

CASTELNUOVO-MUMFORD REGULARITY OF FINITE SCHEMES

DONGHYEOP LEE AND EUISUNG PARK

ABSTRACT. Let $\Gamma \subset \mathbb{P}^n$ be a nondegenerate finite subscheme of degree d . Then the Castelnuovo-Mumford regularity $\text{reg}(\Gamma)$ of Γ is at most $\left\lceil \frac{d-n-1}{t(\Gamma)} \right\rceil + 2$ where $t(\Gamma)$ is the smallest integer such that Γ admits a $(t+2)$ -secant t -plane. In this paper, we show that $\text{reg}(\Gamma)$ is close to this upper bound if and only if there exists a unique rational normal curve C of degree $t(\Gamma)$ such that $\text{reg}(\Gamma \cap C) = \text{reg}(\Gamma)$.

1. INTRODUCTION

Throughout this paper, we work over an algebraically closed field \mathbb{K} of characteristic 0. A closed subscheme $\Gamma \subset \mathbb{P}^n$, defined by a sheaf of ideals \mathcal{I}_Γ in $\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^n}$, is said to be p -regular in the sense of Castelnuovo-Mumford if

$$H^i(\mathbb{P}^n, \mathcal{I}_\Gamma(p-i)) = 0 \quad \text{for all } i \geq 1.$$

The interest in this concept stems partly from the fact that Γ is p -regular if and only if for every $j \geq 0$ the minimal generators of the j -th syzygy module of the saturated homogeneous ideal $I(\Gamma)$ of Γ in the homogeneous coordinate ring $R := \mathbb{K}[x_0, x_1, \dots, x_n]$ of \mathbb{P}^n occur in degree $\leq p+j$ (cf. [EG]). In particular, $I(\Gamma)$ can be generated by forms of degree $\leq p$. The Castelnuovo-Mumford regularity $\text{reg}(\Gamma)$ of Γ is defined to be the least integer p such that Γ is p -regular. In this paper, we study the regularity of finite subschemes of \mathbb{P}^n .

Let $\Gamma \subset \mathbb{P}^n$ be a nondegenerate finite subscheme of degree $d \geq n+3$. There is a well-known upper bound of $\text{reg}(\Gamma)$ in terms of some basic invariants of Γ . To state precisely, recall that a subspace Λ of \mathbb{P}^n is said to be a $(t+2)$ -secant t -plane to Γ if it is a t -dimensional subspace of \mathbb{P}^n such that

$$\text{length}(\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^n}/(\mathcal{I}_\Lambda + \mathcal{I}_\Gamma)) \geq t+2$$

where \mathcal{I}_Λ is the sheaf of ideals of Λ in \mathbb{P}^n . We denote by $t(\Gamma)$ the smallest integer t such that Γ admits a $(t+2)$ -secant t -plane. Then $1 \leq t(\Gamma) \leq n$. Also, Γ is said to be *in linearly general position* if $t(\Gamma)$ is equal to n . It always holds that

$$\text{reg}(\Gamma) \leq \left\lceil \frac{d-n-1}{t(\Gamma)} \right\rceil + 2 \tag{1.1}$$

where $\lceil a \rceil$ is the smallest integer greater than or equal to a (cf. [K, Proposition 2.1]). Briefly speaking, this shows that in order for $\text{reg}(\Gamma)$ to become large, the value of $t(\Gamma)$

Date: Seoul, December 23, 2024.

2010 Mathematics Subject Classification. 14N05, 51N35.

Key words and phrases. Finite scheme, Castelnuovo-Mumford regularity, Rational normal curve.

must be small. Along this line, our paper aims to explore answers to the following problem.

- (*) When $\text{reg}(\Gamma)$ is close to the upper bound $\left\lceil \frac{d-n-1}{t(\Gamma)} \right\rceil + 2$ in (1.1), find some elementary geometric reasons for why Γ is not $(\text{reg}(\Gamma) - 1)$ -regular.

In the case of $t(\Gamma) = 1$, the answer to this problem was obtained in [LPW], where it is proved that if

$$\left\lceil \frac{d-n-1}{2} \right\rceil + 3 \leq \text{reg}(\Gamma) \leq d-n+1$$

(and hence $t(\Gamma) = 1$), then Γ admits a $\text{reg}(\Gamma)$ -secant line. This result provides an intuitive and geometric explanation for why Γ fails to be $(\text{reg}(\Gamma) - 1)$ -regular.

Regarding the problem (*) and the above result in [LPW], our first main result in this paper is as follows :

Theorem 1.1. *Let $\Gamma \subset \mathbb{P}^n$ be a nondegenerate finite subscheme of degree d such that*

$$\left\lceil \frac{d-n-1}{t(\Gamma)+1} \right\rceil + 3 \leq \text{reg}(\Gamma) \leq \left\lceil \frac{d-n-1}{t(\Gamma)} \right\rceil + 2. \quad (1.2)$$

Then there exists a unique $t(\Gamma)$ -dimensional subspace Λ of \mathbb{P}^n such that

- (i) $\Gamma \cap \Lambda$ is nondegenerate and in linearly general position as a subscheme of Λ
- and
- (ii) $\text{reg}(\Gamma \cap \Lambda) = \text{reg}(\Gamma)$.

The proof of Theorem 1.1 is in Section 3.

Note that if $\text{reg}(\Gamma)$ holds the inequalities in (1.2), then d is at least $n + t(\Gamma) + 2$.

Theorem 1.1 generalizes the previously mentioned result in [LPW]. That is, if

$$\left\lceil \frac{d-n-1}{2} \right\rceil + 3 \leq \text{reg}(\Gamma) \leq d-n+1$$

(and hence $t(\Gamma) = 1$), then Theorem 1.1 says that there exists a unique line $\Lambda = \mathbb{P}^1$ such that $\text{reg}(\Gamma \cap \Lambda) = \text{reg}(\Gamma)$. That is, Γ admits a unique $\text{reg}(\Gamma)$ -secant line.

Theorem 1.1 gives us a partial answer for the problem (*). That is, if $\text{reg}(\Gamma)$ satisfies the inequality (1.2) then there exists a subscheme $\Gamma \cap \Lambda$ of Γ which is in linearly general position in Λ and which satisfies $\text{reg}(\Gamma \cap \Lambda) = \text{reg}(\Gamma)$. This leads us to study finite schemes in linearly general position whose regularity is close to the upper bound in (1.1). We begin with recalling the following definition.

Definition 1.2. A nondegenerate finite set $\Gamma \subset \mathbb{P}^n$ of d points is said to be *in uniform position* if

$$h_Y(\ell) = \min\{|Y|, h_\Gamma(\ell)\}$$

for any subset Y of Γ and any $\ell \geq 0$, where $h_\Gamma(t)$ and $h_Y(t)$ are the Hilbert functions of Γ and Y , respectively.

Any finite set in uniform position is always in linearly general position. When Γ is in uniform position and d is large enough, the maximal regularity case was classified as follows.

Theorem 1.3 (N. V. Trung and G. Valla in [TV] and U. Nagel in [N]). *Let $\Gamma \subset \mathbb{P}^n$ be a finite set of d points in uniform position. Then*

(1) *Suppose that $d > (n + 1)^2$. Then*

$$\text{reg}(\Gamma) = \left\lceil \frac{d-1}{n} \right\rceil + 1 \text{ if and only if } \Gamma \text{ lies on a rational normal curve.}$$

(2) *Suppose that $n \geq 3$, $d \geq \min(3n + 1, 2n + 5)$ and Γ does not lie on a rational normal curve. Then $\text{reg}(\Gamma) \leq \tau(n, d)$ where*

$$\tau(n, d) := \begin{cases} \left\lceil \frac{d}{n+1} \right\rceil + 2 & \text{if } n+1 \text{ divides } d, \text{ and} \\ \left\lceil \frac{d}{n+1} \right\rceil + 1 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Theorem 1.3.(1) was shown using the classical Castelnuovo Lemma.

Theorem 1.3 says that if Γ is in uniform position and $d > (n + 1)^2$, then either Γ lies on a rational normal curve and so $\text{reg}(\Gamma)$ is maximal or else $\text{reg}(\Gamma)$ is at most $\tau(n, d)$.

From now on, let $\Gamma \subset \mathbb{P}^n$ be a finite scheme in linearly general position of degree $d \geq n + 3$. We first define the integer $\rho(\Gamma)$ as

$$\rho(\Gamma) = \max\{|\Gamma \cap C| \mid C \text{ is a rational normal curve in } \mathbb{P}^n\}.$$

By [EH, Theorem 1], any finite scheme of degree $n + 3$ in linearly general position is contained in a unique rational normal curve. Therefore, it always holds that

$$n + 3 \leq \rho(\Gamma) \leq d.$$

Also, Theorem 1.3.(1) says that if Γ is in uniform position and $d \geq (n + 1)^2$, then $\text{reg}(\Gamma)$ is maximal if and only if $\rho(\Gamma) = d$.

Along this line, our second main result in the present paper is as follows.

Theorem 1.4. *Let $\Gamma \subset \mathbb{P}^n$, $n \geq 2$, be a finite subscheme of degree d in linearly general position such that*

$$d \geq 4n^2 + 6n + 1 \quad \text{and} \quad \text{reg}(\Gamma) \geq \left\lceil \frac{d-1}{n + \frac{n}{2n+2}} \right\rceil + 3. \quad (1.3)$$

Then

$$\rho(\Gamma) > d - (m + 1)n \quad \text{where} \quad m := \left\lceil \frac{d-1}{n} \right\rceil + 1 - \text{reg}(\Gamma). \quad (1.4)$$

Furthermore, there is a unique rational normal curve C of degree n such that

$$\rho(\Gamma) = |\Gamma \cap C| \quad \text{and} \quad \text{reg}(\Gamma) = \text{reg}(\Gamma \cap C).$$

The proof of Theorem 1.4 is in Section 4.

Considering the inequalities in (1.1) and (1.3), the following condition is required:

$$\left\lceil \frac{d-1}{n + \frac{n}{2n+2}} \right\rceil + 3 \leq \left\lceil \frac{d-1}{n} \right\rceil + 1$$

Note that our assumption $d \geq 4n^2 + 6n + 1$ ensures that this inequality always holds.

Contrary to the results of Theorem 1.3, it can happen that if $\Gamma \subset \mathbb{P}^n$ is in linearly general position but not in uniform position then

$$\left\lceil \frac{d}{n+1} \right\rceil + 2 < \text{reg}(\Gamma) \leq \left\lceil \frac{d-1}{n} \right\rceil + 1.$$

Theorem 1.4 provides a very precise description of such finite subschemes. In particular, it says that if $\text{reg}(\Gamma)$ is close to the maximal possible value then there exists a unique rational normal curve which contains most of Γ . Thus Theorem 1.4 clearly shows what properties hold when the condition on Γ is extended from the “uniform position” to “linearly general position”.

Next, we apply Theorem 1.4 to finite subschemes in linearly general position having maximal regularity. This can be compared to Theorem 1.3.(1).

Corollary 1.5. *Let $\Gamma \subset \mathbb{P}^n$, $n \geq 2$, be a finite subscheme of degree $d \geq 4n^2 + 6n + 1$ in linearly general position. Write $d = nq + r + 2$ for some $0 \leq r \leq n - 1$. Then*

$$\text{reg}(\Gamma) = \left\lceil \frac{d-1}{n} \right\rceil + 1 \quad \text{if and only if} \quad \rho(\Gamma) \geq d - r.$$

In particular, if $r = 0$ and $\text{reg}(\Gamma) = \left\lceil \frac{d-1}{n} \right\rceil + 1$ then Γ lies in a rational normal curve and hence it is in uniform position.

The proof of Corollary 1.5 is in Section 5.

We finish this section by providing an answer to the previous problem (*) by combining Theorem 1.1 and Theorem 1.4.

Theorem 1.6. *Let $\Gamma \subset \mathbb{P}^n$ be a nondegenerate finite subscheme of degree d with $t(\Gamma) = t$. If*

$$\left\lceil \frac{d-1}{t + \frac{t}{2t+2}} \right\rceil + 2 < \text{reg}(\Gamma) \leq \left\lceil \frac{d-n-1}{t} \right\rceil + 2,$$

then there exist a unique subspace \mathbb{P}^t of \mathbb{P}^n and a unique rational normal curve C in \mathbb{P}^t such that $\text{reg}(\Gamma \cap C) = \text{reg}(\Gamma)$.

The proof of Theorem 1.6 is in Section 4.

Regarding Problem (*), if $\Gamma \subset \mathbb{P}^n$ is as in Theorem 1.6 then it fails to be $(\text{reg}(\Gamma) - 1)$ -regular since there exists a rational normal curve C in \mathbb{P}^t such that $\text{reg}(\Gamma \cap C) = \text{reg}(\Gamma)$.

Organization of the paper. In §2, we review some basic facts to study the Castelnuovo-Mumford regularity of finite schemes. In §3 and §4, we give a proof of Theorem 1.1 and a proof of Theorem 1.4, respectively. Finally, in §5 we prove more properties of finite

schemes in linearly general position which have maximal regularity.

Acknowledgement. This work was supported by the National Research Foundation of Korea(NRF) grant funded by the Korea government(MSIT) (No. 2022R1A2C1002784).

2. PRELIMINARIES

We fix a few notations, which we use throughout this paper.

Notation and Conventions 2.1. Let $\Gamma \subset \mathbb{P}^n$ be a (possibly degenerate) finite subscheme, defined by a sheaf of ideals \mathcal{I}_Γ in $\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^n}$. Also, let

$$I(\Gamma) := \bigoplus_{\ell \in \mathbb{Z}} H^0(\mathbb{P}^n, \mathcal{I}_\Gamma(\ell))$$

be the saturated homogeneous ideal of Γ in the homogeneous coordinate ring $R := \mathbb{K}[x_0, x_1, \dots, x_n]$ of \mathbb{P}^n .

- (1) The length of Γ , defined to be the length of $\mathcal{O}_\Gamma = \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^n}/\mathcal{I}_\Gamma$, is equal to $h^0(\Gamma, \mathcal{O}_\Gamma)$. It is also called the degree of Γ . We will denote it by $|\Gamma|$.
- (2) For each $m \in \mathbb{Z}$, let

$$\rho_m : H^0(\mathbb{P}^n, \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^n}(m)) \rightarrow H^0(\Gamma, \mathcal{O}_\Gamma(m))$$

be the natural restriction map. The Hilbert function h_Γ of Γ is defined by

$$h_\Gamma(m) = \dim_{\mathbb{K}} \text{Im}(\rho_m).$$

- (3) We say that Γ is *m-normal* if ρ_m is surjective, or equivalently, if Γ is $(m+1)$ -regular. Let V be a hypersurface of \mathbb{P}^n . The intersection $\Gamma \cap V$ is defined to be the scheme defined by the ideal sheaf $(\mathcal{I}_\Gamma + \mathcal{I}_V)$. Also, *the residual scheme* of Γ with respect to V , denoted by $\Gamma : V$, means the scheme defined by the ideal sheaf $(\mathcal{I}_\Gamma : \mathcal{I}_V)$.
- (4) If $\dim \langle \Gamma \rangle \geq 1$, we define $t(\Gamma)$ to be the largest integer k such that $\dim \langle \Gamma' \rangle = |\Gamma'| - 1$ for any subscheme Γ' of Γ of degree $|\Gamma'| \leq k + 1$. It is elementary to see that $1 \leq t(\Gamma) \leq \dim \langle \Gamma \rangle$. For example, if $|\Gamma| \geq 3$, then the statement that $t(\Gamma) = 1$ is equivalent to the statement that Γ has a trisecant line.

Next, we list a few well-known facts about finite subschemes in a projective space below.

Proposition 2.2. *Let $\Gamma \subset \mathbb{P}^n$ be a finite subscheme of degree d . Then*

- (1) *If Γ is m -normal, then any subscheme Γ' of Γ is also m -normal.*
- (2) *If Γ' is a subscheme of Γ such that $\dim \langle \Gamma' \rangle = n'$ and $|\Gamma'| = d'$, then*

$$\dim \langle \Gamma \rangle \leq \min\{n' + d - d', n\}.$$

- (3) *Let Γ_0 be a subscheme of Γ such that $|\Gamma_0| = d_0$. Then there exist subschemes $\Gamma_1, \Gamma_2, \dots, \Gamma_{d-d_0-1}$ of Γ such that*

$$\Gamma_0 \subsetneq \Gamma_1 \subsetneq \dots \subsetneq \Gamma_{d-d_0-1} \subsetneq \Gamma \quad \text{and} \quad |\Gamma_i| = |\Gamma_0| + i.$$

- (4) *Let V be a hypersurface of \mathbb{P}^n . Then*

$$|\Gamma| = |\Gamma \cap V| + |\Gamma : V|.$$

- (5) *(La méthode d'Horace, [Hi]) Let V be a hypersurface of degree k . If $\Gamma \cap V$ is m -normal and $\Gamma : V$ is $(m - k)$ -normal, then Γ is m -normal.*

- (6) *If Γ is in linearly general position and lies on a rational normal curve of degree n , Then*

$$\operatorname{reg}(\Gamma) = \left\lceil \frac{d-1}{n} \right\rceil + 1.$$

Proof. For (1) \sim (3), we refer the reader to [LPW, Proposition 2.2]. The proof of (4) comes immediately from the following exact sequence

$$0 \rightarrow (S/(I_\Gamma : V))(k) \rightarrow S/I_\Gamma \rightarrow S/\langle I_\Gamma, V \rangle \rightarrow 0$$

where k is the degree of V . For (5), see [Hi, p.352]. For (6), see [P, Proposition 3.4] (cf. [N, Proposition 2.2], [NP, Proposition 2.3]). \square

Remark 2.3. In this paper, we will apply the above-mentioned d'Horace Lemma as follows. Let Γ and V be as in Proposition 2.2.(5) such that $\operatorname{reg}(\Gamma) > \operatorname{reg}(\Gamma \cap V)$. Then

$$\operatorname{reg}(\Gamma : V) \geq \operatorname{reg}(\Gamma) - k.$$

Indeed, if not then $\Gamma \cap V$ is $(\operatorname{reg}(\Gamma) - 2)$ -normal and $\Gamma : V$ is $(\operatorname{reg}(\Gamma) - k - 2)$ -normal. Thus it follows by Proposition 2.2.(5) that Γ is $(\operatorname{reg}(\Gamma) - 2)$ -normal, which is obviously a contradiction.

3. PROOF OF THEOREM 1.1

This section is devoted to giving a proof of Theorem 1.1. We begin with a definition.

Definition 3.1. We say that a nondegenerate finite subscheme $\Gamma \subset \mathbb{P}^n$ satisfies condition RPH (=regularity preserving hyperplane) if it admits a regularity preserving hyperplane section in the sense that there exists a hyperplane $H = \mathbb{P}^{n-1}$ such that the following two statements hold:

- (i) $\Gamma \cap H$ is a nondegenerate subscheme of H ;
- (ii) the equality $\operatorname{reg}(\Gamma \cap H) = \operatorname{reg}(\Gamma)$ holds.

Remark 3.2. (1) Let H be a hyperplane such that $\operatorname{reg}(\Gamma \cap H) = \operatorname{reg}(\Gamma)$ but $\Gamma \cap H$ fails to span H . In such a case, we can choose another hyperplane H' containing $\Gamma \cap H$ and such that $\Gamma \cap H'$ is a nondegenerate subscheme of H' . Then

$$\operatorname{reg}(\Gamma) = \operatorname{reg}(\Gamma \cap H) \leq \operatorname{reg}(\Gamma \cap H') \leq \operatorname{reg}(\Gamma).$$

That is, condition RPH holds for Γ if there is a hyperplane which satisfies only condition (ii) in Definition 3.1.

(2) For example, if a finite subscheme $\Gamma \subset \mathbb{P}^n$ is in linearly general position and $|\Gamma| \geq n+2$, then $\operatorname{reg}(\Gamma) \geq 3$ and any nondegenerate hyperplane section of Γ is 2-regular. Thus, Γ fails to satisfy condition RPH.

Our first goal in this section is to verify that $\Gamma \subset \mathbb{P}^n$ in Theorem 1.1 satisfies condition RPH.

Lemma 3.3. *Let $\Gamma \subset \mathbb{P}^n$ be as in Theorem 1.1 and let $H = \mathbb{P}^{n-1}$ be a hyperplane such that*

$$|\Gamma \cap H| \geq n+1 \quad \text{and} \quad \operatorname{reg}(\Gamma \cap H) < \operatorname{reg}(\Gamma).$$

Then the following statements hold.

- (1) $\text{reg}(\Gamma) \geq 4$.
- (2) $\text{reg}(\Gamma : H) \geq \text{reg}(\Gamma) - 1$.
- (3) $|\Gamma : H| - \dim\langle \Gamma : H \rangle + t(\Gamma : H) \leq d - n - 1$.
- (4) $t(\Gamma : H) = t(\Gamma)$.

Proof. (1) Since $d \geq n + t(\Gamma) + 2$, we have $\text{reg}(\Gamma) \geq 4$ from the first inequalities in (1.2).

(2) See Remark 2.3.

(3) It always holds that $t(\Gamma : H) \leq \dim\langle \Gamma : H \rangle$. This shows that

$$\begin{aligned} n - \dim\langle \Gamma : H \rangle + t(\Gamma : H) &< n + 1 \\ &\leq |\Gamma \cap H| \\ &= d - |\Gamma : H|. \end{aligned}$$

Thus we get the desired inequality $|\Gamma : H| - \dim\langle \Gamma : H \rangle + t(\Gamma : H) \leq d - n - 1$.

(4) First, note that $\dim\langle \Gamma : H \rangle \geq 1$ since $\text{reg}(\Gamma : H) > 1$. By inequality (1.1) and Lemma 3.3.(3), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \text{reg}(\Gamma : H) &\leq \left\lceil \frac{|\Gamma : H| - \dim\langle \Gamma : H \rangle - 1}{t(\Gamma : H)} \right\rceil + 2 \\ &\leq \left\lceil \frac{d - n - 1 - t(\Gamma : H)}{t(\Gamma : H)} \right\rceil + 2 = \left\lceil \frac{d - n - 1}{t(\Gamma : H)} \right\rceil + 1. \end{aligned}$$

Then, we can combine this result with inequalities (1.2) and Lemma 3.3.(2) to deduce that

$$\left\lceil \frac{d - n - 1}{t(\Gamma) + 1} \right\rceil + 2 \leq \text{reg}(\Gamma) - 1 \leq \text{reg}(\Gamma : H) \leq \left\lceil \frac{d - n - 1}{t(\Gamma : H)} \right\rceil + 1.$$

Here, the inequality

$$\left\lceil \frac{d - n - 1}{t(\Gamma) + 1} \right\rceil + 2 \leq \left\lceil \frac{d - n - 1}{t(\Gamma : H)} \right\rceil + 1$$

implies that $t(\Gamma : H) \leq t(\Gamma)$. To see this, suppose that $t(\Gamma : H) < t(\Gamma)$ for the sake of contradiction. Since $\dim\langle \Gamma : H \rangle \geq 1$, we have $t(\Gamma : H) \leq \dim\langle \Gamma : H \rangle$ by the definition of $t(\Gamma : H)$. Remark that

$$|\Gamma : H| > \dim\langle \Gamma : H \rangle + 1$$

since $\text{reg}(\Gamma : H) \geq 3$. If $t(\Gamma : H) < \dim\langle \Gamma : H \rangle$, then $\Gamma : H$ admits a $t(\Gamma : H)$ -dimensional subspace Λ such that $|\Lambda \cap (\Gamma : H)| \geq t(\Gamma : H) + 2$ hence so does Γ . This is impossible since $t(\Gamma : H) < t(\Gamma)$. Thus, we may assume that $t(\Gamma : H) = \dim\langle \Gamma : H \rangle$. Then, it immediately implies that $\dim\langle \Gamma : H \rangle$ is strictly less than $t(\Gamma)$. If $|\Gamma : H| \geq \dim\langle \Gamma : H \rangle + 2$, then $t(\Gamma) \leq t(\Gamma : H)$. This implies that $|\Gamma : H| = \dim\langle \Gamma : H \rangle + 1$ and hence $\text{reg}(\Gamma : H) = 2$. This is a contradiction since

$$\text{reg}(\Gamma : H) \geq \text{reg}(\Gamma) - 1 \geq 3$$

by Lemma 3.3.(1) and (2). Therefore, we can deduce that $t(\Gamma : H) = t(\Gamma)$. \square

Theorem 3.4. *Let $\Gamma \subset \mathbb{P}^n$ be a nondegenerate finite subscheme of degree d . If $t(\Gamma) \leq n - 1$ and*

$$\left\lceil \frac{d - n - 1}{t(\Gamma) + 1} \right\rceil + 3 \leq \text{reg}(\Gamma) \leq \left\lceil \frac{d - n - 1}{t(\Gamma)} \right\rceil + 2, \quad (3.1)$$

then $\Gamma \subset \mathbb{P}^n$ satisfies condition RPH.

Proof. It suffices to show that there exists a hyperplane H such that $\text{reg}(\Gamma \cap H) = \text{reg}(\Gamma)$ by (1) in Remark 3.2. Since $\text{reg}(\Gamma)$ satisfies the inequalities in (3.1) we have $d \geq n+t(\Gamma)+2$. Keeping this in mind, we will use induction on d .

First, consider the initial case that $d = n + t(\Gamma) + 2$. We can choose a hyperplane H such that $|\Gamma \cap H| \geq n + 1$ since Γ is not in linearly general position (i.e., $t(\Gamma) \leq n - 1$). Now, it is easy to see that $|\Gamma : H| \leq d - n - 1 = t(\Gamma) + 1$ and hence

$$\dim\langle \Gamma : H \rangle \leq |\Gamma : H| - 1 \leq t(\Gamma).$$

The inequality $\dim\langle \Gamma : H \rangle \leq t(\Gamma)$ implies that $\dim\langle \Gamma : H \rangle = |\Gamma : H| - 1$ by the definition of $t(\Gamma)$. Thus, we conclude that $1 \leq \text{reg}(\Gamma : H) \leq 2$. On the other hand, it follows from inequalities in (3.1) that $\text{reg}(\Gamma) = 4$. Therefore, we deduce that $\text{reg}(\Gamma \cap H) = 4$ by the Horace method (cf. Proposition 2.2.(5)).

Next, we assume that $d > n + t(\Gamma) + 2$. In order to derive a contradiction, we suppose that there is no hyperplane H such that $\text{reg}(\Gamma \cap H) = \text{reg}(\Gamma)$. As before, we can choose a hyperplane H_0 such that $|\Gamma \cap H_0| \geq n + 1$ since Γ is not in linearly general position. We have $\text{reg}(\Gamma) - 1 \leq \text{reg}(\Gamma : H_0)$ by the Horace method.

We claim that there is a hyperplane $H' = \mathbb{P}^{n-1}$ such that $\text{reg}(\Gamma \cap H') = \text{reg}(\Gamma) - 1$. To see this, consider the case that $\dim\langle \Gamma : H_0 \rangle < n$. From this, we can choose a hyperplane H' containing a subscheme $\Gamma : H_0$. Then,

$$\text{reg}(\Gamma) - 1 \leq \text{reg}(\Gamma : H_0) \leq \text{reg}(\Gamma \cap H') < \text{reg}(\Gamma)$$

and hence we get the desired equality

$$\text{reg}(\Gamma \cap H') = \text{reg}(\Gamma) - 1.$$

Next, consider the other case that $\dim\langle \Gamma : H_0 \rangle = n$. From Lemma 3.3.(3), we have

$$|\Gamma : H_0| - \dim\langle \Gamma : H_0 \rangle + t(\Gamma : H_0) \leq d - n - 1.$$

Remark that $t(\Gamma : H_0) = t(\Gamma)$ by Lemma 3.3.(4). Then we obtain

$$\frac{|\Gamma : H_0| - \dim\langle \Gamma : H_0 \rangle - 1}{t(\Gamma) + 1} + 1 \leq \frac{d - n - 1}{t(\Gamma) + 1}.$$

Thus it holds that

$$\left\lceil \frac{|\Gamma : H_0| - \dim\langle \Gamma : H_0 \rangle - 1}{t(\Gamma) + 1} \right\rceil + 2 \leq \left\lceil \frac{d - n - 1}{t(\Gamma) + 1} \right\rceil + 1 \leq \text{reg}(\Gamma) - 2 \leq \text{reg}(\Gamma : H_0) - 1.$$

In particular, it is shown that

$$\left\lceil \frac{|\Gamma : H_0| - \dim\langle \Gamma : H_0 \rangle - 1}{t(\Gamma) + 1} \right\rceil + 3 \leq \text{reg}(\Gamma : H_0).$$

By induction hypothesis, there is a hyperplane $H' = \mathbb{P}^{n-1}$ such that

$$\text{reg}((\Gamma : H_0) \cap H') = \text{reg}(\Gamma : H_0).$$

It follows that

$$\text{reg}(\Gamma) - 1 \leq \text{reg}(\Gamma : H_0) = \text{reg}((\Gamma : H_0) \cap H') \leq \text{reg}(\Gamma \cap H') \leq \text{reg}(\Gamma) - 1$$

and hence we get the desired equality $\text{reg}(\Gamma \cap H') = \text{reg}(\Gamma) - 1$. Moreover, we may assume that $\Gamma \cap H'$ is nondegenerate in H' (cf. see in Remark 3.2).

For this hyperplane H' , we obtain the following inequalities :

$$\left\lceil \frac{d-n-1}{t(\Gamma)+1} \right\rceil + 2 \leq \text{reg}(\Gamma) - 1 \leq \text{reg}(\Gamma : H') \leq \left\lceil \frac{|\Gamma : H'| - \dim\langle \Gamma : H' \rangle - 1}{t(\Gamma : H')} \right\rceil + 2$$

(cf. inequalities (3.1) and Lemma 3.3.(2)). From the inequality

$$\left\lceil \frac{d-n-1}{t(\Gamma)+1} \right\rceil + 2 \leq \left\lceil \frac{|\Gamma : H'| - \dim\langle \Gamma : H' \rangle - 1}{t(\Gamma : H')} \right\rceil + 2,$$

we can derive the inequality

$$\frac{d-n-1}{t(\Gamma)+1} < \frac{|\Gamma : H'| - \dim\langle \Gamma : H' \rangle - 1}{t(\Gamma)} + 1$$

since $t(\Gamma) = t(\Gamma : H')$ by Lemma 3.3.(4). Since $t(\Gamma) = t(\Gamma : H') \leq \dim\langle \Gamma : H' \rangle$ and $|\Gamma : H'| = d - |\Gamma \cap H'|$, we can derive the following inequalities :

$$|\Gamma \cap H'| < n - \dim\langle \Gamma : H' \rangle + t(\Gamma) + \frac{d-n-1}{t(\Gamma)+1} \leq n + \left\lceil \frac{d-n-1}{t(\Gamma)+1} \right\rceil.$$

Note that $\text{reg}(\Gamma \cap H') \leq |\Gamma \cap H'| - (n-1) + 1$ from the inequality (1.1).

Thus we can deduce that

$$\text{reg}(\Gamma) = \text{reg}(\Gamma \cap H') + 1 \leq |\Gamma \cap H'| - (n-1) + 2 < 3 + \left\lceil \frac{d-n-1}{t(\Gamma)+1} \right\rceil,$$

which contradicts our assumption (3.1). This shows that $\Gamma \subset \mathbb{P}^n$ satisfies condition RPH. \square

Proof of Theorem 1.1. By Theorem 3.4, there is a hyperplane H such that $\Gamma \cap H$ is a nondegenerate subscheme of H and $\text{reg}(\Gamma \cap H) = \text{reg}(\Gamma)$. Then, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \left\lceil \frac{|\Gamma \cap H| - \dim\langle \Gamma \cap H \rangle - 1}{t(\Gamma \cap H) + 1} \right\rceil + 2 &\leq \left\lceil \frac{d-n-1}{t(\Gamma)+1} \right\rceil + 2 \\ &< \text{reg}(\Gamma) \\ &= \text{reg}(\Gamma \cap H) \\ &\leq \left\lceil \frac{|\Gamma \cap H| - \dim\langle \Gamma \cap H \rangle - 1}{t(\Gamma \cap H)} \right\rceil + 2. \end{aligned}$$

Since $|\Gamma \cap H| - \dim\langle \Gamma \cap H \rangle - 1 \leq d - n - 1$, the inequality

$$\left\lceil \frac{d-n-1}{t(\Gamma)+1} \right\rceil + 2 < \left\lceil \frac{|\Gamma \cap H| - \dim\langle \Gamma \cap H \rangle - 1}{t(\Gamma \cap H)} \right\rceil + 2$$

implies that $t(\Gamma \cap H) \leq t(\Gamma)$. As in the proof of Lemma 3.3.(4), we see that $t(\Gamma \cap H) = t(\Gamma)$. If $t(\Gamma \cap H) < n - 1$, then we can use Theorem 3.4 again for $\Gamma \cap H$. Therefore, we can obtain the desired existence by using Theorem 3.4 $n - t(\Gamma)$ times.

To prove the uniqueness, we suppose that there are two distinct $t(\Gamma)$ -dimensional linear spaces Λ_1 and Λ_2 satisfying conditions (i),(ii) in Theorem 1.1. Let d_1 and d_2 denote $|\Gamma \cap \Lambda_1|$ and $|\Gamma \cap \Lambda_2|$ respectively. Then

$$\left\lceil \frac{d-n-1}{t(\Gamma)+1} \right\rceil + 3 \leq \text{reg}(\Gamma) = \text{reg}(\Gamma \cap \Lambda_i) \leq \left\lceil \frac{d_i-1}{t(\Gamma)} \right\rceil + 2 \quad (3.2)$$

for $i = 1, 2$. From this, we get the inequalities $\frac{d-n-1}{t(\Gamma)+1} + 1 < \frac{d_i-1}{t(\Gamma)}$ for $i = 1, 2$. These imply that

$$t(\Gamma) \left(\frac{d-n-1}{t(\Gamma)+1} \right) + 1 < d_i \quad (3.3)$$

for $i = 1, 2$. Let r denote the dimension of $\Lambda_1 \cap \Lambda_2$, with the convention that $r = -1$ when $\Lambda_1 \cap \Lambda_2 = \emptyset$. Thus, the dimension of the linear space spanned by $\Lambda_1 \cup \Lambda_2$ is $2t - r$. Since $\Gamma \cap \Lambda_1$ is in linearly general position in Λ_1 , the degree of $\Gamma \cap \Lambda_1 \cap \Lambda_2$ is less than or equal to $r + 1$. We can obtain an inequality

$$d_1 + d_2 - (r + 1) \leq |(\Gamma \cap \Lambda_1) \cup (\Gamma \cap \Lambda_2)| \leq |\Gamma \cap \langle \Lambda_1 \cup \Lambda_2 \rangle|.$$

Note that $|\Gamma| - |\Gamma \cap \langle \Lambda_1 \cup \Lambda_2 \rangle| \geq n - \dim \langle \Lambda_1 \cup \Lambda_2 \rangle$ since Γ is nondegenerate in \mathbb{P}^n . Then, we can deduce that

$$d - (d_1 + d_2 - (r + 1)) \geq n - (2t(\Gamma) - r).$$

Combined with (3.3), we can derive an inequality

$$2t(\Gamma) \left(\frac{d-n+t(\Gamma)}{t(\Gamma)+1} \right) + 1 + n - 2t(\Gamma) < d.$$

Then we have $2t(\Gamma)(d-n+t(\Gamma)) + (1+n-2t(\Gamma))(t(\Gamma)+1) < d(t(\Gamma)+1)$, and hence

$$0 < (d-n-1)(1-t(\Gamma)).$$

Since $d > n + 1$, we have $t(\Gamma) < 1$. Obviously, this is a contradiction. This completes the proof. \square

4. PROOF OF THEOREM 1.4

This section is primarily devoted to giving a proof of Theorem 1.4, but also includes a proof of Theorem 1.6. We begin with the following interesting observation.

Lemma 4.1. *Let $\Gamma \subset \mathbb{P}^n$ be a finite subscheme of degree d in linearly general position and let m be a nonnegative integer such that*

$$d \geq (m+3)n \quad \text{and} \quad \text{reg}(\Gamma) = \left\lceil \frac{d-1}{n} \right\rceil - m + 1.$$

Let $Q \subset \mathbb{P}^n$ be a quadric such that $|\Gamma \cap Q| \geq (m+3)n$. Then

$$\text{reg}(\Gamma \cap Q) = \text{reg}(\Gamma) \quad \text{and} \quad |\Gamma \cap Q| > d - (m+1)n.$$

Proof. If $\Gamma \subset Q$, then we are done. Suppose that $\Gamma \not\subset Q$, and hence $|\Gamma : Q| > 0$. Note that $\Gamma \cap Q$ and $\Gamma : Q$ are in linearly general position. Also,

$$d = |\Gamma| = |\Gamma \cap Q| + |\Gamma : Q| \geq (m+3)n + |\Gamma : Q|$$

and hence

$$\operatorname{reg}(\Gamma) = \left\lceil \frac{d-1}{n} \right\rceil - m + 1 \geq \left\lceil \frac{|\Gamma : Q| - 1}{n} \right\rceil + 4.$$

Concerning $\Gamma : Q$, all cases can be divided into the following three cases:

- (i) $|\Gamma : Q| = 1$; or
- (ii) $2 \leq |\Gamma : Q| \leq n$; or
- (iii) $n + 1 \leq |\Gamma : Q|$.

In case (i), we have $\operatorname{reg}(\Gamma : Q) = 1$ and $\operatorname{reg}(\Gamma) \geq 4$. In case (ii), we have $\operatorname{reg}(\Gamma : Q) = 2$ and $\operatorname{reg}(\Gamma) \geq 5$. In case (iii), it holds that

$$\operatorname{reg}(\Gamma : Q) \leq \left\lceil \frac{d - |\Gamma \cap Q| - 1}{n} \right\rceil + 1 \leq \left\lceil \frac{d - (m+3)n - 1}{n} \right\rceil + 1 = \operatorname{reg}(\Gamma) - 3.$$

Thus, by Proposition 2.2.(5) and Remark 2.3, it must be true that

$$\operatorname{reg}(\Gamma \cap Q) = \operatorname{reg}(\Gamma).$$

To prove the remaining part, let us suppose on the contrary that

$$|\Gamma \cap Q| \leq d - (m+1)n.$$

Then, we have

$$\operatorname{reg}(\Gamma) = \operatorname{reg}(\Gamma \cap Q) \leq \left\lceil \frac{d - (m+1)n - 1}{n} \right\rceil + 1 = \operatorname{reg}(\Gamma) - 1.$$

This is a contradiction, and so the desired inequality $|\Gamma \cap Q| > d - (m+1)n$ holds. \square

Lemma 4.2. *Let $\Gamma \subset \mathbb{P}^n$ be a nondegenerate finite subscheme of degree d in linearly general position such that*

$$\left\lceil \frac{d-1}{n + \frac{n}{2n+2}} \right\rceil + 3 \leq \operatorname{reg}(\Gamma).$$

Let $Q \subset \mathbb{P}^n$ be a quadric such that $|Q \cap \Gamma| \geq 2n + 1$ and $\operatorname{reg}(\Gamma \cap Q) < \operatorname{reg}(\Gamma)$. Then

$$\left\lceil \frac{|\Gamma : Q| - 1}{n + \frac{n}{2n+2}} \right\rceil + 3 \leq \operatorname{reg}(\Gamma : Q).$$

Also, let m and m' be nonnegative integers such that

$$\operatorname{reg}(\Gamma) = \left\lceil \frac{d-1}{n} \right\rceil - m + 1 \quad \text{and} \quad \operatorname{reg}(\Gamma : Q) = \left\lceil \frac{|\Gamma : Q| - 1}{n} \right\rceil - m' + 1.$$

Then $m \geq m'$.

Proof. Since $\text{reg}(\Gamma \cap Q) < \text{reg}(\Gamma)$, Proposition 2.2.(5) implies that $\text{reg}(\Gamma : Q) \geq \text{reg}(\Gamma) - 2$. Also, it follows from the assumption $|\Gamma \cap Q| \geq 2n + 1$ that $|\Gamma : Q| \leq d - 2n - 1$. Hence we have the following :

$$\begin{aligned} \text{reg}(\Gamma : Q) &\geq \text{reg}(\Gamma) - 2 \\ &\geq \left\lfloor \frac{d-1}{n + \frac{n}{2n+2}} \right\rfloor + 1 = \left\lfloor \frac{d - 2(n + \frac{n}{2n+2}) - 1}{n + \frac{n}{2n+2}} \right\rfloor + 3 \\ &\geq \left\lfloor \frac{d - 2n - 1 - 1}{n + \frac{n}{2n+2}} \right\rfloor + 3 \\ &\geq \left\lfloor \frac{|\Gamma : Q| - 1}{n + \frac{n}{2n+2}} \right\rfloor + 3. \end{aligned}$$

Next, we will verify the second statement. We first note that

$$\left\lfloor \frac{|\Gamma : Q|}{n} \right\rfloor - m + 1 \leq \left\lfloor \frac{d-1}{n} \right\rfloor - m - 1 = \text{reg}(\Gamma) - 2$$

since $|\Gamma : Q| \leq d - 2n - 1$. Now, it follows from the inequality $\text{reg}(\Gamma) - 2 \leq \text{reg}(\Gamma : Q)$ that

$$\left\lfloor \frac{|\Gamma : Q|}{n} \right\rfloor - m + 1 \leq \text{reg}(\Gamma : Q) = \left\lfloor \frac{|\Gamma : Q| - 1}{n} \right\rfloor - m' + 1.$$

Obviously, this implies the desired inequality $m \geq m'$. \square

Now, we are ready to give a proof of Theorem 1.4.

Proof of Theorem 1.4. First, note that we can write

$$\text{reg}(\Gamma) = \left\lfloor \frac{d-1}{n} \right\rfloor - m + 1 \text{ for a nonnegative integer } m$$

since $\text{reg}(\Gamma) \leq \left\lfloor \frac{d-1}{n} \right\rfloor + 1$. Then, it follows from

$$\left\lfloor \frac{d-1}{n + \frac{n}{2n+2}} \right\rfloor + 3 \leq \text{reg}(\Gamma) = \left\lfloor \frac{d-1}{n} \right\rfloor - m + 1$$

that

$$\frac{d-1}{n + \frac{n}{2n+2}} + 3 < \frac{d-1}{n} - m + 2.$$

Thus, we can deduce that

$$(1+m)(2n^2 + 3n) + 1 < d. \quad (4.1)$$

Next, we will show that

(**) there is a unique rational normal curve C of degree n such that $\text{reg}(\Gamma) = \text{reg}(\Gamma \cap C)$.

Before proving the above statement (**), note that (**) implies the two desired properties

$$\rho(\Gamma) > d - (m + 1)n \quad \text{and} \quad \rho(\Gamma) = |\Gamma \cap C|.$$

Indeed, we have

$$\left\lceil \frac{d-1}{n} \right\rceil - m + 1 = \text{reg}(\Gamma) = \text{reg}(\Gamma \cap C) \leq \left\lceil \frac{|\Gamma \cap C| - 1}{n} \right\rceil + 1.$$

Hence the first statement, $\rho(\Gamma) > d - (m + 1)n$, comes immediately from

$$\frac{d-1}{n} - m + 1 \leq \frac{|\Gamma \cap C| - 1}{n} + 2.$$

For the second statement, $\rho(\Gamma) = |\Gamma \cap C|$, assume that there is a rational normal curve C' of degree n such that $|\Gamma \cap C'| > |\Gamma \cap C|$. Then, we have

$$\text{reg}(\Gamma) = \text{reg}(\Gamma \cap C) = \left\lceil \frac{|\Gamma \cap C| - 1}{n} \right\rceil + 1 \leq \left\lceil \frac{|\Gamma \cap C'| - 1}{n} \right\rceil + 1 = \text{reg}(\Gamma \cap C') \leq \text{reg}(\Gamma).$$

Thus, it follows immediately that

$$\text{reg}(\Gamma \cap C') = \text{reg}(\Gamma).$$

This contradicts the uniqueness of C . As a result, it follows that $\rho(\Gamma) = |\Gamma \cap C|$. Therefore, it suffices to prove (**). From now on, we will prove (**) by showing the existence and the uniqueness of the rational normal curve C .

Existence : To prove the existence part in (**), we will proceed in three steps.

Step 1. We will construct a subscheme Γ' of Γ with $|\Gamma'| \geq 2mn + 4n + 3$ such that

$$(**) \text{reg}(\Gamma' \cap Q) = \text{reg}(\Gamma') \text{ for any quadric } Q \subset \mathbb{P}^n \text{ with } |Q \cap \Gamma'| \geq 2n + 1.$$

If Γ satisfies the property (**), then we are done. Suppose that Γ fails to satisfy (**). That is, there exists a quadric Q_0 such that

$$|\Gamma \cap Q_0| \geq 2n + 1 \quad \text{and} \quad \text{reg}(\Gamma) > \text{reg}(\Gamma \cap Q_0).$$

Let Γ_1 denote subscheme $\Gamma : Q_0$. If Γ_1 fails to satisfy (**), then there exists a quadric Q_1 such that

$$|\Gamma_1 \cap Q_1| \geq 2n + 1 \quad \text{and} \quad \text{reg}(\Gamma_1) > \text{reg}(\Gamma_1 \cap Q_1).$$

In this way, setting $\Gamma = \Gamma_0$, we can obtain a subscheme Γ_i of Γ and a quadric Q_{i-1} inductively. Indeed, if Γ_{i-1} fails to satisfy (**) then there exists a quadric Q_{i-1} such that

$$|\Gamma_{i-1} \cap Q_{i-1}| \geq 2n + 1 \quad \text{and} \quad \text{reg}(\Gamma_{i-1}) > \text{reg}(\Gamma_{i-1} \cap Q_{i-1}).$$

Then we define Γ_i as the subscheme $\Gamma_{i-1} : Q_{i-1}$ of Γ_{i-1} . From our construction, it holds that

$$|\Gamma_i| \leq d - (2n + 1)i.$$

Also, it holds by Proposition 2.2.(5) that

$$\text{reg}(\Gamma_i) \geq \text{reg}(\Gamma_{i-1}) - 2.$$

It follows that $\text{reg}(\Gamma_i) \geq \text{reg}(\Gamma) - 2i$, and hence we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\left\lceil \frac{d-1}{n} \right\rceil - m + 1 - 2i &= \text{reg}(\Gamma) - 2i \\
&\leq \text{reg}(\Gamma_i) \\
&\leq \left\lceil \frac{|\Gamma_i| - 1}{n} \right\rceil + 1 \\
&\leq \left\lceil \frac{d - (2n+1)i - 1}{n} \right\rceil + 1 \\
&= \left\lceil \frac{d - i - 1}{n} \right\rceil - 2i + 1.
\end{aligned}$$

The inequality

$$\left\lceil \frac{d-1}{n} \right\rceil - m - 2i + 1 \leq \left\lceil \frac{d-i-1}{n} \right\rceil - 2i + 1$$

implies that $i < (m+1)n$. That is, there exists an integer $i < (m+1)n$ such that the subscheme Γ_i of Γ satisfies the property (**). With this i fixed, we need to show that

$$|\Gamma_i| \geq 2mn + 4n + 3. \quad (4.2)$$

To show this, we first claim that

$$|\Gamma_i| \geq d - (2n+1)((m+1)n - 1) \quad (4.3)$$

(It is clear that the number $d - (2n+1)((m+1)n - 1) > 0$ by our assumptions). For the sake of contradiction, suppose that

$$|\Gamma_i| \leq d - (2n+1)((m+1)n - 1) - 1 = d - (2n+1)(m+1)n + 2n.$$

Then we have

$$\text{reg}(\Gamma_i) \leq \left\lceil \frac{|\Gamma_i| - 1}{n} \right\rceil + 1 \leq \left\lceil \frac{d-1}{n} \right\rceil - m - 2n(m+1) + 2. \quad (4.4)$$

On the other hand, the inequalities $\text{reg}(\Gamma_i) \geq \text{reg}(\Gamma) - 2i$ and $i < (m+1)n$ imply that

$$\text{reg}(\Gamma_i) \geq \text{reg}(\Gamma) - 2i = \left\lceil \frac{d-1}{n} \right\rceil - m - 2i + 1 \geq \left\lceil \frac{d-1}{n} \right\rceil - m - 2n(m+1) + 3. \quad (4.5)$$

It is obvious that (4.4) and (4.5) contradict each other. Now, it follows from inequalities in (4.1) and (4.3) that

$$|\Gamma_i| \geq (1+m)(2n^2 + 3n) + 2 - (2n+1)((m+1)n - 1) = 2mn + 4n + 3.$$

Therefore, this Γ_i is the set Γ' we are looking for.

Step 2. We will show that

$$(**) \text{reg}(\Gamma \cap Q) = \text{reg}(\Gamma) \text{ for any quadric } Q \text{ in } \mathbb{P}^n \text{ such that } |Q \cap \Gamma'| \geq 2n + 1.$$

To prove (**), we will apply Lemma 4.1 to Γ' constructed in Step 1. Since Γ' is in linearly general position in \mathbb{P}^n , we can write

$$\text{reg}(\Gamma') = \left\lceil \frac{|\Gamma'| - 1}{n} \right\rceil - m' + 1$$

for some nonnegative integer m' . Let Q be a quadric in \mathbb{P}^n such that $|Q \cap \Gamma'| \geq 2n + 1$. Then we have $\text{reg}(\Gamma' \cap Q) = \text{reg}(\Gamma')$ by (*). Also, we have

$$|\Gamma' \cap Q| > |\Gamma'| - (m' + 1)n$$

by Lemma 4.1. Since $|\Gamma'| \geq 2mn + 4n + 3$, it follows that

$$|\Gamma' \cap Q| > 2mn - m'n + 3n + 3.$$

Next, we will show that $m \geq m'$. For this purpose, we first recall the construction of Γ' described in Step 1. If we write

$$\text{reg}(\Gamma_j) = \left\lceil \frac{|\Gamma_j| - 1}{n} \right\rceil - m_j + 1$$

for some nonnegative integer m_j , then $m_{j+1} \leq m_j \leq m$ by Lemma 4.2. This shows that $m \geq m'$. Thus, we have

$$|\Gamma \cap Q| \geq |\Gamma' \cap Q| > mn + 3n + 3.$$

Now, we apply Lemma 4.1 once again to deduce that $\text{reg}(\Gamma) = \text{reg}(\Gamma \cap Q)$.

Step 3. Setting $X_0 = \Gamma$, we will choose inductively a subscheme X_i of Γ such that

$$\left\lceil \frac{|X_i| - 1}{n + \frac{n}{2n+2}} \right\rceil + 3 \leq \text{reg}(X_i) = \text{reg}(\Gamma) \quad (4.6)$$

as follows. Let X_i be a subscheme of Γ satisfying (4.6). If X_i is contained in a rational normal curve, then the proof is completed. Suppose not. Then, we have

$$h_{X_i}(2) > 2n + 1$$

by [EH, Theorem 3.2 and Theorem 4]. Also, if we write

$$\text{reg}(X_i) = \left\lceil \frac{|X_i| - 1}{n} \right\rceil - m_i + 1,$$

then

$$|X_i| > (1 + m_i)(2n^2 + 3n) + 1$$

by (4.1). By Step 1 and Step 2, there exists a subscheme X'_i of X_i such that

$$\text{reg}(X_i \cap Q) = \text{reg}(X_i) \quad \text{for any quadric } Q \subset \mathbb{P}^n \quad \text{with } |Q \cap X'_i| \geq 2n + 1.$$

Choose a subscheme A_i of X'_i with $|A_i| = 2n + 1$. Then $h_{A_i}(2) = 2n + 1$ since A_i is 3-regular. Thus, we may deduce that there exists a quadric Q_i such that Q_i contains A_i but not X_i . We set

$$X_{i+1} := X_i \cap Q_i.$$

Since $2n + 1 \leq |Q_i \cap X'_i|$, we have

$$\left\lceil \frac{|X_{i+1}| - 1}{n + \frac{n}{2n+2}} \right\rceil + 3 \leq \left\lceil \frac{|X_i| - 1}{n + \frac{n}{2n+2}} \right\rceil + 3 \leq \text{reg}(X_i) = \text{reg}(X_{i+1}).$$

Note that the sequence $\{|X_i|\}$ is strictly decreasing for i . However, $\{|X_i|\}$ has a lower bound since

$$\left\lceil \frac{d-1}{n + \frac{n}{2n+2}} \right\rceil + 3 \leq \left\lceil \frac{d-1}{n} \right\rceil - m + 1 = \text{reg}(\Gamma) = \text{reg}(X_i) \leq \left\lceil \frac{|X_i| - 1}{n} \right\rceil + 1.$$

After a finite number of steps (this number is less than or equal to $mn + n - 1$), X_i should lie on a rational normal curve and $\text{reg}(X_i) = \text{reg}(\Gamma)$.

Uniqueness : Suppose that there are two different rational normal curves C_1 and C_2 in \mathbb{P}^n such that

$$\text{reg}(\Gamma \cap C_1) = \text{reg}(\Gamma \cap C_2) = \text{reg}(\Gamma).$$

Then

$$\left\lceil \frac{|\Gamma \cap C_i| - 1}{n} \right\rceil + 1 = \text{reg}(\Gamma \cap C_i) = \text{reg}(\Gamma) \geq \left\lceil \frac{d-1}{n + \frac{n}{2n+2}} \right\rceil + 3$$

for $i = 1, 2$. Thus, it holds that

$$\frac{|\Gamma \cap C_i| - 1}{n} + 2 > \frac{d-1}{n + \frac{n}{2n+2}} + 3$$

and hence

$$|\Gamma \cap C_i| \geq \frac{(2n+2)(d-1)}{2n+3} + n + 2.$$

Since the degree of the scheme-theoretic intersection $C_1 \cap C_2$ is at most $n + 2$ (cf. [?, Theorem2.1]), we have

$$|\Gamma \cap C_1 \cap C_2| \leq n + 2.$$

Then, we have

$$\begin{aligned} |(\Gamma \cap C_1) \cup (\Gamma \cap C_2)| &= |\Gamma \cap C_1| + |\Gamma \cap C_2| - |\Gamma \cap C_1 \cap C_2| \\ &\geq \frac{2(2n+2)(d-1)}{2n+3} + n + 2. \end{aligned}$$

Here the last term on the right is strictly bigger than d , which is a contradiction. This completes the proof. \square

Proof of Theorem 1.6. If $t(\Gamma) = n$, then we apply Theorem 1.4 to Γ .

Now, suppose that $t(\Gamma) < n$. Then we first apply Theorem 1.1 to Γ . Thus there exists a unique subspace $\mathbb{P}^{t(\Gamma)}$ of \mathbb{P}^n such that

$$\text{reg}(\Gamma) = \text{reg}(\Gamma \cap \mathbb{P}^{t(\Gamma)}).$$

Then the proof is completed by applying Theorem 1.4 to $\Gamma \cap \mathbb{P}^{t(\Gamma)}$. \square

5. FINITE SCHEMES IN LINEARLY GENERAL POSITION HAVING MAXIMAL REGULARITY

This section is devoted to studying further properties of finite schemes in linearly general position whose regularities are maximal. We begin with proving Corollary 1.5.

Proof of Corollary 1.5. Suppose that $\text{reg}(\Gamma) = \left\lceil \frac{d-1}{n} \right\rceil + 1$. Since $d \geq 4n^2 + 6n + 1$, it holds that

$$\left\lceil \frac{d-1}{n + \frac{n}{2n+2}} \right\rceil + 3 \leq \text{reg}(\Gamma) \leq \left\lceil \frac{d-1}{n} \right\rceil + 1$$

and hence Theorem 1.4 says that there is a unique rational normal curve C such that $\rho(\Gamma) = |\Gamma \cap C|$ and $\text{reg}(\Gamma) = \text{reg}(\Gamma \cap C)$. Then we have

$$\left\lceil \frac{d-1}{n} \right\rceil + 1 = \text{reg}(\Gamma) = \text{reg}(\Gamma \cap C) = \left\lceil \frac{|\Gamma \cap C| - 1}{n} \right\rceil + 1.$$

Since we write $d = nq + r + 2$ for $0 \leq r \leq n - 1$, it follows that $\rho(\Gamma) = |\Gamma \cap C| \geq d - r$.

Conversely, suppose that $\rho(\Gamma) \geq d - r$ and so there exists a rational normal curve C such that $|\Gamma \cap C| \geq d - r$. Since $d = nq + r + 2$ for $0 \leq r \leq n - 1$, it follows that

$$\text{reg}(\Gamma \cap C) = \left\lceil \frac{|\Gamma \cap C| - 1}{n} \right\rceil + 1 \geq \left\lceil \frac{d - r - 1}{n} \right\rceil + 1 = \left\lceil \frac{d-1}{n} \right\rceil + 1$$

But it also holds that

$$\text{reg}(\Gamma \cap C) \leq \text{reg}(\Gamma) \leq \left\lceil \frac{d-1}{n} \right\rceil + 1.$$

Therefore, it is shown that

$$\text{reg}(\Gamma) = \text{reg}(\Gamma \cap C) = \left\lceil \frac{d-1}{n} \right\rceil + 1.$$

This completes the proof. \square

Let $\Gamma \subset \mathbb{P}^n$ be a nondegenerate finite subscheme. When we add some points to Γ , its Castelnuovo-Mumford regularity may either increase or remain the same. In the following theorem, we find a condition such that the latter case occurs.

Theorem 5.1. *Let $m \geq 1$ be an integer and let $\Gamma \subset \mathbb{P}^n$ be a finite scheme of degree*

$$d \geq 4n^2 + 6n + 1 + 2(n+1)m$$

which is contained in a rational normal curve C of degree n . If $A \subset \mathbb{P}^n \setminus C$ is a finite set such that $|A| \leq m$ and $\Gamma \cup A$ is in linearly general position, then

$$\text{reg}(\Gamma \cup A) = \text{reg}(\Gamma) = \left\lceil \frac{d-1}{n} \right\rceil + 1.$$

To give a proof of Theorem 5.1, we begin with the following lemma.

Lemma 5.2. *Let Γ be a nondegenerate finite subscheme of degree $d \geq 4n^2 + 6n + 1$ in linearly general position in \mathbb{P}^n . If there is a rational normal curve C in \mathbb{P}^n such that*

$$\frac{2n+2}{2n+3}(d-1) + 2n+1 \leq |\Gamma \cap C|,$$

then $\text{reg}(\Gamma \cap C) = \text{reg}(\Gamma)$.

Proof. Our assumptions imply that

$$\left\lceil \frac{2n+2}{2n^2+3n}(d-1) \right\rceil + 3 \leq \left\lceil \frac{|\Gamma \cap C| - 1}{n} \right\rceil + 1 = \text{reg}(\Gamma \cap C) \leq \text{reg}(\Gamma).$$

Then we can apply Theorem 1.4, and get a rational normal curve C' such that

$$\text{reg}(\Gamma \cap C') = \text{reg}(\Gamma).$$

Now, one can show that the two rational normal curves C and C' are equal by using the same idea used in the proof of the uniqueness part of Theorem 1.4. Thus, we get the desired equality $\text{reg}(\Gamma \cap C) = \text{reg}(\Gamma)$. \square

Proof of Theorem 5.1. By Lemma 5.2, it suffices to show that

$$\frac{2n+2}{2n+3}(d+|A|-1) + 2n+1 \leq d.$$

This inequality is equivalent to

$$4n^2 + 6n + 1 + 2(n+1)|A| \leq d,$$

which holds by our assume on d since $|A| \leq m$. This completes the proof. \square

Example 5.3. Let $C \subset \mathbb{P}^5$ be a rational normal curve of degree 5 and let Γ be a subscheme of C of length 10000. Theorem 5.1 says that if $A \subset \mathbb{P}^5 \setminus C$ is a finite set such that $|A| \leq 822$ and $\Gamma \cup A \subset \mathbb{P}^5$ is in linearly general position, then $\text{reg}(\Gamma \cup A) = \text{reg}(\Gamma) = 2001$.

Finally, we provide a cohomological characterization of finite schemes in uniform position of maximal regularity. More precisely, let $\Gamma \subset \mathbb{P}^n$ be a finite scheme in linearly general position of degree $d \geq 4n^2 + 6n + 1$ such that $\text{reg}(\Gamma) = \left\lceil \frac{d-1}{n} \right\rceil + 1$. If we write

$$d = nq + r + 2 \quad \text{for some } 0 \leq r \leq n-1,$$

then $\text{reg}(\Gamma) = q + 2$ and hence $h^1(\mathbb{P}^n, \mathcal{I}_\Gamma(q)) > 0$. Furthermore, if Γ lies on a rational normal curve, then one can easily show that

$$h^1(\mathbb{P}^n, \mathcal{I}_\Gamma(q)) = r + 1.$$

The following theorem shows that the converse is also true.

Theorem 5.4. *Let $\Gamma \subset \mathbb{P}^n$, $n \geq 2$, be a finite subscheme of degree $d \geq 4n^2 + 6n + 1$ in linearly general position. Write $d = nq + r + 2$ for some $0 \leq r \leq n-1$. Then*

$$h^1(\mathbb{P}^n, \mathcal{I}_\Gamma(q)) \leq r + 1.$$

Moreover, the following two statements are equivalent:

- (i) Γ lies on a rational normal curve.
- (ii) $h^1(\mathbb{P}^n, \mathcal{I}_\Gamma(q)) = r + 1$.

In particular, if Γ is a finite set such that $h^1(\mathbb{P}^n, \mathcal{I}_\Gamma(q)) > 0$, then the following two statements are equivalent:

- (i) Γ is in uniform position.
- (ii) $h^1(\mathbb{P}^n, \mathcal{I}_\Gamma(q)) = r + 1$.

Proof. Note that $h^1(\mathbb{P}^n, \mathcal{I}_\Gamma(q)) = 0$ if and only if $\text{reg}(\Gamma) < \lceil \frac{d-1}{n} \rceil + 1$. So if $h^1(\mathbb{P}^n, \mathcal{I}_\Gamma(q)) = 0$, then we are done. Now, we assume that $h^1(\mathbb{P}^n, \mathcal{I}_\Gamma(q)) > 0$, or equivalently, that $\text{reg}(\Gamma) = \lceil \frac{d-1}{n} \rceil + 1$. Let $C \subset \mathbb{P}^n$ be the rational normal curve of degree n such that $\rho(\Gamma) = |\Gamma_0|$ where $\Gamma_0 = \Gamma \cap C$ (cf. Theorem 1.4). Then $|\Gamma_0| = nq + 2 + s$ for some $0 \leq s \leq r$ (cf. Corollary 1.5), and we have the exact sequence

$$0 \rightarrow \mathcal{I}_C \rightarrow \mathcal{I}_{\Gamma_0} \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_C(-\Gamma_0) \rightarrow 0,$$

which enables us to verify that

$$I(C)_q = I(\Gamma_0)_q \quad \text{and} \quad h^1(\mathbb{P}^n, \mathcal{I}_{\Gamma_0}(q)) = s + 1.$$

Also, we have the exact sequence

$$0 \rightarrow \mathcal{I}_\Gamma \rightarrow \mathcal{I}_{\Gamma_0} \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_\Gamma(-\Gamma_0) \rightarrow 0$$

of coherent sheaves on \mathbb{P}^n . This induces the following cohomology long exact sequence:

$$H^0(\mathbb{P}^n, \mathcal{I}_{\Gamma_0}(q)) \rightarrow H^0(\Gamma, \mathcal{O}_\Gamma(-\Gamma_0) \otimes \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^n}(q)) \rightarrow H^1(\mathbb{P}^n, \mathcal{I}_\Gamma(q)) \rightarrow H^1(\mathbb{P}^n, \mathcal{I}_{\Gamma_0}(q)) \rightarrow 0$$

Then it follows that

$$h^1(\mathbb{P}^n, \mathcal{I}_\Gamma(q)) \leq h^0(\Gamma, \mathcal{O}_\Gamma(-\Gamma_0) \otimes \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^n}(q)) + h^1(\mathbb{P}^n, \mathcal{I}_{\Gamma_0}(q)) = (r - s) + (s + 1) = r + 1.$$

Moreover, $h^1(\mathbb{P}^n, \mathcal{I}_\Gamma(q)) = r + 1$ if and only if the homomorphism

$$H^0(\mathbb{P}^n, \mathcal{I}_{\Gamma_0}(q)) \rightarrow H^0(\Gamma, \mathcal{O}_\Gamma(-\Gamma_0) \otimes \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^n}(q))$$

is the zero map. Since $\Gamma_0 = \Gamma \cap C$ and $I(C)_q = I(\Gamma_0)_q$, this can happen exactly when $\Gamma = \Gamma_0$ and hence Γ is contained in the rational normal curve C .

For the last statement, first assume that Γ is in uniform position. Then Γ lies on a rational normal curve of degree n by Theorem 1.3. Thus, $h^1(\mathbb{P}^n, \mathcal{I}_\Gamma(q)) = r + 1$. Conversely, assume that $h^1(\mathbb{P}^n, \mathcal{I}_\Gamma(q)) = r + 1$. Then $\text{reg}(\Gamma) = \lceil \frac{d-1}{n} \rceil + 1$ and hence Γ lies on a rational normal curve of degree n by Theorem 1.3.(1). Obviously, any finite subset of a rational normal curve is in uniform position, which completes the proof. \square

REFERENCES

- [C] G. Castelnuovo, *Ricerche di geometria sulle curve algebriche*, Atti R. Accad. Sci Torino 24 (1889), 196–223.
- [EG] D. Eisenbud and S. Goto, *Linear free resolutions and minimal multiplicity*, J. Algebra 88 (1984), no. 1, 89–133.
- [EH] D. Eisenbud and J. Harris, *Finite projective schemes in linearly general position*, J. Algebraic Geom. 1 (1992), no. 1, 15–30.
- [Ha] J. Harris, *Curves in projective space. With the collaboration of David Eisenbud*, Sém. Math. Sup., 85. Presses de l'Université de Montréal, Montreal, QC, 1982. 138 pp.
- [Hi] A. Hirschowitz, *La méthode d'Horace pour l'interpolation à plusieurs variables*, Manuscripta Math. 50 (1985), 337–388.
- [K] S. Kwak, *Generic projections, the equations defining projective varieties and Castelnuovo regularity*, Math. Zeit. 234 (2000), no. 3, 413–434.
- [LPW] W. Lee, E. Park and Y. Woo, *Regularity and multisection lines of finite schemes*, Int. Math. Res. Not., Vol. 2019, No. 6, 1725–1743.
- [N] Uwe Nagel, *Arithmetically Buchsbaum Divisors on Varieties of Minimal Degree*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. 351 (1999), no. 11, 4381–4409.
- [NP] U. Nagel and Y. Pitteloud, *On graded Betti numbers and geometrical properties of projective varieties*, Manuscr. Math. 84(3-4) (1994), 291–314.

- [P] E. Park, *On syzygies of divisors on rational normal scrolls*, Math. Nachr. 287, No. 11–12, (2014), 1383–1393.
- [TV] N. V. Trung, G. Valla, Degree bounds for the defining equations of arithmetically Cohen-Macaulay varieties, Math. Ann. 281 (1988), 209–218.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, KOREA UNIVERSITY, SEOUL 136-701, KOREA
Email address: porket333@korea.ac.kr

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, KOREA UNIVERSITY, SEOUL 136-701, KOREA
Email address: euisungpark@korea.ac.kr