ON T-MAPS AND IDEALS OF ANTIDERIVATIVES OF HYPERSURFACE SINGULARITIES

QUAN SHI, STEPHEN S.-T. YAU, AND HUAIQING ZUO

Abstract. Mather-Yau theorem leads to the massive study about moduli algebras of isolated hypersurface singularities. In this paper, the Tjurina ideal is generalized as T-principal ideals of certain T-maps for Noetherian algebras. Moreover, we introduce the ideal of antiderivatives of a T-map, which creates many new invariants. Firstly, we compute two new invariants associated to ideals of antiderivatives for ADE singularities and conjecture a general pattern of polynomial growth of these invariants. Secondly, the language of T-maps is applied to generalize the well-known theorem that the Milnor number of a semi quasi-homogeneous singularity is equal to the Milnor number of its principal part. Finally, we use two conditions *T-fullness* and *T-dependence* to determine whether an ideal is a T-principal ideal and provide a constructive way of giving a generator of a T-principal ideal. As a result, the problem about reconstruction of a hypersurface singularitiy from its generalized moduli algebras is solved. It generalizes the results of Rodrigues in the cases of the 0-th and 1-st moduli algebra, which inspired our solution.

Key words: Isolated Singularities, Local Rings, Kähler Differential, Semi Quasi-homogeneous Singularities, Tjurina Ideals

2010 Mathematics Subject Classification. Primary 14B07, 32S05.

Content

Zuo is supported by NSFC Grant 12271280 and Tsinghua University Initiative Scientic Research Program. Yau is supported by Tsinghua University Education Foundation fund (042202008).

Acknowledgement. The authors sincerely thank the referees for their thorough review and thoughtful comments that have helped to enhance this manuscript.

1. Introduction

The motivation of this research is Mather-Yau theorem [MY82]. Let $\mathbb{C}\{x_1, x_2, ..., x_n\}$ ($\mathbb{C}\{\boldsymbol{x}\}$ for short) be the ring of complex convergent power series of n variables at $(\mathbb{C}^n, 0)$ For an isolated hypersurface singularity $(V, 0) \subset (\mathbb{C}^n, 0)$ defined by the analytic germ $f : (\mathbb{C}^n, 0) \to (\mathbb{C}, 0)$, one has the moduli algebra $A(V) := \mathcal{O}_n / \left(f, \frac{\partial f}{\partial x_1}, \ldots, \frac{\partial f}{\partial x_n}\right)$ which is finite dimensional. The well-known Mather-Yau theorem states that: Let $(V_1, 0)$ and $(V_2, 0)$ be two isolated hypersurface singularities, $A(V_1)$ and $A(V_2)$ be their respective moduli algebras, then $(V_1, 0) \cong (V_2, 0) \Longleftrightarrow A(V_1) \cong A(V_2)$. The biholomorphic classes of isolated hypersurface singularities correspond to isomorphism classes of commutative $\mathbb{C}$-algebras. The Mather-Yau theorem plays a very important role in the classification of isolated hypersurface singularities.

In the classification theory of isolated singularities, one always wants to find invariants associated to the isolated singularities. Hopefully with enough invariants found, one can distinguish between isolated singularities. Mather-Yau theorem tells us that the moduli algebra $A(V)$ is a complete invariant of an isolated hypersurface singularity $(V, 0)$. All information about singularities can be taken from its moduli algebra. It is natural to ask if there are other $\mathbb{C}$-analytic algebras play similar role as the moduli algebra? In this paper, we call a local algebra which satisfies Mather-Yau theorem a *valid moduli algebra*. Since a valid moduli algebra is often a quotient ring of $\mathbb{C}\{\boldsymbol{x}\}$ modulo an ideal, we call a map $Q : \mathbb{C}\{\boldsymbol{x}\} \to \{\text{ideals of } \mathbb{C}\{\boldsymbol{x}\}\}$ a *moduli ideal map* if for any $f \in \mathbb{C}\{\boldsymbol{x}\}$, $\mathbb{C}\{\boldsymbol{x}\}/Q(f)$ is a local algebra invariant of singularity $(V(f), 0)$. For example, the k-th Tjurina ideal map $Q = T_k : f \mapsto (f) + (\boldsymbol{x})^k J(f)$, $J(f) = (\frac{\partial f}{\partial x_1}, ..., \frac{\partial f}{\partial x_n})$ is a moduli ideal map. Q is called *valid* if each $\mathbb{C}\{\boldsymbol{x}\}/Q(f)$ is a valid moduli algebra when $(V(f), 0)$ is an isolated hypersurface singularity. In past years, Yau, Zuo and their collaborators have introduced many new local algebras to singularities: higher Nash Blow-up local algebra ([HMYZ23]), k-th local Hessian algebra ([HYZ21]), k-th moduli algebra ([HLYZ23]) and k-th singular local moduli algebra ([MYZ23]). These local algebras are new invariants of singularities. They play important roles in the classification theory of singularities. It is a natural question whether these new algebras are valid moduli algebras. The answer is yes for k-th moduli algebra (see *generalized Mather-Yau theorem*, [GLS07]). Moreover, the authors have proven that the k-th local Hessian algebra is also a valid moduli algebra for some k ([CHYZ20]).

For a hypersurface singularity $(V(f), 0)$, its Tjurina ideal is defined by $T(f) := (f) + J(f)$, whose corresponding moduli algebra $\mathbb{C}\{\boldsymbol{x}\}/T(f)$ is also called Tjurina algebra or moduli algebra. In [OR23], Rodrigues proposed the problem how to find a necessary and sufficient condition that an ideal I of $\mathbb{C}\{\boldsymbol{x}\}$ is a Tjurina ideal. By introduction of the conceptions of T-fullness and T-dependence, the problem was finally solved. If one can further find an $f \in \mathbb{C}\{\boldsymbol{x}\}$ such that $I = T(f)$, then the problem of reconstructing a hypersurface singularity from its moduli algebra is also solved, since an analytic algebra is given by $\mathbb{C}\{\boldsymbol{x}\}$ modulo an ideal. Motivated from his work, we propose a more general problem:

Question 1.1. *Let $Q : \mathbb{C}\{\boldsymbol{x}\} \to \{\text{ideals of } \mathbb{C}\{\boldsymbol{x}\}\}$ be a valid moduli ideal map. For an ideal $I \lhd \mathbb{C}\{\boldsymbol{x}\}$, how to find a necessary and sufficient condition that $I = Q(g)$ for some $g \in \mathbb{C}\{\boldsymbol{x}\}$.*

Many well-known valid moduli ideal maps are of the form $Q(f) = (Q_1(f), ..., Q_m(f))$, where m is a fixed integer and all $Q_i : \mathbb{C}\{\boldsymbol{x}\} \to \mathbb{C}\{\boldsymbol{x}\}$ are $\mathbb{C}$-linear maps. For example, Tjurina ideal map is of this form. From this, the problem has an algebraic generalization stated as below:

Question 1.2. *Let A be an algebra over a field F, $Q : A \to \{ideals\ of\ A\}$ is a map of the form $Q(f) = (Q_1(f), ..., Q_m(f))$, where m is a fixed integer and $Q_i \in \mathrm{End}_F(A)$. Then for an ideal $I \lhd A$, how to find a necessary and sufficient condition that $I = Q(g)$ for some $g \in A$.*

In our article, we solved **Question 1.2** when Q is a T-map (see **Definition 4.1**) and A is a Noetherian F-algebra where F is an infinite residue field. The introduction of T-map is of importance, since it includes many well-known moduli ideal maps: higher order Tjurina ideal map (the sum of higher order Jacobian ideals ([DGI20])), k-th Tjurina ideal map ([HLYZ23]) and k-th local Hessian ideal map ([HYZ21]). Our solution is motivated from [OR23], with necessary adjustments. We introduce the ideal of antiderivatives, T-fullness and T-dependence with respect to (w.r.t. for short) T-maps (see **subsection 4.5**) and prove our main theorem:

Theorem A. *(Theorem 4.76 and Algorithm 4.82) Let F be an infinite field and A be a Noetherian local F-algebra with maximal ideal $\mathfrak{m}$. Suppose $A/\mathfrak{m} \simeq F$. Let Q be a fixed T-map of F-algebra A. For an ideal $I \lhd A$, it is a T-principal ideal if and only if I is T-full and $\Delta(I)$ is T-dependent. Moreover, if I is a T-principal ideal, then a generator of I can be explicitly calculated.*

The notions "T-full" and "T-dependent" are conditions w.r.t. Q. Besides, a T-principal ideal refers to an ideal of the form $Q(f), f \in A$. For example, Tjurina ideals are those T-principal ideals in the $\mathbb{C}$-algebra $\mathbb{C}\{\boldsymbol{x}\}$, when $Q(f) = (f, \frac{\partial f}{\partial x_1}, ..., \frac{\partial f}{\partial x_n})$ for all $f \in \mathbb{C}\{\boldsymbol{x}\}$. We point out that the theorem holds for an arbitrary infinite field, even with a positive characteristic. For example, $A = \mathbb{F}_p((t))[x_1, x_2, ..., x_n]$ with $F = \mathbb{F}_p((t))$ also satisfies the assumption. However, the correctness of the theorem when F is a finite field has not been verified, but we conjecture that it is also true.

Furthermore, we give a constructive method to recover a hypersurface singularity from its k-th moduli ideal in **Algorithm 4.82**. This gives an answer to well-known reconstruction problem in [Yau87] given by the second author: How can one construct the singularity $(V, 0)$ explicitly from moduli algebra $A(V)$. The difficulty of this problem is reduced to the computation of the ideal of antiderivatives. In **subsection 4.1**, we provide approaches to finding ideals of antiderivatives w.r.t. higher order Tjurina ideal maps and k-th Tjurina ideal maps.

Besides, we introduce various invariants associated with the ideal of antiderivatives (see **subsection 4.1**). In **subsection 4.2**, we introduce a series of invariants of singularities ρ_k, σ_k and T-threshold. Briefly, for $f \in \mathbb{C}\{\boldsymbol{x}\}$ which defines an isolated singularity at the origin, $\Delta(T_k(f))$ is defined to be the ideal of antiderivatives of k-th Tjurina ideal $T_k(f)$ w.r.t. T_k. Then $\sigma_k := \dim_{\mathbb{C}} \Delta(T_k(f))/T_k(f)^2$ and $\rho_k := \dim_{\mathbb{C}} T_k(f)/\Delta(T_k(f))$ are two new invariants of singularities. We prove that ρ_k decreases to 0 when k tends to infinity and define the T-threshold of f to be the smallest number r such that $T_r(f) = \Delta(T_r(f))$.

We complete the computation of these invariants for ADE curve singularities. As a result, we have verified the following conjecture for ADE curve singularities.

Conjecture 4.35. *Let $(X, 0) = (V(f), 0) \subset (\mathbb{C}^n, 0)$ be an isolated hypersurface singularity. Then T-threshold of f is the smallest integer N such that $\{\sigma_k\}_{k \geq N}$ is a polynomial in k of degree $n - 1$.*

Theorem B. ***Conjecture 4.35*** *holds for ADE curve singularities.*

We are able to find the leading term of the polynomial in **Conjecture 4.35** by sandwiching σ_k between two polynomials of k.

Proposition 4.38. *Suppose* $(X,0)=(V(f),0)\subset(\mathbb{C}^n,0)$ *is an isolated singularity, then:*

$$\sigma_k \sim \frac{2^{n-1}\mathrm{ord}(f)}{(n-1)!}k^{n-1}.$$

Here $\mathrm{ord}(f)$ *denotes the minimal degree among all monomial terms appearing in* f*. For two sequences* $\{a_n\},\{b_n\}\subset\mathbb{C}$*, we denote* $a_n\sim b_n$ *if* $a_n/b_n\to 1$ *when* $n\to\infty$*.*

Corollary 4.39. *If **Conjecture 4.35** holds, then the leading term of this polynomial is* $\frac{2^{n-1}\mathrm{ord}(f)}{(n-1)!}k^{n-1}$.

In **subsection 4.4**, the language of T-maps is applied to the ring of formal power series. Despite contact equivalence, right equivalence is also an important relation in classification of singularities. Among all right invariants, Milnor number is possibly the most widely known one. It is a well-known theorem that for a semi quasi-homogeneous (SQH for short) series $f\in K[[\boldsymbol{x}]]:=K[[x_1,x_2,...,x_n]]$, the Milnor number of f coincides with that of the principal part f_w of f (see [BGM11]). In this paper, we generalize this theorem to the k-th Milnor number $\mu_k(f)$, which is the dimension of the quotient ring of $K[[\boldsymbol{x}]]$ modulo the k-th Jacobian ideal $J_k(f)=\mathfrak{m}^kJ(f)$ (see [HLYZ23]) and is also a right invariant. Using the tools about regular sequence, we finally proved the following:

Theorem C. *(Theorem 4.63) Suppose* $f\in K[[\boldsymbol{x}]]$ *is an SQH series w.r.t.* $w\in\mathbb{N}^n_{>0}$ *i.e.* $\mu(f_w)<\infty$*. Then for* $k\le\min_i\{\mathrm{ord}(\frac{\partial f}{\partial x_i})\}$*,* $\mu_k(f_w)=\mu_k(f)$*.*

Moreover, we believe the result is correct for all $k\ge 0$. Hence we propose the following conjecture:

Conjecture 4.65. Suppose $f\in K[[\boldsymbol{x}]]$ is an SQH series w.r.t. $w\in\mathbb{N}^n_{>0}$ i.e. $\mu(f_w)<\infty$. Then for all $k\in\mathbb{N}$, $\mu_k(f_w)=\mu_k(f)$.

Apart from the three above Theorems, we also give a geometric interpretation of ideals of antiderivatives w.r.t. Tjurina ideal map T_0. For an ideal $I\lhd\mathbb{C}\{\boldsymbol{x}\}$, the ideal of antiderivatives of I w.r.t. T_0 (namely, $\Delta(I)$) is closely related to the well-known second fundamental exact sequence for Kähler differential (see **Theorem 2.9**). We illustrate and prove this connection in **subsection 4.3**. Briefly, $\Delta(I)$ coincides with the kernel of the first homomorphism in the second fundamental exact sequence. We also call the ideal of antiderivatives defined above as locally defined ideal of antiderivatives. In fact, we can generalize the locally defined ideal of antiderivatives to a global version. Consider the global objects complex space $(X,\mathcal{O}_X)$ and coherent ideal sheaf $\mathcal{I}$ of $\mathcal{O}_X$. In **subsection 4.3**, we further define the (globally defined) ideal sheaf of antiderivatives $\Delta(\mathcal{I})$ for $\mathcal{I}$. Besides, we prove if X is smooth, then for each $p\in X$, the stalk $\Delta(\mathcal{I})_p$ is equal to the locally defined ideal $\Delta(\mathcal{I}_p)\lhd\mathcal{O}_{X,p}=\mathbb{C}\{\boldsymbol{x}\}$.

In the appendix we give the code for computing ideals of antiderivatives for T_k and the invariants σ_k,ρ_k. We only provide the code for two variables and the code for three variables is similar.

Remark: After completing the project, we find this paper [OR24]. We would like to point out that our work overlaps merely a small part with this preprint. Our **Theorem A** and the main theorem of [OR24] are both related to reconstruction of a hypersurface singularity from its moduli algebra. We would like to emphasize that our **Theorem A** can be applied to T-maps on local algebras over infinite field F with residue field F, which includes Tjurina ideal map and 1-st Tjurina ideal map of $\mathbb{C}\{\boldsymbol{x}\}$. For example, it can be applied to all of the six maps in **Examples 4.5**. Moreover, we do not even require the characteristic of F to be zero.

2. Preliminary

2.1. **Invariants of Singularities.** Let $(X,0) \subseteq (\mathbb{C}^n,0)$ be the common zero locus of some functions $f_1, f_2, ..., f_m$ which are analytic near 0. If $m = 1$, $(X,0)$ is called a hypersurface singularity. The singular locus of $(X,0)$, denoted as $(\mathrm{Sing}X,0)$ is the zero locus of f_1 and its partial derivatives. The singular locus is often called the singularity of $(X,0)$. Sometimes, if not confusing, we call $(X,0)$ a singularity. A singularity is called isolated if $(\mathrm{Sing}X,0)$ is a single point. A morphism of two analytic space germs $(X,0) \subseteq (\mathbb{C}^n,0)$ and $(Y,0) \subseteq (\mathbb{C}^m,0)$ is a restriction of a holomorphic map germ $f : (\mathbb{C}^n,0) \to (\mathbb{C}^m,0)$ to $(X,0)$, such that $(f(X),0) \subseteq (Y,0)$. $(X,0)$ and $(Y,0)$ are called isomorphic if and only if there are two morphisms between them which are inverse to each other. It is equivalent to say $(X,0)$ and $(Y,0)$ are biholomorphic.

The classification of singularities is based on such isomorphisms. A natural idea of algebraic geometry is to consider the valid functions on spaces i.e. analytic space germs. The function on $(X,0)$ are those analytic germs. By *Hilbert-Rückert theorem*([GLS07]), the ring of holomorphic function of $(X,0)$ is $\mathbb{C}\{x_1,x_2,...,x_n\}/I$, where I is the ideal of analytic germs vanishing at $(X,0)$. $\mathbb{C}\{x_1,x_2,...,x_n\}$ is a Henselian, Noetherian UFD as corollaries of *Weierstraß Preparation theorem (*[GLS07]). If not confusing, we abbreviate $\mathbb{C}\{x_1,x_2,...,x_n\}$ as $\mathbb{C}\{\boldsymbol{x}\}$ and denote $\mathfrak{m}$ as its maximal ideal.

Two analytic germs f and g in $\mathbb{C}\{\boldsymbol{x}\}$ are called *right equivalent* if there exists a $\varphi \in \mathrm{Aut}((\mathbb{C}\{\boldsymbol{x}\})$ such that $\varphi(f) = g$, called *contact equivalent* if $\varphi(f) = ug$, where $\varphi \in \mathrm{Aut}(\mathbb{C}\{\boldsymbol{x}\})$ and $u \in \mathbb{C}\{\boldsymbol{x}\}^*$ is a unit. Note that the two types of equivalence induce an isomorphism of singularities since φ is always given by an isomorphism of analytic space germs. It is not difficult to verify two analytic space germs are isomorphic if and only if their corresponding analytic algebras are isomorphic. Another question is whether such isomorphism can be determined by simpler algebras. Mather and Yau ([MY82]) proved two isolated hypersurface singularities are isomorphic if and only if their moduli algebras are isomorphic. The Mather Yau theorem is slightly generalized in [GLS07], stated as below:

Theorem 2.1 ([GLS07], Theorem 2.26; [GLS23], Theorem 1)**.** *Let $f, g \in \mathfrak{m} \subset \mathbb{C}\{\boldsymbol{x}\}$, the following are equivalent:*

(1) f is contact equivalent to g.

(2) For all $k \geq 1$, $\mathbb{C}\{\boldsymbol{x}\}/T_k(f) \simeq \mathbb{C}\{\boldsymbol{x}\}/T_k(g)$.

(3) There is some $k \geq 1$ such that $\mathbb{C}\{\boldsymbol{x}\}/T_k(f) \simeq \mathbb{C}\{\boldsymbol{x}\}/T_k(g)$.

Here, T_k is the k-th Tjurina ideal $T_k(f) := (f) + \mathfrak{m}^k J(f)$. In particular, $T_0(f) = T(f)$.

Moreover, if f has an isolated singularity, then f is contact equivalent to g if and only if $T(f) \simeq T(g)$.

Hence, Mather-Yau theorem leads to the massive study of moduli algebras, the generalization of which is the main objects studied in this paper.

For a hypersurface singularity, there are a series of invariants: Milnor number ([GLS07]), Tjurina number ([GLS07]), higher Jacobian algebra (The quotient for higher order Jacobian, [DGI20]), spectrum number ([vS20]), Igusa Zeta function ([Igu00]) and Bernstein-Sato polynomial ([AMJNnB21]). Besides, moduli ideal maps often generate invariants, for examples, the Krull dimension or linear dimension over $\mathbb{C}$ of their quotient rings. The following are three kinds of moduli ideal maps.

Higher order Tjurina ideal: For $f \in \mathbb{C}\{\boldsymbol{x}\}$, $T(f) = (f, \frac{\partial f}{\partial x_1}, ..., \frac{\partial f}{\partial x_n})$ is the Tjurina ideal of f. For an ideal $I \lhd \mathbb{C}\{\boldsymbol{x}\}$, we define the action of T over I as $T(I) = \sum_{f \in I} T(f)$. T^k is defined to be the compositions of T by k times i.e. $T^k(f) = T(T(\cdots T(f)))$ is the ideal generated by f and all its partial derivatives whose orders are not greater than k. It is well-known that for any

$\varphi \in \mathrm{Aut}(\mathbb{C}\{\boldsymbol{x}\})$, $\varphi(T(f)) = T(\varphi(f))$ and $T(uf) = T(f)$ for any unit u. By a simple induction, we have $\varphi(T^k(f)) = T^k(\varphi(f))$ for all $\varphi \in \mathrm{Aut}(\mathbb{C}\{\boldsymbol{x}\})$ and $T^k(uf) = T^k(f)$ for any unit u. Hence, T^k is a moduli ideal map.

k-th Tjurina ideal: In [HLYZ23], $T_k(f) := (f)+\mathfrak{m}^k J(f)$ is called the k-th Tjurina ideal, where $\mathfrak{m}$ is the maximal ideal of $\mathbb{C}\{\boldsymbol{x}\}$ and $J(f)$ is the Jacobian ideal of f. One can easily check T_k is a moduli ideal map by noticing two facts: (1) $T_k(uf) = T_k(f)$ for any unit u; (2) $\varphi(\mathfrak{m}) = \mathfrak{m}$ for any $\varphi \in \mathrm{Aut}(\mathbb{C}\{\boldsymbol{x}\})$.

k-th local Hessian ideal: The $k-$th local Hessian ideal is first introduced in [HYZ21]. Let $f \in \mathbb{C}\{\boldsymbol{x}\}$, $J(f)$ be its Jacobian ideal and $\mathrm{Hess}(f) = (\frac{\partial^2 f}{\partial x_i \partial x_j})_{ij}$ be its Hessian matrix. Let $h_k(f)$ denote the ideal generated by all $k \times k$-minors in Hess(f), then $I_k^H(f) := (f) + J(f) + h_k(f)$ is called the k-th local Hessian ideal of f and $H_k(f) := \mathbb{C}\{\boldsymbol{x}\}/I_k^H(f)$ is called the k-th Hessian algebra. As shown in [HYZ21], I_k^H is a moduli ideal map.

Let Q stand for anyone of the three above. It is a natural problem whether an ideal of $\mathbb{C}\{\boldsymbol{x}\}$ is of the form $Q(f), f \in \mathbb{C}\{\boldsymbol{x}\}$. For $Q = T_0$ and $Q = T_1$, the Tjurina ideal map, Rodrigues ([OR23] and [OR24]) gave two conditions and solve the problem. In this article, we will generalize his work, at least to ideal maps including the three above.

A simple observation is that all of three can be written as a sum of principal ideals associated with f and for all $a, g \in \mathbb{C}\{\boldsymbol{x}\}$, $Q(ag) \subseteq Q(g)$. It is important for our generalization in **section 4**.

For a hypersurface singularity $(V(f), 0)$, $\mu = \dim_{\mathbb{C}} \mathbb{C}\{\boldsymbol{x}\}/J(f)$ and $\tau = \dim_{\mathbb{C}} \mathbb{C}\{\boldsymbol{x}\}/T(f)$ are called Milnor number and Tjurina number respectively. They are two important invariants.

Lemma 2.2. *([GLS07], Lemma 2.3) $U \subseteq \mathbb{C}^n$ is an open neighborhood of 0. Let $f : U \to \mathbb{C}$ be holomorphic, then the following are equivalent:*
(a) 0 is an isolated critical point of f.
(b) $\mu(f, 0) < \infty$.
(c) 0 is an isolated singularity of $f^{-1}(f(0)) = V(f - f(0))$.
(d) $\tau(f - f(0), 0) < \infty$.

The lemma can be slightly generalized:

Lemma 2.3. *Let $f \in \mathbb{C}\{\boldsymbol{x}\}$ be a holomorphic function with $f(0) = 0$, then the following are equivalent:*
(a) $\dim \mathbb{C}\{\boldsymbol{x}\}/\mathfrak{m}^k J(f) < \infty$ for all $k \geq 0$.
(b) $\dim \mathbb{C}\{\boldsymbol{x}\}/\mathfrak{m}^k J(f) < \infty$ for some $k \geq 0$.
(c) $(V(f), 0)$ is an isolated singularity.
(d) $\dim \mathbb{C}\{\boldsymbol{x}\}/(f) + \mathfrak{m}^k J(f) < \infty$ for all $k \geq 0$.
(e) $\dim \mathbb{C}\{\boldsymbol{x}\}/(f) + \mathfrak{m}^k J(f) < \infty$ for some $k \geq 0$.
(f) There exists some $r \geq 0$ such that $\mathfrak{m}^r \subseteq J(f)$.

Proof. Since $(f) + \mathfrak{m}^k J(f) \subseteq (f) + J(f)$ and $\mathfrak{m}^k J(f) \subseteq J(f)$, by **Lemma 2.2**, (a), (b), (d) and (e) all imply (c). Moreover, it is clear that (f) implies (a), (b), (d) and (e). Hence, it suffices to prove that (c) implies (f). Suppose f defines an isolated singularity. By **Lemma 2.2**, $\dim_{\mathbb{C}} \mathbb{C}\{\boldsymbol{x}\}/J(f) < \infty$ and hence $\sqrt{J(f)} \supset \mathfrak{m}$. Since $\mathbb{C}\{\boldsymbol{x}\}$ is Noetherian, there exists some $r \geq 0$ s.t. $\mathfrak{m}^r \subseteq J(f)$.

□

Remark 2.4. The proof of $(c) \Rightarrow (f)$ is also true for any ideal I other than $J(f)$, as long as $\dim \mathbb{C}\{\boldsymbol{x}\}/I < \infty$.

2.2. **Commutative Algebra.** In this subsection, we review some facts about commutative algebra and Kähler differential.

Theorem 2.5. *(Artin-Rees,* [AM69]*, Corollary 10.10) Let A be a Noetherian ring, I be an ideal and M be a finitely generated A-module. If M' is a submodule of M, then there exists a $k \geq 0$ such that $I^n M \cap M' = I^{n-k}(I^k M \cap M')$, for all $n \geq k$.*

The next is the basis theorem of finitely generated modules over a principal ideal domain (PID for short).

Theorem 2.6. *(Basis Theorem,* [Rot10]*, Theorem 9.12) If R is a PID, then every finitely generated R-module is a direct sum of cyclic modules in which each cyclic summand is either primary or is isomorphic to R.*

If R is a discrete valuation ring (DVR for short), with ϖ a uniformizer, then every finitely generated $R-$module is a direct sum of a free module and some cyclic modules of the form $R/\varpi^k R$ for some k. If $M = R^a \oplus (\bigoplus_{i=1}^r R/\varpi^{k_i} R), k_i \geq 1$, then $a + r$ is the minimal number of generators of M. We call $a + r$ the rank of M.

Lastly, we recall some notions about regular sequence. Let A be a local ring and M be a finitely generated A-module. $(f_1, f_2, ..., f_r) \in M^r$ is called a regular sequence if for all $1 \leq i \leq r$, f_i is not a zero-divisor in $M/\sum_{j=1}^{i-1} A f_j$.

Proposition 2.7. *(*[Eis95]*, Corollary 17.2) If R is a Noetherian local ring and $(x_1, x_2, ..., x_r)$ is a regular sequence in R, then any permutation of $(x_1, x_2, ..., x_r)$ is again a regular sequence.*

Theorem 2.8. *(*[Mat80]*, Theorem 31) Let $(A, \mathfrak{m})$ be a Cohen-Macaulay ring. Then:*
(i) for every proper ideal I of A, we have

$$\mathrm{ht} I + \dim A/I = \dim A;$$

(ii) for every sequence $a_1, a_2, ..., a_r$ in $\mathfrak{m}$, the following are equivalent:
(1) the sequence $a_1, a_2, ..., a_r$ is $A-$regular;
(2) $\mathrm{ht}(a_1, a_2, ..., a_r) = r$.

The following is the *second fundamental exact sequence for Kähler differential*, we state it in a way assemble to **Theorem 4.42**.

Theorem 2.9 (second fundamental exact sequence for Kähler differential)**.** *Let $\pi : B \to C$ be a surjection of A-algebras with kernel I, then we have the following exact sequence:*

$$I \xrightarrow{d} \Omega_{B/A} \otimes C \longrightarrow \Omega_{C/A} \longrightarrow 0$$

where $d(a) = da \otimes 1$ for all $a \in I$ is a B-module homomorphism and $d : I \to \Omega_{B/A}$ is the restriction of $d : B \to \Omega_{B/A}$. Furthermore, I^2 is contained in $\ker d$.

We may refer to [Har77] and [GLS07] for this theorem. Their statements are slightly different, where the first map of the corresponding sequence in these books is $I/I^2 \xrightarrow{d} \Omega_{B/A} \otimes C$, but in fact they are equivalent to ours.

For complex space $(X, \mathcal{O}_X)$, we can also define Kähler differential. When $X = D \subset \mathbb{C}^n$ is an open subset, Ω_X is the free module $\bigoplus_{i=1}^n \mathcal{O}_D \cdot dx_i$ and d is naturally defined. Locally, $(X, \mathcal{O}_X) = (V(\mathcal{I}), (\mathcal{O}_D/\mathcal{I})|_{V(\mathcal{I})})$ is a complex model space, $\Omega_X = \Omega_D/(\mathcal{I}\Omega_D + \mathcal{O}_D d\mathcal{I})$. The derivation is defined to be the pullback of the quotient map $d : \mathcal{O}_D/\mathcal{I} \to \Omega_D/(\mathcal{I}\Omega_D + \mathcal{O}_D d\mathcal{I})$ by the inclusion map $V(\mathcal{I}) \hookrightarrow D$.

3. T-fullness and T-dependence for Tjurina Ideal

3.1. **T-fullness and T-dependence.** In [OR23], Rodrigues first developed the conceptions of T-fullness and T-dependence. Those are two conditions characterizing whether an ideal of $\mathbb{C}\{\boldsymbol{x}\}$ is a Tjurina ideal. Let $I \lhd \mathbb{C}\{\boldsymbol{x}\}$ be an ideal and T be the Tjurina ideal map i.e. $T(f) = (f, \frac{\partial f}{\partial x_1}, ..., \frac{\partial f}{\partial x_n})$. The action of T can be naturally extended to the set of ideals: $T(I) := \sum_{f \in I} T(f)$. We call $\Delta(I) := \{f \in \mathbb{C}\{\boldsymbol{x}\} \mid T(f) \subseteq I\}$ the ideal of antiderivatives of I. Since $T(af) \subseteq T(f)$ $a, f \in \mathbb{C}\{\boldsymbol{x}\}$ and $T(f+g) \subseteq T(f) + T(g)$ for all $f, g \in \mathbb{C}\{\boldsymbol{x}\}$, $\Delta(I)$ is actually an ideal.

Definition 3.1. I is called T-full if $T(\Delta(I)) = I$.

For an ideal $J = (g_1, g_2, .., g_m) \lhd \mathbb{C}\{\boldsymbol{x}\}$, let $S = \mathbb{C}\{\boldsymbol{x}\}[y_1, y_2, ..., y_m]$ be a polynomial ring over $\mathbb{C}\{\boldsymbol{x}\}$ and $\sigma := \sum_i g_i y_i$. $\mathcal{T}(\sigma) := (\sigma, \frac{\partial \sigma}{\partial x_1}, ..., \frac{\partial \sigma}{\partial x_n})$ is the Tjurina ideal of σ and $T(J)S$ is a homogeneous ideal of S. The original definition of T-dependent is stated in the language of algebraic geometry. Here for simplicity, we give an equivalent definition illustrated in commutative algebra.

Definition 3.2. J is called T-dependent if $(\mathcal{T}(\sigma) : T(J)S) \not\subset \mathfrak{m}S$.

A subtle thing is whether it is well-defined. In [OR23], Rodrigues proved the definition is independent of the choice of generators of J and hence well-defined. The proof will also appear in **subsection 4.5**, which is slightly adjusted to fit in more general cases. Below is the main theorem of [OR23]:

Theorem 3.3. *I is a Tjurina ideal if and only if I is T-full and $\Delta(I)$ is T-dependent.*

Roughly speaking, T-fullness guarantees I can be generated by some analytic germs and their partial derivatives. It can be seen clearly especially in the monomial case.

3.2. **an Example: Monomial Ideal Case.** It is also an interesting problem when a monomial ideal of $\mathbb{C}\{\boldsymbol{x}\}$ is a Tjurina ideal. In this subsection, we give a characterization of a T-full monomial ideal and review some recent results associated with the problem. Notations are followed from [OR23], also reviewed in **subsection 3.1**. The following proposition shows the ideal of antiderivatives of a monomial ideal is also a monomial ideal.

Proposition 3.4. *If $I \lhd \mathbb{C}\{\boldsymbol{x}\}$ is a monomial ideal, so is $\Delta(I)$. Moreover, $\Delta(I) = \bigcap_{i=1}^n Q_i$, where Q_k is the monomial ideal generated by $x_k \cdot I$ and $I \cap \mathbb{C}[x_1, ..., \hat{x_k}, ..., x_n]$. Here $\mathbb{C}[x_1, ..., \hat{x}_k, ..., x_n]$ refers to the polynomial ring of $n-1$ variables apart from x_k.*

Remark 3.5. Throughout the article, we adopt multi-index. That is, $\boldsymbol{x}^{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}, \boldsymbol{\alpha} = (\alpha^1, \alpha^2, ..., \alpha^n) \in \mathbb{N}^n$ refers to the monomial $x_1^{\alpha^1} \cdots x_n^{\alpha^n}$ in $\mathbb{C}[x_1, ..., x_n]$. For $\boldsymbol{\alpha} \in \mathbb{N}^n$, $|\boldsymbol{\alpha}| := \sum_{i=1}^n \alpha^i$ is called the length of $\boldsymbol{\alpha}$. We call $\boldsymbol{\alpha}_1 \leq \boldsymbol{\alpha}_2$, if $\alpha_1^i \leq \alpha_2^i$, for all $1 \leq i \leq n$. If not confusing, we set $\boldsymbol{e}_j = (\delta_i^j)_{i=1}^n \in \mathbb{N}^n$ as the normal orthogonal vectors. For $\boldsymbol{\alpha} \in \mathbb{N}^n$, $\mathrm{Supp}\boldsymbol{\alpha} := \{i \mid \alpha_i \neq 0\}$ is called the support of $\boldsymbol{\alpha}$.

Proof. It is obvious that $f \in \Delta(I)$ if and only if every monomial term of f is $\Delta(I)$, since I is a monomial ideal. So it suffices to work on the second statement.

Let $P_k = \{f \in \mathbb{C}\{\boldsymbol{x}\} \mid f, \frac{\partial f}{\partial x_k} \in I\}$, then $\Delta(I) = \bigcap_{k=1}^n P_k$. We only need to show $P_k = Q_k$. For a subset $W \subseteq \mathbb{C}\{\boldsymbol{x}\}$, we use $\frac{\partial}{\partial x_k}(W)$ to stand for $\{\frac{\partial w}{\partial x_k} \mid w \in W\}$.

On one hand, since I is a monomial ideal, we have $\frac{\partial}{\partial x_k}(x_k I) = I$. Moreover, $\frac{\partial}{\partial x_k}(I \cap \mathbb{C}[x_1, x_2, ..., \hat{x_k}, ..., x_n]) = 0$, and hence $Q_k \subseteq P_k$. On the other hand, for $\boldsymbol{x}^{\boldsymbol{\alpha}} \in P_k$, if x_k does not appear in $\boldsymbol{x}^{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}$, then $\boldsymbol{x}^{\boldsymbol{\alpha}} \in \mathbb{C}[x_1, x_2, .., \hat{x_k}, ..., x_n] \cap I$. Otherwise, we have $\boldsymbol{x}^{\boldsymbol{\alpha}} \in x_k I$, or $P_k \subseteq Q_k$. □

In the next theorem, we give a characterization of T-full monomial ideals.

Theorem 3.6. *Let $I \triangleleft \mathbb{C}\{\boldsymbol{x}\}$ be a monomial ideal, then I is T-full if and only if there exist $\boldsymbol{\alpha}_1, .., \boldsymbol{\alpha}_m \in \mathbb{N}^n$ such that $I = (\{\boldsymbol{x}^{\boldsymbol{\alpha}_i - \boldsymbol{e}_j} \mid 1 \leq i \leq m, 1 \leq j \leq n, \boldsymbol{\alpha}_i - \boldsymbol{e}_j \geq 0\})$.*

Proof. It is clear that the theorem is equivalent to the following statement:

I is T-full if and only if for any $\boldsymbol{x}^{\boldsymbol{\alpha}} \in I$, there exists an $1 \leq i \leq n$ such that $\boldsymbol{x}^{\boldsymbol{\alpha}+\boldsymbol{e}_i-\boldsymbol{e}_j} \in I$ for all $1 \leq j \leq n$ satisfying $\boldsymbol{\alpha} + \boldsymbol{e}_i - \boldsymbol{e}_j \geq 0$.

So it suffices to prove the statement above. The argument for "only if" is easy. By assumption, we have $\boldsymbol{x}^{\boldsymbol{\alpha}+\boldsymbol{e}_i} \in \Delta(I)$ and hence $\boldsymbol{x}^{\boldsymbol{\alpha}} \in T(\Delta(I))$. For "if", since $\Delta(I)$ is a monomial ideal, then there exists an $\boldsymbol{x}^{\boldsymbol{\beta}}$ such that $\boldsymbol{x}^{\boldsymbol{\beta}} = \boldsymbol{x}^{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}$ or $\boldsymbol{x}^{\boldsymbol{\beta}-\boldsymbol{e}_i} = \boldsymbol{x}^{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}$ for some i. In both cases we have $\boldsymbol{x}^{\boldsymbol{\alpha}+\boldsymbol{e}_i} \in \Delta(I)$ for some i, so $\boldsymbol{x}^{\boldsymbol{\alpha}+\boldsymbol{e}_i-\boldsymbol{e}_j} \in I$. □

Remark 3.7. T-full monomial ideals can be easily distinguished through the Newton diagrams. For $n = 2$, they correspond to the diagrams whose corners towards left-down appear as twins different by $(1, -1)$ as figure 1 shows.



FIGURE 1.

Combining **Proposition 3.4** with **Theorem 3.6**, the ideal of antiderivatives of a T-full monomial ideal can be calculated as below:

Corollary 3.8. *Let $I \triangleleft \mathbb{C}\{\boldsymbol{x}\}$ be a T-full monomial ideal. By **Theorem 3.6**, we may assume $I = (\{\boldsymbol{x}^{\boldsymbol{\alpha}_i - \boldsymbol{e}_j} \mid 1 \leq i \leq m, 1 \leq j \leq n, \boldsymbol{\alpha}_i - \boldsymbol{e}_j \geq 0\})$. Then $\Delta(I) = \bigcap_{i=1}^{n} Q_k$, where $Q_k = x_k I + (\{\boldsymbol{x}^{\boldsymbol{\alpha}-\boldsymbol{e}_k}, \boldsymbol{\alpha} \in A\}) + (\{\boldsymbol{x}^{\boldsymbol{\beta}-\boldsymbol{e}_l}, \boldsymbol{\beta} \in B, l \neq k\})$ and $A = \{\boldsymbol{\alpha} \in \mathbb{N}^n \mid \boldsymbol{e}_k \cdot \boldsymbol{\alpha} = 1\}$, $B = \{\boldsymbol{\beta} \in \mathbb{N}^n \mid \boldsymbol{e}_k \cdot \boldsymbol{\beta} = 0\}$.*

Most recently, [ES22] has answered the question when a Tjurina ideal is a monomial ideal by introducing Jacobian semigroup ideals and applying the tool of matroid. Its main theorem is stated as below:

Theorem 3.9. *([ES22]) Let $0 \neq f \in \mathbb{C}\{\boldsymbol{x}\}$ and $I := T(f)$ be its Tjurina ideal. Then I is a monomial ideal if and only if f is right equivalent to a Thom-Sebastiani polynomial. Here a*

Thom-Sebastiani polynomial refers to a polynomial of the form $\sum_{i=1}^{m} \boldsymbol{x}^{\boldsymbol{\alpha}^i}$*, where* $\boldsymbol{\alpha}^i \in \mathbb{N}^n$ *and* $\mathrm{Supp}\boldsymbol{\alpha}^i$ *are disjoint subsets of* $\{1, 2, ..., n\}$.

At last, we give two examples of monomial ideals. The first one is T-full but not T-dependent and the second one is T-dependent but not T-full.

Example 3.10. $n = 3, I = (xy^2z^3, x^2yz^3, x^2y^2z^2, y^7, xy^6, zy^6)$.

By **Theorem 3.6**, I is T-full. But one may compute that the $\mathbb{C}$-dimension of $I/(x, y, z)I$ is 6. By Nakayama's lemma, the minimal number of generators of I is 6 and hence I is not a Tjurina ideal. By **Theorem 3.3**, I not T-dependent.

Example 3.11. $n = 2, I = (xy)$.

$\Delta(I) = (x^2y^2)$, $T(\Delta(I)) = (x^2y, xy^2)$, $\sigma = x^2y^2\alpha$, $\mathcal{T}(\sigma) = (xy^2\alpha, x^2y\alpha)$. Since $\alpha T(\Delta(I)) = \mathcal{T}(\sigma)$ and $\alpha \notin \mathfrak{m}[\alpha]$, $\Delta(I)$ is T-dependent. There is a single corner in the Newton diagram of I and hence I is not T-full.

4. T-map

In this section, we will introduce the conception of T-map and some of its applications. In the first subsection, we introduce the notions of T-map, T-principal ideal and ideal of antiderivatives. In the second subsection, we introduce two new invariants $\sigma_k = \dim_{\mathbb{C}} \Delta(I)/I^2$ and $\rho_k = \dim_{\mathbb{C}} I/\Delta(I)$ associated with k-th Tjurina ideal I and its ideal of antiderivatives $\Delta(I)$ w.r.t. k-th Tjurina ideal map. We find there exists a polynomial $P \in \mathbb{Z}[x]$ such that $\sigma_k = P(k)$ for all k sufficiently large. In the third subsection, we give a geometric interpretation of ideals of antiderivatives w.r.t. Tjurina ideal map. In the fourth subsection, we first review the well-known theorem that the Milnor number of a semi quasi-homogeneous series $f \in K[[\boldsymbol{x}]]$ coincides with the Milnor number of its principal part. Then we generalize the theorem to μ_k, whenever $k \leq \min_i\{\mathrm{ord}(\frac{\partial f}{\partial x_i})\}$. In the fifth and the sixth subsections, we generalize the main theorem of [OR23] to some types of Noetherian local algebras so that many kinds of moduli ideal maps in **subsection 2.1** can be included. Furthermore, we give an approach to finding a generator for a T-principal ideal.

4.1. T-map and Ideal of Antiderivatives.

From now on, R is a ring and A is a Noetherian R-algebra. We will define abstract "Tjurina ideals" for A.

Definition 4.1. The set of all ideals of A is denoted as $\mathfrak{I}$. A map $Q : A \to \mathfrak{I}$ is called a *quasi-T-map* if there is an integer m and R-linear maps $Q_1, Q_2, ..., Q_m : A \to A$ such that $Q(f) = (Q_1(f), ..., Q_m(f))$ for all $f \in A$. A quasi-T-map Q is called a *T-map* if it has the following property:

$$Q(af) \subseteq Q(f), \text{ for all } a, f \in A \qquad (*).$$

Remark 4.2. By definition, we can easily deduce the following properties of a T-map Q:
(i) $Q(f + g) \subseteq Q(f) + Q(g)$.
(ii) If $(f) = (g)$, then $Q(f) = Q(g)$.

Remark 4.3. We note that $R-$linear maps $Q_1, Q_2, ..., Q_m$ are also parts of the definition.

T-maps appear rather frequently in singularity theory. Here are some typical examples. (3), (4) and (5) in **Example 4.5** are those moduli ideal maps mentioned in **subsection 2.1**.

Example 4.4. (quasi-T-maps)
(1) $A = \mathbb{C}\{\boldsymbol{x}\}, R = \mathbb{C}$ and $Q(f) = J_k(f) = (\boldsymbol{x})^k J(f)$ is the k-th Jacobian ideal.
(2) $A = \mathbb{C}\{\boldsymbol{x}\}, R = \mathbb{C}$ and $Q(f)$ is the Nash blow-up ideal of f in [HMYZ23].

Example 4.5. (T-maps)
(1) A is an arbitrary $R-$algebra and $Q(f)=(f)$;
(2) A is an arbitrary $R-$algebra and $Q(f)=(f,\partial_1(f),..,\partial_k(f))$, where $\partial_i\in \mathrm{Der}_R(A)$ are R-derivations;
(3) $A=\mathbb{C}\{\boldsymbol{x}\}, R=\mathbb{C}$, $Q=T^k$;
(4) $A=\mathbb{C}\{\boldsymbol{x}\}, R=\mathbb{C}$, $Q=T_k$;
(5) $A=\mathbb{C}\{\boldsymbol{x}\}, R=\mathbb{C}$, $Q=I_k^H$;
(6) $A=\overline{\mathbb{F}_p}[[\boldsymbol{x}]]$, $R=\overline{\mathbb{F}_p}$, $Q(f)=(f,\frac{\partial^p f}{\partial x_1^p},...,\frac{\partial^p f}{\partial x_n^p})$.

Fix a T-map Q, we call an ideal $I\lhd A$ a *T-principal ideal* if there exists an $f\in A$ such that $I=Q(f)$. Such an f is called a *generator* of I w.r.t. Q. It is an interesting problem when an ideal is a T-principal ideal. Before solving this problem, we will develop some basic notions.

Definition 4.6. Notations as in **Definition 4.1**, for an ideal $I=(g_1,g_2,...,g_n)\lhd A$, $Q(I):=(\{Q(f)\mid f\in I\})=Q(g_1)+Q(g_2)+...+Q(g_n)$. For another T-map $Q'=(Q'_1,...,Q'_r)$, we define the composition of Q' and Q as $(Q'Q)(f)=Q'(Q(f))=(\{Q'_i(Q_j(f)),1\le i\le r,1\le j\le m\})$. It is also a T-map.

One can check the composition of T-maps satisfies the associative rule and $U(f)=(f)$ is the unit of this operation. We write this property as below.

Proposition 4.7. *Notations are as above. $M_T:=\{T$-maps of $A\}$ with the composition as the multiplication is a semigroup with unit element $U(f)=(f)$.*

From now on, we will always assign Q as the fixed T-map of A. When stating properties of T-maps, we will omit the notion "with respect to Q". Following the step of [OR23], it is natural to introduce the ideal of antiderivatives:

Definition 4.8. Suppose $I\lhd A$ is an ideal, then the ideal of antiderivatives $\Delta(I)$ is defined to be the set of all the elements whose images under Q are contained in I i.e.

$$\Delta(I):=\{f\in A\mid Q(f)\subseteq I\}.$$

Remark 4.9. By $(*)$ property, one can easily check $\Delta(I)$ is an ideal.

Proposition 4.10. *Notations are as above. Let Q' be another T-map. To avoid confusion, we denote Δ_Q, $\Delta_{Q'}$ and $\Delta_{Q'Q}$ as the ideals of antiderivatives w.r.t. Q, Q' and $Q'Q$ respectively. Then we have $\Delta_{Q'Q}(I)=\Delta_Q(\Delta_{Q'}(I))$ for any ideal $I\lhd A$.*

Proof. Suppose $f\in\Delta_{Q'Q}(I)$, then $(Q'Q)(f)\subseteq I$. Hence, for all $g\in Q(f)$, $Q'(g)\subseteq I$. Therefore, $Q(f)\subseteq\Delta_{Q'}(I)$ i.e. $f\in\Delta_Q(\Delta_{Q'}(I))$. Conversely, since $f\in\Delta_Q(\Delta_{Q'}(I))$, we have $Q(f)\subseteq\Delta_{Q'}(I)$ and hence $Q'(Q(f))\subset I$. It is equivalent to say $f\in\Delta_{Q'Q}(I)$. □

For the convenience of applying the language of T-maps to singularity theory, we may give some definitions as counterparts of right and contact equivalence.

Definition 4.11. For $f,g\in A$, we call them right (resp. contact) equivalent if there exists a $\varphi\in\mathrm{Aut}_R(A)$ such that $\varphi(f)=g$ (resp. $\varphi(f)=ug$, for some unit $u\in A^*$). Clearly, the definition coincides with the original one when $R=\mathbb{C}$ and $A=\mathbb{C}\{\boldsymbol{x}\}$.

Definition 4.12. A T-map Q is called *stable under contact equivalence*, if for any $\varphi\in\mathrm{Aut}_R(A)$, Q is compatible with φ i.e. $Q(\varphi(f))=\varphi(Q(f))$ for all $f\in A$.

Proposition 4.13. *If Q is stable under contact equivalence and $I\lhd A$ is an ideal, then $\varphi(\Delta(I))=\Delta(\varphi(I))$ for all $\varphi\in\mathrm{Aut}_R(A)$.*

Proof. On one hand, for any $f \in \varphi(\Delta(I))$, there exists a $g \in \Delta(I)$ such that $f = \varphi(g)$. Since $Q(f) = Q(\varphi(g)) = \varphi(Q(g)) \subseteq \varphi(I)$, we have $\varphi(\Delta(I)) \subseteq \Delta(\varphi(I))$. On the other hand, for any $f \in \Delta(\varphi(I))$, we have $Q(f) \subseteq \varphi(I)$. Hence $Q(\varphi^{-1}(f)) \subseteq I$, then $\varphi^{-1}(f) \in \Delta(I)$, or $f \in \varphi(\Delta(I))$. □

Remark 4.14. The three kinds of T-maps in **subsection 2.1** are all stable under contact equivalence. A simple corollary of **Proposition 4.13** is that $T-$maps stable under contact equivalence induce moduli invariants:

Corollary 4.15. *Suppose Q is stable under contact equivalence. For all $\varphi \in \mathrm{Aut}_R(A)$ and an ideal $J \subseteq \Delta(I)$, the homomorphism $\Delta(I)/J \xrightarrow{\bar{\varphi}} \Delta(\varphi(I))/\varphi(J)$ induced by φ is an isomorphism.*

For $A = \mathbb{C}\{\boldsymbol{x}\}, R = \mathbb{C}$ and $Q = T$ the Tjurina ideal map, [OR23] gave an algorithm to compute $\Delta(I)$. We give a brief description of it as below. The algorithm also holds for $Q = T_k$.

Algorithm 4.16. *Let $I = (f_1, f_2, ..., f_m)$ be an ideal of A and $Q(g) = (Q_1(g), ..., Q_m(g))$.*
Step 1: *Compute $M_k = \{(\underline{a}) \in A^m \mid \sum_i a_i Q_k(f_i) \in I\}$.*
Step 2: *Let $I_k = \{\sum_i a_i f_i \mid (\underline{a}) \in M_k\}$. Compute $\bigcap_k I_k = \Delta(I)$.*

Now let $Q = T$ be the Tjurina ideal map. By a simple induction we have the ideal of antiderivatives w.r.t. T^k is Δ^k, composing the Δ w.r.t. T by k times. This gives a method to compute the ideal of antiderivatives for higher order Tjurina ideal map.

In the next subsection, we will apply this algorithm to compute a series of new invariants associated with k-th Tjurina ideal and its ideal of antiderivatives for ADE singularities.

4.2. **Invariants Associated with T_k and Its Ideal of Antiderivatives.** Suppose $(X, 0) = (V(f), 0)$ is an isolated hypersurface singularity and $I = T_k(f) \lhd A := \mathbb{C}\{\boldsymbol{x}\}$, then A/I is of finite dimension over $\mathbb{C}$ by **Lemma 2.3**. Since A is Noetherian, I/I^2 is a finitely generated A/I-module and hence has finite dimension over $\mathbb{C}$. For $Q = T_k$, since $I^2 \subseteq \Delta(I)$ and $\Delta(I)/I^2 \subseteq I/I^2$, we have $\Delta(I)/I^2$ is also of finite dimension. By **Corollary 4.15**, $\dim_{\mathbb{C}}(\Delta(I)/I^2)$ is a contact invariant. The same properties hold for $I/\Delta(I)$ as well. Hence for each k, we obtain two new invariants. For $I = T_k(f)$ and $Q = T_k$, we denote σ_k as $\dim_{\mathbb{C}} \Delta(I)/I^2$ and ρ_k as $\dim_{\mathbb{C}} I/\Delta(I)$. Next, we will prove the stationary property of ρ_k when k tends to infinity and calculate σ_k, ρ_k and T-threshold (defined later) for ADE curve singularities (for classification, see [Ad75]). The code for computing $\Delta(I)$, $\dim \Delta(I)/I^2$ and $\dim I/\Delta(I)$ is **Code 5.1** in the appendix.

Proposition 4.17. *Suppose $(X, 0) = (V(f), 0)$ is an isolated singularity, then $\{\rho_k\}_{k \geq 0}$ is a decreasing sequence. Moreover, there exists an N such that $\rho_k = 0$ for all $k \geq N$. We call the minimum of such N the T-threshold of f, denoted as $Tt(f)$.*

Proof. We first prove $\{\rho_k\}$ is decreasing. To avoid confusion, let Δ_k and Δ_{k+1} be the ideals of antiderivatives of $(I, Q) = (T_k(f), T_k)$ and $(T_{k+1}(f), T_{k+1})$ respectively. Set $I_k = T_k(f)$ and $I_{k+1} = T_{k+1}(f)$. Since $I_{k+1} \subseteq I_k$, $i : I_{k+1}/(I_{k+1} \cap \Delta_k) \hookrightarrow I_k/\Delta_k$ is an inclusion. It suffices to show $I_{k+1} \cap \Delta_k \subseteq \Delta_{k+1}$. For any $g \in I_{k+1} \cap \Delta_k$, we have $g \in I_{k+1} \subseteq I_k$ and $\mathfrak{m}^k J(g) \subseteq (f) + \mathfrak{m}^k J(f)$, where $\mathfrak{m} = (\boldsymbol{x})$ is the maximal ideal of $\mathbb{C}\{\boldsymbol{x}\}$. Then $\mathfrak{m}^{k+1} J(g) \subseteq \mathfrak{m}(f) + \mathfrak{m}^{k+1} J(f) \subseteq I_{k+1}$, hence $g \in \Delta_{k+1}$.

Now we prove $\rho_k = 0$ for k sufficiently large. Let $Q = T_k$, $I = T_k(f)$ and $\Delta(I)$ be the ideal of antiderivatives of I w.r.t. Q. Since $(X, 0)$ is an isolated singularity, there is an integer l such that $\mathfrak{m}^l \subseteq J(f)$ and hence $(f) + \mathfrak{m}^{k+l} \subseteq I$. Clearly, $f \in \Delta(I)$, so it suffices to show for any k large enough, $\boldsymbol{\alpha} \in \mathbb{N}^n, |\boldsymbol{\alpha}| = k$ and $u \in J(f)$, then $\mathfrak{m}^k J(\boldsymbol{x}^{\boldsymbol{\alpha}} u) \subseteq \mathfrak{m}^{k+l}$. Notice that $J(\boldsymbol{x}^{\boldsymbol{\alpha}} u) \subseteq \mathfrak{m}^{k-1} J(f) + \mathfrak{m}^k$, then $\mathfrak{m}^k J(\boldsymbol{x}^{\boldsymbol{\alpha}} u) \subseteq \mathfrak{m}^{2k-1}$. Thus $\Delta(I) = I$ for all $k \geq l + 1$. □

Lemma 4.18. *For $(R,A,Q)=(\mathbb{C},\mathbb{C}\{\boldsymbol{x}\},T_k)$, if I is a monomial ideal, then $\Delta(I)$ is also monomial, given by*

$$\Delta(I)=\bigcap_{\boldsymbol{i},j} Q_{(\boldsymbol{i},j)}, \boldsymbol{i}\in\mathbb{N}^n, |\boldsymbol{i}|=k, 1\le j\le n.$$

Here,

$$\begin{aligned} Q_{(\boldsymbol{i},j)} &= A_{(\boldsymbol{i},j)}+B_{(\boldsymbol{i},j)},\\ A_{(\boldsymbol{i},j)} &= (\{x_j\cdot\boldsymbol{x}^{\boldsymbol{\alpha}} \mid \boldsymbol{x}^{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}\cdot\boldsymbol{x}^{\boldsymbol{i}}\in I\}),\\ B_{(\boldsymbol{i},j)} &= (\{\boldsymbol{x}^{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}\in I \mid \alpha^j=0\}). \end{aligned}$$

Proof. The argument is the same as **Proposition 3.4**. Let

$$P_{(\boldsymbol{i},j)}=\{f\in\mathbb{C}\{\boldsymbol{x}\} \mid f, \boldsymbol{x}^{\boldsymbol{i}}\cdot\frac{\partial f}{\partial x_j}\in I\}.$$

Then we have $I=\bigcap_{\boldsymbol{i},j}P_{(\boldsymbol{i},j)}$. It suffices to show $Q_{(\boldsymbol{i},j)}=P_{(\boldsymbol{i},j)}$. On one hand, for a generator $x_j\cdot\boldsymbol{x}^{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}$ of $A_{(\boldsymbol{i},j)}$, one finds $\boldsymbol{x}^{\boldsymbol{i}}\frac{\partial}{\partial x_j}(x_j\cdot\boldsymbol{x}^{\boldsymbol{\alpha}})=(\alpha^j+1)\boldsymbol{x}^{\boldsymbol{\alpha}+\boldsymbol{i}}\in I$. Besides, $\frac{\partial}{\partial x_j}(\boldsymbol{x}^{\boldsymbol{\alpha}})=0$ for $\alpha^j=0$, and hence we have $Q_{(\boldsymbol{i},j)}\subseteq P_{(\boldsymbol{i},j)}$. On the other hand, since I is a monomial ideal and the operator $\boldsymbol{x}^{\boldsymbol{i}}\cdot\frac{\partial}{\partial x_j}$ sends momomials to monomials, $P_{(\boldsymbol{i},j)}$ is also monomial. For a monomial $\boldsymbol{x}^{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}\in P_{(\boldsymbol{i},j)}$, if x_j is not a factor, then $\boldsymbol{x}^{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}\in B_{(\boldsymbol{i},j)}$. Otherwise, $\boldsymbol{x}^{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}\in A_{(\boldsymbol{i},j)}$. Therefore, $P_{(\boldsymbol{i},j)}=Q_{(\boldsymbol{i},j)}$. □

We will compute ρ_k, σ_k and T-threshold for ADE curve singularities A_m, D_m, E_6, E_7, E_8. To avoid repetition, we compute those invariants for D_m and only provide results for other types. Besides, we will compute the ideal of antiderivatives for ADE surface singularities.

Proposition 4.19. *For $D_m=V(x^{m-1}+xy^2)$, $m\ge 4$, we have*

$$\Delta(T_k(x^{m-1}+xy^2))=\begin{cases}(x^{m-1}+xy^2, 3(m-1)x^{m-2}y+y^3, x^m, y^4, xy^3, x^2y^2, x^{m-1}),\ k=0,\\ (x^{m-1}, x^{m-2}y, xy^2, y^3),\ k=1,\\ (x^{m-1}+xy^2)+(x^{m+k-2}, x^ky^2, ..., xy^{k+1}, y^{k+2}, x^{m-2}y),\ 2\le k\le m-3,\\ (x^{m-1}+xy^2)+(x^{m+k-2}, x^ky^2, ..., xy^{k+1}, y^{k+2}, x^{k+1}y),\ k\ge m-2,\end{cases}$$

$$\rho_k=\begin{cases}m,\ k=0,\\ m-3-k,\ 1\le k\le m-4,\\ 0,\ k\ge m-3,\end{cases}\qquad \sigma_k=\begin{cases}m,\ k=0,\\ m+7k+4,\ 1\le k\le m-4,\\ 2m+6k+1,\ k\ge m-3,\end{cases}$$

and $Tt(x^{m-1}+xy^2)=m-3$.

Remark 4.20. For an ideal $I\lhd\mathbb{C}\{\boldsymbol{x}\}$, we sometimes split I to a sum of finite dimensional $\mathbb{C}$-vector spaces and a monomial ideal as $\mathbb{C}$-vector spaces. This will simplify the computation of $\dim_{\mathbb{C}}\mathbb{C}\{\boldsymbol{x}\}/I$. For example, in the proof, we use $I_1=(x^m, y^3, x^2y)+\mathrm{span}_{\mathbb{C}}\{x^{m-1}+xy^2\}$. It means the sum of monomial ideal (x^m, y^3, x^2y) and $\mathbb{C}$-vector space $\mathrm{span}_{\mathbb{C}}\{x^{m-1}+xy^2\}$.

Proof. We first compute σ_0 by definition:

$$\begin{aligned} I &= T(x^{m-1}+xy^2)=((m-1)x^{m-2}+y^2, xy)=((m-1)x^{m-2}+y^2, x^{m-1}, y^3, xy),\\ I^2 &= ((m-1)^2x^{2m-4}+y^4, (m-1)x^{m-1}y+xy^3, x^{2m-3}, y^5, xy^4, x^my, x^2y^2). \end{aligned}$$

Following **Algorithm 4.16**, we compute $\Delta(I)$ as below:

$M_1=\{(a,b)\in A^2 \mid a(m-2)(m-1)x^{m-2}+by\in I\}$, $M_2=\{(a,b)\in A^2 \mid 2ay+bx\in I\}$. Hence $I_1=(x^m, y^3, x^2y)+\mathrm{span}_{\mathbb{C}}\{x^{m-1}+xy^2\}$ and $I_2=(x^{m-1}, y^4, xy^2)+\mathrm{span}_{\mathbb{C}}\{3(m-1)x^{m-2}y+y^3\}$. So we have $\Delta(I)=I_1\cap I_2=\mathrm{span}_{\mathbb{C}}\{x^{m-1}+xy^2\}+\mathrm{span}_{\mathbb{C}}\{3(m-1)x^{m-2}y+y^3\}+(y^4, xy^3, x^2y^2, x^{m-1})$. One may check $x^m, ..., x^{2m-4}, xy^3, x^{m-1}+xy^2, x^{m-2}y+y^3$ is a basis of $\Delta(I)/I^2$. Therefore, $\sigma_0=m$.

Since $I = \mathrm{span}_{\mathbb{C}}\{(m-1)x^{m-2}+y^2\} + (x^{m-1}, y^3, xy)$, we have $\rho_0 = m$.

For σ_1, one can compute $I = T_1(x^{m-1}+xy^2) = (x^{m-1}, x^2y, xy^2, y^3)$, which is a monomial ideal. By **Lemma 4.18**, $\Delta(I)$ is a monomial ideal as well. One can compute the $P_{(\boldsymbol{i},j)}$ in **Lemma 4.18**:

$$P_{x\frac{\partial}{\partial x}} = I,\ P_{x\frac{\partial}{\partial y}} = (x^{m-1}, x^{m-2}y, xy^2, y^3),$$
$$P_{y\frac{\partial}{\partial y}} = I,\ P_{y\frac{\partial}{\partial x}} = I.$$

Hence $\Delta(I) = (x^{m-1}, x^{m-2}y, xy^2, y^3)$, $I^2 = (x^{2m-2}, x^{m+1}y, x^4y^2, x^3y^3, x^2y^4, xy^5, y^6)$. Since

$$x^{m-1}, ..., x^{2m-3}, x^{m-2}y, x^{m-1}y, x^my, xy^2, x^2y^2, x^3y^2, y^3, xy^3, x^2y^3, y^4, xy^4, y^5$$

is a basis of $\Delta(I)/I^2$, we have $\sigma_1 = m+11$. Since $x^2y, ..., x^{m-3}y$ is a basis of $I/\Delta(I)$, we have $\rho_1 = m-4$.

Next, we compute $\sigma_k,\ k \geq 2$. A simple observation shows that $I = T_k(x^{m-1}+xy^2) = (x^{m-1}+xy^2) + (x^{m+k-2}, x^{k+1}y, x^ky^2, ..., xy^{k+1}, y^{k+2})$. Let $U_i = \{u \in I \mid x^iy^{k-i}\frac{\partial u}{\partial x} \in I\}$ and $V_i = \{v \in I \mid x^iy^{k-i}\frac{\partial v}{\partial y} \in I\}$. Suppose $a((m-1)x^{m-2}+y^2) + bx^{m+k-2} + c_1x^{k+1}y + ... + c_{k+2}y^{k+2} \in U_i$, then

$$x^iy^{k-i}[a((m-1)x^{m-2}+y^2) + (m+k-2)bx^{m+k-3} + (k+1)c_1x^ky + ... + c_{k+1}y^{k+1}] \in I.$$

Hence $U_i = I$, for all $0 \leq i \leq k$. Applying the same argument to V_i, for $a((m-1)x^{m-2}+y^2) + bx^{m+k-2} + c_1x^{k+1}y + ... + c_{k+2}y^{k+2} \in V_i$, we have

$$x^iy^{k-i}[2axy + c_1x^{k+1} + ... + c_{k+2}(k+2)y^{k+1}] \in I.$$

Hence $V_i = I$, for all $0 \leq i \leq k-1$. As for V_k, the only restriction is $c_1x^{k+1} \in I$. Thus $c_1 \in (y, x^{\max\{m-k-3,0\}})$ and $\Delta(I) = (x^{m-1}+xy^2) + (x^{m+k-2}, x^ky^2, ..., xy^{k+1}, y^{k+2}) + (x^{\max\{m-2,k+1\}}y)$. Hence we have $Tt(x^{m-1}+xy^2) = m-3$. Let $J := (x^{m+k-2}, x^{k+1}y, ..., xy^{k+1}, y^{k+2})$, then $I^2 = ((x^{m-1}+xy^2)^2) + (x^{m-1}+xy^2)J + J^2$.

Case 1: $m-2 \geq k+1$.

$$\begin{aligned}\Delta(I) &= (x^{m-1}+xy^2) + (x^{m-2}y) + (x^{m+k-2}, x^ky^2, ..., xy^{k+1}, y^{k+2})\\ &= (x^{m-1}+xy^2) + (x^{m-2}y, xy^3) + (x^{m+k-2}, x^ky^2, y^{k+2})\\ &= \sum_{i=0}^{k-2}\mathrm{span}_{\mathbb{C}}\{x^i(x^{m-1}+xy^2)\} + (x^{m+k-2}, x^{m-2}y, x^ky^2, xy^3, y^{k+2})\\ &:= \sum_{i=0}^{k-2}\mathrm{span}_{\mathbb{C}}\{x^i(x^{m-1}+xy^2)\} + L.\end{aligned}$$

Moreover, $\{x^i(x^{m-1}+xy^2)\}_{0\leq i\leq k-2}$ is linearly independent in $\mathbb{C}\{\boldsymbol{x}\}/L$, that is, $\Delta(I) = (\bigoplus_{i=0}^{k-2}\mathrm{span}_{\mathbb{C}}\{x^i(x^{m-1}+xy^2)\}) \oplus L$ is a direct sum of $\mathbb{C}$-linear spaces.

Since $J^2 = (x^{2m+2k-4}, x^{m+2k-1}y, x^{2k+2}y^2, x^{2k+1}y^3, ..., y^{2k+4})$, we can write I^2 as below:

$$\begin{aligned}I^2 &= (A) + (B) + K,\\ A &= 2x^my^2 + x^2y^4 - x^my^3,\\ B &= x^{m+k}y + x^{k+2}y^3,\\ K &= (x^{2m+k-3}, x^{m+2k-1}y, x^{2k+2}y^2, x^{2k+1}y^3, x^{k+1}y^4, x^ky^5, x^2y^6, xy^{k+4}, y^{2k+4}).\end{aligned}$$

Moreover, $A, ..., x^{k-2}A, yA, ..., x^{k-3}yA, B, ..., x^{k-2}B$ is a basis of I^2/K. Since $K \subseteq L$, $\sigma_k = \dim(L/K) + k - 1 - (k-1) - (k-2) - (k-1) = m + 7k + 4$.

A similar argument shows that $\rho_k = m - 3 - k$.

Case 2: $k \geq m-2$.

$$\Delta(I) = (x^{m-1}+xy^2)+(x^{m+k-2}, x^{k+1}y, x^ky^2, ..., xy^{k+1}, y^{k+2}) = I.$$

One can obtain the following decomposition:

$$\begin{aligned}
I &= (f)+J,\\
I^2 &= (C)+(B)+(A_1, A_2, ..., A_{k+2})+K,\\
f &= x^{m-1}+xy^2, C=f^2, B=x^{m+k-2}f, A_i = x^{k+m+1-i}y^i + x^{k+3-i}y^{2+i},\\
J &= (x^{m+k-2}, , x^{k+1}y, ..., xy^{k+1}, y^{k+2}),\\
K &= (x^{m+2k}, x^{m+2k-1}y, x^{2k+2}y^2, x^{2k+1}y^3, x^{2k-m+4}y^4, ..., x^{k-m+4}y^{k+4}, x^{k-m+3}y^{k+m+1}, ..., y^{2k+4}).
\end{aligned}$$

Moreover, the following are $\mathbb{C}$-bases of I/J and I^2/K respectively:

$$f, ..., x^{k-2}f, yf, ..., x^{k-3}y, ..., y^{k-2}f$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
&A_1, ..., x^{k-2}A_1, A_2, ..., x^{k-m+2}A_2, ..., A_{k+1}, ..., x^{k-m+2}A_{k+1},\\
&A_{k+2}, ..., x^{k-m+2}A_{k+2}, ..., A_{k+2}, ..., x^{k-m+2}y^{m-4}A_{k+2},\\
&y^{m-3}A_{k+2}, ..., x^{k-m+1}y^{m-3}A_{k+2}, y^{m-2}A_{k+2}, ..., x^{k-m}y^{m-2}A_{k+2}, ..., y^{k-2}A_{k+2},\\
&B, ..., x^{k-m+2}B,\\
&C, ..., x^{k-2}C, yC, ..., x^{k-3}yC, ..., y^{k-2}C.
\end{aligned}$$

Since $K \subseteq J$, one can calculate σ_k by $\sigma_k = \dim I/J + \dim J/K - \dim I^2/K = 2m+6k+1$. □

Applying the same argument, one can obtain the results for A_m, E_6, E_8:

Proposition 4.21. *For $A_m = V(x^{m+1}+y^2)$, $m \geq 2$, we have*

$$\Delta(T_k(x^{m+1}+y^2)) = \begin{cases} (x^{m+1}, x^my, y^2), \ k=0,1,\\ (x^{m+1}+y^2)+(x^{m+k}, x^my, x^{k-1}y^2, ..., y^{k+1}), \ 2 \leq k \leq m-1,\\ (x^{m+1}+y^2)+(x^ky, x^{k-1}y^2, ..., y^{k+1}), \ k \geq m,\end{cases}$$

$$\rho_k = \begin{cases} m+1, \ k=0,\\ m-k, \ 1 \leq k \leq m-1,\\ 0, \ k \geq m,\end{cases} \quad \sigma_k = \begin{cases} m-1, \ k=0,1,\\ m+6, \ k=1,\\ m+5k+1, \ 2 \leq k \leq m-1,\\ 2m+4k+1, \ k \geq m,\end{cases}$$

and $Tt(x^{m+1}+y^2) = m$.

Proposition 4.22. *For $E_6 = V(x^3+y^4)$, we have*

$$\Delta(T_k(x^3+y^4)) = \begin{cases} (x^3, x^2y^3, y^4), \ k=0,\\ (x^3, x^2y, xy^3, y^4), \ k=1,\\ (x^3+y^4)+(x^{2+k}, ..., x^2y^k, xy^{k+2}), \ k \geq 2,\end{cases}$$

$$\rho_k = \begin{cases} 5, \ k=0,\\ 1, \ k=1,\\ 0, \ k \geq 2,\end{cases} \quad \sigma_k = \begin{cases} 7, \ k=0,\\ 18, \ k=1,\\ 6k+13, \ k \geq 2,\end{cases}$$

and $Tt(x^3+y^4) = 2$.

Proposition 4.23. *For $E_7 = V(x^3 + xy^3)$, we have*

$$\Delta(T_k(x^3+xy^3)) = \begin{cases} (x^3 + xy^3, 15x^2y^2 + 2y^5, xy^5, y^6), \ k = 0, \\ (3x^2y + y^3, x^4, x^3y, x^2y^2, xy^4, y^5), \ k = 1, \\ (x^3 + xy^3) + (3x^2y^k + y^{k+3}, x^{k+2}, ..., x^3y^{k-1}, x^2y^{k+1}, xy^{k+2}, y^{k+4}), \ k \geq 2, \end{cases}$$

$$\rho_k = \begin{cases} 6, \ k = 0, \\ 2, \ k = 1, \\ 0, \ k \geq 2, \end{cases} \quad \sigma_k = \begin{cases} 8, \ k = 0, \\ 19, \ k = 1, \\ 6k + 15, \ k \geq 2, \end{cases}$$

and $Tt(x^3 + xy^3) = 2$.

Proposition 4.24. *For $E_8 = V(x^3 + y^5)$, we have*

$$\Delta(T_k(x^3 + y^5)) = \begin{cases} (x^3, x^2y^4, y^5), \ k = 0, \\ (x^3, x^2y^3, xy^4, y^5), \ k = 1, \\ (x^3 + y^5) + (x^{k+2}, ..., x^2y^k, xy^{k+3}, y^{k+4}), \ k \geq 2, \end{cases}$$

$$\rho_k = \begin{cases} 6, \ k = 0, \\ 2, \ k = 1, \\ 1, \ k = 2, \\ 0, \ k \geq 3, \end{cases} \quad \sigma_k = \begin{cases} 10, \ k = 0, \\ 21, \ k = 1, \\ 28, \ k = 2, \\ 17 + 6k, \ k \geq 3, \end{cases}$$

and $Tt(x^3 + y^5) = 3$.

Next, we provide a lemma which relate the ideal of antiderivatives of ADE surface singularities to ADE curve singularities.

Lemma 4.25. *Suppose $f \in \mathbb{C}\{\boldsymbol{x}\} = \mathbb{C}\{x_1, ..., x_n\}$ is an analytic germ with an isolated singularity at the origin. Let u be a new variable and $\tilde{f} = u^2 + f \in \mathbb{C}\{u, \boldsymbol{x}\}$ be another analytic germ with an isolated singularity. Notations are shown in the remark below.*

For $k = 0$, we have:

$$\Delta(T_0(\tilde{f})) = (u^2) + (u \cdot T_0^x(f)) + (\Delta^x(T_0^x(f))),$$

and for $k \geq 1$, we have:

$$\Delta(T_k(\tilde{f})) = (\tilde{f}) + (\Psi_k) + (\Lambda_k \cdot u) + (\mathfrak{m}_x^{k-1}u^2) + ... + (\mathfrak{m}_x u^k) + (u^{k+1}),$$

where $(S), S \subset \mathbb{C}\{u, \boldsymbol{x}\}$ is the ideal generated by S. Λ_k and Ψ_k are ideals in $\mathbb{C}\{\boldsymbol{x}\}$ given by $\Lambda_k = (\mathfrak{m}_x^k \cdot J(f) + \mathfrak{m}_x^{k-1} \cdot f : \mathfrak{m}_x^k) \cap \mathfrak{m}_x^k$ and $\Psi_k = \Delta^x(T_k^x(f)) \cap \mathfrak{m}_x^k J(f)$.

Moreover, if f is quasi-homogeneous, then

$$\Delta(T_k(\tilde{f})) = (\tilde{f}) + (\Psi_k) + (\Lambda_k \cdot u).$$

Remark 4.26. Let k be an positive integer. To avoid confusion, let T_k^x denote the k-th Tjurina ideal map in $\mathbb{C}\{\boldsymbol{x}\}$ and T_k is the Tjurina ideal map in $\mathbb{C}\{u, \boldsymbol{x}\}$. Moreover, $\mathfrak{m}_x$ refers to the maximal ideal of $\mathbb{C}\{\boldsymbol{x}\}$ and $J(f)$ the Jacobian ideal of f in $\mathbb{C}\{\boldsymbol{x}\}$. Besides, for an ideal I in $\mathbb{C}\{\boldsymbol{x}\}$, $\Delta^x(I) \subseteq \mathbb{C}\{\boldsymbol{x}\}$ is the ideal of antiderivatives w.r.t. T_k^x. For ideal J in $\mathbb{C}\{u, \boldsymbol{x}\}$, $\Delta(J)$ is the ideal of antiderivatives w.r.t. T_k.

In all, notations attached with an ^{x} or $_x$ are ones associated with $\mathbb{C}\{\boldsymbol{x}\}$ while others are associated with $\mathbb{C}\{u, \boldsymbol{x}\}$.

Proof. We will also follow **Algorithm 4.16**.

When $k=0$, we have $T_0(\tilde{f})=(u,f,J(f))$. Suppose $au+\sum_{i=1}^n b_i\frac{\partial f}{\partial x_i}\in\Delta(T_0(\tilde{f}))$, where $a,b_i\in\mathbb{C}\{u,\boldsymbol{x}\}$. Then, by taking $\frac{\partial}{\partial u}$ and $\frac{\partial}{\partial x_j}$, we have $a\in T_0^x(f)+(u)$ and $\sum_{i=1}^n b_i\frac{\partial^2 f}{\partial x_i\partial x_j}\in T_0(\tilde{f})$. Since $u\in T_0(\tilde{f})$, we may assume $b_i\in\mathbb{C}\{\boldsymbol{x}\}$. Under this assumption, we obtain $\sum_{i=1}^n b_i\frac{\partial^2 f}{\partial x_i\partial x_j}\in T_0^x(f)$ and hence the assertion is proven.

When $k\geq 1$, we have $T_k(\tilde{f})=(\tilde{f})+(\mathfrak{m}_x,u)^k(u,J(f))$. Suppose $\sum a_{i\boldsymbol{\alpha}}u^{i+1}\boldsymbol{x}^{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}+\sum b_{jl\boldsymbol{\beta}}u^j\boldsymbol{x}^{\boldsymbol{\beta}}\frac{\partial f}{\partial x_l}\in\Delta(T_k(\tilde{f}))$, where $i,j\geq 0,\boldsymbol{\alpha},\boldsymbol{\beta}\in\mathbb{N}^n$ with $i+|\boldsymbol{\alpha}|=j+|\boldsymbol{\beta}|=k$. For $s\geq 0,\boldsymbol{\gamma}\in\mathbb{N}^n, s+|\boldsymbol{\gamma}|=k$, apply $u^s\boldsymbol{x}^{\boldsymbol{\gamma}}\frac{\partial}{\partial u}$. If $s\geq 1$, we obtain no restriction to all a and b. If $s=0$, we get one restriction:

$$\mathfrak{m}_x^k(\sum_{|\boldsymbol{\alpha}|=k}a_{0\boldsymbol{\alpha}}\boldsymbol{x}^{\boldsymbol{\alpha}})\subseteq T_k(\tilde{f}).$$

Since $u\boldsymbol{x}^{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}\in T_k(\tilde{f})$ if $|\boldsymbol{\alpha}|=k$, we may assume $a_{0\boldsymbol{\alpha}}\in\mathbb{C}\{\boldsymbol{x}\}$. Under these circumstances, by considering the degree of u, we have $\sum_{|\boldsymbol{\alpha}|}a_{0\boldsymbol{\alpha}}\boldsymbol{x}^{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}\in\Lambda_k$.

For general $s,\boldsymbol{\gamma}$ as before, $u^s\boldsymbol{x}^{\boldsymbol{\gamma}}\frac{\partial}{\partial x_q}$ provides no restriction to $a_{i\boldsymbol{\alpha}}$, since $u^{s+i+1}\boldsymbol{x}^{\boldsymbol{\beta}+\boldsymbol{\gamma}-\boldsymbol{e}_q}$ is always in $T_k(\tilde{f})$. Hence we can focus only on $\sum b_{jl\boldsymbol{\beta}}u^j\boldsymbol{x}^{\boldsymbol{\beta}}\frac{\partial f}{\partial x_l}$. Also, if $s\geq 1$, we have $u^{j+s}\boldsymbol{x}^{\boldsymbol{\beta}+\boldsymbol{\gamma}-\boldsymbol{e}_q}\frac{\partial f}{\partial x_l}\in T_k(\tilde{f})$ and $u^{j+s}\boldsymbol{x}^{\boldsymbol{\beta}+\boldsymbol{\gamma}}\frac{\partial^2 f}{\partial x_l\partial x_q}\in T_k(\tilde{f})$. So these $u^s\boldsymbol{x}^{\boldsymbol{\gamma}}\frac{\partial}{\partial x_q}$ give no restriction. For $s=0$, we have:

$$\sum b_{jl\boldsymbol{\beta}}[u^j\boldsymbol{x}^{\boldsymbol{\beta}+\boldsymbol{\gamma}-e_q}\frac{\partial f}{\partial x_l}+u^j\boldsymbol{x}^{\boldsymbol{\beta}+\boldsymbol{\gamma}}\frac{\partial^2 f}{\partial x_l\partial x_q}]\in T_k(\tilde{f}).$$

If $j\geq 1$, we also have $b_{jl\boldsymbol{\beta}}(u^j\boldsymbol{x}^{\boldsymbol{\beta}+\boldsymbol{\gamma}-\boldsymbol{e}_q}\frac{\partial f}{\partial x_l}+u^j\boldsymbol{x}^{\boldsymbol{\beta}+\boldsymbol{\gamma}}\frac{\partial^2 f}{\partial x_l\partial x_q})\in T_k(\tilde{f})$. So it suffices to consider the condition $W=\sum_l\sum_{|\boldsymbol{\beta}|=k}b_{0l\boldsymbol{\beta}}(\boldsymbol{x}^{\boldsymbol{\beta}+\boldsymbol{\gamma}-\boldsymbol{e}_q}\frac{\partial f}{\partial x_l}+\boldsymbol{x}^{\boldsymbol{\beta}+\boldsymbol{\gamma}}\frac{\partial^2 f}{\partial x_l\partial x_q})\in T_k(\tilde{f})$. We may assume $b_{0l\boldsymbol{\beta}}\in\mathbb{C}\{\boldsymbol{x}\}$ as before. Again considering the degree of u, we have $W\in(\tilde{f})+(\mathfrak{m}_x,u)^k(u,J(f))$ if and only if $W\in(\mathfrak{m}_x,u)^{k-1}(\tilde{f})+(\mathfrak{m}_x,u)^k(u,J(f))=(\mathfrak{m}_x,u)^{k-1}(f)+(\mathfrak{m}_x,u)^k(u,J(f))$. Therefore, we have $\sum b_{0l\boldsymbol{\beta}}\boldsymbol{x}^{\boldsymbol{\beta}}\frac{\partial f}{\partial x_l}\in\Delta^x(T_k^x(\tilde{f}))$. Concluding all restrictions, we have verified the first assertion.

As for the second assertion, let $I=(\tilde{f})+(\Psi_k)+(\Lambda_k\cdot u)$. Since $f\in\mathfrak{m}_xJ(f)$, we have $\mathfrak{m}_x^{k-1}f\subseteq\mathfrak{m}_x^kJ(f)$. Since $\Delta^x(T_k^x(f))$ is an ideal and $f\in\Delta^x(T_k^x(f))$, we have $\mathfrak{m}_x^{k-1}f\subset\Psi_k$. For all $\boldsymbol{x}^{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}\in\mathfrak{m}_x^{k-1}$, $\boldsymbol{x}^{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}u^2=\boldsymbol{x}^{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}\tilde{f}-\boldsymbol{x}^{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}f\in I$. This implies $\mathfrak{m}_x^{k-1}u^2\subset I$. To show $\mathfrak{m}_x^{k-2}u^3\subset I$, it suffices to verify $\mathfrak{m}_x^{k-2}u\cdot f\in(\Lambda_k\cdot u)$. It is clear by definition.

Next, we perform induction on r, aiming to show $\mathfrak{m}_x^{k-r}u^{r+1}\subset I$. The case for $k=1,2$ has been done as above. Suppose it is true for all $r\leq k-1$. Since $(\mathfrak{m}^{k-r+1}u^{r-1})\subset I$ by induction hypothesis and $\mathfrak{m}_x^{k-r}u^{r-1}f\subset\mathfrak{m}_x^{k-r+1}u^{r-1}$, for all $\boldsymbol{x}^{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}u^{r+1}\in\mathfrak{m}_x^{k-r}u^{r+1}$, $\boldsymbol{x}^{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}u^{r+1}=\boldsymbol{x}^{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}u^{r-1}\tilde{f}-\boldsymbol{x}^{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}u^{r-1}f\in I$. □

We have an easy corollary of the lemma.

Corollary 4.27. *Notations are as in **Lemma 4.25**. Let $\rho_k(f)$ and $Tt(f)$ be invariants of $f\in\mathbb{C}\{\boldsymbol{x}\}$ and $\rho_k(\tilde{f})$ and $Tt(\tilde{f})$ be those of $\tilde{f}\in\mathbb{C}\{u,\boldsymbol{x}\}$. Then*

$$\rho_0(\tilde{f})=\tau_0(f)+\rho_0(f),\ \textit{and}$$
$$\sigma_0(\tilde{f})=\sigma_0(f),$$

where $\tau_0(f)$ is the Tjurina number of f. Furthermore, if f is quasi-homogeneous, we have

$$Tt(\tilde{f})=\max\{Tt(f),\mathrm{mm}(f)\},$$

where $\mathrm{mm}(f)$ is the smallest integer r such that $\mathfrak{m}_x^{2r}\subseteq\mathfrak{m}_x^rJ(f)$.

Proof. The first assertion follows from the isomorphism

$$T_0(f)/\Delta(T_0(f))\simeq T_0^x(f)/\Delta^x(T_0^x(f))\oplus(\mathbb{C}\{\boldsymbol{x}\}/T_0^x(f))u$$

between vector spaces. The second assertion follows from $T_0(\tilde{f})^2 = (u^2) + (T_0^x(f)\cdot u) + (T_0^x(f))^2$ and then $\Delta(T_0(\tilde{f}))/(T_0(\tilde{f}))^2 \simeq \Delta^x(T_0^x(f))/(T_0^x(f))^2$.

As for the third assertion, since $(\Psi_k \cdot u) \subseteq (\Lambda_k \cdot u)$ and $(\Lambda_k \cdot u^2) \subseteq (\mathfrak{m}_x^{k-1}u^2)$, we have $\Delta(T_k(\tilde{f})) \cap \mathbb{C}\{\boldsymbol{x}\} = (\Psi_k) + (\mathfrak{m}_x^{k-1}\cdot f)$. Because $\mathfrak{m}_x^{k-1}\cdot f \subseteq \mathfrak{m}^k J(f)$ and $f \in \Delta^x(T_k^x(f))$, we have $\Delta(T_k(\tilde{f})) \cap \mathbb{C}\{\boldsymbol{x}\} = \Psi_k$. Morever, $\Delta(T_k(\tilde{f})) \cap (\mathbb{C}\{\boldsymbol{x}\}\cdot u) = \Lambda_k \cdot u$. Hence, $\Delta(T_k(\tilde{f})) = T_k(\tilde{f})$ if and only if $\Psi_k = \mathfrak{m}_x^k J(f)$ and $\Lambda_k = \mathfrak{m}_x^k$. The smallest number k satisfying respective conditions are $Tt(f)$ and $\mathrm{mm}(f)$ respectively. □

Next we compute the ideal of antiderivatives for ADE surface singularities. We only give Λ_k and Ψ_k so that readers can recover $\Delta(T_k(\tilde{f}))$ by **Lemma 4.25**. We point out that we have deliberately written Δ in the form $(f) + (\Delta \cap \mathfrak{m}^k J(f))$ in the previous computation for curve singularities.

Proposition 4.28. *For $D_m = V(x^{m-1} + xy^2 + u^2), m \geq 4$, we have*

$$\Lambda_k = (xy, x^{m-2}, y^2) \cap \mathfrak{m}_x^k,$$

$$\Psi_k = \begin{cases} (x^{m+k-2}, x^k y^2, ..., xy^{k+1}, y^{k+2}, x^{m-2}y), 1 \leq k \leq m-3, \\ (x^{m+k-2}, x^k y^2, ..., xy^{k+1}, y^{k+2}, x^{k+1}y),\ k \geq m-2. \end{cases}$$

Proposition 4.29. *For $A_m = V(x^{m+1} + y^2 + u^2), m \geq 2$, we have*

$$\Lambda_k = (x^m, y) \cap \mathfrak{m}_x^k,$$

$$\Psi_k = \begin{cases} (x^{m+k}, x^m y, x^{k-1}y^2, ..., y^{k+1}), 2 \leq k \leq m-1, \\ (x^k y, x^{k-1}y^2, ..., y^{k+1}), k \geq m. \end{cases}$$

Proposition 4.30. *For $E_6 = V(x^3 + y^4 + u^2)$, we have*

$$\Lambda_k = (x^2, xy^2, y^3) \cap \mathfrak{m}_x^k,$$

$$\Psi_k = (x^{2+k}, ..., x^2y^k, xy^{k+2}).$$

Proposition 4.31. *For $E_7 = V(x^3 + xy^3 + u^2)$, we have*

$$\Lambda_k = \begin{cases} (3x^2 + y^3, xy^2), k = 1, \\ (x^2, y^3, xy^2) \cap \mathfrak{m}_x^k, k \geq 2, \end{cases}$$

$$\Psi_k = (3x^2y^k + y^{k+3}, x^{k+2}, ..., x^3y^{k-1}, x^2y^{k+1}, xy^{k+2}, y^{k+4}).$$

Proposition 4.32. *For $E_8 = V(x^3 + y^5 + u^2)$, we have*

$$\Lambda_k = (x^2, xy^3, y^4) \cap \mathfrak{m}_x^k$$

$$\Psi_k = \begin{cases} (x^3, x^2y^3, xy^4, y^5), k = 1, \\ (x^3 + y^5) + (x^{k+2}, ..., x^2y^k, xy^{k+3}, y^{k+4}), k \geq 2. \end{cases}$$

Below are the invariants for D_6, E_6, E_7 when $0 \leq k \leq 12$.

Example 4.33. We distinguish invariants of f and $\tilde{f}$ by adding a ˜ over those of $\tilde{f}$.
(1) $f = x^5 + xy^2$, $\tilde{f} = f + u^2$.

k	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
ρ_k	6	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$\tilde{\rho}_k$	12	6	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
σ_k	6	17	24	31	37	43	49	55	61	67	73	79	85
$\tilde{\sigma}_k$	6	28	55	89	130	178	234	298	370	450	538	634	738

One can find $\tilde{\sigma}_k = 4k^2 + 12k + 18, 4 \leq k \leq 12$ and $\sigma_k = 6k + 13, k \geq 3$.

(2) $f = x^3 + y^4$, $\tilde{f} = f + u^2$

k	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
ρ_k	5	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$\tilde{\rho}_k$	11	5	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
σ_k	7	18	25	31	37	43	49	55	61	67	73	79	85
$\tilde{\sigma}_k$	7	29	56	90	130	178	234	298	370	450	538	634	738

One can find $\tilde{\sigma}_k = 4k^2 + 12k + 18, 3 \leq k \leq 12$ and $\sigma_k = 6k + 13, k \geq 2$.

(3) $f = x^3 + xy^3$, $\tilde{f} = f + u^2$

k	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
ρ_k	6	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
$\tilde{\rho}_k$	13	7	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
σ_k	8	19	27	33	39	45	51	57	63	69	75	81	87
$\tilde{\sigma}_k$	8	30	58	92	133	181	237	301	373	453	541	637	741

One can find $\tilde{\sigma}_k = 4k^2 + 12k + 21, 4 \leq k \leq 12$ and $\sigma_k = 6k + 15, k \geq 2$.

Remark 4.34. As in [Ad75], germs $f \in \mathbb{C}\{\boldsymbol{x}\}$ and $\tilde{f} = f + u^2$ are called stable equivalent. Moduli algebra itself can not tell the difference between stable equivalent singularities if not given the dimension of ambient space. However, by **Proposition 4.38** shows invariants σ_k implies the dimension of the singularities and hence separate apart stable equivalent singularities.

So far, some interesting things have happened: (a) There is a polynomial $P \in \mathbb{Z}[x]$, such that $\{\sigma_k\}_{k \geq Tt(f)} = \{P(k)\}_{k \geq Tt(f)}$; (b) Tt is the smallest integer N such that $\{\sigma_k\}_{k \geq N}$ fits a polynomial of k. We state the findings as in the following conjecture.

Conjecture 4.35. *Let $(X, 0) = (V(f), 0) \subset (\mathbb{C}^n, 0)$ be an isolated hypersurface singularity. Then $Tt(f)$ is the smallest integer N such that $\{\sigma_k\}_{k \geq N}$ is a polynomial of k of degree $n - 1$.*

Remark 4.36. Our calculation shows that the conjecture holds for ADE curve singularities. Below are a few examples other than ADE singularities, which support our conjecture.

Example 4.37.

(1) $f = x^6 + xy^7$

k	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
ρ_k	57	13	7	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
σ_k	17	68	85	103	117	129	141	153	165	177	189	201	213

One can find $\sigma_k = 12k + 69,\ 3 \leq k \leq 12$.

(2) $f = x^{10}y + xy^{15}$

k	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
ρ_k	44	40	34	26	18	10	6	2	0	0	0	0	0
σ_k	256	267	284	307	334	365	391	417	441	463	485	507	529

One can find $\sigma_k = 22k + 265,\ 8 \leq k \leq 12$.

(3) $f = x(x+y)(x+2y)(x+3y)(x+4y)(x+5y)$

k	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
ρ_k	14	10	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
σ_k	36	47	64	81	93	105	117	129	141	153	165	177	189

One can find $\sigma_k = 12k + 45,\ 3 \le k \le 12$.

(4) $f = x^3 + y^5 + z^6$

k	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
ρ_k	38	32	20	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
σ_k	82	109	172	252	339	430	533	648	775	914	1065	1228	1403

One can find $\sigma_k = 6k^2 + 37k + 95,\ 4 \le k \le 12$.

(5) $f = x^2y + y^2z + z^2y$

k	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
ρ_k	12	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
σ_k	12	39	85	136	199	274	361	460	571	694	829	976	1135

One can find $\sigma_k = 6k^2 + 21k + 19,\ 2 \le k \le 12$.

Though the correctness of the conjecture is not verified, we can prove the following estimation:

Proposition 4.38. *Suppose $(X,0) = (V(f),0) \subset (\mathbb{C}^n,0)$ is an isolated singularity, then:*

$$\sigma_k \sim \frac{2^{n-1}\mathrm{ord}(f)}{(n-1)!}k^{n-1}.$$

Here $\mathrm{ord}(f)$ denotes the minimal degree among all monomial terms appearing in f. Besides, for two sequences $\{a_n\},\{b_n\} \subset \mathbb{C}$, $a_n \sim b_n$ means $a_n/b_n \to 1$ when $n \to \infty$.

Proof. For $t \in \mathbb{N}$, let $l(t) = \binom{n+t}{t}$ be the cardinality of the set

$$\{(x_1, x_2, ..., x_n) \in \mathbb{N}^n \mid x_1 + x_2 + ... + x_n \le t\}.$$

By **Lemma 2.3**, there exists an integer w, such that $\mathfrak{m}^w \subseteq J(f)$. For a non-negative integer t, we set $L_t = \dim \mathbb{C}\{\boldsymbol{x}\}/((f^2) + (f)\mathfrak{m}^t + \mathfrak{m}^{2t})$ and $R_t = \dim \mathbb{C}\{\boldsymbol{x}\}/((f) + \mathfrak{m}^t)$. Since $\sigma_k = \dim \mathbb{C}\{\boldsymbol{x}\}/T_k(f)^2 - \dim \mathbb{C}\{\boldsymbol{x}\}/T_k(f)$ for large k (**Lemma 4.17**), we have the following estimation:

$$L_k - R_{k+w} \le \sigma_k \le L_{k+w} - R_k \qquad (\sim).$$

In fact, L_t and R_t can be explicitly calculated when $t > \mathrm{ord}(f)$.

$$\begin{aligned} R_t &= l(t-1) - l(t - \mathrm{ord}(f) - 1) \sim \frac{\mathrm{ord}(f)}{(n-1)!}t^{n-1}, \\ L_t &= l(2t-1) - (l(2t-1-\mathrm{ord}(f)) - l(t-1)) - l(t-1-\mathrm{ord}(f)) \\ &\sim \frac{(2^{n-1}+1)\mathrm{ord}(f)}{(n-1)!}t^{n-1}. \end{aligned}$$

Applying the calculation to $(\sim)$, we are done. □

With this proposition, we have a direct corollary.

Corollary 4.39. *If **Conjecture 4.35** holds, the leading term of this polynomial is $\frac{2^{n-1}\mathrm{ord}(f)}{(n-1)!}k^{n-1}$.*

Remark 4.40. In **Proposition 4.38**, we have shown that

$$\dim_{\mathbb{C}} I/I^2 = R_t - L_t = l(2t-1) - l(2t-1-\mathrm{ord}(f)),$$

where $I = (f) + \mathfrak{m}^t \subseteq \mathbb{C}\{\boldsymbol{x}\}$ is an ideal. If $f = \sum_{i=1}^n x_i^r$ is a homogeneous Brieskorn singularity, then $\mathfrak{m}^k J(f) = \mathfrak{m}^{k+r}$ for large k. Consequently, we have

$$\sigma_k = l(2(k+r)-1) - l(2(k+r)-1-\operatorname{ord}(f)),$$

a polynomial, for large k. It also convinces us that **Conjecture 4.35** is true.

4.3. **A Geometric Interpretation for the Ideal of Antiderivatives.** In this subsection, we are going to give a geometric interpretation of the ideal of antiderivatives w.r.t. Tjurina ideal map. Hence, all Δs in this subsection refer to the ideals of antiderivatives w.r.t. Tjurina ideal map. The motivation of the following construction comes from the well-known exact sequence for Kähler differential (**Theorem 2.9**).

Lemma 4.41. *Suppose $I \subseteq \mathfrak{m} \subset \mathbb{C}\{\boldsymbol{x}\}$ is an ideal, then we have the following exact sequence:*

$$0 \longrightarrow \Delta(I) \longrightarrow I \xrightarrow{d} \Omega_{\mathbb{C}\{\boldsymbol{x}\}} \otimes \mathbb{C}\{\boldsymbol{x}\}/I \longrightarrow \Omega_{\mathbb{C}\{\boldsymbol{x}\}/I} \longrightarrow 0.$$

Proof. It suffices to check $\Delta(I) = \ker d$. Since $\Omega_{\mathbb{C}\{\boldsymbol{x}\}} = \bigoplus_{i=1}^n \mathbb{C}\{\boldsymbol{x}\} dx_i$, $\Omega_{\mathbb{C}\{\boldsymbol{x}\}} \otimes \mathbb{C}\{\boldsymbol{x}\}/I \simeq \bigoplus_{i=1}^n (\mathbb{C}\{\boldsymbol{x}\}/I) dx_i$. Therefore, $f \in \ker d$ if and only if $\frac{\partial f}{\partial x_i} \in I$ for all $1 \leq i \leq n$. By definition, $\ker d = \Delta(I) = \{f \in I \mid J(f) \subseteq I\}$. □

Now suppose $(X, \mathcal{O}_X)$ is a complex space and Z is the complex subspace given by coherent ideal sheaf $\mathcal{I}$. We have a natural morphism $\alpha : \mathcal{I} \to \Omega_X \otimes \mathcal{O}_X/\mathcal{I}$ given by $f \mapsto df \otimes 1$. It gives a global exact sequence for X/Z.

Theorem 4.42. *Notations as above, we have the exact sequence:*

$$\mathcal{I} \xrightarrow{\alpha} \Omega_X \otimes \mathcal{O}_X/\mathcal{I} \to i_*\mathcal{O}_Z \longrightarrow 0 \qquad \text{((E))}$$

where $i : Z \hookrightarrow X$ is the natural closed embedding.

Proof. For $p \notin Z$, $(\mathcal{O}_X/\mathcal{I})_p = 0$ and $(i_*\mathcal{O}_Z)_p = 0$. For all $p \in Z$, taking stalks of (E), the sequences coincide with the (algebraic) sequences in **Theorem 2.9**. So we are done. □

Definition 4.43. For a coherent ideal sheaf $\mathcal{I}$ of $\mathcal{O}_X$, the ideal sheaf of antiderivatives is defined by the kernel of α in the above exact sequence.

Remark 4.44. Since i is a closed embedding and hence finite, by [GLS07], *Theorem 1.67*, $i_*\mathcal{O}_Z$ is coherent. Since $\mathcal{I}$, $\Omega_X \otimes \mathcal{O}_X/\mathcal{I}$ and $i_*\mathcal{O}_Z$ are all coherent, then so is $\Delta(\mathcal{I})$.

The following theorem shows for each $p \in X$, the stalk $\Delta(\mathcal{I})_p$ coincides with $\Delta(\mathcal{I}_p) \lhd \mathcal{O}_{X,p}$ in local sense. Hence our global definition gives Δ a geometric interpretation.

Theorem 4.45. *Let $X = D \subset \mathbb{C}^n$ be an open subset and $\mathcal{I}$ be a coherent ideal sheaf of $\mathcal{O}_X$. Then for each $p \in X$, $\Delta(\mathcal{I})_p$ is the ideal of antiderivatives of the ideal $\mathcal{I}_p$ in the local ring $\mathcal{O}_{X,p} = \mathbb{C}\{\boldsymbol{x} - p\}$.*

Proof. Without loss of generality, we set $p = 0$. Under such assumptions, $\mathcal{O}_{X,p} = \mathbb{C}\{\boldsymbol{x}\}$. Applying **Theorem 4.42** and taking stalk at p, one may find it is the exact sequence in **Lemma 4.41**. □

4.4. **k-th Milnor Number of Semi Quasi-Homogeneous Singularity.** In [BGM11], the notion of semi quasi-homogeneity (SQH for short) was provided. The authors proved the Milnor number of an SQH series is equal to the Milnor number of its principal part. We will apply their method to prove an inequality associated with some types of quasi-T-maps. Besides, we prove the equality between the k-th Milnor number of an SQH series and the Milnor number of its principal part.

In this section, $K[[x_1, x_2, ..., x_n]]$ always refers to the ring of formal power series over a field K. We abbreviate $K[[x_1, x_2, ..., x_n]]$ as $K[[\boldsymbol{x}]]$ and $\mathfrak{m}$ is the maximal ideal of $K[[\boldsymbol{x}]]$. We will focus on some quasi-T-maps on the K-algebra $K[[\boldsymbol{x}]]$, where K is an arbitrary field. We first define the notions *continuous* and *efficient* for a linear endomorphism of $K[[\boldsymbol{x}]]$:

Definition 4.46. A linear map $P \in \mathrm{End}_K(K[[\boldsymbol{x}]])$ is called *continuous* if there exists an integer d such that $\mathrm{ord}(P(f)) \geq \mathrm{ord}(f) - d$ for all $f \in K[[\boldsymbol{x}]]$.

Remark 4.47. There is a natural topology on $K[[\boldsymbol{x}]]$, that is, the $\mathfrak{m}$-adic topology. The open basis near 0 is given by the filtration $\mathfrak{m} \supset \mathfrak{m}^2 \supset \mathfrak{m}^3 \supset \cdots$. A sequence $\{f_i\}_{i=1}^{\infty} \subset K[[\boldsymbol{x}]]$ is called a Cauchy sequence, if for any integer $k > 0$, there exists $N_k > 0$ such that $f_i - f_{i+1} \in \mathfrak{m}^k$ for all $i \geq N_k$. It is not hard to check each Cauchy sequence in $K[[\boldsymbol{x}]]$ converges to a unique series. A continuous endomorphism is automatically a continuous map from $K[[\boldsymbol{x}]]$ to itself when considering the $\mathfrak{m}$-adic topology.

Lemma 4.48. *Suppose $P \in \mathrm{End}_K(K[[\boldsymbol{x}]])$ is continuous, then for all $f = \sum_{\boldsymbol{v}} a_{\boldsymbol{v}} \boldsymbol{x}^{\boldsymbol{v}} \in K[[\boldsymbol{x}]]$, $P(f) = \sum_{\boldsymbol{v}} a_{\boldsymbol{v}} P(\boldsymbol{x}^{\boldsymbol{v}})$.*

Proof. Let $C_k : K[[\boldsymbol{x}]] \to K[[\boldsymbol{x}]]/\mathfrak{m}^{k+1} \hookrightarrow K[[\boldsymbol{x}]]$ be the canonical truncation. Namely, it maps $\sum_{\boldsymbol{v}} a_{\boldsymbol{v}} \boldsymbol{x}^{\boldsymbol{v}}$ to $\sum_{|\boldsymbol{v}| \leq k} a_{\boldsymbol{v}} \boldsymbol{x}^{\boldsymbol{v}}$. For all $k \in \mathbb{N}$, we have $f = C_k(f) + (f - C_k(f))$, where $\mathrm{ord}(f - C_k(f)) \geq k+1$. Since $P(C_k(f)) = \sum_{|\boldsymbol{v}| \leq k} a_{\boldsymbol{v}} P(\boldsymbol{x}^{\boldsymbol{v}})$ and $\mathrm{ord}(P(f - C_k(f))) \geq k+1-d$, $P(C_k(f))$ is a Cauchy sequence tending to $P(f)$ in $\mathfrak{m}$-adic topology. Therefore, we have $\sum_{|\boldsymbol{v}| \leq k} a_{\boldsymbol{v}} P(\boldsymbol{x}^{\boldsymbol{v}}) \to P(f)$ i.e. $P(f) = \sum_{\boldsymbol{v}} a_{\boldsymbol{v}} P(\boldsymbol{x}^{\boldsymbol{v}})$. □

Remark 4.49. The lemma is not trivial since it works for infinite sums.

Definition 4.50. For $f \in K[[\boldsymbol{x}]]$ and quasi-T-map Q, we define $\mu_Q(f) := \dim_K K[[\boldsymbol{x}]]/Q(f)$. If the dimension is infinite, we simply write $\mu_Q(f) = \infty$.

As in [BGM11], for $w = (w^1, w^2, ..., w^n) \in \mathbb{N}_{>0}^n$ and $f = \sum_{\boldsymbol{v}} a_{\boldsymbol{v}} \boldsymbol{x}^{\boldsymbol{v}} \in K[[\boldsymbol{x}]]$, the principal part of f w.r.t w is defined to be $f_w = \sum_{\boldsymbol{v} \cdot w \text{ minimal}} a_{\boldsymbol{v}} \boldsymbol{x}^{\boldsymbol{v}}$. f is called semi quasi-homogeneous (SQH for short) w.r.t. a continuous quasi-T-map Q and w ((Q, w) in short) if $\mu_Q(f_w)$ is finite.

For $f = \sum_{\boldsymbol{v}} a_{\boldsymbol{v}} \boldsymbol{x}^{\boldsymbol{v}} \in K[[\boldsymbol{x}]]$, its support is defined as $\mathrm{Supp}(f) := \{\boldsymbol{v} \in \mathbb{N}^n \mid a_{\boldsymbol{v}} \neq 0\}$.

For a quasi-T-map $Q : K[[\boldsymbol{x}]] \to \{\text{Ideals of } K[[\boldsymbol{x}]]\}$, it can be naturally extended to $K[[\boldsymbol{x}, t]] \to \{\text{Ideals of } K[[\boldsymbol{x}, t]]\}$ in a natural way. That is, assuming $Q = (Q_1, ..., Q_m)$, then for $f = \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} f_i \cdot t^i \in K[[\boldsymbol{x}, t]]$, $Q_j(f) := \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} Q_j(f_i) \cdot t^i$ and $Q(f) := (Q_1(f), ..., Q_m(f))$. Let $d = \min_{\boldsymbol{v} \in \mathrm{Supp}(f)} \boldsymbol{v} \cdot w$ and $\hat{f} = t^{-d} f(t^{w^1} x_1, ..., t^{w^n} x_n) = f_w + tg$, where $g \in K[[\boldsymbol{x}, t]]$. Then we have $Q_i(\hat{f}) = Q_i(f_w) + tQ_i(g)$ for each i.

Definition 4.51. Let $w \in \mathbb{N}_{>0}^n$ and $\varphi_w : K[[\boldsymbol{x}, t]] \to K[[\boldsymbol{x}, t]]$ is such that $x_i \mapsto t^{w^i} x_i, t \mapsto t$. A linear map $P \in \mathrm{End}_K(K[[\boldsymbol{x}]])$ is called efficient w.r.t. w if P is continuous and there is an integer e such that for each monomial $\boldsymbol{x}^{\boldsymbol{v}}$, $\varphi_w(P(\boldsymbol{x}^{\boldsymbol{v}})) = t^e P(\varphi_w(\boldsymbol{x}^{\boldsymbol{v}}))$.

Example 4.52. Consider $K[[x, y]]$ and $w = (1, 1)$, then $P = x^2 y^3 \partial_x$ is efficient with $e = 4$, while $P = \partial_x + \partial_x \partial_y$ is continuous yet not efficient.

Definition 4.53. A quasi-T-map $Q = (Q_1, ..., Q_m)$ (i.e. $Q(f) = (Q_1(f), ..., Q_m(f))$ for all $f \in K[[\boldsymbol{x}]]$) is called continuous (efficient resp.) if all Q_i are continuous (efficient resp.).

Proposition 4.54. *Notations are as above. Let Q be an efficient quasi-T-map and $w \in \mathbb{N}_{>0}$. Suppose $f = \sum a_{\boldsymbol{v}} \boldsymbol{x}^{\boldsymbol{v}}$ is SQH w.r.t. (Q, w), and $K[[\boldsymbol{x}, t]]/Q(\hat{f})K[[\boldsymbol{x}, t]]$ is finitely generated as a $K[[t]]$-module, then $\mu_Q(f_w) \geq \mu_Q(f)$. The equality holds if and only if $K[[\boldsymbol{x}, t]]/Q(\hat{f})K[[\boldsymbol{x}, t]]$ is torsion-free as a $K[[t]]$-module.*

Proof. Let L be the fraction field of $K[[t]]$ and $\varphi_w : x_i \to t^{w^i}x_i, t \mapsto t$ be an automorphism of $L[[\boldsymbol{x}]]$. By **Lemma 4.48** and the definition of efficiency, we have $\varphi_w(Q(f))L[[\boldsymbol{x}]] = Q(\varphi_w(f))L[[\boldsymbol{x}]] = Q(\hat{f})L[[\boldsymbol{x}]]$ and the following isomorphisms:

$$\begin{aligned} K[[\boldsymbol{x},t]]/Q(\hat{f})K[[\boldsymbol{x},t]] \otimes_{K[[t]]} L &\simeq L[[\boldsymbol{x}]]/Q(\hat{f})L[[\boldsymbol{x}]] \\ &\simeq L[[\boldsymbol{x}]]/\varphi(Q(f))L[[\boldsymbol{x}]] \simeq L[[\boldsymbol{x}]]/Q(f)L[[\boldsymbol{x}]] \end{aligned}$$

The first isomorphism is due to **Lemma 4.56** below. Also by using **Lemma 4.57** below, we have $\dim_L L[[\boldsymbol{x}]]/Q(f)L[[\boldsymbol{x}]] = \mu_Q(f)$.

Since $K[[t]]$ is a discrete valuation ring, the L-dimension of $K[[\boldsymbol{x},t]]/Q(\hat{f})K[[\boldsymbol{x},t]] \otimes_{K[[t]]} L$ is the free rank of $K[[\boldsymbol{x},t]]/Q(\hat{f})K[[\boldsymbol{x},t]]$ by **Theorem 2.6**. Since $K[[\boldsymbol{x},t]]/Q(\hat{f})K[[\boldsymbol{x},t]]\otimes_{K[[t]]}K \simeq K[[\boldsymbol{x}]]/Q(f_w)$ and $\mu(f_w)$ is the rank of $K[[\boldsymbol{x},t]]/Q(\hat{f})K[[\boldsymbol{x},t]]$, we have $\mu_Q(f_w) \geq \mu_Q(f)$. The condition for equality is obvious. □

Remark 4.55. (1) It is clear that $Q : f \mapsto (f, \frac{\partial f}{\partial x_1}, ..., \frac{\partial f}{\partial x_n})$, the Tjurina ideal map, satisfies all conditions. And $<$ holds when $f \notin (\frac{\partial f}{\partial x_1}, ..., \frac{\partial f}{\partial x_n})$.
(2) The "finitely generated" condition is necessary. Let $K = \mathbb{C}$, $f = x^2 + xy^3 + y^4 \in \mathbb{C}[[x, y]]$, and $w = (\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{4})$, then $f_w = x^2 + y^3$. Consider quasi-T-maps maps Q_1 and Q_2 defined below.

$$\begin{aligned} Q_1 &: \sum_{i,j} a_{ij}x^iy^j \mapsto (\sum_{i,j\geq 5} a_{ij}x^iy^j) + a_{13}(xy^3 - x^2) + a_{20}x^2, \\ Q_2 &: \sum_{i,j} a_{ij}x^iy^j \mapsto (\sum_{i,j\geq 5} a_{ij}x^iy^j) + a_{04}y^4, \\ Q &:= (Q_1, Q_2). \end{aligned}$$

Then $Q(f_w) = (x^2, y^4)$ and $Q(f) = (xy^3, y^3)$, and $K[[x, y, t]]/Q(\hat{f})K[[x, y, t]]$ is not finitely generated. We have $\mu(f_w) = 3 < \mu(f) = \infty$.
(3) We will soon later see the k-th Jacobian ideal map, $J_k : g \mapsto \mathfrak{m}^k \cdot (\frac{\partial g}{\partial x_1}, ..., \frac{\partial g}{\partial x_n})$, satisfies all conditions.

The following two lemmas may be well-known for experts. However, we did not find suitable references. Hence, we give complete proofs below.

Lemma 4.56. *Let $I \subseteq K[[\boldsymbol{x},t]]$ be an ideal of $K[[\boldsymbol{x},t]]$ such that $K[[\boldsymbol{x},t]]/I$ is a finitely generated $K[[t]]$-module. $L := K((t))$ is the field of Laurent series over K, then $K[[\boldsymbol{x},t]]/I \otimes_{K[[t]]} L \simeq L[[\boldsymbol{x}]]/IL[[\boldsymbol{x}]]$ as L-algebras.*

Proof. Let $A = K[[\boldsymbol{x},t]]$, then $A/I \otimes_{K[[t]]} L = A_t/IA_t$ is the localization of A/I. We claim $\mathfrak{m}^r \subseteq IA_t$ for some $r > 0$. If not, there exists an x_i such that $x_i^k \notin IA_t$ for all k. Since A/I is a finitely generated $K[[t]]$-module, A_t/IA_t is a finite L-linear space. Hence $x_i, x_i^2, ..., x_i^p$ is linearly dependent for some p, which implies $x_i^p \in IA_t$. Contradictory!

Hence $A_t/IA_t = A_t/(IA_t + \mathfrak{m}^rA_t) \simeq B/I'B$, where $B = A_t/\mathfrak{m}^rA_t = L[[\boldsymbol{x}]]/\mathfrak{m}^rL[[\boldsymbol{x}]] = L[\boldsymbol{x}]/((\boldsymbol{x})L[[\boldsymbol{x}]])^r$ and I' is the image of I in B. The same argument holds for $L[[\boldsymbol{x}]]/IL[[\boldsymbol{x}]]$, for we only need to notice $\mathfrak{m}^r \subseteq IL[[\boldsymbol{x}]]$. □

Lemma 4.57. *Let $I = (f_1, ..., f_m) \subseteq K[[\boldsymbol{x}]]$ be an ideal. $L := K((t))$ is the field of Laurent series over K. Then $\dim_L L[[\boldsymbol{x}]]/IL[[\boldsymbol{x}]] < \infty$ if and only if $\dim_K K[[\boldsymbol{x}]]/I < \infty$. Moreover, if the finiteness holds, then those dimensions coincide.*

Proof. Suppose $K[[\boldsymbol{x}]]/I$ is finite dimensional, then $\mathfrak{m}^r \subseteq I$ for some r. Since $IL[[\boldsymbol{x}]] \supseteq \mathfrak{m}^rL[[\boldsymbol{x}]]$, $\dim_L L[[\boldsymbol{x}]]/IL[[\boldsymbol{x}]]$ is finite. Conversely, suppose $L[[\boldsymbol{x}]]/IL[[\boldsymbol{x}]]$ is finite dimensional, then $\mathfrak{m}^r \subseteq IL[[\boldsymbol{x}]]$ for some r. Hence $\boldsymbol{x}^{\boldsymbol{\alpha}} = \sum_j f_jg_j, g_j \in L[[\boldsymbol{x}]]$, for all $\boldsymbol{\alpha} \in \mathbb{N}^n, |\boldsymbol{\alpha}| = r$. Consider the degree-zero part of all g_j w.r.t. t, we have $\boldsymbol{x}^{\boldsymbol{\alpha}} \in I$ for all i. Therefore, $I \supseteq \mathfrak{m}^r$.

If both finiteness holds, it suffices to show a finite set of monomials $\{\boldsymbol{x}^{\boldsymbol{\alpha}_i}\}_{i\in I}$ is linearly dependent in $K[[\boldsymbol{x}]]/I$ if and only if in $L[[\boldsymbol{x}]]/IL[[\boldsymbol{x}]]$. The "only if" is trivial. As for "if", suppose $\sum h_i \boldsymbol{x}^{\boldsymbol{\alpha}_i} = \sum_j f_j l_j$ $(+)$, $h_i \in L$ and $l_j \in L[[\boldsymbol{x}]]$. We may assume the degree-zero part of h_1 w.r.t. t is not 0. By considering the degree-zero part of $(+)$ w.r.t. t, we are done. ☐

Let $J_k(f) := \mathfrak{m}^k J(f)$ be the k-th Jacobian ideal. The dimension of its quotient algebra is called the k-th Milnor number $\mu_k(f) := \dim_K K[[\boldsymbol{x}]]/J_k(f)$. One can prove $Q = J_k$ is efficient w.r.t. any weight $w \in \mathbb{N}^n_{>0}$. Two see this, it suffices to check $g \mapsto \boldsymbol{x}^{\boldsymbol{\alpha}} \cdot \frac{\partial g}{\partial x_i}$ is efficient for all i and $|\boldsymbol{\alpha}| = k$. It is not hard to check $\varphi_w(\boldsymbol{x}^{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}) \cdot \frac{\partial \varphi_w(\boldsymbol{x}^{\boldsymbol{\beta}})}{\partial x_i} = t^{w^i} \cdot \varphi_w(\boldsymbol{x}^{\boldsymbol{\alpha}} \cdot \frac{\partial \boldsymbol{x}^{\boldsymbol{\beta}}}{\partial x_i})$ for all $\beta \in \mathbb{N}^n_{>0}$.

Suppose $w \in \mathbb{N}^n_{>0}$ is a weight. In [BGM11], the authors proved when $Q = J = J_0$ and $\mu(f_w) < \infty$, that $K[[\boldsymbol{x}]]/Q(\hat{f})$ is a free $K[[t]]$-module of rank $\mu(f_w)$ and hence torsion free and finitely generated. We will base on this fact and prove $\mu_k(f) = \mu_k(f_w)$, whenever $k \leq \min_i\{\operatorname{ord}(\frac{\partial f}{\partial x_i})\}$ and $\mu(f_w) < \infty$.

Lemma 4.58. *Suppose $I = (g_1, g_2, ..., g_m) \subseteq K[[\boldsymbol{x}, t]]$ is an ideal such that $K[[\boldsymbol{x}, t]]/I$ is a finitely generated $K[[t]]$-module. Then $K[[\boldsymbol{x}, t]]/\mathfrak{m}I$ is also finitely generated.*

Proof. We may emphasize $\mathfrak{m}$ is the maximal ideal of $K[[\boldsymbol{x}]]$. Let $e_1, e_2, ..., e_r \in K[[\boldsymbol{x}, t]]$ whose image in the quotient ring $K[[\boldsymbol{x}, t]]/I$ is a set of generators. Since $\sum g_i \cdot K[[\boldsymbol{x}, t]] + \mathfrak{m}I = I$, we have $e_1, e_2, ..., e_r$ together with $g_1, g_2, ..., g_m$ generates $K[[\boldsymbol{x}, t]]/\mathfrak{m}I$. ☐

As a corollary, $K[[\boldsymbol{x}, t]]/\mathfrak{m}^k J(\hat{f})$ is finitely generated as a $K[[t]]$-module if $\mu(f_w) < \infty$. We have so far proved the "finitely generated" condition in **Proposition 4.54**. Hence we have a simple corollary as below.

Corollary 4.59. *Suppose f is SQH w.r.t. $Q = J_k$ and $w \in \mathbb{N}^n_{>0}$ is a weight such that $\mu_k(f_w) < \infty$ (equivalently, $\mu(f_w) < \infty$), then $\mu_k(f) \leq \mu_k(f_w)$.*

Remark 4.60. The same argument also holds for $Q = T_k$ (i.e. $Q(f) = (f) + \mathfrak{m}^k J(f)$ for all $f \in K[[\boldsymbol{x}]]$), since $T_k(\hat{f}) \supseteq J_k(\hat{f})$. Thus we have $\tau_k(f) \leq \tau_k(f_w)$ for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$ if $\tau(f_w) < \infty$, where τ_k is the k-th Tjurina number. But the equality does not generally hold.

Next, we are going to show that the equality holds for μ_k when $k \leq \min_i\{\operatorname{ord}(\frac{\partial f}{\partial x_i})\}$. By **Proposition 4.54**, it is equivalent that $K[[\boldsymbol{x}, t]]/Q(\hat{f})K[[\boldsymbol{x}, t]]$ is torsion-free. Before giving a proof, we need to do some preparation for regular sequence.

Let A be a ring. We define $A\langle\langle t\rangle\rangle := \prod_{i\in\mathbb{Z}} A$ whose elements are written as $\sum_{i\in\mathbb{Z}} a_i t^i, a_i \in A$. It is an $A[t]$-module but not an $A[[t]]$-module. For $A = K[[\boldsymbol{x}]]$ and $L := K((t))$, $L[[\boldsymbol{x}]]$ is contained in $A\langle\langle t\rangle\rangle$ in set-theoretical sense. The following lemma tells us how elements of $L[[\boldsymbol{x}]]$ are like in $K[[\boldsymbol{x}]]\langle\langle t\rangle\rangle$.

Lemma 4.61.

$$L[[\boldsymbol{x}]] = \{\sum_{i\in\mathbb{Z}} a_i(\boldsymbol{x})t^i \mid a_i \in K[[\boldsymbol{x}]] \ s.t. \ a_i \to 0, i \to -\infty\} \subseteq K[[\boldsymbol{x}]]\langle\langle t\rangle\rangle$$

Here the convergence is in $\mathfrak{m}$-adic topological sense.

Proof. Simply by swapping the order of summation. ☐

Lemma 4.62. *Suppose $(f_1, f_2, ..., f_r)$ is a regular sequence in $K[[\boldsymbol{x}]]$, then it is also regular in $L[[\boldsymbol{x}]]$ where $L = K((t))$.*

Proof. Without a loss of generality, it suffices to prove f_r is a non-zero divisor in the quotient ring $K[[\boldsymbol{x}]]/(f_1, f_2, ..., f_{r-1})L[[\boldsymbol{x}]]$. Suppose $af_r \in (f_1, f_2, ..., f_{r-1})L[[\boldsymbol{x}]]$, $a = \sum a_i(\boldsymbol{x})t^i \in L[[x]] \subset K[[\boldsymbol{x}]]\langle\langle t\rangle\rangle$. Considering the grading w.r.t. t, we have $a_i \in I := (f_1, f_2, ..., f_{r-1}) \subseteq$

$K[[\boldsymbol{x}]]$. Therefore $a_i = \sum_{j=1}^{r-1} a_i^j f_j, a_i^j \in K[[\boldsymbol{x}]]$. We need to select suitable a_i^j such that $a_i^j \to 0, i \to -\infty$. Suppose $a_i \in \mathfrak{m}^{n_i}, n_i \to \infty$ when $i \to -\infty$. By Artin-Rees theorem (**Theorem 2.5**), there exists an $N > 0$ such that for all $n \geq N$ and $k \geq 0$, $\mathfrak{m}^{k+n} \cap I = \mathfrak{m}^k(\mathfrak{m}^n \cap I)$. We may assume $n_i > N$ for all $i \leq 0$, then we can select $a_i^j \in \mathfrak{m}^{n_i - N}$, hence tending to 0. □

Theorem 4.63. *Suppose $f \in K[[\boldsymbol{x}]]$ is SQH w.r.t. $Q = J_k$ and $w \in \mathbb{N}^n_{>0}$ i.e. $\mu(f_w) < \infty$. Then for $k \leq \min_i\{\mathrm{ord}(\frac{\partial f}{\partial x_i})\}$, $\mu_k(f_w) = \mu_k(f)$.*

Proof. By **Lemma 4.58** and **Proposition 4.54**, it suffices to prove $K[[\boldsymbol{x}, t]]/J_k(\hat{f})$ is torsion free. We prove it by induction. The case for $k = 0$ is proved in [BGM11]. Suppose $K[[\boldsymbol{x}, t]]/J_k(\hat{f})$ is torsion-free.

Notations are as in **Proposition 4.54**. Since $\mu(f) < \infty$, by **theorem 2.8**, $(\frac{\partial f}{\partial x_1}, \frac{\partial f}{\partial x_2}, ..., \frac{\partial f}{\partial x_n})$ is a regular sequence in $K[[\boldsymbol{x}]]$. By **Lemma 4.62**, $(\frac{\partial f}{\partial x_1}, \frac{\partial f}{\partial x_2}, ..., \frac{\partial f}{\partial x_n})$ is also regular in $L[[\boldsymbol{x}]]$. $\varphi : L[[\boldsymbol{x}]] \to L[[\boldsymbol{x}]]$, with $x_i \mapsto t^{w^i} x_i, t \mapsto t$, is an automorphism of $L[[\boldsymbol{x}]]$. Since $\frac{\partial \hat{f}}{\partial x_i} = t^{-w^i} \varphi(\frac{\partial f}{\partial x_i})$, $(\frac{\partial \hat{f}}{\partial x_1}, ..., \frac{\partial \hat{f}}{\partial x_n})$ is also a regular sequence.

Suppose $t \cdot a(\boldsymbol{x}) \in J_{k+1}(\hat{f}) \subseteq J_k(\hat{f})$. On one hand, by the induction hypothesis $a(\boldsymbol{x}) \in J_k$. We may assume $a(\boldsymbol{x}) = \sum_i \sum_{|\boldsymbol{\alpha}|=k} a_{i\boldsymbol{\alpha}} \boldsymbol{x}^{\boldsymbol{\alpha}} \frac{\partial \hat{f}}{\partial x_i}, a_{i\boldsymbol{\alpha}} \in K[[t]]$. On the other hand, since $ta(\boldsymbol{x}) \in J_{k+1}(\hat{f}) = \mathfrak{m}^{k+1} \cdot (\frac{\partial \hat{f}}{\partial x_1}, ..., \frac{\partial \hat{f}}{\partial x_n})$, one can write $ta(\boldsymbol{x}) = \sum_i b_i \frac{\partial \hat{f}}{\partial x_i}$, where $b_i \in L[[\boldsymbol{x}]]$ and $\mathrm{ord}(b_i) \geq k+1$. Let $c_i := \sum_{|\boldsymbol{\alpha}|=k} a_{i\boldsymbol{\alpha}} \boldsymbol{x}^{\boldsymbol{\alpha}} - b_i$, then $\sum_i c_i \frac{\partial \hat{f}}{\partial x_i} = 0 \in L[[\boldsymbol{x}]]$.

Since $(\frac{\partial \hat{f}}{\partial x_1}, \frac{\partial \hat{f}}{\partial x_2}, ..., \frac{\partial \hat{f}}{\partial x_n})$ is regular in $L[[\boldsymbol{x}]]$, we have $c_n \in (\frac{\partial \hat{f}}{\partial x_1}, \frac{\partial \hat{f}}{\partial x_2}, ..., \frac{\partial \hat{f}}{\partial x_{n-1}})$. However, $k < \min_i\{\mathrm{ord}(\frac{\partial f}{\partial x_i})\}$ implies $\sum_{|\boldsymbol{\alpha}|=k} a_{n\boldsymbol{\alpha}} \boldsymbol{x}^{\boldsymbol{\alpha}} = 0$. By **Proposition 2.7**, regularity is independent of permutation, thus we have $a = 0$. So we are done. □

However, it seems that $\mu_k(f_w) = \mu_k(f)$ as well when $k > \min_i\{\mathrm{ord}(\frac{\partial f}{\partial x_i})\}$. Here are some examples.

Example 4.64. The following are computed by SINGULAR.

(1) $f = x^3 + y^3 + z^3 + \lambda x^2 y^2 z^2, \lambda \in \mathbb{C}, w = (1, 1, 1)$.

$\mu_k \setminus k$	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
$x^3 + y^3 + z^3 + \lambda x^2 y^2 z^2$	8	11	20	35	56	84	120	165	220	286	364
$x^3 + y^3 + z^3$	8	11	20	35	56	84	120	165	220	286	364

(2) $f = x^3 + y^4 + z^5 + \lambda x^3 y^4 z^5, \lambda \in \mathbb{C}, w = (20, 15, 12)$.

$\mu_k \setminus k$	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
$x^3 + y^4 + z^5 + \lambda x^3 y^4 z^5$	24	27	36	52	75	105	143	190	247	315	395
$x^3 + y^4 + z^5$	24	27	36	52	75	105	143	190	247	315	395

(3) $f = x^2 y + y^2 z + z^2 x + \lambda(x^4 + y^4 + z^4), \lambda \in \mathbb{C}, w = (1, 1, 1)$.

$\mu_k \setminus k$	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
$x^2 y + y^2 z + z^2 x + \lambda(x^4 + y^4 + z^4)$	8	14	24	39	60	88	124	169	224	290	368
$x^2 y + y^2 z + z^2 x$	8	14	24	39	60	88	124	169	224	290	368

Hence we make a conjecture.

Conjecture 4.65. *Suppose $f \in K[[\boldsymbol{x}]]$ is SQH w.r.t. $Q = J_k$ and $w \in \mathbb{N}^n_{>0}$. Equivalently, $\mu(f_w) < \infty$. Then for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$, $\mu_k(f_w) = \mu_k(f)$.*

4.5. **T-fullness and T-dependence: a New Definition.** In this and the next subsections, we will determine whether an ideal of a local Noetherian algebra over an infinite field is a T-principal ideal. We further assume A is a local ring and $\mathfrak{m}$ is its maximal ideal. Remember that Q is a fixed T-map and we omit the notion of "w.r.t. Q" when stating properties about T-maps.

Definition 4.66. An ideal I of A is called T-full if and only $Q(\Delta(I)) = I$.

With this definition, the following proposition is straightforward:

Proposition 4.67. *Suppose $I \triangleleft A$ is a T-principal ideal, then I is T-full.*

However, as a typical example, a T-full ideal of $(R, A, Q) = (\mathbb{C}, \mathbb{C}\{\boldsymbol{x}\}, T_0)$ is not necessarily a Tjurina ideal, thus we need an additional condition. On some scale, T-full implies surjectivity, showing an ideal is possibly generated by the image Q. The following condition essentially tests whether it can be generated by one element.

Definition 4.68. Suppose $J = (g_1, g_2, ..., g_r) \triangleleft A$ is an ideal and consider the graded ring $S = A[y_1, y_2, ..., y_r]$. Let $\sigma = \sum g_i y_i$ and $\mathcal{Q}(\sigma) := (Q_1(\sigma), Q_2(\sigma), ..., Q_m(\sigma))$, where each Q_i acts on the coefficient ring A and acts as identity on $y_1, y_2, ..., y_r$. We call J T-dependent if $(\mathcal{Q}(\sigma) : Q(J)S) \not\subset \mathfrak{m}S$. Equivalently, there is a $P \in \mathbb{P}_A^{r-1}$ such that $\mathfrak{m}S \subseteq P$ and $(Q(J)S)_{(P)} = (\mathcal{Q}(\sigma))_{(P)}$.

Clearly, there is some trouble with "well-defined": whether the condition is independent of the choice of $g_1, g_2, ..., g_r$.

Proposition 4.69. *The definition of T-dependence is independent of the choice of generators of J.*

Before proving the proposition, we shall translate the definition into the language of algebraic geometry. Basic notations are followed from [Har77]. First, identify $\mathcal{Q}(\sigma)$ with its homogeneous sheafification, an ideal sheaf of $\mathbb{P}_A^{r-1}$. Second, let $\pi : \mathbb{P}_A^{r-1} \to \mathrm{Spec}A$ be the canonical projection, then $\pi^*(Q(J))$ is equal to $(IS)^\sim$, another ideal sheaf. It is clear that $\mathcal{Q}(\sigma) \hookrightarrow \pi^*(Q(J))$. Set $\mathcal{F} = \pi^*(Q(J))/\mathcal{Q}(\sigma)$, which is a coherent $\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}_A^{r-1}}$-module and thus $\mathrm{Supp}\mathcal{F}$ is a closed subset of $\mathbb{P}_A^{r-1}$. Since $(J : I)^\sim = (J^\sim : I^\sim)$ for finitely generated graded ideals I, J, we have $P \notin \mathrm{Supp}\mathcal{F}$ if and only if $(Q(J)S)_{(P)} = (\mathcal{Q}(\sigma))_{(P)}$. Therefore, $(\mathcal{Q}(\sigma) : Q(J)S) \not\subset \mathfrak{m}S$ in **Definition 4.68** can be restated as $\mathfrak{m}S \notin \mathrm{Supp}\mathcal{F}$. Since $\mathfrak{m}S$ is the minimal element of $\pi^{-1}(\mathfrak{m})$ under the order "containing", it is also equivalent to say $\pi^{-1}(\mathfrak{m}) \not\subset \mathrm{Supp}\mathcal{F}$. The following proof is basically applying ([OR23], *Lemma 3.8*) to our notations.

Proof. Suppose $h_1, h_2, ..., h_l$ is another set of generators of J. Define σ', S', π' and $\mathcal{F}'$ for it correspondingly, where $z_1, z_2, ..., z_l$ are variables of S'. We may assume $J \neq 0$. It suffices to show $\pi^{-1}(\mathfrak{m}) \not\subset \mathrm{Supp}\mathcal{F}$ implies $\pi'^{-1}(\mathfrak{m}) \not\subset \mathrm{Supp}\mathcal{F}'$.

By definition, $g_i = \sum_j r_{ij} h_j$, for some $r_{ij} \in A$. Suppose all $r_{ij} \in \mathfrak{m}$, then $J \subset \mathfrak{m}J$. By Nakayama's lemma, $J = 0$, contradictory. Therefore, at least one $r_{ij} \notin \mathfrak{m}$. We construct $\Phi : S' \to S$ by $z_j \mapsto \sum_i r_{ij} y_i$. It is a homomorphism of graded A-algebras and hence induces $\varphi : U \to \mathbb{P}_A^{l-1}$ for Spec$A$-schemes by ([Har77], **Chapter II**, Ex 2.14), where U is the open subscheme given by $U = \{\mathfrak{p} \in \mathrm{Proj}S \mid \mathfrak{p} \not\supset \Phi(S'_+)\}$. One can find that $\pi^{-1}(\mathfrak{m}) \cap U \neq \varnothing$, since there is an $r_{ij} \notin \mathfrak{m}$ and then $\mathfrak{m}S \not\supset \Phi(S'_+)$. Consider the following commutative diagram:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} U & \xrightarrow{\quad\varphi\quad} & \mathbb{P}_A^{l-1} \\ & \underset{\pi}{\searrow} \quad \underset{\pi'}{\swarrow} & \\ & \mathrm{Spec}A & \end{array}.$$

By the construction of φ, we have $\sigma|_U = \varphi^*\sigma'$ since $\Phi(\sigma') = \sigma$. Then $\pi^*(Q(J)) = \varphi^*\pi'^*(Q(J))$ and $\mathcal{Q}(\sigma)|_U = \varphi^*(\mathcal{Q}(\sigma'))$. Therefore $\mathcal{F}|_U = \varphi^*\mathcal{F}'$.

As above, $\mathfrak{m}S \in U \setminus \mathrm{Supp}\mathcal{F} = \varphi^{-1}(\mathbb{P}_A^{l-1} \setminus \mathrm{Supp}\mathcal{F}')$. And hence we have $\varphi(\mathfrak{m}S) \notin \mathrm{Supp}\mathcal{F}'$. Observing that $\mathfrak{m}S' \subseteq \Phi^{-1}(\mathfrak{m}S)$, we have $\varphi(\mathfrak{m}S) \in \pi'^{-1}(\mathfrak{m})$. □

In the rest of the article, we only consider the case R is an infinite field, even though the definition of T-full and T-dependence is valid for local Noetherian algebras over arbitrary rings.

4.6. **Determination of a T-principal Ideal and Construction of a Generator.** In this subsection, we are going to generalize the main theorem of [OR23] up to the level of commutative algebra. From now on, F is an *infinite field* and A is an *Noetherian local* F-algebra with maximal ideal $\mathfrak{m}$. Let Q be a fixed T-map of A.

Definition 4.70. For $\lambda \in \mathbb{P}_F^{r-1}$, define p_λ as the prime ideal $(\{\lambda_i y_j - \lambda_j y_i \mid 1 \le i, j \le r\}) \lhd F[y_1, y_2, ..., y_r]$. Note that the definition is reasonable, say it does not depend on the choice of representative element of λ. Here and below $\mathbb{P}_F^{r-1}$ is always in set-theoretical sense, while $\mathbb{P}_A^{r-1}$ is in scheme-theoretical sense.

Lemma 4.71. *For $F[y_1, y_2, ..., y_r]$, p_λ as above, then $f \in p_\lambda$ if and only if $f(\lambda) = 0$. (This lemma also suits for F finite.)*

Proof. The necessity is trivial, we only prove the sufficiency. Since p_λ is a homogeneous ideal, then it suffices to prove the following result:

For $\lambda \in F^r$, $\mathfrak{m}_\lambda := (z_1 - \lambda_1, ..., z_r - \lambda_r) \lhd F[z_1, ..., z_r]$, then a polynomial $f \in \mathfrak{m}_\lambda$ if and only if $f(\lambda) = 0$.

If $r = 1$, it is trivial. Suppose it holds for $r - 1$. Since $f(z_1, ..., z_r) - f(\lambda_1, z_2, ..., z_r)$ is a multiple of $z_1 - \lambda_1$ and $f(\lambda_1, z_2, ..., z_r) \in (z_2 - \lambda_2, ..., z_r - \lambda_r)$ by induction hypothesis, we are done. □

Lemma 4.72. *For $R = F[y_1, y_2, ..., y_r]$, p_λ as above, we have $\bigcap_{\lambda \in \mathbb{P}_F^{r-1}} p_\lambda = 0$.*

Proof. First notice $I = \bigcap_{\lambda \in \mathbb{P}_F^{r-1}} p_\lambda$ is a homogeneous ideal, so we only need to consider the homogeneous polynomials. Suppose $f \in I$ is a homogeneous polynomial. By **Lemma 4.71** $f \in p_\lambda$ implies $f(\lambda_1, \lambda_2, ..., \lambda_r) = 0$. Since λ runs through the whole $\mathbb{P}_F^{r-1}$, f must be 0. □

Lemma 4.73. *Suppose $A/\mathfrak{m} \simeq F$. For ideal $I \lhd A$, if $IS \not\subset \mathfrak{m}S$, then $I \not\subset p_\lambda S + \mathfrak{m}S$, for some $\lambda \in \mathbb{P}_F^{r-1}$*

Proof. Let $\pi : A[y_1, y_2, ..., y_r] \twoheadrightarrow F[y_1, y_2, ..., y_r]$ be the projection of coefficients. Suppose $I \subset p_\lambda S + \mathfrak{m}S$ for all $\lambda \in \mathbb{P}_F^{r-1}$, then $I \subset \bigcap_{\lambda \in \mathbb{P}_F^{r-1}} (\mathfrak{m}S + p_\lambda S) := J$. Since J contains the kernel of π i.e. $\mathfrak{m}S$, $J = \pi^{-1}(\pi(J))$. However, $\pi(J) = \bigcap \pi(\mathfrak{m}S + p_\lambda S) = \bigcap p_\lambda = 0$ by **Lemma 4.72**, a contradiction. □

Remark 4.74. The assumption that F is infinite is necessary. For if F is finite, then $\bigcap p_\lambda$ is a finite intersection of finitely generated ideals. We may take the product of all the generators throughout all the components, then it is in the intersection.

Lemma 4.75. *Let B be a local ring and $\mathfrak{n}$ be its maximal ideal. For ideals $I, J \lhd B$, P be a prime ideal of $C = B[y_1, y_2, ..., y_r]$ containing $\mathfrak{n}C$. If $IC_{(P)} = JC_{(P)}$, then $I = J$.*

Proof. Symmetrically, it suffices to show $I \subseteq J$. For any $h \in I$, $h = g\frac{G_1}{G_2}$, for some $g \in J$ and some homogeneous polynomials G_1, G_2 with the same degree and $G_2 \notin P$. Then there exists a $G_3 \in C \setminus P$ homogeneous such that $G_3(hG_2 - gG_1) = 0$ $(*)$. Noting that G_2 and G_3 both have some coefficients in $B \setminus \mathfrak{n}$, and hence there is a term in G_2G_3 whose coefficient is in B^*. Considering the coefficient of this term in $(*)$, we have $h \in (g)$. Therefore, $I \subseteq J$. □

Theorem 4.76. *Suppose $A/\mathfrak{m} \simeq F$. For an ideal $I \lhd A$, it is a T-principal ideal if and only if I is T-full and $\Delta(I)$ is T-dependent.*

Proof. Notations are as in **Definition 4.68**. We first prove the necessity.

Suppose $I = Q(f)$ is a T-principal ideal. As in **Proposition 4.67**, I is automatically T-full. Suppose $\Delta(I) = (g_1, g_2, ..., g_r)$ and without a loss of generality, we set $g_1 = f$. Hence $f = g_1 + 0 \cdot g_2 + ... + 0 \cdot g_r$. So we may assume $f = \sum \lambda_i g_i$, where $(\lambda_1, ..., \lambda_r) \in F^r \setminus \{0\}$. Consider $P = \mathfrak{m}S + p_\lambda S$ and assume $P \in D_+(y_l)$, then $\lambda_l \neq 0$. We have an estimation below:

$$\begin{aligned} IS_{(P)} = Q(f)S_{(P)} &\subseteq Q(\sum_i (\frac{\lambda_i}{\lambda_l} - \frac{y_i}{y_l})g_i)S_{(P)} + Q(\sigma/y_l)S_{(P)} \\ &\subseteq IP_{(P)} + (\mathcal{Q}(\sigma))_{(P)} \subseteq IS_{(P)}. \end{aligned}$$

By Nakayama's lemma, and consider the $S_{(P)}$-module $IS_{(P)}$ and its submodule $(\mathcal{Q}(\sigma))_{(P)}$, we have $(IS)_{(P)} = (\mathcal{Q}(\sigma))_{(P)}$.

Next, we prove the sufficiency.

Suppose I is T-full and $\Delta(I)$ is T-dependent, then $(\mathcal{Q}(\sigma) : IS) \not\subset \mathfrak{m}S$. By **Lemma 4.73**, it is even not contained in some $P = \mathfrak{m}S + p_\lambda S \in \mathbb{P}^{r-1}_A$, say $(\mathcal{Q}(\sigma))_{(P)} = (IS)_{(P)}$. We may assume $P \in D_+(y_l)$ and hence $\lambda_l \neq 0$. We have an estimation below:

$$\begin{aligned} IS_{(P)} = (\mathcal{Q}(\sigma))_{(P)} = Q(\sigma/y_l)S_{(P)} &\subseteq Q(\sum_i (\frac{\lambda_i}{\lambda_l} - \frac{y_i}{y_l})g_i)S_{(P)} + Q(\sum_i (\frac{\lambda_i}{\lambda_l} g_i))S_{(P)} \\ &\subseteq IP_{(P)} + Q(\sum_i \lambda_i g_i)S_{(P)} \subseteq IS_{(P)}. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, $IP_{(P)} + Q(\sum_i \lambda_i g_i)S_{(P)} = IS_{(P)}$. By Nakayama's lemma, considering $S_{(P)}$-modules $IS_{(P)}$ and $Q(\sum_i \lambda_i g_i)S_{(P)}$, we have $Q(\sum_i \lambda_i g_i)S_{(P)} = IS_{(P)}$. By **Lemma 4.75**, we have $I = Q(\sum_i \lambda_i g_i)$. ☐

Remark 4.77. Essentially, the proof shows that $I = Q(\sum_i \lambda_i g_i)$ if and only if $(\mathcal{Q}(\sigma) : IS) \not\subset \mathfrak{m}S + p_\lambda S$. And the sufficiency part shows that if $\Delta(I)$ is T-dependent and I is T-full, then such p_λ exists.

Remark 4.78. The theorem can be applied to all of the examples in **Example 4.5**

Although the theorem provides a criterion for local Noetherian F-algebra with infinite residue field F, the behaviour when F is finite is note quite clear. We make a conjecture below:

Conjecture 4.79. *Let F be an arbitrary field and A be a local Noetherian F-algebra with maximal ideal $\mathfrak{m}$. Q is a fixed T-map. Suppose $A/\mathfrak{m} \simeq F$, then for an ideal $I \lhd A$, I is T-principal if and only if I is T-full and $\Delta(I)$ is T-dependent.*

In [OR23], Rodrigues proved the following result:

Corollary 4.80. *(*[OR23] *Corollary 3.13) Suppose $0 \neq I \lhd \mathbb{C}\{\boldsymbol{x}\}$ is a Tjurina ideal and $\Delta(I) = (g_1, g_2, ..., g_r)$. Then $I = T(\sum_k \lambda_k g_k)$ for $[\lambda_1, ..., \lambda_r]$ in a non-empty open set of $\mathbb{P}^{r-1}_{\mathbb{C}}$.*

But in fact, such an open set can be described in detail as in the following lemma.

Lemma 4.81. *Notations are as in **Theorem 4.76**. Suppose $0 \neq I = Q(f) \lhd A$ is a T-principal ideal. Let $J = (\mathcal{Q}(\sigma) : IS)$, where $\Delta(I) = (g_1, g_2, ..., g_r)$, $S = A[y_1, y_2, ..., y_r]$ and $\sigma = \sum g_i y_i$. $\pi : A[y_1, y_2, ..., y_r] \twoheadrightarrow F[y_1, y_2, ..., y_r]$ is the projection of coefficients. Then the set $U = \{\lambda \in \mathbb{P}^{r-1}_F \mid I = Q(\sum_k \lambda_k g_k)\}$ coincides with the open set $Z(\pi(J))^c$, where $Z(\pi(J))$ refers to the common zero locus of polynomials in $\pi(J)$.*

Proof. By repeating the proof of **Theorem 4.76**, we have $U = \{\lambda \mid J \not\subset \mathfrak{m}S + p_\lambda S\} = \{\lambda \mid \pi(J) \not\subset p_\lambda\}$. By **Lemma 4.71**, $U = \{\lambda \mid \lambda \notin Z(\pi(J))\} = Z(\pi(J))^c$. □

The above lemma also provides an algorithm to compute a generator for a T-principal ideal I. When $Q = T_k$ or T^k, we can compute the ideal of antiderivatives explicitly. We write the algorithm as following.

Algorithm 4.82. *Notations are as in* ***Lemma 4.81****. By the following steps, one can check an ideal is T-principal with respect to Q and obtain a generator if the ideal is T-principal.*
Step 1: *Compute a set of generators $g_1, g_2, ..., g_r$ of $\Delta(I)$.*
Step 2: *Check if $T(\Delta(I)) = I$.*
Step 3: *If $T(\Delta(I)) \neq I$, return false; Otherwise, compute the colon ideal $J = (\mathcal{Q}(\sigma) : IS)$.*
Step 4: *If $J \subseteq \mathfrak{m}S$, return false; Otherwise, find a $\lambda \in F^r$ such that $\lambda \in Z(\pi(J))^c$, then $\sum_i \lambda_i g_i$ is a generator.*

5. Appendix: Codes

Code 5.1. Computing $\Delta(I)$, ρ_k and σ_k. (SINGULAR)

```
LIB "hnoether.lib";
ring r = 0, (x,y),ds;
int k = 20;
poly f = x^4*y+x*y^5;
def J = jacob(f);
ideal m = x,y;
ideal Tt = f,m^k*J;
ideal Tk = std(Tt);
int u = size(Tk);
matrix B[1][u] = Tk;
matrix C1[k+1][u];
matrix C2[k+1][u];
matrix temp[1][u];
int i;
int j;
for( i = 1 ; i <= u ; i ++){
        temp = jacob(B[1,i]);
        for( j = 0 ; j <= k ; j ++){
                C1[j+1,i] = x^j*y^(k-j)*temp[1,1];
                C2[j+1,i] = x^j*y^(k-j)*temp[1,2];
        }
}
matrix ttp[1][u];
def res = modulo(ttp,ttp);
for(j = 1 ; j <= k+1 ; j ++){
        for(i = 1 ; i <= u ; i ++){
                ttp[1,i] = C1[j,i];
        }
        def rec = modulo(ttp,B);
```

```
        def recc = intersect(res,rec);
        res = recc;
}

for(j = 1 ; j <= k+1 ; j ++){
        for(i = 1 ; i <= u ; i ++){
                ttp[1,i] = C2[j,i];
        }
        def rec = modulo(ttp,B);
        def recc = intersect(res,rec);
        res = recc;
}
matrix Res = res;
int uu = size(res);
matrix D[1][uu];
for(i = 1 ; i <= uu ; i ++){
        for(j = 1 ; j <= u ; j ++){
                D[1,i] = D[1,i]+Res[j,i]*B[1,j];
        }
}
ideal Delta = std(D);
ideal I = std(Tk^2);
ideal D1 = groebner(Delta);
int sigma = vdim(I)-vdim(D1);
sigma;
int rho = -vdim(Tk)+vdim(D1);
rho;
```

References

[Ad75] V. I. Arnol' d. Critical points of smooth functions, and their normal forms. *Uspehi Mat. Nauk*, 30(5(185)):3–65, 1975.

[AM69] M. F. Atiyah and I. G. Macdonald. *Introduction to commutative algebra*. Addison-Wesley Publishing Co., Reading, Mass.-London-Don Mills, Ont., 1969.

[AMJNnB21] Josep Àlvarez Montaner, Jack Jeffries, and Luis Núñez Betancourt. Bernstein-Sato polynomials in commutative algebra. In *Commutative algebra*, pages 1–76. Springer, Cham, [2021] ©2021.

[BGM11] Yousra Boubakri, Gert-Martin Greuel, and Thomas Markwig. Normal forms of hypersurface singularities in positive characteristic. *Mosc. Math. J.*, 11(4):657–683, 821, 2011.

[CHYZ20] Bingyi Chen, Naveed Hussain, Stephen S.-T. Yau, and Huaiqing Zuo. Variation of complex structures and variation of Lie algebras. II: New Lie algebras arising from singularities. *J. Differ. Geom.*, 115(3):437–473, 2020.

[DGI20] Alexandru Dimca, Rodrigo Gondim, and Giovanna Ilardi. Higher order Jacobians, Hessians and Milnor algebras. *Collect. Math.*, 71(3):407–425, 2020.

[Eis95] David Eisenbud. *Commutative algebra*, volume 150 of *Graduate Texts in Mathematics*. Springer-Verlag, New York, 1995. With a view toward algebraic geometry.

[ES22] Raul Epure and Mathias Schulze. Hypersurface singularities with monomial Jacobian ideal. *Bull. Lond. Math. Soc.*, 54(3):1067–1081, 2022.

[GLS07] G.-M. Greuel, C. Lossen, and E. Shustin. *Introduction to singularities and deformations*. Springer Monographs in Mathematics. Springer, Berlin, 2007.

[GLS23] G.-M. Greuel, C. Lossen, and E. Shustin. Corrections and additions to the book introduction to singularities and deformations. 2023.

[Har77] Robin Hartshorne. *Algebraic geometry*. Graduate Texts in Mathematics, No. 52. Springer-Verlag, New York-Heidelberg, 1977.

[HLYZ23] Naveed Hussain, Zhiwen Liu, Stephen S.-T. Yau, and Huaiqing Zuo. k-th Milnor numbers and k-th Tjurina numbers of weighted homogeneous singularities. *Geom. Dedicata*, 217(2):Paper No. 34, 2023.

[HMYZ23] Naveed Hussain, Guorui Ma, Stephen S.-T. Yau, and Huaiqing Zuo. Higher Nash blow-up local algebras of singularities and its derivation Lie algebras. *J. Algebra*, 618:165–194, 2023.

[HYZ21] Naveed Hussain, Stephen S.-T. Yau, and Huaiqing Zuo. Inequality conjectures on derivations of local k-th Hessain algebras associated to isolated hypersurface singularities. *Math. Z.*, 298(3-4):1813–1829, 2021.

[Igu00] Jun-ichi Igusa. *An introduction to the theory of local zeta functions*, volume 14 of *AMS/IP Studies in Advanced Mathematics*. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI; International Press, Cambridge, MA, 2000.

[Mat80] Hideyuki Matsumura. *Commutative algebra*, volume 56 of *Mathematics Lecture Note Series*. Benjamin/Cummings Publishing Co., Inc., Reading, Mass., second edition, 1980.

[MY82] John N. Mather and Stephen S. T. Yau. Classification of isolated hypersurface singularities by their moduli algebras. *Invent. Math.*, 69(2):243–251, 1982.

[MYZ23] Guorui Ma, Stephen S.-T. Yau, and Huaiqing Zuo. k-th singular locus moduli algebras of singularities and its derivation lie algebras. *J. Math. Phys.*, 64(3), 2023.

[OR23] João Hélder Olmedo Rodrigues. On Tjurina ideals of hypersurface singularities. *J. Commut. Algebra*, 15(2):261–274, 2023.

[OR24] João Hélder Olmedo Rodrigues. Reconstruction of a hypersurface singularity from its moduli algebra. *Res. Math. Sci.*, 11:12, 2024.

[Rot10] Joseph J. Rotman. *Advanced modern algebra*, volume 114 of *Graduate Studies in Mathematics*. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2010. Second edition.

[vS20] Duco van Straten. The spectrum of hypersurface singularities. `https://arxiv.org/abs/2003.00519`, 2020.

[Yau87] Stephen S.-T. Yau. A necessary and sufficient condition for a local commutative algebra to be a moduli algebra: weighted homogeneous case. In *Complex analytic singularities*, volume 8 of *Adv. Stud. Pure Math.*, pages 687–697. North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1987.

Zhili College, and Department of Mathematical Sciences, Tsinghua University, Beijing, 100084, P. R. China.
Email address: `shiq20@mails.tsinghua.edu.cn`

Department of Mathematical Sciences, Tsinghua University, Beijing, 100084, P. R. China; Yanqi Lake Beijing Institute of Mathematical Sciences and Applications, Beijing 101400, P. R. China.
Email address: `yau@uic.edu`

Department of Mathematical Sciences, Tsinghua University, Beijing, 100084, P. R. China.
Email address: `hqzuo@mail.tsinghua.edu.cn`