ANNALES SCIENTIFIQUES DE L'É.N.S.

ORLANDO E. VILLAMAYOR

An extension to fields of positive characteristic of Mather's construction of the Thom-Boardman sequence

Annales scientifiques de l'É.N.S. 4^e série, tome 11, nº 1 (1978), p. 1-28. <http://www.numdam.org/item?id=ASENS_1978_4_11_1_1_0>

© Gauthier-Villars (Éditions scientifiques et médicales Elsevier), 1978, tous droits réservés.

L'accès aux archives de la revue « Annales scientifiques de l'É.N.S. » (http://www. elsevier.com/locate/ansens), implique l'accord avec les conditions générales d'utilisation (http://www.numdam.org/legal.php). Toute utilisation commerciale ou impression systématique est constitutive d'une infraction pénale. Toute copie ou impression de ce fichier doit contenir la présente mention de copyright.

\mathcal{N} umdam

Article numérisé dans le cadre du programme Numérisation de documents anciens mathématiques http://www.numdam.org/ Ann. scient. Éc. Norm. Sup., 4° série, t. 11, 1978, p. 1 à 28.

AN EXTENSION TO FIELDS OF POSITIVE CHARACTERISTIC OF MATHER'S CONSTRUCTION OF THE THOM-BOARDMAN SEQUENCE (1)

BY ORLANDO E. VILLAMAYOR (h)

0. Introduction

In [3] J. Mather gives the relation between the numbers introduced by Thom in [7] and certain numbers that he obtains for an ideal in the power series ring on n indeterminates over a field k of characteristic zero.

The main tool in this direction is the concept of Jacobian extension of ideals.

Also Mount and Villamayor have introduced this concept in [6] making use of the Fitting invariant theory ([2], [4]).

The object of this work is to extend the numbers associated by Mather for a given ideal $I \subset k[[x_1, \ldots, x_n]]$ where k is now a field of positive characteristic.

So the first concept to extend was the one of Jacobian extension of ideals and this was possible making use of the Fitting ideals [6] corresponding to the "higher order differentials", and certain operators introduced by Dieudonné in [1].

1. Modules of differentials [8]

In this work ring or k-algebra will mean unitary and commutative.

1.1. Given a k-algebra A we define $\overline{\Phi} : A \times A \to A \overline{\Phi} (a, b) = a.b$ which is k-bilinear so there is a well defined linear morphism Φ such that the diagram



commutes.

(¹) This work was partially supported by a fellowship of the Consejo Nacional de Investigaciones Cientificas Técnicas (Argentina).

Let I (A/k) be the kernel of Φ . If we give to A \otimes A the natural structure of a left A-module the ideal I (A/k) is generated (as a submodule) by $\{1 \otimes a - a \otimes 1/a \in A\}$. In fact given $x \in I(A/k)$:

$$x = \sum_{i=1}^{n} a_i \otimes b_i \quad \text{and} \quad \Phi(x) = \sum_{i=1}^{n} a_i b_i = 0,$$

$$x = x - 0 = \sum_i (a_i \otimes b_i) - (\sum_i a_i b_i) \otimes 1$$

$$= \sum_i a_i \otimes b_i - a_i b_i \otimes 1 = \sum_i a_i (1 \otimes b_i - b_i \otimes 1).$$

Q.E.D.

We define now $T_k : A \to I(A/k)$ by $T_k(a) = 1 \otimes a - a \otimes 1$ which has the following properties:

- (i) $T_k(1) = 0;$
- (ii) T_k is k-linear;
- (iii) $T_k(a.b) = a T_k(b) + b T_k(a) + T_k(a) T_k(b)$.

The application T_k will be called the universal Taylor k-map. If B is an A-algebra a map L: A \rightarrow B which has properties (i), (ii) and (iii) will be called a Taylor k-map.

PROPERTY 1.1. – Given A, B k-algebras and L: $A \rightarrow B$ a Taylor k-map, then there is one and only one A-algebra morphism F: I $(A/k) \rightarrow B$ such that $F \circ T_k = L$ ([5]).

LEMMA 1.2. – If $\Phi: A \to M$ is a k-linear morphism from a k-algebra A to an A-module M such that $\Phi(1) = 0$, then there is one and only one A-morphism $\theta: I(A/k) \to M$ such that $\theta \circ T_k = \Phi$.

Proof. – First of all let us show that $A \bigotimes_{k} A = A(1 \bigotimes 1) \bigoplus_{A} I(A/k)$ direct sum of

left A-modules.

The map $T_k: A \to I(A/k)$ can be extended to an A-linear map $1_A \otimes T_k: A \otimes A \to I(A/k)$ where $(1_A \otimes T_k) (a \otimes b) = a T_k(b)$. And $1_A \otimes T_k$ is a natural projection of A-modules, in fact I (A/k) is generated as an A-module by the set $\{1 \otimes a - a \otimes 1/a \in A\}$ and

$$(\mathbf{1}_{\mathbf{A}} \otimes \mathbf{T}_{\mathbf{k}})(\mathbf{1} \otimes b - b \otimes \mathbf{1}) = \mathbf{1} \mathbf{T}_{\mathbf{k}}(b) - b \mathbf{T}_{\mathbf{k}}(\mathbf{1}) = \mathbf{T}_{\mathbf{k}}(b).$$

On the other hand whenever $y \in A \otimes A$:

$$y = \sum_{i=1}^{n} a_i \otimes b_i = \sum_i a_i (1 \otimes b_i - b_i \otimes 1) + \sum_i a_i b_i \otimes 1$$
$$= \sum_i a_i \operatorname{T}_k(b_i) + (\sum_i a_i b_i) (1 \otimes 1)$$

as it was to be shown.

Given $\Phi: A \to M$ k-linear we extend to $1_A \otimes \Phi: A \otimes A \to M$

$$(1_{\mathbf{A}} \otimes \Phi) (a \otimes b) = a. \quad \Phi(b).$$

The condition $\Phi(1) = 0$ assures that $(1 \otimes \Phi)(1 \otimes 1) = 0$ then $1 \otimes \Phi$ is A-linear and factorizes through I (A/k).

Q.E.D.

Let R be a ring, $\{a_1, \ldots, a_n\}$ a set of elements of R we will denote

$$a_1 \ldots \hat{a}_{i_1} \ldots \hat{a}_{i_r} \ldots a_n = \prod_{k \neq i_1 \ldots i_r} a_k.$$

DEFINITION 1.3. — Given R and k rings, R a k-algebra and M an R-module. An *n*-derivation or derivation of order n, k-linear from R to M will be a k-linear L_n which verifies:

(i) for any set $\{\alpha_0, \ldots, \alpha_n\} \subset \mathbb{R}$:

$$\mathbf{L}_n(\alpha_0\ldots\alpha_n)=\sum_{i=1}^n(-1)^{i+1}(\sum_{j_1<\ldots< j_i}\alpha_{j_1}\ldots\alpha_{j_i}\mathbf{L}_n(\alpha_0\ldots\hat{\alpha}_{j_1}\ldots\hat{\alpha}_{j_i}\ldots\alpha_n));$$

(ii) $L_n(1) = 0$.

Given the map $T_k: \mathbb{R} \to I(\mathbb{R}/k)$ defined in 1.1 we will denote

$$\mathbf{D}^{n}(\mathbf{R}/k) = \mathbf{I}(\mathbf{R}/k)/\mathbf{I}(\mathbf{R}/k)^{n+1}$$

and by T_k^n or simply T^n the map $p \circ T_k$, p the natural projection from I (R/k) to $D^n(R/k)$.

THEOREM 1.4. — Let R, k be rings, M a R-module R a k-algebra and L: $R \rightarrow M$ a k-linear derivation of order n. The k-linear map $T^n: R \rightarrow D^n(R/k)$ (def. 1.3) is a k-linear derivation of order n and there is a unique R-linear morphism h: $D^n(R/k) \rightarrow M$ such that $h \circ T^n = L$.

Conversely, if h: $D^n(R/k) \to M$ is an R-linear morphism then $h \circ T^n \colon R \to M$ is a k-linear derivation of order n.

Proof. — First of all let us show by induction on *n* that given a set $\{x_0, \ldots, x_n\}$ in R and $\{T_k(x_0), \ldots, T_k(x_n)\}$ in I (R/k) we have

$$T_k(x_0) \dots T_k(x_n) = \sum_{i=0}^n (-1)^i \sum_{j_1 < \dots < j_i} x_{j_1} \dots x_{j_i} T_k(x_0 \dots \hat{x}_{j_1} \dots \hat{x}_{j_i} \dots x_n)$$

if n = 1; $T_k(x_0 x_1) - x_0 T_k(x_1) - x_1 T_k(x_0) = T_k(x_1)$. $T_k(x_0)$ by definition.

If the formula is valid for n:

$$T_{k}(x_{0}) \dots T_{k}(x_{n}) \cdot T_{k}(x_{n+1})$$

$$= \sum_{i=0}^{n} (-1)^{i} \sum_{j_{1} < \dots < j_{i}} x_{j_{1}} \dots x_{j_{i}} T(x_{0}, \dots, \hat{x}_{j_{1}} \dots x_{j_{i}} \dots x_{n}) T(x_{n+1})$$

$$= \sum_{i=0}^{n} (-1)^{i} \sum_{j_{1} < \dots < j_{i}} x_{j_{1}} \dots x_{j_{i}} [T_{k}(x_{0} \dots \hat{x}_{j_{1}} \dots \hat{x}_{j_{i}} \dots x_{n} x_{n+1})$$

$$- (x_{0} \dots \hat{x}_{j_{1}} \dots \hat{x}_{j_{i}} \dots x_{n}) T(x_{n+1}) - x_{n+1} T_{k}(x_{0} \dots \hat{x}_{j_{1}} \dots \hat{x}_{j_{i}} \dots x_{n})]$$

$$= \sum_{i=0}^{n+1} (-1)^{i} \sum_{j_{1} < \dots < j_{i}} x_{j_{1}} \dots x_{j_{i}} T_{k}(x_{0} \dots \hat{x}_{j_{1}} \dots \hat{x}_{j_{i}} \dots x_{n+1})$$

$$- \sum_{i=0}^{n} (-1)^{i} \sum_{j_{1} < \dots < j_{i}} x_{0} \dots x_{n} T_{k}(x_{n+1})$$

$$= \sum_{i=0}^{n+1} (-1)^{i} \sum_{j_{1} < \dots < j_{i}} x_{j_{1}} \dots x_{j_{i}} T(x_{0} \dots \hat{x}_{j_{1}} \dots \hat{x}_{j_{i}} \dots x_{n+1})$$

since:

$$\sum_{i=0}^{n} (-1)^{i} \sum_{j_{1} < \dots < j_{i}} 1 = \sum_{i=0}^{n} (-1)^{i} \binom{n}{i} = (1-1)^{n} = 0$$

and $T(x_0) \ldots T(x_n) = 0$ in $D^n(R/k)$ so

$$\mathbf{T}_{k}^{n}(x_{0} \ldots x_{n}) = \sum_{i=1}^{n} (-1)^{i+1} \sum_{j_{1} < \ldots < j_{i}} x_{j_{1}} \ldots x_{j_{i}} \mathbf{T}_{k}^{n}(x_{0} \ldots \hat{x}_{j_{1}} \ldots \hat{x}_{j_{i}} \ldots x_{n}).$$

Let L: $\mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{M}$ be a k-linear derivation of order n. By Lemma 1.2 there is one and only one morphism h^* : I (\mathbb{R}/k) $\to \mathbb{M}$ of R-modules such that $h^* \circ T_k = \mathbb{L}$. To complete the proof we note that h^* is zero on I (\mathbb{R}/k)ⁿ⁺¹:

$$h^{*}(\mathbf{T}(x_{0}) \dots \mathbf{T}(x_{n}))$$

$$= h^{*}\left(\sum_{i=0}^{n} (-1)^{i} \sum_{j_{1} < \dots < j_{i}} x_{j_{1}} \dots x_{j_{i}} \mathbf{T}_{k}(x_{0} \dots \hat{x}_{j_{1}} \dots x_{j_{i}} \dots x_{n})\right)$$

$$= \sum_{i=0}^{n} (-1)^{i} \sum_{j_{1} < \dots < j_{i}} x_{j_{1}} \dots x_{j_{i}} \mathbf{L}(x_{0} \dots \hat{x}_{j_{1}} \dots \hat{x}_{j_{i}} \dots x_{n}) = 0,$$

because L is a k-linear derivation of order n (Def. 1.3).

COROLLARY 1.4. – The pair $(T_k^n, D^n(\mathbb{R}/k))$ is well defined (up to isomorphisms) with the properties of Theorem 1.4.

1.5. If R is a local ring with radical M then the R-module

$$\mathbf{D}^{n}(\mathbf{R}/k)/\bigcap_{n \in \mathbf{N}} \mathbf{M}^{n} \mathbf{D}^{n}(\mathbf{R}/k) = \widehat{\mathbf{D}}^{n}(\mathbf{R}/k)$$

is separated in the M-adic topology.

4° série – tome 11 – 1978 – nº 1

Let $\theta: D^n(\mathbb{R}/k) \to \hat{D}^n(\mathbb{R}/k)$ be the natural projection $\theta T_k^n = \hat{T}_k^n$ is obviously a k-linear derivation of order *n* and a pair $(\hat{T}_k^n, \hat{D}^n(\mathbb{R}/k))$ is universal with the properties of Theorem 1.4 if we restrict ourselves to the subcategory of separated modules in the M-adic topology [8].

NOTE 1.6. – Let A, B be k-algebras, a k-algebra morphism $\lambda: A \to B$ gives B a structure of A-algebra and Dⁿ (B/k) becomes an A-module.

Since T_k^n is a k-linear derivation of order *n* there is a unique A-module morphism $d(\lambda)$ such that the diagram



commutes.

An analogous proof will show that given A, B local k-algebras and $\lambda: A \to B$ a local morphism of k-algebras there will be a morphism $\hat{d}(\lambda): \hat{D}^n(A/k) \to \hat{D}^n(B/k)$ such that the diagram



commutes.

PROPOSITION 1.7. – In the conditions of Note 1.6, given the diagram

$$A \xrightarrow{\lambda} B$$

$$T_{k}^{n} \downarrow \qquad \qquad \downarrow T_{k}^{n}$$

$$B \bigotimes_{A} D^{n}(A/k) \to D^{n}(B/k) \xrightarrow{p} C \to 0$$

with a commutative square and a lower exact row, then $(p \circ T_k^n, C) \simeq (T_A^n, D^n(B/A))$ in the sense of Corollary 1.4.

Proof. – Let $\Delta: B \to M$ an A-linear derivation of order *n* in a B-module M, since λ is a k-algebra morphism Δ becomes k-linear because it is A-linear, so there is one and only one norphism of B-modules γ such that the diagram



commutes.

ANNALES SCIENTIFIQUES DE L'ÉCOLE NORMALE SUPÉRIEURE

By hypothesis

$$\Delta(\lambda(a)) = 0, \quad \forall a \in \mathcal{A}, \quad \gamma(d(\lambda) \operatorname{T}_{k}^{n}(a)) = \gamma(\operatorname{T}_{k}^{n}(\lambda(a))) = \Delta(\lambda(a)) = 0, \quad \forall a \in \mathcal{A},$$

so Image $d(\lambda) \subset$ kernel γ and γ factorizes by C.

The unicity becomes because p is an epimorphism, in fact if γ and γ' are B-module morphisms form C to M and:

 $\gamma \circ p \circ T_k^n = \gamma' \circ p \circ T_k^n = \Delta$ and by the universal property of $D^n(B/k)$;

 $\gamma \circ p = \gamma' \circ p$ so $\gamma = \gamma'$ because p is an epimorphism.

PROPOSITION 1.8. – Given a multiplicative system S of a k-algebra R, then:

$$D^n(R_s/k) \simeq R_s \bigotimes_{R} D^n(R/k).$$

2. Modules of higher order differentials for the ring of power series in *n*-variables over a field k

2.1. Dieudonné has pointed out in [1] that given the ring k[[x]] of series on one indeterminate over a field k and $f(x) \in k[[x]]$ then: f(x+Y) = Tf(x) where Tf(x) is the Taylor expansion on the variable Y. Let us say that if we develop f(x+Y) we obtain

$$f(\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{Y}) = \sum_{i \ge 0} \Delta'_i(f(\mathbf{x})) \mathbf{Y}^i.$$

If the characteristic of k is zero then it is well known that

$$\Delta_{i,i}^{\prime}(f(x)) = \frac{1}{i!} \frac{\partial^{i} f(x)}{\partial^{i} x}.$$

But whenever the characteristic of $k = p \ge 0$ then i! = 0 for any $i \ge p$ and the operator $\partial^i/\partial^i x$ is also trivial.

However these operators Δ'_i are always well defined and if we take $\Delta_e = \Delta'_t$ for $t = p^e e \ge 0$, given $n \in \mathbb{N}$:

$$n = \alpha_0 + \alpha_1 p + \ldots + \alpha_r p^r, \qquad 0 \leq \alpha_i < p,$$

for some r, we have

$$\Delta'_n = \Delta^{\alpha_r}_r \dots \Delta^{\alpha_1}_1 \Delta^{\alpha_0}_0,$$

the product denoting the composition of operators [1].

The operator Δ_e has the following properties ($e \ge 0$):

(i) In the restriction to the subring k [[F^e(x)]] of formal series it acts as ∂/∂F^e(x);
(ii) If f ∈ k [[F^e(x)]] and g ∈ k [[x]]:

$$\Delta_e(f \cdot g) = f \Delta_e(g) + g \Delta_e(f).$$

4° série – tome 11 – 1978 – nº 1

F denotes here the Frobenious morphism $F(x) = x^{p}$ and F^{e} means the composition of the operator *e*-times.

Given a local regular k-algebra R with maximal ideal M we will denote R^* the completion of R in the M-adic topology.

Suppose Δ : $\mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{N}$ is a k-linear derivation of order n (1.3) on a complete separated R-module N.

PROPOSITION 2.2. – Under the above conditions the derivation Δ of order n can be extended to a k-linear derivation of order $n \Delta$: $\mathbb{R}^* \to \mathbb{N}$.

Proof. — The k-linear derivation Δ of order n is continuous in the M-adic topology, in fact given $\{m_0, \ldots, m_n\} \subset M$:

$$\Delta(m_0 \ldots m_n) = \sum_{i=1}^n (-1)^{i+1} \sum_{j_1 < \ldots < j_i} m_{j_1} \ldots m_{j_i} \Delta(m_0 \ldots \hat{m}_{j_1} \ldots \hat{m}_{j_i} \ldots m_n)$$

so $\Delta(m_0 \ldots m_n) \subset MN$ and $\Delta(M^{n+1}) \subset MN$.

Δ

Let r^* be an element of \mathbb{R}^* and $\{r_n\} \subset \mathbb{R}, r_n \to r^*$, we will define

$$\Delta(r) = \lim_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \Delta(r_n),$$

which is well defined because Δ is continuous and N is a complete separated R-module.

Given a set $\{r_0^*, \ldots, r_n^*\} \subset \mathbb{R}^*$ and $\{r_k^i/k \ge 0\} \subset \mathbb{R}, i = 0, \ldots, n$ such that $r_k^i \rightarrow r_i^*$ then:

$$(r_0^* \dots r_n^*) = \Delta(\lim_k r_k^0 \dots r_k^n)$$

= $\lim_k \sum_{i=1}^n (-1)^{i+1} \sum_{j_1 < \dots < j_i} r_k^{j_1} \dots r_k^{j_i} \Delta(r_k^0 \dots \hat{r}_k^{j_1} \dots \hat{r}_k^{j_i} \dots r_k^n)$
= $\sum_{i=1}^n (-1)^{i+1} \sum_{j_1 < \dots < j_i} r_{j_1}^* \dots r_{j_i}^* \Delta(r_0^* \dots \hat{r}_{j_1}^* \dots \hat{r}_{j_i}^* \dots r_n^*),$

so Δ : $\mathbb{R}^* \to \mathbb{N}$ becomes obviously a k-linear derivation of order n.

PROPOSITION 2.3. – The natural inclusion i: $R \rightarrow R^*$ gives the following commutative diagram (Note 1.6):



If $\hat{D}^n(\mathbf{R}/k)$ is a finitely generated R-module then $1 \otimes d(i)$ splits.

ANNALES SCIENTIFIQUES DE L'ÉCOLE NORMALE SUPÉRIEURE

đ

O. E. VILLAMAYOR

Proof. – Since $\hat{D}^n(\mathbb{R}/k)$ is a finitely generated R-module then $\mathbb{R}^* \otimes \hat{D}^n(\mathbb{R}/k)$ will be a completely separated R-module so there is D: $\mathbb{R}^* \to \mathbb{R}^* \otimes \hat{D}^n(\mathbb{R}/k)$ such that $D \circ i = T^n$. Now by the universal property of $\hat{D}^n(\mathbb{R}^*/k)$ there is a \mathbb{R}^* -linear morphism

$$\gamma: D^n(\mathbb{R}^*/k) \to \mathbb{R}^* \otimes D^n(\mathbb{R}/k),$$

such that $D = \gamma T_*^n$.

We will show that γ (1 \otimes d(i)) = identity of R^{*} \otimes D(R/k).

 γ and $1 \otimes d(i)$ are R*-linear and R* \otimes Dⁿ(R/k) is generated over R* by the set $\{1 \otimes T^{n}(r) \in R\}$. We can show that $[\gamma(1 \otimes d(i))](1 \otimes T^{n}(r)) = 1 \otimes T^{n}(r)$ in fact:

$$(1 \otimes d(i)) \cdot \mathbf{T}^n = \mathbf{T}^n_* i \quad \gamma(1 \otimes d(i)) (1 \otimes \mathbf{T}^n r) = \gamma \mathbf{T}^n_* (i(r)) = \mathbf{D}(i(r)) = 1 \otimes \mathbf{T}^n(r).$$

Q.E.D.

2.4. Let us take $A = k [x_1, ..., x_n]$, a polynomial ring with *n* indeterminates over a ring k and go back to the definition of I(A/k) and $T_k: A \to I(A/k)$ of 1.1:

$$A \bigotimes_{k} A \simeq k [x_1, \ldots, x_n, y_1, \ldots, y_n],$$

where $x_i \otimes 1$ corresponds to x_i and $1 \otimes x_i$ to y_i so $T_k(x_i) = x_i - y_i$.

PROPOSITION 2.5. – (i) If x belongs to A, a k-algebra and $T_k: A \to I(A/k)$ is the universal Taylor map (1.1) then: $T_k(x^n) = (x+T_k(x))^n - x^n$ in $A \otimes A$ (where x means $x \otimes 1$).

Proof. – In fact $a \rightarrow a + T(a) = 1 \otimes a$ is a ring homomorphism, so

$$a^{n} + T(a^{n}) = (a + T(a))^{n}$$
 and $T(a^{n}) = (a + T(a))^{n} - a^{n}$

(ii) On the conditions of the last proposition if $\{x_1, \ldots, x_r\}$ are r elements of A then for nonnegative integers $\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_r$:

$$\mathbf{T}(x_1^{\alpha_1}\ldots x_r^{\alpha_r})=(x_1+\mathbf{T}x_1)^{\alpha_1}\ldots (x_r+\mathbf{T}x_r)^{\alpha_r}-x_1^{\alpha_1}\ldots x_r^{\alpha_r}.$$

Proof. – Again, since $a \rightarrow a + T(a)$ is a ring homomorphism

$$T(x_1^{\alpha_1} \dots x_r^{\alpha_r}) + x_1^{\alpha_1} \dots x_r^{\alpha_r} = (x_1 + T x_1)^{\alpha_1} \dots (x_r + T x_r)^{\alpha_r}$$

as was to be shown.

COROLLARY 2.6. – Taking $A = k [x_1, ..., x_n]$ the ring of polynomials in n-indeterminates over a field k then the universal Taylor map:

$$\mathbf{T}_k: \mathbf{A} \to k \begin{bmatrix} x_1, \ldots, x_n, y_1, \ldots, y_n \end{bmatrix}$$

4° série – tome 11 – 1978 – nº 1

`

satisfies

in

$$T_{k}(f(x_{1}, ..., x_{n})) = f(x_{1} + T x_{1}, ..., x_{n} + T x_{n}) - f(x_{1}, ..., x_{n})$$
$$A \bigotimes_{k} A \simeq k [x_{1}, ..., x_{n}, y_{1}, ..., y_{n}].$$

2.7. Since $T(x_i) = x_i - y_i i = 1, ..., n$ is an algebraically independent set over the subring $k [x_1, ..., x_n]$ of $k [x_1, ..., x_n, y_1, ..., y_n]$ then by the last corollary and 1.1 we can assure that the module I(A/k) is freely generated by the monomials in $\{Tx_1, ..., Tx_n\}$ and if $N^* = N \cup \{0\}$.

$$T_{k}(f(x_{1}, \ldots, x_{n}))$$

$$= \sum_{(\alpha(1),\ldots,\alpha(n))\in (\mathbb{N}^{*})^{n}} \Delta(\alpha(1),\ldots,\alpha(n)).(f).(Tx_{1})^{\alpha(1)}\ldots(Tx_{n})^{\alpha(n)},$$

where $\Delta(\alpha(1), \ldots, \alpha(n))(f)$ is obviously zero for almost all $(\alpha(1), \ldots, \alpha(n)) \in (\mathbb{N}^*)^n$. (This was introduced in 2.1 [1].)

COROLLARY 2.7. – Given A in the above conditions then $D^r(A/k) = I(A/k)/I(A/k)^{r+1}$ is the A-module freely generated by the image of the set

$$\left\{ \operatorname{T} x_1^{\alpha(1)} \ldots \operatorname{T} x_n^{\alpha(n)} / \alpha(1) + \ldots + \alpha(n) \leq r \right\}$$

with dual base

$$\{\gamma(\alpha(1)\ldots\alpha(n))/\alpha(1)+\ldots+\alpha(n)\leq r\}$$

and

$$\gamma(\alpha(1), \ldots, \alpha(n)) T_k^n = \Delta(\alpha(1), \ldots, \alpha(n)).$$

If we take $\mathbf{R} = k [x_1, \ldots, x_n]_{\mathbf{M}} \mathbf{M} = (x_1, \ldots, x_n)$ the localization of the ring of polynomials in n variables over k on the complement of M, the completion of R in the M-adic topology will be

$$\mathbf{R}^* = k\left[\left[x_1, \ldots, x_n\right]\right]$$

the formal power series in n variables over k.

PROPOSITION 2.8 ([9] Lemma 4.7). – Under the above conditions

$$\widehat{\mathbf{D}}^n \left(\mathbf{R}^* / k \right) \simeq \mathbf{R}^* \otimes_{\mathbf{R}} \widehat{\mathbf{D}}^n \left(\mathbf{R} / k \right).$$

Proof. – $D^n(R/k)$ is finitely generated by Corollary 2.7 and Proposition 1.8 so $D^n(R/k) = \hat{D}^n(R/k)$.

Applying now Proposition 2.3: $\hat{D}^n(\mathbb{R}^*/k) \simeq \mathbb{R}^* \otimes_{\mathbb{R}} D^n(\mathbb{R}/k) \oplus \mathbb{N}$ for some \mathbb{R}^* -sub-module N.

If $\gamma: D^n(\mathbb{R}^*/k) \to \mathbb{P}$ is a \mathbb{R}^* -linear morphism of separated modules and if $\mathbb{R}^* \otimes_{\mathbb{R}} D^n(\mathbb{R}/k) \subset \ker \gamma$ then γ corresponds to a k-linear derivation of order n, Δ : $\mathbb{R}^* \to \mathbb{P}$ for $\Delta = \gamma \circ \mathbb{T}^n_k$ so $\Delta(i(r)) = 0$ if $r \in \mathbb{R}, i : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}^*$ the natural inclusion.

Since Δ is continuous then Δ is the zero operator and so is γ . Let d(i):

$$\mathbf{R}^* \otimes \mathbf{D}^n (\mathbf{R}/k) \rightarrow \hat{\mathbf{D}}^n (\mathbf{R}^*/k)$$

be the natural inclusion and

$$p: \quad \widehat{\mathbf{D}}^n(\mathbf{R}^*/k) \to \mathbf{N},$$

the natural projection.

We showed above that given any separated R*-module P and a R*-linear map

$$\gamma: \quad \mathbf{D}^n(\mathbf{R}^*/k) \to \mathbf{P}$$

such that $\gamma \circ d(i) = 0$, then $\gamma = 0$.

Since $p \circ d(i) = 0$, then p = 0, so N = 0 as was to be shown.

3. Jacobian extensions

3.1. Let us consider a finitely generated A-module M and the following exact sequence $0 \to \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{A}^n \xrightarrow{\phi} \mathbb{M} \to 0$ where R is the set of *n*-tuples such that their image by φ is zero. We can form a matrix whose rows are vectors that generate R as A-module, and for any natural number s; $1 \leq s \leq n$ we define $f_s(\mathbb{M}) = \langle \det(\mathbb{M}_a) \rangle$ ideal generated by determinants of \mathbb{M}_a , where \mathbb{M}_a runs over all $(n-s+1) \times (n-s+1)$ sub-matrices we can obtain from that matrix. And $f_t(\mathbb{M}) = A$ if t > n.

Fitting [2] shows that these ideals are independent of the solution given before.

3.1.1. Let
$$\{v_1, \ldots, v_n\} \subset A^n$$
 such that $\sum_{i=1}^n Av_i = A^n$ and $\{v_1, \ldots, v_r\} \subset R$.
If

$$p: \mathbf{A}^n \to \sum_{i=r+1}^n \mathbf{A}^{r-1} v_i \simeq \mathbf{A}^{n-1}$$

is the natural projection then $0 \to p(\mathbf{R}) \to \mathbf{A}^{n-r} \to \mathbf{M} \to 0$ is also an exact sequence.

Given a prime ideal $P \subset A$ the rank of M_P is s if and only if $f_s(M) \subset P$ and $f_{s+1}(M) \notin P$, it can be immediately proved that

$$f_s(\mathbf{M}) \subset f_t(\mathbf{M})$$
 whenever $s \leq t$.

The ideals f_s (M) will be called Fitting ideals.

If A is a local ring we will denote by f(M) the biggest proper Fitting ideal.

3.1.2. If A is a local ring I = rad (A) and R \subset IAⁿ then f(M) is the ideal generated by the coefficients of the *n*-tuples that belong to R, i. e. $f(M) = f_n(M)$.

In what follows $A = k[[x_1, ..., x_n]]$ will be the formal power series in *n* independent variables over a perfect field k of characteristic p > 0, F as before will be the Frobenious morphism, $F(a) = a^p$.

M = rad(A) and R.S.P. will mean a regular system of parameters.

4° série – tome 11 – 1978 – nº 1

An ideal will always mean a proper ideal and rank of an ideal I will mean $\dim_k (I+M^2)/M^2$.

LEMMA 3.2. – Given an ideal $I \subset k[[y_1, ..., y_n]] = A$ generated by a set

 $\{y_1,\ldots,y_s\}\cup \mathbf{B}, \qquad 0\leq s\leq n, \qquad \mathbf{B}\subset k[[y_j]]_{j>s}(k[[y_{s+1},\ldots,y_n]]),$

then:

$$\mathbf{I} \cap k[[y_j]]_{j>s} = \mathbf{B} k[[y_j]]_{j>s}.$$

Proof. – If we consider the isomorphism $\alpha = \theta i$

$$k[[y_j]]_{j>s} \stackrel{i}{\to} \mathbf{A} \stackrel{\theta}{\to} k[[y_1, \ldots, y_n]] / \langle y_1, \ldots, y_s \rangle.$$

Since $\langle y_1, \ldots, y_s \rangle \subset I$ we can identify $I \cap k[[y_j]]_{j>s}$ with $\theta(I) = B.k[[y_j]]_{j>s}$ as was to be shown.

LEMMA 3.3. – If an ideal I \subset A admits a set of generators B \subset k [[F (x_1), ..., F (x_n)]] then:

I
$$\cap k[[F(x_1), ..., F(x_n)]] = B \cdot k[[F(x_1), ..., F(x_n)]].$$

Proof. - Suppose $\sum_{i=1}^{r} h_i f_i \in k$ [[F $(x_1), \ldots, F(x_n)$]], $h_i \in B$, $f_j \in A$. Since A is a free finitely generated k [[F $(x_1), \ldots, F(x_n)$]]-module with basis:

let

$$\left\{ x^{\alpha} = x_{1}^{\alpha_{1}} \dots x_{n}^{\alpha_{n}}, \alpha = (\alpha_{1}, \dots, \alpha_{n})/0 \leq \alpha_{i}$$

$$f_{i} = \sum_{\alpha} a_{\alpha}^{i} x^{\alpha} a_{\alpha}^{i} \in k \left[\left[\mathbf{F}(x_{1}), \ldots, \mathbf{F}(x_{n}) \right] \right], \qquad \sum_{i} h_{i} f_{i} = \sum_{\alpha} \left(\sum_{i} h_{i} a_{\alpha}^{i} \right) x^{\alpha}$$

so

$$\sum h_i a^i_{\alpha} = 0$$
 if $\alpha \neq (0, \ldots, 0) = 0$ and $\sum h_i f_i = \sum h_i a^i_0$.

COROLLARY 3.4. – Let $A = k [[y_1, \ldots, y_n]]$ and an ideal

$$\mathbf{I} = \langle y_1, \dots, y_{s(0)} \rangle + \langle \mathbf{F}(y_1), \dots, \mathbf{F}(y_{s(1)}) \rangle + \dots + \langle \mathbf{F}^e(y_1), \dots, \mathbf{F}^e(y_{s(e)}) \rangle$$

$$+\langle B \rangle, s(0) \leq s(1) \leq \ldots \leq s(e)$$
 and $B \subset k[[F^e(y_j)]]_{j>s(e)}$

then:

$$\mathbf{I} \cap k\left[\left[\mathbf{F}^{e}(y_{j})\right]\right]_{j > s(e)} = \mathbf{B} \cdot k\left[\left[\mathbf{F}^{e}(y_{j})\right]\right]_{j > s(e)}$$

Proof. – By induction on e. For e = 0 it was proved in Lemma 3.2. $k \Rightarrow k+1$. Let

$$I = \langle y_1, \dots, y_{s(0)} \rangle + \dots + \langle F^k(y_1), \dots, F^k(y_{s(k)}) \rangle$$
$$+ \langle F^{k+1}(y_1), \dots, F^{k+1}(y_{s(k+1)}) \rangle + \langle B \rangle,$$
$$s(0) \leq s(1) \leq \dots \leq s(k) \leq s(k+1) \quad \text{and} \quad B \subset k [[F^{k+1}(y_j)]]_{j > s(k+1)}.$$

ANNALES SCIENTIFIQUES DE L'ÉCOLE NORMALE SUÉPRIEURE

Q.E.D.

By hypothesis

$$I \cap k[[F^{k}(y_{j})]]_{j>s(k)}$$

= {{ F^{k+1}(y_{s(k)+1}), ..., F^{k+1}(y_{s(k+1)})} ∪ B } k[[F^k(y_{j})]]_{j>s(k)}

by Lemma 3.3:

$$(I \cap k[[F^{k}(y_{j})]]_{j>s(k)}) \cap k[[F^{k+1}(y_{j})]]_{j>s(k)}$$

= {{ F^{k+1}(y_{s(k)+1}), ..., F^{k+1}(y_{s(k+1)})} \ B }.k[[F^{k+1}(y_{j})]]_{j>s(k)}.

Now by Lemma 3.2

$$\left[\left\{\left\{\mathbf{F}^{k+1}(y_{s(k)+1}), \ldots, \mathbf{F}^{k+1}(y_{s(k+1)})\right\} \cup \mathbf{B}\right\} k\left[\left[\mathbf{F}^{k+1}(y_j)\right]\right]_{j>s(k)}\right] \\ \cap k\left[\left[\mathbf{F}^{k+1}(y_j)\right]\right]_{j>s(k+1)} = \mathbf{B}.k\left[\left[\mathbf{F}^{k+1}(y_j)\right]\right]_{j>s(k+1)}$$

as it was to be shown.

LEMMA 3.5. – If $I \subset A$ is an ideal in the conditions of Corollary 3.4 then

$$I \cap k[[F^e(y_1), \ldots, F^e(y_n)]] = \langle F^e(y_1), \ldots, F^e(y_{s(e)}) \rangle + \langle B \rangle$$

(the ideals generated in the subring $k [[F^e(y_1), \ldots, F^e(y_n)]])$.

Proof. - Clearly

$$\langle \mathbf{F}^{e}(y_{1}), \ldots, \mathbf{F}^{e}(y_{s(e)}) \rangle \subset \mathbf{I} \cap k[[\mathbf{F}^{e}(y_{1}), \ldots, \mathbf{F}^{e}(y_{n})]]$$

if

$$f \in \mathbf{I}^1 \cap k[[\mathbf{F}^e(y_1), \ldots, \mathbf{F}^e(y_n)]]$$

then

 $f = f' + f'', \quad f' \in \langle F^e(y_1), \dots, F^e(y_{s(e)}) \rangle, \quad f'' \in I \cap k [[F^e y_j]]_{j > s(e)} = B k [[F^e y_j]]_{j > s(e)}$ by Corollary 3.4.

We will say that an ideal $I \subset A = k [[x_1, ..., x_q]]$ is closed by the action of the derivations if it has the following property: $\partial f/\partial x_i \in I \forall f \in I, i = 1, ..., n$.

LEMMA 3.6. – An ideal $I \subset A$ is closed by the action of the derivations if and only if it admits a family of generators in the subring $k [[F(x_1), \ldots, F(x_n)]]$.

Proof. - Since the sufficient condition is trivial we will show the necessity.

Let $P \subset Z^n$, $P = \{ \alpha = (\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_n)/0 \le \alpha_i < p, i = 1, \ldots, n \}$ we have already pointed out that A is a free $k [[F(x_1), \ldots, F(x_n)]]$ -module with basis

$$\left\{ x^{\alpha} = x_1^{\alpha_1} \cdot x_2^{\alpha_2} \cdot \cdot \cdot x_n^{\alpha_n}, \ \alpha = (\alpha_1, \cdot \cdot \cdot, \alpha_n) \in \mathbb{P} \right\}$$

if $f \in I$, $f = \sum_{\alpha \in F} a_{\alpha} x^{\alpha}$, $a_{\alpha} \in k$ [[F $(x_1), \ldots, F(x_n)$]], there is $\alpha_0 \in F$ such that (i) $|\alpha| = \sum \alpha_i \le |\alpha_0|$ if $a_{\alpha} \ne 0$; (ii) $a_{\alpha_0} \ne 0$,

4° série – tome 11 – 1978 – nº 1

if $\alpha_0 = (\beta_1, \ldots, \beta_n)$ it can be shown that

$$\left[\frac{\partial}{\partial x_1}\right]^{\beta_1} \dots \left[\frac{\partial}{\partial x_n}\right]^{\beta_n} f = {}_{\beta_1}! \dots {}_{\beta_n}! a_{\alpha_0} \quad \text{so} \quad a_{\alpha_0} \in \mathbf{I},$$

and since F is finite we can assure that $a_{\alpha} \in I \forall \alpha \in F$.

PROPOSITION 3.7. – Given any ideal $I \subset A$ there is a regular system of parameters (R.S.P.) $\{y_1, \ldots, y_n\}$ such that

$$I = \langle y_1, \ldots, y_{s(0)} \rangle + \langle F(y_1), \ldots, F(y_{s(1)}) \rangle + \ldots$$
$$+ \langle F^e(y_1), \ldots, F^e(y_{s(e)}) \rangle + \langle B \rangle s(0) \leq s(1) \leq \ldots \leq s(e),$$
$$B \subset \operatorname{rad}(k [[F^e(y_j)]]_{j > s(e)})^2.$$

Proof. – It is enough to show that for any ideal the proposition is true taking e = 0. Let $\{y_1, \ldots, y_{s(0)}\} \subset I$ such that $\{\bar{y}_1, \ldots, \bar{y}_{s(0)}\}$ is a base of the k-vector space $(I+M^2)/M^2$, M = rad(A). $\{y_1, \ldots, y_{s(0)}\}$ can now be extended to a set of generators of I taking a set $B \subset (k [[y_j]]_{j>s(0)})$. Since rank $I = s_0$, we can take

$$\mathbf{B} \subset \operatorname{rad} \left(k \left[[y_j] \right]_{j > s(0)} \right)^2.$$

Given an ideal I in the conditions of Proposition 3.7 we will denote

$$\mathbf{Y} = \{\{y_1, \ldots, y_n\}; \{s(0), \ldots, s(e)\}; \mathbf{B}\}.$$

DÉFINITION. - Given an ideal I and Y in the above conditions

$$\delta_{e}^{\mathbf{y}}(\mathbf{I}) = \left\langle \mathbf{I}, \frac{\partial g}{\partial \mathbf{F}^{e}(y_{j})}, g \in \mathbf{B}, j > s(e) \right\rangle.$$

PROPOSITION 3.8. – In the above conditions if $I = \delta_e^y(I)$ then B can be chosen in rad $(k [[F^{e+1}(y_j)]]_{j>s}(e))$.

Proof. – If $I = \delta_e^y(I)$ then: for any $g \in B$, r > s(e):

$$\frac{\partial g}{\partial F^e(y_r)} \in I \cap k\left[\left[F^e(y_j)\right]\right]_{j>s(e)} = Bk\left[\left[F^e(y_j)\right]\right]_{j>s(e)} \quad (Cor. 3.4)$$

but B.k $[[F^e(y_j)]]_{j>s}(e)$ closed by the derivations means that B' can be taken in rad $(k [[F^{e+1}(y_j)]]_{j>s}(e))$ such that

B'.k[[F^e(y_j)]]_{j>s(e)} = Bk[[F^e(y_j)]]_{j>s(e)} = I
$$\cap$$
 k[[F^e(y_j)]]_{j>s(e)}.
6).

(Lemma 3.6).

COROLLARY 3.9. - If $I = \delta_e^y(I)$ then there is a new set $Y' = \{\{y'_1, \dots, y'_n\}; \{s'(0), \dots, s'(e+1)\}; B'\}, \{y'_1, \dots, y'_n\}$ an R.S.P.;

$$s'(0) \leq \ldots \leq s'(e+1), B' \subset \operatorname{rad}(k[[F^{e+1}(y_j)]])_{j>s(e+1)})^2$$

such that

$$I = \langle y'_1, ..., y'_{s(0)} \rangle + \langle F(y'_1), ..., F(y'_{s(1)}) \rangle + ... + \langle F^e(y'_1), ..., F^e(y'_{s(e)}) \rangle + \langle F^{e+1}(y'_1), ..., F^{e+1}(y'_{s(e+1)}) \rangle + \langle B' \rangle.$$

Proof. – In fact since B can be chosen in rad $(k [[F^{e+1}(y_j)]]_{j>s(e)})$ (Prop. 3.8) then there is a number $s(e+1) \ge s(e)$ such that

$$Bk[[F^{e+1}(y_j)]]_{j>s(e)} = \{F^{e+1}(y_{s(e)+1}), \dots, F^{e+1}(y_{s(e+1)})\}k[[F^{e+1}(y_j)]]_{j>s(e)} + B' \cdot k[[F^{e+1}(y_j)]]_{j>s(e+1)}$$

and B' \subset rad $(k [[F^{e+1}(y_j)]]_{j>s} (e+1))^2$. (Prop. 3.7 applied to

$$Bk[[F^{e+1}(y_j)]]_{j>s(e)} \subset k[[F^{e+1}(y_j)]]_{j>s(e)}.$$

NOTATION. – Let $\Omega(e)$ be $\hat{D}^n(A/k)$ if $n = p^e (e \ge 0)$ (1.5),

THEOREM 3.10. – Given $I \subset A$ an ideal and a system of parameters $\{y_1, \ldots, y_n\}$ such that

$$I = \langle y_1, \dots, y_{s(o)} \rangle + \langle F(y_1), \dots, F(y_{s(1)}) \rangle + \dots + \langle F^e(y_1), \dots, F^e(y_{s(e)}) \rangle$$
$$+ \langle B \rangle, s(0) \leq s(1) \leq \dots \leq s(e) B \subset rad(k [[F^e(y_j)]]_{j>s(e)})^2$$

then:

(3.1) (i)
$$f(A/I \otimes \Omega(e)/\Delta I) = \left\langle I, \frac{\partial f}{\partial F^e(y_j)}, f \in I, j > s(e) \right\rangle;$$

(ii)
$$f(A/I \otimes \Omega(e)/\Delta I) = \left\langle I, \frac{\partial g}{\partial F^e(y_j)}, g \in B, j > s(e) \right\rangle$$

Where ΔI is the submodule generated by the elements $\{1 \otimes Tf/f \in I\}$ and T: $A \rightarrow \hat{D}^n (A/k)$ is the natural derivation.

Proof, – By induction on $e \in \mathbb{Z}$, e = 0,

Given an ideal $a \subset A$ and a regular system of parameters $\{y_1, \ldots, y_n\}$ such that $a = \langle y_1, \ldots, y_{s(0)} \rangle + \langle B \rangle B \subset rad(k[[y_j]])_{j>s(0)}^2$ then

$$\left\{ \mathbf{T} y_{1}, \ldots, \mathbf{T} y_{s(0)} \right\} \subset \Delta a \subset \mathbf{D}^{1} \left(\mathbf{A}/k \right) = \Omega \left(0 \right)$$

the hypothesis assures that $(\partial f/\partial y_j)(0, \ldots, 0) = 0$ for any $f \in a, j > s(0)$, So we know that

$$f(A/a \otimes \Omega(0)/\Delta a) = \left\langle a, \frac{\partial f}{\partial y_j}, f \in a_j > s(0) \right\rangle \quad (3.1.1, \ 3.1.2).$$

4° série – tome $11 - 1978 - N^{\circ} 1$ - second distribution in a solution of the second seco

On the other hand, given $g \in a$, $f \in A$, T $(f \circ g) = f T g + g T f$ where T: A $\rightarrow \Omega(0)$ is the natural derivation, so given any family G of generators for a then

$$\mathbf{G} = \left\{ 1 \otimes \mathbf{T} \, g, g \in \mathbf{G} \right\}$$

is a family of generators for the submodule Δa in A/a $\otimes \Omega$ (0) and using Fitting theory (3.1):

$$f(\mathbf{A}/a \otimes \Omega(0)/\Delta a) = \left\langle a, \frac{\partial g}{\partial y_j} g \in \mathbf{B}j > s(0) \right\rangle.$$

 $k \Rightarrow k+1.$

Since the natural derivation T: $A \rightarrow \hat{D}^n (A/k)$ satisfies

$$T(f.g) = fTg+gTf+Tf$$
. Tg if $n \ge 2$,

then given an ideal $I \subset A$ the A-submodule of $A/I \otimes \hat{D}^n(A/k)$ generated by the family $\{1 \otimes Th/h \in I\}$ is also an ideal in the *n*-truncated algebra $\hat{D}^n(A/k)$. In fact given $g \in I$ and $f \in A$, $T(g) \cdot T(f) = -g Tf \cdot -f \cdot Tg + T(f \cdot g)$ so

$$(1 \otimes Tg) \cdot (1 \otimes Tf) = -f \otimes Tg + 1 \otimes T(f \cdot g)$$
 in $A/I \otimes D^n(A/k)$,

where both g and g.f belong to I,

Now let $I \subset A$ be an ideal such that

$$I = \langle y_1, \ldots, y_{s(0)} \rangle + \langle F(y_1), \ldots, F(y_{s(1)}) \rangle + \ldots + \langle F^{k+1}(y_1), \ldots, F^{k+1}(y_{s(k+1)}) \rangle$$
$$+ \langle B \rangle, s(0) \leq s(1) \leq \ldots \leq s(k) \leq s(k+1), B \subset \operatorname{rad}(k [[F^{k+1}(y_j)]]_{j>s(k+1)})^2.$$

For every $t, 0 \leq t < k+1$ we have

$$\mathbf{I} = \langle y_1, \ldots, y_{s(0)} \rangle + \langle \mathbf{F}(y_1), \ldots, \mathbf{F}(y_{s(1)}) \rangle + \ldots + \langle \mathbf{F}^t(y_1), \ldots, \mathbf{F}^t(y_{s(t)}) \rangle + \langle \mathbf{B}_t \rangle$$

where $B_t \subset rad (k [[F^{t+1}(y_j)]]_{j>s(t)})$ so combining (i) and (ii) of the inductive hypothesis we have

(A)
$$\frac{\partial f}{\partial \mathbf{F}^t y_j} \in \mathbf{I}, \quad \forall f \in \mathbf{I}, \quad j > s_t, \quad t = 0, \ldots, k.$$

On the other hand we have an ideal, E of the $p^{k+1}+1$ -truncated algebra $\Omega(k+1)$,

$$\mathbf{E} = \langle \mathbf{T} y_1, \dots, \mathbf{T} y_{s(0)} \rangle + \langle \mathbf{TF}(y_1), \dots, \mathbf{TF}(y_{s(1)}) \rangle$$
$$+ \dots + \langle \mathbf{TF}^{k+1}(y_1), \dots, \mathbf{TF}^{k+1}(y_{s(k+1)}) \rangle \subset \Delta \mathbf{I}.$$

We will consider as a base of $\Omega(e)$ the monomials on $\{Ty_1, \ldots, Ty_n\}$ of degree at most p^e , since

$$TF^{i}(y_{j}) = F^{i}(T y_{j})$$

for the Fitting theory we will restrict our attention to the coordinates of the elements of ΔI which do not belong to the ideal E, let us say to the coordinates on the monomials of the form

$$(T y_{j(0,1)}, T y_{j(0,2)}, \dots, T y_{j(0,\iota(0))}), (TF y_{j(1,1)}, \dots, TF y_{j(1,\iota(1))}) \times \dots \times (TF^{k+1} y_{j(k+1,1)}, \dots, TF^{k+1} y_{j(k+1,\iota(k+1))}); \qquad j(s, h) \leq j(s, i),$$

if $h \le i, s = 0, ..., k+1, j(m, 1) > s(m) m = 0, ..., k+1$ and where none of the TF^t $(y_{i}(t, i))$ is reepeated *p*-times (3.1.1),

By the result (A) we know that the coordinates of an element Tf when $f \in I$ on this coordinates are again elements of I [zero on the module $A/I \otimes \Omega(e)$] except, may be, the coordinates on the elements $TF^{k+1} y_{j,j} > s(k+1)$.

If we can show then that $(\partial f/\partial F^{k+1} y_j)$ $(0, \ldots, 0) = 0$ whenever $f \in I$ j > s(k+1) then by Fitting theory (3.1.2):

$$f(\mathbf{A}/\mathbf{I} \otimes \mathbf{\Omega}(k+1)/\Delta \mathbf{I}) = \left\langle \mathbf{I}, \frac{\partial f}{\partial \mathbf{F}^{k+1} y_j} / f \in \mathbf{I}, j > s(k+1) \right\rangle$$

In fact suppose $f \in I$ such that $(\partial f/\partial F^{k+1} y_j)(0, \ldots, 0) \neq 0$ for some fixed j > s(k+1), if $n < p^{k+1}$, $n = \alpha(0) + \alpha(1) + \ldots + \alpha(k) p^k$ $0 < \alpha(i) < p$, using once again the result (A):

$$f' = \left[\frac{\partial}{\partial y_j}\right]^{\alpha(0)} \dots \left[\frac{\partial}{\partial F^k y_j}\right]^{\alpha(k)} f \in I, \quad \text{if} \quad f \in I,$$

then $f'(0, \ldots, 0) = 0$. Since this can be done for any $n < p^{k+1}$, the order of the series $f(0, \ldots, 0, y_j, 0, \ldots, 0) \in k[[y_j]]$ is p^{k+1} .

By Weierstrass preparation theorem there is $u \in A$ and

$$\{g_i, i = 0, \dots, p^{k+1} - 1\} \subset k[[y_1, \dots, y_{j-1}, y_{j+1}, \dots, y_n]]$$

such that
$$uf = F^{k+1} y_j + \sum_{i=0}^{p^{k+1} - 1} g_i y_j^i$$

and since I is closed by the action of $(\partial/\partial F^t y_j)$, t = 0, ..., k (A) we have

$$\left\{ g_t/t = 0, \ldots, p^{k+1} - 1 \right\} \subset \mathbf{I}$$

so $F^{k+1} y_i \in I$ which can not be since:

$$\mathbf{I} \cap k\left[\left[\mathbf{F}^{k+1} y_{r}\right]\right]_{r>s(k+1)} = \mathbf{B} k\left[\left[\mathbf{F}^{k+1} y_{r}\right]\right]_{r>s(k+1)}$$

(Cor. 3.4) and $B \subset rad (k [[F^{k+1} y_r]]_{r>s (k+1)})^2$. If

$$f \in \mathbf{I}, f = \sum_{i=0}^{k+1} \sum_{j=1}^{s_{(i)}} a_j^i \mathbf{F}^i y_j + \sum_{i=1}^n b_i h_i, \{a_j^i\} \cup \{b_i\} \subset \mathbf{A}, \{h_i\} \subset \mathbf{B}.$$

4° série – tome 11 – 1978 – nº 1

Hence only the last summand will affect the coordinates of Tf on the monomials $TF^{k+1} y_j, j > s (k+1)$.

Now, $T(\Sigma b_i h_i) = \Sigma b_i T h_i + \Sigma h_i T(b_i) + \Sigma T b_i T h_i$ since:

$$h_i \in \mathbf{B} \subset k \left[\left[\mathbf{F}^{k+1} y_1, \ldots, \mathbf{F}^{k+1} y_n \right] \right] \mathbf{T}(h_i) \in (\Omega(k+1)) p^{k+i} \quad \text{then } \mathbf{T} h_i \mathbf{T}(b_i) = 0$$

n the $p^{k+1}+1$ truncated algebra $\Omega(k+1)$ so in A/I $\otimes \Omega(k+1)$ we have

$$1 \otimes \mathrm{T} \left(\Sigma \, b_i \, h_i \right) = \Sigma \, b_i \otimes \mathrm{T} \, h_i$$

and using once again Fitting theory (3.1):

$$f(A/I) \otimes \Omega(k+1)/\Delta I) = \left\langle I, \frac{\partial h}{\partial F^{k+1} y_j} h \in B, j > s(k+1) \right\rangle.$$

COROLLARY 3.11. – Given an ideal $I \subset A$ as in Proposition 3.7 the ideal $\delta_e^y(I)$ does not depend on the system of parameters but only on e. And $I = \delta_e^y(I)$ if and only if there is a family $B' \subset rad(k[[F^{e+1} y_j]]_{j>s(e)})$ such that

$$I \cap k[[F^e y_j]]_{j>s(e)} = B k[[F^e y_j]]_{j>s(e)}$$
$$= B' k[[F^e y_j]]_{j>s(e)}$$

and in this case we can find a number $i(e, 1) \ge s(e)$ and a family

such that

i

$$I = \langle y_1, \ldots, y_{s(0)} \rangle + \ldots + \langle F^e(y_1), \ldots, F^e(y_{s(e)}) \rangle$$
$$+ \langle F^{e+1}(y_1), \ldots, F^{e+1}(y_{i(e,1)}) \rangle + \langle B'' \rangle.$$

 $B'' \subset rad (k [[F^{e+1} y_j]])_{j>i}^2 (e, 1)$

Proof. - This is a consequence of Theorem 3.10 (ii) and Lemma 3.6.

NOTATION. – Given an ideal I as is Proposition 3.7 let $\delta_{e}(I) = \delta_{e}^{y}(I)$.

COROLLARY 3.12. – The numbers $s(t) \ 0 \le t \le e$ of Proposition 3.7 are well defined as: $s_t = \operatorname{rank} (I \cap k [[F^t(y_1), \ldots, F^t(y_n)]])$ as an ideal of $k [[F^t(y_1, \ldots, F^t(y_n)]].$ Proof. – See Lemma 3.5.

COROLLARY 3.13. – Given $I \subset I'$ ideals of A such that

$$\operatorname{rank}(\mathrm{I} \cap k[[\mathrm{F}^{s}(y_{1}), \ldots, \mathrm{F}^{s}(y_{n})]]) = \operatorname{rank}(\mathrm{I}' \cap k[[\mathrm{F}^{s}y_{1}, \ldots, \mathrm{F}^{s}y_{n}]]),$$

$$s = 0, \ldots, e$$
 and $I = \delta_s(I), I' = \delta_s(I')$ for $0 \leq s \leq e-1$,

then:

(i) there is a system of parameters $\{y_1, \ldots, y_n\} s(0) \leq \ldots \leq s(e)$ and a set $B \subset rad(k[[F^e y_j]])_{j>s(e)}^2$ such that

$$\mathbf{I} = \langle y_1, \ldots, y_{s(0)} \rangle + \ldots + \langle \mathbf{F}^e y_1, \ldots, \mathbf{F}^e y_{s(e)} \rangle + \langle \mathbf{B} \rangle$$

and there is a set $B' \subset rad(k[[F^e y_j]]_{j>s(e)})^2$ such that

(ii) I' = $\langle y_1, \ldots, y_{s(0)} \rangle + \ldots + \langle F^e y_1, \ldots, F^e y_{s(e)} \rangle + \langle B' \rangle$ and $B \subset B'$,

Proof. - (i) by successive applications of Theorem 3.10 (ii), Corollary 3.4 and Lemma 3.6.

(ii) This is a consequence of Corollary 3.12 and Corollary 3.4, in fact B' must be such that

$$B' k [[F^e(y_j)]]_{j>s(e)}$$

= I' \cap k [[F^e(y_j)]]_{j>s(e)} \cap I \cap k [[F^e(y_j)]]_{j>s(e)} = B k [[F^e(y_j)]]_{j>s(e)},

so we can take $B' \supset B$.

4. Thom-Boardman singularities

4.1, Let us make some remarks on Mather's construction of the Thom-Boardman sequence [3],

Given an ideal $I \subset C[[x_1, \ldots, x_n]]$ a set $\{y_1, \ldots, y_s\} \subset I$ can be found such that $\{\overline{y}_1, \ldots, \overline{y}_s\}$ is a base of

$$\frac{\mathbf{I}+\mathbf{M}^2}{\mathbf{M}^2}, \qquad \mathbf{M}=\mathrm{rad}\left(\mathbf{C}\left[\left[x_1,\ldots,x_n\right]\right]\right).$$

Extending the set $\{y_1, \ldots, y_s\}$ to a regular system of parameters $\{y_1, \ldots, y_n\}$ he shows that the Jacobian extension of I is

$$\delta_0(\mathbf{I}) = \left\langle \mathbf{I}, \frac{\partial f}{\partial y_j} f \in \mathbf{I} j > s \right\rangle.$$

What we do in Proposition 3.7 and the definition that follows is to extend the concept in such a way to obtain a good definition in series over fields of positive characteristic of the operator β also introduced in [3]

$$\beta(I) = I + (\delta_0(I))^2 + \ldots + (\delta_0^k(I))^{k+1} + \ldots$$

For which there is a R.S.P. $\{y_1, \ldots, y_n\}$ and a sequence of non-negative numbers $0 \le s(0) \le s(1) \le \ldots \le s(k) \le \ldots \le n$ such that

$$\beta(\mathbf{I}) = \sum_{j \ge 0} (y_1, \dots, y_{s(j)})^{j+1}, \{y_1, \dots, y_{s(j)}\} \subset \delta_0^j(\mathbf{I}),$$

$$s(j) = \dim_k \frac{(\delta_0^j(\mathbf{I}) + \mathbf{M}^2)}{\mathbf{M}^2} \text{ i. e. } s(j) = \text{ rank of } \delta_0^j(\mathbf{I}).$$

This is not true in general when the field k is of positive characteristic p > 0, take $I = \langle x_1^p, \ldots, x_n^p \rangle$, $\delta_0(I) = I$ and there will be no R.S.P. such that $\beta(I) = I$ has the

4° série – tome 11 – 1978 – N° 1

form described above. If we take a principal ideal $I = \langle F \rangle F \in M^2$, $F = F^1 + F^{11}$ such that $F^{11} \in (x_1^p, \ldots, x_n^p)$:

$$\delta_0(\mathbf{I}) = \left\langle \mathbf{I}, \frac{\partial \mathbf{F}}{\partial x_j} j = 1, \ldots, n \right\rangle$$

since (x_1^p, \ldots, x_n^p) is closed by the action of the partial derivations (it is also the biggest ideal with this property as shown in Lemma 3.6), then F" and his partial derivations will always be in $(x_1^p, \ldots, x_n^p) \subset M^2$ so will never affect the numbers s(k) obtained in [3].

Another important difference of the operator δ_0 in positive characteristic is the following, If characteristic of k is zero, let $s(k) = \operatorname{rank}(\delta_0^k(I))$ if m is such that

$$s(m) = s(j) \forall j \ge m$$
 then $\delta_0^m(\mathbf{I}) = \delta_0^j(\mathbf{I})$.

It is enough to prove that $\delta_0 \left(\delta_0^m (I) \right) = \delta_0^m (I)$ in fact

$$\delta_0^m(\mathbf{I}) = \langle y_1, \ldots, y_{s(m)} \rangle + \langle \mathbf{B} \rangle, \mathbf{B} \subset \operatorname{rad}(k[[y_j]]_{j>s(m)})^2$$

(Prop. 3.7 for charac k = 0) s $(m) = s(m+r) \forall r \ge 0$ means that

$$\left\{ B, \frac{\partial^s}{\partial y_{j(1)} \partial y_{j(s)}} g, g \in B, j(i) > s(m), s \leq r \right\} \subset \operatorname{rad}\left(k\left[\left[y_j\right]\right]_{j>s(m)}\right)^2$$
$$\forall r \geq 0 \text{ fixed.}$$

If charac k = 0 this assures that B = 0. Again this is not true in general if characteristic is p > 0. Take the ideal

$$\mathbf{I} = \langle x_1^{p+1} \rangle \subset \langle x_1^p, \ldots, x_n^p \rangle \subset \mathbf{M}^2, \qquad \delta^k(\mathbf{I}) \subset (x_1^p, \ldots, x_n^p) \subset \mathbf{M}^2, \qquad \forall k \ge 0,$$

so s(k) = 0, $\forall k \ge 1$ but $\delta_0(I) = \langle x_1^p \rangle \neq I$.

We have to define the operators δ , β and the Thom-Boardman numbers in order to solve these problems when characteristic of k is not zero.

NOTE 4.1. – Given an ideal $D \subset A$ such that $D = \delta_0(D) = \ldots = \delta_{e-1}(D)$ there will be a R.S.P. $\{y_1, \ldots, y_n\}$ and nonnegative numbers $s(0) \leq s(1) \leq \ldots \leq s(e-1)$ such that

$$\mathbf{D} = \sum_{r=0}^{e-1} \langle \mathbf{F}^r y_1, \ldots, \mathbf{F}^r y_{s(r)} \rangle + \langle \mathbf{B} \rangle \mathbf{B} \subset \operatorname{rad}(k [[\mathbf{F}^e y_j]]_{j > s(e-1)})$$

(applying Prop. 3.8 several times). Now modifying the set $\{y_j\} j > s (e-1)$ if necessary we can take

$$\mathbf{B} = \left\{ \mathbf{F}^{e} y_{s(e-1)+1}, \dots, \mathbf{F}^{e} y_{s(e)} \right\} \cup \mathbf{B}', \qquad \mathbf{B}' \subset \operatorname{rad} \left(k \left[\left[\mathbf{F}^{e} y_{j} \right] \right]_{j > s(e)} \right)^{2} \right.$$
$$\delta_{e}(\mathbf{D}) = \mathbf{D} + \left\langle \frac{\partial g}{\partial \mathbf{F}^{e} y_{j}}, g \in \mathbf{B}', j > s(e) \right\rangle.$$

Since

$$\frac{\partial g}{\partial \mathbf{F}^{e} y_{v}} \in k [[\mathbf{F}^{e} y_{j}]]_{j > s(e)} \quad \text{if} \quad g \in \mathbf{B}', v > s(e)$$

then:

and and a second se

$$\delta_e(\mathbf{D}) = \delta(\delta_e(\mathbf{D})) = \ldots = \delta_{e-1}(\delta_e(\mathbf{D})).$$

Even if we have to modify the subset $\{y_j\}_{j>s \ (e-1)}$ since the chains

$$\delta_e^k(\mathbf{D}) \subset \delta_e^{k+1}(\mathbf{D}) \subset \ldots$$

are stationary we can define $D_e = \delta_e^k(D)$ for k big enough, now $D_e = \delta_e(D_e)$ so we are in the conditions of Corollary 3.11 and we can define $\delta_{e+1}(D_e)$ and obtain an increasing chain:

$$D_e \subset D_{e+1} \subset \ldots,$$

a R.S.P. can be taken so we can define:

DEFINITION 4.1. - If $\delta^k = \delta \cdot \delta^{k-1}$ let:

(i) $I_{-1} = I$ and given $e \in N e \ge 0$:

 $I_e = \delta_e^k(I_{e-1})$ for k big enough.

(ii) $s(I, e): Z \ge 0 \rightarrow Z \ge 0$ non decreasing applications $s(I, e)(k) = p(e) \le n$ for k big enough and

$$\delta_e^t(\mathbf{I}_{e-1}) = \sum_{v=0}^{e-1} \langle \mathbf{F}^v y_1, \dots, \mathbf{F}^v y_{p(v)} \rangle + \langle \mathbf{F}^e y_1, \dots, \mathbf{F}^e y_w \rangle + \langle \mathbf{B} \rangle,$$
$$\mathbf{B} \subset \operatorname{rad}(k[[\mathbf{F}^e y_j]]_{j>w})^2, \qquad w = s(\mathbf{I}, e)(t).$$

For some R.S.P. $\{y_1, \ldots, y_n\}$ (Note 4.1). So s(I, e)(t) is the rank of

 $\delta_e^t(\mathbf{I}_{e-1}) \cap k\left[\left[\mathbf{F}^e y_1, \ldots, \mathbf{F}^e y_n\right]\right]$

as an ideal of $k [[F^e y_1, ..., F^e y_n]]$ (Lemma 3.5). If the ideal I is fixed we will write: i(e, k) = s(I, e)(k).

NOTE 4.2. - By successive application of result (i) of Theorem 3.10 we have

$$\delta_{e}^{t}(\mathbf{I}_{e-1}) = \left\langle \mathbf{I}, \left[\frac{\partial}{\partial y_{j(0,0)}} \dots \frac{\partial}{\partial y_{j(0,n(0))}} \right] \dots \left[\frac{\partial}{\partial \mathbf{F}^{e} y_{j(e,0)}} \dots \frac{\partial}{\partial \mathbf{F}^{e} y_{j(e,n(e))}} \right] f/f \in \mathbf{I} \right\rangle$$
$$j(s, h) \leq j(s, i) \quad \text{if} \quad h \leq i, s = 0, \dots, e \quad \text{and} \quad j(u, v) > s(\mathbf{I}, u)(v).$$

NOTE 4.3. - If $I = I_0 = \ldots = I_{e-1}$ then $s(I, t) = s(\delta_e(I), t) t = 0, \ldots, e-1$ and $s(\delta_e(I), e)(k) = s(I, e)(k+1)$. In fact by hypothesis $I = \delta(I) = \ldots = \delta_{e-1}(I)$ and 4° série - tome 11 - 1978 - N° 1

as we noted out before (Def. 4.1) there is a R.S.P. $\{y_1, \ldots, y_n\}$ of A and $0 \le p(0) \le \ldots \le p(e-1) \le s(e) \le n$ such that

$$I = \sum_{r=0}^{e-1} \langle F^r y_1, \dots, F^r y_{p(r)} \rangle + \langle F^e y_1, \dots, F^e y_{s(e)} \rangle + \langle B \rangle,$$

B \subset rad (k [[F^e y_j]]_{j>s(e)})² and $\delta_e(I) = I + \left\langle \frac{\partial g}{\partial F^e y_j} g \in B, j > s(e) \right\rangle,$

since

$$\frac{\partial g}{\partial \mathbf{F}^e y_j} \in \operatorname{rad}(k[[\mathbf{F}^e y_j]]_{j>s(e)})$$

then:

$$\operatorname{rank} \left(\mathbf{I} \cap k \left[\left[\mathbf{F}^{t} y_{1}, \ldots, \mathbf{F}^{t} y_{n} \right] \right] \right)$$
$$= \operatorname{rank} \left(\delta_{e}(\mathbf{I}) \cap k \left[\left[\mathbf{F}^{t} y_{1}, \ldots, \mathbf{F}^{t} y_{n} \right] \right] \right), \qquad 0 \leq t \leq e-1$$

 $I = \delta_t(I)$ and $\delta_e(I) = \delta_t(\delta_e(I)) t = 0, \dots, e-1$ so $s(I, t)(k) = p(t), \forall k$ and

 $s(\delta_e(\mathbf{I}), t)(k) = p(t), \forall k.$

If t = e:

$$s(\delta_e(\mathbf{I}), e)(k)$$

= rank($\delta_e^k(\delta_e(\mathbf{I})) \cap k[[\mathbf{F}^e y_1, \dots, \mathbf{F}^e y_n]]$)
= rank($\delta_e^{k+1}(\mathbf{I}) \cap k[[\mathbf{F}^e y_1, \dots, \mathbf{F}^e y_n]] = s(\mathbf{I}, e)(k+1).$

PROPOSITION 4.4. - Suppose $I \subset I'$, $I = I_0 = \ldots = I_{e-1}$, $I' = I'_0 = \ldots = I'_{e-1}$ $s(I, t) = s(I', t) \ 0 \le t \le e-1$ and s(I', e)(0) = s(I, e)(0) then: $\delta_e(I_{e-1}) \subset \delta_e(I'_{e-1})$.

Proof. – Since we are in the conditions of Corollary 3.13, then there is a R.S.P. $\{y_1, \ldots, y_n\}, s(0) \leq \ldots \leq s(e)$ and $B \subset B' \subset rad(k [[F^e y_j]]_{j>s(e)})^2$ such that

$$I = \sum_{r=0}^{e} \langle F^{r} y_{1}, \dots, F^{r} y_{s(r)} \rangle + \langle B \rangle; \qquad I' = \sum_{r=0}^{e} \langle F^{r} y_{1}, \dots, F^{r} y_{s(r)} \rangle + \langle B' \rangle,$$

$$s(r) = p(r) \text{ (Def. 4.1) } r = 0, \dots, e-1, s(e) = s(I', e) (0) = s(I, e) (0)$$

and

$$\delta_{e}(\mathbf{I}) = \mathbf{I} + \left\langle \frac{\partial g}{\partial \mathbf{F}^{e} y_{j}} g \in \mathbf{B}, \quad j > s(e) \right\rangle \subset \mathbf{I}' + \left\langle \frac{\partial g'}{\partial \mathbf{F}^{e} y_{j}} g' \in \mathbf{B}' j > s(e) \right\rangle = \delta_{e}(\mathbf{I})$$

(Th. 3.10). If characteristic of k is zero only s(I, 0) will have sense. Mather in [3] assigns to an ideal I a non increasing sequence of natural numbers M(I):

$$M(I)(r) = i_r = n - s(1, 0)(r - 1)$$

then it is found that M (δ_0 (I)) (r) = i_{r+1} , which we generalize in Note 4.3.

This concept together with Proposition 4.4 assures us that if I and I' are as in Proposition 4.4 and s(I, e) = s(I', e) then:

$$I_e \subset I'_e$$

ANNALES SCIENTIFIQUES DE L'ÉCOLE NORMALE SUPÉRIEURE

in fact $I_e = \delta_k^e(I)$ for k big enough and so is I'_e . Applying once more Proposition 4.4 we have:

COROLLARY 4.5. – Suppose $I \subset I'$ ideals of A such that

 $s(I, t) = s(I', t) 0 \le t \le e-1$ and $s(I, e)(k) = s(I', e)(k), \quad 0 \le k \le k_0 - 1,$ then:

$$\delta_e^{k_0}(\mathbf{I}_{e-1}) \subset \delta_e^{k_0}(\mathbf{I}_{e-1}').$$

NOTE 4.6. - Let $\{y_1, ..., y_n\}$ be a R.S.P. of A,

$$s(0) \leq s(I) \leq \ldots \leq s(r) \leq \ldots \leq n$$
 and $\mathscr{A} = \sum_{r=0}^{\infty} \langle y_1, \ldots, y_{s(r)} \rangle^r \subset A$.

 \mathscr{A} is an ideal generated by monomials then given $f \in k[[y_1, \ldots, y_n]] = A, f \notin \mathscr{A}$:

$$f = \sum_{\alpha \in \mathbb{Z}^n} k_{\alpha} M_{\alpha}, \qquad \alpha = (\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_n) \alpha_i \ge 0, \qquad M_{\alpha} = y_1^{\alpha_1}, \ldots, y_n^{\alpha_n}.$$

There must be $\alpha \in \mathbb{Z}^n$ such that $k_{\alpha} \neq 0$ and $M_{\alpha} \notin \mathscr{A}$:

$$\mathbf{M}_{\alpha} = y_{j(1)} y_{j(2)} \dots y_{j(r)} j(1) \leq j(2) \leq \dots \leq j(r)$$

by direct computation if $M_{\alpha} \notin \mathscr{A} \Rightarrow j(1) > s(1), j(2) > s(2), \ldots, j(r) > s(r)$.

THEOREM 4.6. – Given an ideal $I \subset A$ and a regular system of parameters (R.S.P.) $\{y_1, \ldots, y_n\}$ in the conditions of Definition 4.1 then:

(i)
$$\mathbf{I} \subset \mathscr{A} = \sum_{e \ge 0} \left(\sum_{h \ge 0} \langle \mathbf{F}^e y_1, \ldots, \mathbf{F}^e y_{i(e,k)} \rangle^{k+1} \right), \quad i(e, k) = s(\mathbf{I}, e)(k).$$

(ii) For each $e \ge 0$ s (I, e) = s (\mathscr{A} , e).

(iii) \mathscr{A} is maximal among the ideals B such that $s(B, e) = s(\mathscr{A}, e) \forall e \ge 0$.

Proof. – (i) Every $f \in A$ may be written

$$f = \sum_{\alpha \in \mathbb{Z}^n} k_{\alpha}, \mathbf{M}_{\alpha}, \mathbf{M} = y_1^{\alpha(1)}, \ldots, y_n^{\alpha(n)}; \qquad k_{\alpha} \in k$$

and

$$\alpha(i) = \sum_{t=0}^{N} \alpha(i, t) p^{t}, 0 \leq \alpha(i, t) < p$$

(*p*-adic notation). Let $f \in I$ and

$$f' = \left[\left[\frac{\partial}{\partial y_1} \right]^{\alpha(1,0)} \dots \left[\frac{\partial}{\partial y_n} \right]^{\alpha(n,0)} \dots \left[\frac{\partial}{\partial F^N y_1} \right]^{\alpha(1,N)} \dots \left[\frac{\partial}{\partial F^N y_n} \right]^{\alpha(n,N)} \right] f,$$

4° SÉRIE — TOME 11 — 1978 — N° 1 — ALCELERAUCT ALLANDER LE PUBlic ACCELERAU CONTRACTOR LE PUBlic ACCELERAU

then: $f'(0, 0, ..., 0) = (\prod_{i=1}^{n} \alpha(i, j)!) k_{\alpha}$ and

$$M_{\alpha} = \prod_{t=0}^{N} M_{\alpha}^{t}, \qquad M_{\alpha}^{t} = (F^{t} y_{j(t,1)})^{\alpha(j(t,1),t)} \dots (F^{t} y_{j(t,h)})^{\alpha(j(t,h),t)},$$
$$1 \le j(t, i) < j(t, k) \le n \qquad \text{if} \quad 0 \le i < k \le n-1.$$
Now

Now

$$\mathbf{M}_{\alpha} \notin \mathscr{A} \Rightarrow \mathbf{M}_{\alpha}^{t} \notin \sum_{k>0} \langle \mathbf{F}^{t} y_{1}, \ldots, \mathbf{F}^{t} y_{i(t,k)} \rangle^{k+1}; \qquad t = 0, 1, \ldots, \mathbf{N}.$$

So j(t, h) > i(t, h) = s(I, t)(h). for every h (Note 4.6). But then going back to Note 4.2 we have

$$f' \in I_e \subset rad(A)$$
, then $f'(0, \ldots, 0) = 0$ so $k_a = 0$ and $f \in \mathcal{A}$.

(ii) Mather shows in [3] that given

$$B = \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} (y_1, \dots, y_{s(t)})^{t+1}, \qquad s(0) \le s(1) \le \dots \le s(t) \le \dots \le n,$$
$$\delta_0^k(B) = \sum_{r=k}^{\infty} (y_1, \dots, y_{s(r)})^{r-k+1}$$

if we make use of this fact together with the definition of the operators $\boldsymbol{\delta}_{e},$ since

$$\frac{\partial \mathbf{F}^r y_j}{\partial \mathbf{F}^e y_i} = 0 \qquad \text{if} \quad r > e,$$

we have

$$\delta_0^k(\mathscr{A}) = \sum_{t \ge 0}^{\infty} (y_1, \ldots, y_{i(0, t+k)})^{t+1} + \sum_{e \ge 1} (\sum_{r \ge 0} \langle F^e y_1, \ldots, F^e y_{i(e, r)} \rangle^{r+1})$$

so

$$\mathscr{A}_{0} = \langle y_{1}, \ldots, y_{p(0)} \rangle + \sum_{e \geq 1} (\sum_{r \geq 0} \langle F^{e} y_{1}, \ldots, F^{e} y_{i(e,r)} \rangle^{r+1}).$$

Applying now the operator δ_1 we have

$$\delta_1^k(\mathscr{A}_0) = \langle y_1, \ldots, y_{p(0)} \rangle + \sum_{t \ge 0} \langle F y_1, \ldots, F y_{i(1, t+k)} \rangle^{t+1}$$
$$+ \sum_{e \ge 2} \sum_{r \ge 0} \langle F^e y_1, \ldots, F^e y_{i(e, r)} \rangle^{r+1}.$$

In general

$$\mathscr{A}_{e-1} = \langle y_1, \dots, y_{r(0)} \rangle + \langle F y_1, \dots, F y_{p(1)} \rangle + \dots + \dots + \langle F^{e-1} y_1, \dots, F^{e-1} y_{p(e-1)} \rangle + \sum_{h \ge e} \sum_{r \ge 0} \langle F^h y_1, \dots, F^h y_{i(h,r)} \rangle^{r+1}$$

ANNALES SCIENTIFIQUES DE L'ÉCOLE NORMALE SUPÉRIEURE

and a ter

and

$$\delta_{e}^{k}(\mathscr{A}_{e-1}) = \sum_{i=0}^{e-1} \langle F^{i} y_{1}, \dots, F^{i} y_{p(i)} \rangle + \sum_{r \ge 0} \langle F^{e} y_{1}, \dots, F^{e} y_{i(e, r+k)} \rangle^{r+1} + \sum_{h \ge e+1} \sum_{r \ge 0} \langle F^{h} y_{1}, \dots, F^{h}_{i(h, r)} \rangle^{1+r},$$

then rank $(\delta_e^k(\mathscr{A}_{e-1}) \cap k[[F^e y_1, \ldots, F^e y_n]]) = i(e, k)$ in fact it will be given by: $\langle F^e y_1, \ldots, F^e y_{i(e, k)} \rangle$.

(iii) Suppose an ideal $B \supset \mathscr{A}$ such that $s(\mathscr{A}, e) = s(B, e) e \ge 0$, then by Corollary 4.5:

$$\delta_e^k(\mathbf{B}_{e-1}) \supset \delta_e^k(\mathscr{A}_{e-1})$$

and by Corollary 3.13:

$$\delta_e^k(\mathbf{B}_{e-1}) = \langle y_1, \dots, y_{p(0)} \rangle + \dots + \langle \mathbf{F}^{e-1}(y_1), \dots, \mathbf{F}^{e-1}(y_{p(e-1)}) \rangle$$
$$+ \langle \mathbf{F}^e y_1, \dots, \mathbf{F}^e y_{i(e,k)} \rangle + \langle \mathbf{B}' \rangle$$
$$\mathbf{B}' \subset \operatorname{rad}(k [[\mathbf{F}^e y_j]]_{j>i(e,k)})^2; \qquad i(e,k) = s(\mathbf{I}, e)(k)$$

so $\{y_1, \ldots, y_n\}$ is also a R.S.P. in the conditions of Definition 4.1 for the ideal B. Then using (i) of this theorem

 $\mathbf{B} \subset \mathscr{A}$

as it was to be shown.

PROPOSITION 4.7. - Let $\{y_1, \ldots, y_n\}$ be a R.S.P. of A, $I_r = \langle F^e y_1, \ldots, F^e y_r \rangle$ $0 \leq e$ fixed:

$$0 \leq s(0) \leq s(1) \leq \ldots \leq s(k) \leq \ldots \leq n,$$

then:

$$\left(\sum_{i\geq k}\mathbf{I}_{s\,(i)}^{i+1-k}\right)^{k+1} \subset \sum_{i\geq 0}\mathbf{I}_{s\,(i)}^{i+1}.$$

In fact

$$(\sum_{i \ge k} \mathbf{I}_{s(i)}^{i+1-k})^{k+1} = \sum_{k \le j \ (1) \le \dots \le j \ (k+1)} \prod \mathbf{I}_{s(j(l))}^{j(l)+1-k} \qquad \prod_{l=1}^{k+1} \mathbf{I}_{s(j(l))}^{j(l)+1-k} = (\prod_{l < k+1} \mathbf{I}_{s(j(l))}^{j(l)+1-k}) (\mathbf{I}_{s(j(k+1))}^{j(k+1)+1-k})$$

since $I_{s(i)} \subset I_{s(j)}$ if $i \leq j$; and $j(l) \geq k$:

$$j(l) + 1 - k \ge 1$$
 and $\prod_{1 \le l \le k} I_{s(j(l))}^{j(l)+1-k} \subset I_{s(j(k+1))}^{k}$

S0

$$\prod_{l=1}^{k+1} \mathbf{I}_{s(j(l))}^{j(l)+1-k} \subset \mathbf{I}_{s(j(k+1))}^{j(k+1)+1}$$

and this proves the proposition.

4° SÉRIE — TOME 11 — 1978 — Nº 1 — Provensión de la construction de la

NOTE 4.7. – We will now extend what Mather defines in [3] as the ideal β (I), if characteristic of k is zero β (I) = $\sum_{k \ge 0} (\delta_0^k (I))^{k+1}$ and the ideal β (I) is what we called \mathscr{A} in Theorem 4.6 (taking p = charac. k = 0).

We will show that the ideal \mathscr{A} depends only on I and not on the R.S.P. $\{y_1, \ldots, y_n\}$ in the conditions of Definition 4.1.

PROPOSITION 4.8. – Given I and \mathcal{A} ideals of A as in Theorem 4.6.

$$I_{e,k} = \delta_e^k(I_{e-1}) \cap k[[F^e x_1, \dots, F^e x_n]],$$
$$\mathscr{A} = \sum_{e \ge 0} \sum_{k \ge 0} \langle I_{e,k} \rangle^{k+1}.$$

Proof. – Since the R.S.P. $\{y_1, \ldots, y_n\}$ was taken such that

$$\left\{\mathbf{F}^{e} y_{1}, \ldots, \mathbf{F}^{e} y_{s(i, e)(k)}\right\} \subset \mathbf{I}_{e, k},$$

then obviously

then:

$$\mathscr{A} \subset \sum_{e \ge 0} \sum_{k \ge 0} \langle \mathbf{I}_{e,k} \rangle^{k+1}.$$

We proved in Theorem 4.6 that $I \subset \mathscr{A}$ and $s(I, e) = s(\mathscr{A}, e) \forall e \ge 0$ then by Corollary 4.5:

$$\delta_{e}^{k}(\mathbf{I}_{e-1}) \subset \delta_{e}^{k}(\mathscr{A}_{e-1}), \quad \forall e, k \geq 0,$$

so $I_{e, k} \subset \mathscr{A}_{e, k} \forall e, k \ge 0$ ($\mathscr{A}_{e, k}$ defined as $I_{e, k}$):

$$\sum_{e\geq 0}\sum_{k\geq 0}\langle \mathbf{I}_{e,k}\rangle^{k+1}\subset \sum_{e\geq 0}\sum_{k\geq 0}\langle \mathscr{A}_{e,k}\rangle^{k+1},$$

it will be enough to prove that

$$\sum_{e \ge 0} \sum_{k \ge 0} \langle \mathscr{A}_{e,k} \rangle^{k+1} \subset \mathscr{A}, \qquad \delta_e^k (\mathscr{A}_{e-1}) =$$

$$= \sum_{i=0}^{e-1} \langle F^i y_1, \dots, F^i y_{p(i)} \rangle + \sum_{r \ge 0} \langle F^e y_1, \dots, F^e y_{i(e,r+k)} \rangle^{r+1}$$

$$+ \sum_{h \ge e+1} \sum_{r \ge 0} \langle F^h y_1, \dots, F^h y_{i(h,r)} \rangle^{r+1}, \qquad i(h,r) = s(\mathscr{A}, h)(r) \quad [\text{Th. 4.6 (ii)}],$$

so

$$\mathscr{A}_{e,k} = \sum_{r \ge 0} \langle F^{e} y_{1}, \dots, F^{e} y_{i(e,r+k)} \rangle^{r+1} + \sum_{h \ge e+1} \sum_{r \ge 0} \langle F^{h} y_{1}, \dots, F^{h} y_{i(n,r)} \rangle^{r+1} \quad (\text{Lemma 3.5}).$$

Let us show that $\langle \mathscr{A}_{e, k} \rangle^{k+1} \subset \mathscr{A}$ since:

$$\sum_{h \ge e+1} \sum_{r \ge 0} \langle F^h y_1, \ldots, F^h y_{i(h,r)} \rangle^{r+1} \subset \mathscr{A}$$

it is enough to verify:

$$\left(\sum_{r\geq 0} \left\langle \mathbf{F}^{e} y_{1}, \ldots, \mathbf{F}^{e} y_{i(e,r+k)} \right\rangle^{r+1}\right)^{k+1} \subset \mathcal{A}$$

in fact

$$\left(\sum_{r\geq 0} \left\langle \mathbf{F}^{e} y_{1}, \ldots, \mathbf{F}^{e} y_{i\left(e, r+k\right)} \right\rangle^{r+1}\right)^{k+1} \subset \sum_{r\geq 0} \left\langle \mathbf{F}^{e} y_{1}, \ldots, \mathbf{F}^{e} y_{i\left(e, r\right)} \right\rangle^{r+1} \subset \mathscr{A}$$

by Proposition 4.7.

DEFINITION 4.8. - Given I and A ideal of A as in Theorem 4.6 we will define:

 $\beta(\mathbf{I}) = \mathscr{A}.$

DEFINITION 4.9. – For a given ideal $I \subset A$ we have defined the ideals $\{I_e\}e \ge -1$ (Def. 4.1), let: h(e) be the smallest k such that $\delta_e^k(I_{e-1}) = \delta_e^{k+1}(I_{e-1})$. We will define non-increasing applications.

that we will call the Thom-Boardman numbers associated to the ideal I. Since $I_e \subset I_{e+1} \subset \ldots$ then for e big enough $I_e = I_{e+1} = \ldots$ and

$$\mathbf{I}_{e} = \delta_{e+1} \left(\mathbf{I}_{e} \right); \, \mathbf{I}_{e+k} = \delta_{e+k+1} \left(\mathbf{I}_{e+k} \right)$$

so h(e) = 0 for e big enough.

Example 1. – Let A = k[[t]], k of characteristic p, the ideals $I_1 = \langle t^{p+1} \rangle$ and $\langle t^{p+2} \rangle = I_2$ (p = charac k) are such that $s(e, I_1) = s(e, I_2) \forall e \ge 0$ but there Thom-Boardman numbers are different, in fact

$$\begin{split} \delta_0(\mathbf{I}_1) &= \langle t^p \rangle = \delta_0^n(\mathbf{I}_1), \quad \forall n \ge 1, \\ \delta_0(\mathbf{I}_2) &= \langle t^{p+1} \rangle, \quad \delta_0^2(\mathbf{I}_2) = \langle t^p \rangle = \delta_0^n(\mathbf{I}_2), \quad \forall n \ge 2, \end{split}$$

also $\delta_e(\langle t^p \rangle) = \langle t^p \rangle$ for $e \ge 1$ so:

$$s(I_1, 0)(k) = s(I_2, 0)(k) = 0, \quad \forall k \ge 0,$$

$$s(I_1, e)(k) = s(I_2, e)(k) = 1, \quad \forall k \ge 0, e \ge 1,$$

but TB (I₁, 0) = (1, 1); TB (I₁, 1) = (0); TB (I₁, e) = (0), $e \ge 2$ and TB (I₂, 0) = (1, 1, 1); TB (I₂, I) = (0); TB (I₂, e) = (0) $e \ge 2$, so the monomials t^{p+1} and t^{p+2} will have the same sequences s (e, I), but different Thom-Boardman numbers.

$$\beta(\mathbf{I}_1) = \beta(\mathbf{I}_2) = \langle t^p \rangle.$$

 4° série — tome 11 — 1978 — N° 1 — is a complete example of the complete structure of the second second

Example 2.
$$-I = \langle xy + z^p \rangle \subset k [[x, y, z]]$$
 characteristic of $k = p$:
 $\delta_0(I) = \langle x, y, z^p \rangle = \delta_0^k(I) = I_0, k \ge 2$ (Def. 4.1)
 $\delta_1(I_0) = I_0$ and $\delta_e(I_0) = I_0, e \ge 1$,
 $s(I, 0)(0) = 0; \quad s(I, 0)(k) = 2 \forall k \ge 1; \quad s(I, e)(k) = 3, \quad \forall k \ge 0, e \ge 1$,
 $TB(I, 0) = (3, 1); \quad TB(I, 1) = (0) = TB(I, e), e \ge 2$,
 $\beta(I) = \langle x, y \rangle^2 + \langle x^p, y^p, z^p \rangle$.

Example 3. -k[[x, y, z]] as before $I = \langle x^p, y^p, z^p \rangle$:

$$I = I_e \forall e \ge 0; \quad s(I, 0)(k) = 0, \quad \forall k \ge 0; \quad s(I, e)(k) = 3, \quad \forall k, e \ge 1,$$
$$TB(I, 0) = (3); \quad TB(I, 1) = (0) = TB(I, e), \quad e \ge 2,$$
$$\beta(I) = I.$$

Note. — The only information that we have of these 3 examples in characteristic $p \neq 0$ using the same method that in characteristic zero is the one given by TB (I, 0) with the last integer repeated infinite times.

In examples 2 and 3 if we define the ideal β (I) as in characteristic zero:

$$\beta(\mathbf{I}) = \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \left(\delta_0^i(\mathbf{I})\right)^{i+1}$$

there will be no R.S.P. $\{y_1, y_2, y_3\}$ of k[[x, y, z]] such that

$$\beta (I) = \sum_{i=0}^{N} (y_1, \ldots, y_{s(i)})_{i+1}$$

for any non decreasing sequence $0 \le s(0) \le s(1) \le \ldots \le 3$ as in [3].

REFERENCES

- [1] J. DIEUDONNÉ, Le calcul différentiel dans les corps de caractéristique p = 0 (Proc. International Congress of Math., Amsterdam, 1954).
- [2] R. FITTING, Die determinanten ideale eines modules (Jahresbericht der Deut. Math. Vereinigung, V, 1936, pp. 195-221).
- [3] J. MATHER, On Thom-Boardman Singularities (Dynamical Systems, ed. M. M. Peixoto, Academic Press, New York, 1973, pp. 233-247).
- [4] K. R. MOUNT, Some remarks on Fitting's invariants (Pacific Journal of Math., Vol. 13, 1963, pp. 1353-1357).
- [5] K. R. MOUNT and O. E. VILLAMAYOR, *Taylor Series and Higher Derivations (Publ. Dept. Matematicas,* Facultad Ciencias Exactas, Univ. Buenos Aires).

O. E. VILLAMAYOR

[6] K. R. MOUNT and O. E. VILLAMAYOR, An Algebraic Construction of the Generic Singularities of Boardman-Thom (Publ. Math. I.H.E.S., Vol. 43, 1974, pp. 205-244).

[7] R. THOM, Les singularités des applications différentiables (Ann. Inst. Fourier, Vol. 6, 1956, pp. 17-86).

[8] Y. NAKAI and S. SUZUKI, On M-adic differentials, (J. Sci. Hiroshima Univ., Serie a, 24, 1960).

[9] J. ROBERTS, Singularity subschemes and generic projections (Trans. Amer. Math. Soc., Vol. 212, 1975, pp. 229-268).

(Manuscrit reçu le 10 février 1977, révisé le 20 octobre 1977.)

Orlando E. VILLAMAYOR (h) Department of Mathematics, Northwestern University, Evanston, Ill. 60 201, U.S.A.

8×3.

4° série – tome 11 – 1978 – nº 1

ender and ender the formation with a present to the formation