

HILBERT POLYNOMIAL OF LENGTH FUNCTIONS

VERSION 9

ANTONGIULIO FORNASIERO

ABSTRACT. Let L be a general length function for modules over a Noetherian ring R . We use L to define Hilbert series and polynomials for $R[X]$ -modules. The leading term of any such polynomial is an invariant of $R[X]$ -modules, which refines the algebraic entropy.

CONTENTS

1. Introduction	1
2. Length functions and their entropy	3
3. Graded and filtered modules	5
4. λ -Hilbert series and polynomials for Noetherian modules	8
5. Dimension and degree: the general case	14
6. Addition theorem for exact sequences	14
7. Modules over R -algebrae	15
8. Hilbert-Samuel polynomial for homogeneous modules	17
9. d -dimensional and receptive versions of entropy	18
10. Totally additive versions of μ and (receptive) entropy	19
11. Intrinsic Hilbert polynomial	23
12. Fine grading	28
Appendix A. Non-commutative rings	31
Appendix B. Finite generation and Noetherianity according to λ	32
Appendix C. Less assumptions	34
References	34

1. INTRODUCTION

Let R be a commutative ring with unity.

A generalized **length** function on the category $R\text{-mod}$ of R -modules is a function

$$\lambda : R\text{-mod} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \cup \{\infty\}$$

satisfying the following conditions:

- (1) $\lambda(0) = 0$;
- (2) $\lambda(M) = \lambda(M')$ when M and M' are isomorphic;
- (3) for every exact sequence $0 \rightarrow A \rightarrow B \rightarrow C \rightarrow 0$,

$$\lambda(B) = \lambda(A) + \lambda(C);$$

- (4) for every $M \in R\text{-mod}$,

$$\lambda(M) = \sup\{\lambda(M') : M' \leq M \text{ finitely generated } R\text{-sub-module}\}$$

Date: 13/02/2020.

2010 Mathematics Subject Classification. Primary 13D40, 16S50; Secondary 16D10, 16P40.

Key words and phrases. Length function, Hilbert polynomial, Hilbert series, algebraic entropy.

This work was partially in part by GNSAGA of INdAM and by PRIN 2017, project 2017NWTM8R, Mathematical Logic, models, sets, computability.

Generalized length functions were introduced in [NR65] and further studied (among other places) in [Vám68a,SVV13]: see also §2 for a brief introduction; we will simply say “length” or “length function” in the rest of the paper.

Fix $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and let $S := R[x_1, \dots, x_k]$. Let M be an S -module.

We show that, under some assumptions on M , we can define a **Hilbert series** and a **Hilbert polynomial** for M , generalizing the known theory when R is a field and λ is equal to the linear dimension (see e.g. [Eis95,MS05]). More precisely, we fix an R -sub-module $V \leq M$ such that $\lambda(V) < \infty$ and $SV = M$; if we define S_n as the set of polynomials in S of total degree less or equal to n , we see that the formal power series

$$\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \lambda(S_n V) t^n$$

is a rational function (of t), and the function $n \mapsto \lambda(S_n V)$ is equal to a polynomial (for $n \in \mathbb{N}$ large enough). The leading coefficient $\mu(M)$ of this polynomial does not depend on the choice of V (Theorem 4.10): thus, this leading monomial is an invariant of M , and describes the growth rate of λ on M .

After some preliminary definition and facts about graded and filtered modules in §3, in §4 we show the existence of a Hilbert series for the case when M is an \mathbb{N} -graded module (Theorem 4.1); then we move to the case when M is a upward filtered module (Theorem 4.2). Often Hilbert series are defined for downward filtered modules, but, in light of the applications in §4.3 and §6, it is more appropriate for our purposes to consider upward filtered modules (cf. [KLMP99, §1.3]).

We then deduce the existence of a Hilbert polynomial associated to a suitable generating R -sub-module V of an S -module M .

In §5 we generalize this construction to the case when M is not finitely generated, and show that, under some suitable assumptions, the function μ is additive (Theorem 6.1).

The coefficient of the k -term of the Hilbert polynomial is (up to a constant factor) the algebraic entropy of the action of \mathbb{N}^k on M (see §2 for the definition of algebraic entropy and its main properties). Therefore, the additivity of μ is a refinement of the known additivity of algebraic entropy (see Fact 2.5 and [SVV13, SV15,DFGB20]). However, the additivity of algebraic entropy has already been proved under weaker assumptions: one of the most general results considers the case when the acting monoid Γ is cancellative and amenable, and M is locally λ_R -finite (as in Definition 2.1): see [Vir19,DFGB20].

In §8 we show how the usual construction of Hilbert-Samuel polynomial can be extended to length functions.

In §7 we replace S with a finitely generated R -algebra T and we define a corresponding Hilbert polynomial for each T -module M : its degree will be an invariant of M (while the leading coefficient will depend on the choice of a set of generators for T).

In §9 we introduce the d -dimensional entropy (a generalization of the receptive entropy in [BDGSa]) and relate it to the Hilbert polynomial.

In §10 we employ a technique in [Vám68a] and use μ to define an invariant $\hat{\mu}$ which is a length function on S -modules (assuming that R is Noetherian): a similar construction works for the (d -dimensional) entropy.

In §11 we define the “intrinsic” Hilbert polynomial: it bears the same relationship to the Hilbert polynomial that the intrinsic algebraic entropy (introduced in [DGSV15]: see §2.3) bears to the “usual” algebraic entropy. From it we extract an invariant $\tilde{\mu}$, and we show that $\tilde{\mu}$ is a length function on S -modules (always assuming that R is Noetherian). Thus, we have naturally defined 2 length functions on S -modules, $\hat{\mu}$ and $\tilde{\mu}$, which in general are different.

Besides, we consider in §12 a finer version of the Hilbert series where the grading is no longer in \mathbb{N} but in some suitable monoid Γ .

Most of the proof are either adaption of “classical” proof about Hilbert series and polynomials to this setting, or quite straightforward: hence we often skip them.

In most of our results, we assume that R is Noetherian. We think it may be possible to generalize them to some non Noetherian rings (see the Appendices); however, we don’t have (yet) a working theory of “Noetherianity-up-to- λ ” for rings, so we could not go far in this direction of inquiry. Without any assumption of Noetherianity it’s not clear if a Hilbert polynomial exists at all: on the other hand, the algebraic entropy (and its intrinsic version) for non-Noetherian rings has already been studied (see e.g. [SV15, SV19]).

It would be interesting to consider the cases when either the ring R or the algebra S are not commutative (cf. [Nor68] for the case when R is not commutative, and [DFGB20, Vir19] for the case when S is not commutative): some partial results are in Appendix A; we think that most results (except possibly Proposition 10.7 and its corollaries) generalize to the case when R is non-commutative; however, we mostly avoided this line of inquiry due to our lack of familiarity with non-commutative rings.

Acknowledgments. We thank Simone Virili for the useful discussions.

2. LENGTH FUNCTIONS AND THEIR ENTROPY

Let R be a ring and λ be a length function on R -mod.

2.1. Length functions. It can happen that $\lambda(R)$ is infinite: the following definition deals with that situation.

Definition 2.1. Let N be an R -module. We say that N is **locally λ_R -finite**⁽¹⁾ if either of the following equivalent conditions hold:

- (1) For every $v \in N$, $\lambda(Rv) < \infty$;
- (2) For every $N_0 < N$ finitely generated R -sub-module, $\lambda(N_0) < \infty$.

Examples 2.2. (a) If R is a field, then the linear dimension is the unique length λ on R -mod such that $\lambda(R) = 1$.

(b) Let $R = \mathbb{Z}$, and define $\lambda(M)$ to be the logarithm of the cardinality of M . Then, $\lambda(R) = \infty$, and an Abelian group is locally λ_R -finite iff it is torsion. We call λ the **standard length** on \mathbb{Z} -modules, and we will use it often in examples.

(c) The following are two “trivial” lengths:

- i) $\lambda(M) = 0$ for every M ;
- ii) $\lambda(M) = \infty$ for every $M \neq 0$.

(d) Given any ring R , the (classical) length of an R -module M is the length of a composition series for M (see e.g. [Eis95]).

A property we will use often in the rest of the paper is the following:

Definition 2.3. Given an R -algebra S and an S -module M , we say that M is **λ_S -small** if A is finitely generated (as S -module) and locally λ_R -finite.⁽²⁾

Remark 2.4. Assume that S is a Noetherian R -algebra and let M be an S -module. T.f.a.e.:

- (1) M is λ_S -small
- (2) there exists $V < M$ R -sub-module such that:
 - i) $SV = M$

⁽¹⁾ Also called “locally λ -finite” in [SVV13]: here we prefer to write explicitly the ring R too

⁽²⁾ A similar notion is called “Hilbert S -module” in [Nor68, C.7].

- ii) V is finitely generated (as R -module)
- iii) $\lambda(V) < \infty$
- (3) every sub-module and every quotient of M is λ_S -small.

[Vám68a, Theorem 5] characterizes the length functions on Noetherian rings: for every prime ideal $P < R$ there is a canonical length function l_P on $R\text{-mod}$, and any length function λ can be written as

$$\lambda = \sum_{P < R \text{ prime ideal}} r_P^\lambda \cdot l_P$$

for some $r_P^\lambda \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \cup \{\infty\}$.

2.2. Algebraic entropy. The content of this and the following subsections can be skipped: it is mostly a motivation for the definitions and results in the paper. We recall the definition of algebraic entropy and its main properties.

We fix a length λ on $R\text{-mod}$. Let M be an R -module and ϕ be an endomorphism of M . Given an R -sub-module $V \leq M$, we define

$$H_\lambda(\phi; V) := \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\lambda(V + \phi(V) + \dots + \phi^{n-1}(V))}{n}$$

(the limit always exists). The entropy of ϕ (according to the length λ) is defined by

$$h_\lambda(\phi) = \sup\{H_\lambda(\phi; V) : V \leq M \text{ } R\text{-sub-module of finite length}\}.$$

Equivalently, we can see M as an $R[X]$ -module, (with X acting on M as ϕ) and consider h_λ as an invariant of M as $R[X]$ -module. For the relationship between algebraic entropy and multiplicity, see [SVV13, Nor68].

More generally, given an S -module M (where $S = R[x_1, \dots, x_k]$), let S_n be the set of polynomials in S of degree at most n . Define

$$H(M; V) := \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \lambda(S_n V) / \binom{n+k}{k} = k! \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \lambda(S_n V) / n^k$$

$$h_\lambda(M) := \sup\{H(\phi; V) : V \leq M \text{ } R\text{-sub-module of finite length}\}$$

The limit in the definition of $H(M; V)$ exists, and h_λ is the algebraic entropy (relative to the length function λ): see [CSCk14, DFGB20].⁽³⁾

One of the most important properties of algebraic entropy is its additivity:

Fact 2.5. *Let $0 \rightarrow A \rightarrow B \rightarrow C \rightarrow 0$ be an exact sequence of S -modules. Assume that B is locally λ_R -finite. Then,*

$$h_\lambda(B) = h_\lambda(A) + h_\lambda(C).$$

For a proof of the above fact, see [SV15] for the case when $k = 1$, and [DFGB20, Vir19] for the case when $k \geq 1$ (or even more generally of R -modules with an action of a cancellative amenable monoid).

Length functions on R -modules were explicitly introduced in [NR65] and further studied in [Vám68b, Vám68a]; however, additive functions on modules is a “classical” topic (see e.g. [AM69, Chapters 2 and 11]): one of the novelties was allowing values in $\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \cup \{\infty\}$. Algebraic entropy was introduced in [DGSZ09]: it and its variants have been extensively studied, both in particular cases (e.g., $R = \mathbb{Z}$ and $k = 1$) and in general (including non-Noetherian rings): see e.g. [SZ09, DGZ13, SV15, BDGSa, GBV15, GS17b] and see [SVV13, GS17a] for surveys.

⁽³⁾ Let B_n^k be the set of monic monomials in S_n . Then $\binom{n+k}{k}$ is the cardinality of B_n^k . Moreover, the family $(B_n^k)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$, is a Følner sequence inside the monoid of all monic monomials in S , and therefore we can apply the machinery of [CSCk14].

2.3. Intrinsic algebraic entropy. We fix a length λ on R -mod. Let M be an R -module and ϕ be an endomorphism of M . Given an R -sub-module $V \leq M$, we define

$$\tilde{H}_\lambda(\phi; V) := \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\lambda((V + \phi(V) + \cdots + \phi^{n-1}(V))/V)}{n}$$

(the limit always exists). The intrinsic entropy of ϕ (according to the length λ), introduced in [DGSV15], is defined by

$$\tilde{h}_\lambda(\phi) = \sup\{H_\lambda(\phi; V) : V \leq M \text{ } R\text{-sub-module such that } \lambda((V + \phi(V))/V) < \infty\}.$$

There is a corresponding addition theorem

Fact 2.6. *Let $0 \rightarrow A \rightarrow B \rightarrow C \rightarrow 0$ be an exact sequence of $R[x]$ -modules. Then,*

$$\tilde{h}_\lambda(B) = \tilde{h}_\lambda(A) + \tilde{h}_\lambda(C).$$

For a proof of the above fact, see [DGSV15, SV18]: we will give a proof of a stronger version in a more general setting in §11.

3. GRADED AND FILTERED MODULES

Let $S = R[x_1, \dots, x_k]$.

In this section we gather a few definitions and facts about graded and filtered S -modules. The most important ones are: how to construct a graded $S[y]$ -module $\mathcal{B}(\bar{A})$ starting from an upward filtered module \bar{S} (Definition 3.5) and a version of Artin-Rees Lemma for upward filtered modules (Corollary 3.8).

3.1. Graded modules.

Definition 3.1. Fix $\bar{\gamma} = \langle \gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_k \rangle \in \mathbb{N}^k$. An **\mathbb{N} -graded S -module** of degree $\bar{\gamma}$ is given by an S -module M and a decomposition

$$M = \bigoplus_{n \in \mathbb{N}} M_n,$$

where each M_n is an R -module, and, for every $i \leq k$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$x_i M_n \leq M_{n+\gamma_i}.$$

We denote by \bar{M} the module M with the given grading (including the tuple $\bar{\gamma} := \langle \gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_k \rangle$).

Given $\bar{j} \in \mathbb{N}^k$ and $\bar{\gamma} \in \mathbb{N}^k$, we denote

$$|\bar{j}|_{\bar{\gamma}} := \bar{j} \cdot \bar{\gamma} := j_1 \gamma_1 + j_2 \gamma_2 + \cdots + j_k \gamma_k$$

Thus, if \bar{M} is a graded module of degree $\bar{\gamma}$, then, for every $\bar{j} \in \mathbb{N}^k$ and $m \in M_n$,

$$\bar{x}^{\bar{j}} m \in M_{n+|\bar{j}|_{\bar{\gamma}}}$$

We will use implicitly the following lemma many times in the remainder of the article.

Lemma 3.2. *Let \bar{M} be an \mathbb{N} -graded S -module of degree $\bar{\gamma}$. Assume that:*

- (1) $\gamma_\ell > 0$ for each $\ell = 1, \dots, k$;
- (2) M is finitely generated (as S -module).

Then, each M_n is also finitely generated (as R -module).

Proof. Let $m_1, \dots, m_p \in M$ generating M (as S -module). Fix $n \in \mathbb{N}$; we want to show that M_n is finitely generated. W.l.o.g., we may assume that each m_i is homogeneous of degree d_i (i.e., $m_i \in M_{d_i}$).

Let $a \in M_n$. There exist $s_1, \dots, s_p \in S$ such that

$$a = \sum_{i=1}^p s_i m_i.$$

Write

$$s_i = \sum_{\bar{j} \in \mathbb{N}^k} r_{i,\bar{j}} \bar{x}^{\bar{j}}$$

for some (unique) $r_{i,\bar{j}} \in R$. Let

$$c_{i,\bar{j}} := x^{\bar{j}} m_i \in S_{|\bar{j}|_{\bar{\gamma}}} M_{d_i} \subseteq M_{|\bar{j}|_{\bar{\gamma}} + d_i}$$

Thus,

$$a = \sum_{i=1}^p \sum_{\bar{j} \in \mathbb{N}^k} r_{i,\bar{j}} x^{\bar{j}} m_i = \sum_{i=1}^p \sum_{\bar{j} \in \mathbb{N}^k} r_{i,\bar{j}} c_{i,\bar{j}}.$$

For every $\bar{j} \in \mathbb{N}^k$, let

$$I_{\bar{j}} := \{i \leq p : |\bar{j}|_{\bar{\gamma}} - d_i = n\};$$

notice that, $I_{\bar{j}}$ is finite (since each $\gamma_\ell > 0$) and, for every $i \in I_{\bar{j}}$,

$$c_{i,\bar{j}} \in M_n.$$

Since $a \in M_n$, and each $c_{i,\bar{j}} \in M_{|\bar{j}|_{\bar{\gamma}} + d_i}$, we have that

$$a = \sum_{\bar{j} \in \mathbb{N}^k} \sum_{i \in I_{\bar{j}}} r_{i,\bar{j}} c_{i,\bar{j}}.$$

Thus, M_n is generated (as R -module) by the finite set

$$\{c_{i,\bar{j}} : \bar{j} \in \mathbb{N}^k, |\bar{j}|_{\bar{\gamma}} \leq n, i \in I_{\bar{j}}\} \quad \square$$

Definition 3.3. An \mathbb{N} -graded S -module \bar{A} is **acceptable** if:

- (1) \bar{A} is finitely generated (as S -module);
- (2) each x_i has degree 1.

For every $n \in \mathbb{N}$, we denote by $S^{(n)}$ the set of homogeneous polynomials in S of degree n (plus the 0 polynomial).

Proposition 3.4. *Let \bar{A} be an acceptable graded S -module. Then, there exists $d \in \mathbb{N}$ such that, for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$,*

$$A_{d+n} = S^{(n)} A_d.$$

Proof. It is always true that $S^{(n)} A_{d+n} \subseteq A_{d+n}$. We want to show the opposite containment.

Let $a_1, \dots, a_\ell \in A$ be generators of A . W.l.o.g., we may assume that each a_i is homogeneous of degree d_i (i.e., $a_i \in A_{d_i}$).

Let $d := \max(d_i : i = 1, \dots, \ell)$. Let $b \in A_{n+d}$. We can write

$$b = \sum_{i=1}^{\ell} s_i a_i,$$

for some $s_i \in S$. For every $i = 1, \dots, \ell$, write

$$s_i = \sum_{\bar{j} \in \mathbb{N}^k} r_{i,\bar{j}} \bar{x}^{\bar{j}}$$

for some (unique) $r_{i,\bar{j}} \in R$. W.l.o.g., as in the proof of Lemma 3.2, we may assume that $r_{i,\bar{j}} = 0$ when $d_i + |\bar{j}| \neq n + d$. For each i, \bar{j} such that $d_i + |\bar{j}| = n + d$, pick $\bar{j}[i], \bar{j}''[i] \in \mathbb{N}^k$ such that:

$$\bar{j}[i] + \bar{j}''[i] = \bar{j} \quad \& \quad |\bar{j}[i]| = n$$

Let

$$\begin{aligned} c_{i,\bar{j}} &:= \bar{x}^{\bar{j}}[i] a_i \in S^{n-d_i} A_{d_i} \subseteq A_n \\ t_{i,\bar{j}} &:= r_{i,\bar{j}} \bar{x}^{\bar{j}''}[i] \in S^{(n)}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus,

$$b = \sum_{i+|\bar{j}|=n} t_{i,\bar{j}} c_{i,\bar{j}} \in S^{(n)} A_n \quad \square$$

3.2. Filtered modules.

Definition 3.5. Let $\bar{\gamma} := \langle \gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_k \rangle \in \mathbb{N}^k$.

An **increasing filtering** on N with degrees $\bar{\gamma}$ is an increasing sequence of R -submodules of N

$$N_0 \leq N_1 \leq N_2 \leq \dots \leq N$$

such that $\bigcup_{i=0}^{\infty} N_i = N$, and $x_i N_j \leq N_{j+\alpha_i}$ for every $j \in \mathbb{N}$, $i \leq k$. We denote by \bar{N} the S -module with the given tuple $\bar{\gamma}$ and the filtering $(N_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$.

The **blow-up** of \bar{N} is the following graded $S[y]$ -module.⁽⁴⁾

As an R -module,

$$\mathcal{B}(\bar{N}) := \bigoplus_{n \in \mathbb{N}} N_n y^n.$$

The grading of $\mathcal{B}(\bar{N})$ is given by the decomposition $\mathcal{B}(\bar{N}) = \bigoplus_{n \in \mathbb{N}} N_n y^n$.

The multiplication by x_i on $\mathcal{B}(\bar{N})$ is defined as:

$$x_i(vy^j) := (x_i v)y^{j+\gamma_i},$$

for every $i \leq k$, $j \in \mathbb{N}$, $v \in N_j$, and then extended by R -linearity on all $\mathcal{B}(\bar{N})$: notice that the x_i has degree γ_i on $\mathcal{B}(\bar{N})$. The multiplication by y on $\mathcal{B}(\bar{N})$ is defined as:

$$y(vy^j) := vy^{j+1},$$

for every $j \in \mathbb{N}$, $v \in N_j$, and then extended by R -linearity on all $\mathcal{B}(\bar{N})$: notice that y has degree 1.

Let M be an S -module and $\bar{M} = (M_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ be a filtering of M with degrees $\bar{\gamma}$. For every $n \in \mathbb{N}$, we define

$$M^m := \bigoplus_{n \leq m} M_n y^n \leq \mathcal{B}(M).$$

We say that M_m **tightly generates** \bar{M} if: for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $v \in M_n$

- (†) There exist $m_1, \dots, m_r \in \mathbb{N}$ with $m_j \leq m$, $v_1, \dots, v_r \in M$ such that $v_j \in M_{m_j}$, and $\bar{n}_1, \dots, \bar{n}_r \in \mathbb{N}^k$ such that:

$$\begin{aligned} v &= \bar{x}^{\bar{n}_1} v_1 + \dots + \bar{x}^{\bar{n}_r} v_r, \\ n &\geq \bar{n}_j \cdot \bar{\gamma} + m_j, \quad j = 1, \dots, r. \end{aligned}$$

where we are using the notations

$$\bar{n}_j \cdot \bar{\gamma} := n_{j,1} \gamma_1 + \dots + n_{j,k} \gamma_k \quad \bar{x}^{\bar{n}_j} := x_1^{n_{j,1}} \dots x_k^{n_{j,k}}.$$

Notice that (†) is equivalent to:

- (†') There exist $m_1, \dots, m_r \in \mathbb{N}$ with $m_j \leq m$, $v_1, \dots, v_r \in M$ such that $v_j \in M_{m_j}$, and $p_1, \dots, p_r \in S$ such that:

$$\begin{aligned} v &= p_1 v_1 + \dots + p_r v_r, \\ n &\geq \deg_{\gamma}(p_j) + m_j, \quad j = 1, \dots, r. \end{aligned}$$

⁽⁴⁾ A similar construction is widely used in algebraic geometry for *downward* filtrations: see e.g. [Eis95, §5.2].

Lemma 3.6. *Let $m \in \mathbb{N}$. M^m generates $\mathcal{B}(\bar{M})$ (as an $S[y]$ -module) iff M_m tightly generates \bar{M} .*

Proof. \Rightarrow) Let $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $v \in M_n$. Since M^m generates $\mathcal{B}(\bar{M})$, there exist $v_1 y^{m_1}, \dots, v_r y^{m_r} \in M^m$ and $q_1(\bar{x}, y), \dots, q_r(\bar{x}, y) \in R[\bar{x}, y]$ such that:

$$v y^n = q_1(\bar{x}, y) v_1 y^{m_1} + \dots + q_r(\bar{x}, y) v_r y^{m_r}.$$

Thus, if we define $p_j(\bar{x}) := q_j(\bar{x}, 0) \in S$, $j = 1, \dots, r$, we have

$$v = p_1 v_1 + \dots + p_r v_r.$$

Moreover, $\deg_\gamma(p_j) + m_j \leq m$, $j = 1, \dots, r$, showing that M_m tightly generates \bar{M} .

\Leftarrow) Let $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $v y^n \in M_n y^n$. Let $m_1, \dots, m_r \in \mathbb{N}$, $v_1, \dots, v_r \in M$ and $\bar{n}_1, \dots, \bar{n}_r \in \mathbb{N}^k$ as in (†). For $j = 1, \dots, r$, define

$$d_j := n - (\bar{n}_j \cdot \bar{\gamma} + m_j) p_j \quad := \bar{x}^{\bar{n}_j} y^{d_j}.$$

We have $v_j y^{m_j} \in M^m$ and

$$v y^n = \sum_{i=1}^m p_j \cdot (v_j y^{d_j}) \in S[y] M^m$$

□

3.3. Acceptable filterings and upward Artin-Rees.

Definition 3.7. Let M be an S -module. An **acceptable filtering** of M is given by a filtering $\bar{M} := (M_n : n \in \mathbb{N})$ such that $\mathcal{B}(\bar{M})$ is an acceptable graded module; that is:

- (1) Each x_i has degree 1;
- (2) $\mathcal{B}(\bar{M})$ is finitely generated (as an $S[y]$ -module).

The following is an upward version of Artin-Rees Lemma: however, as it can be easily seen, the proof does not require that R is a commutative ring.

Corollary 3.8. *Let M be an S -module. Let \bar{M} be an acceptable filtering of M . Then, there exists $d \in \mathbb{N}$ such that:*

- (i) M_d generates M (as S -module);
- (ii) for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $M_{n+d} = S_n M_d$.

Proof. Since $\mathcal{B}(\bar{M})$ is finitely generated, Lemma 3.6 implies that there exists $d \in \mathbb{N}$ such that M_d tightly generates \bar{M} : thus, (i) is proven.

Claim 1. (ii) also holds (for the same d)

By assumption, $\mathcal{B}(\bar{M})$ is an acceptable graded $S[y]$ -module. Thus, by (the proof of) Proposition 3.4, for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$M_{n+d} y^{n+d} = S[y]^{(n)} M_d y^d$$

(as sub-modules of $\mathcal{B}(\bar{M})$) which is equivalent to (ii). □

4. λ -HILBERT SERIES AND POLYNOMIALS FOR NOETHERIAN MODULES

Let $S := R[x_1, \dots, x_k]$. We will define the Hilbert series and polynomial associated to the length function λ , loosely following the ideas in [KLMP99] and [AM69, Chapter 11].

Theorem 4.1. *Let \bar{M} be an \mathbb{N} -graded S -module of degree $\bar{\gamma} \in \mathbb{N}^k$. For every $n \in \mathbb{N}$, let $a_n := \lambda(M_n)$. Define*

$$F_{\bar{M}}(t) := \sum_n a_n t^n.$$

Assume that:

- (1) $\gamma_i > 0$ for $i = 1, \dots, k$;
- (2) $\lambda(M_n) < \infty$ for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$;
- (3) M is a Noetherian S -module.

Then, there exists a polynomial $p(t) \in \mathbb{R}[t]$ such that

$$F_{\bar{M}}(t) = \frac{p(t)}{\prod_{i=1}^k (1 - t^{\gamma_i})}.$$

Proof. By induction on k .

If $k = 0$, then, since M is Noetherian, only finitely many of the M_n are nonzero. Thus, $F_{\bar{M}}(t)$ is a sum of finitely many (finite) terms, and hence it is a polynomial.

Assume now that we have proven the conclusion for $k - 1$. Let $y : M \rightarrow M$ be the multiplication by x_k and $\alpha := \gamma_k$. For every $n \in \mathbb{N}$, let $y_n : M^n \rightarrow M^{n+\alpha}$ be the restriction of y to M^n . Let $K := \text{Ker}(y)$ and $K_n := K \cap M_n = \text{Ker}(y_n)$. Let $C_n := \text{Coker}(y_n) = M_{n+\alpha}/yM_n$, and $C := \bigoplus_{n \in \mathbb{N}} C_n$. Notice that both $\lambda(K_n)$ and $\lambda(C_n)$ are finite. Therefore, both K and C are \mathbb{N} -graded $R[x_1, \dots, x_{k-1}]$ -modules, and satisfy the assumptions of the theorem (that is, they are Noetherian modules, and each K_n and each C_n has finite λ).

For every $n \in \mathbb{N}$, consider the exact sequence

$$0 \longrightarrow K_n \longrightarrow M_n \xrightarrow{y_n} M_{n+\alpha} \longrightarrow C_n \longrightarrow 0.$$

Since λ is additive, we have

$$a_{n+\alpha} - a_n = \lambda(K_n) - \lambda(C_n).$$

Thus,

$$\sum_n a_n t^{n+\alpha} - \sum_n a_n t^n = \sum_n \lambda(K_n) t^n - \sum_n \lambda(C_n) t^n.$$

Therefore,

$$(t^\alpha - 1)F_{\bar{M}}(t) = F_{\bar{K}}(t) - F_{\bar{C}}(t)$$

(where \bar{K} is the $R[x_1, \dots, x_{k-1}]$ -module with the given grading, and similarly for \bar{C}).

Thus, by induction, there exist polynomials $q, q' \in \mathbb{R}[t]$ such that

$$F_{\bar{K}}(t) = \frac{q(t)}{\prod_{i=1}^{k-1} (1 - t^{\gamma_i})} \quad F_{\bar{C}}(t) = \frac{q'(t)}{\prod_{i=1}^{k-1} (1 - t^{\gamma_i})}.$$

Therefore,

$$F_{\bar{M}}(t) = \frac{q(t) - q'(t)}{\prod_{i=1}^k (1 - t^{\gamma_i})}$$

□

4.1. Filtered modules. We move now from graded modules to upward filtered modules.

Theorem 4.2. *Let \bar{N} be a filtering on N with degrees $\bar{\gamma}$.*

For every $n \in \mathbb{N}$, let $a_n := \lambda(N_n)$. Define

$$F_{\bar{N}}(t) := \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} a_n t^n.$$

Then,

$$F_{\bar{N}} = F_{\mathcal{B}(\bar{N})}.$$

Therefore, if we assume that

- (1) $\gamma_i > 0$ for $i = 1, \dots, k$;
- (2) $\lambda(N_n) < \infty$ for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$;
- (3) $\mathcal{B}(\bar{N})$ is Noetherian as $S[y]$ -module.

Then, there exists a polynomial $p(t) \in \mathbb{R}[t]$ such that

$$F_{\bar{N}}(t) = \frac{p(t)}{(1-t) \prod_{i=1}^k (1-t^{\gamma_i})}$$

(the $(1-t)$ -factor in the denominator is due to the action of y on $\mathcal{B}(N)$ of degree 1).

Definition 4.3. Let M be an S -module. A **good filtering** of M is given by an acceptable filtering $\bar{M} := (M_n : n \in \mathbb{N})$ (see Definition 3.7) such that:

(3) For every $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $\lambda(M_n) < \infty$.

Theorem 4.4. Assume that R is a Noetherian ring.

Let M be an S -module and $\bar{M} := (M_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ be a good filtering of M . For every $n \in \mathbb{N}$, let $a_n := \lambda(M_n)$. Then, for $n \in \mathbb{N}$ large enough, a_n is equal to a polynomial $q_{\bar{M}}(n)$ of degree at most k . Moreover, the leading monomial of $q_{\bar{M}}$ does not depend on the choice of the good filtering (but only on M and λ).

Therefore, we can denote by $\mu(M)$ the leading monomial of the polynomial $q_{\bar{M}}$ associated to some good filtering of M (if such good filtering exists).

Proof. Notice that, under the above assumptions, $\mathcal{B}(M)$ is Noetherian.

By Theorem 4.2,

$$F_{\bar{M}}(t) = \frac{p(t)}{(1-t)^{k+1}},$$

for some polynomial $p(t) \in \mathbb{R}[t]$. Thus, the coefficients a_n of the power series $F_{\bar{M}}$ are equal to some polynomial $q(n) \in \mathbb{R}[n]$ of degree at most k .

Assume now that $\bar{M}' := (M'_n : n \in \mathbb{N})$ is another good filtering of M and denote $a'_n := \lambda(M'_n)$. By Corollary 3.8, there exists $d_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that, for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$M'_{n+d_0} = S_n M'_{d_0}$$

Let $d_1 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $M'_{d_0} \leq M_{d_1}$ (d_1 exists because M'_{d_0} is finitely generated as R -module). Thus, for every n large enough,

$$q_{\bar{M}'}(n+d_0) = \lambda(M'_{n+d_0}) = \lambda(S_n M'_{d_0}) \leq \lambda(S_n M_{d_1}) \leq q_{\bar{M}}(n+d_1).$$

Similarly,

$$q_{\bar{M}}(n+d'_0) \leq q_{\bar{M}'}(n+d'_1)$$

for some $d'_0, d'_1 \in \mathbb{N}$ and every n large enough, showing that $q_{\bar{M}}$ and $q_{\bar{M}'}$ have the same leading monomial. \square

4.2. Polynomial coefficients for some rational functions. We will need the following results: it is probably well known, but I could not find a reference.

Proposition 4.5. Let $\bar{t} = \langle t_1, \dots, t_\ell \rangle$. Let $p(\bar{t}) \in K[\bar{t}]$ for some ring K . Let $\gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_\ell \in \mathbb{N}$. Define

$$f(\bar{t}) := \frac{p(\bar{t})}{\prod_{i=1}^{\ell} (1-t_i)^{\gamma_i}} \in K(\bar{t})$$

and expand f as

$$f(\bar{t}) = \sum_{\bar{n} \in \mathbb{N}^\ell} a_{\bar{n}} \bar{t}^{\bar{n}} \in K[[\bar{t}]]$$

Then, there exists a polynomial $q(\bar{t}) \in K[\bar{t}]$ such that:

(1) For every $\bar{n} \in \mathbb{N}^\ell$ large enough

$$a_{\bar{n}} = q(\bar{n})$$

(2) for every $i = 1, \dots, \ell$

$$\deg_{t_i}(q) \leq \gamma_i - 1$$

(where we set $\deg 0 := -\infty$)

Proof. It's clear that it suffices to treat the case when $p = 1$. We proceed by induction on ℓ . If $\ell = 0$, then $f = 1$, and $q = 0$. If $\ell = 1$, the result is easy: by further induction on γ_1 , one can prove that $a_n = \binom{n+\gamma_1-1}{\gamma_1-1}$.

Assume now that we have already proved the result for $\ell - 1$: we want to prove it for ℓ . Denote $\tilde{t} := \langle t_2, \dots, t_\ell \rangle$ and

$$g(\tilde{t}) := \frac{1}{\prod_{i=2}^{\ell} (1-t_i)^{\gamma_i}} := \sum_{\tilde{n} \in \mathbb{N}^{\ell-1}} b_{\tilde{n}} \tilde{t}^{\tilde{n}}.$$

By inductive hypothesis, there exists $r(\tilde{t}) \in K[\tilde{t}]$ satisfying (1) and (2) for g . Moreover,

$$f = g \cdot \frac{1}{(1-t_1)^{\gamma_1}} = \sum_{\tilde{n} \in \mathbb{N}^{\ell-1}} b_{\tilde{n}} \tilde{t}^{\tilde{n}} \cdot \sum_{m \in \mathbb{N}} c_m t_1^m,$$

where $\frac{1}{(1-t_1)^{\gamma_1}} = \sum_{m \in \mathbb{N}} c_m t_1^m$. Thus,

$$a_{m, \tilde{n}} = c_m b_{\tilde{n}}.$$

By the case $\ell = 1$ there exists $s(t_1) \in K[t_1]$ of degree at most $\gamma_1 - 1$, such that, for every $m \in \mathbb{N}$ large enough,

$$c_m = s(m).$$

Thus, taking $m \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\tilde{n} \in \mathbb{N}^{\ell-1}$ large enough, we have

$$a_{m, \tilde{n}} = s(m)r(\tilde{n}),$$

and the polynomial $q(t_1, \tilde{t}) := s(t_1)r(\tilde{t}) \in K[t]$ satisfies the conclusion. \square

Definition 4.6. Let $p(\tilde{t}), q(\tilde{t}) \in \mathbb{R}[\tilde{t}]$; we write $p = p_0 + p_1 + \dots + p_d$, where each $p_i \in \mathbb{R}[\tilde{t}]$ is homogeneous of degree i , and $p_d \neq 0$. We call p_d the leading homogeneous component of p . We write

- $p \preceq q$ if there exists $\bar{c} \in \mathbb{N}^\ell$ such that, for every $\bar{n} \in \mathbb{N}^\ell$ large enough, $p(\bar{n}) \leq q(\bar{n} + \bar{c})$;
- $p \simeq q$ if $p \preceq q$ and $q \preceq p$;
- $p \succeq 0$ if, for every $\bar{n} \in \mathbb{N}^\ell$ large enough, $p(\bar{n}) \geq 0$

Proposition 4.7. Let $p, q \in \mathbb{R}[\tilde{t}]$ such that:

- (1) $p \succeq 0$
- (2) $q \succeq 0$
- (3) $p \simeq q$

Then, p and q have the same leading homogeneous component.

Proof. Let p' and q' be the leading homogeneous component of p and q respectively, and h' be the leading homogeneous component of $h := p - q$. If, by contradiction, $p' \neq q'$, then $\deg h = \max(\deg p, \deg q)$. Let $\bar{v} \in \mathbb{N}^\ell$ such that $h'(\bar{v}) \neq 0$. Then,

$$r := \lim_{s \rightarrow \infty, s \in \mathbb{N}} h(s\bar{v}) \in \{\pm\infty\}.$$

Since $q \preceq p$, we have $r = +\infty$, but since since $p \preceq q$, we have $r = -\infty$, absurd. \square

4.3. Growth function.

Definition 4.8. Let N be an S -module, and $V_0 \leq N$ be an R -sub-module. For every $n \in \mathbb{N}$, let S_n be the set of polynomial in S of total degree at most n , $V_n := S_n V_0$ (notice that $S_0 = R$, that $V_0 = S_0 V_0$, and that S_n and V_n are R -modules). We denote by

$$\text{Filt}(V_0; N) := (V_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$$

the corresponding filtering of SV (as S -module), where each x_i has degree 1, and

$$\text{Gr}(V_0; N) := \mathcal{B}(\text{Filt}(V_0; N)) = \bigoplus_{n \in \mathbb{N}} S_n V_0 t^n$$

the corresponding graded $S[y]$ -module.

Theorem 4.9. *Let N be an S -module. Let $V_0 \leq N$ be an R -sub-module. Define*

$$G_{V_0}(t) := \sum_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \lambda(S_n V_0) t^n.$$

Assume that:

- (1) $\lambda(V_0) < \infty$;
- (2) V_0 is finitely generated as R -module;
- (3) R is a Noetherian ring.

Then, each a_n is finite, and there exists a polynomial $p(t) \in \mathbb{R}[t]$ such that

$$G_{V_0}(t) = \frac{p(t)}{(1-t)^{k+1}}.$$

Proof. First, we show that (1) implies that $\lambda(V_n)$ is finite for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$. In fact, V_n is a quotient of V_0^ℓ , where $\ell := \binom{n+k}{n} \in \mathbb{N}$ is the number of monic monomials in S of degree less or equal to n , and $\lambda(V_0^\ell)$ is finite.

Let

$$V := SV.$$

Notice that V is an S -module, and that $\text{Filt}(V_0; N)$ is an increasing filtering of V (as S -module). Moreover, $F_{\text{Filt}(V_0; N)} = G_{V_0}$. Thus, it suffices to show that $\mathcal{B}(\bar{V})$ is Noetherian as an $S[y]$ -module to conclude. Since, by (3), R is a Noetherian ring, $S[y]$ is also a Noetherian ring. Thus, it suffices to show that $\text{Gr}(V_0; N)$ is finitely generated (as an $S[y]$ -module). It is easy to see that $\text{Gr}(V_0; N)$ is generated by $V_0 t^0$, and the latter is finitely generated (as R -module) by (2). \square

Theorem 4.10 (Hilbert polynomial). *Let N , V_0 , and V_n be as in Theorem 4.9 and assume that (1), (2), and (3) as in there hold. Then, there exists a polynomial $q_{V_0}(t) \in \mathbb{R}[t]$ of degree at most k , such that, for every n large enough,*

$$\lambda(V_n) = q_{V_0}(n).$$

Assume that $N = \bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} V_n = SV_0$.

Let V_0' be another finitely generated R -sub-module of N such that $\lambda(V_0') < \infty$ and $SV_0' = N$. Then, there exists a constant n_0 such that

$$q_{V_0'}(t) \leq q_{V_0}(t + n_0),$$

and therefore the leading coefficients of q_{V_0} and of $q_{V_0'}$ are the same. Therefore, if we define $\mu_\lambda(N)$ to be the leading coefficient of q_{V_0} , $\mu_\lambda(N)$ does not depend on the choice of V_0 .

Finally, the coefficient of q_{V_0} of degree k is equal to

$$\frac{h_\lambda(N)}{k!}$$

where $h_\lambda(N)$ is the algebraic entropy of N according to λ (see §2.2).

Proof. By Theorem 4.9 and Proposition 4.5 \square

Notice that many authors (e.g., [KLMP99]) use a slightly different construction: in the situation when R is a field, they consider the function

$$H(n) := \dim(V_{n+1}/V_n).$$

It is easy to see that there exists a polynomial $\tilde{G}_{V_0}(t) \in \mathbb{N}[t]$ such that, for n large enough, $H(n) = \tilde{G}_{V_0}(t)$; from the definition it follows that $\tilde{G}_{V_0}(t) = G_{V_0}(t+1) - G_{V_0}(t)$. In the present situation, we found it easier to work with the function $\lambda(V_n)$.

Definition 4.11. Assume that R is Noetherian, and M is an S -module, such that M is λ_S -small (see Definition 2.3). Thus, there exists $V_0 < M$ R -sub-module which is finitely generated, of finite length, and generating M as an S -module.

We define $\mu_\lambda(M)$ as in Theorem 4.10: $\mu_\lambda(M)$ does not depend on the choice of V_0 . When λ is clear from the context, we will write μ instead of μ_λ .

Let d be the degree of $\mu(M)$ and m be the coefficient of $\mu(M)$. We define the **λ -dimension** of M (as an S -module) to be equal to d , and its **λ -degree** as

$$d!m$$

When λ is clear, we will simply say “dimension” and “degree”, respectively.⁽⁵⁾

One reason of the normalizing coefficient $d!$ is the following

Example 4.12. Assume that $\lambda(R) < \infty$ and fix $d \leq k$. Let $M := R[x_1, \dots, x_d]$ as an S -module, by defining the action of x_j on M as multiplication by 0 for $j > d$. Let $V_0 = R$ as a sub-module of M . Then,

$$q_{V_0}(n) = \binom{n+d}{d} \lambda(R) \quad \mu(M) = \frac{t^d}{d!} \lambda(R)$$

Therefore, the λ -dimension of M is d , and its λ -degree is $\lambda(R)$.

Proposition 4.13. Assume that R is Noetherian and $\lambda(R) = \ell < \infty$. Let $p(\bar{x}) \in S$ of degree $e > 0$. Assume that p_e , the leading homogeneous component of p (see Def. 4.6), is not a zero-divisor (inside S). Let $M := S/(p)$. Then, the λ -dimension of M is $k-1$ and its λ -degree is ℓe .

Proof. “Usual” proof. Let $N := (p) < S$. We choose $M_0 := R < M$. We have $SM_0 = M$. For each $n \in \mathbb{N}$, we denote $M_n := S_n M_0 = S_n/(p) < M$. Notice that, since p_e is not a zero-divisor, for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$ we have

$$p \cdot S_n = (p) \cap S_{n+e}$$

and therefore $S_{n+e}/p \cdot S_n$ and M_{n+e} are isomorphic (as R -modules). Moreover p also is not a zero-divisor, and therefore the multiplication by p is an injective function (on S). Therefore, for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$, the following sequence is exact:

$$0 \longrightarrow S_n \xrightarrow{p} S_{n+e} \longrightarrow M_{n+e} \longrightarrow 0$$

Therefore, if $q^{(S)}$ and $q^{(M)}$ are the Hilbert polynomials associated to S and M respectively, we have that, for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$ large enough,

$$q^{(M)}(n+e) = q^{(S)}(n+e) - q^{(S)}(n).$$

The conclusion follows. \square

Corollary 4.14. Assume that R is Noetherian and $\lambda(R) = 1$. Let $p \in S$ be as in Proposition 4.13. Then, the λ -degree of $S/(p)$ is equal to $\deg(p)$, and in particular it is independent from λ .

The above corollary implies that, if R is an integral domain and $\lambda(R) = 1$, then the λ -degree of $S/(p)$ does not depend on λ . However, this hardly surprising, since under the above assumption λ is unique:

Exercise 4.15. Let R be an integral domain. Then, there exists a unique length λ_1 on R -modules satisfying $\lambda_1(R) = 1$. Denoting by K the field of fractions of R , λ_1 is defined by:

$$\lambda_1(M) := \dim_K(K \otimes M).$$

⁽⁵⁾ See [Eis95, §1.9] for the usual definitions of dimension and degree. There is an alternative construction in [Eis95, C.12] using Hilbert-Samuel polynomial, where the “degree” becomes “multiplicity”: see also §8.

5. DIMENSION AND DEGREE: THE GENERAL CASE

We assume now that R is Noetherian (and $S = R[x_1, \dots, x_k]$ for some $k \in \mathbb{N}$). Let M be any R -module. Given $M' \leq M$ S -sub-module which is λ_S -small (see Definition 2.3), let $\mu(M')$ be as in Definition 4.11: it is a monomial if the form rt^d , where $r \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ and $d \in 0, \dots, k$. Given a family $I = \{r_i t^{d_i}\}$ of monomials of the above form, we can define $\sup(I)$ as the monomial rt^d , where

$$\begin{aligned} d &:= \max\{d_i : i \in I\} \in \{0, \dots, k\} \\ r &:= \sup\{r_i : i \in I \text{ \& } d_i = d\} \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \cup \{\infty\}, \end{aligned}$$

or $\sup(I) = 0$ if I is empty.

Thus, we can **define** $\mu(M)$ as the supremum of $\mu(M')$, where M' varies among all the possible S -sub-modules $M' \leq M$ which are λ_S -small (notice that, by definition, $\mu(M) = 0$ if 0 is the only S -sub-module of M of finite length). We can then define as before the λ -dimension and λ -degree of M : the latter can be infinite.

6. ADDITION THEOREM FOR EXACT SEQUENCES

Fix $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and let $S := R[x_1, \dots, x_k]$. In this section we will prove the following Theorem.

Theorem 6.1. *Let $0 \longrightarrow A \xrightarrow{\iota} B \xrightarrow{\pi} C \longrightarrow 0$ be an exact sequence of S -modules. Assume that*

- (1) R is Noetherian;
- (2) B is locally λ_R -finite.

Then, $\mu(B) = \mu(A) \oplus \mu(C)$, where

$$rt^n \oplus st^m = \begin{cases} rt^n & \text{if } n > m \\ st^m & \text{if } n < m \\ (r+s)t^n & \text{if } n = m. \end{cases}$$

Notice that, under the assumptions of the above theorem, also A and C are locally λ_R -finite.

The main ingredient is the following proposition.

Proposition 6.2 (Additivity). *Let $0 \longrightarrow A \xrightarrow{\iota} B \xrightarrow{\pi} C \longrightarrow 0$ be an exact sequence of S -modules. Assume that*

- (1) R is Noetherian;
- (2) B is λ_S -small.

Then, $\mu(B) = \mu(A) \oplus \mu(C)$.

Notice that, under the assumptions of the above propositions, also A and C are λ_S -small.

Proof. Let B_0 be an R -sub-module of B such that B_0 is finitely generated, $\lambda(B_0) < \infty$, and $SB_0 = B$. For every $i \in \mathbb{N}$, define

$$\begin{aligned} B_i &:= S_i B_0 \\ A_i &:= \iota^{-1}(B_i) \\ C_i &:= \pi(B_i), \end{aligned}$$

and define $\bar{B} := (B_i : i \in \mathbb{N})$, $\bar{A} := (A_i : i \in \mathbb{N})$, and $\bar{C} := (C_i : i \in \mathbb{N})$. Notice that \bar{A} , \bar{B} , and \bar{C} are good filterings of A , B , and C , respectively (see Definition 4.3). Thus, by Theorem 4.4, for $n \in \mathbb{N}$ large enough, $\lambda(A_n) = q_{\bar{A}}(n)$ and

$\mu(A)$ is the leading term of $q_{\bar{A}}$, and similarly for B and C . Moreover, for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $\lambda(A_n) + \lambda(C_n) = \lambda(B_n)$: thus,

$$q_{\bar{A}} + q_{\bar{C}} = q_{\bar{B}},$$

and therefore $\mu(A) \oplus \mu(C) = \mu(B)$. \square

Proof of Thm. 6.1. Since B is locally λ_R -finite, every sub-module of A , B , or C is locally λ_R -finite.

Claim 2.

$$\mu(B) \leq \mu(A) \oplus \mu(C).$$

Let $B' \leq B$ be an S -sub-module which is finitely generated. Define

$$A' := \iota^{-1}(B'), \quad C' := \pi(A').$$

Notice that the sequence

$$0 \longrightarrow A' \longrightarrow B' \longrightarrow C' \longrightarrow 0$$

is exact, and therefore, by Proposition 6.2,

$$\mu(B') = \mu(A') \oplus \mu(C') \leq \mu(A) \oplus \mu(C).$$

Taking the supremum among all the B' , we get the Claim.

Claim 3.

$$\mu(B) \geq \mu(A) \oplus \mu(C).$$

Let $A' \leq A$ and $C' \leq C$ be S -sub-modules which are finitely generated. Since C is finitely generated and π is surjective, there exists $B' \leq B$ finitely generated and such that $\pi(B') = C$. Define

$$B'' := B' + \iota(A'), \quad A'' := \iota^{-1}(B'').$$

We have that the sequence

$$0 \longrightarrow A'' \longrightarrow B'' \longrightarrow C' \longrightarrow 0$$

is exact, and B'' is finitely generated and locally λ_R -finite. Thus, by Proposition 6.2,

$$\mu(A') \oplus \mu(C') \leq \mu(A'') \oplus \mu(C') = \mu(B'') \leq \mu(B).$$

Taking the supremum on the left side among all possible A' and C' , we get the Claim. \square

7. MODULES OVER R -ALGEBRAE

Let T be a finitely generated commutative R -algebra. Let M be a T -module. We want to define the dimension of M as a T -module.

Fix $\gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_k$ generators of T as R -algebra. Equivalently, we fix a surjective homomorphism of R -algebrae

$$\phi : R[x_1, \dots, x_k] \rightarrow T$$

and denote $\gamma_i := \phi(x_i)$, $i = 1, \dots, k$. We can therefore see M as an $R[x_1, \dots, x_k]$ -module, and we denote it either by $\langle M; \phi \rangle$ or by $\langle M; \bar{\gamma} \rangle$.

We assume that R is Noetherian, and that there exists $M_0 \leq M$ R -sub-module such that $TM_0 = M$, $\lambda(M_0) < \infty$, and M_0 is finitely generated as R -module. Thus, we can use the above data to compute $\mu(M_0; \phi)$ (which will depend on ϕ).

We prove now that, while the coefficient of μ may depend on ϕ , its degree does not. Thus, we can define the λ -dimension of M (as a T -module) as the degree of $\mu(M_0; \phi)$.

Repeating:

Definition 7.1. Assume that:

- (1) R is Noetherian;
- (2) T is a finitely generated commutative R -algebra;
- (3) M is a T -module;
- (4) there exists $M_0 \leq M$ finitely generated R -sub-module, such that $\lambda(M_0) < \infty$ and $TM_0 = M$.

Then, we can define as before the λ -dimension of M as a T -module, and this dimension does not depend on the choice of M_0 or of ϕ .

Examples 7.2. Fix some length function λ on R such that $\lambda(R) = 1$.

a) Let $M := T = R[z]$, $\bar{\gamma} := \langle 1 \rangle$, $\bar{\delta} := \langle 1, 3 \rangle$. Thus, $\langle M; \bar{\gamma} \rangle$ is $R[z]$ seen as $R[z]$ -module with the canonical action, while $\langle M; \bar{\delta} \rangle$ is $R[z]$ seen as $R[y_1, y_2]$ -module, with y_1 acting as multiplication by z^2 and y_2 as multiplication by z^3 . Then, $\mu(M; \bar{\gamma}) = t$, while $\mu(M; \bar{\delta}) = 3t$.

b) Let $M := T = R[z, z^{-1}]$, $\bar{\gamma} := \langle 1, -1 \rangle$, $\bar{\delta} := \langle 1, -3 \rangle$. Thus, $\langle M; \bar{\gamma} \rangle$ is T seen as $R[x_1, x_2]$ -module with x_1 acting as multiplication by z , and x_2 as multiplication by z^{-1} , while $\langle M; \bar{\delta} \rangle$ is T seen as $R[x_1, x_2]$ -module, with x_1 acting as multiplication by z and x_2 as multiplication by z^{-3} . Then, $\mu(M; \bar{\gamma}) = 2t$, while $\mu(M; \bar{\delta}) = 4t$.

In both examples, we see that the two modules have different degrees, but have the same dimension.

It remains to prove that the degree of $\mu(M; \phi)$ does not depend on the choice of ϕ . It is clear that it suffices to prove the following:

Lemma 7.3. *Let $\bar{\delta} \in T^{k'}$ be another tuple of generators of T . Then, $\langle M; \bar{\gamma} \rangle$ and $\langle M; \bar{\delta} \rangle$ have the same dimension.*

Proof. After exchanging the rôles of $\bar{\gamma}$ and $\bar{\delta}$ if necessary, we may assume that $k \geq k'$. After extending δ by setting $\delta_i = 0$ for $i \geq k'$, we may assume that $k = k'$. As usual, we denote $S := R[x_1, \dots, x_k]$ and by S_n the set of polynomials in S of degree at most n .

We denote by $\psi : R[x_1, \dots, x_k] \rightarrow M$ be the surjective homomorphism of R -algebrae corresponding to $\bar{\delta}$ (and by ϕ the one corresponding to $\bar{\gamma}$).

For every $n \in \mathbb{N}$, define

$$\begin{aligned} T_n &:= \phi(S_n) & T'_n &:= \psi(S_n) \\ M_n &:= T_n M_0 & M'_n &:= T'_n M_0 \end{aligned}$$

Notice that both $(T_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ and $(T'_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ are upward filterings of T as an R -module, that $(M_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ and $(M'_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ are upward filterings of M as an R -module, and that each T_n, T'_n, M_n and M'_n are finitely generated (as R -modules).

Moreover, M_0 generates both $\langle M; \bar{\gamma} \rangle$ and $\langle M; \bar{\gamma}' \rangle$ as S -modules. Thus, we can apply Theorem 4.10; we denote by q (resp., q') the Hilbert polynomial of $\langle M; \bar{\gamma} \rangle$ (resp., of $\langle M; \bar{\gamma}' \rangle$).

Let $c \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_k \in T'_c$. Thus, $T_1 \leq T'_c$.

The following is then clear

Claim 4. For every $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $T_n \leq (T'_c)^n$

Therefore, for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$

$$M_n = T_n M_0 \leq (T'_c)^n M_0 \leq T'_{cn} M_0 = M'_{cn}$$

Therefore, for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$\lambda(M_n) \leq \lambda(M'_{cn}).$$

Therefore, for every n large enough,

$$q(n) = \lambda(M_n) \leq \lambda(M'_{cn}) = q'(nc),$$

proving that $\deg q \leq \deg q'$. Exchanging the rôles of ϕ and ϕ' , we see that q and q' have the same degree. \square

We end this section with a comparison between λ -dimension and Krull dimension for affine rings.

Lemma 7.4. *Let R be a field and λ equal to the linear dimension (as R -vector spaces). Let T be a finitely generated R -algebra. Then, the λ -dimension and the Krull dimension of T coincide.*

Proof. Let d be equal to the Krull dimension of T . By Noether Normalization (see [Eis95, Theorem 13.3], there exists an R -sub-algebra $A < T$ such that:

- (1) A , as an R -algebra, is isomorphic to the polynomial ring $R[y_1, \dots, y_d]$;
- (2) T is finitely generated as A -module.

Thus, T and A have the same Krull dimension d , and it is easy to see that (2) implies that T has the same λ -dimension as A . Finally, A has λ -dimension d . \square

8. HILBERT-SAMUEL POLYNOMIAL FOR HOMOGENEOUS MODULES

Let $S := R[x_1, \dots, x_n]$ and $I := (x_1, \dots, x_n)$ ideal of S . Let M be an S -module. For every $n \in \mathbb{N}$, define $c_n := \lambda(M/I^{n+1}M)$.

Theorem 8.1. *Assume that:*

- (i) R is Noetherian;
- (ii) M is finitely generated (as S -module);
- (iii) $\lambda(M/IM)$ is finite.

Then, for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$, c_n is finite, and there exists a polynomial $\bar{q}(t) \in \mathbb{R}[t]$ such that:

- (1) *for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$ large enough, $c_n = \bar{q}(n)$;*
- (2) $\deg \bar{q} \leq k$.

Proof. Usual proof (see e.g. [Eis95, Proposition 12.2]) \square

Assume moreover, besides the hypothesis in the theorem, that there exists $V < M$ R -sub-module, such that:

- (a) $\lambda(V)$ is finite;
- (b) V is finitely generated (as R -module);
- (c) $SV = M$.

Then, one can define $a_n := \lambda(S_n V)$ as before. We notice that

$$c_n = \lambda(M/I^{n+1}M) = \lambda(S_n V/I^{n+1}M) \leq a_n$$

Therefore, denoting by q_V the Hilbert polynomial associated to V , we have $\bar{q}(t) \leq q_V(t)$ for every t large enough. If $\bar{\mu}(M)$ is the leading term of \bar{q} , we have therefore $\bar{\mu}(M) \leq \mu(M)$.

In general, it can happen that $\bar{\mu}(M) < \mu(M)$.

Example 8.2. Let K be a field, λ be the linear dimension over K , $S := K[x, y]$, $M := K[x, y]/(xy - 1)$. Then, $\mu(M) = 2t$, while $\bar{\mu}(M) = 0$.

It is easy to prove that for homogeneous ideals the situation is different.

Exercise 8.3. Assume that R is Noetherian. Let $J < S$ be a homogeneous ideal, and $M := S/J$. Then,

$$\mu(M) = \bar{\mu}(M).$$

More precisely, fix a finite set G generating J , and let n_0 be the maximum degree of the polynomials in G . Let $V := R$. Then, for every $n > n_0$, $S_n V$ and M/I^{n+1} are isomorphic (as R -modules), and therefore

$$a_n = \lambda(S_n V) = \lambda(M/I^{n+1}) = c_n.$$

See also [Eis95, C.12] and [Nor68, C.7] for the “classical” version of the Hilbert-Samuel polynomial.

9. d -DIMENSIONAL AND RECEPTIVE VERSIONS OF ENTROPY

Let R be Noetherian and M be an S -module. Let m be the coefficient of $\mu(M)$. For every $d \leq k$, define

$$h_\lambda^{(d)}(M) := \begin{cases} +\infty & \text{if } \deg \mu(M) > d \\ 0 & \text{if } \deg \mu(M) < d \\ \frac{m}{d!} & \text{if } \deg \mu(M) = d \end{cases}$$

The value $h^{(1)}(M)$ is the receptive entropy of M w.r.t. the standard regular system generated by (x_1, \dots, x_k) (see [BDGSa, BDGSb]); we call each $h^{(d)}(M)$ the d -**dimensional entropy** of M (and thus the algebraic entropy h is the k -dimensional entropy).

Proposition 9.1. *Let $0 \rightarrow A \rightarrow B \rightarrow C \rightarrow 0$ be an exact sequence of S -modules. Assume that*

- (1) R is Noetherian;
- (2) B is locally λ_R -finite.

Then, for every $d \leq k$

$$h^{(d)}(B) = h^{(d)}(A) + h^{(d)}(C).$$

Proof. By Theorem 6.1. □

Let T be a finitely generated R -algebra. We can give similar definitions for M T -module. Fix $\bar{\gamma} = \langle \gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_k \rangle$ generators of T (as R -algebra). Let $\langle M, \bar{\gamma} \rangle$ be the S -algebra defined in §7. Assume that R is Noetherian. We define

$$h_\lambda^{(d, \bar{\gamma})}(M) := \sup\{h^{(d)}(\langle M', \bar{\gamma} \rangle) : M' < M \text{ } \lambda_S\text{-small } S\text{-sub-module}\}$$

$h_\lambda^{(1, \bar{\gamma})}(M)$ is the receptive entropy of M w.r.t. the the standard regular system generated by $\bar{\gamma}$ (see [BDGSa, BDGSb]); we call each $h^{(d, \bar{\gamma})}(M)$ the d -**dimensional entropy** of M w.r.t. $\bar{\gamma}$.

Theorem 9.2. *Let $0 \rightarrow A \rightarrow B \rightarrow C \rightarrow 0$ be an exact sequence of T -modules. Assume that*

- (1) R is Noetherian;
- (2) B is locally λ_R -finite.

Then, for every $d \leq k$,

$$h^{(d, \bar{\gamma})}(B) = h^{(d, \bar{\gamma})}(A) + h^{(d, \bar{\gamma})}(C).$$

In particular, the receptive entropy $h^{(1, \bar{\gamma})}$ is additive (under the assumptions of Noetherian of R and locally λ_R -finiteness).

10. TOTALLY ADDITIVE VERSIONS OF μ AND (RECEPTIVE) ENTROPY

The definition of $\mu(M)$ reflects the usual definition of algebraic entropy (see §2.2). Following a construction in [Vám68a, Proposition 3], we propose an alternative definition, which is in some ways better behaved

Definition 10.1. Let A be an S -module. A λ_S -small chain in A is a sequence of S -sub-modules

$$\mathfrak{A} = (A_1 \leq A_2 \leq \cdots \leq A_{2n-1} \leq A_{2n} \leq A),$$

where, for every $i \leq n$,

$$\hat{A}_i := A_{2i}/A_{2i-1}$$

is λ_S -small. We call n is the **size** of \mathfrak{A} .

Definition 10.2. Let θ be a partial function from S -modules to the commutative monoid of monomials of the form mt^d , where $d \in \mathbb{N}$ and $m \in R_{\geq 0} \cup \{+\infty\}$ (examples of such function are λ and μ). We will be interested only in functions θ which satisfy the following conditions:

Additivity: $\theta(0) = 0$ and, for every exact sequence $0 \rightarrow A \rightarrow B \rightarrow C \rightarrow 0$ of S -modules in the domain of θ , $\theta(B) = \theta(A) \oplus \theta(C)$;

Invariance: if A and B are isomorphic S -modules in the domain of θ , $\theta(A) = \theta(B)$.

Assume that the domain of θ includes all the λ_S -small S -modules. Let A be any S -module. Given a λ_S -small chain \mathfrak{A} in A of size n , we define

$$\theta(\mathfrak{A}) := \sum_{i=1}^n \theta(\hat{A}_i)$$

$$\hat{\theta}(A) := \sup\{\theta(\mathfrak{A}) : \mathfrak{A} \text{ } \lambda_S\text{-small chain in } A\}$$

We will see later that $\hat{\theta}$ can be defined in a simpler way (Proposition 10.7); see also [Vám68a, Proposition 3] for an equivalent approach.

For “well-behaved” length functions λ , we have $\hat{\lambda} = \lambda$ (here we take $S = R$). However, the following example shows that it is not always the case.

Example 10.3. Let λ be the following function on \mathbb{Z} -modules:

$$\lambda(A) := \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } A \text{ is torsion} \\ \infty & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Then, $\hat{\lambda} = 0$.

Proposition 10.4. *Assume:*

- (1) R is Noetherian;
- (2) the domain of θ includes all λ_S -small S -modules;
- (3) θ is additive and invariant (on λ_S -small S -modules).

Then,

- (a) $\hat{\theta}$ is also additive and invariant;
- (b) if A is a λ_S -small S -module, then $\hat{\theta}(A) = \theta(A)$;
- (c) For every S -module A ,

$$\hat{\theta}(A) = \sup\{\theta(B) : B < A \text{ finitely generated } S\text{-sub-module}\}$$

- (d) if A is a locally λ_R -finite S -module, then

$$\hat{\theta}(A) = \sup\{\theta(B) : B < A \text{ finitely generated } S\text{-sub-module}\}$$

- (e)

$$\hat{\hat{\theta}} = \hat{\theta}$$

Proof. The proof is quite straightforward; we will prove that $\hat{\theta}$ is additive, and leave the remainder as an exercise (see also [Vám68a]). Thus, let $0 \rightarrow A \xrightarrow{\iota} B \xrightarrow{\pi} C \rightarrow 0$ be an exact sequence of S -modules.

Claim 5.

$$\hat{\theta}(B) \leq \hat{\theta}(A) \oplus \hat{\theta}(C).$$

Let $\mathfrak{B} = (B_1 \leq B_2 \leq \cdots \leq B_{2n-1} \leq B_{2n} \leq B)$ be a λ_S -small chain in B . For every $i \leq n$, define

$$A_i := \iota^{-1}(B_i) \quad C_i := \pi(A_i).$$

Then, $\mathfrak{A} := (A_1 \leq A_2 \leq \cdots \leq A_{2n-1} \leq A_{2n} \leq A)$ and $\mathfrak{C} := (C_1 \leq C_2 \leq \cdots \leq C_{2m-1} \leq C_{2m} \leq C)$ are λ_S -small chains in A and C , respectively. Moreover, for every $i \leq n$, we have an exact sequence

$$0 \rightarrow \hat{A}_i \rightarrow \hat{B}_i \rightarrow \hat{C}_i \rightarrow 0.$$

Therefore, $\theta(\mathfrak{B}) = \theta(\mathfrak{A}) \oplus \theta(\mathfrak{C})$, and the claim follows.

Claim 6.

$$\hat{\theta}(B) \geq \hat{\theta}(A) \oplus \hat{\theta}(C)$$

Let $\mathfrak{A} = (A_1 \leq A_2 \leq \cdots \leq A_{2n-1} \leq A_{2n} \leq A)$ and $\mathfrak{C} = (C_1 \leq C_2 \leq \cdots \leq C_{2m-1} \leq C_{2m} \leq C)$ be λ_S -small chains in A and C , respectively. For every $i \leq 2(m+n)$

$$B_i := \begin{cases} \iota(A_i) & \text{if } i \leq 2n; \\ \pi^{-1}(C_{i-2n}) & \text{if } 2n < i \leq 2(n+m). \end{cases}$$

Then, $\mathfrak{B} := (B_1 \leq B_2 \leq \cdots \leq B_{2n+2m-1} \leq B_{2n+2m} \leq B)$ is a λ_S -small chain in B . Moreover, for every $i \leq n+m$,

$$\hat{B}_i = \begin{cases} \hat{A}_i & \text{if } i \leq n; \\ \hat{C}_i & \text{if } n < i \leq n+m. \end{cases}$$

Therefore, $\theta(\mathfrak{B}) = \theta(\mathfrak{A}) \oplus \theta(\mathfrak{C})$, and the claim follows. \square

For the remainder of this section, we **assume** that R is **Noetherian**.

Definition 10.5. Given an ideal $I < R$, we say that I is λ -cofinite if $\lambda(R/I) < \infty$.

Remark 10.6. Let $I < R$ be a λ -cofinite ideal, and A be an R -module. Then, A/I is locally λ_R -finite.

Proposition 10.7. *Let θ be as above and total. Assume that, for every S -module A*

$$\theta(A) = \sup\{\theta(B) : B \leq A \text{ } \lambda_S\text{-small } S\text{-submodule}\}.$$

Then,

$$\hat{\theta}(A) \geq \theta(A)$$

and, if A is finitely generated,

$$\hat{\theta}(A) = \sup\{\theta(A/I) : I < R \text{ } \lambda\text{-cofinite ideal}\}$$

The proof of the above proposition is in the next subsection: for now we will record some consequences.

Corollary 10.8. (1) $\hat{\mu}$ satisfies the conclusions of Propositions 10.4 and 10.7;
(2) $\hat{\mu}(A) = \mu(A)$ for every locally λ_R -finite S -module A ;
(3) if $\lambda(R) < \infty$, then $\hat{\mu} = \mu$.

Corollary 10.9. For every $d \leq k$,

(1) the d -dimensional entropy (see §9) $\hat{h}_\lambda^{(d)}$ is a length functions (on all S -modules) and satisfies the conclusion of Proposition 10.7;

- (2) $\hat{h}_\lambda^{(d)}(A) = h_\lambda^{(d)}(A)$ for every locally λ_R -finite S -module A ;
 (3) if $\lambda(R) < \infty$, then $\hat{h}_\lambda^{(d)} = h_\lambda^{(d)}$.

Remember that

$$\hat{h}_\lambda = \hat{h}^{(k)}.$$

Corollary 10.10. *Let T be a finitely generated R -algebra, $\bar{\gamma} \in T^k$ be a set of generators of T . Given $d \leq k$, let $h^{(d, \bar{\gamma})}$ be defined as in §9. Then:*

- (1) $\hat{h}_\lambda^{(d, \bar{\gamma})}$ is a length functions (on all T -modules) and satisfies the conclusion of Proposition 10.7;
 (2) $\hat{h}_\lambda^{(d, \bar{\gamma})}(A) = h_\lambda^{(d, \bar{\gamma})}(A)$ for every locally λ_R -finite S -module A ;
 (3) if $\lambda(R) < \infty$, then $\hat{h}_\lambda^{(d, \bar{\gamma})} = h_\lambda^{(d, \bar{\gamma})}$.

The above Corollary answers [BDGSb, Question 5.10]. Moreover, Lemma 7.4 answers the conjecture in [BDGSb, Remark 5.9].

Corollary 10.11. *Let λ be the standard length on \mathbb{Z} -modules introduced in Example 2.2(b). Then, for every finitely generated $\mathbb{Z}[\bar{x}]$ -module A ,*

$$\hat{\mu}(A) = \sup\{\mu(A/nA) : 2 \leq n \in \mathbb{N}\} = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mu(A/n!A).$$

We cannot drop the assumption that A is finitely generated in Proposition 10.7.

Example 10.12. Let $R := \mathbb{Z}$ and λ be the standard length. Let $A := \mathbb{Q}[\bar{x}]$ (see as $\mathbb{Z}[\bar{x}]$ -module). Then,

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\mu}(A) &= \infty \cdot t^k \\ \sup\{\mu(A/nA) : 2 \leq n \in \mathbb{N}\} &= 0. \end{aligned}$$

We now give another example of equality between Krull and λ dimensions (besides Lemma 7.4).

Lemma 10.13. *Fix $2 \leq n \in \mathbb{N}$. Let $R := \mathbb{Z}/(n)$. Let λ be the length on R -mod given by*

$$\lambda(M) := \log_n(|M|).$$

Let $A := S/J$ for some ideal $J < S$. Then, λ -dim(A) is equal to the Krull dimension of A .

Proof. We proceed by induction on n .

If n is prime, then R is a field, and λ is equal to the linear dimension: thus, the conclusion follows from Lemma 7.4.

Otherwise, let $p \in \mathbb{N}$ be a prime divisor of n and let $m := n/p$. We have the exact sequence

$$0 \longrightarrow pA \longrightarrow A \longrightarrow A/pA \longrightarrow 0$$

Both pA and A/pA are quotients of $\mathbb{Z}/(m)[\bar{x}]$: therefore, by inductive hypothesis, their λ -dimensions are equal to their Krull dimensions. By additivity of Krull and λ dimensions, the conclusion follows. \square

10.1. Proof of Proposition 10.7.

Lemma 10.14. *Let $I, J < R$ be λ -cofinite ideals. Then, $I \cap J$ is also λ -cofinite.*

Proof. $R/I \cap J$ embeds into $R/I \times R/J$. \square

Lemma 10.15. *Let $I, J < R$ be λ -cofinite ideals. Then, IJ is also λ -cofinite.*

Proof. Let $\bar{a} = (a_1, \dots, a_\ell)$ generate I . Then, I/IJ is a quotient of $(R/J)^\ell$ via the map

$$(r_1 + J, \dots, r_\ell + J) \mapsto r_1 a_1 + \dots + r_\ell a_\ell + IJ.$$

Therefore, $\lambda(I/IJ) \leq \ell \lambda(R/J) < \infty$, and

$$\lambda(R/IJ) \leq \lambda(R/I) + \lambda(I/IJ) < \infty. \quad \square$$

Lemma 10.16. *Let A be an S -module. Assume that A is λ_S -small. Then,*

$$\text{Ann}_R(A) := \{r \in R : rA = 0\}$$

is λ -cofinite

Proof. Let a_1, \dots, a_ℓ be generators of A (as S -module). For every $i \leq \ell$, $\lambda(Ra_i) < \infty$. Moreover, Ra_i is isomorphic (as R -module) to $R/\text{Ann}_R(a_i)$, and therefore $\text{Ann}_R(a_i)$ is λ -cofinite. Finally,

$$\text{Ann}_R(A) = \text{Ann}_R(a_1) \cap \dots \cap \text{Ann}_R(a_\ell)$$

and the conclusion follows from Lemma 10.14. \square

Proof of Proposition 10.7. Let $B \leq A$ be a λ_S -small S -sub-module. By definition, $\hat{\theta}(A) \geq \theta(B)$: therefore, by the assumption, $\hat{\theta}(A) \geq \theta(A)$.

Define

$$\theta'(A) := \sup\{\theta(A/I) : I \leq R \text{ } \lambda\text{-cofinite ideal}\}.$$

We want to prove that, when A is finitely generated, $\hat{\theta}(A) = \theta'(A)$. It suffices to show that θ' is additive on finitely generated S -modules. Thus, let

$$0 \longrightarrow A \longrightarrow B \longrightarrow C \longrightarrow 0$$

be an exact sequence of finitely generated S -modules.

Claim 7. $\hat{\theta}(B) \leq \hat{\theta}(A) \oplus \hat{\theta}(C)$.

Let $I \leq R$ be a λ -cofinite ideal. We have the exact sequence of λ_S -small S -modules

$$0 \longrightarrow A/(A \cap IB) \longrightarrow B/IB \longrightarrow C/IC \longrightarrow 0.$$

Since θ is additive on λ_S -small S -modules, and $IA \leq A \cap IB$, we have

$$\hat{\theta}(A) + \hat{\theta}(C) \geq \theta(A/IA) \oplus \theta(C/IC) \geq \theta(A/(A \cap IB)) \oplus \theta(C/IC) = \theta(B/IB),$$

and the claim follows.

Claim 8. $\hat{\theta}(B) \geq \hat{\theta}(A) \oplus \hat{\theta}(C)$.

Let $I, I' \leq R$ be λ -cofinite ideals. We want to prove that

$$\theta(A/I) + \theta(C/I') \leq \hat{\theta}(B).$$

Replacing I, I' with $I \cap I'$, w.l.o.g. we may assume that $I = I'$. By the Artin-Rees Lemma (see e.g. [Nor68, §4.7]), there exists $1 \leq n_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that, for every $m \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$(1) \quad A \cap I^{m+n_0} B = I^m (A \cap I^{n_0} B).$$

Let $J := I^{n_0}$ and $A' := A \cap JB$: notice that J is also λ -cofinite. Taking $m := n_0$ in (1), we obtain:

$$A \cap J^2 B = JA'.$$

Thus, we have the exact sequence

$$0 \longrightarrow A/JA' \longrightarrow B/J^2 B \longrightarrow C/J^2 C \longrightarrow 0.$$

The modules appearing above are all λ_S -small: therefore,

$$\hat{\theta}(A/IA) \oplus \theta(C/IC) \leq \theta(A/JA') \oplus \theta(C/J^2 C) = \theta(B/J^2 B) \leq \hat{\theta}(B),$$

proving the Claim. \square

10.2. Examples. Let $R := \mathbb{Z}$, α be the standard length introduced in Example 2.2(b) and β be the length given by the rank (i.e., $\beta(M) = \dim_{\mathbb{Q}}(M \otimes \mathbb{Q})$). Since $\beta(\mathbb{Z}) = 1 < \infty$, $\mu_{\beta} = \hat{\mu}_{\beta}$.

1) Let $S := \mathbb{Z}[x]$, I be an ideal of S , and $M := S/I$. The following table shows the values of $\mu_{\alpha}(M)$, $\hat{\mu}_{\alpha}(M)$, and $\mu_{\beta}(M)$ for some values of I :

I	$\mu_{\alpha}(S/I)$	$\hat{\mu}_{\alpha}(S/I)$	$\mu_{\beta}(S/I)$
0	0	$\infty \cdot t^1$	t^1
S	0	0	0
(n) ; $2 \leq n \in \mathbb{N}$	$\log(n) \cdot t^1$	$\log(n) \cdot t^1$	0
$(p(x))$; $\deg p \geq 1$	0	$\infty \cdot t^0$	$\deg p \cdot t^0$
$(p(x), n)$; $2 \leq n \in \mathbb{N}$, p monic, $\deg p \geq 1$	$\log(n) \deg p \cdot t^0$	$\log(n) \deg p \cdot t^0$	0

2) Let $S := \mathbb{Z}[x, y]$ and $M := S/(xy)$. Then,

$$\mu_{\alpha}(M) = 0, \quad \hat{\mu}(M) = \infty \cdot t, \quad \mu_{\beta}(M) = 2t$$

11. INTRINSIC HILBERT POLYNOMIAL

In this section, we assume that R is Noetherian.

Let A be an S -module. Let $\bar{A} := (A_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ be a filtration of A . For each $i \in \mathbb{N}$, define $\tilde{A}_i := A_{i+1}/A_i$ (as R -modules). Define

$$\tilde{\mathcal{B}}(\bar{A}) := \bigoplus_{i \in \mathbb{N}} \tilde{A}_i$$

as graded S -module (where all the x_i have degree 1). An equivalent description of $\tilde{\mathcal{B}}(\bar{A})$ is the following. Remember that $\mathcal{B}(\bar{A})$ is an $S[y]$ -module. Let

$$\cdot y : \mathcal{B}(\bar{A}) \rightarrow \mathcal{B}(\bar{A})$$

be the multiplication by y . Then,

$$\tilde{\mathcal{B}}(\bar{A}) = \text{Coker}(\cdot y);$$

notice that $\text{Coker}(\cdot y)$ is an $S[y]$ -module: however, y acts trivially on $\text{Coker}(\cdot y)$, hence we lose nothing in considering $\text{Coker}(\cdot y)$ as an S -module; moreover, the above isomorphism is of graded S -modules. In particular, if $\mathcal{B}(\bar{A})$ is Noetherian (as $S[y]$ -module), then $\tilde{\mathcal{B}}(\bar{A})$ is also Noetherian (as S -module).

Definition 11.1. We say that \bar{A} is a λ -inert filtration of A if:

- (1) $\tilde{\mathcal{B}}(\bar{A})$ is Noetherian (as S -module);
- (2) there exists $n_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that, for every $n \geq n_0$,

$$\lambda(\tilde{A}_n) < \infty.$$

Proposition 11.2. *Assume that \bar{A} is a λ -inert filtration of A . Then, there exists a polynomial $\tilde{q}_{\bar{A}}(t) \in \mathbb{Q}[t]$ of degree at most $k-1$ such that, for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$ large enough,*

$$\lambda(\tilde{A}_n) = \tilde{q}_{\bar{A}}(n).$$

Proof. Same proof as Theorem 4.10. □

We call $\tilde{q}_{\bar{A}}$ the intrinsic Hilbert polynomial of \bar{A} , and denote by $\tilde{\mu}(\bar{A})$ its leading term.

Remark 11.3. Assume that \bar{A} is a λ -inert filtration of A . Assume moreover that $\lambda(A_0) < \infty$. In this situation, we have defined the Hilbert polynomial $q_{\bar{A}}$. We have, for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$

$$\lambda(\tilde{A}_n) = \lambda(A_{n+1}) - \lambda(A_n),$$

and therefore

$$\tilde{q}_{\bar{A}} = \Delta q_{\bar{A}},$$

where Δp is the difference of p : the polynomial defined by $\Delta p(t) = p(t+1) - p(t)$.

The intrinsic Hilbert polynomial becomes interesting when $\lambda(A_0)$ is infinite (and therefore we cannot compute the usual Hilbert polynomial).

Let $A_0 < A$ be an R -sub-module. Denote $\tilde{A}_0 := (S_1 A_0)/A_0$. We say that A_0 is λ -inert if

$$\lambda(\tilde{A}_0) < \infty.$$

Assume that:

- (1) \tilde{A}_0 is finitely generated (as R -module);
- (2) A_0 is λ -inert;
- (3) $SA_0 = A$;

We can define the associated filtering $\text{Filt}(A_0; A)$ of A . We denote

$$\tilde{\text{Gr}}(A; A_0) := \widetilde{\text{Filt}(A_0; A)} = \bigoplus_n (S_{n+1}A)/(S_nA)t^n.$$

Then, $\tilde{\text{Gr}}(A; A_0)$ is Noetherian (since it is generated, as S -module, by \tilde{A}_0), and therefore $\text{Filt}(A_0, A)$ is a λ -inert filtration.

We can therefore find $\tilde{q}_{\bar{A}}$; we define

$$\tilde{q}_{A_0} := q_{\tilde{\text{Gr}}(A; A_0)} \quad \& \quad \tilde{\mu}[A_0] := \mu(\tilde{\text{Gr}}(A; A_0)).$$

Unlike μ , it can happen that $\tilde{\mu}[A_0]$ depends on the choice of A_0 , as the following example shows (suggested by S. Virili).

Example 11.4. Let $R := \mathbb{Z}$, $A := S$, λ be the standard length. Fix $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and let

$$V := \mathbb{Z} + nS = \mathbb{Z} \oplus n\mathbb{Z}\bar{x} \oplus n\mathbb{Z}\bar{x}^2 \oplus \dots$$

Then,

$$\tilde{V} = (V + \bar{x}V)/V \simeq \bar{x}\mathbb{Z}/n.$$

Thus, $\lambda(\tilde{V}) = k \log n < \infty$; moreover, V is finitely generated and $SV = A$. Moreover,

$$V_i = S_i\mathbb{Z} + nS_iS = S_i + nS,$$

and therefore

$$\tilde{V}_i = (S_{i+1} + nS)/(S_i + nS) = S^{(i)}/(n)$$

Thus,

$$\lambda(\tilde{V}_i) = \log n \cdot |S^{(i+1)}| = \binom{i+k-1}{k} \log n$$

and therefore

$$\tilde{\mu}[V(n)] = \frac{\log n}{(k-1)!} \cdot t^{k-1}.$$

Therefore,

$$\tilde{\mu}(A) = \infty$$

and $\tilde{\mu}[V]$ depends in this case on the choice of V .

Definition 11.5. Assume that A is a finitely generated S -module. Define

$$\tilde{\mu}(A) := \sup\{\tilde{\mu}[V_0] : V_0 < A \text{ is } \lambda\text{-inert, } \tilde{V}_0 \text{ is finitely generated, and } SV_0 = A\}.$$

(We will see later that we can drop the assumption that $SV_0 = A$ in the definition of $\tilde{\mu}(A)$).

Lemma 11.6. *Let A be an S -module. Let $\bar{A} := (A_i)_{i \in \mathbb{N}}$ be a λ -inert filtration of A . Then, $\tilde{\mathcal{B}}(\bar{A})$ is an acceptable graded S -module (see Definition 3.3) and therefore, by Proposition 3.4 there exists $d_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that, for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$,*

$$\tilde{A}_{n+d_0} = S^{(n)} \tilde{A}_{d_0} = S_n A_{d_0}.$$

Let $d_1 \geq d_0$ such that $\lambda(\tilde{A}_{d_1}) < \infty$. Then, A_{d_1} is λ -inert, \tilde{A}_{d_1} is finitely generated, and $S A_{d_1} = S A_{d_0} = A$. Moreover,

$$(2) \quad \tilde{\mu}(\bar{A}) = \tilde{\mu}[A_{d_1}].$$

Therefore,

$$\tilde{\mu}(A) = \sup\{\tilde{\mu}(\bar{A}) : \bar{A} \text{ } \lambda\text{-inert filtration of } A\}$$

Proof. It suffices to prove (2): the rest of the lemma is clear. However, we have, for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$

$$\tilde{A}_{n+d_1} = S_n \cdot \tilde{A}_{d_1} :$$

therefore,

$$\lambda(\tilde{A}_{n+d_1}) = \lambda(S_n \cdot \tilde{A}_{d_1})$$

proving that

$$\tilde{q}_{\bar{A}}(n + d_1) = \tilde{q}_{A_{d_1}}(n)$$

and thus (2) follows. \square

Definition 11.7. Let \bar{A} be a filtration of A . Given $n \in \mathbb{N}$, the translate of \bar{A} by n is

$$\bar{A}[n] := (A_{n+i})_{i \in \mathbb{N}}.$$

Proposition 11.8. *Let $0 \rightarrow A \rightarrow B \xrightarrow{\pi} C \rightarrow 0$ be an exact sequence of finitely generated S -modules. Then,*

$$\tilde{\mu}(B) = \tilde{\mu}(A) \oplus \tilde{\mu}(C).$$

Proof. Let $B_0 < B$ be a λ -inert finitely generated R -sub-module of B such that $S B_0 = B$.

For every $n \in \mathbb{N}$, define

$$B_n := S_n B_0 \quad \& \quad A_n := A \cap B_n \quad \& \quad C_n := \pi(B_n).$$

Let $\bar{A} := (A_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$, $\bar{B} := (B_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}} = \text{Filt}(B_0; B)$, and $\bar{C} := (C_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}} = \text{Filt}(C_0; C)$. It is clear that \bar{A} is a filtration of A and \bar{C} is a filtration of C .

Claim 9. \bar{C} and \bar{A} are λ -inert.

In fact, for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$, we have an exact sequence of R -modules

$$0 \rightarrow \tilde{A}_n \rightarrow \tilde{B}_n \rightarrow \tilde{C}_n \rightarrow 0.$$

Since B_n is finitely generated and R is Noetherian, both \tilde{A}_n and \tilde{C}_n are finitely generated. Since moreover $\lambda(\tilde{B}_n)$ is finite, both $\lambda(\tilde{A}_n)$ and $\lambda(\tilde{C}_n)$ are finite.

Finally, we have an exact sequence of S -modules

$$0 \rightarrow \mathcal{B}(\bar{A}) \rightarrow \mathcal{B}(\bar{B}) \rightarrow \mathcal{B}(\text{bar}C) \rightarrow 0;$$

since $\mathcal{B}(\bar{B})$ is Noetherian, we have that also $\mathcal{B}(\bar{A})$ and $\mathcal{B}(\bar{C})$ are Noetherian.

Notice moreover that, for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$ large enough,

$$\tilde{q}_{\bar{A}}(n) + \tilde{q}_{\bar{C}}(n) = \lambda(\tilde{A}_n) + \lambda(\tilde{C}_n) = \lambda(\tilde{B}_n) = \tilde{q}_{\bar{B}}(n).$$

Thus, by Lemma 11.6,

$$\tilde{\mu}[B_0] = \tilde{\mu}(\bar{A}) \oplus \tilde{\mu}(\bar{C}) \leq \tilde{\mu}(A) + \tilde{\mu}(C).$$

Therefore,

$$\tilde{\mu}(B) \leq \tilde{\mu}(A) + \tilde{\mu}(C).$$

We want to prove now the opposite inequality.

Let $A_0 < A$ be a λ -inert finitely generated R -sub-module of C such that $SA_0 = A$, and similarly for C_0 inside C .

Let $X \subseteq B$ finitely generated R -sub-module, such that $SX = B$. Up to replacing C_0 with $S_d C_0$ for some fixed $d \in \mathbb{N}$, w.l.o.g. we may assume that $\pi(X) \subseteq C_0$.

Pick $D_0 \leq B$ finitely generated R -sub-module, such that $X \subseteq D_0$ and $\pi(D_0) + C_0 = C_1$. For every $n \in \mathbb{N}$, define

$$\begin{aligned} A_n &:= S_n A_0 \\ C_n &:= S_n C_0 \\ D_n &:= S_n D_0 \\ F_n &:= D_{n+1} \cap A \end{aligned}$$

Define as usual the filtrations $\bar{C} := (C_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}} = \text{Filt}(C_0; C)$ of C , and $\bar{A} := (A_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}} = \text{Filt}(A_0; A)$ of A . Define also the filtrations $\bar{D} := (D_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ and $\bar{F} := (F_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ (they are not exhaustive). Notice that $\mathcal{B}(\bar{D})$ is Noetherian, and therefore $\mathcal{B}(\bar{F})$ is also Noetherian, since it is an $S[X]$ -sub-module of $\mathcal{B}(\bar{D})[1]$.

By Corollary 3.8, there exists $d \in \mathbb{N}$ such that: for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $F_{n+d} = S_n F_d$. Replace all the above filtrations by their translates by d : thus, w.l.o.g., for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$F_n = S_n F_0.$$

Since \bar{A} is an exhaustive filtration of A , and F_0 is finitely generated, there exists $d_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that

$$F_0 \leq A_{d_0}.$$

Define

$$\begin{aligned} B_n &:= D_n + A_{n+d_0} \\ E_n &:= B_n \cap A. \end{aligned}$$

Define as usual the filtrations $\bar{B} := (B_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}} = \text{Filt}(B_0; B)$ of B , and $\bar{E} := (E_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ of A (notice that $\bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} B_n = B$ and $\bigcup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} E_n = A$).

Claim 10. For every $n \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$E_n = A_{n+d_0}$$

In fact,

$$E_n = B_n \cap A = (D_n + A_{n+d_0}) \cap A = (D_n \cap A) + A_{n+d_0} = F_{n-1} + A_{n+d_0} = A_{n+d_0}.$$

Claim 11. For every $n \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$D_{n+1} \cap A \leq A_{d_0+n}$$

In fact,

$$D_{n+1} \cap A = F_n = S_n F_0 \leq S_n A_{d_0} = A_{d_0+n}.$$

For every $n \in \mathbb{N}$, we have the exact sequence

$$0 \rightarrow \tilde{E}_n \rightarrow \tilde{B}_n \rightarrow \tilde{C}_n \rightarrow 0$$

Claim 12. \tilde{B}_n is Noetherian (and therefore \tilde{E}_n is also Noetherian).

In fact, \tilde{B}_n is the sum of the Noetherian modules \tilde{D}_n and \tilde{A}_{d_0+n} . By Claim 10, we have

$$\tilde{B}(\bar{E}) = \tilde{B}(\bar{A})[d_0].$$

Since $\tilde{B}(\bar{A})$ is a Noetherian S -module, also $\tilde{B}(\bar{E})$ is Noetherian.

Moreover, we have the exact sequence

$$0 \rightarrow \tilde{B}(\bar{E}) \rightarrow \tilde{B}(\bar{B}) \rightarrow \tilde{B}(\bar{C}) \rightarrow 0$$

Claim 13. $\tilde{\mathcal{B}}(\bar{B})$ is Noetherian.

In fact, $\tilde{\mathcal{B}}(\bar{E})$ and $\tilde{\mathcal{B}}(\bar{C})$ are Noetherian.

Claim 14. \bar{E} is λ -inert.

In fact, by Claim 10, \bar{E} is a translate of \bar{A} .

Claim 15. \bar{B} is λ -inert.

It suffices to show $\lambda(B_{n+1}/B_n)$ is finite for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$. In fact, since $B_n = A_{d_0+n} + D_n$,

$$\lambda(B_{n+1}/B_n) = \lambda(A_{d_0+n+1}/A_{d_0+n}) + \lambda(D_{n+1}/(D_n + A_{d_0+n})).$$

We have

$$\lambda(A_{d_0+n+1}/A_{d_0+n}) < \infty$$

and, by Claim 11

$$\lambda(D_{n+1}/(D_n + A_{d_0+n})) = \lambda(D_{n+1}/D_n + (D_{n+1} \cap A)) = \lambda(C_{n+1}/C_n) < \infty.$$

Moreover, the proof of the above Claim gives the additional information

$$\lambda(\tilde{B}_n) = \lambda(\tilde{A}_n) + \lambda(\tilde{C}_n).$$

Thus,

$$\tilde{\mu}(B) \geq \tilde{\mu}(\bar{B}) = \tilde{\mu}(\bar{A}) \oplus \tilde{\mu}(\bar{C}).$$

We can therefore conclude that

$$\tilde{\mu}(B) \geq \tilde{\mu}(A) \oplus \tilde{\mu}(C). \quad \square$$

From the above Lemma, we can conclude:

Lemma 11.9. *Assume that A is a finitely generated S -module. Then,*

$$\tilde{\mu}(A) = \sup\{\tilde{\mu}[A_0] : A_0 < A \text{ } \lambda\text{-inert } R\text{-sub-module,} \\ \tilde{A}_0 \text{ finitely generated } R\text{-module}\}.$$

Thus, we can extend $\tilde{\mu}$ to all S -modules, by defining, for any S -module A ,

$$\tilde{\mu}(A) := \sup\{\tilde{\mu}[A_0] : A_0 < A \text{ } \lambda\text{-inert } R\text{-sub-module,} \\ \tilde{A}_0 \text{ finitely generated } R\text{-module,} \\ SA_0 \text{ finitely generated } S\text{-module}\} = \\ = \sup\{\tilde{\mu}(B) : B \leq A \text{ finitely generated } S\text{-sub-module}\}.$$

Theorem 11.10. *$\tilde{\mu}$ is additive on all S -modules. That is, if*

$$0 \rightarrow A \rightarrow B \rightarrow C \rightarrow 0$$

is an exact sequence of S -modules, then $\tilde{\mu}(B) = \tilde{\mu}(A) \oplus \tilde{\mu}(C)$

Proof. Same as the proof of Theorem 6.1. □

Let A be an S -module. Let $d \in \mathbb{N}$ be the degree of $\tilde{\mu}(A)$ and $s \in R$ be its coefficient. We define the **intrinsic λ -dimension** of A to be $d + 1$ if $\tilde{\mu}(A) \neq 0$, 0 if $\lambda(A) > 0$ and $\tilde{\mu}(A) = 0$, and $-\infty$ if $\lambda(A) = 0$. For each $i \leq k$, the **intrinsic i -dimensional λ -entropy** of A is

$$\tilde{h}_\lambda^{(i)}(A) := \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } i > d + 1; \\ 0 & \text{if } i \geq 1 \text{ \& } \tilde{\mu}(A) = 0; \\ \infty & \text{if } i \leq d; \\ \frac{s}{(d+1)!} & \text{if } i = d + 1 \text{ \& } \tilde{\mu}(A) \neq 0; \\ \lambda(A) & \text{if } i = 0. \end{cases}$$

The intrinsic λ -entropy is

$$\tilde{h}_\lambda(A) := \tilde{h}_\lambda^{(k)}(A)$$

and has been studied already (at least, in the case $R = \mathbb{Z}$ and $k = 1$) in [DGSV15, GS15, SV18], and for some non-Noetherian rings in [SV19]: our definition of $\tilde{\mu}$ is clearly inspired by the intrinsic algebraic entropy (the notation $\widetilde{\text{ent}}$ is used elsewhere, but we prefer \tilde{h}_λ for consistency).

We have therefore 2 length functions on S -modules extending of h_λ on locally λ_R -finite S -modules: \hat{h}_λ and \tilde{h}_λ . They are different in general.

Example 11.11. Let $R = \mathbb{Z}$, $k = 1$, λ be the standard length, and $A = \mathbb{Q}$ seen as S -module via the action $xq := q/2$. Then, $\tilde{h}_\lambda(A) = \log 2$ (see [DGSV15]: but the computation is easy, since any finitely generated subgroup of \mathbb{Q} is either 0 or isomorphic to \mathbb{Z}), while $\hat{h}_\lambda(A) = 0$.

12. FINE GRADING

Up to now, we have only considered the case when the degrees are natural numbers. As in the classical case when R is a field, one can consider gradings in any commutative monoid (see e.g. [MS05]).

12.1. Graded modules. Let Γ be a commutative monoid.

Remember that Γ has a canonical quasi-ordering, given by $m \leq n$ if there exists $p \in \Gamma$ with $m + p = n$. The neutral element 0 is a minimum of $\langle \Gamma, \leq \rangle$.

Definition 12.1. We say that $\bar{\gamma} \in \Gamma^k$ is **good** (inside Γ) if:

for every $\lambda \in \Gamma$ there exist at most finitely many $\bar{n} \in \mathbb{N}^k$, such that $\bar{n} \cdot \bar{\gamma} = \lambda$.

We say that $\bar{\gamma} \in \Gamma^k$ is **very good** if:

for every $\lambda \in \Gamma$ there exist at most finitely many $\bar{n} \in \mathbb{N}^k$, such that $\bar{n} \cdot \bar{\gamma} \leq \lambda$.

For example, $\bar{\gamma} \in \mathbb{Z}^k$ is good (in \mathbb{Z}) if $\gamma_i > 0$ for $i = 1, \dots, k$. $\bar{\gamma} \in \mathbb{N}^k$ is very good (in \mathbb{N}) iff $\gamma_i \neq 0$ for $i = 1, \dots, k$. Notice that, in general, if $\bar{\gamma}$ is good, then each γ_i is non-zero (and even non-torsion).

Remark 12.2. Given $\bar{\gamma} = \langle \gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_k \rangle \in \Gamma^k$, if $\bar{\gamma}$ is good, then the following expression is well defined:

$$\frac{1}{\prod_{i=1}^k (1 - t^{\gamma_i})} \in \mathbb{N}[[t^\Gamma]]$$

Definition 12.3. Fix $\bar{\gamma} = \langle \gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_k \rangle \in \Gamma^k$. A Γ -graded S -module of degree $\bar{\gamma}$ is given by an S -module M and a decomposition

$$M = \bigoplus_{n \in \Gamma} M_n,$$

where each M_n is an R -module, and, for every $i \leq k$ and $n \in \Gamma$,

$$x_i M_n \leq M_{n + \gamma_i}.$$

We denote by \bar{M} the module M with the given grading (including the tuple $\bar{\gamma} := \langle \gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_k \rangle$).

Theorem 12.4. Let \bar{M} be a Γ -graded S -module of degree $\bar{\gamma} \in \Gamma^k$. For every $n \in \mathbb{N}$, let $a_n := \lambda(M_n)$. Define

$$F_{\bar{M}}(t) := \sum_{n \in \Gamma} a_n t^n.$$

Assume that:

- (1) $\bar{\gamma}$ is good;
- (2) $\lambda(M_n) < \infty$ for every $n \in \Gamma$;

(3) M is a Noetherian S -module.

Then, there exists a polynomial $p(t) \in \mathbb{R}[t^\Gamma]$ such that

$$F_{\bar{M}}(t) = \frac{p(t)}{\prod_{i=1}^k (1 - t^{\gamma_i})}.$$

Proof. *Mutatis mutandis*, same proof as Thm. 4.1. \square

12.2. Filtered modules. We move now from graded modules to upward filtered modules.

Definition 12.5. Let $\bar{\gamma} := \langle \gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_k \rangle \in \Gamma^k$ and N be an S -module.

An **increasing Γ -filtering** on N with degrees $\bar{\gamma}$ is a sequence of R -sub-modules of N

$$(N_i : i \in \Gamma)$$

such that it is increasing (i.e., if $i \leq j$, then $N_i \leq N_j$), $\bigcup_{i \in \Gamma} N_i = N$, and $x_i N_j \leq N_{j+\alpha_i}$ for every $j \in \Gamma$, $i \leq k$. We denote by \bar{N} the S -module with the given tuple $\bar{\gamma}$ and the filtering $(N_i)_{i \in \Gamma}$.

Definition 12.6. Let $\bar{\delta} = \langle \delta_1, \delta_2, \dots \rangle$ be a tuple of generators of Γ (for simplicity, we assume Γ countable: later we will be interested only in the case when $\bar{\delta}$ is a finite tuple). Let \bar{y} be a tuple of variables indexed by $\bar{\delta}$ (i.e., there is one variable y_j for each chosen generator δ_j). The **blow-up** module associated to \bar{N} and the tuple $\bar{\delta}$ is the following graded $S[\bar{y}]$ -module. As an R -module,

$$\mathcal{B}_{\bar{\delta}}(\bar{N}) := \bigoplus_{n \in \Gamma} N_n t^n.$$

The Γ -grading of $\mathcal{B}_{\bar{\delta}}(\bar{N})$ is given by the decomposition $\mathcal{B}_{\bar{\delta}}(\bar{N}) = \bigoplus_{n \in \Gamma} N_n t^n$.

The multiplication by x_i on $\mathcal{B}_{\bar{\delta}}(\bar{N})$ is defined as:

$$x_i(vt^n) := (x_i v) t^{n+\gamma_i},$$

for every $i \leq k$, $n \in \Gamma$, $v \in N_n$, and then extended by R -linearity on all $\mathcal{B}_{\bar{\delta}}(\bar{N})$: notice that the x_i has degree γ_i on $\mathcal{B}_{\bar{\delta}}(\bar{N})$. For each $\delta_j \in \bar{\delta}$, the multiplication by y_j on $\mathcal{B}_{\bar{\delta}}(\bar{N})$ is defined as:

$$y_j(vt^n) := vt^{n+\delta_j},$$

for every $n \in \Gamma$, $v \in N_n$, and then extended by R -linearity on all $\mathcal{B}_{\bar{\delta}}(\bar{N})$: notice that y_j has degree δ_j .

Theorem 12.7. Let \bar{N} be a Γ -filtering on N with degrees $\bar{\gamma}$. Let $\bar{\delta} = \langle \delta_1, \dots, \delta_\ell \rangle$ be a finite tuple of generators of Γ , with corresponding variables $\bar{y} = \langle y_1, \dots, y_\ell \rangle$.

For every $n \in \mathbb{N}$, let $a_n := \lambda(N_n)$. Define

$$F_{\bar{N}}(t) := \sum_{n \in \Gamma} a_n t^n \in \mathbb{R}[[t^\Gamma]]$$

Then,

$$F_{\bar{N}} = F_{\mathcal{B}_{\bar{\delta}}(\bar{N})}.$$

Therefore, if we assume that:

- (1) $\bar{\gamma} \cup \bar{\delta}$ is good;
- (2) for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $\lambda(N_n) < \infty$;
- (3) $\mathcal{B}_{\bar{\delta}}(\bar{N})$ is Noetherian as $S[\bar{y}]$ -module.

Then, there exists a polynomial $p(t) \in \mathbb{R}[t^\Gamma]$ such that

$$F_{\bar{N}}(t) = \frac{p(t)}{\prod_{j=1}^{\ell} (1 - t^{\delta_j}) \prod_{i=1}^k (1 - t^{\gamma_i})}$$

(the $(1 - t^{\delta_j})$ -factor in the denominator is due to the action of y_j on $\mathcal{B}_{\bar{\delta}}(\bar{N})$ of degree δ_j).

12.3. Growth function. In this subsection we fix a monoid Γ with a tuple of generators $\bar{\delta} = \langle \delta_1, \dots, \delta_\ell \rangle$.

We also fix a tuple $\bar{\gamma} = \langle \gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_k \rangle \in \Gamma^k$. Given a monomial in $S = R[x_1, \dots, x_k]$ its $\bar{\gamma}$ -degree $\deg_{\bar{\gamma}}$ is defined in the “obvious” way:

$$\deg_{\bar{\gamma}}(rx_1^{n_1} \cdots x_k^{n_k}) := n_1\gamma_1 + \cdots + n_k\gamma_k.$$

Given a polynomial $p(\bar{x}) \in S = R[x_1, \dots, x_k]$, we say that its $\bar{\gamma}$ -degree is less or equal to $n \in \Gamma$, and write $\deg_{\bar{\gamma}}(p) \leq n$, if each monomial in p has $\bar{\gamma}$ -degree less or equal to $\bar{\gamma}$ (since Γ is not linearly ordered in general, it’s not clear how to define the $\bar{\gamma}$ -degree of a polynomial). For every $n \in \Gamma$, we denote

$$S_n := \langle p \in S : \deg_{\bar{\gamma}}(p) \leq n \rangle.$$

Theorem 12.8. *Let N be an S -module. Let $V_0 \leq N$ be an R -sub-module. For every $n \in \Gamma$, let $V_n := S_n V_0$ (notice that $S_0 = R$, that $V_0 = S_0 V_0$, and that S_n and V_n are R -modules), and $a_n := \lambda(V_n)$. Define*

$$G_{V_0}(t) := \sum_{n \in \Gamma} a_n t^n \in \mathbb{R}[[t^\Gamma]]$$

Assume that:

- (1) $\bar{\gamma} \cup \bar{\delta}$ is very good (inside Γ);
- (2) $\lambda(V_0) < \infty$;
- (3) V_0 is finitely generated as R -module;
- (4) R is a Noetherian ring.

Then, each a_n is finite, and there exists a polynomial $p(t) \in \mathbb{R}[t^\Gamma]$ such that

$$G_{V_0}(t) = \frac{p(t)}{\prod_{j=1}^{\ell} (1 - t^{\delta_j}) \prod_{i=1}^k (1 - t^{\gamma_i})}$$

Proof. The fact that $\bar{\gamma}$ is very good is equivalent to the fact that S_n is finitely generated (as R -module) for every $n \in \Gamma$. The above plus the fact that $\lambda(V_0) < \infty$ easily implies that $\lambda(V_n) < \infty$ for every $n \in \Gamma$. Let $\bar{V} := S V_0$ as filtered $S[\bar{y}]$ -module. Then, $V_0 t^0$ generates $\mathcal{B}(\bar{V})$ as $S[\bar{y}]$ -module, and therefore $\mathcal{B}(\bar{V})$ is a Noetherian $S[\bar{y}]$ -module.

We can conclude as in the proof of Theorem 4.9, using Theorem 12.7. \square

Example 12.9. Let $\bar{x} := \langle x_1, \dots, x_k \rangle$, $\bar{y} := \langle y_1, \dots, y_\ell \rangle$, $S := R[\bar{x}, \bar{y}]$, $\Gamma := \mathbb{N}^{\ell+k}$, $\gamma_i := \delta_1 := \langle 1, 0 \rangle$ for $i = 1, \dots, k$, and $\gamma_i := \delta_2 := \langle 0, 1 \rangle$ for $i = k+1, \dots, k+\ell$. Thus, each x_i has degree δ_1 and each y_j has degree δ_2 . A monomial in $\bar{x}\bar{y}$ has therefore a “double degree” $\langle m, n \rangle \in \Gamma$, where m is its total degree in \bar{x} and n is its total degree in \bar{y} . A polynomial in $\mathbb{R}[t^\Gamma]$ is the same object as a polynomial in the two variables t_1, t_2 . Let N be an S -module and $V_0 < N$ be an R -sub-module which satisfies (2) and (3). Then, if R is Noetherian, we have a corresponding function

$$G_{V_0}(t_1, t_2) = \frac{p(t_1, t_2)}{(1 - t_1)^{k+1} (1 - t_2)^{\ell+1}}$$

where $p \in \mathbb{R}[t_1, t_2]$.

12.4. Multi-variate Hilbert polynomial. Let $P := \langle P_1, \dots, P_\ell \rangle$ be a partition of $\{1, \dots, k\}$ into ℓ nonempty subsets; for every $j \leq \ell$, let p_j be the cardinality of P_j . In the following, we will assume that $P_1 = \{1, 2, \dots, p_1\}$, $P_2 = \{p_1 + 1, p_1 + 2, \dots, p_1 + p_2\}$, \dots , $P_\ell = \{p_1 + \dots + p_{\ell-1} + 1, \dots, k\}$.

Let $\Gamma := \mathbb{N}^\ell$; for every $j \leq \ell$, let $\hat{e}_j \in \Gamma$ be the vector with all coordinates 0 except the j -th which is 1. Let $\bar{x} := \langle x_1, \dots, x_k \rangle$ be a k -tuple of variables; to each variable $x_i \in P_j$ assign the weight \hat{e}_j , and define

$$\bar{e} := \langle \hat{e}_1, \hat{e}_1, \dots, \hat{e}_\ell \rangle \in \mathbb{N}^k,$$

where each weight \hat{e}_j is repeated p_j times.

As usual, $S := R[x_1, \dots, x_k]$; for every $\bar{m} \in \mathbb{N}^\ell$, let

$$S_{\bar{m}}^{(\bar{e})} := \{p \in S : \deg_{\bar{e}}(p) \leq \bar{m}\}.$$

An equivalent way of describing $S_{\bar{m}}^{(\bar{e})}$ is the following. Let $\bar{t} := \langle t_1, \dots, t_\ell \rangle$. Let $\phi : S \rightarrow R[\bar{t}]$ be the homomorphism of R -algebras mapping x_i to t_j when $i \in P_j$. Then, $q \in S_{\bar{m}}^{(\bar{e})}$ iff, for every $j \leq \ell$, $\deg_{t_j}(\phi(q)) \leq m_j$.

Let M be a module over S and $V_0 \leq M$ be an R -sub-module. For every $\bar{m} \in \mathbb{N}^\ell$, define $V_{\bar{m}} := S_{\bar{m}}^{(\bar{e})}V_0 \leq M$ and $a_{\bar{m}} := \lambda(V_{\bar{m}})$.

Theorem 12.10. *In the above setting, assume:*

- (1) $\lambda(V_0) < \infty$;
- (2) V_0 is finitely generated as R -module;
- (3) R is a Noetherian ring;
- (4) $SV_0 = M$

Then, each $a_{\bar{m}}$ is finite. Moreover, there exists a polynomial $q(\bar{t}) \in \mathbb{R}[\bar{t}]$ such that:

(i) for every $\bar{m} \in \mathbb{N}^\ell$ large enough,

$$a_{\bar{m}} = q(\bar{m});$$

(ii) for every $j \leq \ell$,

$$\deg_{t_j}(q) \leq p_j.$$

Moreover, the leading homogeneous component of q (see Def. 4.6) is independent from V_0 .

Proof. Choose \bar{e} as tuple of generators of Γ and apply Theorem 12.8. We obtain that there exists a polynomial $r(\bar{t}) \in \mathbb{R}[\bar{t}]$ such that

$$\sum_{\bar{m} \in \mathbb{N}^\ell} a_{\bar{m}} \bar{t}^{\bar{m}} = \frac{p(\bar{t})}{\prod_{j=1}^{\ell} (1 - t_j)^{p_j+1}}$$

(the exponents $p_j + 1$ in the denominator come from the combination of the p_j variables in P_j , each with degree \hat{e}_j , plus the generator \hat{e}_j). By Proposition 4.5, there exists a polynomial q satisfying (i) and (ii). By Proposition 4.7, the leading homogeneous component of q is independent from V_0 . \square

APPENDIX A. NON-COMMUTATIVE RINGS

In this section R is no longer assumed to be commutative. Let G be some (associative) monoid, and $T := R[G]$. T -mod is the category of left T -modules (by ‘‘modules’’ we will mean left modules). θ is some function from T -mod to the family of monomials of the form rt^n , with $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $r \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \cup \{\infty\}$. We assume:

- (1) θ is additive on the category of λ_T -small T -modules: $\theta(0) = 0$ and, for every exact sequences of λ_T -small T -modules $0 \rightarrow A \rightarrow B \rightarrow C \rightarrow 0$, $\theta(B) = \theta(A) \oplus \theta(C)$;
- (2) θ is invariant: if A and B are isomorphic T -modules, then $\theta(A) = \theta(B)$;
- (3) $\theta(A) = \sup\{\theta(B) : B \leq A \text{ } \lambda_T\text{-small } T\text{-sub-module}\}$.

We define

$$\hat{\theta}(A) := \sup\{\theta(\mathfrak{A}) : \mathfrak{A} \text{ } \lambda_T\text{-small chain in } A\}$$

Theorem A.1. *Assume that T is (left) Noetherian. Then,*

- (a) $\hat{\theta}$ is invariant and additive on all T -mod;
- (b) if A is locally λ_R -finite, then $\hat{\theta}(A) = \theta(A)$;
- (c) $\hat{\theta}(A) = \sup\{\hat{\theta}(B) : B \leq A \text{ finitely generated } T\text{-sub-module}\}$;
- (d) $\hat{\theta} \geq \theta$.

Proof. Same as Propositions 10.4 and 10.7. The assumption that $T = S[G]$ is used in the following way:

Claim 16. Let A be a T -module, generated (as a T -module) by a_1, \dots, a_ℓ . Assume that $\lambda(Ra_i)$ is finite, for $i = 1, \dots, \ell$. Then, A is locally λ_R -finite. \square

It is unclear if, under the same assumptions as in Thm. A.1, we can conclude that, when A is a finitely generated T -module,

$$\hat{\theta}(A) = \sup\{\hat{\theta}(A/I) : I \leq R \text{ } \lambda\text{-cofinite ideal}\}.$$

Example A.2. Let G be an amenable cancellative monoid and $T := R[G]$. Let λ be a length on $R\text{-mod}$. Let $h_\lambda(A)$ be the algebraic entropy of the action of G on A for the length λ (see e.g. [DFGB20]). Assume that T is Noetherian. Then, $\theta := h_\lambda$ satisfies the assumptions of this section. Thus, the function \hat{h}_λ satisfies the conclusion of Theorem A.1, and in particular is a length function on all $T\text{-mod}$.

APPENDIX B. FINITE GENERATION AND NOETHERIANITY ACCORDING TO λ

Let S be an R -algebra, and N be an S -module.

Given $A \subseteq N$, we denote by SA the S -sub-module of N generated by A . We define

$$\lambda_S(b \mid A) := \lambda((SA + Sb)/SA) = \lambda(Sb/(SA \cap Sb)).$$

We also define

$$cl_N^{S,\lambda}(A) := \{b \in N : \lambda_S(b \mid A) = 0\}.$$

Lemma B.1. *Let $N' < N$ be an S -sub-module. We have $\lambda(N/N') > 0$ iff there exists $a \in N \setminus cl_N^{S,\lambda}(N')$.*

Proof. \Leftarrow) Assume that $a \in N \setminus cl_N^{S,\lambda}(N')$, that is, $\lambda((Sa + N')/N') > 0$. We have

$$\lambda(N/N') \geq \lambda((Sa + N')/N') > 0.$$

Conversely, assume that $\lambda(N/N') > 0$. Since λ is continuous, there exists $a_1, \dots, a_n \in N$ such that

$$\lambda((Sa_1 + \dots + Sa_n)/N') > 0$$

We have

$$\lambda((Sa_1 + \dots + Sa_n)/N') \leq \sum_{i=1}^n \lambda(a_i \mid N').$$

Thus, for some $i \leq n$, $\lambda(a_i \mid N') > 0$. \square

Lemma B.2. *$cl_N^{S,\lambda}(A)$ is an S -sub-module of N .*

$cl_N^{S,\lambda}$ is a closure operator (on subsets of N).

$cl_N^{S,\lambda}(A)$ is the largest S -sub-module N' of N such that $\lambda(N'/SA) = 0$.

Proof. Let $a, b \in cl_N^{S,\lambda}(A)$. Thus,

$$\lambda((Sa + Sb + N)/N) \leq \lambda((Sa + N)/N) + \lambda((Sb + N)/N) = 0.$$

Therefore, every $c \in Sa + Sb$ satisfies $\lambda(c \mid N) = 0$, showing that $Sa + Sb \subseteq cl_N^{S,\lambda}(A)$, that is $cl_N^{S,\lambda}(A)$ is an S -sub-module of N .

Claim 17. $cl_N^{S,\lambda}$ is increasing.

In fact, let $A \subseteq B \subseteq N$ and $a \in cl_N^{S,\lambda}(A)$. We have

$$\lambda(a \mid B) = \lambda(Sa/(Sa \cap B)) \leq \lambda(Sa/(Sa \cap A)) = 0.$$

Claim 18. $A \subseteq \text{cl}_N^{S,\lambda}(A)$.

Clear, since $\lambda(A/A) = 0$.

Claim 19. $\lambda(\text{cl}_N^{S,\lambda}(A)/SA) = 0$.

By Lemma B.1.

Claim 20. $\text{cl}_N^{S,\lambda}(\text{cl}_N^{S,\lambda}(A)) = \text{cl}_N^{S,\lambda}(A)$.

We have only to show that $\text{cl}_N^{S,\lambda}(\text{cl}_N^{S,\lambda}(A)) = \text{cl}_N^{S,\lambda}(A)$. Thus, let $C := \text{cl}_N^{S,\lambda}(A)$ and $b \in \text{cl}_N^{S,\lambda}(C)$. We want to prove that $\lambda(b | A) = 0$.

We have the surjective natural map

$$\phi : Sb/(Sb \cap SA) \rightarrow Sb/(Sb \cap C)$$

(remember that $SC = C$). Its kernel is

$$\text{Ker } \phi = (Sb \cap C)/(Sb \cap SA) \leq C/SA.$$

Thus, $\lambda(\text{Ker } \phi) \leq \lambda(C/SA) = 0$. By additivity,

$$\lambda(b | A) = \lambda(Sb/(Sb \cap SA)) = \lambda(b | C) + \lambda(\text{Ker } \phi) = 0 + 0 = 0.$$

Thus, $\text{cl}_N^{S,\lambda}$ is a closure operator, and $\lambda(\text{cl}_N^{S,\lambda}(A)/SA) = 0$. Now let $N' \leq N$ be another S -sub-module such that $\lambda(N'/N) = 0$. Thus, for every $a \in N'$, $\lambda(a | SA) \leq \lambda(N'/SA) = 0$, showing that $N' \subseteq \text{cl}_N^{S,\lambda}(A)$. \square

Definition B.3. • $N' \subseteq N$ is λ_S -closed (in N) if $N' = \text{cl}_N^{S,\lambda}(N')$.

- $A \subseteq N$ λ_S -generates N if $\text{cl}_N^{S,\lambda}(A) = N$.
- N is λ_S -finitely generated (or λ_S -f.g. for short) if there exists a finite subset A of N which λ_S -generates N .
- N is λ_S -Noetherian if every S -sub-module of N is λ_S -f.g..

Lemma B.4. *T.f.a.e.:*

- (1) N is λ_S -Noetherian;
- (2) there doesn't exist an infinite sequence

$$N_0 < N_1 < N_2 < \dots < N$$

of S -sub-modules of N such that, for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $\lambda(N_{n+1}/N_n) > 0$;

- (3) there doesn't exist an infinite sequence a_0, a_1, \dots of elements of N such that, for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$\lambda(a_{n+1} | a_0, \dots, a_n) > 0.$$

It's not clear if in the above Lemma it suffices to assume:

- (4) every λ_S -closed sub-module of N is λ_S -f.g..

B.1. λ -Noetherian algebras. The definitions and results in this subsection will not be used later: it's mostly conjectures which may be used to generalize results on Hilbert polynomials to some non-Noetherian rings.

Definition B.5. We say that S is λ -Noetherian (as an R -algebra) if it is λ_S -Noetherian (as an S -module).

Remark B.6. If N is finitely generated as S -module, then it is λ_S -f.g..

If N is Noetherian (as S -module), then it is λ_S -Noetherian.

If S is a Noetherian ring, then it is λ -Noetherian.

Remark B.7. It's not true in general that if $\lambda(N) < \infty$, then N is λ_S -Noetherian.

We say that λ has positive gap if

$$\inf\{\lambda(M) : M \text{ is an } R\text{-module and } \lambda(M) > 0\} > 0.$$

If λ has positive gap and $\lambda(N) < \infty$, then N is λ_S -Noetherian.

Conjecture B.8. *If S is λ -Noetherian and M is λ_S -f.g., then M is λ_S -Noetherian.*

Conjecture B.9. *If S is λ -Noetherian, then $S[x]$ is also λ -Noetherian.*

APPENDIX C. LESS ASSUMPTIONS

In this section we reprove some of the results in §4 weakening some of the assumptions.

Theorem C.1. *In Theorem 4.1, we can replace Assumption (3) with (3)' M is an λ_S -Noetherian S -module.*

Proof. The proof proceeds in parallel, by induction on k .

If $k = 0$, then, since M is λ_S -Noetherian, only finitely many of the M_i have $\lambda(M_i) > 0$. Thus, $F_{\bar{M}}(t)$ is a polynomial.

Assume now that we have proven the conclusion for $k - 1$. Let $y, \alpha, y_n, \bar{K}, \bar{C}$ be as in the proof of Thm. 4.1.

Claim 21. Let $S' := R[x_1, \dots, x_{k-1}]$. Both K and C are $\lambda_{S'}$ -Noetherian.

We can then apply the inductive hypothesis to \bar{K} and \bar{C} and conclude the proof as in Thm. 4.1.

In fact, K is an S -sub-module of M and C is a quotient of M , and therefore they are both λ_S -Noetherian. However, the action of x_k on K and C is trivial (i.e., $x_k a = 0$ for every a). Thus, if e.g. $N' < K$ is an S' -sub-module, then N' is an S -sub-module, and hence (since K is λ_S -Noetherian) N' is λ_S -finitely generated, and (since again the action of x_k is trivial on K), N' is $\lambda_{S'}$ -finitely generated, showing that K is $\lambda_{S'}$ -Noetherian. Identical argument works for C . \square

Corollary C.2. *In Theorem 4.2 we can weaken Assumption (3) to (3)' $\mathcal{B}(N)$ is $\lambda_{S[y]}$ -Noetherian.*

Moreover, in Theorem 4.9, we can weaken the Assumptions (2) and (3) to (2)" $\mathcal{B}(\bar{V})$ is $\lambda_{S[y]}$ -Noetherian.

REFERENCES

- [AM69] M.F. Atiya and I.G. Macdonald, *Introduction to Commutative Algebra*, Addison Wesley, 1969. $\uparrow 4, 8$
- [BDGSa] Andrzej Biś, Dikran Dikranjan, Anna Giordano Bruno, and Luchezar Stoyanov, *Algebraic entropies of commuting endomorphisms of torsion abelian groups*. Preprint. $\uparrow 2, 4, 18$
- [BDGSb] ———, *Metric vs topological receptive entropy of semigroup actions*. To appear in Qualitative Theory of Dynamical Systems. $\uparrow 18, 21$
- [CSCK14] Tullio Ceccherini-Silberstein, Michel Coornaert, and Fabrice Krieger, *An analogue of Fekete's lemma for subadditive functions on cancellative amenable semigroups*, J. Anal. Math. **124** (2014), 59–81. MR3286049 $\uparrow 4$
- [DFGB20] Dikran Dikranjan, Antongiulio Fornasiero, and Anna Giordano Bruno, *Algebraic entropy for amenable semigroup actions*, Journal of Algebra **556** (2020), 467–546. $\uparrow 2, 3, 4, 32$
- [DGSV15] Dikran Dikranjan, Anna Giordano Bruno, Luigi Salce, and Simone Virili, *Intrinsic algebraic entropy*, J. Pure Appl. Algebr. **219** (2015), no. 7, 2933–2961. $\uparrow 2, 5, 28$
- [DGSZ09] Dikran Dikranjan, Brendan Goldsmith, Luigi Salce, and Paolo Zanardo, *Algebraic entropy for abelian groups*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **361** (2009), no. 7, 3401–3434. MR2491886 $\uparrow 4$
- [DGZ13] D. Dikranjan, K. Gong, and P. Zanardo, *Endomorphisms of abelian groups with small algebraic entropy*, Linear Algebra Appl. **439** (2013), no. 7, 1894–1904. MR3090444 $\uparrow 4$
- [Eis95] David Eisenbud, *Commutative algebra: with a view toward algebraic geometry*, Graduate Texts in Mathematics, vol. 150, Springer-Verlag New York, 1995. $\uparrow 2, 3, 7, 13, 17, 18$
- [GBV15] Anna Giordano Bruno and Simone Virili, *Algebraic Yuzvinski formula*, J. Algebra **423** (2015), 114–147. MR3283712 $\uparrow 4$

- [GS15] Brendan Goldsmith and Luigi Salce, *When the intrinsic algebraic entropy is not really intrinsic*, *Topol. Algebra Appl.* **3** (2015), no. 1, 45–56. MR3420404 ↑28
- [GS17a] ———, *Algebraic entropies for Abelian groups with applications to the structure of their endomorphism rings: a survey*, *Groups, modules, and model theory—surveys and recent developments*, 2017, pp. 135–174. MR3675906 ↑4
- [GS17b] ———, *Corner’s realization theorems from the viewpoint of algebraic entropy*, *Rings, polynomials, and modules*, 2017, pp. 237–255. MR3751699 ↑4
- [KLMP99] M. V. Kondratieva, A. B. Levin, A. V. Mikhalev, and E. V. Pankratiev, *Differential and difference dimension polynomials*, *Mathematics and its Applications*, vol. 461, Kluwer Academic Publishers, Dordrecht, 1999. MR1676955 ↑2, 8, 12
- [MS05] Ezra Miller and Bernd Sturmfels, *Combinatorial commutative algebra*, *Graduate Texts in Mathematics*, vol. 227, Springer-Verlag, New York, 2005. MR2110098 ↑2, 28
- [Nor68] D. G. Northcott, *Lessons on rings, modules and multiplicities*, Cambridge University Press, 1968. ↑3, 4, 18, 22
- [NR65] D. G. Northcott and M. Reufel, *A generalization of the concept of length*, *The Quarterly Journal of Mathematics* **16** (1965), no. 4, 297–321, available at <https://academic.oup.com/qjmath/article-pdf/16/4/297/4369078/16-4-297.pdf>. ↑2, 4
- [SV15] Luigi Salce and Simone Virili, *The addition theorem for algebraic entropies induced by non-discrete length functions*, *Forum Mathematicum* **28** (2015), 1143–1157. ↑2, 3, 4
- [SV18] ———, *Two new proofs concerning the intrinsic algebraic entropy*, *Comm. Algebra* **46** (2018), no. 9, 3939–3949. MR3820607 ↑5, 28
- [SV19] ———, *Intrinsic valuation entropy*, *Model theory of modules, algebras and categories*, 2019, pp. 197–222. MR3959616 ↑3, 28
- [SVV13] Luigi Salce, Peter Vámos, and Simone Virili, *Length functions, multiplicities and algebraic entropy*, *Forum Mathematicum* **25** (2013), no. 2, 255–282. ↑2, 3, 4
- [SZ09] Luigi Salce and Paolo Zanardo, *A general notion of algebraic entropy and the rank-entropy*, *Forum Math.* **21** (2009), no. 4, 579–599. MR2541474 ↑4
- [Vám68a] Peter Vámos, *Additive functions and duality over noetherian rings*, *Q. J. Math.* **19** (1968), no. 1, 43–55. ↑2, 4, 19, 20
- [Vám68b] ———, *Length functions on modules*, Ph.D. Thesis, 1968. ↑4
- [Vir19] Simone Virili, *Algebraic entropy of amenable group actions*, *Math. Z.* **291** (2019), no. 3-4, 1389–1417. MR3936112 ↑2, 3, 4

UNIVERSITÀ DI FIRENZE

Email address: antongiulio.fornasiero@gmail.com

URL: <https://sites.google.com/site/antongiuliofornasiero/>