

ON THE SUPPORT OF RELATIVE D -MODULES

ROBIN VAN DER VEER

ABSTRACT. In this article we investigate the fibers of relative D -modules. In general we prove that there exists an open, Zariski dense subset of the vanishing set of the annihilator over which the fibers of a cyclic relative D -module are non-zero.

Next we restrict our attention to relatively holonomic D -modules. For this class we prove that the fiber over every point in the vanishing set of the annihilator is non-zero.

As a consequence we obtain new proofs of a conjecture of Budur which was recently proven by Budur, van der Veer, Wu and Zhou, as well as a new proof of a theorem of Maisonobe. Moreover, we also obtain a diagonal specialization result for Bernstein-Sato ideals.

CONTENTS

1. Introduction	1
2. A lemma in commutative algebra, and a non-commutative corollary	4
3. Gröbner bases for D_n -modules	6
4. Relatively holonomic modules	9
5. Diagonal specialization of Bernstein-Sato ideals	12
References	15

1. INTRODUCTION

Let $F = (f_1, \dots, f_p)$ be a tuple of polynomials on $X = \mathbb{C}^n$. The Bernstein-Sato ideal of F , denoted B_F , is the ideal in $\mathbb{C}[s_1, \dots, s_p]$ consisting of those $b \in \mathbb{C}[s_1, \dots, s_p]$ for which there exists a $P \in D_n[s_1, \dots, s_p]$ such that

$$bf_1^{s_1} \dots f_p^{s_p} = Pf_1^{s_1+1} \dots f_p^{s_p+1},$$

where D_n is the Weyl algebra. Associated to F we also have the specialization complex $\psi_F(\mathbb{C}_X)$ of [Sab90]. This is a generalisation of the nearby cycles complex to a tuple of functions. It comes equipped with p simultaneous monodromy actions, and we denote by $\mathcal{S}(F) \subset (\mathbb{C}^*)^p$ the support of this monodromy action. We refer to [Bud15], [BvVWZ21] for more details and background on B_F and $\psi_F(\mathbb{C}_X)$.

The motivation of this article is to give an alternative proof of the following theorem:

2020 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 14F10 (primary), 16Z10 (secondary).

Key words and phrases. Groebner basis; Weyl algebra; Bernstein-Sato ideal; b -function.

Theorem A (Conjectured in [Bud15], proven in [BvVWZ21]). *Denote by $\text{Exp} : \mathbb{C}^p \rightarrow (\mathbb{C}^*)^p$ the coordinate-wise exponential map. Then*

$$\text{Exp}(Z(B_F)) = \mathcal{S}(F).$$

In the above theorem and throughout this article $Z(I)$ denotes the scheme defined by an ideal I . The inclusion

$$\text{Exp}(Z(B_F)) \supset \mathcal{S}(F)$$

was proven already in [Bud15]. To analyse the reverse inclusion the following criterion can be extracted from the proof of [Bud15, Proposition 1.7].

Proposition 1.1 ([Bud15]). *If $\alpha \in Z(B_F)$ and*

$$(1) \quad \frac{D_n[s_1, \dots, s_p] f_1^{s_1} \dots f_p^{s_p}}{D_n[s_1, \dots, s_p] f_1^{s_1+1} \dots f_p^{s_p+1}} \otimes_{\mathbb{C}[s_1, \dots, s_p]} \frac{\mathbb{C}[s_1, \dots, s_p]}{\mathfrak{m}_\alpha} \neq 0,$$

then $\text{Exp}(\alpha) \in \mathcal{S}(F)$.

Since $\mathcal{S}(F)$ is a closed subset of $(\mathbb{C}^*)^p$, Theorem A follows if we can prove (1) for α in an open Zariski dense subset of $Z(B_F)$. This observation motivates the following theorem:

Theorem B. *Let $\mathfrak{J} \subset D_n[s_1, \dots, s_p]$ be a left ideal, where D_n is the Weyl algebra. Let \mathfrak{p} be a minimal prime divisor of $\mathfrak{J} \cap \mathbb{C}[s_1, \dots, s_p]$. Then there exists a polynomial $h \in \mathbb{C}[s_1, \dots, s_p] \setminus \mathfrak{p}$ such that for all $\alpha \in Z(\mathfrak{p}) \setminus Z(h)$ with maximal ideal \mathfrak{m}_α ,*

$$\left(\frac{D_n[s_1, \dots, s_p]}{\mathfrak{J}} \right) \otimes_{\mathbb{C}[s_1, \dots, s_p]} \left(\frac{\mathbb{C}[s_1, \dots, s_p]}{\mathfrak{m}_\alpha} \right) \neq 0.$$

As mentioned above, Theorem A was recently proven in [BvVWZ21] where it was deduced from the following theorem.

Theorem C ([BvVWZ21]). *Let $F = (f_1, \dots, f_p)$ be a tuple of polynomials on \mathbb{C}^n . For every codimension 1 irreducible component H of $Z(B_F)$ there is a Zariski open subset $V \subset H$ such that for every $\alpha \in V$ with maximal ideal \mathfrak{m}_α ,*

$$\frac{D_n[s_1, \dots, s_p] f_1^{s_1} \dots f_p^{s_p}}{D_n[s_1, \dots, s_p] f_1^{s_1+1} \dots f_p^{s_p+1}} \otimes_{\mathbb{C}[s_1, \dots, s_p]} \frac{\mathbb{C}[s_1, \dots, s_p]}{\mathfrak{m}_\alpha} \neq 0.$$

This theorem is a special case of Theorem B, since it only deals with codimension 1 components. As explained above, it follows from Proposition 1.1 and this theorem that for every codimension 1 component H of $Z(B_F)$, $\text{Exp}(H) \subset \mathcal{S}(F)$. This restriction of only working with codimension 1 components meant that the following result from [Mai16] had to be used to prove Theorem A in [BvVWZ21]:

Theorem D ([Mai16]). *Every irreducible component of $Z(B_F)$ can be translated along an integer vector into a codimension 1 component of $Z(B_F)$.*

Theorem D is a corollary of Theorem A, since it is known from [BLSW17, Theorem 1.3] that $\mathcal{S}(F)$ is a union of codimension one torsion translated subtori of $(\mathbb{C}^*)^p$. Since our proof of Theorem A does not rely on Theorem D, our methods provide a new proof of Theorem D. Let us also emphasise that, unlike in the methods of [BvVWZ21], in Theorem B no assumption on relative holonomicity of $D_n[s_1, \dots, s_p]/\mathfrak{J}$ is made.

The proof strategy for Theorem B is to specialize a suitable Gröbner basis for $\mathfrak{J} + \mathfrak{p}$ to a Gröbner basis for $(D_n[s_1, \dots, s_p]/\mathfrak{J}) \otimes_{\mathbb{C}[s_1, \dots, s_p]} (\mathbb{C}[s_1, \dots, s_p]/\mathfrak{m}_\alpha)$. Using a result on specializing Gröbner bases from [Ley01] and [Oak97] we can then conclude Theorem B. This method of proof works in every ring where Gröbner basis methods are available, and in particular does not use any D_n -module specific constructions.

In the fourth section we do bring D_n -module theoretical constructions into focus, and restrict our attention to relatively holonomic $D_n[s_1, \dots, s_p]$ -modules (see Definition 4.1). We then obtain the following improvement of Theorem B

Theorem E. *Let M be a relatively holonomic $D_n[s_1, \dots, s_p]$ -module. Then for all $\alpha \in Z(\text{Ann}_{\mathbb{C}[s_1, \dots, s_p]}(M))$ with maximal ideal \mathfrak{m}_α ,*

$$M \otimes_{\mathbb{C}[s_1, \dots, s_p]} \frac{\mathbb{C}[s_1, \dots, s_p]}{\mathfrak{m}_\alpha} \neq 0.$$

In the final section we apply Theorem E to investigate the diagonal specialization of Bernstein-Sato ideals. By this we mean the following: denote by $\Delta = \{s_1 = \dots = s_p\}$ the diagonal in \mathbb{C}^p , and $f = \prod_{i=1}^p f_i$. It is then obvious that

$$Z(B_F) \cap \Delta \supset Z(b_f),$$

where b_f is the usual Bernstein-Sato polynomial of f , and the affine space on which b_f lives is identified with Δ in the obvious way. The reverse inclusion is a delicate matter, and it is expected that it fails in general, although it proved difficult to exhibit this failure with a concrete example. We are able to prove the following partial positive answer to the reverse inclusion:

Theorem F. *Let $F = (f_1, \dots, f_p)$ be a tuple of polynomials on \mathbb{C}^n and denote $f = \prod_{i=1}^p f_i$. Denote by $\nabla : \mathbb{C}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^n$ the map $\nabla(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_p) = (\alpha_1 + 1, \dots, \alpha_p + 1)$ and $\Delta = \{s_1 = \dots = s_p\} \subset \mathbb{C}^n$. Then*

$$(Z(B_F) \cap \Delta) \setminus \bigcup_{i>0} \nabla^i(Z(B_F)) \subset Z(b_f),$$

where the right hand side is identified with a subset of Δ .

This specialization result makes no assumption on the tuple F . For related conditional results on diagonal specialization we refer to [Bat20] and [Wu20].

Acknowledgement. We would like to thank Guillem Blanco, Nero Budur, Feng Hao, Alexander Van Werde and Lei Wu for the helpful comments and suggestions.

The author is supported by a PhD Fellowship of the Research Foundation - Flanders.

2. A LEMMA IN COMMUTATIVE ALGEBRA, AND A NON-COMMUTATIVE COROLLARY

We denote $A = \mathbb{C}[s_1, \dots, s_p]$. An ideal $\mathfrak{q} \subset A$ is called *primary* if for all $x, y \in A$ with $xy \in \mathfrak{q}$, either $x \in \mathfrak{q}$ or $y \in \sqrt{\mathfrak{q}}$. If \mathfrak{q} is primary, then $\mathfrak{p} = \sqrt{\mathfrak{q}}$ is a prime ideal. When we say that \mathfrak{q} is \mathfrak{p} -primary we mean that \mathfrak{q} is primary and $\sqrt{\mathfrak{q}} = \mathfrak{p}$.

Lemma 2.1. *Let $\mathfrak{q} \subset A$ be a \mathfrak{p} -primary ideal. If $\mathfrak{q} \neq \mathfrak{p}$, then there exists an $f \in \mathfrak{p} \setminus \mathfrak{q}$ such that $f\mathfrak{p} \subset \mathfrak{q}$.*

Proof. Let $N \subset A/\mathfrak{q}$ be the nilradical, which is non-zero since $\mathfrak{q} \neq \mathfrak{p}$. Let $g_1, \dots, g_m \in N$ be a set of generators. Let $f_0 = 1 \in A/\mathfrak{q}$. Using induction we define for $i = 1, \dots, m$:

$$f_{i+1} = f_i g_{i+1}^{k_{i+1}-1},$$

where $k_{i+1} \in \mathbb{Z}$ is the smallest integer for which

$$f_i g_{i+1}^{k_{i+1}} = 0.$$

Notice that such k_{i+1} always exists, since each g_i is nilpotent and that k_{i+1} is always at least 1 since f_i is not zero, by induction. By construction we have that for each $i = 1, \dots, m$,

$$g_i f_m = 0.$$

Let f be a lift of f_m to A . Since $f_m \neq 0$, $f \notin \mathfrak{q}$, and since f_m is nilpotent, $f \in \mathfrak{p}$. Let $p \in \mathfrak{p}$. Then in A/\mathfrak{q} we can write $p + \mathfrak{q} = \sum_{i=1}^m a_i g_i$ for some $a_i \in A/\mathfrak{q}$. Then

$$fp + \mathfrak{q} = \sum_{i=1}^m a_i g_i f_m = 0,$$

so that $fp \in \mathfrak{q}$. □

Every ideal $\mathfrak{J} \subset A$ has a *primary decomposition*. This means that we can write $\mathfrak{J} = \bigcap_{i=1}^m \mathfrak{q}_i$ such that

- (1) every \mathfrak{q}_i is primary, and
- (2) for all $1 \leq j \leq m$, $\bigcap_{i=1}^m \mathfrak{q}_i \subsetneq \bigcap_{\substack{i=1 \\ i \neq j}}^m \mathfrak{q}_i$, and
- (3) The prime ideals $\sqrt{\mathfrak{q}_1}, \dots, \sqrt{\mathfrak{q}_m}$ are pairwise distinct.

The minimal (under the inclusion order) elements of the set $\{\sqrt{\mathfrak{q}_i}\}$ are uniquely determined by \mathfrak{J} , and are called the *minimal prime divisors* of \mathfrak{J} .

Theorem 2.2. *Let $\mathfrak{J} \subset A$ be an ideal with primary decomposition $\mathfrak{J} = \bigcap_{i=1}^m \mathfrak{q}_i$, $m > 1$. Let $\sqrt{\mathfrak{q}_j}$ be a minimal prime divisor. Then there exists an $h \in A \setminus \mathfrak{q}_j$ such that $h\sqrt{\mathfrak{q}_j} \subset \mathfrak{J}$.*

Proof. We assume without loss of generality that $j = 1$. We claim that $\bigcap_{i=2}^m \mathfrak{q}_i \not\subset \sqrt{\mathfrak{q}_1}$. If we would have $\bigcap_{i=2}^m \mathfrak{q}_i \subset \sqrt{\mathfrak{q}_1}$ then there is some \mathfrak{q}_i contained in $\sqrt{\mathfrak{q}_1}$, since the latter is prime. Hence also $\sqrt{\mathfrak{q}_i} \subset \sqrt{\mathfrak{q}_1}$. Since $\sqrt{\mathfrak{q}_1}$ is a minimal prime, this must be an equality. However, by definition of the primary decomposition, $\sqrt{\mathfrak{q}_i} \neq \sqrt{\mathfrak{q}_1}$, and this contradiction proves the claim. Let $g \in \bigcap_{i=2}^m \mathfrak{q}_i \setminus \sqrt{\mathfrak{q}_1}$.

If $\sqrt{\mathfrak{q}_1} = \mathfrak{q}_1$, then $h = g$ satisfies the condition of the theorem. Namely, let $q \in \mathfrak{q}_1$. Then $gq \in (\bigcap_{i=2}^m \mathfrak{q}_i) \mathfrak{q}_1 \subset \bigcap_{i=1}^m \mathfrak{q}_i = \mathfrak{J}$.

If $\sqrt{\mathfrak{q}_1} \neq \mathfrak{q}_1$, we get from Lemma 2.1 an $f \in \sqrt{\mathfrak{q}_1} \setminus \mathfrak{q}_1$ such that $f\sqrt{\mathfrak{q}_1} \subset \mathfrak{q}_1$. Set $h = fg$. We claim that this h satisfies the conditions of the theorem. If $h \in \mathfrak{q}_1$, then since \mathfrak{q}_1 is primary, $f \in \mathfrak{q}_1$ or $g \in \sqrt{\mathfrak{q}_1}$, neither of which is possible by choice of f and g . This means that indeed $h \in A \setminus \mathfrak{q}_1$. Let $p \in \sqrt{\mathfrak{q}_1}$. By choice of f , $pf \in \mathfrak{q}_1$, and thus $ph = gpf \in (\bigcap_{i=2}^m \mathfrak{q}_i) \mathfrak{q}_1 \subset \bigcap_{i=1}^m \mathfrak{q}_i = \mathfrak{J}$, which concludes the proof. \square

Corollary 2.3. *Let M be an A -module, and let \mathfrak{p} be a minimal prime divisor of the ideal $\text{Ann}_A(M)$. Then $\text{Ann}_A(M \otimes_A (A/\mathfrak{p})) = \mathfrak{p}$.*

Proof. Let $\text{Ann}_A(M) = \bigcap_{i=1}^m \mathfrak{q}_i$ be a primary decomposition of $\text{Ann}_A(M)$ with $\sqrt{\mathfrak{q}_1} = \mathfrak{p}$. From Theorem 2.2 we get an $h \in A \setminus \mathfrak{q}_1$ such that $h\mathfrak{p} \subset \text{Ann}_A(M)$.

Let $g \in \text{Ann}_A(M \otimes_A (A/\mathfrak{p}))$. This means that for every $m \in M$, $gm \in \mathfrak{p}M$. In other words, for every $m \in M$, there exist $n_1, \dots, n_k \in M$ and $p_1, \dots, p_k \in \mathfrak{p}$ such that $gm = \sum_{i=1}^k p_i n_i$. We multiply this equation by h on both sides to find $ghm = \sum_{i=1}^k hp_i n_i$. By construction, $hp_i \in \text{Ann}_A(M)$, so that $ghm = 0$ for all m , and thus $gh \in \text{Ann}_A(M)$. In particular, $gh \in \mathfrak{q}_1$, so that either $h \in \mathfrak{q}_1$ or $g \in \sqrt{\mathfrak{q}_1} = \mathfrak{p}$. Since $h \notin \mathfrak{q}_1$ by construction, we conclude that $g \in \mathfrak{p}$, which shows that $\text{Ann}_A(M \otimes_A (A/\mathfrak{p})) \subset \mathfrak{p}$. The other inclusion is obvious, and this concludes the proof. \square

Lemma 2.4. *Let $\mathfrak{J} \subset D_n[s_1, \dots, s_p]$ be a left ideal. Let \mathfrak{p} be a minimal prime divisor of $\mathfrak{J} \cap A$. Then $(\mathfrak{J} + R\mathfrak{p}) \cap A = \mathfrak{p}$.*

Proof. We denote $R = D_n[s_1, \dots, s_p]$. We regard R/\mathfrak{J} as an A -module. As such we claim that $\text{Ann}_A(R/\mathfrak{J}) = \mathfrak{J} \cap A$. To see this, let $f \in \text{Ann}_A(R/\mathfrak{J})$, so that $f \cdot (1 + \mathfrak{J}) = f + \mathfrak{J}$ is zero in R/\mathfrak{J} , which means that $f \in \mathfrak{J} \cap A$. For the other inclusion let $f \in \mathfrak{J} \cap A$. Then

$$f \cdot (P + \mathfrak{J}) = fP + \mathfrak{J} = Pf + \mathfrak{J},$$

where in the second equality we use that A is contained in the center of R . Since $f \in \mathfrak{J}$, which is a left ideal, we conclude that $Pf \in \mathfrak{J}$, so that $f \cdot (P + \mathfrak{J}) = 0$ and hence indeed $f \in \text{Ann}_A(R/\mathfrak{J})$.

We apply Corollary 2.3 to find that $\text{Ann}_A((R/\mathfrak{J}) \otimes_A (A/\mathfrak{p})) = \mathfrak{p}$. The lemma follows when we prove that $\text{Ann}_A((R/\mathfrak{J}) \otimes_A (A/\mathfrak{p})) = (\mathfrak{J} + R\mathfrak{p}) \cap A$, which in turn follows, as above, when we prove that we have an isomorphism

$$(R/\mathfrak{J}) \otimes_A (A/\mathfrak{p}) \cong R/(\mathfrak{J} + R\mathfrak{p}).$$

There is a well-defined map from the left hand side to the right hand side given by

$$(P + \mathfrak{J}) \otimes (f + \mathfrak{p}) \mapsto Pf + (\mathfrak{J} + R\mathfrak{p}).$$

Note that this is well-defined because A is contained in the center of R . In the other direction we have the map

$$P + (\mathfrak{J} + R\mathfrak{p}) \mapsto (P + \mathfrak{J}) \otimes (1 + \mathfrak{p}).$$

These maps are inverse to each other, which proves the claim. \square

3. GRÖBNER BASES FOR D_n -MODULES

In this section we recall some facts about Gröbner bases for ideals in D_n and $R = D_n[s_1, \dots, s_p]$, and then prove Theorem B. We denote as in the previous section $A = \mathbb{C}[s_1, \dots, s_p]$. We will always implicitly regard A and D_n as subsets of R .

In D_n we consider the set of standard monomials of the form $x^\alpha \partial^\beta$, $\alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^n$. On these monomials we consider the lexicographical order with

$$(2) \quad \partial_1 > \dots > \partial_n > x_n > \dots > x_1.$$

Any operator in D_n is a finite \mathbb{C} -linear combination of standard monomial in a unique way. Writing $P \in D_n$ as a linear combination $P = \sum_{\alpha, \beta} c_{\alpha, \beta} x^\alpha \partial^\beta$ with non-zero $c_{\alpha, \beta}$ we denote by $\text{lm}_{D_n}(P)$ the largest monomial $x^\alpha \partial^\beta$ with respect to the lexicographical order. For an ideal $\mathfrak{J} \subset D_n$ we denote $\text{lm}_{D_n}(\mathfrak{J}) = \{\text{lm}_{D_n}(P) \mid P \in \mathfrak{J}\}$. A finite generating set $G \subset \mathfrak{J}$ is called a Gröbner basis for \mathfrak{J} if the following is true: for every $m \in \text{lm}_{D_n}(\mathfrak{J})$ there exists a $P \in G$ such that $\sigma(\text{lm}_{D_n}(P)) \mid \sigma(m)$ where σ denotes the operation of taking the principal symbol. More explicitly this says that when $x^\alpha \partial^\beta \in \text{lm}_{D_n}(\mathfrak{J})$ there exists a $P \in G$ with $\text{lm}_{D_n}(P) = x^{\alpha'} \partial^{\beta'}$ and (α', β') is entry-wise less than or equal to (α, β) . To simplify the notation we will write this divisibility notion simply as $x^{\alpha'} \partial^{\beta'} \mid x^\alpha \partial^\beta$, but we emphasise that this does not mean that there exists some $P \in D_n$ for which $Px^{\alpha'} \partial^{\beta'} = x^\alpha \partial^\beta$. It follows immediately from the definition that $\mathfrak{J} = D_n$ if and only if any Gröbner basis for \mathfrak{J} contains a unit, i.e. an element of \mathbb{C} .

In R we consider the set of standard monomials of the form $x^\alpha \partial^\beta s^\gamma$, $\alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^n$, $\gamma \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^p$. On these monomials we consider the lexicographical order with

$$(3) \quad \partial_1 > \dots > \partial_n > x_n > \dots > x_1 > s_p > \dots > s_1.$$

Any operator in R is a finite \mathbb{C} -linear combination of standard monomial in a unique way. We denote by $\text{lm}_R(P)$ the leading monomial of an operator $P \in R$ with respect to the lexicographical order. For an ideal $\mathfrak{Q} \subset R$ we denote $\text{lm}_R(\mathfrak{Q}) = \{\text{lm}_R(P) \mid P \in \mathfrak{Q}\}$. A finite generating set $G \subset \mathfrak{Q}$ is called a Gröbner basis for \mathfrak{Q} if the following *Gröbner property* is true: for every $m \in \text{lm}_R(\mathfrak{Q})$ there exists a $P \in G$ such that $\sigma(\text{lm}_R(P)) \mid \sigma(m)$ where σ denotes the operation of taking the principal symbol. More explicitly this says that when $x^\alpha \partial^\beta s^\gamma \in \text{lm}_R(\mathfrak{Q})$ there exists a $P \in G$ with $\text{lm}_R(P) = x^{\alpha'} \partial^{\beta'} s^{\gamma'}$ and $(\alpha', \beta', \gamma')$ is entry-wise less than or equal to (α, β, γ) . Again we denote this divisibility relation simply by $x^{\alpha'} \partial^{\beta'} s^{\gamma'} \mid x^\alpha \partial^\beta s^\gamma$. Regarding the s_1, \dots, s_p as parameters we will also need the following. Any $P \in R$ can be written uniquely as

$$(4) \quad P = \sum_{\alpha, \beta} h_{\alpha, \beta}(s_1, \dots, s_p) x^\alpha \partial^\beta,$$

with $h_{\alpha,\beta} \neq 0$. We denote the *parametric leading monomial* of P by $\text{plm}(P) = x^\alpha \partial^\beta$ and the *parametric leading coefficient* of P by $\text{plc}(P) = h_{\alpha,\beta}$, where $x^\alpha \partial^\beta$ is the largest monomial occurring in (4) with respect to the monomial order (2).

In the commutative ring A consider the lexicographical monomial order with

$$(5) \quad s_p > \cdots > s_1.$$

We denote by $\text{lm}_A(f)$ the leading monomial of $f \in A$.

In all three rings D_n, A and R a Gröbner basis for an ideal can be obtained by applying Buchbergers algorithm to an arbitrary generating set. We note the following relations between the leading monomials. For $f \in A$: $\text{lm}_R(f) = \text{lm}_A(f)$. For $P \in D_n$, $\text{lm}_{D_n}(P) = \text{lm}_R(P)$. For $P \in R$, $\text{lm}_A(\text{plc}(P)) \text{plm}(P) = \text{lm}_R(P)$. Because of these equalities we will from now on suppress the notation of the ring and simply write lm for leading monomials.

Lemma 3.1. *Let $\mathfrak{Q} \subset R$ be an ideal and let G be a Gröbner basis for \mathfrak{Q} with respect to the order (3). Then $G \cap A$ is a Gröbner basis for $\mathfrak{Q} \cap A$ with respect to the order (5).*

Proof. Let $f \in \mathfrak{Q} \cap A$. There exists a $P \in G$ such that $\text{lm}(P) \mid \text{lm}(f)$. This means that $\text{lm}(P) \in A$, and thus by definition of the order (3), $P \in A$. We conclude that for every $f \in \mathfrak{Q} \cap A$ there exists a $g \in G \cap A$ such that $\text{lm}(g) \mid \text{lm}(f)$. It only remains to show that $G \cap A$ generates $\mathfrak{Q} \cap A$. This follows from the preceding statement, since we can reduce f to zero modulo $G \cap A$ by iteratively canceling leading monomials. \square

Lemma 3.2. *Let $\mathfrak{Q} \subset R$ be an ideal. Then there exists a Gröbner basis G for \mathfrak{Q} with respect to the order (3) such that for all $P \in G \setminus A$, $\text{plc}(P) \notin \mathfrak{Q} \cap A$.*

Proof. Let $P \in G \setminus A$ and write

$$P = \text{plc}(P) \text{plm}(P) + Q.$$

By Lemma 3.1 $G \cap A = \{f_1, \dots, f_m\}$ is a Gröbner basis for $\mathfrak{Q} \cap A$. Using the division algorithm [CLO15, Proposition 1.6.1] we find q_1, \dots, q_m, r such that

$$\text{plc}(P) = \sum_{i=1}^m q_i f_i + r,$$

where $\text{lm}(r)$ is not divisible by any $\text{lm}(f_i)$. This means that

$$P = \left(\sum_{i=1}^m q_i f_i + r \right) \text{plm}(P) + Q \equiv r \text{plm}(P) + Q =: P',$$

where \equiv denotes equivalence modulo \mathfrak{Q} . If $P' = 0$ we define $G' = G \setminus \{P\}$ and if $P' \neq 0$ then we define $G' = G \setminus \{P\} \cup \{P'\}$.

We claim that G' is still a Gröbner basis for \mathfrak{Q} . This is clear if $P = P'$ so assume that $P \neq P'$. We first remark that G' clearly still generates \mathfrak{Q} , and hence we need only verify the Gröbner property. If $\text{lm}(P') = \text{lm}(P)$ then the Gröbner property is clearly still satisfied, so assume that $\text{lm}(P') \neq \text{lm}(P)$. This assumption means that

$\text{lm}(\text{plc}(P))$ was divisible by $\text{lm}(f_i)$ for some f_i . To see this, note that if this were not the case then by the definition of the division algorithm, $\text{lm}(r) = \text{lm}(\text{plc}(P))$, and hence $\text{lm}(P) = \text{lm}(P')$, contradicting our assumption. This means that $\text{lm}(P) = \text{lm}(\text{plc}(P)) \text{plm}(P)$ is divisible by some $\text{lm}(f_i)$. Hence any element $Q \in \mathfrak{Q}$ for which $\text{lm}(P) \mid \text{lm}(Q)$ also satisfies $\text{lm}(f_i) \mid \text{lm}(Q)$. It follows that G' is still a Gröbner basis, since P was redundant for the Gröbner basis property.

We keep repeating this procedure until no $P \in G \setminus A$ is changed by applying this reduction. This is clearly a finite process. Once we are done we thus find that for all $P \in G \setminus A$, $\text{lm}(\text{plc}(P))$ is not divisible by any $\text{lm}(f_i)$. Since the $\{f_1, \dots, f_m\}$ form a Gröbner basis for $\mathfrak{Q} \cap A$, this means that for all $P \in G \setminus A$, $\text{plc}(P) \notin \mathfrak{Q} \cap A$. \square

For any $\alpha \in \mathbb{C}^p$ there is a specialization map $q_\alpha : R \rightarrow D_n$ defined by

$$q_\alpha(P(s_1, \dots, s_p)) = P(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_p).$$

Notice that for any ideal $\mathfrak{Q} \subset R$ we have

$$(R/\mathfrak{Q}) \otimes_A (A/\mathfrak{m}_\alpha) \cong D_n/q_\alpha(\mathfrak{Q}),$$

where \mathfrak{m}_α denotes the maximal ideal corresponding to α .

Theorem 3.3 ([Ley01], Lemma 2.5). *Let $\mathfrak{Q} \subset R$ be an ideal, let \mathfrak{p} be an ideal of the ring A contained in \mathfrak{Q} , and let $G \subset \mathfrak{Q}$ be a Gröbner basis for \mathfrak{Q} with respect to the order (3). Let $h = \prod_{P \in G \setminus \mathfrak{p}} \text{plc}(P)$. Let $\alpha \in Z(\mathfrak{p}) \setminus Z(h)$. Then $q_\alpha(G \setminus \mathfrak{p})$ is a Gröbner basis for $q_\alpha(\mathfrak{Q})$ with respect to the order (2).*

Proof. Apply [Ley01] Lemma 2.5 without any y -parameters. \square

We remark that a statement similar to Theorem 3.3 also appeared in [Oak97], and that the comprehensive Gröbner bases from [KW91] can also be used to give a simple proof of this result.

Proof of Theorem B. Let G be a Gröbner basis for $\mathfrak{Q} = \mathfrak{J} + R\mathfrak{p}$ with respect to the order (3). By Lemma 3.2 we can assume that for all $P \in G \setminus A$,

$$\text{plc}(P) \notin \mathfrak{Q} \cap A = \mathfrak{p},$$

where this equality follows from Corollary 2.4.

Since $\mathfrak{Q} \cap A = \mathfrak{p}$, clearly we have $G \cap A \subset \mathfrak{p}$, and hence $G \cap \mathfrak{p} = G \cap A$, and hence also

$$G \setminus A = G \setminus \mathfrak{p}.$$

Putting the preceding two statements together we conclude that for all $P \in G \setminus \mathfrak{p}$, $\text{plc}(P) \notin \mathfrak{p}$. Since \mathfrak{p} is prime, this means that

$$h = \prod_{P \in G \setminus \mathfrak{p}} \text{plc}(P) \notin \mathfrak{p}$$

Since $G \cap \mathfrak{p} = G \cap A$, we have that $(G \setminus \mathfrak{p}) \cap A = \emptyset$, and hence for every $P \in G \setminus \mathfrak{p}$, $\text{plm}(P) \notin \mathbb{C}$. By choice of h , for all $\alpha \in Z(\mathfrak{p}) \setminus Z(h)$ and $P \in G \setminus \mathfrak{p}$, $\text{plm}(P) = \text{lm}(q_\alpha(P))$,

so that $q_\alpha(G \setminus \mathfrak{p})$ does not contain any units. Since this set is a Gröbner basis for $q_\alpha(\mathfrak{Q})$ by Theorem 3.3 we conclude that $D_n/q_\alpha(\mathfrak{Q}) \neq 0$.

Now notice that

$$\frac{D_n}{q_\alpha(\mathfrak{Q})} \cong \frac{R}{\mathfrak{Q}} \otimes_A \frac{A}{\mathfrak{m}_\alpha} \cong \left(\frac{R}{\mathfrak{J}} \otimes_A \frac{A}{\mathfrak{p}} \right) \otimes_A \frac{A}{\mathfrak{m}_\alpha} \cong \frac{R}{\mathfrak{J}} \otimes_A \frac{A}{\mathfrak{m}_\alpha},$$

which proves the claim. \square

Proof of Theorem A. We denote

$$M = \frac{D_n[s_1, \dots, s_p] f_1^{s_1} \dots f_p^{s_p}}{D_n[s_1, \dots, s_p] f_1^{s_1+1} \dots f_p^{s_p+1}}.$$

Then $B_F = \text{Ann}_A(M)$, and M is a cyclic $D_n[s_1, \dots, s_p]$ -module. Let $C \subset Z(B_F)$ be an irreducible component. By Theorem B there is an $h \in A$ which does not vanish identically on C such that for all $\alpha \in C \setminus Z(h)$, $M \otimes_A (A/\mathfrak{m}_\alpha) \neq 0$.

By Proposition 1.1 we conclude that

$$\text{Exp}(C \setminus Z(h)) \subset \mathcal{S}(F).$$

The map $\text{Exp} : \mathbb{C}^p \rightarrow (\mathbb{C}^*)^p$ is continuous for the analytic topology. In the analytic topology we have $\overline{C \setminus Z(h)} = C$, and hence

$$\text{Exp}(C) \subset \overline{\text{Exp}(C \setminus Z(h))} \subset \overline{\mathcal{S}(F)} = \mathcal{S}(F),$$

which is what we wanted to prove. \square

4. RELATIVELY HOLONOMIC MODULES

We keep the notation of the previous section and denote $A = \mathbb{C}[s_1, \dots, s_p]$, $R = D_n[s_1, \dots, s_p]$. In this section we investigate non-vanishing of the specialization under the assumption that the R -module M is relatively holonomic. To explain what this means we recall the following definitions. On R we have the *relative filtration*

$$F_p R := F_p D_n \otimes_{\mathbb{C}} \mathbb{C}[s_1, \dots, s_p],$$

where $F_p D_n$ is the usual order filtration. The associated graded ring can be identified with the ring of regular functions on $(T^*\mathbb{C}^n) \times \mathbb{C}^p$. Any coherent R -module can be equipped with a good filtration $F_\bullet M$ and this yields a $\text{gr}(R)$ -module $\text{gr}(M)$.

Definition 4.1. An R -module M is called relatively holonomic if

$$\text{Ch}^{\text{rel}}(M) := \text{supp}_{(T^*\mathbb{C}^n) \times \mathbb{C}^p}(\text{gr}(M)) = \bigcup_{i \in I} \Lambda_i \times S_i,$$

where the Λ_i are Lagrangian subvarieties of $T^*\mathbb{C}^n$ and the S_i are subvarieties of \mathbb{C}^p .

We will denote by $\pi_2 : (T^*\mathbb{C}^n) \times \mathbb{C}^p \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^p$ the second projection. It is a standard fact that $\text{Ch}^{\text{rel}}(M)$ does not depend on the chosen good filtration, and that it equals $Z(\sqrt{\text{Ann}_{\text{gr}(R)}(\text{gr}(M))})_{\text{red}}$. Moreover, the irreducible components of $\text{Ch}^{\text{rel}}(M)$ come equipped with well-defined multiplicities.

Proposition 4.2 ([BvVWZ21], Lemma 3.4.1). *If M is relatively holonomic, then $\pi_2(\text{Ch}^{\text{rel}}(M)) = Z(\text{Ann}_A(M))$.*

To analyse the specialization of relatively holonomic R -modules we will need the notion of purity and grade.

Definition 4.3. Let M be an R -module. The *grade* $j(M)$ of M is defined to be the least integer for which $\text{Ext}_R^i(M, R) \neq 0$. M is called *pure* if for every non-zero submodule $N \subset M$, $j(N) = j(M)$.

Proposition 4.4 ([Bjö93], A:IV.2.3). *For a short exact sequence $0 \rightarrow M_1 \rightarrow M_2 \rightarrow M_3 \rightarrow 0$ we have*

$$j(M_2) = \min\{j(M_1), j(M_3)\}.$$

Proposition 4.5. *If M is pure of grade k then there exists a good filtration F_\bullet on M such that $\text{gr}(M)$ has no embedded associated primes, and $\text{Ch}^{\text{rel}}(M)$ is purely $2n + p - k$ dimensional.*

Proof. By [Bjö93, A:IV:4.11] there exists a filtration F_\bullet on M such that $\text{gr}(M)$ is pure and $j(\text{gr}(M)) = j(M)$. By [Bjö93, A:IV:3.7], $\text{gr}(M)$ does not have embedded primes and $\dim(A_{\mathfrak{p}}) = j(M)$ for every minimal prime of $\text{gr}(M)$. This means that $\dim(Z(\mathfrak{p})) = \dim(A) - j(M) = 2n + p - j(M)$. \square

Corollary 4.6. *Let M be a pure R -module. Let $f \in A$ be such that $Z(f)$ does not contain a component of $Z(\text{Ann}_A(M))$. Then $f \in A$ is not a zero divisor on M .*

Proof. Chose a filtration on M such that $\text{gr}(M)$ has no embedded primes, using Proposition 4.5. This means that $f \in A$ is a zero divisor on $\text{gr}(M)$ if and only if $Z(f)$ contains a component of $\text{Ch}^{\text{rel}}(M)$. But by Proposition 4.2 this is equivalent to $Z(f)$ containing a component of $Z(\text{Ann}_A(M))$. Clearly f not being a zero divisor on $\text{gr}(M)$ implies that it is not a zero divisor on M . \square

Theorem 4.7 ([BvVWZ21]). *Suppose that M is pure, and let $f \in A$ be such that f is not contained in any minimal prime ideal containing $\text{Ann}_A(M)$. Then*

$$\text{Ch}^{\text{rel}}\left(M \otimes_A \frac{A}{(f)}\right) = \text{Ch}^{\text{rel}}(M) \cap Z(f).$$

In particular, if $Z(f) \cap Z(\text{Ann}_A(M)) \neq \emptyset$, then $M \otimes_A \frac{A}{(f)} \neq 0$.

Remark 4.8. This theorem implies that $M \otimes_A (A/(f))$ will be a relatively holonomic R -module, and the characteristic variety will be purely $2n + p - k - 1$ dimensional. However, in general it need not be pure, since the associated graded can have embedded primes.

We define

$$G = \bigcup_{\substack{N \subset M \\ j(N) > j(M)}} N.$$

We refer also to [Bjö93, A:IV:2] for a more general and detailed analysis of this construction and the following lemma.

Lemma 4.9. *G is a submodule of R with $j(G) > j(M)$.*

Proof. For the first claim we need only prove that if $g_1, g_2 \in G$, then also $g_1 + g_2 \in G$. It then suffices to show that if $N_1, N_2 \subset M$ are such that $j(N_1), j(N_2) > j(M)$, then also $j(N_1 + N_2) > j(M)$. There is an exact sequence

$$0 \rightarrow N_1 \rightarrow N_1 + N_2 \rightarrow \frac{N_2}{N_1 \cap N_2} \rightarrow 0,$$

so that by Proposition 4.4

$$j(N_1 + N_2) = \min\{j(N_1), j(N_2/(N_1 \cap N_2))\}.$$

But $j(N_2) = \min\{j(N_1 \cap N_2), j(N_2/(N_1 \cap N_2))\}$, which shows that $j(N_2/(N_1 \cap N_2)) \geq j(N_2)$. This means that $j(N_1 + N_2) \geq \min\{j(N_1), j(N_2)\} > j(M)$ which is what we wanted to prove.

Since M is finitely generated, there exist finitely many $N_1, \dots, N_q \subset M$ with $j(N_i) > j(M)$ such that $G = \sum_{i=1}^q N_i$. Using induction and the previous paragraph it then follows that $j(G) > j(M)$. \square

It follows that G can also be characterised as the largest submodule of M with grade larger than $j(M)$.

Definition 4.10. The *purification* of M is defined to be $M^p := M/G$.

Proposition 4.11. *M^p is a pure R -module of grade $j(M)$. If $\text{Ch}^{\text{rel}}(M) = \bigcup_{i \in I} \Lambda_i \times S_i$, then*

$$\text{Ch}^{\text{rel}}(M^p) = \bigcup_{\substack{i \in I \\ \dim(S_i) = 2n + p - j(M)}} \Lambda_i \times S_i.$$

In particular, $Z(\text{Ann}_A(M^p))$ is equal to the top-dimensional part of $Z(\text{Ann}_A(M))$.

Proof. $j(M) = j(M^p)$ follows from Lemma 4.9 and the equality

$$j(M) = \min\{j(G), j(M^p)\}.$$

The second claim now follows when we prove purity of M^p by comparing multiplicities of relative characteristic cycles and the last claim then follows from Proposition 4.2. Hence we need to prove that for every non-zero $H \subset M^p$, $j(H) = j(M^p)$. Denote by \tilde{H} the inverse image of H under the natural map $M \rightarrow M^p$. Then we have an exact sequence

$$0 \rightarrow G \rightarrow \tilde{H} \rightarrow H \rightarrow 0.$$

Since $H \neq 0$, $G \neq \tilde{H}$, and hence by definition of G , $j(\tilde{H}) \leq j(M) < j(G)$. Since $j(\tilde{H}) = \min\{j(G), j(H)\}$, we conclude that $j(\tilde{H}) = j(H)$. It follows that $j(H) \leq j(M) = j(M^p)$. Since $j(M^p) = \min\{j(H), j(M^p/H)\}$, we conclude that $j(H) = j(M^p)$. \square

proof of theorem E. Let $C \subset Z(\text{Ann}_A(M))$ be an irreducible component containing α . Denote by I_0 the ideal of functions vanishing on C . We define $M_0 := M \otimes_A \frac{A}{I_0}$. By Lemma 2.3 we know that $\text{Ann}_A(M_0) = I_0$, so that in particular $M_0 \neq 0$. M_0 is still relatively holonomic. If $I_0 = \mathfrak{m}_\alpha$ we are done.

If not, let $f \in \mathfrak{m}_\alpha \setminus I_0$. We know from Proposition 4.11 and Proposition 4.2 that $Z(\text{Ann}_A((M_0)^p)) = Z(I_0)$. By choice of f and the purity of $(M_0)^p$, Theorem 4.7 applies, so that

$$(M_0)^p \otimes_A \frac{A}{(f)} \neq 0,$$

and $\text{Ch}^{\text{rel}}((M_0)^p \otimes_A A/(f)) = \text{Ch}^{\text{rel}}((M_0)^p) \cap Z(f)$. Right exactness of the tensor product applied to the surjection $M_0 \rightarrow (M_0)^p$ means that also

$$M_1 := M_0 \otimes_A \frac{A}{(f)} = M \otimes_A \frac{A}{I_0 + (f)} \neq 0.$$

If $I_1 := I_0 + (f) = \mathfrak{m}_\alpha$ we are done.

If not, the surjection $M_1 \rightarrow (M_0)^p \otimes_A A/(f)$ shows that

$$\begin{aligned} Z(\text{Ann}_A(M_1)) &\supset Z(\text{Ann}_A((M_0)^p \otimes_A A/(f))) \\ &= \pi_2(\text{Ch}^{\text{rel}}((M_0)^p \otimes_A A/(f))) \\ &= \pi_2(\text{Ch}^{\text{rel}}((M_0)^p) \cap Z(f)) \ni \alpha. \end{aligned}$$

We can now iterate the whole previous procedure by applying it to M_1 rather than M . In this way we keep modding out M by larger and larger ideals, all included in \mathfrak{m}_α , and hence this process is finite and eventually proves that $M \otimes_A (A/\mathfrak{m}_\alpha) \neq 0$. \square

5. DIAGONAL SPECIALIZATION OF BERNSTEIN-SATO IDEALS

We continue to denote $A = \mathbb{C}[s_1, \dots, s_p]$, $R = D_n[s_1, \dots, s_p]$. Let $f_1, \dots, f_p \in \mathbb{C}[x_1, \dots, x_n]$, and denote $f = \prod_{i=1}^p f_i$. We denote $\mathcal{O}_X = \mathbb{C}[x_1, \dots, x_n]$. Then we consider the R -module $N_F = \mathcal{O}_X[s_1, \dots, s_p, f^{-1}]f_1^{s_1} \dots f_p^{s_p}$ and the $D_n[s]$ -module $N_f = \mathcal{O}_X[s, f^{-1}]f^s$. We denote $F^s = f_1^{s_1} \dots f_p^{s_p} \in N_F$. On N_F there is a D_n -linear map $\nabla_F : N_F \rightarrow N_F$ which maps

$$g(x_1, \dots, x_n, s_1, \dots, s_p)F^s \mapsto g(x_1, \dots, x_n, s_1 + 1, \dots, s_p + 1)fF^s.$$

Similarly, there is the D_n -linear map $\nabla_f : N_f \rightarrow N_f$ mapping

$$g(x_1, \dots, x_n, s)f^s \mapsto g(x_1, \dots, x_n, s + 1)ff^s.$$

We denote $M_F = RF^s \subset N_F$, $M_f = D_n[s]f^s \subset N_f$. Clearly $\nabla_F(M_F) \subset M_F$ and $\nabla(M_f) \subset M_f$.

We denote by $\eta : R \rightarrow D_n[s]$ the map

$$P(s_1, \dots, s_p) \mapsto P(s),$$

and by $\eta_F : N_F \rightarrow N_f$ the map

$$g(x_1, \dots, x_n, s_1, \dots, s_p)F^s \mapsto g(x_1, \dots, x_n, s, \dots, s)f^s.$$

- Proposition 5.1.** (1) η is a surjective map of rings with kernel equal to $I_\Delta R$, where I_Δ is the ideal defining the diagonal in \mathbb{C}^p .
- (2) η_F is R -linear when N_f is given the structure of an R -module via η .
- (3) η_F is surjective, and the kernel is equal to $I_\Delta \mathcal{O}_X[s_1, \dots, s_p, f^{-1}]F^S$, where I_Δ is the ideal defining the diagonal in \mathbb{C}^p .
- (4) For every $k > 0$, $\eta_F|_{\nabla^k(M_F)} : \nabla^k(M_F) \rightarrow N_F$ has image equal to $\nabla_f^k(M_f)$, and kernel equal to $\ker \eta_F \cap \nabla^k(M_F)$.
- (5) η_F induces a surjective R -linear map $\widetilde{\eta}_F : M_F/\nabla_F(M_F) \rightarrow M_f/\nabla_f(M_f)$. The class of $P(s_1, \dots, s_p)F^s$ in $M_F/\nabla_F(M_F)$ maps to zero under $\widetilde{\eta}_F$ if and only if

$$P(s_1, \dots, s_p)F^s \in \nabla_F(M_F) + \ker \eta_F \cap M_F$$

Proof. (1) is clear. For (2) it is enough to prove that $\eta_F(\partial_i F^S) = \partial_i \eta_F(F^S)$. This is an easy computation. The surjectivity in (3) is clear. Suppose that

$$g(x_1, \dots, x_n, s_1, \dots, s_p)F^s \in \ker \eta_F,$$

where $g(x_1, \dots, x_n, s_1, \dots, s_p) \in \mathcal{O}_X[s_1, \dots, s_p, f^{-1}]$. This means that

$$g(x_1, \dots, x_n, s, \dots, s)f^s = 0, \text{ i.e. } g(x_1, \dots, x_n, s, \dots, s) = 0,$$

where the last equality is an equality in $\mathcal{O}_X[s, f^{-1}]$. This means that $(X \setminus Z(f)) \times \Delta \subset Z(g)$. Multiply g by the smallest power of f to clear denominators to obtain $h \in \mathcal{O}_X[s_1, \dots, s_p]$, now with $X \times \Delta \subset Z(h)$. The ideal defining $X \times \Delta$ in $X \times \mathbb{C}^p$ is $I_\Delta \mathcal{O}_X[s_1, \dots, s_p]$. It follows that $h \in I_\Delta \mathcal{O}_X[s_1, \dots, s_p]$, and hence $g \in I_\Delta \mathcal{O}_X[s_1, \dots, s_p, f^{-1}]$. In (4) only the claim that the image is equal to $\nabla_f^k(M_f)$ requires a proof. Let $\nabla^k(P(s_1, \dots, s_p)F^s) \in \nabla_F^k(M_F)$. Now:

$$\nabla_F^k(P(s_1, \dots, s_p)F^s) = P(s_1 + k, \dots, s_p + k)f^k F^s,$$

so that by R -linearity of η_F ,

$$\eta_F(\nabla_F^k(P(s_1, \dots, s_p)F^s)) = P(s + k, \dots, s + k)f^k f^s = \nabla_f^k(P(s, \dots, s)f^s) \in \nabla_f^k(M_f).$$

On the other hand,

$$\nabla_f^k(P(s)f^s) = P(s + k)f^k f^s = \eta_F(P(s_1 + k)f^k F^s) = \eta_F(\nabla_F^k(P(s_1)F^s)).$$

In (5) the existence of $\widetilde{\eta}_F$ follows from (4). If $P(s_1, \dots, s_p)F^s \in \nabla_F(M_F) + \ker \eta_F \cap M_F$ then clearly it maps to zero under $\widetilde{\eta}_F$. On the other hand, suppose that $P(s_1, \dots, s_p)F^s$ maps to zero under $\widetilde{\eta}_F$. This means that

$$\eta_F(P(s_1, \dots, s_1)F^s) \in \nabla_f(M_f).$$

But $\nabla_F(M_F)$ surjects onto $\nabla_f(M_f)$ under η_F by (4), so that

$$\eta_F(P(s_1, \dots, s_1)F^s) = \eta_F(\nabla_F(Q(s_1, \dots, s_p)F^s)),$$

for some $Q(s_1, \dots, s_p) \in R$. This means that

$$P(s_1, \dots, s_p)F^s - \nabla_F(Q(s_1, \dots, s_p)F^s) =: T \in \ker \eta_F,$$

Now note that $\nabla_F(Q(s_1, \dots, s_p)F^S) \in M_F$ since $\nabla_F(M_F) \subset M_F$, so that also $T \in \ker \eta_F \cap M_F$. This concludes the proof since

$$P(s_1, \dots, s_p)F^S = \nabla_F(Q(s_1, \dots, s_p)F^S) + T \in \nabla_F(M_F) + \ker \eta_F \cap M_F.$$

□

proof of theorem F. We continue to denote the ideal defining the diagonal in \mathbb{C}^p by $I_\Delta \subset \mathbb{C}[s_1, \dots, s_p]$. Consider the exact sequence

$$0 \rightarrow \frac{\ker \eta_F \cap M_F + \nabla_F(M_F)}{\nabla_F(M_F)} \rightarrow \frac{M_F}{\nabla_F(M_F)} \rightarrow \frac{M_f}{\nabla_f(M_f)} \rightarrow 0,$$

where we use Proposition 5, (5). It follows from Proposition 5, (3) that

$$I_\Delta \frac{M_F}{\nabla_F(M_F)} = \frac{I_\Delta M_F + \nabla_F(M_F)}{\nabla_F(M_F)} \subset \frac{\ker \eta_F \cap M_F + \nabla_F(M_F)}{\nabla_F(M_F)}.$$

We conclude that we have an exact sequence

$$0 \rightarrow \frac{\ker \eta_F \cap M_F + \nabla_F(M_F)}{I_\Delta(M_F) + \nabla_F(M_F)} \rightarrow \frac{M_F}{I_\Delta(M_F) + \nabla_F(M_F)} \rightarrow \frac{M_f}{\nabla_f(M_f)} \rightarrow 0.$$

Let $b \in B_F$, and let $P \in R$ be such that

$$(6) \quad bF^S = PfF^S.$$

Let $T \in \ker \eta_F \cap M_F + \nabla_F(M_F)$. Write

$$T = g(x_1, \dots, x_n, s_1, \dots, s_p)f^{-k}F^S + \nabla_F(W),$$

for some $k \in \mathbb{Z}$, with the first summand in $\ker \eta_F \cap M_F$ and the second summand in $\nabla_F(M_F)$. From Proposition 5.1, (3), we know that $g \in I_\Delta \mathcal{O}_X[s_1, \dots, s_p]$. Then we observe:

$$\begin{aligned} \nabla_F^{-k}(b(s))T &= g(x_1, \dots, x_n, s_1, \dots, s_p)\nabla_F^{-k}(b(s))f^{-k}F^S + \nabla_F^{-k}(b(s))\nabla_F(W) \\ &= g(x_1, \dots, x_n, s_1, \dots, s_p)\nabla_F^{-k}(P)f^{-k+1}F^S + \nabla_F^{-k}(b(s))\nabla_F(W), \end{aligned}$$

where we use (6) after substituting $s = s - k$ and we abuse notation by also denoting

$$\nabla_F : R \rightarrow R, \quad P(s_1, \dots, s_p) \mapsto P(s_1 + 1, \dots, s_p + 1).$$

Iterating this it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \prod_{i=1}^k \nabla_F^{-i}(b)T &= g(x_1, \dots, x_n, s_1, \dots, s_p)\nabla_F^{-1}(P) \dots \nabla_F^{-k}(P)F^S + \prod_{i=1}^k \nabla_F^{-i}(b)\nabla_F(W) \\ &= QF^S + \nabla_F\left(\prod_{i=0}^{k-1} \nabla_F^{-i}(b)W\right), \end{aligned}$$

where $Q = g(x_1, \dots, x_n, s_1, \dots, s_p)\nabla_F^{-1}(P) \dots \nabla_F^{-k}(P) \in I_\Delta R$. It follows that

$$\prod_{i=1}^k \nabla_F^{-i}(b)T \in I_\Delta(M_F) + \nabla_F(M_F).$$

Since $\ker \eta_F \cap M_F + \nabla_F(M_F)$ is finitely generated, there exists a $k \gg 0$ such that

$$\prod_{i=1}^k \nabla_F^{-i}(b) \frac{\ker \eta_F \cap M_F + \nabla_F(M_F)}{I_\Delta(M_F) + \nabla_F(M_F)} = 0.$$

Since this is true for every $b \in B_F$, we conclude that

$$\operatorname{supp}_{\mathbb{C}P} \left(\frac{\ker \eta_F \cap M_F + \nabla_F(M_F)}{I_\Delta(M_F) + \nabla_F(M_F)} \right) \subset \bigcup_{i>0} \nabla^i(Z(B_F)).$$

Taking $\alpha \in (Z(B_F) \cap \Delta) \setminus \bigcup_{i>0} \nabla^i(Z(B_F))$ we thus find

$$0 \rightarrow \frac{M_F}{\nabla_F(M_F)} \otimes_A \frac{A}{\mathfrak{m}_\alpha} \rightarrow \frac{M_f}{\nabla_f(M_f)} \otimes_A \frac{A}{\mathfrak{m}_\alpha} \rightarrow 0,$$

is an isomorphism. The left hand side is non-zero by Theorem E, since we know from [Mai16] that $M_F/\nabla_F(M_F)$ is relatively holonomic, which proves the claim. \square

REFERENCES

- [Bat20] Daniel Bath. A Note on Bernstein-Sato Varieties for Tame Divisors and Arrangements. *arXiv e-prints*, page arXiv:2008.07447, August 2020.
- [Bjö93] Jan-Erik Björk. *Analytic D-modules and Applications*. Springer Netherlands, 1st edition, 1993.
- [BLSW17] Nero Budur, Yongqiang Liu, Luis Saumell, and Botong Wang. Cohomology Support Loci of Local Systems. *Michigan Mathematical Journal*, 66(2):295–307, 06 2017.
- [Bud15] Nero Budur. Bernstein-Sato ideals and local systems. *Annales de l'Institut Fourier*, 65(2):549–603, 2015.
- [BvVWZ21] Nero Budur, Robin van der Veer, Lei Wu, and Peng Zhou. Zero loci of Bernstein–Sato ideals. *Inventiones mathematicae*, pages 1432–1297, 2021.
- [CLO15] David A. Cox, John Little, and Donal O’Shea. *Ideals, Varieties, and Algorithms: An Introduction to Computational Algebraic Geometry and Commutative Algebra*. Springer Publishing Company, 4th edition, 2015.
- [KW91] H. Kredel and V. Weispfenning. Parametric gröbner bases for non-commutative polynomials. In *Computer Algebra in Physical Research, Memorial Volume for N N Govorun Proceedings of the IV International Conference*, pages 236–244. World Scientific, 1991.
- [Ley01] Anton Leykin. Constructibility of the Set of Polynomials with a Fixed Bernstein–Sato Polynomial: an Algorithmic Approach. *Journal of Symbolic Computation*, 32(6):663 – 675, 2001.
- [Mai16] Philippe Maisonobe. Filtration Relative, l’Idéal de Bernstein et ses pentes. *arXiv e-prints*, page arXiv:1610.03354, October 2016.
- [Oak97] Toshinori Oaku. Algorithms for the b-function and D-modules associated with a polynomial. *Journal of Pure and Applied Algebra*, 117-118:495 – 518, 1997.
- [Sab90] Claude Sabbah. Modules d’Alexander et \mathcal{D} -modules. *Duke Mathematical Journal*, 60(3):729 – 814, 1990.
- [Wu20] Lei Wu. Bernstein-Sato ideals and hyperplane arrangements. *arXiv e-prints*, page arXiv:2005.13502, May 2020.

ROBIN VAN DER VEER, KU LEUVEN, DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, CELESTIJNENLAAN 200B
BUS 2400, B-3001 LEUVEN, BELGIUM

Email address: `robin.vanderveer@kuleuven.be`