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Abstract. Let a set of nodes $\mathcal{X}$ in plain be $n$-independent, i.e., each node has a fundamental polynomial of degree $n$. Suppose also that $|\mathcal{X}| = d(n, k - 2) + 2$, where $d(n, k - 2) = (n + 1) + n + \cdots + (n - k + 4)$ and $k \leq n - 1$. In this paper we prove that there can be at most 4 linearly independent curves of degree less than or equal to $k$ passing through all the nodes of $\mathcal{X}$. We provide a characterization of the case when there are exactly four such curves. Namely, we prove that then the set $\mathcal{X}$ has a very special construction: All its nodes but two belong to a (maximal) curve of degree $k - 2$.

At the end, an important application to the Gasca-Maeztu conjecture is provided.

1. Introduction

Denote the space of all bivariate polynomials of total degree $\leq n$ by $\Pi_n$:

$$\Pi_n = \left\{ \sum_{i+j \leq n} a_{ij} x^i y^j \right\}.$$

We have that

$$N := N_n := \dim \Pi_n = (1/2)(n + 1)(n + 2).$$

Consider a set of $s$ distinct nodes

$$\mathcal{X} = \mathcal{X}_s = \{(x_1, y_1), (x_2, y_2), \ldots, (x_s, y_s)\}.$$

The problem of finding a polynomial $p \in \Pi_n$ which satisfies the conditions

$$p(x_i, y_i) = c_i, \quad i = 1, \ldots, s,$$

is called interpolation problem.

A polynomial $p \in \Pi_n$ is called a fundamental polynomial for a node $A \in \mathcal{X}$ if

$$p(A) = 1 \quad \text{and} \quad p|_{\mathcal{X}\setminus\{A\}} = 0,$$

where $p|_{\mathcal{X}}$ means the restriction of $p$ on $\mathcal{X}$. We denote the fundamental polynomial by $p^*_A$. Sometimes we call fundamental also a polynomial that
vanishes at all nodes of $\mathcal{X}$ but one, since it is a nonzero constant times a fundamental polynomial.

**Definition 1.1.** The interpolation problem with a set of nodes $\mathcal{X}_s$ and $\Pi_n$ is called $n$-poised if for any data $(c_1, \ldots, c_s)$ there is a unique polynomial $p \in \Pi_n$ satisfying the interpolation conditions (1.1).

A necessary condition of poisedness is $|\mathcal{X}_s| = s = N$.

**Proposition 1.2.** A set of nodes $\mathcal{X}_N$ is $n$-poised if and only if $p \in \Pi_n$ and $p|_{\mathcal{X}_N} = 0 \implies p = 0$.

Next, let us consider the concept of $n$-independence (see [3], [5]).

**Definition 1.3.** A set of nodes $\mathcal{X}$ is called $n$-independent if all its nodes have $n$-fundamental polynomials. Otherwise, it is called $n$-dependent.

Fundamental polynomials are linearly independent. Therefore a necessary condition of $n$-independence of $\mathcal{X}_s$ is $s \leq N$.

## 2. Some properties of $n$-independent nodes

Let us start with the following simple

**Lemma 2.1** (e.g., [6] Lemma 2.2). Suppose that a node set $\mathcal{X}$ is $n$-independent and a node $A \notin \mathcal{X}$ has $n$-fundamental polynomial with respect to the set $\mathcal{X} \cup \{A\}$. Then the latter node set is $n$-independent, too.

Denote the distance between the points $A$ and $B$ by $\rho(A, B)$. Let us bring the following (see e.g., [4], [8])

**Lemma 2.2.** Suppose that $\mathcal{X}_s = \{A_i\}_{i=1}^s$ is an $n$-independent set. Then there is a number $\epsilon > 0$ such that any set $\mathcal{X}''_s = \{A_i''\}_{i=1}^s$, with the property that $\rho(A_i, A_i'') < \epsilon$, $i = 1, \ldots, s$, is $n$-independent too.

Next result concerns the extension of $n$-independent sets

**Lemma 2.3** (e.g., [5], Lemma 2.1). Any $n$-independent set $\mathcal{X}$ with $|\mathcal{X}| < N$ can be enlarged to an $n$-poised set.

In the sequel we will need the following modification of the above result.

**Lemma 2.4.** Given $n$-independent sets $\mathcal{X}_{s_i}$, $i = 1, \ldots, m$, where $|\mathcal{X}_{s_i}| = s_i < N$, a node $A$, and any number $\epsilon > 0$. Then there is a node $A'$, such that $\rho(A, A') < \epsilon$ and each set $\mathcal{X}_{s_i} \cup \{A\}$, $i = 1, \ldots, m$, is $n$-independent.

**Proof.** Let us use induction with respect to the number of sets: $m$. Suppose that we have one set $\mathcal{X}_s$. Since $s < N$, there is a nonzero polynomial $p \in \Pi_n$ such that $p|_{\mathcal{X}_s} = 0$. Now evidently there is a node $B \notin \mathcal{X}$, such that $\rho(A, B) < \epsilon$ and $p(B) \neq 0$. Thus $p$ is an $n$-fundamental polynomial of the node $B$ with respect to the set $\mathcal{X} \cup \{B\}$. Hence, in view of Lemma 2.1 the set $\mathcal{X}_s \cup \{B\}$ is $n$-independent. Then, assume that Lemma is true in the
case of \( m - 1 \) sets, i.e., there is a node \( B \), such that \( \rho(A, B) < (1/2)\epsilon \) and each set \( X_s \cup \{ B \}, \ i = 1, \ldots, m - 1 \), is \( n \)-independent. In view of Lemma 2.2, there is a number \( \epsilon' < (1/2)\epsilon \) such that for any \( C \), with \( \rho(C, B) < \epsilon' \), each set \( X_s \cup \{ C \}, \ i = 1, \ldots, m - 1 \), is \( n \)-independent. Next, in view of first step of induction, there is a node \( A' \) such that \( \rho(A', B) < (1/2)\epsilon \) and the set \( X_{s_n} \cup \{ A' \} \) is \( n \)-independent. Now, it is easily seen that \( A' \) is a desirable node. \( \Box \)

Denote the linear space of polynomials of total degree at most \( n \) vanishing on \( X \) by

\[ P_{n,X} = \{ p \in \Pi_n : p|_X = 0 \}. \]

The following two propositions are well-known.

**Proposition 2.5** (e.g., [5]). For any node set \( X \) we have that

\[ \dim P_{n,X} = N - |Y|, \]

where \( Y \) is a maximal \( n \)-independent subset of \( X \).

**Proposition 2.6.** Assume that \( \ell \) is a line and \( X_{n+1} \) is any subset of \( \ell \) containing \( n + 1 \) points. Then we have that

\[ p \in \Pi_n \text{ and } p|_{X_{n+1}} = 0 \implies p = \ell r, \]

where \( r \in \Pi_{n-1} \).

A plane algebraic curve is the zero set of some bivariate polynomial. To simplify notation, we shall use the same letter \( p \), say, to denote the polynomial \( p \) of degree \( \geq 1 \) and the curve given by the equation \( p(x, y) = 0 \).

Set \( d(n, k) := N_n - N_{n-k} = (1/2)k(2n + 3 - k) \). The following is a generalization of Proposition 2.6.

**Proposition 2.7** ([9], Prop. 3.1). Let \( q \) be an algebraic curve of degree \( k \leq n \) without multiple components. Then the following hold.

i) Any subset of \( q \) containing more than \( d(n, k) \) nodes is \( n \)-dependent.

ii) Any subset \( X_d \) of \( q \) containing exactly \( d = d(n, k) \) nodes is \( n \)-independent if and only if the following condition holds:

\[ p \in \Pi_n \text{ and } p|_{X_d} = 0 \implies p = qr, \]

where \( r \in \Pi_{n-k} \).

Thus, according to Proposition 2.7 i), at most \( d(n, k) \) nodes of \( X \) can lie in the curve \( q \) of degree \( k \leq n \). This motivates the following definition.

**Definition 2.8** ([9], Def. 3.1). Given an \( n \)-independent set of nodes \( X_s \), with \( s \geq d(n, k) \). A curve of degree \( k \leq n \) passing through \( d(n, k) \) points of \( X_s \), is called maximal.

We say that a node \( A \) of an \( n \)-poised set \( X \) uses a line \( \ell \) if the latter divides the fundamental polynomial of \( A \), i.e., \( p_A^* = \ell q \), for some \( q \in \Pi_{n-1} \).

Next, we bring a characterization of maximal curves:
Proposition 2.9 ([9], Prop. 3.3). Let a node set \( X \) be \( n \)-poised. Then a polynomial \( \mu \) of degree \( k, k \leq n \), is a maximal curve if and only if it is used by any node in \( X \setminus \mu \).

Proposition 2.10 ([8], Prop. 3.5). Assume that \( \sigma \) is an algebraic curve of degree \( k \), without multiple components, and \( X_s \subset \sigma \) is any \( n \)-independent node set of cardinality \( s, s < d(n, k) \). Then the set \( X_s \) can be extended to a maximal \( n \)-independent set \( X_d \subset \sigma \) of cardinality \( d = d(n, k) \).

Finally, let us bring a well-known

Lemma 2.11. Suppose that \( m \) linearly independent curves pass through all the nodes of \( X \). Then for any node \( A \notin X \) there are \( m - 1 \) linearly independent curves, belonging to the linear span of given curves, passing through \( A \) and all the nodes of \( X \).

3. Main result

Let us start with the following result from [7] (see also, [1]).

Theorem 3.1 ([7], Thm. 1). Assume that \( X \) is an \( n \)-independent set of \( d(n, k - 1) + 2 \) nodes lying in a curve of degree \( k \) with \( k \leq n \). Then the curve is determined uniquely by these nodes.

Next result in this series is the following

Theorem 3.2 ([8], Thm. 4.2). Assume that \( X \) is an \( n \)-independent set of \( d(n, k - 1) + 1 \) nodes with \( k \leq n - 1 \). Then two different curves of degree \( k \) pass through all the nodes of \( X \) if and only if all the nodes of \( X \) but one lie in a maximal curve of degree \( k - 1 \).

Now let us present the main result of this paper:

Theorem 3.3. Assume that \( X \) is an \( n \)-independent set of \( d(n, k - 2) + 2 \) nodes with \( k \leq n - 1 \). Then four linearly independent curves of degree less than or equal to \( k \) pass through all the nodes of \( X \) if and only if all the nodes of \( X \) but two lie in a maximal curve of degree \( k - 2 \).

Let us mention that the inverse implication here is evident. Indeed, assume that \( d(n, k - 2) \) nodes of \( X \) are located in a curve \( \mu \) of degree \( k - 2 \). Therefore the curve \( \mu \) is maximal and the remaining two nodes of \( X \), denoted by \( A \) and \( B \), are outside of it: \( A, B \notin \mu \). Hence we have that

\[
P_{k,X} = \{ p : p \in \Pi_k, p(A) = p(B) = 0 \} = \{ q\mu : q \in \Pi_2, q(A) = q(B) = 0 \}.
\]

Thus we readily get that

\[
\dim P_{k,X} = \dim \{ q \in \Pi_2 : q(A) = q(B) = 0 \} = \dim P_{2,\{A,B\}} = 6 - 2 = 4.
\]

In the last equality we use the fact that any two nodes are 2-independent. We get also that there can be at most 4 linearly independent curves of degree \( \leq k \) passing through all the nodes of \( X \).

Before starting the proof of Theorem 3.3 let us present two lemmas.
Lemma 3.4. Assume that $\mathcal{X}$ is an $n$-independent node set and a node $A \in \mathcal{X}$ has an $n$-fundamental polynomial $p^*_A$ such that $p^*_A(A') \neq 0$. Then we can replace the node $A$ with $A'$ such that the resulted set $\mathcal{X}' := \mathcal{X} \cup \{A\} \setminus \{A\}$ is again an $n$-independent. In particular, such replacement can be done in the following two cases:

i) If a node $A \in \mathcal{X}$ belongs to several components of $\sigma$ then we can replace it with a node $A'$, which belongs only to one component of $\sigma$;

ii) If a curve $q$ is not a component of an $n$-fundamental polynomial $p^*_A$ then we can replace the node $A$ with a node $A'$ lying in $q$.

Proof. Indeed, notice that $p^*_A(A') \neq 0$ means that $p^*_A$ is a fundamental polynomial also for the node $A'$ with respect to the set $\mathcal{X}'$. Next, for (i) note that a fundamental polynomial of a node $A$ differs from 0 in a neighborhood of $A$. Finally, for (ii) note that $q$ is not a component of $p^*_A$ means that there is a point $A' \in q$ such that $p^*_A(A') \neq 0$. \hfill $\square$

Lemma 3.5. Assume that the hypotheses of Theorem \cite{J3} hold and assume additionally that there is a curve $q_{k-1} \in \Pi_{k-1}$ passing through all the nodes of $\mathcal{X}$. Then all the nodes of $\mathcal{X}$ but two lie in a maximal curve $\mu$ of degree $k - 2$.

Proof. First note that the curve $q_{k-1}$ is of exact degree $k - 1$, since it passes through more than $d(n, k - 2)$ $n$-independent nodes. This implies also that $q_{k-1}$ has no multiple component. Therefore we can extend the set $\mathcal{X}$ till a maximal $n$-independent set $\mathcal{Y} \subset q_{k-1}$, by adding $n - k + 1$ nodes, i.e.,

$$\mathcal{Y} = \mathcal{X} \cup \mathcal{A},$$

where $\mathcal{A} = \{A_0, \ldots, A_{n-k}\}$.

In view of Lemma \cite{J3} i), we may suppose that the nodes from $\mathcal{A}$ are not intersection points of the components of the curve $q_{k-1}$.

Next, we are going to prove that these $n-k+1$ nodes are collinear together with $m \geq 2$ nodes from $\mathcal{X}$.

To this end denote the line through the nodes $A_0$ and $A_1$ by $\ell_{01}$. Then for each $i = 2, \ldots, n-k$, choose a line $\ell_i$ passing through the node $A_i$ which is not a component of $q_{k-1}$. We require also that each line passes through only one of the mentioned nodes and therefore the lines are distinct.

Now suppose that $p \in \Pi_k$ vanishes on $\mathcal{X}$. Consider the polynomial $r = p\ell_{01}\ell_2 \cdots \ell_{n-k}$. We have that $r \in \Pi_n$ and $r$ vanishes on the node set $\mathcal{Y}$, which is a maximal $n$-independent set in the curve $q_{k-1}$. Therefore we obtain that $r = q_{k-1}s$, where $s \in \Pi_{n-k+1}$. Thus we have that

$$p\ell_{01}\ell_2 \cdots \ell_{n-k} = q_{k-1}s.$$}

The lines $\ell_i$, $i = 2, \ldots, n-k$, are not components of $q_{k-1}$. Therefore they are components of the polynomial $s$. Thus we obtain that

$$p\ell_{01} = q_{k-1}\beta, \text{ where } \beta \in \Pi_2.$$
Now let us verify that $\ell_{01}$ is a component of $q_{k-1}$. Indeed, otherwise it is a component of the conic $\beta$ and we get that

$$p \in \Pi_k, \ p|_\mathcal{X} = 0 \implies \ p = q_{k-1} \ell, \text{ where } \ell \in \Pi_1.$$  

Therefore we get $\dim P_{k,X} = 3$, which contradicts the hypothesis.

Thus we conclude that

$$q_{k-1} = \ell_{01} q_{k-2} \text{ where } q_{k-2} \in \Pi_{k-2}.$$  

The curve $q_{k-2}$ passes through at most $d(n, k-2)$ nodes from $\mathcal{X}$. Hence we get that at least 2 nodes from $\mathcal{X}$ belong to the line $\ell_{01}$.

Next we will show that exactly 2 nodes from $\mathcal{X}$ belong to $\ell_{01}$, which will prove Lemma.

Assume by way of contradiction that at least 3 nodes from $\mathcal{X}$ lie in $\ell_{01}$.

First let us show that all the nodes of $A$ belong to $\ell_{01}$. Suppose conversely that a node from $A$, say $A_2$, does not belong to the line $\ell_{01}$. Then in the same way as in the case of the line $\ell_{01}$ we get that $\ell_{02}$ is a component of $q_{k-1}$. Thus the node $A_0$ is an intersection point of two components of $q_{k-1}$, i.e., $\ell_{01}$ and $\ell_{02}$, which contradicts our assumption.

Next let us verify that in the beginning we could choose a non-collinear $n$-independent set $A \subset q_{k-1}$, which will be a contradiction and will complete the proof. To this end let us prove that one can move any node of $A$, say $A_0$, from $\ell_{01}$ to the other component $q_{k-2}$, such that the resulted set $A$ remains $n$-independent.

In view of Lemma 3.4 ii), for this we need to find an $n$-fundamental polynomial of $A_0$ for which $q_{k-2}$ is not a component. Let us show that any fundamental polynomial of $A_0$ has this property. Indeed, suppose conversely that for an $n$-fundamental polynomial $p_{A_0}^* \in \Pi_n$ the curve $q_{k-2}$ is a component, i.e., $p_{A_0}^* = q_{k-2} r$, where $r \in \Pi_{n-k+2}$. We get from here that $r$ vanishes at all the nodes in $\mathcal{Y} \cap \ell_{01}$ except $A_0$. Thus $r$ vanishes at $\geq 3 + (n-k+1) - 1 = n - k + 3$ nodes in $\ell$. Therefore, in view of Proposition 2.6, $r$ vanishes at all the points of $\ell_{01}$ including $A_0$, which is a contradiction. \(\square\)

Now we are in a position to present

Proof of Theorem 3.3. Recall that it remains to prove the direct implication. Let $\sigma_1, \ldots, \sigma_4$ be the four curves of degree $\leq k$ that pass through all the nodes of the $n$-independent set $\mathcal{X}$ with $|\mathcal{X}| = d(n, k-2) + 2$.

First we will consider

The case $n \geq k + 2$.

Let us start by choosing three nodes $B_1, B_2, B_3 \notin \mathcal{X}$ such that the following four conditions are satisfied:

(i) The set $\mathcal{X} \cup \{B_1, B_2, B_3\}$ is $n$-independent;

(ii) The nodes $B_1, B_2, B_3$, are non-collinear;

(iii) Each line through $B_i$ and $B_j$, $1 \leq i < j \leq 3$, does not pass through any node from $\mathcal{X}$;
(iv) For any subset $A \subset \mathcal{X}$, $|A| = 3$ the set $A \cup \{B_1, B_2, B_3\}$ is 2-poised. Let us verify that one can find such nodes. Indeed, in view of Lemma 2.23 we can start by choosing some nodes $B_i'$, $i = 1, 2, 3$, satisfying the condition (i). Then, according to Lemma 2.2 for some positive $\epsilon$ all the nodes in $\epsilon$ neighborhoods of $B_i'$, $i = 1, 2, 3$, satisfy the condition (i). Next, by using Lemma 2.4 3 times, for the nodes $B_i'$, $i = 1, 2, 3$, consecutively, we obtain that there are nodes $B_i''$, $i = 1, 2, 3$, satisfying the condition (iv) and $\rho(B_i'', B_i') < (1/2)\epsilon$, $i = 1, 2, 3$. Now notice that both conditions (i) and (iv) are satisfied for $B_i''$, $i = 1, 2, 3$. Then, according to Lemma 2.2 for some positive $\epsilon' > 0$ all the nodes in $\epsilon'$ neighborhoods of $B_i''$, $i = 1, 2, 3$, satisfy the conditions (i) and (iv). Finally, from these $\epsilon'$ neighborhoods we can choose the nodes $B_i$, $i = 1, 2, 3$, satisfying the conditions (ii), (iii), too.

Note that, in view of Proposition 1.2 the condition (iv) means that

(v) Any conic through the triple $B_1, B_2, B_3$ passes through at most two nodes from $\mathcal{X}$.

Next, in view of Proposition 2.11 there is a curve of degree at most $k$, denoted by $\sigma$, which passes through all the nodes of $\mathcal{X}' := \mathcal{X} \cup \{B_1, B_2, B_3\}$.

Now notice that the curve $\sigma$ passes through more than $d(n, k - 2)$ nodes and therefore its degree equals either to $k - 1$ or $k$. By taking into account Lemma 3.5 we may assume that the degree of the curve $\sigma$ equals to $k$. Evidently, in view of Lemma 3.5 we may assume also that $\sigma$ has no multiple component.

Therefore, by using Proposition 2.10 we can extend the set $\mathcal{X}'$ till a maximal $n$-independent set $\mathcal{X}'' \subset \sigma$. Notice that, since $|\mathcal{X}''| = d(n, k)$, we need to add a set of $d(n, k) - (d(n, k - 2) + 2) - 3 = 2(n - k)$ nodes to $\mathcal{X}'$, denoted by $A := \{A_1, \ldots, A_{2(n-k)}\}$: $\mathcal{X}'' := \mathcal{X} \cup \{B_1, B_2, B_3\} \cup A$.

Thus the curve $\sigma$ becomes maximal with respect to this set. In view of Lemma 3.4 i), we require that each node of $A$ may belong only to one component of the curve $\sigma$.

Then, by using Lemma 2.11 we get a curve $\sigma_0$ of degree at most $k$, different from $\sigma$ that passes through all the nodes of $\mathcal{X}$ and two more arbitrary nodes, which will be specified below.

Now we intend to divide the set of nodes $A$ into $n - k$ pairs such that the lines $\ell_1, \ldots, \ell_{n-k-1}$ through $n - k - 1$ pairs from them, respectively, are not components of $\sigma$. The remaining pair we associate with the curve $\sigma_0$. More precisely, we require that $\sigma_0$ passes through the two nodes of the last pair.

Before establishing the mentioned division of $A$ let us verify how we can finish the proof by using it. Denote by $\beta$ the conic through the triple of the nodes $B_1, B_2, B_3$ and the pair of nodes associated with the line $\ell_{n-k-1}$. Notice that the following polynomial

$$\sigma_0 \beta \ell_1 \ell_2 \ldots \ell_{n-k-2}$$

of degree $n$ vanishes at all the $d(n, k)$ nodes of $\mathcal{X}'' \subset \sigma$. Consequently, according to Proposition 2.7 $\sigma$ divides this polynomial:

$$\sigma_0 \beta \ell_1 \ell_2 \ldots \ell_{n-k-2} = \sigma q, \quad q \in \Pi_{n-k}. \tag{3.1}$$
The distinct lines $\ell_1, \ell_2, \ldots, \ell_{n-k-2}$, do not divide the polynomial $\sigma \in \Pi_k$, therefore all they have to divide $q \in \Pi_{n-k}$. Therefore, we get from (3.1):

\begin{equation}
\sigma_0 \beta = \sigma \beta', \text{ where } \beta' \in \Pi_2.
\end{equation}

Now, suppose first that the conic $\beta$ is irreducible. Since the curves $\sigma$ and $\sigma_0$ are different the conics $\beta$ and $\beta'$ are also different. Therefore the conic $\beta$ has to divide $\sigma \in \Pi_k$:

\begin{equation}
\sigma = \beta r, \quad r \in \Pi_{k-2}.
\end{equation}

Now, we derive from this relation that the curve $r$ passes through all the nodes of the set $X$ but two. Indeed, $\sigma$ passes through all the nodes of $X$. Therefore these nodes are either in the curve $r$ or in the conic $\beta$. But the latter conic passes through the triple of nodes $B_1, B_2, B_3$, and according to the condition (iv), it passes through at most two nodes of $X$. Thus $r$ passes through at least $d(n, k-2)$ nodes of $X$. Since $r$ is a curve of degree $k-2$ we conclude that $r$ is a maximal curve and passes through exactly $d(n, k-2)$ nodes of $X$.

Next suppose that the conic $\beta$ is reducible. Consider first the case when the pair of nodes associated with the line $\ell_{n-k-1}$ is collinear with a node from the triple $B_1, B_2, B_3$, say with $B_1$. Thus we have that $\beta = \ell_{n-k-1} \ell$, where the line $\ell$ passes through the nodes $B_2, B_3$.

The line $\ell_{n-k-1}$ does not divide the polynomial $\sigma \in \Pi_k$, therefore it has to divide $\beta'$. Thus we get from the relation (3.2) that

\begin{equation}
\sigma_0 \ell = \sigma \ell', \text{ where } \ell' \in \Pi_2.
\end{equation}

Now, the lines $\ell$ and $\ell'$ are different so $\ell$ has to divide $\sigma \in \Pi_k$:

\begin{equation}
\sigma = \ell r, \quad r \in \Pi_{k-1}.
\end{equation}

In view of above condition (iii) the line $\ell$ does not pass through any node of $X$. Therefore the curve $r$ of degree $k - 1$ passes through all the nodes of $X$. Thus the proof of Theorem is completed in view of Lemma 3.5.

Observe that we may conclude from here that any line component of the curve $\sigma$, as well as of the curve $\sigma_0$, passes through at least a node from $X$.

Thus, in view of (iii) the (three) lines through two nodes from $\{B_1, B_2, B_3\}$ are not a component of $\sigma$. Hence, in view of Lemma 3.4 we may assume that the nodes of $A$ do not belong to these three lines. Consequently, no extra case of a reducible $\beta$ is possible.

Next let us establish the above mentioned division of the node set $A$ into $n - k$ pairs such that the lines $\ell_1, \ldots, \ell_{n-k-1}$ through $n - k - 1$ pairs from them, respectively, are not components of $\sigma$. Thus we need to have pairs of nodes not belonging to the same line component of $\sigma$. Consider all the line components of the curve $\sigma$. Recall that each of such components $\ell$ passes through at least a node from $X$.

Recall that the nodes of $A$ belong only to one component of the curve $\sigma$. Therefore the line components do not intersect at the nodes of $A$. By using induction on $n - k$ it can be proved easily that the mentioned division of $A$
into \( n - k \) pairs is possible if and only if no \( n - k \) nodes of \( A \) are located in a line component. Observe also that we may get a desired set \( A \) by removing from it any two nodes, by considering them as associated with the above described curve \( \sigma_0 \). Note that there can be at most two undesirable line components, i.e., containing each \( n - k \) nodes from \( A \). In this case one node from each of the two components we associate with \( \sigma_0 \).

Suppose that there is only one undesirable line component with \( n - k \) or \( n - k + 1 \) nodes. Then one or two nodes from here we associate with \( \sigma_0 \), respectively.

Finally consider the case of one undesirable line component \( \ell \) with \( m \geq n - k + 2 \) nodes. We have that \( \sigma = \ell q \), where \( q \in \Pi_{k-1} \) is a component of \( \sigma \). Now, in view of Lemma 3.4 ii), we will move \( m - n + k - 1 \) nodes, one by one, from \( \ell \) to the component \( q \). For this it suffices to prove that during this process any node \( A \in \ell \cap A \), has no fundamental polynomial for which the curve \( q \) is a component. Suppose conversely that \( p_A^* = qr \), \( r \in \Pi_{n-k+1} \).

Now, we have that \( r \) vanishes at \( \geq n - k + 1 \) nodes in \( \ell \cap A \setminus \{ A \} \), and at least at a node from \( \ell \cap X \) mentioned above. Thus \( r \) together with \( p_A^* \) vanishes at the whole line \( \ell \), including the node \( A \), which is a contradiction.

It remains to note that there will be no more undesirable line, except \( \ell \), in the resulted set \( A \) after the described movement of the nodes, since we keep exactly \( n - k + 1 \) nodes in \( \ell \cap A \).

Finally, let us consider

**The case** \( n = k + 1 \).

Consider three collinear nodes \( B_1, B_2, B_3 \notin X \) such that the following two conditions are satisfied:

(i)' The set \( X \cup \{B_1, B_2, B_3\} \) is \( n \)-independent;

(ii)' The line through \( B_i, i = 1, 2, 3 \), does not pass through any node from \( X \).

Let us verify that one can find such nodes \( B_1, B_2, B_3 \), or the conclusion of Theorem 3.3 holds. Indeed, in view of Lemma 2.3 we can start by choosing some two nodes \( B'_i, i = 1, 2 \), such that

(i)'' The set \( X \cup \{B_1, B_2\} \) is \( n \)-independent.

Then, according to Lemma 2.2 for some positive \( \epsilon \) all the nodes in \( \epsilon \) neighborhoods of \( B'_i, i = 1, 2 \), satisfy (i)''. Thus, from this neighborhoods we can choose the nodes \( B_i, i = 1, 2 \), such that the line through them: \( \ell_0 \) does not pass through any node from \( X \); Now, it remains to prove Theorem 3.3 by assuming that there is no node \( B_3 \in \ell_0 \) such that the condition (i)' holds.

Indeed, this means that any polynomial \( p \in \Pi_n \) vanishing on \( X \cup \{B_1, B_2\} \) vanishes identically on \( \ell_0 \). In view of Lemma 2.11 we may choose a such polynomial \( p \) from the linear span of four linearly independent curves of the hypothesis. Then we get that \( p \in \Pi_k \), \( p|_{\ell_0} = 0 \). Thus we have \( p = \ell_0 q \), where \( q \in \Pi_{k-1} \). Now, in view of (ii)' we readily deduce that the curve \( q \) of degree \( \leq k - 1 \) passes through all the nodes of \( X \). Thus the proof of Theorem is completed in view of Lemma 3.5.
Now we may assume that we have three collinear nodes $B_1, B_2, B_3 \not\in \mathcal{X}$ satisfying the conditions $(i)'$ and $(ii)'$.

Next, as in the previous case, we get a curve of degree $k$, denoted by $\sigma$, which has no multiple component and passes through all the nodes of $\mathcal{X}' := \mathcal{X} \cup \{B_1, B_2, B_3\}$. Then, by using Proposition 2.10 we extend the set $\mathcal{X}'$ till a maximal $n$-independent set $\mathcal{X}'' = \mathcal{X}' \cup \mathcal{A} \subset \sigma$. Note that $|\mathcal{A}| = 2$ in this case.

Then, as in the previous case, we get a curve $\sigma_0$, of degree $k$, different from $\sigma$, passing through all the nodes of the set $\mathcal{X}'$ and two nodes of $\mathcal{A}$. Then, as in the previous case, we get a curve $\sigma_0'$ of degree $k$, different from $\sigma$, passing through all the nodes of the set $\mathcal{X}$ and two nodes of $\mathcal{A}$.

Now, observe that the polynomial $\sigma_0' \ell_0 \in \Pi_{n-1}$ vanishes on the maximal $n = (k + 1)$-independent set $\mathcal{X}'' \subset \sigma$. Therefore we have that $\sigma_0' \ell_0 = \sigma' \ell$, where $\ell \in \Pi_1$. Since $\sigma_0$ and $\sigma'$ are different so are also $\ell_0$ and $\ell$. Thus $\ell_0$ is a component of $\sigma$, i.e., $\sigma = \ell_0 r$, where $r \in \Pi_{k-1}$. Now, in view of above condition $(ii)'$ the line $\ell_0$ does not pass through any node of $\mathcal{X}$. Therefore the curve $r$ of degree $k - 1$ passes through all the nodes of $\mathcal{X}$. Thus the proof of Theorem is completed in view of Lemma 3.5.

4. **An application to the Gasca-Maeztu conjecture**

Recall that a node $A \in \mathcal{X}$ uses a line $\ell$ means that $\ell$ is a factor of the fundamental polynomial $p = p_A^* \star A$, i.e., $p = \ell r$, for some $r \in \Pi_{n-1}$.

A $GC_n$-set in plane is an $n$-poised set of nodes where the fundamental polynomial of each node is a product of $n$ linear factors.

The Gasca-Maeztu conjecture states that any $GC_n$-set possesses a subset of $n + 1$ collinear nodes.

It was proved in [2] that any line passing through exactly 2 nodes of a $GC_n$-set $\mathcal{X}$ can be used at most by one node from $\mathcal{X}$.

It was proved in [7] that any used line passing through exactly 3 nodes of a $GC_n$-set $\mathcal{X}$ can be used either by exactly one or three nodes from $\mathcal{X}$.

Below we consider the case of lines passing through exactly 4 nodes.

**Corollary 4.1.** Let $\mathcal{X}$ be an $n$-poised set of nodes and $\ell$ be a line which passes through exactly 4 nodes. Suppose $\ell$ is used by at least four nodes from $\mathcal{X}$. Then it is used by exactly six nodes from $\mathcal{X}$. Moreover, if it is used by six nodes, then they form a 2-poised set. Furthermore, in the latter case, if $\mathcal{X}$ is a $GC_n$ set then the six nodes form a $GC_2$ set.

**Proof.** Assume that $\ell \cap \mathcal{X} = \{A_1, \ldots, A_4\} =: \mathcal{A}$. Assume also that the four nodes in $B := \{B_1, \ldots, B_4\} \in \mathcal{X}$ use the line $\ell : p_{B_i}^* = \ell q_i$, $i = 1, \ldots, 4$, where $q_i \in \Pi_{n-1}$.

The polynomials $q_1, \ldots, q_4$, vanish at $N - 8$ nodes of the set $\mathcal{X}' := \mathcal{X} \setminus (\mathcal{A} \cup \mathcal{B})$. Hence through these $N - 8 = d(n, n - 3) + 2$ nodes pass four linearly independent curves of degree $n - 1$. By Theorem 3.3 there exists a maximal curve $\mu$ of degree $n - 3$ passing through $N - 10$ nodes of $\mathcal{X}'$ and the remaining two nodes denoted by $C_1, C_2$, are outside of it. Now, according

□
to Proposition 2.3, the nodes $C_1, C_2$, use $\mu$:

$$p^*_C = \mu r_i, \ r_i \in \Pi_3, \ i = 1, 2.$$ 

This polynomials $r_i$ have to vanish at the four nodes of $A \subset \ell$. Hence $q_i = \ell \beta_i, \ i = 1, 2$, with $\beta_i \in \Pi_2$. Therefore, the nodes $C_1, C_2$ use the line $\ell$:

$$p^*_C = \mu \ell \beta_i, \ i = 1, 2.$$ 

Hence if four nodes in $B \subset X$ use the line $\ell$ then there exist two more nodes $C_1, C_2 \in X$ using it and all the nodes of $Y := X \setminus (A \cup B \cup \{C_1, C_2\})$ lie in a maximal curve $\mu$ of degree $n - 3$:

$$Y \subset \mu.$$ 

Next, let us show that there is no seventh node using $\ell$. Assume by way of contradiction that except of the six nodes in $S := \{B_1, \ldots, B_4, C_1, C_2\}$, there is a seventh node $D$ using $\ell$. Of course we have that $D \in Y$.

Then we have that the four nodes $B_1, B_2, B_3$ and $D$ are using $\ell$ therefore, as was proved above, there exist two more nodes $E_1, E_2 \in X$ (which may coincide or not with $B_4$ or $C_1, C_2$) using it and all the nodes of $Y' := X \setminus (A \cup \{B_1, B_2, B_3, D, E_1, E_2\})$ lie in a maximal curve $\mu'$ of degree $n - 3$.

We have also that

$$p^*_D = \mu' q', \ q' \in \Pi_3.$$ 

Now, notice that both the curves $\mu$ and $\mu'$ pass through all the nodes of the set $Z := X \setminus (A \cup B \cup \{C_1, C_2, D, E_1, E_2\})$ with $|Z| \geq N - 13$.

Then, we get from Theorem 3.1, with $k = n - 4$, that $N - 13 = d(n, n - 4) + 2$ nodes determine the curve of degree $n - 3$ passing through them uniquely. Thus $\mu$ and $\mu'$ coincide.

Therefore, in view of (4.1) and (4.2), $p^*_D$ vanishes at all the nodes of $Y$, which is a contradiction since $D \in Y$.

Now, let us verify the last “moreover” statement. Suppose the six nodes in $S \subset X$ use the line $\ell$. Then, as we obtained earlier, the nodes $Y := X \setminus (A \cup S)$ are located in a maximal curve $\mu$ of degree $n - 3$. Therefore the fundamental polynomial of each $A \in S$ uses $\mu$:

$$p^*_A = \mu q_A, \ \text{where } q_A \in \Pi_2.$$ 

It is easily seen that $q_A$ is a 2-fundamental polynomial of $A \in S$. 

□
References


(Hakop Hakopian) Department of Informatics and Applied Mathematics, Yerevan State University, A. Manukyan Str. 1, 0025 Yerevan, Armenia
E-mail address: hakop@ysu.am

(Harutyun Kloyan) Department of Informatics and Applied Mathematics, Yerevan State University, A. Manukyan Str. 1, 0025 Yerevan, Armenia
E-mail address: arutkloyan@gmail.com