

FUNCTORIAL RESOLUTION BY TORUS ACTIONS

JAROSŁAW WŁODARCZYK

ABSTRACT. We show a simple and fast embedded resolution of varieties and principalization of ideals in the language of torus actions on ambient smooth schemes with or without SNC divisors. The canonical functorial resolution of varieties in characteristic zero is given by, the introduced here, operations of *cobordant blow-ups* with smooth weighted centers. The centers are defined by the geometric invariant measuring the singularities on smooth schemes with SNC divisors.

As the result of the procedure we obtain a smooth variety with a torus action and the exceptional divisor having simple normal crossings. Moreover, its geometric quotient is birational to the resolved variety, has abelian quotient singularities, and can be desingularized directly by combinatorial methods. The paper is based upon the ideas of the joint work with Abramovich and Temkin [ATW19] and a similar result by McQuillan [McQ19] on resolution in characteristic zero via stack-theoretic weighted blow-ups.

As an application of the method we show the resolution of a certain class of isolated singularities in positive and mixed characteristic.

1. INTRODUCTION

The importance of G_m -actions in birational geometry and their connection with Mori theory was already discovered by Reid, Thaddeus, and many others (see [Tha94a], [Tha94b], [Tha96], [Rei], [DH98]). In particular, Reid [Rei02] emphasized the role of weighted blowings up and flips in birational geometry using G_m -actions. This was also reflected in the proof of the Weak Factorization theorem, which relied on the notion of birational cobordism and a critical role of G_m -action [Wło00], [Wło03], [AKMW02].

In the present paper, we propose approaching embedded resolution problems and the existing resolution algorithms from the point of view of torus actions. This is an alternative and, to a great extent, equivalent approach to the one pursued in a paper [McQ19] of McQuillan-Marzo, and, a recent paper [Que20] of Quek, and most notably, in the series of papers by Abramovich-Temkin-Włodarczyk [ATW17], [ATW20], [ATW19], where all kind of stack-theoretic blow-ups were considered to simplify resolution procedure or to adapt the algorithm to the relative situation of morphisms. The introduced here definition of *cobordant blow-up* interprets the stack-theoretic weighted blow-ups, logarithmic Kummer blow-up, and more general birational transformations of stacks in terms of torus actions. This naturally leads to the presentation of the weighed blow-ups and other transformations as smooth birational cobordisms. Consequently, the operation is done in the language of smooth schemes with very simple transformation rules. In fact, only one chart is needed to describe the cobordant blow-up, which makes it a very simple tool for

Date: March 8, 2022.

This research is supported by BSF grant 2014365.

algorithmic computations and possible theoretical implementations. The method can be applied to many existing and potential embedded resolution algorithms originally relying on smooth centers, regardless of characteristic. It also allows to avoid lots of additional problems associated with smooth centers and studied intensely in [Abh67, Moh87, Moh96, Hau98, Wło08, CP08, CP09, Cut11, BVU13, KM16, HP19]. Moreover, it is significantly faster and eliminates unnecessary blow-ups. Furthermore, the algorithm in characteristic zero has a very simple structure with the centers defined by a geometric invariant. The smooth centers are replaced with more general smooth weighted centers. In fact, the present paper, similar as [ATW19], contains a highly simplified version of the strong Hironaka algorithm in characteristic zero. Recall that the standard Hironaka algorithm uses a rather complicated invariant where the geometry of singularities is mixed with the combinatorics of the monomials. In the present paper, similarly to [ATW19] and [McQ19] the algorithm is purely geometric, with the combinatorial part hidden in the torus action or respectively in the stack-theoretic structure as, in the two papers above.

Unlike the formalism in [ATW19], or in [McQ19], the resolution here is given in the language of schemes and does not use stack-theoretic language, although if needed, can be converted into such. Moreover, the resolution of varieties and principalization of ideals is obtained in the stronger form where the centers have SNC with the strict transforms, and the inverse image of the ideal is given by an effective SNC divisor.

The actual proof is presented in a convenient language of valuative \mathbb{Q} -ideals on smooth schemes introduced in [ATW19], in the framework of embedded Hironaka resolution. It relies on the basic concepts of the standard Hironaka algorithm from [Hir64],[Vil89],[BM97],[Wło05],[EH02], [EV03], [Kol07], which are adapted to the new language. In particular, we introduce a new definition of the order of ideals (Section 2.3.11), maximal contact, and admissibility, which reflect the considered SNC structure. Moreover, we also show a nonembedded resolution by smooth weighted centers similar to the classical Hironaka resolution in the strong version, with the Hilbert-Samuel function. On the other hand, when ignoring the exceptional divisors and applying the stack-theoretic torus quotients, we obtain the results and the method from [ATW19].

The resolution algorithm outputs a smooth scheme with a torus action and admitting a geometric quotient having abelian quotient singularities and birational to the original scheme. It can be directly resolved by canonical combinatorial methods in any characteristic as in [Wło20, Theorem 7.17.1], or in [BR19] by the destackification method of Bergh.

We also show in Section 5 some applications of the ideas to resolution in positive and mixed characteristic. The method of cobordant blow-ups with weighted centers can be applied to the, introduced here, class of *almost homogenous singularities* in any characteristic (see Theorems 5.2.2, 5.2.3). This class includes, in particular, the isolated singularities whose generalized weighted tangent cone also has an isolated singularity. Moreover, the approach can be generalized to the case where the equimultiple locus of the subscheme and its weighted tangent cone coincide (see Lemma 5.3.1).

1.0.1. *Acknowledgements.* The author would like to thank Dan Abramovich, Kenji Matsuki, Mircea Mustață, Michael Temkin, and Willem Veys for helpful discussions and suggestions.

1.1. Main results in characteristic zero. The following theorems extend the results and the resolution method by stack-theoretic weighted blow-ups from [ATW19, Section 1.2] in the language of torus actions and SNC divisors.

1.1.1. *Functorial principalization.*

Theorem 1.1.2. *Let X be a smooth variety over a field k of characteristic zero, and E be a simple normal crossing (SNC) divisor and \mathcal{I} be an ideal sheaf on X . There exists a canonical principalization of \mathcal{I} , that is a sequence of cobordant blow-ups (Definition 2.2.8) at smooth weighted centers*

$$X = X_0 \leftarrow X_1 \leftarrow \dots \leftarrow X_k = X', \quad (*)$$

such that:

- (1) The torus $T_i = G_m^i$ acts on X_i , with finite stabilizers, where $T_0 = 1$, $T_{i+1} = T_i \times G_m$, and $T := T_k$ so that the geometric quotient (space of orbits) X_i/T_i exists.
- (2) Set $\mathcal{I}_0 := \mathcal{I}$. For $i \geq 1$, the ideals $\mathcal{I}_i \subset \mathcal{O}_{X_i}$, defined as $\mathcal{I}_i := \mathcal{O}_{X_i} \cdot \mathcal{I}_{i-1}$ are T_i -stable.
- (3) Set $E_0 := E$, and let E_i , for $i \geq 1$, be the total transform of E_{i-1} . The divisors E_i on X_i are T_i -stable and have SNC.
- (4) The smooth weighted centers \mathcal{J}_i of the cobordant blow-ups $X_i \leftarrow X_{i+1}$ are compatible with E_i (Definition 2.3.5), and are T_i -stable. Moreover $V(\mathcal{J}_i) \subseteq V(\mathcal{I}_i)$.
- (5) $\mathcal{O}_{X'} \cdot \mathcal{I} = \mathcal{I}_{D'} := \mathcal{O}_{X'}(-D')$ is the ideal of an SNC divisor D' whose components are the strict transforms of the components of the total transform E' of E . Moreover there is a T -equivariant isomorphism over $X \setminus V(\mathcal{I})$:

$$X' \setminus D' \simeq (X \setminus V(\mathcal{I})) \times T.$$

- (6) The sequence (*) defines the sequence of the weighted blow-ups on the induced geometric quotients $X = X/T_0 \leftarrow X_1/T_1 \leftarrow \dots \leftarrow X_k/T_k = X'/T$, such that $\mathcal{O}_{X'/T'} \cdot \mathcal{I} = \mathcal{I}_{D''}$ is the ideal of a locally principal divisor $D'' := D'/T \subset X'/T'$, where D' is a T -stable SNC divisor on X' , and $\mathcal{O}_X \cdot \mathcal{I}_{D''} = \mathcal{I}_{D'}$.
- (7) The sequence (*) defines the sequence of the stack-theoretic weighted blow-ups on the induced smooth stack-theoretic quotients

$$X = X_0 = [X/T_0] \leftarrow [X_1/T_1] \leftarrow \dots \leftarrow [X_k/T_k] = [X'/T'],$$

such that $\mathcal{O}_{[X'/T']} \cdot \mathcal{I}$ is the ideal of an SNC divisor on $[X'/T']$.

- (8) The sequence (*) is functorial for smooth morphisms, field extensions, and group actions preserving (\mathcal{I}, E) .

Theorem 1.1.3. *(Embedded desingularization) Let Y be a reduced closed subscheme of a smooth scheme X over a field k of characteristic zero. Let E be an SNC divisor on E . There exists a sequence of cobordant blow-ups at smooth weighted centers*

$$X = X_0 \leftarrow X_1 \leftarrow \dots \leftarrow X_k = X' \quad (*)$$

and the induced sequence of the strict transforms

$$Y = Y_0 \leftarrow Y_1 \leftarrow \dots \leftarrow Y_k = Y',$$

such that

- (1) The torus $T_i = G_m^i$ acts on X_i , with finite stabilizers, where $T_0 = 1$, $T_{i+1} = T_i \times G_m$ and $T := T_k$ so that the geometric quotient X_i/T_i exists.
- (2) The closed subschemes $Y_i \subset X_i$ are T_i -stable. In particular, they admit geometric quotients Y_i/T_i .
- (3) Set $E_0 := E$, and let E_i , for $i \geq 1$, be either the total or the strict transform of E_{i-1} . The divisors E_i on X_i are T_i -stable and have SNC.
- (4) The smooth weighted centers of the cobordant blow-ups $X_i \leftarrow X_{i+1}$ are compatible with E_i . Moreover they are T_i -stable and contained in the locus $\text{Sing}_{E_i}(Y_i)$ of the points where either Y_i is singular or Y_i is smooth but not transversal to E_i .
- (5) Y' is a smooth subvariety of X and have SNC with $E' := E_k$. If E' is the total transform of E then the exceptional divisor of the induced morphism $Y' \rightarrow Y$ is also SNC.
- (6) The sequence (*) defines the sequence of the weighted blow-ups on the induced geometric quotients $X = X/T_0 \leftarrow X_1/T_1 \leftarrow \dots \leftarrow X_k/T_k = X'/T$, such that $Y'/T \subset X'/T$ admit quotient abelian singularities,
- (7) The sequence (*) defines the sequence of the stack-theoretic weighted blow-ups on the induced smooth stack-theoretic quotients

$$X = X_0 = [X/T_0] \leftarrow [X_1/T_1] \leftarrow \dots \leftarrow [X_k/T_k] = [X'/T'],$$
 such that $[Y'/T'] \subset [X'/T']$ is a smooth substack.
- (8) The sequence (*) is functorial for smooth morphisms, field extensions, and group actions preserving Y .

Remark 1.1.4. The total transform is the union of the strict transform and the exceptional divisors. Using the total transforms gives better control over the induced exceptional divisor of the resolution morphism $X' \rightarrow X$ which is SNC and has simple normal crossings with $Y' \subset X'$. The use of the strict transforms gives a slightly faster and simpler algorithm without control of the exceptional divisors.

Remark 1.1.5. If $E = \emptyset$, and the strict transforms of the divisors are considered in (3) then $E_i = \emptyset$ for $i = 0, \dots, k$ and we get the resolution procedure similar to the one in [ATW19]. Moreover when applying the stack-theoretic quotients as in (5) we reprove the main result of [ATW19, Corollary 1.2.3].

Theorem 1.1.6. (Nonembedded desingularization) *Let Y be a reduced scheme of finite type over a field k of characteristic zero. There exists a sequence of cobordant blow-ups of regular weighted centers (as in Definition 6.1.4):*

$$Y = Y_0 \leftarrow Y_1 \leftarrow \dots \leftarrow Y_k = Y', \quad (**)$$

such that

- (1) Y' is a smooth variety.
- (2) The torus $T_i = G_m^i$ acts on Y_i , with finite stabilizers, where $T_0 = 1$, $T_{i+1} = T_i \times G_m$ and $T := T_k$, so that the geometric quotient Y_i/T_i exists.
- (3) The inverse image of the exceptional locus is a T' -stable SNC divisor E' on Y'
- (4) The inverse image of the nonsingular locus $Y^{ns} \subseteq Y$ is equal to $Y^{ns} \times T$, with the natural action of T on the second component.
- (5) The sequence (**) defines the sequence of the weighted blow-ups on the induced geometric quotients $Y = Y/T_0 \leftarrow Y_1/T_1 \leftarrow \dots \leftarrow Y_k/T_k = Y'/T$, such that Y'/T has an abelian quotient singularities.

- (6) The sequence (**) defines the sequence of the stack-theoretic weighted blow-ups on the induced stack-theoretic quotients

$$Y = Y_0 = [Y/T_0] \leftarrow [Y_1/T_1] \leftarrow \dots \leftarrow [Y_k/T_k] = [Y'/T],$$

such that $[Y'/T]$ is a smooth stack.

- (7) The sequence (**) is functorial for smooth morphisms, group actions and field extensions.

2. COBORDANT BLOW-UPS

2.1. Valuative ideals. It is convenient for a compact notation and a better visualization of the ideas to consider rational powers of ideals on a scheme. In particular, the rational powers of monomials in divisorial unknowns allowing for much easier computations were used already in Bierstone-Milman approach [BM91], [BM97]. The rational powers of monomials were also used in [ATW17] and in [ATW20] in the context of the logarithmic and the relative logarithmic resolutions. In [ATW19] we introduce the language of valuative \mathbb{Q} -ideals, which allow to represent rational powers of any ideals on an integral noetherian scheme.

In this section, we consider mainly a special type of valuative \mathbb{Q} -ideals, which can be represented formally as the roots $\mathcal{I}^{1/n}$ of the ideals \mathcal{I} on a scheme X . Working with such \mathbb{Q} -ideals does not require the use of Zariski-Riemann space. They also have a simpler description and better functoriality properties.

In the actual algorithm the use of valuative \mathbb{Q} -ideals will be limited to the *centers* $(u_1^{a_1}, \dots, u_k^{a_k})$ defined by rational powers of the coordinates of a part of local coordinate system. They are used, in particular, as the centers of the weighted blow-ups and in the definition and construction of the canonical invariant of the resolution.

2.1.1. Zariski-Riemann space. With any integral noetherian scheme X , we can associate its Zariski-Riemann space $\mathbf{ZR}(X)$ together with the projection $\pi : \mathbf{ZR}(X) \rightarrow X$. It is a projective limit of all the birational projective modifications of X . The Zariski-Riemann space $\mathbf{ZR}(X)$ is a locally ringed space equipped with the structure ring \mathcal{O} , which is naturally embedded in the constant sheaf \mathcal{K} of rational functions associated with the quotient field $K = k(X)$. This induces a natural map of the sheaves of the multiplicative groups $\mathcal{K}^* \rightarrow \Gamma := \mathcal{K}^*/\mathcal{O}^*$, with the image of the subsheaf of multiplicative monoids $\mathcal{O} \setminus \{0\}$ denoted by Γ_+ . The subsheaf of monoids Γ_+ induces an order on Γ and makes it into a sheaf of ordered groups. The points of $\mathbf{ZR}(X)$ are the valuations ν of $K = k(X)$, associated with the maps of stalks $\mathcal{K}_\nu^* = K^* \rightarrow \Gamma_\nu = \mathcal{K}_\nu^*/\mathcal{O}_\nu^*$ and the stalks of \mathcal{O} are the valuation rings \mathcal{O}_ν . The topology is induced by all the projections $\pi_Y : \mathbf{ZR}(X) \rightarrow Y$, for any birational projective modifications $Y \rightarrow X$.

2.1.2. Valuative ideals. In [ATW19] we define the *valuative ideal* on $\mathbf{ZR}(X)$ (originally on X) to be a section γ of $H^0(\mathbf{ZR}(X), \Gamma_+)$. As was pointed out by Rydh the valuative ideal is equivalent to a locally principal ideal

$$\mathcal{I}_\gamma := \{f \in \mathcal{O} \mid f_\nu \geq \gamma_\nu\}$$

on $\mathbf{ZR}(X)$, and as such corresponds to an effective Cartier divisor on $\mathbf{ZR}(X)$. In the sequel we shall stick with this ideal representation.

2.1.3. *Valuative ideals on X .* If ¹ \mathcal{I} is an ideal on X then the inverse image $\pi^*(\mathcal{I}) = \mathcal{O}_{\mathbf{ZR}(X)} \cdot \mathcal{I}$ determines the ideal of an effective Cartier divisor on $\mathbf{ZR}(X)$, and thus a valuative ideal on $\mathbf{ZR}(X)$ which will be called a *valuative ideal on X* . It corresponds to a global section $\gamma_{\mathcal{I}} \in H^0(\mathbf{ZR}(X), \Gamma_+)$, such that

$$(\gamma_{\mathcal{I}})_{\nu} = \min\{\nu(f) \mid f \in (\mathcal{O}_{\mathbf{ZR}(X)} \cdot \mathcal{I})_{\nu}\}, \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{O}_{\mathbf{ZR}(X)} \cdot \mathcal{I} = \mathcal{I}_{\gamma_{\mathcal{I}}}.$$

The following result can be traced back to Hironaka (see [ATW19], [Que20, Lemma 2.1.3])

Lemma 2.1.4. *Let X be an integral normal scheme, and \mathcal{I} be an ideal on X . Then $\pi_*(\mathcal{O}_{\mathbf{ZR}(X)} \cdot \mathcal{I})$ is the integral closure \mathcal{I}^{int} of \mathcal{I} in \mathcal{O}_X , and $\mathcal{O}_{\mathbf{ZR}(X)} \cdot \mathcal{I}^{int} = \mathcal{O}_{\mathbf{ZR}(X)} \cdot \mathcal{I}$.*

Proof. Let $\sigma_0 : Y_0 := \text{bl}_{\mathcal{I}}(X) = \text{Proj}(\mathcal{S}) \rightarrow X$ be the blow-up of \mathcal{I} , where

$$\mathcal{S} := \mathcal{O}_X \oplus \mathcal{I}t \oplus \mathcal{I}^2t^2 \oplus \dots$$

is a graded \mathcal{O}_X -module, with t being a dummy unknown. Let $S^{int} \subset \mathcal{O}_X[t]$ denote the integral closure of \mathcal{S} in $\mathcal{O}_X[t]$. Then the natural morphism $\alpha : Y := \text{Proj}(S^{int}) \rightarrow Y_0$ is exactly the normalization and denote by $\sigma : Y = \text{bl}_{\mathcal{I}}(X)^{norm} = Y_0^{norm} \rightarrow X$ the normalized blow-up of \mathcal{I} .

Consider an open affine subset $U \subset X$, and let $Y_U := \sigma^{-1}(U)$, and $Y_{0U} := \sigma_0^{-1}(U)$. Let $(f_1, \dots, f_k) = \mathcal{I}(U)$. Then $(Y_{0U})_{f_it}$ cover Y_{0U} , and their normalizations $(Y_U)_{f_it}$ cover Y_U , and moreover

$$(S^{int}(U))_{f_it} = (\mathcal{O}(Y_{0U})_{f_it}[f_it, f_i^{-1}t^{-1}])^{int} = \mathcal{O}(Y_U)_{f_it}[f_it, f_i^{-1}t^{-1}].$$

Thus $\mathcal{O}_{Y_0} \cdot \mathcal{I}^n = \mathcal{O}_{Y_0}(n)$ is generated over Y_{0Uf_it} by f_i^n , and similarly $\mathcal{O}_Y(n) = \mathcal{O}_Y \cdot \mathcal{I}^n$ is generated over Y_Uf_it by f_i^n .

Consequently $\bigoplus_{n \geq 0} \alpha_*(\mathcal{O}_Y(n))t^n$ is integral over $\bigoplus_{n \geq 0} \mathcal{O}_{Y_0}(n)t^n$, and the \mathcal{O}_X -module $\bigoplus_{n \geq 0} \pi_*(\mathcal{O}_Y(n))t^n$ is integral over $\bigoplus_{n \geq 0} \pi_{0*}(\mathcal{O}_{Y_0}(n))t^n$.

But the graded \mathcal{O}_X -module $\bigoplus_{n \geq 0} \pi_{0*}(\mathcal{O}_{Y_0}(n))t^n$ is integral over the graded \mathcal{O}_X -module $\mathcal{S} = \mathcal{O}_X \oplus \mathcal{I}t \oplus \mathcal{I}^2t^2 \oplus \dots$ by using Hartshorne argument [Har77] (Proof of Theorem 5.19, page 123). Write over open affine $U \subset X$:

$$S'(U) := \bigoplus_{n \geq 0} \pi_{0*}(\mathcal{O}_{Y_0}(n))t^n(U) = \bigoplus_{n \geq 0} \Gamma(\mathcal{O}_{Y_{0U}}(n))t^n$$

We do have a natural injective homomorphism $S := \mathcal{S}(U) \rightarrow S' := S'(U)$, since S is an integral domain.

For any homogenous $s' \in S'$ its restriction to $(Y_{0U})_{f_it}$ is in the localization $S'_{f_it} = S_{f_it}$. So $(f_it)^d s' \in S'$ for some large d . This implies that $s' \cdot S_{d \geq d_0} \subset S_{d \geq d_0}$ for some d_0 . Hence $(s')^n \cdot S_{d \geq d_0} \subset S_{d \geq d_0}$ for any n . In very particular $S[s']f_0^{d_0}t^{d_0} \subset S$, and $S[s'] \subset f_0^{-d_0}t^{-d_0}S$. The latter S -module is finitely generated. So s' is integral over S by [AM69].

Hence, by the above, the natural homomorphism of graded \mathcal{O}_X -modules determines an isomorphism

$$(\mathcal{O}_X \oplus \mathcal{I}t \oplus \mathcal{I}^2t^2 \oplus \dots)^{int} \simeq \bigoplus \sigma_*(\mathcal{O}_Y(n))t^n.$$

The latter shows that $\sigma_*(\mathcal{O}_Y(1)) = \sigma_*(\mathcal{O}_Y \cdot \mathcal{I}) = \mathcal{I}^{int} \subset \sigma_*(\mathcal{O}_Y) = \mathcal{O}_X$.

¹Ideal on X is a coherent sheaf of ideals on X .

On the other hand $\mathcal{O}_Y \cdot \mathcal{I}$ is the ideal of an effective Cartier divisor \mathcal{I}_E on a normal scheme Y locally generated by the function f . Thus for the projection $\pi_Y : \mathbf{Z}\mathbf{R}(X) \rightarrow Y$, the ideal $\pi_{Y*}\pi_Y^*(\mathcal{I}_E) = \mathcal{I}_E$, since it is locally described as $(\pi_{Y*}(\mathcal{O}_{\mathbf{Z}\mathbf{R}(X)}) \cdot f) = \mathcal{O}_Y \cdot f = \mathcal{I}_E$. We use here the fact that locally for any open affine $U = \text{Spec}(A) \subset Y$, by valuative criterion of properness we have $\pi_{Y*}(\mathcal{O}_{\mathbf{Z}\mathbf{R}(X)})(U) \subseteq \bigcap_{\mathcal{O}_\nu \supset A} \mathcal{O}_\nu = A^{\text{int}} = A = \mathcal{O}_Y(U)$, and thus $\pi_{Y*}(\mathcal{O}_{\mathbf{Z}\mathbf{R}(X)}) = \mathcal{O}_Y$. Finally

$$\pi_*(\mathcal{O}_Z \cdot \mathcal{I}) = \sigma_*\pi_{Y*}(\mathcal{O}_Z \cdot \mathcal{I}) = \sigma_*(\mathcal{O}_Y \cdot \mathcal{I}) = \mathcal{I}^{\text{int}}.$$

The second part follows from the fact that the ideal $\mathcal{O}_{\mathbf{Z}\mathbf{R}(X)} \cdot \mathcal{I}$ is integrally closed. \clubsuit

2.1.5. Valuative ideals on X and the equivalence classes. Two ideals \mathcal{I} and \mathcal{J} on X define the same valuative ideals if and only if $\mathcal{O}_Z \cdot \mathcal{I} = \mathcal{O}_Z \cdot \mathcal{J}$. By the above, if X is normal this is equivalent to $\mathcal{I}^{\text{int}} = \pi_*(\mathcal{O}_Z \cdot \mathcal{I}) = \pi_*(\mathcal{O}_Z \cdot \mathcal{J}) = \mathcal{J}^{\text{int}}$.

This shows that the valuative ideals on normal X can be uniquely represented by the integrally closed ideals on a normal scheme X . So the valuative ideals on X are the equivalence classes of ideals on X where we say that two ideals are equivalent if their integral closures are the same. Equivalently the valuative ideals on X can be identified with integrally closed ideals on X .

2.1.6. Valuative \mathbb{Q} -ideals. Consider the sheaf $\Gamma_Q := \Gamma \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} \mathbb{Q}$ of ordered groups. We define in [ATW19] the notion of *valuative \mathbb{Q} -ideal* on $\mathbf{Z}\mathbf{R}(X)$ (originally in [ATW19] called *valuative \mathbb{Q} -ideal* on X) to be a section $\gamma \in H^0(\mathbf{Z}\mathbf{R}(X), \Gamma_{Q+})$ of the subsheaf of monoids $\Gamma_{Q+} \subset \Gamma_Q$, of the nonnegative elements in Γ . If $\gamma \in H^0(\mathbf{Z}\mathbf{R}(X), \Gamma_{Q+})$ then $n\gamma \in H^0(\mathbf{Z}\mathbf{R}(X), \Gamma_+)$ for some n , so $\mathcal{I}_{n\gamma} \subset \mathcal{O}$ is a locally principal ideal on $\mathbf{Z}\mathbf{R}(X)$. Thus the valuative \mathbb{Q} -ideals on $\mathbf{Z}\mathbf{R}(X)$ can be represented as the equivalence classes of expressions $\mathcal{I}^{1/n}$, where $\mathcal{I} \subset \mathcal{O}$ is locally principal ideal on $\mathbf{Z}\mathbf{R}(X)$, and $n \in \mathbb{N}$. We say that $\mathcal{I}^{1/n}$, and $\mathcal{J}^{1/m}$ are equivalent if $\mathcal{I}^m = \mathcal{J}^n$. Any section $\gamma \in H^0(\mathbf{Z}\mathbf{R}(X), \Gamma_{Q+})$ corresponds to the equivalence class \mathcal{I}_γ defined by its representative $(\mathcal{I}_{n\gamma})^{1/n}$ for a sufficiently divisible n . Since we focus mainly on the \mathbb{Q} -ideals on X and use the ideal notation rather than the section terminology, we shall also write general \mathbb{Q} -ideals γ equivalently as \mathcal{I}_γ .

2.1.7. Valuative \mathbb{Q} -ideals on X . For an ideal \mathcal{I} on X and $n \in \mathbb{N}$ the formal expression $\mathcal{I}^{1/n}$ determines a *valuative \mathbb{Q} -ideal on X* or simply (a \mathbb{Q} -ideal on X) corresponding to the section

$$\nu \mapsto \nu(\mathcal{I}^{1/n}) := \min\{1/n \cdot \nu(f) \mid f \in (\mathcal{O}_{\mathbf{Z}\mathbf{R}(X)} \cdot \mathcal{I})_\nu\}.$$

By the above, and Section 2.1.2, the \mathbb{Q} -ideals on a normal X can be identified with equivalence classes of the expressions $\mathcal{I}^{1/n}$, where \mathcal{I} is an ideal on X . We say that $\mathcal{I}^{1/n}$ and $\mathcal{J}^{1/m}$ are equivalent if the ideals $\mathcal{I}^m = \mathcal{I}^{mn/n}$ and $\mathcal{J}^n = \mathcal{J}^{mn/m}$ have the same integral closure.

More generally a formal sum $\sum \mathcal{I}_i^{a_i}$, for the ideals \mathcal{I}_i on X , and $a_i \in \mathbb{Q}_{>0}$ defines a valuative \mathbb{Q} -ideal on X corresponding to the section $\gamma \in H^0(\mathbf{Z}\mathbf{R}(X), \Gamma_{Q+})$, such that $\gamma(\nu) = (\min 1/n_i \cdot \nu(\mathcal{I}_i))_\nu$. It can be written in the equivalent form $(\sum \mathcal{I}_i^{N a_i})^{1/N}$ for sufficiently divisible natural N . Observe that in this language $\sum \mathcal{I}_i^{1/n} = (\sum \mathcal{I}_i)^{1/n}$ and $\mathcal{I}^{1/n} = (\mathcal{I}^{1/mn})^m$.

2.1.8. *Addition and multiplication of valutive \mathbb{Q} -ideals.* We can also consider the operations of addition and multiplication on the \mathbb{Q} -ideals $\sum \mathcal{I}_i^{1/n_i}$ on X . For the ideal \mathbb{Q} -ideals $\sum \mathcal{I}_i^{1/n_i}$ and $\sum \mathcal{J}_j^{1/n_j}$ on X with the corresponding sections $\gamma_1, \gamma_2 \in H^0(\mathbf{Z}\mathbf{R}(X), \Gamma_{Q_+})$ their sum $\sum \mathcal{I}_i^{1/n_i} + \sum \mathcal{J}_j^{1/n_j}$ and the product $\sum \mathcal{I}_i^{1/n_i} \cdot \sum \mathcal{J}_j^{1/n_j} = \sum_{i,j} \mathcal{I}_i^{1/n_i} \cdot \mathcal{J}_j^{1/n_j}$ are also \mathbb{Q} -ideals on X and correspond respectively to $\min(\gamma_1, \gamma_2)$, and $\gamma_1 + \gamma_2$.

In general, we can define the operation of addition $\mathcal{I}_{\gamma_1} + \mathcal{I}_{\gamma_2}$ and multiplication $\mathcal{I}_{\gamma_1} \cdot \mathcal{I}_{\gamma_2}$ for arbitrary \mathbb{Q} -ideals, by, respectively, the equivalence classes of $(\mathcal{I}_{n\gamma_1} + \mathcal{I}_{n\gamma_2})^{1/n}$, and $(\mathcal{I}_{n\gamma_1} \cdot \mathcal{I}_{n\gamma_2})^{1/n}$ for sufficiently divisible n . Thus we have $\mathcal{I}_{\gamma_1} + \mathcal{I}_{\gamma_2} := \mathcal{I}_{\min(\gamma_1, \gamma_2)}$, and $\mathcal{I}_{\gamma_1} \cdot \mathcal{I}_{\gamma_2} := \mathcal{I}_{\gamma_1 + \gamma_2}$.

2.1.9. *Inclusion of \mathbb{Q} -ideals.* Similarly we can extend the inclusion relation. We set $\mathcal{I}_{\gamma_1} \subseteq \mathcal{I}_{\gamma_2}$ if we have the inclusion of ideals $\mathcal{I}_{n\gamma_1} \subseteq \mathcal{I}_{n\gamma_2}$ on $\mathbf{Z}\mathbf{R}(X)$ for sufficiently divisible n . This is equivalent to $\gamma_1 \geq \gamma_2$. In particular if $\mathcal{I}_{\gamma_1} \subseteq \mathcal{I}_{\gamma_2}$ and $\mathcal{I}_{\gamma_2} \subseteq \mathcal{I}_{\gamma_1}$ then $\mathcal{I}_{\gamma_1} = \mathcal{I}_{\gamma_2}$.

2.1.10. *Blow-ups of \mathbb{Q} -ideals on X .* Any \mathbb{Q} -ideal of the form $\mathcal{I}^{1/n}$ on a normal scheme X determines a unique blow-up of $\mathcal{I}^{1/n}$ on X which can be understood as the normalized blow-up of \mathcal{I} on X . It transforms $\mathcal{I}^{1/n}$ into a \mathbb{Q} -Cartier divisor.

2.1.11. *Ideals defined by \mathbb{Q} -ideals.* With any valutive \mathbb{Q} -ideal on $\mathbf{Z}\mathbf{R}(X)$ defined by $\gamma \in H^0(\mathbf{Z}\mathbf{R}(X), \Gamma_{Q_+})$, and any birational projective modification $Y \rightarrow X$ we can associate the ideal $(\mathcal{I}_\gamma)_Y$ on Y , defined as

$$(\mathcal{I}_\gamma)_Y := \{f \in \mathcal{O}_Y \mid v(f) \geq \gamma_\nu\}.$$

- Lemma 2.1.12.**
- (1) $(\mathcal{I}_{\gamma_1})_X + (\mathcal{I}_{\gamma_2})_X \subseteq (\mathcal{I}_{\gamma_1 + \gamma_2})_X$,
 - (2) $(\mathcal{I}_{\gamma_1})_X \cdot (\mathcal{I}_{\gamma_2})_X \subseteq (\mathcal{I}_{\gamma_1 + \gamma_2})_X$.
 - (3) If $\mathcal{I}^n \subseteq ((\mathcal{I}_\gamma)^n)_X$ then $\mathcal{I} \subseteq (\mathcal{I}_\gamma)_X$. ♣
 - (4) If $\mathcal{I}_{\gamma_1} \subseteq \mathcal{I}_{\gamma_2}$ then $(\mathcal{I}_{\gamma_1})_X \subseteq (\mathcal{I}_{\gamma_2})_X$.

By Section 2.1.2, any ideal \mathcal{I} on a normal X could be identified with the valutive ideal on X , and we can write $\mathcal{I}_X = \mathcal{I}^{int}$. Thus $(\mathcal{I}_X)_X = (\mathcal{I}^{int})_X = \mathcal{I}_X = \mathcal{I}^{int}$. Under such an identification for any \mathbb{Q} -ideal \mathcal{I}_γ , we have a natural inclusion of \mathbb{Q} -ideals:

Lemma 2.1.13. $(\mathcal{I}_\gamma)_X \subseteq \mathcal{I}_\gamma$.

2.1.14. *Functoriality of valutive \mathbb{Q} -ideals.* If $X' \rightarrow X$ is any morphism of integral schemes, and $\mathcal{I}^{1/n}$ is a \mathbb{Q} -ideal on X then $(\mathcal{O}_{X'} \cdot \mathcal{I})^{1/n}$ is the *preimage* of $\mathcal{I}^{1/n}$, which is a \mathbb{Q} -ideal on X' .

2.1.15. *Graded algebras of valutive ideals.* One can associate with the valutive ideal $\mathcal{J} = \mathcal{I}_\gamma$, the corresponding graded algebra

$$\mathcal{O}_X[\mathcal{J}t] := \bigoplus (\mathcal{J}^i)t^i = \bigoplus (\mathcal{I}_{i\gamma})t^i$$

of valutive \mathbb{Q} -ideals, where t is a dummy variable. This, in turn, defines the graded Rees algebra of ideals

$$(\mathcal{O}_X[\mathcal{J}t])_X := \bigoplus (\mathcal{J}^i)_X t^i$$

on X .

2.1.16. *Regular weighted centers.* For the purpose of the resolution we shall consider valutive \mathbb{Q} -ideals on a regular scheme X , called *centers*, which can be locally presented in the form $(u_1^{a_1}, \dots, u_k^{a_k})$ where u_1, \dots, u_k is a partial family of local parameters and $a_i \in \mathbb{Q}_{>0}$. We shall always assume that $a_1 \leq \dots \leq a_k$. Note that one can write it in an equivalent form $(u_1^{a_1}, \dots, u_k^{a_k}) = (u_1^{na_1}, \dots, u_k^{na_k})^{1/n}$, where $(u_1^{na_1}, \dots, u_k^{na_k})$ is an ordinary ideal for a sufficiently divisible n . The induced ideal on X which will be denoted by $(u_1^{a_1}, \dots, u_k^{a_k})_X$.

One can describe these ideals in a few different ways.

Lemma 2.1.17. *Let $\mathcal{J} = (u_1^{1/w_1}, \dots, u_k^{1/w_k})$ be a center on a regular X , where $w_i \in \mathbb{N}$. Let ν_J be a monomial valuation such that $\nu_J(u_i) = w_i$, and for any $a > 0$, $\mathcal{I}_{\nu_J, a} := \{f \in \mathcal{O}_X \mid \nu_J(f) \geq a\}$ is equal to $(u^\alpha \mid \nu_J(u^\alpha) \geq a)$. Then for any $a \in \mathbb{Q}_{>0}$:*

$$\begin{aligned} ((u_1^{1/w_1}, \dots, u_k^{1/w_k})^a)_X &= \mathcal{I}_{\nu_J, a} = \{f \in \mathcal{O}_X \mid \nu_J(f) \geq a\} = \\ &= (u_1^{c_1} \cdots u_k^{c_k} \mid c_i \in \mathbb{N}, c_1 w_1 + \dots + c_k w_k \geq a). \end{aligned}$$

In particular

$$((u_1^{a_1}, \dots, u_k^{a_k}))_X = (u_1^{c_1} \cdots u_k^{c_k} \mid c_i \in \mathbb{N}, c_1/a_1 + \dots + c_k/a_k \geq 1).$$

Proof. Note that for any monomial $u^c = u_1^{c_1} \cdots u_k^{c_k}$ with integral c_i and for $a \in \mathbb{Q}_{>0}$ we have :

$$u^c \in \mathcal{I}_{\nu_J, a} \Leftrightarrow c_1 w_1 + \dots + c_k w_k \geq a.$$

Let n be now any positive integer which divides $\text{lcm}(w_1, \dots, w_k)$, and write $a_i w_i = n$, for the relevant integers a_i . Then, the power $(u^c)^n = (u_1^{a_1})^{c_1 w_1} \cdots (u_k^{a_k})^{c_k w_k}$ is an element of an (ordinary) ideal $(u_1^{a_1}, \dots, u_k^{a_k})^n$ if and only if $c_1 w_1 + \dots + c_k w_k \geq n$.

Thus if $u^c \in \mathcal{I}_{\nu_J, n}$ then $u^c \in ((u_1^{a_1}, \dots, u_k^{a_k})^{int}) = (u_1^{a_1}, \dots, u_k^{a_k})_X$. This shows that $\mathcal{I}_{\nu_J, n} \subseteq ((u_1^{a_1}, \dots, u_k^{a_k})_X)$. On the other hand $(u_1^{a_1}, \dots, u_k^{a_k}) \subseteq \mathcal{I}_{\nu_J, n}$, and since $\mathcal{I}_{\nu_J, n}$ is integrally closed $((u_1^{a_1}, \dots, u_k^{a_k})^{int}) \subseteq \mathcal{I}_{\nu_J, n}$. This gives $\mathcal{I}_{\nu_J, n} = (u_1^{a_1}, \dots, u_k^{a_k})_X$, for any integral n , and a_i such that $n = a_i w_i$. In general, let $a = \frac{l}{m} \in \mathbb{Q}_{>0}$, with l, m integral, and let n be as above with $n = a_i w_i$. By Lemma 2.1.12(3)

$$\begin{aligned} f \in ((u_1^{1/w_1}, \dots, u_k^{1/w_k})^a)_X &\Leftrightarrow f^m \in ((u_1^{1/w_1}, \dots, u_k^{1/w_k})^l)_X \Leftrightarrow \\ f^{mn} &\in ((u_1^{a_1}, \dots, u_k^{a_k})^l)_X \Leftrightarrow \nu_J(f^{mn}) \geq ln \Leftrightarrow \nu_J(f) \geq a. \end{aligned}$$

For the second part consider a sufficiently divisible integer $a > 0$ such that $w_i := a/a_i$ are integral. Then we can write

$$(u_1^{a_1}, \dots, u_k^{a_k}) = (u_1^{1/w_1}, \dots, u_k^{1/w_k})^a$$

Thus, by the previous part $u^c \in (u_1^{a_1}, \dots, u_k^{a_k})_X$ is equivalent to $c_1 w_1 + \dots + c_k w_k \geq a$, which translates into $c_1/a_1 + \dots + c_k/a_k \geq 1$.

♣

Quek in [Que20, Theorem 2.2.5] shows that, in particular, the valutive \mathbb{Q} -ideals \mathcal{J} on X (called there *idealistic exponents*) are in the natural bijective correspondence with the Rees algebras $\mathcal{R} = \mathcal{O}_X[\mathcal{J}t]_X \subset \mathcal{O}_X[t]$. In particular, the valutive \mathbb{Q} -ideal $(g_1^{a_1/b_1}, \dots, g_k^{a_k/b_k})$ on X corresponds to the Rees algebra which is the integral closure $\mathcal{O}_X[g_1^{a_1} t^{b_1}, \dots, g_k^{a_k} t^{b_k}]^{int}$ of $\mathcal{O}_X[g_1^{a_1} t^{b_1}, \dots, g_k^{a_k} t^{b_k}]$. In our paper we will use more explicit form of this correspondence for the centers:

Lemma 2.1.18. *Let $w_1 \geq w_2 \geq \dots \geq w_k$ be positive integers, and u_1, \dots, u_k are corresponding local parameters. There is a natural bijective correspondence between*

- (1) *valuative ideals $\mathcal{J} = (u_1^{1/w_1}, \dots, u_k^{1/w_k})$.*
- (2) *graded algebras $\mathcal{A}_J = \mathcal{O}_X[u_1 t^{a_1}, \dots, u_k t^{a_k} \mid a_1 \leq w_1]$.*
- (3) *monomial valuation ν_J , such that $\nu_J(u_i) = w_i$, and $\mathcal{I}_{\nu_J, a} := \{f \in \mathcal{O}_X \mid \nu_J(f) \geq a\}$ is equal to $(u^\alpha \mid \nu_J(u^\alpha) \geq a)$.*

Moreover we get

$$\mathcal{A}_J = \bigoplus_{a \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}} \mathcal{I}_{\nu_J, a} t^a = (\mathcal{O}_X[\mathcal{J} \cdot t])_X.$$

Proof. By Lemma 2.1.17, we can write the Rees algebra $(\mathcal{O}_X[\mathcal{J}t])_X$ as $(\mathcal{O}_X[\mathcal{J}t])_X = \bigoplus_{a \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}} \mathcal{I}_{\nu_J, a} t^a$. Thus the valuation ν_J is determined uniquely. On the other hand one can recover a \mathbb{Q} -ideal \mathcal{J} from N -th gradation $(\mathcal{J}^N)_X = \mathcal{I}_{\nu_J, N}$ of $(\mathcal{O}_X[\mathcal{J}t])_X$ for $N = w_1 \cdot \dots \cdot w_k$ as $\mathcal{J} = (\mathcal{I}_{\nu_J, N})^{1/N}$. Now, given a monomial valuation ν_J , one can form the algebra

$$\mathcal{A}_J := \{f \cdot t^a \mid f \in \mathcal{O}_X, a \leq \nu_J(f)\} = \mathcal{O}_X[u_1 t^{a_1}, \dots, u_k t^{a_k} \mid a_1 \leq w_1].$$

Conversely, for any $f \in \mathcal{O}_X$, we have that $\nu_J(f) = \max\{a : t^a \cdot f \in \mathcal{A}_J\}$. This shows that $\mathcal{A}_J = \bigoplus_{a \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}} \mathcal{I}_{\nu_J, a} t^a = (\mathcal{O}_X[\mathcal{J}t])_X$. \clubsuit

2.1.19. *Vanishing locus.* Given a valutive \mathbb{Q} -ideal γ on $\mathbf{ZR}(X)$, one can associate with it the vanishing locus on X to be $V(\mathcal{I}_\gamma) := (V((\mathcal{I}_\gamma)_X))$. In particular if $\mathcal{I}^{1/n}$ is a \mathbb{Q} -ideal on a normal X then $V(\mathcal{I}^{1/n}) = V(\mathcal{I})$.

2.2. Cobordant blow-ups.

2.2.1. *Stack-theoretic weighted blow-ups.* Let X be an integral scheme over k . In [ATW19, Section 3.1] the stack-theoretic blow-up of any valutive ideal \mathcal{I}_γ is defined to be the stack-theoretic quotient of the scheme (using our notation):

$$[(\mathrm{Spec}_X(\mathcal{O}_X[\mathcal{I}_\gamma t])_X \setminus V((\mathcal{I}_\gamma)_X))/G_m],$$

with the natural action of the multiplicative group $G_m := \mathrm{Spec} k[t, t^{-1}]$. This formula is a natural extension of the formula of the standard blow-up $\mathrm{Proj}(\bigoplus \mathcal{I}^i)$.

In particular, the *stack-theoretic weighted blow-up* of $\mathcal{J} = (u_1^{1/w_1}, \dots, u_k^{1/w_k})$ is defined to be the stack-theoretic quotient

$$[(\mathrm{Spec}_X(\mathcal{O}_X[t^{w_1} x_1, \dots, t^{w_k} x_k]^{\mathrm{int}}) \setminus V(t^{w_1} x_1, \dots, t^{w_k} x_k))/G_m].$$

2.2.2. *Good and geometric quotient.* We consider here a relatively affine action of $T = \mathrm{Spec}(\mathbb{Z}[t_1, t_1^{-1}, \dots, t_k, t_k^{-1}])$ on a scheme X over \mathbb{Z} . By the *good quotient* (or *GIT quotient*) we mean an affine morphism $\pi : X \rightarrow Y = X // T$ such that the induced morphism of the sheaves $\mathcal{O}_Y \rightarrow \pi_*(\mathcal{O}_X)$ defines the isomorphism onto the subsheaf of invariants $\mathcal{O}_Y \simeq \pi_*(\mathcal{O}_X)^T$.

Then $\pi : X \rightarrow Y = X/T$ will be called a *geometric quotient* if additionally every fiber $X_{\bar{y}}$ of π over a geometric point $\bar{y} : \mathrm{Spec}(\bar{k}) \rightarrow Y$ defines a single orbit of the action of $T_{\bar{k}} = T \times_k \mathrm{Spec}(\bar{k}) = \mathrm{Spec}(\bar{k}[t_1, t_1^{-1}, \dots, t_k, t_k^{-1}])$ on $X_{\bar{y}}$.

2.2.3. *Birational cobordisms.* Since the space $\mathrm{Spec}_X(\mathcal{O}_X[t^{w_1}x_1, \dots, t^{w_k}x_k]^{\mathrm{int}}) = \mathrm{Spec}(\mathcal{A}_J)$ in the definition of stack-theoretic quotient is singular even for the standard smooth blow-up with weights $w_i = 1$ we consider here an alternative approach which uses the concept of birational cobordisms. The notion was developed over a field but it can be extended to the schemes with the action of the group scheme $G_m := \mathrm{Spec}(\mathbb{Z}[t, t^{-1}])$. One shall mention that the theory of cobordisms was also considered in the language of schemes in [AT19, Definition 4.3], but their definition of cobordism is far more restrictive.

Definition 2.2.4. Let X be an integral scheme with the action of G_m . Let $x \in X$ be a point. We say that $\lim_{t \rightarrow 0}(tx)$ exists, (respectively $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty}(tx)$ exists) if there is an open neighborhood U of x such that the morphism $G_m \times U \rightarrow X$ extends to the $\mathrm{Spec}(\mathbb{Z}[t]) \times U \rightarrow X$ (respectively to $\mathrm{Spec}(\mathbb{Z}[t^{-1}]) \times U \rightarrow X$).

The following definition extends the original definition over a field.

Definition 2.2.5. [Wlo00, Definition 2] By a birational cobordism representing a birational map $\phi : X_1 \dashrightarrow X_2$ of schemes we mean a scheme with an action of $T = G_m = \mathrm{Spec}(\mathbb{Z}[t, t^{-1}])$ such that the sets

$$\begin{aligned} B_- &:= \{x \in B : \lim_{t \rightarrow 0} t(x) \text{ does not exist in } B\} \\ \text{and } B_+ &:= \{x \in B : \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} t(x) \text{ does not exist in } B\} \end{aligned}$$

are nonempty Zariski open subsets of B , and the geometric quotients $\alpha_1 : B_+/T \simeq X_1$, and $\alpha_2 : B_-/T \simeq X_2$ exists, with the natural birational map $\psi : B_+/T \rightarrow B_-/T$ defined by open inclusions maps $(B_- \cap B_+)/T \rightarrow B_{\pm}/T$, such that

$$\phi \circ \alpha_1 = \alpha_2 \circ \psi.$$

Example 2.2.6. [Wlo00, Example 2] Let T act on $B = \mathbf{A}_k^{n+1} = \mathrm{Spec}(k[x_0, \dots, x_n])$ by $t(x_0, x_1, \dots, x_n) = (t^{-1}x_0, t^{w_1}x_1, \dots, t^{w_k}x_k)$, where $w_1 \geq w_2 \geq \dots \geq w_k > 0$. Then $B_- = B \setminus V(x_0)$, $B_+ = B \setminus V(x_1, \dots, x_n)$.

By using toric geometry we will see that the induced morphism $B_+/T \rightarrow B_-/T = B // T$ is the weighted blow-up at $\mathcal{J} = (u_1^{1/w_1}, \dots, u_k^{1/w_k})$.

First, the cobordism B corresponds to the regular cone

$$\sigma = \langle e_0, \dots, e_n \rangle := \sum_{i=0}^n \mathbb{Q}e_i$$

in \mathbb{Q}^{n+1} with the basis $\{e_0, \dots, e_n\}$. The action of T is determined by the vector $v := -e_0 + \sum w_i e_i$, representing the weights. Then the good quotient

$$B \rightarrow B // T = \mathrm{Spec}(\mathcal{O}(B)^T)$$

corresponds to the map $\sigma \rightarrow \pi(\sigma) = \langle e_1, \dots, e_n \rangle$, defined by the projection

$$\pi : \mathbb{Q}^{n+1} \rightarrow \mathbb{Q}^{n+1}/\mathrm{span}(v) \simeq \mathbb{Q}^n$$

where \mathbb{Q}^n is spanned by $\{e_1, \dots, e_n\}$. It can be described as $\pi(x_0, x_1, \dots, x_n) = (x_1 + w_1, \dots, x_n + w_n)$. Note that face $\sigma_0 := \langle e_1, \dots, e_n \rangle$ of σ can be identified with its image $\pi(\sigma_0) = \pi(\sigma)$.

The cone σ with a vector v and the projection π is an example of the *combinatorial cobordism* in the sense of Morelli [Mor96]. The "lower boundary" B_- of B corresponds to the "lower boundary" σ_- of σ which is the complex consisting of the faces of σ visible from below with respect to v . It contains σ_0 and all of its faces. The geometric quotient $B_- \rightarrow B_-/T$ corresponds to the restriction $\sigma_0 \rightarrow \pi(\sigma_0) = \pi(\sigma)$

of $\pi : \mathbb{Q}^{n+1} \rightarrow \mathbb{Q}^n$ mapping isomorphically σ_0 to $\pi(\sigma_0)$. So both quotients: the geometric quotient B_-/T and the good quotient $B // T = \text{Spec}(\mathcal{O}(B))^T$ can be identified as they correspond to $\pi(\sigma_0) = \pi(\sigma) = \sigma_0 \subset \mathbb{Q}^n$.

The "upper boundary" B_+ corresponds to the subcomplex σ_+ with the maximal faces $\langle e_0, e_1, \dots, \check{e}_i, \dots, e_n \rangle$, for $i = 1, \dots, n$, "visible from above". Their projection $\pi(\sigma_+)$ corresponds to the star subdivision of σ_0 at the vector $w := \pi(e_0) = (w_1, \dots, w_n)$ with maximal faces $\langle w, e_1, \dots, \check{e}_i, \dots, e_n \rangle$.

Consequently the morphism

$$B_+/T \rightarrow B_-/T = B // T = \text{Spec}(k[x_0, \dots, x_k])^T = \text{Spec}(k[u_1, \dots, u_k]),$$

where $u_i := x_i x_0^{w_i}$, is the weighted blow-up corresponding to the star subdivision $\pi(\sigma_+)$ of $\pi(\sigma) = \sigma_0$. The \mathbb{Q} -ideal $\mathcal{J} = (u_1^{1/w_1}, \dots, u_k^{1/w_k})$ defines a piecewise linear convex function

$$F_{\mathcal{J}} := \min\{(1/w_i) \cdot x_i \mid i = 1, \dots, n\}$$

on σ_0 such that $F_{\mathcal{J}}(e_i) = 0$, and $F_{\mathcal{J}}(w) = 1$, and which is linear exactly on the faces $\langle w, e_1, \dots, \check{e}_i, \dots, e_n \rangle$. Thus we see that the blow-up of $\mathcal{J} = (u_1^{1/w_1}, \dots, u_k^{1/w_k})$ corresponds to the star subdivision of σ at v , and can be identified with $B_+/T \rightarrow B_-/T = B // T$.

One can describe the morphism $B_+/T \rightarrow B_-/T = B // T$ explicitly. Set $t := x_0^{-1}$. Then we can write

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{O}(B) &= k[x_0, x_1, \dots, x_k] = \mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{J}} := k[t^{-1}, t^{w_1} u_1, \dots, t^{w_k} u_k] \quad \text{and} \\ B_+/T &= (\text{Spec}(\mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{J}}) \setminus V(t^{w_1} u_1, \dots, t^{w_k} u_k))/T \rightarrow \\ &\rightarrow B/T = B_-/T = \text{Spec}(k[u_1, \dots, u_k]). \end{aligned}$$

Moreover the algebra

$$\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{J}} = (k[u_1, \dots, u_k])[t^{a_1} u_1, \dots, t^{a_k} u_k \mid a_i \leq w_i] = (k[t^{-1}, t^{w_1} u_1, \dots, t^{w_k} u_k])_{\geq 0}$$

is exactly the nonnegative part of the algebra $\mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{J}}$. Thus the natural homomorphism $\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{J}} \subset \mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{J}}$ defines the isomorphisms of the localizations $(\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{J}})_{t^{w_i} u_i} \rightarrow (\mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{J}})_{t^{w_i} u_i}$ which gives the isomorphism of quasi-affine schemes

$$\text{Spec}(\mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{J}}) \setminus V(t^{w_1} u_1, \dots, t^{w_k} u_k) \rightarrow \text{Spec}(\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{J}}) \setminus V(t^{w_1} u_1, \dots, t^{w_k} u_k),$$

and their quotients $B_+/T \rightarrow \text{Proj}_X(\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{J}})$ over B/T .

2.2.7. Cobordant blow-ups. The idea of cobordant blow-up is to represent a weighted blow-up by a smooth cobordism.

Let $T := \mathbb{G}_m = \text{Spec}(\mathbb{Z}[t, t^{-1}])$.

Definition 2.2.8. Let X be a scheme. A *trivial cobordant blow-up* of X is the natural projection $X \times T \rightarrow X$ from the product $X \times T = \text{Spec} \mathcal{O}_X[t, t^{-1}]$.

Let \mathcal{J} be a center locally of the form $\mathcal{J} = (x_1^{1/w_1}, \dots, x_k^{1/w_k})$ on a regular scheme X . Let $\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{J}} = (\mathcal{O}_X[\mathcal{J} \cdot t])_X$ be its associated algebra. By the *full cobordant blow-up* of X at a center \mathcal{J} we mean the T -invariant morphism $\sigma : B \rightarrow X$ defined by the birational cobordism

$$B_{\mathcal{J}} = B := \text{Spec}_X(\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{J}}[t^{-1}]) = \text{Spec}_X(\mathcal{O}_X[t^{-1}, t^{w_1} x_1, \dots, t^{w_k} x_k])$$

The upper and lower boundaries are equal to

$$B_+ = B \setminus V(\mathcal{O}_B \cdot (\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{J}})_{>0}) = B \setminus V(t^{w_1} x_1, \dots, t^{w_k} x_k)$$

$$B_- = B \setminus V(t^{-1}) = \text{Spec}_X(\mathcal{O}_X[t, t^{-1}]).$$

By the *cobordant blow-up* we mean the T -invariant morphism $\sigma_+ : B_+ \rightarrow X$. Here $\sigma_- : B_- \rightarrow X$ is the trivial cobordant blow-up.

Note that

$$V(t^{w_1}x_1, \dots, t^{w_k}x_k) = V(\mathcal{O}_B \cdot (\mathcal{A}_J)_{>0})$$

Remark 2.2.9. The author learned recently from Dan Abramovich that the algebras $\mathcal{O}_X[t^{-1}, t^{w_1}x_1, \dots, t^{w_k}x_k]$ were also considered in the context of stack-theoretic blow-ups by Quek and Rydh in their upcoming paper [QR19]. In fact, Rydh noticed independently that the extended Rees algebra gives a nice and natural description of stack-theoretic weighted blow-ups, and this was part of his original goal for [QR19]. Cobordant blow-ups are a different point of view on the same algebra. They are motivated by the interpretation of the weighted blow-ups in terms of torus action and smooth birational cobordisms in order to, in particular, avoid the use of the Artin stacks in positive and mixed characteristic. It turns out that the cobordant blow-ups and the full cobordant blow-ups carry additional useful information and have some other advantages. One shall mention that all these ideas stem largely from the paper [ATW19].

On the other hand one can link this definition to the extended algebras $\mathcal{O}_X[t^{-1}, \mathcal{I}t]$, considered by Swanson and Huneke in [HS06, Definition 5.1], in particular, in the context of blow-ups of smooth centers.

Remark 2.2.10. (1) By Lemma 6.2.1, the geometric quotient $B_+/\mathbb{G}_m \rightarrow X$ exists. Moreover, by recalling the considerations in the second part of Example 2.2.6 it can be naturally identified with the usual weighted blow-up:

$$\begin{aligned} B_+/\mathbb{G}_m &\simeq \text{Spec}(\mathcal{O}_X[t^{-1}, t^{w_1}x_1, \dots, t^{w_k}x_k] \setminus V(t^{w_1}x_1, \dots, t^{w_k}x_k))/T \simeq \\ &\text{Proj}(\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{J}}) \simeq (\text{Proj}(\mathcal{O}_X[t^{w_1}x_1, \dots, t^{w_k}x_k]))^{\text{nor}} \rightarrow X = B // \mathbb{G}_m = B_-/\mathbb{G}_m. \end{aligned}$$

(2) The stack-theoretic quotient of smooth varieties over a field k of characteristic zero $[B_+/\mathbb{G}_m] \rightarrow X$ is equivalent to the definition considered in [ATW19, Section 3.1].

(3) Similar to the standard blow-up the cobordant blow-up is trivial over the complement of the geometric locus of the center $V(\mathcal{J}) = V(x_1 \dots, x_k)$:

$$\sigma_{\pm} : B_+ \cap B_- = \sigma^{-1}(X \setminus V(\mathcal{J})) \simeq (X \setminus V(\mathcal{J})) \times T \rightarrow X \setminus V(\mathcal{J}).$$

2.2.11. *Exceptional divisor.*

Lemma 2.2.12. *The cobordant blow-up B_+ transforms the center $J = (x_1^{\frac{1}{w_1}}, \dots, x_k^{\frac{1}{w_k}})$ into the (ordinary) ideal of the exceptional divisor E on B_+ generated by a global invariant parameter t^{-1} :*

$$\mathcal{I}_E := \mathcal{J} \cdot \mathcal{O}_{B_+} = t^{-1}\mathcal{O}_{B_+}$$

Proof. We have

$$\mathcal{J} \cdot \mathcal{O}_{B_+} = (\mathcal{J} \cdot t)t^{-1} \cdot \mathcal{O}_{B_+}$$

Note however $(\mathcal{J} \cdot t) = ((x_1 t^{w_1})^{1/w_1}, \dots, (x_k t^{w_k})^{1/w_k}) = \mathcal{O}_{B_+}$, is a trivial \mathbb{Q} -ideal on B_+ . \clubsuit

2.2.13. *Cobordant blow-up: local equations.* Let x_1, \dots, x_n be a system of local parameters (or coordinates) at a point p on a regular X , and let $\mathcal{J} = (x_1^{1/w_1}, \dots, x_k^{1/w_k})$ be a center. Then the full cobordant blow-up $B \rightarrow X$ of \mathcal{J} , can be represented as

$$B = \text{Spec}(\mathcal{O}_X[t^{-1}, x'_1, \dots, x'_n]/((x'_1 t^{-w_1} - x_1), \dots, (x'_k t^{-w_k} - x_k))).$$

Thus $B \subset X \times \mathbb{A}^{n+1}$ is locally a closed regular subscheme of $X \times \mathbb{A}^{n+1}$. Moreover it has system of local T -semiinvariant parameters $t^{-1}, x'_1, \dots, x'_k, x_{k+1}, \dots, x_n$ at the relevant $p' \in V(t^{-1}, x'_1, \dots, x'_k, x_{k+1}, \dots, x_n)$ mapping to p . Consequently the full cobordant blow-up $B \rightarrow X$ at $(x_1^{1/w_1}, \dots, x_k^{1/w_k})$ can be described by a single chart with the following coordinates:

- t^{-1} is the inverse of the coordinate t representing the action of torus $\mathbb{G}_m = \text{Spec}(\mathbb{Z}[t, t^{-1}])$.
- $x'_i = x_i \cdot t^{w_i}$ for $1 \leq i \leq k$, and
- $x'_j = x_j$ for $j > k$.

Remark 2.2.14. In practice, it seems more natural to replace t^{-1} with t so that $x'_i = x_i/t^{w_i}$ in the above formulas. However in the paper we stick with the above notation as it is more consistent with graded algebras.

The cobordant blow-up $B_+ = B \setminus V(x'_1, \dots, x'_k)$ can be covered by the the open subsets $(B_+)_{x'_i} = B \setminus V(x'_i)$, associated with x'_i producing several "charts" similarly to the standard blow-up.

2.2.15. *Cobordant blow-ups of toric varieties.* By definition, the full cobordant blow-up of a smooth toric variety at a weighted toric center is again a smooth toric variety. Let $X_\sigma = \text{Spec } k[x_1, \dots, x_n]$ be the affine toric variety associated with $\sigma \subset N_R := \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^n$. The full cobordant blow-up $B = X_\tau \rightarrow X_\sigma$ of the valua-tive ideal $(x_1^{1/w_1}, \dots, x_n^{1/w_n})$ is the morphism of toric varieties corresponding to the inclusion of algebras:

$$k[x_1, \dots, x_n] \subseteq k[x_1 t^{w_1}, \dots, x_n t^{w_n}, t^{-1}]$$

The standard weighted blow-up at \mathcal{J} corresponds to the star subdivision of σ with the center $v := w_1 e_1 + \dots + w_n e_n$. The full cobordant blow-up B is described by the regular cone $\tau := \langle e_1, \dots, e_n, v + e_{n+1} \rangle$ with the natural projection onto $\sigma = \langle e_1, \dots, e_n \rangle$ along the vector e_{n+1} . The cone τ is a cobordism in the sense of Morelli [Mor96]. The upper boundary τ_+ of τ has maximal faces $\langle e_1, \dots, e_i^\vee, \dots, e_n, v + e_{n+1} \rangle$ which are "visible from above" and which project exactly to the star subdivision of σ at v . The lower boundary τ_- is isomorphic to σ .

The above construction extends to any smooth toric variety $X = X_\Sigma$, and $v \in \text{int}(\sigma)$, $\sigma \in \Sigma$. The fan Σ_B associated with B is the union of cones in Σ and those spanned by the vector $v + e_{n+1}$ and the cones in the closed star $\overline{\text{Star}}(\tau, \Sigma)$.

2.3. **SNC-order.** In the sequel until Section 5, we assume that X is a smooth scheme of dimension n over a field k of characteristic zero, and E is an SNC divisor on X , i.e E is locally defined as $V(x_1^{a_1} \cdot \dots \cdot x_k^{a_k})$, where $a_i \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$, and x_1, \dots, x_k is a partial family of local parameters on X .

2.3.1. *Compatibility with SNC divisors.*

Definition 2.3.2. A coordinate system x_1, \dots, x_n on an open subset U of X is *compatible with E* if the restriction $E_{i|U}$ of any component E_i in E intersecting U is of the form $V(x_i)$. If $p \in V(x_i)$, where $V(x_i)$ determines a component in $E|U$ then we say that x_i is *divisorial* at p . Otherwise we say that x_i is *free* at p .

Remark 2.3.3. This definition can be linked to the logarithmic language. The coordinate system defines at every point $p \in U$ étale map $U \rightarrow \text{Spec}(k[x_1, \dots, x_n]) = \text{Spec}(k[P]) \times \mathbb{A}_k^{n-r}$, where divisorial coordinates x_i at p generate a monoid $P = \overline{\mathcal{M}}_p$, and induce the sharp chart $U \rightarrow \text{Spec}(k[P])$, and free coordinates x_j determine a coordinate system on the stratum $s := V(P \setminus 0)$ through p defined by the divisorial parameters, and an induced étale morphism $s \rightarrow \mathbb{A}_k^{n-r}$.

2.3.4. *The centers compatible with an SNC divisor.* We introduce the total order on the set of symbols

$$\mathbb{Q}_+ := \mathbb{Q} \amalg \{a_+ \mid a \in \mathbb{Q}\},$$

by putting $a_+ > a$, and $a_+ < b$ if $a < b$. Similarly we define $\mathbb{Z}_+ := \mathbb{Z} \cup \{a_+ \mid a \in \mathbb{Z}\}$. The following operations are defined on \mathbb{Q}_+ :

- addition
- subtraction of the elements in \mathbb{Q} from an element in \mathbb{Q}_+ .
- multiplication of elements in \mathbb{Q}_+ by the positive rational elements in $\mathbb{Q}_{>0}$.

Definition 2.3.5. We say that a center \mathcal{J} is *compatible with E on X* , if for any $p \in V(\mathcal{J})$ there is a neighborhood U_p of p , and a coordinate system x_1, \dots, x_k on U_p compatible with $E|_{U_p}$, such that \mathcal{J} on U_p can be written as $\mathcal{J} = (x_1^{a_1}, \dots, x_k^{a_k})$.

For any \mathbb{Q} -ideal \mathcal{J} compatible with E and locally at p of the form $(x_1^{a_1}, \dots, x_k^{a_k})$ we associate with a divisorial coordinate $x_i \in E_p$ the symbol $b_i := a_{i+}$ and with a free coordinate x_i simply $b_i := a_i$.

We shall always assume that:

- (1) A center \mathcal{J} will be compatible with E ,
- (2) $\text{inv}_{p,E}(\mathcal{J}) := (b_1, \dots, b_k)$ is independent of $p \in V(\mathcal{J})$.
- (3) $b_1 \leq \dots \leq b_k$.

Consequently we will use the notation $\text{inv}(\mathcal{J})$, and similarly we define $\text{ord}(\mathcal{J}) := b_1$.

Lemma 2.3.6. *If $\mathcal{J} = (x_1^{1/w_1}, \dots, x_k^{1/w_k})$ is compatible with E on smooth X , and $\sigma : B \rightarrow X$ is a full cobordant blow-up then the total transform $\sigma^{-1}(E)$ of E is an SNC divisor on B . In general, if \mathcal{I} is an ideal on X locally at any $p \in V(\mathcal{I})$ generated by a product of divisorial coordinates then its inverse image $\mathcal{O}_B \cdot \mathcal{I}$ is also such.*

Proof. The divisor E is defined locally by the product of divisorial unknowns $x_{i_1}^{a_{i_1}} \cdot \dots \cdot x_{i_k}^{a_{i_k}}$. Then its inverse image is given by $(x'_{i_1})^{a_{i_1}} \cdot \dots \cdot (x'_{i_k})^{a_{i_k}} \cdot t^{-(a_{i_1} w_{i_1} + \dots + a_{i_k} w_{i_k})}$, where x'_{i_1} describes the strict transform of $V(x_i)$, and t^{-1} determines the exceptional divisor. ♣

 2.3.7. *Coordinates defining centers.*

Lemma 2.3.8. (see also [Que20, Lemma 4.6.2]) *Let $\mathcal{J} = (u_1^{a_1}, \dots, u_k^{a_k})$ be a center and $p \in V(\mathcal{J})$ be a point. If u'_1 is a local free parameter at a point p and $u'_1 \in (u_1^1, \dots, u_k^{a_k/a_1})_X$ in a neighborhood of p then one can find the coordinates*

u'_1, u'_2, \dots, u'_k and u_1, u_2, \dots, u_k compatible with E such that we get the equality of \mathbb{Q} -ideals $\mathcal{J} = (u_1^{a_1}, (u_2')^{a_2}, \dots, (u_k')^{a_k}) = ((u_1')^{a_1}, \dots, (u_k')^{a_k})$ on a neighborhood of $p \in X$.

Proof. Note that we have the inclusion of the valuative \mathbb{Q} -ideals in the sense of Lemma 2.1.13:

$$(u'_1) \subset (u_1^1, \dots, u_k^{a_k/a_1})_X \subset (u_1^1, \dots, u_k^{a_k/a_1}).$$

By Lemma 2.1.17, and the assumption on the center, it follows, that u_1 is a free coordinate.

Case 1. Assume that $\frac{\partial u'_1}{\partial u_1}$ is invertible at p . We can write, at least in the completion $\widehat{\mathcal{O}_{X,p}}$ that $u'_1 = c_1 u_1 + f(u_2, \dots, u_n)$, where c_1 is invertible at p , and $f \in ((u_2^{a_2/a_1}, \dots, u_k^{a_k/a_1})_X)_{\widehat{p}}$. This shows that u'_1, u_2, \dots, u_n forms a coordinate system, and $u_1 \in ((u_1')^1, \dots, u_k^{a_k/a_1})_X$ in a neighborhood of p . We get the inclusion $(u_1) \subset ((u_1')^1, u_2^{a_2/a_1}, \dots, u_k^{a_k/a_1})$. Finally, we obtain the equality of \mathbb{Q} -ideals

$$(u_1^1, \dots, u_k^{a_k/a_1}) = ((u_1')^1, u_1^1, \dots, u_k^{a_k/a_1}) = ((u_1')^1, \dots, u_k^{a_k/a_1}).$$

Case 2. Assume $\frac{\partial u'_1}{\partial u_1}$ is not invertible at p . Then by Corollary 2.1.17, $\frac{\partial u'_1}{\partial u_i}$ is invertible at p for a certain free coordinate u_i with associated $b_i = a_i = a_1$. Then replacing u_i with $u'_i = u_i + u_1$ does not change \mathcal{J} , by Corollary 2.1.17. After the coordinate change $u_i \mapsto u'_i$ the derivative $\frac{\partial u'_1}{\partial u_1}$ becomes invertible since the linear form L of u'_1 at p can be written as

$$L = c_i u_i + \sum c_j u_j = c_i u'_i - c_i u_1 + \sum c_j u_j$$

with c_i, c_j invertible and will contain the term $c_i u_1$. This reduces Case 2 to Case 1. \clubsuit

2.3.9. *Uniqueness of presentation of invariant.* The following Lemma shows that $\text{inv}(\mathcal{J})$ is well defined and is independent upon presentation.

Lemma 2.3.10. (see also [Que20, Proposition 3.2.2]) *Assume that a center \mathcal{J} admits two different presentations $\mathcal{J} = (u_1^{a_1}, \dots, u_k^{a_k}) = \mathcal{J}' = (v_1^{a'_1}, \dots, v_l^{a'_l})$. Then $k = l$ and $(a_1, \dots, a_k) = (a'_1, \dots, a'_k)$.*

Proof. We can consider the powers \mathcal{J}^n and assume that both centers are represented by the ideals $\mathcal{J} = (u_1^{a_1}, \dots, u_k^{a_k})$ and $\mathcal{J}' = (v_1^{a'_1}, \dots, v_l^{a'_l})$ up to the integral closure. Then $a_1 = a'_1 = \text{ord}(\mathcal{J})$. Moreover by the previous Lemma we can write the center \mathcal{J}' as $\mathcal{J}' = (u_1^{a_1}, (u_2')^{a'_2}, \dots, (u_k')^{a'_k})$. Restricting \mathcal{J} to $H := V(u_1)$ we get $\mathcal{J}|_H = (u_2^{a_2}, \dots, u_k^{a_k}) = \mathcal{J}'|_H = ((u_2')^{a'_2}, \dots, (u_k')^{a'_k})$, where we conclude by the induction on the dimension of X that $l = k$ and $a_i = a'_i$. \clubsuit

2.3.11. *SNC-order.* Let E be an SNC divisor on a smooth X . Denote by $\mathcal{I}_{E_p} \subset \mathcal{O}_{X,p}$ the ideal generated by the divisorial unknowns at p , and by $m_p \subset \mathcal{O}_{X,p}$ the maximal ideal.

Definition 2.3.12. We define the *SNC-order* $\text{ord}_{p,E}(\mathcal{I}) \in (\mathbb{Z}_+)_{\geq 0}$ of an ideal \mathcal{I} on X at a point p as follows:

- $\text{ord}_{p,E}(\mathcal{I}) := \text{ord}_p(\mathcal{I}) = a$ if $\mathcal{I}_p \subset m_p^a$, and $\mathcal{I}_p \not\subset \mathcal{I}_{E_p}^a + m_p^{a+1}$, and
- $\text{ord}_{p,E}(\mathcal{I}) := a_+$ if $\mathcal{I}_p \subset \mathcal{I}_{E_p}^a + m_p^{a+1}$ and $\mathcal{I}_p \not\subset m_p^{a+1}$.

This definition can be rewritten in the equivalent form as

Lemma 2.3.13. $\text{ord}_{p,E}(\mathcal{I}) = \max\{\text{ord}(\mathcal{J}) \mid \mathcal{I}_p \subseteq \mathcal{J}_{X,p}\}$, where \mathcal{J} are the centers at $p \in X$.

Proof. Let x_1, \dots, x_n be a coordinate system at a point p compatible with E . Set $\text{ord}_{p,E}(\mathcal{I}) = b$, where $b = a$ or $b = a_+$. Then $\mathcal{I}_p \subseteq m_p^a = ((x_1, \dots, x_n)^a)_{X,p}$. So $\max\{\text{ord}(\mathcal{J}) \mid \mathcal{I}_p \subseteq \mathcal{J}_{X,p}\} \geq a$. On the other hand if

$$\mathcal{I}_p \subseteq \mathcal{J}_{X,p} = (x_1^{a_1}, \dots, x_r^{a_k})_X \subseteq m_p^{\lceil a_1 \rceil}$$

then $\lceil a_1 \rceil \leq a$ and $\text{ord}(\mathcal{J}) \leq a'_1 \leq (\lceil a'_1 \rceil)_+ \leq a_+$. Combining both conclusions we get that if $\text{ord}_{p,E}(\mathcal{I}) = b$ then $a \leq \max\{\text{ord}(\mathcal{J}) \mid \mathcal{I}_p \subseteq \mathcal{J}_{X,p}\} \leq a_+$.

So it suffices to consider the \mathbb{Q} -ideals \mathcal{J} , with $a_1 = a_+$. If $\mathcal{I}_p \subseteq \mathcal{J}_{X,p} = (x_1^{a_1}, \dots, x_r^{a_k})_{X,p}$ and $\text{ord}(\mathcal{J}) = b_1 = a_{1+} = a_+$ then we can write $b_1 = \dots = b_r < b_{r+1} \dots \leq b_k$, where $r \geq 1$, and x_1, \dots, x_r , are necessarily divisorial, and $a_{r+1} > a_1$. This implies $\mathcal{I}_p \subseteq \mathcal{I}_{E_p}^{a_1} + m_p^{a_1+1}$ and $\text{ord}_{p,E}(\mathcal{I}) = a_{1+} = a_+$.

Conversely, if $\text{ord}_{p,E}(\mathcal{I}) = a_{1+} = a_+$, then

$$\mathcal{I}_p \subseteq \mathcal{I}_{E_p}^{a_1} + m_p^{a_1+1} = \mathcal{J}_{X,p} = (x_1^{a_1}, \dots, x_r^{a_1}, x_{r+1}^{a_1+1}, \dots, x_n^{a_1+1})_{X,p},$$

where x_1, \dots, x_r are divisorial and x_{r+1}, \dots, x_n are free. So $\max\{\text{ord}(\mathcal{J}) \mid \mathcal{I}_p \subseteq \mathcal{J}_{X,p}\} \geq a_{1+}$, which implies that $\max\{\text{ord}(\mathcal{J}) \mid \mathcal{I}_p \subseteq \mathcal{J}_{X,p}\} = a_+$. ♣

Remark 2.3.14. Recall that the logarithmic order introduced in [ATW17, Section 3.6], associates with divisorial unknowns the infinity weight, and with free unknowns the weight 1. This language is compatible with the logarithmic derivations and leads to the logarithmic resolution. Here we assign the weight 1_+ to the divisorial unknowns. This is the "minimal weight" which is greater than the weight of the free unknowns, which is still equal to 1. The notion is compatible with the standard derivations, and the standard transformations rules established in [ATW19, Section 5.2.1] (in the language of stacks) and gives an SNC resolution. It prioritizes the divisorial unknowns without essentially changing their weights.

2.3.15. *Derivations.* By $\mathcal{D}_X(\mathcal{I})$ or simply $\mathcal{D}(\mathcal{I})$ we mean the ideal locally generated by all functions $f \in \mathcal{I}$ with their first derivatives. Consequently $\mathcal{D}_X^i(\mathcal{I})$ is defined to be $\mathcal{D}_X(\mathcal{D}_X^{i-1}(\mathcal{I}))$. If $D_{x_i^r}$ be a derivative of order r then by $D_{x_i^r}(\mathcal{I})$ we mean the ideal generated by $D_{x_i^r}(f)$, where $f \in \mathcal{I}$, and $a \leq r$.

2.3.16. *Characterization of the SNC-order.*

Lemma 2.3.17. Let $a \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$, and x_1, \dots, x_n be a coordinate system compatible with E at p .

- (1) $\text{ord}_{p,E}(\mathcal{I}) \leq a_+$ if and only if $\mathcal{D}_X^a(\mathcal{I})$ is invertible at p .
- (2) $\text{ord}_{p,E}(\mathcal{I}) \leq a$ if and only if either there is a free coordinate x_i at p such that $\mathcal{D}_{x_i}(\mathcal{D}_X^{a-1}(\mathcal{I}))$ is invertible at p or $\mathcal{D}_X^{a-1}(\mathcal{I})$ is invertible at p .

Proof. (1) $\text{ord}_{p,E}(\mathcal{I}) \leq a_+$ if and only if using the standard order we write $\text{ord}_p(\mathcal{I}) \leq a$. The latter is equivalent to $(\mathcal{D}_X^a(\mathcal{I}))_p = \mathcal{O}_{X,p}$.

(2) If $\text{ord}_{p,E}(\mathcal{I}) = a$ then there is $(D_{x_i^a}(\mathcal{I}))_p = \mathcal{O}_X$ for $|\alpha| = a$ and x_i^α is not in $\mathcal{I}_{E_p}^a$. So $D_{x_i^a} = D_{x_i} D_{x_i^{a-1}}$ with x_i free and $|\alpha'| = a - 1$. Then $\mathcal{D}_{x_i}(\mathcal{D}_X^{a-1}(\mathcal{I}))$ is invertible at p . Similarly if $\text{ord}_{p,E}(\mathcal{I}) < a$ then $\mathcal{D}_X^{a-1}(\mathcal{I})$ is invertible at p .

Conversely assume that $\mathcal{D}_{x_i}(\mathcal{D}_X^{a-1}(\mathcal{I}))$ is invertible at p with x_i free and suppose $\text{ord}_{p,E}(\mathcal{I}) = a_+$. Then $\mathcal{I}_p \subset \mathcal{I}_{E_p}^a + m_p^{a+1}$, and we get the contradiction:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{O}_{X,p} &= \mathcal{D}_{x_i}(\mathcal{I})_p \subseteq \mathcal{D}_{x_i}(\mathcal{D}_X^{a-1}(\mathcal{I}_{E_p}^a + m_p^{a+1})) \subset \\ &\mathcal{D}_{x_i}(\mathcal{D}_X^{a-1}(\mathcal{I}_{E_p}^a)) + m_p \subset \mathcal{D}_{x_i}(\mathcal{I}_{E_p}) + m_p = \mathcal{I}_{E_p} + m_p = m_p. \end{aligned}$$

So $\text{ord}_{p,E}(\mathcal{I}) \neq a_+$. Moreover $\text{ord}_{p,E}(\mathcal{I}) < a + 1$, which implies $\text{ord}_{p,E}(\mathcal{I}) \leq a$. ♣

3. THE ALGORITHM

3.1. The canonical invariant on varieties with SNC divisors.

3.1.1. *Canonical invariant.* Let E be an SNC divisor on smooth X , and \mathcal{I} be an ideal on X . For a point $p \in X$ we shall define the *canonical invariant* $\text{inv}_{p,E}(\mathcal{I})$ of \mathcal{I} at p to be

$$\text{inv}_{p,E}(\mathcal{I}) := \max\{(b_1, \dots, b_k) \mid \mathcal{I}_p \subseteq (x_1^{a_1}, \dots, x_k^{a_k})_{X,p} \mid (b_1 \leq \dots \leq b_k)\}.$$

where $(x_1^{a_1}, \dots, x_k^{a_k})$ are the centers at p (compatible with E). We compare the sequences of different lengths lexicographically by placing a sequence of ∞ at the end. Then

$$\text{inv}_{p,E}(\mathcal{I}) \in (\mathbb{Q}_{\geq 0}^+)^{\leq n} := \bigsqcup_{k \leq n} (\mathbb{Q}_{\geq 0}^+)^k.$$

If $\text{inv}_{p,E}(\mathcal{I}) = (b_1, \dots, b_k)$ then we say that the \mathbb{Q} -ideal $\mathcal{J} := (x_1^{a_1}, \dots, x_k^{a_k})$ such that $\mathcal{I}_p \subseteq (x_1^{a_1}, \dots, x_k^{a_k})_{X,p}$ is *maximal admissible at p* .

If \mathcal{J} is maximal admissible for \mathcal{I} at any point of $V(\mathcal{J})$ then we say simply that \mathcal{J} is *maximal admissible for \mathcal{I}* .

Remark 3.1.2. If no divisors are present the definition $\text{inv}_{p,E}(\mathcal{I})$ coincides with the canonical invariant $\text{inv}_p(\mathcal{I})$ from [ATW19, Theorem 5.3.1] so we have $\text{inv}_p(\mathcal{I}) = \text{inv}_{p,0}(\mathcal{I})$. In such a case the invariant can be linked to the invariants developed in earlier papers on resolution of singularities, in particular Bierstone and Milman's [BM97], Villamayor's [Vil92], Encinas-Hauser [EH02] and Włodarczyk's [Wło05].

3.1.3. *Order.* By Lemma 2.3.13, the definition of the invariant $\text{inv}_{p,E}(\mathcal{I})$ naturally extends the notion of SNC -order. In particular, we have

$$\text{ord}_{p,E}(\mathcal{I}) = b_1.$$

3.1.4. *Reduced centers.* Any \mathbb{Q} -ideal $\mathcal{J} = (x_1^{a_1}, \dots, x_k^{a_k})$ at p determines its *reduction*, that is the associated center of the cobordant blow-up $\overline{\mathcal{J}} = (x_1^{1/w_1}, \dots, x_k^{1/w_k}) = (x_1^{a_1}, \dots, x_k^{a_k})^{1/a_1 w_1}$, where $w_1 \geq \dots \geq w_k$ are positive integers such that $a_1 w_1 = \dots = a_k w_k$. If additionally $\text{gcd}(w_1, \dots, w_k) = 1$ then we call $\overline{\mathcal{J}}$ *minimal reduced* (originally in [ATW19, Section 3.4], called *reduced*).

3.1.5. *Properties of invariant.* Our algorithm, similarly as the one in [ATW19] uses the invariant $\text{inv}_{p,E}(\mathcal{I})$ to determine the centers of the blow-ups.

The following proposition describes the basic properties of the invariant stated in [ATW19],(Section 5) and those adapted to cobordant blow-ups and our more general setting:

Proposition 3.1.6. *Let X be a scheme which is smooth over k , E be an SNC divisor on X and \mathcal{I} be an ideal on X .*

- (1) A maximal admissible center $\mathcal{J} = (x_1^{a_1}, \dots, x_k^{a_k})$ at p , is determined uniquely for any given ideal. Moreover \mathcal{J} is maximal \mathcal{I} -admissible at any point $p \in V(\mathcal{J}) \cap U_p$, for a certain neighborhood U_p of p .
- (2) A point $p \in Y$ is nonsingular and Y is transversal to E at p iff $\text{inv}_{p,E}(\mathcal{I}_Y) = (1, \dots, 1)$. Then the number of the entries in $\text{inv}_{p,E}(\mathcal{I}_Y)$ is equal to the codimension of Y at p .
- (3) The function $\text{inv}_{p,E}(\mathcal{I}) : X \rightarrow (\mathbb{Q}_{\geq 0}^+)^{\leq n}$ is upper semicontinuous. Moreover for any $p \in X$ and a neighborhood U_p of p we have:

$$\{q \in U_p \mid \text{inv}_{q,E}(\mathcal{I}) = \text{inv}_{p,E}(\mathcal{I}) = V(x_1, \dots, x_n) \cap U_p\}$$

- (4) The invariant $\text{inv}_{p,E}(\mathcal{I})$ and \mathcal{J} are functorial for the smooth morphisms, and field extensions.
- (5) Assume that X admits an action of torus T , and \mathcal{I} and E are T -stable. Then all the coordinates of \mathcal{J} can be chosen to be T -semiinvariant. If additionally, the action of T has finite stabilizers, and X admits a geometric quotient X/T then $\text{inv}_{p,E}(\mathcal{I}) \in (\mathbb{Q}_{\geq 0}^+)^{\leq m}$, where $m := \dim(X/T)$.

3.2. Admissibility and marked ideals.

3.2.1. *Admissibility and blowing up.* The following definition extends the one in [ATW19, Section 5.2]. Let X be a smooth scheme over a field k , and E be an SNC divisor on X . We say that a center \mathcal{J} locally of the form $J = (x_1^{a_1}, \dots, x_k^{a_k})$ is \mathcal{I} -admissible at a point p if the inclusion $\mathcal{I}_p \subseteq (x_1^{a_1}, \dots, x_k^{a_k})_{X,p}$ holds. If \mathcal{J} is admissible for \mathcal{I} at every point $p \in V(\mathcal{J})$, then we say simply that \mathcal{J} is admissible for \mathcal{I} or \mathcal{I} -admissible. If \mathcal{J} is admissible for \mathcal{I} then $V(\mathcal{J}) \subseteq V(\mathcal{I})$. Moreover for any $p \in V(\mathcal{J})$, $\text{ord}_{p,E}(\mathcal{I}) \geq \text{ord}(\mathcal{J}) = b_1$.

Note that in the Hironaka resolution by smooth centers C the analogous condition is formulated as the inclusion $\mathcal{I} \subset \mathcal{I}_C^a$, where \mathcal{I}_C is the ideal of C , and a is certain natural number (a marking).

The following definition extends Hironaka's *idealistic exponent* or *basic object, marked ideal* ([Hir64],[Vil92],[BM91],[Wlo05])

3.2.2. *Marked ideal.* By a *marked ideal* we mean a pair (\mathcal{I}, b_1) of an ideal \mathcal{I} on X and the number $b_1 \in (\mathbb{Q}_+)^{>0}$ which will be called a *marking*. As in the standard situation the marking is often associated with the order of the ideal at a certain point.

By the *support* $\text{supp}(\mathcal{I}, b_1)$ we mean the set

$$\text{supp}(\mathcal{I}, b_1) := \{p \in X \mid \text{ord}_{p,E}(\mathcal{I}) \geq b_1\}.$$

The center \mathcal{J} will be called *admissible* for (\mathcal{I}, b) , where $b = a$ or $b = a_+$, if \mathcal{J}^a is admissible for \mathcal{I} , and $V(\mathcal{J}) \subseteq \text{supp}(\mathcal{I}, b)$.

If $b_1 = \max\{\text{ord}_{p,E}(\mathcal{I}) \mid p \in X\}$ then we say that (\mathcal{I}, b_1) is of *maximal order*. This is exactly the case in a neighborhood of a point p if $\text{inv}_{p,E}(\mathcal{I}) = (b_1, \dots, b_k)$.

We say that \mathcal{J} is *normalized* if it is locally of the form $(x_1^1, \dots, x_k^{a_k/a_1})$.

Lemma 3.2.3. *If $J = (x_1^{a_1}, \dots, x_k^{a_k})$ an \mathcal{I} -admissible center then the normalized ideal $\mathcal{J}^{\frac{1}{a_1}}$ is admissible for a marked ideal (\mathcal{I}, b_1) , where $b_1 = \text{ord}(\mathcal{J})$.*

Proof. We get immediately $(\mathcal{J}^{\frac{1}{a_1}})^{a_1} = \mathcal{J}$ is \mathcal{I} -admissible. Moreover if $p \in V(\mathcal{J})$ then $\text{ord}_{p,E}(\mathcal{I}) \geq \text{ord}_p(\mathcal{J})_X \geq \text{ord}(\mathcal{J}) = b_1$.



3.2.4. *Admissible centers of maximal order.* An \mathcal{I} -admissible center \mathcal{J} , such that

$$\text{ord}(\mathcal{J}) = b_1 = \max\{\text{ord}_{p,E}(\mathcal{I}) \mid p \in X\}$$

will be called an *admissible center of maximal order*.

3.2.5. *Derivations.*

Lemma 3.2.6. (see also [ATW19, Lemma 5.2.7],

- (1) If $\mathcal{I} \subseteq ((x_1^1, \dots, x_k^{a_k/a_1})^{a_1})_X$ then $D_X^i(\mathcal{I}) \subseteq ((x_1^1, \dots, x_k^{a_k/a_1})^{a_1-i})_X$.
- (2) $\text{ord}_{p,E}(D_X^i(\mathcal{I})) = \text{ord}_{p,E}(\mathcal{I}) - i$, for any natural $i \leq \text{ord}_{p,E}(\mathcal{I}) - 1$.
- (3) If a normalized center $\mathcal{J} = (x_1^1, \dots, x_k^{a_k/a_1})$ is admissible for (\mathcal{I}, b) then it is admissible for $(D_X^i(\mathcal{I}), b - i)$, for $i < b$.

Proof. (1) By Lemma 2.1.17, we have $D_X^i(\mathcal{I}) \subseteq D_X^i((x_1^{a_1}, \dots, x_k^{a_k})_X) = D_X^i(x_1^{c_1} \cdot \dots \cdot x_k^{c_k} \mid c_i \in \mathbb{N}, (c_1 + c_2 a_1/a_2 + \dots + c_k a_1/a_k) \geq a_1) \subseteq (x_1^{c_1} \cdot \dots \cdot x_k^{c_k} \mid c_i \in \mathbb{N}, c_1 + c_2 a_1/a_2 + \dots + c_k a_1/a_k \geq a_1 - i) = ((x_1^1, \dots, x_k^{a_k/a_1})^{a_1-i})_X$.

(2) Observe that for $\mathcal{I} \subset m_p$, and $a \geq 2$, we have $\mathcal{I} \subset m_p^a$ if and only if $\mathcal{D}_X(\mathcal{I}) \subset m_p^{a-1}$. Similarly $\mathcal{I} \subset \mathcal{I}_{E_p}^a + m_p^{a+1}$ if and only if $\mathcal{D}_X \mathcal{I} \subset \mathcal{D}_X(\mathcal{I}_{E_p}^a + m_p^{a+1}) = \mathcal{I}_{E_p}^{a-i} + m_p^{a+1-i}$. Thus if $\text{ord}_p(\mathcal{I}) \geq 2$, we have that $\text{ord}_{p,E}(\mathcal{I}) = b$ if and only if $\text{ord}_{p,E}(\mathcal{D}_X(\mathcal{I})) = b - 1$.

(3) Follows from (1), and (2). ♣

In Sections 3.3, 3.4 below we shall construct the invariant $\text{inv}_{p,E}(\mathcal{I})$. We consider two cases:

Case 1: $\text{ord}_{p,E}(\mathcal{I}) = a_1 \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$.

Case 2: $\text{ord}_{p,E}(\mathcal{I}) = a_{1+} \in (\mathbb{Z}_+)_{>0}$

3.3. Construction of the invariant in Case 1. The arguments in this section use the same principles as in [ATW19], originated in the Hironaka resolution by smooth centers, and its simplifications, and adapted to the SNC setting.

3.3.1. *Free maximal contact.* If (\mathcal{I}, a_1) is of maximal order then in characteristic zero, by Lemma 2.3.17, $\mathcal{D}_{x_i}(\mathcal{D}_X^{a_1-1}(\mathcal{I})) = \mathcal{O}_X$, where x_i is a free coordinate. Thus there is a local parameter $u_1 \in \mathcal{D}_X^{a_1-1}(\mathcal{I})$, such that $\mathcal{D}_{x_i}(u_1)$ is invertible at p . We will call u_1 a *free maximal contact* for (\mathcal{I}, a_1) . Using Lemma 2.3.17 we get an immediate extension of the classical result of [Vil89],[Gir74].

Lemma 3.3.2. $V(u_1)$ contains $V(\mathcal{D}_X^{a_1-1}(\mathcal{I})) = \text{supp}(\mathcal{I}, a_1)$.

Proof. The complement of the set $\text{supp}(\mathcal{I}, a_1) = \{p \in X \mid \text{ord}_{p,E}(\mathcal{I}) \geq a_1\}$ consists of the points p for which $\text{ord}_{p,E}(\mathcal{I}) < a_1$. By Lemma 2.3.17, this is equivalent to $\mathcal{D}_X^{a_1-1}(\mathcal{I})$ being invertible. Thus $\text{supp}(\mathcal{I}, a_1) = V(\mathcal{D}_X^{a_1-1}(\mathcal{I}))$, and since $u_1 \in \mathcal{D}_X^{a_1-1}(\mathcal{I})$, we get the desired inclusion. ♣

3.3.3. *Admissible centers of maximal order.* Let $\mathcal{J} = (x_1^{a_1}, \dots, x_k^{a_k})$ be admissible for \mathcal{I} at p of maximal order $\text{ord}(\mathcal{J}) = a_1 = \text{ord}_{p,E}(\mathcal{I})$. By Lemmas 3.2.6(1), a free maximal contact u_1 is in $\mathcal{D}_X^{a_1-1}(\mathcal{I}) \subset (x_1^1, \dots, x_k^{a_k/a_1})_X$. Then, by Lemma 2.3.8, the first coordinate x_1 of the center \mathcal{J} can be chosen to be equal to u_1 by a coordinate change. So, in the sequel we represent \mathcal{I} -admissible centers of maximal order locally in the special form $\mathcal{J} = (x_1^{a_1}, \dots, x_k^{a_k})$, where $x_1 \in \mathcal{D}_X^{a_1-1}(\mathcal{I})$ is any given free maximal contact.

3.3.4. *Rees algebras.* By the *Rees algebra* \mathcal{R} on a scheme X we mean here a homogenous ideal sheaf $\mathcal{R} = \bigoplus_{i \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}} \mathcal{R}_i t^i \subset \mathcal{O}_X[t]$, such that $\mathcal{R}_i \subseteq \mathcal{R}_j$, for $i \geq j$, and $\mathcal{R}_0 = \mathcal{O}_X$.

3.3.5. *Rees algebra for (\mathcal{I}, a_1) .* Introducing dummy variable t and using Lemma 3.2.6(1), we can write

$$\mathcal{O}_X[\mathcal{D}_X^i(\mathcal{I})t^{a_1-i}] \subseteq (\mathcal{O}_X[(x_1^1, \dots, x_k^{a_k/a_1})t])_X$$

Here $\mathcal{R} = \mathcal{R}(\mathcal{I}, a_1) := \mathcal{O}_X[\mathcal{D}_X^i(\mathcal{I})t^{a_1-i}]$ is a differential-closed Rees algebra associated with (\mathcal{I}, a_1) as in [EV07]. By the chain rule it is differential-closed in the sense that $\mathcal{D}^i(\mathcal{R}_j) \subseteq \mathcal{R}_{j-i}$ for $i \leq j$.

If (\mathcal{I}, a_1) is of maximal order the graded ring $\mathcal{R} = \mathcal{O}_X[\mathcal{D}_X^i(\mathcal{I})t^{a_1-i}]$ contains an element $x_1 \cdot t$ in gradation one which is associated with the free maximal contact $x_1 \in \mathcal{D}_X^{a_1-1}(\mathcal{I})$.

3.3.6. *Restriction of $\mathcal{R}(\mathcal{I}, a_1)$ to a free maximal contact.* Restricting of $\mathcal{R} := \mathcal{R}(\mathcal{I}, a_1)$ to $H := V(x_1)$ and using Corollary 2.1.17, gives

$$(D_X^i(\mathcal{I}))|_H \subseteq ((x_2^{a_2/a_1}, \dots, x_k^{a_k/a_1})^{a_1-i})_H$$

Here x_2, \dots, x_n are identified with their restrictions to $H = V(x_1)$.

The latter translates again in terms of Rees algebras on H as

$$\mathcal{R}|_H = \mathcal{O}_H[D^i \mathcal{I}|_H \cdot t^{(a_1-i)}] \subset (\mathcal{O}_H[(x_2^{a_2/a_1}, \dots, x_k^{a_k/a_1})t])_H,$$

3.3.7. *Coefficient ideal.* The ideal in the $a_1!$ -gradation of the graded Rees algebra $\mathcal{R} = \mathcal{O}_X[\mathcal{D}^i(\mathcal{I})t^{a_1-i}]$ will be called *the coefficient ideal of (\mathcal{I}, a_1)* and denoted by $\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{I}, a_1) = \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{I}) := \mathcal{R}_{a_1!}$ on X . The concept of the coefficient ideals goes back to Abhyankhar and Hironaka [Hir64]. Since then many different definitions were considered in [Vil89], [BM97], [Wlo05] and others. This particular definition is equivalent to Kollar's definition [Kol07] and was used in [ATW19, Definition 4.1.1]. By definition

$$\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{I})|_H \cdot t^{a_1} \subseteq (\mathcal{O}_H[(x_2^{a_2/a_1}, \dots, x_k^{a_k/a_1})t])_H,$$

This means exactly that on H we have

$$\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{I})|_H \subseteq ((x_2^{a_2/a_1}, \dots, x_k^{a_k/a_1})^{a_1!})_H = ((x_2, \dots, x_k^{a_k/a_2})^{a_2(a_1-1)!})_H$$

The following lemma links the admissibility for \mathcal{I} on X with the admissibility of $\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{I})|_H$ on H allowing the inductive reduction. The same reduction principle is used implicitly in [ATW19, Lemma 5.2.7].

Lemma 3.3.8. *Let (\mathcal{I}, a_1) be a marked ideal of maximal order on X , and x_1 be a free maximal contact for (\mathcal{I}, a_1) at a point $p \in \text{supp}(\mathcal{I}, a_1)$, and $H = V(x_1)$. Let $\mathcal{J} = (x_1^{a_1}, \dots, x_k^{a_k})$ be a \mathbb{Q} -ideal. The following conditions are equivalent:*

- (1) \mathcal{J} is admissible for \mathcal{I} at p .
- (2) $\mathcal{J}_H := (x_2^{a_2}, \dots, x_k^{a_k})^{(a_1-1)!}$ is admissible for $\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{I})|_H$ at p .
- (3) In a neighborhood of $p \in H$ we have inclusion

$$\mathcal{O}_H[\mathcal{D}_{x_1}^i(\mathcal{I})|_H \cdot t^{(a_1-i)}] \subseteq (\mathcal{O}_H[(x_2^{a_2/a_1}, \dots, x_k^{a_k/a_1})t])_H$$

where $\mathcal{D}_{x_1}^i(\mathcal{I})$ is the ideal generated by \mathcal{I} and $\mathcal{D}_{x_1}^j(f)$, $f \in \mathcal{I}$, $j \leq i$.

We shall call the graded algebra on the left side of the inclusion in (3), *the coefficient ideal of (\mathcal{I}, a_1) in graded form on H* . This concept is not directly used in the proof, but it will be used in the computations of Examples 4.1.1, and 4.2.1.

Proof. The implication (1) \Rightarrow (2) follows from the above. (2) \Rightarrow (3)

$$(D_{x_1}^i(\mathcal{I})|_H)^{a_1!/(a_1-i)} \subset \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{I})|_H \subseteq ((x_2^{a_2/a_1}, \dots, x_k^{a_k/a_1})^{a_1!})_H$$

So, by Lemma 2.1.12(3), $(D_{x_1}^i(\mathcal{I})|_H) \subseteq ((x_2^{a_2/a_1}, \dots, x_k^{a_k/a_1})^{a_1-i})_H$.

(3) \Rightarrow (1) Any $f \in \mathcal{I}_p$ can be written in the completion $\widehat{\mathcal{O}}_{X,p}$ as

$$f = c_{a_1} x_1^{a_1} + c_{a_1-1}(x_2, \dots, x_k) x_1^{a_1-1} + \dots + c_0(x_2, \dots, x_k).$$

Then $c_{a_1-i}(x_2, \dots, x_k) = (\frac{\partial f}{\partial x_1^{a_1-i}})|_H \in ((x_2^{a_2/a_1}, \dots, x_k^{a_k/a_1})^i)_H$. This implies that

$$f = c_{a_1} x_1^{a_1} + c_{a_1-1} x_1^{a_1-1} + \dots + c_0 \in ((x_1, x_2^{a_2/a_1}, \dots, x_k^{a_k/a_1})^{a_1})_{X,p} = (x_1^{a_1}, \dots, x_k^{a_k})_{X,p}$$

♣

3.3.9. Admissible centers with a fixed free maximal contact. Let $x_1 \in \mathcal{D}^{a_1-1}(\mathcal{I})$ be a free maximal contact of (\mathcal{I}, a_1) of maximal order. Any \mathcal{I} -admissible center in the form $(x_1^{a_1}, \dots, x_k^{a_k})$ will be called *\mathcal{I} -admissible with respect to x_1* . If $(x_1^{a_1}, \dots, x_k^{a_k})$ is maximal \mathcal{I} -admissible at p with respect to x_1 then we write

$$\text{inv}_{p,E,x_1}(\mathcal{I}) := (b_1, \dots, b_k)$$

3.3.10. Inductive construction of the center. By the inductive argument and Lemma 3.3.8 we can assume (as in [ATW19, Theorem 6.2.1]) that there exists a uniquely determined valutive \mathbb{Q} -ideal

$$\mathcal{J}_H = ((x_2^{a'_2}, \dots, x_k^{a'_k}) = (x_2^{a_2}, \dots, x_k^{a_k})^{(a_1-1)!})$$

on H which is maximal admissible for $\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{I})|_H$ at $p \in H$ with $\text{inv}_{p,E|_H}(\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{I})|_H) = (a'_2, \dots, a'_n)$, and $a'_i = (a_1 - 1)!a_i$. Here

$$a'_2 = a_2(a_1 - 1)! = \text{ord}_{p,E}(\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{I})|_H)$$

This completely determines the entries a_2, \dots, a_k of the invariant

$$(1) \quad \text{inv}_{p,E,x_1}(\mathcal{I}) = (\text{ord}_{p,E}(\mathcal{I}), \frac{1}{(a_1 - 1)!} \text{inv}_{p,E|_H}(\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{I})|_H))$$

The coordinates x_2, \dots, x_n on $H = V(x_1)$ can be lifted up to (x_1) to X so using Lemma 2.1.18 we can think of \mathcal{J}_H as defined on X and, by Lemma 3.3.8 we can construct a unique maximal admissible \mathbb{Q} -ideal \mathcal{J} with respect to x_1 out of \mathcal{J}_H to be

$$\mathcal{J} = (x_1^{a_1} + \mathcal{J}_H^{\frac{1}{(a_1-1)!}}) = (x_1^{a_1}, \dots, x_k^{a_k}).$$

3.3.11. Independence of maximal contact. We need to show independence of this construction of the free maximal contact. We use the same argument as in [Wł05], adapting the statement of the lemma to our situation. (See also [Kol07] for a more general version). The following lemma is a somewhat stronger version of the result stated in [ATW19, Theorem 4.3.1] which we will need in our situation.

Lemma 3.3.12. *Let $x_1, x'_1 \in \mathcal{D}^{a_1-1}(\mathcal{I})$ be two free maximal contacts and let $p \in \text{supp}(\mathcal{I}, a_1)$. Let $\mathcal{J} = (x_1^{a_1}, \dots, x_k^{a_k})$ be any admissible center for \mathcal{I} . There exist two étale morphisms $\phi, \phi' : X' \rightarrow X$ such that with $\phi(\bar{p}) = \phi'(\bar{p}) = p$, both étale at p , satisfying*

- (1) $\phi_p^* x_1 = \phi'_p{}^* x'_1$,
- (2) $\phi_p^*(\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{I}))_p = \phi'_p{}^*(\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{I}))_p$
- (3) $\phi_p^*(\mathcal{J}) = \phi'_p{}^*(\mathcal{J})$,
- (4) $\phi^{-1}(E) = (\phi')^{-1}(E)$.

where $\phi_p^*, (\phi'_p)^* : \mathcal{O}_{p,X} \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_{\bar{p},X'}$ are the induced morphisms of local rings, and $\phi^*(\mathcal{I}) := \mathcal{O}_{X'} \cdot \phi^{-1}(\mathcal{I})$, $(\phi')^*(\mathcal{I}) := \mathcal{O}_{X'} \cdot (\phi')^{-1}(\mathcal{I})$ are the inverse images of the ideal \mathcal{I} .

Proof. Note that $x'_1 \in (x_1, \dots, x_k^{a_k/a_1})_X$. By Lemma 2.3.8, we can extend x_1, x'_1 to the coordinate systems x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n , and x'_1, x_2, \dots, x_n at p possibly modifying x_2, \dots, x_n , such that $\mathcal{J} = ((x_1^{a_1}, \dots, x_k^{a_k}) = ((x'_1)^{a_1}, \dots, x_k^{a_k})$. Consider two maps $\psi, \psi' : X \rightarrow \mathbf{A}_k^n$ determined by those coordinate systems. Let $X' := X \times_{\mathbf{A}_k^n} X$ be its fiber product, with the induced morphisms $\phi, \phi' : X' \rightarrow X$ mapping a corresponding point \bar{p} to p . The conditions (1),(3), and (4) are satisfied. The only nontrivial condition is (2). Consider a formal isomorphism α of $\widehat{\mathcal{O}}_{p,X}$ such that $\alpha(x_1) = x'_1$, $\alpha(x_i) = x_i$ for $i = 1, \dots, n$. Let $f = f(x_1, \dots, x_n) \in \widehat{(\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{I}))}_p$. Write $\alpha(f)$ as $\alpha(f) = f(x'_1, x_2, \dots, x_n) = f(x_1 + h, x_2, \dots, x_n) = \sum \frac{1}{i!} \frac{\partial^i f}{\partial x_1^i} h^i \in \widehat{(\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{I}))}_p$. Consequently $\alpha(\widehat{(\mathcal{C}_p(\mathcal{I}))}) = \widehat{(\mathcal{C}_p(\mathcal{I}))}$, and since $\widehat{\phi}_p^* = \widehat{\phi}'_p{}^* \alpha$ we obtain that $\widehat{\phi}^*(\widehat{(\mathcal{C}_p(\mathcal{I}))}) = \widehat{\phi}'^*(\widehat{(\mathcal{C}_p(\mathcal{I}))})$. Thus, by faithful flatness, the stalks $\phi_p^*(\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{I}))_p = \phi'_p{}^*(\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{I}))_p$ are equal and thus the sheaves $\phi^*(\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{I}))$ and $(\phi')^*(\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{I}))$ are equal in a neighborhood of \bar{p} . ♣

3.3.13. *Uniqueness of maximal admissible center.* We need to show that our construction of the center \mathcal{J} does not depend upon the choice of free maximal contact. We compare two different maximal admissible centers \mathcal{J} and \mathcal{J}' with respect to maximal contacts x_1 , and x'_1 . Consider the étale morphisms $\phi, \phi' : X' \rightarrow X$ as in Lemma 3.3.12. We assume that $\dim(X) = n$ and that there exists a unique maximal admissible center for any ideal on any smooth $(n-1)$ - dimensional space which is functorial for étale morphisms.

The inverse images $\phi^*(\mathcal{J})$ and $(\phi')^*(\mathcal{J}')$ are defined with respect to the same maximal contact $\phi^* x_1 = \phi'^* x'_1$. Moreover the morphisms ϕ and ϕ' have the same inverse image of the coefficient ideal $\phi^*(\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{I})) = (\phi')^*(\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{I})) = \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{O}'_X \cdot \mathcal{I})_{\bar{p}}$ with the same maximal contact $\phi^* x_1 = \phi'^* x'_1$. Denote by ϕ_H and ϕ'_H are the restriction of ϕ , and ϕ' to $H = V(\phi^* x_1) = V(\phi'^* x'_1)$. This implies that $\phi_H = \phi'_H$. So, by the induction and Lemma 3.3.12, we can assume that $\mathcal{J}_H := \phi_H^*(\mathcal{J}_H)^{(a_1-1)!} = (\phi'_H)^*(\mathcal{J}'_H)^{(a_1-1)!}$ is a unique maximal admissible center for $\phi^*(\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{I}))|_{H'}$. Thus the centers $\phi^*(\mathcal{J})$ and $(\phi')^*(\mathcal{J}')$ are the same since we can write $\phi^*(\mathcal{J}) = (\phi')^*(\mathcal{J}') = \phi^*(x_1) + \phi^*(\mathcal{J}_H)^{1/(a_1-1)!}$. But, by Lemma 3.3.12, $\phi^*(\mathcal{J}) = (\phi')^*(\mathcal{J})$, thus $(\phi')^*(\mathcal{J}') = (\phi')^*(\mathcal{J})$, which means, by Lemma 2.1.18, $(\phi')^*(\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{J}}) = (\phi')^*(\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{J}'})$, and by the faithful flatness $\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{J}} = \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{J}'}$, and $\mathcal{J} = \mathcal{J}'$. This shows that any maximal \mathcal{I} -admissible center \mathcal{J} with respect to x_1 is, in fact, independent of maximal contact, and thus it is a unique maximal \mathcal{I} -admissible center at the point p . In particular

$$\text{inv}_{p,E,x_1}(\mathcal{I}) = \text{inv}_{p,E}(\mathcal{I}).$$

3.4. **Construction of the invariant in Case 2.** Assume now that

$$\text{ord}_{p,E}(\mathcal{I}) = a_{1+}.$$

3.4.1. *Divisorial maximal contact.* By the assumption $\mathcal{I}_p \subset \mathcal{I}_{E_p}^{a_1} + m_p^{a_1+1}$, and thus $\mathcal{D}^{a_1-1}(\mathcal{I}) \subset \mathcal{I}_{E_p} + m_p^2$. We define the *divisorial maximal contact* for (\mathcal{I}, a_+) at p to be

$$\bar{u} := (x_i \in E_p \mid D_{x_i}(\mathcal{D}_X^{a_1-1}(\mathcal{I}))_p = \mathcal{O}_{X,p}),$$

defined by a subset of the divisorial unknowns in E_p . Note that, by Lemma 2.3.17, $\mathcal{D}_{x_j}(\mathcal{I})_p \subset m_p$ for any free unknown x_j . So, by the chain rule, this definition does not depend upon a choice of the coordinate system compatible with E .

Lemma 3.4.2. *Under the assumption $\text{ord}_{p,E}(\mathcal{I}) = a_{1+}$ we have:*

- (1) $\mathcal{D}_X^{a_1-1}(\mathcal{I})_p + m_p^2 = \bar{u} + m_p^2$
- (2) $\mathcal{I}_p \subset \bar{u}^{a_1} + m_p^{a_1+1}$.
- (3) \bar{u} is the minimal ideal generated by the set of divisorial coordinates at p and satisfying the condition (1) or (2).

Proof. (1) By Lemma 2.3.17(2), $\mathcal{D}_{x_j}\mathcal{D}_X^{a_1-1}(\mathcal{I})_p \subset m_p$ for any free coordinate x_j . So the free parameters do not occur in the linear parts of $f \in \mathcal{D}_X^{a_1-1}(\mathcal{I})_p$. Thus, by definition, the linear parts of $f \in \mathcal{D}_X^{a_1-1}(\mathcal{I})_p$ are in \bar{u} .

(2) Let x_1, \dots, x_n be a coordinate system compatible with E at p , where $\bar{u} = (x_1, \dots, x_r)$ is a maximal contact. Write $f \in \mathcal{I}_p$ in the completion $\widehat{\mathcal{I}}_p \subset \widehat{\mathcal{O}_{X,p}}$ as $f = \sum c_\alpha x^\alpha$, and suppose there is $x^\alpha \notin \bar{u}^{a_1}$, with $|\alpha| = a_1$, and c_α invertible at p . Then there is a coordinate $x_j | x^\alpha$ which is not in \bar{u} . This implies that $\mathcal{D}_{x_j}\mathcal{D}_X^{a_1-1}(\mathcal{I})_p$ is invertible. Then by, by Lemma 2.3.17, x_j is divisorial and thus $x_j \in \bar{u}$.

(3) If $\mathcal{I}_p \subset \bar{u}^{a_1} + m_p^{a_1+1}$ then $\mathcal{D}_X^{a_1-1}(\mathcal{I})_p \subseteq \bar{u} + m_p^2$, and, by the reasoning in (1) we get $\bar{u} + m_p^2 \subset \bar{u}' + m_p^2$. ♣

Then we extend Giraud Lemma to our case.

Lemma 3.4.3. *In an open neighborhood of p we have*

$$\text{supp}(\mathcal{I}, a_{1+}) \subset V(\bar{u} + \mathcal{D}^{a_1-1}(\mathcal{I})) \subseteq V(\bar{u}).$$

Proof. Let U_p be an open neighborhood of p such that

- there is a system of parameters x_1, \dots, x_n compatible with E on U_p .
- $D_{x_i}\mathcal{D}^{a_1-1}(\mathcal{I})_q$ is invertible on U_p , for $x_i \in \bar{u}$.

Then

$$\text{supp}(\mathcal{I}, a_{1+}) \subseteq \text{supp}(\mathcal{I}, a_1) = V(\mathcal{D}^{a_1-1}(\mathcal{I})).$$

Let $q \in U_p \setminus V(x_i)$, where $x_i \in \bar{u}$. Then, by definition $D_{x_i}\mathcal{D}^{a_1-1}(\mathcal{I})_q$ is invertible, where x_i is free at q . Thus, by Lemma 2.1.17, $\text{ord}_{q,E}(\mathcal{I}) \leq a_1$, so q is not in $\text{supp}(\mathcal{I}, a_{1+})$. This implies that $\text{supp}(\mathcal{I}, a_{1+}) \subset V(\bar{u})$. ♣

3.4.4. *Admissible centers of maximal order.* Let $\bar{u} = (x_1, \dots, x_r)$ be a divisorial maximal contact of (\mathcal{I}, a_{1+}) . Then \bar{u} is defined uniquely and is independent of choices. Now, assume that $\mathcal{J} = (x_1^{a_1}, \dots, x_k^{a_k})$ is an \mathcal{I} -admissible of maximal order at p , with $\text{inv}(\mathcal{J}) = (b_1, \dots, b_k)$. Let

$$b_1 = \dots = b_{r'} = a_{1+} < b_{r+1} \leq \dots \leq b_k.$$

This implies that $\mathcal{I}_p \subset \mathcal{J}_{X,p} \subset (x_1, \dots, x_{r'})^{a_1} + m_p^{a_1+1}$, where the first r' coordinates of \mathcal{J} are divisorial, and, thus by Lemma 3.4.2(3), $r \leq r'$. Consequently we can assume that the first r coordinates of any \mathcal{I} -admissible center \mathcal{J} of maximal order equal to the divisorial coordinates in \bar{u} , so it can be written as:

$$\mathcal{J} = (x_1^{a_1}, \dots, x_r^{a_r}, x_{r+1}^{a_{r+1}}, \dots, x_k^{a_k}) = (\bar{u}^{a_1}, x_{r+1}^{a_{r+1}}, \dots, x_k^{a_k})$$

3.4.5. *Rees algebra for (\mathcal{I}, a_{1+}) .* We consider the Rees algebra

$$\mathcal{R} = \mathcal{R}(\mathcal{I}, a_{1+}) := \mathcal{O}_X[\mathcal{D}^i(\mathcal{I})t^{a_1-i}, \bar{u}t]$$

which contains $\bar{u}t \in \mathcal{D}_X^{a_1-1}$ in gradation one. Let $\mathcal{J} = (x_1^{a_1}, \dots, x_r^{a_1}, x_{r+1}^{a_{r+1}}, \dots, x_k^{a_k})$ be an \mathcal{I} -admissible ideal of maximal order. Then by Lemma 3.2.6,

$$\mathcal{R} \subset (\mathcal{O}_X[(x_1^1, \dots, x_r^1, x_{r+1}^{a_{r+1}/a_1}, \dots, x_k^{a_k/a_1})t])_X.$$

3.4.6. *Coefficient ideal.* As in the case 1, the ideal in the $a_1!$ -gradation $\mathcal{R}_{a_1!}$ of the graded Rees algebra $\mathcal{R} = \mathcal{O}_X[\mathcal{D}^i(\mathcal{I})t^{a_1-i}, \bar{u}t]$ will be called *the coefficient ideal of (\mathcal{I}, a_{1+})* and denoted by $\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{I}, a_{1+}) = \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{I})$ on X . By definition

$$\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{I})|_H \cdot t^{a_1!} \subseteq (\mathcal{O}_H[(x_{r+1}^{a_{r+1}/a_1}, \dots, x_k^{a_k/a_1})t])_H,$$

3.4.7. *Reduction of $\mathcal{R} := \mathcal{R}(\mathcal{I}, a_{1+})$ to divisorial maximal contact.* Restricting to $H := V(\bar{u}) = V(x_1, \dots, x_r)$ gives

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{R}|_H &= \mathcal{O}_H[\mathcal{D}^i\mathcal{I}|_H \cdot t^{(a_1-i)}] \subset (\mathcal{O}_H[(x_{r+1}^{a_{r+1}/a_1}, \dots, x_k^{a_k/a_1})t])_H, \\ \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{I})|_H \cdot t^{a_1!} &\subseteq (\mathcal{O}_H[(x_{r+1}^{a_{r+1}/a_1}, \dots, x_k^{a_k/a_1})t])_H, \quad \text{and} \\ \mathcal{C}(\mathcal{I})|_H &\subseteq \mathcal{J}_H := ((x_{r+1}^{a_{r+1}/a_1}, \dots, x_k^{a_k/a_1})^{a_1!})_H. \end{aligned}$$

As before we have a variant of Lemma 3.3.8, with unchanged proof:

Lemma 3.4.8. *Let (\mathcal{I}, a_{1+}) be a marked ideal of maximal order on X , and $p \in \text{supp}(\mathcal{I}, a_{1+})$ be a point. Let $\mathcal{J} = (x_1^{a_1}, \dots, x_r^{a_1}, x_{r+1}^{a_{r+1}}, \dots, x_k^{a_k})$ be a \mathbb{Q} -ideal compatible with E where $\bar{u} = (x_1, \dots, x_r)$, $r \leq k$ is a maximal divisorial contact for (\mathcal{I}, a_{1+}) . Let $H = V(\bar{u}) = V(x_1, \dots, x_r)$. The following conditions are equivalent:*

- (1) \mathcal{J} is admissible for \mathcal{I} at $p \in X$.
- (2) $\mathcal{J}_H := (x_{r+1}^{a_{r+1}}, \dots, x_k^{a_k})^{(a_1-1)!}$ is admissible for $\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{I})|_H$ at $p \in H$.
- (3) $\mathcal{O}_H[\mathcal{D}_{x_1}^{i_1} \dots \mathcal{D}_{x_r}^{i_r}(\mathcal{I})|_H \cdot t^{(a_1-(i_1+\dots+i_r))}] \subset (\mathcal{O}_H[(x_{r+1}^{a_{r+1}/a_1}, \dots, x_k^{a_k/a_1})t])_H$ in a neighborhood of $p \in H$.

♣

3.4.9. *Construction and uniqueness of the center.* By the inductive argument and Lemma 3.4.8 we assume that there exists a uniquely determined center

$$\mathcal{J}_H = ((x_{r+1}^{a'_{r+1}}, \dots, x_k^{a'_k}) = (x_{r+1}^{a_{r+1}}, \dots, x_k^{a_k})^{(a_1-1)!}$$

on H which is maximal admissible for $\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{I})|_H$ compatible with $E|_H$ such that $\text{inv}_{p,E}(\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{I})|_H) = (b'_{r+1}, \dots, b'_n)$, with $c_i = (a_1 - 1)!a_i$. Then

$$\text{inv}_{p,E}(\mathcal{I}) = (a_{1+}, \dots, a_{1+}, \frac{1}{(a_1 - 1)!} \text{inv}_{p,E}(\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{I})|_H), \quad \text{and}$$

$$\mathcal{J} := (x_1^{a_1} + \dots + x_r^{a_r} + \mathcal{J}_H^{\frac{1}{(a_1-1)!}}) = (\bar{u}^{a_1} + \mathcal{J}_H^{\frac{1}{(a_1-1)!}}).$$

is, by Lemma 3.4.8, a unique maximal admissible for \mathcal{I} at p compatible with E .

3.5. Properties of invariant. In this section we prove the remaining properties of "inv" in Proposition 3.1.6.

3.5.1. *Semicontinuity of canonical invariant. Local admissibility.* We use induction on $n = \dim(X)$, and assume that the function $p \mapsto \text{inv}_{p,E}(\mathcal{I})$ is upper semicontinuous for any ideal \mathcal{I}' on any smooth scheme X' of dimension $n - 1$. Let \mathcal{I} be an ideal on a smooth X of dimension n . The condition $\text{inv}_{p,E}(\mathcal{I}) \geq (b_1, \dots, b_k)$ means that either $\text{ord}_{p,E}(\mathcal{I}) > b_1$ or $\text{ord}_{p,E} = b_1$ and $\text{inv}_{p,E}(\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{I}, a_1)|_H) \geq (a_1 - 1)!(b_{r+1}, \dots, b_k)$. Here H is either defined by a free maximal contact $H = V(x_1)$, and $r = 1$, or H is the vanishing locus $H = V(\bar{u})$ of a divisorial contact $\bar{u} = (x_1, \dots, x_r)$. Using the induction, and semicontinuity of order, we show that the set

$$\{p \in X \mid \text{inv}_{p,E}(\mathcal{I}) \geq (b_1, \dots, b_k)\}$$

is closed, and $\text{inv}_{p,E}$ is upper semicontinuous.

Similarly, by the inductive argument, we prove that, there is an open neighborhood U_p of p such that

$$\{q \in X \mid \text{inv}_{q,E}(\mathcal{I}) = \text{inv}_{p,E}(\mathcal{I})\} = V(\mathcal{J}),$$

where \mathcal{J} is the maximal \mathcal{I} -admissible valutive \mathbb{Q} -ideal through p . Furthermore by the same inductive argument we show that \mathcal{J} is maximal \mathcal{I} -admissible at any $q \in V(\mathcal{J}) \subset U_p$ of some neighborhood U_p of p .

3.5.2. *Torus action.* If X admits a torus action and \mathcal{I} is T -stable then one can choose inductively semiinvariant coordinates of the maximal admissible centers. These are maximal contacts living on smooth T -stable subvarieties, and can be lifted to the seminvariant coordinates on X . Moreover, if additionally X admits a geometric quotient X/T and has finite stabilizers then the number of semiinvariant coordinates in a T -stable center at a point cannot exceed $\dim(X/T) = \dim(X) - \dim(T)$. The semiinvariant parameters describe a smooth T -stable subvariety of X of dimension at least $\dim(T)$, since the latter contains a T -orbit of dimension $\dim(T)$.

3.5.3. *The invariant for the smooth points.* If $p \in Y$ is a smooth point and $Y = V(u_1, \dots, u_k)$ is of codimension k and transversal with E then by the induction we see that $\mathcal{J} = \mathcal{I}_Y = (u_1, \dots, u_k)$ is maximal admissible center at p , with $\text{inv}_{p,E}(\mathcal{I}) = (1, \dots, 1)$. Conversely, if $\text{inv}_{p,E}(\mathcal{I}) = (1, \dots, 1)$ then $\text{ord}_{p,E}(\mathcal{I}) = 1$, and there is a local parameter $u = x_1 \in \mathcal{I}$ which is a free maximal contact. Moreover $\mathcal{C}(\mathcal{I}) = \mathcal{I}$. Then $\text{inv}_{p,E}(\mathcal{I}) = (1, \text{inv}_{p,E|H}(\mathcal{I}|_H))$, which, by the inductive argument, gives that $V(\mathcal{I}) = V(\mathcal{I}|_H)$ is smooth of codimension $k - 1$ in H and k in X . Moreover, by the construction $\mathcal{J} = \mathcal{I}_Y = (u_1, \dots, u_k)$ is generated by free coordinates and is compatible with E . This concludes the proof of Proposition 3.1.6.

3.5.4. *Functoriality of the invariant.*

Lemma 3.5.5. *The invariant $\text{inv}_{p,E}(\mathcal{I})$ and the maximal \mathcal{I} -admissible \mathbb{Q} -ideal \mathcal{J} at a point p is functorial for smooth morphisms, field extensions, and group actions.*

Functoriality of $\text{inv}_{p,E}(\mathcal{I})$ and the maximal admissible \mathbb{Q} -ideal \mathcal{J} at p follows from the functoriality of $\mathcal{D}_X^i(\mathcal{I})$. It implies functoriality of the Rees algebras, coefficient ideals and of maximal contacts and follows by the induction on dimension.

3.6. **Controlled and strict transforms under the cobordant blow-ups.**

3.6.1. *Reduced centers.* We associate with any center

$$\mathcal{J} = ((x_1^{a_1}, \dots, x_k^{a_k}) = (x_1^{1/w_1}, \dots, x_k^{1/w_k})^{a_1 w_1},$$

with $\text{inv}(\mathcal{J}) = (b_1, \dots, b_n)$, which is admissible for \mathcal{I} its reduction

$\overline{\mathcal{J}} = (x_1^{1/w_1}, \dots, x_k^{1/w_k})$ (as in Section 3.1.4). Let $B_{\overline{\mathcal{J}}} = B \rightarrow X$ be a full cobordant blow-up of $\overline{\mathcal{J}}$.

3.6.2. *Admissibility revisited.* By Lemma 3.2.3, the condition that \mathcal{J} with $\text{ord}_E(\mathcal{J}) = b_1$, is admissible for \mathcal{I} , implies that the normalized center $\mathcal{J}^{1/a_1} = \overline{\mathcal{J}}^{w_1}$ is admissible for (\mathcal{I}, b_1) .

Moreover, by Lemma 3.2.6, $\mathcal{D}_X^i(\mathcal{I}) \subset (\overline{\mathcal{J}}^{(a_1-i)w_1})_X$ and since

$$V(\mathcal{J}) \subset \text{supp}(\mathcal{I}, b_1) = \text{supp}(D_X^i \mathcal{I}, b_1 - i)$$

we conclude that $\overline{\mathcal{J}}^{w_1}$ is admissible for $(\mathcal{D}_X^i(\mathcal{I}), b_1 - i)$.

On the other hand, by Lemma 2.1.18, we write the condition $\mathcal{I} \subseteq (\overline{\mathcal{J}}^{a_1 w_1})_X$ as

$$\mathcal{I} \cdot t^{a_1 w_1} \subseteq (((x_1^{1/w_1}, \dots, x_k^{1/w_k}) \cdot t)^{a_1 w_1})_X \subset \mathcal{O}_B = \mathcal{O}_X[t^{-1}, x_1 t^{w_1}, \dots, x_k t^{w_k}]$$

More generally we have

$$\mathcal{O}_X[D^i \mathcal{I} \cdot t^{(a_1-i)w_1}] \subseteq \mathcal{O}_X[t^{-1}, x_1 t^{w_1}, \dots, x_k t^{w_k}]$$

3.6.3. *Controlled transforms.* By Lemma 2.2.12, the exceptional divisor on B_+ , which is the inverse image of $\overline{\mathcal{J}}$ is given by t^{-1} , which is a local parameter on B .

By the above, if $\overline{\mathcal{J}}^{w_1}$ is admissible for (\mathcal{I}, b_1) then the inverse image $\mathcal{O}_B \cdot \mathcal{I}$ is divisible by $t^{-a_1 w_1}$ since $t^{a_1 w_1} \cdot \mathcal{O}_B \cdot \mathcal{I} = \mathcal{O}_B \cdot t^{a_1 w_1} \cdot \mathcal{I} \subset \mathcal{O}_B$.

So, if $B \rightarrow X$ is the full cobordant blow-up at $\overline{\mathcal{J}}$, where $\overline{\mathcal{J}}^{w_1}$ is admissible for (\mathcal{I}, b_1) , then we define the *controlled transform* of (\mathcal{I}, b_1) , to be

$$\sigma_{\mathcal{J}}^c(\mathcal{I}, b_1) = \sigma^c(\mathcal{I}, b_1) = \sigma^c(\mathcal{I}, a_1) := \mathcal{O}_B \cdot t^{a_1 w_1} \cdot \mathcal{I}.$$

3.6.4. *Derivations on cobordant blow-up.* Denote by \mathcal{D}_X be the sheaf of derivations on X over k . The sheaf \mathcal{D}_X is a coherent \mathcal{O}_X -module locally generated by the derivations D_{x_i} . The derivations in \mathcal{D}_X can be extended uniquely to the derivations on the trivial cobordant blow-up $B_- = X \times T$, and can be thought as derivations of $k(B)$. One can express derivations $D_{x'_i}$ on B as $D_{x'_i} = t^{-w_i} D_{x_i}$, and $D_{x'_j} = D_{x_j}$. We define the *controlled transform* of \mathcal{D}_X to be the subsheaf

$$\sigma^c(\mathcal{D}_X) := t^{-w_1} \mathcal{O}_B \cdot \mathcal{D}_X \subset \mathcal{D}_B$$

of the sheaf \mathcal{D}_B of the derivations on B .

3.6.5. *Controlled transforms for the derivations of ideals.* Similarly, we get classical inclusions

$$\sigma_c(\mathcal{D}^i(\mathcal{I}, b_1 - i)) = \mathcal{O}_B \cdot t^{(a_1-i)w_1} \mathcal{D}^i(\mathcal{I}) = \mathcal{O}_B \cdot t^{-i w_1} \mathcal{D}^i(t^{a_1 w_1} \cdot \mathcal{I}) \subseteq \mathcal{O}_B \cdot \mathcal{D}_B^i(\sigma_c(\mathcal{I}, b_1)).$$

3.6.6. *Strict transforms.* We define the *strict transform* $\sigma^s(\mathcal{I})$ of an ideal \mathcal{I} on X under a full cobordant blow-up $\sigma : B \rightarrow X$ of $\overline{\mathcal{J}}$ on X to be the schematic closure of $(\mathcal{O}_B \cdot \mathcal{I}_X)|_{B_-} = \mathcal{O}_{B_-} \cdot \mathcal{I}_X$. Note that $B_- = X \times \mathbb{G}_m \rightarrow X$ is trivial over X . Then

$$\sigma^s(\mathcal{I}) := \{f \in \mathcal{O}_B \mid t^{-a}f \in \mathcal{O}_B \cdot \mathcal{I}_Y, \quad a \geq 0\}.$$

This implies that $\sigma^c(\mathcal{I}, a_1) \subseteq \sigma^s(\mathcal{I})$, and thus $\text{inv}_{p,E}(\sigma^c(\mathcal{I}, a_1)) \geq \text{inv}_{p,E}(\sigma^s(\mathcal{I}))$ for any $p \in B$.

Remark 3.6.7. For the cobordant blow-up $\sigma_+ : B_+ \rightarrow X$ the induced strict transform coincides with the standard definition $\sigma_+^s(\mathcal{I})$ as the schematic closure on B_+ of $\mathcal{O}_{\sigma_+^{-1}(X \setminus V(\mathcal{J}))} \cdot \mathcal{I}|_{X \setminus V(\mathcal{J})} = (\mathcal{O}_B \cdot \mathcal{I})|_{B_+ \cap B_-}$.

3.7. **Controlled transforms of marked ideals of maximal order.** We assume that (\mathcal{I}, b_1) is of maximal order and $\overline{\mathcal{J}} = (x_1^{1/w_1}, \dots, x_k^{1/w_k})$ be a reduced center and $\overline{\mathcal{J}}^{w_1}$ be admissible for (\mathcal{I}, b_1) . Let $B \rightarrow X$ be a full cobordant blow-up of $\overline{\mathcal{J}}$.

3.7.1. *Decrease of the order of controlled transforms.* If $\text{maxord}_{X,E}(\mathcal{I}) = a_1$ then, by Lemma 2.3.17, $\mathcal{D}_{x_1} \mathcal{D}_X^{a_1-1}(\mathcal{I}) = 1$ for a free unknown x_1 . Then, by Section 3.6.4, $\sigma^c(\mathcal{D}_{x_1}) = \mathcal{D}_{x'_1}$ for $x'_1 = x_1 t^{w_1}$.

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{D}_{x'_1} \mathcal{D}_B^{a_1-1}(\sigma^c(\mathcal{I}, a_1)) &\supseteq \sigma^c(\mathcal{D}_{x_1} \mathcal{D}_X^{a_1-1})(\sigma^c(\mathcal{I}, a_1)) = \\ &\mathcal{O}_B \cdot t^{-a_1 w_1} \mathcal{D}_{x_1} \mathcal{D}_X^{a_1-1} t^{a_1 w_1}(\mathcal{I}) = \mathcal{O}_B \cdot \mathcal{D}_{x_1} \mathcal{D}_X^{a_1-1}(\mathcal{I}) = (1). \end{aligned}$$

So, by Lemma 2.3.17, $\text{maxord}_{B,E'}(\sigma^c(\mathcal{I}, a_1)) \leq a_1$ where E' is either the strict or the total transform of E .

If $\text{maxord}_{X,E}(\mathcal{I}) = a_{1+}$ then, by Lemma 2.3.17, $\mathcal{D}_X^{a_1}(\mathcal{I}) = (1)$. For the controlled transforms we have

$$\mathcal{D}_B^{a_1}(\sigma^c(\mathcal{I}, a_{1+})) \supseteq \sigma^c(\mathcal{D}_X)^{a_1}(\sigma^c(\mathcal{I}, a_{1+})) = t^{-a_1 w_1} \mathcal{D}_X^a t^{a_1 w_1}(\mathcal{I}) = \mathcal{D}_X^{a_1}(\mathcal{I}) = (1).$$

This shows that $\text{maxord}_{B,E}(\sigma^c(\mathcal{I}, a_{1+})) \leq a_{1+}$. Combining both results yields

$$\text{maxord}_{B,E'}(\sigma^c(\mathcal{I}, a_1)) \leq \text{maxord}_{X,E}(\mathcal{I}).$$

3.7.2. *Subvarieties of maximal contact.* Free maximal contact, and divisorial maximal contact transform well under cobordant blow-ups associated with admissible centers of maximal order.

If $\text{maxord}_{X,E}(\mathcal{I}) = a_1$ then a maximal contact $u \in \mathcal{D}_X^{a_1-1}(\mathcal{I})$ of (\mathcal{I}, a_1) , can be used as the first coordinate $u = x_1$ of \mathcal{I} -admissible $\mathcal{J} = (x_1^{a_1}, \dots, x_k^{a_k})$ of maximal order. Thus the controlled transform of $(u, 1) = (x_1, 1)$ for $B_{\overline{\mathcal{J}}} \rightarrow X$ is equal to

$$x'_1 := \sigma^c(x_1, 1) = t^{w_1} x_1 \in t^{w_1} \mathcal{D}_X^{a_1-1}(\mathcal{I}) \subseteq \sigma^c(\mathcal{D}_X^{a_1-1})(\sigma^c(\mathcal{I}, a_1)) \subset \mathcal{D}_B^{a_1-1} \sigma^c(\mathcal{I}, a_1),$$

and is a maximal contact for $(\sigma^c(\mathcal{I}, a_1))$ on B .

If $\text{maxord}_X(\mathcal{I}) = a_{1+}$, then again \mathcal{I} -admissible center \mathcal{J} of maximal order has a form $\mathcal{J} = (x_1^{a_1}, \dots, x_r^{a_r}, x_{r+1}^{a_{r+1}}, \dots, x_k)$ where $\overline{u} = (x_1, \dots, x_r)$ is a divisorial maximal contact, and $a_1 = \dots = a_r$. Then the controlled transform of $(\overline{u}, 1)$ for $B_{\overline{\mathcal{J}}} \rightarrow X$ is equal to

$$(u') := \sigma^c(u, 1) = t^{w_1} u \in t^{w_1} \mathcal{D}_X^{a_1-1}(\mathcal{I}) \subseteq \sigma^c(\mathcal{D}_X^{a_1-1})(\sigma^c(\mathcal{I}, a_1)) \subset \mathcal{D}_B^{a_1-1} \sigma^c(\mathcal{I}, a_1),$$

and is a divisorial maximal contact for $(\sigma^c(\mathcal{I}, a_{1+}))$ on B .

In both cases we call $H := V(u)$ the *subvariety of maximal contact*, and denote its strict transform by $H' := V(u')$. Then H and H' are the smooth subvarieties of codimension $\text{codim}(H) = r = 1$ if $\text{maxord}_X(\mathcal{I}) = a_1$, and of codimension $\text{codim}(H) = r$ if $\text{maxord}_X(\mathcal{I}) = a_{1+}$.

3.7.3. *Controlled transform of Rees algebras.* Combining the above we obtain the inclusion of Rees algebras:

$$\sigma^c(\mathcal{R}(\mathcal{I}, b_1)) = \bigoplus \sigma^c(\mathcal{R}_i, i) \subseteq \bigoplus \mathcal{R}_B(\sigma^c(\mathcal{I}, b_1) \subseteq \mathcal{R}_B(\sigma^s(\mathcal{I}), b_1))$$

In particular for the coefficient ideals we have

Lemma 3.7.4. $\sigma^c(\mathcal{C}(I, b_1), a_1!) \subseteq \mathcal{C}(\sigma^c(\mathcal{I}, b_1)) \subseteq \mathcal{C}(\sigma^s(\mathcal{I}), b_1)$. ♣

3.7.5. *Restriction of cobordant blow-up.* Let

$$\sigma : B = \text{Spec}(\mathcal{O}_X[t^{-1}, t^{w_1}x_1, \dots, t^{w_k}x_k]) \rightarrow X$$

be the full cobordant blow-up of $\overline{\mathcal{J}} = (x_1^{1/w_1}, \dots, x_k^{1/w_k})$, and $H = V(u)$ be a subvariety of maximal contact for (\mathcal{I}, b_1) . Then the restriction $\sigma|_{H'}$ of σ respectively to $H' := V(t^{w_1}u)$ determines a full cobordant blow-up

$$H' = \text{Spec}(\mathcal{O}_H[t^{-1}, t^{w_{r+1}}x_{r+1}, \dots, t^{w_k}x_k]) \rightarrow H.$$

of $\overline{\mathcal{J}}_H = (x_{r+1}^{1/w_{r+1}}, \dots, x_k^{1/w_k})$ on H . Note that $\overline{\mathcal{J}}_H$ is a reduction of \mathcal{J}_H which is usually not minimal, even if $\overline{\mathcal{J}}$ is minimal reduced. Moreover we have:

Lemma 3.7.6. *If $\overline{\mathcal{J}}^{w_1}$ is admissible for (\mathcal{I}, b_1) , of maximal order and H be a subvariety of maximal contact then $\overline{\mathcal{J}}_H^{w_1}$ is admissible for (\mathcal{I}_H, b_1) , and*

$$\sigma^c_{|H'}(\mathcal{I}_H, b_1) = \sigma^c(\mathcal{I}, b_1)|_{H'}$$

♣

3.8. **The maximal centers on X .** The following proposition extends the results from [ATW19, Section 6.1] to the setting of SNC divisors and cobordant blow-ups.

Proposition 3.8.1. *For any smooth X with an SNC divisor E and an ideal \mathcal{I} on X we set*

$$\text{maxinv}_{X,E}(\mathcal{I}) := \max\{\text{inv}_{p,E}(\mathcal{I}) \mid p \in X\} = (b_1, \dots, b_k).$$

Let $\text{Maxinv}_{X,E}(\mathcal{I})$ be the set of the points where $\text{inv}_{p,E}(\mathcal{I}) = \text{maxinv}_{X,E}(\mathcal{I})$. Then

- (1) *There exists a unique maximal \mathcal{I} -admissible center $\mathcal{J} = \mathcal{J}(\mathcal{I})$ for all $p \in V(\mathcal{J}) = \text{Maxinv}_{X,E}(\mathcal{I})$ locally described as $\mathcal{J} = ((x_1^{a_1}, \dots, x_k^{a_k})$ with $\text{inv}(\mathcal{J}) = \text{maxinv}_{X,E}(\mathcal{I})$.*
- (2) *If $B_+ \rightarrow X$ is a cobordant blowup at the reduction $\overline{\mathcal{J}} = (x_1^{1/w_1}, \dots, x_k^{1/w_k})$ of the maximal \mathcal{I} -admissible center $\mathcal{J} = \mathcal{J}(\mathcal{I})$ compatible with E , then $\text{maxinv}_{B,E'}(\mathcal{I}', E') < \text{maxinv}_{X,E}(\mathcal{I}, E)$, where \mathcal{I}' is either the controlled or strict transform of \mathcal{I} and E' is either the total or the strict transform of E .*
- (3) *If $B \rightarrow X$ is a full cobordant blowup at $\overline{\mathcal{J}}$ then*

$$\begin{aligned} \text{maxinv}_{B,E'}(\mathcal{I}') &= \text{maxinv}_{X,E}(\mathcal{I}) \\ \text{Maxinv}_{B,E'}(\mathcal{I}') &= B \setminus B_+ = V(\mathcal{J}(\mathcal{I}')), \end{aligned}$$

where $\mathcal{J}(\mathcal{I}')$ is the maximal admissible center on B for \mathcal{I}' compatible with E' with

$$\text{inv}(\mathcal{J}(\mathcal{I}')) = \text{maxinv}_{B,E'}(\mathcal{I}') = \text{maxinv}_{X,E}(\mathcal{I}),$$

locally described by $((x_1 t^{w_1})^{a_1}, \dots, (x_k t^{w_k})^{a_k})$.

Remark 3.8.2. One of the consequences of the above lemma is that for a suitable center the singularity of $V(\mathcal{I})$ along $\overline{\mathcal{J}}$ is the same as the singularity of the strict transform $V(\sigma^s(\mathcal{I}))$ at $\overline{\mathcal{J}'} \subset B$ for $\overline{\mathcal{J}'} = ((x_1 t^{w_1})^{1/w_1}, \dots, (x_k t^{w_k})^{1/w_k})$. This observation is extended in different contexts and any characteristic in Section 5.

3.8.3. *Construction of $\mathcal{J}(\mathcal{I})$.* By the properties of the invariant "inv" the center $\mathcal{J}(\mathcal{I})$ is defined uniquely at any point $p \in \text{Maxinv}_{X,E}(\mathcal{I})$, as the maximal \mathcal{I} -admissible center \mathcal{J} at p . Moreover, by Section 3.5.1, if \mathcal{J} is maximal \mathcal{I} -admissible center \mathcal{J} at p then it is also maximal \mathcal{I} -admissible center in a neighborhood of p for all points $q \in V(\mathcal{J})$. Then, by uniqueness, there is $\mathcal{J} = \mathcal{J}(\mathcal{I})$ which is maximal \mathcal{I} -admissible center at any $p \in \text{Maxinv}_{X,E}(\mathcal{I}) = V(\mathcal{J})$, and with $\text{inv}(\mathcal{J}) = \text{maxinv}_{X,E}(\mathcal{I})$.

3.8.4. *Decrease of the order.* By Section 3.7.1, the maximal order of the controlled transform $\sigma_{\mathcal{J}}^c(I, a_1) = \mathcal{O}_B \cdot t^{a_1 w_1} \cdot \mathcal{I}$, and of the strict transform does not increase.

3.8.5. *Restriction of $\mathcal{J} = \mathcal{J}(\mathcal{I})$ to the hypersurface of maximal contact.*

Let $\text{maxord}_{X,E}(\mathcal{I}) = b_1$. Let $p \in \text{Maxinv}(\mathcal{I})$, and H be the subvariety of maximal contact at p . Then, by Lemmas 3.3.2 and 3.4.3, $\text{Maxinv}(\mathcal{I}) \subseteq \text{supp}(\mathcal{I}, b_1) \subseteq H$.

Thus, if $p \in X \setminus \text{supp}(\mathcal{I}, b_1)$ then $\text{ord}_{p,E}(\mathcal{I}) < b_1$. If $p \in \text{supp}(\mathcal{I}, b_1)$ then $p \in H$ we use the inductive formula

$$(2) \quad \text{inv}_{p,E}(\mathcal{I}) = (\text{ord}_{p,E}(\mathcal{I}), \dots, \text{ord}_{p,E}(\mathcal{I}), \frac{1}{(a_1 - 1)!} \text{inv}_{p,E}(\mathcal{C}(I)|_H)),$$

where $\text{ord}_{p,E}(\mathcal{I}) = b_1$ is repeated $r = \text{codim}(H)$ times.

This identifies the loci

$$\text{Maxinv}_{X,E}(\mathcal{I}) = \text{Maxinv}_{H,E|_H}(\mathcal{C}(I)|_H)$$

in a neighborhood of p .

3.8.6. *Decrease of the invariant.* Assume that $H = V(u)$ is a subvariety of maximal contact of codimension r , as in Section 3.7.2 and let $H' = V(u') = V(t^{w_1}u)$ on B and $H'_+ = V(u')$ on B_+ . Using Section 3.7.5 and induction on the dimension for the ideal $(\mathcal{C}(I, b_1)|_H)$, as in [ATW19, Section 6.1] we get

$$(3) \quad \text{maxinv}_{H,E|_H}(\mathcal{C}(I, b_1)|_H) > \text{maxinv}_{H'_+,E'|_{H'_+}}(\sigma_{H'}^c(\mathcal{C}(I, b_1)|_{H'}))$$

$$(4) \quad \text{maxinv}_{H,E|_H}(\mathcal{C}(I, b_1)|_H) \geq \text{maxinv}_{H',E'|_{H'}}(\sigma_{H'}^c(\mathcal{C}(I, b_1)|_{H'}))$$

Here E' is either the total or the strict transform of E . Now, by Lemma 3.7.4,

$$\sigma_{H'}^c(\mathcal{C}(I, b_1)|_{H'}) = (\sigma^c(\mathcal{C}(I, b_1))|_{H'}) \subseteq C(\sigma^c((I, b_1)))|_{H'}, \quad \text{and}$$

$$(5) \quad \text{maxinv}_{H'_+,E'|_{H'_+}}(\sigma_{H'}^c(\mathcal{C}(I, b_1)|_{H'})) \geq \text{maxinv}_{H'_+,E'|_{H'_+}}(C(\sigma^c((I, b_1)))|_{H'_+})$$

$$(6) \quad \text{maxinv}_{H',E'|_{H'}}(\sigma_{H'}^c(\mathcal{C}(I, b_1)|_{H'})) \geq \text{maxinv}_{H',E'|_{H'}}(C(\sigma^c((I, b_1)))|_{H'})$$

The marked ideal $\sigma^c(\mathcal{I}, b_1)$ is of maximal order and H' is the subvariety of maximal contact $\sigma^c(\mathcal{I}, b_1)$. Then $\text{supp}(\sigma^c(\mathcal{I}, b_1)) \subset H'$, and $\text{ord}_{p,E}(\sigma^c(\mathcal{I}, b_1)) < b_1$ for $p \notin \text{supp}(\sigma^c(\mathcal{I}, b_1))$. Thus we conclude, by (2), (3), (4), (5), (6) that

$$\text{maxinv}_{X,E}(\mathcal{I}) > \text{maxinv}_{B_+}(\sigma^c((I, b_1))), \quad \text{maxinv}_{X,E}(\mathcal{I}) \geq \text{maxinv}_B(\sigma^c((I, b_1))).$$

Moreover the locus of the points p of B , where the invariant $\text{inv}_{p,E'}(\sigma^c(I, b_1))$ is equal to $\text{maxinv}_{X,E}(\mathcal{I})$, is contained in $B \setminus B_+$. On the other hand we see directly that for dummy unknown T over B there is the inclusion

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma^c(\mathcal{I}, b_1) \cdot T^{a_1 w_1} &= \mathcal{O}_B \mathcal{I} \cdot t^{a_1 w_1} T^{a_1 w_1} \subseteq \mathcal{O}_B [t^{-1} T^{-1}, x_1 t^{w_1} T^{w_1}, \dots, x_k t^{w_k} T^{w_k}] \subseteq \\ &\mathcal{O}_B [T^{-1}, x_1 t^{w_1} T^{w_1}, \dots, x_k t^{w_k} T^{w_k}], \end{aligned}$$

which is equivalent, by Section 3.6.2, to

$$\sigma^c(\mathcal{I}, b_1) \subseteq (x_1 t^{w_1})^{a_1}, \dots, (x_k t^{w_k})^{a_k} \Big|_B = ((x'_1)^{a_1}, \dots, (x'_k)^{a_k}) \Big|_B.$$

This means that $\mathcal{J}' := ((x'_1)^{a_1}, \dots, (x'_k)^{a_k})$, with $\text{inv}(\mathcal{J}') = (b_1, \dots, b_k)$, is a maximal $\sigma^c(\mathcal{I}, b_1)$ -admissible center, and $\text{inv}_{p,E}(\sigma^c(\mathcal{I}, b_1))$ attains its maximum (b_1, \dots, b_k) on $V(x'_1, \dots, x'_k) = B \setminus B_+$. Moreover the above inclusion is valid when replacing $\sigma^c(\mathcal{I}, b_1)$ with the strict transform of \mathcal{I} :

$$\sigma^s(\mathcal{I}) = \{f \in \mathcal{O}_B \mid t^{-af} \in \sigma^c(\mathcal{I}, a_1) \text{ for some } a\}.$$

This concludes the proof of Proposition 3.8.1. ♣

3.9. The algorithm.

3.9.1. *The dcc condition.* By the inductive formula (2), the set of values of $\text{maxinv}_{X,E}(\mathcal{I})$ in the resolution algorithm satisfies the descending chain condition, and the procedure of decreasing $\text{maxinv}_{X,E}(\mathcal{I})$ stabilizes, and thus it is finite.

3.9.2. *Principalization.* We run the algorithm using cobordant blow-ups at the minimal reduced centers $\overline{\mathcal{J}}$ (as in Definition 3.1.4) associated with maximal \mathcal{I} -admissible centers $\mathcal{J}(\mathcal{I})$ on X compatible with E (Section 3.1.4, and Proposition 3.8.1). We use the controlled transforms of ideals. Each such a blow-up lowers $\text{maxinv}_{X,E}(\mathcal{I}, E)$. The process is continued until the maximum value of inv of the controlled transform of \mathcal{I} drops to zero.

In such a case the controlled transform of \mathcal{I} becomes \mathcal{O}_X and the inverse image $\mathcal{O}_X \cdot \mathcal{I}$, by Lemma 2.3.6, is locally the product of divisorial coordinates. This proves Theorem 1.1.2. Each consecutive cobordant blow-up $X_{i+1} \rightarrow X_i$ will create inductively a scheme X_{i+1} with action of $T_{i+1} = T_i \times G_m$. Since all the constructions are canonical and functorial for smooth morphisms the centers and subscheme $Y_i \subset X_i$ are automatically T_i -stable. Moreover by Lemma 6.2.1, each X_i admits a geometric quotient and the action has finite stabilizers.

On the level of the geometric quotients we obtain the weighted blow-ups. As the result the ideal $\mathcal{I}' := \mathcal{O}_{X'/T} \cdot \mathcal{I}$ is locally principal. Indeed its inverse $\mathcal{O}_{X'} \cdot \mathcal{I}'$ is locally principal and generated, say, by the invariant elements m_1, \dots, m_k in $\mathcal{O}_{X'}^T$. Hence one of these elements, say m_1 generates $\mathcal{O}_{X'} \cdot \mathcal{I}'$. Thus $m_i/m_1 \in \mathcal{O}_{X'}^T = \mathcal{O}_{X'/T}$, which shows that m_1 locally generates \mathcal{I}' .

When considering stack-theoretic quotients X_i/T_i we obtain the principalization of \mathcal{I} by stack-theoretic weighted blow-ups on smooth stacks.

3.9.3. *Embedded desingularization.* In the process of the embedded resolution of $Y \subset X$ we consider the ideal $\mathcal{I} = \mathcal{I}_Y$ of Y on X , and run the algorithm applying the cobordant blow-ups at minimal reductions $\overline{\mathcal{J}}$ associated with maximal \mathcal{I} -admissible \mathbb{Q} -ideals $\mathcal{J} = \mathcal{J}(\mathcal{I})$. In the process we use the strict transforms of the ideal $\mathcal{I} = \mathcal{I}_Y$.

Assume that the codimension of Y in X is k_1 . By Proposition 3.8.1, each cobordant blow-up lowers $\text{maxinv}_{\mathcal{I}}(X)$. Moreover the set of $\text{maxinv}_{\mathcal{I}}(X)$ satisfies dcc, and thus the algorithm is finite. We run the algorithm until we reach $\text{maxinv}_{X,E}(\mathcal{I})$

to be equal to $\text{inv}_{p,E}(\mathcal{I}) = (1, \dots, 1)$ with k_1 -components, where p is a nonsingular point of a component Y_i of the strict transform of Y of the codimension k_1 . This is the value of the invariant at the general position points of the irreducible components of Y of codimension k_1 . In such a case the components Y_i of codimension k_1 are smooth and disjoint from the closure $\overline{(V(\mathcal{I}) \setminus \bigcup Y_i)}$. In order to desingularize the remaining singular components of the strict transform of Y we ignore the smooth components Y_i of codimension k_1 and continue to run the algorithm for $X \setminus \bigcup Y_i$ until $\text{maxinv}_{X,E}(\mathcal{I}) = (1, \dots, 1)$ with k_2 -components, where $k_2 > k_1$ is the codimension of $(V(\mathcal{I}) \setminus \bigcup Y_i)$. We desingularize and separate the components of Y of codimension k_2 . We continue the process ignoring all the components of Y of codimension $\geq k_2$. Repeating the procedure we desingularize all the components of the strict transforms.

One can also use the controlled transforms of ideals instead of the strict transforms. The principle is exactly the same: lowering $\text{maxinv}_{X,E}(\mathcal{I})$ and isolating desingularized components of a given codimension. This way we obtain the smooth subscheme which is the disjoint union of the strict transforms of the irreducible components of Y , and other components created in the process. Since each component corresponds to the invariant $\text{inv}_E(\mathcal{I}) = (1, \dots, 1)$ it is desingularized and will have simple normal crossings with the exceptional divisors. Note that once the components with $\text{inv}_E(\mathcal{I}) = (1, \dots, 1)$ of codimension k are isolated there won't be any new components with this invariant formed in the process.

This proves the existence of the functorial embedded desingularization by the smooth cobordant blow-ups as in Theorem 1.1.3. As a result we obtain a smooth subscheme Y on X , with the torus action. On the level of the geometric quotients we obtain the weighted blow-ups. When considering stack-theoretic quotients X_i/T_i we obtain the resolution by stack-theoretic weighted blow-ups on smooth stacks. When additionally we ignore the exceptional divisors by using the strict transforms of the trivial divisors our procedure on the level of stacks will be identical as the method described in [ATW19, Section 1.2].

3.9.4. Nonembedded resolution. Proposition 3.8.1 implies the existence of canonical embedded resolution. The process of nonembedded resolution is a consequence of the functoriality of embedded resolution.

We associate with a reduced scheme Y of finite type over k or its transforms under cobordant blow-ups a modified invariant $\widetilde{\text{inv}}_p(Y)$ in the following way. Embed Y locally into a smooth scheme X . Any two such embeddings $Y \subset X_1$, and $Y \subset X_2$ into smooth schemes of the same dimension are étale equivalent. If $\dim(X_1) + m = \dim(X_2)$, and $m \geq 0$ then the induced embeddings $Y \subseteq X_1 \subseteq \mathbf{A}_{X_1}^m$ and $Y \subset X_2$ are étale equivalent. Here the embedding $X_1 \subseteq \mathbf{A}_{X_1}^m = \text{Spec}(\mathcal{O}_X[x_1, \dots, x_m])$ is defined by $V(x_1, \dots, x_m)$.

For a closed embedding $Y \subset X$ into a smooth X of dimension n , and $p \in Y$ let $\text{inv}_{p,E}(\mathcal{I}_Y) = (b_1, \dots, b_k)$. We define the invariant $\widetilde{\text{inv}}_p(Y)$ on Y to be the equivalence class of the sequences $(b_1, \dots, b_k)_n$, marked by $n = \dim(X)$ where $\text{inv}_{p,E}(\mathcal{I}_Y) = (b_1, \dots, b_k)$. We consider the equivalence relation generated by

$$(b_1, \dots, b_k)_n \simeq (1, \dots, 1, b_1, \dots, b_k)_{n+m},$$

where m is the number of ones in front of a_1 . One can compare two different equivalence classes lexicographically, as before, by fixing their representative with the same marking n .

By the construction, and the above, this definition is independent of the embeddings. Indeed, for any local embeddings $Y \subset X_1$, $Y \subset X_2$ with $\dim(X_1) + m = \dim(X_2)$ we get by the induction on m that

$$\begin{aligned} \operatorname{inv}_{p,E}(\mathcal{I}_{Y,\mathbf{A}_{X_1}^m}) &= (1, \dots, 1, \operatorname{inv}_{p,E}(C(\mathcal{I}_Y, 1)|_{V(x_1, \dots, x_m)})) = \\ &= (1, \dots, 1, \operatorname{inv}_{p,E}(\mathcal{I}_{Y,\mathbf{A}_{X_1}^m}|_{V(x_1, \dots, x_m)})) = (1, \dots, 1, \operatorname{inv}_{p,E}(\mathcal{I}_{Y,X_1})). \end{aligned}$$

Moreover, by functoriality we have

$$\operatorname{inv}_{p,E}(\mathcal{I}_{Y,X_2}) = \operatorname{inv}_{p,E}(\mathcal{I}_{Y,\mathbf{A}_{X_1}^m}) = (1, \dots, 1, \operatorname{inv}_{p,E}(\mathcal{I}_{Y,X_1})).$$

Thus we can run the embedded algorithm using the centers associated with $\widetilde{\max \operatorname{inv}}$ on Y . It locally corresponds to the center \mathcal{J} associated with $\max \operatorname{inv}(\mathcal{I}_Y)$ for a certain embedding $Y \subset X$. We consider the cobordant blow-up $\sigma : X' \rightarrow X$ and their restriction to the strict transform $\sigma|_{Y'} : Y' \rightarrow Y$. The induced smooth centers on the strict transforms of Y define cobordant blow-ups (Section 6.1). Then by Proposition 3.8.1(2), $\widetilde{\max \operatorname{inv}}$ drops giving a functorial nonembedded resolution. The latter fact can be verified locally where it follows from the functorial embedded resolution in Theorem 1.1.3. This completes the proof of Theorem 1.1.6.

4. EXAMPLES

4.1. Simple isolated singularities in characteristic zero. In the examples below and in Section 5 we show existence of cobordant blow-ups lowering different invariants or cobordant resolutions. As a result of a cobordant resolution we obtain regular or a smooth scheme with torus action which admits geometric quotient. At least in the case of the fields of any characteristic using Corollary 6.2.3, and canonical desingularization of locally toric varieties in [Wlo20, Theorem 7.17.1] one obtains a birational projective resolution with SNC divisor. A possible birational resolution for the schemes in the mixed characteristic in the considered cases would require adaptation of the method developed in [Wlo20] to a more general setting.

Example 4.1.1. This is the main motivating example as it illustrates the invariant in simple terms. The example is generalized in Sections 5.2 and 5.4 in any characteristic in two different ways. Consider the isolated singularity defined by

$$f = x_1^{a_1} + \dots + x_n^{a_n},$$

on $X = \mathbb{A}_k^n = \operatorname{Spec} k[x_1, \dots, x_n]$, where $a_1 \leq \dots \leq a_n$. One can easily show inductively that the maximal admissible valuative \mathbb{Q} -ideal is $(x_1^{a_1}, \dots, x_k^{a_k})$ so that $(x_1^{a_1} + \dots + x_n^{a_n})_p \subseteq (x_1^{a_1}, \dots, x_k^{a_k})_{X,p}$, and the invariant $\operatorname{inv}_0(f) = (a_1, \dots, a_n)$. We will compute it using the algorithm. To simplify computations we will use the coefficient ideal in the graded form generated by $D_{u_i^i}(f)|_{V(u_1)} t^{a_1-i}$ as in Lemma 3.3.8. Moreover in the process we can think of the elements $D_{u_i^i}(f)|_{V(u_1)}$ of the coefficient ideal as the ones living in the completion $\widehat{\mathcal{O}_X}$ of \mathcal{O}_X the along the subscheme $V(u_1)$ or in an étale neighborhood of X . The first maximal contact is $x_1 \in \mathcal{D}^{a_1-1}(f)$ and the coefficient ideal lifted to X is given by

$$\mathcal{O}_X[x_1 t, (x_2^{a_2} + \dots + x_n^{a_n}) t^{a_1}].$$

Rescaling gives

$$\mathcal{O}_X[x_1 t^{a_2/a_1}, (x_2^{a_2} + \dots + x_n^{a_n}) t^{a_2}].$$

The next maximal contact is $x_2 = \frac{1}{a_2!} \mathcal{D}_{x_2}^{a_2-1}((x_2^{a_2} + \dots + x_n^{a_n}))$ and the corresponding coefficient ideal with respect to x_2 , lifted to X is

$$\mathcal{O}_X[x_1 t^{a_2/a_1}, x_2 t, (x_3^{a_3} + \dots + x_n^{a_n}) t^{a_2}].$$

Again rescaling gives $\mathcal{O}_X[x_1 t^{a_3/a_1}, x_2 t^{a_3/a_2}, (x_3^{a_3} + \dots + x_n^{a_n}) t^{a_3}]$. Repeating the process and proceeding by induction we obtain finally the algebra

$$\mathcal{O}_X[x_1 t^{a_n/a_1}, x_2 t^{a_n/a_2}, x_3 t^{a_n/a_3}, \dots, x_n t],$$

which shall be rescaled to

$$\mathcal{O}_X[x_1 t^{w_1}, x_2 t^{w_2}, x_3 t^{w_3}, \dots, x_n t^{w_n}]$$

containing $f \cdot t^{a_1 w_1}$ with w_i coprime integral with $w_1 a_1 = w_2 a_2 = \dots = w_n a_n$. The latter corresponds to the maximal (f)-admissible center $(x_1^{a_1}, \dots, x_n^{a_n}) := (x_1^{1/w_1}, \dots, x_n^{1/w_n})^{a_1 w_1}$ at the origin 0, where $a_1 = \text{ord}_0(f)$. This implies that $\text{inv}_0(f) = (a_1, \dots, a_n)$. The full cobordant blow-up B at $\overline{\mathcal{F}} = (x_1^{1/w_1}, \dots, x_n^{1/w_n})$ is an affine space with coordinates t^{-1} and $x'_i = x_i t^{w_i}$. Solving for x_i and substituting into f gives

$$t^{-a_1 w_1} ((x'_1)^{a_1} + \dots + (x'_n)^{a_n}).$$

After clearing the exceptional divisor we obtain the formula for $f' = t^{a_1 w_1} f$ in the new unknowns x'_1, \dots, x'_n on B which is identical to the original formula for f on X . Thus the singularity locus on B is given by $V(x'_1, \dots, x'_n)$, and the cobordant blow-up $B_+ = B \setminus V(x'_1, \dots, x'_n)$ is smooth.

4.2. Invariants on schemes with divisorial structure.

Example 4.2.1. Let $f = (x_1 + x_2^2)^2 + x_3^7$, where x_1, x_2 are divisorial at the origin at x_3 is free. Using Lemma 2.3.17, and computing $D(f) = ((x_1 + x_2^2), x_3^6)$ and $D^2(f) = \mathcal{O}_X$ will give us that $D_{x_3}(D(f)) = ((x_1 + x_2^2), x_3^6)$ does not vanish at 0 and thus the SNC-order of f is $\text{ord}_{0,E}(f) = 2_+$. Then taking derivations with respect to the divisorial unknowns we see that $D_{x_1}(D(f))$ is invertible and $D_{x_2}(D(f))$ is not. So the maximal contact is $\overline{u} = (x_1)$. We form the coefficient in the graded form defined by D_{x_i} on $V(x_1)$ and lifted to X

$$\mathcal{O}_X[x_1 t, (x_1 + x_2^2) t, ((x_1 + x_2^2)^2 + x_3^7) t^2] = \mathcal{O}_X[x_1 t, x_2^2 t, x_3^7 t^2]$$

By rescaling $t \mapsto t^2$ we obtain $\mathcal{O}_X[x_1 t^2, x_2^2 t^2, x_3^7 t^4]$ of maximal order 2_+ on $V(x_1)$. The divisorial maximal contact is x_2 . This gives the coefficient ideal

$$\mathcal{O}_X[x_1 t^2, x_2 t, x_3^7 t^4].$$

After rescaling $t \mapsto t^{7/4}$ we get

$$\mathcal{O}_X[x_1 t^{7/2}, x_2 t^{7/4}, x_3^7 t^7],$$

which admits the maximal contact x_3 on $V(x_1, x_2)$, and the algebra

$$\mathcal{O}_X[x_1 t^{7/2}, x_2 t^{7/4}, x_3 t]$$

The latter corresponds to the algebra with integral weights

$$\mathcal{O}_X[x_1 t^{14}, x_2 t^7, x_3 t^4]$$

It defines the cobordant blow-up $B = \mathcal{O}_X[t^{-1}, x_1 t^{14}, x_2 t^7, x_3 t^4]$ at

$\overline{\mathcal{F}} = (x_1^{1/14}, x_2^{1/7}, x_3^{1/4})$. Since $\text{ord}_0(f) = 2_+$, we obtain $b_1 = 2_+$, and $a_1 = 2$. So

$$\mathcal{J} = \overline{\mathcal{F}}^{a_1 w_1} = (x_1^{1/14}, x_2^{1/7}, x_3^{1/4})^{28} = (x_1^2, x_2^4, x_3^7).$$

Since x_1, x_2 are divisorial, and x_3 is free, we have $\text{inv}_{0,E}(f) = \text{inv}(\mathcal{J}) = (2_+, 4_+, 7)$. The effect of the cobordant blow-up is exactly

$$f = t^{-28}((x'_1 + (x'_2)^2)^2 + (x'_3)^7).$$

On $B \setminus V(x'_1, x'_2)$ we write the equation $f' := t^{28}f$ as $f' = u^2 + (x'_3)^7$, where

$$u := 1/2\mathcal{D}_{x'_1}((x'_1 + (x'_2)^2)^2 + (x'_3)^7) = x'_1 + (x'_2)^2$$

is a free maximal contact. The maximal (f') -admissible ideal is $\mathcal{J}' = (u^2, (x'_3)^7)$ with the invariant $\text{inv}(\mathcal{J}') = (2, 7) < \text{inv}(\mathcal{J}) = (2_+, 4_+, 7)$. On $B \setminus V(x'_3)$, the derivative $\frac{1}{7}\mathcal{D}_{x'_3}(x'_1 + (x'_2)^2)^2 + (x'_3)^7 = (x'_3)^6$ is invertible and f' is nonsingular.

The next cobordant blow-up at $\mathcal{J}' = (u^2, (x'_3)^7)$ resolves the singularity.

In case there no divisors on X the process is faster as we can write immediately $f = u^2 + x_3^7$, where $u = x_1 + x_2^2$. So $\text{maxinv}(f) = (2, 7)$, and by the previous example, $\mathcal{J} = (u^2, x_3^7)$ is the maximal admissible center. The cobordant blow-up of $\overline{\mathcal{J}} = (u^{1/7}, x_3^{1/2})$ resolves the singularity.

5. FREE CHARACTERISTIC RESOLUTION OF ALMOST HOMOGENOUS SINGULARITIES

5.1. The weighted normal bundles to the centers.

5.1.1. *Weighted normal bundle.* Let X be a regular scheme. One can associate with any center \mathcal{J} on X locally written as $\mathcal{J} = (u_1^{1/w_1}, \dots, u_k^{1/w_k})$ the filtration $\{(\mathcal{J}^a)_X\}_{a \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}}$ of \mathcal{O}_X , the algebra $\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{J}} = \bigoplus_{a \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}} \mathcal{J}_X^a t^a \subset \mathcal{O}_X[t]$, where t is a dummy variable as in Lemma 2.1.18, and the associated gradation

$$\text{gr}_{\mathcal{J}}(\mathcal{O}_X) = \bigoplus_{a \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}} ((\mathcal{J}^a)_X / (\mathcal{J}^{a+1})_X) t^a = \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{J}} / (\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{J}} \cap t^{-1} \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{J}}).$$

Then $\text{gr}_{\mathcal{J}}(\mathcal{O}_X)$ is a sheaf of graded $\mathcal{O}_X/\mathcal{J}_X = \mathcal{O}_{V(\mathcal{J})}$ -modules on $V(\mathcal{J})$, which is locally on X , isomorphic to the graded ring

$$\text{gr}_{\mathcal{J}}(\mathcal{O}_X) = \mathcal{O}_{V(\mathcal{J})}[u_1 t^{w_1}, \dots, u_k t^{w_k}],$$

where u_i is in w_i gradation. We shall denote the corresponding scheme of the *weighted normal bundle* as

$$N_{\mathcal{J}}(X) := \text{Spec}(\text{gr}_{\mathcal{J}}(\mathcal{O}_X)).$$

5.1.2. *The ideal of the initial forms.* With any function $f \in \mathcal{O}_{X,p}$, regular at $p \in V(\mathcal{J})$, such that $f \in ((\mathcal{J}^a)_X \setminus (\mathcal{J}^{a+1})_X)$, for a certain $a \in \mathbb{N}$ one can associate the unique homogenous element- the initial form

$$\text{in}(f) \in ((\mathcal{J}^a)_X / (\mathcal{J}^{a+1})_X) t^a \subset \text{gr}_{\mathcal{J}}(\mathcal{O}_X).$$

Similarly we associate with an ideal sheaf \mathcal{I} , the filtration $\mathcal{I}_a := \mathcal{I} \cap (\mathcal{J}^a)_X$, where $a \in \mathbb{N}$, and its ideal of the initial forms on $N_{\mathcal{J}}(X)$:

$$\text{in}(\mathcal{I}) = \bigoplus_{a \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}} (\mathcal{I}_a / (\mathcal{I}_{a+1})_X) = \bigoplus_{a \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}} (\mathcal{I}_a + (\mathcal{J}^{a+1})_X) / (\mathcal{J}^{a+1})_X \subset \text{gr}_{\mathcal{J}}(\mathcal{O}_X).$$

5.1.3. *The weighted normal bundle and the exceptional divisor.* The following extends a classical result of Huneke-Swanson on extended Rees algebras and smooth blow-ups [HS06, Definition 5.1.5].

Lemma 5.1.4. *Let X be a regular scheme and $\sigma : B \rightarrow X$ be the full cobordant blow-up of the center \mathcal{J} . Then the exceptional divisor $V_B(t^{-1})$ is isomorphic to $N_{\mathcal{J}}(X)$:*

$$V_B(t^{-1}) = \text{Spec}_X(\mathcal{O}_B/(t^{-1})) \simeq N_{\mathcal{J}}(X)$$

Proof. The problem is local on X . So we can assume that $\mathcal{J} = (u_1^{1/w_1}, \dots, u_k^{1/w_k})$ and the full cobordant blow-up of \mathcal{J} is given by

$$\sigma : B = \text{Spec}(\mathcal{O}_X[t^{-1}, t_1^w u_1, \dots, t_k^{w_k} u_k]) \rightarrow X.$$

Then

$$\mathcal{O}_B/(t^{-1}) \simeq \mathcal{A}_J/((t^{-1} \cdot \mathcal{A}_J) \cap \mathcal{A}_J) = \text{gr}_{\mathcal{J}}(\mathcal{O}_X).$$

♣

5.1.5. *The strict transform and the ideal of the initial form.* We will need the above identification in the context of the strict transforms of the ideals.

Lemma 5.1.6. *With the previous assumptions and notation. Let $\mathcal{I} \subset \mathcal{O}_X$ be an ideal sheaf on X . Let $\sigma^s(\mathcal{I}) \subset \mathcal{O}_B$ be the strict transform of \mathcal{I} . Then the natural isomorphism $\mathcal{O}_B/(t^{-1}) \rightarrow \text{gr}_{\mathcal{J}}(\mathcal{O}_X)$ takes $\sigma^s(\mathcal{I})|_{V(t^{-1})}$ to $\text{in}(\mathcal{I})$.*

Proof. Let $f \in \mathcal{I}$ such that $f \in (\mathcal{J}^a)_X \setminus (\mathcal{J}^{a+1})_X$. Then the strict transform $\sigma^s(f) = t^a f \in (\mathcal{J}^a)_X t^a \subset \mathcal{O}_B$, and its reduction modulo t^{-1} is in $\mathcal{O}_B/(t^{-1} \cdot \mathcal{O}_B) = \text{gr}_{\mathcal{J}}(\mathcal{O}_X)$ in the gradation

$$(\mathcal{J}^a)_X t^a / (t^{-1} \mathcal{O}_B \cap \mathcal{O}_X t^a) = ((\mathcal{J}^a)_X / (\mathcal{J}^{a+1})_X) t^a,$$

and naturally and bijectively corresponds to $\text{in}(f) \in (\mathcal{J}^a)_X / (\mathcal{J}^{a+1})_X t^a \subset \text{gr}_{\mathcal{J}}(\mathcal{O}_X)$.

♣

5.1.7. *Weighted normal cone.* Let X be a scheme. One can extend the construction of the weighted normal bundle of a center \mathcal{J} on a regular scheme to the weighted normal cone at any Rees algebra $\mathcal{R} = \bigoplus_{i \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}} \mathcal{R}_a t^a \subset \mathcal{O}_X[t]$ on any scheme X (as in Section 3.3.4). Consider the associated gradation

$$\text{gr}_{\mathcal{R}}(\mathcal{O}_X) = \bigoplus_{a \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}} ((\mathcal{R}_a)_X / (\mathcal{R}_{a+1})_X) t^a = \mathcal{R} / (\mathcal{R} \cap t^{-1} \mathcal{R}).$$

Denote by $V(\mathcal{R}_1) = \text{Spec}(\mathcal{O}_X/\mathcal{R}_1)$. Then by *the weighted normal cone of X at \mathcal{R}* we shall mean $C_{\mathcal{R}}(X) := \text{Spec}_{V(\mathcal{R}_1)}(\text{gr}_{\mathcal{R}}(\mathcal{O}_X))$

Lemma 5.1.8. *Let X be a regular scheme, and $Y \subset X$ be an integral closed subscheme with an ideal sheaf \mathcal{I}_Y . Let \mathcal{J} be a center on X with $V(\mathcal{J}) \subset Y$. Denote by $\mathcal{R} := \mathcal{O}_Y \cdot \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{J}}$ the induced Rees algebra on Y . Then the weighted normal cone $C_{\mathcal{R}}(X) = \text{Spec}_{V(\mathcal{R}_1)}(\text{gr}_{\mathcal{R}}(\mathcal{O}_Y))$ is the closed subscheme of the weighted normal bundle $N_{\mathcal{J}}(X)$ defined by $\text{in}(\mathcal{I}_Y) \subset \text{gr}_{\mathcal{J}}(\mathcal{O}_X)$.*

Proof. Consider the surjective morphism of sheaves $\phi : \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{J}} \rightarrow \mathcal{R}$. Its kernel is defined by $\mathcal{I}_Y[t] \cap \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{J}}$. So

$$\mathcal{R} \simeq \bigoplus \frac{(\mathcal{J}^a)_X}{\mathcal{I}_Y \cap (\mathcal{J}^a)_X}.$$

The morphism ϕ defines the surjective morphism

$$\mathrm{gr}_{\mathcal{J}}(\mathcal{O}_X) = \bigoplus (\mathcal{J}^a)_X / (\mathcal{J}^{a+1})_X \rightarrow \mathrm{gr}_{\mathcal{R}}(\mathcal{O}_Y) = \bigoplus \frac{(\mathcal{J}^a)_X}{(\mathcal{J}^{a+1})_X + (\mathcal{I}_Y \cap (\mathcal{J}^a)_X)}.$$

Its kernel is exactly

$$\mathrm{in}(\mathcal{I}_Y) = \bigoplus \frac{(\mathcal{J}^{a+1})_X + (\mathcal{I}_Y \cap (\mathcal{J}^a)_X)}{(\mathcal{J}^{a+1})_X}.$$



Definition 5.1.9. Under the above assumptions and notations we shall call $C_{\mathcal{R}}(Y)$ the *weighted normal cone* of Y at \mathcal{J} and denote it by $C_{\mathcal{J}}(Y)$.

5.2. Almost homogenous singularities and their resolution.

Definition 5.2.1. Let X be a regular scheme. Let $Y \subset X$ be an integral closed subscheme with an ideal sheaf \mathcal{I}_Y . We say that a regular subscheme $Z \subset Y$ is an *almost homogenous singularity* of Y if

- (1) The singular locus of Y is $\mathrm{Sing}(Y) = Z$.
- (2) There is a center \mathcal{J} on X , such that $V(\mathcal{J}) = Z$, and $\mathrm{in}_{\mathcal{J}}(\mathcal{I}_Y) \subset \mathrm{gr}_{\mathcal{J}}(\mathcal{O}_X)$ is a radical ideal sheaf on $N_{\mathcal{J}}(X) := \mathrm{Spec}(\mathrm{gr}_{\mathcal{J}}(\mathcal{O}_X))$ which determines a reduced subscheme which is the weighted normal cone $C_{\mathcal{J}}(Y) \subset N_{\mathcal{J}}(X)$ with the singular locus

$$\mathrm{Sing}(C_{\mathcal{J}}(Y)) = V(\mathrm{in}(\mathcal{J})) = Z \subseteq N_{\mathcal{J}}(X).$$

Theorem 5.2.2. *Let X be a regular scheme. Let $Y \subset X$ be an integral closed subscheme. Let $Z \subset Y$ be an almost homogenous singularity of Y with respect to a center \mathcal{J} . Let $N_{\mathcal{J}}(X)$ be the weighted normal bundle of X at \mathcal{J} , and $C_{\mathcal{J}}(Y) \subset N_{\mathcal{J}}(X)$ be the weighted normal cone of Y at \mathcal{J} . Assume that either X is universally catenary, or the codimension of each component of $C_{\mathcal{J}}(Y) \setminus Z$ in $N_{\mathcal{J}}(X)$ is equal to the codimension of Y in X .*

Then the cobordant blow-up $B_+ \rightarrow X$ defines a cobordant resolution of Y . That is, the strict transform Y' of Y is a regular subscheme of B_+ of the codimension equal to codimension of Y in X .

Proof. The problem is local on X . Thus we can assume that $\mathcal{J} = (u_1^{1/w_1}, \dots, u_k^{1/w_k})$ and the full cobordant blow-up of \mathcal{J} is given by

$$\sigma : B = \mathrm{Spec}(\mathcal{O}_X[t^{-1}, t_1^w u_1, \dots, t^{w_k} u_k]) \rightarrow X.$$

Assume that X is universally catenary, and thus B is catenary. Let d be the codimension of Y in X . Then for the morphism $\sigma_- : B_- = X \times \mathbb{G}_m \rightarrow X$, the inverse image $\sigma_-^{-1}(Y)$ is irreducible of codimension d . So it is its closure $Y' := \overline{\sigma_-^{-1}(Y)}$, which is the strict transform of Y . Then, by the Krull Hauptidealsatz, we have that each component of $Y' \cap V(t^{-1})$ is of codimension 1 in Y' , and the codimension $d + 1$ in B . We conclude that each component of $Y' \cap V(t^{-1})$ is of codimension d in $V(t^{-1})$.

Note that $\mathrm{Sing}(Y') \setminus V(t^{-1}) = \mathrm{Sing}(Y') \cap B_-$ is contained in

$$V_{B_-}(u_1, \dots, u_k) = V_{B_-}(u_1 t^{w_1}, \dots, u_k t^{w_k}) = V_{B_-}(u'_1, \dots, u'_k),$$

where $u'_i = u_i t^{w_i}$. On the other hand, by the assumption and Lemma 5.1.6,

$$\mathrm{Sing}(Y' \cap V_B(t^{-1})) \subset V_B(u'_1, \dots, u'_n).$$

Then, by the assumption on codimension for $p \in (Y' \cap V(t^{-1})) \setminus V(u'_1, \dots, u'_n)$, we can find parameters $v_1, \dots, v_d \in (\mathcal{O}_B/t^{-1}) \cdot \mathcal{I}_{Y'}$ at p which vanish on $Y' \cap V(t^{-1})$. But these parameters come from local parameters in $\mathcal{I}_{Y'}$ on B at p . So they define a regular subscheme Y'' of B of codimension d , containing locally Y' . Thus Y'' locally coincides with Y' which must be regular at $p \in V(t^{-1}) \setminus V_B(u'_1, \dots, u'_n)$. Consequently $\text{Sing}(Y')$ is contained in $V_B(u'_1, \dots, u'_n)$, and Y' is a regular subscheme of $B_+ = B \setminus V_B(u'_1, \dots, u'_n)$ of codimension d . ♣

As a corollary we obtain:

Theorem 5.2.3. *Let X be a smooth scheme over a field K of any characteristic. Let $Y \subset X$ be a closed integral subscheme of X admitting an almost homogenous singularity $Z \subset Y$. There is a resolution of Y at Z , that is, a projective birational morphism $\phi : Y^{res} \rightarrow Y$ from a smooth variety Y^{res} with the exceptional locus $Z \subset Y$, such that $\phi^{-1}(Z)$ is an SNC divisor on Y' .*

Proof. Take the cobordant resolution $B_+ \rightarrow X$ from Theorem 5.2.2. By Corollary 6.2.3, the geometric quotient B_+/\mathbb{G}_m is locally toric and thus it can be canonically resolved by the combinatorial method of [Wło20, Theorem 7.17.1]. This produces the projective birational resolution $Y' \rightarrow Y$ of Y such that the inverse image of the singular point is an SNC divisor. ♣

A typical situation where the theorem can be applied is an isolated singularity.

Example 5.2.4. Consider the mixed characteristic hypersurface Y in $X = \mathbb{A}^2 \setminus V(k)$, where $k \in \mathbb{Z}$, defined by

$$f = x^p + p^p + y^k \in \mathbb{Z}[1/k][x, y],$$

with $p \nmid k$. Taking the derivative of the ideal (f) over $\mathbb{Z}[1/k]$ we get

$$\mathcal{D}(f) = (x^p + p^p + y^k, px^{p-1}, ky^{k-1})$$

we see that $\text{Sing}(f) \subseteq V(x^p + p^p + y^k, px^{p-1}, ky^{k-1}) = V(x, y, p)$. Thus $Y := V(f)$ has an isolated singularity $V(x, y, p)$. After the coordinate change $x' := x + p$ we get the equation:

$$f = x'^p - p \cdot px'^{p-1} + \dots + p \cdot p^{p-1}x' + y^k$$

Consider $\overline{\mathcal{J}} = ((x')^{1/w_1}, p^{1/w_2}, y^{1/w_3})$ with the integral weights satisfying

$$pw_1 = pw_2 + w_1 = kw_3.$$

We obtain the initial form

$$\text{in } f = x'^p + p^p x' + y^k \in \mathbb{Z}_p[x't^{w_1}, pt^{w_2}, zt^{w_3}].$$

Here x', p, y correspond to the graded elements $x't^{w_1}, pt^{w_2}, zt^{w_3}$. Taking derivatives over \mathbb{Z}_p with respect to the free variables x', p, y on $\mathbb{Z}_p[x', p, z]$ we obtain

$$\mathcal{D}(\text{in } f) = (x'^p + p^p x' + y^k, p^p, ky^{k-1}).$$

This implies that

$$\text{Sing}(\text{in}(f)) \subset V(x'^p + p^p x' + y^k, p^p, ky^{k-1}) = V(x', y, p) = V(\overline{\mathcal{J}}).$$

Thus f defines an almost homogenous singularity with respect to $\overline{\mathcal{J}}$, and can be resolved by a single cobordant blow-up of $\overline{\mathcal{J}}$.

Observe that the seemingly natural center $\overline{\mathcal{J}}_1 = (x^{1/k}, p^{1/k}, y^{1/p})$ does not define an almost homogenous singularity (with respect to \mathcal{J}_1), and the corresponding cobordant blow-up does not resolve singularity. In such a case

$$\text{in}(f) = x^p + p^p + y^k = (x + p)^p + z^k \in \mathbb{Z}_p[x, y, p],$$

whence $\text{Sing}(\text{in}(f)) = V(x + p, z) \not\supseteq V(\overline{\mathcal{J}})$. This also motivates the coordinate change above.

5.3. Partial resolution by the invariants. The method can be linked to different invariants and is related to the characteristic zero method.

Lemma 5.3.1. *Let \mathcal{I} be an ideal on a regular scheme X . Assume that there exists a center \mathcal{J} such that*

(1) *The maximal order is the same for \mathcal{I} on X , and $\text{in}_{\mathcal{J}}(\mathcal{I})$ on $C_{\mathcal{J}}(X)$:*

$$\max \text{ord}_X(\mathcal{I}) = \max \text{ord}_{C_{\mathcal{J}}(X)}(\text{in}(\mathcal{I}))$$

(2) *The locus of the points with maximal order*

$$\text{Maxord}_X(\mathcal{I}) = V(\mathcal{J}) \subset X, \quad \text{and}$$

(3) $\text{Maxord}_{C_{\mathcal{J}}(X)}(\text{in}(\mathcal{I})) = V(\text{in}(\mathcal{J})) \subset C_{\mathcal{J}}(X)$.

Then for the cobordant blow-up $\sigma_+ : B_+ \rightarrow X$ of \mathcal{J} , we have:

$$\max(\text{ord}_{B_+}(\sigma^s(\mathcal{I})) < \max(\text{ord}_X(\mathcal{I}))$$

Proof. Let $\max \text{ord}_X(\mathcal{I}) = a$. Let $\overline{\mathcal{J}} = (x_1^{1/w_1}, \dots, x_k^{1/w_k})$ be the center. If $q \in V(t^{-1}) \setminus V(x'_1, \dots, x'_k)$, then

$$\text{ord}_q(\sigma^s(\mathcal{I})) \leq \text{ord}_q(\sigma^s(\mathcal{I})|_{V(t^{-1})}) = \text{ord}_q(\text{in}(\mathcal{I})) < a.$$

If $q \in B \setminus V(t^{-1}) \setminus V(x'_1, \dots, x'_k) = B_- \setminus V(x'_1, \dots, x'_k) = (X \setminus V(\mathcal{J})) \times \mathbb{G}_m$, then since $\sigma(q) \in X \setminus V(\mathcal{J})$ we conclude that

$$\text{ord}_q(\sigma^s(\mathcal{I})) = \text{ord}_{\sigma(q)}(\mathcal{I}) < a.$$

♣

Remark 5.3.2. In practice one can replace "ord" with different type of the invariants satisfying the properties used in the proof of the above lemma, like some modifications of Hilbert-Samuel function or inv and inv_E for smooth schemes in characteristic zero or for certain schemes in positive or mixed characteristic.

Example 5.3.3. Let k be a field of characteristic $p > 2$. Let $Y \subset X = \text{Spec } k[x, y, z]$ be a closed subscheme defined by

$$f = x^p + y^p z + z^k + x^{p-1} y^2 + x^{p+1} y z,$$

of order $p > 2$ with $p \nmid k(k-1)$, $k \geq p+1$. Computing $\mathcal{D}^2(f)$ we obtain that $\text{supp}(f, 3) = V(\mathcal{D}^2(f)) = V(x, y, z)$. Thus

$$V(x, y, z) = \text{supp}(f, p) = \text{Maxord}_X(\mathcal{I})$$

is exactly the locus of the points, where the multiplicity of f is equal to p . Then by solving the equations for the weights

$$p w_1 = p w_2 + w_3 = k w_3$$

we obtain that the initial form with respect to $\overline{\mathcal{J}} = (x^{1/w_1}, y^{1/w_3}, z^{1/w_3})$ is given by

$$\text{in}(f) = x^p + y^p z + z^k.$$

Then $\text{Maxord}_X(\mathcal{I}) = V(\overline{\mathcal{J}}) \subset X$, and by the similar argument $\text{Maxord}_{C_{\overline{\mathcal{J}}}(X)}(\text{in}(\mathcal{I})) = V(\overline{\mathcal{J}}) \subset C_{\overline{\mathcal{J}}}(X)$. The cobordant blow-up at $\overline{\mathcal{J}}$ decreases the maximal order to 2 and the equation can be solved by further cobordant blow-ups.

Observe that if one considers "characteristic zero" center $\overline{\mathcal{J}}_1 := (x^{\frac{1}{p+1}}, y^{\frac{1}{p}}, z^{\frac{1}{p}})$ associated with maximal admissible center (x^p, y^{p+1}, z^{p+1}) then $\text{in}(f) = x^p + y^p z$, and

$$\text{Maxord}(\text{in}(f)) = V(x, y) \neq V(\overline{\mathcal{J}}_1)$$

Consequently the cobordant blow-up $B'_+ \rightarrow X$ of $\overline{\mathcal{J}}_1$ does not decrease the order and $\text{maxord}_{B'_+}(\sigma^s(f)) = \text{maxord}_X(f) = p$.

5.4. Homogenous subschemes. Let V be a regular scheme and

$$X := \mathbb{A}_V^n = \text{Spec}_V(\mathcal{O}_V[x_1, \dots, x_n])$$

be an affine space over V . Let $\overline{\mathcal{J}} = (x_1^{1/w_1}, \dots, x_k^{1/w_k})$ be a center on X . The center $\overline{\mathcal{J}}$ defines the gradation on $\mathcal{O}_V[x_1, \dots, x_n]$ via the isomorphism $x_i \mapsto t^{w_i} x_i$ for $i \leq k$, $x_i \mapsto x_i$:

$$\phi : \mathcal{O}_V[x_1, \dots, x_n] \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_V[t^{w_1} x_1, \dots, t^{w_k} x_k, x_{k+1}, \dots, x_n]$$

It takes the monomial $x^\alpha = x_1^{\alpha_1} \dots x_n^{\alpha_n} \in \mathcal{J}_X^{a_1 w_1 + \dots + a_k w_k}$ to $t^{a_1 w_1 + \dots + a_k w_k} \cdot x^\alpha$.

Let $f \in \mathcal{J}_X^a \setminus \mathcal{J}_X^{a+1}$ be a homogenous element in $\mathcal{O}_X = \mathcal{O}_V[x_1, \dots, x_n]$ of grading a . Then

$$\phi(f) = t^a f \in \mathcal{O}_V[t^{w_1} x_1, \dots, t^{w_k} x_k, x_{k+1}, \dots, x_n].$$

The latter can be interpreted as the strict transform of f inside of the cobordant algebra $\mathcal{O}_B = \mathcal{O}_X[t^{-1}, t^{w_1} x_1, \dots, t^{w_k} x_k]$.

Definition 5.4.1. With the above notation and assumption any subscheme of X defined by a homogenous ideal \mathcal{I} will be called a *homogenous subscheme* with respect to the center $\overline{\mathcal{J}}$.

This leads to a simple but useful result.

Lemma 5.4.2. *With the assumption and notation above. Let $\mathcal{I} \subset \mathcal{O}_V[x_1, \dots, x_n]$ be a homogenous ideal. Let $\sigma : B \rightarrow X$ be a cobordant blow-up of $\overline{\mathcal{J}}$, and $\pi : Y := X \times \mathbb{A}^1 \rightarrow X$ be the standard projection. Then*

$$B = \text{Spec}(\mathcal{O}_X[t^{-1}, t^{w_1} x_1, \dots, t^{w_k} x_k]) = \text{Spec}(\mathcal{O}_V[t^{-1}, t^{w_1} x_1, \dots, t^{w_k} x_k, x_{k+1}, \dots, x_n])$$

Thus there exists an isomorphism $B \simeq Y$ over V , defined by

$$B = \text{Spec}(\mathcal{O}_V[t^{-1}, t^{w_1} x_1, \dots, t^{w_k} x_k, x_{k+1}, \dots, x_n]) \rightarrow Y = \text{Spec}(\mathcal{O}_V[x_1, \dots, x_n, y])$$

which takes $x_i \mapsto t^{w_i} x_i$ for $i \leq k$, $x_i \mapsto x_i$, $y \mapsto t^{-1}$, and sends $\mathcal{O}_Y \cdot \mathcal{I}$ to the strict transform ideal $\sigma_B^s(\mathcal{I})$.



Example 5.4.3. The following example is due to Narasimhman [Nar83]. Let

$$f = x^2 + yz^3 + zw^3 + y^7 w \in k[x, y, z, w],$$

where k is a field of characteristic 2. Its singular locus $\text{Sing}(f)$ coincides with

$$\text{supp}(f, 2) = V(D(f)) = V(f, Y, Z, W),$$

where

$$Y := D_y(f) = z^3 + y^6 w, \quad Z := D_z(f) = yz^2 + w^3, \quad W := D_w(f) = zw^2 + y^7.$$

Note that $F := f + yY + zZ = x^2 + yz^3$ is again binomial. Hence $\text{Sing}(f) = V(F, Y, Z, W)$ is binomial so it is a (non-normal) toric subvariety of \mathbb{A}^4 of dimension 1. One can compute that it coincides with the image $t \mapsto (t^{32}, t^7, t^{19}, t^{15})$.

Observe that the subscheme $V(f)$ is homogenous with respect to the center $\overline{\mathcal{J}} := (x^{1/32}, y^{1/7}, z^{1/19}, t^{1/15})$. Thus, by Lemma 5.4.2, the cobordant blow-up of $\overline{\mathcal{J}}$ transforms X into $B \simeq X \times \mathbb{A}_k^1$ with the same equation f describing $\sigma^s(f)$. Then $B_+ = B \setminus V(x, y, z, w)$. Moreover Y, Z , and W are semiinvariant parameters in a neighborhood $B_{yzw} = B \setminus V(yzw)$ of the singular locus $\text{Sing}(\sigma^s(f)) \cap B_+ = V(\sigma^s(f), Y, Z, W) \cap B_+$. Moreover on B_{yzw} we have

$$\sigma^s(f) = x^2 + \frac{1}{z^2}YZ + \frac{y^6w^4}{z^2} = X^2 + \frac{1}{z^2}YZ,$$

where $X := x + \frac{y^3w^2}{z}$, and z is a unit. The subscheme $V(\sigma^s(f))$ is almost homogenous on B_+ with respect to the \mathbb{G}_m -stable smooth center described as $\overline{\mathcal{J}}_1 := (X, Y, Z)$ on B_+ . In fact, \mathcal{J}_1 is an ordinary ideal defining a smooth locus $\text{Sing}(\sigma^s(f))$. The cobordant (or the ordinary) blow-up of $\overline{\mathcal{J}}_1$ determines a cobordant resolution. Further applying locally toric resolution of [Wlo20, Theorem 7.17.1] resolves the singularity functorially with SNC exceptional divisor.

Alternatively, the singularity can be resolved using the characteristic zero invariant "inv". But the process is longer and requires 3 cobordant blow-ups.

Remark 5.4.4. The Narasinhman example shows that the maximal contact with respect to the order satisfying Lemma 3.3.2 cannot be found. The equimultiple locus $\text{supp}(f, 2) = \text{Sing}(f)$ has embedding dimension 4 and cannot be embedded into a smooth hypersurface. Thus the inductive Hironaka procedure, implemented also in this paper for the characteristic zero algorithm and the construction of "inv", cannot be applied. Consequently the invariant "inv" in positive characteristic is not upper semicontinuous, and its locus not always have good properties.

5.4.5. *Cobordant blow-ups vs blow-ups at smooth centers.* In the cobordant resolution of the Narasinhman example the second cobordant blow-up was at the smooth center (X, Y, Z) with weights equal 1. In general we have:

Lemma 5.4.6. *Let X be a regular scheme. Let $B_+ \rightarrow X$ be a cobordant blow-up of \mathcal{J} , locally given by $\mathcal{J} = (u_1, \dots, u_k)$ with weights 1. Let $Bl_{\mathcal{J}}(X) \rightarrow X$ be the ordinary blow-ups of the smooth center \mathcal{J} . Then the induced quotient morphism*

$$B_+ \rightarrow B_+/\mathbb{G}_m \simeq Bl_{\mathcal{J}}(X)$$

is a locally trivial \mathbb{G}_m -bundle.

Proof. The problem is local on X . Then $B = \text{Spec}_X(\mathcal{O}_X[t^{-1}, u_1t, \dots, u_kt])$, and B_+ is covered by $B_{u_it} = B \setminus V(u_it) = \text{Spec}_X(\mathcal{O}_X[t^{-1}, u_1t, \dots, u_kt, (u_it)^{-1}])$, and

$$B_{u_it}/\mathbb{G}_m = \text{Spec}_X(\mathcal{O}_X[\frac{u_1t}{u_it}, \dots, \frac{u_kt}{u_it}]) = \text{Spec}_X(\mathcal{O}_X[\frac{u_1}{u_i}, \dots, \frac{u_k}{u_i}]).$$

Thus the induced morphism $B_+/\mathbb{G}_m \rightarrow X$ is a weighted blow-up which coincides with the standard blow-up of \mathcal{J} . Since we have that $t^{-1} = (u_it)^{-1}u_i$, we can write

$$\mathcal{O}_{B_{u_it}} = \mathcal{O}_X[\frac{u_1}{u_i}, \dots, \frac{u_k}{u_i}][t^{-1}, u_it, (u_it)^{-1}] = \mathcal{O}_X[\frac{u_1}{u_i}, \dots, \frac{u_k}{u_i}][u_it, (u_it)^{-1}].$$

Thus locally $B_+ \simeq (Bl_{\mathcal{J}}) \times \mathbb{G}_m$. ♣

Remark 5.4.7. The presentation $B_+/\mathbb{G}_m \simeq Bl_{\mathcal{J}}(X)$ was first considered by Swanson and Huneke in [HS06, Definition 5.1.5].

6. APPENDIX

6.1. Cobordant blow-ups of Rees algebras and generalized weighted centers. In general, the centers of cobordant blow-ups cannot be described by valuative \mathbb{Q} -ideals for various reasons. First, the valuative ideal are defined only on Noetherian integral schemes. Second, as it was observed by Quek in [Que20, Theorem 2.2.5], the valuative \mathbb{Q} -ideals on a scheme X are in the bijective correspondence with the integrally closed Rees algebras as in Section 3.3.4. This gives only normalized cobordant blow-ups on normal schemes. For these two reasons it is more natural to think of the centers, in general, as of Rees algebras. This approach was, in particular, pursued in the work of Quek [Que20]. We will generalize cobordant blow-ups accordingly.

6.1.1. *Generalized cobordant blow-ups.*

Definition 6.1.2. Let $\mathcal{R} = \bigoplus_{i \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}} \mathcal{R}_i t^i \subset \mathcal{O}_X[t]$ be any Rees algebra on a Noetherian scheme Y , and let $\mathcal{R}[t^{-1}]$ be an extended algebra of \mathcal{R} . Then the full cobordant blow-up of \mathcal{R} is given by $B := \text{Spec}_X(\mathcal{R}[t^{-1}]) \rightarrow X$. The cobordant blow-up is simply $B_+ := B \setminus V(\mathcal{R}_1)$.

6.1.3. *Generalized centers.* As before B comes with the action of $\mathbb{G}_m = \text{Spec}(\mathbb{Z}[t, t^{-1}])$, and the geometric and good quotients B_+/\mathbb{G}_m and $B // \mathbb{G}_m$ are defined. Moreover $B_- = B \setminus V(t^{-1}) = \text{Spec}_X(\mathcal{O}_X[t, t^{-1}])$.

We generalize the centers accordingly.

Definition 6.1.4. Let X be a Noetherian scheme. By the *generalized center* $\mathcal{J} = (f_1^{1/w_1}, \dots, f_k^{1/w_k})$, for $f_i \in \mathcal{O}_X$ and $w_i \in \mathbb{N}$ we simply mean the Rees algebra

$$\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{J}} := \mathcal{O}_X[t^{-1}, f_1 t^{w_1}, \dots, f_k t^{w_k}]_{\geq 0} \subset \mathcal{O}_X[t].$$

Then the full cobordant blow-up $B_{\mathcal{J}}$ of \mathcal{J} is given by $B_{\mathcal{J}} := \text{Spec}_X(\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{J}}[t^{-1}]) \rightarrow X$, where $\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{J}}[t^{-1}]$ is the extended Rees algebra of $\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{J}}$. We also set \mathcal{J}_X to be the first gradation $\mathcal{J}_X := (\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{J}})_1$ of $\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{J}}$.

Note that $\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{J}}$ is not integrally closed in general. Such a definition generalizes the standard blow-up of \mathcal{I} interpreted by extended algebras as in [HS06, Definition 5.1.5], where

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{I}} &= \mathcal{O}_X[t^{-1}, \mathcal{I}t]_{\geq 0} = \mathcal{O} \oplus \mathcal{I}t \oplus \mathcal{I}^2 t^2 \oplus \dots \\ (B_{\mathcal{I}})_+/\mathbb{G}_m &\simeq Bl_{\mathcal{I}}(X) = \text{Proj}(\mathcal{O} \oplus \mathcal{I}t \oplus \mathcal{I}^2 t^2 \oplus \dots) \end{aligned}$$

6.1.5. *Regular weighted centers.*

Definition 6.1.6. A center \mathcal{J} on a Noetherian scheme X will be called *regular weighted* on X if it can be locally presented as $(u_1^{1/w_1}, \dots, u_k^{1/w_k})$, where u_1, \dots, u_k is a set of local parameters on a scheme X and $V(u_1, \dots, u_k)$ is a regular subscheme of X .

The following is a simple consequence of definition

Lemma 6.1.7. *If $X \rightarrow Y$ is a morphism, and \mathcal{J} is a center on Y then $\mathcal{J}' = \mathcal{O}_X \cdot \mathcal{J}$ is the center on X with the Rees algebra $\mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{J}'} = \mathcal{O}_X \cdot \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{J}}$. Then there is an induced morphism $B_{\mathcal{J}'} \rightarrow B_{\mathcal{J}}$ commuting with cobordant blow-ups to X , and Y . Moreover if $X \rightarrow Y$ is a closed immersion then $B_{\mathcal{J}'} \rightarrow B_{\mathcal{J}}$ is so. ♣*

6.1.8. *The maximal admissible centers on the subscheme are regular.* Let X be a smooth scheme over a field k of characteristic zero, and E be an SNC divisor on X . Let $Y \subset X$ be a reduced closed subscheme of a X which is not locally contained in the divisor E , and let \mathcal{I}_Y be its ideal on X . Let $\mathcal{J} = \mathcal{J}(\mathcal{I}_Y)$ be a maximal \mathcal{I}_Y -admissible center locally at a point $p \in Y$ of the form $(u_1^{a_1}, \dots, u_k^{a_k})$, as in Proposition 3.8.1.

If $\text{ord}(\mathcal{J}) > 1$ then, since Y is not contained in E , we conclude that $\text{ord}(\mathcal{J}) \neq 1_+$, and so $\text{ord}(\mathcal{J}) \geq 2$. The latter implies that $\mathcal{I}_Y \subseteq m_p^2$, and (u_1, \dots, u_k) are local parameters on Y at p . Thus $\mathcal{O}_Y \cdot \mathcal{J} = (u_1^{a_1}, \dots, u_k^{a_k})$ is regular weighted at $p \in Y$, as in Definition 6.1.6

If $\text{ord}(\mathcal{J}) = a_1 = 1$, then there exist free maximal contacts $u_1, \dots, u_r \in \mathcal{I}_Y$, for $a_1 = b_1 = \dots = b_r$. Note that none of the contacts are divisorial in \mathcal{J} , since Y is locally not contained in the divisor E . This shows, by induction, that Y is contained in $X' := V(u_1, \dots, u_r)$, \mathcal{I}_Y contains (u_1, \dots, u_r) and the induced ideal $\mathcal{I}_{Y, X'} \subset \mathcal{O}_{X'}$ is contained in m_p^2 . Consequently all the remaining local parameters u_{r+1}, \dots, u_k in $\mathcal{O}_{X'}$ of the center define local parameters in $\mathcal{O}_Y \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_X/m_p^2$. Hence the center $\mathcal{O}_Y \cdot \mathcal{J} = (u_{r+1}^{a_{r+1}}, \dots, u_k^{a_k})$ is regular weighted at $p \in Y$.

6.2. Geometric quotient and cobordant blow-up. In this section we review some standard properties of the torus actions, usually stated over algebraically closed fields, and extended here to regular schemes resulted from equivariant cobordant blow-ups.

Lemma 6.2.1. *Let X_0 be a regular scheme, and $X \rightarrow X_0$ be a scheme obtained from X_0 by a sequence of m cobordant blow-ups of regular (possibly reducible) weighted centers equivariant with respect to the induced torus actions. Then X is a regular scheme with the relatively affine action of torus $T = \mathbb{G}^m$, where $\mathbb{G}_m = \text{Spec}(\mathbb{Z}[t, t^{-1}])$, such that X admits a geometric quotient $X \rightarrow X/T \rightarrow X_0$ of the torus $T := \mathbb{G}_m^m$. Moreover for any closed T -stable regular subscheme Z of X , and an open affine T -stable subset $U \subset X$, and $Z_U := U \cap Z$ there is a T -equivariant fiber square*

$$\begin{array}{ccc} Z_U & \xrightarrow{\phi} & W := U_0 \times \mathbf{A}^n \times \mathbb{G}_m^r \\ \pi_Z \downarrow & & \pi_W \downarrow \\ Z_U/T = \text{Spec}(\mathcal{O}(Z_U)^T) & \xrightarrow{\phi/T} & W/T := U_0 \times (\mathbf{A}^n \times \mathbb{G}_m^r)/T \end{array},$$

for some $n, r \in \mathbb{N}$, where

- (1) $U_0 \subset X_0$ is an open affine (T -invariant) subset.
- (2) $\mathbf{A}^n \times \mathbb{G}_m^r$ admits a geometric quotient of a diagonal action of T , and the action has finite stabilizers.
- (3) ϕ , and ϕ/T are closed immersions, with their closed images $\phi(Z_U)$, and $\phi_{Z_U/T}(Z_U/T)$ defined by the system of invariant parameters $v_1, \dots, v_k \in (\Gamma(W, \mathcal{O}_W)^T)$, whose restrictions to $U_0 \times \{0\} \times \mathbb{G}_m^r$ also define regular parameters.

Proof. First we show the existence of a local embedding and the fiber square for X . We use the induction on m . Let $X \rightarrow X_0$ be a sequence of m equivariant cobordant blow-ups, and let $B_+ \rightarrow X$ be the cobordant blow-up of a T -stable center \mathcal{J} . We shall need the following lemma:

Lemma 6.2.2. *Let \mathcal{J} be a T -stable center on a regular scheme X with a relatively affine action of T , and T -stable SNC divisor E . Then one can find locally semiinvariant parameters x_1, \dots, x_k such that $\mathcal{J} = (x_1^{1/w_1}, \dots, x_k^{1/w_k})$.*

Proof. Let U be an open affine T -stable neighborhood of p . Consider the coaction

$$\rho : \mathcal{O}(U) \rightarrow \mathcal{O}(U) \otimes \mathbb{Z}[t_1^\pm, \dots, t_m^\pm].$$

The coaction defines a natural grading on $\mathcal{O}(U)$, and thus on \mathcal{O}_X . For any $f \in \mathcal{O}(U)$, $\rho(f) = \sum c_\alpha t^\alpha$, where $c_\alpha \in \mathcal{O}(U)$. Moreover it follows from the associativity that $\rho(c_\alpha) = c_\alpha t^\alpha$, and from existence of the identity map $e : \mathbb{Z}[t_1^\pm, \dots, t_m^\pm] \rightarrow 1$ that $f = \sum c_\alpha$. Thus any element decomposes into a finite sum of the homogenous elements c_α of grading α , and

$$\mathcal{O}(U) = \bigoplus \mathcal{O}(U)_\alpha,$$

where T acts on $\mathcal{O}(U)_\alpha$ by the character t^α . Consequently any T -stable ideal $\mathcal{I} \subset \mathcal{O}(U)$ is homogenous and can be written as $\mathcal{I} = \bigoplus \mathcal{I}_\alpha$.

The coordinate $x_1 \in (\mathcal{J}^{w_1})_X$ is a local parameter at a point p . Write $x_1 = \sum c_\alpha$ as the sum of homogenous components. We conclude that $\text{ord}_p(c_\alpha) = 1$ for some $x'_1 := c_\alpha \in (\mathcal{J}^{w_1})_X$. So, by Lemma 2.3.8, one can replace x_1 with a semiinvariant x'_1 in the presentation of \mathcal{J} . By the induction on dimension, we assume that $\mathcal{J}_{|V(x'_1)} = ((x'_2)^{1/w_2}, \dots, (x'_k)^{1/w_k})$ is represented by semiinvariant local parameters. Moreover there is surjection of graded rings $\mathcal{O}_X \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_X/V(u)$. Then x'_i can be lifted to the homogenous elements in \mathcal{O}_X . Set

$$\mathcal{J}' := ((x'_1)^{1/w_1}, \dots, (x'_k)^{1/w_k}) = (x'_1)^{1/w_1} + ((x'_2)^{1/w_2}, \dots, (x'_k)^{1/w_k}).$$

Note that such a presentation is independent of the liftings of the elements x'_i , $i \geq 2$ on $V(x'_1)$ to U . Then $\mathcal{J}_{|V(x'_1)} = \mathcal{J}'_{|V(x'_1)}$, and their saturated powers $((\mathcal{J}_{|V(x'_1)})^a)^{\text{sat}} = ((\mathcal{J}'_{|V(x'_1)})^a)^{\text{sat}}$ for sufficiently divisible a are equal as ideals. Then in the completion

$$\widehat{\mathcal{O}}_{X,p} = x'_1 \cdot \widehat{\mathcal{O}}_{X,p} \oplus \widehat{\mathcal{O}}_{X,p}/(x'_1)$$

both ideals are equal so

$$\widehat{\mathcal{J}}^a := (x'_1)^{a/w_1} + ((\mathcal{J}'_{|V(x'_1)})^a)^{\text{sat}} = (x'_1)^{a/w_1} + ((\mathcal{J}'_{|V(x'_1)})^a)^{\text{sat}} = \widehat{\mathcal{J}}'^a.$$

This implies that $\mathcal{J}^a = \mathcal{J}'^a$ as ideals and $\mathcal{J} = \mathcal{J}'$ as valutive \mathbb{Q} -ideals. \clubsuit

Now, the center \mathcal{J} of $\sigma_+ : B_+ \rightarrow X$ is locally defined by semiinvariant coordinates $\mathcal{J} = (x_1^{1/w_1}, \dots, x_k^{1/w_k})$. Let $\pi : X \rightarrow X/T$ be a T -invariant morphism defined by the geometric quotient. Then B and B_+ admit an action of $T^{m+1} := T \times \mathbb{G}_m$, and $\pi\sigma_+ : B_+ \rightarrow X/T$ is T^{m+1} -invariant. In order to show that there exists a geometric quotient B_+/T^{m+1} it suffices to show that it exists for $\sigma_+^{-1}\pi^{-1}(V_\alpha)$ for open affine cover V_α of X/T . We can assume that on each element $\pi^{-1}(V_\alpha)$ the center is described as $\mathcal{J} = (x_1^{1/w_1}, \dots, x_k^{1/w_k})$. Consider an open affine neighborhood $U = \pi^{-1}(V_\alpha)$ of a point $p \in X$. Moreover we can further assume that by induction there is a closed T -equivariant embedding:

$$\phi : U \hookrightarrow W := U_0 \times \mathbb{A}^n \times \mathbb{G}_m^r$$

Furthermore the closed image $\phi(U)$ is generated by the seminvariant parameters $v_1, \dots, v_r \in \Gamma(W, \mathcal{O}_W)$.

Consider the local presentation of B as in Section 2.2.13. Let us introduce the free variables denoted by $t^{-1}, x'_1, \dots, x'_n$ and write:

$$\mathrm{Spec}(\mathcal{O}_U[t^{-1}, x'_1, \dots, x'_k]) \setminus V(x'_1, \dots, x'_k) = U \times (\mathbb{A}^{k+1} \setminus V(x'_1, \dots, x'_k)),$$

with the action of \mathbb{G}_m on $\mathbb{A}^{k+1} = \mathrm{Spec}(\mathbb{Z}[t^{-1}, x'_1, \dots, x'_k])$, given by

$$(t^{-1} \cdot t^{-1}, t^{w_1} x'_1, \dots, t^{w_k} x'_k),$$

and with the action of T on $(t^{-1}, x'_1, \dots, x'_k)$ as on the corresponding elements of B . Then $B_U := \sigma^{-1}(U)$ is a closed subscheme of $U \times (\mathbb{A}^{k+1} \setminus V(x'_1, \dots, x'_k))$:

$$(B_U)_+ = \mathrm{Spec}(\mathcal{O}_U[t^{-1}, x'_1, \dots, x'_k] \setminus V(x'_1, \dots, x'_k)) / (t^{-w_i} x'_i - x_i).$$

Now, let $\phi : Z \subset B_+$ be a closed T^{m+1} -stable regular subscheme of B_+ . Then $Z_U := \sigma^{-1}(U)$ is the closed regular T^{m+1} -stable subscheme of $U \times (\mathbb{A}^{k+1} \setminus V(x'_1, \dots, x'_k))$.

The image $\phi(Z_U)$, is described locally by semiinvariant parameters v_1, \dots, v_s , for $s \geq r$.

Restricting Z_U to $(B_U)_i := D(x'_i) = B \setminus V(x_i)$ we obtain the closed embedding $(Z_U)_i \subset \mathrm{Spec}(\mathcal{O}_U[t^{-1}, x'_1, \dots, x'_k, (x'_i)^{-1}]) = U \times \mathbb{A}^{k+1} \times \mathbb{G}_m \hookrightarrow U_0 \times \mathbb{A}^{n+k+1} \times \mathbb{G}_m^{r+1}$

Note that by the inductive assumption and the construction the kernel of the action of T^{m+1} on \mathbb{G}_m^{r+1} defines the group scheme which is finite over \mathbb{Z} .

The ideal of the image of $(Z_U)_i$ is defined by the system $(v_1, \dots, v_s, t^{-w_i} x'_i - x_i)$ of the semiinvariant parameters v_1, \dots, v_s , where $s \geq r$ and $(t^{-w_i} x'_i - x_i)$ on $U_0 \times \mathbb{A}^{n+k+1} \times \mathbb{G}_m^{r+1}$.

Let v be a semiinvariant parameter. Write $v = \sum c_\alpha x^\alpha$ at a point p , where x_i are the coordinates on $\mathbb{A}^{n+k+1} \times \mathbb{G}_m^{r+1}$, and $c_\alpha \in \mathcal{O}(U_0)$. Consider two cases.

Case 1. One of x^α is invertible at p . Then multiplying v by the inverse $x^{-\alpha}$ we reduce the situation to the invariant parameter $v' := x^{-\alpha} v$ on $U_0 \times (\mathbb{A}^{n+k+1} \times \mathbb{G}_m^{r+1})_{x^\alpha} = U_0 \times \mathbb{A}^s \times \mathbb{G}_m^d$, for the relevant s and d .

Case 2. All of x^α are noninvertible at p . Then at least for one $c_\alpha x_\alpha \sim x_i$ is a parameter, with $c_\alpha x_\alpha / x_i$ being invertible. So, after clearing the unit we can assume that the semiinvariant parameter is of the form $x_i + h_i$, where $h_i = \sum b_\alpha x^\alpha$, where x^α do not depend upon x_i . Consider a T^{m+1} -equivariant automorphism taking $x_i + h_i \mapsto x_i$, and $x_j \mapsto x_j$. Thus one can assume that the parameter is one of the coordinates x_i and consider the embedding ϕ' into $V(x_i) = U_0 \times \mathbb{A}^{n+k} \times \mathbb{G}_m^{r+1}$

This way we reduce to the situation where all the parameters describing the image of $(B_U)_i$ are T^{m+1} -invariant. Let x_1, \dots, x_s be the coordinates on \mathbb{A}^{n+k+1} , which are noninvertible at p so we have an embedding of B_U and Z_U into $U_0 \times \mathbb{A}^s \times \mathbb{G}_m^d$, for the relevant s and d .

Write an invariant parameter as $v = v_0 + \sum c_\alpha x^\alpha$, where $v_0, c_\alpha \in \Gamma(U_0 \times \mathbb{G}_m^d)$, where $x^\alpha = x_1^{\alpha_1} \dots x_k^{\alpha_k}$ are noninvertible at p . Moreover v_0 and all $c_\alpha x_\alpha$ are invariant.

If one of the $c_\alpha x_\alpha \sim x_i$ is a parameter, then v can be made into x_i by the coordinate change as in Case (2), and subsequently \mathbb{A}^s will be replaced with $V(x_i)$. Otherwise we can assume that

- (1) $v_0 \in \Gamma(U_0 \times \mathbb{G}_m^d, \mathcal{O}_{U_0 \times \mathbb{G}_m^d})^{T^{m+1}}$ is an invariant parameter on $U_0 \times \mathbb{G}_m^{r+1}$.
- (2) $\sum c_\alpha x^\alpha \in m_p^2$.

This defines the desired T^{m+1} -equivariant fiber square for $(Z_U)_i$, and thus shows that the geometric quotient $(Z_U)_+ / T^{m+1}$ exists, for $U = \pi^{-1}(V_\alpha)$, where V_α is an

open cover of X/T . Consequently the geometric quotient Z/T^{m+1} exists over X/T , and over X_0 .

♣

Corollary 6.2.3. *Let X_0 be a smooth scheme over a field k . Let X be obtained by a sequence of m cobordant blow-ups at smooth centers from Y , equivariant with respect to the induced torus actions. Let Z be a regular T -stable closed subscheme of X , where $\mathbb{G}_m = \text{Spec}(k[t, t^{-1}])$, and $T = \mathbb{G}_m^m$. Then the geometric quotient Z/T exists. Moreover locally there exists a smooth morphism $U_Z/T \rightarrow X_\sigma$, where $U_Z \subset Z$ is an open affine T -stable and X_σ is a toric variety over k with quotient singularities.*

Proof. Let $U_Z \rightarrow U_0 \times \mathbb{A}^s \times \mathbb{G}_m^b$ be a local closed T -equivariant embedding whose image is defined by the invariant parameters such that their restrictions to closed subscheme $U_0 \times \{0\} \times \mathbb{G}_m^b$ also define the parameters. One can further embed U_0 into \mathbb{A}_k^ℓ , which gives the closed immersion $\phi : U_Z \rightarrow \mathbb{A}_k^\ell \times \mathbb{A}_k^s \times \mathbb{G}_m^b$, where T acts trivially on \mathbb{A}_k^ℓ . Again the image $\phi(U_Z)$ is defined by the invariant parameters such that their restrictions $\mathbb{A}_k^\ell \times \{0\} \times \mathbb{G}_m^b$ also define the parameters.

Consider the splitting $\mathbb{G}_m^d = \mathbb{G}_m^a \times \mathbb{G}_m^b$, where $\mathbb{G}_m^a = (\mathbb{G}_m^d)^T$ is the maximal subtorus, such that T acts trivially on \mathbb{G}_m^a , and transitively on \mathbb{G}_m^b . Consider a regular morphism defined by the projection

$$\pi : W := \mathbb{A}_k^\ell \times \mathbb{A}_k^s \times \mathbb{G}_m^d \rightarrow \mathbb{A}_k^s \times \mathbb{G}_m^b.$$

Then, by the previous lemma, there is a fiber square

$$\begin{array}{ccc} U_Z & \xrightarrow{\psi} & \mathbb{A}_k^s \times \mathbb{G}_m^b \\ \pi_X \downarrow & & \pi_A \downarrow \\ U_Z/T & \xrightarrow{\psi/T} & (\mathbb{A}_k^s \times \mathbb{G}_m^b)/T = X_\sigma \end{array} .$$

The morphism ψ is a composition of the embedding $\phi : U_Z \subset W$ and the smooth morphism π . Moreover, by the above, the image $\phi(U_Z)$ is defined by the parameters on W , whose restrictions define the parameters on the fiber $\mathbb{A}_k^\ell \times \{0\} \times \mathbb{G}_m^a$ of π .

Thus, by [Sta, Definition 29.34.1], the morphism $\psi : U_Z \rightarrow \mathbb{A}_k^s \times \mathbb{G}_m^b$ is standard smooth at p . Since π_A is faithfully flat, we conclude that $U_Z/T \rightarrow (\mathbb{A}_k^s \times \mathbb{G}_m^b)/T = X_\sigma$ is smooth at p as well.

♣

Remark 6.2.4. The above result is not valid in the mixed characteristic.

6.3. Cobordant blow-ups in the logarithmic category. Let X be a logarithmically regular scheme, with Zariski logarithmic structure (or a strict toroidal variety) and assume that \mathcal{J} has a more general form

$$\mathcal{J} = (u_1^{1/w_1}, \dots, u_k^{1/w_k}, m_1^{1/w_{k+1}}, \dots, m_r^{1/w_{k+r}}),$$

where u_i are free parameters and m_i are monomials with respect to the logarithmic structure on X then the full cobordant blow-up $B \rightarrow X$ at \mathcal{J} can be described as

$$B = \text{Spec}(\mathcal{O}_X[t^{-1}, t^{w_1}x_1, \dots, t^{w_k}x_k, t^{w_{k+1}}m_1, \dots, t^{w_{k+r}}m_r])^{int},$$

which is again a logarithmically regular scheme, (respectively strict toroidal variety). By functoriality the construction extends to any logarithmically regular schemes (or toroidal varieties).

Initially in the papers [ATW17], [ATW20] we considered the stack-theoretic blow-ups of the centers of the form $\mathcal{J} = (u_1, \dots, u_k, m_1^{1/w_{k+1}}, \dots, m_r^{1/w_{k+r}})$, in the context of Kummer étale topology on the logarithmic stacks. Then in [ATW19] we developed the formalism of the stack-theoretic blow-ups of the weighted centers of the form $(u_1^{1/w_1}, \dots, u_k^{1/w_k})$.

Soon after Quek in [Que20, Section 3.2] studied the stack-theoretic blow-ups of the more general form $\mathcal{J} = (u_1^{1/w_1}, \dots, u_k^{1/w_k}, m_1^{1/w_{k+1}}, \dots, m_r^{1/w_{k+r}}) = (u_1^{1/w_1}, \dots, u_k^{1/w_k}, Q^{1/w})$ in the context of logarithmic stacks and Kummer étale topology. Here Q is generated by m_i^{w/w_i} for the corresponding w .

REFERENCES

- [Abh67] Shreeram Shankar Abhyankar, *Nonsplitting of valuations in extensions of two dimensional regular local domains*, Math. Ann. **170** (1967), 87–144. MR 207698
- [AKMW02] Dan Abramovich, Kalle Karu, Kenji Matsuki, and Jarosław Włodarczyk, *Torification and factorization of birational maps*, J. Amer. Math. Soc. **15** (2002), no. 3, 531–572 (electronic). MR 1896232 (2003c:14016)
- [AM69] M. F. Atiyah and I. G. Macdonald, *Introduction to commutative algebra*, Addison-Wesley Publishing Co., Reading, Mass.-London-Don Mills, Ont., 1969. MR 0242802 (39 #4129)
- [AT19] Dan Abramovich and Michael Temkin, *Functorial factorization of birational maps for qc schemes in characteristic 0*, Algebra Number Theory **13** (2019), no. 2, 379–424. MR 3927050
- [ATW17] Dan Abramovich, Michael Temkin, and Jarosław Włodarczyk, *Principalization of ideals on toroidal orbifolds*, JEMS, to appear, (2017), arXiv:1709.03185.
- [ATW19] ———, *Functorial embedded resolution via weighted blowings up*, arXiv e-prints (2019), arXiv:1906.07106.
- [ATW20] Dan Abramovich, Michael Temkin, and Jarosław Włodarczyk, *Relative desingularization and principalization of ideals*, arXiv:2003.03659.
- [BM91] Edward Bierstone and Pierre D. Milman, *A simple constructive proof of canonical resolution of singularities*, Effective methods in algebraic geometry (Castiglione-cello, 1990), Progr. Math., vol. 94, Birkhäuser Boston, Boston, MA, 1991, pp. 11–30. MR 1106412
- [BM97] ———, *Canonical desingularization in characteristic zero by blowing up the maximum strata of a local invariant*, Invent. Math. **128** (1997), no. 2, 207–302. MR 1440306 (98e:14010)
- [BR19] Daniel Bergh and David Rydh, *Functorial destackification and weak factorization of orbifolds*, arXiv e-prints (2019), arXiv:1905.00872.
- [BVU13] Angélica Benito and Orlando E. Villamayor U., *Monoidal transforms and invariants of singularities in positive characteristic*, Compos. Math. **149** (2013), no. 8, 1267–1311. MR 3103065
- [CP08] Vincent Cossart and Olivier Piltant, *Resolution of singularities of threefolds in positive characteristic. I. Reduction to local uniformization on Artin-Schreier and purely inseparable coverings*, J. Algebra **320** (2008), no. 3, 1051–1082. MR 2427629
- [CP09] ———, *Resolution of singularities of threefolds in positive characteristic. II*, J. Algebra **321** (2009), no. 7, 1836–1976. MR 2494751
- [Cut11] Steven Dale Cutkosky, *A skeleton key to Abhyankar’s proof of embedded resolution of characteristic p surfaces*, Asian J. Math. **15** (2011), no. 3, 369–416. MR 2838213
- [DH98] Igor V Dolgachev and Yi Hu, *Variation of geometric invariant theory quotients*, Inst. Hautes Études Sci. Publ. Math. (1998), no. 87, 5–56, With an appendix by Nicolas Ressayre. MR 1659282
- [EH02] Santiago Encinas and Herwig Hauser, *Strong resolution of singularities in characteristic zero*, Comment. Math. Helv. **77** (2002), no. 4, 821–845. MR 1949115
- [EV03] Santiago Encinas and Orlando Villamayor, *A new proof of desingularization over fields of characteristic zero*, Proceedings of the International Conference on Algebraic

- Geometry and Singularities (Spanish) (Sevilla, 2001), vol. 19, 2003, pp. 339–353. MR 2023188
- [EV07] ———, *Rees algebras and resolution of singularities*, Proceedings of the XVIth Latin American Algebra Colloquium (Spanish), Bibl. Rev. Mat. Iberoamericana, Rev. Mat. Iberoamericana, Madrid, 2007, pp. 63–85. MR 2500351
- [Gir74] Jean Giraud, *Sur la théorie du contact maximal*, Math. Z. **137** (1974), 285–310. MR 0460712
- [Har77] Robin Hartshorne, *Algebraic geometry*, Springer-Verlag, New York, 1977, Graduate Texts in Mathematics, No. 52. MR 0463157 (57 #3116)
- [Hau98] Herwig Hauser, *Seventeen obstacles for resolution of singularities*, Singularities (Oberwolfach, 1996), Progr. Math., vol. 162, Birkhäuser, Basel, 1998, pp. 289–313. MR 1652479
- [Hir64] Heisuke 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** (1964), 205–326. MR 0199184
- [HP19] Herwig Hauser and Stefan Perlega, *Cycles of singularities appearing in the resolution problem in positive characteristic*, J. Algebraic Geom. **28** (2019), no. 2, 391–403. MR 3912062
- [HS06] Craig Huneke and Irena Swanson, *Integral closure of ideals, rings, and modules*, London Mathematical Society Lecture Note Series, vol. 336, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2006. MR 2266432
- [KM16] Hiraku Kawanoue and Kenji Matsuki, *Resolution of singularities of an idealistic filtration in dimension 3 after Benito-Villamayor*, Minimal models and extremal rays (Kyoto, 2011), Adv. Stud. Pure Math., vol. 70, Math. Soc. Japan, [Tokyo], 2016, pp. 115–214. MR 3617780
- [Kol07] János Kollár, *Lectures on resolution of singularities*, Annals of Mathematics Studies, vol. 166, Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ, 2007. MR 2289519 (2008f:14026)
- [McQ19] Michael McQuillan, *Very fast, very functorial, and very easy resolution of singularities*, 2019, preprint, written with the collaboration of G. Marzo.
- [Moh87] T. T. Moh, *On a stability theorem for local uniformization in characteristic p* , Publ. Res. Inst. Math. Sci. **23** (1987), no. 6, 965–973. MR 935710
- [Moh96] ———, *On a Newton polygon approach to the uniformization of singularities of characteristic p* , Algebraic geometry and singularities (La Rábida, 1991), Progr. Math., vol. 134, Birkhäuser, Basel, 1996, pp. 49–93. MR 1395176
- [Mor96] Robert Morelli, *The birational geometry of toric varieties*, J. Algebraic Geom. **5** (1996), no. 4, 751–782. MR 1486987 (99b:14056)
- [Nar83] R. Narasimhan, *Monomial equimultiple curves in positive characteristic*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. **89** (1983), no. 3, 402–406. MR 715853
- [QR19] Ming Hao Quek and David Rydh, *Weighted blow-ups*, 2019, in preparation.
- [Que20] Ming Hao Quek, *Logarithmic resolution via weighted toroidal blowings up*, arXiv e-prints (2020), arXiv:2005.05939.
- [Rei] Miles Reid, *What is a flip?*, Colloquium Talk, Univ. Of Utah, Dec , 1992.
- [Rei02] Miles Reid, *Graded rings and varieties in weighted projective space*, <https://homepages.warwick.ac.uk/~masda/surf/more/grad.pdf>, 2002.
- [Sta] The Stacks Project Authors, *Stacks Project*, <http://stacks.math.columbia.edu>.
- [Tha94a] Michael Thaddeus, *Stable pairs, linear systems and the Verlinde formula*, Invent. Math. **117** (1994), no. 2, 317–353. MR 1273268
- [Tha94b] ———, *Toric quotients and flips*, Topology, geometry and field theory, World Sci. Publ., River Edge, NJ, 1994, pp. 193–213. MR 1312182
- [Tha96] ———, *Geometric invariant theory and flips*, J. Amer. Math. Soc. **9** (1996), no. 3, 691–723. MR 1333296
- [Vil89] Orlando Villamayor, *Constructiveness of Hironaka’s resolution*, Ann. Sci. École Norm. Sup. (4) **22** (1989), no. 1, 1–32. MR 985852
- [Vil92] Orlando Villamayor, *Patching local uniformizations*, Ann. Sci. École Norm. Sup. (4) **25** (1992), no. 6, 629–677. MR 1198092
- [Wło00] Jarosław Włodarczyk, *Birational cobordisms and factorization of birational maps*, J. Algebraic Geom. **9** (2000), no. 3, 425–449. MR 1752010 (2002d:14019)

- [Wło03] ———, *Toroidal varieties and the weak factorization theorem*, *Invent. Math.* **154** (2003), no. 2, 223–331. MR 2013783 (2004m:14113)
- [Wło05] ———, *Simple Hironaka resolution in characteristic zero*, *J. Amer. Math. Soc.* **18** (2005), no. 4, 779–822 (electronic). MR 2163383
- [Wło08] Jarosław Włodarczyk, *Program on resolution of singularities in characteristic p* , Notes from lectures at RIMS, Kyoto, December 2008, 2008.
- [Wło20] Jarosław Włodarczyk, *Functorial resolution except for toroidal locus. toroidal compactification*, arXiv e-prints (2020), arXiv:2007.13846.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, PURDUE UNIVERSITY, 150 N. UNIVERSITY STREET,, WEST LAFAYETTE, IN 47907-2067

Email address: `wlodarcz@purdue.edu`