

SYMMETRIC POWERS: STRUCTURE, SMOOTHABILITY, AND APPLICATIONS

COSIMO FLAVI, JOACHIM JELISIEJEW, MATEUSZ MICHAŁEK

ABSTRACT. We investigate border ranks of twisted powers of polynomials and smoothability of symmetric powers of algebras. We prove that the latter are smoothable. For the former, we obtain upper bounds for the border rank in general and prove that they are optimal under mild conditions. We give applications to complexity theory.

1. INTRODUCTION

We consider two classical problems: finding smoothable finite algebras and finding homogeneous polynomials of small border rank. Both problems are understood to be next-to-impossible in general and positive results are very scarce except for specific cases, such as subschemes of \mathbb{A}^2 [Fog68], Gorenstein subschemes of \mathbb{A}^3 [KMR98], forms in small number of variables [Lan12], subscheme defined by monomial ideals or complete intersections. Outside this realm, the main general tool to obtain either object is using tensor powers:

- (1) if A is a smoothable algebra, then for every d the tensor product $A^{\otimes d}$ is smoothable;
- (2) if $F = F(x_0, \dots, x_n)$ is a homogeneous polynomial of border rank at most r , then for every d the polynomial

$$F^{\otimes d} := F(x_{1,0}, \dots, x_{1,n})F(x_{2,0}, \dots, x_{2,n}) \cdots F(x_{d,0}, \dots, x_{d,n})$$

in $(n+1)d$ variables has border rank with respect to the Segre-Veronese variety (=variety of monomials of the same multi-degree as $F^{\otimes d}$) at most r^d .

In this article we provide twisted *symmetric power* analogues of the two results, see [Theorem 1.1](#) and [Theorem 1.11](#) below. Both results are special cases of more general structure theorems that we explain below. The passage from tensor to symmetric powers may seem to be automatic, but it is not, in fact it is unexpectedly subtle, see Counterexamples [1.4](#), [1.7](#), [5.4](#) below and the discussion about the necessity of twisting. In fact, while the tensor powers are a classical tool, it appears that almost nothing is known about symmetric powers.

Smoothability is of much interest for moduli spaces, with applications to enumerative geometry and combinatorics. Border rank is central to classical theory of secant varieties (see [[BCC⁺18](#), [BGI11](#), [CGO14](#)]) with applications to statistics, signal processing (see [[Che11](#), [DLC07](#), [McC87](#)]) and, most notably, to complexity theory and the geometry of tensors ([[BCS97](#), [LM17b](#), [CW90](#)]). From this point of view, it is important to look at the *asymptotical* behavior: to consider sequences of polynomials or algebras with growing degree and number of variables. In this aspect, the gain from passing from tensor to symmetric powers is very notable. Also in the symmetric power setting the rank we consider is always the usual Waring rank, in contrast with the right hand side of [\(2\)](#) above, where it changes to the Segre-Veronese rank.

1.1. Smoothability. The situation is much cleaner for smoothability, so we begin with setup. We talk about finite schemes $Z = \text{Spec}(A)$ rather than algebras A . By $\text{Ap}(-)$ we denote the apolar algebra.

Theorem 1.1. (1) For every smoothable scheme Z , its d -th symmetric power $S^d Z$ is smoothable for every $d \in \mathbb{N}$;

2020 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary 15A69; Secondary 14N07.

Key words and phrases. Additive decompositions, apolar algebra, border rank, secant varieties, smoothable rank, symmetric tensor, tensor rank.

(2) if $f \in \mathbb{K}[x_1, \dots, x_n]$ and $d \geq 1$ are such that

$$\dim_{\mathbb{K}} \operatorname{Ap}(f^d) = \binom{\dim_{\mathbb{K}} \operatorname{Ap}(f) + d - 1}{d},$$

then the scheme

$$Z_d = \operatorname{Spec}(\operatorname{Ap}(f^d))$$

is isomorphic to $S^d Z_1$; moreover, if Z_1 is smoothable, then Z_d is smoothable.

We remark that in general the smoothability of $\operatorname{Spec}(\operatorname{Ap}(f))$ does not imply the smoothability of $\operatorname{Spec}(\operatorname{Ap}(f^d))$ for $d \geq 1$. In [Example 5.5](#) we provide an f such that $\operatorname{Ap}(f)$ is smoothable, while $\operatorname{Ap}(f^2)$ is not. The proof of [Theorem 1.1](#) is based on the following abstract but useful proposition.

Proposition 1.2. *Let Z be a finite scheme with an action of a linearly reductive algebraic group G and suppose that Z admits a G -equivariant smoothing \mathcal{Z} . Then $\mathcal{Z} \parallel G$ is a smoothing of $Z \parallel G$, so $Z \parallel G$ is smoothable.*

For the case $\operatorname{Spec}(\operatorname{Ap}(f^d))$, we have $Z = \operatorname{Spec}(\operatorname{Ap}(f)^{\otimes d})$ and $G = \Sigma_d$ is the symmetric group acting on Z by permuting the copies of $\operatorname{Ap}(f)$. [Proposition 1.2](#) applies in other natural situations, notably for the Veronese subalgebras. We discuss them now.

Example 1.3. Fix an arbitrary d and consider the monomial algebra

$$A_d := \frac{\mathbb{K}[\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_d]}{(\alpha_1^2, \dots, \alpha_d^2)}$$

and the corresponding scheme $Z_d := \operatorname{Spec}(A_d)$. Let $G := \langle g \rangle$ be a cyclic group of order two that acts on

$$Z_1 = \operatorname{Spec}(\mathbb{K}[\alpha]/(\alpha^2))$$

by $g \cdot \alpha := -\alpha$. The scheme Z_1 has a G -equivariant smoothing $\mathbb{K}[\alpha, t]/(\alpha^2 - t)$. Therefore, also the scheme $Z_d = Z_1 \times \dots \times Z_1$ admits a G -equivariant smoothing, so

$$Z_d \parallel G \simeq \operatorname{Spec}(A^{\mathbb{Z}/2})$$

is smoothable.

[Proposition 1.2](#) is surprisingly sharp in that the assumption of the existence of G -equivariant smoothing is necessary, as we demonstrate in the following example.

Example 1.4. Let us consider the monomial algebra

$$A := \frac{\mathbb{K}[\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_9]}{(\alpha_1^2, \dots, \alpha_9^2)}$$

which has degree 512 and Hilbert function

$$\operatorname{HF}_A = (1, 9, 36, 84, 126, 126, 84, 36, 9, 1).$$

The corresponding subscheme $Z := \operatorname{Spec}(A) \subseteq \mathbb{A}^9$ is torus-fixed and in particular the cyclic group $G := \mathbb{Z}/3$ acts on it by multiplying each variable by a third root of unity. In this case

$$Z \parallel G \simeq \operatorname{Spec}(A^{\mathbb{Z}/3}) = \operatorname{Spec}(\mathbb{K} \oplus A_3 \oplus A_6 \oplus A_9)$$

This is a much smaller subscheme, with Hilbert function $(1, 84, 84, 1)$, but it is not smoothable by the criterion of [\[Jel19, Theorem 1.2\]](#).

Let us define a more general class of algebras which includes the last two examples.

Definition 1.5. Given a graded algebra $A = \bigoplus_{i \geq 0} A_i$ and a positive integer k the algebra $\bigoplus_{i \geq 0} A_{ki}$ is called the k -th Veronese subalgebra.

The previous examples, as well as our theorems on passing to symmetric powers can be seen as specific cases of a more general question:

Question 1.6. Given a finite smoothable scheme $\text{Spec}(A)$ with an action of a group G , when is $\text{Spec}(A^G)$ also smoothable?

As we can see in [Example 1.4](#) the answer is not always positive. Still, [Theorem 1.1](#) and [Proposition 1.2](#) provide many examples when it is.

1.2. Powers of polynomials and their ranks. We now shift the attention from smoothability to border rank. Let $F \in \mathbb{K}[x_0, \dots, x_n]$ be a homogeneous polynomial. The natural expectation is that if $\text{brk}(F) = r$, then

$$\text{brk}(F^d) \leq \binom{r+d-1}{d}$$

for all $d \geq 1$. But this is false even in the most basic cases.

Example 1.7. Let

$$F := x_0^3 + x_1^3 \in \mathbb{K}[x_0, x_1].$$

Then $\text{rk}(F) = 2$ and the middle catalecticant rank of F^2 is $4 > \binom{3}{2}$, so $\text{brk}(F^2) \geq 4$, in fact $\text{brk}(F^2) = 4$. Also $\text{brk}(F^{[2]}) = 4$, where $F^{[2]}$ is the divided square of F . Similar results will be obtained for Fermat cubics in more variables, for exponents higher than 3 and so on.

Since the upper bound on the border rank is wrong in the easiest case of two variables, it may come as a surprise that a bound can be achieved in a fairly general situation, which we explain below. We need two notions.

First, for a homogeneous polynomial $F = \sum_i \lambda_i \mathbf{x}^i \in \mathbb{K}[x_0, \dots, x_n]$, where $i = (i_0, \dots, i_n)$, we define the *twist* of F by

$$\text{tw}(F) := \sum_i \lambda_i \frac{1}{i_0!} \mathbf{x}^i.$$

For example,

$$\text{tw}(x_0^2 x_1 + x_0^3 x_2 + x_1) = \frac{1}{2} x_0^2 x_1 + \frac{1}{6} x_0^3 x_2 + x_1.$$

Second, we say that a polynomial f is *encompassing* if the parts of degree ≤ 1 of a basis of the space of its partials are linearly independent, see [Definition 4.1](#). For example, the polynomial $f := x_1^2 + x_2$ is encompassing, because the degree ≤ 1 part of derivatives of f are

$$(f)_{\leq 1} = x_2, \quad \frac{\partial f}{\partial x_1} = \left(\frac{\partial f}{\partial x_1} \right)_{\leq 1} = 2x_1, \quad \frac{\partial^2 f}{\partial x_1^2} = \left(\frac{\partial^2 f}{\partial x_1^2} \right)_{\leq 1} = 2,$$

and they are linearly independent. The form $F := x_1^2 + x_2^2$ is, instead, not encompassing, because already $F_{\leq 1}$ is zero. Our first theorem is as follows.

Theorem 1.8. *Let $F \in \mathbb{K}[x_0, \dots, x_n]$ be a concise homogeneous polynomial such that its dehomogenization $f := F|_{x_0}$ is encompassing and the apolar algebra of f is smoothable. Then, for every $d \geq 1$, the following conditions hold:*

- (1) *the form $\text{tw}(F^d)$ has smoothable rank, border rank, cactus rank, border cactus rank and the middle catalecticant rank all equal to $\binom{n+d}{d}$;*
- (2) *the scheme $\text{Spec}(\text{Ap}(f^d))$ is smoothable and apolar to $\text{tw}(F^d)$ under a suitable embedding (see [§2.3](#)).*

Example 1.9. Let Q be a full rank quadric given by

$$Q := x_0 x_n + x_1^2 + x_2^2 + \dots + x_{n-1}^2.$$

The dehomogenization $p_n := Q|_{x_0=1}$ is encompassing. By [Theorem 1.8](#), for every $d \geq 1$ the form $\text{tw}(Q^d)$ has smoothable and border ranks equal to

$$\binom{n+d}{d}.$$

For ternary quadratic forms and without twisting this result was obtained by the first author in [\[Fla23, Theorem 4.5\]](#). We warn that not every dehomogenization of Q is encompassing.

Example 1.10. Let us consider the cubic

$$F := x_1^3 + x_2^3 + \cdots + x_n^3 + x_0(x_1y_1 + \cdots + x_ny_n) + x_0^2y_0$$

in $2(n+1)$ variables. The dehomogenization $F|_{x_0=1}$ is encompassing and the apolar algebra

$$\text{Ap}(F|_{x_0=1}) \simeq \text{Ap}(x_1^3 + x_2^3 + \cdots + x_n^3)$$

is smoothable. Hence, by [Theorem 1.8](#), for every $d \geq 1$ we have

$$\text{brk}(\text{tw}(F^d)) = \binom{2n+d+1}{d}.$$

We warn the reader that twisting is necessary: even for F satisfying the assumptions of [Theorem 1.8](#), the border rank of F^2 and $F^{[2]}$ can be higher than $\binom{n+1}{2}$, see [Example 5.4](#).

The theorem implies that $\text{tw}(F)$ has the minimal possible border rank n and smoothable rank also equal to n , so $\text{tw}(F)$ is not wild in the sense of [\[BB15\]](#). A natural question is: *how limiting are the assumptions in [Theorem 1.8](#)?* The following theorem shows that the smoothability of $\text{Ap}(f)$ is the primary requirement. In other words, the perhaps non-intuitive condition of being encompassing is common and can always be assured.

We say that a polynomial $G \in \mathbb{K}[x_0, \dots, x_n]$ restricts to a polynomial $F \in \mathbb{K}[x_0, \dots, x_k]$, where $k \leq n$, if $F = G|_{x_{k+1}=0, \dots, x_n=0}$.

Theorem 1.11. *Let $F \in \mathbb{K}[x_0, \dots, x_k]$ be a concise homogeneous polynomial, let $f := F|_{x_0=1}$ be its dehomogenization, and assume that $\text{Ap}(f)$ be smoothable. If $\dim_{\mathbb{K}}(\text{Ap}(f)) = n$, then there exists a concise homogeneous polynomial $G \in \mathbb{K}[x_0, \dots, x_n]$ restricting to F and such that G satisfies the assumptions of [Theorem 1.8](#). In particular,*

$$\text{brk}(\text{tw}(F^d)) \leq \binom{n+d}{d},$$

for every $d \in \mathbb{N}$. Moreover, for $g := G|_{x_0=1}$ we have $\text{Ap}(g) \simeq \text{Ap}(f)$.

The proof of [Theorem 1.11](#) is constructive and the form G is determined explicitly. Namely, let us take a concise homogeneous $F \in \mathbb{K}[x_0, \dots, x_k]$ and $f = F|_{x_0=1}$. The apolar algebra $\text{Ap}(f)$ is a quotient of the dual ring $\mathcal{D} := \mathbb{K}[\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_k]$, where

$$\alpha_i := \frac{\partial}{\partial x_i}$$

for every $i = 1, \dots, k$. Let us consider a basis \mathcal{B} of $\text{Ap}(f)$ given by

$$\mathcal{B} := \{f, \alpha_1 \circ f, \dots, \alpha_k \circ f, \sigma_1 \circ f, \dots, \sigma_{n-k-1} \circ f\},$$

where $\sigma_i \in \mathcal{D}_{\geq 2}$. For any multi-index $\mathbf{a} \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^{n-k-1}$, let us define

$$\sigma^{\mathbf{a}} := \sigma_1^{\mathbf{a}_1} \cdots \sigma_{n-k-1}^{\mathbf{a}_{n-k-1}} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbf{y}^{\mathbf{a}} := y_1^{\mathbf{a}_1} \cdots y_{n-k-1}^{\mathbf{a}_{n-k-1}}.$$

Then the polynomial $g \in \mathbb{K}[x_1, \dots, x_k, y_1, \dots, y_{n-k-1}]$ is defined by a Taylor-like series

$$g := \sum_{\mathbf{a} \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^{n-k-1}} \frac{\mathbf{y}^{\mathbf{a}}}{\mathbf{a}!} (\sigma^{\mathbf{a}} \circ f) \tag{1.12}$$

and $G \in \mathbb{K}[x_0, \dots, x_k, y_1, \dots, y_{n-k-1}]$ is the homogenization of g with respect to x_0 . To obtain G in $\mathbb{K}[x_0, \dots, x_n]$ one takes $x_j := y_{j-k}$ for $j > k$.

Example 1.13. To obtain [Example 1.9](#), let us consider the form

$$F := x_1^2 + \cdots + x_{n-1}^2 \in \mathbb{K}[x_0, \dots, x_{n-1}].$$

Then $f := F|_{x_0=1}$ is essentially equal to F . Let us fix the set

$$\{1, \alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_{n-1}, \sigma_1\},$$

where $\sigma_1 := \frac{1}{2}\alpha_1^2$, as the basis of $\text{Ap}(f)$. Then, we have

$$\sigma_1^2 \circ f = \sigma_1 \circ 1 = 0,$$

so that the polynomial defined in formula (1.12) is $g = f + y_1$. The homogenization with respect to x_0 yields

$$x_1^2 + \cdots + x_{n-1}^2 + x_0 y_1,$$

as expected.

Example 1.14. To obtain [Example 1.10](#), let us consider the form

$$F := x_1^3 + \cdots + x_n^3 \in \mathbb{K}[x_0, \dots, x_n].$$

Then, we take $f := F|_{x_0=1}$ and as a basis of $\text{Ap}(f)$ fix the set

$$\{1, \alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n, \sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_n, \sigma_{n+1}\},$$

with $\sigma_i := \alpha_i^2/2$ for $i = 1, \dots, n$ and $\sigma_{n+1} := \alpha_1^3/6$. For every i, j we have $\sigma_i \circ (\sigma_j \circ f) = 0$, so that the formula (1.12) becomes

$$g = f + x_1 y_1 + \cdots + x_n y_n + y_{n+1},$$

which homogenizes to the form from the example.

Having discussed the abundance of encompassing polynomials, we present a more geometric point of view for them. In the projective setting, there exist elegant classical links between the algebra of a homogeneous polynomial $F \in \mathbb{K}[x_0, \dots, x_n]$ and the topology of its gradient map

$$\text{grad}(F) = \left(\frac{\partial F}{\partial x_0}, \dots, \frac{\partial F}{\partial x_n} \right) : \mathbb{P}^n \dashrightarrow \mathbb{P}^n,$$

also called the *polar map*. For further details, the reader can see, e.g., [[Huh12](#), [DP03](#), [Dol00](#), [HKS92](#)].

In the affine setting, we prove the following analogue which in particular gives a characterization of polynomials which have dominant affine gradient maps and a characterization of polynomials with maximal growth of powers. We need one definition. By [Proposition 3.5](#) for every polynomial f with $\dim_{\mathbb{K}}(\text{Ap}(f)) = \ell$ and every $d \geq 1$ we have

$$\dim_{\mathbb{K}} \text{Ap}(f^d) \leq \binom{\ell + d - 1}{d}. \quad (1.15)$$

We say that f has *maximal growth of powers* if for every $d \geq 1$ equality holds in (1.15).

Theorem 1.16. *Let $f \in \mathbb{K}[x_1, \dots, x_n]$ be a concise polynomial. Then, the following conditions are equivalent:*

- (1) f has maximal growth of powers;
- (2) the total gradient map

$$\text{totalGrad}(f) = \left(\frac{\partial f}{\partial \mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{a}_1}}, \dots, \frac{\partial f}{\partial \mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{a}_{\ell-1}}} \right) : \mathbb{A}^n \dashrightarrow \mathbb{A}^{\ell-1}$$

is dominant, where the set

$$\left\{ \frac{\partial f}{\partial \mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{a}_i}} \right\}_i \cup \{1\}$$

forms a basis of the space of all partials of f ;

- (3) the partials of f are homogeneously algebraically independent (see [§4](#));
- (4) f is an encompassing polynomial.

Moreover, if these conditions hold, then $\ell = n + 1$ and the higher gradient map $\text{totalGrad}(f)$ is, up to coordinate changes, the usual gradient map

$$\text{grad}(f) = \left(\frac{\partial f}{\partial x_1}, \dots, \frac{\partial f}{\partial x_n} \right) : \mathbb{A}^n \dashrightarrow \mathbb{A}^n.$$

A word of caution is that the rational map $\text{grad}(f)$ yields a rational map $\mathbb{P}^n \dashrightarrow \mathbb{P}^n$, but this map is in general *not* equal to $\text{grad}(f^h)$ for a homogenization f^h of f .

Outside the class of encompassing polynomials, the following natural question seems absolutely open.

Question 1.17. Which sequences can be obtained as $(\dim_{\mathbb{K}} \text{Ap}(f^d))_{d \geq 1}$?

Specializing a bit, one could wonder whether knowing first few dimensions is enough to know the whole sequence. This is an open question as well. In [Corollary 4.15](#) we answer it for the sequence

$$d \mapsto \binom{\ell + d - 1}{d}.$$

We show that if $\dim_{\mathbb{K}} \text{Ap}(f^d)$ is maximal for all $d \leq \deg(f)$, then f is encompassing.

1.3. Applications to complexity theory. In the last part of the article our main results are:

- (1) [Corollary 5.13](#): deciding smoothability of algebras implies estimating border rank of tensors, up to a factor of $1/2$,
- (2) [Corollary 5.15](#): deciding smoothability of modules implies estimating border rank of tensors $T \in \mathbb{K}^n \otimes \mathbb{K}^n \otimes \mathbb{K}^n$ up to an error of n ,
- (3) introduction of *sweet pieces*, that is a special class of tensors appearing in complexity theory, see [Definition 6.2](#),
- (4) estimates of ranks of sweet pieces of interest in [Proposition 6.12](#) and [Proposition 6.17](#).

One of our motivations comes from applications to complexity theory. More precisely, the two major challenges relevant for us are:

- (1) fast matrix multiplication;
- (2) special NP-hard problems, like chromatic number of a graph or the set cover problem.

It turns out that in both of the above problems good upper bounds on ranks of Kronecker powers of special tensors can lead to very surprising upper bounds on complexity. Let us explain in detail how smoothable algebras, their tensor powers, and Veronese subalgebras appear in problems above.

The complexity of matrix multiplication is governed by the constant ω , see [[BCS97](#), [LM17b](#)] for a detailed exposition, or [[MS21](#), Chapter 9.3] for a fast introduction to the topic. The state of the art method to bound ω from above is due to D. Coppersmith and S. Winograd (see [[CW90](#)]). The exact value of ω remains unknown, although upper bounds have been improved in recent years, showing that $\omega < 2.38$, see [[CW90](#), [AVW21](#), [VWXXZ23](#), [ADVW⁺24](#)]. The core method starts with a smoothable algebra A that is apolar to a quadric. The bilinear map given by multiplication in A gives rise to a tensor T_A , known as the Coppersmith-Winograd tensor, that is of minimal border rank $\dim_{\mathbb{K}} A$, see [[BL16](#)]. One identifies direct sums of matrix multiplication tensors as restriction of the tensor associated to $A^{\otimes d}$ for large d , which is also the d -th Kronecker power of T_A . This allows to upper bound the border rank of the direct sums by $(\dim_{\mathbb{K}} A)^d$. Via Schönhage's τ -theorem [[BCS97](#), §15.5] one obtains upper bounds on ω .

The key step in this method is to identify a highly symmetric subtensor SP_d of $T_{A^{\otimes d}}$ and prove that it restricts to the aforementioned direct sum of matrix multiplications. It turns out that SP_d in many cases is not only a restriction of the tensor associated to $A^{\otimes d}$, but also of its much smaller Veronese subalgebra. Thus, obtaining bounds on border rank or smoothable rank of tensors associated to Veronese subalgebras of smoothable algebras would lead to new upper bounds on ω . In particular, if SP_d was of minimal asymptotic rank, then $\omega = 2$.

For the second point one considers some of the well-known NP-hard problems. In the very recent works [[BK23](#), [Pra23](#), [BCH⁺24](#)] one identifies specific families of tensors for which upper bounds on rank would provide algorithms of unexpectedly low complexity. For example for a family of tensors SP_d one could, in the randomized setting, check if there exist three sets from a given three (balanced) families whose union is the whole given set of size n , in time C^n for a constant $C < 2$.

In our work, we identify the properties of SP_d to define the class of tensors called the *sweet pieces*, see [Definition 6.2](#). As argued above, upper bounding ranks of sweet pieces is of central importance. We provide new methods to upper bound not only border ranks, but also ranks of the sweet pieces SP_d , see [Lemmas 6.7](#) and [6.9](#) and [Corollary 6.10](#). We apply these results to obtain new, best upper bounds for rank and border rank of SP_d tensors that appear in the Coppersmith-Winograd tensor and in the work of K. Pratt [[Pra23](#)], see below.

Proposition 1.18 (Proposition 6.12). *The rank of any sweet piece for the N -th Kronecker power of the $n \times n \times n$ Coppersmith-Winograd tensor CW_n is smaller than*

$$n^N - \binom{N}{(2p+2q)N+1} (n-1)^{(p+q)N-1}.$$

In particular, it is smaller than the border rank of $(CW_n)^{\boxtimes N}$.

Proposition 1.19 (Proposition 6.17). *Consider the tensors associated to the bilinear multiplication map*

$$(\mathbb{C}[x]/(x^2)^{\otimes 3k})_k \times (\mathbb{C}[x]/(x^2)^{\otimes 3k})_k \rightarrow (\mathbb{C}[x]/(x^2)^{\otimes 3k})_{2k}$$

where the subindex denotes the degree (these are precisely the tensors from [Pra23]). These tensors have rank at most

$$\frac{1}{2}8^k - \sum_{i=k+1}^{\lfloor 3k/2 \rfloor} \binom{3k}{2i}.$$

The improvements in the upper bounds may seem not big. Indeed, to obtain new estimates on ω one needs to obtain in Proposition 1.18 an upper bound of form n^{CN} , where $C < 1$. Still, we believe that improving the upper bounds of sweet pieces is important, as e.g. for the set covering problem *subexponential* improvements may already refute the conjectures about the complexity of the problem [Pra23, Corollary 1.12]. Further, recently new barrier results appeared [CVZ21, BL20], which show that using many tensors, including the Coppersmith-Winograd tensor, it is essentially impossible to prove $\omega = 2$. However, these barrier results are not valid, if one improves upper bounds on ranks of the sweet pieces. Experts may notice that the sweet pieces of interest have asymptotically largest subrank.

2. PRELIMINARIES

In the study of tensor decomposition, the quantity that has appeared most frequently in the literature is the *Waring rank* of a symmetric tensor or, equivalently, of a homogeneous polynomial. For any $f \in S^d V$, the Waring rank, or simply the rank, of f is minimum number of linear forms such that f can be expressed as a linear combination of the d -th powers of such forms. Over the years, many other concepts related to symmetric tensors have been introduced, such as border rank, cactus rank, and smoothable rank. In general, for tensor decompositions, important tools are provided by the theory of apolarity. In this article we work over an algebraically closed field \mathbb{K} of characteristic zero.

2.1. Apolarity. Let V be an arbitrary $(n+1)$ -dimensional vector space over \mathbb{K} . We will think of V^* as linear forms on a projective space $\mathbb{P}(V)$. This is stressed below by the superscripts $(-)^{\text{gl}}$. Let

$$\mathcal{R}^{\text{gl}} := S(V), \quad \mathcal{D}^{\text{gl}} := S(V^*)$$

denote the symmetric algebra of V and its dual, respectively, and let

$$(\mathcal{R}^{\text{gl}})_d := S^d V, \quad (\mathcal{D}^{\text{gl}})_d := S^d V^*$$

denote the d -th symmetric powers of V and V^* , respectively. The ring \mathcal{D}^{gl} acts on \mathcal{R}^{gl} so that every $\alpha \in V^*$ acts as a partial derivative. If we fix the dual bases $\{x_0, \dots, x_n\}$ and $\{\alpha_0, \dots, \alpha_n\}$ of V and V^* respectively, we can identify their symmetric algebras as

$$\mathcal{R}^{\text{gl}} = \mathbb{K}[x_0, \dots, x_n], \quad \mathcal{D}^{\text{gl}} = \mathbb{K}[\alpha_0, \dots, \alpha_n].$$

We denote the monomials in \mathcal{R}^{gl} and \mathcal{D}^{gl} by

$$\mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{m}} := x_0^{m_0} \cdots x_n^{m_n}, \quad \boldsymbol{\alpha}^{\mathbf{m}} := \alpha_0^{m_0} \cdots \alpha_n^{m_n},$$

for any multi-index $\mathbf{m} = (m_0, \dots, m_n) \in \mathbb{N}^{n+1}$. For such an \mathbf{m} , let $\mathbf{m}! := m_0! \cdots m_n!$. The polarization map is defined on monomials as

$$\boldsymbol{\alpha}^{\mathbf{k}} \circ \mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{m}} := \begin{cases} \frac{\mathbf{m}!}{(\mathbf{m}-\mathbf{k})!} \mathbf{x}^{\mathbf{m}-\mathbf{k}} & \text{if } \mathbf{m}-\mathbf{k} \geq 0, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Definition 2.1. The *apolarity action* of \mathcal{D}^{gl} on \mathcal{R}^{gl} is defined by linearly extending the polarization maps for each component of \mathcal{D}^{gl} and \mathcal{R}^{gl} . It is denoted by $\circ: \mathcal{D}^{\text{gl}} \times \mathcal{R}^{\text{gl}} \rightarrow \mathcal{R}^{\text{gl}}$, and gives $(\sigma, f) \mapsto \sigma \circ f$.

By fixing a polynomial $f \in \mathcal{R}^{\text{gl}}$, it is possible to define a function that describes the apolarity action of the space \mathcal{D}^{gl} on f .

Definition 2.2. For any $f \in \mathcal{R}^{\text{gl}}$, the *catalecticant map* of f is defined as the linear map

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Cat}_f: \mathcal{D}^{\text{gl}} &\longrightarrow \mathcal{R}^{\text{gl}} \\ \sigma &\longmapsto \sigma \circ f. \end{aligned} \tag{2.3}$$

The *annihilator* (or *apolar ideal*) of f is the kernel of Cat_f , that is, the set

$$\text{Ann}(f) := \{ \sigma \in \mathcal{D}^{\text{gl}} \mid \sigma \circ f = 0 \}.$$

The annihilator of a polynomial f was called *principal system* by F. S. Macaulay and its quotient

$$\text{Ap}(f) := \frac{\mathcal{R}^{\text{gl}}}{\text{Ann}(f)},$$

also called the *apolar algebra* of f . The apolar algebra was introduced in [Mac94] by F. S. Macaulay, see also [IK99, p. XX] and [Dol12, p. 75]. The definition above extends immediately to several polynomials.

Definition 2.4. Let $f_1, \dots, f_r \in \mathcal{R}^{\text{gl}}$. The *annihilator* of f_1, \dots, f_r is the ideal

$$\text{Ann}(f_1, \dots, f_r) := \bigcap_{i=1}^r \text{Ann}(f_i).$$

The *apolar algebra* of f_1, \dots, f_r is the quotient space

$$\text{Ap}(f_1, \dots, f_r) := \frac{\mathcal{R}^{\text{gl}}}{\text{Ann}(f_1, \dots, f_r)}.$$

In the specific case of a single polynomial $f \in \mathcal{R}^{\text{gl}}$, we have the isomorphism of \mathcal{D}^{gl} -modules

$$\mathcal{D}^{\text{gl}} \circ f \simeq \text{Ap}(f). \tag{2.5}$$

We also recall that $f \in \mathbb{K}[x_1, \dots, x_n]$ is *concise* if it cannot be written, perhaps after a change of coordinates, using less than n variables. Equivalently, the polynomial f is concise if

$$\text{Ann}(f) \cap \mathbb{K}[x_1, \dots, x_n]_{\leq 1} = \{0\}.$$

2.2. Ranks of tensors. In this section we recall several notions of rank, useful below. A crucial tool for providing upper for the rank is the classical apolarity lemma.

Lemma 2.6 (Apolarity lemma). *Let $f \in (\mathcal{R}^{\text{gl}})_d$ be a homogeneous form and $Z \subseteq \mathbb{P}^n$ be a finite scheme. Let*

$$v_d: \mathbb{P}((\mathcal{R}^{\text{gl}})_1) \rightarrow \mathbb{P}((\mathcal{R}^{\text{gl}})_d)$$

be the d -Veronese map. The following conditions are equivalent:

- (1) $[f] \in \langle v_d(Z) \rangle$;
- (2) $I(Z) \subseteq \text{Ann}(f)$.

If they hold, we say that Z is apolar to f .

The lemma gives rise to three notions of rank, and also gives an alternative but equivalent definition of Waring rank.

Definition 2.7. The *cactus rank* of F is the minimum degree of a scheme Z apolar to F . The *smoothable rank* of F is the minimal degree of such a Z , where Z is smoothable (see §2.4 below). The *Waring rank* of F is the minimum degree of such a Z , where Z is a tuple of points.

The cactus rank was introduced under the name of *scheme length* by A. Iarrobino and V. Kanev (see [IK99, Definition 5.1]). The term *cactus rank* was first used by K. Ranestad and F.-O. Schreyer in [RS11], inspired by the notion of *cactus variety*, introduced by W. Buczyńska and J. Buczyński in [BB14]. The cactus rank was analyzed in several other papers, such as [Ba18, BR13, BBG19]. The smoothable rank was also first introduced in [RS11], motivated by several results appearing in [BGI11, BB14, BGL13]. For a homogeneous polynomial f , we denote its smoothable rank by $\text{smrk } f$ and its cactus rank by $\text{crk } f$. For any f we have inequalities

$$\text{crk } f \leq \text{smrk } f \leq \text{rk } f,$$

which can be strict in general, see, for example, [BB15, HMV20].

2.3. Tautological schemes. In general, the construction of apolar schemes for a given form is a subtle problem. There are several papers in the literature treating these objects, such as [BB14, Chi06, GRV18, RS11].

A clear and general procedure is provided by A. Bernardi and K. Ranestad in [BR13] and later in [BJMR18, section 4]. This strategy allows to relate homogeneous polynomials to their dehomogenizations.

Before proceeding further, we warn the reader about one known caveat: Theorem 3 in [BR13] is false as stated, see corrigendum [BR24]. A counterexample is [Example 1.7](#). The source of problem is the lack of constants in the last line of the proof of [BR13, Lemma 2], compare (2.9) below. As far as we know, the results of [BJMR18, section 4] are fine. However, [BJMR18] uses the contraction action rather than differentiation (see [IK99, Appendix A] for comparison of two actions). The whole problem may seem notational and negligible, but it is unavoidable and led us to the introduction of twists above. [Example 5.4](#) below shows that they are necessary.

In the current article, we do not introduce the contraction action directly. Rather, we only introduce the necessary notation, referring the reader to [BJMR18] and [IK99, Appendix A] for details.

The main result we use is the following proposition.

Proposition 2.8 ([BJMR18, Corollary 4] or corrected [BR13, Lemma 2]). *Let $F \in \mathcal{R}^{\text{gl}} = \mathbb{K}[x_0, \dots, x_n]$ be an arbitrary form and let*

$$Z_{F, x_0} := \text{Spec Ap}(F|_{x_0=1}) \subseteq (x_0 \neq 0) \subseteq \mathbb{P}^n.$$

Then the scheme Z_{F, x_0} is apolar to $\text{tw}(F)$.

Proof. We deliberately follow the notation of [BR13, Lemma 2]. Let d be the degree of F . Take a homogeneous $G \in \mathcal{D}^{\text{gl}}$ such that its dehomogenization $g = G|_{x_0=1}$ is apolar to $f = F|_{x_0=1}$. If the degree of G is higher than d , then the apolarity is clear. Otherwise, write

$$g = g_d + \dots + g_0, \quad F|_{x_0=1} = f_d + \dots + f_0,$$

where f_i and g_i are homogeneous of degree i . The apolarity boils down to

$$\sum_j g_j \circ f_{j+e} = 0$$

for every e . We compute

$$G \circ \text{tw}(F) = \sum_e \sum_j \frac{1}{(d - (e + j))!} (\alpha_0^{d-j} \circ x_0^{d-(e+j)}) g_j \circ f_{e+j} = \sum_e \frac{1}{e!} x_0^e \sum_j g_j \circ f_{e+j} = 0. \quad (2.9)$$

□

2.4. Smoothability. [Lemma 2.6](#) and [Proposition 2.8](#) are powerful results that can be useful in determining upper bounds. To use them to determine smoothable rank, it is necessary to discuss the notion of smoothability. We recall that the *Hilbert scheme* $\text{Hilb}_r(\mathbb{A}^n)$ of r points in the affine space \mathbb{A}^n is a scheme parametrizing all the finite subschemes of \mathbb{A}^n of degree r . It was first introduced by A. Grothendieck in [Gro61] and it is a very important object in algebraic geometry, widely used in the literature (see, e.g., [Str96, MS05, Ber12] for introductions). Denoting by $\text{Hilb}_r^0(\mathbb{A}^n)$ the open subset of $\text{Hilb}_r(\mathbb{A}^n)$ consisting of the r -tuples of distinct points in \mathbb{A}^n , we say that a scheme $Z \subseteq \mathbb{A}^n$ is *smoothable* if it is

contained in the closure of $\text{Hilb}_r^0(\mathbb{A}^n)$. The smoothability does not depend on the embedding of Z , only on Z itself. Moreover, a finite scheme Z is smoothable if and only if all of its irreducible components are smoothable (see [BJ17, Theorem 1.1]). For more details on smoothability, the reader may consult [IK99, BJ17, CEVV09, JKK19].

Let $\mathcal{D} := \mathbb{K}[\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n]$ be the coordinate ring of \mathbb{A}^n . Our interest focuses on the smoothability of symmetric powers of algebras (see §5.1), and we will see that it is cumbersome to consider them as quotients of \mathcal{D} . Thus, it is also important to consider smoothability from the point of view of non-embedded \mathbb{K} -algebras.

Definition 2.10. A \mathbb{K} -algebra A of finite rank is said to be *smoothable* if there exists a homomorphism $\mathbb{K}[[t]] \rightarrow \mathcal{A}$, where $\mathbb{K}[[t]]$ is the formal power series ring in t and \mathcal{A} is a $\mathbb{K}[[t]]$ -algebra such that the *special fiber* $\mathcal{A}/t\mathcal{A}$ is isomorphic to A as a \mathbb{K} -algebra, the *generic fiber* $\mathcal{A}[t^{-1}]$ is a smooth $\mathbb{K}[[t]][t^{-1}]$ -algebra, and \mathcal{A} is a free $\mathbb{K}[[t]]$ -module.

These last two definitions are equivalent. In particular, using Definition 2.10, we recall the following lemma, provided by D. A. Cartwright, D. Erman, M. Velasco, and B. Viray.

Lemma 2.11 ([CEVV09, Lemma 4.1]). *Let $I \subseteq \mathcal{D}$ be an ideal such that $\dim_{\mathbb{K}} \mathcal{D}/I = r$. Then $\text{Spec}(\mathcal{D}/I)$ lies in the smoothable component of $\text{Hilb}_n(\mathbb{A}^r)$ if and only if \mathcal{D}/I is a smoothable \mathbb{K} -algebra in the sense of Definition 2.10.*

For any scheme $Z \subseteq \mathbb{A}^n$, much is known about smoothability of Z for small values of $\deg(Z)$. Indeed, all schemes Z such that $\deg(Z) \leq 7$ are smoothable ([CEVV09]) and all Gorenstein schemes Z such that $\deg(Z) \leq 13$ are smoothable ([CJN15]). However, when $\deg(Z)$ is larger the situation is much more complicated. The known classes of smoothable Z are:

- (1) $Z \subseteq \mathbb{A}^2$
- (2) $Z \subseteq \mathbb{A}^3$ Gorenstein;
- (3) Z given by a locally complete intersection or, more generally, linked to a smoothable scheme;
- (4) Z given by a monomial ideal in an \mathbb{A}^n .

Disjoint union and product of smoothable schemes are smoothable. While there are many other constructions that yield specific examples of smoothable schemes, it seems that the above are the only general ones known. In §5.2 we show that being able to decide if explicit, simple algebras are smoothable or not, would provide upper and lower bounds on tensor border rank that are much better than state-of-the-art techniques.

2.5. Secant varieties and border rank. When dealing with decompositions of homogeneous polynomials, there is another quantity which must be taken into account, namely the *border rank* of a form. The notion of border rank of an arbitrary tensor was introduced for the first time in 1979 by D. Bini, M. Capovani, G. Lotti, and F. Romani in [BCRL79], and then named that way in the following year by D. Bini, G. Lotti, and F. Romani in [BLR80], where the authors defined it as the minimum number of decomposable tensors required to approximate a tensor with an arbitrarily small error. This is, in fact, the reason why it can be useful in cases where tensors have a large gap between rank and border rank (see, e.g., [Zui17]). The analog for homogeneous polynomials is defined in the same way. For a homogeneous polynomial f , the *border rank* of f , denoted by $\text{brk } f$, is the smallest natural number r such that f is in the closure of a set of polynomials having rank equal or less than r . The closure is taken in the Zariski topology. For $\mathbb{K} = \mathbb{C}$ the closure agrees with the closure in the Euclidean topology.

Determining the border rank of a *given* polynomial is in general a very difficult problem. However, again, much information is known for small values of n and d (see, e.g., [LO13, CGLV22, GL19, LMR23, Fla23, GMR23]). A classical example that illustrates the difference between rank and border rank is given by a monomial of the type $x_1^{d-1}x_2$, for any $d \in \mathbb{N}$. Indeed, it has rank equal to d , but its border rank is 2, as we can express it as

$$x_1^{d-1}x_2 = \frac{1}{d} \cdot \lim_{t \rightarrow 0} \frac{1}{t} ((x_1 + tx_2)^d - x_1^d).$$

The **catalecticant bound** is a well known lower bound for the border rank of a form $f \in (\mathcal{R}^{\text{sl}})_d$, historically attributed to J. J. Sylvester in [Syl51]. It states that for every $k \in \mathbb{N}$ we have

$$\text{brk } f \geq \text{rk}(\text{Cat}_f)_k, \quad (2.12)$$

where $(\text{Cat}_f)_k$ is the k -th catalecticant matrix, see (2.3).

The catalecticant bound, usually taken for $k \simeq d/2$, is very effective when d is large with respect to r . For example, it gives set theoretic equations of the r -th secant variety $\sigma_r(\nu_d(\mathbb{P}^n))$ when $d \geq 2r$ and $r \leq 13$, see [BB14, Theorem 1.1 and §8.1]. When r is large with respect to d , the bound is very weak and there are few explicit classes of f for which equality holds: mostly additive decompositions, such as

$$f := x_1^d + \dots + x_n^d,$$

and more generally forms in disjoint sets of variables, such as tangential generalized additive decompositions of the type

$$f := x_1^{d-1}x_2 + x_3^{d-1}x_4 + \dots + x_{2n-1}^{d-1}x_{2n},$$

or yet more generally the GADs, see, e.g., [BOT24]. All examples known to authors have $\max_i \text{rk } \text{Cat}_{f,i}$ equal to n or slightly higher.

There are several examples in the literature concerning the analysis of the rank of the catalecticant matrices of certain homogeneous polynomials (see [BBM14, Example 2.21] for the case of monomials, see also [IK99, p. 198]). A special case concerns the powers of quadratic forms. Given any quadratic form q_n of rank equal to n , B. Reznick proves that for every integer $d \geq 1$ the catalecticant matrices of q_n^d are all full rank. This can be obtained from [Rez92, Theorem 8.15], using [Rez92, Theorem 3.7 and Theorem 3.16]. Different proofs have been provided in [GL19, Theorem 2.2] and [Fla23, Proposition 3.2]. Therefore, by inequality (2.12) we get the following result.

Theorem 2.13. *For a quadratic form $q_n \in (\mathcal{R}^{\text{sl}})_2$ of rank n and for any $d \geq 1$ we have*

$$\text{brk}(q_n^d) \geq \binom{n+d-1}{d}.$$

A notable fact is that the border rank and the smoothable rank can be compared. Indeed, as observed by A. Bernardi, J. Brachat, and B. Mourrain in [BBM14, Remark 2.7], using [IK99, Lemma 5.17], we have

$$\text{brk } f \leq \text{smrk } f. \quad (2.14)$$

As one might expect, there are many cases where the equality in formula (2.14) does not hold. Several examples of polynomials with border rank strictly less than smoothable rank are given by W. Buczyńska and J. Buczyński in [BB15]. It is expected that for many polynomials the inequality (2.14) is strict.

2.6. Lowest and top degree forms. Some of the proofs below make use of the theory of top degree and lowest degree forms, which we briefly review here (see [Iar94, §1] for details). Write a polynomial $f \in \mathcal{R}$ as

$$f = f_e + f_{e+1} + \dots + f_d,$$

for some $e \in \mathbb{N}$, where $f_i \in \mathcal{R}$ is homogeneous of degree i for $e \leq i \leq d$ and $f_e, f_d \neq 0$. Then the *lowest degree form* and the *top degree form* of f are respectively the homogeneous polynomials

$$\text{ldf}(f) := f_e, \quad \text{tdf}(f) := f_d.$$

In general none of these is a monomial. Analogous definitions can be made for any polynomial $\sigma \in \mathcal{D}$.

For a \mathcal{D} -submodule $M \subseteq \mathcal{R}$, we define the *space of the lowest degree forms* and the *space of the top degree forms* as the \mathbb{K} -linear spaces given by

$$\text{ldf}(M) := \langle \{ \text{ldf}(f) \mid f \in M \} \rangle, \quad \text{tdf}(M) := \langle \{ \text{tdf}(f) \mid f \in M \} \rangle,$$

respectively. Then $\text{ldf}(M)$ and $\text{tdf}(M)$ are also \mathcal{D} -submodules. In particular, for any ideal $I \subseteq \mathcal{D}$ such that $\mathcal{D}_{\geq r} \subseteq I$ for some large enough r , we can define $\text{tdf}(I)$, which is the \mathbb{K} -linear space spanned by the set

$$\{ \text{tdf}(\sigma) \mid \sigma \in I \},$$

which is also an ideal.

Lemma 2.15. *Let M be a finitely generated \mathcal{D} -submodule of \mathcal{R} and let $I = \text{Ann}(M)$. Then*

$$\text{Ann}(\text{ldf}(M)) = \text{tdf}(I).$$

Proof. Note that $\text{ldf}(M)$ is a \mathcal{D} -submodule of \mathcal{R} . Since I annihilates M , then also $\text{tdf}(I)$ must annihilate $\text{ldf}(M)$. Therefore, we must have the inclusion

$$\text{tdf}(I) \subseteq \text{Ann}(\text{ldf}(M)).$$

The spaces M and $\mathcal{D}/\text{Ann}(M)$ are dual, so they have the same dimension. We obtain

$$\dim_{\mathbb{K}}(\mathcal{D}/\text{Ann}(\text{ldf}(M))) = \dim_{\mathbb{K}} \text{ldf}(M) = \dim_{\mathbb{K}} M = \dim_{\mathbb{K}}(\mathcal{D}/I) = \dim_{\mathbb{K}}(\mathcal{D}/\text{tdf}(I)) = d,$$

so $\text{tdf}(I)$ and $\text{Ann}(\text{ldf}(M))$ have the same (finite!) codimension and hence the inclusion is an equality. \square

2.7. Iarrobino's symmetric decomposition. In the following, in §4.2 we will need a bit of theory of nonhomogeneous Gorenstein algebras, as developed by Iarrobino [Iar94, chapter 2].

Let f be a polynomial and $A := \text{Ap}(f)$. We have

$$\mathcal{D}_{>\deg(f)} \subseteq \text{Ann}(f),$$

so A is local with maximal ideal \mathfrak{m} being the image of $(\mathcal{D})_{\geq 1}$. We have a bilinear map $\mu: A \times A \rightarrow \mathbb{K}$ given by

$$\mu(a_1, a_2) := ((a_1 a_2) \circ f)_0,$$

where $(-)_0$ denotes the constant part of a polynomial and the action \circ is the apolarity action given in Definition 2.1. The whole operation is well-defined because $\text{Ann}(f)$ by definition annihilates f , so $(-)\circ f$ descends to $\text{Ap}(f)$. For every \mathbb{K} -subspace $L \subseteq A$ we define

$$L^\perp := \{ a \in A \mid \mu(a, L) = 0 \}.$$

We have the following properties:

- (1) the pairing μ is perfect;
- (2) for any m we have $(\mathfrak{m}^m)^\perp = (0 : \mathfrak{m}^m)$;
- (3) for any m the pairing μ induces a perfect pairing

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{\mu}: \frac{\mathfrak{m}^m}{\mathfrak{m}^{m+1}} \times \frac{(0 : \mathfrak{m}^{m+1})}{(0 : \mathfrak{m}^m)} &\longrightarrow \mathbb{K} \\ (a_1 + \mathfrak{m}^{m+1}, a_2 + (0 : \mathfrak{m}^m)) &\mapsto \mu(a_1, a_2). \end{aligned} \tag{2.16}$$

The following lemma is all we will use in the sequel. It is very easy in the case of homogeneous polynomials, but subtler in the nonhomogeneous case.

Lemma 2.17. *Let $f \in \mathcal{R}$ be a polynomial, let $m \geq 0$ be fixed and let $\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_l \in \mathcal{D}_{\geq m} + \text{Ann}(f)$ be elements such that no nonzero \mathbb{K} -linear combination of $\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_l$ lies in $\mathcal{D}_{\geq m+1} + \text{Ann}(f)$. Then there exist $\tau_1, \dots, \tau_l \in \mathcal{D}$ such that the following hold:*

- (1) $\deg(\tau_j \circ f) \leq m$ for every j ;
- (2) $(\tau_j \sigma_j) \circ f = 1$ for every j and $(\tau_i \sigma_j) \circ f = 0$ for every $i \neq j$.

Proof. The surjection $\mathcal{D} \rightarrow \text{Ap}(f)$ sends $\mathcal{D}_{\geq m}$ onto \mathfrak{m}^m . Consider the classes $\bar{\sigma}_1, \dots, \bar{\sigma}_l$ in \mathfrak{m}^m . By assumption, they yield nonzero and linearly independent elements of $\mathfrak{m}^m/\mathfrak{m}^{m+1}$. Complete them to a basis of $\mathfrak{m}^m/\mathfrak{m}^{m+1}$ and let $\bar{\tau}_1, \dots, \bar{\tau}_l \in (0 : \mathfrak{m}^{m+1})$ be the duals of $\bar{\sigma}_1, \dots, \bar{\sigma}_l$ under the perfect pairing of formula (2.16). Let $\tau_1, \dots, \tau_l \in \mathcal{D}$ be any lifts of $\bar{\tau}_1, \dots, \bar{\tau}_l$. For every j we have $\mathfrak{m}^{m+1}\bar{\tau}_j = 0$, so $\mathcal{D}_{\geq m+1}(\tau_j \circ f) = 0$. Hence, $\deg(\tau_j \circ f) \leq m$, which proves (1).

By construction of $\bar{\mu}$, the constant $\bar{\mu}(\bar{\sigma}_i, \bar{\tau}_j)$ is the degree zero part of $(\sigma_i \tau_j) \circ f$. By the choice of $\bar{\tau}_j$, we have

$$\bar{\sigma}_i \bar{\tau}_j \in \mathfrak{m}^m \cdot (0 : \mathfrak{m}^{m+1}) \subseteq (0 : \mathfrak{m}),$$

so $\bar{\sigma}_i \bar{\tau}_j \mathfrak{m} = 0$ and hence $\mathcal{D}_{\geq 1} \circ (\sigma_i \tau_j \circ f) = 0$. It follows that $\sigma_i \tau_j \circ f \in \mathbb{K}$ is a constant polynomial. We can then identify it with the constant $\bar{\mu}(\bar{\sigma}_i, \bar{\tau}_j)$ and obtain part (2). \square

3. APOLAR ALGEBRAS OF POWERS OF POLYNOMIALS

In this section we focus on the apolar algebras of powers f^d of a given polynomial f . It turns out that it is easier to start with the tensor powers.

We now consider, given any number $d \in \mathbb{N}$, the d -th tensor power $\mathcal{R}^{\boxtimes d}$ and its dual space $\mathcal{D}^{\boxtimes d}$. These can be identified as the polynomial rings

$$\mathcal{R}^{\boxtimes d} := \mathbb{K}[x_{ij} \mid i = 1, \dots, n, j = 1, \dots, d], \quad \mathcal{D}^{\boxtimes d} := \mathbb{K}[\alpha_{ij} \mid i = 1, \dots, n, j = 1, \dots, d].$$

For a polynomial $f \in \mathcal{R}$, its d -th tensor power $f^{\boxtimes d}$ is defined as

$$f^{\boxtimes d} := f(x_{11}, \dots, x_{n1})f(x_{12}, \dots, x_{n2}) \cdots f(x_{1d}, \dots, x_{nd}).$$

In the following we will use the notation $\mathbf{x}_{\bullet j}$ for x_{1j}, \dots, x_{nj} and $\alpha_{\bullet j}$ for $\alpha_{1j}, \dots, \alpha_{nj}$, where $j \in \{1, \dots, d\}$.

Proposition 3.1 (apolar algebra of the tensor power). *The apolar algebra $\text{Ap}(f^{\boxtimes d})$ is isomorphic to $\text{Ap}(f)^{\otimes d}$. In particular, it has dimension $(\dim_{\mathbb{K}} \text{Ap}(f))^d$.*

Proof. Let $I = \text{Ann}(f)$ and for every $j = 1, \dots, d$, let $I_j \subseteq \mathbb{K}[\alpha_{\bullet j}]$ be a copy of I . Then every I_j annihilates $f^{\boxtimes d}$, so

$$\text{Ap}(f^{\boxtimes d}) := \mathcal{D}^{\boxtimes d} / \text{Ann}(f^{\boxtimes d})$$

is a quotient of

$$\frac{\mathcal{D}^{\boxtimes d}}{(I_1) + (I_2) + \cdots + (I_d)} \simeq \frac{\mathbb{K}[\alpha_{\bullet 1}]}{I_1} \otimes_{\mathbb{K}} \frac{\mathbb{K}[\alpha_{\bullet 2}]}{I_2} \otimes_{\mathbb{K}} \cdots \otimes_{\mathbb{K}} \frac{\mathbb{K}[\alpha_{\bullet d}]}{I_d} \simeq \text{Ap}(f) \otimes \cdots \otimes \text{Ap}(f) = \text{Ap}(f)^{\otimes d}.$$

Moreover, if $g_1, \dots, g_d \in \mathcal{D} \circ f$ are arbitrary partials of f , say $g_i = \sigma_i \circ f$, then

$$g_1(\mathbf{x}_{\bullet 1}) \cdots g_d(\mathbf{x}_{\bullet d}) = (\sigma_1(\alpha_{\bullet 1}) \cdots \sigma_d(\alpha_{\bullet d})) \circ f^{\boxtimes d}.$$

This shows that the linear space $\mathcal{D}^{\boxtimes d} \circ f^{\boxtimes d}$ has dimension at least $(\dim_{\mathbb{K}} \text{Ap}(f))^d$. Therefore, by formula (2.5), we also have

$$\dim_{\mathbb{K}}(\text{Ap}(f^{\boxtimes d})) \leq (\dim_{\mathbb{K}} \text{Ap}(f))^d. \quad \square$$

Proposition 3.1 implies that the algebra $\text{Ap}(f^{\boxtimes d})$ is closely related to $\text{Ap}(f)$. For example, if $\text{Ap}(f)$ is smoothable by a family $\mathbb{K}[[t]] \rightarrow \mathcal{A}$, then $\text{Ap}(f^{\boxtimes d})$ is smoothable by a family $\mathbb{K}[[t]] \rightarrow \mathcal{A}^{\otimes d}$.

We now move on to discussing the usual powers f^d . We will see that the situation here is much more subtle. This is perhaps unexpected, so we give an example. Namely, the dimension of the \mathbb{K} -vector space $\text{Ap}(f^2)$ is by no means determined by $\dim_{\mathbb{K}}(\text{Ap}(f))$. In fact it is not determined by the isomorphism class of the algebra $\text{Ap}(f)$ itself!

Example 3.2. Let $f := x_1^2$ and $g := x_1^2 + x_2$. We have

$$\text{Ap}(f) \simeq \mathbb{K}[\varepsilon]/(\varepsilon^3) \simeq \text{Ap}(g).$$

However, $\dim_{\mathbb{K}}(\text{Ap}(f^2)) = 5$, while $\dim_{\mathbb{K}}(\text{Ap}(g^2)) = 6$.

We now give a bound on the dimension of $\text{Ap}(f^d)$. It is most convenient to work with the space $\mathcal{D} \circ f^d$. Let $\mathcal{F} := \mathcal{D} \circ f$. Consider the space

$$\mathcal{F}^d := \underbrace{\mathcal{F} \cdots \mathcal{F}}_d \subseteq \mathcal{R},$$

where the product is taken d times. This space contains

$$f^d = \underbrace{f \cdots f}_d$$

and it is closed under the action of \mathcal{D} , hence

$$\mathcal{D} \circ f^d \subseteq \mathcal{F}^d. \quad (3.3)$$

Moreover, there is a natural surjective map $S^d \mathcal{F} \rightarrow \mathcal{F}^d$ which maps a formal product of d elements of \mathcal{F} to the actual product. All in all we get a diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathcal{F}^d & \longleftarrow & S^d \mathcal{F} \\ \uparrow & & \\ \mathcal{D} \circ f^d & & \end{array} \quad (3.4)$$

Proposition 3.5 (dimension of the apolar to the symmetric power). *For any arbitrary polynomial f , let $\ell = \dim_{\mathbb{K}}(\text{Ap}(f))$. Then we have*

$$\dim_{\mathbb{K}}(\text{Ap}(f^d)) \leq \binom{\ell + d - 1}{d}$$

and equality holds if and only if both arrows in diagram (3.4) are bijections.

Proof. Diagram (3.4) yields inequalities

$$\dim_{\mathbb{K}}(\text{Ap}(f^d)) \leq \dim_{\mathbb{K}} \mathcal{F}^d \leq \dim_{\mathbb{K}} S^d \mathcal{F} = \binom{\ell + d - 1}{d}. \quad \square$$

The most interesting case for us is when the dimension of $\text{Ap}(f^d)$ is maximal for all d . When this is the case, we say that f has *maximal growth of powers*. If this holds, we will show that the problem from [Example 3.2](#) disappears: the dimension of $\text{Ap}(f^d)$ is determined by $\dim_{\mathbb{K}} \text{Ap}(f)$, see [Corollary 3.9](#). For this, we need to switch from spaces of partials to quotients of \mathcal{D} and below we prepare for this.

There is a canonical injective homomorphism $\iota_{\mathcal{R}}: \mathcal{R} \hookrightarrow \mathcal{R}^{\boxtimes d}$ of algebras defined on variables by

$$\iota_{\mathcal{R}}(x_i) := \frac{1}{d} \sum_{j=1}^d x_{ij}.$$

There is a corresponding projection homomorphism $\pi_{\mathcal{R}}: \mathcal{R}^{\boxtimes d} \rightarrow \mathcal{R}$, which satisfies the equality $\pi_{\mathcal{R}} \circ \iota_{\mathcal{R}} = \text{id}_{\mathcal{R}}$ and it is defined by $\pi_{\mathcal{R}}(x_{ij}) := x_i$ for every $i = 1, \dots, n$. We do the same for the space $\mathcal{D}^{\boxtimes d}$.

To preserve duality, we define the maps $\iota_{\mathcal{D}}: \mathcal{D} \rightarrow \mathcal{D}^{\boxtimes d}$ and $\pi_{\mathcal{D}}: \mathcal{D}^{\boxtimes d} \rightarrow \mathcal{D}$ such that

$$\iota_{\mathcal{D}}(\alpha_i) := \sum_{j=1}^d \alpha_{ij}, \quad \pi_{\mathcal{D}}(\alpha_{ij}) := \frac{1}{d} \alpha_i,$$

for every $i = 1, \dots, n$ and $j = 1, \dots, d$. Again, we have $\pi_{\mathcal{D}} \circ \iota_{\mathcal{D}} = \text{id}_{\mathcal{D}}$. The duality alluded to above follows from the equality

$$\iota_{\mathcal{D}}(\alpha_i) \circ \iota_{\mathcal{R}}(x_k) = \left(\sum_{j=1}^d \alpha_{ij} \right) \circ \left(\frac{1}{d} \sum_{j=1}^d x_{kj} \right) = \frac{1}{d} \sum_{j=1}^d (\alpha_{ij} \circ x_{kj}) = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } i = k, \\ 0, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

The most important formal property of the above maps is captured by the following statement. The reader will probably recognize that the argument is about the representations of the symmetric group Σ_d , but we keep the proof elementary.

Lemma 3.6. *Let f_j in $\mathbb{K}[x_{\bullet j}]$ for every $j = 1, \dots, d$. For any $\sigma \in \mathcal{D}$ we have*

$$\pi_{\mathcal{R}}(\iota_{\mathcal{D}}(\sigma) \circ (f_1 \cdots f_d)) = \sigma \circ \pi_{\mathcal{R}}(f_1 \cdots f_d).$$

Before we give the proof, let us make an illustrative example. Take $d = 2$ and $\sigma = \alpha_1 \alpha_2$. Then

$$\iota_{\mathcal{D}}(\sigma) = (\alpha_{11} + \alpha_{12})(\alpha_{21} + \alpha_{22}),$$

hence

$$\iota_{\mathcal{D}}(\sigma) \circ f_1 f_2 = (\alpha_{11} \alpha_{21} \circ f_1) f_2 + f_1 (\alpha_{12} \alpha_{22} \circ f_2) + (\alpha_{11} \circ f_1) (\alpha_{22} \circ f_2) + (\alpha_{21} \circ f_1) (\alpha_{12} \circ f_2).$$

Let $\bar{f}_i = \pi_{\mathcal{R}}(f_i)$. Applying $\pi_{\mathcal{R}}$ to the right side, we obtain

$$(\alpha_1 \alpha_2 \circ \bar{f}_1) \bar{f}_2 + \bar{f}_1 (\alpha_1 \alpha_2 \circ \bar{f}_2) + (\alpha_1 \circ \bar{f}_1) (\alpha_2 \circ \bar{f}_2) + (\alpha_2 \circ \bar{f}_1) (\alpha_1 \circ \bar{f}_2) = (\alpha_1 \alpha_2) \circ (\bar{f}_1 \bar{f}_2).$$

Proof of Lemma 3.6. Considering the diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} \mathcal{D} \otimes \mathcal{R}^{\boxtimes d} & \xrightarrow{\iota_{\mathcal{D}}} & \mathcal{D}^{\boxtimes d} \otimes \mathcal{R}^{\boxtimes d} & \xrightarrow{\text{action}} & \mathcal{R}^{\boxtimes d} \\ & \searrow \pi_{\mathcal{R}} & \downarrow \pi_{\mathcal{D}} \otimes \pi_{\mathcal{R}} & & \downarrow \pi_{\mathcal{R}} \\ & & \mathcal{D} \otimes \mathcal{R} & \xrightarrow{\text{action}} & \mathcal{R} \end{array}$$

we have to prove that it commutes for every $\sigma \in \mathcal{D}$ and every f_1, \dots, f_d with $f_j \in \mathbb{K}[x_{\bullet j}]$. Let \mathcal{P} be the linear space spanned by all products f_1, \dots, f_d as above. Then $\mathcal{P} \subseteq \mathcal{R}^{\boxtimes d}$ is a $\mathcal{D}^{\boxtimes d}$ -submodule, in particular it is a \mathcal{D} -submodule. We will prove that for every $p \in \mathcal{P}$ and $\sigma \in \mathcal{D}$ we have

$$\pi_{\mathcal{R}}(\iota_{\mathcal{D}}(\sigma) \circ p) = \sigma \circ \pi_{\mathcal{R}}(p). \quad (3.7)$$

First, we do it for $\sigma = \alpha_i$ a linear form. It is sufficient to check it for p when it is a product $f_1 \cdots f_d$ as above.

$$\begin{aligned} \pi_{\mathcal{R}}(\iota_{\mathcal{D}}(\alpha_i) \circ (f_1 \cdots f_d)) &= \pi_{\mathcal{R}}\left((\alpha_{i1} + \cdots + \alpha_{id}) \circ (f_1(x_{\bullet 1}) \cdots f_d(x_{\bullet d}))\right) \\ &= \sum_{j=1}^d \pi_{\mathcal{R}}\left(\alpha_{ij} \circ (f_1(x_{\bullet 1}) \cdots f_d(x_{\bullet d}))\right) \\ &= \sum_{j=1}^d \pi_{\mathcal{R}}\left((\alpha_{ij} \circ f_j(x_{\bullet j})) \prod_{k \neq j} f_k(x_{\bullet k})\right) \\ &= \sum_{j=1}^d (\alpha_i \circ f_j(x_{\bullet})) \prod_{k \neq j} f_k(x_{\bullet}) \\ &= \alpha_i \circ (f_1(x_{\bullet}) \cdots f_d(x_{\bullet})) = \alpha_i \circ \pi_{\mathcal{R}}(f_1 \cdots f_d). \end{aligned} \quad (3.8)$$

This proves (3.7) for σ a variable. We will now prove (3.7) for σ a monomial. We do this by induction on the degree. To do the induction step, suppose that $\tau = \alpha_i \sigma$ and that (3.7) holds for σ . Take any $p \in \mathcal{P}$. We have $\iota_{\mathcal{D}}(\sigma) \circ p \in \mathcal{P}$, and hence

$$\begin{aligned} \tau \circ \pi_{\mathcal{R}}(p) &= \alpha_i \circ (\sigma \circ \pi_{\mathcal{R}}(p)) \stackrel{(3.7) \text{ for } \sigma}{=} \alpha_i \circ (\pi_{\mathcal{R}}(\iota_{\mathcal{D}}(\sigma) \circ p)) \\ &\stackrel{(3.7) \text{ for } \alpha_i}{=} \pi_{\mathcal{R}}(\iota_{\mathcal{D}}(\alpha_i) \circ (\iota_{\mathcal{D}}(\sigma) \circ p)) = \pi_{\mathcal{R}}(\iota_{\mathcal{D}}(\tau) \circ p). \end{aligned}$$

This concludes the proof of (3.7) for σ a monomial. For general σ , the proof follows by linearity. \square

Lemma 3.6 implies the following key corollary.

Corollary 3.9. *Let $f \in \mathcal{R}$ and $d \geq 1$. Take $\ell = \dim_{\mathbb{K}}(\text{Ap}(f))$. Suppose that*

$$\dim_{\mathbb{K}}(\text{Ap}(f^d)) = \binom{\ell + d - 1}{d}.$$

Then $\text{Ap}(f^d)$ is isomorphic to $S^d \text{Ap}(f)$.

Proof. Let $\sigma \in \mathcal{D}$. Then

$$\pi_{\mathcal{R}}(\iota_{\mathcal{D}}(\sigma) \circ f^{\boxtimes d}) = \sigma \circ f^d.$$

In particular, we have

$$\mathcal{D} \cap \text{Ann}(f^{\boxtimes d}) \subseteq \text{Ann}(f^d).$$

By the construction of $\iota_{\mathcal{D}}$, the image of the map

$$\mathcal{D} \rightarrow \mathcal{D}^{\boxtimes d} \rightarrow \text{Ap}(f^{\boxtimes d})$$

lands in the Σ_d -fixed part, so we obtain the following diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \frac{\mathcal{D}}{\mathcal{D} \cap \text{Ann}(f^{\boxtimes d})} & \hookrightarrow & \text{Ap}(f^{\boxtimes d})^{\Sigma_d} \\ \downarrow & & \\ \text{Ap}(f^d) & & \end{array} \quad (3.10)$$

By [Proposition 3.1](#) the algebra $\text{Ap}(f^{\boxtimes d})$ is isomorphic to $\text{Ap}(f)^{\otimes d}$. The Σ_d -action on $\text{Ap}(f^{\boxtimes d})$ corresponds to permuting factors in $\text{Ap}(f)^{\otimes d}$, so that

$$\text{Ap}(f^{\boxtimes d})^{\Sigma_d} \simeq S^d(\text{Ap}(f))$$

as algebras. We have

$$\dim_{\mathbb{K}} S^d(\text{Ap}(f)) = \binom{\ell + d - 1}{d}.$$

By assumption, this is also the dimension of $\text{Ap}(f^d)$. Therefore, both arrows in diagram (3.10) are isomorphisms. The claim follows. \square

4. ENCOMPASSING POLYNOMIALS

Inequality in [Proposition 3.5](#) and the consequence of equality in [Corollary 3.9](#) naturally leads to asking for which polynomials the equality holds. In this section we answer this question by proving [Theorem 1.16](#). The key property for us is given by the following definition.

Definition 4.1. A polynomial $f \in \mathcal{R}$ is *encompassing* if there is no nonzero element $g \in \mathcal{D} \circ f$ such that $g_{\leq 1} = 0$. Equivalently, for any basis $\{g_1, \dots, g_\ell\}$ of $\mathcal{D} \circ f$, the degree ≤ 1 parts $(g_1)_{\leq 1}, \dots, (g_\ell)_{\leq 1}$ are linearly independent.

We observe how this notion translates to the apolar side.

Lemma 4.2. *A polynomial f is encompassing if and only if the image of $\mathcal{D}_{\leq 1}$ in $\text{Ap}(f)$ spans this algebra (as a \mathbb{K} -vector space).*

Proof. Let $I := \text{Ann}(f)$ and let $\ell := \dim_{\mathbb{K}}(\text{Ap}(f))$. The dimension of the image $\text{im}(\mathcal{D}_{\leq 1}) \subseteq \text{Ap}(f)$ is

$$1 + n - \dim_{\mathbb{K}}(I \cap \mathcal{D}_{\leq 1}).$$

A form is linear if and only if its top degree form is linear, hence

$$1 + n - \dim_{\mathbb{K}}(I \cap \mathcal{D}_{\leq 1}) = 1 + n - \dim_{\mathbb{K}}(\text{tdf}(I))_{\leq 1}.$$

By [Lemma 2.15](#) we have

$$1 + n - \dim_{\mathbb{K}}(\text{tdf}(I))_{\leq 1} = \dim_{\mathbb{K}}(\text{ldf}(\mathcal{D} \circ f))_{\leq 1}.$$

The polynomial f is encompassing precisely when

$$\dim_{\mathbb{K}}(\text{ldf}(\mathcal{D} \circ f))_{\leq 1} = \ell.$$

This holds precisely when the dimension of the image of $\mathcal{D}_{\leq 1}$ is ℓ . \square

For an arbitrary finite-dimensional vector space $V \subseteq \mathcal{R}$, we say that V is *homogeneously algebraically independent* if for any basis $\{v_1, \dots, v_k\}$ of V there is no nonzero *homogeneous* polynomial $p \in \mathbb{K}[t_1, \dots, t_k]$ such that $p(v_1, \dots, v_k) = 0$. We note that if this condition holds for some basis of V , then it holds for every basis of V . The only spaces we will consider are spaces of partial derivatives and they always contain the element $1 \in \mathcal{R}$. Taking $v_1 = 1$, there is always a trivial (nonhomogeneous!) algebraic dependence $p(t_1, \dots, t_k) = t_1 - 1$, so we need to restrict to homogeneous polynomials. It is mostly an aesthetic choice: if $\{v_1 = 1, v_2, \dots, v_k\}$ is a basis of V , then homogeneous algebraic independence of V is equivalent to usual algebraic independence of $\{v_2, \dots, v_k\}$.

Lemma 4.3. *For an encompassing polynomial, its partial derivatives are homogeneously algebraically independent.*

Proof. Fix a basis h_1, \dots, h_ℓ of the space of partials, where $h_\ell = 1$ and $h_1, \dots, h_{\ell-1}$ have zero constant term. By assumption, their linear terms are linearly independent so that, perhaps after a linear change, we have $h_i \equiv x_i \pmod{\mathcal{R}_{\geq 2}}$ for $i = 1, 2, \dots, \ell - 1$. Assume that these partials are homogeneously algebraically dependent and let Φ be a homogeneous polynomial of degree d such that

$$\Phi(h_1, \dots, h_{\ell-1}, h_\ell) = 0.$$

Let $\varphi := \Phi|_{h_\ell=1}$, then $\varphi(h_1, \dots, h_{\ell-1}) = 0$. Let d' be the smallest natural number such that $\varphi_{d'} \neq 0$. Then

$$0 = \varphi_{d'}(\text{ldf}(h_1), \dots, \text{ldf}(h_{\ell-1})) = \varphi_{d'}(x_1, \dots, x_{\ell-1}),$$

so $\varphi_{d'}$ is the zero polynomial, which is a contradiction. \square

Proposition 4.4. *Let f be an encompassing polynomial, let $\ell := \dim_{\mathbb{K}} \text{Ap}(f)$ and suppose that*

$$\text{ldf}(\mathcal{D} \circ f) = \langle l_0 = 1, l_1, \dots, l_{\ell-1} \rangle$$

for linearly independent linear forms $l_1, \dots, l_{\ell-1}$. Then for every $d \geq 1$ we have

$$\text{ldf}(\mathcal{D} \circ f^d) = \mathbb{K}[l_1, \dots, l_{\ell-1}]_{\leq d}.$$

In particular,

$$\dim_{\mathbb{K}}(\mathcal{D} \circ f^d) = \binom{\ell + d - 1}{d}.$$

Proof. The case $\deg(f) = 0$ is trivial, and in the following we assume $\deg(f) \geq 1$. We start by simplifying the notation. Change the coordinates in $\mathcal{D} = \mathbb{K}[\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n]$ so that the kernel of $\mathcal{D}_{\leq 1} \rightarrow \text{Ap}(f)$ is generated by $\alpha_\ell, \dots, \alpha_n$. Then f lies in the subring $\mathbb{K}[x_1, \dots, x_{\ell-1}]$. We restrict to this subring, so that n becomes $\ell - 1$ and

$$\langle l_1, \dots, l_{\ell-1} \rangle = \langle x_1, \dots, x_n \rangle.$$

We make another crucial observation. Since $\mathcal{D}_{\leq 1}$ surjects onto $\text{Ap}(f)$, there is a linear form $\sigma \in \mathcal{D}_{\leq 1}$ such that $\sigma \circ f = 1$. Since

$$\deg(\sigma \circ f) = 0 < \deg(f),$$

we have $\sigma \in \mathcal{D}_1$. By changing the coordinates we can assume $\sigma = \alpha_n$. We have

$$\alpha_n \circ (\mathcal{D}_{\geq 1} \circ f) = \mathcal{D}_{\geq 1} \circ (\alpha_n \circ f) = 0,$$

so no polynomial in $\mathcal{D}_{\geq 1} \circ f$ depends on x_n . We want to prove that

$$\text{ldf}(\mathcal{D} \circ f^d) = \mathbb{K}[x_1, \dots, x_n]_{\leq d}.$$

First we prove the inclusion " \supseteq ". Assuming that this is not the case, we have by [Lemma 2.15](#) a polynomial $\Phi \in \text{Ann}(f^d)$ of degree at most d . Let $d' = \deg(\Phi)$ and let $\Phi_{d'}$ be its top degree form. For any $\mathbf{a} \in \mathbb{N}^n$, we write $\alpha^{\mathbf{a}} := \alpha_1^{\mathbf{a}_1} \cdots \alpha_n^{\mathbf{a}_n}$. Take any monomial $\alpha^{\mathbf{a}}$ of degree d' . Then

$$\alpha^{\mathbf{a}} \circ f^d = (\alpha_1^{\mathbf{a}_1} \cdots \alpha_n^{\mathbf{a}_n}) \circ f^d \equiv \frac{d!}{(d-d')!} (\alpha_1 \circ f)^{\mathbf{a}_1} \cdots (\alpha_n \circ f)^{\mathbf{a}_n} \cdot f^{d-d'} \pmod{f^{d-d'+1}}. \quad (4.5)$$

If instead $\alpha^{\mathbf{a}}$ has degree strictly less than d' , then

$$\alpha^{\mathbf{a}} \circ f^d \equiv 0 \pmod{f^{d-d'+1}}.$$

Suppose that $\Phi_{d'} = \sum_{\mathbf{a}} \lambda_{\mathbf{a}} \alpha^{\mathbf{a}}$. By repeatedly applying (4.5) we get

$$0 = \Phi \circ f^d \equiv \Phi_{d'} \circ f^d \equiv \frac{d!}{(d-d')!} \sum_{\mathbf{a}} \lambda_{\mathbf{a}} (\alpha_1 \circ f)^{\mathbf{a}_1} \cdots (\alpha_n \circ f)^{\mathbf{a}_n} f^{d-d'} \pmod{f^{d-d'+1}}.$$

It follows that the sum

$$\sum_{\mathbf{a}} \lambda_{\mathbf{a}} (\alpha_1 \circ f)^{\mathbf{a}_1} \cdots (\alpha_n \circ f)^{\mathbf{a}_n} \quad (4.6)$$

is a multiple of f . However, the sum does not depend on x_n , while any non-zero element of $\mathcal{R} \cdot f$ depends on x_n . We obtain that the sum (4.6) is zero. By [Lemma 4.3](#) this implies $\Phi_{d'} \equiv 0$, which is a contradiction. This proves that Φ does not exist and hence we obtain one inclusion. The equality then follows by [Proposition 3.5](#), which completes the proof. \square

Proof of Theorem 1.16. We start by a preliminary remark. Since f is concise, the map $\mathcal{D}_1 \rightarrow \text{Ap}(f)$ is injective. The image of this map lies in the maximal ideal of $\text{Ap}(f)$, hence also $\mathcal{D}_{\leq 1} \rightarrow \text{Ap}(f)$ is injective. It follows that

$$n + 1 = \dim_{\mathbb{K}} \mathcal{D}_{\leq 1} \leq \dim_{\mathbb{K}} \text{Ap}(f) = \ell. \quad (4.7)$$

Now we begin the proof of the equivalences. **Proposition 4.4** and **Lemma 4.3** prove that (4) implies (1) and (3), respectively. Let us prove that (1) implies (3). For every d , let $\mathcal{P}_d \subseteq \mathcal{R}$ denote the linear space spanned by products $\prod_{i=1}^d (\sigma_i \circ f)$ over all $\sigma_i \in \mathcal{D}$. We have a natural surjection $S^d(\mathcal{D} \circ f) \rightarrow \mathcal{P}_d$ and an inclusion $\mathcal{D} \circ f^d \subseteq \mathcal{P}_d$, see (3.3). Therefore

$$\binom{\ell + d - 1}{d} = \dim_{\mathbb{K}} S^d(\mathcal{D} \circ f) \geq \dim_{\mathbb{K}} \mathcal{P}_d \geq \dim_{\mathbb{K}}(\mathcal{D} \circ f^d).$$

By assumption (1), equalities must hold. But the first equality shows that the map $S^d(\mathcal{D} \circ f) \rightarrow \mathcal{P}_d$ is an isomorphism, which means that the partials of f satisfy no homogeneous polynomial of degree d . Iterating over all d , we obtain (3).

Now we prove that (3) implies (4). This is perhaps the most surprising part, because it follows easily and yet gives a strong characterization. Since the partials of f are homogeneously algebraically independent, there are at most $n + 1$ of them, so $\dim_{\mathbb{K}} \text{Ap}(f) \leq n + 1$. By (4.7) we have equality $\dim_{\mathbb{K}} \text{Ap}(f) = n + 1$ and additionally get that the image of $\mathcal{D}_{\leq 1}$ spans $\text{Ap}(f)$. By **Lemma 4.2**, this proves that f is encompassing, hence (4).

Finally, let us prove that (2) is equivalent to (3). Assume (2). By (4.7) we have $\ell \geq n + 1$. By (2), we have $\ell - 1 \leq n$. Joining these, we get $\ell = n + 1$. Let b_1, \dots, b_ℓ be a basis of the space of partials of f , where

$$b_i := \frac{\partial f}{\partial \mathbf{x}_i^{\mathbf{a}}}$$

for $i = 1, 2, \dots, \ell - 1$ and $b_\ell = 1$. Suppose that b_1, \dots, b_ℓ satisfy some nonzero homogeneous polynomial Φ . Then $\Phi|_{b_\ell=1}$ is nonconstant. This polynomial shows that $b_1, \dots, b_{\ell-1}$ are algebraically dependent. But this means that the subfield

$$\mathbb{K}(b_1, \dots, b_{\ell-1}) \subseteq \mathbb{K}(x_1, \dots, x_n) \quad (4.8)$$

has transcendence degree at most $\ell - 2$. However, by assumption (2), the field extension (4.8) is finite, so both fields have transcendence degree $n = \ell - 1$. This contradiction proves (3). The proof that (3) implies (2) is analogous. \square

4.1. Encompassing polynomial from any polynomial. In this section we discuss how to construct an encompassing polynomial from any polynomial and prove **Theorem 1.11**. We keep the notation as in the theorem, so we deal with polynomial rings in k variables, rather than in n variables. Take a nonhomogeneous *concise* polynomial $f \in \mathbb{K}[x_1, \dots, x_k]$ with $n := \dim_{\mathbb{K}} \text{Ap}(f)$ and fix elements

$$1, \alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_k, \sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_{n-k-1} \in \mathcal{D} = \mathbb{K}[\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_k]$$

restricting to a basis of $\text{Ap}(f)$. Let $I' := \text{Ann}(f) \subseteq \mathcal{D}$ be the annihilator of f .

Let us now introduce the enlarged rings

$$\widehat{\mathcal{R}} = \mathbb{K}[x_1, \dots, x_k, y_1, \dots, y_{n-k-1}], \quad \widehat{\mathcal{D}} = \mathbb{K}[\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_k, \beta_1, \dots, \beta_{n-k-1}].$$

We define a ring automorphism $\varphi: \widehat{\mathcal{D}} \rightarrow \widehat{\mathcal{D}}$, such that

$$\varphi(\alpha_i) = \alpha_i, \quad \varphi(\beta_j) = \beta_j - \sigma_j,$$

for every $i = 1, \dots, k$ and $j = 1, \dots, n - k - 1$ and consider the ideal

$$I := I' \cdot \widehat{\mathcal{D}} + (\beta_1 - \sigma_1, \dots, \beta_{n-k-1} - \sigma_{n-k-1}) = \varphi(\text{Ann}(f)).$$

Lemma 4.9. *The ideal I is the annihilator of an encompassing polynomial g equal to*

$$g = \sum_{\mathbf{a} \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^{n-k-1}} \frac{\mathbf{y}^{\mathbf{a}}}{\mathbf{a}!} (\sigma^{\mathbf{a}} \circ f).$$

Moreover, the apolar algebras $\text{Ap}(g)$ and $\text{Ap}(f)$ are isomorphic.

Proof. The algebras $\widehat{\mathcal{D}}/I$ and $\widehat{\mathcal{D}}/\text{Ann}(f) \simeq \text{Ap}(f)$ are isomorphic via φ , so by Macaulay's inverse systems (see [IK99, Appendix A]), we get that $I = \text{Ann}(g)$ for some non-unique g and $\text{Ap}(g) \simeq \text{Ap}(f)$. The classes of the elements

$$1, \alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_k, -\sigma_1, \dots, -\sigma_{n-k-1}$$

in $\widehat{\mathcal{D}}/\text{Ann}(f)$ are by definition linearly independent. Since every β_j annihilates f , these classes coincide with the classes of

$$1, \alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_k, (\beta_1 - \sigma_1), \dots, (\beta_{n-k-1} - \sigma_{n-k-1}).$$

But these are the images under φ of the classes of $1, \alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_k, \beta_1, \dots, \beta_{n-k-1}$. Therefore, the classes of $\widehat{\mathcal{D}}_{\leq 1}$ are linearly independent, so g is encompassing by Lemma 4.2. Finally, the explicit expression for g , again non-unique, is given by [Jel17, Proposition 2.12]. \square

Example 4.10. Let

$$f := x_1^4 + x_2^4 + \dots + x_n^4.$$

The Hilbert function of $\text{Ap}(f)$ is $(1, n, n, n, 1)$ and we can take

$$\sigma_i := \alpha_i, \quad \sigma_{n+i} := \frac{1}{12}\alpha_i^2, \quad \sigma_{2n+i} := \frac{1}{24}\alpha_i^3$$

for every $i = 1, 2, \dots, n$, and

$$\sigma_{3n+1} := \frac{1}{24}\alpha_1^4.$$

Then we have

$$g = f(x_1 + y_1, \dots, x_n + y_n) + \sum_{i=1}^n y_{n+i}(y_{n+i} + x_i^2) + \sum_{i=1}^n y_{2n+i}x_i + y_{3n+1}.$$

Unlike the examples in the introduction, here g has parts which are quadratic in y_\bullet .

Proof of Theorem 1.11. Assume that $F \in \mathbb{K}[x_0, \dots, x_k]$ is concise and $f = F|_{x_0=1}$ is its dehomogenization. Let g be an encompassing polynomial obtained from f as above and let G be its homogenization multiplied by a power of x_0 so that $\deg G = \deg F$ and

$$G \in \mathbb{K}[x_0, \dots, x_k, y_1, \dots, y_{n-k-1}] \simeq \mathbb{K}[x_0, \dots, x_n].$$

The polynomial g restricts to f by setting $y_\bullet = 0$, so also G restricts to F by setting $y_\bullet = 0$. We now observe that the homogeneous polynomial G satisfies the assumptions of Theorem 1.8. The algebra $\text{Ap}(g)$ is smoothable, since it is isomorphic to $\text{Ap}(f)$, and the polynomial g is encompassing, see Lemma 4.9 for both claims. This completes this part of the proof.

Fix any d . From Theorem 1.8 it follows that the

$$\text{smrk}(\text{tw}(G^d)) \leq \binom{n+d}{d},$$

so we also have by (2.14) that

$$\text{brk}(\text{tw}(G^d)) \leq \binom{n+d}{d}.$$

Since $\text{tw}(F^d)$ is a restriction of $\text{tw}(G^d)$ and border rank does not increase under restriction, we also get

$$\text{brk}(\text{tw}(F^d)) \leq \binom{n+d}{d}.$$

Finally, the explicit form (1.12) was already noted in Lemma 4.9. \square

4.2. Almost encompassing polynomials.

Definition 4.11. A polynomial f is *almost encompassing* if $f_{\leq 1} = 0$ but for every nonzero element g of $\mathcal{D}_{\geq 1} \circ f$ we have $g_{\leq 1} \neq 0$.

For example, any quadratic form is an almost encompassing polynomial. In general, for any encompassing polynomial f , the polynomial $f_{\geq 2}$ is almost encompassing. This shows that plenty of examples of almost encompassing polynomials can be produced using the method from §4.1.

In this section we show that almost encompassing polynomials f raised to power $\deg f$ fail to have maximal dimension of the apolar algebra, i.e.,

$$\dim_{\mathbb{K}} \text{Ap}(f^{\deg f}) < \binom{\deg f - 1 + \dim_{\mathbb{K}} \text{Ap}(f)}{\deg f}.$$

We conclude with a similar statement for arbitrary polynomials.

Theorem 4.12. *Let f be an almost encompassing polynomial. Then f is equal to a polynomial of degree $\deg f$ in the variables $\mathcal{D}_{\geq 1} \circ f$.*

Proof. Take $f \in \mathcal{R}$. After a possible coordinate change and lowering the n , we can assume that there is no linear form in the variables $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n$ annihilating f . For every $j \geq 2$ define a linear subspace of \mathcal{D}_1 by the formula

$$\mathcal{L}_{\geq j} = \{ \beta \in \mathcal{D}_1 \mid \exists \sigma \in \mathcal{D}_{\geq j} : \beta \circ f = \sigma \circ f \} = \mathcal{D}_1 \cap (\text{Ann}(f) + \mathcal{D}_{\geq j}).$$

We have inclusions

$$\mathcal{L}_{\geq 2} \supseteq \mathcal{L}_{\geq 3} \supseteq \dots \supseteq \mathcal{L}_{\geq j} \supseteq \dots,$$

so after another coordinate change we may assume that for every j we have an n_j such that

$$\mathcal{L}_{\geq j} = \langle \alpha_{n_j+1}, \dots, \alpha_n \rangle \tag{4.13}$$

Taking $k := n_2$ equality (4.13) for $j = 2$ shows that

$$\text{Ann}(f) \subseteq \langle \alpha_{k+1}, \dots, \alpha_n \rangle + \mathcal{D}_{\geq 2}.$$

Dualizing this containment, we obtain

$$\langle 1, x_1, \dots, x_k \rangle = (\langle \alpha_{k+1}, \dots, \alpha_n \rangle + \mathcal{D}_{\geq 2})^\perp \subseteq (\text{Ann}(f))^\perp = \mathcal{D} \circ f,$$

so x_1, \dots, x_k are partials of f . Additionally, it follows from (4.13) and Nakayama's Lemma that the classes of $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_k$ generate the algebra $\text{Ap}(f)$.

We now introduce an auxiliary grading on \mathcal{R} . Namely, taking $n_1 = 0$, for every $i = 1 \dots n$ there is a unique j such that $n_j < i \leq n_{j+1}$. We take the degree of x_i to be j . For example, the degrees of x_1, \dots, x_k are 1. We will refer to the resulting grading on \mathcal{R} as the *custom grading* and to the degree of an element as the *custom degree*, which we denote by \deg' .

For every $i \geq k + 1$ we will now inductively generate elements $\sigma_i, \tau_i \in \mathcal{D}$. Suppose we have already produced them for all $i \leq n_j$. To get them for $i = n_j + 1, \dots, n_{j+1}$, we use (4.13) and fix $\sigma_i \in \mathcal{D}_{\geq j}$ so that $\alpha_i - \sigma_i$ annihilates f .

By definition of $\mathcal{L}_{\geq j}$, $\mathcal{L}_{\geq j+1}$, and the construction of (4.13), no nonzero linear combination of the elements $\alpha_{n_j+1}, \dots, \alpha_{n_{j+1}}$ lies in $\text{Ann}(f) + \mathcal{D}_{\geq j+1}$.

Since $\sigma_i \equiv \alpha_i \pmod{\text{Ann}(f)}$ for $i = n_j + 1, \dots, n_{j+1}$, no nonzero linear combination of $\sigma_{n_j+1}, \dots, \sigma_{n_{j+1}}$ lies in $\text{Ann}(f) + \mathcal{D}_{\geq j+1}$. Using Lemma 2.17, we obtain $\tau_{n_j+1}, \dots, \tau_{n_{j+1}}$ such that

- (1) $\deg(\tau_i \circ f) \leq j$ for every $i = n_j + 1, \dots, n_{j+1}$,
- (2) $\sigma_i \circ (\tau_i \circ f) = 1$ for every $i = n_j + 1, \dots, n_{j+1}$,
- (3) $\sigma_k \circ (\tau_i \circ f) = 0$ for $n_j + 1 \leq i, k \leq n_{j+1}$ with $i \neq k$.

Since $\sigma_i \circ f = \alpha_i \circ f$, the last two equations imply that

$$\alpha_i \circ (\tau_i \circ f) = 1, \quad \alpha_k \circ (\tau_i \circ f) = 0, \tag{4.14}$$

for $n_j + 1 \leq i, k \leq n_{j+1}$ with $i \neq k$.

We claim for every $\rho \in \mathcal{D}$ the custom degree $\deg'(\rho \circ f)$ is equal to $\deg(\rho \circ f)$. It is immediate that

$$\deg'(\rho \circ f) \geq \deg(\rho \circ f),$$

as this holds for every monomial. We will now prove that

$$\deg'(\rho \circ f) \leq \deg(\rho \circ f).$$

It suffices to prove that $\rho \circ f$ is annihilated by every monomial $\alpha_1^{a_1} \dots \alpha_n^{a_n}$ such that

$$\sum a_i \deg'(x_i) > \deg(\rho \circ f).$$

For every such monomial, we get

$$(\alpha_1^{a_1} \dots \alpha_n^{a_n}) \circ \rho \circ f = (\alpha_1^{a_1} \dots \alpha_k^{a_k} \sigma_{k+1}^{a_{k+1}} \dots \sigma_n^{a_n}) \circ \rho \circ f.$$

By definition of the custom degree, the element

$$\alpha_1^{a_1} \dots \alpha_k^{a_k} \sigma_{k+1}^{a_{k+1}} \dots \sigma_n^{a_n}$$

lies in $\mathcal{D}_{\geq \sum a_i \deg'(x_i)}$ which is contained in $\mathcal{D}_{> \deg(\rho \circ f)}$ so this element indeed annihilates $\rho \circ f$. This concludes the proof that $\deg'(\rho \circ f) = \deg(\rho \circ f)$.

Fix an $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ and let j be the custom degree of x_i , so that $n_j < i \leq n_{j+1}$. Consider the element $\tau_i \circ f$. By the first bullet above, the degree of $\tau_i \circ f$ is at most j . By the above argument, also the custom degree of $\tau_i \circ f$ is at most j . In particular, the polynomial $\tau_i \circ f$ does not contain x_k for $k > n_{j+1}$ and contains $x_{n_j+1}, \dots, x_{n_{j+1}}$ at most in the linear part. By (4.14) the linear part contains only x_i , so in particular $\tau_i \circ f$ does not contain x_k with $k > n_j$, $k \neq i$.

We now prove that the polynomial f , written as a polynomial in variables

$$y_1 := x_1, \dots, y_k := x_k, \quad y_{k+1} := \tau_{k+1} \circ f, \dots, y_n := \tau_n \circ f,$$

is of degree equal to $\deg f$. We subsequently replace x_n, \dots, x_{k+1} by the corresponding

$$y_n = \tau_n \circ f, \dots, y_{k+1} = \tau_{k+1} \circ f$$

as follows. We know that for i with $\deg'(x_i) = j$, the element $\tau_i \circ f$ is of the form

$$x_i + P_i(x_1, \dots, x_{n_j})$$

for a polynomial P_i . Going down from n to $k+1$, we replace

$$x_i := \tau_i \circ f - P_i(x_1, \dots, x_{n_j}) = y_i - P_i(x_1, \dots, x_{n_j}).$$

We have $\deg'(x_i) = j$ and $\deg'(\tau_i \circ f) \leq j$, so

$$\deg'(P_i(x_1, \dots, x_{n_j})) \leq j.$$

Therefore, after each substitution the custom degree remains at most $\deg f$, so the usual degree, where the usual degree of each y_i equals one, also remains at most $\deg f$. Finally, all variables in the top degree part of f are in the subset of x_1, \dots, x_k , and these are unchanged, so the obtained polynomial is of degree at least $\deg f$. Hence, it has degree exactly d . \square

Corollary 4.15. *Let f be a polynomial and let $\ell = \dim_{\mathbb{K}} \text{Ap}(f)$. Suppose that*

$$\dim_{\mathbb{K}} \text{Ap}(f^d) = \binom{\ell + d - 1}{d}$$

for $d = 1, 2, \dots, \deg f$. Then f is encompassing.

Proof. Suppose that f is not encompassing. Then there is a partial $g \in \mathcal{D} \circ f$ which is almost encompassing. By Theorem 4.12 it follows that there is a trivial homogeneous algebraic dependence of degree $d := \deg(g) \leq \deg(f)$ among the partials of f . As in the proof of Proposition 3.5 it follows that

$$\dim_{\mathbb{K}} \text{Ap}(f^d) < \binom{\ell + d - 1}{d},$$

which is a contradiction. \square

Remark 4.16. We conjecture that the bound in [Corollary 4.15](#) is optimal in that for every almost encompassing polynomial f , we have

$$\dim_{\mathbb{K}} \text{Ap}(f^d) = \binom{\ell + d - 1}{d}$$

for all $d < \deg f$.

5. SMOOTHABILITY

5.1. Smoothable rank of powers and locally encompassing polynomials. In this section we relate the previous results to the “global” setting of border ranks and smoothable ranks of homogeneous polynomials. A homogeneous polynomial $F \in \mathbb{K}[x_0, \dots, x_n]$ is *locally encompassing* if there exists a linear form, say x_0 , such that $F|_{x_0=1}$ is encompassing.

A locally encompassing form comes with the tautological apolar scheme as defined in [§2.3](#). To complete the proof of [Theorem 1.8](#) we need to know that such a scheme is smoothable.

Example 5.1. In the setting of [Example 1.9](#), we want to know that

$$\text{Ap}((x_1^2 + \dots + x_{n-1}^2 + x_n)^d)$$

is smoothable for every $d \geq 1$. For $d = 1$ this algebra has Hilbert function $\text{HF} = (1, n - 2, 1)$ and is smoothable for example by [\[CEVV09, Proposition 4.9\]](#).

In fact, an explicit smoothing is given over \mathbb{A}^1 with parameter t by the family of n points

$$(0, 0, \dots, 0), \quad \left(t^2, t^2, \dots, t^2, \frac{1}{2}t^3 \right), \quad \left\{ \underbrace{(0, \dots, 0, t, 0, \dots, 0)}_k \mid k = 1, \dots, n - 1 \right\}.$$

In contrast, already for $d = 2$ the Hilbert function is

$$\left(1, n - 2, \binom{n + 1}{2} - 2n, n - 2, 1 \right)$$

and there is no general statement similar to [\[CEVV09, Proposition 4.9\]](#) in the literature.

For a finite-dimensional \mathbb{K} -vector space V we have the vector spaces $V^{\otimes d}$ and $S^d V \subseteq V^{\otimes d}$ where $S^d V = (V^{\otimes d})^{\Sigma_d}$ for the usual symmetric group action. For a finite-dimensional \mathbb{K} -algebra A both $A^{\otimes d}$ and $S^d A$ are algebras as well: the tensor product of \mathbb{K} -algebras is a \mathbb{K} -algebra and the symmetric group Σ_d acts on $A^{\otimes d}$, whence the invariants $S^d A = (A^{\otimes d})^{\Sigma_d}$ is its subalgebra.

Proposition 5.2. *Let A be a smoothable \mathbb{K} -algebra. Then $S^d A$ is smoothable for every $d \geq 1$.*

Proof. Let $\mathbb{K}[[t]] \rightarrow \mathcal{A}$ be a smoothing of A as in [Definition 2.10](#). As a $\mathbb{K}[[t]]$ -module, the algebra \mathcal{A} is isomorphic to $\mathbb{K}[[t]]^{\oplus \ell}$, where $\ell = \dim_{\mathbb{K}} A$. Consider the tensor product algebra $\mathcal{A}^{\otimes d}$. As a $\mathbb{K}[[t]]$ -module, it is free of rank ℓ^d . The subalgebra $S^d \mathcal{A} \subseteq \mathcal{A}^{\otimes d}$ is stable under the $\mathbb{K}[[t]]$ action. Power series are a principal ideal domain, so a submodule of a free $\mathbb{K}[[t]]$ -module is free as well. Hence $S^d \mathcal{A}$ is a free $\mathbb{K}[[t]]$ -module.

The special fiber $(S^d \mathcal{A})/tS^d \mathcal{A}$ is isomorphic to $S^d A$ since $S^d(-)$ is exact. The generic fiber of $S^d \mathcal{A}$ is isomorphic to $S^d(\mathcal{A}[t^{-1}])$. Recall that over any field L , a finite-dimensional L -algebra is smooth (over L) if and only if it is étale if and only if it is geometrically reduced, that is, it is reduced and remains reduced after any change of basis by a field extension $L \subseteq L'$, see [\[Sta23, Tag 03PC\(1\), Tag 030W, Tag 05DS\]](#). Take $L = \mathbb{K}[[t]][t^{-1}]$. The L -algebra

$$\mathcal{A}^{\otimes d}[t^{-1}] \simeq (\mathcal{A}[t^{-1}])^{\otimes d}$$

is smooth by [Definition 2.10](#). Therefore, it is geometrically reduced, so automatically also its L -subalgebra $S^d \mathcal{A}$ is geometrically reduced, hence smooth. Thus $S^d \mathcal{A}$ gives a smoothing of $S^d A$. \square

Proof of Theorem 1.1. The first part is proved in [Proposition 5.2](#). The second follows from the first and [Corollary 3.9](#). \square

Corollary 5.3. *Let f be an encompassing polynomial and take $\ell = \dim_{\mathbb{K}} \text{Ap}(f)$. Suppose that $\text{Ap}(f)$ is smoothable. Then for every d the algebra $\text{Ap}(f^d)$ is smoothable of degree $\binom{\ell+d-1}{d}$.*

Proof. Fix any d . Since f is encompassing, by [Proposition 4.4](#), the algebra $\text{Ap}(f^d)$ has degree $\binom{\ell+d-1}{d}$, so the claim follows from [Theorem 1.1](#). \square

Proof of Theorem 1.8. Let f be the encompassing dehomogenization of F as in the theorem. Since F was concise, also f is concise. Hence the natural map $\mathcal{D}_{\leq 1} \rightarrow \text{Ap}(f)$ is injective. It is also surjective by [Lemma 4.2](#) hence it is bijective and

$$\dim_{\mathbb{K}} \text{Ap}(f) = \dim_{\mathbb{K}} \mathcal{D}_{\leq 1} = n + 1.$$

By [Corollary 5.3](#) the algebra $\text{Ap}(f^d)$ is smoothable and of required degree $\binom{n+d}{d}$. By [Proposition 2.8](#) the smoothable rank of F is at most $\binom{n+d}{d}$. Moreover, by [Proposition 4.4](#) there is no polynomial of degree d annihilating F^d , which means that the rank of $\text{Cat}_{F,d}$ is $\binom{n+d}{d}$. This shows that the smoothable rank equals the catalecticant one. The border rank is always between the catalecticant and the smoothable ranks, hence is equal to both of them as well, and similarly for cactus and border cactus rank. \square

Example 5.4. In this example we show that [Theorem 1.8](#) would be false without the twists. Take the cubic form

$$F := x_1^3 + x_2^3 + x_0(x_1y_1 + x_2y_2) + x_0^2y_0.$$

The algebra $\text{Ap}(F|_{x_0=1})$ is smoothable and has degree 6, so F satisfies the assumptions of [Theorem 1.8](#). Moreover, both the smoothable and border rank of F are equal to 6, so that F is *not* wild in the sense of [\[BB15\]](#). The rank of the middle catalecticant for F^2 is 25, so $\text{brk}(F^2) \geq 25 > \binom{7}{2}$. Similarly, $\text{brk}(F^{[2]}) \geq 25$, where $F^{[2]}$ is the divided square, see [\[IK99, Appendix A\]](#).

Proof of Proposition 1.2. The proof follows the one of [Proposition 5.2](#), so we only sketch it. Let $\mathcal{Z} = \text{Spec}(\mathcal{A})$ for \mathcal{A} as in [Definition 2.10](#). The quotient $\mathcal{Z} // G$ corresponds to the subalgebra \mathcal{A}^G of \mathcal{A} . We argue as in [Proposition 5.2](#), replacing $\Sigma_d, \mathcal{A}^{\otimes d}, S^d \mathcal{A}$ by $G, \mathcal{A}, \mathcal{A}^G$, respectively. \square

Example 5.5. Let

$$f := x_3^3 + x_1x_2x_4 + x_3x_4^2 + x_2^2x_5 + x_2x_3x_5 + x_1x_5^2 + x_5^3$$

be a cubic form in 5 variables where, as always, \mathbb{K} has characteristic zero. The algebra $\text{Ap}(f)$ is smoothable by [\[BCR22, Jel14\]](#). It has degree 12. The algebra $\text{Ap}(f^2)$ has degree $67 < \binom{12+1}{2}$. Moreover it satisfies the *trivial negative tangents* condition from [\[Jel19, Theorem 1.2\]](#) and thus in particular it is not smoothable (and not cleavable).

5.2. Smoothability and border rank. It is well-known that smoothability of algebras A corresponds to minimal border rank of the tensor T_A (see [\[BL16, LM17a\]](#)). As we show below, deciding smoothability of very simple algebras allows to determine border rank of arbitrary tensors up to a multiplicative factor. Our results provide another indication that deciding if an algebra is smoothable should be in general very hard.

Given a concise tensor $T \in S^2(\mathbb{K}^n) \otimes \mathbb{K}^m$ and a nonnegative integer k we define the standard graded local algebra $A_{T,k}$ as follows. The algebra $A_{T,k}$ is nonzero only in degrees 0, 1 and 2. Its degree zero part is spanned by 1. Its degree one part has a basis $x_1, \dots, x_n, y_1, \dots, y_k$. Its degree two part is \mathbb{K}^m . Thus the algebra $A_{T,k}$ has degree $1 + n + k + m$. The multiplication is defined as follows. Each y_i is annihilated by all variables. The multiplication among x_i is defined by the linear map $S^2((\mathbb{K}^n)^*) \rightarrow \mathbb{K}^m$ induced by the tensor T .

Example 5.6. Let $m = n = 2$. Let us represent T by a 2-dimensional space of symmetric 2×2 matrices:

$$\begin{pmatrix} 2a + b & 3b \\ 3b & 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

The multiplication tensor of the algebra $A_{T,1}$, represented as a linear space of symmetric matrices, is:

$$\begin{pmatrix} j & x_1 & x_2 & y_1 & a & b \\ x_1 & 2a+b & 3b & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ x_2 & 3b & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ y_1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ a & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ b & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Definition 5.7. In analogy to the usual rank, for tensors $T \in S^2(\mathbb{K}^n) \otimes \mathbb{K}^m$ we define *partially symmetric rank* of T as the minimum r so that T is a sum of r rank one tensors in $S^2(\mathbb{K}^n) \otimes \mathbb{K}^m$. For $\mathbb{K} = \mathbb{C}$, the *partially symmetric border rank* of T is the minimum r so that in any neighbourhood of T there exist tensors of partially symmetric rank r .

Proposition 5.8. For any $k \in \mathbb{N}$, any tensor $T \in S^2(\mathbb{K}^n) \otimes \mathbb{K}^m$ is a restriction of the tensor $T_{A_{T,k}}$ of the algebra $A_{T,k}$ associated to T . In particular, the border rank of T is at most the border rank of $T_{A_{T,k}}$. If $A_{T,k}$ is smoothable, then the border rank and the partially symmetric border rank of T is at most $1 + n + k + m$.

At first glance, putting $k = 0$ seems optimal. However, it may well happen that $A_{T,0}$ is not smoothable, while $A_{T,k}$ is smoothable for some $k > 0$.

Proof. The tensor T is a restriction as it corresponds to the multiplication map of two elements of degree one in $A_{T,k}$. If A is a tuple of e points, then T_A has partially symmetric rank e , so if $A_{T,k}$ is smoothable then $T_{A_{T,k}}$ has partially symmetric border rank $\dim_{\mathbb{K}} A_{T,k} = 1 + n + k + m$. The last statement follows. \square

Theorem 5.9. If T has partially symmetric border rank b , then $A_{T,b-m}$ is smoothable.

Remark 5.10. Note that for any $T \in S^2(\mathbb{K}^n) \otimes \mathbb{K}^m$ we may consider an isomorphic nonconcise tensor $T' \in S^2(\mathbb{K}^n) \otimes \mathbb{K}^{m+1}$. For such a tensor we have $A_{T,k+1} = A_{T',k}$. Hence, formally $A_{T,b-m} = A_{T',b-(m+1)}$, whenever $b - (m+1) \geq 0$. We may thus naturally extend the definition of $A_{T,b-m}$, even when $b - m < 0$, which may happen only for nonconcise tensors. This reduces the theorem to the case when T is concise.

Proof. A family of T induces a flat family of $A_{T,b-m}$, so by semicontinuity it is enough to prove the result for T of partially symmetric rank equal to b . Such a tensor T is given by $\sum_{i=1}^b L_i^{\otimes 2} \otimes z_i$, where $L_i \in \mathbb{K}^n$ and $z_i \in \mathbb{K}^m$ are arbitrary. As T has partially symmetric rank b , the L_i are pairwise different. Consider a generic tensor of such rank: let $T' \in S^2(\mathbb{K}^n) \otimes \mathbb{K}^b$ be given by

$$T' = \sum_{i=1}^b L_i^2 \otimes \tilde{z}_i,$$

where $\tilde{z}_1, \dots, \tilde{z}_b$ is a basis of \mathbb{K}^b . Then T is a restriction of T' by a linear map π that sends every \tilde{z}_i to z_i . This map has m -dimensional image by assumption on the conciseness of T . Let $K = \ker \pi \subseteq \mathbb{K}^b$ and let k_1, \dots, k_{b-m} be the basis of K .

Consider the algebra $A_{T',b-m}$. By definition, the subspace \mathbb{K}^b is contained in it, as the degree two part. For every $\lambda \in \mathbb{K}$ consider the quotient of $A_{T',b-m}$ by the ideal

$$(k_i - \lambda y_i \mid i = 1, \dots, b-m).$$

Denote it by $B_T(\lambda)$. Both k_i and y_i are annihilated by the maximal ideal of $A_{T',b-m}$, so $\dim_{\mathbb{K}} B_T(\lambda) = \dim_{\mathbb{K}} A_{T',b-m} - (b-m)$. Thus, $B_T(\lambda)$ form a flat family. For every nonzero λ taking the quotient is the same as evaluating $y_i := \lambda^{-1} k_i$, so $B_T(\lambda)$ is isomorphic to the algebra $A_{T',0}$. We claim that $B_T(\lambda = 0)$ is isomorphic to $A_{T,b-m}$. Indeed, the relevant part of the multiplication in $B_T(\lambda = 0)$ sends $S^2\langle x_1, \dots, x_n \rangle$ to

$$\frac{\langle \tilde{z}_1, \dots, \tilde{z}_b \rangle}{\langle k_1, \dots, k_{b-m} \rangle} \simeq \frac{\mathbb{K}^b}{K} \simeq \langle z_1, \dots, z_b \rangle$$

so indeed $B_T(\lambda = 0)$ is isomorphic to $A_{T,b-m}$.

We will now prove that $A_{T',0}$ is smoothable, so $B_T(\lambda)$ are smoothable for $\lambda \neq 0$ and, by semicontinuity (see [subsection 1.1](#)) also $B_T(\lambda = 0) \simeq A_{T,b-m}$ is smoothable.

Recall that $A_{T',0}$ is generated by x_1, \dots, x_n and its degree two part is identified with \mathbb{K}^b , where the multiplication is induced by $L_1^{\otimes 2}, \dots, L_b^{\otimes 2}$. Every form $L_i \in \langle x_1, \dots, x_n \rangle^*$ yields a point of the affine space $\mathbb{A}^n = \text{Spec } \mathbb{K}[x_1, \dots, x_n]$. Consider, for every $\mu \in \mathbb{K}$ the subscheme of \mathbb{A}^n given by

$$\{\mu L_1\} \cup \{\mu L_2\} \cup \dots \cup \{\mu L_b\} \cup \text{Spec} \left(\frac{\mathbb{K}[x_1, \dots, x_n]}{(x_1, \dots, x_n)^2} \right).$$

Such a subscheme is smoothable for every μ and the limit of at $\mu \rightarrow 0$ yields $\text{Spec } A_{T',0}$. \square

Corollary 5.11. *For a tensor $T \in S^2(\mathbb{K}^n) \otimes \mathbb{K}^m$ let k be the smallest integer so that $A_{T,k}$ is smoothable. Then the partially symmetric border rank of T is at most $1 + n + k$ and at least k .*

Proof. The first estimate follows from [Proposition 5.8](#) and the second from [Theorem 5.9](#). \square

Definition 5.12. For any concise tensor $T \in \mathbb{K}^n \otimes \mathbb{K}^n \otimes \mathbb{K}^m$ let $T_S \in S^2(\mathbb{K}^{2n}) \otimes \mathbb{K}^m$ be constructed by replacing each slice $T(e_j^*)$ by a symmetric $2n \times 2n$ matrix, putting $T(e_j^*)$ on the antidiagonal blocks, where one block is transposed in order to obtain symmetry. Clearly, T_S restricts to T .

Corollary 5.13. *For a concise $T \in \mathbb{K}^n \otimes \mathbb{K}^n \otimes \mathbb{K}^m$ let k be the smallest integer so that $A_{T_S,k}$ is smoothable. Then the border rank of T is at most $1 + 2n + k$ and at least $\frac{1}{2}k$.*

Proof. As T_S restricts to T , the partially symmetric border rank of T_S is at least the border rank of T . We claim that the partially symmetric border rank of T_S is at most twice the border rank of T . By taking limits it is enough to consider the case when T has rank r , i.e. $T = \sum_{j=1}^r x_j \otimes y_j \otimes z_j$. We have:

$$2T_S = \sum_{j=1}^r (y_j, x_j)^{\otimes 2} \otimes z_j + \sum_{j=1}^r (iy_j, -ix_j)^{\otimes 2} \otimes z_j.$$

Thus if rank of T is r then partially symmetric rank of T_S is at most $2r$.

The claim follows by applying [Corollary 5.11](#) to T_S . \square

This implies that efficient, general criteria for proving nonsmoothability of simple algebras could lead to superlinear in n lower bounds on border ranks of tensors. Further, efficient, general criteria proving smoothability of simple algebras could lead to upper bounding asymptotic rank and the exponent [\[KM24\]](#) of arbitrary tensor up to arbitrary precision. This indicates that obtaining either type of criteria is extremely hard, but see [\[Jel19\]](#).

The lower estimate $\frac{1}{2}k$ in [Corollary 5.13](#) makes us lose a multiplicative constant $\frac{1}{2}$. This is due to the fact that we insisted on remaining in the realm of algebras and needed to symmetrize our tensor. If instead one works with 1_A -generic tensors we obtain results that are more efficient. Recall that 1_A -generic tensors $T \in \mathbb{K}^a \otimes \mathbb{K}^b \otimes \mathbb{K}^c$ of minimal border rank b correspond to smoothable modules and are actively investigated [\[LM17a, Woj23, JŠ22, JLP24\]](#).

Proposition 5.14. *For any concise tensor $T \in \mathbb{K}^a \otimes \mathbb{K}^b \otimes \mathbb{K}^c$ of border rank k there exists a concise, $1_{\mathbb{K}^{a+1}}$ -generic, minimal border rank $b + k$ tensor $T' \in \mathbb{K}^{a+1} \otimes \mathbb{K}^{b+k} \otimes \mathbb{K}^{b+k}$ such that T is a restriction of T' . Explicitly, if e_1, \dots, e_a is a basis of \mathbb{K}^a and we extend it by e_0 to a basis of \mathbb{K}^{a+1} then $T' = T + e_0 \otimes i$, where i is the identity on \mathbb{K}^{b+k} . As spaces of matrices:*

$$T'((\mathbb{K}^{b+k})^*) = \left(\begin{array}{c|ccc} x_1 \cdots \cdots x_b & y_1 \cdots \cdots y_{k-c} & z_1 \cdots \cdots z_c & \\ \hline T((\mathbb{K}^c)^*) & & & 0 \end{array} \right),$$

where the entries of $T((\mathbb{K}^c)^*)$ are linear forms in z_1, \dots, z_c .

Proof. We proceed in analogy to the proof of [Theorem 5.9](#). However, as we are no longer in the realm of algebras, we provide our rank and border rank estimates in a more direct way.

When $T_i \rightarrow T$, then $T'_i \rightarrow T'$. Thus, it is enough to prove the statement under the assumption that T has rank k . Let $T = \sum_{j=1}^k a_j \otimes b_j \otimes c_j$. Let \tilde{T} be the corresponding generic tensor, i.e. $\tilde{T} = \sum_{j=1}^k a_j \otimes b_j \otimes \tilde{c}_j$, where \tilde{c}_j form a basis of \mathbb{K}^k . We divide the proof into two claims.

Claim 1: \widetilde{T}' has border rank $b + k$. We will present the linear space $\widetilde{T}'((\mathbb{K}^{b+k})^*)$ as the limit of spaces spanned by $(b + k)$ -tuples of rank one matrices. For each integer n , the $b + k$ rank one matrices are as follows:

- (1) b matrices N_j , for $j = 1, \dots, b$, with one nonzero entry in the first row and column j .
- (2) k matrices $M_{n,j}$, for $j = 1, \dots, k$, where $M_{n,j} = (1, \frac{1}{n}a_j) \otimes ((n \cdot b_j) + e_{b+j})$, where e_{b+j} is the $(b + j)$ -th basis vector of \mathbb{K}^{b+k} .

Clearly the matrices N_j span the space corresponding to $\langle x_1, \dots, x_b \rangle$ in the statement, while $M_{n,j} - \sum_{s=1}^k n(b_j)_s N_s$ have limit that corresponds to z_j .

Claim 2: \widetilde{T}' restricts to T' . For every $e_i^* \in (\mathbb{K}^c)^*$ the layer $e_i^*(T)$ is a linear combination of $a_j \otimes b_j$, thus of $e_j^*(\widetilde{T})$. We may use the same restrictions for \widetilde{T}' so that we obtain the same tensor as T' in first b -layers with respect to second tensor factor. Then, it is enough to use an automorphism of $\mathbb{K}^k \subset \mathbb{K}^{b+k}$ to obtain exactly T' .

The two claims above imply that T' has indeed border rank $b + k$. \square

Corollary 5.15. *Fix a concise tensor $T \in \mathbb{K}^a \otimes \mathbb{K}^b \otimes \mathbb{K}^c$. Let k be the smallest integer, so that the tensor T' from the statement of Proposition 5.14 has border rank $b + k$. Then T has border rank at least k and at most $b + k$.*

6. SWEET PIECES

In this section we define a class of tensors that we call *sweet pieces*. As we will argue, sweet pieces play an essential role when using the Coppersmith-Winograd method to bound the constant ω governing the complexity of matrix multiplication. Surprisingly, as we will see, sweet pieces have rank strictly smaller than the bounds used so far in the CW-method. The introduction of sweet pieces also allows to remove any reference to border rank and the Coppersmith-Winograd tensor to obtain upper bounds on ω , as in [CW90]. We start by recalling notions from complexity theory. A good reference for the methods we describe is [BCS97, Part IV]. We work over \mathbb{K} , which is as before, algebraically closed and of characteristic zero. Much of the literature below is done only for \mathbb{C} . In case of need, we may always reduce to this case, by restricting \mathbb{K} to a countably generated field (containing all coefficients of all involved tensors etc.) and embedding it into \mathbb{C} .

Definition 6.1. For a tensor $T \in V_1 \otimes V_2 \otimes V_3$, we call a *blocking* a triad of functions $f_i: \mathcal{B}_i \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}^r$, where \mathcal{B}_i is a basis of V_i for every $i = 1, 2, 3$. For $(a_1, a_2, a_3) \in (\mathbb{Z}^r)^3$, we obtain a *block* T_{a_1, a_2, a_3} as the image of T by the projection

$$V_1 \otimes V_2 \otimes V_3 \rightarrow V'_1 \otimes V'_2 \otimes V'_3$$

where $V'_i \subset V_i$ is the linear subspace spanned by those elements $b \in \mathcal{B}_i$ such that $f_i(b) = a_i$. Thus we may write the *block* (a_1, a_2, a_3) , meaning T_{a_1, a_2, a_3} .

We say that a block is in the *support* of the tensor, if it is nonzero. We call a tensor (or blocking) *tight* if there exists a blocking (f_1, f_2, f_3) such that for every block (a_1, a_2, a_3) in the support we have

$$a_1 + a_2 + a_3 = 0 \in \mathbb{Z}^r.$$

By a (probability) distribution p on any set S we mean a function $p: S \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$, such that

$$\sum_{s \in S} p(s) = 1.$$

Thus, a probability distribution p on the support S of a tensor T with fixed blocking assigns a nonnegative real number $p(a, b, c)$ for each (a, b, c) indexing a block in the support of T . Such a distribution induces three marginal distributions p_1, p_2, p_3 , where p_i is a distribution on the image of f_i . Precisely,

$$p_1(a) := \sum_{(a, b, c) \in S} p(a, b, c)$$

and similarly for p_2 and p_3 .

The following definition has appeared implicitly in many articles on fast matrix multiplication. While it looks technical, in practice it means that the tensor is sufficiently symmetric so that it shares many properties with a tensor that is simply a direct sum of copies of the same tensor.

Definition 6.2. A *sweet piece* is a tight tensor T , with a fixed blocking f_1, f_2, f_3 such that:

- (1) each block in the support is isomorphic to a fixed tensor U ;
- (2) the uniform distribution on support has three equal marginals, which are also uniform.

The cardinality of the image of each f_i , which by the definition does not depend on i , is denoted by p_T .

Definition 6.3. For a tensor T its *asymptotic rank* is defined by

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} R(T^{\boxtimes n})^{\frac{1}{n}},$$

where $R(T^{\boxtimes n})$ is the rank of the n -th Kronecker power of T . For a concise tensor $T \in \mathbb{K}^a \otimes \mathbb{K}^b \otimes \mathbb{K}^c$ the asymptotic rank is always greater or equal to $\max(a, b, c)$ and we say a tensor has *minimal asymptotic rank* when equality holds.

For example, the 2×2 matrix multiplication tensor M_2 has asymptotic rank 2^ω . The following theorem may be considered as the cornerstone of the Coppersmith-Winograd method.

Theorem 6.4. Let $T \in (\mathbb{K}^{p \times a^2})^{\otimes 3}$ be a sweet piece of asymptotic rank r , where each block U is isomorphic to the matrix multiplication tensor M_a , with $a > 1$. Then

$$\omega \leq \log_a(r/p_T).$$

In particular, if T has minimal asymptotic rank, then $\omega = 2$.

Proof. Consider the uniform probability distribution for all blocks and apply the main Coppersmith-Winograd theorem, for example as in [BCS97, Theorem 15.41]. \square

The proof above suggests that **Theorem 6.4** is a simple consequence of the results of Coppersmith-Winograd. However, we would like to emphasize that sweet pieces play an absolutely central role in the whole theory. In particular, the main part of [CW90] can be restated as the following lemma.

Lemma 6.5. Let T be a sweet piece and $\varepsilon > 0$. There exists $N \gg 0$, such that $T^{\boxtimes N}$ restricts to $(p - \varepsilon)^N$ disjoint copies of $U^{\boxtimes N}$.

We emphasize that in **Lemma 6.5**, to obtain a direct sum

$$(U^{\boxtimes N})^{\oplus (p - \varepsilon)^N},$$

one does not need to degenerate the tensor, but only to restrict¹.

The CW-method also provides a way to create new sweet pieces. One starts with a tight tensor T , with blocking f_1, f_2, f_3 , and a probability distribution P on the support of T . Note that the blocking on T induces the blocking on $T^{\boxtimes N}$, where the indices of the blocks are sequences of length N of indices for blocks of T . In particular, each block B in $T^{\boxtimes N}$ provides three sequences of length N . The i -th sequence gives a probability distribution $p_i(B)$ on the image of f_i , where the probability of $a \in \text{im } f_i$ is equal to the number of times a appears in the i -th sequence divided by N .

Proposition 6.6. Let T be a tight tensor with a fixed blocking. Assume P is a probability distribution on blocks b in the support of T that is reconstructable from its three marginals² and all three marginals are the same distributions. Then, the projection of $T^{\boxtimes N}$ onto the basis vectors belonging to the blocks B , such that for $i = 1, 2, 3$ the i -th marginal of P equals $p_i(B)$, is a sweet piece.

Proof. As the three marginals for T are the same, by the action of the permutation group Σ_N on the entries of the indexing sequences and the action of Σ_3 on the sequences themselves, the second point in **Definition 6.2** holds. We have to prove that all blocks in the support are isomorphic. Indeed, we claim

¹However, the proof that such restriction exists is nonconstructive and relies on probabilistic arguments.

²i.e. it is the unique probability distribution on the support with given marginals

that each one is isomorphic to the Kronecker product of blocks of T , where each block b appears $P(b)N$ many times. Fix a block B in $T^{\boxtimes N}$, indexed by the three sequences

$$(a_1, \dots, a_N), \quad (a'_1, \dots, a'_N), \quad (a''_1, \dots, a''_N).$$

Then B is isomorphic to the Kronecker product of T_{a_i, a'_i, a''_i} i.e. blocks of T indexed by a_i, a'_i, a''_i . The three sequences provide a probability distribution P' on the support blocks of T . By the choice of the projection, P' and P have the same marginals. By assumption on P , we have $P = P'$ and the claim follows. \square

The sweet piece from [Proposition 6.6](#) will be denoted by $SP(T)$ or $SP_{P,N}(T)$. Let $T \in V_1 \otimes V_2 \otimes V_3$ be a (possibly not tight) tensor with a fixed blocking. Fix a \mathbb{K}^* action on each V_i , where the fixed basis vectors are eigenvectors and the weight $w(e) = w(f_i(e))$ of the action on a basis vector e depends only on $f_i(e)$. We obtain induced weights of blocks, where the block indexed by (a_1, a_2, a_3) has weight

$$w(a_1) + w(a_2) + w(a_3).$$

Assume that for nonzero blocks the weights are nonnegative. Let T' be the toric degeneration of T , as the parameter $\mathbb{K}^* \ni t \rightarrow 0$.

Lemma 6.7. *Using the notation introduced above, assume that the toric degeneration T' satisfies the assumptions of [Proposition 6.6](#). If $SP(T') \neq 0$, then $SP(T) = SP(T')$.*

Proof. Clearly $SP(T)$ and $SP(T')$ agree on blocks where $SP(T')$ is nonzero. Thus it remains to show that if a block is zero in $SP(T')$, then it is also zero in $SP(T)$. Pick a zero block in $SP(T')$ indexed by three sequences. For contradiction, assume that this block is nonzero in $SP(T)$. Consider the probability distribution P on the blocks of T induced by the three sequences. As the block was nonzero in $SP(T)$ and zero in $SP(T')$, the probability distribution must be supported on blocks of nonnegative weight in T and positive on at least one block of positive weight. Let P' be the probability distribution on the blocks of T induced by the three sequences labeling a block in the support of $SP(T')$. Notice that P and P' have the same marginals. Thus, $P - P'$ is negative only on blocks of weight zero, is positive on at least one block of positive weight and has all three marginals equal to zero.

Let S be the sum of the weights of all the blocks, each one multiplied by the value $P - P'$ takes on that block. Looking at the marginals, we see that $S = 0$. However, by summing over all blocks we see that $S > 0$, which is a contradiction and concludes the proof. \square

Definition 6.8. Let G be a finite abelian group. We identify G with the basis of \mathbb{K}^G . We define $T_G \in \mathbb{K}^G \otimes \mathbb{K}^G \otimes \mathbb{K}^G$ by

$$T_G := \sum_{g_1+g_2=g_3 \in G} g_1 \otimes g_2 \otimes g_3.$$

By the discrete Fourier transform this is a tensor of rank $|G|$. The tensor $CW_n \in \mathbb{K}^n \otimes \mathbb{K}^n \otimes \mathbb{K}^n$ is defined as

$$CW_n := \sum_{i=1}^n e_1 \otimes e_i \otimes e_i + \sum_{i=2}^n e_i \otimes e_1 \otimes e_i + \sum_{i=2}^{n-1} e_i \otimes e_i \otimes e_n.$$

The next lemma and corollary may be regarded as variants or special cases of [\[AVW18\]](#) and [\[HJNY22, Proposition 4.1\]](#). The first work explicitly says that T_G may replace $CW_{|G|}$ for the bounds on ω . In the second, the authors provide degenerations of a larger class of tensors to CW_n . The main difference to the second article is that we may identify sweet pieces of two tensors. In comparison to the first article, we may later apply our results to obtain new rank estimates of sweet pieces of both tensors.

Lemma 6.9. *For any abelian group G of cardinality at least three, the structure tensor T_G has a \mathbb{K}^* degeneration into the big Coppersmith-Winograd tensor $CW_{|G|}$, by using the blocking as in [\[CW90\]](#).*

Proof. Pick a nonneutral element $g \in G$. Assign weight 0 to the neutral element, weight 1 to all elements that are distinct from g and the neutral element, and weight 2 to g for first two copies of \mathbb{K}^G and minus these weights on the third copy. The toric degeneration is isomorphic to $CW_{|G|}$. \square

Corollary 6.10. *The tensors T_G and $CW_{|G|}$ have the same sweet pieces. In particular, $SP_N(CW_n)$ has rank at most n^N .*

The corollary above allows us to provide better bounds for the rank of $SP(CW_n)$.

Definition 6.11. Let T be a tensor with a blocking and a probability distribution P on the blocks. A *chimney* is the image of $T^{\boxtimes N}$ under the projection map:

$$V_1 \otimes V_2 \otimes V_3 \rightarrow V'_1 \otimes V'_2 \otimes V_3,$$

where, for $i = 1, 2$, the subspace V'_i is spanned only by basis vectors indexed by sequences that give rise to the same probability distribution as the i -th marginal of P . By changing $i = 1, 2$ to $i = 1, 3$ or $i = 2, 3$ we similarly obtain two other chimneys.

Note that we should imagine the sweet piece to be the intersection of three chimneys, if we consider $T^{\boxtimes N}$ as a three dimensional cuboid.

Proposition 6.12. *Consider a probability distribution on the six blocks in the support of CW_n that assigns p to each of the three large blocks of format $(n-2)^2 \times 1$ and $q = 1/3 - p$ to each of the three small blocks of format 1^3 . The rank of $SP_{N,P}(CW_n)$ is smaller than*

$$n^N - \binom{N}{(2p+2q)N+1} (n-1)^{(p+q)N-1}.$$

In particular, it is smaller than border rank of $(CW_n)^{\boxtimes N}$.

Proof. By [Corollary 6.10](#) it is enough to prove the statement for $SP_{N,P}(T_G)$ for $|G| = n$. Note that $(T_G)^{\boxtimes N}$ is a tensor of minimal rank n^N .

Let us consider the corresponding chimney with entries indexed by triples of sequences of group elements, where for the first two sequences the neutral element appears $(p+2q)N$ times and the distinguished group element $g \in G$ appears qN times. Note that the third sequence is arbitrary, as we are working with the chimney, not the sweet piece.

Further, note that an entry in the chimney indexed by $(g_i), (g'_i), (g''_i)$ is nonzero only if: for any $i = 1, \dots, N$ we have the implication: if $g_i = e$ then $g'_i = g''_i$. In particular, as we have $(p+2q)N$ neutral elements in the first sequence and only qN elements equal to g in the second sequence, the entries are always zero if the third sequence contains less than $(p+q)N$ elements distinct from g . In particular, there are at least

$$\binom{N}{(2p+2q)N+1} (n-1)^{(p+q)N-1}$$

sequences indexing layers of the chimney that have only zero entries.

We now apply the classical substitution method ([\[LM17a, §3\]](#), [\[Pan66\]](#)) for the tensor $(T_G)^{\boxtimes N}$ and the layers that are zero in the chimney. Note that we do not change the sweet piece, as the layers, nonzero in the whole tensor, are zero over the sweet piece. The result follows. \square

Remark 6.13. Clearly, the previous estimate can be made much better. We believe that estimating ranks and border ranks of sweet pieces may lead to new discoveries about the bounds on ω . We also emphasize that if we bound the ranks of sweet pieces all of the barriers results, as in [\[CVZ21\]](#), do not apply. In particular, it is in principle possible to prove $\omega = 2$, even with the use of arbitrary large Coppersmith-Winograd tensors, assuming we will find better bounds on the ranks of sweet pieces.

Our next aim is to explain relations between sweet pieces and smoothability of algebras. We note that CW_n is the structure tensor of the algebra A apolar to the quadric

$$f := x_1^2 + \dots + x_{n-2}^2.$$

Hence, $CW_n^{\boxtimes N}$ is the structure tensor of the algebra $A^{\otimes N}$ apolar to $f^{\boxtimes N}$. We note that A comes with the standard grading and has Hilbert function $(1, n-2, 1)$. Thus $A^{\otimes N}$ is multigraded and with respect to the total grading

$$\dim_{\mathbb{K}}(A^{\otimes N})_i = \sum_{j=0}^{\lfloor \frac{i}{2} \rfloor} \binom{N}{j} \binom{N-j}{i-2j} (n-2)^{i-2j}.$$

The grading on A corresponds exactly to the blocking of CW_n introduced in [CW90]. The total grading on $CW_n^{\boxtimes N}$ corresponds to the blocking on Kronecker powers of this tensor, which has been used most often so far.

Lemma 6.14. *Let T be a structure tensor of a graded algebra A , with the blocking induced by the grading. Consider the total grading on $A^{\otimes N}$. Then, there exists a degree i , such that $SP_{P,N}(T)$ is a restriction of the tensor representing the map:*

$$(A^{\otimes N})_i \times (A^{\otimes N})_i \rightarrow (A^{\otimes N})_{2i}.$$

Proof. Let $P_1 = P_2$ be the two marginals of P . An indexing sequence of N elements of A is an indexing sequence for the first coordinate in $SP(T)$ if and only if elements of degree d appear $P_1(d)N$ times in it. Thus the total degree of such a sequence is $i := \sum_d P_1(d)dN$. \square

In the setting of the previous lemma $SP(T)$ may also be seen as a restriction of the tensor that is the structure tensor of the subalgebra of $A^{\otimes N}$ generated in degree i . Such algebras are in most cases of much smaller dimension, even asymptotically with N .

Example 6.15. Let $A = \mathbb{K}[x, y]/(x^2, y^2)$ be the algebra representing the CW_4 tensor. Let P be the probability distribution equal to $1/3$ on the large blocks of the support of format $2^2 \times 1$. The Veronese subalgebra of $A^{\otimes 3k}$ generated in degree k has dimension

$$2 + 2 \sum_{a=0}^k \binom{3k}{a} \cdot \binom{3k-a}{2k-a}.$$

The sweet piece $SP_{P,3k}(CW_4)$ is a subtensor of the tensor associated to that Veronese algebra.

One way to realize the Veronese subalgebra of $A^{\otimes N}$ generated in degree i is to fix a $G_i := \mathbb{Z}/i\mathbb{Z}$ action on A , where elements of degree one are acted upon with $1 \in G_i$. We can also think of it as multiplication by the complex i -th root of unity. Then the Veronese subalgebra we are interested in is given by the invariants $(A^{\otimes N})^{G_i}$. Unfortunately, as we have seen in Example 1.4 even when A is smoothable and so is $A^{\otimes N}$, the algebra of invariants does not have to be so.

Let $T \in (\mathbb{K}^n)^{\otimes 3}$ be a tensor giving rise to sweet piece $SP(T)$, where each block is a matrix multiplication tensor. Let us emphasize that the only asymptotically nonoptimal estimation in the Coppersmith-Winograd method is precisely the point that the size of $T^{\otimes N}$, that is n^N , is usually much larger than the size of $SP(T)$. In particular, either

- if $SP(T)$ grows in size as n^N , as it is the case for the symmetric tensor $T \in (\mathbb{K}^3)^{\otimes 3}$ given by the monomial xyz , and T is of minimal asymptotic rank, or
- if one can prove that $SP(T)$ has minimal asymptotic rank,

then $\omega = 2$, by Theorem 6.4. Further, asymptotically in N improvements on the (asymptotic) border rank of $(A^{\otimes N})^{G_i}$ would lead to improvements on bounds on ω .

In the last part of the article we exhibit relations of sweet pieces to NP-hard problems in complexity theory. Consider the algebra $B := \mathbb{K}[x]/(x^2)$ and let $T_B \in (\mathbb{K}^2)^{\otimes 3}$ be the associated tensor. It is natural to identify a basis of \mathbb{K}^2 with subsets of the set with one element. In this way the tensor T_B has the three entries equal to one exactly in 3-way partitions of the one element set [BK23]. We note that the algebra A from Example 6.15 is $B^{\otimes 2}$. Consider the tensor

$$T_N := T_B^{\boxtimes N},$$

where now we identify the basis of \mathbb{K}^{2^N} with subsets of the set with N elements. Notice that T_N encodes 3-way partitions of the set with N elements. Let us fix $N := 3k$ and the uniform probability distribution on the three entries of T_B . We obtain the sweet piece $SP_N T_B$ that is exactly equal to the tensor T_N from [Pra23]. This sweet piece is also the tensor representing the degree one multiplication in the k -th Veronese subalgebra of $B^{\otimes N}$. The dimension of this Veronese subalgebra equals twice the size of the sweet piece plus two. Combining this observation with [Pra23, Corollary 1.12] we obtain the following corollary.

Corollary 6.16. *If the asymptotic rank of a sweet piece coming from tensors with minimal border rank has minimal asymptotic rank or if Veronese subalgebras of smoothable algebras give rise to tensors of minimal asymptotic rank, then the set covering conjecture from [CDL⁺16] is false.*

We note that by [Pra23, Corollary 1.12] one does not need exponential improvements in the border rank of the tensors T_N to disprove the set covering conjecture. The obvious bound is 8^k , while the current best known bound is $\frac{1}{2}8^k$ [Pra23, p. 4, point (4)]. In fact, it would be enough to prove that asymptotic rank is at most

$$\frac{2 \cdot 8^k}{9 \cdot k}.$$

Below we provide a modest improvement on the upper bound.

Proposition 6.17. *The rank of the tensor T_N is at most*

$$\frac{1}{2}8^k - \sum_{i=k+1}^{\lfloor N/2 \rfloor} \binom{N}{2i}.$$

Proof. We proceed similarly to Proposition 6.12. We start with $T_{\mathbb{Z}_2} \in (\mathbb{K}^2)^{\otimes 3}$ and note that T_N is a subtensor of the minimal rank tensor $T_{\mathbb{Z}_2}^{\otimes N}$. By the substitution method the rank of T_N is bounded by the number of sets obtained as the symmetric difference of two subsets of cardinality k of a set of cardinality N . We note that such subsets are always even and of cardinality at most $2k$. The bound follows. \square

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The authors would like to thank Alessandra Bernardi, Maciej Gałazka, Fulvio Gesmundo, Joseph M. Landsberg, Giorgio Ottaviani, Kaski Petteri, Daniele Taufer, and Virginia Vassilevska Williams for very helpful comments. This work 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. A special role in the realization of this paper was taken by the semester program AGATES: *Algebraic Geometry with Applications to Tensors and Secants*, held in Warsaw from September 12 to December 16, 2022. The first author is a member of the research group *Gruppo Nazionale per le Strutture Algebriche Geometriche e Affini* (GNSAGA) of *Istituto Nazionale di Alta Matematica* (INdAM) and is supported by the scientific project *Multilinear Algebraic Geometry* of the program *Progetti di ricerca di Rilevante Interesse Nazionale* (PRIN), granted by the Italian Ministry of University and Research (MUR). The second author is supported by National Science Centre grant 2020/39/D/ST1/00132. The third author is supported by the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft grant 467575307.

REFERENCES

- [ADVW⁺24] J. Alman, R. Duan, V. Vassilevska Williams, Yinzhan Xu, Z. Xu, and R. Zhou, *More asymmetry yields yaster matrix multiplication*, preprint, arXiv:2404.16349 [math.AG] (2024).
- [AVW18] J. Alman and V. Vassilevska Williams, *Further limitations of the known approaches for matrix multiplication*, in: *9th Innovations in Theoretical Computer Science* (Cambridge, 2018), LIPIcs. Leibniz Int. Proc. Inform., vol. 58, Schloss Dagstuhl. Leibniz-Zent. Inform., Wadern, 2018, Paper no. 25, 15 pp.
- [AVW21] ———, *A refined laser method and faster matrix multiplication*, in: *Proceedings of the 2021 ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms (SODA)* (held virtually), edited by D. Marx, Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics (SIAM), Philadelphia, PA, 2021, pp. 522–539.
- [Bal18] E. Ballico, *Beyond the cactus rank of tensors*, Bull. Korean Math. Soc. **55** (2018), no. 5, 1587–1598.
- [BB14] W. Buczyńska and J. Buczyński, *Secant varieties to high degree Veronese reembeddings, catalecticant matrices and smoothable Gorenstein schemes*, J. Algebraic Geom. **23** (2014), no. 1, 63–90.
- [BB15] W. Buczyńska and J. Buczyński, *On differences between the border rank and the smoothable rank of a polynomial*, Glasg. Math. J. **57** (2015), no. 2, 401–413.
- [BBG19] E. Ballico, A. Bernardi, and F. Gesmundo, *A note on the cactus rank for Segre-Veronese varieties*, J. Algebra **526** (2019), 6–11.
- [BBM14] A. Bernardi, J. Brachat, and B. Mourrain, *A comparison of different notions of ranks of symmetric tensors*, Linear Algebra Appl. **460** (2014), 205–230.

- [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** (2018), no. 12, Paper no. 314, 86 pp.
- [BCH⁺24] A. Björklund, R. Curticapean, T. Husfeldt, P. Kaski, and K. Pratt, *Chromatic number in 1.9999^n time? fast deterministic set partitioning under the asymptotic rank conjecture*, preprint, arXiv:2404.04987 [math.AG] (2024).
- [BCR22] C. Bertone, F. Cioffi, and M. Roggero, *Smoothable Gorenstein points via marked schemes and double-generic initial ideals*, *Exp. Math.* **31** (2022), no. 1, 120–137.
- [BCRL79] D. Bini, M. Capovani, F. Romani, and G. Lotti, *$O(n^{2.7799})$ complexity for $n \times n$ approximate matrix multiplication*, *Inform. Process. Lett.* **8** (1979), no. 5, 234–235.
- [BCS97] P. Bürgisser, M. Clausen, and M. A. Shokrollahi, *Algebraic complexity theory*, Grundlehren der mathematischen Wissenschaften [Fundamental Principles of Mathematical Sciences], vol. 315, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1997. With the collaboration of T. Lickteig.
- [Ber12] J. Bertin, *The punctual Hilbert scheme: an introduction*, in: *Geometric methods in representation theory. I*, Sémin. Congr., vol. 24, 2012, pp. 1–102.
- [BGI11] A. Bernardi, A. Gimigliano, and M. Idà, *Computing symmetric rank for symmetric tensors*, *J. Symbolic Comput.* **46** (2011), no. 1, 34–53.
- [BGL13] J. Buczyński, A. Ginensky, and J. M. Landsberg, *Determinantal equations for secant varieties and the Eisenbud-Koh-Stillman conjecture*, *J. Lond. Math. Soc. (2)* **88** (2013), no. 1, 1–24.
- [BJ17] J. Buczyński and J. Jelisiejew, *Finite schemes and secant varieties over arbitrary characteristic*, *Differential Geom. Appl.* **55** (2017), 13–67.
- [BJMR18] A. Bernardi, J. Jelisiejew, P. Macias Marques, and K. Ranestad, *On polynomials with given Hilbert function and applications*, *Collect. Math.* **69** (2018), no. 1, 39–64.
- [BK23] A. Björklund and P. Kaski, *The asymptotic rank conjecture and the set cover conjecture are not both true* (2023), preprint, arXiv:2310.11926 [math.AG].
- [BL16] M. Bläser and V. Lysikov, *On degeneration of tensors and algebras*, in: *41st International Symposium on Mathematical Foundations of Computer Science (Cracow, 2016)*, edited by P. Faliszewski, LIPIcs. Leibniz Int. Proc. Inform., vol. 58, Schloss Dagstuhl. Leibniz-Zent. Inform., Wadern, 2016, Paper no. 19, 11 pp.
- [BL20] M. Bläser and V. Lysikov, *Slice rank of block tensors and irreversibility of structure tensors of algebras*, in: *45th International Symposium on Mathematical Foundations of Computer Science (prague, 2020)*, edited by J. Esparza and D. Král', LIPIcs. Leibniz Int. Proc. Inform., vol. 170, Schloss Dagstuhl. Leibniz-Zent. Inform., Wadern, 2020, Paper No. 17, 15 pp.
- [BLR80] D. Bini, G. Lotti, and F. Romani, *Approximate solutions for the bilinear form computational problem*, *SIAM J. Comput.* **9** (1980), no. 4, 692–697.
- [BOT24] A. Bernardi, A. Oneto, and D. Taufer, *On schemes evinced by generalized additive decompositions and their regularity*, *J. Math. Pures Appl. (9)* **188** (2024), 446–469.
- [BR13] A. Bernardi and K. Ranestad, *On the cactus rank of cubics forms*, *J. Symbolic Comput.* **50** (2013), 291–297.
- [BR24] ———, *Corrigendum to: On the cactus rank of cubics forms*, *J. Symbolic Comput.* (2024).
- [CDL⁺16] M. Cygan, H. Dell, D. Lokshtanov, D. Marx, J. Nederlof, Y. Okamoto, R. Paturi, S. Saurabh, and M. Wahlström, *On problems as hard as CNF-SAT*, *ACM Trans. Algorithms* **12** (2016), no. 3, Paper no. 41, 24 pp.
- [CEVV09] D. A. Cartwright, D. Erman, M. Velasco, and B. Viray, *Hilbert schemes of 8 points*, *Algebra Number Theory* **3** (2009), no. 7, 763–795.
- [CGLV22] A. Conner, F. Gesmundo, J. M. Landsberg, and E. Ventura, *Rank and border rank of Kronecker powers of tensors and Strassen's laser method*, *Comput. Complexity* **31** (2022), no. 1, Paper No. 1, 40.
- [CGO14] E. Carlini, N. Grieve, and L. Oeding, *Four lectures on secant varieties*, in: *Connections between algebra, combinatorics, and geometry* (Regina, SK, 2012), Springer Proc. Math. Stat., vol. 76, Springer, New York, 2014, pp. 101–146.
- [Che11] P. Chevalier, *Optimal separation of independent narrow-band sources – concept and performance*, *Signal Process.* **73**, special issue on blind separation and deconvolution (2011), 27–48.
- [Chi06] J. Chipalkatti, *Apolar schemes of algebraic forms*, *Canad. J. Math.* **58** (2006), no. 3, 476–491.
- [CJN15] G. Casnati, J. Jelisiejew, and R. Notari, *Irreducibility of the Gorenstein loci of Hilbert schemes via ray families*, *Algebra Number Theory* **9** (2015), no. 7, 1525–1570.
- [CVZ21] M. Christandl, P. Vrana, and J. Zuiddam, *Barriers for fast matrix multiplication from irreversibility*, *Theory Comput.* **17** (2021), Paper no. 2, 32 pp.
- [CW90] D. Coppersmith and S. Winograd, *Matrix multiplication via arithmetic progressions*, *J. Symbolic Comput.* **9** (1990), no. 3, 251–280.
- [DLC07] L. De Lathauwer and J. Castaing, *Tensor-based techniques for the blind separation of ds-cdma signals*, *Signal Process.* **87** (2007), 322–336.
- [Dol00] I. V. Dolgachev, *Polar Cremona transformations*, *Michigan Math. J.* **48** (2000), 191–202. Dedicated to William Fulton on the occasion of his 60th birthday.
- [Dol12] ———, *Classical algebraic geometry: A modern view*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2012.
- [DP03] A. Dimca and S. Papadima, *Hypersurface complements, Milnor fibers and higher homotopy groups of arrangements*, *Ann. of Math. (2)* **158** (2003), no. 2, 473–507.

- [Fla23] C. Flavi, *Border rank of powers of ternary quadratic forms*, J. Algebra **634** (2023), 599–625.
- [Fog68] J. Fogarty, *Algebraic families on an algebraic surface*, Amer. J. Math **90** (1968), 511–521.
- [GL19] F. Gesmundo and J. M. Landsberg, *Explicit polynomial sequences with maximal spaces of partial derivatives and a question of K. Mulmuley*, Theory Comput. **15** (2019), Paper no. 3, 24.
- [GMR23] M. Gałazka, T. Mańdziuk, and F. Rupniewski, *Distinguishing secant from cactus varieties*, Found. Comput. Math. **23** (2023), no. 4, 1167–1214.
- [Gro61] A. Grothendieck, *Techniques de construction et théorèmes d'existence en géométrie algébrique IV: les schémas de Hilbert*, Séminaire Bourbaki **221** (1961), 249–276 (French). Reprinted in: *Séminaire Bourbaki, Vol. 6*, Société Mathématique de France, Paris, 1995, reprint of the original edition published by W. A. Benjamin, New York–Amsterdam, 1966.
- [GRV18] M. Gallet, K. Ranestad, and N. Villamizar, *Varieties of apolar subschemes of toric surfaces*, Ark. Mat. **56** (2018), no. 1, 73–99.
- [HJNY22] M. Hoyois, J. Jelisiejew, D. Nardin, and M. Yakerson, *Hermitian K-theory via oriented Gorenstein algebras*, J. Reine Angew. Math. **793** (2022), 105–142.
- [HKS92] K. Hulek, S. Katz, and F.-O. Schreyer, *Cremona transformations and syzygies*, Math. Z. **209** (1992), no. 3, 419–443.
- [HMY20] H. Huang, M. Michałek, and E. Ventura, *Vanishing Hessian, wild forms and their border VSP*, Math. Ann. **378** (2020), no. 3–4, 1505–1532.
- [Huh12] J. Huh, *Milnor numbers of projective hypersurfaces and the chromatic polynomial of graphs*, J. Amer. Math. Soc. **25** (2012), no. 3, 907–927.
- [Iar94] A. Iarrobino, *Associated graded algebra of a Gorenstein Artin algebra*, Mem. Amer. Math. Soc. **107** (1994), no. 514, viii+115 pp.
- [IK99] A. Iarrobino and V. Kanev, *Power sums, Gorenstein algebras, and determinantal loci*, Lecture Notes in Mathematics, vol. 1721, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1999. Appendix C by A. Iarrobino and S. L. Kleiman.
- [Jel14] J. Jelisiejew, *Local finite-dimensional Gorenstein k -algebras having Hilbert function $(1, 5, 5, 1)$ are smoothable*, J. Algebra Appl. **13** (2014), no. 8, Paper no. 1450056, 7 pp.
- [Jel17] ———, *Classifying local Artinian Gorenstein algebras*, Collect. Math. **68** (2017), no. 1, 101–127.
- [Jel19] ———, *Elementary components of Hilbert schemes of points*, J. Lond. Math. Soc. (2) **100** (2019), no. 1, 249–272.
- [JKK19] J. Jelisiejew, G. Kapustka, and M. Kapustka, *Smoothable zero dimensional schemes and special projections of algebraic varieties*, Math. Nachr. **292** (2019), no. 9, 2018–2027.
- [JLP24] J. Jelisiejew, J. M. Landsberg, and A. Pal, *Concise tensors of minimal border rank*, Math. Ann. **388** (2024), no. 3, 2473–2517.
- [JŠ22] J. Jelisiejew and K. Šivic, *Components and singularities of Quot schemes and varieties of commuting matrices*, J. Reine Angew. Math. **788** (2022), 129–187.
- [KM24] P. Kaski and M. Michałek, *A universal sequence of tensors for the asymptotic rank conjecture*, preprint, arXiv:2404.06427 [math.AG] (2024).
- [KMR98] J. O. Kleppe and R. M. Miró-Roig, *The dimension of the Hilbert scheme of Gorenstein codimension 3 subschemes*, J. Pure Appl. Algebra **127** (1998), no. 1, 73–82.
- [Lan12] J. M. Landsberg, *Tensors: geometry and applications*, Graduate Studies in Mathematics, vol. 128, American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2012.
- [LM17a] J. M. Landsberg and M. Michałek, *Abelian tensors*, J. Math. Pures Appl. (9) **108** (2017), no. 3, 333–371.
- [LM17b] ———, *On the geometry of border rank decompositions for matrix multiplication and other tensors with symmetry*, SIAM J. Appl. Algebra Geom. **1** (2017), no. 1, 2–19.
- [LMR23] A. Laface, A. Massarenti, and R. Rischter, *Decomposition algorithms for tensors and polynomials*, SIAM J. Appl. Algebra Geom. **7** (2023), no. 1, 264–290.
- [LO13] J. M. Landsberg and G. Ottaviani, *Equations for secant varieties of Veronese and other varieties*, Ann. Mat. Pura Appl. (4) **192** (2013), no. 4, 569–606.
- [Mac94] F. S. Macaulay, *The algebraic theory of modular systems*, Cambridge Mathematical Library, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1994. Revised reprint of the 1916 original, with an introduction by P. Roberts.
- [McC87] P. McCullagh, *Tensor methods in statistics*, Monographs on Statistics and Applied Probability, Chapman & Hall, London, 1987.
- [MS05] E. Miller and B. Sturmfels, *Combinatorial commutative algebra*, Graduate Texts in Mathematics, vol. 227, Springer-Verlag, New York, 2005.
- [MS21] M. Michałek and B. Sturmfels, *Invitation to nonlinear algebra*, Grad. Stud. Math., vol. 211, American Mathematical Society (AMS), Providence, RI, 2021.
- [Pan66] V. Ja. Pan, *On means of calculating values of polynomials*, Uspehi Mat. Nauk **21** (1966), no. 1(127), 103–134.
- [Pra23] K. Pratt, *A stronger connection between the asymptotic rank conjecture and the set cover conjecture* (2023), preprint, arXiv:2311.02774 [math.AG].
- [Rez92] B. Reznick, *Sums of even powers of real linear forms*, Mem. Amer. Math. Soc. **96** (1992), no. 463, viii+155 pp.
- [RS11] K. Ranestad and F.-O. Schreyer, *On the rank of a symmetric form*, J. Algebra **346** (2011), 340–342.
- [Sta23] The Stacks project authors, *The stacks project*, 2023.

- [Str96] S. A. Strømme, *Elementary introduction to representable functors and Hilbert schemes*, in: *Parameter spaces* (Warsaw, 1994), Banach Center Publ., vol. 36, Polish Acad. Sci. Inst. Math., Warsaw, 1996, pp. 179–198.
- [Syl51] J. J. Sylvester, *An essay on canonical forms, supplement to a sketch of a memoir on elimination, transformation and canonical forms*, George Bell & Sons, London, Fleet Street, 1851. Reprinted in: *The collected mathematical papers of James Joseph Sylvester*, Vol. 1, Paper no. 34, Chelsea Publishing Co., New York, 1973, pp. 203–216, edited by H. F. Baker, reprint of the original edition published by Cambridge University Press, London, Fetter Lane, E. C., 1904.
- [VWXXZ23] V. Vassilevska Williams, Y. Xu, Z. Xu, and R. Zhou, *New bounds for matrix multiplication: from alpha to omega*, preprint, arXiv:2307.07970 [math.AG] (2023).
- [Woj23] M. Wojtala, *Irreversibility of structure tensors of modules*, *Collect. Math.* **74** (2023), no. 2, 487–499.
- [Zui17] J. Zuiddam, *A note on the gap between rank and border rank*, *Linear Algebra Appl.* **525** (2017), 33–44.

(Cosimo Flavi), DIPARTIMENTO DI MATEMATICA E INFORMATICA "ULISSE DINI", UNIVERSITÀ DEGLI STUDI DI FIRENZE, Viale Giovanni Battista Morgagni 67/a, 50134 Florence, Italy
Email address: `cosimo.flavi@unifi.it`

(Joachim Jelisiejew), WYDZIAŁ MATEMATYKI, INFORMATYKI I MECHANIKI, UNIwersYTET WARSZAWSKI, Banacha 2, 02-097 Warsaw, Poland
Email address: `j.jelisiejew@uw.edu.pl`

(Mateusz Michałek), FACHBEREICH MATHEMATIK UND STATISTIK, UNIVERSITÄT KONSTANZ, Fach D 197 D-78457, Konstanz, Germany
Email address: `mateusz.michalek@uni-konstanz.de`