

# The Recovery of $\lambda$ from a Hilbert Polynomial

Joseph Donato <sup>\*†1</sup> and Monica Lewis <sup>‡2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Methods and Algorithms Group, XCP-4, X-Computational  
Physics Division, Los Alamos National Laboratory

<sup>2</sup>School of Mathematics, University of Minnesota

## Abstract

In the study of Hilbert schemes, the integer partition  $\lambda$  helps researchers identify some geometric and combinatorial properties of the scheme in question. To aid researchers in extracting such information from a Hilbert polynomial, we describe an efficient algorithm which can identify if  $p(x) \in \mathbb{Q}[x]$  is a Hilbert polynomial and if so, recover the integer partition  $\lambda$  associated with it.

**Keywords:** Hilbert Scheme, Hilbert Polynomials, Discrete Calculus, Polynomial Interpolation

**Word Count:** 2126

**Disclosure Statement:** The authors report there are no competing interests to declare.

## 1 Introduction

The roots of this work can be traced back to the following theorem proved by Macaulay.

---

\*Corresponding Author

†jdonato@lanl.gov

‡lewi1714@umn.edu

**Theorem 1.** [5] Let  $R = \mathbb{C}[x_0, \dots, x_n]$  and  $p(x) \in \mathbb{Q}[x]$ , there exists ideals in  $R$  with Hilbert polynomial  $p(x)$  iff  $p(x)$  can be written in the form  $\sum_{i=1}^r \binom{x+\lambda_i-i}{\lambda_i-1}$  for some integer partition  $\lambda = (\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_r)$  where  $n \geq \lambda_1 \geq \dots \geq \lambda_r \geq 1$ .

From this work, other researchers have been able to identify the smoothness of the associated Hilbert schemes as well as the sum of the Betti numbers via  $\lambda$  [7, 3].

With the rich information embedded in  $\lambda$  as well as the advent of software used for experimentation in algebraic geometry such as Macaulay2 [4] we recognize the utility of having an algorithm for identifying if  $p(x)$  is a Hilbert polynomial and if so, recover  $\lambda$ .

The outline of this paper is as follows. In section 2 we describe a naive recovery algorithm as well as its severe limitations. In section 3 we review some ideas from discrete derivatives. Finally, in section 4, we employ the ideas in section 3 to derive the efficient and robust algorithm briefly mentioned in [1] and derive its worst case complexity.

## 2 Naive Algorithm

The naive algorithm is fairly simple to describe. That is, if the user provides a polynomial  $p(x) \in \mathbb{Q}[x]$  of degree  $n$  then the algorithm enumerates through all possible  $\lambda$  such that  $\lambda_1 = n + 1$  up to a certain size  $r_{max}$  which must also be provided by the user. The algorithm determines if there is a match by employing the polynomial interpolation theorem.

To define this algorithm, let's begin by defining some subroutines for the sake of simplicity.

- $nonIncrSeqs(m, n)$  which returns the set of non-increasing sequences of size  $m$  with allowed values  $1, \dots, n$ .
- $generateDataPoints(p(x))$  which generates the  $\deg(p(x))+1$  data points of  $p(x)$  needed for comparing polynomials via polynomial interpolation. Here, we will assume that our data points are  $\{p(0), p(1), p(2), \dots, p(\deg(p(x)))\}$ .
- $compare(\lambda, p_{data})$  which compares the  $\deg(p(x)) + 1$  data points  $p_{data}$  of  $p(x)$  to the data points generated by Hilbert polynomial constructed from  $\lambda$  and returns *true* if they match and *false* otherwise.

With these definitions in mind, we define the naive algorithm as follows.

---

**Algorithm 1:** Naive Recovery Algorithm

---

**Input:**  $p(x) \in \mathbb{Q}[x]$ .  
**Input:**  $r_{max}$ : maximum size of  $\lambda$  to search for.  
**Output:**  $\lambda$ : if  $p(x)$  is a Hilbert polynomial with  $\lambda$  of size  $\leq r_{max}$ .  
 $n \leftarrow \deg(p(x))$ ;  
 $\lambda_{init} \leftarrow (n + 1)$ ;  
 $p_{data} \leftarrow \text{computeDataPoints}(p(x))$ ;  
**if**  $\text{compare}(\lambda_{init}, p_{data})$  **then**  
    | **return**  $\lambda_{init}$ ;  
**end**  
**for**  $j = 1 : r_{max} - 1$  **do**  
    | **for**  $s \in \text{nonIncrSeqs}(j, n + 1)$  **do**  
        |  $\lambda \leftarrow (\lambda_{init}, s)$ ;  
        | **if**  $\text{compare}(\lambda, p_{data})$  **then**  
            | **return**  $\lambda$ ;  
        | **end**  
    | **end**  
**end**

---

Now let's draw our attention to some key takeaways of Algorithm 1. First note that we must maintain that the first element in  $\lambda$  must be  $\deg(p(x)) + 1$  since the degree of  $\binom{x+\lambda-i}{\lambda-1}$  is  $\lambda - 1$  and ensures we minimize the set of redundant searches.

From here, let's bring up some glaring set backs of the algorithm. First, note that the algorithm doesn't precisely tell you if  $p(x)$  is a Hilbert polynomial or not, it simply informs you if  $p(x)$  is a Hilbert polynomial up to an upper bound for the size of  $\lambda$ . This upper bound is necessary since if  $p(x)$  is not a Hilbert polynomial and an upper bound is not in place then Algorithm 1 will not terminate.

Now let's derive the complexity of the algorithm. First, we will let  $\mathcal{O}_b(n, k)$  be the complexity of computing the binomial coefficient  $\binom{n}{k}$ . This convention will be employed here since the computation of the binomial coefficients can be done directly or via the memoization of pascals triangle depending on memory considerations.

Next, let's determine the complexities of  $\text{compare}$  and  $\text{nonIncrSeqs}$  individually. The complexity of  $\text{compare}(\lambda, p_{data})$  is  $\mathcal{O}\left(\sum_{x=0}^{\deg(p(x))} \sum_{i=1}^{r=|\lambda|} \mathcal{O}_b(x + \lambda_i - i, \lambda_i - 1)\right)$

since for each data point  $x \in \{0, 1, \dots, \deg(p(x))\}$  we must compute  $\sum_{i=1}^{r=|\lambda|} \binom{x+\lambda_i-i}{\lambda_i-1}$ .

Next, to determine the complexity of  $nonIncrSeqs(m, n)$  it is important to note that the problem of computing non-increasing sequences can be re-framed as the problem of determining all possible non-integer solutions to  $x_1 + \dots + x_n = m$  or the weak composition of  $m$  into  $n$  parts where  $x_\ell$  is the number of times  $\ell$  occurs in the non-increasing sequence. The complexity of generating all such weak compositions is  $\mathcal{O}\left(m \cdot \binom{n+m-1}{m}\right)$  [6].

With the complexities of our subroutines determined, we can now determine the complexity of Algorithm 1. The complexity of  $nonIncrSeqs(j, n+1)$  is  $\mathcal{O}\left(j \cdot \binom{n+j+2}{j}\right)$  and considering this along with the complexity of  $compare(\lambda, p_{data})$  and the fact that  $|\lambda| = j+1$  in the inner loop this tells us that the complexity of the inner loop is  $\mathcal{O}\left(j \cdot \binom{\deg(p(x))+j+2}{j} \cdot \sum_{x=0}^{\deg(p(x))} \sum_{i=1}^{j+1} \mathcal{O}_b(x + \lambda_i - i, \lambda_i - 1)\right)$ . Finally, since the outer loop iterates from 1 to  $r_{max} - 1$  then we can conclude that the complexity of the whole algorithm is

$$\mathcal{O}\left(\sum_{j=1}^{r_{max}-1} \left[ j \cdot \binom{\deg(p(x))+j+2}{j} \cdot \sum_{x=0}^{\deg(p(x))} \sum_{i=1}^{j+1} \mathcal{O}_b(x + \lambda_i - i, \lambda_i - 1) \right]\right).$$

Overall, this leaves more to be desired in terms of efficiency. The study of discrete derivatives will subsequently come to our aid in addressing this.

### 3 Discrete Derivatives

Let  $k$  be a field containing  $\mathbb{Q}$ , so that  $\mathbb{N} \subseteq k$ . Then let  $S = k^{\mathbb{N}}$  be the ring of sequences  $(f(0), f(1), f(2), \dots)$  with entries in  $k$  where  $f : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow k$ , and addition and subtraction are defined entry-wise. A polynomial  $f \in k[x]$  defines a function  $k \rightarrow k$  and by restriction  $f|_{\mathbb{N}} : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow k$ . For  $f \in S$ , we define the  $k$ -linear operator  $\Delta : S \rightarrow S$  which we refer to as the discrete derivative:

$$(\Delta f)(x) = f(x+1) - f(x)$$

with zero entries filled in as appropriate. For example, if  $f = (18, 2, 8, 2, 11, \dots)$ , then

$$\Delta f = (-16, 6, -6, 9, \dots)$$

Before moving on, it is important to note that we refer to a sequence  $f \in S$  as a polynomial of degree  $d$  if there is a (necessarily unique) polynomial  $\hat{f} \in k[x]$  such that  $f = \hat{f}|_{\mathbb{N}}$ .

**Theorem 2.** Let  $f \in S$  be a sequence.

1.  $\Delta f = 0$  iff  $f$  is a constant sequence. Thus,  $\Delta f = \Delta g$  iff  $g = f + c$ , where  $c$  is a constant sequence.
2. If  $f$  is a polynomial of degree  $d > 0$ , then  $\Delta f$  is a polynomial of degree  $d - 1$ .
3. Let  $c$  be a constant sequence. For any  $n > 0$ , there is a polynomial  $g$  of degree  $n$  such that  $c = \Delta^n g$ .
4.  $\Delta^n f = 0$  iff  $f$  is a polynomial of degree  $< n$ .

*Proof.*

1. ( $\implies$ ) Suppose that  $\Delta f = 0$  and let's assume that  $f$  is not a constant sequence. That is, there exists an  $x$  such that  $f(x + 1) - f(x) \neq 0$  which is a contradiction.  
 ( $\impliedby$ ) Suppose that  $f$  is a constant sequence. This means that for every  $x$ ,  $f(x + 1) - f(x) = 0 \implies \Delta f = 0$ .  
 Furthermore, since  $\Delta$  is  $k$ -linear,  $\Delta f = \Delta g$  means that  $\Delta f - \Delta g = \Delta(f - g) = 0$  iff  $f - g = c$  for some constant  $c$ .
2. Let  $f$  be a polynomial of degree  $d > 0$ , say obtained by the restriction of  $a_0x^d + a_1x^{d-1} + \dots$  for  $a_0 \neq 0$ . We can compute the following.

$$\begin{aligned}
 (\Delta f)(x) &= f(x + 1) - f(x) \\
 &= a_0(x + 1)^d + a_1(x + 1)^{d-1} - a_0x^d - a_1x^{d-1} + [\text{lower degree terms}] \\
 &= a_0(x^d + dx^{d-1}) + a_1x^{d-1} - a_0x^d - a_1x^{d-1} + [\text{lower degree terms}] \\
 &= a_0dx^{d-1} + [\text{lower degree terms}]
 \end{aligned}$$

3. Let  $g_0$  be the sequence described by  $g_0 = x^n$ . By repeated application of (2),  $\Delta^n g_0$  is a constant sequence  $a$  (In fact,  $a = n!$ ). Let  $g(x) = \frac{c}{a}g_0(x)$  and we can see by  $k$ -linearity that  $\Delta^n g = c$ .
4. ( $\implies$ ) Suppose that  $\Delta^n f = 0$  and let's assume that  $f$  is a polynomial of degree  $d \geq n$ . By repeated application of (2) this implies that  $\Delta^d f = c$  for some non-zero constant  $c$  which is a contradiction.

(  $\Leftarrow$  ) Suppose that  $f$  is a polynomial of degree  $d < n$ . Then by repeated application of (2) we have that  $\Delta^d f = c$  for some non-zero constant  $c$  and by (1) we have that  $\Delta^{d+1} f = 0$ . Further, since  $d+1 \leq n$  and  $\Delta 0 = 0$  we have our desired result.

□

With these foundational concepts in mind, let's move onto the binomial sequences which we will find have some useful properties.

For each  $d \geq 0$ , define the  $d$ th binomial sequence  $B_d$  by

$$B_d(x) = \frac{x(x-1)\dots(x-(d-1))}{d!} = \binom{x}{d} \in k[x] \subseteq S.$$

By convention,  $B_0$  is the constant sequence equal to 1, and note that  $B_1(x) = x$ . We may write

$$B_d = \left( \underbrace{0, \dots, 0}_{d \text{ times}}, \binom{d}{d}, \binom{d+1}{d}, \binom{d+2}{d}, \binom{d+3}{d}, \dots \right).$$

For example,

$$B_2 = \left( 0, 0, \binom{2}{2}, \binom{3}{2}, \binom{4}{2}, \binom{5}{2}, \dots \right).$$

Next, so that we can swiftly cite it later on, we will remind the reader of the following well known theorem.

**Theorem 3.** *The binomial sequences are integer valued:  $B_d(\mathbb{Z}) \subseteq \mathbb{Z}$ .*

In addition to this, we will find that the following theorem will also provide invaluable utility when deriving the superior algorithm.

**Theorem 4.**  $\Delta B_d(x) = B_{d-1}(x)$

*Proof.* This can trivially be shown using Pascals rule.

$$\Delta B_d(x) = \binom{x+1}{d} - \binom{x}{d} = \binom{x}{d-1} = B_{d-1}(x)$$

□

## 4 Discrete Derivative Algorithm

Now that we have the necessary mechanisms in place from Section 3, let's derive the superior algorithm. First, let's repackage the integer partition into the following form (which has been employed in other literature as well [7]).

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda &= (\lambda_1^{r_1}, \lambda_2^{r_2}, \dots, \lambda_e^{r_e}) \\ &= \underbrace{(\lambda_1, \lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_1)}_{r_1 \text{ times}}, \underbrace{(\lambda_2, \lambda_2, \dots, \lambda_2)}_{r_2 \text{ times}}, \dots, \underbrace{(\lambda_e, \lambda_e, \dots, \lambda_e)}_{r_e \text{ times}} \end{aligned}$$

Where  $\lambda_1 > \lambda_2 > \dots > \lambda_e$  and the size of  $\lambda$  is  $r = r_1 + r_2 + \dots + r_e$ .

With this new notation, we can now say that if  $h(x)$  is a Hilbert polynomial then

$$h(x) = \sum_{i=1}^{r_1} \binom{x + \lambda_1 - i}{\lambda_1 - 1} + \sum_{i=r_1+1}^{r_1+r_2} \binom{x + \lambda_2 - i}{\lambda_2 - 1} + \dots + \sum_{i=r-r_e+1}^r \binom{x + \lambda_e - i}{\lambda_e - 1}.$$

From here, the general idea of the superior algorithm is fairly straightforward. If we consider the sequence  $h \in S$  generated by  $h(x)$  then by Theorem 4 and  $k$ -linearity we know that  $\Delta^{\lambda_1-1}h = r_1$ . With this in mind, we count how many times ( $\lambda^*$ ) we apply  $\Delta$  until we are left with a constant sequence  $r$  and subtract the contribution  $\sum_{i=1}^r \binom{x+\lambda^*-i}{\lambda^*-1}$  leaving us with a new polynomial sequence in which we apply the same procedure. In practice however, if the user provides a polynomial  $p(x)$  with degree  $n$  then we begin by allocating a vector of length  $n + 1$  with values  $\{p(0), p(1), p(2), \dots, p(n)\}$  and we know that the sequence after an arbitrary number of discrete derivatives will have a unique polynomial associated with it due to the polynomial interpolation theorem and Theorem 2(2).

With the above framework in place, let's begin in formalizing the superior algorithm by defining some subroutines. First, we define the trivial method *notConstant*( $p, end$ ) which returns *true* if the sequence  $\{p(0), p(1), \dots, p(end)\}$  is constant (or of size 1) and *false* otherwise. Next, we shall define the *reduce*( $p$ ) which applies  $\Delta$  to the polynomial sequence  $p$  until we are left with a non-zero constant sequence.

---

**Algorithm 2:** *reduce*( $p, n$ )

---

**Input:**  $p$ : Polynomial sequence.

**Input:**  $n$ :  $\text{size}(p) - 1$ .

**Output:**  $m$ : The minimum number of times  $\Delta$  must be applied to  $p$  so that  $\Delta^m p = c$  for some constant  $c$ .

**Output:**  $c$ : The value of the constant sequence  $\Delta^m p = c$ .

$counter \leftarrow 0$ ;

$end \leftarrow n$ ;

**while** *notConstant*( $p, end$ ) **do**

**for**  $i = 0 : end - 1$  **do**

$p(x) \leftarrow p(x + 1) - p(x)$ ;

**end**

$counter \leftarrow counter + 1$ ;

$end \leftarrow end - 1$ ;

**end**

**return** ( $counter, p(0)$ );

---

For the sake of addressing some potential concerns it is important to note that if the user passes in a polynomial sequence  $p$ , a positive integer  $n$  and  $n$  is the degree of  $p$  then the above routine will exit after *notConstant* checks a sequence of size 1 due to repeated application of Theorem 2(2). By the same argument, in cases where  $\text{deg}(p) < n$  we know that the robustness of the algorithm is also not affected with the only difference being that the *reduce* method will return after the *notConstant* routine checks a sequence of size greater than 1. In fact, we will later find that in the context of the superior recovery algorithm, these are the only possible use cases.

Next, we define the method *subtract*( $p, n, \lambda, start, end$ ) which for  $x \in \{0, 1, \dots, n\}$  subtracts  $\sum_{i=start}^{end} \binom{x+\lambda-i}{\lambda-1}$  from  $p(x)$  and returns the resulting sequence.

Finally, let's define the method *isIntegerSeq*( $p$ ) simply as the method which returns *true* if all the elements in the sequence are in  $\mathbb{Z}$  and returns *false* otherwise. In the final formalization of the superior algorithm, *isIntegerSeq* along with one other check will be used to verify that the polynomial provided by the user is in fact a Hilbert polynomial. With all the subroutines in place, let's define the superior recovery routine.



---

**Algorithm 3:** Discrete Derivative Recovery Algorithm

---

**Input:**  $p(x) \in \mathbb{Q}[x]$   
**Output:**  $\lambda$  if  $p(x)$  is a Hilbert polynomial and *false* otherwise.  
 $n \leftarrow \deg(p(x));$   
 $p \leftarrow \{p(0), p(1), \dots, p(n)\};$   
 $\lambda \leftarrow ();$   
 $s \leftarrow 1;$   
 $e \leftarrow 0;$   
**if**  $isIntegerSeq(p) == false$  **then**  
    | **return** *false*;  
**end**  
**while**  $p \neq \vec{0}$  **do**  
    |  $p^* \leftarrow p;$   
    |  $(m, r) \leftarrow reduce(p^*, n);$   
    | **if**  $r < 0$  **then**  
    |    | **return** *false*;  
    |    **end**  
    |  $\lambda \leftarrow (\lambda, (m + 1)^r);$   
    |  $e \leftarrow s + r - 1;$   
    |  $p \leftarrow subtract(p, n, m + 1, s, e);$   
    |  $s \leftarrow s + r;$   
**end**  
**return**  $\lambda;$

---

Now that the algorithm has been defined, let's address some potential questions regarding the algorithm. First, let's address the first "if" statement in the algorithm. This check addresses two concerns. The first being that by Theorem 3 it must be the case that if  $p(x)$  is a Hilbert polynomial then  $\forall x \in \mathbb{Z}, p(x) \in \mathbb{Z}$ . Furthermore, simply checking the values  $\{p(0), p(1), \dots, p(\deg(p(x)))\}$  is sufficient enough due to the following theorem.

**Theorem 5.** [2] *A degree  $n$  polynomial with rational coefficients is integer-valued iff it takes integer values on  $n + 1$  consecutive integer values.*

In addition to the previously mentioned concern, the first "if" statements also addresses ideas surrounding the following theorem.

**Theorem 6.** Let  $(m, r) = \text{reduce}(p, n)$  where  $p$  is an polynomial sequence with values in  $\mathbb{Q}$ . If  $r \in \mathbb{Q} \setminus \mathbb{Z}$  then at least one of the values in  $\{p(0), \dots, p(n)\}$  must be in  $\mathbb{Q} \setminus \mathbb{Z}$ .

*Proof.* Suppose that  $r \in \mathbb{Q} \setminus \mathbb{Z}$  and let's assume that all the values in  $\{p(0), \dots, p(n)\}$  are in  $\mathbb{Z}$  then since  $\mathbb{Z}$  is a subring of  $\mathbb{Q}$ , and *reduce* generates  $r$  by simply subtracting elements in  $p$  from other elements in  $p$  then  $r \in \mathbb{Z}$  which is a contradiction.  $\square$

The importance of this theorem is realized when we note that the leading coefficient of a Hilbert polynomial  $h(x)$  is  $\frac{r}{(\lambda_i - 1)!}$  for some positive integer  $r$  and by the observations in the proof of Theorem 2(3) we know that the second value in the tuple returned by the *reduce*( $h, n$ ) method is  $r$ . It is also important to note that checking if  $p$  is all integers is only needed in the beginning of the algorithm since if that is the case then  $p$  will remain integer valued due to the *subtract* method only subtracting integer contributions from  $p$ .

Moreover, the check for  $r < 0$  in the “if” statement inside the “while” loop is needed since as we mentioned earlier, the leading coefficient of a Hilbert polynomial must be a *positive* integer multiple of  $\frac{1}{(\lambda_1 - 1)!}$ .

Next, let's analyze the complexity of this algorithm by first noting that we cannot derive the average case complexity since we must concede to the fact that the distribution of Hilbert polynomials in  $\mathbb{Q}[x]$  is not precisely known. However, we can derive the worst case complexity. This occurs when  $p(x)$  is a Hilbert polynomial and the  $\lambda$  which generates it is  $((\deg(p(x)) + 1)^{r_1}, (\deg(p(x)))^{r_2}, (\deg(p(x)) - 1)^{r_3}, (\deg(p(x)) - 2)^{r_4}, \dots, 1^{r_{\deg(p(x))+1}})$ . To derive the worst case complexity, we begin by noting that the complexity of *reduce*( $p^*, n$ ) is  $\mathcal{O}(\deg(p^*)^2)$ . Furthermore, the complexity of *subtract*( $p, n, m + 1, j, r$ ) is  $\sum_{x=0}^n \sum_{i=j}^r \mathcal{O}_b(x + m + 1 - i, m + 1 - 1) = \sum_{x=0}^n \sum_{i=j}^r \mathcal{O}_b(x + m + 1 - i, m)$ . Next, in the context of the worst case  $\lambda$ , we can rewrite the “while” loop as a “for” loop from  $k = \deg(p(x)) + 1$  down to  $k = 1$ . In considering this, within a single iteration, the complexity of *reduce*( $p^*, n$ ) becomes  $\mathcal{O}(k^2)$  and the complexity of *subtract*( $p, n, m + 1, j, r$ ) is what we derived above but  $m + 1$  is exchanged for  $k$  and  $r$  is exchanged for  $r_{\deg(p(x))+1-k+1} = r_{\deg(p(x))+2-k}$ . All in all, the worst case complexity of this algorithm is

$$\mathcal{O} \left( \sum_{k=1}^{\deg(p(x))+1} \left[ \mathcal{O}(k^2) + \sum_{x=0}^n \sum_{i=j}^{r_{\deg(p(x))+2-k}} \mathcal{O}_b(x + k - i, k - 1) \right] \right).$$

When comparing the above expression to the complexity of the naive algorithm, it is important to remark that  $r_i$  is not known a priori. However, provided that the user inputs a large enough  $r_{max}$  to recover  $\lambda$ , the naive algorithm has to compute the binomial coefficients associated with the correct  $\lambda$  as well as all candidate  $\lambda$ , whereas the discrete derivative algorithm only computes the binomial coefficients associated with the correct  $\lambda$ .

## 5 Conclusions

In this paper, we began by considering a fairly basic and naive  $\lambda$  recovery algorithm which we found had some very harsh limitations. From there, we reviewed the topic of polynomial sequences, discrete derivatives, and some useful properties of binomial sequences. Finally, by utilizing discrete derivatives, we then devised a robust algorithm whose worst case complexity is a considerable improvement over the complexity of the naive algorithm.

## References

- [1] ALBERELLI, D., AND LELLA, P. Strongly stable ideals and Hilbert polynomials. *J. Softw. Algebra Geom.* 9 (2019), 1–9.
- [2] CAHEN, P.-J., AND CHABERT, J.-L. What You Should Know About Integer-Valued Polynomials. *The American Mathematical Monthly* 123, 4 (2016), 311–337.
- [3] DONATO, J., LEWIS, M., RYAN, T., UDRENAS, F., AND ZHANG, Z. The Sum of the Betti Numbers of Smooth Hilbert Schemes. *Journal of Algebraic Combinatorics* 55, 2 (Mar 2022), 393–411.
- [4] GRAYSON, D. R., AND STILLMAN, M. E. Macaulay2, a Software System for Research in Algebraic Geometry. Available at <http://www.math.uiuc.edu/Macaulay2/>.
- [5] MACAULAY, F. S. Some Properties of Enumeration in the Theory of Modular Systems. *Proc. London Math. Soc. (2)* 26 (1927), 531–555.
- [6] PAGE, D. R. Generalized Algorithm for Restricted Weak Composition Generation. *Journal of Mathematical Modelling and Algorithms in Operations Research* 12, 4 (Dec 2013), 345–372.

- [7] SKJELNES, R., AND SMITH, G. G. Smooth Hilbert Schemes: Their Classification and Geometry. *Journal für die reine und angewandte Mathematik (Crelles Journal)* 2023, 794 (2023), 281–305.