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This paper is about algorithmic invariant theory as it is required within equivariant dynamical systems. The question of generic bifurcation equations (arbitrary equivariant polynomial vector) requires the knowledge of fundamental invariants and equivariants. We discuss computations which are related to this for finite groups and semi-simple Lie groups. We consider questions such as the completeness of invariants and equivariants. Efficient computations are gained by the Hilbert series driven Buchberger algorithm because computation of elimination ideals is heavily required. Applications such as orbit space reduction are presented.
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1. Introduction

This paper deals with algorithmic invariant theory with an emphasis on efficiency of the involved algorithms. Elimination ideals are computed with Gröbner bases (Buchberger, 1985). When a given group action is considered, it is often needed to solve the following problems.

A. Given a set of homogeneous invariants:

(1) What are the relation in the invariants? (This knowledge is needed for the subsequent questions)
(2) Does the set of invariants generate the invariant ring?
(2b) Do the homogeneous invariants generate the ring up to a certain degree?
(3) How is a given invariant represented in terms of fundamental invariants?
(3b) How is the given invariant represented if the fundamental invariants form a Hironaka decomposition?

B. Given a set of homogeneous invariants \( \pi_1, \ldots, \pi_r \) and a set of homogeneous equivariants \( b_1, \ldots, b_s \):

(1) What are the relations?
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(2) Do the given equivariants generate the module of equivariants over the ring generated by the given invariants $\pi_1, \ldots, \pi_r$?

(2b) Is the module generated up to a certain degree?

(3) How does one represent a given equivariant in terms of fundamental invariants and equivariants?

C. Given a representation of a finite group.

(1) How can one determine the fundamental invariants algorithmically such that they form a Hironaka decomposition? (This means that for each invariant there is a unique representation in terms of fundamental invariants which is linear in the secondary invariants.)

(2) How does one determine the fundamental equivariants such that they form a free module over the ring generated by the primary invariants?

D. Given a representation of a compact Lie group. The groups one is interested in dynamical systems are linear reductive groups. Their invariant ring is Cohen–Macaulay, see Bruns and Herzog (1993) and Hochster and Roberts (1974).

(1) How can one compute a homogeneous invariant for a given degree? (Observe that the Reynolds operator for finite groups (projection onto invariants) does not exist or can not be evaluated for continuous groups in this form.)

(2) How can one compute a fundamental set of invariants?

(3) How can one modify a fundamental set of invariants into a Hironaka decomposition? Then each invariant can be written in terms of the fundamental invariants in a unique way.

(4) How does one determine a homogeneous equivariant of a given degree?

(5) How can one compute a generating set of equivariants over a ring generated by a given set of invariants?

(6) Given a set of fundamental invariants and equivariants, how is a Stanley decomposition determined?

There is a lot of information in the literature about all these questions. Table 1 gives an overview of implementations and summarizes the relevant books and articles so far as to whether they contain efficient algorithms. The packages Invar (Kemper, 1993) and Symmetry (Gatermann and Guyard, 1997) are implemented in Maple while implementations for C. 1.) in Singular (Heydtmann, 1997) and Magma (Kemper and Steel, 1997) exist as well.

The new contributions of this paper are the use of the multi-graded Hilbert series driven Buchberger algorithm (Caboara et al., 1996; Gianni et al., 1996) for computation of relations, completeness of equivariants (B. 2), restriction of completeness to certain degree (A. 2b, B. 2b), and membership of free module. Restriction with respect to various gradings is the key for efficiency in the partial completeness questions. This is illustrated by examples which have been computed on a Dec Alpha workstation. These new ideas mainly improve the efficiency of existing algorithms. The algorithmic treatment for continuous groups has been implemented and tested for the first time.

A motivation of this work and the associated software was to provide efficient tools to perform tasks as they arise in equivariant bifurcation theory, equivariant dynamics,
Table 1. Literature containing algorithms answering questions in invariant theory and their implementations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question Task</th>
<th>Literature</th>
<th>Invar</th>
<th>Symmetry</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Given invariants</td>
<td>Becker and Weispfenning (1993, p. 269)</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Relations</td>
<td>Becker and Weispfenning (1993, p. 269)</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Generation</td>
<td>Sturmfels (1993, p. 32)</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Representation</td>
<td>Becker and Weispfenning (1993, p. 269)</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4b</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3b Hironaka repr.</td>
<td>Sturmfels (1993, p. 52)</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Given invs. + equis.</td>
<td>Gatermann (1996b, p. 115)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Relations</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Generation</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3b</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Representation Gatermann (1996b, p. 115)</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Given finite group</td>
<td>Gatermann (1996b, p. 115)</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Compute invs.</td>
<td>Sturmfels (1993, p. 57), Kemper (1996)</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Compute equis. Worfolk (1994), Gatermann (1996b)</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Given Lie group Reynolds projection</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Compute invs.</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Compute parameters Eisenbud and Sturmfels (1994)</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Equiv. projection</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Compute equis.</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Stanley decomposition Sturmfels and White (1991)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

exact solution of symmetric systems of equations by elimination methods, etc. Indeed, these domains appear to be a natural application of algorithmic invariant theory:

(i) The first step in equivariant bifurcation theory (Golubitsky et al., 1988) is to set up a generic equivariant vector field (the bifurcation equations) for a given action of a group. In order to build these equation, one needs nothing else but a set of generators of the module of equivariants for this action. On the theoretical level the famous theorems by Schwarz and Poénaru are an essential ingredient, see Golubitsky et al. (1988, p. 46 and p. 51). Examples of local bifurcation theory are presented in Lari-Lavassani et al. (1997) and a singularity theory approach is done in Gatermann and Lauterbach (1998).

(ii) A special method in equivariant dynamics is known as orbit space reduction. The solutions of a differential equation with symmetry are linked to the solutions of a system of differential equations for a set of fundamental invariants. By this method the group action is ruled out. Although the reduction leads to differential equations on an algebraic variety (restricted to a semi-algebraic set) it has been applied successfully (Chossat, 1993; Chossat and Dias, 1995; Lauterbach and Sanders, 1995; Leis, 1995) because the number of differential equations is often smaller than in the original system. For theoretical results see also Koenig (1997) and Rumberger and Scheurle (1996). The reduced phase space in Hamiltonian systems is similar to the orbit space above.

(iii) Systems of algebraic equations can be solved by the Gröbner basis method such that all solutions are found exactly. If symmetry is present the use of invariant theory is helpful, see Sturmfels (1993, p. 58). In case one is interested in real solutions only, one might as well consider a result involving the fundamental equivariants, see Gatermann (1996b), Jaric et al. (1984) and Worfolk (1994).
For these reasons, the examples and applications in the paper are mainly related to problems occurring in equivariant dynamics. As a tool we use Gröbner bases for the computation of elimination ideals (Buchberger, 1985).

2. Preliminaries: Computations with Ideals and Modules

This section gives an overview of the computations including Gröbner bases. They are necessary in order to understand the sections on algorithmic invariant theory. Moreover, we are using a special variant which proves to be very efficient. For those who want to learn more about it we refer to Becker and Weispfenning (1993), Caboara et al. (1996), Cox et al. (1992), Mishra (1993), and the references therein.

2.1. Gröbner bases and syzygies

We are dealing with ideals in a polynomial ring $K[x_1, \ldots, x_n]$ where the field $K$ is in most practical computations $\mathbb{Q}$. A Gröbner basis is a special ideal basis depending on an order of the monomials.

**Definition 2.1.** (Becker and Weispfenning, 1993, p. 189) ≤ is called a term order, if $\forall \alpha, \beta, \gamma \in K[x_1, \ldots, x_n]$

\[
\begin{align*}
\alpha &\leq \alpha \\
\alpha &\leq \beta \quad \text{and} \quad \beta \leq \gamma \quad \Rightarrow \quad \alpha \leq \gamma \\
\alpha &\leq \beta \quad \text{and} \quad \beta \leq \alpha \quad \Rightarrow \quad \alpha = \beta \\
1 &\leq \alpha \\
\alpha &\leq \beta \quad \Rightarrow \quad \alpha \beta \gamma \leq \beta x^\gamma.
\end{align*}
\]

**Example 2.2.** Let the matrix $M \in \mathbb{Z}^{n \times n}$ have the following properties:

(i) for each column $j$ the first nonzero entry is positive.

\[\forall j \exists k \text{ with } m_{ij} = 0 \quad \forall i < k \quad \text{and} \quad m_{kj} > 0\]

(ii) $M$ has full rank.

By $M\alpha < M\beta$ ($\iff \exists k \text{ with } (M\alpha)_i = (M\beta)_i \forall i < k, (M\alpha)_k < (M\beta)_k$) is a term order defined. Although term orders might be defined in a different way they are almost all equivalent to such a matrix order (Robbiano, 1985; Weispfenning, 1987).

For a polynomial $f \in K[x]$ we denote by $ht(f)$ its leading term, i.e. the monomial with highest order and nonvanishing coefficient $hc(f)$ in $f$:

\[f = hc(f) \cdot ht(f) + \text{ lower order terms}.
\]

**Definition 2.3.** An ideal basis $\{f_1, \ldots, f_m\}$ of $I = (f_1, \ldots, f_m)$ is called a Gröbner basis, if the ideal of the leading terms equals the ideal generated by all leading terms of elements of $I$:

\[(ht(f_1), \ldots, ht(f_m)) = (ht(f))_{f \in I}.
\]
So, the theory of Gröbner bases is closely related to the theory of monomial ideals. Gröbner bases are used to solve systems of equations. From a mathematical point of view it is even more important that the quotient ring $K[x]/I$ with respect to a term order has unique representatives which are computable by a division algorithm modulo on a Gröbner basis. The division algorithm is defined for a set of polynomials $F$. Then $normalf(f,F)$ or short $f^F$ denotes the result of the division applied to $f$ and is called normal form. The result may still depend on how the division is done. It is an important fact that the result of the division algorithm modulo a Gröbner basis is unique.

**Definition 2.4.** A Gröbner basis $\{f_1,\ldots,f_m\}$ such that $\{ht(f_1),\ldots,ht(f_m)\}$ forms a minimal basis of the monomial ideal and the $f_i$ are inter-reduced is called a reduced Gröbner basis.

A reduced Gröbner basis is unique. Although there exists infinitely many term orders for each ideal only a finite number of reduced Gröbner basis exists (Bayer and Morrison, 1988; Mora and Robbiano, 1988; Sturmfels, 1996).

**Definition 2.5.** Given a set $F = \{f_1,\ldots,f_m\}$ with leading terms $ht(f_i)$ a syzygy is a tuple $(s_1,\ldots,s_m) \in K[x]^m$ such that

$$\sum_{i=1}^{m} s_i \cdot he(f_i)ht(f_i) = 0.$$  

The set of all syzygies form a $K[x]$-module denoted by $S(F)$. Each syzygy $s$ corresponds to a polynomial in the ideal generated by $F$ by defining $s \cdot F = \sum_{i=1}^{m} s_i f_i$. The Buchberger algorithm is based on the fact that special sparse syzygies

$$S_{ij} \in S(F), \quad 1 \leq i < j \leq m,$$

form a module basis, where $S_{ij}^k = 0$, $\forall k \neq i, k \neq j$, and

$$S_{ij}^i = \frac{lcm(ht(f_i),ht(f_j))}{ht(f_i)}le(f_j), \quad S_{ij}^{ij} = -\frac{lcm(ht(f_i),ht(f_j))}{ht(f_i)}le(f_i).$$

$S(f_i,f_j) := S_{ij} \cdot F$ is called S-polynomial.

$F$ is a Gröbner basis if

$$normalf(s \cdot f,F) = 0, \quad \forall s \in S(F).$$

This condition is satisfied if it holds for a module basis of $S(F)$, e.g. for the basis $S_{ij}^{ij}, 1 \leq i < j \leq m$. It turns out that $S_{ij}^{ij}$ do not form a minimal basis. Some can be dropped by the Buchberger criteria.

1. Buchberger criterion: If $ht(f_i),ht(f_j)$ are coprime then $S_{ij}^{ij}$ is superfluous.

2. Buchberger criterion: If $ht(f_j)lcm(ht(f_i),ht(f_k))$ and $S_{ij}^{ij}, S_{ij}^{ik}$ are considered then $S_{ij}^{ik}$ is superfluous.
2.2. GRADED RINGS AND GRADED MODULES

Definition 2.6. (Eisenbud, 1995, p. 25) A ring is called graded if a direct sum decomposition $R = \bigoplus_{i=0}^{\infty} R_i$ exists such that
\[ R_i \cdot R_j \subseteq R_{i+j}, \]
holds for all $i, j \in \mathbb{N}$.

Example 2.7. The polynomial ring $K[x]$ with the usual degree is a graded ring. Besides this natural grading there are other gradings: let $w_1, \ldots, w_n \in \mathbb{N}$ be weights on the variables $x_1, \ldots, x_n$. ($W : \{x_1, \ldots, x_n\} \to \mathbb{N}, W(x_i) = w_i$). The weighted degree is defined by
\[ \deg_W(x^\alpha) = \sum_{i=1}^{n} w_i \alpha_i. \]
Polynomials $f = \sum_{\alpha \in A} a_\alpha x^\alpha$ with the property $\deg_W(x^\alpha)$ equal for all $\alpha \in A$ are called $W$-homogeneous. Homogeneous polynomials of a certain degree form vector spaces yielding the graded structure
\[ K[x] = \bigoplus_{i=0}^{\infty} H_W^i(K[x]). \]
The weights $1, \ldots, 1$ refer to the natural grading. All gradings of $K[x]$ are given in this way (Becker and Weispfenning, 1993, p. 467). If all $w_i > 0$ then $H_W^0(K[x]) = K$ and all $K$-vector spaces $H_W^i(K[x])$ have finite dimension.

Of course a ring may be graded several times.

Definition 2.8. (Eisenbud, 1995, p. 42) Let $R$ be a graded ring. A module $M$ is called graded, if it is the direct sum $M = \bigoplus_{j=0}^{\infty} M_j$ such that $R_i M_j \subseteq M_{i+j} \forall i, j \in \mathbb{N}$.

Example 2.9. (i) Let $K[x_1, \ldots, x_n]$ be graded with weights $w_1, \ldots, w_n$. If $z_1, \ldots, z_m$ are additional variables then $\Gamma : \{x_1, \ldots, x_n, z_1, \ldots, z_m\} \to \mathbb{N}$
\[ \Gamma(x_i) = 0, \quad i = 1, \ldots, n, \quad \Gamma(z_j) = 1, \quad j = 1, \ldots, m, \]
defines a grading on $K[x_1, \ldots, x_n, z_1, \ldots, z_m]$ yielding
\[ K[x, z] = \bigoplus_{i=0}^{\infty} H_{\Gamma}^i(K[x, z]). \]
Each $H_{\Gamma}^i(K[x, z])$ is a $K[x]$-module. $H_{\Gamma}^0(K[x, z])$ is especially interesting because each finitely generated, free $K[x]$-module is isomorphic to a $H_{\Gamma}^1(K[x, z])$.
The grading $W$ on $K[x]$ may be extended to $K[x, z]$ by weights on $z_j$:
\[ \Theta : \{z_1, \ldots, z_m\} \to \mathbb{N}, \Theta|_{K[x]} = W. \]
A restriction is a grading of the module $H_{\Gamma}^1(K[x, z])$:
\[ K[x, z] = \bigoplus_{k=0}^{\infty} H_{k}^{\Theta}(K[x, z]), \]
(2.2)
\[H^\Gamma_1(K[x,z]) = \bigoplus_{k=0}^{\infty} H^\Gamma_{1,k}(K[x,z]) \quad \text{with} \quad H^\Gamma_{1,k}(K[x,z]) = H^\Gamma_1(K[x,z]) \cap H_0^\Theta(K[x,z]).\]

(ii) A second example for a graded module is an ideal \(I\) of a \(\Theta\)-graded ring \(K[x]\) which is generated by \(\Theta\)-homogeneous polynomials.

**Definition 2.10.** A \(\Theta\)-homogeneous ideal \(I\) of \(K[x]\) where \(K[x]\) is \(\Theta\)-graded, is an ideal which respects the grading, i.e. is a \(\Theta\)-graded module.

For each \(\Theta\)-homogeneous ideal \(I\) the quotient ring \(K[x]/I\) is a graded module over \(K[x]\) as well.

**Definition 2.11.** (Atiyah and MacDonald, 1969, p. 116) Let \(M\) be a finitely generated, graded module \((M = \bigoplus_{i=0}^{\infty} M_i)\) over a Noetherian graded ring \(R = \bigoplus_{i=0}^{\infty} R_i\) such that \(R_0 = K\) is a field. Then

\[\mathcal{HP}(\lambda) = \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \dim(M_i)\lambda^i,\]

is called the Hilbert–Poincaré series of \(M\). Here \(\dim(M_i)\) denotes the dimension of the \(K\)-vector space \(M_i\).

If \(M\) is multi-graded the multiple Hilbert series is defined in a similar way.

**Definition 2.12.** (Caboara et al., 1996) A tuple of gradings \((W_1, \ldots, W_r)\) of \(K[x]\) is a weight system if for all \(i = 1, \ldots, n\) exists \(j \in \{1, \ldots, r\}\) with \(W_j(x_i) > 0\).

**Example 2.13.** If \(K[x]\) is graded by \(W\) such that all values \(W(x_i) = w_i\) are positive then this grading is a weight system. Then all \(K\)-vector spaces \(H_i(K[x]/I)\) have finite dimension which equals the codimension of \(H_i(I)\) in \(H_i(K[x])\). Thus the Hilbert series \(\mathcal{HP}^{W}_{K[x]/I}\) is well defined.

For monomial ideals the corresponding Hilbert series (single graded or multi-graded) may be computed by an algorithm described in Bayer and Stillman (1992). It is implemented in Macaulay and in Maple in the moregroebner package (Gatermann, 1996a).

It is an important and well-known fact about Gröbner bases that they enable the computation of Hilbert series of homogeneous ideals as was already pointed out in Buchberger (1965).

**Lemma 2.14.** (Macaulay, 1927) Let \((W_1, \ldots, W_r)\) be a weight system for \(K[x]\) and \(I\) a \(W\)-homogeneous ideal. Let \(LT(I)\) be the monomial ideal generated by all leading terms \(ht(f)\) of \(f \in I\) with respect to a term order of \(K[x]\). Then the Hilbert series of \(I\) and \(LT(I)\) are equal.

As the leading terms \(\{ht(f), f \in GB\}\) of a Gröbner basis \(GB\) generate the monomial ideal \(LT(I)\) the series \(\mathcal{HP}_{K[x]/I}\) is easily computed.
2.3. Hilbert series driven Buchberger algorithm

Definition 2.15. Let $U = \{U_1, \ldots, U_r\}$ be a set of gradings of $K[x]$ and $I$ a homogeneous ideal with respect to $U$. Let $d \in \mathbb{N}^r$ be a fixed degree. A finite set of $U$-homogeneous polynomials $F \subset I$ is called a $d$-truncated Gröbner basis of $I$ with respect to $U$ and denoted by $\mathcal{GB}(\bigoplus_{j \leq d} H_j^U(I))$, if

$$\{ht(f) \mid f \in F \text{ and } \deg_{U_i}(f) \leq d_i, i = 1, \ldots, r\},$$

generates (as an ideal, but restricted in degree)

$$\bigcap_{i=1}^r \bigoplus_{j_i=0}^{d_i} H_{j_i}^{U_i}(LT(I)) = \bigoplus_{j \leq d} H_j^U(LT(I)).$$

Observe that this definition only makes sense for homogeneous ideals and that there is no restriction on the term order.

This definition is useful in at least two ways.

Definition 2.16. (Becker and Weispfenning, 1993) Consider $K[x, z]$ with the grading $\Gamma(x_i) = 0, \Gamma(z_j) = 1$. A module Gröbner basis of a submodule of $H^1_I(K[x, z])$ is a truncated Gröbner basis of degree 1 with respect to $\Gamma$.

Lemma 2.17. Let $U = \{U_1, \ldots, U_r\}$ be a set of gradings of $K[x]$ and $d \in \mathbb{N}^r$ a fixed degree. Assume $\mathcal{GB} \subset K[x]$ is a $d$-truncated Gröbner basis of a $U$-homogeneous ideal $I$ with respect to $U$. Let $f \in K[x]$ be a polynomial with $\deg_{U_i}(f) \leq d_i, i = 1, \ldots, r$. Then

$$f \in I \iff \text{normalf}(f, \mathcal{GB}) = 0.$$  

This is the generalization of Theorem 10.39, p. 471 in Becker and Weispfenning (1993) from one grading to multiple grading.

The gradings $U = \{U_1, \ldots, U_r\}$ give rise to gradings on the module of syzygies $S(F)$ for a set $F = \{f_1, \ldots, f_m\}$ in the following way:

$$S \in H_{j_1 \ldots j_r}^{U_1 \ldots U_r}(S(F)) :\iff S_k \cdot ht(f_k) \in H_{j_1 \ldots j_r}^{U_1 \ldots U_r}(K[x]), \quad k = 1, \ldots, m.$$  

The syzygies $S^{kl}$ as defined in (2.1) are especially homogeneous of degree

$$\deg_{U_i}(\lcm(ht(f_k), ht(f_j))).$$  

If the Hilbert series in known information on the structure of the ideal is available it is exploited in order to gain efficiency. Superfluous S-polynomials may be dropped.

Theorem 2.18. Let $U = \{U_1, \ldots, U_r\}$ be a set of gradings of $K[x]$ and the gradings $W = \{W_1, \ldots, W_s\}$ be a weight system of $K[x]$. Let $I \subset K[x]$ be an ideal which is $U$-homogeneous and $W$-homogeneous. Let $d \in \mathbb{N}^r$ be a degree, $F = \{f_1, \ldots, f_m\} \subset I$ a set of $U$-homogeneous, $W$-homogeneous polynomials. Assume the Hilbert series $\mathcal{HP}^W_K(K[x]/I)(\lambda) = \sum_{\lambda \in \mathbb{N}^s} a^i \lambda^i$ is given. Let the Hilbert series of $(LT(F))$ be denoted by $\mathcal{HP}_K^{W}(\lambda) = \sum_{\lambda \in \mathbb{N}^s} b^i \lambda^i$. Assume for all degrees $i \in \mathbb{N}^s$

$$a^i = b^i \quad \text{or} \quad \text{for all syzygies } S := S^{kl}$$
with
\[ \text{deg}_{U,j}(S) \leq d_j, j = 1, \ldots, r, \]
and
\[ \text{deg}_{W,\nu}(S) \leq i_\nu, \nu = 1, \ldots, s \quad \text{normalf}(S \cdot F, F) = 0. \]
Thus \( F \) is a \( d \)-truncated Gröbner basis of \( I \) with respect to \( U \).

**Proof.** In order to show that \( F \) is a \( d \)-truncated Gröbner basis we need to show that for all \( j \leq d \)
\[ \forall S \in H_{i,j}^U(S(F)) \quad \text{normalf}(S \cdot F, F) = 0 \quad \text{holds.} \]
We take advantage of the weight system \( W \) and look at the decomposition
\[ H_i^U(S(F)) = \bigoplus_{i,j \in \mathbb{N}^r} H_{i,j}^{W,U}(S(F)). \]
We need to show for all \( j \leq d \) and all \( i \in \mathbb{N}^s \)
\[ \forall S \in H_{i,j}^{W,U}(S(F)) \quad \text{normalf}(S \cdot F, F) = 0 \quad \text{holds.} \quad (2.4) \]
Consider one fixed pair \( (i, j) \). The vector space \( H_{i,j}^{W,U}(S(F)) \) is part of a module which is generated by the syzygies \( S_{kl} \). Only syzygies \( S_{kl} \) of degree \( \deg_U(S_{kl}) \leq j \leq d \) and \( \deg_W(S_{kl}) \leq i \) generate elements in \( H_{i,j}^{W,U}(S(F)) \). This implies: if \( \text{normalf}(S \cdot F, F) = 0 \) for all \( S_{kl} \) of degree \( \deg_U(S_{kl}) \leq j \leq d \) and \( \deg_W(S_{kl}) \leq i \) then for all \( S \in H_{i,j}^{W,U}(S(F)) \) \( \text{normalf}(S \cdot F, F) = 0 \) holds. So condition (2.4) is satisfied for this particular pair \( (i, j) \).
But there is a second possibility to check condition (2.4) which avoids the computation of the normal forms of \( S \)-polynomials. This argumentation uses a second decomposition
\[ H_i^W(S(F)) = \bigoplus_{\nu \in \mathbb{N}^r} H_{i,\nu}^{W,U}(S(F)). \quad (2.5) \]
We are interested in the case \( \nu = j \) for the moment. Considering the two Hilbert series \( H_{K[x]}^W(\lambda) = \sum_{i \in \mathbb{N}^s} a^i \lambda^i \) and \( H_{K[x]/(LT(F))}^W(\lambda) = \sum_{i \in \mathbb{N}^s} b^i \lambda^i \) the equality of dimensions \( a^i = b^i \) implies
\[ \forall S \in H_i^W(S(F)) \quad \text{normalf}(S \cdot F, F) = 0. \]
The decomposition (2.5) tells us that particularly for \( \nu = j \)
\[ \forall S \in H_{i,j}^{W,U}(S(F)) \quad \text{normalf}(S \cdot F, F) = 0, \]
which is condition (2.4). Since the argumentation is similar for all degrees \( (i, j) \) with \( j \leq d \) and we used only the assumptions in the theorem the proof is complete. □

An implementation using this theorem motivated by the nontruncated version of the multi-graded Hilbert series driven Buchberger algorithm in Caboara et al. (1996) is available by on-line, (Gatermann, 1996a). The basic idea is to climb up by \( W \)-degree and to exploit the Hilbert series. At degree \( i \) there are \( b^i - a^i \) polynomials missing in order to form a nontruncated Gröbner basis. If \( b^i = a^i \) then the remaining \( S \)-polynomials are discarded. As \( S \)-polynomials of \( U \)-degree \( > d \) are neglected one may not come to the point where \( S \)-polynomials are discarded because of the Hilbert series information. In this case the normal form computation for all \( S \)-polynomials needs to be carried out.
Observe that the exploitation of the Buchberger criteria is not affected by the truncation because the gradings give rise to gradings on the module of syzygies.

2.4. Elimination

Let \( I \subseteq K[x_1, \ldots, x_n, y_1, \ldots, y_m] \) be an ideal.

**Definition 2.19.** \( \tilde{I} = I \cap K[y] \) is called the elimination ideal of \( I \) in \( K[y] \).

**Definition 2.20.** A monomial order \( \leq \) of \( K[x,y] \) is called an elimination order, if

\[
x^\alpha y^\gamma \geq y^\delta
\]

for all cases with \( x^\alpha \neq 1 \).

By Becker and Weispfenning (1993, p. 257 Lemma 6.14) it is sufficient to demand

\[
x^\alpha \geq y^\delta \quad \forall x^\alpha \neq 1, y^\delta.
\]

**Example 2.21.** Elimination orders on \( K[x_1, \ldots, x_n, y_1, \ldots, y_m] \) include

(a) the lexicographical order.
(b) all matrix orders with matrix \( M = (M_{ij}) \) with first column \( M_{1i} = 1, i = 1, \ldots, n, \)
\[
M_{1i} = 0, i = n + 1, \ldots, n + m.
\]
This includes the elimination order by Bayer and Stillman.
(c) block orders \( \geq \) consisting of orders \( \geq_x \) and \( \geq_y \) on \( K[x] \) and \( K[y] \), respectively.
\[
(x^\alpha y^\gamma > x^\beta y^\delta \iff x^\alpha > x^\beta \text{ or } x^\alpha = x^\beta \text{ and } y^\gamma > y^\delta).
\]

**Lemma 2.22.** (Becker and Weispfenning, 1993, p. 269; Cox et al., 1992, p. 329)

Let \( f_1, \ldots, f_m \in K[x_1, \ldots, x_n] \) and \( \leq \) be an elimination order for \( K[x_1, \ldots, x_n, y_1, \ldots, y_m] \).

Let \( GB \) be a Gröbner basis of

\[
I = (f_1(x) - y_1, \ldots, f_m(x) - y_m).
\]

Then \( GB \cap K[y] \) is a Gröbner basis of the elimination ideal with respect to \( \leq_{|K[y]} \).

(i) \( f(x) \in K[f_1, \ldots, f_m] \iff \text{normal}(f, GB)(x, y) \in K[y] \).

(ii) if \( f \in K[f_1, \ldots, f_m] \) then \( g := \text{normal}(f, GB) \in K[y] \) gives a rewriting \( f(x) = g(f_1(x), \ldots, f_m(x)) \).

Observe that \( \text{normal}(f, GB) \) depends in general on the term order. The relevance of Lemma 2.22 is that \( K[f_1(x), \ldots, f_m(x)] \) and \( K[y]/\tilde{I} \) are isomorphic as rings.

3. Gröbner Bases for Invariants and Equivariants

In equivariant dynamics we are concerned with the invariant ring and the module of equivariants. Assume \( G \) is a group and \( \vartheta : G \rightarrow GL(K^n) \) its representation. Let \( \rho : G \rightarrow GL(K^m) \) be another representation. (Of course the field \( K \) is \( \mathbb{R} \) in theory, but for practical computations it often will be \( \mathbb{Q} \) or an extension of it.) Moreover, we assume that \( \vartheta, \rho \) are orthogonal.
$p \in K[x]$ is called invariant, if
\[ p(\vartheta(g)x) = p(x), \quad \forall g \in G. \]
By $K[x]_\vartheta$ we denote the invariant ring. $f \in K[x]^m$ is called \(\vartheta\)-equivariant, if
\[ f(\vartheta(g)x) = \rho(g)f(x), \quad \forall g \in G. \]
The $K[x]_\vartheta$-module of \(\vartheta\)-equivariants is denoted by $K[x]_{\vartheta}^\rho$.

In equivariant dynamical systems one studies
\[
\dot{x} = f(x),
\]
where $f$ is a generic equivariant vector field. $f$ is polynomial if a truncation of the Taylor expansion has been performed. So the knowledge of generators of the invariant ring and the module are the key for investigation of generic equivariant dynamical systems.

### 3.1. Relations

Let $\{p_1, \ldots, p_k\}$ denote the Hilbert basis of the invariant ring $K[x]_\vartheta$. The relations among the basis elements are easily determined with the help of Gröbner bases. Recall that the relations are polynomials $r \in K[y_1, \ldots, y_k]$ with $r(p_1(x), \ldots, p_k(x)) = 0$. They form an ideal.

**Algorithm 3.1. (Relations in Fundamental Invariants up to Degree $d$)**

**INPUT:** Invariant polynomials $p_1(x), \ldots, p_k(x) \in K[x]$, homogeneous with respect to the natural grading $N$ on $K[x]$.

**OUTPUT:** relations $r_1, \ldots, r_l \in K[y_1, \ldots, y_k]$

(i) Compute the Hilbert series $\mathcal{H}_K[x,y]/(y_1, \ldots, y_k)$ with respect to the induced grading $W : \{x, y\} \to \mathbb{N}, W_1(x) = N, W(y_i) = \deg_N(p_i(x)), i = 1, \ldots, k$.

(ii) Choose an elimination order $\leq$ on $K[x,y]$ which eliminates $x$.

(iii) Compute a Gröbner basis $\mathcal{GB}(\bigoplus_{d \leq} H^W_1(I))$ of the ideal
\[ I := (p_1(x) - y_1, \ldots, p_k(x) - y_k) \subset K[x,y], \]
with respect to the elimination order, using the Hilbert series driven Buchberger algorithm with the Hilbert series under (i), truncate with respect to the grading $W$ up to degree $d$. The polynomials $\mathcal{GB} \cap K[y]$ are $W_{\{y\}}$-homogeneous and form a truncated Gröbner basis of degree $d$ with respect to $W$ of the ideal of relations $\tilde{I} \subset K[y]$.

**Proof.** Without exploiting homogeneity the correctness of the algorithm is given by Lemma 2.22. As the polynomials $p_i(x) - y_i, i = 1, \ldots, k$ are homogeneous with respect to the induced grading $W$, it makes sense to use truncation and the Hilbert series driven Buchberger algorithm. By the 1. Buchberger criterion the polynomials $p_i(x) - y_i$ form a Gröbner basis of $I$ with respect to a term order which select $y_i$ as leading terms. The Hilbert series $\mathcal{H}_K^{W}[x,y]/I(\lambda)$ is given by the series of the monomial ideal $(y_1, \ldots, y_k)$ by Lemma 2.14. The restriction $W_{\{y\}}$ is a weighted grading on $K[y]$. As $p_i - y_i$ are homogeneous all other polynomials in the Buchberger algorithm are homogeneous, especially $\mathcal{GB}(\tilde{I})$. Thus the ideal of relations is $W$-homogeneous and it makes sense to consider the part up to degree $d$. \(\square\)
Remark 3.2. (i) Different choices of elimination term orders in (ii) give different sets of output polynomials. Nevertheless, the same space $\bigoplus_{i=0}^{d} H_{i}^{W}(\tilde{I})$ is generated. (ii) In case no Hilbert series driven Buchberger algorithm is available, special choices of an elimination order greatly influence the cpu time. Good experience has been gained with a matrix order with first row given by $W$. As $p_{i} - y_{i}$ are $W$-homogeneous this does not affect the final Gröbner basis, but gives good exploitation of the Buchberger criteria because the S-polynomials are ordered with respect to sugar and then ties are broken by the term order.

Given some homogeneous invariant polynomials $p_{1}(x), \ldots, p_{k}(x)$ and some homogeneous equivariants $f_{1}(x), \ldots, f_{l}(x) \in K[x]_{0}$ one denotes by relations the set of polynomials $\mathcal{R} = \{ r \in K[y, u] \mid r(p(x), f(x)) \equiv 0, r \in H^{\Gamma}_{1}(K[y, u]) \}$, where $\Gamma : \{y, u\} \to \mathbb{N}, \Gamma_{\{y\}} = 0, \Gamma_{\{u\}} = N$ is a Kronecker grading.

It is interesting to know a generating set of $\mathcal{R}$ since the $K[p(x)]$-module generated by $f_{1}, \ldots, f_{l}$ is isomorphic to the $K[y,I]$-module $H^{\Gamma}_{1}(K[y, u]) / \mathcal{R}$, where $I$ is the ideal of relations in the invariants.

A Gröbner basis $\mathcal{GB}(\tilde{I})$ gives some generators $u_{i} \cdot g_{i}, g_{i} \in \mathcal{GB}(\tilde{I}), i = 1, \ldots, l$, of $\mathcal{R}$. By the following algorithm these are completed to a generating set of $\mathcal{R}$.

Algorithm 3.3. (Relations in Fundamental Invariants and Equivariants up to Degree $d$)

**Input:** homogeneous invariants $p_{1}(x), \ldots, p_{k}(x)$

homogeneous equivariants $f_{1}(x), \ldots, f_{l}(x) \in K[x]^{m}$

degree $d$

**Output:** relations $r_{1}, \ldots, r_{s} \in H^{\Gamma}_{1}(K[y, u])$

(i) Choose slack variables $z_{1}, \ldots, z_{m}$.

(ii) Choose a term order $\leq$ on $K[x, z, y, u]$ which eliminates $x$ and $z$.

(iii) $W : \{x, z, y, u\} \to \mathbb{N}, W_{\{x\}} = N, W_{\{z\}} = 0, W_{\{y\}} = \deg_{N}(p_{i}(x)), i = 1, \ldots, k, W(u_{i}) = \deg_{N}(f_{j}(x)), i = 1, \ldots, l$.

(iv) Compute $\mathcal{GB}(\bigoplus_{i \leq d} H_{i}^{W}(I))$ with respect to $\leq_{K[x,y]}$ of $I = (p_{1}(x) - y_{1}, \ldots, p_{k}(x) - y_{k}) \subset K[x,y]$ by Algorithm 3.1.

(v) Use grading $U : \{x, z, y, u\} \to \mathbb{N}, U_{\{x,y\}} = 0, U_{\{z,u\}} = N$.

(vi) $g_{i}(x,z) := \sum_{j=1}^{m} (f_{i}(x))_{j} z_{j}, i = 1, \ldots, l$. Define $J = (p_{1}(x) - y_{1}, \ldots, p_{k}(x) - y_{k}, g_{1}(x,z) - u_{1}, \ldots, g_{l}(x,z) - u_{l}) \subset K[x, z, y, u]$.

(vii) Compute the Hilbert series $\mathcal{HP}^{W+U}_{K[x,z,y,u]/J}$ equal to the Hilbert series given by $(y_{1}, \ldots, y_{k}, u_{1}, \ldots, u_{l})$.

(viii) Compute $\mathcal{GB}(\bigoplus_{(i,j) \leq (d,1)} H_{i,j}^{W,U}(J))$ with respect to $\leq$ of $J$. Use the Hilbert series driven Buchberger algorithm with Hilbert series $\mathcal{HP}^{W+U}_{K[x,z,y,u]/J}$ as under (vii) and as input use $\mathcal{GB} \left( \bigoplus_{i \leq d} H_{i}^{W}(I) \right)$ and normalf($g_{i}(x,z) - u_{i}$, $\mathcal{GB} \left( \bigoplus_{i \leq d} H_{i}^{W}(I) \right)$, $i = 1, \ldots, l$.

(ix) The relations are $\mathcal{GB} \cap H^{\Gamma}_{1}(K[y, u])$. 
PROOF. By using the slack variables the relations in \( p_i \) and \( g_j \) of degree 1 equals the set \( R \), the relations in \( p_i \) and \( f_j \). The grading \( U \) enables the restriction to the module. The Gröbner basis of \( J \) gives a Gröbner basis of \( J = J \cap K[y,u] \) by Lemma 2.22. With \( U \) one obtains a Gröbner basis of \( \bigoplus_{i=0}^1 H_i^J(J) \) where \( H_0(J) = \bar{I} \). As \( I \subset J \) one can first compute a Gröbner basis of \( I \). Because \( J \) is homogeneous with respect to \( W \) and the Buchberger algorithm preserves homogeneity one can restrict to degree \( d \). □

**Remark 3.4.** (i) If no Hilbert series driven Buchberger algorithm is available Remark 3.2 is valid analogously.

(ii) If the representation \( \rho : G \to GL(K^m) \) contains no trivial irreducible representation in its isotypic decomposition the efficiency can be improved significantly by using a term order which eliminates \( x \) only. If \( \rho \) contains not the trivial representation the slack variables are eliminated automatically. \( \rho \) induces an action on \( z \) as \( \rho^i : G \to GL(K^m) \), \( g \mapsto \rho(g)^i \). The polynomials \( g_i(x,z) \) are \( (\rho + \rho^i) \)-invariant. \( J \cap H_1^J(K[z,y]) \) is generated over \( K[y] \) by the \( \rho^i \)-invariant in \( K[z] \) of degree 1. As \( \rho \) has no trivial irreducible representation there exists no \( \rho^i \)-invariant of degree 1 and thus \( J \cap H_1^J(K[z,y]) = 0 \). Because of the symmetry this is equivalent to \( J \cap H_1^J(K[z,y,u]) = J \cap H_1^J(K[y,u]) \).

(iii) If \( \rho \) contains the trivial representation then one should use an elimination order which first eliminates \( x \) and in a second step \( z \).

(iv) It is preferable to use the weight system \([U + W, W]\) instead of \([U, W]\) because \( U + W \) is already a weight system. This is used in the Hilbert series driven version of the Buchberger algorithm.

**Example 3.5.** In order to investigate a Takens–Bogdanov point with \( D_3 \)-symmetry in Matthies (1996) a generic equivariant vector field is investigated for the action of \( D_3 \) generated by

\[
\text{flip}(v,w) = (\bar{v}, \bar{w}), \quad \text{and rotation} \ (v,w) = (e^{i \frac{2\pi}{3}} v, e^{i \frac{2\pi}{3}} w),
\]

which decomposes as two times the natural two-dimensional action. The invariants and equivariants in these coordinates are suggested as

\[
s_1 = v \bar{v}, \quad s_2 = w \bar{w}, \quad t_0 = w^3 + \bar{w}^3, \quad t_3 = v^3 + \bar{v}^3, \\
s_3 = v \bar{w} + \bar{v} w, \quad t_4 = v w^2 + \bar{v} \bar{w}^2, \quad t_2 = v^2 w + \bar{v}^2 \bar{w},
\]

\[
g_0 = \begin{pmatrix} v \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad g_1 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ v \end{pmatrix}, \quad g_2 = \begin{pmatrix} w \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad g_3 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ w \end{pmatrix},
\]

and

\[
f_j = \begin{pmatrix} \bar{v}^3 \bar{w}^{3-j-1} \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad h^j = \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ \bar{v}^j \bar{w}^{3-j-1} \end{pmatrix}, \quad j = 0, 1, 2.
\]

The complex notation is chosen since this is common in analysis and is appropriate for hand calculations. For computation in a Computer Algebra Package one chooses different coordinates: \( v = v_r + i \cdot v_i, w = w_r + i \cdot w_i \). Then the invariants and equivariants are

\[
s_1 = v_r^2 + v_i^2, \quad s_2 = w_r^2 + w_i^2, \quad t_0 = 2 w_r^3 - 6 w_r w_i^2, \\
t_3 = 2 v_r^3 - 6 v_r v_i^2, \quad s_3 = 2 v_r w_r + 2 v_i w_i, \\
t_1 = 2 v_r w_r^2 - 2 v_r w_i^2 - 4 v_i w_r w_i, \quad t_2 = 2 v_r^2 w_r - 4 v_r v_i w_i - 2 v_i^2 w_r, \\
g_0 = [v_r, v_i, 0, 0], \quad g_1 = [0, 0, v_r, v_i], \quad g_2 = [w_r, w_i, 0, 0], \quad g_3 = [0, 0, w_r, w_i],
\]
Table 2. Computation of relations in invariants and equivariants for $D_3 + D_3$ with and without use of Hilbert series and as in Algorithm 3.3.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Relations in invariants</th>
<th>Relations in equivariants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No HP</td>
<td>With HP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total nr of pairs</td>
<td>3003</td>
<td>1743</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elim. pairs by trunc.</td>
<td>39952</td>
<td>21148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elim. pairs by criteria</td>
<td>2502</td>
<td>1276</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elim. pairs by HP</td>
<td>322</td>
<td>2469</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treated pairs</td>
<td>501</td>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPU</td>
<td>807 s</td>
<td>239 s</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[
f_0 = [w_r^2 - w_i^2, -2w_rw_i, 0, 0], \quad f_1 = [v_rw_r - v_iw_i, -v_rw_i - v_iw_r, 0, 0],
\]
\[
f_2 = [v_r^2 - v_i^2, -2v_rv_i, 0, 0], \quad h_0 = [0, 0, w_r^2 - w_i^2, -2w_rw_i],
\]
\[
h_1 = [0, 0, v_rw_r - v_iw_i, -v_rw_i - v_iw_r], \quad h_2 = [0, 0, v_r^2 - v_i^2, -2v_rv_i].
\]

Table 2 shows some statistics of the computations of the relations. With the algorithms in Subsection 3.2 it could be shown that the invariant ring and the module of equivariants are generated completely, which Matthies had previously done using polar coordinates.

3.2. Completeness

Given some homogeneous invariants it is easily checked by using Gröbner bases whether the invariant ring $K[x]_0$ is generated up to degree $d$. Without restriction in degree this is Algorithm 2.2.5 p. 32 in Sturmfels (1993).

Algorithm 3.6. (Completeness of Invariants up to Degree $d$)

**INPUT:** Molien series of invariant ring $\mathcal{H}P_{K[x]_0}(z)$, homogeneous invariants $p_1(x), \ldots, p_k(x)$, degree $d$

**OUTPUT:** true or minimal degree of missing invariant

(i) Compute relations $\mathcal{GB}(\bigoplus_{i \leq d} H_i^W(\tilde{I}))$ by Algorithm 3.1.

(ii) $LT := \{ht(f) | f \in \mathcal{GB}\}$

(iii) Compute $\mathcal{HP}_{K[y]/(LT)}^W(z)$

(iv) If $\mathcal{HP}_{K[y]/(LT)}^W(z) \equiv \mathcal{HP}_{K[x]_0}^W(z)$ then “invariants generate invariant ring completely”,

If $\text{series}(\mathcal{HP}_{K[y]/(LT)}^W(z), d) \equiv \text{series}(\mathcal{HP}_{K[x]_0}^W(z), d)$ then true

else mindeg(series(\mathcal{HP}_{K[x]_0}^W(z) - \mathcal{HP}_{K[y]/(LT)}^W(z), d)

**PROOF.** As $p_1, \ldots, p_k$ are invariants we have $K[p(x)] \subset K[x]_0$. As $p_i$ are homogeneous in the natural grading $N$ we have, moreover,

\[
H_i^N(K[p]) \subset H_i^N(K[x]_0), \quad i = 0, \ldots,
\]
and thus
\[ \dim H^N_i(K[p]) \leq \dim H^N_i(K[x]_\partial), \quad i = 0, \ldots. \]
Thus one only needs to compare \( \mathcal{H}P^N_{K[y]_\partial}(z) \) and \( \mathcal{H}P^N_{K[z]_\partial}(z) \) (up to degree \( d \)). As the ideal of relations \( \tilde{I} \subset K[y] \) is homogeneous with respect to the induced grading \( W \) the residue ring \( K[y]/\tilde{I} \) is graded by \( W_{\{y\}} \) as well. Moreover, \( K[y]/\tilde{I} \) with respect to \( W \) and \( K[y]/\tilde{I} \) with respect to the natural grading are isomorphic as graded rings. Thus \( \mathcal{H}P^W_{K[y]_\partial}(z) = \mathcal{H}P^W_{K[y]/\tilde{I}}(z) \). By Lemma 2.14 the Gröbner basis \( GB \) of \( \tilde{I} \) yields \( \mathcal{H}P^N_{K[y]_\partial}(z) = \mathcal{H}P^W_{K[y]/\tilde{I}}(z) \). If one truncates the Gröbner basis to degree \( d \) the last equality is only valid for degrees \( 0, 1, \ldots, d \). \( \Box \)

For the equivariants the algorithmic treatment is analogous.

**Algorithm 3.7. (Completeness of Fundamental Equivariants up to Degree \( d \))**

**Input:** Hilbert–Poincaré series \( \mathcal{H}P^N_{K[x]_\partial}(z) \) of \( K[x]_\partial \)-module of equivariants \( K[x]_\partial \), homogeneous invariants \( p_1(x), \ldots, p_k(x) \), homogeneous equivariants \( f_1(x), \ldots, f_l(x) \), degree \( d \)

**Output:** true, if \( K[x]_\partial \) is generated by \( f_1, \ldots, f_l \) as \( K[p] \)-module up to degree \( d \) else minimal degree of missing part.

(i) Compute \( GB(\bigoplus_{(i,j) \leq (a,1)} H^W_{i,j}(\tilde{J}) \) as in Algorithm 3.3.

(ii) Define \( LT := \{ \text{ht}(f)|f \in GB \} \).

(iii) Compute the Hilbert series of the \( K[p] \)-module \( M \) generated by \( f_1, \ldots, f_l \) by

\[ \text{hp} := 0 \]

for \( j \) from 1 to \( l \) do

\[ T_i = \{ y^a \in K[y]|y^a \in LT \text{ or } u_i y^a \in LT \} \]

\[ \text{hp} := \text{hp} + \sum_{\text{deg}(f_i)} \cdot \mathcal{H}P^N_{K[y]/(T_i)}(z) \]

\[ \mathcal{H}P^N_M(z)|_{0 \cdots d} = \mathcal{H}P^W_{H^1_{\tilde{J}}(K[y,u])/(\tilde{R})(z)|_{0 \cdots d} := \text{hp}(z)|_{0 \cdots d} \]

(iv) If \( \mathcal{H}P^N_M(z) = \mathcal{H}P^N_{K[x]_\partial}(z) \) then “module is generated completely”.

If series(\( \mathcal{H}P^N_M(z), d \)) = series(\( \mathcal{H}P^N_{K[x]_\partial}(z), d \)) then true

else mindeg(series(\( \mathcal{H}P^N_M(z) - \mathcal{H}P^N_{K[x]_\partial}(z), d \)).

**Proof.** As in the proof of correctness of Algorithm 3.6 we use that \( K[p] \) and \( K[y]/\tilde{I} \) are isomorphic as graded rings with respect to the natural grading \( N \) and \( W_{\{y\}} \), respectively. For \( \tilde{J} := J \cap K[y,u] \) the submodule \( H^W_{1\tilde{J}}(\tilde{J}) = R \) is a module over \( K[y] \) and as \( H^U_{1\tilde{J}}(\tilde{J}) = \tilde{I} \) and \( \bigoplus_{i=0}^{\tilde{I}} u_i \tilde{I} \subset H^W_{1\tilde{J}}(\tilde{J}) \) the module is a \( K[y]/\tilde{I} \)-module. As \( H^W_{1\tilde{J}}(\tilde{J}) \) is generated by \( W_{\{y,u\}} \)-homogeneous elements the quotient \( H^W_{1\tilde{J}}(K[y,u])/H^U_{1\tilde{J}}(\tilde{J}) \) is graded by the quotient grading of \( W \) over the graded ring \( K[y]/\tilde{I} \).

In fact, the \( K \)-vector spaces

\[ H^W_{1\tilde{J}} \left( H^U_{1\tilde{J}}(K[y,u])/H^U_{1\tilde{J}}(\tilde{J}) \right) \text{ and } H^N(M) \]

are isomorphic for all \( i \). Together \( U, W \) form a weight system. Thus the spaces have the same dimension and the Hilbert series are equal.

In a generalization of Lemma 2.14 the \( K[y]/\tilde{I} \)-module \( H^U_{1\tilde{J}}(K[y,u])/H^U_{1\tilde{J}}(\tilde{J}) \) and the \( K[y]/LT(\tilde{I}) \)-module \( H^U_{1\tilde{J}}(K[y,u])/LT(H^U_{1\tilde{J}}(\tilde{J})) \) are isomorphic as \( W \)-graded modules. The
For the equivariants Leis has given $LT$ generate of $H$ is of course only valid up to degree $d$. In Leis (1995) a Hopf bifurcation with Example 3.8. After reduction to a fixed point space one is left with the action $E_i$ as $W$ in the gradings by deg $\alpha$. The monomials $\bigcup_{i=1}^4 u_i LT(\mathcal{GB}(H_0^U))$ and

$\{m \in LT(\mathcal{GB}(H_0^U(J) + H_1^U(J))| deg_U(m) = 1\}$

generate $LT(H_1^U(J))$.

By exploiting $LT(H_1^U(J)) = \bigoplus_{i=1}^4 u_i \cdot (T_i)$ the modules $H_1^U(K[y, u])/H_1^U(J)$ and $\bigoplus_{i=1}^4 K[y]/(T_i)$ are isomorphic. As graded modules one needs to take into account the shifts in the gradings by $deg_U(u_i) = deg_N(f_i)$.

In case the Gröbner basis is only computed up to degree $d$ the computed Hilbert series is of course only valid up to degree $d$. □

**Example 3.8.** In Leis (1995) a Hopf bifurcation with $O(3)$ symmetry is investigated. After reduction to a fixed point space one is left with the action

$r_\theta(z_-, z_0, z_2) = (e^{-i\theta} z_-, z_0, e^{i\theta} z_2),$

$\kappa(z_-, z_0, z_2) = (z_2, z_0, z_-),$

$\phi(z_-, z_0, z_2) = (e^{i\theta} z_-, e^{i\theta} z_0, e^{i\theta} z_2),$

of $O(2) \times S^1$ where $S^1$ comes in due to the Hopf bifurcation. The invariants are suggested as

$\pi_1 = |z_0|^2,$

$\pi_2 = |z_-|^2 + |z_2|^2,$

$\pi_3 = |z_-|^2 \cdot |z_2|^2,$

$\pi_4 = \frac{1}{2} (z_0^2 z_- z_2 + z_2^2 z_2 z_- z_0),$  $\pi_5 = \frac{i}{2} (\overline{z_0^2 z_- z_2} - z_0^2 z_- z_2 z_0,$

For the equivariants Leis has given

$e_1 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ z_0 \end{pmatrix},$  $e_2 = \begin{pmatrix} z_- \\ 0 \end{pmatrix},$  $e_3 = \begin{pmatrix} z_- z_2^2 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix},$

$e_4 = \frac{1}{2} \begin{pmatrix} z_0^2 z_2 \\ 2 z_- z_2 z_0 \\ z_0^2 z_2 \end{pmatrix},$  $e_5 = -\frac{i}{2} \begin{pmatrix} \overline{z_0^2 z_2} \\ -2 z_- z_2 \overline{z_0} \\ z_0^2 \overline{z_2} \end{pmatrix},$

such that the equivariants are $E_i = (e_i, e_i)$. These coordinates are very common in dynamical systems. Then the multiplication for a complex number $c$ is meant to be $c \cdot E_i = (c \cdot e_i, c \cdot \overline{e_i})$. In order to be able to compute one needs to change coordinates:

$z_2 = \frac{1}{2} \sqrt{2} (x_1 + i \cdot y_1), z_0 = \frac{1}{2} \sqrt{2} (x_2 + i \cdot y_2), z_2 = \frac{1}{2} \sqrt{2} (x_3 + i \cdot y_3)$ or equivalently $(z, \overline{z}) = A \cdot (x, y)$. The transformed equivariants are

$A^{-1} \cdot E_i (A \cdot (x, y)), A^{-1} \cdot (i \cdot e_i (A \cdot (x, y)) - i \cdot e_i (A \cdot (x, y))) = i = 1, \ldots, 5,$
which gives 10 equivariants. The Molien series and the equivariant Molien series have been computed in Leis (1995) with the Weyl integral formula and theorem of residues to be

$$\mathcal{HP}_{O(2) \times S^1}(\lambda) = \frac{1 + \lambda^4}{(1 - \lambda^2)^2 \cdot (1 - \lambda^4)^2}, \quad \mathcal{HP}^{O^2(2) \times S^1}(\lambda) = \frac{4\lambda + 6\lambda + 2\lambda^5}{(1 - \lambda^2)^2 \cdot (1 - \lambda^4)^2}.$$  

The completeness question for the equivariants turned out to be a hard problem. Table 3 gives some timings. In Leis (1995) the question has been considered up to degree 5 only. Our procedure allows to make the calculation of complete generation of the module for the first time.

3.3. ORBIT SPACE REDUCTION

In equivariant dynamics there is one method known as orbit space reduction, see Chossat (1993), Chossat and Dias (1995), Lauterbach and Sanders (1995) and Koenig (1997). Assume an equivariant system

$$\dot{x} = f(x), \quad x \in \mathbb{R}^n, \quad (3.1)$$

where $f \in \mathbb{R}[x]_\theta$. Without restriction we may assume that $\theta$ is orthogonal because this is true for compact Lie groups, see Fulton and Harris (1991). Let $p_1(x), \ldots, p_k(x)$ be the fundamental invariants which generate $\mathbb{R}[x]_\theta$. Then the dynamic of (3.1) is closely related to the dynamic of a system

$$\dot{y} = g(y), \quad y \in \mathbb{R}^k + \text{algebraic relations} \quad (3.2)$$

because

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial t} p_i(x) = \left(\frac{dp_i}{dx}\right)^t \dot{x} = \left(\frac{dp_i}{dx}\right)^t f(x) = \left(\frac{dp_i}{dx}, f(x)\right) = h_i(x) = g_i(p_1(x), \ldots, p_k(x)),$$

for $i = 1, \ldots, k$, where $g_i \in R[y]$ exist with this property because $h_i$ is invariant. The gradient of an invariant is equivariant and the inner product of two equivariants is an invariant because the inner product $(\cdot, \cdot)$ is invariant for orthogonal representations. There is a lot to say about the topological structure but that is beyond the scope of this paper. Here we are only interested in those calculations which are often done by hand but can be done by computer.

The algebraic relations are computed by Algorithm 3.1. It is well known in Computer Algebra but not in Analysis that the rewriting of $h_i$ in $g_i(p(x))$ is done with Gröbner bases, see Lemma 2.22.

**Algorithm 3.9. (Orbit Space Reduction)**

**Input:** equivariant $f(x) \in K[x]_\theta$, homogeneous invariants $p_1(x), \ldots, p_k(x)$ generating $K[x]_\theta$

**Output:** $\dot{y} = g \in K[y_1, \ldots, y_k]^k$, relations

$$d := \max(\deg(p_1), \ldots, \deg(p_k)) + \deg(f) - 1$$

Compute the Gröbner basis $\mathcal{GB}(\bigoplus_{i=0}^d H^W(I))$ as in Algorithm 3.1.

Then compute the normal forms $g_i(y) = \text{normalf} \left(\frac{dp_i(x)}{dx} \cdot f(x), \mathcal{GB}\right), i = 1, \ldots, k.$
Table 4. Timings of Algorithm 3.9 (orbit space reduction) for examples from literature.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Example</th>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Cpu time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Chossat, 1993)</td>
<td>$O(2)$</td>
<td>5 s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Chossat and Dias, 1995)</td>
<td>$O(2) \times S^1$</td>
<td>72 s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Leis, 1995)</td>
<td>$O(3) \times S^1$</td>
<td>160 s</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Remark 3.10. (i) Observe that we do not need a full Gröbner basis in Algorithm 3.9.

(ii) In case the invariants form a Hironaka decomposition (that means that the secondary invariants $p_{s+1}, \ldots, p_k$ form a free module over the ring $\mathbb{R}[p_1, \ldots, p_s]$ and thus each invariant has a unique representation $\sum_{i=s+1}^{k} a_i(p_1, \ldots, p_s) \cdot p_i$) one would like to compute the unique representations $\sum a_i p_i$ in Algorithm 3.9. This is done, if the eliminating term order $\leq$ on $\mathbb{K}[x, y]$ is such that the matrix representing the order $\leq|_{\mathbb{K}[y]}$ starts with first row with 0’s for $y_1, \ldots, y_s$ and 1’s for $y_{s+1}, \ldots, y_k$ (Sturmfels, 1993, p. 52).

(iii) The polynomial $g_i$ may also be found by linear algebra technique. But the advantage of Gröbner bases is the unique way of representation once a term order has been chosen.

3.4. Computing Invariants

For finite groups there is one famous algorithm in Sturmfels (1993) for the computation of invariants which appeared first in Sturmfels and White (1991). It makes use of the fact that the invariant ring $\mathbb{K}[x]_{\vartheta}$ is Cohen–Macaulay, which means whenever we have polynomials $p_1, \ldots, p_n$ such that $\mathbb{K}[x]_{\vartheta}$ is a finitely generated module over the subring $\mathbb{K}[p(x)]$ then it is a free module.

The generators are called secondary invariants in contrast to the primary invariants $p_i$. The algorithm searches first primary invariants until the set of common zeros of $p_1, \ldots, p_n$ is $\{0\}$ (the nullcone). The degrees of the secondaries are then known by the Molien series of $\mathbb{K}[x]_{\vartheta}$.

Algorithm 3.11. (Sturmfels, 1993, p. 57)

Input: finite group $\vartheta : G \to GL(K^n)$

(i) find primary invariants $p_1, \ldots, p_n$

(ii) find secondary invariants: for degrees $d_i$ there are $c_i$ many, $i = 1, \ldots, m$

$S = \{1\}$

for $i = 1, \ldots, m$

for $j = 1, \ldots, c_i$

$q := \text{nextcandidate} \in H^N_{d_i}(\mathbb{K}[x]_{\vartheta})$

while $q(x)$ is not an element of the free $\mathbb{K}[p]$-module generated by $S$

$q := \text{nextcandidate}$

$S := S \cup \{q\}$

There are at least four ways in performing the task

$q(x) \in \bigoplus_{s \in S} s(x)K[p_1(x), \ldots, p_n(x)],$
whether \( q \) is a member of the free module generated by \( S = \{1, s_2, \ldots, s_l\} \) over \( K[p] \). It is used that \( q_i \) is homogeneous of degree \( d_i = \deg_N(q(x)) \).

(a) Pure linear algebra:

Build all terms \( sp^i_1 \cdots p^i_n \) with \( s \in S, j = (j_1, \ldots, j_n) \) such that \( \deg_N(sp^i) = d_i \) and determine linear dependence of \( q(x) \) on these polynomials by comparing coefficients.

(b) Normal form with respect to Hironaka decomposition:

Compute a Gröbner basis \( \mathcal{GB}(\bigoplus_{j=1}^{d_i} H^N_j(I)) \) of

\[
I = (p_1(x) - y_1, \ldots, p_n(x) - y_n, \eta_2 - s_2(x), \ldots)
\]

with respect to a term order which eliminates first \( x \) and on \( K[y, \eta] \) eliminates \( \eta \), starting with natural degree on \( \eta \), see Sturmfels (1993, p. 52). (Use the Hilbert series driven Buchberger algorithm with \( \mathcal{HP}_K[x,y,\eta]/I \) given by \( (y_1, \ldots, y_n, \eta_2, \ldots, \eta_i) \). If

normalf \( (q, \mathcal{GB}) \in K[y, \eta] \) and is linear in \( \eta \) then \( q \in \bigoplus_{s \in S} s \cdot K[p] \). Once a new secondary invariant is found the Gröbner basis needs to be updated.

(c) Restriction to module with slack variable: choose a variable \( z \) and consider the gradings \( W : \{x, y, \eta, z\} \to \mathbb{N} \) \( W(x) = N \), \( W(y) = \deg_N(p_i(x)) \), \( i = 1, \ldots, n \), \( W(\eta_i) = \deg_N(s_i(x)) \), \( i = 2, \ldots, l \), \( W(z) = 0 \) for restriction in degree and \( U : \{x, y, \eta, z\} \to \mathbb{N}, U(x,y) = N, U(\eta) = N, U(z) = 1 \) for restriction to the module. For

\[
I := (y_1 - p_1(x), \ldots, y_n - p_n(x), \eta_2 - z \cdot s_2, \ldots, \eta_l - z \cdot s_l)
\]

compute \( \mathcal{GB} = \mathcal{GB}(\bigoplus_{k \leq d_i, j=0} H^{W,U}_k(I)) \). (Use the Hilbert series \( \mathcal{HP}_K[x,y,\eta,z]/I \) given by \( (y_1, \ldots, y_n, \eta_2, \ldots, \eta_i) \). If \( g(x, y, \eta, z) = \) normalf \( z \cdot q, \mathcal{GB} \) does not depend on \( x \) then \( q \) is a member of the module and \( q(p(x), s(x), 1) = q(x) \). Like method (b) the Gröbner basis needs updating after a new secondary invariant was found.

(d) Using one Gröbner basis: the Gröbner basis \( \mathcal{GB}(\bigoplus_{j=0}^{\max(d_i)} H^{N}_{j}((p_1(x), \ldots, p_n(x))) \) with respect to any term order is computed once in the beginning. Consider the set of normal forms \( \tilde{S} = \{\text{normalf}(s, \mathcal{GB}) | s \in S\} \) and \( \tilde{q} := \text{normalf}(q, \mathcal{GB}) \in K[x] \).

If \( \tilde{q} \) is \( K \)-linear dependent on \( S \) (on those of degree \( d_i \) then \( q(x) = \bigoplus_{s \in S} s(x) \cdot B^s(x) \) with \( B^s(x) \in (p_1(x), \ldots, p_n(x)) \) members of the ideal. Because of the invariance \( B^s(x) \) can be assumed to be invariant and thus to be members of \( K[p] \). Here one can use restriction to actual degree.

In \textit{Invvar} (Kemper, 1993) method (d) is used. We tested these methods for various examples and give their timings in Table 5. Methods (b) and (c) need more time because more information than needed, namely the representation in \( p(x) \) and \( s \in S \), is computed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Ref.</th>
<th>Degrees of</th>
<th>Up to</th>
<th>Invariants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>( D_3(\theta^2 + \theta^3) )</td>
<td>Gatermann and Werner (1996)</td>
<td>2,2,3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>all</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6 s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9 s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9 s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6 s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( D_3 + D_3 )</td>
<td>Matthes (1996)</td>
<td>2,2,3,3</td>
<td>all</td>
<td>23 s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>243 s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>343 s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>19 s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( D_4(\theta^2 + \theta^3) )</td>
<td>Campbell and Holmes (1992)</td>
<td>2,2,4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>all</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4 s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5 s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5 s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4 s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( Z_4 \cdot Z_2^4 )</td>
<td>Worfolk (1994)</td>
<td>2,4,4,8</td>
<td>6,6,6,</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>108 s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>466 s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>529 s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>107 s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>213 s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>( &gt;1 \ h  )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>( &gt;1 \ h  )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>179 s</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Table 5. Timings for Algorithm 3.11 for various variants. |
Table 6. Timings for computation of equivariants for various variants.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Ref.</th>
<th>degrees of equivariants</th>
<th>up to</th>
<th>a</th>
<th>c</th>
<th>d</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$D_3(\vartheta^2 + \vartheta^3)$</td>
<td>Gatermann and Werner (1996)</td>
<td>1,1,2,3,3</td>
<td>all</td>
<td>37 s</td>
<td>85 s</td>
<td>35 s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$D_3 + D_3$</td>
<td>Matthies (1996)</td>
<td>1,1,1,2,2,2,2,2,3,3,3,4,4,4,4,4,4,5,5,5,5,5,5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>45 s</td>
<td>185 s</td>
<td>46 s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$D_4(\vartheta^2 + \vartheta^5)$</td>
<td>Campbell and Holmes (1992)</td>
<td>1,1,2,3,4</td>
<td>all</td>
<td>324 s</td>
<td>&gt;1 h</td>
<td>229 s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$Z_4 \cdot Z_2^2$</td>
<td>Worfolk (1994)</td>
<td>1,3,3,3,(7<em>5), (8</em>7), (7<em>9), (4</em>11),13</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>158 s</td>
<td>274 s</td>
<td>164 s</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Method (d) is most efficient because it exploits the underlying structure as much as possible.

3.5. EQUIVARIANTS

As the module of equivariants is Cohen–Macaulay for finite groups the second part of the Algorithm 3.11 transfers immediately to the equivariant case, see Gatermann (1996b) and Worfolk (1994).

Only the task $q(x) \in \bigoplus_{e \in E} e(x)K[p(x)]$ where $q(x) \in K[x]^r$ and $E \subset K[x]^r$ of order $m$ needs to be discussed. The methods (a), (c) and (d) are valid analogously, but (b) has no generalization. Timings are given in Table 6.

4. INVARIANTS AND EQUIVARIANTS FOR CONTINUOUS GROUPS

The algorithms given in Section 3.4 cannot be generalized straightforward to continuous groups. We will consider here a different method based on properties of the Lie algebra associated to a compact Lie group. This is a direct extension of a method already used in Sattinger (1978) for the computation of the equivariants for $SO(3)$ and $O(3)$. It holds for the class of semi-simple Lie groups which includes most of the common classical groups ($SO(n)$ and $O(n)$ with $n > 2$, $SU(n)$ and $U(n)$, ...). There is a huge amount of bibliography concerning Lie groups and Lie algebras. Let us cite, for example, Bröcker and tom Dieck (1985), Humphreys (1980), Humphreys (1982), or Fulton and Harris (1991).

From now on, the group $G$ will be a connected Lie group, i.e. a connected subgroup of $GL(n)$. Our approach can also be generalized to cases where a finite group $H$ is involved. We indicate at the end of this section how to generalize the algorithms of this section in some particular cases. In equivariant dynamics problems, we are often interested in subgroups of $GL(n,\mathbb{R})$ acting on real vector spaces. However, for most of the interesting groups (including $SO(n)$, $SL(n)$, $Sp(2n)$) the real representations of subgroups of $GL(n,\mathbb{R})$ can be obtained by restriction to the real part of complex representations of subgroups of $GL(n,\mathbb{C})$.

4.1. LIE GROUP—LIE ALGEBRA

For a connected compact Lie group $G$ let $\vartheta : G \to GL(\mathbb{C}^n)$ and $\rho : G \to GL(\mathbb{C}^m)$ be two linear representations where $\vartheta$ is faithful. The aim of the following sections is
the computation of a generic homogeneous equivariant of degree \(d\), i.e. one computes a vector space basis of \(H_d^N(C[x]^\rho)\). Observe that for \(m = 1, \rho(g) = 1\) the case of invariants is included.

The key for the algorithm is the use of a associated Lie algebra. Recall that a connected Lie group is a manifold and the tangent space at the identity \(T_eG\) has the special meaning of the Lie algebra \(g\), i.e. \(T_eG\) is a vector space and additionally is provided with a Lie bracket.

Each \(Y \in g\) is thus given by a path \(\gamma: [-1,1] \to G, \gamma(0) = e, \frac{d}{ds}\gamma(s)|_{s=0} = Y\). The group action \(\vartheta\) induces by the representation \(\Theta: G \to \text{Aut}(C[x]^m)\),

\[
\Theta(g)(f(x)) = f(\vartheta(g^{-1})x), \quad g \in G,
\]
to an action of the Lie algebra on the polynomial vectors. Elements of the tangent space of \(T_{\vartheta(e)}\Theta(G)\) by \(\theta: g \to \text{Aut}(C[x]^m)\)

\[
\theta(Y)(f(x)) = \frac{d}{ds}\Theta(\gamma(s))(f(x))_{|s=0} = d\frac{d}{ds}f(\vartheta(\gamma(s)^{-1})x)_{|s=0} = \frac{d}{dx}f(x) \cdot \zeta(-Y) \cdot x
\]

Let the Lie algebra action associated to \(\rho\) be denoted by \(\varrho\). The main ingredient in the algorithmic treatment is the following well-known lemma.

**Lemma 4.1.** \(f \in C[x]^m\) is \(\vartheta\)-equivariant iff for all generators \(Y\) of \(g\)

\[
\varrho(-Y)(f(x)) = \varrho(Y) \cdot f(x).
\]

Special structure of the Lie algebra allows for more simplification as described in the following section. Besides this two simplifications are obvious. Assume \(\vartheta\) decomposes into subrepresentations and the coordinates are such that the representation matrices have block diagonal form

\[
\varrho(g) = \begin{pmatrix}
\varrho^1(g) & 0 \\
\vdots & \ddots \\
0 & \varrho^r(g)
\end{pmatrix}.
\]

The set of variables then decomposes into \(r\) subsets \(x = (x^1, \ldots, x^r)\). Then the Kronecker gradings \(N_i: \{x_1, \ldots, x_n\} \to N\),

\[
N_i(x_j) = \begin{cases}
1, & \text{if } x_j \in x^i \\
0, & \text{else}
\end{cases}
\]
define a grading of \(C[x]\) such that the invariant ring is multi-graded by \(N = (N_1, \ldots, N_r)\) as well:

\[
H_d(C[x]_\varrho) = \bigoplus_{k_1 + \cdots + k_r = d} H_d^N(C[x]_\varrho).
\]
The module of equivariants is multi-graded analogously.

The second simplification is given by a decomposition of $\rho$ in block diagonal form $\rho(g) = \text{diag}(\rho_1(g), \ldots, \rho_s(g))$. The $\vartheta$-$\rho$-equivariants are given by the $\vartheta$-$\rho_i$-equivariants $\tilde{f}$ since $(0, \ldots, f, 0, \ldots, 0)$ is a $\vartheta$-$\rho$-equivariant.

Observe that the case $\vartheta = \rho = \vartheta^1 + \vartheta^2$ includes the case which in the theory of dynamical systems is known as mode interaction.

### 4.2. Properties of semi-simple Lie algebras

We consider now the case where the group $G$ is a finite dimensional complex semi-simple Lie group $G$. Let us recall that a connected Lie group is called _semi-simple_ if it does not contain any nontrivial solvable normal subgroup. Similarly, a Lie algebra is called _semi-simple_ if it contains no proper nontrivial Abelian ideal. Now a connected Lie group is semi-simple iff its Lie algebra $\mathfrak{g}$ is semi-simple (Humphreys, 1980, p. 89). The classical complex Lie algebras $\mathfrak{sl}_n(\mathbb{C})$, $\mathfrak{so}_n(\mathbb{C})$ ($n > 2$) and $\mathfrak{sp}_{2n}(\mathbb{C})$ are semi-simple. A maximal Abelian subalgebra $\mathfrak{g}_0$ of $\mathfrak{g}$ is called a _Cartan subalgebra_. Let us recall that the adjoint representation of $\mathfrak{g}$ is the action of $\mathfrak{g}$ on itself using the Lie bracket i.e.

$$\text{ad} : \mathfrak{g} \rightarrow GL(\mathfrak{g}),$$

such that for $X,Y \in \mathfrak{g}$, $\text{ad}(X)(Y) = [X,Y]$.

The action of $\mathfrak{g}_0$ on $\mathfrak{g}$ can be thought of as diagonal (Theorem 9.20 in Fulton and Harris (1991)) i.e. all matrices $\text{ad}(X)$ for $X \in \mathfrak{g}_0$ can be simultaneously diagonalized. This property suggests a so-called _Cartan decomposition_ of $\mathfrak{g}$

$$\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{g}_0 \oplus \mathfrak{g}_n,$$  \hspace{1cm} (4.1)

where each root space $\mathfrak{g}_\alpha$ is a one-dimensional eigenspace for the elements of $\mathfrak{g}_0$ in the adjoint action of $\mathfrak{g}$. Each $\alpha$ occurring in the Cartan decomposition (4.1) is a linear form on $\mathfrak{g}_0$. We denote by $\mathcal{R}$ the set of these linear forms which are called _roots_. For any root space $\mathfrak{g}_\alpha$, the form $\alpha \in \mathfrak{g}_0^*$ is defined by

$$\alpha(X)Y = \text{ad}(X)Y = [X,Y], \text{ } X \in \mathfrak{g}_0, Y \in \mathfrak{g}_\alpha.$$  

If $\mathfrak{g}_\alpha$ is a root space then $\mathfrak{g}_{-\alpha}$ is also a root space. Furthermore, there exists a particular basis of $\mathfrak{g}$ such that the elements of root spaces act in a nice way via the adjoint action.

**Theorem 4.2. (The Cartan–Weyl Form)** Let $\mathfrak{g}$ be a complex semi-simple Lie algebra with the Cartan decomposition (4.1). There exists a basis $\{H_i : i = 1, \ldots, r\}$ of $\mathfrak{g}_0$ and for each $\alpha \in \mathcal{R}$ some $E_\alpha$ generates $\mathfrak{g}_\alpha$ such that

(i) $\text{ad}(H_i) E_\alpha = [H_i, E_\alpha] = \alpha(H_i) E_\alpha,$

(ii) $\text{ad}(E_\alpha) E_{-\alpha} = [E_\alpha, E_{-\alpha}] = \sum_{i=1}^r \alpha(H_i) H_i = H_\alpha,$

(iii) $\text{ad}(E_\alpha) E_\beta = [E_\alpha, E_\beta] = N_{\alpha,\beta} E_{\alpha+\beta}$ with $N_{\alpha,\beta} = 0$ unless $\alpha + \beta \in \mathcal{R},$

with $N_{\alpha,\beta} = -N_{\beta,\alpha} = N_{-\beta, -\alpha} = -N_{-\alpha, -\beta}.$

**Example 4.3.** The Cartan subalgebra of $\mathfrak{so}(3)$ is generated by $J^3$ and there are two root spaces generated by $J^+$ and $J^-$. Then

$$[J^3, J^\pm] = \pm J^\pm, \quad [J^+, J^-] = 2J^3.$$
Now consider an action $\varrho : g \to GL(V)$ where $V$ is a complex vector space. $V$ can be provided with a decomposition similar to (4.1). More precisely,

$$V = \bigoplus_{\beta \in W} V_\beta,$$

where $W$ is a subset of the linear forms on $g_0$. Each weight space $V_\beta$ is characterized by

$$\forall v \in V_\beta, \quad \forall X \in g_0, \quad \varrho(X)(v) = \beta(X)v.$$ and the elements $\beta$ in $W$ are called the weights of the representation. The dimension of a weight space $V_\beta$ is called its multiplicity. If $\dim V_\beta = 1$ then the weight $\beta$ is said simple.

In some sense the adjoint action is a special case of this. So the roots $\alpha$ of the algebra $\mathfrak{g}$ are the weights of the adjoint representation.

The rest of the Lie algebra $g$ acts on $V$ in the following way

$$\varrho(g_\alpha)(V_\beta) \subset V_{\beta + \alpha} \quad \text{if } \alpha + \beta \in W, \quad \varrho(g_\alpha)(V_\beta) = 0 \quad \text{if } \alpha + \beta \notin W.$$

Now, the set $\mathcal{R}$ can be decomposed as $\mathcal{R} = \mathcal{R}_+ \cup \mathcal{R}_-$. The roots in $\mathcal{R}_+$ (resp. $\mathcal{R}_-$) are called positive (resp. negative) roots. This decomposition can be done in such a way that there exists a weight space $V_\beta$ called a highest weight space such that

$$\varrho(E_\alpha)V_\beta = 0 \quad \text{for all } \alpha \in \mathcal{R}_+.$$

Using this notation the key result is:

**Theorem 4.4. (Fulton and Harris, 1991, Proposition 14.13)** For any semi-simple complex Lie algebra $\mathfrak{g}$ the following holds.

(i) Every finite-dimensional representation on $V$ of $\mathfrak{g}$ possesses a highest weight space. Take one vector $v$ in this space.

(ii) The subspace $W$ of $V$ generated by the images of the highest weight vector $v$ under successive applications of generators $E_\alpha$ of root spaces $g_\alpha$ for $\alpha \in \mathcal{R}_-$ is an irreducible subrepresentation.

(iii) An irreducible representation possesses a unique highest weight vector up to multiplication by scalar, i.e. the dimension of the highest weight space is one.

The negative roots allow us to determine explicitly a basis of an irreducible representation once that a highest weight vector is determined. It is, however, possible to find a refinement of this method in order to obtain a more efficient way. Indeed, it can be shown that only a subset of $\mathcal{R}_-$ is necessary. More precisely, we call primitive positive (resp. negative) roots the subset of $\mathcal{R}_+$ (resp. $\mathcal{R}_-$) of roots that cannot be expressed by positive (resp. negative) roots. In the previous theorem, $\mathcal{R}_-$ can be replaced by the subset $\mathcal{R}_-^p$ of primitive negatives roots. More precisely,

**Proposition 4.5. (Fulton and Harris, 1991, Observation 14.16)** Any irreducible representation $V$ is generated by the images of its highest weight vector $v$ under successive applications of roots spaces $g_\alpha$ where $\alpha$ ranges over the primitive negative roots.

Furthermore, the highest weight space $V_{\beta_0}$ is uniquely characterized by the property

$$\varrho(E_\alpha)V_{\beta_0} = 0 \quad \text{for all } \alpha \in \mathcal{R}_+^p.$$
Two other results are also useful for our construction:

**Proposition 4.6.** (a) If a representation is irreducible, its highest weight is simple.

(b) Two irreducible representations are equivalent if their highest weights are equal.

The root systems are well known for the semi-simple complex Lie algebras. There are various equivalent ways to determine the sets of positive, negative and primitive roots (negative or positive) as well as classification of the corresponding highest weight space (see, for instance, Fulton and Harris, 1991). Nevertheless, this information can be found in the literature on Lie groups and Lie algebras.

Before closing this section, we need to introduce a bit more terminology. We assume that the representation space $V$ is decomposed as in (4.2) and that $V_{\beta_0}$ denotes the maximal weight space. Let $\mathcal{R}^P_{-} = \{\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_q\}$ be a set of negative primitive roots. For any weight space $V_{\beta}$, there is a word $P = E_{p_1}E_{p_2}^{} \cdots E_{p_n}^{}$ with $p_i$, $i = 1, \ldots, n$ in $\mathcal{R}^P_{-}$ such that

$$\varrho(E_{p_1}E_{p_2}^{} \cdots E_{p_n}^{})V_{\beta_0} \subset V_{\beta}.$$  

For a given weight vector $\beta$ the length of words $P' = E_{p'_1}^{}E_{p'_2}^{} \cdots E_{p'_n}^{}$ such that $\varrho(P')(V_{\beta_0}) \subset V_{\beta}$ is unique (this length is the sum of the coordinates of the point $\beta$ in the lattice in $\mathfrak{g}_0$ generated by $\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_q$ and with the origin in $\beta_0$). We collect all weight spaces of the same length $n$ into a set, called the $n$th layer $\Delta_n$. With this definition, $V_{\beta_0} \in \Delta_0$ as a corollary of proposition (4.5). The layer $\Delta_{n+1}$ can be generated by successive applications of elements $E_\alpha$ with $\alpha$ in $\mathcal{R}^P_{-}$ on the weight spaces of the layer $\Delta_n$. Furthermore, since $V$ is finite dimensional, the number of layers is finite.

### 4.3. Computing Invariants and Equivariants

We describe in this section an algorithm to determine a vector space basis of the equivariants $f : V \to W$, homogeneous of a certain degree of a connected semi-simple compact Lie group $G$, acting on finite-dimensional vector spaces $V$ and $W$ of dimensions $n$ and $m$, respectively. This algorithm does not distinguish between primary and secondary invariants. Nevertheless, Molien series and Gröbner basis may be useful to recover some part of this information.

Let us choose a basis of $V$ consisting of bases for each irreducible component which yields a decomposition of the variables into groups $x = (x^1, \ldots, x^r)$. So the action of $G$ on $V$ is given by $\varrho : G \to (\mathbb{C}^m)$. Let $\Theta, \zeta, \varrho$ be the associated actions as in Section 4.1. On $W$ the choice of the basis respects the irreducible components as well yielding a block diagonal representation $\rho : G \to GL(\mathbb{C}^m)$, $\rho(g) = \text{diag}(\rho_1^1(g), \ldots, \rho_s^s(g))$. The associated representation of the Lie algebra is denoted $\varrho : \mathfrak{g} \to GL(\mathbb{C}^m)$ and is diagonal as well. Additionally we assume that the basis is chosen such that they form a basis of the weight spaces, i.e. in $\mathbb{C}^m$ unit vectors correspond to the elements of the weight spaces. Indexing by the weights $\beta$ we have the basis $w_{\beta,j}, i = 1, \ldots, s, j = 1, \ldots, \dim V_{\beta}$ where $\beta$ is a weight of $\varrho^i$ and

$$E_\alpha : w_{\beta,j}^i \to \sum_{k=1}^{\dim V_{\beta}} \varrho^i(\beta, \alpha + \beta, k) w_{\alpha + \beta,k}^i,$$

for all generators $E_\alpha$ of root spaces $\mathfrak{g}_\alpha$. Analogously for the generators $H_i$ of the Cartan subalgebra $\varrho^i(H_i)$ is a diagonal matrix with entries $\beta(H_i)$. For both $\rho$ and $\varrho$ we use the
same coordinate system such that \( \rho(\exp(g)) = \exp(\rho(g)) \). For \( \vartheta \) and \( \zeta \) the same is true. \( \vartheta \) and \( \rho \) describe how in these coordinates \( C[x]_0^p \) corresponds to the equivariant polynomial mappings \( V \rightarrow W \). The following algorithm generalizes the description given in Sattinger (1979) for \( SO(3) \).

**Algorithm 4.7. (Computation of Generic Equivariant)**

**Input:**
- A connected semi-simple Lie group given by an associated Lie algebra represented by generators \( H_l \) of the Cartan subalgebra and primitive positive roots \( E_\alpha \in \mathbb{R}_+^p \), and primitive negative roots \( E_\alpha \in \mathbb{R}_-^p \),
- matrices \( \zeta(E_\alpha), \zeta(H_l) \), matrices \( \varrho(E_\alpha), \varrho(H_l) \),
- degree \( k = (k_1, \ldots, k_r) \).

**Output:**
- a vector space basis of \( H_N^k(C[x]^\rho \vartheta) \).

Let \( M \subset H_N^k(C[x]) \) denote the set of monomials of multidegree \( k \). For \( i = 1, \ldots, s \).

A generic homogeneous polynomial is of the form

\[
P(x^1, \ldots, x^r) = \sum_{m \in M} a_m^i \cdot m(x)
\]

where \( a_m^i \) are unknowns. This is an ansatz for the component corresponding to the highest weight space \( f_{i \beta,0} \). The other components \( f_{i \beta,k} \) remain undetermined until step (iii).

(ii) The unknowns \( a_m^i \) are determined by the following conditions

\[
\forall \text{ generators } H_l \quad \theta(-H_l)(f^i(x)) = \varrho(H_l) \cdot f^i(x),
\]

\[
\forall \alpha \in \mathbb{R}_+^p \quad \theta(E_\alpha)(f^i(x)) = 0.
\]

By comparing coefficients in the component \( f_{i \beta,0} \) this gives linear equations in the unknowns \( a_m^i \). Solve this system and substitute the solution into \( f_{i \beta,0} \) which then still depends on a subset of the \( a_m^i \). This determines the layer \( \triangle_0 \).

(iii) Assume the components \( f_{i \beta,k} \) for all weights \( \beta \) in the layer \( \triangle_n \) are known. Then the components \( \alpha + \beta, j \) corresponding to the weight spaces in the following layer \( \triangle_{n+1} \) are determined by \( \alpha \in \mathbb{R}_-^p \) by

\[
\theta(-E_\alpha)f^i(x) = \varrho^i(E_\alpha)f^i(x).
\]

For \( \alpha \in \mathbb{R}_-^p \) and components \( \beta, k \) this means

\[
\frac{d}{dx} f_{i \beta,k}^j(x) \cdot \zeta(E_\alpha) \cdot x = \sum_{\alpha + \beta, j} \varrho^i(E_\alpha)_{\beta,k,\alpha + \beta,j} f_{i \alpha + \beta,j}^i,
\]

where on the left-hand side \( f_{i \beta,k}^j(x) \) are polynomials and \( f_{i \alpha + \beta,j}^i \) on the right-hand side are unknown components. By linear manipulation this gives the components \( f_{i \alpha + \beta,j}^i \) of the layer \( \triangle_{n+1} \).

Altogether \( f = (f^1(x), \ldots, f^s(x)) \) is a generic equivariant.

**Proof.** This algorithm is a direct application of the results of the previous section. The determination of the component \( f_{i \beta,0}^j(x) \) is provided by the fact that the maximal weight is in the kernel of all primitive positive roots and is an eigenspace for the elements in the
Cartan subalgebra. Now, the successive applications of all primitive negative roots on the highest weight provides a set of basis of the full representation space $W$. Each iteration in the algorithm allows us to determine a basis for the $n+1$-th layer from the knowledge of the $n$-th layer. As the number of layers is finite, the algorithm reaches necessarily a layer $\Delta_{n'} = \{0\}$ which is empty. As unit vectors correspond to weight spaces the result is an equivariant vector field in the orthonormal basis $\{w_{i \beta_0}^1, w_{i \beta_1}^1, \ldots, w_{i \beta_q}^q, t_q, i = 1, \ldots, s\}$. □

Remark 4.8. (i) For real Lie groups such as $SO(3)$ the method is also applicable. The real associated Lie algebra can be embedded into a complex one by complexification $g^c = g \times_R \mathbb{C}$. Now if $g$ is a simple Lie algebra (i.e. without proper nontrivial ideal) then its complexified $g^c$ is also simple (see Fulton and Harris (1991)). Then the irreducible representations of $g$ are just obtained by restriction to the real part of the irreducible representations of $g^c$.

(ii) For compact Lie groups being generated by a semi-simple connected component $G$ and a finite group $H$ one computes generic $G$-invariants and $G$-equivariants. For the generators of $H$ additional linear equations in the generic coefficients are derived and solved. This yields generic invariants and equivariants.

(iii) For groups $G \times H$ which are a direct product with a finite group $H$ the application of the Reynolds projection of $H$ onto a $G$-invariant yields an invariant. The $G \times H$-equivariants are obtained from the $G$-equivariants by use of the equivariant Reynolds projection analogously. Concerning the multi-grading observe that less blocks might exist in the diagonalized form of $\vartheta(G \times H)$ than of $\vartheta(G)$. Thus there may exist less grading of the invariant ring and the module of equivariants.

(iv) If $G$ is normal in $K$, the fundamental $K$-invariants are obtained from fundamental $G$-invariants because $N_K(G)/G$ is operating on the vector space of $G$-invariants and its conjugates. The $N_K(G)/G$-invariants of this action yield the $K$-invariants, see Kempf (1987), or more readably in Rumberger (1995).

Example 4.9. For the representations $l = 1$ and $l = 2$ of $SO(3)$ and degree $k = (2, 3)$ the computation of the generic invariant and generic equivariant takes 148 s and 298 s, respectively.

Algorithm 4.7, together with the algorithms for completeness in Section 3.2, yields an algorithmic determination of fundamental invariants and fundamental equivariants for special compact Lie groups. Details of these algorithms will appear elsewhere.

Acknowledgement

This project was started during a research stay at RIACA, Amsterdam. We would like to thank Jan Sanders and Reiner Lauterbach for organizing the research period on nonlinear dynamical systems at RIACA. This work benefited a lot from helpful discussions with Reiner Lauterbach, Patrick Worfolk and Gregor Kemper.

References


Originally Received 25 February 1997
Accepted 4 December 1998