

PROOF OF THE CASAS-ALVERO CONJECTURE

SOHAM GHOSH

ABSTRACT. The Casas-Alvero conjecture states that if $f(X)$ is a monic univariate polynomial of degree d over a characteristic 0 field \mathbb{K} such that $\gcd(f, f_i)$ is non-trivial for each $i = 1, \dots, d-1$, then $f(X) = (X - \alpha)^d$ for some $\alpha \in \mathbb{K}$. In this paper, we prove the Casas-Alvero conjecture for polynomials of any degree $d \geq 3$ over any characteristic 0 field, by using Koszul homology. Along the way we show existence of various “almost counterexamples” over \mathbb{C} , satisfying mildly weaker hypotheses, using Brouwer degree techniques.

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1. Aim and main results of the paper. Let \mathbb{K} be a field and $f(X) \in \mathbb{K}[X]$ be a monic polynomial of degree $d > 1$. Let $f^{(i)}(X) := d^i f(X)/dX^i$ be the i^{th} formal derivative of $f(X)$ with respect to X and let $f_i(X)$ be the i^{th} Hasse–Schmidt derivative of $f(X)$. Over fields of characteristic 0, the two derivatives are related via $f_i(X) = f^{(i)}(X)/i!$. This paper is concerned with the following question posed by E. Casas-Alvero in connection with his work [CA01] on higher-order polar germs:

Conjecture CA (Casas-Alvero, 2001). *Let $f(X)$ be a monic univariate polynomial of degree d over a field \mathbb{K} . Then $\gcd(f, f_i)$ is non-trivial for each $i = 1, \dots, d-1$ if and only if $f(X) = (X - \alpha)^d$ for some $\alpha \in \mathbb{K}$.*

Conjecture CA was originally posed over characteristic 0 fields using ordinary formal derivatives. Using Hasse-Schmidt derivatives, the conjecture has been studied in the literature in the above generalized form over any field irrespective of the characteristic. We review the existing literature on this problem in Section 1.2 below. It is well-known that the conjecture is false in general in any positive characteristic, leaving only the characteristic zero case open. The following theorem, which is the main result of this paper, settles Conjecture CA over *any characteristic zero field* and in *all positive degrees* (degrees 1 and 2 being trivially known).

Theorem A. *Let $f(X)$ be a monic univariate polynomial of degree $d \geq 3$ over a characteristic zero field \mathbb{K} . Then $\gcd(f, f_i)$ is non-trivial for each $i = 1, \dots, d-1$ if and only if $f(X) = (X - \alpha)^d$ for some $\alpha \in \mathbb{K}$.*

By Theorem A and the work of [BLSW07], we also obtain the following.

Corollary B. *Let $f(X)$ be a monic univariate polynomial of degree d over a field \mathbb{K} . Then there exists a finite set $\mathcal{P}(d)$ of primes such that if $\text{char } \mathbb{K} \notin \mathcal{P}(d)$, then $\gcd(f, f_i)$ is non-trivial for each $i = 1, \dots, d-1$ if and only if $f(X) = (X - \alpha)^d$ for some $\alpha \in \mathbb{K}$.*

By [Gho25, Remark 5.9], we also obtain the following strengthening of Corollary B.

Corollary C. *Let $X_d \subseteq \mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{Z}}(1, 2, \dots, d-1)$ be the d^{th} arithmetic Casas-Alvero scheme as defined in [BLSW07]. Then $\dim X_d = 0$ for all $d \geq 3$.*

Date: March 24, 2026.

2020 Mathematics Subject Classification. 12E05, 13D02, 13D03, 14M10.

Key words and phrases. Casas-Alvero conjecture, regular sequences, Koszul homology.

1.1.1. *Idea of the proof.* We briefly sketch the idea of the proof of Theorem A. Without loss of generality we will assume our fields to be algebraically closed. We build on the work done by the present author in [Gho25], whereby Conjecture CA can be reformulated as a complete intersection problem and further as a problem of demonstrating regular sequences of certain homogeneous polynomials in multivariate polynomial rings (see [Gho25, Proposition 5.2]). We pursue a *downward induction* argument on the degree $d \geq 3$, namely by assuming the conjecture in degree $d = n + 1$, we prove the conjecture in degree $d = n$. This step assumes that the characteristic of the ground field is 0.

To establish the downward induction we need two ingredients- both algebraic and topological. First, we prove that the local and global minimal number of generators of the relevant ideals are equal to the expected number- we reduce the local problem to the global problem and utilize Abel-Gontcharoff polynomials and the topological theory of Brouwer degree to prove the global result. We note that this step works only over \mathbb{C} . For the second part, we complete the downward induction by homological methods, in particular Koszul homology. We relate the relevant (truncated) Koszul complexes in degrees $d = n + 1$ and $d = n$ by introducing a filtration. By using the local minimal number of generators information we show that the induced map on 0^{th} Koszul homology by the filtration is injective. Furthermore, by depth sensitivity of Koszul homology and finiteness results of [Gho25], we obtain the vanishing of second and higher homologies. By the long exact sequence in homology obtained from the filtration, we conclude vanishing of the first Koszul homology for the complex in degree $d = n$, completing the downward induction.

Finally, we invoke the results of [BLSW07] (or [DdJ11]) which verify the conjecture in infinitely many degrees, and thereby along with our downward induction argument, prove Conjecture CA in all degrees.

1.2. Existing results and methods. Conjecture CA was originally posed over characteristic 0 fields \mathbb{K} . In general, the conjecture is false over positive characteristic (cf. [BLSW07] for counterexamples). The authors of [BLSW07] also show that the truth of Conjecture CA for algebraically closed fields and in a particular degree d is independent of the choice of field, and only depends on the characteristic of the field. The first progress over characteristic 0 was made for degree ≤ 7 polynomials via computational methods in [DTGV06]. Soon after, in [BLSW07] the authors related the conjecture for a general polynomial $P(X)$ of degree d over any field \mathbb{K} to the absence of \mathbb{K} -rational points of a weighted projective \mathbb{Z} -subscheme X_d of $\mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{Z}}(1, 2, \dots, d - 1)$ defined by vanishing of resultants $\text{Res}_X(P, P_i)$ for all $1 \leq i < \deg P = d$. Their methods, utilizing reduction modulo prime arguments, successfully proved the conjecture over fields of characteristic 0 for polynomials of degree p^k , $2p^k$ for any prime p . Furthermore, by [BLSW07, Proposition 2.2], if Conjecture CA holds for all polynomials of degree n over fields of characteristic p , for some $p = 0$ or p prime, then Conjecture CA holds true for degree d polynomials over fields of any characteristic except finitely many primes. The finitely many primes p for a given d such that the Conjecture does not hold true in degree d and characteristic p are called *bad primes for d* . These methods were reformulated and extended in [DdJ11] using p -adic valuations, where the authors also proved the Conjecture over characteristic 0 for polynomials of degrees $3p^k$ and $4p^k$ for primes p greater than 3 and 4 respectively (except $p = 5, 7$ when $d = 4$).

In this spirit, further results for certain polynomials of degree $5p^k$ were shown in [CS12]. There have also been several computational studies, cf. [CLO14], where the authors verified the conjecture for polynomials of degrees $d = 5p^k$, $6p^k$ and $7p^k$ barring the bad primes in each case, which were also completely classified. These are the only existing positive results towards Conjecture CA. In addition to these, [CLO14] also studied obstructions to hypothetical counterexamples and have verified the conjecture for degree 12. (which is missed by the cases considered above). Computational approaches involving Gröbner bases, even though theoretically possible, get practically

infeasible for large degrees due to the complexity of resultants. Alternate approaches to the conjecture have involved analytic tools via the Gauss–Lucas theorem and to a further extent, the theory of Abel–Gontcharoff polynomials: see [Yak14], [Yak16] and [Mas23].

Recently, Daniel Schaub and Mark Spivakovsky have published a series of papers addressing the conjecture. Their first paper [SS25] provides a partial result towards “independence” of the higher resultants $\text{Res}_X(P, P_i)$ for $1 \leq i \leq d-1$. Their second paper [SS24(a)] attempts to extend the reduction modulo prime techniques of existing positive results by obtaining a non-exhaustive list of bad primes p for each $d > 1$. The conjecture over characteristic 0 fields follows for degree n polynomials if and only if there are finitely many bad primes for p , which signifies the importance of studying bad primes. However, the bad primes p for a given d can be very large as demonstrated in [BLSW07]. This has seemed to hinder a purely algebraic approach to the conjecture so far.

More recently a new approach to Conjecture CA has been initiated by the present author in [Gho25]. The basis of the main results of [Gho25] is the following reformulation of Conjecture CA over any algebraically closed field \mathbb{K} and degree $d \geq 3$.

Proposition 1.4. (*Proposition 5.2, [Gho25]*) *Conjecture CA is true for all monic degree d polynomials over \mathbb{K} if and only if for all choices of $1 \leq j_1, \dots, j_{d-1} \leq d$, the sequence $\Phi_{j_1}^\#(HD_{d-1}^0 \mathbf{x}_{d-1}), \dots, \Phi_{j_{d-1}}^\#(HD_{d-1}^{d-2} \mathbf{x}_{d-1})$ forms a regular sequence of homogeneous polynomials in $\mathbb{K}[x_1, \dots, x_{d-1}]$.*

We refer the reader to Section 4.1 for the relevant notation. Using this reformulation [Gho25] proves that the set of \mathbb{K} -rational points $X_d(\mathbb{K})$ of the d^{th} -arithmetic Casas–Alvero scheme X_d is finite for all $d \geq 3$ and fields \mathbb{K} . Concretely, this implies that for any $d \geq 3$ there are only finitely many (up to affine transformations, i.e., those of the form $f(X) \rightarrow f(aX + b)$) counterexamples to Conjecture CA in degree d over any field \mathbb{K} (irrespective of characteristic). Furthermore, utilizing [Gho25, Proposition 5.2] Schaub and Spivakovsky provide a computable criterion for bad primes for each $d \geq 3$ in their most recent paper [SS24(b)]. This enables them to obtain an upper bound ([SS24(b), Corollary 3.2]) on the set of bad primes $\mathcal{P}(d)$ in Corollary B above for a given d assuming that Conjecture CA holds true in degree d over characteristic 0.

1.3. Historical note. Besides being of independent interest, Conjecture CA originated in the context of Casas–Alvero’s work [CA01] on higher-order polar germs of complex analytic plane curve singularities. This problem has also been considered among a list of forty questions on singularities of algebraic varieties ([HS11, Problem 14**]) compiled by Hauser and Schicho. The following [CA24] is the original context of the conjecture. The main result of [CA01] is a factorization theorem for higher-order polars of an irreducible germ of a complex analytic plane curve, generalizing the known one for first order polars. As a corollary, Casas–Alvero then computed the intersection multiplicity of the r^{th} polar and the original germs, which when viewed as a function in r is defined to be the Plücker function of the germ. The Plücker function can be defined even for a non-irreducible germ. The question that led Casas–Alvero to formulate Conjecture CA is that if the Plücker function of a not necessarily irreducible germ is equal to the Plücker function of an irreducible germ, then is the original germ irreducible to start with. If yes, then one would obtain an easy criterion for irreducibility of complex power series in two variables involving the intersection multiplicities of the germ and its polars.

Acknowledgment. The author would like to thank Mark Spivakovsky for carefully reading through several drafts, suggesting improvements and for providing valuable feedback at various stages. The author would also like to thank his advisors Max Lieblich and Farbod Shokrieh for their constant encouragement and support. This work was partially supported by NSF CAREER DMS-2044564 and NSF FRG DMS-2151718 grants.

2. GLOBAL NOTATIONS AND DEFINITIONS

This paper builds up on the work done in [Gho25], which in some sense serves as a prequel to this. We therefore follow the notation introduced in that paper, which we recall here for convenience.

- (i) For a univariate polynomial $f(x) = a_d x^d + a_{d-1} x^{d-1} + \dots + a_0 \in \mathbb{K}[x]$ over any field \mathbb{K} , we will denote the i^{th} Hasse–Schmidt derivative (introduced in [SH37]) of $f(x)$ by $f_i(x)$, which is defined as

$$f_i(x) = \binom{d}{i} a_d x^{d-i} + \binom{d-1}{i} a_{d-1} x^{d-i-1} + \dots + \binom{i}{i} a_i.$$

- (ii) We will denote the i^{th} multivariate Hasse–Schmidt derivation on $\mathbb{K}[x_1, \dots, x_k]$ by HD_k^i , which is defined as follows: for a monomial $x_1^{\alpha_1} \dots x_k^{\alpha_k} \in \mathbb{K}[x_1, \dots, x_k]$ define

$$HD_k^i x_1^{\alpha_1} \dots x_k^{\alpha_k} := \sum_{j_1 + \dots + j_k = i} \binom{\alpha_1}{j_1} \binom{\alpha_2}{j_2} \dots \binom{\alpha_k}{j_k} x_1^{\alpha_1 - j_1} \dots x_k^{\alpha_k - j_k}. \quad (2.1)$$

The derivation $HD_k^i : \mathbb{K}[x_1, \dots, x_k] \rightarrow \mathbb{K}[x_1, \dots, x_k]$ is defined by extending (2.1) \mathbb{K} -linearly.

- (iii) For each $d \geq 2$ and $1 \leq j \leq d+1$, define the \mathbb{K} -algebra automorphisms $\Phi_{d,j}^\#$ of $\mathbb{K}[x_1, \dots, x_d]$ following [Gho25, Remark 4.13]. If $j = d+1$, define $\Phi_{d,d+1}^\#$ to be the identity map on $\mathbb{K}[x_1, \dots, x_d]$. For $1 \leq j \leq d$ define:

$$\Phi_{d,j}^\# : \mathbb{K}[x_1, \dots, x_d] \rightarrow \mathbb{K}[x_1, \dots, x_d] \text{ by } \Phi_{d,j}^\#(x_l) = \begin{cases} x_l - x_j, & l \neq j, \\ -x_j, & l = j. \end{cases} \quad (2.2)$$

When the polynomial ring $\mathbb{K}[x_1, \dots, x_d]$ is evident from context (i.e., d is evident), then we will abbreviate $\Phi_{d,j}^\#$ as $\Phi_j^\#$ for all $1 \leq j \leq d+1$.

- (iv) Let $\mathbf{x}_d \in \mathbb{K}[x_1, \dots, x_d]$ denote the monomial $x_1 x_2 \dots x_d$. Then $\mathbf{x}_d = e_d(x_1, \dots, x_d)$ is the elementary symmetric polynomial of degree d in d variables. Then one can check that for all $0 \leq i \leq d-1$, $HD_d^i \mathbf{x}_d \in \mathbb{K}[x_1, \dots, x_d]$ is the elementary symmetric polynomial $e_{d-i}(x_1, \dots, x_d)$ of degree $d-i$ in d variables.
- (v) For any choice of indices $1 \leq j_1, \dots, j_n \leq n+1$, we will denote the ideal $(\Phi_{n,j_i}^\#(HD_n^{i-1} \mathbf{x}_n) \mid 1 \leq i \leq n) \subseteq \mathbb{K}[x_1, \dots, x_n]$ by $\mathcal{I}_n(j_1, j_2, \dots, j_n)$.
- (vi) For a ring R and any ideal $I \subseteq R$, the minimal number of generators of the ideal I will be denoted by $\mu_R(I)$.
- (vii) When needed, we will abbreviate the polynomial ring $\mathbb{K}[x_1, \dots, x_n]$ by R_n , when there is no ambiguity about the base field \mathbb{K} .

Thus, the polynomials $\Phi_{j_i}^\#(HD_{d-1}^{i-1} \mathbf{x}_{d-1})$ in Proposition 1.4 for $1 \leq i \leq d-1$ are by definition the polynomials $\Phi_{d-1,j_i}^\#(HD_{d-1}^{i-1} \mathbf{x}_{d-1})$ following (iii) – (iv) above.

3. MINIMAL NUMBER OF GENERATORS OF $\mathcal{I}_n(j_1, \dots, j_n)$

In this section, we determine the global and local minimal number of generators of the ideal $\mathcal{I}_n(j_1, \dots, j_n) := (\Phi_{n,j_i}^\#(HD_n^{i-1} \mathbf{x}_n) \mid 1 \leq i \leq n) \subseteq R_n$ for any choice of $1 \leq j_1, \dots, j_n \leq n+1$. The following lemma gives a formula for the polynomials $\Phi_{n,j}^\#(HD_n^{i-1} \mathbf{x}_n)$, which will be useful in analyzing local minimal number of generators of $\mathcal{I}_n(j_1, \dots, j_n)$.

Lemma 3.1. *For any $1 \leq j \leq n+1$, in the ring $\mathbb{K}[x_1, \dots, x_n]$, we have*

$$\Phi_{n,j}^\#(HD_n^{i-1} \mathbf{x}_n) = \sum_{l=0}^{n+1-i} \binom{n+1-l}{n+1-i-l} (-x_j)^{n+1-i-l} e_l(x_1, \dots, x_n) \quad (3.1)$$

Here we use the convention that $x_{n+1} = 0$ in $\mathbb{K}[x_1, \dots, x_n]$.

Proof. Note that $\Phi_{n,j}^\#(HD_n^{i-1}\mathbf{x}_n) = e_{n+1-i}(x_1-x_j, \dots, x_{j-1}-x_j, -x_j, x_{j+1}-x_j, \dots, x_n-x_j)$, where e_{n+1-i} is the degree $n+1-i$ elementary symmetric polynomial in n variables. Let $z_i := x_i - x_j$ for all $i \neq j$ and $z_j = -x_j$. Then consider the generating function $E_z(T) := \sum_{r=0}^n e_r(z_1, \dots, z_n)T^r = \prod_{i=0}^n (1+z_i T) = (1-x_j T) \prod_{i=0, i \neq j}^n (1+(x_i-x_j)T) = (1-x_j T)^n \prod_{i=0, i \neq j}^n (1+Ux_i)$, where $U = T/(1-x_j T)$. Thus, $E_z(T) = (1-x_j T)^{n+1} \prod_{i=0}^n (1+Ux_i) = (1-x_j T)^{n+1} \sum_{i=0}^n e_i(x_1, \dots, x_n)U^i = \sum_{i=0}^n e_i(x_1, \dots, x_n)T^i(1-x_j T)^{n+1-i}$. Expanding $(1-x_j T)^{n+1-i}$ using binomial theorem, we obtain:

$$\begin{aligned} E_z(T) &= \sum_{r=0}^n e_r(z_1, \dots, z_n)T^r = \sum_{i=0}^n e_i(x_1, \dots, x_n)T^i(1-x_j T)^{n+1-i} \\ &= \sum_{i=0}^n \sum_{k=0}^{n+1-i} e_i(x_1, \dots, x_n)T^i \binom{n+1-i}{k} (-x_j)^k T^k \end{aligned}$$

Then comparing coefficients of T^r , we see that $e_r(z_1, \dots, z_n) = \sum_{l=0}^r \binom{n+1-l}{r-l} e_l(x_1, \dots, x_n) (-x_j)^{r-l}$. Then $\Phi_{n,j}^\#(HD_n^{i-1}\mathbf{x}_n) = e_{n+1-i}(z_1, \dots, z_n) = \sum_{l=0}^{n+1-i} \binom{n+1-l}{n+1-i-l} e_l(x_1, \dots, x_n) (-x_j)^{n+1-i-l}$. \square

Remark 3.2. Lemma 3.1 can be used to obtain a direct proof of Conjecture CA for degrees $n+1 = p^\nu$ for any prime p , and thereby recover [BLSW07][Theorem] partially. Fix a choice of indices $1 \leq j_1, j_2, \dots, j_n \leq n+1$, with the convention that $x_{n+1} = 0$ in $\mathbb{Z}[x_1, \dots, x_n]$. For brevity, denote

$$F(i, j_i, n) := \Phi_{n,j_i}^\#(HD_n^{i-1}\mathbf{x}_n) = \sum_{l=0}^{n+1-i} \binom{n+1-l}{n+1-i-l} (-x_{j_i})^{n+1-i-l} e_l(x_1, \dots, x_n).$$

If $n+1 = p^\nu$, then $p \mid \binom{n+1}{n+1-i}$ for all $1 \leq i \leq n$. Let $F_p := F_p(j_1, \dots, j_n) := [p, F(n, j_n, n), F(n-1, j_{n-1}, n), \dots, F(1, j_1, n)]^T$ and let $E_p := [p, e_1, \dots, e_n]^T$. Then $F_p = A_p E_p$, where $A_p := A_p(j_1, \dots, j_n)$ is the $(n+1) \times (n+1)$ matrix with entries $(A_p)_{i,k}$ for $i \in \{0, \dots, n\}$ and $k \in \{0, \dots, n\}$:

$$(A_p)_{i,k} = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } k = i = 0 \\ \frac{(-1)^{i-k}}{p} \binom{n+1-k}{i-k} x_{j_i}^{i-k} & \text{if } k = 0, 1 \leq i \leq n \\ (-1)^{i-k} \binom{n+1-k}{i-k} x_{j_i}^{i-k} & \text{if } 0 < k \leq i, 1 \leq j_i \leq n \\ 0 & \text{if } 0 \leq k < i, j_i = n+1 \\ 1 & \text{if } k = i, j_i = n+1 \\ 0 & \text{if } k > i. \end{cases}$$

Note that A_p is a lower triangular matrix with 1's on the diagonal, and hence is invertible. Since p, e_1, \dots, e_n is a regular sequence in $\mathbb{Z}[x_1, \dots, x_n]$, so is the sequence $p, F(n, j_n, n), \dots, F(1, j_1, n)$, as $F_p = A_p E_p$. This proves Conjecture CA by Proposition 1.4, for all degrees $n+1 = p^\nu$, where p is any prime and ν is any positive integer.

By Proposition 1.4, Conjecture CA in degree $n+1$ is controlled by the height of the ideals $\mathcal{I}_n(j_1, j_2, \dots, j_n) \subseteq \mathbb{K}[x_1, \dots, x_n]$ for any choice of indices $1 \leq j_1, \dots, j_n \leq n+1$. For any minimal prime $\mathfrak{p} \subseteq R_n$ over $\mathcal{I}_n(j_1, \dots, j_n)$, we have $\text{height } \mathfrak{p} \geq n-1$ by [Gho25][Theorem A]. In a Noetherian ring R , a proper ideal I is *complete intersection* if the minimal number of generators $\mu_R(I)$ of the ideal is equal to $\text{height } I$. A proper ideal generated by a regular sequence is a complete intersection and the converse holds in Cohen-Macaulay rings. Thus, Conjecture CA is equivalent to the ideals $\mathcal{I}_n(j_1, \dots, j_n)$ being complete intersection of height n for any choice of indices. *A priori*, [Gho25][Theorem A] allows the possibility of $\mathcal{I}_n(j_1, \dots, j_n)$ being a complete intersection ideal of height $n-1$ (see [Gho25][§5.2.1] for possible cases). To rule this out, we study the minimal number of generators of $\mathcal{I}_n(j_1, \dots, j_n)$. The following proposition shows that the global minimal number of generators of $\mathcal{I}_n(j_1, \dots, j_n)$ determines the local minimal number of generators and vice versa.

Proposition 3.3. *For every $n \geq 3$, if characteristic of \mathbb{K} does not divide $\prod_{i=1}^n \binom{n}{i-1}$, then for any minimal prime $\mathfrak{p} \subseteq R_n$ over $\mathcal{I}_n(j_1, \dots, j_n)$, we have*

$$\mu_{(R_n)_{\mathfrak{p}}}(\mathcal{I}_n(j_1, \dots, j_n)_{\mathfrak{p}}) = \mu_{R_n}(\mathcal{I}_n(j_1, \dots, j_n)).$$

Proof. First, note that by Krull's height theorem and [Gho25][Theorem A], $\mu_{R_n}(\mathcal{I}_n(j_1, \dots, j_n)) \geq \text{height } \mathcal{I}_n(j_1, \dots, j_n) \geq n - 1$ and the same is true for the localizations at the minimal primes of $\mathcal{I}_n(j_1, \dots, j_n)$. Thus, if $\mu_{R_n}(\mathcal{I}_n(j_1, \dots, j_n)) = n - 1$ then clearly $\mu_{(R_n)_{\mathfrak{p}}}(\mathcal{I}_n(j_1, \dots, j_n)_{\mathfrak{p}}) = n - 1$. The rest of the proof will be showing that if $\mu_{R_n}(\mathcal{I}_n(j_1, \dots, j_n)) = n$ then $\mu_{(R_n)_{\mathfrak{p}}}(\mathcal{I}_n(j_1, \dots, j_n)_{\mathfrak{p}}) = n$ as well, which is sufficient to prove the proposition.

Without loss of generality, we can assume that $j_i \neq n + 1$ for any $1 \leq i \leq n$. This is because there exists $1 \leq l \leq n + 1$ such that $j_i \neq l$ for all $1 \leq i \leq n$. If $1 \leq l \leq n$, then applying the automorphism $\Phi_{n,l}^{\#}$ to the ideal $\mathcal{I}_n(j_1, \dots, j_n)$ yields $\mathcal{I}_n(j'_1, \dots, j'_n)$, where $j'_i = j_i$ if $j_i \neq n + 1$ and $j'_i = l$ if $j_i = n + 1$. Let $\mathfrak{p} \subseteq R_n$ be a minimal prime over $\mathcal{I}_n(j_1, \dots, j_n)$. Then we know,

$$\mu_{(R_n)_{\mathfrak{p}}}(\mathcal{I}_n(j_1, \dots, j_n)_{\mathfrak{p}}) = \dim_{\frac{(R_n)_{\mathfrak{p}}}{\mathfrak{p}(R_n)_{\mathfrak{p}}}} \frac{\mathcal{I}_n(j_1, \dots, j_n)_{\mathfrak{p}}}{\mathfrak{p}\mathcal{I}_n(j_1, \dots, j_n)_{\mathfrak{p}}} \quad (3.2)$$

Since the only height n homogeneous prime ideal in $\mathbb{K}[x_1, \dots, x_n]$ is the irrelevant maximal ideal (x_1, \dots, x_n) , if a minimal prime \mathfrak{p} over $\mathcal{I}_n(j_1, \dots, j_n)$ has height n , then $\mathfrak{p} = (x_1, \dots, x_n)$. In particular, this would be the only minimal prime over $\mathcal{I}_n(j_1, \dots, j_n)$, implying $\text{height } \mathcal{I}_n(j_1, \dots, j_n) = n$ and thus, $\mu_{(R_n)_{\mathfrak{p}}}(\mathcal{I}_n(j_1, \dots, j_n)_{\mathfrak{p}}) = n$, as $\mu(-)$ is lower bounded by $\text{height}(-)$. Thus, we will assume that there exists at least one minimal prime over $\mathcal{I}_n(j_1, \dots, j_n)$ which has height $n - 1$, which is equivalent to assuming that *all minimal primes over $\mathcal{I}_n(j_1, \dots, j_n)$ have height $n - 1$* . Let $\mathfrak{p} \subseteq R_n$ be a minimal prime over $\mathcal{I}_n(j_1, \dots, j_n)$ of height $n - 1$. Since $\mathcal{I}_n(j_1, \dots, j_n)$ is homogeneous, \mathfrak{p} is homogeneous of height $n - 1$ in R_n and corresponds to a line through origin in $\mathbb{A}_{\mathbb{K}}^n$. Thus, there exists a non-zero $\mathbf{a} := (a_1, a_2, \dots, a_n) \in \mathbb{A}_{\mathbb{K}}^n$ such that $\mathfrak{p} = (x_i a_j - x_j a_i \mid 1 \leq i < j \leq n) \subseteq R_n$. Furthermore, we can assume that not all of the a_i 's are equal. This is because $\mathcal{I}_n(j_1, \dots, j_n) \not\subseteq (x_i - x_j \mid 1 \leq i < j \leq n)$ as $\Phi_{j_n}^{\#} HD_n^{n-1} \mathbf{x}_n(a, a, \dots, a) = e_1(a, a, \dots, a) - (n + 1)a = -a \neq 0$ if $a \neq 0$. Note that there exists $1 \leq r \leq n$, $r \neq j_1$ such that $a_r \neq 0$. This is justified since if $a_i = 0$ for all $i \neq j_1$, then $\Phi_{n,j_1}^{\#}(HD_n^0 \mathbf{x}_n)(\mathbf{a}) = (-1)^n a_{j_1}^n = 0$ would force $a_{j_1} = 0$ as well.

Consider the change of coordinates of $R_n = \mathbb{K}[x_1, \dots, x_n]$ as follows: let $t = x_r/a_r$ and $y_i = a_r x_i - a_i x_r$. Since $a_r \neq 0$, clearly $R_n \cong \mathbb{K}[t][y_i \mid 1 \leq i \leq n, i \neq r]$ and under this change of coordinates, $\mathfrak{p} = (y_i \mid 1 \leq i \leq n, i \neq r)$. Thus, the localization $(R_n)_{\mathfrak{p}}$ is isomorphic to $\mathbb{K}(t)[y_1, \dots, \widehat{y}_r, \dots, y_n]_{(y_1, \dots, \widehat{y}_r, \dots, y_n)}$, and the residue field at \mathfrak{p} is isomorphic to $\mathbb{K}(t)$. Let $\Theta : (R_n)_{\mathfrak{p}} \xrightarrow{\sim} \mathbb{K}(t)[y_1, \dots, \widehat{y}_r, \dots, y_n]_{(y_1, \dots, \widehat{y}_r, \dots, y_n)}$ be the isomorphism and let $G(i, j_i) = \Theta(F(i, j_i)) \in R_{n-1}(t) := \mathbb{K}(t)[y_1, \dots, \widehat{y}_r, \dots, y_n]$ for all $1 \leq i \leq n$. Let $\mathfrak{I}_n(j_1, \dots, j_n) \subseteq R_{n-1}(t)$ be the ideal generated by the $G(i, j_i)$'s for $1 \leq i \leq n$. We will denote the prime ideal $\Theta(\mathfrak{p}) = (y_1, \dots, \widehat{y}_r, \dots, y_n)$ by \mathfrak{m} , the irrelevant homogeneous ideal in $R_{n-1}(t)$. Since the residue field of $R_{n-1}(t)$ at \mathfrak{m} is $\mathbb{K}(t)$, we obtain:

$$\begin{aligned} \mu_{(R_n)_{\mathfrak{p}}}(\mathcal{I}_n(j_1, \dots, j_n)_{\mathfrak{p}}) &= \mu_{(R_{n-1}(t))_{\mathfrak{m}}}(\mathfrak{I}_n(j_1, \dots, j_n)_{\mathfrak{m}}) \\ &= \dim_{\mathbb{K}(t)} \mathfrak{I}_n(j_1, \dots, j_n)_{\mathfrak{m}} / \mathfrak{m} \mathfrak{I}_n(j_1, \dots, j_n)_{\mathfrak{m}} \\ &= \dim_{\mathbb{K}(t)} \mathfrak{I}_n(j_1, \dots, j_n) / \mathfrak{m} \mathfrak{I}_n(j_1, \dots, j_n). \end{aligned}$$

To start, let us write down explicit formulae for $G(i, j_i)$'s. We begin with some notational conventions: let $\epsilon_i = y_i/a_r$ if $i \neq r$ and $\epsilon_r = 0$, whereby $x_i = a_i t + \epsilon_i$. Then we have:

$$e_k(x) = \sum_{q=0}^k \sum_{\substack{T \subseteq [n] \setminus \{r\} \\ |T|=q}} t^{k-q} e_{k-q}(a_{[n] \setminus T}) \frac{y_T}{a_r^q}, \quad \text{and} \quad (-x_j)^m = (-1)^m \sum_{s=0}^m \binom{m}{s} a_j^{m-s} t^{m-s} \epsilon_j^s, \quad (3.3)$$

where $y_T := \prod_{i \in T} y_i$ and $a_{[n] \setminus T} := (a_i)_{i \in [n] \setminus T}$. Plugging in (3.3) in (3.1), we have:

$$G(i, j_i) = \sum_{q=0}^{N_i} \sum_{s=0}^{N_i-q} \frac{t^{N_i-q-s}}{a_r^{q+s}} \sum_{\substack{T \subseteq [n] \setminus \{r\} \\ |T|=q}} \left[\sum_{m=s}^{N_i-q} (-1)^m \binom{i+m}{m} \binom{m}{s} a_{j_i}^{m-s} e_{N_i-m-q}(a_{[n] \setminus T}) \right] y_T y_{j_i}^s, \quad (3.4)$$

where $N_i := n + 1 - i$. When $j_i = r$ we have $\epsilon_r = 0$, so $s \geq 1$ terms vanish and (3.4) simplifies to

$$G(i, j_i = r) = \sum_{q=0}^{N_i} \frac{t^{N_i-q}}{a_r^q} \sum_{\substack{T \subseteq [n] \setminus \{r\} \\ |T|=q}} \left[\sum_{m=0}^{N_i-q} (-1)^m \binom{i+m}{m} a_r^m e_{N_i-m-q}(a_{[n] \setminus T}) \right] y_T. \quad (3.5)$$

Since by our choice $\mathfrak{p} \subseteq R_n$ was a minimal prime over $\mathcal{I}_n(j_1, \dots, j_n)$ generated by homogeneous polynomials $F(i, j_i)$'s, we obtain $G(i, j_i)(0, 0, \dots, 0) = F(i, j_i)(a_1, a_2, \dots, a_n) = 0$, implying that the constant terms of $G(i, j_i)$'s in (3.4) and (3.5) are zero. Hence $G(i, j_i) \in \mathfrak{m} = (y_1, \dots, \widehat{y}_r, \dots, y_n)$ for all $1 \leq i \leq n$. We have $\deg_{y_{j_i}} G(i, j_i) = N_i$ if $j_i \neq r$. Furthermore, for $l \neq j_i, r$, $\deg_{y_l} G(i, j_i) = 1$ and $\deg_{y_r} G(i, j_i) = 0$ for all i . Now let,

$$H(i, j_i) = \sum_{q=0}^{N_i} \sum_{s=0}^{N_i-q} \frac{t^{N_i-q-s}}{a_r^{q+s}} \sum_{\substack{T \subseteq [n] \\ |T|=q}} \left[\sum_{m=s}^{N_i-q} (-1)^m \binom{i+m}{m} \binom{m}{s} a_{j_i}^{m-s} e_{N_i-m-q}(a_{[n] \setminus T}) \right] y_T y_{j_i}^s, \quad (3.6)$$

for all $1 \leq i \leq n$, $1 \leq j_1, \dots, j_n \leq n$ (including $j_i = r$). Note that the only difference between $H(i, j_i)$ and $G(i, j_i)$ is that the T -sum in $H(i, j_i)$ varies over all subsets of $[n]$ (including r) and thus, $H(i, j_i) \in \mathbb{K}(t)[y_1, \dots, y_n]$ as opposed to $G(i, j_i) \in \mathbb{K}(t)[y_1, \dots, \widehat{y}_r, \dots, y_n]$. In other words, if $q : \mathbb{K}(t)[y_1, \dots, y_n] \rightarrow \mathbb{K}(t)[y_1, \dots, \widehat{y}_r, \dots, y_n]$ is the natural quotient map modulo y_r , then $q(H(i, j_i)) = G(i, j_i)$ for all $1 \leq i, j_i \leq n$. Let $\mathcal{J}_n(j_1, \dots, j_n) := (H(i, j_i) \mid 1 \leq i \leq n) \subseteq \mathbb{K}(t)[y_1, \dots, y_n]$ and $\mathcal{J}_n^+(j_1, \dots, j_n) := (\mathcal{J}_n(j_1, \dots, j_n), y_r)$. If $\mathfrak{m}^+ := (y_1, \dots, y_n) \subseteq \mathbb{K}(t)[y_1, \dots, y_n]$ is the irrelevant maximal ideal in the polynomial ring including y_r , then the quotient map q induces an isomorphism $\mathbb{K}(t)[y_1, \dots, y_n]_{\mathfrak{m}^+} / (y_r)_{\mathfrak{m}^+} \cong \mathbb{K}(t)[y_1, \dots, \widehat{y}_r, \dots, y_n]_{\mathfrak{m}}$, under which $\overline{\mathcal{J}_n^+(j_1, \dots, j_n)_{\mathfrak{m}^+}} \subseteq \mathbb{K}(t)[y_1, \dots, y_n]_{\mathfrak{m}^+} / (y_r)_{\mathfrak{m}^+}$ gets identified with $\mathcal{J}_n(j_1, \dots, j_n)_{\mathfrak{m}}$, the ideal generated by the $G(i, j_i)$'s. Thus, we have the equality

$$\mu(\mathcal{J}_n(j_1, \dots, j_n)_{\mathfrak{m}}) = \mu(\overline{\mathcal{J}_n^+(j_1, \dots, j_n)_{\mathfrak{m}^+}}),$$

which implies that $\mu(\mathcal{J}_n(j_1, \dots, j_n)_{\mathfrak{m}}) = n$ if and only if $\dim_{\mathbb{K}(t)} \mathcal{J}_n^+(j_1, \dots, j_n) / \mathfrak{m}^+ \mathcal{J}_n^+(j_1, \dots, j_n) = n + 1$. At this point, we can make one more assumption without loss of generality. The marked variable y_r comes from our choice of the non-zero scalar a_r in the vector $\mathbf{a} = (a_1, \dots, a_n)$ determining the minimal prime \mathfrak{p} over $\mathcal{I}_n(j_1, \dots, j_n)$. We had earlier shown it is justified to assume $r \neq j_1$. We will now also additionally assume $r \neq j_n$. This is because if $a_i = 0$ for all $i \neq j_1, j_n$, then $\Phi_{n, j_1}^\#(HD_n^0 \mathbf{x}_n)(\mathbf{a}) = (-a_{j_1})^{n-1} (a_{j_n} - a_{j_1}) = 0$ and $\Phi_{n, j_1}^\#(HD_n^{n-1} \mathbf{x}_n)(\mathbf{a}) = a_{j_1} - na_{j_n} = 0$ which would together imply $a_{j_1} = a_{j_n} = 0$ and thus $\mathbf{a} = \mathbf{0}$. Thus, we can assume that the choice of our non-zero a_r is such that $r \neq j_1, j_n$. With this, we will now prove that if the global minimal number of generators $\mu_{R_n}(\mathcal{I}_n(j_1, \dots, j_n)) = n$, then $\dim_{\mathbb{K}(t)} \mathcal{J}_n^+(j_1, \dots, j_n) / \mathfrak{m}^+ \mathcal{J}_n^+(j_1, \dots, j_n) = n + 1$ giving the desired implication.

Definition 3.4. Let $N_l = n + 1 - l$, and define $\Delta_l := \frac{1}{N_l!} \frac{\partial^{N_l}}{\partial y_{j_l}^{N_l}} \Big|_{y_1=\dots=y_n=0} : \mathbb{K}(t)[y_1, \dots, y_n] \rightarrow \mathbb{K}(t)$ be the N_l^{th} partial derivative operator with respect to y_{j_l} evaluated at $y_1 = \dots = y_n = 0$.

Note that Δ_l is $\mathbb{K}(t)$ -linear and $\Delta_l(f)$ computes the coefficient of the pure monomial $y_{j_l}^{N_l}$ in $f \in \mathbb{K}(t)[y_1, \dots, y_n]$. The following lemma computes these coefficients for $H(i, j_i)$ multiplied with any monomial, for any $1 \leq i \leq n$.

Lemma 3.5. Let $\underline{\beta} = (\beta_1, \dots, \beta_n) \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^n$ and $u(\underline{\beta}) := \prod_{i=1}^n y_i^{\beta_i}$ be the corresponding monomial in $\mathbb{K}(t)[y_1, \dots, y_n]$. Then $\Delta_l(u(\underline{\beta}).H(i, j_i))$ equals:

- (1) 0 if $\underline{\beta} = \underline{0}$ and $l < i$,
- (2) 0 if $l < n$, $\underline{\beta} = \underline{0}$ and $j_i \neq j_l$,
- (3) $t^{l-i} a_r^{-N_l} (C_{i,l,j_i}^{(1)} + C_{i,l,j_i}^{(2)})$, if $\underline{\beta} = \underline{0}$, $i \leq l < n$, and $j_l = j_i \neq r$, where

$$C_{i,l,j_i}^{(1)} = \sum_{m=N_l}^{N_i} (-1)^m \binom{i+m}{m} \binom{m}{N_l} a_j^{m-N_l} e_{N_i-m}(a_{[n]}), \text{ and}$$

$$C_{i,l,j_i}^{(2)} := \sum_{m=N_l-1}^{N_i-1} (-1)^m \binom{i+m}{m} \binom{m}{N_l-1} a_j^{m-N_l+1} e_{N_i-m-1}(a_{[n] \setminus \{a_{j_l}\}}).$$

In particular, if $i = l$, then $\Delta_i(H(i, j_i)) = (-a_r)^{N_i} \binom{n}{i-1}$,

- (4) 0 if $\underline{\beta} := \sum_{i=1}^n \beta_i \geq 1$ and $u(\underline{\beta}) \neq y_{j_l}^b$ for $1 \leq b < N_l = n + 1 - l$
- (5) $\text{coeff}_{y_{j_l}^{N_l-b}} H(i, j_i)$ if $u(\underline{\beta}) = y_{j_l}^b$ for $1 \leq b < N_l = n + 1 - l$. Thus, if $j_i \neq j_l$, then $\text{coeff}_{y_{j_l}^{N_l-b}} H(i, j_i) = 0$ if $1 \leq b \leq N_l - 2$. If $j_i = j_l$ then $\text{coeff}_{y_{j_l}^{N_l-b}} H(i, j_i) = 0$ if $N_l - b > N_i$ or equivalently, $1 \leq b < i - l$.

Proof. Since $\Delta_l(H(i, j_i))$ is the coefficient of the pure monomial $y_{j_l}^{N_l}$ in $H(i, j_i)$, if $l < i$ then $N_i < N_l$ and $\deg_{y_{j_i}} H(i, j_i) = N_i$ and $\deg_{y_k} H(i, j_i) = 1$ if $k \neq j_i$. Thus if $l < i \leq n$, clearly $\Delta_l(H(i, j_i)) = 0$ which gives us (1).

For (2) note that by (3.6), the monomials occurring in $H(i, j_i)$ are of the form $y_T \cdot y_{j_i}^s$ for $T \subseteq [n]$, $0 \leq |T| = q \leq N_i$ and $0 \leq s \leq N_i - q$. Thus, if $l < n$, then $N_l > 1$ and if $j_i \neq j_l$, then clearly there's no $y_{j_l}^{N_l}$ term.

For (3), by (3.6) the monomials $y_T \cdot y_{j_i}^s$ can equal $y_{j_l}^{N_l}$ in two ways: first if $T = \emptyset$ ($q = 0$), $s = N_l$ and second if $T = \{j_l\}$ ($q = 1$), $s = N_l - 1$. Up to a factor of $t^{l-i} \cdot a_r^{-N_l}$, the first coefficient contribution is $C_{i,l,j_i}^{(1)} = \sum_{m=N_l}^{N_i} (-1)^m \binom{i+m}{m} \binom{m}{N_l} a_j^{m-N_l} e_{N_i-m}(a_{[n]})$ and the second coefficient contribution is $C_{i,l,j_i}^{(2)} := \sum_{m=N_l-1}^{N_i-1} (-1)^m \binom{i+m}{m} \binom{m}{N_l-1} a_j^{m-N_l+1} e_{N_i-m-1}(a_{[n] \setminus \{a_{j_l}\}})$. Thus, in this case,

$$\Delta_l(H(i, j_i)) = t^{l-i} a_r^{-N_l} (C_{i,l,j_i}^{(1)} + C_{i,l,j_i}^{(2)})$$

In particular, if $i = l$, then we obtain $\Delta_i(H(i, j_i)) = (-a_r)^{-N_i} (\binom{n+1}{n+1-i} - \binom{n}{n-i}) = (-a_r)^{N_i} \binom{n}{i-1}$.

For (4), if $u(\underline{\beta})$ has $\beta_k > 0$ for some $k \neq j_l$, then clearly, $\Delta_l(u(\underline{\beta})H(i, j_i)) = 0$, since y_k survives the differentiation, but is annihilated when evaluated at $y_1 = \dots = y_n = 0$. If $u(\underline{\beta}) = y_{j_l}^b$ for $b > N_l$, then a power of y_{j_l} always survives the differentiation which annihilates $\Delta_l(H(i, j_i))$, after setting $y_{j_l} = 0$. If $u(\underline{\beta}) = y_{j_l}^{N_l}$, then $\Delta_l(y_{j_l}^{N_l} H(i, j_i)) = \text{coeff}_{y_{j_l}^0} (H(i, j_i)) = 0$, since $H(i, j_i)(0, 0, \dots, 0) = 0$ by choice of (a_1, \dots, a_n) . (5) follows from coefficient interpretation of Δ_l operator, and the vanishing for $\Delta_l(y_{j_l}^b H(i, j_i))$ for $j_i \neq j_l$ and $1 \leq b \leq N_l - 2$ follows from (3.6) via similar arguments as above. \square

Thus, Δ_l is 0 on all of $\mathfrak{m}^+ \mathcal{J}_n(j_1, \dots, j_n)$ except on $y_{j_l}^b H(i, j_i)$ for i such that $j_i = j_l$ and $i - l \leq b \leq N_l - 1$ and $y_{j_l}^{N_l-1} H(i, j_i)$ for i such that $j_i \neq j_l$. We will now show that $\text{Span}_{\mathbb{K}(t)} \{H(i, j_i) \mid 1 \leq i \leq n\}$ and $\mathfrak{m}^+ \mathcal{J}_n(j_1, \dots, j_n)$ are $\mathbb{K}(t)$ -linearly independent, whereby one can construct any $\mathbb{K}(t)$ -linear functional on $\mathcal{J}_n(j_1, \dots, j_n)$ by specifying its values on $\text{Span}_{\mathbb{K}(t)} \{H(i, j_i) \mid 1 \leq i \leq n\}$ and $\mathfrak{m}^+ \mathcal{J}_n(j_1, \dots, j_n)$ separately. Thus, assume that we have a relation of the following form in

$\mathbb{K}(t)[y_1, \dots, y_n]$, where $c_i, d_{i,u} \in \mathbb{K}(t)$ for all $1 \leq i \leq n$ and monomials u of positive degree:

$$\sum_{i=1}^n c_i H(i, j_i) = \sum_{\substack{u \text{ monomial}, 1 \leq i \leq n \\ \deg u \geq 1}}^n d_{i,u} u \cdot H(i, j_i) \quad (3.7)$$

We claim in (3.7), we must have $c_i = 0$ for all $1 \leq i \leq n$. Clearing the denominator by multiplying with appropriate polynomial in $\mathbb{K}[t]$ we can assume that (3.7) holds in $\mathbb{K}[t, y_1, \dots, y_n]$, i.e., $c_i, d_{i,u} \in \mathbb{K}[t]$. Let $H_{N_i}(i, j_i)$ denote the degree N_i homogeneous part of $H(i, j_i)$ in the variables y_1, \dots, y_n . Then from (3.6) we see that $H_{N_i}(i, j_i)$ corresponds to the terms coming from $q + s = N_i$ and hence the innermost sum indexed by m collapses to $(-1)^{N_i - q} \binom{n+1-q}{n+1-i-q}$. Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} H_{N_i}(i, j_i) &= a_r^{-N_i} \sum_{q=0}^{N_i} \sum_{\substack{T \subseteq [n] \\ |T|=q}} (-1)^{N_i - q} \binom{n+1-q}{n+1-i-q} y_T y_{j_i}^{N_i - q} \\ &= a_r^{-N_i} \sum_{q=0}^{N_i} \binom{n+1-q}{n+1-i-q} e_q(y_1, \dots, y_n) (-y_{j_i})^{N_i - q} = a_r^{-N_i} \Phi_{n, j_i}^\#(HD_n^{i-1} \mathbf{y}_n) \in \mathbb{K}[y_1, \dots, y_n], \end{aligned}$$

where the last equality follows from Lemma 3.1. Assume $c_i = \sum_{i'} c_{i,i'} t^{i'}$ and $d_{i,u} = \sum_{i'} d_{i,u,i'} t^{i'}$. Thus, the equation obtained from the constant terms with respect to t of (3.7) is

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i=1}^n c_{i,0} H_{N_i}(i, j_i) &= \sum_{\substack{u \text{ monomial}, 1 \leq i \leq n \\ \deg u \geq 1}}^n d_{i,u,0} u \cdot H_{N_i}(i, j_i) \\ \sum_{i=1}^n c_{i,0} a_r^{-N_i} \Phi_{n, j_i}^\#(HD_n^{i-1} \mathbf{y}_n) &= \sum_{\substack{u \text{ monomial}, 1 \leq i \leq n \\ \deg u \geq 1}}^n d_{i,u,0} u \cdot a_r^{-N_i} \Phi_{n, j_i}^\#(HD_n^{i-1} \mathbf{y}_n), \end{aligned} \quad (3.8)$$

where $c_{i,0}, d_{i,u,0} \in \mathbb{K}$ and $a_r \neq 0$ is a scalar which can be absorbed into the scalars $c_{i,0}, d_{i,u,0}$'s. Note that (3.8) holds in $\mathbb{K}[y_1, \dots, y_n]$ and since we are assuming that the global minimal number of generators $\mu_{R_n}(\mathcal{I}_n(j_1, \dots, j_n)) = n$, we have $c_{i,0} = 0$ for all $1 \leq i \leq n$ in (3.8).

Thus for all c_i 's in (3.7), which holds in $\mathbb{K}[t, y_1, \dots, y_n]$, t must divide c_i . We now claim that t is a non-zero divisor in $\mathbb{K}[t, y_1, \dots, y_n]/\mathfrak{m}^+ \mathcal{J}_n^+(j_1, \dots, j_n)$. This is because if t were a zero-divisor, then $\mathbb{K}(t)[y_1, \dots, y_n]/\mathfrak{m}^+ \mathcal{J}_n^+(j_1, \dots, j_n) = 0$ (since we are inverting a zero-divisor) and thus, when we take its further localization, we obtain $\mathbb{K}(t)[y_1, \dots, y_n]_{\mathfrak{m}^+}/\mathfrak{m}^+ \mathcal{J}_n^+(j_1, \dots, j_n)_{\mathfrak{m}^+} = 0$. But this ring is isomorphic to $(R_n)_{\mathfrak{p}}/(\mathfrak{p} \mathcal{I}_n(j_1, \dots, j_n))_{\mathfrak{p}}$, via the change of coordinates Θ , which we know is not zero. Thus, t is a non-zerodivisor in $\mathbb{K}[t, y_1, \dots, y_n]/\mathfrak{m}^+ \mathcal{J}_n^+(j_1, \dots, j_n)$. Thus, if t divides c_i for all $1 \leq i \leq n$ in (3.7) (considered in $\mathbb{K}[t, y_1, \dots, y_n]$ after clearing denominators), then we can cancel t and obtain an equation analogous to (3.7) but now with the t -degrees of all the new c_i 's strictly lower than that of the initial c_i 's. Repeating this process, we obtain $c_i = 0$ for all $1 \leq i \leq n$ in (3.7) by reducing t -degrees of the c_i 's, which ends in finitely many steps.

We now let $D_l : \mathcal{J}_n^+(j_1, \dots, j_n) \rightarrow \mathbb{K}(t)$ be the $\mathbb{K}(t)$ -linear functional which is 0 on the sub-ideal $\mathfrak{m}^+ \cdot \mathcal{J}_n^+(j_1, \dots, j_n)$ and equals Δ_l on $\text{Span}_{\mathbb{K}(t)}\{H(i, j_i) \mid 1 \leq i \leq n, y_r\}$. Note that $\Delta_l(y_r) = 0$ for all $1 \leq l \leq n$ (in particular, for $l = n$, for which we need our assumption $r \neq j_n$). Thus, D_l descends to a functional $\overline{D}_l : \mathcal{J}_n^+(j_1, \dots, j_n)/\mathfrak{m}^+ \mathcal{J}_n^+(j_1, \dots, j_n) \rightarrow \mathbb{K}(t)$ defined by $\overline{D}_l(\overline{H(i, j_i)}) = \Delta_l(H(i, j_i))$ for all $1 \leq i \leq n$ and $\overline{D}_l(\overline{y_r}) = \Delta_l(y_r) = 0$. For $l = n$, Δ_n is automatically zero on all of $\mathfrak{m}^+ \cdot \mathcal{J}_n^+(j_1, \dots, j_n)$, so it naturally descends to a $\overline{D}_n = \overline{\Delta}_n : \mathcal{J}_n^+(j_1, \dots, j_n)/\mathfrak{m}^+ \mathcal{J}_n^+(j_1, \dots, j_n) \rightarrow \mathbb{K}(t)$.

Furthermore, let $\Delta_{n+1} : \mathbb{K}(t)[y_1, \dots, y_n] \rightarrow \mathbb{K}(t)$ be the $\mathbb{K}(t)$ -linear map $\partial/\partial y_r \mid_{y_1=\dots=y_n=0}$. Then Δ_{n+1} automatically vanishes on $\mathfrak{m}^+ \mathcal{J}_n^+(j_1, \dots, j_n)$, and descends to a $\mathbb{K}(t)$ -linear map $\overline{D}_{n+1} :=$

$\overline{\Delta_{n+1}} : \mathcal{J}_n^+(j_1, \dots, j_n) / \mathfrak{m}^+ \mathcal{J}_n^+(j_1, \dots, j_n) \rightarrow \mathbb{K}(t)$. As above, we see $\Delta_{n+1}(H(i, j_i)) = \text{Coeff}_{y_r} H(i, j_i)$ and $\Delta_{n+1}(y_r) = 1$. Now consider the following $(n+1) \times (n+1)$ matrix over $\mathbb{K}(t)$:

$$A_n^+(j_1, \dots, j_n) := (A_{l,i})_{1 \leq l, i \leq n+1}, \text{ where } A_{l,i} := \overline{D_l(H(i, j_i))} \text{ for } 1 \leq l, i \leq n+1.$$

Here we use the convention $H(n+1, j_{n+1}) := y_r$ when the ambient ring is $\mathbb{K}(t)[y_1, \dots, y_n]$. Then $A_{l,i} = 0$ for $i > l$ by Lemma 3.5 and $A_{i,i} = (-a_r)^{n+1-i} \binom{n}{i-1}$ for $1 \leq i \leq n$ and $A_{0,0} = 1$. This makes $A_n^+(j_1, \dots, j_n)$ lower triangular, and invertible as long as $\prod_{i=1}^n \binom{n}{i-1} \in \mathbb{K}^\times$. This implies that $\overline{H(i, j_i)}$ for $1 \leq i \leq n$ and $\overline{y_r}$ are all $\mathbb{K}(t)$ -linearly independent in $\mathcal{J}_n^+(j_1, \dots, j_n) / \mathfrak{m}^+ \mathcal{J}_n^+(j_1, \dots, j_n)$. This is because if $c_0 \overline{y_r} + \sum_{i=1}^n c_i \overline{H(i, j_i)} = 0$ is a $\mathbb{K}(t)$ -linear relation in $\mathcal{J}_n^+(j_1, \dots, j_n) / \mathfrak{m}^+ \mathcal{J}_n^+(j_1, \dots, j_n)$, then applying $\overline{D_l}$ to this equation for all $0 \leq l \leq n$ we obtain the matrix equation $A_n^+(j_1, \dots, j_n) \cdot \mathbf{c} = \mathbf{0}$, where $\mathbf{c} = (c_0, c_1, \dots, c_n)^T$. By invertibility of $A_n^+(j_1, \dots, j_n)$ we obtain $\mathbf{c} = \mathbf{0}$. This proves:

$$\dim_{\mathbb{K}(t)} \mathcal{J}_n^+(j_1, \dots, j_n) / \mathfrak{m}^+ \mathcal{J}_n^+(j_1, \dots, j_n) = n+1,$$

and thus, $\mu_{(R_n)_{\mathfrak{p}}}(\mathcal{I}_n(j_1, \dots, j_n)_{\mathfrak{p}}) = n$, when $\prod_{i=1}^n \binom{n}{i-1} \in \mathbb{K}^\times$. This proves the proposition as \mathfrak{p} is an arbitrary minimal prime over $\mathcal{I}_n(j_1, \dots, j_n)$ in R_n . \square

We will now prove that the global minimal number of generators $\mu_{R_n}(\mathcal{I}_n(j_1, \dots, j_n))$ is equal to n over fields of all but finitely many prime characteristics.

Theorem 3.6. *For every $n \geq 3$, there exists a finite set of primes $\mathcal{P}(n)$ such that the minimal number of generators $\mu_{R_n}(\mathcal{I}_n(j_1, \dots, j_n)) = n$ over fields of characteristic $p \notin \mathcal{P}(n)$.*

Proof. As in the proof of Proposition 3.3, we can assume that all the indices j_i 's lie between 1 and n . It suffices to show that if $\sum_{i=1}^n c_i \Phi_{n,j_i}^\#(HD_n^{i-1} \mathbf{x}_n) \in \mathfrak{m} \mathcal{I}_n(j_1, \dots, j_n)$ where $c_i \in \mathbb{K}$ and $\mathfrak{m} = (x_1, \dots, x_n) \subseteq R_n$, then $c_i = 0$ for all $1 \leq i \leq n$. This is because then $\text{Span}_{\mathbb{K}}\{\Phi_{n,j_i}^\#(HD_n^{i-1} \mathbf{x}_n) \mid 1 \leq i \leq n\} \cap \mathfrak{m} \mathcal{I}_n(j_1, \dots, j_n) = 0$ in $\mathcal{I}_n(j_1, \dots, j_n)$ and so one can use the linear functionals used in the proof of Proposition 3.3 above to similarly obtain $\mu_{R_n}(\mathcal{I}_n(j_1, \dots, j_n)) = n$ when $\prod_{i=1}^n \binom{n}{i} \in \mathbb{K}^\times$. In particular, $p \in \mathcal{P}(n)$ for every prime p dividing $\prod_{i=1}^n \binom{n}{i}$.

Given a relation of the form $\sum_{i=1}^n c_i \Phi_{n,j_i}^\#(HD_n^{i-1} \mathbf{x}_n) \in \mathfrak{m} \mathcal{I}_n(j_1, \dots, j_n)$ with $c_i \in \mathbb{K}$, we can further break this up into n equations obtained by looking at the degree $n+1-l$ homogeneous part of the relation for all $1 \leq l \leq n$. This immediately gives $c_n = 0$ since $\deg \Phi_{n,j_n}^\#(HD_n^{n-1} \mathbf{x}_n) = 1$, whereas every element in $\mathfrak{m} \mathcal{I}_n(j_1, \dots, j_n)$ has degree at least 2. Now consider the following equation coming from homogeneous degree $n+1-l$ part of the relation for $1 \leq l \leq n-1$:

$$c_l \Phi_{n,j_l}^\#(HD_n^{l-1} \mathbf{x}_n) - \sum_{i=l+1}^n u_i \Phi_{n,j_i}^\#(HD_n^{i-1} \mathbf{x}_n) = 0, \quad (3.9)$$

where $c_l \in \mathbb{K}$ and u_i are homogeneous of degree $i-l$ for all $l+1 \leq i \leq n$. Note that if $c_l \neq 0$, then $\Phi_{n,j_l}^\#(HD_n^{l-1} \mathbf{x}_n) \in (\Phi_{n,j_i}^\#(HD_n^{i-1} \mathbf{x}_n) \mid 1 \leq i \leq n, i \neq l)$ and therefore $\mu_{R_n}(\mathcal{I}_n(j_1, \dots, j_n)) = n-1 = \text{height}(\mathcal{I}_n(j_1, \dots, j_n))$, where equality follows from Krull's height theorem and [Gho25][Theorem A]. This implies that $\{\Phi_{n,j_i}^\#(HD_n^{i-1} \mathbf{x}_n) \mid 1 \leq i \leq n, i \neq l\}$ is a regular sequence in $R_n := \mathbb{K}[x_1, \dots, x_n]$. Let $\mathbf{j} := (j_1, \dots, j_n)$ and let $M_{n,l+1,\mathbf{j}}[n+1-l]$ denote the degree $n+1-l$ Macaulay matrix of the ideal $(\Phi_{n,j_i}^\#(HD_n^{i-1} \mathbf{x}_n) \mid l+1 \leq i \leq n)$ (see [Mac94] or [CLO05][Chapter 3, §4] for definition of Macaulay matrices). The regular sequence property implies that $\text{rank } M_{n,l+1,\mathbf{j}}[n+1-l]$, which by definition is the \mathbb{K} -vector space dimension of the homogeneous degree $n+1-l$ part of the ideal $(\Phi_{n,j_i}^\#(HD_n^{i-1} \mathbf{x}_n) \mid l+1 \leq i \leq n)$, equals

$$r_{n,l+1}[n+1-l] := \dim_{\mathbb{K}} \mathbb{K}[x_1, \dots, x_n]_{(n+1-l)} - h_{[1,2,\dots,n-l]}(n+1-l), \quad (3.10)$$

where $h_{[1,2,\dots,n-l]}(n+1-l)$ is the coefficient of t^{n+1-l} in the Hilbert series of a complete intersection generated by homogeneous forms of degrees $1, 2, \dots, n-l$ in R_n , given by the formula $HS_{n,n-l}(t) :=$

$(1-t)^{-n} \prod_{k=1}^{n-l} (1-t^k)$. Let $M_{n,l,\mathbf{j}}[n+1-l]$ denotes the degree $n+1-l$ Macaulay matrix of the ideal $(\Phi_{n,j_i}^\#(HD_n^{i-1}\mathbf{x}_n) \mid l \leq i \leq n)$, and let \mathbf{v}_l denote the column corresponding to $\Phi_{n,j_l}^\#(HD_n^{l-1}\mathbf{x}_n)$ in $M_{n,l,\mathbf{j}}[n+1-l]$. Then in block matrix form, we can write

$$M_{n,l,\mathbf{j}}[n+1-l] = \left[\mathbf{v}_l \mid M_{n,l+1,\mathbf{j}}[n+1-l] \right].$$

Consequently, $c_l \neq 0$ in (3.9) if and only if $\text{rank } M_{n,l,\mathbf{j}}[n+1-l] = \text{rank } M_{n,l+1,\mathbf{j}}[n+1-l]$. This is because $c_l \neq 0$ in (3.9) can hold if and only if the column \mathbf{v}_l is in the column space of $M_{n,l+1,\mathbf{j}}[n+1-l]$. Let $D(n,l,\mathbf{j})$ be the greatest common divisor of all $r \times r$ minors of $M_{n,l,\mathbf{j}}[n+1-l]$, where $r = r_{n,l+1}[n+1-l] + 1$. It follows that $c_l = 0$ in (3.9) if and only if $D(n,l,\mathbf{j}) \neq 0$. If this holds for all $1 \leq l \leq n-1$, then $\mathcal{P}(n) := \{p \text{ prime} : p \mid \prod_{i=1}^n \binom{n}{i}, \text{ or } p \mid D(n,l,\mathbf{j}) \text{ for some } 1 \leq l \leq n-1\}$ is the set of prime characteristics that one needs to avoid to obtain $\mu_{R_n}(\mathcal{I}_n(j_1, \dots, j_n)) = n$. To prove $D(n,l,\mathbf{j}) \neq 0$ for all $1 \leq l \leq n-1$, we will now work over \mathbb{C} .

Fix some $1 \leq l \leq n-1$. By the correspondence between the sequence of $\{\Phi_{n,j_i}^\#(HD_n^{i-1}\mathbf{x}_n) \mid 1 \leq i \leq n\}$ and the derivative conditions of Conjecture CA (in particular, [Gho25][Lemma 4.8]), the condition $\Phi_{n,j_l}^\#(HD_n^{l-1}\mathbf{x}_n) \in (\Phi_{n,j_i}^\#(HD_n^{i-1}\mathbf{x}_n) \mid l+1 \leq i \leq n)$ is equivalent to the claim that for any degree $n+1$ monic polynomial $f(X) = X \prod_{i=1}^n (X - \alpha_i)$ if $f^{(i)}(\alpha_{j_i}) = 0$ for all $i = l+1, \dots, n$, then we must have $f^{(l)}(\alpha_{j_l}) = 0$ automatically. Thus, to prove $c_l = 0$ in (3.9), it suffices to show the existence of a degree $n+1$ monic polynomial $f(X) = X \prod_{i=1}^n (X - \alpha_i) \in \mathbb{C}[X]$ such that $f^{(i)}(\alpha_{j_i}) = 0$ for all $i = l+1, \dots, n$, but $f^{(l)}(\alpha_{j_l}) \neq 0$. In fact, we now prove the following.

Lemma 3.7. *For any choice of indices $1 \leq j_1, j_2, \dots, j_n \leq n$, there exists a degree $n+1$ monic polynomial $f(X) = X \prod_{i=1}^n (X - \alpha_i) \in \mathbb{C}[X]$ such that $f^{(i)}(\alpha_{j_i}) = 0$ for all $l+1 \leq i \leq n$, but $f^{(l)}(\alpha_{j_l}) \neq 0$.*

Proof of Lemma. We will make use of Abel-Gontcharoff polynomials, which are related to the following interpolation problem. Fix $m \geq 0$ and elements $z_1, \dots, z_m \in \mathbb{C}$. The Abel-Gontcharoff polynomial $G_m(z; z_1, \dots, z_m)$ is the unique monic polynomial in the variable z of degree m such that $G_m^{(k)}(z_{k+1}) = 0$ for all $k = 0, 1, \dots, m-1$, with the convention $G_0 \equiv 1$. These polynomials admit iterated integral representations over the complex plane (see [Gon30], [Lev44], [Evg54] for detailed study of these polynomials). These polynomials have been studied by several authors in relation to Conjecture CA, see for example, [Yak14], [Yak16] and [Mas23].

Let $\mathbf{a} := (\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n) \in \mathbb{C}^n$ be the root tuple and let $\alpha_0 := 0$. We will treat \mathbf{a} as n variables. Define $\gamma_i(\mathbf{a}) := \alpha_{j_i}$ for all $1 \leq i \leq n$. Let $F_{n+1,\mathbf{a}} := (n+1)!$ and define

$$F_{i,\mathbf{a}}(X) := \int_{\gamma_i(\mathbf{a})}^X F_{i+1,\mathbf{a}}(t) dt \text{ for all } 0 \leq i \leq n$$

Then $F_{\mathbf{a}}(X) := F_{0,\mathbf{a}}(X)$ is a monic degree $n+1$ polynomial satisfying the Abel-Gontcharoff property $F_{\mathbf{a}}^{(i)}(\gamma_i(\mathbf{a})) = 0$ for all $0 \leq i \leq n$. If $P_{\mathbf{a}}(X) := X \prod_{i=1}^n (X - \alpha_i)$ is a Casas-Alvero polynomial satisfying $P^{(i)}(\alpha_{j_i}) = 0$, then $F_{\mathbf{a}}(X) = P_{\mathbf{a}}(X) = X \prod_{i=1}^n (X - \alpha_i)$, i.e., in particular the elements $\gamma_i(\mathbf{a})$ are roots of $F_{\mathbf{a}}(X)$. Let $\tilde{F}_{\mathbf{a}}(X) := F_{\mathbf{a}}(X)/X$, since $F_{\mathbf{a}}(0) = 0$ and let $r_{\mathbf{a}}(X) := \tilde{F}_{\mathbf{a}}(X) - p_{\mathbf{a}}(X)$, where $p_{\mathbf{a}}(X) := P_{\mathbf{a}}(X)/X$. Then $\deg r_{\mathbf{a}}(X) \leq n-1$ and write $r_{\mathbf{a}}(X) = \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} r_{\mathbf{a},i} X^i$. Note that the coefficients $r_{\mathbf{a},i}$ are all polynomials in the variables $\mathbf{a} = (\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n)$. Define the polynomial map $\Theta(-) : \mathbb{C}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^n$ given by

$$\Theta(\mathbf{a}) = (r_{\mathbf{a},0}, r_{\mathbf{a},1}, \dots, r_{\mathbf{a},n-1}).$$

Since $r_{\mathbf{a},i}$ are homogeneous polynomials in $\mathbb{C}[\mathbf{a}]$ for all $0 \leq i \leq n-1$, the map $\Theta(-)$ is homogeneous. We dehomogenize, by setting $\alpha_{j_1} = 1$. Thus, consider the polynomial map $\hat{\Theta}(-) : \mathbb{C}^{n-1} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^n$ defined by mapping $\mathbf{b} = (\beta_1, \dots, \widehat{\beta_{j_1}}, \dots, \beta_n) \in \mathbb{C}^{n-1}$ to

$$\hat{\Theta}(\mathbf{b}) = (r_{\mathbf{a},0}, r_{\mathbf{a},1}, \dots, r_{\mathbf{a},n-1}), \text{ where } \mathbf{a} = (\beta_1, \dots, \beta_{j_1-1}, 1, \beta_{j_1+1}, \dots, \beta_n) \in \mathbb{C}^n.$$

For $0 \leq q \leq n-1$, let $\pi_q : \mathbb{C}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^{n-1}$ be the projection away from the q^{th} coordinate, i.e., $\pi_q(z_0, \dots, z_{n-1}) = (z_0, \dots, z_{q-1}, z_{q+1}, \dots, z_{n-1})$. Let $\widehat{\Theta}_q(-) : \mathbb{C}^{n-1} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^{n-1}$ be the composition $\pi_q \circ \widehat{\Theta}(-)$. First of all note that a zero $\mathbf{b}^* \in \mathbb{C}^{n-1}$ of $\widehat{\Theta}(-)$, i.e., $\widehat{\Theta}(\mathbf{b}^*) = \mathbf{0}$, produces a degree $n+1$ monic polynomial $f(X) := X(X-1)p_{\mathbf{b}^*}(X) = X(X-1) \prod_{i \neq j_1} (X - \beta_i^*)$, satisfying $\gcd(f, f^{(i)}) \neq 1$ for all $1 \leq i \leq n$. Such zeroes, exist by hypothesis, since we are assuming that Conjecture CA is false (as else, there is nothing to prove). Thus, zeroes of $\widehat{\Theta}_q(-) : \mathbb{C}^{n-1} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^{n-1}$ exist for all $0 \leq q \leq n-1$.

For any $1 \leq l \leq n$, choose $q = l-1$ and let $\mathbf{b}^* := (\beta_1^*, \dots, \widehat{\beta_{j_1}^*}, \dots, \beta_n^*) \in \mathbb{C}^{n-1}$ be a zero of $\widehat{\Theta}_q(-)$. Then letting $\mathbf{a}^* := (\beta_1^*, \dots, \beta_{j_1-1}^*, 1, \beta_{j_1+1}^*, \dots, \beta_n^*)$, the equation $\widehat{\Theta}_q(\mathbf{b}^*) = \mathbf{0}$ is equivalent to

$$F_{\mathbf{a}^*}(X) = X(X-1) \prod_{i=1}^{n-1} (X - \beta_i^*) + r_l^* X^l \quad (3.11)$$

for some $r_l^* \in \mathbb{C}$. If $P_{\mathbf{b}^*}(X) := X(X-1) \prod_{i=1}^{n-1} (X - \beta_i^*)$, then by definition of $F_{\mathbf{a}^*}(X)$, we have $P_{\mathbf{b}^*}^{(i)}(\beta_{j_i}^*) = F_{\mathbf{a}^*}^{(i)}(\gamma_i(\mathbf{a}^*)) = 0$ for all $i > l$, and $P_{\mathbf{b}^*}^{(l)}(\beta_{j_l}^*) + r_l^* l! = F_{\mathbf{a}^*}^{(l)}(\gamma_l(\mathbf{a}^*)) = 0$ implying $P_{\mathbf{b}^*}^{(l)}(\beta_{j_l}^*) = -r_l^* l!$. If $r_l^* \neq 0$, then $P_{\mathbf{b}^*}(X)$ is the desired polynomial degree $n+1$ monic polynomial $f(X) = X \prod_{i=1}^n (X - \alpha_i) \in \mathbb{C}[X]$ such that $f^{(i)}(\alpha_{j_i}) = 0$ for all $i = l+1, \dots, n$, but $f^{(l)}(\alpha_{j_l}) \neq 0$. Thus in the following, we may assume:

Assumption: For any $\mathbf{b}^* \in \mathbb{C}^{n-1}$ such that $\widehat{\Theta}_{l-1}(\mathbf{b}^*) = \mathbf{0}$, we have $r_l^* = 0$ in (3.11).

Then any such $\mathbf{b}^* \in \mathbb{C}^{n-1}$ produces a polynomial $P_{\mathbf{b}^*}(X)$ with 0 and 1 as roots and satisfying $\gcd(P_{\mathbf{b}^*}, P_{\mathbf{b}^*}^{(i)}) \neq 1$ for all $1 \leq i \leq n$, since $P_{\mathbf{b}^*}(X) = F_{\mathbf{a}^*}(X)$. By [Gho25][Proposition 4.14], such polynomials are in one-to-one correspondence with the \mathbb{C} -rational points of the degree $n+1$ arithmetic Casas-Alvero scheme $X_{n+1}(\mathbb{C}) \subseteq \mathbb{P}_{\mathbb{C}}^n(1, 2, \dots, n)$. By [Gho25][Theorem B], $X_{n+1}(\mathbb{C})$ is a finite set, whereby it follows that there are finitely many zeroes of the map $\widehat{\Theta}_q(-) : \mathbb{C}^{n-1} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^{n-1}$ and hence they are isolated.

Let \mathcal{L} be the space of linear surjections $\mathbb{C}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^{n-1}$. Up to scalar multiplication, these are parametrized by their kernels which are lines in \mathbb{C}^n , and therefore $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{L}) \cong \mathbb{P}^{n-1}$. For $K \in \mathbb{P}^{n-1}$, let $L_K : \mathbb{C}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^{n-1}$ be the associated linear surjection (unique upto scalar multiple) with kernel equal to K and $\widehat{\Theta}_K := L_K \circ \widehat{\Theta} : \mathbb{C}^{n-1} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^{n-1}$. Thus, $\widehat{\Theta}_{l-1} = \widehat{\Theta}_{\langle e_{l-1} \rangle}$, where $\langle e_{l-1} \rangle \subseteq \mathbb{C}^n$ is the line defined by the $(l-1)^{\text{th}}$ standard coordinate vector $e_{l-1} \in \mathbb{C}^n$. Clearly, $\widehat{\Theta}_K(\mathbf{b}) = \mathbf{0}$ if and only if $\widehat{\Theta}(\mathbf{b}) \in K \subseteq \mathbb{C}^n$.

For $K \in \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{L})$, let $V_K := \{\mathbf{b} \in \mathbb{C}^{n-1} \mid \widehat{\Theta}(\mathbf{b}) \in K\} \subseteq \mathbb{C}^{n-1}$. Furthermore, $\mathbf{b} \in V_K$ is a Casas-Alvero point if $\widehat{\Theta}(\mathbf{b}) = \mathbf{0} \in K$. Let the set of all Casas-Alvero points in V_K be Z_K . Then we know that $\bigcup_{K \in \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{L})} Z_K$ is finite. Let $\mathbf{k} = [k_1 : \dots : k_n] \in \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{L})$ and $\mathbb{C}_{\mathbf{b}}^{n-1}$ denote the affine space with coordinates $\mathbf{b} = (\beta_1, \dots, \beta_{n-1})$. Consider the following incidence variety:

$$\mathcal{V} = \{(\mathbf{b}, \mathbf{k}) \in \mathbb{C}_{\mathbf{b}}^{n-1} \times \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{L}) \mid k_i \widehat{\Theta}(\mathbf{b})_j - k_j \widehat{\Theta}(\mathbf{b})_i = 0\} \subset \mathbb{C}_{\mathbf{b}}^{n-1} \times \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{L}).$$

If $p_2 : \mathbb{C}_{\mathbf{b}}^{n-1} \times \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{L}) \rightarrow \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{L})$ is the projection, then the fiber $p_2^{-1}(\mathbf{k})$ is equal to $V_{\langle \mathbf{k} \rangle}$, where $\langle \mathbf{k} \rangle \subseteq \mathbb{C}^n$ is the line spanned by \mathbf{k} . Let $\iota : \mathbb{C}_{\mathbf{b}}^{n-1} \hookrightarrow \mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{b}}^{n-1}$ be the natural inclusion via $\mathbf{b} \mapsto [1 : \mathbf{b}]$ and let $\overline{\mathcal{V}} \subseteq \mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{b}}^{n-1} \times \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{L})$ be the projective closure of \mathcal{V} . If $\pi_2 : \mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{b}}^{n-1} \times \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{L}) \rightarrow \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{L})$ is the natural projection, then the fiber $\pi_2^{-1}(\mathbf{k})$ is the projective closure $\overline{p_2^{-1}(\mathbf{k})} = \overline{V_{\langle \mathbf{k} \rangle}}$ in $\mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{b}}^{n-1}$. Let $H_{\infty} := \mathbb{P}_{\mathbf{b}}^{n-1} \setminus \iota(\mathbb{C}_{\mathbf{b}}^{n-1})$ be the hyperplane at infinity. Then $\overline{V_{\langle \mathbf{k} \rangle}} \cap H_{\infty} \neq \emptyset$ if and only if $V_{\langle \mathbf{k} \rangle} \subseteq \mathbb{C}_{\mathbf{b}}^{n-1}$ is unbounded, or equivalently, not finite. Therefore, by assumption, $\overline{V_{\langle e_{l-1} \rangle}} \cap H_{\infty} = \emptyset$. Let $\Delta_{\infty} := \pi_2(\overline{\mathcal{V}} \cap (H_{\infty} \times \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{L}))) \subseteq \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{L})$, which is Zariski-closed since π_2 is proper. Furthermore, $\Delta_{\infty} \subset \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{L})$ is a proper Zariski-closed subset since $\langle e_{l-1} \rangle \notin \Delta_{\infty}$. Let $\mathcal{U}_{\infty} := \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{L}) \setminus \Delta_{\infty}$.

Let $Z = \{z_1, \dots, z_k\} = \widehat{\Theta}^{-1}(\mathbf{0})$. For $1 \leq i \leq k$, choose $\epsilon_i > 0$ such that $\epsilon_i < \min_{1 \leq j \neq i \leq k} \|z_i - z_j\|/2$, where $\|\cdot\|$ is the standard Euclidean norm on $\mathbb{C}_{\mathbf{b}}^{n-1}$ and let $S_{\epsilon_i}(z_i)$ be the sphere of radius

ϵ_i around z_i . One can check that for all $1 \leq i \leq k$, $D_i := \{K \in \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{L}) \mid V_K \cap S_{\epsilon_i}(z_i) \neq \emptyset\} \subseteq \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{L})$ is a closed subset in the Euclidean topology. Furthermore, each D_i is a proper closed subset since $\langle e_{l-1} \rangle \notin D_i$ for all $1 \leq i \leq k$ as $V_{\langle e_{l-1} \rangle} = \widehat{\Theta}_{l-1}^{-1}(\mathbf{0}) = Z$ by hypothesis. Let $\mathcal{U}_i := \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{L}) \setminus D_i$ for all $1 \leq i \leq k$ and $\mathcal{U} := \mathcal{U}_\infty \cap \bigcap_{i=1}^k \mathcal{U}_i$, which is an Euclidean open subset of $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{L})$. Let $\mathcal{U}' \subseteq \mathcal{U}$ be the connected component containing $\langle e_{l-1} \rangle$.

Let $\mathbf{b}_0 \in \mathbb{C}_{\mathbf{b}}^{n-1} \setminus Z$ such that the line $\langle \widehat{\Theta}(\mathbf{b}_0) \rangle \in \mathcal{U}'$. Such a \mathbf{b}_0 exists since Z is finite and \mathcal{U}' is open. Recall that $V_{\langle \widehat{\Theta}(\mathbf{b}_0) \rangle} \subseteq \mathbb{C}_{\mathbf{b}}^{n-1}$ is finite since $\mathcal{U}' \subseteq \mathcal{U}_\infty$ and has non Casas-Alvero points by construction, since $\mathbf{b}_0 \in V_{\langle \widehat{\Theta}(\mathbf{b}_0) \rangle}$ but $\widehat{\Theta}(\mathbf{b}_0) \neq \mathbf{0}$. Let $A_0 := \widehat{\Theta}_{\langle \widehat{\Theta}(\mathbf{b}_0) \rangle} : \mathbb{C}_{\mathbf{b}}^{n-1} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}_{\mathbf{b}}^{n-1}$ and $A_1 := \widehat{\Theta}_{\langle e_{l-1} \rangle} : \mathbb{C}_{\mathbf{b}}^{n-1} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}_{\mathbf{b}}^{n-1}$. Since $\langle \widehat{\Theta}(\mathbf{b}_0) \rangle, \langle e_{l-1} \rangle \in \mathcal{U}'$, which is path connected, there exists a continuous path $\gamma : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathcal{U}'$ such that $\gamma(0) = \langle \widehat{\Theta}(\mathbf{b}_0) \rangle$ and $\gamma(1) = \langle e_{l-1} \rangle$. Since $\gamma(t) \in \mathcal{U}'$, we know that $|V_{\gamma(t)}| < \infty$ for all $t \in [0, 1]$. Furthermore, $\gamma([0, 1])$ is compact in the Euclidean topology of $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{L})$, whereby there exists $R > 0$ such that $V_{\gamma(t)} \subseteq B_R(\mathbf{0}) \subseteq \mathbb{C}_{\mathbf{b}}^{n-1}$ for all $t \in [0, 1]$, where $B_R(\mathbf{0})$ is the open ball of radius R centered at the origin in $\mathbb{R}^{2n-2} \cong \mathbb{C}_{\mathbf{b}}^{n-1}$.

Let $\Omega := B_R(\mathbf{0}) \setminus \bigsqcup_{i=1}^k \overline{B_{\epsilon_i}(z_i)} \subseteq \mathbb{C}_{\mathbf{b}}^{n-1}$, where $\epsilon_i > 0$ were as chosen above while defining D_i 's. By definition of $\mathcal{U}' \subseteq \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{L})$, for all $t \in [0, 1]$, we have $V_{\gamma(t)} \cap \partial\Omega = \emptyset$. Let $d_B(\widehat{\Theta}_{\gamma(t)}, \Omega, \mathbf{0})$ denote the Brouwer degree of $\widehat{\Theta}_{\gamma(t)} : \Omega \subseteq \mathbb{C}_{\mathbf{b}}^{n-1} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}_{\mathbf{b}}^{n-1}$, as defined in [DM21][§1.2.2]. We first consider the Brouwer degree of $\widehat{\Theta}_{\gamma(0)}$ in Ω . By [DM21][Proposition 1.2.8],

$$d_B(\widehat{\Theta}_{\gamma(0)}, \Omega, \mathbf{0}) = \sum_{z \in V_{\gamma(0)} \setminus Z} i_B(\widehat{\Theta}_{\gamma(0)}, z), \quad (3.12)$$

where $i_B(\widehat{\Theta}_{\gamma(0)}, z)$ is the local Brouwer index (see [DM21][Definition 1.2.9]) of $\widehat{\Theta}_{\gamma(0)}$ at $z \in V_{\gamma(0)} \setminus Z = V_{\gamma(0)} \cap \Omega$ (which is non-empty by choice of \mathbf{b}_0). By [DM21][Definition 1.2.5] and homotopy invariance, the local Brouwer degree $i_B(\widehat{\Theta}_{\gamma(0)}, z)$ can be expressed in terms of Brouwer degree of maps of spheres obtained from boundary of a small ball around z . Since $\widehat{\Theta}_{\gamma(0)} : \mathbb{C}_{\mathbf{b}}^{n-1} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}_{\mathbf{b}}^{n-1}$ is a polynomial map, it is holomorphic, and therefore $i_B(\widehat{\Theta}_{\gamma(0)}, z)$ is equal to the holomorphic index $\text{ind}_z(\widehat{\Theta}_{\gamma(0)})$ (see [AGZV12][Part I, §5.2, Definition]), which is a positive integer by [AGZV12][Part I, §5.4, Proposition 2]. By (3.12), it follows that $d_B(\widehat{\Theta}_{\gamma(0)}, \Omega, \mathbf{0})$ is a positive integer. By homotopy invariance of Brouwer degree [DM21][Theorem 1.2.2], the number $d_B(\widehat{\Theta}_{\gamma(t)}, \Omega, \mathbf{0})$ is independent of the value of $t \in [0, 1]$ and therefore $d_B(\widehat{\Theta}_{\gamma(1)}, \Omega, \mathbf{0}) = d_B(\widehat{\Theta}_{\gamma(0)}, \Omega, \mathbf{0})$ is a positive integer. In particular, we obtain the existence of $\mathbf{b}_1 \in \Omega$ such that $\widehat{\Theta}_{\gamma(1)}(\mathbf{b}_1) = \widehat{\Theta}_{l-1}(\mathbf{b}_1) = \mathbf{0}$, which contradicts our assumption. This proves the existence of solution $\mathbf{a}^* = (\beta_1^*, \dots, \beta_{j_1-1}^*, 1, \beta_{j_1+1}^*, \dots, \beta_n^*)$ of (3.11) with $r_l^* \neq 0$, where $\mathbf{b}_1 = (\beta_1^*, \dots, \widehat{\beta_{j_1}^*}, \dots, \beta_n^*)$. \square

Therefore, by Lemma 3.7, for every $1 \leq l \leq n-1$, we have shown the existence of a degree $n+1$ monic polynomial $f(X) = X \prod_{i=1}^n (X - \alpha_i) \in \mathbb{C}[X]$ such that $f^{(i)}(\alpha_{j_i}) = 0$ for all $i = l+1, \dots, n$, but $f^{(l)}(\alpha_{j_l}) \neq 0$. Thus, for every $1 \leq l \leq n-1$, $c_l = 0$ in (3.9). \square

Remark 3.8. In certain cases, Lemma 3.7 admits simpler alternative proofs, which we note below.

- (1) If $|\{j_{l+1}, \dots, j_n\}| \leq l$, a polynomial satisfying Lemma 3.7 can be written explicitly. Namely, consider the function $f(X) = X^{n+1} - X^l$. Then l out of the $n+1$ roots of $f(X)$ are equal to 0. Since $|\{j_{l+1}, \dots, j_n\}| \leq l$, up to relabelling, we can assume that the roots $\alpha_{j_{l+1}}, \dots, \alpha_{j_n}$ of $f(X)$ are all 0. Then clearly $f^{(i)}(\alpha_{j_i}) = 0$ for all $i \geq l+1$. But $f^{(l)}(X) = (n+1)n \dots (n+1-(l-1))X^{n+1-l} - l!$. Clearly $f^{(l)}(0) \neq 0$ if $\text{char } \mathbb{K} \nmid l!$. Furthermore, any non-zero root α of $f(X)$ satisfies $\alpha^{n+1-l} = 1$ and so $f^{(l)}(\alpha) = (n+1)n \dots (n+1-(l-1)) - l! \neq 0$ in \mathbb{C} .

(2) If $|\{j_1, \dots, j_n\}| = n$, then a polynomial $f(X)$ satisfying Lemma 3.7 exists with all real roots. In this case $\sigma : i \mapsto j_i$ is a permutation of $\{1, 2, \dots, n\}$. We will show existence of polynomial $f(X) = X \prod_{i=1}^n (X - \alpha_i) \in \mathbb{R}[X]$ such that $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n \in [0, 1]$, $\alpha_{j_i} = 1$ and $f^{(i)}(\alpha_{j_i}) = 0$ for all $1 \leq i \neq l \leq n$ and $f^{(l)}(\alpha_{j_l}) = f^{(l)}(1) \neq 0$. This is a mild strengthening of [DdJ11][Theorem 5] on almost counterexamples, and the proof is essentially the same. By applying the permutation σ^{-1} on the roots, we will assume $j_i = i$ without loss of generality. Let $\alpha_{k,m}(f) \in [0, 1]$ denote the m^{th} root of $f^{(k)}$ when arranged in weakly increasing order. Now let $f_\beta := X(X-1) \prod_{1 \leq i \neq l \leq n} (X - \beta_i)$ and consider the map $\Phi_l : [0, 1]^{n-1} \rightarrow [0, 1]^{n-1}$ defined by $\Phi_l(\beta)_i = \alpha_{i,1}(f_\beta)$, for all $1 \leq i \neq l \leq n$ where $\beta = (\beta_1, \dots, \widehat{\beta_l}, \dots, \beta_n)$. Here $\alpha_{i,1}(f_\beta)$ is the smallest root of $f_\beta^{(i)}(X)$ in $[0, 1]$. Then as noted in [DdJ11], Φ_l is continuous, and therefore by Brouwer's fixed point theorem, has a fixed point $\beta^* \in [0, 1]^{n-1}$. Let $f(X) := f_{\beta^*}(X) = X(X-1) \prod_{1 \leq i \neq l \leq n} (X - \beta_i^*)$ be the polynomial corresponding to the fixed point. By definition, $\beta_i^* = \alpha_{i,1}(f)$, so $f^{(i)}(\beta_i) = 0$ for $1 \leq i \neq l \leq n$. Furthermore, we claim that $\beta_i^* \neq 1$ or equivalently $\alpha_{i,1}(f_{\beta^*}) \neq 1$ for all $1 \leq i \neq l \leq n$. We prove this by induction on i . For $i = 1$, note that since $f(0) = f(1) = 0$, by Rolle's theorem $f^{(1)}(X)$ has a root in $(0, 1)$ and thus, $\beta_1^* = \alpha_{1,1}(f_{\beta^*}) < 1$. Assume that for some $1 \leq k \leq n-1$, $\alpha_{k,1}(f_{\beta^*}) < 1$. Then $f_{\beta^*}^{k+1}$ has a root in $(\alpha_{k,1}(f_{\beta^*}), \alpha_{k,2}(f_{\beta^*})) \subseteq (\alpha_{k,1}(f_{\beta^*}), 1)$ thereby proving $\alpha_{k+1,1}(f_{\beta^*}) < 1$. This proves that $\beta_i^* < 1$ for all $1 \leq i \neq l \leq n$. Thus, the largest root of $f_{\beta^*}(X)$ is a simple root at 1, and all other roots are in $[0, 1)$. By repeated applications of Rolle's theorem, it then follows that the roots of $f_{\beta^*}^{(i)}(X)$ are contained in $[0, 1)$ for all $1 \leq i \leq n$. This implies that $f_{\beta^*}^{(i)}(1) \neq 0$ for all $1 \leq i \leq n$, and for $i = l$ in particular. Thus $f_{\beta^*}(X)$ is the desired polynomial satisfying Lemma 3.7.

We obtain the following direct corollary of Proposition 3.3 and Theorem 3.6.

Corollary 3.9. *For any $n \geq 3$, let \mathbb{K} be a field of characteristic $p \notin \mathcal{P}(n)$, given by Theorem 3.6. Then for any minimal prime $\mathfrak{p} \subseteq R_n$ over $\mathcal{I}_n(j_1, \dots, j_n)$, we have $\mu_{(R_n)_{\mathfrak{p}}}(\mathcal{I}_n(j_1, \dots, j_n)_{\mathfrak{p}}) = n$.*

4. PROOF OF THEOREM A

4.1. Setup of the proof of Theorem A. We now describe the setup of our proof of Theorem A. By Proposition 1.4, to prove Theorem A it suffices to prove that when \mathbb{K} is characteristic 0, then for all $d \geq 3$ and for all choices of indices $1 \leq j_1, \dots, j_{d-1} \leq d$, the sequences

$$\mathcal{S}_{d-1}(j_1, \dots, j_{d-1}) := \Phi_{j_1}^{\#}(HD_{d-1}^0 \mathbf{x}_{d-1}), \Phi_{j_2}^{\#}(HD_{d-1}^1 \mathbf{x}_{d-1}), \dots, \Phi_{j_{d-1}}^{\#}(HD_{d-1}^{d-2} \mathbf{x}_{d-1}) \quad (4.1)$$

form regular sequences in the polynomials ring $\mathbb{K}[x_1, \dots, x_{d-1}]$. We will prove this by inducting downwards on d . Henceforth we will denote the polynomial ring $\mathbb{K}[x_1, \dots, x_n]$ by R_n .

4.1.1. The hypothesis. Assume for some $n \geq 3$, Theorem A is true in degree $d = n + 1$. By Proposition 1.4, we are assuming that the sequences

$$\mathcal{S}_n(j_1, \dots, j_n) := \Phi_{j_1}^{\#}(HD_n^0 \mathbf{x}_n), \dots, \Phi_{j_n}^{\#}(HD_n^{n-1} \mathbf{x}_n) \quad (4.2)$$

are regular in R_n for all choices of indices $1 \leq j_1, \dots, j_n \leq n + 1$. Here $\Phi_{j_i}^{\#}$ denotes $\Phi_{n, j_i}^{\#}$ for all $1 \leq i \leq n$, i.e., these are automorphisms of R_n .

4.1.2. The downward inductive step. We want to show that when characteristic of \mathbb{K} is 0, then hypothesis 4.1.1 implies that the sequences

$$\mathcal{S}_{n-1}(j_1, \dots, j_{n-1}) := \Phi_{j_1}^{\#}(HD_{n-1}^0 \mathbf{x}_{n-1}), \dots, \Phi_{j_{n-1}}^{\#}(HD_{n-1}^{n-2} \mathbf{x}_{n-1}) \quad (4.3)$$

are regular in R_{n-1} for all choice of indices $1 \leq j_1, \dots, j_{n-1} \leq n$. Here $\Phi_{j_i}^{\#}$ denotes $\Phi_{n-1, j_i}^{\#}$ for all $1 \leq i \leq n-1$, i.e., these are automorphisms of R_{n-1} .

Now fix a choice of indices $1 \leq j_1, j_2, \dots, j_{n-1} \leq n$ for which we want to show that the sequence $\mathcal{S}_{n-1}(j_1, \dots, j_{n-1})$ in (4.3) is regular in R_{n-1} . Consider the truncated sequence $\widehat{\mathcal{S}}_n(j_1, \dots, j_{n-1})$ in R_n obtained from the sequence (4.2) by removing the last term $\Phi_{j_n}^\#(HD_n^{n-1}\mathbf{x}_n)$, for the same chosen indices j_1, \dots, j_{n-1} but with one modification: if $j_l = n$ for some $1 \leq l \leq n-1$ in $\mathcal{S}_{n-1}(j_1, \dots, j_{n-1})$, then let $j_l = n+1$ in the obtained sequence $\widehat{\mathcal{S}}_n(j_1, \dots, j_{n-1})$ in R_n . This is because $\Phi_{n-1,n}^\# : R_{n-1} \rightarrow R_{n-1}$ is identity by definition, while the corresponding identity map on R_n is defined to be $\Phi_{n,n+1}^\#$.

4.2. Proof of Theorem A. For all $1 \leq i \leq n$, we have the following equation in R_n .

$$\Phi_{n,j_i}^\#(HD_n^{i-1}\mathbf{x}_n) = \Phi_{n,j_i}^\#(x_n)\Phi_{n,j_i}^\#(HD_{n-1}^{i-1}\mathbf{x}_{n-1}) + \Phi_{n,j_i}^\#(HD_{n-1}^{i-2}\mathbf{x}_{n-1}), \quad (4.4)$$

But $HD_{n-1}^{i-1}\mathbf{x}_{n-1}$ and $HD_{n-1}^{i-2}\mathbf{x}_{n-1}$ belong in $R_{n-1} \subset R_n$. We see that if $1 \leq j_i \leq n-1$, then (4.4) can be rewritten as:

$$\Phi_{n,j_i}^\#(HD_n^{i-1}\mathbf{x}_n) = (x_n - x_{j_i})\Phi_{n-1,j_i}^\#(HD_{n-1}^{i-1}\mathbf{x}_{n-1}) + \Phi_{n-1,j_i}^\#(HD_{n-1}^{i-2}\mathbf{x}_{n-1}), \quad (4.5)$$

If $j_i = n+1$, then $\Phi_{n,n+1}^\#$ is identity, so we can rewrite (4.4) as:

$$\Phi_{n,n+1}^\#(HD_n^{i-1}\mathbf{x}_n) = x_n\Phi_{n-1,n}^\#(HD_{n-1}^{i-1}\mathbf{x}_{n-1}) + \Phi_{n-1,n}^\#(HD_{n-1}^{i-2}\mathbf{x}_{n-1}), \quad (4.6)$$

Thus by (4.5), for each $1 \leq i \leq n-1$ such that $j_i \neq n$, it follows that $\Phi_{j_i}^\#(HD_n^{i-1}\mathbf{x}_n)$ is a linear polynomial in $R_n = R_{n-1}[x_n]$ with leading coefficient equal to $\Phi_{j_i}^\#(HD_{n-1}^{i-1}\mathbf{x}_{n-1}) \in R_{n-1}$. Similarly, by (4.6) $\Phi_{n+1}^\#(HD_n^{i-1}\mathbf{x}_n)$ is a linear polynomial in $R_n = R_{n-1}[x_n]$ with leading coefficient equal to $\Phi_n^\#(HD_{n-1}^{i-1}\mathbf{x}_{n-1}) \in R_{n-1}$. Hence, the sequence $\mathcal{S}_{n-1}(j_1, \dots, j_{n-1}) \subseteq R_{n-1}$ in the downward inductive step 4.1.2 is the sequence of leading coefficients (with respect to x_n) of the sequence $\widehat{\mathcal{S}}_n(j_1, \dots, j_{n-1})$ in R_n that we constructed above. To express this formally, let $\lambda_n : R_n = R_{n-1}[x_n] \rightarrow R_{n-1}$ be the leading coefficient function (not a homomorphism!) with respect to x_n . Then for all $1 \leq i \leq n-1$ and index $1 \leq j_i \leq n-1$, we have $\lambda_n(\Phi_{j_i}^\#(HD_n^{i-1}\mathbf{x}_n)) = \Phi_{j_i}^\#(HD_{n-1}^{i-1}\mathbf{x}_{n-1})$ and $\lambda_n(\Phi_{n+1}^\#(HD_n^{i-1}\mathbf{x}_n)) = \Phi_n^\#(HD_{n-1}^{i-1}\mathbf{x}_{n-1})$.

Since, for all $1 \leq i \leq n-1$, the polynomials $\Phi_{j_i}^\#(HD_n^{i-1}\mathbf{x}_n)$ are homogeneous elements of positive degree in the Noetherian graded homogeneous ring R_n , being a regular sequence is equivalent to being H_1 -regular or equivalently, Koszul regular ([SP24, Definition 15.30.1]). Let the Koszul complex of the sequence $\widehat{\mathcal{S}}_n(j_1, \dots, j_{n-1})$ in R_n be:

$$\dots \xrightarrow{d_{n,4}} \bigwedge^3 R_n^{\oplus n-1} \xrightarrow{d_{n,3}} \bigwedge^2 R_n^{\oplus n-1} \xrightarrow{d_{n,2}} R_n^{\oplus n-1} \xrightarrow{d_{n,1}} R_n \longrightarrow 0 \quad (4.7)$$

We know, by hypothesis 4.1.1, that $\widehat{\mathcal{S}}_n(j_1, \dots, j_{n-1})$ is a regular sequence in R_n . Thus, the Koszul complex (4.7) is exact everywhere except at R_n , and all its higher homologies vanish. Furthermore, H_0 of the above complex is the quotient ring $R_n/(\widehat{\mathcal{S}}_n(j_1, \dots, j_{n-1}))$, where $(\widehat{\mathcal{S}}_n(j_1, \dots, j_{n-1})) \subseteq R_n$ is the ideal generated by $\widehat{\mathcal{S}}_n(j_1, \dots, j_{n-1})$. Instead of considering the entire complex (4.7), we will focus on the following truncated versions.

Definition 4.1. (1) Define $\widehat{\mathbf{K}}^n(j_1, \dots, j_{n-1})_\bullet$ to be the following chain complex formed by the first three elements of the Koszul complex (4.7) of $\widehat{\mathcal{S}}_n(j_1, \dots, j_{n-1})$ in $R_n = R_{n-1}[x_n]$.

$$0 \longrightarrow \bigwedge^3 R_{n-1}[x_n]^{\oplus n-1} \xrightarrow{d_{n,3}} \bigwedge^2 R_{n-1}[x_n]^{\oplus n-1} \xrightarrow{d_{n,2}} R_{n-1}[x_n]^{\oplus n-1} \xrightarrow{d_{n,1}} R_{n-1}[x_n] \longrightarrow 0 .$$

(2) Define $\mathbf{K}^{n-1}(j_1, \dots, j_{n-1})_\bullet$ to be the following chain complex formed by the first three elements of the Koszul complex of the sequence $\mathcal{S}_{n-1}(j_1, \dots, j_{n-1})$ in R_{n-1} .

$$\mathbf{K}^{n-1}(j_1, \dots, j_{n-1})_\bullet : 0 \longrightarrow \bigwedge^3 R_{n-1}^{\oplus n-1} \xrightarrow{d_{n-1,3}} \bigwedge^2 R_{n-1}^{\oplus n-1} \xrightarrow{d_{n-1,2}} R_{n-1}^{\oplus n-1} \xrightarrow{d_{n-1,1}} R_{n-1} \longrightarrow 0 .$$

We will now consider the truncated complex $\widehat{K}^n(j_1, \dots, j_{n-1})_\bullet$ as a complex of R_{n-1} -modules (via the natural embedding $R_{n-1} \hookrightarrow R_n$) and construct a filtration by sub-complexes of R_{n-1} -modules.

4.2.1. *Filtration of the truncated Koszul complex $\widehat{K}^n(j_1, \dots, j_{n-1})_\bullet$.* For any $k \geq 0$, let $R_{n-1}[x_n]_k$ be the R_{n-1} -submodule of R_n consisting of polynomials of degree at most k in x_n . Let e_1, \dots, e_{n-1} be the basis elements of $R_n^{\oplus n-1}$, i.e, $R_n^{\oplus n-1} = \bigoplus_{i=1}^n R_n e_i$. For any $l, k \geq 0$, let $\bigwedge^l R_{n-1}[x_n]_k^{\oplus n-1}$ be the R_{n-1} -submodule of $\bigwedge^l R_n^{\oplus n-1}$ consisting of $R_{n-1}[x_n]_k$ -linear combinations of the basis elements $e_{i_1} \wedge e_{i_2} \wedge \dots \wedge e_{i_l}$ for $1 \leq i_1 < i_2 < \dots < i_l \leq n-1$.

Since $j_i \neq n$ for all $1 \leq i \leq n-1$ in the sequence $\widehat{S}_n(j_1, \dots, j_{n-1})$, the polynomials $\Phi_{j_i}^\#(HD_n^{i-1} \mathbf{x}_n)$ are linear in x_n for all $1 \leq i \leq n-1$. We therefore obtain the following induced chain complex $\widehat{K}_k^n(j_1, \dots, j_{n-1})_\bullet$ of R_{n-1} -modules for any $k \geq 1$ from the definition of the Koszul differentials $d_{n,1}$ and $d_{n,2}$.

Definition 4.2. (1) For $k \geq 1$, define $\widehat{K}_k^n(j_1, \dots, j_{n-1})_\bullet$ to be the following chain complex:

$$0 \longrightarrow \bigwedge^3 R_{n-1}[x_n]_{k-3}^{\oplus n-1} \xrightarrow{d_{n,3}} \bigwedge^2 R_{n-1}[x_n]_{k-2}^{\oplus n-1} \xrightarrow{d_{n,2}} R_{n-1}[x_n]_{k-1}^{\oplus n-1} \xrightarrow{d_{n,1}} R_{n-1}[x_n]_k \longrightarrow 0.$$

Here, we use the convention that $\bigwedge^3 R_{n-1}[x_n]_m^{\oplus n-1}$ or $\bigwedge^2 R_{n-1}[x_n]_m^{\oplus n-1}$ are 0 if $m < 0$.

(2) Let $M \subseteq R_{n-1}^{\oplus n-1}$ be the image of the map $d_{n-1,2} : \bigwedge^2 R_{n-1}^{\oplus n-1} \rightarrow R_{n-1}^{\oplus n-1}$ that occurs in the complex $K^{n-1}(j_1, \dots, j_{n-1})_\bullet$ in Definition 4.1(2). Define $\widehat{K}_0^n(j_1, \dots, j_{n-1})_\bullet$ to be the following complex

$$\widehat{K}_0^n(j_1, \dots, j_{n-1})_\bullet : 0 \longrightarrow 0 \longrightarrow 0 \longrightarrow M \xrightarrow{d_{n,1}} R_{n-1}[x_n]_0 \longrightarrow 0,$$

where $d_{n,1}$ is the restriction of the map $R_n^{\oplus n-1} \rightarrow R_n$ in the complex $\widehat{K}^n(j_1, \dots, j_{n-1})_\bullet$.

We have a natural inclusion chain map $\iota_{k,\bullet} : \widehat{K}_{k-1}^n(j_1, \dots, j_{n-1})_\bullet \hookrightarrow \widehat{K}_k^n(j_1, \dots, j_{n-1})_\bullet$ of complexes of R_{n-1} -modules for all $k \geq 1$. While the leading coefficient function $\lambda_n : R_{n-1}[x_n] \rightarrow R_{n-1}$ is not a homomorphism, the morphism $\lambda_{n,k} : R_{n-1}[x_n]_k \rightarrow R_{n-1}$ mapping an element of $R_{n-1}[x_n]_k$ to its coefficient of x_n^k is a R_{n-1} -linear homomorphism for each $k \geq 0$. This homomorphism induces natural R_{n-1} -linear homomorphisms

$$\lambda_{n,k}^{\oplus n-1} : R_{n-1}[x_n]_k^{\oplus n-1} \rightarrow R_{n-1}^{\oplus n-1} \text{ and } \Lambda^i \lambda_{n,k}^{\oplus n-1} : \Lambda^i R_{n-1}[x_n]_k^{\oplus n-1} \rightarrow \Lambda^i R_{n-1}^{\oplus n-1}. \quad (4.8)$$

Explicitly, the homomorphism $\lambda_{n,k}^{\oplus n-1}$ maps any $(f_1, \dots, f_{n-1}) = \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} f_i e_i \in R_{n-1}[x_n]_k^{\oplus n-1}$ to the element $(\lambda_{n,k}(f_1), \dots, \lambda_{n,k}(f_{n-1})) = \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \lambda_{n,k}(f_i) e_i \in R_{n-1}^{\oplus n-1}$ and $\Lambda^2 \lambda_{n,k}^{\oplus n-1}$ maps any $\sum f_{ij} e_i \wedge e_j \in \Lambda^2 R_{n-1}[x_n]_k^{\oplus n-1}$ to $\sum \lambda_{n,k}(f_{ij}) e_i \wedge e_j$ and so on. One checks that these R_{n-1} -linear homomorphisms induce the following surjective chain map $\Lambda_{n,k,\bullet} : \widehat{K}_k^n(j_1, \dots, j_{n-1})_\bullet \rightarrow K^{n-1}(j_1, \dots, j_{n-1})_\bullet$ of R_{n-1} -chain complexes for $k \geq 3$:

$$\begin{array}{ccccccccc} 0 & \longrightarrow & \bigwedge^3 R_{n-1}[x_n]_{k-3}^{\oplus n-1} & \xrightarrow{d_{n,3}} & \bigwedge^2 R_{n-1}[x_n]_{k-2}^{\oplus n-1} & \xrightarrow{d_{n,2}} & R_{n-1}[x_n]_{k-1}^{\oplus n-1} & \xrightarrow{d_{n,1}} & R_{n-1}[x_n]_k & \longrightarrow & 0 \\ & & \downarrow \Lambda^3 \lambda_{n,k-3}^{\oplus n-1} & & \downarrow \Lambda^2 \lambda_{n,k-2}^{\oplus n-1} & & \downarrow \lambda_{n,k-1}^{\oplus n-1} & & \downarrow \lambda_{n,k} & & \\ 0 & \longrightarrow & \bigwedge^3 R_{n-1}^{\oplus n-1} & \xrightarrow{d_{n-1,3}} & \bigwedge^2 R_{n-1}^{\oplus n-1} & \xrightarrow{d_{n-1,2}} & R_{n-1}^{\oplus n-1} & \xrightarrow{d_{n-1,1}} & R_{n-1} & \longrightarrow & 0 \end{array} \quad (4.9)$$

The kernel of the chain map $\Lambda_{n,k,\bullet}$ is the sub-complex $\iota_{k,\bullet} : \widehat{K}_{k-1}^n(j_1, \dots, j_{n-1})_\bullet \hookrightarrow \widehat{K}_k^n(j_1, \dots, j_{n-1})_\bullet$, whence we obtain the following short exact sequence of R_{n-1} -chain complexes for $k \geq 3$:

$$0 \longrightarrow \widehat{K}_{k-1}^n(j_1, \dots, j_{n-1})_\bullet \longrightarrow \widehat{K}_k^n(j_1, \dots, j_{n-1})_\bullet \xrightarrow{\Lambda_{n,k,\bullet}} K^{n-1}(j_1, \dots, j_{n-1})_\bullet \longrightarrow 0 \quad (4.10)$$

Consequently, we have obtained the following filtration of $\widehat{K}^n(j_1, \dots, j_{n-1})_\bullet$ by subcomplexes of R_{n-1} -modules along with the cokernels of successive inclusions. For brevity, we will henceforth suppress the indices (j_1, \dots, j_{n-1}) when referring to the complexes in Definitions 4.1 and 4.2, when it is clear from context.

$$\begin{array}{ccccccccccc}
 \widehat{K}_{0,\bullet}^n & \xleftarrow{\iota_{1,\bullet}} & \widehat{K}_{1,\bullet}^n & \xleftarrow{\iota_{2,\bullet}} & \widehat{K}_{2,\bullet}^n & \xleftarrow{\iota_{3,\bullet}} & \widehat{K}_{3,\bullet}^n & \xleftarrow{\quad} & \dots & \xleftarrow{\quad} & \widehat{K}_{k,\bullet}^n & \xleftarrow{\quad} & \dots & \xleftarrow{\quad} & \widehat{K}_\bullet^n \\
 & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & & & \downarrow & & & & \downarrow \\
 & & \text{Coker } \iota_{1,\bullet} & & \text{Coker } \iota_{2,\bullet} & & K_\bullet^{n-1} & & & & K_\bullet^{n-1} & & & &
 \end{array} \tag{4.11}$$

We can write the complex \widehat{K}_\bullet^n as the direct limit $\varinjlim_{l \geq k} \widehat{K}_{l,\bullet}^n$ corresponding to the natural directed system, for any $k \geq 0$. Since homology commutes with direct limits, we have for all $k \geq 0$:

$$H_\star(\widehat{K}_\bullet^n) = \varinjlim_{l \geq k} H_\star(\widehat{K}_{l,\bullet}^n). \tag{4.12}$$

Proposition 4.3. *The induced maps $\iota_{k,\star} : H_0(\widehat{K}_{k-1,\bullet}^n) \rightarrow H_0(\widehat{K}_{k,\bullet}^n)$ are injective for all $k \geq 1$, when characteristic of the base field \mathbb{K} is 0.*

Proof. We will first show that the natural map $j_0 : H_0(\widehat{K}_{0,\bullet}^n) \rightarrow H_0(\widehat{K}_\bullet^n)$ is injective. Then since this map factors as $j_0 : H_0(\widehat{K}_{0,\bullet}^n) \xrightarrow{\iota_{1,\star}} H_0(\widehat{K}_{1,\bullet}^n) \xrightarrow{j_1} H_0(\widehat{K}_\bullet^n)$, it would imply that $\iota_{1,\star}$ is injective, from which we will obtain the injectivity of all $\iota_{k,\star}$ for $k \geq 1$. Since $\Phi_{n,j_i}^\#(HD_n^{i-1}\mathbf{x}_n)$ are linear in x_n , we can write them as

$$F(i, j_i, n) := \Phi_{n,j_i}^\#(HD_n^{i-1}\mathbf{x}_n) = x_n f(i, j_i, n) + g(i, j_i, n),$$

where $f(i, j_i, n)$ and $g(i, j_i, n)$ belong in R_{n-1} . Recall that $f(i, j_i, n) := \lambda_n(\Phi_{n,j_i}^\#(HD_n^{i-1}\mathbf{x}_n)) = \Phi_{n-1,j_i}^\#(HD_{n-1}^{i-1}\mathbf{x}_{n-1})$ if $j_i \neq n+1$ and $\Phi_{n-1,n}^\#(HD_{n-1}^{i-1}\mathbf{x}_{n-1})$ if $j_i = n+1$. Then we have

$$H_0(\widehat{K}_\bullet^n) = R_n/(\widehat{\mathcal{S}}_n(j_1, \dots, j_{n-1})), \text{ and } H_0(\widehat{K}_{0,\bullet}^n) = R_{n-1}/I_2(\mathcal{M}_n(j_1, \dots, j_{n-1})), \tag{4.13}$$

where $I_2(\mathcal{M}_n(j_1, \dots, j_{n-1}))$ is the ideal generated by the 2×2 minors of the following matrix

$$\mathcal{M}_n(j_1, \dots, j_{n-1}) := \begin{bmatrix} f(1, j_1, n) & f(2, j_2, n) & \cdots & f(n-1, j_{n-1}, n) \\ g(1, j_1, n) & g(2, j_2, n) & \cdots & g(n-1, j_{n-1}, n) \end{bmatrix} \in R_{n-1}^{2 \times n-1}. \tag{4.14}$$

By hypothesis, $H_0(\widehat{K}_\bullet^n)$ is a 1-dimensional Cohen-Macaulay ring. We claim that the same is true for $H_0(\widehat{K}_{0,\bullet}^n)$. Let $\bar{\mathfrak{p}}$ be a minimal prime of $H_0(\widehat{K}_{0,\bullet}^n)$, corresponding to a minimal prime \mathfrak{p} over $I_2(\mathcal{M}_n(j_1, \dots, j_{n-1}))$ in R_{n-1} . If $f(i, j_i, n) \in \mathfrak{p}$ for all $1 \leq i \leq n-1$, then by [Gho25][Theorem 5.6], height $\mathfrak{p} \geq n-2$. If there exists some $1 \leq i \leq n-1$, such that $f(i, j_i, n) \notin \mathfrak{p}$, then consider the map between localized rings $\psi_i : (R_{n-1})_{\mathfrak{p}}[x_n] \rightarrow (R_{n-1})_{\mathfrak{p}}$ defined by sending $x_n \mapsto -g(i, j_i, n)/f(i, j_i, n)$. This induces the isomorphism $(R_{n-1})_{\mathfrak{p}}[x_n]/(F(i, j_i, n)) \cong (R_{n-1})_{\mathfrak{p}}$. Furthermore, the image of $F(l, j_l, n) \in (R_{n-1})_{\mathfrak{p}}[x_n]$ under ψ_i is $\Delta_{il}/f(i, j_i, n)$, where Δ_{il} is the 2×2 minor formed by the i^{th} and l^{th} columns of $\mathcal{M}_n(j_1, \dots, j_{n-1})$. So we obtain the isomorphism:

$$\frac{(R_{n-1})_{\mathfrak{p}}[x_n]}{(F(1, j_1, n), \dots, F(n-1, j_{n-1}, n))} \cong \frac{(R_{n-1})_{\mathfrak{p}}}{(\Delta_{il} \mid 1 \leq l \leq n-1, l \neq i)} \cong \frac{(R_{n-1})_{\mathfrak{p}}}{I_2(\mathcal{M}_n(j_1, \dots, j_{n-1}))}, \tag{4.15}$$

where the second isomorphism follows from the Plücker relations $f(i, j_i, n)\Delta_{pq} = f(p, j_p, n)\Delta_{iq} - f(q, j_q, n)\Delta_{ip}$ for all $1 \leq p < q \leq n-1$, $p, q \neq i$. Now, since $\mathfrak{p} \subset R_{n-1}$ is a minimal prime over $I_2(\mathcal{M}_n(j_1, \dots, j_{n-1}))$, it follows from (4.15) that $(R_{n-1})_{\mathfrak{p}}[x_n]/(F(1, j_1, n), \dots, F(n-1, j_{n-1}, n))$ is 0-dimensional. Since localization is flat, by hypothesis 4.1.1, it follows that $F(1, j_1, n), \dots, F(n-1, j_{n-1}, n)$ is also a regular sequence (of length $n-1$) in $(R_{n-1})_{\mathfrak{p}}[x_n]$. Thus, $\dim(R_{n-1})_{\mathfrak{p}}[x_n] =$

$n - 1$, which implies that $\text{height } \mathfrak{p} = n - 2$. Hence, for all minimal primes $\mathfrak{p} \subset R_{n-1}$ over $I_2(\mathcal{M}_n(j_1, \dots, j_{n-1}))$ we have $\text{height } \mathfrak{p} \geq n - 2$. Furthermore, by [EN62, Theorem 3] height of any minimal prime over $I_2(\mathcal{M}_n(j_1, \dots, j_{n-1}))$ is at most $n - 2$. Consequently, the height of $I_2(\mathcal{M}_n(j_1, \dots, j_{n-1}))$ is equal to $n - 2$ and therefore $H_0(\widehat{K}_{0,\bullet}^n)$ is 1-dimensional, and also Cohen-Macaulay by [BV88, Theorem 2.7].

We now claim that the ideal $\widehat{S}_n(j_1, \dots, j_{n-1}) \subset R_n$ contracts to $I_2(\mathcal{M}_n(j_1, \dots, j_{n-1})) \subset R_{n-1}$ under the natural inclusion $R_{n-1} \hookrightarrow R_n$. Clearly, $I_2(\mathcal{M}_n(j_1, \dots, j_{n-1})) \subset \widehat{S}_n(j_1, \dots, j_{n-1}) \cap R_{n-1}$ since $\Delta_{il} = f(i, j_i, n)F(l, j_l, n) - f(l, j_l, n)F(i, j_i, n)$ for all $1 \leq i < l \leq n - 1$.

Before proving the reverse inclusion, we will state a quick lemma which will be useful.

Lemma 4.4. *Let R be a Noetherian Cohen-Macaulay ring and $f : R \rightarrow S$ be a ring homomorphism. Then f is injective if and only if the induced maps $f_{\mathfrak{p}} : R_{\mathfrak{p}} \rightarrow S_{\mathfrak{p}}$ at localizations at the minimal primes \mathfrak{p} of R , are injective. Here we consider S as an R -module by the map f .*

Proof of Lemma. Since injectivity is a local property, the forward direction is clear. Let $K := \ker f$. By flatness of localization, the exact sequence $0 \rightarrow K \rightarrow R \xrightarrow{f} S$ yields the exact sequence $0 \rightarrow K_{\mathfrak{p}} \rightarrow R_{\mathfrak{p}} \xrightarrow{f_{\mathfrak{p}}} S_{\mathfrak{p}}$. Thus, $K_{\mathfrak{p}} = \ker f_{\mathfrak{p}}$, whereby the hypothesis implies $K_{\mathfrak{p}} = 0$ for all minimal primes \mathfrak{p} of R . Since R is Noetherian, K is finitely generated, implying that for each $\mathfrak{p} \in \text{Min } R$, we obtain $r_{\mathfrak{p}} \in R \setminus \mathfrak{p}$ such that $r_{\mathfrak{p}} \cdot K = 0$. Therefore, $\text{Ann } K \not\subseteq \mathfrak{p}$ for any minimal prime $\mathfrak{p} \in \text{Min } R$, and since there are finitely many minimal primes of R , we obtain $\text{Ann } K \not\subseteq \bigcup_{\mathfrak{p} \in \text{Min } R} \mathfrak{p}$ by the prime avoidance lemma. Since R is Cohen-Macaulay, $\text{Min } R = \text{Ass } R$ and the union of all minimal primes is equal to the set of zero divisors. Thus, we see that there exists a regular element $r \in \text{Ann } K$, implying $K = 0$. This proves the injectivity of f . \square

Since we proved $H_0(\widehat{K}_{0,\bullet}^n)$ is Cohen-Macaulay above, to prove the reverse inclusion $\widehat{S}_n(j_1, \dots, j_{n-1}) \cap R_{n-1} \subseteq I_2(\mathcal{M}_n(j_1, \dots, j_{n-1}))$, it suffices to do so locally at each minimal prime of $I_2(\mathcal{M}_n(j_1, \dots, j_{n-1}))$ by Lemma 4.4. If $\mathfrak{p} \subset R_{n-1}$ is a minimal prime over $I_2(\mathcal{M}_n(j_1, \dots, j_{n-1}))$ such that there exists $f(l, j_l, n) \notin \mathfrak{p}$ for some $1 \leq l \leq n - 1$, then $f(l, j_l, n)$ is a unit in $(R_{n-1})_{\mathfrak{p}}$. Hence, we see that

$$x_n + \frac{g(l, j_l, n)}{f(l, j_l, n)} = \frac{F(l, j_l, n)}{f(l, j_l, n)} \in (F(1, j_1, n), \dots, F(n-1, j_{n-1}, n))(R_{n-1})_{\mathfrak{p}}[x_n] \quad (4.16)$$

By (4.16), $F(i, j_i, n) = f(i, j_i, n)x_n + g(i, j_i, n) = \frac{\Delta_{li}}{f(l, j_l, n)} + \frac{f(i, j_i, n)}{f(l, j_l, n)}F(l, j_l, n)$, whereby we obtain the following equality of ideals in $(R_{n-1})_{\mathfrak{p}}[x_n]$:

$$(F(1, j_1, n), \dots, F(n-1, j_{n-1}, n)) = (F(l, j_l, n), \Delta_{li} \mid 1 \leq i \neq l \leq n-1) \quad (4.17)$$

From (4.17) it follows that $(F(1, j_1, n), \dots, F(n-1, j_{n-1}, n)) \cap (R_{n-1})_{\mathfrak{p}}$ equals

$$(F(l, j_l, n), \Delta_{li} \mid 1 \leq i \neq l \leq n-1) \cap (R_{n-1})_{\mathfrak{p}} = (\Delta_{li} \mid 1 \leq i \neq l \leq n-1) = I_2(\mathcal{M}_n(j_1, \dots, j_{n-1}))_{\mathfrak{p}},$$

where the second equality follows from the Plücker relations $f(l, j_l, n)\Delta_{pq} = f(p, j_p, n)\Delta_{lq} - f(q, j_q, n)\Delta_{lp}$ for all $1 \leq p < q \leq n - 1$, $p, q \neq l$ and the invertibility of $f(l, j_l, n)$. This proves the local injectivity of the map $j_0 : H_0(\widehat{K}_{0,\bullet}^n) \rightarrow H_0(\widehat{K}_{\bullet}^n)$, when localized at a minimal prime $\bar{\mathfrak{p}}$ of $H_0(\widehat{K}_{0,\bullet}^n)$ not containing $\overline{f(l, j_l, n)}$ for some $1 \leq l \leq n - 1$.

We now claim that for any minimal prime $\bar{\mathfrak{p}}$ of $H_0(\widehat{K}_{0,\bullet}^n)$ there exists some $1 \leq l \leq n - 1$ such that $\overline{f(l, j_l, n)} \notin \bar{\mathfrak{p}}$, so that the above proof would give us local injectivity of $j_0 : H_0(\widehat{K}_{0,\bullet}^n) \rightarrow H_0(\widehat{K}_{\bullet}^n)$ at all minimal primes of $H_0(\widehat{K}_{0,\bullet}^n)$. First recall that $F(1, j_1, n), \dots, F(n-1, j_{n-1}, n), F(n, j_n, n)$ is a regular sequence in R_n for any choice of j_n , by hypothesis 4.1.1. We can write $F(n, j_n, n) = f(n, j_n, n)x_n + g(n, j_n, n)$ where $f(n, j_n, n) = 1$ if $j_n \neq n$ and $-n$ if $j_n = n$. Thus, if the characteristic of the base field does not divide n , we have:

$$\frac{R_n}{(F(1, j_1, n), \dots, F(n-1, j_{n-1}, n), F(n, j_n, n))} \cong \frac{R_{n-1}}{(\Delta_{1n}, \Delta_{2n}, \dots, \Delta_{n-1n})}, \quad (4.18)$$

where $\Delta_{in} := f(i, j_i, n)g(n, j_n, n) - f(n, j_n, n)g(i, j_i, n)$ for all $1 \leq i \leq n-1$. From (4.18), we see that $\Delta_{1n}, \Delta_{2n}, \dots, \Delta_{n-1n}$ is a regular sequence in R_{n-1} and by the Plücker relations $f(n, j_n, n)\Delta_{pq} = -f(p, j_p, n)\Delta_{qn} + f(q, j_q, n)\Delta_{pn}$, it follows that $I_2(\mathcal{M}_n(j_1, \dots, j_{n-1})) \subseteq (\Delta_{1n}, \Delta_{2n}, \dots, \Delta_{n-1n})$. Since for any minimal prime $\mathfrak{p} \subset R_{n-1}$ over $I_2(\mathcal{M}_n(j_1, \dots, j_{n-1}))$, we have height $\mathfrak{p} = n-2$, it follows that there exists $1 \leq l \leq n-1$, such that $\Delta_{ln} \notin \mathfrak{p}$. The following lemma shows that this is sufficient to conclude $f(l, j_l, n) \notin \mathfrak{p}$.

Lemma 4.5. *If $\Delta_{ln} \notin \mathfrak{p}$, then $f(l, j_l, n) \notin \mathfrak{p}$.*

Proof of Lemma. We prove by contradiction. So let us assume that $\Delta_{ln} \notin \mathfrak{p}$ and $f(l, j_l, n) \in \mathfrak{p}$. Let $\kappa(\mathfrak{p}) := (R_{n-1})_{\mathfrak{p}}/\mathfrak{p}(R_{n-1})_{\mathfrak{p}}$ be the residue field at \mathfrak{p} . By assumption, $f(l, j_l, n) = 0$ and since $\Delta_{ln} \notin \mathfrak{p}$, we have $g(l, j_l, n) \neq 0$ in $\kappa(\mathfrak{p})$. Thus, $\overline{F(l, j_l, n)} \in \kappa(\mathfrak{p})$ is a unit and we obtain:

$$(F(1, j_1, n), F(2, j_2, n), \dots, F(n-1, j_{n-1}, n))_{\mathfrak{p}} + \mathfrak{p}(R_{n-1})_{\mathfrak{p}}[x_n] = (R_{n-1})_{\mathfrak{p}}[x_n] \quad (4.19)$$

Quotienting out by $I_2(\mathcal{M}_n(j_1, \dots, j_{n-1}))[x_n] \subseteq (R_{n-1})_{\mathfrak{p}}[x_n]$, we obtain

$$\overline{(F(1, j_1, n), F(2, j_2, n), \dots, F(n-1, j_{n-1}, n))_{\mathfrak{p}}} + \frac{\mathfrak{p}(R_{n-1})_{\mathfrak{p}}}{I_2(\mathcal{M}_n(j_1, \dots, j_{n-1}))} [x_n] = \frac{(R_{n-1})_{\mathfrak{p}}}{I_2(\mathcal{M}_n(j_1, \dots, j_{n-1}))} [x_n] \quad (4.20)$$

Since $A := (R_{n-1})_{\mathfrak{p}}/I_2(\mathcal{M}_n(j_1, \dots, j_{n-1}))_{\mathfrak{p}}$ is a 0-dimensional Noetherian local ring, it follows that it is Artinian and then by applying Nakayama for Artinian local rings to (4.20) we see that

$$\overline{(F(1, j_1, n), F(2, j_2, n), \dots, F(n-1, j_{n-1}, n))_{\mathfrak{p}}} = \frac{(R_{n-1})_{\mathfrak{p}}}{I_2(\mathcal{M}_n(j_1, \dots, j_{n-1}))_{\mathfrak{p}}} [x_n] \quad (4.21)$$

Since $\Delta_{il} \in I_2(\mathcal{M}_n(j_1, \dots, j_{n-1}))$ for all $1 \leq i < l \leq n-1$, it follows that the vectors $v_i := (f(i, j_i, n), g(i, j_i, n)) \in A^2$ are proportional for all $1 \leq i \leq n-1$. Concretely, $v_i = (\overline{\Delta_{in}}/\overline{\Delta_{ln}})v_l$ for all $1 \leq i \leq n-1$ and thus, $\overline{F(i, j_i, n)} = (\overline{\Delta_{in}}/\overline{\Delta_{ln}})\overline{F(l, j_l, n)}$ in $A[x_n]$. Consequently, the ideal on the left hand side of (4.21) is the principal ideal $(\overline{F(l, j_l, n)})_{\mathfrak{p}} \subseteq A[x_n]$. Then (4.21) gives us:

$$(F(l, j_l, n), I_2(\mathcal{M}_n(j_1, \dots, j_{n-1}))_{\mathfrak{p}})_{\mathfrak{p}} = (R_{n-1})_{\mathfrak{p}}[x_n] \quad (4.22)$$

We claim that this implies that $f(i, j_i, n) \in I_2(\mathcal{M}_n(j_1, \dots, j_{n-1}))_{\mathfrak{p}}$ for all $1 \leq i \leq n-1$. Assuming not, we have $f(l, j_l, n) \notin I_2(\mathcal{M}_n(j_1, \dots, j_{n-1}))_{\mathfrak{p}}$. Then by (4.22), the following equation holds in $(R_{n-1})_{\mathfrak{p}}[x_n]$:

$$c.F(l, j_l, n) + \sum_{2 \leq i < j \leq n} c_{ij} \Delta_{ij} = 1 \quad (4.23)$$

Let $c = \sum_{l=0}^m c_l x_n^l$ and $c_{ij} = \sum_{l=0}^{m_{ij}} c_{ijl} x_n^l$, where $m := \deg_{x_n} c$ and $m_{ij} = \deg_{x_n} c_{ij}$. Then $m+1 = \max\{m_{ij} \mid 2 \leq i < j \leq n\}$. By convention, set $c_{ijl} = 0$ for $l > m_{ij}$. Comparing coefficients of x_n^{m+1} in (4.23) we have $c_m f(l, j_l, n) + \sum_{i,j} c_{ij, m+1} \Delta_{ij} = 0$. Since $f(l, j_l, n) \notin I_2(\mathcal{M}_n(j_1, \dots, j_{n-1}))_{\mathfrak{p}}$, we must have $c_m \in \mathfrak{p}$, as else c_m would be a unit in $(R_{n-1})_{\mathfrak{p}}[x_n]$. Similarly, comparing coefficient of x_n^m , we have $c_{m-1} f(l, j_l, n) + c_m g(l, j_l, n) + \sum_{i,j} c_{ij, m} \Delta_{ij} = 0$ and since $c_m \in \mathfrak{p}$, a similar reasoning gives $c_{m-1} \in \mathfrak{p}$. Proceeding this way, we obtain that $c_i \in \mathfrak{p}$ for all $i \geq 0$. But then $c \in \mathfrak{p}(R_{n-1})_{\mathfrak{p}}[x_n]$, whereby (4.23) would imply that $1 \in \mathfrak{p}(R_{n-1})_{\mathfrak{p}}[x_n]$, which is contradiction.

Thus, $f(l, j_l, n) \in I_2(\mathcal{M}_n(j_1, \dots, j_{n-1}))_{\mathfrak{p}}$, implying $\overline{f(l, j_l, n)} = 0$ in A , and by the proportionality relation $\overline{f(i, j_i, n)} = (\overline{\Delta_{in}}/\overline{\Delta_{ln}})\overline{f(l, j_l, n)}$ in A , we obtain that all $\overline{f(i, j_i, n)} = 0$ in A , and thus, $f(i, j_i, n) \in I_2(\mathcal{M}_n(j_1, \dots, j_{n-1}))_{\mathfrak{p}}$ for all $1 \leq i \leq n-1$. This yields the following equality of ideals in $(R_{n-1})_{\mathfrak{p}}$:

$$(f(1, j_1, n), \dots, f(n-1, j_{n-1}, n))_{\mathfrak{p}} = I_2(\mathcal{M}_n(j_1, \dots, j_{n-1}))_{\mathfrak{p}} \quad (4.24)$$

But since $g(l, j_l, n) \neq 0 \in \kappa(\mathfrak{p})$, we have $g(l, j_l, n)$ is a unit in $(R_{n-1})_{\mathfrak{p}}$, and thus using the Plücker relations $g(l, j_l, n)\Delta_{pq} = g(p, j_p, n)\Delta_{lq} - g(q, j_q, n)\Delta_{lp}$ for all $1 \leq p, q \leq n-1$ such that $p, q \neq l$, it follows that $I_2(\mathcal{M}_n(j_1, \dots, j_{n-1}))_{\mathfrak{p}} = (\Delta_{li} \mid 1 \leq i \leq n-1, i \neq l)_{\mathfrak{p}}$. Furthermore since we are assuming that the conjecture CA is false in $\deg n$ (i.e., the sequence $\mathcal{S}_{n-1}(j_1, \dots, j_{n-1}) = (f(1, j_1, n), \dots, f(n-$

$1, j_{n-1}, n$) in (4.3) is not a regular sequence in R_{n-1} , then if $(f(1, j_1, n), \dots, f(n-1, j_{n-1}, n))_{\mathfrak{p}} \neq (R_{n-1})_{\mathfrak{p}}$, it follows that \mathfrak{p} is minimal over $(f(1, j_1, n), \dots, f(n-1, j_{n-1}, n)) \subseteq R_{n-1}$, since height $\mathfrak{p} = n-2$. But then (4.24) would imply that $\mu_{(R_{n-1})_{\mathfrak{p}}}((f(1, j_1, n), \dots, f(n-1, j_{n-1}, n))_{\mathfrak{p}}) \leq n-2$, which contradicts Corollary 3.9 in characteristic zero. Hence, we must have $f(l, j_l, n) \notin \mathfrak{p}$. \square

Thus, we have proved that the ideal $\widehat{\mathcal{S}}_n(j_1, \dots, j_{n-1}) \subset R_n$ contracts to $I_2(\mathcal{M}_n(j_1, \dots, j_{n-1})) \subset R_{n-1}$ under the natural inclusion $R_{n-1} \hookrightarrow R_n$ in characteristic 0, implying that the natural map $j_0 : H_0(\widehat{K}_{0, \bullet}^n) \rightarrow H_0(\widehat{K}_{\bullet}^n)$ is injective and thus so is $\iota_{1, \star} : H_0(\widehat{K}_{0, \bullet}^n) \rightarrow H_0(\widehat{K}_{1, \bullet}^n)$. Finally, we will now show that this implies $\iota_{k, \star} : H_0(\widehat{K}_{k-1, \bullet}^n) \rightarrow H_0(\widehat{K}_{k, \bullet}^n)$ is injective for all $k \geq 1$.

Note that $H_0(\widehat{K}_{k, \bullet}^n) = R_{n-1}[x_n]_k / \widehat{\mathcal{I}}_n(j_1, \dots, j_n)_{\leq k}$, where $\widehat{\mathcal{I}}_n(j_1, \dots, j_n)_{\leq k} = \{\sum_{i=1}^{n-1} r_i F(i, j_i, n) \mid r_i \in R_{n-1}[x_n]_{k-1}, F(i, j_i, n) \in \widehat{\mathcal{S}}_n(j_1, \dots, j_{n-1})\}$. Clearly $\iota_{k, \star} : H_0(\widehat{K}_{k-1, \bullet}^n) \rightarrow H_0(\widehat{K}_{k, \bullet}^n)$ is injective if and only if for all $r = \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} r_i F(i, j_i, n) \in R_{n-1}[x_n]_{k-1}$ with $r_i \in R_{n-1}[x_n]_{k-1}$, we have $r = \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} r'_i F(i, j_i, n)$, where $r'_i \in R_{n-1}[x_n]_{k-2}$ for all i . Let $r_i = \sum_{l=0}^{k-1} r_{i,l} x_n^l$ for all $1 \leq i \leq n$. Then $\sum_{i=1}^{n-1} r_{i,k-1} f(i, j_i, n) = 0$ and thus, $\sum_{i=1}^{n-1} r_{i,k-1} F(i, j_i, n) \in R_{n-1}$. Since we proved that $(F(1, j_1, n), \dots, F(n, j_n, n)) \cap R_{n-1} = I_2(\mathcal{M}_n(j_1, \dots, j_{n-1}))$, it follows that $\sum_{i=1}^{n-1} r_{i,k-1} F(i, j_i, n) = \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} r_{i,k-1} g(i, j_i, n) = \sum_{1 \leq i < l \leq n-1} q_{il} \Delta_{il}$. Thus, coefficient of x_n^{k-1} in r is (where $q_{li} = -q_{il}$, $\forall 1 \leq i \leq l \leq n-1$):

$$\sum_{i=1}^{n-1} (r_{i,k-1} g(i, j_i, n) + r_{i,k-2} f(i, j_i, n)) = \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \left(\sum_{l=1}^{n-1} q_{il} g(l, j_l, n) + r_{i,k-2} \right) f(i, j_i, n).$$

Thus, defining $r'_{i,k-2} = \sum_{l=1}^{n-1} q_{il} g(l, j_l, n) + r_{i,k-2}$ and $r'_{i,l} = r_{i,l}$ for all $l < k-2$, we have $r = \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} r'_i F(i, j_i, n)$ where $r'_i \in R_{n-1}[x_n]_{k-2}$. This completes the proof of the injectivity of $\iota_{k, \star} : H_0(\widehat{K}_{k-1, \bullet}^n) \rightarrow H_0(\widehat{K}_{k, \bullet}^n)$ for all $k \geq 1$, when the base field has characteristic 0. \square

4.2.2. Homology computations. Applying the homology long exact sequence to (4.10), we obtain the following long exact sequence of Koszul homology for all $k \geq 3$:

$$\begin{aligned} \dots &\longrightarrow H_2(\mathbf{K}_{\bullet}^{n-1}) \longrightarrow H_1(\widehat{\mathbf{K}}_{k-1, \bullet}^n) \xrightarrow{\iota_{k, \star}} H_1(\widehat{\mathbf{K}}_{k, \bullet}^n) \xrightarrow{\Lambda_{n, k, \star}} H_1(\mathbf{K}_{\bullet}^{n-1}) \longrightarrow \\ &\longrightarrow H_0(\widehat{\mathbf{K}}_{k-1, \bullet}^n) \xrightarrow{\iota_{k, \star}} H_0(\widehat{\mathbf{K}}_{k, \bullet}^n) \xrightarrow{\Lambda_{n, k, \star}} H_0(\mathbf{K}_{\bullet}^{n-1}) \rightarrow 0 \end{aligned} \quad (4.25)$$

Since we are in graded homogeneous setup, our goal of showing that $\mathcal{S}_{n-1}(j_1, \dots, j_{n-1}) := \Phi_{j_1}^{\#}(HD_{n-1}^0 \mathbf{x}_{n-1}), \dots, \Phi_{j_{n-1}}^{\#}(HD_{n-1}^{n-2} \mathbf{x}_{n-1})$ in (4.3) is a regular sequence in R_{n-1} is equivalent to showing that the Koszul homology group $H_1(\mathbf{K}_{\bullet}^{n-1})$ is zero.

By Proposition 4.3, the maps $\iota_{k, \star} : H_0(\widehat{\mathbf{K}}_{k-1, \bullet}^n) \rightarrow H_0(\widehat{\mathbf{K}}_{k, \bullet}^n)$ are injective for all $k \geq 2$, and thus, the image of the boundary map $H_1(\mathbf{K}_{\bullet}^{n-1}) \rightarrow H_0(\widehat{\mathbf{K}}_{k-1, \bullet}^n)$ in (4.25) is 0. Let $\mathcal{I}_n(j_1, \dots, j_{n-1}) \subseteq R_{n-1}$ denote the ideal generated by the sequence $\mathcal{S}_{n-1}(j_1, \dots, j_{n-1}) \subseteq R_{n-1}$. Since R_{n-1} is Cohen-Macaulay, grade $\mathcal{I}_{n-1}(j_1, \dots, j_{n-1}) = \text{height } \mathcal{I}_{n-1}(j_1, \dots, j_{n-1}) \geq n-2$, where the inequality follows from [Gho25, Theorem A]. Then by depth sensitivity of Koszul homology [BH93, Theorem 1.6.17], the i^{th} Koszul homology of $\mathcal{I}_{n-1}(j_1, \dots, j_{n-1})$ vanishes for $i > (n-1) - (n-2) = 1$. In particular, since $\mathbf{K}_{\bullet}^{n-1}$ is the truncation of the Koszul complex of $\mathcal{I}_{n-1}(j_1, \dots, j_{n-1})$ upto the fourth term, we have $H_2(\mathbf{K}_{\bullet}^{n-1}) = 0$. Thus, the maps $\iota_{k, \star} : H_1(\widehat{\mathbf{K}}_{k-1, \bullet}^n) \rightarrow H_1(\widehat{\mathbf{K}}_{k, \bullet}^n)$ in (4.25) are injective for all $k \geq 3$. This along with (4.12) and [Nee02][Introduction] implies that $H_1(\widehat{\mathbf{K}}_{k, \bullet}^n) \rightarrow H_1(\widehat{\mathbf{K}}_{\bullet}^n)$ is injective for all $k \geq 2$. But $H_1(\widehat{\mathbf{K}}_{\bullet}^n) = 0$ by Koszul regularity and our hypothesis that $\widehat{\mathcal{S}}_n(j_1, \dots, j_{n-1})$ is a regular sequence in R_n . Thus, $H_1(\widehat{\mathbf{K}}_{k, \bullet}^n) = 0$ for all $k \geq 2$. But then the boundary map

$H_1(\mathbb{K}_{\bullet}^{n-1}) \rightarrow H_0(\widehat{\mathbb{K}}_{k-1, \bullet}^n)$ in (4.25) is injective and has image equal to 0, implying $H_1(\mathbb{K}_{\bullet}^{n-1}) = 0$. This completes the proof that $\mathcal{S}_{n-1}(j_1, \dots, j_{n-1})$ is a regular sequence in R_{n-1} and concludes the downward inductive step.

4.2.3. *Completion of the proof of Theorem A.* In § 4.1.2 above, we proved that over characteristic 0 fields, the Conjecture CA in degree $n + 1$ implies the conjecture in degree n . This completes the proof of Conjecture CA over characteristic 0 by [BLSW07][Theorem], which states that the conjecture holds in infinitely many degrees (particularly degrees p^k , $2p^k$ for primes p and $k \geq 1$) over characteristic 0.

REFERENCES

- [AGZV12] V. I. Arnold, S. M. Gusein-Zade, and A. N. Varchenko, *Singularities of differentiable maps. Volume 1*, Modern Birkhäuser Classics, Birkhäuser/Springer, New York, 2012. Classification of critical points, caustics and wave fronts; Translated from the Russian by Ian Porteous based on a previous translation by Mark Reynolds; Reprint of the 1985 edition. MR2896292 ↑13
- [BH93] Winfried Bruns and Jürgen Herzog, *Cohen-Macaulay rings*, Cambridge Studies in Advanced Mathematics, vol. 39, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1993. MR1251956 ↑20
- [BV88] Winfried Bruns and Udo Vetter, *Determinantal rings*, Lecture Notes in Mathematics, vol. 1327, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1988. MR0953963 ↑18
- [CA01] Eduardo Casas-Alvero, *Higher order polar germs*, J. Algebra **240** (2001), no. 1, 326–337. MR1830556 ↑1, 3
- [CA24] Eduardo Casas-Alvero, *personal communication*, November 23, 2024. ↑3
- [CLO14] Wouter Castryck, Robert Laterveer, and Myriam Ounaïes, *Constraints on counterexamples to the Casas-Alvero conjecture and a verification in degree 12*, Math. Comp. **83** (2014), no. 290, 3017–3037. MR3246822 ↑2
- [CS12] Mustapha Chellali and Alain Salinier, *La conjecture de Casas Alvero pour les degrés $5p^e$* , An. Univ. Dunărea de Jos Galați Fasc. II Mat. Fiz. Mec. Teor. **4(35)** (2012), no. 1-2, 54–62. MR3136558 ↑2
- [CLO05] David A. Cox, John Little, and Donal O’Shea, *Using algebraic geometry*, 2nd ed., Graduate Texts in Mathematics, vol. 185, Springer, New York, 2005. MR2122859 ↑10
- [DdJ11] Jan Draisma and Johan P. de Jong, *On the Casas-Alvero conjecture*, Eur. Math. Soc. Newsl. **80** (2011), 29–33. MR2848893 ↑2, 14
- [DTGV06] Gema M. Diaz-Toca and Laureano Gonzalez-Vega, *On analyzing a conjecture about univariate polynomials and their roots by using Maple*, Proceedings of the Maple Conference 2006, Waterloo (Canada), July 23–26, 2006, 2006, pp. 81–98. ↑2
- [DM21] George Dinca and Jean Mawhin, *Brouwer degree—the core of nonlinear analysis*, Progress in Nonlinear Differential Equations and their Applications, vol. 95, Birkhäuser/Springer, Cham, 2021. MR4390178 ↑13
- [EN62] J. A. Eagon and D. G. Northcott, *Ideals defined by matrices and a certain complex associated with them*, Proc. Roy. Soc. London Ser. A **269** (1962), 188–204, DOI 10.1098/rspa.1962.0170. MR0142592 ↑18
- [Evg54] M. A. Evgrafov, *Interpoljacionnaya zadača Abelya-Gončarova*, Gosudarstv. Izdat. Tehn.-Teor. Lit., Moscow, 1954 (Russian). MR0069937 ↑11
- [Gho25] Soham Ghosh, *A finiteness result towards the Casas-Alvero conjecture* (2025), preprint, arXiv: math.AG/2402.18717 ↑1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 10, 11, 12, 17, 20
- [Gon30] W. Gontcharoff, *Recherches sur les dérivées successives des fonctions analytiques. Généralisation de la série d’Abel*, Ann. Sci. École Norm. Sup. (3) **47** (1930), 1–78 (French). MR1509300 ↑11
- [BLSW07] Hans-Christian Graf von Bothmer, Oliver Labs, Josef Schicho, and Christiaan van de Woestijne, *The Casas-Alvero conjecture for infinitely many degrees*, J. Algebra **316** (2007), no. 1, 224–230. MR2354861 ↑1, 2, 3, 5, 21
- [SH37] F. K. Schmidt and H. Hasse, *Noch eine Begründung der Theorie der höheren Differentialquotienten in einem algebraischen Funktionenkörper einer Unbestimmten. (Nach einer brieflichen Mitteilung von F.K. Schmidt in Jena)*, J. Reine Angew. Math. **177** (1937), 215–237, DOI 10.1515/crll.1937.177.215 (German). MR1581557 ↑4
- [HS11] Herwig Hauser and Josef Schicho, *Forty questions on singularities of algebraic varieties*, Asian J. Math. **15** (2011), no. 3, 417–435, DOI 10.4310/AJM.2011.v15.n3.a5. MR2838214 ↑3
- [Lev44] Norman Levinson, *The Gontcharoff polynomials*, Duke Math. J. **11** (1944), 729–733. MR0011122 ↑11
- [Mac94] F. S. Macaulay, *The algebraic theory of modular systems*, Cambridge Mathematical Library, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1994. Revised reprint of the 1916 original; With an introduction by Paul Roberts. MR1281612 ↑10

- [Mas23] Cesar Massri, *The Casas-Alvero conjecture for three recycled roots in degree 20* (2023), available at [math.AG/1806.09561](#). ↑3, 11
- [Nee02] Amnon Neeman, *A counterexample to a 1961 “theorem” in homological algebra*, *Inventiones mathematicae* **148** (2002), no. 2, 397–420. ↑20
- [SS24(a)] Daniel Schaub and Mark Spivakovsky, *On the set of bad primes in the study of the Casas–Alvero conjecture*, *Res. Math. Sci.* **11** (2024), no. 2, Paper No. 31, DOI 10.1007/s40687-024-00444-z. MR4729911 ↑3
- [SS24(b)] Daniel Schaub and Mark Spivakovsky, *A description of and an upper bound on the set of bad primes in the study of the Casas-Alvero Conjecture* (2024), available at [math.AC/2411.13967](#). ↑3
- [SS25] Daniel Schaub and Mark Spivakovsky, *On the Casas-Alvero conjecture*, *J. Commut. Algebra* **17** (2025), no. 2, 199–202, DOI 10.1216/jca.2025.17.199. MR4954444 ↑3
- [SP24] The Stacks project authors, *The Stacks project*, 2024. ↑15
- [Yak14] S. Yakubovich, *Polynomial problems of the Casas-Alvero type*, *J. Class. Anal.* **4** (2014), no. 2, 97–120, DOI 10.7153/jca-04-07. MR3324454 ↑3, 11
- [Yak16] S. Yakubovich, *On some properties of the Abel-Goncharov polynomials and the Casas-Alvero problem*, *Integral Transforms Spec. Funct.* **27** (2016), no. 8, 599–610, DOI 10.1080/10652469.2016.1167689. MR3504384 ↑3, 11

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON, SEATTLE, WA 98195, USA
Email address: soham13@uw.edu