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Abstract

The aim of this paper is to generalize the hyperplane section theorem of Gurjar to arbitrary (local) analytic varieties even if the intersection with of hyperplanes is not necessarily isolated.

In case of formal varieties, we generalize the statement to work for different classes of functions than just hyperplanes. We call these classes (which are subsets of formal power series ring) to be algebraic $m$-adically closed (AmAC).
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1 Introduction

In [Gur97], R.V. Gurjar proved the following hyperplane section theorem.

Theorem 1.1. Let $A = \mathbb{C}[x_1, x_2, ..., x_n]$ and $m$ denote its maximal ideal.

Let $f \in m^2$. Assume that, for every hyperplane $h \in m - m^2$, the ring $A/(f, h)$ is an isolated singularity of dimension $n - 2$. Then there abstractly exists an integer $N(f)$ (depending on $f$) such that $\mu(A/(f, h)) \leq N(f)$, for any hyperplane $h \in m - m^2$.

Later Shigefumi Mori gave a simpler proof of it in [Mor01].

The aim of this paper is to generalize this result to arbitrary (formal/analytic) varieties even if the intersection with of hyperplanes is not necessarily isolated, and at the same time for different class of functions than just hyperplanes, as follows.

Let $\mathbb{K}$ be an uncountable field. Let $A = \mathbb{K}[x_1, x_2, ..., x_n]$ and $m$ denote its maximal ideal.
Theorem 3.11. Let $X$ be an equidimensional subvariety of $\text{spec}(A)$. Let $ZD(X)$ denote the zero divisor of $\mathcal{O}_X$ in $A$. Let $P \subset A$ be an algebraic $\mathfrak{m}$-adicly closed class such that $ZD(X) \cap P = \emptyset$. Let $h_i \in P$ be an infinite sequence of hypersurfaces such that $\Sigma_{X \cap H_i}$ is of dimension $d$ and multiplicity of $\Sigma_{X \cap H_i} \to \infty$ as $i \to \infty$. Then there exist a hypersurface $h \in P$ such that $\Sigma_{X \cap H}$ is of dimension $\geq d + 1$.

This tri fold generalization is done by using an appropriate higher dimensional invariant (multiplicity of the singular locus) instead of Milnor number $\mu$. And allowing a different classes of functions which we call algebraic $\mathfrak{m}$-adicly closed (AmAC) classes, of which hyperplanes is an example.

So by putting $P = \mathfrak{m} - \mathfrak{m}^2$ and taking $X$ to be irreducible (to get rid of the hypothesis of zero divisors) we get,

Theorem 3.12. Let $X$ be an irreducible subvariety of $\text{spec}(A)$. Let $h_i \in \mathfrak{m} - \mathfrak{m}^2$ be an infinite sequence of hyperplanes such that $\Sigma_{X \cap H_i}$ is of dimension $d$ and multiplicity of $\Sigma_{X \cap H_i} \to \infty$ as $i \to \infty$. Then there exist a hyperplane $h \in \mathfrak{m} - \mathfrak{m}^2$ such that $\Sigma_{X \cap H}$ is of dimension $\geq d + 1$.

In section 2, we prove preliminary results required to be able to work with multiplicity of singular locus and to prove some subsets of $A/\mathfrak{m}^k$ are constructible in Zariski to topology.

In section 3, we define AmAC classes of functions, prove some of their properties and prove the theorem 3.11. We also use AmAC classes to prove the following result.

Theorem 3.14. Let $X \subset \text{Spec}(A)$ be a isolated hypersurface singularity with Tjurina number $\tau$. Then there abstractly exist a constant $c > 0$ such that $\mu(X) \leq c$. This $c$ depends only on $\tau$ and $n$.

In [DG18], $\mu \leq \frac{1}{2}\tau$ was proposed for the case of plane curves, which was later proven in [ACABMH20] and [HG19] separately for the case of irreducible curves. In [Liu18] an explicit bound of $\mu \leq n\tau$ has been proven.

In section 4, we prove an analogue of the above theorem 3.12 to the case of Analytic variety (using Artin’s approximation theorem), and we also prove a converse in the case of hyperplanes.

In Section 5, we use the AmAC to generalize Gurjar’s theorem further as follows.

Theorem 5.5. Let $X \subset \text{spec}(A)$ be an equidimensional subvariety of dimension 2. Let $ZD(X)$ denote the zero divisor of $\mathcal{O}_X$ in $A$. Let $P \subset A$ be an algebraic $\mathfrak{m}$-adicly closed class such that $ZD(X) \cap P = \emptyset$. Then there abstractly exists constants $e(P), t(P)$, such that for every hypersurface $h \in P$, (where $m$ is the maximal ideal of $B$), multiplicity tuple of $\Sigma_H$ is bounded by $(e(P), t(P))$ in the lexicographic ordering, and there is a hypersurface whose singular locus achieves this maximum.

multiplicity tuple of dimension 1 local ring $R$ is defined as (multiplicity of $R$ w.r.t. $m$, $m$-torsion in $R$). So the above result can also be understood as saying: “From theorem 3.11 we already know that the multiplicity of singular locus of $X \cap H$ is bounded, but among the hypersurfaces of $P$ with maximum multiplicity, the amount of $m$-torsion in $\mathcal{O}_{\Sigma_H}$ is also bounded.”

By putting $P = \mathfrak{m} - \mathfrak{m}^2$ in the above theorem, we can get an invariant for surface singularity. (the maximum possible multiplicity tuple of $\Sigma_H$ for $H \in P = \mathfrak{m} - \mathfrak{m}^2$).
2 Preliminaries

Let \( R \) be a noetherian ring of dimension \( d \) with a maximal ideal \( m \). Let \( I \) be an \( m \)-primary ideal.

**Definition 2.1.** Define Samuel function \( \chi^I_R(n) := \text{len}(R/I^{n+1}) \). If the maximal ideal is clear from the context and \( I = m \), then we will drop the \( m \) in the notation. We take the definition of multiplicity as following

\[
e(R, m) = \lim_{n \to \infty} d \frac{\text{len}(R/m^{n+1})}{n^d}
\]

The equivalence of this and the more geometric definition can be found in [Mat89, Theorem 14.14]. (Since [Mat89] is an algebra book the theorem is algebraic and the result must then be interpreted in a geometric way)

We will use the following fundamental result of dimension theory

**Lemma 2.2.** Let \( R \) be a noetherian \( k \)-algebra of dimension \( d \) with maximal ideal \( m \). Let \( I \) be an \( m \)-primary ideal. Then for \( n \gg 0 \), \( \chi_R(n) = p(n) \), where \( p(n) \) is a rational polynomial of degree \( d \) (called Samuel polynomial).

**Proof.** [Mat89, Theorem 13.4].

**Lemma 2.3.** Let \( q(x) \) be a rational polynomial of degree \( d \) such that \( q(x) > 0 \) for \( x \gg 0 \) i.e has a positive highest coefficient. Let \( p(x) \) be another rational polynomial such that \( p(x) \geq q(x) \) for infinitely many positive integers. Then \( \deg(p) \geq \deg(q) = d \) and \( p(x) > 0 \) for \( x \gg 0 \).

Further more if \( \deg(p) = \deg(q) \) then the highest coefficient of \( p(x) \) is greater than or equal to the highest coefficient of \( q \).

**Proof.** We prove this by contradiction. Let \( \deg(p) < d \), then for \( n \gg 0 \), \( p(n) < q(n) \), which is a contradiction to the assumption.

Similarly, if \( \deg(p) = \deg(q) \) and the highest coefficient of \( p(x) \) is less than the highest coefficient of \( q(x) \), then again for \( n \gg 0 \), \( p(n) < q(n) \), which is a contradiction to the assumption.

The next lemma will be used for doing induction in the proof later.

**Lemma 2.4.** Let \( R \) be a noetherian ring of dimension \( d > 0 \) with a maximal ideal \( m \) such that \( R/m \) is infinite. Let \( \chi_R(n) \) be the Samuel function of \( R \) w.r.t \( m \).

Then there exist two graded rings \( \tilde{R} \) of dimension \( d \) and \( \overline{R} \) of dimension \( d - 1 \) such that

\[
e(R, m) = e(\tilde{R}, \tilde{m}) = e(\overline{R}, \overline{m})
\]

\[
\chi_R(n) \geq \chi_{\tilde{R}}(n)
\]

\[
\chi_{\overline{R}}(n) = \chi_{\tilde{R}}(n - 1) + \chi_R(n)
\]

Here \( \tilde{m} \) and \( \overline{m} \) are the irrelevant ideals of the graded rings \( \tilde{R} \) and \( \overline{R} \) respectively.
Proof. Let \( gr_m(R) \) denote the graded algebra \( R/m \oplus m/m^2 \oplus \ldots \) with the standard grading. (which we note is generated by first grade \( m/m^2 \)).

Since the Samuel function of \( R \) and \( gr_m(R) \) are equal, w.l.o.g. \( R = gr_m(R) = R_0 \oplus R_1 \oplus \ldots \). Therefore \( R \) is a graded \( R/m \)-algebra generated by \( R_1 \).

Let \( x \in R_1 \) be a part of system of parameters so \( \text{dim}(R/(x)) = d - 1 \).

Define \( T_x := \{ a \in R \mid \exists k \text{ such that } x^k a = 0 \} \), which is a graded ideal (as \( x^k \) are homogeneous elements). Define \( \tilde{R} := R/T_x \). This is graded ring and \( \tilde{x} \) (image of \( x \) in \( \tilde{R} \)) is a non zero divisor. Since \( \tilde{R} \) is a quotient of \( R \), we get \( \chi_R(n) \geq \chi_{\tilde{R}}(n) \). Since \( \text{supp}(T_x) \subset V(x) \) is of dimension strictly less than \( d \), multiplicities of \( \tilde{R} \) and \( R \) are equal.

Define \( \overline{R} := \tilde{R}/(\tilde{x}) \). Since \( \tilde{x} \) is a non zero divisor, \( (\tilde{x}) \) isomorphic to \( \tilde{R} \), as \( \tilde{R} \) modules, and \( \text{dim}(\overline{R}) = \text{dim}(R) - 1 \)

\[
\text{len}(\overline{R}/m^{r+1}) = \text{len}(\langle \tilde{x} \rangle/m^{r+1}) = \text{len}(\frac{\tilde{R}}{m^{r+1}}) - \text{len}(\langle \tilde{x} \rangle/m^{r+1})
\]

\[
= \text{len}(\frac{\tilde{R}}{m^{r+1}}) - \text{len}(\frac{\langle \tilde{x} \rangle}{\langle \tilde{x} \rangle \cap m^{r+1}})
\]

\[
= \text{len}(\frac{\tilde{R}}{m^{r+1}}) - \text{len}(\langle \tilde{x} \rangle - \text{len}(\frac{\langle \tilde{x} \rangle \cap m^{r+1}}{\tilde{x}m^r})]
\]

Since \( \tilde{R} \) is a graded ring and \( \tilde{x} \) is a non zero divisor (and a homogeneous element of degree 1), \( \langle \tilde{x} \rangle \cap \tilde{R}_{r+1} = \langle \tilde{x} \rangle_{r+1} = \tilde{x}\tilde{R}_r \) (where \( \langle \tilde{x} \rangle_{r+1} \) is the \( r+1 \) graded piece of ideal \( \langle \tilde{x} \rangle \)). This gives,

\[
\langle \tilde{x} \rangle \cap m^{r+1} = \langle \tilde{x} \rangle \cap (R_{r+1} \oplus R_{r+2} \oplus \ldots) = \tilde{x}R_r \oplus \tilde{x}R_{r+1} \oplus \ldots = \tilde{x}m^r
\]

Also we see that \( R/m^r \xrightarrow{x} \langle x \rangle/xm^r \) is a isomorphism map (as \( \langle \tilde{x} \rangle \cong \tilde{R} \)). So we get

\[
\chi_{\overline{R}}(r) = \chi_{\tilde{R}}(r) - \chi_{\tilde{R}}(r - 1)
\]

Using definition of multiplicity (or [Mat89, Theorem 14.11]), multiplicity of \( \overline{R} \) = multiplicity of \( \tilde{R} \) = multiplicity of \( R \). \( \square \)

Remark 2.5. The inequality (1) and (2) of the following lemma are used in the proof of the main theorems, while (3) will be used only in section 5 to give examples (and hence can be safely skipped).

Lemma 2.6. Let \( R \) be a noetherian ring of dimension \( d \) with a maximal ideal \( m \) such that \( R/m \) is infinite. Let \( \chi_R(n) \) be the Samuel function of \( R \) w.r.t \( m \). Then

\[
\chi_R(n) \geq \binom{n + d}{d}
\]

Let \( e \) be the multiplicity the of \( R \) w.r.t \( m \). Then we can obtain better bounds as follows.

For \( n \leq e - 1 \),

\[
\chi_R(n) \geq \binom{n + d + 1}{d + 1}
\]
For $n \geq e - 1$,

$$
\chi_R(n) \geq \sum_{i=0}^{d} (-1)^i \binom{e}{i+1} \binom{n+d-i}{d-i} = e \binom{n+d}{d} + \text{lower order terms (of } n) \tag{3}
$$

Note that $\binom{n+d}{d}$ is the Samuel polynomial of a regular local ring of dimension $d$.

One can easily see that (1) is a special case of (3) at $e = 1$, but we will give a more geometric proof.

**Proof.** of (1). Since the Samuel function of $R$ and $\text{gr}_m(R)$ are equal, w.l.o.g. we may assume that $R = R_0 \oplus R_1 \oplus ...$ is a graded ring generated by $R_1$.

Now apply noether normalization on $\text{Proj}(R)$. This gives us a graded Ring homomorphism from $A = \frac{R}{m}[x_1, ... x_d] \to R$, which is also a integral and dominant map. In particular the map is injective. So

$$
\binom{n+d}{d} = \text{len}(A/m^{n+1}) = \text{len}(A_0 \oplus A_1 \oplus ... \oplus A_n) \leq \text{len}(R_0 \oplus R_1 \oplus ... \oplus R_n) = \text{len}(\frac{R}{m^{n+1}})
$$

**Proof.** of (2). We prove (2) using induction on dimension.

**Base case :** $\text{dim}(R) = 0$

We see that if $m^r/m^{r+1} = 0$, then by nakayama lemma $m^r = m^{r+1}$, which implies $\text{len}(R/m^r)$ is a strictly monotonic function of $r$ until $\text{len}(R/m^r) = e$.

$$
\chi_R(n) \geq \binom{n+0+1}{0+1} = n+1 \text{ (if } n < e)
$$

Now we prove the **inductive step**, with $\text{dim}(R) = d$

We use lemma 2.4 to get, $\bar{R}$ and $\bar{R}$ such that $\bar{R}$ has dimension $d-1$ and multiplicity $e$.

$$
\chi_R(n) \geq \chi_{\bar{R}}(n) = \sum_{r=0}^{n} \chi_{\bar{R}}(r) 
\geq \sum_{r=0}^{n} \binom{r+d}{d} \text{ (if } n < e) \text{ (using induction on } \bar{R})
= \binom{n+d+1}{d+1} \text{ (if } n < e)
$$

**Proof.** of (3). We will prove this using double induction on $n$ and dimension $d$.

First we note that the coefficient of $x^{d+1}$ in the product of the power series $(1+x)^{-e}$ and $(1+x)^e$ is 0 (as dimension $= d \geq 0$) so we get

$$
\sum_{i=0}^{d+1} (-1)^i \binom{e}{i} \binom{(e-1)+d+1-i}{d+1-i} = 0
$$
Base Case: \( n = e - 1 \) Now using (2)

\[
\chi_R(e - 1) \geq \left( (e - 1) + d + 1 \right) \cdot \frac{1}{d + 1} \\
= \sum_{i=0}^{d} (-1)^i \binom{e}{i+1} \left( \frac{(e - 1) + d - i}{d - i} \right) \text{ (using the above equation)}
\]

Inductive step: We assume the inequality is true for all ring of dimension < \( d \), and for rings of dimension = \( d \) the inequality is true until \( n - 1 \). Using lemma 2.4 construct \( \tilde{R}, \tilde{R} \) as before

Since \( \dim(\tilde{R}) = d - 1 \) by induction hypothesis, the inequality holds for all \( n \geq e - 1 \).

Since \( \dim(\tilde{R}) = d \) the inequality holds until \( n - 1 \)

\[
\chi_R(n) \geq \chi_R(n - 1) + \chi_{\tilde{R}}(n)
\]

\[
\geq \sum_{i=1}^{d} (-1)^i \binom{e}{i+1} \left( \frac{n - 1 + d - i}{d - i} \right) + \sum_{i=1}^{d-1} (-1)^i \binom{e}{i+1} \left( \frac{n + d - 1 - i}{d - i - 1} \right)
\]

\[
= \sum_{i=1}^{d} (-1)^i \binom{e}{i+1} \left( \frac{n + d - 1 - i}{d - i} \right) + (-1)^d \binom{e}{d+1} \left( \frac{n - 1}{0} \right)
\]

\[
= \sum_{i=1}^{d} (-1)^i \binom{e}{i+1} \left( \frac{n + d - 1 - i}{d - i} \right) + (-1)^d \binom{e}{d+1} .1
\]

\[
= \sum_{i=1}^{d} (-1)^i \binom{e}{i+1} \left( \frac{n + d - 1 - i}{d - i} \right)
\]

\( \square \)

Fix \( \mathbb{K} \) to be an uncountable algebraically closed field (eg. \( \mathbb{C}, \mathbb{Q}_p, \mathbb{F}_p((t)) \)). Fix \( A = \mathbb{K}[x_1, \ldots, x_n] \) and fix \( \mathfrak{m} \) to be its maximal ideal.

Definition 2.7. Let \( X \) be a subvariety of \( \text{spec}(A) \) and \( I(X) = (f_1, f_2, \ldots, f_k) \) be ideal defining \( X \). Define \( \Sigma_X^\alpha \) as scheme of “all points \( p \in X \) such that \( \dim(T_p(X)) > \alpha \)”, whose scheme structure is given as follows.

\[
\Sigma_X^\alpha := X \cap \text{spec} \frac{A}{J_{n-\alpha}(X)} = \text{spec} \frac{A}{I(X) + J_{n-\alpha}(X)}
\]

where \( J_{n-\alpha}(X) \) is the ideal generated by \( n - \alpha \times n - \alpha \) minors of the Jacobian matrix \( \left( \frac{\partial f_i}{\partial x_j} \right) \).

As seen in [Loo84, 4.D], \( J_{n-\alpha}(X) \) corresponds to the fitting ideal of the module \( \Theta_f := \text{Coker}(A^k \xrightarrow{\text{fuc}(f_i)} A^n) \), so the scheme \( \Sigma_X^\alpha \) does not depend on the choice of generators of the ideal.

If \( X \) is equidimensional of dimension \( \alpha \), then we denote the singular locus of \( X \) as a scheme by \( \Sigma_X \) and is defined as follows.

\[
\Sigma_X := \Sigma_X^\alpha = X \cap \text{spec} \frac{A}{J_{n-\alpha}(X)} = \text{spec} \frac{A}{I(X) + J_{n-\alpha}(X)}
\]

As seen in [Loo84, 4.A], this scheme corresponds exactly to the singular locus of \( X \).
The next two results are semi-continuity results which will be used throughout this paper at various places to prove that certain sets are Zariski constructible

**Lemma 2.8.** Let \( B = \mathbb{K}[x_1, \ldots, x_n]/I \) and \( \mathfrak{m} \) be its maximal ideal. Let \( I_1, \ldots, I_k \) be \( \mathfrak{m} \)-primary ideals and \( I := I_1 + \ldots + I_k \). Define

\[
\text{len}_I : B/I_1 \times \ldots \times B/I_k \to \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}
\]

\[
\text{len}_I(y_1, \ldots, y_k) = \text{len}(\frac{B}{I + \langle y_1, \ldots, y_k \rangle})
\]

Then \( \text{len}_I \) is upper semi-continuous, when \( B/(I_1) \times \ldots \times B/(I_k) \) is given the Zariski topology.

**Proof.**

\[
\text{len}(\frac{B}{I + \langle y_1, \ldots, y_k \rangle}) = \text{len}(\frac{B}{I}) - \text{len}(\frac{I + \langle y_1, \ldots, y_k \rangle}{I})
\]

So it is enough to prove that that \( \text{len}(\frac{I + \langle y_1, \ldots, y_k \rangle}{I}) \) is lower semi-continuous, since \( \mathbb{K} \) is algebraically closed \( \text{len} = \text{dim}_K \).

Define the linear map \( (B/I)^k \to B/I \), given by \( (a_i) \mapsto \sum_{i=1}^k y_i a_i \). Note that the image is exactly \( I + \langle y_1, \ldots, y_k \rangle \), therefore rank this map is exactly \( \text{dim}_K(\frac{I + \langle y_1, \ldots, y_k \rangle}{I}) \). But rank is lower semi-continuous (in the variable \( (y_1, \ldots, y_k) \)) as needed.

**Notation:** Let \( B = \mathbb{K}[x_1, \ldots, x_n]/I \) and \( h \in B \) then by \( H \) we will denote the corresponding subvariety, i.e. \( H = \text{Spec}(B/\langle h \rangle) \)

**Lemma 2.9.** Let \( B = \mathbb{K}[x_1, \ldots, x_n]/I \) be a ring of dimension \( \alpha + 1 \) and \( \mathfrak{m} \) be its maximal ideal. Define

\[
\text{len}_\Sigma : B/\mathfrak{m}^r \to \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}
\]

\[
\text{len}_\Sigma(h) = \text{len}(\mathcal{O}_{\Sigma_H}/\mathfrak{m}^{r-1})
\]

\( \text{len}_\Sigma \) is well defined and upper semi-continuous, when \( B/\mathfrak{m}^r \) is given the Zariski topology.

**Proof.** Let \( A = \mathbb{K}[x_1, \ldots, x_n] \) and \( I = \langle f_1, \ldots, f_k \rangle \) Define

\[
A/\mathfrak{m}^r \to (A/\mathfrak{m}^r) \times (A/\mathfrak{m}^{r-1})^{(k+1) \times \alpha} \to \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}
\]

\[
\text{len}(\frac{A}{\mathfrak{m}^r + I + \langle h \rangle + \langle \text{nc}\alpha \rangle(H)})
\]

Choose \( h_1, h_2 \in \mathfrak{m} - \mathfrak{m}^2 \) such that \( h_1 = h_2 = \overline{h} \) modulo \( \mathfrak{m}^r \). Then \( \frac{\partial h_1}{\partial x_i} = \frac{\partial h_2}{\partial x_i} \) modulo \( \mathfrak{m}^{r-1} \), so the first map is well defined. Note that the first map is a multi linear map on the vector space \( A/\mathfrak{m}^r \) hence continuous in the Zariski topology. And second map is upper semi-continuous by previous lemma 2.8. Now we go modulo \( I \) to get the map \( \text{len}_\Sigma : B/\mathfrak{m}^r \to \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0} \), which is also upper semi-continuous.
3 Algebraic m-Adically Closed Class

In the Theorem 3.12, we restricted our attention to hyperplanes. In this section, we will generalize the result to other subsets of \( \mathbb{K}[x_1, ..., x_n] \).

Definition 3.1. A subset \( P \subset B = \mathbb{K}[x_1, ..., x_n]/I \) is said to be a algebraic m-adically closed (AmAC) class, if \( P = \varprojlim P_i \) where \( P_i \) are constructible subsets of \( B/m^i \) (in Zariski topology).

Since \( P \) is an inverse limit, \( P \) is automatically m-adically closed (see 3.2).

If \( U \) is set compliment of an AmAC then we refer to it as algebraic m-adically open (AmAO) class.

Lemma 3.2. Let \( P \subset B = \mathbb{K}[x_1, ..., x_n]/I \) then the following are equivalent

1. \( P = \varprojlim P_i \), where \( P_i \subset B/m^i \).
2. \( P \) is a m-adically closed subset.

Proof. (1) \( \implies \) (2)
Since the m-adic topology is given by \( B = \varprojlim B/m^i \), where \( B/m^i \) is given the discrete topology. But \( P_i \) is closed in discreet to topology of \( B/m^i \). So \( P = \varprojlim P_i \) is m-adically closed since it is inverse limit of closed subsets.

(2) \( \implies \) (1)
Let \( \pi_i : B \to B/m^i \) be the canonical projection map. Let \( P_i := \pi_i(P) \). Define \( \overline{P} := \varprojlim P_i \).
As see before \( \overline{P} \) is m-adically closed. We will prove that \( \overline{P} \) is a the closure of \( P \). Since \( P \) is also m-adically closed, we will get \( P = \overline{P} = \varprojlim P_i \).

Let \( p \in \overline{P} \), then \( p = (..., \pi_i(p_i), \pi_{i+1}(p_{i+1}), ...) \), and \( p_i \in P \). The sequence \( p_i \) converges to \( p \) in the m-adic topology (since \( \forall i \exists p_i = p \mod m^i \)). Hence \( \overline{P} \) is a the closure of \( P \). \( \square \)

Remark 3.3. Note that \( P_i \) is in general not closed or open in the Zariski topology, but these are closed in discrete topology since everything is closed in discrete topology.

In [Mor01], Mori proves non emptiness of a certain fixed subset of \( \mathbb{C}[x_1, ..., x_n] \) by proving that it is an inverse limit of Zariski constructible set. (Similarly in theorem 3.12). We in turn have turned this into the definition of AmAC class. The following non emptiness lemma is unsurprising.

Lemma 3.4. Let \( P = \varprojlim P_i \) be a AmAC class. \( P \neq \emptyset \) iff \( P_i \neq \emptyset \ \forall i \).

Proof. We have a sequence of maps \( ... \to P_{r+1} \to P_r \to P_{r-1} \to ... \) given by restriction of projection maps.

Define \( W_{r,s} := \text{Closure of Image}(P_r \to P_s) \) (Closure taken in \( P_s \) w.r.t. Zariski topology)
Define \( W_s := \bigcap_{r>s} W_{r,s} \).
This is an intersection of closed subsets in a noetherian space, so this must be a finite intersection. So \( W_s = W_{t,s} \) for \( t >> s \). So the map from \( W_t \to W_s \) is a dominant map, for all \( t, s \) such that \( t > s \).
Now we can get a sequence of space \( ... \to W_{s+1} \to W_s \to ... \) which are subset of \( ..., P_{s+1}, P_s, ... \) and are nonempty and the maps are dominant.
3.11 we get back Theorem 3.12

Therefore $\phi_K$ is uncountable, an infinite sequence of $A_m$ these are some examples of $A_m$ Example 3.7.

Remark 3.5. We see in the previous proof that we can always assume that the maps between $P_i$ are dominant.

Lemma 3.6. Let $B = \mathbb{K}[x_1, \ldots, x_n]/I$, Let $P^1 = \lim \leftarrow P^1_i$, $P^2 = \lim \leftarrow P^2_i$, ..., $P^j = \lim \leftarrow P^j_i$, ... be an infinite sequence of AmAC classes in $B$.

1. AmAC classes are closed under finite union. ($P^1 \cup P^2 = \lim \leftarrow P^1_i \cup P^2_i$)

2. AmAC classes are closed under finite intersection. ($P^1 \cap P^2 = \lim \leftarrow P^1_i \cap P^2_i$)

3. AmAC classes are closed under countable intersection. ($\bigcap_j P^j = \lim \leftarrow \bigcap_{j \leq i} P^j_i$)

Let $B'$ be another such ring, and $Q = \lim \rightarrow Q_i$ be an AmAC in $B'$. Let $f : B \rightarrow B'$ be a map of local rings. Then.

4. AmAC classes are closed under images. ($f(P^1) = \lim \rightarrow f(P^1_i)$)

5. AmAC classes are closed under inverse images. ($f^{-1}(Q) = \lim \leftarrow f^{-1}(Q_i)$)

Note: We will use this lemma without referring to it.

Proof. Since inverse limit is a limit it commutes with all other limits. We immediately get (2), (5) and for (3) we get that

$$\bigcap_j P^j = \lim \leftarrow \bigcap_{j \leq i} P^j_i = \lim \leftarrow P^j_i$$ (because the intersection is countable.)

We now give a proof of second equality above. $\lim \leftarrow \bigcap_{j \leq i} P^j_i \subset \lim \rightarrow \bigcap_j P^j_i$ as $\bigcap_j P^j_i \subset \bigcap_{j \leq i} P^j_i$.

If $(\ldots, p_i, \ldots, p_j, p_k) \in \bigcap_{j \leq i} P^j_i$, then $\forall j, p_j \in P^j_j$ but Image of $p_j = p_i$, so $\forall j, p_i \in P^j_i$, so $p_i \in \bigcap_j P^j_i$.

(1) follows because inverse limit commutes with finite union

(4) Clearly, $f(P^1) \subset \lim \rightarrow f(P^1_i)$.

Now let $\phi = (\ldots, f(p_i), f(p_{i+1}), \ldots) \in \lim \rightarrow f(P^1_i)$. Take $P^\phi_i = f^{-1}(f(p_i)) \cap P^1_i$. Now $P^\phi_i$ also form an inverse system constructible sets. So $P^\phi = \lim \rightarrow P^\phi_i$ is an AmAC, and by lemma 3.4 its non empty. Also as $P^\phi_i \subset P^1_i$, so $P^\phi \subset P^1_i$. Let $\psi \in P^\phi$ be an element, then $f(\psi) = \phi$. Therefore $\phi \in f(P^1)$.

Example 3.7. these are some examples of AmAC classes.

1. $\{0\} = \lim \leftarrow m^k/m^k$ (i.e. singletons)

2. hyperplanes, $m - m^2$

When we put this class in place of $P$ in Theorem 3.11 we get back Theorem 3.12.
3. \( m^k - m^l \)

4. \( \{ h \in A = \mathbb{K}[x_1, ..., x_n] \mid \tau(h) = r \} \) (where \( \tau(h) = \text{len}(\mathcal{O}_{\Sigma_H}) \) and is called Tjurina number) (this subset is also \( m \)-adically open)

**Notation:** From now onwards \( B = \mathbb{K}[x_1, ..., x_n]/I \) will denote a ring all of whose components have dimension \( \alpha + 1 \), and \( H \) will denote \( \text{spec}(B/(h)) \) for any \( h \in B \)

5. \( T(r) := \{ h \in B \mid \text{len}(\mathcal{O}_{\Sigma_H}) = r \} \) (this subset is also \( m \)-adically open)

**Proof.** We look at \( B_{r+2} = B/m^{r+2} \) regarded as an affine space. Define \( \pi : B \to B_{r+2} \) to be the canonical quotient map.

Using lemma 2.9, \( \overline{T} := \{ \overline{h} \in B/m^{r+2} \mid \text{len}(\mathcal{O}_{\Sigma_H}/m^{r+1}) = r \} \) is a Zariski constructible subset. (As seen in lemma 2.9, \( \text{len}(\mathcal{O}_{\Sigma_H}/m^{r+1}) \) does not depend on which lift \( h \) of \( \overline{h} \) is chosen)

We will prove that \( T(r) = \pi^{-1}(\overline{T}) \)

First let \( h \in T(r) \). Since \( \text{len}(\mathcal{O}_{\Sigma_H}) = r \), \( m^{r+1}\mathcal{O}_{\Sigma_H} = 0 \), so \( \mathcal{O}_{\Sigma_H} = \mathcal{O}_{\Sigma_H}/m^{r+1} \), so \( \pi(h) \in \overline{T} \)

Let \( h \in \pi^{-1}(\overline{T}) \) and let \( \overline{h} := \pi(h) \). If \( \text{dim}(\mathcal{O}_{\Sigma_H}) > 0 \), then by lemma 2.6(1), \( \text{len}(\mathcal{O}_{\Sigma_H}/m^{r+1}) \geq r + 1 \), which is a contradiction to choice of \( h \). So \( \text{dim}(\mathcal{O}_{\Sigma_H}) = 0 \) i.e. \( h \) has an isolated singularity.

Let multiplicity of \( \Sigma_H = \text{len}(\mathcal{O}_{\Sigma_H}) \geq r + 1 \), then by lemma 2.6(2) \( \text{len}(\mathcal{O}_{\Sigma_H}/m^{r+1}) \geq r + 1 \), which is a contradiction to choice of \( h \). So \( \text{len}(\mathcal{O}_{\Sigma_H}) \leq r \), which implies that \( \mathcal{O}_{\Sigma_H}/m^{r+1} = \mathcal{O}_{\Sigma_H} \). So \( \text{len}(\mathcal{O}_{\Sigma_H}) = r \), This implies \( h \in T(r) \).

6. \( \{ h \in A = \mathbb{K}[x_1, ..., x_n] \mid \mu(h) = r \} \) (where \( \mu(h) = \text{len}(A/(\partial h/\partial x_1)) \) and is called the Milnor number of the singularity) (this subset is also \( m \)-adically open)

**Proof.** Same as before but we will use the semicontinuity of the milnor number.

**Remark 3.8.** As \( B \) is chosen to be equidimensional of dimension \( \alpha + 1 \), Let \( ZD(B) \) denote the Zero divisor of \( B \). For any \( h \notin ZD(B) \), \( H \) is equidimensional of dimension \( \alpha \), so \( \Sigma_H^\alpha = \Sigma_H \).

7. \( D(d) := \{ h \in B \mid \text{dim}(\Sigma_H^\alpha) \geq d \} \) (For definition of \( \Sigma_H^\alpha \) see 2.7. See also remark 3.8.)

**Proof.** We will prove that \( D(d) = \lim_{\xi \to \infty} D_\xi(d) \), where \( D_\xi(d) \) is defined as follows.

\[
D_\xi(d) := \{ \overline{h} \in B/m^\xi \mid \text{len}(\mathcal{O}_{\Sigma_H^\alpha}/m^{k+1}) \geq \left( \frac{k + d}{d} \right), \forall k \leq r - 2 \}
\]

Using lemma 2.9, \( D_\xi(d) \) is a Zariski constructible subset.

\( D(d) = \lim_{\xi \to \infty} D_\xi(d) \) because if \( \text{dim}(\Sigma_H^\alpha) \geq r \) then \( \overline{h} = h + m^r \) satisfies the condition of \( D_\xi(d) \) by lemma 2.6(1).
Let $h \in B$ and $h \not\in D(d)$, then $\text{len}(\mathcal{O}_{\Sigma_H} / \mathfrak{m}^{k+1})$ is a polynomial of degree $< d$ (lemma 2.2). So for large $k$, $\text{len}(\mathcal{O}_{\Sigma_H} / \mathfrak{m}^{k+1}) < \left( \frac{k+d}{d} \right)$ which is a higher degree polynomial. So $h \not\in \varprojlim D_i(d)$

**Remark 3.9.** One notes that if $h \in ZD(B)$, then $H$ has dimension $\alpha + 1$. So $\alpha \times \alpha$ minors will vanish along the $\alpha + 1$ dimensional component of $H$. In particular, $\Sigma_H$ will contain this component. Therefore, $ZD(B) \subset D(d)$ $\forall d \leq \alpha + 1$. Similarly if $h \not\in ZD(B)$ then $H$ has dimension $\alpha$ as $\Sigma_H \subset H$, we see that $h \not\in D(\alpha + 1)$. So $D(\alpha + 1) = ZD(B)$ (if Spec$(B)$ is equidimensional). Finally, one notes that $D(d) = \emptyset$ if $d > \alpha + 1$

Though $D(d)$ is an AmAC class, it does not satisfy the hypothesis of theorem 3.11 as $ZD(X) \subset D(d)$ $\forall d \leq \alpha + 1$. None the less, the fact that $D(d)$ is an AmAC class is used in the proof of theorem 3.11.

Gurjar’s theorem in [Gur97] could be understood as “For a sequence of hyperplane $H_i$, if $X \cap H_i$ has a 0-dimensional singular locus and Milnor number tends to $\infty$ as $i \to \infty$, then there exist a hyperplane $H$ such that dimension of singular locus of $X \cap H$ is $\geq 1$”. We want to generalize to the case when the dimension of singular locus of $X \cap H_i$ is $d$ and “some invariant” tends to infinity then there exist a hyperplane $H$ such that dimension of singular locus of $X \cap H$ is $\geq d + 1$. But why should we stop at a jump of $d$ to $d + 1$, why not try and quantify a jump directly to $d + r$.

Note as seen in section 2, understanding growth of Samuel polynomial determines the dimension of variety. This brings us to the following lemma with a technical growth condition. Note the lemma puts no constraint of dimension of $\Sigma_{X \cap H_i}$.

**Lemma 3.10.** Let $X$ be an equidimensional subvariety of Spec$(A)$. Let $ZD(X)$ denote the zero divisor of $\mathcal{O}_X$ in $A$. Let $P \subset A$ be an algebraic $\mathfrak{m}$-adically closed class such that $ZD(X) \cap P = \emptyset$. Let $h_i \in P$ be an infinite sequence of hypersurfaces such that $\text{len}(\mathcal{O}_{\Sigma_{X \cap H_i}} / \mathfrak{m}^{k+1}) \geq \left( \frac{k+d+1}{d+1} \right) \forall k < i$. Then there exist a hyperplane $h \in P$ such that $\Sigma_{X \cap H}$ is of dimension $\geq d + 1$.

**Proof.** Let $X = \text{Spec}(B)$. Define $\alpha + 1 := \text{dim}X$ so if $h \not\in ZD(X)$ then $\Sigma_H = \Sigma_{X \cap H}$ (where $H$ denotes Spec$(B/\langle h \rangle)$) (see remark 3.8).

Let $D(d+1) = \{ h \in B \mid \text{dim}(\Sigma_H) \geq d + 1 \}$ (where $H$ denotes Spec$(B/\langle h \rangle)$) As seen in example 3.7.7, $D(d+1) = \varprojlim D_r(d+1)$ where

$$D_r(d+1) = \{ h \in B/\mathfrak{m}^r \mid \text{len}(\mathcal{O}_{\Sigma_{X \cap H}} / \mathfrak{m}^{k+1}) \geq \left( \frac{k+d+1}{d+1} \right), \forall k \leq r - 1 \}$$

Let map $f : A \to B$ be the map induced by inclusion of $X \to \text{Spec}(A)$. Let $P = \varprojlim P_i$.

The hypothesis implies that for every $i > 0$, there exists a hypersurface $h_i \in \overline{P}$ such that $\text{len}(\Sigma_{H_i \cap X} / \mathfrak{m}^{k+1}) \geq \left( \frac{k+d+1}{d+1} \right)$. This implies $P_i \cap f^{-1}(D_i(d+1)) \neq \emptyset \forall i$. Now using lemma 3.4, gives us that $P \cap f^{-1}(D(d+1)) \neq \emptyset$.

**Theorem 3.11.** Let $X$ be an equidimensional subvariety of Spec$(A)$. Let $ZD(X)$ denote the zero divisor of $\mathcal{O}_X$ in $A$. Let $P \subset A$ be an algebraic $\mathfrak{m}$-adically closed class such that $ZD(X) \cap P = \emptyset$. Let $h_i \in P$ be an infinite sequence of hypersurfaces such that $\Sigma_{X \cap H_i}$ is of dimension $d$ and multiplicity of $\Sigma_{X \cap H_i} \to \infty$ as $i \to \infty$. Then there exist a hypersurface $h \in P$ such that $\Sigma_{X \cap H}$ is of dimension $\geq d + 1$. 11
Proof. Because of the hypothesis, ∃ a hyperplane $h_i \in P$ such that $\dim(\Sigma_{H_i \cap X}) = d$ and multiplicity of singular locus $\geq i$. Now applying, lemma 2.6(2) implies that $\text{len}(\mathcal{O}_{\Sigma_{H_i \cap X}/m^{k+1}}) \geq (k+d+1) \forall k < i$. So $h_i$ satisfies the hypothesis of lemma 3.10. □

Theorem 3.12. Let $X$ be an irreducible subvariety of $\text{spec}(A)$. Let $h_i \in m - m^2$ be an infinite sequence of hyperplanes such that $\Sigma_{X \cap H_i}$ is of dimension $d$ and multiplicity of $\Sigma_{X \cap H_i} \to \infty$ as $i \to \infty$. Then there exist a hyperplane $h \in m - m^2$ such that $\Sigma_{X \cap H}$ is of dimension $\geq d + 1$.

Proof. The proof is similar to the proof of the previous theorem.

Let $X = \text{spec}(B)$. Let map $f : A \to B$ be the map induced by inclusion of $X \to \text{spec}(A)$. Let $P = \varprojlim P_i$.

The hypothesis implies that for every $i > 0$ there exist a hypersurface $h_i \in P$ such that $f(h_i) \in m^i$.

This implies $f(P_i) \cap \{m^i/m^i\} \neq \emptyset \forall i$. Now using lemma 3.4, gives us that $f(P) \cap \{0\} \neq \emptyset$. □

We would like to end this section by ending by proving the following result using AmAC.

Theorem 3.14. Let $X$ be a hypersurface singularity of dimension $n$ and Tjurina number $\tau$ in $\text{spec}(A)$. Then there abstractly exist a $c > 0$ such that $\mu(X) \leq c$. This $c$ depends only on $\tau$ and $n$.

Proof. Let $\pi_r : A \to A/m^r$ and $\pi_{s,r} : A/m^s \to A/m^r$ denote the canonical projection maps.

Claim: $D(1) = \{h \in A = \mathbb{K}[x_1, \ldots, x_n] \mid \mu(h) = \infty\}$ is AmAC.

Note the set given by $K(\neq r) = \{h \in A \mid \mu(h) \neq r\} = \pi_{r+1}^{-1}((\overline{h} \in A/m^{r+1} \mid \mu(\overline{h}) \neq r))$ is AmAC (as compliment is m-adically open). (See Example 3.7.6 and 3.7.5) Similarly $K(> r) = \{h \in A \mid \mu(h) > r\} = \pi_{r+1}^{-1}(\{\overline{h} \in A/m^{r+1} \mid \mu(\overline{h}) > r\})$ is also an AmAC.

$$D(1) = \bigcap_r K(\neq r) = \bigcap_r K(> r) = \varprojlim K(> r)$$

where $\overline{K}(> r) := \{\overline{h} \in A/m^{r+1} \mid \mu(\overline{h}) > r\}$. Note $D(1) = \{h \in A \mid \dim(\Sigma_H) \geq 1\}$.

Let $T(\tau) = \{h \in A \mid \tau(h) = r\}$, as defined in example 3.7.4. So $T(\tau) = \varprojlim \pi_{r,\tau}^{-1}(\overline{T}(\tau))$.

Note $T(\tau)$ is the collection of all possible hypersurface which satisfy the hypothesis of the Theorem (albeit with repetition).

Assume for a contradiction $\mu$ is not bounded on the set $T(\tau)$.

$$T(\tau) \cap K(> r) \neq \emptyset \quad \forall r >> \tau$$

$$\implies \pi_{r,\tau}^{-1}(\overline{T}(\tau)) \cap \overline{K}(> r) \neq \emptyset \quad \forall r >> \tau \quad \text{(by non emptiness lemma 3.4)}$$

$$\implies T(\tau) \cap \varprojlim \overline{K}(> r) \neq \emptyset \quad \text{(by non emptiness lemma 3.4)}$$

$$\implies \overline{T}(\tau) \cap D(1) \neq \emptyset$$

Which contradicts the fact that any $h \in \overline{T}(\tau)$ can only have isolated singularity. □
Remark 3.15. The proof also shows us that, the same AmAC class can be obtained as inverse limit of two different inverse systems. (For example the inverse system used to define $D(1)$ in example 3.7.7 is different from the inverse system used in this proof)

4 The Analytic case

Fix $\hat{A}$ be the ring of algebraic power series\footnote{The ring algebraic power is defined as the ring of all formal power series algebraic over polynomials, which can also be obtained as the henselization of $k[x_1, \ldots, x_n]$ at maximal ideal $(x_1, \ldots, x_n)$} or convergent power series and let $\mathfrak{m}$ be its maximal ideal.

Definition 4.1. A subset $P \subset B = \hat{A}/I$ is said to be a finitely determined AmAC or simply finitely determined class, if $P = \pi_i^{-1}(P_i)$ for some $P_i$ which is a constructible subset of $B/\mathfrak{m}^i$ (in Zariski topology).

Remark 4.2. One notices that finitely determined classes are closed under finite intersection, finite union and complementing. So they are also $\mathfrak{m}$-adically open.

Example 4.3. Example 3.7, (2)-(6) are finitely determined i.e. hyperplanes, $\mathfrak{m}^k - \mathfrak{m}^l$, Tjurina number bound, Milnor number bounded etc.

Theorem 4.4. Let $\hat{X}$ be an irreducible subvariety of $\text{spec}(\hat{A})$. Let $0 \notin \hat{P} \subset \hat{A}$ be a finitely determined class of functions. Let $h_i \in \hat{P}$ be an infinite sequence of hyperplanes such that $\Sigma_{\hat{X} \cap \hat{H}_i}$ is of dimension $d$ and multiplicity of $\Sigma_{\hat{X} \cap \hat{H}_i} \to \infty$ as $i \to \infty$. Then there exist a hyperplane $h \in \hat{P}$ such that $\Sigma_{\hat{X} \cap \hat{H}}$ is of dimension $\geq d + 1$.

Proof. The proof of this statement is a slight modification of the argument given in [Mor01]. For the convenience of reader we will write the argument here. For clarity, during the course of the proof of theorem 4.4 $\hat{A}$ will denote the formal power series ring (instead of the usual $A$).

Let $\hat{I} = \langle f_1, \ldots, f_k \rangle$ denote the ideal defining $\hat{X}$ and $\hat{I} := \hat{I}\hat{A}$. Let $\hat{X}$ be the subscheme defined by $\hat{I}$. By Theorem 3.11, formal power series $\hat{h}$ with the required property exists. We will now use Artin approximation to get the required element in $\hat{A}$.

Since dimension $\Sigma_{\hat{X} \cap \hat{H}} \geq d + 1$ There exist a $d + 1$ dimensional irreducible subvariety $\hat{S} \subset \Sigma_{\hat{X} \cap \hat{H}}$. Let $\hat{p}$ be the prime ideal defining $\hat{S}$. Now We split into two cases.

Case 1: $\hat{S} \subset \Sigma_{\hat{X}}$. But since there is a hypersurface such that $\Sigma_{\hat{X} \cap \hat{H}_i}$ is of dimension $d$, so $\text{dim}\Sigma_{\hat{X}} \leq d + 1$. But $\text{dim}\hat{S} = d + 1$, so $\hat{S}$ is a component of the reduced structure of $\Sigma_{\hat{X}}$. We take the corresponding component of $\Sigma_{\hat{X}}$ and call it $\hat{S}$. In other word $\hat{S}$ already comes from a subscheme of $\text{Spec}(\hat{A})$. We know that $\hat{S} \subset \Sigma_{\hat{X} \cap \hat{H}} \subset \hat{H}$. So by Artin approximation we can find a $\hat{H}$, such that $\hat{S} \subset \hat{H}$.

Case 2: $\hat{S} \not\subset \Sigma_{\hat{X}}$. Then $\hat{X}$ is a smooth at the generic point of $\hat{S}$. Let us now analyze
the dimension of cotangent space of $\text{Spec}\hat{A}$, $\hat{X}$, and $\hat{X} \cap \hat{H}$ at point $\hat{p}$. Here $k(\hat{p}) = \frac{\hat{A}_{\hat{p}}}{I}$

$$\dim_{k(\hat{p})} T^*_p(\text{Spec}\hat{A}) = \frac{\hat{p}\hat{A}_{\hat{p}}}{\hat{p}^2 A_{\hat{p}}} = n - (d + 1)$$

$$\dim_{k(\hat{p})} T^*_p(\hat{X}) = \frac{\hat{p}\hat{A}_{\hat{p}}}{(\hat{p}^2 + 1) A_{\hat{p}}} = (\alpha + 1) - (d + 1) \text{ because } \hat{X} \text{ is a smooth at } \hat{p}$$

$$\dim_{k(\hat{p})} T^*_p(\hat{X} \cap \hat{H}) = \frac{\hat{p}\hat{A}_{\hat{p}}}{(\hat{p}^2 + 1 + (\hat{h})) A_{\hat{p}}} \geq \alpha - (d + 1) \text{ because } \hat{X} \cap \hat{H} \text{ is singular at } \hat{p}$$

Now we have a surjective map form $T^*_p(X) \to T^*_p(X \cap H)$, using the dimensions computed above we get the the map is an isomorphism. So we get that $\hat{h}$ is linearly dependent on $f_1, ..., f_k$ in $\hat{A}_{\hat{p}}$ mod $\hat{p}^2$. We lift this dependence to $\hat{A}$ to get an element $\hat{s}$ not in $\hat{p}$ such that

$$\hat{s}(\hat{\gamma}h + \sum_i \hat{\gamma}_i f_i) \in \hat{p}^2$$

To ensure dimension of the Artin approximation of $\hat{S}$ is $d + 1$, We will use the equations given by Artin in [Art69, 3.8]. Let $\hat{p}$ be generated by $\langle \hat{g}_1, ..., \hat{g}_l \rangle$. Assume further $\hat{g}_1, ..., \hat{g}_{n-d+1}$ form a regular sequence. Geometrically this means $\hat{S}$ is subscheme of a complete intersection $\hat{C}$ (defined by $\langle \hat{g}_1, ..., \hat{g}_{n-d+1} \rangle$) of dimension $d + 1$. Then $\hat{S}$ must be a component of $\hat{C}$. Choose $\hat{d} \in \hat{A}$ such that $\hat{d}$ vanishes on all components of $\hat{C}$ except $\hat{S}$. Then $\hat{d}^n \hat{g}_i \in \langle \hat{g}_1, ..., \hat{g}_{n-d+1} \rangle$.

We now look at The following “equations” (belongs to an ideal, can be made into a equation by replacing the dependence relation by auxiliary variables).

$$\hat{h} \in \langle \hat{g}_1, ..., \hat{g}_l \rangle \quad f_i \in \langle \hat{g}_1, ..., \hat{g}_l \rangle$$

$$\hat{s}(\hat{\gamma}h + \sum_i \hat{\gamma}_i f_i) \in \langle \hat{g}_1, ..., \hat{g}_l \rangle^2$$

$$\hat{d}^n \hat{g}_i \in \langle \hat{g}_1, ..., \hat{g}_{n-d+1} \rangle$$

Applying artin approximation with $\hat{h}, \hat{g}_1, ..., \hat{g}_l, \hat{d}$ as variables we get elements $h, g_1, ..., g_l, d \in \hat{A}$ satisfying the above relations. The last condition ensures that the dimension of Scheme $\hat{S}$ defined by $\langle g_1, ..., g_l \rangle$ is greater than $d$. If we approximate $\hat{g}_i$, with to a large degree then $\langle g_1, ..., g_l \rangle$ must be a prime. So, rest of the conditions give us $\hat{S} \in \Sigma_{\hat{X} \cap \hat{H}}$. \qed

We see that if singular locus of $X \cap H_i$ has dimension $d$ and multiplicity tends to infinity, then we have some hyperplane such that $X \cap H$ has dimension $\geq d + 1$, but does there exist some hyperplane such that $X \cap H$ has dimension exactly $d + 1$? The answer is “Yes” and follows from the following theorem which can be thought of as the converse of Theorem 3.12.

**Theorem 4.5.** Let $X$ be an irreducible variety of $\text{Spec}(\hat{A})$ (or $\text{Spec}(A)$) such that $\dim(\Sigma_X) \leq d$ Let $H$ be a hyperplane such that $\Sigma_{X \cap H}$ is of dimension $d > 0$. given $i \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$ and $j \in \mathbb{Z}$ such that $d - 1 \geq j \geq \dim(\Sigma_X) - 1$, there exist a hyperplane $H_i$ such that $\Sigma_{X \cap H_i}$ is of dimension $j$ and multiplicity of $\Sigma_{X \cap H_i}$ is $\geq i$. 14
Proof. Choose a coordinate \( x_1, \ldots, x_n, z \) for \( \hat{A} \), such that \( H \) is given by \( z = 0 \).

Choose a general hyperplane \( H' \) satisfying the constraints (1)-(4).

1. \( \frac{\partial v'}{\partial z} \neq 0 \)

Using implicit function theorem, this implies that \( H' \) is given by \( z = f(x_1, \ldots, x_n) \).

Define \( H_k \) to be the hyperplane given by \( z = f^k(x_1, \ldots, x_n) \). Fix \( i \geq 2 \)

2. \( \dim(\Sigma_{X \cap H} \cap H_i) = d - 1 \) (i.e. \( H_i \) does not contain any \( d \) dimensional component of \( \Sigma_{X \cap H} \))

3. \( \dim(\Sigma_X \cap H_i) \leq d - 1 \)

4. \( H_i \cap X - (\Sigma_{X \cap H} \cup \Sigma_X) \) should be smooth.

Let \( C' = \Sigma_{X \cap H} \cap H' \) and \( C_i = \Sigma_{X \cap H} \cap H_i \). Since \( \Sigma_{X \cap H} \subset H \) which is given by \( \{z = 0\} \), so \( C' \) and \( C_i \) in \( \Sigma_{X \cap H} \) are defined by \( f(x_1, \ldots, x_n) = 0 \) and \( f(x_1, \ldots, x_n)^i = 0 \) respectively. So \( C'_{red} = (C_i)_{red} \). So \( \dim(C') = \dim(C_i) = d - 1 \) are equal.

By choice of \( H_i \) (using (2,3,4)), \( \dim(\Sigma_{H \cap X}) \leq d - 1 \).

Let \( S \) be given by \( f^{i-1}(x_1, \ldots, x_n) \) in \( \text{Spec}(\hat{A}) \). Note that \( C_i = \Sigma_{X \cap H} \cap S \) is contained inside \( \Sigma_{X \cap H} \), as modulo \( f^{i-1}(x_1, \ldots, x_n) \), The spaces \( \Sigma_{X \cap H} \) and \( \Sigma_{X \cap H_i} \) are same. \( \square \)

5 Another result for singular surfaces

Before we get to the result, We will need we will need a refinement of lemma 2.6 in the case rings of dimension 1 and more examples.

Definition 5.1. Let \( R \) be a noetherian ring and \( I \) be an ideal in \( R \). Then define the torsion of \( R \) supported on \( V(I) \) as

\[
T(R, I) = \{ x \in R | I^n x = 0 \text{ for some } n \} = \lim_{\rightarrow} \text{Hom}(\frac{R}{I^n}, R)
\]

Note that, Since \( R \) is a noetherian \( \sqrt{I} \subset I \subset \sqrt{I} \), so \( T(R, I) = T(R, \sqrt{I}) \). In particular \( T(R, I) \) only depends on \( V(I) \), the variety defied by \( I \).

Lemma 5.2. Let \( K \) be an infinite field. Let \( R \) be a noetherian local complete \( K \)-algebra of dimension 1 with maximal ideal \( m \) such that \( R/m = K \). Let \( t \) and \( e \) be \( \text{len}(T(R, m)) \) and \( e(R, m) \) (multiplicity of \( R \) w.r.t \( m \), as defined in 2.1) respectively. Then we have the following.

for a generic \( x \in m - m^2 \),

\[
eq k \leq t \quad \text{and} \quad \text{len}(\frac{R}{(x^{k+1})}) \leq (e+1)k
\]

and if \( k \geq t \)

\[
\text{len}(\frac{R}{(x^{k+1})}) = ek + t
\]
Proof. Use Noether normalization to conclude get that \( R \) is integral over \( A = K[[x]] \). Also choose \( x \) so that the multiplicity of \( R \) w.r.t \( \langle x \rangle \) is same as multiplicity of \( R \) w.r.t \( m \).

But \( A \) is a PID. So torsion free finitely generated modules are free. Torsion w.r.t \( x \) is same as torsion w.r.t \( m \) as \( \sqrt{\langle x \rangle} = m \). So \( R/T(R,m) \) is a free \( K[[x]] \) module. Let \( \alpha \) be its rank. Now,

\[
e = \text{multiplicity of } R \text{ w.r.t } \langle x \rangle \\
= \text{multiplicity of } R/T(R,m) \text{ w.r.t } \langle x \rangle \\
= \text{rank of } R/T(R,m) \text{ over } K[[x]] \\
= \alpha \text{ (As the hilbert polynomial of the free module is } \alpha n) 
\]

In particular \( R \cong K[[x]]^e \oplus T(R,m) \) as a \( k[x] \)-module. The inequality (4) are just the length of this module (modulo \( \langle x^k \rangle \)) with and without torsion. Also note that eventually the value must be \( ek + t \)

For (5) and (6), we first note that

\[
\text{len}(\frac{R}{\langle x^{k+1} \rangle}) = \text{len}(\frac{R}{\langle x \rangle} \oplus \frac{\langle x \rangle}{\langle x^2 \rangle} \oplus \ldots \oplus \frac{\langle x^k \rangle}{\langle x^{k+1} \rangle}) = \sum_{i=0}^{k} \text{len}(\frac{\langle x^i \rangle}{\langle x^{i+1} \rangle})
\]

We have a sequence of maps

\[
\frac{R}{\langle x \rangle} \xrightarrow{x \cdot x} \frac{\langle x \rangle}{\langle x^2 \rangle} \xrightarrow{x \cdot x} \ldots \xrightarrow{x \cdot x} \frac{\langle x^k \rangle}{\langle x^{k+1} \rangle} \xrightarrow{x \cdot x} \ldots
\]

We see that each of these maps is surjective. In particular, len of these is a decreasing function and eventually must become constant length \( e \) (which is the rank of the free module). So \( \exists q \) such that

\[
\text{len}(\frac{\langle x^i \rangle}{\langle x^{i+1} \rangle}) \begin{cases} 
\geq e+1, & \text{if } i \leq q \\
= e, & \text{if } i > q 
\end{cases}
\]

Now \( q \) can be at most \( t \), since we have finite amount of torsion given by \( \text{len}(T(R,m)) \).

Finally we sum up the inequalities above, from \( i = 1 \) to \( k \). Since we are adding \( e \), for every \( i > q \), and \( ek + t \) must be eventually obtained, so it must be obtained at \( q \) itself. In conclusion, after summing up we get the following.

\[
\text{len}(\frac{R}{\langle x^{k+1} \rangle}) \begin{cases} 
\geq (e+1)k, & \text{if } k \leq q \\
= ek + t \geq (e+1)k, & \text{if } q < k \leq t \\
= ek + t, & \text{if } t < k
\end{cases}
\]

\( \square \)

Example 5.3. Here are some more examples of AmAC. Example (9),(10) are used in the proof of the theorem. As before let \( B = \mathbb{C}[x_1, \ldots, x_2]/I \) be such that all components of \( B \) dimension \( \alpha + 1 \) and \( H = \text{spec}(B/(h)) \), for \( h \in B \).

In the following, we will first write the subset of the ring \( B \), then prove the fact that the set is an AmAC class.
8. \( M(d, e) := \{ h \in B \mid \dim(\Sigma^\alpha_H) \geq d \text{ and if } \dim(\Sigma^\alpha_H) = d \text{ then } m(\Sigma^\alpha_H) \geq e \} \) (where \( m(\Sigma^\alpha_H) \) is the multiplicity of \( \Sigma^\alpha_H \))

\[ M_r := \{ h \in B/m^r \mid \text{len}(\mathcal{O}_{\Sigma^\alpha_H}/m^{k+1}) \geq \sum_{i=0}^{d} (-1)^i \binom{e}{i+1} \binom{n+d-i}{d-i}, \forall k \text{ such that } e - 1 \leq k \leq r - 2 \} \]

Proof.

Using lemma 2.9, \( M_r \) is a Zariski constructible subset. We will prove that \( M(d, e) = \lim_{\leftarrow} M_i \). The proof is very similar to the proof of example 3.7.

\[ M(d, e) \subset \lim_{\leftarrow} M_i \] because if \( h \in M(d, e) \) then \( h + m^r \) satisfies the condition of \( M_r \) by lemma 2.6(3).

9. \( C(e, t) := \{ h \in B \mid \dim(\Sigma_H) = 1 \text{ and } m(\Sigma_H) = e \text{ and } \text{len}(T(\mathcal{O}_{\Sigma_H}, m)) = t \} \) (where \( m(\Sigma_H) \) is the multiplicity of \( \Sigma_H \) w.r.t to \( m \))

This example (or its finite union) can also be use in theorem 3.11 to yield non-trivial result.

\( \text{Proof.} \) For convenience of writing, we define

\[ S_h(x, k, r) := \text{len}(\frac{\mathcal{O}_{\Sigma_H}}{(x^k)^r + m^r}) \]

\[ C_r := \{ h \in B/m^r \mid \forall k > t \text{ such that } ke + t \leq r - 2, \forall x \in m - m^2, \text{ such that } S_h(x, k, r - 1) \text{ is minimum, } S_h(x, k, r - 1) = ke + t \} \]

First we will prove that \( C_r \) is an algebraic constructible set. For this We define

\[ \Pi_r(\alpha) := \{ (h, x) \in B/m^r \times (m/m^r - m^2/m^r) \mid S_h(x, k, r - 1) = \alpha, \forall k > t \text{ such that } ke + t \leq r - 2 \} \]

\[ P_r(\alpha) := \{ h \in B/m^r \mid \exists x \text{ such that } S_h(x, k, r - 1) = \alpha, \forall k > t \text{ such that } ke + t \leq r - 2 \} \]

Now \( \Pi_r(\alpha) \) is Zaraski constructible set, as it is inverse image of a upper semi-continuous function (produced using arguments of lemma 2.8 and 2.9). And so its first projection
\( P_r(\alpha) \) is also an algebraic constructible set. Finally \( C_r = P_r(ke + t) - \bigcup_{i=0}^{ke+t-1} P_r(i) \) is also algebraic constructible set.

We will prove that \( C(e, t) = \lim_{i \to \infty} C_i \).

\( C(e, t) \subset \lim_{i \to \infty} C_i \) because if \( h \in C(e, t) \), then \( \overline{h} = h + m^r \) satisfies the condition of \( C_r \) by lemma 5.2(6).

Let \( h \in \lim_{i \to \infty} C_i \). Then \( S_h(x, k, r - 1) = \text{len}(\frac{\mathcal{O}_{\Sigma_H}}{(x^k + m^r)}) = ke + t \), but since \( r - 1 > ke + t \), \( \mathcal{O}_{\Sigma_H}/(x^k) = \mathcal{O}_{\Sigma_H}/((x^k + m^r)^{-1}) \). This implies that \( \text{len}(\mathcal{O}_{\Sigma_H}/(x^k)) = ke + t \) which is a polynomial of degree 1 and the highest coefficient of this polynomial is \( e \) and constant term is \( t \). So this implies \( \text{dim} \Sigma_H = 1 \) (lemma 2.2). Note that the set of all \( x \) such that \( x \) gives minimum length, is a Zariski open set modulo \( m^r \). Therefore if \( x \) give the minimum length then \( x \) can chosen to be general element. So lemma 5.2(6) can be applied to get that, \( \Sigma_H \) has multiplicity = \( e \) and torsion = \( t \). Therefore \( h \in C(e, t) \). \( \square \)

10. \( Q(e) := \{ h \in B \mid \text{dim} \Sigma_H \geq 1 \text{ and if } \text{dim} \Sigma_H = 1 \text{ then } m(\Sigma_H) \geq e \} \)

Clearly this is a special case of example 8 (M(1,e)), But we will need this as an inverse limit of different sets for the next theorem.

\[ Q_r := \{ h \in B/m^r \mid \forall x \in m - m^2 \text{ such that } \text{len}(\frac{\mathcal{O}_{\Sigma_H}}{(x^k + m^r)}) \geq ek, \]

\[ \forall k \text{ such that } ek \leq r - 2 \}

As seen before \( Q_r \) is a Zariski constructible subset. We will prove that \( Q = D(2) \cup \lim_{i \to \infty} Q_r \)

Where \( D(2) \) is as defined in example 3.7.7

Suppose \( h \in Q \), then either \( \text{dim} \Sigma_H \geq 2 \), in which case \( h \in D(2) \) or \( \text{dim} \Sigma_H = 1 \), then by lemma 5.2(4), \( \overline{h} \in Q_r \). So \( Q \subset D(2) \cup \lim_{i \to \infty} Q_r \).

Clearly, \( D(2) \subset Q \).

Let \( h \in \lim_{i \to \infty} Q_r \), then \( \text{len}(\frac{\mathcal{O}_{\Sigma_H}}{(x^k + m^r)}) \) is unbounded, so \( \text{len}(\mathcal{O}_{\Sigma_H}) \) is infinite, which implies \( \text{dim} \Sigma_H \geq 0 \). If \( \text{dim} \Sigma_H \geq 2 \), then \( h \in D(2) \subset Q \). If \( \text{dim} \Sigma_H = 1 \), then we can apply lemma 5.2(4) to conclude that multiplicity of \( \Sigma_H \) is \( \geq e \). So \( h \in Q \). Therefore, \( Q = D(2) \cup \lim_{i \to \infty} Q_r \).

\( \square \)

One notices that in the arguments of AmAC given in theorems 3.11, 3.13, what is happening is that as multiplicity tends to infinity we get variety of higher dimension, but the multiplicity of this new variety is not infinity any more, as multiplicity of different dimensional variety is defined differently. This leads us to believe that given any noetherian ring \( R \) there is a multiplicity associated to every natural numbers \( i \) (i.e. \( i \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0} \)) representing the multiplicity of \( R \) supported on \( i \) dimensional primes. So if \( \text{dim}(R) \leq d \) then multiplicity associated to all \( i > d \) vanishes.

For example if \( \text{dim}(R) \leq 1 \) then one should be able to get two numbers length of torsion supported on maximal ideals, and multiplicity of ring supported on dimension 1 primes.
This multiplicity supported on dimension 1 primes should be the usual multiplicity of $R$ if $dim(R) = 1$ and 0 if $dim(R) = 0$. As all multiplicity of dimension zero rings are supported on dimension 0 primes (i.e. torsion points) which we have already accounted for. This leads us to the following definition.

**Definition 5.4.** Let $R$ be a local $\mathbb{K}$-algebra of dimension $\leq 1$ with maximal ideal $\mathfrak{m}$ such that $R/\mathfrak{m} = \mathbb{K}$. Use Noether normalization to conclude get that $R$ is integral over $A = \mathbb{K}[[x]]$. Also choose $x$ so that the multiplicity of $R$ w.r.t $(x)$ is same as multiplicity $R$ w.r.t $\mathfrak{m}$. Let $\chi(x)(k) = ek + t$ for large enough $k$, Define the multiplicity tuple of $R$ to be $(e, t)$

If $dim(R) = 1$ and multiplicity of $R$ is $e$ and $lenT(R,m) = t$, then in light of lemma 5.2(6), multiplicity tuple is $(e,t)$

If $dim(R) = 0$ then multiplicity of $R$ is $len(R) = lenT(R,m) = t$, then multiplicity tuple is $(0,t)$

Now if as multiplicity of zero dimensional rings tends to infinity then we get ring of dimension 1. this suggests that $(1,0) > (0,n)\forall n$, which suggests we should use some kind of lexicographic ordering. This is demonstrated in the following theorem.

**Theorem 5.5.** Let $X \subset spec(A)$ be an equidimensional subvariety of dimension 2. Let $ZD(X)$ denote the zero divisor of $O_X$ in $A$. Let $P \subset A$ be an algebraic $\mathfrak{m}$-adically closed class such that $ZD(X) \cap P = \emptyset$. Then there abstractly exists constants $e(P), t(P)$, such that for every hypersurface $h \in P$, (where $m$ is the maximal ideal of $B$), multiplicity tuple of $\Sigma_H$ is bounded by $(e(P), t(P))$ in the lexicographic ordering, and there is a hypersurface whose singular locus achieves this maximum.

**Proof.** Since we have assumed that $dimB = 2$, any hypersurface $h \not\in ZD(X)$ must have dimension 1. So if $h \in P$, then $dim(H) = 1$ (as $h \neq 0$), which implies $dim(\Sigma_H) \leq 1$. Now Assume for a contradiction that their multiplicity is unbounded, then by Theorem 3.11, there is a hypersurface with singular locus of dimension $> 1$, which is a contradiction. So the multiplicity is bounded by some number $e$. We chose $e = e(P)$ to be the maximum achieved by any of the hypersurfaces. (In the case all hypersurfaces (in $P$) intersect in isolated singularities $e(P) = 0$).

Now if $h$ is a hypersurface such that the multiplicity of $\Sigma_H$ is < $e$, then the multiplicity tuple is already less in the lexicographic ordering. So define $L$ as follows.

$$L := \{h \in P \mid dim(\Sigma_H) = 1 \text{ and } m(\Sigma_H) = e(P)\}$$

$$= \{h \in P \mid dim(\Sigma_H) \geq 1 \text{ and if } dim(\Sigma_H) = 1 \text{ then } m(\Sigma_H) \geq e(P)\} = M(1,e(P)) \cap P$$

Where $M(d, e)$ has been defined in Example 5.3.7. So $L$ is an AmAC. Assume for a contradiction that the $\mathfrak{m}$-torsion of $\Sigma_H$ is unbounded for $h \in L$.

As seen in example 5.3.10, $M(1,e+1) = D(2) \cup \bigcup_{r} limQ_r$, where $D(2) = ZD(B)$ and $Q_r$ is as follows.

$$Q_r = \{h \in B/\mathfrak{m}^r \mid \forall x \in \mathfrak{m} - \mathfrak{m}^2 \text{ such that } len(\frac{\mathcal{O}_{\Sigma_H}}{x^k + \mathfrak{m}^r}) \geq (e+1)k, \forall k \text{ such that } (e+1)k \leq r-2\}$$
Since $m$-torsion is unbounded, there is a sequence of $h_i \in L$, such that $\text{len}(T(O_{\mathcal{Z}_H}, m)) \geq i$. But by lemma 5.2(5), $\mathcal{T}_i \in Q_i$. In particular $Q_i \cap L_i$ is non empty $\forall i$. Now by lemma 3.4, $Q \cap L$ is non empty. But clearly $Q \cap L$ is empty since $e$ is the maximum possible multiplicity achieved. This is a contradiction to the assumption.

So the $m$-torsion is bounded (in $L$). Choose a hypersurface $h \in L$ which has maximum $m$-torsion $t(P)$. Then $\Sigma_H$ achieves the maximum multiplicity tuple $(e(P), t(P))$. \hfill \Box

**Example 5.6.** We will compute the above invariant for in the case of quadratic singularity. Let $X = C[x, y, z]$ and $P = m - m^2$

Let $X$ be given by $x^2 + y^2 + z^2 = 0$, and let $H$ be a hyperplane given by $h = 0$. Without loss of generality assume that $\frac{\partial h}{\partial z} \neq 0$. Then by implicit function theorem assume that, $H$ is given by $z = f(x, y)$. $H \cap X$ is given by $x^2 + y^2 + f^2(x, y) = 0$.

Now $\Sigma_{H \cap X}$ is of dimension 1, iff $H \cap X$ is not reduced. Assume that $x^2 + y^2 + f^2(x, y) = g^2 h$ such that $g \in m$ and $h \in A$. if $h \in m^2$, then $g^2 h$ will be of order 3 which is not possible. Therefore $h$ is a unit in the power series ring. So $h = p^2$, and so we may assume $g = gp$ and $h = 1$.

$x^2 + y^2 + f^2(x, y) = g^2$. Again if $g \in m^2$ then order of $g^2$ is 4, which is again not possible. So $g \in m - m^2$. Since $H \cap X$ is given by $g^2$, so $\Sigma_{H \cap X}$ must be given by $g$. Therefore multiplicity of $\Sigma_{H \cap X}$ is 1 and torsion is 0.

So we get that any multiplicity tuple of $\Sigma_{H \cap X}$ must be bounded by $(1, 0)$.

To see that this bound is achieved we use the hyperplane given by $z = iy$. The intersection is given by $x^2 = 0$.
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