

CRITERIA FOR COMPONENTWISE LINEARITY

UWE NAGEL AND TIM RÖMER

Dedicated to Winfried Bruns at the occasion of his 65th birthday.

ABSTRACT. We establish characteristic-free criteria for the componentwise linearity of graded ideals. As applications, we classify the componentwise linear ideals among the Gorenstein ideals, the standard determinantal ideals, and the ideals generated by the submaximal minors of a symmetric matrix.

1. INTRODUCTION

Since their introduction by Herzog and Hibi in [17], componentwise linear ideals have been proven important. They include all stable monomial ideals. In fact, a first breakthrough has been the result in [1] that, in characteristic zero, characterizes the componentwise linear ideals as the ideals that have the same graded Betti numbers as their generic initial ideals with respect to the reverse lexicographic order. It follows in particular that Gotzmann ideals are componentwise linear. In fact, the criterion suggests that componentwise linear ideals may be viewed as the graded ideals that are analogous to the stable ideals among the monomial ideals.

It turns out that ideals with extremal homological properties are often componentwise linear. For example, the homogeneous ideals of almost all curves that have maximal Hartshorne-Rao module with respect to their degree and genus are componentwise linear in characteristic zero (see Corollary 6.2 in [22]). This property is also shared by the graded ideals that have maximal Castelnuovo-Mumford regularity compared to their smallest extended degree, which is consequence of Theorem 4.4 in [23]. Furthermore, the tetrahedral curves whose homogeneous ideal is componentwise linear are characterized in Corollary 4.9 in [12] (see also [13] for some further results). The relevance of componentwise linear ideals for extending classical results by Zariski is conveyed in [8]. However, there are only few classification results for componentwise linear ideals available. In this note, we achieve such a classification in three important classes of ideals: Gorenstein ideals, standard determinantal ideals, and the ideals generated by the submaximal minors of a symmetric matrix of height three. Note that our results are valid over fields of arbitrary characteristic.

After introducing our notation and reviewing some results, in Section 2 we discuss the criteria for componentwise linearity that are the basis for our subsequent results. The first criteria are motivated by the above mentioned result of Aramova, Herzog and Hibi in [1], stating, with the additional assumption $\text{char } K = 0$, that a graded ideal I is componentwise linear if and only if I and $\text{gin}_{<_{\text{rev}}}(I)$ have the same graded Betti numbers. This remarkable theorem has two drawbacks when applying it to a specific ideal. Firstly, one would like to omit the assumption about the characteristic of the field. Secondly, there is usually no way to “compute” the generic initial ideal. Instead one chooses a map $\varphi \in \text{GL}(n; k)$ randomly enough and compares the graded Betti numbers of I with the ones of $\text{in}_{<_{\text{rev}}}(\varphi(I))$. Very likely the ideal $\text{in}_{<_{\text{rev}}}(\varphi(I))$ is equal to $\text{gin}_{<_{\text{rev}}}(I)$, but there

This work was partially supported by a grant from the Simons Foundation (#208869 to Uwe Nagel).

is no effective way to check this. Especially if one uses computer algebra systems like Macaulay 2 [16], both problems occur. We establish solutions to both issues in Theorem 2.3 and in Theorem 2.5. We also recall a homological criterion, using the so-called linear part of the minimal graded free resolution (see Theorem 2.9).

As a first application, in Section 3 we describe all the Gorenstein ideals that are componentwise linear (see Theorem 3.1).

In Section 4 we consider standard determinantal ideals, i.e. the ideals that are generated by the maximal minors of a homogeneous matrix and have the expected height (see [5] for a comprehensive treatment). Theorem 4.1 characterizes the componentwise linear ideals in this class. Notice that this includes a characterization of the Cohen-Macaulay ideals of height two that are componentwise linear.

In our final section we discuss the height three ideals that are generated by the sub-maximal minors of a symmetric matrix. The componentwise linear ideals among these are classified in Theorem 5.1.

As a consequence of the criterion in Theorem 2.5, every componentwise linear ideal has the same graded Betti numbers as a stable monomial ideal. In fact, for each of the componentwise linear ideals mentioned above we explicitly describe such a stable monomial ideal. However, we wonder if the existence of such a stable monomial ideal is sufficient to conclude componentwise linearity. Thus, we pose the following question.

Question 1.1. *Is a graded ideal componentwise linear if and only if it has the same graded Betti numbers as some stable monomial ideal?*

2. CRITERIA

Let K be an arbitrary field, and let $S = K[x_1, \dots, x_n]$ be the standard graded polynomial ring with maximal graded ideal $\mathfrak{m} = (x_1, \dots, x_n)$. In this section we recall known results and present some new methods to check whether a given graded ideal $I \subset S$ is componentwise linear.

We begin by fixing some notation that we use throughout the paper. For an n -tuple $a = (a_1, \dots, a_n)$ of non-negative integers, we set $x^a = x_1^{a_1} \cdot \dots \cdot x_n^{a_n}$ and $|a| = a_1 + \dots + a_n$. We denote the degree reverse lexicographic order and the lexicographic order on the monomials in S by $<_{\text{rev}}$ and $<_{\text{lex}}$, respectively, where $x_1 > x_2 > \dots > x_n$. Let $I \subset S$ be a graded ideal, and let $<$ be any monomial order on S . Then $\text{in}_{<}(I)$ and $\text{gin}_{<}(I)$ denote the initial ideal and the generic initial ideal of I , respectively, with respect to the order $<$.

If d is any integer and M is a graded S -module, then $M_{(d)}$ and $M_{\geq d}$ is the submodule of M generated by the forms of degree d and forms whose degree is at least d , respectively. The Castelnuovo-Mumford regularity of M is denoted by $\text{reg } M$. We use $\beta_{i,j}^S(M)$ and $\beta_i^S(M)$ to denote the graded and total Betti numbers of M , respectively. In particular, $\beta_0^S(M)$ is the number of minimal generators of M .

The module M is said to have a d -linear resolution if $\beta_{i,j}^S(M) = 0$ whenever $j \neq i + d$. Following [17], M is called *componentwise linear* if, for all integers d , the module $M_{(d)}$ has a d -linear resolution.

Recall that a monomial ideal $I \subset S$ is said to be *strongly stable* if, for any monomial $m \in S$, the conditions $m \in I$ and x_i divides m imply that $x_j \cdot \frac{m}{x_i}$ is in I whenever $j \leq i$. The ideal is called *stable* if the analogous condition is true whenever i is the largest index of a variable dividing m . We denote this index by $\max(m)$. Stable ideals admit several combinatorial properties. In particular, due to Eliahou and Kervaire their graded Betti numbers are known.

Theorem 2.1 ([11]). *Let $0 \neq I \subset S$ be a stable monomial ideal that is minimally generated by the monomials m_1, \dots, m_t . Then, for all $i \geq 1$ and $j \in \mathbb{Z}$,*

$$(2.1) \quad \beta_{i,i+j}^S(S/I) = \sum_{\substack{1 \leq k \leq t \\ \deg m_k = j}} \binom{\max(m_k) - 1}{i - 1}.$$

Now we are ready to develop a characteristic-free version of the main result in [1]. In fact, we follow the idea of proofs in [1], but adapt them to address our need for greater generality. We need the following variation of [1, Theorem 1.2 (b)]:

Lemma 2.2. *Let $0 \neq I \subset S$ be a graded ideal, $d \in \mathbb{N}$, and $I = (g_1, \dots, g_m)$ with $\deg g_i = d$ for $i = 1, \dots, m$. Let $<$ be a monomial order on S and assume that $(\text{in}_<(g_1), \dots, \text{in}_<(g_m))$ is a stable monomial ideal. If $\beta_{0,j}^S(\text{in}_<(I)) = 0$ for some $j \in \mathbb{N}$ with $d < j$, then*

$$\beta_{0,k}^S(\text{in}_<(I)) = 0 \text{ for all } k \in \mathbb{N} \text{ with } k \geq j.$$

Moreover, if $\beta_{0,d+1}^S(\text{in}_<(I)) = 0$, then $\text{in}_<(I)$ and I have a d -linear resolution.

Proof. We consider the ideal $I_{\geq j-1}$. Then

$$I_{\geq j-1} = (x^a \cdot g_i : 1 \leq i \leq m, a \in \mathbb{N}^n \text{ with } |a| = j - 1 - d)$$

is generated in degree $j - 1$. We see that

$$\begin{aligned} & (\text{in}_<(x^a \cdot g_i) : 1 \leq i \leq m, a \in \mathbb{N}^n \text{ with } |a| = j - 1 - d) \\ &= (x^a \cdot \text{in}_<(g_i) : 1 \leq i \leq m, a \in \mathbb{N}^n \text{ with } |a| = j - 1 - d) \\ &= \mathfrak{m}^{j-1-d}(\text{in}_<(g_1), \dots, \text{in}_<(g_m)) \end{aligned}$$

is again a stable monomial ideal. Since $\text{in}_<(I_{\geq j-1}) = \text{in}_<(I)_{\geq j-1}$ it suffices to show that $\text{in}_<(I_{\geq j-1})$ has no minimal monomial generator in degrees $\geq j$ in order to conclude the vanishing statement for $\text{in}_<(I)$.

So, if we replace $I_{\geq j-1}$ by I we may assume that I is generated in degree d with $\beta_{0,d+1}^S(\text{in}_<(I)) = 0$, and we have to show that $\text{in}_<(I)$ is generated in degree d . Since $\beta_{0,d+1}^S(\text{in}_<(I)) = 0$ we know that all S -polynomials of $\{g_1, \dots, g_m\}$ of degree $d + 1$ reduce to zero. Using that $(\text{in}_<(g_1), \dots, \text{in}_<(g_m))$ is a stable monomial ideal generated in degree d , it follows from the Eliahou-Kervaire formula (2.1) for the graded Betti numbers of that ideal that its first syzygy module is generated in degree $d + 1$. Now we apply [18, Proposition 2.3.5] to conclude that $\{g_1, \dots, g_m\}$ is a Gröbner-basis of I with respect to $<$. Thus $\text{in}_<(I)$ is generated in degree d , as desired.

Moreover, applying once more the Eliahou-Kervaire formula, we see that $\text{in}_<(I)$, and thus I , both have a d -linear resolution. \square

Using the latter result we establish the following criterion. Its proof is similar to the one of one implication in [1, Theorem 1.1], with appropriate modifications.

Theorem 2.3. *Let $0 \neq I \subset S$ be a graded ideal, $<$ a monomial order on S and assume that $\text{in}_<(I)$ is stable. If $\beta_0^S(I) = \beta_0^S(\text{in}_<(I))$, then I is componentwise linear.*

Proof. Let d be the least degree of a minimal generator of I , and let D be the maximal degree of a minimal generator of I . Set $r = D - d$. We prove the theorem by induction on $r \geq 0$.

Assume that $r = 0$. Then I is generated in degree d . Since $\beta_0^S(I) = \beta_0^S(\text{in}_<(I))$, we see that $\text{in}_<(I)$ is also generated in degree d . By assumption, $\text{in}_<(I)$ is a stable monomial ideal, and thus it has a d -linear resolution by the Eliahou-Kervaire formula. It follows that also I has a d -linear resolution since $\beta_{i,j}^S(I) \leq \beta_{i,j}^S(\text{in}_<(I))$ for all i, j .

Next we consider the case $r > 0$. Assume that $I_{\langle d \rangle}$ has not a d -linear resolution. Let $\{g_1, \dots, g_t\}$ be a Gröbner basis for I with respect to $<$ where $\{g_1, \dots, g_m\}$ are all the elements of this Gröbner basis of degree d . Then $I_{\langle d \rangle} = (g_1, \dots, g_m)$ and $\text{in}_{<}(I)_{\langle d \rangle} = (\text{in}_{<}(g_1), \dots, \text{in}_{<}(g_m))$ is a stable monomial ideal. It follows from Lemma 2.2 applied to $I_{\langle d \rangle}$ that $\beta_{0,d+1}^S(\text{in}_{<}(I_{\langle d \rangle})) \neq 0$. Now

$$\begin{aligned} \beta_{0,d+1}^S(\text{in}_{<}(I)) &= \dim_K \text{in}_{<}(I)_{d+1} - \dim_K(\mathfrak{m} \text{in}_{<}(I)_{\langle d \rangle})_{d+1} \\ &= \dim_K \text{in}_{<}(I)_{d+1} - \dim_K(\mathfrak{m} \text{in}_{<}(I_{\langle d \rangle}))_{d+1} \\ &> \dim_K \text{in}_{<}(I)_{d+1} - \dim_K \text{in}_{<}(I_{\langle d \rangle})_{d+1} \\ &= \dim_K I_{d+1} - \dim_K(I_{\langle d \rangle})_{d+1} \\ &= \dim_K I_{d+1} - \dim_K(\mathfrak{m}I_{\langle d \rangle})_{d+1} = \beta_{0,d+1}^S(I). \end{aligned}$$

This gives the contradiction $\beta_0^S(\text{in}_{<}(I)) = \sum_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \beta_{0,j}^S(\text{in}_{<}(I)) > \sum_{j \in \mathbb{N}} \beta_{0,j}^S(I) = \beta_0^S(I)$. Thus, $I_{\langle d \rangle}$ has a d -linear resolution, as desired. Moreover, we also see that $\beta_{0,j}^S(\text{in}_{<}(I_{\langle d \rangle})) = 0$ for $j > d$, and so the (stable monomial) ideal $\text{in}_{<}(I_{\langle d \rangle})$ has also a d -linear resolution. This implies in particular the equation $\text{in}_{<}(I_{\langle d \rangle}) = \text{in}_{<}(I)_{\langle d \rangle}$ which will be needed below.

Now we claim that $\text{in}_{<}(I_{\geq d+1}) = \text{in}_{<}(I)_{\geq d+1}$ and $I_{\geq d+1}$ have the same graded 0-th Betti numbers. Granting this for the time being and using that $\text{in}_{<}(I_{\geq d+1})$ is again a stable monomial ideal, the induction hypothesis provides that $I_{\geq d+1}$ is componentwise linear. Thus, $I_{\langle j \rangle} = (I_{\geq d+1})_{\langle j \rangle}$ has a j -linear resolution for each $j \geq d+1$. This shows that I is componentwise linear.

It remains to prove the claim about the graded 0-th Betti numbers. For $j \leq d$ we have $\beta_{0,j}^S(I_{\geq d+1}) = 0 = \beta_{0,j}^S(\text{in}_{<}(I_{\geq d+1}))$. For $j \geq d+1$ we consider the short exact sequence

$$0 \rightarrow I_{\geq d+1} \rightarrow I \rightarrow K(-d)^{\beta_{0,d}^S(I)} \rightarrow 0$$

and the associated long exact sequence

$$(2.2) \quad \begin{aligned} \dots &\rightarrow \text{Tor}_1^S(I_{\geq d+1}, K)_{1+j-1} \rightarrow \text{Tor}_1^S(I, K)_{1+j-1} \rightarrow \text{Tor}_1^S(K, K)_{1+j-d-1}^{\beta_{0,d}^S(I)} \\ &\rightarrow \text{Tor}_0^S(I_{\geq d+1}, K)_j \rightarrow \text{Tor}_0^S(I, K)_j \rightarrow \text{Tor}_0^S(K, K)_{j-d}^{\beta_{0,d}^S(I)} \rightarrow 0. \end{aligned}$$

Analogous sequences exist for $\text{in}_{<}(I_{\geq d+1}) = \text{in}_{<}(I)_{\geq d+1}$. If $j > d+1$, then we see that

$$\beta_{0,j}^S(I_{\geq d+1}) = \beta_{0,j}^S(I) = \beta_{0,j}^S(\text{in}_{<}(I)) = \beta_{0,j}^S(\text{in}_{<}(I)_{\geq d+1}) = \beta_{0,j}^S(\text{in}_{<}(I_{\geq d+1}))$$

because K has a linear resolution as an S -module and the second identity is given by the assumption of the Theorem. Finally, we consider the case $j = d+1$. Sequence (2.2) provides

$$\begin{aligned} \beta_{0,d+1}^S(I_{\geq d+1}) &= \beta_{0,d+1}^S(I) + n \cdot \beta_{0,d}^S(I) - \beta_{1,1+d}^S(I) \\ &= \beta_{0,d+1}^S(\text{in}_{<}(I)) + n \cdot \beta_{0,d}^S(\text{in}_{<}(I)) - \beta_{1,1+d}^S(I_{\langle d \rangle}) \\ &= \beta_{0,d+1}^S(\text{in}_{<}(I)) + n \cdot \beta_{0,d}^S(\text{in}_{<}(I)) - \beta_{1,1+d}^S(\text{in}_{<}(I_{\langle d \rangle})) \\ &= \beta_{0,d+1}^S(\text{in}_{<}(I)) + n \cdot \beta_{0,d}^S(\text{in}_{<}(I)) - \beta_{1,1+d}^S(\text{in}_{<}(I)_{\langle d \rangle}) \\ &= \beta_{0,d+1}^S(\text{in}_{<}(I)) + n \cdot \beta_{0,d}^S(\text{in}_{<}(I)) - \beta_{1,1+d}^S(\text{in}_{<}(I)) \\ &= \beta_{0,d+1}^S(\text{in}_{<}(I)_{\geq d+1}) = \beta_{0,d+1}^S(\text{in}_{<}(I_{\geq d+1})). \end{aligned}$$

Here the second identity follows from the assumption of the Theorem and the fact that I and $I_{\langle d \rangle}$ have the same graded Betti-numbers $\beta_{i,i+d}$. The third identity is a consequence of the fact that $\text{in}_{<}(I_{\langle d \rangle})$ and $I_{\langle d \rangle}$ both have a d -linear resolution as was shown above and these ideals have the same Hilbert-function. The fourth identity was also observed above.

For the sixth identity we use analogous arguments applied to $\text{in}_{<}(I)_{\geq d+1}$. This concludes the proof. \square

Remark 2.4.

- (i) As mentioned in the introduction, to decide whether a given ideal I is componentwise linear one checks if the graded Betti numbers of I and $\text{gin}_{<\text{rev}}(I)$ coincide (see, e.g., Theorem 2.5 below). However, to do this in a concrete situation one chooses $\varphi \in \text{GL}(n; K)$ randomly and compares the Betti numbers of I with the ones of $\text{in}_{<\text{rev}}(\varphi(I))$ provided that $\text{in}_{<\text{rev}}(\varphi(I))$ is a stable monomial ideal. The latter assumption is usually fulfilled if $\text{char } K = 0$ or $\text{char } K$ is sufficiently large. Since I is componentwise linear if and only if $\varphi(I)$ is componentwise linear, Theorem 2.3 shows that this randomized test can really be used to conclude that I is componentwise linear if all Betti numbers of I and $\text{in}_{<\text{rev}}(\varphi(I))$ are equal.
- (ii) The assumption that the initial ideal is stable is essential in Theorem 2.3. Usually initial ideals of componentwise linear ideals do not satisfy this assumption. For example, the ideal $I = (x_2, \dots, x_n)$ of $K[x_1, \dots, x_n]$ has a linear resolution given by the Koszul complex on x_2, \dots, x_n . Thus it is componentwise linear. We have $\text{in}_{<}(I) = I$ with respect to any monomial order $<$ on S , but I is not a stable ideal with respect to $x_1 > \dots > x_n$.
- (iii) For an arbitrary monomial order on a polynomial ring there is no hope that the reverse implication of Theorem 2.3 is true. Indeed, for an example consider $S = \mathbb{Z}/31013\mathbb{Z}[x_1, \dots, x_8]$ and the ideal I , generated by the 2-minors of the 2×4 matrix

$$\begin{bmatrix} x_1 & x_2 & x_3 & x_4 \\ x_5 & x_6 & x_7 & x_8 \end{bmatrix}.$$

It is well-known that I has a 2-linear resolution that is given by the Eagon-Northcott complex; see, e.g., [5, Theorem 2.16]. Thus, I and all $\varphi(I)$, for $\varphi \in \text{GL}(8; \mathbb{Z}/31013\mathbb{Z})$, are componentwise linear ideals. A computation with Macaulay 2 [16] shows, that a randomly chosen $\varphi \in \text{GL}(8; \mathbb{Z}/31013\mathbb{Z})$ exists such that $\text{in}_{<\text{lex}}(\varphi(I))$ equals the stable monomial ideal

$$J = (x_1^2, x_1x_2, x_1x_3, x_1x_4, x_1x_5, x_2^2, x_2x_3^2, x_2x_3x_4, x_2x_3x_5, x_2x_4^3, x_3^4).$$

This ideal J is the lex-gin of I with very high probability. But we see that $\beta_0^S(J) = 11 > 6 = \beta_0^S(\varphi(I))$.

The reverse implication of Theorem 2.3 is “generically” true if we consider the reverse lexicographic order. The next result is the desired generalization of [1, Theorem 1.1] to any characteristic.

Theorem 2.5. *Let $0 \neq I \subset S$ be a graded ideal. Then the following statements are equivalent:*

- (i) $\text{gin}_{<\text{rev}}(I)$ is stable and $\beta_{i,j}^S(I) = \beta_{i,j}^S(\text{gin}_{<\text{rev}}(I))$ for all i, j ;
- (ii) $\text{gin}_{<\text{rev}}(I)$ is stable and $\beta_i^S(I) = \beta_i^S(\text{gin}_{<\text{rev}}(I))$ for all i ;
- (iii) $\text{gin}_{<\text{rev}}(I)$ is stable and $\beta_0^S(I) = \beta_0^S(\text{gin}_{<\text{rev}}(I))$;
- (iv) I is componentwise linear.

Proof. Trivially, the implications (i) \Rightarrow (ii) and (ii) \Rightarrow (iii) are true.

(iii) \Rightarrow (iv): There exists a $\varphi \in \text{GL}(n; K)$ such that $\text{gin}_{<\text{rev}}(I) = \text{in}_{<\text{rev}}(\varphi(I))$. It follows from Theorem 2.3 that $\varphi(I)$ is componentwise linear. Hence also I is componentwise linear.

(iv) \Rightarrow (i): Let us assume that I is componentwise linear. By [7, Lemma 1.4] we know that $\text{gin}_{<\text{rev}}(I)$ is stable. The proof of the statement about the Betti numbers is verbatim the same as the (characteristic free) proof of the corresponding implication of [1, Theorem 1.1]. The only difference is to observe that $\text{gin}_{<\text{rev}}(I)$ is still componentwise linear because it is a stable monomial ideal. (In characteristic zero it is even strongly stable, as used in the proof of [1, Theorem 1.1].) \square

Remark 2.6.

- (i) Since in characteristic zero $\text{gin}_{<}(I)$ is always strongly stable, Theorem 2.5 recovers indeed the main result of [1].
- (ii) In characteristic zero [1, Theorem 1.1] was generalized by Conca [6] (see, e.g., Theorem 4.5) in a different direction. He gives equivalent vanishing statements for certain Koszul homology groups. With suitable adjustments, these statements are also true in positive characteristic.
- (iii) If one assumes that $\text{in}_{<\text{rev}}(I)$ and, for all j , $\text{in}_{<\text{rev}}(I_{(j)})$ are stable monomial ideals, then one can also prove a result that is analogous to Theorem 2.5, but where $\text{in}_{<\text{rev}}(I)$ is used instead of $\text{gin}_{<\text{rev}}(I)$.

We leave the details of the proofs to the interested reader.

A monomial ideal I in $K[x_1, \dots, x_n]$ may be considered as a monomial ideal in the polynomial ring $F[x_1, \dots, x_n]$, where F is any other field. So one might ask if the property “componentwise linear” for I is independent of the characteristic of the considered fields. This is not the case as the following example shows.

Example 2.7. Let $S = K[x_1, \dots, x_6]$. With the notation from [4, p. 236], the Stanley-Reisner ideal of the triangulation Δ of the real projective plane $\mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{R}}^2$ is

$$I_{\Delta} = (x_1x_2x_3, x_1x_2x_4, x_1x_3x_5, x_1x_4x_6, x_1x_5x_6, x_2x_3x_6, x_2x_4x_5, x_2x_5x_6, x_3x_4x_5, x_3x_4x_6).$$

If $\text{char } K \neq 2$, then $K[\Delta] = S/I_{\Delta}$ is a 2-dimensional Cohen-Macaulay ring. If $\text{char } K = 2$, then it is well-known that $K[\Delta]$ is not Cohen-Macaulay. We know that $\text{depth } K[\Delta] > 0$. Thus we get immediately that $\text{depth } K[\Delta] = 1$. Hence the first local cohomology module $H_{\mathfrak{m}}^1(K[\Delta]) \neq 0$. Since Δ is a triangulation of a manifold without boundary, it is known that $K[\Delta]$ is Buchsbaum. Hence $H_{\mathfrak{m}}^1(K[\Delta])$ has finite length; see, e.g., [25, Beispiel 6.2.3] for details. Then $K[\Delta]$ cannot be sequentially Cohen-Macaulay as such rings can never have a nonzero first local cohomology module of finite length (see, e.g., [26, Theorem 2.11]).

We set $[n] = \{1, \dots, n\}$. Let $\Delta^* = \{F \subseteq [n] : [n] \setminus F \notin \Delta\}$ be the Alexander dual of Δ , and let I_{Δ^*} be its Stanley-Reisner ideal. Then, in this case, $I_{\Delta} = I_{\Delta^*}$. Hence, [19, Theorem 9] provides that I_{Δ} is componentwise linear if $\text{char } K \neq 2$ and I_{Δ} is not componentwise linear if $\text{char } K = 2$.

In the next sections we also need another method to decide whether a graded ideal is componentwise linear. For this we consider the following construction.

Construction 2.8. Let M be a finitely generated graded S -module. Let F_{\bullet} be the minimal graded free resolution of M with differential ∂ . Since $\partial_n(F_n) \subseteq \mathfrak{m}F_{n-1}$ for all n , we can define subcomplexes F_{\bullet}^i of F_{\bullet} by setting

$$F_n^i = \mathfrak{m}^{i-n}F_n \text{ for all } n \in \mathbb{Z}$$

together with the differential ∂ . Here we set $\mathfrak{m}^j = S$ for $j \leq 0$. Now $F_{\bullet}^{i+1} \subseteq F_{\bullet}^i$ for all i . Hence these subcomplexes define a filtration of F_{\bullet} . The associated graded complex F_{\bullet}^{lin} with respect to this filtration is called the *linear part* F_{\bullet}^{lin} of F_{\bullet} .

We may consider F_{\bullet}^{lin} again as a complex of finitely generated graded S -modules with the following explicit description. We have $F_n^{\text{lin}} = F_n$. The differential of F^{lin} can be obtained as follows. Choose homogeneous bases of the free modules F_n of F_{\bullet} such that all the maps ∂_i are described by homogeneous matrices. Then in all matrices replace each entry by zero whose degree is at least two. These matrices induce exactly the differential of F^{lin} .

Similarly, for a matrix A whose entries are homogeneous polynomials of S , we define A^{lin} as the matrix obtained from A by replacing each entry by zero whose degree is at least two. We call A^{lin} the *linearization* of A .

The following result has been shown in [24, Theorem 3.2.8]; see also [20, Theorem 5.6] for a shorter proof.

Theorem 2.9. *Let M be a finitely generated graded S -module with minimal graded free resolution F_{\bullet} . Then the following statements are equivalent:*

- (i) M is componentwise linear;
- (ii) the complex F_{\bullet}^{lin} is acyclic.

3. GORENSTEIN IDEALS

As a first application of our criterion for componentwise linearity using generic initial ideals, we characterize the componentwise linear Gorenstein ideals in $S = K[x_1, \dots, x_n]$.

Theorem 3.1. *Let $0 \neq I$ be a graded Gorenstein ideal of S . Then I is componentwise linear if and only if I is a complete intersection whose minimal generators, except possibly one, are linear forms.*

Proof. Denote by c the height of I .

If I is a complete intersection that is generated by linear forms and one form of degree $e \geq 1$, then its Castelnuovo-Mumford regularity is e . Using [2], we conclude that $\text{gin}_{<\text{rev}}(I)$ also has regularity e . Hence Proposition 10 in [10] provides that the ideal $(\text{gin}_{<\text{rev}}(I))_{(e)}$ is stable. It follows that $\text{gin}_{<\text{rev}}(I) = (x_1, \dots, x_{c-1}, x_c^e)$ because $\text{gin}_{<\text{rev}}(I)$ has only one minimal generator of degree e if $e > 1$. Since $\text{gin}_{<\text{rev}}(I)$ is stable, Theorem 2.5 yields that I is componentwise linear.

For the converse, assume that I is componentwise linear. We will use the fact that the minimal graded free resolution of S/I over S is self-dual, i.e., dualizing with respect to S the deleted resolution of S/I gives again the resolution of S/I , up to a degree shift. Suppose that S/I does not have a $(c-1)$ -syzygy of degree $c-1$, that is, $\text{Tor}_{c-1}^S(S/I, K)_{c-1} = 0$. By self-duality of the resolution, this means that I does not have a minimal generator of degree $e+1$, where $e = \text{reg}(S/I)$ is the Castelnuovo-Mumford regularity of S/I . However, since I is Gorenstein, $\dim_K \text{Tor}_c^S(S/I, K)_{c+e} = 1$. Using the Eliahou-Kervaire resolution (see [11] and above), it follows that I does not have the graded Betti numbers of a stable ideal. Hence, by Theorem 2.5, I cannot be componentwise linear. This contradiction shows that I must have a $(c-2)$ -syzygy of degree $c-1$. This syzygy is determined by the linear forms in I . The ideal generated by these linear form is resolved by the Koszul complex. It follows that I must contain a regular sequence consisting of $c-1$ linear forms. Since I has height c , I must be a complete intersection as claimed. \square

Remark 3.2.

- (i) The above proof shows that the strongly stable ideals that have the same graded Betti numbers as a Gorenstein ideal are precisely the monomial ideals of the form

$$(x_1, \dots, x_{c-1}, x_c^e),$$

where e is any positive integer. Moreover, these ideals are all the generic initial ideals of componentwise linear Gorenstein ideals. In particular, these generic initial ideals are always strongly stable, regardless of the characteristic of the ground field.

- (ii) Notice that the result of our characterization of the Gorenstein componentwise linear ideals is similar to Goto's one for the characterization of integrally closed complete intersections (see [15]).

4. STANDARD DETERMINANTAL IDEALS

As a second class of examples, we treat standard determinantal ideals now. Recall that a *standard determinantal ideal* in S is an ideal generated by the maximal minors of a $(m+c-1) \times m$ homogenous matrix that has (the expected) height $c \geq 1$. A homogeneous matrix is a matrix describing a graded homomorphism of free graded S -modules.

Let now $A = (a_{ij})$ be a homogeneous $(m+c-1) \times m$ matrix. Its *degree matrix* is $\partial A = (\deg a_{ij})$. The homogeneity of A means that its entries $a_{ij} \in S$ are homogeneous polynomials that satisfy the conditions

$$\deg a_{i,i} + \deg a_{i+1,i+1} = \deg a_{i+1,i} + \deg a_{i,i+1}.$$

Permuting rows and columns of A we may assume that the entries of ∂A do not increase from left to right and from bottom to top, that is,

$$(4.1) \quad \deg a_{i,j} \geq \deg a_{i,j+1} \quad \text{and} \quad \deg a_{i,j} \geq \deg a_{i-1,j}.$$

Throughout this section we assume that ∂A satisfies these conditions. Observe that we also may assume that the entries of A are all in the irrelevant maximal ideal $\mathfrak{m} = (x_1, \dots, x_n)$.

The following is the main result of this section.

Theorem 4.1. *Let $I = I_m(A)$ be the standard determinantal ideal of height c that is generated by the maximal minors of the homogeneous matrix A . Assume that its degree matrix ∂A satisfies (4.1). Then I is componentwise linear if and only if*

- (i) $c = 1$; or
- (ii) $c = 2$ and the entries on the main diagonal of A all have degree one, i.e., for all i , $\deg a_{i,i} = 1$; or
- (iii) $c \geq 3$ and the entries in all rows of A , except possibly the last one, have degree one.

We will divide the proof of Theorem 4.1 into several steps. We begin by deriving necessary conditions.

Lemma 4.2. *Let A be an $(m+1) \times m$ homogeneous matrix with entries in \mathfrak{m} . Assume that the degree of one of the entries on the main diagonal of A is at least two. Then all the maximal minors of its linearization A^{lin} vanish.*

Proof. Let $s \geq 0$ be the least integer such that $\deg a_{s+1,s+1} \geq 2$. Then the linearization of A is of the form

$$A^{\text{lin}} = \begin{bmatrix} B_1 & B_2 \\ 0 & B_3 \end{bmatrix},$$

where B_1 is an $s \times s$ matrix and all entries in the first column of B_3 are zero. Consider now the square matrix $\widetilde{A}^{\text{lin}}$ that is obtained from A^{lin} by deleting $c-1$ of its last $c-1$

rows:

$$\widetilde{A}^{\text{lin}} = \begin{bmatrix} B_1 & B_2 \\ 0 & \widetilde{B}_3 \end{bmatrix}.$$

Then \widetilde{B}_3 is a square matrix whose first column entries are all zero. Thus, we get

$$\det \widetilde{A}^{\text{lin}} = \det B_1 \cdot \det \widetilde{B}_3 = 0.$$

Next, we consider a matrix $\overline{A}^{\text{lin}}$ obtained from A^{lin} by deleting $c - 1$ rows such that t of these rows ($1 \leq t \leq s$) are among the first s rows of A^{lin} . It is of the form

$$\overline{A}^{\text{lin}} = \begin{bmatrix} \overline{B}_1 & \overline{B}_2 \\ 0 & \overline{B}_3 \end{bmatrix},$$

where \overline{B}_1 is an $s \times s$ matrix whose last row has only zero entries. It follows that

$$\det \overline{A}^{\text{lin}} = \det \overline{B}_1 \cdot \det \overline{B}_3 = 0.$$

Thus, we have shown that all m -minors of A^{lin} vanish. \square

We can push these arguments further when we have a weaker assumption.

Lemma 4.3. *Let A be an $(m + 1) \times m$ homogeneous matrix with entries in \mathfrak{m} . Assume that one of the entries on the diagonal below the main diagonal of A is at least two. Then the maximal minors of its linearization A^{lin} generate an ideal whose height is at most one.*

Proof. Let $s \geq 1$ be the least integer such that $\deg a_{s+1,s} \geq 2$. Then the linearization of A is of the form

$$A^{\text{lin}} = \begin{bmatrix} B_1 & B_2 \\ 0 & B_3 \end{bmatrix},$$

where B_1 is an $s \times s$ matrix and B_3 is an $(m + c - 1 - s) \times (m - s)$ matrix. Considering the m -minors of A^{lin} , we distinguish two cases depending on the $c - 1$ rows that are deleted from A^{lin} to obtain a square matrix. First assume that one of the deleted rows has an index which is at most s . Then, we get as in the proof of Lemma 4.2 that the corresponding m -minor vanishes. Second, assume that only rows whose index is at least $s + 1$ have been deleted. Then $\det B_1$ divides the resulting m -minor.

Thus, we have shown that all m -minors of A^{lin} are divisible by $\det B_1$, and our claim follows. \square

We also need the following observation.

Lemma 4.4. *Let A be an $(m + 1) \times m$ homogeneous matrix with entries in \mathfrak{m} such that height $I_m(A) = 2$. Assume that each entry on the main diagonal of A has degree one and that the degree of one entry on the diagonal below the main diagonal of A is at least two. Then A^{lin} has a non-vanishing maximal minor.*

Proof. Denote by \overline{A} the square matrix obtained from A by deleting its last row. Let $a_{i+1,i}$ be an entry whose degree is at least two. If $i < m$, then we get by homogeneity of A that

$$2 = \deg a_{i,i} + \deg a_{i+1,i+1} = \deg a_{i+1,i} + \deg a_{i,i+1}.$$

We conclude that $\deg a_{i,i+1} \leq 0$. Thus, $a_{i,i+1} = 0$. Hence, using also Condition (4.1), the matrix \overline{A} has the following shape

$$\overline{A} = \begin{bmatrix} A_1 & & 0 \\ & \ddots & \\ * & & A_t \end{bmatrix},$$

where each matrix A_j is a square matrix whose entries on the diagonal below the main diagonal all have degree one. As $I_m(A)$ has the expected height, each of the maximal minors of A is non-trivial by the Hilbert-Burch theorem. It follows that

$$0 \neq \det \overline{A} = \det A_1 \cdot \dots \cdot \det A_t.$$

Since the entries on the main diagonal of A_j and the diagonal below have degree one, all entries of A_j have degree one, and thus $A_j^{\text{lin}} = A_j$. This provides,

$$\det \overline{A^{\text{lin}}} = \det A_1 \cdot \dots \cdot \det A_t,$$

which we have seen to be non-trivial. \square

Our proof of Theorem 4.1 is based on the following result.

Proposition 4.5. *Let $I = I_m(A)$ be a standard determinantal ideal of height c , where A is an $(m + c - 1) \times m$ homogeneous matrix with entries in \mathfrak{m} . Then I is componentwise linear if and only if the height of $I_m(A^{\text{lin}})$ is at least $c - 1$.*

Proof. A minimal graded free resolution of I is given by the Eagon-Northcott complex F_\bullet (see, e.g., [5, Theorem 2.16]). Denote by B_1, \dots, B_{c-1} the matrices that describe the maps in the deleted resolution of S/I . For $i \in \{1, \dots, c-1\}$, consider the matrix B_i . If r_i is the rank of B_i , then $\text{Rad } I_{r_i}(B_i) = \text{Rad } I$, where $I_{r_i}(B_i)$ is the ideal generated by the r_i -minors of B_i . Furthermore, the construction of the Eagon-Northcott complex (see, e.g., [5] or [9]) provides that each entry of B_i is either zero or equal to an entry of A . It also follows that the maps in the deleted Eagon-Northcott complex associated to the matrix A^{lin} are given by the matrices $B_1^{\text{lin}}, \dots, B_{c-1}^{\text{lin}}$. Thus, Theorem A2.10.b in [9] provides, for all i ,

$$\text{Rad } I_{r_i}(B_i^{\text{lin}}) = \text{Rad } I_m(A^{\text{lin}}).$$

Using the Buchsbaum-Eisenbud acyclicity criterion, we see that F_\bullet^{lin} is acyclic if and only if $\text{height } I_m(A^{\text{lin}}) \geq c - 1$. Now the claim follows by Theorem 2.9. \square

It is indeed possible that the height of $I_m(A^{\text{lin}})$ is $c - 1$ and $I_m(A)$ is componentwise linear of height c .

Example 4.6. Consider the ideal $I = (x^2, xy, y^3)$ in $K[x, y]$. It is strongly stable, and thus it is componentwise linear. Notice that $I = I_2(A)$ is standard determinantal of height two, where

$$A = \begin{bmatrix} y & 0 \\ -x & y^2 \\ 0 & -x \end{bmatrix}.$$

Then

$$A^{\text{lin}} = \begin{bmatrix} y & 0 \\ -x & 0 \\ 0 & -x \end{bmatrix},$$

and $I_2(A^{\text{lin}}) = (x^2, xy)$ has height one.

We are ready to establish the main result of this section.

Proof of Theorem 4.1. Note that every unmixed ideal of height one is principal, thus componentwise linear. Thus, let now $c \geq 2$.

Recall that we may assume that all entries of A are in \mathfrak{m} and that we have ordered the entries of A according to their degrees. By assumption, I has the expected height, which then implies that all entries on the main diagonal of A have positive degrees. Otherwise,

a calculation shows that the minor using the first m rows of A is zero; a contradiction. We now distinguish two cases.

First assume that the height c is two. If I is componentwise linear, then, by Proposition 4.5, the height of the ideal $I_m(A^{\text{lin}})$ is at least one. Hence, Lemma 4.2 shows that the degrees of the entries on the main diagonal of A are at most one, so they must be equal to one, as claimed.

For the converse, assume that this degree condition is satisfied. If all entries of A have degree one, then I has a linear free resolution, thus it is componentwise linear. If all the entries on the diagonal below the main diagonal of A have degree one, then the homogeneity of A implies that all its entries have degree one. Thus, we are left to consider the case, where one of the entries on the diagonal below the main diagonal of A has a degree which is at least two. Hence, Lemma 4.4 applies and shows $I_m(A^{\text{lin}}) \neq 0$. Since S is an integral domain, Proposition 4.5 implies that again I must be componentwise linear. This concludes the argument if $c = 2$.

Second, assume that $c \geq 3$. If I is componentwise linear, then, by Proposition 4.5, height $I_m(A^{\text{lin}}) \geq c - 1 \geq 2$. Thus, Lemmas 4.2 and 4.3 provide that the entries on the main diagonal of A and the diagonal below it all have degree one. Now, the homogeneity of A implies that each entry in the first $m + 1$ rows of A has degree one and that the entries in any other row of A have the same degree, depending on the row. If more than one row of A contains entries whose degrees are at least two, then the two last rows of A^{lin} consists of zero. It follows that $I_m(A^{\text{lin}})$ is the ideal generated by the m -minors of an $(m + c - 3) \times m$ matrix. Thus, height $I_m(A^{\text{lin}}) \leq c - 2$, which is a contradiction by Proposition 4.5 and establishes the necessity of the claimed degree conditions.

Finally, assume that A satisfies these degree conditions. This means that $B^{\text{lin}} = B$, where B is the matrix obtained from A by deleting its last row. Bruns's generalized principal ideal theorem [3] provides height $I_m(B) = c - 1$ (see also Remark 2.2 in [5]). Therefore, we get

$$\text{height } I_m(A^{\text{lin}}) \geq \text{height } I_m(B^{\text{lin}}) = \text{height } I_m(B) = c - 1.$$

Hence I is componentwise linear by Proposition 4.5, and the argument is complete. \square

Remark 4.7. Theorem 4.1 provides in particular that the minimal graded free resolution of a componentwise linear standard determinantal ideal whose height is at least three has at most two strands.

With respect to Theorem 2.5, it is interesting to find a strongly stable ideal that has the same graded Betti numbers as a given componentwise linear standard determinantal ideal. If the height is two, the answer is clear because each strongly stable Cohen-Macaulay ideal of height two is standard determinantal. If the height is larger, then there are restrictions.

Proposition 4.8. *Adopt the assumptions of Theorem 4.1. Set $e := \deg a_{m,m+c}$. If $c \geq 3$ and I is componentwise linear, then I has the same graded Betti numbers as the strongly stable ideal*

$$J = (x_1, \dots, x_c)^{m-1} \cdot (x_1, \dots, x_{c-1}, x_c^e).$$

Proof. It is easily checked that the ideal J is strongly stable. Thus, the claim follows by comparing the graded Betti numbers of the Eagon-Northcott resolution of I (see, e.g., [5, Theorem 2.16]) with the ones of the Eliahou-Kervaire resolution of J . \square

5. MINORS OF A SYMMETRIC MATRIX

In this section we combine the approaches in the two previous sections in order to determine the componentwise linear ideals of height three that are generated by the submaximal minors of a symmetric matrix.

Throughout this section A will denote a homogeneous symmetric $m \times m$ matrix. Its degree matrix can be written as

$$\partial A = \begin{bmatrix} 2d_1 & d_1 + d_2 & \dots & d_1 + d_m \\ d_1 + d_2 & 2d_2 & \dots & d_2 + d_m \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ d_1 + d_m & d_2 + d_m & \dots & 2d_m \end{bmatrix}$$

for some half integers d_1, \dots, d_m . We may and will always assume that

$$d_1 \leq d_2 \leq \dots \leq d_m.$$

The following is the main result of this section.

Theorem 5.1. *Let A be an $m \times m$ ($m \geq 2$) homogeneous symmetric matrix with entries in \mathfrak{m} such that $I := I_{m-1}(A)$ has height three. Then I is componentwise linear if and only if either all entries of A have degree one or m is odd and the degree matrix B of A is of the form*

$$\begin{bmatrix} B_1 & B_2 \\ B_2^T & B_3 \end{bmatrix},$$

where B_2 is an $\frac{m-1}{2} \times \frac{m+1}{2}$ matrix whose entries are all one, the entries of B_1 are all non-positive, and the entries of B_3 are all at least two.

As preparation for the proof we derive some estimates for the height of certain ideals. Define

$$s := \max\{j \mid d_j = d_1\}$$

and

$$t := \min\{j \mid d_j = d_m\}.$$

Note that $s < t$ if $d_1 < d_m$. We begin now with an upper bound.

Lemma 5.2. *Assume that A satisfies $d_1 \leq 0$, $d_m \geq 2$, $d_1 + d_m = 1$, and $s + t \in \{m, m + 1\}$. If $t \geq s + 2$, then the height of $I_{m-1}(A^{\text{lin}})$ is at most one.*

Proof. The assumptions imply that the linearization of A has the form

$$A^{\text{lin}} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & A_1 \\ 0 & A_2 & 0 \\ A_1^T & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix},$$

where A_1 is an $s \times (m - t + 1)$ matrix and A_2 is a symmetric $(t - s - 1) \times (t - s - 1)$ matrix. We distinguish two cases.

Case 1. Assume that $m - t + 1 = s$, i.e., A_1 is a square matrix. Then we claim that each generator of $I_{m-1}(A^{\text{lin}})$ is divisible by $\det A_1$.

To this end we consider the maximal minors of A^{lin} . Let B be the matrix obtained from A^{lin} by deleting row i and column j . By symmetry, it suffices to consider the case $i \leq j$. If $i \leq s$ and $t \leq j$, then the block structure of B provides $\det B = 0$. Otherwise, it follows that $\det A_1$ is a factor of $\det B$ (where we include the possibility $\det B = 0$). This establishes the claim of Case 1.

Case 2. Assume that A_1 is not a square matrix, that is, $m - t = s$. Then we claim that each generator of $I_{m-1}(A^{\text{lin}})$ is divisible by $\det A_2$.

Again this follows by carefully considering the maximal minors of A^{lin} . If B is the square matrix obtained from A^{lin} by deleting row i and row j such that at least one of i and j is in $\{s + 1, \dots, t\}$, then $\det B = 0$. In all other cases $\det A_2$ is a factor of $\det A^{\text{lin}}$. Our claim follows.

Thus, we have shown that in either case $\text{height } I_m(A^{\text{lin}}) \leq 1$. □

We also need a lower bound.

Lemma 5.3. *Assume that A is a symmetric $(2s + 1) \times (2s + 1)$ matrix of the form*

$$A = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & A_1 \\ A_1^T & A_2 \end{bmatrix},$$

where A_1 is an $s \times (s + 1)$ matrix. If the ideal generated by the maximal minors of A has (expected) height three then the ideal generated by the maximal minors of A_1 has (expected) height two.

Proof. Let B be the matrix obtained from A by deleting its last row. Then, using our assumption on $I_{2s}(A)$, [14, Theorem 1.22] provides

$$\text{height } I_{2s}(B) \geq \text{height } I_{2s}(A) - 1 \geq 2.$$

The block structure of A implies that each $2s$ -minor of B is a linear combination of s -minors of A_1 . It follows that

$$\text{height } I_s(A_1) \geq \text{height } I_{2s}(B) \geq 2.$$

Hence we must have equality because the height of $I_s(A_1)$ is at most two. □

As further preparation, we establish a result that is analogous to Proposition 4.5.

Lemma 5.4. *Assume that the height of $I = I_{m-1}(A)$ is three. Then I is componentwise linear if and only if the height of $I_{m-1}(A^{\text{lin}})$ is at least two.*

Proof. To each symmetric $m \times m$ matrix A , Józefiak [21] provides a complex F_A of length three that is a minimal graded free resolution of $I_{m-1}(A)$ if it has height three. The construction of this complex commutes with passing to its linear part, that is, $(F_A)^{\text{lin}} = F_{A^{\text{lin}}}$. Using Lemma 2.9, our claim now follows as in the proof of Proposition 4.5. □

We are ready to establish the main result of this section.

Proof of Theorem 5.1. We begin with showing the necessity of the stated degree conditions. So assume I is componentwise linear. By [21, Theorem 3.1], I has a minimal graded free resolution of the form

$$(5.1) \quad 0 \rightarrow \bigoplus_{1 \leq i < j \leq m} S(-d_i - d_j - D) \rightarrow \left(\bigoplus_{1 \leq i, j \leq m} S(-D - d_i + d_j) \right) / S(-D) \\ \rightarrow \bigoplus_{1 \leq i \leq j \leq m} S(d_i + d_j - D) \rightarrow S \rightarrow S/I \rightarrow 0,$$

where $D := 2(d_1 + \dots + d_m)$. Denote by M_i the maximal degree of a generator of the i th free module in this resolution. Then we get

$$M_1 = D - 2d_1, \quad M_2 = D + d_m - d_1, \quad \text{and} \quad M_3 = D + d_m + d_{m-1}.$$

Since I is componentwise linear, Theorem 2.5 together with the Eliahou-Kervaire resolution [11] provides

$$M_3 = M_2 + 1 = M_1 + 2.$$

It follows that we must have

$$1 = d_1 + d_m = d_1 + d_{m-1}.$$

Thus, in particular $t \leq m - 1$. If $d_1 = \cdots = d_m = \frac{1}{2}$, then we are done. Otherwise, we have

$$d_1 = \cdots = d_s \leq 0$$

and

$$d_t = \cdots = d_m \geq 1.$$

In particular, the above free resolution has at least three strands. Now denote by n_i the number of generators of degree M_i of the i th free module in the Resolution (5.1). Then we get

$$n_1 = \binom{s+1}{2}, \quad n_2 = s(m-t+1), \quad \text{and} \quad n_3 = \binom{m-t+1}{2}.$$

Using again that I must have the same graded Betti numbers as a stable ideal, we get

$$(5.2) \quad n_1 + n_3 = n_2$$

because in a strongly stable ideal the pure power of x_1 occurs among the minimal generators of least degree, but the resolution of I has more than one strand. Condition (5.2) is equivalent to

$$s \cdot (m - t - s) = (m - t + 1) \cdot (m - t - s).$$

Hence, we have either $m = s + t$ or $m = s + t - 1$. Therefore, Lemma 5.2 applies if $t \geq s + 2$. Together with Lemma 5.4 it shows that then I cannot be componentwise linear. We conclude that $t = s + 1$. Using that $s + t \in \{m, m + 1\}$, we get

$$s = \frac{m-1}{2} \quad \text{and} \quad t = \frac{m+1}{2} \quad \text{if } m \text{ is odd}$$

and

$$s = \frac{m}{2} \quad \text{and} \quad t = \frac{m}{2} + 1 \quad \text{if } m \text{ is even.}$$

However, if m is even, we see that the linearization of A is of the form

$$A^{\text{lin}} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & A_2 \\ A_2^T & 0 \end{bmatrix},$$

where A_2 is an $s \times s$ matrix. It follows that all submaximal minors of A^{lin} are multiples of $\det A_2$, which is a contradiction by Lemma 5.4. Hence, we have shown that m is odd, $t = s + 1 = \frac{m+1}{2}$, $d_1 \leq 0$, and $d_m \geq 2$, as required.

To show the converse, assume that these degree conditions are satisfied. If all entries of A have degree one, then the minimal graded free resolution of I is linear, hence I is componentwise linear. Thus, it remains to consider the case where $d_1 \leq 0$. Since by assumption all entries of A are in \mathfrak{m} , entries of non-positive degree must be zero. Thus, A is of the form

$$A = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & A_2 \\ A_2^T & A_3 \end{bmatrix},$$

where A_2 is an $\frac{m-1}{2} \times \frac{m+1}{2}$ matrix whose entries all have degree one and where the degree of each entry of A_3 is at least two. Hence its linearization is

$$A^{\text{lin}} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & A_2 \\ A_2^T & 0 \end{bmatrix}.$$

Denote by J the ideal that is generated by the maximal minors of A_2 . Then the above block structure implies

$$I_{m-1}(A^{\text{lin}}) = J^2.$$

By Lemma 5.3, the ideal J has height two. It follows that $\text{height } I_{m-1}(A^{\text{lin}}) = 2$. Now we conclude by Lemma 5.4 that I is componentwise linear, which finishes the proof. \square

Remark 5.5. Theorem 5.1 provides that if I is componentwise linear, then its minimal graded free resolution has either one or three strands.

As in the previous section we conclude with determining a strongly stable ideal with the same graded Betti numbers as the given componentwise linear ideal. As a preparation we need the following observation.

Lemma 5.6. *Given any positive integer s , there are unique integers t and r such that $t \geq -1$, $0 \leq r \leq 2s - 2 - t$, and*

$$r + \sum_{i=2s-t}^{2s} i = \binom{s}{2}.$$

Moreover, if $s \geq 2$, then $t \leq s - 3$.

Proof. Observe that t has to be the largest integer j such that

$$\sum_{i=2s-j}^{2s} i \leq \binom{s}{2}.$$

This provides existence and uniqueness of t and r .

Furthermore, if $s \geq 3$, then $\sum_{i=s+3}^{2s} i \geq \binom{s}{2}$. Noting also that $t = -1$ if $s = 2$, the final claim follows. \square

Proposition 5.7. *Adopt the assumptions of Theorem 5.1. Set $e := 2d_m = \deg a_{m,m}$ and $s = \frac{m-1}{2}$. Let t, r be the integers such that $t \geq -1$, $0 \leq r \leq 2s - 2 - t$, and*

$$r + \sum_{i=2s-t}^{2s} i = \binom{s}{2}.$$

If I is componentwise linear, then I has the same graded Betti numbers as the strongly stable ideal $(x_1, x_2, x_3)^{m-1}$, provided $e = 1$, and as

$$\begin{aligned} & (x_1, x_2)^{2s-1-t} (x_1, x_2, x_3)^{t+1} + x_1^{2s-1-t-r} (x_1, x_2)^{r-1} x_3^{t+2} + (x_1, x_2)^{2s-2-t-r} x_2^r x_3^{e+t-1} \\ & + (x_1, x_2)^s (x_1, x_2, x_3)^{s-3-t} x_3^{e+t-2} + (x_1, x_2, x_3)^{s-1} x_3^{e+s-1}, \end{aligned}$$

where $(x_1, x_2)^{r-1}$ is defined to be zero if $r = 0$, whenever $e \geq 2$.

Proof. If $e = 1$, then the claims are clear. Thus, let $e \geq 2$. Then, by Theorem 5.1, the minimal graded free resolution (5.1) of the ideal I takes the following form

$$0 \rightarrow F_3 \rightarrow F_2 \rightarrow F_1 \rightarrow I \rightarrow 0,$$

where

$$F_1 = R^{\binom{s+2}{2}}(-m+1) \oplus R^{s(s+1)}(-m+2-e) \oplus R^{\binom{s+1}{2}}(-m+3-2e),$$

$$F_2 = R^{s(s+1)}(-m) \oplus R^{2s(s+1)}(-m+1-e) \oplus R^{s(s+1)}(-m+2-2e),$$

and

$$F_3 = R^{\binom{s}{2}}(-m-1) \oplus R^{s(s+1)}(-m-e) \oplus R^{\binom{s+1}{2}}(-m+1-2e).$$

Using the Eliahou-Kervaire resolution, one sees that I has the same graded Betti numbers as the monomial ideal, given in the statement. Furthermore, one checks that this monomial ideal is strongly stable. \square

REFERENCES

- [1] A. Aramova, J. Herzog and T. Hibi, *Ideals with stable Betti numbers*. Adv. Math. **152** (2000), no. 1, 72-77.
- [2] D. Bayer and M. Stillman, *A criterion for detecting m -regularity*. Invent. Math. **87** (1987), 1-11.
- [3] W. Bruns, *The Eisenbud-Evans generalized principal ideal theorem and determinantal ideals*. Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. **83** (1981), no. 1, 19-24.
- [4] W. Bruns and J. Herzog, *Cohen-Macaulay rings*. Cambridge Studies in Advanced Mathematics **39**, Cambridge University Press, 1993.
- [5] W. Bruns and U. Vetter, *Determinantal rings*. Lecture Notes in Mathematics **1327**, Springer, 1988.
- [6] A. Conca, *Koszul homology and extremal properties of Gin and Lex* . Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **356** (2004), no. 7, 2945-2961.
- [7] A. Conca, J. Herzog and T. Hibi, *Rigid resolutions and big Betti numbers*. Comment. Math. Helv. **79** (2004), no. 4, 826-839.
- [8] A. Conca, E. De Negri and M. E. Rossi, *Integrally closed and componentwise linear ideals*. Math. Z. **265** (2010), no. 3, 715-734.
- [9] D. Eisenbud, *Commutative Algebra with a View Toward Algebraic Geometry*. Graduate Texts in Mathematics **150**, Springer, 1995.
- [10] D. Eisenbud, A. Reeves and B. Totataro, *Initial ideals, Veronese subrings, and rates of algebras*. Adv. Math. **109** (1994), 168-187.
- [11] S. Eliahou and M. Kervaire, *Minimal resolutions of some monomial ideals*. J. Algebra **129** (1990), no. 1, 1-25.
- [12] C. Francisco, J. Migliore and U. Nagel, *On the componentwise linearity and the minimal free resolution of a tetrahedral curve*. J. Algebra **299** (2006), 535-569.
- [13] C. A. Francisco and A. Van Tuyl, *Some families of componentwise linear monomial ideals*. Nagoya Math. J. **187** (2007), 115-156.
- [14] E. Gorla, *The G -biliaison class of symmetric determinantal schemes*. J. Algebra **310** (2007), no. 2, 880-902.
- [15] S. Goto, *Integral closedness of complete-intersection ideals*. J. Algebra **108** (1987), no. 1, 151-160.
- [16] D. R. Grayson and M. E. Stillman, *Macaulay2, a software system for research in algebraic geometry*. Available at <http://www.math.uiuc.edu/Macaulay2/>.
- [17] J. Herzog and T. Hibi, *Componentwise linear ideals*. Nagoya Math. J. **153** (1999), 141-153.
- [18] J. Herzog and T. Hibi, *Monomial ideals*. Graduate Texts in Mathematics **260**, Springer, 2011.
- [19] J. Herzog, V. Reiner and V. Welker, *Componentwise linear ideals and Golod rings*. Michigan Math. J. **46** (1999), no. 2, 211-223.
- [20] S. B. Iyengar and T. Römer, *Linearity defects of modules over commutative rings*. J. Algebra **322** (2009), no. 9, 3212-3237.
- [21] T. Józefiak, *Ideals generated by minors of a symmetric matrix*. Comment. Math. Helv. **53** (1978), no. 4, 595-607.
- [22] U. Nagel, *Non-degenerate curves with maximal Hartshorne-Rao module*. Math. Z. **244** (2003), 753-773.
- [23] U. Nagel, *Comparing Castelnuovo-Mumford regularity and extended degree: the borderline cases*. Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **357** (2005), 3585-3603.
- [24] T. Römer, *On minimal graded free resolutions*. Dissertation, Essen, 2001.

- [25] P. Schenzel, *Dulaisierende Komplexe in der lokalen Algebra und Buchsbaum-Ringe*. Lecture Notes in Mathematics **907**, Springer, 1982.
- [26] R. P. Stanley, *Combinatorics and commutative algebra. Second edition*. Progress in Mathematics **41**, Birkhäuser, 1996.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY, 715 PATTERSON OFFICE TOWER,
LEXINGTON, KY 40506-0027, USA

E-mail address: `uwe.nagel@uky.edu`

UNIVERSITÄT OSNABRÜCK, INSTITUT FÜR MATHEMATIK, 49069 OSNABRÜCK, GERMANY

E-mail address: `troemer@uos.de`