

SCHUBERT DETERMINANTAL IDEALS ARE HILBERTIAN

ADA STELZER AND ALEXANDER YONG

ABSTRACT. Abhyankar defined an ideal to be *Hilbertian* if its Hilbert polynomial coincides with its Hilbert function for all nonnegative integers. In 1984, he proved that the ideal of $(r + 1)$ -order minors of a generic $p \times q$ matrix is Hilbertian. We give a different proof and a generalization to the *Schubert determinantal ideals* introduced by Fulton in 1994. Our proof reduces to a simple upper bound for the Castelnuovo-Mumford regularity of these ideals.

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1. History and motivation. Fix an r -dimensional vector space V over \mathbb{C} . $GL(V)$ acts on the space $V^{\oplus p} \oplus (V^*)^{\oplus q}$ of p vectors and q covectors. Hence it acts on $\mathbb{C}[V^{\oplus p} \oplus (V^*)^{\oplus q}]$. The *first fundamental theorem of invariant theory for $GL(V)$* states that the invariant ring $\mathbb{C}[V^{\oplus p} \oplus (V^*)^{\oplus q}]^{GL(V)}$ is generated by *contractions* X_{ij} where

$$X_{ij}(v_1, \dots, v_p; \phi_1, \dots, \phi_q) = \phi_j(v_i).$$

The *second fundamental theorem of invariant theory for $GL(V)$* gives the (first) syzygies between the contractions, i.e., it asserts a \mathbb{C} -algebra isomorphism

$$R_{r,p,q} := \mathbb{C}[x_{ij} : 1 \leq i \leq p, 1 \leq j \leq q] / I_{r,p,q} \cong \mathbb{C}[V^{\oplus p} \oplus (V^*)^{\oplus q}]^{GL(V)}$$

induced by the map $x_{ij} \mapsto X_{ij}$, where $I_{r,p,q}$ is the ideal of $(r + 1) \times (r + 1)$ minors of a $p \times q$ matrix.¹ In this way, the *determinantal variety* $\mathfrak{X}_{r,p,q}$ defined by $I_{r,p,q}$ is connected to invariant theory. A vector space basis of $\mathbb{C}[V^{\oplus p} \oplus (V^*)^{\oplus q}]^{GL(V)}$ and hence of $R_{r,p,q}$ was given with *Young bitableaux* by Doubilet–Rota–Stein [8]. This basis and its *straightening law* were further explained by De Concini–Procesi [6], and used to study determinantal varieties *per se* by De Concini–Eisenbud–Procesi [7]. These determinantal varieties were shown to be open neighborhoods of certain Schubert varieties by Lakshmibai–Seshadri [20] (see the survey [31] and the references therein).

Abhyankar studied the Hilbert function of $R_{r,p,q}$. In [1, Theorem 5] he gave a formula for the function and used it to prove that $I_{r,p,q}$ is *Hilbertian*, that is, the Hilbert function agrees with the Hilbert polynomial for all nonnegative integers rather than merely in the long run. Abhyankar–Kulkarni [2, Section 4, Main Theorem] gave a generalization of this result to *ladder determinantal ideals*. See Ghorpade’s survey [13] on Abhyankar’s work for further elaboration and references.

1.2. Main result. We give a different proof of Abhyankar’s Hilbertian theorem [1, Theorem 5], together with a new generalization to *matrix Schubert varieties*. This work complements the aforementioned Abhyankar–Kulkarni theorem [2] as well as recent work on the regularity of matrix Schubert varieties due to Rajchgot–Ren–Robichaux–St. Dizier–Weigandt [28], Rajchgot–Robichaux–Weigandt [29] and Pechenik–Speyer–Weigandt [27].

Date: May 21, 2023.

¹Better yet, one has a minimal free resolution of $R_{r,p,q}$; see work of Lascoux [21] and Weyman [30].

Let Mat_n be the space of $n \times n$ matrices with entries in \mathbb{C} . Let $GL_n \subseteq \text{Mat}_n$ be the group of invertible matrices with Borel subgroup B of upper triangular matrices and opposite Borel B_- of lower triangular matrices. Now, $B_- \times B$ acts on Mat_n by $(b_-, b) \cdot M = b_- M b^{-1}$. If w is a permutation in the symmetric group S_n on $[n] := \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$, let M_w be its permutation matrix with 1's in positions $(i, w(i))$ and 0's elsewhere.

Definition 1.1 ([10, 17]). The *matrix Schubert variety* \mathfrak{X}_w is the $B_- \times B$ -orbit closure of M_w in Mat_n .² Its coordinate ring is denoted R_w .

The *Schubert determinantal ideal* $I_w \subseteq \mathbb{C}[\text{Mat}_n]$ is the defining ideal of \mathfrak{X}_w (see Section 3).

In general, suppose $I \subset S = \mathbb{C}[x_1, x_2, \dots, x_N]$ is a homogeneous ideal. Then $R := S/I$ has the graded decomposition

$$R = \bigoplus_{k \geq 0} R_k.$$

The *Hilbert function* is defined by $HF_R(k) = \dim_{\mathbb{C}}(R_k)$. For sufficiently large values of k the values $HF_R(k)$ match those of a polynomial, called the *Hilbert polynomial* $HP_R(k)$.

Definition 1.2 ([1]). $R = S/I$ is *Hilbertian* if $HF_R(k) = HP_R(k)$ for all $k \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$.³

The first version of our main theorem is as follows:

Theorem 1.3. R_w is Hilbertian for any $w \in S_n$ ($n \geq 2$).

The question of when the Hilbert function and polynomial of $R = S/I$ begin to agree is answered by computing the (*Castelnuovo-Mumford*) *regularity* $\text{reg}(R)$. Recent work has established excellent combinatorial comprehension of this statistic for coordinate rings of matrix Schubert varieties. Previously, Knutson–Miller [17] gave a formula for the Hilbert series of R_w ; the numerator is a *Grothendieck polynomial* \mathfrak{G}_w . Using this, [28], Rajchgot–Ren–Robichaux–St. Dizier–Weigandt made the fruitful observation that

$$(1) \quad \deg(\mathfrak{G}_w) = \text{reg}(R_w) + \text{codim}(\mathfrak{X}_w);$$

we use this idea in our proof. They gave a combinatorial rule for this regularity in the case where w is Grassmannian (has a single descent). Rajchgot–Robichaux–Weigandt [29] generalized this to the case that w is 2143-avoiding or is 1423-avoiding. Pechenik–Speyer–Weigandt [27] gave a rule for regularity for general $w \in S_n$.

As we shall explain, the regularity of R_w (or rather, its *postulation number*) is so small that its precise value is not needed for proving the Hilbertian property. Instead, we use a weak upper bound on the degree of a Grothendieck polynomial (Proposition 4.1). We give a short proof of this bound, *ab initio*, from the “graphical” formulation [19] of Lascoux’s transition formula for Grothendieck polynomials [22]. See also Remark 4.2.

Strictly speaking, the family of varieties $\mathfrak{X}_{r,p,q}$ is *not* a subfamily of the matrix Schubert varieties. Each $\mathfrak{X}_{r,p,q}$ is only equal to some \mathfrak{X}_w up to a Cartesian product with affine space. While such Cartesian products do not change homological invariants, including regularity (see Proposition 2.2), they can affect the Hilbertian property.

²The nomenclature is justified as follows: \mathfrak{X}_w is Zariski closure of $\pi^{-1}(X_w)$ in Mat_n , where $\pi : GL_n \rightarrow GL_n/B$ is the natural projection to the flag variety GL_n/B and $X_w \subseteq GL_n/B$ is a Schubert variety.

³The name “Hilbertian” is credited to [1] in [2] but does not actually appear in the former article of Abhyankar prepared by Galligo.

Example 1.4. $R = \mathbb{C}[x, y]/\langle x \rangle$ has $HF_R(k) = 1$ while $R' = \mathbb{C}[x]/\langle x \rangle$ has $HF_{R'}(0) = 1$ and $HF_{R'}(k) = 0$ for $k > 0$. Thus the coordinate ring of $\langle x \rangle \subset \mathbb{C}[x, y]$ is Hilbertian while that of $\langle x \rangle \subset \mathbb{C}[x]$ is not. The example of R' is precisely why Theorem 1.3 is false for $n = 1$.

The strengthening of Theorem 1.3 given in Theorem 3.2 shows that the Schubert determinantal ideals remain Hilbertian even after removing “irrelevant variables”. This strengthened version generalizes Abhyankar’s Hilbertian theorem (see Example 3.1). Theorem 3.2 and Theorem 1.3 are proved together in Section 4.

We expect that many varieties related to Schubert geometry are Hilbertian; the simplicity of our argument suggests similar proofs. For instance, there are the *quiver loci* for an A_n -quiver of arbitrary orientation. For these, one replaces the Hilbert series theorem of [17] with the Hilbert series theorem of Kinser–Knutson–Rajchgot [16]. In addition, we conjecture the Hilbertian property for the tangent cones to a Schubert variety X_w at a T -fixed point e_v when $v < w$ in Bruhat order; see [32]. We confirmed this conjecture by computer for $n \leq 6$ and can prove it with Theorem 1.3 if w is “covexillary”. Separately, returning back to Section 1.1, the first fundamental theorem is equivalent to *Schur-Weyl duality* (see [14]) and thereby connected to representation theory of general linear groups. We remark that just as $R_{r,p,q}$ is a GL_p -module, R_w is a module for choices of (reductive) Levi subgroups $L \leq GL_n$ depending on the descent positions of w . The representation-theoretic decomposition of R_w into L -irreducibles is of significance to combinatorial study of the Hilbert function of R_w . We hope to address these matters in future work.

2. PRELIMINARIES

2.1. Regularity and Hilbertian ideals. We review standard commutative algebra that we need to state and prove Theorem 1.3, with [5, Chapter 6], [26, Sections 8.2 and 8.3] and [4, Chapter 4] as our references. Let $S = \mathbb{C}[x_1, \dots, x_N]$ be a standard graded polynomial ring. For any homogeneous ideal $I \subseteq S$, a (graded) free resolution F_\bullet of S/I is a sequence $\{F_i\}_{i=0}^\infty$ of free S -modules F_i connected by degree-0 graded maps $\{\partial_i\}_{i=1}^\infty$ as follows:

$$\dots \xrightarrow{\partial_{k+1}} F_k \xrightarrow{\partial_k} F_{k-1} \xrightarrow{\partial_{k-1}} \dots \xrightarrow{\partial_1} F_0 \rightarrow S/I \rightarrow 0.$$

We require that this sequence be *exact*, meaning that the image of each map is the kernel of the next. If $F_k \neq 0$ and $F_i = 0$ for all $i > k$, then F_\bullet has *length* k . Let $S(-j)$ denote a copy of S with all degrees shifted up by j (so $\deg x_i = 1 + j$). Then each free module F_i in a free resolution F_\bullet can be uniquely expressed as $\bigoplus_{j \in \mathbb{Z}} S(-j)^{b_{ij}}$ for some non-negative integers b_{ij} . The maps ∂_i in F_\bullet can be written as matrices with entries in S ; F_\bullet is called *minimal* if none of these entries are units. Equivalently, F_\bullet is minimal if it simultaneously minimizes the values of all b_{ij} among free resolutions of S/I . Hilbert proved that S/I always has a minimal free resolution of length at most n , which is unique up to isomorphism [5, Theorems 6.3.8 and 6.3.13]. The values b_{ij} occurring in the minimal free resolution of S/I are called the (graded) *Betti numbers* of S/I and denoted β_{ij} .

Definition 2.1. The (Castelnuovo-Mumford) *regularity* of S/I is

$$\text{reg}(S/I) = \max\{j - i \mid \beta_{ij} \neq 0\}.$$

We sometimes abuse notation by referring to the regularity of an ideal when we mean the regularity of its coordinate ring. This abuse is convenient because regularity is stable under inclusions of ideals into larger polynomial rings, as the next proposition shows.

Proposition 2.2. *Let $I \subseteq S = \mathbb{C}[x_1, \dots, x_N]$ be a homogeneous ideal, $T = \mathbb{C}[y_1, \dots, y_M]$, and $R = S \otimes_{\mathbb{C}} T = \mathbb{C}[x_1, \dots, x_N, y_1, \dots, y_M]$. Then $\text{reg}(S/I) = \text{reg}(R/I)$.*

Proof. Let F_{\bullet} be the minimal free resolution of S/I . Let $G_{\bullet} = F_{\bullet} \otimes_{\mathbb{C}} T$, meaning $G_i = F_i \otimes_{\mathbb{C}} T$ and $\partial_i^G = \partial_i^F \otimes_{\mathbb{C}} \text{id}_T$ for all $i \geq 0$. Since tensor products distribute over direct sums, we can express G_i as a direct sum of free R -modules $S(-j) \otimes_{\mathbb{C}} T \cong R(-j)$. Thus $G_i = \bigoplus_{j \in \mathbb{Z}} R(-j)^{\beta_{ij}}$ where the β_{ij} are the graded Betti numbers of S/I . Furthermore, the functor $- \otimes_{\mathbb{C}} T$ is exact (indeed, tensoring over a field is always exact), so G_{\bullet} forms an exact sequence and is therefore a resolution of R/I . This resolution is minimal because the matrices representing each ∂_i^G are given by Kronecker products of the matrices representing ∂_i^F and id_T , and the entries of ∂_i^F are non-units by assumption. Thus the Betti numbers of S/I and R/I are the same, so in particular $\text{reg}(S/I) = \text{reg}(R/I)$ as claimed. \square

Remark 2.3. Let $I \subseteq S$ and $J \subseteq T$ be ideals, and let F_{\bullet} and G_{\bullet} be minimal free resolutions for S/I and T/J respectively. Then $F_{\bullet} \otimes_{\mathbb{C}} G_{\bullet}$ is always a minimal free resolution for $(S/I) \otimes_{\mathbb{C}} (T/J) \cong R/(I + J)$. Proposition 2.2 is the special case where $J = (0)$.

Definition 2.4. For a homogeneous ideal $I \subseteq S$, the *Hilbert function* of S/I is the function $HF_{S/I}$ sending each non-negative integer k to the dimension of the grade- k component of S/I (viewed as a \mathbb{C} -vector space).

The *Hilbert series* of S/I is the formal generating series for $HF_{S/I}$. This series is a rational function whose numerator is called the *K-polynomial* $K_{S/I}(t)$ [26, Theorem 8.20]⁴:

$$\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} HF_{S/I}(k)t^k = \frac{K_{S/I}(t)}{(1-t)^N}.$$

The Hilbert function agrees with a (unique) polynomial for sufficiently large input; this polynomial is the *Hilbert polynomial* $HP_{S/I}$ [5, Proposition 6.4.7]. The *postulation number* of S/I captures the “sufficiently large” condition exactly:

$$\text{post}(S/I) = \max\{k : HF_{S/I}(k) \neq HP_{S/I}(k)\}.$$

The coordinate ring S/I is called *Hilbertian* if $HF_{S/I}(k) = HP_{S/I}(k)$ for all $k \geq 0$, i.e., if $\text{post}(S/I) < 0$. The postulation number $\text{post}(S/I)$ and K -polynomial $K_{S/I}(t)$ are related via the regularity of S/I . This relationship is given by Lemma 2.5: the first part is considered well-known by experts and can be obtained from [4, Theorem 4.4.3], while the second is explicitly [4, Proposition 4.1.12].

Lemma 2.5 ([4, Theorem 4.4.3, Proposition 4.1.12]). *Let $I \subseteq S = \mathbb{C}[x_1, \dots, x_N]$ be a homogeneous prime ideal such that S/I is Cohen-Macaulay. Let X be the variety for S/I . Then*

- (1) $\text{reg}(S/I) = \deg(K_{S/I}(t)) - \text{codim}(X)$.
- (2) $\text{post}(S/I) = \text{reg}(S/I) - \dim(X) = \deg(K_{S/I}(t)) - N$.

2.2. Permutation combinatorics. We need some standard permutation combinatorics; our reference is [25]. The *Coxeter length* of $w \in S_n$ is the number of inversions in w :

$$\ell(w) := \#\{i < j : w(i) > w(j)\}.$$

⁴In some sources the K -polynomial is simply called the *Hilbert numerator*.

The *graph* of $w \in S_n$ places a \bullet in each position $(i, w(i))$ (written in matrix notation). The *Rothe diagram* of w , denoted $D(w)$, consists of all boxes in $[n] \times [n]$ not weakly below or right of a \bullet . We have

$$D(w) = \{(i, j) \in [n] \times [n] : j < w(i), i < w^{-1}(j)\}.$$

The *essential set* $E(w)$ of w is comprised of the maximally southeast boxes of each connected component of $D(w)$, i.e.,

$$E(w) = \{(i, j) \in D(w) : (i, j+1), (i+1, j) \notin D(w)\}.$$

Definition 2.6. The *effective region* of $w \in S_n$, denoted $\lambda(w)$, consists of $(i, j) \in [n] \times [n]$ such that (i, j) is weakly northwest of some $(i', j') \in E(w)$.

It follows immediately that $\lambda(w)$ has the shape of a Young diagram.

Definition 2.7. w is *dominant* if $\lambda(w) = D(w)$.

It is convenient to work in $S_\infty = \bigcup_{n \geq 1} S_n$ where we identify two permutations $w \in S_n, w' \in S'_n$ for $n < n'$ if $w(i) = w'(i)$ for $1 \leq i \leq n$ and $w'(i) = i$ for $n+1 < i \leq n'$. In such a case, $D(w) \subseteq [n] \times [n]$ and $D(w') \subseteq [n'] \times [n']$ have the same elements. Identifying these diagrams allows us to unambiguously refer to *the* diagram $D(w)$ of $w \in S_\infty$.

Let $t_{a \leftrightarrow b}$ be the transposition on S_∞ interchanging a and b . Hence $wt_{a \leftrightarrow b}$ swaps the positions a and b . The simple transposition s_i is $t_{i \leftrightarrow i+1}$. A *descent* of a permutation w is an index i such that $\ell(ws_i) < \ell(w)$.

2.3. Grothendieck polynomials. We recall the notion of *Grothendieck polynomial* due to Lascoux–Schützenberger [23]. The definition we use is not the original one and is due to Lascoux [22] (see also [24]). Let $\mathbf{x} = \{x_1, x_2, \dots\}$ be a collection of commuting independent variables. For each $w \in S_\infty$, there is a Grothendieck polynomial $\mathfrak{G}_w(\mathbf{x})$. These polynomials satisfying the following recursion:

Theorem 2.8 (Lascoux’s Transition formula for Grothendieck polynomials [22], cf. [24]). *Let $w \in S_\infty$ have last descent g , let $m > g$ be the largest integer such that $w(m) < w(g)$ and set $w' = wt_{g \leftrightarrow m}$. Suppose that $1 \leq i_1 < i_2 < \dots < i_s < g$ are the indices such that $\ell(w't_{i_j \leftrightarrow g}) = \ell(w') + 1$. Then:*

$$(2) \quad \mathfrak{G}_w(X) = \mathfrak{G}_{w'}(X) + (x_g - 1) [\mathfrak{G}_{w'}(X) \cdot (\text{Id} - t_{i_1 \leftrightarrow g}) \cdots (\text{Id} - t_{i_s \leftrightarrow g})],$$

where $t_{j \leftrightarrow l}$ acts on the $\{\mathfrak{G}_u(X)\}$ by $\mathfrak{G}_u(X) \cdot t_{j \leftrightarrow l} = \mathfrak{G}_{ut_{j \leftrightarrow l}}(X)$ and Id is the identity operator.

Theorem 2.8 uniquely determines all \mathfrak{G}_w from the base case $\mathfrak{G}_{id} = 1$.

3. A STRENGTHENED VERSION OF THEOREM 1.3

Recall from the introduction that the *matrix Schubert variety* \mathfrak{X}_w is the $B_- \times B$ -orbit closure of the permutation matrix M_w in Mat_n . It is an affine variety of codimension $\ell(w)$. The defining ideal I_w of \mathfrak{X}_w is called the *Schubert determinantal ideal*. Make the natural identification $\mathbb{C}[\text{Mat}_n] = \mathbb{C}[z_{ij} : 1 \leq i, j \leq n]$ where z_{ij} is the (i, j) -coordinate function. Fulton [10] produced generators for I_w as follows. Let r_{ij} count the number of 1’s in the northwest $i \times j$ submatrix of M_w . Let $Z = (z_{ij})_{1 \leq i, j \leq n}$ be the generic $n \times n$ matrix and set Z_{ij} to be the northwest $i \times j$ submatrix of Z . Then

$$(3) \quad I_w = \langle \text{rank } r_{ij} + 1 \text{ minors of } Z_{ij}, 1 \leq i, j \leq n \rangle.$$

Moreover in *ibid.* it is proved that I_w is a prime ideal and the coordinate ring

$$R_w := \mathbb{C}[\mathfrak{X}_w] = \mathbb{C}[\text{Mat}_n]/I_w$$

is Cohen-Macaulay. By Lemma 2.5(2) it follows that

$$\text{post}(R_w) = \deg(K_{R_w}(t)) - n^2.$$

The K -polynomial $K_{R_w}(t)$ is known. By [17] it is a Grothendieck polynomial.

$$K_{R_w}(t) = \mathfrak{G}_w(x_i \mapsto 1 - t).$$

The proof of Theorem 1.3 therefore reduces to showing that $\deg(\mathfrak{G}_w) \leq n^2$ for all $n \geq 1$ and $w \in S_n$, with equality holding only when $n = 1$.

Fulton [10] refined the list of generators for I_w by showing that

$$(4) \quad I_w = \langle \text{rank } r_{ij} + 1 \text{ minors of } Z_{ij}, \text{ where } (i, j) \in E(w) \rangle.^5$$

Notice that the generators of I_w in (4) only involve the variables z_{ij} where $(i, j) \in \lambda(w)$. It therefore makes sense to think about the determinantal variety that only uses these “effective” variables. Formally, let us define the *effective Schubert determinantal ideal*

$$\tilde{I}_w \subset \mathbb{C}[z_{ij} : (i, j) \in \lambda(w)]$$

where \tilde{I}_w uses the same generators as in (4). Thus the *effective matrix Schubert variety* \tilde{X}_w is the zero-locus of these equations inside the affine space $\mathbb{C}^{|\lambda(w)|}$ rather than \mathbb{C}^{n^2} . Let \tilde{R}_w denote the coordinate ring of \tilde{X}_w . One has a trivial isomorphism, $\tilde{\mathfrak{X}}_w \times \mathbb{C}^{n^2 - |\lambda(w)|} \cong \mathfrak{X}_w$.


Example 3.1. The effective Schubert determinantal ideals \tilde{I}_w generalize $I_{r,p,q}$. Let $w_{r,p,q} = 1\ 2 \dots r\ q+1\ q+2 \dots q+p\ r+1\ r+2 \dots q$. Then $\lambda(w_{r,p,q})$ is a $p \times q$ rectangle and $r_{pq} = r$, so the ambient ring of $\tilde{I}_{w_{r,p,q}}$ is $\mathbb{C}[z_{ij} : 1 \leq i \leq p, 1 \leq j \leq q]$ and $\tilde{I}_{w_{r,p,q}} = I_{r,p,q}$.⁶

We are now ready to state our strengthened version of Theorem 1.3:

Theorem 3.2. \tilde{I}_w is Hilbertian if and only if w is not a dominant permutation.

Remark 3.3. If w is dominant, then $I_w = \langle z_{ij} : (i, j) \in \lambda(w) \rangle$ is generated by 1×1 minors. Hence $\tilde{X}_w = \{0\}$. Theorem 3.2 therefore asserts that \tilde{R}_w is Hilbertian except for the trivial cases where $R_w \cong \mathbb{C}$.

Example 3.4. The Rothe diagram for $w = 24315$ is presented below, with the values of r_{ij} displayed only in elements of $E(w)$. The effective region $\lambda(w)$ is outlined in red.



⁵For a minimal list of generators see [12].

⁶ $w_{r,p,q}$ is a well-known construction. A *bigrassmannian permutation* $w \in S_\infty$ is one where w and w^{-1} each have at most one descent. All bigrassmannian permutations are of the form $w_{r,p,q}$ for choices of the parameters r, p, q .

The Fulton generators of I_w are the variables x_{11}, x_{21}, x_{31} , along with the six 2×2 minors of the 2×4 matrix $\begin{pmatrix} x_{11} & x_{12} & x_{13} & x_{14} \\ x_{21} & x_{22} & x_{23} & x_{24} \end{pmatrix}$. Then I_w is the ideal with these generators in $\mathbb{C}[x_{ij} | 1 \leq i, j \leq 5]$, while \tilde{I}_w lies in the subring generated by the 9 variables corresponding to boxes in $\lambda(w)$. One can verify that $\deg(\mathfrak{G}_w) = 6$, so by Lemma 2.5(2) we have $\text{post}(R_w) = 6 - 25 = -17$ and $\text{post}(\tilde{R}_w) = 6 - 9 = -3$. Thus both ideals are Hilbertian in accordance with Theorems 1.3 and 3.2.

Notice that by Proposition 2.2 we have $\text{reg}(\tilde{R}_w) = \text{reg}(R_w)$. It follows from Lemma 2.5(2) that $\text{post}(\tilde{R}_w) = \deg(\mathfrak{G}_w) - |\lambda(w)|$. In particular, Theorem 3.2 reduces to the claim that $\deg(\mathfrak{G}_w) \leq |\lambda(w)|$ for all w , with equality if and only if w is a dominant partition.

4. PROOF OF THEOREMS 1.3 AND 3.2

4.1. A (simple) degree bound for Grothendieck polynomials.

Proposition 4.1. $\deg(\mathfrak{G}_w) \leq |\lambda(w)|$, with equality if and only if w is dominant.

This bound is quite weak. For example, $\deg(\mathfrak{G}_{s_k}) = k$ whereas $\lambda(s_k) = k^2$. Nonetheless, it suffices for our needs.

Proof of Proposition 4.1: To prove the inequality, it helps to think about what (2) means in terms of $D(w)$. This is explained in the “diagram moves” description of transition found in [19, Section 2]. We refer the reader to that paper for the straightforward translation. The point is that in the transition formula, $(g, w(m))$ is a maximally southeast element of $E(w)$ and $D(w') = D(w) \setminus \{(g, w(m))\}$, so $\lambda(w') \subsetneq \lambda(w)$. The Grothendieck polynomials $\mathfrak{G}_{w''}$ appearing in $\mathfrak{G}_{w'}(X) \cdot (\text{Id} - t_{i_1 \leftrightarrow g}) \cdots (\text{Id} - t_{i_s \leftrightarrow g})$ all satisfy $\lambda(w'') \subseteq \lambda(w')$, implying

$$(5) \quad \lambda(w'') \subsetneq \lambda(w).$$

Therefore the desired inequality follows from Theorem 2.8 by an easy induction on $|\lambda(w)|$.

Now suppose that w is not dominant but w' is dominant. Then $(g, w(m))$ comprises an entire connected component of $D(w)$ and it follows that $\lambda(w')$ has at least two fewer elements than $\lambda(w)$ (for example, $\lambda(w')$ cannot contain $(g-1, w(m))$ or $(g, w(m)-1)$). The same induction as above then shows that $\deg(\mathfrak{G}_w) < |\lambda(w)|$ when w is not dominant.

Conversely, suppose that w is dominant. Then w' is also dominant and (2) reduces to $\mathfrak{G}_w(\mathbf{x}) = x_g \mathfrak{G}_{w'}$. By induction,

$$\mathfrak{G}_w(\mathbf{x}) = \prod_{i:(i,j) \in \lambda(w)} x_i$$

is a monomial, of degree $|\lambda(w)|$. This establishes “ \Leftarrow ” of the equality characterization and completes the proof. \square

For those knowledgeable about *rc-graph/pipe dream* combinatorics we also offer:

Second proof of Proposition 4.1 (sketch): Fomin–Kirillov’s formula for \mathfrak{G}_w [9] is a generating series over (not necessarily reduced) pipe dreams (cf. [18]). For the inequality of Proposition 4.1 it suffices to show “crosses” + only appear in the effective region. This fact for Schubert polynomials follows from [3, Theorem 3.7]; now one deduces the desired conclusion using the subword complex perspective on Grothendieck polynomials from [17, Section 1.8] or [18]. Finally, it is easy to see from the subword perspective that if the entire effective region is filled with +’s, w is necessarily dominant. \square

4.2. Conclusion of the proofs of Theorems 1.3 and 3.2. As noted in Section 3, Theorem 1.3 reduces to showing that $\deg(\mathfrak{G}_w) \leq n^2$ with equality if and only if $n = 1$. Theorem 3.2 similarly reduces to showing the stronger inequality $\deg(\mathfrak{G}_w) \leq |\lambda(w)|$ with equality if and only if w is dominant. Thus Proposition 4.1 proves both theorems. \square

Remark 4.2 (A simpler degree bound). It is well-known, and trivial to prove using the combinatorial formula for Grothendieck polynomials from [9], that $\deg(\mathfrak{G}_w) \leq \binom{n}{2}$. This upper bound on $\text{reg}(R_w)$ is independent from w and gives an easier proof of Theorem 1.3 since $\binom{n}{2} < n^2$ for $n > 1$. The weaker bound is not sufficient to prove Theorem 3.2.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We thank Reuven Hodges for helpful communications. AS was partially supported by a Susan C. Morosato IGL graduate student scholarship. AY was partially supported by a Simons Collaboration grant. This work was made possible in part by an NSF RTG in Combinatorics (DMS 1937241).

REFERENCES

- [1] Abhyankar, S. Combinatoire des tableaux de Young, variétés déterminantielles et calcul de fonctions de Hilbert. (French) [Combinatorics of Young tableaux, determinantal varieties and calculation of Hilbert functions] Prepared by A. Galligo. Rend. Sem. Mat. Univ. Politec. Torino 42 (1984), no. 3, 65–88.
- [2] Abhyankar, Shreeram; Kulkarni, Devadatta M. On Hilbertian ideals. Linear Algebra Appl. 116 (1989), 53–79.
- [3] Bergeron, Nantel; Billey, Sara. RC-graphs and Schubert polynomials. Experiment. Math. 2 (1993), no. 4, 257–269.
- [4] Bruns, Winfried; Herzog, Jürgen. Cohen-Macaulay Rings. Cambridge Studies in Advanced Mathematics, 39. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1998. 2nd ed.
- [5] Cox, D.; Little, J.; O’Shea, D. Using Algebraic Geometry. Graduate Texts in Mathematics, 185. Springer, New York, 1998. xii+503 pp.
- [6] de Concini, C.; Procesi, C. A characteristic free approach to invariant theory. Advances in Math. 21 (1976), no. 3, 330–354.
- [7] de Concini, C.; Eisenbud, David; Procesi, C. Young diagrams and determinantal varieties. Invent. Math. 56 (1980), no. 2, 129–165.
- [8] Doubilet, Peter; Rota, Gian-Carlo; Stein, Joel. On the foundations of combinatorial theory. IX. Combinatorial methods in invariant theory. Studies in Appl. Math. 53 (1974), 185–216.
- [9] Fomin, Sergey; Kirillov, Anatol N. Grothendieck polynomials and the Yang-Baxter equation. Formal power series and algebraic combinatorics/Séries formelles et combinatoire algébrique, 183–189, DIMACS, Piscataway, NJ, s.d..
- [10] Fulton, William. Flags, Schubert polynomials, degeneracy loci, and determinantal formulas. Duke Math. J. 65 (1992), no. 3, 381–420.
- [11] Fulton, William. Young tableaux. With applications to representation theory and geometry. London Mathematical Society Student Texts, 35. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1997. x+260 pp
- [12] Gao, Shiliang; Yong, Alexander. Minimal equations for matrix Schubert varieties, preprint, 2022. arXiv:2201.06522
- [13] Ghorpade, Sudhir R. Abhyankar’s work on Young tableaux and some recent developments. Algebraic geometry and its applications (West Lafayette, IN, 1990), 215–249, Springer, New York, 1994.
- [14] Goodman, Roe; Wallach, Nolan R. Representations and invariants of the classical groups. Encyclopedia of Mathematics and its Applications, 68. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1998. xvi+685 pp.
- [15] Howe, Roger. Perspectives on invariant theory: Schur duality, multiplicity-free actions and beyond. The Schur lectures (1992) (Tel Aviv), 1–182, Israel Math. Conf. Proc., 8, Bar-Ilan Univ., Ramat Gan, 1995.
- [16] Kinser, Ryan; Knutson, Allen; Rajchgot, Jenna. Three combinatorial formulas for type A quiver polynomials and K -polynomials. Duke Math. J. 168 (2019), no. 4, 505–551.

- [17] Knutson, Allen; Miller, Ezra. Gröbner geometry of Schubert polynomials. *Ann. of Math.* (2) 161 (2005), no. 3, 1245–1318.
- [18] Knutson, Allen; Miller, Ezra. Subword complexes in Coxeter groups. *Adv. Math.* 184 (2004), no. 1, 161–176.
- [19] Knutson, Allen; Yong, Alexander. A formula for K -theory truncation Schubert calculus. *Int. Math. Res. Not.* 2004, no. 70, 3741–3756.
- [20] Lakshmibai, V.; Seshadri, C. S. Geometry of G/P . II. The work of de Concini and Procesi and the basic conjectures. *Proc. Indian Acad. Sci. Sect. A* 87 (1978), no. 2, 1–54.
- [21] Lascoux, Alain. Syzygies des variétés déterminantales. (French) *Adv. in Math.* 30 (1978), no. 3, 202–237.
- [22] Lascoux, A. Transition on Grothendieck polynomials. *Physics and combinatorics, 2000 (Nagoya)*, 164–179, World Sci. Publ., River Edge, NJ, 2001.
- [23] Lascoux, Alain; Schützenberger, Marcel-Paul. Structure de Hopf de l’anneau de cohomologie et de l’anneau de Grothendieck d’une variété de drapeaux. (French) [[Hopf algebra structures of the cohomology ring and Grothendieck ring of a flag manifold]] *C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris Sér. I Math.* 295 (1982), no. 11, 629–633.
- [24] Lenart, Cristian. A K -theory version of Monk’s formula and some related multiplication formulas. *J. Pure Appl. Algebra* 179 (2003), no. 1-2, 137–158.
- [25] Manivel, Laurent. Symmetric functions, Schubert polynomials and degeneracy loci. Translated from the 1998 French original by John R. Swallow. *SMF/AMS Texts and Monographs*, 6. *Cours Spécialisés [Specialized Courses]*, 3. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI; Société Mathématique de France, Paris, 2001. viii+167 pp.
- [26] Miller, Ezra; Sturmfels, Bernd. *Combinatorial commutative algebra*. Graduate Texts in Mathematics, 227. Springer-Verlag, New York, 2005. xiv+417 pp.
- [27] Pechenik, Oliver; Speyer, David; Weigandt, Anna. Castelnuovo–Mumford regularity of matrix Schubert varieties, preprint, 2021. arXiv:2111.10681
- [28] Rajchgot, Jenna; Ren, Yi; Robichaux, Colleen; St. Dizier, Avery; Weigandt, Anna. Degrees of symmetric Grothendieck polynomials and Castelnuovo-Mumford regularity. *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.* 149 (2021), no. 4, 1405–1416.
- [29] Rajchgot, Jenna; Robichaux, Colleen; Weigandt, Anna. Castelnuovo-Mumford regularity of ladder determinantal varieties and patches of Grassmannian Schubert varieties. *J. Algebra* 617 (2023), 160–191.
- [30] Weyman, Jerzy. *Cohomology of vector bundles and syzygies*. Cambridge Tracts in Mathematics, 149. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2003. xiv+371 pp.
- [31] Woo, Alexander; Yong, Alexander. Schubert geometry and combinatorics, preprint, 2023. arXiv:arXiv:2303.01436
- [32] Yong, Alexander. Castelnuovo-Mumford regularity and Schubert geometry, preprint, 2022. arXiv:2202.06462

DEPT. OF MATHEMATICS, U. ILLINOIS AT URBANA-CHAMPAIGN, URBANA, IL 61801, USA

Email address: astelzer@illinois.edu, ayong@illinois.edu