 = \left\{ \left( \frac{4}{3}a, a \right) \mid a \in \mathbb{C}^* \right\}$	$T_3 = \{3x_1 - 4x_2, -3x_1^2 + 16x_1x_2 - 16x_2^2, -3x_1x_2 + 4x_2^2\}$
$S_4 = \{(a_1, a_2) \in \mathbb{C}^2 \mid a_1 \neq \frac{4}{3}a_2, a_1 \neq a_2\}$	$T_4 = \{(3a_1 - 4a_2)^2x_1 - (3a_1 - 4a_2)^2x_2 - 9(a_1 - a_2)x_1^2 + 24(a_1 - a_2)x_1x_2 - 16(a_1 - a_2)x_2^2\}$

It is noteworthy that in the first three cases, the truncated invariant ideal is independent of the initial values. This occurs because these cases correspond to degenerate situations where the initial values are non-generic, i.e., they lie on a proper algebraic variety within  $\mathbb{C}^2$ . In contrast, the last case is generic, and the output depends on the initial values.

### 3.2 Loops with given initial value

Although the algorithm outlined in Theorem 3.2 addresses the most general case, in practice, it quickly becomes impractical, even for small inputs. In this section, we focus on the case where the initial values of the loops are fixed and propose a more efficient adapted algorithm.

The following proposition presents a sufficient condition for a polynomial to be an invariant, based on the loop's fixed initial values.

**Proposition 3.5.** *Consider a loop  $\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{a}_0, h, F)$ , where  $\mathbf{a}_0 \in \mathbb{C}^n$  is fixed. Given polynomials  $g_1(\mathbf{x}), \dots, g_m(\mathbf{x})$  in  $\mathbb{C}[\mathbf{x}]$ , define  $G_0 = y_1g_1(\mathbf{x}) + \dots + y_mg_m(\mathbf{x})$ . For  $k \geq 1$ , define*

$$G_k(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) = \prod_{j=0}^{k-1} h(F^j(\mathbf{x})) \cdot \sum_{i=1}^m y_i g_i(F^k(\mathbf{x})).$$



Let  $\mathbf{b} \in \mathbb{C}^m$ . If  $G_0(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{b})$  is a polynomial invariant of  $\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{a}_0, h, F)$ , then  $\mathbf{b}$  satisfies the following system of linear equations in the  $y_i$ 's:

$$G_0(\mathbf{a}_0, \mathbf{y}) = \cdots = G_K(\mathbf{a}_0, \mathbf{y}) = 0 \quad \text{for any } K \geq 0.$$

This proposition is a direct consequence of the following lemma.

**Lemma 3.6.** Let  $h, \mathbf{g} = (g_1, \dots, g_m)$  and  $F = (f_1, \dots, f_n)$  be polynomials in  $\mathbb{C}[\mathbf{x}]$ . Let

$$X = \mathbf{V}\left(z \cdot (y_1 g_1(\mathbf{x}) + \cdots + y_m g_m(\mathbf{x}))\right) \subset \mathbb{C}^{n+m+1}.$$

For  $k \geq 0$ , let  $X_k = \bigcap_{j=0}^k F_m^{-j}(X)$  and  $S_k = X_k \cap \mathbf{V}(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{a}_0, z - 1)$ , where  $\mathbf{a}_0 \in \mathbb{C}^n$ . Then, the following statements hold for any  $k \geq 0$ :

(a)  $S_k = \mathbf{V}(G_0(\mathbf{a}_0, \mathbf{y}), \dots, G_k(\mathbf{a}_0, \mathbf{y}), \mathbf{x} - \mathbf{a}_0, z - 1)$ .

(b)  $S_{(F_m, X)} \cap \mathbf{V}(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{a}_0, z - 1) \subset S_k$ .

*Proof.* (a) For  $j \geq 0$ , we have  $F_m^j(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}, z) = \left(F^j(\mathbf{x}), \mathbf{y}, z \cdot \prod_{i=1}^{j-1} h(F^i(\mathbf{x}))\right)$ . Then, according to Lemma 2.3, we obtain

$$F_m^{-k}(X) = \mathbf{V}\left(z \cdot \prod_{j=0}^{k-1} h(F^j(\mathbf{x})) \cdot \sum_{i=1}^m y_i g_i(F^k(\mathbf{x}))\right) = \mathbf{V}(z \cdot G_k).$$

Therefore,  $X_k = \mathbf{V}(zG_0, \dots, zG_k)$ , so we have that

$$\begin{aligned} S_k &= \mathbf{V}(zG_0, \dots, zG_k, \mathbf{x} - \mathbf{a}_0, z - 1) \\ &= \mathbf{V}(G_0(\mathbf{a}_0, \mathbf{y}), \dots, G_k(\mathbf{a}_0, \mathbf{y}), \mathbf{x} - \mathbf{a}_0, z - 1). \end{aligned}$$

(b) By Proposition 2.4, we have the following descending chain:

$$X_0 \supset X_1 \supset \cdots \supset X_N = S_{(F_m, X)} = X_{N+1}, \quad \text{for some } N \in \mathbb{N}.$$

Thus, by intersecting with  $V = \mathbf{V}(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{a}_0, z - 1)$  we obtain

$$S_0 \supset S_1 \supset \cdots \supset S_N = S_{(F_m, X)} \cap V = S_{N+1}, \quad \text{for some } N \in \mathbb{N}.$$

Thus,  $S_{(F_m, X)} \cap V$  is a subset of  $S_k$  for any  $k \in \mathbb{N}$ . □

*Remark 6.* Given the initial value of a loop, Proposition 3.5 can provide as many linear constraints as needed, ensuring that a polynomial invariant in a fixed vector space satisfies these conditions. Since the codimension of  $I_{E, \mathcal{L}}$  is bounded by  $m$ , the number of generators  $g_i$ , this bound naturally suggests the number  $K$  of linear equations. This leads to a vector subspace  $F \subset E$ , typically of much lower dimension, that contains  $I_{E, \mathcal{L}}$  and on which the previous algorithms can be executed. As the input size is significantly smaller, this results in a substantial reduction in running time.

---

**Algorithm 5** TruncatedIdeal

---

**Input:** Polynomials  $\mathbf{g} = (g_1, \dots, g_m)$ ,  $\mathbf{h} = (h_1, \dots, h_k)$  and  $F = (f_1, \dots, f_n)$  in  $\mathbb{Q}[\mathbf{x}]$  and  $\mathbf{a} = (a_1, \dots, a_n) \in \mathbb{Q}^n$ .

**Output:** A vector basis for  $I_{E, \mathcal{L}(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{h}, F)}$  where  $E$  is spanned by  $g_1, \dots, g_m$ .

```
1:  $g \leftarrow z \cdot (y_1 g_1 + \dots + y_m g_m)$ ;
2:  $h \leftarrow h_1 \cdot \dots \cdot h_k$ ;
3:  $F_m \leftarrow (F, \mathbf{y}, z \cdot h)$ 
4:  $(\mathbf{b}^1, \dots, \mathbf{b}^s) \leftarrow \text{VectorBasis}(g(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{y}, 1), g(F_m(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{y}, 1)), \dots, g(F_m^m(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{y}, 1)))$ ;
5:  $\mathcal{B} \leftarrow (\sum_{i=1}^m b_i^1 g_i(\mathbf{x}), \dots, \sum_{i=1}^m b_i^s g_i(\mathbf{x}))$ ;
6:  $\mathcal{B}' = (P_1, \dots, P_l) \leftarrow \{P \in \mathcal{B} \mid \text{CheckPI}(\mathbf{a}, P, \mathbf{h}, F) == \text{False}\}$ ;
7: if  $\mathcal{B}' == \emptyset$  then
8:   return  $\mathcal{B}$ ;
9: end if
10:  $A \leftarrow \text{ComputeMatrix}(\mathcal{B}', \mathbf{h}, F)$ ;
11:  $(\mathbf{c}^1, \dots, \mathbf{c}^t) \leftarrow \text{VectorBasis}(A(\mathbf{a}))$ ;
12:  $\mathcal{C} \leftarrow (\sum_{j=1}^l c_j^1 P_j, \dots, \sum_{j=1}^l c_j^t P_j)$ ;
13:  $\mathcal{B}'' \leftarrow \mathcal{B}.\text{remove}(\mathcal{B}')$ ;
14: return  $\mathcal{C}.\text{extend}(\mathcal{B}'')$ 
```

---

The strategy outlined in the remark above is implemented in Algorithm 5. We utilize a procedure, `VectorBasis`, which takes linear forms or a matrix as input and computes a vector basis for the common vanishing set of these forms. This is a standard linear algebra subroutine.

We now prove the correctness of Algorithm 5.

**Theorem 3.7.** *Let  $\mathbf{g} = (g_1, \dots, g_m)$ ,  $\mathbf{h} = (h_1, \dots, h_k)$ , and  $F = (f_1, \dots, f_n)$  be polynomials in  $\mathbb{Q}[\mathbf{x}]$ . Let  $E$  be the vector space spanned by  $\mathbf{g}$ . On input a sequence  $\mathbf{a} = (a_1, \dots, a_n)$  in  $\mathbb{Q}^n$ , along with  $\mathbf{g}$ ,  $\mathbf{h}$ , and  $F$ , Algorithm 5 outputs a sequence of polynomials that forms a vector basis for  $I_{\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{h}, F), E}$ .*

*Proof.* Since  $F_m(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}, z) = (F(\mathbf{x}), \mathbf{y}, zh)$ , the polynomials

$$g(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{y}, 1), g(F_m(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{y}, 1)), \dots, g(F_m^m(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{y}, 1))$$

are linear elements of  $\mathbb{Q}[y_1, \dots, y_m]$ . Let  $(\mathbf{b}^1, \dots, \mathbf{b}^s)$  be a vector basis of their common vanishing set. According to Proposition 3.5, if  $\mathbf{b} \in \mathbb{C}^n$  satisfies the condition that  $g = b_1 g_1 + \dots + b_m g_m$  is a polynomial invariant for  $\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{h}, F)$ , then  $\mathbf{b}$  is a linear combination of the vectors  $\mathbf{b}^{i_j}$ 's. Therefore,  $I_{E, \mathcal{L}}$  is contained in the vector space spanned by the linearly independent polynomials of  $E$  in

$$\mathcal{B} = \left( \sum_{i=1}^m b_{1,i} g_i(\mathbf{x}), \dots, \sum_{i=1}^m b_{s,i} g_i(\mathbf{x}) \right).$$

Let  $\mathcal{B}' = (P_1, \dots, P_l)$ , as defined in Step 6. By Theorem 2.8, these are precisely the polynomials in  $\mathcal{B}$  that are not polynomial invariants of  $\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{h}, F)$ .

If  $\mathcal{B}'$  is empty, then  $\mathcal{B}$  forms a vector basis for  $I_{E,\mathcal{L}}$ , and the proof is complete. Otherwise, by Theorem 3.2, the polynomials in  $\mathcal{C}$ , computed in Step 12, form a basis for the intersection of  $I_{\mathcal{L},E}$  with the vector space spanned by  $\mathcal{B}'$ . Let  $\mathcal{B}'' = \{g_1, \dots, g_{m-l}\}$ , as defined in Step 13.

We now proceed to prove that  $\mathcal{C} \cup \mathcal{B}''$  forms a vector basis of  $I_{E,\mathcal{L}}$ . Since, by construction, these are linearly independent polynomials in  $I_{E,\mathcal{L}}$ , it remains to prove that they span the entire space. Let  $g \in I_{\mathcal{L},E}$ . By the argument above,  $g = \sum_{i=1}^l c_i P_i + \sum_{j=1}^{m-l} c_{l+j} g_j$  for some scalars  $c_1, \dots, c_m \in \mathbb{C}$ . Since  $g, g_{l+1}, \dots, g_m$  all lie in  $I_{\mathcal{L},E}$ , it follows that  $\sum_{i=1}^l c_i P_i$  is also in  $I_{\mathcal{L},E}$ . Thus, this sum lies in the intersection of  $I_{\mathcal{L},E}$  with the vector space spanned by  $\mathcal{B}'$ , and by construction, it is a linear combination of elements in  $\mathcal{C}$ . In conclusion, any  $g \in I_{\mathcal{L},E}$  can be expressed as a linear combination of elements from  $\mathcal{C} \cup \mathcal{B}''$ . Thus, the proof is complete.  $\square$

We now examine the complexity of Algorithm 5. Building on the approach outlined above, we include data intrinsic to the method (namely,  $N$  and  $l$ ) to provide a more precise description of the algorithm's evolution. Notably, the worst-case bounds on  $N$  are coarse (see Remark 1), while the worst-case scenario  $l = m$  masks the algorithm's favorable behavior in more advantageous cases.

**Proposition 3.8.** *Let  $d_g$ ,  $d_h$ , and  $d_F$  denote bounds on the degrees of  $\mathbf{g}$ ,  $\mathbf{h}$ , and  $F$ , respectively. On input  $\mathbf{g}$ ,  $\mathbf{h}$ , and  $F$ , Algorithm 5 performs a number of operations in  $\mathbb{Q}$  bounded by*

$$m \cdot (\max\{d_F, kd_h\}^{N_1} \cdot d_g)^{O(n^2)} + (\max\{d_F, kd_h\}^{N_2} \cdot d_g)^{O(n^2+l^2)},$$

where  $l$  is the number of polynomials  $(P_1, \dots, P_l)$  output in Step 6 of Algorithm 5, and  $N_1$  and  $N_2$  are the numbers of loop iterations performed in the call to `InvariantSet` within the calls to `CheckPI` and `ComputeMatrix`.

*Proof.* The complexity of Steps 1 through 5 involves reasonable polynomial multiplications, iterative evaluations, and linear algebra in dimension at most  $m$ . Consequently, these operations are all bounded by the above complexity estimate. Let  $s$  denote the number of polynomials  $(P_1, \dots, P_s)$  computed in Step 5. Step 6 then consists of at most  $s \leq m$  calls to `CheckPI`, whose total complexity is bounded by  $m \cdot (\max\{d_F, kd_h\}^{N_1} \cdot d_g)^{O(n^2)}$ , applying Theorem 2.8, since  $\deg(P_i) \leq d_g$  for all  $1 \leq i \leq s$ . This accounts for the first part of the summand. The second part arises solely from Step 10, where the complexity estimate follows directly from Theorem 3.2, as only  $l$  generators are considered in this step.  $\square$

*Remark 7.* In the worst-case scenario where  $l = m$ , Algorithm 5 shares the same complexity bounds as Algorithm 3, since the latter is called on the same input as the former, apart from the absence of an initial value. In practice, however, all candidates identified in Step 5

are invariants (see Section 6), meaning  $l = 0$ . As a result, Algorithm 5 terminates at Step 8, with the total cost bounded by  $m$  invariant checks.

**Example 4** (Squares). Consider the “Squares” loop:

```

(x1, x2, x3) = (-1, -1, 1)
while true do
   $\begin{pmatrix} x_1 \\ x_2 \\ x_3 \end{pmatrix} \leftarrow \begin{pmatrix} 2x_1 + x_2^2 + x_3 \\ 2x_2 - x_2^2 + 2x_3 \\ 1 - x_3 \end{pmatrix}$ 
end while

```

For  $d \geq 2$ , Algorithm 3 cannot compute a polynomial matrix  $A$  such that

$$I_{\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{a}, 1, F), \mathbb{Q}[\mathbf{x}]_{\leq d}} = \left\{ \sum_{|\alpha_i| \leq d} b_i \mathbf{x}^{\alpha_i} \mid \mathbf{b} \in \ker A(\mathbf{a}) \right\},$$

for any  $\mathbf{a} \in \mathbb{C}^3$ , within an hour. However, when the initial values are fixed, Algorithm 5 computes all polynomial invariants up to degree 5 within 2 seconds. To compute  $I_{\mathcal{L}, \mathbb{Q}[\mathbf{x}]_{\leq 2}}$ , we call Algorithm 5 with input  $((-1, -1, 1), \mathbf{g}, 1, F)$ , where  $\mathbf{g}$  is the set of all monomials up to degree 2. Assume that  $g = b_1 + b_2x_1 + \dots + b_{10}x_3^2$  is a polynomial invariant. By Proposition 3.5, this leads to 10 linear equations, whose solutions give the following 5 candidates in  $\mathcal{B}$

$$\{1 + x_1 + x_2 + x_3, 1 + x_1 + x_2 + x_3^2, 2 + 3(x_1 + x_2) + (x_1 + x_2)^2, x_1^2 - x_2^2 + 2x_1x_3 - x_1 - 3x_2 - 2, x_2^2 - x_1^2 + 2x_2x_3 - x_2 - 3x_1 + 2\}.$$

The algorithm CheckPI then verifies that all polynomials in  $\mathcal{B}$  are invariant and that  $\mathcal{B}$  forms a basis for  $I_{\mathcal{L}, \mathbb{Q}[\mathbf{x}]_{\leq 2}}$ , which has dimension 5. Additional computations show that  $I_{\mathcal{L}, \mathbb{Q}[\mathbf{x}]_{\leq 3}}$  and  $I_{\mathcal{L}, \mathbb{Q}[\mathbf{x}]_{\leq 4}}$  have dimensions 13 and 26.

Example 4 was previously explored in [ABK<sup>+</sup>22], where the closed formula

$$x_1(n) + x_2(n) = 2^n(x_1(0) + x_2(0) + 2) - \frac{(-1)^n}{2} - \frac{3}{2}$$

was derived, with  $x_i(n)$  representing the value of  $x_i$  after  $n$  iterations of the loop. Notably, none of the invariants listed above were found. Using Algorithm 5, we compute the ideals  $I_{\mathcal{L}, \mathbb{Q}[\mathbf{x}]_{\leq d}}$  for  $d = 1, 2, 3, 4$ , given a specific initial value. This captures all polynomial invariants up to degree 4.

**Example 5.** Consider the “ps6” loop<sup>1</sup>  $\mathcal{L}$ :

```

(x1, x2) = (0, 0)
while x2 - 18665 ≠ 0 do
   $\begin{pmatrix} x_1 \\ x_2 \end{pmatrix} \leftarrow \begin{pmatrix} x_1 + x_2^5 \\ x_2 + 1 \end{pmatrix}$ 
end while

```

<sup>1</sup><https://github.com/sosy-lab/sv-benchmarks/blob/master/c/nla-digbench>

This loop computes the sum of the fifth powers of the first  $n$  natural numbers after  $n$  iterations. Using Algorithm 5, we find the formula for this sum. Specifically, the algorithm reveals that the only polynomial invariant of degree at most 6 (up to scalar multiplication) is

$$x_1 - \left( \frac{1}{6}x_2^6 - \frac{1}{2}x_2^5 + \frac{5}{12}x_2^4 - \frac{1}{12}x_2^2 \right).$$

After  $n + 1$  iterations of  $\mathcal{L}$ , the value of  $x_1$  is  $1^5 + 2^5 + \dots + n^5$  and  $x_2$  is  $n + 1$ . From this invariant, we deduce the formula for the sum of fifth powers:

$$1^5 + 2^5 + \dots + n^5 = \frac{1}{6}(n + 1)^6 - \frac{1}{2}(n + 1)^5 + \frac{5}{12}(n + 1)^4 - \frac{1}{12}(n + 1)^2.$$

### 3.3 Generalization to branching loops

In this subsection, we present a method to generate all polynomial invariants up to a specified degree for branching loops with a nondeterministic conditional statement involving  $k$  branches. Branching loops generalize the types of loops discussed in earlier sections, as they account for multiple scenarios through distinct maps.

**Definition 3.9.** Let  $\mathbf{a} = (a_1, \dots, a_n) \in \mathbb{C}^n$ ,  $h \in \mathbb{C}[\mathbf{x}]$ , and let  $F_1, \dots, F_k : \mathbb{C}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^n$  be polynomial maps. Then,  $\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{a}, h, (F_1, \dots, F_k))$  represents a branching loop with a nondeterministic conditional statement involving  $k$  branches, as follows:

```

 $(x_1, \dots, x_n) = (a_1, \dots, a_n)$ 
while  $h \neq 0$  do
  if * then
     $(x_1, \dots, x_n) \leftarrow F_1(x_1, \dots, x_n)$ 
  ...
  else if * then
     $(x_1, \dots, x_n) \leftarrow F_i(x_1, \dots, x_n)$ 
  ...
  else
     $(x_1, \dots, x_n) \leftarrow F_k(x_1, \dots, x_n)$ 
  end if
end while

```

When no  $h$  is defined, we will write  $\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{a}, 1, (F_1, \dots, F_k))$ .

**Definition 3.10.** Let  $F_1, \dots, F_k : \mathbb{C}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^n$  be polynomial maps. For any  $m \in \mathbb{N}$  and any sequence  $i_1, \dots, i_m \in [k]$ , define the polynomial map

$$F_{i_1, \dots, i_m}(\mathbf{x}) = F_{i_m}(F_{i_{m-1}}(\dots F_{i_1}(\mathbf{x}))).$$

Polynomial invariants for branching loops without guard conditions were studied in [RCK07b]. Here, we extend this definition to include cases where the guard involves an inequation. We denote  $[k] = \{1, \dots, k\}$ .

**Definition 3.11.** A polynomial  $g$  is an invariant of the branching loop  $\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{a}, h, (F_1, \dots, F_k))$  if, for any  $m \in \mathbb{N}$  and any sequence  $i_1, \dots, i_m \in [k]$ , either:

$$g(F_{i_1}(\mathbf{a})) = \dots = g(F_{i_1, \dots, i_m}(\mathbf{a})) = 0,$$

or there exists  $l < m$  such that

$$g(F_{i_1}(\mathbf{a})) = \dots = g(F_{i_1, \dots, i_l}(\mathbf{a})) = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad h(F_{i_1, \dots, i_l}(\mathbf{a})) = 0.$$

The set of all polynomial invariants for  $\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{a}, h, (F_1, \dots, F_k))$ , denoted by  $I_{\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{a}, h, (F_1, \dots, F_k))}$ , is called the invariant ideal of  $\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{a}, h, (F_1, \dots, F_k))$ .

In [HOPW23], the authors showed that the invariant ideals of nondeterministic branching loops are computable when the associated polynomial maps are linear. However, they also established that in the general case, these invariant ideals are not computable. For extended P-solvable nondeterministic branching loops, the computation of invariant ideals is addressed in [HJK17]. The generation of polynomial inequality invariants for nondeterministic branching loops is further explored in [CFGG20].

We now extend the concept of invariant sets to encompass multiple polynomial maps, enabling their application in generating polynomial invariants for branching loops.

**Definition 3.12.** Let  $F_1, \dots, F_k : \mathbb{C}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^n$  be maps and  $X$  be a subset of  $\mathbb{C}^n$ . The invariant set  $S_{((F_1, \dots, F_k), X)}$  of  $((F_1, \dots, F_k), X)$  is defined as:

$$\left\{ x \in X \mid \forall m \in \mathbb{N}, \forall i_1, \dots, \forall i_m \in [k], F_{i_m}(\dots(F_{i_1}(x))) \in X \right\}.$$

We present a method for computing invariant sets of multiple polynomial maps using an iterative, converging outer approximation, analogous to the approach outlined in Proposition 2.4 for a single polynomial map. Building on the following proposition, we further extend Algorithm 1 to handle the case of multiple polynomial maps.

**Proposition 3.13.** Let  $F_1, \dots, F_k : \mathbb{C}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^n$  be polynomial maps and let  $X \subset \mathbb{C}^n$  be an algebraic variety. Define  $X_0 = X$ , and for  $i \geq 1$ , let

$$X_{i+1} = X_i \cap F_1^{-1}(X_i) \cap \dots \cap F_k^{-1}(X_i).$$

Then, there exists an integer  $N$  such that  $X_N = X_{N+1}$ , and the invariant set  $S_{((F_1, \dots, F_k), X)}$  is precisely equal to  $X_N$ .

*Proof.* Following the strategy in Proposition 2.4, one can show that there exists  $N \in \mathbb{N}$  such that  $X_N = X_{N+1}$ , and for this  $N$ ,  $X_N = X_m$  for all  $m \geq N$ . It remains to prove that this  $X_N$  is the invariant set defined above.

First, we prove by induction on  $m$  that  $x \in X_m$  if and only if  $F_{i_1, \dots, i_s}(\mathbf{x}) \in X$  for any  $s \leq m$  and any  $i_1, \dots, i_s \in [k]$ . By definition,  $X_0 = X$ , which establishes the base case.

Now, assume that for some  $m > 0$ ,  $x \in X_{m-1}$  if and only if  $F_{i_1, \dots, i_s}(\mathbf{x}) \in X$  for any  $s \leq m-1$  and any  $i_1, \dots, i_s \in [k]$ . If  $\mathbf{x} \in X_m$ , then

$$\mathbf{x} \in X_{m-1} \cap F_1^{-1}(X_{m-1}) \cap \dots \cap F_k^{-1}(X_{m-1}).$$

Thus, for any  $s \leq m-1$  and any  $i_1, \dots, i_s \in [k]$ , we have  $F_{i_1, \dots, i_s}(\mathbf{x}) \in X$ , and for any  $i_1, \dots, i_s, i \in [k]$ ,  $F_{i_1, \dots, i_s, i}(\mathbf{x}) \in X$ . Finally, for any  $s \leq m$  and any  $i_1, \dots, i_s \in [k]$ ,  $F_{i_1, \dots, i_s}(\mathbf{x}) \in X$ . The converse holds in a similar manner.

We can now conclude the proof of the proposition. Since  $X_N = X_m$  for all  $m \geq N$ , it follows that  $X_N$  is the set of all  $\mathbf{x} \in X$  such that  $F_{i_1, \dots, i_m}(\mathbf{x}) \in X$  for every  $m \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $i_1, \dots, i_m \in [k]$ . This is precisely the invariant set as defined in Definition 3.12.  $\square$

**Theorem 3.14.** *Let  $F_1, \dots, F_k : \mathbb{C}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^n$  be polynomial maps,  $F = (F_1, \dots, F_k)$  and let  $\mathbf{g} = (g_1, \dots, g_m)$  be a collection of polynomials in  $\mathbb{Q}[\mathbf{x}]$ . There exists an algorithm, `InvariantSetBranch`, which takes as input  $(\mathbf{g}, F)$  and outputs a sequence of polynomials whose common vanishing set corresponds to the invariant set  $S_{(F, \mathbf{V}(\mathbf{g}))}$ .*

*Proof.* Let `InvariantSetBranch` be the modified version of Algorithm 1, obtained by making the following replacements:

- `Compose`( $\mathbf{g}, F$ ) with `(Compose`( $\mathbf{g}, F_1$ ),  $\dots$ , `Compose`( $\mathbf{g}, F_k$ )) in Step 2.
- `Compose`( $\tilde{\mathbf{g}}, F$ ) with `(Compose`( $\tilde{\mathbf{g}}, F_1$ ),  $\dots$ , `Compose`( $\tilde{\mathbf{g}}, F_k$ )) in Step 5.

Let  $S_0 = \mathbf{g}_0$ , and for  $m \geq 1$ , define  $S_m$  as the set contained in  $S$  after  $m$  iterations of the **while** loop. Let  $\tilde{\mathbf{g}}_0 = \mathbf{g}$ ,  $\tilde{\mathbf{g}}_1 = (\mathbf{g} \circ F_1, \dots, \mathbf{g} \circ F_k)$ , and for  $m \geq 1$ , let  $\tilde{\mathbf{g}}_{m+1}$  denote the sequence contained in  $\tilde{\mathbf{g}}$  after  $m$  iterations.

Let  $X_0 = \mathbf{V}(\mathbf{g})$ , and for  $m \geq 1$ , let  $X_m$  be as defined in Proposition 3.13. Then, as shown in the proof of Theorem 2.5, it follows that  $X_m = \mathbf{V}(S_m)$ .

Moreover, following the proof of Theorem 2.5 and by Proposition 3.13, there exists an integer  $N$  such that the loop in `InvariantSetBranch` terminates after  $N$  iterations. At this point, the algorithm outputs polynomials in  $S_N$ , ensuring that  $S_{((F_1, \dots, F_k), \mathbf{V}(\mathbf{g}))} = \mathbf{V}(S_N)$ .  $\square$

We now present a necessary and sufficient condition for identifying polynomial invariants of branching loops through the computation of their invariant sets, enabling us to adapt Algorithm 2 to handle branching loops.

**Proposition 3.15.** *Let  $F_1, \dots, F_k : \mathbb{C}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^n$  be polynomial maps,  $F = (F_1, \dots, F_k)$ , and  $h$  and  $g$  be polynomials in  $\mathbb{C}[\mathbf{x}]$ . Let  $z$  be a new indeterminate,  $X = \mathbf{V}(zg) \subset \mathbb{C}^{n+1}$ , and for any  $i \in [k]$ , define*

$$F_{i,0}(\mathbf{x}, z) = (F_i(\mathbf{x}), zh(\mathbf{x}))$$

*and let  $\mathbf{F}_0 = (F_{1,0}, \dots, F_{k,0})$ . Then, for any  $\mathbf{a} \in \mathbb{C}^n$ ,  $g(\mathbf{x}) \in I_{\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{a}, h, (F_1, \dots, F_k))}$  if and only if  $(\mathbf{a}, 1) \in S_{(\mathbf{F}_0, X)}$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $\mathbf{a}_0 = \mathbf{a}$  and for  $l \geq 1$ , let  $\mathbf{a}_{i_1, \dots, i_m} = F_{i_m}(\dots(F_{i_1}(\mathbf{a}_0)))$ . Denote  $F_{i_1, \dots, i_m, 0}(\mathbf{x}) = F_{i_m, 0}(\dots(F_{i_1, 0}(\mathbf{x})))$ . Assume  $g(\mathbf{x})$  is a polynomial invariant of  $\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{a}, h, F)$ . Thus, for any  $m \in \mathbb{N}$  and any  $i_1, \dots, i_m \in [k]$ , either  $g(\mathbf{a}_{i_1}) = \dots = g(\mathbf{a}_{i_1, \dots, i_m}) = 0$  or there exists  $l < m$  such that

$$g(\mathbf{a}_{i_1}) = \dots = g(\mathbf{a}_{i_1, \dots, i_l}) = 0 \text{ and } h(\mathbf{a}_{i_1, \dots, i_l}) = 0.$$

From the definition of polynomial maps  $F_{i, 0}$ , we obtain

$$F_{i_1, \dots, i_m, 0}(\mathbf{a}, 1) = (\mathbf{a}_{i_1, \dots, i_m}, h(\mathbf{a}_0) \cdot h(\mathbf{a}_{i_1}) \cdot \dots \cdot h(\mathbf{a}_{i_1, \dots, i_{m-1}})).$$

Therefore,  $(zg) \circ F_{i_1, \dots, i_m, 0}(\mathbf{a}, 1) = 0$ . Hence,  $F_{i_1, \dots, i_m, 0}(\mathbf{a}, 1) \in X$ , for any  $m \in \mathbb{N}$  and any  $i_1, \dots, i_m \in [k]$ , that is  $(\mathbf{a}, 1) \in S_{(\mathbf{F}_0, X)}$ .

Conversely, assume that  $(\mathbf{a}, 1) \in S_{(\mathbf{F}_0, X)}$ . Let  $m \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $i_1, \dots, i_m \in [k]$ . For any  $l \leq m$ ,  $F_{i_1, \dots, i_l, 0}(\mathbf{a}, 1)$  is in  $X$ , implying that

$$h(\mathbf{a}_0) \cdot h(\mathbf{a}_{i_1}) \cdot \dots \cdot h(\mathbf{a}_{i_1, \dots, i_{l-1}})g(\mathbf{a}_{i_1, \dots, i_l}) = 0.$$

It follows that either  $g(\mathbf{a}_{i_1}) = \dots = g(\mathbf{a}_{i_1, \dots, i_m}) = 0$ , or for some  $l < m$ ,

$$g(\mathbf{a}_{i_1}) = \dots = g(\mathbf{a}_{i_1, \dots, i_l}) = 0 \text{ and } h(\mathbf{a}_{i_1, \dots, i_l}) = 0,$$

which implies that  $g(\mathbf{x}) = 0$  is a polynomial invariant of  $\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{a}, h, F)$ .  $\square$

**Theorem 3.16.** *Let  $F_1, \dots, F_k : \mathbb{C}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^n$  be polynomial maps,  $F = (F_1, \dots, F_k)$ ,  $\mathbf{a} \in \mathbb{Q}^n$ , and let  $g, \mathbf{h} = (h_1, \dots, h_l)$  be polynomials in  $\mathbb{Q}[\mathbf{x}]$ . There exists an algorithm `CheckPIBranch` that takes the input  $(\mathbf{a}, g, \mathbf{h}, F)$  and outputs `True` if  $g \in I_{\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{h}, F)}$ , and `False` otherwise.*

*Proof.* Let `CheckPIBranch` be the algorithm derived from Algorithm 2 by making the following modifications:

- replacing  $(F, zh)$  with  $((F_1, zh), \dots, (F_k, zh))$  in Step 2;
- replacing `InvariantSet` with `InvariantSetBranch` in Step 3.

Let  $X = \mathbf{V}(zg) \subset \mathbb{C}^{n+1}$ . By Theorem 3.14, the invariant set  $S_{(\mathbf{F}_0, X)}$  corresponds to the vanishing set of  $P_1, \dots, P_m$ . Therefore, according to Proposition 3.15,  $g \in I_{\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{h}, F)}$  if and only if  $P_1(\mathbf{a}, 1) = \dots = P_m(\mathbf{a}, 1) = 0$ , that is, if and only if `CheckPIBranch` returns `True`.  $\square$

We now present a criterion for identifying polynomial invariants of branching loops within a vector subspace  $E$  of  $\mathbb{C}[\mathbf{x}]$ . This enables us to extend Algorithm 3 to handle the case of branching loops.

**Proposition 3.17.** *Let  $F_1, \dots, F_k : \mathbb{C}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^n$  be polynomial maps,  $F = (F_1, \dots, F_k)$ , and let  $h, g_1, \dots, g_m$  be polynomials in  $\mathbb{C}[\mathbf{x}]$ . Let  $E$  be the vector space spanned by  $(g_1, \dots, g_m)$ . Let  $\mathbf{y} = (y_1, \dots, y_m)$  be new indeterminates. Define*

$$g(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) = y_1 g_1(\mathbf{x}) + \dots + y_m g_m(\mathbf{x}).$$



Let  $z$  be a new indeterminate, and  $X = \mathbf{V}(zg) \subset \mathbb{C}^{n+m+1}$ . Define

$$F_{i,m}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}, z) = (F_i(\mathbf{x}), \mathbf{y}, zh(\mathbf{x})),$$

for any  $i \in [k]$ . Then, for any  $\mathbf{a} \in \mathbb{C}^n$ ,

$$I_{\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{a}, h, F)} = \{g(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{b}) \mid (\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}, 1) \in S_{((F_{1,m}, \dots, F_{k,m}), X)}\}.$$

*Proof.* Define  $G_i(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) = (F_i(\mathbf{x}), \mathbf{y})$ . Since  $g(G_{i_1, \dots, i_l}(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b})) = g(F_{i_1, \dots, i_l}(\mathbf{a}), \mathbf{b})$ ,

$$g(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{b}) \in I_{\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{a}, h, F)} \iff g(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) \in I_{\mathcal{L}((\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}), h, (G_1, \dots, G_k))}.$$

By Proposition 3.15,  $g(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) \in I_{\mathcal{L}((\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}), h, (G_1, \dots, G_k))}$  if and only if

$$(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}, 1) \in S_{((G_{1,0}, \dots, G_{k,0}), X)}.$$

Since  $G_{i,0}$  is the same polynomial map as  $F_{i,m}$  for any  $i$ , we have

$$g(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{b}) \in I_{\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{a}, h, F)} \iff (\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}, 1) \in S_{((F_{1,m}, \dots, F_{k,m}), X)}.$$

which proves the proposition.  $\square$

**Theorem 3.18.** Let  $F_1, \dots, F_k : \mathbb{C}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^n$  be polynomial maps,  $F = (F_1, \dots, F_k)$ , and  $\mathbf{h} = (h_1, \dots, h_l)$ ,  $\mathbf{g} = (g_1, \dots, g_m)$  be polynomials in  $\mathbb{Q}[\mathbf{x}]$ . Let  $E$  be the vector space spanned by  $\mathbf{g}$ . Then, there exists an algorithm `ComputeMatrixBranch` that takes the input  $(\mathbf{g}, \mathbf{h}, F)$  and outputs a polynomial matrix  $A$  such that for any  $\mathbf{a} \in \mathbb{C}^n$ ,

$$I_{\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{h}, F), E} = \left\{ \sum_{i \leq m} b_i g_i \mid (b_1, \dots, b_m) \in \ker A(\mathbf{a}) \right\}.$$

*Proof.* Let `ComputeMatrixBranch` be the algorithm derived from Algorithm 3 by making the following modifications:

- replacing  $(F, \mathbf{y}, zh)$  with  $((F_1, \mathbf{y}, zh), \dots, (F_k, \mathbf{y}, zh))$  in Step 3;
- replacing `InvariantSet` with `InvariantSetBranch` in Step 4.

Let  $g = y_1 g_1 + \dots + y_m g_m$  and  $h = h_1 \dots h_l$  as in Algorithm 3, and define  $X = \mathbf{V}(zg)$ . By Theorem 3.14, on input  $(zg, ((F_1, \mathbf{y}, zh), \dots, (F_k, \mathbf{y}, zh)))$ , `InvariantSetBranch` outputs polynomials  $P_1, \dots, P_N \in \mathbb{Q}[\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}, z]$  whose common vanishing set is  $S_{((F_{1,m}, \dots, F_{k,m}), X)}$ . Let  $\tilde{P}_j = P_j(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}, 1)$  for each  $j$ . By the construction of `InvariantSetBranch`, for each  $j \in \{1, \dots, N\}$ , there exist indices  $i_1, \dots, i_{s_j} \in [k]$  such that

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{P}_j &= P_j(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}, 1) = (zg) \circ (F_{i_1, \dots, i_{s_j}}(\mathbf{x}), \mathbf{y}, h(\mathbf{x}) \cdot h(F_{i_1}(\mathbf{x})) \cdot \dots \cdot h(F_{i_1, \dots, i_{s_j-1}}(\mathbf{x}))) \\ &= h(\mathbf{x}) \cdot h(F_{i_1}(\mathbf{x})) \cdot \dots \cdot h(F_{i_1, \dots, i_{s_j-1}}(\mathbf{x})) \cdot g(F_{i_1, \dots, i_{s_j}}(\mathbf{x}), \mathbf{y}). \end{aligned}$$

Since  $g(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})$  is linear in the  $\mathbf{y}_i$ 's, the  $P_j$ 's are linear in the  $\mathbf{y}_i$ 's. By applying Proposition 3.17, the rest of the proof follows similarly to the non-branching case in Theorem 3.2.  $\square$

We conclude this subsection by extending Algorithm 5, which computes polynomial invariants for a fixed initial value, to the case of branching loops. First, we generalize Proposition 3.5 to this setting, providing a sufficient condition for a polynomial to be an invariant of a branching loop, based on the initial values of the loop.

**Proposition 3.19.** *Consider a loop  $\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{a}_0, h(\mathbf{x}), (F_1, \dots, F_k))$ . Let  $g_1, \dots, g_m$  be polynomials in  $\mathbb{C}[\mathbf{x}]$ . Define  $G_0(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) = y_1 g_1(\mathbf{x}) + \dots + y_m g_m(\mathbf{x})$ , and*

$$G_{i_1, \dots, i_s}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) = \prod_{j=0}^{s-1} h(F_{i_1, \dots, i_j}(\mathbf{x})) \cdot \sum_{i=1}^m y_i g_i(F_{i_1, \dots, i_s}(\mathbf{x})),$$

for any  $s \geq 1$  and  $i_1, \dots, i_s \in [k]$ . If  $\mathbf{b} \in \mathbb{C}^m$  and  $G_0(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{b})$  is a polynomial invariant of  $\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{a}_0, h, (F_1, \dots, F_k))$ , then for any  $s \geq 1$  and  $i_1, \dots, i_s \in [k]$ ,

$$G_0(\mathbf{a}_0, \mathbf{y}) = G_{i_1, \dots, i_s}(\mathbf{a}_0, \mathbf{y}) = 0.$$

Proposition 3.19 is a direct consequence of the following lemma.

**Lemma 3.20.** *Let  $F_1, \dots, F_k : \mathbb{C}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^n$  be polynomial maps and  $h, g_1, \dots, g_m$  be polynomials in  $\mathbb{C}[\mathbf{x}]$ . Let*

$$X_0 = \mathbf{V}(z(y_1 g_1(\mathbf{x}) + \dots + y_m g_m(\mathbf{x}))) \subset \mathbb{C}^{n+m+1}$$

and for  $l \geq 1$  define  $X_l = X_{l-1} \cap \bigcap_{i=1}^k F_{i,m}^{-1}(X_{l-1})$ . Let  $\mathbf{a}_0 \in \mathbb{C}^n$  and

$$S_l = X_l \cap \mathbf{V}(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{a}_0, z - 1),$$

for all  $l \in \mathbb{N}$ . Finally, let  $\mathbf{G}_{\leq l}$  denote the list containing  $G_0$  and all  $G_{i_1, \dots, i_j}$  for  $1 \leq j \leq l$  and  $i_1, \dots, i_j \in [k]$ . Then for any  $l \in \mathbb{N}$ , the following holds:

- (a)  $S_l = \mathbf{V}(\mathbf{G}_{\leq l}(\mathbf{a}_0, \mathbf{y}), \mathbf{x} - \mathbf{a}_0, z - 1)$ ;
- (b)  $S_{((F_{1,m}, \dots, F_{k,m}), X)} \cap \mathbf{V}(\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{a}_0, z - 1) \subset S_l$ .

*Proof.* Let  $F_{i_1, \dots, i_j; m}(\mathbf{x}) = F_{i_j, m}(\dots(F_{i_1, m}(\mathbf{x})))$ . We now prove

$$X_l = \bigcap_{j=0}^l \bigcap_{i_1, \dots, i_j \in [k]} F_{i_1, \dots, i_j; m}^{-1}(X_0)$$

by induction on  $l$  and define  $F_\emptyset(\mathbf{x}) = \mathbf{x}$ . For  $l = 0$ , we have  $X_0 = F_{\emptyset; m}^{-1}(X_0)$  which proves the base case. Assume that the statement holds for  $l-1 \geq 0$ , that is  $X_{l-1} = \bigcap_{j=0}^{l-1} \bigcap_{i_1, \dots, i_j \in [k]} F_{i_1, \dots, i_j; m}^{-1}(X_0)$ . From inductive hypothesis, it follows that:  $\bigcap_{i=0}^k F_{i,m}^{-1}(X_{l-1}) = \bigcap_{j=1}^l \bigcap_{i_1, \dots, i_j \in [k]} F_{i_1, \dots, i_j; m}^{-1}(X_0)$ .

Since  $X_l = X_{l-1} \cap \bigcap_{i=1}^k F_{i,m}^{-1}(X_{l-1})$ , the proof is complete.

(a) The case  $l = 0$  follows directly from the definitions. Let  $l \geq 1$ , then

$$F_{i_1, \dots, i_j; m}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}, z) = \left( F_{i_1, \dots, i_j}(\mathbf{x}), \mathbf{y}, z \prod_{s=0}^{j-1} h(F_{i_1, \dots, i_s}(\mathbf{x})) \right)$$

for  $1 \leq j \leq l$ . Then, according to Lemma 2.3,

$$\begin{aligned} F_{i_1, \dots, i_j; m}^{-1}(X) &= \mathbf{V} \left( z \prod_{s=0}^{j-1} h(F_{i_1, \dots, i_s}(\mathbf{x})) \cdot \sum_{t=1}^m y_t g_t(F_{i_1, \dots, i_j}(\mathbf{x})) \right) \\ &= \mathbf{V}(z \cdot G_{i_1, \dots, i_j}). \end{aligned}$$

Since  $X_l = \bigcap_{j=0}^l \bigcap_{i_1, \dots, i_j \in [k]} F_{i_1, \dots, i_j; m}^{-1}(X_0)$ , we are done. Indeed, the last two equations allow us to substitute  $\mathbf{x}$  and  $z$  with  $\mathbf{a}_0$  and 1, respectively.

The proof of item (b) is similar to the non-branching case in Lemma 3.6.  $\square$

**Theorem 3.21.** *Let  $F_1, \dots, F_k : \mathbb{C}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^n$  be polynomial maps,  $F = (F_1, \dots, F_k)$ ,  $\mathbf{a} \in \mathbb{Q}^n$ . Consider the polynomials  $\mathbf{h} = (h_1, \dots, h_l)$  and  $\mathbf{g} = (g_1, \dots, g_m)$  in  $\mathbb{C}[\mathbf{x}]$ . Let  $E$  be the vector space spanned by  $\mathbf{g}$ . Then, there exists an algorithm `TruncatedIdealBranch` that takes the input  $(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{g}, \mathbf{h}, F)$  and outputs a sequence of polynomials that forms a vector basis for  $I_{\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{h}, F), E}$ .*

*Proof.* Let `TruncatedIdealBranch` be the modified version of Algorithm 5 obtained by replacing:

- $F$  with  $(F_1, \dots, F_k)$  in Steps 3, 6 and 10;
- the linear equations in Step 4 with those described in Proposition 3.19;
- CheckPI with CheckPIBranch in Step 6;
- ComputeMatrix with ComputeMatrixBranch in Step 10.

By Proposition 3.19,  $I_{\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{h}, F), E}$  is contained in the vector space spanned by the linearly independent polynomials of  $E$  in  $\mathcal{B}$ , as defined in Step 5 of `TruncatedIdealBranch`. By Theorem 3.16,  $\mathcal{B}'$ , defined in Step 6 of `TruncatedIdealBranch`, consists of all polynomials in  $\mathcal{B}$  that are not polynomial invariants of  $\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{h}, F)$ . By Theorem 3.18, the polynomials in  $\mathcal{C}$ , computed in Step 12 of `TruncatedIdealBranch`, form a basis for the intersection of  $I_{\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{h}, F), E}$  with the vector space spanned by  $\mathcal{B}'$ . Let  $\mathcal{B}''$  be as defined in Step 13 of `TruncatedIdealBranch`. Then,  $\mathcal{C} \cup \mathcal{B}''$  forms a basis for  $I_{\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{h}, F), E}$ , and the proof follows in the same way as the non-branching case in Theorem 3.7.  $\square$

## 4 General polynomial invariants of specific forms

In this section, we show that when searching for polynomials of a specific form, it is possible to identify those that hold for any initial value much more efficiently than in Section 3. Specifically, we first present a necessary and sufficient condition for identifying polynomial invariants where only the constant coefficient depends on the initial value. We then use this condition to detect and generate all polynomial invariants of this form.

Let  $h$  and  $F = (F_1, \dots, F_n)$  be polynomials in  $\mathbb{C}[\mathbf{x}]$ . We begin with the following lemma, which reduces a slightly more general form of polynomial invariants to the special case of  $f(\mathbf{x}) - f(\mathbf{a})$ .

**Lemma 4.1.** *Let  $f$ ,  $g$ , and  $P$  be non-zero polynomials in  $\mathbb{C}[\mathbf{x}]$ . Then,  $P(\mathbf{a})f(\mathbf{x}) - g(\mathbf{a})$  is in  $I_{\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{a}, h, F)}$  for any  $\mathbf{a} \in \mathbb{C}^n$  if and only if the following hold:*

1.  $f(\mathbf{x}) - f(\mathbf{a}) \in I_{\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{a}, h, F)}$  for all  $\mathbf{a} \in \mathbb{C}^n$ ,
2.  $g(\mathbf{x}) = P(\mathbf{x})f(\mathbf{x})$ .

*Proof.* Assume that  $P(\mathbf{a})f(\mathbf{x}) - g(\mathbf{a}) \in I_{\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{a}, h, F)}$  for any  $\mathbf{a} \in \mathbb{C}^n$ . It follows that  $P(\mathbf{a})f(\mathbf{a}) - g(\mathbf{a}) = 0$  for any  $\mathbf{a} \in \mathbb{C}^n$ , that is  $g(\mathbf{x}) = P(\mathbf{x})f(\mathbf{x})$ . Therefore,  $f(\mathbf{x}) - f(\mathbf{a}) \in I_{\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{a}, h, F)}$  for every initial value  $\mathbf{a} \notin \mathbf{V}(P)$ . Choose  $\mathbf{a} \in \mathbf{V}(P)$ . Since  $\mathbf{V}(P)$  is a hypersurface, there exists a sequence  $\{\mathbf{a}_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  such that  $\mathbf{a}_n \notin \mathbf{V}(P)$  for any  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{a}_n = \mathbf{a}$ . Given that  $f(\mathbf{x}) - f(\mathbf{a}_n)$  is a polynomial invariant, for any natural number  $N$ , we have

$$h(\mathbf{a}_n) \cdot \dots \cdot h(F^{N-1}(\mathbf{a}_n))(f(F^N(\mathbf{a}_n)) - f(\mathbf{a}_n)) = 0.$$

Since  $F, h$  and  $f$  are polynomial maps,  $F, h$  and  $f$  are continuous. Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} & h(\mathbf{a}) \cdot \dots \cdot h(F^{N-1}(\mathbf{a}))(f(F^N(\mathbf{a})) - f(\mathbf{a})) \\ &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} h(\mathbf{a}_n) \cdot \dots \cdot h(F^{N-1}(\mathbf{a}_n)) \cdot (f(F^N(\mathbf{a}_n)) - f(\mathbf{a}_n)) = 0, \end{aligned}$$

which implies that  $f(\mathbf{x}) - f(\mathbf{a})$  is a polynomial invariant for every  $\mathbf{a} \in \mathbf{V}(P)$ . Therefore,  $f(\mathbf{x}) - f(\mathbf{a}) \in I_{\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{a}, h, F)}$  for any  $\mathbf{a} \in \mathbb{C}^n$ . The converse is trivial.  $\square$

Therefore, polynomial invariants of the form  $f(\mathbf{x}) - f(\mathbf{a})$  encompass those of the form  $P(\mathbf{a})f(\mathbf{x}) - g(\mathbf{a})$ , where the constant coefficient is a rational function of the initial value. Before generating all polynomial invariants of this form, we first establish a necessary and sufficient condition for identifying them. Then, we use this condition to generate all such polynomial invariants, for any polynomial  $f$  within a prescribed finite-dimensional vector space.

**Proposition 4.2.** *Let  $\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{a}, h, F)$  be a polynomial loop, and  $f(\mathbf{x}) \in \mathbb{C}[\mathbf{x}]$ . Let  $y$  and  $z$  be new indeterminates, and  $F_1(\mathbf{x}, y, z) = (F(\mathbf{x}), y, zh(\mathbf{x}))$ . Define*

$$X = \mathbf{V}(z(f(\mathbf{x}) - y)) \subset \mathbb{C}^{n+2}.$$

*Then,  $f(\mathbf{x}) - f(\mathbf{a}) \in I_{\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{a}, h, F)}$  for any  $\mathbf{a} \in \mathbb{C}^n$  if and only if  $S_{(F_1, X)} = X$ .*

*Proof.* First, assume that  $f(\mathbf{x}) - f(\mathbf{a}) \in I_{\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{a}, h, F)}$  for any initial value  $\mathbf{a} \in \mathbb{C}^n$ . Let  $(\mathbf{a}, b, c) \in X$ . By definition, one of the following holds:

$$c = 0 \quad \text{or} \quad b = f(\mathbf{a}).$$

If  $c = 0$ , then  $F_1^m(\mathbf{a}, b, 0) = (F^m(\mathbf{a}), b, 0)$ , so  $F_1^m(\mathbf{a}, b, 0) \in X$  and  $(\mathbf{a}, b, c) \in F^{-m}(X)$  for any  $m \in \mathbb{N}$ . If  $b = f(\mathbf{a})$ , then  $f(F^m(\mathbf{a})) = f(\mathbf{a}) = b$ , because  $f(\mathbf{x}) - f(\mathbf{a})$  is a polynomial invariant. Thus,  $F_1^m(\mathbf{a}, f(\mathbf{a}), c) \in X$ , implying that  $(\mathbf{a}, b, c) \in F^{-m}(X)$  for any  $m \in \mathbb{N}$ . Since

$$S_{(F_1, X)} = \bigcap_{i=0}^N F_1^{-i}(X) \text{ for some } N \in \mathbb{N},$$

we conclude that  $X = \mathbf{V}(z(f(\mathbf{x}) - y)) \subset S_{(F_1, X)}$ . The reverse inclusion holds by definition, so we have  $S_{(F_1, X)} = X$ .

Conversely, assume that  $X = S_{(F_1, X)}$ . Given that  $(\mathbf{a}, f(\mathbf{a}), 1) \in X$ , it follows that  $(\mathbf{a}, f(\mathbf{a}), 1) \in S_{(F_1, X)}$ . Thus, by Proposition 3.1,  $f(\mathbf{x}) - f(\mathbf{a}) \in I_{\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{a}, h, F)}$  for any initial value  $\mathbf{a} \in \mathbb{C}^n$ .  $\square$

We now express the previous geometric condition as an algebraic one.

**Corollary 4.3.** *Let  $\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{a}, h, F)$  be a polynomial loop with  $h \neq 0$  and  $f \in \mathbb{C}[\mathbf{x}]$ . Then,  $f(\mathbf{x}) - f(\mathbf{a}) \in I_{\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{a}, h, F)}$  for any  $\mathbf{a} \in \mathbb{C}^n$  if and only if  $f(F(\mathbf{x})) = f(\mathbf{x})$ .*

*Proof.* Assume that  $f(\mathbf{x}) - f(\mathbf{a}) \in I_{\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{a}, h, F)}$  for any  $\mathbf{a} \in \mathbb{C}^n$ . By Proposition 4.2, and using the same notations, we have that  $X = S_{(F_1, X)}$ .

Let  $X_1 = X \cap F_1^{-1}(X)$ . By Proposition 2.4.(a), we know that  $X \subseteq X_1 \subseteq X$ , so it follows that  $X = X_1$ . By the definition of  $X_1$ , we have:

$$X_1 = \mathbf{V}(z(f(\mathbf{x}) - y), zh(\mathbf{x})(f(F(\mathbf{x})) - y)).$$

Thus, we can conclude that  $V(z(f(\mathbf{x}) - y)) \subseteq V(zh(\mathbf{x})(f(F(\mathbf{x})) - y))$ . By Hilbert's Nullstellensatz, there exists some  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  such that:

$$z^n h(\mathbf{x})^n (f(F(\mathbf{x})) - y)^n \in \langle z(f(\mathbf{x}) - y) \rangle.$$

Note that we can expand the terms as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} (zh)^n (f(F(\mathbf{x})) - y)^n &= (zh)^n [f(\mathbf{x}) - y + (f(F(\mathbf{x})) - f(\mathbf{x}))]^n \\ &= (zh)^n [A(\mathbf{x}, y)(f(\mathbf{x}) - y) + (f(\mathbf{x}) - f(F(\mathbf{x})))^n], \end{aligned}$$

where  $A(\mathbf{x}, y) \in \mathbb{C}[\mathbf{x}, y]$ . Therefore, it follows that:

$$(zh)^n (f(\mathbf{x}) - f(F(\mathbf{x})))^n \in \langle z(f(\mathbf{x}) - y) \rangle.$$

Since  $h \neq 0$  and there is no  $y$ -variable in  $(zh)^n (f(\mathbf{x}) - f(F(\mathbf{x})))^n$ , we conclude that  $f(\mathbf{x}) = f(F(\mathbf{x}))$ . Conversely, if  $f(\mathbf{x}) = f(F(\mathbf{x}))$ , then:

$$X_1 = \mathbf{V}(z(f(\mathbf{x}) - y), zh(f(F(\mathbf{x})) - y)) = \mathbf{V}(z(f(\mathbf{x}) - y)) = X.$$

By Proposition 2.4, we have  $X = S_{(F_1, X)}$ , and using Proposition 4.2, it follows that  $f(\mathbf{x}) - f(\mathbf{a}) \in I_{\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{a}, h, F)}$  for any  $\mathbf{a} \in \mathbb{C}^n$ .  $\square$

In the following, we extend Corollary 4.3 to the case of branching loops.

**Corollary 4.4.** *Let  $F = (F_1, \dots, F_k)$  and  $\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{a}, h, F)$  be a branching loop with  $h \neq 0$  and  $f(\mathbf{x}) \in \mathbb{C}[\mathbf{x}]$ . Then,  $f(\mathbf{x}) - f(\mathbf{a}) \in I_{\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{a}, h, F)}$  for any  $\mathbf{a} \in \mathbb{C}^n$  if and only if  $f(F_i(\mathbf{x})) = f(\mathbf{x})$  for any  $i \in \{1, \dots, k\}$ .*

*Proof.* Assume that  $f(\mathbf{x}) - f(\mathbf{a}) \in I_{\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{a}, h, F)}$  for any  $\mathbf{a} \in \mathbb{C}^n$ , and in particular, that  $f(\mathbf{x}) - f(\mathbf{a}) \in I_{\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{a}, h, F_i)}$  for all  $i \in \{1, \dots, k\}$ . By Corollary 4.2, we have  $f(F_i(\mathbf{x})) = f(\mathbf{x})$  for all  $i \in \{1, \dots, k\}$ .

Conversely, assume that  $f(F_i(\mathbf{x})) = f(\mathbf{x})$  for all  $i$ . Define  $X_0 = \mathbf{V}(z(f(\mathbf{x}) - y))$ , and for  $i \geq 1$ , define  $F_{i,1}(\mathbf{x}, y, z) = (F_i(\mathbf{x}), y, zh(x))$  and let

$$X_{i+1} = X_i \cap F_{1,1}^{-1}(X_i) \cap \dots \cap F_{k,1}^{-1}(X_i).$$

Since  $z(f(\mathbf{x}) - y) = z(f(F_i(\mathbf{x})) - y)$  for all  $i \in \{1, \dots, k\}$ , we obtain

$$X_1 = \mathbf{V}\left(z(f(\mathbf{x}) - y), z(f(F_1(\mathbf{x})) - y), \dots, z(f(F_k(\mathbf{x})) - y)\right) = X.$$

Therefore,  $S_{((F_{1,1}, \dots, F_{k,1}), X)} = \mathbf{V}(z(f(\mathbf{x}) - y))$ , which contains  $(\mathbf{a}, f(\mathbf{a}), 1)$ . By Proposition 3.17, we conclude that  $f(\mathbf{x}) - f(\mathbf{a}) \in I_{\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{a}, h, F)}$  for all  $\mathbf{a} \in \mathbb{C}^n$ .  $\square$

To apply the previous corollary, we design the following algorithm to generate a basis for the vector space of all polynomial invariants of the form  $f(\mathbf{x}) - f(\mathbf{a})$ , where  $f$  belongs to a prescribed vector space (e.g., polynomials of bounded degree). We use the procedure `coefficients`, which takes as input a polynomial  $P \in \mathbb{C}[\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}]$  and outputs the list of coefficients of  $P$ , viewed as an element of  $\mathbb{C}[\mathbf{y}][\mathbf{x}]$ , for some arbitrary monomial ordering. For example:

$$\text{coefficients}\left((y_1 - y_2)x_1^2 + y_1x_1x_2\right) = (y_1 - y_2, y_1).$$

The procedure  $l_i$  returns the  $i$ th coordinate of an element in  $\mathbb{Q}^n$ .

---

**Algorithm 6** General polynomial invariant

---

**Input:** Sequences of polynomials  $F_1, \dots, F_k$  in  $\mathbb{Q}[\mathbf{x}]$ , where  $F_i = (F_{i,1}, \dots, F_{i,n})$  and  $\mathbf{g} = (g_1, \dots, g_m)$  spanning a vector space  $E \subset \mathbb{C}[\mathbf{x}]$ .

**Output:** A vector space basis for all polynomial invariants of the form  $f(\mathbf{x}) - f(\mathbf{a})$ , where  $f \in E$  and  $\mathbf{a} \in \mathbb{C}^n$ , for any loop  $\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{h}, (F_1, \dots, F_k))$  and  $\mathbf{h} \subset \mathbb{C}[\mathbf{x}]$  has only non-zero entries.

- 1:  $g \leftarrow y_1g_1(\mathbf{x}) + \dots + y_mg_m(\mathbf{x})$ ;
  - 2:  $(D_1, \dots, D_k) \leftarrow (g(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) - g(F_1(\mathbf{x}), \mathbf{y}), \dots, g(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) - g(F_k(\mathbf{x}), \mathbf{y}))$ ;
  - 3:  $(L_1(\mathbf{y}), \dots, L_r(\mathbf{y})) \leftarrow \text{concatenate}(\text{coefficients}(D_1), \dots, \text{coefficients}(D_k))$ ;
  - 4:  $(c_1, \dots, c_s) \leftarrow \text{VectorBasis}(L_1(\mathbf{y}), \dots, L_r(\mathbf{y}))$ ;
  - 5: **return**  $\left(\sum_{i=1}^m l_i(c_1)g_i(\mathbf{x}) - \sum_{i=1}^m l_i(c_1)g_i(\mathbf{a}), \dots, \sum_{i=1}^m l_i(c_s)g_i(\mathbf{x}) - \sum_{i=1}^m l_i(c_s)g_i(\mathbf{a})\right)$ ;
-

**Theorem 4.5.** Let  $\mathbf{g} = (g_1, \dots, g_m)$  and  $F_i = (F_{i,1}, \dots, F_{i,n})$  be sequences of polynomials in  $\mathbb{Q}[\mathbf{x}]$ , for  $1 \leq i \leq k$ . Let  $E$  denote the vector space spanned by  $\mathbf{g}$ . Given  $\mathbf{g}$  and  $F_1, \dots, F_k$  as input, Algorithm 6 outputs a sequence of polynomials  $\mathbf{P}$  in  $\mathbb{Q}[\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{a}]$  such that, for any  $\mathbf{a} \in \mathbb{C}^n$  and any  $\mathbf{h} \subset \mathbb{Q}[\mathbf{x}]$  with all entries non-zero, the following hold.

- The polynomials in  $\mathbf{P}$  form a basis for the vector space of all polynomial invariants of  $\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{h}, F)$  of the form  $f(\mathbf{x}) - f(\mathbf{a})$ , where  $f \in E$ .
- Furthermore, if  $d_{\mathbf{g}}$  and  $d_{F_1}, \dots, d_{F_k}$  are bounds on the degrees of  $\mathbf{g}$  and  $F_1, \dots, F_k$  respectively, the algorithm performs at most

$$O\left(\sum_{i=1}^k d_{\mathbf{g}}^m d_{F_i}^m \left(\frac{d_{\mathbf{g}}^{2n} d_{F_i}^n}{n^{2n}} + m^2\right)\right) = k \cdot m^2 (d_{\mathbf{g}} d_F)^{O(n)}$$

operations in  $\mathbb{Q}$ , where  $d_F = \max\{d_{F_1}, \dots, d_{F_k}\}$ .

*Proof.* Without loss of generality, by taking the product of all non-zero entries of  $\mathbf{h}$ , one can assume that  $\mathbf{h}$  reduces to a single non-zero polynomial  $h \in \mathbb{Q}[\mathbf{x}]$ . Since  $g(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})$  is linear in the variables  $\mathbf{y}$ , the polynomials  $L_1(\mathbf{y}), \dots, L_r(\mathbf{y})$  are linear. Let  $V_{gen}$  denote the vector space of all polynomial invariants of the form  $f(\mathbf{x}) - f(\mathbf{a}) = 0$ , where  $f \in E$ . Suppose Algorithm 6 is executed on the inputs  $\mathbf{g}$  and  $F_1, \dots, F_k$ , and outputs

$$(P_1(\mathbf{x}) - P_1(\mathbf{a}), \dots, P_s(\mathbf{x}) - P_s(\mathbf{a})).$$

Therefore,  $P_t = \sum_{i=1}^m l_i(c_s) g_i(\mathbf{x})$ , where  $g(\mathbf{x}, c_i) = g(F_j(\mathbf{x}), c_i)$  for any  $t \leq s$  and  $j \leq k$ . This implies that  $P_i(\mathbf{x}) = P_i(F_j(\mathbf{x}))$  for any  $j \leq k$  and  $i \leq t$ . Moreover,  $P_1, \dots, P_s$  lie within the vector space  $E$ . By Corollary 4.4, it follows that  $P_i(\mathbf{x}) - P_i(\mathbf{a}) \in I_{\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{a}, h, (F_1, \dots, F_k))}$  for any initial value  $\mathbf{a} \in \mathbb{C}^n$  and any  $h \neq 0$ . Consequently, the vector space  $V_{gen}$  includes the space generated by  $(P_1(\mathbf{x}) - P_1(\mathbf{a}), \dots, P_s(\mathbf{x}) - P_s(\mathbf{a}))$ .

To prove the converse, let  $f(\mathbf{x}) - f(\mathbf{a}) \in V_{gen}$  and let  $\mathbf{b} \in \mathbb{C}^m$  such that  $f = \sum_{i=1}^m l_i(\mathbf{b}) g_i(\mathbf{x})$ . Since  $h \neq 0$ , by Corollary 4.4, we know that  $f(F_i(\mathbf{x})) = f(\mathbf{x})$  for all  $i \leq k$ . Consequently,  $L_1(\mathbf{b}) = \dots = L_r(\mathbf{b}) = 0$ . Thus,  $\mathbf{b}$  lies in the kernel of the linear forms  $L_1, \dots, L_r$ . As a result, there exist scalars  $e_1, \dots, e_s \in \mathbb{C}$  such that  $\mathbf{b} = e_1 c_1 + \dots + e_s c_s$ . Since  $l_1, \dots, l_m$  are linear functions, it follows that:

$$\begin{aligned} f(\mathbf{x}) - f(\mathbf{a}) &= \sum_{i=1}^m l_i(\mathbf{b}) g_i(\mathbf{x}) - \sum_{i=1}^m l_i(\mathbf{b}) g_i(\mathbf{a}) \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^m l_i(e_1 c_1 + \dots + e_s c_s) g_i(\mathbf{x}) - \sum_{i=1}^m l_i(e_1 c_1 + \dots + e_s c_s) g_i(\mathbf{a}) \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^m (e_1 l_i(c_1) + \dots + e_s l_i(c_s)) g_i(\mathbf{x}) - \sum_{i=1}^m (e_1 l_i(c_1) + \dots + e_s l_i(c_s)) g_i(\mathbf{a}) \\ &= e_1 (P_1(\mathbf{x}) - P_1(\mathbf{a})) + \dots + e_s (P_s(\mathbf{x}) - P_s(\mathbf{a})) \end{aligned}$$

Hence,  $V_{gen}$  is contained within the vector space spanned by

$$(P_1(\mathbf{x}) - P_1(\mathbf{a}), \dots, P_s(\mathbf{x}) - P_s(\mathbf{a})),$$

proving the first part of the theorem, namely the correctness of Algorithm 6. We now analyze its complexity.

The two computationally intensive steps of Algorithm 6 are Steps 2 and 4, which involve multivariate polynomial arithmetic and linear algebra, respectively. At Step 2, for each  $1 \leq i \leq k$ ,  $D_i$  can be computed in at most  $O\left(\frac{d_g^{3n} d_{F_i}^{2n}}{n^{2n}}\right)$  operations in  $\mathbb{Q}$ , according to [vL13].

Step 4 involves solving a linear system with  $r$  equations and  $m$  unknowns (the  $y_i$ 's). Using Gaussian elimination, this can be done at a cost of  $O(m^2 r)$ . However, from Step 4, the value of  $r$  corresponds to the sum of the supports of the  $D_i$ 's, which satisfies  $r \leq \sum_{i=1}^k d_g^n d_{F_i}^n$ . Combining the complexity bounds for Steps 2 and 4, we obtain the total complexity of Algorithm 6 as claimed.  $\square$

*Remark 8.* In Algorithm 6, we restrict our focus to invariants for loops where no zero polynomials appear in the guard. This condition can be verified with negligible computational cost. If the condition is not satisfied, the loop does not iterate since the statement  $0 \neq 0$  is trivially false. In such cases, the entire invariant ideal reduces to the maximal ideal  $\langle x_1 - a_1, \dots, x_n - a_n \rangle$ .

**Example 6.** Consider the loop Fib 1:

```

(x1, x2, x3) = (2, 1, 1)
while true do
  (x1) ← (x2)
  (x2) ← (x3)
  (x3) ← (2x2x3 - x1)
end while

```

We compute all polynomial invariants of the form  $f(x_1, x_2, x_3) - f(a_1, a_2, a_3) = 0$  up to degree 4 using Algorithm 6. Define

$$g = y_1 + y_2 x_3 + y_3 x_2 + y_4 x_1 + \dots + y_{35} x_1^4.$$

At Step 3, 54 linear equations are generated, including examples such as

$$y_2 - y_3, \quad y_4 - y_3, \quad 16y_{11}, \quad \text{and} \quad y_{10} - y_8.$$

At Step 4, the algorithm computes a vector basis for the solution space of this system of 54 linear equations. From the result, we obtain the output:

$$x_1^2 + x_2^2 + x_3^2 - 2x_1 x_2 x_3 - (a_1^2 + a_2^2 + a_3^2 - 2a_1 a_2 a_3).$$

Thus, the above polynomial is the only polynomial invariant of the form  $f(x_1, x_2, x_3) - f(a_1, a_2, a_3)$  of degree  $\leq 4$ , up to scalar multiplication.



## 5 Termination of algebraic and semi-algebraic loops

In this section, we use invariant sets to establish termination conditions for algebraic and semi-algebraic loops. We begin by presenting a necessary and sufficient condition for the termination of algebraic loops. In contrast, for semi-algebraic loops, we provide only a sufficient condition.

**Proposition 5.1.** *Let  $\mathbf{a} \in \mathbb{C}^n$ ,  $\mathbf{g} = (g_1, \dots, g_m)$  and  $F = (f_1, \dots, f_n)$  be two sequences of polynomials in  $\mathbb{C}[\mathbf{x}]$ . Let  $X = \mathbf{V}(g_1, \dots, g_m) \subset \mathbb{C}^n$ . Then, the polynomial loop  $\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{g} = 0, F)$  never terminates if and only if  $\mathbf{a} \in S_{(F, X)}$ .*

*Proof.* The statement follows directly from the definition, since the loop  $\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{a}, X, F)$  does not terminate if and only if  $F^{(m)}(\mathbf{a}) \in X$  for all  $m \geq 0$ . This is equivalent to  $\mathbf{a} \in S_{(F, X)}$ .  $\square$

**Example 7.** Consider the loop  $\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{g}, F)$  from Example 1. As we have seen in Example 1, the output of `InvariantSet`( $\mathbf{g}, F$ ) is  $(g, g \circ F)$ . Therefore,  $\mathcal{L}$  never terminates if and only if  $(a_1, a_2) \in \mathbf{V}(g, g \circ F)$ .

**Definition 5.2.** *Consider the basic semi-algebraic set  $S$  of  $\mathbb{R}^n$  defined by  $g_1 = \dots = g_k = 0$  and  $h_1 > 0, \dots, h_s > 0$  and a polynomial map  $F = (f_1, \dots, f_n)$ , where the  $f_i$ 's, the  $g_j$ 's and the  $h_j$ 's are polynomials in  $\mathbb{R}[\mathbf{x}]$ . Then a loop of the form:*

$$\boxed{\begin{array}{l} (x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n) = (a_1, a_2, \dots, a_n) \\ \mathbf{while} \ g_1 = \dots = g_k = 0 \ \mathbf{and} \ h_1 > 0, \dots, h_s > 0 \ \mathbf{do} \\ \quad \begin{pmatrix} x_1 \\ x_2 \\ \vdots \\ x_n \end{pmatrix} \xleftarrow{F} \begin{pmatrix} f_1 \\ f_2 \\ \vdots \\ f_n \end{pmatrix} \\ \mathbf{end \ while} \end{array}}$$

*is called a semi-algebraic loop on  $S$  with respect to  $F$ . We denote by  $\mathcal{S}(\mathbf{g}, \mathbf{h})$  the solution set in  $\mathbb{R}^n$  of the polynomial system defined by  $\mathbf{g}$  and  $\mathbf{h}$ .*

The following proposition is a direct consequence of the definitions.

**Proposition 5.3.** *Let  $\mathbf{a} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ , and  $\mathbf{g}$  and  $\mathbf{h}$  be as above. Let  $r_1, \dots, r_p$  be polynomial invariants of  $\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{a}, 0, F)$ . Then the semi-algebraic loop  $\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{a}, (\mathbf{g}, \mathbf{h}), F)$  never terminates if  $\mathbf{V}(r_1, \dots, r_p) \cap \mathbb{R}^n \subset \mathcal{S}(\mathbf{g}, \mathbf{h})$ .*

The above inclusion corresponds to the quantified formula:

$$\forall \mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^n, r_1(\mathbf{x}) = \dots = r_p(\mathbf{x}) = 0 \Rightarrow \begin{cases} g_1(\mathbf{x}) = \dots = g_k(\mathbf{x}) = 0 \\ h_1(\mathbf{x}) > 0, \dots, h_s(\mathbf{x}) > 0 \end{cases} .$$

The validity of such a formula can be determined using a quantifier elimination algorithm [BPR06, Chapter 14]. Since the formula contains no free variables or alternating quantifiers, it corresponds to the emptiness problem of the solution set of a system of polynomial

equations and inequalities. This can be efficiently addressed by specialized algorithms, with the most general version presented in [BPR06, Theorem 13.24]. Furthermore, given the specific structure of the formula, a more efficient approach may involve the method outlined in [GHMM23], which combines the Real Nullstellensatz [BCR98] and Putinar’s Positivstellensatz [Put93]. We will not explore these aspects further, as they fall outside the scope of this paper and will be addressed in future work. Instead, we focus on showing why the above sufficient criterion is not necessary.

**Example 8.** Consider the elementary semi-algebraic loop:

```


$$(x_1, x_2) = (a_1, a_2)$$

while  $x_1 > 0$  do
  
$$\begin{pmatrix} x_1 \\ x_2 \end{pmatrix} \leftarrow \begin{pmatrix} 2x_1 \\ 2x_2 \end{pmatrix}$$

end while

```

A direct analysis of the linear recursive sequence defined by the successive values  $\mathbf{a}^0, \mathbf{a}^1, \dots$  of  $(x_1, x_2)$  reveals that the loop never terminates if and only if  $a_1 > 0$ . Moreover, the polynomial  $a_2x_1 - a_1x_2 = 0$  is an invariant of this loop. Since every  $\mathbf{a}^j$ , for  $j \geq 0$ , must lie on this line, it generates the entire invariant ideal. However,  $\mathbf{V}(a_2x_1 - a_1x_2) \cap \mathbb{R}^2$  is not contained within  $\mathcal{S}(0, x_1)$ , as illustrated in Figure 1.




Figure 1: An illustration of a particular case of Example 8 for  $(a_1, a_2) = (2, 1)$ . In blue are depicted the successive values  $\mathbf{a}^0, \mathbf{a}^1, \dots$  of the variables  $(x_1, x_2)$ , in red is the real zero-set of the invariant ideal, and in gray the set  $\mathcal{S}(0, x_1)$  defined by the condition  $x_1 > 0$ .

## 6 Implementation and Experiments

In this section, we present an implementation of the algorithms discussed in this paper and compare its performance with Polar [MSBK22], which primarily builds on [ABK<sup>+</sup>22] for the case of unsolvable loops. In all tables,  $n$  represents the number of program variables, and  $D$  denotes the degree of the map of a loop. To ensure a fair comparison, and in line with the existing literature, all experiments compute polynomial invariants with a degree bounded by a parameter that we vary. This choice is facilitated by the flexibility of our algorithms in terms of the types of invariants they can compute. The implementation of Algorithms 3, 5, and 6 in Macaulay2 [GS02] is available at:

[github.com/FatemehMohammadi/Algebraic\\_PolyLoop\\_Invariants.git](https://github.com/FatemehMohammadi/Algebraic_PolyLoop_Invariants.git)

## 6.1 Implementation details

The experiments below were performed on a laptop featuring a 4.8 GHz Intel i7 processor, 16 GB of RAM, and a 25 MB L3 cache. The implementation primarily relies on standard linear algebra routines and Gröbner basis computations provided by Macaulay2. This approach ensures that the implementation closely follows the pseudo-code presented in this paper. We made minor modifications to these algorithms to speed up computations, based on insights gained from experimental observations, detailed below.

We observed that for most polynomial loops, all candidate polynomials in  $\mathcal{B}$ , computed at Step 5 of Algorithm 5, are polynomial invariants. Additionally, we found that the smaller the dimension of the variety  $X$ , the faster Algorithm 1 computes polynomials defining  $S_{(F,X)}$ . Therefore, instead of checking each polynomial individually, we test all elements of  $\mathcal{B}$  simultaneously. This approach defines a variety of smaller dimension, leading to a potential speedup of up to 100 times (as seen in Example 4).

## 6.2 Experimental results

In Tables 1 and 2, we compare our implementation of Algorithm 6 with the software Polar, which is based on [ABK<sup>+</sup>22] for the case of unsolvable loops. Notably, on these benchmarks, Polar only produces invariants of the form  $f(\mathbf{x}) - f(\mathbf{a})$  where  $\mathbf{a}$  is the initial value and  $f \in \mathbb{Q}[x]$ . In contrast, Algorithm 6 can generate all polynomial invariants of the form  $f(\mathbf{x}) - f(\mathbf{a})$ , whenever they exist. The benchmarks include those from [ABK<sup>+</sup>22] as well as unsolvable loops in the last two rows, where Polar fails to find any polynomial invariant of degree  $\leq 8$ . These benchmarks can be found at the following link:

[github.com/FatemehMohammadi/Algebraic\\_PolyLoop\\_Invariants/software/loops](https://github.com/FatemehMohammadi/Algebraic_PolyLoop_Invariants/software/loops)

A key distinction is that our approach is global, as we compute *all possible polynomial invariants up to a specified degree*, while Polar generates only a (possibly empty) *subset of them*. However, Polar can handle probabilistic loops, whereas our method is limited to deterministic ones.

In Table 1, we present quantitative data comparing the output of Algorithm 6 and Polar across various benchmarks (listed in the rows) for generating polynomial invariants of degrees 1, 2, 3,  $\dots$ , 8. The column labeled “Alg 6” shows the number of polynomials computed by Algorithm 6, which represents the dimension of the vector space of all polynomial invariants of the form  $f(\mathbf{x}) - f(\mathbf{a})$ . The column labeled “Polar” reports the number of polynomial invariants computed by Polar. For “Nagata” and “Squares,” Polar fails to generate simple invariants such as  $x_1 - a_1$  and  $x_3^2 - x_3 - (a_3^2 - a_3)$ .

We note that when non-zero polynomial invariants exist, we typically find more than Polar does, especially when the initial values are fixed. For example, in the linear case for “Squares”, we identify the single invariant  $1 + x_1 + x_2 + x_3 = 0$  (see also Example 4). Additionally, for “Yaghzev9”, we find the invariants  $x_1 - x_3 + x_5 = 0$ ,  $x_2 - x_4 + x_6 = 0$ , and  $x_8 - x_7 - 7 = 0$ . Furthermore, for “Ex 10”, Polar fails to identify the following “general” invariant in terms of the initial values  $(a_1, a_2, a_3)$ :

Degree			1		2		3		4		5		6		7		8	
Benchmark	$n$	$D$	Alg 6	Polar	Alg 6	Polar	Alg 6	Polar	Alg 6	Polar	Alg 6	Polar	Alg 6	Polar	Alg 6	Polar	Alg 6	Polar
Fib1	3	2	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	2	2	2	2	2	2
Fib2	3	3	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	2	2	2	2	2	TL
Fib3	3	2	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	2	2	2	TL	2	TL
Yagzhev9	9	3	0	0	3	3	4	4	<b>10</b>	TL	TL	TL	TL	TL	TL	TL	TL	TL
Yagzhev11	11	3	0	0	0	0	1	1	TL	TL	TL	TL	TL	TL	TL	TL	TL	TL
Ex 9	3	2	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	<b>2</b>	TL	<b>3</b>	TL	<b>3</b>	TL
Ex 10	3	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	TL	0	TL	0	TL	0	TL	0	TL
markov triples	3	2	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	2	2	2	2	2	2
Nagata	3	5	<b>1</b>	0	<b>3</b>	0	<b>5</b>	0	<b>8</b>	0	<b>11</b>	0	<b>15</b>	0	<b>19</b>	0	<b>24</b>	0
Squares (Ex 4)	3	2	0	0	<b>1</b>	0	<b>1</b>	0	<b>2</b>	0	<b>2</b>	0	<b>3</b>	0	<b>3</b>	0	<b>4</b>	0

TL = Timeout (360 seconds); **bold**: new invariants found

Table 1: Data on outputs of Algorithm 6 and Polar

$$(3a_1 - a_2 - 4a_3)^2(x_1 + x_2) - (3a_1 - a_2 - 4a_3)^2(x_2 + x_3) - 9(a_1 - a_3)(x_1 + x_2)^2 - 16(a_1 - a_3)(x_2 + x_3)^2 + 24(a_1 - a_3)(x_1 + x_2)(x_2 + x_3) = 0.$$

In particular, even when the output is empty (i.e., degree 1 in Tables 1 and 3), or when the results match those of Polar (i.e., the value of  $d$  in the Polar column is the same), we can conclude that no additional linearly independent polynomial invariants can be found.

Degree			1		2		3		4		5		6		7		8	
Benchmark	$n$	$D$	Ours	Polar	Ours	Polar	Ours	Polar	Ours	Polar	Ours	Polar	Ours	Polar	Ours	Polar	Ours	Polar
Fib1	3	2	<b>0.03</b>	0.2	<b>0.04</b>	0.32	<b>0.09</b>	0.68	<b>0.18</b>	1.58	<b>0.35</b>	3.5	<b>0.61</b>	16.6	<b>1.42</b>	67.5	<b>2.88</b>	308
Fib2	3	3	<b>0.03</b>	0.23	<b>0.04</b>	0.46	<b>0.07</b>	1.18	<b>0.15</b>	3.69	<b>0.34</b>	11.5	<b>0.65</b>	45.8	<b>1.25</b>	260	<b>2.51</b>	TL
Fib3	3	2	<b>0.03</b>	0.21	<b>0.05</b>	0.4	<b>0.08</b>	1.26	<b>0.15</b>	4.3	<b>0.27</b>	31.7	<b>0.6</b>	107.9	<b>1.39</b>	TL	<b>2.89</b>	TL
Yagzhev9	9	3	<b>0.05</b>	0.43	<b>0.36</b>	5.2	<b>5.7</b>	131.5	<b>143.7</b>	TL	TL	TL	TL	TL	TL	TL	TL	TL
Yagzhev11	11	3	<b>0.1</b>	0.45	<b>1.1</b>	6.83	<b>19.4</b>	359	TL	TL	TL	TL	TL	TL	TL	TL	TL	TL
Ex 9	3	2	<b>0.03</b>	0.28	<b>0.06</b>	0.64	<b>0.1</b>	2.38	<b>0.18</b>	11.5	<b>0.35</b>	172	<b>0.77</b>	TL	<b>1.6</b>	TL	<b>4.87</b>	TL
Ex 10	3	2	<b>0.02</b>	0.39	<b>0.05</b>	1.7	<b>0.09</b>	14.9	<b>0.2</b>	TL	<b>0.38</b>	TL	<b>0.98</b>	TL	<b>2.1</b>	TL	<b>8.5</b>	TL
markov triples	3	2	<b>0.04</b>	0.27	<b>0.06</b>	0.54	<b>0.13</b>	1.31	<b>0.26</b>	2.82	<b>0.51</b>	6	<b>1.3</b>	14.87	<b>2.6</b>	33.84	<b>4.55</b>	88.1
Nagata	3	5	<b>0.03</b>	0.25	<b>0.04</b>	0.55	<b>0.08</b>	1.21	<b>0.17</b>	2.84	<b>0.42</b>	5.86	<b>0.8</b>	11.15	<b>1.97</b>	20.3	<b>3.8</b>	35.6
Squares (Ex 4)	3	2	<b>0.03</b>	0.5	<b>0.04</b>	0.67	<b>0.07</b>	1.15	<b>0.16</b>	2.25	<b>0.3</b>	5.46	<b>0.72</b>	10.1	<b>1.6</b>	70.3	<b>4.3</b>	165.9

TL = Timeout (360 seconds);

Table 2: Timings for Algorithm 6 and Polar, in seconds

In Table 2, we present the execution times for Algorithm 6 and Polar as reported in Table 1, with a time limit of 360 seconds. In cases where Polar reaches this limit (e.g., degree 4 for Yagzhev9), we confirmed that it does not terminate after 15 minutes or hit the maximum recursion depth.

We observe that our implementation is at least 10 times faster than Polar in most cases. For all examples except Yagzhev9 and Yagzhev11, Algorithm 6 computes all general polynomial invariants up to degree 10 within 120 seconds. In contrast, Polar fails to compute these invariants within the 360-second limit for all examples except Nagata.

Finally, in Table 3, we present experimental results for Algorithm 5 on several benchmarks with varying degrees for the polynomial invariants. Since Algorithm 5 requires a fixed initial value, we selected random integers in  $[-100, 100]$  and averaged the timings over five

runs. For each case, we show the dimension of the vector space of all computed polynomial invariants and the corresponding average running time.

For Ex9, Ex10, MarkovTriples, and Nagata, Algorithm 5 successfully terminates within 360 seconds for polynomial invariants of degree  $\leq 8$ . However, for all other benchmarks, it fails to terminate within 360 seconds for polynomial invariants of degree  $\geq 5$ . Table 3 also indicates that, for many benchmarks, there are no polynomial invariants of degree  $\leq 2$ , requiring the search for degree 3 invariants, which are sufficient for all benchmarks.

Degree			1		2		3		4		5		6	
Benchmark	$n$	$D$	Timing	dim	Timing	dim	Timing	dim	Timing	dim	Timing	dim	Timing	dim
Fib1	3	2	0.026	0	0.062	0	0.34	1	30.79	4	TL	TL	TL	TL
Fib2	3	3	0.019	0	0.055	0	25.26	1	TL	TL	TL	TL	TL	TL
Fib3	3	2	0.017	0	0.057	0	3.1	1	25.12	4	TL	TL	TL	TL
Yagzhev9	9	3	0.089	3	TL	TL	TL	TL	TL	TL	TL	TL	TL	TL
Yagzhev11	11	3	0.11	0	2.64	0	318	1	TL	TL	TL	TL	TL	TL
Ex 9	3	2	0.02	0	0.055	0	0.17	3	0.57	11	2.63	25	10.14	46
Ex 10	3	2	0.017	0	0.066	2	0.18	8	0.62	19	2.61	36	11.4	60
markov triples	3	2	0.033	0	0.11	0	0.36	1	1.28	4	2.87	10	8.7	20
Nagata	3	5	0.019	1	0.057	5	0.14	13	0.39	26	0.98	45	2.56	71
Squares (Ex 4)	3	2	0.017	0	0.063	1	0.82	4	TL	TL	TL	TL	TL	TL

TL = Timeout (360 seconds);

Table 3: Timings in seconds and data on outputs for Algorithm 5

When the initial values are fixed, all polynomial invariants of a loop up to a specified degree can be computed as the kernel of the polynomial matrix evaluated at these initial values, as output by Algorithm 3. However, for most of the examples above, Algorithm 3 does not terminate within an hour.

## References

- [ABK<sup>+</sup>22] Daneshvar Amrollahi, Ezio Bartocci, George Kenison, Laura Kovács, Marcel Moosbrugger, and Miroslav Stankovič. Solving invariant generation for unsolvable loops. In *International Static Analysis Symposium*, pages 19–43. Springer, 2022.
- [BCR98] Jan Bochnack, Michel Coste, and Marie-Françoise Roy. *Real Algebraic Geometry*, volume 3 of *Ergebnisse der Mathematik und ihrer Grenzgebiete*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, Heidelberg, 1st edition, 1998.
- [BDSW17] Michael Benedikt, Timothy Duff, Aditya Sharad, and James Worrell. Polynomial automata: Zeroness and applications. In *2017 32nd Annual ACM/IEEE Symposium on Logic in Computer Science*, pages 1–12, 2017.

- [BES21] Jérémy Berthomieu, Christian Eder, and Mohab Safey El Din. Msolve: A library for solving polynomial systems. In *Proceedings of the 2021 on International Symposium on Symbolic and Algebraic Computation*, pages 51–58, 2021.
- [BMP24] Erdenebayar Bayarmagnai, Fatemeh Mohammadi, and Rémi Prébet. Algebraic tools for computing polynomial loop invariants. In *Proceedings of the 2024 International Symposium on Symbolic and Algebraic Computation*, pages 371–381, 2024.
- [BPR06] Saugata Basu, Richard Pollack, and Marie-Françoise Roy. *Algorithms in Real Algebraic Geometry*. Algorithms and Computation in Mathematics. Springer International Publishing, 2nd revised and extended 2016 edition, 2006.
- [CFGG20] Krishnendu Chatterjee, Hongfei Fu, Amir Kafshdar Goharshady, and Ehsan Kafshdar Goharshady. Polynomial invariant generation for non-deterministic recursive programs. In *Proceedings of the 41st ACM SIGPLAN Conference on Programming Language Design and Implementation*, pages 672–687, 2020.
- [CJJK14] David Cachera, Thomas Jensen, Arnaud Jobin, and Florent Kirchner. Inference of polynomial invariants for imperative programs: A farewell to gröbner bases. *Science of Computer Programming*, 93:89–109, 2014.
- [CK24] John Cyphert and Zachary Kincaid. Solvable polynomial ideals: The ideal reflection for program analysis. *Proceedings of the ACM on Programming Languages*, 8(POPL):724–752, 2024.
- [CLO13] David Cox, John Little, and Donal O’Shea. *Ideals, varieties, and algorithms: an introduction to computational algebraic geometry and commutative algebra*. Springer Science & Business Media, 2013.
- [dOBP16] Steven de Oliveira, Saddek Bensalem, and Virgile Prevosto. Polynomial invariants by linear algebra. In *Automated Technology for Verification and Analysis: 14th International Symposium, ATVA 2016, Chiba, Japan, October 17-20, 2016, Proceedings 14*, pages 479–494. Springer, 2016.
- [dOBP17] Steven de Oliveira, Saddek Bensalem, and Virgile Prevosto. Synthesizing invariants by solving solvable loops. In *International Symposium on Automated Technology for Verification and Analysis*, pages 327–343. Springer, 2017.
- [EF17] Christian Eder and Jean-Charles Faugère. A survey on signature-based algorithms for computing gröbner bases. *Journal of Symbolic Computation*, 80:719–784, 2017.
- [Flo93] Robert Floyd. Assigning meanings to programs. In *Program Verification: Fundamental Issues in Computer Science*, pages 65–81. Springer, 1993.

- [GHMM23] Amir Kafshdar Goharshady, S Hitarth, Fatemeh Mohammadi, and Harshit Jitendra Motwani. Algebro-geometric algorithms for template-based synthesis of polynomial programs. *Proceedings of the ACM on Programming Languages*, 7(OOPSLA1):727–756, 2023.
- [GS02] Daniel R Grayson and Michael E Stillman. Macaulay2, a software system for research in algebraic geometry, 2002.
- [Har13] Robin Hartshorne. *Algebraic geometry*, volume 52. Springer Science & Business Media, 2013.
- [HJK17] Andreas Humenberger, Maximilian Jaroschek, and Laura Kovács. Invariant generation for multi-path loops with polynomial assignments. In *International Conference on Verification, Model Checking, and Abstract Interpretation*, pages 226–246. Springer, 2017.
- [HOPW18] Ehud Hrushovski, Joël Ouaknine, Amaury Pouly, and James Worrell. Polynomial invariants for affine programs. In *Proceedings of the 33rd Annual ACM/IEEE Symposium on Logic in Computer Science*, pages 530–539, 2018.
- [HOPW23] Ehud Hrushovski, Joël Ouaknine, Amaury Pouly, and James Worrell. On strongest algebraic program invariants. *Journal of the ACM*, 70(5):1–22, 2023.
- [Kar76] Michael Karr. Affine relationships among variables of a program. *Acta Informatica*, 6:133–151, 1976.
- [Kem93] G. Kempf. *Algebraic Varieties*. London Mathematical Society Lecture Note Series. Cambridge University Press, 1993.
- [KM76] Shmuel Katz and Zohar Manna. Logical analysis of programs. *Communications of the ACM*, 19(4):188–206, 1976.
- [Kol88] János Kollár. Sharp effective nullstellensatz. *Journal of the American Mathematical Society*, 1(4):963–975, 1988.
- [Kov08] Laura Kovács. Reasoning algebraically about p-solvable loops. In *International Conference on Tools and Algorithms for the Construction and Analysis of Systems*, pages 249–264. Springer, 2008.
- [Kov23] Laura Kovács. Algebra-based loop analysis. In *Proceedings of the 2023 International Symposium on Symbolic and Algebraic Computation*, pages 41–42, 2023.
- [MKSV24] Rida Ait El Manssour, George Kenison, Mahsa Shirmohammadi, and Anton Varonka. Simple linear loops: Algebraic invariants and applications. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2407.09154*, 2024.

- [MM82] E. Mayr and A. Meyer. The complexity of the word problem for commutative semi-groups and polynomial ideals. *Advances in Mathematics*, 46:305–329, 1982.
- [MMK24] Julian Müllner, Marcel Moosbrugger, and Laura Kovács. Strong invariants are hard: On the hardness of strongest polynomial invariants for (probabilistic) programs. *Proc. ACM Program. Lang.*, 8(POPL), January 2024.
- [MOS04a] Markus Müller-Olm and Helmut Seidl. Computing polynomial program invariants. *Information Processing Letters*, 91(5):233–244, 2004.
- [MOS04b] Markus Müller-Olm and Helmut Seidl. A note on karr’s algorithm. In *International Colloquium on Automata, Languages, and Programming*, pages 1016–1028. Springer, 2004.
- [MP12] Zohar Manna and Amir Pnueli. *Temporal verification of reactive systems: safety*. Springer Science & Business Media, 2012.
- [MS92] Guillermo Moreno Socias. Length of polynomial ascending chains and primitive recursiveness. *MATHEMATICA SCANDINAVICA*, 71:181–205, Jun. 1992.
- [MSBK22] Marcel Moosbrugger, Miroslav Stankovic, Ezio Bartocci, and Laura Kovács. This is the moment for probabilistic loops. *Proc. ACM Program. Lang.*, 6(OOPSLA2):1497–1525, 2022.
- [NY99] Dmitri Novikov and Sergei Yakovenko. Trajectories of polynomial vector fields and ascending chains of polynomial ideals. *Annales de l’institut Fourier*, 49(2):563–609, 1999.
- [Pas20] Grzegorz Pastuszak. Ascending chains of ideals in the polynomial ring. *Turkish Journal of Mathematics*, 44(6):2652–2658, 2020.
- [Put93] Mihai Putinar. Positive polynomials on compact semi-algebraic sets. *Indiana University Mathematics Journal*, 42(3):969–984, 1993.
- [RCK04] Enric Rodríguez-Carbonell and Deepak Kapur. Automatic generation of polynomial loop invariants: Algebraic foundations. In *Proceedings of the 2004 international symposium on Symbolic and algebraic computation*, pages 266–273, 2004.
- [RCK07a] Enric Rodríguez-Carbonell and Deepak Kapur. Automatic generation of polynomial invariants of bounded degree using abstract interpretation. *Science of Computer Programming*, 64(1):54–75, 2007.
- [RCK07b] Enric Rodríguez-Carbonell and Deepak Kapur. Generating all polynomial invariants in simple loops. *Journal of Symbolic Computation*, 42(4):443–476, 2007.



- [Sei72] A. Seidenberg. Constructive proof of hilbert’s theorem on ascending chains. *Transactions of the American Mathematical Society*, 174:305–312, 1972.
- [Sit92] William Y Sit. An algorithm for solving parametric linear systems. *Journal of Symbolic Computation*, 13(4):353–394, 1992.
- [SSM04] Sriram Sankaranarayanan, Henny B Sipma, and Zohar Manna. Non-linear loop invariant generation using gröbner bases. In *Proceedings of the 31st ACM SIGPLAN-SIGACT symposium on Principles of programming languages*, pages 318–329, 2004.
- [vL13] Joris van der Hoeven and Grégoire Lecerf. On the bit-complexity of sparse polynomial and series multiplication. *Journal of Symbolic Computation*, 50:227–254, 2013.
- [VZGG13] Joachim Von Zur Gathen and Jürgen Gerhard. *Modern computer algebra*. Cambridge university press, 2013.