

THE ASYMPTOTIC SAMUEL FUNCTION AND INVARIANTS OF SINGULARITIES

A. BENITO, A. BRAVO, S. ENCINAS

ABSTRACT. The asymptotic Samuel function generalizes to arbitrary rings the usual order function of a regular local ring. In this paper, we use this function to define the *Samuel slope* of a Noetherian local ring, and we study some of its properties. In addition, we focus on the case of a local ring at singular point of a variety, and, among other results, we prove that the Samuel slope of these rings is related to some invariants used in algorithmic resolution of singularities.

1. INTRODUCTION

The *asymptotic Samuel function* was first introduced by Samuel in [28] and studied afterwards by D. Rees in a series of papers ([24], [25], [26], [27]). Thorough expositions on this topic can be found in [22] and [30]. Here we explore how this function can be used to study singularities and, more precisely, to define refinements of the multiplicity.

Suppose A is a commutative ring with unit 1, and let $I \subset A$ be a proper ideal. For each $f \in A$, consider the value $\nu_I(f) = \sup\{\ell \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{\infty\} \mid f \in I^\ell\}$. Observe that for $f, g \in A$ we have $\nu_I(f + g) \geq \min\{\nu_I(f), \nu_I(g)\}$ and $\nu_I(f \cdot g) \geq \nu_I(f) + \nu_I(g)$. In particular, for $m \in \mathbb{N}$, $\nu_I(f^m) \geq m\nu_I(f)$ and the inequality could be strict.

The *asymptotic Samuel function at I* , $\bar{\nu}_I : A \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \cup \{\infty\}$, is a normalized version of ν_I , and is defined as:

$$(1.0.1) \quad \bar{\nu}_I(f) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\nu_I(f^n)}{n}, \quad f \in A.$$

It can be shown that this limit exists in $\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \cup \{\infty\}$, and in fact, when A is Noetherian the limit exists in $\mathbb{Q}_{\geq 0} \cup \{\infty\}$. Moreover, it can be proven that $\bar{\nu}_I(f^m) = m\bar{\nu}_I(f)$. When (A, \mathfrak{m}) is a local regular ring, $\bar{\nu}_{\mathfrak{m}}$ is just the ordinary order function at the maximal ideal of A , in which case we just write $\nu_{\mathfrak{m}}$.

To have an intuitive insight about this function, one can say that it measures how deep a given element lies into the integral closure of an ideal. More precisely, it can be shown that if A is a Noetherian ring, then

$$\bar{\nu}_I(f) \geq \frac{a}{b} \iff f^b \in \overline{I^a}.$$

For each ideal $I \subset A$, $\bar{\nu}_I$ defines a natural graduation by considering the sets:

$$I^{(\geq r)} := \{a \in A : \bar{\nu}_I(a) \geq r\}, \quad I^{(> r)} := \{a \in A : \bar{\nu}_I(a) > r\},$$

for $r \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ (see [22]).

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification*. 13B22, 14E15, 13H15.

Key words and phrases. Singularities; Rees Algebras; Integral Closure; Asymptotic Samuel Function.

The authors were partially supported by PGC2018-095392-B-I00; The second author was partially supported from the Spanish Ministry of Economy and Competitiveness, through the ‘‘Severo Ochoa’’ Programme for Centres of Excellence in R&D (SEV-2015-0554).

To start with, we will be interested in studying this graduation in the particular case of a Noetherian local ring (A, \mathfrak{m}, k) in which $I = \mathfrak{m}$ is the maximal ideal. Observe that there is a natural map

$$\lambda_{\mathfrak{m}} : \mathfrak{m}/\mathfrak{m}^2 \rightarrow \mathfrak{m}^{(\geq 1)}/\mathfrak{m}^{(>1)}.$$

When (A, \mathfrak{m}, k) is regular, $\lambda_{\mathfrak{m}}$ is an isomorphism. We will focus in the case of non regular local rings: if (A, \mathfrak{m}, k) is not regular, then $\ker(\lambda_{\mathfrak{m}})$ might be non trivial, and the dimension of $\ker(\lambda_{\mathfrak{m}})$ as a k -vector space is an invariant. We will see that this dimension is bounded above by the *excess of embedding dimension of (A, \mathfrak{m})* , $\text{exc-emb-dim}(A, \mathfrak{m})$, i.e.,

$$0 \leq \dim_k(\ker(\lambda_{\mathfrak{m}})) \leq \text{exc-emb-dim}(A, \mathfrak{m}) := \dim_k(\mathfrak{m}/\mathfrak{m}^2) - \dim(A),$$

where $\dim(A)$ denotes the Krull dimension of the ring A .

Local non regular rings where the upper bound is not achieved seem to have milder singularities than the others (in some sense that will be clarified below). Local rings for which the later inequality is an equality will be referred as to being in the *extremal case*, otherwise we will say that (A, \mathfrak{m}) is in the *non-extremal case*.

Suppose that (A, \mathfrak{m}) is in the extremal case and set $t = \text{exc-emb-dim}(A, \mathfrak{m}) > 0$. We will say that the elements $\gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_t \in \mathfrak{m}$ form a $\lambda_{\mathfrak{m}}$ -sequence if their classes in $\mathfrak{m}/\mathfrak{m}^2$ form a basis of $\ker(\lambda_{\mathfrak{m}})$. Then, we define the *Samuel Slope of (A, \mathfrak{m})* , $\mathcal{S}\text{-Sl}(A)$, as

$$\mathcal{S}\text{-Sl}(A) := \sup_{\lambda_{\mathfrak{m}}\text{-sequence}} \{ \min \{ \bar{\nu}_{\mathfrak{m}}(\gamma_1), \dots, \bar{\nu}_{\mathfrak{m}}(\gamma_t) \} \},$$

where the supremum is taken over all the $\lambda_{\mathfrak{m}}$ -sequences of (A, \mathfrak{m}) . To have an intuition of what this invariant means, we will see that when (A, \mathfrak{m}) is in the extremal case, it can be proved that \mathfrak{m} has a reduction generated by $d = \dim(A)$ elements, $\kappa_1, \dots, \kappa_d$. In addition we have that

$$\langle \bar{\kappa}_1, \dots, \bar{\kappa}_d \rangle \oplus \ker(\lambda_{\mathfrak{m}}) = \mathfrak{m}/\mathfrak{m}^2.$$

In this situation, the Samuel Slope of (A, \mathfrak{m}) measures how deep the ideals generated by $\lambda_{\mathfrak{m}}$ -sequences lie into the integral closure of powers of \mathfrak{m} . If (A, \mathfrak{m}) is in the non-extremal case, then we set $\mathcal{S}\text{-Sl}(A) := 1$.

We will be specially interested in the case in which (A, \mathfrak{m}) is the local ring of a singular point ζ in an equidimensional variety X defined over a perfect field. Among other results, we will show that $\mathcal{S}\text{-Sl}(\mathcal{O}_{X, \zeta})$ is related to some resolution invariants defined over perfect fields introduced by the first author and O.E. Villamayor U. (see [5] and [6]). In particular, these invariants were used by the same authors in [4] to prove resolution of singularities of surfaces over perfect fields. We give more details in the paragraphs to come.

Simplifications of the multiplicity

Let X be an equidimensional algebraic variety of dimension d defined over a perfect field k . If X is not regular, then the set of points of maximum multiplicity, $\underline{\text{Max}} \text{mult}_X$, is a closed proper set in X . We will denote by $\max \text{mult}_X$ the maximum value of the multiplicity at points of X . A *simplification of the multiplicity* of X is a finite sequence of blow ups,

$$(1.0.2) \quad X = X_0 \xleftarrow{\pi_1} X_1 \xleftarrow{\pi_2} \dots \xleftarrow{\pi_{L-1}} X_{L-1} \xleftarrow{\pi_L} X_L$$

with

$$\max \text{mult}_{X_0} = \max \text{mult}_{X_1} = \dots = \max \text{mult}_{X_{L-1}} > \max \text{mult}_{X_L},$$

where $\pi_i : X_i \rightarrow X_{i-1}$ is the blow up at a regular center contained in $\underline{\text{Max}} \text{mult}_{X_{i-1}}$.

Simplifications of the multiplicity exists if the characteristic of k is zero (see [35]), and resolution of singularities follows from there. The centers in the sequence (1.0.2) are determined by resolution functions. These are upper semi-continuous functions

$$f_{X_i} : \begin{array}{ccc} X_i & \rightarrow & (\Gamma, \geq) \\ \zeta & \mapsto & f_{X_i}(\zeta) \end{array}, \quad i = 0, \dots, L-1$$

and their maximum value, $\max f_{X_i}$, achieved in a closed regular subset $\underline{\text{Max}} f_{X_i} \subseteq \underline{\text{Max}} \text{mult}_{X_i}$, selects the center to blow up. Hence, a simplification of the multiplicity of X , $X \leftarrow X_L$, is defined as a sequence of blow ups at regular centers.

$$(1.0.3) \quad X = X_0 \leftarrow X_1 \leftarrow \dots \leftarrow X_L.$$

so that

$$\max f_{X_0} > \max f_{X_1} > \dots > \max f_{X_L},$$

where $\max f_{X_i}$ denotes the maximum value of f_{X_i} for $i = 0, 1, \dots, L$.

Usually, f_X is defined at each point as a sequence of rational numbers. The first coordinate of f_X is the multiplicity, and the second is what we refer to as *Hironaka's order function in dimension d* , $\text{ord}_X^{(d)}$, where d is the dimension of X . The function $\text{ord}_X^{(d)}$ is a positive rational number. At a given singular point $\zeta \in X$, $f_X(\zeta)$ would look as follows:

$$(1.0.4) \quad f_X(\zeta) = (\text{mult}_{\mathfrak{m}_\zeta}(\mathcal{O}_{X,\zeta}), \text{ord}_X^{(d)}(\zeta), \dots) \in \mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{Q}^r,$$

where $\text{mult}_{\mathfrak{m}_\zeta}(\mathcal{O}_{X,\zeta})$ denotes the multiplicity of the local ring $\mathcal{O}_{X,\zeta}$ at the maximal ideal \mathfrak{m}_ζ . The remaining coordinates of $f_X(\zeta)$ can be shown to depend on $\text{ord}_X^{(d)}(\zeta)$, thus, we usually say that this is the main invariant in constructive resolution. Therefore, the last set of coordinates can be thought as a *refinement of the function $\text{ord}_X^{(d)}$* .

To give an idea of how the function $\text{ord}_X^{(d)}$ is defined, let us consider the case of a hypersurface.

Example 1.1. Let k be a perfect field, let S be a smooth k -algebra of dimension d and define $R = S[x]$ as the polynomial ring in one variable with coefficients in S . Suppose X is a hypersurface in $\text{Spec}(R)$ of maximum multiplicity $m > 1$ given by an equation of the form

$$f(x) = x^m + a_1 x^{m-1} + \dots + a_m \in S[x].$$

Set $\beta : \text{Spec}(R) \rightarrow \text{Spec}(S)$ and let $\zeta \in X$ be a point of multiplicity m . Then one can define a Rees algebra, \mathcal{R} , on S , which we refer to as *elimination algebra*, that collects information on the coefficients $a_i \in S$, $i = 1, \dots, m$. Hironaka's order function at the point ζ is defined using \mathcal{R} (see Section 6).

If the characteristic of the field k does not divide m , then, after a translation on the variable x , we can assume that the equation is on Tschirnhausen form:

$$(x')^m + a'_2 (x')^{m-2} + \dots + a'_m \in S[x].$$

And, in such case, it can be shown that:

$$(1.1.1) \quad \text{ord}_X^{(d)}(\zeta) := \text{ord}_\zeta(\mathcal{R}) = \min_{i=2, \dots, m} \left\{ \frac{\nu_{\beta(\zeta)}(a'_i)}{i} \right\},$$

where $\nu_{\beta(\zeta)}$ denotes the usual order at the regular local ring $S_{\mathfrak{m}_{\beta(\zeta)}}$.

As it turns out, with the information provided by the elimination algebra \mathcal{R} , which is generated by *weighted functions* on the coefficients of $f(x)$, one has all the information needed to find a simplification of the multiplicity, at least in the characteristic zero case. Observe that this example takes care of the case in which X is locally a hypersurface at a singular point ζ , since, after considering a suitable étale neighborhood of X at ζ , it can be assumed that X is in the situation described before.

Example 1.2. The previous example can be, somehow, generalized to the case of an arbitrary equidimensional algebraic variety X of dimension d . In [35], it is proven that, locally (in an étale neighborhood) of a closed point ξ of maximum multiplicity $m > 0$, one can find a smooth k -algebra S of dimension d and polynomials with coefficients in S ,

$$(1.2.1) \quad f_1(x_1), \dots, f_e(x_e) \in R = S[x_1, \dots, x_e],$$

of degrees m_1, \dots, m_e , defining hypersurfaces of maximum multiplicity m_i , $H_i = \{f_i = 0\}$, so that:

$$(1.2.2) \quad \underline{\text{Max}} \text{ mult}_X = \bigcap_i \underline{\text{Max}} \text{ mult}_{H_i}.$$

In fact, the link between X and the hypersurfaces H_i is stronger as we will see in Section 4.

As in the previous example, Hironaka's order function, $\text{ord}_X^{(d)}$, is defined by constructing an *elimination algebra*, \mathcal{R} on S , again using certain weighted functions on the coefficients of the polynomials $f_i(x_i)$ (see Section 6).

The spirit of the description of the maximum multiplicity locus in Example 1.2 parallels Hironaka's strategy on the use of idealistic exponents to describe the maximum stratum of the Hilbert Samuel function [19, 20].

The case of algebraic varieties over perfect fields of characteristic $p > 0$

Suppose now that k is a perfect field of positive characteristic $p > 0$. If X is a hypersurface, as in Example 1.1, we can define an elimination algebra \mathcal{R} using the coefficients of the polynomial in the presentation. Thus we can define the function $\text{ord}_X^{(d)}$ too. However, if p divides m , then, in general, the equality (1.1.1) does not hold (even if, by chance, the polynomial were in Tschirnhausen form).

Philosophically speaking, the elimination algebra \mathcal{R} collects information about the coefficients of $f(x)$, but somehow falls short in collecting *the sufficient amount of information* when the characteristic is positive. This problem motivated in part the papers [5] and [6]. There, the function $\text{H-ord}_X^{(d)}$ was introduced by the first author in collaboration with O. Villamayor.

Example 1.3. Using the same notation and setting as in Example 1.1, suppose now the characteristic of k is $p > 0$, and that in addition:

$$f(x) = x^{p^\ell} + a_1 x^{p^\ell - 1} + \dots + a_{p^\ell} \in S[x].$$

Let ζ be a point of multiplicity p^ℓ . Then it can be proved that

$$\text{ord}_X^{(d)}(\zeta) \leq \frac{\nu_{\beta(\zeta)}(a_i)}{i}, \quad i = 1, \dots, p^\ell - 1.$$

But there are examples where

$$\frac{\nu_{\beta(\zeta)}(a_{p^\ell})}{p^\ell} < \text{ord}_X^{(d)}(\zeta),$$

and the inequality remains even after considering translations of the form $x' = x + s$, $s \in S_{\mathfrak{q}}$, where $\mathfrak{q} = \mathfrak{m}_{\beta(\zeta)}$. And this pathology is part of the reasons why the resolution strategy (that works in characteristic zero) cannot be extended to the positive characteristic case.

This motivates the definition of the slope of $f(x)$ at ζ as:

$$Sl(f(x))(\zeta) = \min \left\{ \frac{\nu_{\beta(\zeta)}(a_{p^\ell})}{p^\ell}, \text{ord}_X^{(d)}(\zeta) \right\}.$$

Changes of variables of the form $x = x' + s$ with $s \in S_{\mathfrak{q}}$ produce changes on the coefficients of the equation:

$$(1.3.1) \quad f(x') = (x')^{p^\ell} + a'_1 (x')^{p^\ell - 1} + \dots + a'_{p^\ell}$$

which may lead to a different value of the slope. However, it is possible to construct an invariant from these numbers by setting:

$$\text{H-ord}_X^{(d)}(\zeta) := \sup_{s \in S_q} \{Sl(f(x+s))(\zeta)\}.$$

Moreover this supremum is a maximum since there is a change of variables as in (1.3.1) for which

$$\text{H-ord}_X^{(d)}(\zeta) = \min \left\{ \frac{\nu_{\beta(\zeta)}(a'_{p^\ell})}{p^\ell}, \text{ord}_X^{(d)}(\zeta) \right\}.$$

Our results say, among other things, that when $\text{H-ord}_X^{(d)}(\zeta) = \frac{\nu_{\beta(\zeta)}(a'_{p^\ell})}{p^\ell}$ we can read this value using the Samuel slope of the local ring $\mathcal{O}_{X,\zeta}$.

The $\text{H-ord}_X^{(d)}$ can be defined for any hypersurface with maximum multiplicity m , even when m is not a p -th power. Moreover, if X is an arbitrary algebraic variety defined over a perfect field, as in Example 1.2, then the $\text{H-ord}_X^{(d)}$ can be defined using the polynomials $f_i(x_i)$ defining the hypersurfaces H_i in (1.2.2). Precise details and definitions will be given in Section 7.

Results

For a given singular point $\zeta \in X$ to compute the value $\text{H-ord}_X^{(d)}(\zeta)$ one needs to find a presentation of the maximum multiplicity as in (1.2.2) that uses the polynomials in (1.2.1). The value $\text{H-ord}_X^{(d)}(\zeta)$ codifies information from the coefficients of these polynomials that only depends on the inclusion $S \subset R$ in (1.2.1), in other words, it codifies information that does not change after translation on the variables x_i by elements in S .

Notice that the definition of this function $\text{H-ord}_X^{(d)}$ requires the use of local (étale) embeddings, the selection of sufficiently general finite projections to smooth schemes, and the construction of local presentations of the multiplicity as in Example 1.2. Neither of these choices is unique. As a consequence, some work has to be done to show that the values of the function do not depend on any of these different choices.

In this paper we show that the value $\text{H-ord}_X^{(d)}(\zeta)$ can be read from the arc space of X combined with the use of the Samuel slope of the local ring at ζ (see (1.0.1)). In particular, no étale extensions and no local embeddings into smooth schemes are needed: the information is already present in the cotangent space at ζ , $\mathfrak{m}_\zeta/\mathfrak{m}_\zeta^2$, and the space of arcs in X with center at ζ , $\mathcal{L}(X, \zeta)$.

More precisely, on the one hand, the value $\text{ord}_X^{(d)}(\zeta)$ can be read studying the Nash multiplicity sequences of arcs in X with center ζ (this was studied in [8] by the last two authors in collaboration with B. Pascual-Escudero). On the other hand, a careful study of the asymptotic Samuel function of the local ring $\mathcal{O}_{X,\zeta}$ will lead us to a classification of the singular points depending on the dimension of $\ker(\lambda_{\mathfrak{m}_\zeta})$. Then we will see that the value $\text{H-ord}_X^{(d)}(\zeta)$ can be read using the Samuel slope of the local ring and the value $\text{ord}_X^{(d)}(\zeta)$.

First observe that, if $\zeta \in X$ is a singular point, then the embedding dimension of X at ζ is strictly larger than $d_\zeta = \dim(\mathcal{O}_{X,\zeta})$. Let us say that $\dim_{k(\zeta)}(\mathfrak{m}_\zeta/\mathfrak{m}_\zeta^2) = d_\zeta + t_\zeta$ with $t_\zeta > 0$. To ease the notation set $\lambda_\zeta = \lambda_{\mathfrak{m}_\zeta}$. To start with, we will show that any minimal set of generators of \mathfrak{m}_ζ contains at least d_ζ elements with asymptotic Samuel function equal to one. In other words:

Proposition 3.2. *Let X be a equidimensional algebraic variety of dimension d defined over a perfect field k , and let $\zeta \in X$ be a point of multiplicity $m > 1$ with local ring $(\mathcal{O}_{X,\zeta}, \mathfrak{m}_\zeta, k(\zeta))$. Suppose that the embedding dimension at ζ is $(d_\zeta + t_\zeta)$ for some $t_\zeta > 0$. Then:*

$$0 \leq \dim_{k(\zeta)} \ker(\lambda_\zeta) \leq t_\zeta.$$

This result leads us to distinguishing two cases depending on whether the upper bound for the dimension of the kernel is reached or not.

The non-extremal case: $\dim_{k(\zeta)} \ker(\lambda_\zeta) < t_\zeta$.

We will see that in this case, necessarily $\text{H-ord}_X^{(d)}(\zeta) = 1$. In fact, we can show that a stronger statement holds:

Theorem 8.2. *Let X be an equidimensional algebraic variety of dimension d defined over a perfect field k and let $\zeta \in X$ be a point of multiplicity $m > 1$.*

If ζ is in the non-extremal case, then $\text{H-ord}_X^{(d)}(\zeta) = 1$. Thus,

$$\mathcal{S}\text{-Sl}(\mathcal{O}_{X,\zeta}) = \text{H-ord}_X^{(d)}(\zeta) = 1.$$

Moreover, if ζ is a closed point, then $\text{ord}_X^{(d)}(\zeta) = 1$.

We give an idea of the meaning of this result in the following lines. When the characteristic is zero, the description of the maximum multiplicity locus of X in Example 1.2 goes far beyond equality (1.2.2). From that equality it can be proven that to lower the maximum multiplicity of X it suffices to work with the elimination algebra \mathcal{R} (which is defined on a smooth scheme of dimension d). In other words, a simplification of the multiplicity of the d -dimension variety X becomes a problem about *finding a resolution* of a Rees algebra defined on a smooth d -dimensional scheme (see Sections 4 and 6). If $\text{ord}_X^{(d)}(\zeta) = 1$, then this indicates that, either the multiplicity of X can be lowered with a single blow up at a regular center, or else, a simplification of the multiplicity of X is a problem that can be solved using certain Rees algebra defined in a $(d-1)$ -dimensional smooth scheme (see §5.2 and Remark 6.16 for details). Thus, our original problem is, in principle, simpler to solve. And the theorem says that the condition $\text{ord}_X^{(d)}(\zeta) = 1$ is already encrypted in $\mathfrak{m}_\zeta/\mathfrak{m}_\zeta^2$.

The extremal case: $\dim_{k(\zeta)} \ker(\lambda_\zeta) = t_\zeta$.

Theorem 8.11. *Let X be an equidimensional variety of dimension d defined over a perfect field k . Let $\zeta \in X$ be a point of multiplicity $m > 1$ which is in the extremal case. Then,*

$$\text{H-ord}_X^{(d)}(\zeta) = \min\{\mathcal{S}\text{-Sl}(\mathcal{O}_{X,\zeta}), \text{ord}_X^{(d)}(\zeta)\}.$$

In particular, this theorem says that the relevant information from the coefficients of the polynomials in (1.2.1), which, in general, only exist in a suitable étale neighborhood of the point, can already be read through the Samuel slope of the original local ring at the singular point.

Organization of the paper

The asymptotic Samuel function is studied in Sections 2 and 3. Rees algebras and their use in resolution of singularities are studied in Sections 4, 5, and 6. The function $\text{H-ord}_X^{(d)}$ is treated in Section 7. The proofs of the main results are addressed in Sections 3 and 8.

Acknowledgments: We profited from conversations with O. E. Villamayor U., C. Abad, B. Pascual-Escudero, C. del-Buey-de-Andrés, and C. Chiu. In addition, we would like to thank S. D. Cutkosky for giving us a crucial hint that led us to a proof of Proposition 3.7.

2. THE ASYMPTOTIC SAMUEL FUNCTION

We will use A to denote a commutative ring with 1. In this section the main references are [22] and [30].

Definition 2.1. A function $w : A \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \cup \{\infty\}$ is an *order function* if

- (i) $w(f + g) \geq \min\{w(f) + w(g)\}$, for all $f, g \in A$,
- (ii) $w(f \cdot g) \geq w(f) + w(g)$, for all $f, g \in A$,
- (iii) $w(0) = \infty$ and $w(1) = 0$.

Remark 2.2. [22, Remark 0.1.3] If w is an order function then $w(x) = w(-x)$ and if $w(x) \neq w(y)$ then $w(x + y) = \min\{w(x), w(y)\}$.

Example 2.3. Let $I \subset A$ be a proper ideal. Then the function $\nu_I : A \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \cup \{\infty\}$ defined by

$$\nu_I(f) := \sup\{m \in \mathbb{N} \mid f \in I^m\}$$

is an order function. If (A, \mathfrak{m}) is a local regular ring, then $\nu_{\mathfrak{m}}$ is just the usual order function.

In general, for $n \in \mathbb{N}_{>1}$, the inequality $\nu_I(f^n) \geq n\nu_I(f)$ can be strict. This can be seen for instance by considering the following example. Let k be a field, and let $A = k[x, y]/\langle x^2 - y^3 \rangle$. Set $\mathfrak{m} = \langle \bar{x}, \bar{y} \rangle$. Then $\nu_{\mathfrak{m}}(\bar{x}) = 1$, but $\nu_{\mathfrak{m}}(\bar{x}^2) = 3$. The asymptotic Samuel function is a normalized version of the previous order that gets around this problem:

Definition 2.4. Let $I \subset A$ be a proper ideal. The *asymptotic Samuel function at I* , $\bar{\nu}_I : A \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \cup \{\infty\}$, is defined as:

$$(2.4.1) \quad \bar{\nu}_I(f) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\nu_I(f^n)}{n}, \quad f \in A.$$

It can be shown that the limit (2.4.1) exists in $\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \cup \{\infty\}$ for any ideal $I \subset A$ (see [22, Lemma 0.2.1]). Again, if (A, \mathfrak{m}) is a local regular ring, then $\bar{\nu}_{\mathfrak{m}}$ is just the usual order function. As indicated before, this is an order function with nice properties:

Proposition 2.5. [22, Corollary 0.2.6, Proposition 0.2.9] *The function $\bar{\nu}_I$ is an order function. Furthermore, it satisfies the following properties for each $f \in A$ and each $r \in \mathbb{N}$:*

- (i) $\bar{\nu}_I(f^r) = r\bar{\nu}_I(f)$;
- (ii) $\bar{\nu}_{I^r}(f) = \frac{1}{r}\bar{\nu}_I(f)$.

2.6. The graded ring associated to $\bar{\nu}_I$. [22, §0.1.7, §0.2.11 and §0.2.12] Let A be a ring and let $I \subset A$ be a proper ideal. For every $b \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ set:

$$I^{(\geq b)} = \{g \in A \mid \bar{\nu}_I(g) \geq b\}, \quad \text{and} \quad I^{(>b)} = \{g \in A \mid \bar{\nu}_I(g) > b\}.$$

Note that $I^{(\geq b)}$ and $I^{(>b)}$ are ideals in A , and that a graded ring can be defined in a natural way:

$$\overline{\text{Gr}}_I(A) = \bigoplus_{b \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}} I^{(\geq b)} / I^{(>b)}.$$

The graded ring $\overline{\text{Gr}}_I(A)$ is reduced, and there is a natural morphism of graded algebras,

$$\Lambda_I : \begin{array}{ccc} \text{Gr}_I(A) & \longrightarrow & \overline{\text{Gr}}_I(A) \\ f + I^{b+1} & \mapsto & \Lambda_I(f + I^{b+1}) := f + I^{(>b)}, \end{array}$$

whose kernel is the nilradical of $\text{Gr}_I(A)$. As a consequence, Λ_I is injective if and only if $\text{Gr}_I(A)$ is reduced. For the purposes of the contents of this paper we will be paying special attention to the degree one part of this map. Precise details will be given in the next section.

The asymptotic Samuel function on Noetherian rings

When A is Noetherian, the number $\bar{\nu}_I(f)$ measures how deep the element f lies in the integral closure of powers of I . In fact, the following results hold:

Proposition 2.7. [30, Corollary 6.9.1] *Suppose A is Noetherian. Then for a proper ideal $I \subset A$ and every $a \in \mathbb{N}$,*

$$\overline{I^a} = \{f \in R \mid \bar{v}_I(f) \geq a\}.$$

Corollary 2.8. *Let A be a Noetherian ring and $I \subset A$ a proper ideal. If $f \in A$ then*

$$\bar{v}_I(f) \geq \frac{a}{b} \iff f^b \in \overline{I^a}.$$

The previous characterization of \bar{v}_I leads to the following result that give a valuative version of the function.

Theorem 2.9. *Let A be a Noetherian ring, and let $I \subset A$ be a proper ideal not contained in a minimal prime of A . Let v_1, \dots, v_s be a set of Rees valuations of the ideal I . If $f \in A$ then*

$$\bar{v}_I(f) = \min \left\{ \frac{v_i(f)}{v_i(I)} \mid i = 1, \dots, s \right\}.$$

Proof. See [30, Lemma 10.1.5, Theorem 10.2.2] and [29, Proposition 2.2]. \square

Remark 2.10. Let A be a Noetherian reduced ring, and let $I \subset A$ be a proper ideal not contained in any minimal prime of A . Set $X = \text{Spec}(A)$ and let \overline{X} be the normalized blow up of X at the ideal I . Then, the sheaf of ideals $I\mathcal{O}_{\overline{X}}$ is invertible and, since \overline{X} is normal, there is a finite number of reduced and irreducible hypersurfaces H_1, \dots, H_ℓ in \overline{X} , and there exists an open set $U \subset \overline{X}$, such that $\overline{X} \setminus U$ has codimension at least 2 such that:

$$I\mathcal{O}_U = I(H_1)^{c_1} \cdots I(H_\ell)^{c_\ell}|_U$$

for some integers $c_1, \dots, c_\ell \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}$. Denote by v_i the valuation associated to $\mathcal{O}_{\overline{X}, h_i}$, where h_i is the generic point of H_i . Then note that a subset of $\{v_1, \dots, v_\ell\}$ has to be a Rees valuation set of I . Therefore, if $f \in A$ then

$$\bar{v}_I(f) = \min \left\{ \frac{v_i(f)}{v_i(I)} \mid i = 1, \dots, \ell \right\}.$$

See [30, Theorem 10.2.2] and [29, Theorem 2.1, Proposition 2.2].

As an application of Remark 2.10 we can prove the following result about the behavior of the \bar{v} function on products of elements. This will be used in the proof of Theorems 8.2 and 8.11.

Proposition 2.11. *Let $A \rightarrow C$ be ring homomorphism of Noetherian rings, where A is regular and C is reduced. Let $\mathfrak{q} \in \text{Spec}(C)$ and $\mathfrak{n} = \mathfrak{q} \cap A$. Assume that $\mathfrak{n}C$ is a reduction of $\mathfrak{q} \subset C$, and that A/\mathfrak{n} is regular.*

If $a \in A$ and $f \in C$ then:

$$\bar{v}_{\mathfrak{q}}(a) = \bar{v}_{\mathfrak{n}}(a)$$

and

$$\bar{v}_{\mathfrak{q}}(af) = \bar{v}_{\mathfrak{q}}(a) + \bar{v}_{\mathfrak{q}}(f).$$

Proof. Set $X = \text{Spec}(C)$ and $Z = \text{Spec}(A)$. Let \overline{X} be the normalized blow up of X at the ideal \mathfrak{q} and let \overline{Z} be the blow up of Z at \mathfrak{n} . Then there is a commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} X & \longleftarrow & \overline{X} \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ Z & \longleftarrow & \overline{Z}, \end{array}$$

(see [3, Lemma 4.2]). The exceptional divisor E of the blow up $\overline{Z} \rightarrow Z$ defines only a valuation v_0 in A . The exceptional divisor of $\overline{X} \rightarrow X$ defines valuations

$$v_1, \dots, v_\ell$$

as in Remark 2.10. Note that every valuation v_i is an extension of v_0 to C . Then if $a \in A$:

$$\bar{v}_{\mathfrak{n}}(a) = \frac{v_0(a)}{v_0(\mathfrak{n})} = \frac{v_i(a)}{v_i(\mathfrak{n})} = \bar{v}_{\mathfrak{q}}(a) \quad \text{for all } i = 1, \dots, \ell.$$

On the other hand, for each $i \in \{1, \dots, \ell\}$,

$$\frac{v_i(af)}{v_i(\mathfrak{q})} = \frac{v_i(a)}{v_i(\mathfrak{q})} + \frac{v_i(f)}{v_i(\mathfrak{q})} = \bar{v}_{\mathfrak{q}}(a) + \frac{v_i(f)}{v_i(\mathfrak{q})}.$$

And, again, by Remark 2.10 we have the required equality. \square

2.12. Notation. Along this paper we will be interested in computing the function order \bar{v} at points ζ in a variety X over a field k . We will be distinguishing between \bar{v}_{ζ} and $\bar{v}_{\mathfrak{p}_{\zeta}}$ where \mathfrak{p}_{ζ} is the prime defining ζ in an affine open set of X .

In the first case, for an element $f \in \mathcal{O}_{X,\zeta}$, $\bar{v}_{\zeta}(f)$ is computed using the function \bar{v} for the local ring $\mathcal{O}_{X,\zeta}$ at the maximal ideal $\mathfrak{m}_{\zeta} = \mathfrak{p}_{\zeta}\mathcal{O}_{X,\zeta}$.

In the second case, for an element $f \in B$, where $\text{Spec}(B) \subset X$ is an affine open containing ζ , $\nu_{\mathfrak{p}_{\zeta}}$ is computed using the function \bar{v} for the ring B at the prime ideal \mathfrak{p}_{ζ} .

Note that, if $f \in B$, then $\bar{v}_{\zeta}(f) \geq \bar{v}_{\mathfrak{p}_{\zeta}}(f)$.

If the local ring $\mathcal{O}_{X,\zeta}$ is regular then we will use the standard notation ν_{ζ} for the usual order function, and note that $\nu_{\zeta} = \bar{v}_{\zeta}$.

3. THE SAMUEL SLOPE OF A LOCAL RING

Suppose that (A, \mathfrak{m}) is a Noetherian local ring of dimension d . Our purpose is to use the function Λ introduced in §2.6 for the function $\bar{v}_{\mathfrak{m}}$ in order to define a subspace in the $k(\mathfrak{m})$ -vectorial space $\mathfrak{m}/\mathfrak{m}^2$, where $k(\mathfrak{m})$ denotes the residue field of (A, \mathfrak{m}) .

Definition 3.1. Consider the morphism $\Lambda_{\mathfrak{m}} : \text{Gr}_{\mathfrak{m}}(A) \rightarrow \overline{\text{Gr}}_{\mathfrak{m}}(A)$ defined in §2.6, and its restriction to $\mathfrak{m}/\mathfrak{m}^2$,

$$\lambda_{\mathfrak{m}} : \mathfrak{m}/\mathfrak{m}^2 \rightarrow \mathfrak{m}^{(\geq 1)}/\mathfrak{m}^{(>1)}.$$

We will focus on the $k(\mathfrak{m})$ -linear subspace $\ker(\lambda_{\mathfrak{m}}) \subset \mathfrak{m}/\mathfrak{m}^2$ and we define $r_{\mathfrak{m}} = \dim \ker(\lambda_{\mathfrak{m}})$.

The subspace $\ker(\lambda_{\mathfrak{m}}) \subset \mathfrak{m}/\mathfrak{m}^2$ contains all the classes $\bar{\theta} \in \mathfrak{m}/\mathfrak{m}^2$ of elements $\theta \in \mathfrak{m}$ which are nilpotent in $\text{Gr}_{\mathfrak{m}}(A)$. An analysis of sequences of elements in \mathfrak{m} inducing a basis of $\ker(\lambda_{\mathfrak{m}})$ will lead us to the main results in this section. More precisely, when (A, \mathfrak{m}) is a regular local ring, $\lambda_{\mathfrak{m}}$ is an isomorphism and $\ker(\lambda_{\mathfrak{m}}) = (0)$. The interesting situation is when (A, \mathfrak{m}) is not regular. Then we have that $\dim_{k(\mathfrak{m})} \mathfrak{m}/\mathfrak{m}^2 = d + t$, with $t > 0$ being the excess of the embedding dimension of (A, \mathfrak{m}) . Our first main result is that $\dim_{k(\mathfrak{m})}(\ker(\lambda_{\mathfrak{m}})) \leq t$ (see Proposition 3.2). Using this bound, we will define the *Samuel slope of the local ring* (A, \mathfrak{m}) in terms of the function $\bar{v}_{\mathfrak{m}}$ (see Definition 3.4). And we will see that, under some assumptions, this value does not change after an étale extension (see Proposition 3.7). And we will address a similar more technical result in Proposition 3.8.

Proposition 3.2. *Let (A, \mathfrak{m}) be a Noetherian local ring of dimension d . Suppose that the embedding dimension of (A, \mathfrak{m}) is $d + t$ for some $t \geq 0$. Then:*

$$0 \leq \dim_{k(\mathfrak{m})} \ker(\lambda_{\mathfrak{m}}) \leq t.$$

Proof. From the assumptions, $G = \text{Gr}_{\mathfrak{m}}(A)$ is generated in degree 1 by $d + t$ elements. Assume that $\dim_{k(\mathfrak{m})}(\ker(\lambda_{\mathfrak{m}})) > t$. Then we can find a minimal set of generators, $\gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_{d+t} \in \mathfrak{m}$, of \mathfrak{m} such that the classes of the first $(t + 1)$ elements, $\bar{\gamma}_1, \dots, \bar{\gamma}_{t+1} \in \ker(\lambda_{\zeta})$, are linearly independent. This means that $\bar{\gamma}_i \in G$ are nilpotent, for $i = 1, \dots, t + 1$. The quotient ring $G/\langle \bar{\gamma}_1, \dots, \bar{\gamma}_{t+1} \rangle$ has Krull dimension d , since the $\bar{\gamma}_i$ are nilpotents for $i = 1, \dots, t + 1$. But the graduate ring $G/\langle \bar{\gamma}_1, \dots, \bar{\gamma}_{t+1} \rangle$ is generated in degree one by $d - 1$ elements, so that its Krull dimension is at most $d - 1$, which leads to a contradiction. \square

Definition 3.3. Let (A, \mathfrak{m}) be a Noetherian local ring. Suppose that the embedding dimension of (A, \mathfrak{m}) is $d + t$ with $t > 0$. We say that (A, \mathfrak{m}) is in the *extremal case* if $\dim \ker(\lambda_{\mathfrak{m}}) = t$. Otherwise we say that (A, \mathfrak{m}) is in the *non-extremal case*.

Assume that $\dim \ker(\lambda_{\mathfrak{m}}) = t$. We say that a sequence of elements $\gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_t \in \mathfrak{m}$ is a $\lambda_{\mathfrak{m}}$ -sequence if their classes $\bar{\gamma}_i \in \mathfrak{m}/\mathfrak{m}^2$ form a basis of $\ker(\lambda_{\mathfrak{m}})$.

Definition 3.4. Let (A, \mathfrak{m}) be a Noetherian local ring. Suppose that the embedding dimension of (A, \mathfrak{m}) is $d + t$ with $t > 0$. We define the *Samuel Slope of (A, \mathfrak{m})* , $\mathcal{S}\text{-Sl}(A)$, as follows:

- If $\dim \ker(\lambda_{\mathfrak{m}}) < t$ (non-extremal case), then $\mathcal{S}\text{-Sl}(A) := 1$;
- If $\dim \ker(\lambda_{\mathfrak{m}}) = t$ (extremal case), then

$$\mathcal{S}\text{-Sl}(A) := \sup_{\lambda_{\mathfrak{m}}\text{-sequence}} \{ \min \{ \bar{\nu}_{\mathfrak{m}}(\gamma_1), \dots, \bar{\nu}_{\mathfrak{m}}(\gamma_t) \} \},$$

where the supremum is taken over all the $\lambda_{\mathfrak{m}}$ -sequences in the local ring (A, \mathfrak{m}) .

Remark 3.5. Suppose that X is an equidimensional variety of dimension d defined over a perfect field k , and $\zeta \in X$ a (non-necessarily closed) point of multiplicity $m > 1$. Set $d_{\zeta} = \dim(\mathcal{O}_{X, \zeta})$ and $d_{\zeta} + t_{\zeta} = \dim_{k(\zeta)}(\mathfrak{m}_{\zeta}/\mathfrak{m}_{\zeta}^2)$ be the embedding dimension at ζ , where $k(\zeta)$ denotes the residue field of $\mathcal{O}_{X, \zeta}$. The Samuel slope of X at ζ is the Samuel slope of the local ring $\mathcal{O}_{X, \zeta}$. We denote $\bar{\nu}_{\zeta} = \bar{\nu}_{\mathfrak{m}_{\zeta}}$ and a λ_{ζ} -sequence will be a $\lambda_{\mathfrak{m}_{\zeta}}$ -sequence.

The Samuel slope and étale extensions.

To prove Theorems 8.2 and 8.11 we will have to work in an étale neighborhood of a given point. To be able to use étale extensions in our arguments, we will first prove that the dimension of $\ker(\lambda_{\zeta})$ is an invariant under such extensions. From here, it follows that if $X' \rightarrow X$ is an étale morphism mapping $\zeta' \in X'$ to $\zeta \in X$ then $\mathcal{S}\text{-Sl}(\mathcal{O}_{X, \zeta}) \leq \mathcal{S}\text{-Sl}(\mathcal{O}_{X', \zeta'})$. We do not know if the equality holds in general. However we can prove it for some special cases, which will be enough for our purposes.

Proposition 3.6. Let $\varphi : (A, \mathfrak{m}) \rightarrow (A', \mathfrak{m}')$ be an étale homomorphism of Noetherian local rings. Then

$$r_{\mathfrak{m}} = \dim \ker(\lambda_{\mathfrak{m}}) = r_{\mathfrak{m}'} = \dim \ker(\lambda_{\mathfrak{m}'}).$$

Proof. Set $n = \dim_{k(\mathfrak{m})}(\mathfrak{m}/\mathfrak{m}^2) = \dim_{k(\mathfrak{m}')}(\mathfrak{m}'/\mathfrak{m}'^2)$. Observe that there is a commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathfrak{m}/\mathfrak{m}^2 & \xrightarrow{\lambda_{\mathfrak{m}}} & \mathfrak{m}^{(\geq 1)}/\mathfrak{m}^{(>1)} \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ \mathfrak{m}'/\mathfrak{m}'^2 & \xrightarrow{\lambda_{\mathfrak{m}'}} & \mathfrak{m}'^{(\geq 1)}/\mathfrak{m}'^{(>1)}, \end{array}$$

and that $\text{Gr}_{\mathfrak{m}'}(A') = k(\mathfrak{m}') \otimes \text{Gr}_{\mathfrak{m}}(A)$ is an étale extension of $\text{Gr}_{\mathfrak{m}}(A)$. Since the vertical maps are injective, it follows that $r = r_{\mathfrak{m}} \leq r' = r_{\mathfrak{m}'}$. Now, let $L \subset \mathfrak{m}/\mathfrak{m}^2$ be a vector subspace such that

$$\ker(\lambda_{\mathfrak{m}}) \oplus L = \mathfrak{m}/\mathfrak{m}^2.$$

Note that by tensor product one obtains the same decomposition.

$$\ker(\lambda_{\mathfrak{m}'}) \oplus L' = \mathfrak{m}'/\mathfrak{m}'^2,$$

where $L' = k(\mathfrak{m}') \otimes L$ and $\ker(\lambda_{\mathfrak{m}'}) = k(\mathfrak{m}') \otimes \ker(\lambda_{\mathfrak{m}})$. Because the left vertical map is étale, we have that $\ell = \dim_{k(\mathfrak{m}')}(\mathfrak{m}'/\mathfrak{m}'^2) = \dim_{k(\mathfrak{m}')}(\ker(\lambda_{\mathfrak{m}'}) \oplus L')$. Finally, $n = r + \ell \leq r' + \ell \leq n$ and $r = r'$. \square

Proposition 3.7. Let $\varphi : (A, \mathfrak{m}) \rightarrow (A', \mathfrak{m}')$ be an étale homomorphism of Noetherian local rings. If $k(\mathfrak{m}) = k(\mathfrak{m}')$, then

$$\mathcal{S}\text{-Sl}(A) = \mathcal{S}\text{-Sl}(A').$$

Proof. Let d be the Krull dimension of A . Suppose that $\dim_{k(\mathfrak{m})} \mathfrak{m}/\mathfrak{m}^2 = d + t$, with $t > 0$. By Proposition 3.6, the result is immediate if $\dim \ker(\lambda_{\mathfrak{m}}) < t$, and in fact, in this case, the hypothesis $k(\mathfrak{m}) = k(\mathfrak{m}')$ is not needed.

Suppose now that $\dim \ker(\lambda_{\mathfrak{m}}) = t$. Since $k(\mathfrak{m}) = k(\mathfrak{m}')$, it follows that $\text{Gr}_{\mathfrak{m}}(A) = \text{Gr}_{\mathfrak{m}'}(A')$. Observe that if $\theta' \in \mathfrak{m}'$ then, for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$, there exists some $\rho_n \in \mathfrak{m}$ such that $\theta' - \rho_n \in (\mathfrak{m}')^n$. This means that there is some $n \gg 0$ such that $\bar{\nu}_{\mathfrak{m}}(\rho_n) = \bar{\nu}_{\mathfrak{m}'}(\theta')$. From here we can conclude that given a $\lambda_{\mathfrak{m}'}$ -sequence $\theta'_1, \dots, \theta'_t \in \mathfrak{m}'$ we can always find $\theta_1, \dots, \theta_t \in \mathfrak{m}$ such that :

- $\theta_1, \dots, \theta_t$ is a $\lambda_{\mathfrak{m}}$ -sequence of (A, \mathfrak{m}) and
- $\bar{\nu}_{\mathfrak{m}}(\theta_i) = \bar{\nu}_{\mathfrak{m}'}(\theta'_i)$ for $i = 1, \dots, t$.

The result now follows by the definition of the Samuel Slope. \square

The following result will allow us to compare the Samuel slope of a local ring, at a non closed point of a variety, before and after an étale extension (at least under some special assumptions). This will be used in the proof of Theorem 8.11.

Proposition 3.8. *Let (A, \mathfrak{m}) be a formally d -equidimensional local Noetherian ring. Let $\mathfrak{p} \subset A$ be a prime ideal such that the quotient ring A/\mathfrak{p} is a $(d - r)$ -dimensional regular ring, with $r > 0$, and $\text{mult}_{\mathfrak{m}}(A) = \text{mult}_{\mathfrak{p}A_{\mathfrak{p}}}(A_{\mathfrak{p}}) = m > 1$. Suppose that:*

- *the excess of embedding dimension of (A, \mathfrak{m}) is t and coincides with the excess of embedding dimension of $(A_{\mathfrak{p}}, \mathfrak{p}A_{\mathfrak{p}})$;*
- *both (A, \mathfrak{m}) and $(A_{\mathfrak{p}}, \mathfrak{p}A_{\mathfrak{p}})$ are in the extremal case.*

Let $\varphi : (A, \mathfrak{m}) \rightarrow (A', \mathfrak{m}')$ be an étale homomorphism of local rings, and $\mathfrak{p}' \subset A'$ be a prime ideal such that $\mathfrak{p}' \cap A = \mathfrak{p}$. Assume that:

- *$k(\mathfrak{m}) = k(\mathfrak{m}')$;*
- *there is $\lambda_{\mathfrak{m}'}$ -sequence at A' , $\gamma'_1, \dots, \gamma'_t$, that is also a $\lambda_{\mathfrak{p}'A'_{\mathfrak{p}'}}$ -sequence.*

Then there is a $\lambda_{\mathfrak{p}A_{\mathfrak{p}}}$ -sequence at A , $\gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_t$, such that:

$$\min_i \{\bar{\nu}_{\mathfrak{p}}(\gamma_i)\} \geq \min_i \{\bar{\nu}_{\mathfrak{p}'}(\gamma'_i)\},$$

and

$$\min_i \{\bar{\nu}_{\mathfrak{p}A_{\mathfrak{p}}}(\gamma_i)\} \geq \min_i \{\bar{\nu}_{\mathfrak{p}'A'_{\mathfrak{p}'}}(\gamma'_i)\}.$$

In particular $\mathcal{S}\text{-Sl}(A_{\mathfrak{p}}) \geq \min_i \{\bar{\nu}_{\mathfrak{p}'A'_{\mathfrak{p}'}}(\gamma'_i)\}$.

Proof. We divide the proof in three steps:

Step 1. We claim that there are elements $y_1, \dots, y_r, y_{r+1}, \dots, y_d \in A'$ such that

$$\mathfrak{m}' = \langle y_1, \dots, y_d, \gamma'_1, \dots, \gamma'_t \rangle \quad \text{and} \quad \mathfrak{p}' = \langle y_1, \dots, y_r, \gamma'_1, \dots, \gamma'_t \rangle.$$

To prove the claim observe first that $\overline{A'} := A'/\mathfrak{p}'$ is a regular local ring of dimension $(d - r)$. Therefore, we have that $\overline{\mathfrak{m}'} := \mathfrak{m}'/\mathfrak{p}' = \langle \overline{y}_{r+1}, \dots, \overline{y}_d \rangle$ for some $\overline{y}_{r+1}, \dots, \overline{y}_d \in \overline{A'}$. Thus

$$\mathfrak{m}' = \mathfrak{p}' + \langle y_{r+1}, \dots, y_d \rangle,$$

where $y_{r+1}, \dots, y_d \in A'$ are liftings of $\overline{y}_{r+1}, \dots, \overline{y}_d$. Notice that $\bar{\nu}_{\mathfrak{m}'}(y_i) = 1$ for $i = r + 1, \dots, d$ (because this is so at $\overline{A'}$). Since $\gamma'_i \in \mathfrak{p}'$ and $\bar{\nu}_{\mathfrak{m}'}(\gamma'_i) > 1$, we should be able to find r elements, y_1, \dots, y_r in \mathfrak{p}' , with $\bar{\nu}_{\mathfrak{m}'}(y_i) = 1$ and so that,

$$\mathfrak{m}' = \langle y_1, \dots, y_d \rangle + \langle \gamma'_1, \dots, \gamma'_t \rangle.$$

Now we have that,

$$\langle y_1, \dots, y_r \rangle + \langle \gamma'_1, \dots, \gamma'_t \rangle \subset \mathfrak{p}'.$$

To see that the last containment is an equality it suffices to prove that $\mathfrak{q} := \langle y_1, \dots, y_r \rangle + \langle \gamma'_1, \dots, \gamma'_t \rangle$ is prime and that it defines a $(d-r)$ -dimensional closed subscheme at $\text{Spec}(B')$. But this is immediate since

$$d - r = \dim(A'/\mathfrak{p}') \leq \dim(A'/\mathfrak{q}) \leq d - r,$$

where that last inequality follows because $\mathfrak{m}'/\mathfrak{q}$ is generated by classes of y_{r+1}, \dots, y_d .

Step 2. Consider the surjective morphism of graded $k(\mathfrak{m}')$ -algebras:

$$\mathfrak{D}' := \bigoplus_{n \geq 0} \mathfrak{p}'^n / \mathfrak{p}'^n \mathfrak{m}' [T_{r+1}, \dots, T_d] \xrightarrow{\psi'} \mathfrak{C}' := \bigoplus_{n \geq 0} \mathfrak{m}'^n / \mathfrak{m}'^{n+1} \longrightarrow 0.$$

where the T_i are variables mapping to the class of y_i in $\mathfrak{m}'/\mathfrak{m}'^2$, for $i = r+1, \dots, d$. We claim that

$$(3.8.1) \quad \text{Nil}(\mathfrak{D}') = \langle [\gamma'_1]_{\mathfrak{D}'}, \dots, [\gamma'_t]_{\mathfrak{D}'} \rangle,$$

where $[\gamma'_i]_{\mathfrak{D}'}$ denotes the class of γ'_i in $\mathfrak{p}'/\mathfrak{p}'\mathfrak{m}'$ for $i = 1, \dots, t$, and that

$$(3.8.2) \quad \text{Nil}(\mathfrak{C}') = \langle [\gamma'_1]_{\mathfrak{C}'}, \dots, [\gamma'_t]_{\mathfrak{C}'} \rangle,$$

where $[\gamma'_i]_{\mathfrak{C}'}$ denotes the class of γ'_i in $\mathfrak{m}'/\mathfrak{m}'^2$ for $i = 1, \dots, t$.

To prove the claim, consider the ring of polynomials in d variables over $k(\mathfrak{m}')$ localized at the origin, $T := k(\mathfrak{m}') [x_1, \dots, x_d]_{\langle x_1, \dots, x_d \rangle}$, and the morphism of $k(\mathfrak{m}')$ -algebras,

$$(3.8.3) \quad \begin{array}{ccc} T = k(\mathfrak{m}') [x_1, \dots, x_d]_{\langle x_1, \dots, x_d \rangle} & \longrightarrow & A' \\ x_i \longmapsto & & y_i, \end{array}$$

(here we are using the notation from step 1). Setting $\mathfrak{n} := \langle x_1, \dots, x_d \rangle \subset T$, the previous morphism induces another morphism of $k(\mathfrak{m}')$ -algebras between the graded rings, $\text{Gr}_{\mathfrak{n}}(T)$ and $\text{Gr}_{\mathfrak{m}'}(A')$,

$$(3.8.4) \quad \begin{array}{ccc} \mathfrak{T} := \text{Gr}_{\mathfrak{n}}(T) & \xrightarrow{\rho_{\xi'}} & \text{Gr}_{\mathfrak{m}'}(A') = \mathfrak{C}' \\ [x_i]_1 \longmapsto & & [y_i]_1, \end{array}$$

where $[x_i]_1$ (resp. $[y_i]_1$) denotes the class of x_i at $\mathfrak{n}/\mathfrak{n}^2$ (resp. $\mathfrak{m}'/\mathfrak{m}'^2$) for $i = 1, \dots, d$. Via this morphism, $\text{Gr}_{\mathfrak{m}'}(A')$ is a finite extension of $\text{Gr}_{\mathfrak{n}}(T)$ (here we use the fact that the γ'_i define nilpotents at $\text{Gr}_{\mathfrak{m}'}(A')$).

Now set $\mathfrak{b} := \langle x_1, \dots, x_r \rangle \subset T$. Then we have the following commutative diagram of graded rings:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathfrak{D}' = \bigoplus_{n \geq 0} \mathfrak{p}'^n / \mathfrak{p}'^n \mathfrak{m}' [T_{r+1}, \dots, T_d] & \xrightarrow{\psi'} & \mathfrak{C}' = \bigoplus_{n \geq 0} \mathfrak{m}'^n / \mathfrak{m}'^{n+1} \longrightarrow 0 \\ \uparrow \rho_{\eta'} & & \uparrow \rho_{\xi'} \\ \mathfrak{F} := \bigoplus_{n \geq 0} \mathfrak{b}^n / \mathfrak{b}^n \mathfrak{n} [T_{r+1}, \dots, T_d] & \xrightarrow{\phi} & \mathfrak{T} = \bigoplus_{n \geq 0} \mathfrak{n}^n / \mathfrak{n}^{n+1} \longrightarrow 0. \end{array}$$

By [23, §5, Theorem 5], $\ker(\psi')$ is nilpotent. Observe that ϕ is an isomorphism and that \mathfrak{D}' is a finite extension of \mathfrak{F} (here we use the fact that each $[\gamma'_i]_{\mathfrak{C}'}$ is nilpotent at \mathfrak{C}' and that $\ker(\psi')$ is nilpotent: hence each $[\gamma'_i]_{\mathfrak{D}'}$ is nilpotent at \mathfrak{D}'). Thus

$$\langle [\gamma'_1]_{\mathfrak{D}'}, \dots, [\gamma'_t]_{\mathfrak{D}'} \rangle \subset \text{Nil}(\mathfrak{D}') \quad \text{and} \quad \langle [\gamma'_1]_{\mathfrak{C}'}, \dots, [\gamma'_t]_{\mathfrak{C}'} \rangle \subset \text{Nil}(\mathfrak{C}').$$

To check that the containments are equalities it suffices to observe that

$$\mathfrak{D}' / \langle [\gamma'_1]_{\mathfrak{D}'}, \dots, [\gamma'_t]_{\mathfrak{D}'} \rangle \simeq \mathfrak{F} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathfrak{C}' / \langle [\gamma'_1]_{\mathfrak{C}'}, \dots, [\gamma'_t]_{\mathfrak{C}'} \rangle \simeq \mathfrak{T}.$$

Step 3. Consider the commutative diagram,

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathfrak{D}' = \bigoplus_{n \geq 0} \mathfrak{p}^n / \mathfrak{p}^n \mathfrak{m}' [T'_{r+1}, \dots, T'_d] & \xrightarrow{\psi'} & \mathfrak{E}' = \bigoplus_{n \geq 0} \mathfrak{m}^n / \mathfrak{m}^{n+1} \longrightarrow 0 \\ \uparrow & & \parallel \\ \mathfrak{D} := \bigoplus_{n \geq 0} \mathfrak{p}^n / \mathfrak{p}^n \mathfrak{m} [T_{r+1}, \dots, T_d] & \xrightarrow{\psi} & \mathfrak{E} := \bigoplus_{n \geq 0} \mathfrak{m}^n / \mathfrak{m}^{n+1} \longrightarrow 0, \end{array}$$

paying attention to the sequence for the n -th-degree part from \mathfrak{D}' and \mathfrak{D} :

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} & & & \xrightarrow{[\psi']_n} & & & \\ & & & \searrow & & & \\ [\mathfrak{D}']_n = \mathfrak{p}^n / \mathfrak{p}^n \mathfrak{m}' & \xrightarrow{\epsilon'_n} & \mathfrak{m}^n / \mathfrak{p}^n \mathfrak{m}' & \xrightarrow{\pi'_n} & \mathfrak{m}^n / \mathfrak{m}^{n+1} & \longrightarrow & 0 \\ & \uparrow & \uparrow \iota_n & & \parallel & & \\ [\mathfrak{D}]_n = \mathfrak{p}^n / \mathfrak{p}^n \mathfrak{m} & \xrightarrow{\epsilon_n} & \mathfrak{m}^n / \mathfrak{p}^n \mathfrak{m} & \xrightarrow{\pi_n} & \mathfrak{m}^n / \mathfrak{m}^{n+1} & \longrightarrow & 0 \\ & & & \swarrow & & & \\ & & & \xrightarrow{[\psi]_n} & & & \end{array}$$

Now, for each $i \in \{1, \dots, t\}$, choose $[\kappa_{i,1}]_1 \in \mathfrak{m}/\mathfrak{p}\mathfrak{m}$ so that $\pi_1([\kappa_{i,1}]_1) = [\gamma'_i]_{\mathfrak{E}'} \in \mathfrak{m}/\mathfrak{m}^2 = \mathfrak{m}'/\mathfrak{m}'^2$. Then if $[\gamma'_i]_1$ denotes the class of γ'_i in $\mathfrak{m}'/\mathfrak{p}'\mathfrak{m}'$, we have that $[\gamma'_i]_1 - \iota_1([\kappa_{i,1}]_1) \in \ker(\pi'_1) = \epsilon'_1(\ker(\psi'_1))$. Notice that from Step 2 and [23, §5, Theorem 5], it follows that $\ker(\pi') \subset \langle [\gamma'_1]_1, \dots, [\gamma'_t]_1 \rangle$.

Thus, selecting $\kappa_{i,1} \in A$ as some lifting of $[\kappa_{i,1}]_1$ we have that

$$\gamma'_i - \kappa_{i,1} \in \langle \gamma'_1, \dots, \gamma'_t \rangle + \alpha_{i,2}$$

for some $\alpha_{i,2} \in \mathfrak{p}'\mathfrak{m}'$. Notice that it follows from here that $\kappa_{i,1} \in \mathfrak{p}$.

Since $\alpha_{i,2} \in \mathfrak{p}'\mathfrak{m}' \subset \mathfrak{m}'^2$ we now choose $[\kappa_{i,2}]_2 \in \mathfrak{m}^2/\mathfrak{p}^2\mathfrak{m}$ so that

$$\pi_2([\kappa_{i,2}]_2) = [\alpha_{i,2}]_{\mathfrak{E}} \in \mathfrak{m}^2/\mathfrak{m}^3 = \mathfrak{m}'^2/\mathfrak{m}'^3.$$

Then

$$[\alpha_{i,2}]_2 - \iota_2([\kappa_{i,2}]_2) \in \ker(\pi'_2) = \epsilon'_2(\ker(\psi'_2)).$$

And, selecting some lifting $\kappa_{i,2} \in A$ of $[\kappa_{i,2}]_2$, we have that

$$\alpha_{i,2} - \kappa_{i,2} \in \langle \gamma'_1, \dots, \gamma'_t \rangle + \alpha_{i,3}$$

with $\alpha_{i,3} \in \mathfrak{p}'^2\mathfrak{m}'$. From here it follows that $\kappa_{i,2} \in \mathfrak{p}$. Iterating this procedure, we find that

$$\gamma'_i - (\kappa_{i,1} + \kappa_{i,2} + \dots + \kappa_{i,n}) \in \langle \gamma'_1, \dots, \gamma'_t \rangle + \alpha_{i,n}$$

with $\alpha_{i,n} \in \mathfrak{p}'^n\mathfrak{m}'$, and $\kappa_{i,j} \in \mathfrak{p}$. Taking $n \gg 0$, and setting

$$\gamma_i := \kappa_{i,1} + \dots + \kappa_{i,n}$$

we have that $\gamma_i \in \mathfrak{p}$ for $i = 1, \dots, t$, that:

$$\min_{i=1, \dots, t} \{\bar{\nu}_{\mathfrak{p}}(\gamma_i)\} = \min_{i=1, \dots, t} \{\bar{\nu}_{\mathfrak{p}'}(\gamma_i)\} \geq \min_{i=1, \dots, t} \{\bar{\nu}_{\mathfrak{p}'}(\gamma'_i)\} > 1,$$

$$\min_{i=1, \dots, t} \{\bar{\nu}_{\mathfrak{p}A_{\mathfrak{p}}}(\gamma_i)\} = \min_{i=1, \dots, t} \{\bar{\nu}_{\mathfrak{p}'A'_{\mathfrak{p}'}}(\gamma_i)\} \geq \min_{i=1, \dots, t} \{\bar{\nu}_{\mathfrak{p}'A'_{\mathfrak{p}'}}(\gamma'_i)\} > 1,$$

and that

$$\min_{i=1, \dots, t} \{\bar{\nu}_{\mathfrak{m}}(\gamma_i)\} = \min_{i=1, \dots, t} \{\bar{\nu}_{\mathfrak{m}'}(\gamma_i)\} \geq \min_{i=1, \dots, t} \{\bar{\nu}_{\mathfrak{m}'}(\gamma'_i)\} > 1.$$

In particular, $\bar{\nu}_{\mathfrak{p}A_{\mathfrak{p}}}(\gamma_i) > 1$ and $\bar{\nu}_{\mathfrak{m}}(\gamma_i) > 1$ for $i = 1, \dots, t$. By construction,

$$[\gamma_i]_{\mathfrak{E}} = [\kappa_{i,1}]_{\mathfrak{E}} = [\gamma'_i]_{\mathfrak{E}'},$$

from where it follows that $\gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_t \in \mathfrak{m}$ form both a $\lambda_{\mathfrak{m}}$ -sequence and $\lambda_{\mathfrak{m}'}$ -sequence. We also have that

$$\mathfrak{m}' = \langle y_1, \dots, y_d \rangle + \langle \gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_t \rangle,$$

and that

$$\langle y_1, \dots, y_r \rangle + \langle \gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_t \rangle \subset \mathfrak{p}'.$$

To show that the inclusion is an equality we can argue as in Step 1, to check that

$$A' / (\langle y_1, \dots, y_r \rangle + \langle \gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_t \rangle)$$

is a $(d - r)$ -dimensional regular local ring. Thus $\{y_1, \dots, y_r, \gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_t\}$ form a minimal set of generators for $\mathfrak{p}'A'_{\mathfrak{p}'} \subset A'_{\mathfrak{p}'}$, hence $\gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_t \in \mathfrak{p}$ form a $\lambda_{\mathfrak{p}'A'_{\mathfrak{p}'}}$ -sequence and therefore a $\lambda_{\mathfrak{p}A_{\mathfrak{p}}}$ -sequence. \square

4. REES ALGEBRAS AND THEIR USE IN RESOLUTION

The stratum defined by the maximum value of the multiplicity function of a variety can be described using equations and weights ([35]); and the same occurs with the Hilbert-Samuel function ([20]). Such descriptions can be convenient when addressing a resolution of singularities of an algebraic variety. As we will see, Rees algebras happen to be a suitable tool to work in this setting: they provide a language to rephrase the problem of resolution, in addition to opening the possibility of using different algebraic techniques that sometimes facilitate the comprehension and the solution of some of the difficulties of the problem. We refer to [34] and [16] for further details.

Definition 4.1. Let R be a Noetherian ring. A *Rees algebra* \mathcal{G} over R is a finitely generated graded R -algebra

$$\mathcal{G} = \bigoplus_{l \in \mathbb{N}} I_l W^l \subset R[W]$$

for some ideals $I_l \in R$, $l \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $I_0 = R$ and $I_l I_j \subset I_{l+j}$, for all $l, j \in \mathbb{N}$. Here, W is just a variable to keep track of the degree of the ideals I_l . Since \mathcal{G} is finitely generated, there exist some $f_1, \dots, f_r \in R$ and positive integers (weights) $n_1, \dots, n_r \in \mathbb{N}$ such that

$$(4.1.1) \quad \mathcal{G} = R[f_1 W^{n_1}, \dots, f_r W^{n_r}].$$

The previous definition extends to Noetherian schemes in the obvious manner.

Rees Algebras on smooth schemes

In the following lines we assume that $\mathcal{G} = \bigoplus_{l \geq 0} I_l W^l$ is a Rees algebra defined on a scheme V that is smooth over a perfect field k (whenever the conditions on V are relaxed it will be explicitly indicated).

When V is smooth, one can define the *singular locus* of \mathcal{G} , $\text{Sing}(\mathcal{G})$, as the closed set given by all the points $\zeta \in V$ such that $\nu_{\zeta}(I_l) \geq l$, $\forall l \in \mathbb{N}$, where $\nu_{\zeta}(I)$ denotes the order of the ideal I in the regular local ring $\mathcal{O}_{V, \zeta}$. If $\mathcal{G} = R[f_1 W^{n_1}, \dots, f_r W^{n_r}]$, the singular locus of \mathcal{G} can be computed as

$$(4.1.2) \quad \text{Sing}(\mathcal{G}) = \{\zeta \in \text{Spec}(R) \mid \nu_{\zeta}(f_i) \geq n_i, i = 1, \dots, r\} \subset V,$$

see [16, Proposition 1.4].

Example 4.2. Suppose that R is smooth over a perfect field k , and that $X \subset \text{Spec}(R) = V$ is a hypersurface with $I(X) = (f)$. Let $m > 1$ be the maximum multiplicity at the points of X . Then the singular locus of $\mathcal{G} = R[fW^m]$ is the set of points of X having maximum multiplicity m .

The idea of Example 4.2 can be generalized to the case of an arbitrary algebraic variety:

Example 4.3. Suppose X is a variety over a perfect field, and let $\max \text{mult}_X$ be the maximum value of the multiplicity at points of X , Mult_X . In [35], Villamayor showed that locally, in an étale neighborhood of each closed point $\xi \in \underline{\text{Max}} \text{mult}_X$, there is an immersion of X in a smooth scheme, V , together with functions $f_1, \dots, f_r \in \mathcal{O}_{V, \xi}$ such that $\langle f_1, \dots, f_r \rangle \subset \mathcal{I}(X)$, and furthermore,

$$(4.3.1) \quad \underline{\text{Max}} \text{mult}_X = \bigcap_{j=1}^r \underline{\text{Max}} \text{mult}_{\{f_j=0\}}.$$

If m_j is the maximum order of f_j at ξ for $j = 1, \dots, r$, and if $\mathcal{G} := \mathcal{O}_V[f_1 W^{m_1}, \dots, f_r W^{m_r}]$, then it follows that $\text{Sing}(\mathcal{G}) = \underline{\text{Max}} \text{mult}_X$. This description is in the same spirit as that given by Hironaka for the Hilbert Samuel function in [20].

In the previous examples, the link between the closed set of points of *worst singularities* of X and the singular loci of the corresponding Rees algebras is much stronger than just an equality of closed sets in Example 4.2 or (4.3.1). In particular, by defining a suitable law of transformations of Rees algebras after a blow up, we can establish the same link between the closed set of points of *worst singularities* of the strict transform of X , and the singular locus of the *transform* of the corresponding Rees algebra (at least if the singularities of X have not improved). This motivates the following definitions.

Definition 4.4. Let \mathcal{G} be a Rees algebra on a smooth scheme V . A \mathcal{G} -*permissible blow up*, $V \xleftarrow{\pi} V_1$, is the blow up of V at a smooth closed subset $Y \subset V$ contained in $\text{Sing}(\mathcal{G})$ (a *permissible center for \mathcal{G}*). We use \mathcal{G}_1 to denote the (weighted) transform of \mathcal{G} by π , which is defined as

$$\mathcal{G}_1 := \bigoplus_{l \in \mathbb{N}} I_{l,1} W^l,$$

where

$$(4.4.1) \quad I_{l,1} = I_l \mathcal{O}_{V_1} \cdot I(E)^{-l}$$

for $l \in \mathbb{N}$ and E the exceptional divisor of the blow up $V \xleftarrow{\pi} V_1$.

Definition 4.5. Let \mathcal{G} be a Rees algebra over a smooth scheme V . A *resolution of \mathcal{G}* is a finite sequence of blow ups

$$(4.5.1) \quad \begin{array}{ccccccc} V = V_0 & \xleftarrow{\pi_1} & V_1 & \xleftarrow{\pi_2} & \dots & \xleftarrow{\pi_L} & V_L \\ \mathcal{G} = \mathcal{G}_0 & \longleftarrow & \mathcal{G}_1 & \longleftarrow & \dots & \longleftarrow & \mathcal{G}_L \end{array}$$

at permissible centers $Y_i \subset \text{Sing}(\mathcal{G}_i)$, $i = 0, \dots, L-1$, such that $\text{Sing}(\mathcal{G}_L) = \emptyset$, and such that the exceptional divisor of the composition $V_0 \longleftarrow V_L$ is a union of hypersurfaces with normal crossings. Recall that a set of hypersurfaces $\{H_1, \dots, H_r\}$ in a smooth n -dimensional V has normal crossings at a point $\zeta \in V$ if there is a regular system of parameters $x_1, \dots, x_n \in \mathcal{O}_{V, \zeta}$ such that if $\zeta \in H_{i_1} \cap \dots \cap H_{i_s}$, and $\zeta \notin H_l$ for $l \in \{1, \dots, r\} \setminus \{i_1, \dots, i_s\}$, then $\mathcal{I}(H_{i_j})_\zeta = \langle x_{i_j} \rangle$ for $i_j \in \{i_1, \dots, i_s\}$; we say that H_1, \dots, H_r have normal crossings in V if they have normal crossings at each point of V .

Example 4.6. The Rees algebras of Examples 4.2 and 4.3 are defined so that a resolution of the corresponding Rees algebra induces a sequence of blow ups on X , that ultimately leads to a lowering of the maximum value of the multiplicity. For instance for \mathcal{G} as in Example 4.3, a resolution of \mathcal{G} induces a sequence of transformations such that the multiplicity of the strict transform of X

decreases:

$$(4.6.1) \quad \begin{array}{ccccccc} \mathcal{G} = \mathcal{G}_0 & \longleftarrow & \mathcal{G}_1 & \longleftarrow & \dots & \longleftarrow & \mathcal{G}_{L-1} & \longleftarrow & \mathcal{G}_L \\ V = V_0 & \xleftarrow{\pi_1} & V_1 & \xleftarrow{\pi_2} & \dots & \xleftarrow{\pi_{L-1}} & V_{L-1} & \xleftarrow{\pi_L} & V_L \\ \cup & & \cup & & & & \cup & & \cup \\ X = X_0 & \xleftarrow{\pi_1} & X_1 & \xleftarrow{\pi_2} & \dots & \xleftarrow{\pi_{L-1}} & X_{L-1} & \xleftarrow{\pi_L} & X_L \end{array}$$

(4.6.2)

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} m = \max \text{mult}(X_0) & = & \max \text{mult}(X_1) & = & \dots & = & \max \text{mult}(X_{L-1}) & > & \max \text{mult}(X_L) \\ \parallel & & \parallel & & \dots & & \parallel & & \\ \text{Sing}(\mathcal{G}_0) & & \text{Sing}(\mathcal{G}_1) & & \dots & & \text{Sing}(\mathcal{G}_{L-1}) & & \text{Sing}(\mathcal{G}_L) = \emptyset. \end{array}$$

Here each X_i is the strict transform of X_{i-1} after the blow up π_i , and $\max \text{mult}(X_i)$ refers to the maximum multiplicity of X_i . Note that the set of points of X_L having multiplicity m is $\text{Sing}(\mathcal{G}_L) = \emptyset$. We say that a sequence as in (4.6.1) is a *simplification of the multiplicity* of X .

Remark 4.7. Resolution of Rees algebras is known to exist when V is a smooth scheme defined over a field of characteristic zero ([19], [20]). In [31] and [7] different algorithms of resolution of Rees algebras are presented (see also [15], [14]). More details will be given in the next section.

4.8. On the representation of the multiplicity by Rees algebras. In addition to permissible blow ups, there are other morphisms that play a role in resolution. These are involved in the arguments of *Hironaka's trick*, and they are used to justify that the *resolution invariants* are *well defined* ([9, §21]). Some of these invariants will be treated in the following sections. Apart from permissible blow ups, these morphisms are multiplications by an affine line or restrictions to open subsets. A concatenation of any of these three kinds of morphisms is what we call a *local sequence*. Therefore, for a given Rees algebra \mathcal{G} defined on a smooth scheme V , a *\mathcal{G} -local sequence over V* is a sequence of transformations over V ,

$$(4.8.1) \quad (V = V_0, \mathcal{G} = \mathcal{G}_0) \xleftarrow{\pi_0} (V_1, \mathcal{G}_1) \xleftarrow{\pi_1} \dots \xleftarrow{\pi_{L-1}} (V_L, \mathcal{G}_L),$$

where each π_i is either a permissible blow up for $\mathcal{G}_i \subset \mathcal{O}_{V_i}[W]$ (and \mathcal{G}_{i+1} is the transform of \mathcal{G}_i in the sense of Definition 4.4), or a multiplication by a line or a restriction to some open subset of V_i (and then \mathcal{G}_{i+1} is the pull-back of \mathcal{G}_i in V_{i+1}). If we assume that sequence (4.6.1) is a \mathcal{G} -local sequence over V (instead of just a sequence of permissible blow ups), then the equality $\underline{\text{Max}} \text{mult}_{X_i} = \text{Sing}(\mathcal{G}_i)$ still holds for each $i = 1, \dots, L-1$. Because of this fact we say that the *pair* (V, \mathcal{G}) *represents the closed set* $\underline{\text{Max}} \text{mult}_X$, since there is such a strong link between the two closed sets $\text{Sing}(\mathcal{G}_i)$ and $\underline{\text{Max}} \text{mult}_{X_i}$ along the sequence. The same can be said about the representation of the Hilbert Samuel function in [20]. See [13] for precise definitions and results on local presentations.

4.9. Uniqueness of the representations of the multiplicity. The Rees algebra of Example 4.3 is not the unique Rees algebra on V representing $\underline{\text{Max}} \text{mult}_X$. There are other Rees algebras on V with the same property. This is our motivation for considering two operations that will be performed on Rees algebras: integral closure and saturation by differential operators.

(i) Rees algebras and integral closure. Two Rees algebras over a (not necessarily regular) Noetherian ring R are *integrally equivalent* if their integral closure in $\text{Quot}(R)[W]$ coincide. A Rees algebra over R , $\mathcal{G} = \bigoplus_{l \geq 0} I_l W^l$ is *integrally closed* if it is integrally closed as an R -ring in $\text{Quot}(R)[W]$. We use $\overline{\mathcal{G}}$ for the integral closure of \mathcal{G} . It can be shown that $\overline{\mathcal{G}}$ is also a Rees algebra over R ([10, §1.1]). It is worth noticing that for a given Rees algebra $\mathcal{G} = \bigoplus_l I_l W^l$ there is always some integer N such that \mathcal{G} is finite over $R[I_N W^N]$ (see [16, Remark 1.3]).

(ii) Rees algebras and saturation by differential operators. Let $\beta : V \rightarrow V'$ be a smooth morphism of smooth schemes defined over a perfect field k with $\dim V > \dim V'$. Then, for any integer s , the sheaf of relative differential operators of order at most s , $\text{Diff}_{V/V'}^s$, is locally free over

V ([17, (4) § 16.11]). We will say that a sheaf of \mathcal{O}_V -Rees algebras $\mathcal{G} = \bigoplus_l I_l W^l$ is a β -relative differential Rees algebra or simply a β -differential Rees algebra if there is an affine covering $\{U_i\}$ of V , such that for every homogeneous element $fW^N \in \mathcal{G}$ and every $\Delta \in \text{Diff}_{V/V'}^s(U_i)$ with $s < N$, we have that $\Delta(f)W^{N-s} \in \mathcal{G}$ (in particular, $I_{i+1} \subset I_i$ since $\text{Diff}_{V/V'}^0 \subset \text{Diff}_{V/V'}^1$). Given an arbitrary Rees algebra \mathcal{G} over V there is a natural way to construct a β -relative differential algebra with the property of being the smallest containing \mathcal{G} , and we will denote it by $\text{Diff}_{V/V'}(\mathcal{G})$ (see [33, Theorem 2.7]). Relative differential Rees algebras will play a role in the definition of the so called *elimination algebras* that will be treated in Section 6.

We say that \mathcal{G} is *differentially closed* (or *differentially saturated*) if it is closed by the action of the sheaf of (absolute) differential operators $\text{Diff}_{V/k}$. We use $\text{Diff}(\mathcal{G})$ to denote the smallest differential Rees algebra containing \mathcal{G} (its *differential closure*). See [33, Theorem 3.4] for the existence and construction.

It can be shown that:

$$\text{Sing}(\mathcal{G}) = \text{Sing}(\overline{\mathcal{G}}) = \text{Sing}(\text{Diff}(\mathcal{G})),$$

(see [34, Proposition 4.4 (1), (3)]). In addition, it can be checked that if \mathcal{G} represents $\underline{\text{Max}} \text{mult}_X$ as in Example 4.3, then any other Rees algebra with the same integral closure as \mathcal{G} also represents this closed set; in the same line, any other Rees algebra on V with the same differential saturation as \mathcal{G} also represents $\underline{\text{Max}} \text{mult}_X$. In fact, the integral closure of $\text{Diff}(\mathcal{G})$ is the largest algebra in V with this property.

The previous facts motivate the following definition: two Rees algebras on V , \mathcal{G} and \mathcal{H} , are said to be *weakly equivalent* if: (i) they share the same singular locus; (ii) any \mathcal{G} -local sequence is an \mathcal{H} -local sequence, and vice versa, and they share the same singular locus after any \mathcal{G} - (respectively \mathcal{H} -) local sequence.

It can be proven that two Rees algebras \mathcal{G} and \mathcal{H} are weakly equivalent if and only if $\overline{\text{Diff}(\mathcal{G})} = \overline{\text{Diff}(\mathcal{H})}$ (see [10] and [21]), and, in particular, a resolution of one of them induces a resolution of the other and vice versa.

4.10. Some details on the construction of the representation of the multiplicity in Example 4.3. [35, §5, §7] We end this section giving some details on the construction of the Rees algebra in Example 4.3. We will use this construction in several places along this paper, and it will play a central role in the proofs of our main results in Section 8. Let us assume that X is an equidimensional algebraic variety of dimension d , and let $\xi \in X$ be a closed point of multiplicity $m > 1$. Then it can be shown that, after considering a suitably étale extension of $\mathcal{O}_{X,\xi}$, which we denote by B' , we are in the following setting: $X' = \text{Spec}(B')$, there is a smooth k -algebra, S , and a finite extension $S \subset B'$ of generic rank m , inducing a finite morphism $\alpha : \text{Spec}(B') \rightarrow \text{Spec}(S)$. Under these assumptions, $B' = S[\theta_1, \dots, \theta_e]$, for some $\theta_1, \dots, \theta_e \in B'$ and some $e \in \mathbb{N}$. Observe that the previous extension induces a natural embedding $X' \subset V^{(d+e)} := \text{Spec}(R)$, where $R = S[x_1, \dots, x_e]$. Let $K(S)$ be the field of fractions of S and let $\text{Quot}(B')$ be the total quotient ring of B' . Now, if $f_i(x_i) \in K(S)[x_i]$ denotes the minimal polynomial of θ_i for $i = 1, \dots, e$, then it can be shown that in fact $f_i(x_i) \in S[x_i]$ and as a consequence $\langle f_1(x_1), \dots, f_e(x_e) \rangle \subset \mathcal{I}(X')$, where $\mathcal{I}(X')$ is the defining ideal of X' in $V^{(d+e)}$. Finally, if each polynomial $f_i(x_i)$ is of degree m_i , it is proven that the differential Rees algebra

$$(4.10.1) \quad \mathcal{G}^{(d+e)} = \text{Diff}(R[f_1(x_1)W^{m_1}, \dots, f_e(x_e)W^{m_e}])$$

is a representation of the multiplicity of X at ξ . Observe that $\mathcal{G}_i^{(d+1)} := \text{Diff}(S[x_i][f_i(x_i)W^{m_i}])$ represents the maximum multiplicity of the hypersurface defined by $f_i(x_i)$ in $V_i^{(d+1)} = \text{Spec}(S[x_i])$. By identifying $\mathcal{G}_i^{(d+1)}$ with its pull-back in $V^{(d+e)}$, we have that:

$$(4.10.2) \quad \mathcal{G}^{(d+e)} = \text{Diff}(\mathcal{G}_1^{(d+1)}) \odot \dots \odot \text{Diff}(\mathcal{G}_e^{(d+1)}).$$

Here $\mathcal{H}_1 \odot \mathcal{H}_2$ denotes the smallest Rees algebra containing \mathcal{H}_1 and \mathcal{H}_2 .

5. ALGORITHMIC RESOLUTION AND RESOLUTION INVARIANTS

In characteristic zero, an algorithmic resolution of Rees algebras requires the definition of *resolution invariants*. These are used to assign a string of numbers to each point $\zeta \in \underline{\text{Max}} \text{mult}_X = \text{Sing}(\mathcal{G})$. In this way one can define an upper semi-continuous function $g : \text{Sing}(\mathcal{G}) \rightarrow (\Gamma, \geq)$, where Γ is some well ordered set, and whose maximum value determines the first center to blow up. This function is constructed so that its maximum value drops after each blow up. As a consequence, a resolution of \mathcal{G} is achieved after a finite number of steps.

The most important resolution invariant is *Hironaka's order function at a point* $\zeta \in \text{Sing}(\mathcal{G})$ which we also refer as the *order of the Rees algebra* \mathcal{G} at ζ :

$$(5.0.1) \quad \text{ord}_\zeta(\mathcal{G}) := \inf_{l \geq 0} \left\{ \frac{\nu_\zeta(I_l)}{l} \right\}.$$

If $\mathcal{G} = R[f_1 W^{m_1}, \dots, f_r W^{m_r}]$ and $\zeta \in \text{Sing}(\mathcal{G})$ then it can be shown (see [16, Proposition 6.4.1]) that:

$$\text{ord}_\zeta(\mathcal{G}) = \min_{i=1, \dots, r} \left\{ \frac{\nu_\zeta(f_i)}{m_i} \right\}.$$

Any other invariant involved in the algorithmic resolution of a Rees algebra \mathcal{G} derives from Hironaka's order function.

It can be proved that for any point $\zeta \in \text{Sing}(\mathcal{G})$ we have $\text{ord}_\zeta(\mathcal{G}) = \text{ord}_\zeta(\overline{\mathcal{G}}) = \text{ord}_\zeta(\text{Diff}(\mathcal{G}))$ (see [16, Remark 3.5, Proposition 6.4 (2)]).

5.1. Resolution invariants and weak equivalence. It can be proven that two Rees algebras that are weakly equivalent share the same resolution invariants and therefore a resolution of one induces a resolution of the other. In particular, this is the case for \mathcal{G} , $\overline{\mathcal{G}}$ and $\text{Diff}(\mathcal{G})$ ([16, Proposition 3.4, Theorem 4.1, Theorem 7.18], [36]).

5.2. The role of Hironaka's order in resolution and the use of induction in the dimension. Suppose \mathcal{G} is defined on a smooth scheme V of dimension n , and assume that $\text{ord}_\xi(\mathcal{G}) = 1$ for some closed point $\xi \in \text{Sing}(\mathcal{G})$. Then, there are two possibilities:

- (i) Either the point ξ is contained in some codimension-one component Y of $\text{Sing}(\mathcal{G})$; in such case it can be shown that Y is smooth, and the blow up at Y induces a resolution of \mathcal{G} , locally at ξ ([11, Lemma 13.2]);
- (ii) Otherwise, it can be proven that, locally, in an étale neighborhood of ξ , there is a smooth projection from V to some smooth $(n-1)$ -dimensional scheme Z , together with a new Rees algebra \mathcal{R} on Z such that a resolution of \mathcal{R} induces a resolution of \mathcal{G} and vice versa, at least if the characteristic is zero. This is what we call an *elimination algebra of \mathcal{G}* and details on its construction will be given in the next section.

Case (ii) indicates that resolution of Rees algebras can be addressed by induction on the dimension when the characteristic is zero; this is the key point of resolution and motivates the notion of elimination algebras that will be addressed in the next section. Observe that the Rees algebra in (4.10.1) from Example 4.10 has order equal to one at each point of its singular locus.

It is worthwhile mentioning that if the maximum order at the points of $\text{Sing}(\mathcal{G})$ is larger than one, then one can attach a new Rees algebra \mathcal{H} to the closed points of maximum order, $\underline{\text{max}} \text{ord}(\mathcal{G})$, so that $\text{Sing}(\mathcal{H}) = \underline{\text{max}} \text{ord}(\mathcal{G})$, and so that the equality is preserved by \mathcal{H} -local sequences. Thus \mathcal{H} is unique up to weak equivalence. This new Rees algebra \mathcal{H} is constructed so that its maximum order equal to one, and the arguments in (i) and (ii) can be applied to it.

6. ELIMINATION ALGEBRAS

Along this and the following sections, $V^{(n)}$ denotes an n -dimensional smooth scheme over a perfect field k , and $\mathcal{G}^{(n)} = \bigoplus_l I_l W^l$ a Rees algebra over $V^{(n)}$. Our purpose is to search for smooth

morphisms from $V^{(n)}$ to some $(n-e)$ -dimensional smooth scheme, for some $e \geq 1$, so that $\text{Sing}(\mathcal{G}^{(n)})$ is homeomorphic to its image via β , and so that this condition is preserved by permissible blow ups in some sense that will be specified below. One way to find such smooth morphisms is by considering morphisms from $V^{(n)}$ which are somehow *transversal* to $\mathcal{G}^{(n)}$. The condition of transversality is expressed in terms of the *tangent cone of $\mathcal{G}^{(n)}$* at a given point of its singular locus (see Definition 6.5 below).

Let $\xi \in \text{Sing}(\mathcal{G}^{(n)})$ be a closed point, and let $\text{Gr}_{\mathfrak{m}_\xi}(\mathcal{O}_{V^{(n)},\xi})$ denote the graded ring of $\mathcal{O}_{V^{(n)},\xi} \simeq k'[Y_1, \dots, Y_n]$, where k' is the residue field at ξ . Observe that $\text{Spec}(\text{Gr}_{\mathfrak{m}_\xi}(\mathcal{O}_{V^{(n)},\xi})) = \mathbb{T}_{V^{(n)},\xi}$, the tangent space of $V^{(n)}$ at ξ .

Definition 6.1. Suppose $\xi \in \text{Sing}(\mathcal{G}^{(n)})$ is a closed point with $\text{ord}_\xi(\mathcal{G}^{(n)}) = 1$. The *initial ideal* or *tangent ideal of $\mathcal{G}^{(n)}$ at ξ* , $\text{In}_\xi \mathcal{G}^{(n)}$, is the homogeneous ideal of $\text{Gr}_{\mathfrak{m}_\xi}(\mathcal{O}_{V^{(n)},\xi})$ generated by

$$\text{In}_\xi(I_l) := \frac{I_l + \mathfrak{m}_\xi^{l+1}}{\mathfrak{m}_\xi^{l+1}}$$

for all $l \geq 1$. The *tangent cone of $\mathcal{G}^{(n)}$ at ξ* , $\mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{G}^{(n)},\xi}$, is the closed subset of $\mathbb{T}_{V^{(n)},\xi}$ defined by the initial ideal of $\mathcal{G}^{(n)}$ at ξ .

Definition 6.2. [33, 4.2] The τ -invariant of $\mathcal{G}^{(n)}$ at the closed point ξ is the minimum number of variables in $\text{Gr}_{\mathfrak{m}_\xi}(\mathcal{O}_{V^{(n)},\xi})$ needed to generate $\text{In}_\xi(\mathcal{G}^{(n)})$. This in turn is the codimension of the largest linear subspace $\mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{G}^{(n)},\xi} \subset \mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{G}^{(n)},\xi}$ such that $u + v \in \mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{G}^{(n)},\xi}$ for all $u \in \mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{G}^{(n)},\xi}$ and $v \in \mathcal{L}_{\mathcal{G}^{(n)},\xi}$. The τ -invariant of $\mathcal{G}^{(n)}$ at ξ is denoted by $\tau_{\mathcal{G}^{(n)},\xi}$.

Example 6.3. It can be checked that for the Rees algebra in (4.10.1), one has that $\tau_{\mathcal{G}^{(n)},\xi} \geq e$. This follows from the fact that the initial forms of the polynomials $f_i(x_i) \in S[x_i]$ depend on different variables, see [8, §4.2] for further details.

Definition 6.4. Let $\xi \in \text{Sing}(\mathcal{G}^{(n)})$ be a closed point with $\tau_{\mathcal{G}^{(n)},\xi} \geq e \geq 1$. A local smooth projection to a $(n-e)$ -dimensional (smooth) scheme $V^{(n-e)}$, $\beta : V^{(n)} \rightarrow V^{(n-e)}$, is $\mathcal{G}^{(n)}$ -*transversal* at ξ if

$$\ker(d_\xi \beta) \cap \mathcal{C}_{\mathcal{G}^{(n)},\xi} = \{0\} \subset \mathbb{T}_{V^{(n)},\xi},$$

where $d_\xi \beta$ denotes the differential of β at the point ξ .

Definition 6.5. Let $\xi \in \text{Sing} \mathcal{G}^{(n)}$ be a closed point with $\tau_{\mathcal{G}^{(n)},\xi} \geq e \geq 1$. A local smooth projection to an $(n-e)$ -dimensional (smooth) scheme $V^{(n-e)}$, $\beta : V^{(n)} \rightarrow V^{(n-e)}$, is $\mathcal{G}^{(n)}$ -*admissible locally* at ξ if the following conditions hold:

- (1) The point ξ is not contained in any codimension- e -component of $\text{Sing} \mathcal{G}^{(n)}$;
- (2) The Rees algebra $\mathcal{G}^{(n)}$ is a β -relative differential algebra (see §4.9 (ii));
- (3) The morphism β is $\mathcal{G}^{(n)}$ -transversal at ξ .

Regarding condition (1), observe that if ξ is contained in a codimension- e -component of $\text{Sing} \mathcal{G}^{(n)}$ then this component is a permissible center, see §5.2.

Remark 6.6. Given $\mathcal{G}^{(n)}$, $V^{(n)}$ and ξ as in Definition 6.5, it is always possible to construct a $\mathcal{G}^{(n)}$ -admissible morphism in an (étale) neighborhood of ξ (see [33] and also [11, §8.3]).

Example 6.7. The morphism $\beta : \text{Spec}(R) \rightarrow \text{Spec}(S)$ in §4.10 is $\mathcal{G}^{(n)}$ -admissible locally at ξ' for $\mathcal{G}^{(n)}$ as in (4.10.1), if condition (1) in Definition 6.5 holds at ξ' (see [2, Chapter 7] and also [8, §4.2]).

Definition 6.8. Let $\beta : V^{(n)} \rightarrow V^{(n-e)}$ be a $\mathcal{G}^{(n)}$ -admissible projection in an (étale) neighborhood of the closed point ξ . Then the $\mathcal{O}_{V^{(n-e)}}$ -Rees algebra

$$\mathcal{G}^{(n-e)} := \mathcal{G}^{(n)} \cap \mathcal{O}_{V^{(n-e)}}[W],$$

and any other with the same integral closure in $\mathcal{O}_{V^{(n-e)}}[W]$, is an *elimination algebra of $\mathcal{G}^{(n)}$ in $V^{(n-e)}$* .

Remark 6.9. The notion of elimination algebras is formulated differently in [33] (in the case $e = 1$) and [11] (in the case $e \geq 1$). Nevertheless, up to integral closure, both definitions lead to the same $\mathcal{O}_{V^{(n-e)}}$ -Rees algebra (see [33, Theorem 4.11]).

Example 6.10. Let S be a smooth d -dimensional k -algebra of finite type, with $d > 0$. Let $V^{(d+1)} = \text{Spec}(S[x])$. Then the natural inclusion $S \xrightarrow{\beta^*} S[x]$, induces a smooth projection $V^{(d+1)} \xrightarrow{\beta} V^{(d)} = \text{Spec}(S)$. Let $f(x) \in S[x]$ be a polynomial of degree $m > 1$, defining a hypersurface X in $V^{(n)}$. Set $X = \text{Spec}(S[x]/\langle f(x) \rangle)$. Suppose that $\xi \in X$ is a point of multiplicity m . Then,

$$\mathcal{G}^{(d+1)} = \text{Diff}(S[x][fW^m]) \subset S[x][W]$$

represents the multiplicity function on X locally at ξ .

If the characteristic is zero and if we assume that f has the form of Tschirnhausen:

$$(6.10.1) \quad f(x) = x^m + a_2x^{m-2} + \dots + a_{m-i}x^i + \dots + a_m \in S[x],$$

where $a_i \in S$ for $i = 0, \dots, m-2$, then it can be shown that, up to integral closure,

$$\mathcal{G}^{(d)} = \text{Diff}(S[x][a_2W^2, \dots, a_{m-i}W^{m-i}, \dots, a_mW^m]),$$

is an elimination algebra of $\mathcal{G}^{(d+1)}$. When the characteristic of k is zero, there is always a change a coordinates for f that allows to assume that f is in the form of Tschirnhausen. If the characteristic is positive, the elimination algebra is also defined. In either case, it can be shown that it is generated by a finite set of some symmetric (weighted homogeneous) functions evaluated on the coefficients of $f(x)$ (cf. [32], [33, §1, Definition 4.10]). It is worthwhile noticing that the elimination algebra $\mathcal{G}^{(d)}$ is invariant under changes of the form $x' = x + \alpha$ with $\alpha \in S$ [33, §1.5].

Example 6.11. Consider the notation and the setting of §4.10 for an algebraic variety X defined over a perfect field k and a closed point $\xi \in \text{Max mult}_X$. Then after an étale extension B' of $\mathcal{O}_{X,\xi}$, the natural inclusion $S \subset R = S[x_1, \dots, x_e]$ induces smooth projections, $\beta : V^{(d+e)} \rightarrow V^{(d)} = \text{Spec}(S)$, and $\beta_i : V_i^{(d+1)} = \text{Spec}(S[x_i]) \rightarrow V^{(d)} = \text{Spec}(S)$ for $i = 1, \dots, e$. It can be shown that $\tau_{\beta,\xi} \geq e$, that β is $\mathcal{G}^{(d+e)}$ -admissible, and that each β_i is $\mathcal{G}_i^{(d+1)}$ -admissible. Moreover, up to integral closure,

$$(6.11.1) \quad \mathcal{G}^{(d)} = \mathcal{G}_1^{(d)} \odot \dots \odot \mathcal{G}_e^{(d)} \subset S[W],$$

where $\mathcal{G}_i^{(d)}$ is an elimination algebra of $\mathcal{G}_i^{(d+1)}$ on $V^{(d)}$. See [8, §3.8].

6.12. First properties of elimination algebras. Let $\beta : V^{(n)} \rightarrow V^{(n-e)}$ be a $\mathcal{G}^{(n)}$ -admissible projection in an (étale) neighborhood of a closed $\xi \in \text{Sing}(\mathcal{G}^{(n)})$, and let $\mathcal{G}^{(n-e)} \subset \mathcal{O}_{V^{(n-e)}}[W]$ be an elimination algebra. Then:

- (1) $\text{Sing}(\mathcal{G}^{(n)})$ maps injectively into $\text{Sing}(\mathcal{G}^{(n-e)})$, in particular

$$\beta(\text{Sing}(\mathcal{G}^{(n)})) \subset \text{Sing}(\mathcal{G}^{(n-e)})$$

with equality if the characteristic is zero, or if $\mathcal{G}^{(n)}$ is a differential Rees algebra. Moreover, in this case $\text{Sing}(\mathcal{G}^{(n)})$ and $\beta(\text{Sing}(\mathcal{G}^{(n)}))$ are homeomorphic (see [11, §8.4]).

- (2) If $\mathcal{G}^{(n)}$ is a differential Rees algebra, then so is $\mathcal{G}^{(n-e)}$ (see [33, Corollary 4.14]).
- (3) If $\mathcal{G}^{(n)} \subset \mathcal{G}'^{(n)}$ is a finite extension, then $\mathcal{G}^{(n-e)} \subset \mathcal{G}'^{(n-e)}$ is a finite extension (see [33, Theorem 4.11]).
- (4) For a point $\zeta \in \text{Sing}(\mathcal{G}^{(n)})$, the order of $\mathcal{G}^{(n-e)}$ at $\beta(\zeta)$ does not depend on the choice of the projection β (see [33, Theorem 5.5] and [11, Theorem 10.1]).

Definition 6.13. Let $\beta : V^{(n)} \rightarrow V^{(n-e)}$ be a $\mathcal{G}^{(n)}$ -admissible projection in an (étale) neighborhood of a closed point $\xi \in \text{Sing}(\mathcal{G}^{(n)})$, and let $\mathcal{G}^{(n-e)} \subset \mathcal{O}_{V^{(n-e)}}[W]$ be an elimination algebra for some $e \geq 1$. Then, by §6.12 (4), for $\mathcal{G}^{(n)}$ we can define *Hironaka's order function in dimension $(n - e)$ at every point $\zeta \in \text{Sing}(\mathcal{G}^{(n)})$* as:

$$\text{ord}_{\mathcal{G}^{(n)}}^{(n-e)}(\zeta) := \text{ord}_{\beta(\zeta)}(\mathcal{G}^{(n-e)}).$$

Example 6.14. With the setting and notation in §4.10 and Example 6.11, recall that $\mathcal{G}^{(d)} = \mathcal{G}_1^{(d)} \odot \dots \odot \mathcal{G}_e^{(d)} \subset S[W]$ is an elimination algebra of $\mathcal{G}^{(d+e)}$ (up to integral closure), and for each $\zeta \in \text{Sing}(\mathcal{G}^{(d+e)})$ we have

$$\text{ord}_{\mathcal{G}^{(d+e)}}^{(d)}(\zeta) = \text{ord}_{\beta(\zeta)}(\mathcal{G}^{(d)}) = \min_{i=1, \dots, e} \left\{ \text{ord}_{\beta(\zeta)}(\mathcal{G}_1^{(d)}), \dots, \text{ord}_{\beta(\zeta)}(\mathcal{G}_e^{(d)}) \right\}.$$

6.15. Hironaka's order of an algebraic variety. The number $\text{ord}_{\mathcal{G}^{(d+e)}}^{(d)}(\zeta)$ from Example 6.14 does not depend on the choice of the pair $(V^{(d+e)}, \mathcal{G}^{(d+e)})$, nor on the choice of the admissible projection $\beta : V^{(d+e)} \rightarrow V^{(d)}$. This motivates the following definition.

Let X be an equidimensional variety of dimension d over a perfect field k and let $\zeta \in X$ be a point of multiplicity $m > 1$. Let $\xi \in \overline{\{\zeta\}}$ be a closed of multiplicity m and consider the construction from §4.10 where $X' = \text{Spec}(B')$ is an étale neighborhood of $\mathcal{O}_{X, \xi}$. Let $\zeta' \in X'$ be a point mapping to ζ . Then using the notation of Example 6.11 we define *Hironaka's order function of X at ζ* as:

$$\text{ord}_X^{(d)}(\zeta) := \text{ord}_{\mathcal{G}^{(d+e)}}^{(d)}(\zeta').$$

Now, it is worthwhile noticing that in [1] it is shown that the restriction of $\mathcal{G}^{(d+e)}$ to X' , $\mathcal{G}_{X'} = \bigoplus_n J_n$, does not depend (up to integral closure) on the selection of the pair $(V^{(d+e)}, \mathcal{G}^{(d+e)})$ representing the multiplicity. Let $\mathfrak{p}_{\zeta'} \subset B'$ be the prime ideal defining the point ζ' . Using the asymptotic Samuel function we define

$$\overline{\text{ord}}_{\zeta'}(\mathcal{G}_{X'}) := \inf_n \left\{ \frac{\overline{\nu}_{\zeta'}(J_n)}{n} \right\}, \quad \text{and} \quad \overline{\text{ord}}_{\mathfrak{p}_{\zeta'}}(\mathcal{G}_{X'}) := \inf_n \left\{ \frac{\overline{\nu}_{\mathfrak{p}_{\zeta'}}(J_n)}{n} \right\}.$$

These functions $\overline{\text{ord}}$ will play a role in the proofs of our results in Section 8 (see §8.1).

Remark 6.16. When facing an algorithmic resolution of the variety X in characteristic zero, the number $\text{ord}_X^{(d)}(\zeta)$ is the most important invariant at the point ζ (after the multiplicity), and there is a strong link between the resolutions of $\mathcal{G}^{(d+e)}$ and $\mathcal{G}^{(d)}$: in particular, a resolution of the first induces a resolution of the second and vice versa. When the characteristic is positive, this link between $\mathcal{G}^{(d+e)}$ and $\mathcal{G}^{(d)}$ is weaker, and more invariants need to be defined. This motivates the contents of the following section.

7. THE FUNCTION H-ord

Now suppose that X is an equidimensional variety of dimension d with maximum multiplicity $m > 1$ defined over a perfect field k . From the discussions in §4.10 it follows that finding a simplification of the multiplicity of X is equivalent to finding a resolution of the Rees algebra $\mathcal{G}^{(d+e)}$ in (4.10.1) from §4.10 (see Example 4.6)). If the characteristic is zero, by Remark 6.16, this is equivalent to finding a resolution of the elimination algebra constructed in (6.11.1) from Example 6.11. Observe that the elimination algebra $\mathcal{G}^{(d)}$ is defined in a d -dimensional smooth scheme. Therefore, the first relevant resolution invariant, (after the multiplicity at ζ) is $\text{ord}_{\mathcal{G}^{(d+e)}}^{(d)}(\zeta) = \text{ord}_{\beta(\zeta)}(\mathcal{G}^{(d)})$.

When the characteristic is positive, the Rees algebra $\mathcal{G}^{(d)}$ of Example 6.11 is the one that *best approximates* $\underline{\text{Max}} \text{ mult}_X$ in some d -dimensional smooth scheme (see [3]). However, in some cases it

is too coarse and it exaggerates the image of the set of points of multiplicity m of a strict transform of X after a sequence of permissible blow ups.

Example 7.1. Let $X = \text{Spec}(\mathbb{F}_2[z, y]/\langle z^2 - y^3 \rangle)$. Set $V^{(2)} = \text{Spec}(\mathbb{F}_2[z, y])$, define the $\mathbb{F}_2[z, y]$ -Rees algebra

$$\mathcal{G}^{(2)} := \text{Diff}(\mathbb{F}_2[z, y][\langle z^2 - y^3 \rangle W^2]) = \mathbb{F}_2[z, y][y^2 W, (z^2 - y^3)W^2],$$

and let ξ be the singular point of X . Then the natural inclusion $\mathbb{F}_2[y] \subset \mathbb{F}_2[z, y]$ induces a $\mathcal{G}^{(2)}$ -transversal projection $\beta : V^{(2)} \rightarrow V^{(1)} = \text{Spec}(\mathbb{F}_2[y])$. The elimination algebra is

$$\mathcal{G}^{(1)} = \mathbb{F}_2[y][y^2 W].$$

Let $V_1^{(2)} \rightarrow V^{(2)}$ be the blow up at ξ and $X_1 \subset V_1^{(2)}$ be the strict transform of X . Then X_1 is regular and it can be checked that the singular locus of the weak transform $\mathcal{G}_1^{(2)}$ of $\mathcal{G}^{(2)}$ is empty. Observe that the blow up of $V^{(1)}$ at $\beta(\xi)$ is an isomorphism, but the weak transform of $\mathcal{G}^{(1)}$ is $\mathcal{G}_1^{(1)} = \mathbb{F}_2[y][yW]$, and $\text{Sing}(\mathcal{G}_1^{(1)})$ is not empty.

Thus, when the characteristic is positive, what we consider the first relevant invariant in characteristic zero, $\text{ord}_{\mathcal{G}^{(d+e)}}^{(d)}(\zeta) = \text{ord}_{\beta(\zeta)} \mathcal{G}^{(d)}$, needs to be refined.

The previous discussion motivates the search for other invariants, which in this case leads us to talk about the function $\text{H-ord}_X^{(d)}$, introduced and studied in [5] and [6].

Presentation of a hypersurface

7.2. The hypersurface setting. Let $V^{(d+1)}$ be $(d+1)$ -dimensional smooth scheme over a perfect field k , let $X \subset V^{(d+1)}$ be a hypersurface of dimension d , and let $\xi \in X$ be a closed point of maximum multiplicity $m > 1$.

Choose a local generator $f \in \mathcal{O}_{V^{(d+1)}, \xi}$ defining the hypersurface X in an open affine neighborhood $U \subset V^{(d+1)}$ of ξ , which we denote by $V^{(d+1)}$ for simplicity. Define the Rees algebra $\mathcal{G}^{(d+1)} = \text{Diff}(\mathcal{O}_{V^{(d+1)}}[fW^m])$. It can be checked that the singular locus of $\mathcal{G}^{(d+1)}$ describes the set of points of multiplicity m of X in $V^{(d+1)}$:

$$\underline{\text{Max}} \text{mult}(X) = \text{Sing}(\mathcal{G}^{(d+1)}).$$

Moreover this equality is preserved after local transformations.

After applying Weierstrass Preparation Theorem, we can assume that in an étale neighborhood of $\xi \in V^{(d+1)}$, which we also denote by $V^{(d+1)}$ for simplicity, we have the following situation. There is an affine smooth scheme of dimension d , $V^{(d)} = \text{Spec}(S)$, such that $V^{(d+1)} = \text{Spec}(S[z])$, where z is a variable, and X is defined by

$$f = z^m + a_1 z^{m-1} + \cdots + a_{m-1} z + a_m, \quad a_i \in S, \quad i = 1, 2, \dots, m.$$

It can be checked that the morphism $\beta : V^{(d+1)} \rightarrow V^{(d)}$ is $\mathcal{G}^{(d+1)}$ -transversal at ξ (Definition 6.4). We say that f is written in *Weierstrass form with respect to the projection* β .

7.3. Relative differential operators. The natural inclusion $S \subset S[z]$ induces a smooth projection of relative dimension 1. If T is another variable, then there is a morphism of S -algebras,

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Tay} : S[z] &\rightarrow S[z, T] \\ f(z) &\mapsto f(z + T) = \sum \Delta_z^i(f(z))T^i, \end{aligned}$$

where the operators $\Delta_z^i : S[z] \rightarrow S[z]$ are induced by Tay. The set $\{\Delta_z^0, \dots, \Delta_z^r\}$ is a basis of the free module of S -differential operators of $S[z]$ of order r .

Remark 7.4. [6, §2.15] With the same notation as in §7.2, it can be proved that, in a neighborhood of ξ , $\mathcal{G}^{(d+1)}$ has the same integral closure as

$$(7.4.1) \quad S[z][fW^m, \Delta_z^\alpha(f)W^{m-\alpha}]_{1 \leq \alpha \leq m-1} \odot \mathcal{G}^{(d)},$$

where $\mathcal{G}^{(d)}$ is an elimination algebra of $\mathcal{G}^{(d+1)}$ (see [5, Proposition 2.12]; see also Example 6.10). We will say that (7.4.1) is a *simplified presentation* of $\mathcal{G}^{(d+1)}$ at ξ . The presentation depends on the choice of the smooth morphism β , the variable z and the monic generator fW^m . We will use $\mathcal{P}(\beta, z, fW^m)$ to denote this simplified presentation.

Definition 7.5. [6, §5.5] Let $\mathcal{P}(\beta, z, fW^m)$ be a simplified presentation of $\mathcal{G}^{(d+1)}$ as in Remark 7.4, with

$$f = z^m + a_1 z^{m-1} + \cdots + a_{m-1} z + a_m \in \mathcal{O}_{V^{(d)}}[z].$$

The *slope* of $\mathcal{P}(\beta, z, fW^m)$ at a point $\zeta \in \text{Sing}(\mathcal{G}^{(d+1)}) \subset V^{(d+1)}$ is defined as:

$$(7.5.1) \quad Sl(\mathcal{P})(\zeta) := \min \left\{ \nu_{\beta(\zeta)}(a_1), \dots, \frac{\nu_{\beta(\zeta)}(a_j)}{j}, \dots, \frac{\nu_{\beta(\zeta)}(a_m)}{m}, \text{ord}_{\beta(\zeta)}(\mathcal{G}^{(d)}) \right\}.$$

Remark 7.6. Note that the value $Sl(\mathcal{P})(\zeta)$ depends on the chosen data, that is, on the morphism β , the generator fW^m and the global section z . Translations of the form $z + s$, with $s \in \mathcal{O}_{V^{(d)}}$, give new simplified presentations $\mathcal{P}(\beta, z + s, fW^m)$ which may lead to different values of the slope. This motivates the following definition.

Definition 7.7. Given the morphism $\beta : V^{(d+1)} \rightarrow V^{(d)}$ and $fW^m \in \mathcal{G}^{(d+1)}$ for $\zeta \in \text{Sing}(\mathcal{G}^{(d+1)})$ we define

$$(7.7.1) \quad \beta\text{-ord}(\zeta) := \sup_{z'} \{ Sl(\mathcal{P}(\beta, z', fW^m))(\zeta) \}$$

where z' runs over all changes of the form $z' = uz + s$, with $u, s \in \mathcal{O}_{V^{(d)}, \beta(\zeta)}$ and u is a unit (see [5, §5.2]).

Remark 7.8. It can be shown that the value $\beta\text{-ord}(\xi)$ does not depend on the choice of the transversal morphism β , nor on the choice of the order-one-element $fW^m \in \mathcal{G}^{(d+1)}$ (fW^m can be replaced by any other order-one-element $gW^{m_1} \in \mathcal{G}^{(d+1)}$ non necessarily defining the hypersurface X). Moreover, the supremum in (7.7.1) is a maximum for a suitable selection of z' . See [5, Theorem 7.2].

This leads us to the following definition:

Definition 7.9. [6, §5, Definition 5.12] Let $\zeta \in X$ be a point of a hypersurface X of multiplicity $m > 1$, we define

$$\text{H-ord}_X^{(d)}(\zeta) := \text{H-ord}_{X'}^{(d)}(\zeta') := \beta\text{-ord}(\zeta') = \max_{z'} \{ Sl(\mathcal{P}(\beta, z', gW^N))(\zeta') \},$$

where $X' \rightarrow X$ is some étale neighborhood of a closed point of multiplicity m , $\xi \in \overline{\{\zeta\}}$, such that the setting of §7.2 holds, and $\zeta' \in X'$ is a point mapping to ζ .

Remark 7.10. When the characteristic of the base field k is zero, then it can be shown that for all $\zeta \in \text{Sing}(\mathcal{G}^{(d+1)})$,

$$\text{H-ord}_X^{(d)}(\zeta) = \text{ord}_{\beta(\zeta)}(\mathcal{G}^{(d)})$$

(see [6, §2.13] and Example 6.10). Thus, this invariant really provides new information only when the characteristic of k is positive. For example, we can consider X as in Example 7.1, where it can be checked that

$$\text{H-ord}_X^{(d)}(\xi) = 3/2 < \text{ord}_{\beta(\xi)}(\mathcal{G}^{(1)}) = 2.$$

The previous discussion motivates the content of the next subsection.

7.11. p -Presentations. Suppose $\text{char}(k) = p > 0$. Continuing with the notation introduced in 7.2, Since $\mathcal{G}^{(d+1)}$ is a differential algebra, in order to compute the value $\beta\text{-ord}(\xi)$, it is always possible to find an order-one-element of the form $hW^{p^\ell} \in \mathcal{G}^{(d+1)}$, where h is a monic polynomial of degree p^ℓ for some $\ell \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}$, and in Weierstrass form with respect to β . This can be done as follows. Assume that $g(z)W^N \in \mathcal{G}^{(d+1)}$ and that

$$g(z) = z^N + b_1 z^{N-1} + \cdots + b_{N-1} z + b_N, \quad b_i \in S, \quad i = 1, \dots, N.$$

Write $N = N'p^\ell$ with p not dividing N' . Set $r = (N' - 1)p^\ell$ and $h(z) = \frac{1}{N'} \Delta_z^r(g(z))$. Note that

$$(7.11.1) \quad h(z) = z^{p^\ell} + \tilde{b}_1 z^{p^\ell-1} + \cdots + \tilde{b}_{p^\ell}$$

where, for $j = 1, \dots, p^\ell - 1$, $\tilde{b}_j = \frac{c_j}{N'} b_j$ for some integer c_j , and $\tilde{b}_{p^\ell} = \frac{1}{N'} b_{p^\ell}$. Then $h(z)W^{p^\ell} \in \mathcal{G}^{(d+1)}$ and $\mathcal{P}(\beta, z, h(z)W^{p^\ell})$ is a special type of simplified presentation of $\mathcal{G}^{(d+1)}$. Presentations of the form $\mathcal{P}(\beta, z, hW^{p^\ell})$ will be called p -presentations ([5, Definition 2.14]).

Compared to general simplified presentations, p -presentations have the advantage that the computation of the slope (7.5.1) becomes simpler.

Theorem 7.12. [5, Theorem 4.4] *Let $\mathcal{P}(\beta, z, hW^{p^\ell})$ be a p -presentation of $\mathcal{G}^{(d+1)}$, where*

$$(7.12.1) \quad h(z) = z^{p^\ell} + \tilde{b}_1 z^{p^\ell-1} + \cdots + \tilde{b}_{p^\ell-1} z + \tilde{b}_{p^\ell} \in \mathcal{O}_{V^{(d)}}[z].$$

Let $\zeta \in \text{Sing}(\mathcal{G}^{(d+1)})$. Then

$$Sl(\mathcal{P})(\zeta) = \min \left\{ \frac{\nu_{\beta(\zeta)}(\tilde{b}_{p^\ell})}{p^\ell}, \text{ord}_{\beta(\zeta)}(\mathcal{G}^{(d)}) \right\}.$$

In [5] it is explained how to find a p -presentation that maximizes $Sl(\mathcal{P})(\zeta)$. In the next lines we summarize the main ideas of the so called *cleaning process* since we will be using them in Section 8.

7.13. Cleaning process [5, §5.1, §5.2, and Proposition 5.3] For a given p -presentation, and a point $\zeta \in \text{Sing}(\mathcal{G}^{(d+1)})$, there are different possibilities:

- (A) $Sl(\mathcal{P})(\zeta) = \text{ord}_{\beta(\zeta)}(\mathcal{G}^{(d)})$;
- (B) $Sl(\mathcal{P})(\zeta) = \frac{\nu_{\beta(\zeta)}(\tilde{b}_{p^\ell})}{p^\ell} < \text{ord}_{\beta(\zeta)}(\mathcal{G}^{(d)})$, and then:
 - (B1) $\frac{\nu_{\beta(\zeta)}(\tilde{b}_{p^\ell})}{p^\ell} \notin \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$;
 - (B2) $\frac{\nu_{\beta(\zeta)}(\tilde{b}_{p^\ell})}{p^\ell} \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$ and the initial part of \tilde{b}_{p^ℓ} at ζ , $\text{In}_\zeta(\tilde{b}_{p^\ell}) \in \text{Gr}_{\beta(\zeta)}(\mathcal{O}_{V^{(d)}, \zeta})$ is not a p^e th power at $\text{Gr}_{\beta(\zeta)}(\mathcal{O}_{V^{(d)}, \zeta})$;
 - (B3) $\frac{\nu_{\beta(\zeta)}(\tilde{b}_{p^\ell})}{p^\ell} \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$ and $\text{In}_\zeta(\tilde{b}_{p^\ell})$ is a p^e th power at $\text{Gr}_{\beta(\zeta)}(\mathcal{O}_{V^{(d)}, \zeta})$.

It can be proven that changes of the form $uz + s$ produce a new p -presentation \mathcal{P}' with $Sl(\mathcal{P}')(\zeta) > Sl(\mathcal{P})(\zeta)$ only in case (B3). In such case, only changes of the section of the form: $z' := z + s$ with $s \in \mathcal{O}_{V^{(d)}, \beta(\zeta)}$, and $\nu_{\beta(\eta)}(s) \geq \nu_{\beta(\zeta)}(\tilde{b}_{p^\ell})/p^e$ lead to new p -presentations \mathcal{P}' with $Sl(\mathcal{P}')(\zeta) \geq Sl(\mathcal{P})(\zeta)$. Moreover, if $\xi \in \overline{\{\zeta\}}$, and ζ defines a regular closed subscheme at ξ , then to maximize the slope it suffices to consider changes of the form $z' := z + s$ with $s \in \mathcal{O}_{V^{(d)}, \xi}$, see [5, proof of Propositions 5.7 and 5.8].

The previous discussion leads us to conclude that to maximize the value $Sl(\mathcal{P})(\zeta)$ for a given p -presentation $\mathcal{P}(\beta, z, hW^{p^\ell})$, one can work with presentations in *normal form*:

Definition 7.14. [5, Definition 5.4] A p -presentation $\mathcal{P}(\beta, z, hW^{p^\ell})$ with h as in (7.12.1) is in *normal form*¹ at a point $\zeta \in \text{Sing}(\mathcal{G}^{(d+1)})$, if one of the following conditions holds:

- (A) Either $Sl(\mathcal{P})(\zeta) = \text{ord}(\mathcal{G}^{(d)})(\beta(\zeta))$,
- (B) or $Sl(\mathcal{P})(\zeta) < \text{ord}(\mathcal{G}^{(d)})(\beta(\zeta))$ and either
 - (B1) $\frac{\nu_{\beta(\zeta)}(\tilde{b}_{p^\ell})}{p^\ell} \notin \mathbb{Z}$ or
 - (B2) $\frac{\nu_{\beta(\zeta)}(\tilde{b}_{p^\ell})}{p^\ell} \in \mathbb{Z}$ and the initial part $\text{In}_\zeta(\tilde{b}_{p^\ell})$ is not a p^ℓ -th power in $\text{Gr}_{\beta(\zeta)}(\mathcal{O}_{V^{(d)}, \beta(\zeta)})$.

For simplicity we restrict the notion of normal form to p -presentations, but a similar concept can be defined for any presentation, see [6, §5.7].

Remark 7.15. Given a hypersurface X and $\mathcal{G}^{(d+1)}$ as in §7.2, for a point $\zeta \in \text{Sing}(\mathcal{G}^{(d+1)})$, and a p -presentation $\mathcal{P}(\beta, z, hW^{p^\ell})$ in normal form at ζ , it can be shown that

$$(7.15.1) \quad \text{H-ord}_X^{(d)}(\zeta) = Sl(\mathcal{P}(\beta, z, hW^{p^\ell}))(\zeta).$$

See [5, Theorem 7.2, Corollary 7.3 and §5].

The general case

Given an equidimensional variety X of dimension d over a perfect field k , and a singular point $\zeta \in X$, we would like to emulate the previous statements, which were valid for a hypersurface. To this end, we will use the following result, which can be understood as a generalization of Weierstrass preparation theorem.

Theorem 7.16. [6, Theorem 6.5] *Let $\mathcal{G}^{(n)}$ be a Rees algebra on a smooth scheme $V^{(n)}$ over k and let $\xi \in \text{Sing}(\mathcal{G}^{(n)})$ be a closed point with $\tau_{\mathcal{G}^{(n)}, \xi} \geq e \geq 1$. Then, at a suitable étale neighborhood of ξ , a $\mathcal{G}^{(n)}$ -transversal morphism, $\beta : V^{(n)} \rightarrow V^{(n-e)}$, can be defined so that the following conditions hold:*

- (i) *There are global functions z_1, \dots, z_e in $\mathcal{O}_{V^{(n)}}$ such that $\{dz_1, \dots, dz_e\}$ forms a basis of Ω_{β}^1 , the module of β -relative differentials;*
- (ii) *There are positive integers m_1, \dots, m_e ;*
- (iii) *There are elements $f_1W^{m_1}, \dots, f_eW^{m_e} \in \mathcal{G}^{(n)}$, such that:*

$$(7.16.1) \quad \begin{aligned} f_1(z_1) &= z_1^{m_1} + a_1^{(1)}z_1^{m_1-1} + \dots + a_{m_1}^{(1)} \in \mathcal{O}_{V^{(n-e)}}[z_1], \\ &\vdots \\ f_e(z_e) &= z_e^{m_e} + a_1^{(e)}z_1^{m_e-1} + \dots + a_{m_e}^{(e)} \in \mathcal{O}_{V^{(n-e)}}[z_e], \end{aligned}$$

for some global functions $a_i^{(j)} \in \mathcal{O}_{V^{(n-e)}}$;

- (iv) *The Rees algebra $\mathcal{G}^{(n)}$ has the same integral closure as:*

$$(7.16.2) \quad \mathcal{O}_{V^{(n)}}[f_iW^{m_i}, \Delta_{z_i}^{j_i}(f_i)W^{m_i-j_i}]_{\substack{1 \leq j_i \leq m_i-1 \\ i=1, \dots, e}} \odot \beta^*(\mathcal{G}^{(n-e)}),$$

where $\mathcal{G}^{(n-e)}$ is an elimination algebra of $\mathcal{G}^{(n)}$ on $V^{(n-e)}$, and the set $\{\Delta_{z_i}^{j_i}\}_{\substack{1 \leq j_i \leq m_i-1 \\ i=1, \dots, e}}$ consists of the relative differential operators described in Remark 7.17 below.

Remark 7.17. Observe that since $\beta : V^{(n)} \rightarrow V^{(n-e)}$ is a smooth morphism of relative dimension e , locally, $\mathcal{O}_{V^{(n)}}$ is étale over the polynomial ring $\mathcal{O}_{V^{(n-e)}}[z_1, \dots, z_e]$. The differential operators $\Delta_{z_i}^{j_i}$ are defined as in §7.3.

¹This is called *well-adapted presentation* in [5].

Definition 7.18. [6, Definition 6.6] With the setting and the notation of Theorem 7.16, the data,

$$(7.18.1) \quad \mathcal{P}(\beta, z_1, \dots, z_e, f_1 W^{m_1}, \dots, f_e W^{m_e})$$

that fulfils conditions (i)-(iv) in Theorem 7.16 is a *simplified presentation* of $\mathcal{G}^{(n)}$.

Remark 7.19. Now we go back to the setting in §4.10, where we consider a representation of the multiplicity of a variety X at a given closed point $\xi \in X$. Then it follows from Remark 7.4 and the expression in (4.10.2) that, in this case, for each $i = 1, \dots, e$, the Rees algebra $\mathcal{G}_i^{(d+1)}$ has the same integral closure as

$$R[f_i, \Delta_{x_i}^{j_i}(f_i)W^{m_i-j_i}]_{1 \leq j_i \leq m_i-1} \odot \beta^*(\mathcal{G}_i^{(d)}).$$

Therefore, by (6.11.1), $\mathcal{G}^{(d+e)}$ has the same integral closure as,

$$(7.19.1) \quad R[f_i, \Delta_{x_i}^{j_i}(f_i)W^{m_i-j_i}]_{\substack{1 \leq j_i \leq m_i-1 \\ i=1, \dots, e}} \odot \beta^*(\mathcal{G}_1^{(d)}) \odot \dots \odot \beta^*(\mathcal{G}_e^{(d)}).$$

Thus,

$$\mathcal{P}(\beta, x_1, \dots, x_e, f_1 W^{m_1}, \dots, f_e W^{m_e})$$

is a simplified presentation of $\mathcal{G}^{(d+e)}$. We will say that $\mathcal{P}(\beta, x_1, \dots, x_e, f_1 W^{m_1}, \dots, f_e W^{m_e})$ is a *simplified presentation* of $\underline{\text{Max}} \text{mult}_X$ at the point ξ .

Definition 7.20. [6, §6.7] Let $\mathcal{G}^{(n)}$ be a Rees algebra in $V^{(n)}$, let $\xi \in \text{Sing}(\mathcal{G}^{(n)})$ be a closed point with $\tau_{\mathcal{G}^{(n)}, \xi} \geq e$, and let $\mathcal{P}(\beta, z_1, \dots, z_e, f_1 W^{m_1}, \dots, f_e W^{m_e})$ be a simplified presentation of $\mathcal{G}^{(n)}$ as in Definition 7.18. Recall that $\beta : V^{(n)} \rightarrow V^{(n-e)}$ and for $i = 1, \dots, e$

$$f_i(z_i) = z_i^{m_i} + a_1^{(i)} z_i^{m_i-1} + \dots + a_{m_i-1}^{(i)} z_i + a_{m_i}^{(i)} \in \mathcal{O}_{V^{(n-e)}}[z_i].$$

We define the *slope* of \mathcal{P} at a point $\zeta \in \text{Sing}(\mathcal{G}^{(n)})$ as

$$Sl(\mathcal{P})(\zeta) := \min_{\substack{j_i=1, \dots, m_i \\ i=1, \dots, e}} \left\{ \frac{\nu_{\beta(\zeta)}(a_{j_i}^{(i)})}{j_i}, \text{ord}_{\beta(\zeta)}(\mathcal{G}^{(n-e)}) \right\}.$$

Remark 7.21. Note that the value $Sl(\mathcal{P})(\zeta)$ depends on the chosen data, the morphism $\beta : V^{(n)} \rightarrow V^{(n-e)}$, the elements $f_i W^{m_i} \in \mathcal{G}^{(n)}$ and the global sections z_i , $i = 1, \dots, e$. Translations of the form $z_i + s_i$, with $s_i \in \mathcal{O}_{V^{(n-e)}}$, give new simplified presentations which may lead to different values of the slope. This motivates the following definition.

Definition 7.22. Given the morphism $\beta : V^{(n)} \rightarrow V^{(n-e)}$ and elements $f_i W^{m_i} \in \mathcal{G}^{(n)}$ as in Theorem 7.16, we define for $\zeta \in \text{Sing}(\mathcal{G}^{(n)})$

$$(7.22.1) \quad \beta\text{-ord}(\zeta) := \sup_{z'_1, \dots, z'_e} \{ Sl(\mathcal{P}(\beta, z'_1, \dots, z'_e, f_1 W^{m_1}, \dots, f_e W^{m_e}))(\zeta) \}$$

where the z'_i run over all changes of the form $z'_i = u_i z_i + s_i$ with $u_i, s_i \in \mathcal{O}_{V^{(n-e)}, \beta(\zeta)}$ and u_i a unit.

Remark 7.23. It can be shown that $\beta\text{-ord}(\zeta)$ does not depend on the choice of the transversal morphism β , nor on the choice of the elements $f_i W^{m_i} \in \mathcal{G}^{(n)}$ so far as they satisfy conditions (i)-(iv) in Theorem 7.16. Indeed, the supremum in (7.22.1) is a maximum for a suitable selection of the z'_i . Moreover, the value $\beta\text{-ord}(\zeta)$ is entirely determined by the weak equivalence class of the Rees algebra $\mathcal{G}^{(n)}$ (see [6, Theorem 6.9]).

Thus, we define:

Definition 7.24. [6, Definition 6.10] Let X be an equidimensional variety of dimension d , let $\zeta \in X$ a point of multiplicity $m > 1$. We define

$$\text{H-ord}_X^{(d)}(\zeta) := \text{H-ord}_{X'}^{(d)}(\zeta') := \beta\text{-ord}(\zeta') = \max_{x'_1, \dots, x'_e} \{Sl(\mathcal{P}(\beta, x'_1, \dots, x'_e, f_1 W^{m_1}, \dots, f_e W^{m_e}))(\zeta)\},$$

where $X' = \text{Spec}(B')$ is an étale neighborhood of $\mathcal{O}_{X, \xi}$ with $\xi \in \overline{\{\zeta\}}$ a closed point of multiplicity m , as in §4.10 and $\zeta' \in X'$ is a point mapping to ζ (see Remark 7.19).

Remark 7.25. If $(V^{(n)}, \mathcal{G}^{(n)})$ is any pair representing $\underline{\text{Max}} \text{mult}_X$ in an étale neighborhood of a closed point ξ , and ξ' is mapping to ξ then it can be shown that $\tau_{\mathcal{G}^{(n)}, \xi'} \geq n - d$ ([12]). Now we can use Theorem 7.16 to find a simplified presentation $\mathcal{P}(\beta, z_1, \dots, z_e, g_1 W^{N_1}, \dots, g_e W^{N_e})$ of $\mathcal{G}^{(n)}$. It can be proven that this would have led to the same definition of $\text{H-ord}_X^{(d)}$.

7.26. p-Presentations revisited. As in the hypersurface case (see §7.11), since $\mathcal{G}^{(d+e)}$ is a differential algebra, in order to compute $\beta\text{-ord}(\xi)$, it is always possible to find order-one-elements of the form $h_i W^{p^{\ell_i}} \in \mathcal{G}^{(d+e)}$, $i = 1, \dots, e$, where the h_i are monic polynomials in z_i of degree p^{ℓ_i} for some $\ell_i \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}$. Presentations of the form $\mathcal{P}(\beta, z_1, \dots, z_e, h_1 W^{p^{\ell_1}}, \dots, h_e W^{p^{\ell_e}})$ are called *p-presentations* ([6, §7.1]).

The following result parallels the statement of Theorem 7.12:

Theorem 7.27. [6, §7.1] *Let $\mathcal{P}(\beta, z_1, \dots, z_e, h_1 W^{p^{\ell_1}}, \dots, h_e W^{p^{\ell_e}})$ be a p-presentation of $\mathcal{G}^{(d+e)}$, where for $i = 1, \dots, e$,*

$$(7.27.1) \quad h_i(z) = z_i^{p^{\ell_i}} + \tilde{b}_1^{(i)} z_i^{p^{\ell_i}-1} + \dots + \tilde{b}_{p^{\ell_i}-1}^{(i)} z_i + \tilde{b}_{p^{\ell_i}}^{(i)} \in \mathcal{O}_{V(d)}[z_i].$$

Let $\zeta \in \text{Sing}(\mathcal{G}^{(d+e)})$. Then

$$Sl(\mathcal{P})(\zeta) = \min_{i=1, \dots, e} \left\{ \frac{\nu_{\beta(\zeta)}(\tilde{b}_{p^{\ell_i}}^{(i)})}{p^{\ell_i}}, \text{ord}_{\beta(\zeta)}(\mathcal{G}^{(d)}) \right\}.$$

Remark 7.28. Using the arguments as in the proof of [5, Theorem 4.4] it follows that for $i = 1, \dots, e$,

$$(7.28.1) \quad \frac{\nu_{\beta(\zeta)}(\tilde{b}_{j_i}^{(i)})}{j_i} \geq \text{ord}_{\beta(\zeta)}(\mathcal{G}^{(d)}),$$

whenever $1 \leq j_i \leq p^{\ell_i} - 1$.

Remark 7.29. [6, §7.1] To maximize the value $Sl(\mathcal{P})(\zeta)$ one can use normal forms for each h_i in a p-presentation $\mathcal{P}(\beta, z_1, \dots, z_e, h_1 W^{p^{\ell_1}}, \dots, h_e W^{p^{\ell_e}})$, see §7.13 and Definition 7.14.

8. MAIN RESULTS

The proofs of Theorems 8.2 and 8.11 are of local nature. For a given point $\zeta \in X$ of multiplicity $m > 0$, and a closed point $\xi \in \overline{\{\zeta\}}$ with the same multiplicity, our strategy relies on the existence of a finite morphism of generic rank m from $\text{Spec}(\mathcal{O}_{X, \xi})$ to some regular affine k -scheme as described in §4.10. This can always be assumed to be the case after considering a suitable étale extension of $(\mathcal{O}_{X, \xi}, \mathfrak{m}_\xi, k(\xi))$. Thus the proofs of the theorems will be given at an étale neighborhood of the closed point ξ , and then we will show that the statements actually hold for $\zeta \in X$. For this reason, in §8.1 below we give a closer look at the construction mentioned in §4.10. In addition, we will see how to use this construction to apply the results in Section 7, where the function $\text{H-ord}_X^{(d)}$ was defined. We will use the setting and the results in §8.1 in the proofs of different statements along this section.

8.1. The setting. Let $\xi \in X$ be a closed point of multiplicity $m > 1$. We will use $(B, \mathfrak{m}, k(\xi))$ for the local ring at the point. According to §4.10, there is an étale extension $B \rightarrow B'$ for which we can find a regular k' -algebra S (where k' is a field and an étale extension of $k(\xi)$) and an inclusion $S \rightarrow B'$ which is finite with generic rank equal to m . The existence of the étale extension together with the finite morphism is proven in [13, Appendix A] (a brief sketch of the proof will be given in Remark 8.5 below).

Writing $B' = S[\theta_1, \dots, \theta_e]$ and letting $f_i(x_i) \in S[x_i]$ be the minimal polynomial of θ_i over $K(S)$, we have the following commutative diagram:

$$(8.1.1) \quad \begin{array}{ccc} R = S[x_1, \dots, x_e] & \twoheadrightarrow & S[x_1, \dots, x_e]/\langle f_1, \dots, f_e \rangle & \twoheadrightarrow & B' \\ \beta^* \uparrow & & \nearrow \alpha^* & & \\ S & & & & \end{array}$$

Observe that we can assume that the order m_i of each $f_i(x_i) \in S[x_i]$ is greater than 1.

Since diagram (8.1.1) commutes, we will be simultaneously using $\alpha(\zeta')$ and $\beta(\zeta')$ to denote the image in $\text{Spec}(S)$ of a point $\zeta' \in \text{Spec}(B')$. We will choose the first notation when we want to use the properties of the finite projection from $\text{Spec}(B')$. The second notation will be convenient when we want to use the fact that ζ' is also a point in the smooth scheme $\text{Spec}(R)$.

(A) The slope of a p -presentation at the closed point of $\text{Spec}(B')$.

Suppose that $\xi' \in X' := \text{Spec}(B')$ maps to ξ , and let $\mathfrak{m}_{\xi'} \subset B'$ be the corresponding maximal ideal. Let $\alpha : \text{Spec}(B') \rightarrow \text{Spec}(S)$ be the morphism induced by α^* . Since the generic rank of $S \rightarrow B'$ equals the multiplicity at ξ' , by Zariski's multiplicity formula for finite projections ([37, Chapter 8, §10, Theorem 24]) we have that:

- (i) The point ξ' is the only one mapping to $\alpha(\xi') \in \text{Spec}(S)$;
- (ii) The residue fields $k(\xi')$ and $k(\alpha(\xi'))$ are equal;
- (iii) The expansion of the maximal ideal of $\alpha(\xi')$, $\mathfrak{m}_{\alpha(\xi')}B'$, is a reduction of $\mathfrak{m}_{\xi'}$.

From (ii) it follows that, after a translation of the form $\theta_i + s_i$, for some $s_i \in S$, we can also assume that $\theta_i \in \mathfrak{m}_{\xi'}$ for $i = 1, \dots, e$, and that in addition, $\mathfrak{m}_{\xi'} = \mathfrak{m}_{\alpha(\xi')}B' + \langle \theta_1, \dots, \theta_e \rangle$.

Since X is a d dimensional variety, we set $V^{(d+e)} = \text{Spec}(R)$, and $V^{(d)} = \text{Spec}(S)$. Recall that:

$$(8.1.2) \quad \mathcal{G}^{(d+e)} = \text{Diff}(R[f_1(x_1)W^{m_1}, \dots, f_e(x_e)W^{m_e}]),$$

and that $(V^{(d+e)}, \mathcal{G}^{(d+e)})$ represents the maximum multiplicity locus of $\text{Spec}(B')$ (see §4.8). Also, $\tau_{\mathcal{G}^{(d+e)}, \xi'} \geq e$, and $\beta : V^{(d+e)} \rightarrow V^{(d)}$ is $\mathcal{G}^{(d+e)}$ -admissible (see Example 6.11). Therefore,

$$\mathcal{G}^{(d)} = \mathcal{G}^{(d+e)} \cap S[W]$$

is an elimination algebra of $\mathcal{G}^{(d+e)}$ (see Examples 6.10 and 6.11). As indicated in Remark 7.19, $\mathcal{G}^{(d+e)}$ has the same integral closure as

$$(8.1.3) \quad R[f_i(x_i)W^{m_i}, \Delta_{x_i}^{j_i}(f_i(x_i))W^{m_i-j_i}]_{1 \leq j_i \leq m_i-1} \odot \beta^*(\mathcal{G}^{(d)}),$$

which in turns is a simplified presentation of $\mathcal{G}^{(d+e)}$ (see Theorem 7.16). We will write:

$$(8.1.4) \quad f_i(x_i) = x_i^{m_i} + a_1^{(i)} x_i^{m_i-1} + \dots + a_{m_i}^{(i)},$$

with $a_j^{(i)} \in S$, for $j = 1, \dots, m_i$ and $i = 1, \dots, e$. Note that, since we have assumed that $\theta_i \in \mathfrak{m}_{\xi'}$, it follows that $\nu_{\alpha(\xi')}(a_j^{(i)}) \geq 1$, for $j = 1, \dots, m_i$ and $i = 1, \dots, e$. Moreover, since $\xi' \in \text{Sing}(\mathcal{G}^{(d+e)})$, we have that $\nu_{\alpha(\xi')}(a_j^{(i)}) = \nu_{\beta(\xi')}(a_j^{(i)}) \geq j$.

By §7.26, after applying suitable Taylor operators to the elements $f_i(x_i) \in R$, we get that $\mathcal{G}^{(d+e)}$ is weakly equivalent to:

$$(8.1.5) \quad R[h_i(x_i)W^{p^{\ell_i}}, \Delta_{x_i}^{j_i}(h_i(x_i))W^{p^{\ell_i}-j_i}]_{1 \leq j_i \leq \ell_i-1} \odot \beta^*(\mathcal{G}^{(d)}),$$

where for each $i = 1, \dots, e$, $h_i(x_i) \in S[x_i] \subset R$ is a monic polynomial of order p^{ℓ_i} for some $\ell_i \geq 1$,

$$(8.1.6) \quad h_i(x_i) = x_i^{p^{\ell_i}} + \tilde{a}_1^{(i)} x_i^{p^{\ell_i}-1} + \dots + \tilde{a}_{p^{\ell_i}}^{(i)},$$

with $\tilde{a}_j^{(i)} \in S$, for $j = 1, \dots, p^{\ell_i}$. Observe that $\nu_{\alpha(\xi')}(\tilde{a}_j^{(i)}) \geq j$ for $j = 1, \dots, p^{\ell_i}$ and $i = 1, \dots, e$. Expression (8.1.5) is a p -presentation \mathcal{P} of $\mathcal{G}^{(d+e)}$ at ξ (see §7.26). Notice that the differential operators in (8.1.5) are elements in $\text{Diff}_{V^{(d+e)}/V^{(d)}}$.

With the previous notation, the slope of the p -presentation \mathcal{P} at ξ' (8.1.5) is

$$(8.1.7) \quad Sl(\mathcal{P})(\xi') = \min_{i=1, \dots, e} \left\{ \frac{\nu_{\alpha(\xi')}(\tilde{a}_{p^{\ell_i}}^{(i)})}{p^{\ell_i}}, \text{ord}_{\alpha(\xi')}(\mathcal{G}^{(d)}) \right\}.$$

From the exposition in §7.13, it follows that a p -presentation \mathcal{P}' with $Sl(\mathcal{P}')(\xi') = \text{H-ord}_{X'}^{(d)}(\xi')$ can be found starting from the presentation \mathcal{P} after considering translations of the form $\theta'_i := \theta_i + s_i$ with $s_i \in S$, and so that for each translation

$$(8.1.8) \quad \bar{\nu}_{\mathfrak{m}_{\alpha(\xi')}}(s_i) \geq \frac{\nu_{\mathfrak{m}_{\alpha(\xi')}}(\tilde{a}_{p^{\ell_i}}^{(i)})}{p^{\ell_i}}.$$

Finally, it can be shown that the restriction of $\mathcal{G}^{(d+e)}$ to B' , $\mathcal{G}_{B'}$ (see §6.15), is finite over the expansion of $\mathcal{G}^{(d)}$ in B' , $\mathcal{G}^{(d)}B'$ (see [1]). Using this fact, Proposition 2.11 and following similar arguments as in [22, Proposition 0.2.10], it can be checked that if we write $\mathcal{G}_{B'} = \bigoplus_n J_n W^n$, then

$$(8.1.9) \quad \text{ord}_{\alpha(\xi')}(\mathcal{G}^{(d)}) = \overline{\text{ord}}_{\xi'}(\mathcal{G}_{B'}) = \min \left\{ \frac{\bar{\nu}_{\xi'}(J_n)}{n} : n \in \mathbb{N} \right\},$$

where the first equality holds because $\mathfrak{m}_{\alpha(\xi')}B'$ is a reduction of \mathfrak{m}' .

(B) The slope of a p -presentation at non-closed points of $\text{Spec}(B')$.

With the same setting and notation as before, now let $\eta \in X$ be a non closed point of multiplicity m with $\xi \in \overline{\{\eta\}}$. Let $\eta' \in \text{Spec}(B')$ be a point mapping to η , let $\mathfrak{p}_{\eta'} \subset B'$ be the corresponding prime and set $\mathfrak{p}_{\alpha(\eta')} := \mathfrak{p}_{\eta'} \cap S$. Again, by Zariski's multiplicity formula for finite projections we have that:

- (i') The point η' is the only one mapping to $\alpha(\eta') \in \text{Spec}(S)$;
- (ii') The residue fields $k(\eta')$ and $k(\alpha(\eta'))$ are equal;
- (iii') The expansion of the maximal ideal $\mathfrak{p}_{\alpha(\eta')}S_{\mathfrak{p}_{\alpha(\eta')}}$, $\mathfrak{m}_{\alpha(\eta')}B_{\mathfrak{p}_{\eta'}}$, is a reduction of $\mathfrak{m}_{\eta'} := \mathfrak{p}_{\eta'}B'_{\mathfrak{p}_{\eta'}}$.

From (i') it follows that $B' \otimes_S S_{\mathfrak{p}_{\alpha(\eta')}}$ is local (thus $B'_{\mathfrak{p}_{\eta'}} = S_{\mathfrak{p}_{\alpha(\eta')}}[\theta_1, \dots, \theta_e]$). By (ii'), after translating θ_i by elements of $S_{\mathfrak{p}_{\alpha(\eta')}}$, we can assume that $\theta_i \in \mathfrak{m}_{\eta'}$. The localization at η' of the p -presentation \mathcal{P} at ξ' (8.1.5) can be used to compute $\text{H-ord}_{X'}^{(d)}(\eta')$. Interpreting η' as a point in $V^{(d+e)}$, and using the fact that $\eta' \in \text{Sing}(\mathcal{G}^{(d+e)})$, i.e., η' is a point of multiplicity m in X' , it follows that $\nu_{\alpha(\eta')}(\tilde{a}_j^{(i)}) \geq j$ for $i = 1, \dots, e$, and $j = 1, \dots, m_e$ (see [35, Propositions 5.4 and 5.7]).

(C) The slope of a p -presentation at non-closed points defining regular subschemes of $\text{Spec}(B')$.

Now suppose that η' is the generic point of a regular closed subscheme at ξ' . In such case, it can be shown that $\mathfrak{p}_{\alpha(\eta')}$ also defines a regular closed subscheme at $\alpha(\xi')$ (cf. [35, Proposition 6.3]). In addition, after traslating the elements θ_i by elements in S , it can be assumed that $B' = S[\theta_1, \dots, \theta_e]$ with $\theta_i \in \mathfrak{p}_{\eta'}$, and that moreover, $\mathfrak{p}_{\alpha(\eta')}B'$ is a reduction of $\mathfrak{p}_{\eta'}$ (without localizing at $\mathfrak{p}_{\eta'}$, see [3, Lemma 3.6]).

As we argued above, again, interpreting η' as a point in $V^{(d+e)}$, and using the fact that $\eta' \in \text{Sing}(\mathcal{G}^{(d+e)})$, i.e., η' is a point of multiplicity m in X' , it follows that $\nu_{\alpha(\eta')}(a_j^{(i)}) \geq j$ for $i = 1, \dots, e$, and $j = 1, \dots, m_e$ (see [35, Propositions 5.4 and 5.7]). But now, because $\mathfrak{p}_{\alpha(\eta')}$ determines a closed regular subscheme at $\alpha(\xi')$, its ordinary powers and symbolic powers coincide on S . Therefore also $\nu_{\mathfrak{p}_{\alpha(\eta')}}(a_j^{(i)}) \geq j$ for $i = 1, \dots, e$, and $j = 1, \dots, m_e$. Hence it follows that for the coefficients in (8.1.6),

$$(8.1.10) \quad \nu_{\mathfrak{p}_{\alpha(\eta')}}(\tilde{a}_j^{(i)}) \geq j$$

for $j = 1, \dots, p^{\ell_i}$ and $i = 1, \dots, e$.

With the previous notation, the slope of the p -presentation \mathcal{P} at η' (8.1.5) equals to:

$$(8.1.11) \quad \text{Sl}(\mathcal{P})(\eta') = \min_{i=1, \dots, e} \left\{ \frac{\nu_{\alpha(\eta')}(\tilde{a}_{p^{\ell_i}}^{(i)})}{p^{\ell_i}}, \text{ord}_{\alpha(\eta')}(\mathcal{G}^{(d)}) \right\} = \min_{i=1, \dots, e} \left\{ \frac{\nu_{\mathfrak{p}_{\alpha(\eta')}}(\tilde{a}_{p^{\ell_i}}^{(i)})}{p^{\ell_i}}, \text{ord}_{\mathfrak{p}_{\alpha(\eta')}}(\mathcal{G}^{(d)}) \right\},$$

see [6, Definition 6.7]. Going back to the discussion in §7.13, recall that a p -presentations \mathcal{P}' with $\text{Sl}(\mathcal{P}')(\eta') = \text{H-ord}_{X'}^{(d)}(\eta')$ can be found after considering translations of the form $\theta'_i := \theta_i + s_i$ with $s_i \in S$ and so that for each translation,

$$(8.1.12) \quad \bar{\nu}_{\mathfrak{p}_{\alpha(\eta')}}(s_i) \geq \frac{\nu_{\mathfrak{p}_{\alpha(\eta')}}(\tilde{a}_{p^{\ell_i}}^{(i)})}{p^{\ell_i}}.$$

We emphasize here that there is no need to consider translation with $s_i \in S_{\mathfrak{p}_{\eta'}}$.

To conclude, considering $\mathcal{G}_{B'}$ as before, recall that:

$$(8.1.13) \quad \overline{\text{ord}}_{\eta'}(\mathcal{G}_{B'}) = \inf \left\{ \frac{\bar{\nu}_{\eta'}(J_n)}{n} : n \in \mathbb{N} \right\}.$$

Then, on the one hand,

$$\text{ord}_{\alpha(\eta')}(\mathcal{G}^{(d)}) = \text{ord}_{\mathfrak{p}_{\alpha(\eta')}}(\mathcal{G}^{(d)}).$$

On the other, since $\mathfrak{p}_{\alpha(\eta')}B'$ is a reduction of $\mathfrak{p}_{\eta'}$, and $\mathcal{G}^{(d)}B' \subset \mathcal{G}_{B'}$ is a finite extension of Rees algebras, by Proposition 2.11, and following similar arguments as in [22, Proposition 0.2.10],

$$\text{ord}_{\mathfrak{p}_{\alpha(\eta')}}(\mathcal{G}^{(d)}) = \overline{\text{ord}}_{\mathfrak{p}_{\eta'}}(\mathcal{G}'_B).$$

For similar reasons,

$$\text{ord}_{\alpha(\eta')}(\mathcal{G}^{(d)}) = \overline{\text{ord}}_{\eta'}(\mathcal{G}'_B).$$

Thus it follows that,

$$(8.1.14) \quad \overline{\text{ord}}_{\eta'}(\mathcal{G}_{B'}) = \text{ord}_{\alpha(\eta')}(\mathcal{G}^{(d)}) = \text{ord}_{\mathfrak{p}_{\alpha(\eta')}}(\mathcal{G}^{(d)}) = \overline{\text{ord}}_{\mathfrak{p}_{\eta'}}(\mathcal{G}_{B'}) = \min \left\{ \frac{\bar{\nu}_{\mathfrak{p}_{\eta'}}(J_n)}{n} : n \in \mathbb{N} \right\}.$$

Results for the non-extremal case

Theorem 8.2. *Let X be an equidimensional algebraic variety of dimension d defined over a perfect field k and let $\zeta \in X$ be a point of multiplicity $m > 1$. If ζ is in the non-extremal case, then $\text{H-ord}_X^{(d)}(\zeta) = 1$. Thus, $\mathcal{S}\text{-Sl}(\mathcal{O}_{X,\zeta}) = \text{H-ord}_X^{(d)}(\zeta)$. Moreover, if ζ is a closed point, then $\text{ord}_X^{(d)}(\zeta) = 1$.*

Proof. Closed points. Assume that ζ is a closed point and denote it by $\xi \in X$. Let $t = t_\xi$ be the excess of embedding dimension. After replacing $(\mathcal{O}_{X,\xi}, \mathfrak{m}_\xi, k(\xi))$ by $(B', \mathfrak{m}_{\xi'}, k(\xi'))$, we can assume the setting and the notation described in §8.1, where $B' = S[\theta_1, \dots, \theta_e]$, with S regular. After translating the θ_i if needed, we have that

$$(8.2.1) \quad \mathfrak{m}_{\xi'} = \mathfrak{m}_{\alpha(\xi')} + \langle \theta_1, \dots, \theta_e \rangle.$$

Observe that $\text{Gr}_{\alpha(\xi')}(S) \rightarrow \text{Gr}_{\xi'}(B')$ is a finite extension which induces an inclusion in degree one. Therefore, any regular system of parameters generating $\mathfrak{m}_{\alpha(\xi')}$, y_1, \dots, y_d , can be considered as part of a minimal set of generators of $\mathfrak{m}_{\xi'}$. Recall in addition that $\bar{\nu}_{\xi'}(y_i) = 1$, for $i = 1, \dots, d$. Therefore, if $\dim_{k(\xi)} \ker(\lambda_\xi) < t$, then by Proposition 3.6, $\dim_{k(\xi')} \ker(\lambda_{\xi'}) < t$, and hence, necessarily, $\bar{\nu}_{\xi'}(\theta_i) = 1$ for some $i \in \{1, \dots, e\}$. Without loss of generality we can assume that $\bar{\nu}_{\xi'}(\theta_1) = 1, \dots, \bar{\nu}_{\xi'}(\theta_c) = 1$ and $\bar{\nu}_{\xi'}(\theta_{c+1}) > 1, \dots, \bar{\nu}_{\xi'}(\theta_e) > 1$ for some $c \in \{1, \dots, e\}$.

Continuing with the setting in §8.1, if $f(x_i) \in S[x_i]$ is the minimum polynomial of θ_i over S , for $i = 1, \dots, e$, then the Rees algebra $\mathcal{G}^{(d+e)}$ from (8.1.2) is a local presentation of the maximum multiplicity locus of $\text{Spec}(B')$. Recall in addition that $\mathcal{G}^{(d+e)}$ is also weakly equivalent to the Rees algebra in (8.1.5), which in turn is a p-presentation of $\mathcal{G}^{(d+e)}$.

Now, since $h_i(x_i)W^{p^{\ell_i}} \in \mathcal{G}^{(d+e)}$, we have that $\nu_{\xi'}(h_i(x_i)) \geq p^{\ell_i}$ in $V^{(d+e)}$, and hence $\bar{\nu}_{\xi'}(h_i(\theta_i)) \geq p^{\ell_i}$ in $\text{Spec}(B')$ for $i = 1, \dots, p^{\ell_i}$ (see (8.1.9)). Note here that if $h_i(\theta_i) = 0 \in B'$, then $\bar{\nu}_{\xi'}(h_i(\theta_i)) = \infty$, but the arguments below go through even in this case.

Since the assumption is that $\bar{\nu}_{\xi'}(\theta_i) = 1$, for $i = 1, \dots, c$, we will pay special attention to $h_i(\theta_i)W^{p^{\ell_i}}$ for $i = 1, \dots, c$. To start with, by Definition 2.1 and the properties in 2.5, we have that

$$(8.2.2) \quad \bar{\nu}_{\xi'}(h_i(\theta_i) - \theta_i^{p^{\ell_i}}) \geq \min_{j=1, \dots, p^{\ell_i}} \left\{ \bar{\nu}_{\xi'}(\tilde{a}_j^{(i)} \theta_i^{p^{\ell_i-j}}) \right\} \geq \min_{j=1, \dots, p^{\ell_i}} \left\{ \bar{\nu}_{\xi'}(\tilde{a}_j^{(i)}) + (p^{\ell_i} - j) \right\}.$$

Next, we will distinguish different cases depending on the values $\bar{\nu}_{\xi'}(\tilde{a}_j^{(i)})/j$. Recall that $\bar{\nu}_{\xi'}(\tilde{a}_j^{(i)}) = \nu_{\alpha(\xi')}(\tilde{a}_j^{(i)}) \geq j$ for $j = 1, \dots, p^{\ell_i}$ and $i = 1, \dots, e$ (see Proposition 2.11).

Case (a). There exists some $i \in \{1, \dots, c\}$ such that $\bar{\nu}_{\xi'}(\tilde{a}_j^{(i)}) > j$ for all $j = 1, \dots, p^{\ell_i}$. Then by Remark 2.2, and by (8.2.2), for that index i ,

$$\bar{\nu}_{\xi'}(h_i(\theta_i)) = \min \left\{ \bar{\nu}_{\xi'}(\theta_i^{p^{\ell_i}}), \bar{\nu}_{\xi'}(h_i(\theta_i) - \theta_i^{p^{\ell_i}}) \right\} = p^{\ell_i}$$

from where it follows that $\overline{\text{ord}}_{\xi'}(\mathcal{G}_{B'}) = \text{ord}_{\alpha(\xi')}(\mathcal{G}^{(d)}) = 1$. Here we use that $h_i(\theta_i)W^{p^{\ell_i}} \in \mathcal{G}_{B'}$ and (8.1.9).

Case (b). For each $i \in \{1, \dots, c\}$ there exist some $j \in \{1, \dots, p^{\ell_i}\}$ such that $\bar{\nu}_{\xi'}(\tilde{a}_j^{(i)}) = j$. Here we distinguish two cases:

Case (b.1). If $j \in \{1, \dots, p^{\ell_i} - 1\}$, then by Remark 7.28,

$$1 = \min_{j=1, \dots, p^{\ell_i} - 1} \left\{ \frac{\nu_{\alpha(\xi')}(\tilde{a}_j^{(i)})}{j} \right\} \geq \text{ord}_{\alpha(\xi')}(\mathcal{G}^{(d)}) \geq 1,$$

hence $\text{ord}_{\alpha(\xi')}(\mathcal{G}^{(d)}) = 1$.

Case (b.2). Assume that for all $i = 1, \dots, c$ we have $\bar{\nu}_{\xi'}(\tilde{a}_j^{(i)}) > j$ for $j = 1, \dots, p^{\ell_i} - 1$ and $\bar{\nu}_{\xi'}(\tilde{a}_{p^{\ell_i}}^{(i)}) = p^{\ell_i}$. After replacing θ_i by $\theta_i + s_i$, for some $s_i \in S$, we may assume that the initial

part of $\tilde{a}_{p^{\ell_i}}^{(i)}$ is not a p^{ℓ_i} -th-power (here we consider $\text{In}_{\alpha(\xi')}(\tilde{a}_{p^{\ell_i}}^{(i)}) = H(Y_1, \dots, Y_d) \in \text{Gr}_{\alpha(\xi')}(S)$ as a homogeneous polynomial of degree p^{ℓ_i} , see §7.13 and Definition 7.14). Note that the elimination algebra is invariant by the change $\theta_i \rightarrow \theta_i + s_i$ (see Example 6.10). Observe that now $\bar{\nu}_{\xi'}(\theta_i + s_i) \geq 1$ but from our hypothesis there must be at least one $\theta_i + s_i$ such that $\bar{\nu}_{\xi'}(\theta_i + s_i) = 1$. Setting $\theta'_i = \theta_i + s_i$ after relabeling if needed we can assume $\bar{\nu}_{\xi'}(\theta'_1) = \dots = \bar{\nu}_{\xi'}(\theta'_{c'}) = 1$, for some $c' \leq c$. If some θ'_i falls into cases (a) or (b.1) we are done, and $\text{ord}^{(d)X}(\xi) = 1$.

Otherwise if all θ'_i , $i = 1, \dots, c'$, with $c' \geq 1$ are in case (b.2), then it follows that $\text{H-ord}_X^{(d)}(\xi') = 1$. In such case, moreover, since ξ is a closed point and the initial part of $\tilde{a}_{p^{\ell_1}}^{(1)}$ has some term which is not a p^{ℓ_1} -th-power, there is a differential operator D in S of order $b < p^{\ell_1}$ such that $\nu_{\alpha(\xi')}(D(\tilde{a}_{p^{\ell_1}}^{(1)})) = p^{\ell_1} - b$. Now, D is also a differential operator in $S[x_1, \dots, x_e]$, thus we have that $D(h_1(x_1))W^{p^{\ell_1-b}} \in \mathcal{G}^{(d+e)}$, since $\mathcal{G}^{(d+e)}$ is differentially saturated. Finally, observe that

$$D(h_1(x_1)) = D(\tilde{a}_{p^{\ell_1}}^{(1)}) + \tilde{a}_1 x_1^{p^{\ell_1-1}} + \dots + \tilde{a}_{p^{\ell_1-1}} x_1.$$

Using the same argument as in the proof of Theorem 4.4 in [5] (page 1286) it follows that the norm of $D(h_1(x_1))$ is an element of order one in $\mathcal{G}^{(d)}$, and hence $\text{ord}_{\alpha(\xi')}(\mathcal{G}^{(d)}) = 1$.

To conclude, for all the cases $\text{ord}_{\alpha(\xi')}(\mathcal{G}^{(d)}) = 1$, and by Theorem 7.27

$$\min_{j=1, \dots, p^{\ell_1}} \left\{ \frac{\nu_{\alpha(\xi')}(\tilde{a}_j^{(1)})}{j}, \text{ord}_{\alpha(\xi')}(\mathcal{G}^{(d)}) \right\} = \min \left\{ \frac{\nu_{\alpha(\xi')}(\tilde{a}_{p^{\ell_1}}^{(1)})}{p^{\ell_1}}, \text{ord}_{\alpha(\xi')}(\mathcal{G}^{(d)}) \right\}.$$

Hence $\text{H-ord}_X^{(d)}(\xi) = \text{H-ord}_{X'}^{(d)}(\xi') = \text{ord}_{\alpha(\xi')}(\mathcal{G}^{(d)}) = 1$.

Non-closed points. Let $\zeta = \eta \in X$ be a non closed point of multiplicity $m \geq 1$. Denote by \mathfrak{p}_η the prime defined by η in some affine open set $U \subset X$. Choose a closed point $\xi \in \overline{\{\eta\}} \subseteq X$ with the following conditions:

- (1) ξ and η has the same multiplicity m .
- (2) $\mathcal{O}_{X,\xi}/\mathfrak{p}_\eta$ is a regular local ring of dimension $d - r$ for $r \geq 1$.

Let $B = \mathcal{O}_{X,\xi}$, and let $B \rightarrow B'$ an étale extension, and $S \rightarrow B'$ a finite morphism as in §8.1. Denote by $\mathfrak{p}_{\eta'}$ the prime dominating \mathfrak{p}_η , ξ' the closed point dominating ξ , and $\mathfrak{p}_{\alpha(\eta')}$ the prime $\mathfrak{p}_{\eta'} \cap S$. By [3, Corollary 3.2], $\mathfrak{p}_{\alpha(\eta')}$ determines a regular prime. Under these assumptions, using [3, Lemma 3.6], we can assume that $B' = S[\theta_1, \dots, \theta_e]$ with $\theta_i \in \mathfrak{p}_{\eta'}$. Note that $\bar{\nu}_{\mathfrak{p}_{\eta'}}(\theta_i) \geq 1$ and $\bar{\nu}_{\xi'}(\theta_i) \geq 1$, for $i = 1, \dots, e$.

Since $\theta_i \in \mathfrak{p}_{\eta'}$, it follows that $\mathfrak{p}_{\eta'} = \mathfrak{p}_{\alpha(\eta')} + \langle \theta_1, \dots, \theta_e \rangle$. Because η' is not in the extremal case, necessarily $\bar{\nu}_{\mathfrak{p}_{\eta'}}(\theta_i) = 1$ for some i . After reordering we may assume that $\bar{\nu}_{\eta'}(\theta_1) = 1, \dots, \bar{\nu}_{\eta'}(\theta_c) = 1$ and $\bar{\nu}_{\eta'}(\theta_{c+1}) > 1, \dots, \bar{\nu}_{\eta'}(\theta_e) > 1$. Note that, in particular, $\bar{\nu}_{\mathfrak{p}_{\eta'}}(\theta_i) = 1$ for $i = 1, \dots, c$.

Now using the fact that

$$\bar{\nu}_{\eta'}(\tilde{a}_j^{(i)}) = \nu_{\alpha(\eta')}(\tilde{a}_j^{(i)}) = \nu_{\mathfrak{p}_{\alpha(\eta')}}(\tilde{a}_j^{(i)}) = \bar{\nu}_{\mathfrak{p}_{\eta'}}(\tilde{a}_j^{(i)})$$

cases (a) and (b.1) follow using the same argument as in the closed point case. Observe that in case (b.2) if $\bar{\nu}_{\mathfrak{p}_{\eta'}}(\tilde{a}_{p^{\ell_i}}^{(i)}) = p^{\ell_i}$, after replacing θ_i by $\theta_i + s_i$, for some $s_i \in S$, we may assume that the initial part of $\tilde{a}_{p^{\ell_i}}^{(i)}$ is not a p^{ℓ_i} -th-power (here we consider $\text{In}_{\mathfrak{p}_{\alpha(\eta')}}(\tilde{a}_{p^{\ell_i}}^{(i)}) = H(Y_1, \dots, Y_r) \in \text{Gr}_{\mathfrak{p}_{\alpha(\eta')}}(S)$ as a homogeneous polynomial of degree p^{ℓ_i}). Here there is no need to localize as it is shown in the proof of [5, Proposition 5.8].

After the translations $\theta_i + s_i$ we may fall into cases (a), (b.1) or (b.2). From here it follows that $\text{H-ord}_X^{(d)}(\eta) = 1$. \square

Example 8.3. The last conclusion of Theorem 8.2 might not hold if ζ is not a closed point. To see this, let $p \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$ be a prime and let X be the hypersurface in $V^{(3)} := \text{Spec}(\mathbb{F}_p[x, y_1, y_2])$ defined by $f = x^p - y_1^p y_2$. Then $\mathfrak{p} = \langle x, y_1 \rangle$ determines a non-closed point of maximum multiplicity p which is not in the extremal case. The Rees algebra

$$(8.3.1) \quad \mathcal{G}^{(3)} = \text{Diff}(\mathbb{F}_p[x, y_1, y_2][(x^p - y_1^p y_2)W^p]) = \mathbb{F}_p[x, y_1, y_2][y_1^p W^{p-1}, (x^p - y_1^p y_2)W^p].$$

represents the stratum of p -fold points of X . Let ξ be the closed point corresponding to $\mathfrak{m} = \langle x, y_1, y_2 \rangle$. Then the natural inclusion $\mathbb{F}_p[y_1, y_2] \subset \mathbb{F}_p[x, y_1, y_2]$ is $\mathcal{G}^{(3)}$ -admissible at ξ and provides a presentation of $B = \mathbb{F}_p[x, y_1, y_2]/\langle f \rangle$ as in §8.1. The Rees algebra

$$\mathcal{G}^{(2)} = \mathbb{F}_p[y_1, y_2][y_1^p W^{p-1}],$$

is an elimination algebra for $\mathcal{G}^{(3)}$. Notice that (8.3.1) is a p -presentation of $\mathcal{G}^{(3)}$ which is already in normal form at η , and that

$$\frac{\bar{v}_\eta(y_1^p y_2)}{p} = \frac{p}{p} = 1.$$

On the other hand, setting $\mathfrak{q} := \mathfrak{p} \cap \mathbb{F}_p[y_1, y_2]$, we have that

$$\text{ord}_X^{(2)}(\eta) = \text{ord}_{\mathfrak{q}}(\mathcal{G}^{(2)}) = \frac{p}{p-1}.$$

Thus, $\text{H-ord}_X^{(2)}(\eta) = 1 < \text{ord}_X^{(2)}(\eta)$, even though η is not in the extremal case.

Results for the extremal case

Our next goal is to prove Theorem 8.11. As in the proof of Theorem 8.2, we will be using the setting in §8.1. The use of this setting will lead us to a proof of Theorem 8.11 in an étale neighborhood of an m -fold point of $\zeta \in X$. To prove that the theorem actually holds in X we will be needing to compare the Samuel Slope of a local ring with that of some étale extension. As indicated in Section 3, we do not know how to make such comparison in general, except for some special cases (see Propositions 3.7 and 3.8). Thus, before proving Theorem 8.11, we will prove some technical results needed to see that we can assume that the étale extension in §8.1 can be selected so that the hypotheses of Propositions 3.7 and 3.8 are satisfied.

Proposition 8.4. *Let X be an equidimensional algebraic variety of dimension d defined over a perfect field k , and let $\xi \in X$ be a closed point of multiplicity $m > 1$ with local ring $(\mathcal{O}_{X,\xi}, \mathfrak{m}_\xi, k(\xi))$. Assume that the embedding dimension at ξ is $(d+t)$ for some $t \geq 1$. If ξ is in the extremal case, then \mathfrak{m}_ξ has a reduction $\mathfrak{a} \subset \mathfrak{m}_\xi$ generated by d -elements.*

Proof. To prove the statement it is enough to show that there are d -elements $\kappa_1, \dots, \kappa_d \in \mathfrak{m}_\xi \setminus \mathfrak{m}_\xi^2$ such that if $\bar{\kappa}_1, \dots, \bar{\kappa}_d$ denote their images in $\mathfrak{m}_\xi/\mathfrak{m}_\xi^2$, then $\text{Gr}_{\mathfrak{m}_\xi}(\mathcal{O}_{X,\xi})/\langle \bar{\kappa}_1, \dots, \bar{\kappa}_d \rangle$ is a graded ring of dimension 0 (see [18, Theorem 10.14]).

Since $\dim_{k(\xi)} \mathfrak{m}_\xi/\mathfrak{m}_\xi^2 = d+t$ and by hypothesis $\dim_{k(\xi)} \ker(\lambda_\xi) = t$, we can find generators of \mathfrak{m}_ξ ,

$$(8.4.1) \quad \kappa_1, \dots, \kappa_d, \delta_1, \dots, \delta_t$$

such that $\bar{\delta}_1, \dots, \bar{\delta}_t$ form a basis of $\ker(\lambda_\xi)$. Notice that the elements $\bar{\delta}_1, \dots, \bar{\delta}_t$ are nilpotent in $\text{Gr}_{\mathfrak{m}_\xi}(\mathcal{O}_{X,\xi})/\langle \bar{\kappa}_1, \dots, \bar{\kappa}_d \rangle$ (see §2.6). Since the graded ring $\text{Gr}_{\mathfrak{m}_\xi}(\mathcal{O}_{X,\xi})$ is generated in degree one by $\{\bar{\kappa}_1, \dots, \bar{\kappa}_d, \bar{\delta}_1, \dots, \bar{\delta}_t\}$ it follows that the quotient $\text{Gr}_{\mathfrak{m}_\xi}(\mathcal{O}_{X,\xi})/\langle \bar{\kappa}_1, \dots, \bar{\kappa}_d \rangle$ is a graded ring of dimension zero and hence $\langle \bar{\kappa}_1, \dots, \bar{\kappa}_d \rangle$ is a reduction of \mathfrak{m}_ξ . \square

Observe that the previous Proposition holds for any local Noetherian ring which is in the extremal case.

Remark 8.5. Now we give a closer look at the way the étale extension in §8.1 is constructed. Suppose $\xi \in X$ is a closed point of multiplicity $m > 1$. Our purpose is to show that if the point ξ is in the extremal case, then we can find an étale extension $\mathcal{O}_{X,\xi} \rightarrow B'$ and a point $\xi' \in \text{Spec}(B')$ mapping to ξ such that:

- (i) There is a finite morphism of generic rank m from a smooth $k(\xi')$ algebra S , $S \rightarrow B'$, as in §8.1;
- (ii) The residue fields at ξ and ξ' are equal, i.e., $k(\xi) = k(\xi')$.

Therefore $\text{Gr}_{\mathfrak{m}_\xi}(\mathcal{O}_{X,\xi}) = \text{Gr}_{\mathfrak{m}_{\xi'}}(B')$.

To prove our claim, we follow the construction given in [13, Appendix A], where a full detailed proof of the existence of the finite morphism to $\text{Spec}(S)$ is given. Here we briefly sketch the three main steps in the argument that require considering étale extensions.

Step 1: If $k(\xi)$ is the residue field at ξ , then, after considering the extension $B_1 = \mathcal{O}_{X,\xi} \otimes_k k(\xi)$ it can be assumed that the point of interest is rational. Let \mathfrak{m}_1 be a maximal ideal of B_1 dominating \mathfrak{m}_ξ . Then if $k_1 := B_1/\mathfrak{m}_1$, we have that $k_1 = k(\xi)$.

Step 2: After a finite extension of the base field k_1 , k_2 , considering the base change $B_2 = B_1 \otimes_{k_1} k_2$, there is a maximal ideal $\mathfrak{m}_2 \subset B_2$, dominating \mathfrak{m}_1 , such that \mathfrak{m}_2 contains a reduction generated by d elements, $\kappa_1, \dots, \kappa_d$. To achieve this step, a graded version of Noether's Normalization Lemma is used at the graded ring $\text{Gr}_{\mathfrak{m}_2}(B_2)$. Letting $k_2 = B_2/\mathfrak{m}_2$ we get a k_2 -morphism from a polynomial ring in d variables with coefficients in k_2 :

$$(8.5.1) \quad \begin{array}{ccc} S_2 := k_2[Y_1, \dots, Y_d] & \longrightarrow & B_2 \\ Y_i & \mapsto & \kappa_i \quad \text{for } i = 1, \dots, d. \end{array}$$

Notice here that by Proposition 8.4, we do not need to extend the residue field when ξ is in the extremal case. Therefore under such hypothesis we can assume that $k_2 = k_1 = k(\xi)$.

Step 3: Finally, after considering an étale extension S_3 of S_2 (inside the henselization of the local ring $(S_2)_{\langle Y_1, \dots, Y_d \rangle}$; the strict henselization is not needed in this step),

$$\begin{array}{ccc} B_2 & \longrightarrow & B_3 := B_2 \otimes_{S_2} S_3 \\ \uparrow & & \uparrow \\ S_2 & \longrightarrow & S_3 \end{array}$$

it can be assumed that the extension $S_3 \rightarrow B_3$ is finite of generic rank equal to m . Let $\mathfrak{n}_3 \subset S_3$ be the maximal ideal dominating $\langle Y_1, \dots, Y_d \rangle$. Notice that the residue field of S_3 at \mathfrak{n}_3 is again k_2 . There is a maximal ideal $\mathfrak{m}_3 \subset B_3$ dominating \mathfrak{m}_2 and if $k_3 = B_3/\mathfrak{m}_3$ then $k_3 = k_2$.

Observe that from the construction we have the following sequence of étale local extensions:

$$(\mathcal{O}_{X,\xi}, \mathfrak{m}) \rightarrow ((B_1)_{\mathfrak{m}_1}, \mathfrak{m}_1) \rightarrow ((B_2)_{\mathfrak{m}_2}, \mathfrak{m}_2) \rightarrow ((B_3)_{\mathfrak{m}_3}, \mathfrak{m}_3)$$

leading to the following (étale) extensions of graded rings:

$$(8.5.2) \quad \text{Gr}_{\mathfrak{m}_\xi}(\mathcal{O}_{X,\xi}) = \text{Gr}_{\mathfrak{m}_1}(B_1) \longrightarrow \text{Gr}_{\mathfrak{m}_1}(B_1) \otimes_{k_1} k_2 = \text{Gr}_{\mathfrak{m}_2}(B_2) = \text{Gr}_{\mathfrak{m}_3}(B_3),$$

which by our hypothesis are all equal. To conclude, set $B' = (B_3)_{\mathfrak{m}_3}$, and following the notation of §8.1 set $S = S_3$ and $\alpha : \text{Spec}(B') \rightarrow \text{Spec}(S)$.

Remark 8.6. Notice that from the way the finite projection $S \rightarrow B'$ is constructed (see Remark 8.5, step 2), the morphism $\text{Gr}_{\mathfrak{m}_{\alpha(\xi')}}(S) \rightarrow \text{Gr}_{\mathfrak{m}_{\xi'}}(B')$ is injective, we have that

$$\mathfrak{m}_{\alpha(\xi')}/\mathfrak{m}_{\alpha(\xi')}^2 \oplus \ker(\lambda_{\xi'}) = \mathfrak{m}_{\xi'}/\mathfrak{m}_{\xi'}^2.$$

Lemma 8.7. Let $B' = S[\theta_1, \dots, \theta_e]$ be as in §8.1. Let ξ' be the closed point of $\text{Spec}(B')$ with multiplicity m , and assume that η' is a point of multiplicity m defining a regular subscheme in $\text{Spec}(B')$. If

$$\mathfrak{m}_{\xi'} = \mathfrak{m}_{\alpha(\xi')}B' + \langle \gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_s \rangle$$

with $\gamma_i \in \mathfrak{p}_{\eta'}$ for $i = 1, \dots, s$, then

$$\mathfrak{p}_{\eta'} = \mathfrak{p}_{\alpha(\eta')}B' + \langle \gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_s \rangle.$$

Proof. By the assumptions, there is a regular system of parameters at S , y_1, \dots, y_d , such that $\mathfrak{p}_{\alpha(\eta')} = \langle y_1, \dots, y_r \rangle$ for some $r < d$ and $\mathfrak{m}_{\alpha(\xi')} = \langle y_1, \dots, y_d \rangle$. Since $S \rightarrow B'$ is an inclusion, we will identify y_i with its image at B' . We have that,

$$(8.7.1) \quad \langle y_1, \dots, y_r, \gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_s \rangle \subset \mathfrak{p}_{\eta'}.$$

Let $\overline{B'} = B'/\langle y_1, \dots, y_r, \gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_s \rangle$. Notice now that

$$d - r = \dim(B'/\mathfrak{p}_{\eta'}) \leq \dim(\overline{B'}) \leq d - r,$$

where the last inequality follows because $\mathfrak{m}_{\xi'}/\langle y_1, \dots, y_r, \gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_s \rangle$ can be generated by $d - r$ elements. Therefore $\overline{B'}$ is a regular local ring of dimension $d - r$ and the inclusion (8.7.1) is an equality. \square

Lemma 8.8. *Let $B' = S[\theta_1, \dots, \theta_e]$ be as in §8.1, suppose that the embedding dimension of $\xi' \in X'$ is $d + t$, and assume that ξ' is in the extremal case. Suppose $\mathfrak{m}_{\alpha(\xi')} = \langle y_1, \dots, y_d \rangle$. Then, after reordering the elements θ_i and after considering translations of the form $\theta'_i = \theta_i + s_i$ with $s_i \in S$, it can be assumed that:*

- (i) $B' = S[\theta'_1, \dots, \theta'_e]$, and
- (ii) $\{y_1, \dots, y_d, \theta'_1, \dots, \theta'_t\}$ is a minimal set of generators of $\mathfrak{m}_{\xi'}$ with $t \leq e$.

Furthermore,

- (iii) For a given a $\lambda_{\xi'}$ -sequence, $\{\delta_1, \dots, \delta_t\}$, after translating again the elements $\theta'_i := \theta_i + s_i$ for suitably chosen elements $s_i \in S$, we can assume that $B' = S[\theta'_1, \dots, \theta'_e]$, that

$$\min\{\overline{\nu}_{\xi'}(\theta'_i) : i = 1, \dots, t, \dots, e\} = \min\{\overline{\nu}_{\xi'}(\theta'_i) : i = 1, \dots, t\} \geq \min\{\overline{\nu}_{\xi'}(\delta_i) : i = 1, \dots, t\},$$

and that $\{\theta'_1, \dots, \theta'_t\}$ is a $\lambda_{\xi'}$ -sequence.

Proof. Recall that, maybe after translating the θ_i by elements in S , it can be assumed that $\mathfrak{m}_{\xi'} = \langle y_1, \dots, y_d, \theta_1, \dots, \theta_e \rangle$ (here we will identify y_i with its image at B'). Note that $\overline{\nu}_{\xi'}(\theta_i) \geq 1$ for $i = 1, \dots, e$. We can extract a minimal set of generators for $\mathfrak{m}_{\xi'}$ from the previous set, and we can always assume that such a minimal set contains $\{y_1, \dots, y_d\}$ (see Remark 8.6 or the proof of Proposition 3.2). After reordering the elements θ_i , we can think that such a minimal set is of the form $\{y_1, \dots, y_d, \theta_1, \dots, \theta_t\}$. Thus conditions (i) and (ii) hold.

For condition (iii), given a $\lambda_{\xi'}$ -sequence, $\delta_1, \dots, \delta_t$, by Remark 8.6, we have that

$$\mathfrak{m}_{\xi'} = \langle y_1, \dots, y_d, \delta_1, \dots, \delta_t \rangle,$$

and since $\theta_i \in \mathfrak{m}_{\xi'}$, for $i = 1, \dots, t$, we can write,

$$\theta_i = p_{i,1}y_1 + \dots + p_{i,d}y_d + q_{i,1}\delta_1 + \dots + q_{i,t}\delta_t,$$

where $p_{i,j}, q_{i,k} \in B' = S[\theta_1, \dots, \theta_t, \dots, \theta_e]$ for $i = 1, \dots, t$, $j = 1, \dots, d$, and $k = 1, \dots, t$. For $i = 1, \dots, t$, and $j = 1, \dots, d$, we can write

$$p_{i,j} = s_{i,j,0} + \sum_{i_1, \dots, i_e} s_{i,j,i_1, \dots, i_e} \theta_1^{i_1} \cdots \theta_e^{i_e},$$

with $s_{i,j,0}, s_{i,j,i_1, \dots, i_e} \in S$ and $i_1 + \dots + i_e \geq 1$. For $i = 1, \dots, t$, set

$$\theta'_i := \theta_i - s_{i,1,0}y_1 - \dots - s_{i,d,0}y_d.$$

Note that $B' = S[\theta'_1, \dots, \theta'_t, \theta_{t+1}, \dots, \theta_e]$. In addition, since

$$\theta'_i = (p_{i,1} - s_{i,1,0})y_1 + \dots + (p_{i,d} - s_{i,d,0})y_d + q_{i,1}\delta_1 + \dots + q_{i,t}\delta_t,$$

$\bar{\nu}_{\xi'}((p_{i,j} - s_{i,j,0})y_j) \geq 2$ for $j = 1, \dots, d$, and $\bar{\nu}_{\xi'}(\delta_j) > 1$ for $j = 1, \dots, t$, we have that $\bar{\nu}_{\xi'}(\theta'_i) > 1$ and that $\bar{\theta}'_i \in \ker(\lambda_{\xi'})$. Since

$$\langle y_1, \dots, y_d, \theta_1, \dots, \theta_t \rangle = \langle y_1, \dots, y_d, \theta'_1, \dots, \theta'_t \rangle$$

it follows that $\bar{\theta}'_1, \dots, \bar{\theta}'_t \in \mathfrak{m}_{\xi'}/\mathfrak{m}_{\xi'}^2$ form a basis of $\ker(\lambda_{\xi'})$. Moreover by construction,

$$\bar{\nu}_{\xi'}(\theta'_i) \geq \min\{1 + \bar{\nu}_{\xi'}(\theta_1), \dots, 1 + \bar{\nu}_{\xi'}(\theta_e), \bar{\nu}_{\xi'}(\delta_1), \dots, \bar{\nu}_{\xi'}(\delta_t)\}.$$

Iterating this process we can assume that

$$\min\{\bar{\nu}_{\xi'}(\theta'_i) : i = 1, \dots, t\} \geq \min\{\bar{\nu}_{\xi'}(\delta_i) : i = 1, \dots, t\}.$$

Now suppose that there is some $j > t$ such that $\bar{\nu}_{\xi'}(\theta_j) < \bar{\nu}_{\xi'}(\theta'_i)$, for $i = 1, \dots, t$. After reordering again, we can assume that $j = t + 1$.

Repeating the previous argument,

$$\theta_{t+1} = p_1 y_1 + \dots + p_d y_d + q_1 \theta'_1 + \dots + q_t \theta'_t,$$

where $p_i, q_j \in B' = S[\theta_1, \dots, \theta_t, \dots, \theta_e]$ for $i = 1, \dots, d$, and $j = 1, \dots, t$. Now for $i = 1, \dots, d$, write

$$p_i = s_{i,0} + \sum_{i_1, \dots, i_e} s_{i, i_1, \dots, i_e} \theta_1^{i_1} \cdots \theta_e^{i_e},$$

with $s_{i,0}, s_{i, i_1, \dots, i_e} \in S$ and $i_1 + \dots + i_e \geq 1$. Set

$$\theta'_{t+1} := \theta_{t+1} - s_{1,0} y_1 - \dots - s_{d,0} y_d.$$

Then

$$\bar{\nu}_{\xi'}(\theta'_{t+1}) \geq \min\left\{\bar{\nu}_{\xi'}((p_1 - s_{1,0})y_1 + \dots + (p_d - s_{d,0})y_d), \bar{\nu}_{\xi'}(q_1 \theta'_1 + \dots + q_t \theta'_t)\right\}.$$

Now, it can be checked that either

$$\bar{\nu}_{\xi'}(\theta'_{t+1}) \geq \min\{\bar{\nu}_{\xi'}(\theta_i) + 1 : i = 1, \dots, e\},$$

or

$$\bar{\nu}_{\xi'}(\theta'_{t+1}) \geq \min\{\bar{\nu}_{\xi'}(\theta'_1), \dots, \bar{\nu}_{\xi'}(\theta'_t)\}.$$

Since $B' = S[\theta'_1, \dots, \theta'_t, \theta'_{t+1}, \theta_{t+2}, \dots, \theta_e]$, the claims in (iii) follow after a finite number of translations of the elements θ_i ($i = t + 1, \dots, e$) by elements in S . \square

Remark 8.9. With the same assumptions as in Lemma 8.8, assume now that $\eta' \in X'$ is a point of multiplicity m defining a regular closed subscheme at ξ' . Let $\mathfrak{p}_{\eta'} \subset \mathfrak{m}_{\xi'}$ be the corresponding prime, and suppose that

$$\mathfrak{p}_{\eta'} = \mathfrak{p}_{\alpha(\eta')} + \langle \gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_s \rangle,$$

for some $\gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_s \in B'$. Then, using a similar argument as the one given in the proof of Lemma 8.8 (iii), it can be proven that, after reordering the elements θ_i , and after considering translations of the form $\theta'_i = \theta_i + s_i$ with $s_i \in S$, it can be assumed that $B' = S[\theta'_1, \dots, \theta'_e]$ and

$$(8.9.1) \quad \min\{\bar{\nu}_{\mathfrak{p}_{\eta'}}(\theta'_i) : i = 1, \dots, e\} \geq \min\{\bar{\nu}_{\mathfrak{p}_{\eta'}}(\gamma_i) : i = 1, \dots, s\}.$$

To see this it suffices to observe that since $\mathfrak{p}_{\eta'}$ defines a regular prime at $\mathfrak{m}_{\xi'}$, after translating the elements θ_i if needed, we may assume that $\theta_i \in \mathfrak{p}_{\eta'}$ for $i = 1, \dots, e$ (see §8.1 (C)). Then we can select a regular system of parameters at S , $y_1, \dots, y_r, y_{r+1}, \dots, y_d$, so that

$$\mathfrak{p}_{\alpha(\eta')} = \langle y_1, \dots, y_r \rangle.$$

Now for $i = 1, \dots, e$,

$$\theta_i = p_{i,1} y_1 + \dots + p_{i,r} y_r + q_{i,1} \gamma_1 + \dots + q_{i,s} \gamma_s,$$

where $p_{i,j}, q_{i,k} \in B' = S[\theta_1, \dots, \theta_t, \dots, \theta_e]$ for $i = 1, \dots, e$, $j = 1, \dots, r$, and $k = 1, \dots, s$. For $i = 1, \dots, e$, and $j = 1, \dots, r$, we can write

$$p_{i,j} = s_{i,j,0} + \sum_{i_1, \dots, i_e} s_{i,j,i_1, \dots, i_e} \theta_1^{i_1} \cdots \theta_e^{i_e},$$

with $s_{i,j,0}, s_{i,j,i_1, \dots, i_e} \in S$ and $i_1 + \dots + i_e \geq 1$. Set

$$\theta'_i := \theta_i - s_{i,1,0}y_1 - \dots - s_{i,d,0}y_r \in \mathfrak{p}_{\eta'}.$$

Finally (8.9.1) follows using the same argument as in Lemma 8.8 (iii).

Proposition 8.10. *Let X be an equidimensional variety of dimension d defined over a perfect field k . Let $\zeta \in X$ be a point of multiplicity $m > 1$ which is in the extremal case. If $\text{H-ord}_X^{(d)}(\zeta) < \text{ord}_X^{(d)}(\zeta)$, then*

$$\text{H-ord}_X^{(d)}(\zeta) > 1.$$

Proof. Closed points. Suppose first that $\zeta = \xi$ is a closed point in X . Consider a suitable étale extension of $(\mathcal{O}_{X,\xi}, \mathfrak{m}_\xi, k(\xi))$ as in §8.1, and work on $(B', \mathfrak{m}_{\xi'}, k(\xi'))$. Following the notation and results in §8.1 (A), we can write $B' = S[\theta_1, \dots, \theta_e]$ with $\theta_i \in \mathfrak{m}_{\xi'}$ for $i = 1, \dots, e$. And since ξ' is in the extremal case, by Lemma 8.8, we can assume that $\bar{\nu}_{\xi'}(\theta_i) > 1$ for $i = 1, \dots, e$.

Recall that

$$(8.10.1) \quad Sl(\mathcal{P})(\xi') = \min_{i=1, \dots, e} \left\{ \frac{\nu_{\alpha(\xi')}(\tilde{a}_{p^{\ell_i}}^{(i)})}{p^{\ell_i}}, \text{ord}_{\alpha(\xi')}(\mathcal{G}^{(d)}) \right\},$$

and that for every $i \in 1, \dots, e$ and each $j = 1, \dots, p^{\ell_i} - 1$,

$$(8.10.2) \quad \text{H-ord}_{X'}^{(d)}(\xi') < \text{ord}_{\alpha(\xi')}(\mathcal{G}^{(d)}) \leq \frac{\nu_{\alpha(\xi')}(\tilde{a}_j^{(i)})}{j},$$

where the first inequality follows from the hypothesis in the proposition, and the second from Remark 7.28. Thus, there must be some $i \in \{1, \dots, e\}$ such that,

$$(8.10.3) \quad \frac{\nu_{\alpha(\xi')}(\tilde{a}_{p^{\ell_i}}^{(i)})}{p^{\ell_i}} < \text{ord}_{\alpha(\xi')}(\mathcal{G}^{(d)}).$$

For every i such that (8.10.3) holds, since $h_i(\theta_i)W^{p^{\ell_i}} \in \mathcal{G}_{B'}$,

$$(8.10.4) \quad \overline{\text{ord}}_{\xi'}(h_i(\theta_i)W^{p^{\ell_i}}) = \overline{\text{ord}}_{\xi'}(\theta_i^{p^{\ell_i}} + \tilde{a}_1^{(i)}\theta_i^{p^{\ell_i}-1} + \dots + \tilde{a}_{p^{\ell_i}}^{(i)}W^{p^{\ell_i}}) \geq \overline{\text{ord}}_{\xi'}(\mathcal{G}_{B'}) = \text{ord}_{\alpha(\xi')}(\mathcal{G}^{(d)}),$$

(see equality (8.1.9)). Thus, necessarily, for those indexes i ,

$$\bar{\nu}_{\xi'}(\theta_i) = \frac{\nu_{\alpha(\xi')}(\tilde{a}_{p^{\ell_i}}^{(1)})}{p^{\ell_i}},$$

and since $\bar{\nu}_{\xi'}(\theta_i) > 1$ the result follows from the definition of $\text{H-ord}_{X'}^{(d)}(\xi') = \text{H-ord}_X^{(d)}(\xi)$.

Non-closed points. Let $\zeta = \eta \in X$ be a non-closed point of multiplicity $m \geq 1$. Denote by \mathfrak{p}_η the prime defined by η in some affine open set of $U \subset X$. Choose a closed point $\xi \in \overline{\{\eta\}} \subseteq X$ with the following conditions:

- (1) ξ and η have the same multiplicity m .
- (2) $\mathcal{O}_{X,\xi}/\mathfrak{p}_\eta$ is a regular local ring of dimension $d - r$ for some $r \geq 1$.
- (3) Both points, ξ and η , are in the extremal case.

Conditions (1) and (2) hold in some open affine set $U \subset X$ containing η . To see that condition (3) can be achieved, choose a minimal set of generators $z_1, \dots, z_r, \gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_{t_\eta} \in \mathcal{O}_{X,\eta}$ of $\mathfrak{p}_\eta \mathcal{O}_{X,\eta}$ with $\overline{\nu}_\eta(\gamma_i) > 1$, for $i = 1, \dots, t_\eta$. Notice that after shrinking U , if needed, we can assume that $\mathfrak{p}_\eta = \langle z_1, \dots, z_r, \gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_{t_\eta} \rangle$ on U , and that for any closed point $\xi \in U \cap \overline{\{\eta\}}$, $\overline{\nu}_\xi(\gamma_i) > 1$ for $i = 1, \dots, t_\eta$.

Let $\xi \in U \cap \overline{\{\eta\}}$ be a closed point. Since condition (2) holds, we can find $z_{r+1}, \dots, z_d \in \mathfrak{m}_\xi$ such that $\mathfrak{m}_\xi = \langle z_1, \dots, z_d, \gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_{t_\eta} \rangle$ with $\overline{\nu}_\xi(z_i) = 1$, for $i = 1, \dots, d$. Since $\overline{\nu}_\xi(\gamma_i) > 1$ for $i = 1, \dots, t_\eta$, (3) holds. In particular if $\overline{\gamma}_i$ denotes the class of γ_i in $\mathfrak{m}_\xi/\mathfrak{m}_\xi^2$, then

$$(8.10.5) \quad \ker(\lambda_\xi) = \langle \overline{\gamma}_1, \dots, \overline{\gamma}_{t_\eta} \rangle$$

and $t_\xi \leq t_\eta$.

Let $B = \mathcal{O}_{X,\xi}$, and let $B \rightarrow B'$ an étale extension, and $S \rightarrow B'$ a finite morphism as in §8.1. Denote by $\mathfrak{p}_{\eta'} \subset B'$ the prime dominating $\mathfrak{p}_\eta B$, ξ' the closed point dominating ξ , and $\mathfrak{p}_{\alpha(\eta')}$ the prime $\mathfrak{p}_{\eta'} \cap S$. By [3, Corollary 3.2], $\mathfrak{p}_{\alpha(\eta')}$ determines a regular prime. Under these assumptions, using [3, Lemma 3.6], we can assume that $B' = S[\theta_1, \dots, \theta_e]$ with $\theta_i \in \mathfrak{p}_{\eta'}$. Note that $\overline{\nu}_{\mathfrak{p}_{\eta'}}(\theta_i) \geq 1$ and $\overline{\nu}_{\xi'}(\theta_i) \geq 1$ (see §8.1 (C)).

Since $\ker(\lambda_\xi) \otimes_{k(\xi)} k(\xi') = \ker(\lambda_{\xi'})$, by (8.10.5) and Remark 8.6,

$$(8.10.6) \quad \mathfrak{m}_{\xi'} = \mathfrak{m}_{\alpha(\xi')} + \langle \gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_{t_\eta} \rangle.$$

Thus, by Lemma 8.7,

$$(8.10.7) \quad \mathfrak{p}_{\eta'} = \mathfrak{p}_{\alpha(\eta')} + \langle \gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_{t_\eta} \rangle.$$

By Remark 8.9, maybe after translating the θ_i , we can assume that $B' = S[\theta'_1, \dots, \theta'_e]$ and that

$$(8.10.8) \quad \min\{\overline{\nu}_{\mathfrak{p}_{\eta'}}(\theta'_i) : i = 1, \dots, e\} \geq \min\{\overline{\nu}_{\mathfrak{p}_{\eta'}}(\gamma_i) : i = 1, \dots, s\} > 1.$$

Now, using (8.1.11) and the definition of $\text{H-ord}_{X'}(\eta')$, the proof of the proposition follows using a similar argument as the one we used for closed points (see §8.1 (C)), thus $1 < \text{H-ord}_{X'}(\eta') = \text{H-ord}_X(\eta)$. \square

Theorem 8.11. *Let X be an equidimensional variety of dimension d defined over a perfect field k . Let $\zeta \in X$ be a point of multiplicity $m > 1$ which is in the extremal case. Then,*

$$\text{H-ord}_X^{(d)}(\zeta) = \min\{\mathcal{S}\text{-Sl}(\mathcal{O}_{X,\zeta}), \text{ord}_X^{(d)}(\zeta)\}.$$

Proof. Closed points. Let $\xi = \zeta \in X$ be a closed point. Replace $(\mathcal{O}_{X,\xi}, \mathfrak{m}_\xi, k(\xi))$ by a suitable local étale extension (B', \mathfrak{m}', k') where there is a setting as that in of §8.1, with $B' = S[\theta_1, \dots, \theta_e]$. We will use the notation and the results presented there too (see especially §8.1 (A)). Set $t := t_{\xi'}$ the excess of the embedding dimension at ξ' . By Lemma 8.8, we can assume that

$$\mathfrak{m}_{\xi'} = \mathfrak{m}_{\alpha(\xi')} + \langle \theta_1, \dots, \theta_t \rangle$$

with $t \leq e$, that

$$\min\{\overline{\nu}_{\xi'}(\theta_i) : i = 1, \dots, t\} = \min\{\overline{\nu}_{\xi'}(\theta_i) : i = 1, \dots, t, \dots, e\},$$

and that $\overline{\nu}_{\xi'}(\theta_i) > 1$ for $i = 1, \dots, t$. Thus $\{\theta_1, \dots, \theta_t\}$ is λ_ξ -sequence. As in §8.1 (A), we can assume that we have a p -presentation $\mathcal{P}(\beta, \{z_i\}_{i=1}^e, \{h_i(z_i)\}_{i=1}^e)$ of $\mathcal{G}^{(d+e)}$.

Recall that by Remark 7.28, for every $i \in 1, \dots, e$, and each $j = 1, \dots, p^{\ell_i} - 1$,

$$(8.11.1) \quad \text{ord}_{\alpha(\xi')}(\mathcal{G}^{(d)}) \leq \frac{\nu_{\alpha(\xi')}(\tilde{a}_j^{(i)})}{j},$$

Since $h_i(\theta_i)W^{p^{\ell_i}} \in \mathcal{G}_{B'}$, we have that

$$(8.11.2) \quad \overline{\text{ord}}_{\xi'}(h_i(\theta_i)W^{p^{\ell_i}}) \geq \overline{\text{ord}}_{\xi'}(\mathcal{G}_{B'}) = \text{ord}_{\alpha(\xi')}(\mathcal{G}^{(d)}),$$

(see (8.1.9)). We will distinguish two cases:

Case (a) Suppose that $\bar{\nu}_{\xi'}(\theta_i) \geq \text{ord}_{\alpha(\xi')} \mathcal{G}^{(d)}$ for all $i \in \{1, \dots, t\}$. Then

$$(8.11.3) \quad \mathcal{S}\text{-Sl}(\mathcal{O}_{X', \xi'}) \geq \text{ord}_{\alpha(\xi')} \mathcal{G}^{(d)}.$$

In addition, for $i = 1, \dots, t, \dots, e$ we have also $\bar{\nu}_{\xi'}(\theta_i) \geq \text{ord}_{\alpha(\xi')} \mathcal{G}^{(d)}$, and by (8.11.1),

$$\frac{\bar{\nu}_{\xi'} \left(\theta_i^{p^{\ell_i}} + \tilde{a}_1^{(i)} \theta_i^{p^{\ell_i-1}} + \dots + \tilde{a}_{p^{\ell_i-1}}^{(i)} \theta_i \right)}{p^{\ell_i}} \geq \text{ord}_{\alpha(\xi')} \mathcal{G}^{(d)},$$

for $i = 1, \dots, e$. As a consequence, by (8.11.2) and Remark 2.2,

$$\frac{\bar{\nu}_{\xi'}(\tilde{a}_{p^{\ell_i}}^{(i)})}{p^{\ell_i}} = \frac{\nu_{\alpha(\xi')}(\tilde{a}_{p^{\ell_i}}^{(i)})}{p^{\ell_i}} \geq \text{ord}_{\alpha(\xi')} \mathcal{G}^{(d)}.$$

Therefore,

$$\text{Sl}(\mathcal{P})(\xi') = \min \left\{ \frac{\nu_{\alpha(\xi')}(\tilde{a}_{p^{\ell_i}}^{(i)})}{p^{\ell_i}}, \text{ord}_{\alpha(\xi')}(\mathcal{G}^{(d)}) \right\} = \text{ord}_{\alpha(\xi')}(\mathcal{G}^{(d)}) = \text{H-ord}_{X'}^{(d)}(\xi').$$

Thus, by (8.11.3),

$$\text{H-ord}_{X'}^{(d)}(\xi') = \min\{\mathcal{S}\text{-Sl}(\mathcal{O}_{X', \xi'}), \text{ord}_{X'}^{(d)}(\xi')\}.$$

Case (b) Suppose that $\bar{\nu}_{\xi'}(\theta_i) < \text{ord}_{\alpha(\xi')} \mathcal{G}^{(d)}$ for some $i \in \{1, \dots, t\}$. We will prove that in this case:

$$(8.11.4) \quad \min_{i=1, \dots, t} \left\{ \bar{\nu}_{\xi'}(\theta_i), \text{ord}_{\alpha(\xi')}(\mathcal{G}^{(d)}) \right\} = \text{Sl}(\mathcal{P})(\xi') = \min_{i=1, \dots, e} \left\{ \frac{\nu_{\alpha(\xi')}(\tilde{a}_{p^{\ell_i}}^{(i)})}{p^{\ell_i}}, \text{ord}_{\alpha(\xi')}(\mathcal{G}^{(d)}) \right\}.$$

By (8.11.2) and Remark 2.2, either $\bar{\nu}_{\xi'}(\theta_i^{p^{\ell_i}}) = \bar{\nu}_{\xi'}(\tilde{a}_j^{(i)} \theta_i^{p^{\ell_i-j}})$ for some $j \in \{1, \dots, p^{\ell_i} - 1\}$, or else $\bar{\nu}_{\xi'}(\theta_i^{p^{\ell_i}}) = \bar{\nu}_{\xi'}(\tilde{a}_{p^{\ell_i}}^{(i)})$. In the first case, we would have that $\bar{\nu}_{\xi'}(\theta_i^{p^{\ell_i}}) = \bar{\nu}_{\xi'}(\tilde{a}_j^{(i)} \theta_i^{p^{\ell_i-j}})$ which by Proposition 2.11 implies that

$$p^{\ell_i} \bar{\nu}_{\xi'}(\theta_i) = \bar{\nu}_{\xi'}(\tilde{a}_j^{(i)}) + (p^{\ell_i} - j) \bar{\nu}_{\xi'}(\theta_i),$$

and therefore, $\bar{\nu}_{\xi'}(\theta_i) = \bar{\nu}_{\xi'}(\tilde{a}_j^{(i)})/j = \nu_{\alpha(\xi')}(\tilde{a}_j^{(i)})/j \geq \text{ord}_{\alpha(\xi')} \mathcal{G}^{(d)}$ (by Remark 7.28) which is a contradiction. Thus, necessarily, $\bar{\nu}_{\xi'}(\theta_i) = \bar{\nu}_{\xi'}(\tilde{a}_{p^{\ell_i}}^{(i)})/p^{\ell_i} = \nu_{\alpha(\xi')}(\tilde{a}_{p^{\ell_i}}^{(i)})/p^{\ell_i} < \text{ord}_{\alpha(\xi')} \mathcal{G}^{(d)}$ (since by assumption $\bar{\nu}_{\xi'}(\theta_i) < \text{ord}_{\alpha(\xi')} \mathcal{G}^{(d)}$).

Conversely, if for some $i = 1, \dots, e$, $\nu_{\alpha(\xi')}(\tilde{a}_{p^{\ell_i}}^{(i)})/p^{\ell_i} < \text{ord}_{\alpha(\xi')}(\mathcal{G}^{(d)})$, then this leads to $\bar{\nu}_{\xi'}(\theta_i) = \bar{\nu}_{\xi'}(\tilde{a}_{p^{\ell_i}}^{(i)})/p^{\ell_i} = \nu_{\alpha(\xi')}(\tilde{a}_{p^{\ell_i}}^{(i)})/p^{\ell_i}$. Hence equality (8.11.4) holds.

Now we check that the theorem follows from here for $\xi' \in X'$. On the one hand, by Lemma 8.8, for each $\lambda_{\xi'}$ -sequence, $\delta_1, \dots, \delta_t$, we can find suitable elements $\theta_1, \dots, \theta_t, \dots, \theta_e$, so that $B' = S[\theta_1, \dots, \theta_e]$ and

$$\min_{i=1, \dots, t} \{\bar{\nu}_{\xi'}(\theta_i)\} \geq \min_{i=1, \dots, t} \{\bar{\nu}_{\xi'}(\delta_i)\},$$

for which we either fall in case (a), or else we fall in case (b) and then equality (8.11.4) holds.

On the other hand, higher values of $\text{Sl}(\mathcal{P})(\xi')$ are only obtained in case (b) after translations on the coefficients $\tilde{a}_{p^{\ell_i}}^{(i)}$ by elements on S . These in turn induce changes of the form $\theta'_i := \theta_i + s_i$, with $s_i \in \mathfrak{m}_{\alpha(\xi')}$ and with the additional property pointed out in (8.1.8), thus $\bar{\nu}_{\xi'}(\theta'_i) \geq \bar{\nu}_{\xi'}(\theta_i)$ for $i = 1, \dots, e$. Observing that also $B' = S[\theta'_1, \dots, \theta'_e]$, again by Lemma 8.8, we can extract a

$\lambda_{\xi'}$ -sequence among $\theta'_1, \dots, \theta'_e$ for which we either fall in case (a) or else we fall in case (b) and equality (8.11.4) holds.

To conclude, to check that the theorem holds at $(\mathcal{O}_{X,\xi}, \mathbf{m}, k(\xi))$ it suffices to observe that by Proposition 8.4 and Remark 8.5, $\text{Gr}_{\mathbf{m}_\xi}(\mathcal{O}_{X,\xi}) = \text{Gr}_{\mathbf{m}'}(B')$. Therefore the theorem follows from Proposition 3.7.

Non-closed points. Let $\eta = \zeta \in X$ be a non closed point of multiplicity $m \geq 1$. Denote by \mathfrak{p}_η the prime defined by η in some affine open set of $U \subset X$. Choose a closed point $\xi \in \overline{\{\eta\}} \subseteq X$ of multiplicity m . Replace $(\mathcal{O}_{X,\xi}, \mathbf{m}_\xi, k(\xi))$ by a suitable local étale extension (B', \mathbf{m}', k') where there is a setting as that in of §8.1, with $B' = S[\theta_1, \dots, \theta_e]$. Let $\eta' \in \text{Spec}(B') = X'$ be a point dominating η , and let $\mathfrak{p}_{\eta'}$ be the corresponding prime ideal. Then we can repeat the arguments in cases (a) or (b) for $B'_{\mathfrak{p}_{\eta'}} = S_{\mathfrak{p}_{\alpha(\eta')}}[\theta_1, \dots, \theta_e]$ where the arguments are valid for a local ring (see 8.1 (B)). Thus:

$$(8.11.5) \quad \text{H-ord}_{X'}^{(d)}(\eta') = \min\{\mathcal{S}\text{-Sl}(\mathcal{O}_{X',\eta'}), \text{ord}_{X'}^{(d)}(\eta')\}.$$

We have that $\mathcal{S}\text{-Sl}(\mathcal{O}_{X,\eta}) \leq \mathcal{S}\text{-Sl}(\mathcal{O}_{X',\eta'})$. To prove the theorem for $\eta \in X$ we will want to use Proposition 3.8. But to do so, among other things, we need to show that there is some $\lambda_{\eta'}$ -sequence in B' (without localizing at $\mathfrak{p}_{\eta'}$), that is also a $\lambda_{\xi'}$ -sequence, $\gamma'_1, \dots, \gamma'_{t_{\eta'}} \in \mathfrak{p}_{\eta'}$, for which the following equality holds:

$$(8.11.6) \quad \text{H-ord}_{X'}^{(d)}(\eta') = \min\{\bar{\nu}_{\eta'}(\gamma'_1), \dots, \bar{\nu}_{\eta'}(\gamma'_{t_{\eta'}}), \text{ord}_{X'}^{(d)}(\eta')\}.$$

From here the theorem will follow for $\mathcal{O}_{X,\eta}$ because

- either $\text{H-ord}_X^{(d)}(\eta) = \text{H-ord}_{X'}^{(d)}(\eta') = \text{ord}_{X'}^{(d)}(\eta') = \text{ord}_X^{(d)}(\eta)$, and applying Proposition 3.8 to $\gamma'_1, \dots, \gamma'_{t_{\eta'}}$ we would get that:

$$\mathcal{S}\text{-Sl}(\mathcal{O}_{X,\eta}) \geq \min\{\bar{\nu}_{\eta'}(\gamma'_1), \dots, \bar{\nu}_{\eta'}(\gamma'_{t_{\eta'}})\} \geq \text{ord}_{X'}^{(d)}(\eta') = \text{ord}_X^{(d)}(\eta);$$

- or $\text{H-ord}_X^{(d)}(\eta) = \text{H-ord}_{X'}^{(d)}(\eta') = \mathcal{S}\text{-Sl}(\mathcal{O}_{X',\eta'})$, and, again, by Proposition 3.8 applied to the same sequence we would get that:

$$\mathcal{S}\text{-Sl}(\mathcal{O}_{X,\eta}) = \mathcal{S}\text{-Sl}(\mathcal{O}_{X',\eta'}).$$

To find $\gamma'_1, \dots, \gamma'_{t_{\eta'}} \in \mathfrak{p}_{\eta'} \subset B'$, with the previous properties, we will proceed as follows.

Using the same arguments as in the proof of Proposition 8.10, we can find a closed point $\xi \in \overline{\{\eta\}} \subseteq X$ with the following conditions:

- (1) ξ and η have the same multiplicity m .
- (2) $\mathcal{O}_{X,\xi}/\mathfrak{p}_\eta$ is a regular local ring of dimension $d - r$ for some $r \geq 1$.
- (3) Both points, ξ and η , are in the extremal case.

Recall that under these conditions, we have that

$$(8.11.7) \quad t_\xi \leq t_\eta.$$

Let $B = \mathcal{O}_{X,\xi}$, and let $B \rightarrow B'$ an étale extension, and $S \rightarrow B'$ a finite morphism as in §8.1. Denote by and $\mathfrak{p}_{\eta'} \subset B'$ the prime dominating $\mathfrak{p}_\eta B$, ξ' the closed point dominating ξ , and $\mathfrak{p}_{\alpha(\eta')}$ the prime $\mathfrak{p}_{\eta'} \cap S$. By [3, Corollary 3.2], $\mathfrak{p}_{\alpha(\eta')}$ determines a regular prime. Under these assumptions, using [3, Lemma 3.6], we can assume that $B' = S[\theta_1, \dots, \theta_e]$ with $\theta_i \in \mathfrak{p}_{\eta'}$ (see §8.1 (C)). And moreover, following the same arguments as in the proof of Proposition 8.10 we can assume that $\bar{\nu}_{\mathfrak{p}_{\eta'}}(\theta_i) > 1$ and hence that $\bar{\nu}_{\xi'}(\theta_i) > 1$ for $i = 1, \dots, e$ (see (8.10.8)).

Suppose first that $\text{H-ord}_{X'}^{(d)}(\eta') = \text{ord}_{X'}^{(d)}(\eta')$. Since

$$(8.11.8) \quad \overline{\text{ord}}_{\mathfrak{p}_{\eta'}}(h_i(\theta_i)W^{p^{e_i}}) \geq \overline{\text{ord}}_{\mathfrak{p}_{\eta'}}(\mathcal{G}_{X'}) = \text{ord}_{\alpha(\eta')} \mathcal{G}^{(d)},$$

and by Remark 7.28,

$$\text{ord}_{\mathfrak{p}_{\alpha(\eta')}}(\mathcal{G}^{(d)}) \leq \frac{\nu_{\mathfrak{p}_{\alpha(\eta')}}(\tilde{a}_j^{(i)})}{j},$$

for all $i = 1, \dots, e$ and $j = 1, \dots, p^{\ell_i} - 1$, the hypothesis $\bar{\nu}_{\mathfrak{p}_{\eta'}}(\theta_i) > 1$ for $i = 1, \dots, e$, implies

$$\frac{\nu_{\mathfrak{p}_{\alpha(\eta')}}(\tilde{a}_{p^{\ell_i}}^{(i)})}{p^{\ell_i}} > 1.$$

Now, by the discussion in §7.13, after a finite number of translations of the form $\theta'_i = \theta_i + s_i$ with $s_i \in S$ it can be assumed that for $i = 1, \dots, e$,

$$\frac{\nu_{\mathfrak{p}_{\alpha(\eta')}}(\tilde{a}_{p^{\ell_i}}^{(i)})}{p^{\ell_i}} \geq \text{ord}_{X'}^{(d)}(\eta').$$

Recall that for each translations, $\theta'_i = \theta_i + s_i$, we have that

$$\nu_{\mathfrak{p}_{\alpha(\eta')}}(s_i) \geq \frac{\nu_{\mathfrak{p}_{\alpha(\eta')}}(\tilde{a}_{p^{\ell_i}}^{(i)})}{p^{\ell_i}} > 1$$

(see (8.1.10) and (8.1.12), which implies that, after a finite number of translations, we are in the following situation: $B' = S[\theta_1, \dots, \theta_e]$, with

$$(8.11.9) \quad \bar{\nu}_{\mathfrak{p}_{\eta'}}(\theta_i) \geq \text{ord}_{X'}^{(d)}(\eta')$$

and

$$(8.11.10) \quad \bar{\nu}_{\mathfrak{p}_{\eta'}}(\theta_i) > 1$$

for $i = 1, \dots, e$. This already implies that $\mathcal{S}\text{-Sl}(\mathcal{O}_{X', \eta'}) \geq \text{ord}_{X'}^{(d)}(\eta')$. Since $\mathfrak{m}_{\xi'} = \mathfrak{m}_{\alpha(\xi')} + \langle \theta_1, \dots, \theta_e \rangle$, after relabeling, we can assume that $\theta_1, \dots, \theta_{t_{\xi'}}$ form a $\lambda_{\xi'}$ -sequence. Thus

$$\mathfrak{m}_{\xi'} = \mathfrak{m}_{\alpha(\xi')} + \langle \theta_1, \dots, \theta_{t_{\xi'}} \rangle,$$

and by Lemma 8.7,

$$\mathfrak{p}_{\eta'} = \mathfrak{m}_{\alpha(\eta')} + \langle \theta_1, \dots, \theta_{t_{\xi'}} \rangle.$$

Hence $t_{\eta'} = t_{\xi'}$ and setting $t = t_{\eta'}$, we have that $\theta_1, \dots, \theta_t$ form also a $\lambda_{\eta'}$ -sequence. Since in addition ξ' is in the extremal case, we can assume that $k(\xi) = k(\xi')$ (see Remark 8.5). Finally, we can use Proposition 3.8 (with $\gamma'_i = \theta_i$ for $i = 1, \dots, t$) to conclude that

$$\text{H-ord}_X^{(d)}(\eta) = \text{ord}_X^{(d)}(\eta) = \min\{\mathcal{S}\text{-Sl}(\mathcal{O}_{X, \eta}), \text{ord}_X^{(d)}(\eta)\}.$$

Suppose now that $\text{H-ord}_X^{(d)}(\eta') < \text{ord}_X^{(d)}(\eta')$. Since η' is in the extremal case, by Proposition 8.10, we only have to consider the case where

$$(8.11.11) \quad 1 < \text{H-ord}_X^{(d)}(\eta') < \text{ord}_X^{(d)}(\eta').$$

As in §8.1, we can assume that

$$(8.11.12) \quad h_i(\theta_i)W^{p^{\ell_i}} = (\theta_i^{p^{\ell_i}} + \tilde{a}_1^{(i)}\theta_i^{p^{\ell_i}-1} + \dots + \tilde{a}_{p^{\ell_i}}^{(i)})W^{p^{\ell_i}} \in \mathcal{G}_{B'}.$$

By (8.11.11), there must be some indexes i_1, \dots, i_c , for which

$$1 < \bar{\nu}_{\mathfrak{p}_{\eta'}}(\theta_{i_j}) = \frac{\nu_{\mathfrak{p}_{\eta'}}(\tilde{a}_{p^{\ell_{i_j}}}^{(i_j)})}{p^{\ell_{i_j}}} \leq \text{H-ord}_X^{(d)}(\eta').$$

If the second inequality is strict for all i_1, \dots, i_e , then we can make changes of variables of the form $\theta'_{i_j} = \theta_{i_j} + s_{i_j}$ with $s_{i_j} \in S$ and

$$\nu_{\mathfrak{p}_{\alpha(\eta')}}(s_{i_j}) \geq \frac{\nu_{\mathfrak{p}_{\eta'}}(\tilde{a}_{\ell_{i_j}}^{(i_j)})}{p^{\ell_{i_j}}}$$

(see (8.1.12)), such that for some index, which we can assume to be e ,

$$\bar{\nu}_{\mathfrak{p}_{\eta'}}(\theta'_e) = \text{H-ord}_{X'}^{(d)}(\eta') \leq \bar{\nu}_{\mathfrak{p}_{\eta'}}(\theta'_i),$$

for $i = 1, \dots, e-1$. Notice that from the way the changes are made, $\bar{\nu}_{\xi'}(\theta'_i) \geq \bar{\nu}_{\xi}(\theta_i) > 1$ and $B' = S[\theta'_1, \dots, \theta'_e]$ (here there is no need to localize as it is shown in the proof of [5, Proposition 5.8]; see also §7.13).

To summarize, there is a presentation of B' , $B' = S[\theta'_1, \dots, \theta'_e]$, such that $\bar{\nu}_{\mathfrak{p}_{\eta'}}(\theta'_i) > 1$ for $i = 1, \dots, e$ (thus $\bar{\nu}_{\xi'}(\theta_i) > 1$ for $i = 1, \dots, e$), and so that

$$\bar{\nu}_{\mathfrak{p}_{\eta'}}(\theta_e) = Sl(\mathcal{P})(\eta') = \text{H-ord}_{X'}^{(d)}(\eta').$$

Now recall that $\mathfrak{m}_{\xi'} = \mathfrak{m}_{\alpha(\xi')} + \langle \theta'_1, \dots, \theta'_e \rangle$. We claim that we can select $t_{\xi'}$ elements among $\theta'_1, \dots, \theta'_e$ so that the order of at least one of them at $\mathfrak{p}_{\eta'}$ equals $\bar{\nu}_{\mathfrak{p}_{\eta'}}(\theta'_e)$. The claim follows immediately if $\theta'_e \in \mathfrak{m}_{\xi'} \setminus \mathfrak{m}_{\xi'}^2$. Otherwise, we can assume, without loss of generality, that the classes of $\theta'_1, \dots, \theta'_{t_{\xi'}}$ are linearly independent at $\mathfrak{m}_{\xi'}/\mathfrak{m}_{\xi'}^2$ and that $\bar{\nu}_{\mathfrak{p}_{\eta'}}(\theta'_i) > \bar{\nu}_{\mathfrak{p}_{\eta'}}(\theta'_e)$ for $i = 1, \dots, t_{\xi'}$. Then we can replace θ'_1 by $\theta'_1 + \theta'_e$, so $\mathfrak{m}_{\xi'} = \mathfrak{m}_{\alpha(\xi')} + \langle \theta'_1, \dots, \theta'_{t_{\xi'}}, \theta'_1, \dots, \theta'_{t_{\xi'}} \rangle$ form a $\lambda_{\xi'}$ -sequence and $\bar{\nu}_{\mathfrak{p}_{\eta'}}(\theta'_1) = \bar{\nu}_{\mathfrak{p}_{\eta'}}(\theta'_e)$. By Lemma 8.7, $\mathfrak{p}_{\eta'} = \mathfrak{p}_{\alpha(\eta')} + \langle \theta'_1, \dots, \theta'_{t_{\xi'}} \rangle$, thus $t_{\xi'} \geq t_{\eta'}$, hence by (8.11.7), $t_{\xi'} = t_{\eta'}$, we have that $\theta'_1, \dots, \theta'_{t_{\xi'}}$ is also a $\lambda_{\eta'}$ -sequence and setting $t := t_{\eta'}$, by construction

$$(8.11.13) \quad \min\{\bar{\nu}_{\mathfrak{p}_{\eta'}}(\theta'_1), \dots, \bar{\nu}_{\mathfrak{p}_{\eta'}}(\theta'_t)\} = \text{H-ord}_{X'}^{(d)}(\eta').$$

Note that, in general, $\bar{\nu}_{\mathfrak{p}_{\eta'}}(\theta_i) \leq \bar{\nu}_{\eta'}(\theta_i)$. If these inequalities were strict for all $i = 1, \dots, t$ then we would have found a $\lambda_{\eta'}$ -sequence for which

$$\min\{\bar{\nu}_{\eta'}(\theta'_1), \dots, \bar{\nu}_{\eta'}(\theta'_t)\} > \text{H-ord}_{X'}^{(d)}(\eta'),$$

and since $\text{H-ord}_{X'}^{(d)}(\eta') < \text{ord}_{X'}^{(d)}(\eta')$ and we already know that the theorem holds for $B_{\mathfrak{p}_{\eta'}}$, we would get a contradiction. Hence, there must be some index i for which $\bar{\nu}_{\eta'}(\theta_i) = \text{H-ord}_{X'}^{(d)}(\eta')$. Finally, since ξ' is in the extremal case, we can also assume that $k(\xi') = k(\xi)$, and apply Proposition 3.8 to $\gamma'_i = \theta'_i$ for $i = 1, \dots, t$, from where it follows that the theorem holds for $\eta \in X$. \square

REFERENCES

- [1] C. Abad. On the highest multiplicity locus of algebraic varieties and Rees algebras. *J. Algebra*, 441:294–313, 2015.
- [2] C. Abad. *Multiplicity along embedded schemes and differential operators*. 2017. Thesis (Ph.D.).
- [3] C. Abad, A. Bravo, and O.E. Villamayor U. Finite morphisms and simultaneous reduction of the multiplicity. *Preprint, arXiv:1719.08805v1 [math.AG]*, 2017.
- [4] A. Benito and O. E. Villamayor U. Techniques for the study of singularities with applications to resolution of 2-dimensional schemes. *Math. Ann.*, 353(3):1037–1068, 2012.
- [5] Angélica Benito and Orlando E. Villamayor U. Monoidal transforms and invariants of singularities in positive characteristic. *Compos. Math.*, 149(8):1267–1311, 2013.
- [6] Angélica Benito and Orlando E. Villamayor U. On elimination of variables in the study of singularities in positive characteristic. *Indiana Univ. Math. J.*, 64(2):357–410, 2015.
- [7] E. Bierstone and P. D. Milman. Canonical desingularization in characteristic zero by blowing up the maximum strata of a local invariant. *Invent. Math.*, 128(2):207–302, 1997.
- [8] A. Bravo, S. Encinas, and B. Pascual-Escudero. Nash multiplicity sequences and Hironaka's order function. *Indiana Univ. Math. J.*, 69(6):1933–1973, 2020.

- [9] A. Bravo, S. Encinas, and O. Villamayor U. A simplified proof of desingularization and applications. *Rev. Mat. Iberoamericana*, 21(2):349–458, 2005.
- [10] A. Bravo, M. L. Garcia-Escamilla, and O. E. Villamayor U. On Rees algebras and invariants for singularities over perfect fields. *Indiana Univ. Math. J.*, 61(3):1201–1251, 2012.
- [11] A. Bravo and O. Villamayor U. Singularities in positive characteristic, stratification and simplification of the singular locus. *Adv. Math.*, 224(4):1349–1418, 2010.
- [12] A. Bravo and O. E. Villamayor U. Elimination algebras and inductive arguments in resolution of singularities. *Asian J. Math.*, 15(3):321–355, 2011.
- [13] A. Bravo and O. E. Villamayor U. On the behavior of the multiplicity on schemes: stratification and blow ups. In *The resolution of singular algebraic varieties*, pages 81–207. Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 2014.
- [14] S. Encinas and H. Hauser. Strong resolution of singularities in characteristic zero. *Comment. Math. Helv.*, 77(4):821–845, 2002.
- [15] S. Encinas and O. Villamayor. A course on constructive desingularization and equivariance. In *Resolution of singularities (Obergrugl, 1997)*, volume 181 of *Progr. Math.*, pages 147–227. Birkhäuser, Basel, 2000.
- [16] S. Encinas and O. Villamayor. Rees algebras and resolution of singularities. In *Proceedings of the XVth Latin American Algebra Colloquium (Spanish)*, *Bibl. Rev. Mat. Iberoamericana*, pages 63–85. Rev. Mat. Iberoamericana, Madrid, 2007.
- [17] A. Grothendieck. éléments de géométrie algébrique. IV. étude locale des schémas et des morphismes de schémas. III. *Inst. Hautes Études Sci. Publ. Math.*, (28):255, 1966.
- [18] M. Herrmann, S. Ikeda, and U. Orbanz. *Equimultiplicity and blowing up*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1988. An algebraic study, With an appendix by B. Moonen.
- [19] H. Hironaka. Resolution of singularities of an algebraic variety over a field of characteristic zero. I, II. *Ann. of Math. (2)* 79 (1964), 109–203; *ibid. (2)*, 79:205–326, 1964.
- [20] H. Hironaka. Idealistic exponents of singularity. In *Algebraic geometry (J. J. Sylvester Sympos., Johns Hopkins Univ., Baltimore, Md., 1976)*, pages 52–125. Johns Hopkins Univ. Press, Baltimore, Md., 1977.
- [21] Heisuke Hironaka. Three key theorems on infinitely near singularities. In *Singularités Franco-Japonaises*, volume 10 of *Sémin. Congr.*, pages 87–126. Soc. Math. France, Paris, 2005.
- [22] Monique Lejeune-Jalabert and Bernard Teissier. Clôture intégrale des idéaux et équisingularité. *Centre De Mathématiques, Université Scientifique et Médicale de Grenoble*, 1974. With an appendix by Jean-Jacques Risler.
- [23] J. Lipman. Equimultiplicity, reduction, and blowing up. In *Commutative algebra (Fairfax, Va., 1979)*, volume 68 of *Lecture Notes in Pure and Appl. Math.*, pages 111–147. Dekker, New York, 1982.
- [24] D. Rees. Valuations associated with a local ring. I. *Proc. London Math. Soc. (3)*, 5:107–128, 1955.
- [25] D. Rees. Valuations associated with a local ring. II. *J. London Math. Soc.*, 31:228–235, 1956.
- [26] D. Rees. Valuations associated with ideals. *Proc. London Math. Soc. (3)*, 6:161–174, 1956.
- [27] D. Rees. Valuations associated with ideals. II. *J. London Math. Soc.*, 31:221–228, 1956.
- [28] P. Samuel. Some asymptotic properties of powers of ideals. *Ann. of Math. (2)*, 56:11–21, 1952.
- [29] I. Swanson. *Rees valuations*. Commutative algebra—Noetherian and non-Noetherian perspectives. Springer, New York, 2011.
- [30] I. Swanson and C. Huneke. *Integral closure of ideals, rings, and modules*, volume 336 of *London Mathematical Society Lecture Note Series*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2006.
- [31] O. Villamayor. Constructiveness of Hironaka’s resolution. *Ann. Sci. École Norm. Sup. (4)*, 22(1):1–32, 1989.
- [32] O. E. Villamayor. Tschirnhausen transformations revisited and the multiplicity of the embedded hypersurface. *Bol. Acad. Nac. Cienc. (Córdoba)*, 65:233–243, 2000. Colloquium on Homology and Representation Theory (Spanish) (Vaquerías, 1998).
- [33] O. Villamayor U. Hypersurface singularities in positive characteristic. *Adv. Math.*, 213(2):687–733, 2007.
- [34] O. Villamayor U. Rees algebras on smooth schemes: integral closure and higher differential operator. *Rev. Mat. Iberoam.*, 24(1):213–242, 2008.
- [35] O. E. Villamayor U. Equimultiplicity, algebraic elimination, and blowing-up. *Adv. Math.*, 262:313–369, 2014.
- [36] Orlando E. Villamayor U. Differential operators on smooth schemes and embedded singularities. *Rev. Un. Mat. Argentina*, 46(2):1–18 (2006), 2005.
- [37] O. Zariski and P. Samuel. *Commutative algebra. Vol. II*. The University Series in Higher Mathematics. D. Van Nostrand Co., Inc., Princeton, N. J.-Toronto-London-New York, 1960.

DEPTO. DIDÁCTICAS ESPECÍFICAS, FACULTAD DE EDUCACIÓN, UNIVERSIDAD AUTÓNOMA DE MADRID, CANTOBLANCO 28049 MADRID, SPAIN

E-mail address, A. Benito: angelica.benito@uam.es

DEPTO. MATEMÁTICAS, FACULTAD DE CIENCIAS, UNIVERSIDAD AUTÓNOMA DE MADRID AND INSTITUTO DE CIENCIAS MATEMÁTICAS CSIC-UAM-UC3M-UCM, CANTOBLANCO 28049 MADRID, SPAIN

E-mail address, A. Bravo: ana.bravo@uam.es

DEPTO. ÁLGEBRA, ANÁLISIS MATEMÁTICO, GEOMETRÍA Y TOPOLOGÍA, AND IMUVA, INSTITUTO DE MATEMÁTICAS.
UNIVERSIDAD DE VALLADOLID

E-mail address, S. Encinas: santiago.encinas@uva.es