

BIRATIONAL NEVANLINNA CONSTANTS, BETA CONSTANTS, AND DIOPHANTINE APPROXIMATION TO CLOSED SUBSCHEMES

PAUL VOJTA

University of California, Berkeley

19 September 2020

ABSTRACT. In an earlier paper (joint with Min Ru), we proved a result on diophantine approximation to Cartier divisors, extending a 2011 result of P. Autissier. This was recently extended to certain closed subschemes (in place of divisors) by Ru and Wang. In this paper we extend this result to a broader class of closed subschemes. We also show that some notions of $\beta(\mathcal{L}, D)$ coincide, and that they can all be evaluated as limits.

Let k be either a number field or the field \mathbb{C} of complex numbers, and let X be a complete variety over k (see Section 1 for detailed definitions). We recall the following from ([Ru and Vojta 2020], Def. 1.9 and “General Theorem”).

Definition 0.1. Let \mathcal{L} be a big line sheaf on X and let D be a nonzero effective Cartier divisor on X . Then

$$(0.1.1) \quad \beta(\mathcal{L}, D) = \liminf_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\sum_{m=1}^{\infty} h^0(X, \mathcal{L}^N(-mD))}{N h^0(X, \mathcal{L}^N)}.$$

(In this paper \mathcal{L}^N always means $\mathcal{L}^{\otimes N}$, the tensor power of N copies of \mathcal{L} .)

Theorem 0.2. Let k and X be as above, let \mathcal{L} be a big line sheaf on X , and let D_1, \dots, D_q be nonzero effective Cartier divisors on X that intersect properly (i.e., for any nonempty $I \subseteq \{1, \dots, q\}$ and any $x \in \bigcap_{i \in I} \text{Supp } D_i$, the divisors D_i , $i \in I$ are locally generated near x by a regular sequence in $\mathcal{O}_{X,x}$).

(a). **(Arithmetic part)** Assume that k is a number field, and let S be a finite set of places of k . Then, for all $\epsilon > 0$, there is a proper Zariski-closed subset Z of X such that the inequality

$$(0.2.1) \quad \sum_{i=1}^q \beta(\mathcal{L}, D_i) m_S(D_i, x) \leq (1 + \epsilon) h_{\mathcal{L}}(x) + O(1)$$

1991 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 11J97, 32H30.

Key words and phrases. Nevanlinna constant; b-divisors; closed subscheme.

holds for all points $x \in X(k) \setminus Z$.

- (b). **(Analytic part)** Assume that $k = \mathbb{C}$. Then, for all $\epsilon > 0$, there is a proper Zariski-closed subset Z of X such that the inequality

$$(0.2.2) \quad \sum_{i=1}^q \beta(\mathcal{L}, D_i) m_f(D_i, r) \leq_{\text{exc}} (1 + \epsilon) T_{f, \mathcal{L}}(r)$$

holds for all holomorphic mappings $f: \mathbb{C} \rightarrow X$ whose image is not contained in Z . The subscript “exc” means that the inequality holds for all $r \in (0, \infty)$ outside of a set of finite Lebesgue measure.

Remark 0.3. Part (b) in this theorem has been strengthened so that it applies to all f whose image is not contained in Z , whereas in [Ru and Vojta 2020] f was required to have Zariski-dense image. This version can be obtained by revising the statements of Thm. 2.7 (see Remark 2.8), Thm. 2.11, Thm. 1.4, and the Main Theorem of [Ru and Vojta 2020] accordingly, where Z depends on ϵ only in the last two theorems.

The purpose of this paper is to generalize Theorem 0.2 to replace the divisors D_i with proper closed subschemes Y_i .

Upon circulating an early version of this paper, I was informed that Ru and Wang [2020pre] had already proved a version of Theorem 0.2 for closed subschemes. However, the version presented here is somewhat more general.

For both the work of Ru and Wang and the present paper, extending Theorem 0.2 to closed subschemes involves defining what it means for the subschemes Y_i to intersect properly. In both cases this is done using regular sequences—see Remark 2.11 and Definition 3.1. However, the details of this definition are different in the two papers, and this is the main difference between them.

For example, if X is Cohen–Macaulay (e.g., if it is nonsingular), then the Y_i intersect properly, in the sense of the present paper, if and only if (i) at each intersection point x , each of the Y_i passing through x is generated by monomials in the elements of some regular sequence in the local ring, and (ii) the subschemes Y_i are in general position (in other words, they intersect properly in the sense of intersection theory). See Definitions 2.4 and 2.9. This condition is only needed at points where two or more of the Y_i intersect, leading to a definition that they “weakly intersect properly” (Definition 3.1c). The definition of Ru and Wang uses the stronger condition that the ideals are generated by the actual elements of a regular sequence. In particular, (in the Cohen–Macaulay case) their result requires each Y_i to be a local complete intersection as a scheme, but this paper relaxes this condition somewhat—see Remark 2.11.

The generalization of Theorem 0.2 to be proved here is stated below as Theorem 0.9. This statement also describes the main theorem of Ru and Wang [2020pre], except that it is relative to the notion of proper intersection described in Remark 2.11 instead of Definition 3.1.

Heier and Levin [2017pre] have also proved a diophantine theorem on approximation to proper closed subschemes. In their theorem, closed subschemes of codimension

r may be repeated up to r times. In this paper, as well as in the paper of Ru and Wang, however, subschemes may not be repeated. Instead, $\beta(\mathcal{L}, Y_i)$ is usually larger for such subschemes, as is the case for linear subspaces of projective space (Proposition 9.2).

The definition of $\beta(\mathcal{L}, Y)$ for a proper closed subscheme Y of X is a straightforward extension of (0.1.1):

Definition 0.4 ([Ru and Wang 2020pre], Def. 1.2). Let \mathcal{L} be a big line sheaf on X , let Y be a nonempty proper closed subscheme of X , and let \mathcal{I} be the sheaf of ideals corresponding to Y . Then

$$(0.4.1) \quad \beta(\mathcal{L}, Y) = \liminf_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\sum_{m=1}^{\infty} h^0(X, \mathcal{L}^N \otimes \mathcal{I}^m)}{N h^0(X, \mathcal{L}^N)}.$$

Remark 0.5. A closely related definition was given by Ru and Wang ([2017], Def. 1.1):

$$(0.5.1) \quad \beta_{\mathcal{L}, Y} = \liminf_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\sum_{m=1}^{\infty} h^0(W, \pi^* \mathcal{L}^N(-mE))}{N h^0(X, \mathcal{L}^N)},$$

where $\pi: W \rightarrow X$ is the blowing-up of X along Y and E is the exceptional divisor, so in particular the two definitions coincide when Y is an effective Cartier divisor. In fact, they coincide for all Y ; see ([Ru and Wang 2020pre], Remark 1.3) when X is Cohen–Macaulay and Y is a local complete intersection, or Corollary 5.9 for the general case.

Another major goal of this paper is to show that these three beta constants all coincide (Corollary 5.9).

Remark 0.6. There is a “birational” version of Definition 0.1, in which D is replaced by a Cartier b-divisor \mathbf{D} . This constant is denoted $\beta(\mathcal{L}, \mathbf{D})$; see Definition 5.5. Since a proper closed subscheme is a special case of a b-divisor (see Definition 5.7), this leads to a constant $\beta(\mathcal{L}, \mathbf{Y})$ defined by a slightly different limit. This, as it turns out, has the same value as $\beta(\mathcal{L}, Y)$ and $\beta_{\mathcal{L}, Y}$ —see Corollary 5.9. Note also that in Definitions 0.1, 0.5, 5.5, and 0.4, the \liminf can be replaced by a limit whenever $\text{char } k = 0$. This is proved in Section 10.

Remark 0.7. The proof of Theorem 0.9 uses $\beta(\mathcal{L}, Y)$. This is because the Autissier property (see below) is not preserved by blowing up, so we work on Y .

Remark 0.8. It is possible to let \mathbf{D} be an \mathbb{R} -Cartier b-divisor in the definition of $\beta(\mathcal{L}, \mathbf{D})$. We have not done that here, though, as it would not provide any benefit (so far), but would involve additional complexity.

One defines Weil functions relative to proper closed subschemes Y on X by blowing up X along Y to obtain a Cartier divisor on the blow-up; see for example ([Silverman 1987], 2.2) or ([Yamanoi 2004], 2.2), in combination with ([Silverman 1987], Thm. 2.1(h)). These can then be used to define proximity and counting functions for Y . For details see Section 8.

With these definitions, the main theorem of this paper is as follows.

Theorem 0.9. *Let X be a complete variety over a field k , let \mathcal{L} be a big line sheaf on X , and let Y_1, \dots, Y_q be proper closed subschemes of X that weakly intersect properly (see Definition 3.1).*

- (a). **(Arithmetic part)** *Assume that k is a number field, and let S be a finite set of places of k . Then, for all $\epsilon > 0$ and all $C \in \mathbb{R}$, there is a proper Zariski-closed subset Z of X such that the inequality*

$$(0.9.1) \quad \sum_{i=1}^q \beta(\mathcal{L}, Y_i) m_S(Y_i, x) \leq (1 + \epsilon) h_{\mathcal{L}}(x) + C$$

holds for all points $x \in X(k) \setminus Z$.

- (b). **(Analytic part)** *Assume that $k = \mathbb{C}$. Then, for all $\epsilon > 0$, there is a proper Zariski-closed subset Z of X such that the inequality*

$$(0.9.2) \quad \sum_{i=1}^q \beta(\mathcal{L}, Y_i) m_f(Y_i, r) \leq_{\text{exc}} (1 + \epsilon) T_{f, \mathcal{L}}(r)$$

holds for all holomorphic mappings $f: \mathbb{C} \rightarrow X$ whose image is not contained in Z .

Diophantine inequalities for closed subschemes have already been obtained by other authors. For example, Ru and Wang [2017] proved the inequality

$$\sum_{i=1}^q m_S(Y_i, x) \leq \left(\ell \max_i \beta(\mathcal{L}, Y_i)^{-1} + \epsilon \right) h_{\mathcal{L}}(x),$$

where at most ℓ of the Y_i have nonempty intersection. This overlaps with our results here, but is not fully implied by our Theorem 0.9 because the latter theorem requires that the Y_i weakly intersect properly, but Ru and Wang only need the condition involving ℓ .

Heier and Levin [2017pre] also have an inequality involving closed subschemes. Their theorem again has weaker conditions on the Y_i (and in fact it allows some Y_i of codimension > 1 to be repeated). It is harder to compare their theorem to ours since their theorem involves Seshadri constants. Not much is known about how Seshadri constants compare with $\beta(\mathcal{L}, Y_i)$.

Theorem 0.9 will be proved by splitting it up into two theorems, involving a property due originally to Autissier ([2011], Lemme 3.3); see also Lemma 2.3. This will be expressed by saying that closed subschemes Y_1, \dots, Y_q **have the Autissier property**; see Definition 3.2.

These two theorems are the following.

Theorem 0.10. *Let X be a complete variety over a field k , and let Y_1, \dots, Y_q be proper closed subschemes of X . If Y_1, \dots, Y_q weakly intersect properly, then they have the Autissier property.*

Theorem 0.11. *Let X be a complete variety over a field k of characteristic 0, let \mathcal{L} be a big line sheaf on X , and let Y_1, \dots, Y_q be proper closed subschemes of X that have the Autissier property. Then (depending on k) part (a) or (b) of Theorem 0.9 holds.*

It is clear that the conjunction of these theorems implies Theorem 0.9.

The outline of the paper is as follows. Section 1 briefly gives some fundamental definitions used in the paper. Sections 2 and 3 give a version of Autissier's lemmas on ideals associated to saturated subsets of \mathbb{N}^r , in the local and global cases, respectively, leading up to the proof of Theorem 0.10 (see Proposition 3.3) and the proof in Section 4 that his function $N(\mathbf{t})$ is convex. These constitute the key insight of the paper. Section 5 develops the machinery that will be used to work with the ideal sheaves associated to the closed subschemes Y_i in the paper. Section 6 adapts work of Autissier [2011], as modified by Ru and Vojta [2020], to the current context, finishing the technical parts of the proof. Section 7 introduces a birational Nevanlinna constant for \mathbb{R} -Cartier \mathbf{b} -divisors, which is then used in Section 8 to finish the proof of Theorem 0.9. Section 9 explores the special case of linear subvarieties of \mathbb{P}^n . Finally, Section 10 gives a detailed proof of the fact that the limits infima in (0.1.1), (0.4.1), (0.5.1), and (5.5.1) (the definitions of $\beta(\mathcal{L}, D)$, $\beta(\mathcal{L}, Y)$, $\beta_{\mathcal{L}, Y}$, and $\beta(\mathcal{L}, \mathbf{D})$, respectively) can be replaced by limits (in characteristic 0).

I thank Min Ru for suggesting the idea of extending the Main Theorem of [Ru and Vojta 2020] to subschemes.

§1. Basic Notation and Conventions

The basic notations of this paper follow those of [Ru and Vojta 2020] and [Ru and Vojta 2020pre].

In this paper $\mathbb{N} = \{0, 1, 2, \dots\}$. Also $\mathbb{Z}_{>0} = \{1, 2, 3, \dots\}$, $\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} = \{x \in \mathbb{R} : x \geq 0\}$, etc.

A **variety** over a field k is an integral scheme, separated and of finite type over k . A **morphism** of varieties over k is a morphism of schemes over k .

Subschemes will always be assumed to be closed and proper (i.e., not the whole scheme).

§2. A Property of Autissier

This section extends ([Autissier 2011], Lemme 3.3) to accommodate subschemes of higher codimension.

This lemma motivates a definition of a property of subschemes, which basically says that they satisfy the conclusion of this lemma. This property will be called the *Autissier property*; see Definitions 2.12 and 3.2. The entire remainder of the proof of Theorem 0.9 hinges on this property.

Throughout this section, A is a noetherian local ring.

We start by recalling some definitions and a lemma of Autissier [2011].

Definition 2.1. Let $r \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$. A subset N of \mathbb{N}^r is **saturated** if it is nonempty and if $N \supseteq \mathbf{a} + \mathbb{N}^r$ for all $\mathbf{a} \in N$.

Definition 2.2. Let $\phi_1, \dots, \phi_r \in A$ with $r > 0$, and let N be a saturated subset of \mathbb{N}^r . Then $\mathcal{J}(N)$ is the ideal of A generated by the set $\{\phi_1^{b_1} \dots \phi_r^{b_r} : \mathbf{b} \in N\}$.

The key fact about this definition is the following lemma due to Autissier.

Lemma 2.3 ([Autissier 2011], Lemme 3.3). *Let ϕ_1, \dots, ϕ_r ($r > 0$) be a regular sequence in A , and let N_1 and N_2 be saturated subsets of \mathbb{N}^r . Then*

$$\mathcal{J}(N_1 \cap N_2) = \mathcal{J}(N_1) \cap \mathcal{J}(N_2).$$

Now we carry the above over to the situation of ideals in A .

Definition 2.4. Let I be an ideal of A and let ϕ_1, \dots, ϕ_r be a sequence of elements of A . Then I is of **monomial type** with respect to ϕ_1, \dots, ϕ_r if $r > 0$ and $I = \mathcal{J}(N)$ (taken relative to ϕ_1, \dots, ϕ_r) for some saturated subset N of \mathbb{N}^r .

Note that if I is of monomial type with respect to some sequence ϕ_1, \dots, ϕ_r , then so is I^n for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. This is immediate from the following lemma.

Lemma 2.5. *Let $r \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$ and let N be a saturated subset of \mathbb{N}^r . For all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ let*

$$(2.5.1) \quad nN = \begin{cases} \mathbb{N}^r & \text{if } n = 0; \\ \{\mathbf{b}_1 + \dots + \mathbf{b}_n : \mathbf{b}_1, \dots, \mathbf{b}_n \in N\} & \text{if } n > 0. \end{cases}$$

(When $n > 0$ this is the Minkowski sum of N with itself n times.) Then

- (a). nN is saturated for all n ;
- (b). $\mathcal{J}(N)^n = \mathcal{J}(nN)$ for all n ; and
- (c). $nN \subseteq mN$ for all $n \geq m \geq 0$.

Proof. Left to the reader. □

As a counterpart to Definition 2.2, but with closed subschemes in place of Cartier divisors, we have the following.

Definition 2.6. Let $q \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$, let I_1, \dots, I_q be ideals in A , and let N be a saturated subset of \mathbb{N}^q . Then $\mathcal{J}(N)$ is the ideal of A defined by

$$\mathcal{J}(N) = \sum_{\mathbf{b} \in N} I_1^{b_1} \dots I_q^{b_q}.$$

This can be expressed in terms of $\mathcal{J}(\cdot)$ as follows.

Definition 2.7. Let $q \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$. For each $i = 1, \dots, q$ let M_i be a saturated subset of \mathbb{N}^{r_i} with $r_i \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$. For all saturated subsets N of \mathbb{N}^q , we then define

$$(2.7.1) \quad M(N) = \bigcup_{\mathbf{c} \in N} c_1 M_1 \times \cdots \times c_q M_q .$$

This is a saturated subset of \mathbb{N}^r , where $r = r_1 + \cdots + r_q$.

Lemma 2.8. Let $q \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$. For each $i = 1, \dots, q$, let M_i be a saturated subset of \mathbb{N}^{r_i} and let $I_i = \mathcal{J}(M_i)$, taken relative to a nonempty sequence $\phi_{i1}, \dots, \phi_{ir_i}$ in A . Let N be a saturated subset of \mathbb{N}^q . Then

$$\mathcal{J}(N) = \mathcal{J}(M(N)) ,$$

where $\mathcal{J}(N)$ is taken with respect to I_1, \dots, I_q and $\mathcal{J}(M(N))$ is taken with respect to the sequence

$$(2.8.1) \quad \phi_{11}, \dots, \phi_{1r_1}, \dots, \phi_{q1}, \dots, \phi_{qr_q} .$$

Proof. This is immediate from Definitions 2.2, 2.6, and 2.7. See also ([Ru and Wang 2020pre], Lemma 3.3). \square

We can now state the main definitions and main result of this section.

Definition 2.9. Let I_1, \dots, I_q be ideals of A , with $q \in \mathbb{N}$. Then I_1, \dots, I_q **intersect properly** if (i) for each $i = 1, \dots, q$ there is a nonempty regular sequence $\phi_{i1}, \dots, \phi_{ir_i}$ in A such that I_i is of monomial type with respect to $\phi_{i1}, \dots, \phi_{ir_i}$; and (ii) the combined sequence (2.8.1) is a regular sequence.

Remark 2.10. Since the length of the sequence (2.8.1) is at most $\dim A$, we must have $q \leq \dim A$ whenever I_1, \dots, I_q intersect properly.

Remark 2.11. Ru and Wang [2020pre] say that I_1, \dots, I_q intersect properly if, in the notation of Definition 2.9, I_i is generated by $\phi_{i1}, \dots, \phi_{ir_i}$ for all i (and (2.8.1) is a regular sequence). In other words, this is the special case of Definition 2.9 in which the subset N of Definition 2.4 equals $\mathbb{N}^r \setminus \{\mathbf{0}\}$. One then obtains their notion of subschemes Y_1, \dots, Y_q intersecting properly by using this definition in place of Definition 2.9 in Definition 3.1.

As an example, assume that X contains an open subset isomorphic to $\mathbb{A}_k^2 = \operatorname{Spec} k[x, y]$. Then x, y is a regular sequence in the local ring at $(0, 0)$, so $I = (x, y)$ satisfies the hypotheses of Ru and Wang's theorem (and it is also of monomial type with respect to x and y). The ideal (x^3, xy, y^2) , however, does not satisfy their condition, but it is of monomial type in x, y , so it can be handled by Theorem 0.9.

Definition 2.12. Let I_1, \dots, I_q be ideals in A . We say that they **have the Autissier property** if

$$(2.12.1) \quad \mathcal{J}(N \cap N') = \mathcal{J}(N) \cap \mathcal{J}(N')$$

for all saturated subsets N and N' of \mathbb{N}^q .

Proposition 2.13. *Let I_1, \dots, I_q be ideals in A . If they intersect properly, then they have the Autissier property.*

Proof. By Lemmas 2.8 and 2.3, we immediately reduce to showing that

$$(2.13.1) \quad M(N \cap N') = M(N) \cap M(N') .$$

To prove this, we first need some basic facts on the product ordering on \mathbb{N}^q .

Recall that the product ordering on \mathbb{N}^q is defined by $\mathbf{a} \leq \mathbf{b}$ if and only if $a_i \leq b_i$ for all $i = 1, \dots, q$. This ordering is a lattice; in particular, for any $\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b} \in \mathbb{N}^q$, the join, or least upper bound, of \mathbf{a} and \mathbf{b} is the element $\mathbf{a} \vee \mathbf{b} = \mathbf{c} \in \mathbb{N}^q$ defined by $c_i = \max\{a_i, b_i\}$ for all i .

Now we note that if N and N' are saturated subsets of \mathbb{N}^q , then

$$(2.13.2) \quad \{\mathbf{c} \vee \mathbf{c}' : \mathbf{c} \in N, \mathbf{c}' \in N'\} = N \cap N' .$$

Indeed, the inclusion “ \supseteq ” is immediate by taking $\mathbf{c}' = \mathbf{c}$ for all $\mathbf{c} \in N \cap N'$. Conversely, if $\mathbf{c}'' = \mathbf{c} \vee \mathbf{c}'$ with $\mathbf{c} \in N$ and $\mathbf{c}' \in N'$, then $\mathbf{c}'' \in N$ and $\mathbf{c}'' \in N'$ because N and N' are saturated (respectively); hence $\mathbf{c}'' \in N \cap N'$.

Then, by (2.7.1), distributivity of \cap over \cup , compatibility of intersection and product, Lemma 2.5c, (2.13.2), and (2.7.1) again, we have

$$\begin{aligned} M(N) \cap M(N') &= \left(\bigcup_{\mathbf{c} \in N} c_1 M_1 \times \cdots \times c_q M_q \right) \cap \left(\bigcup_{\mathbf{c}' \in N'} c'_1 M_1 \times \cdots \times c'_q M_q \right) \\ &= \bigcup_{\substack{\mathbf{c} \in N \\ \mathbf{c}' \in N'}} ((c_1 M_1 \times \cdots \times c_q M_q) \cap (c'_1 M_1 \times \cdots \times c'_q M_q)) \\ &= \bigcup_{\mathbf{c}, \mathbf{c}'} ((c_1 M_1 \cap c'_1 M_1) \times \cdots \times (c_q M_q \cap c'_q M_q)) \\ &= \bigcup_{\mathbf{c}, \mathbf{c}'} \max\{c_1, c'_1\} M_1 \times \cdots \times \max\{c_q, c'_q\} M_q \\ &= \bigcup_{\mathbf{c}'' \in N \cap N'} c''_1 M_1 \times \cdots \times c''_q M_q \\ &= M(N \cap N') . \end{aligned}$$

This gives (2.13.1). □

Turning to consequences of the Autissier property, in the local setting we only need the following.

Proposition 2.14 ([Autissier 2011], Remarque 3.4) and ([Ru and Vojta 2020], Remark 6.3)). Let $q \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$, let

$$(2.14.1) \quad \square = \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^q \setminus \{\mathbf{0}\},$$

and for all $\mathbf{t} \in \square$ and all $x \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ let

$$(2.14.2) \quad N(\mathbf{t}, x) = \{\mathbf{b} \in \mathbb{N}^q : t_1 b_1 + \cdots + t_q b_q \geq x\}.$$

Let I_1, \dots, I_q be ideals in A that have the Autissier property. Then

$$(2.14.3) \quad \mathcal{J}(N(\mathbf{t}, x)) \cap \mathcal{J}(N(\mathbf{u}, y)) \subseteq \mathcal{J}(N(\lambda \mathbf{t} + (1 - \lambda)\mathbf{u}, \lambda x + (1 - \lambda)y))$$

for all $\mathbf{t}, \mathbf{u} \in \square$, all $x, y \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$, and all $\lambda \in [0, 1]$.

Proof. This is immediate from Definition 2.12 and the observation that

$$N(\mathbf{t}, x) \cap N(\mathbf{u}, y) \subseteq N(\lambda \mathbf{t} + (1 - \lambda)\mathbf{u}, \lambda x + (1 - \lambda)y). \quad \square$$

Remark 2.15. An interesting theory of regular sequences of ideals has been developed by Jothilingham, et al. [2011]. In this theory, ideals I_1, \dots, I_q of A are said to be a **regular sequence of ideals** if all of them are nonzero and proper, and if

$$(I_1 + \cdots + I_j) \cap I_{j+1} = (I_1 + \cdots + I_j) \cdot I_{j+1}$$

for all $j = 1, \dots, q - 1$. This extends the definition of a regular sequence of elements of a local ring, in the sense that a sequence $(x_1), \dots, (x_q)$ of principal ideals in A is regular if and only if the elements x_1, \dots, x_q form a regular sequence.

Although it was very tempting to write this paper using the concept of regular sequences of ideals, ultimately we decided not to. This was because many of the results of [Jothilingham, et al. 2011] (e.g., Theorem 1) assumed that A was a regular local ring; in addition, there were other difficulties in trying to rewrite the proof of ([Autissier 2011], Lemme 6.2) directly in terms of a regular sequence of ideals.

§3. The Autissier Property of Subschemes

This brief section carries over Definitions 2.9 and 2.12 and Proposition 2.13 to the case of subschemes.

First we start with the definitions.

Throughout this section, X is a complete variety over a field k and Y_1, \dots, Y_q are proper closed subschemes of X .

Definition 3.1. Let $\mathcal{I}_1, \dots, \mathcal{I}_q$ be the ideal sheaves that correspond to Y_1, \dots, Y_q , respectively.

- (a). We say that Y_1, \dots, Y_q **intersect properly** at a point $P \in X$ if the subsequence of proper ideals in the sequence $(\mathcal{I}_1)_P, \dots, (\mathcal{I}_q)_P$ of ideals of the local ring $\mathcal{O}_{X,P}$ intersect properly (in the sense of Definition 2.9). (If the subsequence is trivial, i.e., if $P \notin \bigcup Y_i$, then this is vacuously true.)
- (b). We say that Y_1, \dots, Y_q **intersect properly** if Y_1, \dots, Y_q intersect properly at all points of X .
- (c). We say that Y_1, \dots, Y_q **weakly intersect properly** if they intersect properly at all $P \in \bigcup_{i \neq j} (Y_i \cap Y_j)$.

Clearly, if Y_1, \dots, Y_q intersect properly, then they also weakly intersect properly.

Definition 3.2. Let $\mathcal{I}_1, \dots, \mathcal{I}_q$ be as in Definition 3.1.

- (a). Let $P \in X$, and let j_1, \dots, j_r be the subsequence of $1, \dots, q$ consisting of those j such that $P \in Y_j$. We say that Y_1, \dots, Y_q **have the Autissier property** at P if

$$(3.2.1) \quad \mathcal{I}(N \cap N') = \mathcal{I}(N) \cap \mathcal{I}(N')$$

for all saturated subsets N and N' of \mathbb{N}^r , where \mathcal{I} is taken with respect to the sequence $(\mathcal{I}_{j_1})_P, \dots, (\mathcal{I}_{j_r})_P$ of (proper) ideals of $\mathcal{O}_{X,P}$. (This is equivalent to saying that $(\mathcal{I}_{j_1})_P, \dots, (\mathcal{I}_{j_r})_P$ have the Autissier property as in Definition 2.12).

- (b). We say that Y_1, \dots, Y_q **have the Autissier property** if they have the Autissier property at all $P \in X$.

Corresponding to Proposition 2.13, we then have the following, which is Theorem 0.10.

Proposition 3.3. *If Y_1, \dots, Y_q weakly intersect properly, then they have the Autissier property.*

Proof. First, note that if $P \in X \setminus \bigcup_{i \neq j} (Y_i \cap Y_j)$; i.e., if $P \in X$ lies in at most one of the Y_i , then the Autissier property holds trivially at P , because (3.2.1) is trivial when $r \leq 1$.

For all $P \in \bigcup_{i \neq j} (Y_i \cap Y_j)$, we then have that Y_1, \dots, Y_q intersect properly at P ; therefore they have the Autissier property at P by Proposition 2.13. \square

(Of course, if Y_1, \dots, Y_q intersect properly, then the first paragraph of the above proof is unnecessary.)

§4. Filtrations and Convexity

This section summarizes the core of Autissier's argument in [Autissier 2011], as adapted for working with subschemes.

Throughout this section, we fix a complete variety X over k and proper closed subschemes Y_1, \dots, Y_q of X . Let $\mathcal{I}_1, \dots, \mathcal{I}_q$ be the sheaves of ideals in \mathcal{O}_X , corresponding to Y_1, \dots, Y_q , respectively.

We start with some definitions.

Definition 4.1. Let \square and $N(\mathbf{t}, x)$ be as in Proposition 2.14.

(a). Let N be a saturated subset of \mathbb{N}^q . Then

$$(4.1.1) \quad \mathcal{I}_X(N) = \sum_{\mathbf{b} \in N} \mathcal{I}_1^{b_1} \dots \mathcal{I}_q^{b_q}.$$

This is a coherent ideal sheaf in \mathcal{O}_X .

(b). For each $\mathbf{t} \in \square$ and all $x \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$, let

$$(4.1.2) \quad \mathcal{I}_X(\mathbf{t}, x) = \mathcal{I}_X(N(\mathbf{t}, x)) = \sum_{\mathbf{b} \in N(\mathbf{t}, x)} \mathcal{I}_1^{b_1} \dots \mathcal{I}_q^{b_q}.$$

(c). Fix a line sheaf \mathcal{L} on X , and let \mathbf{t} and x be as above. Then we let

$$(4.1.3) \quad \mathcal{F}(\mathbf{t})_x = \mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{L}}(\mathbf{t})_x = H^0(X, \mathcal{L} \otimes \mathcal{I}_X(\mathbf{t}, x)).$$

Then $(\mathcal{F}(\mathbf{t})_x)_{x \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}}$ is a descending filtration of $H^0(X, \mathcal{L})$ that satisfies $\mathcal{F}(\mathbf{t})_x = 0$ for all $x \gg 0$.

(d). Finally, for all $\mathbf{t} \in \square$ we let

$$(4.1.4) \quad F(\mathbf{t}) = F_{\mathcal{L}}(\mathbf{t}) = \frac{1}{h^0(X, \mathcal{L})} \int_0^\infty (\dim \mathcal{F}(\mathbf{t})_x) dx.$$

In terms of this definition, Proposition 2.14 gives the following.

Lemma 4.3. Assume that Y_1, \dots, Y_q have the Autissier property, and let \mathcal{L} be a line sheaf on X . Let \square and $N(\mathbf{t}, x)$ be as in Proposition 2.14. Then

$$(4.3.1) \quad \mathcal{F}(\mathbf{t})_x \cap \mathcal{F}(\mathbf{u})_y \subseteq \mathcal{F}(\lambda \mathbf{t} + (1 - \lambda) \mathbf{u})_{\lambda x + (1 - \lambda)y}$$

for all $\mathbf{t}, \mathbf{u} \in \square$, all $x, y \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$, and all $\lambda \in [0, 1]$.

Proof. Let $\mathbf{t}, \mathbf{u}, x, y, \lambda$ be as above. By Proposition 2.14 (applied at all $P \in X$),

$$(4.3.2) \quad \mathcal{I}_X(\mathbf{t}, x) \cap \mathcal{I}_X(\mathbf{u}, y) \subseteq \mathcal{I}_X(\lambda \mathbf{t} + (1 - \lambda) \mathbf{u}, \lambda x + (1 - \lambda)y).$$

This remains true after tensoring with \mathcal{L} , and (4.3.1) then follows because the global section functor is left exact. \square

We then have the following concavity theorem of Autissier ([2011], Théorème 3.6) (see also ([Ru and Vojta 2020], Prop. 6.7)).

Theorem 4.4. *Let $\mathcal{F}(\mathbf{t})_x$ ($\mathbf{t} \in \square$, $x \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$) and $F: \square \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be as in Definition 4.1. Let $\beta_1, \dots, \beta_q \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$. If (4.3.1) holds, then the inequality*

$$(4.4.1) \quad F(\mathbf{t}) \geq \min_{1 \leq i \leq q} \left(\frac{1}{\beta_i} \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} \frac{h^0(X, \mathcal{L} \otimes \mathcal{I}_i^m)}{h^0(X, \mathcal{L})} \right)$$

holds for all $\mathbf{t} \in \square$ for which $\sum \beta_i t_i = 1$.

Proof. See ([Ru and Vojta 2020], Prop. 6.7). □

The results of this section can then be summarized as follows.

Theorem 4.5. *If Y_1, \dots, Y_q have the Autissier property and if $\beta_1, \dots, \beta_q \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$, then (4.4.1) holds.*

This provides a slight strengthening of the “General Theorem” of [Ru and Vojta 2020]: in that theorem, the divisors D_i were assumed to be Cartier, but this condition has been relaxed so that they only need to be Cartier at points where they meet other divisors in the collection.

§5. Ideal Sheaves and B-divisors

The remainder of the proof in [Ru and Vojta 2020] involves Prop. 4.18 of that paper, so it is necessary to interpret things such as $H^0(X, \mathcal{L} \otimes \mathcal{I}_1^{b_1} \dots \mathcal{I}_q^{b_q})$ in terms of Cartier b-divisors. This is quite easy, because ideal sheaves are special cases of b-divisors. That is the topic of this section.

Throughout this section, X is a complete variety over a field k , unless otherwise specified.

We briefly recall that a **model** of X is a proper birational morphism $\pi: W \rightarrow X$ of varieties over k , and a **Cartier b-divisor** \mathbf{D} on X is an equivalence class of pairs $(W, D) = (\pi: W \rightarrow X, D)$, where $\pi: W \rightarrow X$ is a model of X and D is a Cartier divisor on W ; here pairs (W_1, D_1) and (W_2, D_2) are said to be equivalent if there exist a model W_3 of X and morphisms $f_i: W_3 \rightarrow W_i$ over X for $i = 1, 2$ such that $f_1^* D_1 = f_2^* D_2$. For more details and basic properties, see ([Ru and Vojta 2020], § 4).

We start with some basic results about spaces of global sections of line sheaves on projective varieties. The first result is a general result on growth of cohomology groups, and is essentially due to the Stacks project authors ([2020], Lemma 0BEM). The latter lemma says that the Euler characteristic of the sheaves $\mathcal{F} \otimes \mathcal{L}_1^{n_1} \otimes \dots \otimes \mathcal{L}_r^{n_r}$ is a numerical polynomial in n_1, \dots, n_r of a certain degree. Although the lemma below gives instead a bound on the dimensions of the cohomology groups of these sheaves, the method of proof is the same. These upper bounds will only be needed for h^0 , but we will prove the general case as it is no more difficult.

Lemma 5.1. *Let X be a proper scheme over a field k , let \mathcal{F} be a coherent sheaf on X , let $d = \dim \text{Supp } \mathcal{F}$, and let $\mathcal{L}_1, \dots, \mathcal{L}_r$ be line sheaves on X . Then*

$$h^i(X, \mathcal{F} \otimes \mathcal{L}_1^{n_1} \otimes \dots \otimes \mathcal{L}_r^{n_r}) \leq O(|\mathbf{n}|^d + 1)$$

for all $\mathbf{n} = (n_1 + \dots + n_r) \in \mathbb{N}^r$ and all i , where the implicit constant depends only on X , k , \mathcal{F} , and $\mathcal{L}_1, \dots, \mathcal{L}_r$.

Proof. We give a sketch of this proof, following [Stacks project authors 2020], including all places where the proofs differ.

For typographical simplicity, we let $\mathcal{L}^{\mathbf{n}}$ denote $\mathcal{L}_1^{n_1} \otimes \dots \otimes \mathcal{L}_r^{n_r}$ (multiindex notation) for all $\mathbf{n} \in \mathbb{N}^r$.

The proof is by induction on d . The base case $d = 0$ (including also $\text{Supp } \mathcal{F} = \emptyset$) is trivial.

First, if \mathcal{F} contains embedded points, then by ([Stacks project authors 2020], Lemma 02OL) there is a short exact sequence

$$(5.1.1) \quad 0 \rightarrow \mathcal{K} \rightarrow \mathcal{F} \rightarrow \mathcal{F}' \rightarrow 0$$

of coherent sheaves such that $\dim \text{Supp } \mathcal{K} < d$ and \mathcal{F}' has no embedded points. It remains exact after tensoring with $\mathcal{L}^{\mathbf{n}}$, so by the long exact sequence in cohomology and the inductive hypothesis we have

$$|h^i(X, \mathcal{F} \otimes \mathcal{L}^{\mathbf{n}}) - h^i(X, \mathcal{F}' \otimes \mathcal{L}^{\mathbf{n}})| \leq O(|\mathbf{n}|^{d-1} + 1).$$

Therefore it suffices to prove the lemma when \mathcal{F} has no embedded points.

We may replace X with $\text{Supp } \mathcal{F}$ (this does not change the cohomologies), so we may assume that $\dim X = d$ and that X has no embedded points. In this situation, by ([Stacks project authors 2020], Lemmas 02OZ and 02P2), there exist a coherent ideal sheaf \mathcal{I} on X and short exact sequences

$$0 \rightarrow \mathcal{I}\mathcal{F} \rightarrow \mathcal{F} \rightarrow \mathcal{Q} \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{and} \quad 0 \rightarrow \mathcal{I}\mathcal{F} \rightarrow \mathcal{F} \otimes \mathcal{L}_1 \rightarrow \mathcal{Q}' \rightarrow 0$$

such that $\dim \text{Supp } \mathcal{Q} < d$ and $\dim \text{Supp } \mathcal{Q}' < d$. Again tensoring with $\mathcal{L}^{\mathbf{n}}$ and applying the long exact sequence and the inductive hypothesis, we have

$$|h^i(X, \mathcal{F} \otimes \mathcal{L}^{\mathbf{n}}) - h^i(X, \mathcal{I}\mathcal{F} \otimes \mathcal{L}^{\mathbf{n}})| \leq O(|\mathbf{n}|^{d-1} + 1)$$

and

$$|h^i(X, \mathcal{F} \otimes \mathcal{L}^{\mathbf{n}} \otimes \mathcal{L}_1) - h^i(X, \mathcal{I}\mathcal{F} \otimes \mathcal{L}^{\mathbf{n}})| \leq O(|\mathbf{n}|^{d-1} + 1)$$

for all \mathbf{n} and all i . Combining these inequalities, and using a symmetrical argument, we obtain

$$|h^i(X, \mathcal{F} \otimes \mathcal{L}^{\mathbf{n}} \otimes \mathcal{L}_j) - h^i(X, \mathcal{F} \otimes \mathcal{L}^{\mathbf{n}})| \leq O(|\mathbf{n}|^{d-1} + 1)$$

for all \mathbf{n} , all i , and all $j = 1, \dots, r$.

Applying this inequality $|\mathbf{n}|$ times then gives

$$|h^i(X, \mathcal{F} \otimes \mathcal{L}^{\mathbf{n}}) - h^i(X, \mathcal{F})| \leq O(|\mathbf{n}|^d + 1),$$

and the result follows. \square

The following lemma applies this to give bounds more directly applicable to the current situation.

Lemma 5.2. *Let $\pi: W' \rightarrow W$ be a proper birational morphism of complete varieties over a field k .*

- (a). *Assume that W is normal. Then $\pi_*\pi^*\mathcal{L} \cong \mathcal{L}$ for all line sheaves \mathcal{L} on W , and the natural map $H^0(W, \mathcal{L}) \rightarrow H^0(W', \pi^*\mathcal{L})$ is an isomorphism.*
- (b). *For general W , the coherent sheaf $\mathcal{F} = \pi_*\mathcal{O}_{W'}/\mathcal{O}_W$ on W is supported on a proper subset of W , and*

$$(5.2.1) \quad 0 \leq h^0(W', \pi^*\mathcal{L}) - h^0(W, \mathcal{L}) \leq h^0(W, \mathcal{F} \otimes \mathcal{L})$$

for all line sheaves \mathcal{L} on W .

- (c). *Let \mathcal{L} be a line sheaf on W , let D be a Cartier divisor on W , and let $d = \dim W$. Then*

$$(5.2.2) \quad 0 \leq h^0(W', \pi^*\mathcal{L}^N(-m\pi^*D)) - h^0(W, \mathcal{L}^N(-mD)) \leq O((N+m)^{d-1})$$

for all $N \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$ and all $m \in \mathbb{N}$, where the implicit constant depends on π , k , \mathcal{L} , and D , but not on N or m .

- (d). *Under the same conditions as (c),*

$$(5.2.3) \quad 0 \leq \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} h^0(W', \pi^*\mathcal{L}^N(-m\pi^*D)) - \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} h^0(W, \mathcal{L}^N(-mD)) \leq O(N^d).$$

Proof. For part (a), we first note that $\pi_*\mathcal{O}_{W'} = \mathcal{O}_W$ (as subsheaves on the constant sheaves of the function field $K(W') \cong K(W)$) by ([Hartshorne 1977], II Prop. 6.3A) and the fact that W is normal. Therefore the projection formula gives $\pi_*\pi^*\mathcal{L} \cong \mathcal{L}$, and taking global sections gives $H^0(W', \pi^*\mathcal{L}) \cong H^0(W, \mathcal{L})$.

For (b), we have an exact sequence

$$0 \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_W \rightarrow \pi_*\mathcal{O}_{W'} \rightarrow \mathcal{F} \rightarrow 0$$

of sheaves on W , where \mathcal{F} is supported on a proper subset of W . Tensoring each term with \mathcal{L} and taking global sections then gives an exact sequence

$$(5.2.4) \quad 0 \rightarrow H^0(W, \mathcal{L}) \rightarrow H^0(W', \pi^*\mathcal{L}) \rightarrow H^0(W, \mathcal{F} \otimes \mathcal{L}),$$

which gives (5.2.1).

By (b), part (c) is a matter of showing that

$$h^0(W, \mathcal{F} \otimes \mathcal{L}^N(-mD)) \leq O((N+m)^{d-1})$$

for all N and m . This is immediate from Lemma 5.1 with $\mathcal{L}_1 = \mathcal{L}$ and $\mathcal{L}_2 = \mathcal{O}(-D)$, since $\dim \text{Supp } \mathcal{F} \leq d-1$.

For (d), the lower bound holds (termwise) by the first part of (5.2.2).

For the upper bound, we first note that there is a constant c (independent of N and m) such that the summands in (5.2.3) vanish for all $m > cN$. Indeed, let $\pi'': W'' \rightarrow W'$ be a projective model of W that dominates W' and let A be an ample divisor on W'' ; then it suffices to take $c \geq (\pi''^* \mathcal{L} \cdot A^{d-1}) / (\pi''^* D \cdot A^{d-1})$, where in this case A^{d-1} is meant in the sense of intersection theory.

The sums then have $O(N)$ nonzero terms with $m \leq O(N)$, so the upper bound follows from (5.2.2). \square

Definition 5.3. Let \mathcal{L} be a line sheaf on X and let \mathbf{D} be an effective Cartier b-divisor on X . Then

$$H_{\text{bir}}^0(X, \mathcal{L}(-\mathbf{D})) = H^0(W, \pi^* \mathcal{L}(-D)),$$

where $\pi: W \rightarrow X$ is any normal model of X on which \mathbf{D} is represented by a Cartier divisor D . This is independent of the choice of W by Lemma 5.2a.

Also (as usual)

$$h_{\text{bir}}^0(X, \mathcal{L}(-\mathbf{D})) = \dim_k H_{\text{bir}}^0(X, \mathcal{L}(-\mathbf{D})).$$

When $\mathbf{D} = 0$, these are also denoted $H_{\text{bir}}^0(X, \mathcal{L})$ and $h_{\text{bir}}^0(X, \mathcal{L})$, respectively.

The subscript “bir” is needed because $H_{\text{bir}}^0(X, \mathcal{L})$ may differ from $H^0(X, \mathcal{L})$ if X is not normal.

Lemma 5.4. Let \mathcal{L} be a line sheaf on X , let D be a nonzero effective Cartier divisor on X , and let $d = \dim X$. Then

$$(5.4.1) \quad h_{\text{bir}}^0(X, \mathcal{L}^N) = h^0(X, \mathcal{L}^N) + O(N^{d-1})$$

and

$$(5.4.2) \quad \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} h_{\text{bir}}^0(X, \mathcal{L}^N(-mD)) = \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} h^0(X, \mathcal{L}^N(-mD)) + O(N^d)$$

as $N \rightarrow \infty$, where the implicit constants depend only on \mathcal{L} and D . In particular, if \mathcal{L} is big, then

$$(5.4.3) \quad \beta(\mathcal{L}, D) = \liminf_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\sum_{m=1}^{\infty} h_{\text{bir}}^0(X, \mathcal{L}^N(-mD))}{N h_{\text{bir}}^0(X, \mathcal{L}^N)}.$$

Proof. First of all, by Lemma 5.2a, $h_{\text{bir}}^0(X, \mathcal{L}^N(-mD))$ for all $N, m \in \mathbb{N}$ can be computed on a fixed normal model W of X , independent of N and m .

Then (5.4.1) is immediate from Lemma 5.2c.

For (5.4.2), note that $h_{\text{bir}}^0(X, \mathcal{L}^N(-mD)) = h^0(W, \pi^* \mathcal{L}^N(-mD))$ for any normal model $\pi: W \rightarrow X$. Then (5.4.2) is immediate from Lemma 5.2d applied to any such model π .

Finally, since \mathcal{L} is big, (5.4.3) follows easily from (5.4.1) and (5.4.2). \square

Therefore we may extend Definition 0.1 as follows.

Definition 5.5. Let \mathcal{L} be a big line sheaf on X and let \mathbf{D} be a nonzero effective Cartier b-divisor on X . Then

$$(5.5.1) \quad \beta(\mathcal{L}, \mathbf{D}) = \liminf_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\sum_{m=1}^{\infty} h_{\text{bir}}^0(X, \mathcal{L}^N(-m\mathbf{D}))}{Nh_{\text{bir}}^0(X, \mathcal{L}^N)}.$$

Remark 5.6. As noted in [Ru and Vojta 2020] (following Def. 1.9), the above \liminf is actually a limit when \mathcal{L} is big and D is a Cartier divisor. A detailed proof is given in Section 10, including the case when \mathbf{D} is a b-divisor.

Now we consider b-divisors associated to proper closed subschemes.

Definition 5.7. Let Y be a proper closed subscheme of X , and let \mathcal{I} be the corresponding ideal sheaf. Let $\pi: W \rightarrow X$ be the blow-up of X along \mathcal{I} , and let E be the exceptional divisor of π (so that $\mathcal{O}(E) = \mathcal{O}(-1)$ for the blowing-up). Then the Cartier b-divisor \mathbf{Y} associated to Y is the b-divisor represented by E on W .

Next we compare the relevant spaces of global sections.

Lemma 5.8. Let \mathcal{L} be a line sheaf on X .

- (a). Let Y , \mathcal{I} , $\pi: W \rightarrow X$, and E be as in Definition 5.7. Let $m \in \mathbb{N}$. Then the restriction to \mathcal{I}^m of the natural map $\mathcal{O}_X \hookrightarrow \pi_* \mathcal{O}_W$ gives a map

$$(5.8.1) \quad \mathcal{I}^m \hookrightarrow \pi_*(\mathcal{O}_W(-mE)).$$

This gives an injection

$$(5.8.2) \quad H^0(X, \mathcal{L} \otimes \mathcal{I}^m) \hookrightarrow H^0(W, \pi^* \mathcal{L}(-mE)).$$

- (b). The map (5.8.2) is an isomorphism for all sufficiently large m , independent of \mathcal{L} .
- (c). For each $i = 1, \dots, q$ let Y_i be a proper closed subscheme of X , and let \mathbf{Y}_i and \mathcal{I}_i be the corresponding Cartier b-divisor and ideal sheaf on X , respectively. Then, for all $n_1, \dots, n_q \in \mathbb{N}$, there is a canonical injection

$$(5.8.3) \quad H^0(X, \mathcal{L} \otimes \mathcal{I}_1^{n_1} \cdots \mathcal{I}_q^{n_q}) \hookrightarrow H_{\text{bir}}^0(X, \mathcal{L}(-n_1 \mathbf{Y}_1 - \cdots - n_q \mathbf{Y}_q)),$$

induced by the maps of part (a) for all i .

Proof. With notation as in part (a), let U be an open subset of X . Then any local section $s \in \Gamma(U, \mathcal{I})$ pulls back to a section of $\pi^{-1} \mathcal{I} \cdot \mathcal{O}_W = \mathcal{O}(1) = \mathcal{O}(-E)$ over $\pi^{-1}(U)$; see ([Hartshorne 1977], II Prop. 7.13). This gives (5.8.1).

Tensoring both sides of (5.8.1) with \mathcal{L} and applying the projection formula gives an injection $\mathcal{L} \otimes \mathcal{I}^m \hookrightarrow \pi_*(\pi^* \mathcal{L}(-mE))$, which then gives (5.8.2).

For part (b), it suffices to show that the map (5.8.1) is surjective (hence an isomorphism) for all $m \gg 0$. This map can be written $\mathcal{I}^m \rightarrow \pi_* \mathcal{O}_W(m)$. The fact that it is surjective for all $m \gg 0$ is noted at the very end of the proof of ([Hartshorne 1977], II Thm. 5.19). (This is shown locally over open affines of X , but extends to all of X by a compactness argument.)

For part (c), let $\pi: W \rightarrow X$ be any normal model of X that dominates the blowings-up of X along Y_i for all i . Since $\mathcal{L} \otimes \mathcal{I}_1^{n_1} \cdots \mathcal{I}_q^{n_q}$ is locally generated by products of local sections of \mathcal{L} and of $\mathcal{I}_1^{n_1}, \dots, \mathcal{I}_q^{n_q}$, we obtain from (5.8.1) an injection $\mathcal{L} \otimes \mathcal{I}_1^{n_1} \cdots \mathcal{I}_q^{n_q} \hookrightarrow \pi_*(\pi^* \mathcal{L}(-n_1 E_1 - \cdots - n_q E_q))$, which gives (5.8.3). \square

We conclude this section by proving the assertions of Remarks 0.5 and 0.6.

Corollary 5.9. *Let Y be a proper closed subscheme of X and let \mathbf{Y} be the corresponding b -divisor. Let \mathcal{L} be a big line sheaf on X . Then:*

- (a). *Recalling Definitions 0.4, 0.5, and 5.5,*
- (5.9.1)
$$\beta(\mathcal{L}, Y) = \beta_{\mathcal{L}, Y} = \beta(\mathcal{L}, \mathbf{Y}).$$
- (b). *If any of these three quantities can be computed by evaluating the corresponding limits, then all of them can.*

Proof. Let \mathcal{I} , $\pi: W \rightarrow X$, and E be as in Definition 5.7, and let $d = \dim X$. For all $m \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$ let \mathcal{F}_m be the cokernel of the map (5.8.1); by Lemma 5.8b there is an m_0 such that $\mathcal{F}_m = 0$ for all $m > m_0$. Tensoring the short exact sequence $0 \rightarrow \mathcal{I}^m \rightarrow \pi_* \mathcal{O}_W(-mE) \rightarrow \mathcal{F}_m \rightarrow 0$ with \mathcal{L}^N and taking global sections then gives

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &\leq \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} h^0(W, \pi^* \mathcal{L}^N(-mE)) - \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} h^0(X, \mathcal{L}^N \otimes \mathcal{I}^m) \\ &\leq \sum_{m=1}^{m_0} h^0(X, \mathcal{F}_m \otimes \mathcal{L}^N) \\ &\leq O(N^{d-1} + 1) \end{aligned}$$

for all $N > 0$, by Lemma 5.2c. This gives

$$(5.9.2) \quad \liminf_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\sum_{m=1}^{\infty} h^0(X, \mathcal{L}^N \otimes \mathcal{I}^m)}{N h^0(X, \mathcal{L}^N)} = \liminf_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\sum_{m=1}^{\infty} h^0(W, \pi^* \mathcal{L}^N(-mE))}{N h^0(X, \mathcal{L}^N)},$$

which is the first equality $\beta(\mathcal{L}, Y) = \beta_{\mathcal{L}, Y}$ of (5.9.1).

The second equality $\beta_{\mathcal{L}, Y} = \beta(\mathcal{L}, \mathbf{Y})$ is a matter of showing that

$$(5.9.3) \quad \liminf_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\sum_{m=1}^{\infty} h^0(W, \pi^* \mathcal{L}^N(-mE))}{N h^0(X, \mathcal{L}^N)} = \liminf_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\sum_{m=1}^{\infty} h_{\text{bir}}^0(X, \mathcal{L}^N(-m\mathbf{D}))}{N h_{\text{bir}}^0(X, \mathcal{L}^N)}$$

This is true by (5.4.2) and (5.4.1).

Part (b) is immediate from the fact that (5.9.2) and (5.9.3) remain true (for the same reasons) when all instances of \liminf are replaced by \limsup . \square

§6. An Inequality of B-divisors

This section continues with the proof of Theorem 0.11, by applying the method of Autissier ([2011], § 4) as adapted in [Ru and Vojta 2020], leading up to an inequality of \mathbb{R} -Cartier b-divisors (Lemma 6.9). This closely follows the proof in ([Ru and Vojta 2020], § 6), but we simplify it here by eliminating the sets Σ and Δ_σ (see Remark 6.10).

We start with some notation. Let X and Y_1, \dots, Y_q be as in the statement of Theorem 0.11, and let $\beta_1, \dots, \beta_q \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$. Let b and N be large positive integers, to be chosen later (Proposition 7.4).

Let

$$\Delta = \{\mathbf{t} \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^q : t_1 + \dots + t_q = 1\}.$$

Recalling that $b \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$, let

$$\Delta_b = \left\{ \mathbf{a} \in \prod_{i=1}^q \beta_i^{-1} \mathbb{N} : \sum \beta_i a_i = b \right\},$$

so that $b^{-1}\Delta_b$ is a finite discrete subset of Δ .

Recall from Sections 2 and 4 that $\square = \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^q \setminus \{\mathbf{0}\}$ and that

$$N(\mathbf{t}, x) = \{\mathbf{b} \in \mathbb{N}^q : \sum t_i b_i \geq x\}, \quad \mathbf{t} \in \square, x \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}.$$

Let $F = F_{\mathcal{L}^N} : \square \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be the function of Definition 4.1. Write $b^{-1}\mathbf{a} = \mathbf{a}/b$ for all $\mathbf{a} \in \Delta_b$, and recall that

$$F(\mathbf{a}/b) = \int_0^\infty \frac{\dim \mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{L}^N}(\mathbf{a}/b)_x}{h^0(X, \mathcal{L}^N)} dx,$$

where $(\mathcal{F}(\mathbf{a}/b))_x = (\mathcal{F}_{\mathcal{L}^N}(\mathbf{a}/b))_x$ is the filtration of $H^0(X, \mathcal{L}^N)$ given by

$$\mathcal{F}(\mathbf{a}/b)_x = H^0(X, \mathcal{L}^N \otimes \mathcal{I}_X(\mathbf{a}/b, x))$$

and

$$\mathcal{I}_X(\mathbf{a}/b, x) = \sum_{\mathbf{b} \in N(\mathbf{a}/b, x)} \mathcal{I}_1^{b_1} \dots \mathcal{I}_q^{b_q}.$$

For all $\mathbf{a} \in \Delta_b$ and $x \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ let $K = K(\mathbf{a}/b, x)$ be the set of minimal elements in $N(\mathbf{a}/b, x)$. Then

$$(6.1) \quad \mathcal{I}_X(\mathbf{a}/b, x) = \sum_{\mathbf{b} \in K} \mathcal{I}_1^{b_1} \dots \mathcal{I}_q^{b_q},$$

and this is a finite sum since K is a finite set.

Following Ru and Vojta ([2020], § 6), for all $\mathbf{a} \in \Delta_b$ and all $s \in H^0(X, \mathcal{L}^N) \setminus \{0\}$ we define

$$(6.2) \quad \mu_{\mathbf{a}/b}(s) = \sup\{x : \mathcal{F}(\mathbf{a}/b)_x \ni s\}.$$

Lemma 6.3. *Let $\mathbf{a} \in \Delta_b$ and $s \in H^0(X, \mathcal{L}^N) \setminus \{0\}$. Let $\mu = \mu_{\mathbf{a}/b}(s)$. Then*

$$(6.3.1) \quad s \in H^0\left(X, \sum_{\mathbf{b} \in K(\mathbf{a}/b, \mu)} \mathcal{L}^N \otimes \mathcal{I}_1^{b_1} \cdots \mathcal{I}_q^{b_q}\right).$$

Proof. The union $\bigcup_{x \in [0, \mu]} K(\mathbf{a}/b, x)$ is finite, and each \mathbf{b} in this union occurs in the sum (6.1) for a closed set of x . Therefore the supremum in (6.2) is actually a maximum. In particular, $s \in \mathcal{F}(\mathbf{a}/b)_\mu$, and this gives (6.3.1). \square

Remark 6.4. Since the injection (5.8.3) is not necessarily bijective, it is important in this section to carefully distinguish between objects defined on X (non-birational objects) and the birational objects defined in Section 5. So far in this Section 6, everything has been non-birational. This will now change.

Corollary 6.5. *Let \mathbf{a} , s , and μ be as in Lemma 6.3, and let $K = K(\mathbf{a}/b, s)$. Let $\mathbf{Y}_1, \dots, \mathbf{Y}_q$ be the b -divisors on X corresponding to Y_1, \dots, Y_q , respectively. Then*

$$(6.5.1) \quad (s) \geq \bigwedge_{\mathbf{b} \in K} \sum_{i=1}^q b_i \mathbf{Y}_i.$$

Proof. Let $\pi: W \rightarrow X$ be a model of X on which all \mathbf{Y}_i are represented by Cartier divisors D_i . Then, by (6.3.1), s is a global section of the subsheaf of $\pi^* \mathcal{L}^N$ generated by the set $\{\pi^* \mathcal{L}^N(-b_1 D_1 - \cdots - b_q D_q) : \mathbf{b} \in K\}$. By ([Ru and Vojta 2020], Prop. 4.18), since this set is finite, we have

$$(\pi^* s) \geq \bigwedge_{\mathbf{b} \in K} (b_1 D_1 + \cdots + b_q D_q).$$

This gives (6.5.1). \square

Definition 6.6. Let $\mathcal{F} = (\mathcal{F}_x)_{x \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}}$ be a filtration of a finite dimensional vector space V , and let \mathcal{B} be a basis of V . Then \mathcal{B} is **adapted** to \mathcal{F} if $\mathcal{B} \cap \mathcal{F}_x$ is a basis of \mathcal{F}_x for all x .

Definition 6.7. Let \mathcal{B} be a basis of $H^0(X, \mathcal{L}^N)$. Then

$$(\mathcal{B}) = \sum_{s \in \mathcal{B}} (s).$$

Remark 6.8. At this point we start using \mathbb{R} -Cartier b-divisors. These are basically finite formal linear combinations of Cartier b-divisors with real coefficients. An \mathbb{R} -Cartier b-divisor is said to be **effective** if it is a finite linear combination of effective Cartier b-divisors with positive (real) coefficients. For more details on \mathbb{R} -Cartier divisors and \mathbb{R} -Cartier b-divisors, see ([Ru and Vojta 2020pre], § 2).

Lemma 6.9. Assume that $\text{char } k = 0$. For each $\mathbf{a} \in \Delta_b$ let $\mathcal{B}_{\mathbf{a}}$ be a basis of $H^0(X, \mathcal{L}^N)$ adapted to the filtration $\mathcal{F}(\mathbf{a}/b)$. Then

$$(6.9.1) \quad \bigvee_{\mathbf{a} \in \Delta_b} (\mathcal{B}_{\mathbf{a}}) \geq \frac{b}{b+q} \left(\min_{1 \leq i \leq q} \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} \frac{h^0(X, \mathcal{L}^N \otimes \mathcal{I}_i^m)}{\beta_i} \right) \sum_{i=1}^q \beta_i \mathbf{Y}_i.$$

Proof. Let \mathbf{D}' be the left-hand side of (6.9.1), and let $\pi: W \rightarrow X$ be a model of X on which \mathbf{D}' and $\mathbf{Y}_1, \dots, \mathbf{Y}_q$ are represented by Cartier divisors D' and D_1, \dots, D_q , respectively. We also assume that W is nonsingular.

Let E be a prime divisor on W . Let ν' , $\nu_{\mathbf{a}}$ for all $\mathbf{a} \in \Delta_b$, and ν_1, \dots, ν_q be the multiplicities of E in D' , $(\mathcal{B}_{\mathbf{a}})$ for all \mathbf{a} , and D_1, \dots, D_q , respectively. Let $\nu = \sum \beta_i \nu_i$.

We claim that there is an $\mathbf{a} \in \Delta_b$ (depending on E) such that

$$(6.9.2) \quad \nu_{\mathbf{a}} \geq \frac{b}{b+q} h^0(X, \mathcal{L}^N) F(\mathbf{a}/b) \nu.$$

Since the divisor $(\mathcal{B}_{\mathbf{a}})$ is effective for all \mathbf{a} (and Δ_b is nonempty), the claim is trivial if $\nu = 0$, so we assume that $\nu > 0$.

Let

$$(6.9.3) \quad t_i = \frac{\nu_i}{\nu}, \quad i = 1, \dots, q.$$

Since $\sum \beta_i \nu_i = \nu$, we have $\sum \beta_i t_i = 1$ and therefore $b \leq \sum \lfloor (b+q)\beta_i t_i \rfloor \leq b+q$. Therefore we may choose $\mathbf{a} \in \Delta_b$ such that

$$(6.9.4) \quad a_i \leq (b+q)t_i, \quad i = 1, \dots, q.$$

Let $s \in \mathcal{B}_{\mathbf{a}}$, and let ν_s be the multiplicity of E in the divisor (π^*s) . Let $K = K(\mathbf{a}/b, \mu_{\mathbf{a}/b}(s))$. By (6.5.1), (6.9.3), (6.9.4), and the fact that $\sum a_i b_i \geq b \mu_{\mathbf{a}/b}(s)$ for all $\mathbf{b} \in K \subseteq N(\mathbf{a}/b, \mu_{\mathbf{a}/b}(s))$,

$$(6.9.5) \quad \frac{\nu_s}{\nu} \geq \frac{1}{\nu} \min_{\mathbf{b} \in K} \sum_{i=1}^q b_i \nu_i = \min_{\mathbf{b} \in K} \sum_{i=1}^q b_i t_i \geq \min_{\mathbf{b} \in K} \sum_{i=1}^q \frac{a_i b_i}{b+q} \geq \frac{b}{b+q} \mu_{\mathbf{a}/b}(s).$$

Since $\mathcal{B}_{\mathbf{a}}$ is adapted to the filtration $\mathcal{F}(\mathbf{a}/b)$, we have

$$h^0(X, \mathcal{L}^N) F(\mathbf{a}/b) = \int_0^\infty \dim \mathcal{F}(\mathbf{a}/b)_x dx = \sum_{s \in \mathcal{B}_{\mathbf{a}}} \mu_{\mathbf{a}/b}(s)$$

(see ([**Ru and Vojta 2020**], Remark 6.6)). Combining this with (6.9.5) and the fact that $\nu_{\mathbf{a}} = \sum_{s \in \mathcal{B}_{\mathbf{a}}} \nu_s$ then gives (6.9.2).

Since Y_1, \dots, Y_n have the Autissier property, Theorem 4.5 gives

$$h^0(X, \mathcal{L}^N) F(\mathbf{a}/b) \geq \min_{1 \leq i \leq q} \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} \frac{h^0(X, \mathcal{L} \otimes \mathcal{I}_i^m)}{\beta_i}.$$

Therefore, by (6.9.2) and the definition of ν , we have

$$\nu' \geq \frac{b}{b+q} \left(\min_{1 \leq i \leq q} \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} \frac{h^0(X, \mathcal{L}^N \otimes \mathcal{I}_i^m)}{\beta_i} \right) \sum_{i=1}^q \beta_i \nu_i.$$

We conclude that the difference of the two sides of (6.9.1) is represented on W by a finite sum of effective Cartier divisors with nonnegative real coefficients (these divisors are the finitely many prime divisors E occurring in $\text{Supp } D'$, and they are Cartier because W is nonsingular). This proves (6.9.1). \square

Remark 6.10. As noted in the introductory paragraph of this section, we have simplified the argument somewhat by eliminating the dependence on subsets $\sigma \subseteq \{1, \dots, q\}$. It would be easy to put this dependence back (by Remark 2.10 it is still true that at most $\dim X$ of the Y_i can pass through any point of X). With this change, the fraction $b/(b+q)$ in Lemma 6.9 can be replaced by $b/(b+\dim X)$, as in [**Ru and Vojta 2020**].

§7. A Birational Nevanlinna Constant for B-divisors

In this section we introduce the birational Nevanlinna constant of Ru and Vojta [2020], as modified to use \mathbb{R} -Cartier b-divisors, and prove the bound (7.4.2), which corresponds to the penultimate step in the proof of the Main Theorem of [**Ru and Vojta 2020**].

We start with the following definition, which is ([**Ru and Vojta 2020pre**], Def. 1.1), except that \mathbf{D} is allowed to be an \mathbb{R} -Cartier b-divisor instead of an \mathbb{R} -Cartier divisor.

Definition 7.1. Let X be a complete variety, let \mathcal{L} be a line sheaf on X , and let \mathbf{D} be an effective \mathbb{R} -Cartier b-divisor on X . Then

$$(7.1.1) \quad \text{Nev}_{\text{bir}}(\mathcal{L}, \mathbf{D}) = \inf_{N, V, \mu} \frac{\dim V}{\mu},$$

where the infimum passes over all triples (N, V, μ) such that $N \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$, V is a linear subspace of $H^0(X, \mathcal{L}^N)$ with $\dim V > 1$, and $\mu \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$, with the following property. There exists a model $\pi: W \rightarrow X$ such that the following condition holds. For all $Q \in W$ there is a basis \mathcal{B} of V such that

$$(7.1.2) \quad (\mathcal{B}) \geq \mu N \mathbf{D}$$

in a Zariski-open neighborhood U of Q , relative to the cone of effective \mathbb{R} -Cartier b-divisors on U . If there are no such triples (N, V, μ) , then $\text{Nev}_{\text{bir}}(\mathcal{L}, \mathbf{D})$ is defined to be $+\infty$.

As in ([**Ru and Vojta 2020**], Cor. 4.17), we have the following alternative characterization.

Proposition 7.2. *Let X , \mathcal{L} , and \mathbf{D} be as in Definition 7.1. Then*

$$\mathrm{Nev}_{\mathrm{bir}}(\mathcal{L}, \mathbf{D}) = \inf_{N, V, \mu} \frac{\dim V}{\mu},$$

where the infimum passes over all triples (N, V, μ) such that $N \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$, V is a linear subspace of $H^0(X, \mathcal{L}^N)$ with $\dim V > 1$, and $\mu \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$, with the following property. There is a finite list $\mathcal{B}_1, \dots, \mathcal{B}_\ell$ of bases of $H^0(X, \mathcal{L}^N)$ such that

$$\bigvee_{i=1}^{\ell} (\mathcal{B}_i) \geq \mu N \mathbf{D}$$

(with the same convention if there are no such triples).

Remark 7.3. One could make Definition “fully birational” by allowing \mathcal{L} to be a b-line-sheaf. Here a **b-line-sheaf** is an element of $\varinjlim \mathrm{Pic} W$, where the direct limit is over all models W of X . However, this would basically amount to replacing X with some model W on which the hypothetical b-line-sheaf lies in $\mathrm{Pic} W$, so nothing new would be introduced.

With Definition 7.1, we have:

Proposition 7.4. *Let k , X , \mathcal{L} , and Y_1, \dots, Y_q be as in the statement of Theorem 0.11. For each $i = 1, \dots, q$ let \mathbf{Y}_i be the Cartier b -divisor on X corresponding to Y_i . Let $\beta_1, \dots, \beta_q \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$, and let \mathbf{D} be the effective \mathbb{R} -Cartier b -divisor $\beta_1 \mathbf{Y}_1 + \dots + \beta_q \mathbf{Y}_q$. Then*

(7.4.1)

$$\begin{aligned} \mathrm{Nev}_{\mathrm{bir}}(\mathcal{L}, \mathbf{D}) &\leq N h^0(X, \mathcal{L}^N) \left(\frac{b+q}{b} \right) \left(\min_{1 \leq i \leq q} \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} \frac{h^0(X, \mathcal{L}^N \otimes \mathcal{I}_i^m)}{\beta_i} \right)^{-1} \\ &= \left(\frac{b+q}{b} \right) \left(\min_{1 \leq i \leq q} \frac{1}{\beta_i} \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} \frac{h^0(X, \mathcal{L}^N \otimes \mathcal{I}_i^m)}{N h^0(X, \mathcal{L}^N)} \right)^{-1} \end{aligned}$$

for all $b \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$ and all $N \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$ such that $H^0(X, \mathcal{L}^N \otimes \mathcal{I}_i) \neq 0$ for all i .
In particular, if $\beta_i = \beta(\mathcal{L}, Y_i)$ for all i , then

(7.4.2)

$$\mathrm{Nev}_{\mathrm{bir}}(\mathcal{L}, \mathbf{D}) \leq 1.$$

Proof. The inequality (7.4.1) follows from Lemma 6.9 and Proposition 7.2, with $V = H^0(X, \mathcal{L}^N)$. For the second inequality, we can omit those Y_i for which $\beta(\mathcal{L}, Y_i) = 0$; then (7.4.2) follows from (7.4.1) and (0.4.1) by taking b and N sufficiently large. \square

§8. Conclusion of the Main Proof

This section gives the last step of the proof of Theorems 0.11 and 0.9. This relies on Theorem 8.2, which generalizes ([Ru and Vojta 2020], Thms. 1.4 and 1.5). (Theorem 8.2 may be regarded as the Second Main Theorem for birational Nevanlinna constants.)

We start by introducing Weil functions, and the resulting proximity and counting functions, for \mathbb{R} -Cartier b-divisors \mathbf{D} . Basically, this involves lifting to a model on which the b-divisor in question is represented by an \mathbb{R} -Cartier divisor, and using \mathbb{R} -linearity. This model may not be isomorphic to X over all of $X \setminus \text{Supp } \mathbf{D}$ (here $\text{Supp } \mathbf{D}$ is defined as $\pi(\text{Supp } D)$, where $\pi: W \rightarrow X$ is a model of X on which \mathbf{D} is represented by a Cartier divisor D). Therefore the domain of the Weil function may be smaller than one would otherwise expect.

For more details on Weil functions, see ([Ru and Vojta 2020], 2.3), ([Lang 1983], Ch. 10), or ([Vojta 2011], §8).

Definition 8.1. Let \mathbf{D} be an \mathbb{R} -Cartier b-divisor on X . Let $\pi: W \rightarrow X$ be a model of X on which \mathbf{D} is represented by an \mathbb{R} -Cartier divisor D . Let U be the largest open subset of X such that $\pi^{-1}(U) \rightarrow U$ is an isomorphism and that satisfies $\pi^{-1}(U) \cap \text{Supp } D = \emptyset$. If λ is a Weil function for D on W (defined using classical Weil functions by \mathbb{R} -linearity), then its push-forward to U is a Weil function for \mathbf{D} on X .

If $k = \mathbb{C}$, then such a Weil function has domain $U(k) = U(\mathbb{C})$; if k is a number field, then the domain of λ is the disjoint union $\coprod_{v \in M_k} U(\mathbb{C}_v)$, where M_k is the set of places of k and \mathbb{C}_v is the completion of the algebraic closure of the local field k_v for all $v \in M_k$.

One can use such Weil functions to define proximity and counting functions for holomorphic curves $f: \mathbb{C} \rightarrow X$ whose image meets U if $k = \mathbb{C}$, or points in $U(k)$ or $U(\bar{k})$ if k is a number field. This is done in the obvious way.

Finally, let Y be a proper closed subscheme of X and let \mathbf{Y} be the corresponding b-divisor on X , represented by the exceptional divisor E on the blowing-up $\pi: W \rightarrow X$ of X along Y (as in Definition 5.7). Then we can use this W as the model in Definition 8.1, and can use $U = X \setminus Y$. Therefore the resulting Weil function coincides with the Weil function as defined by Silverman [1987] or Yamanoi [2004] (up to an M -bounded function, as usual).

The following is the main theorem of this section. It generalizes ([Ru and Vojta 2020], Thms. 1.4 and 1.5), which is the special case in which \mathbf{D} is replaced by an effective (integral) Cartier divisor on a complete variety.

Theorem 8.2. *Let X be a complete variety over a field k , let \mathcal{L} be a line sheaf on X with $h^0(X, \mathcal{L}^N) > 1$ for some $N > 0$, and let \mathbf{D} be an effective \mathbb{R} -Cartier b-divisor on X .*

- (a). **(Arithmetic part)** *Assume that k is a number field, and let S be a finite set of places of k . Then, for all $\epsilon > 0$ and all $C \in \mathbb{R}$, there is a proper*

Zariski-closed subset Z of X such that the inequality

$$(8.2.1) \quad m_S(\mathbf{D}, x) \leq (\text{Nev}_{\text{bir}}(\mathcal{L}, \mathbf{D}) + \epsilon)h_{\mathcal{L}}(x) + C$$

holds for all points $x \in X(k) \setminus Z$.

- (b). **(Analytic part)** Assume that $k = \mathbb{C}$. Then, for all $\epsilon > 0$, there is a proper Zariski-closed subset Z of X such that the inequality

$$(8.2.2) \quad m_f(\mathbf{D}, r) \leq_{\text{exc}} (\text{Nev}_{\text{bir}}(\mathcal{L}, \mathbf{D}) + \epsilon)T_{f, \mathcal{L}}(r)$$

holds for all holomorphic mappings $f: \mathbb{C} \rightarrow X$ whose image is not contained in Z .

Proof. This is proved by reducing to the special case ([Ru and Vojta 2020], Thms. 1.4 and 1.5).

First, we reduce to the case in which \mathbf{D} is replaced by an \mathbb{R} -Cartier divisor.

Let $\pi: W \rightarrow X$ be a normal model of X such that \mathbf{D} is represented by an \mathbb{R} -Cartier divisor D on W . Since $H^0(X, \mathcal{L}^N) \rightarrow H^0(W, \pi^* \mathcal{L}^N)$ is injective, every triple (N, V, μ) appearing in the infimum (7.1.1) for the computation of $\text{Nev}_{\text{bir}}(\mathcal{L}, \mathbf{D})$ also appears in the infimum for computing $\text{Nev}_{\text{bir}}(\pi^* \mathcal{L}, D)$. Therefore

$$\text{Nev}_{\text{bir}}(\pi^* \mathcal{L}, D) \leq \text{Nev}_{\text{bir}}(\mathcal{L}, \mathbf{D}).$$

Also, as is the case for Weil functions (see Definition 8.1), we have

$$m_S(\mathbf{D}, x) = m_S(D, \pi^{-1}(x)) \quad \text{and} \quad m_f(\mathbf{D}, r) = m_{\tilde{f}}(D, r)$$

in the arithmetic and analytic cases, respectively, where in the arithmetic case we consider only $x \in U$ with U as in Definition 8.1, and in the analytic case $\tilde{f}: \mathbb{C} \rightarrow W$ is the lifting of a holomorphic map $f: \mathbb{C} \rightarrow X$ whose image meets U . In both cases we also assume that the Weil functions used for computing the two proximity functions are related as in Definition 8.1.

For the remainder of the proof, we show only the arithmetic case; the analytic case is similar.

By the special case for \mathbb{R} -Cartier divisors, applied to D on W , we have

$$\begin{aligned} m_S(\mathbf{D}, x) &= m_S(D, \pi^{-1}(x)) \\ &\leq (\text{Nev}_{\text{bir}}(\pi^* \mathcal{L}, D) + \epsilon)h_{\pi^* \mathcal{L}}(\pi^{-1}(x)) + C \\ &\leq (\text{Nev}_{\text{bir}}(\mathcal{L}, \mathbf{D}) + \epsilon)h_{\mathcal{L}}(x) + C. \end{aligned}$$

This completes the reduction to the case of \mathbb{R} -Cartier divisors.

Next, we reduce to the case in which D is a \mathbb{Q} -Cartier divisor. This is done by choosing $\epsilon' \in (0, \epsilon)$ and increasing the coefficients of D by a small amount to obtain a

\mathbb{Q} -Cartier divisor D' such that $D \leq D' \leq (1 + \eta)D$ with small $\eta > 0$. We then have $m_S(D, x) \leq m_S(D', x) + O(1)$. Also

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Nev}_{\text{bir}}(\mathcal{L}, D') + \epsilon' &\leq \text{Nev}_{\text{bir}}(\mathcal{L}, (1 + \eta)D) + \epsilon' \\ &= (1 + \eta) \text{Nev}_{\text{bir}}(\mathcal{L}, D) + \epsilon' \\ &\leq \text{Nev}_{\text{bir}}(\mathcal{L}, D) + \epsilon. \end{aligned}$$

Here the first step is true because increasing the divisor leaves fewer triples (N, V, μ) that satisfy (7.1.2), which may increase the value of the infimum; the second step holds by ([Ru and Vojtá 2020], Remark 1.8); and the third step is true with sufficiently small choices of ϵ' and η .

The above two inequalities then give the reduction to the case of \mathbb{Q} -Cartier divisors (apply the latter case to D'). This achieves the reduction to \mathbb{Q} -Cartier divisors.

Finally, by ([Ru and Vojtá 2020], Remark 1.8), we can cancel the denominators and reduce to the case of integral Cartier divisors. This case has been proved already ([Ru and Vojtá 2020], Thms. 1.4 and 1.5). \square

Proof of Theorems 0.11 and 0.9. Theorem 0.11 is immediate from Theorem 8.2 and (7.4.2), with $\mathbf{D} = \sum \beta(\mathcal{L}, Y_i) \mathbf{Y}_i$. Combining Theorem 0.11 with Theorem 0.10 (Proposition 3.3) then gives Theorem 0.9. \square

§9. An Example: Linear Subspaces of \mathbb{P}_k^n

This section gives an example involving linear subspaces of \mathbb{P}_k^n .

Let Y_1, \dots, Y_q be linear subvarieties of \mathbb{P}_k^n that intersect properly. In this case, Definition 3.1 reduces to the condition that they intersect properly in the sense of intersection theory; i.e.,

$$(9.1) \quad \text{codim} \bigcap_{i \in I} Y_i = \sum_{i \in I} \text{codim } Y_i$$

for all nonempty $I \subseteq \{1, \dots, q\}$ such that $\bigcap_{i \in I} Y_i \neq \emptyset$.

We now compute $\beta(\mathcal{O}(1), Y_i)$ for these subschemes.

Proposition 9.2. *Let k be a field, let $X = \mathbb{P}_k^n$ with $n > 0$, and let Y be a integral linear subscheme of X of codimension $r > 0$. Then*

$$(9.2.1) \quad \beta(\mathcal{O}(1), Y) = \frac{r}{n+1}.$$

Proof. Let x_0, \dots, x_n be homogeneous coordinates on X . We may assume that Y is the subscheme $x_1 = \dots = x_r = 0$. Let \mathcal{I} be the ideal sheaf corresponding to Y .

We will compute $\beta(\mathcal{O}(1), Y)$ explicitly.

First, for all $N \in \mathbb{N}$, $H^0(X, \mathcal{O}(N))$ has a basis over k consisting of all homogeneous monomials in x_0, \dots, x_n of degree N . The number of such monomials is

$$(9.2.2) \quad h^0(X, \mathcal{O}(N)) = \binom{N+n}{n} = \frac{N^n}{n!} + O(N^{n-1})$$

as $N \rightarrow \infty$, where the constant in $O(N^{n-1})$ depends only on n .

For all $m \in \mathbb{N}$ the subspace $H^0(X, \mathcal{O}(N) \otimes \mathcal{I}^m)$ of $H^0(X, \mathcal{O}(N))$ is the subspace generated by

$$\{x_0^{j_0} \cdots x_n^{j_n} : j_0 + \cdots + j_n = N \text{ and } j_1 + \cdots + j_r \geq m\}.$$

Therefore, for all $0 \leq m \leq N$,

$$(9.2.3) \quad \begin{aligned} & h^0(X, \mathcal{O}(N)) - h^0(X, \mathcal{O}(N) \otimes \mathcal{I}^m) \\ &= \left| \left\{ (j_0, \dots, j_n) \in \mathbb{N}^{n+1} : \sum j_i = N \text{ and } j_1 + \cdots + j_r < m \right\} \right| \\ &= \sum_{\ell=0}^{m-1} |\{(j_0, \dots, j_n) : j_0 + j_{r+1} + \cdots + j_n = N - \ell \text{ and } j_1 + \cdots + j_r = \ell\}| \\ &= \sum_{\ell=0}^{m-1} \binom{N - \ell + n - r}{n - r} \binom{\ell + r - 1}{r - 1}. \end{aligned}$$

For future reference, we see from the above that

$$(9.2.4) \quad \begin{aligned} & \sum_{\ell=0}^N \binom{N - \ell + n - r}{n - r} \binom{\ell + r - 1}{r - 1} \\ &= |\{(j_0, \dots, j_n) : j_0 + \cdots + j_n = N \text{ and } j_1 + \cdots + j_r \leq N\}| \\ &= \binom{N+n}{n}. \end{aligned}$$

Lemma 9.2.5. *Let $0 < r \leq n$ be integers. For all $N \in \mathbb{N}$ let*

$$(9.2.5.1) \quad f_{n,r}(N) = \sum_{m=1}^N \sum_{\ell=0}^{m-1} \binom{N - \ell + n - r}{n - r} \binom{\ell + r - 1}{r - 1}.$$

Then

$$f_{n,r}(N) = (n - r + 1) \frac{N^{n+1}}{(n+1)!} + O(N^n) \quad \text{as } N \rightarrow \infty,$$

where the constant in $O(N^n)$ depends only on n and r .

Proof. Fix r . We will use induction on $n \geq r$.

For the base case $n = r$, we have

$$f_{n,n}(N) = \sum_{m=1}^N \sum_{\ell=0}^{m-1} \binom{\ell+n-1}{n-1}.$$

Since $\binom{\ell+n-1}{n-1}$ is a polynomial in ℓ with leading term $\ell^{n-1}/(n-1)!$, it follows that $\sum_{\ell=0}^{m-1} \binom{\ell+n-1}{n-1}$ is a polynomial in m with leading term $m^n/n!$; hence $f_{n,n}(N)$ is a polynomial in N with leading term $N^{n+1}/(n+1)!$. (In each case the polynomial in question depends only on n .)

For the inductive step, assume that $n > r$ and that the lemma is true when n is replaced by $n-1$.

Since the double sum in (9.2.5.1) is over all m and ℓ with $0 \leq \ell < m \leq N$, and since the summand does not depend on m ,

$$\begin{aligned} f_{n,r}(N) &= \sum_{\ell=0}^{N-1} (N-\ell) \binom{N-\ell+n-r}{n-r} \binom{\ell+r-1}{r-1} \\ &= \sum_{\ell=0}^N (N-\ell) \binom{N-\ell+n-r}{n-r} \binom{\ell+r-1}{r-1}. \end{aligned}$$

By the identity $a_N b_N - a_{N-1} b_{N-1} = a_N (b_N - b_{N-1}) + (a_N - a_{N-1}) b_{N-1}$, Pascal's Rule, (9.2.4), the inductive hypothesis, and (9.2.2),

$$\begin{aligned} f_{n,r}(N) - f_{n,r}(N-1) &= \sum_{\ell=0}^{N-1} (N-\ell) \binom{N-\ell+n-r-1}{n-r-1} \binom{\ell+r-1}{r-1} \\ &\quad + \sum_{\ell=0}^{N-1} \binom{N-\ell+n-r-1}{n-r} \binom{\ell+r-1}{r-1} \\ &= f_{n-1,r}(N) + \binom{N-1+n}{n} \\ &= \left((n-r) \frac{N^n}{n!} + O(N^{n-1}) \right) + \left(\frac{(N-1)^n}{n!} + O((N-1)^{n-1}) \right) \\ &= (n-r+1) \frac{N^n}{n!} + O(N^{n-1}) \end{aligned}$$

as $N \rightarrow \infty$, where again the implicit constants depend only on n and r .

Since $f_{n,r}(0) = 0$, the lemma then follows by induction. \square

Applying (9.2.3), the lemma, and (9.2.2), we then have

$$\begin{aligned}
\beta(\mathcal{O}(1), Y) &= \liminf_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\sum_{m=1}^N h^0(X, \mathcal{O}(N) \otimes \mathcal{I}^m)}{N h^0(X, \mathcal{O}(N))} \\
&= \liminf_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{N h^0(X, \mathcal{O}(N)) - f_{n,r}(N)}{N h^0(X, \mathcal{O}(N))} \\
&= 1 - \limsup_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{(n-r+1)N^{n+1}/(n+1)! + O(N^n)}{N \cdot N^n/n! + O(N^n)} \\
&= 1 - \frac{n-r+1}{n+1} \\
&= \frac{r}{n+1},
\end{aligned}$$

as was to be shown. \square

As a corollary of Theorem 0.9, we then obtain:

Theorem 9.3. *Let k be a number field, let S be a finite set of places of k , let $X = \mathbb{P}_k^n$, and let Y_1, \dots, Y_q be linear subvarieties of X in general position (according to (9.1)). Then, for all $\epsilon > 0$ and all $C \in \mathbb{R}$, there is a proper Zariski-closed subset Z of X such that the inequality*

$$\sum_{i=1}^q (\text{codim } Y_i) m_S(Y_i, x) \leq (n+1+\epsilon) h_k(x) + C$$

holds for all $x \in X(k)$ outside of Z .

This is a consequence of ([Vojta 1989], (3.9)), in which \mathcal{D} is a finite collection of hyperplanes containing, for each i , a subset whose intersection is Y_i .

It is also a special case of the Main Theorem of [Heier and Levin 2017pre].

§10. Proof that (0.1.1), (0.4.1), (0.5.1), and (5.5.1) Exist as Limits

This section gives a proof that the limits infima in the definitions of $\beta(\mathcal{L}, D)$ (Definition 0.1), $\beta(\mathcal{L}, Y)$ (Definition 0.4), $\beta_{\mathcal{L}, Y}$ (Remark 0.5), and $\beta(\mathcal{L}, \mathbf{D})$ (Definition 5.5) can be replaced by limits.

It has already been noted that the \liminf in the definition of $\beta(\mathcal{L}, D)$ (Definition 0.1) is a limit when D is a nonzero effective Cartier divisor (see the discussion following Def. 1.9 in [Ru and Vojta 2020]). We extend this result to allow D to be a nonzero effective Cartier b-divisor. Since a detailed proof has not appeared before, we include here such a proof of both results. It will then be immediate from Corollary 5.9b that the same is true for $\beta(\mathcal{L}, Y)$ and $\beta_{\mathcal{L}, Y}$.

Recall that in all cases, \mathcal{L} is assumed to be big.

This argument is based on an idea of Julie Wang to compare the limit to a Riemann sum.

We start with the proof that the limit in (0.1.1) converges.

Theorem 10.1. *Let X be a complete variety over a field F of characteristic zero, let \mathcal{L} be a big line sheaf on X , and let D be a nonzero effective Cartier divisor on X . Then the limit*

$$(10.1.1) \quad \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\sum_{m=1}^{\infty} h^0(X, \mathcal{L}^N(-mD))}{N h^0(X, \mathcal{L}^N)}$$

converges. In particular, the \liminf in Definition 0.1 can be replaced by a limit.

Proof. We start by reducing to the projective case. Let $d = \dim X$.

By Chow's lemma and resolution of singularities there is a model $\pi: W \rightarrow X$, with W projective and nonsingular. Then

$$\sum_{m=1}^{\infty} h^0(X, \mathcal{L}^N(-mD)) = \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} h^0(W, \pi^*(\mathcal{L}^N(-mD))) + O(N^d)$$

by Lemma 5.2d, and

$$h^0(X, \mathcal{L}^N) = h^0(W, \pi^* \mathcal{L}^N) + O(N^{d-1})$$

by Lemma 5.2c. Therefore

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\sum_{m=1}^{\infty} h^0(X, \mathcal{L}^N(-mD))}{N h^0(X, \mathcal{L}^N)} = \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\sum_{m=1}^{\infty} h^0(W, \pi^*(\mathcal{L}^N(-mD)))}{N h^0(W, \pi^* \mathcal{L}^N)},$$

in the sense that if one limit converges, then both do, and they are equal.

So assume now that X is projective and nonsingular.

For all line sheaves \mathcal{L} on X , all effective Cartier divisors D on X , and all $x \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$, we let

$$H^0(X, \mathcal{L}(-xD)) = \{s \in H^0(X, \mathcal{L}) : \text{the } \mathbb{R}\text{-divisor } (s) - xD \text{ is effective}\}$$

and (as usual)

$$h^0(X, \mathcal{L}(-xD)) = \dim_F H^0(X, \mathcal{L}(-xD)).$$

These coincide with the usual definitions whenever xD is an integral divisor.

Define $f: \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ by

$$f(x) = \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{h^0(X, \mathcal{L}^N(-Nx D))}{N^d},$$

where the limit is over $N \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$.

Recall from ([Lazarsfeld 2004], II, Def. 11.4.2 and Example 11.4.7) that

$$(10.1.2) \quad \text{vol}(\mathcal{L}) = \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{h^0(X, \mathcal{L}^N)}{N^d/d!}.$$

Then $f(x) = \text{vol}(\mathcal{L}(-xD))/d!$ whenever xD is an integral Cartier divisor.

Since D is effective, f is a nonincreasing function.

We also have $f(x) = 0$ for all sufficiently large x . Indeed, given an ample divisor A on X , this is true for all $x > (\mathcal{L} \cdot A^{d-1})/(D \cdot A^{d-1})$. Fix some $R \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ such that $H^0(X, \mathcal{L}^N(-NRD)) = 0$ for all $N > 0$ (and therefore $f(R) = 0$).

Let

$$I = \int_0^\infty f(x) dx = \int_0^R f(x) dx.$$

It will then suffice to prove that

$$(10.1.3) \quad \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{N^{d+1}} \sum_{m \geq 1} h^0(X, \mathcal{L}^N(-mD)) = I,$$

since by (10.1.2) this would imply

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\sum_{m \geq 1} h^0(X, \mathcal{L}^N(-mD))}{N h^0(X, \mathcal{L}^N)} = \frac{d! I}{\text{vol}(\mathcal{L})}.$$

Lemma 10.1.4. *Let \mathcal{M} be a line sheaf on X . If the limit*

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{N^{d+1}} \sum_{m \geq 1} h^0(X, \mathcal{L}^N(-mD))$$

exists, then so does the limit

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{N^{d+1}} \sum_{m \geq 1} h^0(X, \mathcal{M} \otimes \mathcal{L}^N(-mD)),$$

and they are equal.

Proof. First, let \mathcal{M}_1 and \mathcal{M}_2 be line sheaves on X . Since X is projective, we have $h^0(X, \mathcal{M}_1 \otimes \mathcal{M}_2^{-1} \otimes \mathcal{L}^p) \neq 0$ for some $p \in \mathbb{N}$ by a consequence of Kodaira's lemma ([Lazarsfeld 2004], 2.2.7). Therefore

$$h^0(X, \mathcal{M}_2 \otimes \mathcal{L}^N(-mD)) \leq h^0(X, \mathcal{M}_1 \otimes \mathcal{L}^{N+p}(-mD))$$

for all $m, N \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$. Therefore we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \liminf_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{N^{d+1}} \sum_{m \geq 1} h^0(X, \mathcal{M}_2 \otimes \mathcal{L}^N(-mD)) \\ & \leq \liminf_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{(N-p)^{d+1}} \sum_{m \geq 1} h^0(X, \mathcal{M}_1 \otimes \mathcal{L}^N(-mD)) \\ & = \liminf_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{N^{d+1}} \sum_{m \geq 1} h^0(X, \mathcal{M}_1 \otimes \mathcal{L}^N(-mD)), \end{aligned}$$

and likewise for \limsup .

This gives

$$\begin{aligned} \liminf_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{N^{d+1}} \sum_{m \geq 1} h^0(X, \mathcal{L}^N(-mD)) &\leq \liminf_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{N^{d+1}} \sum_{m \geq 1} h^0(X, \mathcal{M} \otimes \mathcal{L}^N(-mD)) \\ &\leq \limsup_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{N^{d+1}} \sum_{m \geq 1} h^0(X, \mathcal{M} \otimes \mathcal{L}^N(-mD)) \\ &\leq \limsup_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{N^{d+1}} \sum_{m \geq 1} h^0(X, \mathcal{L}^N(-mD)), \end{aligned}$$

and this implies the lemma. \square

Now let $k \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$. We show that if

$$(10.1.5) \quad \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{N^{d+1}} \sum_{m \geq 1} h^0(X, \mathcal{M} \otimes \mathcal{L}^{Nk}(-mD)) = k^{d+1}I$$

with $\mathcal{M} = \mathcal{O}_X$, then (10.1.3) is true. Indeed, if (10.1.5) is true with $\mathcal{M} = \mathcal{O}_X$, then by Lemma 10.1.4 it is true with $\mathcal{M} = \mathcal{L}^j$ with $j = 0, 1, \dots, k-1$. Therefore the limit in (10.1.3) exists for N in each congruence class modulo k , and these limits are all equal.

Thus, if (10.1.3) is true with \mathcal{L} replaced by \mathcal{L}^k for some $k > 0$, then it is true with the original \mathcal{L} . In particular, choosing k such that $H^0(X, \mathcal{L}^k) \neq 0$, we may assume that $H^0(X, \mathcal{L}) \neq 0$.

We then have

$$(10.1.6) \quad h^0(X, \mathcal{L}^N(-mD)) \leq h^0(X, \mathcal{L}^{N'}(-mD))$$

for all $0 \leq N \leq N'$ and all $m \in \mathbb{N}$.

We now begin the main argument of the proof.

Given $\epsilon > 0$, pick $\epsilon_1 > 0$ and $k, l_0 \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$ such that

$$(10.1.7) \quad \left(1 + \frac{1}{l_0}\right)^{d+1} \left(I + \frac{f(0)}{k} + \epsilon_1\right) \leq I + \epsilon$$

and

$$\left(1 - \frac{1}{l_0}\right)^{d+1} \left(I - \frac{f(0)}{k} - \epsilon_1\right) \geq I - \epsilon.$$

We claim that if k and l_0 are chosen sufficiently large, then we also have

$$(10.1.8) \quad \frac{1}{(lk)^d} \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} h^0(X, \mathcal{L}^{lk}(-mlD)) \leq \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} f\left(\frac{m}{k}\right) + \epsilon_1 k$$

and

$$(10.1.9) \quad \frac{1}{(lk)^d} \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} h^0(X, \mathcal{L}^{lk}(-mlD)) \geq \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} f\left(\frac{m}{k}\right) - \epsilon_1 k$$

for all $l \geq l_0$.

We will show this result only for (10.1.8). The argument for (10.1.9) is similar and is left to the reader.

We may assume that $R \in \mathbb{Z}$.

Choose $\epsilon_2 > 0$, $\epsilon_3 > 0$, and $\epsilon_4 > 0$ such that $\epsilon_2 + \epsilon_3 + \epsilon_4 \leq \epsilon_1$.

Choose $x_0, \dots, x_t \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $0 = x_0 < x_1 < \dots < x_t = R$ and

$$\sum_{i=1}^t (x_i - x_{i-1})(f(x_{i-1}) - f(x_i)) \leq \epsilon_2.$$

Define a function $g: \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ by

$$g(x) = f(x_{i-1}) - f(x) \quad \text{for all } x \in [x_{i-1}, x_i] \text{ and all } i$$

and by $g(x) = 0$ for all $x \geq R$. Then $g(x) \leq f(x_{i-1}) - f(x_i)$ for all $x \in [x_{i-1}, x_i]$ and all i ; hence

$$\int_0^{\infty} g(x) dx = \int_0^R g(x) dx \leq \epsilon_2.$$

By the theory of Riemann integration, since g is piecewise nondecreasing, we have

$$\frac{1}{k} \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} g\left(\frac{m}{k}\right) \leq \epsilon_2 + \epsilon_3$$

for all sufficiently large k . Fix such a k . Then there is an integer N_0 , depending on k , such that

$$\left| \frac{h^0(X, \mathcal{L}^N(-Nx_{i-1}D))}{N^d} - f(x_{i-1}) \right| \leq \frac{\epsilon_4}{kR}$$

for all $1 \leq i \leq t$ and all $N \geq N_0$. Therefore

$$\frac{h^0(X, \mathcal{L}^N(-Nx_{i-1}D))}{N^d} \leq \frac{h^0(X, \mathcal{L}^N(-Nx_{i-1}D))}{N^d} \leq f(x_{i-1}) + \frac{\epsilon_4}{kR} = f(x) + g(x) + \frac{\epsilon_4}{kR}$$

for all i , all $x \in [x_{i-1}, x_i]$, and all $N \geq N_0$. Let $l_0 = \lceil N_0/k \rceil$. Then, for all $l \geq l_0$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{k} \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} \frac{h^0(X, \mathcal{L}^{lk}(-mlD))}{(lk)^d} - \frac{1}{k} \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} f\left(\frac{m}{k}\right) \\ &= \frac{1}{k} \sum_{m=0}^{kR-1} \frac{h^0(X, \mathcal{L}^{lk}(-mlD))}{(lk)^d} - \frac{1}{k} \sum_{m=0}^{kR-1} f\left(\frac{m}{k}\right) \\ &\leq \frac{1}{k} \sum_{m=0}^{kR-1} g\left(\frac{m}{k}\right) + \epsilon_4 \\ &\leq \epsilon_2 + \epsilon_3 + \epsilon_4 \\ &\leq \epsilon_1. \end{aligned}$$

This concludes the proof of the claim.

By elementary facts about Riemann sums for monotone functions, we have

$$\frac{1}{k} \sum_{m=1}^{kR} f\left(\frac{m}{k}\right) \leq I \leq \frac{1}{k} \sum_{m=0}^{kR-1} f\left(\frac{m}{k}\right).$$

Since $f(R) = 0$ and since the two sums differ by $f(0)/k$, we have

$$(10.1.10) \quad \frac{1}{k} \sum_{m=0}^{kR} f\left(\frac{m}{k}\right) \leq I + \frac{f(0)}{k} \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{1}{k} \sum_{m=1}^{kR} f\left(\frac{m}{k}\right) \geq I - \frac{f(0)}{k}.$$

Now let any $N \geq l_0 k$ be given. Let $l = \lceil \frac{N}{k} \rceil$. Then $lk \geq N$ and $l \geq l_0$; hence

$$(10.1.11) \quad \frac{lk}{N} < \frac{N+k}{N} \leq 1 + \frac{1}{l_0}.$$

By (10.1.6), effectivity of D , (10.1.11), (10.1.8), (10.1.10), and (10.1.7),

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{N^{d+1}} \sum_{m \geq 1} h^0(X, \mathcal{L}^N(-mD)) &\leq \frac{1}{N^{d+1}} \sum_{m \geq 1} h^0(X, \mathcal{L}^{lk}(-mD)) \\ &\leq \frac{1}{N^{d+1}} \sum_{m \geq 0} h^0\left(X, \mathcal{L}^{lk}\left(-\left\lfloor \frac{m}{l} \right\rfloor lD\right)\right) \\ &= \frac{1}{N^{d+1}} \sum_{m'=0}^{\infty} lh^0(X, \mathcal{L}^{lk}(-m'lD)) \\ &< \left(1 + \frac{1}{l_0}\right)^{d+1} \frac{1}{l^d k^{d+1}} \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} h^0(X, \mathcal{L}^{lk}(-mlD)) \\ &\leq \left(1 + \frac{1}{l_0}\right)^{d+1} \left(\frac{1}{k} \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} f\left(\frac{m}{k}\right) + \epsilon_1\right) \\ &\leq \left(1 + \frac{1}{l_0}\right)^{d+1} \left(I + \frac{f(0)}{k} + \epsilon_1\right) \\ &\leq I + \epsilon. \end{aligned}$$

A similar argument gives

$$\frac{1}{N^{d+1}} \sum_{m \geq 1} h^0(X, \mathcal{L}^N(-mD)) > I - \epsilon,$$

and this implies (10.1.3), concluding the proof of the theorem. \square

Corollary 10.2. *Let X be a complete variety over a field of characteristic 0, let \mathcal{L} be a big line sheaf on X , and let \mathbf{D} be a nonzero effective Cartier b -divisor on X . Then, recalling Definition 5.3, the limit*

$$(10.2.1) \quad \lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\sum_{m=1}^{\infty} h_{\text{bir}}^0(X, \mathcal{L}^N(-m\mathbf{D}))}{Nh_{\text{bir}}^0(X, \mathcal{L}^N)}$$

exists. Thus, the \liminf in (5.5.1) is actually a limit.

Proof. Let $\pi: W \rightarrow X$ be a normal model of X on which \mathbf{D} is represented by an effective Cartier divisor D . By Lemma 5.2a, we then have

$$h_{\text{bir}}^0(X, \mathcal{L}^N(-m\mathbf{D})) = h^0(W, \pi^* \mathcal{L}^N(-mD))$$

for all $m, N \in \mathbb{N}$ (notably including $m = 0$). Thus

$$\frac{\sum_{m=1}^{\infty} h_{\text{bir}}^0(X, \mathcal{L}^N(-m\mathbf{D}))}{Nh_{\text{bir}}^0(X, \mathcal{L}^N)} = \frac{\sum_{m=1}^{\infty} h^0(W, \pi^* \mathcal{L}^N(-mD))}{Nh^0(W, \pi^* \mathcal{L}^N)} \quad \text{for all } N \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0},$$

and the corollary then follows from Theorem 10.1. □

Corollary 10.3. *If $\text{char } k = 0$, then the limits infima in (0.4.1) and (0.5.1) converge as limits.*

Proof. This is immediate from Corollaries 10.2 and 5.9b. □

REFERENCES

Autissier, Pascal

2011 Sur la non-densité des points entiers. *Duke Math. J.* 158 (2011) pp. 13–27.

Hartshorne, Robin

1977 *Algebraic Geometry*, Graduate Texts in Mathematics, No. 52, Springer-Verlag, New York-Heidelberg, 1977.

Heier, Gordon and Levin, Aaron

2017pre A generalized Schmidt subspace theorem for closed subschemes. Preprint arXiv:1712.02456 (2017).

Jothilingham, P., Duraivel, T., and Bose, Sibnath

2011 Regular sequences of ideals. *Beitr. Algebra Geom.* 52 (2011), pp. 479–485.

Lang, Serge

1983 *Fundamentals of Diophantine geometry*, Springer-Verlag, New York, 1983.

Lazarsfeld, Robert

2004 *Positivity in Algebraic Geometry I, II*, Ergebnisse der Mathematik und ihrer Grenzgebiete 3. Folge 48, 49, Springer-Verlag, Berlin Heidelberg 2004.

Ru, Min and Vojta, Paul

- 2020 A birational Nevanlinna constant and its consequences. *Amer. J. Math.* 142 (2020), pp. 957–991.
- 2020pre An Evertse–Ferretti Nevanlinna constant and its consequences. Preprint arXiv:2004.12257 (2020).

Ru, Min and Wang, Julie Tzu-Yueh

- 2017 A subspace theorem for subvarieties. *Algebra and Number Theory* 11 (2017), pp. 2323–2337.
- 2020pre The Ru–Vojta result for subvarieties. Preprint (2020).

Silverman, Joseph H.

- 1987 Arithmetic distance functions and height functions in diophantine geometry. *Math. Ann.* 279 (1987) pp. 193–216.

The Stacks project authors

- 2020 The Stacks project, <https://stacks.math.columbia.edu> (2020).

Vojta, Paul

- 1989 A refinement of Schmidt’s Subspace Theorem. *Amer. J. Math.* 111 (1989), pp. 489–518.
- 2011 Diophantine approximation and Nevanlinna theory. In: *Arithmetic geometry*, Lecture Notes in Mathematics 2009, Springer, Berlin, 2011, pp. 111–224.

Yamanoi, Katsutoshi

- 2004 Algebro-geometric version of Nevanlinna’s lemma on logarithmic derivative and applications. *Nagoya Math. J.* 173 (2004) pp. 23–63.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, 970 EVANS HALL #3840,
BERKELEY, CA 94720-3840