POLYNOMIAL SYSTEMS ADMITTING A SIMULTANEOUS SOLUTION

AUSTIN CONNER, MATEUSZ MICHAŁEK, MICHAEL SCHINDLER, AND BALÁZS SZENDRŐI

Abstract. We provide a complete description of the ideal that serves as the resultant ideal for n univariate polynomials of degree d. We in particular describe a set of generators of this resultant ideal arising as maximal minors of a set of cascading matrices formed from the coefficients of the polynomials, generalising the classical Sylvester resultant of two polynomials.

1. Introduction

Fix integers $n > 1$ and $d > 1$. Consider a system

$$f_i(x) := a_{i,0}x^d + a_{i,1}x^{d-1} + \cdots + a_{i,d} = 0 \qquad 1 \le i \le n \tag{1}$$

of n univariate polynomials of degree d in a variable x over an algebraically closed field K. A natural question arises: *when do the polynomials f_i have a common root?*

By eliminating the variable x from the ideal $\langle f_i(x)\rangle$, we obtain a radical ideal

$$I_{d,n} \lhd K[a_{i,j}]_{1\le i\le n, 0\le j\le d}$$

in the polynomial ring of coefficients, which serves as a resultant for the set of polynomials $\{f_i(x)\}$ in the following sense.

(a) If the polynomials $f_i(x)$ have a common root, then the coefficients $a_{i,j}$ belong to the variety $V(I_{d,n})$.
(b) If the coefficients $a_{i,j}$ belong to the variety $V(I_{d,n})$, then either the polynomials $f_i(x)$ have a common root, or for all i we have $a_{i,0} = 0$.

The conclusion in (b) simply means that the associated binary forms

$$g_i(x, y) := a_{i,0}x^d + a_{i,1}x^{d-1}y + \cdots + a_{i,d}y^d$$

have a common root in $\mathbb{P}^1_{[x:y]}$. This is a Zariski closed condition in the projective space defined by the coefficients $a_{i,j}$, and is the closure of the condition that the polynomials $f_i(x)$ have a common root in $\mathbb{A}^1_x$. Thus the ideal $I_{d,n}$ is the fundamental object providing the answer to our basic question; we will call it the *resultant ideal* of the polynomial system (1).

For the case $n = 2$ of two equations, the answer is classical: $I_{d,2}$ is principal, generated by the Sylvester resultant polynomial $\mathrm{Res}(f_1, f_2) \in K[a_{i,j}]$. For the smallest interesting case $d = 2, n = 3$, the ideal $I_{2,3}$ is easily computed (at least by computer algebra), and was studied earlier in [1, Ex. 5.6, Ex. 6.6]. For small, fixed $n > 2$ and d, one can still compute explicitly $I_{d,n}$ via elimination. However, this quickly becomes impossible, and the answer intractable.

Date: May 2023.
M.M.: Supported by DFG grant 467575307.

A closely related question was already answered a long time ago by Kakié [4], though this does not appear to be generally known [6], even for the case of quadratic polynomials. This is the set-theoretic question of giving polynomial conditions for the coefficients a_{ij} which guarantee the existence of a common root. As it turns out, the set of conditions in [4] solves the problem in a set-theoretic but not in a scheme-theoretic sense: the polynomials from [ibid.] do not generate the resultant ideal $I_{d,n}$, for simple degree reasons. What they generate instead is a non-radical ideal with radical $I_{d,n}$. This phenomenon already occurs for quadratic polynomials, where for $n > 2$ a natural set of generators for $I_{d,n}$ include classical resultant quartics, some further degree-4 relations already contained in [ibid.], as well as cubic relations. See Remark 5 and Corollary 14 for further discussion.

In this article we provide a complete, general description of the resultant ideal $I_{d,n}$. In particular, we provide

(a) a list of generators, in determinantal form, for $I_{d,n}$;
(b) a Gröbner basis for $I_{d,n}$;
(c) the degree and the dimension of the variety $X_{d,n} := V(I_{d,n}) \subset \mathbb{P}^{n(d+1)-1}$.

Here (c) is straightforward, using a natural resolution of singularities of $X_{d,n}$ via vector bundles, the subject of our Section 2. At the start of Section 3, we provide a set of determinantal elements in the resultant ideal. Our strategy to solve (a)-(b), and in particular to prove our main result Theorem 4, is as follows. First, we will pick a term order on the polynomial ring of coefficients, and a subset $G \subset I_{d,n}$, which will eventually be shown to be a Gröbner basis. We will show that the leading terms of G are square-free and that the variety defined by the corresponding initial ideal is the union of $\deg X_{d,n}$ coordinate subspaces and of dimension equal to $\dim X_{d,n}$. As we will argue, these facts establish that G is a Gröbner basis of $I_{d,n}$. We conclude the paper in Section 4 with final remarks, in particular recovering the set-theoretic description of Kakié as a special case.

In Section 2, we will be working in a more general setting, where the polynomials in the system (1) can have different degrees. However, from Section 3, we focus on the case of polynomials of equal degree d. We hope to return to the more general case in later work.

We will be assuming familiarity with ideals, Gröbner bases, term orders, elimination theory and the Nullstellensatz, as presented in [5, Chapters 1–4 and 6]. We also rely on basic intersection theory, referring the interested reader to [2].

Acknowledgements

We would like to thank Bernd Sturmfels for many inspiring talks on the topic, and for some influential comments on early versions of our result. The last-named author would also like to thank Jerzy Weyman for a conversation on this subject.

2. Dimension and degree

We start by computing the dimension and degree of the projective variety

$$X_{d,n} = V(I_{d,n}) \subset \mathbb{P}^{n(d+1)-1},$$

the vanishing locus of the resultant ideal, defined in the Introduction.

Let us slightly generalize the setting: consider n bivariate, homogeneous forms

$$g_i(x, y) := a_{i,0}x^{d_i} + a_{i,1}x^{d_i-1}y + \cdots + a_{i,d_i}y^{d_i}, \quad i = 1, \ldots, n$$

of possibly distinct degrees $d_1, \dots, d_n$. Denoting $D := \sum_{i=1}^n d_i$, the space of such forms is parameterized by the affine space K^{n+D} of coefficients $a_{i,j}$. Let $X_{d_1,\dots,d_n} \subset \mathbb{P}^{n-1+D}$ be the locus inside the projective space of coefficients corresponding to those n-tuples of forms that have a common root in $\mathbb{P}^1$.

Proposition 1. *The set $X_{d_1,\dots,d_n} \subset \mathbb{P}^{n-1+D}$ is an irreducible projective variety of dimension D and degree D.*

Proof. Consider the projective line $\mathbb{P}^1$ with coordinates x, y. Inside $\mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^{n-1+D}$, each binary form $g_i(x, y)$ defines a codimension one subvariety B_i. Projecting B_i to $\mathbb{P}^1$ makes B_i into a projective bundle of rank $n-2+D$ over $\mathbb{P}^1$, a codimension one subbundle of the trivial bundle.

We now prove that all B_i's intersect transversally. Indeed, as bundles are locally trivial, they intersect transversally if and only if they intersect transversally on every fiber. However, for fixed $[x : y]$ each g_i becomes a linear equation in a *distinct* set of variables. In particular, the linear equations are independent and thus the intersection is transversal. It follows that the variety $Y_{d_1,\dots,d_n} := \bigcap_{i=1}^n B_i$ is also a projective bundle over $\mathbb{P}^1$ of rank $(n-1+D)-n = D-1$. Hence, $\dim Y_{d_1,\dots,d_n} = D$.

Consider the projection $\mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^{n-1+D} \to \mathbb{P}^{n-1+D}$. We claim that the image of $Y_{d_1,\dots,d_n}$ is precisely $X_{d_1,\dots,d_n}$. Indeed, a point $([x : y], [a_{i,j}])$ belongs to $Y_{d_1,\dots,d_n}$ if and only if $[x : y]$ is a common root of the binary forms $g_i(x, y)$. In particular, $X_{d_1,\dots,d_n}$ is an irreducible variety. Further, we claim that the resulting map

$$\pi \colon Y_{d_1,\dots,d_n} \to X_{d_1,\dots,d_n}$$

is birational. Indeed, the general fiber is a singleton, as, for general $g_i(x, y)$ having a common root, this root is unique[1]. Thus, $\dim X_{d_1,\dots,d_n} = \dim Y_{d_1,\dots,d_n} = D$.

As a side remark, we note that π is not an isomorphism, as some systems have several common solutions. In particular, $X_{d_1,\dots,d_n}$ in general is singular, while $Y_{d_1,\dots,d_n}$ is always smooth, with π a resolution of singularities of $X_{d_1,\dots,d_n}$.

Recall that the degree of $X_{d_1,\dots,d_n}$ is the number of points we obtain after intersecting it with D general hyperplanes in $\mathbb{P}^{n-1+D}$. Pulling back hyperplanes of $\mathbb{P}^{n-1+D}$ by the projection map, we obtain divisors on $\mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^{n-1+D}$ that belong to a base-point-free linear system $\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^{n-1+D}}(H_2)$, the pullback of the hyperplane system on the second factor. Intersecting $Y_{d,n}$ with D general divisors from this linear system, by Bertini's theorem we obtain a finite number k of reduced points of Y that are general in the sense that they belong to the open complement $Y_{d_1,\dots,d_n} \setminus \operatorname{Exc}(\pi)$ of the exceptional locus of π. Let us note that as the intersection points belong to the locus where $Y_{d_1,\dots,d_n}$ and $X_{d_1,\dots,d_n}$ are isomorphic, to know that we obtain reduced points, it is enough to apply Bertini's theorem for the complete linear system of hyperplanes in the projective space, which holds in arbitrary characteristic of the field. It follows that $k = \deg X_{d_1,\dots,d_n}$.

It remains to compute the number of points we obtain by intersecting $Y_{d_1,\dots,d_n}$ with D divisors of the linear system $\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^{n-1+D}}(H_2)$. Recall that the Chow ring of $\mathbb{P}^1 \times \mathbb{P}^{n-1+D}$ is $R = \mathbb{Z}[H_1, H_2]/(H_1^2, H_2^{n+D})$, with H_i the hyperplane class pulled back from each factor, the class of the point being the top nonzero intersection $H_1 H_2^{n-1+D}$.

[1]It is easy to exhibit one case when the equations have exactly one common root and notice that this remains true in a neighbourhood.

Each divisor B_i is of degree d_i in x, y and degree 1 in the coefficient variables $a_{i,j}$. Its class is thus $d_i H_1 + H_2 \in R$. As we proved that $Y_{d_1,\dots,d_n}$ is a transversal intersection of the hypersurfaces B_i, its class is the product $\prod_{i=1}^n (d_i H_1 + H_2) \in R$. It remains to compute the intersection with D divisors of class H_2, which are general, hence transversal by Bertini's theorem, to deduce

$$H_2^D \prod_{i=1}^n (d_i H_1 + H_2) = D \cdot H_1 H_2^{n-1+D} \in R,$$

and thus $k = D$. □

Corollary 2. *For the projective variety $X_{d,n} \subset \mathbb{P}^{n(d+1)-1}$, we have $\dim X_{d,n} = nd$ and $\deg X_{d,n} = nd$.*

Remark 3. As argued above, $Y_{d,n} \subset \mathbb{P}^{n(d+1)-1} \times \mathbb{P}^1$ is a complete intersection, and hence its ideal can be resolved by the Koszul complex. Pushing forward this resolution along the map π, together with a standard computation[2], shows that $X_{d,n}$ is not normal. Finding a full resolution of the ideal of the embedding $X_{d,n} \subset \mathbb{P}^{n(d+1)-1}$ appears to be of some interest.

3. Determinantal equations and the main result

Our next step is to construct determinantal equations in $I_{d,n}$. For $1 \le k \le d$, define the $nk \times (d+k)$ matrix

$$M_k = \begin{bmatrix} a_{1,0} & \cdots & a_{1,d} & & & \\ & \vdots & & & & \\ a_{n,0} & \cdots & a_{n,d} & & & \\ & a_{1,0} & \cdots & a_{1,d} & & \\ & & \vdots & & & \\ & a_{n,0} & \cdots & a_{n,d} & & \\ & & & \ddots & & \\ & & & a_{1,0} & \cdots & a_{1,d} \\ & & & \vdots & & \\ & & & a_{n,0} & \cdots & a_{n,d} \end{bmatrix},$$

where each rectangular matrix is shifted to the right by one step corresponding to the rectangle above it, there are a total of k rectangles, and the unspecified entries are all zero. If x is a common solution to the system (1), then $[x^{d+k-1}, x^{d+k-2}, \dots, 1]^t$ lies in the kernel of M_k, hence all $(d+k) \times (d+k)$ minors of M_k lie in $I_{d,n}$. Alternatively, writing P_s for the vector space of univariate polynomials of degree at most s, M_k^t can be interpreted as the map $(P_k)^{\times n} \to P_{d+k}$, $(h_1, \dots, h_n) \mapsto f_1 h_1 + \cdots + f_n h_n$. This map is rank deficient when x is a common root of the polynomials f_i, as then it is a common root of the entire image.

The following is our main result.

Theorem 4. *The resultant ideal $I_{d,n} \lhd K[a_{i,j}]_{1 \le i \le n, 0 \le j \le d}$ is generated by all $(d+k) \times (d+k)$ minors of M_k for $1 \le k \le d$.*

---

[2]We would like to thank Jerzy Weyman for explaining this.

Remark 5. In the above theorem, if n is small with respect to d, there may be no appropriately sized minors of M_k for small k. For instance, the theorem asserts that in the case $n = 2$, $I_{d,2}$ is generated by a single $2d \times 2d$ determinant, the classical Sylvester resultant $\mathrm{Res}(f_1, f_2)$.

More generally, it is easy to see that for the largest value $k = d$, some of the $2d \times 2d$ minors of M_d are just the pairwise resultants $\mathrm{Res}(f_i, f_j)$ of the original polynomials. The vanishing of the entire set of $2d \times 2d$ minors of M_d is precisely the set-theoretic condition for the existence of a common root found by Kakié [4]; we will recover this result below in Corollary 14. These degree $2d$ polynomials alone clearly cannot generate the ideal $I_{d,n}$, as the minors of the smaller M_k are of lower degree $d + k$.

At the other extreme $k = 1$, the condition on the rank of M_1 is simply the condition that if $d + 1$ univariate polynomials of degree d share a root, then these polynomials are linearly dependent; this is easy to see directly. However, it is also immediate (for example for dimension reasons) that the set of equations $\mathrm{rk}\, M_1 < d+1$ is not sufficient, even set-theoretically, to force a common root.

We will use Gröbner basis techniques to prove Theorem 4. The first step is to establish a term order on the polynomial ring $K[a_{i,j}]_{1\le i\le n, 0\le j\le d}$, which is achieved in the next proposition.

Proposition 6. *There is a term order on $K[a_{i,j}]_{1\le i\le n, 0\le j\le d}$ with the property that the leading monomial of any minor of M_k is the product of its diagonal elements.*

Remark 7. Observe that the content of this proposition is sensitive to the order of the rows of M_k, even as the set of minors up to sign is not. If the order of the rows of M_k is permuted, the meaning of the diagonals of minors will change and the claim may no longer hold.

Remark 8. The proposition implies that a minor of M_k is not identically zero exactly when its diagonal contains no zeros. The fact that a zero on the diagonal implies that the minor is zero can also be seen directly.

Proof of Proposition 6. Fix an increasing sequence of positive numbers

$$x_{n,1} < x_{n-1,1} < \cdots < x_{1,1} < x_{n,2} < x_{n-1,2} < \cdots < x_{1,2} < x_{n,3} < \dots$$
$$\cdots < x_{n,d} < x_{n-1,d} < \cdots < x_{1,d}.$$

Assign weight one to each $a_{k,d}$ for $k = 1, \dots, n$. Inductively, from $l = d$ and going down to $l = 0$, assign weight $w_{k,l}$ to each $a_{k,l}$ so that $w_{k,l} - w_{k,l+1} = x_{k,l+1}$. We claim that any term order compatible with the given weights will choose the diagonal as a leading term for any minor.

For contradiction assume this is not the case and fix a minor for which the leading term is not the diagonal. Let $X = (y_{i,j})$ be the corresponding submatrix. If the leading term does not correspond to the diagonal then it must be divisible by the product $y_{i,j}y_{p,q}$ so that $i < p$ and $q < j$. We claim that replacing this term by $y_{i,q}y_{p,j}$ would increase the weight, which gives the contradiction.

Say $y_{i,j} = a_{i',j'}$ and $y_{p,q} = a_{p',q'}$. Then there is a c such that $y_{i,q} = a_{i',j'-c}$ and $y_{p,j} = a_{p',q'+c}$. In particular, we note that these are nonzero, as $q' < q'+c, j'-c \le j'$. It remains to observe that the difference of weights $w_{i',j'-c} - w_{i',j'}$ is greater than the difference of weights $w_{p',q'} - w_{p',q'+c}$, which follows from the choice of $x_{i,j}$'s. $\square$

Choosing a $(d+k)\times(d+k)$ minor of M_k is the same as choosing a subset of the rows of size $d+k$. Rows of M_k are naturally indexed by pairs (i,j), where $1 \le i \le k$ and $1 \le j \le n$, so we may identify such minors with their lexicographically ordered list of pairs $((i_1,j_1),\dots,(i_{d+k},j_{d+k}))$. Here, the ordering corresponds to taking rows of M_k from top to bottom.

Corollary 9. *Write $a_{i,j}=0$ if $j<0$ or $j>d$. The leading monomial of the minor $((i_1,j_1),\dots,(i_{d+k},j_{d+k}))$ is $\prod_{s=1}^{d+k} a_{j_s,s-i_s}$.*

For fixed minor, for each s, write $(u_s,v_s) := (j_s, s-i_s)$. When $s>1$, we have that either $v_s \le v_{s-1}$ or ($v_s = v_{s-1}+1$ and $u_s > u_{s-1}$). These correspond to the cases that $i_s > i_{s-1}$ and $i_s = i_{s-1}$, respectively. Restrict attention now to nonzero minors. These are exactly those for which each (u_s,v_s) is contained within the $n\times(d+1)$ lattice. We always have $v_1 = 1-i_1 \le 0$ and $v_{d+k} = d+k-i_{d+k} \ge d$, so for a nonzero minor in particular equality holds for both. Call a walk $(u_1,v_1),\dots,(u_{d+k},v_{d+k})$ through the lattice satisfying the conditions

(1) $v_{s+1} \le v_s$ or both $v_{s+1} = v_s+1$ and $u_{s+1} > u_s$;
(2) $v_1 = 0$ and $v_{d+k} = d$

a *minor walk*. Every minor walk arises from an actual minor: the only thing to check is that i_s satisfies $1 \le i_s \le k$. These are the conditions $s-k \le v_s \le s-1$. The upper bound follows from $v_1 = 0$ and $v_{s+1} \le v_s + 1$ and the lower bound from the fact that $v_{d+k} = d$ and $v_{s-1} \ge v_s - 1$. We have shown

Proposition 10. *The nonzero $(d+k)\times(d+k)$ minors of M_k correspond exactly to minor walks of length $d+k$. The leading monomial of the minor corresponding to a walk is obtained by multiplying the variables corresponding to the visited lattice points, counted with multiplicity.*

If any subset of the minors of Theorem 4 forms a Gröbner basis, then so must a subset whose leading terms divide the leading terms of any minor. Let us construct a minimal such subset, which we will see actually corresponds to a unique set of minors. Let a *reduced* minor walk denote a minor walk which is minimal under inclusion, i.e., one for which no vertex can be deleted and remain a minor walk.

Lemma 11. *A minor walk $(u_1,v_1),\dots,(u_{d+k},v_{d+k})$ is a reduced if and only if*

(1) *$v_{s+1} \ge v_s$;*
(2) *$v_2 = 1$ and $v_{d+k-1} = d-1$;*
(3) *if $v_{s+1} = v_s$, then $v_s = v_{s-1}+1$, $v_{s+2} = v_{s+1}+1$ and $u_{s+2} \le u_s$. In particular, $u_{s+1} < u_s$.*

Furthermore, a reduced minor walk visits each vertex at most once, is determined by the set of vertices it visits, and no minor walk can visit a proper subset of the visited vertices.

Proof. Let $(u_1,v_1),\dots,(u_{d+k},v_{d+k})$ be a minor walk. We first show if any of the conditions of the claim are violated, this walk is not reduced.

(1) If $v_{s+1} < v_s$, then $v_{s+1} \le v_{s-1}$ and thus we can remove the s-th step.
(2) If $v_2 \ne 1$, then $v_2 = 0$ and we may remove the first step. Analogously if $v_{d+k-1} \ne d-1$ we could remove the last step.
(3) Suppose $v_{s+1} = v_s$ and thus $u_{s+1} \ne u_s$. If $v_s \ne v_{s-1}+1$ we may remove the s-th step. If $v_{s+2} \ne v_{s+1}+1$ then we could remove the $(s+1)$-st step. This implies $u_{s+2} > u_{s+1}$. We could also remove the $(s+1)$-st step if $u_{s+2} > u_s$.

Conversely, suppose the walk satisfies the conditions, and consider (u_s, v_s) and (u_t, v_t) for $t \geq s+2$. We have either $v_t \geq v_s + 2$ or both $v_t = v_s + 1$ and $u_s \leq u_t$. In either case, it is illegal to make such a step directly in a minor walk, and it follows that the walk is reduced.

Now, note that a reduced walk can visit a vertex at most once, as otherwise we could remove the part of the walk from leaving a given vertex until coming back to it. For the remaining claims, consider any minor walk visiting a subset of $\{(u_1, v_1), \dots, (u_{d+k}, v_{d+k})\}$. Such a walk must begin with (u_1, v_1) and end with (u_{d+k}, v_{d_k}), so for each s, it must at some point pass from the set $\{(u_1, v_1), \dots, (u_s, v_s)\}$ to $\{(u_{s+1}, v_{s+1}, \dots, (u_{d+k}, v_{d+k})\}$. By the reasoning of the last paragraph, the only legal step accomplishing this is $(u_s, v_s), (u_{s+1}, v_{s+1})$. This establishes the remaining claims. □

Let G be the set of minors corresponding to reduced walks. From the second claim of Lemma 11, every leading term not divisible by another is represented in G exactly once, and no others are. From the definition of reduced, it is clear that the leading term of any minor is divisible by that of one in G. Furthermore, by the same Lemma, it is clear that reduced walks must have length at most $2d$ and that this length is achievable when $n \geq 2$. Walks of length at most $2d$ correspond to minors of M_k, $k \leq d$, which accounts for the reason the claim of Theorem 4 is as it is and is sharp.

Now let us determine $V(\operatorname{lt} G)$, which consists of coordinate subspaces. The equations of one of the components consist of a minimal subset of variables so that all generators of $\operatorname{lt} G$ are divisible by at least one in the subset.

Proposition 12. *Let $1 \leq s \leq n$ and $1 \leq t \leq d$. Write*

$$S_{s,t} = \{a_{i,t-1}, i < s\} \cup \{a_{i,t}, i > s\}.$$

Then $S_{s,t}$ is an inclusion minimal subset of variables intersecting the vertices of every (reduced) minor walk, and all such subsets are one of the $S_{s,t}$.

Thus, there are nd such subsets, each of size $d-1$. In particular $V(\operatorname{lt} G)$ is equidimensional of projective dimension nd and degree nd.

Proof. A minor walk must intersect $S_{s,t}$ at the beginning or end of any step it passes from column $t-1$ to t, and it must do this at least once. It is easy to construct a minor walk avoiding any proper subset of $S_{s,t}$, so the first claim is shown.

Now, let S be an inclusion minimal subset intersecting any walk, and identify variables with corresponding lattice points. Suppose $(i_1, j_1), (i_2, j_2) \in S$, $i_1 \leq i_2$. Since S is minimal under inclusions, there must be a minor walk avoiding any proper subset of S, in particular there is a pair of minor walks that avoid S except for exactly (i_1, j_1) and (i_2, j_2), respectively.

Suppose either $i_1 + 2 \leq i_2$ or $i_1 + 1 = i_2$ and $j_1 \geq j_2 - 1$. Then the prefix of the path into and excluding the first occurrence of (i_2, j_2) followed by the suffix out of and excluding the last occurrence (i_1, j_1) is a minor walk avoiding S, contradiction. Hence S is confined to two adjacent columns, and any element of S in the left column rules out any in the right column above one below the element. Such a set S is then a subset of an $S_{s,t}$, and by minimality of $S_{s,t}$ equal. □

We can now finish the proof of our main result.

Proof of Theorem 4. We will prove that G is a Gröbner basis of the resultant ideal $I_{d,n}$, that is $\operatorname{lt} G$ generates the initial ideal of $I_{d,n}$. By Proposition 12, we know that $V(\operatorname{lt} G)$ is a reduced, equidimensional variety of degree dn and dimension dn. For any ideal J that strictly contains $\operatorname{lt} G$, the variety $V(J)$ must be strictly included in $V(\operatorname{lt} G)$. In particular, it must have either strictly smaller dimension, or the same dimension and strictly smaller degree. However, $V(\operatorname{lt} I_{d,n})$ has the same dimension and degree as $V(I_{d,n})$, that is, dn and dn by Corollary 2. Thus, $\operatorname{lt} I_{d,n}$ cannot strictly contain the ideal generated by $\operatorname{lt} G$, and as $G \subset I_{d,n}$, G is a Gröbner basis for $I_{d,n}$ and in particular generates it. □

4. Final remarks

We have provided a full description of the resultant ideal $I_{d,n}$. Below we explain in detail how this is related to equations defining $X_{d,n} = V(I_{d,n}) \subset \mathbb{P}^{n(d+1)-1}$.

Lemma 13. *If rank of M_k is strictly smaller than $d+k$, then rank of M_{k-1} is strictly smaller than $d+k-1$.*

Proof. Suppose for contradiction that M_{k-1} has rank $d+k-1$. We may consider M_{k-1} as an upper left submatrix of M_k. Thus the rank of M_k and M_{k-1} would have to be equal. This would be only possible if the last column of M_k is zero. But in this case, so would be the last row of M_{k-1}, which is a contradiction. □

We recover Kakie's result [4].

Corollary 14. *The set-theoretic zero locus of all $2d \times 2d$ minors of M_d is the variety $X_{d,n} \subset \mathbb{P}^{n(d+1)-1}$.*

As noted before, in general these minors clearly cannot generate the ideal $I_{d,n}$, as smaller minors have smaller degree.

We finally note that one of the main steps of the proof was finding a square-free Gröbner basis of $I_{d,n}$. There exist other term orders that provide square-free initial ideals, which however do not choose the diagonal as the leading term.

Example 15. Consider the first non-trivial case $d = 2, n = 3$. We calculate minors and leading terms in `degrevlex` polynomial ordering using Macaulay2 [3].

```
R = QQ[a_1..a_3,b_1..b_3,c_1..c_3];
N = matrix {
{a_1,b_1,c_1,0},
{a_2,b_2,c_2,0},
{a_3,b_3,c_3,0},
{0,a_1,b_1,c_1},
{0,a_2,b_2,c_2},
{0,a_3,b_3,c_3}};

M = matrix {
{a_1,b_1,c_1},
{a_2,b_2,c_2},
{a_3,b_3,c_3}};

U = (minors(3,M) + minors(4,N))
LU = leadTerm U
```

The output is

$$a_3b_2c_1, a_3b_2b_3c_2, a_3b_1b_3c_2, a_2b_1b_3c_2, a_3b_1b_3c_1, a_2b_1b_3c_1, a_2b_1b_2c_1$$

See [1, Ex. 6.6] for a different analysis of this example.

References

[1] Alicia Dickenstein, Eva Maria Feichtner, and Bernd Sturmfels, *Tropical discriminants*, J. Amer. Math. Soc. **20** (2007), 1111–1133.

[2] David Eisenbud and Joe Harris, *3264 and all that: A second course in algebraic geometry*, Cambridge University Press, 2016.

[3] Daniel R. Grayson and Michael E. Stillman, *Macaulay2, a software system for research in algebraic geometry*. Available at `http://www.math.uiuc.edu/Macaulay2/`.

[4] Kunio Kakié, *The resultant of several homogeneous polynomials in two indeterminates*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. **54** (1976), 1–7.

[5] Mateusz Michałek and Bernd Sturmfels, *Invitation to nonlinear algebra*, Vol. 211, American Mathematical Soc., 2021.

[6] Michael Schindler, *Compatibility conditions for quadratic equations*, 16 January 2023. `https://mathoverflow.net/q/438667`.

(A. Conner and M. Michałek) University of Konstanz, Dept. of Mathematics and Statistics, Universitätsstr. 10, 78457 Konstanz, Germany

Email address: `austin.conner@uni-konstanz.de, mateusz.michalek@uni-konstanz.de`

(M. Schindler) CNRS UMR7083, ESPCI Paris, Université PSL, 10 rue Vauquelin, 75005 Paris, France

Email address: `michael.schindler@espci.fr`

(B. Szendrői) Faculty of Mathematics, University of Vienna, Oscar-Morgenstein-Platz 1, 1090 Vienna, Austria

Email address: `balazs.szendroi@univie.ac.at`