

Algebra & Number Theory

Volume 6

2012

No. 3

**A finiteness property of graded
sequences of ideals**

Mattias Jonsson and Mircea Mustața



mathematical sciences publishers

A finiteness property of graded sequences of ideals

Mattias Jonsson and Mircea Mustață

Given a graded sequence of ideals $(\mathfrak{a}_m)_{m \geq 1}$ on X , having finite log canonical threshold, we show that if there are divisors E_m over X computing the log canonical threshold of \mathfrak{a}_m , and such that the log discrepancies of the divisors E_m are bounded, then the set $\{E_m \mid m \geq 1\}$ is finite.

1. Introduction

Let X be a smooth algebraic variety over an algebraically closed field k of characteristic zero. The log canonical threshold of a nonzero ideal \mathfrak{a} on X is a fundamental invariant of the singularities of the subscheme defined by \mathfrak{a} . Originally known as the *complex singularity index*, it shows up in many contexts related to singularities, and it has found a plethora of applications in birational geometry [Kollár 1997; Ein and Mustață 2006].

In this note we will be interested in the behavior of this invariant in certain sequences of ideals. Let $\mathfrak{a}_\bullet = (\mathfrak{a}_m)_{m \geq 1}$ be a *graded sequence of ideals* on X , that is, a sequence of ideals that satisfies $\mathfrak{a}_\ell \cdot \mathfrak{a}_m \subseteq \mathfrak{a}_{\ell+m}$ for every $\ell, m \geq 1$. We always assume that, in addition, some ideal \mathfrak{a}_m is nonzero. The main motivating example is the graded sequence \mathfrak{a}_\bullet^L associated to a line bundle L of nonnegative Iitaka dimension on a smooth projective variety X : the ideal \mathfrak{a}_m^L defines the base-locus of the linear system $|L^m|$. Note that in this case the behavior of \mathfrak{a}_\bullet^L is easy to understand if the section ring $\bigoplus_m \Gamma(X, L^m)$ is finitely generated over k . Indeed, in this case there is a positive integer p such that $\mathfrak{a}_{mp} = \mathfrak{a}_p^m$ for all m . The study of \mathfrak{a}_\bullet^L is useful precisely when the section ring is not finitely generated (or at least, when this property is not known *a priori*).

Jonsson was partially supported by NSF grants DMS-0449465 and DMS-1001740. Mustață was partially supported by NSF grant DMS-0758454 and a Packard Fellowship.

MSC2010: primary 14F18; secondary 14B05.

Keywords: graded sequence of ideals, log canonical threshold.

To a graded sequence \mathfrak{a}_\bullet , as above, one can associate an asymptotic version of the log canonical threshold, by putting

$$\text{lct}(\mathfrak{a}_\bullet) := \sup_{m; \mathfrak{a}_m \neq (0)} m \cdot \text{lct}(\mathfrak{a}_m).$$

This can be infinite: for example, if $\mathfrak{a}_\bullet = \mathfrak{a}_\bullet^L$ as above, with L big, then $\text{lct}(\mathfrak{a}_\bullet)$ is infinite if and only if L is nef (see [Remark 2.2](#) below).

We will be concerned with the divisors that compute the log canonical thresholds of the elements of a graded sequence. We denote by $A(\text{ord}_E)$ the log discrepancy of a divisor E over X (see [Section 2](#) for the relevant definitions). Our main result, which gives a positive answer to a question of Mihai Păun, is [Theorem A](#) below. (Păun’s question was motivated by [[Siu 2009](#)], in which Y.-T. Siu presents part of his arguments for the finite generation of the canonical ring. At the end of [Section 6.3](#), he evokes a subtle point in his approach, involving the control of an infinite sequence of blow-ups. Although expressed in a different language, our main result shows that the infinite blow-up process in Siu’s approach can be “stopped”, provided that the log discrepancies of the divisors computing the log canonical thresholds are bounded.)

Theorem A. *Let \mathfrak{a}_\bullet be a graded sequence of ideals on a smooth variety X such that $\text{lct}(\mathfrak{a}_\bullet) < \infty$. If $I \subseteq \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$ is a subset such that for all $m \in I$ we have a divisor E_m over X that computes $\text{lct}(\mathfrak{a}_m)$ such that $\{A(\text{ord}_{E_m}) \mid m \in I\}$ is bounded, then the set $\{E_m \mid m \in I\}$ is finite.*

Corollary B. *Under the hypothesis in [Theorem A](#), suppose that the set I is infinite. Then there is a divisor E over X that computes $\text{lct}(\mathfrak{a}_m)$ for infinitely m . In particular, E computes $\text{lct}(\mathfrak{a}_\bullet)$.*

In fact, since our proof will require replacing X by a suitable blow-up, we will need to prove a stronger version of the above theorem, in which we replace the log canonical threshold by the possibly higher jumping numbers, in the sense of [[Ein et al. 2004](#)] (see [Theorem 4.1](#) below for the precise statement).

Here is a sketch of the proof. Let Z_m be the image of E_m on X , and let W be the Zariski closure of $\bigcup_{m \in I} Z_m$. We may assume that W is irreducible, and we first show that since $\text{lct}(\mathfrak{a}_\bullet) < \infty$, the asymptotic order of vanishing $\text{ord}_W(\mathfrak{a}_\bullet)$ is positive. In particular, W is a proper subset of X . If W has codimension at least two in X , then blowing-up X along W decreases the log discrepancies of the divisors E_m , and since these are bounded above, we reduce to the case when W is a hypersurface. In this case, we use the following result, which we believe is of independent interest.

Theorem C. *Let H be a hypersurface in X , and \mathfrak{a} a nonzero ideal. Suppose that E is a divisor over X that computes $\text{lct}(\mathfrak{a})$. If the image Z of E on X is a proper*

subset of H , and if H is smooth at the generic point of Z , then

$$\text{ord}_Z(\mathfrak{a}) \geq \text{ord}_H(\mathfrak{a}) \cdot \left(1 + \frac{\text{ord}_E(I_Z)}{A(\text{ord}_E)} \right),$$

where I_Z is the ideal defining Z .

Of course, as we have already mentioned, we need in fact a version of this result that applies also to higher jumping numbers (see [Theorem 3.1](#) below for this more general version of the theorem). Using [Theorem C](#), we show that if there were infinitely many Z_m that were properly contained in W , then the ideals in \mathfrak{a}_\bullet would vanish along W more than they should. Therefore all but finitely many of the E_m are equal to W (note that at this point we are on some blow-up of our original variety).

In the following section we review some basic facts about log canonical thresholds and higher jumping numbers. The proofs of the stronger versions of [Theorems C](#) and [A](#) are given in [Section 3](#), and respectively, [Section 4](#).

2. Jumping numbers and valuations

In this section we recall some definitions and results concerning the invariants of singularities that we will use, and set the notation for the rest of the paper. We work over a fixed algebraically closed field k of characteristic zero. Let X be a smooth variety over k (in particular, we assume that X is connected and separated). All ideal sheaves on X are assumed to be coherent.

By a divisor E over X we mean a prime divisor on a normal variety Y that has a proper birational morphism $\pi : Y \rightarrow X$. This induces a discrete valuation of the function field $K(Y) = K(X)$, that we denote by ord_E . As usual, we identify two such divisors if they induce the same valuation. In particular, it follows from Hironaka’s theorem on resolution of singularities that we may assume that both Y and E are nonsingular. If we denote by $K_{Y/X}$ the relative canonical divisor, then the *log discrepancy* of ord_E is given by $A(\text{ord}_E) := 1 + \text{ord}_E(K_{Y/X})$. Note that this depends on the variety X , and whenever the variety is not clear from the context, we will write $A_X(\text{ord}_E)$. The *center* of E on X is the image $c_X(E) := \pi(E)$ of E . We always consider on $c_X(E)$ the reduced scheme structure. If \mathfrak{a} is a nonzero ideal sheaf on X , we put

$$\text{ord}_E(\mathfrak{a}) := \min\{\text{ord}_E(f) \mid f \in \mathfrak{a} \cdot \mathcal{O}_{X, c_X(E)}\} \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}.$$

If Z is the subscheme defined by \mathfrak{a} , we also denote this by $\text{ord}_E(Z)$.

Given an irreducible closed subset Z of X , we define the order of vanishing along Z as follows. Consider the normalized blow-up of X along Z , and put $\text{ord}_Z := \text{ord}_E$, where E is the unique irreducible component of the exceptional

divisor that dominates Z . It is clear that in this case $c_X(E) = Z$. Note also that $\text{ord}_Z(\mathfrak{a}) = \min_{x \in Z} \text{ord}_x(\mathfrak{a})$.

Let us recall the definition of multiplier ideals. For details and proofs we refer to [Lazarsfeld 2004, Section 9]. Suppose that \mathfrak{a} is a nonzero ideal on X . Let $\mu: X' \rightarrow X$ be a log resolution of (X, \mathfrak{a}) , that is, π is proper and birational, X' is nonsingular, $\mathfrak{a} \cdot \mathcal{O}_{X'} = \mathcal{O}_{X'}(-F)$ for an effective divisor F , and $F + K_{X'/X}$ has simple normal crossings. For every $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$, the multiplier ideal of \mathfrak{a} of exponent λ is given by

$$\mathcal{F}(\mathfrak{a}^\lambda) := \pi_* \mathcal{O}_{X'}(K_{X'/X} - \lfloor \lambda F \rfloor).$$

The definition is independent of the choice of log resolution.

It is clear from the above definition that if $\lambda < \lambda'$, then $\mathcal{F}(\mathfrak{a}^{\lambda'}) \subseteq \mathcal{F}(\mathfrak{a}^\lambda)$. Furthermore, for every λ there is $\varepsilon > 0$ such that $\mathcal{F}(\mathfrak{a}^\lambda) = \mathcal{F}(\mathfrak{a}^t)$ for every $t \in [\lambda, \lambda + \varepsilon]$. One says that $\lambda > 0$ is a *jumping number* of \mathfrak{a} if $\mathcal{F}(\mathfrak{a}^\lambda) \neq \mathcal{F}(\mathfrak{a}^{\lambda'})$ for every $\lambda' < \lambda$. It follows from the definition that if we write $F = \sum_i a_i E_i$, then for every jumping number λ there is i such that λa_i is an integer. In particular, the jumping numbers form a discrete set of rational numbers.

For basic properties of the jumping numbers and applications, we refer to [Ein et al. 2004]. The most important jumping number is the smallest one, known as the *log canonical threshold* and denoted by $\text{lct}(\mathfrak{a})$. This is the smallest λ such that $\mathcal{F}(\mathfrak{a}^\lambda) \neq \mathcal{O}_X$ (note that $\mathcal{F}(\mathfrak{a}^0) = \mathcal{O}_X$).

It is convenient to index the jumping numbers as follows (see [Jonsson and Mustață 2010]). Let \mathfrak{q} be a nonzero ideal on X . We put

$$\text{lct}^{\mathfrak{q}}(\mathfrak{a}) := \min\{\lambda \mid \mathfrak{q} \not\subseteq \mathcal{F}(\mathfrak{a}^\lambda)\}.$$

Note that $\text{lct}^{\mathcal{O}_X}(\mathfrak{a})$ is the log canonical threshold $\text{lct}(\mathfrak{a})$ of \mathfrak{a} . It follows from the definition that if $\mathfrak{a} \neq \mathcal{O}_X$, then $\bigcap_{\lambda \geq 0} \mathcal{F}(\mathfrak{a}^\lambda) = (0)$, hence $\text{lct}^{\mathfrak{q}}(\mathfrak{a})$ is finite. When $\mathfrak{a} = \mathcal{O}_X$, we make the convention $\text{lct}^{\mathfrak{q}}(\mathfrak{a}) = \infty$. We will also use the notation $\text{Arn}^{\mathfrak{q}}(\mathfrak{a}) := 1/\text{lct}^{\mathfrak{q}}(\mathfrak{a})$ (where *Arn* stands for *Arnold multiplicity*). It follows from the definition that we have

$$\text{Arn}^{\mathfrak{q}}(\mathfrak{a}) = \max_E \frac{\text{ord}_E(\mathfrak{a})}{A(\text{ord}_E) + \text{ord}_E(\mathfrak{q})}, \tag{1}$$

where the maximum can be taken either over all divisors over X , or just over those lying on a log resolution of (X, \mathfrak{a}) . We say that E computes $\text{lct}^{\mathfrak{q}}(\mathfrak{a})$ (or $\text{Arn}^{\mathfrak{q}}(\mathfrak{a})$) if the maximum in (1) is achieved by E .

The most interesting of the jumping numbers is the log canonical threshold. However, as the following lemma shows, the other jumping numbers appear naturally when we consider higher birational models.

Proposition 2.1. *Let $\pi : X' \rightarrow X$ be a proper birational morphism, with X' smooth, and \mathfrak{a} and \mathfrak{q} nonzero ideals on X . If $\mathfrak{a}' = \mathfrak{a} \cdot \mathbb{O}_{X'}$, and $\mathfrak{q}' = \mathfrak{q} \cdot \mathbb{O}_{X'}(-K_{X'/X})$, then*

$$\text{lct}^{\mathfrak{q}}(\mathfrak{a}) = \text{lct}^{\mathfrak{q}'}(\mathfrak{a}').$$

Proof. This is an immediate consequence of (1), and of the fact that for every divisor E over X , we have $A_X(\text{ord}_E) = A_{X'}(\text{ord}_E) + \text{ord}_E(K_{X'/X})$. \square

Suppose now that \mathfrak{a}_\bullet is a graded sequence of ideals on X , and let $S = \{m \mid \mathfrak{a}_m \neq (0)\}$. Note that S is closed under addition. In this case we have the following asymptotic version of the jumping numbers:

$$\text{lct}^{\mathfrak{q}}(\mathfrak{a}_\bullet) := \sup_{m \in S} m \cdot \text{lct}^{\mathfrak{q}}(\mathfrak{a}_m) = \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty, m \in S} m \cdot \text{lct}^{\mathfrak{q}}(\mathfrak{a}_m) \tag{2}$$

(see [Jonsson and Mustařa 2010, Section 2]). We put $\text{Arn}^{\mathfrak{q}}(\mathfrak{a}_\bullet) = 1 / \text{lct}^{\mathfrak{q}}(\mathfrak{a}_\bullet)$. When $\mathfrak{q} = \mathbb{O}_X$, we simply write $\text{lct}(\mathfrak{a}_\bullet)$ and $\text{Arn}(\mathfrak{a}_\bullet)$. Note that $\text{lct}^{\mathfrak{q}}(\mathfrak{a}_\bullet) \in \mathbb{R}_{>0} \cup \{\infty\}$. One can show that $\text{lct}^{\mathfrak{q}}(\mathfrak{a}_\bullet) = \infty$ if and only if $\text{lct}(\mathfrak{a}_\bullet) = \infty$ (see [Jonsson and Mustařa 2010, Corollary 6.10]).

Remark 2.2. If X is a smooth projective variety, L is a big line bundle on X , and $\mathfrak{a}_\bullet = \mathfrak{a}_\bullet^L$ is the graded sequence of ideals defining the base loci of the powers of L (see Introduction), then [Ein et al. 2006, Corollary 2.10] shows that $\text{lct}(\mathfrak{a}_\bullet) = \infty$ if and only if L is nef.

If \mathfrak{a}_\bullet is as above and E is a divisor over X , we will also consider the following asymptotic version of the order of vanishing along E :

$$\text{ord}_E(\mathfrak{a}_\bullet) := \inf_m \frac{\text{ord}_E(\mathfrak{a}_m)}{m} = \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty, m \in S} \frac{\text{ord}_E(\mathfrak{a}_m)}{m}.$$

We have the following extension of (1)

$$\text{Arn}^{\mathfrak{q}}(\mathfrak{a}_\bullet) = \sup_E \frac{\text{ord}_E(\mathfrak{a}_\bullet)}{A(\text{ord}_E) + \text{ord}_E(\mathfrak{q})}. \tag{3}$$

For these facts, we refer to [Jonsson and Mustařa 2010, Section 2]. We say that E computes $\text{lct}^{\mathfrak{q}}(\mathfrak{a}_\bullet)$ if the supremum in (3) is achieved by E . Note however that unlike in the case of one ideal, there may be no divisor E that computes $\text{lct}^{\mathfrak{q}}(\mathfrak{a}_\bullet)$; see [Jonsson and Mustařa 2010, Example 8.5].

We will use the following Izumi-type estimate [Izumi 1985; Ein et al. 2003].

Proposition 2.3. *If E is a divisor over X with $c_X(E) = Z$, then*

$$\text{ord}_E(\mathfrak{a}) \leq A(\text{ord}_E) \cdot \text{ord}_Z(\mathfrak{a})$$

for every nonzero ideal sheaf \mathfrak{a} on X .

Proof. We may replace X by an affine open subset of the generic point of Z , and therefore assume that X is affine. In this case we may assume that \mathfrak{a} is principal. If $\text{ord}_Z(\mathfrak{a}) = m$, then for a general $p \in Z$ we have $\text{ord}_p(\mathfrak{a}) = m$. By [Kollár 1997, Lemma 8.10], there is an open neighborhood U of p such that $\text{lct}(\mathfrak{a}|_U) \geq 1/m$, and we get the assertion in the proposition since $U \cap Z \neq \emptyset$ implies

$$\frac{A(\text{ord}_E)}{\text{ord}_E(\mathfrak{a})} \geq \text{lct}(\mathfrak{a}|_U). \quad \square$$

3. An inequality between orders of vanishing

We keep the notation and the conventions from Section 2. The following is the main result in this section. Note that in the special case $\mathfrak{q} = \mathbb{C}_X$, this recovers Theorem C in the Introduction.

Theorem 3.1. *Let H be a hypersurface in X , and $\mathfrak{a}, \mathfrak{q}$ nonzero ideals on X . Suppose that E is a divisor over X that computes $\text{lct}^{\mathfrak{q}}(\mathfrak{a})$. If the center Z of E on X is a proper subset of H , and if H is smooth at the generic point of Z , then the following inequality holds*

$$\text{ord}_Z(\mathfrak{a}) \geq \text{ord}_H(\mathfrak{a}) \cdot \left(1 + \frac{\text{ord}_E(Z)}{A(\text{ord}_E)(1 + \text{ord}_H(\mathfrak{q}))} \right). \quad (4)$$

We start by recalling a basic estimate for the log discrepancy of a valuation. For a proof, see for example [Lazarsfeld 2004, page 157].

Lemma 3.2. *Let E be a divisor over X with $c_X(E) = Z$, and let ξ be the generic point of Z . If x_1, \dots, x_r form a regular system of parameters of $\mathbb{C}_{X,\xi}$, then*

$$A(\text{ord}_E) \geq \sum_{i=1}^r \text{ord}_E(x_i).$$

Corollary 3.3. *If H is a hypersurface in X , and E is a divisor over X such that $Z := c_X(E)$ is a proper subset of H , and H is smooth at the generic point of Z , then*

$$A(\text{ord}_E) \geq \text{ord}_E(H) + \text{ord}_E(Z). \quad (5)$$

Proof. Let ξ be the generic point of Z . Since H is smooth at ξ , we may choose a regular system of parameters x_1, \dots, x_r of $\mathbb{C}_{X,\xi}$ such that H is defined at ξ by (x_1) . Note that by assumption $r \geq 2$. By definition, we have $\text{ord}_E(Z) = \min_j \text{ord}_E(x_j)$. Let i be such that $\text{ord}_E(x_i) = \text{ord}_E(Z)$. If $i \geq 2$, then by the lemma

$$A(\text{ord}_E) \geq \text{ord}_E(x_1) + \text{ord}_E(x_i) = \text{ord}_E(H) + \text{ord}_E(Z).$$

On the other hand, if $i = 1$, then using again the lemma we get

$$A(\text{ord}_E) \geq \text{ord}_E(x_1) + \text{ord}_E(x_2) \geq 2 \cdot \text{ord}_E(x_1) = \text{ord}_E(H) + \text{ord}_E(Z). \quad \square$$

Proof of Theorem 3.1. Let us put $m = \text{ord}_H(\mathfrak{a})$ and $p = \text{ord}_H(\mathfrak{q})$. We can write $\mathfrak{a} = \mathbb{C}_X(-H)^m \cdot \tilde{\mathfrak{a}}$, and we get

$$\text{ord}_E(\mathfrak{a}) = m \cdot \text{ord}_E(H) + \text{ord}_E(\tilde{\mathfrak{a}}), \quad \text{ord}_Z(\mathfrak{a}) = m + \text{ord}_Z(\tilde{\mathfrak{a}}) \quad (6)$$

(note that $\text{ord}_Z(H) = 1$ since H is smooth at the generic point of Z). Since E computes $\text{lct}^q(\mathfrak{a})$, it follows from (1) that

$$\frac{\text{ord}_E(\mathfrak{a})}{A(\text{ord}_E) + \text{ord}_E(\mathfrak{q})} \geq \frac{\text{ord}_H(\mathfrak{a})}{A(\text{ord}_H) + \text{ord}_H(\mathfrak{q})} = \frac{m}{1 + p}. \quad (7)$$

Corollary 3.3 gives $\text{ord}_E(H) \leq A(\text{ord}_E) - \text{ord}_E(Z)$, and combining this with (7) we deduce

$$\begin{aligned} m \leq (1+p) \cdot \frac{\text{ord}_E(\mathfrak{a})}{A(\text{ord}_E) + \text{ord}_E(\mathfrak{q})} &\leq \frac{\text{ord}_E(\tilde{\mathfrak{a}}) + m(A(\text{ord}_E) - \text{ord}_E(Z)) + p \cdot \text{ord}_E(\mathfrak{a})}{A(\text{ord}_E) + \text{ord}_E(\mathfrak{q})} \\ &= m + \frac{\text{ord}_E(\tilde{\mathfrak{a}}) + p \cdot \text{ord}_E(\mathfrak{a}) - m(\text{ord}_E(\mathfrak{q}) + \text{ord}_E(Z))}{A(\text{ord}_E) + \text{ord}_E(\mathfrak{q})}. \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

Therefore $\text{ord}_E(\tilde{\mathfrak{a}}) \geq m(\text{ord}_E(\mathfrak{q}) + \text{ord}_E(Z)) - p \cdot \text{ord}_E(\mathfrak{a})$. Using one more time the first equation in (6), this implies

$$(1 + p) \cdot \text{ord}_E(\tilde{\mathfrak{a}}) \geq m(\text{ord}_E(\mathfrak{q}) + \text{ord}_E(Z)) - pm \cdot \text{ord}_E(H). \quad (9)$$

On the other hand, by Proposition 2.3 we have $\text{ord}_E(\tilde{\mathfrak{a}}) \leq A(\text{ord}_E) \cdot \text{ord}_Z(\tilde{\mathfrak{a}})$, while clearly $\text{ord}_E(\mathfrak{q}) \geq p \cdot \text{ord}_E(H)$. Putting these together with (9) gives

$$\begin{aligned} (1 + p)A(\text{ord}_E) \cdot \text{ord}_Z(\tilde{\mathfrak{a}}) &\geq (1 + p) \cdot \text{ord}_E(\tilde{\mathfrak{a}}) \\ &\geq m(\text{ord}_E(\mathfrak{q}) + \text{ord}_E(Z)) - pm \cdot \text{ord}_E(H) \\ &\geq m \cdot \text{ord}_E(Z). \end{aligned}$$

Combining this with the second equality in (6), we obtain

$$\text{ord}_Z(\mathfrak{a}) = m + \text{ord}_Z(\tilde{\mathfrak{a}}) \geq m \cdot \left(1 + \frac{\text{ord}_E(Z)}{A(\text{ord}_E)(1 + p)} \right),$$

which completes the proof of the theorem. □

Remark 3.4. In Theorem 3.1 one can replace ord_E by any real valuation of $K(X)$, having center on X and computing $\text{lct}^q(\mathfrak{a})$. The proof goes through if one uses the definition of $A(v)$ from [Jonsson and Mustařa 2010, Section 5]. In this case, the assertion in Lemma 3.2 follows from Corollary 5.4 of that reference.

Example 3.5. The inequality in Theorem 3.1 is optimal, at least in an asymptotic sense. Indeed, let us consider the ideal $\mathfrak{a} = x^m(x, y^{m+1})$ in $k[x, y]$, where m is a positive integer. Since this is a monomial ideal, one can use Howald’s theorem [Howald 2001] to compute its log canonical threshold. It is easy to check that

$\text{lct}(\mathbf{a}) = (m + 2)/(m + 1)^2$, and this log canonical threshold is computed by the (toric) divisor E over $X = \mathbb{A}^2$ such that

$$\text{ord}_E \left(\sum_{i,j \geq 0} c_{i,j} x^i y^j \right) = \min\{(m + 1)i + j \mid c_{i,j} \neq 0\}.$$

Note that $A(\text{ord}_E) = m + 2$, and the center of E on X is the origin. If we take $\mathfrak{q} = \mathbb{C}_X$ and $H = (x = 0)$, then

$$\frac{\text{ord}_Z(\mathbf{a})}{\text{ord}_H(\mathbf{a}) \left(1 + \frac{\text{ord}_E(Z)}{A(\text{ord}_E)} \right)} = \frac{m + 1}{m \left(1 + \frac{1}{m+2} \right)} = \frac{(m + 1)(m + 2)}{m(m + 3)},$$

and this converges to 1 when m goes to infinity.

Remark 3.6. The right-hand side of the inequality (4) is bounded above by

$$\text{ord}_H(\mathbf{a}) \cdot \left(1 + \frac{1}{\text{lct}(I_Z) \cdot (1 + \text{ord}_H(\mathfrak{q}))} \right),$$

where I_Z is the ideal defining Z . One could ask whether this expression is $\leq \text{ord}_Z(\mathbf{a})$, improving in this way the assertion in [Theorem 3.1](#). However, this is not the case: let us consider the special case $m = 3$ in [Example 3.5](#), that is, $\mathbf{a} = x^3(x, y^4)$. With $\mathfrak{q} = \mathbb{C}_X$ and $H = (x = 0)$, we have $\text{ord}_Z(\mathbf{a}) = 4$, while

$$\text{ord}_H(\mathbf{a}) \cdot \left(1 + \frac{1}{\text{lct}(I_Z)} \right) = 3 \left(1 + \frac{1}{2} \right) = \frac{9}{2} > 4.$$

4. The main result

In this section we prove the generalized version of [Theorem A](#) in the Introduction. We work in the same setting as in [Section 2](#).

Theorem 4.1. *Let \mathbf{a}_\bullet be a graded sequence of ideals on X , and \mathfrak{q} a nonzero ideal on X such that $\text{lct}^{\mathfrak{q}}(\mathbf{a}_\bullet) < \infty$. If $I \subseteq \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$ is a subset such that for all $m \in I$ we have a divisor E_m over X that computes $\text{lct}^{\mathfrak{q}}(\mathbf{a}_m)$ such that $\{A(\text{ord}_{E_m}) \mid m \in I\}$ is bounded, then the set $\{E_m \mid m \in I\}$ is finite.*

Corollary 4.2. *Under the same hypothesis as in [Theorem 4.1](#), suppose that the set I is infinite. Then there is a divisor E over X that computes $\text{lct}^{\mathfrak{q}}(\mathbf{a}_m)$ for infinitely many m . In particular, E computes $\text{lct}^{\mathfrak{q}}(\mathbf{a}_\bullet)$.*

Proof of [Theorem 4.1](#). Note that the hypothesis implies, in particular, that \mathbf{a}_m is nonzero for every $m \in I$. We assume that I is an infinite set, that $E_i \neq E_j$ for all $i \neq j$ in I and aim to derive a contradiction. Let $Z_m = c_X(E_m)$. We argue by induction on $M := \max\{A(\text{ord}_{E_i}) \mid i \in I\}$. This is finite by assumption. Note that M is a positive integer, and $M = 1$ if and only if all the E_i 's are divisors on X . At

several stages in the proof we will replace I by an infinite subset. Note that this can only decrease the value of M .

We start with the following lemma.

Lemma 4.3. *With the above notation, suppose that there is an infinite subset $J \subseteq I$ such that $W := \overline{\bigcup_{j \in J} Z_j}$ is irreducible, and $Z_j \neq W$ for all $j \in J$. In this case*

$$\text{ord}_W(\mathfrak{a}_\bullet) \geq \text{Arn}(\mathfrak{a}_\bullet) \geq \text{Arn}^q(\mathfrak{a}_\bullet) > 0.$$

Proof. We only need to prove the first inequality. Let $C = \text{Arn}(\mathfrak{a}_\bullet)$, so that $\text{Arn}(\mathfrak{a}_m) \geq Cm$ for every m . If $j \in J$, then by [Proposition 2.3](#) we have $\text{Arn}(\mathfrak{a}_j) \leq \text{ord}_{Z_j}(\mathfrak{a}_j)$.

We need to show that $\text{ord}_W(\mathfrak{a}_m) \geq Cm$ for every $m \geq 1$. We may, of course, assume that \mathfrak{a}_m is nonzero. By hypothesis, we can find $0 \leq \ell \leq m - 1$ such that the set

$$\bigcup_{\substack{j \in J \\ j \equiv \ell \pmod{m}}} Z_j \quad (10)$$

is dense in W . Since all Z_j are proper subsets of W , this implies that if in (10) we only take the union over those $j \in J$ with $j \equiv \ell \pmod{m}$ and with $j \geq N$, for some N , then the union is still dense in W . Let us fix $j_0 \in J$ with $j_0 \equiv \ell \pmod{m}$, and let $C' := \max_{x \in W} \text{ord}_x(\mathfrak{a}_{j_0}) < \infty$ (recall that \mathfrak{a}_{j_0} is nonzero). If $mp + j_0 \in J$, then the inclusion $\mathfrak{a}_m^p \cdot \mathfrak{a}_{j_0} \subseteq \mathfrak{a}_{mp+j_0}$ implies

$$p \cdot \text{ord}_{Z_{mp+j_0}}(\mathfrak{a}_m) + \text{ord}_{Z_{mp+j_0}}(\mathfrak{a}_{j_0}) \geq \text{ord}_{Z_{mp+j_0}}(\mathfrak{a}_{mp+j_0}) \geq \text{Arn}(\mathfrak{a}_{mp+j_0}) \geq C(mp+j_0).$$

Therefore $\text{ord}_{Z_{mp+j_0}}(\mathfrak{a}_m) \geq Cm - C'/p$. Since we have arbitrarily large such p , and since the union of the corresponding Z_{mp+j_0} is dense in W , we conclude that $\text{ord}_W(\mathfrak{a}_m) \geq Cm$, as required. \square

A first consequence of the lemma is that if W is the closure of $\bigcup_{i \in I} Z_i$, then $W \neq X$. In particular, this shows that when $M = 1$, we have a contradiction.

Arguing by Noetherian induction on W , we may assume that W is minimal in X with the property that there is an infinite family of divisors $(E_i)_{i \in I}$ as above, with $\max\{A(\text{ord}_{E_i}) \mid i \in I\} \leq M$. This implies first that W is irreducible. Indeed, if we consider the irreducible decomposition $W = W_1 \cup \dots \cup W_r$, then there is j such that $Z_i \subseteq W_j$ for infinitely many $i \in I$. Since we may replace I by $\{i \in I \mid Z_i \subseteq W_j\}$, it follows from the minimality assumption on W that $W = W_j$.

A second consequence of the minimality of W is that for every infinite subset $J \subseteq I$, the union $\bigcup_{j \in J} Z_j$ is dense in W . In particular, if U is an open subset of X that meets W , then there are infinitely many $i \in I$ such that U meets Z_i (and the union of these $Z_i \cap U$ is dense in $W \cap U$). Therefore in order to deduce a

contradiction we may replace X by U and each \mathfrak{a}_m by its restriction to U . We may thus assume that W is nonsingular.

We claim that the induction hypothesis on M implies that W is a hypersurface in X . Indeed, suppose that $c = \text{codim}(W, X) \geq 2$, and let $\pi : X' \rightarrow X$ be the blow-up of X along W . If E is the exceptional divisor of π , then $K_{X'/X} = (c - 1)E$. Since $c_X(E_i) \subseteq W$ for every $i \in I$, it follows that $c_{X'}(E_i) \subseteq E$, hence

$$A_{X'}(\text{ord}_{E_i}) = A_X(\text{ord}_{E_i}) - \text{ord}_{E_i}(K_{X'/X}) \leq A_X(\text{ord}_{E_i}) - (c - 1).$$

If $\mathfrak{a}'_m = \mathfrak{a}_m \cdot \mathcal{O}_{X'}$ and $\mathfrak{q}' = \mathfrak{q} \cdot \mathcal{O}_{X'}(-K_{X'/X})$, then by [Proposition 2.1](#) we have $\text{lct}^{\mathfrak{q}}(\mathfrak{a}_i) = \text{lct}^{\mathfrak{q}'}(\mathfrak{a}_i)$, and it follows from hypothesis and [\(1\)](#) that E_i computes $\text{lct}^{\mathfrak{q}'}(\mathfrak{a}'_i)$ for every $i \in I$. Since $\max\{A_{X'}(\text{ord}_{E_i}) \mid i \in I\} \leq M - 1$, we have a contradiction by induction on M .

Therefore W is a smooth hypersurface in X . If $Z_i = W$, then $E_i = W$, hence this can be the case for at most one i . After discarding this i , we may assume that each Z_i is a proper subset of W . In particular, we may apply [Theorem 3.1](#) to get

$$\text{ord}_{Z_i}(\mathfrak{a}_i) \geq \text{ord}_W(\mathfrak{a}_i) \cdot \left(1 + \frac{\text{ord}_{E_i}(Z_i)}{A(\text{ord}_{E_i})(1 + \text{ord}_W(\mathfrak{q}))} \right). \tag{11}$$

Note that $\text{ord}_{E_i}(Z_i) \geq 1$ for all $i \in I$. Let $\alpha = \text{ord}_W(\mathfrak{a}_\bullet)$. We have $\alpha > 0$ by [Lemma 4.3](#). Let us fix $\varepsilon > 0$ with

$$\varepsilon < \frac{1}{M(1 + \text{ord}_W(\mathfrak{q}))}.$$

If we show that $\text{ord}_W(\mathfrak{a}_m) \geq \alpha m(1 + \varepsilon)$ for every $m \geq 1$, then

$$\alpha = \text{ord}_W(\mathfrak{a}_\bullet) \geq \alpha(1 + \varepsilon),$$

a contradiction. We now argue as in the proof of [Lemma 4.3](#). Let $0 \leq \ell \leq m - 1$ be such that the set in [\(10\)](#) is dense in W . We fix $j_0 \in I$ such that $j_0 \equiv \ell \pmod{m}$, and let $C' := \max_{x \in W} \text{ord}_x(\mathfrak{a}_{j_0})$. It follows from the inclusion $\mathfrak{a}_m^p \cdot \mathfrak{a}_{j_0} \subseteq \mathfrak{a}_{mp+j_0}$ and from [\(11\)](#) that for every p such that $mp + j_0 \in I$ we have

$$p \cdot \text{ord}_{Z_{mp+j_0}}(\mathfrak{a}_m) \geq \text{ord}_{Z_{mp+j_0}}(\mathfrak{a}_{mp+j_0}) - \text{ord}_{Z_{mp+j_0}}(\mathfrak{a}_{j_0}) \geq \text{ord}_W(\mathfrak{a}_{mp+j_0})(1 + \varepsilon) - C'.$$

Therefore for every such p we have $\text{ord}_{Z_{mp+j_0}}(\mathfrak{a}_m) \geq \alpha m(1 + \varepsilon) - C'/p$. Since there are arbitrarily large such p , and the union of the corresponding Z_{mp+j_0} is dense in W , we conclude that $\text{ord}_W(\mathfrak{a}_m) \geq \alpha m(1 + \varepsilon)$. As we have seen, this leads to a contradiction, and thus completes the proof of the theorem. \square

Acknowledgement

We are grateful to Mihai Păun for the question that led to our main result.

References

- [Ein and Mustață 2006] L. Ein and M. Mustață, “Invariants of singularities of pairs”, pp. 583–602 in *International congress of mathematicians*, vol. 2, edited by M. Sanz-Solé et al., Eur. Math. Soc., Zürich, 2006. [MR 2007m:14050](#) [Zbl 1096.14030](#)
- [Ein et al. 2003] L. Ein, R. Lazarsfeld, and K. E. Smith, “Uniform approximation of Abhyankar valuation ideals in smooth function fields”, *Amer. J. Math.* **125**:2 (2003), 409–440. [MR 2003m:13004](#) [Zbl 1033.14030](#)
- [Ein et al. 2004] L. Ein, R. Lazarsfeld, K. E. Smith, and D. Varolin, “Jumping coefficients of multiplier ideals”, *Duke Math. J.* **123**:3 (2004), 469–506. [MR 2005k:14004](#) [Zbl 1061.14003](#)
- [Ein et al. 2006] L. Ein, R. Lazarsfeld, M. Mustață, M. Nakamaye, and M. Popa, “Asymptotic invariants of base loci”, *Ann. Inst. Fourier (Grenoble)* **56**:6 (2006), 1701–1734. [MR 2007m:14008](#) [Zbl 1127.14010](#)
- [Howald 2001] J. A. Howald, “Multiplier ideals of monomial ideals”, *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* **353**:7 (2001), 2665–2671. [MR 2002b:14061](#) [Zbl 0979.13026](#)
- [Izumi 1985] S. Izumi, “A measure of integrity for local analytic algebras”, *Publ. Res. Inst. Math. Sci.* **21**:4 (1985), 719–735. [MR 87i:32014](#) [Zbl 0587.32016](#)
- [Jonsson and Mustață 2010] M. Jonsson and M. Mustață, “Valuations and asymptotic invariants for sequences of ideals”, preprint, 2010. To appear in *Ann. Inst. Fourier*. [arXiv 1011.3699](#)
- [Kollár 1997] J. Kollár, “Singularities of pairs”, pp. 221–287 in *Algebraic geometry* (Santa Cruz, 1995), vol. 1, edited by J. Kollár et al., Proc. Sympos. Pure Math. **62**, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 1997. [MR 99m:14033](#) [Zbl 0905.14002](#)
- [Lazarsfeld 2004] R. Lazarsfeld, *Positivity in algebraic geometry, II: positivity for vector bundles, and multiplier ideals*, *Ergeb. Math. Grenzgeb. (3)* **49**, Springer, Berlin, 2004. [MR 2005k:14001b](#) [Zbl 1093.14500](#)
- [Siu 2009] Y.-T. Siu, “Techniques for the analytic proof of the finite generation of the canonical ring”, pp. 177–219 in *Current developments in mathematics, 2007*, edited by D. Jerison et al., Int. Press, Somerville, MA, 2009. [MR 2011c:32030](#) [Zbl 1183.14012](#)

Communicated by János Kollár

Received 2010-11-27

Revised 2011-05-23

Accepted 2011-06-30

mattiasj@umich.edu

*Department of Mathematics, University of Michigan,
Ann Arbor, MI 48109-1043, United States*

mmustata@umich.edu

*Department of Mathematics, University of Michigan,
Ann Arbor, MI 48109-1043, United States*

Algebra & Number Theory

msp.berkeley.edu/ant

EDITORS

MANAGING EDITOR

Bjorn Poonen
Massachusetts Institute of Technology
Cambridge, USA

EDITORIAL BOARD CHAIR

David Eisenbud
University of California
Berkeley, USA

BOARD OF EDITORS

| | | | |
|----------------------|--|-----------------------|--|
| Georgia Benkart | University of Wisconsin, Madison, USA | Shigefumi Mori | RIMS, Kyoto University, Japan |
| Dave Benson | University of Aberdeen, Scotland | Raman Parimala | Emory University, USA |
| Richard E. Borcherds | University of California, Berkeley, USA | Jonathan Pila | University of Oxford, UK |
| John H. Coates | University of Cambridge, UK | Victor Reiner | University of Minnesota, USA |
| J-L. Colliot-Thélène | CNRS, Université Paris-Sud, France | Karl Rubin | University of California, Irvine, USA |
| Brian D. Conrad | University of Michigan, USA | Peter Sarnak | Princeton University, USA |
| Hélène Esnault | Universität Duisburg-Essen, Germany | Joseph H. Silverman | Brown University, USA |
| Hubert Flenner | Ruhr-Universität, Germany | Michael Singer | North Carolina State University, USA |
| Edward Frenkel | University of California, Berkeley, USA | Ronald Solomon | Ohio State University, USA |
| Andrew Granville | Université de Montréal, Canada | Vasudevan Srinivas | Tata Inst. of Fund. Research, India |
| Joseph Gubeladze | San Francisco State University, USA | J. Toby Stafford | University of Michigan, USA |
| Ehud Hrushovski | Hebrew University, Israel | Bernd Sturmfels | University of California, Berkeley, USA |
| Craig Huneke | University of Kansas, USA | Richard Taylor | Harvard University, USA |
| Mikhail Kapranov | Yale University, USA | Ravi Vakil | Stanford University, USA |
| Yujiro Kawamata | University of Tokyo, Japan | Michel van den Bergh | Hasselt University, Belgium |
| János Kollár | Princeton University, USA | Marie-France Vignéras | Université Paris VII, France |
| Yuri Manin | Northwestern University, USA | Kei-Ichi Watanabe | Nihon University, Japan |
| Barry Mazur | Harvard University, USA | Andrei Zelevinsky | Northeastern University, USA |
| Philippe Michel | École Polytechnique Fédérale de Lausanne | Efim Zelmanov | University of California, San Diego, USA |
| Susan Montgomery | University of Southern California, USA | | |

PRODUCTION

contact@msp.org

Silvio Levy, Scientific Editor

See inside back cover or www.jant.org for submission instructions.

The subscription price for 2012 is US \$175/year for the electronic version, and \$275/year (+\$40 shipping outside the US) for print and electronic. Subscriptions, requests for back issues from the last three years and changes of subscribers address should be sent to Mathematical Sciences Publishers, Department of Mathematics, University of California, Berkeley, CA 94720-3840, USA.

Algebra & Number Theory (ISSN 1937-0652) at Mathematical Sciences Publishers, Department of Mathematics, University of California, Berkeley, CA 94720-3840 is published continuously online. Periodical rate postage paid at Berkeley, CA 94704, and additional mailing offices.

ANT peer review and production are managed by EditFLOW[®] from Mathematical Sciences Publishers.

PUBLISHED BY

 **mathematical sciences publishers**
<http://msp.org/>

A NON-PROFIT CORPORATION

Typeset in L^AT_EX

Copyright ©2012 by Mathematical Sciences Publishers

Algebra & Number Theory

Volume 6 No. 3 2012

| | |
|--|-----|
| The image of complex conjugation in l -adic representations associated to automorphic forms | 405 |
| RICHARD TAYLOR | |
| Betti numbers of graded modules and the multiplicity conjecture in the non-Cohen–Macaulay case | 437 |
| MATS BOIJ and JONAS SÖDERBERG | |
| \mathcal{L} -invariants and Shimura curves | 455 |
| SAMIT DASGUPTA and MATTHEW GREENBERG | |
| On the weak Lefschetz property for powers of linear forms | 487 |
| JUAN C. MIGLIORE, ROSA M. MIRÓ-ROIG and UWE NAGEL | |
| Resonance equals reducibility for A -hypergeometric systems | 527 |
| MATHIAS SCHULZE and ULI WALTHER | |
| The Chow ring of double EPW sextics | 539 |
| ANDREA FERRETTI | |
| A finiteness property of graded sequences of ideals | 561 |
| MATTIAS JONSSON and MIRCEA MUSTAȚĂ | |
| On unit root formulas for toric exponential sums | 573 |
| ALAN ADOLPHSON and STEVEN SPERBER | |
| Symmetries of the transfer operator for $\Gamma_0(N)$ and a character deformation of the Selberg zeta function for $\Gamma_0(4)$ | 587 |
| MARKUS FRACZEK and DIETER MAYER | |