

Upper Bounds on Resolvent Degree and Its Growth Rate

Alexander J. Sutherland*

November 16, 2021

Abstract

For each n , let $\text{RD}(n)$ denote the minimum d for which there exists a formula for the general polynomial of degree n in algebraic functions of at most d variables. In 1945, Segre called for a better understanding of the large n behavior of $\text{RD}(n)$. In this paper, we provide improved thresholds for upper bounds on $\text{RD}(n)$. Our techniques build upon classical algebraic geometry to provide new upper bounds for small n and, in doing so, fix gaps in the proofs of A. Wiman and G.N. Chebotarev in [Wim1927] and [Che1954].

Contents

| | | |
|----------|--|-----------|
| 1 | Introduction | 1 |
| 2 | Polar Cones | 3 |
| 2.1 | An Introduction to Polar Cones | 3 |
| 2.2 | Resolvent Degree | 6 |
| 2.3 | Iterated Polar Cones and k -Polar Points | 7 |
| 3 | New Upper Bounds on $\text{RD}(n)$ | 9 |
| 3.1 | Tschirnhaus Transformations | 9 |
| 3.2 | New Bounds From Iterated Polar Cones | 10 |
| 3.3 | New Bounds from Moduli Spaces | 17 |
| 3.4 | Upper Bounds on the Bounding Function $G(m)$ | 23 |
| 4 | Comparison with Prior Bounds | 27 |
| 5 | Appendices | 35 |
| 5.1 | Explicit Bounds on $\text{RD}(n)$ | 35 |
| 5.2 | Explicit Approximations of $F(m)/G(m)$ | 36 |
| 5.3 | Proof of Technical Lemma | 37 |

1 Introduction

Consider the following classical problem:

Problem 1.1. Given a general polynomial $z^n + a_1 z^{n-1} + \cdots + a_{n-1} z + a_n$, determine a root of the polynomial in terms of a_1, \dots, a_n in the simplest manner possible.

Recent work on this problem has been cast within the framework of resolvent degree (as in [FW2019]). Informally, $\text{RD}(n)$ is the minimal d for which there exists a formula for the roots of the generic degree n polynomial using algebraic functions of at most d variables (see Definitions 2.13 and 2.14). While there are currently no non-trivial lower bounds on $\text{RD}(n)$ and it is possible in theory that $\text{RD}(n) = 1$ for all n , there is a history of determining upper bounds on $\text{RD}(n)$. This includes the work of Bring [Bri1786], Hamilton

*This work was supported in part by the National Science Foundation under Grant No. DMS-1944862.

[Ham1836], Sylvester [Syl1887, SH1887, SH1888], Klein [Kle1884, Kle1887, Kle1905], and Hilbert ([Hil1927]).¹ Indeed, Hamilton proved that $\text{RD}(6) \leq 2$, $\text{RD}(7) \leq 3$, and $\text{RD}(8) \leq 4$. Hilbert’s sextic conjecture, Hilbert’s 13th problem, and Hilbert’s octic conjecture, respectively, predict that these upper bounds are sharp. In Section 3 of [Seg1945], Segre indicated the following problem:

Problem 1.2. (Segre, 1945)

Determine the large n behavior of $\text{RD}(n)$.

The current upper bounds on $\text{RD}(n)$ are found in [Wol2021], where Wolfson introduces a function $F(m)$ such that $\text{RD}(n) \leq n - m$ for all $n \geq F(m)$ (Definition 5.4 and Theorem 5.6, [Wol2021]). In this paper, we construct a similar function $G(m)$. For $21 \leq n \leq 3,632,428,800$, we use methods which build upon the work of Segre. By using a theorem of Debarre and Manivel (see Theorem 3.20, or Theorem 2.1 of [DM1998]), we are able to streamline Wolfson’s method to obtain better thresholds on upper bounds on $\text{RD}(n)$ for $n \geq 348,489,068,134$. For $3,632,428,801 \leq n \leq 348,489,068,133$, we obtain the same bounds as Wolfson’s method. More specifically, we prove the following results:

Theorem 1.3. (Key Properties of $G(m)$)

The function $G(m)$ of Definition 3.26 has the following properties:

1. For each $m \geq 1$ and $n \geq G(m)$, $\text{RD}(n) \leq n - m$.
2. For each $d \geq 4$, $G(2d^2 + 7d + 6) \leq \frac{(2d^2+7d+5)!}{d!}$. In particular, for $d \geq 4$ and $n \geq \frac{(2d^2+7d+5)!}{d!}$,

$$\text{RD}(n) \leq n - 2d^2 - 7d - 6.$$
3. For each $m \geq 1$, $G(m) \leq F(m)$ with equality only when $m \in \{1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 15, 16\}$ and

$$\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \frac{F(m)}{G(m)} = \infty.$$

The first statement of Theorem 1.3 is Theorem 3.27 and, in light of this statement, we refer to $F(m)$ and $G(m)$ as “bounding functions” for $\text{RD}(n)$. Hamilton was the first to provide a bounding function for $\text{RD}(n)$ (see [OEIS2021]). Brauer greatly improved Hamilton’s result when he showed that $\text{RD}(n) \leq n - m$ for $n \geq (m - 1)! + 1$ in [Bra1975]. Wolfson improved upon these bounds with his function $F(m)$, but did not provide an upper bound on $F(m)$ in terms of elementary functions. The construction of $G(m)$ is simpler than $F(m)$, but is not as explicit as Brauer’s condition. The second statement of Theorem 1.3 gives an upper bound on $\text{RD}(n)$ and its growth rate using elementary functions; it is Theorem 3.28.

The third statement of Theorem 1.3 shows that $G(m)$ provides better asymptotic bounds than $F(m)$; it is Theorem 4.1. Note that the inequalities when $1 \leq m \leq 4$ (which imply $\text{RD}(n) \leq 1$ for $2 \leq n \leq 5$) are due to the classical solutions of general polynomials of low degree. Recall that Hilbert’s Octic Conjecture predicts that $\text{RD}(8) = 4$ and, if true, would imply that the bounds $G(5) = F(5) = 9$ cannot be improved. We expect that the general thresholds obtained by $G(m)$ are not sharp (including the cases of $G(15) = F(15)$ and $G(16) = F(16)$).

Historical Remarks Many of the approaches above rely on the theory of Tschirnhaus transformations. In [Wol2021], Wolfson consolidates the history of Tschirnhaus transformations and establishes upper bounds on $\text{RD}(n)$ by determining points of Tschirnhaus complete intersections over field extensions of bounded resolvent degree. In [Wim1927], Wiman used these methods to give an argument that implied $\text{RD}(n) \leq n - 5$ for $n \geq 9$ and Chebotarev² extended Wiman’s idea to argue that $\text{RD}(n) \leq n - 6$ for $n \geq 21$ in [Che1954]. Dixmier noted in [Dix1993], however, that Wiman’s argument has a gap and provided an algebraic argument to conclude that $\text{RD}(n) \leq n - 5$ for $n \geq 9$. Moreover, the gap found in Wiman’s argument is also present in the argument of Chebotarev.

Building on the work of Segre, we introduce (iterated) polar cones for hypersurfaces and intersections of hypersurfaces, which we use to determine linear subvarieties on intersections of hypersurfaces over extensions of bounded resolvent degree. In doing so, we fix the gaps in the arguments of Chebotarev and provide a geometric fix for the arguments of Wiman.

¹Chen, He, and McKay provide a modern English translation of [Bri1786] (originally in Latin) in [CHM2017] and the author provides a modern English translation of [Kle1905] (originally in German) in [Sut2019].

²Note that this is G.N. Chebotarev, son of Nikolai Chebotarev.

Outline of the Paper In Section 2, we use the language of polar cones (respectively, iterated polar cones) and highlight their connection to lines (respectively, k -planes) on intersections of hypersurfaces. In Section 3, we use techniques involving iterated polar cones and moduli spaces to construct a function $G(m)$ which yields the upper bounds on $\text{RD}(n)$. In Section 4, we compare these new bounds to those of Wolfson. In Appendix 5.1, we give explicit values of $G(m)$ for small values of m . In Appendix 5.2, we provide additional data on the ratio $F(m)/G(m)$. In Appendix 5.3, we provide the proof of a technical lemma from Section 2.

Conventions

1. We restrict to fields K which are finitely generated \mathbb{C} -algebras. The interested reader could instead fix an arbitrary algebraically closed field F of characteristic zero (in lieu of \mathbb{C}) and the statements (relative to F) would hold.
2. For varieties, we follow the conventions of [Har2010]. Namely, we define a projective (respectively, affine) variety to be a closed algebraic set in \mathbb{P}_K^n (respectively, \mathbb{A}_K^n). When we simply say variety, we mean a quasi-projective variety. In particular, we do not assume that varieties are irreducible.
3. For a collection of homogeneous polynomials $f_1, \dots, f_s \in K[x_0, \dots, x_r]$, we write $\mathbb{V}(f_1, \dots, f_s)$ for the subvariety of \mathbb{P}_K^r determined by the conditions $f_1 = \dots = f_s = 0$.
4. Given a subvariety $V \subseteq \mathbb{P}_K^r$, we use the notation $V(K)$ to refer to the set of K -rational points of V .
5. We write K_n to mean $\mathbb{C}(a_1, \dots, a_n)$, a purely transcendental extension of \mathbb{C} with transcendence basis a_1, \dots, a_n .
6. We write $\text{Gr}(k, r)$ to denote the Grassmannian of k -dimensional subspaces of \mathbb{C}^r and $\mathcal{G}r(k, r)$ for the space of k -planes in $\mathbb{P}_\mathbb{C}^r$. In particular, $\mathcal{G}r(k, r) \cong \text{Gr}(k+1, r+1)$.
7. Given a polynomial ring $K[x_0, \dots, x_r]$ over a field K , we write
 - $K[x_0, \dots, x_r]_{(d)}$ for the vector space of degree d polynomials,
 - $K[x_0, \dots, x_r]_{(d)}^\vee$ for its dual space,
 - $S^*(K[x_0, \dots, x_r]_{(d)}^\vee)$ for the corresponding free commutative K -algebra, and
 - $S^*(K[x_0, \dots, x_r]_{(d)}^\vee)^{\text{GL}(K, r+1)}$ for the associated graded ring of $\text{GL}(K, r+1)$ -invariants.
8. We write \log to mean the base e logarithm.

With respect to convention 2, note that for generic choices of f_1, \dots, f_s , $\mathbb{V}(f_1, \dots, f_s)$ is a complete intersection. However, there are examples of such choices which are not complete intersections, such as the twisted cubic curve. Our methods apply to all such choices and to avoid confusion, we generally use the terminology “intersection of hypersurfaces” instead of “complete intersection” to refer to a variety of the form $\mathbb{V}(f_1, \dots, f_s)$. Additionally, we note that conventions 5 and 6 are primarily for Definition 3.12 and Remark 3.14, respectively.

Acknowledgements I thank Jesse Wolfson for his generous support. Next, I thank Joshua Jordan for several key conversations and general support. I thank Benson Farb, Hannah Knight, Curt McMullen, and Zinovy Reichstein for helpful comments on a draft. Finally, I thank Kenneth Ascher, Claudio Gómez-González, and Roman Vershynin for helpful conversations.

2 Polar Cones

2.1 An Introduction to Polar Cones

In [Seg1945], Segre refers to a “well-known fact” which is the main ingredient for many of his proofs. This fact may no longer be as well-known as it once was. Definitions 2.1, 2.2, and 2.4 are necessary to state the

fact, which we include as Lemma 2.5 and refer to as Bertini's Lemma (for Hypersurfaces), since the reference Segre gives for this fact is [Ber1923].

Definition 2.1. (Polars of a Polynomial)

Let $f \in K[x_0, \dots, x_r]$ be a homogeneous polynomial of degree d and $P \in \mathbb{P}^r(K)$. For every $n \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}$, let

$$\begin{aligned} [n] &= \{0, 1, \dots, n\}, \\ [n]^* &= \{1, \dots, n\}. \end{aligned}$$

For each $0 \leq k \leq d-1$, we set

$$I_k := \left\{ (i_0, \dots, i_r) \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^{r+1} \mid i_0 + \dots + i_r = k \right\}.$$

We have $r+1$ first partial derivatives $\frac{\partial}{\partial x_0}, \dots, \frac{\partial}{\partial x_r}$. To obtain an (ordered) k^{th} partial derivative of f , we make k successive choices of first partial derivatives. Hence, the set of all (ordered) k^{th} partial derivatives is indexed by $I_k^* = \text{Hom}_{\text{Set}}([k]^*, [r])$. For any $\iota \in I_k^*$ and $0 \leq j \leq r$, we set

$$|\iota|(j) := |\iota^{-1}(j)|$$

and note that $(|\iota|(0), \dots, |\iota|(r)) \in I_k$. Additionally, we use the shorthand

$$\partial_0^{j_0} \dots \partial_r^{j_r} f := \frac{\partial^{j_0 + \dots + j_r} f}{\partial x_0^{j_0} \dots \partial x_r^{j_r}}.$$

With this notation set, the k^{th} **polar of f at P** is the homogeneous polynomial of degree $d-k$

$$t(k, f, P)(y_0, \dots, y_r) := \sum_{\iota \in I_{d-k}^*} \left(\partial_0^{|\iota|(0)} \dots \partial_r^{|\iota|(r)} f \right) \Big|_P y_0^{|\iota|(0)} \dots y_r^{|\iota|(r)}.$$

Definition 2.2. (Polars of a Hypersurface)

Let $V = \mathbb{V}(f)$ be a hypersurface in \mathbb{P}_K^r and $P \in V(K)$. The k^{th} **polar of V at P** is

$$T(k, f, P) := \mathbb{V}(t(k, f, P)) \subseteq \mathbb{P}_K^r.$$

Example 2.3. Using the conventions of Definition 2.2, we observe that

$$\begin{aligned} t(0, f, P)(x_0, \dots, x_r) &= f(x_0, \dots, x_r), \\ t(d, f, P)(x_0, \dots, x_r) &= f(P), \end{aligned}$$

so the 0^{th} polar of $\mathbb{V}(f)$ at P is $T(0, f, P) = V$ for all P and the d^{th} polar of $\mathbb{V}(f)$ at P is

$$T(d, f, P) = \begin{cases} \mathbb{P}_K^r, & \text{if } P \in \mathbb{V}(f), \\ \emptyset, & \text{if } P \notin \mathbb{V}(f). \end{cases}$$

Moreover, if V is smooth at P , then $T(d-1, f, P)$ is the tangent hyperplane of V at P ; this motivates the use of $T(k, f, P)$ for polar hypersurfaces and hence $t(k, f, P)$ for their defining polynomials.

Definition 2.4. (Polar Cone of a Hypersurface)

Let $V = \mathbb{V}(f)$ be a degree d hypersurface in \mathbb{P}_K^r and $P \in V(K)$. The **(first) polar cone** of V at P is

$$\mathcal{C}(V; P) := \bigcap_{k=0}^{d-1} T(k, f, P).$$

We can now state Lemma 2.5, which motivates the terminology of the previous definition.

Lemma 2.5. (Bertini's Lemma for Hypersurfaces)³

Let $V = \mathbb{V}(f)$ be a hypersurface in \mathbb{P}_K^r and $P \in V(K)$. Then, $\mathcal{C}(V; P)$ is a cone with vertex P which is contained in V .

Example 2.6. (Lines on Cubic Surfaces)

Let $V \subseteq \mathbb{P}_K^3$ be a smooth cubic surface. If $K = \overline{K}$, then V contains exactly 27 lines L_1, \dots, L_{27} . If $P \in V(K)$ lies on exactly one line L (respectively, exactly two lines L_1, L_2), then $\mathcal{C}(V; P) = L$ (respectively, $\mathcal{C}(V; P) = L_1 \cup L_2$). Most points $Q \in V(K)$, however, do not lie on any line and in such a case $\mathcal{C}(V; Q)$ is the point Q with multiplicity 6. We will generally consider fields K which are not algebraically closed, in which case we may need to pass to an extension of K to obtain a line.

Remark 2.7. For an alternative modern perspective on Definitions 2.1 and 2.2, Remark 2.3, and Lemma 2.8, see p.5-6 of [Dol2012] - in particular, equations 1.8 through 1.11. Note that Lemma 2.5 follows directly from the following technical lemma. The proof of Lemma 2.8 can be found in Appendix 5.3; it is not exceedingly complicated, but is notationally cumbersome.

Lemma 2.8. (Technical Lemma)

Let $P, Q \in \mathbb{P}^r(K)$ and $f \in K[x_0, \dots, x_r]$ be a homogeneous polynomial of degree d . Applying a projective change of coordinates as necessary, we assume that

$$\begin{aligned} P &= [1 : p_1 : \dots : p_r], \\ Q &= [1 : q_1 : \dots : q_r], \end{aligned}$$

so that the line determined by P and Q is

$$L(P, Q)(K) = \{[1 : \lambda p_1 + \mu q_1 : \dots : \lambda p_r + \mu q_r] \mid [\lambda : \mu] \in \mathbb{P}^1(K)\}.$$

For any point $R_{\lambda:\mu} = [1 : \lambda p_1 + \mu q_1 : \dots : \lambda p_r + \mu q_r] \in L(P, Q)(K)$,

$$f(R_{\lambda:\mu}) = f(\lambda P) + f(\mu Q) + \sum_{k=1}^{d-1} \frac{1}{k!} t(d-k, f, \lambda P)(\mu Q). \quad (1)$$

Remark 2.9. Lemma 2.5 implies that for every point $Q \in \mathcal{C}(V; P)(K) \setminus \{P\}$, the line $L(P, Q)$ determined by P and Q lies in V . Furthermore, a line L lies on an intersection of hypersurfaces $\mathbb{V}(f_1, \dots, f_n)$ exactly when it lies on each $\mathbb{V}(f_i)$. This motivates Definition 2.10 and implies Lemma 2.11.

Definition 2.10. (Polar Cone of an Intersection of Hypersurfaces)

Let $V = \mathbb{V}(f_1, \dots, f_n) \subseteq \mathbb{P}_K^r$ be an intersection of hypersurfaces and $P \in V(K)$. The **(first) polar cone of V at P** is

$$\mathcal{C}(V; P) := \bigcap_{i=1}^n \mathcal{C}(\mathbb{V}(f_i); P).$$

Lemma 2.11. (Bertini's Lemma for Intersections of Hypersurfaces)

Let $V = \mathbb{V}(f_1, \dots, f_n) \subseteq \mathbb{P}_K^r$ be an intersection of hypersurfaces and $P \in V(K)$. Then, $\mathcal{C}(V; P)$ is a cone with vertex P which is contained in V .

Remark 2.12. (Passing to Extensions)

We continue using the notation of Lemma 2.11. It is easy to see that when K is algebraically closed and $\dim(\mathcal{C}(V; P)) \geq 1$, the set $\mathcal{C}(V; P)(K) \setminus \{P\}$ is not empty. Thus, any choice of $Q \in \mathcal{C}(V; P) \setminus \{P\}$ determines a line on V containing P . When K is not algebraically closed, however, it may be that $\mathcal{C}(V; P)(K) = \{P\}$. In what follows, we will often extend scalars to an extension L/K over which we can determine an L -rational point.

³See Chapter 8 of [Ber1923] for the reference given in [Seg1945].

2.2 Resolvent Degree

Resolvent degree is an invariant introduced independently by Brauer in [Bra1975] and Arnol'd-Shimura in [AS1976]. Farb and Wolfson summarize the history of resolvent degree and significantly broaden the resolvent degree framework in [FW2019], which we refer the reader to for background on resolvent degree. We now recall the definition of resolvent degree for finite field extensions and for generically finite, dominant, rational maps of \mathbb{C} -varieties. We refer the reader to Section 4 of [Wol2021] for how to extend this definition to arbitrary dominant, rational maps. We also remind the reader that in this paper, we work only with fields that are finitely generated \mathbb{C} -algebras.

Definition 2.13. (Resolvent Degree of Field Extensions)

Let L/K be a finite extension of \mathbb{C} -fields. The **resolvent degree** of L/K , denoted $\text{RD}(L/K)$, is the minimum d for which there is a tower of finite field extensions

$$K = E_0 \hookrightarrow E_1 \hookrightarrow \cdots \hookrightarrow E_\ell$$

such that L embeds into E_ℓ over K and for each E_{i+1}/E_i , there is a finite extension of \tilde{F}_i/F_i with $\text{tr.deg}_{\mathbb{C}}(F_i) \leq d$ such that

$$E_{i+1} \cong E_i \otimes_{F_i} \tilde{F}_i.$$

Definition 2.14. (Resolvent Degree of Generically Finite, Dominant Maps)

Let $Y \dashrightarrow X$ be a generically finite, dominant, rational map of \mathbb{C} -varieties. The **resolvent degree** of $Y \dashrightarrow X$, denoted $\text{RD}(Y \dashrightarrow X)$, is the minimum d for which there is a tower of generically finite, dominant, rational maps

$$E_\ell \dashrightarrow \cdots \dashrightarrow E_1 \dashrightarrow E_0 \subseteq X$$

such that $E_0 \subseteq X$ is a dense Zariski open; $E_\ell \dashrightarrow E_0$ factors through $Y \dashrightarrow X$; and for each $\pi_i : E_{i+1} \dashrightarrow E_i$, there exists a surjective morphism $\tilde{Z}_i \rightarrow Z_i$ with $\dim(Z_i) \leq d$, a Zariski open $E_i^\circ \subseteq E_i$, and a morphism $E_i^\circ \rightarrow Z_i$ such that

$$\pi_i^{-1}(E_i^\circ) \cong E_i^\circ \times_{Z_i} \tilde{Z}_i.$$

Remark 2.15. (Compatibility of Resolvent Degree Definitions)

We note that Definitions 2.13 and 2.14 are equivalent. For an irreducible, affine \mathbb{C} -variety X , the equivalence of definitions is derived from the classical equivalence which sends X to its function field $\mathbb{C}(X)$; the general case follows from invariance of resolvent degree under birational equivalence. We refer the reader to [FW2019] for details.

Remark 2.16. (RD(n) Notation)

We write $\text{RD}(n)$ for the resolvent degree of the general degree n polynomial. Recall that $K_n = \mathbb{C}(a_1, \dots, a_n)$. If $f(z) = z^n + a_1 z^{n-1} + \cdots + a_{n-1} z + a_n \in K_n[z]$, and $K'_n = K_n[z]/(f(z))$, then

$$\text{RD}(n) = \text{RD}(K'_n/K_n) = \text{RD}(\text{Spec}(K'_n) \rightarrow \text{Spec}(K_n)).$$

Remark 2.17. (RD of a Composition)

We will frequently use the following field-theoretic version of Lemma 2.7 of [FW2019] without explicit reference: given a tower of field extensions

$$E_0 \hookrightarrow E_1 \hookrightarrow \cdots \hookrightarrow E_k,$$

the resolvent degree of the composition is the maximum of the resolvent degree of the components, e.g.

$$\text{RD}(E_k/E_0) = \max \{ \text{RD}(E_j/E_{j-1}) \mid 1 \leq j \leq k \}.$$

Lemma 2.18. (Upper Bound on $\text{RD}(L/K)$)

Let L/K be a degree ℓ field extension. Then, $\text{RD}(L/K) \leq \text{RD}(\ell)$.

Proof. As L and K are \mathbb{C} -fields, they have characteristic zero. Hence, the Primitive Element Theorem yields that we need only solve a degree ℓ polynomial to determine a primitive element ζ of L/K . The isomorphism $L \cong K(\zeta)$ then establishes the claim. \square

We will frequently make use of the previous lemma without explicit reference after giving an upper bound on the degree of an extension.

Proposition 2.19. (Determining Rational Points over Extensions)

Let $V \subseteq \mathbb{P}_K^r$ be a degree d subvariety. Then, there is an extension L/K with $\text{RD}(L/K) \leq \text{RD}(d)$ over which we can determine a rational point of V .

Proof. Set $\ell = \dim(V)$. For a generic $(r - \ell)$ -plane Λ , the intersection $V \cap \Lambda$ has dimension 0 and thus has d \overline{K} -points (with multiplicity) in any algebraic closure \overline{K} of K ; we denote these points by Q_1, \dots, Q_d . Observe that the polynomial

$$f(z) = (z - Q_1)(z - Q_2) \cdots (z - Q_d)$$

has coefficients defined over K . Let $m(z)$ be an irreducible factor of $f(z)$ over K . We set $L := K[z]/(m(z))$ and observe that we can determine an L -point of V by construction. Lemma 2.18 yields that $\text{RD}(L/K) \leq \text{RD}(d)$. \square

Remark 2.20. (Extensions Given By Solving Polynomials)

Given Proposition 2.19, we henceforth say that we can determine a point of V by solving a degree d polynomial.

2.3 Iterated Polar Cones and k -Polar Points

As we have established, for an intersection of hypersurfaces V and $P \in V(K)$, points of $\mathcal{C}(V; P) \setminus \{P\}$ determine lines on V . Next, we will iterate the polar cone construction in a method to determine k -planes on intersections of hypersurfaces (as in Lemma 2.24). To do so, we must first introduce additional definitions and notation.

Remark 2.21. (Linear Subvarieties)

- For any points $P_0, \dots, P_k \in \mathbb{P}^r(K)$, we denote the linear subvariety they determine by $L(P_0, \dots, P_k)$. Note that $L(P_0, \dots, P_k)$ has dimension at most k .
- Henceforth, when we say k -plane, we mean a linear subvariety of \mathbb{P}^r of dimension k . When $k = 1$, we say line instead of 1-plane and when $k = 2$, we say plane instead of 2-plane.

Definition 2.22. (Iterated Polar Cones & k -Polar Points)

Let $V \subseteq \mathbb{P}_K^r$ be an intersection of hypersurfaces and $P_0 \in V(K)$; we set $\mathcal{C}^1(V; P_0) := \mathcal{C}(V; P_0)$. Given additional points $P_1, \dots, P_{k-1} \in V(K)$ such that

$$P_{\ell-1} \in \mathcal{C}^{\ell-1}(V; P_0, \dots, P_{\ell-2}) \setminus L(P_0, \dots, P_{\ell-2}) \tag{2}$$

for $0 \leq \ell \leq k - 1$, the k^{th} **polar cone of V at P_0, \dots, P_{k-1}** is

$$\mathcal{C}^k(V; P_0, \dots, P_{k-1}) := \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{C}^{k-1}(V; P_0, \dots, P_{k-2}), P_{k-1}).$$

We refer to an ordered collection of points (P_0, \dots, P_k) that satisfy (2) for each $0 \leq \ell \leq k - 1$ as a **k -polar point** of V .

When the points in question have already been specified, we simply refer to *the k^{th} polar cone of V* . When such points exist but have not been specified, we refer to *a k^{th} polar cone of V* . It is occasionally useful to refer to V itself as a zeroth polar cone of V (at any rational point of V).

Remark 2.23. (Iterated Polar Cones Are Nested)

Note that if (P_0, \dots, P_k) is a k -polar point of an intersection of hypersurfaces $V \subseteq \mathbb{P}_K^r$, then

$$\mathcal{C}^k(V; P_0, \dots, P_{k-1}) \subseteq \mathcal{C}^{k-1}(V; P_0, \dots, P_{k-2}) \subseteq \cdots \subseteq \mathcal{C}^2(V; P_0, P_1) \subseteq \mathcal{C}^1(V; P_0) = \mathcal{C}(V; P_0).$$

Lemma 2.24. (Polar Point Lemma)

Let $V \subseteq \mathbb{P}_K^r$ be an intersection of hypersurfaces and let (P_0, \dots, P_k) be a k -polar point of V . Then, $L(P_0, \dots, P_k) \subseteq V$ is a k -plane.

Proof. We prove the claim by induction on k and observe that the case of $k = 1$ follows immediately from Lemma 2.11. Now, consider arbitrary $k > 1$ and let (P_0, \dots, P_k) be a k -polar point of V . Then, (P_1, \dots, P_k) is a $(k - 1)$ -polar point of $\mathcal{C}(V; P_0)$. Recall that $\mathcal{C}(V; P_0)$ is a cone and $L(P_1, \dots, P_k) \subseteq \mathcal{C}(V; P_0)$ is a $(k - 1)$ -plane which does not contain the vertex P_0 , hence $L(P_0, \dots, P_k) \subseteq V$ is a k -plane. \square

Definition 2.25. (Type of an Intersection of Hypersurfaces)

Given an intersection of hypersurfaces $V \subseteq \mathbb{P}_K^r$, we say that V is of **type** $\begin{bmatrix} d & d-1 & \cdots & 2 & 1 \\ \ell_d & \ell_{d-1} & \cdots & \ell_2 & \ell_1 \end{bmatrix}$ if V has multi-degree

$$\underbrace{(d, \dots, d)}_{\ell_d \text{ many}} \underbrace{(d-1, \dots, d-1)}_{\ell_{d-1} \text{ many}} \cdots \underbrace{(2, \dots, 2)}_{\ell_2 \text{ many}} \underbrace{(1, \dots, 1)}_{\ell_1 \text{ many}}.$$

If $\ell_j = 0$ for any $1 \leq j \leq d-1$, we may omit it in the presentation; e.g. an intersection of four quadrics is of type $\begin{bmatrix} 2 \\ 4 \end{bmatrix}$. When $d \geq 2$ and each $\ell_j = 1$, we abbreviate the notation and say V is of type $(1, \dots, d)$. When $d \geq 2$, $\ell_1 = 0$, and the other $\ell_j = 1$, we say V is of type $(2, \dots, d)$.

Consider an intersection of hypersurfaces $V = V_d \cap \cdots \cap V_1$ of type $(1, \dots, d)$ in \mathbb{P}_K^r with $\deg(V_j) = j$. Note that $V_1 \cong \mathbb{P}_K^{r-1}$ and thus we can also consider V as an intersection of hypersurfaces of type $(2, \dots, d)$ inside $V_1 \cong \mathbb{P}_K^{r-1}$.

Proposition 2.26. (Type of a k^{th} Polar Cone of an Intersection of Type $(1, \dots, d)$)

Let $V \subseteq \mathbb{P}_K^r$ be an intersection of hypersurfaces of type $(1, \dots, d)$ and take $k \geq 1$. A k^{th} polar cone $\mathcal{C}^k(V; P_0, \dots, P_{k-1})$ is of type

$$\begin{bmatrix} d & d-1 & d-2 & \cdots & 3 & 2 & 1 \\ 1 & k+1 & \binom{k+2}{2} & \cdots & \binom{k+d-3}{d-3} & \binom{k+d-2}{d-2} & \binom{k+d-1}{d-1} \end{bmatrix}$$

for $r \geq \binom{k+d}{d-1}$.

Proof. We proceed by induction on k and note that the $k = 1$ case follows from the definition of a polar cone of an intersection of hypersurfaces, along with the observation that $\binom{1+j}{j} = 1 + j$ for each $2 \leq j \leq n - 1$.

Now, suppose the claim is true for an arbitrary k . The number of hypersurfaces of degree j in a $(k+1)^{\text{st}}$ polar cone is exactly the number of hypersurfaces of degree at least j in a k^{th} polar cone, e.g. $\sum_{i=0}^j \binom{k+i}{i}$. However,

$$\sum_{i=0}^j \binom{k+i}{i} = \binom{k+j+1}{j} = \binom{(k+1)+j}{j},$$

by induction on j , using that $\binom{a}{b} = \binom{a-1}{b} + \binom{a-1}{b-1}$ for positive integers $a > b$. This combinatorial argument also yields that $\sum_{i=0}^{d-1} \binom{k+i}{i} = \binom{k+d}{d-1}$. \square

In Subsection 3.2, we will use iterated polar cones to establish new upper bounds on $\text{RD}(n)$. We first use iterated polar cones to determine k -planes on intersections of quadrics.

Proposition 2.27. (k -Polar Points Intersections of Quadrics)

Let $V \subseteq \mathbb{P}_K^r$ be an intersection of hypersurfaces of type $\begin{bmatrix} 2 \\ \ell \end{bmatrix}$ and take $k \geq 1$. For $r \geq (k+1)\ell + k$, we can determine a k -polar point (P_0, \dots, P_k) over an extension L/K with $\text{RD}(L/K) \leq \text{RD}(2^\ell)$. Moreover, for any point $P \in V(K)$, we can determine a k -plane containing P over such an extension L .

Proof. When $r > (k+1)\ell + k$, we can restrict to an arbitrary $(k+1)\ell + k$ -plane in \mathbb{P}_K^r and hence it suffices to consider the case where $r = (k+1)\ell + k$. Note that for a quadric hypersurface, a k^{th} polar cone consists of the original quadric and k hyperplanes (e.g. is of type $\begin{bmatrix} 2 & 1 \\ 1 & k \end{bmatrix}$). Hence, a k^{th} polar cone of V has type $\begin{bmatrix} 2 & 1 \\ \ell & k\ell \end{bmatrix}$. We proceed by induction on k .

When $k = 1$ and $r = 2\ell + 1$, $\dim(V) \geq \ell + 1 > 0$ and Proposition 2.19 allows us to determine a point $P_0 \in V(L_1)$ over an extension L_1/K of degree 2^ℓ . The polar cone $\mathcal{C}(V; P_0)$ is of type $\begin{bmatrix} 2 & 1 \\ \ell & \ell \end{bmatrix}$, hence

$$\dim(\mathcal{C}(V; P_0)) \geq (2\ell + 1) - (2\ell) = 1 > 0.$$

We use Proposition 2.19 to determine a point $P_1 \in \mathcal{C}(V; P_0)(L) \setminus \{P_0\}$ over an extension L/L_1 of resolvent degree at most $\text{RD}(2^\ell)$. Note that (P_0, P_1) is a 1-polar point of V by construction.

We now consider the case of an arbitrary $k > 1$. By induction, we pass to an extension L_1/K of degree at most 2^ℓ to determine a $(k-1)$ -polar point (P_0, \dots, P_{k-1}) of V . Observe that

$$\dim(\mathcal{C}^k(V; P_0, \dots, P_{k-1})) \geq (k+1)\ell + k - (k+1)\ell \geq k.$$

By Proposition 2.19, we can pass to an extension L/L_1 of degree at most 2^ℓ to determine an L -rational point P_k of $\mathcal{C}^k(V; P_0, \dots, P_{k-1}) \setminus L(P_0, \dots, P_{k-1})$. By construction, (P_0, \dots, P_k) is a k -polar point of V .

For the final claim, note that we can replace P_0 with P in the proof and then Lemma 2.24 yields $L(P, P_1, \dots, P_k)$ is a suitable k -plane. \square

3 New Upper Bounds on $\text{RD}(n)$

3.1 Tschirnhaus Transformations

We recall pertinent information about Tschirnhaus transformations here and refer the reader to [Wol2021] for a more complete treatment. Recall that $K_n = \mathbb{C}(a_1, \dots, a_n)$, a purely transcendental extension of \mathbb{C} with transcendence basis a_1, \dots, a_n .

Definition 3.1. (General Polynomials)

The **general polynomial of degree n** is the polynomial

$$\phi_n(z) = z^n + a_1 z^{n-1} + \dots + a_{n-1} z + a_n \in K_n[z].$$

Definition 3.2. (Tschirnhaus Transformations)

A **Tschirnhaus transformation** of the general degree n polynomial is an isomorphism of K_n -fields

$$K_n[z]/(\phi_n(z)) \cong K_n[z]/(\psi(z)),$$

where

$$\psi(z) = z^n + b_1 z^{n-1} + \dots + b_{n-1} z + b_n.$$

It has **type** (j_1, \dots, j_k) if $b_{j_1} = \dots = b_{j_k} = 0$.

Remark 3.3. (Description of Tschirnhaus Transformations)

Given primitive elements ζ_ϕ of $K_n[z]/(\phi_n(z))$ and ζ_ψ of $K_n[z]/(\psi(z))$, every K_n -algebra isomorphism $\Upsilon : K_n[z]/(\phi_n(z)) \rightarrow K_n[z]/(\psi(z))$ is determined by $\Upsilon(\zeta_\phi)$, which is a K_n -linear combination of powers of ζ_ψ :

$$\Upsilon(\zeta_\phi) = w_0 + w_1 \zeta_\psi + \dots + w_{n-1} \zeta_\psi^{n-1}.$$

Note that Υ is an isomorphism exactly when there is some $j \geq 1$ such that $w_j \neq 0$. Let $\mathbb{A}_{K_n}^n$ be the affine space with coordinates w_0, \dots, w_{n-1} and denote the w_0 -axis of $\mathbb{A}_{K_n}^n$ by $\mathbb{A}_{K_n,0}^1$. Corollary 3.3 of [Wol2021] shows that the space of Tschirnhaus transformations is exactly

$$\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_{K_n}^n = \mathbb{A}_{K_n}^n \setminus \mathbb{A}_{K_n,0}^1.$$

However, we need only work with Tschirnhaus transformations up to re-scaling. Let $\mathbb{P}_{K_n}^{n-1}$ denote the projective space with coordinates w_0, \dots, w_{n-1} and observe that the space of Tschirnhaus transformations up to re-scaling is

$$\mathcal{T}_{K_n}^n = \mathbb{P}_{K_n}^{n-1} \setminus \{[1 : 0 : \dots : 0]\}.$$

Moreover, each b_m in Definition 3.2 is a homogenous polynomial of degree m in the w_0, \dots, w_{n-1} with coefficients in K_n (e.g. an element of $K_n[w_0, \dots, w_{n-1}]_{(m)}$). In the following definition, we build upon the language used in [Wol2021].

Definition 3.4. (Tschirnhaus Complete Intersections)

Fix $n \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}$. For any $m \in \{1, \dots, n\}$, the m^{th} **extended Tschirnhaus hypersurface** is

$$\tau_m := \mathbb{V}(b_m) \subseteq \mathbb{P}_{K_n}^n,$$

and the m^{th} **extended Tschirnhaus complete intersection** is

$$\tau_{1, \dots, m} := \tau_1 \cap \dots \cap \tau_m \subseteq \mathbb{P}_{K_n}^n.$$

Similarly, the m^{th} **Tschirnhaus hypersurface** is

$$\tau_m^\circ := \tau_m \cap \mathcal{T}_{K_n}^n = \tau_m \setminus \{[1 : 0 : \dots : 0]\},$$

and the m^{th} **Tschirnhaus complete intersection** is

$$\tau_{1, \dots, m}^\circ := \tau_{1, \dots, m} \cap \mathcal{T}_{K_n}^n \setminus \{[1 : 0 : \dots : 0]\}.$$

Remark 3.5. (RD Bounds from Tschirnhaus Transformations)

Given a Tschirnhaus transformation Υ (up to re-scaling) of type $(1, \dots, m-1)$ of $\phi_n(z)$ (i.e. a point of $\tau_{1, \dots, m-1}^\circ$), we need only consider the normal form

$$z^n + b_m z^{n-m} + \dots + b_{n-1} z + b_n, \tag{3}$$

as Υ^{-1} takes the roots of (3) to the roots of ϕ_n . We can then re-scale the roots over $\sqrt[n]{b_n}$ (over a cyclic extension) and arrive at the normal form

$$z^n + c_m z^{n-m} + \dots + c_{n-1} z + 1. \tag{4}$$

Note that (4) is an algebraic function of $n-m$ variables and so if we can determine an L -rational point of $\tau_{1, \dots, m-1}^\circ$ over an extension L/K_n of sufficiently small resolvent degree, we can conclude that $\text{RD}(n) \leq n-m$.

3.2 New Bounds From Iterated Polar Cones

Definition 3.6. (Sub-Intersections of Given Level)

Let $V \subseteq \mathbb{P}_K^r$ be an intersection of hypersurfaces of type $\begin{bmatrix} d & d-1 & \dots & 2 & 1 \\ \ell_d & \ell_{d-1} & \dots & \ell_2 & \ell_1 \end{bmatrix}$ defined by

$$V = \bigcap_{i=1}^d \bigcap_{j=1}^{\ell_i} \mathbb{V}(f_{i,j}),$$

with $\deg(f_{i,j}) = i$ for all $1 \leq j \leq \ell_i$. For each $1 \leq d' \leq d$, the **sub-intersection of V of level d'** is the intersection of all defining hypersurfaces of V of degree d' and is denoted $V_{d'}$, i.e.

$$V_{d'} := \mathbb{V}(f_{d',1}) \cap \dots \cap \mathbb{V}(f_{d',\ell_{d'}}).$$

Theorem 3.7. (The $n-6$ Bound)

For $n \geq 21$, $\text{RD}(n) \leq n-6$.

Proof. First, suppose that we can determine a plane $\Lambda \subseteq \tau_{1,2,3}^\circ$ over an extension of K_n of low resolvent degree. Observe that $\deg(\Lambda \cap \tau_{1,\dots,5}) = 20$ and, by Proposition 2.19, we can solve a polynomial of degree at most 20 to determine a point Q of $\Lambda \cap \tau_{1,\dots,5}$.

From Lemma 2.24, it suffices to determine a 2-polar point (P_0, P_1, P_2) on $\tau_{1,2,3} \subseteq \mathcal{T}^n$ such that $L(P_0, P_1, P_2) \subseteq \tau_{1,2,3}^\circ$ for $n = 20$ over a suitable extension. Indeed, we show the stronger claim that we can determine such a 2-polar point of $\tau_{1,2,3}$ when $n = 19$ over an extension of resolvent degree at most $\text{RD}(12)$, which implies the result for larger n .

Recall that when $n = 19$, we work in $\mathbb{P}_{K_n}^{18}$ (as in Remark 3.3). To ensure that the plane Λ associated to the 2-polar point we determine lies in $\tau_{1,2,3}^\circ$, we pass to a hyperplane H which does not contain $[1 : 0 : \dots : 0]$. We can determine a point $P_0 \in (\tau_{1,2,3} \cap H)(L_1)$, where L_1/K_n is an extension of degree 6, by Proposition 2.19. The polar cone $\mathcal{C}(\tau_{1,2,3} \cap H; P_0)$ has type $\begin{bmatrix} 3 & 2 & 1 \\ 1 & 2 & 4 \end{bmatrix}$ and so

$$\dim(\mathcal{C}(\tau_{1,2,3} \cap H; P_0)) \geq 18 - 7 = 11.$$

Hence, we can determine a point $P_1 \in \mathcal{C}(\tau_{1,2,3} \cap H; P_0)(L_2) \setminus \{P_0\}$ over a degree 12 extension L_2/L_1 .

The second polar cone $\mathcal{C}^2(\tau_{1,2,3} \cap H; P_0, P_1)$ has type $\begin{bmatrix} 3 & 2 & 1 \\ 1 & 3 & 7 \end{bmatrix}$. As $\mathcal{C}^2(\tau_{1,2,3} \cap H; P_0, P_1)_1$ is the intersection of 7 hyperplanes, $\mathcal{C}^2(\tau_{1,2,3} \cap H; P_0, P_1)_1 \cong \mathbb{P}_{L_2}^{11}$. Denote one of the quadrics defining $\mathcal{C}^2(\tau_{1,2,3} \cap H; P_0, P_1)$ by U . Applying Proposition 2.27 to $U \cap \mathcal{C}^2(\tau_{1,2,3} \cap H; P_0, P_1)_1$ (with $\ell = 1$ and $k = 5$) yields that we can determine a 5-plane $\Lambda' \subseteq U \cap \mathcal{C}^2(\tau_{1,2,3} \cap H; P_0, P_1)_1$ over a quadratic extension L_3/L_2 . Note that $\mathcal{C}^2(\tau_{1,2,3} \cap H; P_0, P_1) \cap \Lambda'$ has type $\begin{bmatrix} 3 & 2 \\ 1 & 2 \end{bmatrix}$ inside Λ' and

$$\dim(\mathcal{C}^2(\tau_{1,2,3} \cap H; P_0, P_1) \cap \Lambda') \geq 5 - 3 \geq 2.$$

Thus, we can determine a point $P_2 \in (\mathcal{C}^2(\tau_{1,2,3} \cap H; P_0, P_1) \cap \Lambda') \setminus L(P_0, P_1)$ over an extension L_4/L_3 of degree

$$\deg(\mathcal{C}^2(\tau_{1,2,3} \cap H; P_0, P_1) \cap \Lambda') = 3 \cdot 2^2 = 12,$$

and (P_0, P_1, P_2) is a 2-polar point of $\tau_{1,2,3} \cap H$ by construction. \square

Remark 3.8. (Fixing Gaps in [Che1954])

As noted in Section 1, Chebotarev gave an argument that $\text{RD}(n) \leq n - 6$ for $n \geq 21$ in [Che1954]. However, his argument had gaps (similar to those of Wiman in [Wim1927] and which are also in the translation [Sut2021A]). There are two specific issues. First, Chebotarev uses a geometric argument of Wiman which assumed without proof that certain intersections of hypersurfaces in affine space were generic (see p.190-191 of [Che1954] or p.3 of the translation [Sut2021B]). Additionally, Lemma 1 and Lemma 2 of [Che1954] (Lemma 2.1 and Lemma 2.2 of the translation [Sut2021B]) also assume, but do not prove, that certain intersections of affine hypersurfaces are generic. The above proof of Theorem 3.7 fixes the issues associated to the use of Lemma 1 and Lemma 2 in the proof of the un-numbered theorem of [Che1954] (Theorem 2.3 of [Sut2021B]). Additionally, this argument can be adapted to give a geometric proof of Wiman's claims, although Dixmier has already given an algebraic proof in the appendix of [Dix1993].

Remark 3.9. (Notation for Theorem 3.10)

We move from finding a plane on $\tau_{1,2,3}^\circ$ to finding k -planes on $\tau_{1,2,3,4}^\circ$ to improve the bound on n for which $\text{RD}(n) \leq n - m$ for m between 7 and 14. To simplify the statement of Theorem 3.10, we introduce two functions $\rho : \{1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9\} \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$ and $\eta : \{1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9\} \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}$. For each k , $\rho(k)$ is the ambient dimension needed in our method to determine a k -plane on $\tau_{1,2,3,4}$ and $\eta(k)$ is the degree of the largest extension needed. The functions ρ and η are defined by the following values:

| k | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 |
|-----------|----|-----|-----|-----|------|------|-------|-------|--------|
| $\rho(k)$ | 25 | 60 | 264 | 806 | 1773 | 8905 | 34546 | 77040 | 612581 |
| $\eta(k)$ | 36 | 108 | 324 | 972 | 2916 | 8748 | 26244 | 78732 | 236196 |

Theorem 3.10. (The $n - 7, \dots, n - 14$ Bounds)

1. For $n \geq 109$, $\text{RD}(n) \leq n - 7$.
2. For $n \geq 325$, $\text{RD}(n) \leq n - 8$.
3. For each $9 \leq \ell \leq 14$ and $n > \frac{(\ell-1)!}{24}$, $\text{RD}(n) \leq n - \ell$.

Proof. We claim that we can determine a k -plane $\Lambda \subseteq \tau_{1,2,3,4}^\circ$ over an extension of K_n of resolvent degree at most $\text{RD}(\eta(k))$ when $n \geq \rho(k)$. Given this claim, $\Lambda \cap \tau_{1,\dots,k+4}$ has degree $\frac{(k+4)!}{24}$. By Proposition 2.19, we can solve a polynomial of degree at most $\frac{(k+4)!}{24}$ to determine a point Q of $\Lambda \cap \tau_{1,\dots,k+4}^\circ$. Then, the new bounds on resolvent degree follow immediately from Remark 3.5. Note that for the $n - 7$ bound (respectively, $n - 8$ bound), $k = 2$ (respectively, $k = 3$) and $\eta(k) \geq \frac{(k+4)!}{24}$.

It remains to determine the k -planes on $\tau_{1,2,3,4}^\circ$ and, by Lemma 2.24, it suffices to construct a k -polar point (P_0, \dots, P_k) of $\tau_{1,2,3,4}$ which does not contain $[1 : 0 : \dots : 0]$. For each k , it suffices to prove the claim when $n = \rho(k)$, as we can always restrict to a $\mathbb{P}_{K_n}^{\rho(k)}$ when $n > \rho(k)$. In each case, we immediately pass to a hypersurface which does not contain $[1 : 0 : \dots : 0]$ and, to simplify notation, the computations that follow all start within this hypersurface. Recall that the space of Tschirnhaus transformations (up to re-scaling) is $\mathbb{P}_{K_n}^{n-1}$ and we are passing to a hypersurface, so for each k we work in a $\mathbb{P}_{K_n}^{\rho(k)-2}$. In each case, the extensions will be enumerated as L_j and we always begin with L_1/K_n . Similarly, the k -planes we determine will be enumerated as Λ_ℓ and we always begin with Λ_1 . Additionally, Proposition 2.26 gives the type of the relevant polar cone.

Case: $k = 1$. Recall that $\rho(1) = 25$ and thus we work in $\mathbb{P}_{K_n}^{23}$. By Proposition 2.19, we can determine a point P_0 of $\tau_{1,2,3,4}$ over an extension L_1/K_n of degree at most 24. The polar cone $\mathcal{C}(\tau_{1,2,3,4}; P_0)$ has type $\begin{bmatrix} 4 & 3 & 2 & 1 \\ 1 & 2 & 3 & 4 \end{bmatrix}$. Note that $\mathcal{C}(\tau_{1,2,3,4}; P_0)_1$ is an intersection of 4 hyperplanes and thus $\mathcal{C}(\tau_{1,2,3,4}; P_0)_1 \cong \mathbb{P}_{L_1}^{19}$.

Since $\mathcal{C}(\tau_{1,2,3,4}; P_0)_2 \cap \mathcal{C}(\tau_{1,2,3,4}; P_0)_1$ has type $\begin{bmatrix} 2 \\ 3 \end{bmatrix}$ inside $\mathcal{C}(\tau_{1,2,3,4}; P_0)_1$ and

$$19 = (4 + 1)(3) + 4,$$

Proposition 2.27 (with $k = 4$ and $\ell = 3$) allows us to determine a 4-plane $\Lambda_1 \subseteq \mathcal{C}(\tau_{1,2,3,4}; P_0)_2 \cap \mathcal{C}(\tau_{1,2,3,4}; P_0)_1$ over an extension L_2/L_1 of degree at most 8. Observe that $\mathcal{C}(\tau_{1,2,3,4}; P_0) \cap \Lambda_1$ has type $\begin{bmatrix} 4 & 1 \\ 1 & 2 \end{bmatrix}$, hence

$$\dim(\mathcal{C}(\tau_{1,2,3,4}; P_0) \cap \Lambda_1) \geq 4 - 3 \geq 1.$$

Consequently, we can determine a rational point P_1 of $\mathcal{C}(\tau_{1,2,3,4}; P_0) \setminus \{P_0\}$ over an extension L_3/L_2 of degree at most 36. By construction, (P_0, P_1) is a 1-polar point of $\tau_{1,2,3,4}$.

Case: $k = 2$. Note that $\rho(2) = 60$, so we work in $\mathbb{P}_{K_n}^{58}$. From the $k = 1$ case, we pass to an extension L_1/K_n of resolvent degree at most $\text{RD}(36)$ and assume that we have a 1-polar point (P_0, P_1) . The second polar cone $\mathcal{C}^2(\tau_{1,2,3,4}; P_0, P_1)$ has type $\begin{bmatrix} 4 & 3 & 2 & 1 \\ 1 & 3 & 6 & 10 \end{bmatrix}$. Observe that $\mathcal{C}^2(\tau_{1,2,3,4}; P_0, P_1)_1$ is an intersection of 10 hyperplanes, hence $\mathcal{C}^2(\tau_{1,2,3,4}; P_0, P_1)_1 \cong \mathbb{P}_{L_1}^{48}$. Moreover, $\mathcal{C}^2(\tau_{1,2,3,4}; P_0, P_1)_2 \cap \mathcal{C}^2(\tau_{1,2,3,4}; P_0, P_1)_1$ has type $\begin{bmatrix} 2 \\ 6 \end{bmatrix}$ in $\mathcal{C}^2(\tau_{1,2,3,4}; P_0, P_1)_1$ and

$$48 = (5 + 1)(6) + 5.$$

Thus, applying Proposition 2.27 (with $k = 5$ and $\ell = 6$) allows us to determine a 5-plane $\Lambda_1 \subseteq \mathcal{C}^2(\tau_{1,2,3,4}; P_0, P_1)_2 \cap \mathcal{C}^2(\tau_{1,2,3,4}; P_0, P_1)_1$ over an extension L_2/L_1 of degree at most 64. Note that $\mathcal{C}^2(\tau_{1,2,3,4}; P_0, P_1) \cap \Lambda_1$ has type $\begin{bmatrix} 4 & 3 \\ 1 & 3 \end{bmatrix}$ inside Λ_1 , hence

$$\dim(\mathcal{C}^2(\tau_{1,2,3,4}; P_0, P_1) \cap \Lambda_1) \geq 6 - 4 \geq 2.$$

As a result, we can determine a rational point P_2 of $\mathcal{C}^2(\tau_{1,2,3,4}; P_0, P_1) \setminus L(P_0, P_1)$ over an extension L_3/L_2 of degree at most 108 and our method ensures that (P_0, P_1, P_2) is a 2-polar point of $\tau_{1,2,3,4}$.

Case: $k = 3$. Recall that $\rho(3) = 264$ and so we work in $\mathbb{P}_{K_n}^{262}$. Using the $k = 2$ case, we pass to an extension L_1/K_n of resolvent degree at most RD(108) and assume that we have a 2-polar point (P_0, P_1, P_2) . Observe that the third polar cone $\mathcal{C}^3(\tau_{1,2,3,4}; P_0, P_1, P_2)$ has type $\begin{bmatrix} 4 & 3 & 2 & 1 \\ 1 & 4 & 10 & 20 \end{bmatrix}$. Thus, $\mathcal{C}^3(\tau_{1,2,3,4}; P_0, P_1, P_2)_1$ is an intersection of 35 hyperplanes and $\mathcal{C}^3(\tau_{1,2,3,4}; P_0, P_1, P_2)_1 \cong \mathbb{P}_{L_1}^{242}$. Inside $\mathcal{C}^3(\tau_{1,2,3,4}; P_0, P_1, P_2)_1$, $\mathcal{C}^3(\tau_{1,2,3,4}; P_0, P_1, P_2)_2 \cap \mathcal{C}^3(\tau_{1,2,3,4}; P_0, P_1, P_2)_1$ has type $\begin{bmatrix} 2 \\ 10 \end{bmatrix}$. However, $2^8 = 256$ is the largest power of 2 less than $4 \cdot 3^4 = 324$. As a result, we split $\mathcal{C}^3(\tau_{1,2,3,4}; P_0, P_1, P_2)_2$ into two intersections of quadrics:

$$\mathcal{C}^3(\tau_{1,2,3,4}; P_0, P_1, P_2)_2 = W_1 \cap W_2,$$

where W_1 has type $\begin{bmatrix} 2 \\ 2 \end{bmatrix}$ and W_2 has type $\begin{bmatrix} 2 \\ 8 \end{bmatrix}$. Next, observe that

$$242 = (80 + 1)(2) + 80,$$

and thus applying Proposition 2.27 (with $k = 75$ and $\ell = 2$) allows us to determine an 80-plane $\Lambda_1 \subseteq W_1 \cap \mathcal{C}^3(\tau_{1,2,3,4}; P_0, P_1, P_2)_1$ over an extension L_2/L_1 of degree at most 4. Also, $W_2 \cap \Lambda_1$ has type $\begin{bmatrix} 2 \\ 8 \end{bmatrix}$ in Λ_1 and

$$80 = (8 + 1)(8) + 8.$$

We then apply Proposition 2.27 (with $k = 8$ and $\ell = 8$) to determine an 8-plane $\Lambda_2 \subseteq W_2 \cap \Lambda_1$ over an extension L_3/L_2 of degree at most 256. Now, $\mathcal{C}^3(\tau_{1,2,3,4}; P_0, P_1, P_2) \cap \Lambda_2$ has type $\begin{bmatrix} 4 & 3 \\ 1 & 4 \end{bmatrix}$ in Λ_2 . Consequently,

$$\dim(\mathcal{C}^3(\tau_{1,2,3,4}; P_0, P_1, P_2) \cap \Lambda_2) \geq 8 - 5 \geq 3$$

and we can determine a rational point P_3 of $\mathcal{C}^3(\tau_{1,2,3,4}; P_0, P_1, P_2) \setminus L(P_0, P_1, P_2)$ over an extension L_4/L_3 of degree at most 324. By design, (P_0, P_1, P_2, P_3) is a 3-polar point of $\tau_{1,2,3,4}$.

Case: $k = 4$. Observe that $\rho(4) = 806$, hence we work in $\mathbb{P}_{K_n}^{804}$. By the $k = 3$ case, we pass to an extension L_1/K_n of resolvent degree at most RD(324) and assume that we have a 3-polar point (P_0, P_1, P_2, P_3) . Observe that the fourth polar cone $\mathcal{C}^4(\tau_{1,2,3,4}; P_0, \dots, P_3)$ has type $\begin{bmatrix} 4 & 3 & 2 & 1 \\ 1 & 5 & 15 & 35 \end{bmatrix}$. Thus, $\mathcal{C}^4(\tau_{1,2,3,4}; P_0, \dots, P_3)_1$ is an intersection of 35 hyperplanes and $\mathcal{C}^4(\tau_{1,2,3,4}; P_0, \dots, P_3)_1 \cong \mathbb{P}_{L_1}^{769}$. Note that $\mathcal{C}^4(\tau_{1,2,3,4}; P_0, \dots, P_3)_2 \cap \mathcal{C}^4(\tau_{1,2,3,4}; P_0, \dots, P_3)_1$ has type $\begin{bmatrix} 2 \\ 15 \end{bmatrix}$ in $\mathcal{C}^4(\tau_{1,2,3,4}; P_0, \dots, P_3)_1$ and $2^9 = 512$ is the largest power of 2 less than $4 \cdot 3^5 = 972$. Consequently, we split $\mathcal{C}^4(\tau_{1,2,3,4}; P_0, \dots, P_3)_2$ into two intersections of quadrics:

$$\mathcal{C}^4(\tau_{1,2,3,4}; P_0, \dots, P_3)_2 = W_1 \cap W_2,$$

where W_1 has type $\begin{bmatrix} 2 \\ 6 \end{bmatrix}$ and W_2 has type $\begin{bmatrix} 2 \\ 9 \end{bmatrix}$. We have that

$$769 = (109 + 1)(6) + 109,$$

and so by applying Proposition 2.27 (with $k = 109$ and $\ell = 6$), we can determine a 109-plane $\Lambda_1 \subseteq W_1 \cap \mathcal{C}^4(\tau_{1,2,3,4}; P_0, \dots, P_3)_1$ over an extension L_2/L_1 of degree at most 64. Similarly, $W_2 \cap \Lambda_1$ has type $\begin{bmatrix} 2 \\ 9 \end{bmatrix}$ in Λ_1 and

$$109 = (10 + 1)(9) + 10.$$

By applying Proposition 2.27 (with $k = 10$ and $\ell = 9$), we determine an 8-plane $\Lambda_2 \subseteq W_2 \cap \Lambda_1$ over an extension L_3/L_2 of degree at most 512. It follows that $\mathcal{C}^4(\tau_{1,2,3,4}; P_0, \dots, P_3) \cap \Lambda_2$ has type $\begin{bmatrix} 4 & 3 \\ 1 & 5 \end{bmatrix}$ in Λ_2 . Consequently,

$$\dim(\mathcal{C}^4(\tau_{1,2,3,4}; P_0, \dots, P_3) \cap \Lambda_2) \geq 10 - 6 \geq 4$$

and we can determine a rational point P_4 of $\mathcal{C}^4(\tau_{1,2,3,4}; P_0, \dots, P_3) \setminus L(P_0, P_1, P_2, P_3)$ over an extension L_4/L_3 of degree at most 972. Indeed, (P_0, \dots, P_4) is a 4-polar point of $\tau_{1,2,3,4}$.

Case: $k = 5$. Observe that $\rho(5) = 1773$, hence we work in $\mathbb{P}_{K_n}^{1771}$. From the $k = 4$ case, we pass to an extension L_1/K_n of resolvent degree at most RD(972) and assume that we have a 4-polar point (P_0, \dots, P_4) . The fifth polar cone $\mathcal{C}^5(\tau_{1,2,3,4}; P_0, \dots, P_4)$ has type $\begin{bmatrix} 4 & 3 & 2 & 1 \\ 1 & 6 & 21 & 56 \end{bmatrix}$. Hence, $\mathcal{C}^5(\tau_{1,2,3,4}; P_0, \dots, P_4)_1$ is an intersection of 56 hyperplanes and $\mathcal{C}^5(\tau_{1,2,3,4}; P_0, \dots, P_4)_1 \cong \mathbb{P}_{L_1}^{1715}$. Note that $\mathcal{C}^5(\tau_{1,2,3,4}; P_0, \dots, P_4)_2 \cap \mathcal{C}^5(\tau_{1,2,3,4}; P_0, \dots, P_4)_1$ has type $\begin{bmatrix} 2 \\ 21 \end{bmatrix}$ in $\mathcal{C}^5(\tau_{1,2,3,4}; P_0, \dots, P_4)_1$. Observe that $2^{11} = 2048$ is the largest power of 2 less than $4 \cdot 3^6 = 2916$ and so we split $\mathcal{C}^5(\tau_{1,2,3,4}; P_0, \dots, P_4)_2$ into two intersections of quadrics:

$$\mathcal{C}^5(\tau_{1,2,3,4}; P_0, \dots, P_4)_2 = W_1 \cap W_2,$$

where W_1 has type $\begin{bmatrix} 2 \\ 10 \end{bmatrix}$ and W_2 has type $\begin{bmatrix} 2 \\ 11 \end{bmatrix}$. Note that

$$1715 = (155 + 1)(10) + 155,$$

and, by applying Proposition 2.27 (with $k = 155$ and $\ell = 10$), we can determine a 155-plane $\Lambda_1 \subseteq W_1 \cap \mathcal{C}^5(\tau_{1,2,3,4}; P_0, \dots, P_4)_1$ over an extension L_2/L_1 of degree at most 1024. Also, $W_2 \cap \Lambda_1$ has type $\begin{bmatrix} 2 \\ 11 \end{bmatrix}$ in Λ_1 and

$$155 = (12 + 1)(11) + 12,$$

so we can apply Proposition 2.27 (with $k = 12$ and $\ell = 11$) to determine a 10-plane $\Lambda_2 \subseteq W_2 \cap \Lambda_1$ over an extension L_3/L_2 of degree at most 2048. It follows that $\mathcal{C}^5(\tau_{1,2,3,4}; P_0, \dots, P_4) \cap \Lambda_2$ has type $\begin{bmatrix} 4 & 3 \\ 1 & 6 \end{bmatrix}$ in Λ_2 . Consequently,

$$\dim(\mathcal{C}^5(\tau_{1,2,3,4}; P_0, \dots, P_4) \cap \Lambda_2) \geq 12 - 7 \geq 5,$$

and we can determine a rational point P_5 of $\mathcal{C}^5(\tau_{1,2,3,4}; P_0, \dots, P_4) \setminus L(P_0, \dots, P_4)$ over an extension L_4/L_3 of degree at most 2916. By construction, (P_0, \dots, P_5) is a 5-polar point of $\tau_{1,2,3,4}$.

Case: $k = 6$. Recall that $\rho(6) = 8905$ and thus we work in $\mathbb{P}_{K_n}^{8903}$. Using the $k = 5$ case, we pass to an extension L_1/K_n of resolvent degree at most RD(2916) and assume that we have a 5-polar point (P_0, \dots, P_5) . The sixth polar cone $\mathcal{C}^6(\tau_{1,2,3,4}; P_0, \dots, P_5)$ has type $\begin{bmatrix} 4 & 3 & 2 & 1 \\ 1 & 7 & 28 & 84 \end{bmatrix}$. It follows that $\mathcal{C}^6(\tau_{1,2,3,4}; P_0, \dots, P_5)_1$ is an intersection of 84 hyperplanes, so $\mathcal{C}^6(\tau_{1,2,3,4}; P_0, \dots, P_5)_1 \cong \mathbb{P}_{L_1}^{8819}$. Note that $\mathcal{C}^6(\tau_{1,2,3,4}; P_0, \dots, P_5)_2 \cap \mathcal{C}^6(\tau_{1,2,3,4}; P_0, \dots, P_5)_1$ has type $\begin{bmatrix} 2 \\ 28 \end{bmatrix}$ in $\mathcal{C}^6(\tau_{1,2,3,4}; P_0, \dots, P_5)_1$ and $2^{13} = 8192$ is the largest power of 2 less than $4 \cdot 3^7 = 8748$. Consequently, we split $\mathcal{C}^6(\tau_{1,2,3,4}; P_0, \dots, P_5)_2$ into three intersections of quadrics:

$$\mathcal{C}^6(\tau_{1,2,3,4}; P_0, \dots, P_5)_2 = W_1 \cap W_2 \cap W_3,$$

where W_1 has type $\begin{bmatrix} 2 \\ 2 \end{bmatrix}$ and both W_2, W_3 have type $\begin{bmatrix} 2 \\ 13 \end{bmatrix}$. We have that

$$8819 = (2939 + 1)(2) + 2939,$$

and so by applying Proposition 2.27 (with $k = 2939$ and $\ell = 2$), we can determine a 2939-plane $\Lambda_1 \subseteq W_1 \cap \mathcal{C}^6(\tau_{1,2,3,4}; P_0, \dots, P_5)_1$ over an extension L_2/L_1 of degree at most 4. Additionally, $W_2 \cap \Lambda_1$ has type $\begin{bmatrix} 2 \\ 13 \end{bmatrix}$ inside Λ_1 and

$$2939 = (209 + 1)(13) + 209.$$

We then apply Proposition 2.27 (with $k = 209$ and $\ell = 13$) to determine a 209-plane $\Lambda_2 \subseteq W_2 \cap \Lambda_1$ over an extension L_3/L_2 of degree at most 8192. Similarly, $W_3 \cap \Lambda_2$ has type $\begin{bmatrix} 2 \\ 13 \end{bmatrix}$ in Λ_2 and

$$209 = (14 + 1)(13) + 14,$$

and thus we apply Proposition 2.27 (with $k = 14$ and $\ell = 13$) to determine a 14-plane $\Lambda_3 \subseteq W_3 \cap \Lambda_2$ over an extension L_4/L_3 of degree at most 8192. Observe that $\mathcal{C}^6(\tau_{1,2,3,4}; P_0, \dots, P_5) \cap \Lambda_3$ has type $\begin{bmatrix} 4 & 3 \\ 1 & 7 \end{bmatrix}$ inside Λ_3 and

$$\dim(\mathcal{C}^6(\tau_{1,2,3,4}; P_0, \dots, P_5) \cap \Lambda_3) \geq 14 - 8 \geq 6.$$

As a consequence, we can determine a rational point P_6 of $\mathcal{C}^6(\tau_{1,2,3,4}; P_0, \dots, P_5) \setminus L(P_0, \dots, P_5)$ over an extension L_5/L_4 of degree at most 8748. It follows that (P_0, \dots, P_6) is a 6-polar point of $\tau_{1,2,3,4}$.

Case: $k = 7$. Note that $\rho(7) = 34546$, so we work in $\mathbb{P}_{K_n}^{34544}$. By the $k = 6$ case, we pass to an extension L_1/K_n of resolvent degree at most RD(8748) and assume that we have a 6-polar point (P_0, \dots, P_6) . Observe that the seventh polar cone $\mathcal{C}^7(\tau_{1,2,3,4}; P_0, \dots, P_6)$ has type $\begin{bmatrix} 4 & 3 & 2 & 1 \\ 1 & 8 & 36 & 120 \end{bmatrix}$ and so $\mathcal{C}^7(\tau_{1,2,3,4}; P_0, \dots, P_6)_1$ is an intersection of 120 hyperplanes. Thus, $\mathcal{C}^7(\tau_{1,2,3,4}; P_0, \dots, P_6)_1 \cong \mathbb{P}_{L_1}^{34424}$. Inside $\mathcal{C}^7(\tau_{1,2,3,4}; P_0, \dots, P_6)_1$, $\mathcal{C}^7(\tau_{1,2,3,4}; P_0, \dots, P_6)_2 \cap \mathcal{C}^7(\tau_{1,2,3,4}; P_0, \dots, P_6)_1$ has type $\begin{bmatrix} 2 \\ 36 \end{bmatrix}$. Note that $2^{14} = 16384$ is the largest power of 2 less than $4 \cdot 3^8 = 26244$. Consequently, we split $\mathcal{C}^7(\tau_{1,2,3,4}; P_0, \dots, P_6)_2$ into three intersections of quadrics:

$$\mathcal{C}^7(\tau_{1,2,3,4}; P_0, \dots, P_6)_2 = W_1 \cap W_2 \cap W_3,$$

where W_1 has type $\begin{bmatrix} 2 \\ 8 \end{bmatrix}$ and both W_2, W_3 have type $\begin{bmatrix} 2 \\ 14 \end{bmatrix}$. We have that

$$34424 = (3824 + 1)(8) + 3824,$$

and apply Proposition 2.27 (with $k = 3824$ and $\ell = 8$) to determine a 3824-plane $\Lambda_1 \subseteq W_1 \cap \mathcal{C}^7(\tau_{1,2,3,4}; P_0, \dots, P_6)_1$ over an extension L_2/L_1 of degree at most 256. Additionally, $W_2 \cap \Lambda_1$ has type $\begin{bmatrix} 2 \\ 14 \end{bmatrix}$ inside Λ_1 and

$$3824 = (254 + 1)(14) + 254.$$

Consequently, we can apply Proposition 2.27 (with $k = 254$ and $\ell = 14$) to determine a 254-plane $\Lambda_2 \subseteq W_2 \cap \Lambda_1$ over an extension L_3/L_2 of degree at most 16384. Observe that $W_3 \cap \Lambda_2$ has type $\begin{bmatrix} 2 \\ 14 \end{bmatrix}$ in Λ_2 and

$$254 = (16 + 1)(14) + 16,$$

and so, by Proposition 2.27 (with $k = 16$ and $\ell = 14$) to determine a 16-plane $\Lambda_3 \subseteq W_3 \cap \Lambda_2$ over an extension L_4/L_3 of degree at most 16384. Observe that $\mathcal{C}^7(\tau_{1,2,3,4}; P_0, \dots, P_6) \cap \Lambda_3$ has type $\begin{bmatrix} 4 & 3 \\ 1 & 8 \end{bmatrix}$ inside Λ_3 and

$$\dim(\mathcal{C}^7(\tau_{1,2,3,4}; P_0, \dots, P_6) \cap \Lambda_3) \geq 16 - 9 \geq 7.$$

It follows that we can determine a rational point P_7 of $\mathcal{C}^7(\tau_{1,2,3,4}; P_0, \dots, P_6) \setminus L(P_0, \dots, P_6)$ over an extension L_5/L_4 of degree at most 26244. Note that (P_0, \dots, P_7) is a 7-polar point of $\tau_{1,2,3,4}$.

Case: $k = 8$. Recall that $\rho(8) = 77040$ and thus we work in $\mathbb{P}_{K_n}^{77038}$. By the $k = 7$ case, we pass to an extension L_1/K_n of resolvent degree at most RD(26244) and assume that we have a 7-polar point (P_0, \dots, P_7) . Observe that the eighth polar cone $\mathcal{C}^8(\tau_{1,2,3,4}; P_0, \dots, P_7)$ has type $\begin{bmatrix} 4 & 3 & 2 & 1 \\ 1 & 9 & 45 & 165 \end{bmatrix}$ and so $\mathcal{C}^8(\tau_{1,2,3,4}; P_0, \dots, P_7)_1$ is an intersection of 165 hyperplanes. Thus, $\mathcal{C}^8(\tau_{1,2,3,4}; P_0, \dots, P_7)_1 \cong \mathbb{P}_{L_1}^{76873}$ and $\mathcal{C}^8(\tau_{1,2,3,4}; P_0, \dots, P_7)_2 \cap \mathcal{C}^8(\tau_{1,2,3,4}; P_0, \dots, P_7)_1$ has type $\begin{bmatrix} 2 \\ 45 \end{bmatrix}$ inside $\mathcal{C}^8(\tau_{1,2,3,4}; P_0, \dots, P_7)_1$. We have that $2^{16} = 65536$ is the largest power of 2 less than $4 \cdot 3^9 = 78732$. Consequently, we split $\mathcal{C}^8(\tau_{1,2,3,4}; P_0, \dots, P_7)_2$ into three intersections of quadrics:

$$\mathcal{C}^8(\tau_{1,2,3,4}; P_0, \dots, P_7)_2 = W_1 \cap W_2 \cap W_3,$$

where W_1 has type $\begin{bmatrix} 2 \\ 13 \end{bmatrix}$ and both W_2, W_3 have type $\begin{bmatrix} 2 \\ 16 \end{bmatrix}$. Observe that

$$76873 = (5490 + 1)(13) + 5490.$$

Thus, we can apply Proposition 2.27 (with $k = 5490$ and $\ell = 13$) to determine a 5490-plane $\Lambda_1 \subseteq W_1 \cap \mathcal{C}^8(\tau_{1,2,3,4}; P_0, \dots, P_7)_1$ over an extension L_2/L_1 of degree at most 8192. We also have that $W_2 \cap \Lambda_1$ has type $\begin{bmatrix} 2 \\ 16 \end{bmatrix}$ inside Λ_1 and

$$5490 = (322 + 1)(16) + 322.$$

As a result, we apply Proposition 2.27 (with $k = 322$ and $\ell = 16$) to determine a 322-plane $\Lambda_2 \subseteq W_2 \cap \Lambda_1$ over an extension L_3/L_2 of degree at most 65536. Note that $W_3 \cap \Lambda_2$ has type $\begin{bmatrix} 2 \\ 16 \end{bmatrix}$ in Λ_2 and

$$322 = (18 + 1)(16) + 18,$$

and so Proposition 2.27 (with $k = 18$ and $\ell = 16$) allows us to determine an 18-plane $\Lambda_3 \subseteq W_3 \cap \Lambda_2$ over an extension L_4/L_3 of degree at most 65536. Observe that $\mathcal{C}^8(\tau_{1,2,3,4}; P_0, \dots, P_7) \cap \Lambda_3$ has type $\begin{bmatrix} 4 & 3 \\ 1 & 9 \end{bmatrix}$ inside Λ_3 and

$$\dim(\mathcal{C}^8(\tau_{1,2,3,4}; P_0, \dots, P_7) \cap \Lambda_3) \geq 18 - 10 \geq 8.$$

Consequently, we can determine a rational point P_8 of $\mathcal{C}^8(\tau_{1,2,3,4}; P_0, \dots, P_7) \setminus L(P_0, \dots, P_7)$ over an extension L_5/L_4 of degree at most 78732. By design, (P_0, \dots, P_8) is an 8-polar point of $\tau_{1,2,3,4}$.

Case: $k = 9$. Recall that $\rho(9) = 612581$ and thus we work in $\mathbb{P}_{K_n}^{612579}$. By the $k = 8$ case, we pass to an extension L_1/K_n of resolvent degree at most $\text{RD}(78732)$ and assume that we have a 8-polar point (P_0, \dots, P_8) . Note that the ninth polar cone $\mathcal{C}^9(\tau_{1,2,3,4}; P_0, \dots, P_8)$ has type $\begin{bmatrix} 4 & 3 & 2 & 1 \\ 1 & 10 & 55 & 220 \end{bmatrix}$. So, $\mathcal{C}^9(\tau_{1,2,3,4}; P_0, \dots, P_8)_1$ is an intersection of 220 hyperplanes and $\mathcal{C}^9(\tau_{1,2,3,4}; P_0, \dots, P_8)_1 \cong \mathbb{P}_{L_1}^{612359}$. Observe that $\mathcal{C}^9(\tau_{1,2,3,4}; P_0, \dots, P_8)_2 \cap \mathcal{C}^9(\tau_{1,2,3,4}; P_0, \dots, P_8)_1$ has type $\begin{bmatrix} 2 \\ 55 \end{bmatrix}$ inside $\mathcal{C}^9(\tau_{1,2,3,4}; P_0, \dots, P_8)_1$ and $2^{17} = 131072$ is the largest power of 2 less than $4 \cdot 3^{10} = 236196$. Correspondingly, we split $\mathcal{C}^9(\tau_{1,2,3,4}; P_0, \dots, P_8)_2$ into four intersections of quadrics:

$$\mathcal{C}^9(\tau_{1,2,3,4}; P_0, \dots, P_8)_2 = W_1 \cap W_2 \cap W_3 \cap W_4,$$

where W_1 has type $\begin{bmatrix} 2 \\ 4 \end{bmatrix}$ and all of W_2, W_3, W_4 have type $\begin{bmatrix} 2 \\ 17 \end{bmatrix}$. Note that

$$612359 = (122471 + 1)(4) + 122471,$$

and so, by Proposition 2.27 (with $k = 122471$ and $\ell = 4$), we can determine a 122471-plane $\Lambda_1 \subseteq W_1 \cap \mathcal{C}^9(\tau_{1,2,3,4}; P_0, \dots, P_8)_1$ over an extension L_2/L_1 of degree at most 16. Additionally, $W_2 \cap \Lambda_1$ has type $\begin{bmatrix} 2 \\ 17 \end{bmatrix}$ inside Λ_1 and

$$122471 = (6805 + 1)(17) + 6805.$$

As a result, we apply Proposition 2.27 (with $k = 6805$ and $\ell = 17$) to determine a 6805-plane $\Lambda_2 \subseteq W_2 \cap \Lambda_1$ over an extension L_3/L_2 of degree at most 131072. Note that $W_3 \cap \Lambda_2$ has type $\begin{bmatrix} 2 \\ 17 \end{bmatrix}$ in Λ_2 and

$$6805 = (377 + 1)(17) + 377.$$

and so Proposition 2.27 (with $k = 18$ and $\ell = 16$) allows us to determine an 18-plane $\Lambda_3 \subseteq W_3 \cap \Lambda_2$ over an extension L_4/L_3 of degree at most 65536. Also, $W_4 \cap \Lambda_3$ has type $\begin{bmatrix} 2 \\ 17 \end{bmatrix}$ in Λ_3 and

$$377 = (20 + 1)(17) + 20.$$

From Proposition 2.27 (with $k = 18$ and $\ell = 16$), we can determine a 20-plane $\Lambda_4 \subseteq W_4 \cap \Lambda_3$ over an extension L_5/L_4 of degree at most 131072. We have that $\mathcal{C}^9(\tau_{1,2,3,4}; P_0, \dots, P_8) \cap \Lambda_4$ has type $\begin{bmatrix} 4 & 3 \\ 1 & 10 \end{bmatrix}$ inside Λ_4 and

$$\dim(\mathcal{C}^9(\tau_{1,2,3,4}; P_0, \dots, P_8) \cap \Lambda_4) \geq 20 - 11 \geq 9.$$

As a result, we can determine a rational point P_9 of $\mathcal{C}^9(\tau_{1,2,3,4}; P_0, \dots, P_8) \setminus L(P_0, \dots, P_8)$ over an extension L_6/L_5 of degree at most 236196 and it follows that (P_0, \dots, P_9) is a 9-polar point of $\tau_{1,2,3,4}$. \square

3.3 New Bounds from Moduli Spaces

In [Wol2021], Wolfson uses moduli space methods to determine k -planes on intersections of hypersurfaces over extensions of scalars of bounded resolvent degree. Wolfson then applies these methods to obtain upper bounds on $\text{RD}(n)$. We will use a similar construction (Theorem 3.24) and thus begin by giving an example of Wolfson's process in Example 3.17. To do so, we must introduce additional language and notation.

Definition 3.11. (Parameter and Moduli Spaces of Hypersurfaces)

Fix $d \geq 2$. The **parameter space of degree d hypersurfaces** in $\mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{C}}^r$ is

$$\mathcal{H}(d; r) \cong \mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{C}}^{\binom{r+d}{d}-1}$$

However, there is a natural action of $\text{PGL}(\mathbb{C}, r+1)$ on $\mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{C}}^r$ which identifies hypersurfaces which are projectively equivalent. The **parameter space of semi-stable, degree d hypersurfaces** in $\mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{C}}^r$ is the largest proper Zariski open $U \subseteq \mathcal{H}(d; r)$ which is $\text{PGL}(\mathbb{C}, r+1)$ -invariant; we denote it by $\mathcal{S}(d; r)$. Consequently, the **coarse moduli space of semi-stable, degree d hypersurfaces** in $\mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{C}}^r$ is thus

$$\mathcal{M}(d; r) := \mathcal{S}(d; r) / \text{PGL}(\mathbb{C}, r+1).$$

The semi-stable locus $\mathcal{S}(d; r)$ is a dense Zariski open of $\mathcal{H}(d; r)$ which is $\text{PGL}(\mathbb{C}, r+1)$ -invariant. It contains another dense, $\text{PGL}(\mathbb{C}, r+1)$ -invariant Zariski open $\mathcal{S}^\circ(d; r) \subseteq \mathcal{S}(d; r)$ which parametrizes the smooth hypersurfaces. The **coarse moduli space of smooth, degree d hypersurfaces** in $\mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{C}}^r$ is

$$\mathcal{M}^\circ(d; r) := \mathcal{S}^\circ(d; r) / \text{PGL}(\mathbb{C}, r+1).$$

Each of the above parameter and moduli spaces classifies certain objects. We will additionally need to refer to the spaces classifying these objects with an associated choice of k -plane.

Definition 3.12. (Parameter and Moduli Spaces of Hypersurfaces with k -Planes)

Continuing with the notation of Definition 3.11 and recalling that $\mathcal{G}r(k, r)$ is the variety of k -planes in $\mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{C}}^r$, we denote the **parameter space of degree d hypersurfaces with choice of k -plane** in $\mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{C}}^r$ by $\mathcal{H}(d; r, k)$; it is the incidence variety

$$\mathcal{H}(d; r, k) = \{(V, L) \mid L \subseteq V\} \subseteq \mathcal{H}(d; r) \times \mathcal{G}r(k, r).$$

Similarly, we write $\mathcal{S}(d; r, k)$, $\mathcal{M}(d; r, k)$, and $\mathcal{M}^\circ(d; r, k)$ for the analogous spaces which additionally classify a choice of k -plane. They similarly arise as incidence varieties or as quotients of incidence varieties by $\text{PGL}(\mathbb{C}, r+1)$.

We now expand these definitions from classifying hypersurfaces to intersections of hypersurfaces of type $(2, \dots, d)$.

Definition 3.13. (Parameter and Moduli Spaces of Intersections of Hypersurfaces)

The **parameter space of intersections of hypersurfaces of type $(2, \dots, d)$** in $\mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{C}}^r$ is

$$\mathcal{H}(2, \dots, d; r) = \mathcal{H}(2; r) \times \dots \times \mathcal{H}(d; r).$$

The natural action of $\mathrm{PGL}(\mathbb{C}, r+1)$ action on $\mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{C}}^r$ induces a diagonal action on $\mathcal{H}(2, \dots, d; r)$ and the **parameter space of semi-stable intersections of hypersurfaces of type** $(2, \dots, d)$ in $\mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{C}}^r$ is the largest proper Zariski open $U \subseteq \mathcal{H}(2, \dots, d; r)$ which is $\mathrm{PGL}(\mathbb{C}, r+1)$ -invariant; it is denoted by $\mathcal{S}(2, \dots, d; r)$.

The **moduli space of semi-stable intersections of hypersurfaces of type** $(2, \dots, d)$ in $\mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{C}}^r$ is

$$\mathcal{M}(2, \dots, d; r) = \mathcal{S}(2, \dots, d; r) / \mathrm{PGL}(\mathbb{C}, r+1).$$

In analogy with Definition 3.12, we write $\mathcal{H}(2, \dots, d; r, k)$, $\mathcal{S}(2, \dots, d; r, k)$, and $\mathcal{M}(2, \dots, d; r, k)$ for the respective spaces which additionally classify a choice of k -plane; they analogously arise as incidence varieties or as quotients of incidence varieties by $\mathrm{PGL}(\mathbb{C}, r+1)$, as well.

Remark 3.14. (Parameter and Moduli Spaces as Schemes)

For the interested reader, we note that these spaces can be constructed as schemes via classical invariant theory, beginning with

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{H}(d; r) &= \mathrm{Proj} \left(S^* \left(\mathbb{C}[x_0, \dots, x_r]_{(d)}^{\vee} \right) \right), \\ \mathcal{M}(d; r) &= \mathrm{Proj} \left(S^* \left(\mathbb{C}[x_0, \dots, x_r]_{(d)}^{\vee} \right)^{\mathrm{GL}(\mathbb{C}, r+1)} \right). \end{aligned}$$

The remaining spaces arise analogously from the same constructions as in the variety case.

We will use the dimension of these parameter and moduli spaces, so we recall the dimensions in the case of hypersurfaces and give the dimensions in the case of intersections of hypersurfaces of type $(2, \dots, d)$. In the proof of Proposition 2.26, we observed the combinatorial identity

$$\sum_{i=0}^d \binom{r+i}{i} = \binom{r+d+1}{d}.$$

In Remark 3.15 and Definition 3.21, we will use the slight variation

$$\sum_{i=2}^d \binom{r+i}{i} = \binom{r+d+1}{d} - (r+2). \tag{5}$$

Remark 3.15. (Dimension of Parameter and Moduli Spaces)

For fixed $d, r \geq 1$, we have

$$\dim(\mathcal{S}(d; r)) = \dim(\mathcal{H}(d; r)) = \binom{r+d}{d} - 1.$$

When $\binom{r+d}{d} - (r+1)^2 < 0$, $\mathcal{M}(d; r)$ is empty. When $\binom{r+d}{d} - (r+1)^2 \geq 0$, we have

$$\dim(\mathcal{M}^{\circ}(d; r)) = \dim(\mathcal{M}(d; r)) = \binom{r+d}{d} - (r+1)^2.$$

Similarly, for d, r for which the following spaces are non-empty, we have

$$\dim(\mathcal{S}(2, \dots, d; r)) = \dim(\mathcal{H}(2, \dots, d; r)) = \left(\sum_{i=2}^d \binom{r+i}{i} \right) - (d-1),$$

$$\dim(\mathcal{M}(2, \dots, d; r)) = \left(\sum_{i=2}^d \binom{r+i}{i} \right) - (r+1)^2 - (d-2).$$

From equation (5), we re-write these quantities as

$$\dim(\mathcal{S}(2, \dots, d; r)) = \dim(\mathcal{H}(2, \dots, d; r)) = \binom{r+d+1}{d} - (r+d+1),$$

$$\dim(\mathcal{M}(2, \dots, d; r)) = \binom{r+d+1}{d} - (r+1)^2 - (r+d).$$

We now examine how Wolfson's algorithm determines k -planes on hypersurfaces. A theorem of Waldron (Theorem 3.16) guarantees the existence of a k -plane on a degree d hypersurface once the ambient dimension r is above a given threshold:

Theorem 3.16. (Theorem 1.6 of [Wal2008])

Fix $d \geq 3$. When r and k are such that

$$(k+1)(r-k) - \binom{k+d}{d} \geq 0,$$

then the natural maps

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{H}(d; r, k) &\rightarrow \mathcal{H}(d; r), \\ \mathcal{M}^\circ(d; r, k) &\rightarrow \mathcal{M}^\circ(d; r), \end{aligned}$$

are surjective.⁴

Definition 2.4 of [Wol2021] shows that the extended Tschirnhaus complete intersections are defined over \mathbb{Z} . Thus, for suitable d, r, k , Waldron's theorem allows us to determine a k -plane on τ_d over an extension L/K_n with

$$\text{RD}(L/K_n) \leq \text{RD}(\mathcal{H}(d; r, k) \rightarrow \mathcal{H}(d; r)) \leq \dim(\mathcal{H}(d; r)).$$

Moreover, Theorem 2.12 of [Wol2021] shows that $\tau_{1,2,3}$ (along with certain other extended Tschirnhaus complete intersections) are generically smooth. It follows that for suitable r, k , Waldron's theorem allows us to determine a k -plane on τ_3 over an extension L'/K_n with

$$\text{RD}(L'/K_n) \leq \text{RD}(\mathcal{M}^\circ(3; r, k) \rightarrow \mathcal{M}^\circ(3; r)) \leq \dim(\mathcal{M}^\circ(3; r)).$$

Note that for a generically finite, dominant, rational map of \mathbb{C} -varieties $Y \dashrightarrow X$, the upper bound

$$\text{RD}(Y \dashrightarrow X) \leq \dim(X), \tag{6}$$

follows directly from Definition 2.14; it is also included in Lemma 2.5 of [FW2019].

Example 3.17. (Wolfson's Method)

For $n \geq 1559$, we can determine an 8-plane on $\tau_{1,2,3,4}$ over an extension L/K_n with $\text{RD}(L/K_n) \leq 78485029$.

Proof. First, τ_1 is a hyperplane and so $\tau_1 \cong \mathbb{P}_{K_n}^{1557}$. Next, τ_2 is a quadric hypersurface in τ_1 and thus it is known classically that there is a 778-plane $\Lambda_2 \subseteq \tau_{1,2}$ over an iterated quadratic extension L_1/K_n (see [Wol2021] for details). $\tau_{1,2,3} \cap \Lambda_2$ is a cubic hypersurface in Λ_2 and

$$(63+1)(778-63) - \binom{63+3}{3} = 0,$$

hence we can determine a 63-plane $\Lambda_3 \subseteq \tau_{1,2,3} \cap \Lambda_2$ over an extension L_2/L_1 with

$$\text{RD}(L_2/L_1) \leq \text{RD}(\mathcal{M}^\circ(3; 778, 63) \rightarrow \mathcal{M}^\circ(3; 778)) \leq \dim(\mathcal{M}^\circ(3; 778)) = 78485029.$$

Finally, $\tau_{1,2,3,4} \cap \Lambda_3$ is a quartic hypersurface in Λ_3 and

$$(8+1)(63-8) - \binom{8+4}{4} = 0,$$

hence we can determine an 8-plane $\Lambda_4 \subseteq \tau_{1,2,3,4} \cap \Lambda_3$ over an extension L_3/L_2 with

$$\text{RD}(L_3/L_2) \leq \text{RD}(\mathcal{H}(4; 63, 8) \rightarrow \mathcal{H}(4; 63)) \leq \dim(\mathcal{H}(4; 63)) = 766479.$$

□

⁴This is not the entirety of Waldron's result; see Theorem 1.6 of [Wal2008] for more details.

We next provide an example which highlights the current limitations of using iterated polar cones for determining additional upper bounds on $\text{RD}(n)$.

Example 3.18. (Wolfson Method for a 9-Plane on $\tau_{1,2,3,4,5}$)

We can determine a 9-plane on $\tau_{1,2,3,4,5}$ over an extension L/K_n with

$$\text{RD}(L/K_n) \leq 3298353885918738132194252727911 \ (\approx 3 \cdot 10^{30}),$$

as long as

$$r \geq 54097786526 \ (\approx 5 \cdot 10^{10}).$$

The core construction is the same as Example 3.17. In Wolfson's notation, observe that $54097786526 = \psi(5,9)_4 + 1$ and

$$\dim(\mathcal{M}^\circ(3; \psi(5,9)_3)) = 3298353885918738132194252727911 \ (\approx 3 \cdot 10^{30}).$$

See the proof of Theorem 5.6 of [Wol2021] for details.

Remark 3.19. (Iterated Polar Cone Comparison)

Observe that a 9^{th} polar cone $\mathcal{C}^9(\tau_{1,2,3,4,5}; P_0, \dots, P_8)$ of $\tau_{1,2,3,4,5}$ has type $\begin{bmatrix} 5 & 4 & 3 & 2 & 1 \\ 1 & 10 & 55 & 220 & 715 \end{bmatrix}$. Thus, even for n large enough so that we may determine a suitable 66-plane Λ on $\mathcal{C}^9(\tau_{1,2,3,4,5}; P_0, \dots, P_8)_1 \cap \mathcal{C}^9(\tau_{1,2,3,4,5}; P_0, \dots, P_8)_2$ (the intersection of the 220 quadrics and 715 hyperplanes defining $\mathcal{C}^9(\tau_{1,2,3,4,5}; P_0, \dots, P_8)$), it still follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \deg(\mathcal{C}^9(\tau_{1,2,3,4,5}, P_8) \cap \Lambda) &= 5 \cdot 4^{10} \cdot 3^{55}, \\ &= 914616279415496004448658427740160 \quad (\approx 9 \cdot 10^{32}), \\ &> 3298353885918738132194252727911 \quad (\approx 3 \cdot 10^{30}), \\ &= \dim(\mathcal{M}^\circ(3; \psi(5,9)_3)). \end{aligned}$$

Indeed, the degree of the analogous intersection grows exponentially in k whereas the required resolvent degree for Wolfson's method grows polynomially in k . Similar issues arise for k -planes on intersections of hypersurfaces of type (1,2,3,4) for $k \geq 33$.

In [DM1998], Debarre and Manivel give an explicit combinatorial condition for an intersection of hypersurfaces in $\mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{C}}^r$ to contain a k -plane:

Theorem 3.20. (Theorem 2.1 of [DM1998])

Let $V \subseteq \mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{C}}^r$ be an intersection of hypersurfaces of type $\begin{bmatrix} d & d-1 & \cdots & 2 & 1 \\ \ell_d & \ell_{d-1} & \cdots & \ell_2 & \ell_1 \end{bmatrix}$ which is not a quadric hypersurface. When r and k are such that

$$(k+1)(r-k) - \sum_{i=1}^d \ell_i \binom{k+i}{i} \geq 0,$$

then the natural maps

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{H}(2, \dots, d; r, k) &\rightarrow \mathcal{H}(2, \dots, d; r), \\ \mathcal{M}(2, \dots, d; r, k) &\rightarrow \mathcal{M}(2, \dots, d; r), \end{aligned}$$

are surjective. ⁵

⁵This is not the entirety of Debarre and Manivel's result; see Theorem 2.1 of [DM1998] for more details.

We will use this result to deal with k -planes on intersections of hypersurfaces directly (instead of using a recursive process on the set of defining hypersurfaces) to obtain new thresholds for upper bounds on $\text{RD}(n)$ for $n \geq 348, 489, 068, 134$ in Theorem 3.24.

Similarly to Wolfson, we can use the upper bound

$$\text{RD}(\mathcal{M}(2, \dots, d; r, k) \rightarrow \mathcal{M}(2, \dots, d; r)) \leq \dim(\mathcal{M}(2, \dots, d; r)),$$

once we establish that the Tschirnhaus complete intersections $\tau_{1, \dots, m}$ are semi-stable in Lemma 3.22 and Proposition 3.23.

Definition 3.21. (Notation for Lemma 3.22)

To succinctly state Lemma 3.22 and its applications, we define a new set function

$$\vartheta : \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 3} \times \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1} \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1},$$

where $\vartheta(d, k)$ is the smallest positive integer r such that

$$(k+1)(r-k) - \sum_{i=2}^d \binom{k+i}{i} \geq 0.$$

Using the combinatorial identity in equation (5), we can equivalently write

$$\vartheta(d, k) = k + \left\lceil \frac{1}{k+1} \left(\binom{k+d+1}{d} - (k+2) \right) \right\rceil.$$

Lemma 3.22. (k -Planes on an Intersection of Hypersurfaces of Type $(2, \dots, d)$)

Let $d \geq 3$, and $V \in \mathcal{S}(2, \dots, d; r)(K)$ for some \mathbb{C} -field K . For any $k \geq 1$, if $r \geq \vartheta(d, k)$, then we can determine a k -plane on V over an extension L/K with

$$\text{RD}(L/K) \leq \dim(\mathcal{M}(2, \dots, d; \vartheta(d, k))).$$

Proof. First, observe that it suffices to prove the case where $r = \vartheta(d, k)$ by restriction. Theorem 3.20 then yields that V contains a k -plane. We identify V with $\mathbb{A}_K^0 \rightarrow \mathcal{M}(2, \dots, d; \vartheta(d, k))$ and note that the resolvent degree of determining a k -plane is exactly the resolvent degree of the map

$$\pi_K : \mathbb{A}_K^0 \times_{\mathcal{M}(2, \dots, d; \vartheta(d, k))} \mathcal{M}(2, \dots, d; \vartheta(d, k), k) \rightarrow \mathbb{A}_K^0$$

determined by the pullback square

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathbb{A}_K^0 \times_{\mathcal{M}(2, \dots, d; \vartheta(d, k))} \mathcal{M}(2, \dots, d; \vartheta(d, k), k) & \xrightarrow{\pi_{\mathcal{M}}} & \mathcal{M}(2, \dots, d; \vartheta(d, k), k) \\ \pi_K \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ \mathbb{A}_K^0 & \xrightarrow{\quad \quad \quad} & \mathcal{M}(2, \dots, d; \vartheta(d, k)). \end{array}$$

However, Lemma 2.5 of [FW2019] yields that

$$\text{RD}(\pi_K) \leq \text{RD}(\mathcal{M}(2, \dots, d; \vartheta(d, k), k) \rightarrow \mathcal{M}(2, \dots, d; \vartheta(d, k))) \leq \dim(\mathcal{M}(2, \dots, d; \vartheta(d, k))).$$

□

Proposition 3.23. (Semi-Stability of Tschirnhaus Complete Intersections)

For each $d \geq 3$ and $n \geq d+2$, $\tau_{1, \dots, d} \in \mathcal{S}(2, \dots, d; n-2)(K_n)$.

Proof. First, note that $\tau_1 \subseteq \mathbb{P}_{K_n}^{n-1}$ is a hyperplane, so we can consider $\tau_{1, \dots, d} \subseteq \tau_1 \cong \mathbb{P}_{K_n}^{n-2}$, e.g. as a K_n -point of $\mathcal{S}(2, \dots, d; n-2)$.

From the definition of $\mathcal{S}(2, \dots, d; n-2)$, it suffices to show that there is some $\text{PGL}(K_n, n-1)$ -invariant polynomial in $K_n[x_0, \dots, x_{n-1}]$ which does not vanish at $\tau_{1, \dots, d}$. Theorem 2.12 of [Wol2021] yields that $\tau_{1, 2, 3}$ is generically smooth, hence semi-stable. In particular, there is a $\text{PGL}(K_n, n-1)$ -invariant polynomial $f(x_0, \dots, x_{n-1}) \in K_n[x_0, \dots, x_{n-1}]$ which does not vanish at $\tau_{1, 2, 3} \in \mathcal{H}(2, 3; n-2)(K_n)$. When pulled back to $\mathcal{H}(2, \dots, d; n-2)(K_n)$ via the standard projection map, $f(x_0, \dots, x_{n-1})$ does not vanish at $\tau_{1, \dots, d}$ as well. □

Theorem 3.24. (Determining a Point on $\tau_{1,\dots,d+k}$)

Fix $k, d \geq 1$. For $n \geq \vartheta(d, k) + 3$, we can determine a point of $\tau_{1,\dots,d+k}^\circ \subseteq \mathcal{T}^n$ over an extension L/K_n with

$$\text{RD}(L/K_n) \leq \max \left\{ \dim(\mathcal{M}(2, \dots, d; \vartheta(d, k))), \frac{(d+k)!}{d!} \right\}.$$

Proof. By restriction, it suffices to prove the case where $n = \vartheta(d, k) + 3$. As such, we work in $\mathbb{P}_{K_n}^{\vartheta(d,k)+2}$. We then pass to a hypersurface H which does not contain $[1 : 0 : \dots : 0]$ and $\tau_1 \cap H \cong \mathbb{P}_{K_n}^{\vartheta(d,k)}$ in this hypersurface. Hence, Lemma 3.22 and Proposition 3.23 yield that we can determine a k -plane $\Lambda \subseteq \tau_{1,\dots,d}$ over an extension L_1/K_n with

$$\text{RD}(L_1/K_n) \leq \dim(\mathcal{M}(2, \dots, d; \vartheta(d, k))).$$

Thus, $\deg(\tau_{1,\dots,d+k} \cap \Lambda) = \frac{(d+k)!}{d!}$ and we can determine a point Q of $\tau_{1,\dots,d+k} \cap \Lambda \subseteq \tau_{1,\dots,d+k}^\circ$ over an extension of degree at most $\frac{(d+k)!}{d!}$. \square

Remark 3.25. (Wolfson's Function F)

In Definition 5.4 and Theorem 5.6 of [Wol2021], Wolfson introduces a monotone increasing function $F(r)$ such that $\text{RD}(n) \leq n - r$ for $n \geq F(r)$; we will define this function explicitly in Section 4. To remain consistent with the notation in this paper, we write F as a function of m .

Wolfson shows that $\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \frac{B(m)}{F(m)} = \infty$, where $B(m) = (m-1)! + 1$ was the previous best bounding function, established in [Bra1975]. We construct a similar function $G(m)$ and prove that G similarly improves on F (Theorem 4.1).

Definition 3.26. (Defining the Function $G(m)$)

We define $\varphi : \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 15} \times \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1} \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}$ by

$$\varphi(d, k) = \max \left\{ \frac{(d+k)!}{d!}, \dim(\mathcal{M}(2, \dots, d; \vartheta(d, k))) \right\}.$$

Next, we define $G : \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1} \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}$ for $2 \leq m \leq 14$ by

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|--------|---|---|---|---|---|----|-----|-----|------|-------|
| m | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 |
| $G(m)$ | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 9 | 21 | 109 | 325 | 1681 | 15121 |

| | | | | |
|--------|---------|-----------|------------|-------------|
| m | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 |
| $G(m)$ | 151,201 | 1,663,201 | 19,958,401 | 259,459,201 |

and for $m \geq 15$ by

$$G(m) = 1 + \min \{ \varphi(d, m-d-1) \mid 4 \leq d \leq m-1 \}.$$

Theorem 3.27. (Upper Bounds on $\text{RD}(n)$)

For each $m \geq 1$ and all $n \geq G(m)$, $\text{RD}(n) \leq n - m$.

Proof. (Proof of Theorem 3.27)

The claim for $1 \leq m \leq 5$ is classical and is covered in [Wol2021]. The case $m = 6$ is Theorem 3.7 and the cases of $7 \leq m \leq 14$ are Theorem 3.10.

Now, fix $m \geq 15$. For each $4 \leq d \leq m-1$, Theorem 3.24 yields that we can determine a point of $\tau_{1,\dots,m-1}^\circ \subseteq \mathcal{T}^n$ over an extension of scalars L/K_n with $\text{RD}(L/K_n) \leq \varphi(d, m-d-1)$ when $n \geq \vartheta(d, m-d-1) + 3$. Note that

$$\begin{aligned} \vartheta(d, m-d-1) + 3 &< \binom{\vartheta(d, m-d-1) + d + 1}{d} - (\vartheta(d, m-d-1) + 1)^2 - (\vartheta(d, m-d-1) + d) \\ &= \dim(\mathcal{M}(2, \dots, d; \vartheta(d, m-d-1))) \\ &\leq \varphi(m, m-d-1). \end{aligned}$$

It suffices to minimize over all such d and so the definition of $G(m)$ and Remark 3.5 yield the theorem. \square

In Section 4, we pin down how $G(m)$ improves on $F(m)$. First, we use $G(m)$ to establish an upper bound on $\text{RD}(n)$ using elementary functions à la Brauer.

3.4 Upper Bounds on the Bounding Function $G(m)$

While $G(m)$ is simpler than $F(m)$, its definition does not immediately yield a description in terms of elementary functions. We state such a description now and use the remainder of the subsection to obtain this approximation.

Theorem 3.28. (Upper Bound on the Growth Rate of $\text{RD}(n)$)

For every positive integer $d \geq 4$, $G(2d^2 + 7d + 6) \leq \frac{(2d^2+7d+5)!}{d!}$. Hence, for $n \geq \frac{(2d^2+7d+5)!}{d!}$, it follows that

$$\text{RD}(n) \leq n - 2d^2 - 7d - 6.$$

To prove Theorem 3.28, we establish a simple criterion for m , in terms of d , so that we can conclude that $G(m) < \frac{(m-1)!}{d!}$ when that criterion is met.

Recall that $\vartheta(d, k)$ is defined such that an intersection of hypersurfaces of type $(1, \dots, d)$ in \mathbb{P}^r contains a k -plane when $r \geq \vartheta(d, k)$. We begin by approximating $\vartheta(d, m - d - 1)$ above.

Lemma 3.29. (Upper Bound on ϑ)

Fix $m > d \geq 4$. Then

$$\vartheta(d, m - d - 1) \leq m - d - 2 + \binom{m}{d}.$$

Proof. We first recall Definition 3.21:

$$\vartheta(d, k) = k + \left\lceil \frac{1}{k+1} \left(\binom{k+d+1}{d} - (k+2) \right) \right\rceil.$$

By using the identification $k = m - d - 1$, we observe that

$$\begin{aligned} \vartheta(d, m - d - 1) &= (m - d - 1) + \left\lceil \frac{1}{(m - d - 1) + 1} \left(\binom{(m - d - 1) + d + 1}{d} - ((m - d - 1) + 2) \right) \right\rceil, \\ &= (m - d - 1) + \left\lceil \frac{1}{m - d} \left(\binom{m}{d} - (m - d + 1) \right) \right\rceil, \\ &\leq m - d - 2 + \binom{m}{d}. \end{aligned}$$

□

Corollary 3.30. (Upper Bound on Parameter Space Dimension)

Fix $m > d \geq 4$. Then,

$$\dim(\mathcal{H}(2, \dots, d; \vartheta(d, m - d - 1))) \leq \binom{m - 1 + \binom{m}{d}}{d} - \left(m - 1 + \binom{m}{d} \right).$$

Proof. Remark 3.15 established that

$$\dim(\mathcal{H}(2, \dots, d; \vartheta(d, m - d - 1))) \leq \binom{\vartheta(d, m - d - 1) + d + 1}{d} - (\vartheta(d, m - d - 1) + d + 1),$$

which is non-decreasing in $\vartheta(d, m - d - 1)$. Thus, Lemma 3.29 yields

$$\dim(\mathcal{H}(2, \dots, d; \vartheta(d, m - d - 1))) \leq \binom{m - 1 + \binom{m}{d}}{d} - \left(m - 1 + \binom{m}{d} \right).$$

□

We will now introduce a constant C_d and give a bound on $\log \left(\frac{C_d}{d+1} \right)$, both of which will be useful in the proof of Lemma 3.33. We also remind the reader that every use of \log in this paper refers to the base e logarithm.

Definition 3.31. (Constant for the Proof of Lemma 3.33)

For each $d \geq 4$, we set

$$C_d := \max \left\{ \binom{d+1}{i} \mid 0 \leq i \leq d+1 \right\}.$$

Lemma 3.32. (Bound on $\log(C_d)$)

For each $d \geq 1$, it follows that

$$\log \left(\frac{C_d}{d+1} \right) \leq d + \frac{3}{2}.$$

We will frequently use Stirling's approximations for factorials, including in the proof of Lemma 3.32, and thus state the version we use explicitly (a stronger version of which can be found in [Rob1955]):

Let a be an positive integer. Then,

$$\sqrt{2\pi} a^{a+\frac{1}{2}} e^{-a} \leq a! \leq a^{a+\frac{1}{2}} e^{1-a}. \quad (7)$$

Proof. (Proof of Lemma 3.32)

Our proof depends on the parity of $d+1$; we begin with the case where $d+1 = 2\ell$ is even. Then, $C_d = \binom{2\ell}{\ell} = \frac{(2\ell)!}{(\ell!)^2}$ and Stirling's approximation yields

$$C_d \leq \frac{(2\ell)^{2\ell+\frac{1}{2}} e^{1-2\ell}}{\left(\sqrt{2\pi} \ell^{\ell+\frac{1}{2}} e^{-\ell}\right)^2} = \frac{2^{d+\frac{1}{2}} e}{\pi \sqrt{\ell}}.$$

Consequently,

$$\log \left(\frac{C_d}{d+1} \right) \leq \log \left(\frac{2^{d-\frac{1}{2}} e}{\pi \sqrt{\ell} (d+1)} \right) \leq \log \left(\frac{e}{\pi (d+1) \sqrt{\ell}} \right) + \log \left(e^{d+\frac{1}{2}} \right) \leq d + \frac{1}{2}.$$

When $d+1 = 2\ell+1$ is odd, we observe

$$C_d = \binom{2\ell+1}{\ell} \leq \binom{2\ell+2}{\ell+1} \leq \frac{2^{d+\frac{3}{2}} e}{\pi \sqrt{\ell+1}},$$

and thus

$$\log \left(\frac{C_d}{d+1} \right) \leq \log \left(\frac{2^{d+\frac{3}{2}} e}{\pi \sqrt{\ell+1}} \right) \leq d + \frac{3}{2}.$$

□

Recall that for each $1 \leq d \leq m-1$ and when n is large enough, we can determine an $(m-d-1)$ -plane $\Lambda \subseteq \tau_{1,\dots,d}^\circ$ over an extension L_1/K_n with

$$\text{RD}(L_1/K_n) \leq \dim(\mathcal{M}(2, \dots, d; \vartheta(d, m-d-1))).$$

In such a case, we can determine a point of $\tau_{1,\dots,m-1} \cap \Lambda$ over an extension L_2/L_1 of degree $\frac{(m-1)!}{d!}$. Hence, we set

$$\varphi(d, m-d-1) = \max \left\{ \frac{(m-1)!}{d!}, \dim(\mathcal{M}(2, \dots, d; \vartheta(d, m-d-1))) + m \right\}$$

in Definition 3.26. We next give a condition relating $\varphi(d, m-d-1)$ and $\varphi(d+1, m-d-2)$.

Lemma 3.33. (The φ Condition)

Fix $d \geq 4$. For all $m \geq 2d^2 + 7d + 6$, it follows that

$$\varphi(d+1, m-d-2) < \varphi(d, m-d-1). \quad (8)$$

Proof. For any such d and m , it is always true that

$$\frac{(m-1)!}{(d+1)!} < \frac{(m-1)!}{d!}.$$

As a result, to conclude (8), we need only show that

$$\frac{(m-1)!}{d!} > \binom{m-1 + \binom{m}{d+1}}{d+1}, \quad (9)$$

since

$$\binom{m-1 + \binom{m}{d+1}}{d+1} > \dim(\mathcal{H}(2, \dots, d; \vartheta(d, m-d-1))) > \dim(\mathcal{M}(2, \dots, d; \vartheta(d, m-d-1))).$$

Observe that

$$\binom{m-1 + \binom{m}{d+1}}{d+1} = \frac{\left(m-1 + \binom{m}{d+1}\right)!}{(d+1)! \left(m-d-2 + \binom{m}{d+1}\right)!} = \frac{1}{(d+1)!} \prod_{i=1}^{d+1} \left(m-i + \binom{m}{d+1}\right). \quad (10)$$

Next, we approximate $\binom{m}{d+1}$:

$$\binom{m}{d+1} = \frac{1}{(d+1)!} \cdot \frac{m!}{(m-d-1)!} = \frac{1}{(d+1)!} \prod_{j=0}^{d+1} (m-j) \leq \frac{1}{(d+1)!} m^{d+2} \leq m^{d+2}. \quad (11)$$

By substituting the inequality (11) into equation (10) and using that $m-i \leq m$, we obtain the approximation

$$\binom{m-1 + \binom{m}{d+1}}{d+1} \leq \frac{1}{(d+1)!} \prod_{i=1}^{d+1} (m + m^{d+2}),$$

which, after substituting into inequality (9) and multiplying both sides by $d!$, yields the sufficient condition

$$(m-1)! > \frac{1}{d+1} \prod_{i=1}^{d+1} (m + m^{d+2}). \quad (12)$$

Notice that main term of the right side of inequality (12) is of the form $\prod_{i=1}^{d+1} (a+b) = (a+b)^{d+1}$, hence applying the binomial theorem yields

$$\begin{aligned} \prod_{i=1}^{d+1} (m + m^{d+2}) &= \sum_{i=0}^{d+1} \binom{d+1}{i} (m^{d+2})^i m^{d+1-i}, \\ &= \sum_{i=0}^{d+1} \binom{d+1}{i} m^{di+2i} (m-1)^{d+1-i}, \\ &= \sum_{i=0}^{d+1} \binom{d+1}{i} m^{(d+1)i+d+1}, \\ &= m^{d+1} \sum_{i=0}^{d+1} \binom{d+1}{i} (m^{d+1})^i. \end{aligned}$$

However, for any positive integer a and $x \geq a$ it follows from induction $\sum_{i=0}^{a+1} x^i \leq 2x^{a+1}$. Applying this to $(m-1) \sum_{i=0}^{d+1} \binom{d+1}{i} ((m-1)^d)^i$ and recalling $C_d = \max \left\{ \binom{d+1}{i} \mid 0 \leq i \leq d+1 \right\}$ yields

$$m^{d+1} \sum_{i=0}^{d+1} \binom{d+1}{i} (m^{d+1})^i \leq m^{d+1} C_d \left(2(m^{d+1})^{d+1} \right). \quad (13)$$

Substituting inequality (13) into inequality (12) and simplifying, we obtain the condition

$$(m-1)! > \frac{2}{d+1} C_d m^{d^2+3d+2}.$$

Next, we apply Stirling's approximation and re-arrange terms to arrive at the condition

$$\frac{(m-1)^{m-\frac{1}{2}}}{e^{m-1}} > \frac{2C_d}{\sqrt{2\pi}(d+1)} m^{d^2+3d+2}. \quad (14)$$

Observe that $a^{a-1} < (a-1)^{a-\frac{1}{2}}$ for positive integers $a \geq 8$. By requiring $m > 8$, we need only consider when

$$\frac{m^{m-1}}{e^{m-1}} > \frac{2C_d}{\sqrt{2\pi}(d+1)} m^{d^2+3d+2}. \quad (15)$$

Multiplying both sides of inequality (15) by e^{d^2+3d+2} , dividing both sides by m^{d^2+3d+2} , and simplifying, we arrive at the condition

$$\left(\frac{m}{e} \right)^{m-d^2-3d-3} > \frac{2C_d e^{d^2+3d+2}}{\sqrt{2\pi}(d+1)}. \quad (16)$$

We take log of both sides of inequality (16), which yields

$$(m-d^2-3d-3) \log \left(\frac{m}{e} \right) > \log \left(\frac{2C_d e^{d^2+3d+2}}{\sqrt{2\pi}(d+1)} \right). \quad (17)$$

Requiring $m > e^2$, it suffices to consider

$$m-d^2-3d-3 > \log \left(\frac{2}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \right) + \log \left(\frac{C_d}{d+1} \right) + (d^2+3d+2). \quad (18)$$

We note $\log \left(\frac{2}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \right) < 0$ and apply the bound on $\log \left(\frac{C_d}{d+1} \right) \leq d + \frac{3}{2}$ from Lemma 3.32 to obtain the sufficient condition

$$m-d^2-3d-3 > \left(d + \frac{3}{2} \right) + (d^2+3d+2),$$

which re-arranges to yield our initial supposition

$$m \geq 2d^2 + 7d + 6. \quad (19)$$

Finally, note that for all $d \geq 4$, $2d^2 + 7d + 6 > e^2 > 8$, hence the requirements $m \geq 8$, $m > e^2$ used in the proof are rendered superfluous. \square

Corollary 3.34. (Upper Bound on the Growth Rate of G)

For any $d \geq 4$ and $m \geq 2d^2 + 7d + 6$, it follows that

$$G(m) < \frac{(m-1)!}{d!}.$$

Proof. Recall Definition 3.26; in particular, for $m \geq 15$,

$$G(m) = \min \{ \varphi(d, m-d-1) \mid 15 \leq d \leq m-d-1 \} + 1.$$

Consequently, for any $d \geq 4$ and $m \geq 2d^2 + 3d$, we have

$$G(m) \leq \varphi(d+1, m-d-2) + 1 < \frac{(m-1)!}{d!}$$

from Lemma 3.33. □

We now prove Theorem 3.28.

Proof. (Proof of Theorem 3.28)

Fix $d \geq 4$. From Corollary 3.34, we have that

$$G(m) \leq \frac{(2d^2 + 7d + 5)!}{d!}$$

for $m \geq 2d^2 + 7d + 6$. From Theorem 3.27, it follows that

$$\text{RD}(n) \leq n - 2d^2 - 7d - 6$$

for $n \geq \frac{(2d^2+7d+5)!}{d!}$. □

4 Comparison with Prior Bounds

We now give a precise sense of how the bounds from $G(m)$ improve upon the bounds of $F(m)$.

Theorem 4.1. (Comparison With $F(m)$)

Let F be the function defined in Definition 4.3 (which is originally Definition 5.4 of [Wol2021]).

1. For every $m \geq 1$, $G(m) \leq F(m)$ with equality if and only if $m = 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 15$, or 16 .
2. $G(m)$ provides asymptotic improvements on $F(m)$, in the sense that

$$\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \frac{F(m)}{G(m)} = \infty.$$

Remark 4.2. Despite Theorem 4.1, $G(m)$ does not yield a strictly better bound on $\text{RD}(n)$ for all n . As an example,

$$\begin{array}{ll} G(17) = 348,489,068,134, & F(17) = 871,782,912,001, \\ G(18) = 2,964,061,900,801 & F(18) = 14,820,309,504,001, \end{array}$$

so $\frac{F(17)}{G(17)} \sim 2.502$ and $\frac{F(18)}{G(18)} \sim 5.000$. However, for any integer n between $F(17)$ and $G(18)$, F and G yield the same upper bound; namely, $\text{RD}(n) \leq n - 17$.

The remainder of the section is spent proving Theorem 4.1. We will now define Wolfson's function $F(m)$. Our presentation will vary slightly from Wolfson's and we refer the reader to Section 5 of [Wol2021] for details of the construction.

Definition 4.3. (Wolfson's Functions)

Given $(d, k) \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 3} \times \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}$, set $\psi(d, k)_0 = k$. For $0 \leq i < d-2$, set

$$\psi(d, k)_{i+1} := \psi(d, k)_i + \left\lceil \frac{1}{\psi(d, k)_i + 1} \cdot \binom{\psi(d, k)_i + d - i}{d - i} \right\rceil,$$

along with $\psi(d, k)_{d-1} := 2\psi(d, k)_{d-2} + 1$.

Additionally, define

$$\Phi(d, k) := \max \left\{ \frac{(d+k)!}{d!}, \dim(\mathcal{M}(3; \psi(d, k)_{d-2})) + d + k + 1 \right\}.$$

Finally, for $m \leq 3$, set $F(m) := m + 1$ and for $m \geq 4$, set

$$F(m) := 2 \left\lfloor \frac{1}{2} \left(\min_{1 \leq d \leq m-2} \Phi(d, m-d-1) \right) \right\rfloor + 1.$$

Remark 4.4. (Outline for Section 4)

Our goal is to establish a criterion for m , in terms of d , so that we can conclude $F(m) > \frac{(m-1)!}{d!}$ when this criterion is met. We do this by examining when

$$\Phi(d, m-d-1) < \Phi(d+1, m-d-2).$$

We first show that for any $m \geq d+3$,

$$\dim(\mathcal{M}(3; \psi(d, m-d-1)_{d-2})) \leq \dim(\mathcal{M}(3; \psi(d+1, m-d-2)_{d-1})), \quad (20)$$

which will then leave us to consider when

$$\frac{(m-1)!}{d!} < \dim(\mathcal{M}(3; \psi(d+1, m-d-2)_{d-1})). \quad (21)$$

We begin by introducing auxiliary functions which will be useful for proving inequality (20) holds for $m \geq d+3$.

Definition 4.5. (Auxiliary Functions $\Psi(d; i)$)

For any $d \geq 2$, any $d-2 \geq i \geq 1$ and $x \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}$, we set

$$\Psi(d; i)(x) = x + \left\lfloor \frac{1}{x+1} \cdot \binom{x+d-i}{d-i} \right\rfloor.$$

Remark 4.6. (Key Properties of $\Psi(d; i)$)

The functions $\Psi(d, i)$ satisfy

1. $\Psi(d; i+1)(\psi(d, m-d-1)_i) = \psi(d, m-d-1)_{i+1}$ for $i \leq d-3$, and
2. $\Psi(d+1; i+1) = \Psi(d, i)$.

Lemma 4.7. ($\Psi(d; i)$ are Non-Decreasing)

For each $m \geq d+1$ with $d \geq 2$ and each $d-2 \geq i \geq 1$, the function $\Psi(d; i)(x)$ is non-decreasing.

Proof. First, observe that

$$\Psi(d; i)(x+1) - \Psi(d; i)(x) = 1 + \left\lfloor \frac{1}{x+2} \cdot \binom{x+1+d-i}{d-i} \right\rfloor - \left\lfloor \frac{1}{x+1} \cdot \binom{x+d-i}{d-i} \right\rfloor,$$

thus

$$\Psi(d; i)(x+1) - \Psi(d; i)(x) \geq \frac{1}{x+2} \cdot \binom{x+1+d-i}{d-i} - \frac{1}{x+1} \cdot \binom{x+d-i}{d-i}.$$

Now, observe that

$$\frac{1}{x+2} \cdot \binom{x+1+d-i}{d-i} = \frac{(x+1+d-i)!}{(x+2)(d-i)!(x+1)!} = \frac{(x+d-i)!}{(d-i)!(x+1)!} \left(\frac{x+d-i+1}{x+2} \right),$$

and

$$\frac{1}{x+1} \cdot \binom{x+d-i}{d-i} = \frac{(x+d-i)!}{(x+1)(d-i)!x!} = \frac{(x+d-i)!}{(d-i)!(x+1)!}.$$

Hence,

$$\Psi(d; i)(x+1) - \Psi(d; i)(x) \geq \frac{(x+d-i)!}{(d-i)!(x+1)!} \left(\frac{x+d-i+1}{x+2} - 1 \right),$$

and the right side is positive when $i \leq d-2$. □

Lemma 4.8. ($\psi(d, m-d-1)_{d-2}$ is Non-Decreasing in d)

Fix $m \geq 4$. Then,

$$\psi(2, m-3)_0 \leq \psi(3, m-4)_1 \leq \dots \leq \psi(m-3, 2)_{m-5} \leq \psi(m-2, 1)_{m-4}.$$

Furthermore, for each $2 \leq d \leq m-3$,

$$\dim(\mathcal{M}(3; \psi(d, m-d-1)_{d-2})) \leq \dim(\mathcal{M}(3; \psi(d+1, m-d-2)_{d-1})).$$

Proof. In light of Remark 4.6 and Lemma 4.7, it suffices to show

$$\psi(d+1, m-d-2)_1 \geq \psi(d, m-d-1)_0$$

to prove the claim. However,

$$\psi(d+1, m-d-2)_1 = m-d-2 + \left[\frac{1}{m-d-1} \cdot \binom{m-2}{d-1} \right] \geq m-d-1 = \psi(d, m-d-1)_0.$$

□

Remark 4.9. Having proved Lemma 4.8, we now begin to work towards the second task outlined in Remark 4.4: establishing a criterion for m in terms of d , which, when met, implies

$$\frac{(m-1)!}{d!} \leq \dim(\mathcal{M}(3; \psi(d+1, m-d-2)_{d-1})).$$

Next, we establish simple functions which we use to approximate $\psi(d, m-d-1)_{d-2}$ from below.

Definition 4.10. (Auxiliary Functions Ω and $\omega(d, i)$)

For each $d \geq 4$ and $d-3 \geq i \geq 1$, define $\omega(d, i) : \mathbb{R}_{>0} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{>0}$ by

$$\omega(d, i)(x) = \frac{1}{(d-i)!} x^{d-i-1}.$$

Similarly, for each pair $m \geq d$ with $d \geq 4$, define the function Ω by

$$\Omega(d, m) = (\omega(d, d-3) \circ \dots \circ \omega(d, 1))(m-d-1).$$

Remark 4.11. (Bounding Properties of Ω and $\omega(d, i)$)

Observe that for each i ,

$$\omega(d, i+1)(\psi(d, m-d-1)_i) \leq \psi(d, m-d-1)_{i+1}.$$

In particular,

$$\Omega(d, m) \leq \psi(d, m-d-1)_{d-2}.$$

Example 4.12. Consider the cases when $d = 5$ and $m = 10, 100$. Then,

$$\begin{aligned} \Omega(5, 10) &\sim 1.185, & \Omega(5, 100) &\sim 1.996 \times 10^8, \\ \psi(5, 10)_3 &= 133, & \psi(5, 100)_3 &\sim 3.633 \times 10^8. \end{aligned}$$

Lemma 4.13. (Explicit Form of Ω)

For any $d \geq 4$, set

$$\mathfrak{C}_d := \prod_{i=3}^{d-1} \frac{1}{(i!)^{(i-2)!}}.$$

For all $m \geq d + 2$,

$$\Omega(d, m) = \mathfrak{C}_d (m - d - 1)^{(d-2)!},$$

Proof. We proceed by induction on d . When $d = 4$, we have

$$\Omega(4, m) = \rho(4, 1)(m - 5) = \frac{1}{3!}(m - 5)^2 = \mathfrak{C}_2(m - 5)^{2!}.$$

For arbitrary d , recall

$$\Omega(d, m) = (\omega(d, d - 3) \circ \cdots \circ \omega(d, 2) \circ \omega(d, 1))(m - d - 1),$$

and

$$\Omega(d - 1, m - 1) = (\omega(d - 1, d - 4) \circ \cdots \circ \omega(d - 1, 2) \circ \omega(d - 1, 1))(m - d - 1).$$

By definition, however, $\omega(d + 1, i + 1) = \omega(d, i)$. Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} \Omega(d, m) &= (\omega(d, d - 3) \circ \cdots \circ \omega(d, 2) \circ \omega(d, 1))(m - d - 1), \\ &= (\omega(d, d - 3) \circ \cdots \circ \omega(d, 2))(\omega(d, 1)(m - d - 1)), \\ &= (\omega(d - 1, d - 4) \circ \cdots \circ \omega(d - 1, 1))(\omega(d, 1)(m - d - 1)), \\ &= \Omega(d - 1, \omega(d, 1)(m - d - 1) + d + 1). \end{aligned}$$

By induction, we know that

$$\begin{aligned} \Omega(d - 1, \omega(d, 1)(m - d - 1) + d + 1) &= \mathfrak{C}_{d-1} (\omega(d, 1)(m - d - 1))^{(d-3)!}, \\ &= \mathfrak{C}_{d-1} \left(\frac{1}{(d-1)!} (m - d - 1)^{d-2} \right)^{(d-3)!}, \\ &= \mathfrak{C}_{d-1} \left(\frac{1}{(d-1)!} \right)^{(d-3)!} ((m - d - 1)^{d-2})^{(d-3)!}, \\ &= \mathfrak{C}_d (m - d - 1)^{(d-2)!}. \end{aligned}$$

Consequently,

$$\Omega(d, m) = \Omega(d - 1, \omega(d, 1)(m - d - 1) + d + 1) = \mathfrak{C}_d (m - d - 1)^{(d-2)!}.$$

□

In the following lemma, we prove an inequality that will be useful in the proof of Proposition 4.15, the proposition which establishes the criterion we seek.

Lemma 4.14. (Bounding $\log(\mathfrak{C}_d)$)

For each $d \geq 4$,

$$\log(\mathfrak{C}_d) \geq 2(d - 2)! - 2(d - 2)! \log(d - 1) - 2(d - 3)! \log(d - 1).$$

Proof. Observe

$$\log(\mathfrak{C}_d) = - \sum_{i=3}^{d-1} (i - 2)! \log(i!) \geq - \sum_{i=3}^{d-1} (i - 2)! \log(e^{1-i} i^i),$$

where the approximation is due to Stirling's approximation (equation 7). Hence,

$$\begin{aligned}
\log(\mathfrak{C}_d) &\geq -\sum_{i=3}^{d-1} (i-2)! (1-i+i \log(i)), \\
&= \sum_{i=3}^{d-1} (i-1)! - \sum_{i=3}^{d-1} (i-2)! (i) \log(i), \\
&= \sum_{j=1}^{d-3} (j+1)! - \sum_{j=1}^{d-3} j!(j+2) \log(j+2), \\
&= \sum_{j=1}^{d-3} (j+1)! - \sum_{j=1}^{d-3} j!(j+1) \log(j+2) - \sum_{j=1}^{d-3} j! \log(j+2), \\
&\geq \sum_{j=1}^{d-3} (j+1)! - \log(d-1) \sum_{j=1}^{d-3} (j+1)! - \log(d-1) SL_{j=1}^{d-3} j!, \\
&= (1 - \log(d-1)) \sum_{j=1}^{d-3} (j+1)! - \log(d-1) \sum_{j=1}^{d-3} j!.
\end{aligned}$$

Recall that for any positive integer a , $\sum_{i=1}^a i! \leq 2(a!)$. Since $d \geq 4$, it follows that $1 - \log(d-1)$ and $-\log(d-1)$ are negative, hence

$$\begin{aligned}
\log(\mathfrak{C}_d) &\geq 2(1 - \log(d-1))(d-2)! - 2\log(d-1)(d-3)!, \\
&= 2(d-2)! - 2(d-2)! \log(d-1) - 2(d-3)! \log(d-1).
\end{aligned}$$

□

Proposition 4.15. (The Ω Condition)

Fix $d \geq 6$. For any $m \geq d^2 - d + 4$ such that

$$m^2 - \frac{5}{2}m + \frac{1}{2} < (d+1) + \log(d) \left(d + \frac{1}{2} \right) + 6(d-3)!(d-2 - \log(d-1)),$$

it follows that

$$\Phi(d, m-d-1) < \Phi(d+1, m-d-2).$$

Proof. In light of Lemma 4.8, it suffices to have

$$\frac{(m-1)!}{d!} < \dim(\mathcal{M}(3, \psi(d+1, m-d-2)_{d-1})) + m. \quad (22)$$

First, we approximate $\psi(d+1, m-d-2)_{d-1}$ below by $\lceil \Omega(d+1, m-d-2) \rceil$ to get

$$\dim(\mathcal{M}(3, \psi(d+1, m-d-2)_{d-1})) + m \geq \dim(\mathcal{M}(3, \lceil \Omega(d+1, m-d-2) \rceil)) + m. \quad (23)$$

Observe that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\dim(\mathcal{M}(3, \lceil \Omega(d+1, m-d-2) \rceil)) + m \\
&= \frac{1}{6} \left(\lceil \Omega(d+1, m-d-2) \rceil^3 + 6 \lceil \Omega(d+1, m-d-2) \rceil^2 + 11 \lceil \Omega(d+1, m-d-2) \rceil + 6 \right) \\
&\geq \frac{1}{6} \left(\Omega(d+1, m-d-2)^3 + 6\Omega(d+1, m-d-2)^2 + 11\Omega(d+1, m-d-2) + 6 \right) \\
&\quad - (\Omega(d+1, m-d-2) + 1)^2 + m, \\
&= \frac{1}{6} \Omega(d+1, m-d-2)^3 - \frac{1}{6} \Omega(d+1, m-d-2) + m.
\end{aligned}$$

Since $d \geq 6$ and $m \geq d^2 - d + 4 \geq 34$, it follows that

$$\Omega(d+1, m-d-2) \geq \Omega(6, m-8) \geq \Omega(6, 26) > 5.6 \times 10^{12},$$

and consequently

$$\frac{1}{6}\Omega(d+1, m-d-2)^3 - \frac{1}{6}\Omega(d+1, m-d-2) + m > \frac{1}{7}\Omega(d+1, m-d-2)^3. \quad (24)$$

Substituting inequality (24) into inequality (22) and re-arranging, we have the sufficient criterion

$$\frac{7(m-1)!}{d!} < \Omega(d+1, m-d-2)^3 = \mathfrak{C}_d^3(m-d-2)^{3(d-2)!}.$$

Next, we apply Stirling's approximations (equation 7) and obtain

$$\frac{7(m-1)^{m-\frac{1}{2}}e^{2-m}}{\sqrt{2\pi}d^{d+\frac{1}{2}}e^{-d}} < \mathfrak{C}_d^3(m-d-2)^{3(d-2)!},$$

which we re-arrange as

$$\frac{(m-1)^{m-\frac{1}{2}}}{e^m(m-d-2)^{3(d-2)!}} < \frac{\sqrt{2\pi}}{7} \cdot e^{d-2} \cdot d^{d+\frac{1}{2}} \cdot \mathfrak{C}_d^3. \quad (25)$$

We take log of both sides of inequality (25) and examine them individually. First, the right side of inequality (25) becomes

$$\log\left(\frac{\sqrt{2\pi}}{7}\right) + (d+2) + \left(d+\frac{1}{2}\right)\log(d) + 3\log(\mathfrak{C}_d). \quad (26)$$

By applying Lemma 4.14 to $\log(\mathfrak{C}_d)$, observing $\log\left(\frac{\sqrt{2\pi}}{7}\right) \geq -1$, and simplifying, it suffices to replace expression (26) with

$$(d+1) + \left(d+\frac{1}{2}\right)\log(d) + 6(d-2)! - 6(d-2)!\log(d-1) - 6(d-3)!\log(d-1). \quad (27)$$

The left side of inequality (25) becomes

$$\left(m-\frac{1}{2}\right)\log(m-1) - m - 3(d-2)!\log(m-d-2). \quad (28)$$

For $m \geq d^2 - d + 4$,

$$\log(m-d-2) > \log(d^2 - 2d + 1) = 2\log(d-1),$$

and multiplying by $3(d-2)!$ yields

$$3(d-2)!\log(m-d-2) > 6(d-2)!\log(d-1). \quad (29)$$

By combining expressions (27) and (28) with inequality (29), we obtain

$$\left(m-\frac{1}{2}\right)\log(m-1) - m < (d+1) + \left(d+\frac{1}{2}\right)\log(d) + 6(d-2)! - 6(d-3)!\log(d).$$

Using the approximation $\log(m-1) < m-1$, we finally arrive at the condition

$$m^2 - \frac{5}{2}m + \frac{1}{2} < (d+1) + \left(d+\frac{1}{2}\right)\log(d) + 6(d-3)!(d-2-\log(d-1)),$$

as claimed above. \square

Using the simple approximations $\log(d) \geq \log(6) > 1$ and $d - 2 - \log(d - 1) > 1$, we arrive at a simplified condition.

Corollary 4.16. (The Simplified Ω Condition)

Fix $d \geq 6$. For any $m \geq d^2 - d + 4$ such that

$$m^2 - \frac{5}{2}m \leq 6(d - 3)! + 2d + 1,$$

it follows that

$$\Phi(d, m - d - 1) < \Phi(d + 1, m - d - 2).$$

Moreover,

$$F(m) \geq \frac{(m - 1)!}{d!}.$$

Proof. Together, Lemma 4.8 and Proposition 4.15 yield that

$$\Phi(d, m - d - 1) < \Phi(d', m - d' - 1)$$

for each $d < d' < m - 2$. For any $d'' < d$, we have

$$\frac{(m - 1)!}{d!} < \frac{(m - 1)!}{(d'')!} \leq \Phi(d'', m - d'' - 1).$$

Hence,

$$F(m) \geq 2 \left\lfloor \frac{1}{2} \Phi(d, m - d - 1) \right\rfloor + 1 \geq \frac{(m - 1)!}{d!}.$$

□

We state and prove a corollary, then we recall and prove Theorem 4.1.

Corollary 4.17. (Bounding the Ratio $\frac{F(m)}{G(m)}$)

For $d \geq 11$ and $m \geq 2d^2 + 11d + 15$, $\frac{F(m)}{G(m)} > d + 1$.

Remark 4.18. We expect that better estimates of $\frac{F(m)}{G(m)}$ could reasonably be obtained. However, Corollary 4.17 suffices to prove Theorem 4.1, which establishes that $G(m)$ is the better bounding function and thus we do not need additional data on the growth rate of $F(m)$.

Proof. (Proof of Corollary 4.17)

Let $d \geq 11$. Recall that Corollary 3.34 applies for $m \geq 2d^2 + 7d + 6$ and so we set $m_d = 2d^2 + 7d + 6$. Similarly, Corollary 4.16 applies for $m \geq d^2 - d + 4$ such that

$$m^2 - \frac{5}{2}m \leq 6(d - 3)! + 2d + 1.$$

Correspondingly, we set

$$M_d = \max \left\{ m \in \mathbb{Z} \mid m^2 - \frac{5}{2}m \leq 6(d - 3)! + 2d + 1 \right\}.$$

Observe that $2d^2 + 7d + 6 \geq d^2 - d + 4$ and, since $d \geq 11$, we have

$$m_{d+1} = 2d^2 + 11d + 15 < M_d.$$

Corollary 3.34 yields $G(m_{d+1}) < \frac{(m_d-1)!}{(d+1)!}$ and Corollary 4.16 yields that $F(m_{d+1}) \geq \frac{(m_d-1)!}{d!}$. As a result, we have

$$\frac{F(m_{d+1})}{G(m_{d+1})} > \frac{\left(\frac{(m_d-1)!}{d!}\right)}{\left(\frac{(m_d-1)!}{(d+1)!}\right)} = \frac{(d+1)!}{d!} = d+1.$$

In fact,

$$(6(d-3)! + 2d+1) - \left(m_{d+2}^2 - \frac{5}{2}m_{d+2}\right)$$

is positive and strictly increasing for $d \geq 11$, so $m_{d+2} < M_d$. Hence, Corollaries 3.34 and 4.16 yield that

$$\frac{F(m)}{G(m)} > \frac{\left(\frac{(m-1)!}{d!}\right)}{\left(\frac{(m-1)!}{(d+1)!}\right)} = d+1.$$

for all $m \geq m_d = 2d^2 + 7d + 6$. □

Proof. (Proof of Theorem 4.1)

First, observe that Corollary 4.17 implies that

$$\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \frac{F(m)}{G(m)} = \infty,$$

and that $G(m) \leq F(m)$ for

$$m \geq 2(11^2) + 11(11) + 15 = 378.$$

The verification of that $G(m) \leq F(m)$ for $1 \leq m \leq 59$ comes from explicit computation and the relevant data is provided in Appendices 5.1 and 5.2.

Finally, we address the cases of $60 \leq m \leq 377$. Recall that Lemma 3.29 yields

$$\vartheta(d, m-d-1) \leq m-d-2 + \binom{m}{d}.$$

For a fixed d , $\vartheta(m, d-m-1)$ is bounded above by a polynomial of degree d in m with positive coefficients. Remark 3.15 yields that $\dim(\mathcal{M}(2, \dots, d; \vartheta(d, m-d-1)))$ is also a polynomial in m , hence there is a polynomial $p_d(m)$ with positive coefficients that bounds $\dim(\mathcal{M}(2, \dots, d; \vartheta(d, m-d-1)))$ above. Hence, there is a minimal positive integer a_d such that $\frac{(a_d-1)!}{d!} > p_d(a_d)$. Moreover, $\frac{m!}{d!} > p_d(m)$ for all $m \geq a_d$. In particular,

$$G(m) \leq \frac{(m-1)!}{d!}$$

for all $m \geq a_d$.

We compute explicitly that for all $m \geq 57$, $\frac{(m-1)!}{9!} > \dim(\mathcal{M}(2, \dots, 9; \vartheta(9, m-10)))$ and thus

$$G(m) \leq \frac{(m-1)!}{9!}.$$

Additionally, we explicitly compute that for $m \leq 377$,

$$\frac{(m-1)!}{6!} < \dim(\mathcal{M}(3; \psi(7, m-d-1)_5)).$$

and the same argument proving Corollary 4.16 yields that

$$F(m) \geq \frac{(m-1)!}{6!}.$$

As a consequence,

$$\frac{F(m)}{G(m)} \geq \frac{\frac{(m-1)!}{6!}}{\frac{(m-1)!}{9!}} \geq \frac{9!}{6!} = 504$$

for all $60 \leq m \leq 376$, which yields the theorem. □

5 Appendices

5.1 Explicit Bounds on $\text{RD}(n)$

Here we provide initial data on the behavior of $G(m)$ and provide data about $F(m)$ for comparison.

Table 1: Upper Bounds on $\text{RD}(n)$

| m | $G(m)$ | $F(m)$ | $F(m)/G(m)$ | First Established by |
|-----|-------------------|--------------------|-------------|--|
| 2 | 3 | 3 | 1 | Babylonians & Egyptians Ferrari Bring, in [Bri1786] Segre, in [Seg1945] |
| 3 | 4 | 4 | 1 | |
| 4 | 5 | 5 | 1 | |
| 5 | 9 | 9 | 1 | |
| 6 | 21 | 41 | 1.952 | |
| 7 | 109 | 121 | 1.175 | Theorem 3.10 |
| 8 | 325 | 841 | 2.645 | |
| 9 | 1681 | 6721 | 3.998 | |
| 10 | 15121 | 60481 | 4.000 | |
| 11 | 151,201 | 604,801 | 4.000 | |
| 12 | 1,663,201 | 6,652,801 | 4.000 | Theorem 3.10 / Theorem 3.24 |
| 13 | 19,958,401 | 78,485,043 | 3.932 | |
| 14 | 259,459,201 | 320,082,459 | 1.234 | |
| 15 | 3,632,428,801 | 3,632,428,801 | 1 | Wolfson, in [Wol2021] |
| 16 | 54,486,432,001 | 54,486,432,001 | 1 | Theorem 3.24 |
| 17 | 348,489,068,134 | 871,782,912,001 | 2.502 | |
| 18 | 2,964,061,900,801 | 14,820,309,504,001 | 5 | |

When $m = 12, 13, 14$, the methods of Theorems 3.10 and 3.24 both obtain the new bound on resolvent degree.

5.2 Explicit Approximations of $F(m)/G(m)$

Here we provide additional data about the ratio $\frac{F(m)}{G(m)}$. In particular, the behavior exhibited from $m = 58$ to $m = 59$ illustrates why the ratio $\frac{F(m)}{G(m)}$ is not always non-decreasing.

Table 2: $F(m)/G(m)$ for $19 \leq m \leq 59$

| m | $F(m)/G(m)$ | $G(m)$ given by determining an | $F(m)$ given by determining an |
|-----|-------------|---|--|
| 19 | 5.000 | $(m - 6)$ -plane on $\tau_{1,\dots,5}$ | $(m - 5)$ -plane on $\tau_{1,2,3,4}$ |
| 20 | 5.000 | | |
| 21 | 5.000 | | |
| 22 | 5.000 | | |
| 23 | 5.000 | | |
| 24 | 5.000 | | |
| 25 | 29.930 | $(m - 7)$ -plane on $\tau_{1,\dots,6}$ | $(m - 5)$ -plane on $\tau_{1,2,3,4}$ |
| 26 | 30.000 | | |
| 27 | 30.000 | | |
| 28 | 30.000 | | |
| 29 | 30.000 | | |
| 30 | 30.000 | | |
| 31 | 30.000 | | |
| 32 | 30.000 | | |
| 33 | 30.000 | | |
| 34 | 146.129 | $(m - 8)$ -plane on $\tau_{1,\dots,7}$ | $(m - 5)$ -plane on $\tau_{1,2,3,4}$ |
| 35 | 210.000 | | |
| 36 | 210.000 | | |
| 37 | 210.000 | | |
| 38 | 210.000 | | |
| 39 | 210.000 | | |
| 40 | 210.000 | | |
| 41 | 210.000 | | |
| 42 | 210.000 | | |
| 43 | 210.000 | | |
| 44 | 294.103 | $(m - 9)$ -plane on $\tau_{1,\dots,8}$ | $(m - 5)$ -plane on $\tau_{1,2,3,4}$ |
| 45 | 1680.000 | | |
| 46 | 1680.000 | | |
| 47 | 1680.000 | | |
| 48 | 1680.000 | | |
| 49 | 1680.000 | | |
| 50 | 1680.000 | | |
| 51 | 1680.000 | | |
| 52 | 1680.000 | | |
| 53 | 1680.000 | | |
| 54 | 1680.000 | | |
| 55 | 1680.000 | | |
| 56 | 2613.173 | $(m - 10)$ -plane on $\tau_{1,\dots,9}$ | $(m - 5)$ -plane on $\tau_{1,2,3,4}$ |
| 57 | 15120.000 | | |
| 58 | 15120.000 | | |
| 59 | 3024.000 | $(m - 10)$ -plane on $\tau_{1,\dots,9}$ | $(m - 6)$ -plane on $\tau_{1,\dots,5}$ |

5.3 Proof of Technical Lemma

We now recall the statement of Lemma 2.8 and provide a proof. We will continue to use the notation established in Definition 2.1.

Lemma 2.8. (Technical Lemma)

Let $P, Q \in \mathbb{P}^r(K)$ and $f \in K[x_0, \dots, x_r]$ be a homogeneous polynomial of degree d . Applying a projective change of coordinates as necessary, we assume that

$$\begin{aligned} P &= [1 : p_1 : \dots : p_r], \\ Q &= [1 : q_1 : \dots : q_r], \end{aligned}$$

so that the line determined by P and Q is

$$L(P, Q)(K) = \{[1 : \lambda p_1 + \mu q_1 : \dots : \lambda p_r + \mu q_r] \mid [\lambda : \mu] \in \mathbb{P}^1(K)\}.$$

For any point $R_{\lambda:\mu} = [1 : \lambda p_1 + \mu q_1 : \dots : \lambda p_r + \mu q_r] \in L(P, Q)(K)$,

$$f(R_{\lambda:\mu}) = f(\lambda P) + f(\mu Q) + \sum_{k=1}^{d-1} \frac{1}{k!} t(d-k, f, \lambda P)(\mu Q).$$

Proof. Set $p_0 = 1$ and $q_0 = 1$. Let $f \in K[x_0, \dots, x_r]$ be a homogeneous polynomial of degree d . When $r = 1$, the claim follows immediately from the binomial formula. We thus assume $r \geq 2$. As partial derivatives are linear, it suffices to consider the case where f is a monomial:

$$f(x_0, \dots, x_r) = ax_0^{i_0} x_1^{i_1} \dots x_r^{i_r}.$$

Note that

$$\begin{aligned} f(R_{\lambda:\mu}) &= a \prod_{j=0}^r (\lambda p_j + \mu q_j)^{i_j} \\ &= a \prod_{j=0}^r \sum_{\ell_j=0}^{i_j} \binom{i_j}{\ell_j} (\lambda p_j)^{i_j - \ell_j} (\mu q_j)^{\ell_j} \\ &= a \sum_{\ell_0=0}^{i_0} \dots \sum_{\ell_r=0}^{i_r} \left(\prod_{j=0}^r \binom{i_j}{\ell_j} (\lambda p_j)^{i_j - \ell_j} (\mu q_j)^{\ell_j} \right). \end{aligned}$$

To simplify notation, we denote an indexing set

$$I = \{(k_0, \dots, k_r) \in \mathbb{Z}^{r+1} \mid 0 \leq k_j \leq i_j\}$$

and, in accordance with the notation of Definition 2.1, partition it into subsets

$$I_k = \{(k_0, \dots, k_r) \in \mathbb{Z}^{r+1} \mid k_0 + \dots + k_r = k\}$$

for $0 \leq k \leq d$. Thus, we write

$$\begin{aligned} f(R_{\lambda:\mu}) &= a \sum_I \left(\prod_{j=0}^r \binom{i_j}{k_j} (\lambda p_j)^{i_j - k_j} (\mu q_j)^{k_j} \right) \\ &= a \sum_{k=0}^d \sum_{I_k} \left(\prod_{j=0}^r \binom{i_j}{k_j} (\lambda p_j)^{i_j - k_j} (\mu q_j)^{k_j} \right) \end{aligned}$$

Note that

$$f(\lambda P) = a \left(\prod_{j=0}^r (\lambda p_j)^{i_j} \right) = a \sum_{I_0} \left(\prod_{j=0}^r \binom{i_j}{0} (\lambda p_j)^{i_j-0} (\mu q_j)^0 \right),$$

$$f(\mu Q) = a \left(\prod_{j=0}^r (\mu q_j)^{i_j} \right) = a \sum_{I_d} \left(\prod_{j=0}^r \binom{i_j}{i_j} (\lambda p_j)^{i_j-i_j} (\mu q_j)^{i_j} \right).$$

Thus,

$$f(R_{\lambda, \mu}) - f(\lambda P) - f(\mu Q) = a \sum_{k=1}^{d-1} \sum_{I_k} \left(\prod_{j=0}^r \binom{i_j}{l_j} (\lambda p_j)^{i_j-k_j} (\mu q_j)^{k_j} \right).$$

Consequently, it suffices to show that

$$\frac{1}{k!} t(d-k, f, \lambda P)(\mu Q) = a \sum_{I_k} \left(\prod_{j=0}^r \binom{i_j}{l_j} (\lambda p_j)^{i_j-k_j} (\mu q_j)^{k_j} \right)$$

for each $1 \leq k \leq d-1$. Recall that

$$\begin{aligned} [k]^* &= \{1, \dots, k\}, \\ [r] &= \{0, 1, \dots, r\}, \\ I_k^* &= \text{Hom}_{\mathbf{Set}}([k]^*, [r]) \end{aligned}$$

and for $\iota \in I_k^*$, we set $|\iota|(j) = |\iota^{-1}(j)|$. Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{k!} t(d-k, f, \lambda P)(\mu Q) \\ &= \frac{1}{k!} \sum_{\iota \in I_k^*} \left(\partial_0^{|\iota|(0)} \dots \partial_r^{|\iota|(r)} f \right) \Big|_{\lambda P} (\mu q_0)^{|\iota|(0)} \dots (\mu q_r)^{|\iota|(r)} \\ &= \frac{1}{k!} \sum_{\iota \in I_k^*} a \frac{i_0}{(i_0 - |\iota|(0))!} \dots \frac{i_r}{(i_r - |\iota|(r))!} (\lambda p_0)^{i_0 - |\iota|(0)} \dots (\lambda p_r)^{i_r - |\iota|(r)} (\mu q_0)^{|\iota|(0)} \dots (\mu q_r)^{|\iota|(r)} \\ &= \frac{a}{k!} \sum_{\iota \in I_k^*} \prod_{j=0}^r \frac{i_j}{(i_j - |\iota|(j))!} (\lambda p_j)^{i_j - |\iota|(j)} (\mu q_j)^{|\iota|(j)} \end{aligned}$$

Note that for any $\iota, \iota' \in I_k^*$ whose fibers at every point of $[r]$ have the same cardinality, we have

$$\partial_0^{|\iota|(0)} \dots \partial_r^{|\iota|(r)} f = \partial_0^{|\iota'|(0)} \dots \partial_r^{|\iota'|(r)} f$$

as partial derivatives of polynomials commute. Now, given any $\iota \in I_k^*$, we can apply a permutation of the symmetric group S_k to $[k]^*$ and not change the number of fibers of each cardinality. However, to get a unique representative of each unordered class of partial derivative, we must identify any permutations which fix all of the fibers, but permute the elements within any such fiber. Thus, to a given ι , there are

$$\frac{|S_k|}{|S_{|\iota|(0)}| \dots |S_{|\iota|(r)}|} = k! \prod_{l=0}^r \frac{1}{(|\iota|(l))!}$$

permutations which give the same unordered partial derivative. Hence,

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{1}{k!}t(d-k, f, \lambda P)(\mu Q) &= \frac{a}{k!} \sum_{\iota \in I_k^*} \prod_{j=0}^r \frac{i_j}{(i_j - |\iota(j)|)!} (\lambda p_j)^{i_j - |\iota(j)|} (\mu q_j)^{|\iota(j)|} \\
&= \frac{a}{k!} \sum_{I_k} \left(k! \prod_{l=0}^r \frac{1}{(|\iota(j)|)!} \right) \prod_{j=0}^r \frac{i_j}{(i_j - k_j)!} (\lambda p_j)^{i_j - k_j} (\mu q_j)^{k_j} \\
&= a \sum_{I_k} \prod_{j=0}^r \binom{i_j}{k_j} (\lambda p_j)^{i_j - k_j} (\mu q_j)^{k_j}
\end{aligned}$$

which yields the lemma. □

References

- [AS1976] Arnol'd, V.I. and Shimura, G. Superpositions of algebraic functions. *Proc. Symposia in Pure Math*, AMS, Providence, 28:45-46, 1976.
- [Ber1923] Bertini, E. Introduzione alla geometria proiettiva degli iperspazi con appendice sulle curve algebriche e loro singolarità. Seconda edizione riveduta ed ampliata. Messina, G. Principato, 1923.
- [Bra1975] Brauer, R. On the resolvent problem. *Ann. Mat. Pura Appl.* (4) 102:45-55, 1975.
- [Bri1786] Bring, E. Meletemata quædam Mathematica circa Transformationem Æquationum Algebraicarum (“Some Selected Mathematics on the Transformation of Algebraic Equations”). Lund, 1786.
- [Che1954] Chebotarev, G. N. On the problem of resolvents. *Kazan. Gos. Univ. Uč. Zap.*, (2) 114:189-193, 1954.
- [CHM2017] Chen, A., He, Y-H., and McKay J. Erland Samuel Bring’s “Transformation of Algebraic Equations,” 2017. arXiv:1711.09253v1.
- [DM1998] Debarre, O and Manivel, L. Sur la variété des espaces linéaires contenus dans une intersection complète. *Math. Ann.*, 312(3):549-574, 1998.
- [Dix1993] Dixmier, J. Histoire de 13e problème de Hilbert. *Cahiers du séminaire d’histoire des mathématiques*, 3(2):85-94, 1993.
- [Dol2012] Dolgachev, I. Classical Algebraic Geometry: A Modern View. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012.
- [FW2019] Farb, B and Wolfson, J. Resolvent degree, Hilbert’s 13th problem and geometry. *Enseign. Math.*, 65(3-4):303-376, 2019.
- [Ham1836] Hamilton, W. Inquiry into the validity of a method recently proposed by George B. Jerrard, esq., for transforming and resolving equation of elevated degrees. *Report of the Sixth Meeting of the British Association for the Advancement of Science*, p.295-348, 1836.
- [Har2010] Harris, J. Algebraic Geometry. Springer: New York, 2010.
- [Hil1927] Hilbert, D. Über die Gleichung neunten Grades. *Math. Ann.*, 97(1):243-250, 1927.
- [Kle1884] Klein, F. Vorlesungen über das Ikosaeder und die Auflösung der Gleichungen vom fünften Grade. Teubner, Leipzig, 1884.
- [Kle1887] Klein, F. Zur Theorie der allgemeinen Gleichungen sechsten und siebenten Grades. *Math. Ann.*, 28 (4):499-532, 1887.

- [Kle1905] Klein, F. Über die Auflösung der allgemeinen Gleichungen fünften und sechsten Grades. *J. Reine Angew. Math.*, 129:150-174, 1905.
- [Mor1956] Morrice, G.G. Felix Klein's "Lectures on the icosahedron and solution of equation of fifth degree," 2nd and rev. edition, New York, Dover Publications, 1956.
- [OEIS2021] OEIS Foundation Inc. (2021), The On-Line Encyclopedia of Integer Sequences, <http://oeis.org/A000905>.
- [Rob1955] Robbins, H. A Remark on Stirling's Formula. *Amer. Math. Monthly*, 62(1):26, 1955.
- [Seg1945] Segre, B. The Algebraic Equations of Degrees 5, 9, 157 . . . , and the Arithmetic Upon an Algebraic Variety. *Ann. of Math.*, 46(2):287-301, 1945.
- [Sut2019] Sutherland, A. Felix Klein's "About the Solution of General Equations of Fifth and Sixth Degree (Excerpt from a letter to Mr. K. Hensel)," A. Sutherland, 2019, arXiv:1911.02358.
- [Sut2021A] Sutherland, A. Anders Wiman's "On the Application of Tschirnhaus Transformations to the Reduction of Algebraic Equations," 2021, arXiv:2106.09247.
- [Sut2021B] Sutherland, A. G. N. Chebotarev's "On the Problem of Resolvents," 2021, arXiv:2107.01006.
- [Syl887] Sylvester, J.J. On the so-called Tschirnhausen Transformation. *J. Reine Angew. Math.*, 100:465-486, 1887.
- [SH1887] Sylvester, J.J. and Hammond, J. On Hamilton's numbers. *Philos. Trans. R. Soc. Lond., A*, 178:285-312, 1887.
- [SH1888] Sylvester, J.J. and Hammond, J. On Hamilton's numbers, Part II. *Philos. Trans. R. Soc. Lond., A*, 179:65-72, 1888.
- [Tsc1683] von Tschirnhaus, E. Methodus auferendi omnes terminos intermedios ex data aequatione (Method of eliminating all intermediate terms from a given equation). *Acta Eruditorum*, p.204-207, 1683.
- [Wal2008] Waldron, A. Fano Varieties of Low-Degree Smooth Hypersurfaces and Unirationality, Bachelor thesis, Harvard University, Cambridge, Massachusetts, 2008.
- [Wim1927] Wiman, A. Über die Anwendung der Tschirnhausen-Transformation auf die Reduktion algebraischer Gleichungen. *Nova Acta R. Soc. scient. Uppsala*, 4(16), 1927.
- [Wol2021] Wolfson, J. Tschirnhaus transformations after Hilbert. *Enseign. Math.*, 66(3):489-540, 2021.