LOG CANONICAL THRESHOLD, SEGRE CLASSES, AND POLYGAMMA FUNCTIONS

PAOLO ALUFFI

Abstract. We express the Segre class of a monomial scheme in projective space in terms of log canonical thresholds of associated ideals. Explicit instances of the relation amount to identities involving the classical polygamma functions.

1. Introduction

As proven by J. Howald ([How01]), the log canonical threshold of a monomial ideal $I$ in a polynomial ring has a very simple expression in terms of the Newton diagram of the ideal: it measures the distance of the diagram from the origin along the main diagonal. It easily follows that the whole diagram for $I$ may be reconstructed from knowledge of the log canonical thresholds of suitable extensions of the ideal, and hence other invariants of $I$ may be computed by using the thresholds of such extensions. We apply this simple observation to the Segre class of the scheme defined by $I$ in projective space. The result is the following.

Theorem 1.1. Let $I$ be a proper monomial ideal in the variables $x_1, \ldots, x_n$, and let $S$ be the subscheme defined by $I$ in $\mathbb{P}^N$, $N \geq n - 1$. For $r_i > 0$, denote by $I_{r_1, \ldots, r_n}$ the extension of $I$ under the homomorphism defined by $x_i \mapsto x_i^{r_i}$, $i \leq n$. Then

$$s(S, \mathbb{P}^N) = 1 - \lim_{m \to \infty} \sum \frac{m! X_1 \cdots X_n}{(m + a_1 X_1 + \cdots + a_n X_n)^{n+1}}$$

where the sum is taken over all $(a_1, \ldots, a_n) \in \mathbb{Z}^n_{>0}$ such that

$$\text{lct}(I_{a_2 \cdots a_n, a_1 \cdots a_{n-1}}) \geq \frac{m}{a_1 \cdots a_n},$$

and $X_i$ denotes the hyperplane $x_i = 0$.

The limit appearing in the statement should be interpreted as follows. When the parameters $X_1, \ldots, X_n$ are set to complex numbers (say, with positive real part), the given limit converges to, and hence determines, a rational function of $X_1, \ldots, X_n$, with a well-defined expansion as a series in $X_1, \ldots, X_n$. The statement is that evaluating the terms of this series as intersection products with $X_i$, the $i$-th coordinate hyperplane in $\mathbb{P}^N$, the right-hand side equals the Segre class of $S$ in $\mathbb{P}^N$. (Each of the terms is supported on a subscheme of $S$, cf. Lemma 2.10 in [Alu], hence this computation determines a class in $A_\ast S$.)

Theorem 1.1 is proved in [3]. In [2] we illustrate the result in simple examples. In the case of ideals generated by a pure power $x_1^\ell$, the statement reduces to an elementary limit of polygamma functions. In general, every independent computation of the Segre class of a monomial ideal would give rise, via [1], to an identity involving limits and series of such functions. We find this observation intriguing, but we hasten to add that the shape of the formulas, more than their algebro-geometric content, seems to be responsible for this
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phenomenon. The role played by the log canonical threshold is limited to the demarcation of the Newton polytope of $I$ in the positive orthant in $\mathbb{R}^n$ (Lemma 3.1).

Our main interest in Theorem 1.1 stems from the fact that both sides of (1) are defined for arbitrary homogeneous ideals in a polynomial ring. It is natural to ask to what extent formulas such as (1) may hold for non-monomial schemes, perhaps after a push-forward to projective space.
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2. Examples

Let $n = 1$, and $I = (x_1^\ell)$ for some $\ell \geq 1$. Then $I_{a_2,\ldots,a_n,\ldots,a_{n-1}} = I$, $\text{lct}(I) = \frac{1}{\ell}$, and the range of summation specified in Theorem 1.1 is $\text{lct}(I) \geq \frac{m}{a_1}$, that is, $a_1 \geq m\ell$. Thus, the summation in the statement of the theorem is

$$
\sum_{a \geq m\ell} \frac{mX_1}{(m + aX_1)^2}.
$$

Recall that the $r$-th polygamma function $\Psi^{(r)}(x)$, defined for $r > 0$ as the $r$-th derivative of the digamma function $\frac{d}{dx} \ln(\Gamma(x)) = \frac{d}{dx} \frac{\Gamma(x)}{x}$, admits the series representation

$$
\Psi^{(r)}(x) = (-1)^{r+1} r! \sum_{a \geq 0} \frac{1}{(a + x)^{r+1}}
$$

for $x$ complex, not equal to a negative integer. We have

$$
\sum_{a \geq 0} \frac{x^2}{(m + (a + x)X_1)^2} = \sum_{a \geq 0} \frac{x^2}{(m + (a + m\ell)x)^2} = \sum_{a \geq 0} \frac{1}{(a + m\ell + \frac{m}{X_1})^2} = \Psi^{(1)}(m\ell + \frac{m}{X_1})
$$

Thus, formally

$$
\sum_{a \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}, a \geq m\ell} \frac{mX_1}{(m + aX_1)^2} = \frac{m\Psi^{(1)}(m\ell + \frac{m}{X_1})}{X_1},
$$

and the right-hand side in (1) may be rewritten as

$$
1 - \lim_{m \to \infty} \frac{m}{X_1} \Psi^{(1)}(m\ell + \frac{m}{X_1})
$$

The asymptotic behavior of $\Psi^{(r)}(x)$ is well-known: as $x \to \infty$ in any fixed sector not including the negative real axis,

$$
\Psi^{(r)}(x) \sim (-1)^{r+1} r! \left( \frac{x^{-r}}{r} + \frac{x^{-r-1}}{2} + \sum_{k \geq 1} \frac{B_{2k}}{(2k)!} \frac{\Gamma(r + 2k)}{\Gamma(r + 1)} x^{-r-2k} \right)
$$

(see for instance \cite{Apo13}, (25.11.43)). In particular, for fixed $\ell$ and $x$

$$
\Psi^{(1)}(m\left(\ell + \frac{1}{x}\right)) \sim \left( m\left(\ell + \frac{1}{x}\right) \right)^{-1} = \frac{x}{m(1 + \ell x)}
$$

as $m \to \infty$ in $\mathbb{Z}_{>0}$. Therefore,

$$
\lim_{m \to \infty} \frac{m}{X_1} \Psi^{(1)}(m\ell + \frac{m}{X_1}) = \lim_{m \to \infty} \frac{mX_1}{m(1 + \ell X_1)} = \frac{1}{1 + \ell X_1}.
$$
Theorem 1.1 asserts that
\[ s(S, \mathbb{P}^N) = 1 - \frac{1}{1 + \ell X_1} = \frac{\ell X_1}{1 + \ell X_1} = c(N_S\mathbb{P}^N)^{-1} \cap [S] , \]
as it should, since \( S \) is a divisor in this case.

The assumption \( n = 1 \) in this computation must be irrelevant, since the Segre class is not affected by this choice. The computation itself is, however, affected by the choice of \( n \).

Viewing the monomial \( x_1^{\ell} \) as a monomial in (for example) two variables \( x_1, x_2 \) leads via Theorem 1.1 to the formula
\[ s(S, \mathbb{P}^N) = 1 - \lim_{m \to \infty} \sum_{a_1 \geq m \ell} \frac{2mX_1X_2}{(m + a_1X_1 + a_2X_2)^3} , \]
where the summation is over all positive integers \( a_1, a_2 \) such that \( lct(I_{a_2, a_1}) \geq \frac{m}{a_1a_2} \). Since \( I_{a_2, a_1} = (x_1^{a_2}) \), this amounts to the requirement that \( a_1 \geq m\ell, a_2 \geq 1 \), so the summation may be rewritten
\[ \sum_{a_1 \geq m \ell, a_2 \geq 1} \frac{2mX_1X_2}{(m + a_1X_1 + a_2X_2)^3} = \frac{2mX_1X_2}{X_2^3} \sum_{a_1 \geq m \ell} \sum_{a_2 \geq 0} \frac{1}{a_2 + 1 + \frac{m + a_1X_1}{X_2}^3} \, . \]

After performing the second summation, we see that the content of Theorem 1.1 in this case is
\[ s(S, \mathbb{P}^N) = 1 - \lim_{m \to \infty} -\frac{mX_1}{X_2^2} \sum_{a_1 \geq m \ell} \Psi^{(2)} \left( \frac{m + a_1X_1 + X_2}{X_2} \right) . \]
Heuristically, we can now argue that, as \( m \to \infty, \)
\[ \Psi^{(2)} \left( \frac{m + a_1X_1 + X_2}{X_2} \right) \sim - \left( \frac{m + a_1X_1 + X_2}{X_2} \right)^{-2} \]
so that, again as \( m \to \infty, \)
\[ \sum_{a_1 \geq m \ell} \Psi^{(2)} \left( \frac{m + a_1X_1 + X_2}{X_2} \right) \sim - \sum_{a_1 \geq m \ell} \frac{X_2^2}{(m + a_1X_1 + X_2)^2} = \frac{X_2^2}{X_2^3} \sum_{a_2 \geq 0} \frac{1}{(a + m\ell + \frac{m + X_2}{X_1})^2} \, . \]
Thus, the right-hand side of \( \sim \) equals
\[ 1 - \lim_{m \to \infty} \frac{1}{1 + \ell X_1 + \frac{X_2}{m}} = \frac{\ell X_1}{1 + \ell X_1} \]
as expected.

For ‘diagonal’ ideals \( I = (x_1^{\ell_1}, \ldots, x_n^{\ell_n}) \), we have
\[ lct(I_{a_2\cdots a_n}) = lct(x_1^{a_2\cdots a_n}, \ldots, x_n^{a_1\cdots a_n-1\ell_n}) = \frac{1}{\ell_1 a_2 \cdots a_n} + \cdots + \frac{1}{a_1 \cdots a_n - 1 \ell_n} \, ; \]
the condition that this be \( \geq m/a_1 \cdots a_n \) is equivalent to
\[ \frac{a_1}{\ell_1} + \cdots + \frac{a_n}{\ell_n} \geq m \, . \]
For e.g., \( n = 2 \), the content of Theorem \[1.1\] in this case is the identity

\[
1 + \lim_{m \to \infty} \frac{m X_1}{X_2^2} \left( \sum_{a_1 = 1}^{m} \Psi^{(2)} \left( m \ell_2 - \left\lfloor \frac{a_1 \ell_2}{\ell_1} \right\rfloor + m + a_1 X_1 \right) + \sum_{a_1 \geq m \ell_1} \Psi^{(2)} \left( 1 + \frac{m + a_1 X_1}{X_2} \right) \right) = \frac{\ell_1 \ell_2 X_1 X_2}{(1 + \ell_1 X_1)(1 + \ell_2 X_2)}.
\]

3. Proof of Theorem \[1.1\]

For positive integers \( r_1, \ldots, r_n \) and a homogeneous ideal \( I \) of \( k[x_1, \ldots, x_{N+1}] \) generated by polynomials in \( x_1, \ldots, x_n \), with \( N + 1 \geq n \), we let \( I_{r_1, \ldots, r_n} \) denote the extension of \( I \) via the ring homomorphism \( k[x_1, \ldots, x_{N+1}] \to k[x_1, \ldots, x_{N+1}] \) defined by \( x_i \mapsto x_i^{r_i}, i = 1, \ldots, n \). If \( I \) is a monomial ideal, let \( N' \subset \mathbb{R}^n \) be the convex hull of the lattice points \((i_1, \ldots, i_n) \in \mathbb{Z}^n \) such that \( x_1^{i_1} \cdots x_n^{i_n} \in I \), and let \( N \) be the (closure of the) complement of \( N' \) in the positive orthant \( \mathbb{R}^n_+ \). We call \( N \) the ‘Newton region’ for \( I \).

If \( I \) is monomial, the ideal \( I_{r_1, \ldots, r_n} \) is also monomial, and its Newton region is obtained by stretching \( N \) by a factor of \( r_1 \) in the \( x_1 \) direction, \( \ldots, r_n \) in the \( x_n \) direction. We will denote by \( N_{r_1, \ldots, r_n} \) this stretched region.

Lemma 3.1. Let \( I \) be a proper monomial ideal, and let \( N \) be as above. For \((a_1, \ldots, a_n) \in \mathbb{Z}^n_{>1} \) and \( m > 0 \),

\[
\left( \frac{a_1}{m}, \ldots, \frac{a_n}{m} \right) \in N \iff a_1 \cdots a_n \text{lct}(I_{a_2 \cdots a_n, a_1}) \leq m \quad .
\]

Proof. Let \( a_1, \ldots, a_n \) integers \( > 1 \). Note that

\[
\left( \frac{a_1}{m}, \ldots, \frac{a_n}{m} \right) \in N \iff \left( \frac{a_1}{m} a_2 \cdots a_n, \ldots, \frac{a_n}{m} a_1 \cdots a_{n-1} \right) \in N_{a_2 \cdots a_n, a_1} \quad .
\]

By Howald’s result (\[How01\], Example 5) this is the case if and only if

\[
\frac{a_1 \cdots a_n}{m} \leq \frac{1}{\text{lct}(I_{a_2 \cdots a_n, a_1})} \quad ,
\]

yielding the statement. \( \square \)

Remark 3.2. The restriction to \( a_i > 1 \) in this statement is in order to ward off the ‘annoying exception’ raised in \[How01\], Example 5: the formula for the log canonical threshold used in the proof does not hold if the corresponding multiplier ideal is trivial. In any case, the difference between \( N \) and the region spanned by the \( n \)-tuples \((\frac{a_1}{m}, \ldots, \frac{a_n}{m}) \) satisfying the stated condition with \( a_i > 0 \) vanishes in the limit as \( m \to \infty \), so we may (and will) adopt the condition for \((a_1, \ldots, a_n) \in \mathbb{Z}^n_{>0} \) in the application to Theorem \[1.1\].

By Lemma 3.1, the limit in \[1.1\] equals

\[
\lim_{m \to \infty} \frac{1}{m^n} \sum_{(a_1, \ldots, a_n) \in \mathbb{Z}^n_{>0}} \sum_{(\frac{a_1}{m}, \ldots, \frac{a_n}{m}) \in N'} \frac{n! X_1 \cdots X_n}{(1 + \frac{a_1}{m} X_1 + \cdots + \frac{a_n}{m} X_n)^{n+1}} \quad .
\]

This may be interpreted as a limit of Riemann sums for the integral

\[
\int_{N'} \frac{n! X_1 \cdots X_n}{(1 + a_1 X_1 + \cdots + a_n X_n)^{n+1}} \quad .
\]
Since the value of this integral on the positive orthant is 1, the right-hand side of (1) equals
\[ \int_N \frac{n!X_1 \cdots X_n \, da_1 \cdots da_n}{(1 + a_1X_1 + \cdots + a_nX_n)^{n+1}}. \]

This equals the Segre class \( s(S, \mathbb{P}^N) \) once \( X_i \) is interpreted as the \( i \)-th coordinate hyperplane in \( \mathbb{P}^N \), by Theorem 1.1 in [Alu].
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