Betti tables of ideals in a polynomial ring

MATTEO VARBARO

Dipartimento di Matematica, Università di Genova

From a joint work Jürgen Herzog and Leila Sharifan

Free resolutions

Let $S = K[x_0, ..., x_n]$ be a polynomial ring over a field K and $I \subset S$ a graded ideal. The minimal graded free resolution of I is:

 $0 \to \bigoplus_{j \in \mathbb{N}} S(-j)^{\beta_{n,j}} \to \ldots \to \bigoplus_{j \in \mathbb{N}} S(-j)^{\beta_{1,j}} \to \bigoplus_{j \in \mathbb{N}} S(-j)^{\beta_{0,j}} \to I \to 0.$

The invariants $\beta_{i,j}(I) = \beta_{i,j}$ are the graded Betti numbers of I.

If X ⊂ Pⁿ is a projective scheme, we will refer to its free resolution (and related concepts) as the one of the saturated ideal defining it.

- Let $S = K[x_0, ..., x_n]$ be a polynomial ring over a field K and $I \subset S$ a graded ideal. The minimal graded free resolution of I is:
 - $0 \to \bigoplus_{j \in \mathbb{N}} S(-j)^{\beta_{n,j}} \to \ldots \to \bigoplus_{j \in \mathbb{N}} S(-j)^{\beta_{n,j}} \to \bigoplus_{j \in \mathbb{N}} S(-j)^{\beta_{n,j}} \to I \to 0.$
- The invariants $eta_{i,j}(l)=eta_{i,j}$ are the graded Betti numbers of l .
- If X ⊂ Pⁿ is a projective scheme, we will refer to its free resolution (and related concepts) as the one of the saturated ideal defining it.

- Let $S = K[x_0, ..., x_n]$ be a polynomial ring over a field K and $l \in S$ a graded ideal. The minimal graded free resolution of l is:
 - $0 \to \bigoplus_{j \in \mathbb{N}} S(-j)^{\beta_{n,j}} \to \ldots \to \bigoplus_{j \in \mathbb{N}} S(-j)^{\beta_{1,j}} \to \bigoplus_{j \in \mathbb{N}} S(-j)^{\beta_{0,j}} \to I \to 0.$
- The invariants $\beta_{l,j}(I) = \beta_{l,j}$ are the graded Betti numbers of I.
- If $X \subset \mathbb{P}^n$ is a projective scheme, we will refer to its free resolution (and related concepts) as the one of the saturated ideal defining it.

- Let $S = K[x_0, ..., x_n]$ be a polynomial ring over a field K and $I \subset S$ a graded ideal. The minimal graded free resolution of I is:
 - $0 \to \bigoplus_{j \in \mathbb{N}} S(-j)^{\beta_{n,j}} \to \ldots \to \bigoplus_{j \in \mathbb{N}} S(-j)^{\beta_{1,j}} \to \bigoplus_{j \in \mathbb{N}} S(-j)^{\beta_{0,j}} \to I \to 0.$
- The invariants $eta_{i,j}(I)=eta_{i,j}$ are the graded Betti numbers of I_+
- If $X \subset \mathbb{P}^n$ is a projective scheme, we will refer to its free resolution (and related concepts) as the one of the saturated ideal defining it.

Let $S = K[x_0, ..., x_n]$ be a polynomial ring over a field K and $I \subset S$ a graded ideal. The minimal graded free resolution of I is:

 $0 \to \bigoplus_{j \in \mathbb{N}} S(-j)^{\beta_{n,j}} \to \ldots \to \bigoplus_{j \in \mathbb{N}} S(-j)^{\beta_{1,j}} \to \bigoplus_{j \in \mathbb{N}} S(-j)^{\beta_{0,j}} \to I \to 0.$

The invariants $\beta_{i,j}(I) = \beta_{i,j}$ are the graded Betti numbers of I.

If $X \subset \mathbb{P}^n$ is a projective scheme, we will refer to its free resolution (and related concepts) as the one of the saturated ideal defining it.

Let $S = K[x_0, ..., x_n]$ be a polynomial ring over a field K and $I \subset S$ a graded ideal. The minimal graded free resolution of I is:

$$0 \to \bigoplus_{j \in \mathbb{N}} S(-j)^{\beta_{n,j}} \to \ldots \to \bigoplus_{j \in \mathbb{N}} S(-j)^{\beta_{1,j}} \to \bigoplus_{j \in \mathbb{N}} S(-j)^{\beta_{0,j}} \to I \to 0.$$

The invariants $\beta_{i,j}(I) = \beta_{i,j}$ are the graded Betti numbers of I.

If $X \subset \mathbb{P}^n$ is a projective scheme, we will refer to its free resolution (and related concepts) as the one of the saturated ideal defining it.

Let $S = K[x_0, ..., x_n]$ be a polynomial ring over a field K and $I \subset S$ a graded ideal. The minimal graded free resolution of I is:

$$0 o igoplus_{j\in\mathbb{N}} S(-j)^{eta_{n,j}} o \ldots o igoplus_{j\in\mathbb{N}} S(-j)^{eta_{1,j}} o igoplus_{j\in\mathbb{N}} S(-j)^{eta_{0,j}} o I o 0.$$

The invariants $\beta_{i,j}(I) = \beta_{i,j}$ are the graded Betti numbers of *I*.

If $X \subset \mathbb{P}^n$ is a projective scheme, we will refer to its free resolution (and related concepts) as the one of the saturated ideal defining it.

Let $S = K[x_0, ..., x_n]$ be a polynomial ring over a field K and $I \subset S$ a graded ideal. The minimal graded free resolution of I is:

$$0 o igoplus_{j\in\mathbb{N}} S(-j)^{eta_{n,j}} o \ldots o igoplus_{j\in\mathbb{N}} S(-j)^{eta_{1,j}} o igoplus_{j\in\mathbb{N}} S(-j)^{eta_{0,j}} o I o 0.$$

The invariants $\beta_{i,j}(I) = \beta_{i,j}$ are the graded Betti numbers of I.

If $X \subset \mathbb{P}^n$ is a projective scheme, we will refer to its free resolution (and related concepts) as the one of the saturated ideal defining it.

Let $S = K[x_0, ..., x_n]$ be a polynomial ring over a field K and $I \subset S$ a graded ideal. The minimal graded free resolution of I is:

$$0 o igoplus_{j\in\mathbb{N}} S(-j)^{eta_{n,j}} o \ldots o igoplus_{j\in\mathbb{N}} S(-j)^{eta_{1,j}} o igoplus_{j\in\mathbb{N}} S(-j)^{eta_{0,j}} o I o 0.$$

The invariants $\beta_{i,j}(I) = \beta_{i,j}$ are the graded Betti numbers of I.

If $X \subset \mathbb{P}^n$ is a projective scheme, we will refer to its free resolution (and related concepts) as the one of the saturated ideal defining it.

The Betti table of I is the matrix $(\beta_{i,i+d}(I))_{i,d}$. It can be thought as a $(n + 1) \times \operatorname{reg}(I)$ matrix: For example, if

$$I = (x_0 x_1, x_1 x_2, x_2 x_3, x_3^2) \subset S = K[x_0, \dots, x_3],$$

the resolution of I is:

 $0 o S(-4) o S(-3)^3\oplus S(-4) o S(-2)^4 o I o 0$ Therefore its Betti table is:

The Betti table of I is the matrix $(\beta_{i,i+d}(I))_{i,d}$. It can be thought as a $(n + 1) \times \operatorname{reg}(I)$ matrix: For example, if

 $I = (x_0 x_1, x_1 x_2, x_2 x_3, x_3^2) \subset S = K[x_0, \dots, x_3],$

the resolution of *I* is:

 $0 o S(-4) o S(-3)^3 \oplus S(-4) o S(-2)^4 o I o 0$ erefore its Betti table is:

The Betti table of I is the matrix $(\beta_{i,i+d}(I))_{i,d}$. It can be thought as a $(n + 1) \times \operatorname{reg}(I)$ matrix: For example, if

$$I = (x_0 x_1, x_1 x_2, x_2 x_3, x_3^2) \subset S = K[x_0, \dots, x_3],$$

the resolution of I is:

 $0 \rightarrow S(-4) \rightarrow S(-3)^3 \oplus S(-4) \rightarrow S(-2)^4 \rightarrow I \rightarrow 0$

Therefore its Betti table is:

 $\left(\begin{array}{rrrrr} 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 4 & 3 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 1 & 0 \end{array}\right)$

The Betti table of I is the matrix $(\beta_{i,i+d}(I))_{i,d}$. It can be thought as a $(n + 1) \times \operatorname{reg}(I)$ matrix: For example, if

$$I = (x_0x_1, x_1x_2, x_2x_3, x_3^2) \subset S = K[x_0, \dots, x_3],$$

the resolution of I is:

 $0 \rightarrow S(-4) \rightarrow S(-3)^3 \oplus S(-4) \rightarrow S(-2)^4 \rightarrow I \rightarrow 0$

Therefore its Betti table is:

The Betti table of I is the matrix $(\beta_{i,i+d}(I))_{i,d}$. It can be thought as a $(n + 1) \times \operatorname{reg}(I)$ matrix: For example, if

$$I = (x_0x_1, x_1x_2, x_2x_3, x_3^2) \subset S = K[x_0, \dots, x_3],$$

the resolution of I is:

$$0 \rightarrow S(-4) \rightarrow S(-3)^3 \oplus S(-4) \rightarrow S(-2)^4 \rightarrow I \rightarrow 0$$

Therefore its Betti table is:

The Betti table of I is the matrix $(\beta_{i,i+d}(I))_{i,d}$. It can be thought as a $(n + 1) \times \operatorname{reg}(I)$ matrix: For example, if

$$I = (x_0x_1, x_1x_2, x_2x_3, x_3^2) \subset S = K[x_0, \dots, x_3],$$

the resolution of I is:

$$0 \rightarrow S(-4) \rightarrow S(-3)^3 \oplus S(-4) \rightarrow S(-2)^4 \rightarrow I \rightarrow 0$$

Therefore its Betti table is:

$$\left(\begin{array}{rrrr} 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 4 & 3 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 1 & 0 \end{array}\right)$$

The ideal I is said to have d-linear resolution if all its minimal generators are of degree d and reg(I) = d. Equivalently, if the Betti tables of I has only one nonzero row, the dth.

For example, the rational normal curve in \mathbb{P}^4 has Betti table:

 $\left(\begin{array}{cccc} 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 6 & 8 & 3 & 0 & 0 \end{array}\right)$

thus it has 2-linear resolution. Indeed it is known that all varieties of minimal degree have a 2-linear resolution. More generally:

The ideal I is said to have d-linear resolution if all its minimal generators are of degree d and reg(I) = d. Equivalently, if the Betti tables of I has only one nonzero row, the dth.

For example, the rational normal curve in \mathbb{P}^4 has Betti table:

 $\left(\begin{array}{rrrrr} 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 6 & 8 & 3 & 0 & 0 \end{array}\right)$

thus it has 2-linear resolution. Indeed it is known that all varieties of minimal degree have a 2-linear resolution. More generally:

The ideal I is said to have d-linear resolution if all its minimal generators are of degree d and reg(I) = d. Equivalently, if the Betti tables of I has only one nonzero row, the dth.

For example, the rational normal curve in \mathbb{P}^4 has Betti table:

 $\left(\begin{array}{rrrrr} 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 6 & 8 & 3 & 0 & 0 \end{array}\right)$

thus it has 2-linear resolution. Indeed it is known that all varieties of minimal degree have a 2-linear resolution. More generally:

The ideal I is said to have *d*-linear resolution if all its minimal generators are of degree d and reg(I) = d. Equivalently, if the Betti tables of I has only one nonzero row, the *d*th.

For example, the rational normal curve in \mathbb{P}^4 has Betti table:

 $\left(\begin{array}{rrrr} 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 6 & 8 & 3 & 0 & 0 \end{array}\right)$

thus it has 2-linear resolution. Indeed it is known that all varieties of minimal degree have a 2-linear resolution. More generally:

The ideal I is said to have d-linear resolution if all its minimal generators are of degree d and reg(I) = d. Equivalently, if the Betti tables of I has only one nonzero row, the dth.

For example, the rational normal curve in \mathbb{P}^4 has Betti table:

 $\left(\begin{array}{rrrr} 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 6 & 8 & 3 & 0 & 0 \end{array}\right)$

thus it has 2-linear resolution. Indeed it is known that all varieties of minimal degree have a 2-linear resolution. More generally:

The ideal I is said to have d-linear resolution if all its minimal generators are of degree d and reg(I) = d. Equivalently, if the Betti tables of I has only one nonzero row, the dth.

For example, the rational normal curve in \mathbb{P}^4 has Betti table:

$$\left(\begin{array}{rrrrr} 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 6 & 8 & 3 & 0 & 0 \end{array}\right)$$

thus it has 2-linear resolution. Indeed it is known that all varieties of minimal degree have a 2-linear resolution. More generally:

The ideal I is said to have d-linear resolution if all its minimal generators are of degree d and reg(I) = d. Equivalently, if the Betti tables of I has only one nonzero row, the dth.

For example, the rational normal curve in \mathbb{P}^4 has Betti table:

$$\left(\begin{array}{rrrrr} 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 6 & 8 & 3 & 0 & 0 \end{array}\right)$$

thus it has 2-linear resolution. Indeed it is known that all varieties of minimal degree have a 2-linear resolution. More generally:

The ideal I is said to have d-linear resolution if all its minimal generators are of degree d and reg(I) = d. Equivalently, if the Betti tables of I has only one nonzero row, the dth.

For example, the rational normal curve in \mathbb{P}^4 has Betti table:

$$\left(\begin{array}{rrrrr} 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 6 & 8 & 3 & 0 & 0 \end{array}\right)$$

thus it has 2-linear resolution. Indeed it is known that all varieties of minimal degree have a 2-linear resolution. More generally:

A graded Betti number $\beta_{i,i+d}$ of I is said extremal if $\beta_{i,i+d}(I) \neq 0$ and $\beta_{h,h+k}(I) = 0$ for all $(h, k) \neq (i, d)$ with $h \ge i$ and $k \ge d$.

For example, let us look at the Betti table of

 $I = (x_0^4, x_0^3 x_1, x_0^3 x_2, x_0^3 x_3, x_0^2 x_1^3, x_0 x_1^4, x_0^2 x_1^2 x_2, x_0 x_1^3 x_2, x_1^6)$

A graded Betti number $\beta_{i,i+d}$ of I is said extremal if $\beta_{i,i+d}(I) \neq 0$ and $\beta_{h,h+k}(I) = 0$ for all $(h, k) \neq (i, d)$ with $h \ge i$ and $k \ge d$.

For example, let us look at the Betti table of

 $I = (x_0^4, x_0^3 x_1, x_0^3 x_2, x_0^3 x_3, x_0^2 x_1^3, x_0 x_1^4, x_0^2 x_1^2 x_2, x_0 x_1^3 x_2, x_1^6)$

A graded Betti number $\beta_{i,i+d}$ of I is said extremal if $\beta_{i,i+d}(I) \neq 0$ and $\beta_{h,h+k}(I) = 0$ for all $(h, k) \neq (i, d)$ with $h \ge i$ and $k \ge d$.

For example, let us look at the Betti table of

 $I = (x_0^4, x_0^3 x_1, x_0^3 x_2, x_0^3 x_3, x_0^2 x_1^3, x_0 x_1^4, x_0^2 x_1^2 x_2, x_0 x_1^3 x_2, x_1^6)$



A graded Betti number $\beta_{i,i+d}$ of I is said extremal if $\beta_{i,i+d}(I) \neq 0$ and $\beta_{h,h+k}(I) = 0$ for all $(h, k) \neq (i, d)$ with $h \ge i$ and $k \ge d$.

For example, let us look at the Betti table of

 $I = (x_0^4, x_0^3 x_1, x_0^3 x_2, x_0^3 x_3, x_0^2 x_1^3, x_0 x_1^4, x_0^2 x_1^2 x_2, x_0 x_1^3 x_2, x_1^6)$



A graded Betti number $\beta_{i,i+d}$ of I is said extremal if $\beta_{i,i+d}(I) \neq 0$ and $\beta_{h,h+k}(I) = 0$ for all $(h, k) \neq (i, d)$ with $h \ge i$ and $k \ge d$.

For example, let us look at the Betti table of

 $I = (x_0^4, x_0^3 x_1, x_0^3 x_2, x_0^3 x_3, x_0^2 x_1^3, x_0 x_1^4, x_0^2 x_1^2 x_2, x_0 x_1^3 x_2, x_1^6)$



A graded Betti number $\beta_{i,i+d}$ of I is said extremal if $\beta_{i,i+d}(I) \neq 0$ and $\beta_{h,h+k}(I) = 0$ for all $(h, k) \neq (i, d)$ with $h \ge i$ and $k \ge d$.

For example, let us look at the Betti table of

 $I = (x_0^4, x_0^3 x_1, x_0^3 x_2, x_0^3 x_3, x_0^2 x_1^3, x_0 x_1^4, x_0^2 x_1^2 x_2, x_0 x_1^3 x_2, x_1^6)$

A graded Betti number $\beta_{i,i+d}$ of I is said extremal if $\beta_{i,i+d}(I) \neq 0$ and $\beta_{h,h+k}(I) = 0$ for all $(h, k) \neq (i, d)$ with $h \ge i$ and $k \ge d$.

For example, let us look at the Betti table of

 $I = (x_0^4, x_0^3 x_1, x_0^3 x_2, x_0^3 x_3, x_0^2 x_1^3, x_0 x_1^4, x_0^2 x_1^2 x_2, x_0 x_1^3 x_2, x_1^6)$

- Let $X \subset \mathbb{P}^n$ be a projective scheme and \mathcal{I}_X its ideal sheaf. Then $\beta_{i,i+d}$ is an extremal Betti number of $\bigoplus_{m \in \mathbb{Z}} \Gamma(X, \mathcal{I}_X(m)) \subset S$ iff:
 - (i) *i* < *n*;
 - $\begin{aligned} &\|(i) \dim_{\mathcal{K}}(H^{p}(X,\mathcal{I}_{X}(q-p))) = \beta_{i,i+d} \neq 0 \text{ for } p = n-i \text{ and } q = d-1; \\ &\|(i) H^{r}(X,\mathcal{I}_{X}(s-r)) = 0 \text{ for all } (r,s) \neq (p,q), \ 1 \leq r \leq p \text{ and } s \geq q. \end{aligned}$

- Let $X \subset \mathbb{P}^n$ be a projective scheme and \mathcal{I}_X its ideal sheaf. Then $\beta_{i,i+d}$ is an extremal Betti number of $\bigoplus_{m \in \mathbb{Z}} \Gamma(X, \mathcal{I}_X(m)) \subset S$ iff:
 - (i) i < n;
 - (ii) $\dim_{\mathcal{K}}(H^p(X,\mathcal{I}_X(q-p))) = \beta_{i,i+d} \neq 0$ for p = n-i and q = d-1;
 - $H^r(X,\mathcal{I}_X(s-r))=0 \text{ for all } (r,s)\neq (p,q), \ 1\leq r\leq p \text{ and } s\geq q.$

Let $X \subset \mathbb{P}^n$ be a projective scheme and \mathcal{I}_X its ideal sheaf. Then $\beta_{i,i+d}$ is an extremal Betti number of $\bigoplus_{m \in \mathbb{Z}} \Gamma(X, \mathcal{I}_X(m)) \subset S$ iff:

(i) i < n;

(ii) $\dim_{\mathcal{K}}(H^p(X,\mathcal{I}_X(q-p))) = \beta_{i,i+d} \neq 0 \text{ for } p = n-i \text{ and } q = d-1;$

Let $X \subset \mathbb{P}^n$ be a projective scheme and \mathcal{I}_X its ideal sheaf. Then $\beta_{i,i+d}$ is an extremal Betti number of $\bigoplus_{m \in \mathbb{Z}} \Gamma(X, \mathcal{I}_X(m)) \subset S$ iff:

(i) i < n

(ii) $\dim_{\mathcal{K}}(H^{p}(X, \mathcal{I}_{X}(q-p))) = \beta_{i,i+d} \neq 0 \text{ for } p = n-i \text{ and } q = d-1;$ (iii) $H^{r}(X, \mathcal{I}_{X}(s-r)) = 0 \text{ for all } (r, s) \neq (p, q), \ 1 \leq r \leq p \text{ and } s \geq q.$

Let $X \subset \mathbb{P}^n$ be a projective scheme and \mathcal{I}_X its ideal sheaf. Then $\beta_{i,i+d}$ is an extremal Betti number of $\bigoplus_{m \in \mathbb{Z}} \Gamma(X, \mathcal{I}_X(m)) \subset S$ iff:

(i) *i* < *n*;

(ii) $\dim_{\mathcal{K}}(H^p(X,\mathcal{I}_X(q-p))) = \beta_{i,i+d} \neq 0 \text{ for } p = n-i \text{ and } q = d-1;$ (iii) $H^r(X,\mathcal{I}_X(s-r)) = 0 \text{ for all } (r,s) \neq (p,q), \ 1 \le r \le p \text{ and } s \ge q.$
Let $X \subset \mathbb{P}^n$ be a projective scheme and \mathcal{I}_X its ideal sheaf. Then $\beta_{i,i+d}$ is an extremal Betti number of $\bigoplus_{m \in \mathbb{Z}} \Gamma(X, \mathcal{I}_X(m)) \subset S$ iff:

(i) i < n;

(ii) $\dim_{\mathcal{K}}(H^p(X,\mathcal{I}_X(q-p))) = \beta_{i,i+d} \neq 0$ for p = n-i and q = d-1;

(iii) $H^r(X, \mathcal{I}_X(s-r)) = 0$ for all $(r, s) \neq (p, q)$, $1 \leq r \leq p$ and $s \geq q$.

Let $X \subset \mathbb{P}^n$ be a projective scheme and \mathcal{I}_X its ideal sheaf. Then $\beta_{i,i+d}$ is an extremal Betti number of $\bigoplus_{m \in \mathbb{Z}} \Gamma(X, \mathcal{I}_X(m)) \subset S$ iff:

(i) *i* < *n*;

(ii) $\dim_{\mathcal{K}}(H^p(X,\mathcal{I}_X(q-p))) = \beta_{i,i+d} \neq 0$ for p = n-i and q = d-1;

(iii) $H^r(X, \mathcal{I}_X(s-r)) = 0$ for all $(r, s) \neq (p, q), 1 \leq r \leq p$ and $s \geq q$.

We will explain how to give a numerical characterization of:

(i) The Betti tables of ideals *I* ⊂ *S* with *d*-linear resolution.
(ii) The extremal Betti numbers of any graded ideal *I* ⊂ *S*.

We will explain how to give a numerical characterization of:

(i) The Betti tables of ideals *I* ⊂ *S* with *d*-linear resolution.
(ii) The extremal Betti numbers of any graded ideal *I* ⊂ *S*.

We will explain how to give a numerical characterization of:

(i) The Betti tables of ideals *I* ⊂ *S* with *d*-linear resolution.
(ii) The extremal Betti numbers of any graded ideal *I* ⊂ *S*.

We will explain how to give a numerical characterization of:

(i) The Betti tables of ideals *I* ⊂ *S* with *d*-linear resolution.
(ii) The extremal Betti numbers of any graded ideal *I* ⊂ *S*.

We will explain how to give a numerical characterization of:

(i) The Betti tables of ideals *I* ⊂ *S* with *d*-linear resolution.
(ii) The extremal Betti numbers of any graded ideal *I* ⊂ *S*.

If I has d-linear resolution, then it has the same Betti table of its generic initial ideal Gin(I) (Aramova, Herzog, Hibi).

Gin(1) is strongly stable (Gin(1) : $x_i \subset$ Gin(1) : $x_j \forall j < i$). Viceversa, any strongly stable ideal generated in degree *d* has *d*-linear resolution (Elihaou, Kervaire).

If I has d-linear resolution, then it has the same Betti table of its generic initial ideal Gin(I) (Aramova, Herzog, Hibi).

Gin(*I*) is strongly stable (Gin(*I*) : $x_i \subset$ Gin(*I*) : $x_j \forall j < i$). Viceversa, any strongly stable ideal generated in degree *d* has *d*-linear resolution (Elihaou, Kervaire).

If I has d-linear resolution, then it has the same Betti table of its generic initial ideal Gin(I) (Aramova, Herzog, Hibi).

Gin(*I*) is strongly stable (Gin(*I*) : $x_i \subset$ Gin(*I*) : $x_j \forall j < i$). Viceversa, any strongly stable ideal generated in degree *d*

has *d*-linear resolution (Elihaou, Kervaire).

If I has d-linear resolution, then it has the same Betti table of its generic initial ideal Gin(I) (Aramova, Herzog, Hibi).

Gin(*I*) is strongly stable (Gin(*I*) : $x_i \subset$ Gin(*I*) : $x_j \forall j < i$). Viceversa, any strongly stable ideal generated in degree *d* has *d*-linear resolution (Elihaou, Kervaire).

If I has d-linear resolution, then it has the same Betti table of its generic initial ideal Gin(I) (Aramova, Herzog, Hibi).

Gin(*I*) is strongly stable (Gin(*I*) : $x_i \subset$ Gin(*I*) : $x_j \forall j < i$). Viceversa, any strongly stable ideal generated in degree *d* has *d*-linear resolution (Elihaou, Kervaire).

Given an ideal $I \subset S = K[x_0, \ldots, x_n]$, we define:

$$\sum_{k=0}^{n} m_k(I) t^k = \sum_{i=0}^{n} \beta_i(I) (t-1)^i.$$

Obviously to characterize the possible Betti tables of ideals with linear resolution we can characterize the possible sequences $(m_0(l), m_1(l), \dots, m_n(l)).$

For a monomial $u \in S$, let us set $m(v) = \max\{i : x_i | v\}$. Elihaou and Kervaire showed that, if $J \subset S$ is strongly stable, then:

 $m_k(J) = |\{u \in \mathsf{G}(I) : m(u) = k\}|$

Given an ideal $I \subset S = K[x_0, \ldots, x_n]$, we define:

$$\sum_{k=0}^{n} m_k(l) t^k = \sum_{i=0}^{n} \beta_i(l) (t-1)^i.$$

Obviously to characterize the possible Betti tables of ideals with linear resolution we can characterize the possible sequences $(m_0(l), m_1(l), \ldots, m_n(l)).$

For a monomial $u \in S$, let us set $m(u) = \max\{i : x_i | u\}$. Elihaou and Kervaire showed that, if $J \subset S$ is strongly stable, then:

 $m_k(J) = |\{u \in \mathsf{G}(I) : m(u) = k\}|$

Given an ideal $I \subset S = K[x_0, \ldots, x_n]$, we define:

$$\sum_{k=0}^{n} m_k(I) t^k = \sum_{i=0}^{n} \beta_i(I) (t-1)^i.$$

Obviously to characterize the possible Betti tables of ideals with linear resolution we can characterize the possible sequences $(m_0(l), m_1(l), \ldots, m_n(l)).$

For a monomial $u \in S$, let us set $m(u) = \max\{i : x_i | u\}$. Elihaou and Kervaire showed that, if $J \subset S$ is strongly stable, then:

 $m_k(J) = |\{u \in G(I) : m(u) = k\}|$

Given an ideal $I \subset S = K[x_0, \ldots, x_n]$, we define:

$$\sum_{k=0}^{n} m_{k}(I)t^{k} = \sum_{i=0}^{n} \beta_{i}(I)(t-1)^{i}.$$

Obviously to characterize the possible Betti tables of ideals with linear resolution we can characterize the possible sequences $(m_0(l), m_1(l), \ldots, m_n(l)).$

For a monomial $u \in S$, let us set $m(u) = \max\{i : x_i | u\}$. Elihaou and Kervaire showed that, if $J \subset S$ is strongly stable, then:

 $m_k(J) = |\{u \in \mathsf{G}(I) : m(u) = k\}|$

Given an ideal $I \subset S = K[x_0, \ldots, x_n]$, we define:

$$\sum_{k=0}^{n} m_{k}(I)t^{k} = \sum_{i=0}^{n} \beta_{i}(I)(t-1)^{i}.$$

Obviously to characterize the possible Betti tables of ideals with linear resolution we can characterize the possible sequences $(m_0(I), m_1(I), \ldots, m_n(I)).$

For a monomial $u \in S$, let us set $m(u) = \max\{i : x_i | u\}$. Elihaou and Kervaire showed that, if $J \subset S$ is strongly stable, then:

$$m_k(J) = |\{u \in G(I) : m(u) = k\}|$$

Given an ideal $I \subset S = K[x_0, \ldots, x_n]$, we define:

$$\sum_{k=0}^{n} m_{k}(I)t^{k} = \sum_{i=0}^{n} \beta_{i}(I)(t-1)^{i}.$$

Obviously to characterize the possible Betti tables of ideals with linear resolution we can characterize the possible sequences $(m_0(I), m_1(I), \ldots, m_n(I)).$

For a monomial $u \in S$, let us set $m(u) = \max\{i : x_i | u\}$. Elihaou and Kervaire showed that, if $J \subset S$ is strongly stable, then:

$$m_k(J) = |\{u \in G(I) : m(u) = k\}|$$

Given an ideal $I \subset S = K[x_0, \ldots, x_n]$, we define:

$$\sum_{k=0}^{n} m_{k}(I)t^{k} = \sum_{i=0}^{n} \beta_{i}(I)(t-1)^{i}.$$

Obviously to characterize the possible Betti tables of ideals with linear resolution we can characterize the possible sequences $(m_0(I), m_1(I), \ldots, m_n(I)).$

For a monomial $u \in S$, let us set $m(u) = \max\{i : x_i | u\}$. Elihaou and Kervaire showed that, if $J \subset S$ is strongly stable, then:

$$m_k(J) = |\{u \in G(I) : m(u) = k\}|$$

Given an ideal $I \subset S = K[x_0, \ldots, x_n]$, we define:

$$\sum_{k=0}^{n} m_{k}(I)t^{k} = \sum_{i=0}^{n} \beta_{i}(I)(t-1)^{i}.$$

Obviously to characterize the possible Betti tables of ideals with linear resolution we can characterize the possible sequences $(m_0(I), m_1(I), \ldots, m_n(I)).$

For a monomial $u \in S$, let us set $m(u) = \max\{i : x_i | u\}$. Elihaou and Kervaire showed that, if $J \subset S$ is strongly stable, then:

$$m_k(J) = |\{u \in G(I) : m(u) = k\}|$$

Given an ideal $I \subset S = K[x_0, \ldots, x_n]$, we define:

$$\sum_{k=0}^{n} m_{k}(I)t^{k} = \sum_{i=0}^{n} \beta_{i}(I)(t-1)^{i}.$$

Obviously to characterize the possible Betti tables of ideals with linear resolution we can characterize the possible sequences $(m_0(I), m_1(I), \ldots, m_n(I)).$

For a monomial $u \in S$, let us set $m(u) = \max\{i : x_i | u\}$. Elihaou and Kervaire showed that, if $J \subset S$ is strongly stable, then:

$$m_k(J) = |\{u \in G(I) : m(u) = k\}|$$

Given two monomials $u, v \in S_d$, write them as $u = x_{i_1} \cdots x_{i_d}$ and $x_{j_1} \cdots x_{j_d}$ with $i_1 \leq \ldots \leq i_d$ and $j_1 \leq \ldots \leq j_d$, and define:

$$u * v = \begin{cases} x_{i_1+j_1} x_{i_2+j_2} \cdots x_{i_d+j_d} & \text{if } i_d + j_d \le n, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

We extend the operation to the whole S_d by K-linearity, and denote by S_d the gotten K-algebra. For example, if d = 4, $n \ge 6$, $u = x_0 x_1^2 x_3$ and $v = x_2^2 x_3^2$, then:

Given two monomials $u, v \in S_d$, write them as $u = x_{i_1} \cdots x_{i_d}$ and $x_{j_1} \cdots x_{j_d}$ with $i_1 \leq \ldots \leq i_d$ and $j_1 \leq \ldots \leq j_d$, and define:

$$u * v = \begin{cases} x_{i_1+j_1} x_{i_2+j_2} \cdots x_{i_d+j_d} & \text{if } i_d + j_d \le n, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

We extend the operation to the whole S_d by *K*-linearity, and denote by S_d the gotten *K*-algebra. For example, if d = 4, $n \ge 6$, $u = x_0 x_1^2 x_3$ and $v = x_2^2 x_3^2$, then:

Given two monomials $u, v \subset S_d$, write them as $u = x_{i_1} \cdots x_{i_d}$ and $x_{j_1} \cdots x_{j_d}$ with $i_1 \leq \ldots \leq i_d$ and $j_1 \leq \ldots \leq j_d$, and define:

$$u * v = \begin{cases} x_{i_1+j_1} x_{i_2+j_2} \cdots x_{i_d+j_d} & \text{if } i_d + j_d \le n, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

We extend the operation to the whole S_d by K-linearity, and denote by S_d the gotten K-algebra. For example, if d = 4, $n \ge 6$, $u = x_0 x_1^2 x_3$ and $v = x_2^2 x_3^2$, then:

Given two monomials $u, v \subset S_d$, write them as $u = x_{i_1} \cdots x_{i_d}$ and $x_{j_1} \cdots x_{j_d}$ with $i_1 \leq \ldots \leq i_d$ and $j_1 \leq \ldots \leq j_d$, and define:

$$u * v = \begin{cases} x_{i_1+j_1} x_{i_2+j_2} \cdots x_{i_d+j_d} & \text{if } i_d + j_d \le n, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

We extend the operation to the whole S_d by K-linearity, and denote by S_d the gotten K-algebra. For example, if d = 4, $n \ge 6$, $u = x_0 x_1^2 x_3$ and $v = x_2^2 x_3^2$, then:

Given two monomials $u, v \subset S_d$, write them as $u = x_{i_1} \cdots x_{i_d}$ and $x_{j_1} \cdots x_{j_d}$ with $i_1 \leq \ldots \leq i_d$ and $j_1 \leq \ldots \leq j_d$, and define:

$$u * v = \begin{cases} x_{i_1+j_1} x_{i_2+j_2} \cdots x_{i_d+j_d} & \text{if } i_d + j_d \le n, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

We extend the operation to the whole S_d by *K*-linearity, and denote by S_d the gotten *K*-algebra. For example, if d = 4, $n \ge 6$, $u = x_0 x_1^2 x_3$ and $v = x_2^2 x_3^2$, then

Given two monomials $u, v \subset S_d$, write them as $u = x_{i_1} \cdots x_{i_d}$ and $x_{j_1} \cdots x_{j_d}$ with $i_1 \leq \ldots \leq i_d$ and $j_1 \leq \ldots \leq j_d$, and define:

$$u * v = \begin{cases} x_{i_1+j_1} x_{i_2+j_2} \cdots x_{i_d+j_d} & \text{if } i_d + j_d \le n, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

We extend the operation to the whole S_d by *K*-linearity, and denote by S_d the gotten *K*-algebra. For example, if d = 4, $n \ge 6$, $u = x_0 x_1^2 x_3$ and $v = x_2^2 x_3^2$, then:

Given two monomials $u, v \subset S_d$, write them as $u = x_{i_1} \cdots x_{i_d}$ and $x_{j_1} \cdots x_{j_d}$ with $i_1 \leq \ldots \leq i_d$ and $j_1 \leq \ldots \leq j_d$, and define:

$$u * v = \begin{cases} x_{i_1+j_1} x_{i_2+j_2} \cdots x_{i_d+j_d} & \text{if } i_d + j_d \le n, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

We extend the operation to the whole S_d by *K*-linearity, and denote by S_d the gotten *K*-algebra. For example, if d = 4, $n \ge 6$, $u = x_0 x_1^2 x_3$ and $v = x_2^2 x_3^2$, then:

Given two monomials $u, v \subset S_d$, write them as $u = x_{i_1} \cdots x_{i_d}$ and $x_{j_1} \cdots x_{j_d}$ with $i_1 \leq \ldots \leq i_d$ and $j_1 \leq \ldots \leq j_d$, and define:

$$u * v = \begin{cases} x_{i_1+j_1} x_{i_2+j_2} \cdots x_{i_d+j_d} & \text{if } i_d + j_d \le n, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

We extend the operation to the whole S_d by *K*-linearity, and denote by S_d the gotten *K*-algebra. For example, if d = 4, $n \ge 6$, $u = x_0 x_1^2 x_3$ and $v = x_2^2 x_3^2$, then:

$$u * v = x_0 x_1 x_1 x_3 * x_2 x_2 x_3 x_3 = x_2 x_3 x_4 x_6.$$

Given two monomials $u, v \subset S_d$, write them as $u = x_{i_1} \cdots x_{i_d}$ and $x_{j_1} \cdots x_{j_d}$ with $i_1 \leq \ldots \leq i_d$ and $j_1 \leq \ldots \leq j_d$, and define:

$$u * v = \begin{cases} x_{i_1+j_1} x_{i_2+j_2} \cdots x_{i_d+j_d} & \text{if } i_d + j_d \le n, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

We extend the operation to the whole S_d by *K*-linearity, and denote by S_d the gotten *K*-algebra. For example, if d = 4, $n \ge 6$, $u = x_0 x_1^2 x_3$ and $v = x_2^2 x_3^2$, then:

$$u * v = x_0 x_1 x_1 x_3 * x_2 x_2 x_3 x_3 = x_2 x_3 x_4 x_6.$$

Notice that S_d has a natural \mathbb{N} -grading, namely $S_d = \bigoplus_{k=0}^n (S_d)_k$,

$$(\mathcal{S}_d)_k = \langle u \in \mathcal{S}_d : m(u) = k \rangle.$$

One can show that there is a graded isomorphism of K-algebras:

$$S_d \cong \frac{K[y_1, \dots, y_d]}{(y_1, \dots, y_d)^{n+1}}$$
.

We showed that, if $J \subset S$ is a strongly stable monomial ideal, then $\mathcal{G}(J) = (G(J), *)$ is a quotient of \mathcal{S}_d . The Hilbert function of $\mathcal{G}(J)$ is:

 $\dim_{K}(\mathcal{G}(J)_{k})=m_{k}(J),$

Notice that \mathcal{S}_d has a natural \mathbb{N} -grading, namely $\mathcal{S}_d = \bigoplus_{k=0}^n (\mathcal{S}_d)_k$,

 $(\mathcal{S}_d)_k = \langle u \in \mathcal{S}_d : m(u) = k \rangle.$

One can show that there is a graded isomorphism of K-algebras:

 $S_d \cong \frac{K[y_1,\ldots,y_d]}{(y_1,\ldots,y_d)^{n+1}}.$

We showed that, if $J \subset S$ is a strongly stable monomial ideal, then $\mathcal{G}(J) = (\mathsf{G}(J), *)$ is a quotient of \mathcal{S}_d . The Hilbert function of $\mathcal{G}(J)$ is:

 $\dim_K(\mathcal{G}(J)_k)=m_k(J),$

Notice that S_d has a natural \mathbb{N} -grading, namely $S_d = \bigoplus_{k=0}^n (S_d)_k$,

$$(\mathcal{S}_d)_k = \langle u \in \mathcal{S}_d : m(u) = k \rangle.$$

One can show that there is a graded isomorphism of K-algebras:

$$S_d \cong rac{K[y_1,\ldots,y_d]}{(y_1,\ldots,y_d)^{n+1}}.$$

We showed that, if $J \subset S$ is a strongly stable monomial ideal, then $\mathcal{G}(J) = (G(J), *)$ is a quotient of S_d . The Hilbert function of $\mathcal{G}(J)$ is:

$$\dim_{K}(\mathcal{G}(J)_{k})=m_{k}(J),$$

Notice that S_d has a natural \mathbb{N} -grading, namely $S_d = \bigoplus_{k=0}^n (S_d)_k$,

$$(\mathcal{S}_d)_k = \langle u \in \mathcal{S}_d : m(u) = k \rangle.$$

One can show that there is a graded isomorphism of K-algebras:

$$S_d \cong rac{K[y_1,\ldots,y_d]}{(y_1,\ldots,y_d)^{n+1}}.$$

We showed that, if $J \subset S$ is a strongly stable monomial ideal, then $\mathcal{G}(J) = (\mathsf{G}(J), *)$ is a quotient of \mathcal{S}_d . The Hilbert function of $\mathcal{G}(J)$ is:

$\dim_K(\mathcal{G}(J)_k)=m_k(J),$

Notice that S_d has a natural \mathbb{N} -grading, namely $S_d = \bigoplus_{k=0}^n (S_d)_k$,

$$(\mathcal{S}_d)_k = \langle u \in \mathcal{S}_d : m(u) = k \rangle.$$

One can show that there is a graded isomorphism of K-algebras:

$$\mathcal{S}_d \cong rac{\mathcal{K}[y_1,\ldots,y_d]}{(y_1,\ldots,y_d)^{n+1}}.$$

We showed that, if $J \subset S$ is a strongly stable monomial ideal, then $\mathcal{G}(J) = (\mathsf{G}(J), *)$ is a quotient of \mathcal{S}_d . The Hilbert function of $\mathcal{G}(J)$ is: $\dim_{\mathcal{K}}(\mathcal{G}(J)_k) = m_k(J),$

Notice that S_d has a natural \mathbb{N} -grading, namely $S_d = \bigoplus_{k=0}^n (S_d)_k$,

$$(\mathcal{S}_d)_k = \langle u \in \mathcal{S}_d : m(u) = k \rangle.$$

One can show that there is a graded isomorphism of K-algebras:

$$\mathcal{S}_d \cong rac{\mathcal{K}[y_1,\ldots,y_d]}{(y_1,\ldots,y_d)^{n+1}}.$$

We showed that, if $J \subset S$ is a strongly stable monomial ideal, then $\mathcal{G}(J) = (G(J), *)$ is a quotient of \mathcal{S}_d . The Hilbert function of $\mathcal{G}(J)$ is: $\dim_{\mathcal{K}}(\mathcal{G}(J)_k) = m_k(J),$
Notice that S_d has a natural \mathbb{N} -grading, namely $S_d = \bigoplus_{k=0}^n (S_d)_k$,

$$(\mathcal{S}_d)_k = \langle u \in \mathcal{S}_d : m(u) = k \rangle.$$

One can show that there is a graded isomorphism of K-algebras:

$$\mathcal{S}_d \cong rac{\mathcal{K}[y_1,\ldots,y_d]}{(y_1,\ldots,y_d)^{n+1}}.$$

We showed that, if $J \subset S$ is a strongly stable monomial ideal, then $\mathcal{G}(J) = (G(J), *)$ is a quotient of \mathcal{S}_d . The Hilbert function of $\mathcal{G}(J)$ is:

 $\dim_{\mathcal{K}}(\mathcal{G}(J)_k)=m_k(J),$

so $(m_0(J),m_1(J),\ldots,m_n(J))$ satisfies Macaulay's conditions.

Notice that S_d has a natural \mathbb{N} -grading, namely $S_d = \bigoplus_{k=0}^n (S_d)_k$,

$$(\mathcal{S}_d)_k = \langle u \in \mathcal{S}_d : m(u) = k \rangle.$$

One can show that there is a graded isomorphism of K-algebras:

$$\mathcal{S}_d \cong rac{\mathcal{K}[y_1,\ldots,y_d]}{(y_1,\ldots,y_d)^{n+1}}.$$

We showed that, if $J \subset S$ is a strongly stable monomial ideal, then $\mathcal{G}(J) = (G(J), *)$ is a quotient of \mathcal{S}_d . The Hilbert function of $\mathcal{G}(J)$ is:

 $\dim_{\mathcal{K}}(\mathcal{G}(J)_k)=m_k(J),$

so $(m_0(J),m_1(J),\ldots,m_n(J))$ satisfies Macaulay's conditions.

Notice that S_d has a natural \mathbb{N} -grading, namely $S_d = \bigoplus_{k=0}^n (S_d)_k$,

$$(\mathcal{S}_d)_k = \langle u \in \mathcal{S}_d : m(u) = k \rangle.$$

One can show that there is a graded isomorphism of K-algebras:

$$\mathcal{S}_d \cong rac{\mathcal{K}[y_1,\ldots,y_d]}{(y_1,\ldots,y_d)^{n+1}}.$$

We showed that, if $J \subset S$ is a strongly stable monomial ideal, then $\mathcal{G}(J) = (\mathcal{G}(J), *)$ is a quotient of \mathcal{S}_d . The Hilbert function of $\mathcal{G}(J)$ is:

 $\dim_{\mathcal{K}}(\mathcal{G}(J)_k)=m_k(J),$

so $(m_0(J), m_1(J), \ldots, m_n(J))$ satisfies Macaulay's conditions.

Notice that S_d has a natural \mathbb{N} -grading, namely $S_d = \bigoplus_{k=0}^n (S_d)_k$,

$$(\mathcal{S}_d)_k = \langle u \in \mathcal{S}_d : m(u) = k \rangle.$$

One can show that there is a graded isomorphism of K-algebras:

$$\mathcal{S}_d \cong rac{\mathcal{K}[y_1,\ldots,y_d]}{(y_1,\ldots,y_d)^{n+1}}.$$

We showed that, if $J \subset S$ is a strongly stable monomial ideal, then $\mathcal{G}(J) = (G(J), *)$ is a quotient of \mathcal{S}_d . The Hilbert function of $\mathcal{G}(J)$ is:

 $\dim_{\mathcal{K}}(\mathcal{G}(J)_k)=m_k(J),$

so $(m_0(J), m_1(J), \ldots, m_n(J))$ satisfies Macaulay's conditions.

Indeed we can show that, for a sequence (m_0, \ldots, m_n) , TFAE:

- (i) There exists an ideal *l* ⊂ *S* with *d*-linear resolution such that m_k(*l*) = m_k for all k = 0,..., n.
- (ii) There exists a strongly stable monomial ideal J ⊂ S generated in degree d such that m_k(J) = m_k for all k = 0,..., n.
 - I) There exists a standard graded K-algebra A with
 - $\dim_K A_1 \leq d$ and $\dim_K A_k = m_k$ for all $k = 0, \dots, n$.
- $m_0=1,\ m_1\leq d,\ m_{i+1}\leq m_i^{(0)}$ for all $i=1,\ldots,n-1$.

- (i) There exists an ideal $l \subset S$ with *d*-linear resolution such that $m_k(l) = m_k$ for all k = 0, ..., n.
- (ii) There exists a strongly stable monomial ideal J ⊂ S generated in degree d such that m_k(J) = m_k for all k = 0,..., n.
 (iii) There exists a standard graded K-algebra A with dim_K A₁ ≤ d and dim_K A_k = m_k for all k = 0,..., n.
- The same result has been shown, with a different proof, by Murai.

Indeed we can show that, for a sequence (m_0, \ldots, m_n) , TFAE:

- (i) There exists an ideal $I \subset S$ with *d*-linear resolution such that $m_k(I) = m_k$ for all k = 0, ..., n.
- (ii) There exists a strongly stable monomial ideal J ⊂ S generated in degree d such that m_k(J) = m_k for all k = 0,..., n.
 (iii) There exists a standard graded K-algebra A with dim_K A₁ ≤ d and dim_K A_k = m_k for all k = 0,..., n.
 (iv) m₀ = 1, m₁ ≤ d, m_{i+1} ≤ m_i⁽ⁱ⁾ for all i = 1,..., n 1.

- (i) There exists an ideal $I \subset S$ with *d*-linear resolution such that $m_k(I) = m_k$ for all k = 0, ..., n.
- (ii) There exists a strongly stable monomial ideal J ⊂ S generated in degree d such that m_k(J) = m_k for all k = 0,..., n.
 (iii) There exists a standard graded K-algebra A with dim_K A₁ ≤ d and dim_K A_k = m_k for all k = 0,..., n.
 (iv) m₀ = 1, m₁ ≤ d, m_{i+1} ≤ m_i⁽ⁱ⁾ for all i = 1,..., n 1.

- (i) There exists an ideal $I \subset S$ with *d*-linear resolution such that $m_k(I) = m_k$ for all k = 0, ..., n.
- (ii) There exists a strongly stable monomial ideal J ⊂ S generated in degree d such that m_k(J) = m_k for all k = 0,..., n.
 (iii) There exists a standard graded K-algebra A with dim_K A₁ ≤ d and dim_K A_k = m_k for all k = 0,..., n.
 (iv) m₀ = 1, m₁ ≤ d, m_{i+1} ≤ m_i⁽ⁱ⁾ for all i = 1,..., n 1.

- (i) There exists an ideal $I \subset S$ with *d*-linear resolution such that $m_k(I) = m_k$ for all k = 0, ..., n.
- (ii) There exists a strongly stable monomial ideal J ⊂ S generated in degree d such that m_k(J) = m_k for all k = 0,..., n.
 (iii) There exists a standard graded K-algebra A with dim_K A₁ ≤ d and dim_K A_k = m_k for all k = 0,..., n.
 (iv) m₀ = 1, m₁ ≤ d, m_{i+1} ≤ m_i⁽ⁱ⁾ for all i = 1,..., n 1.

- (i) There exists an ideal $I \subset S$ with *d*-linear resolution such that $m_k(I) = m_k$ for all k = 0, ..., n.
- (ii) There exists a strongly stable monomial ideal J ⊂ S generated in degree d such that m_k(J) = m_k for all k = 0,..., n.
 (iii) There exists a standard graded K-algebra A with dim_K A₁ ≤ d and dim_K A_k = m_k for all k = 0,..., n.
 (iv) m₀ = 1, m₁ ≤ d, m_{i+1} ≤ m_i⁽ⁱ⁾ for all i = 1,..., n 1.

We will never find an ideal $I \subset S$ with the below minimal free resolution: $0 \to S(-6)^6 \to S(-5)^{22} \to S(-4)^{29} \to S(-3)^{14} \to I \to 0.$ Indeed we would have $m_0(I) = 1$, $m_1(I) = 3$, $m_2(I) = 4$ and $m_3(I) = 6$, but $m_2(I)^{(2)} = 4^{(2)} = 5 < 6 = m_3(I).$

We will never find an ideal $I \subset S$ with the below minimal free resolution:

 $0 \to S(-6)^6 \to S(-5)^{22} \to S(-4)^{29} \to S(-3)^{14} \to I \to 0.$

Indeed we would have $m_0(I) = 1$, $m_1(I) = 3$, $m_2(I) = 4$ and $m_3(I) = 6$,

but $m_2(I)^{(2)} = 4^{(2)} = 5 < 6 = m_3(I).$

We will never find an ideal $I \subset S$ with the below minimal free resolution:

$$0 \to S(-6)^6 \to S(-5)^{22} \to S(-4)^{29} \to S(-3)^{14} \to I \to 0.$$

Indeed we would have $m_0(I)=1,\ m_1(I)=3,\ m_2(I)=4$ and $m_3(I)=6,$

but $m_2(I)^{(2)} = 4^{(2)} = 5 < 6 = m_3(I)$.

We will never find an ideal $I \subset S$ with the below minimal free resolution:

$$0 \to S(-6)^6 \to S(-5)^{22} \to S(-4)^{29} \to S(-3)^{14} \to I \to 0.$$

Indeed we would have $m_0(I) = 1$, $m_1(I) = 3$, $m_2(I) = 4$ and $m_3(I) = 6$,

but $m_2(I)^{(2)} = 4^{(2)} = 5 < 6 = m_3(I)$.

We will never find an ideal $I \subset S$ with the below minimal free resolution:

$$0 \to S(-6)^6 \to S(-5)^{22} \to S(-4)^{29} \to S(-3)^{14} \to I \to 0.$$

Indeed we would have $m_0(I) = 1$, $m_1(I) = 3$, $m_2(I) = 4$ and $m_3(I) = 6$,

but
$$m_2(I)^{(2)} = 4^{(2)} = 5 < 6 = m_3(I)$$
.

Our initial dream was to characterize the possible Betti tables of componentwise linear ideals $I \subset S$, that is such that $I_{\langle m \rangle}$ has *m*-linear resolution for all *m*, where $I_{\langle m \rangle} = (f \in I : \deg(f) = m)$. The interest in this comes from the fact that the generic initial ideal of every homogeneous ideal is componentwise linear.

Our initial dream was to characterize the possible Betti tables of componentwise linear ideals $I \subset S$, that is such that $I_{(m)}$ has *m*-linear resolution for all *m*, where $I_{(m)} = (f \in I : \deg(f) = m)$. The interest in this comes from the fact that the generic initial ideal of every homogeneous ideal is componentwise linear

Our initial dream was to characterize the possible Betti tables of componentwise linear ideals $I \subset S$, that is such that $I_{\langle m \rangle}$ has *m*-linear resolution for all *m*, where $I_{\langle m \rangle} = (f \in I : \deg(f) = m)$. The interest in this comes from the fact that the generic initial ideal of every homogeneous ideal is componentwise linear.

Our initial dream was to characterize the possible Betti tables of componentwise linear ideals $I \subset S$, that is such that $I_{\langle m \rangle}$ has *m*-linear resolution for all *m*, where $I_{\langle m \rangle} = (f \in I : \deg(f) = m)$. The interest in this comes from the fact that the generic initial

ideal of every homogeneous ideal is componentwise linear.

Our initial dream was to characterize the possible Betti tables of componentwise linear ideals $I \subset S$, that is such that $I_{\langle m \rangle}$ has *m*-linear resolution for all *m*, where $I_{\langle m \rangle} = (f \in I : \deg(f) = m)$. The interest in this comes from the fact that the generic initial ideal of every homogeneous ideal is componentwise linear.

Our initial dream was to characterize the possible Betti tables of componentwise linear ideals $I \subset S$, that is such that $I_{\langle m \rangle}$ has *m*-linear resolution for all *m*, where $I_{\langle m \rangle} = (f \in I : \deg(f) = m)$. The interest in this comes from the fact that the generic initial ideal of every homogeneous ideal is componentwise linear.

Our initial dream was to characterize the possible Betti tables of componentwise linear ideals $I \subset S$, that is such that $I_{\langle m \rangle}$ has *m*-linear resolution for all *m*, where $I_{\langle m \rangle} = (f \in I : \deg(f) = m)$. The interest in this comes from the fact that the generic initial ideal of every homogeneous ideal is componentwise linear.

Our initial dream was to characterize the possible Betti tables of componentwise linear ideals $I \subset S$, that is such that $I_{\langle m \rangle}$ has *m*-linear resolution for all *m*, where $I_{\langle m \rangle} = (f \in I : \deg(f) = m)$. The interest in this comes from the fact that the generic initial ideal of every homogeneous ideal is componentwise linear.

Our initial dream was to characterize the possible Betti tables of componentwise linear ideals $I \subset S$, that is such that $I_{\langle m \rangle}$ has *m*-linear resolution for all *m*, where $I_{\langle m \rangle} = (f \in I : \deg(f) = m)$. The interest in this comes from the fact that the generic initial ideal of every homogeneous ideal is componentwise linear.

Let us consider the following two ideals in $K[x_0, x_1, x_2]$:

 $I = (x_0^4, x_0^3 x_1, x_0^2 x_1^2, x_0 x_1^3, x_1^4, x_0^3 x_2, x_0^2 x_1 x_2^2, x_0^2 x_2^3, x_0 x_1^2 x_2^2),$ $J = (x_0^4, x_0^3 x_1, x_0^2 x_1^2, x_0^3 x_2, x_0 x_1^2 x_2, x_0 x_1 x_2^2, x_0 x_1^4, x_0^2 x_2^3, x_1^4 x_2).$

$$\left(\begin{array}{cccc}
0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 \\
6 & 6 & 1 \\
3 & 6 & 3
\end{array}\right)$$

Let us consider the following two ideals in $K[x_0, x_1, x_2]$:

 $I = (x_0^4, x_0^3 x_1, x_0^2 x_1^2, x_0 x_1^3, x_1^4, x_0^3 x_2, x_0^2 x_1 x_2^2, x_0^2 x_2^3, x_0 x_1^2 x_2^2),$ $J = (x_0^4, x_0^3 x_1, x_0^2 x_1^2, x_0^3 x_2, x_0 x_1^2 x_2, x_0 x_1 x_2^2, x_0 x_1^4, x_0^2 x_2^3, x_1^4 x_2).$

$$\left(\begin{array}{cccc}
0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 \\
6 & 6 & 1 \\
3 & 6 & 3
\end{array}\right)$$

Let us consider the following two ideals in $K[x_0, x_1, x_2]$:

$$I = (x_0^4, x_0^3 x_1, x_0^2 x_1^2, x_0 x_1^3, x_1^4, x_0^3 x_2, x_0^2 x_1 x_2^2, x_0^2 x_2^3, x_0 x_1^2 x_2^2),$$

$$I = (x_0^4, x_0^3 x_1, x_0^2 x_1^2, x_0^3 x_2, x_0 x_1^2 x_2, x_0 x_1 x_2^2, x_0 x_1^4, x_0^2 x_3^3, x_1^4 x_2).$$

$$\left(\begin{array}{cccc}
0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 \\
6 & 6 & 1 \\
3 & 6 & 3
\end{array}\right)$$

Let us consider the following two ideals in $K[x_0, x_1, x_2]$:

$$I = (x_0^4, x_0^3 x_1, x_0^2 x_1^2, x_0 x_1^3, x_1^4, x_0^3 x_2, x_0^2 x_1 x_2^2, x_0^2 x_2^3, x_0 x_1^2 x_2^2),$$

$$J = (x_0^4, x_0^3 x_1, x_0^2 x_1^2, x_0^3 x_2, x_0 x_1^2 x_2, x_0 x_1 x_2^2, x_0 x_1^4, x_0^2 x_2^3, x_1^4 x_2).$$

$$\left(\begin{array}{cccc}
0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 \\
6 & 6 & 1 \\
3 & 6 & 3
\end{array}\right)$$

Let us consider the following two ideals in $K[x_0, x_1, x_2]$:

$$I = (x_0^4, x_0^3 x_1, x_0^2 x_1^2, x_0 x_1^3, x_1^4, x_0^3 x_2, x_0^2 x_1 x_2^2, x_0^2 x_2^3, x_0 x_1^2 x_2^2),$$

$$J = (x_0^4, x_0^3 x_1, x_0^2 x_1^2, x_0^3 x_2, x_0 x_1^2 x_2, x_0 x_1 x_2^2, x_0 x_1^4, x_0^2 x_2^3, x_1^4 x_2).$$

Let us consider the following two ideals in $K[x_0, x_1, x_2]$:

$$I = (x_0^4, x_0^3 x_1, x_0^2 x_1^2, x_0 x_1^3, x_1^4, x_0^3 x_2, x_0^2 x_1 x_2^2, x_0^2 x_2^3, x_0 x_1^2 x_2^2),$$

$$J = (x_0^4, x_0^3 x_1, x_0^2 x_1^2, x_0^3 x_2, x_0 x_1^2 x_2, x_0 x_1 x_2^2, x_0 x_1^4, x_0^2 x_2^3, x_1^4 x_2).$$

Let us consider the following two ideals in $K[x_0, x_1, x_2]$:

$$I = (x_0^4, x_0^3 x_1, x_0^2 x_1^2, x_0 x_1^3, x_1^4, x_0^3 x_2, x_0^2 x_1 x_2^2, x_0^2 x_2^3, x_0 x_1^2 x_2^2),$$

$$J = (x_0^4, x_0^3 x_1, x_0^2 x_1^2, x_0^3 x_2, x_0 x_1^2 x_2, x_0 x_1 x_2^2, x_0 x_1^4, x_0^2 x_2^3, x_1^4 x_2).$$

Let us consider the following two ideals in $K[x_0, x_1, x_2]$:

$$I = (x_0^4, x_0^3 x_1, x_0^2 x_1^2, x_0 x_1^3, x_1^4, x_0^3 x_2, x_0^2 x_1 x_2^2, x_0^2 x_2^3, x_0 x_1^2 x_2^2),$$

$$J = (x_0^4, x_0^3 x_1, x_0^2 x_1^2, x_0^3 x_2, x_0 x_1^2 x_2, x_0 x_1 x_2^2, x_0 x_1^4, x_0^2 x_2^3, x_1^4 x_2).$$

$$\left(\begin{array}{rrrr} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 6 & 6 & 1 \\ 3 & 6 & 3 \end{array}\right)$$

Let us consider the following two ideals in $K[x_0, x_1, x_2]$:

$$I = (x_0^4, x_0^3 x_1, x_0^2 x_1^2, x_0 x_1^3, x_1^4, x_0^3 x_2, x_0^2 x_1 x_2^2, x_0^2 x_2^3, x_0 x_1^2 x_2^2),$$

$$J = (x_0^4, x_0^3 x_1, x_0^2 x_1^2, x_0^3 x_2, x_0 x_1^2 x_2, x_0 x_1 x_2^2, x_0 x_1^4, x_0^2 x_2^3, x_1^4 x_2).$$

$$\left(\begin{array}{rrrr} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 6 & 6 & 1 \\ 3 & 6 & 3 \end{array}\right)$$

haracterization of extremal Betti numbers.

If we restrict our attention to the extremal Betti numbers of a componentwise linear ideal, we are able to show that "the necessary conditions discussed above become sufficient"! Exploiting a result of Bayer, Charalambous and Popescu, this le to a numerical characterization of the positive integers:

- $((0)) \ 0 < i_1 < i_2 < \ldots < i_k \le n$
 -) $d_1 > d_2 > \ldots > d_k > 0$
- (0) b_1, b_2, \ldots, b_k

such that exists a graded ideal $I \subset S$ with extremal Betti numbers:

 $eta_{l_{
ho},l_{
ho}+d_{
ho}}(l)=b_{
ho} \ \ \, orall \ \,
ho=1,\ldots,k$

If we restrict our attention to the extremal Betti numbers of a componentwise linear ideal, we are able to show that "the necessary conditions discussed above become sufficient"! Exploiting a result of Bayer, Charalambous and Popescu, this leads to a numerical characterization of the positive integers: $0 < h < b < \dots < h < n$

-) $d_1 > d_2 > \ldots > d_k > 0$
- $(0) \quad b_1, b_2, \ldots, b_k$

such that exists a graded ideal $I \subset S$ with extremal Betti numbers:

 $eta_{l_{
ho},l_{
ho}+d_{
ho}}(l)=b_{
ho} \ \ \, orall \ \,
ho=1,\ldots,k$
If we restrict our attention to the extremal Betti numbers of a componentwise linear ideal, we are able to show that "the necessary conditions discussed above become sufficient"!

Exploiting a result of Bayer, Charalambous and Popescu, this leads to a numerical characterization of the positive integers:

- (i) $0 < i_1 < i_2 < \ldots < i_k \le n$
- (ii) $d_1 > d_2 > \ldots > d_k > 0$
- $(|||) \quad b_1, b_2, \ldots, b_k$

such that exists a graded ideal $I \subset S$ with extremal Betti numbers:

 $eta_{i_{
ho},i_{
ho}+d_{
ho}}(l)=b_{
ho} \ \ \, orall \ \,
ho=1,\ldots,k$

If we restrict our attention to the extremal Betti numbers of a componentwise linear ideal, we are able to show that "the necessary conditions discussed above become sufficient"! Exploiting a result of Bayer, Charalambous and Popescu, this leads to a numerical characterization of the positive integers:

(i) $0 < i_1 < i_2 < \ldots < i_k \le n$ (ii) $d_1 > d_2 > \ldots > d_k > 0$ (iii) b_1, b_2, \ldots, b_k

such that exists a graded ideal $I\subset S$ with extremal Betti numbers:

 $eta_{i_{
ho},i_{
ho}+d_{
ho}}(I)=b_{
ho} ~~orall~
ho=1,\ldots,k^{-1}$

If we restrict our attention to the extremal Betti numbers of a componentwise linear ideal, we are able to show that "the necessary conditions discussed above become sufficient"!

Exploiting a result of Bayer, Charalambous and Popescu, this leads to a numerical characterization of the positive integers:

(i) $0 < i_1 < i_2 < \ldots < i_k \le n$

(ii) $d_1 > d_2 > \ldots > d_k > 0$

(iii) $b_1, b_2, ..., b_k$

such that exists a graded ideal $I\subset S$ with extremal Betti numbers:

 $eta_{i_{
ho},i_{
ho}+d_{
ho}}(I)=b_{
ho} \ \ \, orall \ \,
ho=1,\ldots,k$

Exploiting a result of Bayer, Charalambous and Popescu, this leads to a numerical characterization of the positive integers:

(i) $0 < i_1 < i_2 < \ldots < i_k \le n$ (ii) $d_1 > d_2 > \ldots > d_k > 0$

(iii) b_1, b_2, \dots, b_k

such that exists a graded ideal $I\subset S$ with extremal Betti numbers:

 $eta_{i_p,i_p+d_p}(l)=b_p \quad \forall \ p=1,\ldots,k$

Exploiting a result of Bayer, Charalambous and Popescu, this leads to a numerical characterization of the positive integers:

(i)
$$0 < i_1 < i_2 < \ldots < i_k \le n$$

(ii) $d_1 > d_2 > \ldots > d_k > 0$
(iii) b_1, b_2, \ldots, b_k

$$\beta_{i_p,i_p+d_p}(I) = b_p \quad \forall \ p = 1, \dots, k$$

Exploiting a result of Bayer, Charalambous and Popescu, this leads to a numerical characterization of the positive integers:

(i)
$$0 < i_1 < i_2 < \ldots < i_k \le n$$

(ii) $d_1 > d_2 > \ldots > d_k > 0$
(iii) b_1, b_2, \ldots, b_k

$$eta_{i_p,i_p+d_p}(I)=b_p \quad \forall \ p=1,\ldots,k$$

Exploiting a result of Bayer, Charalambous and Popescu, this leads to a numerical characterization of the positive integers:

(i)
$$0 < i_1 < i_2 < \ldots < i_k \le n$$

(ii) $d_1 > d_2 > \ldots > d_k > 0$
(iii) b_1, b_2, \ldots, b_k

$$\beta_{i_p,i_p+d_p}(I) = b_p \quad \forall \ p = 1,\ldots,k$$

Exploiting a result of Bayer, Charalambous and Popescu, this leads to a numerical characterization of the positive integers:

(i)
$$0 < i_1 < i_2 < \ldots < i_k \le n$$

(ii) $d_1 > d_2 > \ldots > d_k > 0$
(iii) b_1, b_2, \ldots, b_k

$$\beta_{i_p,i_p+d_p}(I) = b_p \quad \forall \ p = 1,\ldots,k$$





The above numerical characterization requires some technical definitions, so I prefer to quickly explain how we could get it: In

The above numerical characterization requires some technical definitions, so I prefer to quickly explain how we could get it: In

The above numerical characterization requires some technical definitions, so I prefer to quickly explain how we could get it: In the proof of our result on the Betti numbers of ideals with linear resolution, we actually construct a special strongly stable ideal

The above numerical characterization requires some technical definitions, so I prefer to quickly explain how we could get it: In the proof of our result on the Betti numbers of ideals with linear resolution, we actually construct a special strongly stable ideal generated in degree d, termed piecewise lexsegment, with prescribed Betti numbers. One of the obstructions to characterize

The above numerical characterization requires some technical definitions, so I prefer to quickly explain how we could get it: In the proof of our result on the Betti numbers of ideals with linear resolution, we actually construct a special strongly stable ideal generated in degree d, termed piecewise lexsegment, with prescribed Betti numbers. One of the obstructions to characterize the Betti tables of componentwise linear ideals, is that a piecewise lexsegment ideal does not keep its special feature when multiplied with the maximal ideal. Many piecewise lexsegment ideals have the

The above numerical characterization requires some technical definitions, so I prefer to quickly explain how we could get it: In the proof of our result on the Betti numbers of ideals with linear resolution, we actually construct a special strongly stable ideal generated in degree d, termed piecewise lexsegment, with prescribed Betti numbers. One of the obstructions to characterize the Betti tables of componentwise linear ideals, is that a piecewise lexsegment ideal does not keep its special feature when multiplied with the maximal ideal. Many piecewise lexsegment ideals have the same extremal Betti number (in this case there is only the one given by the projective dimension): Roughly speaking, we are able

The above numerical characterization requires some technical definitions, so I prefer to quickly explain how we could get it: In the proof of our result on the Betti numbers of ideals with linear resolution, we actually construct a special strongly stable ideal generated in degree d, termed piecewise lexsegment, with prescribed Betti numbers. One of the obstructions to characterize the Betti tables of componentwise linear ideals, is that a piecewise lexsegment ideal does not keep its special feature when multiplied with the maximal ideal. Many piecewise lexsegment ideals have the same extremal Betti number (in this case there is only the one given by the projective dimension): Roughly speaking, we are able to choose a special one among them, which keeps enough of its properties when multiplied with the maximal ideal.

The above numerical characterization requires some technical definitions, so I prefer to quickly explain how we could get it: In the proof of our result on the Betti numbers of ideals with linear resolution, we actually construct a special strongly stable ideal generated in degree d, termed piecewise lexsegment, with prescribed Betti numbers. One of the obstructions to characterize the Betti tables of componentwise linear ideals, is that a piecewise lexsegment ideal does not keep its special feature when multiplied with the maximal ideal. Many piecewise lexsegment ideals have the same extremal Betti number (in this case there is only the one given by the projective dimension): Roughly speaking, we are able to choose a special one among them, which keeps enough of its properties when multiplied with the maximal ideal.