

HILBERT POLYNOMIAL OF LENGTH FUNCTIONS

VERSION 8

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. λ -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 μ and (receptive) entropy	16
10. Fine grading	20
Appendix A. Non-commuative rings	24
Appendix B. Finite generation and Noetherianity according to λ	24
Appendix C. Less assumptions	26
References	27

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 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 3.9): thus, this leading monomial is an invariant of M , and describes the growth rate of λ 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 μ 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 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 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 [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 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.

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 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. 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 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.

(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 M 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) $SV = M$
 - 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.

[Vám68, Theorem 5] characterizes of length functions on Noetherian rings: for every prime ideal $P < R$ there is a canonical length function on R -mod l_P , 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 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 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

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

⁽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].

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

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

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

The limit in the definition of $H(M; V)$ exists, and h_λ is the algebraic entropy (relative to the length function λ): see [CSCCK14, 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] 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. 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].

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.

⁽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 [CSCCK14].

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,

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

□

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

⁽⁴⁾ 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 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.

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 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 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^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

$$V := \bigcup_n V_n.$$

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 λ (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 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 3.9: $\mu_\lambda(M)$ 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⁾

⁽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 §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 λ -dimension of M is d , and its λ -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 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 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 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 3.14. 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:

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

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 λ_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 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.

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 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 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 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.

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 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 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 $M = \bigcup_n M_i$, 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 filterings 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 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 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 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 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 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 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 λ -dimension of M as a T -module, and this dimension does not depend on the choice of M_0 or of ϕ .

Examples 6.2. 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 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 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 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 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 6.4. *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

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, 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 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 λ_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 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 Noetherianity of R and locally λ_R -finiteness).

9. 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 [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 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 9.2. 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 9.7); see also [Vám68, 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 9.3. 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 9.4. *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 ,

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

- (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 [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 $\mathfrak{B} = (B_1 \leq B_2 \leq \dots \leq B_{2n-1} \leq B_{2n} \leq B)$ 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, $\mathfrak{A} := (A_1 \leq A_2 \leq \dots \leq A_{2n-1} \leq A_{2n} \leq A)$ and $\mathfrak{C} := (C_1 \leq C_2 \leq \dots \leq C_{2m-1} \leq C_{2m} \leq C)$ 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 $\mathfrak{A} = (A_1 \leq A_2 \leq \dots \leq A_{2n-1} \leq A_{2n} \leq A)$ and $\mathfrak{C} = (C_1 \leq C_2 \leq \dots \leq C_{2m-1} \leq C_{2m} \leq C)$ 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, $\mathfrak{B} := (B_1 \leq B_2 \leq \dots \leq B_{2n+2m-1} \leq B_{2n+2m} \leq B)$ 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 9.5. Given an ideal $I < R$, we say that I is λ -cofinite if $\lambda(R/I) < \infty$.

Remark 9.6. Let $I < R$ be a λ -cofinite ideal, and A be an R -module. Then, A/I is locally λ_R -finite.

Proposition 9.7. 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 9.8. (1) $\hat{\mu}$ satisfies the conclusions of Propositions 9.4 and 9.7;
(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 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 λ_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 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 6.4 answers the conjecture in [BDGSb, Remark 5.9].

Corollary 9.11. Let λ be the 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 9.7.

Example 9.12. Let $R := \mathbb{Z}$ and λ be the length introduced in Example 2.2b. 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 6.4).

Lemma 9.13. 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 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 λ -dimensions are equal to their Krull dimensions. By additivity of Krull and λ dimensions, the conclusion follows. \square

9.1. Proof of Proposition 9.7.

Lemma 9.14. *Let $I, J < R$ be λ -cofinite ideals. Then, $I \cap J$ is also λ -cofinite.*

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

Lemma 9.15. *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 9.16. *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 the previous lemma. □

Proof of Proposition 9.7. 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

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

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

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

proving the Claim. \square

9.2. Examples. Let $R := \mathbb{Z}$, α be the 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,

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

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

Definition 10.1. 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 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 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 10.4. *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) γ 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. \square

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 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 10.6. 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 10.7. *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) $\mathcal{B}(\bar{N})$ 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_k).

10.3. 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 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 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 $\bar{V} := S\bar{V}_0$ 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 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 $p \in \mathbb{R}[t_1, t_2]$.

10.4. 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 , $P_\ell = \{p_1 + \dots + p_{\ell-1}, \dots, k\}$.

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 Γ 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 $T := R[G]$. $T\text{-mod}$ is the category of left T -modules (by “modules” we will mean left modules). θ is some function from $T\text{-mod}$ 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 $T\text{-mod}$;
- (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 9.4 and 9.7. The assumption that $T = S[G]$ is used in the following way:

Claim 9. 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. □

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

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

We also define

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

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

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

Thus, for some $i \leq n$, $\lambda(a_i | N') > 0$. \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 $\lambda(c | N) = 0$, 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 10. $cl_N^{S,\lambda}$ is increasing.

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

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

Claim 11. $A \subseteq cl_N^{S,\lambda}(A)$.

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

Claim 12. $\lambda(cl_N^{S,\lambda}(A)/SA) = 0$.

By Lemma B.1.

Claim 13. $cl_N^{S,\lambda}(cl_N^{S,\lambda}(A)) = cl_N^{S,\lambda}(A)$.

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 $\lambda(b | A) = 0$.

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, $cl_N^{S,\lambda}$ is a closure operator, and $\lambda(cl_N^{S,\lambda}(A)/SA) = 0$. 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 $N' \subseteq cl_N^{S,\lambda}(A)$. \square

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

- $A \subseteq N$ λ_S -generates N if $cl_N^{S,\lambda}(A) = N$.
- 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

$$N_0 < N_1 < N_2 < \cdots < N$$

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 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 §3 weakening some of the assumptions.

Theorem C.1. In Theorem 3.2, 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. 3.2.

Claim 14. 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 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 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. ↑2, 15
- [BDGSb] ———, *Metric vs topological receptive entropy of semigroup actions*. To appear in *Qualitative Theory of Dynamical Systems*. ↑15, 18
- [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 ↑4
- [DFGB20] Dikran Dikranjan, Antongiulio Fornasiero, and Anna Giordano Bruno, *Algebraic entropy for amenable semigroup actions*, *Journal of Algebra* **556** (2020), 467–546. ↑2, 3, 4, 24
- [Eis95] David Eisenbud, *Commutative algebra: with a view toward algebraic geometry*, *Graduate Texts in Mathematics*, vol. 150, Springer-Verlag New York, 1995. ↑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 ↑2, 4, 8
- [MS05] Ezra Miller and Bernd Sturmfels, *Combinatorial commutative algebra*, *Graduate Texts in Mathematics*, vol. 227, Springer-Verlag, New York, 2005. MR2110098 ↑2, 20
- [Nor68] D. G. Northcott, *Lessons on rings, modules and multiplicities*, Cambridge University Press, 1968. ↑3, 4, 15, 19
- [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, 4
- [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
- [Vám68] Peter Vámos, *Additive functions and duality over noetherian rings*, *Q. J. Math.* **19** (1968), no. 1, 43–55. ↑2, 3, 16, 17

UNIVERSITÀ DI FIRENZE

Email address: antongiulio.fornasiero@gmail.com

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