

AN ALGORITHM TO COMPUTE THE HILBERT DEPTH

ADRIAN POPESCU

ABSTRACT. We present an algorithm which computes the Hilbert depth of a graded module based on a theorem of Uliczka. Connected to a Herzog's question we see that the Hilbert depth of a direct sum of modules can be strictly bigger than the Hilbert depth of all the summands.

Key words : Depth, Hilbert depth, Stanley Depth.

2010 Mathematics Subject Classification : Primary 13C15, Secondary 13F20, 13F55, 13P10.

INTRODUCTION

Let K be a field and $R = K[x_1, \dots, x_n]$ be the polynomial algebra over K in n variables. On R consider the following two grading structures: the \mathbb{Z} -grading in which each x_i has degree 1 and the multigraded structure, that is the \mathbb{Z}^n -grading in which each x_i has degree the i -th vector e_i of the canonical basis.

After Bruns-Krattenthaler-Uliczka [4] (see also [9]), a **Hilbert decomposition** of a \mathbb{Z} -graded R -module M is a finite family

$$\mathcal{H} = (R_i, s_i)_{i \in I}$$

in which $s_i \in \mathbb{Z}$ and R_i is a \mathbb{Z} -graded K -algebra retract of R for each $i \in I$ such that

$$M \cong \bigoplus_{i \in I} R_i(-s_i)$$

as a graded K -vector space.

The **Hilbert depth** of \mathcal{H} denoted by $\text{hdepth}_1 \mathcal{H}$ is the depth of the R -module $\bigoplus_{i \in I} R_i(-s_i)$. The **Hilbert depth** of M is defined as

$$\text{hdepth}_1(M) = \max\{\text{hdepth}_1 \mathcal{H} \mid \mathcal{H} \text{ is a Hilbert decomposition of } M\}.$$

We set $\text{hdepth}_1(0) = \infty$.

Theorem 0.1. (*Uliczka* [11]) $\text{hdepth}_1(M) = \max\{e \mid (1-t)^e HP_M(t) \text{ is positive}\}$, where $HP_M(t)$ is the Hilbert-Poincaré series of M and a power series in $\mathbb{Z}[t, t^{-1}]$ is called **positive** if it has only nonnegative coefficients.

If M is a multigraded \mathbb{Z}^n -module, one can define $\text{hdepth}_n(M)$ as above by considering the \mathbb{Z}^n -grading instead of the standard one. There exists an algorithm for

computing the hdepth_n of a finitely generated multigraded module M over the standard multigraded polynomial ring $K[x_1, \dots, x_n]$ in Ichim and Moyano-Fernandez's paper [6] (see also [7]).

The main purpose of this paper is to provide an algorithm for the $\text{hdepth}_1(M)$ computation where M is a graded R -module (see Algorithm 1.3). This is part of our Master Thesis [8].

A **Stanley decomposition** (see [10]) of a \mathbb{Z} -graded (resp. \mathbb{Z}^n -graded) R -module M is a finite family

$$\mathcal{D} = (R_i, u_i)_{i \in I}$$

in which u_i are homogeneous elements of M and R_i is a graded (resp. \mathbb{Z}^n -graded) K -algebra retract of R for each $i \in I$ such that $R_i \cap \text{Ann}(u_i) = 0$ and

$$M = \bigoplus_{i \in I} R_i u_i$$

as a graded K -vector space.

The **Stanley depth** of \mathcal{D} denoted by $\text{sdepth } \mathcal{D}$ is the depth of the R -module $\bigoplus_{i \in I} R_i u_i$. The **Stanley depth** of M is defined as

$$\text{sdepth}(M) = \max\{\text{sdepth } \mathcal{D} \mid \mathcal{D} \text{ is a Stanley decomposition of } M\}.$$

We set $\text{sdepth}(0) = \infty$.

We will speak about $\text{sdepth}_1(M)$ and $\text{sdepth}_n(M)$ if we consider the \mathbb{Z} -grading respectively the \mathbb{Z}^n -grading of M . The Hilbert depth of M is bigger than the Stanley depth of M and can be strictly bigger (such example can be found in [4]).

Herzog asked (see also [1, Problem 1.67]) if $\text{sdepth}_n(R \oplus m) = \text{sdepth}_n(m)$, where m is the maximal ideal in R . Since we implemented an algorithm to compute hdepth_1 , we tested in the next section whether $\text{hdepth}_1(R \oplus m) = \text{hdepth}_1(m)$ and as a consequence when $\text{sdepth}_n(R \oplus m) = \text{sdepth}_n(m)$ (see Remark 1.7, Proposition 1.9). We owe thanks to Ichim who suggested us this problem and to Uliczka who found a mistake in a previous version of our algorithm.

1. HDEPTH COMPUTATION

We present the algorithm (Algorithm 1.3), prove its correctness (Theorem 1.4) and at the end we present the Hilbert depth computation algorithm as a procedure for the computer algebra system SINGULAR [5].

Recall [3, Corollary 4.1.8] that the Hilbert–Poincaré series of a module M

$$\text{HP}_M(t) = \frac{Q(t)}{(1-t)^n} = \frac{G(t)}{(1-t)^d}, \quad (1)$$

where $d = \dim M$ and $Q(t), G(t) \in \mathbb{Z}[t, t^{-1}]$.

Remark 1.1. The algorithm which we construct requires the module M as the input – in fact it is only needed the $G(t)$ from (1) and the dimension $\dim M$. The algorithm seems to work in a possible more general setting: we work with rational positive power series $R(t)$ of the form $\frac{G(t)}{(1-t)^d}$ with $G(t) \in \mathbb{Z}[t, t^{-1}]$ and $G(1) > 0$.

This is not the case since all these power series are some HP_M of a module M due to [11, Corollary 2.3]. Note that $G(1)$ is equal to the multiplicity of the module which is known to be positive.

Definition 1.2. By the j -jet of a power series $p(t) = \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} a_i \cdot t^i$ we understand the

$$\text{polynomial } j\text{-jet}(p) = \sum_{i=0}^j a_i \cdot t^i.$$

Algorithm 1.3. Next we present the algorithm for the hdepth_1 computation. At the end of the paper, one can find the algorithm builded as a procedure for SINGULAR [5]. We used that procedure to compute the numbers in the Figure 1. The algorithm uses the following easy procedures:

- `inverse(poly p, int bound)`: computes the inverse of a power series `p` till the degree `bound`,
- `hilbconstruct(intvec v)`: computes the second Hilbert series, where `v` is the output of the SINGULAR command `hilb(ideal i, 2)`,
- `positive(poly f)`: returns 1 if `f` has all the coefficients nonnegative and 0 else,
- `sumcoef(poly f)`: returns the sum of the coefficients of `f`.

On the next page we present `hdepth(poly g, int dd)`. Hence if we want to compute $\text{hdepth}_1 M$, then consider `g(t) = hilbconstruct(hilb(M,2))` and `dd = dim(M)`.

Algorithm hdepth₁ (poly g, int dd)

Input:

- a polynomial $g(t) \in \mathbb{Z}[t]$ (equal to $\text{HP}_M(t)$)
- a integer $dd = \dim M$

Output:

- hdepth M

```
1: int d = dd;
2: print "G(t) = ", g;
3: if positive(g) = 1 then
4:   print "hdepth = ", d;
5:   return d;
6: end if
7: poly f = g;
8: int c, beta;
9: beta = deg(g);
10: while d ≥ 0 do
11:   d = d - 1;
12:   f = beta - jet(g · inverse((1 - t)dd-d, 2 · beta));
13:   if positive(f) = 1 then
14:     print "G(t)/(1 - t)^", dd - d, " = ", f, "+ ...";
15:     print "hdepth = ", d;
16:     return d;
17:   end if
18:   c = sumcoef(f);
19:   if c < 0 then
20:     while c < 0 do
21:       beta = beta + 1;
22:       f = beta - jet(g · inverse((1 - t)dd-d, 2 · beta));
23:       c = sumcoef(f);
24:     end while
25:   end if
26: end while
```

Theorem 1.4. *Algorithm 1.3 correctly computes*

$$\max \{n \mid (1 - t)^n \cdot \text{HP}_M(t) \text{ is positive} \} \quad (2)$$

where $\text{HP}_M(t) = \frac{G(t)}{(1 - t)^{\dim M}}$ such that $G(t) \in \mathbb{Z}[t, t^{-1}]$ and $G(1) > 0$. Hence by Theorem 0.1 it results that the algorithm computes the Hilbert depth of a module M for $g = \text{HP}_M(t)$ and $dd = \dim M$.

Proof. The termination of the algorithm follows easily since we know that in last loop we will consider $\frac{G(t)}{(1-t)^{\dim M}} = \text{HP}_M(t)$ which is positive by the definition of the Hilbert–Poincaré series.

Assume that $M \neq 0$. Denote the bound β at the end of the loop where $d = i$ by β_i . To prove this theorem one have to show the following two things:

- the maximum from (2) does not exceed $\dim M$
- after the bound β_i degree, the coefficients are nonnegative.

We now show the first part. Consider that $G(t) = \sum_{i=0}^g a_i \cdot t^i$. Note that

$$(1-t)^{\dim M+1} \cdot \text{HP}_M(t) = (1-t) \cdot G(t) = a_0 + (a_1 - a_0) \cdot t + \dots + (a_g - a_{g-1}) \cdot t^g - a_g \cdot t^{g+1} \quad (3)$$

If this would have all the coefficients nonnegative, then we would get that $0 \geq a_g \geq a_{g-1} \geq a_{g-2} \geq \dots \geq a_2 \geq a_1 \geq a_0 \geq 0$ which would imply that $G(t) = 0$. Contradiction to $M \neq 0$. The same holds for $(1-t)^{\dim M+\alpha} \cdot \text{HP}_M(t)$ by considering $(1-t)^{\dim M+\alpha-1} \cdot \text{HP}_M(t)$ instead of $G(t)$. Thus the maximum from (2) is not bigger than $\dim M$.

Note that if $G(t)$ has already all the coefficients nonnegative, then the algorithm stops by returning $\dim M$, and the result is correct since of the above.

We now prove the second part. For this we show that at each step i the coefficient of the order β_i term in $\frac{G(t)}{(1-t)^{\dim M-i}}$ is nonnegative and that the coefficients of the terms of higher order are increasing (and hence nonnegative). We prove by induction on i . For the starting step, i.e. $\frac{G(t)}{(1-t)}$, all the coefficients of the terms of order $\geq \beta_{\dim M-1} = \deg G(t)$ are equal to the sum of the coefficients, that is $G(1) > 0$ (by assumption). Now consider the step i . Assume that for $\frac{G(t)}{(1-t)^{\dim M-i}} = \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} a_i \cdot t^i$ all the desired properties hold and that the bound β_{i-1} was increased (if it was needed) such that the coefficient sum $c_i := \sum_{i=0}^{\beta_{i-1}} a_i > 0$, as the algorithm states. We now compute

$$\frac{G(t)}{(1-t)^{\dim M-i+1}} = \overbrace{a_0 + (a_0 + a_1) \cdot t + \dots + \left(\sum_{i=0}^{\beta_{i-1}} a_i \right) \cdot t^{\beta_{i-1}} + (c_i + a_{\beta_{i-1}+1}) \cdot t^{\beta_{i-1}+1} + \dots}^{=\beta_{i-1}\text{-jet}} \quad \underbrace{\hspace{10em}}_{c_i > 0}$$

Since of the induction, $0 < a_{\beta_{i-1}} \leq a_{\beta_{i-1}+1} \leq a_{\beta_{i-1}+2} \leq \dots$ and since $c_i > 0$ we got our conclusion. \square

The next examples show us how we can use it. Note that in the outputs we print exactly the jet we considered in our computations followed by “+...”.

Example 1.5. Consider the ring $\mathbb{Q}[x, y_1, \dots, y_5]$ and consider the ideal $I = (x) \cap (y_1, \dots, y_5)$.

```
ring R=0,(x,y(1..5)),ds;

ideal i=intersect(x,ideal(y(1..5)));

"dim I = ",dim(i);

// dim I = 5

hdepth( hilbconstruct( hilb(i,2) ), dim(i) );

// G(t)= 1+t-4t2+6t3-4t4+t5
// G(t)/(1-t)^ 1 = 1+2t-2t2+4t3+t5 +...
// G(t)/(1-t)^ 2 = 1+3t+t2+5t3+5t4+6t5 +...
// hdepth= 3
```

Example 1.6. Consider a module M such that $\text{HP}_M(t) = \frac{2 - 3t - 2t^2 + 2t^3 + 4t^4}{(1 - t)^d}$.

Then the `hdepth` procedure will return

```
// G(t)= 2-3t-2t2+2t3+4t4
// G(t)/(1-t)^ 1 = 2-t-3t2-t3+3t4+3t5 +...
// G(t)/(1-t)^ 2 = 2+t-2t2-3t3+3t5 +...
// G(t)/(1-t)^ 3 = 2+3t+t2-2t3-2t4+t5 +...
// G(t)/(1-t)^ 4 = 2+5t+6t2+4t3+2t4+3t5 +...
```

and hence $\text{hdepth}_1 = d - 4$.

Note that in the example, the coefficient sum of the 4-jet $\left(\frac{G(t)}{(1-t)}\right)$ is equal to zero and thus we increase the bound to 5 (the coefficient sum of the 5-jet will be equal to 3).

We computed with the presented algorithm constructed as a procedure for SINGULAR (one can see it in the Appendix) the $\text{hdepth}_1 m$, $\text{hdepth}_1(R \oplus m)$, \dots , $\text{hdepth}_1(R^6 \oplus m)$ and $\text{hdepth}_1(R^{100} \oplus m)$, where m is the maximal ideal in $R = K[x_1, \dots, x_n]$ for $n \in \{4, 5, \dots, 19\}$. We got the following results:

n	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19
$\text{hdepth}_1(m)$	2	3	3	4	4	5	5	6	6	7	7	8	8	9	9	10
$\text{hdepth}_1(R \oplus m)$	2	3	4	4	5	5	6	6	7	8	8	9	9	10	11	11
$\text{hdepth}_1(R^2 \oplus m)$	3	3	4	4	5	6	6	7	8	8	9	10	10	11	11	12
$\text{hdepth}_1(R^3 \oplus m)$	3	3	4	5	5	6	7	7	8	9	9	10	10	11	12	12
$\text{hdepth}_1(R^4 \oplus m)$	3	3	4	5	6	6	7	8	8	9	9	10	11	11	12	12
$\text{hdepth}_1(R^5 \oplus m)$	3	4	4	5	6	6	7	8	8	9	10	10	11	11	12	13
$\text{hdepth}_1(R^6 \oplus m)$	3	4	4	5	6	7	7	8	8	9	10	10	11	11	12	13
$\text{hdepth}_1(R^{100} \oplus m)$	3	4	5	6	7	8	8	9	10	11	11	12	13	13	14	15

FIGURE 1.

Remark 1.7. Note that for $n = 6$ we have $\text{hdepth}_1(R \oplus m) = 4 > 3 = \text{hdepth}_1 m$. The difference $\text{hdepth}_1(R \oplus m) - \text{hdepth}_1 m$ can be > 1 as one can see for $n = 18$.

Also see that $\text{hdepth}_1(R^s \oplus m) - \text{hdepth}_1 m$ increase when s and n increase. For example $\text{hdepth}_1(R^{100} \oplus m) - \text{hdepth}_1 m = 5$ for $s = 100$ and $n = 19$.

Lemma 1.8. Let n be such that $\text{hdepth}_1 m = \text{hdepth}_1(R \oplus m)$. Then $\text{sdepth}_n m = \text{sdepth}_n(R \oplus m)$.

Proof. By [11] and [2] we have $\text{hdepth}_1 m = \left\lceil \frac{n}{2} \right\rceil = \text{sdepth}_n m$. It is enough to see that the following inequalities hold:

$$\text{hdepth}_1 m = \text{sdepth}_n m \leq \text{sdepth}_n(R \oplus m) \leq \text{hdepth}_n(R \oplus m) \leq \text{hdepth}_1(R \oplus m).$$

□

Proposition 1.9. If $n \in \{1, \dots, 5, 7, 9, 11\}$ then $\text{sdepth}_n m = \text{sdepth}_n(R \oplus m)$, that is Herzog's question has a positive answer.

Proof. Note that $\text{hdepth}_1 m = \text{hdepth}_1(R \oplus m)$ for n as above and apply Lemma 1.8. □

APPENDIX

This is the `hdepth1` computation algorithm builded as a procedure for the computer algebra system SINGULAR [5]. This procedure was used in the results from Figure 1. Note that there are some additional easy procedures which have been used: `inverse`, `positive` and `sumcoef` defined in Algorithm 1.3.

```

proc hdepth(poly g, int dd)
{
    int d;
    d = dd;
    ring T = 0,t,ds;
        "G(t)=" ,g;
    if(positiv(g)==1)
        {return("hdepth=" ,d);}
    poly f=g;
    number ag;
    int c1;
    int bound;
    bound = deg(g);
    while(d >= 0)
    {
        d = d-1;
        f = jet( g*inverse( (1-t)^(dd-d),2*bound ) , bound );
        if(positiv(f) == 1)
        {
            "G(t)/(1-t)^(dd-d)," ,f," +...";
            "hdepth=" ,d;
            return();
        }
        c1=sumcoef(f);
        if(c1<=0)
        {
            while( c1<0 )
            {
                bound = bound + 1;
                f = jet( g*inverse( (1-t)^(dd-d),2*bound ) , bound );
                c1 = sumcoef(f);
            }
            "G(t)/(1-t)^(dd-d)," ,g," +...";
        }
    }
}

```


REFERENCES

- [1] A.M. Bigatti, P. Gimenez, E. Sáenz-de-Cabezón: *Monomial Ideals, Computations and Applications*, Springer, 2013
- [2] C. Biro, D.M. Howard, M.T. Keller, W.T. Trotter, S.J. Young, *Interval partitions and Stanley depth*, J. Combin. Theory Ser. A 117 (2010), 475-482.
- [3] W. Bruns, J. Herzog: *Cohen-Macaulay rings*, Revised edition, Cambridge University Press (1998).
- [4] W. Bruns, C. Krattenthaler, J. Uliczka: *Stanley decompositions and Hilbert depth in the Koszul complex*, J. Commut. Algebra 2 (2010), 327-357
- [5] W. Decker, G.-M. Greuel, G. Pfister, H. Schönemann: SINGULAR 3-1-6 — A computer algebra system for polynomial computations. <http://www.singular.uni-kl.de> (2013).
- [6] B. Ichim, J.J. Moyano-Fernandez, *How to compute the multigraded Hilbert depth of a module*, (2012), arXiv:AC/1209.0084.
- [7] B. Ichim, A. Zarojanu: *An algorithm for computing the multigraded Hilbert depth of a module*, (2013), arxiv.org/abs/1304.7215
- [8] A. Popescu: *Standard Bases over Principal Ideal Rings*, Master Thesis at Technische Universität Kaiserslautern (2013).
- [9] Y.H. Shen: *Lexsegment ideals of Hilbert depth 1*, (2012), arXiv:AC/1208.1822v1.
- [10] R.P. Stanley: *Linear Diophantine equations and local cohomology*, Invent. Math. **68** (1982) 175-193.
- [11] J. Uliczka: *Remarks on Hilbert series of graded modules over polynomial rings*, Manuscripta Math. 132 (2010), 159168. MR2609292 (2011c:13030)

ADRIAN POPESCU, TECHNISCHE UNIVERSITÄT KAISERSLAUTERN, GOTTLIEB-DAIMLER 47,
67663 KAISERSLAUTERN, GERMANY
E-mail address: popescu@mathematik.uni-kl.de