$u=a-b \text{ for monomials } \mathbf{x}^b<_{\mathrm{mon}}\mathbf{x}^a.$   $Result\ 1.\ \text{If}\ \nu_1,\nu_2\in C\ \text{and}\ p,q\in\mathbb{Q}_+\ \text{then}\ p\nu_1+q\nu_2\in C\ \text{whenever}\ p\nu_1+q\nu_2\in\mathbb{Z}^n.$ 

**d.** Suppose we have a monomial ordering  $<_{\mathrm{mon}}$  and let C be the set of vectors  $\nu \in \mathbb{Z}^n$  such that

Proof. Consider four monomials  $\mathbf{x}^b <_{\mathrm{mon}} \mathbf{x}^a$  and  $\mathbf{x}^d <_{\mathrm{mon}} \mathbf{x}^c$  in  $\mathbb{F}[x_1,\ldots,x_n]$ . Suppose we have  $p,q \in \mathbb{Q}_+$  such that  $\nu = p(a-b) + q(c-d) \in \mathbb{Z}^n$ . It is convenient to explicitly write p and q as fractions:

$$p = \frac{p_N}{p_D}, \ q = \frac{q_N}{q_D} \ \text{with} \ p_D, q_D, p_N, q_N \in \mathbb{Z}_+$$
 We know  $(\mathbf{x}^b)^{p_N q_D} <_{\text{mon}} (\mathbf{x}^a)^{p_N q_D} \ \text{and} \ (\mathbf{x}^d)^{p_D q_N} <_{\text{mon}} (\mathbf{x}^c)^{p_D q_N}.$  Defining 
$$f = p_N q_D a + p_D q_N c$$

 $f = p_N q_D a + p_D q_N c$  $g = p_N q_D b + p_D q_N d$ 

 $e \in \mathbb{Z}^n_{\geq 0}$  so that  $e + \nu \in \mathbb{Z}^n_{\geq 0}$ , then  $(\mathbf{x}^e)^{p_Dq_D} = \mathbf{x}^{p_Dq_De}$  and  $(\mathbf{x}^{e+\nu})^{p_Dq_D} = \mathbf{x}^{p_Dq_De+f-g}$ . Because f - g is in C and  $<_{\mathrm{mon}}$  is a total ordering on monomials, we have  $\mathbf{x}^{p_Dq_De} <_{\mathrm{mon}} \mathbf{x}^{p_Dq_De+f-g}$  so  $(\mathbf{x}^e)^{p_Dq_D} <_{\mathrm{mon}} (\mathbf{x}^{e+\nu})^{p_Dq_D}$ . But then it must be true that  $\mathbf{x}^e <_{\mathrm{mon}} \mathbf{x}^{e+\nu}$  so  $\nu \in C$ .

we have  $\mathbf{x}^g <_{\text{mon}} \mathbf{x}^f$  so  $f - g \in C$ . It is easy to check that  $-\mu \notin C$  whenever  $\mu \in C$ . Now, choose

Suppose we are given a finite number of vectors  $u_1, \nu_2, \dots, \nu_m \in C$  and consider the convex combination

Suppose we are given a finite number of vectors  $\nu_1, \nu_2, \dots, \nu_m \in C$  and consider the convex combination  $\sum_{i=1}^m r_i \nu_i = 0$ 

Say  $\beta = \{u_1, \dots, u_l\}$  and write  $r = c_1u_1 + \dots + c_lu_l$ . As r lies in  $\mathbb{R}_+^m$  we may find rationals  $c_1^*, \dots, c_l^*$  sufficiently close to  $c_1, \dots, c_l$  (respectively) such that  $q = c_1^*u_1 + \dots + c_l^*u_l$  has positive components, i.e.  $q \in \mathbb{Q}_+^m$ . We can choose these rational coefficients so that the components of q add up to q. But

with  $r_1, \ldots, r_m \in \mathbb{R}_+$ . Clearly  $m \geq 2$ . Let M be the  $n \times m$  matrix with i-th column equal to  $\nu_i$  and let

 $r=(r_1,\ldots,r_m)$ . The null space of the linear map  $L_M$  induced by M is nontrivial because  $L_M(r)=0$ 

and has a basis  $\beta$  consisting of vectors in  $\mathbb{Q}^m$ . This may be checked by Gaussian elimination on M.

 $\sum_{i=1}^{m} (q)_i \nu_i = 0$ 

then  $L_M(q) = 0$  and we have the rational convex combination

More conveniently, we have positive integers 
$$n_1,\dots,n_m$$
 such that

$$\sum_{i=1}^{m} n_i \nu_i = 0$$

Using Result 1 inductively we obtain a contradiction because clearly  $0 \notin C$ . Note Equation 1 holds for vectors  $\nu_1, \dots, \nu_m \in C$  iff 0 lies in the convex hull of C, denoted by  $\operatorname{ch}(C)$ . Thus  $0 \notin \operatorname{ch}(C)$ .

One separation theorem in convex analysis shows there exists an hyperplane  $H^{(1)}$  of  $\mathbb{R}^n$  separating

(not necessarily strictly) 0 and  $\operatorname{ch}(C)$ , *i.e.* there exists a vector  $v_1 \in \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \{0\}$  such that  $v_1 \cdot x \geq 0$  for all  $x \in \operatorname{ch}(C)$ . Actually  $v_1$  has nonnegative components because C contains the canonical basis of  $\mathbb{R}^n$ . Moreover, if  $\mu$  is a vector in  $\mathbb{Z}^n \setminus \{0\}$  such that  $v_1 \cdot \mu > 0$  then  $\mu$  lies in C because either  $\mu \in C$  or

whoseover, if  $\mu$  is a vector in  $\mathbb{Z}\setminus\{0\}$  such that  $v_1\cdot\mu>0$  then  $\mu$  lies in C because either  $\mu\in C$  or  $-\mu\in C$  holds and in the later case we would have  $v_1\cdot\mu\leq 0$ . We may simply define  $H^{(1)}=v_1^\perp$ , the orthogonal complement of  $v_1$ .

Now, define the set  $C^{(1)}=H^{(1)}\cap C$ . If  $C^{(1)}=\emptyset$  then we are done and we can tell apart any element of C via taking the dot product with  $v_1$ . Otherwise, notice that  $0\notin \operatorname{ch}(C^{(1)})$ . Extending the separation theorem to arbitrary vector subspaces of  $\mathbb{R}^n$  we can find an hyperplane  $H^{(2)}$  of  $H^{(1)}$ 

separation theorem to arbitrary vector subspaces of  $\mathbb R^-$  we can find an hyperplane  $H^{(r)}$  of  $H^{(r)}$  separating 0 and  $\mathrm{ch}(C^{(1)})$ , or equivalently, a vector  $v_2 \in H^{(1)} \setminus \{0\}$  such that  $v_2 \cdot x \geq 0$  for all  $x \in \mathrm{ch}(C^{(1)})$  so that  $H^{(2)} = v_1^{\perp} \cap v_2^{\perp}$ . Again, if for some  $\mu \in \mathbb Z^n \setminus \{0\}$  we have  $v_1 \cdot \mu = 0$  and  $v_1 \cdot \mu \geq 0$ , then  $\mu$  lies in  $C^{(1)} \subseteq C$ . We then define  $C^{(2)} = H^{(2)} \cap C^{(1)}$  and ask whether  $C^{(2)} = \emptyset$ .

 $v_2 \cdot \mu > 0$ , then  $\mu$  lies in  $C^{(1)} \subseteq C$ . We then define  $C^{(2)} = H^{(2)} \cap C^{(1)}$  and ask whether  $C^{(2)} = \emptyset$ . If true, we can tell apart vectors in C via first taking their dot product with  $v_1$  and, in case of a 0, subsequently taking the product with  $v_2$ , which would suffice. If not true, we continue our inductive

pairwise orthogonal by construction, so by linear independence they form a basis of  $\mathbb{R}^n$  and we would have  $C^{(n)} = H^{(n)} \cap C^{(n-1)} = (v_1^{\perp} \cap v_2^{\perp} \cap \cdots \cap v_n^{\perp}) \cap C^{(n-1)} \subseteq \{0\} \cap C = \emptyset$ . In any case, we could

complete the orthogonal basis without affecting the weight order.

process until we stop. It will have to stop necessarily when we find n vectors  $v_1, v_2, \dots, v_n$ : they are