

MULTIPLICITY VERSUS BUCHSBAUMNESS OF THE SPECIAL FIBER RING

KUMARI SALONI

ABSTRACT. Let (A, \mathfrak{m}) be a Noetherian local ring of dimension $d > 0$ with infinite residue field and I an \mathfrak{m} -primary ideal. Let \mathcal{I} be an I -good filtration. We study an equality of Hilbert coefficients, first given by Elias and Valla, versus passage of Buchsbaum property from the local ring to the blow-up algebras. Suppose $e_1(\mathcal{I}) - e_1(Q) = 2e_0(\mathcal{I}) - 2\ell(A/I_1) - \ell(I_1/(I_2 + Q))$ where $Q \subseteq I$, a minimal reduction of \mathcal{I} , is a standard parameter ideal. Under some mild conditions, we prove that if A is Buchsbaum (generalized Cohen-Macaulay respectively), then the associated graded ring $G(\mathcal{I})$ is Buchsbaum (generalized Cohen-Macaulay respectively) with $\mathbb{I}(G(\mathcal{I})) = \mathbb{I}(A)$. Our results settle a question of Corso in general for an I -good filtration. Further, let $f_0(I) = e_1(I) - e_0(I) - e_1(Q) + \ell(A/I) + \mu(I) - d + 1$ and $e_1(I) - e_1(Q) = 2e_0(I) - 2\ell(A/I) - \ell(I/(I^2 + Q))$. We prove, under mild conditions, that (1) if A is generalized Cohen-Macaulay, then the special fiber ring $F_{\mathfrak{m}}(I)$ is generalized Cohen-Macaulay; In addition, if $\text{depth } A > 0$, then $\text{depth } F_{\mathfrak{m}}(I) = \text{depth } A$ and (2) if A is Buchsbaum and $\text{depth } A \geq d - 1$, then $F_{\mathfrak{m}}(I)$ is Buchsbaum with $\mathbb{I}(F_{\mathfrak{m}}(I)) = \mathbb{I}(A)$.

1. Introduction

Let (A, \mathfrak{m}) be a Noetherian local ring of dimension $d > 0$ and I an \mathfrak{m} -primary ideal of A . Let \mathcal{I} be an I -good filtration of A , i.e., \mathcal{I} is a sequence of ideals $\mathcal{I} = \{I_n\}_{n \geq 0}$ satisfying $I_{n+1} \subseteq I_n$, $I_n I_m \subseteq I_{n+m}$ and there exists $k \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $I^n \subseteq I_n \subseteq I^{n-k}$ for all $n, m \geq 0$. The associated graded ring $G(\mathcal{I}) = \bigoplus_{n \geq 0} I_n/I_{n+1}$, the Rees ring $R(\mathcal{I}) = \bigoplus_{n \geq 0} I_n t^n$ and the special fiber ring $F_{\mathfrak{m}}(I) = \bigoplus_{n \geq 0} I^n/\mathfrak{m}I^n$ are referred to as the blow-up algebras. When \mathcal{I} is the I -adic filtration $\{I^n\}$, we write $G(I)$ and $R(I)$ for the associated graded ring and the Rees ring respectively.

The structural properties of the local ring and the blow-up algebras are greatly connected to each other. The local ring A inherits many important properties, such as reducedness, normality, Cohen-Macaulayness, from the associated graded ring. However, this is not true for Buchsbaum rings. See [10, Example 4.10] for an example where $G(I)$ is Buchsbaum and A is not Buchsbaum. A finite A -module M is said to be a *Buchsbaum module* if the invariant $\ell_A(M/QM) - e_0(Q, M)$ is independent of the choice of parameter ideals Q of M where $\ell_A(M/QM)$ and $e_0(Q, M)$ denote the length of M/QM and the multiplicity of M relative to Q respectively. The above condition is equivalent to saying that every system $x_1, x_2, \dots, x_{\dim M}$ of parameters of M forms a weak M -sequence, that is $(x_1, \dots, x_{i-1})M :_M x_i = (x_1, \dots, x_{i-1})M :_M \mathfrak{m}$ for $1 \leq i \leq \dim M$. A module is Cohen-Macaulay if and only if it is Buchsbaum with $\ell_A(M/QM) - e_0(Q, M) = 0$ for every parameter ideal Q . Buchsbaum modules appear in abundance. In fact, it was proved in [6, Theorem 1.1] that for given integers $d > 0$ and $h_i \geq 0$ for $0 \leq i \leq d - 1$, there exists a Buchsbaum local ring A with $\dim A = d$ and $h_i = \ell_A(H_{\mathfrak{m}}^i(A))$ for $0 \leq i \leq d - 1$ where $H_{\mathfrak{m}}^i(A)$ denote the i -th local cohomology module of A with support in \mathfrak{m} .

We are interested in the inheritance of ring theoretic properties while passing from A to the blow-up algebras. For example, suppose A is a Cohen-Macaulay local ring. If the reduction number of \mathcal{I} is at most one, then $G(\mathcal{I})$ is Cohen-Macaulay. In a Noetherian ring, it is true that

$$e_1(\mathcal{I}) - e_1(Q) \geq 2e_0(\mathcal{I}) - 2\ell(A/I_1) - \ell(I_1/(I_2 + Q)) \quad (1.1)$$

where $Q = (a_1, \dots, a_d) \subseteq I$ is a minimal reduction of \mathcal{I} , see [23, Theorem 2.4]. When A is Cohen-Macaulay, we have $e_1(\mathcal{I}) \geq 2e_0(\mathcal{I}) - 2\ell(A/I_1) - \ell(I_1/(I_2 + Q))$. In [4] and [14], authors proved that the

2020 *Mathematics Subject Classification*. Primary 13A30, 13D40, 13H10; Secondary 13D45.

Key words and phrases. Buchsbaum rings, local cohomology modules, Hilbert polynomial, blow-up algebra.

equality $e_1(I) = 2e_0(I) - 2\ell(A/I) - \ell(I/(I^2 + Q))$ holds true if and only if $I^3 = QI^2$ and $Q \cap I^2 = QI$. In this case, $G(I)$ is Cohen-Macaulay.

In [2], Corso proved that

$$f_0(I) \leq e_1(I) - e_1(Q) - e_0(I) + \ell(A/I) + \mu(I) - d + 1$$

where $f_0(I)$ is the multiplicity of $F_{\mathfrak{m}}(I)$ and $Q \subseteq I$ is a minimal reduction of I , also see [3], [23, Chapter 5]. If A is Cohen-Macaulay, then $f_0(I) = e_1(I) - e_0(I) + \ell(A/I) + \mu(I) - d + 1$ does not assure Cohen-Macaulayness of $F_{\mathfrak{m}}(I)$, see [3, Example 2.3]. However, in [3, Theorem 2.5], authors proved that the above equality implies that $F_{\mathfrak{m}}(I)$ is unmixed.

Since the notion of Buchsbaum modules is a generalization of Cohen-Macaulay modules, an interesting problem is to study the cases when $G(I)$ or $F_{\mathfrak{m}}(I)$ inherits Buchsbaumness from the local ring. Now suppose that A is a Buchsbaum local ring. Goto, in [7, 8], proved various conditions for the Buchsbaumness of $G(\mathfrak{m})$. In [9], he proved that $G(Q)$ is Buchsbaum for a parameter ideal Q . Furthermore, the \mathfrak{m} -primary ideals with reduction number one exhibit nice properties, see [10, 11, 13, 19]. Nakamura in [19] proved the following result: If $I^2 = QI$ for a minimal reduction $Q = (a_1, \dots, a_d)$ of I , then $G(I)$ is Buchsbaum if and only if the equality $(a_1^2, \dots, a_d^2) \cap I^n = (a_1^2, \dots, a_d^2)I^{n-2}$ holds for $3 \leq n \leq d+1$. Yamagishi [31, 32] removed the condition on the reduction number of I and proved that $G(I)$ is Buchsbaum and $\ell_A(H_{\mathfrak{m}}^i(A)) = \ell(H_{\mathcal{U}}^i(G(I)))$ for $0 \leq i < d$ where $\mathcal{U} := \mathfrak{m}R(I) + R(I)_+$ if and only if $\mathbb{I}(G(I)) = \mathbb{I}(A)$. Recall that the \mathbb{I} -invariant of an A -module M of dimension s is

$$\mathbb{I}(M) = \sum_{i=0}^{s-1} \binom{s-1}{i} \ell_A(H_{\mathfrak{m}}^i(M)).$$

In [24], the author generalized the above result of Yamagishi for an I -good filtration.

Now suppose that A is a Buchsbaum local ring and

$$e_1(I) - e_1(Q) = 2e_0(I) - 2\ell(A/I) - \ell(I/(I^2 + Q)) \quad (1.2)$$

When $d = 1$ and $I = \mathfrak{m}$, Corso in [2] proved that $G(I)$ is a Buchsbaum ring. Rossi and Valla in [23, Theorem 2.1] generalized Corso's result for modules. In [20] and [21], Ozeki extended Corso's result for an \mathfrak{m} -primary ideal in an arbitrary dimension. In this paper, we prove the next two results for an I -good filtration on the passage, from A to $G(\mathcal{I})$, of generalized Cohen-Macaulayness and Buchsbaumness respectively. Here, $\mathcal{M} = \mathfrak{m}R(Q) + R(Q)_+$ with $R(Q) = \bigoplus_{n \geq 0} Q^n t^n$.

Theorem A. Let A be a generalized Cohen-Macaulay local ring and $Q = (a_1, \dots, a_d) \subseteq I$ a reduction of \mathcal{I} such that $(a_1, \dots, \check{a}_i, \dots, a_d) : a_i \subseteq I$ for $1 \leq i \leq d$. Suppose Q is a standard parameter ideal and the equality

$$e_1(\mathcal{I}) - e_1(Q) = 2e_0(\mathcal{I}) - 2\ell(A/I_1) - \ell(I_1/(I_2 + Q))$$

holds. Then $G(\mathcal{I})$ is generalized Cohen-Macaulay with

$$\ell(H_{\mathcal{M}}^0(G(\mathcal{I}))) = \ell(H_{\mathfrak{m}}^0(A)), \quad H_{\mathcal{M}}^i(G(\mathcal{I})) = [H_{\mathcal{M}}^i(G(\mathcal{I}))]_{2-i} \cong H_{\mathfrak{m}}^i(A)$$

for $1 \leq i \leq d-1$ and $a(G(\mathcal{I})) \leq 2-d$. Furthermore,

- (1) $e_2(\mathcal{I}) = e_1(Q) + e_2(Q) + e_1(\mathcal{I}) - e_0(\mathcal{I}) + \ell_A(A/I_1)$ if $d \geq 2$;
- (2) $e_i(\mathcal{I}) = e_{i-2}(Q) + 2e_{i-1}(Q) + e_i(Q)$ for $3 \leq i \leq d$.

When this is the case, we clearly have $\text{depth } G(\mathcal{I}) = \text{depth } A$ and $\mathbb{I}(G(\mathcal{I})) = \mathbb{I}(A)$.

Theorem B. Let A be a Buchsbaum local ring and $Q = (a_1, \dots, a_d) \subseteq I$ a reduction of \mathcal{I} such that $(a_1, \dots, \check{a}_i, \dots, a_d) : a_i \subseteq I$ for $1 \leq i \leq d$. Suppose

$$e_1(\mathcal{I}) - e_1(Q) = 2e_0(\mathcal{I}) - 2\ell(A/I_1) - \ell(I_1/(I_2 + Q)).$$

Then $G(\mathcal{I})$ is Buchsbaum with $\mathbb{I}(G(\mathcal{I})) = \mathbb{I}(A)$.

We now discuss the passage of Buchsbaumness to the special fiber ring when the following equality holds:

$$f_0(I) = e_1(I) - e_1(Q) - e_0(I) + \ell(A/I) + \mu(I) - d + 1 \quad (1.3)$$

This relation was studied by Corso, Polini, Vasconcelos [3] when A is Cohen-Macaulay. Our main motivation is the following result:

Remark. Suppose A is Cohen-Macaulay and the equality (1.3) holds. Suppose $\text{depth } G(I) \geq d - 1$. Then $F_{\mathfrak{m}}(I)$ is Cohen-Macaulay. It follows from [3, Corollary 2.6].

We aim to obtain results in the same spirit of Remark 1 in case of generalized Cohen-Macaulay or Buchsbaum local rings. For that purpose, we consider the equality in (1.2) along with (1.3) and investigate the local cohomology modules of $F_{\mathfrak{m}}(I)$. We observe that (1.2) is stronger than saying $\text{depth } G(I) \geq d - 1$ in Cohen-Macaulay local rings. Indeed if A is Cohen-Macaulay, the equality (1.2) implies that $G(I)$ is Cohen-Macaulay. Also, we note that the equality (1.2) enforces the passage of generalized Cohen-Macaulayness (Theorem A) or Buchsbaumness (Theorem B) from A to $G(I)$. So, it makes sense to consider (1.2) along with (1.3) while discussing Buchsbaumness of $F_{\mathfrak{m}}(I)$. We prove the following results for generalized Cohen-Macaulay and Buchsbaum local rings respectively. Here, $\mathcal{U} := \mathfrak{m}R(I) + R(I)_+$.

Theorem C. Let A be a generalized Cohen-Macaulay local ring and $Q = (a_1, \dots, a_d) \subseteq I$ a reduction of I such that $(a_1, \dots, \check{a}_i, \dots, a_d) : a_i \subseteq I$ for $1 \leq i \leq d$. Suppose Q is a standard parameter ideal and the equalities in (1.3) and (1.2) hold. Then, $F_{\mathfrak{m}}(I)$ is generalized Cohen-Macaulay with

$$[H_{\mathcal{U}}^0(F_{\mathfrak{m}}(I))]_n \cong \begin{cases} W/(\mathfrak{m}I^2 \cap W) & \text{if } n = 2 \\ (I^n \cap W)/(\mathfrak{m}I^n \cap W) & \text{if } n \geq 3 \\ (0) & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

and $H_{\mathcal{U}}^i(F_{\mathfrak{m}}(I)) = [H_{\mathcal{U}}^i(F_{\mathfrak{m}}(I))]_{2-i} \cong H_{\mathfrak{m}}^i(A)$ for $1 \leq i \leq d - 1$. Consequently, if $\text{depth } A > 0$ then $\text{depth } F_{\mathfrak{m}}(I) = \text{depth } A$.

Theorem D. Let A be a Buchsbaum local ring with $\text{depth } A \geq d - 1$ and $Q = (a_1, \dots, a_d) \subseteq I$ a reduction of I such that $(a_1, \dots, \check{a}_i, \dots, a_d) : a_i \subseteq I$ for $1 \leq i \leq d$. Suppose the equalities in (1.3) and (1.2) hold. Then $F_{\mathfrak{m}}(I)$ is Buchsbaum with $\mathbb{I}(F(I)) = \mathbb{I}(A)$.

In dimension two, we may remove the condition $\text{depth } A \geq 1$ and obtain the following corollary.

Corollary E. Suppose A is a Buchsbaum local ring of dimension two and $\text{depth } A = 0$. Let the rest of the hypothesis be same as in Theorem D. Then $F_{\mathfrak{m}}(I)/H_{\mathcal{U}}^0(F_{\mathfrak{m}}(I))$ is Buchsbaum.

We organize the paper in various sections. We begin by introducing some notations in Section 2. In Section 3, we discuss preliminary notions and results which are needed subsequently. This section includes a brief discussion on Sally modules of filtration. In Section 4, we mainly prove the inequality (1.1) and discuss some cases when equality holds. In Section 5, we prove a necessary and sufficient condition for equality in (1.1). Then we take a detour in Section 6 to discuss the generalized depth and generalized Cohen-Macaulayness of form rings of filtration. Our results extend the respective statements in I -adic case to I -good filtration. In Section 7, we prove Theorem A and Theorem B. In the last section of the paper, we prove Theorem C and Theorem D. Our methods are inspired by the work in [2], [3], [20], [21], [23] and [24].

2. Notation

Throughout this article, $\mu(I)$ denote the minimal number of generators of I and $e_i(\mathcal{I})$, $1 \leq i \leq d$ are the Hilbert coefficients of \mathcal{I} , i.e., the unique integres such that $\ell(A/I_n) = \sum_{i=0}^d (-1)^i e_i(\mathcal{I}) \binom{n+d-i-1}{d-i}$ for $n \gg 0$. When \mathcal{I} is the I -adic filtration, we write $e_i(I)$ in place of $e_i(\mathcal{I})$. For a reduction $Q \subseteq \mathcal{I}$, let

$T = \bigoplus_{n=0}^{\infty} Q^{n+1}t^n$ be the Rees algebra of Q . We regard $R(\mathcal{I})$ and T as sub-algebras of the polynomial ring $A[t]$. Let $\mathcal{R}_{\geq m} = \bigoplus_{n \geq m} I_n$ be the graded ideal of $R(\mathcal{I})$. In particular, we write \mathcal{R}_+ for $\mathcal{R}_{\geq 1}$. The unique homogeneous maximal ideal of $R(\mathcal{I})$ and T are denoted by \mathcal{N} and \mathcal{M} respectively, i.e., $\mathcal{N} = \mathfrak{m}R(\mathcal{I}) + \mathcal{R}_+$ and $\mathcal{M} = \mathfrak{m}T + T_+$. We write $F = F_I(Q) = T/IT$ and $\mathcal{F}' = T/I_1T$.

Let $W = H_{\mathfrak{m}}^0(A)$, $C = A/W$ and $\mathcal{I}C$ denote the filtration $\{I_n C = (I_n + W)/W\}$ in C . For $a \in A$, we write $A' = A/(a)$, $Q' = Q/(a)$, $I' = I/(a)$ and $\mathcal{I}' = \mathcal{I}/(a)$ for the filtration $\{I'_n = I_n + (a)/(a)\}$ in $A/(a)$. If \mathcal{I} is an I -good filtration, then $\mathcal{I}C$ is an IC -good filtration in C and \mathcal{I}' is an I' -good filtration in A' .

For $Q = (a_1, \dots, a_d)$ a minimal reduction of \mathcal{I} , we consider the following conditions introduced in [21]:

- (C₀) The sequence a_1, \dots, a_d is a d -sequence in A as defined in [16].
- (C₁) The above sequence is an unconditioned strong d -sequence.
- (C₂) We have $(a_1, \dots, \check{a}_i, \dots, a_d) : a_i \subseteq I$ for $1 \leq i \leq d$.
- (C₃) $\text{depth } A > 0$.

All the four conditions (C₀)-(C₃) are satisfied if A is Cohen-Macaulay. The condition (C₁) is equivalent to saying that A is generalized Cohen-Macaulay and Q is a standard parameter ideal. The role played by regular sequences in the study of Cohen-Macaulay modules is broadly replaced by d -sequences in case of generalized Cohen-Macaulay modules. A sequence a_1, \dots, a_s of elements of A is said to be a d -sequence if the equality

$$q_{i-1} : a_i a_j = q_{i-1} : a_j$$

holds for $1 \leq i \leq j \leq s$ where $q_{i-1} = (a_1, \dots, a_{i-1})$ and $q_0 = (0)$. It is said to be an *unconditioned d -sequence* if it is a d -sequence in any order. Moreover, we say that a_1, \dots, a_s is an *unconditioned strong d -sequence* (u.s.d-sequence) if $a_1^{n_1}, \dots, a_s^{n_s}$ is an unconditioned d -sequence for all integers $n_1, \dots, n_s > 0$. Recall that a local ring is Buchsbaum if and only if every system of parameters is u.s.d-sequence. So, (C₀) and (C₁) are satisfied if A is a Buchsbaum local ring.

Remark 2.1. Suppose (C₁) is satisfied. Then $a_i W \subseteq QW \subseteq Q \cap W = 0$, see [28, Corollary 3.9]. This gives $W \subseteq (a_1, \dots, \check{a}_i, \dots, a_d) : a_i$ for $1 \leq i \leq d$.

We assume that the residue field A/\mathfrak{m} is infinite.

3. Preliminaries

In this section, we present some auxiliary results for filtration which will be used in subsequent sections. We discuss most of the proofs for the convenience of reader and mention the references for I -adic cases of some results.

3.1. Sally module of filtration

To study blow-up algebras, Vasconcelos in [29] introduced the notion of Sally modules. Let Q be a minimal reduction of \mathcal{I} , then the Sally module of \mathcal{I} with respect to Q , defined as $S_Q(\mathcal{I}) = \bigoplus_{n \geq 1} I_{n+1}/I_1 Q^n$, is a graded $R(Q)$ -module. In Cohen-Macaulay local rings, Vasconcelos recovered many results using the method of Sally modules, such as Northcott's inequality $e_1(\mathcal{I}) \geq e_0(\mathcal{I}) - \ell(A/I_1)$ and its boundary conditions. The Sally module, $S = S_Q(\mathcal{I})$ can be seen as the cokernel of the following map of graded T -modules:

$$0 \longrightarrow I_1 T \longrightarrow \mathcal{R}_+(+1) = \bigoplus_{j \geq 1} I_j t^{j-1} \longrightarrow S \longrightarrow 0.$$

Therefore, $S = \bigoplus_{j \geq 1} I_{j+1}/I_1 Q^j$ is a finitely generated graded T -module and $\dim_T S \leq d$. In [3], authors used another exact sequence to describe Sally module. We recall it in the next lemma for I -good filtration.

Lemma 3.1. *Assume that $Q \subsetneq I_1$ and $\mu = \mu(I_1 \setminus Q)$. Then there exists an exact sequence*

$$T(-1)^\mu \xrightarrow{\phi} R(\mathcal{I}) \setminus T \rightarrow S(-1) \rightarrow 0$$

of graded T -modules.

Proof. Let $I_1 = Q + (x_1, \dots, x_\mu)$. Consider the map

$$T(-1)^\mu \xrightarrow{\phi} R(\mathcal{I})/T$$

defined as $\phi(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_\mu) = \overline{\sum_{i=1}^{\mu} \alpha_i x_i t} \in R(\mathcal{I})/T$. Then $[\text{Coker } \phi]_n = I_n/(Q^n + Q^{n-1}I_1) = I_n/Q^{n-1}I_1 = S(-1)_n$ for $n \geq 1$ and $[\text{Coker } \phi]_0 = 0$. Therefore, $\text{Coker } \phi \cong S(-1)$ as graded T -module. \square

Lemma 3.2. *Suppose that the conditions (C_0) and (C_2) are satisfied for an I -good filtration \mathcal{I} . Then $F \cong (A/I)[X_1, \dots, X_d]$ and $\mathcal{F}' \cong (A/I_1)[X_1, \dots, X_d]$ as graded A -algebras. In particular, F and \mathcal{F}' are Cohen-Macaulay rings of dimension d .*

Proof. See [12, Proposition 2.2] for $F \cong (A/I)[X_1, \dots, X_d]$. Then $\mathcal{F}' \cong A/I_1 \otimes_A T/IT \cong (A/I_1)[X_1, \dots, X_d]$. \square

Lemma 3.3. *Suppose that the conditions (C_0) , (C_2) and (C_3) are satisfied and the ring T satisfies Serre's condition (S_2) . Then $\text{Ass}_T(S) \subseteq \{\mathfrak{m}T\}$. Hence, $\dim_T(S) = d$ if $S \neq 0$.*

For $\mathcal{I} = \{I^n\}$ and $\mathcal{I} = \{\overline{I^n}\}$, the above result is discussed in [12, Lemma 2.3] and [22, Lemma 2.2] respectively. We provide a proof for an I -good filtration.

Proof. Let $P \in \text{Ass}_T(S)$. Since $\mathfrak{m}^l S = 0$ for $l \gg 0$, we have $\mathfrak{p} = \mathfrak{m}T \subseteq P$. Suppose $\mathfrak{p} \neq P$. Note that $\text{depth}_{T_P}(\mathcal{R}_+(+1))_P \geq 1$ since $a_1 \in \mathfrak{p} \subseteq P$ is a non-zero-divisor on $\mathcal{R}_+(+1) = \bigoplus_{j \geq 1} I_j t^{j-1}$. Applying depth Lemma on the exact sequence

$$0 \longrightarrow (I_1 T)_P \longrightarrow (\mathcal{R}_+(+1))_P \longrightarrow S_P \longrightarrow 0,$$

of graded T_P -modules, we get $\text{depth}_{T_P}(I_1 T)_P \geq \min\{\text{depth}_{T_P}(\mathcal{R}_+(+1))_P, \text{depth}_{T_P} S_P + 1\} \geq 1$ and $\text{depth}_{T_P} S_P = 0 \geq \min\{\text{depth}_{T_P}(\mathcal{R}_+(+1))_P, \text{depth}_{T_P}(I_1 T)_P - 1\} = \text{depth}_{T_P}(I_1 T)_P - 1$. Hence $\text{depth}_{T_P}(I_1 T)_P = 1$. Now consider the exact sequence

$$0 \longrightarrow (I_1 T)_P \longrightarrow T_P \longrightarrow (T/I_1 T)_P \longrightarrow 0.$$

Since $\mathfrak{p} \neq P$, $\text{ht } P \geq 2$. So $\dim T_P \geq 2$ which implies that $\text{depth } T_P \geq \min\{2, \dim T_P\} = 2$ as T satisfies (S_2) . Again by depth Lemma, $1 = \text{depth}_{T_P}(I_1 T)_P \geq \min\{\text{depth}_{T_P} T_P, \text{depth}_{T_P}(T/I_1 T)_P + 1\} = \text{depth}_{T_P}(T/I_1 T)_P + 1$ which implies $\text{depth}_{T_P}(T/I_1 T)_P = 0$. By Lemma 3.2, $T/I_1 T$ is Cohen-Macaulay which means $\dim(T/I_1 T)_P = \text{depth}_{T_P}(T/I_1 T)_P = 0$. Thus $P \in \min_T(T_P/I_1 T_P) = \{\mathfrak{m}T\}$ which is a contradiction. \square

The Hilbert coefficients $e_i(S)$ of the Sally module S and the coefficients $e_i(\mathcal{I})$ of \mathcal{I} are related through the following relations:

$$\ell(A/I_{n+1}) = \ell(A/Q^n I_1) - \ell(S_n) = \ell(A/Q^n) + \ell(Q^n/Q^n I_1) - \ell(S_n)$$

for $n \geq 0$.

Proposition 3.4. *Let \mathcal{I} be an I -good filtration. Then*

$$e_1(\mathcal{I}) \geq \begin{cases} e_1(Q) + e_0(I) - \ell_A(A/I_1) + e_0(S) & \text{if } \dim S = d. \\ e_1(Q) + e_0(I) - \ell_A(A/I_1) & \text{if } \dim S \leq d - 1. \end{cases}$$

Proof. For $n \geq 0$, we have $Q^n/Q^n I_1 \cong (T/I_1 T)_n$ and $T/I_1 T$ is a homomorphic image of $A/I_1[X_1, \dots, X_d]$. So for all $n \geq 0$,

$$\ell(Q^n/Q^n I_1) \leq \ell(A/I_1) \binom{n+d-1}{d-1} + \text{terms with degree} \leq d-2 \quad (3.1)$$

There exists an integer N such that for all $n \geq N$,

$$\begin{aligned} \ell(A/Q^n) &= \sum_{i=0}^d (-1)^i e_i(Q) \binom{n-1+d-i}{d-i} \\ &= e_0(I) \binom{n+d}{d} - (e_0(I) + e_1(Q)) \binom{n+d-1}{d-1} \\ &\quad + \sum_{i=2}^d (-1)^i (e_{i-1}(Q) + e_i(Q)) \binom{n+d-i}{d-i} \end{aligned}$$

Thus, for all $n \geq N$,

$$\begin{aligned} \ell(A/I_{n+1}) + \ell(S_n) &= \ell(A/Q^n) + \ell(Q^n/Q^n I_1) \\ &\leq e_0(I) \binom{n+d}{d} - (e_0(I) + e_1(Q)) \binom{n+d-1}{d-1} + \sum_{i=2}^d (-1)^i (e_{i-1}(Q) + \\ &\quad e_i(Q)) \binom{n+d-i}{d-i} + \ell(A/I_1) \binom{n+d-1}{d-1} + \text{terms with degree} \leq d-2 \\ &\leq e_0(I) \binom{n+d}{d} - \{e_0(I) + e_1(Q) - \ell(A/I_1)\} \binom{n+d-1}{d-1} \\ &\quad + \sum_{i=2}^d (-1)^i (e_{i-1}(Q) + e_i(Q)) \binom{n+d-i}{d-i} + \text{terms with degree} \leq d-2. \end{aligned}$$

Now the conclusion follows by comparing the coefficients. \square

Proposition 3.5. *Let \mathcal{I} be an I -good filtration. Suppose that the conditions (C_0) and (C_2) are satisfied. Then, for all $n \geq 0$,*

$$\begin{aligned} \ell_A(A/I_{n+1}) &= e_0(I) \binom{n+d}{d} - \{e_0(I) + e_1(Q) - \ell(A/I_1)\} \binom{n+d-1}{d-1} \\ &\quad + \sum_{i=2}^d (-1)^i (e_{i-1}(Q) + e_i(Q)) \binom{n+d-i}{d-i} - \ell_A(S_n) \end{aligned} \quad (3.2)$$

Proof. Suppose that the the conditions (C_0) and (C_2) hold. Then $N = 0$ in the proof of Proposition 3.4 and $T/I_1 T \cong A/I_1[X_1, \dots, X_d]$ by Lemma 3.2. Hence equality holds in (3.1) for all $n \geq 0$. \square

In (3.2), we may write

$$\ell_A(S_n) = e_0(S) \binom{n+s-1}{s-1} - e_1(S) \binom{n+s-2}{s-2} + \dots + (-1)^{s-1} e_{s-1}(S)$$

for $n \gg 0$ where $s = \dim S$. Then, on comparing the coefficients of both sides, we get the following corollary.

Corollary 3.6. *Suppose that the conditions (C_0) and (C_2) are satisfied and $s = \dim S$.*

- (i) *Suppose $s = d$. Then*
 - (a) $e_1(\mathcal{I}) = e_0(I) + e_1(Q) - \ell(A/I_1) + e_0(S)$ and
 - (b) $e_i(\mathcal{I}) = e_{i-1}(Q) + e_i(Q) + e_{i-1}(S)$ for $2 \leq i \leq d$.
- (ii) *Suppose $s < d$. Then*
 - (a) $e_1(\mathcal{I}) = e_0(\mathcal{I}) + e_1(Q) - \ell(A/I_1)$,

- (b) $e_i(\mathcal{I}) = e_{i-1}(Q) + e_i(Q)$ for $2 \leq i \leq d - s$ and
(c) $e_i(\mathcal{I}) = e_{i-1}(Q) + e_i(Q) + (-1)^{d-s} e_{i-d+s-1}(S)$ for all $d - s + 1 \leq i \leq d$.

3.2. Reduction steps

In the theory of Hilbert polynomials, it is very useful to reduce a problem (i) to the case when depth $A > 0$ and (ii) to a lower dimensional case for applying induction. The following results allow us to do both these reductions in our problem.

Lemma 3.7. (i) *If A satisfies (C_1) and (C_2) , then C satisfies (C_1) and (C_2) .*

- (ii) *Suppose that $d \geq 2$. Let $a \in Q \setminus \mathfrak{m}_Q$ be a superficial element for $\mathcal{I} = \{I_n\}$ and Q . Then $2e_0(\mathcal{I}) - e_1(\mathcal{I}) + e_1(Q) = 2\ell_A(A/I_1) + \ell_A(I_1/(I_2 + Q))$ if and only if $2e_0(\mathcal{I}') - e_1(\mathcal{I}') + e_1(Q') = 2\ell_A(A'/I_1') + \ell_A(I_1'/(I_2' + Q'))$.*
(iii) *$2e_0(\mathcal{I}) - e_1(\mathcal{I}) + e_1(Q) = 2\ell_A(A/I_1) + \ell_A(I_1/(I_2 + Q))$ if and only if $2e_0(\mathcal{I}C) - e_1(\mathcal{I}C) + e_1(QC) = 2\ell_A(C/I_1C) + \ell_A(I_1C/(I_2C + QC))$ and $W \subseteq I_2 + Q$.*

Proof. (i) Suppose A satisfies (C_1) . Then it follows from [28, Corollary 3.9] that C is generalized Cohen-Macaulay with QC a standard parameter ideal in C and $Q \cap W = 0$. Now let $(a_1, \dots, \tilde{a}_i, \dots, a_d) :_A a_i \subseteq I$ and $r + W \in (a_1, \dots, \tilde{a}_i, \dots, a_d)C :_C a_i$. Then $ra_i \in (a_1, \dots, \tilde{a}_i, \dots, a_d) + W$. Suppose $ra_i = s + w_0$ with $s \in (a_1, \dots, \tilde{a}_i, \dots, a_d)$ and $w_0 \in W$. Then $w_0 \in Q \cap W = 0$ which implies that $r \in (a_1, \dots, \tilde{a}_i, \dots, a_d) : a_i \subseteq I$. Therefore, $(a_1, \dots, \tilde{a}_i, \dots, a_d)C :_C a_i \subseteq IC$.

- (ii) We have $e_i(\mathcal{I}) = e_i(\mathcal{I}')$, $e_i(Q) = e_i(Q')$ for $0 \leq i \leq d - 2$, $e_{d-1}(\mathcal{I}) = e_{d-1}(\mathcal{I}') + (-1)^d \ell(0 :_A a)$ and $e_{d-1}(Q) = e_{d-1}(Q') + (-1)^d \ell(0 :_A a)$. Therefore, $2e_0(\mathcal{I}) - e_1(\mathcal{I}) + e_1(Q) = 2e_0(\mathcal{I}') - e_1(\mathcal{I}') + e_1(Q')$. Further, $2\ell_A(A/I_1) + \ell_A(I_1/(I_2 + Q)) = 2\ell_A(A'/I_1') + \ell_A(I_1'/(I_2' + Q'))$.
(iii) We have $e_i(\mathcal{I}) = e_i(\mathcal{I}C)$ and $e_i(Q) = e_i(QC)$ for $0 \leq i \leq d - 1$, $e_d(\mathcal{I}) = e_d(\mathcal{I}C) + (-1)^d \ell_A(W)$ and $e_d(Q) = e_d(QC) + (-1)^d \ell_A(W)$. Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} 2e_0(\mathcal{I}) - e_1(\mathcal{I}) + e_1(Q) &= 2e_0(\mathcal{I}C) - e_1(\mathcal{I}C) + e_1(QC) \\ &\leq 2\ell_A(C/I_1C) + \ell_A(I_1C/(I_2C + QC)) \text{ by (1.1)} \\ &\leq 2\ell_A(A/I_1) + \ell_A(I_1/(I_2 + Q)) \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, $2e_0(\mathcal{I}) - e_1(\mathcal{I}) + e_1(Q) = 2\ell_A(A/I_1) + \ell_A(I_1/(I_2 + Q))$ if and only if $2e_0(\mathcal{I}C) - e_1(\mathcal{I}C) + e_1(QC) = 2\ell_A(C/I_1C) + \ell_A(I_1C/(I_2C + QC))$, $\ell_A(I_1C/(I_2C + QC)) = \ell_A(I_1/(I_2 + Q))$ and $\ell_A(C/I_1C) = \ell_A(A/I_1)$. Note that the last two equalities hold if and only if $W \subseteq I_2 + Q$. \square

We end this section with the following remark.

Remark 3.8. *Suppose $e_1(\mathcal{I}) - e_1(Q) = 2(e_0(Q) - \ell(A/Q))$ for an I -good filtration \mathcal{I} and $Q \subseteq I \subseteq I_1$ a minimal reduction. Then*

- (i) $e_1(\mathcal{I}) = e_1(Q)$,
(ii) A is Cohen-Macaulay and
(iii) $\mathcal{I} = \{I^n\}$.

Proof. We have $e_0(\mathcal{I}) - \ell(A/I_1) \leq e_1(\mathcal{I}) - e_1(Q) = 2(e_0(Q) - \ell(A/Q))$ which gives $e_0(Q) - 2\ell(A/Q) \geq -\ell(A/I_1) \implies e_0(Q) - \ell(A/Q) \geq \ell(I_1/Q) \geq 0$. On the other hand, $e_0(Q) \leq \ell(A/Q)$. Therefore, we get $e_0(Q) = \ell(A/Q)$. Thus A is Cohen-Macaulay, see [?, Corollary 4.7.11] and $e_1(\mathcal{I}) = e_1(Q) = 0$. This gives that $\mathcal{I} = \{I^n\}$ by [17, Theorem 3.21]. \square

4. The inequality (1.1) and its boundary condition

In this section, we prove the inequality $e_1(\mathcal{I}) - e_1(Q) \geq 2e_0(\mathcal{I}) - 2\ell_A(A/I_1) - \ell_A(I_1/(I_2 + Q))$ for an I -good filtration in Theorem 4.1. A different proof can be found in [23, Theorem 2.4]. An important

consequence of our method is Proposition 4.3 in which we find some equivalent conditions for equality in (1.1). Let $L = \bigoplus_{n \geq 1} \frac{I_{n+2} + I_1 Q^n}{I_1 Q^n}$ which is a graded submodule of S .

Theorem 4.1. *Let (A, \mathfrak{m}) be a Noetherian local ring, I an \mathfrak{m} -primary ideal and $\mathcal{I} = \{I_n\}$ an I -good filtration. Then*

$$e_1(\mathcal{I}) - e_1(Q) \geq 2e_0(\mathcal{I}) - 2\ell_A(A/I_1) - \ell_A(I_1/(I_2 + Q)).$$

Proof. If $I_1 = Q (= I)$, then by Proposition 3.4, $e_1(\mathcal{I}) - e_1(Q) \geq e_0(Q) - \ell(A/I_1) \geq 2e_0(Q) - 2\ell(A/I_1)$ as $e_0(Q) \leq \ell(A/Q)$.

Suppose $Q \subsetneq I_1$, $\mu = \mu(I_1 \setminus Q)$ and $I_1 = Q + (x_1, \dots, x_\mu)$ as defined in Lemma 3.1. The canonical graded homomorphism $\mathcal{F}' \rightarrow G(\mathcal{I}) = R(\mathcal{I})/\mathcal{R}_+(1)$ gives an exact sequence

$$0 \rightarrow K^{(2)} \rightarrow \mathcal{F}' \rightarrow G(\mathcal{I}) \rightarrow R(\mathcal{I})/(\mathcal{R}_+(1) + T) \rightarrow 0 \quad (4.1)$$

of graded T -modules where $K^{(2)} = \ker(\mathcal{F}' \rightarrow G(\mathcal{I}))$. Now consider the graded homomorphism of graded T -modules

$$(T/I_1 T(-1))^\mu \xrightarrow{\phi} R(\mathcal{I})/(\mathcal{R}_+(1) + T)$$

defined as

$$\phi(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_\mu) = \overline{\sum_{i=1}^{\mu} \alpha_i x_i t} \in R(\mathcal{I})/(\mathcal{R}_+(1) + T)$$

where $\alpha_i \in T/I_1 T$ for $1 \leq i \leq \mu$. Then $[\text{Coker } \phi]_n = \frac{I_n/I_{n+1} + Q^n}{(I_1 Q^{n-1} + I_{n+1})/(I_{n+1} + Q^n)} \cong I_n/(I_{n+1} + I_1 Q^{n-1}) = (S/L)_{n-1}$. Thus $\text{Coker } \phi \cong S/L(-1)$ and we get the exact sequence

$$0 \rightarrow \ker \phi \rightarrow \mathcal{F}'(-1)^\mu \xrightarrow{\phi} R(\mathcal{I})/(\mathcal{R}_+(1) + T) \rightarrow S/L(-1) \rightarrow 0 \quad (4.2)$$

Next, we consider the following exact sequence induced from (4.2),

$$0 \rightarrow [\ker \phi]_1 \rightarrow [\mathcal{F}'^\mu]_0 \rightarrow [R(\mathcal{I})/\mathcal{R}_+(1) + T]_1 \rightarrow 0$$

and tensor it with \mathcal{F}' to get the following commutative diagram:

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} ([\ker \phi]_1 \otimes \mathcal{F}')(-1) & \rightarrow & ([\mathcal{F}'^\mu]_0 \otimes \mathcal{F}')(-1) & \rightarrow & ([R(\mathcal{I})/\mathcal{R}_+(1) + T]_1 \otimes \mathcal{F}')(-1) & \rightarrow & 0 \\ \downarrow \psi_1 & & \downarrow \psi_2 & & \downarrow \psi_3 & & \\ 0 & \longrightarrow & \ker \phi & \xrightarrow{f} & [\mathcal{F}'(-1)^\mu] & \longrightarrow & \text{Im } \phi \longrightarrow 0 \end{array}$$

of graded T -modules where ψ_2 is bijective. So, we have an exact sequence

$$0 \rightarrow K^{(1)} \rightarrow ([R(\mathcal{I})/\mathcal{R}_+(1) + T]_1 \otimes \mathcal{F}')(-1) \xrightarrow{\psi_3} \text{Im } \phi \rightarrow 0 \quad (4.3)$$

of graded T -modules where $K^{(1)} = \ker \psi_3$. We put $K^{(3)} = L$ for convenience of notation. Note that $K^{(1)} \leq ([R(\mathcal{I})/\mathcal{R}_+(1) + T]_1 \otimes \mathcal{F}')(-1)$, $K^{(2)} \leq \mathcal{F}'$ and $K^{(3)} \leq S$. So, $\dim K^{(i)} \leq d$ for $i = 1, 2, 3$.

From (4.1), (4.2) and (4.3), we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \ell_A(G(\mathcal{I})_n) &= \ell_A(\mathcal{F}'_n) + \ell_A([R(\mathcal{I})/\mathcal{R}_+(1) + T]_n) - \ell_A([K^{(2)}]_n) \\ &= \ell_A(\mathcal{F}'_n) + \{\ell_A([\text{Im } \phi]_n) + \ell_A([S/L]_{n-1})\} - \ell_A([K^{(2)}]_n) \\ &= \ell_A(\mathcal{F}'_n) + \{\ell_A([R(\mathcal{I})/\mathcal{R}_+(1) + T]_1 \otimes \mathcal{F}'_{n-1}) - \ell_A([K^{(1)}]_n)\} \\ &\quad + \ell_A(S_{n-1}) - \ell_A([K^{(3)}]_{n-1}) - \ell_A([K^{(2)}]_n) \end{aligned} \quad (4.4)$$

for all $n \geq 0$. Since $(A/I_1)[X_1, \dots, X_d] \rightarrow \mathcal{F}' = T/I_1 T$ defined by $X_i \mapsto \overline{x_i t}$ is surjective map and $[R(\mathcal{I})/\mathcal{R}_+(1) + T]_1 = I_1/(I_2 + Q)$, we have that

$$\ell_A([R(\mathcal{I})/\mathcal{R}_+(1) + T]_1 \otimes \mathcal{F}'_{n-1}) \leq \ell_A(I_1/(I_2 + Q)) \binom{n-1+d-1}{d-1}$$

$$\leq \ell_A(I_1/(I_2 + Q)) \left(\binom{n+d-1}{d-1} - \binom{n+d-2}{d-2} \right) \text{ and}$$

$$\ell_A([\mathcal{F}'_n]) \leq \ell_A(A/I_1) \binom{n+d-1}{d-1}$$

Further, we write

$$\ell_A(G(\mathcal{I})_n) = e_0(\mathcal{I}) \binom{n+d-1}{d-1} - e_1(\mathcal{I}) \binom{n+d-2}{d-2} + \dots + (-1)^{d-1} e_{d-1}(\mathcal{I})$$

$$\ell_A(S_{n-1}) = e_0(S) \binom{n-1+s-1}{s-1} - e_1(S) \binom{n+s-3}{s-2} + \dots + (-1)^{s-1} e_{s-1}(S)$$

where $s = \dim S \leq d$. We get

$$e_0(\mathcal{I}) \leq \begin{cases} \ell_A(A/I_1) + \ell_A(I_1/(I_2 + Q)) + e_0(S) & \text{if } \dim S = d \\ \ell_A(A/I_1) + \ell_A(I_1/(I_2 + Q)) & \text{if } \dim S < d. \end{cases}$$

Since $e_0(S) \leq e_1(\mathcal{I}) - e_1(Q) - e_0(\mathcal{I}) + \ell_A(A/I_1)$ if $\dim S = d$ and $e_1(\mathcal{I}) - e_1(Q) - e_0(\mathcal{I}) + \ell_A(A/I_1) \geq 0$ if $\dim S < d$ by Proposition 3.4, we have

$$e_0(\mathcal{I}) \leq 2\ell_A(A/I_1) + \ell_A(I_1/(I_2 + Q)) + e_1(\mathcal{I}) - e_1(Q) - e_0(\mathcal{I}).$$

This completes the proof. \square

Next, we discuss the conditions when equality holds in Theorem 4.1. First we note the following lemma. The I -adic case can be seen in [21].

Lemma 4.2. *Suppose that the conditions (C_0) and (C_2) are satisfied and $Q \subsetneq I_1$. Then,*

$$\ell_A(I_n/I_{n+1}) = \left\{ \ell_A(A/I_1) + \ell_A(I_1/(I_2 + Q)) \right\} \binom{n+d-1}{d-1} - \ell(I_1/(I_2 + Q)) \binom{n+d-2}{d-2}$$

$$+ \ell_A(S_{n-1}) - \ell_A([K^{(1)}]_n) - \ell_A([K^{(2)}]_n) - \ell_A([K^{(3)}]_{n-1})$$

for all $n \geq 0$. Furthermore,

$$e_1(\mathcal{I}) - e_1(Q) = 2e_0(\mathcal{I}) - 2\ell_A(A/I_1) - \ell_A(I_1/(I_2 + Q)) + \sum_{i \in \Gamma} e_0(K^{(i)})$$

where $\Gamma = \{i \mid 1 \leq i \leq 3, \dim_T K^{(i)} = d\}$.

Proof. By (4.4), we have that

$$\ell_A(I_n/I_{n+1}) = \ell_A(G(\mathcal{I})_n) = \ell_A(\mathcal{F}'_n) + \{ \ell_A([R(\mathcal{I})/(\mathcal{R}_+(1) + T)]_1 \otimes \mathcal{F}')_{n-1} - \ell_A([K^{(1)}]_n) \}$$

$$+ \ell_A(S_{n-1}) - \ell_A([K^{(3)}]_{n-1}) - \ell_A([K^{(2)}]_n)$$

for all $n \geq 0$. By Lemma 3.2, $\mathcal{F}' \cong (A/I_1)[X_1, \dots, X_d]$ and $[R(\mathcal{I})/(\mathcal{R}_+(1) + T)]_1 \otimes \mathcal{F}' \cong (I_1/(I_2 + Q)) \otimes A/I_1[X_1, \dots, X_d]$. Therefore, we have for all $n \geq 0$,

$$\ell_A(\mathcal{F}'_n) = \ell_A(A/I_1) \binom{n+d-1}{d-1} \text{ and}$$

$$\ell_A([R(\mathcal{I})/(\mathcal{R}_+(1) + T)]_1 \otimes \mathcal{F}'_{n-1}) = \ell_A(I_1/(I_2 + Q)) \binom{n+d-2}{d-1}$$

Thus,

$$\ell_A(I_n/I_{n+1}) = \ell_A(A/I_1) \binom{n+d-1}{d-1} + \ell_A(I_1/(I_2 + Q)) \binom{n+d-2}{d-1} - \ell_A([K^{(1)}]_n)$$

$$+ \ell_A(S_{n-1}) - \ell_A([K^{(3)}]_{n-1}) - \ell_A([K^{(2)}]_n)$$

$$= \ell_A(A/I_1) \binom{n+d-1}{d-1} + \ell_A(I_1/(I_2 + Q)) \left\{ \binom{n+d-1}{d-1} - \binom{n+d-2}{d-2} \right\}$$

$$+ \ell_A(S_{n-1}) - \ell_A([K^{(1)}]_n) - \ell_A([K^{(3)}]_{n-1}) - \ell_A([K^{(2)}]_n)$$

$$= \left(\ell_A(A/I_1) + \ell_A(I_1/(I_2 + Q)) \right) \binom{n+d-1}{d-1} - \ell_A(I_1/(I_2 + Q)) \binom{n+d-2}{d-2} \\ + \ell_A(S_{n-1}) - \ell_A([K^{(1)}]_n) - \ell_A([K^{(3)}]_{n-1}) - \ell_A([K^{(2)}]_n)$$

for all $n \geq 0$. On comparing the coefficients, we get that

$$e_0(\mathcal{I}) = \begin{cases} \ell_A(A/I_1) + \ell_A(I_1/(I_2 + Q)) + e_0(S) - \sum_{i \in \Gamma} e_0(K^{(i)}) & \text{if } \dim S = d \\ \ell_A(A/I_1) + \ell_A(I_1/(I_2 + Q)) - \sum_{i \in \Gamma} e_0(K^{(i)}) & \text{if } \dim S \leq d-1 \end{cases} \\ = 2\ell_A(A/I_1) + \ell_A(I_1/(I_2 + Q)) + e_1(\mathcal{I}) - e_1(Q) - e_0(\mathcal{I}) - \sum_{i \in \Gamma} e_0(K^{(i)})$$

since $e_1(\mathcal{I}) - e_0(\mathcal{I}) - e_1(Q) + \ell(A/I_1) = e_0(S)$ if $\dim S = d$ and $e_1(\mathcal{I}) - e_0(\mathcal{I}) - e_1(Q) + \ell(A/I_1) = 0$ if $\dim S \leq d-1$ using Corollary 3.6. \square

It is easy to observe that $\text{Ass}_T K^{(i)} \subseteq \{\mathfrak{m}T\}$ for $1 \leq i \leq 3$. To see this, note that $K^{(1)} \leq [R(\mathcal{I})/\mathcal{R}_+(1) + T]_1 \otimes \mathcal{F}' \cong (I_1/(I_2 + Q)) \otimes (A/I_1)[X_1, \dots, X_d]$ which is a maximal Cohen-Macaulay $\mathcal{F}' \cong A/I_1[X_1, \dots, X_d]$ -module, $K^{(2)} \leq \mathcal{F}' \cong A/I_1[X_1, \dots, X_d]$ and $K^{(3)} \leq S$. Therefore, if $K^{(i)} \neq 0$, then $\dim K^{(i)} = d$ for $1 \leq i \leq 3$. We will need the following proposition later. Here note that $(C_1) \implies (C_0)$ and $(C_1) + (C_3) \implies T$ satisfies (S_2) see [28, Theorem 6.2].

Proposition 4.3. *Suppose that the conditions (C_1) , (C_2) and (C_3) are satisfied. Assume that $Q \not\subseteq I_1$. Then the following conditions are equivalent:*

(i) *We have $e_1(\mathcal{I}) - e_1(Q) = 2e_0(\mathcal{I}) - 2\ell_A(A/I_1) - \ell_A(I_1/(I_2 + Q))$.*

(ii) *There exist exact sequences*

$$0 \rightarrow (I_1/(I_2 + Q)) \otimes \mathcal{F}'(-1) \rightarrow R(\mathcal{I})/(\mathcal{R}_+(1) + T) \rightarrow S(-1) \rightarrow 0$$

and

$$0 \rightarrow \mathcal{F}' \rightarrow G(\mathcal{I}) \rightarrow R(\mathcal{I})/(\mathcal{R}_+(1) + T) \rightarrow 0$$

of graded T -modules.

(iii) *$K^{(i)} = 0$ for $1 \leq i \leq 3$.*

When this is the case, we have the injective maps

$$\mathrm{H}_{\mathcal{M}}^i(G(\mathcal{I})) \hookrightarrow \mathrm{H}_{\mathcal{M}}^i(R(\mathcal{I})/(\mathcal{R}_+(1) + T)) \hookrightarrow \mathrm{H}_{\mathcal{M}}^i(S)(-1)$$

of graded T -modules for $0 \leq i \leq d-1$ and $\mathrm{H}_{\mathcal{M}}^i(G(\mathcal{I})) \cong \mathrm{H}_{\mathcal{M}}^i(R(\mathcal{I})/(\mathcal{R}_+(1) + T)) \cong \mathrm{H}_{\mathcal{M}}^i(S)(-1)$ for $0 \leq i \leq d-2$.

Proof. We show that (i) \implies (iii) \implies (ii) \implies (i).

(i) \implies (iii) Suppose (i) holds and $K^{(i)} \neq 0$ for some $1 \leq i \leq 3$. Then $i \in \Gamma$ and $e_0(K^{(i)}) = 0$ using Lemma 4.2 which is a contradiction.

(iii) \implies (ii) From the exact sequence (4.3), we get that $\text{Im } \phi \cong ((I_1/(I_2 + Q)) \otimes \mathcal{F}')(-1)$. Now the first exact sequence follows from the exact sequence in (4.2) and the second exact sequence follows from the exact sequence in (4.1).

(ii) \implies (i) Suppose (ii) holds. Then, for all $n \geq 0$,

$$\ell_A(I_n/I_{n+1}) = \ell_A(G(\mathcal{I})_n) = \ell_A([\mathcal{F}']_n) + \ell_A([R(\mathcal{I})/\mathcal{R}_+(1) + T]_n) \\ = \ell_A([\mathcal{F}']_n) + \ell_A([(I_1/(I_2 + Q)) \otimes \mathcal{F}']_{n-1}) + \ell_A(S_{n-1}).$$

Now using the same argument as done in Lemma 4.2, we get the desired equality.

Finally, since $\mathcal{F}' \cong (A/I_1)[X_1, \dots, X_d]$ by Lemma 3.2 and $(I_1/(I_2 + Q)) \otimes \mathcal{F}'$ is a maximal Cohen-Macaulay module, we get the injective maps

$$\mathrm{H}_{\mathcal{M}}^i(G(\mathcal{I})) \hookrightarrow \mathrm{H}_{\mathcal{M}}^i(R(\mathcal{I})/(\mathcal{R}_+(1) + T)) \hookrightarrow \mathrm{H}_{\mathcal{M}}^i(S)(-1)$$

of graded T -modules for $0 \leq i \leq d-1$ and $H_{\mathcal{M}}^i(G(\mathcal{I})) \cong H_{\mathcal{M}}^i(R(\mathcal{I})/(\mathcal{R}_+(1)+T)) \cong H_{\mathcal{M}}^i(S)(-1)$ for $0 \leq i \leq d-2$. \square

Corollary 4.4. *Suppose that the conditions (C_1) , (C_2) and (C_3) are satisfied and the equality $e_1(\mathcal{I}) - e_1(Q) = 2e_0(\mathcal{I}) - 2\ell(A/I_1) - \ell(I_1/(I_2+Q))$ holds. Then*

- (i) $I_{n+2} \subseteq Q^n I_1$ for all $n \geq 0$,
- (ii) $Q^n \cap I_{n+1} = Q^n I_1$ for all $n \geq 0$,
- (iii) $\text{depth } G(\mathcal{I}) > 0$ and
- (iv) $(a_1, \dots, \tilde{a}_i, \dots, a_d) : a_i \subseteq I_2 + Q$ for all $1 \leq i \leq d$.

Proof. If $I_1 = Q$, then by Remark 3.8, A is Cohen-Macaulay and $\mathcal{I} = \{I^n = Q^n\}$. Then the conclusion holds. Suppose $Q \subsetneq I_1$.

- (i) By Proposition 4.3, $K^{(3)} = 0$ which gives $I_{n+2} \subseteq Q^n I_1$ for all $n \geq 0$.
- (ii) By Proposition 4.3, $K^{(2)} = 0$, so $[K^{(2)}]_n = Q^n \cap I_{n+1}/Q^n I_1 = 0$ for all $n \geq 0$.
- (iii) Using the two exact sequences of Proposition 4.3(ii) and depth lemma, it is enough to see that $(I_1/(I_2+Q)) \otimes \mathcal{F}' \cong (I_1/(I_2+Q)) \otimes A/I_1[X_1, \dots, X_d]$ and S have positive depths as T -modules.
- (iv) Let $x \in (a_1, \dots, \tilde{a}_i, \dots, a_d) : a_i$. Then $xa_i = \sum_{1 \leq j \leq d, j \neq i} a_j x_j$, $x_j \in A$. Here, $x, x_j \in I_1$ due to the condition (C_2) . Let

$$g = \bar{x} \otimes \overline{a_i t} - \sum_{1 \leq j \leq d, j \neq i} \bar{x}_j \otimes \overline{a_j t} \in (I_1/(I_2+Q)) \otimes \mathcal{F}'$$

where \bar{x}, \bar{x}_j denote the images of x, x_j in $I_1/(I_2+Q)$ and $\overline{a_i t}$ denote the image of $a_i t$ in \mathcal{F}' . The image of g under the map $0 \rightarrow ((I_1/(I_2+Q)) \otimes \mathcal{F}')(-1) \rightarrow R(\mathcal{I})/(\mathcal{R}_+(1)+T)$ is

$$\overline{xa_i t^2} - \sum_{1 \leq j \leq d, j \neq i} \overline{x_j a_j t^2} = 0$$

which implies that $g = 0 \in (I_1/(I_2+Q)) \otimes \mathcal{F}' \cong (I_1/(I_2+Q)) \otimes (A/I_1)[\overline{a_1 t}, \dots, \overline{a_d t}]$. Therefore, $x \in I_2 + Q$. \square

5. A necessary and sufficient condition for equality in (1.1)

In this section, we prove a necessary and sufficient condition for the equality $e_1(\mathcal{I}) - e_1(Q) = 2e_0(\mathcal{I}) - 2\ell_A(A/I_1) - \ell_A(I_1/(I_2+Q))$ to hold. We begin with the following remark.

Remark 5.1. *Suppose $I_2 \subseteq Q$ and the equality $e_1(\mathcal{I}) - e_1(Q) = 2e_0(\mathcal{I}) - 2\ell(A/I_1) - \ell(I_1/(I_2+Q))$ holds. Then A is Cohen-Macaulay with $I_{n+1} = Q^n I_1$ for $n \geq 1$, $S = (0)$ and $G(\mathcal{I})$ is Cohen-Macaulay with $a(G(\mathcal{I})) \leq 1 - d$.*

Proof. By Proposition 3.4, $e_1(\mathcal{I}) - e_1(Q) \geq e_0(\mathcal{I}) - \ell(A/I_1)$. Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= e_1(\mathcal{I}) - e_1(Q) - 2e_0(\mathcal{I}) + 2\ell(A/I_1) + \ell(I_1/Q) \\ &= e_1(\mathcal{I}) - e_1(Q) - 2e_0(\mathcal{I}) + \ell(A/I_1) + \ell(A/Q) \\ &\geq \ell(A/Q) - e_0(\mathcal{I}) \\ &\geq 0. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, $\ell_A(A/Q) = e_0(Q)$ which implies that A is Cohen-Macaulay, see [?, Section 4.7] and $e_1(\mathcal{I}) - e_1(Q) = e_0(\mathcal{I}) - \ell(A/I_1)$. Using Corollary 3.6, $S = (0)$ as $\dim S \neq d$. Recall that if A is Cohen-Macaulay, then either $S = (0)$ or $\dim S = d$, see [30, Proposition 2.1]. Consequently, $I_{n+1} = Q^n I_1$ for all $n \geq 1$ and $G(\mathcal{I})$ is Cohen-Macaulay by Vallabrega-Valla criteria. Since $G(\mathcal{I})$ is Cohen-Macaulay, we have $a_d(G(\mathcal{I})) + d \leq 1$. \square

Proposition 5.2. *Suppose that the conditions (C_1) and (C_2) are satisfied and the equality $e_1(\mathcal{I}) - e_1(Q) = 2e_0(\mathcal{I}) - 2\ell_A(A/I_1) - \ell_A(I_1/(I_2+Q))$ holds. Then $I_{n+2} \subseteq Q^n I_2 + W$ for $n \geq 1$ and $W \subseteq I_2$.*

Proof. We first show that $W \subseteq I_2$. By Lemma 3.7(iii), we have that $W \subseteq I_2 + Q$ and the equality (1.1) holds in C . Then by Corollary 4.4, $Q^n C \cap I_{n+1} C = Q^n I_1 C$ for $n \geq 0$. Now let $w = i + q \in W$ where $i \in I_2$ and $q \in Q$. Then $q = w - i \in (Q + W) \cap (I_2 + W) = QI_1 + W$. So, $q \in (QI_1 + W) \cap Q = QI_1$ since $Q \cap W = 0$ which implies $w = i + q \in I_2$. Hence $W \subseteq I_2$.

For the rest of the proof, we may pass to the ring C and assume that the conditions (C_1) , (C_2) and (C_3) are satisfied. We show, by induction on d , that $I_{n+2} = Q^n I_2$ for all $n \geq 1$. Suppose the equality $e_1(\mathcal{I}) - e_1(Q) = 2e_0(\mathcal{I}) - 2\ell_A(A/I_1) - \ell_A(I_1/(I_2 + Q))$ holds. Then by Corollary 4.4, $\text{depth } G(\mathcal{I}) > 0$ and $I_{n+2} \subseteq Q^n I_1$ for all $n \geq 0$. We may assume that $f_1 = a_1 t \in R(\mathcal{I})$ is a regular element of $G(\mathcal{I})$.

Suppose $d = 1$. Since $I_{n+2} \subseteq Q^n I_1 \subseteq (a_1^n)$ and f_1^n is a regular element of $G(\mathcal{I})$, we get that $I_{n+2} = I_{n+2} \cap (a_1^n) = a_1^n I_2 = Q^n I_2$ for all $n \geq 1$.

Suppose $d \geq 2$. As earlier, let $A' = A/(a_1)$, $Q' = Q/(a_1)$, $I' = I/(a_1)$ and $\mathcal{I}' = \mathcal{I}/(a_1)$ be the filtration in A' . Then the conditions (C_1) and (C_2) are satisfied for A' and $e_1(\mathcal{I}') - e_1(Q') = 2e_0(\mathcal{I}') - 2\ell_A(A'/I_1') - \ell_A(I_1'/(I_2' + Q'))$ by Lemma 3.7. Further, (C_1) , (C_2) and (C_3) are satisfied for $C' = A'/H_m^0(A')$. Let $\mathcal{I}C' = \{I_n A' + H_m^0(A')/H_m^0(A')\}$ be the $I'C'$ -good filtration in C' . By induction hypothesis, we have for all $n \geq 1$,

$$\begin{aligned} I_{n+2} A' &\subseteq Q^n I_2 A' + H_m^0(A') \\ \Rightarrow I_{n+2} &\subseteq Q^n I_2 + (a_1) + H_m^0(A') \\ &\subseteq Q^n I_2 + ((a_1) : Q) \end{aligned}$$

since a_1, \dots, a_d is a d -sequence and $H_m^0(A') = ((a_1) : Q)$. Now we show that $I_{n+2} \subseteq Q^n I_2$ by induction on n . let $x \in I_{n+2}$, write $x = y + z$ where $y \in Q^n I_2$ and $z \in ((a_1) : Q)$. Then $z = x - y \in ((a_1) : Q) \cap I_{n+2} \subseteq ((a_1) : Q) \cap Q^n I_1 \subseteq ((a_1) : Q) \cap Q = (a_1)$ since $I_{n+2} \subseteq Q^n I_1$ by Corollary 4.4 and a_1, \dots, a_d is a d -sequence. This implies

$$z \in (a_1) \cap I_{n+2} = a_1 I_{n+1} \subseteq Q I_{n+1}$$

as $a_1 t$ is a regular element for $G(\mathcal{I})$. For $n = 1$, we get that $x = y + z \in Q I_2$. Suppose $n > 1$. Then $z \in Q I_{n+1} \subseteq Q \cdot Q^{n-1} I_2$ by induction hypothesis which implies $x \in Q^n I_2$. This completes the proof. \square

Now we prove the main result of this section.

Theorem 5.3. *Let $Q = (a_1, \dots, a_d) \subseteq I$ be a reduction of \mathcal{I} and the conditions (C_1) and (C_2) hold. Then the following conditions are equivalent:*

- (1) $e_1(\mathcal{I}) - e_1(Q) = 2e_0(\mathcal{I}) - 2\ell(A/I_1) - \ell(I_1/(I_2 + Q))$;
- (2) $I_{n+2} \subseteq Q^n I_2 + W$, $(Q^n + W) \cap (I_{n+1} + W) = Q^n I_1 + W$ for all $n \geq 1$ and $(a_1, \dots, \check{a}_i, \dots, a_d) : a_i \subseteq I_2 + Q$ for $1 \leq i \leq d$.

When this is the case, we have $W \subseteq I_2$.

Proof. (1) \Rightarrow (2) By Proposition 5.2, $I_{n+2} \subseteq Q^n I_2 + W$ for $n \geq 1$ and $W \subseteq I_2$. By Lemma 3.7, we have $e_1(\mathcal{I}C) - e_1(QC) = 2e_0(\mathcal{I}C) - 2\ell_A(C/I_1 C) - \ell_A(I_1 C/(I_2 C + QC))$ and $W \subseteq I_2 + Q$. Since (C_1) , (C_2) and (C_3) are satisfied for C , by Corollary 4.4 we get $(Q^n + W) \cap (I_{n+1} + W) = Q^n I_1 + W$ for $n \geq 1$ and $(a_1, \dots, \check{a}_i, \dots, a_d) :_A a_i \subseteq I_2 + Q$ for all $1 \leq i \leq d$;

(2) \Rightarrow (1) Suppose $Q = I_1$. Then $I_2 + W = (I_2 + W) \cap (Q + W) = QI_1 + W = Q^2 + W$ and $I_{n+2} \subseteq Q^{n+2} + W$ for $n \geq 1$. This implies that $\mathcal{I}C = \{Q^n C\}$ and $e_1(\mathcal{I}C) - e_1(QC) = 0$. Since $W \subseteq (a_1, \dots, \check{a}_i, \dots, a_d) : a_i \subseteq I_2 + Q$, it is enough to get the equality

$$e_1(\mathcal{I}C) - e_1(QC) = 0 = 2(e_0(\mathcal{I}C) - \ell(C/QC))$$

in C and apply Lemma 3.7. By [27, Theorem 4.1], we have that $e_0(\mathcal{I}C) = e_0(QC) = \ell(C/QC) - \ell((a_1, \dots, a_{d-1}) : a_d / ((a_1, \dots, a_{d-1}) : a_d) \cap Q) = \ell(C/QC)$ as $(a_1, \dots, a_{d-1}) : a_d \subseteq I_2 + Q = Q$.

Now let $Q \subsetneq I_1$. Since A satisfies (C_1) , by Remark 2.1, $W \subseteq (a_1, \dots, \check{a}_i, \dots, a_d) : a_i \subseteq I_2 + Q$. We show the required equality in the ring C and use Lemma 3.7. Passing to the ring C , we may assume that

the conditions (C_1) , (C_2) and (C_3) are satisfied and $I_{n+1} = Q^{n-1}I_2$ for $n \geq 2$ and $Q^n \cap I_{n+1} = Q^n I_1$ for all $n \geq 1$. By Proposition 4.3, it is enough to show that $K^{(i)} = 0$ for $1 \leq i \leq 3$. It follows easily that

$$K^{(3)} = \bigoplus_{n \geq 1} \frac{I_{n+2} + I_1 Q^n}{I_1 Q^n} = 0 \text{ and } K^{(2)} = \bigoplus_{n \geq 1} \frac{Q^n \cap I_{n+1}}{I_1 Q^n} = 0.$$

Now we show that $K^{(1)} = 0$. From (4.3), we have the exact sequence

$$0 \rightarrow K^{(1)} \rightarrow ([R(\mathcal{I})/(\mathcal{R}_+(1) + T)]_1 \otimes \mathcal{F}')(-1) \xrightarrow{\psi_3} \text{Im } \phi \rightarrow 0$$

where $K^{(1)} = \ker \psi_3$. Suppose $K^{(1)} \neq 0$. Let

$$n = \min\{m \mid [K^{(1)}]_m \neq 0\}.$$

Since $[[R(\mathcal{I})/(\mathcal{R}_+(1) + T)]_1 \otimes \mathcal{F}']_{m-1} = 0$ for all $m \leq 0$, we have $[K^{(1)}]_m = 0$ for $m \leq 0$. For $m = 1$, notice that

$$[[R(\mathcal{I})/(\mathcal{R}_+(1) + T)]_1 \otimes \mathcal{F}']_0 \cong I_1/(I_2 + Q) \otimes A/I_1 \cong I_1/(I_2 + Q).$$

Let $g = \sum_{1 \leq i \leq p} \bar{z}_i \otimes \bar{r}_i \in [K^{(1)}]_1$ where \bar{z}_i denote the image of $z_i \in I_1$ in $I_1/(I_2 + Q)$ and \bar{r}_i denote the image of r_i in A/I_1 . Then $\psi_3(g) = \sum_{1 \leq i \leq p} \overline{z_i r_i t} = 0$ where $\overline{z_i r_i t}$ denote the image in $\text{Im } \phi \subseteq [R(\mathcal{I})/(\mathcal{R}_+(1) + T)]_1 = I_1/(I_2 + Q)$ which implies $\sum_{1 \leq i \leq p} z_i r_i \in I_2 + Q$, i.e., $g = \sum_{1 \leq i \leq p} \bar{z}_i \otimes \bar{r}_i = \sum_{1 \leq i \leq p} \overline{z_i r_i} \otimes \bar{1} = 0$ in $[[R(\mathcal{I})/(\mathcal{R}_+(1) + T)]_1 \otimes \mathcal{F}']_0$. This gives that $[K^{(1)}]_1 = 0$. Therefore, $n \geq 2$. Let $0 \neq g \in [K^{(1)}]_n = [\ker \psi_3]_n$. Put

$$\Lambda = \{(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_d) \in \mathbb{Z}^d \mid \alpha_i \geq 0 \text{ for } 1 \leq i \leq d \text{ and } \sum_{i=1}^d \alpha_i = n - 1\}$$

We may write

$$g = \sum_{\alpha \in \Lambda, \alpha_1 \geq 1} \overline{x_\alpha} \otimes \overline{(a_1 t)^{\alpha_1} (a_2 t)^{\alpha_2} \dots (a_d t)^{\alpha_d}} + \sum_{\beta \in \Lambda, \beta_1 = 0} \overline{x_\beta} \otimes \overline{(a_2 t)^{\beta_2} \dots (a_d t)^{\beta_d}}$$

where $\overline{x_\alpha}$ and $\overline{x_\beta}$ denote the images of $x_\alpha, x_\beta \in I_1$ in $I_1/(I_2 + Q)$, and $\overline{(a_1 t)^{\alpha_1} (a_2 t)^{\alpha_2} \dots (a_d t)^{\alpha_d}}$ and $\overline{(a_2 t)^{\beta_2} \dots (a_d t)^{\beta_d}}$ denote the images of corresponding elements in \mathcal{F}'_{n-1} . Then

$$\begin{aligned} \psi_3(g) &= \sum_{\alpha \in \Lambda, \alpha_1 \geq 1} \overline{x_\alpha a_1^{\alpha_1} a_2^{\alpha_2} \dots a_d^{\alpha_d} t^n} + \sum_{\beta \in \Lambda, \beta_1 = 0} \overline{x_\beta a_2^{\beta_2} \dots a_d^{\beta_d} t^n} = 0 \in [R(\mathcal{I})/\mathcal{R}_+(1) + T]_n \\ &\Rightarrow \sum_{\alpha \in \Lambda, \alpha_1 \geq 1} x_\alpha a_1^{\alpha_1} a_2^{\alpha_2} \dots a_d^{\alpha_d} + \sum_{\beta \in \Lambda, \beta_1 = 0} x_\beta a_2^{\beta_2} \dots a_d^{\beta_d} \in I_{n+1} + Q^n. \end{aligned}$$

We have for all $n \geq 2$, $I_{n+1} + Q^n = Q^{n-1}I_2 + Q^n \subseteq a_1 Q^{n-2}I_2 + (a_2, \dots, a_d)^{n-1}I_2 + a_1 Q^{n-1} + (a_2, \dots, a_d)^n \subseteq a_1 Q^{n-2}I_2 + a_1 Q^{n-1} + (a_2, \dots, a_d)^{n-1}$ and $\sum_{\beta \in \Lambda, \beta_1 = 0} x_\beta a_2^{\beta_2} \dots a_d^{\beta_d} \in (a_2, \dots, a_d)^{n-1}$. So,

there exists $q \in Q^{n-2}I_2$ and $q' \in Q^{n-1}$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} &\sum_{\alpha \in \Lambda, \alpha_1 \geq 1} x_\alpha a_1^{\alpha_1} a_2^{\alpha_2} \dots a_d^{\alpha_d} + a_1 q + a_1 q' \in (a_2, \dots, a_d)^{n-1} \\ &\Rightarrow a_1 \cdot \left\{ \sum_{\alpha \in \Lambda, \alpha_1 \geq 1} x_\alpha a_1^{\alpha_1 - 1} a_2^{\alpha_2} \dots a_d^{\alpha_d} + q + q' \right\} \in (a_2, \dots, a_d)^{n-1} \\ &\Rightarrow \sum_{\alpha \in \Lambda, \alpha_1 \geq 1} x_\alpha a_1^{\alpha_1 - 1} a_2^{\alpha_2} \dots a_d^{\alpha_d} + q + q' \in (a_2, \dots, a_d)^{n-2}(I_2 + Q) \subseteq I_n + Q^{n-1} \end{aligned}$$

since $(a_2, \dots, a_d)^{n-1} : a_1 \subseteq (a_2, \dots, a_d)^{n-2} \cdot ((a_2, \dots, a_d) : a_1)$ by [12, Lemma 3.5] and $(a_2, \dots, a_d) : a_1 \subseteq I_2 + Q$ is given. Hence, we get

$$\sum_{\alpha \in \Lambda, \alpha_1 \geq 1} x_\alpha a_1^{\alpha_1 - 1} a_2^{\alpha_2} \dots a_d^{\alpha_d} \in I_n + Q^{n-1}$$

$$\Rightarrow \sum_{\alpha \in \Gamma_1} \overline{x_\alpha} \otimes \overline{(a_1 t)^{\alpha_1 - 1} (a_2 t)^{\alpha_2} \dots (a_d t)^{\alpha_d}} \in [K^{(1)}]_{n-1} = 0$$

which implies that

$$g = \sum_{\beta \in \Gamma_2} \overline{x_\beta} \otimes \overline{(a_2 t)^{\beta_2} \dots (a_d t)^{\beta_d}}.$$

Therefore $g = 0$ since, by symmetry of the elements $a_i t$, the similar steps can be repeated for any a_i , $1 \leq i \leq d$. This is a contradiction. Hence $K^{(1)} = 0$. This completes the proof. \square

6. A detour to generalized depth and generalized Cohen-Macaulayness

At this point, we take a detour to gather facts on the finiteness properties of the local cohomology modules. The results of this section will be used in proving our main theorems in Section 7. We first recall the notion of generalized depth, defined in [15]. We refer to the papers of Brodmann [1] and Faltings [5] for this topic. For an A -module M and an ideal J of A , the generalized depth of M with respect to J is

$$g\text{-depth}_J(M) := \sup\{k \in \mathbb{Z} \mid J \subseteq \sqrt{\text{Ann}_A H_m^i(M)} \text{ for all } i < k\}.$$

Note that, $g\text{-depth}_J M \geq k$ if and only if some power of J annihilates $H_m^i(M)$ for $0 \leq i \leq k-1$. For a non-negatively graded Noetherian ring $S = \bigoplus_{n \geq 0} S_n$ with S_0 local and a homogeneous ideal \mathcal{J} of S , we define the generalized depth of a graded S -module L with respect to \mathcal{J} as,

$$g\text{-depth}_{\mathcal{J}} L = g\text{-depth}_{\mathcal{J}L_{\mathcal{E}}} L_{\mathcal{E}}$$

where \mathcal{E} is the unique maximal homogeneous ideal of S . Investigating the relationship between the depths of $R(I)$ and $G(I)$, authors in [15, Proposition 3.2] proved that

$$g\text{-depth}_{R(I)_+} R(I) = g\text{-depth}_{G(I)_+} G(I) + 1.$$

We extend the above result for I -good filtration in Proposition 6.2. First we note the following lemma.

Lemma 6.1. *Let \mathfrak{p} be a prime ideal of $R(\mathcal{I})$ such that $R(\mathcal{I})_+(1) \subseteq \mathfrak{p}$ and $R(\mathcal{I})_+ \not\subseteq \mathfrak{p}$. Let $\mathfrak{q} = \mathfrak{p}/R(\mathcal{I})_+(1)$. Then*

$$\text{depth } R(\mathcal{I})_{\mathfrak{p}} = \text{depth } G(\mathcal{I})_{\mathfrak{q}} + 1.$$

Proof. Choose $xt^m \in R(\mathcal{I})_+ \setminus \mathfrak{p}$ with $x \in I_m$. Then $(xt^{m-1})R(\mathcal{I})_{\mathfrak{p}} \subseteq R(\mathcal{I})_+(1)R(\mathcal{I})_{\mathfrak{p}}$. Indeed, $(xt^{m-1})R(\mathcal{I})_{\mathfrak{p}} = R(\mathcal{I})_+(1)R(\mathcal{I})_{\mathfrak{p}}$. To see this, let $a = yt^n \in R(\mathcal{I})_+(1)$ with $y \in I_{n+1}$, then $yt^n = xt^{m-1} \cdot \frac{yt^{n+1}}{xt^m} \in xt^{m-1}R(\mathcal{I})_{\mathfrak{p}}$. Therefore $G(\mathcal{I})_{\mathfrak{q}} \cong R(\mathcal{I})_{\mathfrak{p}}/R(\mathcal{I})_+(1)R(\mathcal{I})_{\mathfrak{p}} = R(\mathcal{I})_{\mathfrak{p}}/(xt^{m-1})R(\mathcal{I})_{\mathfrak{p}}$. If xt^{m-1} is a zero-divisor in $R(\mathcal{I})_{\mathfrak{p}}$, then there exists an associated prime \mathfrak{p}' of $R(\mathcal{I})$ such that $xt^{m-1} \in \mathfrak{p}' \subseteq \mathfrak{p}$. Suppose $\mathfrak{p}' = (0 :_{R(\mathcal{I})} f)$, then $xt^{m-1}f = 0 \implies xt^m f = 0 \implies xt^m \in \mathfrak{p}' \subseteq \mathfrak{p}$, a contradiction. Thus, xt^{m-1} is non-zero-divisor in $R(\mathcal{I})_{\mathfrak{p}}$ which gives the desired result. \square

Suppose $I_{n+1} = I_1 I_n$ for all $n \geq n_0$. Then $I_{n_0+r} = I_1^r I_{n_0}$ for all $r \geq 1$ which gives $(\mathcal{R}_+)_{n_0+r} = I_{n_0+r} t^{n_0+r} = (I_1 t)^r I_{n_0} t^{n_0} \subseteq (\mathcal{R}_+^{r+1})_{n_0+r}$ for all $r \geq 1$. In other words, $(\mathcal{R}_+)_{n_0+r} = (\mathcal{R}_+^{n-n_0+1})_{n_0+r}$ for $n \geq n_0$. Therefore, for each $m \geq 1$ and for all $n \gg 0$, we have

$$(\mathcal{R}_+^m)_n = (\mathcal{R}_+)_{n_0+m} \quad (6.1)$$

Proposition 6.2. *Let (A, \mathfrak{m}) be a Noetherian local ring and $\mathcal{I} = \{I_n\}$ a filtration of A . Then*

$$g\text{-depth}_{G(\mathcal{I})_+} G(\mathcal{I}) = g\text{-depth}_{R(\mathcal{I})_+} R(\mathcal{I}) - 1$$

Proof. We may assume that A is complete, see [15, Remark 2.4]. Consequently, A is a homomorphic image of a regular local ring and hence $R(\mathcal{I})$ and $G(\mathcal{I})$ are homomorphic images of regular rings. Now using [18, Proposition 2.4], we have that

$$g\text{-depth}_{G(\mathcal{I})_+} G(\mathcal{I}) = \min\{\text{depth } G(\mathcal{I})_{\mathfrak{p}} + \dim G(\mathcal{I})/\mathfrak{p} \mid \mathfrak{p} \in \text{Spec } G(\mathcal{I}), G(\mathcal{I})_+ \not\subseteq \mathfrak{p}, \mathfrak{p} \text{ is homogeneous}\}$$

$g\text{-depth}_{R(\mathcal{I})_+} R(\mathcal{I}) = \min\{\text{depth } R(\mathcal{I})_{\mathfrak{p}} + \dim R(\mathcal{I})/\mathfrak{p} \mid \mathfrak{p} \in \text{Spec}R(\mathcal{I}), R(\mathcal{I})_+ \not\subseteq \mathfrak{p}, \mathfrak{p} \text{ is homogeneous}\}.$

Suppose $g\text{-depth}_{\mathcal{R}_+} R(\mathcal{I}) \geq k$. Let \mathfrak{q} be a prime ideal of $G(\mathcal{I})$ not containing $G(\mathcal{I})_+$. Then there exists a prime ideal \mathfrak{p} in $R(\mathcal{I})$ such that $\mathcal{R}_+(1) \subseteq \mathfrak{p}$ and $\mathfrak{q} = \mathfrak{p}/\mathcal{R}_+(1)$. Clearly, $\mathcal{R}_+ \not\subseteq \mathfrak{p}$ as $G(\mathcal{I})_+ \not\subseteq \mathfrak{q}$. By Lemma 6.1, $\text{depth } R(\mathcal{I})_{\mathfrak{p}} = \text{depth } G(\mathcal{I})_{\mathfrak{q}} + 1$. Therefore,

$$\text{depth } G(\mathcal{I})_{\mathfrak{q}} + \dim G(\mathcal{I})/\mathfrak{q}G(\mathcal{I}) = \text{depth } R(\mathcal{I})_{\mathfrak{p}} - 1 + \dim R(\mathcal{I})/\mathfrak{p} \geq k - 1.$$

which implies that $g\text{-depth}_{G(\mathcal{I})_+} G(\mathcal{I}) \geq g\text{-depth}_{\mathcal{R}_+} R(\mathcal{I}) - 1$.

For the converse, let $g\text{-depth}_{G(\mathcal{I})_+} G(\mathcal{I}) \geq k$. let \mathfrak{p} be a homogeneous prime ideal of $R(\mathcal{I})$ such that $\mathcal{R}_+ \not\subseteq \mathfrak{p}$. Then, there exists a $\mathfrak{p}' \in \text{Spec}R(\mathcal{I})$, $\mathcal{R}_+ \not\subseteq \mathfrak{p}'$ and $(\mathcal{R}_+(1), \mathfrak{p}) \subseteq \mathfrak{p}'$. Otherwise, for each prime ideal \mathfrak{p}' with $(\mathcal{R}_+(1), \mathfrak{p}) \subseteq \mathfrak{p}'$, we have $\mathcal{R}_+ \subseteq \mathfrak{p}'$. This means $\mathcal{R}_+ \subseteq \sqrt{(\mathcal{R}_+(1), \mathfrak{p})}$ which implies $\mathcal{R}_+^l \subseteq (\mathcal{R}_+(1), \mathfrak{p})$ for all $l \gg 0$. Using (6.1), $(\mathcal{R}_+^l)_n = (\mathcal{R}_+)_n = (\mathcal{R}_+(1), \mathfrak{p})_n$ for all $n \gg 0$. This implies $I_n t^n = I_{n+1} t^n + \mathfrak{p}_n \implies \mathfrak{p}_n = I_n t^n$ for all $n \gg 0$. Thus, for all $n \gg 0$, $(\mathcal{R}_+)_n = \mathfrak{p}_n \implies \mathcal{R}_+ \subseteq \mathfrak{p}$ which is a contradiction.

Now let $\mathfrak{q} = \mathfrak{p}'/\mathcal{R}_+(1)$. From [15, Remark 2.2] and Lemma 6.1, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \text{depth } R(\mathcal{I})_{\mathfrak{p}} + \dim R(\mathcal{I})/\mathfrak{p} &\geq \text{depth } R(\mathcal{I})_{\mathfrak{p}'} + \dim R(\mathcal{I})/\mathfrak{p}' \\ &\geq \text{depth } G(\mathcal{I})_{\mathfrak{q}} + 1 + \dim G(\mathcal{I})/\mathfrak{q} \\ &\geq k + 1. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, $g\text{-depth}_{\mathcal{R}_+} R(\mathcal{I}) \geq k + 1$ which gives $g\text{-depth}_{\mathcal{R}_+} R(\mathcal{I}) \geq g\text{-depth}_{G(\mathcal{I})_+} G(\mathcal{I}) + 1$. \square

Next, we establish a relationship between the generalized depths of Sally module and associated graded ring of filtration in Proposition 6.4. The I -adic case was discussed in [21]. First we need the following lemma.

Lemma 6.3. *Suppose that the conditions (C_1) and (C_2) are satisfied. Then, for each $0 \leq i \leq d$, we have*

$$[\mathbf{H}_{\mathcal{M}}^i(I_1 T)]_n \cong \begin{cases} \mathbf{H}_{\mathcal{M}}^0(A) & \text{if } i = n = 0 \\ \mathbf{H}_{\mathcal{M}}^{i-1}(A) & \text{if } 3 \leq i \leq d \text{ and } 2 - i \leq n \leq -1 \\ (0) & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

for all $n \in \mathbb{Z}$. Hence $I_1 T$ is a generalized Cohen-Macaulay T -module and $\dim_T I_1 T = d + 1$.

Proof. By Lemma 3.2, $\mathcal{F}' \cong (A/I_1)[X_1, \dots, X_d]$ is Cohen-Macaulay. So, by the exact sequence,

$$0 \rightarrow I_1 T \rightarrow T \rightarrow \mathcal{F}' \rightarrow 0,$$

we get

$$\mathbf{H}_{\mathcal{M}}^i(I_1 T) \cong \mathbf{H}_{\mathcal{M}}^i(T)$$

for $0 \leq i \leq d - 1$ and the exact sequence

$$0 \rightarrow \mathbf{H}_{\mathcal{M}}^d(I_1 T) \rightarrow \mathbf{H}_{\mathcal{M}}^d(T) \rightarrow \mathbf{H}_{\mathcal{M}}^d(\mathcal{F}')$$

of graded T -modules. Since $[\mathbf{H}_{\mathcal{M}}^d(T)]_n = 0$ for all $n \leq 1 - d$ by [28, Theorem 6.2] and $[\mathbf{H}_{\mathcal{M}}^d(\mathcal{F}')]_n = 0$ for all $n \geq 1 - d$, we have $\mathbf{H}_{\mathcal{M}}^d(I_1 T) \cong \mathbf{H}_{\mathcal{M}}^d(T)$ as graded T -modules. Now the conclusion follows by [28, Theorem 6.2]. \square

Proposition 6.4. *Suppose that the conditions (C_1) , (C_2) and (C_3) are satisfied and $S \neq 0$. Let $l = g\text{-depth}_{\mathcal{M}} S$. Then (i) $g\text{-depth}_{\mathcal{M}} G(\mathcal{I}) = l - 1$ if $l < d$ and (ii) S is generalized Cohen-Macaulay T -module if and only if $g\text{-depth}_{\mathcal{M}} G(\mathcal{I}) \geq d - 1$. The later is the case when $l = d$.*

Proof. Clearly $l \leq \dim_T S = d$. By Lemma 6.3, $I_1 T$ is generalized Cohen-Macaulay with $\dim_T I_1 T = d + 1$. Consider the exact sequence

$$0 \rightarrow I_1 T \rightarrow \mathcal{R}_+(1) \rightarrow S \rightarrow 0.$$

If $l = d$, then it follows that $g\text{-depth}_{\mathcal{M}} \mathcal{R}_+(1) \geq d$ and if $l < d$, then $g\text{-depth}_{\mathcal{M}} \mathcal{R}_+(1) = l$. Next, we consider the exact sequence

$$0 \rightarrow \mathcal{R}_+ \rightarrow R(\mathcal{I}) \rightarrow A \rightarrow 0.$$

Since A is generalized Cohen-Macaulay local ring of dimension d , we get that $g\text{-depth}_{\mathcal{M}} R(\mathcal{I}) \geq d$ if $l = d$ and $g\text{-depth}_{\mathcal{M}} \mathcal{R} = g\text{-depth}_{\mathcal{M}} R(\mathcal{I})_+ = l$ if $l < d$. By Proposition 6.2, $g\text{-depth}_{\mathcal{M}} G(\mathcal{I}) = l - 1$ if $l < d$.

Thus, we have that $l = d \iff g\text{-depth}_{\mathcal{M}} R(\mathcal{I}) \geq d \iff g\text{-depth}_{\mathcal{M}} G(\mathcal{I}) \geq d - 1$. Note that S is generalized Cohen-Macaulay if and only if $l = d$. \square

7. Buchsbaumness of $G(\mathcal{I})$

In this section, we develop the proofs of Theorem A and Theorem B. With the hypothesis as in Theorem A, we first see that $G(\mathcal{I})$ is generalized Cohen-Macaulay in Proposition 7.1. We begin with the following note.

Consider the canonical homomorphism of graded rings $G(\mathcal{I}) \xrightarrow{\phi} G(\mathcal{I}C) \rightarrow 0$. It is easy to see that $[\ker \phi]_n \cong (I_n \cap W)/(I_{n+1} \cap W)$ which is (0) for $n \gg 0$. So, $H_{\mathcal{M}}^0(\ker \phi) = \ker \phi$ and $H_{\mathcal{M}}^i(\ker \phi) = 0$ for $i \geq 1$. We get an exact sequence

$$0 \rightarrow H_{\mathcal{M}}^0(\ker \phi) \rightarrow H_{\mathcal{M}}^0(G(\mathcal{I})) \rightarrow H_{\mathcal{M}}^0(G(\mathcal{I}C)) \text{ and} \\ H_{\mathcal{M}}^i(G(\mathcal{I})) \cong H_{\mathcal{M}}^i(G(\mathcal{I}C)) \text{ for } i \geq 1 \quad (7.1)$$

Suppose $e_1(\mathcal{I}) - e_1(Q) = 2e_0(\mathcal{I}) - 2\ell(A/I_1) - \ell(I_1/(I_2 + Q))$. Then passing to C , we may assume that (C_1) , (C_2) and (C_3) are satisfied. Then by Corollary 4.4, $\text{depth } G(\mathcal{I}C) > 0$ which gives

$$H_{\mathcal{M}}^0(\ker \phi) = H_{\mathcal{M}}^0(G(\mathcal{I})) \quad (7.2)$$

Proposition 7.1. *Suppose that the conditions (C_1) and (C_2) are satisfied and $e_1(\mathcal{I}) - e_1(Q) = 2e_0(\mathcal{I}) - 2\ell_A(A/I_1) - \ell_A(I_1/(I_2 + Q))$ holds. Then $G(\mathcal{I})$ is generalized Cohen-Macaulay and S is a generalized Cohen-Macaulay T -module.*

Proof. By Remark 5.1, we may assume that $I_2 \not\subseteq Q$, $S \neq 0$. We have $H_{\mathcal{M}}^i(G(\mathcal{I})) \cong H_{\mathcal{M}}^i(G(\mathcal{I}C))$ for $i \geq 1$ as in (7.1). Thus we may pass to the ring C and assume that (C_1) , (C_2) and (C_3) are satisfied. By Proposition 4.3, we have that

$$H_{\mathcal{M}}^i(G(\mathcal{I})) \hookrightarrow H_{\mathcal{M}}^i(R(\mathcal{I})/(\mathcal{R}_+(1) + T)) \hookrightarrow H_{\mathcal{M}}^i(S)(-1)$$

for $0 \leq i \leq d-1$. Then $g\text{-depth}_{\mathcal{M}} S \leq g\text{-depth}_{\mathcal{M}} G(\mathcal{I})$. Therefore, by Proposition 6.4, $g\text{-depth}_{\mathcal{M}} S = g\text{-depth}_{\mathcal{M}} G(\mathcal{I}) = d$ which gives that $G(\mathcal{I})$ and S are generalized Cohen-Macaulay. \square

We now describe the local cohomology modules of $G(\mathcal{I})$.

Theorem 7.2. *Suppose that the conditions (C_1) and (C_2) are satisfied and $e_1(\mathcal{I}) - e_1(Q) = 2e_0(\mathcal{I}) - 2\ell(A/I_1) - \ell(I_1/(I_2 + Q))$. Then the following hold true.*

(i) For all $n \in \mathbb{Z}$,

$$[H_{\mathcal{M}}^0(G(\mathcal{I}))]_n \cong \begin{cases} W/I_3 \cap W & \text{if } n = 2 \\ (I_n \cap W)/(I_{n+1} \cap W) & \text{if } n \geq 3 \\ (0) & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

(ii) We have $H_{\mathcal{M}}^i(G(\mathcal{I})) = [H_{\mathcal{M}}^i(G(\mathcal{I}))]_{2-i} \cong H_{\mathfrak{m}}^i(A)$ for $1 \leq i \leq d-1$.

(iii) We have $a(G(\mathcal{I})) \leq 2 - d$.

Proof. In view of Remark 5.1, we may assume that $I_2 \not\subseteq Q$, $S \neq (0)$. By (7.2), $[\mathbf{H}_{\mathcal{M}}^0(G(\mathcal{I}))]_n = (I_n \cap W)/(I_{n+1} \cap W)$ which vanishes for $n = 0, 1$ as $W \subseteq I_2$ from Proposition 5.2. Further, $[\mathbf{H}_{\mathcal{M}}^0(G(\mathcal{I}))]_2 = W/I_3 \cap W$. This proves part (i).

Now by passing to the ring C , we may assume that (C_1) , (C_2) and (C_3) are satisfied, $\text{depth } G(\mathcal{I}) > 0$ by Corollary 4.4 and $f_1 = a_1 t$ is a non-zero-divisor on $G(\mathcal{I})$. The exact sequence $0 \rightarrow G(\mathcal{I})(-1) \xrightarrow{f_1} G(\mathcal{I}) \rightarrow G(\mathcal{I})/f_1 G(\mathcal{I}) \rightarrow 0$ gives the following exact sequence of local cohomology modules

$$\begin{aligned} 0 \rightarrow \mathbf{H}_{\mathcal{M}}^0(G(\mathcal{I})/f_1 G(\mathcal{I})) \rightarrow \mathbf{H}_{\mathcal{M}}^1(G(\mathcal{I}))(-1) \xrightarrow{f_1} \mathbf{H}_{\mathcal{M}}^1(G(\mathcal{I})) \rightarrow \mathbf{H}_{\mathcal{M}}^1(G(\mathcal{I})/f_1 G(\mathcal{I})) \rightarrow \dots \\ \rightarrow \mathbf{H}_{\mathcal{M}}^{i-1}(G(\mathcal{I})/f_1 G(\mathcal{I})) \rightarrow \mathbf{H}_{\mathcal{M}}^i(G(\mathcal{I}))(-1) \xrightarrow{f_1} \mathbf{H}_{\mathcal{M}}^i(G(\mathcal{I})) \rightarrow \mathbf{H}_{\mathcal{M}}^i(G(\mathcal{I})/f_1 G(\mathcal{I})) \rightarrow \dots \\ \rightarrow \mathbf{H}_{\mathcal{M}}^{d-1}(G(\mathcal{I})/f_1 G(\mathcal{I})) \rightarrow \mathbf{H}_{\mathcal{M}}^d(G(\mathcal{I}))(-1) \xrightarrow{f_1} \mathbf{H}_{\mathcal{M}}^d(G(\mathcal{I})) \rightarrow 0. \end{aligned} \quad (7.3)$$

We apply induction on d to prove the assertions in (ii) and (iii). Suppose $d = 1$. Then $I_3 = a_1 I_2$ by Proposition 5.2. We have $G(\mathcal{I})/f_1 G(\mathcal{I}) = A/I_1 \oplus I_1/(I_2 + Q) \oplus I_2/QI_1$ and $[\mathbf{H}_{\mathcal{M}}^1(G(\mathcal{I}))]_n = 0$ for all $n \gg 0$. This gives that $a_1(G(\mathcal{I})) \leq 1$.

Now let $d \geq 2$ and the assertions in (ii) and (iii) hold for $d - 1$. Let $A' = A/(a_1)$, $I' = I/(a_1)$, $Q' = Q/(a_1)$ and $\mathcal{I}' = \mathcal{I}/a_1$. Note that $G(\mathcal{I}') \cong G(\mathcal{I})/f_1 G(\mathcal{I})$. Then by Lemma 3.7,

$$e_1(\mathcal{I}') - e_1(Q') = 2e_0(\mathcal{I}') - 2\ell_A(A'/I_1') - \ell_A(I_1'/(I_2' + Q'))$$

and the conditions (C_1) and (C_2) hold for A' . By induction hypothesis, we have that

$$a_{d-1}(G(\mathcal{I}')) \leq 2 - (d - 1) = 3 - d$$

and for all $1 \leq i \leq d - 2$,

$$\mathbf{H}_{\mathcal{M}}^i(G(\mathcal{I}')) = [\mathbf{H}_{\mathcal{M}}^i(G(\mathcal{I}'))]_{2-i} \cong \mathbf{H}_{\mathfrak{m}}^i(A'). \quad (7.4)$$

For $i = d - 1$, we consider the exact sequence, obtained from (7.3),

$$[\mathbf{H}_{\mathcal{M}}^{d-1} G(\mathcal{I}')]_{a(G(\mathcal{I}))+1} \rightarrow [\mathbf{H}_{\mathcal{M}}^d(G(\mathcal{I})(-1))]_{a(G(\mathcal{I}))+1} \rightarrow 0$$

which implies that $[\mathbf{H}_{\mathcal{M}}^{d-1} G(\mathcal{I}')]_{a(G(\mathcal{I}))+1} \neq 0$. Therefore $a(G(\mathcal{I})) + 1 \leq a(G(\mathcal{I}')) \leq 3 - d$ i.e. $a(G(\mathcal{I})) \leq 2 - d$.

Now the condition (C_1) implies that $Q = (a_1, \dots, a_d)$ is a standard system of parameters of A . Then (a_2, \dots, a_d) is a standard system of parameters of A' . Since $I_{n+2} = Q^n I_2$ for all $n \geq 1$ by Proposition 5.2, we have $I'_n \cap \mathbf{H}_{\mathfrak{m}}^0(A') \subseteq Q' \cap \mathbf{H}_{\mathfrak{m}}^0(A') = 0$ for all $n \geq 3$ by [28, Corollary 2.3]. Therefore, by part (i),

$$\mathbf{H}_{\mathcal{M}}^0(G(\mathcal{I}')) = [\mathbf{H}_{\mathcal{M}}^0(G(\mathcal{I}'))]_2 \cong \mathbf{H}_{\mathfrak{m}}^0(A'). \quad (7.5)$$

Since $\mathbf{H}_{\mathcal{M}}^{i-1}(G(\mathcal{I}')) = [\mathbf{H}_{\mathcal{M}}^{i-1}(G(\mathcal{I}'))]_{3-i}$ for all $1 \leq i \leq d - 1$ by (7.4) and (7.5), we get the exact sequences

$$0 \rightarrow [\mathbf{H}_{\mathcal{M}}^i(G(\mathcal{I}))]_{n-1} \rightarrow [\mathbf{H}_{\mathcal{M}}^i(G(\mathcal{I}))]_n$$

for all $n \geq 4 - i$ and $1 \leq i \leq d - 1$. This gives $[\mathbf{H}_{\mathcal{M}}^i(G(\mathcal{I}))]_n = 0$ for all $n \geq 3 - i$ and $1 \leq i \leq d - 1$.

From (7.3) and (7.4), we also get

$$[\mathbf{H}_{\mathcal{M}}^i(G(\mathcal{I}))]_{n-1} \rightarrow [\mathbf{H}_{\mathcal{M}}^i(G(\mathcal{I}))]_n \rightarrow 0$$

for all $n \leq 1 - i$ and $1 \leq i \leq d - 2$. By Proposition 7.1, $G(\mathcal{I})$ is generalized Cohen-Macaulay which implies that $[\mathbf{H}_{\mathcal{M}}^i(G(\mathcal{I}))]_n = 0$ for $n \ll 0$ for $1 \leq i \leq d - 2$. Therefore, we have $[\mathbf{H}_{\mathcal{M}}^i(G(\mathcal{I}))]_n = (0)$ for all $1 \leq i \leq d - 2$ and $n \leq 1 - i$. Thus, for $1 \leq i \leq d - 2$,

$$\mathbf{H}_{\mathcal{M}}^i(G(\mathcal{I})) = [\mathbf{H}_{\mathcal{M}}^i(G(\mathcal{I}))]_{2-i}.$$

Next, we show that $[\mathbf{H}_{\mathcal{M}}^{d-1}(G(\mathcal{I}))]_n = (0)$ for all $n \leq 2 - d$. Considering the monomorphisms

$$0 \rightarrow [\mathbf{H}_{\mathcal{M}}^{d-1}(G(\mathcal{I}))]_{n-1} \rightarrow [\mathbf{H}_{\mathcal{M}}^{d-1}(G(\mathcal{I}))]_n$$

for all $n \leq 2 - d$, it is enough to show that $[\mathbf{H}_{\mathcal{M}}^{d-1}(G(\mathcal{I}))]_{2-d} = (0)$. By Proposition 4.3, we have the injections

$$[\mathbf{H}_{\mathcal{M}}^{d-1}(G(\mathcal{I}))]_{2-d} \hookrightarrow [\mathbf{H}_{\mathcal{M}}^{d-1}(R(\mathcal{I})/\mathcal{R}_+(1) + T)]_{2-d} \hookrightarrow [\mathbf{H}_{\mathcal{M}}^{d-1}(S)]_{1-d}. \quad (7.6)$$

We show that $[\mathbf{H}_{\mathcal{M}}^{d-1}(S)]_{1-d} = (0)$.

Claim: For $1 \leq i \leq d - 1$, we have $[\mathbf{H}_{\mathcal{M}}^i(\mathcal{R}_+(1))]_n = (0)$ for all $n \leq 2 - i$ and $n < 0$.

Proof of Claim. The exact sequence $0 \rightarrow \mathcal{R}_+(1) \rightarrow R(\mathcal{I}) \rightarrow G(\mathcal{I}) \rightarrow 0$ of graded T -modules induces the exact sequence

$$\mathbf{H}_{\mathcal{M}}^{i-1}(G(\mathcal{I})) \rightarrow \mathbf{H}_{\mathcal{M}}^i(\mathcal{R}_+(1)) \rightarrow \mathbf{H}_{\mathcal{M}}^i(R(\mathcal{I}))$$

of local cohomology modules. Since $\mathbf{H}_{\mathcal{M}}^{i-1}(G(\mathcal{I})) = [\mathbf{H}_{\mathcal{M}}^{i-1}(G(\mathcal{I}))]_{3-i}$, we have the injective maps

$$[\mathbf{H}_{\mathcal{M}}^i(\mathcal{R}_+(1))]_n \hookrightarrow [\mathbf{H}_{\mathcal{M}}^i(R(\mathcal{I}))]_n$$

for $n \neq 3 - i$. On the other hand, the exact sequence $0 \rightarrow \mathcal{R}_+(-1) \rightarrow R(\mathcal{I}) \rightarrow A \rightarrow 0$ induces isomorphism $[\mathbf{H}_{\mathcal{M}}^i(R(\mathcal{I}))]_n \cong [\mathbf{H}_{\mathcal{M}}^i(\mathcal{R}_+)]_{n-1}$ for all $n < 0$. Thus,

$$[\mathbf{H}_{\mathcal{M}}^i(\mathcal{R}_+(1))]_n \hookrightarrow [\mathbf{H}_{\mathcal{M}}^i(R(\mathcal{I}))]_n \cong [\mathbf{H}_{\mathcal{M}}^i(\mathcal{R}_+)]_{n-1} \quad (7.7)$$

for all $n \leq 2 - i$ and $n < 0$. Since $G(\mathcal{I})$ is generalized Cohen-Macaulay by Proposition 7.1, $R(\mathcal{I})$ is generalized Cohen-Macaulay by [26, Proposition 3.5] which implies that $\mathbf{H}_{\mathcal{M}}^i(R(\mathcal{I}))$ is finitely graded for $1 \leq i \leq d - 1$. Using (7.7), we get that $[\mathbf{H}_{\mathcal{M}}^i(\mathcal{R}_+(1))]_n = 0$ for all $n \leq 2 - i$ and $n < 0$. \square

Now consider the exact sequence

$$0 \rightarrow I_1T \rightarrow \mathcal{R}_+(1) \rightarrow S \rightarrow 0 \quad (7.8)$$

and the induced exact sequence of local cohomology modules

$$[\mathbf{H}_{\mathcal{M}}^{d-1}(\mathcal{R}_+(1))]_{1-d} \rightarrow [\mathbf{H}_{\mathcal{M}}^{d-1}(S)]_{1-d} \rightarrow [\mathbf{H}_{\mathcal{M}}^d(I_1T)]_{1-d}.$$

Since $[\mathbf{H}_{\mathcal{M}}^d(I_1T)]_{1-d} = (0)$ by Lemma 6.3 and $[\mathbf{H}_{\mathcal{M}}^{d-1}(\mathcal{R}_+(1))]_{1-d} = (0)$ by Claim, we get $[\mathbf{H}_{\mathcal{M}}^{d-1}(S)]_{1-d} = (0)$ and so $[\mathbf{H}_{\mathcal{M}}^{d-1}(G(\mathcal{I}))]_{2-d} = 0$ by (7.6).

It remains to show that $[\mathbf{H}_{\mathcal{M}}^i(G(\mathcal{I}))]_{2-i} \cong \mathbf{H}_{\mathfrak{m}}^i(A)$ for $1 \leq i \leq d - 1$. The exact sequence $0 \rightarrow A \xrightarrow{a_1} A \rightarrow A' \rightarrow 0$ induces the isomorphism $\mathbf{H}_{\mathfrak{m}}^0(A') \cong \mathbf{H}_{\mathfrak{m}}^1(A)$ since $a_1 \mathbf{H}_{\mathfrak{m}}^1(A) = (0)$. Therefore, using (7.5), we get that

$$\mathbf{H}_{\mathcal{M}}^1(G(\mathcal{I})) = [\mathbf{H}_{\mathcal{M}}^1(G(\mathcal{I}))]_1 \cong [\mathbf{H}_{\mathcal{M}}^0(G(\mathcal{I}'))]_2 \cong \mathbf{H}_{\mathfrak{m}}^0(A') \cong \mathbf{H}_{\mathfrak{m}}^1(A)$$

Suppose $2 \leq i \leq d - 1$. From Proposition 4.3, we have

$$[\mathbf{H}_{\mathcal{M}}^i(G(\mathcal{I}))]_{2-i} \hookrightarrow [\mathbf{H}_{\mathcal{M}}^i(R(\mathcal{I})/(\mathcal{R}_+(1) + T))]_{2-i} \hookrightarrow [\mathbf{H}_{\mathcal{M}}^i(S)]_{1-i}$$

and from (7.8), we have

$$[\mathbf{H}_{\mathcal{M}}^i(\mathcal{R}_+(1))]_{1-i} \rightarrow [\mathbf{H}_{\mathcal{M}}^i(S)]_{1-i} \rightarrow [\mathbf{H}_{\mathcal{M}}^{i+1}(I_1T)]_{1-i}.$$

Since $[\mathbf{H}_{\mathcal{M}}^i(\mathcal{R}_+(1))]_{1-i} = 0$ by Claim and $[\mathbf{H}_{\mathcal{M}}^{i+1}(I_1T)]_{1-i} \cong \mathbf{H}_{\mathfrak{m}}^i(A)$ by Lemma 6.3, we get that

$$\mathbf{H}_{\mathcal{M}}^i(G(\mathcal{I})) = [\mathbf{H}_{\mathcal{M}}^i(G(\mathcal{I}))]_{2-i} \hookrightarrow \mathbf{H}_{\mathfrak{m}}^i(A)$$

for $2 \leq i \leq d - 1$. Then

$$\mathbb{I}(A) \leq \mathbb{I}(G(\mathcal{I})) = \sum_{i=1}^{d-1} \binom{d-1}{i} \ell(\mathbf{H}_{\mathcal{M}}^i(G(\mathcal{I}))) \leq \sum_{i=1}^{d-1} \binom{d-1}{i} \ell_A(\mathbf{H}_{\mathfrak{m}}^i(A)) = \mathbb{I}(A)$$

see [28, Corollary 5.2] for the first inequality. Then $\mathbf{H}_{\mathcal{M}}^i(G(\mathcal{I})) = [\mathbf{H}_{\mathcal{M}}^i(G(\mathcal{I}))]_{2-i} \cong \mathbf{H}_{\mathfrak{m}}^i(A)$ for $1 \leq i \leq d - 1$. This completes the proof. \square

Now we state and prove our main results.

Theorem 7.3. *Let A be a Noetherian local ring and $Q = (a_1, \dots, a_d) \subseteq I$ a reduction of \mathcal{I} such that the conditions (C_1) and (C_2) are satisfied. Suppose the equality*

$$e_1(\mathcal{I}) - e_1(Q) = 2e_0(\mathcal{I}) - 2\ell(A/I_1) - \ell(I_1/(I_2 + Q))$$

holds. Then $G(\mathcal{I})$ is generalized Cohen-Macaulay with

$$\ell(\mathbf{H}_{\mathcal{M}}^0(G(\mathcal{I}))) = \ell(\mathbf{H}_{\mathfrak{m}}^0(A)), \quad \mathbf{H}_{\mathcal{M}}^i(G(\mathcal{I})) = [\mathbf{H}_{\mathcal{M}}^i(G(\mathcal{I}))]_{2-i} \cong \mathbf{H}_{\mathfrak{m}}^i(A)$$

for $1 \leq i \leq d-1$ and $a(G(\mathcal{I})) \leq 2-d$. Furthermore,

- (1) $e_2(\mathcal{I}) = e_1(Q) + e_2(Q) + e_1(\mathcal{I}) - e_0(\mathcal{I}) + \ell_A(A/I_1)$ if $d \geq 2$;
- (2) $e_i(\mathcal{I}) = e_{i-2}(Q) + 2e_{i-1}(Q) + e_i(Q)$ for $3 \leq i \leq d$.

When this is the case, clearly $\mathbb{I}(G(\mathcal{I})) = \mathbb{I}(A)$ and $\text{depth } G(\mathcal{I}) = \text{depth } A$.

Proof. By Proposition 7.1, $G(\mathcal{I})$ is generalized Cohen-Macaulay and the description of the local cohomology modules $\mathbf{H}_{\mathcal{M}}^i(G(\mathcal{I}))$ follows from Theorem 7.2. It remains to find the Hilbert coefficients. If $I_2 \subseteq Q$, then A is Cohen-Macaulay and $I_{n+1} = Q^n I_1$ for $n \geq 1$ by Remark 5.1. Then we have $e_1(Q) = 0$ and $e_1(\mathcal{I}) = 2e_0(\mathcal{I}) - 2\ell_A(A/I_1) - \ell_A(I_1/Q) = e_0(\mathcal{I}) - \ell_A(A/I_1)$ which implies $e_i(\mathcal{I}) = 0$ for $2 \leq i \leq d$, see [14, Corollary 2.4]. Since $e_i(Q) = 0$ for $1 \leq i \leq d$, the assertions (1) and (2) hold.

Suppose $I_2 \not\subseteq Q$. Then $e_1(\mathcal{I}C) - e_1(QC) = 2e_0(\mathcal{I}C) - 2\ell(C/I_1C) - \ell(I_1C/(I_2C + QC))$. We also have that $e_i(\mathcal{I}C) = e_i(\mathcal{I})$, $e_i(QC) = e_i(Q)$ for $1 \leq i \leq d-1$, $e_d(\mathcal{I}) = e_d(\mathcal{I}C) + (-1)^d \ell_A(W)$, $e_d(Q) = e_d(QC) + (-1)^d \ell_A(W)$ and $\ell_A(A/I_1) = \ell_A(C/I_1C)$ as $W \subseteq I_2$ by Proposition 5.2. Therefore, we may pass to the ring C and assume that (C_1) , (C_2) and (C_3) are satisfied. By Corollary 3.6,

$$e_i(\mathcal{I}) = e_{i-1}(Q) + e_i(Q) + e_{i-1}(S) \tag{7.9}$$

for $2 \leq i \leq d$. For $n \gg 0$, we write

$$\begin{aligned} \ell(S_{n-1}) &= \sum_{i=0}^{d-1} (-1)^i e_i(S) \binom{n+d-2-i}{d-1-i} \\ &= e_0(S) \binom{n+d-1}{d-1} + \sum_{i=1}^{d-1} (-1)^i (e_i(S) + e_{i-1}(S)) \binom{n+d-1-i}{d-1-i}. \end{aligned}$$

By Lemma 4.2 and Proposition 4.3, we have

$$\ell(S_{n-1}) = \ell(I_n/I_{n+1}) - \{\ell(A/I_1) + \ell(I_1/(I_2 + Q))\} \binom{n+d-1}{d-1} + \ell(I_1/(I_2 + Q)) \binom{n+d-2}{d-2}$$

for all $n \geq 0$. On comparing the coefficients, we get

$$\begin{aligned} e_0(S) &= e_0(\mathcal{I}) - \ell(A/I_1) - \ell(I_1/(I_2 + Q)), \\ e_1(S) + e_0(S) &= e_1(\mathcal{I}) - \ell(I_1/I_2 + Q) \text{ and} \\ e_i(S) + e_{i-1}(S) &= e_i(\mathcal{I}) \text{ for } 2 \leq i \leq d-1. \end{aligned}$$

We use Corollary 3.6 to obtain $e_1(S) = e_1(\mathcal{I}) - e_0(S) - \ell(I_1/I_2 + Q) = e_1(\mathcal{I}) - e_0(\mathcal{I}) + \ell(A/I_1)$ and $e_i(S) = e_i(\mathcal{I}) - e_{i-1}(S) = e_{i-1}(Q) + e_i(Q)$, for $2 \leq i \leq d-1$. We put these values in (7.9) to complete the proof. \square

In a Buchsbaum local ring, having $\mathbb{I}(G(\mathcal{I})) = \mathbb{I}(A)$ is a sufficient condition to conclude that $G(\mathcal{I})$ is Buchsbaum. We recall the following theorem of [24] for our use.

Theorem 7.4. [24, Theorem 1.2] *Let A be a Buchsbaum local ring and $Q = (a_1, \dots, a_d) \subseteq I$ a reduction of \mathcal{I} . Then the following statements are equivalent:*

- (1) $G(\mathcal{I})$ is a Buchsbaum $R(\mathcal{I})$ -module and $\ell(\mathbf{H}_{\mathcal{M}}^i(G(\mathcal{I}))) = \ell(\mathbf{H}_{\mathfrak{m}}^i(A))$ for $0 \leq i < d$.
- (2) $\mathbb{I}(G(\mathcal{I})) = \mathbb{I}(A)$.

Now we state our result on Buchsbaumness of $G(\mathcal{I})$.

Theorem 7.5. *Let A be a Buchsbaum local ring and $Q = (a_1, \dots, a_d) \subseteq I$ a reduction of \mathcal{I} such that the condition (C_2) is satisfied. Suppose*

$$e_1(\mathcal{I}) - e_1(Q) = 2e_0(\mathcal{I}) - 2\ell(A/I_1) - \ell(I_1/(I_2 + Q)).$$

Then $G(\mathcal{I})$ is Buchsbaum with $\mathbb{I}(G(\mathcal{I})) = \mathbb{I}(A)$.

Proof. Suppose A is Buchsbaum. Then the condition (C_1) is satisfied and $\mathbb{I}(G(\mathcal{I})) = \mathbb{I}(A)$ by Theorem 7.3. Therefore, by Theorem 7.4, $G(\mathcal{I})$ is Buchsbaum. \square

8. Buchsbaumness of $F_{\mathfrak{m}}(I)$

Now we discuss the passage of Buchsbaumness from the local ring to the special fiber ring $F_{\mathfrak{m}}(I)$ of I . We prove Theorem C and Theorem D in this section. Recall that $\mathcal{U} := \mathfrak{m}R(I) + R(I)_+$. For the rest of the paper, let $Q = (a_1, \dots, a_d) \subseteq I$ be a reduction of I and let us fix \mathcal{I} to be the I -good filtration: $\{I_0 = A, I_n = \mathfrak{m}I^{n-1} \text{ for } n \geq 1\}$. Then $\ell_A(I^n/\mathfrak{m}I^n) = \ell_A(A/I_{n+1}) - \ell_A(A/I^n)$ for $n \geq 0$ which gives the relation $f_0(I) = e_1(I) - e_1(\mathcal{I}) + e_0(I)$. Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} e_1(\mathcal{I}) - e_1(Q) &= 2e_0(I) - 2\ell(A/I_1) - \ell(I_1/(I_2 + Q)) \text{ if and only if} \\ f_0(I) &= e_1(I) - e_0(I) - e_1(Q) + \ell(A/I) + \mu(I) - d + 1. \end{aligned}$$

Further, we consider the following exact sequences of $R(I)$ -modules.

$$0 \rightarrow N \rightarrow G(I) \rightarrow F_{\mathfrak{m}}(I) \rightarrow 0 \quad (8.1)$$

$$0 \rightarrow F_{\mathfrak{m}}(I) \rightarrow G(\mathcal{I}) \rightarrow N(-1) \rightarrow 0 \quad (8.2)$$

where $N = \bigoplus_{n \geq 0} \mathfrak{m}I^n/I^{n+1}$. This induces the exact sequences of local cohomology modules

$$0 \rightarrow H_{\mathcal{U}}^0(N) \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow H_{\mathcal{U}}^i(G(I)) \rightarrow H_{\mathcal{U}}^i(F_{\mathfrak{m}}(I)) \rightarrow H_{\mathcal{U}}^{i+1}(N) \rightarrow \dots \text{ and} \quad (8.3)$$

$$0 \rightarrow H_{\mathcal{U}}^0(F_{\mathfrak{m}}(I)) \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow H_{\mathcal{U}}^i(G(\mathcal{I})) \rightarrow H_{\mathcal{U}}^i(N)(-1) \rightarrow H_{\mathcal{U}}^{i+1}(F_{\mathfrak{m}}(I)) \rightarrow \dots \quad (8.4)$$

Lemma 8.1. *Suppose the conditions (C_1) and (C_2) are satisfied. Suppose $e_1(I) - e_1(Q) = 2e_0(I) - 2\ell(A/I) - \ell(I/(I^2 + Q))$ and $f_0(I) = e_1(I) - e_0(I) - e_1(Q) + \ell(A/I) + \mu(I) - d + 1$. Then*

(1)

$$[H_{\mathcal{U}}^0(N)]_n \cong \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } n = 0, 1 \\ (\mathfrak{m}I^n \cap W)/(I^{n+1} \cap W) & \text{if } n \geq 2. \end{cases}$$

(2)

$$[H_{\mathcal{U}}^0(F_{\mathfrak{m}}(I))]_n \cong \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } n = 0, 1 \\ W/(\mathfrak{m}I^2 \cap W) & \text{if } n = 2 \\ (I^n \cap W)/(\mathfrak{m}I^n \cap W) & \text{if } n \geq 3. \end{cases}$$

Proof. From the exact sequences (8.3) and (8.4), we have

$$\begin{aligned} [H_{\mathcal{U}}^0(N)]_n &= \ker \left([H_{\mathcal{U}}^0(G(I))]_n \rightarrow [H_{\mathcal{U}}^0(F_{\mathfrak{m}}(I))]_n \right) \text{ and} \\ [H_{\mathcal{U}}^0(F_{\mathfrak{m}}(I))]_n &= \ker \left([H_{\mathcal{U}}^0(G(\mathcal{I}))]_n \rightarrow [H_{\mathcal{U}}^0(N(-1))]_n \right). \end{aligned}$$

By Theorem 7.2, $[H_{\mathcal{U}}^0(F_{\mathfrak{m}}(I))]_n = 0 = [H_{\mathcal{U}}^0(N)]_n$ for $n = 0, 1$ and $[H_{\mathcal{U}}^0(F_{\mathfrak{m}}(I))]_2 \cong [H_{\mathcal{U}}^0(G(\mathcal{I}))]_2 = W/(\mathfrak{m}I^2 \cap W)$. Further, $[H_{\mathcal{U}}^0(N)]_2 = \ker \left(W/(I^3 \cap W) \rightarrow W/(\mathfrak{m}I^2 \cap W) \right) = (\mathfrak{m}I^2 \cap W)/(I^3 \cap W)$ which implies $[H_{\mathcal{U}}^0(F_{\mathfrak{m}}(I))]_3 = \ker \left((\mathfrak{m}I^2 \cap W)/(\mathfrak{m}I^3 \cap W) \rightarrow (\mathfrak{m}I^2 \cap W)/(I^3 \cap W) \right) = (I^3 \cap W)/(\mathfrak{m}I^3 \cap W)$. We may now proceed by induction on n . Suppose $[H_{\mathcal{U}}^0(N)]_{n-1} \cong (\mathfrak{m}I^{n-1} \cap W)/(I^n \cap W)$ and $[H_{\mathcal{U}}^0(F_{\mathfrak{m}}(I))]_n =$

$(I^n \cap W)/(\mathfrak{m}I^n \cap W)$ for some $n \geq 3$. Then $[\mathbb{H}_{\mathcal{U}}^0(N)]_n = \ker \left((I^n \cap W)/(I^{n+1} \cap W) \rightarrow (I^n \cap W)/(\mathfrak{m}I^n \cap W) \right) = (\mathfrak{m}I^n \cap W)/(I^{n+1} \cap W)$ which implies that $[\mathbb{H}_{\mathcal{U}}^0(F_{\mathfrak{m}}(I))]_{n+1} = \ker \left((\mathfrak{m}I^n \cap W)/(\mathfrak{m}I^{n+1} \cap W) \rightarrow (\mathfrak{m}I^n \cap W)/(I^{n+1} \cap W) \right) = (I^{n+1} \cap W)/(\mathfrak{m}I^{n+1} \cap W)$. \square

Theorem 8.2. *Let A be a Noetherian local ring and $Q = (a_1, \dots, a_d) \subseteq I$ a reduction of I such that (C_1) and (C_2) are satisfied. Suppose*

$$e_1(I) - e_1(Q) = 2e_0(I) - 2\ell(A/I) - \ell(I/(I^2 + Q)) \text{ and} \quad (8.5)$$

$$f_0(I) = e_1(I) - e_0(I) - e_1(Q) + \ell(A/I) + \mu(I) - d + 1. \quad (8.6)$$

Then $F_{\mathfrak{m}}(I)$ is generalized Cohen-Macaulay with

$$[\mathbb{H}_{\mathcal{U}}^0(F_{\mathfrak{m}}(I))]_n \cong \begin{cases} W/(\mathfrak{m}I^2 \cap W) & \text{if } n = 2 \\ (I^n \cap W)/(\mathfrak{m}I^n \cap W) & \text{if } n \geq 3 \\ (0) & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

and $\mathbb{H}_{\mathcal{U}}^i(F_{\mathfrak{m}}(I)) = [\mathbb{H}_{\mathcal{U}}^i(F_{\mathfrak{m}}(I))]_{2-i} \cong \mathbb{H}_{\mathfrak{m}}^i(A)$ for $1 \leq i \leq d-1$. Consequently, if $\text{depth } A > 0$, then $\text{depth } F_{\mathfrak{m}}(I) = \text{depth } A$.

Proof. The description of $\mathbb{H}_{\mathcal{U}}^0(F_{\mathfrak{m}}(I))$ follows from Lemma 8.1. We now prove that

$$\mathbb{H}_{\mathcal{U}}^1(F_{\mathfrak{m}}(I)) = [\mathbb{H}_{\mathcal{U}}^1(F_{\mathfrak{m}}(I))]_1 \cong \mathbb{H}_{\mathfrak{m}}^1(A).$$

By the exact sequence (8.4), we have $0 = [\mathbb{H}_{\mathcal{U}}^0(N)]_{n-1} \rightarrow [\mathbb{H}_{\mathcal{U}}^1(F_{\mathfrak{m}}(I))]_n \rightarrow [\mathbb{H}_{\mathcal{U}}^1(G(\mathcal{I}))]_n \rightarrow [\mathbb{H}_{\mathcal{U}}^1(N(-1))]_n$ for $n = 0, 1, 2$. Using Theorem 7.2, we get that $[\mathbb{H}_{\mathcal{U}}^1(F_{\mathfrak{m}}(I))]_n = 0$ for $n = 0, 2$ and $[\mathbb{H}_{\mathcal{U}}^1(F_{\mathfrak{m}}(I))]_1 = \ker \left([\mathbb{H}_{\mathcal{U}}^1(G(\mathcal{I}))]_1 \cong \mathbb{H}_{\mathfrak{m}}^1(A) \rightarrow [\mathbb{H}_{\mathcal{U}}^1(N(-1))]_1 \right)$ where $[\mathbb{H}_{\mathcal{U}}^1(N(-1))]_1 = 0$ follows from the exact sequence $0 = \mathbb{H}_{\mathcal{U}}^0(F_{\mathfrak{m}}(I))_0 \rightarrow [\mathbb{H}_{\mathcal{U}}^1(N)]_0 \rightarrow [\mathbb{H}_{\mathcal{U}}^1(G(I))]_0 = 0$. Therefore,

$$[\mathbb{H}_{\mathcal{U}}^1(F_{\mathfrak{m}}(I))]_1 = [\mathbb{H}_{\mathcal{U}}^1(G(\mathcal{I}))]_1 \cong \mathbb{H}_{\mathfrak{m}}^1(A).$$

Further by the exact sequence (8.4), we have exact sequences

$$0 \rightarrow \frac{W \cap I^n}{W \cap \mathfrak{m}I^n} \rightarrow \frac{W \cap \mathfrak{m}I^{n-1}}{W \cap \mathfrak{m}I^n} \rightarrow \frac{W \cap \mathfrak{m}I^{n-1}}{W \cap I^n} \rightarrow [\mathbb{H}_{\mathcal{U}}^1(F_{\mathfrak{m}}(I))]_n \rightarrow 0$$

for $n \geq 3$. Therefore, $[\mathbb{H}_{\mathcal{U}}^1(F_{\mathfrak{m}}(I))]_n = 0$ for $n \geq 3$.

Next, we prove that

$$\mathbb{H}_{\mathcal{U}}^2(F_{\mathfrak{m}}(I)) = [\mathbb{H}_{\mathcal{U}}^2(F_{\mathfrak{m}}(I))]_0 \cong \mathbb{H}_{\mathfrak{m}}^2(A).$$

For this, we first show that $\mathbb{H}_{\mathcal{U}}^1(N) = 0$ and $[\mathbb{H}_{\mathcal{U}}^2(N)]_{-1} = 0$. To see this, consider the exact sequence $0 = [\mathbb{H}_{\mathcal{U}}^0(F_{\mathfrak{m}}(I))]_n \rightarrow [\mathbb{H}_{\mathcal{U}}^1(N)]_n \rightarrow [\mathbb{H}_{\mathcal{U}}^1(G(I))]_n = 0$ for $n \leq 0$ which gives $[\mathbb{H}_{\mathcal{U}}^1(N)]_n = 0$ for $n \leq 0$. For $n = 1$, we have $0 \rightarrow [\mathbb{H}_{\mathcal{U}}^1(N)]_1 \rightarrow [\mathbb{H}_{\mathcal{U}}^1(G(I))]_1 \cong \mathbb{H}_{\mathfrak{m}}^1(A) \rightarrow [\mathbb{H}_{\mathcal{U}}^1(F_{\mathfrak{m}}(I))]_1 \cong \mathbb{H}_{\mathfrak{m}}^1(A)$. Thus, $[\mathbb{H}_{\mathcal{U}}^1(N)]_1 = 0$. For $n \geq 2$, we have

$$0 \rightarrow [\mathbb{H}_{\mathcal{U}}^0(N)]_n \rightarrow [\mathbb{H}_{\mathcal{U}}^0(G(I))]_n \rightarrow [\mathbb{H}_{\mathcal{U}}^0(F_{\mathfrak{m}}(I))]_n \rightarrow [\mathbb{H}_{\mathcal{U}}^1(N)]_n \rightarrow 0.$$

which gives $W/(I^3 \cap W) \rightarrow W/(\mathfrak{m}I^2 \cap W) \rightarrow [\mathbb{H}_{\mathcal{U}}^1(N)]_2 \rightarrow 0$ and $(I^n \cap W)/(I^{n+1} \cap W) \rightarrow (I^n \cap W)/(\mathfrak{m}I^n \cap W) \rightarrow [\mathbb{H}_{\mathcal{U}}^1(N)]_n \rightarrow 0$ for $n \geq 3$. This implies $[\mathbb{H}_{\mathcal{U}}^1(N)]_n = 0$ for $n \geq 2$.

It is easy to see that $[\mathbb{H}_{\mathcal{U}}^2(N)]_{-1} = 0$ follows from the exact sequence

$$0 = [\mathbb{H}_{\mathcal{U}}^1(F_{\mathfrak{m}}(I))]_{-1} \rightarrow [\mathbb{H}_{\mathcal{U}}^2(N)]_{-1} \rightarrow [\mathbb{H}_{\mathcal{U}}^2(G(I))]_{-1} = 0.$$

Now from (8.4), we have $0 = [\mathbb{H}_{\mathcal{U}}^1(N(-1))]_n \rightarrow [\mathbb{H}_{\mathcal{U}}^2(F_{\mathfrak{m}}(I))]_n \rightarrow [\mathbb{H}_{\mathcal{U}}^2(G(\mathcal{I}))]_n \rightarrow [\mathbb{H}_{\mathcal{U}}^2(N(-1))]_n$. Since $[\mathbb{H}_{\mathcal{U}}^2(N(-1))]_0 = 0$, we get $[\mathbb{H}_{\mathcal{U}}^2(F_{\mathfrak{m}}(I))]_0 \cong [\mathbb{H}_{\mathcal{U}}^2(G(\mathcal{I}))]_0 \cong \mathbb{H}_{\mathfrak{m}}^2(A)$ and $[\mathbb{H}_{\mathcal{U}}^2(F_{\mathfrak{m}}(I))]_n = 0$ for $n \neq 0$ as $[\mathbb{H}_{\mathcal{U}}^2(G(\mathcal{I}))]_n = 0$ for $n \neq 0$. Therefore

$$\mathbb{H}_{\mathcal{U}}^2(F_{\mathfrak{m}}(I)) \cong [\mathbb{H}_{\mathcal{U}}^2(F_{\mathfrak{m}}(I))]_0 \cong \mathbb{H}_{\mathfrak{m}}^2(A).$$

By induction on i , we now show that for all $3 \leq i \leq d$, and $1 \leq t \leq i - 1$, we have

$$[\mathbf{H}_{\mathcal{U}}^t(F_{\mathfrak{m}}(I))]_n \cong \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } n \neq 2 - t \\ [\mathbf{H}_{\mathcal{U}}^t(G(\mathcal{I}))]_{2-t} \cong \mathbf{H}_{\mathfrak{m}}^t(A) & \text{if } n = 2 - t. \end{cases}$$

The base case is when $i = 3$. Suppose the above claim is true for some $3 \leq i \leq d - 1$. To prove it for $i + 1$, it is enough to take $t = i \geq 3$. First we note that

$$\mathbf{H}_{\mathcal{U}}^{t-1}(N) = 0 \text{ and } [\mathbf{H}_{\mathcal{U}}^t(N)]_{1-t} = 0.$$

To see this, consider the exact sequence, induced from (8.1),

$$0 = [\mathbf{H}_{\mathcal{U}}^{t-2}(F_{\mathfrak{m}}(I))]_n \rightarrow [\mathbf{H}_{\mathcal{U}}^{t-1}(N)]_n \rightarrow [\mathbf{H}_{\mathcal{U}}^{t-1}(G(I))]_n = 0$$

for $n \neq 4 - t, 3 - t$. Then $[\mathbf{H}_{\mathcal{U}}^{t-1}(N)]_n = 0$ for $n \neq 4 - t, 3 - t$. Further, $\mathbf{H}_{\mathcal{U}}^{t-1}(N)_{4-t} = \text{Coker} \left([\mathbf{H}_{\mathcal{U}}^{t-2}(G(I))]_{4-t} \rightarrow [\mathbf{H}_{\mathcal{U}}^{t-2}(F_{\mathfrak{m}}(I))]_{4-t} \right)$ and $[\mathbf{H}_{\mathcal{U}}^{t-1}(N)]_{3-t} = \ker \left([\mathbf{H}_{\mathcal{U}}^{t-1}(G(I))]_{3-t} \rightarrow [\mathbf{H}_{\mathcal{U}}^{t-1}(F_{\mathfrak{m}}(I))]_{3-t} \right)$. By induction, we have $[\mathbf{H}_{\mathcal{U}}^{t-2}(G(I))]_{4-t} \cong [\mathbf{H}_{\mathcal{U}}^{t-2}(F_{\mathfrak{m}}(I))]_{4-t}$ and $[\mathbf{H}_{\mathcal{U}}^{t-1}(G(I))]_{3-t} \cong [\mathbf{H}_{\mathcal{U}}^{t-1}(F_{\mathfrak{m}}(I))]_{3-t}$ which implies that $[\mathbf{H}_{\mathcal{U}}^{t-1}(N)]_n = 0$ for $n = 4 - t, 3 - t$. Lastly $[\mathbf{H}_{\mathcal{U}}^t(N)]_{1-t} = 0$ follows from the exact sequence

$$0 = [\mathbf{H}_{\mathcal{U}}^{t-1}(F_{\mathfrak{m}}(I))]_{1-t} \rightarrow [\mathbf{H}_{\mathcal{U}}^t(N)]_{1-t} \rightarrow [\mathbf{H}_{\mathcal{U}}^t(G(I))]_{1-t} = 0.$$

Finally, from (8.4), we have

$$[\mathbf{H}_{\mathcal{U}}^{t-1}(N(-1))]_n \rightarrow [\mathbf{H}_{\mathcal{U}}^t(F_{\mathfrak{m}}(I))]_n \rightarrow [\mathbf{H}_{\mathcal{U}}^t(G(\mathcal{I}))]_n \rightarrow [\mathbf{H}_{\mathcal{U}}^t(N(-1))]_n$$

where $\mathbf{H}_{\mathcal{U}}^{t-1}(N) = 0 = [\mathbf{H}_{\mathcal{U}}^t(N)]_{1-t}$. So, $[\mathbf{H}_{\mathcal{U}}^t(F_{\mathfrak{m}}(I))]_{2-t} \cong [\mathbf{H}_{\mathcal{U}}^t(G(\mathcal{I}))]_{2-t} \cong \mathbf{H}_{\mathfrak{m}}^t(A)$ and $[\mathbf{H}_{\mathcal{U}}^t(F_{\mathfrak{m}}(I))]_n = 0$ for $n \neq 2 - t$ since $[\mathbf{H}_{\mathcal{U}}^t(G(\mathcal{I}))]_n = 0$ for $n \neq 2 - t$ by Theorem 7.2. \square

In the next theorem, we prove the passage of Buchsbaumness to $F_{\mathfrak{m}}(I)$ for Buchsbaum local rings of almost maximal depth. In dimension two, we remove the depth condition and conclude that $F_{\mathfrak{m}}(I)/\mathbf{H}_{\mathcal{U}}^0(F_{\mathfrak{m}}(I))$ is Buchsbaum.

Theorem 8.3. *Suppose A is a Buchsbaum local ring with $\text{depth } A \geq d - 1$ and $Q = (a_1, \dots, a_d) \subseteq I$ a reduction of I such that the condition (C_2) is satisfied. Suppose the equalities in (8.5) and (8.6) hold. Then $F_{\mathfrak{m}}(I)$ is Buchsbaum with $\mathbb{I}(F(I)) = \mathbb{I}(A)$.*

Proof. Let $d = 1$. Since $\mathfrak{m} \cdot \mathbf{H}_{\mathfrak{m}}^0(A) = 0$, we have $\mathcal{U} \cdot \mathbf{H}_{\mathcal{U}}^0(F_{\mathfrak{m}}(I)) = 0$ which implies $F_{\mathfrak{m}}(I)$ is Buchsbaum. Suppose $d \geq 2$ and the assertion holds for $d - 1$. By Theorem 7.3 and Theorem 8.2, $G(I)$, $G(\mathcal{I})$ and $F_{\mathfrak{m}}(I)$ have positive depths. Let $D = A/(a_1)$ and $f = a_1 t \in R(I)$. Then D is Buchsbaum, the condition (C_2) and the equality in (8.5) and (8.6) are satisfied in D . By induction hypothesis, $F_{\mathfrak{m}D}(ID)$ is Buchsbaum. Since $f = a_1 t$ is a regular element on both $F_{\mathfrak{m}}(I)$ and $G(I)$, we have $F_{\mathfrak{m}D}(ID) \cong F_{\mathfrak{m}}(I)/fF_{\mathfrak{m}}(I)$. By [25, I. Proposition 2.19], $F_{\mathfrak{m}}(I)$ is Buchsbaum. \square

Corollary 8.4. *Suppose A is a Buchsbaum local ring of dimension two and $\text{depth } A = 0$. Let the rest of the hypothesis be same as in Theorem 8.3. Then $F_{\mathfrak{m}}(I)/\mathbf{H}_{\mathcal{U}}^0(F_{\mathfrak{m}}(I))$ is Buchsbaum.*

Proof. Let $C = A/W$. Then $\text{depth } C \geq 1$, C is Buchsbaum, the conditions (C_2) and the equality in (8.5) and (8.6) are satisfied in C . Therefore, $F_{\mathfrak{m}C}(IC)$ is Buchsbaum. Further, the kernel of $F_{\mathfrak{m}}(I) \rightarrow F_{\mathfrak{m}C}(IC)$ is $\mathbf{H}_{\mathcal{U}}^0(F_{\mathfrak{m}}(I))$, i.e., $F_{\mathfrak{m}C}(IC) \cong F_{\mathfrak{m}}(I)/\mathbf{H}_{\mathcal{U}}^0(F_{\mathfrak{m}}(I))$. \square

References

- [1] M. Brodmann, Einige Ergebnisse aus der lokalen Kohomologietheorie und ihre Anwendung, Osnabrücker Schriften zur Mathematik, 5, (1983), 439-445.
- [2] A. Corso, Sally modules of \mathfrak{m} -primary ideals in local rings, Comm. Algebra, 37, (2009), 4503-4515.
- [3] A. Corso, C. Polini and W. V. Vasconcelos, Multiplicity of the special fiber of blowups, Math. Proc. Cambridge Philos. Soc., 140, (2006), 207-219.
- [4] J. Elias and G. Valla, Rigid Hilbert functions, J. Pure Appl. Algebra, 71, (1991), 19-41.
- [5] G. Faltings, Über die Annulatoren lokaler Kohomologiegruppen, Arch. Math., 30, (1978), 473-476.
- [6] S. Goto, On Buchsbaum rings, J. Algebra, 67, (1980), 272-279.
- [7] S. Goto, Buchsbaum rings of maximal embedding dimension, J. Algebra, 76, (1982), 383-399.
- [8] S. Goto, Buchsbaum rings with multiplicity 2, J. Algebra, 74, (1982), 494-508.
- [9] S. Goto, On the associated graded rings of parameter ideals in Buchsbaum rings, J. Algebra, 85, (1983), 490-534.
- [10] S. Goto, Noetherian local rings with Buchsbaum associated graded rings, J. Algebra, 86, (1984), 336-384.
- [11] S. Goto and K. Nishida, Hilbert coefficients and Buchsbaumness of associated graded rings, J. Pure Appl. Algebra, 181, (2003), 61-74.
- [12] S. Goto and K. Ozeki, The structure of Sally modules-towards a theory of non-Cohen-Macaulay cases, J. Algebra, 324, (2010), 2129-2165.
- [13] S. Goto and H. Sakurai, The equality $I^2 = QI$ in Buchsbaum rings, Rend. Sem. Mat. Univ. Padova, 110, (2003), 25-56.
- [14] A. Guerrieri and M. E. Rossi, Hilbert coefficients of Hilbert filtrations, J. Algebra 199, (1998), 40-61.
- [15] S. Huckaba and T. Marley, Depth formulas for certain graded rings associated to an ideal, Nagoya Math. J., 133, (1998), 57-69.
- [16] C. Huneke, On the symmetric and Rees algebra of an ideal generated by a d -sequence, J. Algebra 62, (1980), 268-275.
- [17] T. Marley, Hilbert function of ideals in Cohen-Macaulay rings, PhD Thesis, Purdue University, 1989.
- [18] T. Marley, Finitely graded local cohomology and the depths of graded algebras, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc., 123, (1995), 3601-3607.
- [19] Y. Nakamura, On the Buchsbaum property of associated graded rings, J. Algebra, 209, (1998), 345-366.
- [20] K. Ozeki, The equality of Elias-Valla and the associated graded ring of maximal ideals, J. Pure Appl. Algebra, 216, (2012), 1306-1317.
- [21] K. Ozeki, The structure of Sally modules and Buchsbaumness of associated graded rings, Nagoya Math. J., 212, (2013), 97-138.
- [22] T. T. Phuong, Normal Sally modules of rank one, J. Algebra, 493, (2018), 236-250.
- [23] M. E. Rossi and G. Valla, Hilbert Functions of Filtered Modules, Lecture Notes of the Unione Matematica Italiana, 9, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2010.
- [24] K. Saloni, Buchsbaumness of the associated graded rings of filtration, *in press*, J. Algebra Appl., 2022. DOI:10.1142/S0219498822500396.
- [25] J. Stückrad and W. Vogel, Buchsbaum rings and Applications: An Interaction between Algebra, Geometry and Topology, Springer, Berlin, 1986.
- [26] N. Taniguchi, T. Phuong, N. Dung and T. N. An, Sequentially Cohen-Macaulay Rees algebras, J. Math. Soc. Japan, 69(1), (2017), 293-309.
- [27] N. V. Trung, Absolutely superficial sequences, Proc. Cambridge Philos. Soc., 93(1), (1983), 35-47.
- [28] N. V. Trung, Toward a theory of generalized Cohen-Macaulay modules, Nagoya Math. J., 102, (1986), 1-47.
- [29] W. V. Vasconcelos, Hilbert functions, analytic spread and Koszul homology, Commutative Algebra: syzygies, multiplicities, and birational algebra, Contemporary Mathematics 159, Amer. Math. Soc., (1994), 401-422.
- [30] W. V. Vasconcelos, The Sally modules of ideals: a survey, Preprint, arXiv:1612.06261v1 (2016).
- [31] K. Yamagishi, The associated graded modules of Buchsbaum modules with respect to \mathfrak{m} -primary ideals in the equi-I-invariant case, J. Algebra, 225, (2000), 1-27.
- [32] K. Yamagishi, Buchsbaumness of certain generalization of the associated graded modules in the equi-II-invariant case, J. Algebra, 322, (2009), 2861-2885.

KUMARI SALONI
 DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS
 IIT PATNA, BIHTA PATNA, 801106, INDIA
 PH-0612-3028121
 Email address: ksaloni@iitp.ac.in