

ON VIRTUAL RESOLUTIONS OF POINTS IN A PRODUCT OF PROJECTIVE SPACES

ISIDORA BAILLY-HALL, CHRISTINE BERKESCH, KARINA DOVGODKO, SEAN GUAN,
SAISUDHARSHAN SIVAKUMAR, AND JISHI SUN

ABSTRACT. For finite sets of points in $\mathbb{P}^n \times \mathbb{P}^m$, we produce short virtual resolutions, as introduced by Berkesch, Erman, and Smith [BES20]. We first intersect with a sufficiently high power of one set of variables for points in $\mathbb{P}^n \times \mathbb{P}^m$ to produce a virtual resolution of length $n + m$. Then, we describe an explicit virtual resolution of length 3 for a set of points in sufficiently general position in $\mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^2$, via a subcomplex of a free resolution. This first result generalizes to $\mathbb{P}^n \times \mathbb{P}^m$ work of Harada, Nowroozi, and Van Tuyl [HNVT22] and the second partially generalizes work of [HNVT22] and Booms-Peot [BP], which were both for $\mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^1$. Along the way, we also note an explicit relationship between Betti numbers and higher difference matrices of bigraded Hilbert functions for $\mathbb{P}^n \times \mathbb{P}^m$.

1. INTRODUCTION

Minimal free resolutions of the vanishing ideal of an embedded projective variety Y contain important geometric information; for example, the length of such a complex is bounded below by the codimension of Y and above by the dimension of the ambient projective space. When working over the Cox ring of a smooth projective toric variety, the virtual resolutions introduced by Berkesch, Erman, and Smith in [BES20], can be shorter than minimal free resolutions and encode more geometry; for one, it is possible to find such complexes with length at most the dimension of the ambient space, see [BES20, FH, HHL, BE, And]. There is growing interest in producing families of short virtual resolutions, see [ABLS20, DS20, BKLY21, GLLM21, Lop21, Yan21, BPC22, HNVT22, KLM⁺23, BS, BP, VTY]. Most relevant to this article are [HNVT22, BP], which study virtual resolutions of points in $\mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^1$, as we will consider finite sets of points $X \subseteq \mathbb{P}^n \times \mathbb{P}^m$.

Let $S = \mathbb{k}[x_0, x_1, \dots, x_n, y_0, y_1, \dots, y_m]$ denote the *Cox ring* of $\mathbb{P}^n \times \mathbb{P}^m$, where \mathbb{k} is an algebraically closed field, and S carries the multigrading $\deg(x_i) = (1, 0) \in \mathbb{Z}^2$ and $\deg(y_j) = (0, 1) \in \mathbb{Z}^2$ for all i, j . Let $\mathbf{x} = x_0, x_1, \dots, x_n$ and $\mathbf{y} = y_0, y_1, \dots, y_m$. The *irrelevant ideal* of $\mathbb{P}^n \times \mathbb{P}^m$ in S is

$$B := \langle x_0, x_1, \dots, x_n \rangle \cap \langle y_0, y_1, \dots, y_m \rangle = \langle \mathbf{x} \rangle \cap \langle \mathbf{y} \rangle.$$

Let X denote a finite set of points in $\mathbb{P}^n \times \mathbb{P}^m$, and let I_X denote the homogeneous vanishing ideal of X in S . A graded free complex of S -modules

$$F_\bullet := F_0 \leftarrow F_1 \leftarrow F_2 \leftarrow \dots$$

is a *virtual resolution* of a finitely generated \mathbb{Z}^2 -graded S -module M if it satisfies:

- (1) For each $i > 0$, there is some t such that $B^t H_i(F_\bullet) = 0$, and
- (2) $H_0(F_\bullet) / \Gamma_B(H_0(F_\bullet)) \cong M / \Gamma_B(M)$,

where $\Gamma_B(M) := \{m \in M \mid B^t m = 0 \text{ for some } t \in \mathbb{N}\}$. Equivalently, F_\bullet is a virtual resolution of M if \widetilde{F}_\bullet is a locally free resolution of \widetilde{M} over $\mathbb{P}^n \times \mathbb{P}^m$.

2020 *Mathematics Subject Classification*. Primary: 13D02. Secondary: 14M25, 14F06.

Key words and phrases. Syzygies, resolutions, toric varieties, virtual resolution.

For a finite set X of points in $\mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^1$, [HNVT22, Theorem 4.2] made explicit the construction of a virtual resolution for S/I_X in [BES20, Theorem 4.1]. Our first main result generalizes this to $\mathbb{P}^n \times \mathbb{P}^m$.

Theorem 1.1. *Let X be a finite set of points in $\mathbb{P}^n \times \mathbb{P}^m$ with natural first projection $\pi_1: \mathbb{P}^n \times \mathbb{P}^m \rightarrow \mathbb{P}^n$. Let $\ell = |\pi_1(X)|$ denote the number of unique first coordinates among the points in X . For all $t \geq \ell - 1$, the minimal free resolution of $S/(I_X \cap \langle \mathbf{x} \rangle^t)$ is a virtual resolution of S/I_X of length $n + m$.*

A second method for finding virtual resolutions, called *virtual of a pair* in [BES20] obtains virtual resolutions by taking certain subcomplexes of the minimal free resolution, see Theorem 5.3. [HNVT22, Theorem 3.1] used the virtual of a pair construction to give an explicit description of certain virtual resolutions for finite sets of points $X \subseteq \mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^1$. In the same setting [BP, Theorems 3.3, 1.4] built on this result and gave a sufficient condition for when virtual resolutions of a pair have length 2.

Our second main result generalizes part of this work to $\mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^2$, while relying on a weakened form of the Minimal Resolution Conjecture (see Conjecture 4.4), which is open for multiprojective spaces.

Definition 1.2. For a finite set of points $X \subseteq \mathbb{P}^n \times \mathbb{P}^m$, the *Hilbert matrix* H_X has entries

$$(H_X)_{i,j} := H_{S/I_X}(i,j) \quad \text{for all } (i,j) \in \mathbb{Z}^2$$

tabulating the bigraded Hilbert function of S/I_X . If

$$H_X(i,j) = \min\{|X|, T_{i,n}T_{j,m}\} \quad \text{for all } i,j \geq 0,$$

with

$$T_{a,b} := \binom{a+b}{b},$$

then we say that X has a *generic Hilbert matrix*. Proposition 4.1 shows that this is an open condition on the Hilbert scheme of points in $\mathbb{P}^n \times \mathbb{P}^m$. We will further say that X is a set of points in *sufficiently general position* if it has a generic Hilbert function and satisfies an additional condition on its first Betti numbers, as given in Conjecture 4.4.

Theorem 1.3 (See Theorem 5.4 and Appendix A). *Let $X \subseteq \mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^2$ be a finite set of points in sufficiently general position. If a weakened form of the Minimal Resolution Conjecture holds (see Conjecture 4.4), then S/I_X has a virtual resolution of length 3 obtained from the virtual of a pair construction at $\mathbf{d} = (|X| - 1, 0)$.*

It is well-known that Hilbert functions can be computed as alternating sums of graded Betti numbers. For $\mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^1$, [GMR92, Proposition 3.3] show that Betti numbers can be expressed via a certain “second difference matrix” of H_X , and the authors of [HNVT22] and [BP] exploited this in their study of virtual resolutions for sets of points in $\mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^1$. In our proof of Theorem 1.3, we similarly use an analogous observation that for $\mathbb{P}^n \times \mathbb{P}^m$.

Definition 1.4. Define a partial order on \mathbb{Z}^2 by letting $(i,j) \geq (i',j')$ if $i \geq i'$ and $j \geq j'$. For any infinite matrix $H = (H_{i,j})$ indexed by $(i,j) \in \mathbb{Z}^2$, the *column difference operator* Δ^C and *row difference operator* Δ^R are

$$\Delta^C(H)_{i,j} := H_{i,j} - H_{i-1,j} \quad \text{and} \quad \Delta^R(H)_{i,j} := H_{i,j} - H_{i,j-1}.$$

Note that the operators Δ^C and Δ^R commute.

Proposition 1.5. *If M is a finitely generated bigraded S -module with minimal free resolution*

$$F_\bullet: \bigoplus_{i,j \geq 0} S(-i, -j)^{\beta_{0,(i,j)}} \leftarrow \bigoplus_{i,j \geq 0} S(-i, -j)^{\beta_{1,(i,j)}} \leftarrow \cdots \leftarrow \bigoplus_{i,j \geq 0} S(-i, -j)^{\beta_{k,(i,j)}} \leftarrow \cdots,$$

then the Hilbert matrix H_M satisfies

$$((\Delta^C)^{n+1}(\Delta^R)^{m+1}H_M)_{i,j} = B_{i,j},$$

where $B_{p,q} := \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} (-1)^k \beta_{k,(p,q)}$ for all $(p, q) \in \mathbb{Z}^2$.

Outline. We examine syzygies of points in $\mathbb{P}^n \times \mathbb{P}^m$ in Section 2 and prove Theorem 1.1. Proposition 1.5 is proven in Section 3. We then focus our attention on $\mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^2$, discussing our notion of points in sufficiently general position in Section 4, including a weakened statement of the Minimal Resolution Conjecture. Finally, we use this to prove Theorem 1.3 in Section 5.

Acknowledgements. This work is a result of the University of Minnesota School of Mathematics REU in Algebra and Combinatorics during Summer 2023, funded by NSF RTG Grant DMS-1745638. The group is grateful for TA Sasha Pevzner's guidance during the REU. We also thank Daniel Erman for helpful conversations related to this work and Gregory G. Smith for supplying a sketch of Proposition 4.1. CB was partially supported by NSF Grant DMS 2001101.

2. A SHORT VIRTUAL RESOLUTION VIA INTERSECTION IN $\mathbb{P}^n \times \mathbb{P}^m$

By the end of this section, we prove Theorem 1.1. We begin with several preliminary results. First, we note that after a change of coordinates, we may assume that y_0 is a nonzero divisor on S/I_X ; see Assumption 2.1.

For a point

$$\mathbf{a} \times \mathbf{b} = [1 : a_1 : a_2 : \cdots : a_n] \times [1 : b_1 : b_2 : \cdots : b_m] \in \mathbb{P}^n \times \mathbb{P}^m,$$

and for $i, j > 0$, let $L_{a_i} := a_i x_0 - x_i$ and $L_{b_j} := b_j y_0 - y_j$. Let

$$I_{\mathbf{a}} = \langle L_{a_1}, L_{a_2}, \dots, L_{a_n} \rangle \text{ and } I_{\mathbf{b}} = \langle L_{b_1}, L_{b_2}, \dots, L_{b_m} \rangle,$$

so that $I_{\mathbf{a}} + I_{\mathbf{b}}$ is the bihomogeneous ideal for the point $\mathbf{a} \times \mathbf{b}$.

Assumption 2.1. Throughout this paper, we will consider a finite set of points $X \subseteq \mathbb{P}^n \times \mathbb{P}^m$. After a linear change of coordinates, we may and will assume that every point in X is of the form $[1 : a_1 : \cdots : a_n] \times [1 : b_1 : \cdots : b_m]$.

Notation 2.2. Let $\pi_1(X) = \{P_1, P_2, \dots, P_\ell\}$ denote the set of distinct first coordinates in X , so $\ell = |\pi_1(X)|$. Let $X_k := \pi_1^{-1}(P_k) \cap X$ denote the pre-image in X of P_k , and write

$$X_k = \{P_k \times Q_{k,1}, P_k \times Q_{k,2}, \dots, P_k \times Q_{k,r_k}\} \subseteq X,$$

where $r_k = |\pi_1^{-1}(P_k)|$. Thus, for each k with $1 \leq k \leq \ell$,

$$I_{X_k} = I_{P_k} + \bigcap_{j=1}^{r_k} I_{Q_{k,j}}. \quad (2.1)$$

Note that the ideal I_X is necessarily B -saturated. For each $j \in \{1, 2, \dots, \ell\}$, let

$$J_j := \bigcap_{k=1}^j I_{X_k}.$$

Note that $J_j = I_{Y_j}$, where $Y_j = \bigsqcup_{k=1}^j X_k$ for $1 \leq j \leq \ell$.

Lemma 2.3. *Let X be a set of at least two points in $\mathbb{P}^n \times \mathbb{P}^m$ with $\ell = |\pi_1(X)|$ and $J_{\ell-1}$ as in Notation 2.2. If $t \geq \ell - 1$, then $\langle \mathbf{x} \rangle^t \subseteq I_{X_\ell} + J_{\ell-1}$.*

Proof. We prove this statement by induction on $\ell = |\pi_1(X)|$. The base case $\ell = 1$ is trivial. If $\ell = 2$, then $I_{X_1} = \langle L_{a_1}, \dots, L_{a_n}, G_1, G_2, \dots, G_k \rangle$, where L_{a_i} is a linear form in x_0 and x_i , and each G_i is a polynomial in the \mathbf{y} -variables; the ideal $I_{X_2} = \langle L'_{a_1}, \dots, L'_{a_n}, G'_1, G'_2, \dots, G'_{k'} \rangle$ is of the same form. Then together,

$$I_{X_1} + I_{X_2} = \langle x_0, x_1, \dots, x_n, G_1, G_2, \dots, G_k, G'_1, G'_2, \dots, G'_{k'} \rangle,$$

which contains $\langle \mathbf{x} \rangle^t$ for all $t \geq 1$, as desired.

Now for any $\ell > 2$, write $X = Y_1 \sqcup Y_2 \sqcup X_\ell$, where $Y_1 = \bigsqcup_{k=1}^{\ell-2} X_k$ and $Y_2 = X_{\ell-1}$, so $|\pi_1(Y_1)| = \ell - 2$ and $|\pi_1(Y_2)| = 1$. Then by the inductive hypothesis,

$$\langle \mathbf{x} \rangle^{\ell-2} \subseteq I_{X_\ell} + I_{Y_1} \quad \text{and} \quad \langle \mathbf{x} \rangle \subseteq I_{X_\ell} + I_{Y_2}.$$

Putting these together yields the desired result:

$$\langle \mathbf{x} \rangle^{\ell-2} \cdot \langle \mathbf{x} \rangle \subseteq (I_{X_\ell} + I_{Y_1}) \cdot (I_{X_\ell} + I_{Y_2}) \subseteq I_{X_\ell} + (I_{Y_1} \cap I_{Y_2}) = I_{X_\ell} + \bigcap_{k=1}^{\ell-1} I_{X_k} = I_{X_\ell} + J_{\ell-1}. \quad \square$$

We now begin working towards Proposition 2.7, which provides a primary decomposition of $\langle I_X \cap \langle \mathbf{x} \rangle^t, y_0 \rangle$, the final ingredient needed to prove Theorem 1.1.

Lemma 2.4. *If I is an ideal in S such that S/I has a nonzero divisor L of degree $(0, 1)$, then for all $(i, j) \in \mathbb{Z}^2$,*

$$H_{S/(I+\langle L \rangle)}(i, j) = H_{S/I}(i, j) - H_{S/I}(i, j - 1).$$

Proof. There is a graded short exact sequence

$$0 \rightarrow \frac{S}{I : \langle L \rangle}(0, -1) \xrightarrow{\cdot L} \frac{S}{I} \rightarrow \frac{S}{I + \langle L \rangle} \rightarrow 0,$$

and, since L is a nonzero divisor on S/I , $I : \langle L \rangle = I$, so the desired equality of Hilbert functions follows. \square

Lemma 2.5. *Let X be a finite set of points in $\mathbb{P}^n \times \mathbb{P}^m$ as in Assumption 2.1. If $i \geq |\pi_1(X)| - 1$, then there is an equality of bigraded pieces for all $j \in \mathbb{Z}$:*

$$\left[\bigcap_{P_k \in \pi_1(X)} \langle I_{X_k}, y_0 \rangle \right]_{(i, j)} = [\langle I_X, y_0 \rangle]_{(i, j)}. \quad (2.2)$$

Proof. Because the vector space on the right-hand side of (2.2) is contained in the left-hand side, it suffices to show that these vector spaces have the same dimension, which we use induction on $\ell := |\pi_1(X)|$. The base case $\ell = 1$ is a tautology for all i .

By way of induction, suppose that $\ell > 1$ and (2.2) holds for all sets of points with strictly fewer distinct first coordinates than X . To examine the right-hand side of (2.2), note that Assumption 2.1 and Lemma 2.4 together imply that

$$H_{S/\langle I_X, y_0 \rangle}(i, j) = H_{S/I_X}(i, j) - H_{S/I_X}(i, j - 1). \quad (2.3)$$

Since $I_X = \bigcap_{k=1}^{\ell} I_{X_k}$, there is a graded short exact sequence

$$0 \rightarrow S/I_X \rightarrow S/J_{\ell-1} \oplus S/I_{X_\ell} \rightarrow S/(J_{\ell-1} + I_{X_\ell}) \rightarrow 0,$$

where $J_{\ell-1}$ is as in Notation 2.2. By Lemma 2.3, the ideal $J_{\ell-1} + \langle I_{X_\ell} \rangle$ contains $\langle \mathbf{x} \rangle^{\ell-1}$. Hence $H_{S/(J_{\ell-1} + I_{X_\ell})}(i, j) = 0$ for all $i \geq \ell - 1$, so by the additivity of Hilbert functions on graded short exact sequences, for all j ,

$$H_{S/I_X}(i, j) = H_{S/J_{\ell-1}}(i, j) + H_{S/I_{X_\ell}}(i, j) \quad (2.4)$$

$$\text{and } H_{S/I_X}(i, j - 1) = H_{S/J_{\ell-1}}(i, j - 1) + H_{S/I_{X_\ell}}(i, j - 1). \quad (2.5)$$

Combining (2.3), (2.4), and (2.5) yields the following expression for the Hilbert function of the right-hand side of (2.2):

$$H_{S/\langle I_X, y_0 \rangle}(i, j) = H_{S/J_{\ell-1}}(i, j) + H_{S/I_{X_\ell}}(i, j) - H_{S/J_{\ell-1}}(i, j - 1) - H_{S/I_{X_\ell}}(i, j - 1). \quad (2.6)$$

Now to examine the left-hand side of (2.2), it follows from the inductive hypothesis that

$$\left[\bigcap_{k=1}^{\ell-1} \langle I_{X_k}, y_0 \rangle \right]_{(i,j)} = \left[\bigcap_{k=1}^{\ell-1} I_{X_k} + \langle y_0 \rangle \right]_{(i,j)}.$$

Since there is a graded short exact sequence

$$0 \rightarrow \frac{S}{\bigcap_{k=1}^{\ell} \langle I_{X_k}, y_0 \rangle} \rightarrow \frac{S}{J_{\ell-1} + \langle y_0 \rangle} \oplus \frac{S}{I_{X_\ell} + \langle y_0 \rangle} \rightarrow \frac{S}{J_{\ell-1} + I_{X_\ell} + \langle y_0 \rangle} \rightarrow 0,$$

the following equality of Hilbert functions holds for all j :

$$H_{S/\bigcap_{k=1}^{\ell} \langle I_{X_k}, y_0 \rangle}(i, j) = H_{S/(J_{\ell-1} + \langle y_0 \rangle)}(i, j) + H_{S/(I_{X_\ell} + \langle y_0 \rangle)}(i, j) - H_{S/(J_{\ell-1} + I_{X_\ell} + \langle y_0 \rangle)}(i, j).$$

Next, by Lemma 2.3, since $i \geq |\pi_1(X)| - 1$, there is a containment $\langle \mathbf{x} \rangle^i \subseteq J_{\ell-1} + I_{X_\ell}$, so

$$S_{i,j} = \left[\bigcap_{k=1}^{\ell-1} I_{X_k} + I_{X_\ell} \right]_{(i,j)} \quad \text{and} \quad H_{S/(J_{\ell-1} + I_{X_\ell} + \langle y_0 \rangle)}(i, j) = 0.$$

Since y_0 is a nonzero divisor on $S/J_{\ell-1}$ and S/I_{X_ℓ} , by Lemma 2.4, for all j ,

$$\begin{aligned} H_{S/(J_{\ell-1} + \langle y_0 \rangle)}(i, j) &= H_{S/J_{\ell-1}}(i, j) - H_{S/J_{\ell-1}}(i, j - 1) \\ \text{and } H_{S/(I_{X_\ell} + \langle y_0 \rangle)}(i, j) &= H_{S/I_{X_\ell}}(i, j) - H_{S/I_{X_\ell}}(i, j - 1). \end{aligned}$$

Comparing with (2.6), it follows that for $i \geq \ell - 1$,

$$H_{S/\langle I_X, y_0 \rangle}(i, j) = H_{S/\bigcap_{k=1}^{\ell} \langle I_{X_k}, y_0 \rangle}(i, j),$$

so (2.2) is an equality, as desired. \square

When a set of points X has a generic Hilbert function, equality can be obtained sooner.

Corollary 2.6. *If X is a finite set of points with generic Hilbert function in $\mathbb{P}^n \times \mathbb{P}^m$ as in Assumption 2.1 and $d = \min\{r \mid T_{r,n} \geq |X|\}$, then (2.2) holds for all $i \geq d$ and $j \in \mathbb{Z}$.*

Proof. First consider the case that $j = 0$. Here,

$$\left[\bigcap_{P_k \in \pi_1(X)} \langle I_{X_k}, y_0 \rangle \right]_{(i,0)} = [I_X]_{(i,0)} \quad \text{and} \quad [\langle I_X, y_0 \rangle]_{(i,0)} = [I_X]_{(i,0)},$$

so (2.2) holds. When $j \geq 1$, just as in Lemma 2.5, because the vector space on the right-hand side (RHS) of (2.2) is contained in the left-hand side (LHS), it suffices to show that for all $i \geq d$, the dimension of the RHS is greater than or equal to the dimension of the LHS. This is equivalent to showing that

$$\dim_{\mathbb{k}} \left[\bigcap_{P_k \in \pi_1(X)} \langle I_{X_k}, y_0 \rangle \right]_{(i,j)} \leq \dim_{\mathbb{k}} [\langle I_X, y_0 \rangle]_{(i,j)}.$$

In turn, this is equivalent to showing $H_{RHS}(i, j) \leq H_{LHS}(i, j)$. By Assumption 2.1 and Lemma 2.4, it follows that

$$H_{RHS}(i, j) = H_{S/\langle I_X, y_0 \rangle}(i, j) = H_{S/I_X}(i, j) - H_{S/I_X}(i, j - 1).$$

Since the points are in sufficiently general position and $i \geq d$, $H_{S/I_X}(i, j) = H_{S/I_X}(i, j - 1) = |X|$, so $H_{RHS}(i, j) = 0$. \square

Proposition 2.7. *Let X be a finite set of points in $\mathbb{P}^n \times \mathbb{P}^m$ as in Assumption 2.1 and Notation 2.2. Then for any integer $t \geq |\pi_1(X)| - 1$, there is a primary decomposition of the form*

$$\langle I_X \cap \langle \mathbf{x} \rangle^t, y_0 \rangle = \bigcap_{P_k \in \pi_1(X)} \langle I_{X_k}, y_0 \rangle \cap \langle \langle \mathbf{x} \rangle^t, y_0 \rangle.$$

Remark 2.8. Note that when $m = 1$, then the statement of Proposition 2.7 can be made more explicit, since for each point $\mathbf{a} \times \mathbf{b} \in X$, $I_{\mathbf{a} \times \mathbf{b}} = \langle L_{a_1}, \dots, L_{a_n}, L_{b_1} \rangle$. Then by (2.1), for any $P_k \in \pi_1(X)$,

$$I_{X_k} = \langle L_{P_{k,1}}, L_{P_{k,2}}, \dots, L_{P_{k,n}}, L_{Q_{k,1}} L_{Q_{k,2}} \cdots L_{Q_{k,r_k}} \rangle.$$

Since each $L_{Q_{k,j}}$ is a linear form in y_0 or y_1 , their product will be a polynomial of degree r_k in y_0 and y_1 . By Assumption 2.1, each $Q_{k,j}$ is of the form $[b_{j,0} : b_{j,1}]$, with $b_{j,0} = 1$. Therefore, the product of the $L_{Q_{k,j}}$'s will have a term $y_1^{r_k}$. Thus

$$\langle I_{X_k}, y_0 \rangle = \langle L_{P_{k,1}}, L_{P_{k,2}}, \dots, L_{P_{k,n}}, y_0, y_1^{r_k} \rangle.$$

Proof of Proposition 2.7. For any S -ideals I_1, I_2, I_3 , $(I_1 \cap I_2) + I_3 \subseteq (I_1 + I_3) \cap (I_2 + I_3)$; in particular, for all $t \geq 0$,

$$\langle I_X \cap \langle \mathbf{x} \rangle^t, y_0 \rangle \subseteq \bigcap_{P_k \in \pi_1(X)} \langle I_{X_k}, y_0 \rangle \cap \langle \langle \mathbf{x} \rangle^t, y_0 \rangle. \quad (2.7)$$

We will now show that when $t \geq |\pi_1(X)| - 1$, the left-hand side of (2.7) contains the right-hand side, and it suffices to do so on each bigraded piece, i.e., show that for all $(i, j) \in \mathbb{Z}^2$ and $t \geq |\pi_1(X)| - 1$,

$$\left[\bigcap_{P_k \in \pi_1(X)} \langle I_{X_k}, y_0 \rangle \cap \langle \langle \mathbf{x} \rangle^t, y_0 \rangle \right]_{(i,j)} \subseteq [\langle I_X \cap \langle \mathbf{x} \rangle^t, y_0 \rangle]_{(i,j)}. \quad (2.8)$$

We consider two cases, based on a comparison between i and t . First, $0 \leq i < t$ and suppose that f is in the left-hand side of (2.8); in particular, $f \in [\langle \langle \mathbf{x} \rangle^t, y_0 \rangle]_{(i,j)}$. Since $i < t$ by assumption, f is of low degree, so it must be that $f \in \langle y_0 \rangle$. This clearly also places f in the right-hand side of (2.8), so the equality holds in this case.

Second, if $i \geq t$, then $[\langle \mathbf{x} \rangle^t]_{i,j} = S_{(i,j)}$, so

$$[\langle \langle \mathbf{x} \rangle^t, y_0 \rangle]_{(i,j)} = S_{(i,j)} \quad \text{and} \quad [\langle I_X \cap \langle \mathbf{x} \rangle^t, y_0 \rangle]_{(i,j)} = [\langle I_X, y_0 \rangle]_{(i,j)}.$$

Thus it suffices to show that for $i \geq t$,

$$\left[\bigcap_{P_k \in \pi_1(X)} \langle I_{X_k}, y_0 \rangle \right]_{(i,j)} \subseteq [\langle I_X, y_0 \rangle]_{(i,j)},$$

which was shown in Lemma 2.5, finishing this case. Having established both cases, we have now shown that (2.7) is an equality for $t \geq |\pi_1(x)| - 1$.

It now remains to show that the ideals on the right-hand side of (2.7) are primary. By [Vil15, Proposition 6.1.7], $\langle \langle \mathbf{x} \rangle^t, y_0 \rangle$ is primary. To see that $\langle I_{X_k}, y_0 \rangle$ is primary for each $1 \leq k \leq |\pi_1(X)|$, recall from Notation 2.2 that for each k , $X_k = \{P_k \times Q_{k,1}, \dots, P_k \times Q_{k,r_k}\}$ and

$$\langle I_{X_k}, y_0 \rangle = I_{P_k} + \bigcap_{j=1}^{r_k} I_{Q_{k,j}} + \langle y_0 \rangle = \langle L_{P_{k,1}}, L_{P_{k,2}}, \dots, L_{P_{k,n}}, G_1, G_2, \dots, G_s, y_0 \rangle,$$

where $L_{P_{k,i}} = P_{k,i}x_0 - x_i$ (with $P_{k,i}$ allowed to be 0) are the linear forms generating each I_{P_k} and G_1, G_2, \dots, G_s are forms in the \mathbf{y} such that $\langle G_1, G_2, \dots, G_s \rangle = \bigcap_{j=1}^{r_k} I_{Q_{k,j}}$. Putting this together,

$$\begin{aligned} S/\langle I_{X_k}, y_0 \rangle &= S/\langle L_{P_{k,1}}, L_{P_{k,2}}, \dots, L_{P_{k,n}}, G_1, G_2, \dots, G_s, y_0 \rangle \\ &\cong \mathbb{k}[x_0, y_0, y_1, \dots, y_m]/\langle G_1, G_2, \dots, G_s, y_0 \rangle, \end{aligned}$$

so it suffices to show that the ideal $J := \langle G_1, G_2, \dots, G_s, y_0 \rangle$ is primary in $\mathbb{k}[x_0, y_0, \dots, y_m]$. To this end, let J' denote the ideal generated by the same elements, but viewed as an ideal of $\mathbb{k}[y_0, \dots, y_m]$. Since $J = J'\mathbb{k}[x_0, y_0, \dots, y_m]$, it suffices to show that J' is primary in $\mathbb{k}[y_0, \dots, y_m]$. Now by Assumption 2.1, $Q_{k,j} = [1 : Q_{k,j_1} : \dots : Q_{k,j_m}]$, so

$$I_{Q_{k,j}} = \langle Q_{k,j_1}y_0 - y_1, \dots, Q_{k,j_m}y_0 - y_m \rangle.$$

Combining this with

$$\left\langle \prod_{j=1}^{r_k} I_{Q_{k,j}}, y_0 \right\rangle \subseteq \left\langle \bigcap_{j=1}^{r_k} I_{Q_{k,j}}, y_0 \right\rangle = J',$$

it follows that $\langle y_0, \dots, y_m \rangle^{r_k} \subseteq J' \subseteq \langle y_0, \dots, y_m \rangle$, so the radical of J' is $\langle \mathbf{y} \rangle$, which is maximal in $\mathbb{k}[y_0, \dots, y_m]$. Thus J' is primary in $\mathbb{k}[y_0, \dots, y_m]$, as desired. \square

We are now prepared to prove the main result of this section.

Proof of Theorem 1.1. Since the ideal I_X is B -saturated, $I_X \cap \langle \mathbf{x} \rangle^t : B^\infty = I_X$. Thus a minimal free resolution of $S/(I_X \cap \langle \mathbf{x} \rangle^t)$ is indeed a virtual resolution of S/I_X .

Next, note that by [BES20, Proposition 2.5.a], the minimal free resolution of $S/(I_X \cap \langle \mathbf{x} \rangle^t)$ has length at least $n + m$, the codimension of I_X . It is thus left to show that the minimal free resolution of $S/(I_X \cap \langle \mathbf{x} \rangle^t)$ is of length at most (and thus equal to) $n + m$. To begin, by the Auslander–Buchsbaum formula,

$$\text{pdim}(S/(I_X \cap \langle \mathbf{x} \rangle^t)) = n + m + 2 - \text{depth}(S/(I_X \cap \langle \mathbf{x} \rangle^t)),$$

thus it suffices to show that the depth of $S/(I_X \cap \langle \mathbf{x} \rangle^t)$ is at least 2. To do this, we produce a regular sequence on $S/(I_X \cap \langle \mathbf{x} \rangle^t)$ of length two.

Without loss of generality by Assumption 2.1, y_0 is a nonzero divisor on S/I_X . Further, we claim that y_0 is a nonzero divisor on $S/(I_X \cap \langle \mathbf{x} \rangle^t)$. Indeed, if $f \in S$ with $y_0 f \in I_X \cap \langle \mathbf{x} \rangle^t$, then $y_0 f \in I_X$ and $y_0 f \in \langle \mathbf{x} \rangle^t$. This will only happen if $f \in I_X \cap \langle \mathbf{x} \rangle^t$, establishing the claim. We are now left to produce a nonzero divisor on $S/\langle I_X \cap \langle \mathbf{x} \rangle^t, y_0 \rangle$.

To find such a nonzero divisor, note that since $t \geq |\pi_1(X)| - 1$, Proposition 2.7 provides the primary decomposition

$$\langle I_X \cap \langle \mathbf{x} \rangle^t, y_0 \rangle = \bigcap_{P_k \in \pi_1(X)} \langle I_{X_k}, y_0 \rangle \cap \langle \langle \mathbf{x} \rangle^t, y_0 \rangle.$$

Now from (2.1),

$$\langle I_{X_k}, y_0 \rangle = I_{P_k} + \bigcap_{j=1}^{r_k} I_{Q_{k,j}} + \langle y_0 \rangle,$$

so the zero divisors of $S/\langle I_X \cap \langle \mathbf{x} \rangle^t, y_0 \rangle$ are the elements belonging to the associated primes of $S/\langle I_X \cap \langle \mathbf{x} \rangle^t, y_0 \rangle$, namely

$$\bigcup_{P_k \in \pi_1(X)} \sqrt{\langle I_{X_k}, y_0 \rangle} \cup \sqrt{\langle \langle \mathbf{x} \rangle^t, y_0 \rangle} = \bigcup_{P_k \in \pi_1(X)} \langle I_{P_k}, G_1, G_2, \dots, G_s, y_0 \rangle \cup \langle \mathbf{x}, y_0 \rangle, \quad (2.9)$$

where each G_i is a polynomial in only the \mathbf{y} -variables. Thus, let L be any element of degree $(1, 0)$ in S such that L does not vanish at any point in $\pi_1(X)$. In this way, $L + y_1$ does not belong to the set in (2.9), so $L + y_1$ is a nonzero divisor on $S/\langle I_X \cap \langle \mathbf{x} \rangle^t, y_0 \rangle$. Therefore, $S/\langle I_X \cap \langle \mathbf{x} \rangle^t \rangle$ has depth at least 2, so its minimal free resolution has length (at most) $n + m$, as desired. \square

Remark 2.9. Note that the bound shown in Theorem 1.1 is not necessarily a sharp one. For points with generic Hilbert function, we can improve the bound given in Theorem 1.1. In this case, the minimal free resolution of $I_X \cap \langle \mathbf{x} \rangle^t$ is a virtual resolution of I_X of length $m + n$ whenever $t \geq \min\{r \mid T_{r,n} \geq |X|\}$. To see this, apply Corollary 2.6 and then follow the proofs of Proposition 2.7 and Theorem 1.1.

3. DIFFERENCE HILBERT MATRICES AND BETTI NUMBERS

In this section, we prove Proposition 1.5, which relates a certain difference matrix of a Hilbert matrix to the Betti numbers of the corresponding free resolution.

Recall that S is the Cox ring of $\mathbb{P}^n \times \mathbb{P}^m$ and M a finitely generated bigraded S -module with minimal bigraded free resolution F_\bullet with Betti numbers $\beta_{k,(i,j)}$ and for all $(p,q) \in \mathbb{Z}^2$, $B_{p,q} = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} (-1)^k \beta_{k,(p,q)}$. Recall Δ^C and Δ^R from Definition 1.4, and let

$$T_{i,n} := \binom{i+n}{n}$$

denote the number of monomials of degree i in $\mathbb{k}[x_0, x_1, \dots, x_n]$, so $T_{i,n}T_{j,m} = H_S(i, j)$.

Lemma 3.1. *There is an equality $H_M(i, j) = \sum_{(p,q) \leq (i,j)} T_{i-p,n}T_{j-q,m}B_{p,q}$.*

Proof. For all $k \geq 0$, $H_S(i, j) = T_{i,n}T_{j,m}$ and $F_k = \bigoplus_{p,q \geq 0} S(-p, -q)^{\beta_{k,(p,q)}}$, so

$$\begin{aligned} H_{F_k}(i, j) &= \dim_{\mathbb{k}}(F_k)_{i,j} = \sum_{(p,q) \leq (i,j)} \dim_{\mathbb{k}}(S(-p, -q)_{i,j})^{\beta_{k,(p,q)}} \\ &= \sum_{(p,q) \leq (i,j)} \dim_{\mathbb{k}}(S_{i-p,j-q})^{\beta_{k,(p,q)}} \\ &= \sum_{(p,q) \leq (i,j)} T_{i-p,n}T_{j-q,m}\beta_{k,(p,q)}. \end{aligned} \quad (3.1)$$

By definition of $B_{p,q}$, for any $(p,q) \leq (i,j)$ and k sufficiently large, $\beta_{k,(p,q)} = 0$ and thus $H_{F_k}(i, j) = 0$. Since $0 \leftarrow M \leftarrow F_\bullet$ is an exact sequence in the category of graded S -modules,

$$H_M(i, j) = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} (-1)^k H_{F_k}(i, j).$$

Substituting (3.1) into the right hand side now yields the desired result. \square

Lemma 3.2. *Two identities hold for Δ^C and Δ^R applied to the Hilbert matrix of M :*

$$\begin{aligned} (\Delta^C H_M)(i, j) &= \sum_{(p,q) \leq (i,j)} T_{i-p,n-1}T_{j-q,m}B_{p,q} \\ \text{and } (\Delta^R H_M)(i, j) &= \sum_{(p,q) \leq (i,j)} T_{i-p,n}T_{j-q,m-1}B_{p,q}. \end{aligned}$$

Proof. We prove the identity for Δ^C ; the proof for Δ^R is analogous. By Lemma 3.1,

$$H_M(i, j) = \sum_{(p,q) \leq (i,j)} T_{i-p,n}T_{j-q,m}B_{p,q}.$$

Now separate the sum into two parts, noting that when $p = i$, $T_{i-p,n} = T_{0,n} = 1$, so that

$$H_M(i, j) = \sum_{q \leq j} T_{j-q,m}B_{i,q} + \sum_{(p,q) \leq (i-1,j)} T_{i-p,n}T_{j-q,m}B_{p,q}.$$

By Lemma 3.1 applied to $(i-1, j)$,

$$H_M(i-1, j) = \sum_{(p,q) \leq (i-1, j)} T_{i-1-p, n} T_{j-q, m} B_{p,q}.$$

Now by definition of Δ^C ,

$$\begin{aligned} (\Delta^C H_M)(i, j) &= H_M(i, j) - H_M(i-1, j) \\ &= \sum_{q \leq j} T_{j-q, m} B_{i, q} + \sum_{(p,q) \leq (i-1, j)} (T_{i-p, n} - T_{i-1-p, n}) T_{j-q, m} B_{p,q}. \end{aligned} \tag{3.2}$$

Using the binomial identities $T_{i-p, n} - T_{i-1-p, n} = T_{i-p, n-1}$, (3.2) simplifies to

$$(\Delta^C H_M)(i, j) = \sum_{q \leq j} T_{j-q, m} B_{i, q} + \sum_{(p,q) \leq (i-1, j)} T_{i-p, n-1} T_{j-q, m} B_{p,q}.$$

Recombining the last two sums yields

$$(\Delta^C H_M)(i, j) = \sum_{(p,q) \leq (i, j)} T_{i-p, n-1} T_{j-q, m} B_{p,q}. \quad \square$$

Proposition 1.5 now follows by applying each of Δ^C and Δ^R repeatedly.

Proof of Proposition 1.5. Combining Lemmas 3.1 and 3.2,

$$\begin{aligned} G_M(i, j) &:= ((\Delta^C)^n (\Delta^R)^m H_M)(i, j) \\ &= \sum_{(p,q) \leq (i, j)} T_{i-p, 0} T_{j-q, 0} B_{p,q} \\ &= \sum_{(p,q) \leq (i, j)} B_{p,q}. \end{aligned}$$

Now applying Δ^C ,

$$\begin{aligned} (\Delta^C G_M)(i, j) &= G_M(i, j) - G_M(i-1, j) \\ &= \sum_{(p,q) \leq (i, j)} B_{p,q} - \sum_{(p,q) \leq (i-1, j)} B_{p,q} = \sum_{q \leq j} B_{i, q}, \end{aligned}$$

so applying Δ^R yields the desired result:

$$(\Delta^R \Delta^C G_M)(i, j) = \sum_{q \leq j} B_{i, q} - \sum_{q \leq j-1} B_{i, q} = B_{i, j}. \quad \square$$

4. SUFFICIENTLY GENERAL POINTS IN $\mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^2$

We now discuss the notion of sufficiently general points, as per the setting of Theorem 1.3. We begin with the notion of a generic Hilbert function for S/I_X , sketched for us by Gregory G. Smith. While this result holds over any smooth toric variety, for continuity of notation, we state the result only for $\mathbb{P}^n \times \mathbb{P}^m$.

Proposition 4.1. *For every $N \geq 1$ and all $n, m \geq 1$, there exists a dense open subset $U \subseteq (\mathbb{P}^n \times \mathbb{P}^m)^N$, such that for any $X = \{P_1, P_2, \dots, P_N\} \subseteq \mathbb{P}^n \times \mathbb{P}^m$, if $(P_1, P_2, \dots, P_N) \in U$, then*

$$H_X(i, j) = \min\{|X|, T_{i,n}T_{j,m}\} \quad \text{for all } i, j \geq 0,$$

where $T_{i,n} := \binom{i+n}{n}$ is equal to the number of monomials of degree i in $\mathbb{k}[x_0, x_1, \dots, x_n]$.

Proof. A natural parameter space for N distinct points in $\mathbb{P}^n \times \mathbb{P}^m$ is simply the open subset of $(\mathbb{P}^n \times \mathbb{P}^m)^N$, the N -fold product of $\mathbb{P}^n \times \mathbb{P}^m$, obtained by removing the large diagonals, i.e., subsets where two points are equal. Note that the Hilbert function of the Cox ring S of $\mathbb{P}^n \times \mathbb{P}^m$ at $(i, j) \in \mathbb{N}^2$ is $H_S(i, j) = T_{i,n}T_{j,m}$.

If the Hilbert function of a set Y of N distinct points disagrees with $H_S(i, j)$ for some $(i, j) \in \mathbb{N}^2$, then it must be strictly smaller. It follows that matrix with N rows and $H_S(i, j)$ columns, corresponding to evaluating the N points in Y at the monomial basis for the Cox ring S in degree (i, j) has less than maximal rank. Thus the corresponding maximal minors of the matrix, interpreted as polynomial equations in the Cox ring of the parameter space $(\mathbb{P}^n \times \mathbb{P}^m)^N$, determine a closed subset that contains Y , as desired. \square

Example 4.2. If $X \subseteq \mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^2$ is a finite set of sufficiently general points with $|X| = N \geq 12$,

$$N = 6q + r = 3q' + r' \quad \text{with } 0 \leq r \leq 5 \quad \text{and } 0 \leq r' \leq 2,$$

$c_j = \max\{c \mid cT_{j,2} < N\}$, and $d = \min\{j \mid T_{j,2} \geq |X|\}$, then the Hilbert matrix of S/I_X is

$$H_X = \begin{matrix} & \begin{matrix} 0 & 1 & 2 & \cdots & j & \cdots & d & d+1 & \cdots \end{matrix} \\ \begin{matrix} 0 \\ 1 \\ \vdots \\ c_j - 1 \\ c_j \\ \vdots \\ q - 1 \\ q \\ \vdots \\ q' - 1 \\ q' \\ \vdots \\ N - 1 \\ N \\ \vdots \end{matrix} & \left(\begin{matrix} 1 & 3 & 6 & \cdots & T_{j,2} & \cdots & N & N & \cdots \\ 2 & 6 & 12 & \cdots & 2T_{j,2} & \cdots & N & N & \cdots \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \\ c_j & 3c_j & 6c_j & \cdots & c_j T_{j,2} & \cdots & N & N & \cdots \\ c_j + 1 & 3(c_j + 1) & 6(c_j + 1) & \cdots & N & \cdots & N & N & \cdots \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \\ q & 3q & 6q & \cdots & N & \cdots & N & N & \cdots \\ q + 1 & 3q + 3 & N & \cdots & N & \cdots & N & N & \cdots \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \\ q' & 3q' & N & \cdots & N & \cdots & N & N & \cdots \\ q' + 1 & N & N & \cdots & N & \cdots & N & N & \cdots \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \\ N & N & N & \cdots & N & \cdots & N & N & \cdots \\ N & N & N & \cdots & N & \cdots & N & N & \cdots \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots \end{matrix} \right). \quad \diamond \end{matrix}$$

Moving towards Theorem 1.3, we now turn our attention to the specific setting of $\mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^2$, for which we need an additional assumption on set of points that restricts their first Betti numbers.

Notation 4.3. Given a matrix H with indices $(i, j) \in \mathbb{Z}^2$, set

$$DH := (\Delta^C)^2 (\Delta^R)^3 H. \quad (4.1)$$

For a finite set of points X in $\mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^2$, Proposition 1.5 implies that the Betti numbers of S/I_X satisfy

$$DH_X(i, j) = -\beta_{1,(i,j)} + \beta_{2,(i,j)} - \beta_{3,(i,j)} + \beta_{4,(i,j)}. \quad (4.2)$$

for all $(i, j) > (0, 0)$. Ideally, we would like to say that under certain assumptions (for example, when X has generic Hilbert matrix), the matrix DH_X completely determines all Betti numbers of S/I_X . This amounts to saying that a certain version of the Minimal Resolution Conjecture (MRC) holds for sets of points in $\mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^2$.

Originally formulated by Lorenzini in [Lor93] for points in \mathbb{P}^n , the MRC states that for a set of points in sufficiently general position, Betti numbers cannot overlap, meaning that $\beta_{i,j}\beta_{i+1,j} = 0$ for all $0 \leq i \leq n$ and $j \in \mathbb{Z}$. Later, Mustață generalized the MRC to sets of points in arbitrary projective varieties [Mus98]. A more detailed discussion of the history and current status of the MRC can be found in the introduction of [BP].

In [GMR96], it is shown that the MRC holds for all sufficiently general sets of points lying on a smooth quadric in \mathbb{P}^3 . The techniques of [GMR96] are highly specific to the geometry of \mathbb{P}^3 and therefore difficult to generalize to higher dimensions or multiprojective spaces. The recent studies [HNVT22, BP] of virtual resolutions for points in $\mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^1$ show a weakened partial version of the MRC, which provides enough control to obtain their results.

For the purpose of our study, we now state a weakened version of the MRC for points in $\mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^2$ that parallels [GMR96]. Here we only require that the Betti numbers $\beta_{1,(i,j)}$ are entirely predicted by DH_X . This assumption provides enough control over Betti numbers to prove Theorem 1.3.

Conjecture 4.4 (Weakened Minimal Resolution Conjecture). Let $N \geq 2$ be an integer. There exists a dense open subset $U \subseteq (\mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^2)^N$ such that for every $(P_1, P_2, \dots, P_N) \in U$, the set of points $X = \{P_1, \dots, P_N\}$ satisfies:

- (1) X has a generic Hilbert matrix as in Definition 1.2, and
- (2) For every fixed $(i, j) > (0, 0)$, the bigraded Betti numbers of S/I_X are such that $\beta_{1,(i,j)} > 0$ if and only if $DH_X(i, j) < 0$ and $DH_X(i', j') \leq 0$ for all $(i', j') \leq (i, j)$ with $(i', j') \neq (0, 0)$, with DH as in Notation 4.3, and whenever the above condition holds, $\beta_{1,(i,j)} = -DH_X(i, j)$.

Example 4.5. For each $2 \leq N \leq 100$, we verified in Macaulay2 that Conjecture 4.4 holds for 50 random sets of N points in $\mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^2$ with generic Hilbert function [M2]. \diamond

5. A SHORT VIRTUAL OF A PAIR RESOLUTION IN $\mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^2$

In this section, we prove Theorem 1.3. To begin, The virtual of a pair construction is one of the methods given by Berkesch, Erman, and Smith to construct virtual resolutions, and it relies on Maclagan and Smith's notion of multigraded regularity. We do not define this invariant in general, but instead provide a simplified characterization for our specific setting.

Proposition 5.1 (See [MS04, Proposition 6.7]). *Let X be a finite set of points in $\mathbb{P}^n \times \mathbb{P}^m$. Then the multigraded regularity of S/I_X is*

$$\text{reg}(S/I_X) = \{\mathbf{d} \in \mathbb{Z}^2 \mid H_X(\mathbf{d}) = |X|\}.$$

Example 5.2. Recall that for points in sufficiently general position in $\mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^2$, the Hilbert matrix is given by

$$H_X(i, j) = \min\{|X|, T_{i,1}T_{j,2}\} \quad \text{for all } i, j \geq 0,$$

Therefore if $|X| = N$, then

$$H_X(N-1, 0) = \min\{N, T_{N-1,1}T_{0,2}\} = \min\{N, N\} = N,$$

so $(N-1, 0) \in \text{reg}(S/I_X)$ for all finite sets of N points $X \subseteq \mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^2$. \diamond

Theorem 5.3 (See [BES20, Theorem 1.3]). *Let S be the Cox ring of $\mathbb{P}^n \times \mathbb{P}^m$, let M be a finitely generated bigraded B -saturated S -module, and let $\mathbf{d} \in \mathbb{Z}^2$ be such that $\mathbf{d} \in \text{reg}(M)$. If G_\bullet is the free subcomplex of a minimal free resolution F_\bullet of M consisting of all summands of F_\bullet generated in degree at most $\mathbf{d} + (n, m)$, then G_\bullet is a virtual resolution of M .*

As in [BES20], we call the virtual resolution in Theorem 5.3 the *virtual resolution of the pair* (M, \mathbf{d}) . With this in hand, we are now prepared to state the main result of this section, a more explicit version of Theorem 1.3 when $|X| \geq 12$. The case for smaller sets of points is handled in Remark 5.5.

Theorem 5.4 (See Theorem 1.3). *Let $X \subseteq \mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^2$ be a finite set of sufficiently general points with $N = |X| \geq 12$. If Conjecture 4.4 holds, then the virtual of a pair construction for $\mathbf{d} = (N-1, 0)$ yields a virtual resolution of S/I_X of the form*

$$\begin{array}{c} S(-q, -2)^{6-r} \\ \oplus \\ S(-q-1, -2)^r \quad S(-q', -2)^{9-3r'} \\ \oplus \\ S \leftarrow S(-q', -1)^{3-r'} \leftarrow S(-q'-1, -2)^{3r'} \leftarrow S(-N, -2)^3 \leftarrow 0, \\ \oplus \\ S(-q'-1, -1)^{r'} \quad S(-N, -1)^3 \\ \oplus \\ S(-N, 0) \end{array}$$

where $N = 6q + r = 3q' + r'$ with $0 \leq r \leq 5$ and $0 \leq r' \leq 2$. When r (respectively, r') is zero, the term $S(-q-1, -2)^r$ (respectively, $S(-q'-1, -1)^{r'}$ and $S(-q'-1, -2)^{3r'}$) do not appear in the virtual resolution.

Remark 5.5. In the case that $2 \leq |X| \leq 11$, if we assume Conjecture 4.4, then it is still true that S/I_X has a virtual resolution of length 3 obtained by taking $\mathbf{d} = (|X| - 1, 0)$ in Theorem 5.3, and the proofs are analogous to Theorem 5.4, but the resulting virtual resolution has a slightly different form. These cases are listed in Appendix A, and with Theorem 5.4, complete the proof of Theorem 1.3.

We now state two lemmas for the proof of Theorem 5.4.

Lemma 5.6. *Let $X \subseteq \mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^2$ be a collection of points with generic Hilbert matrix as in Definition 1.2 with $N = |X| \geq 12$. If*

$$N = 6q + r = 3q' + r' \quad \text{with } 0 \leq r \leq 5 \quad \text{and } 0 \leq r' \leq 2,$$

then using Notation 4.3,

$$DH_X = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & \cdots \\ 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \cdots \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \\ q-1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \cdots \\ q & 0 & 0 & r-6 & \cdots \\ q+1 & 0 & 0 & -r & \cdots \\ q+2 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \cdots \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \\ q'-1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \cdots \\ q' & 0 & r'-3 & 9-3r' & \cdots \\ q'+1 & 0 & -r' & 3r' & \cdots \\ q'+2 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \cdots \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \\ N-1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \cdots \\ N & -1 & 3 & -3 & \cdots \\ N+1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \cdots \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots \end{pmatrix}.$$

Proof. Recall from Definition 1.4 that Δ^C and Δ^R commute, and set $\Delta := \Delta^C \Delta^R = \Delta^R \Delta^C$. In light of Example 4.2, straightforward computation yields

$$H_X = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 & 3 & 6 & \cdots \\ 1 & 2 & 6 & 12 & \cdots \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \\ q-1 & q & 3q & 6q & \cdots \\ q & q+1 & 3q+3 & N & \cdots \\ q+1 & q+2 & 3q+6 & N & \cdots \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \\ q'-1 & q' & 3q' & N & \cdots \\ q' & q'+1 & N & N & \cdots \\ q'+1 & q'+2 & N & N & \cdots \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \\ N-1 & N & N & N & \cdots \\ N & N & N & N & \cdots \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots \end{pmatrix} \quad \text{and} \quad \Delta H_X = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 & 2 & 3 & \cdots \\ 1 & 1 & 2 & 3 & \cdots \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \\ q-1 & 1 & 2 & 3 & \cdots \\ q & 1 & 2 & r-3 & \cdots \\ q+1 & 1 & 2 & -3 & \cdots \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \\ q'-1 & 1 & 2 & -3 & \cdots \\ q' & 1 & r'-1 & -r' & \cdots \\ q'+1 & 1 & -1 & 0 & \cdots \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \\ N-1 & 1 & -1 & 0 & \cdots \\ N & 0 & 0 & 0 & \cdots \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots \end{pmatrix}.$$

The result follows from direct computation. \square

Lemma 5.7. *Let X be a set of $N \geq 12$ points in sufficiently general position in $\mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^2$, and let F_\bullet be the minimal free resolution of S/I_X with Betti numbers $\beta_{k,(i,j)}$. If $DH_X(i, j)$ is the first positive entry in the i th row of DH_X (excluding the 0th and 1st row), then $\beta_{2,(i,j)} = DH_X(i, j)$, i.e., that positive entry corresponds exactly to the number of first syzygies of S/I_X of degree (i, j) . Furthermore, $\beta_{2,(i,j')} = 0$ for all $j' < j$, i.e., there are no first syzygies of smaller degree coming from that row.*

Proof. This argument follows the approach of [BP, Lemma 3.2]. Let F_\bullet be the minimal free resolution of S/I_X . For $i \geq 0$, let $C^{\leq i}$ denote the subcomplex of F_\bullet with summands generated in degree $\mathbf{a} = (a_1, a_2)$ such that $a_1 \leq i$. These complexes provide a filtration of F_\bullet , so for $i \geq 1$, let C^i denote the cokernel of the natural inclusion $C^{\leq i-1} \hookrightarrow C^{\leq i}$.

When $K \gg N$, we claim that $C^{\leq i}$ is a virtual resolution of a pair for $(S/I_X, (i-1, K-2))$. To see this, note that $(0, N-2) \in \text{reg}(S/I_X)$ by Proposition 5.1. Thus $(i-1, K-2) \in \text{reg}(S/I_X)$ for all $i \geq 1, K \gg N$. By choosing K to be the largest degree in the second coordinate of a generator of any summand in $C^{\leq i}$, $C^{\leq i}$ is exactly the virtual resolution of the pair $(S/I_X, (i-1, K-2))$. Now $0 \rightarrow C^{\leq i-1} \rightarrow C^{\leq i} \rightarrow C^i \rightarrow 0$ is a short exact sequence of complexes, and $C^{\leq i-1}$ and $C^{\leq i}$ are both virtual resolutions of S/I_X by Theorem 5.3, so C^i must have irrelevant homology. Further, since the first coordinates of the degrees of all generators in C^i are fixed at i , it is actually a complex over $\mathbb{k}[y_0, y_1, y_2]$ with homology modules annihilated by some power of $\langle y_0, y_1, y_2 \rangle$. The Acyclicity Lemma [Eis95, Lemma 20.11] thus ensures that $H_k(C^i) = 0$ for all $k > 1$.

Now if $DH_X(i, j)$ is the first positive entry with $i \geq 2$ in the i th row of DH_X , then

$$C^i: \quad 0 \leftarrow C_1^i \leftarrow C_2^i \leftarrow C_3^i \leftarrow C_4^i \leftarrow 0$$

is a minimal free resolution over $\mathbb{k}[y_0, y_1, y_2]$, so there are no units in its maps and the minimal generating degrees of summands must increase with homological degree.

By Conjecture 4.4, it follows that the Betti numbers $\beta_{1,(i,j')}$ come precisely from the first negative entries of the i th row of DH_X , where $j' < j$. By inspection from Lemma 5.6, $0 > DH_X(i, j-1) = \beta_{1,(i,j-1)}$ and thus $\beta_{1,(i,j)} = 0$. Further, since the minimal degree of generators must increase in C^i , $\beta_{3,(i,j)} = \beta_{4,(i,j)} = 0$ and $DH_X(i, j) = \beta_{2,(i,j)}$, as desired. \square

We are now prepared to prove the main theorem of this section.

Proof of Theorem 5.4. Since X has the generic Hilbert matrix in Definition 1.2, $H_X(N-1, 0) = |X| = N$, so $(N-1, 0) \in \text{reg}(S/I_X)$ by [MS04, Proposition 6.7]. Thus Theorem 5.3 produces a virtual resolution of S/I_X that is the subcomplex of the minimal free resolution of S/I_X consisting of all summands generated in degrees at most $(N, 2)$.

We now examine the minimal free resolution of S/I_X . By Conjecture 4.4, the first Betti numbers can be read from the first negative entries in the rows of DH_X , and these occurs at positions $(q, 2), (q+1, 2), (q', 1), (q'+1, 1)$, and $(N, 0)$ by Lemma 5.6. Since graded Betti numbers in a minimal free resolution must increase in degree due to minimality and by Conjecture 4.4, it also follows that $\beta_{k,(i,j)} = 0$ for $k > 1$ for the (i, j) for which $\beta_{1,(i,j)} \neq 0$.

Next, by Lemma 5.7, the second Betti numbers can be read from the first positive entries occurring after a negative entry along a row of DH_X . By Lemma 5.6, these occur in positions $(q', 2), (q'+1, 2)$, and $(N, 1)$, with values which match the statement of the theorem. Since graded Betti numbers in a minimal free resolution must increase in degree due to minimality, it also follows that $\beta_{k,(i,j)} = 0$ for $k > 2$ for the (i, j) for which $\beta_{2,(i,j)} \neq 0$.

Third Betti numbers are now only possible in degrees $(q'+2, 2), (q'+3, 2), \dots, (N, 2)$. However, minimality of the original complex disallows both $\beta_{3,(i,j)}$ and $\beta_{4,(i,j)}$ to be nonzero. Thus, only $\beta_{3,(N,2)}$ can be nonzero and $\beta_{4,(N,2)} = 0$, so by Proposition 1.5, $\beta_{3,(N,2)} = 3$. Having exhausted the possible degrees for nonzero Betti numbers, the proof is now complete. \square

It is worth noting that the virtual of a pair construction does not always yield a short virtual resolution, even when the $\mathbf{d} \in \text{reg}(S/I_X)$ used is as small as possible. In [BP], Booms-Peot showed that in $\mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^1$, under certain conditions virtual of a pair yields a virtual resolution of length 3. The same issue persists in $\mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^2$, as shown below.

Example 5.8. For $X \subseteq \mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^2$ with $|X| = 31$ in sufficiently general position, the minimal free resolution has total Betti numbers

$$S \leftarrow S^{34} \leftarrow S^{66} \leftarrow S^{39} \leftarrow S^6 \leftarrow 0.$$

Performing virtual of a pair at $(2, 4) \in \text{reg}(S/I_X)$ yields the complex

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} & & S(-3, -3)^9 & & S(-3, -4)^{26} & & \\ & & \oplus & & \oplus & & \\ 0 \leftarrow S/I_X \leftarrow S \leftarrow & S(-2, -4)^{14} \leftarrow & S(-2, -5)^{32} \leftarrow & S(-3, -5)^{24} & \leftarrow & S(-3, -6)^6 \leftarrow & 0. \quad \diamond \\ & \oplus & \oplus & \oplus & & & \\ & S(-1, -5)^{11} & & S(-1, -6)^8 & & S(-2, -6)^{15} & \end{array}$$

APPENDIX A. SHORT VIRTUAL OF A PAIR RESOLUTIONS FOR SMALL NUMBERS OF SUFFICIENTLY GENERAL POINTS

Listed below are the virtual resolutions obtained from performing virtual of a pair at $(|X| - 1, 0)$ on the minimal free resolutions of S/I_X when $X \subseteq \mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^2$ is a set of sufficiently general points with $2 \leq |X| \leq 11$. The proofs here closely follow that of Theorem 5.4 and are thus omitted. The main difference is that for a smaller number of points, the difference matrix DH_X is considerably more crowded.

- $|X| = 2$:

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} & & S(0, -2) & & & & \\ & & \oplus & & & & \\ S \leftarrow & S(0, -1) & \leftarrow & S(-1, -2)^4 & \leftarrow & S(-2, -2)^3. & \\ & \oplus & & \oplus & & & \\ & S(-1, -1)^2 & \leftarrow & S(-2, -1)^3 & & & \\ & \oplus & & & & & \\ & S(-2, 0) & & & & & \end{array}$$

- $|X| = 3$:

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} & & S(0, -2)^3 & & & & \\ & & \oplus & & S(-1, -2)^6 & & \\ S \leftarrow & S(-1, -1)^3 & \leftarrow & \oplus & \leftarrow & S(-3, -2)^3. & \\ & \oplus & & \oplus & & & \\ & S(-3, 0) & & S(-3, -1)^3 & & & \end{array}$$

- $|X| = 4$:

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} & & S(0, -2)^2 & & & & \\ & & \oplus & & S(-1, -2)^2 & & \\ S \leftarrow & S(-1, -1)^2 & \leftarrow & \oplus & \leftarrow & S(-4, -2)^3. & \\ & \oplus & & \oplus & & & \\ & S(-2, -1) & \leftarrow & S(-2, -2)^3 & \leftarrow & S(-4, -2)^3. & \\ & \oplus & & \oplus & & & \\ & S(-4, 0) & & S(-4, -1)^3 & & & \end{array}$$

- $|X| = 5$:

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} & & S(0, -2) & & & & \\ & & \oplus & & & & \\ S \leftarrow & S(-1, -2)^2 & \leftarrow & \oplus & \leftarrow & S(-2, -2)^6 & \\ & \oplus & & \oplus & & S(-5, -2)^3. & \\ & S(-1, -1) & \leftarrow & \oplus & \leftarrow & S(-5, -1)^3 & \\ & \oplus & & \oplus & & & \\ & S(-2, -1)^2 & & \oplus & & & \\ & \oplus & & \oplus & & & \\ & S(-5, 0) & & & & & \end{array}$$

- $|X| = 6$:

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} & & S(-1, -2)^6 & & & & \\ & & \oplus & & S(-2, -2)^9 & & \\ S \leftarrow & S(-2, -1)^3 & \leftarrow & \oplus & \leftarrow & S(-6, -2)^3. & \\ & \oplus & & \oplus & & & \\ & S(-6, 0) & & \oplus & & & \\ & & & \oplus & & & \end{array}$$

- $|X| = 7$:

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} & & S(-1, -2)^5 & & & & \\ & & \oplus & & S(-2, -2)^5 & & \\ S \leftarrow & S(-2, -1)^2 & \leftarrow & \oplus & \leftarrow & S(-7, -2)^3. & \\ & \oplus & & \oplus & & & \\ & S(-3, -1) & \leftarrow & S(-3, -2)^3 & \leftarrow & S(-7, -2)^3. & \\ & \oplus & & \oplus & & & \\ & S(-7, 0) & & \oplus & & & \\ & & & \oplus & & & \end{array}$$

• $|X| = 8$:

$$S \leftarrow \begin{array}{ccc} S(-1, -2)^4 & & \\ \oplus & & \\ S(-2, -1) & S(-2, -2) & \\ \oplus & \oplus & \\ S(-3, -1)^2 & \leftarrow S(-3, -2)^6 \leftarrow S(-8, -2)^3 & \\ \oplus & \oplus & \\ S(-8, 0) & S(-8, -1)^3 & \end{array}$$

• $|X| = 9$:

$$S \leftarrow \begin{array}{ccc} S(-1, -2)^3 & & \\ \oplus & & \\ S(-2, -2)^3 & S(-3, -2)^9 & \\ \oplus & \oplus & \\ S(-3, -1)^3 & S(-9, -1)^3 \leftarrow S(-9, -2)^3 & \\ \oplus & & \\ S(-9, 0) & & \end{array}$$

• $|X| = 10$:

$$S \leftarrow \begin{array}{ccc} S(-1, -2)^2 & & \\ \oplus & & \\ S(-2, -2)^4 & S(-3, -2)^6 & \\ \oplus & \oplus & \\ S(-3, -1)^2 \leftarrow S(-4, -2)^3 \leftarrow S(-10, -2)^3 & & \\ \oplus & \oplus & \\ S(-4, -1) & S(-10, -1)^3 & \\ \oplus & & \\ S(-10, 0) & & \end{array}$$

• $|X| = 11$:

$$S \leftarrow \begin{array}{ccc} S(-1, -2) & & \\ \oplus & & \\ S(-2, -2)^5 & S(-3, -2)^3 & \\ \oplus & \oplus & \\ S(-3, -1) \leftarrow S(-4, -2)^6 \leftarrow S(-11, -2)^3 & & \\ \oplus & \oplus & \\ S(-4, -1)^2 & S(-11, -1)^3 & \\ \oplus & & \\ S(-11, 0) & & \end{array}$$

REFERENCES

- [ABLS20] Ayah Almousa, Juliette Bruce, Michael Loper, and Mahrud Sayrafi, *The virtual resolutions package for Macaulay2*, J. Softw. Algebra Geom. **10** (2020), no. 1, 51–60.
- [And] Reginald Anderson, *A Resolution of the Diagonal for Toric Deligne–Mumford Stacks*, arXiv:2303.17497 [math.AG], 52 pages.
- [BES20] Christine Berkesch, Daniel Erman, and Gregory G. Smith, *Virtual resolutions for a product of projective spaces*, Algebr. Geom. **7** (2020), no. 4, 460–481.
- [BKLY21] Christine Berkesch, Patricia Klein, Michael C. Loper, and Jay Yang, *Homological and combinatorial aspects of virtually Cohen–Macaulay sheaves*, Trans. London Math. Soc. **8** (2021), no. 1, 413–434.
- [BP] Caitlyn Booms-Peot, *Hilbert–Burch virtual resolutions for points in $\mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^1$* , arXiv.AC:2304.04953, 21 pages.
- [BPC22] Caitlyn Booms-Peot and John Cobb, *Virtual criterion for generalized Eagon–Northcott complexes*, J. Pure Appl. Algebra **226** (2022), no. 12, Paper No. 107138, 8.
- [BE] Michael K. Brown and Daniel Erman, *Results on virtual resolutions for toric varieties*, arXiv:2303.14319 [math.AG], 5 pages.
- [BS] Michael K. Brown and Mahrud Sayrafi, *A short resolution of the diagonal for smooth projective toric varieties of Picard rank 2*, arXiv:2208.00562 [math.AG], 18 pages.
- [DS20] Eliana Duarte and Alexandra Seceleanu, *Implicitization of tensor product surfaces via virtual projective resolutions*, Math. Comp. **89** (2020), no. 326, 3023–3056.
- [Eis95] David Eisenbud, *Commutative Algebra: With a View Toward Algebraic Geometry*, Springer New York, 1995.
- [FH] David Favero and Jesse Huang, *Rouquier dimension is Krull dimension for normal toric varieties*, arXiv.2302.09158 [math.AG], 9 pages.
- [GLLM21] Jiyang Gao, Yutong Li, Michael C. Loper, and Amal Mattoo, *Virtual complete intersections in $\mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^1$* , J. Pure Appl. Algebra **225** (2021), no. 1, Paper No. 106473, 15.
- [GMR92] S. Giuffrida, R. Maggioni, and A. Ragusa, *On the postulation of 0-dimensional subschemes on a smooth quadric*, Pacific J. Math. **155** (1992), no. 2, 251–282.
- [GMR96] ———, *Resolutions of generic points lying on a smooth quadric*, Manuscripta Math. **91** (1996), no. 4, 421–444.
- [HHL] Andrew Hanlon, Jeff Hicks, and Oleg Lazarev, *Resolutions of toric subvarieties by line bundles and applications*, arxiv:2303.03763 [math.AG], 63 pages.

- [HNVT22] Megumi Harada, Maryam Nowroozi, and Adam Van Tuyl, *Virtual resolutions of points in $\mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^1$* , J. Pure Appl. Algebra **226** (2022), no. 12, Paper No. 107140, 18.
- [KLM⁺23] Nathan Kenshur, Feiyang Lin, Sean McNally, Zixuan Xu, and Teresa Yu, *On virtually Cohen-Macaulay simplicial complexes*, J. Algebra **631** (2023), 120–135.
- [Lop21] Michael C. Loper, *What makes a complex a virtual resolution?*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. Ser. B **8** (2021), 885–898.
- [Lor93] Anna Lorenzini, *The minimal resolution conjecture*, J. Algebra **156** (1993), no. 1, 5–35.
- [MS04] Diane Maclagan and Gregory G. Smith, *Multigraded Castelnuovo-Mumford regularity*, J. Reine Angew. Math. **571** (2004), 179–212.
- [M2] Daniel R. Grayson and Michael E. Stillman, *Macaulay2, a software system for research in algebraic geometry*.
- [Mus98] Mircea Mustață, *Graded Betti numbers of general finite subsets of points on projective varieties*, 1998, pp. 53–81. Pragmatic 1997 (Catania).
- [VTY] Adam Van Tuyl and Jay Yang, *Conditions for Virtually Cohen–Macaulay Simplicial Complexes*, arxiv:2311.17806 [math.AC], 15 pages.
- [Vil15] Rafael H. Villarreal, *Monomial algebras*, 2nd ed., Monographs and Research Notes in Mathematics, CRC Press, Boca Raton, FL, 2015.
- [Yan21] Jay Yang, *Virtual resolutions of monomial ideals on toric varieties*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. Ser. B **8** (2021), 100–111.

GRINNELL COLLEGE

Email address: `baillyha@grinnell.edu`

UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

Email address: `cberkesc@umn.edu`

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY

Email address: `kmd2235@columbia.edu`

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, BERKELEY

Email address: `seanguan@berkeley.edu`

UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA

Email address: `sivakumars@ufl.edu`

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

Email address: `joshsun@umich.edu`