

NON-DEFECTIVITY OF SEGRE-VERONESE VARIETIES

HIROTACHI ABO, MARIA CHIARA BRAMBILLA, FRANCESCO GALUPPI,
AND ALESSANDRO ONETO

ABSTRACT. We prove that Segre-Veronese varieties are never secant defective if each degree is at least three. The proof is by induction on the number of factors, degree and dimension. As a corollary, we give an almost optimal non-defectivity result for Segre-Veronese varieties with one degree equal to one and all the others at least three.

1. INTRODUCTION

A *Segre-Veronese variety*, the embedding of a multi-projective space by a very ample line bundle, parameterizes the rank-one partially symmetric tensors, and the compactification of the space parameterizing those with partially symmetric rank at most m is called the m -th secant variety of the Segre-Veronese variety. This paper concerns the problem of classifying the so-called *defective* secant varieties of Segre-Veronese varieties, the ones with dimension smaller than expected. This problem is very classical and has its roots in XIX century algebraic geometry (see [BCC⁺18]). On the other hand, it is closely related to partially symmetric tensor rank, partially symmetric tensor border rank, simultaneous rank, and partially symmetric tensor decompositions, as well as their uniqueness, that are relevant topics to many branches of modern applied sciences, see [Lan11]. Hence, it has the potential to impact a variety of areas, including mathematics, computer science, and statistics.

Our goal is to establish non-defectivity for a large family of Segre-Veronese varieties. The simplest examples of Segre-Veronese varieties are Veronese varieties, whose defectivity is completely understood due to the celebrated theorem by J. Alexander and A. Hirschowitz [AH95]. Beyond Veronese varieties, this classification problem, however, is still far from complete.

Some cases are better understood than the others. For example, the conjecturally complete list of defective secant varieties for Segre-Veronese varieties with two factors was suggested by M. C. Brambilla and H. Abo in [AB13]. Significant progress towards this conjecture was made by F. Galuppi and A. Oneto in [GO22]: they proved that if the bi-projective space is embedded by a linear system of degree at least three in both factors, then its secant varieties are all non-defective. In this paper, we extend this result to an arbitrary number of factors.

M. V. Catalisano, A. T. Geramita, and A. Gimigliano carried out the first systematic study of the secant varieties of Segre-Veronese varieties in two papers [CGG05, CGG08]. In these papers, they discovered many defective cases, including *unbalanced cases* (where one of the factors of the multi-projective space has a much larger dimension than the rest). Several of these defective cases were later generalized by H. Abo and M. C. Brambilla [AB12], as well as A. Laface, A. Massaranti, and R. Richter [LMR22].

Regarding the secant non-defectivity, A. Laface and E. Postinghel in [LP13] employed toric approaches to show that the secant varieties of Segre-Veronese varieties of an arbitrary number of copies of the projective line are never defective. E. Ballico [Bal23] and E. Ballico, A. Bernardi, and T. Mańdziuk [BBM23] proved non-defectivity for more families of Segre-Veronese varieties, with some assumptions on the dimensions.

C. Araujo, A. Massarenti, and R. Rischter [AMR19] developed a new approach using osculating projections and obtained an asymptotic bound under which the secant varieties of Segre-Veronese varieties always have the expected dimensions. Their bound was improved by A. Laface, A. Massarenti, and R. Rischter [LMR22].

Very recently, A. Taveira Blomenhofer and A. Casarotti [BC23] significantly improved the bound from [LMR22] showing that most secant varieties of Segre-Veronese varieties are not defective. However, there is still a range of values of m for which the non-defectivity of the m -th secant variety of a Segre-Veronese variety is not known. As the longevity of the classification problem of the defective cases suggests, making this final stretch is difficult. The primary goal of this paper is to fill this gap for Segre-Veronese varieties embedded with degree at least three in all factors. In the remaining part of this introduction, we introduce basic notation and state our main results.

For given k -tuples $\mathbf{n} = (n_1, n_2, \dots, n_k)$ and $\mathbf{d} = (d_1, d_2, \dots, d_k)$ of positive integers, we write $\mathbb{P}^{\mathbf{n}}$ for $\mathbb{P}^{n_1} \times \mathbb{P}^{n_2} \times \dots \times \mathbb{P}^{n_k}$ and $\text{SV}_{\mathbf{n}}^{\mathbf{d}}$ for the Segre-Veronese variety obtained by embedding $\mathbb{P}^{\mathbf{n}}$ by the morphism associated with its complete linear system $|\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^{\mathbf{n}}}(\mathbf{d})|$. The closure of the union of secant $(m-1)$ -planes to $\text{SV}_{\mathbf{n}}^{\mathbf{d}}$ is called the m -th secant variety of $\text{SV}_{\mathbf{n}}^{\mathbf{d}}$ and denoted by $\sigma_m(\text{SV}_{\mathbf{n}}^{\mathbf{d}})$. We say that it is non-defective if it is not m -defective for any positive integer m , that is, if $\sigma_m(\text{SV}_{\mathbf{n}}^{\mathbf{d}})$ has dimension equal to the expected one defined by a naïve parameter count, see Section 2 for explicit definitions.

Theorem 1.1. *Let $k \geq 3$. If $d_1, d_2, \dots, d_k \geq 3$, then $\text{SV}_{\mathbf{n}}^{\mathbf{d}}$ is not defective.*

The proof of this theorem, presented in Section 3, is an application of the *differential Horace method*, which enables us to show the secant non-defectivity of a Segre-Veronese variety by induction on dimension and degree. This type of approach often leads to a complicated nested induction. The significance of this paper is to overcome this complication and to give a clean proof.

As a consequence of Theorem 1.1, we deduce an almost optimal non-defectivity result for Segre-Veronese variety having one factor embedded in degree 1 and all the others at least three.

Theorem 1.2. *Let $k \geq 2$, let $\mathbf{n} = (n_1, n_2, \dots, n_k)$, $\mathbf{d} = (d_1, d_2, \dots, d_k)$ be k -tuples of positive integers, let $|\mathbf{n}| = \sum_{i=1}^k n_i$, and let $N_{\mathbf{n}, \mathbf{d}} = \prod_{i=1}^k \binom{n_i + d_i}{n_i}$. If $d_1, d_2, \dots, d_k \geq 3$ and if*

$$m \leq (n_0 + 1) \left\lfloor \frac{N_{\mathbf{n}, \mathbf{d}}}{n_0 + |\mathbf{n}| + 1} \right\rfloor \quad \text{or} \quad m \geq (n_0 + 1) \left\lceil \frac{N_{\mathbf{n}, \mathbf{d}}}{n_0 + |\mathbf{n}| + 1} \right\rceil,$$

then $\text{SV}_{(n_0, \mathbf{n})}^{(1, \mathbf{d})}$ is not m -defective.

The proof, presented in Section 4, is based on an inductive method which allows to deduce non-defectivity results for a Segre product $\mathbb{P}^n \times X$ from the non-defectivity of the algebraic variety X , see Proposition 4.1. It is worth noting that Theorem 1.2 is stronger than [BC23, Theorem 4.8] for these specific multidegrees, see Remark 4.6 for more details.

While the rank of a tensor tells us about the length of a minimal decomposition as a sum of rank-one elements, identifiability is the uniqueness of such decomposition. For applied purposes it is very important to know when the Segre-Veronese variety is identifiable, namely when the general partially symmetric tensor has a unique decomposition. Thanks to [MM22, Theorem 1.5], the non-defectivity of a variety has direct consequences on its identifiability, so we immediately get the following corollaries of Theorems 1.1 and 1.2.

Corollary 1.3. *Let $k \geq 2$, let $\mathbf{n}, \mathbf{d} \in \mathbb{N}^k$ be tuples of positive integers with $d_1, d_2, \dots, d_k \geq 3$, and let $N_{\mathbf{n}, \mathbf{d}} = \prod_{i=1}^k \binom{n_i + d_i}{n_i}$.*

- (1) If $m(|\mathbf{n}| + 1) \leq N_{\mathbf{n},\mathbf{d}}$, then $\text{SV}_{\mathbf{n}}^{\mathbf{d}}$ is $(m - 1)$ -identifiable.
- (2) If $m \leq (n_0 + 1) \left\lfloor \frac{N_{\mathbf{n},\mathbf{d}}}{n_0 + |\mathbf{n}| + 1} \right\rfloor$, then $\text{SV}_{(n_0, \mathbf{n})}^{(1, \mathbf{d})}$ is $(m - 1)$ -identifiable.

In order to complete the classification of Segre-Veronese varieties, it remains to solve the cases in which one of the degrees is 1 or 2. A major difficulty here is that, besides the unbalanced ones, several defective cases are known, and it is complicated to shape a general inductive strategy that avoids them. We underline that all known balanced defective cases appear when the number of factors is four or less. For this reason, we want to explicitly draw attention to the following question.

Question. *Is it true that the only defective cases for Segre-Veronese varieties with at least five factors are the unbalanced cases?*

During the final part of the preparation of the present manuscript, E. Ballico privately informed us that he independently obtained a result similar to [Theorem 1.1](#).

Acknowledgements. This project started during the semester AGATES in Warsaw, and it is partially supported by the Thematic Research Programme Tensors: geometry, complexity and quantum entanglement, University of Warsaw, Excellence Initiative – Research University and the Simons Foundation Award No. 663281 granted to the Institute of Mathematics of the Polish Academy of Sciences for the years 2021-2023.

We would also like to thank the University of Trento and the Università Politecnica delle Marche, Ancona, for hosting us during our research visits.

M. C. Brambilla and A. Oneto are members of INdAM-GNSAGA and have been funded by the European Union under NextGenerationEU. PRIN 2022 Prot. n. 2022ZRRL4C and Prot. n. 20223B5S8L, respectively. Views and opinions expressed are however those of the author(s) only and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union or European Commission. Neither the European Union nor the granting authority can be held responsible for them.



Finanziato
dall'Unione europea
NextGenerationEU



Ministero
dell'Università
e della Ricerca



Italiadomani
PIANO NAZIONALE
DI RIPRESA E RESILIENZA



UNIVERSITÀ
DI TRENTO

2. TOOLS AND BACKGROUND

We work over an algebraically closed field \mathbb{k} of characteristic zero.

Given an algebraic variety $X \subset \mathbb{P}^N$, the m -th secant variety

$$\sigma_m(X) = \overline{\bigcup_{x_1, \dots, x_m \in X} \langle x_1, \dots, x_m \rangle} \subset \mathbb{P}^N.$$

of $X \subset \mathbb{P}^N$ is the Zariski-closure of the union of all linear spaces spanned by m points of X .

The notion of *expected dimension* of $\sigma_m(X) \subset \mathbb{P}^N$ follows from a straightforward parameter count:

$$\exp. \dim \sigma_m(X) = \min\{N, m \dim(X) + m - 1\}.$$

It is immediate to see that this is always an upper bound for the actual dimension: we say that X is m -defective if $\dim \sigma_m(X) < \exp. \dim \sigma_m(X)$.

Let us fix some notation we will use throughout the paper.

Notation 2.1. Let $\mathbf{a} = (a_1, \dots, a_k)$, $\mathbf{b} = (b_1, \dots, b_k) \in \mathbb{N}^k$:

- For any $j \in \mathbb{N}$, we write $\mathbf{a}(j) = (a_1 - j, a_2, \dots, a_k)$.
- We write $\mathbf{a} \succeq \mathbf{b}$ if $a_i \geq b_i \forall i \in \{1, \dots, k\}$.
- We write $|\mathbf{a}| = a_1 + \dots + a_k$.

If $\mathbf{n} = (n_1, \dots, n_k)$ and $\mathbf{d} = (d_1, \dots, d_k)$ are k -tuples of positive integers, then we set

$$N_{\mathbf{n}, \mathbf{d}} = \prod_{i=1}^k \binom{n_i + d_i}{d_i}$$

and we define

$$r^*(\mathbf{n}, \mathbf{d}) = \left\lceil \frac{N_{\mathbf{n}, \mathbf{d}}}{|\mathbf{n}| + 1} \right\rceil \quad \text{and} \quad r_*(\mathbf{n}, \mathbf{d}) = \left\lfloor \frac{N_{\mathbf{n}, \mathbf{d}}}{|\mathbf{n}| + 1} \right\rfloor. \quad (2.1)$$

Remark 2.2. The two values defined in (2.1) are *critical* in the following sense:

- $r^*(\mathbf{n}, \mathbf{d})$ is the smallest integer m such that the m -th secant varieties is expected to fill the ambient space, namely it is expected to have dimension $N_{\mathbf{n}, \mathbf{d}} - 1$. Since $\dim \sigma_m(X)$ is increasing with respect to m , if $\text{SV}_{\mathbf{n}}^{\mathbf{d}}$ is not $r^*(\mathbf{n}, \mathbf{d})$ -defective then it is not m -defective for any $m \geq r^*(\mathbf{n}, \mathbf{d})$. For these values of m we say that $\sigma_m(\text{SV}_{\mathbf{n}}^{\mathbf{d}})$ is *superabundant*.
- $r_*(\mathbf{n}, \mathbf{d})$ is the largest integer m such that the m -th secant varieties is expected to have dimension equal to the parameter count $m(|\mathbf{n}| + 1) - 1$. Since the difference of the dimensions of two consecutive secant varieties of $\text{SV}_{\mathbf{n}}^{\mathbf{d}}$ is at most $|\mathbf{n}| + 1$, if $\text{SV}_{\mathbf{n}}^{\mathbf{d}}$ is not $r_*(\mathbf{n}, \mathbf{d})$ -defective then it is not m -defective for any $m \leq r_*(\mathbf{n}, \mathbf{d})$. For these values of m we say that $\sigma_m(\text{SV}_{\mathbf{n}}^{\mathbf{d}})$ is *subabundant*.

Therefore, in order to prove that a Segre-Veronese variety $\text{SV}_{\mathbf{n}}^{\mathbf{d}}$ is never defective, it is enough to prove non-defectiveness at the critical values.

The *Horace method* is an inductive approach that goes back to G. Castelnuovo and was improved by J. Alexander and A. Hirschowitz, leading to the classification of defective Veronese varieties. This is a degeneration technique to study the dimension of complete linear systems of divisors with base points in general position with some multiplicities. We refer to [BCC⁺18, section 2.2] for a detailed presentation of the method and its extensions. For the purpose of the present paper, we will employ the Horace method in the following formulation.

Theorem 2.3 ([AB13, Theorem 1.1]). *Let $\mathbf{n}, \mathbf{d} \in \mathbb{N}^k$ be such that $d_1 \geq 3$ and let $r \in \mathbb{N}$. Let*

$$s_r = s_r(\mathbf{n}, \mathbf{d}) = \left\lfloor \frac{(|\mathbf{n}| + 1)r - N_{\mathbf{n}, \mathbf{d}(1)}}{|\mathbf{n}|} \right\rfloor \quad \text{and} \\ \epsilon_r = \epsilon_r(\mathbf{n}, \mathbf{d}) = (|\mathbf{n}| + 1)r - N_{\mathbf{n}, \mathbf{d}(1)} - |\mathbf{n}|s_r(\mathbf{n}, \mathbf{d}).$$

If all the following conditions are satisfied:

- (1) $\text{SV}_{\mathbf{n}(1)}^{\mathbf{d}}$ is not s_r -defective;
- (2) $\text{SV}_{\mathbf{n}}^{\mathbf{d}(1)}$ is not $(r - s_r)$ -defective and $s_r \geq \epsilon_r$;
- (3) $\text{SV}_{\mathbf{n}}^{\mathbf{d}(2)}$ is not $(r - s_r - \epsilon_r)$ -defective and $(r - s_r - \epsilon_r)(|\mathbf{n}| + 1) \geq N_{\mathbf{n}, \mathbf{d}(2)}$;

then $\text{SV}_{\mathbf{n}}^{\mathbf{d}}$ is not r -defective.

Remark 2.4. The numerical assumption in condition (2) guarantees that $\sigma_{r-s_r}(\text{SV}_{\mathbf{n}}^{\mathbf{d}(1)})$ is a subabundant case. On the contrary, the numerical condition (3) affirms that $\sigma_{r-s_r-\epsilon_r}(\text{SV}_{\mathbf{n}}^{\mathbf{d}(2)})$ is a superabundant case.

While it may be difficult to prove that a variety is not defective, in the literature several varieties have been proven to be not m -defective when m is sufficiently far from the critical ones. One example is [BC23], where A. Blumenhofer and A. Casarotti generalize a result by B. Ådlandsvik [Åd88] and prove non-defectivity for varieties that are invariant under the action of a group G and contained in irreducible G -module. The precise statement that we need in the case of Segre-Veronese varieties is the following.

Theorem 2.5 ([BC23, Theorem 4.8]). *Let $\mathbf{n}, \mathbf{d} \in \mathbb{N}^k$. If $m \leq r_*(\mathbf{n}, \mathbf{d}) - |\mathbf{n}| - 1$ or $m \geq r^*(\mathbf{n}, \mathbf{d}) + |\mathbf{n}| + 1$, then $\mathrm{SV}_{\mathbf{n}}^{\mathbf{d}}$ is not m -defective.*

3. PROOF OF THEOREM 1.1

We prove [Theorem 1.1](#) by induction on the number k of factors, on the dimension n_1 and on the degree d_1 . First we give the necessary results to deal with the base case for $n_1 = 1$ and two base cases for $d_1 \in \{3, 4\}$.

We recall the following result by E. Ballico.

Theorem 3.1 ([Bal23, Theorem 2]). *Let $X \subset \mathbb{P}^N$ be an irreducible non-degenerate variety with $\dim(X) \geq 3$. Let*

$$r = \left\lfloor \frac{N+1}{\dim(X)} \right\rfloor$$

and assume that X is not r -defective. Let $d \geq 2$ and consider $Y = \mathbb{P}^1 \times X$ embedded in $\mathbb{P}^{(d+1)(N+1)-1}$ by the line bundle $\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^1}(d) \otimes \mathcal{O}_X(1)$. If $N+1 > \dim(X)^2$, then Y is not defective.

By applying this theorem, we prove a technical result that will be useful in the proof of [Theorem 1.1](#).

Corollary 3.2. *Let $k \geq 2$. Let $\mathbf{n}' = (n_2, \dots, n_k)$ and $\mathbf{d}' = (d_2, \dots, d_k) \succeq 3^{k-1}$ be $(k-1)$ -tuples of positive integers. If $\mathrm{SV}_{\mathbf{n}'}^{\mathbf{d}'}$ is not defective and $d_1 \geq 2$, then $\mathrm{SV}_{(1, \mathbf{n}')}^{(d_1, \mathbf{d}'})$ is never defective.*

Proof. We start by proving that

$$\prod_{i=2}^k \binom{n_i + d_i}{n_i} > (n_2 + \dots + n_k)^2. \quad (3.1)$$

The left-hand-side is increasing with respect to d_2, \dots, d_k , so it is enough to prove (3.1) for $\mathbf{d} = 3^{k-1}$. On the left-hand-side n_i^2 appears with coefficient 1, while $n_i n_j$ ($i \neq j$) appears with coefficient $11^2/6^2 > 2$.

If $k = 2$ and $n_2 = n_3 = 1$, then $\mathrm{SV}_{(1,1,1)}^{(d_1, d_2, d_3)}$ is not defective by [LP13, Theorem 3.1]. In any other case we have $n_2 + \dots + n_k \geq 3$, so we can apply [Theorem 3.1](#) to the variety $X = \mathrm{SV}_{\mathbf{n}'}^{\mathbf{d}'}$, which is not defective by hypothesis. \square

In [Theorem 2.3](#) there are no assumptions about the order of the d_i 's and the n_i 's. Up to permuting the factors, it is not restrictive to suppose that $n_1 \leq n_2 \leq \dots \leq n_k$. This is crucial for some of our numerical computations.

Now we deal with the case $d_1 = 3$. In order to make our arguments easier to read, we postpone some of the arithmetic computations to [Appendix A](#).

Proposition 3.3. *Let $k \geq 2$ and let $\mathbf{n}' = (n_2 \leq n_3 \leq \dots \leq n_k)$ and $\mathbf{d}' = (d_2, d_3, \dots, d_k) \succeq 3^{k-1}$ be $(k-1)$ -tuples of positive integers. If $\mathrm{SV}_{\mathbf{n}'}^{\mathbf{d}'}$ is not defective and n_1 is a positive integer, then $\mathrm{SV}_{(n_1, \mathbf{n}')}^{(3, \mathbf{d}'})$ is not defective.*

Proof. We argue by induction on n_1 . The initial case $n_1 = 1$ is [Corollary 3.2](#). For $n_1 \geq 2$, we prove that $\text{SV}_{\mathbf{n}}^{\mathbf{d}}$ is not r -defective for the critical values $r \in \{r_*(\mathbf{n}, \mathbf{d}), r^*(\mathbf{n}, \mathbf{d})\}$ by applying [Theorem 2.3](#). We check all conditions:

- (1) $\text{SV}_{\mathbf{n}(1)}^{\mathbf{d}}$ is not defective by our inductive hypothesis on n_1 .
- (2) By [Lemma A.1](#), $r - s_r \leq r_*(\mathbf{n}, \mathbf{d}(1)) - |\mathbf{n}| - 1$, so $\text{SV}_{\mathbf{n}}^{\mathbf{d}(1)}$ is not $(r - s_r)$ -defective by [Theorem 2.5](#). The numerical condition [Theorem 2.3\(2\)](#) is [Lemma A.2](#).
- (3) By [Lemma A.3](#), $r - s_r - \epsilon_r \geq r^*(\mathbf{n}, \mathbf{d}(2)) + |\mathbf{n}| + 1$, so $\text{SV}_{\mathbf{n}}^{\mathbf{d}(2)}$ is not $(r - s_r - \epsilon_r)$ -defective by [Theorem 2.5](#). The numerical condition [Theorem 2.3\(3\)](#) also follows from [Lemma A.3](#), because $r^*(\mathbf{n}, \mathbf{d}(2)) + |\mathbf{n}| + 1 \geq \frac{N_{\mathbf{n}, \mathbf{d}(2)}}{|\mathbf{n}|+1}$. \square

Next we consider the case $d_1 = 4$. The proof is very similar to the previous one. The only difference is that we apply [Proposition 3.3](#) to check the second condition in the [Theorem 2.3](#).

Proposition 3.4. *Let $k \geq 2$ and let $\mathbf{n}' = (n_2 \leq n_3 \leq \dots \leq n_k)$ and $\mathbf{d}' = (d_2, d_3, \dots, d_k) \succeq 3^{k-1}$ be $(k-1)$ -tuples of positive integers. If $\text{SV}_{\mathbf{n}'}^{\mathbf{d}'}$ is not defective and n_1 is a positive integer, then $\text{SV}_{(n_1, \mathbf{n}')}^{(4, \mathbf{d}')}$ is not defective.*

Proof. We argue by induction on n_1 . The initial case $n_1 = 1$ is [Corollary 3.2](#). For $n_1 \geq 2$, we prove that $\text{SV}_{\mathbf{n}}^{\mathbf{d}}$ is not r -defective for $r \in \{r_*(\mathbf{n}, \mathbf{d}), r^*(\mathbf{n}, \mathbf{d})\}$ by applying [Theorem 2.3](#). We check all conditions:

- (1) $\text{SV}_{\mathbf{n}(1)}^{\mathbf{d}}$ is not defective by the inductive hypothesis.
- (2) $\text{SV}_{\mathbf{n}}^{\mathbf{d}(1)}$ is not defective by [Proposition 3.3](#). The numerical condition [Theorem 2.3\(2\)](#) is [Lemma A.2](#).
- (3) By [Lemma A.3](#), we have $r - s_r - \epsilon_r \geq r^*(\mathbf{n}, \mathbf{d}(2)) + |\mathbf{n}| + 1$, so $\text{SV}_{\mathbf{n}}^{\mathbf{d}(2)}$ is not $(r - s_r - \epsilon_r)$ -defective by [Theorem 2.5](#). The numerical condition [Theorem 2.3\(3\)](#) also follows from [Lemma A.3](#), because $r^*(\mathbf{n}, \mathbf{d}(2)) + |\mathbf{n}| + 1 \geq \frac{N_{\mathbf{n}, \mathbf{d}(2)}}{|\mathbf{n}|+1}$. \square

Proof of Theorem 1.1. As we pointed out, without loss of generality we may assume that $n_1 \leq n_2 \leq \dots \leq n_k$. We argue by induction on $k \geq 2$. The base case $k = 2$ is [[GO22](#), Theorem 1.2]. We assume that $k \geq 3$ and that $\text{SV}_{n_2, \dots, n_k}^{d_2, \dots, d_k}$ is not defective, and we prove that $\text{SV}_{\mathbf{n}}^{\mathbf{d}}$ is not defective. We proceed by one-step induction on n_1 and by two-step induction on d_1 . The base case $n_1 = 1$ is a consequence of [Corollary 3.2](#), while the base cases $d_1 \in \{3, 4\}$ follow from [Propositions 3.3](#) and [3.4](#). Now we suppose that $n_1 \geq 2$, $d_1 \geq 5$ and we assume that $\text{SV}_{\mathbf{n}(1)}^{\mathbf{d}}$, $\text{SV}_{\mathbf{n}}^{\mathbf{d}(1)}$ and $\text{SV}_{\mathbf{n}}^{\mathbf{d}(2)}$ are not defective. Thanks to [Theorem 2.3](#), in order to conclude, it is enough to show that the two numerical conditions hold. The numerical condition of [Theorem 2.3\(2\)](#) is [Lemma A.2](#). The numerical condition [Theorem 2.3\(3\)](#) follows from [Lemma A.3](#), because $r^*(\mathbf{n}, \mathbf{d}(2)) + |\mathbf{n}| + 1 \geq \frac{N_{\mathbf{n}, \mathbf{d}(2)}}{|\mathbf{n}|+1}$. \square

4. THE SPLITTING LEMMA AND PROOF OF [THEOREM 1.2](#)

Let V and W be \mathbb{k} -vector spaces with $\dim V = n_0 + 1$ and $\dim W = \alpha + 1$. Let $X \subseteq \mathbb{P}W$ be a non-degenerate algebraic variety and let $Y = \mathbb{P}V \times X \subset \mathbb{P}(V \otimes W)$ be the Segre product. In this section we describe an inductive method useful to derive non-defectivity of Y from the non-defectivity of X . Using such a method we prove [Theorem 1.2](#).

Let $\widehat{T}_p Y$ denote the affine cone over the tangent space to Y at p . It is immediate to observe that, if $p = [v \otimes w] \in Y$, then $\widehat{T}_p Y = V \otimes w + v \otimes \widehat{T}_{[w]} X$.

Proposition 4.1 (Segre induction). *Let*

$$a_* = \left\lfloor \frac{\alpha + 1}{n_0 + \dim X + 1} \right\rfloor \text{ and } a^* = \left\lceil \frac{\alpha + 1}{n_0 + \dim X + 1} \right\rceil.$$

Suppose that X is neither a_ -defective nor a^* -defective. If $m \leq (n_0 + 1)a_*$ or $m \geq (n_0 + 1)a^*$, then Y is not m -defective.*

By combining [Proposition 4.1](#) and [Theorem 1.1](#) we immediately deduce [Theorem 1.2](#). The rest of this section is devoted to proving [Proposition 4.1](#). We will employ the so-called splitting lemma, which is a variation of the inductive approach successfully employed in studying secant varieties of various classically known varieties such as Segre varieties [[BCS13](#), [AOP09](#)] and Segre-Veronese varieties with two factors embedded in bi-degree $(1, 2)$ [[AB09](#)]. The splitting lemma is based on the classical *Terracini's lemma*.

Lemma 4.2 (Terracini's Lemma, [[Ter11](#)]). *Let $Z \subset \mathbb{P}^N$ be a non-degenerate algebraic variety. Let $p_1, \dots, p_m \in Z$ be generic and let $q \in \langle p_1, \dots, p_m \rangle$ be generic. Then,*

$$\widehat{T}_q \sigma_m(Z) = \sum_{i=1}^m \widehat{T}_{p_i} Z.$$

Notation 4.3. Fixed X and Y as above, we denote by $T(n_0, s, t)$ the following property:

$$\text{For generic } p_1, \dots, p_m, q_1, \dots, q_t \in Y, \text{ with } p_i = [v_i \otimes w_i] \text{ and } q_i = [v'_i \otimes w'_i], \\ \dim \left(\sum_{i=1}^m \widehat{T}_{p_i} Y + \sum_{i=1}^t V \otimes w'_i \right) = \min\{(n_0 + 1)(\alpha + 1), m(n_0 + x + 1) + t(n_0 + 1)\}.$$

Moreover, analogously to the terminology introduced in [Section 2](#), we say that the triple (n_0, m, t) is *subabundant* if $m(n_0 + \dim X + 1) + t(n_0 + 1) \leq (n_0 + 1)(\alpha + 1)$; while we say that it is *superabundant* if $m(n_0 + \dim X + 1) + t(n_0 + 1) \geq (n_0 + 1)(\alpha + 1)$.

Remark 4.4. By Terracini's Lemma, the property $T(n_0, m, 0)$ is equivalent to say that Y is not m -defective. For example, [Remark 2.2](#) can be rephrased by saying that:

- $T(n_0, m, 0)$ implies $T(n_0, m', 0)$ for every $m' \leq m$ whenever $(n_0, m, 0)$ is subabundant;
- $T(n_0, m, 0)$ implies $T(n_0, m', 0)$ for every $m' \geq m$ whenever $(n_0, m, 0)$ is superabundant.

Lemma 4.5 (Splitting Lemma). *Let $m' \in \{0, 1, \dots, m\}$ and let $n' \in \{0, 1, \dots, n_0 - 1\}$.*

- (1) *If $(n', m', t + m - m')$ and $(n_0 - n' - 1, m - m', t + m')$ are both subabundant (resp. superabundant) then (n_0, m, t) is subabundant (resp. superabundant).*
- (2) *If $T(n', m', t + m - m')$ and $T(n_0 - n' - 1, m - m', t + m')$ are both true, then $T(n_0, m, t)$ is true.*

Proof. (1) If $(n', m', t + m - m')$ and $(n_0 - n' - 1, m - m', t + m')$ are subabundant, then

$$\begin{aligned} m(n_0 + x + 1) + t(n_0 + 1) &= m'(n' + x + 1) + (t + m - m')(n' + 1) \\ &\quad + (m - m')(n_0 - n' + x) + (t + m')(n_0 - n') \\ &\leq (n' + 1)(\alpha + 1) + (n_0 - n')(\alpha + 1) = (n_0 + 1)(\alpha + 1), \end{aligned}$$

thus, (n_0, m, t) is subabundant. An analogous proof holds for the superabundant case.

(2) By semicontinuity, in order to prove $T(n_0, s, t)$ it is enough to prove that the property holds for a *special* choice of the points. Let V_1 be of dimension $(n' + 1)$ and let V_2 be such that

$V = V_1 \oplus V_2$. Let $Y_i = \mathbb{P}V_i \times X$ be the Segre product in $\mathbb{P}(V_i \otimes W)$, for $i = 1, 2$. We specialize the p_i 's such that $v_1, \dots, v_{m'}$ are generic in V_1 and $v_{m'+1}, \dots, v_m$ are generic in V_2 , then

$$\widehat{T}_{p_i} Y = (V_1 \oplus V_2) \otimes w_i + v_i \otimes \widehat{T}_{[w_i]} X = \begin{cases} \widehat{T}_{p_i} Y_1 + V_2 \otimes w_i & \text{for each } i \in \{1, 2, \dots, m'\}, \\ \widehat{T}_{p_i} Y_2 + V_1 \otimes w_i & \text{for each } i \in \{s'+1, \dots, m\}. \end{cases}$$

Thus, $\sum_{i=1}^m \widehat{T}_{p_i} Y + \sum_{i=1}^t V \otimes w'_i$ is the direct sum

$$\left(\sum_{i=1}^{m'} \widehat{T}_{p_i} Y_1 + \sum_{i=1}^t V_1 \otimes w'_i + \sum_{i=m'+1}^m V_1 \otimes w_i \right) \oplus \left(\sum_{i=m'+1}^m \widehat{T}_{p_i} Y_2 + \sum_{i=1}^t V_2 \otimes w'_i + \sum_{i=1}^{m'} V_2 \otimes w_i \right).$$

By the assumptions $T(n', m', t + m - m')$ and $T(n_0 - n' - 1, m - m', t + m')$, we have that both summands have the expected dimension and then also $T(n_0, m, t)$ holds. \square

Proof of Proposition 4.1. By Remark 4.4, it is enough to show that

- (1) $(n_0, (n_0 + 1) a_*, 0)$ is subabundant and $T(n_0, (n_0 + 1) a_*, 0)$ is true;
- (2) $(n_0, (n_0 + 1) a^*, 0)$ is superabundant and $T(n_0, (n_0 + 1) a^*, 0)$ is true.

We only prove the first statement because the proof of (2) is similar.

Note that $(0, a_*, n_0 a_*)$ is subabundant by the definition of a_* . Moreover, since $T(0, a_*, 0)$ is true by the assumption of non-defectivity of X , so is $T(0, a_*, n_0 a_*)$ because adding generic points always impose the expected number of conditions. Thus, by Lemma 4.5, it is enough to prove that $(n_0 - 1, n_0 a_*, a_*)$ is subabundant and $T(n_0 - 1, n_0 a_*, a_*)$ is true.

In order to prove this, we show that $(n_0 - i, (n_0 - i + 1) a_*, i a_*)$ is subabundant and $T(n_0 - i, (n_0 - i + 1) a_*, i a_*)$ is true for all $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, n_0\}$. We proceed by backward induction on i . The case $i = n_0$ is true as commented above. If we assume that $(n_0 - i, (n_0 - i + 1) a_*, i a_*)$ for any $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, n_0\}$ is subabundant and $T(n_0 - i, (n_0 - i + 1) a_*, i a_*)$ then, by Lemma 4.5, it follows that $(n_0 - (i - 1), (n_0 - (i - 1) + 1) a_*, (i - 1) a_*)$ is subabundant and $T(n_0 - (i - 1), (n_0 - (i - 1) + 1) a_*, (i - 1) a_*)$ holds. In particular, it holds for $i = 1$. \square

Remark 4.6. Recall that $(n_0, (n_0 + 1) a_*, 0)$ is subabundant and that $(n_0, (n_0 + 1) a^*, 0)$ is superabundant. Furthermore,

$$(n_0 + 1) a^* - (n_0 + 1) a_* = (n_0 + 1)(a^* - a_*) \leq n_0 + 1.$$

Thus, $(n_0 + 1) a_*$ is the greatest multiple of $n_0 + 1$ which is smaller than or equal to $\lfloor \frac{(n_0 + 1)(\alpha + 1)}{n_0 + \dim X + 1} \rfloor$, while $(n_0 + 1) a^*$ is the least multiple of $n_0 + 1$ which is greater than or equal to $\lceil \frac{(n_0 + 1)(\alpha + 1)}{n_0 + \dim X + 1} \rceil$. Observe that the gap between the thresholds is $2|\mathbf{n}| + 2$ in Theorem 2.5, while it is $n_0 + 1$ in our Theorem 1.2.

Remark 4.7. If X is a d -th Veronese embedding of \mathbb{P}^{n_1} such that the Alexander-Hirschowitz Theorem implies that $\sigma_{a_*}(X)$ and $\sigma_{a^*}(X)$ have the expected dimensions, then by Proposition 4.1, if $m \leq (n_0 + 1) a_*$ or $m \geq (n_0 + 1) a^*$, then $\sigma_m(Y)$ has the expected dimension. This gives an alternative proof to almost all cases of [BCC11, Corollary 2.2], and it extends it to any number of factors.

APPENDIX A. NUMERICAL COMPUTATIONS

In this section we prove the numerical conditions that are needed in the main proofs. Let $k \geq 3$. Let $\mathbf{n} = (n_1 \leq n_2 \leq \dots \leq n_k)$ and $\mathbf{d} \succeq 3^k$ be k -tuples positive integers such that $n_1 \geq 2$. Let $s_r = s_r(\mathbf{n}, \mathbf{d})$ and $\epsilon_r = \epsilon_r(\mathbf{n}, \mathbf{d})$ be defined as in Theorem 2.3.

Lemma A.1. *If $r \in \{r^*(\mathbf{n}, \mathbf{d}), r_*(\mathbf{n}, \mathbf{d})\}$, then $r - s_r \leq r_*(\mathbf{n}, \mathbf{d}(1)) - |\mathbf{n}| - 1$.*

Proof. We prove that $r - s_r - r_*(\mathbf{n}, \mathbf{d}(1)) + |\mathbf{n}| + 1 \leq 0$. By definition of s_r and $r_*(\mathbf{n}, \mathbf{d}(1))$, and by the fact that $-\lfloor \frac{a}{b} \rfloor \leq -\frac{a-b+1}{b}$, it suffices to show that

$$r - \frac{(|\mathbf{n}| + 1)r - N_{\mathbf{n}, \mathbf{d}(1)} - (|\mathbf{n}| - 1)}{|\mathbf{n}|} - \frac{N_{\mathbf{n}, \mathbf{d}(1)} - |\mathbf{n}|}{|\mathbf{n}| + 1} + |\mathbf{n}| + 1 \leq 0.$$

By clearing the denominators, one gets

$$-(|\mathbf{n}| + 1)r + N_{\mathbf{n}, \mathbf{d}(1)} + |\mathbf{n}|^3 + 4|\mathbf{n}|^2 + |\mathbf{n}| - 1 \leq 0.$$

Since $r \geq r_*(\mathbf{n}, \mathbf{d})$ and by using again that $-\lfloor \frac{a}{b} \rfloor \leq -\frac{a-b+1}{b}$, it is enough to show that

$$-N_{\mathbf{n}, \mathbf{d}} + N_{\mathbf{n}, \mathbf{d}(1)} + |\mathbf{n}|^3 + 4|\mathbf{n}|^2 + 2|\mathbf{n}| - 1 \leq 0. \quad (\text{A.1})$$

Since

$$-N_{\mathbf{n}, \mathbf{d}} + N_{\mathbf{n}, \mathbf{d}(1)} = - \binom{n_1 + d_1 - 1}{d_1} \prod_{i=2}^k \binom{n_i + d_i}{d_i}$$

is decreasing with respect to d_1, \dots, d_k , then it is enough to prove (A.1) for $\mathbf{d} = 3^k$. We do it by induction on k .

Base case: we prove (A.1) for $\mathbf{d} = (3, 3, 3)$. Since $n_1 \leq n_2 \leq n_3$, it is enough to prove that

$$- \binom{n_1 + 2}{3} \binom{n_1 + 3}{3} \binom{n_3 + 3}{3} + (n_1 + 2n_3)^3 + 4(n_1 + 2n_3)^2 + 2(n_1 + 2n_3) - 1 \leq 0. \quad (\text{A.2})$$

As univariate polynomial in $\mathbb{Q}[n_1][n_3]$, the left-hand-side is equal to

$$\begin{aligned} & \left(-\frac{1}{216}n_1^6 - \frac{1}{24}n_1^5 - \frac{31}{216}n_1^4 - \frac{17}{72}n_1^3 - \frac{5}{27}n_1^2 - \frac{1}{18}n_1 + 8 \right) n_3^3 \\ & + \left(-\frac{1}{36}n_1^6 - \frac{1}{4}n_1^5 - \frac{31}{36}n_1^4 - \frac{17}{12}n_1^3 - \frac{10}{9}n_1^2 + \frac{35}{3}n_1 + 16 \right) n_3^2 \\ & + \left(-\frac{11}{216}n_1^6 - \frac{11}{24}n_1^5 - \frac{341}{216}n_1^4 - \frac{187}{72}n_1^3 + \frac{107}{27}n_1^2 + \frac{277}{18}n_1 + 4 \right) n_3 \\ & - \frac{1}{36}n_1^6 - \frac{1}{4}n_1^5 - \frac{31}{36}n_1^4 - \frac{5}{12}n_1^3 + \frac{26}{9}n_1^2 + \frac{5}{3}n_1 - 1. \end{aligned}$$

It is immediate to note that all coefficients are negative for $n_1 \geq 3$, allowing us to conclude that (A.2) holds, and consequently (A.1) for $\mathbf{d} = (3, 3, 3)$ and $n_1 \geq 3$.

We are left with the case $n_1 = 2$ for which (A.2) doesn't hold for $n_3 \gg 0$. Therefore, we prove directly (A.1) by substituting $n_1 = 2$, i.e., we consider

$$-4 \binom{n_2 + 3}{3} \binom{n_3 + 3}{3} + (2 + n_2 + n_3)^3 + 4(2 + n_2 + n_3)^2 + 2(2 + n_2 + n_3) - 1 \leq 0. \quad (\text{A.3})$$

As a univariate polynomial in $\mathbb{Q}[n_2][n_3]$, the left-hand-side is equal to

$$\begin{aligned} & \left(-\frac{1}{9}n_2^3 - \frac{2}{3}n_2^2 - \frac{11}{9}n_2 + \frac{1}{3} \right) n_3^3 + \left(-\frac{2}{3}n_2^3 - 4n_2^2 - \frac{13}{3}n_2 + 6 \right) n_3^2 \\ & + \left(-\frac{11}{9}n_2^3 - \frac{13}{3}n_2^2 + \frac{59}{9}n_2 + \frac{68}{3} \right) n_3 + \frac{1}{3}n_2^3 + 6n_2^2 + \frac{68}{3}n_2 + 23 \end{aligned}$$

For $n_2 \geq 2$ the first and the second coefficients are positive and the fourth is negative, so there is only one change of sign in the coefficients. Hence, by Descartes' rule of signs it has only one positive real root. In order to show that (A.3) holds for every $n_3 \geq 2$, it is enough to show that such polynomial is negative for $n_3 = 2$. For $n_3 = 2$ it becomes

$$-\frac{17}{3}n_2^3 - 24n_2^2 + \frac{26}{3}n_2 + 95 \leq 0.$$

Hence (A.1) holds for $\mathbf{d} = (3, 3, 3)$ and $n_1 = 2$.

Inductive step: we prove (A.1) for $\mathbf{d} = 3^k$ and $k \geq 4$. Let $\mathbf{n}' = (n_1, \dots, n_{k-1})$. By inductive assumption

$$\begin{aligned} & -\binom{n_1+2}{3} \prod_{i=2}^{k-1} \binom{n_i+3}{3} \binom{n_k+3}{3} + (|\mathbf{n}|^3 + 4|\mathbf{n}|^2 + 2|\mathbf{n}| - 1) \\ & \leq -\binom{n_k+3}{3} (|\mathbf{n}'|^3 + 4|\mathbf{n}'|^2 + 2|\mathbf{n}'| - 1) + (|\mathbf{n}|^3 + 4|\mathbf{n}|^2 + 2|\mathbf{n}| - 1). \end{aligned}$$

We express this as univariate polynomial in $\mathbb{Q}[|\mathbf{n}'|][n_k]$:

$$\begin{aligned} & \left(-\frac{1}{6}|\mathbf{n}'|^3 - \frac{2}{3}|\mathbf{n}'|^2 - \frac{1}{3}|\mathbf{n}'| + \frac{7}{6} \right) n_k^3 \\ & + (-|\mathbf{n}'|^3 - 4|\mathbf{n}'|^2 + |\mathbf{n}'| + 5) n_k^2 \\ & + \left(-\frac{11}{6}|\mathbf{n}'|^3 - \frac{13}{3}|\mathbf{n}'|^2 + \frac{13}{3}|\mathbf{n}'| + \frac{23}{6} \right) n_k. \end{aligned}$$

Since $2 \leq n_1 \leq n_2 \leq \dots \leq n_{k-1}$ and $k \geq 4$, then $|\mathbf{n}'| \geq 6$: under this condition all coefficients of the latter polynomial are negative and then (A.1) holds also for $\mathbf{d} = 3^k$ for any $k \geq 4$. \square

Lemma A.2. *If $r \in \{r^*(\mathbf{n}, \mathbf{d}), r_*(\mathbf{n}, \mathbf{d})\}$, then $s_r \geq \epsilon_r$.*

Proof. Note that

$$\begin{aligned} s_r - \epsilon_r &= s_r - (|\mathbf{n}| + 1)r + N_{\mathbf{n}, \mathbf{d}(1)} + |\mathbf{n}|s_r = (|\mathbf{n}| + 1)(s_r - r) + N_{\mathbf{n}, \mathbf{d}(1)} \\ &\geq (|\mathbf{n}| + 1)(-r_*(\mathbf{n}, \mathbf{d}(1)) + |\mathbf{n}| + 1) + N_{\mathbf{n}, \mathbf{d}(1)} \\ &\geq (|\mathbf{n}| + 1) \left(-\frac{N_{\mathbf{n}, \mathbf{d}(1)}}{|\mathbf{n}| + 1} + |\mathbf{n}| + 1 \right) + N_{\mathbf{n}, \mathbf{d}(1)} = (|\mathbf{n}| + 1)^2 \end{aligned}$$

where the first inequality is Lemma A.1 and the second one follows by definition of r_* . \square

Lemma A.3. *If $r \in \{r^*(\mathbf{n}, \mathbf{d}), r_*(\mathbf{n}, \mathbf{d})\}$, then $r^*(\mathbf{n}, \mathbf{d}(2)) + |\mathbf{n}| + 1 \leq r - s_r - \epsilon_r$.*

Proof. By definition $\epsilon_r \leq |\mathbf{n}| - 1$, so $r - s_r - \epsilon_r - r^*(\mathbf{n}, \mathbf{d}(2)) - |\mathbf{n}| - 1 \geq r - s_r - r^*(\mathbf{n}, \mathbf{d}(2)) - 2|\mathbf{n}|$. We prove that the latter is greater or equal than zero. By definition of s_r

$$r - s_r - r^*(\mathbf{n}, \mathbf{d}(2)) - 2|\mathbf{n}| \geq r - \frac{(|\mathbf{n}| + 1)r - N_{\mathbf{n}, \mathbf{d}(1)}}{|\mathbf{n}|} - r^*(\mathbf{n}, \mathbf{d}(2)) - 2|\mathbf{n}|.$$

Clearing the denominator, it suffices to show that

$$-r + N_{\mathbf{n}, \mathbf{d}(1)} - |\mathbf{n}|r^*(\mathbf{n}, \mathbf{d}(2)) - 2|\mathbf{n}|^2 \geq 0.$$

Since $r \leq r^*(\mathbf{n}, \mathbf{d})$, then

$$\begin{aligned} -r + N_{\mathbf{n}, \mathbf{d}(1)} - |\mathbf{n}|r^*(\mathbf{n}, \mathbf{d}(2)) - 2|\mathbf{n}|^2 &\geq -\left\lceil \frac{N_{\mathbf{n}, \mathbf{d}}}{|\mathbf{n}| + 1} \right\rceil + N_{\mathbf{n}, \mathbf{d}(1)} - |\mathbf{n}| \left\lceil \frac{N_{\mathbf{n}, \mathbf{d}(2)}}{|\mathbf{n}| + 1} \right\rceil - 2|\mathbf{n}|^2 \\ &\geq -\frac{N_{\mathbf{n}, \mathbf{d}} + |\mathbf{n}|}{|\mathbf{n}| + 1} + N_{\mathbf{n}, \mathbf{d}(1)} - |\mathbf{n}| \frac{N_{\mathbf{n}, \mathbf{d}(2)} + |\mathbf{n}|}{|\mathbf{n}| + 1} - 2|\mathbf{n}|^2. \end{aligned}$$

Clearing the denominator, we are left to prove that

$$-N_{\mathbf{n}, \mathbf{d}} + (|\mathbf{n}| + 1)N_{\mathbf{n}, \mathbf{d}(1)} - |\mathbf{n}|N_{\mathbf{n}, \mathbf{d}(2)} - |\mathbf{n}|(|\mathbf{n}| + 1)(2|\mathbf{n}| + 1) \geq 0 \quad (\text{A.4})$$

Observe that

$$-N_{\mathbf{n}, \mathbf{d}} + (|\mathbf{n}| + 1)N_{\mathbf{n}, \mathbf{d}(1)} - |\mathbf{n}|N_{\mathbf{n}, \mathbf{d}(2)} = \frac{(n_1 + d_1 - 2)!}{(n_1 - 1)!d_1!} \prod_{i=2}^k \binom{n_i + d_i}{n_i} (|\mathbf{n}|d_1 - n_1 - d_1 + 1).$$

The left-hand-side of (A.4) is increasing when the d_i 's are positive and increasing. Therefore, it is enough to prove it for $\mathbf{d} = 3^k$. We do it by induction on k .

Base case: we prove (A.4) for $\mathbf{d} = (3, 3, 3)$. We employ the fact that $n_1 \leq n_2 \leq n_3$ to deduce that the left-hand-side of (A.4) for $\mathbf{d} = (3, 3, 3)$ is greater or equal to

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{3} \binom{n_1+1}{2} \binom{n_1+3}{3} \binom{n_3+3}{3} (5n_1 + 3n_3 - 2) - (n_1 + 2n_3)(n_1 + 2n_3 + 1)(2n_1 + 4n_3 + 1) \\ &= \left(\frac{1}{72}n_1^5 + \frac{7}{72}n_1^4 + \frac{17}{72}n_1^3 + \frac{17}{72}n_1^2 + \frac{1}{12}n_1 \right) n_3^4 \\ &+ \left(\frac{5}{216}n_1^6 + \frac{17}{72}n_1^5 + \frac{197}{216}n_1^4 + \frac{119}{72}n_1^3 + \frac{151}{108}n_1^2 + \frac{4}{9}n_1 - 16 \right) n_3^3 \\ &+ \left(\frac{5}{36}n_1^6 + \frac{77}{72}n_1^5 + \frac{73}{24}n_1^4 + \frac{289}{72}n_1^3 + \frac{179}{72}n_1^2 - \frac{281}{12}n_1 - 12 \right) n_3^2 \\ &+ \left(\frac{55}{216}n_1^6 + \frac{127}{72}n_1^5 + \frac{907}{216}n_1^4 + \frac{289}{72}n_1^3 - \frac{1165}{108}n_1^2 - \frac{109}{9}n_1 - 2 \right) n_3 \\ &+ \frac{5}{36}n_1^6 + \frac{11}{12}n_1^5 + \frac{71}{36}n_1^4 - \frac{7}{12}n_1^3 - \frac{28}{9}n_1^2 - \frac{4}{3}n_1. \end{aligned}$$

Regarding it as a univariate polynomial in $\mathbb{Q}[n_1][n_3]$, we observe that each coefficient is positive under our assumption that $n_1 \geq 2$. Hence, (A.4) holds for $\mathbf{d} = (3, 3, 3)$.

Inductive step: we prove (A.4) for $\mathbf{d} = 3^k$ with $k \geq 4$. Let $\mathbf{n}' = (n_1, \dots, n_{k-1})$. By inductive assumption,

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{3} \binom{n_1+1}{2} \prod_{i=2}^k \binom{n_i+3}{n_i} (3|\mathbf{n}'| - n_1 - 2) - |\mathbf{n}'|(|\mathbf{n}'| + 1)(2|\mathbf{n}'| + 1) \\ & \geq \binom{n_k+3}{n_k} |\mathbf{n}'|(|\mathbf{n}'| + 1)(2|\mathbf{n}'| + 1) - |\mathbf{n}'|(|\mathbf{n}'| + 1)(2|\mathbf{n}'| + 1) \end{aligned}$$

We express this as univariate polynomial in $\mathbb{Q}[|\mathbf{n}'|][n_k]$:

$$\begin{aligned} & \left(\frac{1}{3}|\mathbf{n}'|^3 + \frac{1}{2}|\mathbf{n}'|^2 + \frac{1}{6}|\mathbf{n}'| - 2 \right) n_k^3 \\ &+ (2|\mathbf{n}'|^3 + 3|\mathbf{n}'|^2 - 5|\mathbf{n}'| - 3) n_k^2 \\ &+ \left(\frac{11}{3}|\mathbf{n}'|^3 - \frac{1}{2}|\mathbf{n}'|^2 - \frac{25}{6}|\mathbf{n}'| - 1 \right) n_k. \end{aligned}$$

Since $2 \leq n_1 \leq n_2 \leq \dots \leq n_{k-1}$ and $k \geq 4$, we have $|\mathbf{n}'| \geq 6$: under this condition all coefficients of the latter polynomial are negative, and hence (A.4) also holds for $\mathbf{d} = 3^k$ for any $k \geq 4$. \square

REFERENCES

- [AB09] H. Abo and M.C. Brambilla. Secant varieties of Segre-Veronese varieties $\mathbb{P}^m \times \mathbb{P}^n$ embedded by $\mathcal{O}(1, 2)$. *Experiment. Math.*, 18(3):369–384, 2009.
- [AB12] H. Abo and M. C. Brambilla. New examples of defective secant varieties of Segre-Veronese varieties. *Collect. Math.*, 63(3):287–297, 2012.
- [AB13] H. Abo and M. C. Brambilla. On the dimensions of secant varieties of Segre-Veronese varieties. *Annali di Matematica Pura ed Applicata*, 192(1):61–92, 2013.
- [AH95] J. Alexander and A. Hirschowitz. Polynomial interpolation in several variables. *Journal of Algebraic Geometry*, 4(2):201–222, 1995.
- [AMR19] C. Araujo, A. Massarenti, and R. Rischter. On non-secant defectivity of Segre-Veronese varieties. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 371(4):2255–2278, 2019.
- [AOP09] H. Abo, G. Ottaviani, and C. Peterson. Induction for secant varieties of segre varieties. *Transactions of the American Mathematical Society*, 361(2):767–792, 2009.

- [Bal23] E. Ballico. Partially symmetric tensors and the non-defectivity of secant varieties of products with a projective line as a factor. *Vietnam Journal of Mathematics*, pages 1–10, 2023.
- [BBM23] E. Ballico, A. Bernardi, and T. Mańdziuk. Tensoring by a plane maintains secant-regularity in degree at least two. *preprint arXiv:2312.01933*, 2023.
- [BC23] A. Blomenhofer and A. Casarotti. Nondefectivity of invariant secant varieties. *preprint arXiv:2312.12335*, 2023.
- [BCC11] A. Bernardi, E. Carlini, and M. V. Catalisano. Higher secant varieties of $\mathbb{P}^n \times \mathbb{P}^m$ embedded in bi-degree $(1, d)$. *Journal of Pure and Applied Algebra*, 215:2853–2858, 2011.
- [BCC⁺18] A. Bernardi, E. Carlini, M. V. Catalisano, A. Gimigliano, and A. Oneto. The hitchhiker guide to: Secant varieties and tensor decomposition. *Mathematics*, 6(12):314, 2018.
- [BCS13] P. Bürgisser, M. Clausen, and M. Shokrollahi. *Algebraic complexity theory*, volume 315. Springer Science & Business Media, 2013.
- [CGG05] M. V. Catalisano, A. V. Geramita, and A. Gimigliano. Higher secant varieties of Segre-Veronese varieties. In *Projective varieties with unexpected properties*, pages 81–107. Walter de Gruyter, Berlin, 2005.
- [CGG08] M. V. Catalisano, A. V. Geramita, and A. Gimigliano. On the ideals of secant varieties to certain rational varieties. *Journal of Algebra*, 319:1913–1931, 2008.
- [GO22] F. Galuppi and A. Oneto. Secant non-defectivity via collisions of fat points. *Advances in Mathematics*, 409:Paper No. 108657, 58, 2022.
- [Lan11] J. M. Landsberg. *Tensors: geometry and applications: geometry and applications*, volume 128. American Mathematical Soc., 2011.
- [LMR22] A. Laface, A. Massarenti, and R. Rischter. On secant defectiveness and identifiability of Segre-Veronese varieties. *Rev. Mat. Iberoam.*, 38:1605–1635, 2022.
- [LP13] A. Laface and E. Postingshel. Secant varieties of Segre-Veronese embeddings of $(\mathbb{P}^1)^r$. *Math. Ann.*, 356(4):1455–1470, 2013.
- [MM22] A. Massarenti and M. Mella. Bronowski’s conjecture and the identifiability of projective varieties. *preprint arXiv:2210.13524*, 2022.
- [Ter11] A. Terracini. Sulle v_k per cui la varietà degli s_h ($h + 1$) seganti ha dimensione minore dell’ordinario. *Rendiconti del Circolo Matematico di Palermo (1884-1940)*, 31:392–396, 1911.
- [Åd88] B. Ådlandsvik. Varieties with an extremal number of degenerate higher secant varieties. *J. Reine Angew. Math.*, 392:16–26, 1988.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF IDAHO, MOSCOW, IDAHO 83844–1103, UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Email address: abo@uidaho.edu

UNIVERSITÀ POLITECNICA DELLE MARCHE, VIA BRECCE BIANCHE, 60131 ANCONA, ITALY

Email address: m.c.brambilla@univpm.it

FACULTY OF MATHEMATICS, INFORMATICS, AND MECHANICS, UNIVERSITY OF WARSAW, BANACHA 2, 02-097 WARSAW, POLAND

Email address: galuppi@mimuw.edu.pl (ORCID 0000-0001-5630-5389)

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITÀ DI TRENTO, VIA SOMMARIVE 14, 38123 POVO (TRENTO), ITALY

Email address: alessandro.oneto@unitn.it