

ERRATUM FOR “THE SHEAF  $\alpha_X^\bullet$ ”

DANIEL BARLET

1. ERRATUM FOR “THE SHEAF  $\alpha_X^\bullet$ ”

The aim of this erratum is to correct several mistakes in [3]. The main mistake is in Theorem 4.1.1 of [3] which is wrong in the very general setting in which it is stated.

So we give here a much more modest version of the “pull-back theorem” for these sheaves which has a rather simple proof.

Recall that on a reduced complex space  $X$  the sheaf  $\alpha_X^\bullet$  is the integral closure in the sheaf  $\omega_X^\bullet$  of the sheaf  $\Omega_X^\bullet/torsion$ , where  $\Omega_X^\bullet$  is the sheaf of Kähler differential forms and where the sheaf  $\omega_X^\bullet$  is the sheaf of  $(\bullet, 0) - \bar{\partial}$ -closed currents on  $X$  modulo its torsion sub-sheaf (see [1]).

**Theorem 1.0.1.** *Let  $f : X \rightarrow Y$  be a holomorphic map between reduced complex spaces and assume that  $f^{-1}(S(Y))$  has empty interior in  $X$ , where  $S(Y)$  is the singular set of  $Y$ . Then there exists a natural “pull-back map”*

$$\hat{f}^* : f^*(\alpha_Y^\bullet) \rightarrow \alpha_X^\bullet$$

which extends the usual pull-back of the graduate sheaf of holomorphic differential forms

$$f^* : f^*(\Omega_Y^\bullet/torsion) \rightarrow \Omega_X^\bullet/torsion.$$

For any holomorphic maps  $f : X \rightarrow Y$  and  $g : Y \rightarrow Z$  between reduced complex spaces such that  $f^{-1}(S(Y) \cup g^{-1}(S(Z)))$  has empty interior in  $X$  and  $g^{-1}(S(Z))$  has empty interior in  $Y$  we have

$$(1) \quad \hat{f}^*(\hat{g}^*(\sigma)) = \widehat{f \circ g}^*(\sigma) \quad \forall \sigma \in \alpha_Z^\bullet.$$

PROOF. The problem is local. Let  $\sigma$  be a section of the sheaf  $\alpha_Y^\bullet$  on an open set  $V$  in  $Y$ . Let  $V'$  be the set of regular points in  $V$  and let  $U''$  the set of regular points in the open set  $U' := f^{-1}(V')$ . This is a Zariski dense open set in  $U := f^{-1}(V)$  and, as  $\sigma$  is a holomorphic form on  $V'$ ,  $f^*(\sigma)$  is a well defined holomorphic form on  $U''$  which is Zariski open and dense in  $U$ . Take a point  $x$  in  $U$ ; by definition (see Proposition 2.2.4 in [3]) there exists an open neighborhood  $W$  of  $y := f(x)$  in  $V$  and a monic polynomial

$$P(z) = z^k + \sum_{h=1}^k S_h \cdot z^{k-h}$$

such that  $S_h$  is a section on  $W$  of the symmetric algebra of degree  $h$ ,  $S^h(\Omega_Y^\bullet/torsion)$ , of the sheaf  $\Omega_Y^\bullet/torsion$ , which satisfies  $P(\sigma) = 0$  in  $\Gamma(W, S^k(\Omega_Y^\bullet/torsion))$ . Then the pull-back  $f^*(P)$  of  $P$  by  $f$  is well defined on  $f^{-1}(W)$  and is a monic polynomial whose coefficients are sections on  $f^{-1}(W)$  of the symmetric algebra of  $\Omega_X^\bullet/torsion$ . On the open set  $U'' \cap f^{-1}(W)$  the holomorphic

2010 Mathematics Subject Classification. 32S05, 32S10, 32S20.

Key words and phrases. singular complex spaces, singularity invariants, meromorphic differential forms.

I thank the referee for several careful readings and for many relevant remarks.

form  $f^*(\sigma)$  is a root of  $f^*(P)$  and so the meromorphic<sup>1</sup> form  $f^*(\sigma)$  on  $U \cap f^{-1}(W)$  is integrally dependent on the sheaf  $\Omega_X^\bullet / \text{torsion}$ . So it defines a unique section on  $U$  of the sheaf  $\alpha_X^\bullet$ . As the equality (1) holds generically on  $X$  the conclusion follows from the fact that the sheaf  $\alpha_X^\bullet$  has no torsion.  $\blacksquare$

The second mistake (which is a consequence of the previous one) is that, in Definition 5.1.5 of [3], it is necessary to ask that the  $p$ -dimensional irreducible analytic subset  $Y$  is not contained in the singular set of  $X$  in order to define the integral on  $Y$  of a form of the type  $\rho \cdot \alpha \wedge \bar{\beta}$ , where  $\alpha, \beta$  are sections of the sheaf  $\alpha_X^p$  in  $X$ .

To be clear we give here the correct statements for Definition 5.1.5, Lemma 5.1.6 and for Theorem 5.1.7. The statement of such a result makes sense only assuming that the pull-back for the sheaf  $\alpha^\bullet$  is defined. This is consequence of the hypothesis that  $Y$  is not contained in  $S(X)$  which allows one to apply Theorem 1.0.1 above.

**Definition 1.0.2.** *Let  $X$  be a reduced complex space and let  $Y \subset X$  be a closed irreducible  $p$ -dimensional analytic subset in  $X$ ; assume that  $Y$  is not contained in the singular set  $S(X)$  of  $X$ . We shall note  $j : Y \rightarrow X$  the inclusion map. Let  $\rho$  be a continuous function with compact support in  $X$  and let  $\alpha, \beta$  be sections on  $X$  of the sheaf  $\alpha_X^p$ . We define the number  $\int_Y \rho \cdot \alpha \wedge \bar{\beta}$  as the integral*

$$\int_Y j^*(\rho) \cdot \hat{j}^*(\alpha) \wedge \overline{\hat{j}^*(\beta)}$$

which is well-defined by Theorem 1.0.1 above.

This definition extends by additivity to any  $p$ -cycle  $Y$  in  $X$  such that its support has no irreducible component contained in  $S(X)$ .

REMARK. The definition above makes sense, more generally, still assuming that  $Y$  is not contained in  $S(X)$ , when  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$  are sections of the sheaf  $L_X^p$  of meromorphic forms which become holomorphic on any desingularisation of  $X$  because we see that the improper integral on  $Y \setminus S(X)$  converges by looking at the strict transform of  $Y$  by the desingularisation map.

**Lemma 1.0.3.** *Let  $f : X \rightarrow Y$  be a holomorphic map between reduced complex spaces such that  $f^{-1}(S(Y))$  has empty interior in  $X$ . Let  $Z$  be a closed  $p$ -dimensional irreducible analytic subset in  $X$  such that  $Z$  is not contained in the singular set  $S(X)$  of  $X$ , the restriction of  $f$  to  $Z$  is proper and  $f(Z)$  is not contained in the singular set of  $Y$ . Let  $\alpha, \beta$  be sections on  $Y$  of the sheaf  $\alpha_Y^p$  and let  $\rho$  be a continuous function with compact support in  $Y$ . Then we have the equality*

$$\int_Z f^*(\rho) \cdot \hat{f}^*(\alpha) \wedge \overline{\hat{f}^*(\beta)} = \int_{f_*(Z)} \rho \cdot \hat{j}^*(\alpha) \wedge \overline{\hat{j}^*(\beta)}$$

where  $f_*(Z)$  is the direct image cycle of  $Z$  by  $f$  and  $j : |f_*(Z)| \rightarrow Y$  the inclusion in  $Y$  of the support of the cycle  $f_*(Z)$ .

Moreover if the set  $f(Z)$  is contained in  $S(Y)$  the singular set of  $Y$  and has dimension at most  $p-1$  (so that  $f_*(Z)$  is the empty  $p$ -cycle) we have

$$\int_Z f^*(\rho) \cdot \hat{f}^*(\alpha) \wedge \overline{\hat{f}^*(\beta)} = 0.$$

Of course, when  $f(Z) \not\subset S(Y)$  and satisfies  $f_*(Z) = 0$  as a  $p$ -cycle in  $Y$ , the first part of the lemma gives also the vanishing of  $\int_Z f^*(\rho) \cdot \hat{f}^*(\alpha) \wedge \overline{\hat{f}^*(\beta)} = 0$ .

<sup>1</sup>Remember that  $\sigma$  is a meromorphic form on  $V$  with poles in  $S(Y) \cap V$ .

PROOF. The first assertion is an easy consequence of the same result when  $\alpha, \beta$  are holomorphic forms (see [2] Ch.IV Prop. 2.3.1, or Prop. 4.2.17 in the English translation), by considering a modification of  $X$  where it is the case, using for instance, a desingularisation of  $X$  (see [5]).

When  $f(Z) \subset S(Y)$  and  $f_*(Z) = 0$  the restriction of  $f$  to  $Z$  has generic rank at most  $p - 1$ , so the pull-back of any holomorphic  $p$ -form on  $Y$  to  $Z$  is torsion. Then the monic polynomial giving an integral dependence relation of  $\alpha$  (or of  $\beta$ ) reduces to  $z^k = 0$  on  $f(Z)$  and so  $\alpha$  (and  $\beta$ ) vanishes on  $Z$ . ■

We give now a correct version of Theorem 5.1.7 in [3].

**Theorem 1.0.4.** *Let  $X$  be a reduced complex space and  $(Y_t)_{t \in T}$  be a proper analytic family of compact  $p$ -cycles in  $X$  parametrized by a reduced complex space  $T$  (see [2] Section IV.3). Assume that for  $t$  in a dense open subset  $T'$  in  $T$  no component of the cycle  $Y_t$  is contained in  $S(X)$ , the singular set of  $X$ . Let  $\rho$  be a continuous function with support in the compact set  $K$  in  $X$  and let  $\alpha, \beta$  be two sections of the sheaf  $\alpha_X^\bullet$ . Define the function*

$$\varphi : T' \rightarrow \mathbb{C} \quad \text{by} \quad \varphi(t) := \int_{Y_t} \rho \cdot \hat{j}_t^*(\alpha) \wedge \overline{\hat{j}_t^*(\beta)}$$

where  $j_t : |Y_t| \rightarrow X$  is the inclusion in  $X$  of the support of the cycle  $Y_t$ .

Then  $\varphi$  is continuous on  $T'$  and locally bounded near each point in  $T$ .

For any continuous hermitian metric  $h$  on  $X$ , there exists a constant  $C > 0$  (depending on  $K, \alpha, \beta, h$  but not of the choice of  $\rho$  with support in  $K$ ) such that for each  $t \in T'$  we have:

$$(2) \quad |\varphi(t)| \leq C \cdot \int_{Y_t} |\rho| \cdot h^{\wedge p} \leq C \cdot \|\rho\|_\infty \cdot \int_{Y_t \cap K} h^{\wedge p}.$$

PROOF. Let  $\tau : \tilde{X} \rightarrow X$  be a desingularisation of  $X$ ; so  $\hat{\tau}^*(\alpha)$  and  $\hat{\tau}^*(\beta)$  are holomorphic  $p$ -forms on  $\tilde{X}$ . Using Corollary IV 9.1.3 in [2] we may lift the analytic family  $(Y_t)_{t \in T}$  to an analytic family  $(\tilde{Y}_{\tilde{t}})_{\tilde{t} \in \tilde{T}}$  where  $\theta : \tilde{T} \rightarrow T$  is a (proper) modification such that for each  $\tilde{t} \in \theta^{-1}(T')$  we have the equality of cycles in  $X$

$$(S) \quad \tau_*(\tilde{Y}_{\tilde{t}}) = Y_{\theta(\tilde{t})}.$$

Then Proposition IV 2.3.1 in [2] gives the continuity of the function  $\tilde{\varphi} : \tilde{T} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$  defined by

$$\tilde{\varphi}(\tilde{t}) = \int_{\tilde{Y}_{\tilde{t}}} \tau^*(\rho) \cdot \hat{\tau}^*(\alpha) \wedge \overline{\hat{\tau}^*(\beta)}.$$

The point is now to show that for  $\tilde{t} \in \theta^{-1}(T')$  we have  $\tilde{\varphi}(\tilde{t}) = \varphi(\theta(\tilde{t}))$ . Thanks to Corollary IV 2.5.5 in [2] this is clear using the formula (S) if we can prove that for  $\theta(\tilde{t}) \in T'$  the contribution to the integral  $\tilde{\varphi}(\tilde{t})$  of an irreducible component  $Z$  of  $\tilde{Y}_{\tilde{t}}$  satisfying  $\tau_*(Z) = 0$  as a  $p$ -cycle in  $X$  vanishes, because this implies the equality  $\varphi(\theta(\tilde{t})) = \tilde{\varphi}(\tilde{t})$ . But this is precisely the content of the second part of Lemma 1.0.3. This gives the continuity of  $\varphi$  on  $T'$ .

As  $\tilde{\varphi}$  is continuous on  $\tilde{T}$ , the function  $\varphi$  is locally bounded near each point in  $T$ .

The estimate (2) is a direct consequence of Corollary 5.1.2 in [3]. ■

REMARKS.

- (1) Assuming only that  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$  are sections of the sheaf  $L_X^p$ , it is not clear that  $\varphi$  is continuous on  $T'$  because in order to lift the family of cycles  $(Y_t)_{t \in T}$  in a continuous family of cycles on a desingularisation of  $X$  it may be necessary to add exceptional components to the strict transform of  $Y_t$  for some values of  $t \in T'$  and the argument used above to show that these components do not contribute to the integral upstairs

does not work for sections in  $L_X^p$ . Moreover, the estimate (2) is not true in general for sections in  $L_X^p$  (see Remark 2 following Corollary 5.1.2 in [3]).

- (2) For any analytic family of compact cycles  $(Y_t)_{t \in T}$  in  $X$ , the subset of points  $t \in T$  where the cycle  $Y_t$  has at least one irreducible component contained in  $S(X)$  is a closed analytic subset in  $T$  by a general result on analytic families of compact cycles (see the exercise following Theorem IV 3.3.1 in [2]). So, assuming that  $T$  is irreducible, if there exists a point  $t$  such that  $Y_t$  has no irreducible component contained in  $S(X)$ , there exists a Zariski open and dense subset  $T'$  of  $T$  which satisfies the hypothesis in the previous theorem.
- (3) The previous theorem is in fact a local result on  $X$  and  $T$ , but we consider here only the case of a proper analytic family of compact cycles in  $X$  to have a simple argument to lift the analytic family of cycles in  $X$  to an analytic family of cycles in  $\tilde{X}$  such that  $(S)$  is satisfied.

The last mistake is Lemma 6.2.2 which is wrong for  $k \geq 4$ . The correct computation of  $\alpha_{S_k}^2$  is given in Paragraph 2.3 in [4].

#### REFERENCES

1. Barlet, Daniel, *Le faisceau  $\omega_X^\bullet$  sur un espace complexe réduct*, Séminaire F. Norguet III, Lecture Notes, vol. 670, Springer Verlag (1978), pp.187-204. DOI: [10.1007/bfb0064400](https://doi.org/10.1007/bfb0064400)
2. Barlet, Daniel et Magnusson, Jon, *Cycles analytiques complexes I : théorèmes de préparation des cycles*, Cours Spécialisés 22, SMF, 2014. English translation : Grundlehren ... 356 Springer 2020.
3. Barlet, Daniel, *The sheaf  $\alpha_X^\bullet$* , J. Sing. 18 (2018) pp.50-83. DOI: [10.5427/jsing.2018.18e](https://doi.org/10.5427/jsing.2018.18e)
4. Barlet, Daniel, *New singularity invariants: the sheaf  $\beta_X^\bullet$* , J. Sing. 23 (2021) pp. 19-32. DOI: [10.5427/jsing.2021.23c](https://doi.org/10.5427/jsing.2021.23c)
5. Hironaka, Heisuke *Resolution of Singularities ...I and II*, Annals of Math. (2) 79, (1964) pp.109-203 and pp.205-326.

DANIEL BARLET, INSTITUT ELIE CARTAN, GÉOMÉTRIE, UNIVERSITÉ DE LORRAINE, CNRS UMR 7502 AND INSTITUT UNIVERSITAIRE DE FRANCE