# ON THE MAXIMUM NUMBER OF COMPLEXES OF A GIVEN DEGREE CONTAINING SUBVARIETIES OF GRASSMANNIANS

CIRO CILIBERTO

ABSTRACT. Let  $\mathbb{G}(k,r)$  be the Grassmannian of k–subspaces in  $\mathbb{P}^r$  embedded in  $\mathbb{P}^{N(k,r)}$ , with  $N(k, r) = \binom{r+1}{k+1} - 1$ , via the Plücker embedding. In this paper, extending some classical results by Gallarati (see [\[3,](#page-9-0) [4\]](#page-9-1)), we give a sharp upper bound for the number of independent sections of  $H^0(\mathbb{G}(k,r),\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{G}(k,r)}(m))$  vanishing on a subvariety X of  $\mathbb{G}(k,r)$ such that the union of the k–subspaces corresponding to the points of X spans  $\mathbb{P}^r$ .

#### **INTRODUCTION**

Let  $\mathbb{G}(k,r)$  be the Grassmannian of k–subspaces (i.e., linear subspaces of dimension k) in  $\mathbb{P}^r$  embedded in  $\mathbb{P}^{N(k,r)}$ , with  $N(k,r) = \binom{r+1}{k+1} - 1$ , via the Plücker embedding. To avoid trivial cases we will assume  $k \neq 0, r - 1$ .

For every positive integer m we consider  $H^0(\mathbb{G}(k,r), \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{G}(k,r)}(m))$  whose dimension we denote by  $\varepsilon_{k,r}(m)$ . This is a well known number, computed for instance in [\[6,](#page-9-2) Thm. III, p. 387], which is not necessary to make explicit here. Given any non–zero section  $s \in H^0(\mathbb{G}(k,r), \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{G}(k,r)}(m))$ , the zero locus scheme (s) of s is called a m-complex of  $\mathbb{G}(k,r)$ .

Let now X be an irreducible, projective subvariety of  $\mathbb{G}(k,r)$ . We can consider the subvariety

$$
Z(X) = \bigcup_{\pi \in X} \pi
$$

of  $\mathbb{P}^r$ . We will say that X is *Grassmann non–degenerate* if  $Z(X)$  is non–degenerate in  $\mathbb{P}^r$ , i.e., if  $Z(X)$  spans  $\mathbb{P}^r$ . We will say that X presents the *cone case* if the subspaces corresponding to the points of  $X$  pass through one and the same linear subspace of dimension  $k-1$ , in which case  $Z(X)$  is a cone with vertex a linear space of dimension  $k-1$ .

Let  $\mathcal{I}_{X,\mathbb{G}(k,r)}$  be the ideal sheaf of X in  $\mathbb{G}(k,r)$ . We will set

<span id="page-0-0"></span>
$$
\theta_X(m) := h^0(\mathbb{G}(k,r), \mathcal{I}_{X, \mathbb{G}(k,r)}(m))
$$

that is the maximum number of independent m–complexes of  $\mathbb{G}(k, r)$  containing X. In the two papers [\[3,](#page-9-0) [4\]](#page-9-1), D. Gallarati proved the following two results:

Theorem 1. *Let* X *be an irreducible projective Grassmann non–degenerate curve in* G(1, r)*. Then for any positive integer* m *one has*

(1) 
$$
\theta_X(m) \leq \varepsilon_{1,r}(m) - m(r-1) - 1.
$$

*Moreover:*

*(i) if*  $m > 1$  *and* X *is a rational normal curve of degree*  $r - 1$  *(equivalently if*  $Z(X)$  *is a rational normal scroll surface of degree*  $r - 1$ *), then the equality holds in* [\(1\)](#page-0-0)*;* 

<sup>2020</sup> *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary 14M15, 14N05; Secondary 14N15.

*Key words and phrases.* Grassmannians, complexes, rational normal varieties, Hilbert function.

*(ii) if* m = 1 *equality holds in* [\(1\)](#page-0-0) *if and only if either* X *is a rational normal curve of degree*  $r - 1$  *or*  $X$  *presents the cone case.* 

Theorem 2. *Let* X *be an irreducible projective Grassmann non–degenerate curve in*  $\mathbb{G}(k,r)$ *. Then* 

<span id="page-1-0"></span>(2) 
$$
\theta_X(1) \leq {r+1 \choose k+1} - r + k - 1 = \varepsilon_{k,r}(1) - r + k - 1.
$$

*Moreover, equality holds in* [\(2\)](#page-1-0) *if and only if either* X *is a rational normal curve of degree*  $r - k$  (equivalently  $Z(X)$  *is a*  $(k + 1)$ –dimensional rational normal scroll of degree  $r - k$ ) *or* X *presents the cone case.*

In this note we will prove an extension of Gallarati's results. Before stating our result, let us introduce some notation. Given positive integers  $n, k, r, m$  we will set

$$
\theta(n,k,r,m) = \varepsilon_{k,r}(m) - (r-k)\sigma(n,m) - \tau(n,m)
$$

where  $\sigma(1, m) = m$ ,  $\sigma(2, m) = \frac{m(m+1)}{2}$ , whereas if  $n \ge 3$  one has

$$
\sigma(n,m) = \sum_{i_{n-2}=1}^{m} \sum_{i_{n-3}=1}^{i_{n-2}} \cdots \sum_{i_1=1}^{i_2} \frac{i_1(i_1+1)}{2},
$$

and

$$
\tau(1, m) = 1, \quad \tau(2, m) = m + 1, \quad \tau(3, m) = \frac{m(m + 1)}{2} + m + 1
$$

whereas if  $n \geq 4$  one has

$$
\tau(n,m) = \sum_{i_{n-3}=1}^{m} \sum_{i_{n-4}=1}^{i_{n-3}} \cdots \sum_{i_1=1}^{i_2} \frac{i_1(i_1+1)}{2} + \sum_{i_{n-4}=1}^{m} \sum_{i_{n-5}=1}^{i_{n-4}} \cdots \sum_{i_1=1}^{i_2} \frac{i_1(i_1+1)}{2} + \cdots + \frac{m(m+1)}{2} + m + 1.
$$

One notes that  $\theta(1, 1, r, m)$  coincides with Gallarati's upper bound in [\(1\)](#page-0-0) and  $\theta(1, k, r, 1)$ coincides with the upper bound in [\(2\)](#page-1-0). In addition we notice that

(3) 
$$
\sigma(n,m) = \sum_{i=1}^{m} \sigma(n-1,i)
$$
 and  $\tau(n,m) = \sum_{i=1}^{m} \tau(n-1,i) + 1$ .

Moreover, given positive integers  $n > 1, k, r, m$  we set

<span id="page-1-3"></span><span id="page-1-1"></span>
$$
\bar{\theta}(n,k,r,m) = \varepsilon_{k,r}(m) - \binom{m+n-1}{n}(r-k-n) - \binom{m+n}{n}.
$$

Then we can state our result:

<span id="page-1-2"></span>Theorem 3. *Let* X *be an irreducible projective Grassmann non–degenerate variety of dimension n in*  $\mathbb{G}(k,r)$ *.* 

*(a) If either*  $n = 1$  *or*  $n > 1$  *and* X *does not present the cone case, then* 

(4) 
$$
\theta_X(m) \leq \theta(n, k, r, m).
$$

*Moreover:*

*(i) for* m = 1 *equality holds in* [\(4\)](#page-1-1) *if and only if either* X *is a rational normal variety of degree* r −k *in a subspace of dimension* r −k +n−1 *in* P <sup>N</sup>(k,r) *or* n = 1 *and* X *presents the cone case;*

*(ii)* for  $n = 1$  *and*  $m > 1$  *equality holds in* [\(4\)](#page-1-1) *if* X *is a rational normal curve of degree* r − k*;*

*(iii)* for  $n > 1$  *and*  $m > 1$ *, equality holds in* [\(4\)](#page-1-1) *if and only if* X *is a rational normal variety of degree*  $r - k$  *spanning a subspace of dimension*  $r - k + n - 1$  *in*  $\mathbb{P}^{N(k,r)}$ *.* 

<span id="page-2-0"></span>*(b)* If  $n > 1$  *and X* presents the cone case then

(5) 
$$
\theta_X(m) \leq \bar{\theta}(n, k, r, m).
$$

*Moreover:*

*(iv) equality holds in [\(5\)](#page-2-0) for*  $m = 1$ ;

*(v) if equality holds in* [\(5\)](#page-2-0) *for some*  $m \ge 2$ *, then* X *is a rational normal variety of degree* r − k − n + 1 *in a linear subspace of dimension* r − k *contained in* G(k, r) *whose points correspond to* k–subspaces containing a fixed  $(k - 1)$ –subspace, or, equivalently,  $Z(X)$  is *a cone with vertex a* (k − 1)*–subspace over a variety of dimension* n *and minimal degree*  $r - k - n + 1$  *in a*  $(r - k)$ –*linear subspace of*  $\mathbb{P}^r$ *.* 

The proof of part (a) works by induction on the dimension  $n$  of X. We first treat the curve case in [§1,](#page-2-1) then the surface and threefold case in [§2.](#page-3-0) Then, to complete the proof of part (a) in the rest of  $\S2$ , we proceed by induction using a classical method going back to Castelnuovo, passing from  $X$  to a general hyperplane section of it. We will treat case (b) in [§3,](#page-6-0) again using Castelnuovo's method. In [§4](#page-8-0) we finish with some examples showing that the varieties mentioned in the statement of Theorem [3,](#page-1-2) for which equality holds in [\(4\)](#page-1-1) and [\(5\)](#page-2-0), do really occur.

<span id="page-2-1"></span>Acknowledgements: The author is a member of GNSAGA of INdAM.

#### 1. THE CURVE CASE

In this section we will prove Theorem [3](#page-1-2) in the curve case  $n = 1$ . A great part of this proof is already in Gallarati's papers [\[3,](#page-9-0) [4\]](#page-9-1). However it is the case to review some details of the proof that are a bit too terse in Gallarati's treatment.

Let us start with the following easy lemma:

**Lemma 4.** Let X be an irreducible projective Grassmann non-degenerate curve in  $\mathbb{G}(k, r)$ . *Then given*  $r-k$  *general points*  $P_1, \ldots, P_{r-k}$  *of* X, there is a hyperplane section of  $\mathbb{G}(k,r)$ *not containing* X *and containing*  $P_1, \ldots, P_{r-k}$ .

*Proof.* Given a linear subspace  $\Pi$  of dimension  $r - k - 1$ , one can consider the Schubert cycle of all linear k–subspaces of  $\mathbb{P}^r$  intersecting  $\Pi$ . This is a linear complex, i.e., a hyperplane section  $H_{\Pi}$  of  $\mathbb{G}(k, r)$ . Given  $P_1, \ldots, P_{r-k}$  general points of X, these correspond to  $r - k$  general subspaces sweeping out  $Z(X)$ . Let us fix a general point  $p_i \in P_i$  for any  $1 \leq i \leq r - k$ , so that  $p_1, \ldots, p_{r-k}$  are general points of  $Z(X)$ . The Grassmann non–degeneracy of X is equivalent to  $Z(X)$  being non–degenerate, so  $p_1, \ldots, p_{r-k}$  are linearly independent in  $\mathbb{P}^r$ . Then  $\Pi = \langle p_1, \ldots, p_{r-k} \rangle$  is a  $(r - k - 1)$ –subspace of  $\mathbb{P}^r$ , and actually it is a general such subspace, so that it intersects  $Z(X)$ , that has dimension  $k + 1$ , in finitely many points. Then  $\Pi$  intersects the subspaces  $P_1, \ldots, P_{r-k}$  but does not intersect all the subspaces  $P \in X$ . Hence  $H_{\Pi}$  is a hyperplane section of  $\mathbb{G}(k,r)$  not containing X and containing  $P_1, \ldots, P_{r-k}$ , as required.

Let  $X \subset \mathbb{P}^r$  be an irreducible non–degenerate projective variety. For all non–negative integers m we let  $h_X(m)$  be the *Hilbert function* of X, i.e.,  $h_X(m)$  is the dimension of the image of the restriction map

$$
H^0(\mathbb{P}^r, \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^r}(m)) \longrightarrow H^0(X, \mathcal{O}_X(m)).
$$

So  $h_X(m) - 1$  is the dimension of the linear series cut out on X by the hypersurfaces of degree m of  $\mathbb{P}^r$ .

Now suppose that  $X$  is an irreducible projective Grassmann non-degenerate variety of dimension n in  $\mathbb{G}(k, r)$ . For any non–negative integer m, we have the exact sequence

$$
0 \longrightarrow \mathcal{I}_{X,\mathbb{G}(k,r)}(m) \longrightarrow \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{G}(k,r)}(m) \longrightarrow \mathcal{O}_X(m) \longrightarrow 0
$$

which gives

(6)

<span id="page-3-1"></span>
$$
0 \longrightarrow H^0(\mathbb{G}(k,r), \mathcal{I}_{X, \mathbb{G}(k,r)}(m)) \longrightarrow H^0(\mathbb{G}(k,r), \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{G}(k,r)}(m)) \longrightarrow H^0(X, \mathcal{O}_X(m))
$$

The image of

(7) 
$$
\rho_m: H^0(\mathbb{G}(k,r), \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{G}(k,r)}(m)) \longrightarrow H^0(X, \mathcal{O}_X(m))
$$

coincides with the image of

<span id="page-3-5"></span>
$$
H^0(\mathbb{P}^r, \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^r}(m)) \longrightarrow H^0(X, \mathcal{O}_X(m))
$$

because  $\mathbb{G}(k, r)$  is projectively normal and therefore

(8) 
$$
H^{0}(\mathbb{P}^{r}, \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^{r}}(m)) \longrightarrow H^{0}(\mathbb{G}(k, r), \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{G}(k, r)}(m))
$$

is surjective for all non–negative integers m. So the dimension of the image of  $\rho_m$  is  $h_X(m)$ .

By [\(6\)](#page-3-1) we have

(9)  $\theta_X(m) = \varepsilon_{k,r}(m) - h_X(m)$ 

<span id="page-3-2"></span>
$$
\theta_X(m) = \varepsilon_{k,r}(m) - h_X(m)
$$

Now we are ready for the:

*Proof of Theorem [3](#page-1-2) for*  $n = 1$ . By [\(9\)](#page-3-2), to bound  $\theta_X(m)$  from above we have to bound  $h_X(m)$  from below. To do so, notice that given  $m(r - k)$  general points of X, there is some m–complex of  $\mathbb{G}(k, r)$  containing those points and not containing X. It suffices to divide the  $m(r - k)$  general points of X in m subsets of  $r - k$  general points, and then apply Lemma [7,](#page-4-0) thus finding the required  $m$ –complex splitting in  $m$  linear complexes each containing one of the m subsets of  $r - k$  points. This proves that

(10) hX(m) − 1 > m(r − k).

Then by [\(9\)](#page-3-2) we get

<span id="page-3-3"></span>
$$
\theta_X(m) = \varepsilon_{k,r}(m) - h_X(m) \leq \varepsilon_{k,r}(m) - m(r-k) - 1 = \theta(1, k, r, m)
$$

proving [\(4\)](#page-1-1) in this case.

The proof of (i) in the case  $n = 1$  is contained in [\[3,](#page-9-0) [4\]](#page-9-1) and we do not dwell on this here. As for (ii), if X is a rational normal curve of degree  $r - k$ , then for all positive integers m we have  $h_X(m) = m(r-k)+1$  and therefore from [\(9\)](#page-3-2) we find that  $\theta_X(m) = \theta(1, k, r, m)$ as wanted.  $\Box$ 

### 2. THE GENERAL CASE

<span id="page-3-0"></span>Before treating the general case it is necessary to work out first the surface and the threefold cases. We start with some lemmata.

<span id="page-3-4"></span>Lemma 5. *Let* X *be an irreducible projective Grassmann non–degenerate variety in*  $\mathbb{G}(k, r)$  *not presenting the cone case. Let*  $P_1, \ldots, P_{r-k}$  *be general points in* X*, which correspond to* k*–subspaces of* P r *that we denote by the same symbols. Then*

$$
\langle P_1,\ldots,P_{r-k}\rangle=\mathbb{P}^r.
$$

*Proof.* One has  $\dim(\langle P_1, P_2 \rangle) = k + a_1$ , with  $a_1 \ge 1$ . If  $a_1 = 1$ , two k–subspaces corresponding to general points of X span a linear space of dimension  $k + 1$ , so they intersect in a linear subspace of dimension  $k - 1$ . Then either they all lie in a linear space of dimension  $k + 1$  or they all pass through a linear space of dimension  $k - 1$ , but neither case can occur by the non–degeneracy of  $X$  and the fact that  $X$  does not present the cone case. Hence  $a_1 \geq 2$ .

Next, if  $\langle P_1, P_2 \rangle = \mathbb{P}^r$  the claim clearly holds. So suppose that  $\langle P_1, P_2 \rangle$  is a proper subspace of  $\mathbb{P}^r$ , hence  $k + a_1 < r$ . Then  $P_3$  cannot lie in  $\langle P_1, P_2 \rangle$  by the non–degeneracy of X, so  $\dim(\langle P_1, P_2, P_3 \rangle) = k + a_1 + a_2$ , with  $a_2 \ge 1$ . If  $\langle P_1, P_2, P_3 \rangle = \mathbb{P}^r$ , the claim is clearly true, otherwise we iterate the above argument. The upshot is that either a proper subset of  $P_1, \ldots, P_{r-k}$  spans  $\mathbb{P}^r$  and we are done, or

$$
\dim(\langle P_1,\ldots,P_{r-k}\rangle)=k+a_1+\cdots+a_{r-k-1}\geqslant k+r-k=r
$$

proving the lemma.  $\Box$ 

<span id="page-4-1"></span>Lemma 6. *Let* X *be an irreducible projective Grassmann non–degenerate variety in*  $\mathbb{G}(k,r)$ *. Then* 

$$
h_X(1) \geqslant r - k + 1.
$$

*Proof.* If X is a curve, the assertion follows from [\(10\)](#page-3-3). Assume that X has dimension  $n \geq 2$ . Fix  $P_1, \ldots, P_{r-k}$  general points in X. Let C be the complete intersection curve of X with  $n-1$  general hypersurfaces of degree  $d \gg 0$  containing  $P_1, \ldots, P_{r-k}$ . One clearly has  $\theta_C(1) = \theta_X(1)$ . By Lemma [5,](#page-3-4) C is Grassmann non–degenerate, and therefore, by [\(4\)](#page-1-1) one has

$$
\theta_X(1) = \theta_C(1) \le \theta(1, k, r, 1) = \binom{r+1}{k+1} - r + k - 1,
$$

whence the assertion immediately follows.  $\Box$ 

<span id="page-4-0"></span>Lemma 7. *Let* X *be an irreducible projective Grassmann non–degenerate variety of dimension*  $n \geq 2$  *in*  $\mathbb{G}(k, r)$  *not presenting the cone case. If* Y *is a general hyperplane section of* X*, then* Y *is also Grassmann non–degenerate and does not present the cone case.*

*Proof.* Let  $P_1, \ldots, P_{r-k}$  be general points in X. By Lemma [6,](#page-4-1) there is a hyperplane section Y of X containing  $P_1, \ldots, P_{r-k}$ , and Y can be considered to be a general hyperplane section of  $X$ . By Lemma [5,](#page-3-4)  $Y$  is Grassmann non–degenerate.

To finish the proof we have to show that for a general hyperplane section  $Y$  of  $X, Y$ does not present the cone case. Suppose, by contradiction, that this is the case. Then given two general points  $P_1, P_2 \in X$ , there is a hyperplane section of X containing them, and therefore the k–subspaces  $P_1, P_2$  intersect along a  $(k - 1)$ –subspace. Then either all subspaces corresponding to points of X pass through the same  $(k - 1)$ –subspace or they all lie in the same  $(k + 1)$ –subspace. Both possibilites lead to contradictions since X is Grassmann non–degenerate and does not present the cone case.

Next let  $X \subset \mathbb{P}^r$  be an irreducible non–degenerate projective variety. Let Y be a general hyperplane section of X. For all  $m \geq 1$  one has the inequality

<span id="page-4-2"></span>(11) hX(m) − hX(m − 1) > h<sup>Y</sup> (m)

and equality holds for all m if and only if X is projectively normal (see [\[5,](#page-9-3) Lemma (3.1)]).

6 CIRO CILIBERTO

*Proof of part (a) of Theorem [3](#page-1-2) for surfaces.* Let X be an irreducible projective Grassmann non–degenerate surface in  $G(k, r)$  not presenting the cone case and let Y be a general hyperplane section of  $X$ . By Lemma [7,](#page-4-0)  $Y$  is Grassmann non–degenerate. By [\(11\)](#page-4-2), for all positive integers  $m$  one has the inequalities

<span id="page-5-0"></span>(12) 
$$
h_X(m) - h_X(m-1) \ge h_Y(m)
$$

$$
\dots
$$

$$
h_X(1) - h_X(0) \ge h_Y(1)
$$

and summing up we get

<span id="page-5-1"></span>(13) 
$$
h_X(n) \geqslant \sum_{i=1}^m h_Y(i) + h_X(0) = \sum_{i=1}^m h_Y(i) + 1.
$$

By [\(9\)](#page-3-2) we have

<span id="page-5-2"></span>(14) 
$$
\varepsilon_{k,r}(m) - \theta_X(m) = h_X(n) \ge \sum_{i=1}^m h_Y(i) + 1 = \sum_{i=1}^m (\varepsilon_{k,r}(i) - \theta_Y(i)) + 1
$$

whence, using Theorem [3](#page-1-2) for the curve  $Y$  (that we can do because  $Y$  is Grassmann non– degenerate), we have

<span id="page-5-3"></span>(15) 
$$
\theta_X(m) \leq \varepsilon_{k,r}(m) - \sum_{i=1}^m (\varepsilon_{k,r}(i) - \theta_Y(i)) - 1 =
$$

$$
= \varepsilon_{k,r}(m) - \sum_{i=1}^m \varepsilon_{k,r}(i) + \sum_{i=1}^m \theta_Y(i) - 1 =
$$

$$
= \sum_{i=1}^m \theta_Y(i) - \sum_{i=1}^{m-1} \varepsilon_{k,r}(i) - 1 \leq
$$

$$
\leq \sum_{i=1}^m \left( \varepsilon_{k,r}(i) - i(r - k) - 1 \right) - \sum_{i=1}^{m-1} \varepsilon_{k,r}(i) - 1 =
$$

$$
= \varepsilon_{k,r}(m) - \frac{m(m+1)}{2}(r - k) - m - 1 = \theta(2, k, r, m)
$$

proving [\(4\)](#page-1-1) in this case.

Next let us prove (i). If  $\theta_X(1) = \theta(2, k, r, 1)$  then the above argument shows that  $\theta_Y(1) = \theta(1, k, r, 1)$ . By Theorem [3\(](#page-1-2)i) for Y and by Lemma [7,](#page-4-0) Y is a rational normal curve of degree  $r - k$ , because Y cannot present the cone case. Hence X is a rational normal surface of degree  $r - k$ . Conversely, if X is a rational normal surface of degree  $r - k$ , then  $h_X(1) = r - k + 2$  and therefore

$$
\theta_X(1) = \varepsilon_{k,r}(1) - (r - k + 2) = \theta(2, k, r, 1)
$$

as wanted.

As for (iii), suppose that for some  $m > 1$  one has  $\theta_X(m) = \theta(2, k, r, m)$ . Then the above argument implies that  $\theta_Y(i) = \theta(1, k, r, i)$ , for  $1 \leq i \leq m$ . By Theorem [3\(](#page-1-2)ii) for Y, Y is a rational normal curve of degree  $r - k$  and therefore X is a rational normal surface of degree  $r - k$ . Conversely, if X is a rational normal surface of degree  $r - k$ , then  $X$  is projectively normal and we have equalities in [\(12\)](#page-5-0), [\(13\)](#page-5-1) and [\(14\)](#page-5-2). Moreover  $\theta_Y(i) = \theta(1, k, r, i)$  for all positive integers i by Theorem [3\(](#page-1-2)ii) for Y, and therefore we have equalities in [\(15\)](#page-5-3). This implies that  $\theta_X(m) = \theta(2, k, r, m)$ . The proof in the case of threefolds is similar so we will be brief.

*Proof of part (a) of Theorem [3](#page-1-2) for threefolds.* Let X be an irreducible projective Grassmann non–degenerate threefold in  $\mathbb{G}(k,r)$  not presenting the cone case and let Y be a general hyperplane section of X, which, by Lemma [7,](#page-4-0) is Grassmann non–degenerate and does not present the cone case. Arguing as in the proof of the surface case, and applying part (a) of Theorem [3](#page-1-2) for  $Y$ , we have

$$
\theta_X(m) \leqslant \sum_{i=1}^m \theta_Y(i) - \sum_{i=1}^{m-1} \varepsilon_{k,r}(i) - 1 \leqslant
$$
\n
$$
\leqslant \sum_{i=1}^m \left( \varepsilon_{k,r}(i) - \frac{i(i+1)}{2}(r-k) - i - 1 \right) - \sum_{i=1}^{m-1} \varepsilon_{k,r}(i) - 1 =
$$
\n
$$
= \varepsilon_{k,r}(m) - \left( \sum_{i=1}^m \frac{i(i+1)}{2} \right) (r-k) - \frac{m(m+1)}{2} - m - 1 = \theta(3, k, r, m)
$$

proving [\(4\)](#page-1-1) in this case. The proof of (i) and (ii) proceed exactly in the same way as in the surface case, so we leave it to the reader.  $\Box$ 

We can now finish the proof of part (a) of Theorem [3.](#page-1-2) The proof is similar to the surface and threefold case so we will again be brief.

*Proof of part (a) of Theorem [3,](#page-1-2) the general case.* We will work by induction, since we have proved the theorem for  $n = 1, 2, 3$ . Let X be an irreducible projective Grassmann non– degenerate variety of dimension  $n \geq 4$  in  $\mathbb{G}(k, r)$  not presenting the cone case. Let Y be its general hyperplane section, which by Lemma [7,](#page-4-0) is Grassmann non–degenerate and does not present the cone case. So we can apply induction on Y . Arguing as in the surface and threefold case and applying induction and [\(3\)](#page-1-3), we have

$$
\theta_X(m) \leqslant \sum_{i=1}^m \theta_Y(i) - \sum_{i=1}^{m-1} \varepsilon_{k,r}(i) - 1 \leqslant
$$
\n
$$
\leqslant \sum_{i=1}^m (\varepsilon_{k,r}(i) - (r - k)\sigma(n - 1, k, r, i) - \tau(n - 1, k, r, i)) - \sum_{i=1}^{m-1} \varepsilon_{k,r}(i) - 1 =
$$
\n
$$
= \varepsilon_{k,r}(m) - \left(\sum_{i=1}^m \sigma(n - 1, k, r, i)\right)(r - k) - \left(\sum_{i=1}^m \tau(n - 1, k, r, i)\right) - 1 =
$$
\n
$$
= \theta(n, k, r, m)
$$

<span id="page-6-0"></span>proving [\(4\)](#page-1-1) in this case. The proof of (i) and (ii) proceeds exactly in the same way as in the surface case, so we leave it to the reader.  $\Box$ 

## <span id="page-6-1"></span>3. THE CONE CASE

Next we come to the proof of part (b) of Theorem [3.](#page-1-2) For this we need a preliminary. Let X be an irreducible, non degenerate variety of degree d and dimension  $n \geq 1$  in  $\mathbb{P}^r$ . We will denote by  $X_i$  the *i*-dimensional section of X with a general subspace of dimension  $r - n + i$  of  $\mathbb{P}^r$ . One has  $X = X_n$ . We note that

(16) 
$$
h_{X_0}(m) \geq \min\{d, m(r - n) + 1\}
$$

(see [\[5,](#page-9-3) Corollary (3.5)]).

<span id="page-7-3"></span>Proposition 8. *Let* X *be an irreducible, non degenerate variety of degree* d *and dimension*  $n \geq 1$  in  $\mathbb{P}^r$ , with  $r > n$ . For all positive integers m, one has

<span id="page-7-0"></span>(17) 
$$
h_X(m) \geqslant {m+n-1 \choose n}(r-n)+{m+n \choose n}.
$$

*Moreover:*

*(i) equality holds in [\(17\)](#page-7-0) for*  $m = 1$ *;* 

*(ii) equality holds in [\(17\)](#page-7-0) for some*  $m \geqslant 2$  *if and only if* X *is a variety of minimal degree*  $d = r - n + 1.$ 

*Proof.* This proposition is essentially contained in Theorem 6.1 in [\[2\]](#page-9-4). However we give here a proof for completeness.

First we note that trivially equality holds in [\(17\)](#page-7-0) for  $m = 1$ , i.e., (i) holds. Next we prove [\(17\)](#page-7-0) by double induction, first on the dimension n and then on m.

In the curve case, we proceed by induction on m, assuming  $m \ge 2$ . By [\(11\)](#page-4-2) we have

<span id="page-7-1"></span>
$$
h_X(m) \geq h_X(m-1) + h_{X_0}(m)
$$

and by [\(16\)](#page-6-1), by the induction and the fact that  $d \geq r$  since X is non–degenerate, we have

(18) 
$$
h_X(m) \geqslant (m-1)(r-1) + m + r = m(r-1) + m + 1
$$

proving [\(17\)](#page-7-0) in this case. If equality holds in [\(18\)](#page-7-1) in particular we have

$$
\min\{d, m(r-1)+1\} = r
$$

and since  $m(r - 1) + 1 \ge 2r - 1 > r$  (because  $r > 1$ ), we deduce  $d = r$ , hence X is a rational normal curve. Conversely, if X is a rational normal curve, one has  $h_X(m) =$  $mr + 1$  and the equality holds in [\(17\)](#page-7-0).

Next we treat the case of varieties X of dimension  $n > 1$  and we assume by induction that the proposition holds for varieties of dimension smaller than  $n$ . Moreover we proceed by induction on  $m$ . By [\(11\)](#page-4-2), by induction and by [\(16\)](#page-6-1), we have

<span id="page-7-2"></span>(19)  
\n
$$
h_X(m) \ge h_X(m-1) + h_{X_{n-1}}(m) \ge
$$
\n
$$
\ge \binom{m+n-2}{n}(r-n) + \binom{m+n-1}{n} + \binom{m+n-2}{n-1}(r-n) + \binom{m+n-1}{n-1} =
$$
\n
$$
= \binom{m+n-1}{n}(r-n) + \binom{m+n}{n}
$$

as wanted. Moreover, if the equality holds in [\(19\)](#page-7-2) for some  $m > 1$ , then the equality holds in [\(17\)](#page-7-0) for some  $m > 1$  for  $X_{n-1}$ . Then by induction  $X_{n-1}$  is of minimal degree and therefore also  $X$  is of minimal degree. Conversely, if  $X$  is of minimal degree, then also  $X_{n-1}$  is of minimal degree. Moreover X is projectively normal. Because of this and by induction we have that equalities hold in [\(19\)](#page-7-2) and therefore equality holds in [\(17\)](#page-7-0).  $\Box$ 

Now we are in position to finish the:

*Proof of part (b) of Theorem [3.](#page-1-2)* Let X be an irreducible projective Grassmann non–degenerate variety of dimension n in  $\mathbb{G}(k, r)$  presenting the cone case. Let  $\Pi$  be the vertex of  $Z(X)$ , that is a  $(k-1)$ –dimensional subspace of  $\mathbb{P}^r$ . Then X lies in the  $(r-k)$ – subspace  $\Pi^{\perp}$  contained in  $\mathbb{G}(k, r)$ , whose points correspond to linear spaces of dimension k containing Π. Since each map  $\rho_m$  as in [\(7\)](#page-3-5) factors through the maps

$$
H^0(\mathbb{G}(k,r),\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{G}(k,r)}(m)) \longrightarrow H^0(\Pi^{\perp},\mathcal{O}_{\Pi^{\perp}}(m)) \longrightarrow H^0(X,\mathcal{O}_X(m))
$$

and since  $H^0(\mathbb{G}(k,r),\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{G}(k,r)}(m)) \longrightarrow H^0(\Pi^{\perp},\mathcal{O}_{\Pi^{\perp}}(m))$  is clearly surjective, to compute  $h_X(m)$  it suffices to compute it as a subvariety of  $\Pi^{\perp}$ . We can then apply Proposition [8.](#page-7-3) By [\(9\)](#page-3-2) we have

$$
\theta_X(m) = \varepsilon_{k,r}(m) - h_X(m) \leqslant
$$
  

$$
\leqslant \varepsilon_{k,r}(m) - {m+n-1 \choose n} (r-k-n) - {m+n \choose n} = \bar{\theta}(n,k,r,m)
$$

as wanted. If the equality holds for some  $m \geq 2$ , then in particular

$$
h_X(m) = \binom{m+n-1}{n}(r-k-n) + \binom{m+n}{n}
$$

<span id="page-8-0"></span>and, by Proposition [8,](#page-7-3) X is a variety of minimal degree in  $\Pi^{\perp}$ , proving the assertion.  $\Box$ 

### 4. EXAMPLES

In the statement of Theorem [3](#page-1-2) it is mentioned the possibility that either  $X$  does not present the cone case and is a rational normal variety of degree  $r - k$  in a subspace of dimension  $r - k + n - 1$  in  $\mathbb{P}^{N(k,r)}$ , or X presents the cone case and X is a rational normal variety of degree  $r - k - n + 1$  in a linear subspace of dimension  $r - k + n - 1$  contained in  $\mathbb{G}(k, r)$ . The latter case can clearly occur, whereas it is not a priori clear that the former case can occur for all values of  $n \geq 2$  and k (for  $n = 1$  also the former case occurs when  $Z(X)$  is a rational normal  $(k + 1)$ –dimensional variety of degree  $r - k$  in  $\mathbb{P}^r$ ). In this section we provide two examples showing that for  $n \geq 2$  also the former case can occur.

**Example 9.** Fix positive integers n, k and set  $r = n + k - 1$ . In  $\mathbb{P}^r$ , fix a k-linear space  $\Pi$ and inside it a  $(k-2)$ –linear space  $\pi$ . Then let X be the subvariety of  $\mathbb{G}(k, r)$  described by all points corresponding to k-subspaces of  $\mathbb{P}^r$  intersecting  $\Pi$  in a subspace of dimension at least  $k-1$  containing  $\pi$ . It is easy to check that  $\dim(X) = n$ , that it is Grassmann nondegenerate and that it does not present the cone case. Moreover  $X$  is a cone with vertex the point corresponding to  $\Pi$ . Let us intersect X with a hyperplane H not containing  $\Pi$ . To do this, let us fix a general linear space  $\Pi'$  of dimension  $r - k - 1 = n - 2$ . Then  $\Pi'$ does not intersect  $\pi$  and we can consider the hyperplane section  $H_{\Pi'}$  of  $\mathbb{G}(k, n)$  consisting of all points corresponding to linear spaces of dimension  $k$  intersecting  $\Pi'$ . The points in the intersection  $X \cap H_{\Pi'}$  can be obtained in the following way. Take any  $(k-1)$ –space P in  $\Pi$  containing  $\pi$ , take a point  $p \in \Pi'$ , take  $\Pi_{P,p} := \langle P, p \rangle$  and consider it as a point of  $\mathbb{G}(k,r)$ . One has

$$
X \cap H_{\Pi'} = \bigcup_{\pi \subset P \subset \Pi, p \in \Pi'} \Pi_{P,p}.
$$

Now the subspaces P such that  $\pi \subset P \subset \Pi$  vary in a  $\mathbb{P}^1$ , and  $p \in \Pi'$  varies in a  $\mathbb{P}^{n-2}$ . An easy explicit computation shows that  $X \cap H_{\Pi'}$  is isomorphic to the Segre variety Seg(1, n– 2)  $\cong \mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^{n-2}$  which has degree  $n-1$  and spans a linear space of dimension  $2n-3$ . Hence X has degree  $n - 1$  and spans a linear space of dimension  $2n - 2$ . Thus X is a rational normal variety of dimension n and degree  $n + 1$  contained in  $\mathbb{G}(k, n)$ .

**Example 10.** Fix positive integers n, k and set  $r = k+4$ . First consider the case  $k = 2h+1$ is odd. Then fix two skew subspaces  $\Pi$ ,  $\Pi'$  of dimension  $h+2$  in  $\mathbb{P}^r$  and inside  $\Pi$ ,  $\Pi'$  fix two  $(h-1)$ –subspaces  $\pi, \pi'$  respectively. For any h–linear space P [resp. P'] contained in  $\Pi$ 

[resp. contained in  $\Pi'$ ] and containing  $\pi$  [resp. containing  $\pi'$ ], consider  $\Pi_{P,P'} = \langle P, P' \rangle$ , that has dimension  $2h + 1 = k$ , so we can consider it as a point in  $\mathbb{G}(k, r)$ . The subspaces P [resp. P'] contained in  $\Pi$  [resp. contained in  $\Pi'$ ] and containing  $\pi$  [resp. containing  $\pi'$ ] vary in a  $\mathbb{P}^2$ , hence

$$
V = \bigcup_{\pi \subset P \subset \Pi, \pi' \subset P' \subset \Pi'} \Pi_{P, P'}
$$

is a subvariety of  $\mathbb{G}(k, r)$  which is easy to check to be isomorphic to the Segre variety  $Seg(2, 2) \cong \mathbb{P}^2 \times \mathbb{P}^2$  embedded in  $\mathbb{P}^8$ . As well known,  $Seg(2, 2)$  contains a Veronese surface  $X \subset \mathbb{P}^5$ , as the image of the diagonal of  $\mathbb{P}^2 \times \mathbb{P}^2$ . The surface X is a rational normal surface contained in  $\mathbb{G}(k,n)$  which is Grassman non-degenerate and not presenting the cone case.

Consider now the case  $k = 2h + 2$  (and still  $r = k + 4$ ). Now fix two skew subspaces Π, Π' of dimension  $h+2$  in  $\mathbb{P}^r$  and a point p off the hyperplane of  $\mathbb{P}^r$  spanned by Π and Π'. As in the odd case, inside  $\Pi$ ,  $\Pi'$  we fix two  $(h - 1)$ –subspaces  $\pi$ ,  $\pi'$  respectively. For any h–linear space P [resp. P'] contained in  $\Pi$  [resp. contained in  $\Pi'$ ] and containing  $\pi$  [resp. containing  $\pi'$ ], consider  $\Pi_{P,P'} = \langle P, P', p \rangle$ , that has dimension k, so we can consider it as a point in  $\mathbb{G}(k, r)$ . The subspaces P [resp. P'] contained in  $\Pi$  [resp. contained in  $\Pi'$ ] and containing  $\pi$  [resp. containing  $\pi'$ ] vary in a  $\mathbb{P}^2$ , hence

$$
V = \bigcup_{\pi \subset P \subset \Pi, \pi' \subset P' \subset \Pi'} \Pi_{P, P'}
$$

is a subvariety of  $\mathbb{G}(k, r)$  which is isomorphic to the Segre variety Seg(2, 2). As in the odd case we see that  $\mathbb{G}(k,r)$  contains a Veronese surface  $X \subset \mathbb{P}^5$ , that is a rational normal surface which is Grassman non–degenerate and not presenting the cone case.

### **REFERENCES**

- [1] G. Castelnuovo, *Sui multipli di una serie lineare di gruppi di punti appartenenti ad una curva algebrica*, Rend. del Circolo Mat. di Palermo, 7, (1893), 89–110.
- <span id="page-9-4"></span><span id="page-9-0"></span>[2] L. Chiantini, C. Ciliberto, *Weakly defective varieties*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc., 354 (1), (2001), 151–178.

[3] D. Gallarati, *Sul numero dei complessi algebrici di rette, di ordine assegnato, che contengono una data rigata algebrica*, Rend. Accad. Naz. Lincei, Ser. VIII 14 (2), (1953), 213–220.

<span id="page-9-1"></span>[4] D. Gallarati, *Sulle varietà di*  $S_r$  *composte di*  $\infty$ <sup>1</sup> $S_k$ , *i cui*  $S_k$  *appartengono al massimo numero di complessi lineari*, Rend. Accad. Naz. Lincei, Ser. VIII 14 (3), (1953),408–412.

<span id="page-9-3"></span>[5] J. Harris, *Curves in projective space* (with the collaboration of D. Eisenbud), Les Presses de l'Université de Montréal, 1982.

<span id="page-9-2"></span>[6] W.V.D. Hodge, D. Pedoe, *Methods of algebraic geometry*, Vol. II, Cambridge University Press, 1952.

DIPARTIMENTO DI MATEMATICA, UNIVERSITÀ DI ROMA TOR VERGATA, VIA O. RAIMONDO 00173 ROMA, ITALIA

*Email address*: cilibert@axp.mat.uniroma2.it