

# THE LOWER BOUND ON THE HK MULTIPLICITIES OF QUADRIC HYPERSURFACES

VIJAYLAXMI TRIVEDI

ABSTRACT. Here we prove that the Hilbert-Kunz multiplicity of a quadric hypersurface of dimension  $d$  and odd characteristic  $p \geq 2d - 4$  is bounded below by  $1 + m_d$ , where  $m_d$  is the  $d^{\text{th}}$  coefficient in the expansion of  $\sec + \tan$ . This proves a part of the long standing conjecture of Watanabe-Yoshida. We also give an upper bound on the HK multiplicity of such a hypersurface.

We approach the question using the HK density function and the classification of ACM bundles on the smooth quadrics via matrix factorizations.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Let  $R$  be a Noetherian ring containing a field of characteristic  $p > 0$  and  $I$  be an ideal of finite colength in  $R$ . For such a pair Monsky ([M]) had introduced a characteristic  $p$  invariant known as the Hilbert-Kunz (HK) multiplicity  $e_{HK}(R, I)$ . This is a positive real number ( $\geq 1$ ) given by

$$e_{HK}(R, I) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\ell(R/I^{[q]})}{q^d}.$$

If  $(R, \mathbf{m}, k)$  is a formally unmixed Noetherian local ring then it was proved by Watanabe-Yoshida (Theorem 1.5 in [WY1]) that  $e_{HK}(R, \mathbf{m}) = 1$  if and only if  $R$  is regular. For the next best class of rings, namely quadric hypersurfaces they made the following (Conjecture 4.2 in [WY2])

**Conjecture [WY]** *Let  $p > 2$  be prime and  $K = \bar{\mathbf{F}}_p$  and let  $(R, \mathbf{m}_R, K)$  be a formally unmixed nonregular local ring of dimension  $n + 1$ . Then*

$$e_{HK}(R, \mathbf{m}_R) \geq e_{HK}(R_{p,n+1}, \mathbf{m}) \geq 1 + m_{n+1}.$$

Here  $R_{p,n+1} = K[x_0, \dots, x_{n+1}]/(x_0^2 + \dots + x_{n+1}^2)$  and  $m_{n+1}$  are the constants occurring as the coefficients of the following expression

$$\sec(x) + \tan(x) = 1 + \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} m_{n+1} x^{n+1}, \quad \text{where } |x| < \pi/2.$$

In the same paper ([WY2]) they showed that the conjecture holds for  $n \leq 3$ . The second inequality of the conjecture for  $n \leq 5$  was proved by Yoshida in [Y]. Later the conjecture upto  $n \leq 5$  was proved by Aberbach-Enescu in [AE2].

In the context of this conjecture, we recall the following result (around 2010) of Gessel-Monsky:

$$\lim_{p \rightarrow \infty} e_{HK}(R_{p,n+1}, \mathbf{m}) = 1 + m_{n+1}.$$

In higher dimensional cases for the class of local formally unmixed nonregular rings of fixed dimension  $d$ , various people ([AE1], [AE2], Celikbas-Dao-Huneke-Zhang in [CDHZ]) have given a lower bound  $C(d)$  ( $> 1$ ) on the HK multiplicity  $e_{HK}(R, \mathbf{m})$ .

However such lower bounds  $C(d)$  are weaker than the bound given in the above conjecture as implied by the above result of Gessel-Monsky.

Enescu and Shimomoto in [ES] have proved the first inequality  $e_{HK}(R) \geq e_{HK}(R_{p,n+1})$ , where  $R$  belongs to the class of complete intersection local rings.

The conjecture [WY] and related problems have been revisited in the recent paper [JNSWY].

Here we focus on the second inequality of the above mentioned conjecture and prove the following in Section 4.

**Theorem 1.1.** *Let  $p \neq 2$  and let  $p \geq n - 2$  for  $n$  even and let  $p \geq 2n - 4$  for  $n$  odd. Then*

$$1 + m_{n+1} + \left( \frac{2n - 4}{p} \right) \geq e_{HK}(R_{p,n+1}, \mathbf{m}) \geq 1 + m_{n+1}.$$

We approach the invariant by considering the Hilbert-Kunz (HK) density functions for the pair  $(R_{p,n+1}, \mathbf{m})$ , where  $k$  is a perfect field of characteristic  $p > 0$ . The notion of HK density function for  $(R, I)$ , where  $R$  is a  $\mathbb{N}$ -graded ring and  $I$  is a homogeneous ideal in  $R$  of finite colength, was introduced by the author ([T]) for standard graded rings and later generalized by the author and Watanabe ([TW2]) for  $\mathbb{N}$ -graded rings. We recall that the HK density function is a compactly supported continuous function  $f_{R,I} : [0, \infty] \rightarrow [0, \infty)$  defined as

$$f_{R,I}(x) = \lim_{s \rightarrow \infty} \ell(R/I^{[q]})_{[xq]}, \quad \text{where } q = p^s$$

and

$$e_{HK}(R, I) = \int_0^\infty f_{R,I}(x) dx.$$

To prove Theorem 1.1 we prove a stronger result about char  $p$  vis-a-vis char 0 (in Section 4):

**Theorem 1.2.** *The function  $f_{R_{n+1}^\infty} : [0, \infty) \rightarrow [0, \infty)$  given by*

$$f_{R_{n+1}^\infty}(x) := \lim_{p \rightarrow \infty} f_{R_{p,n+1}, \mathbf{m}}(x)$$

*is a well defined continuous function such that  $\int_0^\infty f_{R_{n+1}^\infty} = 1 + m_{n+1}$ .*

*Moreover, if  $p \geq 2n - 4$  and  $n$  is odd, or  $p \geq n - 2$  and  $n$  even then*

$$\begin{aligned} f_{R_{p,n+1}, \mathbf{m}}(x) &= f_{R_{n+1}^\infty}(x) \quad x \in [0, \frac{n+2}{2} - \frac{n-2}{2p}] \\ &\geq f_{R_{n+1}^\infty}(x) \quad x \in [\frac{n+2}{2} - \frac{n-2}{2p}, \frac{n+2}{2} + \frac{n-2}{2p}] \\ &= f_{R_{n+1}^\infty}(x) \quad x \in [\frac{n+2}{2} + \frac{n-2}{2p}, \infty). \end{aligned}$$

Note that for  $n = 1$  and  $n = 2$  the ring  $R_{p,n+1}$  is the homogeneous coordinate ring of  $\mathbb{P}_k^1$  and  $\mathbb{P}_k^1 \times \mathbb{P}_k^1$  respectively. In both the cases the invariants  $e_{HK}(R_{p,n+1})$  and  $f_{R_{p,n+1}, \mathbf{m}}$  are independent of the characteristic (see Eto-Yoshida [EY] and [T]). Hence we can assume  $n \geq 3$ .

Here given  $n$  we explicitly write the function  $f_{R_{n+1}^\infty}$  in Theorem 4.3, by first writing the function  $f_{R_{p,n+1}, \mathbf{m}}(x)$  for  $x \in [0, \infty) \setminus [\frac{n+2}{2} - \frac{n-2}{2p}, \frac{n+2}{2} + \frac{n-2}{2p}]$ . Hence we have a computation of  $F$ -thresholds as a (see Corollary 4.5)

**Corollary** *The  $F$ -thresholds  $c^{\mathbf{m}}(\mathbf{m}) = n$  for  $R_{p,n+1}$  defined over a perfect field of characteristic  $p \neq 2$ , where  $p \geq 2n - 4$  and  $n$  is odd, or  $p \geq n - 2$  and  $n$  even.*

Theorem 1.1 and the result of [ES] prove the Conjecture [WY] for the class of complete local rings (for large  $p$ ):

Let  $p \neq 2$  and let  $p \geq n - 2$  for  $n$  even and let  $p \geq 2n - 4$  for  $n$  odd. Let  $(R, \mathbf{m}_R, K)$  be a formally unmixed nonregular local ring of dimension  $n + 1$ . Then  $R$  is a complete intersection ring implies

$$e_{HK}(R, \mathbf{m}_R) \geq e_{HK}(R_{p,n+1}, \mathbf{m}) \geq 1 + m_{n+1}.$$

We go about computing the HK density function as follows. Recall that there exists the complete classification of indecomposable Arithmetically Cohen-Macaulay (ACM) bundles (due to Buchweitz-Eisenbud-Herzog [BEH]) on smooth quadrics  $Q_n = \text{Proj } R_{p,n+1}$  in terms of line bundles  $\mathcal{O}(t) = \mathcal{O}_{Q_n}(t)$  and twisted spinor bundles  $\mathcal{S}(t)$  (see Section 2). Since  $F_*^s(\mathcal{O}(a))$  and  $F_*^s(\mathcal{S}(a))$  are ACM bundles on  $Q_n$ , for every  $s^{\text{th}}$  iterated Frobenius map  $F^s : Q_n \rightarrow Q_n$  we have

$$F_*^s(\mathcal{O}(a)) = \bigoplus_{t \in \mathbb{Z}} \mathcal{O}(t)^{\nu^s(t,a)} \oplus \bigoplus_{t \in \mathbb{Z}} \mathcal{S}(t)^{\mu^s(t,a)}$$

and

$$F_*^s(\mathcal{S}(a)) = \bigoplus_{t \in \mathbb{Z}} \mathcal{O}(t)^{\tilde{\nu}^s(t,a)} \oplus \bigoplus_{t \in \mathbb{Z}} \mathcal{S}(t)^{\tilde{\mu}^s(t,a)},$$

Achinger in [A] showed that the ranks of the bundles  $\mathcal{O}(t)$  and  $\mathcal{S}(t)$  are related to the graded components of the ring  $R_{p,n+1}/\mathbf{m}^{[q]}$  by the formula

$$(1.1) \quad \ell(R_{p,n+1}/\mathbf{m}^{[q]})_a = \nu^s(0, a) + 2\lambda_0 \mu^s(1, a),$$

where  $\mathbf{m} = (x_0, \dots, x_{n+1})$ . This at once implies that to compute  $f_{R_{p,n+1}}$  it is enough to compute all the pairs

$$\nu^s(t, a) + 2\lambda_0 \mu^s(t + 1, a), \quad \text{for } q = p^s \gg 0, \quad \text{where } t \in \mathbb{Z}, \text{ and } 0 \leq a < q.$$

Now we use another result (Theorem 2 in [A]) which determines, in terms of  $q = p^s$ ,  $a$  and  $n$ , the occurrence of the bundle  $\mathcal{O}(t)$  or  $\mathcal{S}(t)$  in the decomposition of  $F_*^s(\mathcal{O}(a))$  and  $F_*^s(\mathcal{S}(a))$ .

The layout of the paper is as follows:

In Section 2 we recall the known results.

In Section 3 we prove that the pairs are computable if the decomposition of  $F_*^s(\mathcal{O}(a))$  has only one *type* of spinor bundles. However this is not always the case, as the existence of only one type of spinor bundle would imply that the HK density function  $f_{R_{p,n+1}}$  and therefore the HK multiplicity  $e_{HK}(R_{p,n+1})$  are independent of the characteristic  $p$ . However, for large enough  $p$  one can ensure that there are at the most two types of spinor bundles, as observed in Lemma 3.2.

We analyse the *difficult range* in the interval  $[0, 1)$ , with the property that if  $a/q$  is outside this range, then the bundle  $F_*^s(\mathcal{O}(a))$  has at most one type of spinor bundle. In particular every pair  $\{\nu^s(t, a) + 2\lambda_0 \mu^s(t + 1, a)\}_t$  is computable provided  $a/q$  avoids this range.

Notably this range keeps shrinking as  $p \rightarrow \infty$ . We use this observation in Section 4 to explicitly write down the HK density function everywhere except on the range (as in Theorem 1.2) and also get a closed formula for the function  $f_{R_{n+1}^\infty}$ .

On this range too the HK density function  $R_{p,n+1}$  can be computed as suggested by the Lemma 3.9 and the computation done in Section 5 for  $n = 3$  case. However the expression will get more complicated as the case  $n = 3$  shows; here the function  $f_{R_{p,4}}$  is a piecewise polynomial and, on the range  $[2 + (p - 1)/2p, 2 + (p + 1)/p)$ , it is given by infinitely many polynomial functions, defined using a nested sequence of intervals.

Looking further, this suggests possible computations for the HK density and related invariants in other situations, where we have information on ACM bundles using matrix factorizations.

## 2. PRELIMINARIES

In this section we recall the relevant results which are known in the literature.

**Definition 2.1.** A vector bundle  $E$  on a smooth  $n$ -dimensional hypersurface  $X = \text{Proj } S/(f)$ , where  $S = k[x_0, \dots, x_{n+1}]$  is called arithmetically Cohen-Macaulay (ACM) if  $H^i(X, E(m)) = 0$ , for  $0 < i < n$  and for all  $m$ .

It is easy to check that a vector bundle  $E$  on  $X$  is ACM if and only if the corresponding graded  $S/(f)$  module is maximal Cohen-Macaulay (MCM).

Let  $Q_n = \text{Proj } S/(f)$  be the quadric given by the hypersurface  $x_0^2 + \dots + x_{n+1}^2 = 0$  in  $\mathbb{P}_k^{n+1} = \text{Proj } S$ , where  $n \geq 3$ . Let  $k$  be an algebraically closed field. Henceforth we assume  $n > 2$ .

By B-E-H classification ([BEH]) of indecomposable graded MCM modules over quadrics we have: Other than free modules on  $S/(f)$ , there is (upto shift) only one indecomposable module  $M$  (which is the single spinor bundle  $\Sigma$  on  $Q_n$ ) if  $n$  is odd and there are only two of them  $M_+$  and  $M_-$  (which correspond to the two spinor bundles  $\Sigma_+$  and  $\Sigma_-$  on  $Q_n$ ) if  $n$  is even.

Moreover an MCM module over  $S/(f)$  corresponds to a *matrix factorization* of the polynomial  $f$  (such an equivalence is given by Eisenbud in [E], for more general hypersurfaces ( $f$ )), which is a pair  $(\phi, \psi)$  of square matrices of polynomials, of the same size, such that  $\phi \cdot \psi = f \cdot \text{id} = \psi \cdot \phi$  and the MCM module is the cokernel of  $\phi$ .

Now the matrix factorization  $(\phi_n, \psi_n)$  for indecomposable bundles on  $Q_n$  (see Langer [L], Section 2.2) gives an exact sequence of locally free sheaves on  $\mathbb{P}_k^{n+1}$

$$(2.1) \quad 0 \longrightarrow \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}_k^N}(-2)^{2^{\lfloor n/2 \rfloor + 1}} \xrightarrow{\Phi_n} \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}_k^N}(-1)^{2^{\lfloor n/2 \rfloor + 1}} \longrightarrow i_* \mathcal{S} \longrightarrow 0,$$

$\mathcal{S} = \Sigma$  and  $\Phi = \phi_n = \psi_n$  for  $n$  odd and  $\mathcal{S} = \Sigma_+ \oplus \Sigma_-$  and  $\Phi_n = \phi_n \oplus \psi_n$  for  $n$  even. Since  $\mathcal{S}$  is supported on  $Q_n$  it is sheaf on  $Q_n$ . Moreover the above description gives the short exact sequences of vector bundles on  $Q_n$ : If  $n$  odd then

$$0 \longrightarrow \mathcal{S} \longrightarrow \mathcal{O}_{Q_n}^{2^{\lfloor n/2 \rfloor + 1}} \longrightarrow \mathcal{S}(1) \longrightarrow 0.$$

If  $n$  is even then

$$0 \longrightarrow \Sigma_- \longrightarrow \mathcal{O}_{Q_n}^{2^{\lfloor n/2 \rfloor}} \longrightarrow \Sigma_+(1) \longrightarrow 0$$

and

$$0 \longrightarrow \Sigma_+ \longrightarrow \mathcal{O}_{Q_n}^{2^{\lfloor n/2 \rfloor}} \longrightarrow \Sigma_-(1) \longrightarrow 0.$$

We also have the natural exact sequence

$$(2.2) \quad 0 \longrightarrow \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}_k^N}(-2) \longrightarrow \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}_k^N} \longrightarrow \mathcal{O}_{Q_n} \longrightarrow 0.$$

We denote

$$R_{p,n+1} = \frac{k[x_0, \dots, x_{n+1}]}{(x_0^2 + \dots + x_{n+1}^2)} = \bigoplus_{m \geq 0} H^0(Q_n, \mathcal{O}_{Q_n}(m)) \quad \text{and} \quad n \geq 3,$$

where  $k$  is a field of characteristic  $p > 2$ . In particular the  $m^{\text{th}}$  graded component of  $R_{p,n+1}$  is  $H^0(Q_n, \mathcal{O}_{Q_n}(m))$ . We will be using the following set of equalities in our forthcoming computations.

$$\begin{aligned} \ell(R_{p,n+1})_m &= h^0(Q_n, \mathcal{O}_{Q_n}(m)) = h^0(\mathbb{P}_k^{n+1}, \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}_k^{n+1}}(m)) - h^0(\mathbb{P}_k^{n+1}, \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}_k^{n+1}}(m-2)) \\ h^0(Q_n, \mathcal{S}(m)) &= 2\lambda_0 \left[ h^0(\mathbb{P}_k^{n+1}, \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}_k^{n+1}}(m-1)) - h^0(\mathbb{P}_k^{n+1}, \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}_k^{n+1}}(m-2)) \right], \end{aligned}$$

where  $2\lambda_0 = 2^{\lfloor n/2 \rfloor + 1}$ .

By Serre duality ( $\omega_{Q_n} = \mathcal{O}_{Q_n}(-n)$  and  $\mathcal{S}^\vee = \mathcal{S}(1)$ )

$$h^n(Q_n, \mathcal{O}(m)) = h^0(Q_n, \mathcal{O}(-m-n)) \quad \text{and} \quad h^n(Q_n, \mathcal{S}(m)) = h^0(Q_n, \mathcal{S}(1-m-n)).$$

The rank of  $Q_n$ -bundle  $\mathcal{S} = \lambda_0$ .

Now we recall other relevant facts from [A].

Since  $\mathcal{O}(a)$  and  $\mathcal{S}(a)$  are ACM bundles (also follows from (2.1)), the projection formula implies that  $F_*^s(\mathcal{O}(a))$  is an ACM bundle on  $Q_n$ . For  $q = p^s$  and  $a \in \mathbb{Z}$ ,

$$(2.3) \quad F_*^s(\mathcal{O}(a)) = \bigoplus_{t \in \mathbb{Z}} \mathcal{O}(t)^{\nu^s(t,a)} \oplus \bigoplus_{t \in \mathbb{Z}} \mathcal{S}(t)^{\mu^s(t,a)}.$$

Similarly

$$(2.4) \quad F_*^s(\mathcal{S}(a)) = \bigoplus_{t \in \mathbb{Z}} \mathcal{O}(t)^{\tilde{\nu}^s(t,a)} \oplus \bigoplus_{t \in \mathbb{Z}} \mathcal{S}(t)^{\tilde{\mu}^s(t,a)}.$$

Then (see the proof of Theorem 1 of [A]) considering the short exact sequence

$$0 \longrightarrow \Omega_{\mathbb{P}_k^{n+1}}(1) |_Q \longrightarrow \bigoplus^{n+2} \mathcal{O}_{Q_n} \longrightarrow \mathcal{O}_{Q_n}(1) \longrightarrow 0,$$

where the second map is given by  $(a_0, \dots, a_{n+1}) \rightarrow \sum a_i x_i$ , we get

$$0 \longrightarrow H^0(Q_n, F^{s*} \Omega_{\mathbb{P}_k^{n+1}}(1) \otimes \mathcal{O}(a)) \longrightarrow H^0(Q_n, \bigoplus F^{s*} \mathcal{O}(a)) \xrightarrow{\Psi^{a+q}} H^0(Q_n, \mathcal{O}(a+q)) \longrightarrow \dots$$

This gives

$$\ell\left(\frac{R_{p,n+1}}{\mathbf{m}^{[q]}}\right)_{a+q} = \ell(\text{coker } \Psi_{a+q}) = h^1(Q_n, F^{s*} \Omega_{\mathbb{P}_k^{n+1}}(1) \otimes \mathcal{O}(a)) = h^1(Q_n, \Omega_{\mathbb{P}_k^{n+1}} \otimes F_*^s \mathcal{O}(a+q)).$$

Now by Lemma 1.2 in [A] we have

$$h^1(Q_n, \Omega_{\mathbb{P}_k^{n+1}}(t) |_{Q_n}) = \delta_{t,0} \quad \text{and} \quad h^1(Q_n, \mathcal{S} \otimes \Omega_{\mathbb{P}_k^{n+1}}(t) |_{Q_n}) = 2^{\lfloor n/2 \rfloor + 1} \delta_{t,1}.$$

Therefore, (replacing  $a$  by  $a - q$ ) we have

$$(2.5) \quad \ell(R_{p,n+1}/\mathbf{m}^{[q]})_a = \text{coker } \Psi_a = \nu^s(0, a) + 2\lambda_0 \mu^s(1, a),$$

where  $\mathbf{m} = (x_0, \dots, x_{n+1})$ .

We use this observation of [A], for the computation of the HK density function  $f_{R_{p,n+1}, \mathbf{m}}$ . Note that for any integer  $m \geq 0$ , there is an integer  $i \geq 0$  such that  $iq \leq m < (i+1)q$ . Hence by the projection formula

$$F_*^s(\mathcal{O}(m)) = F_*^s(\mathcal{O}(m-iq) \otimes F^{s*}(\mathcal{O}(iq))) = F_*^s(\mathcal{O}(m-iq)) \otimes \mathcal{O}(i).$$

In particular

$$(2.6) \quad \ell(R_{p,n+1}/\mathbf{m}^{[q]})_m = \nu^s(-i, m-iq) + 2\lambda_0 \mu^s(-i+1, m-iq).$$

Therefore to know the HK density function  $f_{R_{p,n+1}, \mathbf{m}}$ , it is enough to compute the pair  $\nu^s(-i, a) + 2\lambda_0 \mu^s(-i+1, a)$ , for all  $i$  and for  $0 \leq a < q$ .

We also use the following result of Achinger (Theorem 2 in [A]) which determines, in terms of  $s$ ,  $a$  and  $n$ , when the numbers  $\nu^s(i, a)$  and  $\mu^s(i, a)$  are nonzero in the decomposition of  $F_*^s(\mathcal{O}(a))$ . Langer in [L] has given such formula for the occurrence of line bundles in the Frobenius direct image.

**Theorem** [A]. *Let  $p \neq 2$ ,  $s \geq 1$  and  $n \geq 3$  and*

$$F_*^s(\mathcal{O}(a)) = \bigoplus_{t \in \mathbb{Z}} \mathcal{O}(t)^{\nu^s(t,a)} \oplus \bigoplus_{t \in \mathbb{Z}} \mathcal{S}(t)^{\mu^s(t,a)}.$$

*Then*

(1)  $F_*^s(\mathcal{O}(a))$  contains  $\mathcal{O}(t)$  if and only if  $0 \leq a - tq \leq n(q - 1)$ .

(2)  $F_*^s(\mathcal{O}(a))$  contains  $\mathcal{S}(t)$  if and only if

$$\left( \frac{(n-2)(p-1)}{2} \right) \frac{q}{p} \leq a - tq \leq \left( \frac{(n-2)(p-1)}{2} + n - 2 + p \right) \frac{q}{p} - n.$$

(3)  $F_*^s(\mathcal{S}(a))$  contains  $\mathcal{O}(t)$  if and only if  $1 \leq a - tq \leq n(q - 1)$ .

(4)  $F_*^s(\mathcal{S}(a))$  contains  $\mathcal{S}(t)$  if and only if

$$\left( \frac{(n-2)(p-1)}{2} \right) \frac{q}{p} + 1 - \delta_{s,1} \leq a - tq \leq \left( \frac{(n-2)(p-1)}{2} + n - 2 + p \right) \frac{q}{p} - n + \delta_{s,1}.$$

### 3. FORMULA FOR THE PAIRS $\nu^s(i, a) + 2\lambda_0\mu^s(i + 1, a)$

In the rest of the paper

$$R_{p,n+1} = \frac{k[x_0, \dots, x_{n+1}]}{(x_0^2 + \dots + x_{n+1}^2)} \quad \text{and} \quad Q_n = \text{Proj } R_{p,n+1},$$

where  $n \geq 3$  and  $k$  is a perfect field of characteristic  $p > 2$ .

**Notations 3.1.** (1)  $\nu^s(-t, a) = \nu_{-t}^s(a)$  and  $\mu^s(-t, a) = \mu_{-t}^s(a)$ , where

$$F_*^s(\mathcal{S}(a)) = \bigoplus_{t \in \mathbb{Z}} \mathcal{O}(t)^{\tilde{\nu}^s(t,a)} \oplus \bigoplus_{t \in \mathbb{Z}} \mathcal{S}(t)^{\tilde{\mu}^s(t,a)}.$$

(2) We also denote  $\mathcal{O}_{Q_n}(m)$  by  $\mathcal{O}(m)$ .

(3)  $h^0(Q_n, \mathcal{O}(m)) = Y_m$  and  $h^0(\mathbb{P}_k^{n+1}, \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}_k^{n+1}}(m)) = X_m$ .

(4) Let

$$n_0 = \lceil \frac{(n-2)(p-1)}{2p} \rceil \quad \text{and} \quad \Delta = n_0 - \frac{(n-2)(p-1)}{2p}.$$

Now

$$n \text{ even} \implies \Delta = \frac{n-2}{2p} \quad \text{and} \quad n \text{ odd} \implies \Delta = \frac{n-2}{2p} + \frac{1}{2}.$$

(5) A spinor bundle is of *type*  $t$  if it is isomorphic to  $\mathcal{S}(t)$ . We say two spinor bundles  $\mathcal{S}(t)$  and  $\mathcal{S}(t')$  are of *the same type* if  $t = t'$ .

(6) An invariant such as  $\nu_i^s(a)$  is *computable* if there exists a polynomial  $F_i(X, Y) \in \mathbb{Q}[X, Y]$  of degree  $\leq n$  such that  $\nu_i^s(a) = F_i(p^s, a)$  (similarly for  $\mu_i^s(a)$ ).

In the first lemma we prove that for sufficiently large  $p$  (compare to  $n$ ) there are atmost three types of spinor bundles in the decomposition of  $F_*^s(a)$ , for any  $0 \leq a < q$ . Moreover for a fixed such an integer  $a$ , there are atmost two types of spinor bundles.

However one can not do better than this, because if the decomposition of  $F_*^s(\mathcal{O}(a))$  contains only one type of the spinor bundle then all the pairs  $\nu_i^s(a) + 2\lambda_0\mu_{i+1}^s(a)$  are computable as will be shown in Lemma 3.6. But then the HK density function  $f_{R_p, n+1}$  and therefore  $e_{HK}(R_{p, n+1})$  will be independent of characteristic  $p$ , which is a contradiction due to the examples of [WY2].

**Lemma 3.2.** *If  $0 \leq a < q = p^s$  and  $p > 2$  then*

(1)  $F_*^s(\mathcal{O}(a))$  contains  $\mathcal{O}(t)$  if and only if  $t \in \{0, -1, \dots, -n + 1\}$ . Moreover

(2)  $F_*^s(\mathcal{O}(a))$  contains  $\mathcal{S}(t)$  implies

$$t \in \left\{ -(n_0 - 1), -n_0, -(n_0 + 1), \dots, -\left(n_0 + \left\lceil \frac{n-2}{p} \right\rceil \right) \right\}.$$

In particular, if  $n-2 \leq p$  then  $n_0 = \lceil n/2 \rceil - 1$  and  $t \in \{-n_0 - 1, -n_0, -n_0 + 1\}$ .

Moreover,

(a) if  $n$  is even then

- (i)  $\mu_{-n_0-1}^s(a) \neq 0 \implies 0 \leq a/q < \frac{n-2}{2p}$
- (ii)  $\mu_{-n_0}^s(a) \neq 0 \implies 0 \leq a/q < 1$
- (iii)  $\mu_{-n_0+1}^s(a) \neq 0 \implies 1 - \frac{n-2}{2p} \leq a/q$ .

(b) If  $n$  is odd then

- (i)  $\mu_{-n_0-1}^s(a) = 0$
- (ii)  $\mu_{-n_0}^s(a) \neq 0 \implies 0 \leq a/q < \frac{1}{2} + \frac{n-2}{2p}$
- (iii)  $\mu_{-n_0+1}^s(a) \neq 0 \implies \frac{1}{2} - \frac{n-2}{2p} \leq a/q$ .

*Proof.* The assertion (1) is just restating the assertion (1) of [A].

By the assertion (2) of [A], if  $\mathcal{S}(t)$  occurs in  $F_*^s(\mathcal{O}(a))$  then

$$\begin{aligned} (n_0 - \Delta)q &\leq a - tq \leq (n_0 - \Delta)q + (n - 2)q/p + q - n. \\ (n_0 - \Delta) &\leq a/q - t \leq (n_0 - \Delta) + (n - 2)/p + 1 - n/q. \end{aligned}$$

Hence

$$0 \leq \frac{a}{q} + \Delta - t - n_0 \leq \frac{n-2}{p} + 1 - \frac{n}{q}.$$

Now  $n_0 - 1 \leq -t$  as  $a/q + \Delta < 2$ . On the other hand

$$-t - n_0 - 1 \leq \frac{n-2}{p} - \frac{n}{q} \implies -t - n_0 - 1 < \frac{n-2}{p} \leq \left\lceil \frac{n-2}{p} \right\rceil$$

This implies  $-t \leq n_0 + \left\lceil \frac{n-2}{p} \right\rceil$ .

This proves assertion (2):  $n_0 - 1 \leq -t \leq \lceil (n-2)/p \rceil + n_0$ .

In particular  $n-2 \leq p$  implies  $-t \in \{n_0 - 1, n_0, n_0 + 1\}$ .

Now the rest of the assertion follows from the following three possibilities:

- (1) If  $-t = n_0 - 1$  then we have  $0 \leq a/q + \Delta - 1 \leq 1 + \frac{n-2}{p} - \frac{n}{q} < 1 + \frac{n-2}{p}$ .
- (2) If  $-t = n_0$  then we have  $0 \leq a/q + \Delta \leq 1 + \frac{n-2}{p} - \frac{n}{q} < 1 + \frac{n-2}{p}$ .
- (3) If  $-t = n_0 + 1$  then we have  $0 \leq a/q + \Delta \leq \frac{n-2}{p} - \frac{n}{q} < \frac{n-2}{p}$ .

□

**Remark 3.3.** If  $n$  is even and  $p \geq n-2$  then  $F_*^s(\mathcal{O}(a))$  has at most three types of spinor bundles. If  $0 \leq a < q$ , then they all belong to the set  $\{\mathcal{S}(-n_0+1), \mathcal{S}(-n_0), \mathcal{S}(-n_0-1)\}$  (we will see that the only first two are relevant for our computation). Moreover for a given choice of such an integer  $a$ , there are at most two types of spinor bundles, namely  $\mathcal{S}(-n_0+1)$ ,  $\mathcal{S}(-n_0)$  or  $\mathcal{S}(-n_0)$ ,  $\mathcal{S}(-n_0-1)$ .

If  $n$  is odd and  $p \geq n-2$  and  $0 \leq a < q$  then the only possible spinor bundles are  $\mathcal{S}(-n_0+1)$ ,  $\mathcal{S}(-n_0)$ .

**Notations 3.4.** Let  $0 \leq a < q = p^s$  be an integer. We define iteratively,  $Z_{-i}^s(a)$  for  $0 \leq i \leq n_0 + 2$  as follows.

$$\text{Let } Z_0^s(a) = Y_a, \quad Z_{-1}^s(a) = Y_{a+q} - Y_1 Y_a$$

and let

$$Z_{-i}^s(a) = Y_{a+iq} - [Y_1 Z_{-i+1}^s(a) + Y_2 Z_{-i+2}^s(a) + \dots + Y_i Z_0^s(a)].$$

Similarly we define iteratively,  $L_{-i}^s(a)$  for  $n_0 + 1 \leq i \leq n - 1$  as follows.

Let  $L_{-n+1}^s(a) = Y_{q-a-n}$  and for  $n_0 + 1 \leq i < n - 1$  we denote

$$L_{-i}^s(a) = Y_{(n-i)q-a-n} - [Y_{n-i-1}L_{-n+1}^s(a) + \cdots + Y_1L_{-i-1}^s(a)].$$

**Remark 3.5.** By construction

$$Z_{-i}^s(a) = r_{i0}Y_a + r_{i1}Y_{a+q} + \cdots + r_{i(i-1)}Y_{a+(i-1)q} + Y_{a+iq}$$

and

$$L_{-i}^s(a) = s_{i0}Y_{q-a-n} + s_{i1}Y_{2q-a-n} + \cdots + s_{i(n-i-2)}Y_{(n-i-1)q-a-n} + Y_{(n-i)q-a-n},$$

where  $\{r_{ij}, s_{ik}\}_{j,k}$  are some rational numbers independent of  $s$  and  $a$ . On the other hand for an integer  $m \geq 0$

$$Y_m = \binom{m+n+1}{n+1} - \binom{m+n-1}{n+1} = \frac{2m^n}{n!} + O(m^{n-1}).$$

Hence both  $Z_{-i}^s(a)$  and  $L_{-i}^s(a)$  are computable in the sense of Notations 3.1.

The following lemma implies that except for  $i = n_0 + 1$  and  $i = n_0 + 2$  all the pairs  $\nu_{-i}^s(a) + 2\lambda_0\mu_{-i+1}^s(a)$  are computable.

**Lemma 3.6.** *If  $p \geq n - 2$  is an odd prime and  $n \geq 3$ . Then for given  $1 \leq s$  and  $0 \leq a < q = p^s$*

- (1)  $\nu_{-i}^s(a) + 2\lambda_0\mu_{-i+1}^s(a) = Z_{-i}^s(a)$ , if  $0 \leq i \leq n_0$ .
- (2)  $\nu_{-n_0-1}^s(a) + 2\lambda_0\mu_{-n_0}^s(a) = Z_{-n_0-1}^s(a) + 2\lambda_0\mu_{-n_0+1}^s(a)$ .
- (3)  $\nu_{-n_0-2}^s(a) + 2\lambda_0\mu_{-n_0-1}^s(a) = Z_{-n_0-2}^s(a) + 2\lambda_0(Y_1 - Y_0)\mu_{-n_0+1}^s(a) + 2\lambda_0\mu_{-n_0}^s(a)$ .
- (4)  $\nu_{-i}^s(a) + 2\lambda_0\mu_{-i+1}^s(a) = L_{-i}^s(a)$ , if  $n_0 + 3 \leq i \leq n - 1$ .
- (5)  $\nu_{-n_0-2}^s(a) = L_{-n_0-2}^s(a)$ .
- (6)  $\nu_{-n_0-1}^s(a) = L_{-n_0-1}^s(a) - 2\lambda_0\mu_{-n_0-1}^s(a)$ .
- (7)  $\nu_{-i}^s(a) = 0$ , for  $i \geq n$  and  $\mu_{-j}^s(a) = 0$  if  $j \notin \{n_0 + 1, n_0, n_0 - 1\}$ .

*Proof.* We fix  $0 \leq a < q = p^s$ . Then, by Lemma 3.2

$$\begin{aligned} F_*^s(\mathcal{O}(a)) &= \mathcal{O}(-n+1)^{\nu_{-n+1}^s(a)} \oplus \cdots \oplus \mathcal{O}(-1)^{\nu_{-1}^s(a)} \oplus \mathcal{O}^{\nu_0^s(a)} \\ &\quad \oplus \mathcal{S}(-n_0+1)^{\mu_{-n_0+1}^s(a)} \oplus \mathcal{S}(-n_0)^{\mu_{-n_0}^s(a)} \oplus \mathcal{S}(-n_0-1)^{\mu_{-n_0-1}^s(a)}. \end{aligned}$$

Tensoring the above equation by  $\mathcal{O}(i)$  and by projection formula, we get

$$\begin{aligned} F_*^s(\mathcal{O}(a+iq)) &= \mathcal{O}(i-n+1)^{\nu_{-n+1}^s(a)} \oplus \cdots \oplus \mathcal{O}(i-1)^{\nu_{-1}^s(a)} \oplus \mathcal{O}(i)^{\nu_0^s(a)} \\ &\quad \oplus \mathcal{S}(i-n_0+1)^{\mu_{-n_0+1}^s(a)} \oplus \mathcal{S}(i-n_0)^{\mu_{-n_0}^s(a)} \oplus \mathcal{S}(i-n_0-1)^{\mu_{-n_0-1}^s(a)}. \end{aligned}$$

Applying the the functor  $H^0(Q_n, -)$  we get

$$(3.1) \quad \begin{aligned} \nu_0^s(a) &= Y_a = Z_0^s(a) \\ \nu_{-1}^s(a) &= Y_{a+q} - Y_1Y_a = Z_{-1}^s(a) \end{aligned}$$

In general, for  $i < n_0$ ,

$$Y_{a+iq} = Y_0\nu_{-i}^s(a) + Y_1\nu_{-i+1}^s(a) + \cdots + Y_i\nu_0^s(a)$$



which implies

$$\nu_{-i}^s(a) = \nu_{-i}^s(a) + 2\lambda_0\mu_{-i+1}^s(a) = Z_{-i}^s(a).$$

For  $i = n_0$

$$\begin{aligned} Y_{a+n_0q} &= Y_0\nu_{-n_0}^s(a) + Y_1\nu_{-n_0+1}^s(a) + \cdots + Y_{n_0}\nu_0^s(a) + 2\lambda_0\mu_{-n_0+1}^s(a) \\ &= \nu_{-n_0}^s(a) + Y_1Z_{-n_0+1}^s(a) + \cdots + Y_{n_0}Z_0^s(a) + 2\lambda_0\mu_{-n_0+1}^s(a) \\ &\implies \nu_{-n_0}^s(a) + 2\lambda_0\mu_{-n_0+1}^s(a) = Z_{-n_0}^s(a) \end{aligned}$$

This proves assertion (1).

For  $i = n_0 + 1$

$$\begin{aligned} Y_{a+(n_0+1)q} &= Y_0\nu_{-n_0-1}^s(a) + Y_1\nu_{-n_0}^s(a) + \cdots + Y_{n_0+1}\nu_0^s(a) + 2\lambda_0[(Y_1 - Y_0)\mu_{-n_0+1}^s(a) + \mu_{-n_0}^s(a)] \\ &\implies \nu_{-n_0-1}^s(a) + 2\lambda_0\mu_{-n_0}^s(a) = Z_{-n_0-1}^s(a) + 2\lambda_0\mu_{-n_0+1}^s(a) \end{aligned}$$

This proves assertion (2).

For  $i = n_0 + 2$

$$\begin{aligned} Y_{a+(n_0+2)q} &= Y_0\nu_{-n_0-2}^s(a) + Y_1\nu_{-n_0-1}^s(a) + \cdots + Y_{n_0+2}\nu_0^s(a) \\ &\quad + 2\lambda_0(X_2 - X_1)\mu_{-n_0+1}^s(a) + 2\lambda_0(X_1 - X_0)\mu_{-n_0}^s(a) + 2\lambda_0\mu_{-n_0-1}^s(a). \end{aligned}$$

This implies

$$\nu_{-n_0-2}^s(a) + 2\lambda_0\mu_{-n_0-1}^s(a) = Z_{-n_0-2}^s(a) + 2\lambda_0(Y_1 - Y_0)\mu_{-n_0+1}^s(a) + 2\lambda_0\mu_{-n_0}^s(a).$$

This proves assertion (3).

Now we tensor the decomposition of  $F_*^s(\mathcal{O}(a))$  by  $\mathcal{O}(-j)$  and apply the functor  $H^n(Q_n, -)$ . By duality  $h^n(Q_n, \mathcal{O}_{Q_n}(m)) = h^0(Q_n, \mathcal{O}_{Q_n}(-m - n)) = Y_{-m-n}$ , hence

$$\begin{aligned} Y_{jq-a-n} &= Y_{j-1}\nu_{-n+1}^s(a) + Y_{j-2}\nu_{-n+2}^s(a) + \cdots + Y_0\nu_{-n+j}^s(a) + \mu_{-n_0+1}h^0(Q_n, S(n_0+j-n)) \\ &\quad + \mu_{-n_0}h^0(Q_n, S(n_0+j+1-n)) + \mu_{-n_0-1}h^0(Q_n, S(n_0+j+2-n)). \end{aligned}$$

Hence  $1 \leq j \leq n - n_0 - 2$ , we get

$$Y_{jq-a-n} = Y_{j-1}\nu_{-n+1}^s(a) + Y_{j-2}\nu_{-n+2}^s(a) + \cdots + Y_0\nu_{-n+j}^s(a).$$

Hence

$$\nu_{-n+j} = Y_{jq-a-n} - [Y_{j-1}\nu_{-n+1}^s(a) + \cdots + Y_2\nu_{-n+j-2}^s(a) + Y_1\nu_{-n+j-1}^s(a)] = L_{-n+j}.$$

$$(3.2) \quad \begin{aligned} \text{For } j = 1, \quad &\nu_{-n+1}^s(a) = Y_{q-a-n}, \\ \text{For } j = 2, \quad &\nu_{-n+2}^s(a) = Y_{2q-a-n} - Y_1\nu_{-n+1}^s(a) \end{aligned}$$

In general

$$\begin{aligned} \nu_{-i}^s(a) &= \nu_{-i}^s(a) + 2\lambda_0\mu_{-i+1}^s(a) = L_{-i}^s(a), \quad \text{for } n_0 + 3 \leq i \leq n - 1 \\ \nu_{-n_0-2}^s(a) &= L_{-n_0-2}^s(a). \end{aligned}$$

This proves assertions (4) and (5).

For  $j = n - n_0 - 1$  we get

$$Y_{(n-n_0-1)q-a-n} = Y_{n-n_0-2}\nu_{-n+1}^s(a) + \cdots + Y_0\nu_{-n_0-1}^s(a) + 2\lambda_0\mu_{-n_0-1}^s(a).$$

$$(3.3) \quad \nu_{-n_0-1}^s(a) = L_{-n_0-1}^s(a) - 2\lambda_0\mu_{-n_0-1}^s(a).$$

This proves assertion (6) and hence the lemma.  $\square$

**Remark 3.7.** By the above set of equalities it follows that, for a given  $a$ , if there is at the most one type of spinor bundle in the decomposition of  $F_*^s(\mathcal{O}(a))$  then all the pairs  $\nu_{-i}^s(a) + 2\lambda_0\mu_{-i+1}^s(a)$  are computable.

In the next lemma we use this observation to classify the  $(a, q)$  for which all the pairs are computable. It is enough to check this for the pairs  $\nu_{-n_0-1}^s(a) + 2\lambda_0\mu_{-n_0}^s(a)$  and  $\nu_{-n_0-2}^s(a) + 2\lambda_0\mu_{-n_0-1}^s(a)$ , as, by Lemma 3.6, rest of the other pairs are computable.

**Lemma 3.8.** *Let  $0 \leq a < q = p^s$ , where  $p > 2$  and  $n \geq 3$ .*

(1) *If  $n$  is even and  $p \geq n - 2$  then*

$$(a) \quad \nu_{-n_0-1}^s(a) + 2\lambda_0\mu_{-n_0}^s(a) = Z_{-n_0-1}^s(a), \quad \text{if } 0 \leq \frac{a}{q} < 1 - \frac{(n-2)}{2p}.$$

$$(b) \quad \nu_{-n_0-2}^s(a) + 2\lambda_0\mu_{-n_0-1}^s(a)$$

$$= \begin{cases} Z_{-n_0-2}^s(a) + 2\lambda_0\mu_{-n_0}^s(a) & \text{if } 0 \leq \frac{a}{q} < \frac{(n-2)}{2p}. \\ \nu_{-n_0-2}^s(a) = L_{-n_0-2}^s(a) & \text{if } \frac{(n-2)}{2p} \leq \frac{a}{q}. \end{cases}$$

*In particular all the pairs are computable for  $a/q \in [0, 1) \setminus [0, \frac{n-2}{p}] \cup [1 - \frac{n-2}{p}, 1)$ .*

(2) *If  $n$  is odd and  $p \geq 2n - 4$  then*

$$(a) \quad \nu_{-n_0-1}^s(a) + 2\lambda_0\mu_{-n_0}^s(a)$$

$$= \begin{cases} Z_{-n_0-1}^s(a) & \text{if } 0 \leq \frac{a}{q} < \frac{1}{2} - \frac{(n-2)}{2p} \\ \nu_{-n_0-1}^s(a) = L_{-n_0-1}^s(a) & \text{if } \frac{1}{2} + \frac{(n-2)}{2p} \leq \frac{a}{q} < 1. \end{cases}$$

$$(b) \quad \nu_{-n_0-2}^s(a) + 2\lambda_0\mu_{-n_0-1}^s(a) = \nu_{-n_0-2}^s(a) = L_{-n_0-2}^s(a).$$

*In particular all the pairs are computable for  $a/q \in [0, 1) \setminus [\frac{1}{2} - \frac{n-2}{2p}, \frac{1}{2} + \frac{n-2}{2p}]$*

*Proof.* Let  $\delta = 1$  if  $n$  is even and  $\delta = 1/2$  if  $n$  is odd.

(1) If  $0 \leq a/q < \delta - (n-2)/2p$  then  $\mu_{-n_0+1}^s(a) = 0$ . Hence the assertion

$$\nu_{-n_0-1}^s(a) + 2\lambda_0\mu_{-n_0}^s(a) = Z_{-n_0-1}^s(a)$$

follows from Lemma 3.6 (2).

(2) If  $\delta + (n-2)/2p \leq a/q < 1$  (which holds only if  $n$  is odd) then  $\mu_{-n_0-1}^s(a) = 0$  and  $\mu_{-n_0}^s(a) = 0$  hence by Lemma 3.6 (6)

$$\nu_{-n_0-1}^s(a) + 2\lambda_0\mu_{-n_0}^s(a) = \nu_{-n_0-1}^s(a) = L_{-n_0-1}^s(a).$$

(3) If  $0 \leq a/q < (n-2)/2p$  then, by Lemma 3.2 (2),  $\mu_{-n_0+1}^s(a) = 0$  and hence the equality

$$\nu_{-n_0-2}^s(a) + 2\lambda_0\mu_{-n_0-1}^s(a) = Z_{-n_0-2}^s(a) + 2\lambda_0\mu_{-n_0}^s(a)$$

follows from Lemma 3.6 (3).

(4) If  $(n-2)/2p \leq a/q < 1$  or if  $n$  is odd then  $\mu_{-n_0-1}^s(a) = 0$ . Hence by Lemma 3.6 (5), we have the equality  $\nu_{-n_0-2}^s(a) + 2\lambda_0\mu_{-n_0-1}^s(a) = L_{-n_0-2}^s(a)$ .  $\square$

Proposition 5.2 of [L] states that if  $s = 1$  then  $F_*(\mathcal{O}(a))$  and  $F_*\mathcal{S}(a)$  both have almost one type of spinor bundle, Here, using explicit formulation of [A] we write them down explicitly. In particular all the pairs and  $\nu_i^1(a)$ ,  $\mu_i^1(a)$ ,  $\tilde{\nu}_i^1(a)$ , and  $\tilde{\mu}_i^1(a)$  are computable, where  $\tilde{\nu}_i^1(a) = \tilde{\nu}^1(i, a)$  and  $\tilde{\mu}_i^1(a) = \tilde{\mu}^1(i, a)$  are the integers as in (2.4).

**Lemma 3.9.** *If  $p \neq 2$  and  $n = 3$  then for  $0 \leq a < p$ , we have*

$$F_*(\mathcal{O}(a)) = \begin{cases} \mathcal{O}(-2)^{\nu_{-2}^1(a)} \oplus \mathcal{O}(-1)^{\nu_{-1}^1(a)} \oplus \mathcal{O}^{\nu_0^1(a)} \oplus \mathcal{S}(-1)^{\mu_{-1}^s(a)}, & \text{if } a \leq \frac{p-1}{2} - 2 \\ \mathcal{O}(-2)^{\nu_{-2}^1(a)} \oplus \mathcal{O}(-1)^{\nu_{-1}^1(a)} \oplus \mathcal{O}^{\nu_0^1(a)}, & \text{if } a = \frac{p-1}{2} - 1 \\ \mathcal{O}(-2)^{\nu_{-2}^1(a)} \oplus \mathcal{O}(-1)^{\nu_{-1}^1(a)} \oplus \mathcal{O}^{\nu_0^1(a)} \oplus \mathcal{S}(0)^{\mu_0^s(a)}, & \text{if } a \geq \frac{p-1}{2}. \end{cases}$$

Moreover  $4\tilde{\mu}_{-1}^1(a) = Y_{a+2p} - Y_1Y_{a+p} + (Y_1^2 - Y_2)Y_a - Y_{p-a-3}$ , if  $a \leq \frac{p-1}{2} - 2$ .  
Also

$$F_*(\mathcal{S}(a)) = \begin{cases} \mathcal{O}(-2)^{\tilde{\nu}_{-2}^1(a)} \oplus \mathcal{O}(-1)^{\tilde{\nu}_{-1}^1(a)} \oplus \mathcal{O}^{\tilde{\nu}_0^1(a)} \oplus \mathcal{S}(-1)^{\tilde{\mu}_{-1}^s(a)}, & \text{if } a \leq \frac{p-1}{2} - 1 \\ \mathcal{O}(-2)^{\tilde{\nu}_{-2}^1(a)} \oplus \mathcal{O}(-1)^{\tilde{\nu}_{-1}^1(a)} \oplus \mathcal{O}^{\tilde{\nu}_0^1(a)} \oplus \mathcal{S}(0)^{\tilde{\mu}_0^s(a)}, & \text{if } a \geq \frac{p-1}{2}. \end{cases}$$

Moreover, if  $a \leq \frac{p-1}{2} - 1$  then

$$4\tilde{\mu}_{-1}^1(a) = h^0(Q_3, \mathcal{S}(a+2p)) - Y_1h^0(Q_3, \mathcal{S}(a+p)) + (Y_1^2 - Y_2)h^0(Q_3, \mathcal{S}(a)) - h^0(Q_3, \mathcal{S}(p-a-2)).$$

In general, for any given  $n \geq 3$  and  $0 \leq a < p$  the bundle  $F_*(\mathcal{O}(a))$  (similarly  $F_*(\mathcal{S}(a))$ ) can not contain both  $\mathcal{S}(t)$  and  $\mathcal{S}(t')$ , where  $t \neq t'$ .

*Proof.* We first prove the last assertion for  $n \geq 3$ . By Theorem 2 of [A],  $F_*\mathcal{O}(a)$  contains  $\mathcal{S}(t)$  if and only if

$$\frac{(n-2)(p-1)}{2} \leq a - tp \leq \frac{(n-2)(p-1)}{2} + (p-2).$$

Since the difference between the maximum and minimum is  $\leq p-1$ , there can not be two different  $t$  and  $t'$  satisfying such equation. Similar assertion holds for  $F_*(\mathcal{S}(a))$  contains  $\mathcal{S}(t)$  if and only if

$$\frac{(n-2)(p-1)}{2} \leq a - tp \leq \frac{(n-2)(p-1)}{2} + (p-1).$$

It is easy to work out  $n = 3$  case. The formula for  $\tilde{\mu}_{-1}^1(a)$  can be worked out as follows:

Let  $a < (p-1)/2$ . Tensoring the equation

$$F_*(\mathcal{S}(a)) = \mathcal{O}(-2)^{\tilde{\nu}_{-2}^1(a)} \oplus \mathcal{O}(-1)^{\tilde{\nu}_{-1}^1(a)} \oplus \mathcal{O}^{\tilde{\nu}_0^1(a)} \oplus \mathcal{S}(-1)^{\tilde{\mu}_{-1}^s(a)}$$

by  $\mathcal{O}(i)$  we get

$$F_*(\mathcal{S}(a+ip)) = \mathcal{O}(i-2)^{\tilde{\nu}_{-2}^1(a)} \oplus \mathcal{O}(i-1)^{\tilde{\nu}_{-1}^1(a)} \oplus \mathcal{O}(i)^{\tilde{\nu}_0^1(a)} \oplus \mathcal{S}(i-1)^{\tilde{\mu}_{-1}^s(a)}.$$

Applying the functor  $h^0(Q_n, -)$  for  $i = 0, 1$  and  $2$  Now we have  $\tilde{\nu}_0^1(a) = h^0(Q, \mathcal{S}(a))$ ,  $\tilde{\nu}_{-1}^1(a) = h^0(Q, \mathcal{S}(a+p)) - Y_1\tilde{\nu}_0^1(a)$  and

$$4\tilde{\mu}_{-1}^1(a) = h^0(Q, \mathcal{S}(a+2p)) - [Y_2\tilde{\nu}_0^1(a) + Y_1\tilde{\nu}_{-1}^1(a) + \tilde{\nu}_{-2}^1(a)].$$

□

4. THE HK DENSITY FUNCTION  $f_{R_{p,n+1},\mathbf{m}}$  AND  $f_{R_{n+1},\mathbf{m}}^\infty$ 

**Remark 4.1.** Let  $Z_{-i}^s(a)$  and  $L_{-i}^s(a)$  be the numbers as Notations 3.4. Then we can write

$$Z_{-i}^s(a) = \sum_{j=0}^i r_{ij} Y_{a+jq} \quad \text{and} \quad L_{-i}^s(a) = \sum_{j=0}^{n-i-1} s_{ij} Y_{(j+1)q-a-n}$$

where  $\{r_{ij}, s_{ik}\}_{j,k}$  are rational numbers independent of  $a$  and  $s$ , Now if  $x \geq 0$  such that  $xq_0 \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$  for some  $q_0 = p^{s_0}$  and if  $i$  is the integer such that  $0 \leq xq_0 - iq_0 < q_0$  then  $\lim_{q \rightarrow \infty} (xq - iq)/q = x - i$ . This observation implies that, if we define the functions  $\mathbf{Z}_{-i}$  and  $\mathbf{L}_{-i}$  on the interval  $[i, i+1)$  by

$$\mathbf{Z}_{-i}(x) := \lim_{q \rightarrow \infty} \frac{Z_{-i}^s(\lfloor xq \rfloor - iq)}{q^n} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbf{L}_{-i}(x) := \lim_{q \rightarrow \infty} \frac{L_{-i}^s(\lfloor xq \rfloor - iq)}{q^n}.$$

then we have

$$\mathbf{Z}_{-i}(x) = \frac{2}{n!} [r_{i0}(x-i)^n + r_{i1}(x-i+1)^n + \cdots + r_{ii}(x)^n]$$

and

$$\mathbf{L}_{-i}(x) = \frac{2}{n!} [s_{i0}(i+1-x)^n + s_{i1}(i+2-x)^n + \cdots + s_{i(n-i-1)}(n-x)^n].$$

**Lemma 4.2.** (1) *If  $n \geq 4$  is an even number and  $p \geq n-2$  and  $p \neq 2$  Then*

$$f_{R_{p,n+1}}(x) = \begin{cases} \mathbf{Z}_{-i}(x), & \text{if } i \leq x < i+1 \quad \text{and} \quad 0 \leq i \leq n_0 \\ \mathbf{Z}_{-n_0-1}(x), & \text{if } (n_0+1) \leq x < (n_0+2) - \frac{n-2}{2p} \\ \mathbf{Z}_{-n_0-1}(x) + 2\lambda_0 \lim_{q \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\mu_{-n_0+1}^s(\lfloor xq \rfloor - (n_0+1)q)}{q^n}, & \text{if } 1 - \frac{n-2}{2p} \leq x - (n_0+1) < 1 \\ \mathbf{Z}_{-n_0-2}(x) + 2\lambda_0 \lim_{q \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\mu_{-n_0}^s(\lfloor xq \rfloor - (n_0+2)q)}{q^n}, & \text{if } 0 \leq x - (n_0+2) < \frac{n-2}{2p} \\ \mathbf{L}_{-n_0-2}(x), & \text{if } (n_0+2) + \frac{n-2}{2p} \leq x < (n_0+3) \\ \mathbf{L}_{-i}(x), & \text{if } i \leq x < i+1 \quad \text{and} \quad n_0+3 \leq i < n \end{cases}$$

and  $f_{R_{p,n+1}}(x) = 0$  otherwise.

(2) *If  $n \geq 3$  is an odd number and  $2n-4 \leq p$  and  $p \neq 2$  then*

$$f_{R_{p,n+1}}(x) =$$

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \mathbf{Z}_{-i}(x) \quad \text{if } i \leq x < i+1 \quad \text{and } 0 \leq i \leq n_0 \\ \mathbf{Z}_{-n_0-1}(x), \quad \text{if } (n_0+1) \leq x < (n_0+\frac{3}{2}) - \frac{n-2}{2p} \\ \mathbf{Z}_{-n_0-1}(x) + 2\lambda_0 \lim_{q \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\mu_{-n_0+1}^s(\lfloor xq \rfloor - (n_0+1)q)}{q^n}, \quad \text{if } \frac{1}{2} - \frac{n-2}{2p} \leq x - (n_0+1) < \frac{1}{2} + \frac{n-2}{2p} \\ \mathbf{L}_{-n_0-1}(x), \quad \text{if } (n_0+1) + \frac{1}{2} + \frac{n-2}{2p} \leq x < (n_0+2) \\ \mathbf{L}_{-i}(x), \quad \text{if } i \leq x < i+1 \quad \text{and } n_0+2 \leq i < n \end{array} \right.$$

and  $f_{R_p, n+1}(x) = 0$  otherwise.

*Proof.* Let  $q = p^s$  and  $m \in \mathbb{Z}$  and let  $\nu_t^s(m)$  and  $\mu_t^s(m)$  be the numbers occurring in the decomposition

$$F_*^s(\mathcal{O}(m)) = \bigoplus_{t \in \mathbb{Z}} \mathcal{O}(t)^{\nu_t^s(m)} \oplus \bigoplus_{t \in \mathbb{Z}} \mathcal{S}(t)^{\mu_t^s(m)}.$$

If  $m \geq 0$  is integer then there is  $i \geq 0$  an integer such that  $0 \leq m - iq < q$ . Now, by (2.6),

$$\ell(R_{p, n+1}/\mathbf{m}^{[q]})_m = \nu_0^s(a+iq) + 2\lambda_0 \mu_1^s(a+iq) = \nu_{-i}^s(a) + 2\lambda_0 \mu_{-i+1}^s(a).$$

Here we write the details when  $n$  is even, the case when  $n$  is odd follows along the same lines.

Lemma 3.6 (1) gives

$$\ell\left(\frac{R_{p, n+1}}{\mathbf{m}^{[q]}}\right)_{a+iq} = Z_{-i}^s(a) \quad \text{for every } 0 \leq i \leq n_0 \quad \text{and for } 0 \leq a < q$$

By Lemma 3.8 and Lemma 3.6 (2), we have ,

$$\ell\left(\frac{R_{p, n+1}}{\mathbf{m}^{[q]}}\right)_{a+(n_0+1)q} = \begin{cases} Z_{-n_0-1}^s(a) & \text{if } 0 \leq a < q(1 - \frac{n-2}{2p}) \\ Z_{-n_0-1}^s(a) + 2\lambda_0 \mu_{-n_0+1}^s(a) & \text{if } q - \frac{n-2}{2p}q \leq a < q \end{cases}$$

$$\ell\left(\frac{R_{p, n+1}}{\mathbf{m}^{[q]}}\right)_{a+(n_0+2)q} = \begin{cases} Z_{-n_0-2}^s(a) + 2\lambda_0 \mu_{-n_0}^s(a) & \text{if } 0 \leq a < \frac{n-2}{2p}q \\ L_{-n_0-2}^s(a) & \text{if } \frac{n-2}{2p}q \leq a < q \end{cases}$$

By Lemma 3.6 (4)

$$\ell\left(\frac{R_{p, n+1}}{\mathbf{m}^{[q]}}\right)_{a+jq} = L_{-j}^s(a) \quad \text{for every } n_0+3 \leq j \leq n-1 \quad \text{and for } 0 \leq a < q.$$

and  $\ell\left(\frac{R_{p, n+1}}{\mathbf{m}^{[q]}}\right)_m = 0$  otherwise.

By definition

$$f_{R_p, n+1}(x) = \lim_{s \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{q^n} \ell(R_{p, n+1}/\mathbf{m}^{[q]})_{\lfloor xq \rfloor}$$

and is a continuous function and the set  $\{x \in \mathbb{R} \mid xq \in \mathbb{Z}, \text{ for some } q = p^s\}$  is a dense of  $\mathbb{R}$ . Hence the theorem follows from Remark 4.1.  $\square$

**Theorem 4.3.** The function  $f_{R_{n+1}}^\infty : [0, \infty) \rightarrow [0, \infty)$  given by

$$f_{R_{n+1}}^\infty(x) := \lim_{p \rightarrow \infty} f_{R_{p,n+1}}(x)$$

is partially symmetric continuous function, that is

$$f_{R_{n+1}}^\infty(x) = f_{R_{n+1}}^\infty(n-x), \quad \text{for } 0 \leq x \leq (n-2)/2$$

and is described as follows:

(1) If  $n \geq 4$  is even then

$$f_{R_{n+1}}^\infty(x) = \begin{cases} \mathbf{Z}_{-i}(x) & \text{if } i \leq x < i+1 \text{ and } 0 \leq i \leq n_0+1 \\ \mathbf{L}_{-n_0-2}(x) & \text{if } (n_0+2) \leq x < (n_0+3) \\ \mathbf{L}_{-i}(x) & \text{if } i \leq x < i+1 \text{ and } n_0+3 \leq i < n \end{cases}$$

and  $f_{R_{n+1}}^\infty(x) = 0$  otherwise.

(2) If  $n \geq 3$  is an odd number then

$$f_{R_{p,n+1}}(x) = \begin{cases} \mathbf{Z}_{-i}(x) & \text{if } i \leq x < i+1 \text{ and } 0 \leq i \leq n_0 \\ \mathbf{Z}_{-n_0-1}(x) & \text{if } (n_0+1) \leq x < (n_0+\frac{3}{2}) \\ \mathbf{L}_{-n_0-1}(x) & \text{if } (n_0+\frac{3}{2}) \leq x < (n_0+2) \\ \mathbf{L}_{-i}(x) & \text{if } i \leq x < i+1 \text{ and } n_0+2 \leq i < n \end{cases}$$

and  $f_{R_{n+1}}^\infty(x) = 0$  otherwise.

*Proof.* The description of the function  $f_{R_{n+1}}^\infty : [0, \infty) \rightarrow [0, \infty)$  follows from Lemma 4.2. To prove the symmetry, we consider the  $\mathbf{Z}_{-j} : [0, \infty) \rightarrow [0, \infty)$  and  $\mathbf{L}_{-j} : [0, \infty) \rightarrow [0, \infty)$  and

**Claim.**  $\mathbf{Z}_{-j}(x) = \mathbf{L}_{n-1-j}(n-x)$ , if  $j \leq x < j+1$ .

Proof of the claim: By induction on  $j \geq 0$ , first we prove the assertion that

$$\lim_{q \rightarrow \infty} Z_{-i}^s(a)/q^n = \lim_{q \rightarrow \infty} L_{-(n-1-i)}^s(q-a)/q^n \quad \text{for } 0 \leq a < q.$$

If  $j = 0$  then

$$\lim_{q \rightarrow \infty} Z_0^s(a)/q^n = \lim_{q \rightarrow \infty} Y_a/q^n = \lim_{q \rightarrow \infty} Y_{a+n}/q^n = \lim_{q \rightarrow \infty} L_{-(n-1)}^s(q-a)/q^n.$$

Assume that the assertion holds for  $0 \leq j < i$ . Now

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{q \rightarrow \infty} Z_{-i}(a)/q^n &= \lim_{q \rightarrow \infty} Y_a/q^n - [Y_1 Z_{-i+1}(a) + \cdots + Y_i Z_0(a)]/q^n \\ &= \lim_{q \rightarrow \infty} Y_{a+n}/q^n - [Y_1 L_{-(n-i)}(q-a) + \cdots + Y_i L_{-(n-1)}(q-a)]/q^n \\ &= \lim_{q \rightarrow \infty} L_{-(n-1-i)}(q-a)/q^n. \end{aligned}$$

Now to prove the claim, it is enough to prove for  $x = m/q$ , where  $m \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ . If  $j \leq x < j+1$  then  $m = a + jq$ , where  $0 \leq a < q$ . Now

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{Z}_{-j}(x) &= \lim_{q \rightarrow \infty} Z_{-j}^s(m-jq)/q^n = \lim_{q \rightarrow \infty} L_{-(n-1-j)}^s((j+1)q-m)/q^n \\ &= \lim_{q \rightarrow \infty} L_{-(n-1-j)}^s((n-m)q - (nq - q - jq))/q^n = \mathbf{L}_{-(n-1-j)}(n-x). \end{aligned}$$

This proves the claim.

If  $n$  is even then  $n_0 = n/2 - 1$ . Let  $0 \leq x < (n-2)/2 = n_0$  then  $i \leq x < (i+1)$  for some  $0 \leq i \leq (n_0 - 1)$ . Now

$$f_{R_{n+1}}^\infty(x) = \mathbf{Z}_{-i}(x) = \mathbf{L}_{-(n-1-i)}(n-x) = f_{R_{n+1}}^\infty(n-x).$$

where the second equality follows as  $n - (i+1) < n - x \leq n - i$ .

If  $n$  is odd then  $n_0 = (n-1)/2$ . Let  $0 \leq x < (n-2)/2 = n_0 - (1/2)$ .

If  $i \leq x < (i+1)$ , where  $i \leq n_0 - 1$  then

$$f_{R_{n+1}}^\infty(x) = \mathbf{Z}_{-i}(x) = \mathbf{L}_{-(n-1-i)}(n-x) = f_{R_{n+1}}^\infty(n-x).$$

If  $(n_0 - 1) \leq x < n_0 - 1/2$  then again

$$f_{R_{n+1}}^\infty(x) = \mathbf{Z}_{-(n_0-1)}(x) = \mathbf{L}_{-(n_0+1)}(n-x) = f_{R_{n+1}}^\infty(n-x).$$

□

**Remark 4.4.** The same argument as above proves that  $f_{R_p, n+1}$  is partially symmetric and the symmetry is given by

$$f_{R_p, n+1}(x) = f_{R_p, n+1}(n-x) \quad \text{for } 0 \leq x \leq \frac{n-2}{2} \left(1 - \frac{1}{p}\right).$$

Proof of Theorem 1.2. If  $n$  is even then  $n_0 = \frac{n-2}{2}$  and the interval

$$\left[ n_0 + 2 - \frac{n-2}{2p}, n_0 + 2 + \frac{n-2}{2p} \right) = \left[ \frac{n+2}{2} - \frac{n-2}{2p}, \frac{n+2}{2} + \frac{n-2}{2p} \right)$$

If  $n$  is odd then  $n_0 = \frac{n-1}{2}$ . and the interval

$$\left[ n_0 + \frac{3}{2} - \frac{n-2}{2p}, n_0 + \frac{3}{2} + \frac{n-2}{2p} \right) = \left[ \frac{n+2}{2} - \frac{n-2}{2p}, \frac{n+2}{2} + \frac{n-2}{2p} \right)$$

Note that, by Lemma 4.2 and Theorem 4.3

$$f_{R_p, n+1}(x) = f_{R_{n+1}}^\infty(x) \quad \text{if } x \notin \left[ \frac{n+2}{2} - \frac{n-2}{2p}, \frac{n+2}{2} + \frac{n-2}{2p} \right).$$

Since both  $f_{R_p, n+1}$  and  $f_{R_{n+1}}^\infty$  are continuous functions on  $\mathbb{R}$ , it is enough to prove the rest of the assertion for  $x \in \mathbb{Z}[1/p]$ . Now let  $xq_0 \in \mathbb{Z}$  for some  $q_0 = p^{s_0}$ .

(1) Let  $n \geq 4$  be an even number with  $n-2 \leq p$ .

(a) Let  $n_0 + 2 - \frac{n-2}{2p} \leq x < n_0 + 2$ . For a fix  $q \geq q_0$  let  $a_q = xq - (n_0 + 1)q$ . Then  $0 \leq a_q < q$  for all  $q \geq q_0$  and by Lemma 3.6 (2)

$$\ell \left( \frac{R_{p, n+1}}{\mathbf{m}^{[q]}} \right)_{xq} = \nu_{-n_0-1}^s(a_q) + 2\lambda_0 \mu_{-n_0}^s(a_q) = Z_{-n_0-1}^s + 2\lambda_0 \mu_{-n_0+1}^s(a_q).$$

Hence

$$f_{R_p, n+1}(x) = \mathbf{Z}_{-n_0-1}(x) + \lim_{q \rightarrow \infty} 2\lambda_0 \frac{\mu_{-n_0+1}^s(a_q)}{q^n}$$

whereas  $f_{R_{n+1}}^\infty(x) = \mathbf{Z}_{-n_0-1}(x)$ .

(b) Let  $n_0 + 2 \leq x < n_0 + 2 + \frac{n-2}{2p}$ . For a fix  $q \geq q_0$  let  $a_q = xq - (n_0 + 2)q$  then  $0 \leq a_q < q$  and, by Lemma 3.6 (5)

$$\ell \left( \frac{R_{p, n+1}}{\mathbf{m}^{[q]}} \right)_{xq} = \nu_{-n_0-2}^s(a_q) + 2\lambda_0 \mu_{-n_0-1}^s(a_q) = L_{-n_0-2}^s + 2\lambda_0 \mu_{-n_0-1}^s(a_q).$$

Hence

$$f_{R_{p,n+1}}(x) = \mathbf{L}_{-n_0-2}(x) + \lim_{q \rightarrow \infty} 2\lambda_0 \frac{\mu_{-n_0-1}^s(a_q)}{q^n}$$

whereas  $f_{R_{n+1}^\infty}(x) = \mathbf{L}_{-n_0-2}(x)$ .

(2) Let  $n \geq 3$  be an odd number with  $2n - 4 \leq p$ .

(a) Let  $n_0 + \frac{3}{2} - \frac{n-2}{2p} \leq x < n_0 + \frac{3}{2} + \frac{n-2}{2p}$ .

For a fix  $q = p^s \geq q_0$  let  $a_q = xq - (n_0 + 1)q$ . Then  $0 \leq a_q < q$  and

$$\begin{aligned} \ell \left( \frac{R_{p,n+1}}{\mathbf{m}[q]} \right)_{xq} &= \nu_{-n_0-1}^s(a_q) + 2\lambda_0 \mu_{-n_0}^s(a_q) = Z_{-n_0-1}^s + 2\lambda_0 \mu_{-n_0+1}^s(a_q) \\ &= L_{-n_0-1}(a_q) - 2\lambda_0 \mu_{-n_0}(a_q), \end{aligned}$$

where the last equality follows as, by Lemma 3.6 (6) and Lemma 3.2 (2)(b)(i)

$$\nu_{-n_0-1}^s(a_q) = L_{-n_0-1}(a_q).$$

Hence we can write

$$\begin{aligned} f_{R_{p,n+1}}(x) &= \mathbf{Z}_{-n_0-1}(x) + \lim_{q \rightarrow \infty} 2\lambda_0 \frac{\mu_{-n_0+1}^s(a_q)}{q^n} \\ &= \mathbf{L}_{-n_0-1}(x) + \lim_{q \rightarrow \infty} 2\lambda_0 \frac{\mu_{-n_0}^s(a_q)}{q^n}. \end{aligned}$$

Whereas

$$f_{R_{n+1}^\infty}(x) = \begin{cases} \mathbf{Z}_{-n_0-1}(x) & \text{if } n_0 + \frac{3}{2} - \frac{n-2}{2p} \leq x < n_0 + \frac{3}{2} \\ \mathbf{L}_{-n_0-1}(x) & \text{if } n_0 + \frac{3}{2} \leq x < n_0 + \frac{3}{2} + \frac{n-2}{2p}. \end{cases}$$

This proves the theorem.  $\square$

Proof of Theorem 1.1. We note that, for any integer  $0 \leq a < q$  and  $q = p^s$ , we have the decomposition

$$F_*^s(\mathcal{O}(a)) = \sum_{n_0-1}^0 \mathcal{O}(-i)^{\nu_{-i}^s(a)} \oplus \dots \oplus \oplus \sum_{i=n_0-1}^{n_0+1} \mathcal{S}(-i)^{\mu_{-i}^s(a)}.$$

By computing the ranks we get  $q^n = \sum_{n_0-1}^0 \nu_{-i}^s(a) + \sum_{i=n_0-1}^{n_0+1} \lambda_0 \mu_{-i}^s(a)$ . In particular  $0 \leq \lambda_0 \mu_{-j}^s(a)/q^n \leq 1$ .

Therefore, by Lemma 4.2 and by the proof of Theorem 1.2 we have

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &\leq \int_0^\infty f_{R_{p,n+1}}(x) dx - \int_0^\infty f_{R_{n+1}^\infty}(x) dx \\ &= \int_{\frac{n+2}{2} - \frac{n-2}{2p}}^{\frac{n+2}{2} + \frac{n-2}{2p}} (f_{R_{p,n+1}}(x) - f_{R_{n+1}^\infty}(x)) dx \leq \frac{2n-4}{p}. \end{aligned}$$

On the other hand by Theorem 1.1 of [T] we have

$$e_{HK}(R_{p,n+1}, \mathbf{m}) = \int_0^\infty f_{R_{p,n+1}, \mathbf{m}}(x) dx.$$

This gives

$$1 + m_{n+1} = \lim_{p \rightarrow \infty} e_{HK}(R_{p,n+1}, \mathbf{m}) = \lim_{p \rightarrow \infty} \int_0^\infty f_{R_{p,n+1}, \mathbf{m}}(x) dx = \int_0^\infty f_{R_{n+1}^\infty, \mathbf{m}}(x) dx,$$

where the first equality follows by the result of Gessel-Monsky [GM], this can also be derived using Theorem 4.3, in principle.  $\square$

**Corollary 4.5.** *Let  $p > 2$ .*

(1) *If  $n$  even and  $p \geq n - 2$ , or*



(2) if  $n$  and  $p \geq 2n - 4$

then the  $F$ -threshold of the ring  $R_{p,n+1}$  is  $c^{\mathbf{m}}(\mathbf{m}) = n$ .

*Proof.* By Theorem E of [TW1], the  $F$ -threshold  $c^{\mathbf{m}}(\mathbf{m}) = \max \{x \mid f_{R_{p,n+1}}(x) \neq 0\}$ .

Now, by Lemma 4.2,  $f_{R_{p,n+1}}(x) = 0$ , for  $x \geq n$  and for  $n - 1 \leq x \leq n$ ,

$$f_{R_{p,n+1}}(x) = \mathbf{L}_{-n+1}(x) = \lim_{q \rightarrow \infty} \frac{L_{-n+1}^s(\lfloor xq \rfloor - (n-1)q)}{q^n} = \frac{2(n-x)^n}{n!},$$

where the last equality follows as  $L_{-n+1}^s(a) = Y_{q-a-n}$ .  $\square$

## 5. THE HK DENSITY FUNCTION FOR $R_{p,4}$

**Notations 5.1.** Let  $p \geq 5$  be a prime and

$$P_0 = \frac{p-1}{2} \quad \text{and} \quad P_i = \frac{p-1}{2p} \left[ \frac{1}{p^{i-1}} + \cdots + \frac{1}{p} + 1 \right] \quad \text{for } i \geq 1.$$

then

$$P_1 < \cdots < P_j < P_{j+1} < \cdots < \frac{1}{2} < \cdots < \left( P_{j+1} + \frac{1}{p^{j+1}} \right) < \left( P_j + \frac{1}{p^j} \right) < \cdots < \left( P_1 + \frac{1}{p} \right).$$

We divide the interval

$$[2, 3) = [2, 2 + \frac{p-1}{2p}) \cup [2 + \frac{p-1}{2p}, 2 + \frac{p+1}{2p}) \cup [2 + \frac{p+1}{2p}, 3),$$

then  $[2 + \frac{p-1}{2p}, 2 + \frac{p+1}{2p}) = [2 + P_1, 2 + P_1 + \frac{1}{p})$  can be further divided as

$$[2 + P_1, 2 + P_1 + \frac{1}{p}) = \bigcup_{j=1}^{\infty} [2 + P_j, 2 + P_{j+1}) \cup \{2 + \frac{1}{2}\} \cup \bigcup_{j=1}^{\infty} [2 + P_{j+1} + \frac{1}{p^{j+1}}, 2 + P_j + \frac{1}{p^j}).$$

Let

$$\mu_{-1} = \mu_{-1}^1(P_0 - 2) \quad \text{and} \quad \overline{\mu_{-1}} = \tilde{\mu}_{-1}^1(P_0 - 1),$$

where the formula for  $\mu_{-1}^1(a)$  and  $\tilde{\mu}_{-1}^1(a)$  is given in Lemma 3.9

**Theorem 5.2.** Let  $k$  be a perfect field of characteristic  $p \geq 5$  and let

$$R_{p,4} = \frac{k[x_0, x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4]}{(x_0^2 + x_1^2 + x_2^2 + x_3^2 + x_4^2)}.$$

Then

$$f_{R_{p,4}, \mathbf{m}}(x) = \begin{cases} x^3/3 & \text{for } 0 \leq x < 1 \\ x^3/3 - 5/3(x-1)^3 & \text{for } 1 \leq x < 2 \\ \frac{1}{3}x^3 - \frac{5}{3}(x-1)^3 + \frac{11}{3}(x-2)^3 & \text{for } 2 \leq x < 2 + P_1 \end{cases}$$

$$\begin{aligned} f_{R_{p,4}, \mathbf{m}}(x) &= \frac{(3-x)^3}{3} + \frac{4}{3} \sum_{i=1}^j \left[ \frac{1}{p^i} + P_i + 2 - x \right]^3 (\mu_{-1} \overline{\mu_{-1}})^{i-1} \\ &\quad + \left[ \frac{8}{3} [x - 2 - P_j]^3 - \frac{4}{p^j} [x - 2 - P_j]^2 + \frac{2}{3p^{3j}} \right] (\overline{\mu_{-1}})^j, \\ &\quad \text{for } 2 + P_j \leq x < 2 + P_{j+1} \quad \text{and for } j \geq 1 \end{aligned}$$

$$f_{R_{p,4},\mathbf{m}}(x) = \frac{(3-x)^3}{3} + \frac{4}{3} \sum_{i=1}^j \left[ \frac{1}{p^i} + P_i + 2 - x \right]^3 (\mu_{-1} \overline{\mu_{-1}}^{i-1}),$$

for  $2 + P_{j+1} + \frac{1}{p_{j+1}} \leq x < 2 + P_j + \frac{1}{p_j}$  and for  $j \geq 1$ .

$$f_{R_{p,4},\mathbf{m}}(x) = \begin{cases} \frac{(3-x)^3}{3} & \text{for } 2 + P_1 + \frac{1}{p_1} \leq x < 3 \\ 0 & \text{for } x \geq 3. \end{cases}$$

*Proof.* Since we know that the function  $f_{R_{p,4},\mathbf{m}}$  is continuous and the function on the right hand side is piecewise polynomial, it is enough to prove the equality for the dense subset  $\{m/p^l \mid l, m \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}\}$  of  $[0, \infty)$ , For  $q = p^s$  and  $xq = m = a + iq$  where  $0 \leq a < q$  we have

$$f_{R_{p,4}}(x) = \lim_{s \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{p^{3s}} \ell(R_{p,4}/\mathbf{m}^{[q]})_{a+iq}$$

We fix  $q = p^s$  and the nonnegative integer  $a < q$ . By Lemmas 3.6 and 3.8, for  $n_0 = 1$  we get

$$\begin{aligned} \ell\left(\frac{R_{p,4}}{\mathbf{m}^{[q]}}\right)_a &= Z_0^s(a) = Y_a && \text{for } 0 \leq a < q \\ \ell\left(\frac{R_{p,4}}{\mathbf{m}^{[q]}}\right)_{a+q} &= Z_{-1}^s(a) = Y_{a+q} - Y_1 Y_a && \text{for } 0 \leq a < q \\ \ell\left(\frac{R_{p,4}}{\mathbf{m}^{[q]}}\right)_{a+2q} &= Z_{-2}^s(a) = Y_{a+2q} - 5Y_{a+q} + 11Y_a && \text{for } 0 \leq a < \frac{q}{p}\left(\frac{p-1}{2}\right) \\ \ell\left(\frac{R_{p,4}}{\mathbf{m}^{[q]}}\right)_{a+2q} &= \nu_{-2}^s(a) + 2\lambda_0 \mu_{-1}^s(a) && \text{for } \frac{q}{p}\left(\frac{p-1}{2}\right) \leq a < \frac{q}{p}\left(\frac{p+1}{2}\right) \\ \ell\left(\frac{R_{p,4}}{\mathbf{m}^{[q]}}\right)_{a+2q} &= L_{-2}^s(a) = Y_{q-a-3} && \text{for } \frac{q}{p}\left(\frac{p+1}{2}\right) \leq a < q \\ &= 0 && \text{otherwise.} \end{aligned}$$

By Lemma 3.6 (6) and (7) we have  $\nu_{-2}^s(a) = Y_{q-a-3}$ . Therefore we only need to compute  $\mu_{-1}^s(a)$  for  $a$  in the range  $\frac{p-1}{2p} \leq a/q < \frac{p+1}{2p}$ .

We will use the following fact: If  $b_0 + \dots + b_{m-1}p^{m-1} = b$  is a  $p$ -adic expansion of  $b$  then

$$b_{m-1} < P_0 \iff b/p^m < (p-1)/2p \quad \text{and} \quad b_{m-1} > P_0 \iff b/p^m \geq (p+1)/2p.$$

Therefore, by Lemma 3.8 (2) (ii),

$$b_{m-1} < P_0 \implies \mu_{-1}^m(b) = Z_{-2}^m(b) - \nu_{-2}^m(b) = Y_{b+2p^m} - Y_1 Y_{b+p^m} + (Y_1^2 - Y_2) Y_b - Y_{p^m-b-3}$$

and  $b_{m-1} > P_0 \implies \mu_{-1}^m(b) = 0$ . Moreover for  $m = 1$ , by Lemma 3.9,  $b = b_0 \geq P_0$  implies  $\mu_{-1}^1(b) = 0$ .

Consider the  $p$ -adic expansion  $a_0 + a_1p + \dots + a_{s-1}p^{s-1}$  of  $a$ . Then by the hypothesis on  $a$  we have  $a_{s-1} = P_0$ .

In general if  $1 \leq j \leq s-1$  is an integer such that  $a_{s-j} = \dots = a_{s-1} = P_0$ . then  $P_j \leq a/q < P_j + \frac{1}{p^j}$ . Moreover

- (1)  $a_{s-j-1} < P_0 \iff P_j \leq a/q < P_{j+1}$ .
- (2)  $a_{s-j-1} = P_0 \iff P_{j+1} \leq a/q < P_{j+1} + \frac{1}{p^{j+1}}$ .
- (3)  $a_{s-j-1} > P_0 \iff P_{j+1} + \frac{1}{p^{j+1}} \leq a/q < P_j + \frac{1}{p^j}$ .

We choose

- (1)  $j = s - 1$  if  $a_0 = a_1 = \cdots = a_{s-1} = P_0$ . Otherwise
- (2)  $1 \leq j \leq s - 1$  is the integer such that  $a_{s-j} = \cdots = a_{s-1} = P_0$  and  $a_{s-j-1} \neq P_0$ .

We denote  $A_{s-i} = a_0 + a_1p + \cdots + a_{s-i-1}p^{s-i-1}$ . Therefore

$$A_{s-j} = a_0 + a_1p + \cdots + a_{s-j-1}p^{s-j-1}m \quad \text{where } a_{s-j-1} \neq P_0.$$

Hence  $\mu_{-1}^{s-j}(A_{s-j})$  and, for all  $i$ ,  $\nu_{-2}^{s-i}(A_{s-i})$  are computable. By Lemma 3.9, the numbers  $\mu_{-1}^1(b)$  and  $\tilde{\mu}_{-1}^1(b)$  are computable.

**Claim.** Let  $\mu_{-1} = \mu_{-1}^1(P_0 - 2)$  and  $\overline{\mu_{-1}} = \tilde{\mu}_{-1}^1(P_0 - 1)$ . Then

$$\begin{aligned} \mu_{-1}^s(a) &= \nu_{-2}^{s-1}(A_{s-1})(\mu_{-1}) + \nu_{-2}^{s-2}(A_{s-2})(\mu_{-1}\overline{\mu_{-1}}) \\ &\quad + \cdots + \nu_{-2}^{s-j}(A_{s-j})(\mu_{-1}\overline{\mu_{-1}}^{j-1}) + \mu_{-1}^{s-j}(A_{s-j})(\overline{\mu_{-1}}^j). \end{aligned}$$

Proof of the claim: For an integer  $m$  and  $q = p^s$ , we have the decomposition (by [A])

$$F_*^s(\mathcal{O}(m)) = \mathcal{O}(-2)^{\nu_{-2}^s(m)} \oplus \mathcal{O}(-1)^{\nu_{-1}^s(m)} \oplus \mathcal{O}^{\nu_0^s(m)} \oplus M(0)^{\mu_0^s(m)} \oplus M(-1)^{\mu_{-1}^s(m)}$$

$$F_*^s(\mathcal{S}(m)) = \mathcal{O}(-2)^{\tilde{\nu}_{-2}^s(m)} \oplus \mathcal{O}(-1)^{\tilde{\nu}_{-1}^s(m)} \oplus \mathcal{O}^{\tilde{\nu}_0^s(m)} \oplus M(0)^{\tilde{\mu}_0^s(m)} \oplus M(-1)^{\tilde{\mu}_{-1}^s(m)}.$$

By the projection formula

$$F_*^s(\mathcal{O}(a)) = F_*^j(F_*^{s-j}(\mathcal{O}(A_{s-j})) \otimes \mathcal{O}(P_0 + \cdots + P_0p^{j-1})).$$

Therefore

(5.1)

$$[\nu_{-2}^s(a), \nu_{-1}^s(a), \nu_0^s(a), \mu_0^s(a), \mu_{-1}^s(a)] = [\nu_{-2}^{s-j}(A_{s-j}), \cdots, \mu_{-1}^{s-j}(A_{s-j})] \cdot [b_{kl}] \times j \text{ times} \times [b_{kl}],$$

where  $[b_{kl}]$  is the matrix

$$[b_{kl}] = \begin{bmatrix} \nu_{-2}^1(P_0 - 2) & \nu_{-1}^1(P_0 - 2) & \nu_0^1(P_0 - 2) & 0 & \mu_{-1} \\ \nu_{-2}^1(P_0 - 1) & \nu_{-1}^1(P_0 - 1) & \nu_0^1(P_0 - 1) & 0 & 0 \\ \nu_{-2}^1(P_0) & \nu_{-1}^1(P_0) & \nu_0^1(P_0) & \mu_0^1(P_0) & 0 \\ \tilde{\nu}_{-2}^1(P_0) & \tilde{\nu}_{-1}^1(P_0) & \tilde{\nu}_0^1(P_0) & \tilde{\mu}_0^1(P_0) & 0 \\ \tilde{\nu}_{-2}^1(P_0 - 1) & \tilde{\nu}_{-1}^1(P_0 - 1) & \tilde{\nu}_0^1(P_0 - 1) & 0 & \overline{\mu_{-1}}. \end{bmatrix}$$

Now the claim follows by induction on  $j$ .

If  $a_0 = \cdots = a_{s-1} = P_0$  then  $A_{s-j} = a_0$  and  $\mu_{-1}^1(a_0) = 0$ .

We recall that

$$Y_a = \frac{1}{6}(2a^3 + 9a^2 + 13a + 6) = a^3/3 + O(a^2).$$

Hence

$$\lim_{s \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\nu_{-2}^{s-i}(A_{s-i})}{p^{3s}} = \lim_{s \rightarrow \infty} \frac{Y_{p^{s-i} - (a - p_0(p^{s-i} + \cdots + p^{s-1})) - 3}}{p^{3s}} = \frac{1}{3} \left[ \frac{1}{p^i} + P_i - x \right]^3.$$

Now

(1) If there is  $1 \leq j \leq s-1$  such that  $P_j \leq a/q < P_{j+1}$  then  $a_{s-j-1} < P_0$  and

$$\lim_{q \rightarrow \infty} \frac{(4)\mu_{-1}^{s-j}(A_{s-j})}{q^3} = \lim_{q \rightarrow \infty} Z_{-2}^{s-j}(A_{s-j}) - \nu_{-2}^{s-j}(A_{s-j}) = \frac{8}{3} [x - P_j]^3 - \frac{4}{p^j} [x - P_j]^2 + \frac{2}{3p^{3j}}.$$

Hence

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{q \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\nu_{-2}^s(a) + 4\mu_{-1}^s(a)}{q^3} &= \frac{(1-x)^3}{3} + \frac{4}{3} \sum_{i=1}^j \left[ \frac{1}{p^i} + P_i - x \right]^3 (\mu_{-1} \overline{\mu_{-1}}^{i-1}) \\ &\quad + \left( \frac{8}{3} [x - P_j]^3 - \frac{4}{p^j} [x - P_j]^2 + \frac{2}{3p^{3j}} \right) (\overline{\mu_{-1}}^j). \end{aligned}$$

(2) If there is  $1 \leq j \leq s-1$  such that  $P_{j+1} + \frac{1}{p^{j+1}} \leq a/q < P_j + \frac{1}{p^j}$ . Then  $a_{s-j-1} > P_0$  and hence  $\mu_{-1}^{s-j}(A_{s-j}) = 0$ . This gives

$$\lim_{q \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\nu_{-2}^s(a) + 4\mu_{-1}^s(a)}{q^3} = \frac{(1-x)^3}{3} + \frac{4}{3} \sum_{i=1}^j \left[ \frac{1}{p^i} + P_i - x \right]^3 (\mu_{-1} \overline{\mu_{-1}}^{i-1}).$$

(3) If there is no  $j$  satisfying the any of the above two cases then  $a/q = P_s$  and  $j = s-1$  and  $A_{s-j} = A_1 = P_0$ . But  $\mu_{-1}^1(P_0) = 0$ . Hence

$$\lim_{q \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\nu_{-2}^s(a) + 4\mu_{-1}^s(a)}{q^3} = \frac{(1-x)^3}{3} + \frac{4}{3} \sum_{i=1}^{s-1} \left[ \frac{1}{p^i} + P_i - x \right]^3 (\mu_{-1} \overline{\mu_{-1}}^{i-1}).$$

This proves the theorem.  $\square$

## REFERENCES

- [AE1] I. M. Aberbach and F. Enescu, *Lower bounds for Hilbert-Kunz multiplicities in local rings of fixed dimension*, Michigan Math. J.57 (2008), 1-16.
- [AE2] I. M. Aberbach and F. Enescu, *New estimates of Hilbert-Kunz multiplicities for local rings of fixed dimension*, Nagoya Math. Journal, **212** (2013), 59-85.
- [A] P. Achinger, *Frobenius push-forwards on quadrics*. Comm. Algebra 40 (2012), no. 8, 2732-2748.
- [BEH] R. Buchweitz, D. Eisenbud and J. Herzog, *Cohen-Macaulay modules on quadrics*. In: *Singularities, Representation of Algebras, and Vector Bundles* (Lambrecht, 1985). Vol. 1273 of Lecture Notes in Math. Berlin : Springer, pp. 58-116.
- [CDHZ], O. Celikbas, H. Dao, C. Huneke and Y. Zhang, *Bounds on the Hilbert-Kunz multiplicity*, Nagoya Math. J.205(2012), 149-165.
- [E] D. Eisenbud, *Homological algebra on a complete intersection, with an application to group representations*. Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. 260 (1): 35-64.
- [ES] F. Enescu and K. Shimomoto, *On the upper semi-continuity of the Hilbert-Kunz multiplicity*, Journal of Algebra 285 (2005), 222-237.
- [EY] K. Eto and K.I. Yoshida, *Notes on Hilbert-Kunz multiplicity of Rees algebras*, Comm. Algebra **31** (2003), no. 12, 5943-5976.
- [JNSWY] J. Jeffries, Y. Nakajima, I. Smirnov, K.I. Watanabe, K.I. Yoshida, *Lower bounds on Hilbert-Kunz multiplicities and maximal F-signatures*, arXiv:2002.06166.

- [L] A. Langer, *D-affinity and Frobenius morphism on quadrics*, Int. Math. Res. Not. IMRN (1) 145, 26 (2008).
- [H] R. Hartshorne, *Algebraic geometry*, Springer 1977.
- [M] P. Monsky, *The Hilbert-Kunz function*, Math. Ann. 263 (1983) 43-49.
- [MG] P. Monsky and I. Gessel, *The limit as  $p \rightarrow \infty$  of the Hilbert-Kunz multiplicity of  $\sum x_i^{d_i}$* , preprint, 2010, arXiv:1007.2004[math.AC].
- [T] V. Trivedi, *Hilbert-Kunz Density Function and Hilbert-Kunz Multiplicity*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. 370 (2018), no. 12, 8403-8428.
- [TW1] V. Trivedi and K.I. Watanabe, *Hilbert-Kunz Density Functions and  $F$ -thresholds*, to appear in Journal of Algebra.
- [TW2] V. Trivedi and K.I. Watanabe, *Hilbert-Kunz density function for graded domains*, arXiv:2003.07035.
- [WY1] K.i. Watanabe and K.i. Yoshida, *Hilbert-Kunz multiplicity and an inequality between multiplicity and colength*, Journal of Algebra (2000), 230, 295-317.
- [WY2] K.i. Watanabe and K.i. Yoshida, *Hilbert-Kunz multiplicity of two-dimensional local rings*, Nagoya Math. Journal 162 (2001), 87-110.
- [Y] K.i. Yoshida, *Small Hilbert-Kunz multiplicity and  $(A_1)$ -type singularity* in Proceedings of the 4<sup>th</sup> Japan-Vietnam Joint Seminar on Commutative Algebra by and for Young Mathematicians, Meiji University, Japan, 2009.

SCHOOL OF MATHEMATICS, TATA INSTITUTE OF FUNDAMENTAL RESEARCH, HOMI BHABHA ROAD,  
MUMBAI-40005, INDIA

*Email address:* `vija@math.tifr.res.in`