

TENSORING BY A PLANE MAINTAINS SECANT-REGULARITY IN DEGREE AT LEAST TWO

E. BALLICO, A. BERNARDI, T. MAŃDZIUK

To our friend and colleague Gianfranco Casnati.

ABSTRACT. Starting from an integral projective variety Y equipped with a very ample, non-special and not-secant defective line bundle \mathcal{L} , the paper establishes, under certain conditions, the regularity of $(Y \times \mathbb{P}^2, \mathcal{L}[t])$ for $t \geq 2$. The mildness of those conditions allow to classify all secant defective cases of any product of $(\mathbb{P}^1)^j \times (\mathbb{P}^2)^k$, $j, k \geq 0$, embedded in multidegree at least $(2, \dots, 2)$ and $(\mathbb{P}^m \times \mathbb{P}^n \times (\mathbb{P}^2)^k, \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^m \times \mathbb{P}^n \times (\mathbb{P}^2)^k}(d, e, t_1, \dots, t_k))$ where $d, e \geq 3$, $t_i \geq 2$, for any n and m .

INTRODUCTION

The problem of classifying the dimensions of secant varieties to algebraic varieties is a classical problem that dates back to the XIX Century with the discovery of the Veronese surface in \mathbb{P}^5 being the only surface in that space whose secant variety of lines was expected to fill the ambient space but it is actually a hypersurface (cf. [Pal09]). Then in the 1990s the contributions of F. Zak ([Zak93]) and J. Alexander and A. Hirschowitz ([AH00, AH92b, AH92a]) made a turning point. In particular the last ones gave the complete classification of all defective secant varieties of Veronese varieties. After that work many other studies have been done with a specific focus on varieties parameterizing tensors (we refer to some of them [CGG02b, CGG07, AOP09, BD10, BCC11, AH11, BBC12, CGG05a, LMR22, AMR19, CGG02a, Bal05, BC06, BCGI07, BCGI09, AB11, TV21, CGG05b, AOP12, Bor13, BBCC13, BV18, BDHM17]). Nevertheless the unique complete classifications of defectiveness of secant varieties were up to now very few. A. Laface and E. Postinghel classified the products of \mathbb{P}^1 's (cf. [LP13]), H. Abo and N. Vannieuwenhoven gave the classification of the tangential varieties of Veronese varieties (cf. [AV18]), M.V. Catalisano and A. Oneto covered the tangential varieties of Segre-Veronese varieties (cf. [CO20]) and F. Galuppi together with A. Oneto classified the Segre-Veronese of two factors embedded in bi-degree at least $(3, 3)$ (cf. [GO22]). See [BCC⁺18] for a comprehensive description of the history of the problem.

Despite its long history and the significant efforts made to classify as many cases as possible, the state of the art is still far from having a complete description of it.

The defectiveness of a secant variety depends on the celebrated Terracini's Lemma (cf. [Ter11], [Ädl87, Cor. 1.11]), which identifies the relationship between the dimension of the tangent space to the z -th secant variety of a variety X and the tangent spaces to X at z general points. A dual form of this lemma is often used, which allows one to transform the geometric problem into an algebraic problem of computing the h^0 of the ideal sheaf of z double points twisted with the line bundle that induces the immersion of X (see Remark 1). This is the technique we also employ in our current work, which enables us to study a broader problem than just focusing on the defectiveness of a single type of variety.

In this work, we tensor a projective and integral variety Y embedded with a not secant defective and non special line bundle \mathcal{L} by a \mathbb{P}^2 . We provide sufficient conditions on the dimension of Y and $h^0(Y, \mathcal{L})$ to guarantee the regularity of $(X = Y \times \mathbb{P}^2, \mathcal{L}[t])$ for $t \geq 2$.

Here is the complete statement of our main theorem:

Theorem (Theorem 1). *Let Y be an integral projective variety of dimension r and \mathcal{L} a very ample and not secant defective line bundle on Y such that $h^1(Y, \mathcal{L}) = 0$. We denote by $\alpha := h^0(Y, \mathcal{L})$ and $X_2 := Y \times \mathbb{P}^2$. For the following values of r and α*

- $r = 2, 3$ and $\alpha \geq 60$,
- $r = 4$ and $\alpha \geq 98$,
- $r = 5$ and $\alpha \geq 133$,
- $r = 6$ and $\alpha \geq 176$,
- $r = 7$ and $\alpha \geq 231$,
- $r \geq 8$ and $\alpha \geq \frac{1}{81}(27r^3 + 144r^2 + 210r + 79)$,

we have that if $t \geq 2$, then $(X_2, \mathcal{L}[t])$ is not secant defective.

The conditions on r and α may seem very restrictive, but in cases where the regularity of secant varieties is guaranteed (either because it is already known or because it can be easily verified through computation or other means), these conditions allow for an inductive method that provides regularity for entire families of varieties. For example, through the application of our theorem, it becomes evident that Segre-Veronese varieties, constituted by products of \mathbb{P}^2 's exclusively and embedded in degrees greater than or equal to 2, are all regular except the well known cases of the Veronese surface embedded with either $\mathcal{O}(2)$ or $\mathcal{O}(4)$ and the 3×3 matrices embedded with $\mathcal{O}(2, 2)$. Here the precise statement.

Theorem (Theorem 2). *The pair $((\mathbb{P}^2)^k, \mathcal{O}_{(\mathbb{P}^2)^k}(t_1, \dots, t_k))$ with $t_1, \dots, t_k \geq 2$ is defective if and only if one of the following holds:*

- $k = 1$ and $t_1 \in \{2, 4\}$,
- $k = 2$ and $t_1 = t_2 = 2$.

To our knowledge, this result had not been established previously and it is a complete classification of the defectivity for the product of \mathbb{P}^2 's embedded in any multidegree at least $(2, \dots, 2)$.

We also generalize the above classification to any product of \mathbb{P}^1 's and \mathbb{P}^2 's embedded in multidegree at least $(2, \dots, 2)$ (cf. Theorem 3).

Expanding on our main result's application, we demonstrate another significant implication.

Theorem (Theorem 4). *If $d, e \geq 3$ and $n \geq m \geq 1$, then the pair*

$$(\mathbb{P}^m \times \mathbb{P}^n \times (\mathbb{P}^2)^k, \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^m \times \mathbb{P}^n \times (\mathbb{P}^2)^k}(d, e, t_1, \dots, t_k))$$

is not secant defective for all k and $t_1 \geq t_2 \geq \dots \geq 2$.

The main technique used in our work is well-known as the method of *Differential Horace*, introduced by Alexander and Hirschowitz in 1992 (cf. [AH92b, AH00]). The significant technical innovation we introduce is the simultaneous application of this method to a divisor H and a divisors of H itself within the same framework (cf. Lemma 3).

The structure of the paper is the following.

In the Preliminary Section 1 we recall the Horace Differential Lemma and how to apply it in our specific instances. We explain its simultaneous version and then we recall how a semicontinuity argument allows to reduce the proof of the regularity to a specialization of points.

In Section 2 we collect the lemmas that lead to the main theorem (Theorem 1) which are the first steps of the inductive procedure. Some of those lemmas are technical and need computational claims whose proofs are collected in the final Section 4.

In Section 3, we present straightforward examples that demonstrate the broad applicability of our theorem. These instances play a crucial role in finalizing the classification of defective cases, resolving numerous open cases comprehensively. In particular we prove the already mentioned Theorem 2, Theorem 3 and Theorem 4.

Acknowledgments. EB and AB are member of GNSAGA of INDAM. AB and TM have been 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. All authors are members of TensorDec laboratory of the Mathematical Department of Trento.

Funded by the European Union under NextGenerationEU. PRIN 2022 Prot. n. 2022ZRRL4C_004. Views and opinions expressed are however those of the authors only and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union or European Commission. Neither the European Union nor the granting authority can be held responsible for them.



1. PRELIMINARIES

Notation 1. Let X be a projective variety. For any non singular point $p \in X_{\text{reg}}$ of X , with $(2p, X)$ we denote the closed subscheme of X with $(\mathcal{I}_{p,X})^2$ as its ideal sheaf. The degree of this scheme is $\deg((2p, X)) = \dim X + 1$ and its support is $(2p, X)_{\text{red}} = \{p\}$. For any finite set $S \subset X_{\text{reg}}$, set $(2S, X) := \cup_{p \in S} (2p, X)$. We often write $2p$ and $2S$ instead of $(2p, X)$ and $(2S, X)$ if the ambient variety is obvious from the context.

Remark 1 (Terracini Lemma). For any positive integer z , denote the z -th secant variety of a projective variety X as $\sigma_z(X)$. The celebrated Terracini Lemma (cf. [Ter11], [Ådl87, Cor. 1.11], [Lan12, 5.3.1.1]) can be stated in the following form: The dimension $\dim \sigma_z(X)$ is the dimension of the linear span of the zero-dimensional scheme $(2S, X)$, where S is a general subset of X with $\#S = z$. As a consequence, if the embedding of X is induced by the complete linear system $|\mathcal{L}|$, then $\dim \sigma_z(X) = h^0(X, \mathcal{L}) - 1 - h^0(X, \mathcal{I}_{(2S,X)} \otimes \mathcal{L})$. Hence $\dim \sigma_z(X) = z(\dim X + 1) - 1$ if and only if $h^1(X, \mathcal{I}_{(2S,X)} \otimes \mathcal{L}) = h^1(X, \mathcal{L})$.

Definition 1. Let \mathcal{L} be a line bundle on a projective variety X with $h^1(X, \mathcal{L}) = 0$. The pair (X, \mathcal{L}) is said to be *not- z -secant defective* if for a general union Z of z double points of X the following equality holds

$$h^0(X, \mathcal{I}_Z \otimes \mathcal{L}) \cdot h^1(X, \mathcal{I}_Z \otimes \mathcal{L}) = 0.$$

Should (X, \mathcal{L}) consistently be not- z -secant defective for all $z \geq 1$, it is referred to as *not being secant defective*.

Remark that $h^0(X, \mathcal{I}_Z \otimes \mathcal{L}) = 0$ is equivalent to the fact that $\sigma_z(X)$ fills the ambient space; while $h^1(X, \mathcal{I}_Z \otimes \mathcal{L}) = 0$ corresponds to $\dim(\sigma_z(X)) = z(\dim X + 1) - 1$.

1.1. Horace Differential Lemma. One of the main tools that we will use in this paper is the Horace Differential Lemma (cf. [AH92b, AH00]) and its simultaneous version in codimensions 1 and

2. We present here the versions that we will use.

We first recall few basic definitions.

Let X be an integral projective variety and H an integral effective Cartier divisor of X . For any zero-dimensional scheme $W \subset X$ let $\text{Res}_H(W)$ denote the residual scheme of W with respect to H , i.e. the closed subscheme of X with $\mathcal{I}_W : \mathcal{I}_H$ as its ideal sheaf. We have $\deg(W) = \deg(\text{Res}_H(W)) + \deg(W \cap H)$, $\text{Res}_H(W) \subseteq W$, $\text{Res}_H(W) = W$ if $W \cap H = \emptyset$, $\text{Res}_H(W) = \emptyset$ if $W \subset H$ and $\text{Res}_H(W) = \text{Res}_H(A) \cup \text{Res}_H(B)$ if $W = A \cup B$ and $A \cap B = \emptyset$. If $p \in H_{\text{reg}} \cap X_{\text{reg}}$, then $\text{Res}_H((2p, X)) = \{p\}$ and $(2p, X) \cap H = (2p, H)$. For any line bundle \mathcal{R} on X there is an exact sequence

$$(1) \quad 0 \rightarrow \mathcal{I}_{\text{Res}_H(W)} \otimes \mathcal{R}(-H) \rightarrow \mathcal{I}_W \otimes \mathcal{R} \rightarrow \mathcal{I}_{W \cap H, H} \otimes \mathcal{R}|_H \rightarrow 0$$

of coherent sheaves on X which we call the *residual sequence of H* . The scheme $W \cap H$ is often called the trace of W on H and denoted by $\text{Tr}_H(W)$.

The following definition is originally from [AH00] and we quote it as stated in [BCGI09].

Definition 2. In the algebra of formal functions $\kappa[[\mathbf{x}, y]]$, where $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, \dots, x_{n-1})$, a *vertically graded* (with respect to y) ideal is an ideal of the form:

$$I = I_0 \oplus I_1 y \oplus \dots \oplus I_{m-1} y^{m-1} \oplus (y^m)$$

where for $i = 0, \dots, m-1$, $I_i \subset \kappa[[\mathbf{x}]]$ is an ideal.

Let X be an n -dimensional projective variety, let H be an integral divisor on X . We say that $Z \subset X$ is a *vertically graded subscheme* of X with base H and support $z \in H$, if Z is a 0-dimensional scheme with support at a regular point z of X such that there is a regular system of parameters (\mathbf{x}, y) at z such that $y = 0$ is a local equation for H and the ideal of Z in $\widehat{\mathcal{O}}_{X,z} \cong \kappa[[\mathbf{x}, y]]$ is vertically graded.

Let $Z \subset X$ be a vertically graded subscheme with base H , and $p \geq 0$ be a fixed integer; we denote by $\text{Res}_H^p(Z) \subset X$ and $\text{Tr}_H^p(Z) \subset H$ the closed subschemes defined, respectively, by the ideals:

$$\mathcal{I}_{\text{Res}_H^p(Z)} := \mathcal{I}_Z + (\mathcal{I}_Z : \mathcal{I}_H^{p+1}) \mathcal{I}_H^p, \quad \mathcal{I}_{\text{Tr}_H^p(Z), H} := (\mathcal{I}_Z : \mathcal{I}_H^p) \otimes \mathcal{O}_H$$

and we call them the *p -th virtual residue (trace) of Z with respect to H* (respectively). Notice that for $p = 0$ we get the usual trace $\text{Tr}_H(Z)$ and residual schemes $\text{Res}_H(Z)$.

Let $Z_1, \dots, Z_r \subset X$ be vertically graded subschemes with base H and supports $z_i \in H$, $i = 1, \dots, r$ pairwise distinct, $Z = Z_1 \cup \dots \cup Z_r$, and $\mathbf{p} = (p_1, \dots, p_r) \in \mathbb{N}^r$.

We set:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Tr}_H^{\mathbf{p}}(Z) &:= \text{Tr}_H^{p_1}(Z_1) \cup \dots \cup \text{Tr}_H^{p_r}(Z_r) \\ \text{Res}_H^{\mathbf{p}}(Z) &:= \text{Res}_H^{p_1}(Z_1) \cup \dots \cup \text{Res}_H^{p_r}(Z_r). \end{aligned}$$

Lemma 1 (Horace Differential Lemma [AH00]). *Let X be an integral projective variety and H be an integral effective Cartier divisor. Let \mathcal{R} be a very ample line bundle. Let $W \subset X$ be a 0-dimensional scheme supported in the regular locus of X . Let $A_1, \dots, A_r, B_1, \dots, B_r$ be 0-dimensional irreducible subschemes of X such that $A_i \cong B_i$, $i = 1, \dots, r$, B_i has support on H and is vertically graded with base H , and the supports of $A = A_1 \cup \dots \cup A_r$ and $B = B_1 \cup \dots \cup B_r$ are general in their respective Hilbert schemes. Let $\mathbf{p} = (p_1, \dots, p_r) \in \mathbb{N}^r$. Then for $i = 0, 1$:*

$$h^i(X, \mathcal{I}_{W \cup A} \otimes \mathcal{R}) \leq h^i(X, \mathcal{I}_{\text{Res}_H W \cup \text{Res}_H^{\mathbf{p}}(B)} \otimes \mathcal{R}(-H)) + h^i(H, \mathcal{I}_{\text{Tr}_H W \cup \text{Tr}_H^{\mathbf{p}}(B), H} \otimes \mathcal{R}|_H).$$

Lemma 2 (Horace Differential Lemma for double points). *Let X be an integral projective variety and $H \subset X$ be an integral effective Cartier divisor. Let \mathcal{R} be a very ample line bundle. Fix an integer $r > 0$. Let $W \subset X$ be a zero-dimensional scheme supported in the regular locus of X , $\tilde{S} \subset X$ be a general subset of H with $\#\tilde{S} = r$ and $\tilde{Z} \subset X$ be a general set with $\#\tilde{Z} = r$. Then for $i \in \{0, 1\}$ we have*

$$h^i(X, \mathcal{I}_{W \cup (2\tilde{Z}, X)} \otimes \mathcal{R}) \leq h^i(X, \mathcal{I}_{\text{Res}_H W \cup (2\tilde{S}, H)} \otimes \mathcal{R}(-H)) + h^i(H, \mathcal{I}_{(\text{Tr}_H W) \cup \tilde{S}} \otimes \mathcal{R}|_H).$$

Proof. We apply Lemma 1 with $A = (2\tilde{Z}, X)$, $B = (2\tilde{S}, X)$ and $\mathbf{p} = (1, \dots, 1)$. \square

The following Lemma 3 is one of our main strategy since it allows to apply Horace Differential Lemma simultaneously to a divisor H' of X and a divisor E of H' itself.

Lemma 3 (Simultaneous Horace Differential Lemma). *Let X be an integral projective variety with a very ample line bundle \mathcal{R} . Take integral effective Cartier divisors H and H' such that $H \neq H'$ and $E := H \cap H'$ is integral. Let \tilde{S} (resp. \tilde{Z}) be a set of r general points of E (resp. H). Let W be a zero-dimensional subscheme of X contained in the regular locus of X and such that $W \cap \tilde{S} = W \cap \tilde{Z} = \emptyset$. For $i = 0, 1$ we have*

$$h^i(X, \mathcal{I}_{W \cup (2\tilde{Z}, H)} \otimes \mathcal{R}) \leq h^i(X, \mathcal{I}_{\text{Res}_{H'}(W) \cup (2\tilde{S}, E)} \otimes \mathcal{R}(-H')) + h^i(H', \mathcal{I}_{(\text{Tr}_{H'}(W)) \cup \tilde{S}} \otimes \mathcal{R}|_{H'}).$$




FIGURE 1. This is an intuitive graphical representation of Lemma 3 in a special case where $\dim X = 3$, $\dim H = \dim H' = 2$ so $\deg(2\tilde{Z}) = 3(\#\tilde{Z})$ and $\dim E = 1$ so $\deg(2\tilde{S}) = 2(\#\tilde{S})$. The residual of W mod H' is in dark gray, while the trace in light gray. The dots denote the supports of the corresponding schemes.

Proof. The main idea is to apply Lemma 1 to $H = H'$, $A = (2\tilde{Z}, H)$, $B = (2\tilde{S}, H)$ and $\mathbf{p} = (1, \dots, 1)$, but let us give more details.

Set $n := \dim X$. We degenerate each point of \tilde{Z} to a different point of \tilde{S} . For each $p \in \tilde{Z}$ call p' the corresponding point of \tilde{S} . In the degeneration the zero-dimensional scheme $(2p, H)$ would have as a limit the scheme $(2p', H)$. Let $\kappa[[x_1, \dots, x_n]]$ denote the formal completion of the local ring $\mathcal{O}_{X, p'}$ with $x_n = 0$ a local equation of H (not of H') at p' . The scheme $(2p', H)$ is vertically graded in the sense of [AH00, p. 392], i.e. locally one can write the ideal of $(2p', H)$ as $\bigoplus_{i=0}^m I_i x_{n-1}^i$ with x_{n-1} the local equation of H' and $I_i \subset \mathbb{K}[[x_1, \dots, x_{n-2}, x_n]]$. The virtual trace of $(2p', H)$ with respect to H' is p' , while the virtual residue is $(2p', E)$, because $H \cap H' = E$. Small explanation: if we started with $(2p', X)$ for the usual Horace Differential Lemma the usual virtual trace would be p' and virtual residue $(2p', H')$. Here for the smaller scheme we get the same virtual trace and exactly $(2p', E)$ as virtual residue, because p goes to p' remaining in H and $E = H \cap H'$. \square

1.2. Specializing and adding simple points.

Notation 2. From now on we fix the following:

- Y will be an integral projective variety of dimension r ,
- \mathcal{L} a very ample line bundle on Y such that $h^1(Y, \mathcal{L}) = 0$, and $\alpha := h^0(Y, \mathcal{L})$,
- $X_m := Y \times \mathbb{P}^m$ with $m \geq 1$,
- $H := Y \times \mathbb{P}^{m-1}$ for some hyperplane $\mathbb{P}^{m-1} \subseteq \mathbb{P}^m$.

With these assumptions we have $h^0(X_m, \mathcal{L}[t]) = \alpha \binom{m+t}{m}$ and $h^1(X_m, \mathcal{L}[t]) = 0$ for all $t \in \mathbb{N}$.

Remark 2. Let $f : U_1 \rightarrow U_2$ be a surjective submersion of smooth and connected quasi-projective varieties. Fix $p \in U_1$. Let A_1 (resp. A_2) be the completion of the local ring $\mathcal{O}_{U_1, p}$ (resp. $\mathcal{O}_{U_2, f(p)}$). Since U_1 is smooth at p and U_2 is smooth at $f(p)$, A_i is a ring of power series in $\dim A_i$ variables. Set $n_2 := \dim A_2$ and $n_1 := \dim A_1$. Since f is a submersion, we have formal coordinates x_1, \dots, x_{n_1} of A_1 such that the variables x_1, \dots, x_{n_2} are formal variables for the power series ring A_2 . Thus the scheme $2f(p) \subset U_2$ is the scheme-theoretic image of $f(2p)$. If $S \subset U_1$ is a general finite set, then $f|_S$ is injective and $f(S)$ is a general subset of U_2 with cardinality $\#S$. Thus if $Z \subset U_1$ is a general union of z double points of U_1 , then $f(Z)$ is a general union of z double points of U_2 .

Let X_m and Y be as in Notation 2. Consider π_1 and π_2 as the projections from X_m onto its first and second factors, respectively. Let $U_1 := Y_{\text{reg}}$, $U_2 := \pi_1^{-1}(Y_{\text{reg}}) = X_{m, \text{reg}}$ and $\pi := \pi_1|_{U_2}$. If $Z \subset X_m$ is a general union of z double points of X_m and u double points of H , then $\pi_1(Z)$ is a general union of $z + u$ double points of Y . Recall that $\mathcal{L}[0] := \pi_1^*(\mathcal{L})$ and hence π_1^* induces an isomorphism $H^0(Y, \mathcal{L}) \cong H^0(X_m, \mathcal{L}[0])$. Thus $H^0(X_m, \mathcal{I}_Z \otimes \mathcal{L}[0]) \cong H^0(Y, \mathcal{I}_{f(Z)} \otimes \mathcal{L})$. If (Y, \mathcal{L}) is not- $(z + u)$ -secant defective, then $h^0(Y, \mathcal{I}_{f(Z)} \otimes \mathcal{L}) = \max\{0, \alpha - (r + 1)(z + u)\}$.

Remark 3 (Semicontinuity). Let X be an integral projective variety, $H \subset X$ be an integral effective Cartier divisor of X , \mathcal{R} a line bundle on X and $Z_X \subset X$ a zero-dimensional scheme on X . Let Z_H be a specialization of Z_X on H . By the semicontinuity theorem for cohomology (cf. [Har77, Ch. III]), if one can prove that $h^i(X, \mathcal{I}_{Z_H} \otimes \mathcal{R}) = 0$ for special scheme Z_H then also $h^i(X, \mathcal{I}_{Z_X} \otimes \mathcal{R}) = 0$ for the general scheme Z_X .

Lemma 4. *Let X be an integral projective variety such that $\dim X \geq 2$, $H \subset X$ be an integral effective Cartier divisor of X , \mathcal{R} a line bundle on X and $W \subset X$ a zero-dimensional scheme. Set $\beta := h^0(X, \mathcal{I}_W \otimes \mathcal{R})$. Fix an integer $e \geq 0$ and let $S \subset H$ be a general subset of H with cardinality e . Then $h^0(X, \mathcal{I}_{W \cup S} \otimes \mathcal{R}) \leq \max\{\beta - e, h^0(X, \mathcal{I}_{\text{Res}_H(W)} \otimes \mathcal{R}(-H))\}$.*

Proof. The lemma is trivial if $e = 0$ and hence we may assume $e > 0$ and use induction on the integer e . We order the points p_1, \dots, p_e of S and set $S' := S \setminus \{p_e\}$. By the inductive assumption we have $h^0(X, \mathcal{I}_{W \cup S'} \otimes \mathcal{R}) \leq \max\{\beta - e + 1, h^0(X, \mathcal{I}_{\text{Res}_H(W)} \otimes \mathcal{R}(-H))\}$. Since $h^0(X, \mathcal{I}_{W \cup S} \otimes \mathcal{R}) \leq h^0(X, \mathcal{I}_{W \cup S'} \otimes \mathcal{R})$, we get the lemma if $h^0(X, \mathcal{I}_{W \cup S'} \otimes \mathcal{R}) \leq h^0(X, \mathcal{I}_{\text{Res}_H(W)} \otimes \mathcal{R}(-H))$. Now assume $h^0(X, \mathcal{I}_{W \cup S'} \otimes \mathcal{R}) = \beta - e + 1 > h^0(X, \mathcal{I}_{\text{Res}_H(W)} \otimes \mathcal{R}(-H))$. Since the lemma is true if $h^0(X, \mathcal{I}_{W \cup S} \otimes \mathcal{R}) < h^0(X, \mathcal{I}_{W \cup S'} \otimes \mathcal{R})$, we may assume $h^0(X, \mathcal{I}_{W \cup S} \otimes \mathcal{R}) = h^0(X, \mathcal{I}_{W \cup S'} \otimes \mathcal{R})$. Note that $\text{Res}_H(W \cup S') = \text{Res}_H(W)$. Since we take p_e general in H after fixing $W \cup S'$, H is contained in the base locus of $|\mathcal{I}_{W \cup S'} \otimes \mathcal{R}|$. Thus $h^0(X, \mathcal{I}_{W \cup S'} \otimes \mathcal{R}) = h^0(X, \mathcal{I}_{\text{Res}_H(W)} \otimes \mathcal{R}(-H))$. \square

Remark 4. In the content of Lemma 4, if we assume that $h^1(X, \mathcal{I}_W \otimes \mathcal{R}) = 0$, then the following are true.

- If $h^0(X, \mathcal{I}_{\text{Res}_H(W)} \otimes \mathcal{R}(-H)) \leq \beta - e$, we get $h^0(X, \mathcal{I}_{W \cup S} \otimes \mathcal{R}) = \beta - e$ and hence $h^1(X, \mathcal{I}_{W \cup S} \otimes \mathcal{R}) = 0$.
- If $h^0(X, \mathcal{I}_{\text{Res}_H(W)} \otimes \mathcal{R}(-H)) = 0$ and $\beta < e$, we get $h^0(X, \mathcal{I}_{W \cup S} \otimes \mathcal{R}) = 0$.

2. MAIN RESULT

We remind that, as settled in Notation 2, Y is an integral projective variety of dimension r embedded with a very ample line bundle \mathcal{L} such that $h^1(Y, \mathcal{L}) = 0$, $\alpha := h^0(Y, \mathcal{L})$ and $X_m := Y \times \mathbb{P}^m$ with $m \geq 1$.

Establishing the regularity of $(X_2, \mathcal{L}[t])$ relies on an inductive approach, requiring a foundational understanding of essential results concerning X_1 .

Lemma 5 ([Bal23, Theorem 2]). *Let $X_1 = Y \times \mathbb{P}^1$, with (Y, \mathcal{L}) and α as in Notation 2; $\dim(Y) = r > 1$, $\alpha > (\dim Y + 1)^2$. If the pair (Y, \mathcal{L}) is not $\lfloor \alpha/(r+1) \rfloor$ -secant defective, then the pair $(X_1, \mathcal{L}[t])$ is not secant defective for all $t \geq 2$.*

Lemma 6. *Let $X_1 = Y \times \mathbb{P}^1$, with (Y, \mathcal{L}) , α as in Notation 2 and $\dim(Y) = r > 1$. If $Z \subset X_1$ is a general union of z double points, then*

- (a) $h^1(X_1, \mathcal{I}_Z \otimes \mathcal{L}[1]) = 0$ if $z \leq 2\lfloor \alpha/(r+2) \rfloor$ and (Y, \mathcal{L}) is not $\lfloor \alpha/(r+2) \rfloor$ -secant defective.
- (b) $h^1(X_1, \mathcal{I}_Z \otimes \mathcal{L}[1]) = 0$ if $(r+2)z \leq 2\alpha - 2r - 2$ and (Y, \mathcal{L}) is not $\lfloor \alpha/(r+2) \rfloor$ -secant defective.
- (c) $h^0(X_1, \mathcal{I}_Z \otimes \mathcal{L}[1]) = 0$ if $z \geq 2\lceil \alpha/(r+2) \rceil$ and (Y, \mathcal{L}) is not $\lceil \alpha/(r+2) \rceil$ -secant defective.
- (d) $h^0(X_1, \mathcal{I}_Z \otimes \mathcal{L}[1]) = 0$ if $(r+2)z \geq 2\alpha + 2r + 2$ and (Y, \mathcal{L}) is not $\lceil \alpha/(r+2) \rceil$ -secant defective.

Proof. Note that item (a) implies item (b). To prove item (a) we may assume $z = 2\lfloor \alpha/(r+2) \rfloor$. Fix $o \in \mathbb{P}^1$ and set $H := Y \times \{o\} \in |\mathcal{O}_{X_1}[1]|$. Take a general $\bar{S} \cup \tilde{S} \subset H$ such that $\#\bar{S} = \#\tilde{S} = \lfloor \alpha/(r+2) \rfloor$. Decompose the support of Z into the disjoint union of two sets $\bar{Z} \cup \tilde{Z}$ where $\#\bar{Z} = \#\tilde{Z} = \lfloor \alpha/(r+2) \rfloor$. In order to show that $h^1(X_1, \mathcal{I}_Z \otimes \mathcal{L}[1]) = 0$ it is sufficient by semicontinuity to show that $h^1(X_1, \mathcal{I}_{(2\bar{S}, X_1) \cup (2\tilde{Z}, X_1)} \otimes \mathcal{L}[1]) = 0$.

Note that $\deg(\bar{S} \cup (2\tilde{S}, H)) = \deg((2\bar{S}, H) \cup \tilde{S}) = (r+2)\lfloor \alpha/(r+2) \rfloor \leq \alpha$. Since (Y, \mathcal{L}) is not $\lfloor \alpha/(r+2) \rfloor$ -secant defective and $\bar{S} \cup \tilde{S} \subset H$ is general we have

$$h^1(X_1, \mathcal{I}_{\bar{S} \cup (2\tilde{S}, H)} \otimes \mathcal{L}[0]) = h^1(H, \mathcal{I}_{(2\bar{S}, H) \cup \tilde{S}} \otimes \mathcal{L}[1]|_H) = 0.$$

Therefore, by Horace Differential Lemma for double points (Lemma 2) applied with $W = (2\bar{S}, X_1)$ and $\mathcal{R} = \mathcal{L}[1]$ we get $h^1(X_1, \mathcal{I}_{(2\bar{S}, X_1) \cup (2\tilde{Z}, X_1)} \otimes \mathcal{L}[1]) = 0$ which finishes the proof of item (a).

The proof of item (c) and hence of item (d) is similar reversing the inequalities. \square

Lemma 7. *Let $X_2 = Y \times \mathbb{P}^2$ with (Y, \mathcal{L}) , r and α as in Notation 2. Let L be a line in \mathbb{P}^2 and $Z \subset X_2$ be a general union of z double points of X_2 and u double points of $H := Y \times L$.*

- (a) $h^1(X_2, \mathcal{I}_Z \otimes \mathcal{L}[1]) = 0$ if $(r+2)z \leq 2\alpha - 2r - 2$, $(r+2)z + u \leq 2\alpha$, $u \leq \lfloor \alpha/(r+1) \rfloor$, $z \leq \alpha - (r+1)u$ and (Y, \mathcal{L}) is not- s -secant defective for all $s \in \{z, u, \lfloor \alpha/(r+2) \rfloor\}$.
- (b) $h^0(X_2, \mathcal{I}_Z \otimes \mathcal{L}[1]) = 0$ if (Y, \mathcal{L}) is not- s -secant defective for $s \in \{u, \lceil \alpha/(r+2) \rceil\}$, $(r+2)z \geq 2\alpha + 2r + 2$, and either $u \geq \lceil \alpha/(r+1) \rceil$ or $z \geq \alpha - (r+1)u$.

Proof. Fix a line L' in \mathbb{P}^2 different from L and let o be the point of intersection of these lines. Call $E := Y \times \{o\}$. Let \tilde{Z} be the union of the supports of the u double points of H that are connected components of Z . Fix a general $\tilde{S} \subset E$ such that $\#\tilde{S} = u$ and a general $\bar{S} \subset H'$ such that $\#\bar{S} = z$. We specialize the z double points of Z to $(2\bar{S}, X_2)$. As recalled in Remark 3 if we can prove that such a specialization is regular then we will have that also Z is regular. So, in order to prove item (a) now we need to show that $h^1(X_2, \mathcal{I}_{(2\bar{S}, X_2) \cup (2\tilde{Z}, H)} \otimes \mathcal{L}[1]) = 0$ in the right range. It follows from Lemma 3 applied with $W = (2\bar{S}, X_2)$ and $\mathcal{R} = \mathcal{L}[1]$ that it is sufficient to prove that $h^1(H', \mathcal{I}_{(2\bar{S}, H') \cup \tilde{S}} \otimes \mathcal{L}[1]|_{H'}) = 0$ and $h^1(X_2, \mathcal{I}_{\bar{S} \cup (2\tilde{Z}, E)} \otimes \mathcal{L}[0]) = 0$.

Claim 1. $h^1(H', \mathcal{I}_{(2\bar{S}, H') \cup \tilde{S}} \otimes \mathcal{L}[1]|_{H'}) = 0$.

Proof of Claim 1. By Lemma 6 we have $h^1(H', \mathcal{I}_{(2\bar{S}, H')} \otimes \mathcal{L}[1]_{|H'}) = 0$. Therefore,

$$h^0(H', \mathcal{I}_{(2\bar{S}, H')} \otimes \mathcal{L}[1]_{|H'}) = 2\alpha - (r+2)z \geq u.$$

We have $h^0(H', \mathcal{I}_{\text{Res}_E(2\bar{S}, H')} \otimes \mathcal{L}[0]_{|H'}) = h^0(H', \mathcal{I}_{(2\bar{S}, H')} \otimes \mathcal{L}[0]_{|H'})$ which is equal to $\max\{0, \alpha - (r+1)z\}$ by Remark 2. By Remark 4 in order to prove the claim it is sufficient to show that

$$\alpha - (r+1)z \leq 2\alpha - (r+2)z - u.$$

This is equivalent to $z + u \leq \alpha$ which follows from the inequalities in the statement of this Lemma 7. \square

Now it is sufficient to show that $h^1(X_2, \mathcal{I}_{\bar{S} \cup (2\tilde{S}, E)} \otimes \mathcal{L}[0]) = 0$. By Remark 2 we have $h^1(X_2, \mathcal{I}_{(2\tilde{S}, E)} \otimes \mathcal{L}[0]) = 0$, because (Y, \mathcal{L}) is not- u -secant defective and $u \leq \lfloor \alpha/(r+1) \rfloor$. Note that $h^0(X_2, \mathcal{I}_{(2\tilde{S}, E)} \otimes \mathcal{L}[0]) = \alpha - (r+1)u \geq z$. Since \bar{S} is general in H' and $h^0(X_2, \mathcal{I}_{(2\tilde{S}, E)} \otimes \mathcal{L}[0]) \geq z$, by Remark 4 to prove item (a) it is sufficient to use that $h^0(X_2, \mathcal{L}[-1]) = 0$.

The proof of item (b) is similar and omitted. \square

Lemma 8. *Let $X_2 = Y \times \mathbb{P}^2$ where (Y, \mathcal{L}) , r and α are as in Notation 2. If the pair (Y, \mathcal{L}) is not secant defective, then for all the following values of r and α we have that the pair $(X_2, \mathcal{L}[2])$ is not secant defective.*

- $r = 2$ and $\alpha \geq 71$,
- $r = 3$ and $\alpha \geq 75$,
- $r = 4$ and $\alpha \geq 99$,
- $r = 5$ and $\alpha \geq 138$,
- $r = 6$ and $\alpha \geq 183$,
- $r = 7$ and $\alpha \geq 234$,
- $r \geq 8$ and $\alpha \geq \frac{1}{81}(27r^3 + 144r^2 + 210r + 79)$.

Proof. Let $Z \subset X_2$ be a general union of z double points with $z \in \{\lfloor 6\alpha/(r+3) \rfloor, \lceil 6\alpha/(r+3) \rceil\}$. Set $j = 1$ if $z = \lfloor 6\alpha/(r+3) \rfloor$ and $j = 0$, otherwise. In order to obtain that $(X_2, \mathcal{L}[2])$ is not secant defective it is sufficient to show that $h^j(X_2, \mathcal{I}_Z \otimes \mathcal{L}[2]) = 0$. We will obtain this vanishing of cohomology by applying the Horace Differential Lemma to a suitable specialization of Z that we now describe. First of all consider a divisor $H = Y \times \mathbb{P}^1$ of X_2 as in Notation 2. Write $Z = Z' \cup (2\tilde{Z}, X_2) \cup (2\tilde{Z}, X_2)$ with $\#\tilde{Z} = x_1$ and $\#\tilde{Z} = y_1$ for some integers x_1, y_1 (we first finish to explain the construction and we will specify the precise values of x_1 and y_1 later in Claim 2). Then specialize \tilde{Z} on H and call it \bar{S} . Consider $\tilde{S} \subset H$ a set of general y_1 points disjoint from \bar{S} . Now, in order to apply the Horace Differential Lemma for double points (Lemma 2) we need x_1 and y_1 to be properly chosen.

Claim 2. There exist non-negative integers x_1 and y_1 such that $(r+2)x_1 + y_1 = 3\alpha$, $x_1 + y_1 \leq z$, $2r+2 \leq y_1 \leq \lfloor \alpha/(r+1) \rfloor$, $(r+2)(z - x_1 - y_1) + y_1 \leq 2\alpha$, $z - x_1 - y_1 \leq \alpha - (r+1)y_1$.

The proof of this claim is computational only and it is collected in Section 4. However it is worth to remark that the statement of Claim 2 is a consequence of a common solutions for the inequalities eq. (8), eq. (10), eq. (12) and eq. (13). Remark that for $r = 2, 3$, Claim 2 holds also for values of α smaller than 71 and 75 (resp.) of the statement of the present Lemma, but the inequality eq. (14) used in the proof of Claim 4 holds only for $\alpha \geq 71, 75$ (resp.). By semicontinuity, in order to show that $h^j(X_2, \mathcal{I}_Z \otimes \mathcal{L}[2]) = 0$, it is sufficient to show that $h^j(X_2, \mathcal{I}_{Z' \cup (2\bar{S}, X_2) \cup (2\tilde{S}, X_2)} \otimes \mathcal{L}[2]) = 0$.

We have

$$\deg((2\bar{S}, H) \cup \tilde{S}) = (r+2)x_1 + y_1 = 3\alpha = h^0(H, \mathcal{L}[2]_{|H}).$$

By Lemma 5 ([Bal23, Theorem 2]) the pair $(H, \mathcal{L}[2]_{|H})$ is not secant defective, so

$$h^i(H, \mathcal{I}_{(\mathrm{Tr}_H(Z' \cup (2\bar{S}, X_2))) \cup \tilde{S}} \otimes \mathcal{L}[2]_{|H}) = h^i(H, \mathcal{I}_{(2\bar{S}, H) \cup \tilde{S}} \otimes \mathcal{L}[2]_{|H}) = 0 \text{ for } i = 0, 1.$$

Thus, by the Horace Differential Lemma for double points (Lemma 2) applied with $W = Z' \cup (2\bar{S}, X_2)$ and $\mathcal{R} = \mathcal{L}[2]$ in order to show that $h^j(X_2, \mathcal{I}_{Z' \cup (2\bar{S}, X_2) \cup (2\tilde{Z}, X_2)} \otimes \mathcal{L}[2]) = 0$, it is sufficient to prove that $h^j(X_2, \mathcal{I}_{\mathrm{Res}_H(Z' \cup (2\bar{S}, X_2)) \cup (2\tilde{S}, H)} \otimes \mathcal{L}[1]) = 0$. Observe that $\mathrm{Res}_H(Z' \cup (2\bar{S}, X_2)) = Z' \cup \bar{S}$. We have

$$(2) \quad h^1(X_2, \mathcal{I}_{Z' \cup (2\tilde{S}, H)} \otimes \mathcal{L}[1]) = 0$$

as a consequence of Claim 2 and Lemma 7 applied with $u := y_1$ and $z - x_1 - y_1$ instead of z .

Claim 3. $z - x_1 - y_1 \geq \lceil \alpha / (r + 1) \rceil$.

The computational proof of this claim is presented in Section 4.

By eq. (2) we have $h^0(X_2, \mathcal{I}_{Z' \cup (2\tilde{S}, H)} \otimes \mathcal{L}[1]) = 3\alpha - (z - x_1 - y_1)(r + 3) - (r + 2)y_1 = 3\alpha - (r + 3)z + ((r + 2)x_1 + y_1) + x_1 = x_1 + 6\alpha - (r + 3)z$. If $j = 1$ we get $h^0(X_2, \mathcal{I}_{Z' \cup (2\tilde{S}, H)} \otimes \mathcal{L}[1]) \geq x_1$ and if $j = 0$ we get $h^0(X_2, \mathcal{I}_{Z' \cup (2\tilde{S}, H)} \otimes \mathcal{L}[1]) < x_1$. It follows from Remark 4 that in order to get $h^j(X_2, \mathcal{I}_{Z' \cup (2\tilde{S}, H) \cup \bar{S}} \otimes \mathcal{L}[1]) = 0$ it is sufficient to have $h^0(X_2, \mathcal{I}_{Z'} \otimes \mathcal{L}[0]) = 0$. This is true by Claim 3 and Remark 2. \square

The bound of the previous lemma can be improved, as already remarked inside the proof, via a computational check. We preferred to write a separate statement to not make the previous proof too cumbersome.

Lemma 9. *Let $X_2 = Y \times \mathbb{P}^2$ where (Y, \mathcal{L}) , r and α are as in Notation 2. If the pair (Y, \mathcal{L}) is not secant defective, then for all the following values of r and α we have that the pair $(X_2, \mathcal{L}[2])$ is not secant defective.*

- $r = 2, 3$ and $\alpha \geq 60$,
- $r = 4$ and $\alpha \geq 98$,
- $r = 5$ and $\alpha \geq 133$,
- $r = 6$ and $\alpha \geq 176$,
- $r = 7$ and $\alpha \geq 231$,
- $r \geq 8$ and $\alpha \geq \frac{1}{81}(27r^3 + 144r^2 + 210r + 79)$.

Proof. The present Lemma is an improvement of the bounds on the α 's of Lemma 8. The previous bounds were based on Claim 2 and Claim 3 which one can computationally check that hold for all the finitely many values of α of the present Lemma not covered in Lemma 8. \square

Lemma 10. *Let (Y, \mathcal{L}) , X_2 and H be as in Notation 2 and r and α be as in Lemma 9. Set $a := \lfloor 4\alpha / (r + 2) \rfloor$, $b := 4\alpha - (r + 2)a$, $z := \lceil \binom{5}{2} \alpha / (r + 3) \rceil$ and $z' := z - a - b$. Let $Z' \subset X_2$ be a general union of z' double points of X_2 . Let $B \subset H$ be a set of b general points. If the pair (Y, \mathcal{L}) is not secant defective, then $h^1(X_2, \mathcal{I}_{Z' \cup (2B, H)} \otimes \mathcal{L}[2]) = 0$.*

Proof. Let $z_1 = \lfloor 6\alpha / (r + 3) \rfloor$ and x_1, y_1 be as in Claim 2 with z_1 instead of z . Let $\bar{z} = z' - z_1 + x_1$, $\tilde{z} = y_1$ and $z'' = z_1 - x_1 - y_1$.

Claim 4. $\bar{z} \geq 0$.

The proof of the above claim is given in Section 4.

Choose two disjoint subsets \bar{Z} and \tilde{Z} of the support of Z' consisting of \bar{z} and \tilde{z} points, respectively. Let Z'' be the union of the remaining z'' double points of Z' that are supported outside

$\bar{Z} \cup \tilde{Z}$. Let \bar{S} and \tilde{S} be general disjoint subsets of H with $\#\bar{S} = \bar{z}$ and $\#\tilde{S} = \tilde{z}$. By semicontinuity, in order to show that $h^1(X_2, \mathcal{I}_{Z' \cup (2B, H)} \otimes \mathcal{L}[2]) = 0$ it is sufficient to establish the equality $h^1(X_2, \mathcal{I}_{Z'' \cup (2\bar{S}, X_2) \cup (2\tilde{Z}, X_2) \cup (2B, H)} \otimes \mathcal{L}[2]) = 0$.

Claim 5. $h^1(H, \mathcal{I}_{(2\bar{S}, H) \cup \tilde{S} \cup (2B, H)}, \mathcal{L}[2]|_H) = 0$.

Proof of Claim 5. By Lemma 5 ([Bal23, Theorem 2]) it is enough to show that $\deg((2\bar{S}, H) \cup \tilde{S} \cup (2B, H)) \leq h^0(H, \mathcal{L}[2]|_H) = 3\alpha$. We have

$$\begin{aligned} \deg((2\bar{S}, H) \cup \tilde{S} \cup (2B, H)) &= (r+2)\bar{z} + \tilde{z} + (r+2)b \\ &= (r+2)(z' - z_1 + x_1) + y_1 + (r+2)b = (r+2)(z' - z_1 + b) + (r+2)x_1 + y_1 \\ &= (r+2)(z' - z_1 + b) + 3\alpha \end{aligned}$$

so it is sufficient to show that

$$(3) \quad (r+3)(r+2)(z' - z_1 + b) \leq 0.$$

We have

$$\begin{aligned} (r+3)(r+2)(z' - z_1 + b) &= (r+3)(r+2)(z - a) - (r+3)(r+2)z_1 \\ &\leq (r+2)(10\alpha + (r+2)) - (r+3)(4\alpha - (r+1)) - (r+2)(6\alpha - (r+2)) = 3r^2 + 12r + 11 - 4\alpha \end{aligned}$$

which is negative by the lower bounds on α and r . \square

Claim 6. $h^1(X_2, \mathcal{I}_{Z'' \cup \bar{S} \cup (2\tilde{S}, H)}, \mathcal{L}[1]) = 0$.

Proof of Claim 6. The integers z_1, x_1 and y_1 satisfy the inequalities of Claim 2 (with z_1 instead of z). Therefore, we have $h^1(X_2, \mathcal{I}_{Z'' \cup (2\tilde{S}, H)}, \mathcal{L}[1]) = 0$ by Lemma 7 item (a) applied with $z = z'' = z_1 - x_1 - y_1$ and $u = \tilde{z} = y_1$. It follows that $h^0(X_2, \mathcal{I}_{Z'' \cup (2\tilde{S}, H)}, \mathcal{L}[1]) = 3\alpha - (z_1 - x_1 - y_1)(r+3) - (r+2)y_1 = (x_1 + 6\alpha - (r+3)z_1)$ which is at least x_1 . On the other hand we have $\bar{z} \leq \bar{z} + b = z' - z_1 + b + x_1 \leq x_1$ by eq. (3). It follows from Remark 4 that to conclude the proof of the claim it is sufficient to show that $h^0(X_2, \mathcal{I}_{Z''} \otimes \mathcal{L}[0]) = 0$. This follows from Remark 2 and Claim 3 (with z_1 instead of z). \square

By Claim 5 and Claim 6, the lemma follows from Horace Differential Lemma for double points (Lemma 2) applied with $W = Z'' \cup (2\bar{S}, X_2) \cup (2B, H)$ and $\mathcal{R} = \mathcal{L}[2]$. \square

Lemma 11. *Let $(Y, \mathcal{L}), X_2, r$ and α be as in Lemma 9. If Z is a general union of z double points of X_2 and the pair (Y, \mathcal{L}) is not secant defective, then $h^0(X_2, \mathcal{I}_Z \otimes \mathcal{L}[1]) \leq \max\{0, 3\alpha - (r+2)z\}$.*

Proof. Let $H = Y \times \mathbb{P}^1$ be a divisor of X_2 as in Notation 2. Write Z as the following disjoint union $Z = (2\bar{Z}, X_2) \cup (2\tilde{Z}, X_2) \cup Z'$ where \bar{Z} and \tilde{Z} are disjoint subsets of the support of Z whose cardinalities are specified below. Take a general $\bar{S} \cup \tilde{S} \subset H$ such that $\#\bar{S} = \#\bar{Z}$, $\#\tilde{S} = \#\tilde{Z}$ and $\bar{S} \cap \tilde{S} = \emptyset$. By semicontinuity it is enough to show that $h^0(X_2, \mathcal{I}_{Z' \cup (2\bar{S}, X_2) \cup (2\tilde{S}, X_2)} \otimes \mathcal{L}[1]) \leq \max\{0, 3\alpha - (r+2)z\}$. Let

$$a := 2\lfloor \alpha / (r+2) \rfloor \text{ and } b := 2\alpha - (r+2)a.$$

- Assume for the moment $z \geq a + b$. Let $\#\bar{Z} = a$ and $\#\tilde{Z} = b$. Note that $0 \leq b \leq 2r + 2$. Lemma 6 applied to $(2\bar{S}, H)$ gives $h^1(H, \mathcal{I}_{(2\bar{S}, H)} \otimes \mathcal{L}[1]|_H) = 0$. Now if we add the general b simple points of \tilde{S} to $(2\bar{S}, H)$ then we get also $h^i(H, \mathcal{I}_{(2\bar{S}, H) \cup \tilde{S}} \otimes \mathcal{L}[1]|_H) = 0$ for $i = 0, 1$ since $\deg((2\bar{S}, H) \cup \tilde{S}) = (r+2)a + b = 2\alpha = h^0(H, \mathcal{L}[1]|_H)$. By the Horace Differential Lemma for double points (Lemma 2) applied with $W = Z' \cup (2\bar{S}, X_2)$ and $\mathcal{R} = \mathcal{L}[1]$, we

have $h^0(X_2, \mathcal{I}_{Z' \cup (2\bar{S}, X_2) \cup (2\tilde{Z}, X_2)} \otimes \mathcal{L}[1]) \leq h^0(X_2, \mathcal{I}_{Z' \cup \bar{S} \cup (2\tilde{S}, H)} \otimes \mathcal{L}[0])$. Since the pair (Y, \mathcal{L}) is not secant defective, Z' is general in X_2 and $\bar{S} \cup \tilde{S}$ is general in H , it follows from Remark 2 that $h^0(X_2, \mathcal{I}_{Z' \cup \bar{S} \cup (2\tilde{S}, H)} \otimes \mathcal{L}[0]) = \max\{0, \alpha - a - (r+1)(z-a-b) - (r+1)b\} = \max\{0, \alpha + ar - (r+1)z\} \leq \max\{0, \alpha + \alpha \frac{2r}{r+2} - (r+1)z\}$. Now since it is easy to check that

$$\max\left\{0, \alpha + \alpha \frac{2r}{r+2} - (r+1)z\right\} \leq \max\{0, 3\alpha - (r+2)z\}$$

we are done in the case $z \geq a+b$.

- Now assume $a \leq z < a+b$. We take $Z' = \emptyset$, $\#\bar{Z} = a = 2\lfloor \alpha/(r+2) \rfloor$ and $\#\tilde{Z} = z - a$. The same argument of the previous case leads to

$$(4) \quad h^1(H, \mathcal{I}_{(2\bar{S}, H) \cup \tilde{S}} \otimes \mathcal{L}[1]_{|H}) = 0.$$

Let $\beta = h^0(X_2, \mathcal{I}_{(2\tilde{S}, H)} \otimes \mathcal{L}[0])$. By Remark 2 we have $\beta = \max\{0, \alpha - (r+1)(z-a)\} = \alpha - (r+1)(z-a)$. Therefore, $h^1(X_2, \mathcal{I}_{(2\tilde{S}, H)} \otimes \mathcal{L}[0]) = 0$. We have $h^0(X_2, \mathcal{I}_{\text{Res}_H(2\tilde{S}, H)} \otimes \mathcal{L}[-1]) = 0 \leq \beta - a$ where we skip the routine verification of the inequality. It follows from Remark 4 that

$$(5) \quad h^1(X_2, \mathcal{I}_{(2\tilde{S}, H) \cup \bar{S}} \otimes \mathcal{L}[0]) = 0.$$

From the Horace Differential Lemma for double points (Lemma 2) applied to $W = (2\bar{S}, X_2)$ and $\mathcal{R} = \mathcal{L}[1]$ combined with semicontinuity, eq. (4) and eq. (5) we get $h^1(X_2, \mathcal{I}_Z \otimes \mathcal{L}[1]) = 0$ and therefore, $h^0(X_2, \mathcal{I}_Z \otimes \mathcal{L}[1]) = 3\alpha - (r+3)z \leq 3\alpha - (r+2)z$.

- Now assume $z < a$. We take $Z' = \tilde{Z} = \emptyset$ and $\#\bar{Z} = z$. We have $h^1(H, \mathcal{I}_{(2\bar{S}, H)} \otimes \mathcal{L}[1]_{|H}) = 0$ and $h^1(X_2, \mathcal{I}_{\bar{S}} \otimes \mathcal{L}[0]) = 0$. Therefore, by the standard Horace Lemma we have $h^1(X_2, \mathcal{I}_{(2\bar{S}, X_2)} \otimes \mathcal{L}[1]) = 0$. Thus, $h^0(X_2, \mathcal{I}_Z \otimes \mathcal{L}[1]) = 3\alpha - (r+3)z \leq 3\alpha - (r+2)z$ \square

At this stage, we have gathered all essential elements to formulate the main theorem within this paper.

Theorem 1. *Let (Y, \mathcal{L}) , X_2 , r and α be as in Lemma 9. If $t \geq 2$ and the pair (Y, \mathcal{L}) is not secant defective, then $(X_2, \mathcal{L}[t])$ is not secant defective.*

Proof. Since the case $t = 2$ was already proved in Lemma 9, we may assume $t > 2$ and proceed by induction. Namely assume that $(X_2, \mathcal{L}[x])$ is non secant defective for $2 \leq x < t$. It is sufficient to prove that either $h^1(X_2, \mathcal{I}_Z \otimes \mathcal{L}[t]) = 0$ or $h^0(X_2, \mathcal{I}_Z \otimes \mathcal{L}[t]) = 0$ for a general union $Z \subset X_2$ of z double points of X_2 for all $z \in \{\lfloor \binom{t+2}{2} \alpha / (r+3) \rfloor, \lceil \binom{t+2}{2} \alpha / (r+3) \rceil\}$. Set $j := 1$ if $z = \lfloor \binom{t+2}{2} \alpha / (r+3) \rfloor$ and $j := 0$ otherwise. We need to prove that $h^j(X_2, \mathcal{I}_Z \otimes \mathcal{L}[t]) = 0$. Let $H = X \times \mathbb{P}^1$ be a divisor of X_2 as in Notation 2. By Lemma 5 ([Bal23, Theorem 2]) the pairs $(H, \mathcal{L}[t]_{|H})$ and $(H, \mathcal{L}[t-1]_{|H})$ are not secant defective. Set

$$a := \lfloor (t+1)\alpha / (r+2) \rfloor \text{ and } b := (t+1)\alpha - (r+2)a.$$

Claim 7. $z \geq a+b$

See Section 4 for the proof of Claim 7.

Decompose Z into the disjoint union $Z = Z' \cup (2\bar{Z}, X_2) \cup (2\tilde{Z}, X_2)$ where $\#\bar{Z} = a$ and $\#\tilde{Z} = b$. Take a general $\bar{S} \cup \tilde{S} \subset H$ such that $\#\bar{S} = a$, $\#\tilde{S} = b$ and $\bar{S} \cap \tilde{S} = \emptyset$. By semicontinuity and Horace Differential Lemma for double points (Lemma 2) applied to $W = Z' \cup (2\bar{S}, X_2)$ and $\mathcal{R} = \mathcal{L}[t]$ we have that $h^j(X_2, \mathcal{I}_Z \otimes \mathcal{L}[t]) \leq h^j(X_2, \mathcal{I}_{Z' \cup \bar{S} \cup (2\tilde{S}, H)} \otimes \mathcal{L}[t-1]) + h^j(H, \mathcal{I}_{(2\bar{S}, H) \cup \tilde{S}} \otimes \mathcal{L}[t]_{|H})$. In order to show that $h^j(X_2, \mathcal{I}_Z \otimes \mathcal{L}[t]) = 0$, it is now sufficient to prove that $h^j(X_2, \mathcal{I}_{Z' \cup \bar{S} \cup (2\tilde{S}, H)} \otimes \mathcal{L}[t-1]) = h^j(H, \mathcal{I}_{(2\bar{S}, H) \cup \tilde{S}} \otimes \mathcal{L}[t]_{|H}) = 0$. By Lemma 5 the pair $(H, \mathcal{L}[t]_{|H})$ is not secant defective, moreover

here the degree of the scheme is equal to $h^0(H, \mathcal{L}[t]_{|H})$ so $h^i(H, \mathcal{I}_{(2\bar{S}, H) \cup \bar{S}} \otimes \mathcal{L}[t]_{|H}) = 0$, $i = 0, 1$. Thus it is sufficient to prove $h^j(X_2, \mathcal{I}_{Z' \cup \bar{S} \cup (2\tilde{S}, H)} \otimes \mathcal{L}[t-1]) = 0$.

Claim 8. $h^1(X_2, \mathcal{I}_{Z' \cup (2\tilde{S}, H)} \otimes \mathcal{L}[t-1]) = 0$.

Proof of Claim 8. If $b = 0$ there are no double points on H (i.e. \tilde{S} is empty), so we just use that $(X_2, \mathcal{L}[t-1])$ is not secant defective and $(r+3)(z-a) \leq \binom{t+1}{2}\alpha$, because $(r+3)z \leq \binom{t+2}{2}\alpha + r+2$, $(r+2)a = (t+1)\alpha$ and $a \geq r+2$. Now assume $b > 0$. If $t = 3$, then Claim 8 is true by Lemma 10 applied with $B = \tilde{S}$. Thus we may assume $t \geq 4$. Set

$$c := \lfloor t\alpha / (r+2) \rfloor - b.$$

Decompose Z' into the disjoint union $Z' = Z'' \cup (2\hat{Z}, X_2)$ where $\#\hat{Z}$ is specified below depending on the value of c . Let \hat{S} be a general subset of H such that $\hat{S} \cap \tilde{S} = \emptyset$ and $\#\hat{Z} = \#\hat{S}$.

- (1) Assume that $c \leq z - a - b$. Let $\#\hat{Z} = c$. Since $(H, \mathcal{L}[t-1]_{|H})$ is not secant defective, $h^1(H, \mathcal{I}_{(2\hat{S}, H) \cup (2\tilde{S}, H)} \otimes \mathcal{L}[t-1]_{|H}) = 0$. Thus by semicontinuity and the standard Horace Lemma, in order to prove Claim 8 it is sufficient to prove $h^1(X_2, \mathcal{I}_{Z'' \cup \hat{S}} \otimes \mathcal{L}[t-2]) = 0$. One can compute that $\deg(Z'' \cup \hat{S}) \leq \binom{t}{2}\alpha$. Since $t \geq 4$ the inductive assumption gives $h^1(X_2, \mathcal{I}_{Z''} \otimes \mathcal{L}[t-2]) = 0$. Therefore, $h^0(X_2, \mathcal{I}_{Z''} \otimes \mathcal{L}[t-2]) = \binom{t}{2}\alpha - (r+3)(z-a-b-c)$. Hence to prove that $h^1(X_2, \mathcal{I}_{Z'' \cup \hat{S}} \otimes \mathcal{L}[t-2]) = 0$ it is sufficient by Remark 4 to prove that $h^0(X_2, \mathcal{I}_{Z''} \otimes \mathcal{L}[t-3]) \leq \binom{t}{2}\alpha - (r+3)(z-a-b-c) - c$.
 - If $t \geq 5$, the last inequality is true, because $(X_2, \mathcal{L}[t-3])$ is not secant defective and $c \leq c+b \leq t\alpha / (r+2) \leq (t-1)\alpha$.
 - Now assume $t = 4$ with the assumption $z \geq a+b+c$. We have $0 \leq b \leq r+1$, $(r+2)a+b = 5\alpha$, $|(r+3)z - 15\alpha| \leq r+2$ and $4\alpha - r - 1 \leq (r+2)(b+c) \leq 4\alpha$ and it is sufficient to prove that $h^0(X_2, \mathcal{I}_{Z''} \otimes \mathcal{L}[1]) \leq 6\alpha - (r+3)(z-a-b-c) - c$. Lemma 11 gives $h^0(X_2, \mathcal{I}_{Z''} \otimes \mathcal{L}[1]) \leq \max\{0, 3\alpha - (r+2)(z-a-b-c)\}$. Thus it is sufficient to prove that $(z-a-b-c) + c \leq 3\alpha$.
- (2) If $a+b \leq z < a+b+c$ to get Claim 8 using the proof in item (1) we take $\#\hat{Z} = z-a-b$ and $Z'' = \emptyset$. \square

Claim 8 gives $h^0(X_2, \mathcal{I}_{Z' \cup (2\tilde{S}, H)} \otimes \mathcal{L}[t-1]) = \binom{t+1}{2}\alpha - (r+3)(z-a-b) - (r+2)b$. By Remark 4 and the generality of \bar{S} in H , in order to conclude the proof of Theorem 1 it is sufficient to prove that $h^0(X_2, \mathcal{I}_{Z'} \otimes \mathcal{L}[t-2]) \leq \max\{0, \binom{t+1}{2}\alpha - (r+3)(z-a-b) - (r+2)b - a\}$. If $t \geq 4$ we can use the inductive assumption. Namely, since $(X_2, \mathcal{L}[t-2])$ is not secant defective, we have $h^0(X_2, \mathcal{I}_{Z'} \otimes \mathcal{L}[t-2]) = \max\{0, \binom{t}{2}\alpha - (r+3)(z-a-b)\}$ so it is sufficient to observe that $\binom{t}{2}\alpha \leq \binom{t+1}{2}\alpha - (r+2)b - a$. Now assume $t = 3$. We need to check the inequality $h^0(X_2, \mathcal{I}_{Z'} \otimes \mathcal{L}[1]) \leq \max\{0, 6\alpha - (r+3)(z-a-b) - (r+2)b - a\}$. Lemma 11 gives $h^0(X_2, \mathcal{I}_{Z'} \otimes \mathcal{L}[1]) \leq \max\{0, 3\alpha - (r+2)(z-a-b)\}$. Thus it is sufficient to prove the inequality $3\alpha \geq z-a-b + (r+2)b + a = z + (r+1)b$. We have $(r+3)(z + (r+1)b) \leq 10\alpha + (r+2) + (r+1)^2(r+3)$ so it is enough to show that $3\alpha(r+3) \geq 10\alpha + (r+2) + (r+1)^2(r+3)$, or equivalently, that

$$\alpha(3r-1) \geq r^3 + 5r^2 + 8r + 5.$$

This inequality holds by the assumed lower bounds on α from Lemma 9. \square

3. APPLICATIONS

Proposition 1. *Assume that $n \in \{1, 2\}$ and $t \geq 2$. If (Y, \mathcal{L}) satisfies the assumptions of Theorem 1, then so does $(Y \times \mathbb{P}^n, \mathcal{L}[t])$.*

Proof. Observe that if r and α are as in Lemma 9, then $\alpha > (r + 1)^2$. Therefore, $(Y \times \mathbb{P}^n, \mathcal{L}[t])$ is not secant defective by Lemma 5 ([Bal23, Theorem 2]) if $n = 1$ and by Theorem 1 if $n = 2$. One may verify that $r + n$ and $\binom{t+n}{n}\alpha$ satisfy the inequalities in Lemma 9. \square

Proposition 2. *For every $t \geq 3$ the pair $(\mathbb{P}^2 \times \mathbb{P}^2, \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^2 \times \mathbb{P}^2}(2, t))$ is not secant defective.*

Proof. For $t \geq 10$ we have $h^0(\mathbb{P}^2, \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^2}(t)) \geq 60$. Furthermore, for such values of t , by Alexander-Hirschowitz theorem (cf. [AH00]) the pair $(\mathbb{P}^2, \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^2}(t))$ is not secant defective. Therefore, by Theorem 1 it is sufficient to prove the statement for $3 \leq t \leq 9$. Due to Terracini's lemma these cases can be checked on a computer to be not secant defective. We did it with Macaulay2 ([GS]). \square

Proposition 3. *For every $t \geq 2$ the pair $(\mathbb{P}^2 \times \mathbb{P}^2 \times \mathbb{P}^2, \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^2 \times \mathbb{P}^2 \times \mathbb{P}^2}(2, 2, t))$ is not secant defective.*

Proof. For $t \geq 5$ we have $h^0(\mathbb{P}^2 \times \mathbb{P}^2, \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^2 \times \mathbb{P}^2}(2, t)) \geq 98$. Furthermore, for such values of t , the pair $(\mathbb{P}^2 \times \mathbb{P}^2, \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^2 \times \mathbb{P}^2}(2, t))$ is not secant defective by Proposition 2. Therefore, by Theorem 1 it is sufficient to prove the Proposition for $2 \leq t \leq 4$. Using Terracini's lemma one may check computationally that the following pairs are not secant defective

1. $(\mathbb{P}^2 \times \mathbb{P}^2 \times \mathbb{P}^2, \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^2 \times \mathbb{P}^2 \times \mathbb{P}^2}(2, 2, 1))$;
2. $(\mathbb{P}^2 \times \mathbb{P}^2 \times \mathbb{P}^2, \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^2 \times \mathbb{P}^2 \times \mathbb{P}^2}(2, 2, 2))$;
3. $(\mathbb{P}^2 \times \mathbb{P}^2 \times \mathbb{P}^1, \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^2 \times \mathbb{P}^2 \times \mathbb{P}^1}(2, 2, 3))$;
4. $(\mathbb{P}^2 \times \mathbb{P}^2 \times \mathbb{P}^1, \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^2 \times \mathbb{P}^2 \times \mathbb{P}^1}(2, 2, 4))$.

Again we did it with Macaulay2 ([GS]).

Let $X = \mathbb{P}^2 \times \mathbb{P}^2 \times \mathbb{P}^2$ and $H = \mathbb{P}^2 \times \mathbb{P}^2 \times \mathbb{P}^1 \subset X$ be a divisor. Let $\mathcal{L} = \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^2 \times \mathbb{P}^2}(2, 2)$. Using this notation, we need to prove that the pairs $(X, \mathcal{L}[t])$ with $t = 3, 4$ are not secant defective. Let $z \in \{[h^0(X, \mathcal{L}[t]) / (\dim X + 1)] = \lfloor \frac{36}{7} \binom{t+2}{2} \rfloor, \lceil \frac{36}{7} \binom{t+2}{2} \rceil\}$ and Z be the union of z general double points of X . Let $j = 1$ if $z = \lfloor \frac{36}{7} \binom{t+2}{2} \rfloor$ and $j = 0$ otherwise. It is sufficient to prove that $h^j(X, \mathcal{I}_Z \otimes \mathcal{L}[t]) = 0$. Let $\bar{z} = 6(t + 1)$ and $\bar{S} \subset H$ be a general subset with $\#\bar{S} = \bar{z}$. Decompose Z into the disjoint union $Z = Z' \cup (2\bar{Z}, X)$ where \bar{Z} is a subset of the support of Z of cardinality \bar{z} . By the standard Horace Lemma and semicontinuity, it is now sufficient to show that $h^j(X, \mathcal{I}_{Z' \cup \bar{S}} \otimes \mathcal{L}[t - 1]) = h^j(H, \mathcal{I}_{(2\bar{S}, H)} \otimes \mathcal{L}[t]_{|H}) = 0$. We have $\deg(2\bar{S}, H) = 6\bar{z} = h^0(H, \mathcal{L}[t]_{|H})$. Therefore, $h^j(H, \mathcal{I}_{(2\bar{S}, H)} \otimes \mathcal{L}[t]_{|H}) = 0$ since $(H, \mathcal{L}[t]_{|H})$ is not secant defective as mentioned above in item 3. and item 4.

On the other hand, $\deg Z' = 7(z - \bar{z}) \leq 36 \binom{t+1}{2} = h^0(X, \mathcal{L}[t - 1])$. Therefore, since the pair $(X, \mathcal{L}[t - 1])$ is not secant defective (for $t = 3$ it was mentioned above in item 2. and for $t = 4$ it follows after we prove this Proposition for $t = 3$), we obtain that $\beta := h^0(X, \mathcal{I}_{Z'} \otimes \mathcal{L}[t - 1]) = 36 \binom{t+1}{2} - 7(z - \bar{z})$. In particular, $h^1(X, \mathcal{I}_{Z'} \otimes \mathcal{L}[t - 1]) = 0$. Furthermore, $\text{Res}_H(Z') = Z'$ since Z' is general in X . Moreover $h^0(X, \mathcal{I}_{Z'} \otimes \mathcal{L}[t - 2]) = \max\{0, 36 \binom{t}{2} - 7(z - \bar{z})\}$ since the pair $(X, \mathcal{L}[t - 2])$ is not secant defective by item 1. and item 2. It follows from Remark 4 that to conclude the proof it is sufficient to check that $36 \binom{t}{2} - 7(z - \bar{z}) \leq \beta - \bar{z} = 36 \binom{t+1}{2} - 7z + 6\bar{z}$. This is equivalent to the inequality $\bar{z} \leq 36t$ which holds since $\bar{z} = 6(t + 1) \leq 30 \leq 36t$. \square

Theorem 2. *The pair $((\mathbb{P}^2)^k, \mathcal{O}_{(\mathbb{P}^2)^k}(t_1, \dots, t_k))$ with $t_1, \dots, t_k \geq 2$ is secant defective if and only if one of the following holds:*

- $k = 1$ and $t_1 \in \{2, 4\}$
- $k = 2$ and $t_1 = t_2 = 2$.

Proof. If $k = 1$, the secant defective cases are described by Alexander-Hirschowitz theorem (cf. [AH00]). The fact that $(\mathbb{P}^2 \times \mathbb{P}^2, \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^2 \times \mathbb{P}^2}(2, 2))$ is secant defective was already known (cf. [CGG05a]). The pairs $(\mathbb{P}^2 \times \mathbb{P}^2, \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^2 \times \mathbb{P}^2}(2, t))$ with $t \geq 3$ are not secant defective by Proposition 2. The pairs $(\mathbb{P}^2 \times \mathbb{P}^2, \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^2 \times \mathbb{P}^2}(t_1, t_2))$ with $t_1, t_2 \geq 3$ are not secant defective by [GO22].

The pairs $(\mathbb{P}^2 \times \mathbb{P}^2 \times \mathbb{P}^2, \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^2 \times \mathbb{P}^2 \times \mathbb{P}^2}(2, 2, t))$ with $t \geq 2$ are not secant defective by Proposition 3. The pairs $(\mathbb{P}^2 \times \mathbb{P}^2 \times \mathbb{P}^2, \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^2 \times \mathbb{P}^2 \times \mathbb{P}^2}(t_1, t_2, t_3))$ with $t_1, t_2 \geq 3$ and $t_3 \geq 2$ are not secant defective by [GO22] and Theorem 1 since $h^0(\mathbb{P}^2 \times \mathbb{P}^2, \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^2 \times \mathbb{P}^2}(t_1, t_2)) \geq h^0(\mathbb{P}^2 \times \mathbb{P}^2, \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^2 \times \mathbb{P}^2}(3, 3)) = 100 \geq 98$.

Therefore we have that the pair $(\mathbb{P}^2 \times \mathbb{P}^2 \times \mathbb{P}^2, \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^2 \times \mathbb{P}^2 \times \mathbb{P}^2}(t_1, t_2, t_3))$ is not secant defective for all $t_1, t_2, t_3 \geq 2$. Since $h^0(\mathbb{P}^2 \times \mathbb{P}^2 \times \mathbb{P}^2, \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^2 \times \mathbb{P}^2 \times \mathbb{P}^2}(t_1, t_2, t_3)) \geq h^0(\mathbb{P}^2 \times \mathbb{P}^2 \times \mathbb{P}^2, \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^2 \times \mathbb{P}^2 \times \mathbb{P}^2}(2, 2, 2)) = 216 \geq 176$ we conclude using Proposition 1 and induction on k that $(\mathbb{P}^2)^k, \mathcal{O}_{(\mathbb{P}^2)^k}(t_1, \dots, t_k)$ with $t_1, \dots, t_k \geq 2$ is not secant defective for every $k \geq 3$. \square

Proposition 4. *If $s_1, s_2, t \geq 2$ the pair $(\mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^2, \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^2}(s_1, s_2, t))$ is secant defective if and only if $s_1 = s_2 = t = 2$.*

Proof. See [CGG05a] for the secant defective case. If either $t \geq 3$ or $t = 2$ and s_1 and s_2 are not both even the pair is not secant defective by [BD10] together with Lemma 5 ([Bal23, Theorem 2]). In what follows we assume that $t = 2$ and $s_1 = 2a, s_2 = 2b$ for some positive integers a, b . Suppose that both a and b are larger than 1. Then the pair $(\mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^1, \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^1}(2a, 2b))$ is not secant defective by [LP13]. Therefore, by Theorem 1, if $(2a+1)(2b+1) \geq 60$ then the pair $(\mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^2, \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^2}(2a, 2b, 2))$ is not secant defective. If we assume that $a \geq b$, the remaining cases (still with $a, b > 1$) are $(a, b) \in \{(2, 2), (3, 2), (4, 2), (5, 2), (3, 3)\}$. One may verify with a computer aid that in all these cases the pair $(\mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^2, \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^2}(2a, 2b, 2))$ is not secant defective (we did it via Macaulay2 [GS]). We verified computationally (with [GS]) that also the pairs $(\mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^2, \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^2}(2a, 2, 2))$ with $2 \leq a \leq 5$ are not secant defective.

Therefore, in what follows we assume that $a \geq 6$ and $b = 1$.

Let $z \in \{\lfloor 18(2a+1)/5 \rfloor, \lceil 18(2a+1)/5 \rceil\}$ and let $j = 1$ if $z = \lfloor 18(2a+1)/5 \rfloor$ and $j = 0$ otherwise. Let Z be a general union of z double points of $\mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^2$. In order to show that the pair $(\mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^2, \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^2}(2a, 2, 2))$ is not secant defective it is sufficient to show that $h^j(\mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^2, \mathcal{I}_Z(2a, 2, 2)) = 0$.

Let $\bar{z} = \lfloor 9(2a+1)/4 \rfloor$, $\tilde{z} = 9(2a+1) - 4\bar{z}$ and $z' = z - \bar{z} - \tilde{z}$. Decompose Z into the disjoint union

$$Z = Z' \cup (2\bar{Z}, \mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^2) \cup (2\tilde{Z}, \mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^2)$$

where $\#\bar{Z} = \bar{z}$ and $\#\tilde{Z} = \tilde{z}$. Let $H = \mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^1$ and \bar{S}, \tilde{S} be general disjoint subsets of H with $\#\bar{S} = \bar{z}$ and $\#\tilde{S} = \tilde{z}$. By semicontinuity and Horace Differential Lemma for double points (Lemma 2) applied with $W = Z' \cup (2\bar{S}, \mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^2)$ in order to conclude that $h^j(\mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^2, \mathcal{I}_Z(2a, 2, 2)) = 0$ it is sufficient to show that

$$h^j(\mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^2, \mathcal{I}_{Z' \cup \bar{S} \cup (2\tilde{S}, H)}(2a, 2, 1)) = h^j(H, \mathcal{I}_{(2\bar{S}, H) \cup \tilde{S}}(2a, 2, 2)) = 0.$$

The pair $(\mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^1, \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^1}(2a, 2, 2))$ is not secant defective by [LP13]. Since

$$\deg(2\bar{S}, H) \cup \tilde{S} = 4\bar{z} + \tilde{z} = h^0(H, \mathcal{O}_H(2a, 2, 2))$$

and \bar{S}, \tilde{S} are general we conclude that $h^j(H, \mathcal{I}_{(2\bar{S}, H) \cup \tilde{S}}(2a, 2, 2)) = 0$.

Claim 9. We have

- $h^1(\mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^2, \mathcal{I}_{Z' \cup (2\tilde{S}, H)}(2a, 2, 1)) = 0$.
- $h^0(\mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^2, \mathcal{I}_{Z'}(2a, 2, 0)) = 0$.

For the proof of Claim 9 see Section 4. As a result of Claim 9 and Remark 4 we obtain $h^j(\mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^2, \mathcal{I}_{Z' \cup \bar{S} \cup (2\tilde{S}, H)}(2a, 2, 1)) = 0$. \square

Proposition 5. *For every $t \geq 2$ the pair $(\mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^2 \times \mathbb{P}^2, \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^2 \times \mathbb{P}^2}(t, 2, 2))$ is not secant defective.*

Proof. The pairs $(\mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^2 \times \mathbb{P}^2, \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^2 \times \mathbb{P}^2}(t, 2, 2))$ with $t = 2, 3$ are not secant defective by a computer check (cf. [GS]). We proceed by induction. In what follows we assume that $t \geq 4$ and the pair $(\mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^2 \times \mathbb{P}^2, \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^2 \times \mathbb{P}^2}(t-2, 2, 2))$ is not secant defective.

To simplify notation, let $Y = \mathbb{P}^2 \times \mathbb{P}^2$, $\mathcal{L} = \mathcal{O}_Y(2, 2)$ and $X = \mathbb{P}^1 \times Y$. Let $z = h^0(X, \mathcal{L}[t]) / (\dim X + 1) = 6(t+1)$ and Z be a general union of z double points of X . We need to show that $h^1(X, \mathcal{I}_Z \otimes \mathcal{L}[t]) = 0$. Let \bar{Z} and \tilde{Z} be disjoint subsets of the support of Z with $\#\bar{Z} = \#\tilde{Z} = 6$. Decompose Z into the disjoint union $Z = Z' \cup (2\bar{Z}, X) \cup (2\tilde{Z}, X)$. Let o be a point of \mathbb{P}^1 and H be the divisor $\{o\} \times Y \subseteq \mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^2 \times \mathbb{P}^2$. Let \bar{S} and \tilde{S} be general disjoint subsets of H with $\#\bar{S} = \#\tilde{S} = 6$. By semicontinuity and Horace Differential Lemma for double points (Lemma 2) applied with $W = Z' \cup (2\bar{S}, X)$ it is now sufficient to show that

$$h^1(X, \mathcal{I}_{Z' \cup \bar{S} \cup (2\tilde{S}, H)} \otimes \mathcal{L}[t-1]) = h^1(H, \mathcal{I}_{(2\bar{S}, H) \cup \tilde{S}} \otimes \mathcal{L}[t]|_H) = 0.$$

We have $\deg(2\bar{S}, H) \cup \tilde{S} = 36 = h^0(Y, \mathcal{O}_Y(2, 2))$. Since the 6-th secant variety of $(Y, \mathcal{O}_Y(2, 2))$ is not defective by [CGG08] we conclude that $h^1(H, \mathcal{I}_{(2\bar{S}, H) \cup \tilde{S}} \otimes \mathcal{L}[t]|_H) = 0$.

In order to show that $h^1(X, \mathcal{I}_{Z' \cup \bar{S} \cup (2\tilde{S}, H)} \otimes \mathcal{L}[t-1]) = 0$, it is sufficient by the standard Horace Lemma to show that $h^1(X, \mathcal{I}_{Z'} \otimes \mathcal{L}[t-2]) = h^1(H, \mathcal{I}_{\bar{S} \cup (2\tilde{S}, H)} \otimes \mathcal{L}[t-1]|_H) = 0$. The first of these cohomology groups vanishes since by induction the pair $(X, \mathcal{L}[t-2])$ is not secant defective. Since $\#\tilde{S} = \#\bar{S}$, the second one vanishes as already shown above. \square

Theorem 3. *If $s_1, \dots, s_j, t_1, \dots, t_k \geq 2$, then the pair*

$$((\mathbb{P}^1)^j \times (\mathbb{P}^2)^k, \mathcal{O}_{(\mathbb{P}^1)^j \times (\mathbb{P}^2)^k}(s_1, \dots, s_j, t_1, \dots, t_k))$$

is secant defective if and only if one of the following holds up to a permutation of $\{s_1, \dots, s_j\}$

- $j = 0, k = 1$ and $t_1 \in \{2, 4\}$;
- $j = 0, k = 2$ and $t_1 = t_2 = 2$;
- $j = 2, k = 0$ and $s_1 = 2, s_2 = 2a$ for some $a \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$;
- $j = 3, k = 0$ and $s_1 = 2, s_2 = 2, s_3 = 2$;
- $j = 1, k = 1$ and $s_1 = 2a, t_1 = 2$ for some $a \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$.
- $j = 2, k = 1$ and $s_1 = s_2 = t_1 = 2$.

Proof. By Theorem 2 and [LP13] it is enough to consider the cases where $j, k > 0$. Furthermore, the case of $j = k = 1$ is known (cf. [BD10]) so we assume that $j + k \geq 3$.

If $k \geq 3$ or $k = 2$ and $(t_1, t_2) \neq (2, 2)$, then the corresponding pair is not secant defective. This can be seen by Theorem 2 and a repeated application of Lemma 5 ([Bal23, Theorem 2]).

If $k = 2$ and $(t_1, t_2) = (2, 2)$ then it follows from Proposition 5 that $(\mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^2 \times \mathbb{P}^2, \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^2 \times \mathbb{P}^2}(t, 2, 2))$ is not secant defective for every $t \geq 2$.

The case of more factors of \mathbb{P}^1 follows by a repeated application of Lemma 5.

Finally assume that $j \geq 2$ and $k = 1$. If at least one s_i or t_1 is larger than 2 then we conclude that the pair is not secant defective by Proposition 4 and induction on j using Lemma 5.

We are left with the case that $j \geq 2, k = 1$ and $s_1 = \dots = s_j = t_1 = 2$. If $j = 2$, then as recalled in Proposition 4, the pair is secant defective by [CGG05a]. If $j = 3$ the pair is not secant defective by a computer check (with Macaulay2 [GS]). The general case follows from this and a repeated application of Lemma 5. \square

Theorem 4. *If $d, e \geq 3$ and $n \geq m \geq 1$, then the pair*

$$(\mathbb{P}^m \times \mathbb{P}^n \times (\mathbb{P}^2)^k, \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^m \times \mathbb{P}^n \times (\mathbb{P}^2)^k}(d, e, t_1, \dots, t_k))$$

is not secant defective for all k and $t_1 \geq t_2 \geq \dots \geq 2$.

Proof.

- (1) Assume first that $m + n \geq 8$. By [GO22] and Proposition 1, it is enough to show that the pair $(\mathbb{P}^m \times \mathbb{P}^n, \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^m \times \mathbb{P}^n}(3, 3))$ satisfies the assumptions of Theorem 1. That is we need to check that

$$\binom{n+3}{3} \binom{m+3}{3} \geq \frac{1}{81}(27(m+n)^3 + 144(m+n)^2 + 210(m+n) + 79).$$

Let $r = m + n$. Observe that $27r^3 + 144r^2 + 210r + 79 \leq 27r^3 + 162r^2 + 324r + 216 = (3r+6)^3$. Therefore, the right side is bounded from the above by $\frac{1}{3}(r+2)^3$. For $i = 1, 2, 3$, we have $(n+i)((r-n)+i) \geq (1+i)((r-1)+i)$. Therefore,

$$\binom{n+3}{3} \binom{m+3}{3} \geq \frac{4 \cdot 3 \cdot 2}{36}(r+2)(r+1)(r).$$

Now it is enough to observe that $2(r+1)r \geq (r+2)^2$. This holds since $r \geq 8$.

- (2) Now assume that $m + n \leq 7$ and $m, n \geq 2$. By [GO22] and Proposition 1, it is enough to show that the pair $(\mathbb{P}^m \times \mathbb{P}^n, \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^m \times \mathbb{P}^n}(3, 3))$ satisfies the assumptions of Theorem 1. There are finitely many cases to consider. We omit the calculations.
- (3) If $m = 1$ and $4 \leq n \leq 6$, then we argue as in (2).
- (4) If $m = 1$, $n = 3$ and $e \geq 4$, then we argue as in (2) with $(\mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^3, \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^3}(3, 4))$ instead of $(\mathbb{P}^m \times \mathbb{P}^n, \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^m \times \mathbb{P}^n}(3, 3))$.
- (5) Assume that $m = 1$, $n = 3$, $e = 3$ and either $k = 0$ or $t_1 \geq 3$. If $k = 0$, then the pair is not secant defective by [GO22]. If $k \geq 1$ and $t_1 \geq 3$, then the pair $(\mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^3 \times \mathbb{P}^2, \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^3 \times \mathbb{P}^2}(d, e, t_1))$ is not secant defective by [GO22] and Lemma 5 ([Bal23, Theorem 2]). Since $h^0(\mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^3 \times \mathbb{P}^2, \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^3 \times \mathbb{P}^2}(d, e, t_1)) \geq 4 \cdot 20 \cdot 10 > 231$ we conclude by Proposition 1.
- (6) Assume that $m = 1$, $n = 3$, $e = 3$, $k \geq 1$ and all t_i are equal to 2. By Proposition 1 it is enough to consider the case $k = 1$. The pair $(\mathbb{P}^3 \times \mathbb{P}^2, \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^3 \times \mathbb{P}^2}(3, 2))$ is not secant defective by a computer check. Therefore, so is $(\mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^3 \times \mathbb{P}^2, \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^3 \times \mathbb{P}^2}(d, 3, 2))$ by Lemma 5.
- (7) If $m = 1$ and $n \in \{1, 2\}$ the pair is not secant defective by Theorem 3. \square

4. PROOFS OF CLAIMS

For the sake of completeness, this section compiles the proofs of the Claims that primarily involve computational steps.

Proof of Claim 2. Let y_0 be the maximal integer such that $y_0 \leq \lfloor \alpha/(r+1) \rfloor$ and $y_0 \equiv 3\alpha \pmod{r+2}$. Let x_0 be the unique integer such that $(r+2)x_0 + y_0 = 3\alpha$. We show that

$$(6) \quad (r+2)(z - x_0 - y_0) + y_0 \leq 2\alpha.$$

By the definition of y_0 we have $y_0 \geq \lfloor \alpha/(r+1) \rfloor - (r+1)$. Therefore,

$$(7) \quad (r+1)y_0 \geq \alpha - r - (r+1)^2.$$

Multiplying eq. (6) by $(r+3)(r+1)$ and rearranging we need to show that

$$\begin{aligned} (r+1)(r+2)(r+3)z &\leq 2\alpha(r+1)(r+3) + (r+3)(r+1)((r+2)x_0 + (r+1)y_0) \\ &= 2\alpha(r+1)(r+3) + (r+3)(r+1)(3\alpha + ry_0) = 5\alpha(r+1)(r+3) + r(r+1)(r+3)y_0. \end{aligned}$$

Using the definition of z and eq. (7) it is sufficient to show that

$$(r+1)(r+2)(6\alpha + (r+2)) \leq 5\alpha(r+1)(r+3) + r(r+3)(\alpha - (r + (r+1)^2))$$

which is equivalent to

$$(8) \quad 5\alpha r + 3\alpha \geq r^4 + 7r^3 + 15r^2 + 11r + 4.$$

Using the lower bounds on α from the statement we see that eq. (8) holds.

In all cases from the statement, we have $\alpha \geq 3(r+1)^2 + r = 3r^2 + 7r + 3$. It follows from $y_0 \geq \lfloor \alpha/(r+1) \rfloor - (r+1)$ that $y_0 \geq 2r+2$. Let y_1 be the smallest integer $y \geq 2r+2$ such that $y \equiv 3\alpha \pmod{r+2}$ and $(r+2)(z-x-y) + y \leq 2\alpha$ where x is the unique integer for which $(r+2)x + y = 3\alpha$. Let x_1 be the unique integer for which $(r+2)x_1 + y_1 = 3\alpha$. By construction we have $(r+2)x_1 + y_1 = 3\alpha$, $2r+2 \leq y_1 \leq \lfloor \alpha/(r+1) \rfloor$ and $(r+2)(z-x_1-y_1) + y_1 \leq 2\alpha$. We need to show that $x_1 + y_1 \leq z$ and $z - x_1 - y_1 \leq \alpha - (r+1)y_1$.

We start with the latter inequality. We multiply it by $(r+2)(r+3)$ and rearrange to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} (r+2)(r+3)z &\leq (r+2)(r+3)\alpha + (r+3)(r+2)x_1 - r(r+2)(r+3)y_1 \\ &= (r+2)(r+3)\alpha + 3(r+3)\alpha - (r+1)^2(r+3)y_1. \end{aligned}$$

Using the definition of z it is sufficient to show that

$$(r+2)(6\alpha) + (r+2)^2 \leq (r+5)(r+3)\alpha - (r+1)^2(r+3)y_1$$

or equivalently,

$$(9) \quad \alpha(r^2 + 2r + 3) \geq (r+1)^2(r+3)y_1 + (r+2)^2.$$

By definition of y_1 we have

- either $y_1 < (2r+2) + (r+2)$,
- or $(r+2)(z - (x_1 + 1) - (y_1 - (r+2))) + (y_1 - (r+2)) - 1 \geq 2\alpha$.

In the first case, to obtain eq. (9) it is enough to have

$$(10) \quad \alpha(r^2 + 2r + 3) \geq 3(r+1)^3(r+3) + (r+2)^2 = 3r^4 + 18r^3 + 37r^2 + 34r + 13.$$

Using the lower bounds of α from the statement we verify that eq. (10) holds.

In the second case we have $(r+2)z - 5\alpha + (r+2)r - 1 \geq ry_1$ and using the fact that $(r+3)z \leq 6\alpha + (r+2)$ we get

$$(11) \quad \alpha r - 3\alpha + r^3 + 6r^2 + 9r + 1 \geq (r+3)ry_1.$$

Therefore, to obtain eq. (9) it is sufficient if we have

$$\alpha(r^3 + 2r^2 + 3r) \geq (r+1)^2(\alpha r - 3\alpha + r^3 + 6r^2 + 9r + 1) + r(r+2)^2$$

or, equivalently

$$(12) \quad \alpha(3r^2 + 8r + 3) \geq r^5 + 8r^4 + 23r^3 + 29r^2 + 15r + 1.$$

It is enough to verify that this inequality holds for the lower bounds of α .

Finally, we verify that $x_1 + y_1 \leq z$. We have

$$(r+3)(r+2)(x_1 + y_1) = (r+3)(3\alpha + (r+1)y_1) \leq (r+3)(4\alpha)$$

and

$$(r+2)(r+3)z \geq (r+2)6\alpha - (r+2)^2.$$

Therefore, it is enough to show that

$$(r+2)6\alpha - (r+2)^2 \geq (r+3)(4\alpha)$$

or, equivalently, that

$$(13) \quad 2\alpha r \geq r^2 + 4r + 4.$$

This holds by the assumed lower bounds on α . □

Proof of Claim 3. We have $(r+3)(r+2)(r+1)r(z-x_1-y_1) \geq (r+2)(r+1)r(6\alpha-(r+2)) - (r+3)(r+1)r(3\alpha+(r+1)y_1)$ and

$$(r+3)(r+2)(r+1)r\lceil\alpha/(r+1)\rceil \leq (r+3)(r+2)r(\alpha+r).$$

Thus, it is sufficient to show that

$$(r+2)(r+1)r(6\alpha-(r+2)) - (r+3)(r+1)r(3\alpha+(r+1)y_1) \geq (r+3)(r+2)r(\alpha+r)$$

or equivalently, that

$$\alpha(2r^3+r^2-3r) - 2r^4 - 10r^3 - 14r^2 - 4r \geq r(r+1)^2(r+3)y_1.$$

Recall from the proof of Claim 2 that $y_1 \leq 3r+3$ or we have eq. (11).

If $y_1 \leq 3r+3$, it is sufficient to show that

$$(14) \quad \alpha(2r^3+r^2-3r) - 2r^4 - 10r^3 - 14r^2 - 4r \geq 3r(r+1)^3(r+3).$$

This may be verified by using the lower bound for α . Assume that eq. (11) holds. We show that

$$\alpha(2r^3+r^2-3r) - 2r^4 - 10r^3 - 14r^2 - 4r \geq (\alpha r - 3\alpha + r^3 + 6r^2 + 9r + 1)(r+1)^2$$

or equivalently that

$$\alpha(r^3 + 2r^2 + 2r + 3) \geq r^5 + 10r^4 + 32r^3 + 39r^2 + 15r + 1.$$

Using the lower bounds for α we see that this inequality holds. \square

Proof of Claim 4.

$$\begin{aligned} (r+2)(r+3)(z' - z_1 + x_1) &= (r+2)(r+3)(z - z_1 - 4\alpha + (r+1)a) + (r+3)(3\alpha - y_1) \\ &\geq (r+2)(10\alpha) - (r+2)(6\alpha) - 4\alpha(r+2)(r+3) + (r+1)(r+3)(4\alpha - r - 1) + (r+3)(3\alpha - y_1) \\ &= \alpha(3r+5) - (r^3 + 5r^2 + 7r + 3) - (r+3)y_1. \end{aligned}$$

It is enough to show that

$$\alpha(3r+5)(r+1) \geq (r^3 + 5r^2 + 7r + 3)(r+1) + (r+3)\alpha$$

or equivalently

$$(3r^2 + 7r + 2)\alpha \geq r^4 + 6r^3 + 12r^2 + 10r + 3$$

which is true by the lower bounds on α and r . \square

Proof of Claim 7. We have

$$(r+2)(r+3)(a+b) = (r+3)((t+1)\alpha + (r+1)b) \leq (r+3)(t+1)\alpha + (r+1)^2(r+3)$$

and

$$(r+2)(r+3)z \geq (r+2) \left(\binom{t+2}{2} \alpha - (r+2) \right)$$

so it is sufficient to show that

$$(r+2) \left(\binom{t+2}{2} \alpha - (r+2) \right) \geq (r+3)(t+1)\alpha + (r+1)^2(r+3)$$

or equivalently, that

$$\alpha(t+1)(tr+2t-2) \geq 2(r+1)^2(r+3) + 2(r+2)^2.$$

It is enough to show the above inequality for $t=3$. Then it can be verified using the lower bounds on α from Lemma 9. \square

Proof of Claim 9. In order to obtain the first part of the claim, we to apply Lemma 7 item (a) with $(Y, \mathcal{L}) = (\mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^1, \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^1}(2a, 2))$, $z = z'$ and $u = \tilde{z}$. In particular, $r = 2$ and $\alpha = 3(2a + 1)$. We first verify that the pair (Y, \mathcal{L}) is not- s -secant defective for all $s \in \{z', \tilde{z}, \lfloor 3(2a + 1)/4 \rfloor\}$. By [LP13] only the $(2a + 1)$ -st secant variety of $(\mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^1, \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^1}(2a, 2))$ is defective. We have $\lfloor 3(2a + 1)/4 \rfloor \leq 2a$, $\tilde{z} \leq 2a$ and

$$(15) \quad z' \geq 2a + 2$$

In order to show eq. (15), it is sufficient to show that $4(18(2a + 1) - 4) - 5(4\bar{z} + \tilde{z}) - 15\tilde{z} \geq 20(2a + 2)$. Or equivalently, that $27(2a + 1) \geq 40a + 56 + 15\tilde{z}$. This inequality is true since $\tilde{z} \leq 3$ and $a \geq 6$.

Therefore, in order to show the first part of the claim it is sufficient to show that the following are true

$$(16) \quad 4(\lceil 18(2a + 1)/5 \rceil - \bar{z} - \tilde{z}) \leq 6(2a + 1) - 6$$

$$(17) \quad 4(\lceil 18(2a + 1)/5 \rceil - \bar{z} - \tilde{z}) + \tilde{z} \leq 6(2a + 1)$$

$$(18) \quad \tilde{z} \leq 2a + 1$$

$$(19) \quad \lceil 18(2a + 1)/5 \rceil - \bar{z} - \tilde{z} \leq 3(2a + 1) - 3\tilde{z}.$$

By definition $\tilde{z} \leq 3$, hence eq. (18) holds. It also implies that eq. (17) is a consequence of eq. (16). Furthermore, assuming that eq. (16) holds, in order to obtain eq. (19) it is sufficient to show that $6\tilde{z} \leq 3(2a + 1) + 3$. This holds since $a \geq 6$ and $\tilde{z} \leq 3$. Thus we are left with proving eq. (16). We have $20(\lceil 18(2a + 1)/5 \rceil - \bar{z} - \tilde{z}) \leq 4(18(2a + 1) + 4) - 5(4\bar{z} + \tilde{z}) - 15\tilde{z} = 27(2a + 1) + 16 - 15\tilde{z}$ and our goal is to show that this is at most equal to $30(2a + 1) - 30$. Equivalently, we need to show that $46 \leq 3(2a + 1) + 15\tilde{z}$. This holds since $\tilde{z} \geq 1$ and $a \geq 6$. \square

REFERENCES

- [AB11] E. Arrondo and A. Bernardi. On the variety parameterizing completely decomposable polynomials. *J. Pure Appl. Algebra*, 215(3):201–220, 2011.
- [Ådl87] B. Ådlandsvik. Joins and higher secant varieties. *Math. Scand.*, 61:213–222, 1987.
- [AH92a] J. Alexander and A. Hirschowitz. La méthode d’Horace éclatée: application à l’interpolation en degré quatre. *Invent. Math.*, 107(3):585–602, 1992.
- [AH92b] J. Alexander and A. Hirschowitz. Un lemme d’Horace différentiel: application aux singularités hyperquartiques de \mathbf{P}^5 . *J. Algebraic Geom.*, 1(3):411–426, 1992.
- [AH00] J. Alexander and A. Hirschowitz. An asymptotic vanishing theorem for generic unions of multiple points. *Invent. Math.*, 140(2):303–325, 2000.
- [AH11] T. Aladpoosh and H. Haghighi. On the dimension of higher secant varieties of Segre varieties $\mathbb{P}^n \times \dots \times \mathbb{P}^n$. *J. Pure Appl. Algebra*, 215(5):1040–1052, 2011.
- [AMR19] C. Araujo, A. Massarenti, and R. Rischter. On non-secant defectivity of Segre-Veronese varieties. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 371(4):2255–2278, 2019.
- [AOP09] H. Abo, G. Ottaviani, and C. Peterson. Induction for secant varieties of Segre varieties. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 361(2):767–792, 2009.
- [AOP12] H. Abo, G. Ottaviani, and C. Peterson. Non-defectivity of Grassmannians of planes. *J. Algebraic Geom.*, 21(1):1–20, 2012.
- [AV18] H. Abo and N. Vannieuwenhoven. Most secant varieties of tangential varieties to Veronese varieties are nondefective. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 370(1):393–420, 2018.
- [Bal05] E. Ballico. On the secant varieties to the tangent developable of a Veronese variety. *J. Algebra*, 288(2):279–286, 2005.
- [Bal23] E. Ballico. Partially symmetric tensors and the non-defectivity of secant varieties of products with a projective line as a factor, arXiv:2306.05932, 2023.
- [BBC12] E. Ballico, A. Bernardi, and M. V. Catalisano. Higher secant varieties of $\mathbb{P}^n \times \mathbb{P}^1$ embedded in bi-degree (a, b) . *Comm. Algebra*, 40(10):3822–3840, 2012.
- [BBCC13] E. Ballico, A. Bernardi, M.V. Catalisano, and L. Chiantini. Grassmann secants, identifiability, and linear systems of tensors. *Linear Algebra Appl.*, 438(1):121–135, 2013.

- [BC06] A. Bernardi and M.V. Catalisano. Some defective secant varieties to osculating varieties of Veronese surfaces. *Collect. Math.*, 57(1):43–68, 2006.
- [BCC11] A. Bernardi, E. Carlini, and M. V. Catalisano. Higher secant varieties of $\mathbb{P}^n \times \mathbb{P}^m$ embedded in bi-degree $(1, d)$. *J. Pure Appl. Algebra*, 215(12):2853–2858, 2011.
- [BCC⁺18] A. Bernardi, E. Carlini, M.V. Catalisano, A. Gimigliano, and A. Oneto. The Hitchhiker guide to: Secant varieties and tensor decomposition. *Mathematics*, 6(12), 2018.
- [BCGI07] A. Bernardi, M.V. Catalisano, A. Gimigliano, and M. Idà. Osculating varieties of Veronese varieties and their higher secant varieties. *Canad. J. Math.*, 59(3):488–502, 2007.
- [BCGI09] A. Bernardi, M. V. Catalisano, A. Gimigliano, and M. Idà. Secant varieties to osculating varieties of Veronese embeddings of \mathbb{P}^n . *J. Algebra*, 321(3):982–1004, 2009.
- [BD10] K. Baur and J. Draisma. Secant dimensions of low-dimensional homogeneous varieties. *Adv. Geom.*, 10(1):1–29, 2010.
- [BDHM17] A. Bernardi, N.S. Daleo, J.D. Hauenstein, and B. Mourrain. Tensor decomposition and homotopy continuation. *Differential Geom. Appl.*, 55:78–105, 2017.
- [Bor13] A. Boralevi. A note on secants of Grassmannians. *Rendicont. dell'Istituto Matematico dell'Università Trieste*, 45(1):67–72, 2013.
- [BV18] A. Bernardi and D. Vanzo. A new class of non-identifiable skew-symmetric tensors. *Ann. Mat. Pura Appl.*, 197(5):1499–1510, 2018.
- [CGG02a] M.V. Catalisano, A.V. Geramita, and A. Gimigliano. On the secant varieties to the tangential varieties of a Veronesean. *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 130(4):975–985, 2002.
- [CGG02b] M.V. Catalisano, A.V. Geramita, and A. Gimigliano. Ranks of tensors, secant varieties of Segre varieties and fat points. *Linear Algebra Appl.*, 355(1-3):263–285, 2002.
- [CGG05a] M. V. Catalisano, A. V. Geramita, and A. Gimigliano. Higher secant varieties of Segre-Veronese varieties. In *Projective varieties with unexpected properties*, pages 81–107. Walter de Gruyter, Berlin, 2005.
- [CGG05b] M.V. Catalisano, A.V. Geramita, and A. Gimigliano. Secant varieties of Grassmann varieties. *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 133(3):633–642, 2005.
- [CGG07] M. V. Catalisano, A. V. Geramita, and A. Gimigliano. Segre-Veronese embeddings of $\mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^1$ and their secant varieties. *Collect. Math.*, 58(1):1–24, 2007.
- [CGG08] M.V. Catalisano, A.V. Geramita, and A. Gimigliano. On the ideals of secant varieties to certain rational varieties. *J. Algebra*, 319(5):1913–1931, 2008.
- [CO20] M.V. Catalisano and A. Oneto. Tangential varieties of Segre-Veronese surfaces are never defective. *Rev. Mat. Complut.*, 33(1):295–324, 2020.
- [GO22] F. Galuppi and A. Oneto. Secant non-defectivity via collisions of fat points. *Adv. Math.*, 409(part B):Paper No. 108657, 2022.
- [GS] Daniel R. Grayson and Michael E. Stillman. Macaulay2, a software system for research in algebraic geometry. Available at <http://www.math.uiuc.edu/Macaulay2/>.
- [Har77] R. Hartshorne. *Algebraic Geometry*. Springer New York, 1977.
- [Lan12] J. M. Landsberg. *Tensors: geometry and applications*, volume 128 of *Graduate Studies in Mathematics*. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2012.
- [LMR22] A. Laface, A. Massarenti, and R. Rischter. On secant defectiveness and identifiability of Segre-Veronese varieties. *Rev. Mat. Iberoam.*, 38(5):1605–1635, 2022.
- [LP13] A. Laface and E. Postingshel. Secant varieties of Segre-Veronese embeddings of $(\mathbb{P}^1)^r$. *Math. Ann.*, 356(4):1455–1470, 2013.
- [Pal09] F. Palatini. Sulle varietà algebriche per le quali sono di dimensione minore dell' ordinario, senza riempire lo spazio ambiente, una o alcuna delle varietà formate da spazi seganti. *Atti Accad. Torino Cl. Sci. Mat. Fis. Nat.*, pages 362–375, 1909.
- [Ter11] A. Terracini. Sulle v_k per cui la varietà degli s_h $(h+1)$ -seganti ha dimensione minore dell'ordinario. *Rend. Circ. Mat. Palermo*, 31:392–396, 1911.
- [TV21] D.A. Torrance and N. Vannieuwenhoven. All secant varieties of the Chow variety are nondefective for cubics and quaternary forms. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 374(7):4815–4838, 2021.
- [Zak93] F.L. Zak. *Tangents and secants of algebraic varieties*, volume 127. 1993.

(E. Ballico, A. Bernardi) UNIVERSITÀ DI TRENTO, VIA SOMMARIVE, 14 - 38123 POVO (TRENTO), ITALY.

(T. Mańdziuk) UNIVERSITÀ DI TRENTO, VIA SOMMARIVE, 14 - 38123 POVO (TRENTO), ITALY, AND UNIVERSITY OF WARSAW, BANACHA 2, 02-097 WARSAW, POLAND.

Email address: edoardo.ballico@unitn.it, alessandra.bernardi@unitn.it, tomasz.mandziuk@unitn.it