

# Integration in D-modules

Pierre Lairez

MATHEXP, Université Paris-Saclay, Inria, France

Joint work with Hadrien Brochet (Inria) and Frédéric Chyzak (Inria)

MathemAmplitudes, September 25, Mainz



# Algebraic integration

❓ Can we compute integrals

$$\int_{\Gamma} f(x_1, \dots, x_n) dx_1 \cdots dx_n$$

using algebraic relations?

# Algebraic integration

❓ Can we compute integrals

$$\int_{\Gamma} f(x_1, \dots, x_n) dx_1 \cdots dx_n$$

using algebraic relations?

✓ Yes!

D-module theory provides an expressive and effective framework.

# Algebraic integration

❓ Can we compute integrals

$$\int_{\Gamma} f(x_1, \dots, x_n) dx_1 \cdots dx_n$$

using algebraic relations?

✓ Yes!

D-module theory provides an expressive and effective framework.



Saito, M., Sturmfels, B., & Takayama, N. (2000). *Gröbner deformations of hypergeometric differential equations* (Vol. 6). Springer-Verlag

# Algebraic integration

❓ Can we compute integrals

$$\int_{\Gamma} f(x_1, \dots, x_n) dx_1 \cdots dx_n$$

using algebraic relations?

✓ Yes!

D-module theory provides an expressive and effective framework.

📖 Saito, M., Sturmfels, B., & Takayama, N. (2000). *Gröbner deformations of hypergeometric differential equations* (Vol. 6). Springer-Verlag

⚡ How to compute them faster?

# What does *computing* mean?

I

## ✓ Computing master integrals

Given  $f_1(\mathbf{x}), \dots, f_r(\mathbf{x})$ , find linear relations

$$a_1 \int f_1(\mathbf{x}) d\mathbf{x} + \dots + a_r \int f_r(\mathbf{x}) d\mathbf{x} = 0.$$

## What does *computing* mean?

## II

### ✓ Picard–Fuchs equations

Given  $y(t) = \int f(t, \mathbf{x}) d\mathbf{x}$ , find a differential equation

$$a_r(t)y^{(r)}(t) + \cdots + a_1(t)y'(t) + a_0(t)y(t) = 0.$$

## What does *computing* mean?

## II

### ✓ Picard–Fuchs equations

Given  $y(t) = \int f(t, \mathbf{x}) d\mathbf{x}$ , find a differential equation

$$a_r(t)y^{(r)}(t) + \cdots + a_1(t)y'(t) + a_0(t)y(t) = 0.$$

This reduces to finding a relation between several integrals:

- \* Use  $\mathbb{C}(t)$  as the base field.
- \* Find a relation between the integrals

$$y(t) = \int f(t, \mathbf{x}) d\mathbf{x},$$

$$y'(t) = \int \frac{\partial f(t, \mathbf{x})}{\partial t} d\mathbf{x},$$

$$y''(t) = \int \frac{\partial^2 f(t, \mathbf{x})}{\partial t^2} d\mathbf{x}, \dots$$



# What does *computing* not mean?

## Numerical evaluation

Given  $f(\mathbf{x})$ , compute a numerical approximation of

$$\int f(\mathbf{x})d\mathbf{x}.$$

Finding master integrals, or computing differential equations, *may* help, but it is only a step.

## D-modules

### Definition

A D-module  $M$  is a space of *functions* of  $x_1, \dots, x_n$  in which you can:

- \* multiply by polynomial functions in  $\mathbf{x}$
- \* differentiate with respect to  $\mathbf{x}$

## D-modules

### Definition

A D-module  $M$  is a space of *functions* of  $x_1, \dots, x_n$  in which you can:

- \* multiply by polynomial functions in  $\mathbf{x}$
- \* differentiate with respect to  $\mathbf{x}$

### Definition (alternative)

Let  $D = \mathbb{C}[x_1, \dots, x_n] \langle \partial_1, \dots, \partial_n \rangle$  be the  $n$ th Weyl algebra:

- \*  $[x_i, x_j] = [\partial_i, \partial_j] = [\partial_i, x_j] = 0$
- \*  $[\partial_i, x_i] = 1$  (Leibniz' rule)

A D-module is a  $D$ -module.

# D-modules

## Definition

A D-module  $M$  is a space of *functions* of  $x_1, \dots, x_n$  in which you can:

- \* multiply by polynomial functions in  $\mathbf{x}$
- \* differentiate with respect to  $\mathbf{x}$

## Definition (alternative)

Let  $D = \mathbb{C}[x_1, \dots, x_n] \langle \partial_1, \dots, \partial_n \rangle$  be the  $n$ th Weyl algebra:

- \*  $[x_i, x_j] = [\partial_i, \partial_j] = [\partial_i, x_j] = 0$
- \*  $[\partial_i, x_i] = 1$  (Leibniz' rule)

A D-module is a  $D$ -module.

## Examples

- \* Polynomials in  $\mathbf{x}$
- \* Holomorphic functions on an open subset of  $\mathbb{C}^n$
- \* Schwartz distributions on  $\mathbb{R}^n$

# Holonomic D-modules

## Definition

A D-module  $M$  is *holonomic* if:

1. it is finitely generated (as a module over  $D$ )

# Holonomic D-modules

## Definition

A D-module  $M$  is *holonomic* if:

1. it is finitely generated (as a module over  $D$ )
2. for any  $f \in M$ , as  $s \rightarrow \infty$ ,

$$\dim_{\mathbb{C}} \text{Vect} \{ \mathbf{x}^{\alpha} \partial^{\beta} \cdot f \mid |\alpha| + |\beta| \leq s \} = O(s^n).$$

# Holonomic D-modules

## Definition

A D-module  $M$  is *holonomic* if:

1. it is finitely generated (as a module over  $D$ )
2. for any  $f \in M$ , as  $s \rightarrow \infty$ ,

$$\dim_{\mathbb{C}} \text{Vect} \{ \mathbf{x}^{\alpha} \partial^{\beta} \cdot f \mid |\alpha| + |\beta| \leq s \} = O(s^n).$$

# Holonomic D-modules

## Definition

A D-module  $M$  is *holonomic* if:

1. it is finitely generated (as a module over  $D$ )
2. for any  $f \in M$ , as  $s \rightarrow \infty$ ,

$$\dim_{\mathbb{C}} \text{Vect} \{ \mathbf{x}^{\alpha} \partial^{\beta} \cdot f \mid |\alpha| + |\beta| \leq s \} = O(s^n).$$

## Examples

✓  $M = \mathbb{C}[x_1, \dots, x_n]$



# Holonomic D-modules

## Definition

A D-module  $M$  is *holonomic* if:

1. it is finitely generated (as a module over  $D$ )
2. for any  $f \in M$ , as  $s \rightarrow \infty$ ,

$$\dim_{\mathbb{C}} \text{Vect} \{ \mathbf{x}^{\alpha} \partial^{\beta} \cdot f \mid |\alpha| + |\beta| \leq s \} = O(s^n).$$

## Examples

✓  $M = \mathbb{C}[x_1, \dots, x_n]$

✗  $M = \mathbb{C}(x_1, \dots, x_n)$

# Holonomic D-modules

## Definition

A D-module  $M$  is *holonomic* if:

1. it is finitely generated (as a module over  $D$ )
2. for any  $f \in M$ , as  $s \rightarrow \infty$ ,

$$\dim_{\mathbb{C}} \text{Vect} \{ \mathbf{x}^{\alpha} \partial^{\beta} \cdot f \mid |\alpha| + |\beta| \leq s \} = O(s^n).$$

## Examples

✓  $M = \mathbb{C}[x_1, \dots, x_n]$

✗  $M = \mathbb{C}(x_1, \dots, x_n)$

✓  $M = \mathbb{C}[x_1, \dots, x_n, F^{-1}] = \{ aF^{-k} \mid a \in \mathbb{C}[\mathbf{x}], k \geq 0 \}$

# Holonomic D-modules

## Definition

A D-module  $M$  is *holonomic* if:

1. it is finitely generated (as a module over  $D$ )
2. for any  $f \in M$ , as  $s \rightarrow \infty$ ,

$$\dim_{\mathbb{C}} \text{Vect} \{ \mathbf{x}^{\alpha} \partial^{\beta} \cdot f \mid |\alpha| + |\beta| \leq s \} = O(s^n).$$

## Examples

✓  $M = \mathbb{C}[x_1, \dots, x_n]$

✗  $M = \mathbb{C}(x_1, \dots, x_n)$

✓  $M = \mathbb{C}[x_1, \dots, x_n, F^{-1}] = \{ aF^{-k} \mid a \in \mathbb{C}[\mathbf{x}], k \geq 0 \}$

✓  $M = \mathbb{C}[x_1, \dots, x_n, F^{-1}]F^{\mathbb{Z}}$

# Holonomic D-modules

## Definition

A D-module  $M$  is *holonomic* if:

1. it is finitely generated (as a module over  $D$ )
2. for any  $f \in M$ , as  $s \rightarrow \infty$ ,

$$\dim_{\mathbb{C}} \text{Vect} \{ \mathbf{x}^{\alpha} \partial^{\beta} \cdot f \mid |\alpha| + |\beta| \leq s \} = O(s^n).$$

## Examples

✓  $M = \mathbb{C}[x_1, \dots, x_n]$

✗  $M = \mathbb{C}(x_1, \dots, x_n)$

✓  $M = \mathbb{C}[x_1, \dots, x_n, F^{-1}] = \{ aF^{-k} \mid a \in \mathbb{C}[\mathbf{x}], k \geq 0 \}$

✓  $M = \mathbb{C}[x_1, \dots, x_n, F^{-1}]F^{\mathbb{Z}}$

✗  $M = \mathbb{C}[x] \frac{1}{1+\exp(x)}$

# Computer representation of holonomic D-modules

$$M \simeq \frac{D^m}{Dg_1 + \cdots + Dg_s},$$

with:

- \*  $m$ : the number of generators of  $M$  (we can always assume  $m = 1$ , but this is not free)
- \*  $Dg_1 + \cdots + Dg_s$ : the module of relations between the generators

# Computer representation of holonomic D-modules

$$M \simeq \frac{D^m}{Dg_1 + \cdots + Dg_s},$$

with:

- \*  $m$ : the number of generators of  $M$  (we can always assume  $m = 1$ , but this is not free)
- \*  $Dg_1 + \cdots + Dg_s$ : the module of relations between the generators

## Examples

✓  $\mathbb{C}[\mathbf{x}] \simeq D / (D\partial_1 + \cdots + D\partial_n)$

# Computer representation of holonomic D-modules

$$M \simeq \frac{D^m}{Dg_1 + \cdots + Dg_s},$$

with:

- \*  $m$ : the number of generators of  $M$  (we can always assume  $m = 1$ , but this is not free)
- \*  $Dg_1 + \cdots + Dg_s$ : the module of relations between the generators

## Examples

✓  $\mathbb{C}[\mathbf{x}] \simeq D / (D\partial_1 + \cdots + D\partial_n)$

✓  $\mathbb{C}[\mathbf{x}]e^{f(\mathbf{x})} \simeq D / \left( \sum_i D \left( \partial_i - \frac{\partial f}{\partial x_i} \right) \right)$

# Computer representation of holonomic D-modules

$$M \simeq \frac{D^m}{Dg_1 + \cdots + Dg_s},$$

with:

- \*  $m$ : the number of generators of  $M$  (we can always assume  $m = 1$ , but this is not free)
- \*  $Dg_1 + \cdots + Dg_s$ : the module of relations between the generators

## Examples

✓  $\mathbb{C}[\mathbf{x}] \simeq D / (D\partial_1 + \cdots + D\partial_n)$

✓  $\mathbb{C}[\mathbf{x}]e^{f(\mathbf{x})} \simeq D / \left( \sum_i D \left( \partial_i - \frac{\partial f}{\partial x_i} \right) \right)$

!  $D \cdot \frac{1}{x^2 - y^3} \simeq D / (D(3x\partial_x + 2y\partial_y + 6) + D(3y^2\partial_x + 2x\partial_y))$



## Rational functions as D-modules

Let  $f = 1 - (1 - xy)z - xyz(1 - x)(1 - y)(1 - z)$  (Beukers & Peters, 1984) and consider  $M = \mathbb{C}[x, y, z, f^{-1}]$ .

 It is not finitely generated as a  $\mathbb{C}[x, y, z]$ -module.

## Rational functions as D-modules

Let  $f = 1 - (1 - xy)z - xyz(1 - x)(1 - y)(1 - z)$  (Beukers & Peters, 1984) and consider  $M = \mathbb{C}[x, y, z, f^{-1}]$ .

⚠ It is not finitely generated as a  $\mathbb{C}[x, y, z]$ -module.

💡 It is generated by  $f^{-2}$  as a D-module:

$$\mathbb{C}[x, y, z, f^{-1}] = D \cdot f^{-2} \simeq D/I$$

where  $I$  is the left ideal generated by

- [illegible]



## Rational functions as D-modules

Let  $f = 1 - (1 - xy)z - xyz(1 - x)(1 - y)(1 - z)$  (Beukers & Peters, 1984) and consider  $M = \mathbb{C}[x, y, z, f^{-1}]$ .

⚠ It is not finitely generated as a  $\mathbb{C}[x, y, z]$ -module.

💡 It is generated by  $f^{-2}$  as a D-module:

$$\mathbb{C}[x, y, z, f^{-1}] = D \cdot f^{-2} \simeq D/I$$

where  $I$  is the left ideal generated by

- [illegible]

- Singular (Andres et al., 2010) or Macaulay2 (Leykin, 2002).

❓ Do we deal correctly with poles?

# Integrals

## Definition

An *integral*  $\int$  on a D-module  $M$  is a linear form  $\int : M \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$  such that for any  $f_1, \dots, f_n \in \mathbb{C}$ ,

$$\int (\partial_1 f_1 + \dots + \partial_n f_n) \, d\mathbf{x} = 0.$$

# Integrals

## Definition

An *integral*  $\int$  on a  $D$ -module  $M$  is a linear form  $\int : M \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$  such that for any  $f_1, \dots, f_n \in \mathbb{C}$ ,

$$\int (\partial_1 f_1 + \dots + \partial_n f_n) d\mathbf{x} = 0.$$

## Definition

The *integral of a  $D$ -module  $M$*  is the  $\mathbb{C}$ -linear space

$$\int M \triangleq \frac{M}{\partial_1 M + \dots + \partial_n M}.$$

(So an integral on  $M$  is a linear form  $\int M \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ .)

# Integrals

## Definition

An *integral*  $\int$  on a  $D$ -module  $M$  is a linear form  $\int : M \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$  such that for any  $f_1, \dots, f_n \in \mathbb{C}$ ,

$$\int (\partial_1 f_1 + \dots + \partial_n f_n) d\mathbf{x} = 0.$$

## Definition

The *integral of a  $D$ -module  $M$*  is the  $\mathbb{C}$ -linear space

$$\int M \triangleq \frac{M}{\partial_1 M + \dots + \partial_n M}.$$

(So an integral on  $M$  is a linear form  $\int M \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ .)

## Theorem (Kashiwara)

If  $M$  is holonomic,  $\int M$  is finite dimensional.

## Integrals with boundaries

In general

$$\int_{\Gamma} (\partial_1 f_1 + \cdots + \partial_n f_n) \, d\mathbf{x} = \int_{\partial\Gamma} [\dots] \neq 0.$$



## Integrals with boundaries

In general

$$\int_{\Gamma} (\partial_1 f_1 + \cdots + \partial_n f_n) \, d\mathbf{x} = \int_{\partial\Gamma} [\dots] \neq 0.$$

\* In the D-module approach, we need  $\partial\Gamma = \emptyset$ .

## Integrals with boundaries

In general

$$\int_{\Gamma} (\partial_1 f_1 + \cdots + \partial_n f_n) \, d\mathbf{x} = \int_{\partial\Gamma} [\dots] \neq 0.$$

- \* In the D-module approach, we need  $\partial\Gamma = \emptyset$ .
- \* Even if  $\partial\Gamma \neq \emptyset$ , you still learn something useful from your integral by studying the consequences of

$$\int (\partial_1 f_1 + \cdots + \partial_n f_n) \, d\mathbf{x} = 0.$$

## Integrals with boundaries

In general

$$\int_{\Gamma} (\partial_1 f_1 + \cdots + \partial_n f_n) \, d\mathbf{x} = \int_{\partial\Gamma} [\dots] \neq 0.$$

- \* In the D-module approach, we need  $\partial\Gamma = \emptyset$ .
- \* Even if  $\partial\Gamma \neq \emptyset$ , you still learn something useful from your integral by studying the consequences of

$$\int (\partial_1 f_1 + \cdots + \partial_n f_n) \, d\mathbf{x} = 0.$$

- \* The approach of Oaku (2013) may apply:

$$\int_{\Gamma} f \, d\mathbf{x} = \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} \mathbb{1}_{\Gamma} f \, d\mathbf{x},$$

if you can work with Schwartz distributions.

## Takayama's algorithm for integration

Let  $M = D/I$  a holonomic D-module with  $I \subseteq D$  a left ideal.

$$\int M = \frac{M}{\partial_1 M + \cdots + \partial_n M} \simeq \frac{D}{I + \partial_1 D + \cdots + \partial_n D}.$$

# Takayama's algorithm for integration

Let  $M = D/I$  a holonomic D-module with  $I \subseteq D$  a left ideal.

$$\int M = \frac{M}{\partial_1 M + \cdots + \partial_n M} \simeq \frac{D}{I + \partial_1 D + \cdots + \partial_n D}.$$

## Algorithm (Takayama, 1990)

1. Pick some  $r$  and some  $s$  large enough.
2. Compute the finite dimensional vector space

$$V_{r+s} = I \cap D_{r+s} + \partial_1 D_{r+s-1} + \cdots + \partial_n D_{r+s-1},$$

where  $D_k = \text{Vect} \{ \mathbf{x}^\alpha \partial^\beta \mid |\alpha| + |\beta| \leq k \}.$

3. Return  $D_r / (V_{r+s} \cap D_r).$

# Takayama's algorithm for integration

Let  $M = D/I$  a holonomic D-module with  $I \subseteq D$  a left ideal.

$$\int M = \frac{M}{\partial_1 M + \cdots + \partial_n M} \simeq \frac{D}{I + \partial_1 D + \cdots + \partial_n D}.$$

## Algorithm (Takayama, 1990)

1. Pick some  $r$  and some  $s$  large enough.
2. Compute the finite dimensional vector space

$$V_{r+s} = I \cap D_{r+s} + \partial_1 D_{r+s-1} + \cdots + \partial_n D_{r+s-1},$$

where  $D_k = \text{Vect} \{ \mathbf{x}^\alpha \partial^\beta \mid |\alpha| + |\beta| \leq k \}.$

3. Return  $D_r / (V_{r+s} \cap D_r).$

*Correctness.* There is a canonical map  $D_r / (V_{r+s} \cap D_r) \rightarrow \int M$ .  
It is surjective if  $r \gg 0$  and injective if  $s \gg 0$ .

# Issues with Takayama's algorithm

❓ How to choose  $r$  and  $s$ ?

Important theoretical question, but in practice:

- Choose  $r$  large enough so that  $D_r$  contains what you want
- Increase  $s$  until you discover no new relations

# Issues with Takayama's algorithm

❓ How to choose  $r$  and  $s$ ?

Important theoretical question, but in practice:

- Choose  $r$  large enough so that  $D_r$  contains what you want
- Increase  $s$  until you discover no new relations

⌚ Linear algebra in large dimension



## A priori bounds

- \* Let  $w(\mathbf{x}^\alpha \partial^\beta) = |\alpha| - |\beta|$  be the *weight* of a monomial.
- \* Let  $w(g) = \max \{w(m) \mid m \text{ is a monomial in } g\}$
- \* Let  $\theta = \sum_i x_i \partial_i$ .

**NB**  $\theta \cdot \mathbf{x}^\alpha = |\alpha| \mathbf{x}^\alpha$  and  $\theta = -n + \sum_i \partial_i x_i$ .

## A priori bounds

- \* Let  $w(\mathbf{x}^\alpha \partial^\beta) = |\alpha| - |\beta|$  be the *weight* of a monomial.
- \* Let  $w(g) = \max \{w(m) \mid m \text{ is a monomial in } g\}$
- \* Let  $\theta = \sum_i x_i \partial_i$ .

**NB**  $\theta \cdot \mathbf{x}^\alpha = |\alpha| \mathbf{x}^\alpha$  and  $\theta = -n + \sum_i \partial_i x_i$ .

✚ [b-function theory] There is some  $g \in I$  and  $b \in \mathbb{C}[s]$  such that

$$g = b(\theta) + \text{terms of negative weights.}$$

## A priori bounds

- \* Let  $w(\mathbf{x}^\alpha \partial^\beta) = |\alpha| - |\beta|$  be the *weight* of a monomial.
- \* Let  $w(g) = \max \{w(m) \mid m \text{ is a monomial in } g\}$
- \* Let  $\theta = \sum_i x_i \partial_i$ .

**NB**  $\theta \cdot \mathbf{x}^\alpha = |\alpha| \mathbf{x}^\alpha$  and  $\theta = -n + \sum_i \partial_i x_i$ .

 [b-function theory] There is some  $g \in I$  and  $b \in \mathbb{C}[s]$  such that

$$g = b(\theta) + \text{terms of negative weights.}$$

 For any  $\mathbf{x}^\alpha$ ,

$$\mathbf{x}^\alpha g = b(-|\alpha| - n) \mathbf{x}^\alpha + \text{lower order terms} + \sum_i \partial_i (\dots)$$

## A priori bounds

- \* Let  $w(\mathbf{x}^\alpha \partial^\beta) = |\alpha| - |\beta|$  be the *weight* of a monomial.
- \* Let  $w(g) = \max \{w(m) \mid m \text{ is a monomial in } g\}$
- \* Let  $\theta = \sum_i x_i \partial_i$ .

**NB**  $\theta \cdot \mathbf{x}^\alpha = |\alpha| \mathbf{x}^\alpha$  and  $\theta = -n + \sum_i \partial_i x_i$ .

✂ [b-function theory] There is some  $g \in I$  and  $b \in \mathbb{C}[s]$  such that

$$g = b(\theta) + \text{terms of negative weights.}$$

🔑 For any  $\mathbf{x}^\alpha$ ,

$$\mathbf{x}^\alpha g = b(-|\alpha| - n) \mathbf{x}^\alpha + \text{lower order terms} + \sum_i \partial_i(\dots)$$

- ✓ In Takayama's algorithm,  
if  $r \geq \max \{k \in \mathbb{N} \mid b(-k - n) = 0\}$   
then  $D_r / (V_{r+s} \cap D_r) \rightarrow \int M$  surjective.  
(It is also injective, but this is more subtle.)

# Integration of rational functions

Let  $a, f \in \mathbb{C}[\mathbf{x}]$  homogeneous,  $k > 0$  with  $\deg a + n = k \deg f$ .

The following questions are equivalent:

\* Is  $\int \frac{a}{f^k} d\mathbf{x} = 0$ ?

# Integration of rational functions

Let  $a, f \in \mathbb{C}[\mathbf{x}]$  homogeneous,  $k > 0$  with  $\deg a + n = k \deg f$ .

The following questions are equivalent:

- \* Is  $\int \frac{a}{f^k} d\mathbf{x} = 0$ ?
- \* Is  $\int a e^f d\mathbf{x} = 0$ ?

# Integration of rational functions

Let  $a, f \in \mathbb{C}[\mathbf{x}]$  homogeneous,  $k > 0$  with  $\deg a + n = k \deg f$ .

The following questions are equivalent:

- \* Is  $\int \frac{a}{f^k} d\mathbf{x} = 0$ ?
- \* Is  $\int a e^f d\mathbf{x} = 0$ ?
- \* Does  $a e^f = \sum_i \frac{\partial}{\partial x_i} (u_i e^f)$  for some polynomials  $u_i$ ?

# Integration of rational functions

Let  $a, f \in \mathbb{C}[\mathbf{x}]$  homogeneous,  $k > 0$  with  $\deg a + n = k \deg f$ .

The following questions are equivalent:

- \* Is  $\int \frac{a}{f^k} d\mathbf{x} = 0$ ?
- \* Is  $\int a e^f d\mathbf{x} = 0$ ?
- \* Does  $a e^f = \sum_i \frac{\partial}{\partial x_i} (u_i e^f)$  for some polynomials  $u_i$ ?
- \* Does  $a \in I + \partial_1 D + \cdots + \partial_n D$  where  $I = \sum_i D(\partial_i - \frac{\partial f}{\partial x_i})$ ?



## Griffiths–Dwork reduction

⚡ The reduction step modulo  $I + \partial_1 D + \cdots + \partial_n D$ :

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_i b_i \frac{\partial f}{\partial x_i} &\equiv \sum_i b_i \partial_i \pmod{I} \\ &= \sum_i \partial_i b_i - \frac{\partial b_i}{\partial x_i} \quad (\text{commutation rule in } D) \\ &\equiv - \sum_i \frac{\partial b_i}{\partial x_i} \pmod{\partial_1 D + \cdots + \partial_n D}\end{aligned}$$

## Griffiths–Dwork reduction

⚡ The reduction step modulo  $I + \partial_1 D + \cdots + \partial_n D$ :

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_i b_i \frac{\partial f}{\partial x_i} &\equiv \sum_i b_i \partial_i \pmod{I} \\ &= \sum_i \partial_i b_i - \frac{\partial b_i}{\partial x_i} \quad (\text{commutation rule in } D) \\ &\equiv - \sum_i \frac{\partial b_i}{\partial x_i} \pmod{\partial_1 D + \cdots + \partial_n D}\end{aligned}$$

```
1  def GD(a):  
2      while True:  
3           $r + \sum_i b_i \frac{\partial f}{\partial x_i} \leftarrow a$  [multivariate polynomial division]  
4          if  $a = r$ :  
5              return a  
6           $a \leftarrow r - \sum_i \frac{\partial b_i}{\partial x_i}$ 
```

# Griffiths–Dwork reduction



## **Theorem (Dwork, 1962, 1964; Griffiths, 1969)**

If  $\{f = 0\}$  is *smooth* in  $\mathbb{P}^{n-1}$ , then  $GD(a) = 0$  if and only if  $\int a e^f = 0$ .



More often than not,  $\{f = 0\}$  is not smooth...

# Griffiths–Dwork reduction

☀ **Theorem (Dwork, 1962, 1964; Griffiths, 1969)**

If  $\{f = 0\}$  is *smooth* in  $\mathbb{P}^{n-1}$ , then  $GD(a) = 0$  if and only if  $\int a e^f = 0$ .

☁ More often than not,  $\{f = 0\}$  is not smooth...

⚡ Syzigies give more relations! (Lairez, 2016)

$$\sum_i b_i \frac{\partial f}{\partial x_i} = 0 \Rightarrow \sum_i \frac{\partial b_i}{\partial x_i} \in I + \sum_i \partial_i D.$$

And only *nontrivial* syzigies may give new relations.

## A Griffiths–Dwork reduction for holonomic ideal?

Let  $M = D/I$  be a holonomic D-module. We want to compute in

$$\int M \simeq \frac{D}{\underbrace{I}_{\text{left ideal}} + \underbrace{\partial_1 D + \cdots + \partial_n D}_{\text{right ideal}}}.$$

## A Griffiths–Dwork reduction for holonomic ideal?

Let  $M = D/I$  be a holonomic D-module. We want to compute in

$$\int M \simeq \frac{D}{\underbrace{I}_{\text{left ideal}} + \underbrace{\partial_1 D + \cdots + \partial_n D}_{\text{right ideal}}}.$$

```
1 def GenGD( $a$ ): [Brochet, Chyzak, and Lairez, 2025]
2   while  $a$  is reducible:
3      $a \leftarrow \text{LeftRem}(a, I)$ 
4      $a \leftarrow \text{RightRem}(a, \partial_1 D + \cdots + \partial_n D)$ 
5   return  $a$ 
```

## Fixing *GenGD*

- \* An element  $a \in D$  is *irreducible* if  $\text{GenGD}(a) = a$ .  
Irreducible elements forms a linear subspace  $E \subseteq D$ .

## Fixing $GenGD$

- \* An element  $a \in D$  is *irreducible* if  $GenGD(a) = a$ .  
Irreducible elements forms a linear subspace  $E \subseteq D$ .
- \* We may have missed relations!  
They form the subspace  $E \cap (I + \sum_i \partial_i D)$ .



## Fixing *GenGD*

- \* An element  $a \in D$  is *irreducible* if  $\text{GenGD}(a) = a$ .  
Irreducible elements forms a linear subspace  $E \subseteq D$ .

- \* We may have missed relations!  
They form the subspace  $E \cap (I + \sum_i \partial_i D)$ .

-  To fix *GenGD*, we need to compute (or rather enumerate) a generating set of  $E \cap (I + \sum_i \partial_i D)$ .

## Fixing *GenGD*

- \* An element  $a \in D$  is *irreducible* if  $\text{GenGD}(a) = a$ .  
Irreducible elements forms a linear subspace  $E \subseteq D$ .

- \* We may have missed relations!  
They form the subspace  $E \cap (I + \sum_i \partial_i D)$ .

-  To fix *GenGD*, we need to compute (or rather enumerate) a generating set of  $E \cap (I + \sum_i \partial_i D)$ .

-  The missing relations come from monomials  $m \in D$  that are reducible both by  $I$  and by  $\sum_i \partial_i D$  (critical pairs)

## Fixing *GenGD*

- \* An element  $a \in D$  is *irreducible* if  $\text{GenGD}(a) = a$ .  
Irreducible elements forms a linear subspace  $E \subseteq D$ .

- \* We may have missed relations!  
They form the subspace  $E \cap (I + \sum_i \partial_i D)$ .

-  To fix *GenGD*, we need to compute (or rather enumerate) a generating set of  $E \cap (I + \sum_i \partial_i D)$ .

-  The missing relations come from monomials  $m \in D$  that are reducible both by  $I$  and by  $\sum_i \partial_i D$  (critical pairs)

-  Among this critical pairs, many can be eliminated *a priori*.

## Fixing *GenGD*

- ✓ *GenGD* Coincides with Griffiths–Dwork reduction when  $M = \mathbb{C}[\mathbf{x}]e^f$ .
- ! Does not reduce every derivatives to zero, but this can be fixed.
- ✓ After taking into accounts these critical pairs, we obtain all the relations.
- 🐙 <https://github.com/HBrochet/MultivariateCreativeTelescoping.jl>

## Fixing *GenGD*

- ✓ *GenGD* Coincides with Griffiths–Dwork reduction when  $M = \mathbb{C}[\mathbf{x}]e^f$ .
- ! Does not reduce every derivatives to zero, but this can be fixed.
- ✓ After taking into accounts these critical pairs, we obtain all the relations.
- 🐙 <https://github.com/HBrochet/MultivariateCreativeTelescoping.jl>

### 🕒 Is it fast?

✗ Sometimes not.

For example:  $I = D\partial_1 + \cdots + D\partial_n$ , so that  $D/I = \mathbb{C}[\mathbf{x}]$ . We just want to integrate polynomials. This should be trivial, but *GenGD* is just the identity map...

✓ Sometimes yes.

For example: computation of the generating series of the number of 8-regular graphs on  $k$  vertices.

## References I

- Andres, D., Brickenstein, M., Levandovskyy, V., Martín-Morales, J., & Schönemann, H. (2010). Constructive D-Module Theory with Singular. *Math. Comput. Sci.*, 4(2–3), 359–383.
- Beukers, F., & Peters, C. A. M. (1984). A family of K3 surfaces and  $\zeta(3)$ . *J. Reine Angew. Math.*, 351, 42–54.
- Brochet, H., Chyzak, F., & Lairez, P. (2025). *Faster multivariate integration in D-modules*. arXiv: 2504.12724.
- Dwork, B. (1962). On the zeta function of a hypersurface. *Inst. Hautes Études Sci. Publ. Math.*, (12), 5–68.
- Dwork, B. (1964). On the zeta function of a hypersurface: II. *Ann. of Math.*, 80, 227–299.
- Griffiths, P. A. (1969). On the periods of certain rational integrals I. *Ann. Math.*, 90(3), 460.
- Lairez, P. (2016). Computing periods of rational integrals. *Math. Comput.*, 85(300), 1719–1752.

## References II

- Leykin, A. (2002, July 1). D-modules for macaulay 2. In *Mathematical Software* (pp. 169–179). World Scientific.
- Oaku, T. (2013). Algorithms for integrals of holonomic functions over domains defined by polynomial inequalities. *J. Symb. Comput.*, 50, 1–27.
- Saito, M., Sturmfels, B., & Takayama, N. (2000). *Gröbner deformations of hypergeometric differential equations* (Vol. 6). Springer-Verlag.
- Takayama, N. (1990). An algorithm of constructing the integral of a module: An infinite dimensional analog of Gröbner basis. *Proc. ISSAC 1990*, 206–211.