NEWTON POLYHEDRA AND WHITNEY EQUISINGULARITY FOR ISOLATED DETERMINANTAL SINGULARITIES

THAÍS M. DALBELO, LUIZ HARTMANN, AND MAICOM VARELLA

ABSTRACT. Using Newton polyhedra and non-degeneracy of matrices we present conditions which guarantees the Whitney equisingularity of families of isolated determinantal singularities and we compute the local Euler obstruction of an isolated determinantal singularity. We use equivalence of matrices in order to present examples of these results and to obtain versions of them in terms of a single Newton polyhedron.

Contents

1.	Introduction	1
2.	Determinantal singularities and Newton polyhedra	3
3.	Whitney equisingularity	5
4.	Local Euler obstruction	12
5.	Equivalent matrices and invariants of determinantal singularities	14
6.	Applications	22
References		

1. INTRODUCTION

We divide this work into three main tasks. The first task is to provide conditions in terms of Newton polyhedra which guarantee the Whitney equisingularity of a family of isolated determinantal singularities. For this purpose, in Section 2 we present some concepts and definitions regarding isolated determinantal singularities and Newton polyhedra and, in Section 3, we apply [NNOOT18, Theorem 5.3] to a family of isolated determinantal

Date: January 24, 2023.

²⁰²⁰ Mathematics Subject Classification. Primary 32S30; Secondary 32S10.

Key words and phrases. Polar multiplicity, vanishing Euler characteristic, Whitney equisingularity, Newton polyhedra.

During this work T. M. Dalbelo was partially supported by FAPESP-Grant 2019/21181o. L. Hartmann was partially supported by FAPESP-Grant 2021/09534-4. M. Varella was supported by CAPES-Brazil Finance code 001 and DAAD.

singularities to obtain the following theorem, which is the main result of this work.

Theorem 1.1. Let $\{(X_{A_t}^s, 0)\}_{t\in D}$, be a d-dimensional family of determinantal singularities, defined by the germ of matrices $A_t = ((a_{ij})_t) : (\mathbb{C}^m, 0) \to (M_{n,k}, 0)$ with holomorphic entries. Suppose that $X_{A_0}^s$ has an isolated singularity at 0 and, for all $t \in D$, the matrix A_t satisfies the following conditions:

- (i) the Newton polyhedra Δ_{i}^{t} of $(a_{ij})_{t}$ are convenient and independent of t;
- (ii) the matrix A_t is strongly Newton non-degenerate (Definition 2.5).

Then the family $\{(X_{A_t}^s, 0)\}_{t \in D}$ *is Whitney equisingular.*

The second task is to present, in Section 4, a formula to compute the local Euler obstruction of an isolated determinantal singularity in terms of Newton polyhedra. In this part, we strongly use the results introduced by Esterov [Esto7]. In his work, Esterov presents a formula to compute the Euler characteristic of the Milnor fiber of a function defined on an isolated determinantal singularity in terms of Newton polyhedra, as a particular case of his results on resultantal singularities.

The third task is to present more examples, where we can apply the previous results. In Section 5, we use the equivalence of matrices to encounter matrices which define the same determinantal singularities where the condition on the Newton polyhedron being convenient is more satisfiable and also to simplify these results. Using this equivalence we obtain a formula to compute the local Euler obstruction in terms of a single Newton polyhedra.

Theorem 1.2. Let X_A^n be an isolated determinantal singularity defined by the germ $A : (\mathbb{C}^m, 0) \to (M_{n,k}, 0)$, where A has holomorphic entries and Newton polyhedron Δ_A . Suppose that Δ_A is convenient, if there exists a generic linear form $l : (\mathbb{C}^m, 0) \to (\mathbb{C}, 0)$ with a convenient Newton polyhedron such that l is Newton non-degenerate with respect to A and Δ_A (Definition 5.7), then

$$\begin{split} Eu_{X^n_A}(0) &= \sum_{q=k-n+1}^k \sum_{I \subset \{1,...,m\} \atop |I| \geq q+1} \sum_{a=1}^{|I|-q} (-1)^{|I|+k-n} \binom{|I|+q-a-2}{n+q-k-1} \\ &\times \binom{|I|-a-1}{q-1} \binom{k}{q} \cdot |I|! \cdot (L^I)^a (\widetilde{\Delta}^I_A)^{|I|-a}, \end{split}$$

where L is the standard m-dimensional simplex and $\Delta = \mathbb{R}^{m}_{+} \setminus \Delta$.

In Section 6, we introduce some applications of the results presented along this work, such as Whitney equisingularity for a family of functions

defined on isolated determinantal singularities and a Lê-Greuel type formula for the vanishing Euler characteristic of an isolated determinantal singularity.

2. Determinantal singularities and Newton polyhedra

2.1. Determinantal singularities. Determinantal varieties have been widely studied by researchers in Commutative Algebra and Algebraic Geometry (see [BRHE98, BRVE98]). In Singularity Theory there are countless articles with the purpose of studying those varieties, we can quote, for instance, Ebeling and Gusein-Zade [EBGZ09], Frühbis-Krüger and Neumer [FKNE10], Nuño-Ballesteros, Oréfice-Okamoto and Tomazella [NBOOT13], Pereira and Ruas [PERU14] and Zach [ZAC20].

Consider $M_{n,k}$ the set of complex matrices of size $n \times k$ and $M_{n,k}^s$ the subset consisting of the matrices with rank less than s, where $0 < s \leq n \leq k$ are integers. The set $M_{n,k}^s$ is an irreducible subvariety of $M_{n,k}$ with codimension (n - s + 1)(k - s + 1), which is called *generic determinantal variety*, and $M_{n,k}^{s-1}$ is its singular set.

Let $A : (\mathbb{C}^m, 0) \to (M_{n,k}, 0)$ be a holomorphic map germ defined by $A(x) = (a_{ij}(x))$ with $a_{ij} \in \mathcal{O}_m$, where \mathcal{O}_m is the ring of holomorphic functions in \mathbb{C}^m , for $1 \le i \le n$ and $1 \le j \le k$.

Definition 2.1. Let $(X_A^s, 0) \subset (\mathbb{C}^m, 0)$ be the germ of the variety defined by $X_A^s = A^{-1}(M_{n,k}^s)$. We say that X_A^s is a determinantal variety of type (n, k; s) in $(\mathbb{C}^m, 0)$ if its dimension is equal to

$$m - (n - s + 1)(k - s + 1).$$

The analytical structure of X_A^s is the one defined by A and $M_{n,k'}^s$, *i.e.*, given by the s size of A(x). When s = 1, the determinantal variety X_A^s is a complete intersection variety.

Definition 2.2. Let $(X_A^s, 0) \subset (\mathbb{C}^m, 0)$ be a determinantal variety of type (n, k; s) satisfying the condition

$$s = 1 \text{ or } m < (n - s + 2)(k - s + 2).$$

The variety $(X_A^s, 0)$ is said to be an isolated determinantal singularity (IDS) if X_A^s is smooth at x and rank A(x) = s - 1 for all $x \neq 0$ in a neighbourhood of the origin.

Remark 2.3. Isolated determinantal singularities are *G*-determined (see [PER10]), then they have a polynomial representative.

2.2. Newton polyhedra. The Newton polyhedra of polynomial functions are important objects which can be very useful to compute some invariants, such as the Milnor number, local Euler obstruction, multiplicities, among others.

The monomial $x_1^{a_1} \cdots x_m^{a_m}$ is denoted by x^a , where $a = (a_1, \ldots, a_m) \in \mathbb{Z}^m$. We denote by \mathbb{R}^m_+ , the positive orthant of \mathbb{R}^m . A subset $\Delta \subset \mathbb{R}^m_+$ is called a *Newton polyhedron* when there exists some $P \subset \mathbb{Z}^m_+$ such that Δ is the convex hull of the set $\{p + \nu : p \in P \text{ and } \nu \in \mathbb{R}^m_+\}$. In this case, Δ is said to be the Newton polyhedron determined by P. If Δ touches all the coordinate axes, we say that Δ is *convenient*.

For a face Γ of a polyhedron Δ and a function $f = \sum_{\alpha \in \Delta} c_{\alpha} x^{\alpha}$, we denote the polynomial $\sum_{\alpha \in \Gamma} c_{\alpha} x^{\alpha}$ by $f|_{\Gamma}$.

Definition 2.4. If $f \in \mathcal{O}_m$ is a germ of a polynomial function $f(x) = \sum_{p \in \mathbb{Z}_+^m} c_p x^p$,

then the support of f is supp(f) := { $p \in \mathbb{Z}_{+}^{m} | c_{p} \neq o$ }. The Newton polyhedron of f Δ_{f} is the Newton polyhedron determined by supp(f).

In the following, we present the Newton non-degeneracy conditions adapted to determinantal singularities. The Newton non-degeneracy conditions were first defined in [Esto7, Definition 1.16] for determinantal singularities given by the maximal minors of a matrix. Here we relax the maximal condition.

Definition 2.5. Let $A = (a_{ij}) : (\mathbb{C}^m, 0) \to (M_{n,k}, 0)$ be a germ of a holomorphic matrix, which defines a determinantal singularity X_A^s of type (n, k; s). We denote by $\Delta_j \subset \mathbb{R}^m_+$ the Newton polyhedron of a_{ij} , for all i = 1, ..., n, .

(i) The matrix A is said to be Newton non-degenerate if, for each collection of faces $\Gamma_j \subset \Delta_j$ such that the sum $\sum_j \Gamma_j$ is a bounded face of the polyhedron $\sum_j \Delta_j$ and for every subset $\mathcal{I} \subset \{1, ..., n\}$, with $|\mathcal{I}| \ge n - s + 1$, the matrix

$$(\mathfrak{a}_{ij}|_{\Gamma_j})_{i\in\mathcal{I},\ j\in\{1,\dots,k\}}$$

defines a determinantal variety of type $(|\mathcal{I}|, k; |\mathcal{I}| - n + s)$ *in* $(\mathbb{C} \setminus 0)^m$ *;*

- (ii) The matrix A is said to be strongly Newton non-degenerate if for each collection of faces Γ_j ⊂ Δ_j such that the sum Σ_j Γ_j is a bounded face of the polyhedron Σ_j Δ_j, the polynomial matrix (a_{ij}|_{Γ_j}) defines a non-singular determinantal variety of type (n, k; s) in (C \ 0)^m;
- (iii) A function f : (C^m, 0) → (C, 0) is said to be Newton non-degenerate with respect to A, if, for each collection of faces Γ_i ⊂ Δ_i and Γ₀ ⊂ Δ_f such that the sum ∑_{j=0}^k Γ_j is a bounded face of the polyhedron ∑_{j=0}^k Δ_j, the restriction of the 1-form df|_{Γ₀} to the determinantal variety of type (n, k; s), defined by the matrix (a_{ij}|_{Γ_j}) in (C \ 0)^m, has no zeros, which means that f|_{Γ₀} has no critical points in this determinantal variety.

The set of all convex bounded polyhedra in \mathbb{R}^m is denoted by \mathcal{M} . The *mixed volume* is defined in [GKZ08, Definition 2.6] as the unique symmetric multi-linear function

$$\mathrm{MV}:\underbrace{\mathcal{M}\times\times\mathcal{M}}_{\mathfrak{m}}\to \frac{\mathbb{Z}}{\mathfrak{m}!},$$

which satisfies $MV(\Gamma, ..., \Gamma) = Vol(\Gamma)$ for every polyhedron $\Gamma \in \mathcal{M}$, where $Vol(\Gamma)$ is the usual Euclidean volume of Γ . More explicitly, we have

$$\mathrm{MV}(\Gamma_1,\ldots,\Gamma_m)=\frac{1}{m!}\sum_{r=1}^m(-1)^{m-r}\sum_{1\leq i_1\leq\cdots\leq i_r\leq m}\mathrm{Vol}(\Gamma_{i_1}+\cdots+\Gamma_{i_r}),$$

where $\Gamma_{i_1}+\dots+\Gamma_{i_r}$ is the Minkowiski sum of the sets $\Gamma_{i_1},\dots,\Gamma_{i_r}$.

For brevity, we denote the mixed volume

$$\mathrm{MV}(\underbrace{\Gamma_1,\ldots,\Gamma_1}_{\alpha_1},\ldots,\underbrace{\Gamma_r,\ldots,\Gamma_r}_{\alpha_r})=\Gamma_1^{\alpha_1}\cdots\Gamma_r^{\alpha_r}.$$

For a set $I \subset \{1, ..., m\}$, let \mathbb{R}^I be a coordinate plane given by the equations $x_i = 0$, for $i \notin I$. Given a polyhedron $\Delta \subset \mathbb{R}^m_+$, we denote by $\widetilde{\Delta}^I$ the intersection $\mathbb{R}^I \cap \widetilde{\Delta}$, where $\widetilde{\Delta} = \mathbb{R}^m_+ \setminus \Delta$.

3. WHITNEY EQUISINGULARITY

In this section, we use the information given by Newton polyhedra and Newton non-degeneracy to present conditions which guarantee the Whitney equisingularity of a family of isolated determinantal singularities.

The relation between Whitney equisingularity and Newton polyhedra was strongly studied by Briançon (on unpublished notes), for a family of Newton non-degenerate isolated hypersurface singularities and by Eyral and Oka ([EYOK17]), for families of non-degenerate non-isolated hypersurfaces.

The concept of Whitney equisingularity is strongly related to the polar multiplicities for many important classes of spaces. For instance, in [GAF93, GAF96], Gaffney showed that a family of d-dimensional isolated complete intersection singularities (ICIS) { $(X_t, 0)$ } of any dimension d is Whitney equisingular if, and only if, the polar multiplicities $m_i(X_t, 0)$, i = 0, ..., d are constant on this family.

The polar multiplicities $m_i(X,0)$, for i = 0, ..., d - 1 are defined for any variety (X,0) (see [LêTE81]), while $m_d(X,0)$ was defined, initially, only for ICIS in [GAF93]. Using topological and geometric information from generic linear projections, Pereira and Ruas [PERU14] and Nuño-Ballesteros, Oréfice-Okamoto and Tomazella [NBOOT13] defined the top polar multiplicity $m_d(X_A^s, 0)$ for an IDS X_A^s . In [NNOOT18], the authors proved that a family of IDS $\{(X_{A_t}^s, 0)\}$ is Whitney equisingular if, and only if, $m_i(X_{A_t}^s, 0)$, i = 0, ..., d, do not depend on t.

Given an IDS $(X_A^s, 0)$, the top polar multiplicity $m_d(X_A^s, 0)$ is related to the local Euler obstruction of X_A^s (for more details on the local Euler obstruction see Section 4). In fact, in [NBOOT13, Theorem 4.5], the authors proved

$$m_d(X^s_A, 0) = \nu(X^s_A, 0) + (-1)^{d-1} \operatorname{Eu}_{X^s_A}(0) + 1,$$
 (3.1)

where $v(X_A^s, 0)$ is the vanishing Euler characteristic of X_A^s , $Eu_{X_A^s}(0)$ is the local Euler obstruction of X_A^n at 0 and $d = \dim X_A^s$. In the following we present the definition of vanishing Euler characteristic of an IDS.

Definition 3.1. The vanishing Euler characteristic of an IDS X_A^s , denoted by $v(X_A^s, 0)$, is defined as

$$\nu(X_A^s, 0) = (-1)^d (\chi(X_A^s) - 1),$$

where $\widetilde{X_A^s}$ is the generic fiber of the determinantal smoothing¹ of X_A^s , $\chi(\cdot)$ denotes the Euler characteristic and $d = \dim X_A^s$.

For more details on the vanishing Euler characteristic see [NBOOT13, Definition 3.2].

When X_A^s has codimension 2 the vanishing Euler characteristic coincides with the Milnor number defined by Pereira and Ruas in [PERU14]. Moreover, the vanishing Euler characteristic has a Lê-Greuel type formula expressing $v(X_A^s, 0)$ in terms of the top polar multiplicity and the vanishing Euler characteristic of a generic section (see [NBOOT13, Theorem 4.3 and Definition 4.4]), *i.e.*, the following equality holds

$$m_{d}(X_{A}^{s}, 0) = \nu(X_{A}^{s}, 0) + \nu(X_{A}^{s} \cap p^{-1}(0), 0),$$
(3.2)

where $p : (\mathbb{C}^m, 0) \to (\mathbb{C}, 0)$ is a generic linear function and $d = \dim X^s_A$.

We recall some notions about determinantal deformations. Consider a map germ $\mathcal{A} : (\mathbb{C}^m \times \mathbb{C}, 0) \to (M_{n,k}, 0)$ such that $\mathcal{A}(x, 0) = A(x)$ for all $x \in \mathbb{C}^m$. When X^s_A is a determinantal variety, the projection

$$\pi: egin{array}{cccc} (X^s_{\mathcal{A}}, \mathfrak{0}) & o & (\mathbb{C}, \mathfrak{0}) \ & (x, t) & \mapsto & t \end{array}$$

is called a *determinantal deformation of* X_A^s . If we fix a small enough representative $A : B_{\epsilon} \to (M_{n,k}, 0)$, where B_{ϵ} is the open ball centred at the origin with radius $\epsilon > 0$, then we set $A_t(x) := \mathcal{A}(x, t)$ and $X_{A_t}^s = A_t^{-1}(M_{n,k}^s)$.

If $X_{A_t}^s$ is a determinantal deformation of $(X_{A_0}^s, 0)$ as above, we say that:

¹For the definition see [NBOOT13, Definition 3.3].

- (i) $X_{A_t}^s$ is origin preserving if $0 \in S(X_{A_t}^s)$, for all t in D, where $S(X_{A_t}^s)$ denotes the singular set of $X^s_{A_t}$ and $D \subset \mathbb{C}$ is a disc around the origin. Then $\{(X_{A_t}^s, 0)\}_{t\in D}$ is called a 1-*parameter family* of IDS;
- (ii) $\{(X_{A_t}^s, 0)\}_{t \in D}$ is a good family if there exists $\varepsilon > 0$ with $S(X_{A_t}^s) = \{0\}$ on B_{ε} , for all t in D;
- (iii) $\left\{(X^s_{A_t},0)\right\}_{t\in D}$ is Whitney equisingular if it is a good family and $\{X_{\mathcal{A}}^{s} \setminus T, T\}$ satisfies the Whitney conditions, where $T = \{0\} \times D$.

To prove the main result we need some concepts and results in order to guarantee an uniformity condition on the family. The following concept was first introduced by Eyral and Oka [EYOK17, OKA97] for hypersurfaces and complete intersection singularities and we extend it to determinantal singularities.

Definition 3.2. Let $f : (\mathbb{C}^m, 0) \to (\mathbb{C}, 0)$ be a germ of an analytic function and $I \subset \{1, \ldots, m\}$. We say that $\mathbb{C}^I = \{(x_1, \ldots, x_m) \in \mathbb{C}^m : x_i = 0, i \notin I\}$ is an admissible coordinate subspace for f if $f|_{\mathbb{C}^I \cap U}$ is not constantly zero, where U is a neighbourhood of the origin in \mathbb{C}^m .

Definition 3.3. Let $A = (a_{ij}) : (\mathbb{C}^m, 0) \to (M_{n,k}, 0)$ be a germ of a holomorphic map, we say that \mathbb{C}^{I} is an admissible coordinate space for A if \mathbb{C}^{I} is admissible for *each* a_{ij} , j = 1, ..., k *and* i = 1, ..., n.

Along this work, we will use the following notation:

- (i) $A^{I} = (a^{I}_{ij})$, where $a^{I}_{ij} = a_{ij}|_{\mathbb{C}^{I} \cap U}$; (ii) $A^{*I} = (a^{*I}_{ij})$, where $a^{*I}_{ij} = a_{ij}|_{\mathbb{C}^{*I} \cap U}$ and $\mathbb{C}^{*I} = \{(x_{1}, \dots, x_{m}) \in \mathbb{C}^{m} :$ $x_i = 0 \Leftrightarrow i \notin I$.

In the following Lemma we extend [OKA97, Proposition 7] to determinantal singularities and using the ideas of Eyral and Oka [EYOK17, Proposition 3.1], we prove Proposition 3.5.

Lemma 3.4. Let $A : (\mathbb{C}^m, 0) \to (M_{n,k}, 0)$ be a germ of a strongly Newton nondegenerate matrix. If \mathbb{C}^1 is an admissible coordinate subspace for A, then A^I is a germ of a strongly Newton non-degenerate matrix.

Proof. For each j = 1, ..., k, let σ_j be a face of $\Delta_{\alpha_{ij}}$ such that $\sum \sigma_j = \sigma$ is a bounded face of $\sum \Delta_{a_{ij}^{I}}$. Since $\Delta_{a_{ij}^{I}} = \Delta_{a_{ij}} \cap \mathbb{R}^{I}$, σ_{j} is also a face of $\Delta_{a_{ij}}$ such that σ is a bounded face of $\sum \Delta_{a_{ij}}$ for each $j = 1, \ldots, k$. Thus, $(\mathfrak{a}_{ij}^{\scriptscriptstyle 1}|_{\sigma})$ defines a non-singular determinantal variety in $(\mathbb{C} \setminus \mathfrak{0})^m$. Hence, A^I is strongly Newton non-degenerate. \square

Proposition 3.5. Suppose that for all t sufficiently small, the following two conditions are satisfied:

(i) the matrix $A_t = ((a_{ij})_t)$ is strongly Newton non-degenerate;

(ii) the Newton polyhedron Δ_{j}^{t} of $(a_{ij})_{t}$ is independent of t, for all $j = 1, \ldots, k$.

Then there exists a positive number R > 0 such that for any admissible coordinate subspace \mathbb{C}^{I} of A_{0} and any t sufficiently small, the set $X_{A_{t}}^{s} \cap \mathbb{C}^{*I} \cap B_{R}$ is non-singular, where B_{R} is the open ball with center at the origin $0 \in \mathbb{C}^{m}$ and radius R.

Proof. As Δ_j^t is independent of t, the set of admissible systems is also independent of t and, since there are only finitely many subsets $I \subset \{1, ..., m\}$, it suffices to show the result for a fixed $I = \{1, ..., r\}$, $r \leq m$.

We argue by contradiction. Suppose that for all R > 0 the intersection $X_{A_t}^s \cap \mathbb{C}^{*I} \cap B_R$ has a singular point and consider the sequence $\{(t_R, z_R)\}$ of points in $X_{\mathcal{A}}^s \cap (D \times \mathbb{C}^{*I})$ converging to (0, 0), where z_R is a singularity of $X_{A_t}^s \cap \mathbb{C}^{*I} \cap B_R$. Then (0, 0) is in the closure of the set

$$W = \{(t, z) \in D \times \mathbb{C}^{*1} : z \in X^s_{A_t} \text{ and } z \text{ is a singular point of } X^s_{A_t}\}.$$

Then, by the curve selection lemma [MIL68], there exists an analytic curve

$$p: egin{array}{ccc} [0,\epsilon] & o & W \ q & \mapsto & (\mathfrak{t}(q),z(q)) \end{array}$$

such that $p(q) = (t(q), z_1(q), \dots, z_r(q), 0, \dots, 0)$, for all $q \neq 0$, and p(0) = (0, 0). For $1 \le i \le r$, consider the Taylor expansions

$$\mathbf{t}(\mathbf{q}) = \mathbf{t}_0 \mathbf{q}^{\mathbf{v}} + \cdots, \qquad \mathbf{z}_{\mathbf{i}}(\mathbf{q}) = \mathbf{a}_{\mathbf{i}} \mathbf{q}^{\mathbf{w}_{\mathbf{i}}} + \cdots,$$

where $t_0, a_i \neq 0$ and $\nu, w_i > 0$. Here, the three centered dots stand for the higher order terms. Choose $a = (a_1, \ldots, a_r, 0, \ldots, 0) \in \mathbb{C}^{*I}$ and $w = (w_1, \ldots, w_r, 0, \ldots, 0) \in \mathbb{N}^r \setminus \{0\}$ and consider the face σ_j of $(\Delta_j^{t(q)})^I = (\Delta_j^0)^I$ defined as the set where the map

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} l^{i}_{w}: & (\Delta^{t(q)}_{j})^{I} & \rightarrow & \mathbb{R}_{+} \\ & x:=(x_{1},\ldots,x_{r},0,\ldots,0) & \mapsto & \displaystyle\sum_{i=1}^{r} x_{i}w_{i} \end{array}$$

takes its minimal value d_j.

Now, note that

$$(\mathfrak{a}_{ij})_{\mathfrak{t}}(z) = ((\mathfrak{a}_{ij})_{\mathfrak{t}})|_{\sigma_{j}} + \sum_{\alpha \notin \sigma_{j}} c_{\alpha} z^{\alpha}. \tag{3.3}$$

Consider a monomial component

$$(\mathbf{c}_{\alpha} z^{\alpha})|_{\sigma_{j}} = \mathbf{c}_{\alpha} z_{1}^{\alpha_{1}} \dots z_{r}^{\alpha_{r}}$$
(3.4)

of the face function $a_{ij}|_{\sigma_i}$. Then over the curve p we have

$$\begin{aligned} (c_{\alpha} z(q)^{\alpha})|_{\sigma_{j}} &= c_{\alpha} (a_{1}q^{w_{1}} + \cdots)^{\alpha_{1}} \dots (a_{r}q^{w_{r}} + \cdots)^{\alpha_{r}} \\ &= c_{\alpha} a_{1}^{\alpha_{1}} \dots a_{r}^{\alpha_{r}} q^{d_{j}} + \cdots. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore,

$$((a_{ij})_{t(q)}|_{\mathbb{C}^{*I}})|_{\sigma_{j}}(z(q)) = ((a_{ij})_{t(q)}|_{\mathbb{C}^{*I}})|_{\sigma_{j}}(a)q^{d_{j}} + \cdots .$$
(3.5)

Taking the derivative of Eq. (3.4), we have

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial z_l}(c_{\alpha}z^{\alpha}) = \alpha_l c_{\alpha} z_1^{\alpha_1} \dots z_l^{\alpha_l-1} \dots z_r^{\alpha_r}.$$

Then, over the curve p

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial}{\partial z_{l}} (c_{\alpha} z(q)^{\alpha})|_{\sigma_{j}} &= \alpha_{l} c_{\alpha} (a_{1} q^{w_{1}} + \cdots)^{\alpha_{1}} \dots (a_{l} q^{w_{l}} + \cdots)^{\alpha_{l-1}} \dots (a_{r} q^{w_{r}} + \cdots)^{\alpha_{r}} \\ &= \alpha_{l} a_{1}^{\alpha_{1}} \dots a_{l}^{\alpha_{l-1}} \dots a_{r}^{\alpha_{r}} q^{d_{j}-w_{l}} + \cdots \\ &= \frac{\partial}{\partial z_{l}} (c_{\alpha} z(q)^{\alpha})|_{\sigma_{j}} (a) \cdot q^{d_{j}-w_{l}} + \cdots. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, the following equation holds

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial z_{l}}((\mathfrak{a}_{ij})_{\mathfrak{t}(\mathfrak{q})}|_{\mathbb{C}^{*1}})|_{\sigma_{j}}(z(\mathfrak{q})) = \frac{\partial}{\partial z_{l}}((\mathfrak{a}_{ij})_{\mathfrak{t}(\mathfrak{q})}|_{\mathbb{C}^{*1}})|_{\sigma_{j}}(\mathfrak{a}) \cdot \mathfrak{q}^{d_{j}-w_{l}} + \cdots .$$
(3.6)

It follows from Eq. (3.3) that

$$((a_{ij})_{t(q)}|_{\mathbb{C}^{*I}})(z(q)) = ((a_{ij})_{t(q)}|_{\mathbb{C}^{*I}})|_{\sigma_{j}}(z(q)) + \sum_{\alpha \notin \sigma_{j}} c_{\alpha} z(q)^{\alpha}$$

and

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial z_{\iota}}((\mathfrak{a}_{\mathfrak{i}\mathfrak{j}})_{\mathfrak{t}(\mathfrak{q})}|_{\mathbb{C}^{*\mathrm{I}}})(z(\mathfrak{q})) = \frac{\partial}{\partial z_{\iota}}((\mathfrak{a}_{\mathfrak{i}\mathfrak{j}})_{\mathfrak{t}(\mathfrak{q})}|_{\mathbb{C}^{*\mathrm{I}}})|_{\sigma_{\mathfrak{j}}}(z(\mathfrak{q})) + \frac{\partial}{\partial z_{\iota}}(\sum_{\alpha \notin \sigma_{\mathfrak{j}}} c_{\alpha} z(\mathfrak{q})^{\alpha}).$$

By Eq. (3.6)

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial z_{\iota}}((\mathfrak{a}_{\mathfrak{i}\mathfrak{j}})_{\mathfrak{t}(\mathfrak{q})}|_{\mathbb{C}^{*1}})(z(\mathfrak{q}))=\frac{\partial}{\partial z_{\iota}}((\mathfrak{a}_{\mathfrak{i}\mathfrak{j}})_{\mathfrak{t}(\mathfrak{q})}|_{\mathbb{C}^{*1}})|_{\sigma_{\mathfrak{j}}}(\mathfrak{a})\cdot\mathfrak{q}^{\mathfrak{d}_{\mathfrak{j}}-w_{\iota}}+\cdots.$$

Since $w_i \neq 0$ for i = 1, ..., r, then each σ_j , j = 1, ..., k, is a bounded face of Δ_j and, since σ_j is the face where the function l_w^j takes its minimal value, $\sum_{j=1}^k \sigma_j$ is a face of $\sum_{j=1}^k \Delta_j$ where $l_w : \sum_{j=1}^k (\Delta_j^{t(q)})^I \to \mathbb{R}_+$ defined by $\sum_{i=1}^r x_i w_i$ also takes its minimal value. Therefore, $\sum_{j=1}^k \sigma_j$ is a bounded face of $\sum_{j=1}^k \Delta_j$.

Consider the $n \times k$ matrix

$$(A_{t(q)}^{*I})|_{\sigma}(z(q)) = ((a_{ij})_{t(q)}|_{\mathbb{C}^{*I}})|_{\sigma_{j}}(z(q)) \stackrel{\text{Eq. } (3.5)}{=} (((a_{ij})_{t(q)}|_{\mathbb{C}^{*I}})|_{\sigma_{j}}(a)q^{d_{j}} + \cdots)_{n \times k}.$$

Since z(q) belongs to the determinantal singularity $X_{A_{t(q)}^{s,I}}^{s}$, which is defined by the s size minors of $A_{t(q)}^{*I}$, then for each set $\mathcal{I} \subset \{1, ..., n\}$ and $\mathcal{J} \subset \{1, ..., k\}$ such that $|\mathcal{I}| = |\mathcal{J}| = s$ we have the zero polynomial

$$\begin{aligned} \det((((a_{ij})_{t(q)}|_{\mathbb{C}^{*1}})|_{\sigma_{j}}(a)q^{d_{j}}+\cdots)_{i\in\mathcal{I},\,j\in\mathcal{J}}) \\ &= \det((((a_{ij})_{t(q)}|_{\mathbb{C}^{*1}})|_{\sigma_{j}}(a))_{i\in\mathcal{I},\,j\in\mathcal{J}})q^{\sum_{j\in\mathcal{J}}d_{j}}+\cdots=0, \end{aligned}$$

which implies that all the coefficients of this polynomial are equal to zero, in particular

$$\det((((\mathfrak{a}_{ij})_{\mathfrak{t}(\mathfrak{q})}|_{\mathbb{C}^{*1}})|_{\sigma_{j}}(\mathfrak{a}))_{i\in\mathcal{I},\,j\in\mathcal{J}})=0.$$

Taking $q \to 0$ for each \mathcal{I} and \mathcal{J} as above, $t(q) \to 0$ and, therefore, the point a belongs to the determinantal singularity $X^s_{A^{*1}}$.

Furthermore, by Eq. (3.6)

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial}{\partial z_{\mathfrak{l}}} (\det((((\mathfrak{a}_{\mathfrak{i}\mathfrak{j}})_{\mathfrak{t}(\mathfrak{q})}|_{\mathbb{C}^{*1}})|_{\sigma_{\mathfrak{j}}}(z(\mathfrak{q})))_{\mathfrak{i}\in\mathcal{I},\,\mathfrak{j}\in\mathcal{J}})) &= \\ \frac{\partial}{\partial z_{\mathfrak{l}}} (\det((((\mathfrak{a}_{\mathfrak{i}\mathfrak{j}})_{\mathfrak{t}(\mathfrak{q})}|_{\mathbb{C}^{*1}})|_{\sigma_{\mathfrak{j}}}(\mathfrak{a}))_{\mathfrak{i}\in\mathcal{I},\,\mathfrak{j}\in\mathcal{J}})) \cdot \mathfrak{q}^{(\sum_{\mathfrak{j}\in\mathcal{J}}d_{\mathfrak{j}})-w_{\mathfrak{l}}} + \cdots \end{aligned}$$

Then the Jacobian matrix of the function given by the s size minors of the matrix $(((a_{ij})_{t(q)}|_{\mathbb{C}^{*1}})|_{\sigma_j}(a)q^{d_j} + \cdots)_{i \in \mathcal{I}, j \in \mathcal{J}}$ is the $\binom{k}{q}\binom{n}{s} \times m$ matrix

$$(\frac{\partial}{\partial z_{l}}(\det((((\mathfrak{a}_{ij})_{\mathfrak{t}(\mathfrak{q})}|_{\mathbb{C}^{*1}})|_{\sigma_{j}}(\mathfrak{a}))_{i\in\mathcal{I},\,j\in\mathcal{J}})\cdot q^{(\sum_{j\in\mathcal{J}}d_{j})-w_{l}}+\cdots)_{\mathcal{I}\subset\{1,\dots,n\},\,\mathcal{J}\subset\{1,\dots,k\}}.$$

Since z(q) is a singularity of the determinantal variety $X_{A_{t(q)}^{s_{I}}}^{s}$, this matrix has rank less than (k - s + 1)(n - s + 1) then, by the same argument as before, the Jacobian matrix

$$(\frac{\partial}{\partial z_{l}}(\det((((\mathfrak{a}_{ij})_{\mathfrak{t}(\mathfrak{q})}|_{\mathbb{C}^{*1}})|_{\sigma_{j}}(\mathfrak{a}))_{i\in\mathcal{I}, j\in\mathcal{J}})))_{\mathcal{I}\subset\{1,\dots,n\}, \mathcal{J}\subset\{1,\dots,k\}}$$

has also rank less than (k - s + 1)(n - s + 1).

Taking again $q \to 0$, $t(q) \to 0$ and, therefore, the point a is a singularity of the determinantal variety $X^s_{A^{*I}_0}$. This implies that the matrix A^{*I}_0 is not Newton non-degenerate which contradicts Lemma 3.4.

Corollary 3.6. In addition to the conditions of Proposition 3.5, if the Newton polyhedra Δ_j^t of $(a_{ij})_t$ are convenient, then there exists a positive number R > 0 such that for any t sufficiently small, the set $X_{A_t}^s \cap B_R$ is smooth outside the origin, where B_R is the open ball with center at the origin $0 \in \mathbb{C}^m$ and radius R.

Finally, we have all the tools necessary to prove Theorem 1.1.

Proof. (of Theorem 1.1) Firstly, since the Newton polyhedra Δ_j^t are convenient and independent of t for each j = 1, ..., k and the matrix A_t is

strongly Newton non-degenerate, then by Corollary 3.6, there exists a positive number R such that for any t sufficiently small, the set $X_{A_t}^s \cap B_R$ is smooth outside the origin, where B_R is the open ball with center at the origin and radius R. Therefore, this family is good.

Moreover, since $X_{A_t}^s \cap B_R$ is smooth outside the origin, we have $\chi(X_{A_t}^s \cap B_R) = 1$, consequently, by [NNOOT18, Corollary 4.3]

$$v(X_{A_t}^s, 0) = v(X_{A_0}^s, 0).$$

Now, for each $t \in D$ consider a linear form $h_t : (\mathbb{C}^m, 0) \to (\mathbb{C}, 0)$, which is generic with respect to $X_{A_t}^s$. Then, $X_{A_t}^s \cap (h_t)^{-1}(0)$ is a determinantal singularity defined by $(A_t|_{h_t})^{-1}(M_{n,k}^s)$. Thus, we can define a family of determinantal singularities considering the map $\widetilde{\mathcal{A}} : (\mathbb{C}^{m-1}, 0) \to (M_{n,k}, 0)$ with $\widetilde{\mathcal{A}}(x, t) = A_t|_{h_t}(x)$ and $\widetilde{\mathcal{A}}(x, 0) = A_0|_{h_0}(x)$. Since $X_{A_t}^s \cap B_R$ is smooth outside the origin and h_t is generic for all $t \in D$, the set $X_{A_t}^s \cap (h_t)^{-1}(0) \cap B_R$ is also smooth outside the origin. Hence, again by [NNOOT18, Corollary 4.3]

$$\nu(X^{s}_{A_{t}} \cap (h_{t})^{-1}(0), 0) = \nu(X^{s}_{A_{0}} \cap (h_{0})^{-1}(0), 0).$$

Therefore, by Eq. (3.2)

$$m_d(X^s_{A_t}, 0) = m_d(X^s_{A_0}, 0).$$
 (3.7)

We can proceed exactly in the same way to obtain

$$\nu(X^{s}_{A_{t}} \cap H^{1}_{t} \cap \dots \cap H^{l}_{t}, 0) = \nu(X^{s}_{A_{0}} \cap H^{1}_{0} \cap \dots \cap H^{l}_{0}, 0),$$

where H_t^i are generic hyperplanes for i = 1, ..., l. Hence,

$$\mathfrak{m}_{d}(X^{s}_{A_{t}}\cap H^{1}_{t}\cap\cdots\cap H^{1}_{t}, \mathfrak{0}) = \mathfrak{m}_{d}(X^{s}_{A_{0}}\cap H^{1}_{\mathfrak{0}}\cap\cdots\cap H^{1}_{\mathfrak{0}}, \mathfrak{0}).$$
(3.8)

In addition, by [GGJR19, Lemma 2.6], we have

$$\mathfrak{m}_{d-l}(X^{s}_{A_{t}}\cap H^{1}_{t}\cap\cdots\cap H^{l}_{t},0)=\mathfrak{m}_{d-l}(X^{s}_{A_{t}},0), \tag{3.9}$$

for l = 2, ..., d. Combining both Eq. (3.8) and (3.9), we have

$$\begin{split} \mathfrak{m}_{d-l}(X^s_{A_t}, \mathfrak{0}) &= \mathfrak{m}_{d-l}(X^s_{A_t} \cap H^1_t \cap \dots \cap H^l_t, \mathfrak{0}) \\ &= \mathfrak{m}_{d-l}(X^s_{A_0} \cap H^1_0 \cap \dots \cap H^l_0, \mathfrak{0}) \\ &= \mathfrak{m}_{d-l}(X^s_{A_0}, \mathfrak{0}), \end{split}$$

for all $l = 2, \ldots, d$.

Lastly, since $m_d(X_{A_t}^s, 0) = m_d(X_{A_0}^s, 0)$ and $\nu(X_{A_t}^s, 0) = \nu(X_{A_0}^s, 0)$, by Eq. (3.1), we have

$$\mathrm{Eu}_{X^{s}_{A_{*}}}(0) = \mathrm{Eu}_{X^{s}_{A_{0}}}(0).$$

For the polar multiplicity $m_{d-1}(X_{A_t}^s, 0)$, we use the last equation together with the Lê and Teissier formula (see Eq. (4.1) below) to obtain

$$\sum_{k=0}^{d-1} (-1)^k \mathfrak{m}_k(X_{A_t}^s, 0) = Eu_{X_{A_t}^s}(0) = Eu_{X_{A_0}^s}(0) = \sum_{k=0}^{d-1} (-1)^k \mathfrak{m}_k(X_{A_0}^s, 0).$$

In addition, $m_j(X^s_{A_t}, 0) = m_j(X^s_{A_0}, 0)$, $j = 0, 1, \dots, d-2$, then

$$\mathfrak{m}_{d-1}(X^{s}_{A_{t}}, 0) = \mathfrak{m}_{d-1}(X^{s}_{A_{0}}, 0).$$

Therefore, $m_j(X_{A_t}^s, 0) = m_j(X_{A_0}^s, 0)$, for all $0 \le j \le d$. Hence, by [NNOOT18, Theorem 5.3], the family $\{(X_{A_t}^s, 0)\}_{t\in D}$ is Whitney equisingular.

In Section 5, we use equivalence of matrices to introduce a method which allows us to encounter examples where we can apply Theorem 1.1 in an easier manner.

4. LOCAL EULER OBSTRUCTION

The Euler obstruction at a point $x \in X$, denoted by $Eu_X(x)$, was defined by MacPherson [MAC74], using 1-forms and Nash modification. An equivalent definition of the local Euler obstruction was given by Brasselet and Schwartz in the context of index of vector fields [BrSc81]. Lê and Teissier [LêTe81] related the local Euler obstruction of X with its polar multiplicities. More precisely, if X is a d-dimensional germ at zero of a reduced analytic space in \mathbb{C}^m , then

$$Eu_X(0) = \sum_{k=0}^{d-1} (-1)^k m_k(X, 0),$$
(4.1)

where $m_k(X, 0)$ is the kth-polar multiplicity of X at zero. Brasselet, Lê and Seade [BLSoo] presented a Lefschetz type formula for $Eu_X(0)$ (Theorem 4.1).

Let $(X, 0) \subset (\mathbb{C}^m, 0)$ be a d-dimensional germ of a reduced equidimensional analytic variety on an open set $U \subset \mathbb{C}^m$. Consider $\mathcal{V} = \{V_i\}_{i=0}^q$ a Whitney stratification of U adapted to X (i.e. X is a union of strata) and assume that $V_0 = \{0\}$ is a stratum. We choose a representative small enough X of (X, 0) such that 0 belongs to the closure of all strata. We also assume that the strata V_0, \ldots, V_q are connected, the analytic sets $\overline{V_1}, \ldots, \overline{V_q}$ are reduced and $V_q = X_{reg}$.

Theorem 4.1 ([BLSoo]). Let (X, 0) be an equidimensional reduced algebraic variety and $\mathcal{V} = \{V_i\}_{i=0}^q$ a Whitney stratification of X, then for each generic linear form l, there exists ε_0 such that for any ε with $0 < \varepsilon < \varepsilon_0$ and $t_0 \neq 0$ sufficiently

small, the Euler obstruction of (X, 0) is equal to

$$\operatorname{Eu}_X(0) = \sum_{i=0}^{q} \chi(V_i \cap B_{\varepsilon} \cap l^{-1}(t_0)) \cdot \operatorname{Eu}_X(V_i),$$

where B_{ϵ} is a ball with center at 0 and radius ϵ , $\chi(\cdot)$ is the Euler characteristic, $Eu_X(V_i)$ is the Euler obstruction of X at a point of V_i , i = 0, ..., q and $0 < |t_0| \ll \epsilon \ll 1$.

We apply Theorem 4.1 and [EST07, Theorem 1.12] to an isolated determinantal singularity in order to obtain the following result.

Theorem 4.2. Let X_A^n be an isolated determinantal singularity defined by the germ $A : (\mathbb{C}^m, 0) \to (M_{n,k}, 0)$, where A has holomorphic entries. Suppose that the Newton polyhedra Δ_j of $a_{i,j}$ are convenient, if there exists a generic linear form $l : (\mathbb{C}^m, 0) \to (\mathbb{C}, 0)$ with a convenient Newton polyhedron such that l is Newton non-degenerate with respect to A, then

$$\begin{split} Eu_{X^n_A}(0) &= \sum_{\{j_1,\dots,j_q\} \subset \{1,\dots,k\}} \sum_{\substack{I \subset \{1,\dots,m\}\\|I| \geq q+1}} \sum_{a=1}^{|I|-q} (-1)^{|I|+k-n} \binom{|I|+q-a-2}{n+q-k-1} \\ &\times \sum_{\substack{a_{j_1},\dots,a_{j_q} \in \mathbb{N}\\a_{j_1}+\dots+a_{j_q}=|I|-a}} |I|! \cdot (L^I)^a (\widetilde{\Delta}^I_{j_1})^{a_{j_1}} \cdots (\widetilde{\Delta}^I_{j_q})^{a_{j_q}}. \end{split}$$

Proof. Since X_A^n has an isolated singularity at the origin, the partition

$$\mathcal{V} = \{\{0\}, X_A^n \setminus \{0\}\}$$

is a Whitney stratification of X_A^n . Thus, if $l : (\mathbb{C}^m, 0) \to (\mathbb{C}, 0)$ is a generic linear form, by Theorem 4.1

$$\begin{split} \mathrm{Eu}_{X^n_A}(\mathfrak{0}) &= \chi(\{\mathfrak{0}\} \cap \mathsf{B}_{\varepsilon} \cap \mathfrak{l}^{-1}(\mathfrak{t}_0)) \cdot \mathrm{Eu}_{X^n_A}(\{\mathfrak{0}\}) \\ &+ \chi((X^n_A \setminus \{\mathfrak{0}\}) \cap \mathsf{B}_{\varepsilon} \cap \mathfrak{l}^{-1}(\mathfrak{t}_0)) \cdot \mathrm{Eu}_{X^n_A}(X^n_A \setminus \{\mathfrak{0}\}) \end{split}$$

On the other hand, as $t_0 \neq 0$, then $\{0\} \cap B_{\varepsilon} \cap l^{-1}(t_0) = \emptyset$. Therefore,

$$\chi(\{0\} \cap B_{\varepsilon} \cap l^{-1}(t_0)) = 0.$$

Moreover, the stratum $X_A^n \setminus \{0\}$ is the smooth part of X_A^n , then $Eu_{X_A^n}(X_A^n \setminus \{0\}) = 1$. Consequently,

$$\operatorname{Eu}_{X^n_A}(0) = \chi(X^n_A \setminus \{0\} \cap B_{\varepsilon} \cap l^{-1}(t_0)).$$

Therefore, the formula follows by [EST07, Theorem 1.12].

We will also compute the local Euler obstruction for some examples in the following, for that, we will use some techniques introduced in Section 5.

THAÍS M. DALBELO, LUIZ HARTMANN, AND MAICOM VARELLA

5. Equivalent matrices and invariants of determinantal singularities

The purpose of this section is to present a method which allows us to compute more concrete examples where we can apply both the results from the previous sections and the results from Esterov [Esto7]. We apply row and column operations to the germ of a matrix $A = (a_{ij})$ in order to obtain a new matrix \tilde{A} such that up to constants all the monomial components of each a_{ij} will appear on each entry of \tilde{A} and, therefore, the Newton polyhedron of each entry of \tilde{A} will be the same. After this process, the condition that the Newton polyhedron of each column of the matrix \tilde{A} is convenient will be more satisfiable and we can also simplify the formulas for the invariants.

5.1. Equivalent matrices and Newton polyhedra.

Definition 5.1. The germs of matrices $A, A : (\mathbb{C}^m, 0) \to (M_{n,k}, 0)$ are said to be equivalent if they belong to the same equivalence class of the following relation:

$$A \sim \widetilde{A} \Leftrightarrow \exists P \in GL(n; \mathbb{C}), \exists Q \in GL(k; \mathbb{C}) : \widetilde{A} = P \cdot A \cdot Q,$$

where $GL(l; \mathbb{C})$ is the group of invertible matrices in $M_{l,l}(\mathbb{C})$.

Given a matrix $A \in M_{n,k}$, let $I_s(A)$ be the ideal generated by the s size minors of A. It is well known that for the matrices $P \in GL(n; \mathbb{C})$ and $Q \in GL(k; \mathbb{C})$, we have $I_s(A) = I_s(P \cdot A \cdot Q)$ (see [BrML88, Chapter XVI, Sections 7-8]). The reason is that A represents a \mathbb{C} -linear map $\mathbb{C}^k \to \mathbb{C}^n$ and the entries of the matrix $\wedge^s : \wedge^s(\mathbb{C}^n) \to \wedge^s(\mathbb{C}^k)$ are the s-size minors of A, where \wedge^s is the exterior product of vectors taking s at a time. Since $\wedge^s(PA) = \wedge^s(P) \wedge^s(A)$, then $I_s(PA) \subseteq I_s(P)I_s(A) \subseteq I_s(A)$ and $I_s(PA) \subseteq$ $I_s(P)$. Therefore, $I_s(A) = I_s(P^{-1}(PA)) \subseteq I_s(PA)$ and, consequently, $I_s(PA) =$ $I_s(A)$. Similarly, $I_s(AQ) = I_s(A)$.

Therefore, if the germs $A, A : (\mathbb{C}^m, 0) \to (M_{n,k}, 0)$ are equivalent, then $X^s_A = X^s_{\widetilde{a}}$.

Furthermore, the action $GL(n; \mathbb{C}) \times GL(k; \mathbb{C})$ on the space of matrices $M_{n,k}(\mathcal{O}_m)$ is a subgroup of the \mathcal{G} -action (see [DAM84, PER10]). Since the invariants such as polar multiplicities, Euler obstruction, vanishing Euler characteristic only depend on the \mathcal{G} -equivalence class, the equivalence of matrices does not alter them.

Definition 5.2. If $A = (a_{ij}) : (\mathbb{C}^m, 0) \to (M_{n,k}, 0)$ is a germ of a matrix with polynomial entries, we denote by

$$supp(A) := \bigcup_{\substack{i \in \{1, \dots, n\} \\ j \in \{1, \dots, k\}}} supp(a_{ij}).$$

The Newton polyhedron of A, which we denote by Δ_A , is the Newton polyhedron determined by supp(A).

Given a germ of a matrix A, there is always a germ \tilde{A} equivalent to A such that the Newton polyhedron of each entry of \tilde{A} is equal to Δ_A . Since both the matrices A and \tilde{A} define the same determinantal singularity, whenever we need the Newton polyhedron of each entry of a matrix A and \tilde{A} is Newton non-degenerate, we can replace them by Δ_A .

Definition 5.3. Let A be a germ of a matrix with polynomial entries. We say that \widetilde{A} is equivalent to A with respect to Δ_A , if \widetilde{A} is equivalent to A and the Newton polyhedron of each entry of \widetilde{A} is equal to Δ_A .

Example 5.4. Consider the determinantal singularity given by the germ $A : (\mathbb{C}^4, 0) \to (M_{2,3}, 0)$, where

$$A = \left[\begin{array}{ccc} x - z & y - w & z - w \\ y - w & z - w & w + x \end{array} \right].$$

None of the entries of A has convenient Newton polyhedron $\Delta_{i,j}$. Now, consider the matrices

$$P = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 2 \end{bmatrix} \text{ and } Q = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 2 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 & 2 \end{bmatrix}.$$
 (5.1)

We obtain the germ $\widetilde{A} = P \cdot A \cdot Q$, given by

$$\widetilde{A} = \begin{bmatrix} 2x + 2y + z - 3w & 2x + 3y + 2z - 5w & 3x + 2y + 2z - 3w \\ 3x + 3y + 2z - 4w & 3x + 4y + 4z - 7w & 5x + 3y + 3z - 3w \end{bmatrix}.$$

The Newton $\Delta_{i,j}$ of each entry of \widetilde{A} is equal to Δ_A and its complement in \mathbb{R}^4_+ is the 4-dimensional standard simplex, therefore it is convenient.

Using the matrix A instead of A may affect the Newton non-degeneracy conditions. In the following we exemplify this fact with some examples.

Example 5.5. In Example 5.4, both matrices A and \widetilde{A} are Newton non-degenerate. Therefore, we can apply the results to \widetilde{A} .

Now, consider the determinantal singularity given by the germ of the matrix

$$\mathbf{B} = \left[\begin{array}{ccc} z & -\mathbf{y}^2 & -\mathbf{x}^3 \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{x} & \mathbf{y} \end{array} \right].$$

Using the matrices P and Q from Eq. (5.1), we obtain the germ $B = P \cdot B \cdot Q$ given by the matrix

$$\left[\begin{array}{rrrr} x+y+z-x^3-y^2 & 2x+y+z-x^3-2y^2 & x+2y+z-2x^3-y^2 \\ 2x+2y+z-x^3-y^2 & 4x+2y+z-x^3-2y^2 & 2x+4y+z-2x^3-y^2 \end{array}\right].$$

The matrix B is Newton non-degenerate, but the matrix B is not Newton non-degenerate.

Remark 5.6. This behavior of the non-degeneracy with respect to the row and column operation is in some sense expected, since it is well known that the non-degeneracy depends, for instance, on the coordinate system of the source (see [OKA97, Remark 1.4.1]).

Motivated by this example, we present the following definition.

Definition 5.7. Let $A = (a_{ij}) : (\mathbb{C}^m, 0) \to (M_{n,k}, 0)$ be a germ of a matrix with polynomial entries.

- (i) The matrix A is Newton non-degenerate with respect to Δ_A if for every bounded face Γ of Δ_A the matrix $A|_{\Gamma}$ is Newton non-degenerate;
- (ii) The matrix A is strongly Newton non-degenerate with respect to Δ_A if for every bounded face Γ of Δ_A the matrix $A|_{\Gamma}$ is strongly Newton non-degenerate;
- (iii) The germ of a function f is Newton non-degenerate with respect to A and Δ_A if for every bounded face Γ of Δ_A the function $f|_{\Gamma}$ is Newton non-degenerate with respect to the matrix $A|_{\Gamma}$.

Using this ideas we show, in the next paragraphs, how we can compute invariants using only one Newton polyhedron.

5.2. **Multiplicity.** In [Esto7], Esterov presented a formula to compute the multiplicity of a determinantal variety X_A^n when A is Newton non-degenerate and the Newton polyhedron Δ_j of a_{ij} is convenient, for all j = 1, ..., k. Using this result and equivalence of matrices we present the next result, which depends only on the Newton polyhedron of A.

Proposition 5.8. Let $A = (a_{ij}) : (\mathbb{C}^m, 0) \to (M_{n,k}, 0)$ be a germ of a matrix with polynomial entries and a convenient Newton polyhedron Δ_A . If A is Newton non-degenerate with respect to Δ_A , then A defines the germ of a determinantal singularity X_A^n , whose multiplicity is

$$\mathfrak{m}(X_{A}^{\mathfrak{n}}, \mathfrak{0}) = \binom{k}{k-\mathfrak{n}+1} \cdot \mathfrak{m}! \cdot \widetilde{\Delta}_{A}^{k-\mathfrak{n}+1} L^{\mathfrak{m}-k+\mathfrak{n}-1}.$$

Proof. Let \tilde{A} be a germ of a matrix equivalent to A with respect to Δ_A . In [EST07, Theorem 1.9], it is proved that $X_{\tilde{A}}^n$ is a determinantal singularity and it has multiplicity

$$\mathfrak{m}(X^{\mathfrak{n}}_{\widetilde{A}}, 0) = \sum_{0 < j_{0} < \cdots < j_{k-n} \leq k} \mathfrak{m}! \cdot \widetilde{\Delta}^{1}_{j_{0}} \cdots \widetilde{\Delta}^{1}_{j_{k-n}} L^{\mathfrak{m}-k+\mathfrak{n}-1},$$
(5.2)

where Δ_j is the Newton polyhedron of the function $\tilde{a}_{ij} : \mathbb{C}^m \to \mathbb{C}$. Since $X_A^n = X_{\widetilde{A}}^n$ and $\Delta_j = \Delta_A$, for all j = 1, ..., k, by Equation (5.2), the multiplicity of $X_A^n = X_{\widetilde{A}}^n$ is

$$\begin{split} \mathfrak{m}(X_{A}^{n},0) &= \mathfrak{m}(X_{\widetilde{A}}^{n},0) = \sum_{0 < j_{0} < \cdots < j_{k-n} \leq k} \mathfrak{m}! \cdot \widetilde{\Delta}_{A}^{k-n+1} L^{\mathfrak{m}-k+n-1} \\ &= \binom{k}{k-n+1} \cdot \mathfrak{m}! \cdot \widetilde{\Delta}_{A}^{k-n+1} L^{\mathfrak{m}-k+n-1}. \end{split}$$

The last proposition allows us to compute more examples.

Example 5.9. Consider A the germ given by the matrix

$$A = \begin{bmatrix} x - z^3 & y^2 - w^3 & z^3 - w^3 \\ y^2 - w^3 & z^3 - w^3 & w^3 + x \end{bmatrix}$$

and P and Q from Eq. (5.1), then we obtain the germ $A = P \cdot A \cdot Q$, given by the matrix

$$\begin{bmatrix} 2x + 2y^2 + z^3 - 3w^3 & 2x + 3y^2 + 2z^3 - 5w^3 & 3x + 2y^2 + 2z^3 - 3w^3 \\ 3x + 3y^2 + 2z^3 - 4w^3 & 3x + 4y^2 + 4z^3 - 7w^3 & 5x + 3y^2 + 3z^3 - 3w^3 \end{bmatrix}.$$

The Newton polyhedron of each entry of A Δ_A is convenient and the matrix \widetilde{A} is Newton non-degenerate, then the matrix A is Newton non-degenerate with respect to Δ_A . By Proposition 5.8, X_A^2 is a determinantal singularity and its multiplicity is

$$\mathfrak{m}(X_A^2, 0) = \binom{3}{2} \cdot 4! \cdot \widetilde{\Delta}_A^2 L^2 = \binom{3}{2} = 3 \cdot 4! \cdot \frac{2}{4!} = 6.$$

We observe that, we could not apply Theorem [ESTO7, Theorem 1.9] to the matrix A. However, we can apply to a germ \tilde{A} , which is equivalent to A with respect to Δ_A . This is the same as applying Proposition 5.8 directly to the matrix A.

Now, we compute the multiplicity of a determinantal singularity defined by a matrix A such that $\widetilde{\Delta_A} = L$. This class of determinantal singularities includes the ones defined by matrices with linear entries, which is very important, for instance, in [AHRU19], the authors find a class of

essentially isolated determinantal singularities defined by a matrix with homogeneous entries using a matrix with linear entries.

Corollary 5.10. Under the conditions of the Proposition 5.8, if the germ $A : (\mathbb{C}^m, 0) \to (M_{n,k}, 0)$ is such that $\widetilde{\Delta}_A = L$, then the multiplicity of X_A^n is given by

$$\mathfrak{m}(X_A^n, \mathfrak{0}) = \binom{k}{k-n+1}.$$

Example 5.11. Consider the germ A, given in Example 5.4. The Newton polyhedron Δ_A is convenient, A is Newton non-degenerate with respect to Δ_A and $\widetilde{\Delta}_A = L$. By the last corollary, X_A^2 is a determinantal singularity and its multiplicity is

$$\mathfrak{m}(X_A^2,\mathfrak{0})=\binom{3}{2}=3.$$

In the following, we present an example where the matrix A is not Newton non-degenerate with respect to Δ_A , but we use the equivalence of matrices to find an equivalent matrix which is Newton non-degenerate, using one Newton polyhedra for the first two columns of A and another Newton polyhedron for the last column.

Example 5.12. Consider the germ A given by the matrix

$$A = \begin{bmatrix} z + w - y & y + x + z & x - y - w \\ x - y - w & w - z - y & y^2 + (z + w - y)^k \end{bmatrix}$$

and the matrix

$$\mathbf{Q} = \left[\begin{array}{cc} 1 & 2 \\ 2 & 3 \end{array} \right].$$

Then, we have the equivalent matrix $\tilde{A} = Q \cdot A$ given by

$$\begin{bmatrix} 2x - 3y + z + w & x - y - z + w & x - y + y^{2} + 2(z + w - y)^{k} - w \\ 3x - 4y + z + 2w & x - 2y - 2z + 2w & x - y + 2y^{2} + 3(z + w - y)^{k} - w \end{bmatrix}.$$

The matrix \widetilde{A} is Newton non-degenerate, the complement of the Newton polyhedra of the first two columns of \widetilde{A} are the 4-dimensional standard simplex L and of the last column $\widetilde{\Delta}$ is the convex hull of the vertices {(1,0,0,0), (0,1,0,0), (0,0,k,0), (0,0,0,1), (0,0,0,0)}. Therefore, we can apply [Esto7, Theorem 1.9] to \widetilde{A} and obtain

$$\mathfrak{m}(X_A^n, 0) = L^4 + \Delta^1 L^3 + \Delta^1 L^3 = 3.$$

5.3. **Local Euler obstruction.** Using the same process, we present Proposition 5.13, where we apply [ESTO7, Theorem 1.12] to a germ of an equivalent matrix.

Proposition 5.13. Let X_A^n be a determinantal singularity given by the matrix $A = (a_{ij}) : (\mathbb{C}^m, 0) \to (M_{n,k}, 0)$, where A has holomorphic entries and Newton polyhedron Δ_A . Suppose that Δ_A is convenient and $m \le 2(k - n + 2)$.

- If A is strongly Newton non-degenerate with respect to Δ_A, then Xⁿ_A is smooth outside the origin.
- ii) If the Newton polyhedron Δ_f of a germ $f : (\mathbb{C}^m, 0) \to (\mathbb{C}, 0)$ is convenient and f is Newton non-degenerate with respect to A and Δ_A , then the Euler characteristic of the Milnor fiber of $f|_{X_A^n}$ is given by

$$\begin{split} \chi(F_0) &= \sum_{q=k-n+1}^k \sum_{I \subset \{1,...,m\} \atop |I| \geq q+1} \sum_{a=1}^{|I|-q} (-1)^{|I|+k-n} \binom{|I|+q-a-2}{n+q-k-1} \\ &\times \binom{|I|-a-1}{q-1} \binom{k}{q} \cdot |I|! \cdot (\widetilde{\Delta}_f^I)^a (\widetilde{\Delta}_A^I)^{|I|-a} . \end{split}$$

Proof. Let \tilde{A} be a germ equivalent to A with respect to Δ_A . Esterov [EST07, Theorem 1.12] shows that, the determinantal singularity $X_A^n = X_{\tilde{A}}^n$ is smooth outside the origin and

$$\begin{split} \chi(F_0) &= \sum_{\substack{a \in \mathbb{N}, \ I \subset \{1, \dots, m\} \\ \{j_1, \dots, j_q\} \subset \{1, \dots, k\}}} (-1)^{|I| + k - n} \binom{|I| + q - a - 2}{n + q - k - 1} \\ &\times \sum_{\substack{a_{j_1}, \dots, a_{j_q} \in \mathbb{N} \\ a_{j_1} + \dots + a_{j_q} = |I| - a}} |I|! \cdot (\widetilde{\Delta}_f^I)^a (\widetilde{\Delta}_{j_1}^I)^{a_{j_1}} \cdots (\widetilde{\Delta}_{j_q}^I)^{a_{j_q}}, \end{split}$$

where Δ_j is the Newton polyhedron of \tilde{a}_{ij} . Since $\Delta_A = \Delta_j$, for all $j \in \{1, ..., k\}$, we have

$$\begin{split} \chi(F_0) &= \sum_{\substack{\mathfrak{a} \in \mathbb{N}, \ I \subset \{1, \dots, m\} \\ \{j_1, \dots, j_q\} \subset \{1, \dots, k\}}} (-1)^{|I|+k-n} \binom{|I|+q-\mathfrak{a}-2}{n+q-k-1} \\ &\times \sum_{\substack{\mathfrak{a}_{j_1}, \dots, \mathfrak{a}_{j_q} \in \mathbb{N} \\ \mathfrak{a}_{j_1}+\dots+\mathfrak{a}_{j_q} = |I|-\mathfrak{a}}} |I|! \cdot (\widetilde{\Delta}_f^I)^{\mathfrak{a}} (\widetilde{\Delta}_A^I)^{\mathfrak{a}_{j_1}} \cdots (\widetilde{\Delta}_A^I)^{\mathfrak{a}_{j_q}}. \end{split}$$

Furthermore, the number of combinations for the sum $a_{j_1}+\dots+a_{j_q}=|I|-a$ is $\binom{|I|-a-1}{q-1}$, then we have

•

$$\begin{split} \chi(F_0) &= \sum_{\substack{\alpha \in \mathbb{N}, \ I \subset \{1, \dots, m\} \\ \{j_1, \dots, j_q\} \subset \{1, \dots, k\}}} (-1)^{|I|+k-n} \binom{|I|+q-\alpha-2}{n+q-k-1} \\ &\times \binom{|I|-\alpha-1}{q-1} \binom{k}{q} \cdot |I|! \cdot (\widetilde{\Delta}_f^I)^{\alpha} (\widetilde{\Delta}_A^I)^{|I|-\alpha}. \end{split}$$

We assume $\binom{r}{s} = 0$ for $r \notin \{0, \ldots, s\}$, then, all terms in this sum are equal to zero, except the terms with $|I| - a \ge q > k - n$. Hence,

$$\begin{split} \chi(F_0) &= \sum_{q=k-n+1}^k \sum_{\substack{I \subset \{1,...,m\}\\|I| \geq q+1}} \sum_{a=1}^{|I|-q} (-1)^{|I|+k-n} \binom{|I|+q-a-2}{n+q-k-1} \\ &\times \binom{|I|-a-1}{q-1} \binom{k}{q} \cdot |I|! \cdot (\widetilde{\Delta}_f^I)^a (\widetilde{\Delta}_A^I)^{|I|-a}. \end{split}$$

As a consequence of Proposition 5.13, we can also compute the local Euler obstruction of a determinantal variety with isolated singularity using the Newton polyhedron of A, which is the Theorem 1.2.

As an application of Theorem 1.2, in the following example, we compute the local Euler obstruction of an ICIS in terms of a single Newton polyhedron.

Example 5.14. Let $(X, 0) \subset (\mathbb{C}^m, 0)$ be an ICIS defined by the polynomial functions f_1, \ldots, f_k , where $f_i : (\mathbb{C}^m, 0) \to (\mathbb{C}, 0)$ for $i = 1, \ldots, k$. Since X is an ICIS, X is also a determinantal singularity given by $X = X_A^1$, where $A = [f_1 \cdots f_k]$. Let $l : (\mathbb{C}^m, 0) \to (\mathbb{C}, 0)$ be a generic linear form. If Δ_A and Δ_{l} are convenient and l is Newton non-degenerate with respect to A and Δ_A , then the local Euler obstruction of X is

$$Eu_X(0) = \sum_{I \subset \{1, \dots, m\} \atop |I| \ge k+1} \sum_{a=1}^{|I|-k} (-1)^{|I|+k-1} \cdot \binom{|I|-a-1}{k-1} \cdot |I|! \cdot (L^I)^a (\widetilde{\Delta}_A^I)^{|I|-a}.$$

For instance, consider the ICIS X^1_A where $A : (\mathbb{C}^3, 0) \to (M_{1,2}, 0)$ is defined by $A(x, y, z) = \begin{bmatrix} x^2 + y^2 & xy + z^k \end{bmatrix}$ and the generic linear form $l: (\mathbb{C}^3, 0) \to (\mathbb{C}, 0)$ given by l(x, y, z) = -x - y - z. The function l is Newton non-degenerate with respect to A and Δ_A , therefore

$$\operatorname{Eu}_{X_{A}^{1}}(0) = {\binom{1}{1}} \cdot 3! \cdot (L)^{1} (\widetilde{\Delta}_{A})^{2} = 3! \cdot \frac{4}{3!} = 4.$$

Another way to make this computation is using Eq. (4.1). Since, X_A^1 is a curve, then

$$Eu_{X_{A}^{1}}(0) = m_{0}(X_{A}^{1}, 0) = 4.$$

Remark 5.15. In the last example, we can see that the local Euler obstruction can be independent of k in the A_k , D_k and S_k series of singularities. There are many cases where the local Euler obstruction depends on characteristics which are not related to every exponent of every monomial. For instance, the Euler obstruction of affine toric surfaces depends only in the minimum dimension of the embbeding (see [GS79]) and the local Euler obstruction of images of stable maps with corank 1 is always 1 (see [JPSA06]).

In the following we present a class of IDS for which the local Euler obstruction is given just as a sum of binomial coefficients.

Corollary 5.16. When a germ A satisfies the conditions for Theorem 1.2 and $\widetilde{\Delta}_A = L$, we have the following formula for the local Euler obstruction of X_A^n :

$$\begin{split} \mathrm{Eu}_{X^n_A}(0) &= \sum_{q=k-n+1}^k \sum_{|I|=q+1}^m \sum_{a=1}^{|I|-q} (-1)^{|I|+k-n} \binom{|I|+q-a-2}{n+q-k-1} \\ &\times \binom{|I|-a-1}{q-1} \binom{k}{q} \binom{m}{|I|} \end{split}$$

Note that, if the germ A has linear entries, then Δ_A is the standard simplex.

Example 5.17. Consider A the germ given in Example 5.4. Since the matrix A have linear entries, $\widetilde{\Delta}_A = L$. Now, consider the generic linear form $l : (\mathbb{C}^4, 0) \to (\mathbb{C}, 0)$ given by l(x, y, z, w) = x - 3y + 2z - 2w. The linear form l is Newton non-degenerate with respect to A and Δ_A . Then, by Corollary 5.16,

$$\begin{split} \mathrm{Eu}_{X^2_A}(0) &= \sum_{q=2}^{3} \sum_{|I|=q+1}^{4} \sum_{a=1}^{|I|-q} (-1)^{|I|+1} \binom{|I|+q-a-2}{q-2} \binom{|I|-a-1}{q-1} \binom{3}{q} \binom{4}{|I|} \\ &= -1. \end{split}$$

5.4. Whitney equisingularity. Lastly, we can also present examples of Theorem 1.1 using the Newton polyhedron of a matrix, instead of a Newton polyhedron for each entry of it.

Corollary 5.18. Let $\{(X_{A_t}^s, 0)\}_{t\in D}$, be a d-dimensional family of determinantal singularities, defined by the germ of matrices $A_t = (a_{ij}^t) : (\mathbb{C}^m, 0) \to (M_{n,k}, 0)$ with holomorphic entries. Suppose that $X_{A_0}^s$ has an isolated singularity at 0 and, for all $t \in D$, the matrix A_t satisfies the following conditions:

- (i) the Newton polyhedron Δ_{A_t} of A_t is convenient and independent of t;
- (ii) the matrix A_t is strongly Newton non-degenerate with respect to Δ_{A_t} .

Then the family $\{(X_{A_t}^s, 0)\}_{t\in D}$ is Whitney equisingular.

Using Corollary 5.18, Example 5.4 and the elements from the previous sections, we present an example of a Whitney equisingular family.

Example 5.19. Let $\{(X_{A_t}^2, 0)\}_{t\in D}$ be the family of 2-dimensional determinantal singularities defined by the germ $A_t : (\mathbb{C}^4, 0) \to (M_{2,3}, 0)$, with

$$A_t = \left[\begin{array}{ccc} x-z & y+ty^2-w & z-w \\ y-w & z-w & w+x \end{array} \right].$$

For all $t \in D$, the matrix A_t is strongly Newton non-degenerate with respect to Δ_{A_t} , Δ_{A_t} is convenient and independent of t. Then, by Corollary 5.18, $\{(X_{A_t}^2, 0)\}_{t\in D}$ is Whitney equisingular.

6. Applications

Let X_A^s be a determinantal singularity defined by the matrix $A : (\mathbb{C}^m, 0) \rightarrow (M_{n,k}, 0)$ and $f : (X_A^s, 0) \rightarrow (\mathbb{C}, 0)$ be a function with isolated singularity at the origin. Since $f^{-1}(0)$ is a hypersurface, dim $X_A^s \cap f^{-1}(0) = \dim X_{A_t}^s - 1$. In general $X_A^s \cap f^{-1}(0)$ is not determinantal, since the variety $X_A^s \cap f^{-1}(0)$ is not always given by a matrix $A^f \in M_{n,k}$. When there exists such matrix, $X_{A^f}^s = X_A^s \cap f^{-1}(0) \subset \mathbb{C}^{m-1}$ is said to be a *determinantal fiber*. If $X_{A^f}^s$ is a determinantal fiber then $X_{A^f}^s \subset \mathbb{C}^{m-1}$ is determinantal.

Remark 6.1. Let $f(x) = \sum_{p \in \mathbb{Z}_{+}^{m}} c_{p}x^{p}$ be a polynomial function and suppose that there exists $p = (0, ..., 0, p_{i}, 0, ..., 0) \in \text{supp}(f)$ such that for all $r \neq p \in \text{supp}(f)$, $r = (r_{1}, ..., r_{i-1}, 0, r_{i+1}, ..., r_{m})$. Consider a matrix $A : (\mathbb{C}^{m}, 0) \rightarrow (M_{n,k}, 0)$ such that for all $q = (q_{1}, ..., q_{i-1}, q_{i}, q_{i+1}, ..., q_{m}) \in$ supp(A), we have $q_{i} = \lambda_{i}p_{i}$. If at least one $\lambda_{i} \neq 0$, then $X_{A^{f}}^{s} = X_{A}^{s} \cap f^{-1}(0) \subset$ \mathbb{C}^{m-1} is a determinantal fiber defined by the matrix $A^{f} : (\mathbb{C}^{m-1}, 0) \rightarrow (M_{n,k}, 0)$.

We can write the support of A^{f} in terms of the support of A and f, however, this is not an easy task in general. In the following, we present a case, where this can be done in a simpler manner: given a point $p = (p_1, \ldots, p_m) \in \mathbb{Z}_+^m$, we denote by $\hat{p}_i = (p_1, \ldots, p_{i-1}, p_{i+1}, \ldots, p_m) \in \mathbb{Z}_+^{m-1}$. Now, let $f(x) = c_{p_i} x_i^{p_i} + \sum_{\hat{p}_i \in \mathbb{Z}_+^{m-1}} c_{\hat{p}_i} x^{\hat{p}_i}$ and let A be a germ of a matrix such

that

$$supp(A) = \{(0, ..., 0, p_i, 0, ..., 0), (q_1, ..., q_{i-1}, 0, q_{i+1}, ..., q_m) : q_j \in \mathbb{Z}_+\}.$$

Therefore, $supp(A^{f}) = \{k_i : k \in supp(A) \cup supp(f)\}$ and $\Delta_{A^{f}}$ is the Newton polyhedron determined by $supp(A^{f})$.

Note that, whenever $f : (\mathbb{C}^m, 0) \to (\mathbb{C}, 0)$ is a regular function at the origin, we can make a change of coordinates and assume that $f(x_1, \ldots, x_m) = x_m$. Therefore, we are in a particular case of Remark 6.1. Then $X_A^s \cap f^{-1}(0)$ is a determinantal fiber. In this case,

$$supp(A^{\dagger}) = { \hat{p}_{\mathfrak{m}} : \mathfrak{p} = (\mathfrak{p}_1, \dots, \mathfrak{p}_{\mathfrak{m}}) \in supp(A) }$$

and $\Delta_{A^f} = \Delta_A \cap \mathbb{R}^{m-1}_+$. However, as we can see in Example 6.2, regular functions are not the only functions which make $X_A^s \cap f^{-1}(0)$ a determinantal fiber.

Example 6.2. Let X_A^2 be the determinantal singularity defined by the germ $A : (\mathbb{C}^6, 0) \to (M_{2,3}, 0)$, where

$$\mathsf{A} = \left[egin{array}{ccc} x & y & v \ z & w & x + u^k \end{array}
ight],$$

and the function $f : (\mathbb{C}^6, 0) \to (\mathbb{C}, 0)$ defined by $f(x, y, z, w, v, u) = x^2 + y^2 + z^2 + w^2 + v^2 - u^k$, for $k \ge 2$. Then, the variety $X^2_{A^f} \cap f^{-1}(0) \subset \mathbb{C}^5$ is given by the matrix

$$A^{f} = \begin{bmatrix} x & y & v \\ z & w & x + x^{2} + y^{2} + z^{2} + w^{2} + v^{2} \end{bmatrix}.$$

Therefore, $X_A^2 \cap f^{-1}(0) = X_{A^f}^2$ is a determinantal fiber.

6.1. Whitney equisingularity for family of functions. Let $\{f_t : (X_{A_t}^s, 0) \rightarrow (\mathbb{C}, 0)\}_{t \in D}$ be a good family of functions defined on a family $\{(X_{A_t}^s, 0)\}$ of IDS such that $X_{A_t^{f_t}}^s$ is a determinantal fiber for all $t \in D$. In [CNBOOT20], the authors proved that this family is Whitney equisingular if, and only if, all the polar multiplicities $m_i(X_{A_t}^s, 0), i = 0, ..., d$ and $m_i(X_{A_t^{f_t}}^s, 0), i = 0, ..., d - 1$ are constant on the family.

Let $\mathcal{A}:(\mathbb{C}^m\times\mathbb{C},0)\to(M_{n,k},0)$ be a determinantal deformation of X^s_A and

$$\begin{array}{rcl} F: & (X^s_{\mathcal{A}}, 0) & \to & (\mathbb{C} \times \mathbb{C}, 0) \\ & (x, t) & \mapsto & F(x, t) := (f_t(x), t) \end{array}$$

be an unfolding of f. Then, we say that:

- (i) F is *origin preserving* if $0 \in X_{A_t}^s$ and $f_t(0) = 0$ for all t small enough. Then F is a 1-parameter family of map germs { $f_t : (X_{A_t}^s, 0) \rightarrow (\mathbb{C}, 0)$ }_{t \in D}, where D is an open disc around the origin;
- (ii) $\{f_t : (X_{A_t}^s, 0) \to (\mathbb{C}, 0)\}_{t \in D}$ is a *good family* if there is a representative of F defined in $D \times U$, such that $X_{A_t}^s \setminus 0$ is smooth and f_t is regular on $X_{A_t}^s \setminus 0$, for any $t \in D$, where D and U are neighbourhoods of the origin in \mathbb{C} and \mathbb{C}^m , respectively;

THAÍS M. DALBELO, LUIZ HARTMANN, AND MAICOM VARELLA

(iii) { $f_t : (X_{A_t}^s, 0) \to (\mathbb{C}, 0)$ }_{t \in D} is *Whitney equisingular* if it is a good family and there is a representative as in item (ii) which admits a regular stratification²given by $\mathcal{V} = \{X_{\mathcal{A}}^s \setminus F^{-1}(T), F^{-1}(T) \setminus S, S\}$ in the source and $\mathcal{V}' = \{(\mathbb{C} \times \mathbb{C} \setminus T, T\}$ in the target, where $S = D \times 0 \subset \mathbb{C} \times \mathbb{C}^m$ and $T = D \times 0 \subset \mathbb{C} \times \mathbb{C}$.

Consider the unfoldings $\mathcal{A} : (\mathbb{C}^m \times \mathbb{C}, 0) \to (M_{n,k}, 0)$ and $F : (\mathbb{C}^m \times \mathbb{C}, 0) \to (\mathbb{C} \times \mathbb{C}, 0)$ of $A : (\mathbb{C}^m, 0) \to (M_{n,k}, 0)$ and $f : (\mathbb{C}^m, 0) \to (\mathbb{C}, 0)$, respectively. Suppose that both $X_{A_t}^s$ and F are origin preserving, both $\{(X_{A_t}^s, 0)\}_{t \in D}$ and $\{f_t : (X_{A_t}^s, 0) \to (\mathbb{C}, 0)\}_{t \in D}$ are good families and $X_{A_t}^s \cap f_t^{-1}(0)$ is a determinantal fiber for all $t \in D$. Then $X_{A_t}^s^{f_t}$ is a determinantal deformation of $X_{A_0}^s$ and

- (i) $X_{A_t^{f_t}}^s$ is origin preserving and $\{(X_{A_t^{f_t}}^s, 0)\}_{t \in D}$ is a 1-parameter family of IDS;
- (ii) $\{(X^s_{A^{f_t}}, 0)\}_{t \in D}$ is a good family.

Corollary 6.3. Let $\{(X_{A_t}^s, 0)\}_{t\in D}$ be a family of determinantal singularities defined by the germ of matrices $A_t : (\mathbb{C}^m, 0) \to (M_{n,k}, 0)$ and $F : (X_{\mathcal{A}}^s, 0) \to (\mathbb{C} \times \mathbb{C}, 0)$ an unfolding. If f_t is Newton non-degenerate with respect to A_t and Δ_{A_t} , Δ_{A_t} and Δ_{f_t} are convenient and independent of t and $X_{A_t^f}^s$ is a determinantal fiber, for all $t \in D$, then the family $\{f_t : (X_{A_t}^s, 0) \to (\mathbb{C}, 0)\}_{t\in D}$ is Whitney equisingular.

Proof. Since $X_{A_t^{t_t}}^s$ is a determinantal fiber, for all $t \in D$, by [CNBOOT20, Theorem 3.19], the family $\{f_t : (X_{A_t}^s, 0) \to (\mathbb{C}, 0)\}_{t \in D}$ is Whitney equisingular lar if, and only if, the families $\{(X_{A_t}^s, 0)\}_{t \in D}$ and $\{(X_{A_t}^s, 0)\}_{t \in D}$ are Whitney equisingular. By Corollary 5.18, the family $\{(X_{A_t}^s, 0)\}_{t \in D}$ is Whitney equisingular. Furthermore, f_t is Newton non-degenerate with respect to A_t and Δ_{A_t} , then the matrix $A_t^{f_t}$ is strongly Newton non-degenerate. Lastly, since Δ_{f_t} and Δ_{A_t} are independent of t, then $\Delta_{A^{f_t}}$ is independent of t. Moreover, Δ_{A_t} and Δ_{f_t} are convenient, then $\Delta_{A^{f_t}}$ is convenient, for all $t \in D$. By Proposition 5.18, the family $\{(X_{A_t^{f_t}}^s, 0)\}_{t \in D}$ is Whitney equisingular. Consequently, the family $\{f_t : (X_{A_t}^s, 0) \to (\mathbb{C}, 0)\}_{t \in D}$ is Whitney equisingular. \Box

Example 6.4. Consider the family $\{f_t : (X^2_{A_t}, 0) \to (\mathbb{C}, 0)\}_{t \in D}$, where $X^2_{A_t}$ is defined by the matrix

$$A_{t} = \begin{bmatrix} x-z & y+ty^{2}-w & z-w \\ y-w & z-w & w+x \end{bmatrix}$$

²By a regular stratification, we mean a Whitney stratification where F satisfies the Thom condition (see [MAS96]).

and $f_t(x, y, z, w) = x - 3y + ty^3 + 2z - 2w$, for t sufficient small. For each t, $X^2_{A^{f_t}} \cap f_t^{-1}(0) \subset \mathbb{C}^3$ is a family of determinantal fibers, given by

$$A^{\rm ft}_t = \left[\begin{array}{ccc} y + ty^3 + w & y + ty^2 - w & z - w \\ y - w & z - w & y + ty^3 + z + 2w \end{array} \right].$$

Also, we have

$$supp(A) = \{(1, 0, 0, 0), (0, 1, 0, 0), (0, 2, 0, 0), (0, 0, 1, 0), (0, 0, 0, 1)\},$$

$$supp(f) = \{(1, 0, 0, 0), (0, 1, 0, 0), (0, 3, 0, 0), (0, 0, 1, 0), (0, 0, 0, 1)\},$$

$$supp(A^{f}) = \{((1, 0, 0), (0, 1, 0), (0, 2, 0), (0, 0, 1), (0, 3, 0)\}.$$

Since f_t is Newton non-degenerate with respect to A_t and Δ_{A_t} and the Newton polyhedra Δ_{A_t} and Δ_{f_t} are convenient and independent of t and , for all $t \in D$, by Corollary 6.3, this family is Whitney equisingular.

6.2. Constancy of Morse points. In [ANNOOT16] it is presented a formula relating the local Euler obstruction of f to the vanishing Euler characteristic of the fiber X_{Af}^s , where $f : (X_A^s, 0) \to (\mathbb{C}, 0)$ is an analytic function germ with isolated singularity on an IDS.

Using the results of [ANNOOT16, DuGJ14] and the hypothesis that $X_{A^f}^n$ is a determinantal fiber, we establish a Lê-Greuel type formula for germs of functions f, g : $X_A^n \to \mathbb{C}$ with stratified isolated singularity.

To present the next result it is necessary the following definition.

Definition 6.5. Let \mathcal{V} be a good stratification³ of X relative to f. We say that $g : (X, 0) \to (\mathbb{C}, 0)$ is prepolar with respect to \mathcal{V} at the origin if the origin is a stratified singularity of g.

Let $f : (\mathbb{C}^m, 0) \to (\mathbb{C}, 0)$ be a holomorphic function germ such that $f|_{X^s_A} : X^s_A \to \mathbb{C}$ has isolated singularity at the origin. The authors define in [NBOOT13] an invariant which provides geometrical and topological information of the Milnor fiber of f. In the following we present the definition of this invariant.

Definition 6.6. The vanishing Euler characteristic of the fiber $(X_A^s \cap f^{-1}(0), 0)$ is defined by

$$\nu(X^s_A\cap f^{-1}(0),0)=(-1)^{\dim X^s_A-1}(\chi(\widetilde{X^s_A}\cap B_\epsilon\cap \widetilde{f}^{-1}(c))-1),$$

where $\widetilde{X_A^s}$ is the generic fiber of the determinantal smoothing of X_A^s , \tilde{f} is a morsification of f and $1 \gg \varepsilon \gg |c| > 0$ sufficiently general.

³The concept of good stratification can be found on [MAs96].

Corollary 6.7. Let X_A^n be a d-dimensional IDS given by a germ of a matrix $A : (\mathbb{C}^m, 0) \to (M_{n,k}, 0)$, $f : (X_A^n, 0) \to (\mathbb{C}, 0)$ be a function with isolated stratified singularity at the origin and $g : (X_A^n, 0) \to (\mathbb{C}, 0)$ be a prepolar function with respect to a good stratification \mathcal{V} of X_A^n relative to f at 0. Suppose that $X_{A^g}^n$ is a determinantal fiber, then

$$\nu(X_A^n \cap f^{-1}(0)) + \nu(X_{A^g}^n \cap f^{-1}(0)) = n_{reg},$$

where n_{reg} is the number of Morse points which appear in a stratified morsification of f in a small neighbourhood of 0.

Proof. Since X_A^n is an IDS, $X_{A^g}^n$ is a determinantal fiber and g is a prepolar function with respect to a good stratification \mathcal{V} of X_A^n relative to f at 0, both X_A^n and $X_{A^g}^n$ are IDS. Thus, by [ANNOOT16, Proposition 3.7], the following equations hold

$$v(X_A^n \cap f^{-1}(0)) = (-1)^{d-1} \big[(\chi(X_A^n \cap f^{-1}(t_0) \cap B_{\varepsilon}) - 1 \big], \tag{6.1}$$

$$\nu(X_{A^g}^n \cap f^{-1}(0)) = (-1)^{d-2} \big[(\chi(X_{A^g}^n \cap f^{-1}(t_0) \cap B_{\epsilon}) - 1 \big].$$
 (6.2)

Furthermore, adding Eq. (6.1), (6.2) and applying [DuGJ14, Theorem 4.4]

$$(-1)^{d-1} \big[(\chi(X^n_A \cap f^{-1}(t_0) \cap B_{\epsilon}) - (\chi(X^n_{A^g} \cap f^{-1}(t_0) \cap B_{\epsilon}) \big] = n_{reg}.$$

Therefore,

$$\nu(X_{A}^{n} \cap f^{-1}(0)) + \nu(X_{A^{g}}^{n} \cap f^{-1}(0)) = (-1)^{d-1}(-1)^{d-1}n_{reg} = n_{reg}.$$

Corollary 6.8. Under the assumptions of Corollary 6.7, suppose that Δ_f , Δ_A and Δ_{A^9} are convenient and the function f is Newton non-degenerate with respect to A and Δ_A and with respect to A^9 and Δ_{A^9} . Then, n_{reg} is given in terms of mixed volumes of $\widetilde{\Delta}_f$, $\widetilde{\Delta}_A$ and $\widetilde{\Delta}_{A^9}$.

Proof. It follows directly from Proposition 5.13 and Corollary 6.7. \Box

As a consequence of this result, it is possible to guarantee that n_{reg} is constant on families.

Corollary 6.9. Under the assumptions of Corollaries 6.7 and 6.8, suppose that, for all $t \in D$, the function f_t is Newton non-degenerate with respect to A_t and Δ_{A_t} and with respect to A_t^g and $\Delta_{A_t^g}$. If Δ_{f_t} , Δ_{g_t} and Δ_{A_t} are convenient and independent of t, where $\{f_t, g_t : (X_{A_t}^n, 0) \to (\mathbb{C}, 0)\}_{t \in D}$ and $\{(X_{A_t}^n, 0)\}_{t \in D}$ are families of functions and IDS, respectively, then n_{reg} is constant for $t \in D$.

Acknowledgments. The authors are grateful to Bruna Oréfice Okamoto (UFSCar) for helpful conversations about determinantal varieties and for her help with some examples. We would also like to thank Anne Frühbis-Krüger (Oldenburg University) and Matthias Zach for their help in solving some examples and especially with the simplification of the formula from Proposition 5.13.

References

[AhRu19]	I. AHMED and M. A. S. RUAS, Determinacy of determinantal varieties,
	Manuscripta Math. 159 (2019), no. 1-2, 269–278. MR 3936143
[ANNOOI 16]	D. A. H. AMENT, J. J. NUNO-BALLESTEROS, B. OREFICE-OKAMOTO, and
	J. N. IOMAZELLA, The Euler obstruction of a function on a determinantal va-
	<i>riety and on a curve,</i> Bull. Braz. Math. Soc. (N.S.) 47 (2016), no. 3, 955–970.
	MR 3549078
[BLSoo]	JP. BRASSELET, D. T. LE, and J. SEADE, Euler obstruction and indices of vector
	<i>fields</i> , Topology 39 (2000), no. 6, 1193–1208. MR 1783853
[BrHe98]	W. BRUNS and J. HERZOG, Cohen-Macaulay rings, Revised edition, Cam-
	bridge University Press, New York (1998).
[BrML88]	G. BRIKHOFF and S. MAC LANE, Algebra: Third edition., vol. 330, AMS
	Chelsea Publisching, Providence, Rhode Island, 1988.
[BrSc81]	JP. BRASSELET and MH. SCHWARTZ, Sur les classes de Chern d'un ensemble
	analytique complexe, The Euler-Poincaré characteristic (French), Astérisque,
	vol. 82, Soc. Math. France, Paris, 1981, pp. 93–147. MR 629125
[BrVe98]	W. BRUNS and U. VETTER, Determinantal rings, Springer-Verlang, New York
	(1998).
[CNBOOT20]	R. S. CARVALHO, J. J. NUÑO-BALLESTEROS, B. ORÉFICE-OKAMOTO, and J. N.
	TOMAZELLA, Equisingularity of families of functions in isolated determinantal
	singularities, arXiv:2005.04505v1 (2020).
[Dam84]	J. DAMON, The unfolding and determinacy theorems for subgroups of A and K ,
	Mem. Amer. Math. Soc. 50 (1984), no. 306, x+88. MR 748971
[DuGJ14]	N. DUTERTRE and N. G. GRULHA JR., Lê-Greuel type formula for the Euler
	<i>obstruction and applications,</i> Adv. Math. 251 (2014), 127–146. MR 3130338
[EbGZ09]	W. EBELING and S. M. GUSEIN-ZADE, On indices of 1-forms on determinantal
	<i>singularities,</i> Tr. Mat. Inst. Steklova 267 (2009), 119–131.
[Esто7]	A. ESTEROV, Determinantal singularities and Newton polyhedra, Tr. Mat. Inst.
	Steklova 259 (2007), no. Anal. i Osob. Ch. 2, 20–38. MR 2433675
[ЕұОк17]	C. EYRAL and M. OKA, Non-compact Newton boundary and Whitney eq-
	uisingularity for non-isolated singularities, Adv. Math. 316 (2017), 94-113.
	MR 3672903
[FKNe10]	A. FRÜHBIS-KRÜGER and A. NEUMER, Simple Cohen-Macaulay codimension 2
	<i>singularities,</i> Comm. Algebra 38 (2010), no. 2, 454–495. MR 2598893
[Gaf93]	T. GAFFNEY, Polar multiplicities and equisingularity of map germs, Topology 32
	(1993), no. 1, 185–223. MR 1204414
[Gaf96]	, Multiplicities and equisingularity of ICIS germs, Invent. Math. 123
	(1996), no. 2, 209–220. MR 1374196
[GGJR19]	T. GAFFNEY, N. G. GRULHA JR., and M. A. S. RUAS, The local Euler obstruction
	and topology of the stabilization of associated determinantal varieties, Math. Z.
	291 (2019), no. 3-4, 905–930. MR 3936093
[GKZ08]	I. M. GELFAND, M. M. KAPRANOV, and A. V. ZELEVINSKY, Discriminants,
	resultants and multidimensional determinants, Modern Birkhäuser Classics,

28	THAÍS M. DALBELO, LUIZ HARTMANN, AND MAICOM VARELLA
	Birkhäuser Boston, Inc., Boston, MA, 2008, Reprint of the 1994 edition. MR 2394437
[GS79]	G. GONZÁLEZ-SPRINBERG, Calcul de l'invariant local d'Euler pour les singu- larités quotient de surfaces, C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris Sér. A-B 288 (1979), no. 21, A989–A992. MR 540374
[JPSa06]	V. H. JORGE PÉREZ and M. J. SAIA, <i>Euler obstruction, polar multiplicities and</i> equisingularity of map germs in $O(n, p)$, $n < p$, Internat. J. Math. 17 (2006), no. 8, 887–002, MR 2261620.
[LêTe81]	D. T. Lê and B. TEISSIER, Variétés polaires locales et classes de Chern des variétés singulières, Ann. of Math. (2) 114 (1981), no. 3, 457–491. MR 634426
[Mac74]	R. D. MACPHERSON, Chern classes for singular algebraic varieties, Ann. of Math. (2) 100 (1974), 423–432. MR 0361141
[Mas96]	D. B. MASSEY, <i>Hypercohomology of Milnor fibres</i> , Topology 35 (1996), no. 4, 969–1003. MR 1404920
[M1L68]	J. MILNOR, <i>Singular points of complex hypersurfaces</i> , Annals of Mathematics Studies, No. 61, Princeton University Press, Princeton, N.J.; University of Tokyo Press, Tokyo, 1968. MR 0239612
[NBOOT13]	J. J. NUÑO-BALLESTEROS, B. ORÉFICE-OKAMOTO, and J. N. TOMAZELLA, <i>The</i> vanishing Euler characteristic of an isolated determinantal singularity, Israel J. Math. 107 (2012), pp. 1, 475–405. MR 2006625
[NnOOT18]	J. J. Nuño-Ballesteros, B. Oréfice-Окамото, and J. N. Tomazella, Eq- uisingularity of families of isolated determinantal singularities, Math. Z. 289 (2018), no. 3-4, 1409–1425. MR 3830255
[Ока97]	M. OKA, Non-degenerate complete intersection singularity, Actualités Mathématiques. [Current Mathematical Topics], Hermann, Paris, 1997. MR 1483897
[Per10]	M. S. PEREIRA, Variedades determinantais e singularidades de matrizes, Ph.D. thesis, 2010.
[PeRu14]	M. S. PEREIRA and M. A. S. RUAS, <i>Codimension two determinantal varieties with isolated singularities</i> , Math. Scand. 115 (2014), no. 2, 161–172. MR 3291723
[Zac20]	M. ZACH, Bouquet decomposition for determinantal Milnor fibers, Journal of Singularities 22 (2020), 190–204.
Universi Email add	IDADE FEDERAL DE SÃO CARLOS, BRAZIL <i>Tress</i> : thaisdalbelo@ufscar.br
Universi	idade Federal de São Carlos, Brazil

Email address: hartmann@dm.ufscar.br, luizhartmann@ufscar.br URL: http://www.dm.ufscar.br/profs/hartmann

UNIVERSIDADE FEDERAL DE SÃO CARLOS, BRAZIL Email address: maicomvarella@estudante.ufscar.br