



HAL
open science

In-depth comparison of the Berlekamp–Massey–Sakata and the Scalar-FGLM algorithms: the adaptive variants

Jérémy Berthomieu, Jean-Charles Faugère

► **To cite this version:**

Jérémy Berthomieu, Jean-Charles Faugère. In-depth comparison of the Berlekamp–Massey–Sakata and the Scalar-FGLM algorithms: the adaptive variants. 2018. hal-01805478v1

HAL Id: hal-01805478

<https://inria.hal.science/hal-01805478v1>

Preprint submitted on 1 Jun 2018 (v1), last revised 28 Aug 2019 (v3)

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

In-depth comparison of the Berlekamp–Massey–Sakata and the Scalar-FGLM algorithms: the adaptive variants

Jérémy Berthomieu*, Jean-Charles Faugère*

*Sorbonne Université, CNRS, INRIA, Laboratoire d'Informatique de Paris 6, LIP6, Équipe PolSys,
4 place Jussieu, 75252 Paris Cedex 05, France*

Abstract

The BERLEKAMP–MASSEY–SAKATA algorithm and the SCALAR-FGLM algorithm both compute the ideal of relations of a multidimensional linear recurrent sequence.

Whenever quering a single sequence element is prohibitive, the bottleneck of these algorithms becomes the computation of all the needed sequence terms. As such, having adaptive variants of these algorithms, reducing the number of sequence queries, becomes mandatory.

A native adaptive variant of the SCALAR-FGLM algorithm was presented by its authors, the so-called ADAPTIVE SCALAR-FGLM algorithm.

In this paper, our first contribution is to make the BERLEKAMP–MASSEY–SAKATA algorithm more efficient by making it adaptive to avoid some useless relation testings. This variant allows us to divide by four in dimension 2 and by seven in dimension 3 the number of basic operations performed on some sequence family.

Then, we compare the two adaptive algorithms. We show that their behaviors differ in a way that it is not possible to tweak one of the algorithms in order to mimic exactly the behavior of the other. We detail precisely the differences and the similarities of both algorithms and conclude that in general the ADAPTIVE SCALAR-FGLM algorithm needs fewer queries and performs fewer basic operations than the ADAPTIVE BERLEKAMP–MASSEY–SAKATA algorithm.

We also show that these variants are always more efficient than the original algorithms.

Keywords: The BMS algorithm, the SCALAR-FGLM algorithm, Gröbner basis

*Laboratoire d'Informatique de Paris 6, Sorbonne Université, Campus Pierre-et-Marie-Curie, boîte courrier 169, 4 place Jussieu, F-75252 Paris Cedex 05, France.

Email addresses: jeremy.berthomieu@lip6.fr (Jérémy Berthomieu),
jean-charles.faugere@inria.fr (Jean-Charles Faugère)

Contents

1	Introduction	2
1.1	Related works	4
1.2	Contributions	4
1.3	Conclusion and Perspectives	6
2	Preliminaries	7
2.1	Sequences and relations	7
2.2	Gröbner bases	8
2.3	Multi-Hankel matrices	9
3	An Adaptive version of the BMS algorithm	10
4	The Adaptive version of the SCALAR-FGLM algorithm	19
5	Analogies and differences of the adaptive variants	22
5.1	Closed staircase	22
5.2	Reduction of relations	23
5.3	Validity of relations	25
5.4	Monomial ordering and Set of Terms	28
6	Complexity and Benchmarks of the adaptive variants	29
6.1	Counting the number of table queries	30
6.2	Counting the number of basic operations	31
	References	34
	Appendices	38
A	The BMS algorithm	38
A.1	A Polynomial interpretation of the BMS algorithm	38
A.2	A Linear Algebra interpretation of the BMS algorithm	46

1. Introduction

A fundamental problem in Computer Science is to estimate the linear complexity of an infinite sequence S : this is the smallest length of a recurrence with

constant coefficients satisfied by S or the length of the shortest linear feedback shift register (LFSR) which generates it.

Linear Prediction dates back to Gauß in the 18th century: given a discrete set of original values $(u_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$, the goal is to find the best coefficients, in the least-squares sense, $(\alpha_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ that will approximate u_i by $-\sum_{k=1}^d \alpha_k u_{i-k}$. Least-square sense means that the solution minimizes the sum of the squares of the errors.

This yields a linear system whose matrix is Hankel. This problem has also been extensively used in Digital Signal Processing theory and applications. Numerically, Levinson–Durbin recursion method can be used to solve this problem. Hence, to some extent, the original Levinson–Durbin problem in Norbert Wiener’s Ph.D. thesis, Levinson (1947); Wiener (1964), predates the Hankel interpretation of the Berlekamp–Massey algorithm, see for instance Jonckheere and Ma (1989).

The Berlekamp–Massey algorithm (BM, Berlekamp (1968); Massey (1969)) is a famous algorithm guessing a solution of this problem for a one-dimensional sequence. This algorithm has been tremendously studied and many variants were designed. We refer the reader to Kaltofen and Pan (1991); Kaltofen and Yuhasz (2013a,b) for a very nice classification of the BM algorithms for solving this problem, and for its generalization to matrix sequences.

A generalization of the BM algorithm to 2 dimensions was first designed in Sakata (1988). It was then further generalized to n dimensions in Sakata (1990, 2009). The so-called Berlekamp–Massey–Sakata algorithm (BMS) guesses a Gröbner basis of the ideal of relations satisfied by the first terms of the input sequence, (Sakata, 1990, Lemma 5).

In Berthomieu et al. (2015, 2017), the authors designed the SCALAR-FGLM algorithm. It also guesses a reduced Gröbner basis of the ideal of relations of a sequence. While the BM algorithm can be seen as the computation of the kernel of a Hankel matrix, the SCALAR-FGLM algorithm computes the kernel of a *multi-Hankel* matrix, its multivariate generalization.

In some applications, computing even a term of the input sequence is costly or even the bottleneck of the SCALAR-FGLM algorithm. An adaptive variant of the algorithm, called the ADAPTIVE SCALAR-FGLM algorithm was designed in Berthomieu et al. (2015, 2017) in order to minimize the number of sequence queries.

More recently, the authors proposed a new algorithm, POLYNOMIAL SCALAR-FGLM, in Berthomieu and Faugère (2018) for computing the linear recurrence relations of a sequence based on multivariate polynomial arithmetic. It extends the BMS algorithm through the use of polynomial divisions and is a complete revision of the SCALAR-FGLM algorithm without any linear algebra operations. Yet, in this paper the algorithms are treated as high-level ones, with linear algebra operations. We do not try to improve them using polynomial arithmetic as in Berthomieu and Faugère (2018).

Finally, let us recall that as it is not possible to store the whole input sequence, all these algorithms take a bound as an input and only handle sequence terms up to this index bound. This is why they can only *guess* the ideal of relations.

1.1. Related works

Computing linear recurrence relations of multi-dimensional sequences finds applications in Coding Theory, Computer Algebra and Combinatorics.

Historically, the BM algorithm was designed to decode cyclic codes, like the BCH codes, Bose and Ray-Chaudhuri (1960); Hocquenghem (1959). Therefore, decoding n -dimensional cyclic codes, a generalization of Reed Solomon codes, was Sakata's motivation for designing the BMS algorithm in Sakata (1991).

On the other hand, as the output of the BMS and the SCALAR-FGLM algorithms is a Gröbner basis, a natural application in Computer Algebra is the computation of a Gröbner basis of an ideal for another order, typically from a total degree ordering to an elimination ordering. In fact the latest versions of the SPARSE-FGLM algorithm rely heavily on the BM and BMS algorithms, see Faugère and Mou (2011, 2017). These notions are recalled in a concise way in Section 2, see also (Berthomieu and Faugère, 2017, Section 2).

Finally, computing linear recurrence relations with *polynomial* coefficients finds applications in Computer Algebra for computing properties of univariate and multivariate Special Functions. The Dynamic Dictionary of Mathematical Functions (DDMF, Benoit et al. (2010)) generates automatically web-pages on univariate special functions through the differential equations they satisfy. Equivalently, they could be generated through the linear recurrence relations satisfied by their Taylor series sequence of coefficients. Deciding whether 2D/3D-space walks are D-finite or not finds applications in Combinatorics, see Banderier and Flajolet (2002); Bostan et al. (2014); Bousquet-Mélou and Mishna (2010); Bousquet-Mélou and Petkovšek (2003). This motivated the authors to extend the SCALAR-FGLM algorithm to handle relations with polynomial coefficients in Berthomieu and Faugère (2016).

1.2. Contributions

Following the open question in Berthomieu and Faugère (2017) whether an adaptive variant of the BMS algorithm, reducing the number of sequence queries, exists or not, first we answer positively. Then, the goal of this paper is to compare this adaptive variant and the ADAPTIVE SCALAR-FGLM algorithm.

In Section 3, we design an adaptive variant of the BMS algorithm, namely the ADAPTIVE BMS algorithm, reducing the number of sequence queries. To our knowledge some early termination criteria were proposed for the BMS algorithm, see Sakata (2009). However, these criteria did not allow one to skip some relation testings. Here, the ADAPTIVE BMS algorithm can skip some relation testings and

still test some further relations. In practice, this variant is more efficient than the BMS algorithm thanks to these skipings. To do so, it uses an a priori upper bound on the staircase size to prevent some useless relation testings. In some favorable cases, this can even allow us to require fewer sequence elements than when calling the BMS algorithm. The presentation of this variant follows the linear algebra description of the BMS algorithm introduced in (Berthomieu and Faugère, 2017, Section 3.2), see also Appendix A.2.

In Section 4, we deal with the ADAPTIVE SCALAR-FGLM algorithm, first presented in Berthomieu et al. (2015). Compared to the BMS algorithm, we iteratively increase the size of the staircase. Although it can drastically decrease the number of sequence queries, one of its drawback is that it can fail to compute the true ideal of relations of a sequence.

Therefore, it is essential to investigate when these algorithms output a Gröbner basis of the ideal of relations. To do so, we focus on their similarities and differences of behaviors. We report here simplified and synthetic versions of the results obtained in Section 5.

A first similarity is that they both output a zero-dimensional ideal of relations.

Theorem 1 (Theorem 7). *Let $\mathbf{u} = (u_{i,j})_{(i,j) \in \mathbb{N}^2}$ be a sequence, let $<$ be a degree monomial ordering and d be the size of the staircase.*

Calling each algorithm on \mathbf{u} , $<$, d yields a truncated Gröbner basis of a zero-dimensional ideal.

In the Gröbner basis change of ordering application, like the SPARSE-FGLM algorithm, one needs to use the lexicographical ordering. Although the BMS algorithm is not designed to handle such an ordering, the ADAPTIVE BMS can perfectly be called with this ordering. Indeed, if the ideal is in *shape position*, then, as a second similarity, both algorithm output correctly the ideal.

Theorem 2 (Theorem 10). *Let $\mathbf{u} = (u_{i,j})_{(i,j) \in \mathbb{N}^2}$ be a linear recurrent sequence whose ideal of relations $I = \langle g(y), x - f(y) \rangle$ is in shape position for the $\text{LEX}(y < x)$ ordering, with $\deg f < \deg g = d$ and g squarefree.*

Assuming no error is thrown in the execution of the ADAPTIVE SCALAR-FGLM algorithm called on \mathbf{u} , d and $\text{LEX}(y < x)$ ordering, then the output ideal is I .

Likewise, calling the ADAPTIVE BMS algorithm on \mathbf{u} , d and $\text{LEX}(y < x)$ yields ideal I .

Although, the previous two theorems seem to show that both algorithms have very similar outputs, their outputs can still differ.

Indeed, as neither algorithm can test if their output relations are valid on the whole sequence, they intrinsically return the *shifts* of the relations: that is the set of

translation monomials for which the relations are valid. Thus, the larger the shift, the more the relation has been tested. Therefore, it reinforces the confidence one can have in the guessed output ideal. Even if both algorithms output the same ideal, they usually do so while outputting different shifts.

Theorem 3 (Theorem 9). *Let $\mathbf{u} = (u_{i,j})_{(i,j) \in \mathbb{N}^2}$ be a sequence, $<$ be a monomial ordering and d be the size of the output staircase S . Let us assume that both algorithms return a common relation g when called on \mathbf{u} , $<$, d and some stopping monomial M for the ADAPTIVE BMS algorithm.*

Then, the shift associated to g the ADAPTIVE BMS algorithm yields is the monomial set $\{m, m \text{ LM}(g) \leq M\}$. In other words, the smaller $\text{LM}(g)$, the larger its shift.

The shift associated to g the ADAPTIVE SCALAR-FGLM algorithm returns is either S if $\text{LM}(g) > \max_{<}(S)$ or $\{m \in S, m < \text{LM}(g)\} \cup \{\text{LM}(g)\}$ otherwise. In other words, the larger $\text{LM}(g)$, the larger its shift.

As a consequence of these differences of behavior, it is not possible to tweak one of the algorithms in order to mimic exactly the behavior of the other.

Finally, in Section 6, we compare both algorithms based on the number of sequence queries they perform and their number of basic operations. We show that the ADAPTIVE BMS algorithm is able to perform four (resp. seven) times fewer operations than the BMS algorithm to output the ideal of relations of a family of bidimensional (resp. tridimensional) sequences.

We also show that the ADAPTIVE SCALAR-FGLM needs fewer queries and fewer basic operations to recover the whole ideal of relations of several families of sequences. However, it seems that asymptotically the ratios between the number of basic operations and the number of sequence queries made by both algorithm could be the same.

1.3. Conclusion and Perspectives

We now understand better the advantages of each algorithm.

On the one hand, the ADAPTIVE SCALAR-FGLM algorithm can fail to return the right answer, yet, on the other hand, we can tweak it to test the computed relations further, allowing us to discard wrong relations. Furthermore, generally it returns the right ideal of relations and it usually does so faster than the ADAPTIVE BMS algorithm.

However, the ADAPTIVE BMS algorithm seems to be the safer one. If the upper bounds on the staircase size is correct, it will always return the right ideal of relations. Though, its performance speedup relies on the number of skipped relation testings and thus on the sharpness of this bound. Moreover, it seems hard to predict in advance which monomials will be totally skipped during the execution of the algorithm.

Combining the design of the POLYNOMIAL SCALAR-FGLM algorithm, based on polynomial arithmetic in Berthomieu and Faugère (2018), and the comparison of the ADAPTIVE BMS and ADAPTIVE SCALAR-FGLM algorithms in this paper could lead to the design of an hybrid algorithm taking advantage of all these algorithms. In particular, this algorithm could replace the linear algebra arithmetic by a polynomial one.

Indeed, the goal would be to mix the efficiency of the polynomial arithmetic in the POLYNOMIAL SCALAR-FGLM algorithm and the small number of queries performed by the ADAPTIVE BMS and the ADAPTIVE SCALAR-FGLM algorithms to compute the relations.

2. Preliminaries

In this section, we give a brief description of classical notation used all along the paper. We refer the reader to (Berthomieu and Faugère, 2017, Section 2) for a more detailed presentation.

2.1. Sequences and relations

For $n \geq 1$, we let $\mathbf{i} = (i_1, \dots, i_n) \in \mathbb{N}^n$. Classically, we write $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, \dots, x_n)$ and $\mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{i}} = x_1^{i_1} \cdots x_n^{i_n}$. An n -dimensional sequence $\mathbf{u} = (u_{\mathbf{i}})_{\mathbf{i} \in \mathbb{N}^n}$ over a field \mathbb{K} satisfies the (linear recurrence) relation induced by $\alpha = (\alpha_{\mathbf{k}})_{\mathbf{k} \in \mathcal{K}} \in \mathbb{K}^{|\mathcal{K}|}$, with $\mathcal{K} \subset \mathbb{N}^n$ finite if

$$\forall \mathbf{i} \in \mathbb{N}^n, \sum_{\mathbf{k} \in \mathcal{K}} \alpha_{\mathbf{k}} u_{\mathbf{k}+\mathbf{i}} = 0. \quad (1)$$

Example 1. Let \mathbf{b} be the 2-dimensional sequence of the binomial coefficients, $\mathbf{b} = \left(\binom{i}{j} \right)_{(i,j) \in \mathbb{N}^2}$. Then the Pascal's rule:

$$\forall (i, j) \in \mathbb{N}^2, \mathbf{b}_{i+1, j+1} - \mathbf{b}_{i, j+1} - \mathbf{b}_{i, j} = 0$$

is a linear recurrence relation for the sequence \mathbf{b} .

As we can only work with a finite number of terms of a sequence, in this paper, a *table* shall denote a finite subset of terms of a sequence: it is one of the input parameters of the algorithms.

Given a finite table extracted from the sequence \mathbf{u} , the main purpose of the BMS and the SCALAR-FGLM algorithms is to, lousy speaking, determine a minimal set of relations that will allow us to generate this finite table using only the values of \mathbf{u} on their supports.

Relations satisfied by a sequence can be added and shifted, therefore it is natural to associate them with multivariate polynomials in $\mathbb{K}[\mathbf{x}]$.

Definition 1. Let $f = \sum_{\mathbf{k} \in \mathcal{K}} \alpha_{\mathbf{k}} \mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{k}} \in \mathbb{K}[\mathbf{x}]$. We will denote by $[f]_{\mathbf{u}}$, or $[f]$ when no ambiguity arises, the linear combination $\sum_{\mathbf{k} \in \mathcal{K}} \alpha_{\mathbf{k}} u_{\mathbf{k}}$. Moreover, if α defines a relation for \mathbf{u} , that is for all $\mathbf{i} \in \mathbb{N}^n$, $[\mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{i}} f] = 0$, then we say that f is the polynomial of this relation.

The main benefit of the $[\]$ notation resides in the immediate fact that for all index \mathbf{i} , $[\mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{i}} f] = \sum_{\mathbf{k} \in \mathcal{K}} \alpha_{\mathbf{k}} u_{\mathbf{k} + \mathbf{i}}$.

In the previous example, the Pascal's rule relation is associated with polynomial $P = xy - y - 1$, so that

$$\forall (i, j) \in \mathbb{N}^2, [x^i y^j P] = 0.$$

Definition 2 (Fitzpatrick and Norton (1990); Sakata (1988)). Let $\mathbf{u} = (u_{\mathbf{i}})_{\mathbf{i} \in \mathbb{N}^n}$ be an n -dimensional sequence with coefficients in \mathbb{K} . The sequence \mathbf{u} is linear recurrent if from a nonzero finite number of initial terms $\{u_{\mathbf{i}}, \mathbf{i} \in S\}$, and a finite number of linear recurrence relations, without any contradiction, one can compute any term of the sequence.

Equivalently, \mathbf{u} is linear recurrent if its ideal of relations $\{f, \forall m \in \mathbb{K}[\mathbf{x}], [m f] = 0\}$ is zero-dimensional.

2.2. Gröbner bases

Let $\mathcal{T} = \{\mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{i}}, \mathbf{i} \in \mathbb{N}^n\}$ be the set of all monomials in $\mathbb{K}[\mathbf{x}]$. A monomial ordering $<$ on $\mathbb{K}[\mathbf{x}]$ is an order relation satisfying the following three classical properties:

1. for all $m \in \mathcal{T}$, $1 \leq m$;
2. for all $m, m', s \in \mathcal{T}$, $m < m' \Rightarrow m s < m' s$;
3. every subset of \mathcal{T} has a least element for $<$.

For a monomial ordering $<$ on $\mathbb{K}[\mathbf{x}]$, the *leading monomial* of f , denoted $\text{LM}(f)$, is the greatest monomial in the support of f for $<$. The *leading coefficient* of f , denoted $\text{LC}(f)$, is the nonzero coefficient of $\text{LM}(f)$. The *leading term* of f , $\text{LT}(f)$, is defined as $\text{LT}(f) = \text{LC}(f) \text{LM}(f)$. For an ideal I , we denote, classically, $\text{LM}(I) = \{\text{LM}(f), f \in I\}$.

We recall briefly the definition of a Gröbner basis and a staircase.

Definition 3. Let I be a nonzero ideal of $\mathbb{K}[\mathbf{x}]$ and let $<$ be a monomial ordering. A set $\mathcal{G} \subseteq I$ is a Gröbner basis of I if for all $f \in I$, there exists $g \in \mathcal{G}$ such that $\text{LM}(g) \mid \text{LM}(f)$.

The set \mathcal{G} is a minimal Gröbner basis of I if for any $g \in \mathcal{G}$, $\mathcal{G} \setminus \{g\}$ does not span I .

Furthermore, \mathcal{G} is (minimal) reduced if for any $g, g' \in \mathcal{G}$, $g \neq g'$ and any monomial $m \in \text{supp } g'$, $\text{LT}(g) \nmid m$.

Let \mathcal{G} be a reduced truncated Gröbner basis, the staircase of \mathcal{G} is

$$S = \text{Staircase}(\mathcal{G}) = \{s \in \mathcal{T}, \forall g \in \mathcal{G}, \text{LM}(g) \nmid s\}.$$

It is also the canonical basis of $\mathbb{K}[\mathbf{x}]/I$.

Gröbner basis theory allows us to choose any monomial ordering $<$. Among all the monomial ordering, we will mainly use the

- $\text{LEX}(x_n < \dots < x_1)$ ordering which compares monomials as follows $\mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{i}} < \mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{i}'}$ if, and only if, there exists k , $1 \leq k \leq n$ such that for all $\ell < k$, $i_\ell = i'_\ell$ and $i_k < i'_k$, see (Cox et al., 2015, Chapter 2, Definition 3);
- $\text{DRL}(x_n < \dots < x_1)$ order which compares monomials as follows $\mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{i}} < \mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{i}'}$ if, and only if, $i_1 + \dots + i_n < i'_1 + \dots + i'_n$ or $i_1 + \dots + i_n = i'_1 + \dots + i'_n$ and there exists k , $2 \leq k \leq n$ such that for all $\ell > k$, $i_\ell = i'_\ell$ and $i_k > i'_k$. Equivalently, there exists k , $1 \leq k \leq n$ such that for all $\ell > k$, $i_1 + \dots + i_\ell = i'_1 + \dots + i'_\ell$ and $i_1 + \dots + i_k < i'_1 + \dots + i'_k$, see (Cox et al., 2015, Chapter 2, Definition 6).

However, in the BMS algorithm, we need to be able to enumerate all the monomials up to a bound monomial. This forces the user to take an ordering $<$ such that for all $M \in \mathcal{T}$, the set $\{m < M, m \in \mathcal{T}\}$ is finite. Such an ordering $<$ makes $(\mathbb{N}^n, <)$ isomorphic to $(\mathbb{N}, <)$, thus it makes sense to speak about the next monomial for $<$.

This request excludes for instance the LEX ordering, and more generally any elimination ordering. In other words, only weighted degree ordering, or *weight ordering*, should be used.

2.3. Multi-Hankel matrices

A matrix $H \in \mathbb{K}^{m \times n}$ is *Hankel*, if there exists a sequence $\mathbf{u} = (u_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ such that for all $(i, i') \in \{1, \dots, m\} \times \{1, \dots, n\}$, the coefficient $h_{i, i'}$ lying on the i th row and i' th column of H satisfies $h_{i, i'} = u_{i+i'}$.

In a multivariate setting, we can extend this Hankel matrices notion to *multi-Hankel* matrices. Indexing the rows and columns with monomials $\mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{i}} = x_1^{i_1} \dots x_n^{i_n}$ and $\mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{i}'} = x_1^{i'_1} \dots x_n^{i'_n}$, the coefficient of H lying on the row labeled with $\mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{i}}$ and column labeled with $\mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{i}'}$ is $u_{\mathbf{i}+\mathbf{i}'}$. Given two sets of monomials U and T , we let $H_{U, T}$ be the multi-Hankel matrix with rows (resp. columns) indexed with monomials in U (resp. T).

Example 2. Let $\mathbf{u} = (u_{i, j})_{(i, j) \in \mathbb{N}^2}$ be a sequence.

1. Let $U = \{1, y, y^2, x, xy, xy^2, x^2, x^2y, x^2y^2\}$ and $T = \{1, y, x, xy, x^2, x^2y, x^3, x^3y\}$, then

$$H_{U,T} = \begin{matrix} & \begin{matrix} 1 & y & x & xy & x^2 & x^2y & x^3 & x^3y \end{matrix} \\ \begin{matrix} 1 \\ y \\ y^2 \\ x \\ xy \\ xy^2 \\ x^2 \\ x^2y \\ x^2y^2 \end{matrix} & \left(\begin{array}{cc|cc|cc|cc} u_{0,0} & u_{0,1} & u_{1,0} & u_{1,1} & u_{2,0} & u_{2,1} & u_{3,0} & u_{3,1} \\ u_{0,1} & u_{0,2} & u_{1,1} & u_{1,2} & u_{2,1} & u_{2,2} & u_{3,1} & u_{3,2} \\ u_{0,2} & u_{0,3} & u_{1,2} & u_{1,3} & u_{2,2} & u_{2,3} & u_{3,2} & u_{3,3} \\ \hline u_{1,0} & u_{1,1} & u_{2,0} & u_{2,1} & u_{3,0} & u_{3,1} & u_{4,0} & u_{4,1} \\ u_{1,1} & u_{1,2} & u_{2,1} & u_{2,2} & u_{3,1} & u_{3,2} & u_{4,1} & u_{4,2} \\ u_{1,2} & u_{1,3} & u_{2,2} & u_{2,3} & u_{3,2} & u_{3,3} & u_{4,2} & u_{4,3} \\ \hline u_{2,0} & u_{2,1} & u_{3,0} & u_{3,1} & u_{4,0} & u_{4,1} & u_{5,0} & u_{5,1} \\ u_{2,1} & u_{2,2} & u_{3,1} & u_{3,2} & u_{4,1} & u_{4,2} & u_{5,1} & u_{5,2} \\ u_{2,2} & u_{2,3} & u_{3,2} & u_{3,3} & u_{4,2} & u_{4,3} & u_{5,2} & u_{5,3} \end{array} \right) \end{matrix}.$$

We can see that this matrix is a 3×4 block-Hankel matrix with Hankel blocks of size 3×2 .

2. Let $T = \{1, y, x, y^2, xy, x^2, y^3, xy^2, x^2y, x^3\}$, then the following matrix has a less obvious structure:

$$H_{T,T} = \begin{matrix} & \begin{matrix} 1 & y & x & y^2 & xy & x^2 & y^3 & xy^2 & x^2y & x^3 \end{matrix} \\ \begin{matrix} 1 \\ y \\ x \\ y^2 \\ xy \\ x^2 \\ y^3 \\ xy^2 \\ x^2y \\ x^3 \end{matrix} & \left(\begin{array}{cccccccccc} u_{0,0} & u_{0,1} & u_{1,0} & u_{0,2} & u_{1,1} & u_{2,0} & u_{0,3} & u_{1,2} & u_{2,1} & u_{3,0} \\ u_{0,1} & u_{0,2} & u_{1,1} & u_{0,3} & u_{1,2} & u_{2,1} & u_{0,4} & u_{1,3} & u_{2,2} & u_{3,1} \\ u_{1,0} & u_{1,1} & u_{2,0} & u_{1,2} & u_{2,1} & u_{3,0} & u_{1,3} & u_{2,2} & u_{3,1} & u_{4,0} \\ u_{0,2} & u_{0,3} & u_{1,2} & u_{0,4} & u_{1,3} & u_{2,2} & u_{0,5} & u_{1,4} & u_{2,3} & u_{3,2} \\ u_{1,1} & u_{1,2} & u_{2,1} & u_{1,3} & u_{2,2} & u_{3,1} & u_{1,4} & u_{2,3} & u_{3,2} & u_{4,1} \\ u_{2,0} & u_{2,1} & u_{3,0} & u_{2,2} & u_{3,1} & u_{4,0} & u_{2,3} & u_{3,2} & u_{4,1} & u_{5,0} \\ u_{0,3} & u_{0,4} & u_{1,3} & u_{0,5} & u_{1,4} & u_{2,3} & u_{0,6} & u_{1,5} & u_{2,4} & u_{3,3} \\ u_{1,2} & u_{1,3} & u_{2,2} & u_{1,4} & u_{2,3} & u_{3,2} & u_{1,5} & u_{2,4} & u_{3,3} & u_{4,2} \\ u_{2,1} & u_{2,2} & u_{3,1} & u_{2,3} & u_{3,2} & u_{4,1} & u_{2,4} & u_{3,3} & u_{4,2} & u_{5,1} \\ u_{3,0} & u_{3,1} & u_{4,0} & u_{3,2} & u_{4,1} & u_{5,0} & u_{3,3} & u_{4,2} & u_{5,1} & u_{6,0} \end{array} \right) \end{matrix}.$$

3. An Adaptive version of the BMS algorithm

The BMS algorithm was presented first in Sakata (1988) for the dimension 2 case and then was extended to dimension n in Sakata (1990, 2009). In (Berthomieu and Faugère, 2017, Section 3) or Appendix A, we give a description of the algorithm mainly based on linear algebra.

The BMS algorithm is an iterative algorithm, visiting each term $u_i = [\mathbf{x}^i]$ of the input sequence in increasing order for the input monomial order. At each step, it has a truncated Gröbner basis of the ideal of relations and test them in the visited

monomial. If some of them fail, the algorithm updates the Gröbner basis with new valid relations.

When a relation g fails at monomial m , two situations arise: either $\frac{m}{\text{LM}(g)}$ was already in the staircase and then a new relation g' with $\text{LM}(g') = \text{LM}(g)$ is computed or it was not and both $\text{LM}(g)$ and $\frac{m}{\text{LM}(g)}$ are added to the staircase. New relations are then computed depending on the possible new leading monomials. See (Berthomieu and Faugère, 2017, Proposition 9) and Proposition A.4.

This is summed up in the following example; it is a truncated version of (Berthomieu and Faugère, 2017, Example 10) and Example A.3.

Example 3. We give the trace of the algorithm called on the binomial sequence \mathbf{b} for the $\text{DRL}(y < x)$ ordering from monomial y^5 up to monomial x^5 .

To simplify the reading, whenever a relation succeeds in m or cannot be tested in m , we skip the updating part as this relation remains the same.

We start with the non empty staircase $S = \{[y^2, x^2], [x^2 - 2x + 1, y^2]\}$ and the relations $G = \{xy - y - 1, y^3, x^3 - 2x^2 + x\}$. This means that on the one hand the relations in G have been tested up to all their multiples less than y^5 while relation y^2 (resp. $x^2 - 2x + 1$) in S fails when multiplied by x^2 (resp. y^2) but does not fail when multiplied by a lesser monomial.

For the monomial y^5

Nothing must be done for the relation $g_1 = xy - y - 1$.

The relation $g_2 = y^3$ succeeds since $[\mathbf{b}_{0,5}] = 0$.

Nothing must be done for the relation $g_3 = x^3 - 2x^2 + x$.

For the monomial xy^4

The relation $g_1 = xy - y - 1$ succeeds since $[\mathbf{b}_{1,4} - \mathbf{b}_{0,4} - \mathbf{b}_{0,3}] = 0$.

The relation $g_2 = y^3$ succeeds since $[\mathbf{b}_{1,4}] = 0$.

Nothing must be done for the relation $g_3 = x^3 - 2x^2 + x$.

For the monomial x^2y^3

The relation $g_1 = xy - y - 1$ succeeds since $[\mathbf{b}_{1,4} - \mathbf{b}_{0,4} - \mathbf{b}_{0,3}] = 0$.

The relation $g_2 = y^3$ succeeds since $[\mathbf{b}_{2,3}] = 0$.

Nothing must be done for the relation $g_3 = x^3 - 2x^2 + x$.

For the monomial x^3y^2

The relation $g_1 = xy - y - 1$ succeeds since $[\mathbf{b}_{3,2} - \mathbf{b}_{2,2} - \mathbf{b}_{2,1}] = 0$.

Nothing must be done for the relation $g_2 = y^3$.

The relation $g_3 = x^3 - 2x^2 + x$ fails since $[\mathbf{b}_{3,2} - 2\mathbf{b}_{2,2} + \mathbf{b}_{1,2}] = 1$. Thus $S' = \{[y^2, x^2], [x^2 - 2x + 1, y^2], [x^3 - 2x + 1, y^2]\}$.

S' is set to $\{[y^2, x^2], [x^2 - 2x + 1, y^2]\}$ and $G' = \{y^3, xy, x^3\}$.

We set $g'_1 = xy - y - 1$ and $g'_2 = y^3$.

For the relation $g'_3 = x^3$, $x^3|x^3y^2$ and $\frac{x^3y^2}{x^3}| \text{fail}(x^2 - 2x + 1)$, hence $g'_3 = x^3 - 3x^2 + 3x - 1$.

We update $G := G' = \{y^3, xy - y - 1, x^3 - 3x^2 + 3x - 1\}$ and $S := S' = \{[y^2, x^2], [x^2 - 2x + 1, y^2]\}$.

For the monomial x^4y

The relation $g_1 = xy - y - 1$ succeeds since $[\mathbf{b}_{4,1} - \mathbf{b}_{3,1} - \mathbf{b}_{3,0}] = 0$.

Nothing must be done for the relation $g_2 = y^3$.

The relation $g_3 = x^3 - 3x^2 + 3x - 1$ succeeds since $[\mathbf{b}_{4,1} - 3\mathbf{b}_{3,1} + 3\mathbf{b}_{2,1} - \mathbf{b}_{1,1}] = 0$.

For the monomial x^5

Nothing must be done for the relation $g_1 = xy - y - 1$.

Nothing must be done for the relation $g_2 = y^3$.

The relation $g_3 = x^3 - 3x^2 + 3x - 1$ succeeds since $[\mathbf{b}_{5,0} - 3\mathbf{b}_{4,0} + 3\mathbf{b}_{3,0} - \mathbf{b}_{2,0}] = 0$.

The algorithm returns relations $xy - y - 1, y^3, x^3 - 3x^2 + 3x - 1$, the first one with a shift x^3 and the last two with a shift x^2 .

The problem is now to understand when the Gröbner basis of the ideal of relations has actually been computed. Assuming the sequence is linear recurrent, Proposition 4 provides an answer to this question (see also (Berthomieu and Faugère, 2017, Proposition 11) and Proposition A.6).

Proposition 4. *Let \mathbf{u} be a linear recurrent sequence and I be its ideal of relations.*

Let S be the staircase of I for \prec . Let s_{\max} be the largest monomial in S . Then, at step $m \geq (s_{\max})^2$, the computed staircase is equal to S .

Let \mathcal{G} be a minimal Gröbner basis of I for \prec and let g_{\max} be the largest leading monomial of \mathcal{G} . Then, at step $m \geq s_{\max} \cdot \max_{\prec}(g_{\max}, s_{\max})$, the computed Gröbner basis is a minimal Gröbner basis of I for \prec .

Example 4. *For the $\text{DRL}(y \prec x)$ ordering, $I = \langle x^p, y^q \rangle$ and $q > p \geq 1$, we have, $s_{\max} = x^{p-1}y^{q-1}$ and $g_{\max} = y^q$. Therefore, the right staircase is found at most at step $m = x^{2p-2}y^{2q-2}$, while the Gröbner basis is found at most at step $x^{p-1}y^{q-1} \max_{\prec}(x^{p-1}y^{q-1}, y^q)$, i.e. y^{2q-1} if $p = 1$ and $x^{2p-2}y^{2q-2}$ otherwise.*

Remark 5. *In some favourable cases though, it is not necessary to go up to this bound to guess the right relations. In Example 4, for $p = 1$ and $q = 2$, the right staircase is found at step y . In fact, the right Gröbner basis is already guessed as well, while Proposition 4 only ensures that it will be correctly guessed at step y^3 .*

It could therefore be very fruitful to have an heuristic helping us determining if the current Gröbner basis is the right one when the size of the staircase is known in advance. Indeed, it could allow us to end earlier the running of the BMS algorithm. Unfortunately, it is not rare that an interrupted BMS algorithm does not return the

correct Gröbner basis, in fact such an interrupted BMS algorithm will never return the right Gröbner basis for any of the four families of sequences used in Section 6. The goal is thus to reduce the number of testings differently.

Let us recall that at step m , whenever a relation g such that $\text{LM}(g)|m$ fails, if $\frac{m}{\text{LM}(g)}$ is not in the staircase, then the algorithm adds both $\text{LM}(g)$ and $\frac{m}{\text{LM}(g)}$ in the new staircase. Assuming we know in advance the size of the staircase of the output Gröbner basis, during the execution of the algorithm, we can detect that testing the relation g in m is useless if the staircase becomes too big after adding the two monomials.

Let us show in the following example how we can take advantage of this strategy.

Example 5. *Let us reconsider Example 3 with the assumption that the staircase has a size at most 5.*

We start with the non empty staircase $S = \{[y^2, x^2], [x^2 - 2x + 1, y^2]\}$ and the relations $G = \{xy - y - 1, y^3, x^3 - 2x^2 + x\}$. This means that on the one hand the relations in G have been tested up to all their multiples less than y^5 while relation y^2 (resp. $x^2 - 2x + 1$) in S fails when multiplied by x^2 (resp. y^2) but does not fail when multiplied by a lesser monomial.

For the monomial y^5

Nothing must be done for the relation $g_1 = xy - y - 1$.

The relation $g_2 = y^3$ succeeds since $[\mathbf{b}_{0,5}] = 0$.

Nothing must be done for the relation $g_3 = x^3 - 2x^2 + x$.

For the monomial xy^4

Should the relation $g_1 = xy - y - 1$ fail in xy^4 , we would have to add xy and y^3 in the staircase, raising its size to 7. We skip testing g_1 .

Should the relation $g_2 = y^3$ fail in xy^4 , we would have to add y^3 and xy in the staircase, raising its size to 7. We skip testing g_2 .

Nothing must be done for the relation $g_3 = x^3 - 2x^2 + x$.

For the monomial x^2y^3

Should the relation $g_1 = xy - y - 1$ fail in x^2y^3 , we would have to add xy and xy^2 in the staircase, raising its size to 7. We skip testing g_1 .

The relation $g_2 = y^3$ succeeds since $[\mathbf{b}_{2,3}] = 0$.

Nothing must be done for the relation $g_3 = x^3 - 2x^2 + x$.

For the monomial x^3y^2

Should the relation $g_1 = xy - y - 1$ fail in x^3y^2 , we would have to add xy and x^2y in the staircase, raising its size to 7. We skip testing g_1 .

Nothing must be done for the relation $g_2 = y^3$.

The relation $g_3 = x^3 - 2x^2 + x$ fails since $[\mathbf{b}_{3,2} - 2\mathbf{b}_{2,2} + \mathbf{b}_{1,2}] = 1$. Thus $S' = \{[y^2, x^2], [x^2 - 2x + 1, y^2], [x^3 - 2x + 1, y^2]\}$.

S' is set to $\{[y^2, x^2], [x^2 - 2x + 1, y^2]\}$ and $G' = \{y^3, xy, x^3\}$.

We set $g'_1 = xy - y - 1$ and $g'_2 = y^3$.

For the relation $g'_3 = x^3$, $x^3 | x^3 y^2$ and $\frac{x^3 y^2}{x^3} \nmid \text{fail}(x^2 - 2x + 1)$, hence $g'_3 = x^3 - 3x^2 + 3x - 1$.

We update $G := G' = \{y^3, xy - y - 1, x^3 - 3x^2 + 3x - 1\}$ and $S := S' = \{[y^2, x^2], [x^2 - 2x + 1, y^2]\}$.

For the monomial $x^4 y$

Should the relation $g_1 = xy - y - 1$ fail in $x^4 y$, we would have to add xy and x^3 in the staircase, raising its size to 7. We skip testing g_1 .

Nothing must be done for the relation $g_2 = y^3$.

Should the relation $g_3 = x^3 - 3x^2 + 3x - 1$ fail in $x^4 y$, we would have to add x^3 and xy in the staircase, raising its size to 7. We skip testing g_3 .

For the monomial x^5

Nothing must be done for the relation $g_1 = xy - y - 1$.

Nothing must be done for the relation $g_2 = y^3$.

The relation $g_3 = x^3 - 3x^2 + 3x - 1$ succeeds since $[\mathbf{b}_{5,0} - 3\mathbf{b}_{4,0} + 3\mathbf{b}_{3,0} - \mathbf{b}_{2,0}] = 0$.

The algorithm returns relations $xy - y - 1, y^3, x^3 - 3x^2 + 3x - 1$, the first one with a shift x^3 and the other two with a shift x^2 .

In this example, skipping some relation testings allowed us to skip all the testings in a loop, namely loops xy^4 and $x^4 y$. As a byproduct, we also reduced the number of table queries.

Integrating this strategy in the BMS algorithm yields an adaptive variant, Algorithm 1, reducing the number of relation testings and table queries.

This version was motivated by a remark in Sakata (2009) where the author announced that in applications where an approximate size of the staircase is known, one can stop early the execution of the BMS algorithm. Yet, we do not know if such a strategy is classical and if it is exactly the one described in Algorithm 1.

Predicting how many monomials will be completely skipped in order to reduce the number of table queries can be a hard task. Indeed, it is clear that if relation g can be skipped at monomial m , it will also be skipped at any multiple of m . Yet, even if m is completely skipped, a relation that cannot be tested in m might need to be tested in $m x_i$ for some i .

Therefore, even if m is completely skipped, $m x_i$ might be not. We illustrate this phenomon with the following example.

Example 6. Let $\mathbf{u} = (u_{i,j})_{(i,j) \in \mathbb{N}^2}$ be the sequence defined by $u_{4,1} = 1$ and $u_{i,j} = 0$ if $(i,j) \neq (4,1)$. Running the BMS algorithm on these arguments yields relations

Algorithm 1: ADAPTIVE BMS (Linear Algebra variant).

Input: A table $\mathbf{u} = (u_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}^n}$ with coefficients in \mathbb{K} , a monomial ordering $<$, a given bound d and a monomial M as the stopping condition.

Output: A set G of relations generating I_M .

$T := \{m \in \mathbb{K}[\mathbf{x}], m \leq M\}$.

$G := \{1\}$.

$S := \emptyset$.

For all $m \in T$ **do**

$S' := S$.

For $g \in G$ **do**

If $\text{LM}(g) \mid m$ **then**

If $\frac{m}{\text{LM}(g)} \notin \text{Stabilize}(S)$ **and** $\# \text{Stabilize}(S \cup \{\frac{m}{\text{LM}(g)}\}) > d$ **then**
 | **next.** // skip this relation testing

$e := \left[\frac{m}{\text{LM}(g)} g \right]_{\mathbf{u}}$

If $e \neq 0$ **then**

 | $S' := S' \cup \left\{ \left[\frac{e}{\text{LM}(g)} \right] \right\}$.

$S' := \min_{\text{fail}(h) \in S'} \{[h, \text{fail}(h)] / \text{LM}(h)\}$.

$G' := \text{Border}(S')$.

For $g' \in G'$ **do**

 Let $g \in G$ such that $\text{LM}(g) \mid \text{LM}(g')$.

If $\text{LM}(g) \nmid m$ **then**

 | $g' := \frac{\text{LM}(g')}{\text{LM}(g)} g$.

Else if $\exists h \in S, \frac{m}{\text{LM}(g')} \mid \text{fail}(h)$ **then**

 | $g' := \frac{\text{LM}(g')}{\text{LM}(g)} g - \left[\frac{m}{\text{LM}(h)} h \right]_{\mathbf{u}} \frac{\text{LM}(g') \text{fail}(h)}{m} h$.

Else $g' := g$.

$G := G'$.

$S := S'$.

Return G .

y^2, x^5 so that the staircase has size 10. We assume though that the only known upper bound on the staircase size is 14.

We give a short trace of the algorithm called on \mathbf{u} for the $\text{DRL}(y < x)$ ordering up to monomial x^9 . Therefore, we also input 14 as the upper bound on the size of the output staircase to the ADAPTIVE BMS algorithm.

For all the monomials from 1 to $x^3 y^2$

The relation $g_1 = 1$ succeeds.

For the monomial $x^4 y$

The relation $g_1 = 1$ fails since $[u_{4,1}] = 1$. Thus $S' = \{[1, x^4 y]\}$.

S' is set to $\{[1, x^4 y]\}$ and $G' = \{y^2, x^5\}$.

We set $g'_1 = y^2$ and $g'_2 = x^5$.

For the relation $g'_1 = y^2$, $y^2 \nmid x^4 y$ thus $g'_1 = y^2$.

For the relation $g'_2 = x^5$, $x^5 \nmid x^4 y$ thus $g'_2 = x^5$.

We update $G := G' = \{y^2, x^5\}$ and $S := S' = \{[1, x^4 y]\}$.

For the monomial x^5

The relation $g_2 = x^5$ succeeds.

For the monomial y^6

The relation $g_1 = y^2$ succeeds.

For the monomial xy^5

The relation $g_1 = y^2$ succeeds.

For the monomial $x^2 y^4$

The relation $g_1 = y^2$ succeeds.

For the monomial $x^3 y^3$

The relation $g_1 = y^2$ succeeds.

For the monomial $x^4 y^2$

The relation $g_1 = y^2$ succeeds.

For the monomial $x^5 y$

The relation $g_2 = x^5$ succeeds.

For the monomial x^6

The relation $g_2 = x^5$ succeeds.

For the monomial y^7

The relation $g_1 = y^2$ succeeds.

For the monomial xy^6

Should the relation $g_1 = y^2$ fail, we would have to add y^2 and xy^4 to the staircase, raising its size to 16. We skip testing g_1 .

For the monomial $x^2 y^5$

Should the relation $g_1 = y^2$ fail, we would have to add y^2 and $x^2 y^3$ to the staircase, raising its size to 16. We skip testing g_1 .

For the monomial $x^3 y^4$

The relation $g_1 = y^2$ succeeds.

For the monomial $x^4 y^3$

The relation $g_1 = y^2$ succeeds.

For the monomial $x^5 y^2$

The relation $g_1 = y^2$ succeeds.

The relation $g_2 = x^5$ succeeds.

For the monomial $x^6 y$

The relation $g_2 = x^5$ succeeds.

For the monomial x^7

The relation $g_2 = x^5$ succeeds.

For the monomial y^8

Should the relation $g_1 = y^2$ fail, we would have to add y^2 and y^6 to the staircase, raising its size to 16. We skip testing g_1 .

For the monomial xy^7

We did not test g_1 in xy^6 . We skip testing g_1 .

For the monomial $x^2 y^6$

We did not test g_1 in xy^6 and $x^2 y^5$. We skip testing g_1 .

For the monomial $x^3 y^5$

We did not test g_1 in $x^2 y^5$. We skip testing g_1 .

For the monomial $x^4 y^4$

Should the relation $g_1 = y^2$ fail, we would have to add y^2 and $x^4 y^2$ to the staircase, raising its size to 15. We skip testing g_1 .

For the monomial $x^5 y^3$

The relation $g_1 = y^2$ succeeds.

The relation $g_2 = x^5$ succeeds.

For the monomial $x^6 y^2$

The relation $g_1 = y^2$ succeeds.

The relation $g_2 = x^5$ succeeds.

For the monomial $x^7 y$

The relation $g_2 = x^5$ succeeds.

For the monomial x^8

The relation $g_2 = x^5$ succeeds.

For the monomial y^9

We did not test g_1 in y^8 . We skip testing g_1 .

For the monomial xy^8

We did not test g_1 in y^8 and xy^7 . We skip testing g_1 .

For the monomial $x^2 y^7$

We did not test g_1 in xy^7 and $x^2 y^6$. We skip testing g_1 .

For the monomial $x^3 y^6$

We did not test g_1 in $x^2 y^6$ and $x^3 y^5$. We skip testing g_1 .

For the monomial $x^4 y^5$

We did not test g_1 in $x^3 y^5$ and $x^4 y^4$. We skip testing g_1 .

For the monomial $x^5 y^4$

We did not test g_1 in $x^4 y^4$. We skip testing g_1 .

The relation $g_2 = x^5$ succeeds.

For the monomial $x^6 y^3$

Should the relation $g_1 = y^2$ fail, we would have to add y^2 and $x^6 y$ to the staircase, raising its size to 15. We skip testing g_1 .

Should the relation $g_2 = x^5$ fail, we would have to add x^5 and xy^3 to the staircase, raising its size to 15. We skip testing g_2 .

For the monomial $x^7 y^2$

The relation $g_1 = y^2$ succeeds.

The relation $g_2 = x^5$ succeeds.

For the monomial $x^8 y$


The relation $g_2 = x^5$ succeeds.

For the monomial x^9

The relation $g_2 = x^5$ succeeds.

The algorithm returns relations y^2, x^5 , the first one with a shift x^7 and the other one with a shift x^4 .

The following figure shows the visited monomials where at least one relation was tested (·) and those completely skipped (×).



Although the monomial $x^4 y^4$ was completely skipped, $x^5 y^4$ is not thanks to the relation x^5 that must be tested.

4. The Adaptive version of the SCALAR-FGLM algorithm

While the BMS and ADAPTIVE BMS algorithms are iterative algorithms, the SCALAR-FGLM algorithm is global, see Berthomieu et al. (2015, 2017) and (Berthomieu and Faugère, 2017, Section 4). It finds the Gröbner basis of the ideal of relations by computing the column rank profile of a big multi-Hankel matrix indexed by a set of monomials T . In practice, this set T must contain all the monomials less than the monomials in the Gröbner basis of relations.

To circumvent the inherent complexity of computing the rank profile of a big multi-Hankel matrix, the authors proposed an adaptive algorithm behaving more closely to the FGLM algorithm, see Faugère et al. (1993).

The goal is to iterate on a monomial t and compute, for a set S such that $H_{S,S}$ is full rank, if $H_{S \cup \{t\}, S \cup \{t\}}$ is also full rank. If it is, then t is added to S , otherwise a relation with support in $S \cup \{t\}$ has been found. No further relation with leading term a multiple of t will be computed. When a given lower-bound on the size of the staircase is reached, the algorithm stops and computes the remaining relations from the leading terms lying on the border of the staircase.

This yields the ADAPTIVE SCALAR-FGLM algorithm: Algorithm 2.

Example 7. We give the trace of the algorithm on the sequence $\mathbf{u} = (2^i 3^j (i + 1))_{(i,j) \in \mathbb{N}^2}$ with the DRL($y < x$) ordering with a lower bound 2 on the staircase size.

We set $L = \{1\}$, $S = \emptyset$, $G' = \emptyset$.

We set $t = 1$ and build the matrix $H_{S \cup \{1\}, S \cup \{1\}} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 \end{pmatrix}$ that is full rank. Hence $S = \{1\}$ and $L = \{y, x\}$.

We set $t = y$ and build the matrix $H_{S \cup \{y\}, S \cup \{y\}} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 3 \\ 3 & 9 \end{pmatrix}$ that is not full rank. Solving $H_{S,S} \alpha + H_{S,\{y\}} = 0$ yields relation $y - 3$, so $G = \{y - 3\}$, $G' = \{y\}$ and L is updated to $\{x\}$.

We set $t = x$ and build the matrix $H_{S \cup \{x\}, S \cup \{x\}} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 4 \\ 4 & 12 \end{pmatrix}$ that is full rank. Hence $S = \{1, x\}$ and $L = \{x^2\}$.

Now $\#S$ is greater or equal to the bound 2. Solving $H_{S,S} \alpha + H_{S,\{x^2\}} = 0$ yields relation $x^2 - 4x + 4$, so $G = \{y - 3, x^2 - 4x + 4\}$ and L is updated to \emptyset .

Furthermore, the relation $y - 3$ has been tested with a shift $\{1, y\}$ while the relation $x^2 - 4x + 4$ has been tested with a shift $\{1, x\}$.

Remark 6. If no lower bound on the size of S were given, then an infinite loop might occur on a non linear recurrent sequence. For instance, on the factorial sequence $(i!)_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$, all the monomials x^i would be found in the staircase.

Algorithm 2: ADAPTIVE SCALAR-FGLM (simple version).

Input: A table $\mathbf{u} = (u_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}^n}$ with coefficients in \mathbb{K} , $<$ a monomial ordering and d a given bound.

Output: A reduced truncated Gröbner basis of a zero-dimensional ideal of degree $\geq d$.

$L := \{1\}$. // set of next terms to study
 $S := \emptyset$. // the useful staircase with respect to $<$
 $G := \emptyset, G' := \emptyset$.

While $L \neq \emptyset$ **do**

$t := \min_{<}(L)$.

If $H_{S \cup \{t\}, S \cup \{t\}}$ *is full rank* **then**

$S := S \cup \{t\}$ and $L := L \cup \{x_i t, i = 1, \dots, n\} \setminus \{t\}$.

 Remove multiples of elements of G' in L .

If $\#S \geq d$ **then** // early termination

While $L \neq \emptyset$ **do**

$t' := \min_{<}(L)$.

 Find α such that $H_{S,S} \alpha + H_{S,\{t'\}} = 0$.

$G := G \cup \{t' + \sum_{s \in S} \alpha_s s\}$.

 Remove multiples of elements of t' in L .

Return G .

Else

 Find α such that $H_{S,S} \alpha + H_{S,\{t\}} = 0$.

$G' := G' \cup \{t\}$.

$G := G \cup \{t + \sum_{s \in S} \alpha_s s\}$.

 Remove multiples of t in L and sort L by increasing order.

Error "Run SCALAR-FGLM".

If we know the sequence is linear recurrent, then we can remove this bound. In that case, the last step of Example 7 becomes:

We set $t = x^2$ and build the matrix $H_{S \cup \{x^2\}, S \cup \{x^2\}} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 4 & 12 \\ 4 & 12 & 32 \\ 12 & 32 & 80 \end{pmatrix}$ that is not full rank. Solving $H_{S,S} \alpha + H_{S,\{x^2\}} = 0$ yields relation $x^2 - 4x + 4$, so $G = \{y - 3, x^2 - 4x + 4\}$, $G' = \{y, x^2\}$ and L is updated to \emptyset .

Furthermore, the relation $y - 3$ has been tested with shift $\{1, y\}$ while the relation $x^2 - 4x + 4$ has been tested with a shift $\{1, x, x^2\}$.

For a generic sequence, the algorithm computes the ideal of relations of the sequence. However, it is easy to make a sequence such that the algorithm fails. It suffices to have a sequence whose staircase S has a subset S' such that the matrix $H_{S',S'}$ has a rank defect.

This motivated the authors to extend the algorithm to bypass this issue in Berthomieu et al. (2017).

We give an example of what can happen when the wrong relations are computed and describe their shifts.

Example 8. We consider the ideal $I = \langle y^2 - y, x^2 y - xy, x^4 - 6x^3 + 11x^2 - 6x \rangle \subseteq \mathbb{F}_{11}[x, y]$ and a sequence $\mathbf{u} = (u_{i,j})_{(i,j) \in \mathbb{N}^2}$ over \mathbb{F}_{11} made from this ideal and some

initial conditions. The first terms of the sequence are $\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 2 & 2 & 2 & 2 & \dots \\ 3 & 4 & 4 & 4 & 4 & \dots \\ 3 & 4 & 4 & 4 & 4 & \dots \\ -1 & 4 & 4 & 4 & 4 & \dots \\ 1 & 4 & 4 & 4 & 4 & \dots \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots \end{pmatrix}$. We also call

the algorithm on the $\text{DRL}(y < x)$ ordering.

We set $L = \{1\}$, $S = \emptyset$, $G' = \emptyset$.

We set $t = 1$ and build the matrix $H_{S \cup \{1\}, S \cup \{1\}} = (1)$ that is full rank. Hence $S = \{1\}$ and $L = \{y, x\}$.

We set $t = y$ and build the matrix $H_{S \cup \{y\}, S \cup \{y\}} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 2 \\ 2 & 2 \end{pmatrix}$ that is full rank. Hence $S = \{1, y\}$ and $L = \{x, y^2, xy\}$.

We set $t = x$ and build the matrix $H_{S \cup \{x\}, S \cup \{x\}} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 2 & 3 \\ 2 & 2 & 4 \\ 3 & 4 & 3 \end{pmatrix}$ that is full rank. Hence $S = \{1, y, x\}$ and $L = \{y^2, xy, x^2\}$.

We set $t = y^2$ and build the matrix $H_{S \cup \{y^2\}, S \cup \{y^2\}} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 2 & 3 & 2 \\ 2 & 2 & 4 & 2 \\ 3 & 4 & 3 & 4 \\ 2 & 2 & 4 & 2 \end{pmatrix}$ that is not full rank. Solving $H_{S,S} \alpha + H_{S,\{y^2\}} = 0$ yields relation $y^2 - y$ with a shift $\{1, y, x, y^2\}$, so $G = \{y^2 - y\}$, $G' = \{y^2\}$ and L is updated to $\{xy, x^2\}$.

We set $t = xy$ and build the matrix $H_{S \cup \{xy\}, S \cup \{xy\}} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 2 & 3 & 4 \\ 2 & 2 & 4 & 4 \\ 3 & 4 & 3 & 4 \\ 4 & 4 & 4 & 4 \end{pmatrix}$ that is not full rank. Solving $H_{S,S} \alpha + H_{S,\{xy\}} = 0$ yields relation $xy - x - y + 1$ with a shift $\{1, y, x, xy\}$, so $G = \{y^2 - y, xy - x - y + 1\}$, $G' = \{y^2, xy\}$ and L is updated to $\{x^2\}$.

We set $t = x^2$ and build the matrix $H_{S \cup \{x^2\}, S \cup \{x^2\}} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 2 & 3 & 3 \\ 2 & 2 & 4 & 4 \\ 3 & 4 & 3 & -1 \\ 3 & 4 & -1 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$ that is full rank. Hence $S = \{1, y, x, x^2\}$ and $L = \{x^3\}$.

We set $t = x^3$ and build the matrix $H_{S \cup \{x^3\}, S \cup \{x^3\}} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 2 & 3 & 3 & -1 \\ 2 & 2 & 4 & 4 & 4 \\ 3 & 4 & 3 & -1 & 1 \\ 3 & 4 & -1 & 1 & 2 \\ -1 & 4 & 1 & 2 & 6 \end{pmatrix}$ that is not full rank. Solving $H_{S,S} \alpha + H_{S,\{x^3\}} = 0$ yields relation $g_3 = x^3 + 3x^2 + 10x + y + 4$ with a shift $\{1, y, x, x^2\}$, so $G = \{y^2 - y, xy - x - y + 1, x^3 + 3x^2 + 10x + y + 4\}$, $G' = \{y^2, xy, x^3\}$ and L is updated to \emptyset .

We can notice that

- the first relation, $y^2 - y$ is really a relation of \mathbf{u} but has only, a priori, a shift $\{1, y, x, y^2\}$, i.e. its shift is y^2 .
- the second relation, $xy - x - y + 1$, is not a real relation of \mathbf{u} and is known to have a shift $\{1, y, x, xy\}$. Actually we can check that $[y^2(xy - x - y + 1)] = 0$ and $[x^2(xy - x - y + 1)] = 4$, so that the relation has a shift $\{1, y, x, y^2, xy\}$, i.e. its shift is xy and its fail is x^3y .
- the third relation, $x^3 + 3x^2 + 10x + y + 4$, is not a true relation of \mathbf{u} and is known to have a shift $\{1, y, x, x^2, x^3\}$. Actually we can check that $[y^2(x^3 + 3x^2 + 10x + y + 4)] = 0$ and $[xy(x^3 + 3x^2 + 10x + y + 4)] = -1$, i.e. its shift is y^2 and its fail is x^4y .

All in all, we computed the relation $x^3 + 3x^2 + 10x + y + 4$ assuming it should be valid when multiplied by x^2 or x^3 , while it cannot be valid when multiplied by $xy < x^2 < x^3$.

5. Analogies and differences of the adaptive variants

We now compare theoretically the ADAPTIVE BMS and the ADAPTIVE SCALAR-FGLM algorithms. As the ADAPTIVE BMS algorithm differs from the BMS algorithm just in the execution: mainly some testings are skipped, results from (Berthomieu and Faugère, 2017, Section 6) are still valid for the ADAPTIVE BMS algorithm. On the other hand, the ADAPTIVE SCALAR-FGLM algorithm does not necessarily provide the same output as the SCALAR-FGLM algorithm.

5.1. Closed staircase

In (Berthomieu and Faugère, 2017, Section 5.1, Theorem 7), we show that the BMS algorithm always returns a zero-dimensional ideal while the SCALAR-FGLM algorithm can return a zero-dimensional or a positive-dimensional ideal. This is in fact one of the main differences between these two algorithms.

In the following theorem, we prove that the ADAPTIVE BMS algorithm and the ADAPTIVE SCALAR-FGLM algorithm are closer on that matter assuming one knows the size of the output staircase in advance.

Theorem 7. *Let \mathbf{u} be a sequence, $<$ be a monomial ordering and d be the size of the staircase.*

Calling the ADAPTIVE BMS algorithm on \mathbf{u} , $<$, d and a stopping monomial M yields a truncated Gröbner basis of a zero-dimensional ideal.

Calling the ADAPTIVE SCALAR-FGLM algorithms on \mathbf{u} , $<$ and d yields a truncated Gröbner basis of a zero-dimensional ideal.

Proof. The first part of the result comes directly from the line $G' := \text{Border}(S')$ in the description of the ADAPTIVE BMS algorithm, Algorithm 1.

The second part of the result comes from the fact that the leading terms of the relations are lying in the border of the staircase and are minimal for both $<$ and $|$. Thus, for any variable x_i , there always exists a relation with leading term a pure power of x_i . \square

It is possible to change this early termination procedure so that the ADAPTIVE SCALAR-FGLM algorithm is closer to the SCALAR-FGLM algorithm, yielding a potential positive-dimensional algorithm. If we still want to try to close as much as possible the staircase with degenerate square matrices, it suffices to check that the relation $t' + \sum_{s \in S} \alpha_s s$ is valid with a shift $S \cup \{t'\}$. This yields Algorithm 3.

5.2. Reduction of relations

The ADAPTIVE SCALAR-FGLM algorithm computes a staircase and then relations with support in the staircase except their leading terms that lie on the border. On the other hand, although the ADAPTIVE BMS algorithm may compute the same ideal of relations as the ADAPTIVE SCALAR-FGLM algorithm, their Gröbner basis can be different.

Theorem 8. *Let \mathbf{u} be a sequence, $<$ be a monomial ordering and d be the size of the staircase.*

Calling the ADAPTIVE SCALAR-FGLM algorithms on \mathbf{u} , $<$, and d yields a truncated reduced Gröbner basis of an ideal.

Calling the ADAPTIVE BMS algorithm on \mathbf{u} , $<$, d and a stopping monomial M yields a truncated minimal Gröbner basis of an ideal, which is not necessarily reduced.

Furthermore, even if \mathbf{u} is linear recurrent and the ADAPTIVE SCALAR-FGLM algorithm computes the ideal of relations of \mathbf{u} , then there is no reason for the output of the ADAPTIVE BMS algorithm to be reduced.

Algorithm 3: Tweaked ADAPTIVE SCALAR-FGLM.

Input: A table $\mathbf{u} = (u_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}^n}$ with coefficients in \mathbb{K} , $<$ a monomial ordering and d a given bound.

Output: A reduced truncated Gröbner basis of a zero-dimensional ideal of degree $\geq d$.

$L := \{1\}$. // set of next terms to study
 $S := \emptyset$. // the useful staircase with respect to $<$
 $G := \emptyset, G' := \emptyset$.

While $L \neq \emptyset$ **do**

$t := \min_{<}(L)$.

If $H_{S \cup \{t\}, S \cup \{t\}}$ *is full rank* **then**

$S := S \cup \{t\}$ and $L := L \cup \{x_i t, i = 1, \dots, n\} \setminus \{t\}$.

 Remove multiples of elements of G' in L .

If $\#S \geq d$ **then** // early termination

While $L \neq \emptyset$ **do**

$t' := \min_{<}(L)$.

 Find α such that $H_{S,S} \alpha + H_{S,\{t'\}} = 0$.

If $H_{\{t'\},S} \alpha + H_{\{t'\},\{t'\}} = 0$ **then**

$G := G \cup \{t' + \sum_{s \in S} \alpha_s s\}$.

 Remove multiples of elements of t' in L .

Return G .

Else

 Find α such that $H_{S,S} \alpha + H_{S,\{t\}} = 0$.

$G' := G' \cup \{t\}$.

$G := G \cup \{t + \sum_{s \in S} \alpha_s s\}$.

 Remove multiples of t in L and sort L by increasing order.

Error "Run SCALAR-FGLM".

Proof. For two distinct polynomials g, g' in the Gröbner basis returned by ADAPTIVE SCALAR-FGLM algorithm, $\text{LT}(g)$ does not divide any monomial in the support of g' . Hence the Gröbner basis is reduced.

For two distinct polynomials g, g' in the Gröbner basis returned by ADAPTIVE BMS algorithm, $\text{LT}(g)$ does not divide $\text{LT}(g')$. Hence the Gröbner basis is minimal. However, there is no reason for $\text{LT}(g)$ not to divide any monomial in the support of g' . \square

Example 9. We let $\mathbf{u} = (i^2 + j^2 - 1)_{(i,j) \in \mathbb{N}^2}$ be a sequence and consider the $\text{DRL}(y < x)$ ordering. The ideal of relations of \mathbf{u} is $I = \langle xy - x - y + 1, x^2 - y^2 - 2x + 2y, y^3 - 3y^2 + 3y - 1 \rangle$.

The ADAPTIVE BMS algorithm called on \mathbf{u} and the stopping monomial y^5 returns $g_1 = xy - x - y + 1$, with shift x^2 , $g_2 = x^2 - \frac{1}{3}xy - y^2 - \frac{5}{3}x + \frac{7}{3}y - \frac{1}{3}$, with shift x^2 and $g_3 = y^3 - \frac{1}{2}xy - 3y^2 + \frac{1}{2}x + \frac{7}{2}y - \frac{3}{2}$, with shift y^2 . We can notice that $\{g_1, g_2, g_3\}$ is a Gröbner basis but not a reduced Gröbner basis of I .

The ADAPTIVE SCALAR-FGLM algorithm called on \mathbf{u} and the set of all the monomials of degree at most 3 yields relations $g'_1 = xy - x - y + 1$, $g'_2 = x^2 - y^2 - 2x + 2y$, $g'_3 = y^3 - 3y^2 + 3y - 1$. We can notice that $\{g'_1, g'_2, g'_3\} = \{g_1, g_2 + \frac{1}{3}g_1, g_3 + \frac{1}{2}g_1\}$ is a reduced Gröbner basis of I .

As for the BMS algorithm, it is not hard to tweak the ADAPTIVE BMS algorithm so that it returns a reduced Gröbner basis. It suffices to perform an inter-reduction of the relations either at the end of each step of the main **For** loop or just before returning the Gröbner basis, see Algorithm 4.

5.3. Validity of relations

One of the main differences between the BMS and the SCALAR-FGLM algorithms is the validity of the relations they return. Given a Gröbner basis returned by both algorithms. Loosely speaking, the SCALAR-FGLM algorithm will only ensure that all the relations in the Gröbner basis have the same shifts while for the BMS algorithm, the smaller the leading term of a relation is, the larger its shift is computed. See (Berthomieu and Faugère, 2017, Theorem 19).

Naturally, if the given upper bound on the size of the staircase to the ADAPTIVE BMS algorithm is correct, then the shifts computed by the ADAPTIVE BMS algorithm are the same as those computed by the BMS algorithm.

In Examples 7 and 8, we can see that the shifts computed by the ADAPTIVE SCALAR-FGLM algorithm are not all the same. This is the main difference between the SCALAR-FGLM and the ADAPTIVE SCALAR-FGLM algorithms.

In fact, we prove in the following Theorem 9 that the larger the leading term of a computed relation, the larger its shift.

Algorithm 4: Tweaked ADAPTIVE BMS algorithm.

Input: A table $\mathbf{u} = (u_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}^n}$ with coefficients in \mathbb{K} , a monomial ordering \prec , a given bound d and a monomial M as the stopping condition.

Output: A set G of relations generating I_M .

$T := \{m \in \mathbb{K}[\mathbf{x}], m \leq M\}$.

$G := \{1\}$.

$S := \emptyset$.

For all $m \in T$ **do**

$S' := S$.

For $g \in G$ **do**

If $\text{LM}(g) \mid m$ **then**

If $\frac{m}{\text{LM}(g)} \notin \text{Stabilize}(S)$ **and** $\# \text{Stabilize}(S \cup \{\frac{m}{\text{LM}(g)}\}) > d$ **then**
 | **next.** // skip this relation testing

$e := \left[\frac{m}{\text{LM}(g)} g \right]_{\mathbf{u}}$

If $e \neq 0$ **then**

 | $S' := S' \cup \left\{ \left[\frac{e}{\text{LM}(g)} \right] \right\}$.

$S' := \min_{\text{fail}(h) \in S'} \{[h, \text{fail}(h)] / \text{LM}(h)\}$.

$G' := \text{Border}(S')$.

For $g' \in G'$ **do**

 Let $g \in G$ such that $\text{LM}(g) \mid \text{LM}(g')$.

If $\text{LM}(g) \nmid m$ **then**

 | $g' := \frac{\text{LM}(g')}{\text{LM}(g)} g$.

Else if $\exists h \in S, \frac{m}{\text{LM}(g')} \mid \text{fail}(h)$ **then**

 | $g' := \frac{\text{LM}(g')}{\text{LM}(g)} g - \left[\frac{m}{\text{LM}(h)} h \right]_{\mathbf{u}} \frac{\text{LM}(g') \text{fail}(h)}{m} h$.

Else $g' := g$.

$G := \text{InterReduce}(G')$

$S := S'$.

Return G .

Theorem 9. Let \mathbf{u} be a sequence, \prec be a monomial ordering and d be the size of the output staircase S . Let $S_M = \{m \in S, m < M\}$.

Calling the ADAPTIVE BMS algorithm on \mathbf{u} , \prec , d and a stopping monomial M yields relations g_1, \dots, g_r and shifts v_1, \dots, v_r such that

$$\forall i, 1 \leq i \leq r, \quad v_i \text{ LM}(g_i) \leq M$$

and g_i is valid with a shift v_i , potentially 0.

Calling the ADAPTIVE SCALAR-FGLM algorithm on \mathbf{u} , \prec and d yields relations $g'_1, \dots, g'_{r'}$ such that

$$\forall i, 1 \leq i \leq r', \quad \deg \text{LM}(g'_i) \leq d$$

and g'_i has a shift $S_{\text{LM}(g'_i)} \cup \{\text{LM}(g'_i)\}$ if $\text{LM}(g'_i) > \max_{\prec}(S)$ and S otherwise.

Proof. The first part is clear from the behavior of both the BMS and the ADAPTIVE BMS algorithms.

The second part comes from the fact that if g'_i , with $\text{LM}(g'_i) = t$ is found before S is completed, then it was because the matrix $H_{S^t \cup \{t\}, S^t \cup \{t\}}$ had a rank defect, where S^t is the state for S at loop t . Furthermore, $S^t = S_{\text{LM}(g'_i)} = S_t$.

Otherwise, it is computed by solving $H_{S,S} \alpha + H_{S,\{t\}} = 0$ so that the relation has only been tested with a shift S . \square

In a way, the behavior of the ADAPTIVE SCALAR-FGLM algorithm is the opposite of the behaviors of the BMS and the ADAPTIVE BMS algorithms.

Furthermore, if one uses Algorithm 3 instead of the ADAPTIVE SCALAR-FGLM algorithm, then each returned relation g'_i has a shift $S_{\text{LM}(g'_i)} \cup \{\text{LM}(g'_i)\}$.

Example 10. Let us consider the sequence $\mathbf{u} = (F_{i+1})_{(i,j) \in \mathbb{N}^2}$, where $(F_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ is the Fibonacci sequence. Its ideal of relation is $\langle y - 1, x^2 - x - 1 \rangle$ so that its staircase has size 2.

Calling the ADAPTIVE SCALAR-FGLM algorithm on this sequence with this bound of the staircase makes us creating the matrices

$H_{\{1\},\{1\}}$, which is full rank, hence $1 \in S$;

$H_{\{1,y\},\{1,y\}}$, which is not full rank, hence the relation $y - 1$ is found with a shift $\{1, y\}$;

$H_{\{1,x\},\{1,x\}}$, which is full rank, hence $x \in S$.

Now, the staircase is found so it remains to solve $H_{S,S} \alpha + H_{S,\{x^2\}} = 0$ yielding the relation $x^2 - x - 1$ with a shift S .

5.4. Monomial ordering and Set of Terms

In this section, we study how both algorithms handle a monomial ordering that is not a weighted degree ordering. The classical specification of the BMS algorithm are that the ordering must be a weighted ordering. However, when running the ADAPTIVE BMS algorithm, the upper bound on the staircase size makes us never visit monomials of degree more than twice this size. Therefore, we can now use any monomial ordering with the ADAPTIVE BMS algorithm by just enumerating, in increasing order, all the monomials of degree less than twice the upper bound.

This allows us to deal with ideal in shape position with both the ADAPTIVE BMS and the ADAPTIVE SCALAR-FGLM algorithms.

Theorem 10. *Let \mathbf{u} be a linear recurrent sequence whose ideal of relation I is in shape position for the $\text{LEX}(x_n < \dots < x_2 < x_1)$ ordering, i.e. there exist g_n squarefree and $f_{n-1}, \dots, f_1 \in \mathbb{K}[x_n]$ with $\deg g_n = d, \deg f_i < d$ such that $I = \langle g_n(x_n), x_{n-1} - f_{n-1}(x_n), \dots, x_1 - f_1(x_n) \rangle$.*

Assuming no error is thrown in the execution of the ADAPTIVE SCALAR-FGLM algorithm called on \mathbf{u} , d and $\text{LEX}(x_n < \dots < x_2 < x_1)$, then the output is I .

Calling the ADAPTIVE BMS algorithm on \mathbf{u} , d and $\text{LEX}(x_n < \dots < x_2 < x_1)$ yields I .

Proof. Assuming no error is thrown during the execution of the ADAPTIVE SCALAR-FGLM algorithm, the staircase is incrementally updated from \emptyset to $\{1, x_n, \dots, x_n^{d-1}\}$. Then, the staircase size is reached and the early termination procedure solves the system $H_{S,S} \alpha + H_{S,\{t\}} = 0$ for $t \in \{x_n^d, x_{n-1}, \dots, x_1\}$ yielding $g_n(x_n), x_{n-1} - f_{n-1}(x_n), \dots, x_1 - f_1(x_n)$.

For the ADAPTIVE BMS algorithm, we visit every monomial of degree at most $2d - 1$. The first relation, $g_n(x_n)$ is computed by the algorithm visiting monomials $1, x_n, \dots, x_n^{2d-1}$ like the BM algorithm. Then, each relation $x_i - f_i(x_n)$ is computed by visiting monomials $x_i, x_i x_n, \dots, x_i x_n^{d-1}$, all of degree less than $2d - 1$. \square

Example 11. *We let $\mathbf{u} = (F_{4i+k+1})_{(i,j,k) \in \mathbb{N}^3}$, where $(F_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ is the Fibonacci sequence. The ideal of relations of \mathbf{u} is $I = \langle z^2 - z - 1, y - 1, x - 3z - 2 \rangle$ with a staircase of size 2.*

For the ADAPTIVE SCALAR-FGLM called on \mathbf{u} , $d = 2$ and the $\text{LEX}(z < y < x)$ ordering, the algorithm creates the matrices

$$H_{\{1\},\{1\}} = (1), \text{ which is full rank, hence } 1 \in S;$$

$$H_{\{1,z\},\{1,z\}} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 2 \end{pmatrix}, \text{ which is full rank, hence } z \in S.$$

Now, the staircase is found so it remains to solve

$$H_{S,S} \alpha + H_{S,\{z^2\}} = 0 \text{ yielding the relation } g_1 = z^2 - z - 1;$$

$H_{S,S} \alpha + H_{S,\{y\}} = 0$ yielding the relation $g_2 = y - 1$;
 $H_{S,S} \alpha + H_{S,\{x\}} = 0$ yielding the relation $g_3 = x - 3z - 2$.
 The algorithm returns $\langle g_1, g_2, g_3 \rangle = I$.

Calling the ADAPTIVE BMS algorithm on \mathbf{u} , $d = 2$, the stopping monomial xz and $\text{LEX}(z < y < x)$ ordering makes us visit the set of all monomials of degree at most $2d - 1 = 3$ less than xz , i.e. $\{1, z, z^2, z^3, y, yz, yz^2, y^2, y^2z, y^3, x, xz\}$.

The algorithms tests the relation $g = 1$ in $u_{0,0,0} = F_1 = 1$ where it fails. It has now relations $g_1 = x, g_2 = y$ and $g_3 = z$.

Testing $g_3 = z$ in $u_{0,0,2} = F_2 = 1$, it updates now the relation to $g_3 = z - 1$. Going on testing $g_3 = z - 1$ in $u_{0,0,2} = F_3 = 2$ and $u_{0,0,3} = F_4 = 3$, it is able to guess that $g_3 = z^2 - z - 1$. The staircase is now $\{1, z\}$ of size 2 so it has been found. As anticipated, there is no need to go further in that direction.

Testing $g_2 = y$ in $u_{0,1,0} = F_1 = 1$, the relation is updated to $g_2 = y - 1$.

Then, it checks that this relation is valid in $u_{0,1,1}$ but skips $u_{0,1,2}, u_{0,2,0}, u_{0,2,1}, u_{0,3,0}$ thanks to its criterion.

It remains to test $g_3 = x$ in $u_{1,0,0} = F_5 = 5$. It fails and the algorithm updates the relation to $g_3 = x - 5$.

Finally, $g_3 = x - 5$ is tested in $u_{1,0,1} = F_6 = 8$ and the relation is updated to $g_3 = x - 3z - 2$.

The algorithm returns $\langle g_1, g_2, g_3 \rangle = I$.

6. Complexity and Benchmarks of the adaptive variants

In this section, we present some benchmarks to compare how the ADAPTIVE BMS and the ADAPTIVE SCALAR-FGLM algorithms behave.

Four families of ideals of relations are used to make the sequences.

- In the first family, the leading monomials of the ideal of relations are $\langle y^{\lfloor d/2 \rfloor}, x^d \rangle$. Thus, its staircase is a rectangle of size around $d^2/2$. In three variables, the leading monomials are $\langle z^{\lfloor d/3 \rfloor}, y^{\lfloor d/2 \rfloor}, x^d \rangle$, so that the staircase is a rectangular cuboid of size around $d^3/6$. This family will be called *Rectangle*.
- In the second family, the leading monomials of the ideal of relations are $\langle xy, y^d, x^d \rangle$. Thus, its staircase looks like a L and has size $2d - 1$. In three variables, the leading monomials are $\langle yz, xz, xy, z^d, y^d, x^d \rangle$, so that the staircase has size $3d - 2$. This family will be called *L shape*. It was considered as the worst case in Berthomieu et al. (2015, 2017) for the ADAPTIVE SCALAR-FGLM algorithm for the number of queries. It should also be a worst case for the ADAPTIVE BMS algorithm.

- In the third family, the leading monomials of the ideal of relations are all the monomials of degree d . Thus, its staircase is a simplex and has size $\binom{d+1}{2} = \frac{d(d+1)}{2}$ in two variables. In three variables, the staircase has size $\binom{d+2}{3} = \frac{d(d+1)(d+2)}{6}$. This family will be called *Simplex*. It should be the best case for both the SCALAR-FGLM and the BMS algorithms.
- In the last family, the leading monomials of the ideal of relations are $\langle y^d, x \rangle$. Thus, its staircase looks like a line and has size d . In three variables, the leading monomials are $\langle z^d, y, x \rangle$, so that the staircase has also size d . This is the generic family for a LEX($z < y < x$) basis and this example corresponds to the change of ordering application, see Section 5.4. This family will be called *Shape position*.

For the first three families, we called the algorithms with the DRL($z < y < x$) ordering, for the last one, we called them with the LEX($z < y < x$) ordering.

For the ADAPTIVE BMS algorithm, we used Proposition 4 to estimate sharply the stopping monomial.

6.1. Counting the number of table queries

The ADAPTIVE SCALAR-FGLM algorithm computes all the multi-Hankel matrices whose rows and columns are all the terms that are in the staircase or are a leading monomial in the Gröbner basis.

Likewise, the ADAPTIVE BMS algorithm needs to test each relation, with support in $S \cup \text{LM}(\mathcal{G})$, shifted by as many monomial as in S .

Therefore, we have the following proposition.

Proposition 11. *Let $\mathbf{u} = (u_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}^n}$ be a sequence and \mathcal{G} be a reduced Gröbner basis of its ideal of relations for a total degree ordering.*

Let S be the staircase of \mathcal{G} , $S^+ = S \cup \text{LM}(\mathcal{G})$. Let $S + T = \{st, s \in S, t \in T\}$ and $2S = S + S = \{s s', s, s' \in S\}$.

Let d_S be the greatest degree of the elements in S , $d_{\mathcal{G}}$ be the greatest degree of the elements in \mathcal{G} and $d_{\max} = \max(d_S, d_{\mathcal{G}})$.

Let $\mathcal{S}(d)$ be the simplex of all monomials of degree d .

Then, the ADAPTIVE BMS algorithm needs to perform at least $\#(S + S^+)$ and at most $\#\mathcal{S}(d_S + d_{\max}) = \binom{n+d_S+d_{\max}}{n}$ queries to the sequence.

The ADAPTIVE SCALAR-FGLM algorithm needs to perform at least $\#(2S)$ and fewer than $\#(2S^+)$ queries to \mathbf{u} . In the worst case, this number grows as $(\#S^+)^2$.

In the experiments of Figures 1 and 2, we can see that for the Rectangle family, the ADAPTIVE SCALAR-FGLM algorithm perform much fewer queries than the ADAPTIVE BMS.




Figure 1: Number of table queries (2D): ADAPTIVE SCALAR-FGLM & ADAPTIVE BMS

For the L shape family, the size of the staircase only grows as $O(d)$. Our experiments suggest that the number of queries grows as $O(d^n)$ for the ADAPTIVE BMS algorithm, while it only grows as $O(d^2)$ for the ADAPTIVE SCALAR-FGLM algorithm. This can be a huge advantage in dimension at least 3.

We can see that the ADAPTIVE BMS algorithm cannot take profit from the size of the staircase in the L shape family as it needs as many queries as in the Simplex family. Yet, although the L shape family is a worst case for the ADAPTIVE SCALAR-FGLM algorithm, it is still able to query fewer sequence terms for the L shape family than for the Simplex family.

6.2. Counting the number of basic operations

The complexity of the BMS algorithm has been studied in Sakata (2009) yielding the following proposition.

Proposition 12. *Let $\mathbf{u} = (u_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}^n}$ be a sequence, \mathcal{G} be a minimal Gröbner basis of its ideal of relations for a total degree ordering and S be the staircase of \mathcal{G} .*

Then, the BMS algorithm performs at most $O((\#S)^2 \text{LM}(\mathcal{G}))$ operations to recover the ideal of relations of \mathbf{u} .

Obviously, the bound of Proposition 12 on the number of basic operations applies to the ADAPTIVE BMS algorithm. Yet, since the number of skipped relation




Figure 2: Number of table queries (3D): ADAPTIVE SCALAR-FGLM & ADAPTIVE BMS

testings is hard to predict, it is not clear how to make it sharper for the ADAPTIVE BMS algorithm.

The ADAPTIVE SCALAR-FGLM computes the rank of a matrix of size at most $\#S$. Furthermore, it solves as many linear systems with this matrix as there are polynomials in the Gröbner basis. All in all, we have the following result.

Proposition 13. *Let $\mathbf{u} = (u_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}^n}$ be a sequence, \mathcal{G} be a reduced Gröbner basis of its ideal of relations for a total degree ordering and S be the staircase of \mathcal{G} .*

Then, the number of operations performed by the ADAPTIVE SCALAR-FGLM algorithm to recover the ideal of relations of \mathbf{u} is at most $O((\#S)^2 (\#S + \# \text{LM}(\mathcal{G})))$.

In the following Figures 3 and 4, we report on the ratio between the number of basic operations and the cube of the size of the staircase.

It seems that the ADAPTIVE SCALAR-FGLM always perform fewer operations than the ADAPTIVE BMS algorithm. Though, it is possible that, in dimension 2, for larger parameters, the ADAPTIVE BMS becomes more efficient than the ADAPTIVE SCALAR-FGLM algorithm as suggested by the graphs. Concerning the L shape family, although the ADAPTIVE BMS algorithm do not reduce much its number of table queries, it performs in fact much fewer basic operations than the BMS algorithm. For instance, in (Berthomieu and Faugère, 2017, Section 6), we can see that the BMS algorithm performs four times (resp. seven times) as many basic operations as the ADAPTIVE BMS algorithm in dimension 2 (resp. dimension 3).




Figure 3: Number of basic operations (2D): ADAPTIVE SCALAR-FGLM & ADAPTIVE BMS




Figure 4: Number of basic operations (3D): ADAPTIVE SCALAR-FGLM & ADAPTIVE BMS

It is also possible that the larger number of operations the ADAPTIVE BMS algorithm performs compared to the SCALAR-FGLM algorithm is due to the larger number of queries it needs to recover the relations.

Therefore, we now also compare the ratio between their number of basic operations and their number of queries in Figures 5 and 6.




Figure 5: Number of basic operations by queries (2D): ADAPTIVE SCALAR-FGLM & ADAPTIVE BMS

In dimension 2, the ADAPTIVE SCALAR-FGLM algorithm seems to have a better ratio between the number of operations and the number of queries than the ADAPTIVE BMS algorithm. Yet, once again, it is possible that this statement is not true for larger d .

In dimension 3, however, our experiments lead us to believe that this ratio will always be larger for the ADAPTIVE BMS algorithm than for the ADAPTIVE SCALAR-FGLM algorithm.

Banderier, C., Flajolet, P., 2002. Basic analytic combinatorics of directed lattice paths. Theoret. Comput. Sci. 281 (1–2), 37–80, selected Papers in honour of Maurice Nivat.

URL <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0304397502000075>

Benoit, A., Chyzak, F., Darrasse, A., Gerhold, S., Mezzarobba, M., Salvy, B., 2010. The Dynamic Dictionary of Mathematical Functions (DDMF). In: Fukuda, K., Hoeven, J. v. d., Joswig, M., Takayama, N. (Eds.), Mathematical Software – ICMS 2010. Springer, Berlin, Heidelberg, pp. 35–41.

URL http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-15582-6_7




Figure 6: Number of basic operations by queries (3D): ADAPTIVE SCALAR-FGLM & ADAPTIVE BMS

Berlekamp, E., 1968. Nonbinary BCH decoding. *IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory* 14 (2), 242–242.

Berthomieu, J., Boyer, B., Faugère, J.-Ch., 2015. Linear Algebra for Computing Gröbner Bases of Linear Recursive Multidimensional Sequences. In: 40th International Symposium on Symbolic and Algebraic Computation. Proceedings of the 40th International Symposium on Symbolic and Algebraic Computation. Bath, United Kingdom, pp. 61–68.

Berthomieu, J., Boyer, B., Faugère, J.-Ch., 2017. Linear Algebra for Computing Gröbner Bases of Linear Recursive Multidimensional Sequences. *Journal of Symbolic Computation* 83 (Supplement C), 36–67, special issue on the conference ISSAC 2015: Symbolic computation and computer algebra. URL <https://hal.inria.fr/hal-01253934>

Berthomieu, J., Faugère, J.-Ch., 2016. Guessing Linear Recurrence Relations of Sequence Tuples and P-recursive Sequences with Linear Algebra. In: 41st International Symposium on Symbolic and Algebraic Computation. Waterloo, ON, Canada, pp. 95–102.

Berthomieu, J., Faugère, J.-Ch., 2017. In-depth comparison of the Berlekamp – Massey – Sakata and the Scalar-FGLM algorithms: the non adaptive variants, preprint. URL <https://hal.inria.fr/hal-01516708>

- Berthomieu, J., Faugère, J.-Ch., 2018. A Polynomial-Division-Based Algorithm for Computing Linear Recurrence Relations. In: ISSAC 2018 - 43rd International Symposium on Symbolic and Algebraic Computation. New York, United States, p. 8.
URL <https://hal.inria.fr/hal-01784369>
- Bose, R., Ray-Chaudhuri, D., 1960. On a class of error correcting binary group codes. *Information and Control* 3 (1), 68 – 79.
URL <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0019995860902874>
- Bostan, A., Bousquet-Mélou, M., Kauers, M., Melczer, S., 2014. On 3-dimensional lattice walks confined to the positive octant, to appear in *Annals of Combinatorics*.
- Bousquet-Mélou, M., Mishna, M., 2010. Walks with small steps in the quarter plane. In: *Algorithmic probability and combinatorics*. Vol. 520 of *Contemp. Math. Amer. Math. Soc.*, Providence, RI, pp. 1–39.
URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.1090/conm/520/10252>
- Bousquet-Mélou, M., Petkovšek, M., 2003. Walks confined in a quadrant are not always d-finite. *Theoret. Comput. Sci.* 307 (2), 257–276, *random Generation of Combinatorial Objects and Bijective Combinatorics*.
URL <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0304397503002196>
- Bras-Amorós, M., O’Sullivan, M. E., 2006. The correction capability of the Berlekamp–Massey–Sakata algorithm with majority voting. *Applicable Algebra in Engineering, Communication and Computing* 17 (5), 315–335.
URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s00200-006-0015-8>
- Cox, D., Little, J., O’Shea, D., 2015. *Ideals, Varieties, and Algorithms*, 4th Edition. *Undergraduate Texts in Mathematics*. Springer, New York, an introduction to computational algebraic geometry and commutative algebra.
- Cox, D. A., Little, J., O’Shea, D., 2005. *Using Algebraic Geometry*, 2nd Edition. Vol. 185 of *Graduate Texts in Mathematics*. Springer, New York.
- Faugère, J.-Ch., Gianni, P., Lazard, D., Mora, T., 1993. Efficient Computation of Zero-dimensional Gröbner Bases by Change of Ordering. *J. Symbolic Comput.* 16 (4), 329–344.
- Faugère, J.-Ch., Mou, C., 2011. Fast Algorithm for Change of Ordering of Zero-dimensional Gröbner Bases with Sparse Multiplication Matrices. In: *Proc. of the 36th ISSAC*. ACM, pp. 115–122.

- Faugère, J.-Ch., Mou, C., 2017. Sparse FGLM algorithms. *Journal of Symbolic Computation* 80 (3), 538 – 569.
- Fitzpatrick, P., Norton, G., 1990. Finding a basis for the characteristic ideal of an n -dimensional linear recurring sequence. *IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory* 36 (6), 1480–1487.
- Guisse, V., 2016. Algèbre linéaire dédiée pour les algorithmes SCALAR-FGLM et Berlekamp-Massey-Sakata. Master’s thesis, Université Paris-Diderot.
- Hocquenghem, A., 1959. Codes correcteurs d’erreurs. *Chiffres* 2, 147 – 156.
- Jonckheere, E., Ma, C., 1989. A simple Hankel interpretation of the Berlekamp-Massey algorithm. *Linear Algebra Appl.* 125 (0), 65 – 76.
URL <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/0024379589900323>
- Kaltofen, E., Pan, V., 1991. Processor efficient parallel solution of linear systems over an abstract field. In: *SPAA ’91*. ACM Press, New York, N.Y., pp. 180–191.
- Kaltofen, E., Yuhasz, G., 2013a. A fraction free Matrix Berlekamp/Massey algorithm. *Linear Algebra Appl.* 439 (9), 2515–2526.
- Kaltofen, E., Yuhasz, G., 2013b. On the Matrix Berlekamp-Massey Algorithm. *ACM Trans. Algorithms* 9 (4), 33:1–33:24.
URL <http://doi.acm.org/10.1145/2500122>
- Levinson, N., 1947. The Wiener RMS (Root-Mean-Square) error criterion in the filter design and prediction. *J. Math. Phys.* 25, 261–278.
- Massey, J. L., 1969. Shift-register synthesis and BCH decoding. *IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory* rr-15, 122–127.
- Sakata, S., 1988. Finding a minimal set of linear recurring relations capable of generating a given finite two-dimensional array. *J. Symbolic Comput.* 5 (3), 321–337.
URL <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0747717188800336>
- Sakata, S., 1990. Extension of the Berlekamp-Massey algorithm to N Dimensions. *Inform. and Comput.* 84 (2), 207–239.
URL [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0890-5401\(90\)90039-K](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0890-5401(90)90039-K)
- Sakata, S., 1991. Decoding binary 2-D cyclic codes by the 2-D Berlekamp-Massey algorithm. *IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory* 37 (4), 1200–1203.
URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.1109/18.86974>

Sakata, S., 2009. The BMS Algorithm. In: Sala, M., Sakata, S., Mora, T., Traverso, C., Perret, L. (Eds.), Gröbner Bases, Coding, and Cryptography. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, Berlin, Heidelberg, pp. 143–163.
 URL http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/978-3-540-93806-4_9

Wiener, N., 1964. Extrapolation, Interpolation, and Smoothing of Stationary Time Series. The MIT Press.

Appendix A The BMS algorithm

This appendix can also be found in (Berthomieu and Faugère, 2017, Section 3).

As in Guisse (2016), we specialize to $\mathbb{K}[\mathbf{x}]$ the presentation of the BMS algorithm given in Bras-Amorós and O’Sullivan (2006), Cox et al. (2005) and Sakata (2009) in the more general case of ordered domains.

A.1 A Polynomial interpretation of the BMS algorithm

Given a table $\mathbf{u} = (u_{\mathbf{i}})_{\mathbf{i} \in \mathbb{N}^n}$ and a weight ordering $<$ for \mathbf{x} . We let $\mathcal{T}_0 = \{0\} \cup \{\mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{i}}, \mathbf{i} \in \mathbb{N}^n\}$ and extend $<$ (still denoted by $<$) to \mathcal{T}_0 with the convention that $0 < 1$.

The goal is to iterate on a monomial m , by only considering, at each step, the table $(u_{\mathbf{i}})_{\mathbf{i} \in \{\mathbf{k}, \mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{k} \leq m}\}}$. As we only know partially the table \mathbf{u} , we need to define some notions according to this partial knowledge at step m .

Definition A.1. Let $m \in \mathcal{T}_0$. Let $f \in \mathbb{K}[\mathbf{x}]$, we say that the relation f is valid up to m , whenever

$$\forall t \in \mathcal{T}_0, \text{LM}(t f) \leq m \Rightarrow [t f] = 0.$$

We thus define the shift of f as $\text{shift}(f) = \frac{m}{\text{LM}(f)}$.

We say that the relation f fails at m whenever

$$\forall t \in \mathcal{T}_0, t f < m \Rightarrow [t f] = 0, \\ \left[\frac{m}{\text{LM}(f)} f \right] \neq 0.$$

We define the fail of f as $\text{fail}(f) = m$. If the relation f never fails, that is for all $t \in \mathcal{T}_0$, $[t f] = 0$, then by convention $\text{fail}(f) = \text{shift}(f) = +\infty$.

Proposition A.1. Let \mathbf{u} be a table and $f \in \mathbb{K}[x]$ such that $\text{fail}(f) > m$. For all $g \in \mathbb{K}[\mathbf{x}]$, if $\text{LM}(g f) \leq m$, then $[g f] = 0$.

The following proposition show how to combine two failing relations with the same shift in order to obtain a new relation valid with a bigger shift.

Proposition A.2. Let f_1 and f_2 be two relations such that $v = \frac{\text{fail}(f_1)}{\text{LM}(f_1)} = \frac{\text{fail}(f_2)}{\text{LM}(f_2)}$ and $e_1 = [v f_1]$, $e_2 = [v f_2]$. Let f be the nonzero polynomial $f_1 - \frac{e_1}{e_2} f_2$. Then, for $i \in \{1, 2\}$, $\text{fail}(f) > \text{fail}(f_i)$, i.e. $\frac{\text{fail}(f)}{\text{LM}(f)} > v$.

Proof. For any $c \in \mathbb{K}$ and any $\mu \in \mathbb{K}[\mathbf{x}]$ such that $\text{LM}(g) < v$, we have $[\mu(f_1 + c f_2)] = [\mu f_1] + c[\mu f_2] = 0$, hence $\text{fail}(f_1 + c f_2) \geq \text{fail}(f_1)$.

It remains to prove that for a good choice of c , we have a strict inequality: as, $[v(f_1 + c f_2)] = [v f_1] + c[v f_2] = e_1 + c e_2$, it is clear that $[v f] = [v(f_1 - \frac{e_1}{e_2} f_2)] = 0$, so that $\text{fail}(f) > v \text{LM}(f) \geq \text{fail}(f_i)$. \square

Definition A.2. Using the same notation as in Definition 3, we let

$$I_m = \{f \in \mathbb{K}[\mathbf{x}], \text{fail}(f) > m\},$$

and \mathcal{G}_m be the least elements for $<$ of I_m , it is a truncated Gröbner basis of I_m :

$$\mathcal{G}_m = \min_{<} \{g, g \in I_m\},$$

$$S_m = \text{Staircase}(\mathcal{G}_m).$$

Example A.1. Let us go back to Example 1 with sequence $\mathbf{b} = \left(\binom{i}{j}\right)_{(i,j) \in \mathbb{N}^2}$. Consider $\mathbb{K}[x, y]$ with the $\text{DRL}(y < x)$ ordering, and $m = x^2$.

y^2	0	
y	0	1
1	1	1
	1	$x \quad x^2$

From this table, on the one hand, we can deduce that


- since it is not identically 0, there is no relation with leading monomial 1 valid up to x^2 , hence $1 \in S_{x^2}$;
- since $[y + \alpha] = \alpha$ and $[x(y + \alpha)] = 1 + \alpha$, there is no relation with leading monomial y valid up to xy and thus x^2 , hence $y \in S_{x^2}$;
- since $[y(x + \beta y + \alpha)] = 1$, there is no relation with leading monomial x valid up to xy and thus x^2 , hence $x \in S_{x^2}$.

On the other hand, we can check that

- since $[y^2] = 0$, relation y^2 is valid up to y^2 and thus x^2 , hence $y^2 \in \mathcal{T} \setminus S_{x^2}$;


- since $[xy - 1] = 0$, relation $xy - 1$ is valid up to xy and thus x^2 , hence $xy \in \mathcal{T} \setminus S_{x^2}$;
- since $[x^2 - x] = 0$, relation $x^2 - x$ is valid up to x^2 , hence $x^2 \in \mathcal{T} \setminus S_{x^2}$.

Therefore, $S_{x^2} = \{1, y, x\}$, $\max_1(S_{x^2}) = \{y, x\}$ and $\min_1(\mathcal{T} \setminus S_{x^2}) = \{y^2, xy, x^2\}$. This is summed up in the following diagram.



Let us notice that many relations with respective leading monomials y^2, xy, x^2 suit actually. These would be $y^2 - \alpha_1 x + \alpha_y y + \alpha_1, xy - (1 + \alpha_1)x + \alpha_y y + \alpha_1$ and $x^2 - (1 + \alpha_1)x + \alpha_y y + \alpha_1$. Furthermore, I_{x^2} is not stable by addition: $(x^2 - x), (x^2 - 2x + 1) \in I_{x^2}$ but $x^2 - x - (x^2 - 2x + 1) = (x - 1) \notin I_{x^2}$ since $\text{fail}(x - 1) = xy$. Hence, I_{x^2} is not an ideal of $\mathbb{K}[x, y]$.


For $m = x^3$, with the following table, we find that



- since $[y^2] = [yy^2] = [xy^2] = 0$, then y^2 is valid up to xy^2 and thus x^3 ;
- since $[xy - 1] = [y(xy - 1)] = 0$ and $[x(xy - y)] = 1$, then $xy - 1$ fails at x^2y . Yet, since $[y] = [yy] = 0$ and $[xy] = 1$, then by Proposition A.2, $[xy - y - 1] = [y(xy - y - 1)] = 0$ and $[x(xy - y - 1)]$ vanishes as well. Hence, $xy - y - 1$ is valid up to x^2y and thus x^3 ;
- since $[x^2 - x] = 0$ and $[y(x^2 - x)] = 1$, then $x^2 - x$ fails at x^2y . Likewise, since $[x - 1] = 0$ and $[y(x - 1)] = 1$, then $[x^2 - 2x + 1] = 0$ and $[y(x^2 - 2x + 1)] = 0$. Furthermore, $[x(x^2 - 2x + 1)] = 0$, so that $x^2 - 2x + 1$ is valid up to x^3 .

Therefore, $S_{x^3} = \{1, y, x\}$, $\max_1(S_{x^3}) = \{y, x\}$ and $\min_1(\mathcal{T} \setminus S_{x^3}) = \{y^2, xy, x^2\}$. We can also check that these relations span the only valid relations with support in

$$S_{x^3} \cup \{y^2, xy, x^2\}.$$



Although I_m is not an ideal in general, we have the following results:

Proposition A.3. *Using the notation of Definitions A.1 and A.2,*

1. I_m is closed under multiplication by elements of $\mathbb{K}[\mathbf{x}]$,
2. for all monomials t, t' such that $t|t'$,
 - (a) if $t' \in S_m$, then $t \in S_m$.
 - (b) if $t \in \mathcal{T} \setminus S_m$, then $t' \in \mathcal{T} \setminus S_m$.

Moreover, it is clear that the sequence $(I_m)_{m \in \mathcal{T}_0}$ is decreasing and that if \mathbf{u} is linear recurrent then $I = \bigcap_{m \in \mathcal{T}_0} I_m$. Therefore, $(S_m)_{m \in \mathcal{T}_0}$ is increasing and its limit is S the finite target staircase. Hence, for m big enough, S_m will be the target staircase. We will give an upper bound in Proposition A.6.

The following result gives an intrinsic characterization of S_m that is key in the iteration of the BMS algorithm.

Proposition A.4. *For all monomial $m \in \mathcal{T}_0$, $S_m = \left\{ \frac{\text{fail}(f)}{\text{LM}(f)}, f \notin I_m \right\}$.*

Furthermore, let m^+ be the successor of m . Let s be a monomial in the staircase S_{m^+} . Then, s was added at step m^+ , i.e. $s \notin S_m$, if, and only if, $s|m^+$ and $\frac{m^+}{s} \in S_{m^+} \setminus S_m$.

Proof. We shall prove the first assertion by double inclusion. If $s = \frac{\text{fail}(f)}{\text{LM}(f)}$ then for all $g \in \mathbb{K}[\mathbf{x}]$ such that $\text{LM}(g) = s$, $\text{fail}(g) \leq m$, hence $s \notin \text{LM}(I_m)$, $s \in S_m$.

The reverse inclusion is proved by induction on m . For $m = 0$, $S_m = \emptyset$ and there is nothing to do. Let us assume the inclusion is satisfied for a monomial m .

Let $s \in S_{m^+}$. On the one hand, if $s \in S_m$, then there exists $f \in \mathbb{K}[\mathbf{x}] \setminus I_m \subseteq \mathbb{K}[\mathbf{x}] \setminus I_{m^+}$ such that $s = \frac{\text{fail}(f)}{\text{LM}(f)}$.

If, on the other hand, $s \in S_{m^+} \setminus S_m$, then there exists a relation $f \in \mathbb{K}[\mathbf{x}]$ such that $\text{LM}(f) = s$, and $m < \text{fail}(f) \leq m^+$, hence $\text{fail}(f) = m^+$ and s divides m^+ .

Let us assume that for all $g \in \mathbb{K}[\mathbf{x}]$ with $\text{LM}(g) = \frac{m^+}{s}$, we have $\text{fail}(g) \leq m < m^+$. Therefore, $\frac{m^+}{s} \in S_m$ and there exists $h \notin I_m$ such that $\frac{\text{fail}(h)}{\text{LM}(h)} = \frac{m^+}{s}$. By Proposition A.2, there is $\alpha \in \mathbb{K}$ such that $\text{fail}(f - \alpha h) > m^+$. Since $\text{fail}(h) \leq m < m^+$, then $\text{LM}(h) \leq s$ and $\text{LM}(f - \alpha h) = s$, hence $\frac{\text{fail}(f - \alpha h)}{\text{LM}(f - \alpha h)} > \frac{m^+}{s}$. This contradicts the fact that $\frac{m^+}{s} \in S_m$. Thus there exists a $g \in \mathbb{K}[\mathbf{x}]$ with $\text{LM}(g) = \frac{m^+}{s}$ and $\text{fail}(g) \geq m^+$.

Let g be such a relation, since $\text{fail}(f) = m^+$, then $[g f] \neq 0$ and $\text{fail}(g) = m^+$. Therefore, $\frac{\text{fail}(g)}{\text{LM}(g)} = \frac{m^+}{m^+/s} = s$ so that $s \in \left\{ \frac{\text{fail}(f)}{\text{LM}(f)}, f \notin I_{m^+} \right\}$.

Now, we proved that $s \in S_{m^+} \setminus S_m$ implies $s|m^+$ and $\frac{m^+}{s} \in S_{m^+} \setminus S_m$. This implication is clearly an equivalence. \square

From this proposition it follows that if $m \in \mathcal{T}_0$, and if m^+ is its successor:

$$\max_{\downarrow}(S_{m^+}) = \max_{\downarrow} \left(\max_{\downarrow}(S_m) \cup \left\{ \frac{m^+}{s}, s \in \min_{\downarrow}(\mathcal{T} \setminus S_m) \cap S_{m^+} \right\} \right) \quad (2)$$

Relation 2 allows us to construct, iterating on the monomial m , the set of relations G_m representing the truncated Gröbner basis of I_m . Relations $g \in G_m$ are indexed by their leading monomials, describing $\mathcal{T} \setminus S_m$.

Remark A.5. We can also construct another set, describing the edge of S_m , still denoted S_m , as there is a one-to-one correspondence between a staircase and its edge. The relations $h \in S_m$ are indexed by their ratio $\frac{\text{fail}(h)}{\text{LM}(h)}$ between their fail and their leading monomial, describing the full staircase of I_m .

When two relations h and h' in S_m are such that $\frac{\text{fail}(h)}{\text{LM}(h)} = \frac{\text{fail}(h')}{\text{LM}(h')}$, then we only need to keep one. Since the goal is to combine a relation of S_m with a relation failing at m^+ to make a new one with a bigger shift, as in Proposition A.2, it is best to handle smaller polynomials.

This yields Algorithm 5.

We saw that for m big enough, S_m will be the target staircase. We now give an upper bound.

Proposition A.6. Let \mathbf{u} be a linear recurrent sequence and I be its ideal of relations.

Let S be the staircase of I for \prec . Let s_{\max} be the largest monomial in S . Then, for $m \geq (s_{\max})^2$, $S_m = S$.

Let \mathcal{G} be a minimal Gröbner basis of I for \prec and let g_{\max} be the largest leading monomial of \mathcal{G} . Then, for $m \geq s_{\max} \cdot \max_{\prec}(g_{\max}, s_{\max})$, the BMS algorithm returns a minimal Gröbner basis of I for \prec .

Example A.2. For the $\text{DRL}(y \prec x)$ ordering, $I = \langle x^p, y^q \rangle$ and $q > p \geq 1$, we have, $s_{\max} = x^{p-1} y^{q-1}$ and $g_{\max} = y^q$. Therefore, the right staircase is found at most at step $m = x^{2p-2} y^{2q-2}$, while the Gröbner basis is found at most at step $x^{p-1} y^{q-1} \max_{\prec}(x^{p-1} y^{q-1}, y^q)$, i.e. y^{2q-1} if $p = 1$ and $x^{2p-2} y^{2q-2}$ otherwise.

From Propositions A.4 and A.6, we can deduce that $S = \left\{ \frac{\text{fail}(f)}{\text{LM}(f)}, f \notin I \right\}$.

Algorithm 5: The BMS algorithm.

Input: A table $\mathbf{u} = (u_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}^n}$ with coefficients in \mathbb{K} , a monomial ordering $<$ and a monomial M as the stopping condition.

Output: A set G of relations generating I_M .

$T := \{m \in \mathbb{K}[\mathbf{x}], m \leq M\}$. // ordered for $<$

$G := \{1\}$. // the future Gröbner basis

$S := \emptyset$. // staircase edge, elements will be $[h, \text{fail}(h)/\text{LM}(h)]$

For all $m \in T$ **do**

$S' := S$.

For $g \in G$ **do**

If $\text{LM}(g) \mid m$ **then**

$e := \left[\frac{m}{\text{LM}(g)} g \right]_{\mathbf{u}}$.

If $e \neq 0$ **then**

$S' := S' \cup \left\{ \left[\frac{g}{e}, \frac{m}{\text{LM}(g)} \right] \right\}$.

$S' := \min_{\mid} \{[h, \text{fail}(h)/\text{LM}(h)]\}$. // see Remark A.5

$G' := \text{Border}(S')$.

For $g' \in G'$ **do**

Let $g \in G$ such that $\text{LM}(g) \mid \text{LM}(g')$.

If $\text{LM}(g) \nmid m$ **then**

$g' := \frac{\text{LM}(g')}{\text{LM}(g)} g$. // translates the relation

Else if $\exists h \in S, \frac{m}{\text{LM}(g')} \mid \text{fail}(h)$ **then**

$g' := \frac{\text{LM}(g')}{\text{LM}(g)} g - \left[\frac{m}{\text{LM}(g)} g \right]_{\mathbf{u}} \frac{\text{LM}(g') \text{fail}(h)}{m} h$. // see Proposition A.2

Else $g' := g$.

$G := G'$.

$S := S'$.

Return G .

Example A.3. We give the trace of the algorithm called on the binomial sequence \mathbf{b} for the $\text{DRL}(y < x)$ ordering up to monomial x^3 (hence visiting all the monomials of degree at most 3).

To simplify the reading, whenever a relation succeeds in m or cannot be tested in m , we skip the updating part as this relation remains the same.

We start with the empty staircase S and the relation $G = \{1\}$.

For the monomial 1

The relation $g_1 = 1$ fails since $[\mathbf{b}_{0,0}] = 1$. Thus $S' = \{[1, 1]\}$.

S' is updated to $\{[1, 1]\}$ and $G' = \{y, x\}$.

For the relation $g'_1 = y$, $y \nmid 1$ thus $g'_1 = y$.

For the relation $g'_2 = x$, $x \nmid 1$ thus $g'_2 = x$.

We update $G := G' = \{y, x\}$ and $S := S' = \{[1, 1]\}$.

For the monomial y

The relation $g_1 = y$ succeeds since $[\mathbf{b}_{0,1}] = 0$.

Nothing must be done for the relation $g_2 = x$.

S' is set to $\{[1, 1]\}$ and $G' = \{y, x\}$.

We set $g'_1 = y$ and $g'_2 = x$.

We update $G := G' = \{y, x\}$ and $S := S' = \{[1, 1]\}$.

For the monomial x

Nothing must be done for the relation $g_1 = y$.

The relation $g_2 = x$ fails since $[\mathbf{b}_{1,0}] = 1$. Thus $S' = \{[1, 1], [x, 1]\}$.

S' is set to $\{[1, 1]\}$ and $G' = \{y, x\}$.

We set $g'_1 = y$.

For the relation $g'_2 = x$, $x \mid x$ and $\frac{x}{x} \mid \text{fail}(1)$, hence $g'_2 = x - 1$.

We update $G := G' = \{y, x - 1\}$ and $S := S' = \{[1, 1]\}$.

For the monomial y^2

The relation $g_1 = y$ succeeds since $[\mathbf{b}_{0,2}] = 0$.

Nothing must be done for the relation $g_2 = x - 1$.

S' is set to $\{[1, 1]\}$ and $G' = \{y, x\}$.

We set $g'_1 = y$ and $g'_2 = x - 1$.

We update $G := G' = \{y, x - 1\}$ and $S := S' = \{[1, 1]\}$.

For the monomial xy

The relation $g_1 = y$ fails since $[\mathbf{b}_{1,1}] = 1$. Thus $S' = \{[1, 1], [y, x]\}$.

The relation $g_2 = x - 1$ fails since $[\mathbf{b}_{1,1} - \mathbf{b}_{0,1}] = 1$. Thus $S' = \{[1, 1], [y, x], [x - 1, y]\}$.

S' is set to $\{[y, x], [x - 1, y]\}$ and $G' = \{y^2, xy, x^2\}$.

For the relation $g'_1 = y^2$, $y^2 \nmid xy$ thus $g'_1 = y^2$.

For the relation $g'_2 = xy$, $xy \mid xy$ and $\frac{xy}{xy} \mid \text{fail}(y)$, hence $g'_2 = xy - 1$.

For the relation $g'_3 = x^2$, $x^2 \nmid xy$ thus $g'_3 = x^2 - x$.

We update $G := G' = \{y^2, xy-1, x^2-x\}$ and $S := S' = \{[y, x], [x-1, y]\}$.

For the monomial x^2

Nothing must be done for the relation $g_1 = y^2$.

Nothing must be done for the relation $g_2 = xy - 1$.

The relation $g_3 = x^2 - x$ succeeds since $[\mathbf{b}_{2,0} - \mathbf{b}_{1,0}] = 0$.

S' is set to $\{[y, x], [x-1, y]\}$ and $G' = \{y^2, xy, x^2\}$.

We set $g'_1 = y^2$, $g'_2 = xy - 1$ and $g'_3 = x^2 - x$.

We update $G := G' = \{y^2, xy-1, x^2-x\}$ and $S := S' = \{[y, x], [x-1, y]\}$.

For the monomial y^3

The relation $g_1 = y^2$ succeeds since $[\mathbf{b}_{0,3}] = 0$.

Nothing must be done for the relation $g_2 = xy - 1$.

Nothing must be done for the relation $g_3 = x^2 - x$.

S' is set to $\{[y, x], [x-1, y]\}$ and $G' = \{y^2, xy, x^2\}$.

We set $g'_1 = y^2$, $g'_2 = xy - 1$ and $g'_3 = x^2 - x$.

We update $G := G' = \{y^2, xy-1, x^2-x\}$ and $S := S' = \{[y, x], [x-1, y]\}$.

For the monomial xy^2

The relation $g_1 = y^2$ succeeds since $[\mathbf{b}_{1,2}] = 0$.

The relation $g_2 = xy - 1$ succeeds since $[\mathbf{b}_{1,2} - \mathbf{b}_{0,1}] = 0$.

Nothing must be done for the relation $g_3 = x^2 - x$.

S' is set to $\{[y, x], [x-1, y]\}$ and $G' = \{y^2, xy, x^2\}$.

We set $g'_1 = y^2$, $g'_2 = xy - 1$ and $g'_3 = x^2 - x$.

We update $G := G' = \{y^2, xy-1, x^2-x\}$ and $S := S' = \{[x, y], [y, x-1]\}$.

For the monomial x^2y

Nothing must be done for the relation $g_1 = y^2$.

The relation $g_2 = xy - 1$ fails since $[\mathbf{b}_{2,1} - \mathbf{b}_{1,0}] = 1$. Thus $S' = \{[y, x], [x-1, y], [xy-1, x]\}$.

The relation $g_3 = x^2 - x$ fails since $[\mathbf{b}_{2,1} - \mathbf{b}_{1,1}] = 1$. Thus $S' = \{[y, x], [x-1, y], [xy-1, x], [x^2-x, y]\}$.

S' is set to $\{[y, x], [x-1, y]\}$ and $G' = \{y^2, xy, x^2\}$.

We set $g'_1 = y^2$.

For the relation $g'_2 = xy$, $xy|x^2y$ and $\frac{x^2y}{xy}|fail(y)$, hence $g'_3 = xy - y - 1$.

For the relation $g'_3 = x^2$, $x^2|x^2y$ and $\frac{x^2y}{x^2}|fail(x-1)$, hence $g'_3 = x^2 - 2x + 1$.

We update $G := G' = \{y^2, xy - y - 1, x^2 - 2x + 1\}$ and $S := S' = \{[y, x], [x-1, y]\}$.

For the monomial x^3

Nothing must be done for the relation $g_1 = y^2$.

Nothing must be done for the relation $g_2 = xy - y - 1$.

The relation $g_3 = x^2 - 2x + 1$ succeeds since $[\mathbf{b}_{3,0} - 2\mathbf{b}_{2,0} + \mathbf{b}_{1,0}] = 0$.

Let m^+ be the successor of m , $m^+ \text{ LM}(f)$ is the fail of f if

$$H_{\{1, \dots, m, m^+\}, S \cup \{\text{LM}(f)\}} \vec{f} = \begin{matrix} & \dots & s \in S & \dots & \text{LM}(f) \\ 1 & \left(\begin{array}{cccc} \cdots & [s] & \cdots & [\text{LM}(f)] \\ \vdots & \vdots & & \vdots \\ m & \cdots & [m s] & \cdots & [m \text{ LM}(f)] \\ m^+ & \cdots & [m^+ s] & \cdots & [m^+ \text{ LM}(f)] \end{array} \right) & \begin{pmatrix} \vdots \\ \alpha_s \\ \vdots \\ 1 \end{pmatrix} \end{matrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ \vdots \\ 0 \\ e \end{pmatrix},$$

with $e \neq 0$.

We can also write another proof of Proposition A.2 with a matrix viewpoint.

Proof of Proposition A.2. Let $f_1 = \text{LM}(f_1) + \sum_{s \in S} \alpha_s s$ and $f_2 = \text{LM}(f_2) + \sum_{s \in S'} \beta_s s$ be monic. Let v^- be the predecessor of v . Let $\tilde{S} = S \cup S' \setminus \{\text{LM}(f_2), \text{LM}(f_1)\}$, assuming $\text{LM}(f_2) \neq \text{LM}(f_1)$, then we have

$$H_{\{1, \dots, v^-, v\}, \tilde{S} \cup \{\text{LM}(f_2), \text{LM}(f_1)\}} (\vec{f}_1 + c \vec{f}_2) = \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ \vdots \\ 0 \\ e_1 + c e_2 \end{pmatrix}$$

$$\begin{matrix} & \dots & s \in \tilde{S} & \dots & \text{LM}(f_2) & \text{LM}(f_1) \\ 1 & \left(\begin{array}{cccc} \cdots & [s] & \cdots & [\text{LM}(f_2)] & [\text{LM}(f_1)] \\ \vdots & \vdots & & \vdots & \vdots \\ v^- & \cdots & [v^- s] & \cdots & [v^- \text{LM}(f_2)] & [v^- \text{LM}(f_1)] \\ v & \cdots & [v s] & \cdots & [v \text{LM}(f_2)] & [v \text{LM}(f_1)] \end{array} \right) & \begin{pmatrix} \vdots \\ \alpha_s + c \beta_s \\ \vdots \\ c \\ 1 \end{pmatrix} \end{matrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ \vdots \\ 0 \\ e_1 + c e_2 \end{pmatrix}.$$

It is now clear that vector $\vec{f}_1 - \frac{e_1}{e_2} \vec{f}_2$ is in the kernel of this matrix. That is, polynomial $f_1 - \frac{e_1}{e_2} f_2$ has a shift v . \square

Changing every evaluation into a matrix-vector product in the BMS algorithm yields the following presentation of the BMS algorithm, namely Algorithm 6.

Algorithm 6: Linear Algebra variant of the BMS algorithm.

Input: A table $\mathbf{u} = (u_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}^n}$ with coefficients in \mathbb{K} , a monomial ordering $<$ and a monomial M as the stopping condition.

Output: A set G of relations generating I_M .

$T := \{m \in \mathbb{K}[\mathbf{x}], m \leq M\}$. // ordered for $<$

$G := \{1\}$. // the future Gröbner basis

$S := \emptyset$. // staircase edge, elements will be $[h, \text{fail}(h)/\text{LM}(h)]$

For all $m \in T$ **do**

$S' := S$.

For $g \in G$ **do**

If $\text{LM}(g) \mid m$ **then**

$e := H_{\{\frac{m}{\text{LM}(g)}, \text{supp}(g)\}} \vec{g}$.

If $e \neq 0$ **then**

$S' := S' \cup \left\{ \left[\frac{g}{e}, \frac{m}{\text{LM}(g)} \right] \right\}$.

$S' := \min_{\text{fail}(h) \in S'} \{[h, \text{fail}(h)/\text{LM}(h)]\}$. // see Remark A.5

$G' := \text{Border}(S')$.

For $g' \in G'$ **do**

Let $g \in G$ such that $\text{LM}(g) \mid \text{LM}(g')$.

If $\text{LM}(g) \nmid m$ **then**

$g' := \frac{\text{LM}(g')}{\text{LM}(g)} g$. // shifts the relation

Else if $\exists h \in S, \frac{m}{\text{LM}(g')} \mid \text{fail}(h)$ **then**

$g' := \frac{\text{LM}(g')}{\text{LM}(g)} g - \left(H_{\{\frac{m}{\text{LM}(g)}, \text{supp}(g)\}} \vec{g} \right) \frac{\text{LM}(g') \text{fail}(h)}{m} h$. // see Prop. A.2

Else $g' := g$.

$G := G'$

$S := S'$

Return G .