

THE DUAL F-SIGNATURE OF VERONESE RINGS

VINICIUS BOUÇA, ELIANA TOLOSA VILLARREAL, AND KEVIN VASCONCELLOS

ABSTRACT. In this paper we address the question of I. Smirnov and K. Tucker on the dual F -signature of the Veronese subrings of polynomial rings in n variables using methods of commutative algebra.

1. INTRODUCTION

Let R be a complete d -dimensional reduced Noetherian local ring with prime characteristic $p > 0$ and perfect residue field $K = R/pR$. For $e \in \mathbb{N}$, we can naturally identify the inclusion $R \subseteq R^{1/p^e}$ into the p^e -th roots of elements of R , with the e -th iterate of the Frobenius endomorphism. The behaviour of such endomorphism characterizes some singularities, called the F -singularities. Among the classes of F -singularities, three hold primordial significance: F -purity, strong F -regularity and F -rationality. To investigate and classify F -singularities, several numerical invariants have been introduced since the past four decades.

Let us decompose R^{1/p^e} as the direct sum of free R -modules and a non-free summand M_e and let a_e denote the largest rank of the free R -module appearing in the decomposition. That is,

$$R^{1/p^e} = R^{\oplus a_e} \oplus M_e.$$

The number a_e is called the e -th *Frobenius splitting number* and it gives information on how the Frobenius endomorphism acts on R . In order to study the asymptotic behaviour of a_e , it was defined the F -signature as the following limit

$$s(R) = \lim_{e \rightarrow \infty} \frac{a_e}{p^{ed}}.$$

The F -signature was first implicitly mentioned in the work of K. Smith and M. Van der Bergh [SdB02] in 1997 and then it was formally introduced and studied by C. Huneke and G. Leuschke [HL02] in 2002. Nonetheless, the existence of the limit was not clear until 2012, when K. Tucker proved it in general [Tuc12].

This invariant carries interesting information about the singularities of R . In fact, if R is a regular ring, R^{1/p^e} is a free R -module of rank p^{ed} , meaning that the F -signature somehow measures how far is the ring R to be regular. C. Huneke and G. Leuschke [HL02] proved that $s(R) \geq 1$ with equality if and only if R is regular. Furthermore, I. Aberbach and G. Leuschke [AL03] showed that $s(R) > 0$ if and only if R is strongly F -regular.

To study the relationship between the F -signature and F -rationality, A. Sannai [San15] expanded the definition of F -signature to encompass modules, introducing the *dual F -signature* and defined as follows

$$s_{dual}(M) = \limsup_{q \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\max\{N \mid \text{there is a surjection } F_*^e \omega_R \rightarrow \omega_R^N\}}{\text{rank } F_*^e \omega_R},$$

where R is assumed Cohen-Macaulay and ω_R is its canonical module.

Sannai established that, for F -finite reduced Cohen-Macaulay local rings with characteristic $p > 0$ and admitting canonical module ω_R , the condition of F -rationality is unequivocally defined: R is F -rational if and only if the dual F -signature of its canonical module is positive.

However, calculating the F -signature and the dual F -signature is not trivial. The question is still open even for well studied rings.

Our work focuses on calculating the dual F -signature of the d -th Veronese subring $S^{(d)}$ of the polynomial ring $S = k[x_1, \dots, x_n]$, validating the suspicion presented by Smirnov and Tucker in [ST23]. We state our main result next.

Theorem 1.1. *Let k be a perfect field of prime characteristic $p > 0$ and $S^{(d)}$ the d -Veronese subring of $k[x_1, \dots, x_n]$. Then, the dual F -signature of $S^{(d)}$ is*

$$s_{dual}(S^{(d)}) = \frac{1}{d} \left\lceil \frac{d}{n} \right\rceil.$$

The paper is organized as follows. In section 2 we recall some basic definitions about the dual F -signature of a module and establish the notation used throughout the paper. In section 3, we explicitly give a decomposition of the module of p^e -roots canonical module of the Veronese rings $S^{(d)}$ as a direct sum of $S^{(d)}$ -modules. In section 4 we pause the discussion on the dual F -signature to prove an auxiliary result that is used. Finally, in section 5, we state again our main question and prove it by bounding above the F -signature by counting generators and bounding it below by exhibiting explicit maps between

2. PRELIMINARIES

Throughout what follows, (R, \mathfrak{m}, K) is a d -dimensional reduced Noetherian ring of prime characteristic $p > 0$. We use the symbol q to represent a varying power of p in our notation. We set $\alpha(R) = \log_p[K : K^p]$ and assume that R is F -finite, which means that the Frobenius endomorphism is finite. Equivalently, considering $R^{1/q} = \{r^{1/q} ; r \in R\}$ the ring of q -th roots of elements of R , R is F -finite if $R^{1/q}$ is a finite R -module, which implies that $\alpha(R) < \infty$. In the following we present the definition of the F -signature of R .

Definition 2.1. *Let (R, \mathfrak{m}, k) be a ring as above. For each $q = p^e$, decompose $R^{1/q}$ as a direct sum of finite R -modules $R^{a_q} \oplus M_q$, where M_q does not contain non-zero free direct summands. The F -signature of R is*

$$s(R) = \lim_{q \rightarrow \infty} \frac{a_q}{q^{d+\alpha(R)}}.$$

For any positive integer e , we define the ring endomorphism F^e through the composition of the Frobenius endomorphism applied e times. Consequently, for an R -module M , this endomorphism induces on M a new R -module structure on M , denoted as $F_*^e M$. Sannai [San15] extended the concept of F -signature for R -modules, introducing what he referred to as the dual F -signature.

Definition 2.2. *Let (R, \mathfrak{m}, k) be a ring as above and M an R -module. For each q , let b_q be the F -surjective number of M defined by*

$$b_q = \max\{n \in \mathbb{N} ; \exists F_*^e : M \longrightarrow M^n \text{ surjective}\}.$$

We define the dual F -signature of M by

$$s_{\text{dual}}(M) = \limsup_{q \rightarrow \infty} \frac{b_q}{q^{d+\alpha(R)}}.$$

Let K be a perfect field with a prime characteristic $p > 0$. Consider $S = K[x_1, \dots, x_n]$ the polynomial ring over K with n indeterminates and equipped with the standard grading. Let's denote by S_i the i -th homogeneous component of the polynomial ring S . This component is spanned over K by all monomials of S that possess a degree i . This leads us the following direct sum decomposition

$$S = \bigoplus_{i=0}^{\infty} S_i.$$

The d -th Veronese ring of S , commonly denoted as $S^{(d)}$, is the graded subring generated over K by all monomials of degree d , that is

$$S^{(d)} = \bigoplus_{i=0}^{\infty} S_{id}.$$

Observe that S can be regarded as a finite module over $S^{(d)}$. With this structure, S decomposes into a direct sum of S_d -modules

$$S = \bigoplus_{j=0}^{d-1} S_{[j]},$$

where

$$S_{[j]} = \bigoplus_{i=0}^{\infty} S_{j+id}$$

for $j = 0, 1, \dots, d-1$. Notice that we can think of $S_{[j]}$ as the polynomials with degree j modulo d . Lastly, the superscript $^{1/p^e}$ shall symbolize the ring (or module) resulting from taking p -th roots.

Remark 2.3. *Note that, if $S = K[x_1, \dots, x_n]$ is the polynomial ring over K with n indeterminates over a perfect field of prime characteristic $p > 0$, then its d -Veronese subring $S^{(d)}$ is a reduced F -finite ring.*

3. THE STRUCTURE OF THE CANONICAL MODULE OF VERONESE RINGS

In this section we will explain the structure of the canonical module of the Veronese ring $S^{(d)}$. Recall that the canonical module of the polynomial ring S is $S(-n)$. Hence the canonical module $\omega_{S^{(d)}}$ is given by

$$\omega_{S^{(d)}} = (\omega_S)^{(d)} = \bigoplus_{i=0}^{\infty} S_{-n+id} = S_{[k]},$$

where k is the remainder of n when divided by d .

Proposition 3.1. *Let $S = K[x_1, \dots, x_n]$ be a standard graded polynomial ring over a perfect field K of characteristic $p > 0$ a non-negative integer e and $d = p^e q$ a positive integer with $\gcd(p, q) = 1$. Then the p^e -th root of canonical module $(\omega_{S^{(d)}})^{\frac{1}{p^e}}$ of the d -Veronese subring decomposes as a direct sum*

$$(\omega_{S^{(d)}})^{\frac{1}{p^e}} = S_{[0]}^{\oplus n_0} \oplus \dots \oplus S_{[d-1]}^{\oplus n_{d-1}},$$

with $n_i = \frac{p^{ne} - k_e}{d}$ or $\frac{p^{ne} - k_e}{d} + 1$ and k_e is the remainder of p^{ne} when divided by d .

Proof: Since $\omega_{S^{(d)}}$ is given by

$$\omega_{S^{(d)}} = (\omega_S)^{(d)} = \bigoplus_{i=0}^{\infty} S_{-n+id} = S_{[k]},$$

where k is the remainder of n when divided by d , one has that

$$(\omega_{S^{(d)}})^{\frac{1}{p^e}} = (S_{[k]})^{\frac{1}{p^e}} = \bigoplus_{\sum c_i \equiv_d k} K \cdot x_1^{\frac{c_1}{p^e}} \dots x_n^{\frac{c_n}{p^e}}.$$

Now observe that each of the c_i can be written uniquely as a sum $a_i p^f + b_i$ with $0 \leq b_i < p^f$.

Hence

$$\left(\sum_{i=1}^n a_i \right) p^e + \sum_{i=1}^n b_i = \sum_{i=1}^n c_i \equiv_d k.$$

Since we are interested in the asymptotic behavior of p^e we can suppose that $e > f$.

Therefore by the Chinese Remainder Theorem, one has

$$(1) \quad \left(\sum a_i \right) p^e + \sum b_i \equiv_{p^f} k \quad \text{and} \quad \left(\sum a_i \right) p^e + \sum b_i \equiv_q k$$

which is

$$(2) \quad \sum b_i \equiv_{p^f} k \quad \text{and} \quad \left(\sum a_i \right) p^e + \sum b_i \equiv_q k.$$

Let

$$S_{[k,l]} = \bigoplus_{g \in G} S_g,$$

where G is the set of all elements g such that $g \equiv_{p^e} k$ and $g \equiv_q l$. Notice that this is a refinement of $S_{[h]}$ in the sense that

$$S_{[h]} \cong \bigoplus_{j=0}^{p^e-1} S_{[j,h]}$$

for the piece of degree congruent to h module q .

Let $\widetilde{\sum a_i}$ and $\widetilde{\sum b_i}$ be the congruence classes of $\sum a_i$ and $\sum b_i$ in $\mathbb{Z}/p^e\mathbb{Z}$ respectively; and let $\overline{\sum a_i}$ and $\overline{\sum b_i}$ be the congruence classes in $\mathbb{Z}/q\mathbb{Z}$ respectively. By Equation 2, $\widetilde{\sum b_i}$ is fixed and there is no constraint on $\widetilde{\sum a_i}$. Then, we only have to consider how $\overline{\sum a_i}$ and $\overline{\sum b_i}$ change.

Let us fix $\overline{\sum b_i}$ and $(b_1, \dots, b_n) \in \{0, \dots, p^e - 1\}^n$. Then, we have a unique $\overline{\sum a_i}$, say $\sum a_i \equiv_q k_b$, that can be reached with different vector values (a_1, \dots, a_n) .

Consider the direct sum of all the K -modules such that $\sum a_i \equiv_q k_b$,

$$\bigoplus_{\sum a_i \equiv_q k_b} K \cdot x_1^{\frac{a_1 p^e + b_1}{p^e}} \dots x_n^{\frac{a_n p^e + b_n}{p^e}} \cong \bigoplus_{j=0}^{p^e-1} S_{[j, k_b]} \cong S_{[k_b]}.$$

We have this direct sum for each $(b_1, \dots, b_n) \in \{0, \dots, p^e - 1\}^n$, then we have to count how many vectors (b_0, \dots, b_n) we have such that $\sum b_i \equiv_d \alpha$ to see how many copies of $S_{[k_b]}$ we obtain:

There are $(p^e)^n$ vectors (b_1, \dots, b_n) . We have to divide this total in the amount of congruence classes, that is $\frac{p^{ne}}{d}$. But as it has to be an integer we obtain

$$(3) \quad \frac{p^{ne} - k_e}{d} \quad \text{or} \quad \frac{p^{ne} - k_e}{d} + 1,$$

where k_e is the reminder of p^{ne} divided by d .

Finally we obtain

$$\bigoplus_{0 \leq k_b \leq q} \left[\bigoplus_{\sum a_i \equiv_q k_b} K \cdot x_1^{\frac{a_1 p^e + b_1}{p^e}} \dots x_n^{\frac{a_n p^e + b_n}{p^e}} \right]^{n_i},$$

where $n_i = \frac{p^{ne} - k_e}{d}$ or $\frac{p^{ne} - k_e}{d} + 1$. Hence We can conclude that if $d = p^e q$,

$$(\omega_{S^{(d)}})^{\frac{1}{p^e}} = S_{[0]}^{\oplus n_0} \oplus \dots \oplus S_{[d-1]}^{\oplus n_{d-1}},$$

with $n_i = \frac{p^{ne} - k_e}{d}$ or $\frac{p^{ne} - k_e}{d} + 1$ and this proves (2). \square

4. MAIN THEOREM

In this section, we prove the conjecture by I. Smirnov and K. Tucker on the dual F -signature of the Veronese rings $S^{(d)}$. For the sake of convenience, we restate here the conjecture.

Theorem 4.1. *Let K be a perfect field of prime characteristic $p > 0$ and $S^{(d)}$ the d -Veronese subring of $K[x_1, \dots, x_n]$. Then, the dual F -signature of $S^{(d)}$ is*

$$s_{dual}(S^{(d)}) = \frac{1}{d} \left\lceil \frac{d}{n} \right\rceil.$$

We break the proof of the theorem in several steps. Firstly, by counting the number of generators of each module, we give an upper bound $s_{dual}(S^{(d)})$.

Proposition 4.2. *Let $S = K[x_1, \dots, x_n]$ be a polynomial ring over a perfect field K of characteristic $p > 0$ and d a positive integer. Consider $S^{(d)}$ the d -th Veronese subring of S . Then,*

$$s_{dual}(S^{(d)}) \leq \frac{1}{n} \left\lceil \frac{n}{d} \right\rceil.$$

Proof: Recall that our goal is to find the largest N such that there is surjection

$$\omega_{S^{(d)}}^{\frac{1}{p^e}} = S_{[0]}^{\oplus n_0} \oplus \dots \oplus S_{[d-1]}^{\oplus n_{d-1}} \twoheadrightarrow \omega_{S^{(d)}}^N$$

as $S^{(d)}$ -modules. The $S^{(d)}$ -linearity of such a surjection implies that the induced map

$$S^{(d)\frac{1}{p^e}} = S_{[0]}^{\oplus n_0} \oplus \dots \oplus S_{[k]}^{\oplus n_k} \twoheadrightarrow \omega_{S^{(d)}}^N = S_{[k]}^N$$

also is a surjection, where k is the remainder of n when divided by d .

Now recall that the minimal number of generators of $S_{[i]}$ as a $S^{(d)}$ -module is given by $\binom{n+i-1}{n-1}$. Hence, by counting the minimal number of generators on each side, we have

$$\binom{n+k-1}{n-1} N \leq \sum_{i=0}^k \binom{n+i-1}{n-1} n_i,$$

which implies that

$$N \leq \frac{\sum_{i=0}^k \binom{n+i-1}{n-1} n_i}{\binom{n+k-1}{n-1}}.$$

Now it is clear that

$$\lim_{e \rightarrow \infty} \frac{n_i}{p^{ne}} = \frac{1}{d}.$$

Hence

$$s_{dual}(S^{(d)}) = \lim_{e \rightarrow \infty} \frac{N}{p^{nd}} \leq \frac{\sum_{i=0}^k \binom{n+i-1}{n-1}}{d \binom{n+k-1}{n-1}} = \frac{\binom{n+k}{n}}{d \binom{n+k-1}{n-1}} = \frac{1}{n} \left\lceil \frac{n}{d} \right\rceil.$$

□

We now establish the reverse inequality by studying the possible $S^{(d)}$ -linear surjections $S_{[i]}^e \twoheadrightarrow S_{[j]}^f$ for $0 \leq i \leq j < d$. Notice that the $S^{(d)}$ -linearity implies that $i \leq j$. Furthermore notice that this is equivalent to giving a homogeneous map $S_{(i-j)^e} \rightarrow S^f$ which is surjective in degree j . To construct such maps, we have the following proposition, which proof is postponed to the next section.

Proposition 4.3. *The homogeneous map $S(-1)^{n+k-1} \rightarrow S^k$ given by the matrix*

$$\Psi = \begin{bmatrix} x_1 & x_2 & x_3 & \dots & x_{n-1} & x_n & 0 & 0 & \dots & 0 \\ 0 & x_1 & x_2 & x_3 & \dots & x_{n-1} & x_n & 0 & \dots & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & x_1 & x_2 & x_3 & \dots & x_{n-1} & x_n & \dots & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & \dots & 0 & x_1 & x_2 & x_3 & \dots & x_{n-1} & x_n \end{bmatrix}$$

is surjective in degree $j \geq k$.

When applied for $k \leq d-1$, Proposition 4.3 shows that one can construct a surjection $S_{[k-1]}^{n+k} \twoheadrightarrow S_{[k]}^{1+k}$ and the domain and target of such map has the same number of minimal generators over $S^{(d)}$. Hence the surjection constructed in Proposition 4.3 is optimal.

Now we are able to count on how many copies of $S_{[i]}$ we need to build a surjection $S_{[i]}^{e_i} \twoheadrightarrow S_{[k]}^{f_i}$. Obviously, if $i = k$, then $e_i = f_i = 1$, while Proposition 4.3 conceives the case $e_{k-1} = n+k-1$ and $f_{k-1} = k$.

Proposition 4.4. *Let $0 \leq i < k < d$. Then there is a surjection*

$$S_{[i]}^{e_i} \twoheadrightarrow S_{[k]}^{f_i}$$

such that

$$\frac{f_i}{e_i} = \frac{\binom{n+i-1}{n-1}}{\binom{n+k-1}{n-1}}.$$

Proof. We prove the theorem by induction on the difference $k-i$, being the case $i = 1$ already discussed. Suppose then that we have a surjection

$$(4) \quad S_{i+1}^{e_{i+1}} \twoheadrightarrow S_{[k]}^{f_{i+1}}$$

such that

$$(5) \quad \frac{f_{i+1}}{e_{i+1}} = \frac{\binom{n+i}{n-1}}{\binom{n+k-1}{n-1}}.$$

Again by Proposition 4.3, there is a surjective map $S_{[i]}^{n+i} \twoheadrightarrow S_{[i+1]}^{i+1}$ and, we have a surjection

$$(6) \quad S_{[i]}^{e_{i+1}(n+i)} \twoheadrightarrow S_{[i+1]}^{(i+1)e_{i+1}}$$

by taking direct sums of these maps. Also, by taking direct sums of the map (4), one has a surjection

$$(7) \quad S_{i+1}^{(i+1)e_{i+1}} \twoheadrightarrow S_{[k]}^{(i+1)f_{i+1}}.$$

The composing of the surjections (4 and (6) yields the surjection

$$(8) \quad S_{[i]}^{e_{i+1}(n+i)} \twoheadrightarrow S_{[k]}^{(i+1)f_{i+1}}.$$

For the last assertion of the proposition, notice that

$$(9) \quad \frac{f_i}{e_i} = \frac{(i+1)f_{i+1}}{(n+1)e_{i+1}} = \frac{i+1}{n+i} \frac{\binom{n+i}{n-1}}{\binom{n+k-1}{n-1}} = \frac{\binom{n+i-1}{n-1}}{\binom{n+k-1}{n-1}}.$$

□

We are now ready to prove the promised lower bound.

Proposition 4.5. *Let $S = K[x_1, \dots, x_n]$ be a polynomial ring over a perfect field K of characteristic $p > 0$ and d a positive integer. Consider $S^{(d)}$ the d -th Veronese subring of S . Then,*

$$s_{dual}(S^{(d)}) \geq \frac{1}{n} \left\lceil \frac{n}{d} \right\rceil.$$

Proof. Let e be such that $p^e d \gg e_i$ as in the previous proposition. Then, with e_i copies of $S_{[i]}$ we surject on f_i copies of $S_{[k]}$. Then, if $r_{e,i}$ is the remainder of $n_{e,i}$ when divided by e_i , we have that $S_{[i]}^{\oplus n_{e,i}}$ can surject in

$$\frac{f_i(n_{e,i} - r_{e,i})}{e_i} = \frac{e_i(n_{e,i} - r_{e,i})}{f_i}$$

copies of $S_{[k]}$. Summing up in all i and noticing that $\lim_{e \rightarrow \infty} \frac{r_{e,i}}{p^{ne}} = 0$, we have that

$$s_{dual}(S^{(d)}) = \lim_{e \rightarrow \infty} \frac{N}{p^{ne}} \geq \lim_{e \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{i=0}^k \frac{\frac{e_i(n_{e,i} - r_{e,i})}{f_i}}{p^{ne}} = \sum_{i=0}^k \frac{e_i}{df_i} = \frac{\sum_{i=0}^k \binom{n+i-1}{n-1}}{d \binom{n+k-1}{n-1}} = \frac{\binom{n+k}{n}}{d \binom{n+k-1}{n-1}} = \frac{1}{n} \left\lceil \frac{n}{d} \right\rceil.$$

□

5. APPENDIX: AN AUXILIARY LEMMA

In the proof of Theorem 4.1 we invoked as an auxiliary result Proposition 4.3, that now we give a complete proof using monomial ordering techniques. For the sake of clarity, we recall the statement that we want to prove.

Proposition 5.1. *The homogeneous map $S(-1)^{n+k-1} \rightarrow S^k$ given by the matrix*

$$\Psi = \begin{bmatrix} x_1 & x_2 & x_3 & \dots & x_{n-1} & x_n & 0 & 0 & \dots & 0 \\ 0 & x_1 & x_2 & x_3 & \dots & x_{n-1} & x_n & 0 & \dots & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & x_1 & x_2 & x_3 & \dots & x_{n-1} & x_n & \dots & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & \dots & 0 & x_1 & x_2 & x_3 & \dots & x_{n-1} & x_n \end{bmatrix}$$

is surjective in degree $j \geq k$

The proposition follows immediately if we prove that $I_k(\Psi) = (x_1, \dots, x_n)^k$. Indeed, one always has

$$(x_1, \dots, x_n)^k = \text{Fitt}_0(\text{Coker}(\Psi)) \subset \text{Ann}(\text{Coker}(\Psi))$$

and this implies that $\text{Coker}(\Psi)_j = 0$ for $j \geq k$. Hence, our focus will be on proving that $I_k(\Psi) = (x_1, \dots, x_n)^k$.

We set some notations and conventions. Equip the polynomial ring S with lexicographical monomial order $x_1 < \dots < x_n$, and given $r \geq 1$, consider the $r \times (n+r-1)$ matrix

$$M(n, r) := \begin{bmatrix} x_1 & x_2 & x_3 & \dots & x_{n-1} & x_n & 0 & 0 & \dots & 0 \\ 0 & x_1 & x_2 & x_3 & \dots & x_{n-1} & x_n & 0 & \dots & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & x_1 & x_2 & x_3 & \dots & x_{n-1} & x_n & \dots & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & \dots & 0 & x_1 & x_2 & x_3 & \dots & x_{n-1} & x_n \end{bmatrix}.$$

Next, for each $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n$ non-negative integers such that $\sum_{k=1}^n \alpha_k = r$, consider the $r \times r$ matrix $M_{\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n}(r)$ constructed as follows:

- For $1 \leq j \leq \alpha_1$, the j -th column of $M_{\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n}(r)$ is the column of $M(n, r)$ for which x_1 appears on the j -th row;
- For $(\sum_{i=1}^k \alpha_i) + 1 \leq j \leq \sum_{i=1}^{k+1} \alpha_i$, the j -th column of $M_{\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n}(r)$ is the column of $M(n, r)$ for which x_{k+1} appears on the j -th row.

In order to illustrate this construction, it follows an example.

Example 5.2. Let $S = K[x_1, x_2, x_3]$ and $r = 6$ be chosen and consider $\alpha_1 = 2$, $\alpha_2 = 3$ and $\alpha_3 = 1$. Then one has

$$M(3, 6) = \begin{bmatrix} x_1 & x_2 & x_3 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & x_1 & x_2 & x_3 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & x_1 & x_2 & x_3 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & x_1 & x_2 & x_3 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & x_1 & x_2 & x_3 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & x_1 & x_2 & x_3 \end{bmatrix} \quad \text{and} \quad M_{3,2,1}(6) = \begin{bmatrix} x_1 & x_2 & x_3 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & x_1 & x_2 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & x_1 & x_3 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & x_2 & x_3 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & x_1 & x_2 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & x_1 & x_3 \end{bmatrix}.$$

Notice that each $r \times r$ minor of $M(n, r)$ is determinant of $M_{\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n}(r)$ for some non-negative integers $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n$ such that $\sum_{k=1}^n \alpha_k = r$. In the next proposition, denote

$$\mathfrak{M}(n, r) = \left\{ (x_1, \dots, x_n) \in \mathbb{N}_0^n ; \sum_{k=1}^n x_k = r \right\}.$$

Note that x_1^r is the minimum element of $\mathfrak{M}(n, r)$.

We are now ready to prove the desired equality.

Proposition 5.3. *Let $S = K[x_1, \dots, x_n]$ be the polynomial ring in n indeterminates over a field K equipped with lexicographical monomial ordering $x_1 < \dots < x_n$ and r a positive integer. Then*

$$I_n(M(n, r)) = (x_1, \dots, x_r)^r$$

Proof:

Before starting the actual proof we first describe loosely what is the idea behind it. In the previous lines, we noticed that x_1^r belongs to the ideal $I_n(M(n, r))$. Our main goal is to prove that if all monomials m' that are smaller than a given monomial m belongs to $I_n(M(n, r))$, then m also belongs to $I_n(M(n, r))$. We prove this by giving an explicit $r \times r$ minor of $M(n, r)$ consisting of a combination of m and smaller monomials. The result then follows by induction.

Now we proceed with the proof. It is clear that $I_n(M(n, r)) \subseteq (x_1, \dots, x_r)^r$. In order to prove the other inclusion, it is enough to show that $x_1^{\alpha_1} \dots x_n^{\alpha_n} \in I_n(M(n, r))$ for any n -tuple $(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n)$ of non-negative integers with $\sum_{k=1}^n \alpha_k = r$. We'll prove the following claim:

Let $m = x_1^{\alpha_1} \dots x_n^{\alpha_n}$ a monomial with $\sum_{k=1}^n \alpha_k = r$ be chosen. If $m' \in I_n(M(n, r))$ for all $m' < m$, then $m \in I_n(M(n, r))$.

As mentioned before $x_1^r \in I_r(M(n, r))$. Indeed, if $\alpha_1 = r$ and $\alpha_i = 0$ for all $1 < i \leq n$, one has

$$\det(M_{r,0,\dots,0}) = \det \begin{bmatrix} x_1 & x_2 & \cdots & x_{r-1} & x_r \\ 0 & x_1 & \cdots & x_{r-2} & x_{r-1} \\ 0 & 0 & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & \cdots & x_1 & x_2 \\ 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 & x_1 \end{bmatrix} = x_1^r.$$

Next let $m = x_1^{\alpha_1} \cdots x_n^{\alpha_n}$ be a monomial with $\sum_{k=1}^n \alpha_k = r$. Now let m be a degree r monomial and suppose that for any $m' < m$ and that $m' \in I_r(M(n, r))$. Observe that

$$\det(M_{\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \dots, \alpha_r}(r)) = x_1^{\alpha_1} \det(M_{0, \alpha_2, \dots, \alpha_r}(r - \alpha_1))$$

and that

$$\det(M_{0, \alpha_2, \dots, \alpha_r}(r - \alpha_1)) = x_2 \det(M_{0, \alpha_2-1, \dots, \alpha_r}(r - \alpha_1 - 1)) - x_1 f(x_1, \dots, x_n),$$

where $f(x_1, \dots, x_n)$ is a homogeneous polynomial in S with degree $r - (\alpha_1 + 1)$. Hence

$$\det(M_{\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \dots, \alpha_r}(r)) = x_1^{\alpha_1} x_2 \det(M_{0, \alpha_2-1, \dots, \alpha_r}(r - \alpha_1 - 1)) - x_1^{\alpha_1+1} f(x_1, \dots, x_n)$$

Since each monomial of $x_1^{\alpha_1+1} f(x_1, \dots, x_n)$ is smaller than m and $\det(M_{\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \dots, \alpha_r}(r))$ is a minor of $M(n, r)$, by induction hypothesis, one concludes that

$$x_1^{\alpha_1} x_2 \det(M_{0, \alpha_2-1, \dots, \alpha_r}(r - \alpha_1 - 1)) \in I_r(M(n, r)).$$

Suppose that we have proved that $x_1^{\alpha_1} x_2^i \det(M_{0, \alpha_2-i, \dots, \alpha_r}(r - \alpha_1 - i)) \in I_r(M(n, r))$ for all $1 \leq i < \alpha_2$. Again we have

$$\begin{aligned} x_1^{\alpha_1} x_2^i \det(M_{0, \alpha_2-i, \dots, \alpha_r}(r - \alpha_1 - i)) &= x_1^{\alpha_1} x_2^i \left(x_2 \det(M_{0, \alpha_2-(i+1), \dots, \alpha_r}(r - \alpha_1 - (i+1))) - x_1 f'(x) \right) \\ &= x_1^{\alpha_1} x_2^{i+1} \det(M_{0, \alpha_2-(i+1), \dots, \alpha_r}(r - \alpha_1 - (i+1))) - x_1^{\alpha_1+1} x_2^i f'(x), \end{aligned}$$

where $f'(x_1, \dots, x_n)$ is a homogeneous polynomial in S with degree $r - (\alpha_1 + i + 1)$. Similarly, since each monomial of $x_1^{\alpha_1+1} x_i f'(x_1, \dots, x_n)$ is smaller than m and

$$x_1^{\alpha_1} x_2^i \det(M_{0, \alpha_2-i, \dots, \alpha_r}(r - \alpha_1 - i)) \in I_r(M(n, r)),$$

by induction hypothesis, one concludes that

$$x_1^{\alpha_1} x_2^{i+1} \det(M_{0, \alpha_2-(i+1), \dots, \alpha_r}(r - \alpha_1 - (i+1))) \in I_r(M(n, r)).$$

Proceeding until $i = \alpha_2 - 1$ and repeating the argument, one gets

$$x_1^{\alpha_1} x_2^{\alpha_2} \det(M_{0,0,\alpha_3,\dots,\alpha_r}(r - \alpha_1 - \alpha_2)) \in I_r(M(n, r)).$$

In general, let $1 \leq i \leq n$ and $0 \leq e < \alpha_i$. Setting $\tau = r - \sum_{k=1}^i \alpha_k$, note that

$$\det(M_{0,\dots,0,\alpha_i-e,\dots,\alpha_r}(\tau - e)) = x_i \det(M_{0,\dots,0,\alpha_i-(e+1),\dots,\alpha_r}(\tau - (e+1))) + \sum_{j=1}^{i-1} (-1)^j x_{i-j} \det(S_j),$$

where S_j is the submatrix $M_{0,\dots,0,\alpha_i-e,\dots,\alpha_r}(\tau - e)$ obtained by omission of the first column and j row. Thus

$$\begin{aligned} x_1^{\alpha_1} \dots x_i^e \det(M_{0,\dots,0,\alpha_i-e,\dots,\alpha_r}(\tau - e)) &= x_1^{\alpha_1} \dots x_i^{e+1} \det(M_{0,\dots,0,\alpha_i-(e+1),\dots,\alpha_r}(\tau - (e+1))) \\ &\quad + \sum_{j=1}^{i-1} (-1)^j x_1^{\alpha_1} \dots x_{i-j}^{\alpha_{i-j}+1} \dots x_i^e \det(S_j). \end{aligned}$$

Supposing that $x_1^{\alpha_1} \dots x_i^e \det(M_{0,\dots,0,\alpha_i-e,\dots,\alpha_r}(\tau - e)) \in I_r(M(n, r))$, by induction hypothesis, one concludes that $x_1^{\alpha_1} \dots x_i^{e+1} \det(M_{0,\dots,0,\alpha_i-(e+1),\dots,\alpha_r}(\tau - (e+1))) \in I_r(M(n, r))$. If we repeat this process until $x_1^{\alpha_1} \dots x_r^{\alpha_r-1} \det(M_{0,\dots,0,1}(1))$ and argue as above, we conclude that $x_1^{\alpha_1} \dots x_r^{\alpha_r} \in I_r(M(n, r))$. \square

Acknowledgment: This question was proposed to us during the conference PRAGMATIC 2023 at Catania (Italy), where Luis Núñez-Betancourt and Eamon Quinlan-Gallego were part of the mentoring team. We let our gratitude to the PRAGMATIC 2023 organization, as well as Luis Núñez-Betancourt and Eamon Quinlan-Gallego for their valuable contributions with discussions and insightful comments. Additionally, we would like to thank CAPES for funding the transportation expenses of one of the team members.

REFERENCES

- [AL03] Ian M. Aberbach and Graham J. Leuschke. The F -signature and strong F -regularity. *Math. Res. Lett.*, 10(1):51–56, 2003.
- [HL02] Craig Huneke and Graham J. Leuschke. Two theorems about maximal Cohen-Macaulay modules. *Math. Ann.*, 324(2):391–404, 2002.
- [San15] Akiyoshi Sannai. On dual F -signature. *Int. Math. Res. Not. IMRN*, (1):197–211, 2015.
- [SdB02] Karen E. Smith and Michel Van den Bergh. Simplicity of rings of differential operators in prime characteristic, 2002.
- [ST23] Ilya Smirnov and Kevin Tucker. The theory of F -rational signature, 2023.
- [Tuc12] Kevin Tucker. F -signature exists. *Inventiones mathematicae*, 190(3):743–765, March 2012.

¹ INSTITUTO DE MATEMÁTICA, UNIVERSIDADE FEDERAL DO RIO DE JANEIRO, BRAZIL.
Email address: vbouca@im.ufrj.br

² INSTITUTO DE MATEMÁTICA, UNIVERSITÀ DEGLI STUDI DI GENOVA, ITALY
Email address: etolosav@gmail.com

³ INSTITUTO DE MATEMÁTICA, UNIVERSIDADE FEDERAL DO RIO DE JANEIRO, BRAZIL.
Email address: kevin.vasconcellos@im.ufrj.br