

# NOTE ON LOWER ESTIMATES OF MULTIPLICITIES

ATSUSHI MORIWAKI

## INTRODUCTION

The lower estimates of multiplicities are crucial to establish Faltings' product theorem (cf. [3], [2], [4] and [1]). In this note we would like to give an explicit lower bound by using a lower saturated subset of  $\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^n$ .

Let  $A := k[X_1, \dots, X_n]$  be the polynomial ring of  $n$ -variables over a field  $k$ ,  $\mathfrak{p}$  be a prime ideal of  $A$ , and  $x_i$  be the image of  $X_i$  in  $A/\mathfrak{p}$  for  $i = 1, \dots, n$ . Let

$$K_i := \begin{cases} k(x_i, \dots, x_n) & \text{if } i = 1, \dots, n, \\ k & \text{if } i = n + 1 \end{cases}$$

for  $i = 1, \dots, n + 1$ , and  $\Upsilon := \{i \in \{1, \dots, n\} \mid K_i \text{ is algebraic over } K_{i+1}\}$ . Let  $\Delta$  be a lower saturated subset of  $\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^n$ , that is,  $\Delta$  is a non-empty subset of  $\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^n$  such that  $[0, \xi_1] \times \dots \times [0, \xi_n] \subseteq \Delta$  for all  $(\xi_1, \dots, \xi_n) \in \Delta$ . Here we define  $\Sigma$ ,  $(\mathbb{R}^n)_{\Upsilon}$ ,  $\Delta_{\Upsilon}$  and  $\partial^{\gamma}$  ( $\gamma = (e_1, \dots, e_n) \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^n$ ) as follows:

$$\begin{cases} \Sigma := \Delta \cap \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^n, & (\mathbb{R}^n)_{\Upsilon} := \{(\xi_1, \dots, \xi_n) \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid \xi_j = 0 \ (\forall j \notin \Upsilon)\} \cong \mathbb{R}^{\Upsilon}, \\ \Delta_{\Upsilon} := \Delta \cap (\mathbb{R}^n)_{\Upsilon}, & \partial^{\gamma} := \partial^{e_1 + \dots + e_n} / \partial X_1^{e_1} \dots \partial X_n^{e_n} \end{cases}$$

Then one has the following:

**Proposition 0.1** (cf. Corollary 3.2). *We assume that the characteristic of  $k$  is zero. Let  $\mathfrak{J}$  be an ideal of  $A$  such that  $\mathfrak{p}$  is a minimal prime of  $\mathfrak{J}$  and  $\partial^{\gamma}(\mathfrak{J}) \subseteq \mathfrak{p}$  for all  $\gamma \in \Sigma$ . Then one has  $\text{length}_{A_{\mathfrak{p}}}((A/\mathfrak{J})_{\mathfrak{p}}) \geq \text{vol}_{(\mathbb{R}^n)_{\Upsilon}}(\Delta_{\Upsilon})$ , where  $\text{vol}_{(\mathbb{R}^n)_{\Upsilon}}(\Delta_{\Upsilon})$  is the volume of  $\Delta_{\Upsilon}$  in  $(\mathbb{R}^n)_{\Upsilon}$ .*

## 1. LOWER SATURATED SUBSET

For  $\varphi = (\xi_1, \dots, \xi_n) \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^n$ , we set  $\mathbb{I}_{\varphi} := [0, \xi_1] \times \dots \times [0, \xi_n]$ . A subset  $\Delta$  of  $\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^n$  is said to be *lower saturated* if  $(0, \dots, 0) \in \Delta$  and  $\mathbb{I}_{\varphi} \subseteq \Delta$  for all  $\varphi \in \Delta$ . Note that a lower saturated subset of  $\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^n$  is Lebesgue measurable (for details, see Proposition A.1). Similarly a subset  $\Sigma$  of  $\mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^n$  is said to be *lower  $\mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ -saturated* if  $(0, \dots, 0) \in \Sigma$  and  $\mathbb{I}_{\gamma} \cap \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^n \subseteq \Sigma$  for all  $\gamma \in \Sigma$ .

---

*Date:* 01/Jan/2018, (Version 1.0).

**Proposition 1.1.** *Let  $\Sigma$  be a lower  $\mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ -saturated subset of  $\mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^n$ . If we set*

$$\Delta(\Sigma) := \bigcup_{\gamma \in \Sigma} \mathbb{I}_{\gamma} \quad \text{and} \quad \Delta'(\Sigma) := \bigcup_{\gamma=(e_1, \dots, e_n) \in \Sigma} [e_1, e_1 + 1) \times \cdots \times [e_n, e_n + 1),$$

then one has the following:

- (1)  $\Delta(\Sigma)$  is a closed lower saturated subset of  $\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^n$  such that  $\Delta(\Sigma) \cap \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^n = \Sigma$ .
- (2)  $\Delta'(\Sigma)$  is a lower saturated subset of  $\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^n$  such that  $\Delta'(\Sigma) \cap \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^n = \Sigma$ .
- (3) Let  $\Delta$  be a lower saturated subset of  $\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^n$  such that  $\Delta \cap \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^n = \Sigma$ . Then one has  $\Delta(\Sigma) \subseteq \Delta \subseteq \Delta'(\Sigma)$ . In particular,  $\text{vol}(\Delta) \leq \#(\Sigma)$ .

*Proof.* In the followings, for  $\xi \in \mathbb{R}$ ,  $\min\{a \in \mathbb{Z} \mid \xi \leq a\}$  and  $\max\{b \in \mathbb{Z} \mid b \leq \xi\}$  are denoted by  $\lceil \xi \rceil$  and  $\lfloor \xi \rfloor$ , respectively.

(1) The lower saturatedness of  $\Delta(\Sigma)$  is obvious. First let us see that  $\Delta(\Sigma)$  is closed. Let  $\{\varphi_m\}_{m=1}^{\infty}$  be a sequence of  $\mathbb{R}^n$  such that  $\varphi_m \in \Delta(\Sigma)$  for all  $m \geq 1$  and  $\varphi := \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \varphi_m$  exists. If we set  $\varphi_m = (\xi_{m1}, \dots, \xi_{mn})$  and  $\gamma_m = (\lceil \xi_{m1} \rceil, \dots, \lceil \xi_{mn} \rceil)$ , then  $\gamma_m \in \Sigma$ . As  $\lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \varphi_m$  exists, there are  $\gamma \in \Sigma$  and a subsequence  $\{\varphi_{m_i}\}$  of  $\{\varphi_m\}$  such that  $\gamma_{m_i} = \gamma$  for all  $i$ . Then, as  $\varphi_{m_i} \in \mathbb{I}_{\gamma}$ , one has  $\varphi = \lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} \varphi_{m_i} \in \mathbb{I}_{\gamma}$ , so that  $\varphi \in \Delta(\Sigma)$ .

Finally let us see that  $\Delta(\Sigma) \cap \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^n = \Sigma$ . Indeed, if  $\gamma \in \Delta(\Sigma) \cap \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^n$ , then there is  $\gamma' \in \Sigma$  such that  $\gamma \in \mathbb{I}_{\gamma'}$ , so that  $\gamma \in \mathbb{I}_{\gamma'} \cap \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^n \subseteq \Sigma$ .

(2) Note that  $\Delta'(\Sigma) = \{(\xi_1, \dots, \xi_n) \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^n \mid (\lfloor \xi_1 \rfloor, \dots, \lfloor \xi_n \rfloor) \in \Sigma\}$ . Therefore the lower saturatedness follows from the lower  $\mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ -saturatedness of  $\Sigma$ . The assertion  $\Delta'(\Sigma) \cap \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^n = \Sigma$  is obvious.

(3) For  $\gamma \in \Sigma$ , one has  $\mathbb{I}_{\gamma} \subseteq \Delta$ , so that the first assertion  $\Delta(\Sigma) \subseteq \Delta$  follows. Next let us see  $\Delta \subseteq \Delta'(\Sigma)$ . Indeed, if we set  $\gamma = (\lfloor \xi_1 \rfloor, \dots, \lfloor \xi_n \rfloor)$  for  $\varphi = (\xi_1, \dots, \xi_n) \in \Delta$ , then  $\gamma \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^n$  and  $\gamma \in \mathbb{I}_{\varphi}$ , so that  $\gamma \in \Delta \cap \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^n = \Sigma$ , and hence  $\varphi \in \Delta'(\Sigma)$ . The final assertion is obvious because  $\text{vol}(\Delta'(\Sigma)) = \#(\Sigma)$ .  $\square$

## 2. THE KEY LEMMA

Let  $k$  be a field and  $A := k[X_1, \dots, X_n]$  be the polynomial ring of  $n$ -variables over  $k$ . For  $\gamma = (e_1, \dots, e_n) \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^n$ , we denote  $e_1 + \cdots + e_n$  by  $|\gamma|$  and the monomial  $X_1^{e_1} \cdots X_n^{e_n}$  by  $X^{\gamma}$ . We set  $\text{Supp}(f) := \{\gamma \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^n \mid a_{\gamma} \neq 0\}$  for  $f = \sum_{\gamma \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^n} a_{\gamma} X^{\gamma} \in A$ . It is easy to see that

$$(2.1) \quad \text{Supp}(f + g) \subseteq \text{Supp}(f) \cup \text{Supp}(g)$$

for all  $f, g \in A$ .

**Lemma 2.1.** *Let  $\mathfrak{J}$  be an ideal of  $A$ . Let  $\Sigma$  be a non-empty subset of  $\mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^n$  such that  $\Sigma \cap \bigcup_{f \in \mathfrak{J}} \text{Supp}(f) = \emptyset$ . Then  $\text{length}_A(A/\mathfrak{J}) \geq \#(\Sigma)$ .*

*Proof.* It is sufficient to show that  $\text{length}_A(A/\mathfrak{J}) \geq \#(\Sigma')$  for any finite subset  $\Sigma'$  of  $\Sigma$ , so that we may assume that  $\Sigma$  is a finite set. We set  $\Sigma = \{\gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_N\}$  such that  $\gamma_i$ 's are distinct and  $|\gamma_i| \leq |\gamma_j|$  for  $1 \leq j \leq i \leq N$ . Let

$$\mathfrak{J}_i := \begin{cases} \mathfrak{J} & \text{if } i = 0, \\ \mathfrak{J} + X^{\gamma_1}A + \dots + X^{\gamma_i}A & \text{if } 1 \leq i \leq N. \end{cases}$$

Let us check that  $\mathfrak{J}_{i-1} \subsetneq \mathfrak{J}_i$  for each  $i = 1, \dots, N$ . Otherwise, there are  $f_1, \dots, f_{i-1} \in A$  and  $f \in \mathfrak{J}$  such that  $X^{\gamma_i} = f + X^{\gamma_1}f_1 + \dots + X^{\gamma_{i-1}}f_{i-1}$ , so that, by (2.1),

$$\gamma_i \in \text{Supp}(f) \cup \text{Supp}(X^{\gamma_1}f_1) \cup \dots \cup \text{Supp}(X^{\gamma_{i-1}}f_{i-1}).$$

Therefore, as  $\gamma_i \notin \text{Supp}(f)$ , there is  $j$  such that  $1 \leq j < i$  and  $\gamma_i \in \text{Supp}(X^{\gamma_j}f_j)$ , that is,  $\gamma_i = \gamma_j + \gamma$  for some  $\gamma \in \text{Supp}(f_j)$ , and hence  $\gamma = 0$  because  $|\gamma_i| \leq |\gamma_j|$ . This is a contradiction. Therefore one has the assertion of the lemma.  $\square$

### 3. DIFFERENTIAL OPERATORS AND MULTIPLICITIES

From now on, we assume that the characteristic of  $k$  is zero. For  $\gamma = (e_1, \dots, e_n) \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^n$ , we set

$$\partial^\gamma = \frac{\partial^\gamma}{\partial X^\gamma} := \frac{\partial^{|\gamma|}}{\partial X_1^{e_1} \dots \partial X_n^{e_n}} \quad \text{and} \quad \partial_\gamma := \frac{1}{e_1! \dots e_n!} \partial^\gamma.$$

Note that Leibnitz's rule can be written by

$$(3.2) \quad \partial_\gamma(f_1 \cdots f_r) = \sum_{\substack{\gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_r \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^n \\ \gamma_1 + \dots + \gamma_r = \gamma}} \partial_{\gamma_1}(f_1) \cdots \partial_{\gamma_r}(f_r)$$

in terms of the normalized differential operators  $\partial_\gamma$ 's.

Let  $\Delta$  be a lower saturated subset of  $\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^n$  and  $\Sigma := \Delta \cap \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^n$ . Note that  $\Sigma$  is a lower  $\mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ -saturated subset of  $\mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^n$ .

**Proposition 3.1.** *Let  $\mathfrak{m}$  be a maximal ideal of  $A$  and  $\mathfrak{J}$  be an ideal of  $A$  such that  $\mathfrak{m}$  is a minimal prime of  $\mathfrak{J}$ . If  $\partial_\gamma(\mathfrak{J}) \subseteq \mathfrak{m}$  for all  $\gamma \in \Sigma$ , then  $\text{length}_{A_{\mathfrak{m}}}((A/\mathfrak{J})_{\mathfrak{m}}) \geq \#(\Sigma)$ .*

*Proof.* First of all, let us claim the following:

**Claim 3.1.1.** *We may assume that  $\sqrt{\mathfrak{J}} = \mathfrak{m}$ .*

*Proof.* Let us see that  $\partial_\gamma(\mathfrak{J}A_{\mathfrak{m}}) \subseteq \mathfrak{m}A_{\mathfrak{m}}$  for any  $\gamma \in \Sigma$ . Indeed, for  $f \in \mathfrak{J}$  and  $a \in A_{\mathfrak{m}}$ , by virtue of Leibnitz's rule (3.2),

$$\partial_\gamma(fa) = \sum_{\substack{\gamma_1, \gamma_2 \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^n \\ \gamma_1 + \gamma_2 = \gamma}} \partial_{\gamma_1}(f) \cdot \partial_{\gamma_2}(a),$$

so that  $\partial_\gamma(fa) \in \mathfrak{m}A_{\mathfrak{m}}$  by our assumptions. Therefore, if we set  $\mathfrak{J}' = \mathfrak{J}A_{\mathfrak{m}} \cap A$ , then  $\sqrt{\mathfrak{J}'} = \mathfrak{m}$  and  $\partial_\gamma(\mathfrak{J}') \subseteq \mathfrak{m}A_{\mathfrak{m}} \cap A = \mathfrak{m}$ . Moreover,  $\text{length}_{A_{\mathfrak{m}}}((A/\mathfrak{J})_{\mathfrak{m}}) = \text{length}_{A_{\mathfrak{m}}}((A/\mathfrak{J}')_{\mathfrak{m}})$ , as required.  $\square$

From now on, we assume that  $\sqrt{\mathfrak{J}} = \mathfrak{m}$ , that is,  $\text{Supp}(A/\mathfrak{J}) = \{\mathfrak{m}\}$ . In this case, note that  $\text{length}_{A/\mathfrak{m}}((A/\mathfrak{J})_{\mathfrak{m}}) = \text{length}_A(A/\mathfrak{J})$ .

First we assume that  $k = A/\mathfrak{m}$ . Then  $\text{length}_A(A/\mathfrak{J}) = \dim_k(A/\mathfrak{J})$ . Moreover there are  $a_1, \dots, a_n \in k$  such that  $\mathfrak{m} = (X_1 - a_1, \dots, X_n - a_n)$ . Note that  $\partial/\partial X_i = \partial/\partial X'_i$ , where  $X'_i = X_i - a_i$  for  $i = 1, \dots, n$ , so that, replacing  $X_i$  by  $X'_i$ , we may assume that  $a_1 = \dots = a_n = 0$ . By Lemma 2.1, it is sufficient to show  $\Sigma \cap \bigcup_{f \in \mathfrak{J}} \text{Supp}(f) = \emptyset$ . Otherwise, there are  $\gamma \in \Sigma$  and  $f \in \mathfrak{J}$  such that  $\gamma \in \text{Supp}(f)$ , so that we can set

$$f = a_\gamma X^\gamma + \sum_{\gamma' \neq \gamma} a_{\gamma'} X^{\gamma'} \quad (a_\gamma \neq 0),$$

and hence  $\partial_\gamma(f) = a_\gamma + \sum_{\gamma' \neq \gamma} a_{\gamma'} \partial_\gamma(X^{\gamma'})$ . Note that  $\partial_\gamma(X^{\gamma'}) \in \mathfrak{m}$  for all  $\gamma'$  with  $\gamma' \neq \gamma$ . Thus  $\partial_\gamma(f) \notin \mathfrak{m}$ , which contradicts to  $\gamma \in \Sigma$ .

In general, let  $\bar{k}$  be an algebraic closure of  $k$ . Then  $\mathfrak{m}_{\bar{k}} := \mathfrak{m} \otimes_k \bar{k}$  and  $\mathfrak{J}_{\bar{k}} := \mathfrak{J} \otimes_k \bar{k}$  are ideals of  $A_{\bar{k}} := A \otimes_k \bar{k} = \bar{k}[X_1, \dots, X_n]$ . Moreover, if we set  $r = [A/\mathfrak{m} : k]$ , then there are distinct maximal ideals  $\mathfrak{m}_1, \dots, \mathfrak{m}_r$  and ideals  $\mathfrak{J}_1, \dots, \mathfrak{J}_r$  of  $A_{\bar{k}}$  such that  $\mathfrak{m}_{\bar{k}} = \mathfrak{m}_1 \cdots \mathfrak{m}_r$ ,  $\mathfrak{J}_{\bar{k}} = \mathfrak{J}_1 \cdots \mathfrak{J}_r$  and  $\sqrt{\mathfrak{J}_i} = \mathfrak{m}_i$  for  $i = 1, \dots, r$ .

**Claim 3.1.2.**  $\partial_\gamma(\mathfrak{J}_i) \subseteq \mathfrak{m}_i$  for any  $\gamma \in \Sigma$  and  $i = 1, \dots, r$ .

*Proof.* Without loss of generality, we may assume that  $i = 1$ . Fix  $f_1 \in \mathfrak{J}_1$ . We prove it by induction on  $|\gamma|$ . The assertion for  $|\gamma| = 0$  is obvious, so that we may assume that  $\gamma \neq (0, \dots, 0)$ . As  $\mathfrak{m}_1 + \mathfrak{J}_1 = A$  for  $i = 2, \dots, r$ , one can find  $f_i \in \mathfrak{J}_i$  such that  $f_i \notin \mathfrak{m}_1$ . Since  $\partial_\gamma$  is linear over  $\bar{k}$ , one has  $\partial_\gamma(\mathfrak{J}_{\bar{k}}) \subseteq \mathfrak{m}_{\bar{k}}$ , so that  $\partial_\gamma(f_1 \cdots f_r) \in \mathfrak{m}_1$ . On the other hand, by Leibnitz's rule (3.2),

$$\partial_\gamma(f_1 \cdots f_r) = \partial_\gamma(f_1) f_2 \cdots f_r + \sum_{\substack{\gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_r \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^n \\ \gamma_1 \neq \gamma, \gamma_1 + \dots + \gamma_r = \gamma}} \partial_{\gamma_1}(f_1) \cdots \partial_{\gamma_r}(f_r)$$

and  $\sum_{\substack{\gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_r \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^n \\ \gamma_1 \neq \gamma, \gamma_1 + \dots + \gamma_r = \gamma}} \partial_{\gamma_1}(f_1) \cdots \partial_{\gamma_r}(f_r) \in \mathfrak{m}_1$  by the hypothesis of induction, so that  $\partial_\gamma(f_1) f_2 \cdots f_r \in \mathfrak{m}_1$ , and hence  $\partial_\gamma(f_1) \in \mathfrak{m}_1$  because  $f_2 \cdots f_r \notin \mathfrak{m}_1$ .  $\square$

By Claim 3.1.2 together with the case where  $k = A/\mathfrak{m}$ , one has

$$\dim_{\bar{k}}(A_{\bar{k}}/\mathfrak{J}_i) = \text{length}_{A_{\bar{k}}}(A_{\bar{k}}/\mathfrak{J}_i) \geq \#(\Sigma)$$

for  $i = 1, \dots, r$ . Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} \text{length}_A(A/\mathfrak{J}) &= \frac{\dim_k(A/\mathfrak{J})}{[(A/\mathfrak{m}) : k]} = \frac{\dim_{\bar{k}}((A/\mathfrak{J}) \otimes_k \bar{k})}{[(A/\mathfrak{m}) : k]} = \frac{\dim_{\bar{k}}(A_{\bar{k}}/\mathfrak{J}_{\bar{k}})}{[(A/\mathfrak{m}) : k]} \\ &= \frac{\dim_{\bar{k}}(\bigoplus_{i=1}^r A_{\bar{k}}/\mathfrak{J}_i)}{[(A/\mathfrak{m}) : k]} = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^r \dim_{\bar{k}}(A_{\bar{k}}/\mathfrak{J}_i)}{[(A/\mathfrak{m}) : k]} \\ &\geq \frac{\sum_{i=1}^r \#(\Sigma)}{[(A/\mathfrak{m}) : k]} = \#(\Sigma), \end{aligned}$$

as required.  $\square$

Let  $\mathfrak{p}$  be a prime ideal of  $A$ ,  $K$  be the fractional field of  $A/\mathfrak{p}$  and  $x_i$  be the image of  $X_i$  in  $A/\mathfrak{p}$  for  $i = 1, \dots, n$ . Let

$$K_i := \begin{cases} k(x_i, \dots, x_n) & \text{if } i = 1, \dots, n, \\ k & \text{if } i = n + 1 \end{cases}$$

for  $i = 1, \dots, n + 1$ . Then

$$K = K_1 \supseteq K_2 \supseteq \dots \supseteq K_n \supseteq K_{n+1} = k.$$

Let  $\sigma_i$  be the transcendental degree of  $K_i$  over  $K_{i+1}$  for  $i = 1, \dots, n$ . Note that  $\sigma_1 + \dots + \sigma_n = \dim(A/\mathfrak{p})$  and  $\sigma_i \in \{0, 1\}$  for all  $i = 1, \dots, n$ . We set

$$\begin{cases} \Upsilon := \{i \in \{1, \dots, n\} \mid \sigma_i = 0\}, \\ (\mathbb{R}^n)_\Upsilon := \{(\xi_1, \dots, \xi_n) \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid \xi_j = 0 \text{ for all } j \in \{1, \dots, n\} \setminus \Upsilon\} \cong \mathbb{R}^\Upsilon, \\ \Delta_\Upsilon = \Delta \cap (\mathbb{R}^n)_\Upsilon, \quad \Sigma_\Upsilon := \Sigma \cap (\mathbb{R}^n)_\Upsilon. \end{cases}$$

Note that  $s := \#\Upsilon$  is the codimension of  $\text{Spec}(A/\mathfrak{p})$  in  $\text{Spec}(A)$ .

**Corollary 3.2.** *Let  $\mathfrak{J}$  be an ideal of  $A$  such that  $\mathfrak{p}$  is a minimal prime of  $\mathfrak{J}$  and  $\partial_\gamma(\mathfrak{J}) \subseteq \mathfrak{p}$  for all  $\gamma \in \Sigma$ . Then one has*

$$\text{length}_{A_{\mathfrak{p}}}((A/\mathfrak{J})_{\mathfrak{p}}) \geq \#\Sigma.$$

In particular,  $\text{length}_{A_{\mathfrak{p}}}((A/\mathfrak{J})_{\mathfrak{p}}) \geq \text{vol}_{(\mathbb{R}^n)_\Upsilon}(\Delta_\Upsilon)$ , where  $\text{vol}_{(\mathbb{R}^n)_\Upsilon}(\Delta_\Upsilon)$  is the volume of  $\Delta_\Upsilon$  in  $(\mathbb{R}^n)_\Upsilon$ .

*Proof.* We set  $\Upsilon_0 = \{i_1, \dots, i_s\}$  and  $\{1, \dots, n\} \setminus \Upsilon_0 = \{j_1, \dots, j_t\}$  ( $i_1 < \dots < i_s$  and  $j_1 < \dots < j_t$ ). By our construction,  $x_{j_1}, \dots, x_{j_t}$  are algebraically independent over  $k$  and  $x_{i_1}, \dots, x_{i_s}$  are algebraic over  $k(x_{j_1}, \dots, x_{j_t})$ . In particular,  $k[X_{j_1}, \dots, X_{j_t}] \setminus \{0\} \subseteq A \setminus \mathfrak{p}$  and  $K$  is finite over  $k(x_{j_1}, \dots, x_{j_t})$ .

Let  $A_S$  be the localization of  $A$  with respect to  $S = k[X_{j_1}, \dots, X_{j_t}] \setminus \{0\}$ , that is,  $A_S = k(X_{j_1}, \dots, X_{j_t})[X_{i_1}, \dots, X_{i_s}]$ . By the above observation,  $\mathfrak{p}A_S$  gives rise to a maximal ideal of  $A_S$  and  $\mathfrak{p}A_S$  is a minimal prime of  $\mathfrak{J}A_S$ . Moreover, as  $\partial_\gamma(\mathfrak{J}) \subseteq \mathfrak{p}$  for  $\gamma \in \Sigma_\Upsilon$ , one can see  $\partial_\gamma(\mathfrak{J}A_S) \subseteq \mathfrak{p}A_S$ . Therefore, the first assertion of the corollary follows from Proposition 3.1. The second assertion follows from Proposition 1.1.  $\square$

**Example 3.3.** Under the assumptions of Corollary 3.2, we introduce a special closed lower saturated subset  $\Delta$  of  $\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^n$ . Let  $\mathbf{d} = (d_1, \dots, d_n)$  be a sequence of positive number. For  $\varphi = (\xi_1, \dots, \xi_n) \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^n$ , we set  $|\varphi|_{\mathbf{d}} := \xi_1/d_1 + \dots + \xi_n/d_n$ . For a non-negative number  $\epsilon$ , we set  $\Delta := \{\varphi \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^n \mid |\varphi|_{\mathbf{d}} \leq \epsilon\}$ . Note that  $\Delta$  is lower saturated and

$$\text{vol}_{(\mathbb{R}^n)_\Upsilon}(\Delta_\Upsilon) = (\epsilon^s/s!) \prod_{j \in \Upsilon} d_j = (\epsilon^s/s!) d_1^{1-\sigma_1} \dots d_n^{1-\sigma_n}.$$

Therefore, by Corollary 3.2, if  $\partial_\gamma(\mathfrak{J}) \subseteq \mathfrak{p}$  for all  $\gamma \in \Sigma$ , then

$$(3.3) \quad \text{length}_{A_{\mathfrak{p}}}((A/\mathfrak{J})_{\mathfrak{p}}) \geq (\epsilon^s/s!) d_1^{1-\sigma_1} \dots d_n^{1-\sigma_n}.$$

We assume that there are integers  $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_m, \alpha_{m+1}$  such that

$$1 = \alpha_1 < \alpha_2 < \dots < \alpha_m < \alpha_{m+1} = n + 1$$

and  $d_{\alpha_i} = \dots = d_{\alpha_{i+1}-1}$  for all  $i = 1, \dots, m$ . We set

$$\begin{cases} \mathfrak{d}_i := d_{\alpha_i}, & \mathfrak{n}_i := \alpha_{i+1} - \alpha_i, \\ \delta_i := \text{the transcendental degree of } K_{\alpha_i} \text{ over } K_{\alpha_{i+1}}. \end{cases}$$

for  $i = 1, \dots, m$ . In this case, (3.3) asserts that

$$(3.4) \quad \text{length}_{A_{\mathfrak{p}}}((A/\mathfrak{J})_{\mathfrak{p}}) \geq (\epsilon^s/s!) \prod_{i=1}^m \mathfrak{d}_i^{\mathfrak{n}_i - \delta_i}.$$

Indeed, as  $\sum_{j=\alpha_i}^{\alpha_{i+1}-1} \sigma_j = \delta_i$ , one has

$$\prod_{j=1}^n d_j^{1-\sigma_j} = \prod_{i=1}^m \prod_{j=\alpha_i}^{\alpha_{i+1}-1} \mathfrak{d}_i^{1-\sigma_j} = \prod_{i=1}^m \mathfrak{d}_i^{\mathfrak{n}_i - \delta_i},$$

as desired.

#### APPENDIX A. LEBESGUE MEASURABILITY OF LOWER SATURATED SUBSET

In this appendix, let us consider the measurability of lower saturated subsets of  $\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^n$ , that is, one has the following:

**Proposition A.1.** *Let  $\Delta$  be a lower saturated subset of  $\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^n$ . Let  $\overline{\Delta}$  be the closure of  $\Delta$  and  $\Delta^\circ$  be the set of all interior points of  $\Delta$ . Then  $\text{vol}(\overline{\Delta} \setminus \Delta^\circ) = 0$ . In particular,  $\Delta$  is Lebesgue measurable.*

*Proof.* For a positive integer  $N$ , we set  $\Delta_N := \Delta \cap [0, N]^n$ . Then  $\Delta_N$  is lower saturated. Moreover, we set

$$J_{N,m} := \left\{ \frac{j}{m} \mid 0 \leq j \leq mN, j \in \mathbb{Z} \right\} \quad \text{and} \quad \Sigma_{N,m} := \Delta \cap (J_{N,m})^n$$

for a positive integer  $m$ . Further, we set

$$\Delta_{N,m} := \bigcup_{\varphi \in \Sigma_{N,m}} \mathbb{I}_{\varphi} \quad \text{and} \quad \Delta'_{N,m} := \bigcup_{(a_1, \dots, a_n) \in \Sigma_{N,m}} \left[ a_1, a_1 + \frac{1}{m} \right] \times \dots \times \left[ a_n, a_n + \frac{1}{m} \right].$$

Note that  $\Delta_{N,m} \subseteq \Delta_N \subseteq \Delta'_{N,m}$ , and  $\Delta_{N,m}$  and  $\Delta'_{N,m}$  are closed. Then one has the following:

**Claim A.1.1.** (1)  $\text{vol}(\Delta'_{N,m} \setminus \Delta_{N,m}) \leq n(1+N)^{n-1}/m$ .

(2)  $\text{vol}(\overline{\Delta} \cap [0, N]^n) \leq \text{vol}(\Delta'_{N,m})$ .

(3)  $\text{vol}(\Delta_{N,m}) \leq \text{vol}(\Delta^\circ \cap [0, N]^n)$ .

(4)  $\text{vol}((\overline{\Delta} \setminus \Delta^\circ) \cap [0, N]^n) = 0$ .

*Proof.* (1) We set

$$\Delta''_{N,m} := \Delta'_{N,m} - \left( \frac{1}{m}, \dots, \frac{1}{m} \right) = \bigcup_{(a_1, \dots, a_n) \in \Sigma_{N,m}} \left[ a_1 - \frac{1}{m}, a_1 \right] \times \cdots \times \left[ a_n - \frac{1}{m}, a_n \right].$$

Note that  $\Delta_{N,m} \subseteq \Delta''_{N,m}$ . Moreover, if we set

$$\partial S := \{(a_1, \dots, a_n) \in S \mid \exists i \in \{1, \dots, n\}, a_i = 0\}$$

for a subset  $S$  of  $(J_{N,m})^n$ , then

$$\Delta''_{N,m} \setminus \Delta_{N,m} \subseteq \bigcup_{(a_1, \dots, a_n) \in \partial \Sigma_{N,m}} \left[ a_1 - \frac{1}{m}, a_1 \right] \times \cdots \times \left[ a_n - \frac{1}{m}, a_n \right].$$

Therefore, one has

$$\begin{aligned} \text{vol}(\Delta'_{N,m} \setminus \Delta_{N,m}) &= \text{vol}(\Delta'_{N,m}) - \text{vol}(\Delta_{N,m}) \\ &= \text{vol}(\Delta''_{N,m}) - \text{vol}(\Delta_{N,m}) = \text{vol}(\Delta''_{N,m} \setminus \Delta_{N,m}) \\ &\leq \frac{\#(\partial \Sigma_{N,m})}{m^n} \leq \frac{\#(\partial (J_{N,m})^n)}{m^n}. \end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, since

$$\begin{aligned} \partial (J_{N,m})^n &= \{(a_1, \dots, a_{n-1}, 0) \mid (a_1, \dots, a_{n-1}) \in (J_{N,m})^{n-1}\} \\ &\quad \cup \{(a_1, \dots, a_{n-1}, a_n) \mid (a_1, \dots, a_{n-1}) \in \partial (J_{N,m})^{n-1} \text{ and } a_n \neq 0\}, \end{aligned}$$

one has

$$\begin{aligned} \#(\partial (J_{N,m})^n) &= (1 + mN)^{n-1} + (mN)\#(\partial (J_{N,m})^{n-1}) \\ &\leq m^{n-1}(1 + N)^{n-1} + m(1 + N)\#(\partial (J_{N,m})^{n-1}), \end{aligned}$$

so that one can see that  $\#(\partial (J_{N,m})^n) \leq nm^{n-1}(1 + N)^{n-1}$  by induction on  $n$ , as required.

(2) First as  $\text{vol}([0, N]^n \setminus [0, N]^n) = 0$ , one has  $\text{vol}(\overline{\Delta} \cap [0, N]^n) = \text{vol}(\overline{\Delta} \cap [0, N]^n)$ . Next let us see that  $\overline{\Delta} \cap [0, N]^n \subseteq \overline{\Delta}_N$ . Indeed, if  $\varphi \in \overline{\Delta} \cap [0, N]^n$ , then there is a sequence  $\{\varphi_m\}_{m=1}^\infty$  such that  $\varphi_m \in \Delta$  for all  $m$  and  $\varphi = \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \varphi_m$ . As  $\varphi \in [0, N]^n$ , there is a positive integer  $M$  such that  $\varphi_m \in [0, N]^n$  for  $m \geq M$ , so that  $\varphi \in \overline{\Delta}_N$ , as desired. Therefore, we obtain  $\text{vol}(\overline{\Delta} \cap [0, N]^n) \leq \text{vol}(\overline{\Delta}_N)$ .

On the other hand, as  $\Delta_N \subseteq \Delta'_{N,m}$  and  $\Delta'_{N,m}$  is closed, one has  $\overline{\Delta}_N \subseteq \Delta'_{N,m}$ , so that  $\text{vol}(\overline{\Delta}_N) \leq \text{vol}(\Delta'_{N,m})$ , and hence the assertion of (2) follows.

(3) As  $\mathbb{I}_\varphi^\circ \subseteq \Delta^\circ$  for  $\varphi \in \Sigma_{N,m}$ , one obtains  $\bigcup_{\varphi \in \Sigma_{N,m}} \mathbb{I}_\varphi^\circ \subseteq \Delta^\circ \cap [0, N]^n$ , and hence  $\text{vol}\left(\bigcup_{\varphi \in \Sigma_{N,m}} \mathbb{I}_\varphi^\circ\right) \leq \text{vol}(\Delta^\circ \cap [0, N]^n)$ . On the other hand, note that

$$\Delta_{N,m} \setminus \bigcup_{\varphi \in \Sigma_{N,m}} \mathbb{I}_\varphi^\circ = \left( \bigcup_{\varphi \in \Sigma_{N,m}} \mathbb{I}_\varphi \right) \setminus \left( \bigcup_{\varphi \in \Sigma_{N,m}} \mathbb{I}_\varphi^\circ \right) \subseteq \bigcup_{\varphi \in \Sigma_{N,m}} (\mathbb{I}_\varphi \setminus \mathbb{I}_\varphi^\circ),$$

so that

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &\leq \text{vol}(\Delta_{N,m}) - \text{vol}\left(\bigcup_{\varphi \in \Sigma_{N,m}} \mathbb{I}_\varphi^\circ\right) = \text{vol}\left(\Delta_{N,m} \setminus \bigcup_{\varphi \in \Sigma_{N,m}} \mathbb{I}_\varphi^\circ\right) \\ &\leq \text{vol}\left(\bigcup_{\varphi \in \Sigma_{N,m}} (\mathbb{I}_\varphi \setminus \mathbb{I}_\varphi^\circ)\right) \leq \sum_{\varphi \in \Sigma_{N,m}} \text{vol}(\mathbb{I}_\varphi \setminus \mathbb{I}_\varphi^\circ) = 0. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore,  $\text{vol}(\Delta_{N,m}) \leq \text{vol}(\Delta^\circ \cap [0, N]^n)$ , as required.

(4) By (1), (2) and (3), one has

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &\leq \text{vol}((\overline{\Delta} \setminus \Delta^\circ) \cap [0, N]^n) = \text{vol}(\overline{\Delta} \cap [0, N]^n) - \text{vol}(\Delta^\circ \cap [0, N]^n) \\ &\leq \text{vol}(\Delta'_{N,m}) - \text{vol}(\Delta_{N,m}) \leq n(1+N)^{n-1}/m, \end{aligned}$$

so that the assertion of (4) follows because  $m$  is an arbitrary positive integer.  $\square$

By (4) in Claim A.1.1, one can see that  $\text{vol}(\overline{\Delta} \setminus \Delta^\circ) = 0$  because

$$\bigcup_{N \geq 1} (\overline{\Delta} \setminus \Delta^\circ) \cap [0, N]^n = \overline{\Delta} \setminus \Delta^\circ.$$

In particular, since  $\Delta = \Delta^\circ \cup (\Delta \cap (\overline{\Delta} \setminus \Delta^\circ))$  and the Lebesgue measure is complete, the measurability of  $\Delta$  follows.  $\square$

#### REFERENCES

- [1] B. Edixhoven & J.-H. Evertse, Diophantine approximation and abelian varieties, Lecture Notes in Math., 1566.
- [2] J.-H. Evertse, An explicit version of Faltings' product theorem and an improvement of Roth's lemma, Acta Arithmetica, 73 (1995), 215–248.
- [3] G. Faltings, Diophantine approximation on abelian varieties, Ann. of Math., 133 (1991), 549–576.
- [4] R. Ferretti, An effective version of Faltings' product theorem, Forum Math., 8 (1996), 401–427.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, FACULTY OF SCIENCE, KYOTO UNIVERSITY, KYOTO, 606-8502, JAPAN

*E-mail address:* moriwaki@math.kyoto-u.ac.jp