

# A matryoshka structure of higher secant varieties and the generalized Bronowski's conjecture

Junho Choe and Sijong Kwak

## Abstract

In this paper, we propose a matryoshka structure of higher secant varieties which includes many matryoshka phenomena in the category of higher secant varieties and generalizes certain celebrated classical results in the study of syzygy to higher secant varieties. For example, we prove a generalized  $K_{p,1}$  theorem for higher secant varieties, the syzygetic and geometric characterizations of minimal degree higher secant varieties, defined by Ciliberto and Russo ([13]), and del Pezzo higher secant varieties, newly defined in this paper, and also give the determinantal presentation of higher secant varieties having minimal degree.

These results come mainly from the structure of the tangent cones to higher secant varieties and from inductive analyses of defining equations and their syzygies in relation to inner and tangential projections. For our purposes, we prove a weak form of the generalized Bronowski's conjecture due to Ciliberto and Russo ([13]) that relates the identifiability for higher secant varieties to the geometry of tangential projections.

## Contents

<b>1</b>	<b>Introduction</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>2</b>	<b>Higher secant varieties</b>	<b>6</b>
2.1	Projections and partial elimination ideals . . . . .	7
2.2	Equations and syzygies . . . . .	11
<b>3</b>	<b>The generalized Bronowski's conjecture</b>	<b>14</b>
3.1	A proof of the generalized Bronowski's conjecture, weak form . . . . .	14
<b>4</b>	<b>A generalized <math>K_{p,1}</math> theorem</b>	<b>19</b>

<b>5</b>	<b>Higher secant varieties of minimal degree</b>	<b>22</b>
5.1	Syzygetic characterization of minimal degree $q$ -secant varieties . . . . .	22
5.2	Determinantal presentation . . . . .	23
<b>6</b>	<b>Del Pezzo higher secant varieties</b>	<b>32</b>
6.1	An analogue of the generalized Bronowski's conjecture . . . . .	35
6.2	Syzygetic characterization of del Pezzo higher secant varieties . . . . .	37
6.3	Higher secant varieties of almost minimal degree . . . . .	40
	<b>Appendix: Partial elimination ideals</b>	<b>42</b>
A.1	Hilbert polynomials via the inner projection, and applications . . . . .	44
A.2	A basic inequality of Betti numbers . . . . .	45
A.3	A vanishing theorem . . . . .	46

# 1 Introduction

Throughout this paper, we work over an algebraically closed field of characteristic zero. The main research interest is the category of *higher secant varieties* which have been studied for over a hundred years in algebraic geometry. Historically, much attention has been paid to the defectiveness of higher secant varieties due to Severi, Zak, Chiantini and Ciliberto, etc ([11], [35], [37]). Recently, computing the exact dimension of higher secant varieties of specific varieties has also been important in tensor geometry and algebraic variants of P versus NP problem in complexity theory ([31]).

However, we are particularly interested in geometry and syzygies in the category of higher secant varieties from a viewpoint of matryoshka structure. "Matryoshka" is a set of traditional Russian dolls with the same shape but different sizes inside successively. Mathematically, many fundamental results on geometry and syzygy for irreducible varieties are also expected to hold in the category of higher secant varieties in a very similar pattern. In 2015, Fyodor Zak pointed out to the second author this kind of phenomena implicitly to which he gave the name matryoshka structure. The authors have realized that structures of the Betti tables and their geometric meanings in the category of higher secant varieties are very similar to those in the category of projective varieties just like "Matryoshka". (Another kind of matryoshka phenomenon was also mentioned in the book [34], concerns the comparison of uniruled varieties and their varieties of lines, and provides surprising applications to the classification of Severi varieties and Hartshorne's conjecture on complete intersections.)

Let  $X$  be a nondegenerate irreducible, reduced projective variety in  $\mathbb{P}^r$ . For any positive integer  $q \geq 1$ , the  $q$ -secant variety, denoted by  $S^q(X)$ , is the Zariski closure of the union of all linear spaces of dimension  $q - 1$  spanned by linearly independent  $q$  points of  $X$ . It was proved in [13] that

$$\deg S^q(X) \geq \binom{e+q}{q},$$

where  $e$  is the codimension of  $S^q(X)$  in  $\mathbb{P}^r$ . One can say that  $S^q(X)$  is a  $q$ -secant variety of *minimal degree* if  $\deg S^q(X) = \binom{e+q}{q}$ , and  $X$  is called an  $M^q$ -variety if  $S^q(X)$  is a  $q$ -secant variety of minimal degree. Thus, for each  $q \geq 1$ , there are objects of minimal degree in the category of  $q$ -secant varieties and it would be very interesting to characterize or classify objects of minimal degree: For  $q = 1$ , there are many characterization results on minimal degree varieties in various aspects, and it is well known that varieties of minimal degree are only quadric hypersurfaces, a cone over the Veronese surface in  $\mathbb{P}^5$  and rational normal scrolls ([1], [16], [22]). On the other hand, for  $q \geq 2$ , it would be very difficult to do the same thing in the category of  $q$ -secant varieties. Note that for a variety  $X$  of minimal degree,  $S^q(X)$  is also of minimal degree ([13, Claim 5.2] or Corollary 3.8). But the converse is not true in general. For irreducible curves, the converse is also true. For smooth surfaces, some exceptions were

classified due to Ciliberto-Russo ([13, Theorem 9.2]), and however, it might be a very hard task to keep going on this kind of classification.

Instead, through detailed observation of the matryoshka structure, we establish the following syzygetic characterization:

**Theorem 1.1.** *Let  $e = \text{codim} S^q(X)$ . Assume that  $e \geq 1$  and  $q \geq 1$ . Then, we have the following equivalence:*

- (1)  $S^q(X) \subset \mathbb{P}^r$  is a  $q$ -secant variety of minimal degree;
- (2)  $S^q(X) \subset \mathbb{P}^r$  has  $q$ -pure Cohen-Macaulay Betti table;
- (3a)  $\beta_{p,q}(S^q(X)) = \binom{p+q-1}{q} \binom{e+q}{p+q}$  for every  $p$ ;
- (3b)  $\dim(I_{S^q(X)})_{q+1} = \binom{e+q}{q+1}$ ;
- (3c)  $\beta_{p,q}(S^q(X)) = \binom{p+q-1}{q} \binom{e+q}{p+q}$  for some  $1 \leq p \leq e$ ;
- (4) the  $(q+1)$ -strand of  $S^q(X) \subset \mathbb{P}^r$  has length  $e$ ;
- (5a)  $\text{reg} S^q(X) = q+1$ ; and
- (5b) the homogeneous coordinate ring  $S_{S^q(X)}$  satisfies property  $N_{q+1,e}$ .

For instance, (2) tells us that the Betti table of any minimal degree  $q$ -secant variety is the following:

	0	1	...	$e-1$	$e$
0	1				
$q$		*	...	*	*

Figure 1: The Betti table of  $q$ -secant varieties of minimal degree

Refer to the fact that there are no hypersurfaces of degree  $q$  containing  $S^q(X)$ .

In fact, it is proved in Corollary 2.14 that  $\beta_{p,q}(S^q(X)) \leq \binom{p+q-1}{q} \binom{e+q}{p+q}$  for every  $p$ . Thus, among all  $q$ -secant varieties,  $q$ -secant varieties of minimal degree are characterized to have the maximal Betti number  $\beta_{p,q}(S^q(X)) = \binom{p+q-1}{q} \binom{e+q}{p+q}$  for some  $1 \leq p \leq e$ . For  $q = 1$ , it is classical and was proved by Castelnuovo, Eisenbud-Green-Hulek-Popescu and Han-Kwak ([8],[15],[27]).

Furthermore, in terms of *determinantal presentation*, we describe higher secant varieties of minimal degree. Varieties of minimal degree are completely classified as mentioned above to be determinantal varieties, and similarly, an analogue exists for higher secant varieties.

Explicitly speaking, a  $q$ -secant variety of minimal degree with codimension  $e \geq 2$  is ideal-theoretically defined by  $(q+1)$ -minors of either a  $(q+1) \times (e+q)$  linear matrix (*scroll type*) or a symmetric  $(q+2) \times (q+2)$  linear matrix (*Veronese type*). Moreover, these matrices of linear forms provide a complete description of the minimal free resolution for higher secant varieties of minimal degree, and induce a peculiar pair of linear systems whenever the given projective variety is smooth so that we obtain one geometric reason for a given projective variety to be an  $M^q$ -variety, that is, a suitable decomposition of the embedding line bundle. See Theorem 5.7 and Theorem 5.9. (There is another geometric reason (Corollary 3.7):  $X$  is an  $M^q$ -variety if and only if its general  $(q-1)$ -tangential projection is a variety of minimal degree.)

On the other hand, in birational geometry, Fano varieties including del Pezzo surfaces are basic objects as building blocks. However, varieties of minimal degree and del Pezzo varieties are basic objects in projective algebraic geometry, where by definition, a del Pezzo variety is an arithmetically Cohen-Macaulay variety of almost minimal degree. One may expect that there is an analogue of the del Pezzo variety in the category of higher secant varieties. Note that varieties of almost minimal degree have sectional genus less than or equal to one, and that a variety of almost minimal degree has sectional genus one if and only if it is a del Pezzo variety. Similarly, suppose that  $S^q(X)$  is not a  $q$ -secant variety of minimal degree with codimension  $e \geq 1$ . Then, it can be shown (Proposition 6.1) that

$$\deg S^q(X) \geq \binom{e+q}{q} + \binom{e+q-1}{q-1}.$$

In addition, if  $\deg S^q(X) = \binom{e+q}{q} + \binom{e+q-1}{q-1}$ , then we obtain the upper bound of the sectional genus (Proposition 6.5):

$$\pi(S^q(X)) \leq (q-1) \left( \binom{e+q}{q} + \binom{e+q-1}{q-1} \right) + 1.$$

Note that in positive characteristic, the degree bound above is not true in general (see Remark 6.3). It would be natural to call  $S^q(X)$  a *del Pezzo  $q$ -secant variety* if  $\deg S^q(X) = \binom{e+q}{q} + \binom{e+q-1}{q-1}$  and  $\pi(S^q(X)) = (q-1) \left( \binom{e+q}{q} + \binom{e+q-1}{q-1} \right) + 1$ .

As in the case of minimal degree  $q$ -secant varieties, the viewpoint of the matryoshka structure enables us to prove the following:

**Theorem 1.2.** *Put  $e = \text{codim} S^q(X)$ . Assume that  $e \geq 2$  and  $q \geq 1$ . The following are equivalent:*

- (1)  $S^q(X) \subset \mathbb{P}^r$  is a del Pezzo  $q$ -secant variety;
- (2)  $S^q(X) \subset \mathbb{P}^r$  has  $q$ -pure Gorenstein Betti table;

- (3a)  $\beta_{p,q}(S^q(X)) = \binom{p+q-1}{q} \binom{e+q}{p+q} - \binom{e+q-p-1}{q-1} \binom{e+q-1}{e+q-p}$  for every  $1 \leq p \leq e$ ;
- (3b)  $\dim(I_{S^q(X)})_{q+1} = \binom{e+q}{q+1} - \binom{e+q-2}{q-1}$ ;
- (3c)  $\beta_{p,q}(S^q(X)) = \binom{p+q-1}{q} \binom{e+q}{p+q} - \binom{e+q-p-1}{q-1} \binom{e+q-1}{e+q-p}$  for some  $1 \leq p \leq e-1$ ; and
- (4)  $S_{S^q(X)}$  satisfies property  $N_{q+1,e-1}$ , but not property  $N_{q+1,e}$ .

Hence, every del Pezzo  $q$ -secant variety has Betti table of the following form:

	0	1	...	$e-1$	$e$
0	1				
$q$		*	...	*	
$2q$					1

Figure 2: The Betti table of del Pezzo  $q$ -secant varieties

For  $q = 1$ , it is classical and was proved by Fano, and Han-Kwak ([17], [27]). It was also proved for higher secant varieties to elliptic normal curves due to Bothmer and Hulek, or Fisher (see [3],[18]). It looks very mysterious that  $S^q(X) \subset \mathbb{P}^r$  is not del Pezzo  $q$ -secant even if  $X$  is del Pezzo; for smooth del Pezzo surfaces,  $S^q(X)$  is always a minimal degree  $q$ -secant variety. However, for curves, we prove that  $X$  is del Pezzo if and only if  $S^q(X)$  is also a del Pezzo  $q$ -secant variety (Proposition 6.13).

In [4], J. Bronowski studied the Waring problem for homogeneous polynomials, and he claimed that when  $n+1$  divides  $\binom{d+n}{n}$  with quotient  $q$ , a general homogeneous form of degree  $d$  in  $n+1$  variables can be expressed as the sum of  $q$  linear forms to the power of  $d$  if and only if a general  $(q-1)$ -tangential projection of the Veronese variety  $v_d(\mathbb{P}^n) \subseteq \mathbb{P}^{\binom{d+n}{n}-1}$  is birational, and that a similar thing holds for arbitrary (smooth) projective varieties. However, the proof was considered insufficient by Ciliberto-Russo. They extended the Bronowski's assertion, and called it the *generalized Bronowski's conjecture*.

One says  $X$  to be a *variety with the minimal number of apparent  $q$ -secant  $(q-2)$ -planes*, or an  $MA^q$ -variety if it is an  $M^q$ -variety and a unique span of linearly independent  $q$  points of  $X$  passes through a general point of  $S^q(X)$ , namely  $X$  is *identifiable* for  $S^q(X)$ . As noted in [13],  $X^n \subset \mathbb{P}^{2n+1}$  is an  $MA^2$ -variety if and only if it is a *variety with one apparent double point* which was studied by Severi. For an  $MA^q$ -variety  $X$ , its general  $(q-1)$ -tangential projection is birational onto a variety of minimal degree. Its proof depends on the inequality that the number of  $q$ -secant  $(q-1)$ -planes to  $X$  passing through a general point of  $S^q(X)$  is at least  $\deg \pi_\Lambda \deg X_\Lambda / \deg S^q(X)$  when  $\dim S^q(X) = q \dim X + q - 1$  with  $\pi_\Lambda$  and  $X_\Lambda$  a general  $(q-1)$ -tangential projection of  $X$ ; see [13, Theorem 2.7 and Corollary 4.5]. The generalized

Bronowski's conjecture says that if a general  $(q - 1)$ -tangential projection of  $X$  is birational and its image is a variety of minimal degree, then  $X$  is an  $MA^q$ -variety.

To obtain our main theorems on characterization, we need to prove a weak form of the generalized Bronowski's conjecture for  $q$ -secant varieties of minimal degree which was described for the first time due to Ciliberto-Russo, and also to prove an analogue of the weak generalized Bronowski's conjecture for del Pezzo higher secant varieties.

**Theorem 1.3** (The generalized Bronowski's conjecture, weak form). *Let  $e$  denote the codimension of  $S^q(X)$ . If either*

- (1) *a general inner projection  $X_z$  is an  $M^q$ -variety with  $e \geq 2, q \geq 1$ ; or*
- (2) *a general tangential projection  $X_{\mathbb{T}_z X}$  is an  $M^{q-1}$ -variety with  $e \geq 1, q \geq 2$ ,*

*then  $X$  is an  $M^q$ -variety.*

It is elementary to check that any  $M^q$ -variety satisfies both (1) and (2).

Consequently,  $X$  is an  $M^q$ -variety provided that a general  $(q - 1)$ -tangential projection of  $X$  is a variety of minimal degree with positive codimension. Once one shows that there passes a unique  $(q - 1)$ -plane spanned by  $q$  points in  $X$  through a general point of  $S^q(X)$  under the assumption, the original conjecture is proved. This is the case for most of projective varieties including curves; we verify the generalized Bronowski's conjecture when either  $X$  is a curve or satisfies  $\dim S^{q+1}(X) = \dim \tilde{S}^{q+1}(X)$  (Corollary 3.12 and Theorem 3.14). Thus, the conjecture is still open and interesting for the following cases:  $S^{q+1}(X)$  is nondefective with  $S^{q+1}(X) = \mathbb{P}^r$ , or defective.

And as an application of the weak form of the generalized Bronowski's conjecture, we extend M. Green's famous theorem, the  $K_{p,1}$  theorem, to higher secant varieties. While the  $K_{p,1}$  theorem gives an upper bound of the length of quadratic strand, and characterize its maximal and almost maximal cases, we establish a parallel length bound for the  $(q + 1)$ -strand of  $q$ -secant varieties, and conclude that the corresponding maximal case is precisely  $q$ -secant varieties of minimal degree.

Similarly, if by definition, we call  $X$  a  $dP^q$ -variety when  $S^q(X)$  is a del Pezzo  $q$ -secant variety, then we have the following theorem for del Pezzo  $q$ -secant varieties:

**Theorem 1.4** (The generalized Bronowski's conjecture II, weak form). *Let  $e := \text{codim} S^q(X)$ . If either*

- (1) *a general inner projection  $X_z$  is a  $dP^q$ -variety with  $e \geq 3, q \geq 1$ ; or*
- (2) *a general tangential projection  $X_{\mathbb{T}_z X}$  is a  $dP^{q-1}$ -variety with  $e \geq 2, q \geq 3$ ,*

*then  $X$  is a  $dP^q$ -variety.*

As  $M^q$ -varieties,  $dP^q$ -varieties satisfy both (1) and (2); see Propositions 6.1 and 6.5, and Definition 6.7.

From these new viewpoints, we are also able to raise many interesting open questions in the category of higher secant varieties whose analogues are well known in the case of usual varieties.

The paper is organized as follows: In Sect. 2, we discuss inner and tangential projections of higher secant varieties and establish the basic structure of Betti tables for higher secant varieties. In Sect. 3, we prove a weak form of the generalized Bronowski's conjecture. In Sect. 5, we investigate the algebraic structure of the higher secant varieties of minimal degree and determinantal presentation. In Sect. 6, we define del Pezzo higher secant variety with some basic background. Furthermore, the algebraic structures and characterization of del Pezzo secant varieties are described. Finally, we end with an appendix for a systematic approach of the partial elimination ideals to study the algebraic structures of higher secant varieties.

**Acknowledgements.** We would like to thank Prof. Fyodor Zak for conversations on the matryoshka structure and interesting comments. We also thank D. Eisenbud and M. Mella for general remarks on higher secant varieties of minimal degree and the identifiability. We are particularly grateful to F. Russo who read the first version of the paper and explained to us what he did on matryoshka phenomena.

## 2 Higher secant varieties

**Definition 2.1.** Let  $X \subseteq \mathbb{P}^r$  be an irreducible projective variety, and let  $q \geq 1$  be an integer. The  $q$ -secant variety  $S^q(X)$  to  $X$  is defined by

$$S^q(X) := \overline{\bigcup_{z_1, \dots, z_q \in X} \langle z_1, \dots, z_q \rangle} \subseteq \mathbb{P}^r \quad \text{with} \quad \langle z_1, \dots, z_q \rangle = \mathbb{P}^{q-1},$$

where the union runs over all linearly independent  $q$  points  $z_i$  in  $X$ .

In addition, we define the *abstract  $q$ -secant variety*  $\tilde{S}^q(X)$  by

$$\tilde{S}^q(X) = \overline{\{(\zeta, w) : \zeta \in U, w \in \langle \zeta \rangle\}} \subseteq X^{(q)} \times \mathbb{P}^r,$$

where  $X^{(q)}$  is the  $q$ -th symmetric power of  $X$ , and  $U$  is the set of linearly independent distinct  $q$  points  $\zeta \in X^{(q)}$ . The second projection  $X^{(q)} \times \mathbb{P}^r \rightarrow \mathbb{P}^r$  induces a surjective map

$$\tilde{S}^q(X) \rightarrow S^q(X),$$

and this map will be frequently mentioned. If the map  $\tilde{S}^q(X) \rightarrow S^q(X)$  is generically finite of degree  $d$ , then a general point of  $S^q(X)$  lies in exactly  $d$  spans of linearly independent  $q$  points of  $X$ , and vice versa.



In the category of  $q$ -secant varieties, we shall have many results that involve  $(q-1)$ -secant varieties. The parallel results for the case  $q = 1$  still hold subject to  $S^0(X) = \emptyset \subset \mathbb{P}^r$ , where the homogeneous ideal of the empty set  $\emptyset$  is chosen to be the maximal homogeneous ideal so that  $\text{codim} \emptyset = r + 1$  and  $\text{deg} \emptyset = 1$ . For this reason, we define the 0-secant variety  $S^0(X)$  to be the empty set  $\emptyset \subset \mathbb{P}^r$ .

**Notation.** From now on, we fix our notation:

- $X \subseteq \mathbb{P}^r$  is a nondegenerate irreducible reduced projective variety.
- $\text{Vert}X$  is the vertex of  $X$ .
- $S$  is the homogeneous coordinate ring of  $\mathbb{P}^r$ , and  $V$  is the vector space  $S_1$  of linear forms.
- $I_X$  and  $S_X$  are the homogeneous ideal and coordinate ring of  $X \subseteq \mathbb{P}^r$ , respectively.
- $S_z$  is the polynomial ring in  $S$  generated by linear forms vanishing at a point  $z \in \mathbb{P}^r$ , and  $V_z$  is the vector space  $(S_z)_1$ .
- $(I)$  is the ideal of  $S$  generated by an ideal  $I$  of a subring  $R \subseteq S$ .

## 2.1 Projections and partial elimination ideals

Given a  $\lambda$ -plane  $\Lambda \subsetneq \mathbb{P}^r$ , the *projection of  $X$  from  $\Lambda$*  is the map  $\pi_\Lambda : X \setminus \Lambda \rightarrow \mathbb{P}^{r-\lambda-1}$  defined by

$$\pi_\Lambda(x_0 : \cdots : x_\lambda : x_{\lambda+1} : \cdots : x_r) = (x_{\lambda+1} : \cdots : x_r)$$

if  $\Lambda = V(x_{\lambda+1}, \dots, x_r)$ . By abuse of language, its image  $X_\Lambda := \overline{\pi_\Lambda(X \setminus \Lambda)} \subseteq \mathbb{P}^{r-\lambda-1}$  is also called a projection of  $X$  from  $\Lambda$ .

By the irreducibility of  $X$ , the projection commutes with taking higher secant varieties, namely

$$S^q(X)_\Lambda = S^q(X_\Lambda).$$

**Inner projections.** When  $\Lambda$  is a point of  $X$ , the projection is called an *inner projection*. The  *$m$ -inner projection* is to do inner projections  $m$  times. We will frequently consider a general  $m$ -inner projection image  $X_{\langle z_1, \dots, z_m \rangle}$ , where  $z_1, \dots, z_m$  are  $m$  general points of  $X$ .

Let  $z \in X$  be a point. Then,  $\dim X - 1 \leq \dim X_z \leq \dim X$ , and the right equality holds if and only if  $z$  is not in  $\text{Vert}X$ . Choosing suitable coordinates  $x_0, x_1, \dots, x_r$ , we may assume that  $z = (1 : 0 : \cdots : 0)$ . Then, the *projective tangent cone*  $\mathbb{T}C_z X \subseteq \mathbb{P}^r$  to  $X$  and the *projectivized tangent cone*  $\mathbb{P}TC_z X \subseteq \mathbb{P}^{r-1}$  to  $X$  are (possibly non-reduced) projective schemes defined by the leading coefficient  $f'$  of  $f = f'x_0^d + (\text{lower } x_0\text{-degree terms}) \in I_X$  in  $x_0$  with  $f'$  in variables

$x_1, \dots, x_r$ . Note that  $\mathbb{T}C_z X$  and  $\mathbb{P}TC_z X$  are equidimensional with  $\dim \mathbb{T}C_z X = \dim X$  and  $\dim \mathbb{P}TC_z X = \dim X - 1$ . Whenever  $z \notin \text{Vert} X$ , we have the degree formula

$$\deg X = \deg \pi_z \deg X_z + \deg \mathbb{T}C_z X, \quad (1)$$

where  $\pi_z : X \dashrightarrow X_z$  is the projection map.

On the other hand, due to M. Green, the projection from one point can also be analyzed via the *partial elimination ideal* theory: We restrict to the inner projection case  $z \in X$ . Let  $S_z$  be the homogeneous coordinate ring of  $\mathbb{P}^{r-1}$ , the image of projection map  $\pi_z : \mathbb{P}^r \setminus \{z\} \rightarrow \mathbb{P}^{r-1}$ . Then, there is an infinite filtration of  $I_X$  by graded  $S_z$ -modules:

$$\tilde{K}_0(z, I_X) \subseteq \tilde{K}_1(z, I_X) \subseteq \dots \subseteq \tilde{K}_i(z, I_X) \subseteq \dots \subseteq I_X,$$

where  $\tilde{K}_i(z, I_X) = \{f \in I_X : \deg_{\mathfrak{g}_{x_0}} f \leq i\}$ , and we obtain homogeneous ideals

$$K_i(z, I_X) = \{\partial^i f / \partial x_0^i : f \in \tilde{K}_i(z, I_X)\} \subseteq S_z,$$

called the *i-th partial elimination ideal*, together with an ascending chain

$$K_0(z, I_X) \subseteq K_1(z, I_X) \subseteq \dots \subseteq K_{s-1}(z, I_X) \subsetneq K_s(z, I_X) = K_{s+1}(z, I_X) = \dots.$$

The chain  $K_i(z, I_X)$  eventually stabilizes at  $s(z, I_X) := s$  to a homogeneous ideal  $K_\infty(z, I_X) := K_s(z, I_X)$  in  $S_z$ .

Then,  $K_0(z, I_X)$  is the homogeneous ideal of  $X_z \subseteq \mathbb{P}^{r-1}$ , and  $K_\infty(z, I_X)$  defines  $\mathbb{P}TC_z X$  scheme-theoretically. Moreover, by Proposition A.2 and Corollary A.3 in the appendix, we have the set-theoretical equality

$$V(K_i(z, I_X)) = \{p \in \mathbb{P}^{r-1} : \text{length}(\pi_z^{-1}(p)) > i\} \cup \mathbb{P}TC_z X,$$

where  $\pi_z$  is the projection map  $X \setminus \{z\} \rightarrow X_z$ , and if  $\pi_z$  is generically finite, then

$$\deg \pi_z = \min\{i : \dim V(K_i(z, I_X)) < \dim X_z\}.$$

For details, refer to the appendix.

**Tangential projections.** The projection  $\pi_{\mathbb{T}_z X} : X \dashrightarrow X_{\mathbb{T}_z X} \subseteq \mathbb{P}^{r-n-1}$ ,  $n := \dim \mathbb{T}_z X$ , of  $X$  from a projective tangent space  $\mathbb{T}_z X$  is called a *tangential projection*, and repeating tangential projections  $m$  times, we obtain an *m-tangential projection*. A general *m-tangential projection*  $X_\Lambda$  will often be used, where  $\Lambda = \langle \mathbb{T}_{z_1} X, \dots, \mathbb{T}_{z_m} X \rangle$  for  $m$  general points  $z_1, \dots, z_m$  of  $X$ .

Recall the well-known *Terracini's lemma*:

$$\mathbb{T}_w S^q(X) = \langle \mathbb{T}_{z_1} X, \dots, \mathbb{T}_{z_q} X \rangle$$

for  $q$  general points  $z_1, \dots, z_q \in X$  and a general point  $w \in \langle z_1, \dots, z_q \rangle \subseteq S^q(X)$ . Let  $\Lambda$  be the span of  $m$  general projective tangent spaces to  $X$  with  $\lambda := \dim \Lambda < r$  and  $m < q$ . Consider the  $m$ -tangential projection  $X_\Lambda \subset \mathbb{P}^{r-\lambda-1}$  and its  $(q-m)$ -secant variety  $S^{q-m}(X_\Lambda)$ . By Terracini's lemma,  $S^{q-m}(X_\Lambda) \subseteq \mathbb{P}^{r-\lambda-1}$  has the same codimension as  $S^q(X) \subseteq \mathbb{P}^r$  (cf. [13, Lemma 1.13]).

The general  $m$ -tangential projection is the basic ingredient of both the tangent cone structure of higher secant varieties and the generalized Bronowski's conjecture.

**The structure of tangent cones.** Note that whenever  $q \geq 2$  and  $S^q(X) \neq \mathbb{P}^r$ ,  $S^q(X)$  is singular at every point of  $S^m(X)$ ,  $1 \leq m < q$ . Understanding the tangent cone to  $S^q(X)$  at a general point  $z \in S^m(X)$  is very important in geometry and syzygies of higher secant varieties. The structure of tangent cone in connection with the tangential projection is the origin of matryoshka structure of higher secant varieties in many aspects.

**Proposition 2.2** (Ciliberto-Russo, [13, Theorem 3.1]). *Let  $1 \leq m < q$ , and  $z_1, \dots, z_m$   $m$  general points of  $X$ . Choose a general point  $z$  in  $\langle z_1, \dots, z_m \rangle \subseteq S^m(X)$ , and write  $\Lambda = \langle \mathbb{T}_{z_1} X, \dots, \mathbb{T}_{z_m} X \rangle$ . Then, the cone over  $S^{q-m}(X_\Lambda)$  with vertex  $\Lambda$  is an (reduced) irreducible component of the projective tangent cone  $\mathbb{T}_{C_z} S^q(X)$ .*

**Definition 2.3.** One can say that  $S^q(X)$  has simple tangent cone at  $z \in X$  if  $s(z, I_{S^q(X)}) = 1$  and  $K_\infty(z, I_{S^q(X)})$  is prime.

*Remark 2.4.* Let  $z$  be a general point in  $X$ , and suppose that  $S^q(X)$  has simple tangent cone at  $z$ . If  $q = 1$ , then  $K_1(z, I_X)$  is generated by linear forms which define  $\mathbb{P}T_z X$ . For  $q \geq 2$ , similar observation describes the following:

- (1) By the partial elimination ideal theory and Proposition 2.2, we obtain a chain of homogeneous ideals

$$K_1(z, I_{S^q(X)}) \subseteq K_2(z, I_{S^q(X)}) \subseteq \dots \subseteq K_\infty(z, I_{S^q(X)}) \subseteq I_{\mathbb{P}T_{C_z} S^q(X)} \subseteq (I_{S^{q-1}(X_{\mathbb{T}_z X})}),$$

where  $I_{\mathbb{P}T_{C_z} S^q(X)}$  is the (saturated) homogeneous ideal defining the projective scheme  $\mathbb{P}T_{C_z} S^q(X)$  and  $(I_{S^{q-1}(X_{\mathbb{T}_z X})}) \subseteq S_z$  is the prime ideal generated by  $I_{S^{q-1}(X_{\mathbb{T}_z X})}$ .

- (2) If  $S^q(X)$  has simple tangent cone at the general point  $z \in X$ , then all the homogeneous ideals in the chain above are the same so that  $\mathbb{T}_{C_z} S^q(X)$  is irreducible and reduced, and in fact, equal to the cone over  $S^{q-1}(X_{\mathbb{T}_z X})$ , and moreover, the projection  $\pi_z : S^q(X) \dashrightarrow S^q(X)_z = S^q(X_z)$  is birational (Corollary A.3).
- (3) It is the case for higher secant varieties of minimal degree and del Pezzo higher secant varieties; see Proposition 3.4 and Proposition 6.12.

*Example 2.5.* There are non-examples of having simple tangent cone.

(1) Let  $C$  be a trigonal smooth curve of genus 3. Take  $K$  to be the canonical divisor on  $C$ , and  $D$  the divisor associated to the trigonal map  $C \rightarrow \mathbb{P}^1$ . Embed  $C \subset \mathbb{P}^4$  by  $|K + D|$ . Macaulay2 presents that the projectivized tangent cone  $\mathbb{P}TC_z S^2(C)$  to a general point  $z \in C$  is the union of the cone over  $C_{\mathbb{T}_z C}$  and a linear space. For details, when the general point  $z \in C$  has coordinates  $(x_0 : x_1 : \cdots : x_4) = (1 : 0 : \cdots : 0)$ ,  $S^2(C)$  is a hypersurface  $f = 0$  of degree 12 with  $\deg_{x_0} f = 6$ . Therefore,  $\deg\{\pi_z : S^2(C) \rightarrow S^2(C_z) = \mathbb{P}^3\} = s(z, I_{S^2(C)}) = 6$ . And we have  $\deg C_{\mathbb{T}_z C} = 5$ . Similarly, using a trigonal smooth curve of genus 4, we have another non-example in  $\mathbb{P}^5$ .

(2) Let  $S \subset \mathbb{P}^8$  be a rational normal surface (for instance,  $S(3, 4)$ ). Take  $X \subset \mathbb{P}^7$  to be the projection image of  $S$  from a general point in  $S^2(S)$ . Then, by computing via Macaulay2 ([19]), for a general point  $z \in X$ ,

$$K_0(z, I_{S^2(X)}) \subsetneq K_1(z, I_{S^2(X)}) \subsetneq K_2(z, I_{S^2(X)}) = K_\infty(z, I_{S^2(X)}) = (I_{X_{\mathbb{T}_z X}}).$$

Hence,  $K_\infty(z, I_{S^2(X)})$  is prime, but  $s(z, I_{S^2(X)}) = 2$ . For more information, see Proposition 6.21.

From the degree formula (1) and the fact that  $\deg \mathbb{T}C_z S^q(X) \geq \deg S^{q-1}(X_{\mathbb{T}_z X})$  for a general point  $z \in X$  (Proposition 2.2), the results below follow:

**Proposition 2.6** (cf. [13, Lemma 4.1]). *Let  $z \in X$  be a general point. Then, we have*

$$\deg S^q(X) \geq \deg S^q(X_z) + \deg S^{q-1}(X_{\mathbb{T}_z X}),$$

*with equality if and only if  $\deg \mathbb{T}C_z S^q(X) = \deg S^{q-1}(X_{\mathbb{T}_z X})$  with the projection  $\pi_z : S^q(X) \dashrightarrow S^q(X_z)$  birational.*

**Corollary 2.7** ([13, Theorem 4.2]). *We have*

$$\deg S^q(X) \geq \binom{e+q}{q}.$$

*And the equality implies that  $\deg S^q(X_z) = \binom{e-1+q}{q}$  and  $\deg S^{q-1}(X_{\mathbb{T}_z X}) = \binom{e+q-1}{q-1}$  for a general point  $z$  in  $X$ .*

**Definition 2.8.** One says that  $S^q(X)$  is a  $q$ -secant variety of minimal degree if  $\deg S^q(X)$  has its own minimal value, i.e.,  $\deg S^q(X) = \binom{e+q}{q}$  for  $e := \text{codim} S^q(X)$ . And we call  $X$  an  $M^q$ -variety if  $S^q(X)$  has minimal degree, and an  $MA^q$ -variety if it is an  $M^q$ -variety and the map  $\tilde{S}^q(X) \rightarrow S^q(X)$  is birational.

*Remark 2.9.* The projective variety  $X$  need not be an  $MA^q$ -variety even if it is an  $M^q$ -variety and  $\dim S^q(X) = \dim \tilde{S}^q(X) < \dim \mathbb{P}^r$ . Indeed, take  $X$  to be the image of  $\mathbb{P}^2$  in  $\mathbb{P}^6$  induced

by the linear system  $|6L - 2p_1 - \dots - 2p_7|$ , where  $L$  is any line in  $\mathbb{P}^2$  and  $p_1, \dots, p_7$  are seven general points of  $\mathbb{P}^2$ . Then, by using [13, Theorem 9.1],  $X$  is an  $M^2$ -variety with  $\dim S^2(X) = \dim \tilde{S}^2(X)$ . On the other hand, let  $p_8$  be a general point of  $\mathbb{P}^2$  with  $z_8$  its image in  $X$ . Then,  $X_{z_8}$  is the image of  $\mathbb{P}^2$  in  $\mathbb{P}^5$  corresponding to the linear system  $|6L - 2p_1 - \dots - 2p_7 - p_8|$ . By [12, Theorem 1.1],  $X_{z_8}$  is not an  $MA^2$ -variety, hence neither is  $X$ .

Closing this subsection, we summarize facts used frequently and implicitly as follows:

- For two general points  $z, w \in X$ , inner projection and tangential projection procedures commute:

- (1)  $(X_z)_{\overline{w}} = (X_w)_{\overline{z}} = X_{\langle z, w \rangle}$ ;
- (2)  $(X_z)_{\mathbb{T}_{\overline{w}}(X_z)} = (X_{\mathbb{T}_w X})_{\overline{z}} = X_{\langle z, \mathbb{T}_w X \rangle}$ ; and
- (3)  $(X_{\mathbb{T}_z X})_{\mathbb{T}_{\overline{w}}(X_{\mathbb{T}_z X})} = (X_{\mathbb{T}_w X})_{\mathbb{T}_{\overline{z}}(X_{\mathbb{T}_w X})} = X_{\langle \mathbb{T}_z X, \mathbb{T}_w X \rangle}$ ,

where  $\overline{z} = \pi_w(z)$ ,  $\overline{\overline{z}} = \pi_{\mathbb{T}_w X}(z)$ ,  $\overline{w} = \pi_z(w)$  and  $\overline{\overline{w}} = \pi_{\mathbb{T}_z X}(w)$ .

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
 X_{\langle z, \mathbb{T}_w X \rangle} \leftarrow \overset{\text{inn.}}{\text{---}} X_{\mathbb{T}_w X} & & X_{\langle \mathbb{T}_z X, \mathbb{T}_w X \rangle} \leftarrow \overset{\text{tan.}}{\text{---}} X_{\mathbb{T}_w X} \\
 \uparrow \text{tan.} \quad \swarrow \text{---} & & \uparrow \text{tan.} \quad \swarrow \text{---} \\
 X_z \leftarrow \overset{\text{inn.}}{\text{---}} X & & X_{\mathbb{T}_z X} \leftarrow \overset{\text{tan.}}{\text{---}} X
 \end{array}$$

- For any linear space  $\Lambda \neq \mathbb{P}^r$ , we have  $S^q(X)_\Lambda = S^q(X_\Lambda)$ .
- If  $e = \text{codim} S^q(X)$ , then for a general point  $z$  in  $X$ ,  $S^q(X_z)$  has codimension  $e - 1$  and  $S^{q-1}(X_{\mathbb{T}_z X})$  has codimension  $e$ .

## 2.2 Equations and syzygies

In this subsection, we will collect special properties on equations and syzygies of higher secant varieties, which in general, do not hold in the category of all projective varieties. To the end, let us introduce some definitions: Let  $M$  be a finitely generated graded  $S$ -module, and consider the minimal free resolution

$$0 \longleftarrow M \longleftarrow F_0 \longleftarrow F_1 \longleftarrow \dots \longleftarrow F_i = \bigoplus_j S^{\beta_{i,j}(M)}(-i-j) \longleftarrow \dots$$

Here, the  $\beta_{i,j}(M)$  are called the (graded) Betti numbers of  $M$ . The Betti table of  $M$  is a diagram of the following form:

	...	$i$	$i+1$	...
$\vdots$		$\vdots$	$\vdots$	
$j$	...	$\beta_{i,j}(M)$	$\beta_{i+1,j}(M)$	...
$j+1$	...	$\beta_{i,j+1}(M)$	$\beta_{i+1,j+1}(M)$	...
$\vdots$		$\vdots$	$\vdots$	

When  $\beta_{i,j}(M) = 0$ , we put “-” at the place in the Betti table. The Betti table of  $X \subseteq \mathbb{P}^r$  is that of the homogeneous coordinate ring  $S_X$ .

**Definition 2.10.** The homogeneous coordinate ring  $S_X$  is said to *satisfy property  $N_{d,p}$*  if  $\beta_{i,j}(S_X) = 0$  for every  $i \leq p$  and every  $j \geq d$ .  $X$  is  *$m$ -regular* if  $\beta_{i,j}(S_X) = 0$  for every  $j \geq m$ , and we define the *regularity* of  $X$  as  $\text{reg}X := \min\{m : X \text{ is } m\text{-regular}\}$ .

**Definition 2.11.** Let  $M$  be a graded  $S$ -module. We define the *Koszul cohomology group*  $K_{i,j}(M, V)$  to be the cohomology of the complex

$$\wedge^{i+1} V \otimes M_{j-1} \xrightarrow{\delta_{i+1,j-1}} \wedge^i V \otimes M_j \xrightarrow{\delta_{i,j}} \wedge^{i-1} V \otimes M_{j+1}$$

at the middle, where the differential  $\delta_{i,j}$  is defined by

$$\delta_{i,j}(v_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge v_i \otimes m) = \sum_{k=1}^i (-1)^{k-1} v_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge \widehat{v_k} \wedge \cdots \wedge v_i \otimes v_k m.$$

An element of  $K_{i,j}(M, V)$  is called a *Koszul class*.

By the symmetry of Tor functor, for a finitely generated graded  $S$ -module  $M$ , we have  $K_{i,j}(M, V) \cong \text{Tor}_i^S(M, S/(V))_{i+j}$ , hence  $\dim K_{i,j}(M, V) = \beta_{i,j}(M)$ . The mapping of  $\delta_{i,j}$  induces an isomorphism  $K_{i,j}(S_X, V) \cong K_{i-1,j+1}(I_X, V)$  unless  $(i, j) = (0, 0)$

**Conventions.** We introduce several conventions:

- $\beta_{i,j}(X) = \beta_{i,j}(S_X)$ .
- $K_{i,j}(M) = K_{i,j}(M, V)$  if  $V$  is well understood.
- $K_{i,j}(X) = K_{i,j}(S_X)$ .
- $I_\emptyset$  is the irrelevant ideal  $S_+$  of  $S$  for the empty set  $\emptyset \subset \mathbb{P}^r$ . (Recall that  $S^0(X) = \emptyset \subset \mathbb{P}^r$ .)
- $S_\emptyset$  is the residue field  $S/I_\emptyset$  of  $S$ .
- $\beta_{i,j}(\emptyset) = \beta_{i,j}(S_\emptyset)$  and  $K_{i,j}(\emptyset) = K_{i,j}(S_\emptyset)$ .

Note that the residue field  $S_\emptyset$  is minimally resolved by the Koszul complex

$$0 \longleftarrow S_\emptyset \longleftarrow S \longleftarrow V \otimes S(-1) \longleftarrow \wedge^2 V \otimes S(-2) \longleftarrow \cdots$$

**Equations and syzygies of  $S^q(X)$ .** Now, some observations on equations and syzygies of higher secant varieties are made as follows:

**Lemma 2.12.** *Take linearly independent  $r + 1$  points  $z_0, \dots, z_r$  in  $X \subseteq \mathbb{P}^r$ , and their dual basis  $x_0, \dots, x_r$  for  $V$ . Then, every monomial of an equation for  $S^q(X)$  consists of more than  $q$  distinct variables  $x_i$ . In particular, no hypersurfaces of degree  $q$  contain  $S^q(X)$ , and we have  $\deg_{x_0} f \leq m - q$  for all  $f \in (I_{S^q(X)})_m$ .*

*Proof.* Since an equation of  $S^q(X)$  always vanishes on linear spans of linearly independent  $q$  points in  $X$ , we are done.  $\square$

Therefore, the Betti table of  $S^q(X)$  can not have a nonzero entry in the  $i$ -th row for any  $i \leq q - 1$  except  $\beta_{0,0}$ :

	0	1	2	$\dots$	$p$	$\dots$
0	1	–	–	$\dots$	–	$\dots$
1	–	–	–	$\dots$	–	$\dots$
$\vdots$	$\vdots$	$\vdots$	$\vdots$	$\vdots$	$\vdots$	$\vdots$
$q - 1$	–	–	–	$\dots$	–	$\dots$
$q$	–	$\beta_{1,q}$	$\beta_{2,q}$	$\dots$	$\beta_{p,q}$	$\dots$
$\vdots$	$\vdots$	$\vdots$	$\vdots$	$\vdots$	$\vdots$	$\vdots$

We have the following basic inequality on the Betti numbers appearing in each first possible nontrivial row of higher secant varieties, which is a consequence of Proposition A.6, Lemma 2.12 and the containment  $K_1(z, I_{S^q(X)}) \subseteq (I_{S^{q-1}(X_{\mathbb{T}_z X})})$  with no degree  $q - 1$  equations of  $S^{q-1}(X_{\mathbb{T}_z X})$ :

**Proposition 2.13** (The basic inequality). *Taking a general point  $z \in X$ , we have*

$$\beta_{p,q}(S^q(X)) \leq \beta_{p,q}(S^q(X_z)) + \beta_{p-1,q}(S^q(X_z)) + \beta_{p,q-1}(S^{q-1}(X_{\mathbb{T}_z X})).$$

*And if  $S^q(X)$  has simple tangent cone at a general point of  $X$ , and if  $\beta_{p-1,q+1}(S^q(X_z))$  and  $\beta_{p-1,q}(S^{q-1}(X_{\mathbb{T}_z X}))$  vanish, then the equality holds.*

For the case  $q = 1$ , refer to [27, Theorem 3.1]. Notice that according to our conventions, if  $q = 1$ , then the value of  $\beta_{p,q-1}(S^{q-1}(X_{\mathbb{T}_z X}))$  is equal to  $\binom{e}{p}$ ,  $e = \text{codim} X$ .

**Corollary 2.14** (Upper bounds of Betti numbers). *Let  $e = \text{codim} S^q(X)$ . Then, we have*

$$\beta_{p,q}(S^q(X)) \leq B_{p,q}^e := \binom{p+q-1}{q} \binom{e+q}{p+q}$$

*for every  $p \geq 1$ . And if the equality holds for some  $p \geq 1$ , then for a general point  $z$  in  $X$ , we have*

$$\beta_{p,q}(S^q(X_z)) = B_{p,q}^{e-1}, \quad \beta_{p-1,q}(S^q(X_z)) = B_{p-1,q}^{e-1} \quad \text{and} \quad \beta_{p,q-1}(S^{q-1}(X_{\mathbb{T}_z X})) = B_{p,q-1}^e.$$

*Proof.* We will use double induction on  $e$  and  $q$ . The case  $q = 1$  follows from [27, Theorem 1.2], and the case  $e = 1$  is trivial. Due to the equality  $B_{p,q}^e = B_{p,q}^{e-1} + B_{p-1,q}^{e-1} + B_{p,q-1}^e$ , we are done.  $\square$

In addition, we present a useful theorem on Koszul cohomology vanishing. This is very important in proving the syzygetic characterization theorems: Theorems 1.1 and 1.2. For its proof, refer to Proposition A.8.

**Theorem 2.15** (Vanishing of Betti numbers). *Suppose that  $S^q(X)$  has simple tangent cone at a general point  $z$  of  $X$ . If*

- (1)  $\beta_{i,j-1}(S^{q-1}(X_{\mathbb{T}_z X})) = 0$ ; and
  - (2)  $\beta_{i-1,j}(S^q(X_z)) = \beta_{i,j}(S^q(X_z)) = 0$ ,
- then we have  $\beta_{i,j}(S^q(X)) = 0$ .

### 3 The generalized Bronowski's conjecture

As explained in the introduction, the generalized Bronowski's conjecture is raised by C. Ciliberto and F. Russo based on Bronowski's claim, and reads off algebraic and geometric properties of a  $q$ -secant variety from those of a general  $(q-1)$ -tangential projection.

**Conjecture 3.1** (The generalized Bronowski's conjecture, Ciliberto-Russo). *If a general  $(q-1)$ -tangential projection of  $X$  is birational, and if its image is a variety of minimal degree, then  $X$  is an  $MA^q$ -variety.*

The converse was already proved in [13, Corollary 4.5].

#### 3.1 A proof of the generalized Bronowski's conjecture, weak form

**Definition 3.2.** For simplicity, we define the following:

- (1)  $S^q(X)$  satisfies *property ST* if it has simple tangent cone at a general point of  $X$ .
- (2)  $S^q(X)$  satisfies *property IC* if  $I_{S^q(X)} = \sum_{i=0}^{q+1} (I_{S^q(X_{z_i})})$  for  $q+2$  general points  $z_i$  in  $X$ .

*Example 3.3.* Let  $X = C$  be a linearly normal smooth curve of genus 2. Suppose that  $C$  is a space curve. Then,  $C$  has a (unique) quadratic equation, but neither does any general inner projection of  $C$ . Thus,  $C$  does not satisfy property *IC*. Now, suppose that  $\text{codim} C = 3$ . It is known that  $I_C$  is minimally generated by four quadratic forms. Since a general inner projection of  $C$  lies in only one quadric, the sum  $(I_{X_{z_0}}) + (I_{X_{z_1}}) + (I_{X_{z_2}})$ ,  $z_i \in X$  general, has at most three quadratic forms, and thus  $C$  does not satisfy property *IC*. If  $\text{codim} C \geq 4$ , then  $C$  satisfies property *IC* by Corollary 3.5.



The following proposition shows that property *ST* and property *IC* are very closely related, and is a key step towards proving the generalized Bronowski's conjecture, weak form:

**Proposition 3.4.** *Let  $e = \text{codim} S^q(X)$ . The following hold:*

- (1) *Set  $e \geq 2$  and  $q = 1$ . Suppose that  $X_z$  satisfies property *ST* for a general point  $z$  in  $X$ . Then,  $X$  satisfies both property *ST* and property *IC*.*
- (2) *Set  $e \geq 2$  and  $q \geq 2$ . Suppose that for a general point  $z$  in  $X$ ,  $S^q(X_z)$  satisfies property *ST* and  $S^{q-1}(X_{\mathbb{T}_z X})$  satisfies property *IC*. Then,  $S^q(X)$  satisfies both property *ST* and property *IC*.*
- (3) *Set  $e \geq 1$  and  $q \geq 1$ . If  $S^q(X)$  is a  $q$ -secant variety of minimal degree, then  $S^q(X)$  satisfies property *ST*, and if in addition,  $e \geq 2$ , then  $S^q(X)$  satisfies property *IC*.*

*Proof.* In the argument below,  $\bar{z}$  denotes the image of  $z$  under an appropriate projection map, and  $\mathbb{T}_i$  projective tangent spaces to  $X$  at  $z_i \in X$  when an indexed set  $z_i$  of points is given.

(1) A proof of (1) is similar to that of (2) below because for three general points  $z_0, z_1, z_2$  in  $X$ , we obtain  $\mathbb{T}_0 = \langle z_1, \mathbb{T}_0 \rangle \cap \langle z_2, \mathbb{T}_0 \rangle$ , and so

$$V_{\mathbb{T}_0} = V_{\langle z_1, \mathbb{T}_0 \rangle} + V_{\langle z_2, \mathbb{T}_0 \rangle},$$

where  $V_\Lambda$  is the vector space of linear forms vanishing on a linear space  $\Lambda$ .

(2) Set  $q \geq 2$ . Take  $q+2$  general points  $z_i$  in  $X$ , and say  $z_0 = (1 : 0 : \cdots : 0)$  in homogeneous coordinates  $(x_0 : x_1 : \cdots : x_r)$ . For the property *ST* part, choose an arbitrary element  $f \in I_{S^{q-1}(X_{\mathbb{T}_0})}$ . Note that by the assumption,

$$f \in I_{S^{q-1}(X_{\mathbb{T}_0})} = \sum_{i=1}^{q+1} (I_{S^{q-1}(X_{\langle \mathbb{T}_0, z_i \rangle})}) = \sum_{i=1}^{q+1} (K_1(\bar{z}_0, I_{S^q(X_{z_i})})).$$

So,  $I_{S^q(X)}$  has an element  $g$  of form  $f x_0 +$  (terms without  $x_0$ ), and thus  $f \in K_1(z_0, I_{S^q(X)})$ . For the property *IC* assertion, let  $f \in I_{S^q(X)}$ . Now, we will use induction on  $d := \deg_{x_0} f$ . If  $d = 0$ , then  $f \in (I_{S^q(X_{z_0})})$ . Suppose that  $f = f' x_0^d +$  (lower  $x_0$ -degree terms) with  $d \geq 1$ . Then, by the assumption,

$$f' \in K_d(z_0, I_{S^q(X)}) \subseteq (I_{S^{q-1}(X_{\mathbb{T}_0})}) = \sum_{i=1}^{q+1} (I_{S^{q-1}(X_{\langle \mathbb{T}_0, z_i \rangle})}) = \sum_{i=1}^{q+1} (K_d(\bar{z}_0, I_{S^q(X_{z_i})})).$$

Therefore, an element  $g$  of form  $f' x_0^d +$  (lower  $x_0$ -degree terms) exists in  $\sum_{i=1}^{q+1} (I_{S^q(X_{z_i})})$ . Consider the difference  $f - g$  and its degree in  $x_0$  so that the value of  $d$  decreases. Thus,  $f \in \sum_{i=0}^{q+1} (I_{S^q(X_{z_i})})$ . We are done.

(3) Note that if  $e = 1$  and  $q \geq 1$ , then property *ST* is obvious since  $S^q(X)$  and  $S^{q-1}(X_{\mathbb{T}_z X})$  are both hypersurfaces, and that the case  $e \geq 2, q = 1$  can be proved by (1). Using (2) and double induction on  $e, q \geq 2$ , we are done.  $\square$

**Corollary 3.5.** *If  $X$  satisfies property  $N_{2,2}$  with  $\text{codim}X \geq 2$ , then it satisfies property IC.*

*Proof.* By (1) of the proposition above, it is enough to show that a general inner projection  $X_z$  satisfies property ST. By [26],  $X_z$  satisfies property  $N_{2,1}$ , hence property ST.  $\square$

The following lemma is useful to deal with the case where  $S^q(X)$  has small codimension. In particular, it is used for the proof of Theorem 1.3.

**Lemma 3.6.** *Let  $q \geq 2$ . Given an indexed set  $z_i$  of points in  $X$ , set a homogeneous coordinate system  $x_0, \dots, x_r$  such that  $V(x_j) \ni z_i$  if  $i \neq j$ , and put  $\mathbb{T}_i := \mathbb{T}_{z_i}X$ . Suppose that*

- (1) *every  $(q-1)$ -form vanishing on  $S^{q-2}(X_{(\mathbb{T}_0, \mathbb{T}_1)})$  is of the form  $\partial f / \partial x_1$  with some  $q$ -form  $f$  vanishing on  $S^{q-1}(X_{\mathbb{T}_0})$  for two general points  $z_0, z_1$  in  $X$ ; and*
- (2) *there are no degree  $q-1$  hypersurfaces containing  $S^{q-2}(X_{(z_0, \mathbb{T}_1, \mathbb{T}_2)})$  for three general points  $z_0, z_1, z_2$  in  $X$ .*

*Then, every  $q$ -form vanishing on  $S^{q-1}(X_{\mathbb{T}_0})$  is of the form  $\partial f / \partial x_0$  with some  $(q+1)$ -form  $f$  vanishing on  $S^q(X)$  for a general point  $z_0$  in  $X$ .*

*Proof.* Choose  $r+1$  general points  $z_i$  in  $X$ , and let  $f_0$  be any  $q$ -form in  $I_{S^{q-1}(X_{\mathbb{T}_0})}$ . Then,  $\deg_{x_i} f_0 \leq 1$  and

$$\frac{\partial f_0}{\partial x_i} \in (I_{\mathbb{P}TC_{z_i}S^{q-1}(X_{\mathbb{T}_0})})_{q-1} \subseteq (I_{S^{q-2}(X_{(\mathbb{T}_0, \mathbb{T}_i)})})_{q-1},$$

which by assumption, says that for each  $1 \leq i \leq r$ , there is some  $q$ -form  $f_i \in I_{S^{q-1}(X_{\mathbb{T}_i})}$  such that  $\partial f_i / \partial x_0 = \partial f_0 / \partial x_i$ .

We claim that

$$\frac{\partial f_i}{\partial x_j} = \frac{\partial f_j}{\partial x_i}$$

for every pair  $i \neq j$ . Indeed, we have

$$\frac{\partial^2 f_i}{\partial x_0 \partial x_j} = \frac{\partial^2 f_i}{\partial x_j \partial x_0} = \frac{\partial^2 f_0}{\partial x_j \partial x_i} = \frac{\partial^2 f_0}{\partial x_i \partial x_j} = \frac{\partial^2 f_j}{\partial x_i \partial x_0} = \frac{\partial^2 f_j}{\partial x_0 \partial x_i},$$

and by assumption in consideration of the difference  $\partial f_i / \partial x_j - \partial f_j / \partial x_i$ , the claim is verified. Now, by the claim above, the  $(q+1)$ -form

$$f := \frac{1}{q+1} \sum_{i=0}^r x_i f_i$$

satisfies  $\partial f / \partial x_i = f_i \in I_{S^{q-1}(X_{\mathbb{T}_i})} \subset I_{S^{q-1}(X)}$ . Due to the prolongation theorem [36, Theorem 1.2], we obtain  $f \in I_{S^q(X)}$  with  $\partial f / \partial x_0 = f_0$ . We are done.  $\square$

We are ready to prove the generalized Bronowski's conjecture, weak form.

**Proof of Theorem 1.3.** (1) We use induction on  $q \geq 1$ . For  $q = 1$ , it is trivial that if  $X_z$  is a variety of minimal degree, then so is  $X$ . Now, suppose that  $q \geq 2$ . Let  $w \in X$  be another general point. Then, by the induction hypothesis,  $S^{q-1}(X_{\mathbb{T}_z X})$  has minimal degree since so does  $S^{q-1}(X_{\langle w, \mathbb{T}_z X \rangle})$ . By Proposition 3.4,  $S^q(X)$  has simple tangent cone at a general point of  $X$ . Hence,  $S^q(X)$  is a  $q$ -secant variety of minimal degree.

(2) Similarly, use induction on  $e \geq 1$ . The case  $e = 1$  is due to Lemma 3.6. Let  $z, w \in X$  be two general points, and consider  $S^{q-1}(X_{\mathbb{T}_w X})$ ,  $S^{q-1}(X_{\langle z, \mathbb{T}_w X \rangle})$  and  $S^q(X_z)$ . As above,  $S^q(X_z)$  has minimal degree as well as  $S^{q-1}(X_{\mathbb{T}_z X})$ , and  $S^q(X)$  has simple tangent cone at a general point in  $X$ . We are done.  $\square$

**Corollary 3.7.**  *$X$  is an  $M^q$ -variety if and only if its general  $(q - 1)$ -tangential projection is a minimal degree variety.*

*Proof.* The “only if” part is by Corollary 2.7. In order to show the “if” part, we use induction on  $q$ . The case  $q = 1$  is trivial. Now, let  $q \geq 2$ , and  $X'$  a general tangential projection of  $X$ . Then, by assumption, a general  $(q - 2)$ -tangential projection of  $X'$  is a variety of minimal degree. The induction hypothesis says that  $X'$  is an  $M^{q-1}$ -variety. We are done by Theorem 1.3.  $\square$

As a general tangential projection of a minimal degree variety again has minimal degree, Corollary 3.7 implies the following:

**Corollary 3.8.** *If  $X$  is an  $M^q$ -variety, then it is also an  $M^{q+1}$ -variety. In particular, any variety of minimal degree is an  $M^q$ -variety for all  $q \geq 1$ .*

The rest of this subsection will be devoted to revealing the portion of the weak form in solving the generalized Bronowski’s conjecture.

*Remark 3.9.* The generalized Bronowski’s conjecture is true for the following cases:

- (1)  $e = 0, q = 2$  and  $X$  is smooth with  $1 \leq \dim X \leq 3$ ; and
- (2)  $e \geq 0, q \geq 2$  and  $X$  is a smooth surface,

where  $e = \text{codim} S^q(X)$ . See [13, pp. 26-27]. Their arguments depend on the classification of  $MA^q$ -varieties.

**Corollary 3.10.** *If the generalized Bronowski’s conjecture holds for the case  $S^q(X) = \mathbb{P}^r$ , then so does it for all the cases.*

*Proof.* Let  $e \geq 1$  be the codimension of  $S^q(X)$ . Suppose that a general  $(q - 1)$ -tangential projection of  $X$  is birational, and its image  $X_\Lambda$  is a variety of minimal degree. Let  $X'$  be a general  $e$ -inner projection of  $X$ . Since a general  $e$ -inner projection of  $X_\Lambda$  is birational, and since

two projections commute, a general  $(q - 1)$ -tangential projection of  $X'$  is birational onto the projective space. Now, if the generalized Bronowski's conjecture holds for  $X'$ , then  $X'$  is an  $MA^q$ -variety, hence  $X$  is an  $MA^q$ -variety by Theorem 1.3 and the commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
& \text{generically} & \\
& \text{1:1} & \\
\tilde{S}^q(X) & \dashrightarrow & \tilde{S}^q(X') \\
\downarrow & & \downarrow \text{generically} \\
& & \text{1:1} \\
S^q(X) & \dashrightarrow & S^q(X') \\
& \text{generically} & \\
& \text{1:1} & 
\end{array}$$

(cf. [13, Lemma 4.1 (vii)]). □

Now, we will prove the generalized Bronowski's conjecture for curves. The following definition will be used:

**Definition 3.11** ([30]). Let  $X = C \subset \mathbb{P}^r$  be a curve. One says that  $C$  is *tangentially degenerate* if for a general point  $z \in C$ , there is a point  $z' \in C \cap \mathbb{T}_z C$  other than  $z$ .

**Corollary 3.12.** *The generalized Bronowski's conjecture is true for curves.*

*Proof.* Let  $X = C \subseteq \mathbb{P}^r$  be a curve. If  $S^q(C) \neq \mathbb{P}^r$ , then this is because of Theorem 1.3 and the fact that the map  $\tilde{S}^q(C) \rightarrow S^q(C)$  is birational with  $S^q(C) \neq \mathbb{P}^r$  (cf. [13, Proposition 1.5]). We only need to consider the curve  $C$  in  $\mathbb{P}^{2q-1}$  such that its general  $(q - 1)$ -tangential projection is birational onto  $\mathbb{P}^1$ . Let  $C' \subset \mathbb{P}^3$  be a general  $(q - 2)$ -tangential projection of  $C$ . Write  $d = \deg C'$ . As a general tangential projection of  $C'$  is birational, we have  $\text{length}(C' \cap \mathbb{T}_z C') = d - 1$  for a general point  $z \in C'$ , which implies that  $C'$  has maximal regularity, namely  $\text{reg} C' = d - 1$ . Now, by referring to the classification of curves with maximal regularity in [24], if  $d > 4$ , then  $C'$  is smooth, and so not tangentially degenerate ([30, Theorem 3.1]), which means that  $\text{length}(C' \cap \mathbb{T}_z C') = 2$ , a contradiction. Note that the following is well known: any nondegenerate irreducible projective curve of almost minimal degree is smooth or cut out by quadrics. So, by a similar reason,  $C'$  can not have almost minimal degree. Thus,  $C'$  is a twisted cubic curve, hence  $C$  is an  $M^{q-1}$ -variety by Theorem 1.3. Thus, as noted in [13, Theorem 6.1],  $C$  is an  $MA^q$ -variety since it is a rational normal curve. □

For a result applied to any dimensions, refer to the remark below:

*Remark 3.13.* The projective variety  $X$  is said to be *q-tangentially weakly defective* if  $q$  general points  $z_1, \dots, z_q$  in  $X$  are not isolated points of the locus

$$\overline{\{z \in \text{Sm} X : \mathbb{T}_z X \subseteq \langle \mathbb{T}_{z_1} X, \dots, \mathbb{T}_{z_q} X \rangle\}} \subseteq X.$$

The tangentially weak defectiveness enjoys the following properties:

- (1) If  $X$  is not  $q$ -tangentially weakly defective, then it is  $q$ -identifiable, that is, the map  $\tilde{S}^q(X) \rightarrow S^q(X)$  is birational; see [6, Proposition 14].
- (2) When a general  $m$ -tangential projection of  $X$  is generically finite for an integer  $1 \leq m \leq q - 1$ , the projection image is  $(q - m)$ -tangentially weakly defective if and only if  $X$  is  $q$ -tangentially weakly defective; see [7, Proposition 14].
- (3) If  $X$  is smooth, then it is not 1-tangentially weakly defective; see [37, Theorem 0].

**Theorem 3.14.** *If  $\dim S^{q+1}(X) = \dim \tilde{S}^{q+1}(X)$ , then  $X$  verifies the generalized Bronowski's conjecture for  $S^q(X)$ . Especially, if  $\dim S^m(X) = \dim \tilde{S}^m(X)$  for some integer  $m \geq q + 1$ , and if  $X$  satisfies the assumption of generalized Bronowski's conjecture for  $S^q(X)$ , then  $X$  is an  $MA^j$ -variety for  $q \leq j \leq m - 1$ .*

*Proof.* Theorem 1.3 tells us that  $X$  is an  $M^q$ -variety. It suffices to show that the map  $\tilde{S}^q(X) \rightarrow S^q(X)$  is birational. Let  $X_\Lambda$  be a general  $(q - 1)$ -tangential projection. Then, by assumption,  $X_\Lambda$  is a variety of minimal degree that satisfies  $\dim S^2(X_\Lambda) = 2 \dim X_\Lambda + 1$ . This means that  $X_\Lambda$  is a smooth rational normal scroll. By the remark above,  $X_\Lambda$  is not 1-tangentially defective, and thus  $X$  is not  $q$ -tangentially weakly defective so that the map  $\tilde{S}^q(X) \rightarrow S^q(X)$  is birational.  $\square$

Before closing this section, it is worth mentioning the following:

*Remark 3.15.* In fact, the proof of theorem above shows that  $X$  is an  $MA^q$ -variety whenever its general  $(q - 1)$ -tangential projection is birational onto a smooth variety of minimal degree and positive codimension. For the complete proof of generalized Bronowski's conjecture, the only thing that remains is to consider the case where a general  $(q - 1)$ -tangential projection is a cone over a variety of minimal degree (in this case,  $\dim S^{q+1}(X) \neq \dim \tilde{S}^{q+1}(X)$ ).

For instance, when  $X = S(1, 6) \subset \mathbb{P}^8$ , the generalized Bronowski's conjecture holds for  $S^2(X)$ , but the theorem above can not be applied since  $\dim S^3(X) = 7$  and  $\dim \tilde{S}^3(X) = 8$  are different.

## 4 A generalized $K_{p,1}$ theorem

In this section, we will discuss the  $q$ -th row

$$\beta_{1,q}(S^q(X)), \beta_{2,q}(S^q(X)), \dots, \beta_{p,q}(S^q(X)), \dots$$

of Betti table of  $S^q(X) \subset \mathbb{P}^r$  (or the corresponding subcomplex of the minimal free resolution), namely the  $(q + 1)$ -strand of  $S^q(X) \subset \mathbb{P}^r$ . Since  $(I_{S^q(X)})_q = 0$ , the  $(q + 1)$ -strand is the possibly first nontrivial row of Betti table. The *length of  $(q + 1)$ -strand* is defined to be

$$\max\{p : \beta_{p,q} \neq 0\}.$$

The following is a generalization of a result in [21].

**Proposition 4.1.** *Choose  $r + 1$  linearly independent points  $z_0, \dots, z_r \in V^*$  in  $X$  with dual basis  $x_0, \dots, x_r \in V$ , and write  $x_\alpha := x_{i_1} \wedge \dots \wedge x_{i_{|\alpha|}} \in \wedge^{|\alpha|} V$  for any  $\alpha = \{i_1 < \dots < i_{|\alpha|}\} \subseteq \{0, \dots, r\}$ . And let  $z \in V^*$  be a point of  $X$ .*

(1) *For any Koszul class  $\eta = \sum_{|\alpha|=p-1} x_\alpha \otimes f_\alpha$  in  $K_{p-1, q+1}(IS^q(X), V)$ , we have*

$$f_\alpha = \sum_{\substack{j_0 < \dots < j_q \\ \text{in } \alpha^c}} a_\alpha^{j_0, \dots, j_q} x_{j_0} \cdots x_{j_q}$$

*for some  $a_\alpha^{j_0, \dots, j_q}$  in the base field. If in addition, we fix any nonzero Koszul class  $\eta$  in  $K_{p-1, q+1}(IS^q(X), V)$  and choose the points  $z_i$  generally in  $X$ , then the coefficients  $a_\alpha^{j_0, \dots, j_q}$  above are all nonzero.*

(2) *The evaluation map at  $z$  extends to a map  $K_{p, q}(S^q(X)) \rightarrow K_{p-1, q}(S^q(X_z))$ . And for a given nonzero Koszul class  $\gamma \in K_{p, q}(S^q(X))$ , its image under the map is nonzero when we take  $z$  to be general in  $X$ .*

*Proof.* Assume that a monomial  $x_i \cdot M$  with  $i \in \alpha$  occurs in the expression of  $f_\alpha$  (with nonzero coefficient) for some monomial  $M$ . Then, from the fact that  $\eta$  is a Koszul cycle, it follows that letting  $\beta := \alpha \setminus \{i\}$  for convenience, we have

$$\sum_{j \in \beta^c} \pm x_j f_{\{j\} \cup \beta} = 0.$$

Then, the summand  $\pm x_i f_\alpha$  involves the monomial  $x_i^2 \cdot M$ . So, for some  $j \in \beta^c$  with  $j \neq i$  and  $x_j | M$ ,  $f_{\{j\} \cup \beta}$  involves the monomial  $x_j^2 \cdot (M/x_j)$ , for the monomial  $x_i^2 \cdot M$  need to be canceled out. We have established a contradiction.

Now, in order to show that  $a_\alpha^{j_0, \dots, j_q} \neq 0$ , consider the loci

$$U_{\alpha, J} := \{(z'_0, \dots, z'_r) : \eta(z'_{i_1} \wedge \dots \wedge z'_{i_{p-1}}) \neq 0 \text{ on } \langle z'_{j_0}, \dots, z'_{j_q} \rangle\} \subseteq X^{r+1},$$

for  $\alpha = \{i_1 < \dots < i_{p-1}\} \subseteq \{0, \dots, r\}$  and  $J = \{j_0 < \dots < j_q\} \subseteq \{0, \dots, r\} \setminus \alpha$ . Note that the  $U_{\alpha, J}$  are open, and that

$$(z_0, \dots, z_r) \in U_{\alpha, J} \text{ if and only if the coefficient } a_\alpha^{j_0, \dots, j_q} \text{ is nonzero.}$$

Furthermore, under the natural actions,  $\sigma(U_{\alpha, J}) = U_{\sigma(\alpha), \sigma(J)}$  holds for each element  $\sigma$  of the symmetric group  $\mathfrak{S}_{r+1}$ , and since  $\eta \neq 0$ , at least one of the  $U_{\alpha, J}$  is nonempty. Thus, we see that every  $U_{\alpha, J}$  is nonempty, and so the general point  $(z_0, \dots, z_r)$  in  $X^{r+1}$  lies in all of the  $U_{\alpha, J}$ , which means that each of the coefficients  $a_\alpha^{j_0, \dots, j_q}$  is nonzero.

Now, consider the mapping

$$\eta = \sum_{|\alpha|=p-1} x_\alpha \otimes f_\alpha \mapsto \sum_{\substack{|\beta|=p-2, \\ \beta \neq 0}} x_\beta \otimes f_{\beta \cup \{0\}}$$

which is an extension of the map  $v_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge v_{p-1} \mapsto \sum_{i=1}^{p-1} (-1)^{i-1} v_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge \widehat{v}_i \wedge \cdots \wedge v_{p-1} \cdot v_i(z)$ . The image is in  $K_{p-2,q+1}(I_{S^{q-1}(X_z)})$ , and nonzero if  $\eta \neq 0$  is fixed and  $z \in X$  is general (with respect to the fixed  $\eta$ ).  $\square$

*Remark 4.2.* The statement (2) of the proposition above says that under the assumption, the projection map  $\text{pr}_z : K_{p-1,q+1}(I_{S^q(X)}, V) \rightarrow K_{p-2,q+1}(I_{S^q(X)}, V_z)$  (see [1, Section 2.2.1]) factors through  $K_{p-2,q+1}(I_{S^q(X_z)}, V_z)$ .

$$\begin{array}{ccc} & & K_{p-2,q+1}(I_{S^q(X_z)}, V_z) \\ & \nearrow \text{dashed} & \downarrow \\ K_{p-1,q+1}(I_{S^q(X)}, V) & \xrightarrow{\text{pr}_z} & K_{p-2,q+1}(I_{S^q(X)}, V_z) \end{array}$$

This result need not be true anymore if we do not impose the condition  $z \in X$ .

**Corollary 4.3.** *Suppose that  $K_{p,q}(S^q(X)) \neq 0$ . Then, for any nonzero Koszul class  $\eta$  lying in  $K_{p-1,q+1}(I_{S^q(X)}, V)$ , the induced map  $\eta : \wedge^{p-1} V^* \rightarrow (I_{S^q(X)})_{q+1}$  has rank at least  $\binom{p+q}{q+1}$ . In particular, we have*

$$\dim(I_{S^q(X)})_{q+1} \geq \binom{p+q}{q+1}.$$

*Proof.* Let  $\eta$  be a nonzero Koszul class in  $K_{p-1,q+1}(I_{S^q(X)}, V)$ . Choose  $r+1$  general points  $z_0, \dots, z_r \in V^*$  in  $X$  with their dual basis  $x_0, \dots, x_r \in V$ . The collection of

$$f_{\{0, \dots, p+q-1\} \setminus \beta}, \quad |\beta| = q+1 \text{ in } \{0, \dots, p+q-1\}$$

gives the desired result by the proposition above. Here,  $\eta \neq 0$  makes sure that  $p+q-1 \leq r$ .  $\square$

**Theorem 4.4** (A generalized  $K_{p,1}$  theorem). *Let  $e = \text{codim} S^q(X)$ . The following hold:*

- (1)  $K_{p,q}(S^q(X)) = 0$  whenever  $p > e$ .
- (2)  $K_{e,q}(S^q(X)) \neq 0$  if and only if  $S^q(X)$  has minimal degree.

*Proof.* Suppose that  $K_{p,q}(S^q(X)) \neq 0$  with  $p \geq e$ . Let  $X_\Lambda$  be a general  $(e-1)$ -inner projection of  $X$ . By Proposition 4.1,  $K_{p-e+1,q}(S^q(X_\Lambda)) \neq 0$ . But since  $S^q(X_\Lambda)$  is a hypersurface of degree larger than  $q$ , we have  $p = e$  and  $\deg S^q(X_\Lambda) = q+1$ . By Theorem 1.3,  $S^q(X)$  is of minimal degree.

Now, for the reverse implication, assume that  $S^q(X)$  is a  $q$ -secant variety of minimal degree. We will show that  $\text{reg}S^q(X) = q + 1$  instead, which is enough since the projective dimension of  $S_{S^q(X)}$  is at least  $e$ . Keep in mind that the case  $e = 1$  is trivial and the case  $q = 1$  is well known, and that  $\text{codim}S^q(X_z) = e - 1$  and  $\text{codim}S^{q-1}(X_{\mathbb{T}_z X}) = e$  for a general point  $z \in X$ . We are done by double induction on  $e, q$  together with Corollary 2.7, Proposition 3.4 and Theorem 2.15.  $\square$

## 5 Higher secant varieties of minimal degree

### 5.1 Syzygetic characterization of minimal degree $q$ -secant varieties

For convenience, one can say that the Betti table of  $X \subseteq \mathbb{P}^r$  is  $q$ -pure Cohen-Macaulay if it is of the following form.

$$\begin{array}{c|cccc} & 0 & 1 & \cdots & e \\ \hline 0 & 1 & & & \\ q & & B_{1,q}^e & \cdots & B_{e,q}^e \end{array}$$

Here, the remaining entries are all zero, and as in Corollary 2.14,

$$B_{p,q}^e = \binom{p+q-1}{q} \binom{e+q}{p+q}.$$

Due to Proposition 2.13 (or Proposition A.5) and Theorem 2.15, we have the following lemma:


**Lemma 5.1.** *Let  $e = \text{codim}S^q(X)$ . Set  $e \geq 2$  and  $q \geq 2$ . Assume that  $S^q(X)$  has simple tangent cone at a general point  $z$  of  $X$ . If*

- (1)  $S^q(X_z)$  has  $q$ -pure Cohen-Macaulay Betti table; and
- (2)  $S^{q-1}(X_{\mathbb{T}_z X})$  has  $(q-1)$ -pure Cohen-Macaulay Betti table,

*then  $S^q(X)$  has  $q$ -pure Cohen-Macaulay Betti table.*

Now, we proceed to prove one of our main theorems.

**Proof of Theorem 1.1.**





The directions (2)  $\Rightarrow$  (3a)  $\Rightarrow$  (3b)  $\Rightarrow$  (3c) and (2)  $\Rightarrow$  (5a)  $\Rightarrow$  (5b)  $\Rightarrow$  (4) are trivial. (4)  $\Rightarrow$  (1) is by the generalized  $K_{p,1}$  theorem (Theorem 4.4). It suffices to show (3c)  $\Rightarrow$  (1) and (1)  $\Rightarrow$  (2).

In order to prove (3c)  $\Rightarrow$  (1), suppose that (3c) holds. Then, the  $q$ -secant variety to a general  $(e - 1)$ -inner projection of  $X$  has minimal degree by the equality case in Corollary 2.14. Thus, by Theorem 1.3,  $S^q(X)$  is of minimal degree.

For a proof of (1)  $\Rightarrow$  (2), mimic the second part in the proof of Theorem 4.4. One shall use Lemma 5.1. □

## 5.2 Determinantal presentation

If  $X$  is a variety of minimal degree, then it is completely determined by the *del Pezzo-Bertini classification*, that is, it is either a rational normal scroll or a cone over the Veronese surface in  $\mathbb{P}^5$  as long as  $\text{codim}X \geq 2$ . And both rational normal scrolls and cones over  $v_2(\mathbb{P}^2) \subset \mathbb{P}^5$  are defined by 2-minors of a suitable linear matrix. In this subsection, we present its analogue for higher secant varieties of minimal degree, namely the *determinantal presentation*, and especially, when  $X$  is a smooth  $M^q$ -variety, construct a particular pair of linear systems that explains the common geometric structure of smooth  $M^q$ -varieties. Here, the pair of linear systems corresponds to the determinantal presentation naturally as dealt with in [14].

Let  $M$  be a matrix whose entries are in  $V$ . It is well known that if  $\text{rank}M(z) \leq 1$  for every point  $z \in X$ , then  $\text{rank}M(w) \leq q$  for every point  $w \in S^q(X)$ . In other words,  $(q + 1)$ -minors of  $M$  vanishes on  $S^q(X)$  provided that so do 2-minors on  $X$ .

Put  $e = \text{codim}S^q(X)$ . Assume that there is an 1-*generic*  $(q + 1) \times (e + q)$  linear matrix  $M$  such that 2-minors of  $M$  are equations of  $X$ , where by definition, a matrix of linear forms is 1-*generic* if it has no zero entries even after taking arbitrary row or column operations. Then, [14, Theorem 2.1] implies that the *Eagon-Northcott complex* associated to  $M$  resolves the homogeneous coordinate ring of  $S^q(X) \subset \mathbb{P}^r$ , hence  $S^q(X)$  is a  $q$ -secant variety of minimal degree whose homogeneous ideal is generated by  $(q + 1)$ -minors of  $M$ .

On the other hand, together with assuming  $e = 3$ , suppose given a symmetric  $(q + 2) \times (q + 2)$  matrix  $M$  of linear forms such that its 2-minors vanish on  $X$  and its  $(q + 1)$ -minors defines a codimension 3 subscheme of  $\mathbb{P}^r$ . Consulting with [29, (3.1)], we find that  $S^q(X)$  is a minimal degree  $q$ -secant variety ideal-theoretically generated by  $(q + 1)$ -minors of  $M$ , and furthermore, see what shape the minimal resolution of  $S_{S^q(X)}$  is.

In what follows, we denote by  $I_m(M)$  the ideal generated by the  $m$ -minors of  $M$ , and the labeling around a matrix indicates the size of submatrices; for example, the submatrix  $M'$  of

$$\begin{array}{c}
 1 \quad l \\
 1 \quad \left( \begin{array}{cc} * & * \\ * & M' \end{array} \right) \\
 m
 \end{array}$$

has size  $m \times l$ .

**Definition 5.2.** Suppose that  $S^q(X)$  has minimal degree of codimension  $e$ . One says  $S^q(X)$  to be *of scroll type* if it is ideal-theoretically defined by  $(q+1)$ -minors of a  $(q+1) \times (e+q)$  linear matrix  $M$  such that  $I_2(M) \subseteq I_X$ . And if  $e=3$  and  $I_{S^q(X)}$  is generated by  $(q+1)$ -minors of a symmetric  $(q+2) \times (q+2)$  linear matrix  $M$  satisfying that  $I_2(M) \subseteq I_X$ , then  $S^q(X)$  is called *of Veronese type*. In these cases, for convenience, the matrix  $M$  is said to be a *determinantal presentation* of  $S^q(X)$ .

*Example 5.3.* The following are fundamental examples:

- (1) Any rational normal scrolls have minimal degree higher secant varieties of scroll type.
- (2) For the second Veronese variety  $X = \nu_2(\mathbb{P}^n)$ , its  $(n-1)$ -secant variety is of Veronese type. Let us see the higher secant varieties to  $X$ :

$$X = S^1(X) \subsetneq S^2(X) \subsetneq \dots \subsetneq S^{n-1}(X) \subsetneq S^n(X) \subsetneq S^{n+1}(X) = \mathbb{P}^r$$

with  $r = \binom{n+2}{2} - 1$ . Let  $M$  be the linear matrix on  $\mathbb{P}^r$  such that  $M_{i,j} = t_i t_j$ , where the  $t_i$  are homogeneous coordinates of  $\mathbb{P}^n$ . Then, it is the determinantal presentation of  $S^{n-1}(X)$ . And  $S^n(X)$  is of scroll type, for the determinant of  $M$  defines it. On the other hand, in the range  $1 \leq i \leq n-2$ , the  $i$ -th secant variety  $S^i(X)$  does not even have minimal degree. Indeed, Terracini's lemma says that  $\dim S^2(X) = 2n$ , and a general tangential projection  $X_{\mathbb{T}_z X}$  lies in  $\nu_2(\mathbb{P}^{n-1})$  (up to projective equivalence), hence  $X_{\mathbb{T}_z X} = \nu_2(\mathbb{P}^{n-1})$ . Recall that if  $X$  is an  $M^i$ -variety, then  $X_{\mathbb{T}_z X}$  is an  $M^{i-1}$ -variety.

- (3) Let  $X$  be a smooth quadric surface  $Q \subset \mathbb{P}^3$ , and embed it into  $\mathbb{P}^8$  by the complete linear system  $|\mathcal{O}_Q(2)|$ . Then,  $S^2(X)$  is a Veronese type 2-secant variety of minimal degree. This is because  $X$  is a "general" hyperplane section  $\nu_2(\mathbb{P}^3) \cap H$  and  $\dim S^2(X) = 5$  holds by a theorem of Severi so that  $S^2(X) = S^2(\nu_2(\mathbb{P}^3)) \cap H$  is satisfied.
- (4) If a variety of minimal degree is of Veronese type, then after assuming that it is not a cone, it is either the Veronese surface  $\nu_2(\mathbb{P}^2) \subset \mathbb{P}^5$  (hence the name) or the twisted quartic curve  $\nu_4(\mathbb{P}^1) \subset \mathbb{P}^4$ . Note that the twisted quartic curve has determinantal presentation

$$\begin{pmatrix} x_0 & x_1 & x_2 \\ x_1 & x_2 & x_3 \\ x_2 & x_3 & x_4 \end{pmatrix}$$

under the canonical embedding, and that it is also of scroll type.

**Proposition 5.4.** Assume that  $S^q(X)$  is a  $q$ -secant variety of minimal degree.

- (1) If  $S^q(X)$  is of scroll type, then for a general point  $z \in X$ ,  $S^q(X_z)$  and  $S^{q-1}(X_{\mathbb{T}_z X})$  are of scroll type.
- (2) If  $S^q(X)$  is of Veronese type, then for a general point  $z \in X$ ,  $S^q(X_z)$  is of scroll type and  $S^{q-1}(X_{\mathbb{T}_z X})$  is of Veronese type.

*Proof.* Let  $M$  be the determinantal presentation for each case, and take a general point  $z \in V^*$  in  $X$ . We may assume that  $M$  is of the form

$$M = \begin{matrix} & & 1 & e+q-1 \\ & & \left( \begin{array}{cc} a & B \\ C & M^0 \end{array} \right) \\ & & q & \end{matrix} \quad \text{with} \quad M(z) = \begin{matrix} & & 1 & e+q-1 \\ & & \left( \begin{array}{cc} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{array} \right) \\ & & q & \end{matrix}; \quad \text{or}$$

$$M = \begin{matrix} & & 1 & q+1 \\ & & \left( \begin{array}{cc} a & B \\ B^T & M^0 \end{array} \right) \\ & & q+1 & \end{matrix} \quad \text{with} \quad M(z) = \begin{matrix} & & 1 & q+1 \\ & & \left( \begin{array}{cc} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{array} \right) \\ & & q+1 & \end{matrix} \quad \text{and} \quad (M^0)^T = M^0.$$

Set a matrix  $M_0$  to be

$$\begin{pmatrix} B \\ M^0 \end{pmatrix} \quad \text{if } S^q(X) \text{ is of scroll type,} \quad \text{and} \quad \begin{pmatrix} B^T & M^0 \end{pmatrix} \quad \text{if } S^q(X) \text{ is of Veronese type.}$$

Since  $I_2(M) \subseteq I_X$ , the containments  $I_2(M_0) \subseteq I_{X_z}$  and  $I_2(M^0) \subseteq I_{X_{\mathbb{T}_z X}}$  are trivial. And since  $K_1(z, I_{S^q(X)}) = (I_{S^{q-1}(X_{\mathbb{T}_z X})})$ , we have  $I_q(M^0) = I_{S^{q-1}(X_{\mathbb{T}_z X})}$ . All we need to show is that  $I_{q+1}(M_0)$  is equal to  $I_{S^q(X_z)}$ .

(1) Since the  $(q+1)$ -minors of  $M$  are linearly independent, so are those of  $M_0$ . Thus,  $I_{q+1}(M_0) = I_{S^q(X_z)}$ .

(2) Let  $\Delta_{i,j}$ ,  $0 \leq i \leq j \leq q+1$ , be the  $(q+1)$ -minors of  $M$  obtained by deleting the  $i$ -th row and the  $j$ -th column. They are linearly independent, hence the minors  $\Delta_{0,j}$ ,  $0 \leq j \leq q+1$ , are linearly independent. We are done.  $\square$

**Lemma 5.5.** *Assume that  $S^q(X)$  is a  $q$ -secant variety of minimal degree. If  $S^q(X)$  is either of scroll type or of Veronese type, then its determinantal presentation is 1-generic.*

*Proof.* To the contrary, suppose that the determinantal presentation  $M$  is not 1-generic. So, we may assume that

$$M = \begin{matrix} & & 1 \\ & & \left( \begin{array}{cc} 0 & B \\ C & * \end{array} \right) \end{matrix}.$$

Then, as 2-minors of  $M$  vanish on the nondegenerate irreducible projective variety  $X$ , either  $B$  or  $C$  is identically zero. Therefore, the  $(q+1)$ -minors of  $M$  are not enough to define  $S^q(X)$ , a contradiction by Theorem 1.1.(3b).  $\square$

**Lemma 5.6.** *Suppose that  $S^q(X)$  is a minimal degree  $q$ -secant variety with  $e := \text{codim}S^q(X)$ .*

- (1) *Assume that  $S^q(X)$  is of scroll type with  $M$  the determinantal presentation. If  $e \geq 2$ , then  $M$  is unique up to the natural  $\text{GL}(q+1) \times \text{GL}(e+q)$ -action. For the case  $e = 1$ , if the last row is given and fixed, then  $M$  is unique up to the natural left  $\text{GL}(q+1)$ -action.*
- (2) *Assume that  $S^q(X)$  is of Veronese type. Then, the determinantal presentation  $M$  is unique up to the  $\text{GL}(q+2)$ -action  $P \mapsto PMP^T$ .*

*Proof.* Let us say that another matrix  $N$  serves as the determinantal presentation. We will show that  $N$  can be transformed into  $M$  under each action.

(1) For the first uniqueness of scroll type, we will use induction on  $e \geq 2$ . If  $e = 2$ , then it is due to the Hilbert-Burch theorem and due to the uniqueness of minimal free resolution. Set  $e \geq 3$ , and take a general point  $z \in V^*$  in  $X$ . Considering the  $\text{GL}(q+1) \times \text{GL}(e+q)$ -action, we may assume that

$$M(z) = N(z) = \begin{matrix} & 1 & e+q-1 \\ & \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \end{matrix}.$$

By the induction hypothesis, suitable basis changes induce that

$$M = \begin{matrix} & 1 & e+q-1 \\ & \begin{pmatrix} * & M_0 \end{pmatrix} \end{matrix} \quad \text{and} \quad N = \begin{matrix} & 1 & e+q-1 \\ & \begin{pmatrix} A & M_0 \end{pmatrix} \end{matrix}.$$

Consider the  $(q+1) \times (e+q+1)$  matrix  $\tilde{M} = \begin{pmatrix} A & M \end{pmatrix}$  of linear forms. Then, 2-minors of  $\tilde{M}$  vanish on  $X$  obviously, and so  $S^q(X) = V(I_{q+1}(\tilde{M}))$ . Since  $\text{codim}S^q(X) = e$ ,  $\tilde{M}$  is not 1-generic. However,  $M$  is 1-generic with  $X \subseteq V(I_2(\tilde{M}))$ , which means that  $A$  is a linear combination of columns in  $M$ . Thus,  $M = N$  up to the  $\text{GL}(q+1) \times \text{GL}(e+q)$ -action.

Now, to see the case  $e = 1$ , further assume that the last row of  $N$  is the same as  $M$ . Write

$$N = \begin{matrix} & q+1 \\ & \begin{pmatrix} N' \\ * \end{pmatrix} \end{matrix}.$$

By letting  $\tilde{M} = \begin{pmatrix} N' \\ M \end{pmatrix}$ , the same reasoning as above says that  $M = N$  up to the left  $\text{GL}(q+1)$ -action.

(2) In fact, the uniqueness holds for the case  $q = 0$ , that is, when  $r = 2$  so that  $S^0(X) = \emptyset \subset \mathbb{P}^2$  has codimension 3, and when there is a symmetric  $2 \times 2$  linear matrix  $M$  such that entries of  $M$  generate all of the variables with  $\det M \in I_X$ , the matrix  $M$  is uniquely determined up to the  $\text{GL}(q+2)$ -action described above. Indeed, taking three general points  $z_0, z_1, z_2 \in V^*$  of  $X$

with dual basis  $x_0, x_1, x_2 \in V$ , there exists an invertible  $2 \times 2$  constant matrix  $P$  such that after replacing  $M$  with  $PMP^T$ , we have

$$M(z_0) = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad M(z_1) = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \quad \text{and} \quad M(z_2) = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 \end{pmatrix},$$

hence

$$M = \begin{pmatrix} x_0 + x_2 & x_2 \\ x_2 & x_1 + x_2 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Now, set  $q \geq 1$ , and use induction on  $q$ . By the uniqueness for the case  $q - 1$ , we may begin with a general point  $z \in V^*$  in  $X$  and

$$M = \begin{matrix} & & 1 & q+1 \\ & & & \\ & & & \\ & & & \end{matrix} \begin{pmatrix} a & B \\ B^T & M^0 \end{pmatrix} \quad \text{and} \quad N = \begin{matrix} & & 1 & q+1 \\ & & & \\ & & & \\ & & & \end{matrix} \begin{pmatrix} * & B' \\ B'^T & M^0 \end{pmatrix}$$

with  $M(z) = N(z) = \begin{matrix} & & 1 & q+1 \\ & & & \\ & & & \\ & & & \end{matrix} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$ , where  $M^0$  defines  $S^{q-1}(X_{\mathbb{T}_z X})$ . Then, by considering the determinantal presentation of  $S^q(X_z)$ , the part (1) implies that  $B'^T$  is a linear combina-

tion of columns in  $\begin{pmatrix} B^T & M^0 \end{pmatrix}$ . Rewrite  $N = \begin{matrix} & & 1 & q+1 \\ & & & \\ & & & \\ & & & \end{matrix} \begin{pmatrix} a' & B \\ B^T & M^0 \end{pmatrix}$ . Let  $\Delta_M$  (resp.,  $\Delta_N$ ) be the  $(q+1)$ -minor of  $M$  (resp.,  $N$ ) obtained by deleting the last row and column. Considering the difference  $\Delta_M - \Delta_N$  lying in  $I_{S^q(X)}$ , we have  $a' = a$ . We are done.  $\square$

The following is the main result of this subsection:

**Theorem 5.7.** *Suppose that  $S^q(X)$  is a  $q$ -secant variety of minimal degree with codimension  $e \geq 2$ . Then,  $S^q(X)$  is either*

- (1) *of scroll type; or*
- (2) *of Veronese type with  $e = 3$ .*

*And when  $e = 3$ ,  $S^q(X)$  is of Veronese type but not of scroll type if and only if a general  $(q-1)$ -tangential projection of  $X$  is a cone over the Veronese surface  $v_2(\mathbb{P}^2) \subset \mathbb{P}^5$ .*

*Proof.* (1) First, consider the case  $e = 2$ . Note that  $S^q(X)$  is arithmetically Cohen-Macaulay. The Hilbert-Burch theorem tells us that the homogeneous ideal of  $S^q(X)$  is generated by  $(q+1)$ -minors of a  $(q+1) \times (q+2)$  linear matrix  $M$ . It is enough to show that  $I_2(M) \subseteq I_X$ . We claim that  $M$  is 1-generic. If  $M$  were not 1-generic, then we would be able to construct a nonzero

Koszul class  $\eta \in K_{1,q+1}(I_{S^q(X)}, V)$  such that the rank of induced map  $\eta : V^* \rightarrow (I_{S^q(X)})_{q+1}$  is less than  $q+2$ , a contradiction by Corollary 4.3. Indeed, when the first row of  $M$  looks like  $(0 \ \ell_1 \ \cdots \ \ell_{q+1})$ , the Koszul class

$$\eta = \sum_{i=1}^{q+1} (-1)^i \ell_i \otimes \Delta_i$$

is the desired one, where  $\Delta_i$  is the  $(q+1)$ -minor of  $M$  obtained by deleting the  $i$ -th row,  $0 \leq i \leq q+1$ . Thus,  $M$  is 1-generic, and so its minors of various sizes are nonzero. Now, if  $X \not\subseteq V(I_2(M))$ , then for a general point  $z \in X$ ,  $S^{q-1}(X_{\mathbb{T}_z X})$  would lie in a hypersurface of degree at most  $q-1$ . Thus,  $I_2(M) \subseteq I_X$ .

Second, assume that  $e = 3$  and a general  $(q-1)$ -tangential projection is not a cone over the Veronese surface, hence a rational normal scroll. We proceed by induction on  $q$ . Let  $z_0, z_1 \in V^*$  be two general points in  $X$ . Suppose that we have obtained a linear matrix

$$M^0 = \begin{matrix} & 1 & q+1 \\ & * & C_1 \\ q-1 & * & M^{0,1} \end{matrix} \quad \text{with} \quad M^0(z_1) = \begin{matrix} & 1 & q+1 \\ & 1 & 0 \\ q-1 & 0 & 0 \end{matrix}$$

whose  $q$ -minors generate  $I_{S^{q-1}(X_{\mathbb{T}_{z_0} X})}$ , where the matrix  $M^{0,1}$  is the determinantal presentation of  $S^{q-2}(X_{\langle \mathbb{T}_{z_0} X, \mathbb{T}_{z_1} X \rangle})$ . So,  $\begin{pmatrix} C_1 \\ M^{0,1} \end{pmatrix}$  defines  $S^{q-1}(X_{\langle z_1, \mathbb{T}_{z_0} X \rangle})$ , and thus  $S^q(X_{z_1})$  is ideal-theoretically defined by  $(q+1)$ -minors of the linear matrix

$$M_1 = \begin{matrix} & 1 & q+1 \\ & a_0 & C_0 \\ & a_1 & C_1 \\ q-1 & A_2 & M^{0,1} \end{matrix} \quad \text{with} \quad M_1(z_0) = \begin{matrix} & 1 & q+1 \\ & 1 & 0 \\ & 0 & 0 \\ q-1 & 0 & 0 \end{matrix}.$$

Similarly, a linear matrix

$$M_0 = \begin{matrix} & 1 & q+1 \\ & * & * \\ & * & * \\ q-1 & * & M^{0,1} \end{matrix} \quad \text{with} \quad M_0(z_1) = \begin{matrix} & 1 & q+1 \\ & 0 & 0 \\ & 1 & 0 \\ q-1 & 0 & 0 \end{matrix}$$

has  $(q+1)$ -minors that are minimal generators of  $I_{S^q(X_{z_0})}$ . Apply Lemma 5.6.(1) with codimension one so that we may transform  $M_0$  into

$$\begin{matrix} & 1 & q+1 \\ & b_0 & C_0 \\ & b_1 & C_1 \\ q-1 & B_2 & M^{0,1} \end{matrix}.$$

Consider the matrix

$$M = \begin{pmatrix} a_0 & b_0 & C_0 \\ a_1 & b_1 & C_1 \\ A_2 & B_2 & M^{0,1} \end{pmatrix}$$

of linear forms. It is the determinantal presentation of  $S^q(X)$ ; refer to the fact that  $M$  is 1-generic since so is  $M_0$  together with  $a_0(z_0) = 1 \neq 0$ .

Lastly, set  $e \geq 4$ . We may assume that for a general point  $z \in X$ ,  $S^q(X_z)$  is of scroll type; it is because a general inner projection of a rational normal scroll is again a rational normal scroll. Take two general points  $z_0, z_1 \in V^*$  in  $X$ . By assumption,  $S^q(X_{z_0})$  has the determinantal presentation

$$M_0 = q+1 \begin{pmatrix} 1 & e+q-2 \\ B & M_{0,1} \end{pmatrix} \text{ with } B(z_1) \neq 0,$$

where  $M_{0,1}$  is the determinantal presentation of  $S^q(X_{\langle z_0, z_1 \rangle})$ . Then, applying Lemma 5.6, we may assume that a linear matrix

$$M_1 = q+1 \begin{pmatrix} 1 & e+q-2 \\ A & M_{0,1} \end{pmatrix} \text{ with } A(z_0) \neq 0$$

is the determinantal presentation of  $S^q(X_{z_1})$ . Put

$$M = \begin{pmatrix} A & B & M_{0,1} \end{pmatrix}.$$

Then, it is easy to see that  $X \subseteq V(I_2(M))$  and  $M$  is 1-generic, hence  $M$  works as the determinantal presentation of  $S^q(X)$ .

(2) Let  $X_\Lambda$  stand for a general  $(q-1)$ -tangential projection of  $X$ . Notice the following: Proposition 5.4 and the part (1) imply that  $S^q(X)$  is of scroll type if and only if  $X_\Lambda$  is of scroll type. For the proof of (2), it suffices to show that  $S^q(X)$  is of Veronese type provided that  $X_\Lambda$  is a cone over the Veronese surface. Let us use induction on  $q \geq 1$ . The case  $q = 1$  is well known; set  $q \geq 2$ . Let  $z_0, z_1 \in V^*$  be two general points in  $X$ . By the induction hypothesis,  $S^{q-1}(X_{\mathbb{T}_{z_0}X})$  is defined by  $q$ -minors of a symmetric linear matrix

$$M^0 = \frac{1}{q} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & q \\ d & E \\ E^T & M^{0,1} \end{pmatrix} \text{ with } M^0(z_1) = \frac{1}{q} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & q \\ 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix},$$

where the submatrix  $M^{0,1}$  is the determinantal presentation of  $S^{q-2}(X_{\langle \mathbb{T}_{z_0}X, \mathbb{T}_{z_1}X \rangle})$ . So, the  $(q-1)$ -secant variety  $S^{q-1}(X_{\langle \mathbb{T}_{z_0}X, z_1 \rangle})$  is defined by  $q$ -minors of  $\begin{pmatrix} E^T & M^{0,1} \end{pmatrix}$ , and thus  $S^q(X_{z_1})$  is defined by  $(q+1)$ -minors of a certain linear matrix

$$M_1 = \frac{1}{q} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 & q \\ * & b & C \\ * & E^T & M^{0,1} \end{pmatrix} \text{ with } M_1(z_0) = \frac{1}{q} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 & q \\ 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Put

$$M_0 := \begin{pmatrix} b & d & E \\ C^T & E^T & M^{0,1} \end{pmatrix} \quad \text{so that} \quad M_0(z_1) = \frac{1}{q} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 & q \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix},$$

and its  $(q+1)$ -minors of  $M_0$  define  $S^q(X_{z_0})$  since  $\text{rank} M_0(z) \leq 1$  on  $X_{z_0}$  and  $\begin{pmatrix} b & E \\ C^T & M^{0,1} \end{pmatrix} =$

$\begin{pmatrix} b & C \\ E^T & M^{0,1} \end{pmatrix}^T$  is 1-generic. Moreover,  $\begin{pmatrix} C^T & M^{0,1} \end{pmatrix}$  defines  $S^{q-1}(X_{(z_0, \mathbb{T}_{z_1} X)})$ . Obviously, a linear

matrix  $M^1$  of the form  $\begin{pmatrix} a & C \\ C^T & M^{0,1} \end{pmatrix}$  with  $M^1(z_0) = \frac{1}{q} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & q \\ 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$  defines  $S^{q-1}(X_{\mathbb{T}_{z_1} X})$ , and we may assume that

$$M_1 = \begin{pmatrix} a & b & C \\ C^T & E^T & M^{0,1} \end{pmatrix}$$

Take

$$M := \begin{pmatrix} a & b & C \\ b & d & E \\ C^T & E^T & M^{0,1} \end{pmatrix}$$

Then, we have  $\text{rank} M(z) \leq 1$  on  $X$  so that  $S^q(X) \subseteq V(I_{q+1}(M))$ . For each  $0 \leq i \leq j \leq q+1$ , consider the  $(q+1)$ -minor  $\Delta_{i,j}$  of  $M$  obtained by deleting the  $i$ -th column and the  $j$ -th row, and its partial derivative  $\partial \Delta_{i,j} / \partial x_0$  with respect to any homogeneous coordinate system  $x_0, \dots, x_r$  satisfying  $x_i(z_0) = 0$ ,  $1 \leq i \leq r$ . Since the matrices  $M^0$  and  $M_0$  define  $S^{q-1}(X_{\mathbb{T}_{z_0} X})$  and  $S^q(X_{z_0})$ , respectively, the  $\Delta_{i,j}$  are linearly independent, and so  $M$  is the determinantal presentation of  $S^q(X)$ .  $\square$

*Remark 5.8.* If a  $(q+1) \times (e+q)$  matrix of linear forms has  $(q+1)$ -minors that define the  $q$ -secant variety  $S^q(X)$  of codimension  $e \geq 2$  ideal-theoretically, then in fact, it can be proved that  $I_2(M) \subseteq I_X$  by using part of the proof above.

In the case  $X$  smooth, Theorem 5.7 can be delivered in a more intrinsic geometric way by the theorem given below. To the end, it would be helpful to keep in mind that a line bundle decomposition of the embedding line bundle induces a linear matrix having various interesting properties. Let  $L_1$  and  $L_2$  be two line bundles such that  $L_1 \otimes L_2 = \mathcal{O}_X(1)$ . Take linear systems  $|V_i| \subseteq |L_i|$ ,  $i = 1, 2$ , and bases  $\langle s_0, \dots, s_a \rangle = V_1$  and  $\langle t_0, \dots, t_b \rangle = V_2$ . Assume that every product  $s_i t_j$  lies in the vector space  $V$  of linear forms which is a subspace of  $H^0(X, \mathcal{O}_X(1))$ . Now, consider the linear matrix  $M$  defined by  $M_{i,j} = s_i t_j$  for each  $0 \leq i \leq a$  and  $0 \leq j \leq b$ . Then, this matrix  $M$  has rank at most one on  $X$  so that  $I_{q+1}(M) \subseteq I_{S^q(X)}$ , and is moreover 1-generic.



**Theorem 5.9.** *Suppose that  $S^q(X)$  has minimal degree of codimension  $e \geq 2$ , and that  $X$  is smooth. Let  $|V| \subseteq |L|$  be the embedding linear system of  $X \subset \mathbb{P}^r$ , and  $B$  the divisorial part of  $X \cap \text{Vert}S^q(X)$ . Then, there is a unique decomposition  $L(-B) = L_1 \otimes L_2$  into two line bundles together with linear systems  $|V_i| \subseteq |L_i|$  and the induced multiplication map  $V_1 \otimes V_2 \rightarrow V$  such that*

- (1)  $\dim V_1 = q + 1$  and  $\dim V_2 = e + q$  when  $S^q(X)$  is of scroll type; and
- (2)  $L_1 = L_2$  and  $V_1 = V_2$  with  $\dim V_i = q + 2$  when  $S^q(X)$  is of Veronese type.

*Proof.* Let  $M$  be the determinantal presentation of  $S^q(X)$  in each case. Note that by Lemma 5.5, every minor of  $M$  with arbitrary appropriate size is nonzero, hence if  $z \in \text{Vert}S^q(X)$ , then  $M(z) = 0$  since  $\deg_{x_0} f = 0$  for all  $f \in I_{S^q(X)}$  and homogeneous coordinates  $x_0, x_1, \dots, x_r$  with  $x_i(z) = 0, 1 \leq i \leq r$ . Thus, the divisorial part of  $V(I_1(M)) \cap X$  is equal to  $B$ .

(1) Let  $M$  have size  $(q+1) \times (e+q)$ . Define a rational map  $\phi: X \dashrightarrow \mathbb{P}^q$  by  $\phi(z) = (M_{0,j}(z) : \dots : M_{q,j}(z))$  for any  $0 \leq j \leq e+q-1$ . (Note that the definition of  $\phi$  does not depend on  $j$  since  $\text{rank}M(z) \leq 1$  on  $X$ .) Since  $X$  is smooth, there are global sections  $s_0, \dots, s_q \in H^0(L_1)$  of a line bundle  $L_1$  such that  $\phi = (s_0 : \dots : s_q)$  and  $\text{codim}(\text{Bs}(s_0, \dots, s_q), X) \geq 2$  (cf. [23, p. 492]). Take  $V_1 := \langle s_0, \dots, s_q \rangle \subseteq H^0(L_1)$ . Then, since  $\text{Bs}(V_1)$  has codimension larger than one, the rational section  $M_{0,j}/s_0 = \dots = M_{q,j}/s_q$  of  $L \otimes L_1^{-1}$  defines a global section  $t_j^0 \in H^0(L \otimes L_1^{-1})$  for each  $j$ . So,  $M_{i,j} = s_i t_j^0$ , and thus by the choice of  $B$ ,  $t_j^0$  is the image of a global section  $t_j \in H^0((L \otimes L_1^{-1})(-B))$ . Put  $L_2 := (L \otimes L_1^{-1})(-B)$  and  $V_2 := \langle t_0, \dots, t_{e+q-1} \rangle \subseteq H^0(L_2)$ . The uniqueness is due to that of  $M$  (Lemma 5.6). And  $\dim V_1 = q + 1$  and  $\dim V_2 = e + q$  since  $M$  is 1-generic.

(2) Let  $M$  be symmetric of size  $(q+2) \times (q+2)$ . Do the same thing as above so that we have  $M_{i,j} = s_i t_j u$ , where  $u \in H^0(\mathcal{O}_X(B))$  is the defining section of  $B$ . As the rational map  $\psi(z) = (M_{i,0}(z) : \dots : M_{i,q+1}(z))$  is equal to the rational map  $\phi(z) = (M_{0,j}(z) : \dots : M_{q+1,j}(z))$ , we have  $t_i = s_i$  for every  $0 \leq i \leq q+1$ . We are done.  $\square$

*Example 5.10.* Here are some elementary line bundle decompositions in question.

- (1) If  $X$  is a rational normal scroll with  $H$  a hyperplane section and  $F$  a ruling linear space, then the decomposition

$$H = qF + (H - qF)$$

confirms that  $S^q(X)$  is a  $q$ -secant variety of minimal degree, and gives the determinantal presentation of  $S^q(X)$ .

- (2) Suppose that  $X$  is a smooth del Pezzo surface  $S$  different from  $\mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^1$ . So, it is a blow up of  $\mathbb{P}^2$  at some  $m$  points. Consider exceptional divisors  $E_1, \dots, E_m \subset S$  and a line  $L \subset S$  coming from  $\mathbb{P}^2$ . Recall that  $S$  is embedded by  $H := 3L - E_1 - \dots - E_m$ . Then, due to the decomposition

$$H = L + (2L - E_1 - \dots - E_m),$$

together with the induced determinantal presentation,  $S^2(X)$  is a 2-secant variety of minimal degree.

- (3) The  $(n-1)$ -secant variety to the second Veronese variety  $X = \nu_2(\mathbb{P}^n) \subset \mathbb{P}^r$ ,  $r = \binom{n+2}{2} - 1$ , is of Veronese type thanks to the line bundle decomposition

$$\mathcal{O}_X(1) = \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^n}(2) = \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^n}(1) \otimes \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^n}(1).$$

*Remark 5.11.* In the theorem above, the divisor  $B$  is possibly nonempty. Indeed, let  $X \subset \mathbb{P}^7$  be a Roth surface (cf. [28, Definition 3.1]) with associated rational normal scroll  $Y = S(0, 0, 5)$  and vertex line  $\ell := \text{Vert}Y$ . By definition,  $X$  is smooth together with  $\ell \subset X \subset Y$ . A theorem of Severi says that  $\dim S^2(X) = 5$ . Therefore,  $S^2(X)$  and  $S^2(Y)$  are the same, and  $S^2(X)$  is thus a 2-secant variety of minimal degree with codimension two. Since  $\text{Vert}S^2(Y) = \ell$ , we obtain  $B = \ell$ .

## 6 Del Pezzo higher secant varieties

Already mentioned in the introduction, *del Pezzo higher secant varieties* are subextremal objects in the family of higher secant varieties. This section provides their definition and several properties that look similar to those of minimal degree higher secant varieties.

**Proposition 6.1.** *Let  $e = \text{codim}S^q(X)$ . If  $S^q(X)$  is not a  $q$ -secant variety of minimal degree, then*

$$\deg S^q(X) \geq \binom{e+q}{q} + \binom{e+q-1}{q-1}.$$

*And when  $e \geq 2$ , the equality holds if and only if for a general point  $z$  in  $X$ , we have*

$$\deg S^q(X_z) = \binom{e+q-1}{q} + \binom{e+q-2}{q-1} \quad \text{and} \quad \deg S^{q-1}(X_{\mathbb{T}_z X}) = \binom{e+q-1}{q-1} + \binom{e+q-2}{q-2}$$

*with the map  $S^q(X) \dashrightarrow S^q(X_z)$  birational and  $\deg \mathbb{T}_{C_z} S^q(X) = \deg S^{q-1}(X_{\mathbb{T}_z X})$ .*

*Proof.* First of all, note that by Theorem 1.3, if  $S^q(X)$  does not have minimal degree, then neither does  $S^q(X_z)$  (resp.,  $S^{q-1}(X_{\mathbb{T}_z X})$ ) whenever  $e \geq 2$  (resp.,  $q \geq 2$ ).

Let us see the case  $e = 1$ . We will use induction on  $q \geq 1$ . Let  $s = \deg\{\pi_z : S^q(X) \dashrightarrow S^q(X_z)\}$  for a general point  $z \in X$ . If  $s = 1$ , then one can easily find that  $\deg S^q(X) = q + 1$ , a contradiction. So, we have  $\deg S^q(X) \geq 2 + \deg S^{q-1}(X_{\mathbb{T}_z X})$  by the degree formula (1). And by Theorem 1.3,  $S^{q-1}(X_{\mathbb{T}_z X})$  do not have minimal degree so that the induction process works. On the other hand, the case  $q = 1$  is trivial. For the remaining cases, use double induction on  $e$  and  $q$ , together with the Theorem 1.3. Refer to the identity

$$\left( \binom{e+q-1}{q} + \binom{e+q-2}{q-1} \right) + \left( \binom{e+q-1}{q-1} + \binom{e+q-2}{q-2} \right) = \binom{e+q}{q} + \binom{e+q-1}{q-1}.$$

□

*Remark 6.2.* Let  $e = \text{codim} S^q(X)$ . Suppose that  $\deg S^q(X) = \binom{e+q}{q} + \binom{e+q-1}{q-1}$ , and that the map  $\tilde{S}^q(X) \rightarrow S^q(X)$  is birational. Then, a general  $e$ -inner projection of  $X$  is a *variety of two apparent  $q$ -secant  $(q-2)$ -planes*.

*Remark 6.3.* In positive characteristic, Proposition 6.1 can not apply. For example, with  $k$  equal to the algebraic closure of  $\mathbb{F}_2$ , consider a rational map  $\mathbb{P}_k^4 \dashrightarrow \mathbb{P}_k^8$  given by the linear system

$$\langle y_0 y_2^2, y_0 y_3^2, y_0 y_4^2, y_1 y_2^2, y_1 y_3^2, y_1 y_4^2, y_2^3, y_2^2 y_3, y_2^2 y_4 \rangle \subset |\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}_k^4}(3)|.$$

Its image  $X \subset \mathbb{P}_k^8$  is a nondegenerate irreducible projective variety whose homogeneous ideal is generated by the 2-minors of the matrix

$$M = \begin{pmatrix} x_0 & x_1 & x_2 \\ x_3 & x_4 & x_5 \\ x_6^2 & x_7^2 & x_8^2 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Then, thanks to the identity  $M(z+z') = M(z) + M(z')$ ,  $z, z' \in V^*$  (Frobenius in characteristic two), the 2-secant variety  $S^2(X)$  is defined by the determinant of  $M$ . Hence, it has degree 4, whereas the inequality above says that  $\deg S^2(X) \geq 5$ .

In characteristic zero, the projective variety  $X \subset \mathbb{P}^8$  constructed in the same way satisfies  $S^2(X) = \mathbb{P}^8$ .

The *sectional genus*  $\pi(X)$  of  $X$  is the arithmetic genus of a general curve section of  $X$ . So, the Hilbert polynomial of an  $n$ -dimensional projective variety  $X$  is given by

$$\deg X \cdot \binom{z+n-1}{n} + (1-\pi(X)) \binom{z+n-2}{n-1} + (\text{lower terms}).$$

By Theorem A.4, we have the following lemma:

**Lemma 6.4.** *Suppose that the equality in Proposition 6.1 holds with  $\text{codim} S^q(X) \geq 2$ . Then, we obtain*

$$\pi(S^q(X)) \leq \pi(S^q(X_z)) + \pi(S^{q-1}(X_{\mathbb{T}_z X})) + \deg S^{q-1}(X_{\mathbb{T}_z X}) - 1.$$

*Proof.* Following the notation in Theorem A.4, one may see that the projective schemes  $Z_i$  contain  $\mathbb{P}TC_z S^q(X)$ , and have the same dimension as  $\mathbb{P}TC_z S^q(X)$ . So, we have  $\deg Z_i \geq \deg \mathbb{P}TC_z S^q(X)$ . By these inequalities, we are done. □

By using the lemma above, double induction on  $e, q$  deduces the following:

**Proposition 6.5.** Let  $e = \text{codim}S^q(X)$ . Suppose that  $\deg S^q(X) = \binom{e+q}{q} + \binom{e+q-1}{q-1}$ . Then, we obtain

$$\pi(S^q(X)) \leq (q-1) \left( \binom{e+q}{q} + \binom{e+q-1}{q-1} \right) + 1.$$

And if the equality holds for the case  $e \geq 2$ , then for a general point  $z \in X$ ,  $\pi(S^q(X_z))$  and  $\pi(S^q(X_{\mathbb{T}_z X}))$  have their own maximal values.

*Remark 6.6.* Similarly, if  $S^q(X) \subseteq \mathbb{P}^r$  is a  $q$ -secant variety of minimal degree, then

$$\pi(S^q(X)) = (q-1) \binom{e+q}{q} - \binom{e+q}{q-1} + 1.$$

Here, we used the equality instead of the inequality because we have  $s = s' = 1$  in Theorem A.4.

**Definition 6.7.** A  $q$ -secant variety of *almost minimal degree* is defined to be such that for its degree, the equality in Proposition 6.1 holds. And a  $q$ -secant variety  $S^q(X)$  of almost minimal degree is called a *del Pezzo  $q$ -secant variety* if  $\pi(S^q(X))$  attains the maximum in Proposition 6.5.

*Remark 6.8.* Here are some fundamental remarks:

(1) Let  $X \subset \mathbb{P}^r$  be of almost minimal degree. Then, as aforementioned in the introduction, we have

$$\pi(X) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } X \text{ is a del Pezzo variety} \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

(2) Suppose that  $S^q(X)$  is del Pezzo of codimension  $e$ , and let  $z \in X$  be a general point. If  $e \geq 2$  and  $q \geq 1$ , then  $S^q(X_z)$  is del Pezzo. If  $e \geq 1$  and  $q \geq 2$ , then  $S^{q-1}(X_{\mathbb{T}_z X})$  is del Pezzo.

*Example 6.9.* Let  $X = E \subset \mathbb{P}^6$  be an elliptic normal curve. Then, using Macaulay2 ([19]), one may find that  $E$ ,  $S^2(E)$  and  $S^3(E)$  are del Pezzo, and furthermore, the two diagrams below are Betti tables of  $E$  and  $S^2(E)$ , respectively:

		0	1	2	3	4	5			0	1	2	3
	0	1	-	-	-	-	-			1	-	-	-
	1	-	14	35	35	14	-			-	-	-	-
	2	-	-	-	-	-	1			-	-	-	1

And  $S^3(E)$  is a hypersurface of degree 7.

For a higher dimensional example, consider the Plücker embedding  $X = \mathbb{G}(\mathbb{P}^1, \mathbb{P}^6) \subset \mathbb{P}^N$ ,  $N = \binom{7}{2} - 1 = 20$ , of the Grassmannian. Then, it is defined by the ideal  $\text{Pf}_4(M)$  for the  $7 \times 7$  generic skew-symmetric matrix  $M$ , and thus the 2-secant variety  $S^2(X)$  by the ideal  $\text{Pf}_6(M)$ . Therefore,  $S^2(X)$  has the same Betti table as  $S^2(E)$  in the paragraph above, and apparently, is a del Pezzo 2-secant variety.

*Remark 6.10.* If  $S^q(X)$  is a del Pezzo  $q$ -secant variety of codimension two, then it is a complete intersection of two  $(q+1)$ -forms. Indeed, the case  $q=1$  is classical, and if  $q=2$ , then applying [25, p. 32] and [33, p. 251] to its general curve section  $C := S^2(X) \cap \Lambda$ , we find that  $C$  is a complete intersection of two cubics, hence so is  $S^2(X)$ . And for the other cases  $q \geq 3$ , use Lemma 3.6 to get two linearly independent  $(q+1)$ -forms; they generate the homogeneous ideal of  $S^q(X)$  due to the invariants of  $S^q(X)$ .

By double induction on  $e, q$  based on Theorem 1.3, the following is straightforward.

**Proposition 6.11.** *Let  $e = \text{codim} S^q(X)$ . Suppose that  $S^q(X)$  is not a  $q$ -secant variety of minimal degree. Then,*

$$\beta_{p,q}(S^q(X)) \leq B_{p,q}^{\prime e} := \binom{p+q-1}{q} \binom{e+q}{p+q} - \binom{e+q-p-1}{q-1} \binom{e+q-1}{e+q-p}$$

for every  $1 \leq p \leq e$ . And if the equality holds for some  $1 \leq p \leq e$ , then for a general point  $z$  in  $X$ , we have

$$\beta_{p,q}(S^q(X_z)) = B_{p,q}^{\prime e-1}, \beta_{p-1,q}(S^q(X_z)) = B_{p-1,q}^{\prime e-1} \text{ and } \beta_{p,q-1}(S^{q-1}(X_{\mathbb{T}_z X})) = B_{p,q-1}^{\prime e}.$$

## 6.1 An analogue of the generalized Bronowski's conjecture

One says  $X$  to be a  $\text{dP}^q$ -variety if  $S^q(X)$  is a del Pezzo  $q$ -secant variety, and to be a  $\text{dPA}^q$ -variety if it is a  $\text{dP}^q$ -variety and the map  $\tilde{S}^q(X) \rightarrow S^q(X)$  is birational. In view of the generalized Bronowski's conjecture, one may expect that if a general  $(q-1)$ -tangential projection of  $X$  is birational onto a del Pezzo variety of codimension at least 2, then  $X$  is a  $\text{dPA}^q$ -variety. For convenience, we call it the *generalized Bronowski's conjecture II*.

Note that the condition on the codimension can not be dropped because for a smooth rational curve  $X = C \subset \mathbb{P}^4$  of degree 5, its general tangential projection is birational onto a plane cubic, but  $\deg S^2(C) = 6 \neq 5$ .

Referring to Proposition 3.4 and its proof, together with Remark 6.10, we have:

**Proposition 6.12.** *Set  $e := \text{codim} S^q(X) \geq 2$ . If  $S^q(X)$  is a del Pezzo  $q$ -secant variety, then it satisfies property *ST*, and if in addition,  $e \geq 3$ , then it satisfies property *IC*.*

**Proof of Theorem 1.4.** (1) Set  $e \geq 3$ . We will use induction on  $q \geq 1$ . The case  $q=1$  is well known. Now, assume that  $q \geq 2$ . Let  $w$  be another general point of  $X$ . Then,  $S^{q-1}(X_{\langle w, \mathbb{T}_z X \rangle})$

is a del Pezzo  $(q - 1)$ -secant variety. By the induction hypothesis,  $S^{q-1}(X_{\mathbb{T}_z X})$  is a del Pezzo  $(q - 1)$ -secant variety. Proposition 3.4 applies so that  $S^q(X)$  has simple tangent cone at a general point of  $X$ . Therefore,  $S^q(X)$  is a del Pezzo  $q$ -secant variety.

(2) Similarly, use induction on  $e \geq 2$ . Refer to the proof of (2) in Theorem 1.3.  $\square$

**Proposition 6.13.** *Let  $X = C \subset \mathbb{P}^r$ ,  $r \geq 5$ , be a curve. Suppose that its general tangential projection is a del Pezzo curve. Then,  $S^2(C)$  is a del Pezzo secant variety. Furthermore,  $C$  is a del Pezzo curve. Especially, the generalized Bronowski's conjecture II is true for curves.*

The proof will be given later after establishing lemmas.

*Example 6.14.* If  $C \subset \mathbb{P}^r$  is a del Pezzo curve, then  $S^q(C)$  is a del Pezzo  $q$ -secant variety whenever  $S^q(C) \neq \mathbb{P}^r$ . Indeed, suppose that  $C$  is a del Pezzo curve with  $S^q(C) \neq \mathbb{P}^r$ , and let us prove that  $S^q(C)$  is a del Pezzo  $q$ -secant variety. If  $C$  is an elliptic normal curve, then we are done by [18]. Assume that  $C$  is singular so that  $C$  is the projection of a rational normal curve  $D \subset \mathbb{P}^{r+1}$  from a point  $z \in S^2(D) \setminus D$ . By Theorem 1.3, taking inner projections several times, it suffices to consider the case  $r = (2q - 1) + 2$  only. We will mimic [32]. Note that the homogeneous ideal of  $S^q(D)$  is generated by  $(q + 1)$ -minors of the matrix

$$M = \begin{pmatrix} x_0 & x_1 & \cdots & x_q & x_{q+1} & x_{q+2} \\ x_1 & x_2 & \cdots & x_{q+1} & x_{q+2} & x_{q+3} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \\ x_q & x_{q+1} & \cdots & x_{2q} & x_{2q+1} & x_{2q+2} \end{pmatrix}.$$

By symmetry, we need to consider only two cases:  $z = (1 : 0 : \cdots : 0 : 1)$  or  $z = (0 : 1 : 0 : \cdots : 0)$ . Let  $\Delta^{i,j}$  be the minor of  $M$  obtained by deleting  $i$ -th and  $j$ -th columns. If  $z = (1 : 0 : \cdots : 0 : 1)$ , then  $\Delta^{0,q+2}$  and  $\Delta^{q+1,q+2} - \Delta^{0,1}$  are linearly independent two cubic equations of  $S^2(C)$ . And if  $z = (0 : 1 : 0 : \cdots : 0)$ , then  $\Delta^{0,1}$  and  $\Delta^{1,2} + \Delta^{0,3}$  are. Thus,  $S^q(C)$  is del Pezzo.

**Lemma 6.15.** *Let  $X = C \subset \mathbb{P}^r$ ,  $r \geq 5$ , be a curve. If its general tangential projection has almost minimal degree, then so does itself.*

*Proof.* Let  $z$  be a general point of  $C$ . Then, either  $C_{\mathbb{T}_z C}$  is smooth, or its homogeneous ideal is generated by quadrics. Thus, in any event,  $C_{\mathbb{T}_z C}$  is not tangentially degenerate. (Refer to [30] for smooth curves.) It is easy to see that  $C$  is also not tangentially degenerate. By the proposition above, we are done.  $\square$

**Lemma 6.16.** *Suppose that the homogeneous ideal of  $S^{q+1}(X)$  is generated by  $(q + 2)$ -forms, and that  $\text{Sing}S^{q+1}(X) = S^q(X)$ . Let  $N = \dim S^{q+1}(X)$ . Then, we have*

$$\bigcap_{i=0}^{N+1} J(\mathbb{T}_{z_i} X, S^q(X)) = S^q(X).$$

as sets for  $N + 2$  general points  $z_0, \dots, z_{N+1} \in X$ , where  $J$  means the join.

*Proof.* Take  $N + 2$  general points  $z_0, \dots, z_{N+1}$  in  $X$ , and choose homogeneous coordinates  $x_0, \dots, x_r$  such that  $z_i \in V(x_j)$  if and only if  $i \neq j$ . Let  $p$  be any point of the intersection in question. Then, the first  $N + 2$  columns of the Jacobian matrix vanish at  $p$ . Therefore,  $p \in \text{Sing}S^{q+1}(X) = S^q(X)$ . The reverse containment is trivial.  $\square$

*Proof of Proposition 6.13.* By Lemma 6.15,  $C$  is of almost minimal degree. To the contrary, assume that  $C$  is an isomorphic projection of a rational normal curve  $D \subset \mathbb{P}^{r+1}$  from a point  $b \in \mathbb{P}^{r+1} \setminus S^2(D)$ . Let  $w$  be a general point of  $D$  so that  $z := \pi_b(w)$  is also a general point of  $C$ . Let  $\bar{b} = \pi_{\mathbb{T}_w D}(b)$ .  $D_{\mathbb{T}_w D}$  is obviously a rational normal curve in  $\mathbb{P}^{r-1}$ .

$$\begin{array}{ccc} C_{\mathbb{T}_z C} & \xleftarrow{\pi_{\bar{b}}} & D_{\mathbb{T}_w D} \\ \uparrow \pi_{\mathbb{T}_z C} & & \uparrow \pi_{\mathbb{T}_w D} \\ C & \xleftarrow{\pi_b} & D \end{array}$$

We claim that  $\bar{b} \notin S^2(D_{\mathbb{T}_w D})$ . Since  $w$  was general in  $D$ , by Lemma 6.16 together with [2, p. 440],  $b \notin J(\mathbb{T}_w D, S^2(D))$ , or in other words,  $\bar{b} \notin S^2(D_{\mathbb{T}_w D})$ . Thus,  $\pi_{\bar{b}}$  is not only a regular map but also an isomorphic projection, a contradiction. Thus,  $C$  is a del Pezzo curve. Now, in order to show that  $S^2(C)$  is a del Pezzo secant variety, refer to Example 6.14.  $\square$

*Remark 6.17.* Let  $q \geq 2$ , and assume that  $\text{codim}S^q(C) \geq 2$ . If  $S^q(C)$  has almost minimal degree, then it is in fact a del Pezzo  $q$ -secant variety. Indeed, let  $C'$  be a general  $(q-2)$ -tangential projection of  $C$  so that  $S^2(C')$  has almost minimal degree. Since a general tangential projection of  $C'$  is of almost minimal degree, so is  $C'$ . If  $C'$  were an isomorphic projection of a rational normal curve, then  $\deg S^2(C') = \binom{(e+1)+2}{2} \neq \binom{e+2}{2} + \binom{e+1}{1}$  for  $e := \text{codim}S^2(C')$ . Thus,  $C'$  is a del Pezzo variety, and  $S^2(C')$  is a del Pezzo 2-secant variety by Example 6.14. By Theorem 1.4,  $S^q(C)$  is a del Pezzo  $q$ -secant variety.

## 6.2 Syzygetic characterization of del Pezzo higher secant varieties

We need the technical lemma below:

**Lemma 6.18.** *Let  $I \subseteq S$  be a homogeneous ideal with  $I_q = 0$ . Suppose that  $S/I$  satisfies property  $N_{q+1,p}$ ,  $p \geq 1$ . Let  $m = \min\{j : \beta_{p+1,j}(S/I) \neq 0\}$  with  $k = p + m + 1$  and  $m' = m - q + 1$ . Consider a double complex*

$$C^{i,j} = \bigwedge^{k-i-j} V \otimes I_i \otimes S_j$$

*with differentials  $\delta_I, \delta_{II}$  induced by Koszul type differentials. Then, there is an isomorphism*

$$K_{p+1,m}(S/I, V) \cong (\ker \delta_I^{q+1,m'}) \cap (\ker \delta_{II}^{q+1,m'}) \subseteq C^{q+1,m'}.$$

*And the intersection above maps to zero under the multiplication map  $C^{q+1,m'} = \bigwedge^{p-1} V \otimes I_{q+1} \otimes S_{m'} \rightarrow \bigwedge^{p-1} V \otimes I_{m+2}$ .*

*Proof.* Since  $S/I$  satisfies property  $N_{q+1,p}$ , chopping the minimal free resolution of  $S_X$  into short exact sequences, we have graded  $S$ -modules  $I = Q_1, Q_2, \dots, Q_{p+1}$  with

$$0 \longrightarrow Q_{i+1} \longrightarrow Q_{i,q+i} \otimes S(-q-i) \longrightarrow Q_i \longrightarrow 0$$

for each  $1 \leq i \leq p$ . Then, it is easy to show that  $K_{p+1,m}(S/I) \cong K_{0,k}(Q_{p+1}) \cong Q_{p+1,k}$ . Note that

$$Q_{p+1,k} = \ker\{Q_{p,p+q} \otimes S_{m-q+1} \rightarrow Q_{p,k}\},$$

$$Q_{p,p+q} = \ker\{Q_{p-1,p+q-1} \otimes V \rightarrow Q_{p-1,p+q}\},$$

and so on. That is,  $Q_{p+1,k} \subseteq I_{q+1} \otimes T^{p-1}V \otimes S_{m'}$  consists of elements mapping to zero under the maps induced by multiplication maps of adjacent pairs. Considering multiplication maps of adjacent pairs in  $T^{p-1}V$ , one can see that the inclusion  $Q_{p+1,k} \subseteq I_{q+1} \otimes T^{p-1}V \otimes S_{m'}$  factors through  $I_{q+1} \otimes \wedge^{p-1}V \otimes S_{m'} = \wedge^{p-1}V \otimes I_{q+1} \otimes S_{m'} = C^{q+1,m'}$ . And in consideration of the multiplication maps  $I_{q+1} \otimes V \rightarrow I_{q+2}$  and  $V \otimes S_{m'} \rightarrow S_{m'+1}$  of adjacent pairs, the first assertion holds.

Now, let us prove the second assertion. Take any element  $\theta \in (\ker \delta_I) \cap (\ker \delta_{II}) \subseteq C^{q+1,m'}$ . Consider maps  $D : C^{i,j} \rightarrow C^{i,j-1}$  induced by  $\omega \otimes f \mapsto \sum_{l=0}^r x_l \wedge \omega \otimes \partial f / \partial x_l$ , and the element  $(\delta_I D)^{m'} \theta \in C^{m+2,0} = \wedge^{p-1}V \otimes I_{m+2}$ . Notice that

$$D\delta_{II} + \delta_{II}D = (k-i) \cdot \text{id}$$

on each  $C^{i,j}$ . Then, by (finite) induction, we see that  $\delta_{II}(\delta_I D)^s \theta = 0$  for all  $0 \leq s \leq m'$ . But the map  $\delta_{II}^{m+2,0} : \wedge^{p-1}V \otimes I_{m+2} \rightarrow \wedge^{p-2}V \otimes I_{m+2} \otimes V$  is injective, hence  $(\delta_I D)^{m'} \theta = 0$ . On the other hand,  $(\delta_I D)^{m'} \theta$  is nothing but the image of  $\theta$  under the multiplication map  $C^{q+1,m'} = \wedge^{p-1}V \otimes I_{q+1} \otimes S_{m'} \rightarrow \wedge^{p-1}V \otimes I_{m+2}$ , up to nonzero factor. We are done.  $\square$

For convenience, one can say that the Betti table of  $X \subseteq \mathbb{P}^r$  is  $q$ -pure Gorenstein if it is of the following form:

	0	1	...	$e-1$	$e$
0	1				
$q$		$B_{1,q}^{e}$	...	$B_{e-1,q}^{e}$	
$2q$					1

Here,  $e := \text{codim} X$ , the remaining entries are all zero, and the value of  $B_{p,q}^{e}$  is given in Proposition 6.11, namely

$$B_{p,q}^{e} = \binom{p+q-1}{q} \binom{e+q}{p+q} - \binom{e+q-p-1}{q-1} \binom{e+q-1}{e+q-p}.$$

**Lemma 6.19.** *Let  $e = \text{codim} S^q(X)$ . Set  $e \geq 2$  and  $q \geq 2$ . Assume that  $S^q(X)$  has simple tangent cone at a general point  $z$  of  $X$ . If*




- (1)  $S^q(X_z)$  has  $q$ -pure Gorenstein Betti table; and  
(2)  $S^{q-1}(X_{\mathbb{T}_z X})$  has  $(q-1)$ -pure Gorenstein Betti table,  
then  $S^q(X)$  has  $q$ -pure Gorenstein Betti table.

*Proof.* By Theorem 2.15 and Proposition A.5, all Betti numbers of  $S^q(X) \subseteq \mathbb{P}^r$  have the required values except  $\beta_{e-1,2q}(S^q(X))$  and  $\beta_{e,2q-1}(S^q(X))$  whose values are the same. Considering the “partial” Euler characteristic of  $\mathbb{F} \otimes_S K(S)$ , where  $\mathbb{F}$  is the minimal free resolution of  $S_{S^q(X)}$ , we find that  $\beta_{e-1,2q}(X) = 0$ . We are done.  $\square$

Let us prove the syzygetic characterization of del Pezzo higher secant varieties.

**Proof of Theorem 1.2.**



The directions  $(2) \Rightarrow (3a) \Rightarrow (3b) \Rightarrow (3c)$  and  $(2) \Rightarrow (4)$  are trivial. We only need to show  $(3c) \Rightarrow (1), (4) \Rightarrow (1)$  and  $(1) \Rightarrow (2)$ .

To see  $(3c) \Rightarrow (1)$ , by Theorem 1.4, it is enough to show that  $\beta_{1,q}(S^q(X_\Lambda)) = 2$  for a general  $(e-2)$ -inner projection  $X_\Lambda$  of  $X$ . Indeed, it is the case thanks to the equality part of Proposition 6.11.

For  $(4) \Rightarrow (1)$ , consider a general  $(e-2)$ -inner projection  $X_\Lambda$ . We will show that  $S^q(X_\Lambda)$  lies in two or more distinct hypersurfaces of degree  $q+1$ , which implies (1) by Theorem 1.4. Notice that Proposition 4.1 ensures the existence of at least one hypersurface of degree  $q+1$  in which  $S^q(X_\Lambda)$  is. Suppose that a unique degree  $q+1$  hypersurface contains  $S^q(X_\Lambda)$ . Let  $\eta \in K_{e-2,q+1}(I_{S^q(X)}, V)$  be a nonzero Koszul class. Take  $r+1$  general points  $z_i \in V^*$  in  $X$  with their dual basis  $x_i$ . Then, by Proposition 4.1,

$$\eta = \sum_{|\alpha|=e-2} x_\alpha \otimes f_\alpha$$

with  $f_\alpha$  nonzero in  $I_{S^q(X_\Lambda)}$ , where for any  $\alpha = \{i_1 < \dots < i_{|\alpha|}\} \subseteq \{0, \dots, r\}$ ,  $x_\alpha = x_{i_1} \wedge \dots \wedge x_{i_{|\alpha|}} \in \wedge^{|\alpha|} V$  and  $\Lambda_\alpha = \langle z_i : i \in \alpha \rangle$ . Let  $\eta' \in K_{e-2,q+1}(I_{S^q(X)}, V)$  be another Koszul class so that  $\eta' = \sum_\alpha x_\alpha \otimes f'_\alpha$  with  $f'_\alpha \in I_{S^q(X_\Lambda)}$  by Proposition 4.1. By assumption,  $f'_\alpha$  is a multiple of  $f_\alpha$ .

Now, referring to Lemma 6.18, we will show that  $\ker \delta_I \cap \ker \delta_{II} = 0$  in  $C^{q+1,m'}$  with  $p = e-1$ , which deduces that the projective dimension of  $S_X$  is less than  $e$ , a contradiction. Let  $\theta \in \ker \delta_I \cap \ker \delta_{II} \subseteq C^{q+1,m'}$  be an arbitrary element. By the observation above, we can write

$$\theta = \sum_{|\alpha|=e-2} x_\alpha \otimes f_\alpha \otimes g_\alpha$$

for some  $g_\alpha \in S_{m'}$ . But by Lemma 6.18 again, we have  $\sum_\alpha x_\alpha \otimes f_\alpha g_\alpha = 0$ , which means that  $g_\alpha = 0$  for every  $|\alpha| = e - 2$ , hence  $\theta = 0$ .

Now, let us see the direction (1)  $\Rightarrow$  (2). If  $q = 1$ , then it is well known. Assume that  $q \geq 2$ . When  $X_\Lambda$  is a general  $(e-2)$ -inner projection of  $X$ , consider its  $q$ -secant variety  $S^q(X_\Lambda)$  whose codimension is 2. By Remark 6.10, it is a complete intersection of two  $(q+1)$ -forms. We are done by using double induction on  $e, q$  with Proposition 6.12 and Lemma 6.19.  $\square$

*Remark 6.20.* By [5, Theorem 2.1], Theorem 1.2 implies that a del Pezzo  $q$ -secant variety of codimension 3 is ideal-theoretically defined by the ideal  $\text{Pf}_{2q+2}(M)$  of all the  $(2q+2)$ -pfaffians of  $M$  for some  $(2q+3) \times (2q+3)$  skew-symmetric matrix  $M$  of linear forms.

On the other hand, if there is a  $(2q+3) \times (2q+3)$  skew-symmetric linear matrix  $M$  such that its 4-pfaffians vanish on  $X$  and  $\text{codim} V(\text{Pf}_{2q+2}(M)) = 3$ , then the  $q$ -secant variety  $S^q(X)$  is del Pezzo with  $I_{S^q(X)} = \text{Pf}_{2q+2}(M)$  unless it has minimal degree. This is because we have  $\text{rank} M(w) \leq 2q$  for every  $w \in S^q(X)$  (since  $\text{rank} M(z) \leq 2$  on  $X$ ) and thus  $\dim(I_{S^q(X)})_{q+1} \geq \dim \text{Pf}_{2q+2}(M)_{q+1} = 2q+3$  (due to  $\text{codim} V(\text{Pf}_{2q+2}(M)) = 3$ ).

### 6.3 Higher secant varieties of almost minimal degree

Let us remind that by definition,  $S^q(X)$  is a  $q$ -secant variety of almost minimal degree if  $\deg S^q(X) = \binom{e+q}{q} + \binom{e+q-1}{q-1}$ , where  $e := \text{codim} S^q(X)$ .

**Proposition 6.21.** *Suppose that  $S^q(X)$  is a  $q$ -secant variety of minimal degree with codimension  $e \geq 2$  and  $q \geq 2$ . Then,  $S^q(X_z)$  is a  $q$ -secant variety of almost minimal degree with codimension  $e - 1$  when  $z$  is a general point of  $S^2(X)$ . In this case,  $\deg\{\pi_z : S^q(X) \dashrightarrow S^q(X_z)\} = 1$ ,  $K_\infty(z, I_{S^q(X)}) = (I_{S^{q-2}(X_\Lambda)})$  with  $s(z, I_{S^q(X)}) = 2$ , and*

$$\begin{aligned} \pi(S^q(X_z)) &= (q-1) \left( \binom{e+q-1}{q} + \binom{e+q-2}{q-1} \right) + 1 \\ &\quad - \left( \binom{e+q-1}{q-1} + \binom{e+q-2}{q-2} - \deg Z_1 \right), \end{aligned}$$

where  $\Lambda = \mathbb{T}_z S^2(X)$  and  $Z_1 \subseteq \mathbb{P}^{r-1}$  is the projective scheme defined by  $K_1(z, I_{S^q(X)})$ .

*Proof.* We may assume that there are two general points  $z_0, z_1 \in X$  such that  $\langle z_0, z_1 \rangle$  has  $z$  as its general point, hence  $z_0 = (1 : 0 : 0 : \dots)$ ,  $z_1 = (0 : 1 : 0 : \dots)$  and  $z = (1 : 1 : 0 : \dots)$  in a homogeneous coordinates system  $x_i$ . By Terracini's lemma,  $\langle \mathbb{T}_{z_0} X, \mathbb{T}_{z_1} X \rangle = \mathbb{T}_z S^2(X) = \Lambda$ , and so  $X_\Lambda$  is a general 2-tangential projection which is an  $M^{q-2}$ -variety. As  $S^q(X)$  and  $S^{q-1}(X_{\mathbb{T}_{z_0} X})$  have simple tangent cone,

$$K_1(z_0, I_{S^q(X)}) = (I_{S^{q-1}(X_{\mathbb{T}_{z_0} X})}) \quad \text{and} \quad K_1(\bar{z}_1, I_{S^{q-1}(X_{\mathbb{T}_{z_0} X})}) = (I_{S^{q-2}(X_\Lambda)}),$$

where  $\overline{z_1}$  is the image of  $z_1$  under the projection  $\pi_{\mathbb{T}_{z_0}X}$ , which means that the composition

$$(I_{S^q(X)})_{q+1} \xrightarrow{\partial/\partial x_0} (I_{S^{q-1}(X_{\mathbb{T}_{z_0}X})})_q \xrightarrow{\partial/\partial x_1} (I_{S^{q-2}(X_\Lambda)})_{q-1}$$

is surjective. Thus, every minimal generator  $f'$  of  $I_{S^{q-2}(X_\Lambda)}$  comes from an element  $f = f'x_0x_1 + g_0x_0 + g_1x_1 + h \in I_{S^q(X)}$  for some polynomials  $g_0, g_1, h$  in  $x_2, \dots, x_r$ . Consider a coordinate change:  $y_i = x_i$  for  $i \neq 1$  and  $y_1 = x_1 - x_0$  for which  $z = (1 : 0 : \dots : 0)$ . Then, in coordinates  $y_i$ ,  $f$  looks like  $f'y_0(y_0 + y_1) + g_0y_0 + g_1(y_0 + y_1) + h$  with  $f', g_0, g_1, h$  in  $y_2, \dots, y_r$ . On the other hand, there is a nonzero  $(q+1)$ -form  $f$  in  $I_{S^q(X_{z_1})}$  such that  $\deg_{y_0} f = \deg_{x_0} f = 1$ . Thus,

$$K_0(z, I_{S^q(X)}) \subsetneq K_1(z, I_{S^q(X)}) \subsetneq K_2(z, I_{S^q(X)}) = K_\infty(z, I_{S^q(X)}) = (I_{S^{q-2}(X_\Lambda)}),$$

that is,  $s(z, I_{S^q(X)}) = 2$  and  $\deg \pi_z = 1$ . Now, the degree formula (1) says that

$$\begin{aligned} \deg S^q(X_z) &= \frac{\deg S^q(X) - \deg \mathbb{T}C_z S^q(X)}{\deg \pi_z} \\ &= \binom{e+q}{q} - \binom{e+q-2}{q-2} \\ &= \binom{e+q-1}{q} + \binom{e+q-2}{q-1}. \end{aligned}$$

Further, by Theorem A.4, we obtain

$$\pi(S^q(X)) = \pi(S^q(X_z)) + \pi(S^{q-2}(X_\Lambda)) + 2 \deg S^{q-2}(X_\Lambda) - \deg Z_1 - 1.$$

By using Remark 6.6 for  $\pi(S^q(X))$  and  $\pi(S^{q-2}(X_\Lambda))$ , the computation is straightforward.  $\square$

*Remark 6.22.* Let us consider the  $q$ -secant variety  $S^q(X_z)$  constructed in the proposition above. When  $X$  is a rational normal curve,  $S^q(X_z)$  is a del Pezzo  $q$ -secant variety by Example 6.14. Therefore,  $\deg Z_1 = \binom{e+q-1}{q-1} + \binom{e+q-2}{q-2}$  in this case. However, some computational evidence suggests that  $S^q(X_z)$  is not del Pezzo in general.

*Example 6.23.* In assistance of Macaulay2 ([19]), Proposition 6.21 produces an example of a non-del Pezzo 2-secant variety of almost minimal degree. Let  $X_z \subset \mathbb{P}^7$  be the projection of a rational normal surface  $X \subset \mathbb{P}^8$  (for instance,  $S(3,4)$ ) from a general point  $z \in S^2(X)$ . Then,  $S^2(X_z)$  is a 2-secant variety of almost minimal degree and codimension 2, and the Betti table of  $S^2(X_z)$  is given below:

	0	1	2	3
0	1	-	-	-
1	-	-	-	-
2	-	1	-	-
3	-	-	-	-
4	-	6	9	3

Moreover,  $Z_1 = V(K_1(z, I_{S^2(X)}))$  has degree 1, and so the sectional genus of  $S^2(X_z)$  is 6 by the formula in Proposition 6.21, which can also be checked by Macaulay2.

In particular,  $Z_1$  is not equal to the projectivized tangent space  $\mathbb{P}T_z S^2(X)$ , and the Betti table of  $S/K_1(z, I_{S^2(X)})$  is the following:

	0	1	2	3	4
0	1	-	-	-	-
1	-	6	5	-	-
2	-	-	6	9	3

## Appendix: Partial elimination ideals

Let  $x_0, \dots, x_r$  be the homogeneous coordinates of  $\mathbb{P}^r$ . When  $z = (1 : 0 : \dots : 0) \in \mathbb{P}^r$ ,  $S_z$  denotes the polynomial ring generated by variables  $x_1, \dots, x_r$ , and  $V_z$  the vector space  $(S_z)_1$  of linear forms vanishing at  $z$ .

**Definition A.1** (Partial Elimination Ideals). Let  $I \subseteq S$  be a homogeneous ideal, and  $z$  any point in  $\mathbb{P}^r$ . Taking a homogeneous coordinate system  $(x_0 : \dots : x_r)$  so that  $z = (1 : 0 : \dots : 0)$ , consider

$$\tilde{K}_i(z, I) := \{f \in I : \deg_{x_0} f \leq i\}.$$

For  $f \in \tilde{K}_i(z, I)$ , write  $f = f'x_0^i + (\text{lower } x_0\text{-degree terms})$ . Define  $K_i(z, I)$  to be the image of the map  $f \mapsto f'$ , or equivalently,  $f \mapsto \partial^i f / \partial x_0^i$ . This is a homogeneous ideal of  $S_z$ , and called the  $i$ -th partial elimination ideal of  $I$ .

We have a short exact sequence

$$0 \longrightarrow \tilde{K}_{i-1}(z, I) \longrightarrow \tilde{K}_i(z, I) \longrightarrow K_i(z, I)(-i) \longrightarrow 0 \quad (2)$$

fitting into the following commutative diagram:

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} 0 & \longrightarrow & \tilde{K}_{i-1}(z, I) & \longrightarrow & \tilde{K}_i(z, I) & \longrightarrow & K_i(z, I)(-i) \longrightarrow 0 \\ & & \downarrow \times x_0 & & \downarrow \times x_0 & & \downarrow \subseteq \\ 0 & \longrightarrow & \tilde{K}_i(z, I)(1) & \longrightarrow & \tilde{K}_{i+1}(z, I)(1) & \longrightarrow & K_{i+1}(z, I)(-i) \longrightarrow 0 \end{array} \quad (3)$$

The chain

$$K_0(z, I) \subseteq K_1(z, I) \subseteq \dots \subseteq K_i(z, I) \subseteq \dots$$

of ideals stabilizes at  $i = s$ , that is,  $K_{s-1}(z, I) \subsetneq K_s(z, I) = K_{s+1}(z, I) = \dots$ . Here, the *stabilization number*  $s(z, I)$  is defined by  $s(z, I) = s$ , and  $K_\infty(z, I)$  is defined to be  $K_s(z, I)$ .

The following is the geometric interpretation of partial elimination ideals:

**Proposition A.2.** *Let  $I$  be a homogeneous ideal in  $S$ , and  $z$  a point of  $\mathbb{P}^r$ . For the projection  $\pi_z : V(I) \setminus \{z\} \rightarrow \mathbb{P}^{r-1}$ ,*

$$V(K_i(z, I)) = \{p \in \mathbb{P}^{r-1} : \text{length}(\pi_z^{-1}(p)) > i\} \cup V(K_\infty(z, I))$$

*set-theoretically.*

*Proof.* Let  $K_i = K_i(z, I)$  and  $K_\infty = K_\infty(z, I)$ . Write

$$U_i = \{p \in \mathbb{P}^{r-1} : \text{length}(\pi_z^{-1}(p)) \leq i\} \setminus V(K_\infty).$$

It is easy to show that  $\mathbb{P}^{r-1} \setminus V(K_i) \subseteq U_i$ . For the reverse containment, suppose that  $p \in U_i$ . Let  $l = \text{length}(\pi_z^{-1}(p)) = \text{length}((V(I) \setminus \{z\}) \cap \langle z, p \rangle)$ . Since  $p \notin V(K_\infty)$ , there is a polynomial  $f \in I$  with  $\deg_{x_0} f = s$  such that  $\deg_{x_0} f(x_0, p) = s$ , where  $s = s(z, I)$ . And by Serre vanishing, there is a polynomial  $g \in I$ , say  $\deg_{x_0} g = d$ , such that  $\deg_{x_0} g(x_0, p) = l$ . Write  $f = \sum f_i x_0^i$  and  $g = \sum g_i x_0^i$  with  $f_i, g_i$  not having  $x_0$ . Consider a Sylvester type square matrix  $M = \begin{pmatrix} M' \\ M'' \end{pmatrix}$ ,

where

$$M' = \begin{pmatrix} f_s & \cdots & f_l & f_{l-1} & 0 & \cdots \\ 0 & f_s & \cdots & f_l & f_{l-1} & \ddots \\ \vdots & \ddots & \ddots & \ddots & \ddots & \ddots \\ \cdots & 0 & f_s & \cdots & f_l \end{pmatrix}$$

has size  $(d-l) \times (d+s-2l)$  and

$$M'' = \begin{pmatrix} g_d & \cdots & g_l & g_{l-1} & 0 & \cdots \\ 0 & g_d & \cdots & g_l & g_{l-1} & \ddots \\ \vdots & \ddots & \ddots & \ddots & \ddots & \ddots \\ \cdots & 0 & g_d & \cdots & g_l \end{pmatrix}$$

has size  $(s-l) \times (d+s-2l)$ . Then, using the classical adjoint matrix of  $M$ , one may find a row vector  $v = (a_{d-l-1}, \dots, a_0, b_{s-l-1}, \dots, b_0)$  of polynomials such that  $vM = (0, \dots, 0, \det M)$ . Put  $a = \sum a_i x_0^i$  and  $b = \sum b_i x_0^i$  so that the polynomial  $h := af + bg \in I$  has form  $(\det M)x_0^l +$  (lower  $x_0$ -degree terms). However,  $(\det M)(p) = f_s(p)^{d-l} g_l(p)^{s-l} \neq 0$ . Hence,  $p \notin V(K_l) \supseteq V(K_i)$ . We are done.  $\square$

**Corollary A.3.** *For a generically finite projection  $\pi_z : X \dashrightarrow X_z$ , we have*

$$\deg \pi_z = \min\{i : \dim V(K_i(z, I_X)) < \dim X_z\}.$$

In order to use partial elimination ideals, the following mapping cone sequence is fundamental:

$$\cdots \rightarrow K_{i,j-1}(I, V_z) \rightarrow K_{i,j}(I, V_z) \rightarrow K_{i,j}(I, V) \rightarrow K_{i-1,j}(I, V_z) \rightarrow K_{i-1,j+1}(I, V_z) \rightarrow \cdots \quad (4)$$

In this long exact sequence, the maps  $K_{i,j-1}(I, V_z) \rightarrow K_{i,j}(I, V_z)$  come from the multiplication by  $x_0$ .

## A.1 Hilbert polynomials via the inner projection, and applications

Let  $M$  be a finitely generated graded  $S$ -module of dimension  $n + 1$ . Consider the Hilbert polynomial

$$P_M(m) = \sum_{i=0}^n \chi_i(M) \binom{m+i-1}{i}.$$

When  $M = S_X$ , we write  $P_X(m)$  and  $\chi_i(X)$  instead. If  $X$  has dimension  $n$ , then  $\chi_n(X) = \deg X$  and  $\chi_{n-1}(X) = 1 - \pi(X)$ .

Let  $z$  be a point in  $X$  such that the projection  $\pi_z : X \dashrightarrow X_z$  has degree  $s' < \infty$ , and  $s$  the stabilization number  $s(z, I_X)$ . By the choice of  $s'$ , one may find that

$$K_0(z, I_X) = \cdots = K_{s'-1}(z, I_X).$$

Using the short exact sequences (2), we have

$$\begin{aligned} H_{S_X}(m) &= \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} H_{S_z/K_i}(m-i) \\ &= \sum_{i=0}^{s'-1} H_{S_z/K_i}(m-i) + \sum_{i=s'}^{s-1} H_{S_z/K_i}(m-i) + \sum_{i=s}^{\infty} H_{S_z/K_{\infty}}(m-i) \\ &= \sum_{i=0}^{s'-1} H_{S_z/K_0}(m-i) + \sum_{i=s'}^{s-1} H_{S_z/K_i}(m-i) + H_{S/(K_{\infty})}(m-s), \end{aligned}$$

hence

$$P_X(m) = \sum_{i=0}^{s'-1} P_{X_z}(m-i) + \sum_{i=s'}^{s-1} P_{Z_i}(m-i) + P_{\mathbb{T}C_z X}(m-s),$$

where  $Z_i \subseteq \mathbb{P}^{r-1}$  is the projective scheme defined by  $K_i(z, I_X)$ . Notice that the difference  $P_X(m) - P_X(m-1)$  is the Hilbert polynomial of a general hyperplane section of  $X$ . So, we have

$$\begin{aligned} (\deg X)m + 1 - \pi(X) &= \sum_{i=0}^{s'-1} ((\deg X_z)(m-i) + 1 - \pi(X_z)) + \sum_{i=s'}^{s-1} \deg Z_i \\ &\quad + (\deg \mathbb{T}C_z X)(m-s) + 1 - \pi(\mathbb{T}C_z X). \end{aligned}$$

Thus, the following is obtained:

**Theorem A.4.** *Let  $z \in X$  be a point such that the projection  $\pi_z : X \dashrightarrow X_z$  is generically finite. Write  $s = s(z, I)$  and  $s' = \deg \pi_z$ . Let  $Z_i \subseteq \mathbb{P}^{r-1}$  be the projective scheme defined by  $K_i(z, I_X)$ . Then, we have*

(1)

$$\deg X = s' \deg X_z + \deg \mathbb{T}C_z X; \text{ and}$$

(2)

$$\pi(X) = s' \pi(X_z) - s' + \binom{s'}{2} \deg X_z - \sum_{i=s'}^{s-1} \deg Z_i + \pi(\mathbb{T}C_z X) + s \deg \mathbb{T}C_z X.$$

To compute the Betti table, an elementary step is to calculate alternating sums of Betti numbers, that is,

$$B_j(M, V) := \sum_i (-1)^i \beta_{i, j-i}(M) = \sum_i (-1)^i \dim K_{i, j-i}(M, V).$$

If no confusion arises, then we simply write  $B_j(M)$  instead of  $B_j(M, V)$ . The following is used for the syzygetic characterization of del Pezzo higher secant varieties.

**Proposition A.5.** *Let  $I \subseteq S$  be a homogeneous ideal, and  $z \in V(I)$  a point with  $s = s(z, I)$ . Write  $K_i = K_i(z, I)$ . Then, for every  $j$ , we have*

$$B_j(I, V) = B_j(K_0, V_z) + \sum_{i=1}^s (B_{j-i}(K_i, V_z) - B_{j-i}(K_{i-1}, V_z)).$$

*Epecially, when  $s(z, I) = 1$ , we have  $B_j(I, V) = B_j(K_0, V_z) - B_{j-1}(K_0, V_z) + B_{j-1}(K_\infty, V_z)$  for all  $j$ .*

*Proof.* By the mapping cone sequence above, it is easy to get  $B_j(I, V) = B_j(I, V_z) - B_{j-1}(I, V_z)$ . Also, by letting  $\tilde{K}_i = \tilde{K}_i(z, I)$ , a sufficiently large  $N (\geq j)$  induces  $B_{j'}(\tilde{K}_N) = B_{j'}(I, V_z)$  with  $j' = j$  or  $j - 1$ . And by definition,

$$B_{j'}(\tilde{K}_N) = B_{j'}(\tilde{K}_{N-1}) + B_{j-i}(K_N) = \cdots = \sum_{k=0}^N B_{j'-k}(K_k).$$

So,  $B_j(I, V) = \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} (B_{j-i}(K_i) - B_{j-i-1}(K_i))$ . □

## A.2 A basic inequality of Betti numbers

**Proposition A.6.** *Let  $I \subseteq S = k[x_0, \dots, x_r]$  be a homogeneous ideal, and  $z$  any point in  $\mathbb{P}^r$ . Suppose that  $I_q = 0$ ,  $I_{q+1} = \tilde{K}_1(z, I)_{q+1}$  and  $I_{q+2} = \tilde{K}_2(z, I)_{q+2}$ . Then, we have*

$$\beta_{p,q}(S/I) \leq \beta_{p,q}(S_z/K_0(z, I)) + \beta_{p-1,q}(S_z/K_0(z, I)) + \beta_{p,q-1}(S_z/K_1(z, I)).$$

*And if  $\beta_{p-1,q+1}(S_z/K_0(z, I)) = 0$  and  $\beta_{p-1,q}(S_z/K_1(z, I)) = 0$ , then the equality holds.*

*Proof.* Write  $\tilde{K}_i = \tilde{K}_i(z, I)$  and  $K_i = K_i(z, I)$ . Note that by assumption, we have

- (1)  $K_{p-1,q}(I, V_z) = 0$ ;
- (2)  $K_{i,q+1}(I, V_z) = K_{i,q+1}(\tilde{K}_1)$ ;
- (3)  $K_{p-2,q+2}(I, V_z) = K_{p-2,q+2}(\tilde{K}_2)$ ;
- (4)  $K_{i,q-1}(K_1) = 0$ ; and

$$(5) \quad K_{p-1,q-1}(K_2/K_1) = 0.$$

We begin with the following diagram induced by (4):

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} K_{p-1,q}(I, V_z) & \longrightarrow & K_{p-1,q+1}(I, V_z) & \longrightarrow & K_{p-1,q+1}(I, V) & \longrightarrow & K_{p-2,q+1}(I, V_z) \xrightarrow{\times x_0} K_{p-2,q+2}(I, V_z) \\ \parallel & & \parallel & & \parallel & & \parallel \\ 0 & & K_{p-1,q+1}(\tilde{K}_1) & & K_{p-2,q+1}(\tilde{K}_1) & \xrightarrow[\mu]{\times x_0} & K_{p-2,q+2}(\tilde{K}_2). \end{array}$$

We will count the dimension of  $\ker \mu$ . First of all, we have

$$\dim \ker \mu = \beta_{p,q}(S/I) - \beta_{p-1,q+1}(\tilde{K}_1).$$

And by the exact sequence

$$K_{p,q-1}(K_1) \longrightarrow K_{p-1,q+1}(\tilde{K}_0) \longrightarrow K_{p-1,q+1}(\tilde{K}_1) \longrightarrow K_{p-1,q}(K_1) \longrightarrow K_{p-2,q+2}(\tilde{K}_0),$$

together with  $K_{p,q-1}(K_1) = 0$ , we get

$$\dim \ker \mu \geq \beta_{p,q}(S/I) - \beta_{p,q}(S_z/K_0(z, I)) - \beta_{p-1,q}(K_1).$$

Now, let us look at the commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} K_{p-1,q-1}(K_1) & \longrightarrow & K_{p-2,q+1}(\tilde{K}_0) & \longrightarrow & K_{p-2,q+1}(\tilde{K}_1) & \xrightarrow{f} & K_{p-2,q}(K_1) \\ & & & & \mu \downarrow & & \times x_0 \downarrow v \\ & & K_{p-2,q+2}(\tilde{K}_1) & \longrightarrow & K_{p-2,q+2}(\tilde{K}_2) & \xrightarrow{g} & K_{p-2,q}(K_2). \end{array}$$

Since  $K_{p-1,q-1}(K_2/K_1) = 0$ , the map  $v$  is injective. And as  $K_{p-1,q-1}(K_1) = 0$ ,

$$\dim \ker \mu \leq \dim \ker(g \circ \mu) = \dim \ker(v \circ f) = \dim \ker f = \beta_{p-1,q}(X_z).$$

Combine the inequalities above. Note that if

$$\beta_{p-1,q+1}(S_z/K_0(z, I)) = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \beta_{p-1,q}(S_z/K_1(z, I)) = 0,$$

hence  $K_{p-2,q+2}(\tilde{K}_1) = 0$ , then the equality holds.  $\square$

### A.3 A vanishing theorem

**Lemma A.7.** *Let  $I \subseteq S$  be a homogeneous ideal, and  $z$  any point in  $\mathbb{P}^r$ . Write  $\tilde{K}_i = \tilde{K}_i(z, I)$  and  $K_i = K_i(z, I)$ . Suppose that  $s(z, I) = 1$ . Then, the map  $\times x_0 : K_{i,j}(I, V_z) \rightarrow K_{i,j+1}(I, V_z)$  is*

(1) *injective if  $K_{i,j}(K_0, V_z) \rightarrow K_{i,j}(K_1, V_z)$  is one-to-one; and*



(2) *surjective if*

- (a)  $K_{i,j}(K_0, V_z) \rightarrow K_{i,j}(K_1, V_z)$  is onto;
- (b)  $K_{i+1,j-1}(K_1, V_z) \rightarrow K_{i,j+1}(\tilde{K}_0, V_z)$  is onto; and
- (c)  $K_{i-1,j+1}(K_0, V_z) \rightarrow K_{i-1,j+1}(K_1, V_z)$  is one-to-one.

*Proof.* For a sufficiently large  $N(\geq j)$ , due to the commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} K_{i,j}(\tilde{K}_N) & \xrightarrow{\times x_0} & K_{i,j+1}(\tilde{K}_{N+1}) \\ \cong \downarrow & & \downarrow \cong \\ K_{i,j}(I, V_z) & \xrightarrow{\times x_0} & K_{i,j+1}(I, V_z), \end{array}$$

it is enough to consider the map

$$\times x_0 : K_{i,j}(\tilde{K}_N) \rightarrow K_{i,j+1}(\tilde{K}_{N+1}).$$

We will use the commuting diagram (3). Note that the map  $K_k(-k) \rightarrow K_{k+1}(-k)$  is an isomorphism whenever  $k \geq 1$  because  $s(z, I) = 1$ . Taking the Koszul cohomology, we have

$$\begin{array}{ccccccccc} K_{i+1,j-k-1}(K_k) & \longrightarrow & K_{i,j}(\tilde{K}_{k-1}) & \longrightarrow & K_{i,j}(\tilde{K}_k) & \longrightarrow & K_{i,j-k}(K_k) & \longrightarrow & K_{i-1,j+1}(\tilde{K}_{k-1}) \\ \downarrow & & \times x_0 \downarrow & & \times x_0 \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \times x_0 \downarrow \\ K_{i+1,j-k-1}(K_{k+1}) & \longrightarrow & K_{i,j+1}(\tilde{K}_k) & \longrightarrow & K_{i,j+1}(\tilde{K}_{k+1}) & \longrightarrow & K_{i,j-k}(K_{k+1}) & \longrightarrow & K_{i-1,j+2}(\tilde{K}_k). \end{array}$$

Setting  $k = 0$ , we have

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} & & & & K_{i,j}(\tilde{K}_0) & \xrightarrow{\cong} & K_{i,j}(K_0) \\ & & & & \times x_0 \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ K_{i+1,j-1}(K_1) & \longrightarrow & K_{i,j+1}(\tilde{K}_0) & \longrightarrow & K_{i,j+1}(\tilde{K}_1) & \longrightarrow & K_{i,j}(K_1). \end{array}$$

We claim that

- (1)  $\times x_0 : K_{i,j}(\tilde{K}_k) \rightarrow K_{i,j+1}(\tilde{K}_{k+1})$  is injective for all  $k \geq 0$  provided that  $K_{i,j}(K_0) \rightarrow K_{i,j}(K_1)$  is a monomorphism.
- (2)  $\times x_0 : K_{i,j}(\tilde{K}_k) \rightarrow K_{i,j+1}(\tilde{K}_{k+1})$  is surjective for all  $k \geq 0$  provided that  $K_{i,j}(K_0) \rightarrow K_{i,j}(K_1)$  and  $K_{i+1,j-1}(K_1) \rightarrow K_{i,j+1}(\tilde{K}_0)$  are epimorphisms, and  $K_{i-1,j+1}(K_0) \rightarrow K_{i-1,j+1}(K_1)$  is injective.

We find that  $\times x_0 : K_{i,j}(\tilde{K}_0) \rightarrow K_{i,j+1}(\tilde{K}_1)$  is an injection when so is  $K_{i,j}(K_0) \rightarrow K_{i,j}(K_1)$ , Applying the 4-lemma, we have (1).

For the proof of (2), we will use induction on  $k \geq 0$ . The case  $k = 0$  is obvious by the surjectivity of  $K_{i,j}(K_0) \rightarrow K_{i,j}(K_1)$  and  $K_{i+1,j-1}(K_1) \rightarrow K_{i,j+1}(K_0)$ . Set  $k \geq 1$ . Since  $K_{i-1,j+1}(K_0) \rightarrow K_{i-1,j+1}(K_1)$  is injective, so is  $\times x_0 : K_{i-1,j+1}(\tilde{K}_k) \rightarrow K_{i-1,j+2}(\tilde{K}_{k+1})$  by (1). Then, by the 4-lemma on surjectivity, we are done.  $\square$

**Proposition A.8.** *Suppose that  $s(z, I) = 1$ . Then,  $K_{i,j}(I, V) = 0$  if*

- (1)  $K_{i,j-1}(K_\infty, V_z) = 0$ ; and
- (2)  $K_{i-1,j}(K_0, V_z) = K_{i,j}(K_0, V_z) = 0$ .

*Proof.* Consider the exact sequence (4), that is,

$$K_{i,j-1}(I, V_z) \xrightarrow{\times x_0} K_{i,j}(I, V_z) \longrightarrow K_{i,j}(I, V) \longrightarrow K_{i-1,j}(I, V_z) \xrightarrow{\times x_0} K_{i-1,j+1}(I, V_z).$$

By applying the lemma above, the first  $\times x_0$  is surjective, and the second  $\times x_0$  is injective.  $\square$

## References

- [1] Marian Aprodu and Jan Nagel. *Koszul cohomology and algebraic geometry*, volume 52. American Mathematical Soc., 2010.
- [2] Aaron Bertram et al. Moduli of rank-2 vector bundles, theta divisors, and the geometry of curves in projective space. *Journal of Differential Geometry*, 35(2):429–469, 1992.
- [3] Hans-Christian Graf v Bothmer and Klaus Hulek. Geometric syzygies of elliptic normal curves and their secant varieties. *manuscripta mathematica*, 113(1):35–68, 2004.
- [4] J Bronowski. The sum of powers as canonical expression. In *Mathematical Proceedings of the Cambridge Philosophical Society*, volume 29, pages 69–82. Cambridge University Press, 1933.
- [5] David A Buchsbaum and David Eisenbud. Algebra structures for finite free resolutions, and some structure theorems for ideals of codimension 3. *American Journal of Mathematics*, 99(3):447–485, 1977.
- [6] Alex Casarotti and Massimiliano Mella. From non defectivity to identifiability. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1911.00780*, 2019.
- [7] Alex Casarotti and Massimiliano Mella. Tangential weak defectiveness and generic identifiability. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2009.00968*, 2020.
- [8] Guido Castelnuovo. *Ricerche di geometria sulle curve algebriche*. Loescher, 1889.

- [9] Michael L Catalano-Johnson. The homogeneous ideals of higher secant varieties. *Journal of Pure and Applied Algebra*, 158(2-3):123–129, 2001.
- [10] Luca Chiantini and Ciro Ciliberto. Weakly defective varieties. *Transactions of the American Mathematical Society*, 354(1):151–178, 2002.
- [11] Luca Chiantini and Ciro Ciliberto. On the dimension of secant varieties. *Journal of the European Mathematical Society*, 12(5):1267–1291, 2010.
- [12] Ciro Ciliberto and Francesco Russo. On surfaces with two apparent double points. *Advances in Geometry*, (2):223–236, 2005.
- [13] Ciro Ciliberto and Francesco Russo. Varieties with minimal secant degree and linear systems of maximal dimension on surfaces. *Advances in Mathematics*, 200(1):1–50, 2006.
- [14] David Eisenbud. Linear sections of determinantal varieties. *American Journal of Mathematics*, 110(3):541–575, 1988.
- [15] David Eisenbud, Mark Green, Klaus Hulek, and Sorin Popescu. Restricting linear syzygies: algebra and geometry. *Compositio Mathematica*, 141(6):1460–1478, 2005.
- [16] David Eisenbud and Joe Harris. On varieties of minimal degree. In *Proc. Sympos. Pure Math*, volume 46, pages 3–13, 1987.
- [17] Gino Fano. *Sopra le curve di dato ordine e dei massimi generi in uno spazio qualunque: memoria*. Clausen, 1893.
- [18] Tom Fisher. The higher secant varieties of an elliptic normal curve. *preprint*, 2006.
- [19] Daniel R. Grayson and Michael E. Stillman. Macaulay2, a software system for research in algebraic geometry. Available at <https://faculty.math.illinois.edu/Macaulay2/>.
- [20] Mark L Green. Generic initial ideals. In *Six lectures on commutative algebra*, pages 119–186. Springer, 1998.
- [21] Mark L Green et al. The canonical ring of a variety of general type. *Duke Mathematical Journal*, 49(4):1087–1113, 1982.
- [22] Mark L Green et al. Koszul cohomology and the geometry of projective varieties. *Journal of Differential Geometry*, 19(1):125–171, 1984.

- [23] Phillip Griffiths and Joseph Harris. *Principles of algebraic geometry*, volume 19. Wiley Online Library, 1978.
- [24] Laurent Gruson, Robert Lazarsfeld, and Christian Peskine. On a theorem of Castelnuovo, and the equations defining space curves. *Inventiones mathematicae*, 72(3):491–506, 1983.
- [25] Laurent Gruson and Christian Peskine. Genre des courbes de l’espace projectif. In *Algebraic geometry*, pages 31–59. Springer, 1978.
- [26] Kangjin Han and Sijong Kwak. Analysis on some infinite modules, inner projection, and applications. *Transactions of the American Mathematical Society*, 364(11):5791–5812, 2012.
- [27] Kangjin Han and Sijong Kwak. Sharp bounds for higher linear syzygies and classifications of projective varieties. *Mathematische Annalen*, 361(1-2):535–561, 2015.
- [28] Bo Ilic. Geometric properties of the double-point divisor. *Transactions of the American Mathematical Society*, 350(4):1643–1661, 1998.
- [29] Tadeusz Józefiak. Ideals generated by minors of a symmetric matrix. *Commentarii mathematici Helvetici*, 53(1):595–607, 1978.
- [30] Hajime Kaji. On the tangentially degenerate curves. *Journal of the London Mathematical Society*, 2(3):430–440, 1986.
- [31] Joseph M Landsberg. Tensors: geometry and applications. *Representation theory*, 381(402):3, 2012.
- [32] Wanseok Lee and Euisung Park. On non-normal del pezzo varieties. *Journal of Algebra*, 387:11–28, 2013.
- [33] Margherita Roggero. Laudal-type theorems in  $\mathbb{P}^N$ . *Indagationes Mathematicae*, 14(2):249–262, 2003.
- [34] Francesco Russo. *On the geometry of some special projective varieties*. Springer, 2016.
- [35] Francesco Severi. Intorno ai punti doppi impropri di una superficie generale dello spazio a quattro dimensioni, e a’suoi punti tripli apparenti. *Rendiconti del Circolo Matematico di Palermo*, 15(1):33–51, 1901.
- [36] Jessica Sidman and Seth Sullivant. Prolongations and computational algebra. *Canadian Journal of Mathematics*, 61(4):930–949, 2009.

- [37] Fyodor Lazarevich Zak. Projections of algebraic varieties. *Mathematics of the USSR-Sbornik*, 44(4):535, 1983.