

NASH RESOLUTIONS OF SINGULAR FOLIATIONS WITH A VIEW TOWARDS AFFINE VARIETIES

RUBEN LOUIS

ABSTRACT. We use the universal Lie ∞ -algebroid of a singular foliation to construct several notions of resolution of singularities. For instance, we recover Nash modification or the monoidal transformation of an affine variety and a resolution method due to Mohsen [Moh21]. One of the important features is that any singular foliation becomes a Debord foliation after one blowup. Some examples are also given.

CONTENTS

Introduction	1
1. Preliminaries	2
1.1. Grassmannian	2
1.1.1. Topological structure	2
1.1.2. Manifold structure	2
1.2. Singular foliations and universal Lie ∞ -algebroids	3
1.2.1. Definitions	4
2. The blowup procedures	7
2.1. Blowup of vector bundle morphisms.	7
2.2. Main constructions and results	8
3. Proof of the main results	10
3.1. Proof of Theorem 2.5	12
3.2. Proof of Theorem 2.12 and 2.14	14
4. Examples	16
5. Conclusion	20
References	21

INTRODUCTION

The results of this paper are taken from Chapter 7 of my PhD thesis. It is shown in [LLS20, LGL22] that behind any singular foliation there is a unique up to homotopy Lie ∞ -algebroid, i.e., a Lie ∞ -algebroid built over a geometric resolution of \mathfrak{F} . Now, in [Moh21], Omar Mohsen introduced a notion of blow-up of a smooth manifold along the singular leaves of a singular foliation. In this paper, we give an interpretation of the latter in terms of the universal Lie ∞ -algebroid of \mathfrak{F} , in fact in terms of an almost Lie algebroid over a geometric resolution of \mathfrak{F} . Indeed, we show that this construction is the 1st type of a series indexed by \mathbb{N}_0 of blowups of a singular foliation. For $n = 0$, we recover the Nash blowups for a singular foliation, which matches Nash blowups for an affine variety W when applied to the vector fields tangent to W .

A consequence of our construction for $n = 1$ is that a resolution of any singular foliation can be constructed, which is given by an action of a Lie algebroid whose anchor map is injective on an open dense subset, i.e., a Debord foliation [Deb01].

The paper is organized as follows. In section 1, we recall the definition of Grassmann bundles and their properties. Then, we recall the concept of singular foliations and its universal Lie ∞ -algebroids. In section 2, we give the constructions of several notions of blowup of a singular foliation. Then, we state the main theorems. In Section 3 we write the proofs of the results. In section 4, we give some examples, where we recover the usual notions of blowups for affine varieties.

1. PRELIMINARIES

1.1. Grassmannian. For E a finite dimension vector space over a field $\mathbb{K} \in \{\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{C}\}$, we denote by $\text{Gr}_{-r}(E)$ the set of all vector subspaces of E of co-dimension $r \in \mathbb{N}$. Let us recall a few facts on $\text{Gr}_{-r}(E)$.

1.1.1. Topological structure. $\text{Gr}_{-r}(E)$ is metric space, the corresponding metric is defined by

$$\delta(V, V') = \|p_V - p_{V'}\|, \quad (1)$$

where p_V stands for the orthogonal projection of E onto $V \subset E$. It is important to notice that: for all $V, V' \in \text{Gr}_{-r}(E)$,

$$\delta(V, V') = \delta(V^\perp, V'^\perp)$$

here V^\perp stands for the orthogonal space of V . It is proven (see e.g., [FGP94]) that $\text{Gr}_{-r}(E)$ equipped with the topology induced by the so-called ‘‘gap’’ metric (1), is equivalent to the Grassmann topology, i.e., the topology on $\text{Gr}_{-r}(E)$ whose open subsets $\mathcal{W} \subseteq \text{Gr}_{-r}(E)$ are such that $\tau^{-1}(\mathcal{W})$ is open in $\text{St}_r(d, \mathbb{K}) := \{A \in M_{d \times r}(\mathbb{K}) \mid \text{rk}(A) = r\}$, with

$$\tau: \text{St}_r(d, \mathbb{K}) \longrightarrow \text{Gr}_{-r}(E), \quad A \longmapsto \{\text{vector space spanned by the columns of } A\}.$$

Also, $\text{Gr}_{-r}(E)$ is a compact space.

1.1.2. Manifold structure. $\text{Gr}_{-r}(E)$ is moreover a compact manifold of dimension $r(d - r)$ and also, a projective variety.

- (1) **Coordinates charts:** One manner to define the standard affine coordinates on the Grassmannian $\text{Gr}_{-r}(E)$ is as follows. Fix a basis $e_1, \dots, e_{d=\dim E}$ for E . Let us describe the first chart. Consider

$$\begin{aligned} \psi: M_{r, d-r}(\mathbb{K}) &\longrightarrow M_{d, d-r}(\mathbb{K}) \\ A' &\longmapsto \begin{pmatrix} I_{d-r} \\ A' \end{pmatrix}. \end{aligned}$$

The vector space $V = \tau \left(\begin{pmatrix} I_{d-r} \\ A' \end{pmatrix} \right)$ admits a basis of the form

$$v_j := e_j + \sum_{k=1}^{\ell} a_{kj} e_k, \quad j = 1, \dots, d - r. \quad (2)$$

V is completely determined by the matrix A' . Hence, $\tau \circ \psi$ is the first chart.

For a permutation $\sigma \in \mathfrak{S}_d$, let $P(\sigma)$ be the permutation matrix of lines associated to σ . We claim that the family $\tau \circ P(\sigma) \circ \psi(M_{r, d-r}(\mathbb{K}))$, indexed by $\sigma \in \mathfrak{S}_d$ is an atlas of $\text{Gr}_r(E)$. Its image consists of (2) up to permutation.

- (2) **Grassmann bundle:** For $E \rightarrow M$ a vector bundle of rank d over a manifold M (or a quasi-projective variety¹). Let $r \leq d$. The disjoint union:

$$\mathrm{Gr}_{-r}(E) := \coprod_{x \in M} \mathrm{Gr}_{-r}(E|_x)$$

comes equipped with a natural manifold structure in the smooth or complex case and a quasi-projective variety structure when M is a quasi-projective variety. Also

$$\Pi: \mathrm{Gr}_{-r}(E) \longrightarrow M \quad (3)$$

is a fibration. It is called $(d-r)$ -th *Grassmann bundle*. To fix notations, for $x \in M$, elements of the fiber $\Pi^{-1}(x)$, i.e., points of $\mathrm{Gr}_{-r}(E|_x)$, are denoted by (V, x) with $V \in \mathrm{Gr}_{-r}(E|_x)$.

For every open subset $\mathcal{U} \subset M$ on which E is trivial, $\Pi^{-1}(\mathcal{U}) \simeq \mathrm{Gr}_{-r}(\mathbb{K}^d) \times \mathcal{U}$. An *adapted chart* for $\mathrm{Gr}_{-r}(E) \rightarrow M$ around a point $x \in M$ is a set of local coordinates of the form $(\Pi^*x_1, \dots, \Pi^*x_n, z_1, \dots, z_{r(d-r)})$, where (x_1, \dots, x_n) are local coordinates on M and $(z_1, \dots, z_{r(d-r)})$ are functions which are standard affine coordinates on an open subset of each fiber of Π as in item (1).

Convention 1.1. Let $x \in M$. Let e_1, \dots, e_d be local frame for E in a neighborhood \mathcal{U} of x . For $y \in \mathcal{U}$, let κ_y be the linear isomorphism defined by

$$\kappa_y: E_x \longrightarrow E_y, \quad \kappa_y(e_i(x)) = e_i(y), \quad \text{for all } i \in \{1, \dots, d\}. \quad (4)$$

Let (x_n) be a sequence of M that converges to x . We will say that a sequence of vector space $V_{x_n} \in \mathrm{Gr}_{-r}(E)$ with $V_{x_n} \subset E_{x_n}$, converges to $V \subset E_x$ and write $V_{x_n} \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow +\infty]{} V$ if

$$\kappa^{-1}(V_{x_n}) \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow +\infty]{} V \text{ in } \mathrm{Gr}_{-r}(E_x). \quad (5)$$

In the sequel we will not mention κ , since this notion of convergence does not depend on the chosen local frames of E .

- (3) **Tautological subbundle:** The Grassmann bundle $\mathrm{Gr}_{-r}(E)$ comes equipped with two vector bundles τ^E and A^E , called tautological subbundle and tautological quotient bundle, that fit into the exact sequence

$$0 \longrightarrow \tau^E \longrightarrow \Pi^*E \longrightarrow A^E \longrightarrow 0. \quad (6)$$

Precisely, the fiber of τ^E over the point $(V, x) \in \mathrm{Gr}_{-r}(E|_x)$ is the codimension r subvector space V of $E|_x = E|_{\Pi(V, x)} = (\Pi^*E)|_{(V, x)}$. By construction, τ^E is a subbundle of the pull-back bundle Π^*E . Furthermore, $A^E \simeq \Pi^*E/\tau^E$.

This tautological quotient bundle is important for us to express some results of this paper.

1.2. Singular foliations and universal Lie ∞ -algebroids. We refer the reader to [AS09, AZ14, Cer79, Deb01, LLS20, LGLR22] for the topic of singular foliations, in particular to [LLS20, LGL22] for the notion of universal Lie ∞ -algebroids. For Lie algebroids, see [Mac05].

¹the intersection inside some projective space of a Zariski-open and a Zariski-closed subset.

1.2.1. *Definitions.* We recall some basic definitions and properties on singular foliations.

- (1) A *singular foliation* on a smooth, real analytic, or complex manifold M , or a quasi-projective variety, is a subsheaf $\mathfrak{F} \subseteq \mathfrak{X}(M)$ that fulfills the following conditions,
 - (a) *Stability under Lie bracket* : $[\mathfrak{F}, \mathfrak{F}] \subseteq \mathfrak{F}$.
 - (b) \mathfrak{F} is a *module* over its respective relevant sheaf of functions.
 - (c) *Locally finitely generateness* : every $m \in M$ admits an open neighborhood \mathcal{U} together with a finite number of vector fields $X_1, \dots, X_k \in \mathfrak{X}(\mathcal{U})$ such that for every open subset $\mathcal{V} \subseteq \mathcal{U}$ the vector fields $X_1|_{\mathcal{V}}, \dots, X_k|_{\mathcal{V}}$ generates \mathfrak{F} on \mathcal{V} as a module over functions on \mathcal{V} . This condition is only necessary in the smooth case (see, [LGLR22]).

There are two classes of singular foliations we are interested in.

A *locally polynomial singular foliation* is a singular foliation over a smooth or complex manifold which admits, around each point, polynomial generators in some local chart.

Proposition 1.2. *A singular foliation \mathfrak{F} is projective as a module over functions if and only if there exists a Lie algebroid $(A, [\cdot, \cdot], \rho)$ such that $\rho(\Gamma(A)) = \mathfrak{F}$ whose anchor is injective on an open dense subset.*

These singular foliations are called Debord singular foliations.

- (2) Here are some important features of the above definition in the smooth/complex cases.
 - Singular foliation admits leaves : there exists a partition of M into submanifolds called leaves such that for all $m \in M$, the image of the evaluation map $\mathfrak{F} \rightarrow T_m M$ is the tangent space of the leaf through m .
 - *Singular foliations are self-preserving*: the flow ϕ_t^X of vector fields $X \in \mathfrak{F}$, whenever defined, preserves \mathfrak{F} [AS09, GY18], i.e.,

$$\forall m \in M, \exists \varepsilon > 0 \text{ such that } \forall t \in]-\varepsilon, \varepsilon[, (\phi_t^X)_*(\mathfrak{F}) = \mathfrak{F}.$$

- (3) We introduce here a notion of tangency and singular foliation for arbitrary closed subsets of a smooth or complex manifold. Let M be a smooth or complex manifold. Let $S \subseteq M$ be a closed subset.
 - (a) A vector field Z on M is said to be *tangent* to S if its flows ϕ_t^Z preserves S , [MP82]. We define $\mathfrak{X}(S)$ to be the restriction to S of vector fields of M tangent to S , it is a $\mathcal{O}_M/\mathcal{I}_S$ -module and a Lie algebra, with \mathcal{I}_S being the ideal of smooth functions on M that vanish on S .
 - (b) A *singular foliation* over S is a $\mathcal{O}_M/\mathcal{I}_S$ -submodule \mathfrak{F} of $\mathfrak{X}(S)$ which is
 - (i) finitely (locally) generated,
 - (ii) stable under Lie bracket.
 It is said to be *projective* if it is projective as a module.
 - (c) A *Lie algebroid over S* is a locally generated projective Lie-Rinehart algebra over $\mathcal{O}_M/\mathcal{I}_S$.

Remark 1.3. The previous definitions match the usual notions of tangency and singular foliations, for affine or Stein subvarieties in the algebraic or holomorphic cases, and for S a smooth submanifold in the smooth case.

- (4) Let $\mathcal{F} \subseteq \mathfrak{X}(M)$ be a submodule. A complex of vector bundles (E, d, ρ)

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc}
 \longrightarrow & E_{-i-1} & \xrightarrow{d^{(i+1)}} & E_{-i} & \xrightarrow{d^{(i)}} & E_{-i+1} & \longrightarrow \cdots \xrightarrow{d^{(2)}} E_{-1} \xrightarrow{\rho} TM \\
 & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & \downarrow \\
 \longleftarrow & M & \longleftarrow & M & \longleftarrow & M & \longleftarrow \cdots \longleftarrow M \longleftarrow M
 \end{array}$$

is said to be a *geometric resolution* of \mathcal{F} if the following complex is an exact sequence of sheaves:

$$\longrightarrow \Gamma(E_{-i-1}) \xrightarrow{d^{(i+1)}} \Gamma(E_{-i}) \xrightarrow{d^{(i)}} \Gamma(E_{-i+1}) \longrightarrow \cdots \longrightarrow \Gamma(E_{-1}) \xrightarrow{\rho} \mathcal{F}. \quad (7)$$

A geometric resolution is said to be *minimal* at a point $x \in M$ if, for all $i \geq 2$, the linear maps $d^{(i)}|_x: E_{-i}|_x \rightarrow E_{-i+1}|_x$ vanish. Recall that it exists in many contexts, e.g., singular foliation with polynomial generators on \mathbb{R}^n or \mathbb{C}^n or locally real analytic singular foliation on a compact manifold (see, [LLS20]).

- (5) An *almost graded Lie algebroid* over M is the datum of a sequence $(E, d = \ell_1, \rho)$ of vector bundles over M equipped with a graded symmetric degree +1 \mathbb{K} -bilinear *bracket*

$$\ell_2: \Gamma(E) \odot \Gamma(E) \rightarrow \Gamma(E)$$

such that:

- (a) ℓ_2 satisfies the *Leibniz identity* with respect to $\rho: \Gamma(E_{-1}) \rightarrow \mathfrak{X}(M)$, i.e.,

$$\ell_2(x, fy) = f\ell_2(x, y) + \rho(x)[f]y \quad (8)$$

for all $x \in \Gamma(E_{-1}), y \in \Gamma(E)$ and $f \in \mathcal{O}$.

- (b) ℓ_1 is degree +1-derivation of ℓ_2 , i.e., for all $x \in \Gamma(E_{-i}), y \in \Gamma(E)$:

$$\ell_1(\ell_2(x, y)) + \ell_2(\ell_1(x), y) + (-1)^i \ell_2(x, \ell_1(y)) = 0,$$

- (c) ρ is a morphism, i.e., for all $x, y \in \Gamma(E_{-1})$

$$\rho(\ell_2(x, y)) = [\rho(x), \rho(y)].$$

The \mathcal{O} -linear map ρ is called the *anchor map*, and ℓ_1 the *differential*.

- (6) A *Lie ∞ -algebroid* over M is the datum of a sequence $E = (E_{-i}), 1 \leq i < \infty$ of vector bundles over M together with a structure of Lie ∞ -algebra $(\ell_k)_{k \geq 1}$ on the sheaf of sections of E and a vector bundle morphism, $\rho: E_{-1} \rightarrow TM$, called *anchor map* such that the k -ary brackets $\ell_k, k \neq 2$ are \mathcal{O} -multilinear and such that

$$\ell_2(e_1, fe_2) = \rho(e_1)[f]e_2 + f\ell_2(e_1, e_2) \quad (9)$$

for all $e_1 \in \Gamma(E_{-1}), e_2 \in \Gamma(E_\bullet)$ and $f \in \mathcal{O}$. The sequence

$$\cdots \xrightarrow{\ell_1} E_{-2} \xrightarrow{\ell_1} E_{-1} \xrightarrow{\rho} TM, \quad (10)$$

is a complex called the *linear part* of the Lie ∞ -algebroid.

- (7) The following theorem is important, (see [Lav17, LLS20, LGL22] for more details) :

Theorem 1.4. *Let \mathfrak{F} be a singular foliation over M . Any geometric resolution of \mathfrak{F}*

$$\cdots \xrightarrow{d} E_{-3} \xrightarrow{d} E_{-2} \xrightarrow{d} E_{-1} \xrightarrow{\rho} TM \quad (11)$$

comes equipped with a Lie ∞ -algebroid structure whose unary bracket is d and whose anchor map is ρ (in particular $\rho(\Gamma(E_{-1})) = \mathfrak{F}$). Such a Lie ∞ -algebroid structure is unique up to homotopy and is called a universal Lie ∞ -algebroid of \mathfrak{F} .

In particular, this structure can be truncated to an almost graded Lie algebroid for \mathfrak{F} .

(8) Let $(E_\bullet, \ell_\bullet, \rho)$ a universal Lie ∞ -algebroid of a singular foliation \mathfrak{F} . For every point $x \in M$,

(a) We let $H^\bullet(\mathfrak{F}, x) = \bigoplus_{i \geq 1} H^{-i}(\mathfrak{F}, x)$ be the cohomology of the complex (11). The cohomology groups $H^\bullet(\mathfrak{F}, x)$ do not depend on the choice of a geometric resolution of \mathfrak{F} . Notice that when the complex (11) is minimal at x , $H^{-i}(\mathfrak{F}, x) \simeq E_{-i}|_x$ for every $i \geq 1$.

(b) The 1,2-ary brackets restrict to the graded vector space

$$\left(\bigoplus_{i \geq 2} E_{-i}|_x \right) \oplus \ker(\rho_x)$$

and equip the latter with an almost graded Lie ∞ -algebra structure as follows : for every $k \in \{1, 2\}$,

$$\{x_1, \dots, x_k\}_k := \ell_k(s_1, \dots, s_k)|_x \quad (12)$$

for all $x_1, \dots, x_k \in \text{ev}(E, x)$ and $s_1, \dots, s_k \in \Gamma(E)$ sections of E such that $s_i(x) = x_i$ with $i = 1, \dots, k$.

The bracket $\{\cdot, \cdot\}_2$ induces a graded Lie algebra on $H^\bullet(\mathfrak{F}, x)$. In particular, the 2-ary bracket $\{\cdot, \cdot\}_2$ satisfies the Jacobi identity on $H^{-1}(\mathfrak{F}, x) = \frac{\ker(\rho_x)}{\text{im}(d_x^{(2)})}$, and equips the latter with a Lie algebra structure.

(9) Let (M, \mathfrak{F}) be a singular foliation, let $\mathcal{I}_x := \{f \in C^\infty(M) \mid f(x) = 0\}$ and $\mathfrak{F}(x) := \{X \in \mathfrak{F} \mid X(x) = 0\}$. The quotient $\mathfrak{g}_x = \frac{\mathfrak{F}(x)}{\mathcal{I}_x \mathfrak{F}}$ is a Lie algebra and is called the isotropy Lie algebra of \mathfrak{F} at x .

Lemma 1.5. *Let (E, ℓ_\bullet, ρ) be a universal Lie ∞ -algebroid of \mathfrak{F} . Consider its underlying geometric resolution*

$$(E, d, \rho) : \quad \cdots \xrightarrow{\ell_1=d^{(4)}} E_{-3} \xrightarrow{\ell_1=d^{(3)}} E_{-2} \xrightarrow{\ell_1=d^{(2)}} E_{-1} \xrightarrow{\rho=d^{(1)}} TM. \quad (13)$$

Then,

(a) for all $x \in M$, we have $H^{-1}(\mathfrak{F}, x) \simeq \mathfrak{g}_x$ as Lie algebras;

(b) the subset of regular points of \mathfrak{F} in M satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} M_{\text{reg}, \mathfrak{F}} &= \{x \in M \mid \text{rk}(d_x^{(2)}) = \dim(\ker \rho_x)\} \\ &= \{x \in M \mid H^{-i}(\mathfrak{F}, x) = 0, \forall i \geq 1\}, \end{aligned}$$

$M_{\text{reg}, \mathfrak{F}}$ is open and dense in M ;

(c) the restriction of the foliation \mathfrak{F} to $M_{\text{reg}, \mathfrak{F}}$ is the set of sections of a subbundle of TM , i.e., is a regular foliation;

(d) For every $i \geq 0$, the dimension of $\text{im}(d^{(i+1)})$ is locally constant on $M_{\text{reg}, \mathfrak{F}}$. Moreover, if r the dimension of a regular leaf, then $\text{im}(d^{(i+1)})$ is of codimension

$$r_i = \sum_{j=1}^{i-1} (-1)^{j+1} \text{rk}(E_{-j}) + (-1)^{i+1} r, \text{ for } i \geq 1$$

in E_{-i} or $r_0 = \dim M - r$, with $E_0 := TM$;

(e) if (E, d, ρ) is of finite length, then (in the smooth case) all the regular leaves have the same dimension.

In what follows, we assume that a geometric resolution of finite length exists. Under these assumptions, all the regular leaves have the same dimension. Denote by r the common dimension of the regular leaves.

2. THE BLOWUP PROCEDURES

In what follows M can be a connected complex or smooth manifold or an irreducible affine or quasi-projective. Firstly, let us explain a general construction on morphisms of vector bundles.

2.1. Blowup of vector bundle morphisms. Let E, F be vector bundles over M and

$$\begin{array}{ccc} F & \xrightarrow{d} & E \\ & \searrow & \swarrow \\ & M & \end{array}$$

a morphism of vector bundles. In the smooth case, we assume that d is of constant rank on an open dense subset $M_{\text{reg},d} \subset M$, i.e., the dimensions of $\text{im}(d_x)$ or $\text{ker}(d_x)$ are constant for $x \in M_{\text{reg},d}$, called the *regular* part (this is automatically true when M is complex or a quasi-projective variety). Let r be the codimension of $\text{im}(d_x) \subseteq E_x$ for a point $x \in M_{\text{reg},d}$. Notice that for every $x \in M_{\text{reg},d}$, $\text{im}(d_x)$ is a point of the Grassmannian $\text{Gr}_{-r}(E_x)$ and $\text{ker}(d_x)$ is a point of $\text{Gr}_{\text{rk}(F)-r}(F_x)$. We consider the natural section of $\text{Gr}_{-r}(E) \rightarrow M$ which is defined on $M_{\text{reg},d}$ by:

$$\sigma: M_{\text{reg},d} \rightarrow \text{Gr}_{-r}(E), \quad x \mapsto (\text{im}(d_x), x). \quad (14)$$

Then we define $\widetilde{M} := \overline{\sigma(M_{\text{reg},d})}$ to be the closure of the image of the section σ in $\text{Gr}_{-r}(E)$, together with the projection $\pi: \widetilde{M} \rightarrow M$, where π denotes the restriction of $\Pi: \text{Gr}_{-r}(E) \rightarrow M$ to \widetilde{M} .

Remark 2.1. Intuitively, for $x \in M$, $\pi^{-1}(x) = \widetilde{M} \cap \Pi^{-1}(x)$ is the set of all possible limits of the images $\text{im}d_y$ when $y \in M_{\text{reg},d}$ converges to x . One can make a similar construction with the kernel of d .

Here is an immediate property of that construction.

Proposition 2.2. *Let $F \xrightarrow{d} E$ be a vector bundle morphism over M . The projection $\pi: \widetilde{M} \rightarrow M$ has the following property:*

- (1) π is proper and surjective. In particular, for each point $x \in M$, the fiber $\pi^{-1}(x)$ is non-empty.
- (2) For every $x \in M$ and $V \in \pi^{-1}(x)$, one has $\text{im}(d_x) \subseteq V$.
- (3) For every $x \in M_{\text{reg},d}$, $\pi^{-1}(x) = \text{im}(d_x)$ is reduced to a point in $\text{Gr}_{-r}(E)$. Also, $\pi^{-1}(M_{\text{reg},d})$ is a manifold² and the restriction $\pi: \pi^{-1}(M_{\text{reg},d}) \rightarrow M_{\text{reg},d}$ is invertible³ in the smooth and holomorphic contexts.

Proof. We prove it in the smooth and complex settings. Properness derives from the fact that the projection Π admits compact fibers. For any $x \in M$, choose $\mathcal{U} \subset M$ an open neighborhood of x that trivializes $E \rightarrow M$ over \mathcal{U} . Then, $\text{Gr}_{-r}(E) \simeq \text{Gr}_{-r}(\mathbb{K}^{\text{rk}(E)}) \times \mathcal{U}$. Notice that,

$$\pi^{-1}(x) = \left\{ V \subset E_x \mid \exists (x_n) \in M_{\text{reg},d}^{\mathbb{N}}, \text{ such that, } \text{im}(d_{x_n}) \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow +\infty} V \text{ as } x_n \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow +\infty} x \right\}.$$

²Manifold is to be understood as quasi-projective when M is quasi-projective.

³Invertible here means: diffeomorphism, in the smooth case; bi-holomorphism, in the complex case.

For any sequence (x_n) in $(M_{\text{reg,d}} \cap \mathcal{U})^{\mathbb{N}}$ that converges to x , we can extract a sequence $(x_{\varphi(n)})$ such that $n \mapsto \text{im}(d_{x_{\varphi(n)}}) \in \text{Gr}_{-r}(\mathbb{K}^{\text{rk}(E)})$ has a limit V , since the Grassmannian manifold $\text{Gr}_{-r}(\mathbb{K}^{\text{rk}(E)})$ is compact. Hence, $\pi^{-1}(x) \neq \emptyset$ and π is onto. This proves item 1.

Let us show item 2. Let $V \in \pi^{-1}(x)$ and $(x_n) \in (M_{\text{reg,d}})^{\mathbb{N}}$ such that $x_n \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow +\infty} x$ and $\text{im}(d_{x_n}) \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow +\infty} V$. Let $v \in \text{im}(d_x)$. We have $v = d_x u$ for some $u \in F_x$. Choose a (local) section \tilde{u} of F through u . By continuity, $d_{x_n} \tilde{u}(x_n) \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow +\infty} d_x u$, hence $d_x u \in V$. Thus, $\text{im}(d_x) \subseteq V$.

In particular, if $x \in M_{\text{reg,d}}$ and $V \in \pi^{-1}(x)$ one has $\text{im}(d_x) = V$ since $\dim V = \dim(\text{im}(d_x))$. Therefore, $\pi^{-1}(M_{\text{reg,d}})$ is the image of the map σ on $M_{\text{reg,d}}$, it is isomorphic/biholomorphic to $M_{\text{reg,d}}$. This proves item 3. \square

We are now going to apply the constructions above to a sequence of vector bundle morphisms which are all of constant rank on an open dense subset.

2.2. Main constructions and results. Let us work in the complex or holomorphic setting. Let \mathfrak{F} be a locally finitely generated $\mathcal{O}(M)$ -submodule of $\mathfrak{X}(M)$, i.e., every point of M admits an open neighborhood \mathcal{U} and a finite number of vector fields $X_1, \dots, X_n \in \mathfrak{X}(M)$ such that $\mathfrak{F}|_{\mathcal{U}} = \sum_{k=1}^n f_k X_k$ for $f_k \in \mathcal{O}(M)$. We assume that there exists a geometric resolution, i.e., complex of vector bundles $(E_{\bullet}, d^{(\bullet)}, \rho)$ of finite length

$$\begin{array}{ccccccccccc} 0 \cdots & \longrightarrow & E_{-i-1} & \xrightarrow{d^{(i+1)}} & E_{-i} & \xrightarrow{d^{(i)}} & E_{-i+1} & \longrightarrow & \cdots & \xrightarrow{d^{(2)}} & E_{-1} & \xrightarrow{\rho=d^{(1)}} & TM & (15) \\ & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & \\ M \cdots & \xlongequal{\quad} & M & \xlongequal{\quad} & M & \xlongequal{\quad} & M & \xlongequal{\quad} & \cdots & \xlongequal{\quad} & M & \xlongequal{\quad} & M & \end{array}$$

such that $\rho(\Gamma(E_{-1})) = \mathfrak{F}$ and exact as in (7), (see [LLS20] for conditions on existence of geometric resolutions at least locally). Denote by $M_{\text{reg},\mathfrak{F}}$ (as in Lemma 1.5) the open dense subset such that the fibers of $\text{im}(d^{(i)})$ are of constant rank and $\text{im}(d^{(i+1)}) = \ker(d^{(i)})$, for all $i \geq 1$. We set $E_0 := TM$ by convention and proceed as the following:

- (a) For every $i \geq 0$, let $\Pi_i: \text{Gr}_{-r_i}(E_{-i}) \longrightarrow M$ be the Grassmann bundle of E_{-i} with r_i as in Lemma 1.5 (d). Consider the natural section of Π_i on $M_{\text{reg},\mathfrak{F}}$ defined by :

$$\sigma_i: M_{\text{reg},\mathfrak{F}} \longrightarrow \text{Gr}_{-r_i}(E_{-i}), x \longmapsto \left(\text{im} \left(d_x^{(i+1)} \right), x \right) \quad (16)$$

- (b) Let $\widetilde{M}_i := \overline{\sigma_i(M_{\text{reg},\mathfrak{F}})}$ be the closure of the image of σ_i in $\text{Gr}_{-r_i}(E_{-i})$. Let $\pi_i: \widetilde{M}_i \longrightarrow M$ denote the restriction of Π_i to \widetilde{M}_i .

We also consider the section

$$\sigma_{\infty}: M_{\text{reg},\mathfrak{F}} \longrightarrow \prod_{x \in M} \prod_{i \geq 1} \text{Gr}_{-r_i}(E_{-i}|_x), x \mapsto (\sigma_1(x), \sigma_2(x), \dots, \sigma_i(x), \dots)$$

and define $\widetilde{M}_{\infty} := \overline{\sigma_{\infty}(M_{\text{reg},\mathfrak{F}})}$. Here, \widetilde{M}_{∞} should be understood as the tuples made of elements $V_1 \in \text{Gr}_{-r_1}(E_{-1}|_x), \dots, V_i \in \text{Gr}_{-r_i}(E_{-i}|_x), \dots$ such that there exists $(x_n) \in M_{\text{reg,d}}^{\mathbb{N}}$ such that $\text{im} \left(d_{x_n}^{(i+1)} \right) \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow +\infty} V_i$ as $x_n \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow +\infty} x$ for all $i \in \mathbb{N}$. It is important to notice that the V_i 's are given by the same sequence $(x_n) \in M_{\text{reg},\mathfrak{F}}^{\mathbb{N}}$.

Remark 2.3. The construction also makes sense for M an affine variety in \mathbb{C}^N , upon replacing TM by $T\mathbb{C}^N|_M \simeq M \times \mathbb{C}^N$. Notice that in the definition of \widetilde{M}_{∞} we leave \widetilde{M}_0 out.

By Proposition 2.2, for each $i \geq 0$, the projection $\pi_i: \widetilde{M}_i \rightarrow M$ is invertible on the open dense subset $M_{\text{reg}, \mathfrak{F}}$, it is proper and surjective. Moreover, for each point $x \in M$ and for every $i \geq 0$, the fiber $\pi_i^{-1}(x)$ is non-empty. Also, $\pi_\infty^{-1}(x)$ is non-empty.

From now on, most of the proofs are delayed to Section 3.

As sets, $\widetilde{M}_i, \widetilde{M}_\infty$ do not need to be manifolds. They can be singular, see Section 4.

Proposition 2.4. *Let \mathfrak{F} be a singular foliation on a smooth or complex variety on $M \in \{\mathbb{C}^N, \mathbb{R}^N\}$ that admits polynomial generators, then it admits a geometric resolution of finite length and \widetilde{M}_i and \widetilde{M}_∞ are quasi-projective varieties for all $i \geq 0$.*

For \mathfrak{F} a singular foliation on an affine variety, \widetilde{M}_i is a quasi-projective variety.

The following assertion follows from the existence of homotopy equivalence between any two geometric resolutions.

Theorem 2.5. *Let \mathfrak{F} be a singular foliation on M that admits geometric resolution. For each $i \geq 1$, \widetilde{M}_i does not depend on the choice of a geometric resolution of \mathfrak{F} . The same is true for \widetilde{M}_∞ .*

To prove Theorem 2.5, we first establish the following results.

Proposition 2.6. *Let (15) be a geometric resolution for \mathfrak{F} . For every $x \in M$, for every $i \geq 1$ and $V \in \pi_i^{-1}(x)$ one has,*

$$\text{im}(d_x^{(i+1)}) \subseteq V \subseteq \ker(d_x^{(i)}). \quad (17)$$

In particular, for all $x \in M_{\text{reg}, \mathfrak{F}}$ and $i \geq 1$, $\ker(d_x^{(i)}) = \text{im}(d_x^{(i+1)}) = \pi_i^{-1}(x)$.

Proposition 2.7. *Fix a geometric resolution (E, d, ρ) of \mathfrak{F} and a universal Lie ∞ -algebroid of \mathfrak{F} . The following are satisfied:*

- (1) *For every $x \in M$ and $V \in \pi_1^{-1}(x)$, the 2-ary bracket $\{\cdot, \cdot\}_2$ on $\ker \rho_x$ restricts to V and the image of V in $H^{-1}(\mathfrak{F}, x) \simeq \mathfrak{g}_x$, is a Lie subalgebra of codimension $r - \dim(L_x)$, where $\dim(L_x)$ is the dimension the leaf through x .*
- (2) *For all $x \in M$, and $(V_1 \subset E_{-1}|_x, \dots, V_k \subset E_{-k}|_x, \dots) \in \pi_\infty^{-1}(x)$ we have $\{V_i, V_j\}_2 \subset V_{i+j-1}$ for every $i, j \in \mathbb{N}_0$.*

The corollary below is a direct consequence of Proposition 2.6, and is another manner to state that M_i does not depend on the geometric resolution.

Corollary 2.8. *There are inclusions*

$$\widetilde{M}_i \hookrightarrow \coprod_{x \in M} \text{Gr}_{\text{rk}(d_x^{(i)}) - r_i}(H^{-i}(\mathfrak{F}, x)) \quad \text{and} \quad \widetilde{M}_\infty \hookrightarrow \coprod_{x \in M} \prod_{i \geq 1} \text{Gr}_{\text{rk}(d_x^{(i)}) - r_i}(H^{-i}(\mathfrak{F}, x)). \quad (18)$$

Proof. Let $x \in M$ and $i \geq 0$. By Proposition 2.6, elements $V \in \pi_i^{-1}(x)$ satisfy $\text{im}(d_x^{(i+1)}) \subseteq V \subseteq \ker(d_x^{(i)})$, they correspond injectively to a (unique) sub-vector space of codimension $r_i - \text{rk}(d_x^{(i)})$ in $H^{-i}(\mathfrak{F}, x)$. In particular, this implies the existence of an inclusion $\pi_i^{-1}(x) \hookrightarrow \text{Gr}_{r_i - \text{rk}(d_x^{(i)})}(H^{-i}(\mathfrak{F}, x))$. \square

Remark 2.9. In particular, $\widetilde{M}_1 \hookrightarrow \sqcup_{x \in M} \text{GrLie}_{\dim(L_x) - r}(\mathfrak{g}_x)$, where \mathfrak{g}_x is the isotropy Lie algebra of the singular foliation \mathfrak{F} at x and L_x is the leaf that passes through x . Here, $\text{GrLie}_{r - \dim(L_x)}(\mathfrak{g}_x)$ denotes the Grassmannian of Lie subalgebras of \mathfrak{g}_x of codimension $r - \dim(L_x)$.

Assume now that \mathfrak{F} is a singular foliation and that Equation (15) is a geometric resolution for \mathfrak{F} .

Definition 2.10. Let $i \geq 0$. We say that $X \in \mathfrak{F}$ *lifts* to $\widetilde{M}_i \subset \text{Gr}_{-r_i}(E_{-i})$, or \widetilde{M}_∞ , if there exists a vector field $\widetilde{X} \in \mathfrak{X}(\text{Gr}_{-r_i}(E_{-i}))$ or $\mathfrak{X}\left(\coprod_{x \in M} \prod_{i \geq 1} \text{Gr}_{-r_i}(E_{-i}|_x)\right)$, projectable to X and tangent to M_i in the sense of Section 1.2.1 (3). We denote by \widetilde{X}_i or \widetilde{X}_∞ the restriction of \widetilde{X} to M_i or \widetilde{M}_∞ respectively.

We say that a \mathfrak{F} *lifts* to \widetilde{M}_i if every vector field $X \in \mathfrak{F}$ lifts to \widetilde{M}_i .

Remark 2.11. \widetilde{X}_i on $\pi_i^{-1}(M_{\text{reg},\mathfrak{F}})$ is tangent in the usual sense to the submanifold and projects to X through π_i . In particular, if a lift exists, its restriction to $\pi^{-1}(M_{\text{reg},\mathfrak{F}})$ is unique, because $\pi_i: \pi_i^{-1}(M_{\text{reg},\mathfrak{F}}) \xrightarrow{\sim} M_{\text{reg},\mathfrak{F}}$. Since the other points of \widetilde{M}_i are limits of elements of $\pi_i^{-1}(M_{\text{reg},\mathfrak{F}})$, thus its restriction to \widetilde{M}_i is unique.

Theorem 2.12. *Let \mathfrak{F} be a singular foliation on M that admits geometric resolution. For every $i \geq 1$, the following items hold:*

- (1) *Every vector field $X \in \mathfrak{F}$ lifts to a vector field \widetilde{X}_i on \widetilde{M}_i ,*
- (2) *the map $X \in \mathfrak{F} \rightarrow \widetilde{X}|_{\widetilde{M}_i}$ does not depend on any choices. In particular, it is a Lie algebra morphism.*
- (3) *The module $\widetilde{\mathfrak{F}}_i$ over functions of \widetilde{M}_i generated by the \widetilde{X}'_i s for $X \in \mathfrak{F}$ is a singular foliation.*

The same holds for \widetilde{M}_∞ .

Definition 2.13. For each $i \geq 1$, $\widetilde{\mathfrak{F}}_i$ is called the *blowup* of \mathfrak{F} on \widetilde{M}_i .

Here is a remarkable fact.

Theorem 2.14. *Let \mathfrak{F} be a singular foliation on M that admits geometric resolution (E, d, ρ) . $\widetilde{\mathfrak{F}}_1$ is projective, i.e., it is the image of a Lie algebroid over \widetilde{M}_1 whose anchor map is injective on an open dense subset.*

In Theorem 2.14, we do not need the existence of geometric resolutions of \mathfrak{F} . An almost Lie algebroid of \mathfrak{F} is enough, the latter always exists [LLS20].

3. PROOF OF THE MAIN RESULTS

In this section, we prove Proposition 2.4, Proposition 2.6, Proposition 2.7 and Theorem 2.12.

Proof (of Proposition 2.4). Since $M = \mathbb{R}^N$ or \mathbb{C}^N and \mathfrak{F} is generated by polynomial vector fields, we can choose a polynomial geometric resolution (E, d, ρ) of \mathfrak{F} by trivial vector bundles, [LLS20]. Here by polynomial we mean the d and ρ are given by polynomials.

Let e_1, \dots, e_d resp. $e'_1, \dots, e'_{d'}$ be a basis by constant sections of E_{-i} resp. E_{-i+1} . One has,

$$d^{(i)}(e_l) = \sum_{k=1}^{d'} f_l^k e'_k \quad (19)$$

for some polynomial functions f_l^k on \mathbb{K}^N . Without any loss of generality, let us describe \widetilde{M}_i using local coordinates on $\text{Gr}_{-r_i}(E_{-i})$ consider for example the first standard coordinates chart \mathcal{U}_1 for the Grassmannian $\text{Gr}_{-r_i}(E_{-i})$, (see Section 1.1.2). Denote by $x = (x_1, \dots, x_N)$ the coordinates

on M . Let $m \in M$. For $W \in \mathcal{U}_1 \cap \text{Gr}_{-r_i}(E_{-i}|_m)$ and $(a_{pq}(m)) \in M_{d,d-r_i}(\mathbb{K})$ be the homogeneous coordinates of W , let us define the sections

$$\tilde{w}_q(x) := e_q(x) + \sum_{k=1}^{r_i} a_{kq}(x)e_k(x), \quad q = 1, \dots, d - r_i. \quad (20)$$

By construction, the $\tilde{w}_q(x)$'s, evaluated at m , form a basis for W . Notice that we have,

$$d^{(i)}(\tilde{w}_q)(x) = \sum_{k=1}^{d'} \left(f_q^k(x) + \sum_{s=1}^{r_i} a_{sq} f_s^k(x) \right) e'_k(x).$$

Therefore, $W \subseteq \ker d_m^{(i)}$ if and only if

$$\begin{aligned} f_q^k(m) + \sum_{s=1}^{r_i} a_{sq}(m) f_s^k(m) &= 0, \quad q = 1, \dots, d - r_i \\ k &= 1, \dots, d'. \end{aligned} \quad (21)$$

This defines an affine variety. As a result, \widetilde{M}_i is given in local coordinates \mathcal{U}_1 by elements that satisfy

- (1) Equation (21)
- (2) and that are limits of solutions of (21) in nearby regular points, elements which are unique. Hence, it is, on the affine variety, the irreducible components of (21) that projects onto M .

This concludes the proof in the smooth or complex cases. For a quasi-projective variety, the proof is similar. \square

Remark 3.1. When \mathfrak{F} is generated by polynomial vector fields, $\pi_i^{-1}(M_{\text{reg},\mathfrak{F}})$ is locally defined by polynomial equations.

Proof (of Proposition 2.6). We know by Proposition 2.2(2) that, for every $x \in M$ and $V \in \pi_i^{-1}(x)$, one has $\text{im}(d_x^{(i+1)}) \subseteq V$. Now, for any element $v \in V$, there exists a sequence $v_n \in \ker(d_{x_n}^{(i)}) = \text{im}(d_{x_n}^{(i+1)})$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$ that converges to v . In particular, $d_{x_n}^{(i)}(v_n) = 0$ for all n . Hence, by continuity, one has $v \in \ker(d_x^{(i)})$. Hence, $V \subseteq \ker d_x^{(i)}$. This completes the proof. \square

Proof. (of Proposition 2.7). For all $i \geq 1$, choose a local frame $e_1^{(i)}, \dots, e_{q_i}^{(i)}, \dots, e_{q_i+r_i}^{(i)}$ of E_{-i} on a neighborhood \mathcal{U} of x such that $e_1^{(i)}(x), \dots, e_{q_i}^{(i)}(x)$ is an orthogonal basis for V_i for an arbitrary Hermitian structure on E_{-i} . For $i, j \geq 1$, let $(c_{kl}^{ij,s}) \in \mathcal{O}(\mathcal{U})$ be a family of functions over \mathcal{U} such that for all $k \leq q_i$ and $l \leq q_j$,

$$\ell_2 \left(e_k^{(i)}, e_l^{(j)} \right) = \sum_{s \geq 1} c_{kl}^{ij,s} e_s^{(i+j-1)} \in \Gamma_{\mathcal{U}}(E_{-i-j+1}).$$

In particular,

$$\left\{ e_k^{(i)}(x), e_l^{(j)}(x) \right\}_2 = \sum_{s \geq 1} c_{kl}^{ij,s}(x) e_s^{(i+j-1)}(x). \quad (22)$$

The bracket in Equation 22 is well-defined even for $i = 1$ or $j = 1$, although only the 2-ary bracket of local sections is defined in such cases, because even if i or $j = 1$, we are taking the brackets of elements in $\ker \rho_x$. Let $u \in V_i, v \in V_j$ with $u = \sum_{s=1}^{q_i} \alpha^s e_s^{(i)}(x)$, and $v = \sum_{s=1}^{q_j} \beta^s e_s^{(j)}(x)$.

Let $(x_n) \in M_{\text{reg}, \mathfrak{F}}^{\mathbb{N}}$ be a sequence that converges to x such that $\text{im}(d_{x_n}^{(i+1)}) \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow +\infty} V_i$ and $\text{im}(d_{x_n}^{(j+1)}) \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow +\infty} V_j$. There exist sequences

$$u_n = \sum_{k=1}^{q_i+r_i} \alpha_n^k e_k^{(i)}(x_n) \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow +\infty} u; \quad v_n = \sum_{l=1}^{q_j+r_j} \beta_n^l e_l^{(j)}(x_n) \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow +\infty} v$$

with $u_n \in \text{im}(d_{x_n}^{(i+1)}) = \ker d_{x_n}^{(i)}$ and $v_n \in \text{im}(d_{x_n}^{(j+1)}) = \ker d_{x_n}^{(j)}$, for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. In particular, the sequences $(\alpha_n^k), (\beta_n^l) \in \mathbb{K}^{\mathbb{N}}$ satisfy $\alpha_n^k \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow +\infty} \alpha^k$; $\beta_n^l \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow +\infty} \beta^l$ with $\alpha^k = \beta^l = 0$ for $k \geq q_i + 1, l \geq q_j + 1$. Therefore, for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$ we have

$$\sum \alpha_n^k \beta_n^l c_{kl}^{ij,s}(x_n) e_s^{(i+j-1)}(x_n) = \{u_n, v_n\}_2 \in \text{im}(d_{x_n}^{(i+j)}) = \ker d_{x_n}^{(i+j-1)}. \quad (23)$$

We have used in (23), the fact that $\{du_1, du_2\}_2 \in \text{im}(d)$, for all $u_1, u_2 \in E_{\leq -2}$. Since

$$\begin{aligned} \sum \alpha_n^k \beta_n^l c_{kl}^{ij,s}(x_n) e_s^{(i+j+1)}(x_n) &\xrightarrow{n \rightarrow +\infty} \sum \alpha^k \beta^l c_{kl}^{ij,s}(x) e_s^{(i+j-1)}(x) \in E_{-i-j+1}|_x \\ &= \{u, v\}_2. \end{aligned} \quad (24)$$

As a result, $\{u, v\}_2 \in V_{i+j-1} \in \pi_{i-j-1}^{-1}(x)$. Hence, for every point $(V_1, \dots, V_i, \dots, V_j, \dots) \in \pi_{\infty}^{-1}(x)$ one has $\{V_i, V_j\}_2 \subseteq V_{i+j-1}$. This proves item 2. By taking $i = j = 1$ and $V_i = V_j = V \in \pi_1^{-1}(x)$, Equation (24) means that $\{u, v\}_2 \in V$. This proves item 1. \square

3.1. Proof of Theorem 2.5. In this section, we give a proof of Theorem 2.5. By Corollary 2.8 (whose proof is independent of Theorem 2.5), for every $i \geq 1$, we have an inclusion $\widetilde{M}_i \hookrightarrow \coprod_{x \in M} \text{Gr}_{\text{rk}(d_x^{(i)})-r_i}(H^{-i}(\mathfrak{F}, x))$, where r_i is defined as in Lemma 1.5(d). We now need to show this inclusion is canonical, i.e., independent of the choice of a geometric resolution (E, d, ρ) .

Convention 3.2. For (E, d, ρ) a geometric resolution of \mathfrak{F} . Denote by $\widetilde{M}_i^E := \widetilde{M}_i$ constructed out of (E, d, ρ) and $\widetilde{M}_i^{E'} := \widetilde{M}_i$ constructed out of (E', d', ρ') for $i \geq 1$. Also, for $x \in M$ and $V \in \pi_i^{-1}(x)$, we denote by \overline{V} the image of V in $\text{Gr}_{\text{rk}(d_x^{(i)})-r_i}(H^{-i}(\mathfrak{F}, x))$.

Remark 3.3. Let $x \in M$. Consider a minimal geometric resolution (E', d', ρ') of \mathfrak{F} at x (see Definition (4)). For $(V, x) \in \widetilde{M}_1^E$ and $(V', x) \in \widetilde{M}_1^{E'}$ one has that $\dim V' \leq \dim V$, because $\text{rk}(E'_1) \leq \text{rk}(E_1)$ by minimality. Hence, V, V' do not necessarily belong to the same Grassmannian. However, $\dim \overline{V} = \dim \overline{V}'$. We prove the latter in the next Lemma.

Lemma 3.4. Let (E, d, ρ) and (E', d', ρ') be geometric resolutions of \mathfrak{F} . For all $i \geq 1$, and for all $(V, x) \in \widetilde{M}_i^E$ and $(V', x) \in \widetilde{M}_i^{E'}$, one has, $\dim \overline{V} = \dim \overline{V}'$.

Proof. If $x \in M$ is a regular point, then $\overline{V} = \overline{V}' = \{0\}$. Thus, the equality holds. Let $x \in M$ be a singular point. We prove it only for $i = 1, 2$, since $i = 1$ is a special case and for $i \geq 3$ the proof uses a similar argument as for the one of $i = 2$. The key point in the latter is, for every $x \in M$, the restriction of the complexes (E, d, ρ) and (E', d', ρ') at x are quasi-isomorphic. This implies that the codimension of $\text{im}(d_x^{(i+1)})$ inside $\ker d_x^{(i)}$, resp. $\text{im}(d_x'^{(i+1)})$ inside $\ker d_x'^{(i)}$, is invariant.

Let $(V, x) \in \widetilde{M}_1^E$ and $(V', x) \in \widetilde{M}_1^{E'}$. We have

$$\begin{aligned}
 \dim \overline{V} &= \dim V - \dim(\operatorname{im}(d_x^{(2)})) \\
 &= \dim V - (\dim \ker \rho_x - \dim \ker \rho'_x + \dim(\operatorname{im}(d'_x{}^{(2)}))) \\
 &= \dim V - \operatorname{rk}(E_{-1}) + \operatorname{rk}(E'_{-1}) - \dim(\operatorname{im}(d'_x{}^{(2)})) \\
 &= \dim V' - \dim(\operatorname{im}(d'_x{}^{(2)})) \\
 &= \dim \overline{V'}.
 \end{aligned}$$

We have used the fact the cohomology groups at degree -1 of both complexes are isomorphic and the Rank–nullity theorem.

For $i = 2$, let $(V, x) \in \widetilde{M}_2^E$ and $(V', x) \in \widetilde{M}_2^{E'}$. Notice that $\dim V = \operatorname{rk}(E_{-2}) - \operatorname{rk}(E_{-1}) + r$. We have a similar formula for $\dim V'$. By direct computation we find that

$$\begin{aligned}
 \dim \overline{V} &= \dim V - \dim(\operatorname{im} d_x^{(3)}) \\
 &= \dim V - \operatorname{rk}(E_{-2}) + \operatorname{rk}(E'_{-2}) + \dim(\operatorname{im}(d_x^{(2)})) - \dim(\operatorname{im}(d'_x{}^{(2)})) - \dim(\operatorname{im}(d'_x{}^{(3)})).
 \end{aligned} \tag{25}$$

We have used the fact the cohomology groups at degree -2 of both complexes are isomorphic and the Rank–nullity theorem. But

$$\dim(\operatorname{im}(d_x^{(2)})) = \operatorname{rk}(E_{-1}) - \dim(\operatorname{im}(\rho_x)) - \dim W,$$

where W is such that $\dim(\operatorname{im}(d_x^{(2)})) \oplus W = \ker \rho_x$. A similar formula holds for $\dim(\operatorname{im}(d'_x{}^{(2)}))$ by adding $'$ everywhere. Substituting them into the Equation (25) we obtain

$$\dim \overline{V} = \dim \overline{V'} + \dim W' - \dim W = \dim \overline{V'},$$

since $\dim W' = \dim W$. □

Proof of (Theorem 2.5). For simplicity, we prove it for $i = 1$. For $i \geq 1$, the same arguments hold.

Let (E, d, ρ) and (E', d', ρ') be geometric resolutions of \mathfrak{F} . There exists chain morphisms $\varphi: E \rightarrow E'$ and $\psi: E' \rightarrow E$ whose compositions are homotopic to identity. In particular, φ defines an isomorphism $\overline{\varphi}$ at the level of cohomology, the latter is canonical (see [LLS20], Lemma 4.1). All we need to show is $\overline{\varphi}$ sends \widetilde{M}_1^E to $\widetilde{M}_1^{E'}$. The strategy is to show that for $x \in M$, the fiber $\widetilde{M}_1^E \cap \operatorname{Gr}_{r-\dim(L_x)}(E_{-1}|_x)$ over x is independent of any choices of minimal geometric resolutions at x , then deduce the result for every point $y \in M$, and for any two arbitrary geometric resolutions (E, d, ρ) and (E'', d'', ρ'') of \mathfrak{F} by introducing a minimal geometric resolution (E', d', ρ') at y of \mathfrak{F} between them, then compose the underlying quasi-isomorphisms.

Let $x \in \widetilde{M}_1^E$. Like we said, let us assume that (E', d', ρ') is minimal at x , i.e., $d'_x = 0$. Let e_1, \dots, e_k be local sections around x of E_{-2} such that

$$\operatorname{span}(d^{(2)}e_1|_x, \dots, d^{(2)}e_k|_x) = \operatorname{im}(d_x^{(2)}).$$

There is a neighborhood U_x of x such that $F_y = \operatorname{span}(d^{(2)}e_1|_y, \dots, d^{(2)}e_k|_y) \subseteq \operatorname{im}(d_y^{(2)})$ is of constant rank. These sections define a vector bundle F on U_x and $F_x = \operatorname{im}(d_x^{(2)})$. Likewise,

one consider the vector bundle $F' \subseteq \text{im}(d'^{(2)})$ on a neighborhood of x such that $\varphi_y(F_y) \subseteq F'_y$. Therefore, $\overline{\varphi}$ induces a map

$$\frac{\text{im}(d_y^{(2)})}{F_y} \longrightarrow \frac{\text{im}(d'_y{}^{(2)})}{F'_y}.$$

The latter is injective, because $d'_x = 0$. Since $\overline{\varphi}_y \left(\frac{\text{im}(d_y^{(2)})}{F_y} \right) \hookrightarrow \frac{\text{im}(d'_y{}^{(2)})}{F'_y}$, then $\varphi_y \left(\frac{\text{im}(d_y^{(2)})}{F_y} \right)$ converges to $\overline{W} \subseteq \frac{\text{im}(d'_y{}^{(2)})}{F'_y}$ when $y \in M_{\text{reg}, \mathfrak{F}}$ tends to x . Consequently, for $(V, x), (V', x)$ such that $\text{im}(d_y^{(2)})$ and $\text{im}(d'_y{}^{(2)})$ converges to V and V' respectively, one has, $\overline{\varphi}_x(\overline{W}) \subseteq \overline{V'}$. Hence, $\overline{\varphi}_x(\overline{W}) = \overline{V'}$. Also, $\overline{\psi}_x(\overline{V'}) = \overline{V}$ since $\overline{\psi}_x$ and $\overline{\varphi}_x$ are the inverse of each other. \square

3.2. Proof of Theorem 2.12 and 2.14. Theorem 2.12 follows from Lemma 3.6 which itself requires Lemma 3.5. We prove those in the smooth context. We recall that for $p: E \rightarrow M$ a vector bundle over M , a linear vector field on E is a pair $(Z, X) \in \mathfrak{X}(E) \times \mathfrak{X}(M)$ such that

$$\begin{array}{ccc} E & \xrightarrow{Z} & TE \\ p \downarrow & & \downarrow dp \\ M & \xrightarrow{X} & TM \end{array}$$

is a morphism of vector bundles (see e.g [Mac05], p. 110). Equivalently,

$$(1) \ Z[C_{\text{lin}}^\infty(E)] \subset C_{\text{lin}}^\infty(E) \text{ and } Z[p^*C^\infty(M)] \subset p^*C^\infty(M).$$

or

$$(2) \ \text{The flow of } Z \text{ on } E \text{ are (local) vector bundle morphisms } E \rightarrow E \text{ over the flow of } X \text{ on } M.$$

where $C_{\text{lin}}^\infty(E)$ is the subalgebra of smooth functions on E which are fiberwise linear. The latter is canonically isomorphic to $\Gamma(E^*)$ as $C^\infty(M)$ -modules. Notice in particular that, a linear vector field is p -projectable to X .

Lemma 3.5. *A linear vector field on $E \rightarrow M$ induces a vector field on $\Pi: \text{Gr}_{-r}(E) \rightarrow M$ that is Π -projectable on M .*

Proof. Let (Z, X) be a linear vector field on $E \rightarrow M$. Its flow $\phi_t^Z: E \rightarrow E$ is a vector bundle isomorphism whenever it is defined, induces a diffeomorphism $\text{Gr}_{-r}(E)$ so that it induces a map $\text{Gr}_{-r}(E) \rightarrow \text{Gr}_{-r}(E)$, $V \mapsto \phi_t^Z(V)$ that we still denote by ϕ_t^Z . Define $\tilde{Z} \in \mathfrak{X}(\text{Gr}_{-r}(E))$ for $(V, x) \in \text{Gr}_{-r}(E)$ by

$$\tilde{Z}(V) := \frac{d}{dt} \Big|_{t=0} c(t) \in T_{(V,x)}\text{Gr}_{-r}(E) \quad (26)$$

where $c(t) = (\phi_t^Z|_x(V), \phi_t^X(x))$ for t in some interval I . Also, \tilde{Z} is Π -projectable to X , by construction. \square

Lemma 3.6. *Let $i \geq 1$. For every $X \in \mathfrak{F}$, there is a linear vector field (Z^i, X) on the vector bundle $p_i: E_{-i} \rightarrow M$ or on $p_0: E_0 := TM \rightarrow M$, p_i -projectable to X . Their flows are compatible with the complex of vector bundles,*

$$\dots \xrightarrow{\ell_1=d^{(4)}} E_{-3} \xrightarrow{\ell_1=d^{(3)}} E_{-2} \xrightarrow{\ell_1=d^{(2)}} E_{-1} \xrightarrow{\rho=d^{(1)}} TM. \quad (27)$$

i.e., the diagram below commutes for all $i \geq 1$,

$$\begin{array}{ccccc}
 & & M & \xrightarrow{\phi_t^X} & M \\
 & \nearrow & \parallel & & \parallel \\
 E_{-i} & \xrightarrow{\phi_t^{Z^i}} & E_{-i} & \xrightarrow{\phi_t^X} & E_{-i} \\
 \downarrow d^{(i+1)} & & \downarrow \phi_t^X & & \downarrow d^{(i+1)} \\
 E_{-i+1} & \xrightarrow{\phi_t^{Z^{i-1}}} & E_{-i+1} & \xrightarrow{\phi_t^X} & E_{-i+1} \\
 & \nearrow & \parallel & & \parallel \\
 & & M & \xrightarrow{\phi_t^X} & M
 \end{array} \tag{28}$$

and induces a vector field \tilde{Z}^i on $\text{Gr}_{-r_i}(E_{-i})$ such that

- (1) \tilde{Z}^i is tangent to \tilde{M}_i .
- (2) \tilde{Z}^i projects onto X .

where $\phi_t^{Z^i}$ or ϕ_t^X denotes the flow of Z^i or X , when defined.

Proof. Let $(E, \ell_1, \ell_2, \rho)$ be an almost graded Lie algebroid of \mathfrak{F} , see Section 1.2.1(5). Let $X \in \mathfrak{F}$ and $i \geq 0$. For $i \neq 0$, there exists a section v of the vector bundle $p_i: E_{-i} \rightarrow M$ such that $\rho(v) = X$. Consider the linear vector field $Z^i \in \mathfrak{X}(E_{-i})$ defined as follows

$$Z^i[p_i^* f] := p_i^*(X[f]), \quad \forall f \in C^\infty(M), \tag{29}$$

$$Z^i[\alpha] := X[\langle \alpha, e \rangle] - \langle \alpha, \ell_2(v, e) \rangle, \quad \forall \alpha \in \Gamma(E_{-i}^*), \quad e \in \Gamma(E_{-i}). \tag{30}$$

For $i = 0$, one replaces $\ell_2(v, e)$ in (30) by $[X, Y]$ with $Y \in \Gamma(E_0) = \mathfrak{X}(M)$. Notice that Z^i depends on the choice of the almost graded Lie algebroid bracket ℓ_2 and X . The items 1, 2, 3 and 4 hold (see [LGLR22], Lemma 2.1.19. p. 61).

By Lemma 3.5, the linear vector field (Z^i, X) induces a vector field \tilde{Z}^i on the Grassmanian bundle $\text{Gr}_{-r_i}(E_{-i})$. Let us show item 1, $\phi_t^{Z^i}$ preserves \tilde{M}_i : to see this take $(V, x) \in \tilde{M}_i$, let $x_n \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow +\infty} x$ be such that $\text{im } d_{x_n}^{(i+1)} \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow +\infty} V$ with $(x_n) \subset M_{\text{reg}, \mathfrak{F}}$. Since, $d^{(i+1)} \circ \phi_t^{Z^i} = \phi_t^{Z^{i-1}} \circ d^{(i+1)}$ for $i \geq 0$, one has

$$\phi_t^{Z^i}|_{x_n} \left(\text{im } d_{x_n}^{(i+1)} \right) = \text{im } d_{\phi_t^X(x_n)}^{(i+1)}, \quad \text{for every } n \in \mathbb{N}_0.$$

Thus,

$$\begin{aligned}
 \phi_t^{Z^i}|_x(V) &= \lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \phi_t^{Z^i}|_{x_n} \left(\text{im } d_{x_n}^{(i+1)} \right) \\
 &= \lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \left(\text{im } d_{\phi_t^X(x_n)}^{(i+1)} \right) \in \pi^{-1} \left(\phi_t^X(x) \right).
 \end{aligned}$$

By consequence, \tilde{X}^i is tangent to \tilde{M}_i , by Equation (26). \square

Proof (of Theorem 2.12). By Lemma 3.6, every vector field $X \in \mathfrak{F}$ extends to a linear field $X^i \in \mathfrak{X}(\text{Gr}_{-r_i}(E_{-i}))$ which is tangent to \tilde{M}_i in the sense of Definition 3a. This proves item 1. Furthermore, the restriction \tilde{X}_i of X^i to \tilde{M}_i is unique, since $\pi_i|_{\pi_i^{-1}(M_{\text{reg}, \mathfrak{F}})}: \pi_i^{-1}(M_{\text{reg}, \mathfrak{F}}) \rightarrow M_{\text{reg}, \mathfrak{F}}$ is invertible. In particular, the map $X \in \mathfrak{F} \rightarrow \tilde{X}|_{\tilde{M}_i}$ does not depend on any choices and is a Lie algebra morphism. The module which is generated by the \tilde{X}_i is closed under Lie bracket by item 2 of Theorem 2.12). This ends the proof. \square

Proof (of Theorem 2.14). Let (E, d, ρ) be a geometric resolution of \mathfrak{F} . Fix a universal Lie ∞ -algebroid of \mathfrak{F} on (E, d, ρ) . Let τ^{E-1} and A^{E-1} be the tautological subbundle and tautological quotient bundle on $\text{Gr}_{-r}(E_{-1})$, that fit into the exact sequence

$$0 \rightarrow \tau^{E-1} \rightarrow \Pi^* E_{-1} \rightarrow A^{E-1} \rightarrow 0. \tag{31}$$

with $A^{E-1} \simeq \Pi^*E_{-1}/\tau^{E-1}$. In particular, $\text{rk}(A^{E-1})$ is the dimension of the regular leaves. One has

- (1) $\widetilde{\mathfrak{F}}_1$ the image of an almost Lie algebroid on $\Pi^*E_{-1}|_{\widetilde{M}_1}$ via the anchor map $\widetilde{\rho}: \Gamma(\Pi^*E_{-1})|_{\widetilde{M}_1} \rightarrow \mathfrak{X}(\widetilde{M}_1)$ defined by $\pi_1^*e \mapsto \widetilde{\rho}(e) \in \widetilde{\mathfrak{F}}_1$.
- (2) The tautological subbundle τ^{E-1} lies in the kernel of the anchor map: indeed, the fiber of τ^{E-1} over a point $(V, x) \in \widetilde{M}_1$ is equal to V by definition. By Proposition 2.6, the latter is included in $\ker \rho_x$ with equality if $x \in M_{\text{reg}, \mathfrak{F}}$.

Therefore, the anchor map $\widetilde{\rho}$ goes to quotient

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} 0 & \longrightarrow & \tau^{E-1} & \longrightarrow & \Pi^*E_{-1} & \longrightarrow & A^{E-1} \longrightarrow 0 \\ & & & & \downarrow \widetilde{\rho} & \swarrow & \\ & & & & T\widetilde{M}_1 & & . \end{array} \quad (32)$$

and makes $\widetilde{\mathfrak{F}}_1$ the image of an almost Lie algebroid on $A^{E-1}|_{\widetilde{M}_1}$ whose anchor is injective on the open dense subset $M_{\text{reg}, \mathfrak{F}}$. Thus, $A^{E-1}|_{\widetilde{M}_1}$ is a Lie algebroid with anchor, injective on $\pi_1^{-1}(M_{\text{reg}, \mathfrak{F}})$, whose image is $\widetilde{\mathfrak{F}}_1$. This proves the result. \square

Remark 3.7. Notice that in the proof of Theorem 2.14 we do not need the existence of a geometric resolution, we only make use of the anchor map and the bracket of an almost Lie algebroid of \mathfrak{F} , i.e., we only need E_{-1} and $\rho: E_{-1} \rightarrow TM$.

4. EXAMPLES

Let us start with some examples where our constructions give nothing new, i.e., $\widetilde{M}_i \simeq M$ or $\widetilde{M}_\infty \simeq M$.

Example 4.1. If \mathfrak{F} is a projective singular foliation, then $\widetilde{M}_i \simeq M$, for all $i \geq 1$ and $i = +\infty$. This comes from the fact that there exists a vector bundle $E_{-1} \rightarrow M$ such that $\Gamma(E_{-1}) \simeq \mathfrak{F}$ by Serre-Swan theorem [Swa62, Mor13]. This isomorphism is given by a vector bundle morphism, $E_{-1} \xrightarrow{\rho} TM$ which is injective on an open dense subset $M_{\text{reg}, \mathfrak{F}}$. As a consequence, $E_{-1} \xrightarrow{\rho} TM$ is a geometric resolution of \mathfrak{F} . Therefore, $\widetilde{M}_i \simeq M$ since $E_{-i} = 0$ for $i \geq 2$. Also, if r is the dimension of the regular leaves of \mathfrak{F} , then $r = \text{rk}(E_{-1})$. Hence $\text{Gr}_{-r}(E_{-1}) \simeq M$. In particular, $\widetilde{M}_1 \simeq M$.

Example 4.2. If the regular leaves of \mathfrak{F} are open, then $\widetilde{M}_0 \simeq M$, since $\text{Gr}_{-0}(TM) \simeq M$.

Example 4.3. If there exists a geometrical resolution (E, d, ρ) of length k , then $\widetilde{M}_i \simeq M$ for all $i \geq k+1$. Notice that one also has $\widetilde{M}_k \simeq M$ since the last differential map $d^{(k)}: E_{-k} \rightarrow E_{-k+1}$ is injective on an open dense subset so that the considered Grassmann bundle is $\text{Gr}_{-\text{rk}(E_{-k})}(E_{-k}) \simeq M$.

In contrast with Examples 4.1, 4.2 and 4.3, we construct two related examples where our construction is not trivial.

Example 4.4. Consider the projective singular foliation \mathfrak{F} generated by the Euler vector field $\vec{E} = \sum_{i=1}^N x_i \frac{\partial}{\partial x_i}$ on $M = \mathbb{C}^N$. Here, $M_{\text{reg}, \mathfrak{F}} = \mathbb{C}^N \setminus \{0\}$. It is easily checked that \widetilde{M}_0 is the closure of the graph $\{([x_1 : \cdots : x_N], x) \in \mathbb{P}^{N-1}(\mathbb{C}) \times \mathbb{C}^N \mid x \neq 0\}$. The latter is the blowup of \mathbb{C}^N at 0. This is an example where \mathfrak{F} is projective and $\widetilde{M}_0 \neq M$.

Example 4.5. Let \mathfrak{F} be the singular foliation of all vector fields vanishing at the origin $0 \in M = \mathbb{C}^N$. Here, $M_{\text{reg}, \mathfrak{F}} = \mathbb{C}^N \setminus \{0\}$. Let us compute \widetilde{M}_1 . To do this, we only need E_{-1} the

degree -1 of a geometric resolution (E, d, ρ) of \mathfrak{F} . See Example 3.34 of [LLS20] for a complete description of the latter. Here $E_{-1} \simeq M_N(\mathbb{C}) \times \mathbb{C}^N$ and the anchor map ρ is $E_{ij} \mapsto x_i \frac{\partial}{\partial x_j}$, where $M_N(\mathbb{C})$ is the vector space of $N \times N$ matrix with coefficient in \mathbb{C} and $(E_{ij})_{i,j=1,\dots,N}$ its canonical basis.

A direct computation for every $x \neq 0$ tells that $\ker \rho_x$ is the subspace of matrices $M \in M_N(\mathbb{C})$ such that $Mx = 0$, where $x = (x_1, \dots, x_N)$ is seen as a column vector. Equivalently, this kernel can be described as N copies of $[x_1 : \dots : x_N]^\perp$. Hence, \widetilde{M}_1 is the blowup of \mathbb{C}^N at the origin. This is an example of a singular foliation whose regular leaves are open, but such that $\widetilde{M}_1 \neq M$.

Let us study some examples related to the notion of an affine variety in \mathbb{C}^d .

Let \mathbb{A}^d be an affine space over \mathbb{K} with a set of coordinates x_1, \dots, x_d . Recall that an *affine variety* W is a subset of the affine space \mathbb{A}^d given by the zero locus $Z(\mathcal{I}_W)$ of a radical ideal $\mathcal{I}_W \subseteq \mathbb{K}[x_1, \dots, x_d]$ and equipped with the induced Zariski topology of \mathbb{A}^d . The *coordinate ring* of W is the quotient ring $\mathcal{O}_W = \mathbb{K}[x_1, \dots, x_d]/\mathcal{I}_W$. The Lie algebra $\mathfrak{X}(W)$ of *vector fields* on W are derivations of \mathcal{O}_W . We denote by W_{reg} the set of regular points of W . For every $x \in \mathbb{A}^d$ we denote by \mathfrak{m}_x the maximal ideal of vanishing polynomials at x . See, for instance, [Har77] for more details on these notions.

Example 4.6. Let $M = \mathbb{C}^d$ and $\varphi \in \mathbb{C}[x_1, \dots, x_d]$. Consider the singular foliation $\mathfrak{F}_\varphi = \{X \in \mathfrak{X}(\mathbb{C}^d) \mid X[\varphi] = 0\}$. In this case, $M_{reg, \mathfrak{F}} = \{x \in \mathbb{C}^d, \mid d_x \varphi \neq 0\}$. For every $y \in \mathbb{C}^d$, $(T_y \mathfrak{F}_\varphi)^\perp = \langle \nabla_y \varphi \rangle$. For a convergent sequence $y_n \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow +\infty]{} y$ with $y_n \in W_{reg, \mathfrak{F}}$. The sequence $\text{im}(\rho_{y_n}) = T_{y_n} \mathfrak{F}$ converges if and only if $\nabla_{y_n} \varphi$ converges in $\text{Gr}_{-(d-1)}(\mathbb{C}^d)$, that is, $\left[\frac{\partial \varphi}{\partial x_1}(y_n) : \dots : \frac{\partial \varphi}{\partial x_d}(y_n) \right]$ converges in the projective space $\mathbb{P}^{d-1}(\mathbb{C})$. Therefore, \widetilde{M}_0 is the closure of the image of the map, $y \mapsto (y, \left[\frac{\partial \varphi}{\partial x_1}(y) : \dots : \frac{\partial \varphi}{\partial x_d}(y) \right])$ which is the blow up of \mathbb{C}^d along the singular locus of φ , i.e., along $d\varphi = 0$.

Example 4.7. (Nash modification). Let $M = W$ be an affine irreducible affine variety of dimension r embedded in \mathbb{C}^d . Let Σ be its singular locus. Let $\mathfrak{F} = \text{Der}(\mathcal{O}_W)$ the singular foliation of vector fields on W tangent to Σ , where \mathcal{I}_Σ stands for the polynomial functions that vanish on Σ . Here, $W_{reg, \mathfrak{F}} = W_{reg} = W \setminus \Sigma$. Consider a geometric resolution (E_\bullet, d, ρ) of \mathfrak{F} by trivial vector bundles (which exists because \mathcal{O}_W is Noetherian, see Section 3.3 in [LLS20]).

Let us show that for every $x \in W \setminus \Sigma$, $\text{im}(\rho_x) = T_x \mathfrak{F} = T_x W$. It is clear that $\text{im}(\rho_x) \subseteq T_x W$. Conversely, it is a classical property that $x \in W$ is a regular point if and only if there exists “local coordinates” $y_1, \dots, y_d \in \mathcal{O}_x$ such that W is of the form

$$y_1 = \dots = y_k = 0,$$

i.e., the localization of \mathcal{I}_W is generated by these variables, where \mathcal{O}_x denotes the local ring at x . Hence, the tangent space of W at x is the vector space, $\text{span}\left\{ \frac{\partial}{\partial y_i} \Big|_{\mathfrak{m}_x}, i \geq k+1 \right\}$. Therefore, for $v \in T_x W$ the local vector field

$$X = \sum_{i=1}^{\dim W} v_i \frac{\partial}{\partial y_{k+i}}$$

maps \mathcal{O}_x to \mathcal{O}_x , in particular it maps \mathcal{O} to \mathcal{O}_x and we have $X[\mathcal{I}_W] \subset (\mathcal{I}_W)_{\mathfrak{m}_x}$. Therefore, for every, $i \in \{1, \dots, d\}$ there exists a polynomial function g_i that does not vanish at x such that $g_i Y[x_i] \in \mathbb{C}[x_1, \dots, x_d]$. By construction, the vector field $\hat{X} = \frac{g_1 \dots g_r}{g_1(x) \dots g_r(x)} X$ is tangent to W , i.e., $\hat{X}[\mathcal{I}_W] \subset \mathcal{I}_W$, and satisfies $\hat{X}(x) = v$.

The map $\pi_0: W \setminus \Sigma \rightarrow \text{Gr}_{-(d-r)}(\mathbb{C}^d)$ $x \mapsto \text{im}(\rho_x) = T_x W$ is the so-called Gauss map [LU81]. The Zariski closure \widetilde{W}_0 of the image of such a map is by definition the classical Nash blow-up of W along its singular locus Σ .

Example 4.8. (*Monoidal transformation*). Let $W = \mathbb{C}^d$. Let $C = Z(\mathcal{I}_C) \subset \mathbb{C}^d$ be a subvariety of \mathbb{C}^d defined by the ideal \mathcal{I}_C generated by $f_1, \dots, f_k \in \mathcal{O}_W$. Let $\mathfrak{F} = \mathcal{I}_C \mathfrak{X}(W)$ the singular foliation of vector fields vanishing along C . By Hilbert's Syzygy theorem [Eis04], there exists a free resolution of finite length for the ideal \mathcal{I}_C of polynomial functions vanishing on C of the form

$$\cdots \rightarrow K_{-2} \xrightarrow{\partial} K_{-1} \xrightarrow{\partial} \mathcal{I}_C \rightarrow 0 \quad (33)$$

Since $\mathfrak{X}(W)$ is a flat $\mathcal{O}_W = \mathbb{C}[x_1, \dots, x_d]$ -module (in fact $\mathfrak{X}(W) \simeq \mathcal{O}_W^d$ is a free module), the sequence

$$\cdots \xrightarrow{\partial \otimes \text{id}} K_{-2} \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_W} \mathfrak{X}(W) \xrightarrow{\partial \otimes \text{id}} K_{-1} \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_W} \mathfrak{X}(W) \xrightarrow{\rho} \mathfrak{F}. \quad (34)$$

is a free resolution $\mathbb{K}[W]$ by finitely generated $\mathbb{K}[W]$ -modules of the singular foliation $\mathfrak{F} = \mathcal{I}_C \mathfrak{X}(W)$, where for (μ_1, \dots, μ_k) a set of generators of K_{-1} the map given by, $\rho(\mu_i \otimes \frac{\partial}{\partial y_j}) = f_i \frac{\partial}{\partial y_j}$, for $i = 1, \dots, k$ and $j = 1, \dots, d$. By Theorem 2.1 in [LGL22], \mathfrak{F} admits a universal Lie ∞ -algebroid structure over the complex (34) whose unary bracket is $\ell_1 = \partial \otimes \text{id}$ and whose anchor is ρ .

Here, $W_{\text{reg}, \mathfrak{F}} = W \setminus C$. A direct computation shows that, for every $x \in W \setminus C$, $\ker \rho_x$ is equal to d copies of $[f_1(x) : \cdots : f_k(x)]^\perp$, i.e.,

$$\ker \rho_x = \left([f_1(x) : \cdots : f_k(x)]^\perp \right)^d,$$

where $[f_1(x) : \cdots : f_k(x)]$ is a well-defined straight line of \mathbb{K}^k generated by the vector $(f_1(x), \dots, f_k(x)) \in \mathbb{K}^k$ seen as a point of the projective space $\mathbb{P}^{k-1}(\mathbb{K}) = \text{Gr}_{-(k-1)}(\mathbb{C}^k)$.

One has,

$$\pi_1^{-1}(x) = \begin{cases} \left([f_1(x) : \cdots : f_k(x)]^\perp \right)^d, & \text{for } x \in W \setminus C, \\ V^d \in \left(\text{Gr}_{-1}(\mathbb{C}^k) \right)^d \text{ such that } \exists (x_n) \in W_{\text{reg}, \mathfrak{F}}^{\mathbb{N}}, [f_1(x_n) : \cdots : f_k(x_n)]^\perp \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow +\infty} V, \\ \text{with } V \in \text{Gr}_{-1}(\mathbb{C}^k) \text{ as } x_n \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow +\infty} x, & \text{for } x \in C. \end{cases}$$

The d components converge if and only if one of them converges. Since $[f_1(x_n) : \cdots : f_k(x_n)]^\perp$ converges in $\text{Gr}_{-1}(\mathbb{K}^k)$ if and only if the straight line $[f_1(x_n) : \cdots : f_k(x_n)]$ converges in $\mathbb{P}^{k-1}(\mathbb{K})$, \widetilde{W}_1 corresponds to the usual monoidal transformation of W with center C (see, for instance [Hau14]). In particular, \widetilde{W}_1 does not depend, up to isomorphism over W , on the choice of the generators f_1, \dots, f_k .

When f_1, \dots, f_k form a regular sequence, (33) can be chosen to be the Koszul complex. Then for each $i \geq 1$, \widetilde{W}_i is again the blowup of \mathbb{C}^d along C . In particular, $\widetilde{W}_i = \widetilde{W}_\infty$ is the blowup of $W = \mathbb{C}^d$ along C . Let us prove it. The proof is similar for every $i \geq 2$. Let us show it for $i = 2$. Since (34) is given by $E_{-i} = \wedge^i \mathcal{M} \otimes \mathfrak{X}(\mathbb{C}^d)$, where \mathcal{M} is a $\mathbb{C}[x_1, \dots, x_d]$ -module generated by some degree -1 symbols μ_1, \dots, μ_k and the differential map is defined by: for every $i \geq 1$, $j = 1, \dots, d$ and $1 \leq j_1 < \cdots < j_i \leq k$,

$$\text{d}^{(i)}(\mu_{j_1} \wedge \cdots \wedge \mu_{j_i} \otimes \frac{\partial}{\partial x_j}) = \sum_{l=1}^i (-1)^{l+1} f_{j_l} \mu_{j_1} \wedge \cdots \wedge \widehat{\mu_{j_l}} \wedge \cdots \wedge \mu_{j_i} \otimes \frac{\partial}{\partial x_j},$$

here the hat $\hat{\cdot}$ means the term is omitted. The computations of \widetilde{M}_i are similar for all $i \in \mathbb{N}_0$, let us compute \widetilde{M}_2 . Let $(g_{pq}^j) \in \mathbb{C}[x_1, \dots, x_d]$ with $j = 1, \dots, d$ and $p, q = 1, \dots, k$ such that $d^{(2)} \left(\sum_{p,q,j} g_{p,q}^j \mu_p \wedge \mu_q \otimes \frac{\partial}{\partial x_j} \right) = 0$. This implies that

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= \sum_{p,q,j} g_{p,q}^j (f_p \mu_q - f_q \mu_p) \otimes \frac{\partial}{\partial x_j} \\ &= \sum_{q,j} \left(\sum_p g_{p,q}^j f_p \right) \mu_q \otimes \frac{\partial}{\partial x_j} - \sum_{p,j} \left(\sum_q g_{p,q}^j f_q \right) \mu_p \otimes \frac{\partial}{\partial x_j}. \end{aligned}$$

For $x \in W_{\text{reg}, \mathfrak{F}}$, one finds that for every (p, j) and (q, j) that $(g_{1,q}^j(x), \dots, g_{k,q}^j(x)), (g_{p,1}^j(x), \dots, g_{p,k}^j(x)) \in [f_1(x) : \dots : f_k(x)]^\perp$. This proves the result.

Here is an example related to Poisson manifolds.

Example 4.9. Let (M, P) a smooth or holomorphic Poisson manifold with $P \in \Gamma(\wedge^2 TM)$. Consider the singular foliation generated by the Hamiltonian vector fields associated to P , i.e., $\mathfrak{F} = P^\sharp(\Gamma(T^*M))$, where $P^\sharp: T^*M \rightarrow TM$, $\alpha \mapsto P(\alpha, \cdot)$. Assume that a geometric resolution exists. By Lemma 3.6, every Hamiltonian vector field lifts to a vector field tangent to \widetilde{M}_i , $i \geq 1$. It is natural to ask whether the bivector field P lifts to \widetilde{M}_i . Assume that \widetilde{M}_i is smooth. Since for every $i \geq 1$, $\pi_i^{-1}(M_{\text{reg}, \mathfrak{F}}) \rightarrow M_{\text{reg}, \mathfrak{F}}$ is invertible, the restriction $P|_U$ lifts to a Poisson bivector field on $\pi_i^{-1}(M_{\text{reg}, \mathfrak{F}})$. However, it does not lift to \widetilde{M}_i in general. Indeed, consider the Poisson manifold $M = \mathfrak{so}^*(3) \simeq \mathbb{R}^3$ with

$$P = x \frac{\partial}{\partial y} \wedge \frac{\partial}{\partial z} + y \frac{\partial}{\partial z} \wedge \frac{\partial}{\partial x} + z \frac{\partial}{\partial x} \wedge \frac{\partial}{\partial y}. \quad (35)$$

Here \mathfrak{F} is generated by the vector fields $P^\sharp(dx) = z \frac{\partial}{\partial y} - y \frac{\partial}{\partial z}$, $P^\sharp(dy) = x \frac{\partial}{\partial z} - z \frac{\partial}{\partial x}$, $P^\sharp(dz) = y \frac{\partial}{\partial x} - x \frac{\partial}{\partial y}$. Let us compute \widetilde{M}_1 . Given a point $m \in M_{\text{reg}, \mathfrak{F}} = \mathbb{R}^3 \setminus \{0\}$, we find that

$$\ker P^\sharp|_m = \left\{ (a, b, c) \in \mathbb{R}^3 \mid (a, b, c) \in [x(m) : y(m) : z(m)] \in \mathbb{P}^2(\mathbb{R}) \right\} = [x(m) : y(m) : z(m)].$$

Hence, \widetilde{M}_1 is the usual blowup $B_0(\mathbb{R}^3)$ of \mathbb{R}^3 at the origin.

The bivector field P does not lift to \widetilde{M}_1 . Recall that the blowup space of \mathbb{R}^3 at the origin $B_0(\mathbb{R}^3) \subset \mathbb{P}^2(\mathbb{R}) \times \mathbb{R}^3$ is covered by three charts given by $x \neq 0$, $y \neq 0$ and $z \neq 0$. Let us look at the x -chart where the projection π_1 becomes $(x, y, z) \mapsto (x, xy, xz)$. In this chart P pulls back to

$$y \frac{\partial}{\partial z} \wedge \frac{\partial}{\partial x} + z \frac{\partial}{\partial x} \wedge \frac{\partial}{\partial y} + \frac{1}{x}(1 + y^2 + z^2) \frac{\partial}{\partial y} \wedge \frac{\partial}{\partial x}. \quad (36)$$

For $x = 0$ Equation (36) is not defined. In conclusion, the Hamiltonian vector fields of the Poisson structure P in (35) lift to \widetilde{M}_1 , but the bivector field P does not lift to \widetilde{M}_1 .

Example 4.10. Let $(E_{-1}, [\cdot, \cdot], \rho)$ be a smooth or holomorphic Lie algebroid over a manifold M and denote by $\mathfrak{F} = \rho(\Gamma(E_{-1}))$ the induced singular foliation. Assume there exists geometric resolutions. The Lie algebroid E_{-1} acts on the spaces \widetilde{M}_i for all $i \in \mathbb{N}_0$ also on \widetilde{M}_∞ , in a way that the following

$$\begin{array}{ccc} & & \mathfrak{X}(\widetilde{M}_1) \\ & \nearrow \bar{\rho} & \uparrow \\ \Gamma(E_{-1}) & \xrightarrow{\rho} & \mathfrak{X}(M) \end{array} \quad (37)$$

is a commutative diagram of Lie algebra morphisms. In addition, for each $i \in \mathbb{N}_0$, $\widetilde{\mathfrak{F}}_i$ is the image of a Lie algebroid on \widetilde{M}_i , namely the pull-back to \widetilde{M}_i of the Lie Algebroid E_{-1} . In particular, if \mathfrak{F} is given by a Lie algebra action of a Lie algebra \mathfrak{g} on M , then $\widetilde{\mathfrak{F}}_i$ is given by an action of \mathfrak{g} on \widetilde{M}_i .

In the following example, we show that our \widetilde{M}_1 is the blowup construction $\text{blup}(\mathfrak{F})$ given by Mohsen in Section 2.2 of [Moh21]

Example 4.11. Let \mathfrak{F} be a singular foliation that admits a geometrical resolution (E, d, ρ) . For every $x \in M$, $\text{blup}(\mathfrak{F})_x$ is constructed out of minimal generators X_1, \dots, X_d of \mathfrak{F} in a neighborhood of x as follows: for $y \in M_{\text{reg}, \mathfrak{F}}$, let ϕ_y be the surjective linear map defined by

$$\phi_y: \frac{\mathfrak{F}}{\mathcal{I}_x \mathfrak{F}} \longrightarrow T_y \mathfrak{F}, \quad \phi_y([X_i]_x) = X_i(y), \quad \text{for all } i \in \{1, \dots, d\}, \quad (38)$$

where $T_y \mathfrak{F}$ is the image of the evaluation map $e_y: \mathfrak{F} \longrightarrow T_y M$ at y . By definition, $\text{blup}(\mathfrak{F})_x$ is made of subspaces $V \subseteq \frac{\mathfrak{F}}{\mathcal{I}_x \mathfrak{F}}$ such that there exists a sequence $x_n \in M_{\text{reg}, \mathfrak{F}}$ such that

$$x_n \longrightarrow x, \quad \phi_{x_n}^{-1}(0) \longrightarrow V \in \text{Gr}_{-r} \left(\frac{\mathfrak{F}}{\mathcal{I}_x \mathfrak{F}} \right). \quad (39)$$

We claim that for every $x \in M$, $\text{blup}(\mathfrak{F})_x \simeq \pi_1^{-1}(x)$. Indeed, we can assume that (E, d, ρ) is a minimal geometric resolution at x such that $\rho(e_i) = X_i$ for $i = 1, \dots, d$, where $(e_i)_{i=1, \dots, d}$ is a local frame of E_{-1} . Since $\frac{\Gamma(E_{-1})}{\mathcal{I}_{x'} \Gamma(E_{-1})} \simeq E_{-1}|_{x'}$ for all $x' \in M$, the anchor map defines an isomorphism $\bar{\rho}_x: E_{-1}|_x \longrightarrow \frac{\mathfrak{F}}{\mathcal{I}_x \mathfrak{F}}$ such that the diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} E_{-1}|_x & \xrightarrow[\simeq]{\bar{\rho}_x} & \frac{\mathfrak{F}}{\mathcal{I}_x \mathfrak{F}} \\ \kappa_y \downarrow \wr & & \downarrow \phi_y \\ E_{-1}|_y & \xrightarrow{\rho_y} & T_y \mathfrak{F} \end{array} \quad (40)$$

commutes. The claim follows.

5. CONCLUSION

Let us conclude this paper with an open question. Can we desingularize a singular affine variety W by applying the constructions above to the singular foliation $\mathfrak{F} = \mathfrak{X}(W)$ of vector fields tangent to W ? We should then understand \widetilde{W}_0 as the Nash modification of W [LU81]. The meaning of \widetilde{W}_1 when \mathfrak{F} is the vector fields that vanish along a subvariety, is the monoidal transformation of W along of that subvariety. $\widetilde{\mathfrak{F}}_1$ is projective, and is included into the vector fields tangent to \widetilde{W}_1 . It is logical to apply the construction again to \widetilde{W}_1 or apply it to a sub-singular foliation of \mathfrak{F} .

Notice that until now we have used the anchor map, the unary bracket and the 2-ary bracket of a universal Lie- ∞ -algebroid, we would like to go further to understand, e.g., the role of the 3-ary bracket in this procedure.

Acknowledgements. I would like to thank C. Laurent-Gengoux, my PhD supervisor, for supporting me in writing this article and directing me to such questions that are originated from Claire Debord and Georges Skandalis. Also, I thank the management of the University of Lorraine for having supported me financially through an ATER position.

REFERENCES

- [AS09] Iakovos Androulidakis and Georges Skandalis. The holonomy groupoid of a singular foliation. *Journal für die reine und angewandte Mathematik*, 2009(626):1–37, 2009. <https://doi.org/10.5167/uzh-23589>.
- [AZ14] Iakovos Androulidakis and Marco Zambon. Holonomy transformations for singular foliations. *Advances in Mathematics (New York. 1965)*, 256:348–397, 2014. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.aim.2014.02.003>.
- [Cer79] Dominique Cerveau. Distributions involutives singulières. *Ann. Inst. Fourier (Grenoble)*, 29(3):xii, 261–294, 1979. http://archive.numdam.org/article/AIF_1979__29_3_261_0.pdf.
- [Deb01] Claire Debord. Holonomy Groupoids of Singular Foliations. *J. Differential Geom.*, 58(3):467–500, 07 2001. <https://doi.org/10.4310/jdg/1090348356>.
- [Eis04] David Eisenbud. *The Geometry of Syzygies: A Second Course in Algebraic Geometry and Commutative Algebra*. Springer New York, New York, NY, 2004.
- [FGP94] J. Ferrer, MI. García, and F. Puerta. Differentiable families of subspaces. *Linear Algebra and its Applications*, 199:229–252, 1994. Special Issue Honoring Ingram Olkin.
- [GY18] Alfonso Garmendia and Ori Yudilevich. On the inner automorphisms of a singular foliation. *Mathematische Zeitschrift*, 2018.
- [Har77] Robin Hartshorne. *Algebraic Geometry*. Graduate Texts in Mathematics, 52. Springer New York, New York, NY, 1st ed. 1977. edition, 1977.
- [Hau14] Herwig Hauser. Blowups and Resolution. 2014. <https://arxiv.org/abs/1404.1041>.
- [Lav17] Sylvain Lavau. Lie ∞ -algebroids and singular foliations. Ph-D 2017. <https://arxiv.org/abs/1703.07404>.
- [LGL22] Camille Laurent-Gengoux and Ruben Louis. Lie-Rinehart algebras \simeq acyclic Lie ∞ -algebroids. *Journal of Algebra*, 594:1–53, 2022. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jalgebra.2021.11.023>.
- [LGLR22] Camille Laurent-Gengoux, Ruben Louis, and Leonid Ryvkin. *Geometry of singular foliations: a draft of an introduction*. CRM Barcelona, Poisson geometry summer school, 2022. <https://www.crm.cat/wp-content/uploads/2022/07/Singular-Foliations.pdf>.
- [LLS20] Camille Laurent-Gengoux, Sylvain Lavau, and Thomas Strobl. The universal Lie ∞ -algebroid of a singular foliation. *Doc. Math.*, 25:1571–1652, 2020.
- [LU81] D.T. Lê and T. Urabe. *Geometry of Tangents on Singular Spaces and Chern Classes*. Kyoto University. Department of Mathematics. Lectures in mathematics. Kinokuniya Company, 1981.
- [Mac05] Kirill C. Mackenzie. *General theory of Lie groupoids and Lie algebroids / Kirill C.H. Mackenzie,...* London Mathematical Society lecture note series. Cambridge University press, Cambridge, C 2005.
- [Moh21] Omar Mohsen. Blow-up groupoid of singular foliations. 2021. <https://arxiv.org/abs/2105.05201>.
- [Mor13] Archana S. Morye. Note on the Serre-Swan theorem. *Mathematische Nachrichten*, 286(2-3):272–278, 2013.
- [MP82] D Motreanu and N.H Pavel. Quasi-tangent vectors in flow-invariance and optimization problems on banach manifolds. *Journal of Mathematical Analysis and Applications*, 88(1):116–132, 1982.
- [Swa62] Richard G. Swan. Vector Bundles and Projective modules. *Transactions of the American Mathematical Society*, 105(2):264–277, 1962. <https://doi.org/10.1090/S0002-9947-1962-0143225-6>.