Lecture LVIII: Towards Gröbner bases III

Recall: Notions discussed in Lecture 57.

- <u>Monomial Order</u>: a Total ordering on the set of monomials $1 \times \frac{d}{2} : d \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^{n}$ if $(\pi \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^{n})$ such that (1) $\times \frac{d}{2} \le \times \frac{d}{2} \Longrightarrow \times \frac{d+2}{2} \le \times \frac{d+2}{2} \quad \forall \forall \forall \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^{n}$ $(z) \le is a well-ordering (so <math>1 < \times \frac{d}{2} \quad \forall d \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^{n} \cdot \frac{10}{2})$ <u>Remark</u>: Given (1), we have $(z) \iff 1 < \times \frac{d}{2} \quad \forall d \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^{n} \cdot \frac{10}{2}$.
- Definition: Given $I \subseteq K[x_1, ..., x_n]$ an ideal, we define the <u>hadeing ideal</u> of I as LT(I) = ideal in $K[x_1, ..., x_n]$ generated by $\{LT(F) : F \in I\}$
 - $LT(f) = x^{\frac{\alpha}{20}} \quad \text{for } f = \sum c_{(\underline{d})} x^{\underline{\alpha}} \quad \text{if } c_{(\underline{d}_0)} \neq 0$ $\cdot x^{\underline{\alpha}} \leq x^{\frac{\alpha}{20}} \quad \forall \underline{d} \text{ with } c_{(\underline{d}_0)} \neq 0$

Definition: A finite set of generators of I say
$$\{g_1, \dots, g_m\}$$
 is called a Gröbner
basis of I with respect to a monomial order < on $K[x_1, \dots, x_n]$ if
 $LT(I) = (LT(g_1), \dots, LT(g_m))$
Key: We will only need $\{g_1, \dots, g_m\} \in I$ & $(LT(g_1), \dots, LT(g_m)) = LT(I)$.

where (1) No term in r is devisible by LT(S,), LT(S_2),..., LT(Sm)

(2)
$$LT(q;g;) \leq LT(F) \quad \forall i=1,...,m.$$

• PROCE DURE :

Start by setting
$$q_1, \dots, q_m, c = 0$$
, $p = f$.
While $p \neq 0$:

. if
$$LT(p)$$
 is divisible by $LT(g_i)$ for some i leg test in order $i=1,...,m$) 2
Say $L(p) = a_i L(g_i)$ for $a_i \in K[x_1...x_n]$ (it will be a momental!), then
 $g_i \longmapsto g_i + a_i$
 $P \longmapsto P - a_i g_i$
. else:
 $r \longmapsto r + LT(p)$
 $P \longmapsto P - LT(p)$

Remarks: (1) Each step of the algorithm does not produce monomials on p that are larger that LT(f). (2) At each step, we may add terms Tor that are not divisible by any CT(81),..., CT(8m) These 2 observations ensure the output has the desired properties. Turthermore, we obtain an extra endition on each fifi:

Lemma: The polynomials at each step of the proceduce satisfy:

$$LT(F) \gg LT(P) \quad \text{and} \quad LT(F) \gg LT(\mathfrak{z};\mathfrak{z};\mathfrak{z}) \quad \text{whencen } \mathfrak{z}_{\mathfrak{z}}\mathfrak{z}_{\mathfrak{z}} \neq \mathfrak{d} \cdot \mathfrak{z}_{\mathfrak{z}} = \mathfrak{d} \cdot \mathfrak{z}_{\mathfrak{z}}\mathfrak{d} \mathfrak{z}_{\mathfrak{z}} + \mathfrak{z}_{\mathfrak{z}}\mathfrak{z}_{\mathfrak{z}} + \mathfrak{z}_{\mathfrak{z}}\mathfrak{z}_{\mathfrak{z}}} + \mathfrak{z}_{\mathfrak{z}}\mathfrak{z}_{\mathfrak{z}} + \mathfrak{z}_{\mathfrak{z}}\mathfrak{z}_{\mathfrak{z}} + \mathfrak{z}_{\mathfrak{z}}\mathfrak{z}_{\mathfrak{z}}^{\mathfrak{z}} + \mathfrak{z}_{\mathfrak{z}}}\mathfrak{z}_{\mathfrak{z}}^{\mathfrak{z}} + \mathfrak{z}}\mathfrak{z}_{\mathfrak{z}}^{\mathfrak{z}} + \mathfrak{z}_{\mathfrak{z}}\mathfrak{z}_{\mathfrak{z}}^{\mathfrak{z}}} + \mathfrak{z}_{\mathfrak{z}}\mathfrak{z}_{\mathfrak{z}}^{\mathfrak{z}} + \mathfrak{z}_{\mathfrak{z}}\mathfrak{z}_{\mathfrak{z}}^{\mathfrak{z}} + \mathfrak{z}}\mathfrak{z}_{\mathfrak{z}}^{\mathfrak{z}} + \mathfrak{z}}\mathfrak{z}_{\mathfrak{z}}^{\mathfrak{z}} + \mathfrak{z}}\mathfrak{z}_{\mathfrak{z}}^{\mathfrak{z}} + \mathfrak{z}_{\mathfrak{z}}\mathfrak{z}_{\mathfrak{z}}} + \mathfrak{z}_{\mathfrak{z}}\mathfrak{z}^{\mathfrak{z}} + \mathfrak{z}_{\mathfrak{z}}\mathfrak{z}_{\mathfrak{z}} + \mathfrak{z}_{\mathfrak{z}}\mathfrak{z}} + \mathfrak{z}_{\mathfrak{z}}\mathfrak{z}_{\mathfrak{z}} + \mathfrak{z}_{\mathfrak{z}}\mathfrak{z}_{\mathfrak{z}} + \mathfrak{z}}\mathfrak{z}_{\mathfrak{z}} + \mathfrak{z}_{\mathfrak{z}}\mathfrak{z}_{\mathfrak{z}} + \mathfrak{z}_{\mathfrak{z}}\mathfrak{z}_{\mathfrak{z}}} + \mathfrak{z}_{\mathfrak{z}}\mathfrak{z}_{\mathfrak{z}} + \mathfrak{z}_{\mathfrak{z}}\mathfrak{z}_{\mathfrak{z}} + \mathfrak{z}_{\mathfrak{z}}\mathfrak{z}_{\mathfrak{z}}} + \mathfrak{z}_{\mathfrak{z}}\mathfrak{z}_{\mathfrak{z}} + \mathfrak{z}_{\mathfrak{$$

Broof of Concerness and Lemma: By an structin, no normanical of 5 is derivible by any LT(8i) The variable p represents the intermediate dividend at each step. With this notation, ur show that:

$$f = q_1 g_1 + \dots + q_m g_m + p + r$$
 (**)
 $LT(F) \ge LT(F) \ge LT(q_1 g_1)$ if $f_1 g_1 \ne 0$ (***)
iteration.

after each iteration.

This is clearly true at the first step
$$(q_1 = \cdots = q_m = r = 0, p = f)$$

(1) If some
$$LT(g_i)$$
 durides $LT(p) \Rightarrow$ Write $LT(p) = a_i LT(g_i)$
 $f \stackrel{?}{=} g_i g_i + \dots + (g_i + a_i) g_i + \dots + g_i g_i + (p - a_i g_i) + f_i$ because we be

$$\stackrel{?}{=}$$
 $q_1 g_1 + \dots + (q_i + a_i) g_i + \dots + q_n q_n + (p - a_i g_i) + \Gamma$.
Le cause we had us valid
fam the purisus step.

Now:
$$L(p) = a; L(g;) = \sum LT(p-a;g;) < LT(p) \leq LT(f)$$
 because
. For each monomial x^{k} in $g;$ we have $a; x^{k} \leq a; LT(g;) = LT(p)$ and the
imegrality is strict if $x^{k} \neq LT(g;)$.

$$LT(p-q;g;) \text{ does not entein the nonmial } LT(p). \\ LT(q;+q;)g;) \in \max LT(q;g;), LT(q;g;) \leq LT(f) \\ \leq LT(f) LT(p) \leq LT(f)$$

· For j = i LT(\$ 35) = LT(F) is known from the previous step This confirms (**)

(2) If us
$$LT(g_i)$$
 divides $LT(p)$, then :
 $F = q_i g_i + \dots + q_m g_m + (p - LT(p)) + (r + LT(p))$
Now $LT(p - LT(p)) < LT(p) \leq LT(F)$
 $LT(q_i g_i) \leq LT(F)$ Vi with $q_i g_i \neq 0$ by the punious step.

Q: Why does the paredure terminate? Indeed, F - a: Si will typically have more terms than h, so we need to give a reason to ensure our while loop is not infinite.

As we showed in the proof of conectmens, at each step of the Broof of Termination: algorithm we get LT(Prev) < LT(P) where $Prev = \begin{cases} P - a; g; \\ P - LT(P) \end{cases}$ depending

on whether some LT(g;) | LT(p) or not. 4

Thus, if the algorithm didn't terminate (ie, we never get p=0), then we would produce a strictly decreasing sequence of mnomials, intradicting the well-ordining property $0F \prec .$ This cannot happen.

\$58.2 Existence of Gröbne basis :

Our first roult weakens the requirement for a GB To being a generating set (if will be a consequence).

Proposition 1: Assume $I \subseteq R = K[x_1, ..., x_n]$ is a un-zero ideal and $3g_{1,...,}g_m t \subseteq I$ satisfy $LT(I) = (LT(g_1), ..., LT(g_m))$. Then, $\{g_1, ..., g_m\}$ is a Gröbuer basis of I.

$$\frac{g_{noof}}{F_{i}} \text{ We need to prove } (g_{1}, \dots, g_{m}) = I .$$

$$Pich f \in I \quad \text{a use multivariate division algorithm to write}$$

$$f = \sum_{i=1}^{m} g_{i}g_{i} + r$$

where r=0 or $r\neq 0$ is no monomial in r is kinetible by any $LT(g_i)$ (p; i. As $f, g_1, ..., g_m \in I$, we have $r \in I$. Thus, $LT(r) \in LT(I)$. <u>Uain</u>: $LT(r) \in (LT(g_1), ..., LT(g_m)) \Longrightarrow \exists i$ st $LT(g_i) \mid LT(r)$ $\exists f / By$ definition, we have $LT(r) = \sum_{i=1}^{m} hi LT(g_i)$ (pr some $h_1, ..., h_m \in R$. Now, LT(r) and each $LT(g_i)$ are all nonomials. So, LT(r) must be a monomial on the (RHS) $\Longrightarrow \exists i$ and χ^{\pm} in one hi with $LT(r) = \chi^{rr} LT(g_i)$

This shows $LT(g_i) \mid LT(r)$ for some i. As a unsequence, we must have r = 0 (otherwise, we get $LT(g_i) \not \in LT(r)$ $\forall i$ and $\exists i$ with $LT(g_i) \mid LT(r)$, which is impossible). Hence $F \in (g_1, \dots, g_m)$, as we wanted to show .

Thurem 1: Gröbner bases exist.

<u>Brook</u>: Since LT(I) is an ideal of R, which is Noetherian, we know it is initely generated. Furthermore, by Lemma 351.3 we can find a finite generating set for LT(I) among $\int LT(F) : F \in I \int$. That is $\exists g_{1}, ..., g_{m} \in I$ with LT(I) = (LT(g1),..., LT(gn)). By Propritin, we undude fg1,..., gnt is a GB of I.

Remark: If we can show directly that LT(I) is always frintely generated (without invoking Hilbert's Basis Theorem), the existence of Guöbner basis would reprove K[x,..., xn] is Noetherian The later statement is true and it is known as Dicksn's Lemma. It can be proved by using induction m n,

. The main application of GB is to provide a concrete cutificate for when a polynomial lies in a given ideal

<u>Theorem 2</u> (Membership Test) Let $I \subset R = K(x_1, ..., x_n]$ be an ideal and $lit \{g_{1}, ..., g_m\}$ be a Gaöbmen basis of I. Then, for every $F \in R$, there exist unique elements $f_{\pm} \in I$ and $r \in R$ such that :

(1) $f = f_{I} + r$ (2) No monomial appearing in r is divisible by any LT(Si) for i=1,...,m. Proof: We write $f = \sum_{i=1}^{n} g_i g_i + r$ using the multivariate division algorithm. $= f_{I} \in I$

This which conditions (1) and (2) are true. Thus, we rely need to prove uniqueness. Assume $f = f_{I} + r = \tilde{F}_{I} + \tilde{r} \implies r - \tilde{r} = \tilde{F}_{I} - f_{I} \subset I$ $\implies LT(r-\tilde{r}) \in LT(I) = (LT(g_{1}), ..., LT(g_{m}))$ by definition of GB. The proof of the Claim in Proposition 1 answers $\exists i$ with $LT(g_{i}) \mid LT(r-\tilde{r})$ Since $LT(r-\tilde{r})$ is a maximal in either $r \approx \tilde{r}(if if is mn - q_{MO})$, we get a contradiction unless $r-\tilde{r} = 0$. Thus, $r = \tilde{r}$ and so $f_{I} = \tilde{F}_{I}$

(rollary: FEI = r=0.

Meaning: if we are given an ideal I, as being generated by $h_1, ..., h_q$ and asked to check whether $h \in I$ is not

(1) Replace 14,..., te} by a Gröbner basis of I, say 18,..., 8m}

(2) Use the division algorithm to compute the remainder r

- · L=D => feI
- r = > F = [This part will be false if is not a GB)