

# HILBERT POLYNOMIAL OF LENGTH FUNCTIONS

## VERSION 7

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. $\lambda$ -Hilbert series and polynomials for Noetherian modules	4
4. Dimension and degree: the general case	9
5. Addition theorem for exact sequences	10
6. Modules over $R$ -algebrae	13
7. Hilbert-Samuel polynomial for homogeneous modules	14
8. $d$ -dimensional and receptive versions of entropy	15
9. Totally additive versions of $\mu$ and (receptive) entropy	16
10. Fine grading	19
Appendix A. Non-commutative rings	23
Appendix B. Finite generation and Noetherianity according to $\lambda$	24
Appendix C. Less assumptions	25
References	26

### 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 [Vám68, 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  $\lambda$  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 3.9): thus, this leading monomial is an invariant of  $M$ , and describes the growth rate of  $\lambda$  on  $M$ .

First we show the existence of a Hilbert series for the case when  $M$  is an  $\mathbb{N}$ -graded module (Theorem 3.2), then we move to the case when  $M$  is a upward filtered module (Theorem 3.4). Often Hilbert series are defined for downward filtered modules, but, in light of the applications in §3.4 and §5, 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 §4 we generalize this construction to the case when  $M$  is not finitely generated, and show that, under some suitable assumptions, the function  $\mu$  is additive (Theorem 5.1).

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  $\mu$  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 been proved under weaker assumptions: one of the most general results considers the case when the acting monoid  $\Gamma$  is cancellative and amenable, and  $M$  is locally  $\lambda_R$ -finite (as in Definition 2.1): see [DFGB20].

In §7 we show how the usual construction of Hilbert-Samuel polynomial can be generalized to length functions.

We also consider in §6 the case when  $S$  is a finitely generated  $R$ -algebra and we define a corresponding Hilbert polynomial: its degree will be an invariant of  $M$ .

In §8 we introduce the  $d$ -dimensional entropy as a generalization of the receptive entropy (see [BDGSa]) and relate it to the Hilbert polynomial.

In §9 we employ a technique in [Vám68] and use  $\mu$  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.

Besides, we consider in §10 a finer version of the Hilbert series where the grading is no longer in  $\mathbb{N}$  but in some suitable monoid  $\Gamma$ .

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- $\lambda$ ” for rings, so we could not go far in this direction of inquiry. Another open line of inquiry is

considering the case when either the ring  $R$  or the algebra  $S$  are not commutative (cf. [Nor68] for the case when  $R$  is not commutative, and [DFGB20] for the case when  $S$  is not commutative): some partial results are in Appendix A.

## 2. LENGTH FUNCTIONS AND THEIR ENTROPY

Let  $R$  be a ring and  $\lambda$  be a length function on  $R\text{-mod}$ .

**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  $\lambda_R$ -finite**<sup>(1)</sup> 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  $\lambda$  on  $R\text{-mod}$  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  $\lambda_R$ -finite iff it is torsion.

(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  **$\lambda_S$ -small** if  $M$  is finitely generated (as  $S$ -module) and locally  $\lambda_R$ -finite.<sup>(2)</sup>

**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  $\lambda_S$ -small
- (2) there exists  $V < M$   $R$ -sub-module such that:
  - i)  $SV = M$
  - ii)  $V$  is finitely generated (as  $R$ -module)
  - iii)  $\lambda(V) < \infty$
- (3) every sub-module and every quotient of  $M$  is  $\lambda_S$ -small.

[Vám68, Theorem 5] characterizes of length functions on Noetherian rings: for every prime ideal  $P < R$  there is a canonical length function on  $R\text{-mod } l_P$ , and any length function  $\lambda$  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 subsection 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  $\lambda$  on  $R\text{-mod}$ . Let  $M$  be an  $R$ -module and  $\phi$  be an endomorphism of  $M$ . Given an  $R$ -sub-module  $V \leq M$ , we define

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

<sup>(1)</sup> Also called “locally  $\lambda$ -finite” in [SVV13]: here we prefer to write explicitly the ring  $R$  too

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

(the limit always exists). The entropy of  $\phi$  (according to the length  $\lambda$ ) is defined by

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

Equivalently, we can see  $M$  as an  $R[x]$ -module, (with  $X$  acting on  $M$  as  $\phi$ ) and consider  $h_\lambda$  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

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

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

The limit in the definition of  $H(M; V)$  exists, and  $h_\lambda$  is the algebraic entropy (relative to the length function  $\lambda$ ): see [CSC14, DFGB20].<sup>(3)</sup>

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  $\lambda_R$ -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] 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 introduced in [NR65]. For an introduction to lengths and algebraic entropy, see [SVV13].

### 3. $\lambda$ -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  $\lambda$ , loosely following the ideas in [KLMP99].

#### 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  $\bar{\gamma} := \langle \gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_k \rangle$ ).

**Theorem 3.2.** *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.

<sup>(3)</sup> 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 [CSC14].

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  $\lambda$ ).

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  $\lambda$  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,

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

□

**3.2. Filtered modules.** We move now from graded modules to upward filtered modules.

**Definition 3.3.** Let  $S = R[x_1, \dots, x_k]$ , and 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.<sup>(4)</sup>

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

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

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

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

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  $\gamma_i$  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.

**Theorem 3.4.** *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).*

**3.3. 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 3.5.** *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  $\ell$ . If  $\ell = 0$ , then  $f = 1$ , and  $q = 0$ . If  $\ell = 1$ , the result is easy: by further induction on  $\gamma_1$ , 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  $\ell$ . 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 3.6.** Let  $p(\bar{t}), q(\bar{t}) \in \mathbb{R}[\bar{t}]$ ; we write  $p = p_0 + p_1 + \dots + p_d$ , where each  $p_i \in \mathbb{R}[\bar{t}]$  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 3.7.** Let  $p, q \in \mathbb{R}[\bar{t}]$  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  $p \preceq q$ , we have  $r = -\infty$ , absurd.  $\square$

### 3.4. Growth function.

**Theorem 3.8.** Let  $N$  be an  $S$ -module. Let  $V_0 \leq N$  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), and  $a_n := \lambda(V_n)$ . Define

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

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  $V_0^\ell$ , 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

$$V := \bigcup_n V_n.$$

Notice that  $V$  is an  $S$ -module, and that  $\bar{V} := (V_n : n \in \mathbb{N})$  is an increasing filtering of  $V$  (as  $S$ -module), where each  $x_i$  has degree 1. Moreover,  $F_{\bar{V}} = G_{V_0}$ . 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  $\mathcal{B}(\bar{V})$  is finitely generated (as an  $S[y]$ -module). It is easy to see that  $\mathcal{B}[\bar{V}]$  is generated by  $V_0 t^0$ , and the latter is finitely generated (as  $R$ -module) by (2).  $\square$

**Theorem 3.9** (Hilbert polynomial). *Let  $N$ ,  $V_0$ , and  $V_n$  be as in Theorem 3.8 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  $\lambda$  (see §2.2).

*Proof.* By Theorem 3.8 and Proposition 3.5  $\square$

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 3.10.** Assume that  $R$  is Noetherian, and  $M$  is an  $S$ -module, such that  $M$  is  $\lambda_S$ -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 3.9:  $\mu_\lambda(M)$  does not depend on the choice of  $V_0$ . When  $\lambda$  is clear from the context, we will write  $\mu$  instead of  $\mu_\lambda$ .

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

$$d! m$$

When  $\lambda$  is clear, we will simply say “dimension” and “degree”, respectively.<sup>(5)</sup>

<sup>(5)</sup> 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 §7.



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

**Example 3.11.** 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  $\lambda$ -dimension of  $M$  is  $d$ , and its  $\lambda$ -degree is  $\lambda(R)$ .

**Proposition 3.12.** 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. 3.6), is not a zero-divisor (inside  $S$ ). Let  $M := S/(p)$ . Then, the  $\lambda$ -dimension of  $M$  is  $k-1$  and its  $\lambda$ -degree is  $\ell e$ .

*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 of  $S$  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 3.13.** Assume that  $R$  is Noetherian and  $\lambda(R) = 1$ . Let  $p \in S$  be as in Proposition 3.12. Then, the  $\lambda$ -degree of  $S/(p)$  is equal to  $\deg(p)$ , and in particular it is independent from  $\lambda$ .

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

*Exercise 3.14.* Let  $R$  be an integral domain. Then, there exists a unique length  $\lambda_1$  on  $R$ -modules satisfying  $\lambda_1(R) = 1$ . Denoting by  $K$  the field of fractions of  $R$ ,  $\lambda_1$  is defined by:

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

#### 4. 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  $\lambda_S$ -small (see Definition 2.3), let  $\mu(M')$  be as in Definition 3.10: 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

$$d := \max\{d_i : i \in I\} \in \{0, \dots, k\}$$

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

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  $\lambda_S$ -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  $\lambda$ -dimension and  $\lambda$ -degree of  $M$ : the latter can be infinite.

### 5. 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 5.1.** *Let  $0 \rightarrow A \xrightarrow{t} B \xrightarrow{\pi} C \rightarrow 0$  be an exact sequence of  $S$ -modules. Assume that*

- (1)  $R$  is Noetherian;
- (2)  $B$  is locally  $\lambda_R$ -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  $\lambda_R$ -finite and finitely generated.

The main ingredient is the following proposition.

**Proposition 5.2** (Additivity). *Let  $0 \rightarrow A \xrightarrow{t} B \xrightarrow{\pi} C \rightarrow 0$  be an exact sequence of  $S$ -modules. Assume that*

- (1)  $R$  is Noetherian;
- (2)  $B$  is  $\lambda_S$ -small.

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

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

Before proving the proposition, we need to extend the machinery of §3.

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:

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

**Lemma 5.3.** *Let  $m \in \mathbb{N}$ .  $M^m$  generates  $M$  (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

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

□

**Definition 5.4.** Let  $M$  be an  $S$ -module. A **good filtering** of  $M$  is given by a filtering  $\bar{M} := (M_n : n \in \mathbb{N})$  if:

- (1) Each  $x_i$  has degree 1;
- (2) For every  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $\lambda(M_n) < \infty$ ;
- (3)  $\mathcal{B}(\bar{M})$  is finitely generated (as an  $S[y]$ -module).

**Theorem 5.5.** 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  $\lambda$ ).

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 3.4,

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

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  $a'_n := \lambda(M'_n)$ . Since  $\mathcal{B}(\bar{M})$  is Noetherian, there exists  $m_0 \in \mathbb{N}$  such that  $M^{m_0}$  generates  $\mathcal{B}(M)$ ; similarly, after enlarging  $m_0$  if necessary, we may assume that  $M'^{m_0} := \bigoplus_{n \leq m_0} M'_n y^n$  generates  $\mathcal{B}(M')$ . Thus,  $M_{m_0}$  tightly generates  $\bar{M}$ . Let  $v_1, \dots, v_\ell \in M'^{m_0}$  which generate  $M'^{m_0}$  (as  $R$ -module). Since  $M = \bigcup_n M_n$ , there exists  $d \geq 0$  such that  $v_1, \dots, v_\ell \in M_{m_0+d}$ . Thus,

$$B'_{m_0} \leq B_{m_0+d}.$$

*Claim 1.* For every  $n \geq m_0$ ,

$$B'_n \leq B_{n+d}.$$

Denote  $S_m$  to be the set of polynomials in  $S'$  of degree at most  $m$ . Since  $B'_{m_0}$  tightly generates  $\bar{M}'$ , for every  $i \in \mathbb{N}$  we have

$$B'_{m_0+i} \leq S_i B'_{m_0} \leq S_i B_{m_0+d} \leq B'_{m_0+d+i}$$

proving the claim.

Thus,  $a'_n \leq a_{n+d}$ : therefore, for every  $n$  large enough,

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

Similarly,

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

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

We can now prove the proposition and the theorem at the start of the section.

*Proof of Prop. 5.2.* 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 filtrings of  $A$ ,  $B$ , and  $C$ , respectively. Thus, for  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  large enough,  $\lambda(A_n) = q_{\bar{A}}(n)$ , 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. 5.1.* Since  $B$  is locally  $\lambda_R$ -finite, every sub-module of  $A$ ,  $B$ , or  $C$  is locally  $\lambda_R$ -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 5.2,

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

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  $\pi$  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  $\lambda_R$ -finite. Thus, by Proposition 5.2,

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

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

6. 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  $\phi$ ).

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

Repeating:

**Definition 6.1.** 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  $\lambda$ -dimension of  $M$  as a  $T$ -module, and this dimension does not depend on the choice of  $M_0$  or of  $\phi$ .

**Examples 6.2.** Fix some length function  $\lambda$  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  $\phi$ . It is clear that it suffices to prove the following:

**Lemma 6.3.** 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  $\bar{\delta}$  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  $\phi$  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 3.9; 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  $\phi$  and  $\phi'$ , we see that  $q$  and  $q'$  have the same degree.  $\square$

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

**Lemma 6.4.** *Let  $R$  be a field and  $\lambda$  equal to the linear dimension (as  $R$ -vector spaces). Let  $T$  be a finitely generated  $R$ -algebra. Then, the  $\lambda$ -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  $\lambda$ -dimension as  $A$ . Finally,  $A$  has  $\lambda$ -dimension  $d$ .  $\square$

## 7. 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 7.1.** *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 7.2.** Let  $K$  be a field,  $\lambda$  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 7.3.* 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.

## 8. $d$ -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 8.1.** *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  $\lambda_R$ -finite.

*Then, for every  $d \leq k$*

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

*Proof.* By Theorem 5.1. □

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 §6. 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 8.2.** *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  $\lambda_R$ -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 Noetherianity of  $R$  and locally  $\lambda_R$ -finiteness).

### 9. TOTALLY ADDITIVE VERSIONS OF $\mu$ AND (RECEPTIVE) ENTROPY

The definition of  $\mu(M)$  reflects the usual definition of algebraic entropy (see §2.2). Following a construction in [Vám68, Proposition 3], we propose an alternative definition, which is in some ways better behaved

**Definition 9.1.** Let  $A$  be an  $S$ -module. A  $\lambda_S$ -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  $\lambda_S$ -small. We call  $n$  is the **size** of  $\mathfrak{A}$ .

**Definition 9.2.** Let  $\theta$  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  $\lambda$  and  $\mu$ ). We will be interested only in functions  $\theta$  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  $\theta$ ,  $\theta(B) = \theta(A) \oplus \theta(C)$ ;

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

Assume that the domain of  $\theta$  includes all the  $\lambda_S$ -small  $S$ -modules. Let  $A$  be any  $S$ -module. Given a  $\lambda_S$ -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 9.7); see also [Vám68, Proposition 3] for an equivalent approach.

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

**Example 9.3.** Let  $\lambda$  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 9.4.** *Assume:*

- (1)  *$R$  is Noetherian;*
- (2) *the domain of  $\theta$  includes all  $\lambda_S$ -small  $S$ -modules;*
- (3)  *$\theta$  is additive and invariant (on  $\lambda_S$ -small  $S$ -modules).*

*Then,*



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

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

- (d) if  $A$  is a locally  $\lambda_R$ -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 [Vám68]). 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  $\lambda_S$ -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  $\lambda_S$ -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  $\lambda_S$ -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  $\lambda_S$ -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 9.5.** Given an ideal  $I < R$ , we say that  $I$  is  $\lambda$ -cofinite if  $\lambda(R/I) < \infty$ .

**Remark 9.6.** Let  $I < R$  be a  $\lambda$ -cofinite ideal, and  $A$  be an  $R$ -module. Then,  $A/I$  is locally  $\lambda_R$ -finite.

**Proposition 9.7.** Let  $\theta$  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,

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

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

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

- Corollary 9.8.** (1)  $\hat{\mu}$  satisfies the conclusions of Propositions 9.4 and 9.7;  
(2)  $\hat{\mu}(A) = \mu(A)$  for every locally  $\lambda_R$ -finite  $S$ -module  $A$ ;  
(3) if  $\lambda(R) < \infty$ , then  $\hat{\mu} = \mu$ .

**Corollary 9.9.** For every  $d \leq k$ ,

- (1) the  $d$ -dimensional entropy (see §8)  $\hat{h}_\lambda^{(d)}$  is a length functions (on all  $S$ -modules) and satisfies the conclusion of Proposition 9.7;  
(2)  $\hat{h}_\lambda^{(d)}(A) = h_\lambda^{(d)}(A)$  for every locally  $\lambda_R$ -finite  $S$ -module  $A$ ;  
(3) if  $\lambda(R) < \infty$ , then  $\hat{h}_\lambda^{(d)} = h_\lambda^{(d)}$ .

**Corollary 9.10.** 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 §8. Then:

- (1)  $\hat{h}_\lambda^{(d, \bar{\gamma})}$  is a length functions (on all  $T$ -modules) and satisfies the conclusion of Proposition 9.7;  
(2)  $\hat{h}_\lambda^{(d, \bar{\gamma})}(A) = h_\lambda^{(d, \bar{\gamma})}(A)$  for every locally  $\lambda_R$ -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 6.4 answers the conjecture in [BDGSb, Remark 5.9].

**Corollary 9.11.** Let  $\lambda$  be the length on  $\mathbb{Z}$ -modules introduced in Example 2.2(b). Then, for every  $\mathbb{Z}$ -module  $A$

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

We now give another example of equality between Krull and  $\lambda$  dimensions (besides Lemma 6.4).

**Lemma 9.12.** Fix  $2 \leq n \in \mathbb{N}$ . Let  $R := \mathbb{Z}/(n)$ . Let  $\lambda$  be the length on  $R$ -mod given by

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

Let  $A := S/J$  for some ideal  $J < S$ . Then,  $\lambda\text{-dim}(A)$  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  $\lambda$  is equal to the linear dimension: thus, the conclusion follows from Lemma 6.4.

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  $\lambda$ -dimensions are equal to their Krull dimensions. By additivity of Krull and  $\lambda$  dimensions, the conclusion follows.  $\square$

### 9.1. Proof of Proposition 9.7.

**Lemma 9.13.** Let  $I, J < R$  be  $\lambda$ -cofinite ideals. Then,  $I \cap J$  is also  $\lambda$ -cofinite.

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

**Lemma 9.14.** Let  $A$  be an  $S$ -module. Assume that  $A$  is  $\lambda_S$ -small. Then,

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

is  $\lambda$ -cofinite

*Proof.* Let  $a_1, \dots, a_\ell$  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  $R/Ann_R(a_i)$ , and therefore  $Ann_R(a_i)$  is  $\lambda$ -cofinite. Finally,

$$Ann_R(A) = Ann_R(a_1) \cap \dots \cap Ann_R(a_\ell)$$

and the conclusion follows from the previous lemma.  $\square$

*Proof of Proposition 9.7.* Let  $B \leq A$  be a  $\lambda_S$ -small  $S$ -sub-module. By definition,  $\hat{\theta}(A) \geq \theta(B)$ : therefore, by the assumption,  $\hat{\theta}(A) \geq \theta(A)$

Let  $\mathfrak{A} = (A_1 < A_2 < \dots < A_{2n})$  be a  $\lambda_S$ -small chain in  $A$ . For each  $i = 1, \dots, n$ , let  $J_i := Ann_R(A_{2i}/A_{2i-1})$ . By the above lemma, each  $J_i$  is a  $\lambda$ -cofinite ideal, and therefore  $J := J_1 \cap \dots \cap J_n$  is  $\lambda$ -cofinite. We have

$$\theta(\mathfrak{A}) \leq \theta(A/J)$$

proving that

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

*Claim 7.* If  $B$  is a locally  $\lambda_R$ -finite  $S$ -module, then  $\theta(B) = \hat{\theta}(B)$ .

In fact,

$$\theta(B) = \sup\{\theta(C) : C \leq B \text{ } \lambda_S\text{-small } S\text{-sub-module}\} \leq \hat{\theta}(B).$$

Moreover,

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

and, for every  $I \leq R$   $\lambda$ -cofinite ideal,  $\hat{\theta}(A/I) \geq \theta(A/I)$ .  $\square$

**9.2. Examples.** Let  $R := \mathbb{Z}$ ,  $\alpha$  be the length introduced in Example 2.2(b) and  $\beta$  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,

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

## 10. 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]).

**10.1. Graded modules.** Let  $\Gamma$  be a commutative monoid.

Remember that  $\Gamma$  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 the  $\langle \Gamma, \leq \rangle$ .

**Definition 10.1.** We say that  $\bar{\gamma} \in \Gamma^k$  is **good** (inside  $\Gamma$ ) 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  $\gamma_i$  is non-zero (and even non-torsion).

**Remark 10.2.** 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 10.3.** Fix  $\bar{\gamma} = \langle \gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_k \rangle \in \Gamma^k$ . A  $\Gamma$ -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 10.4.** Let  $\bar{M}$  be a  $\Gamma$ -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. 3.2. □

**10.2. Filtered modules.** We move now from graded modules to upward filtered modules.

**Definition 10.5.** Let  $\bar{\gamma} := \langle \gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_k \rangle \in \Gamma^k$  and  $N$  be an  $S$ -module.

An **increasing  $\Gamma$ -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 10.6.** Let  $\bar{\delta} = \langle \delta_1, \delta_2, \dots \rangle$  be a tuple of generators of  $\Gamma$  (for simplicity, we assume  $\Gamma$  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  $\delta_j$ ). 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  $\Gamma$ -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  $\gamma_i$  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  $\delta_j$ .

**Theorem 10.7.** Let  $\bar{N}$  be a  $\Gamma$ -filtering on  $N$  with degrees  $\bar{\gamma}$ . Let  $\bar{\delta} = \langle \delta_1, \dots, \delta_\ell \rangle$  be a finite tuple of generators of  $\Gamma$ , 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)  $\mathcal{B}(\bar{N})$  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  $\delta_j$ ).

**10.3. Growth function.** In this subsection we fix a monoid  $\Gamma$  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  $\Gamma$  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 10.8.** *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  $\Gamma$ );
- (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  $\gamma$  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 3.8, using Theorem 10.7.  $\square$

**Example 10.9.** Let  $\bar{x} := \langle x_1, \dots, x_k \rangle$ ,  $\bar{y} := \langle y_1, \dots, y_\ell \rangle$ ,  $S := R[\bar{x}, \bar{y}]$ ,  $\Gamma := \mathbb{N}^2$ ,  $\gamma_i := \delta_1 := \langle 1, 0 \rangle$  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  $\delta_1$  and each  $y_j$  has degree  $\delta_2$ . 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  $p \in \mathbb{R}[t_1, t_2]$ .

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

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  $R$ -algebrae 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 10.10.** *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. 3.6) is independent from  $V_0$ .

*Proof.* Choose  $\bar{e}$  as tuple of generators of  $\Gamma$  and apply Theorem 10.8. 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 3.5, there exists a polynomial  $q$  satisfying (i) and (ii). By Proposition 3.7, 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).  $\theta$  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)  $\theta$  is additive on the category of  $\lambda_T$ -small  $T$ -modules:  $\theta(0) = 0$  and, for every exact sequences of  $\lambda_T$ -small  $T$ -modules  $0 \rightarrow A \rightarrow B \rightarrow C \rightarrow 0$ ,  $\theta(B) = \theta(A) \oplus \theta(C)$ ;
- (2)  $\theta$  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  $\lambda_R$ -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)  $\hat{\theta} \geq \theta$ ;
- (e)  $\hat{\theta}(A) = \sup\{\hat{\theta}(A/I) : I \leq R \text{ } \lambda\text{-cofinite ideal}\}$

*Proof.* Same as Propositions 9.4 and 9.7. The assumption that  $T = S[G]$  is used in the following way:

*Claim 8.* Let  $A$  be a  $T$ -module, generated (as a  $T$ -module) by  $a_1, \dots, a_\ell$ . Assume that  $\lambda(Ra_i)$  is finite, for  $i = 1, \dots, \ell$ . Then,  $A$  is locally  $\lambda_R$ -finite.  $\square$

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

APPENDIX B. FINITE GENERATION AND NOETHERIANITY ACCORDING TO  $\lambda$ 

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  $\lambda$  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  $i \leq n$ ,  $\lambda(a_i \mid N') > 0$ . □

**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 9.*  $cl_N^{S,\lambda}$  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 10.*  $A \subseteq cl_N^{S,\lambda}(A)$ .

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

*Claim 11.*  $\lambda(cl_N^{S,\lambda}(A)/SA) = 0$ .

By Lemma B.1.

*Claim 12.*  $cl_N^{S,\lambda}(cl_N^{S,\lambda}(A)) = cl_N^{S,\lambda}(A)$ .

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

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,

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

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

**Definition B.3.** •  $N' \subseteq N$  is  $\lambda_S$ -closed (in  $N$ ) if  $N' = c\ell_N^{S,\lambda}(N')$ .

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

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

- (1)  $N$  is  $\lambda_S$ -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  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ ,

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

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

- (4) every  $\lambda_S$ -closed sub-module of  $N$  is  $\lambda_S$ -f.g..

**B.1.  $\lambda$ -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  $\lambda$ -Noetherian (as an  $R$ -algebra) if it is  $\lambda_S$ -Noetherian (as an  $S$ -module).

**Remark B.6.** If  $N$  is finitely generated as  $S$ -module, then it is  $\lambda_S$ -f.g..

If  $N$  is Noetherian (as  $S$ -module), then it is  $\lambda_S$ -Noetherian.

If  $S$  is a Noetherian ring, then it is  $\lambda$ -Noetherian.

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

We say that  $\lambda$  has positive gap if

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

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

**Conjecture B.8.** *If  $S$  is  $\lambda$ -Noetherian and  $M$  is  $\lambda_S$ -f.g., then  $M$  is  $\lambda_S$ -Noetherian.*

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

## APPENDIX C. LESS ASSUMPTIONS

In this section we reprove some of the results in §3 weakening some of the assumptions.

**Theorem C.1.** *In Theorem 3.2, we can replace Assumption (3) with*

*(3)'  $M$  is an  $\lambda_S$ -Noetherian  $S$ -module.*

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

If  $k = 0$ , then, since  $M$  is  $\lambda_S$ -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. 3.2.

*Claim 13.* 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. 3.2.

In fact,  $K$  is an  $S$ -sub-module of  $M$  and  $C$  is a quotient of  $M$ , and therefore they are both  $\lambda_S$ -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  $\lambda_S$ -Noetherian)  $N'$  is  $\lambda_S$ -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 3.4 we can weaken Assumption (3) to*

*(3)'  $\mathcal{B}(N)$  is  $\lambda_{S[y]}$ -Noetherian.*

*Moreover, in Theorem 3.8, we can weaken the Assumptions (2) and (3) to*

*(2)''  $\mathcal{B}(\bar{V})$  is  $\lambda_{S[y]}$ -Noetherian.*

#### REFERENCES

- [BDGSa] Andrzej Biś, Dikran Dikranjan, Anna Giordano Bruno, and Luchezar Stoyanov, *Algebraic entropies of commuting endomorphisms of torsion abelian groups*. Preprint.  $\uparrow$ 2, 15
- [BDGSb] ———, *Metric vs topological receptive entropy of semigroup actions*. To appear in *Qualitative Theory of Dynamical Systems*.  $\uparrow$ 15, 18
- [CSCCK14] 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, 23
- [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, 5, 8, 14, 15
- [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  $\uparrow$ 2, 4, 8
- [MS05] Ezra Miller and Bernd Sturmfels, *Combinatorial commutative algebra*, *Graduate Texts in Mathematics*, vol. 227, Springer-Verlag, New York, 2005. MR2110098  $\uparrow$ 2, 19
- [Nor68] D. G. Northcott, *Lessons on rings, modules and multiplicities*, Cambridge University Press, 1968.  $\uparrow$ 3, 4, 15
- [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>.  $\uparrow$ 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.  $\uparrow$ 2, 4
- [SVV13] Luigi Salce, Peter Vámos, and Simone Virili, *Length functions, multiplicities and algebraic entropy*, *Forum Mathematicum* **25** (2013), no. 2, 255–282.  $\uparrow$ 2, 3, 4
- [Vám68] Peter Vámos, *Additive functions and duality over noetherian rings*, *Q. J. Math.* **19** (1968), no. 1, 43–55.  $\uparrow$ 2, 3, 16, 17

UNIVERSITÀ DI FIRENZE

*Email address:* [antongiulio.fornasiero@gmail.com](mailto:antongiulio.fornasiero@gmail.com)

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