

VECTOR-SPREAD MONOMIAL IDEALS AND ELIAHOU–KERVAIRE TYPE RESOLUTIONS

Antonino Ficarra

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS AND COMPUTER SCIENCES, PHYSICS AND EARTH SCIENCES,
UNIVERSITY OF MESSINA, VIALE FERDINANDO STAGNO D'ALCONTRES 31, 98166 MESSINA, ITALY

E-mail address: antficarra@unime.it

Abstract

We introduce the class of vector-spread monomial ideals. This notion generalizes that of t -spread ideals introduced by Ene, Herzog and Qureshi. In particular, we focus on vector-spread strongly stable ideals, we compute their Koszul cycles and describe their minimal free resolution. As a consequence the graded Betti numbers and the Poincaré series are determined. Finally, we consider a generalization of algebraic shifting theory for such a class of ideals.

INTRODUCTION

Algebraic shifting is one of the most powerful techniques in Combinatorial Commutative Algebra [23, Chapter 11]. It is based on the simple idea of shifting and spreading the variables of the generators of a monomial ideal in a coherent way. The origins of this theory date back to a famous paper by Erdős, Ko and Rado, *Intersection theorems for systems of finite sets* [19], and made its way into Commutative Algebra through the work of Gil Kalai [27]. Lately, algebraic shifting theory and monomial ideals arising from *shifting operators* [23] have seen a resurgence. The *t -spread monomial ideals* have been introduced in 2019 by Ene, Herzog and Qureshi [18]. The homological and combinatorial properties of these and some related classes of ideals are the subject of a large body of research [1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 13, 14, 15, 16, 18, 20, 21, 24, 28, 29, 30].

In this paper, our aim is to investigate the more general possible class of such ideals. Let $S = K[x_1, \dots, x_n]$ be a polynomial ring, with K a field. Given a vector $\mathbf{t} = (t_1, t_2, \dots, t_{d-1}) \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^{d-1}$, $d \geq 2$, of non negative integers, we say that a monomial $u = x_{j_1} x_{j_2} \cdots x_{j_\ell} \in S$, with $j_1 \leq j_2 \leq \cdots \leq j_\ell$ and $\ell \leq d$, is a *vector-spread monomial of type \mathbf{t}* or simply a *\mathbf{t} -spread monomial* if

$$j_{i+1} - j_i \geq t_i, \quad \text{for all } i = 1, \dots, \ell - 1.$$

Keywords: monomial ideals, minimal graded resolution, vector-spread ideals, t -spread ideals, Koszul homology, Eliahou–Kervaire resolution.

2020 Mathematics Subject Classification: 05E40, 13B25, 13D02, 16W50, 68W30.

For instance, $u = x_1^3 x_2 x_4$ is $(0, 0, 1, 2)$ -spread, but not $(1, 0, 1, 2)$ -spread. A monomial ideal $I \subseteq S$ is a \mathbf{t} -spread monomial ideal if it is generated by \mathbf{t} -spread monomials. If $t_i = t$, for all i , a \mathbf{t} -spread monomial is called an *ordinary* or *uniform* t -spread monomial, see [18]. A $\mathbf{1} = (1, 1, \dots, 1)$ -spread monomial ideal is in particular *squarefree*.

Let $\mathbf{t} \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^{d-1}$, $d \geq 2$. We say that a \mathbf{t} -spread monomial ideal $I \subset S = K[x_1, \dots, x_n]$ is a \mathbf{t} -spread *strongly stable ideal* if for any \mathbf{t} -spread monomial $u \in I$, and all $j < i$ such that x_i divides u and $x_j(u/x_i)$ is \mathbf{t} -spread, then $x_j(u/x_i) \in I$. For $\mathbf{t} = \mathbf{0} = (0, 0, \dots, 0)$ ($\mathbf{t} = \mathbf{1} = (1, 1, \dots, 1)$) one obtains the classical notion of strongly stable (squarefree strongly stable) ideals [23]. On the other hand, strongly stable ideals have a central role in Commutative Algebra. Indeed, for a field K of characteristic zero, they appear as *generic initial ideals* [23]. Eliahou and Kervaire constructed their minimal free resolutions [17]. Bigatti and Hulett showed that among all homogeneous ideals with the same Hilbert function, the lexicographic ideals (which are also strongly stable) have the biggest Betti numbers [12, 26]. Using shifting theory [18, 23, 27], Aramova, Herzog and Hibi extended these results to squarefree ideals [10, 11].

In [18], it was shown that ordinary t -spread strongly stable ideals have *linear quotients* [23, 25]. For ideals with linear quotients, the graded Betti numbers can be easily computed. Moreover, if the so-called *decomposition function* of I is *regular* [25], then the minimal free resolution can be explicitly described. Unfortunately, even ordinary 2-spread strongly stable ideals do not have *regular decomposition functions*, as noted in [18]. Hence, the minimal free resolution of ordinary t -spread strongly stable ideals could not be determined and has remained elusive ever since.

The purpose of this paper is twofold, we construct the minimal free resolution of vector-spread strongly stable ideals generalizing the *Eliahou–Kervaire resolution* [17], and extend *algebraic shifting theory* to vector-spread strongly stable ideals [27].

The paper is organized as follows. After some preliminary materials in Section 1, we introduce in Section 2 the concept of vector-spread monomials and ideals.

In Sections 3 and 4 we construct the minimal free resolution of I a \mathbf{t} -spread strongly stable ideal of S . As pointed out before, the method of linear quotients is unavailable to us, as the decomposition functions of vector-spread strongly stable ideals are, in general, non regular. Thus we use *Koszul homology* as developed by Aramova and Herzog in [9]. Let $H_i(\mathbf{x}; S/I)$ the i th homology module of $\mathbf{x} = x_1, \dots, x_n$ with respect to S/I . Due to the isomorphism $\text{Tor}_i^S(K, S/I)_j \cong H_i(\mathbf{x}; S/I)_j$, one can calculate the graded Betti numbers of S/I as $\beta_{i,j}(S/I) = \dim_K H_i(\mathbf{x}; S/I)_j$. Thus one has to determine a basis of this K -vector space. To do so we compute the *Koszul cycles* of S/I . As many examples indicate, Koszul cycles of arbitrary \mathbf{t} -spread strongly stable ideals do not have a nice expression as in the cases $\mathbf{t} = \mathbf{0}, \mathbf{1}$ [9, 10] (Remark 3.10). To compute them we introduce the following notion (Definition 3.1). If $u = x_{j_1} x_{j_2} \cdots x_{j_\ell}$ is a \mathbf{t} -spread monomial, the \mathbf{t} -spread *support* of u is the set

$$\text{supp}_{\mathbf{t}}(u) := \bigcup_{i=1}^{\ell-1} [j_i, j_i + (t_i - 1)],$$

where $[a, b] = \{c : a \leq c \leq b\}$, for $a, b \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}$. Furthermore, we set $[n] = \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$, for $n \geq 1$. Let $G(I)$ be the unique minimal set of monomial generators of I . For a monomial $u \in S$, $\max(u) = \max\{j : x_j \text{ divides } u\}$. The main result of Section 3 is

Theorem 3.8. *Let $I \subset S$ be a \mathbf{t} -spread strongly stable ideal. Then, for all $i \geq 1$, the K -vector space $H_i(\mathbf{x}; S/I)$ has as a basis the homology classes of the Koszul cycles*

$$e(u; \sigma) \quad \text{such that} \quad u \in G(I), \quad \sigma \subseteq [\max(u) - 1] \setminus \text{supp}_{\mathbf{t}}(u), \quad |\sigma| = i - 1.$$

Firstly, we show that the elements $e(u; \sigma)$ (Definition 3.3) are Koszul cycles. We employ an inductive argument, as a direct proof is rather tedious (Remark 3.5). Then, we inductively determine the basis for the Koszul homologies of S/I on partial sequences of \mathbf{x} . Note that for $\mathbf{t} = \mathbf{0}$ ($\mathbf{t} = \mathbf{1}$) the conditions that σ must satisfy in Theorem 3.8 are the same as in [9, Proposition 2.1] ([10, Proposition 2.2]). So, we get a formula for the graded Betti numbers (Corollary 5.2) independent from the characteristic of the underlying field K , generalizing the known results in [9, 10, 17, 18].

In Section 4, we introduce the \mathbf{t} -spread decomposition function (Definition 4.1). As a consequence, the differentials of the minimal free resolution of S/I are explicitly described (Theorem 4.2). Examples 3.9, 3.11, 4.3 illustrate our methods.

Finally, Section 5 is devoted to a generalization of the algebraic shifting theory. Classically, a *simplicial complex* Δ on the vertex set $[n]$ is called *shifted* if for all $F \in \Delta$, all $i \in F$, $j \in [n]$, $j > i$, then $(F \setminus \{i\}) \cup \{j\} \in \Delta$ [23, 27]. Note that Δ is shifted if and only if the Stanley–Reisner ideal of Δ , I_{Δ} , is an ordinary squarefree (1-spread) strongly stable ideal [23]. The usefulness of *Combinatorial shifting* comes from the fact that a simplicial complex shares the same *f-vector* of its shifted simplicial complex [23], and moreover the *f-vector* of the shifted complex is easier to compute.

From the algebraic point of view, *Algebraic shifting* is defined as follows. Let K be a field of characteristic zero. Let $\text{Gin}(I)$ the *generic initial ideal* of $I \subset S$ with respect to the reverse lexicographic order [23], in particular $\text{Gin}(I)$ is ($\mathbf{0}$ -spread) strongly stable. One defines $I^s = (\text{Gin}(I))^{\sigma}$, where σ is the *squarefree operator* that assign to each monomial $u = x_{i_1}x_{i_2} \cdots x_{i_d}$ the monomial $\sigma(u) := x_{i_1}x_{i_2+1} \cdots x_{i_d+(d-1)}$ and to each monomial ideal I , the monomial ideal I^{σ} with minimal generating set $G(I^{\sigma}) = \{\sigma(u) : u \in G(I)\}$ [23, 27]. Then, the following properties hold

- (Shift₁) I^s is a squarefree strongly stable monomial ideal;
- (Shift₂) $I^s = I$ if I is a squarefree strongly stable ideal;
- (Shift₃) I and I^s have the same Hilbert function;
- (Shift₄) If $I \subseteq J$, then $I^s \subseteq J^s$.

We are mainly interested in the algebraic side of this construction. We introduce an analogous “ \mathbf{t} -spread” algebraic shifting by the assignment $I^{s, \mathbf{t}} = (\text{Gin}(I))^{\sigma_{\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{t}}}$, where $\sigma_{\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{t}}$ will be a suitable shifting operator. The \mathbf{t} -spread versions of (Shift₁)-(Shift₄) will be established. For $\mathbf{t} = \mathbf{1} = (1, 1, \dots, 1)$, our construction returns the classical one. In particular, $(\text{Gin}(I))^{\sigma_{\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{t}}} = I$, if I is a \mathbf{t} -spread strongly stable ideal (Theorem 5.5).

1. PRELIMINARIES

1.1. Monomial Ideals. For the rest of the paper, $S = K[x_1, \dots, x_n]$ is the standard graded polynomial ring in n indeterminates, with K a field. Let $u = x_1^{a_1} x_2^{a_2} \cdots x_n^{a_n} \in S$ be a monomial, the integer $\deg(u) = a_1 + a_2 + \cdots + a_n$ is called the *degree* of u .

By $\text{Mon}(S)$ we denote the set of all monomials of S . Whereas, $\text{Mon}_\ell(S)$ denotes the set of all monomial of S having degree ℓ . For a monomial $u \in S$, the *support* of u is the set $\text{supp}(u) := \{i : x_i \text{ divides } u\}$. Furthermore, we set $\max(u) := \max \text{supp}(u)$ and $\min(u) := \min \text{supp}(u)$. For convenience we let $\min(1) = \max(1) = n$, for the monomial $1 \in S$. For I a monomial ideal of S , $G(I)$ denotes the unique minimal set of monomial generators of I , whereas $G(I)_\ell := \{u \in G(I) : \deg(u) = \ell\}$.

Any monomial ideal I of S has a unique minimal graded free resolution

$$\mathbb{F} : 0 \rightarrow \bigoplus_{j \geq 0} S(-j)^{\beta_{r,j}} \xrightarrow{d_r} \cdots \xrightarrow{d_1} \bigoplus_{j \geq 0} S(-j)^{\beta_{0,j}} \xrightarrow{d_0} I \rightarrow 0,$$

where $S(-j)$ is the free S -module obtained by shifting the degrees of S by j . For all $i, j \geq 0$, the numbers $\beta_{i,j} = \beta_{i,j}(I) = \dim_K \text{Tor}_i^S(K, I)_j$ are called the *graded Betti numbers* of I , and $\beta_i(I) = \sum_j \beta_{i,j}(I)$ is the i th *total Betti number* of I . Furthermore, $\text{pd}(I) = \max\{i : \beta_i(I) \neq 0\}$ is the *projective dimension* of I . Whereas, the (*Castelnuovo–Mumford*) *regularity* of I is $\text{reg}(I) = \max\{j : \beta_{i,i+j}(I) \neq 0, \text{ for some } i\}$.

1.2. The Koszul complex. To compute the graded Betti numbers one can use the *Koszul complex* [23]. Let $\mathbf{f} = f_1, \dots, f_m$ be a sequence of elements of S . The Koszul complex $K_\bullet(\mathbf{f}; S)$ attached to the sequence \mathbf{f} is defined as follows: let F be the free S -module with basis e_1, \dots, e_m .

- We let $K_i(\mathbf{f}; S) = \bigwedge^i F$, for all $i = 0, \dots, m$. A basis of the free S -module $K_i(\mathbf{f}; S)$ is given by the wedge products $e_\tau = e_{k_1} \wedge e_{k_2} \wedge \cdots \wedge e_{k_i}$, where $\tau = \{k_1 < k_2 < \cdots < k_i\} \subseteq [m] = \{1, \dots, m\}$, with $\deg(u_\tau) = |\tau| = i$.
- We define the differential $\partial_i : K_i(\mathbf{f}; S) \rightarrow K_{i-1}(\mathbf{f}; S)$, $i = 1, \dots, m-1$ by

$$\partial_i(e_\tau) = \sum_{\ell=1}^i (-1)^{\ell+1} f_{k_\ell} e_{\tau \setminus \{k_\ell\}}.$$

We order the wedge products *lexicographically*, as follows: Let $\sigma = \{k_1 < k_2 < \cdots < k_p\}, \tau = \{\ell_1 < \ell_2 < \cdots < \ell_q\} \subseteq [m]$, we define $\sigma > \tau$ if $p = q$ and for some $j \in [p] = \{1, \dots, p\}$ one has

$$k_1 = \ell_1, \quad k_2 = \ell_2, \quad \dots, \quad k_{j-1} = \ell_{j-1} \quad \text{and} \quad k_j < \ell_j.$$

If $\sigma > \tau$, then we set $e_\sigma > e_\tau$. For example,

$$e_1 \wedge e_2 > e_1 \wedge e_3 > e_1 \wedge e_4 > e_2 \wedge e_3 > e_2 \wedge e_4 > e_3 \wedge e_4.$$

1.3. Koszul Homology. Let I be a monomial ideal of S , and let $\varepsilon : S \rightarrow S/I$ be the canonical epimorphism. For all $1 \leq j \leq n$, we let \mathbf{x}_j be the regular sequence $\mathbf{x}_j = x_j, x_{j+1}, \dots, x_n$. In particular, $\mathbf{x}_1 = \mathbf{x} = x_1, \dots, x_n$. One can define the complex $K_\bullet(\mathbf{x}_j; S/I) = K_\bullet(\mathbf{x}_j; S) \otimes S/I$. We set $\varepsilon(f)e_\sigma > \varepsilon(g)e_\tau$ if $e_\sigma > e_\tau$. We denote by $H_i(\mathbf{x}_j; S/I) = H_i(K_\bullet(\mathbf{x}_j; S/I))$ the i th homology module of \mathbf{x}_j with respect to S/I , such modules are graded. If $a \in K_i(\mathbf{x}_j; S/I)$ is a *Koszul cycle*, i.e., $\partial_i(a) = 0$, the symbol $[a]$ denotes the *homology class* of a in $H_i(\mathbf{x}_j; S/I)$.

Koszul homology allows us to calculate the graded Betti numbers. Indeed, we have the isomorphism $H_i(\mathbf{x}; S/I)_j \cong \text{Tor}_i^S(K, S/I)_j$, see [23, Corollary A.3.5]. Thus

$$\beta_{i-1,j}(I) = \beta_{i,j}(S/I) = \dim_K H_i(\mathbf{x}; S/I)_j \quad \text{for all } i \geq 1, j \geq 0. \quad (1)$$

We recall the following rule of multiplication: $\partial(a \wedge b) = \partial(a) \wedge b + (-1)^{\deg a} a \wedge \partial(b)$ for $a, b \in K_\bullet(\mathbf{x}; S/I)$, with a homogeneous.

To simplify the notations, if there is no risk of confusion, we set $K_i(\mathbf{x}_j) = K_i(\mathbf{x}_j; S/I)$ and $H_i(\mathbf{x}_j) = H_i(\mathbf{x}_j; S/I)$, for all i and all $j = 1, \dots, n$. Each module $H_i(\mathbf{x}_j)$ is a $S = K[x_1, \dots, x_n]$ -module, so it is in particular a $S/(\mathbf{x}_j) \cong K[x_1, \dots, x_{j-1}]$ -module, and for $j = 1$, a K -vector space.

Let $1 \leq j \leq n-1$. For all i , let $\alpha_i : K_i(\mathbf{x}_{j+1}) \rightarrow K_i(\mathbf{x}_j)$ be the inclusion. We define also a homomorphism $\beta_i : K_i(\mathbf{x}_j) \rightarrow K_{i-1}(\mathbf{x}_{j+1})$ as follows: Any element $a \in K_i(\mathbf{x}_j)$ can be written uniquely as $a = e_j \wedge b + c$, for unique $b \in K_{i-1}(\mathbf{x}_{j+1})$ and $c \in K_i(\mathbf{x}_{j+1})$, we set $\beta_i(a) = b$. One immediately verifies that $\beta_i \circ \alpha_i = 0$.

We can construct the following short exact sequence of complexes

$$0 \rightarrow K_\bullet(\mathbf{x}_{j+1}; S/I) \xrightarrow{\alpha} K_\bullet(\mathbf{x}_j; S/I) \xrightarrow{\beta} K_\bullet(\mathbf{x}_{j+1}; S/I)[-1] \rightarrow 0, \quad (2)$$

where $[-1]$ denotes the shifting of the homological degree by -1 ; indeed the following diagram is commutative with exact rows

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} & & \vdots & & \vdots & & \vdots \\ & & \downarrow \partial_{i+2} & & \downarrow \partial_{i+2} & & \downarrow \partial_{i+1} \\ 0 & \longrightarrow & K_{i+1}(\mathbf{x}_{j+1}) & \xrightarrow{\alpha_{i+1}} & K_{i+1}(\mathbf{x}_j) & \xrightarrow{\beta_{i+1}} & K_i(\mathbf{x}_{j+1}) \longrightarrow 0 \\ & & \downarrow \partial_{i+1} & & \downarrow \partial_{i+1} & & \downarrow \partial_i \\ 0 & \longrightarrow & K_i(\mathbf{x}_{j+1}) & \xrightarrow{\alpha_i} & K_i(\mathbf{x}_j) & \xrightarrow{\beta_i} & K_{i-1}(\mathbf{x}_{j+1}) \longrightarrow 0 \\ & & \downarrow \partial_i & & \downarrow \partial_i & & \downarrow \partial_{i-1} \\ 0 & \longrightarrow & K_{i-1}(\mathbf{x}_{j+1}) & \xrightarrow{\alpha_{i-1}} & K_{i-1}(\mathbf{x}_j) & \xrightarrow{\beta_{i-1}} & K_{i-2}(\mathbf{x}_{j+1}) \longrightarrow 0 \\ & & \downarrow \partial_{i-1} & & \downarrow \partial_{i-1} & & \downarrow \partial_{i-2} \\ & & \vdots & & \vdots & & \vdots \end{array}$$

Therefore, we can apply the homology functor H to the short exact sequence of complexes (2). By abuse of notations, we denote the induced maps $H_i(\alpha), H_i(\beta)$ again by α_i, β_i , for all i . So, we have the long exact sequence

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} \cdots & \xrightarrow{\delta_{i+1}} & H_{i+1}(\mathbf{x}_{j+1}) & \xrightarrow{\alpha_{i+1}} & H_{i+1}(\mathbf{x}_j) & \xrightarrow{\beta_{i+1}} & H_i(\mathbf{x}_{j+1}) \xrightarrow{\delta_i} \\ & & \xrightarrow{\delta_i} & H_i(\mathbf{x}_{j+1}) & \xrightarrow{\alpha_i} & H_i(\mathbf{x}_j) & \xrightarrow{\beta_i} H_{i-1}(\mathbf{x}_{j+1}) \xrightarrow{\delta_{i-1}} \\ & & \xrightarrow{\delta_{i-1}} & H_{i-1}(\mathbf{x}_{j+1}) & \xrightarrow{\alpha_{i-1}} & \cdots & \xrightarrow{\alpha_0} H_0(\mathbf{x}_j) \longrightarrow 0, \end{array} \quad (3)$$

where the maps δ_i are the *connecting homomorphisms*. It can be verified that δ_i is *multiplication by $\pm x_j$* , i.e., $\delta_i([a]) = \pm x_j[a]$, see [23, Theorem A.3.3].

2. BASIC CONCEPTS

From now on, $\mathbf{t} = (t_1, \dots, t_{d-1})$ is a vector of non negative integers and $d \geq 2$.

Definition 2.1 Let $u = x_{j_1} x_{j_2} \cdots x_{j_\ell} \in S$ be a monomial of degree $\ell \leq d$, with $1 \leq j_1 \leq j_2 \leq \cdots \leq j_\ell \leq n$. We say that u is a *vector-spread monomial of type \mathbf{t}* , or simply a *\mathbf{t} -spread monomial*, if

$$j_{i+1} - j_i \geq t_i, \quad \text{for all } i = 1, \dots, \ell - 1.$$

In particular, any variable x_j is \mathbf{t} -spread. We assume that $u = 1$ is \mathbf{t} -spread too. Whereas, we say that a monomial ideal $I \subseteq S$ is a *vector-spread monomial ideal of type \mathbf{t}* , or simply a *\mathbf{t} -spread monomial ideal*, if all monomials $u \in G(I)$ are \mathbf{t} -spread.

For instance, the monomial $u = x_1^3 x_2 x_4 x_5$ is $(0, 0, 1, 2, 1)$ -spread, but it is not $(1, 0, 1, 2, 1)$ -spread. For a \mathbf{t} -spread monomial ideal $I \subset S$, it is $G(I)_k = \emptyset$ for $k > d$. Let $\mathbf{0} = (0, 0, \dots, 0)$ be the null vector with $d-1$ components. All monomials of degree $\ell \leq d$ are $\mathbf{0}$ -spread. If $t_i \geq 1$ for all i , a \mathbf{t} -spread monomial is *squarefree* [23].

Definition 2.2 In our context, if $t_i = t \geq 0$, for all $i = 1, \dots, d-1$, we say that a \mathbf{t} -spread monomial (ideal) $u \in \text{Mon}(S)$, ($I \subseteq S$), is an *uniform* or *ordinary \mathbf{t} -spread monomial (ideal)*. Such definition agrees with that given in [18]. In this case, we drop the bold character “ \mathbf{t} ” and we simply speak of t -spread monomial ideals.

Let $T = K[x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n, \dots]$ be the polynomial ring in infinitely many variables. We let $\text{Mon}(T; \mathbf{t})$ to be the set of all \mathbf{t} -spread monomials of T . Analogously, $\text{Mon}(S; \mathbf{t})$ denotes the set of all \mathbf{t} -spread monomials of S . Furthermore, for all $0 \leq \ell \leq d$, we define the following sets

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Mon}_\ell(T; \mathbf{t}) &:= \{u \in \text{Mon}(T; \mathbf{t}) : \deg(u) = \ell\}, \\ \text{Mon}_\ell(S; \mathbf{t}) &:= \{u \in \text{Mon}(S; \mathbf{t}) : \deg(u) = \ell\}. \end{aligned}$$

Note that $\text{Mon}_\ell(S; \mathbf{t}) = \text{Mon}_\ell(T; \mathbf{t}) \cap S$, $\text{Mon}_\ell(S; \mathbf{t}) = \emptyset$ for $\ell > d$, and $\text{Mon}(S; \mathbf{t})$ is the disjoint union of the sets $\text{Mon}_\ell(S; \mathbf{t})$, $\ell = 0, \dots, d$.

Sometimes, we may use the abbreviation $M_{n,\ell,\mathbf{t}}$ for $\text{Mon}_\ell(S; \mathbf{t})$. For instance,

$$M_{5,4,(1,0,2)} = \{x_1x_2^2x_4, x_1x_2^2x_5, x_1x_2x_3x_5, x_1x_3^2x_5, x_2x_3^2x_5\}.$$

In order to compute the cardinality of the sets $M_{n,\ell,\mathbf{t}}$, we introduce a new *shifting operator*, see [11]. Let $\mathbf{0} = (0, 0, \dots, 0)$ be the null vector with $d - 1$ components, we define the map $\sigma_{\mathbf{0},\mathbf{t}} : \text{Mon}(T; \mathbf{0}) \rightarrow \text{Mon}(T; \mathbf{t})$, by setting $\sigma_{\mathbf{0},\mathbf{t}}(1) = 1$, $\sigma_{\mathbf{0},\mathbf{t}}(x_i) = x_i$ and for all monomials $u = x_{j_1}x_{j_2} \cdots x_{j_\ell} \in \text{Mon}(T; \mathbf{0})$ with $j_1 \leq j_2 \leq \cdots \leq j_\ell$, $2 \leq \ell \leq d$,

$$\sigma_{\mathbf{0},\mathbf{t}}(x_{j_1}x_{j_2} \cdots x_{j_\ell}) := \prod_{k=1}^{\ell} x_{j_k + \sum_{s=1}^{k-1} t_s}.$$

Whereas, $\sigma_{\mathbf{t},\mathbf{t}} : \text{Mon}(T; \mathbf{t}) \rightarrow \text{Mon}(T; \mathbf{t})$ denotes the identity function of $\text{Mon}(T; \mathbf{t})$.

Lemma 2.3 *The map $\sigma_{\mathbf{0},\mathbf{t}}$ is a bijection.*

Proof. We define the map $\sigma_{\mathbf{t},\mathbf{0}} : \text{Mon}(T; \mathbf{t}) \rightarrow \text{Mon}(T; \mathbf{0})$, by setting $\sigma_{\mathbf{t},\mathbf{0}}(1) = 1$, $\sigma_{\mathbf{t},\mathbf{0}}(x_i) = x_i$, for all $i \in \mathbb{N}$, and for all monomials $u = x_{j_1}x_{j_2} \cdots x_{j_\ell} \in \text{Mon}(T; \mathbf{t})$ with $1 \leq j_1 \leq j_2 \leq \cdots \leq j_\ell$, and $2 \leq \ell \leq d$,

$$\sigma_{\mathbf{t},\mathbf{0}}(x_{j_1}x_{j_2} \cdots x_{j_\ell}) := \prod_{k=1}^{\ell} x_{j_k - \sum_{s=1}^{k-1} t_s}.$$

One immediately verifies that $\sigma_{\mathbf{0},\mathbf{t}} \circ \sigma_{\mathbf{t},\mathbf{0}} = \sigma_{\mathbf{t},\mathbf{t}}$ and $\sigma_{\mathbf{t},\mathbf{0}} \circ \sigma_{\mathbf{0},\mathbf{t}} = \sigma_{\mathbf{0},\mathbf{0}}$. \square

In particular, the restriction $\sigma_{\mathbf{t},\mathbf{0}}|_{M_{n,\ell,\mathbf{t}}}$ is an injective map whose image is the set $M_{n-(t_1+t_2+\dots+t_{\ell-1}),\ell,\mathbf{0}} = \text{Mon}_\ell(K[x_1, \dots, x_{n-(t_1+t_2+\dots+t_{\ell-1})}])$. Thus,

Corollary 2.4 *For all $0 \leq \ell \leq d$,*

$$|M_{n,\ell,\mathbf{t}}| = \binom{n + (\ell - 1) - \sum_{j=1}^{\ell-1} t_j}{\ell}.$$

Now, we introduce three fundamental classes of \mathbf{t} -spread ideals.

Definition 2.5 Let U be a non empty subset of $M_{n,\ell,\mathbf{t}}$, $\ell \leq d$. We say that

- U is a \mathbf{t} -spread stable set, if for all $u \in U$, and all $j < \max(u)$ such that $x_j(u/x_{\max(u)})$ is \mathbf{t} -spread, then $x_j(u/x_{\max(u)}) \in U$;
- U is a \mathbf{t} -spread strongly stable set, if for all $u \in U$, and all $j < i$ such that x_i divides u and $x_j(u/x_i)$ is \mathbf{t} -spread, then $x_j(u/x_i) \in U$;
- U is a \mathbf{t} -spread lexicographic set, if for all $u \in U$, $v \in M_{n,\ell,\mathbf{t}}$ such that $v \geq_{\text{lex}} u$, then $v \in U$, where \geq_{lex} is the lexicographic order with $x_1 > x_2 > \cdots > x_n$ [23].

We assume the empty set \emptyset to be a \mathbf{t} -spread stable, strongly stable and lexicographic set. Whereas, for I a \mathbf{t} -spread ideal of S , we say that I is a *\mathbf{t} -spread stable, strongly stable, lexicographic ideal*, if $U_\ell = I \cap M_{n,\ell,\mathbf{t}}$ is a \mathbf{t} -spread stable, strongly stable, lexicographic set, respectively, for all $\ell = 0, \dots, d$.

For $\mathbf{t} = \mathbf{0} = (0, 0, \dots, 0)$ we obtain the classical notions of stable, strongly stable and lexicographic sets and ideals [23]. For $\mathbf{t} = \mathbf{1} = (1, 1, \dots, 1)$, the *squarefree* analogues [10]. Finally, if $\mathbf{t} = (t, t, \dots, t)$ we have the ordinary t -spread stable, strongly stable and lexicographic sets and ideals, as in [18].

The following hierarchy of \mathbf{t} -spread monomial ideals of S holds

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{t}\text{-spread lexicographic ideals} &\implies \mathbf{t}\text{-spread strongly stable ideals} \\ &\implies \mathbf{t}\text{-spread stable ideals.} \end{aligned}$$

The next lemma provides the existence of a *standard decomposition* for all \mathbf{t} -spread monomials belonging to a \mathbf{t} -spread strongly stable ideal.

Lemma 2.6 *Let I be a \mathbf{t} -spread strongly stable ideal of S , and $w \in I$ a \mathbf{t} -spread monomial. Then, there exist unique monomials $u \in G(I)$ and $v \in \text{Mon}(S)$ such that $w = uv$ and $\max(u) \leq \min(v)$.*

Proof. The statement holds when $w \in G(I)$. In such a case, $w = w \cdot 1$, with $w \in G(I)$, $1 \in \text{Mon}(S)$ and $\max(w) \leq n = \min(1)$. Otherwise, there exists a \mathbf{t} -spread monomial $u \in G(I)$ such that u divides w and $\deg(u) < \deg(w)$. We choose u to be of minimal degree. Then $w = uv$, for a suitable monomial $v \in \text{Mon}(S)$. Write $w = x_{j_1} x_{j_2} \cdots x_{j_\ell}$, then $u = x_{j_{k_1}} x_{j_{k_2}} \cdots x_{j_{k_s}}$ for $1 \leq k_1 < k_2 < \cdots < k_s < \ell$. Now, $u_1 = x_{j_1} x_{j_2} \cdots x_{j_s} \in I$, as u_1 is \mathbf{t} -spread and I is \mathbf{t} -spread strongly stable. Moreover, u_1 divides w and it is a minimal generator. Otherwise, if there exists $u_2 \in G(I)$ such that u_2 divides u_1 and $\deg(u_2) < \deg(u_1)$, then $\deg(u_2) < \deg(u)$ and u_2 divides w , an absurd for the choice of u . Hence $w = u_1 v_1$ with $u_1 = x_{j_1} \cdots x_{j_s} \in G(I)$ and $v_1 = x_{j_{s+1}} \cdots x_{j_\ell} \in \text{Mon}(S)$. Clearly, the monomials u_1 and v_1 satisfying the statement are unique. \square

As a consequence we have the following

Corollary 2.7 *Let I be a \mathbf{t} -spread monomial ideal of S . Then, the following conditions are equivalent:*

- (i) *I is a \mathbf{t} -spread strongly stable ideal;*
- (ii) *for all $u \in G(I)$, $i \in \text{supp}(u)$, $j < i$ such that $x_j(u/x_i)$ is a \mathbf{t} -spread monomial, then $x_j(u/x_i) \in I$.*

Proof. (i) \implies (ii) is obvious. For the converse, let $w \in I$ be a \mathbf{t} -spread monomial, $i \in \text{supp}(w)$ and $j < i$ such that $w_1 = x_j(w/x_i)$ is \mathbf{t} -spread, we need to prove that $w_1 \in I$. Write $w = uv$, with u and v as in Lemma 2.6. If $i \notin \text{supp}(u)$, then u divides w_1 , and so $w_1 \in I$. Otherwise, if $i \in \text{supp}(u)$, then $j < i \leq \max(u)$ and so $j \notin \text{supp}(v)$. Thus, $w_1 = x_j(w/x_i) = x_j(u/x_i)v = u_1 v$ with $u_1 = x_j(u/x_i)$, and u_1 is \mathbf{t} -spread, as w_1 is. By (ii), $u_1 \in I$. Hence u_1 divides w_1 and so $w_1 \in I$. \square

3. KOSZUL CYCLES OF VECTOR-SPREAD STRONGLY STABLE IDEALS

The main computational tool in this paper is Theorem 3.8. It allows to calculate a basis of the homology modules of the Koszul complex $K_\bullet(\mathbf{x}; S/I)$, where $\mathbf{x} = x_1, \dots, x_n$ and I is a \mathbf{t} -spread strongly stable ideal of S .

The symbol $[n]$ denotes the set $\{1, 2, \dots, n\}$, where $n \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}$. If $j, k \geq 1$ are integers, we set $[j, k] := \{\ell \in \mathbb{N} : j \leq \ell \leq k\}$, and $[j, k] \neq \emptyset$ if and only if $j \leq k$. If $j = k = 0$, we set $[0, 0] = [0] := \emptyset$. For a monomial $u \in S$, $u \neq 1$, we set $u' = u/x_{\max(u)}$.

The next combinatorial tool will be fundamental for our aim.

Definition 3.1 Let $u = x_{j_1}x_{j_2} \cdots x_{j_\ell} \in \text{Mon}(S; \mathbf{t})$ a \mathbf{t} -spread monomial of S , with $1 \leq j_1 \leq \dots \leq j_\ell \leq n$. The \mathbf{t} -spread support of u is the following subset of $[n]$:

$$\text{supp}_{\mathbf{t}}(u) := \bigcup_{i=1}^{\ell-1} [j_i, j_i + (t_i - 1)].$$

Note that $\text{supp}_{\mathbf{0}}(u) = \emptyset$, and if u is squarefree, $\text{supp}_{\mathbf{1}}(u) = \text{supp}(u/x_{\max(u)}) = \{j_1, j_2, \dots, j_{\ell-1}\}$, where $\mathbf{1} = (1, 1, \dots, 1) \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^{d-1}$.

Let us explain now the *combinatorial meaning* of the vector-spread support. Let $u = x_{j_1}x_{j_2} \cdots x_{j_\ell} \in \text{Mon}(S; \mathbf{t})$, $u \neq 1$. For any $k \in [\max(u) - 1] \setminus \text{supp}_{\mathbf{t}}(u)$, we define $k^{(u)} := \min\{j \in \text{supp}(u) : j > k\}$. We note that $k^{(u)}$ always exists as $k < \max(u)$ and $\max(u) \in \text{supp}(u)$. An easy calculation shows that $w = x_k(u/x_{k^{(u)}})$ is again a \mathbf{t} -spread monomial, and moreover, if I is a \mathbf{t} -spread strongly stable ideal and $u \in I$, then $w \in I$ also, by definition. This property will be crucial in order to construct our Koszul cycles. For instance,

Example 3.2 Let $u = x_1^2x_2x_4x_6x_8 \in \text{Mon}(S; (0, 0, 1, 2, 1))$, $S = K[x_1, \dots, x_8]$. We have $\text{supp}_{(0,0,1,2,1)}(x_1x_1x_2x_4x_6x_8) = \{2, 4, 5, 6\}$, and $[\max(u) - 1] \setminus \text{supp}_{\mathbf{t}}(u) = \{1, 3, 7\}$. For $k = 1$, $k^{(u)} = 2$, for $k = 3$, $k^{(u)} = 4$ and for $k = 7$, $k^{(u)} = \max(u) = 8$. Note that $x_1(u/x_2) = x_1^3x_4x_6x_8$, $x_3(u/x_4) = x_1^2x_2x_3x_6x_8$ and $x_7(u/x_8) = x_1^2x_2x_4x_6x_7$ are all $(0, 0, 1, 2, 1)$ -spread monomials.

Let I be a \mathbf{t} -spread strongly stable ideal of S . We are going to construct suitable cycles of $K_i(\mathbf{x}; S/I) = K_i(\mathbf{x})$.

We shall make the following conventions. For a non empty subset $A \subseteq [n]$, we set $\mathbf{x}_A = \prod_{i \in A} x_i$ and $e_A = \bigwedge_{i \in A} e_i$, whereas for $A = \emptyset$, $\mathbf{x}_\emptyset = 1$ and $e_\tau \wedge e_\emptyset = e_\emptyset \wedge e_\tau = e_\tau$ for any non empty subset $\tau \subseteq [n]$. We take account of repetitions. For example, if $A = \{1, 1, 2, 3\}$, then $\mathbf{x}_A = x_1^2x_2x_3$ and $e_A = e_1 \wedge e_1 \wedge e_2 \wedge e_3 = 0$.

Let $u \in S$ be a \mathbf{t} -spread monomial and $\sigma = \{k_1 < k_2 < \dots < k_{i-1}\} \subseteq [\max(u) - 1]$ with $|\sigma| = i - 1$, $i \geq 1$. For each $\ell = 1, \dots, i - 1$, we define

$$k_\ell^{(u)} = j_\ell := \min\{j \in \text{supp}(u) : j > k_\ell\}.$$

Clearly, $j_1 \leq j_2 \leq \dots \leq j_{i-1} \leq \max(u)$. If $F = \{k_{s_1}, \dots, k_{s_m}\} \subseteq \sigma$, we set

$$F^{(u)} := \{j_{s_1} \leq j_{s_2} \leq \dots \leq j_{s_m}\} = \{\min\{j \in \text{supp}(u) : j > k_{s_\ell}\} : \ell = 1, \dots, m\}.$$

Definition 3.3 Let $u \in S$ be a \mathbf{t} -spread monomial. We set $u' = u/x_{\max(u)}$. Let $\sigma = \{k_1 < k_2 < \dots < k_{i-1}\} \subseteq [\max(u) - 1] \setminus \text{supp}_{\mathbf{t}}(u)$ with $|\sigma| = i - 1$, $i \geq 1$. Let I be any \mathbf{t} -spread strongly stable ideal of S such that $u \in I$ and let $\varepsilon : S \rightarrow S/I$ be the canonical map. We define the following element of $K_i(\mathbf{x}; S/I)$:

$$\begin{aligned} e(u; \sigma) &:= \sum_{F \subseteq \sigma} (-1)^{u(\sigma; F)} \varepsilon(\mathbf{x}_F(u'/\mathbf{x}_{F(u)})) e_{\sigma \setminus F} \wedge e_{F(u)} \wedge e_{\max(u)} \\ &= \varepsilon(u') e_{\sigma} \wedge e_{\max(u)} + \sum_{\emptyset \neq F \subseteq \sigma} (-1)^{u(\sigma; F)} \varepsilon(\mathbf{x}_F(u'/\mathbf{x}_{F(u)})) e_{\sigma \setminus F} \wedge e_{F(u)} \wedge e_{\max(u)}, \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

with $u(\sigma; \emptyset) := 0$ and for $F \neq \emptyset$, $F \subseteq \sigma$, $u(\sigma; F)$ is defined recursively as follows:

- if $\max(\sigma) = k_{i-1} \notin F$, then $u(\sigma; F) := u(\sigma \setminus \{k_{i-1}\}; F) + |F|$;
- if $\max(\sigma) = k_{i-1} \in F$, then

$$\begin{aligned} u(\sigma; F) &:= u(\sigma \setminus \{k_r \in \sigma : j_r = j_{i-1}\}; F \setminus \{k_r \in F : j_r = j_{i-1}\}) \\ &\quad + (|\{k_r \in \sigma : j_r = j_{i-1}\}| - 1)(|F| + 1) + 1. \end{aligned}$$

The definition of the $u(\sigma; F)$'s will become clear in the proof of Proposition 3.4.

The element $e(u; \sigma) \in K_i(\mathbf{x})$ is well defined. Indeed, if for some $k_p < k_q$, $k_p, k_q \in \sigma$ we have $j_p = j_q = j$, then x_j^2 may not divide u , however, in such case the wedge product $e_{\sigma \setminus F} \wedge e_{F(u)} \wedge e_{\max(u)}$ is zero, as $j_p, j_q \in F^{(u)}$ and $e_{j_p} \wedge e_{j_q} = e_j \wedge e_j = 0$. The same reasoning applies if $j_p = \max(u)$, for some p . Moreover, $\varepsilon(u') e_{\sigma} \wedge e_{\max(u)}$ is the biggest summand of $e(u; \sigma)$ with respect to the order on the wedge products we have defined in Section 1.

As noted before, for $u \in I$ a \mathbf{t} -spread monomial and $k_\ell \in [\max(u) - 1] \setminus \text{supp}_{\mathbf{t}}(u)$, then $x_{k_\ell}(u/x_{j_\ell}) \in I$, i.e., $\varepsilon(x_{k_\ell}(u/x_{j_\ell})) = 0$, as I is a \mathbf{t} -spread strongly stable ideal.

Proposition 3.4 Let $I \subseteq S$ be a \mathbf{t} -spread strongly stable ideal. For all $i \geq 1$, the elements

$$e(u; \sigma) \text{ such that } u \in G(I), \quad \sigma \subseteq [\max(u) - 1] \setminus \text{supp}_{\mathbf{t}}(u), \quad |\sigma| = i - 1,$$

are cycles of $K_i(\mathbf{x}; S/I)$.

Remark 3.5 Proving the above proposition in the cases $i = 1, 2, 3$ is straightforward. For the general case, $e(u; \sigma)$ is a sum of 2^{i-1} terms, if $|\sigma| = i - 1$. A direct verification of the equation $\partial_i(e(u; \sigma)) = 0$ is nasty. Therefore, we employ an inductive argument. After verifying two base cases ($i = 1, 2$), we assume that $e(u; \vartheta)$ is a cycle for all proper subsets $\vartheta \subset \sigma$. Depending on some cases, we suitably write $e(u; \sigma)$ in terms of the $e(u; \vartheta)$'s, equations (5) and (6). It is from these equations that we obtained our coefficients $u(\sigma; F)$, $F \subseteq \sigma$, by observing that we must change sign each time we exchange two consecutive basis elements e_k, e_ℓ in a non zero wedge product involving them. Finally, using the rule of multiplication, $\partial(a \wedge b) = \partial(a) \wedge b + (-1)^{\deg a} a \wedge \partial(b)$ for $a, b \in K_\bullet(\mathbf{x}; S/I)$, with a homogeneous, we complete our proof.

We begin by giving the *decomposition* for the $e(u; \sigma)$'s mentioned above.

Lemma 3.6 *Let $u \in S$ be a \mathbf{t} -spread monomial, and let $\sigma = \{k_1 < \cdots < k_{i-1}\} \subseteq [\max(u) - 1] \setminus \text{supp}_{\mathbf{t}}(u)$, $|\sigma| = i - 1$, $i \geq 2$. Then the following hold:*

(a) *If $j_{i-1} = \max(u)$, setting $\tau = \sigma \setminus \{k_{i-1}\}$, then*

$$e(u; \sigma) = -e(u; \tau) \wedge e_{k_{i-1}}. \quad (5)$$

(b) *If $j_{i-1} \neq \max(u)$, setting $\ell = \min\{\ell \in [i - 1] : j_\ell = j_{i-1}\}$, $v = x_{k_{i-1}}u/x_{j_{i-1}}$ and $\rho = \sigma \setminus \{k_\ell, k_{\ell+1}, \dots, k_{i-2}, k_{i-1}\}$, then*

$$e(u; \sigma) = -e(u; \tau) \wedge e_{k_{i-1}} + (-1)^{i-1-\ell} e(v; \rho) \wedge e_{k_\ell} \wedge e_{k_{\ell+1}} \wedge \cdots \wedge e_{k_{i-2}} \wedge e_{j_{i-1}}. \quad (6)$$

Proof. (a) Suppose that $j_{i-1} = \max(u)$. In such a case, for all $F \subseteq \sigma$ with $k_{i-1} \in F$, the corresponding term of $e(u; \sigma)$ is zero, as $e_{j_{i-1}} \wedge e_{\max(u)} = e_{\max(u)} \wedge e_{\max(u)} = 0$. Moreover, for all $F \subseteq \sigma$ such that $k_{i-1} = \max(\sigma) \notin F$, that is $F \subseteq \tau$, we have $u(\sigma; F) = u(\tau; F) + |F|$, hence $(-1)^{u(\sigma; F)}(-1)^{|F|+1} = -(-1)^{u(\tau; F)+2|F|} = -(-1)^{u(\tau; F)}$. So, we obtain the desired formula (5),

$$\begin{aligned} e(u; \sigma) &= \sum_{F \subseteq \tau} (-1)^{u(\sigma; F)} \varepsilon(\mathbf{x}_F(u'/\mathbf{x}_{F(u)})) e_{\sigma \setminus F} \wedge e_{F(u)} \wedge e_{\max(u)} \\ &= \sum_{F \subseteq \tau} (-1)^{u(\sigma; F)} (-1)^{|F|+1} \varepsilon(\mathbf{x}_F(u'/\mathbf{x}_{F(u)})) e_{\tau \setminus F} \wedge e_{F(u)} \wedge e_{\max(u)} \wedge e_{k_{i-1}} \\ &= - \left(\sum_{F \subseteq \tau} (-1)^{u(\tau; F)} \varepsilon(\mathbf{x}_F(u'/\mathbf{x}_{F(u)})) e_{\tau \setminus F} \wedge e_{F(u)} \wedge e_{\max(u)} \right) \wedge e_{k_{i-1}} \\ &= - e(u; \tau) \wedge e_{k_{i-1}}. \end{aligned}$$

(b) Suppose $j_{i-1} \neq \max(u)$. Note that $v = x_{k_{i-1}}(u/x_{j_{i-1}}) \in I$, as $u \in G(I)$, v is \mathbf{t} -spread, $k_{i-1} < j_{i-1}$ and I is \mathbf{t} -spread strongly stable. Moreover $\max(v) = \max(u)$, $\ell \leq i - 1$ and $\rho = \{k_1, k_2, \dots, k_{\ell-1}\} \subseteq \tau \subseteq [\max(v) - 1] \setminus \text{supp}_{\mathbf{t}}(v)$. Hence, we can consider the element

$$e(v; \rho) := \sum_{G \subseteq \rho} (-1)^{v(\rho; G)} \varepsilon(\mathbf{x}_G(v'/\mathbf{x}_{G(v)})) e_{\rho \setminus G} \wedge e_{G(v)} \wedge e_{\max(u)} \quad (7)$$

where $G^{(v)} = \{\min\{s \in \text{supp}(v) : s > g\} : g \in G\}$. For $k_r \in G$, $r < \ell$, so $s_r = \min\{s \in \text{supp}(v) : s > k_r\} = j_r$, as $j_r \in \text{supp}(u) \setminus \{j_{i-1}\}$, and $k_{i-1} > j_r$, lest $k_{i-1} \leq j_r < j_{i-1}$ would imply that $j_r = j_{i-1}$, an absurd. So, for all $G \subseteq \rho$, we have $G^{(u)} = G^{(v)}$. This implies, by the definition of the coefficients, that $v(\rho; G) = u(\rho; G)$ for all $G \subseteq \rho$.

Let $F \subseteq \sigma$ with $F \neq \emptyset$ such that the corresponding term of $e(u; \sigma)$ is non zero.

If $k_{i-1} \notin F$, then $F \subseteq \tau$ and in (a) we have already shown that the corresponding terms of $e(u; \sigma)$ and $-e(u; \tau) \wedge e_{k_{i-1}}$ are equal.

Suppose now that $k_{i-1} \in F$. Set $D = \{k_\ell, \dots, k_{i-2}\}$. We assume that $D \cap F$ is empty, otherwise $e_{F(u)} = 0$, as $j_r = j_{i-1}$ for some $k_r \in D \cap F$. So, we can write $F = G \cup \{k_{i-1}\}$ for a unique $G \subseteq \rho$. Thus, the relevant sum T of terms of $e(u; \sigma)$ indexed by $\{F = G \cup \{k_{i-1}\} : G \subseteq \rho\}$ is, as $\max(u) = \max(v)$ and $x_{k_{i-1}}(u'/x_{j_{i-1}}) = v'$,

$$\begin{aligned} T &= \sum_{\substack{G \cup \{k_{i-1}\} \\ G \subseteq \rho}} (-1)^{u(\sigma; G \cup \{k_{i-1}\})} \varepsilon(\mathbf{x}_G x_{k_{i-1}}(u'/(x_{j_{i-1}} \mathbf{x}_{G(u)}))) e_{\sigma \setminus (G \cup \{k_{i-1}\})} \wedge e_{G(u)} \wedge e_{j_{i-1}} \wedge e_{\max(u)} \\ &= \sum_{G \subseteq \rho} (-1)^{u(\sigma; G \cup \{k_{i-1}\})} \varepsilon(\mathbf{x}_G(v'/\mathbf{x}_{G(v)})) e_{\rho \setminus G} \wedge e_D \wedge e_{G(v)} \wedge e_{j_{i-1}} \wedge e_{\max(v)} \\ &= \sum_{G \subseteq \rho} (-1)^{u(\sigma; G \cup \{k_{i-1}\}) + 1 + |D|(|G|+1)} \varepsilon(\mathbf{x}_G(v'/\mathbf{x}_{G(v)})) e_{\rho \setminus G} \wedge e_{G(v)} \wedge e_{\max(v)} \wedge e_D \wedge e_{j_{i-1}}. \end{aligned}$$

Now, for all $F = G \cup \{k_{i-1}\}$, with $G \subseteq \rho$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} u(\sigma; F) &= u(\sigma \setminus \{k_\ell, \dots, k_{i-1}\}; F \setminus \{k_\ell, \dots, k_{i-1}\}) + (|\{k_\ell, \dots, k_{i-1}\}| - 1)(|F| + 1) + 1 \\ &= u(\sigma \setminus \{k_\ell, \dots, k_{i-1}\}; G) + (|\{k_\ell, \dots, k_{i-1}\}| - 1)(|F| + 1) + 1 \\ &= u(\rho; G) + |D|(|F| + 1) + 1. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, as $|G| + 1 = |F|$ and $|D| = i - 1 - \ell$, we have

$$(-1)^{u(\sigma; F) + 1 + |D|(|G|+1)} = (-1)^{u(\rho; G) + 2 + 2|D||F| + |D|} = (-1)^{i-1-\ell} (-1)^{u(\rho; G)}.$$

So, we have $e(u; \sigma) = -e(u; \tau) \wedge e_{k_{i-1}} + T$, with, as $u(\rho; G) = v(\rho; G)$ for all $G \subseteq \rho$,

$$\begin{aligned} T &= \left(\sum_{G \subseteq \rho} (-1)^{i-1-\ell} (-1)^{u(\rho; G)} \varepsilon(\mathbf{x}_G(v'/\mathbf{x}_{G(v)})) e_{\rho \setminus G} \wedge e_{G(v)} \wedge e_{\max(v)} \right) \wedge e_D \wedge e_{j_{i-1}} \\ &= (-1)^{i-1-\ell} \left(\sum_{G \subseteq \rho} (-1)^{v(\rho; G)} \varepsilon(\mathbf{x}_G(v'/\mathbf{x}_{G(v)})) e_{\rho \setminus G} \wedge e_{G(v)} \wedge e_{\max(v)} \right) \wedge e_D \wedge e_{j_{i-1}} \\ &= (-1)^{i-1-\ell} e(v; \rho) \wedge e_{k_\ell} \wedge e_{k_{\ell+1}} \wedge \dots \wedge e_{k_{i-2}} \wedge e_{j_{i-1}}, \end{aligned}$$

and equation (6) holds. \square

Finally we can prove Proposition 3.4.

Proof of Proposition 3.4. For $i = 1$ we have $|\sigma| = 0$, so $\sigma = \emptyset$, $u(\emptyset; \emptyset) = 0$ by definition, and the element $e(u; \emptyset) = \varepsilon(u') e_{\max(u)} = \varepsilon(u/x_{\max(u)}) e_{\max(u)}$ is clearly a cycle of $K_1(\mathbf{x})$. Let $i \geq 2$. We proceed by induction on $i \geq 2$.

For $i = 2$, $\sigma = \{k_1\}$. Let $j_1 = \min\{j \in \text{supp}(u) : j > k_1\}$. We have $u(\{k_1\}; \emptyset) = 0$ and $u(\{k_1\}, \{k_1\}) = u(\{k_1\} \setminus \{k_1\}; \{k_1\} \setminus \{k_1\}) + (|\{k_1\}| - 1)(|\{k_1\}| + 1) + 1 = u(\emptyset; \emptyset) + 1 = 1$, so

$$e(u; \sigma) = \varepsilon(u') e_{k_1} \wedge e_{\max(u)} - \varepsilon(x_{k_1} u'/x_{j_1}) e_{j_1} \wedge e_{\max(u)}.$$

If $j_1 = \max(u)$, then $e(u; \sigma) = \varepsilon(u') e_{k_1} \wedge e_{\max(u)}$. In such a case,

$$\partial_2(e(u; \sigma)) = \varepsilon(x_{k_1} u') e_{\max(u)} - \varepsilon(x_{\max(u)} u') e_{k_1} = 0,$$

as $x_{k_1}u', x_{\max(u)}u' = u \in I$. Otherwise, if $j_1 < \max(u)$, then

$$\partial_2(e(u; \sigma)) = \varepsilon(x_{k_1}u')e_{\max(u)} - \varepsilon(x_{\max(u)}u')e_{k_1} - \varepsilon(x_{k_1}u')e_{\max(u)} + \varepsilon(x_{k_1}(u/x_{j_1}))e_{j_1} = 0,$$

as the first and third terms cancel each other, and $x_{\max(u)}u' = u, x_{k_1}(u/x_{j_1}) \in I$.

Suppose now $i > 2$. Let $\sigma = \{k_1 < \dots < k_{i-2} < k_{i-1}\}$, and $\tau = \{k_1 < \dots < k_{i-2}\}$. We distinguish two cases.

(a) Suppose $j_{i-1} = \max(u)$. By induction $e(u; \tau)$ is a cycle. By Lemma 3.6 (a),

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_i(e(u; \sigma)) &= \partial_i(-e(u; \tau) \wedge e_{k_{i-1}}) \\ &= -\partial_{i-1}(e(u; \tau)) \wedge e_{k_{i-1}} - (-1)^{\deg(e(u; \tau))} x_{k_{i-1}} e(u; \tau) \\ &= -(-1)^{\deg(e(u; \tau))} x_{k_{i-1}} e(u; \tau) = 0. \end{aligned}$$

Indeed, $x_{k_{i-1}}u/x_{j_{i-1}} = x_{k_{i-1}}u/x_{\max(u)} = x_{k_{i-1}}u' \in I$. Thus, each non zero term of $x_{k_{i-1}}e(u; \tau)$ vanish, as it has coefficient $\varepsilon(\mathbf{x}_F x_{k_{i-1}}u'/\mathbf{x}_{F(u)})$, and $\mathbf{x}_F x_{k_{i-1}}u'/\mathbf{x}_{F(u)} \in I$ as I is a \mathbf{t} -spread strongly stable ideal. In such a case, $e(u; \sigma)$ is a cycle, as desired.

(b) Suppose $j_{i-1} \neq \max(u)$. Set $\ell = \min\{\ell \in [i-1] : j_\ell = j_{i-1}\}$, $v = x_{k_{i-1}}u/x_{j_{i-1}}$, $\rho = \sigma \setminus \{k_\ell, \dots, k_{i-2}, k_{i-1}\}$ and $D = \{k_\ell, \dots, k_{i-2}\}$. By Lemma 3.6 (b),

$$e(u; \sigma) = -e(u; \tau) \wedge e_{k_{i-1}} + (-1)^{i-1-\ell} e(v; \rho) \wedge e_D \wedge e_{j_{i-1}}. \quad (8)$$

Let J be the smallest \mathbf{t} -spread strongly stable ideal of S that contains v . J is generated only in one degree $\deg(v) = \deg(u)$, and $J \subseteq I$. By inductive hypothesis, as $|\rho| < |\sigma|$, $e(v; \rho)$ is a cycle of $K_i(\mathbf{x}; S/J)$. So, it is also a cycle of $K_i(\mathbf{x}; S/I) = K_i(\mathbf{x})$.

By inductive hypothesis $\partial_{i-1}(e(u; \tau)) = \partial_\ell(e(v; \rho)) = 0$. Since $\deg(e(u; \tau)) = |\tau|$ and $\deg(e(v; \rho)) = |\rho|$, by equation (8) we have

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_i(e(u; \sigma)) &= -\partial_{i-1}(e(u; \tau)) \wedge e_{k_{i-1}} - (-1)^{\deg(e(u; \tau))} x_{k_{i-1}} e(u; \tau) \\ &\quad + (-1)^{i-1-\ell} [\partial_\ell(e(v; \rho)) \wedge e_D \wedge e_{j_{i-1}} + (-1)^{\deg(e(v; \rho))} e(v; \rho) \wedge \partial_{i-\ell}(e_D \wedge e_{j_{i-1}})] \\ &= -(-1)^{|\tau|} (x_{k_{i-1}} e(u; \tau) - (-1)^{|\rho| - |\tau|} (-1)^{i-1-\ell} e(v; \rho) \wedge \partial_{i-\ell}(e_D \wedge e_{j_{i-1}})). \end{aligned}$$

We have $i-1-\ell+|\rho|-|\tau| = i-1-\ell+\ell-1-(i-2) = 0$. So $(-1)^{|\rho|-|\tau|}(-1)^{i-1-\ell} = 1$.

Set

$$f := x_{k_{i-1}}e(u; \tau) - e(v; \rho) \wedge \partial_{i-\ell}(e_{k_\ell} \wedge e_{k_{\ell+1}} \wedge \dots \wedge e_{k_{i-2}} \wedge e_{j_{i-1}}).$$

To show that $\partial_i(e(u; \sigma)) = 0$, it suffices to prove that f is zero. Let $F \subseteq \tau$. The set $D \cap F = \{k_\ell, \dots, k_{i-2}\} \cap F$ can have at most one element, otherwise $e_{F(u)} = 0$, as shown before. Therefore, $F = G$ or $F = G \cup \{k_r\}$ for a unique $G \subseteq \rho$ and $r \in \{\ell, \dots, i-2\}$. By construction we have $G^{(u)} = G^{(v)}$ and $u(\rho; G) = v(\rho; G)$ for all $G \subseteq \rho$, as already observed in Lemma 3.6.

Suppose $F = G$, then the corresponding term of f is $a - b$, where

$$a = (-1)^{u(\tau; G)} \varepsilon(x_{k_{i-1}} \mathbf{x}_G(u'/\mathbf{x}_{G(u)})) e_{\tau \setminus G} \wedge e_{G(u)} \wedge e_{\max(u)},$$

and, as $i - 1 - \ell = |D|$,

$$\begin{aligned} b &= (-1)^{i-1-\ell} (-1)^{v(\rho;G)} \varepsilon(x_{j_{i-1}} \mathbf{x}_G x_{k_{i-1}} u' / (x_{j_{i-1}} \mathbf{x}_{G(v)})) e_{\rho \setminus G} \wedge e_{G(v)} \wedge e_{\max(v)} \wedge e_D \\ &= (-1)^{u(\rho;G)+|D|} (-1)^{|D|(|G|+1)} \varepsilon(x_{k_{i-1}} \mathbf{x}_G (u' / \mathbf{x}_{G(u)})) e_{\rho \setminus G} \wedge e_D \wedge e_{G(u)} \wedge e_{\max(u)} \\ &= (-1)^{u(\rho;G)+|D|(|G|+2)} \varepsilon(x_{k_{i-1}} \mathbf{x}_G (u' / \mathbf{x}_{G(u)})) e_{\tau \setminus G} \wedge e_{G(u)} \wedge e_{\max(u)}. \end{aligned}$$

We have, as $i - 1 - \ell = |D|$,

$$\begin{aligned} u(\tau; G) &= u(\tau \setminus \{k_{i-2}\}; G) + |G| \\ &= u(\tau \setminus \{k_{i-3}, k_{i-2}\}; G) + 2|G| \\ &\vdots \\ &= u(\tau \setminus \{k_\ell, \dots, k_{i-2}\}; G) + (i - 1 - \ell)|G| \\ &= u(\rho; G) + |D| \cdot |G|. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, $(-1)^{u(\rho;G)+|D|(|G|+2)} = (-1)^{u(\tau;G)}$ and $a - b = 0$, in this case.

Otherwise, if $F = G \cup \{k_r\}$, the corresponding term of f is $a - b$, where

$$\begin{aligned} a &= (-1)^{u(\tau;G \cup \{k_r\})} \varepsilon(x_{k_{i-1}} x_{k_r} \mathbf{x}_G u' / (x_{j_{i-1}} \mathbf{x}_{G(u)})) e_{\tau \setminus (G \cup \{k_r\})} \wedge e_{G(u)} \wedge e_{j_{i-1}} \wedge e_{\max(u)} \\ &= (-1)^{u(\tau;G \cup \{k_r\})} \varepsilon(x_{k_{i-1}} x_{k_r} \mathbf{x}_G u' / (x_{j_{i-1}} \mathbf{x}_{G(u)})) e_{\tau \setminus F} \wedge e_{G(u)} \wedge e_{j_{i-1}} \wedge e_{\max(u)}, \end{aligned}$$

and, setting $c = v(\rho; G) + r - \ell$,

$$\begin{aligned} b &= (-1)^{r-\ell} (-1)^{v(\rho;G)} \varepsilon(x_{k_r} \mathbf{x}_G v' / \mathbf{x}_{G(v)}) e_{\rho \setminus G} \wedge e_{G(v)} \wedge e_{\max(v)} \wedge e_{D \setminus \{k_r\}} \wedge e_{j_{i-1}} \\ &= (-1)^{c+(|D|-1)(|G|+1)+1} \varepsilon(x_{k_{i-1}} x_{k_r} \mathbf{x}_G u' / (\mathbf{x}_{G(u)} x_{j_{i-1}})) e_{\rho \setminus G} \wedge e_{D \setminus \{k_r\}} \wedge e_{F(u)} \wedge e_{\max(u)} \\ &= (-1)^{c+(|D|-1)(|G|+1)+1} \varepsilon(x_{k_{i-1}} x_{k_r} \mathbf{x}_G u' / (\mathbf{x}_{G(u)} x_{j_{i-1}})) e_{\tau \setminus F} \wedge e_{G(u)} \wedge e_{j_{i-1}} \wedge e_{\max(u)}. \end{aligned}$$

Now,

$$\begin{aligned} u(\tau; G \cup \{k_r\}) &= u(\tau \setminus \{k_{i-2}\}; G \cup \{k_r\}) + (|G| + 1) \\ &= u(\tau \setminus \{k_{i-3}, k_{i-2}\}; G \cup \{k_r\}) + 2(|G| + 1) \\ &\vdots \\ &= u(\tau \setminus \{k_{r+1}, \dots, k_{i-2}\}; G \cup \{k_r\}) + (i - r)(|G| + 1) \\ &= u(\tau \setminus \{k_\ell, \dots, k_{i-2}\}; G) + (|\{k_\ell, \dots, k_r\}| - 1)(|G| + 2) + 1 + (i - r)(|G| + 1) \\ &= u(\rho; G) + (r - \ell + i - r)(|G| + 1) + (r - \ell) + 1 \\ &= v(\rho; G) + (i - \ell)(|G| + 1) + (r - \ell) + 1. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, since $(-1)^{(i-\ell)(|G|+1)} = (-1)^{(|D|+1)(|G|+1)} = (-1)^{(|D|-1)(|G|+1)}$, we have

$$(-1)^{u(\tau;G \cup \{k_r\})} = (-1)^{v(\rho;G)+(i-\ell)(|G|+1)+(r-\ell)+1} = (-1)^{c+(|D|-1)(|G|+1)+1}$$

and $a - b = 0$. Therefore, $f = 0$ and $e(u; \sigma)$ is a cycle, as desired. \square

Remark 3.7 Let $\sigma = \{k_1 < k_2 < \dots < k_{i-1}\} \subseteq [\max(u) - 1] \setminus \text{supp}_{\mathbf{t}}(u)$, $i > 2$. Set

$$r(u; \sigma) := \sum_{\substack{F \subseteq \sigma \\ k_1 \in F}} (-1)^{u(\sigma; F)} \varepsilon(\mathbf{x}_F(u' / \mathbf{x}_{F(u)})) e_{\sigma \setminus F} \wedge e_{F(u)} \wedge e_{\max(u)}.$$

We show that $e(u; \sigma) = e_{k_1} \wedge e(u; \sigma \setminus \{k_1\}) + r(u; \sigma)$. For this aim, it is enough to prove that, for all $F \subseteq \sigma$ such that $k_1 \notin F$, we have $(-1)^{u(\sigma; F)} = (-1)^{u(\sigma \setminus \{k_1\}; F)}$. For $\sigma = \{k_1\}$ this is clear. Let $|\sigma| = i - 1 \geq 2$. We distinguish two cases.

CASE 1. Suppose $\max(\sigma) \notin F$, then $u(\sigma; F) = u(\sigma \setminus \{k_{i-1}\}; F) + |F|$. Moreover $\max(\sigma \setminus \{k_1\}) = \max(\sigma)$ as $|\sigma| \geq 2$. Therefore $u(\sigma \setminus \{k_1\}; F) = u(\sigma \setminus \{k_1, k_{i-1}\}; F) + |F|$. By induction on $|\sigma|$, $(-1)^{u(\sigma \setminus \{k_1, k_{i-1}\}; F)} = (-1)^{u(\sigma \setminus \{k_{i-1}\}; F)}$, and the desired conclusion follows in such a case.

CASE 2. Suppose $\max(\sigma) \in F$. Set $D = \{k_r \in F : j_r = j_{i-1}\}$ and $d = |\{k_r \in \sigma : j_r = j_{i-1}\}|$. Observe that, as $k_1 \notin F$, $d = |\{k_r \in \sigma \setminus \{k_1\} : j_r = j_{i-1}\}|$. Therefore, by the definition of the coefficients, we have

$$\begin{aligned} u(\sigma; F) &= u(\sigma \setminus D; F \setminus \{k_{i-1}\}) + (d - 1)(|F| + 1) + 1, \\ u(\sigma \setminus \{k_1\}; F) &= u(\sigma \setminus (\{k_1\} \cup D); F \setminus \{k_{i-1}\}) + (d - 1)(|F| + 1) + 1. \end{aligned}$$

As $k_{i-1} \in D$ so $D \neq \emptyset$, we have $|\sigma \setminus D| < |\sigma|$. So by inductive hypothesis, $(-1)^{u(\sigma \setminus D; F \setminus \{k_{i-1}\})} = (-1)^{u(\sigma \setminus (\{k_1\} \cup D); F \setminus \{k_{i-1}\})}$, and the desired conclusion follows.

Note that e_{k_1} doesn't appear in $r(u; \sigma)$. Hence, we have the useful decomposition $e(u; \sigma) = e_{k_1} \wedge e(u; \sigma \setminus \{k_1\}) + r(u; \sigma)$. Moreover, equations (5) and (6) give us recurrence relations for our Koszul cycles.

We are in position to state and prove the main result of this Section.

Theorem 3.8 *Let $I \subset S$ be a \mathbf{t} -spread strongly stable ideal. Then, for all $i \geq 1$, the K -vector space $H_i(\mathbf{x}; S/I)$ has as a basis the homology classes of the Koszul cycles*

$$e(u; \sigma) \quad \text{such that} \quad u \in G(I), \quad \sigma \subseteq [\max(u) - 1] \setminus \text{supp}_{\mathbf{t}}(u), \quad |\sigma| = i - 1. \quad (9)$$

Proof. Let us prove the following more general statement,

CLAIM 1. *For all $i \geq 1$ and all $j = 1, \dots, n$, a minimal generating set for $H_i(\mathbf{x}_j)$, as a $S/(\mathbf{x}_j)$ -module, is given by the homology classes of the Koszul cycles*

$$e(u; \sigma) \quad \text{such that} \quad u \in G(I), \quad \sigma \subseteq ([\max(u) - 1] \setminus \text{supp}_{\mathbf{t}}(u)) \cap [j, n], \quad |\sigma| = i - 1.$$

We proceed by induction on $n - j \geq 0$. For the base case, let $n - j = 0$. We only have to consider $H_1(\mathbf{x}_n)$. Indeed, for $i \geq 2$, $H_i(\mathbf{x}_n) = 0$, since $K_{\bullet}(x_n; S/I)$ has length one. $H_1(\mathbf{x}_n)$ is generated by the elements $[e(u; \emptyset)] = [\varepsilon(u/x_{\max(u)})e_{\max(u)}]$ with $u \in G(I)$ and $\max(u) = n$. Moreover $(\mathbf{x}_n) = (x_n)$ clearly annihilates these elements, so they form a minimal generating set of $H_1(\mathbf{x}_n)$ as a $S/(\mathbf{x}_n)$ -module.

For the inductive step, suppose $n - j > 0$ and that the thesis holds for $j + 1$. First, we consider the case $i = 1$. By the sequence (3), we have the exact sequence

$$H_1(\mathbf{x}_{j+1}) \xrightarrow{\alpha_1} H_1(\mathbf{x}_j) \xrightarrow{\beta_1} H_0(\mathbf{x}_{j+1}) \xrightarrow{\delta_0} H_0(\mathbf{x}_{j+1}). \quad (10)$$

By the third isomorphism theorem for commutative rings,

$$H_0(\mathbf{x}_{j+1}) \cong \frac{S/I}{(\mathbf{x}_{j+1}, I)/I} \cong \frac{S}{(x_{j+1}, x_{j+2}, \dots, x_n, I)} \cong S_{\leq j}/I_{\leq j},$$

where $S_{\leq j} = K[x_1, \dots, x_j]$ and $I_{\leq j} = I \cap S_{\leq j}$. We observe that $I_{\leq j}$ is a monomial ideal of $S_{\leq j}$ with minimal generating set $G(I_{\leq j}) = \{u \in G(I) : \max(u) \leq j\}$.

Let $\text{Ker}(\delta_0) = \text{Im}(\beta_1)$ be the kernel of the rightmost non zero map of sequence (10), we obtain the short exact sequence of $S/(\mathbf{x}_{j+1})$ -modules,

$$0 \rightarrow \text{Im}(\alpha_1) \xrightarrow{\alpha_1} H_1(\mathbf{x}_j) \xrightarrow{\beta_1} \text{Ker}(\delta_0) \rightarrow 0. \quad (11)$$

By inductive hypothesis, $H_1(\mathbf{x}_{j+1})$ is generated by the homology classes of the elements

$$e(u; \emptyset) = \varepsilon(u/x_{\max(u)})e_{\max(u)},$$

such that $\max(u) \geq j + 1$ and $u \in G(I)$. These elements also generate $\text{Im}(\alpha_1)$, as α_1 sends these homology classes to the corresponding homology classes in $H_1(\mathbf{x}_j)$. Whilst, $\text{Ker}(\delta_0)$ has as a basis the elements $\varepsilon(u/x_{\max(u)})$ with $\max(u) = j$ and $u \in G(I)$. Each of these elements is pulled back in $H_1(\mathbf{x}_j)$ to the homology class of the element $e(u; \emptyset)$, with $\max(u) = j$ and $u \in G(I)$. Moreover (\mathbf{x}_j) annihilates $H_1(\mathbf{x}_j)$. Indeed, consider $x_\ell[e(u; \emptyset)]$, $\ell \in [j, n]$. If $\ell = \max(u)$, then $x_\ell[e(u; \emptyset)] = [0]$. If $\ell \neq \max(u)$, then $\partial_2(e_\ell \wedge e(u; \emptyset)) = x_\ell e(u; \emptyset)$, so $x_\ell[e(u; \emptyset)] = [0]$. Therefore, we see that a generating set for $H_1(\mathbf{x}_j)$ as a $S/(\mathbf{x}_j)$ -module is as given in CLAIM 1.

Now, let $i > 1$. By (3), we have the short exact sequence of $S/(\mathbf{x}_{j+1})$ -modules,

$$0 \rightarrow \text{Im}(\alpha_i) \xrightarrow{\alpha_i} H_i(\mathbf{x}_j) \xrightarrow{\beta_i} \text{Ker}(\delta_{i-1}) \rightarrow 0. \quad (12)$$

By inductive hypothesis, a minimal generating set of the $S/(\mathbf{x}_{j+1})$ -module $H_{i-1}(\mathbf{x}_{j+1})$ is given by the homology classes of the Koszul cycles

$$e(u; \sigma) \text{ such that } u \in G(I), \quad \sigma \subseteq ([\max(u) - 1] \setminus \text{supp}_{\mathbf{t}}(u)) \cap [j + 1, n], \quad |\sigma| = i - 2.$$

The map δ_{i-1} is multiplication by $\pm x_j$. We show that the minimal generating set of $\text{Ker}(\delta_{i-1})$ is given by those elements $[e(u; \sigma)]$ of $H_{i-1}(\mathbf{x}_{j+1})$ such that $j \notin \text{supp}_{\mathbf{t}}(u)$.

Let $u \in G(I)$ and let $[e(u; \sigma)]$ be an element of $H_{i-1}(\mathbf{x}_{j+1})$ as in CLAIM 1.

CASE 1. Suppose that $j \in \text{supp}_{\mathbf{t}}(u)$, then $x_j(u/x_{\max(u)}) \notin I$. So, $\pm x_j e(u; \sigma) \neq 0$, as $\pm x_j \varepsilon(u')e_\sigma \wedge e_{\max(u)} \neq 0$. If for absurd $[e(u; \sigma)] \in \text{Ker}(\delta_{i-1})$, then $\delta_{i-1}([e(u; \sigma)]) =$

$\pm x_j[e(u; \sigma)] = [0]$. Since $\pm x_j e(u; \sigma) \neq 0$, there exists $a \in K_i(\mathbf{x}_{j+1})$, $a = \sum \varepsilon(u_\gamma) e_\gamma$, for some $\gamma \subseteq [j+1, n]$, $|\gamma| = i$, $u_\gamma \in S$, such that $\partial_i(a) = \pm x_j e(u; \sigma)$. Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} x_j e(u; \sigma) &= \varepsilon(x_j u / x_{\max(u)}) e_\sigma \wedge e_{\max(u)} + (\text{smaller terms}) = \partial_i(a) \\ &= \partial_i\left(\sum \varepsilon(u_\gamma) e_\gamma\right) = \sum_{\gamma : \gamma \setminus \{\ell\} = \sigma \cup \{\max(u)\}} \varepsilon(x_\ell u_\gamma) e_\sigma \wedge e_{\max(u)} + R, \end{aligned}$$

where R is a sum of other terms not involving $e_\sigma \wedge e_{\max(u)}$. We have $x_j(u/x_{\max(u)}) \notin I$, i.e., $\varepsilon(x_j(u/x_{\max(u)})) \neq 0$. Hence, for some e_{γ_0} occurring in a and some $\ell_0 \in \gamma_0$ such that $\gamma_0 \setminus \{\ell_0\} = \sigma \cup \{\max(u)\}$, we must have $x_j(u/x_{\max(u)}) = x_{\ell_0} u_{\gamma_0}$. We have $\ell_0 \neq \max(u)$, and since $x_j(u/x_{\max(u)}) = x_{\ell_0} u_{\gamma_0}$ and $j < j+1 \leq \max(u)$, we also have $\ell_0 < \max(u)$. Now, $\max(u) \in \gamma_0$ and the term $\pm \varepsilon(x_{\max(u)} u_{\gamma_0}) e_{\gamma_0 \setminus \{\max(u)\}}$ appears in R . The inequality $\ell_0 < \max(u)$ implies that $\gamma_0 \setminus \{\max(u)\} > \gamma_0 \setminus \{\ell_0\} = \sigma \cup \{\max(u)\}$, and since each wedge product appearing in $x_j e(u; \sigma)$ is smaller than $e_\sigma \wedge e_{\max(u)}$, we must have either $\varepsilon(x_{\max(u)} u_{\gamma_0}) = 0$ or there exist $\gamma_1 \subseteq [j+1, n]$ and an integer $\ell_1 \in \gamma_1$ such that the term $\pm \varepsilon(x_{\ell_1} u_{\gamma_1}) e_{\gamma_1 \setminus \{\ell_1\}}$ appears in R and cancels with $\pm \varepsilon(x_{\max(u)} u_{\gamma_0}) e_{\gamma_0 \setminus \{\max(u)\}}$.

SUBCASE 1.1. We have $x_{\max(u)} u_{\gamma_0} \in I$. Hence,

$$x_{\max(u)} u_{\gamma_0} = x_{\max(u)} x_j(u/x_{\max(u)}) / x_{\ell_0} = x_j(u/x_{\ell_0}) \in I.$$

Therefore, $x_j(u/x_{\ell_0}) \in I$, absurd. Indeed, write $u = x_{j_1} x_{j_2} \cdots x_{j_d}$, then $j \in \text{supp}_{\mathbf{t}}(u)$ implies that $j = j_p + r$, with $0 \leq r \leq t_p - 1$, $t_p \geq 1$. Moreover, $\ell_0 > j$, so $\ell_0 = j_q$, $q > p$. If $x_j(u/x_{\ell_0}) = x_{j_1} \cdots x_{j_p} x_{j_p+r} x_{j_{p+1}} \cdots x_{j_{q-1}} x_{j_{q+1}} \cdots x_{j_d} \in I$, then for some $v \in G(I)$, v divides $x_j(u/x_{\ell_0})$. As v is \mathbf{t} -spread but $x_j(u/x_{\ell_0})$ is not, we have $v \neq x_j(u/x_{\ell_0})$, hence $\deg(v) < \deg(x_j(u/x_{\ell_0})) = \deg(u)$. So, v must divide $x_j(u/x_{\ell_0})/x_j = u/x_{\ell_0}$, and $u/x_{\ell_0} \in I$, absurd as $u \in G(I)$.

SUBCASE 1.2. We have $\gamma_1 \setminus \{\ell_1\} = \gamma_0 \setminus \{\max(u)\} = \sigma \cup \{\ell_0\}$ and $x_{\max(u)} u_{\gamma_0} = x_{\ell_1} u_{\gamma_1}$. Therefore, $\gamma_1 = \sigma \cup \{\ell_0, \ell_1\}$. The term $\pm \varepsilon(x_{\ell_0} u_{\gamma_1}) e_{\sigma \cup \{\ell_1\}}$ appears in R and it is bigger than $\varepsilon(u') e_\sigma \wedge e_{\max(u)}$. So, we have two cases to consider. As before, in the first case, $\varepsilon(x_{\ell_0} u_{\gamma_1}) = 0$, and recalling that $x_j(u/x_{\max(u)}) = x_{\ell_0} u_{\gamma_0}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} x_{\ell_0} u_{\gamma_1} &= x_{\ell_0} (x_{\max(u)} u_{\gamma_0}) / x_{\ell_1} = x_{\max(u)} (x_{\ell_0} u_{\gamma_0}) / x_{\ell_1} = x_{\max(u)} x_j(u/x_{\max(u)}) / x_{\ell_1} \\ &= x_j(u/x_{\ell_1}) \in I, \end{aligned}$$

with $\ell_1 > j$. Arguing as in SUBCASE 1.1 we obtain an absurd. Otherwise there exist $\gamma_2 \subseteq [j+1, n]$ and an integer $\ell_2 \in \gamma_2$ such that the term $\pm \varepsilon(x_{\ell_2} u_{\gamma_2}) e_{\gamma_2 \setminus \{\ell_2\}}$ appears in R and cancels with $\pm \varepsilon(x_{\ell_0} u_{\gamma_1}) e_{\sigma \cup \{\ell_1\}}$. We have $\gamma_2 = \sigma \cup \{\ell_1, \ell_2\}$ and consider the term arising from $\gamma_2 \setminus \{\ell_1\}$. We can distinguish two cases as before. After a finite number of steps s , we have $x_j(u/x_{\ell_s}) \in I$ for some $\ell_s > j$, obtaining an absurd. Hence, $\pm x_j e(u; \sigma) \notin \text{Im}(\partial_i)$, and $\pm x_j[e(u; \sigma)] \notin \text{Ker}(\delta_{i-1})$.

CASE 2. Suppose now $j \notin \text{supp}_{\mathbf{t}}(u)$. By Remark 3.7,

$$e(u; \sigma \cup \{j\}) = e_j \wedge e(u; \sigma) + r(u; \sigma).$$

Recalling the map $\beta_i : K_i(\mathbf{x}_j) \rightarrow K_{i-1}(\mathbf{x}_{j+1})$, we have that $\beta_i(e(u; \sigma \cup \{j\})) = e(u; \sigma)$. By Proposition 3.4, $e(u; \sigma \cup \{j\})$ is a cycle. We prove that $[e(u; \sigma \cup \{j\})] \neq [0]$ in $H_i(\mathbf{x}_j)$. Suppose on the contrary that there exists $a \in K_{i+1}(\mathbf{x}_j)$ such that $\partial_{i+1}(a) = e(u; \sigma \cup \{j\})$. Now, $a = \sum \varepsilon(u_\gamma) e_\gamma$, for some $\gamma \subseteq [j, n]$, $|\gamma| = i + 1$ and $u_\gamma \in S$. So,

$$\begin{aligned} e(u; \sigma \cup \{j\}) &= \varepsilon(u/x_{\max(u)}) e_{\sigma \cup \{j\}} \wedge e_{\max(u)} + (\text{smaller terms}) = \partial_i(a) \\ &= \partial_i\left(\sum \varepsilon(u_\gamma) e_\gamma\right) = \sum_{\gamma : \gamma \setminus \{\ell\} = \sigma \cup \{j, \max(u)\}} \varepsilon(x_\ell u_\gamma) e_{\sigma \cup \{j\}} \wedge e_{\max(u)} + R, \end{aligned}$$

where R is a sum of other terms not involving $e_{\sigma \cup \{j\}} \wedge e_{\max(u)}$. For some e_{γ_0} occurring in a and some $\ell_0 \in \gamma_0$ such that $\gamma_0 \setminus \{\ell_0\} = \sigma \cup \{j, \max(u)\}$, we must have $u/x_{\max(u)} = x_{\ell_0} u_{\gamma_0}$. We have $\ell_0 \neq \max(u)$ and $j < j+1 \leq \max(u)$, so $\ell_0 < \max(u)$. Therefore, $\gamma_0 = \sigma \cup \{j, \ell_0, \max(u)\}$ and $\pm \varepsilon(x_{\max(u)} u_{\gamma_0}) e_{\gamma_0 \setminus \{\max(u)\}} = \pm \varepsilon(x_{\max(u)} u_{\gamma_0}) e_{\sigma \cup \{j, \ell_0\}}$ appears in R . Now $\ell_0 < \max(u)$ implies $\gamma_0 \setminus \{\max(u)\} > \gamma_0 \setminus \{\ell_0\} = \sigma \cup \{j, \max(u)\}$, and since each wedge product appearing in $e(u; \sigma \cup \{j\})$ is smaller than $e_{\sigma \cup \{j\}} \wedge e_{\max(u)}$, we must have either $\varepsilon(x_{\max(u)} u_{\gamma_0}) = 0$ or there exist $\gamma_1 \subseteq [j, n]$ and $\ell_1 \in \gamma_1$ such that the term $\pm \varepsilon(x_{\ell_1} u_{\gamma_1}) e_{\gamma_1 \setminus \{\ell_1\}}$ appears in R and cancels with $\pm \varepsilon(x_{\max(u)} u_{\gamma_0}) e_{\gamma_0 \setminus \{\max(u)\}}$.

SUBCASE 2.1. We have $x_{\max(u)} u_{\gamma_0} \in I$. So, $x_{\max(u)} u_{\gamma_0} = x_{\max(u)} (u/x_{\max(u)})/x_{\ell_0} = u/x_{\ell_0} \in I$, but this is absurd, as u is a minimal monomial generator of I .

SUBCASE 2.2. We have $\gamma_1 \setminus \{\ell_1\} = \gamma_0 \setminus \{\max(u)\} = \sigma \cup \{j, \ell_0\}$ and $x_{\max(u)} u_{\gamma_0} = x_{\ell_1} u_{\gamma_1}$. Therefore, $\gamma_1 = \sigma \cup \{j, \ell_0, \ell_1\}$. The term $\pm \varepsilon(x_{\ell_0} u_{\gamma_1}) e_{\sigma \cup \{j, \ell_1\}}$ appears in R and it is bigger than $\varepsilon(u') e_{\sigma \cup \{j\}} \wedge e_{\max(u)}$. So, we have two cases to consider. As before, in the first case, $\varepsilon(x_{\ell_0} u_{\gamma_1}) = 0$, and recalling that $u/x_{\max(u)} = x_{\ell_0} u_{\gamma_0}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} x_{\ell_0} u_{\gamma_1} &= x_{\ell_0} (x_{\max(u)} u_{\gamma_0})/x_{\ell_1} = x_{\max(u)} (x_{\ell_0} u_{\gamma_0})/x_{\ell_1} = x_{\max(u)} (u/x_{\max(u)})/x_{\ell_1} \\ &= u/x_{\ell_1} \in I, \end{aligned}$$

an absurd, as $u \in G(I)$. Otherwise, we iterate the reasoning. After a finite number of steps s , we have $u/x_{\ell_s} \in I$, for some ℓ_s , an absurd. Hence $e(u; \sigma \cup \{j\}) \notin \text{Im}(\partial_{i+1})$, and $[e(u; \sigma \cup \{j\})] \neq [0]$ in $H_i(\mathbf{x}_j)$. Therefore, $\beta_i([e(u; \sigma \cup \{j\})]) = [e(u; \sigma)]$, and $[e(u; \sigma)] \in \text{Im}(\beta_i) = \text{Ker}(\delta_{i-1})$, as desired.

Finally, a basis for $\beta_i^{-1}(\text{Ker}(\delta_{i-1}))$ is given by all the elements as in CLAIM 1 such that $j \in \sigma$. By inductive hypothesis, we know a basis for $H_i(\mathbf{x}_{j+1})$, and as α_i sends these homology classes to the corresponding homology classes of $H_i(\mathbf{x}_j)$, a minimal generating set for $\text{Im}(\alpha_i)$ is given by all the elements as in CLAIM 1 such that $j \notin \sigma$.

We observe that (\mathbf{x}_j) annihilates these elements. Indeed, the elements $[e(u; \sigma)]$ as in CLAIM 1 minimally generate $H_i(\mathbf{x}_j)$ as a $S/(\mathbf{x}_{j+1})$ -module. So (\mathbf{x}_{j+1}) annihilates all $[e(u; \sigma)]$. It remains to prove that x_j annihilates all elements $[e(u; \sigma)]$. If $j \notin \sigma$, then by definition of $e(u; \sigma)$, e_j doesn't appear in the first term $\varepsilon(u/x_{\max(u)}) e_\sigma \wedge e_{\max(u)}$ of $e(u; \sigma)$. We have

$$\partial_{i+1}(e_j \wedge e(u; \sigma)) = x_j e(u; \sigma) + e_j \wedge (-1)^{\deg(e_j)} \partial_i(e(u; \sigma)) = x_j e(u; \sigma),$$

so $x_j[e(u; \sigma)] = [0]$. Suppose now $j \in \sigma$. Then $\beta_i(x_j[e(u; \sigma)]) = x_j[e(u; \sigma \setminus \{j\})] = [0]$, as $[e(u; \sigma \setminus \{j\})] \in \text{Ker}(\delta_{i-1})$. Hence, $x_j[e(u; \sigma)] \in \text{Ker}(\beta_i) = \text{Im}(\alpha_i)$. By Remark 3.7,

$$x_j[e(u; \sigma)] = x_j[e_j \wedge e(u; \sigma \setminus \{j\}) + r(u; \sigma)] = x_j[r(u; \sigma)] \in \text{Im}(\alpha_i) \subseteq H_i(\mathbf{x}_{j+1}),$$

the first summand vanishes, as $e_j \notin H_i(\mathbf{x}_{j+1})$. If we set $a = r(u; \sigma)$, $x_j[a]$ is a cycle, and we have $\partial_{i+1}(e_j \wedge a) = -x_j a$, so $x_j[r(u; \sigma)] = [0]$ and $x_j[e(u; \sigma)] = [0]$, as desired. Hence, a minimal generating set for the $S/(\mathbf{x}_j)$ -module $H_i(\mathbf{x}_j)$ is as in CLAIM 1.

Finally for $j = 1$, $S/(\mathbf{x}_1) = S/(x_1, \dots, x_n) \cong K$, and CLAIM 1 implies the result, as a minimal generating set of a K -vector space is a basis. \square

We provide an example that demonstrate our methods.

Example 3.9 Let $\mathbf{t} = (1, 0, 2)$, and let $I = (x_1, x_2 x_3^2, x_2 x_3 x_4 x_6, x_2 x_4^2 x_6)$. We set $w_1 = x_1, w_2 = x_2 x_3^2, w_3 = x_2 x_3 x_4 x_6, w_4 = x_2 x_4^2 x_6$. The ideal $I \subseteq S = K[x_1, \dots, x_6]$ is a \mathbf{t} -spread strongly stable ideal with minimal generating set $G(I) = \{w_1, w_2, w_3, w_4\}$. Let $\mathbf{x} = x_1, x_2, \dots, x_6$. The basis for the Koszul homologies of S/I are:

$$H_1(\mathbf{x}; S/I): e(w; \emptyset) = \varepsilon(w/x_{\max(w)}) e_{\max(w)}, \quad \text{for } w \in G(I);$$

$$H_2(\mathbf{x}; S/I): w_1 \text{ gives no rise to any basis element,}$$

$$w_2 \text{ gives } e(w_2; \{1\}) = \varepsilon(x_2 x_3) e_1 \wedge e_3,$$

$$w_3 \text{ gives } e(w_3; \{1\}) = \varepsilon(x_2 x_3 x_4) e_1 \wedge e_6,$$

$$e(w_3; \{3\}) = \varepsilon(x_2 x_3 x_4) e_3 \wedge e_6,$$

$$w_4 \text{ gives } e(w_4; \{1\}) = \varepsilon(x_2 x_4^2) e_1 \wedge e_6,$$

$$e(w_4; \{3\}) = \varepsilon(x_2 x_4^2) e_3 \wedge e_6 - \varepsilon(x_2 x_3 x_4) e_4 \wedge e_6;$$

$$H_3(\mathbf{x}; S/I): w_1, w_2 \text{ give no rise to any basis element,}$$

$$w_3 \text{ gives } e(w_3; \{1, 3\}) = \varepsilon(x_2 x_3 x_4) e_1 \wedge e_3 \wedge e_6,$$

$$w_4 \text{ gives } e(w_4; \{1, 3\}) = \varepsilon(x_2 x_4^2) e_1 \wedge e_3 \wedge e_6 - \varepsilon(x_2 x_3 x_4) e_1 \wedge e_4 \wedge e_6;$$

$$H_j(\mathbf{x}; S/I): \emptyset, \quad \text{for all } j \geq 4.$$

For instance, consider $e(w_4; \{1, 3\}) \in K_3(\mathbf{x}; S/I)$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_3(e(w_4; \{1, 3\})) &= \partial_3(\varepsilon(x_2 x_4^2) e_1 \wedge e_3 \wedge e_6 - \varepsilon(x_2 x_3 x_4) e_1 \wedge e_4 \wedge e_6) \\ &= \varepsilon(x_1 x_2 x_4^2) e_3 \wedge e_6 - \varepsilon(x_2 x_3 x_4^2) e_1 \wedge e_6 + \varepsilon(x_2 x_4^2 x_6) e_1 \wedge e_3 \\ &\quad - \varepsilon(x_1 x_2 x_3 x_4) e_4 \wedge e_6 + \varepsilon(x_2 x_3 x_4^2) e_1 \wedge e_6 - \varepsilon(x_2 x_3 x_4 x_6) e_1 \wedge e_4 \\ &= 0. \end{aligned}$$

In fact, the first, third, fourth and sixth terms vanish, as $\varepsilon(x_1 x_2 x_4^2) = \varepsilon(x_2 x_4^2 x_6) = \varepsilon(x_1 x_2 x_3 x_4) = \varepsilon(x_2 x_3 x_4 x_6) = 0$, and the second and fifth terms are opposite.

We illustrate how to obtain some of these elements.

Consider $w_3 = x_2 x_3 x_4 x_6$. Then $\text{supp}_{\mathbf{t}}(w_3) = \text{supp}_{(1,0,2)}(x_2 x_3 x_4 x_6) = \{2, 4, 5\}$ and $[\max(w_3) - 1] \setminus \text{supp}_{\mathbf{t}}(w_3) = \{1, 3\}$. Let $\vartheta = \{1, 3\}$, then $\vartheta^{(w_3)} = \{2, 4\}$. Moreover

$\max(w_3) = 6 \notin \mathfrak{I}^{(w_3)}$. So, we can use equation (6) to compute the relevant Koszul cycles $e(w_3; \sigma)$. Of course, we may also use equation (4).

The monomial w_3 gives rise to the following Koszul cycles:

$$\begin{aligned}
\sigma = \emptyset; \quad e(w_3; \emptyset) &= \varepsilon(w_3/x_6)e_6 = \varepsilon(x_2x_3x_4)e_6, \\
\sigma = \{1\}; \quad e(w_3; \{1\}) &= -e(w_3; \emptyset) \wedge e_1 + e(x_1(w_3/x_2); \emptyset) \wedge e_2 \\
&= -\varepsilon(x_2x_3x_4)e_6 \wedge e_1 + \varepsilon(x_1x_3x_4)e_6 \wedge e_2 \\
&= \varepsilon(x_2x_3x_4)e_1 \wedge e_6, \\
\sigma = \{3\}; \quad e(w_3; \{3\}) &= -e(w_3; \emptyset) \wedge e_3 + e(x_3(w_3/x_4); \emptyset) \wedge e_4 \\
&= -\varepsilon(x_2x_3x_4)e_6 \wedge e_3 + \varepsilon(x_2x_3^2)e_6 \wedge e_4 \\
&= \varepsilon(x_2x_3x_4)e_3 \wedge e_6, \\
\sigma = \{1, 3\}; \quad e(w_3; \{1, 3\}) &= -e(w_3; \{1\}) \wedge e_3 + e(x_3(w_3/x_4); \{1\}) \wedge e_4 \\
&= -\varepsilon(x_2x_3x_4)e_1 \wedge e_6 \wedge e_3 + e(x_2x_3^2x_6; \{1\}) \wedge e_4 \\
&= \varepsilon(x_2x_3x_4)e_1 \wedge e_3 \wedge e_6 + \varepsilon(x_2x_3^2)e_1 \wedge e_6 \wedge e_4 \\
&= \varepsilon(x_2x_3x_4)e_1 \wedge e_3 \wedge e_6.
\end{aligned}$$

Our computations yield the Betti table of S/I ,

	0	1	2	3
total:	1	4	5	2
0:	1	1	-	-
1:	-	-	-	-
2:	-	1	1	-
3:	-	2	4	2

Remark 3.10 The expression of our Koszul cycles is not so nice. Indeed, a basis element $e(u; \sigma)$ of $H_i(\mathbf{x}; S/I)$, I a \mathbf{t} -spread strongly stable ideal, is a sum of 2^{i-1} wedge products! However, if $\mathbf{t} = (1, \dots, 1, 0, \dots, 0) \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^{d-1}$, $d \geq 2$, the element

$$z(u; \sigma) := \varepsilon(u/x_{\max(u)})e_\sigma \wedge e_{\max(u)}.$$

with $u \in G(I)$ and $\sigma \subseteq [\max(u) - 1] \setminus \text{supp}_{\mathbf{t}}(u)$ is easily seen to be a cycle. Indeed,

$$\begin{aligned}
\partial_i(z(u; \sigma)) &= \sum_{j=1}^{i-1} (-1)^{j+1} \varepsilon(x_{k_j}(u/x_{\max(u)}))e_{\sigma \setminus \{k_j\}} \wedge e_{\max(u)} + (-1)^{i+1} \varepsilon(u)e_\sigma \\
&= 0,
\end{aligned}$$

as $x_{k_j}(u/x_{\max(u)}) \in I$ for all j and $u \in I$, since $\mathbf{t} = (1, \dots, 1, 0, \dots, 0)$. It's easy to see that the homology classes $[z(u; \sigma)]$ are non zero and K -independent. Hence, they form a basis for $H_i(\mathbf{x})$, as the map $z : z(u; \sigma) \mapsto e(u; \sigma)$ is a bijection and the elements $e(u; \sigma)$ form a basis of $H_i(\mathbf{x})$ by Theorem 3.8. These Koszul cycles have been considered in the papers [9, 10]. But in general they are cycles only when the vector \mathbf{t} has the form $\mathbf{t} = (1, \dots, 1, 0, \dots, 0)$.

Example 3.11 Let $I = (x_1x_2, x_1x_3, x_1x_2^2, x_1x_2x_3, x_1x_2x_4, x_1x_3^2, x_1x_3x_4, x_1x_4^2)$ be a $(1, 0)$ -spread strongly stable ideal of $K[x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4]$. By Remark 3.10, since $\mathbf{t} = (1, 0)$ and $G(I) = \{x_1x_2, x_1x_3, x_1x_4^2\}$, the relevant basis for the Koszul homologies of S/I are:

$$\begin{aligned} H_1(\mathbf{x}; S/I): & \quad \varepsilon(x_1x_2/x_2) e_2, \quad \varepsilon(x_1x_3/x_3) e_3, \quad \varepsilon(x_1x_4^2/x_4) e_4; \\ H_2(\mathbf{x}; S/I): & \quad \varepsilon(x_1x_3/x_3) e_2 \wedge e_3, \quad \varepsilon(x_1x_4^2/x_4) e_2 \wedge e_4, \quad \varepsilon(x_1x_4^2/x_4) e_3 \wedge e_4; \\ H_3(\mathbf{x}; S/I): & \quad \varepsilon(x_1x_4^2/x_4) e_2 \wedge e_3 \wedge e_4; \\ H_j(\mathbf{x}; S/I): & \quad \emptyset, \text{ for all } j \geq 4. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, using *Macaulay2* [22] the Betti table of I is

$$\begin{array}{cccc} & & 0 & 1 & 2 \\ \text{total:} & 3 & 3 & 1 & \\ 2: & 2 & 1 & - & \\ 3: & 1 & 2 & 1 & \end{array}$$

4. THE MINIMAL FREE RESOLUTION OF VECTOR-SPREAD STRONGLY STABLE IDEALS

In this Section we construct the minimal free resolution of \mathbf{t} -spread strongly stable ideals of S . This resolution will generalize that of Eliahou and Kervaire [17], and also the squarefree lexsegment analogue in [10]. We will follow the construction given by Aramova and Herzog in [9].

Let $I \subset S = K[x_1, \dots, x_n]$ be a \mathbf{t} -spread strongly stable ideal. Note that, since $\text{Tor}_i^S(K, S/I) \cong H_i(\mathbf{x}; S/I) = H_i(\mathbf{x})$, for all i , the minimal free resolution of S/I may be written as follows,

$$\mathbb{F} : \dots \xrightarrow{d_3} S \otimes_K H_2(\mathbf{x}) \xrightarrow{d_2} S \otimes_K H_1(\mathbf{x}) \xrightarrow{d_1} S \otimes_K H_0(\mathbf{x}) \xrightarrow{d_0} S/I \rightarrow 0.$$

We set $F_i = S \otimes_K H_i(\mathbf{x})$, for all i , and note that $F_0 = S$. By Theorem 3.8 and also [9], for all $i \geq 1$ a basis of the graded free S -module F_i is given by the elements,

$$f(u; \sigma) := 1 \otimes (-1)^{(i-1)(i-2)/2} [e(u; \sigma)],$$

such that $u \in G(I)$, $\sigma \subseteq [\max(u) - 1] \setminus \text{supp}_{\mathbf{t}}(u)$ and $|\sigma| = i - 1$. For later use, we shall make the following convention. If $\sigma \not\subseteq [\max(u) - 1] \setminus \text{supp}_{\mathbf{t}}(u)$ we set $f(u; \sigma) = 0$.

Thus, it remains to describe the differentials d_i , for all $i \geq 0$. For this purpose, suppose the differentials d_0, d_1, \dots, d_{i-1} have already been constructed such that

$$\mathbb{F}_{< i} : F_{i-1} \xrightarrow{d_{i-1}} F_{i-2} \xrightarrow{d_{i-2}} \dots \xrightarrow{d_1} F_0 \xrightarrow{d_0} S/I \rightarrow 0$$

is exact. Fix a basis element $f(u; \sigma)$ of F_i . Let $\mathbb{K} = K_\bullet(\mathbf{x}; S/I)$ be the Koszul complex attached to \mathbf{x} with respect to S/I whose i th module and differential are, respectively, K_i and $\partial_i : K_i \rightarrow K_{i-1}$. We consider the double complex $\mathbb{K} \otimes_S \mathbb{F}_{<i}$,

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc}
& \vdots & & \vdots & & \vdots & \\
& \downarrow \text{id} \otimes d_2 & & \downarrow \text{id} \otimes d_2 & & \downarrow \text{id} \otimes d_2 & \\
0 \longrightarrow & K_n \otimes F_1 & \xrightarrow{\partial_n \otimes \text{id}} & K_{n-1} \otimes F_1 & \xrightarrow{\partial_{n-1} \otimes \text{id}} \cdots \xrightarrow{\partial_1 \otimes \text{id}} & K_0 \otimes F_1 & \longrightarrow 0 \\
& \downarrow \text{id} \otimes d_1 & & \downarrow \text{id} \otimes d_1 & & \downarrow \text{id} \otimes d_1 & \\
0 \longrightarrow & K_n \otimes F_0 & \xrightarrow{\partial_n \otimes \text{id}} & K_{n-1} \otimes F_0 & \xrightarrow{\partial_{n-1} \otimes \text{id}} \cdots \xrightarrow{\partial_1 \otimes \text{id}} & K_0 \otimes F_0 & \longrightarrow 0 \\
& \downarrow \text{id} \otimes d_0 & & \downarrow \text{id} \otimes d_0 & & \downarrow \text{id} \otimes d_0 & \\
0 \longrightarrow & K_n \otimes S/I & \xrightarrow{\partial_n \otimes \text{id}} & K_{n-1} \otimes S/I & \xrightarrow{\partial_{n-1} \otimes \text{id}} \cdots \xrightarrow{\partial_1 \otimes \text{id}} & K_0 \otimes S/I & \longrightarrow 0 \\
& \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & \\
& 0 & & 0 & & 0 &
\end{array}$$

where “id” denotes each time a suitable identity function.

It is known by [9, Section 1] that to describe how the differential d_i acts on $f(u; \sigma)$ it suffices to determine elements $g_j \in K_{i-j} \otimes F_j$, $j = 0, \dots, i-1$, satisfying

$$(\text{id}_{K_i} \otimes d_0)(g_0) = (-1)^{(i-1)(i-2)/2} 1 \otimes e(u; \sigma), \quad \text{and} \quad (13)$$

$$(\text{id}_{K_{i-j-1}} \otimes d_{j+1})(g_{j+1}) = (\partial_{i-j} \otimes \text{id}_{F_j})(g_j) \quad \text{for } j = 0, \dots, i-2. \quad (14)$$

To construct such a sequence is a difficult combinatorial task. Thus we restrict ourself to the case when $\mathbf{t} = (1, \dots, 1, 0, \dots, 0)$, (Remark 3.10). In this case we can replace the cycles $e(u; \sigma)$ by the cycles $z(u; \sigma)$. In order to construct the sequence of elements satisfying equations (13) and (14) we need the following notion. We recall that the *pure lexicographic order* is defined as follows: $x_1^{a_1} x_2^{a_2} \cdots x_n^{a_n} >_{\text{plex}} x_1^{b_1} x_2^{b_2} \cdots x_n^{b_n}$ if and only if $a_1 = b_1, a_2 = b_2, \dots, a_{s-1} = b_{s-1}$ and $a_s > b_s$ for some $s \in \{1, \dots, n\}$.

Definition 4.1 Let $I \subset S$ be a \mathbf{t} -spread strongly stable ideal, $\mathbf{t} = (1, \dots, 1, 0, \dots, 0)$. Let $M(I)$ be the set of all monomials belonging to I . We define the map $g : M(I) \rightarrow G(I)$, as follows: for $w \in M(I)$, we set $g(w) := \max_{>_{\text{plex}}} \{u \in G(I) : u \text{ divides } w\}$. The map g is called the *\mathbf{t} -spread decomposition function* of I .

For $u \in G(I)$, $k \in [\max(u) - 1] \setminus \text{supp}_{\mathbf{t}}(u)$, we set

$$u_k := g(x_k u) \quad \text{and} \quad v_k := (x_k u)/u_k.$$

We shall need also the following notations. For a subset σ of $[n]$ and for $k \in \sigma$ we define $\alpha(\sigma; k) := |\{s \in \sigma : s < k\}|$. For τ a subset of σ we let $\gamma(\tau) := \sum_{k \in \sigma \setminus \tau} \alpha(\sigma; k)$. In what follows, we denote $\sigma \setminus \{k\}$ by $\sigma \setminus k$, and $\sigma \cup \{k\}$ by $\sigma \cup k$, omitting the parentheses.

To further simplify the notations, we set $\text{id}_{K_{i-j-1}} \otimes d_{j+1} = d_{j+1}$ and $\partial_{i-j} \otimes \text{id}_{F_j} = \partial_{i-j}$, for all $j = 0, \dots, i-2$.

The next theorem gives the desired differentials of the resolution \mathbb{F} of S/I and generalize [9, Theorem 2.3]. To write the elements g_j more conveniently we switch the order in the tensor products, that is we think g_j as an element of $F_j \otimes K_{i-j}$.

Theorem 4.2 *Let $g_0 = (-1)^{\frac{(i-1)(i-2)}{2}} 1 \otimes (u'e_\sigma \wedge e_{\max(u)})$, and for $j = 1, \dots, i-1$ let*

$$g_j = (-1)^{i-j} \sum_{\substack{\tau \subset \sigma \\ |\tau|=j-1}} (-1)^{\gamma(\tau)} f(u; \tau) \otimes e_{\sigma \setminus \tau} + \sum_{\substack{\tau \subset \sigma \\ |\tau|=j}} (-1)^{\gamma(\tau)} s_\tau \otimes e_{\sigma \setminus \tau} \wedge e_{\max(u)},$$

where

$$s_\tau = \sum_{k \in \tau} (-1)^{\alpha(\tau; k)} \frac{v_k}{x_{\max(u)}} f(u_k; \tau \setminus k).$$

Then the elements g_0, g_1, \dots, g_{i-1} satisfy equations (13) and (14). Moreover, the i th differential of the minimal free resolution of S/I acting on $f(u; \sigma)$ is given by

$$\begin{aligned} d_i(f(u; \sigma)) &= \partial_1(g_{i-1}) \\ &= \sum_{k \in \sigma} (-1)^{\alpha(\sigma; k)} (-x_k f(u; \sigma \setminus k) + v_k f(u_k; \sigma \setminus k)). \end{aligned} \quad (15)$$

Proof. Note that in the definition of s_τ , $x_{\max(u)}$ always divide v_k . Indeed, if we let $k^{(u)} = \min\{j \in \text{supp}(u) : j > k\}$, then $w = x_k(u/x_{k^{(u)}}) \in I$ is again a \mathbf{t} -spread monomial. By Lemma 2.6, $w = w_1 w_2$ with $w_1 \in G(I)$ and $\max(w_1) \leq \min(w_2)$. Consequently $\{y \in G(I) : y \text{ divides } x_k u\}$ is non empty and u_k exists. Proceeding as in the proof of Lemma 2.6 we see that $\max(u_k) \leq \min(v_k)$. Finally, $v_k \neq 1$ otherwise $u_k = x_k u \in G(I)$, which is absurd. Hence $x_{\max(u)}$ divides v_k as wanted.

We proceed by induction on i . The case $i = 1$ is trivial. By induction, we can assume that the last formula for the differential d_ℓ holds for $\ell < i$. We need to verify the equations $\partial_{i-j}(g_j) = d_{j+1}(g_{j+1})$. For $j = 0$ this is trivial. Let $j > 0$.

Firstly, we calculate $\partial_{i-j}(g_j)$. Since $|\sigma \setminus \tau| = i - j - 1$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_{i-j}(g_j) &= (-1)^{i-j} \sum_{\substack{\tau \subset \sigma \\ |\tau|=j-1}} (-1)^{\gamma(\tau)} f(u; \tau) \otimes \left(\sum_{k \in \sigma \setminus \tau} (-1)^{\alpha(\sigma \setminus \tau; k)} x_k e_{\sigma \setminus (\tau \cup k)} \right) \\ &+ \sum_{\substack{\tau \subset \sigma \\ |\tau|=j}} (-1)^{\gamma(\tau)} s_\tau \otimes \left(\sum_{k \in \sigma \setminus \tau} (-1)^{\alpha(\sigma \setminus \tau; k)} x_k e_{\sigma \setminus (\tau \cup k)} \wedge e_{\max(u)} + (-1)^{i-j-1} x_{\max(u)} e_{\sigma \setminus \tau} \right). \end{aligned}$$

We suitably rewrite both sums.

For the first sum, note that for $\tau \subseteq \sigma$, $|\tau| = j-1$ and $k \in \sigma \setminus \tau$, then setting $\rho = \tau \cup k$ we have that $|\rho| = j$, $\gamma(\tau) = \gamma(\rho \setminus k) = \sum_{s \in \sigma \setminus (\rho \cup k)} \alpha(\sigma; s) = \gamma(\rho) + \alpha(\sigma; k)$, $\alpha(\sigma; k) = \alpha(\sigma \setminus \tau; k) + \alpha(\tau; k)$ and also $\alpha(\tau; k) = \alpha(\rho; k)$ for it is $k \notin \tau$. Hence,

$$(-1)^{\gamma(\tau)} (-1)^{\alpha(\sigma \setminus \tau; k)} = (-1)^{\gamma(\rho) + \alpha(\sigma \setminus \tau; k) + \alpha(\tau; k)} (-1)^{\alpha(\sigma \setminus \tau; k)} = (-1)^{\gamma(\rho)} (-1)^{\alpha(\rho; k)}.$$

As $\tau \subseteq \sigma$, $|\tau| = j - 1$ and $k \in \sigma \setminus \tau$ are arbitrary, $\rho = \tau \cup k \subseteq \sigma$ with $|\rho| = j$ is arbitrary too, thus the first sum of $\partial_{i-j}(g_j)$ can be rewritten as follows,

$$A = (-1)^{i-j-1} \sum_{\substack{\rho \subseteq \sigma \\ |\rho|=j}} (-1)^{\gamma(\rho)} \left(\sum_{k \in \rho} (-1)^{\alpha(\rho;k)+1} x_k f(u; \rho \setminus k) \right) \otimes e_{\sigma \setminus \rho}. \quad (16)$$

Analogously, the second sum can be written as $B + C$, where

$$B = \sum_{\substack{\vartheta \subseteq \sigma \\ |\vartheta|=j+1}} (-1)^{\gamma(\vartheta)} \left(\sum_{k \in \vartheta} (-1)^{\alpha(\vartheta;k)} x_k s_{\vartheta \setminus k} \right) \otimes e_{\sigma \setminus \vartheta} \wedge e_{\max(u)}, \quad (17)$$

$$C = (-1)^{i-j-1} \sum_{\substack{\rho \subseteq \sigma \\ |\rho|=j}} (-1)^{\gamma(\rho)} s_\rho \otimes x_{\max(u)} e_{\sigma \setminus \rho}. \quad (18)$$

Taking into account equations (16), (18), the inductive hypothesis and the definition of s_ρ we have that

$$\begin{aligned} A + C &= (-1)^{i-(j+1)} \sum_{\substack{\rho \subseteq \sigma \\ |\rho|=j}} (-1)^{\gamma(\rho)} \left(\sum_{k \in \rho} (-1)^{\alpha(\rho;k)+1} x_k f(u; \rho \setminus k) + x_{\max(u)} s_\rho \right) \otimes e_{\sigma \setminus \rho} \\ &= (-1)^{i-(j+1)} \sum_{\substack{\rho \subseteq \sigma \\ |\rho|=j}} (-1)^{\gamma(\rho)} d_{j+1}(f(u; \rho)) \otimes e_{\sigma \setminus \rho}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, by the structure of g_{j+1} , to complete our proof we need to prove that

$$B = \sum_{\substack{\vartheta \subseteq \sigma \\ |\vartheta|=j+1}} (-1)^{\gamma(\vartheta)} d_{j+1}(s_\vartheta) \otimes e_{\sigma \setminus \vartheta} \wedge e_{\max(u)}.$$

That is, we have to prove

$$\begin{aligned} d_{j+1}(s_\vartheta) &= \sum_{k \in \vartheta} (-1)^{\alpha(\vartheta;k)} x_k s_{\vartheta \setminus k} \\ &= \sum_{k \in \vartheta} \sum_{r \in \vartheta \setminus k} (-1)^{\alpha(\vartheta;k)+\alpha(\vartheta \setminus k;r)} x_k \frac{v_r}{x_{\max(u)}} f(u_r; \vartheta \setminus \{k, r\}), \end{aligned} \quad (19)$$

for all $\vartheta \subseteq \sigma$, $|\vartheta| = j + 1$.

Since $j < i - 1$, then $j + 1 < i$, and by inductive hypothesis,

$$\begin{aligned} d_{j+1}(s_\vartheta) &= \sum_{r \in \vartheta} (-1)^{\alpha(\vartheta;r)} \frac{v_r}{x_{\max(u)}} \left(\sum_{k \in \vartheta \setminus r} (-1)^{\alpha(\vartheta \setminus r;k)} \times \right. \\ &\quad \left. (-x_k f(u_r; \vartheta \setminus \{k, r\}) + \frac{x_k u_r}{g(x_k u_r)} f(g(x_k u_r); \vartheta \setminus \{k, r\})) \right). \end{aligned}$$

For $u \in G(I)$ and $\tau \subseteq [n]$, we define

$$\Gamma(u; \tau) := \{r \in \tau : \tau \setminus r \subseteq [\max(u_r) - 1] \setminus \text{supp}_{\mathbf{t}}(u_r)\},$$

where $u_r = g(x_r u)$. Note that for $r \in \tau \setminus \Gamma(u; \tau)$, $f(u_r; \tau \setminus r) = 0$.

Now, for the first sum of terms of $d_{j+1}(s_{\vartheta})$, note that $\alpha(\vartheta; r) = \alpha(\vartheta \setminus k; r) + \alpha(k; r)$, $\alpha(\vartheta; k) = \alpha(\vartheta \setminus r; k) + \alpha(r; k)$ and $\alpha(k; r) - \alpha(r; k) = 1$ if $k < r$ or -1 if $k > r$. Thus,

$$(-1)^{\alpha(\vartheta; r) + \alpha(\vartheta \setminus r; k) + 1} = (-1)^{\alpha(\vartheta \setminus k; r) + \alpha(k; r) + \alpha(\vartheta; k) - \alpha(r; k) + 1} = (-1)^{\alpha(\vartheta; k) + \alpha(\vartheta \setminus k; r)}.$$

Taking into account this calculation and exchanging the indices k with r in the second sum of terms of $d_{j+1}(s_{\vartheta})$, we can write $d_{j+1}(s_{\vartheta})$ as $B_1 + B_2$, where

$$\begin{aligned} B_1 &= \sum_{r \in \Gamma(u; \vartheta)} \sum_{k \in \vartheta \setminus r} (-1)^{\alpha(\vartheta; k) + \alpha(\vartheta \setminus k; r)} x_k \frac{v_r}{x_{\max(u)}} f(u_r; \vartheta \setminus \{k, r\}), \\ B_2 &= \sum_{\substack{k \in \Gamma(u; \vartheta) \\ r \in \Gamma(u_k; \vartheta \setminus k)}} (-1)^{\alpha(\vartheta; k) + \alpha(\vartheta \setminus k; r)} \frac{x_r u_k v_k}{g(x_r u_k) x_{\max(u)}} f(g(x_r u_k); \vartheta \setminus \{k, r\}). \end{aligned}$$

In all terms of the right-hand side in equation (19), for $k, r \in \vartheta$, $k \neq r$, we have either $r \in \Gamma(u; \vartheta)$ or $r \notin \Gamma(u; \vartheta)$ and $r \in \Gamma(u; \vartheta \setminus k)$. Let B_3 be the sum of terms such that $r \in \Gamma(u; \vartheta)$, and let B_4 be the sum of terms such that $r \notin \Gamma(u; \vartheta)$ and $r \in \Gamma(u; \vartheta \setminus k)$. To finish the proof, it is enough to show that $B_1 = B_3$ and $B_2 = B_4$.

It is clear that $B_1 = B_3$.

Let us see that $B_2 = B_4$. The hypotheses $r \notin \Gamma(u; \vartheta)$ and $r \in \Gamma(u; \vartheta \setminus k)$ imply that $k \notin [\max(u_r) - 1] \setminus \text{supp}_{\mathbf{t}}(u_r)$, where $u_r v_r = x_r u$ and $\max(u_r) \leq \min(v_r)$. But $k \in \vartheta \subseteq \sigma \subseteq [\max(u) - 1] \setminus \text{supp}_{\mathbf{t}}(u)$. Thus, either $k \in [\max(u_r), \max(u) - 1]$ or $k \in \text{supp}_{\mathbf{t}}(u_r) \setminus \text{supp}_{\mathbf{t}}(u)$. We show in both cases that $g(x_r u_k) = u_r$.

If $k \in [\max(u_r), \max(u) - 1]$, then $k \geq \max(u_r) \geq r$, so $k > r$ since $k \neq r$. This implies that $r < k \leq \max(u_k)$ too. Hence, u_r divides $x_r u_k$. Finally, $g(x_r u_k) = u_r$.

If $k \in \text{supp}_{\mathbf{t}}(u_r) \setminus \text{supp}_{\mathbf{t}}(u)$, then $k > r$, and so $r < \max(u_k)$. Since $k \in \text{supp}_{\mathbf{t}}(u_r)$ we have that $k < \max(u_r)$. Let us see that $\max(u_r) \leq \max(u_k)$. Suppose on the contrary that $\max(u_r) > \max(u_k)$. If $u = x_{j_1} x_{j_2} \cdots x_{j_d}$, then $u_k = x_k \cdot x_{j_1} \cdots x_{j_p}$ and $u_r = x_r \cdot x_{j_1} \cdots x_{j_q}$ are both \mathbf{t} -spread monomials of I with $p < q < d$. Then $x_r(u_k/x_k)$ is a \mathbf{t} -spread monomial of I that divides $x_r u$ and $x_r(u_k/x_k) >_{\text{plex}} u_r$, an absurd. Hence $\max(u_r) \leq \max(u_k)$, so u_r divides $x_r u_k$ and again $g(x_r u_k) = u_r$.

Thus, $g(x_r u_k) = u_r$ and

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{x_r u_k v_k}{g(x_r u_k) x_{\max(u)}} f(g(x_r u_k); \vartheta \setminus \{k, r\}) && (\text{as } u_k v_k = x_k u), \\ = & \frac{x_r x_k u}{u_r x_{\max(u)}} f(u_r; \vartheta \setminus \{k, r\}) && (\text{as } x_r u = u_r v_r), \\ = & x_k \frac{v_r}{x_{\max(u)}} f(u_r; \vartheta \setminus \{k, r\}). \end{aligned}$$

This shows that $B_2 = B_4$ and completes our proof. \square

We consider the ideal in Example 3.11 and construct the differentials of its minimal free resolution. Note that in this case $\mathbf{t} = (1, 0)$.

Example 4.3 Let $I \subset S = K[x_1, \dots, x_6]$ be the $(1, 0)$ -spread strongly stable ideal of Example 3.11 with minimal generating set

$$G(I) = \{w_1 = x_1x_2, w_2 = x_1x_3, w_3 = x_1x_4^2\}.$$

By Example 3.11, $\text{pd}(S/I) = 3$. Let

$$\mathbb{F} : 0 \rightarrow F_3 \xrightarrow{d_3} F_2 \xrightarrow{d_2} F_1 \xrightarrow{d_1} F_0 = S \xrightarrow{d_0} S/I \rightarrow 0$$

the minimal free resolution of S/I . We know that $d_0 = \varepsilon : S \rightarrow S/I$ is the canonical map. We shall describe the differentials d_1, d_2, d_3 by appropriate monomial matrices.

For $i = 1, 2, 3$, the basis of the free S -modules $F_i = S \otimes_K H_i(\mathbf{x})$ consists of

$$f(w_j; \sigma) = (-1)^{(i-1)(i-2)/2} 1 \otimes [z(w_j; \sigma)],$$

for $j = 1, \dots, 4$, $\sigma \subseteq [\max(w_j) - 1] \setminus \text{supp}_{\mathbf{t}}(w_j)$ and $|\sigma| = i - 1$.

We introduce a natural order on the basis elements of F_i , as follows,

$$f(w_i; \sigma) \succ f(w_j; \vartheta) \iff i < j \text{ or } i = j \text{ and } e_\sigma > e_\vartheta,$$

where $e_\sigma > e_\vartheta$ with respect to the order on the wedge products defined in Section 1.

For instance,

$$f(w_2; \{2\}) \succ f(w_3; \{2\}) \succ f(w_3; \{3\}). \quad (20)$$

Then, d_i , $i = 1, 2, 3$, may be represented by a matrix whose j th column is given by the components of $d_i(f_j)$ with respect to the ordered basis of F_{i-1} , where f_j is the j th basis element of F_i with respect to the order introduced.

By equation (15) we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{F} : 0 \rightarrow F_3 &\xrightarrow{\begin{pmatrix} -x_4^2 \\ x_3 \\ -x_2 \end{pmatrix}} F_2 \xrightarrow{\begin{pmatrix} x_3^2 & x_4^2 & 0 \\ -x_2 & 0 & x_4^2 \\ 0 & -x_2 & -x_3 \end{pmatrix}} \\ &F_1 \xrightarrow{\begin{pmatrix} x_1x_2 & x_1x_3 & x_2x_4^2 \end{pmatrix}} F_0 \xrightarrow{d_0} S/I \rightarrow 0. \end{aligned}$$

For instance, taking into account the order given in (20), we have

$$\begin{aligned} d_3(f(w_3; \{2, 3\})) &= \begin{pmatrix} -x_4^2 \\ x_3 \\ -x_2 \end{pmatrix} (1) = -x_4^2 f(w_2; \{2\}) + x_3 f(w_3; \{2\}) - x_2 f(w_3; \{3\}), \\ d_2 d_3(f(w_3; \{2, 3\})) &= -x_4^2 (-x_2 f(w_2; \emptyset) + x_3 f(w_1; \emptyset)) \\ &\quad + x_3 (-x_2 f(w_3; \emptyset) + x_4^2 f(w_1; \emptyset)) \\ &\quad - x_2 (-x_3 f(w_3; \emptyset) + x_4^2 f(w_2; \emptyset)) = 0. \end{aligned}$$

5. GENERALIZED ALGEBRAIC SHIFTING THEORY

In this final Section, we extend algebraic shifting theory to vector-spread strongly stable ideals. From now on, K is a field of characteristic zero. We recall that by the symbol $\text{Gin}(I)$ we mean the *generic initial ideal* of a monomial ideal $I \subset S$, with respect to the reverse lexicographic order, with $x_1 > x_2 > \cdots > x_n$ [23]. It is known that $\text{Gin}(I)$ is a ($\mathbf{0}$ -spread) strongly stable ideal.

Firstly, we need some notions.

Let $\mathbf{t}, \mathbf{s} \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^{d-1}$, $\mathbf{t} = (t_1, \dots, t_{d-1})$, $\mathbf{s} = (s_1, \dots, s_{d-1})$, with $d \geq 2$. We can transform any \mathbf{t} -spread monomial ideal into a \mathbf{s} -spread monomial ideal as follows: Let $\mathbf{0} \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^{d-1}$ be the null vector with $d-1$ components. To denote the composition of functions

$$\text{Mon}(T; \mathbf{t}) \xrightarrow{\sigma_{\mathbf{t}, \mathbf{0}}} \text{Mon}(T; \mathbf{0}) \xrightarrow{\sigma_{\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{s}}} \text{Mon}(T; \mathbf{s})$$

we use the symbol $\sigma_{\mathbf{t}, \mathbf{s}}$, where $T = K[x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n, \dots]$. Note that $\sigma_{\mathbf{t}, \mathbf{s}}(1) = 1$, $\sigma_{\mathbf{t}, \mathbf{s}}(x_i) = x_i$, and for all monomials $u = x_{j_1} x_{j_2} \cdots x_{j_\ell} \in \text{Mon}(T; \mathbf{t})$, $2 \leq \ell \leq d$,

$$\sigma_{\mathbf{t}, \mathbf{s}}(x_{j_1} x_{j_2} \cdots x_{j_\ell}) = \prod_{k=1}^{\ell} x_{j_k - \sum_{r=1}^{k-1} t_r + \sum_{r=1}^{k-1} s_r}.$$

Finally, for I a \mathbf{t} -spread monomial ideal, we let $I^{\sigma_{\mathbf{t}, \mathbf{s}}}$ the monomial ideal whose minimal generating set is $G(I^{\sigma_{\mathbf{t}, \mathbf{s}}}) := \{\sigma_{\mathbf{t}, \mathbf{s}}(u) : u \in G(I)\}$. Note that $I^{\sigma_{\mathbf{t}, \mathbf{s}}} = (I^{\sigma_{\mathbf{t}, \mathbf{0}}})^{\sigma_{\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{s}}}$.

As mentioned in the Introduction, we define the *\mathbf{t} -spread algebraic shifting* as follows: for I a monomial ideal of T , we let $I^{s, \mathbf{t}}$ the following monomial ideal

$$I^{s, \mathbf{t}} := (\text{Gin}(I))^{\sigma_{\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{t}}}.$$

Note that for $\mathbf{t} = \mathbf{1} = (1, 1, \dots, 1)$, we obtain the classical algebraic shifting. Indeed, for $\mathbf{t} = \mathbf{1}$, $\sigma_{\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{t}}$ is the *squarefree operator* defined in the Introduction.

We are going to verify the following four properties:

- (Shift₁) $I^{s, \mathbf{t}}$ is a \mathbf{t} -spread strongly stable monomial ideal;
- (Shift₂) $I^{s, \mathbf{t}} = I$ if I is a \mathbf{t} -spread strongly stable ideal;
- (Shift₃) I and $I^{s, \mathbf{t}}$ have the same Hilbert function;
- (Shift₄) If $I \subseteq J$, then $I^{s, \mathbf{t}} \subseteq J^{s, \mathbf{t}}$.

Proposition 5.1 *Let I be a monomial ideal. Then, I is a \mathbf{t} -spread strongly stable ideal if and only if $I^{\sigma_{\mathbf{t}, \mathbf{s}}}$ is a \mathbf{s} -spread strongly stable ideal.*

Proof. Suppose that I is a \mathbf{t} -spread strongly stable ideal. Set $I' = I^{\sigma_{\mathbf{t}, \mathbf{s}}}$. To show that I' is a \mathbf{s} -spread strongly stable ideal, it suffices to check condition (ii) of Corollary 2.7. So, let $u \in G(I)$, $u = x_{j_1} x_{j_2} \cdots x_{j_d}$, then

$$u_1 = \sigma_{\mathbf{t}, \mathbf{s}}(u) = \prod_{k=1}^d x_{j_k - \sum_{r=1}^{k-1} t_r + \sum_{r=1}^{k-1} s_r} = x_{j'_1} x_{j'_2} \cdots x_{j'_d} \in G(I') = G(I^{\sigma_{\mathbf{t}, \mathbf{s}}}).$$

Let $i \in \text{supp}(u_1)$, $j < i$ such that $v_1 = x_j(u_1/x_i)$ is \mathbf{s} -spread, we prove that $v_1 \in I'$.

Now, $i = j'_\ell = j_\ell - \sum_{r=1}^{\ell-1} t_r + \sum_{r=1}^{\ell-1} s_r$, for some $\ell \in \{1, \dots, d\}$, and $j'_{p-1} + s_{p-1} \leq j \leq j'_p - 1$, for some $p \leq \ell$, in particular for $p = 1$, $j < j'_1$. Hence,

$$v_1 = x_j(u_1/x_i) = \left(\prod_{k=1}^{p-1} x_{j'_k} \right) x_j \left(\prod_{k=p}^{\ell-1} x_{j'_k} \right) \left(\prod_{k=\ell+1}^d x_{j'_k} \right).$$

Recall that $\sigma_{\mathbf{s}, \mathbf{t}}$ is the inverse map of $\sigma_{\mathbf{t}, \mathbf{s}}$. Set $v = \sigma_{\mathbf{s}, \mathbf{t}}(v_1)$, then v is \mathbf{t} -spread, and

$$v = \sigma_{\mathbf{s}, \mathbf{t}}(v_1) = \left(\prod_{k=1}^{p-1} x_{j_k} \right) x_{j - \sum_{r=1}^{p-1} s_r + \sum_{r=1}^{p-1} t_r} \left(\prod_{k=p}^{\ell-1} x_{j_k - s_k + t_k} \right) \left(\prod_{k=\ell+1}^d x_{j_k} \right).$$

Since $j_{k+1} - j_k \geq t_k$ for all k and $j'_p = j_p - \sum_{r=1}^{p-1} t_r + \sum_{r=1}^{p-1} s_r$, we have

$$j_k - s_k + t_k \leq j_{k+1} - s_k \leq j_{k+1}, \quad \text{for all } k = p, \dots, \ell - 1, \quad \text{and} \quad (21)$$

$$j - \sum_{r=1}^{p-1} s_r + \sum_{r=1}^{p-1} t_r < j'_p - \sum_{r=1}^{p-1} s_r + \sum_{r=1}^{p-1} t_r = j_p. \quad (22)$$

Setting

$$z_m = \begin{cases} x_{j - \sum_{r=1}^{p-1} s_r + \sum_{r=1}^{p-1} t_r} (u/x_{j_p}), & \text{for } m = 1, \\ x_{j_{(p+m-2)} - s_{(p+m-2)} + t_{(p+m-2)}} (z_{m-1}/x_{j_{(p+m-1)}}), & \text{for } m = 2, \dots, \ell + 1 - p, \end{cases}$$

we see that the monomials z_m are \mathbf{t} -spread. Moreover, as I is \mathbf{t} -spread strongly stable, $z_1 \in I$ by (22), and inductively $z_m \in I$, by (21). So, $v = z_{\ell+1-p} \in I$, and by Lemma 2.6, $v = w_1 w_2$ for unique monomials $w_1 \in G(I)$, w_2 such that $\max(w_1) \leq \min(w_2)$. Hence, $\sigma_{\mathbf{t}, \mathbf{s}}(w_1)$ divides $v_1 = \sigma_{\mathbf{t}, \mathbf{s}}(v)$, with $\sigma_{\mathbf{t}, \mathbf{s}}(w_1) \in G(I') = G(I^{\sigma_{\mathbf{t}, \mathbf{s}}})$. Finally, $v_1 \in I' = I^{\sigma_{\mathbf{t}, \mathbf{s}}}$, as desired. The converse is trivially true as $I, \mathbf{t}, \mathbf{s}$ are arbitrary. \square

By virtue of this proposition, the property (Shift₁) is verified. Indeed, it is known that $\text{Gin}(I)$ is a $\mathbf{0}$ -spread strongly stable ideal [23]. Consequently, $I^{\mathbf{s}, \mathbf{t}}$ is a \mathbf{t} -spread strongly stable ideal, as desired.

The operators $\sigma_{\mathbf{t}, \mathbf{s}}$ behave well, in fact they preserve the graded Betti numbers. We first note that Theorem 3.8 implies a formula for the graded Betti numbers. We remark that the next result holds whatever the characteristic of the field K is.

Corollary 5.2 *Let I be a \mathbf{t} -spread strongly stable ideal of S . Then,*

$$\beta_{i, i+j}(I) = \sum_{u \in G(I)_j} \binom{\max(u) - 1 - \sum_{\ell=1}^{j-1} t_\ell}{i}, \quad \text{for all } i, j \geq 0. \quad (23)$$

In particular, the graded Betti numbers of a vector-spread strongly stable ideal $I \subset S$ do not depend upon the characteristic of the field K .

Proof. Let $i, j \geq 0$. By equation (1), $\beta_{i,i+j}(I) = \beta_{i+1,i+j}(S/I) = \dim_K H_{i+1}(\mathbf{x}; S/I)_{i+j}$. By Theorem 3.8, the degree of a basis element $[e(u; \sigma)]$ of $H_{i+1}(\mathbf{x}; S/I)_{i+j}$ is given by $|\sigma| + 1 + \deg(u) - 1 = i + j$. Thus $u \in G(I)_j$. For a fixed $u \in G(I)_j$, we have $\sigma \subseteq [\max(u) - 1] \setminus \text{supp}_{\mathbf{t}}(u)$. Hence, there are $\binom{|\max(u)-1| \setminus \text{supp}_{\mathbf{t}}(u)|}{i} = \binom{\max(u)-1-\sum_{\ell=1}^{j-1} t_{\ell}}{i}$ possible choices for σ . Summing all these binomials over $u \in G(I)_j$, we obtain the formula in the statement. \square

Suitable choices of \mathbf{t} return several well known formulas for the graded Betti numbers. $\mathbf{t} = (0, 0, \dots, 0)$ returns the Eliahou–Kervaire formula for (strongly) stable ideals [17]; $\mathbf{t} = (1, 1, \dots, 1)$ gives the Aramova–Herzog–Hibi formula for squarefree (strongly) stable ideals [10]. Finally, in the *uniform* case, *i.e.*, $\mathbf{t} = (t, t, \dots, t)$, we have the Ene–Herzog–Qureshi formula for uniform t -spread strongly stable ideals [18].

Let $P_I^S(y) = \sum_i \beta_i(I) y^i$ be the Poincaré series of I . Equation (23) implies

Corollary 5.3 *Let $I \subset S$ be a \mathbf{t} -spread strongly stable ideal. Then*

- (a) $P_I^S(y) = \sum_{u \in G(I)} (1 + y)^{\max(u)-1-\sum_{\ell=1}^{\deg(u)-1} t_{\ell}};$
- (b) $\text{pd}(I) = \max \left\{ \max(u) - 1 - \sum_{j=1}^{\deg(u)-1} t_j : u \in G(I) \right\};$
- (c) $\text{reg}(I) = \max \left\{ \deg(u) : u \in G(I) \right\}.$

Let us return now to our shifting operators. As announced, we have

Lemma 5.4 *Let I be a \mathbf{t} -spread strongly stable ideal. Then $I^{\sigma_{\mathbf{t},\mathbf{s}}}$ is a \mathbf{s} -spread strongly stable ideal, and for all $i, j \geq 0$,*

$$\beta_{i,i+j}(I) = \beta_{i,i+j}(I^{\sigma_{\mathbf{t},\mathbf{s}}}).$$

Proof. We have just proved that $I^{\sigma_{\mathbf{t},\mathbf{s}}}$ is a \mathbf{s} -spread strongly stable ideal with minimal generating set $G(I^{\sigma_{\mathbf{t},\mathbf{s}}}) = \{\sigma_{\mathbf{t},\mathbf{s}}(u) : u \in G(I)\}$. Moreover, for $u \in G(I)$, we have $\max(\sigma_{\mathbf{t},\mathbf{s}}(u)) = \max(u) - \sum_{\ell=1}^{\deg(u)-1} t_{\ell} + \sum_{\ell=1}^{\deg(u)-1} s_{\ell}$. Hence, Corollary 5.2 yields

$$\begin{aligned} \beta_{i,i+j}(I^{\sigma_{\mathbf{t},\mathbf{s}}}) &= \sum_{\sigma_{\mathbf{t},\mathbf{s}}(u) \in G(I^{\sigma_{\mathbf{t},\mathbf{s}}})_j} \binom{\max(\sigma_{\mathbf{t},\mathbf{s}}(u)) - 1 - \sum_{\ell=1}^{j-1} s_{\ell}}{i} \\ &= \sum_{u \in G(I)_j} \binom{\max(u) - \sum_{\ell=1}^{j-1} t_{\ell} + \sum_{\ell=1}^{j-1} s_{\ell} - 1 - \sum_{\ell=1}^{j-1} s_{\ell}}{i} \\ &= \sum_{u \in G(I)_j} \binom{\max(u) - 1 - \sum_{\ell=1}^{j-1} t_{\ell}}{i} = \beta_{i,i+j}(I). \end{aligned}$$

\square

As a consequence, the property (Shift₃) is verified too. Indeed, it is known that I and $\text{Gin}(I)$ have the same Hilbert function. Moreover, by Lemma 5.4, $\text{Gin}(I)$ and $(\text{Gin}(I))^{\sigma_0, \mathbf{t}}$ have the same graded Betti numbers and thus the same Hilbert function.

Note that condition (Shift₄) is trivially verified. Finally it remains to establish condition (Shift₂). This is accomplished in the next theorem.

Theorem 5.5 *Let K be a field of characteristic zero. Let $I \subset S$ be a \mathbf{t} -spread strongly stable ideal. Then*

$$I = (\text{Gin}(I))^{\sigma_0, \mathbf{t}}.$$

Proof. We proceed by induction on the integer $\ell = \max\{\max(u) : u \in G(I)\} \geq 1$. If $\ell = 1$, then $G(I) = \{x_1^a\}$, $I = (x_1^a)$, and $\text{Gin}(I) = I = (x_1^a)$, moreover $\sigma_{\mathbf{t}, \mathbf{0}}(x_1^a) = x_1^a$, for some $a \geq 1$. So, the thesis holds for $\ell = 1$.

Let $\ell > 1$. By [23, Lemma 11.2.8] we can assume $\ell = n$. So, there exists a monomial $u \in G(I)$ with $\max(u) = n$. Let $p = \max\{p : x_n^p \text{ divides } u \text{ for some } u \in G(I)\}$, our hypothesis implies that $p \geq 1$. We consider the following ideals:

$$I' = I : (x_n^p), \quad I'' = (u \in G(I) : \max(u) < n).$$

Both are again \mathbf{t} -spread strongly stable ideals, and $I'' \subseteq I \subseteq I'$. By inductive hypothesis, $\text{Gin}(I') = (I')^{\sigma_{\mathbf{t}, \mathbf{0}}}$ and $\text{Gin}(I'') = (I'')^{\sigma_{\mathbf{t}, \mathbf{0}}}$. Equivalently,

$$I' = \text{Gin}(I')^{\sigma_0, \mathbf{t}} \quad \text{and} \quad I'' = \text{Gin}(I'')^{\sigma_0, \mathbf{t}}.$$

Therefore, $I'' \subseteq \text{Gin}(I)^{\sigma_0, \mathbf{t}} \subseteq I'$.

CLAIM 2. It is

$$I \subseteq \text{Gin}(I)^{\sigma_0, \mathbf{t}}. \tag{24}$$

To prove CLAIM 2, it is enough to show that each $u \in G(I)$ with $\max(u) = n$ belongs to $\text{Gin}(I)^{\sigma_0, \mathbf{t}}$. Indeed, since $I'' \subseteq \text{Gin}(I)^{\sigma_0, \mathbf{t}}$, all monomials $u \in G(I)$ with $\max(u) < n$ are in $\text{Gin}(I)^{\sigma_0, \mathbf{t}}$.

Let $u \in G(I)$ with $\max(u) = n$. We set $a = n - 1 - \sum_{j=1}^{\deg(u)-1} t_j$ and $b = a + \deg(u)$. By Corollary 5.2 we have

$$\begin{aligned} \beta_{a,b}(I) &= \sum_{\substack{v \in G(I) \\ \deg(v) = \deg(u)}} \binom{\max(v) - 1 - \sum_{j=1}^{\deg(u)-1} t_j}{n - 1 - \sum_{j=1}^{\deg(u)-1} t_j} \\ &= |\{v \in G(I) : \max(v) = n, \deg(v) = \deg(u)\}|. \end{aligned}$$

Similarly, as $\text{Gin}(I)^{\sigma_0, \mathbf{t}}$ is \mathbf{t} -spread strongly stable,

$$\begin{aligned} \beta_{a,b}(\text{Gin}(I)^{\sigma_0, \mathbf{t}}) &= \sum_{\substack{w \in G(\text{Gin}(I)^{\sigma_0, \mathbf{t}}) \\ \deg(w) = \deg(u)}} \binom{\max(w) - 1 - \sum_{j=1}^{\deg(u)-1} t_j}{n - 1 - \sum_{j=1}^{\deg(u)-1} t_j} \\ &= |\{w \in G(\text{Gin}(I)^{\sigma_0, \mathbf{t}}) : \max(w) = n, \deg(w) = \deg(u)\}|. \end{aligned}$$

Moreover, by [23, Corollary 3.3.3] and by Lemma 5.4, we have

$$\beta_{a,b}(I) \leq \beta_{a,b}(\text{Gin}(I)) = \beta_{a,b}(\text{Gin}(I)^{\sigma_{\mathbf{o},\mathbf{t}}}).$$

Hence

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \left\{ w \in G(\text{Gin}(I)^{\sigma_{\mathbf{o},\mathbf{t}}}) : \max(w) = n, \deg(w) = \deg(u) \right\} \right| \geq \\ & \left| \left\{ v \in G(I) : \max(v) = n, \deg(v) = \deg(u) \right\} \right|. \end{aligned} \quad (25)$$

Our aim is to prove that $u \in G(I)$ with $\max(u) = n$ belongs to $\text{Gin}(I)^{\sigma_{\mathbf{o},\mathbf{t}}}$.

Let w_1, \dots, w_s be the monomial generators in $G(\text{Gin}(I)^{\sigma_{\mathbf{o},\mathbf{t}}})$ such that $\max(w_i) = n$ and $\deg(w_1) \leq \deg(w_2) \leq \dots \leq \deg(w_s)$. Since $\text{Gin}(I)^{\sigma_{\mathbf{o},\mathbf{t}}} \subseteq I'$, we have $w_i x_n^p \in I$, for all $i = 1, \dots, s$. We prove that $w_i \in I$ for all i . Since $w_i x_n^p \in I$, there is a monomial $v_i \in G(I)$ such that v_i divides $w_i x_n^p$. We have $\deg(v_i) \leq \deg(w_i) + p$, for all $i = 1, \dots, s$.

If $\deg(v_1) < \deg(w_1)$, setting $u = v_1$ in (25), we would have an absurd. Hence $\deg(v_1) \geq \deg(w_1)$. By finite induction, $\deg(v_i) \geq \deg(w_i)$, for all $i = 1, \dots, s$.

Now, if $\deg(v_s) \geq \deg(w_s) + 1$, setting $u = v_s$ in (25), we would obtain an absurd. Hence, $\deg(v_s) \leq \deg(w_s)$, and since we have proved that $\deg(v_s) \geq \deg(w_s)$, we obtain $\deg(v_s) = \deg(w_s)$. Iterating this argument, $\deg(v_i) = \deg(w_i)$, for all $i = 1, \dots, s$.

If $v_i = (w_i x_n^p) / x_n^p = w_i$ we set $u_i = v_i$ and note that $u_i = w_i$ divides w_i . Otherwise, $v_i = (w_i x_n^p) / z_i$ for some monomial $z_i \neq x_n^p$, we note that v_i has bigger sorted indexes than w_i , thus since I is \mathbf{t} -spread strongly stable $w_i \in I$. Hence, there is a monomial $u_i \in G(I)$ that divides w_i . Finally, we have constructed monomials $u_1, \dots, u_s \in G(I)$ such that u_i divides w_i , for all $i = 1, \dots, s$. Repeating the same argument as before, using (25), we see that $\deg(u_i) \geq \deg(w_i)$, for all i , hence $u_i = w_i$, since u_i divides w_i , for all $i = 1, \dots, s$.

Thus, $w_i = u_i \in G(I)$, for all $i = 1, \dots, s$, and we get the inclusion

$$\{w \in G(\text{Gin}(I)^{\sigma_{\mathbf{o},\mathbf{t}}}) : \max(w) = n\} \subseteq \{u \in G(I) : \max(u) = n\}.$$

This equation together with (25) yield

$$\{w \in G(\text{Gin}(I)^{\sigma_{\mathbf{o},\mathbf{t}}}) : \max(w) = n\} = \{u \in G(I) : \max(u) = n\}.$$

Hence, CLAIM 2 is true.

Finally, I and $\text{Gin}(I)$ have the same Hilbert function. Moreover, by Lemma 5.4, $\text{Gin}(I)$ and $\text{Gin}(I)^{\sigma_{\mathbf{o},\mathbf{t}}}$ have the same Hilbert function. Hence I and $\text{Gin}(I)^{\sigma_{\mathbf{o},\mathbf{t}}}$ have the same Hilbert function. Formula (24) and this observation imply that $I = \text{Gin}(I)^{\sigma_{\mathbf{o},\mathbf{t}}}$, or equivalently $\text{Gin}(I) = I^{\sigma_{\mathbf{t},\mathbf{o}}}$, proving the theorem. \square

We end the paper by remarking that the operator $\sigma_{\mathbf{t},\mathbf{s}}$ establishes a bijection between \mathbf{t} -spread strongly stable ideals and \mathbf{s} -spread strongly stable ideals.

REFERENCES

- [1] L. Amata. Computational methods for t -spread monomial ideals, available at arXiv preprint <https://arxiv.org/abs/2110.11801> [math.AC].
- [2] L. Amata, M. Crupi. Extremal Betti Numbers of t -Spread Strongly Stable Ideals. *Mathematics* **7** (2019), 695.
- [3] L. Amata, M. Crupi, A. Ficarra. Upper bounds for extremal Betti numbers of t -spread strongly stable ideals. *Bulletin Mathematique de la Societe des Sciences Mathematiques de Roumanie*, 2022, **65**(1), pp. 13–34
- [4] L. Amata, M. Crupi, A. Ficarra. Projective dimension and Castelnuovo–Mumford regularity of t -spread ideals, *International Journal of Algebra and Computation*, 2022, **32**(4), pp. 837–858
- [5] L. Amata, A. Ficarra, M. Crupi. A numerical characterization of extremal Betti numbers of t -spread strongly stable ideals. *Journal of Algebraic Combinatorics*, 2022, **55**(3), pp. 891–918
- [6] C. Andrei–Ciobanu, Nearly Normally Torsionfree Ideals. *Combinatorial Structures in Algebra and Geometry*, 1–13, NSA 26, Constanța, Romania, August 26–September 1, 2018. DOI: 10.1007/978-3-030-52111-0_1
- [7] C. Andrei–Ciobanu, V. Ene, B. Lajmiri. Powers of t -spread principal Borel ideals. *Archiv der Mathematik* (2018), 1–11.
- [8] C. Andrei–Ciobanu. Kruskal–Katona Theorem for t -spread strongly stable ideals, *Bull. Math. Soc. Sci. Math. Roumanie (N.S.)* **62(110)(2)**, 107–122 (2019).
- [9] A. Aramova, J. Herzog. Koszul cycles and Eliahou–Kervaire type resolutions. *Journal of Algebra*. **181** (2), 347–370, 1996.
- [10] A. Aramova, J. Herzog, T. Hibi. Squarefree lexsegment ideals. *Math.Z.* **228** (1998), 353–378.
- [11] A. Aramova, J. Herzog, T. Hibi. Shifting Operations and Graded Betti Numbers. *Journal of Algebraic Combinatorics* **12**, 207–222 (2000).
- [12] A. M. Bigatti. Upper bounds for the betti numbers of a given Hilbert function. *Comm. Algebra* **21**: 2317–2334. (1993).
- [13] M. Cimpoeaş. Polarization and spreading of monomial ideals. *Communications in Algebra*, **47**(12) (2019), 5492–5508.
- [14] M. Crupi, A. Ficarra. Classification of Cohen–Macaulay t -spread lexsegment ideals via simplicial complexes, *Illinois J. Math.*(to appear), available at arXiv preprint <https://arxiv.org/abs/2208.02175>[math.AC].
- [15] R. Dinu. Gorenstein T -spread Veronese algebras. *Osaka J. Math.* **57**(4) (2020), 935–947.
- [16] R. Dinu, J. Herzog, A. A. Qureshi. Restricted classes of veronese type ideals and algebras. *International Journal of Algebra and Computation*. **31**(01), 173–197 (2021).
- [17] S. Eliahou, M. Kervaire. Minimal resolutions of some monomial ideals, *J. Algebra*, **129** (1990), 1–25.
- [18] V. Ene, J. Herzog, A. A. Qureshi. t -spread strongly stable monomial ideals, *Communications in Algebra* **47**(12), 5303–5316 (2019).
- [19] P. Erdős, P. C. Ko, R. Rado. Intersection theorems for systems of finite sets. *Quart. J. Math. Oxford Ser.*, **12**, 313–320 (1961).

- [20] A. Ficarra, M. Crupi. Shifting operations and completely t -spread lexsegment ideals. *Comm. Alg.* **50**(8) (2022), 3320–3337.
- [21] A. Ficarra, M. Crupi. Minimal resolutions of vector-spread Borel ideals, 2022, available at arXiv preprint <https://arxiv.org/abs/2208.02181>.
- [22] D. R. Grayson, M. E. Stillman. *Macaulay2, a software system for research in algebraic geometry*. Available at <http://www.math.uiuc.edu/Macaulay2>.
- [23] J. Herzog, T. Hibi. *Monomial ideals*, Graduate texts in Mathematics **260**, Springer–Verlag, 2011.
- [24] J. Herzog, S. Moradi, M. Rahimbeigi, G. Zhu, Some homological properties of Borel type ideals, 2021, available at arXiv preprint <https://arxiv.org/abs/2112.11726>.
- [25] J. Herzog, Y. Takayama. Resolutions by mapping cones, in: The Roos Festschrift volume Nr.2(2), *Homology, Homotopy and Applications* **4**, (2002), 277–294.
- [26] H. Hulett. Maximum Betti numbers of homogeneous ideals with a given Hilbert function. *Comm. Algebra* 21: 2335–2350. (1993).
- [27] G. Kalai. Algebraic shifting. In: Hibi, T. (ed.) *Computational commutative algebra and combinatorics*. *Adv. Studies in Pure Math.*, **33**, Mathematical Society of Japan, Tokyo (2002).
- [28] B. Lajmiri, F. Rahmati. Properties of t -spread principal Borel ideals generated in degree two. *Facta Universitatis Series Mathematics and Informatics* **35**(1):131, (2020).
- [29] M. Nasernejad, A. A. Qureshi, K. Khashyarmansh, L. G. Roberts. Classes of normally and nearly normally torsion-free monomial ideals, *Comm. Alg.* **50** (2022), 3715–3733
- [30] G. Zhu, Y. Zhao, Y. Cui. Freiman t -spread principal Borel ideals, *Mathematical Notes* **112**, pp 191–198 (2022)