

QUASI-F-SPLITTINGS IN BIRATIONAL GEOMETRY III

TATSURO KAWAKAMI, TEPPEI TAKAMATSU, HIROMU TANAKA, JAKUB WITASZEK,
FUETARO YOBUKO, AND SHOU YOSHIKAWA

ABSTRACT. We prove that \mathbb{Q} -Gorenstein quasi- F -regular singularities are klt. To this end, we shall introduce quasi-test ideals.

CONTENTS

1. Introduction	2
1.1. Various classes of singularities	3
1.2. Construction of quasi-test ideals	6
2. Preliminaries	8
2.1. Notation	8
2.2. Recollection on the theory of F -singularities via closures	10
2.3. Tight closure and test ideals	17
2.4. Witt dualising modules	20
2.5. Quasi- F^e -splitting and quasi- F -regularity	23
3. Quasi-test submodules and quasi- F -rationality	25
3.1. Quasi-test submodules (no boundary) and quasi- F -rationality	25
3.2. Quasi-tight closure in local cohomologies (no boundary)	32
3.3. Duality between quasi-test submodules and quasi-tight closure	39
3.4. Quasi-+-rationality	44
4. Quasi-test ideals and quasi-test submodules for pairs	49
4.1. Quasi-test submodules (pairs)	50
4.2. Quasi-tight closure in local cohomologies (pairs)	59
4.3. Duality and quasi-test ideals	65
5. Quasi-test ideals via alterations	76
5.1. Quasi-test ideals in the global case	77
5.2. Behaviour of quasi-test ideals under alterations	78
5.3. Quasi- F -regularity and quasi-+-regularity	82
6. Cone correspondence for quasi- F -regularity	85
7. Quasi- F -regularity for Fano varieties and klt singularities	89
7.1. Fano varieties	89
7.2. Klt singularities	97
8. Miscellaneous results	98
8.1. More on quasi- F^e -splittings	98

2020 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 14E30, 13A35.

Key words and phrases. quasi- F -regular, Witt vectors, klt singularities, quasi-test ideals.

8.2. Three-dimensional quasi- F -regular rings are Cohen-Macaulay	101
9. Appendix: dualising complexes on Witt rings	104
References	115

1. INTRODUCTION

One of the fundamental topics of research in both positive characteristic birational geometry and commutative algebra is the theory of Frobenius splittings and Frobenius regularity. Recently, the fifth author introduced a new notion in [Yob23], called *quasi- F -splitting*, motivated by the theory of crystalline cohomology. It shares many properties with the usual F -splitting but is much less restrictive. In turn, in [KTT⁺22] and [KTT⁺23], we engaged in the development of the theory of quasi- F -splittings in the context of birational geometry, from which we deduced new results on the liftability of singularities and extensions of differential forms. We refer to the introductions of [Yob23] and [KTT⁺22] for more information on quasi- F -splittings, and to [KTY22] for Fedder's criterion for quasi- F -splittings.

Having gained a basic understanding of quasi- F -splittings in the context of birational geometry, [TWY24] introduced and studied, amongst other things, the notion of quasi- F -regularity, generalising strong- F -regularity. Our paper continues the work of [KTT⁺22], [KTT⁺23], and [TWY24], with a focus on the local theory of singularities.

The discovery of the connection between F -singularities and birational-geometric singularities, such as rational or Kawamata log terminal, triggered impactful collaborations between commutative algebraists and birational geometers. In our main result, we establish such connections for some quasi- F -singularities. In particular, we generalise the fact that \mathbb{Q} -Gorenstein strongly F -regular singularities are Kawamata log terminal.

Theorem A (Theorem 5.8). *Let R be an F -finite normal Noetherian \mathbb{Q} -Gorenstein domain over \mathbb{F}_p . If R is quasi- F -regular, then it is klt.*

In order to prove Theorem A, we introduce an analogue $\tau^q(R)$ of the test ideal $\tau(R)$, which we call the *quasi-test ideal*. This ideal measures how far the ring is from being quasi- F -regular. A big part of this article is devoted to establishing foundational results on $\tau^q(R)$. For example, we prove the following.

- (a) $\tau^q(R)$ commutes with localisation and completion (Remark 4.24).
- (b) $\tau^q(R) = R$ if and only if R is quasi- F -regular (Proposition 4.30).
- (c) $\tau^q(R) \subseteq \mathcal{J}(R)$ for the multiplier ideal $\mathcal{J}(R)$ (Corollary 5.7).

Theorem A is a consequence of (b) and (c).

The opposite implication to that in Theorem A does not hold in general, that is, there exist klt singularities which are not quasi- F -regular (see [KTT⁺23, Theorem 8.3]). On the other hand, it is tempting to expect that such an implication holds

in low dimensions and for high characteristic. In [KTT⁺23], we proved that three-dimensional \mathbb{Q} -Gorenstein klt singularities of characteristic $p > 42$ are quasi- F -split. We can now generalise this result to prove their quasi- F -regularity.

Theorem B (Theorem 7.10). *Let k be a perfect field of characteristic $p > 42$ and let R be a three-dimensional \mathbb{Q} -factorial klt ring of finite type over k . Then R is quasi- F -regular.*

In fact, quasi- F -regularity and quasi-test ideals $\tau^q(R, \Delta)$ can be defined for arbitrary pairs (R, Δ) . Similarly to Theorem B, we can now generalise the fact that two-dimensional klt pairs are quasi- F -split to the quasi- F -regular case.

Theorem C (Theorem 7.9). *Let k be a perfect field of characteristic $p > 0$ and let (R, Δ) be a two-dimensional klt pair of finite type over k . Then (R, Δ) is quasi- F -regular.*

Finally, one of the fundamental properties of strongly F -regular singularities is that they are Cohen-Macaulay, and so it is natural to wonder if the same holds for quasi- F -regular singularities.

Theorem D. *Let R be an F -finite normal Noetherian \mathbb{Q} -Gorenstein domain over \mathbb{F}_p . Assume that R is quasi- F -regular and $\dim(R) \leq 3$. Then R is Cohen-Macaulay.*

Alas, we do not know how to prove this statement in higher dimensions. Let us point out that the restriction on the dimension is not a consequence of any classification or the minimal model program, but arises from surprising cohomological constraints.

1.1. Various classes of singularities. Recall that a ring R is n -quasi- F -split for an integer $n > 0$ if given a pushout diagram of $W_n R$ -modules

$$\begin{array}{ccc} W_n R & \xrightarrow{F} & F_* W_n R \\ \downarrow R^{n-1} & & \downarrow \\ R & \xrightarrow{\Phi_{R,n}} & Q_{R,n}, \end{array}$$

the R -module homomorphism $\Phi_{R,n}: R \rightarrow Q_{R,n}$ splits. This is equivalent to the surjectivity of

$$\mathrm{Hom}_R(\Phi_{R,n}, R): \mathrm{Hom}_R(Q_{R,n}, R) \rightarrow R.$$

In order to incorporate higher powers of Frobenius, [TWY24] considers the pushout

$$(1.0.1) \quad \begin{array}{ccc} W_n R & \xrightarrow{F^e} & F_*^e W_n R \\ \downarrow R^{n-1} & & \downarrow \\ R & \xrightarrow{\Phi_{R,n}^e} & Q_{R,n}^e, \end{array}$$

and defines R to be n -quasi- F^e -split if

$$(1.0.2) \quad \mathrm{Hom}_{W_n R}(\Phi_{R,n}^e, W_n \omega_R(-K_R)): \mathrm{Hom}_{W_n R}(Q_{R,n}^e, W_n \omega_R(-K_R)) \rightarrow R.$$

is surjective. The reader should be warned that $Q_{R,n}^e$ is not an R -module anymore if $e > 1$. We have the following two implications:

$$\begin{aligned} n\text{-quasi-}F^e\text{-split} &\implies (n+1)\text{-quasi-}F^e\text{-split.} \\ n\text{-quasi-}F^e\text{-split} &\implies n\text{-quasi-}F^{e-1}\text{-split.} \end{aligned}$$

One can formulate similar definitions for pairs (R, Δ) . Then we say that

Definition 1.1. R is n -quasi- F -regular if for every Weil divisor E there exists $\epsilon > 0$ such that $(R, \epsilon E)$ is n -quasi- F^e -split for every $e \gg 0$ (depending on E and ϵ).

Then R is *quasi- F -regular* if it is n -quasi- F -regular for some integer $n > 0$. Similarly, one defines the notion of *quasi-+-regularity* (“quasi-splinter”) by replacing F^e by every possible finite surjective morphism in (1.0.1) and (1.0.2).

Remark 1.2. Before proceeding, let us briefly sketch how three-dimensional klt singularities in large characteristic were proven to be quasi- F -split in [KTT⁺22, KTT⁺23] so that we can later sketch the proof of Theorem B. First, one considers a special projective birational map $\pi: Y \rightarrow \text{Spec } R$, called a plt blow-up, which has a property that the exceptional locus is a (log) del Pezzo surface. Then one shows that this (log) del Pezzo surface is globally quasi- F -split if $p \geq 42$. By using a special case of global inversion of adjunction, one deduces that Y is globally quasi- F -split, which, by pushing forward, shows that $\text{Spec } R$ is quasi- F -split.

Since necessary variants of inversion of adjunction for global +-regularity have been already established in [TWY24, Corollary 6.8], in order to conclude Theorem B, we need to do two things. First, we need to compare quasi- F -regularity with quasi-+-regularity (see Theorem E). Second we need to show that (log) del Pezzo surfaces are globally quasi-+-regular (or quasi- F -regular) for $p \geq 42$ and not just quasi- F -split (see Theorem G).

Singh has shown in [Sin99] that a \mathbb{Q} -Gorenstein ring is +-regular (that is, a splinter) if and only if it is strongly F -regular (see also [BST15a]), and proving the same statement for non- \mathbb{Q} -Gorenstein rings is a big open problem in the theory of F -singularities. We generalise Singh’s result to the quasi setting. Note that the easier implication, from left to right, has already been established in [TWY24, Proposition 4.9].

Theorem E (Theorem 5.11). *Let R be an F -finite normal Noetherian \mathbb{Q} -Gorenstein domain over \mathbb{F}_p . Then R is quasi- F -regular if and only if R is quasi-+-regular.*

The interaction between the parameters n and e in the definition of n -quasi- F^e -splitting, as well as with the divisor E and $\epsilon > 0$ in the definition of quasi- F -regularity, is very subtle (see the discussion below the sketch of the proof of Theorem G). The following fundamental result streamlines the definition of quasi- F -regularity significantly.¹

¹Let us briefly explain the key idea of the proof of this and many similar results in this paper. In the usual theory of F -splittings and F -regularity, various definitions become often equivalent up to multiplication by t for a test element t . In the quasi-setting for height n , we show by induction on n

Theorem F (Theorem 4.33). *Let R be an F -finite normal Noetherian \mathbb{Q} -Gorenstein domain over \mathbb{F}_p . Let D be an effective Cartier divisor such that $\text{Sing}(R) \subseteq \text{Supp } D$, where $\text{Sing}(R)$ denotes the non-regular locus of $\text{Spec } R$. Then, for every rational number $\epsilon > 0$, there exists a constant $e_0(R, D, \epsilon)$ such that the following holds.*

The ring R is quasi- F -regular if and only if there exist a rational number $\epsilon > 0$ and integers $n > 0$ and $e \geq e_0(R, D, \epsilon)$ such that $(R, \epsilon D)$ is n -quasi- F^e -split.

In fact, if replace D by a multiple (depending only on R), then it is enough to check that $(R, \frac{1}{p^e}D)$ is n -quasi- F^e -split for some integers $n > 0$ and $e > 0$.

Finally, we address how, in the case of (log) Fano varieties, to deduce quasi- F -regularity from quasi- F -splitting (cf. Remark 1.2). This is particularly meaningful, because quasi- F -splitting is the weakest notion and quasi- F -regularity is the strongest one amongst what we have introduced (see Figure 1.1). The result is interesting even when X is smooth. Also note that, in fact, we show that the same result holds for strongly F -regular pairs with standard coefficients.

Theorem G (Theorem 7.5, Corollary 7.6). *Let k be an F -finite field of characteristic $p > 0$. Let X be a projective normal \mathbb{Q} -factorial strongly F -regular variety over k such that $-K_X$ is ample. Then X is quasi- F -split if and only if it is globally quasi- F -regular.*

Sketch of the proof. The proof consists of two parts. First, using Cartier operators, we show that X is n -quasi- F^e -split for some fixed $n > 0$ and all $e > 0$. In fact, we show a bit more: that $(X, \frac{1}{p^e}H)$ is n -quasi- F^e -split for a fixed, carefully chosen divisor H and all $e \gg 0$.

Second, in the context of (log) Fano varieties, we establish a connection between quasi- F -regularity of a projective variety and its cone (see Corollary 6.6). Thus by taking a cone of X and applying Theorem F, we can deduce that X is globally quasi- F -regular. \square

In [KTY22], two variants of quasi- F^∞ splittings were defined:

- (1) R is *quasi- F^∞ -split* if for every integer $e > 0$, there exists an integer $n > 0$ such that R is n -quasi- F^e -split.
- (2) R is *uniformly quasi- F^∞ -split* if there exists an integer $n > 0$ such that R is n -quasi- F^e -split for every integer $e > 0$.

Note that quasi- F -regular rings are uniformly quasi- F^∞ -split. On the other hand, elliptic curves are n -quasi- F^e -split if and only if $e \leq n + 1$; in particular, they are quasi- F^∞ -split but not uniformly quasi- F^∞ -split.

What was not known before however is whether quasi- F -split rings are automatically quasi- F^∞ -split.

that the same is often true up to multiplication by t^2 . Here one t allows to reduce the induction from height n to height $n - 1$, in which case the other t turns into t^p , where clearly $p \geq 2$, so the induction can continue to be run. Note that for technical reasons, we sometimes consider t^4 as opposed to t^2 .

Theorem H (Corollary 8.6). *Let R be an F -finite normal Noetherian \mathbb{Q} -Gorenstein domain over \mathbb{F}_p . Assume that R is Cohen-Macaulay. Then R is quasi- F -split if and only if it is quasi- F^∞ -split.*

In fact, if R is n -quasi- F -split, then it is automatically $(ne - e + 1)$ -quasi- F^{e+1} -split for every $e > 0$. We do not know however if the assumption on the Cohen-Macaulaity of R can be dropped in the above theorem.

Combining the above work, we can now significantly extend the diagram of singularities from [KTY22, p. 5].




FIGURE 1. Relation between singularities when R is \mathbb{Q} -Gorenstein.

One can also extend this diagram by adding notions of feeble quasi- F -regularity or non-uniform quasi- F -regularity, but these notions are now known to agree with the usual quasi- F -regularity by Theorem 4.34 and Remark 4.35.

Also note that in a forthcoming paper, Sato-Takagi-Yoshikawa will prove that quasi- F^∞ -split singularities are log canonical. In particular, combined with Theorem H, this addresses a long-standing question, at least in the Cohen-Macaulay case, whether the usual quasi- F -split singularities are log canonical.

1.2. Construction of quasi-test ideals. For simplicity, we will start by explaining how to construct the quasi-test submodule $\tau_n(\omega_R)$ of ω_R . When R is Gorenstein, this object agrees with the quasi-test ideal $\tau_n(R)$.

In the spirit of [KTY22] and the discussion in Subsection 1.1, one can define $\tau_n(\omega_R)$ as follows:

$$(1.2.1) \quad \tau_n(\omega_R) := \bigcap_{c \in R^\circ} \sum_{e_0 > 0} \bigcap_{e \geq e_0} \text{Hom}_{W_n R}(Q_{R,n}^e, W_n \omega_R(-K_R)) \xrightarrow{(\star)} R,$$

where (\star) is the composition of $\text{Hom}_{W_n R}(\Phi_{R,n}^e, W_n \omega_R(-K_R))$ from (1.0.2) and multiplication by the Teichmüller lift $[c^{p^{e-e_0}}]$. In this subsection, we shall present a different perspective on $\tau_n(\omega_R)$, coming from commutative algebra, and which has some additional benefits. We eventually show in Corollary 4.29 that this different approach agrees with (1.2.1). The key idea that allows us to show Theorem A is to redefine $\tau_n(\omega_R)$ in terms of a new object $\tau(W_n \omega_R)$ which behaves more naturally in terms of birational morphisms. For more details, we refer to Section 3.

Let R be an F -finite Noetherian integral domain R of characteristic $p > 0$. Let $R^\circ = R \setminus \{0\}$ denote the subset of non-zero divisors. We first define $\tau(W_n \omega_R)$ as

the smallest co-small T -stable $W_n R$ -submodule of $W_n \omega_R$. Here we say that a $W_n R$ -submodule $M \subseteq W_n \omega_R$ is

- *co-small* if there exists $c \in R^\circ$ such that $[c] \cdot W_n \omega_R \subseteq M$, where $[c] \in W_n R$ denotes the Teichmüller lift of c ;
- *T-stable* if $T_n(F_* M) \subseteq M$, where $T_n : F_* W_n \omega_X \rightarrow W_n \omega_X$ is the trace map, that is, the $W_n R$ -module homomorphism obtained by applying $\text{Hom}_{W_n R}(-, W_n \omega_R)$ to Frobenius $F : W_n R \rightarrow F_* W_n R$.

Note that one can also construct $\tau(W_n \omega_R)$ via appropriate images of Frobenius trace maps (see Proposition 4.6 and Proposition 4.25).

Using $\tau(W_n \omega_R)$, we introduce the *quasi-test R -submodule* $\tau_n(\omega_R)$ of ω_R , which is given as the inverse image of $\tau(W_n \omega_R)$ by $(R^{n-1})^* : \omega_R \rightarrow W_n \omega_R$:

$$(1.2.2) \quad \begin{array}{ccc} W_n \omega_R & \supseteq & \tau(W_n \omega_R) \\ (R^{n-1})^* \uparrow & \text{Inverse Image} \uparrow & \\ \omega_R & \supseteq & \tau_n(\omega_R) \end{array} \quad \text{where} \quad \tau_n(\omega_R) := ((R^{n-1})^*)^{-1}(\tau(W_n \omega_R)).$$

We say that R is *quasi- F -rational* if there exists an integer $n > 0$ such that R is *n -quasi- F -rational*, i.e., $\tau_n(\omega_R) = \omega_R$ and R is Cohen-Macaulay.

When (R, \mathfrak{m}) is a local ring, it is often more convenient to work with the dual, via Matlis duality, statements involving local cohomology. In our setup, we introduce two modules $\tilde{0}_n^*$ and 0_n^* , which are summarised in the following square:

$$(1.2.3) \quad \begin{array}{ccc} H_{\mathfrak{m}}^d(W_n R) & \supseteq & \tilde{0}_n^* \\ R^{n-1} \downarrow & & \downarrow \text{Image} \\ H_{\mathfrak{m}}^d(R) & \supseteq & 0_n^* \end{array}$$

This square (1.2.3) corresponds to the square (1.2.2) via Matlis duality, for example, $\text{Hom}_R(0_n^*, E) \simeq \omega_R / \tau_n(\omega_R)$. As their notations indicate, $\tilde{0}_n^*$ and 0_n^* are obtained as analogues of the usual tight closure 0_M^* of 0 in an R -module M . For example, 0_n^* is defined as follows:

$$0_n^* := \bigcup_{\substack{c \in R^\circ, \\ e_0 \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}}} \bigcap_{e \geq e_0} K_n^{e,c} \subseteq H_{\mathfrak{m}}^d(R),$$

where

$$K_n^{e,c} := \text{Ker} \left(H_{\mathfrak{m}}^d(R) \xrightarrow{\Phi_{R,n}^{e,c}} H_{\mathfrak{m}}^d(Q_{R,n}^{e,c}) \right).$$

and $\Phi_{R,n}^{e,c}$ and $Q_{R,n}^{e,c}$ are given by the following pushout diagram:

$$\begin{array}{ccccc}
W_n R & \xrightarrow{F^e} & F_*^e W_n R & \xrightarrow{\cdot F_*^e [c]} & F_*^e W_n R \\
\downarrow R^{n-1} & & \downarrow & & \downarrow \\
R & \xrightarrow{\Phi_{R,n}^e} & Q_{R,n}^e & \longrightarrow & Q_{R,n}^{e,c} \\
& \searrow & \nearrow & \searrow & \nearrow \\
& & \Phi_{R,n}^{e,c} & &
\end{array}$$

1.2.1. *Definition of $\tau^q(X, \Delta)$.* We now overview how to define the quasi-test ideal $\tau^q(R, \Delta)$, which is the main object of interest of this article. Let R be an F -finite normal integral domain of characteristic $p > 0$ and let Δ be an effective \mathbb{Q} -divisor on X such that $K_R + \Delta$ is \mathbb{Q} -Cartier. We introduce the log versions of 0_n^* and $\tau_n(\omega_R)$, specifically the n -quasi-tight closure $0_{D,n}^* \subseteq H_m^d(R(D))$ and the n -quasi-test submodule $\tau_n(\omega_R, D) \subseteq \omega_R(-D) := \mathcal{H}om_R(R(D), \omega_R)$, respectively. Then the n -quasi-test ideal $\tau_n(R, \Delta)$ is defined as

$$\tau_n(R, \Delta) := \tau_n(\omega_R, K_R + \Delta) \subseteq R([- \Delta]) \simeq \omega_R([- (K_R + \Delta)]).$$

It is easy to see that $\{\tau_n(R, \Delta)\}_{n \geq 1}$ forms an ascending chain of ideals

$$\tau_1(R, \Delta) \subseteq \tau_2(R, \Delta) \subseteq \cdots \subseteq R.$$

Since R is a Noetherian ring, we have

$$\tau^q(R, \Delta) := \bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} \tau_n(R, \Delta) = \tau_n(R, \Delta)$$

for $n \gg 0$.

In contrast to the usual test ideal $\tau(R, \Delta)$, we define the n -quasi-test ideal $\tau_n(R, \Delta)$ only through the n -quasi-test submodule $\tau_n(\omega_R, D)$. This definition is advantageous due to its simplicity, but it requires the assumption that $K_R + \Delta$ is \mathbb{Q} -Cartier.

Acknowledgements.

- Kawakami was supported by JSPS KAKENHI Grant number JP22KJ1771 and JP24K16897.
- Takamatsu was supported by JSPS KAKENHI Grant number JP22J00962.
- Tanaka was supported by JSPS KAKENHI Grant numbers JP22H01112 and JP23K03028.
- Witaszek was supported by NSF research grant DMS-2101897.
- Yobuko was supported by JSPS KAKENHI Grant number JP19K14501.
- Yoshikawa was supported by JSPS KAKENHI Grant number JP20J11886 and RIKEN iTHEMS Program.

2. PRELIMINARIES

2.1. **Notation.** In this subsection, we summarise notation and terminologies used in this article.

- (1) Throughout the paper, p denotes a prime number and we set $\mathbb{F}_p := \mathbb{Z}/p\mathbb{Z}$.
- (2) We say that a ring R is *of characteristic $p > 0$* if R is an \mathbb{F}_p -algebra, i.e., the ring homomorphism $\mathbb{Z} \rightarrow R$ factors through \mathbb{F}_p . We say that a scheme X is *of characteristic $p > 0$* if X is an \mathbb{F}_p -scheme, i.e., the morphism $X \rightarrow \text{Spec } \mathbb{Z}$ factors through $\text{Spec } \mathbb{F}_p$.
- (3) For a ring R of characteristic $p > 0$, $F : R \rightarrow R$ denotes the absolute Frobenius ring homomorphism, i.e., $F(r) = r^p$ for every $r \in R$. Given a scheme X of characteristic $p > 0$, $F : X \rightarrow X$ denotes the absolute Frobenius morphism.
- (4) Given a ring R , R° denotes the subset of R consisting of non-zero-divisors. In other words, for $x \in R$, we have $x \in R^\circ$ if and only if the map $R \rightarrow R$ given by $r \mapsto xr$ is injective. In particular, R° is a multiplicatively closed subset of R .
 - If R is an integral domain, then $R^\circ = R \setminus \{0\}$.
 - If R is a Noetherian reduced ring, then we have $R^\circ = R \setminus (\mathfrak{p}_1 \cup \dots \cup \mathfrak{p}_r)$, where $\mathfrak{p}_1, \dots, \mathfrak{p}_r$ are all the minimal prime ideals of R .
- (5) Given $r \in R$ and $n \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$, we define

$$[r] := (r, 0, \dots, 0) \in W_n R.$$

and call it the *Teichmüller lift* of $r \in R$.

- (6) We say that a Noetherian scheme X is *equi-dimensional* if $\dim Y_1 = \dim Y_2 = \dots = \dim Y_r$ for all the irreducible components Y_1, Y_2, \dots, Y_r of X . We say that a Noetherian ring R is *equi-dimensional* if so is $\text{Spec } R$.
- (7) We say that an \mathbb{F}_p -scheme X is *F -finite* if $F : X \rightarrow X$ is a finite morphism, and we say that an \mathbb{F}_p -algebra R is *F -finite* if $\text{Spec } R$ is F -finite. Such schemes admit many good properties.
 - (a) If R is an F -finite Noetherian \mathbb{F}_p -algebra, then it is a homomorphic image of a regular ring of finite Krull dimension [Gab04, Remark 13.6]; in particular, R is excellent, it admits a dualising complex, and $\dim R < \infty$.
 - (b) F -finite rings are stable under localisation and ideal-adic completions [Has15, Example 9].
 - (c) If a scheme X is of finite type over an F -finite Noetherian \mathbb{F}_p -scheme Y , then it is also F -finite.
- (8) Let X be an integral normal F -finite Noetherian scheme X of characteristic $p > 0$. For a \mathbb{Q} -divisor D on X , we define $\mathcal{O}_X(D)$ as the coherent \mathcal{O}_X -submodule of the constant sheaf $\underline{K}(X)$ given by the formula

$$\Gamma(U, \mathcal{O}_X(D)) := \{f \in K(X) \mid (\text{div}(f) + D)|_U \geq 0\}.$$

We define $W_n\mathcal{O}_X(D)$ as the subsheaf of the constant sheaf $\underline{W_n(K(X))}$ given by the formula

$$\begin{aligned}\Gamma(U, W_n\mathcal{O}_X(D)) &:= \prod_{m=0}^{n-1} \Gamma(U, \mathcal{O}_X(p^m D)) \\ &= \{(f_0, \dots, f_{n-1}) \in W_n(K(X)) \mid \\ &\quad (\operatorname{div}(f_i) + p^i D)|_U \geq 0 \text{ for all } 0 \leq i \leq n-1\}.\end{aligned}$$

It is known that $W_n\mathcal{O}_X(D)$ is a coherent $W_n\mathcal{O}_X$ -submodule of the constant sheaf $\underline{W_n(K(X))}$ [Tan22, Proposition 3.8].

- (9) We say that $f : Y \rightarrow X$ is an *alteration* if f is a proper surjective morphism of Noetherian integral schemes such that induced field extension $K(X) \subseteq K(Y)$ is of finite degree.

2.1.1. *Frobenius push-forward modules* $F_*^e M$. Let R be a ring of characteristic $p > 0$. Fix integers $e \geq 0$ and $n > 0$. For a $W_n R$ -module M , we define a $W_n R$ -module $F_*^e M$ as follows.

- (1) As an additive group, we set $F_*^e M := M$.
- (2) For $m \in M$, we set $F_*^e M \ni F_*^e m := m$ (in order to distinguish $F_*^e M$ from M).
- (3) For $x \in W_n R$ and $m \in M$, the $W_n R$ -linear structure on $F_*^e M$ is defined by

$$x \cdot (F_*^e m) := F_*^e(F^e(x)m),$$

where the product $F^e(x)m$ is given by the one in M .

In particular, we have $F_*^{e_1} F_*^{e_2} M = F_*^{e_1+e_2} M$. Similarly, if $0 \leq e' \leq e$, $x \in W_n R$, and $m \in M$, then we set

$$(2.0.1) \quad (F_*^{e'} x) \cdot (F_*^e m) := F_*^{e'}(x \cdot (F_*^{e-e'} m)) \in F_*^e M.$$

For example, if $x = F^{e'}(y)$ for some $y \in W_n R$, then we have

$$(2.0.2) \quad (F_*^{e'}(F^{e'}(y))) \cdot (F_*^e m) = y \cdot (F_*^e m) \quad \text{in } F_*^e M,$$

because

$$(F_*^{e'}(F^{e'}(y))) \cdot (F_*^e m) = F_*^{e'}((F^{e'}(y)) \cdot (F_*^{e-e'} m)) = y \cdot F_*^{e'}(F_*^{e-e'} m) = y \cdot (F_*^e m).$$

Remark 2.1. Given a scheme X of characteristic $p > 0$ and a quasi-coherent $W_n\mathcal{O}_X$ -module M (i.e., a quasi-coherent sheaf on the scheme $(X, W_n\mathcal{O}_X)$), we have the e -th iterated Frobenius morphism $F_*^e : W_n X \rightarrow W_n X$. The above definition coincides with the usual scheme-theoretic push-forward $F_*^e M$ for the case when X is affine via the identification of quasi-coherent $W_n\mathcal{O}_X$ -modules and $\Gamma(X, W_n\mathcal{O}_X)$ -modules.

2.2. Recollection on the theory of F -singularities via closures. The goal of this subsection is to provide a brief introduction to the theory of F -singularities via closures and to justify some of the definitions we will use later in the context of quasi- F -singularities. The results, proofs, and definitions in this subsection will not be used anywhere else in our paper and are only provided for the convenience of the reader. For this reason, we do not strive for the highest level of generality. Most

general definitions may be found in Subsection 2.3. For more on this topic, we refer the reader to [ST12, Section 3], [Tak21, Section 2], as well as the forthcoming book [SS].

Let (R, \mathfrak{m}) be a d -dimensional Noetherian F -finite local domain of characteristic $p > 0$. Set $R^\circ := R \setminus \{0\}$. By applying $\mathrm{Hom}_R(-, \omega_R)$ to $F^e : R \rightarrow F_*^e R$, we obtain the trace of Frobenius $T^e : F_*^e \omega_R \rightarrow \omega_R$. We will often denote $T^1 : F_* \omega_R \rightarrow \omega_R$ by T .

Definition 2.2 (cf. [ST12, Definition 8.7 and Exercise 8.8]). For simplicity, assume that R is Cohen-Macaulay. In this case, we say that R is F -injective if one of the following equivalent conditions hold:

- (1) $T^e : F_*^e \omega_R \rightarrow \omega_R$ is surjective for every $e > 0$,
- (2) $H_{\mathfrak{m}}^d(R) \rightarrow H_{\mathfrak{m}}^d(F_*^e R)$ is injective for every $e > 0$.

The equivalence of these two conditions follows by applying Matlis duality $\mathrm{Hom}_R(-, E)$, where $E = H_{\mathfrak{m}}^d(\omega_R)$ is the injective hull of the R -module R/\mathfrak{m} . Moreover, it is enough to check these conditions for a single $e > 0$, for example, $e = 1$. Last, we point out that if $\omega_R \simeq R$, then R is F -injective if and only if R is F -split.

Next, one constructs an R -submodule $\sigma(\omega_R)$ of ω_R that measures how far a ring is from being F -injective. To this end, we define the Frobenius closure of 0 in the R -module $H_{\mathfrak{m}}^d(R)$ as follows:

$$0_{H_{\mathfrak{m}}^d(R)}^{F,e} := \mathrm{Ker}\left(F^e : H_{\mathfrak{m}}^d(R) \rightarrow H_{\mathfrak{m}}^d(F_*^e R)\right), \text{ and}$$

$$0_{H_{\mathfrak{m}}^d(R)}^F := \bigcup_{e>0} 0_{H_{\mathfrak{m}}^d(R)}^{F,e}.$$

Definition 2.3. We define the R -submodule $\sigma(\omega_R)$ of ω_R by one of the following four equivalent assertions:

- (1) $\sigma(\omega_R) := \bigcap_{e>0} \mathrm{Im}(T^e : F_*^e \omega_R \rightarrow \omega_R)$,
- (2) $\sigma(\omega_R) := \left(\varinjlim_{e>0} \mathrm{Im}(F^e : H_{\mathfrak{m}}^d(R) \rightarrow H_{\mathfrak{m}}^d(F_*^e R))\right)^\vee$,
- (3) $\sigma(\omega_R) := \left(H_{\mathfrak{m}}^d(R) / 0_{H_{\mathfrak{m}}^d(R)}^F\right)^\vee$,
- (4) $\sigma(\omega_R) := \mathrm{Ann}_{\omega_R}(0_{H_{\mathfrak{m}}^d(R)}^F)$.²

Here $(-)^\vee := \mathrm{Hom}_R(-, E)$.

One can show that the intersection and colimit in these definitions stabilise for $e \gg 0$ (see [KTY22, Lemma 8.1])

Brief sketch of the proof. By stabilisation, the equivalence of (1) and (2) follows from Matlis duality. Further, the equivalence of (2) and (3) is ensured by the short exact sequence:

$$(2.3.1) \quad 0 \rightarrow 0_{H_{\mathfrak{m}}^d(R)}^{F,e} \rightarrow H_{\mathfrak{m}}^d(R) \rightarrow \mathrm{Im}(F^e : H_{\mathfrak{m}}^d(R) \rightarrow H_{\mathfrak{m}}^d(F_*^e R)) \rightarrow 0.$$

²the annihilator is taken with respect to the multiplicative pairing $\eta : \omega_R \otimes H_{\mathfrak{m}}^d(R) \rightarrow H_{\mathfrak{m}}^d(\omega_R) = E$; specifically: $\mathrm{Ann}_{\omega_R}(0_{H_{\mathfrak{m}}^d(R)}^F) = \{x \in \omega_R \mid \eta(x \otimes y) = 0 \text{ for every } y \in 0_{H_{\mathfrak{m}}^d(R)}^F\}$. This pairing is perfect by Matlis duality.

As for the equivalence of (3) and (4), since $\omega_R \otimes H_m^d(R) \rightarrow H_m^d(\omega_R)$ is a perfect pairing, we can identify the annihilator $\text{Ann}_{\omega_R}(0_{H_m^d(R)}^F)$ with the R -submodule

$$\text{Hom}_R(H_m^d(R)/0_{H_m^d(R)}^F, H_m^d(\omega_R)) \subseteq \text{Hom}_R(H_m^d(R), H_m^d(\omega_R)).$$

But the left hand side is exactly $\left(H_m^d(R)/0_{H_m^d(R)}^F\right)^\vee$ [BH93, Corollary 3.5.9]. \square

Remark 2.4. Note that (3) is equivalent to $\left(\frac{\omega_R}{\sigma(\omega_R)}\right)^\vee = 0_{H_m^d(R)}^F$. Indeed, by applying Matlis duality to (2.3.1), we get the following short exact sequence

$$0 \rightarrow \sigma(\omega_R) \rightarrow \omega_R \rightarrow \left(0_{H_m^d(R)}^F\right)^\vee \rightarrow 0,$$

thanks to the fact that Matlis duality is exact and $H_m^d(R)^\vee \simeq \omega_R$.

Now, we move to the definition of F -rationality. To this end, given $c \in R$, we define $T^{e,c}$ as the composition of the following R -module homomorphisms:

$$T^{e,c}: F_*^e \omega_R \xrightarrow{\cdot F_*^e c} F_*^e \omega_R \xrightarrow{T^e} \omega_R.$$

Definition 2.5 (cf. [ST08, Definition 8.1] and [BST15a, Definition 2.31]). We say that R is *F-rational* if R is Cohen-Macaulay and, for every $c \in R^\circ$, there exists an integer $e > 0$ such that the following equivalent conditions hold:

- (1) the R -module homomorphism $T^{e,c}: F_*^e \omega_R \rightarrow \omega_R$ is surjective,
- (2) the composition $H_m^d(R) \xrightarrow{F^e} H_m^d(F_*^e R) \xrightarrow{\cdot F_*^e c} H_m^d(F_*^e R)$ is injective.

To construct the R -submodule $\tau(\omega_R)$ of ω_R measuring F -rationality, define

$$K^{e,c} := \text{Ker}\left(H_m^d(R) \xrightarrow{F^e} H_m^d(F_*^e R) \xrightarrow{\cdot F_*^e c} H_m^d(F_*^e R)\right)$$

for any integer $e > 0$ and $c \in R^\circ$.

Definition 2.6 ([ST08, Definition 5.19]). The *tight closure* of 0 in $H_m^d(R)$ is given by

$$0_{H_m^d(R)}^* := \bigcup_{\substack{c \in R^\circ, \\ e_0 \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}}} \bigcap_{e \geq e_0} K^{e,c} \subseteq H_m^d(R).$$

Equivalently, given $z \in H_m^d(R)$, we have $z \in 0_{H_m^d(R)}^*$ if and only if there exist $c \in R^\circ$ and an integer $e_0 > 0$ such that z is contained in $K^{e,c}$ for every integer $e \geq e_0$.

Remark 2.7. A key result in the theory of F -singularities is the existence of a test element (cf. Definition 2.16). In particular, this implies the existence of $t \in R^\circ$ such that $t0_{H_m^d(R)}^* = 0$. We will see by equality (2.10.1) that this condition is the same as $t\omega_R \subseteq \tau(\omega_R)$ for the test submodule $\tau(\omega_R)$ defined below.

Finally, we say that an R -submodule $M \subseteq \omega_R$ is *T-stable* if $T(F_* M) \subseteq M$ for $T: F_* \omega_R \rightarrow \omega_R$.

Before proceeding, we need the following lemma.

Lemma 2.8. *Take $t \in \text{Ann}_R(0_{H_m^d(R)}^*) \cap R^\circ$ and $c \in (t^2) \cap R^\circ$. Set*

$$I^{e,c} := \text{Im}(T^{e,c} : F_*^e \omega_R \rightarrow \omega_R).$$

Then there exists an integer $e_0 > 0$ such that

- (1) $K^{0,c} \supseteq K^{1,c} \supseteq \dots \supseteq K^{e_0,c} = K^{e_0+1,c} = \dots$, and
- (2) $I^{0,c} \subseteq I^{1,c} \subseteq \dots \subseteq I^{e_0,c} = I^{e_0+1,c} = \dots$.

Proof. By $0_{H_m^d(R)}^F \subseteq 0_{H_m^d(R)}^*$, we get $t \in \text{Ann}_R(0_{H_m^d(R)}^*) \subseteq \text{Ann}_R(0_{H_m^d(R)}^F)$. This, together with $(0_{H_m^d(R)}^F)^\vee = \omega_R / \sigma(\omega_R)$, implies $t\omega_R \subseteq \sigma(\omega_R)$. For $c = t^2 c'$, assertion (2) follows from

$$\begin{aligned} I^{e,c} &= \text{Im}(T^{e,t^2 c'} : F_*^e \omega_R \rightarrow \omega_R) \\ &\subseteq \text{Im}(T^{e,tc'} : F_*^e \sigma(\omega_R) \rightarrow \omega_R) \\ &\subseteq \text{Im}(T^{e+1,t^p c'^p} : F_*^{e+1} \omega_R \rightarrow \omega_R) \\ &\subseteq \text{Im}(T^{e+1,t^2 c'} : F_*^{e+1} \omega_R \rightarrow \omega_R) = I^{e+1,c}. \end{aligned}$$

By Matlis duality, we have $(I^{e,c})^\vee \simeq H_m^d(R)/K^{e,c}$, and hence (2) implies (1). \square

Definition 2.9 (cf. [BST15a, Definition 2.33]). We define the *test submodule* $\tau(\omega_R)$ of ω_R by one of the following equivalent assertions:

- (1) $\tau(\omega_R) := \bigcap_{c \in R^\circ} \bigcap_{e_0 > 0} \sum_{e \geq e_0} \text{Im}(T^{e,c} : F_*^e \omega_R \rightarrow \omega_R)$,
- (3) $\tau(\omega_R) := \left(H_m^d(R) / 0_{H_m^d(R)}^* \right)^\vee$,
- (4) $\tau(\omega_R) := \text{Ann}_{\omega_R}(0_{H_m^d(R)}^*)$,
- (5) $\tau(\omega_R) := \bigcap_{c \in R^\circ} \sum_{e_0 > 0} \text{Im}(T^{e_0,c} : F_*^{e_0} \omega_R \rightarrow \omega_R)$,
- (6) $\tau(\omega_R)$ is the smallest nonzero R -submodule of ω_R which is T -stable,
- (7) $\tau(\omega_R) := \text{Im}(T^{e,t^2} : F_*^e \omega_R \rightarrow \omega_R)$, where $t \in \text{Ann}_R(0_{H_m^d(R)}^*) \cap R^\circ$ and $e \gg 0$ (depending on t).
- (8) $\tau(\omega_R) := \bigcap_{c \in R^\circ} \sum_{e_0 > 0} \bigcap_{e \geq e_0} \text{Im}(T^{e,c^{p^{e-e_0}}} : F_*^e \omega_R \rightarrow \omega_R)$.

It is clear by (5) that $\tau(\omega_R) = R$ if and only if R is F -rational. Also note that we skipped the analogue of (2) from Definition 2.3 as formulating a correct statement is a bit subtle.

Sketch of the proof of the equivalences. For the sake of the proof, we define $\tau(\omega_R)$ by assertion (1):

$$\tau(\omega_R) := \bigcap_{c \in R^\circ} \bigcap_{e_0 > 0} \sum_{e \geq e_0} \text{Im}(T^{e,c} : F_*^e \omega_R \rightarrow \omega_R)$$

and show that it is equivalent to (3)–(7). Fix $t \in \text{Ann}_R(0_{H_m^d(R)}^*) \cap R^\circ$.

(1) \iff (3): By Matlis duality, $\text{Im}(T^{e,c}: F_*^e \omega_R \rightarrow \omega_R) \simeq (H_{\mathfrak{m}}^d(R)/K^{e,c})^\vee$. Then since Matlis duality interchanges limits and colimits, we get that

$$\begin{aligned} \tau(\omega_R) &= \bigcap_{c \in R^\circ} \bigcap_{e_0 > 0} \sum_{e \geq e_0} (H_{\mathfrak{m}}^d(R)/K^{e,c})^\vee \\ &= \bigcap_{c \in t^2 R^\circ} \bigcap_{e_0 > 0} \sum_{e \geq e_0} (H_{\mathfrak{m}}^d(R)/K^{e,c})^\vee \\ &\stackrel{(\star)}{=} \varprojlim_{c \in t^2 R^\circ} \varprojlim_{e_0 > 0} \varinjlim_{e \geq e_0} (H_{\mathfrak{m}}^d(R)/K^{e,c})^\vee \\ &\simeq \left(\varinjlim_{c \in t^2 R^\circ} \varinjlim_{e_0 > 0} \varprojlim_{e \geq e_0} H_{\mathfrak{m}}^d(R)/K^{e,c} \right)^\vee \\ &= \left(\varinjlim_{c \in R^\circ} \varinjlim_{e_0 > 0} \varprojlim_{e \geq e_0} H_{\mathfrak{m}}^d(R)/K^{e,c} \right)^\vee \\ &\stackrel{(\star\star)}{=} \left(H_{\mathfrak{m}}^d(R)/0_{H_{\mathfrak{m}}^d(R)}^* \right)^\vee, \end{aligned}$$

where (\star) and $(\star\star)$ hold, because the following hold for $e_1 \gg e_0$ (Lemma 2.8):

$$K^{e_0,c} \supseteq K^{e_0+1,c} \supseteq \dots \supseteq K^{e_1,c} = K^{e_1+1,c} = \dots.$$

(3) \iff (4): This is exactly the same as in Definition 2.3.

(1) \iff (5): Define $\tau'(\omega_R) := \bigcap_{c \in R^\circ} \sum_{e_0 > 0} \text{Im}(T^{e_0,c}: F_*^{e_0} \omega_R \rightarrow \omega_R)$. Clearly $\tau(\omega_R) \subseteq \tau'(\omega_R)$, so it suffices to prove the opposite inclusion. Take any $t \in R^\circ$ such that $t\omega_R \subseteq \sigma(\omega_R)$. Then

$$\text{Im}(T^{e_0,ct}) \subseteq \text{Im}(T^{e,c^{p^{e-e_0}}}) \subseteq \text{Im}(T^{e,c})$$

for all integers $e \geq e_0 \geq 0$. This implies inclusion (\dagger) in

$$\tau'(\omega_R) = \bigcap_{c \in R^\circ} \sum_{e_0 > 0} \text{Im}(T^{e_0,ct}) \stackrel{(\dagger)}{\subseteq} \bigcap_{c \in R^\circ} \bigcap_{e_0 > 0} \sum_{e \geq e_0} \text{Im}(T^{e,c}) = \tau(\omega_R).$$

(5) \iff (6): It is enough to prove that $\tau(\omega_R) = \bigcap_{c \in R^\circ} \sum_{e_0 > 0} \text{Im}(T^{e_0,c}: F_*^{e_0} \omega_R \rightarrow \omega_R)$ is T -stable and is contained in any nonzero T -stable R -submodule M of ω_R . Clearly,

$$\begin{aligned} T(F_* \tau(\omega_R)) &\subseteq \bigcap_{c \in R^\circ} \sum_{e_0 > 0} \text{Im}(T^{e_0+1,c^p}: F_*^{e_0+1} \omega_R \rightarrow \omega_R) \\ &\subseteq \bigcap_{c \in R^\circ} \sum_{e_0 > 0} \text{Im}(T^{e_0,c^p}: F_*^{e_0} \omega_R \rightarrow \omega_R) \\ &= \tau(\omega_R). \end{aligned}$$

Hence $\tau(\omega_R)$ is T -stable. To show that it is contained in M , pick $d \in R^\circ$ such that $d\omega_R \subseteq M$. Then

$$\tau(\omega_R) = \bigcap_{c \in R^\circ} \sum_{e_0 > 0} \text{Im}(T^{e_0,cd}) \subseteq \bigcap_{c \in R^\circ} \sum_{e_0 > 0} T^{e_0,c}(F_*^{e_0} M) \subseteq \sum_{e_0 > 0} T^{e_0}(F_*^{e_0} M) \subseteq M,$$

where the last inclusion is clear as M is T -stable.

(6) \iff (7): We will implicitly use that the equivalence of (1) and (6) is already proven. Define

$$\tau''(\omega_R) := \sum_{e>0} \text{Im}(T^{e,t^2} : F_*^e \omega_R \rightarrow \omega_R) = \text{Im}(T^{e,t^2} : F_*^e \omega_R \rightarrow \omega_R),$$

where the latter equality holds for $e \gg 0$ (Lemma 2.8).

To finish the proof, it suffices to prove that $\tau''(\omega_R)$ is T -stable and is contained in $\tau(\omega_R)$. Clearly

$$T(F_* \tau''(\omega_R)) \subseteq \text{Im}(T^{e+1,t^2} : F_*^{e+1} \omega_R \rightarrow \omega_R) = \tau''(\omega_R).$$

Moreover,

$$\tau''(\omega_R) = \text{Im}(T^{e,t^2} : F_*^e \omega_R \rightarrow \omega_R) \subseteq \text{Im}(T^{e,t} : F_*^e \tau(\omega_R) \rightarrow \omega_R) \stackrel{(6)}{\subseteq} \tau(\omega_R).$$

This concludes the proof.

(5) \iff (8): Let us denote the right hand side of (8) by $\tau'''(\omega_R)$. It holds that

$$\begin{aligned} \tau'''(\omega_R) &= \bigcap_{c \in R^\circ} \sum_{e_0 > 0} \bigcap_{e \geq e_0} \text{Im}(T^{e, c^{p^{e-e_0}}} : F_*^e \omega_R \rightarrow \omega_R) \\ &\subseteq \bigcap_{c \in R^\circ} \sum_{e_0 > 0} \text{Im}(T^{e_0, c} : F_*^{e_0} \omega_R \rightarrow \omega_R) \\ &\stackrel{(5)}{=} \tau(\omega_R). \end{aligned}$$

It suffices to show the opposite inclusion $\tau'''(\omega_R) \supseteq \tau(\omega_R)$. We now compute $\bigcap_{e \geq e_0} \text{Im}(T^{e, c^{p^{e-e_0}}} : F_*^e \omega_R \rightarrow \omega_R)$. For $c \in R^\circ$, $\zeta \in \omega_R$, and integers $e \geq e_0$, we have that

$$\begin{aligned} T^e((F_*^e c^{p^{e-e_0}}) \cdot (F_*^e \zeta)) &= T^{e_0}(F_*^{e_0} T^{e-e_0}((F_*^{e-e_0} c^{p^{e-e_0}}) \cdot (F_*^{e-e_0} \zeta))) \\ &= T^{e_0}(F_*^{e_0} T^{e-e_0}(c \cdot (F_*^{e-e_0} \zeta))) \\ &= T^{e_0}(F_*^{e_0}(c \cdot T^{e-e_0}(F_*^{e-e_0} \zeta))). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, we get

$$\begin{aligned} \bigcap_{e \geq e_0} \text{Im}(T^{e, c^{p^{e-e_0}}} : F_*^e \omega_R \rightarrow \omega_R) &= \bigcap_{e \geq e_0} T^{e_0}(F_*^{e_0}(c \cdot \text{Im}(T^{e-e_0}))) \\ &\supseteq T^{e_0}(F_*^{e_0}(c \cdot (\bigcap_{e \geq e_0} \text{Im}(T^{e-e_0})))) \\ &= T^{e_0}(F_*^{e_0}(c \cdot \sigma(\omega_R))). \end{aligned}$$

Then, for an element $d \in R^\circ$ satisfying $\sigma(\omega_R) \supseteq d\omega_R$, it holds that

$$\tau'''(\omega_R) \supseteq \bigcap_{c \in R^\circ} \sum_{e_0 > 0} T^{e_0}(F_*^{e_0}(c \cdot \sigma(\omega_R))) \supseteq \bigcap_{c \in R^\circ} \sum_{e_0 > 0} T^{e_0}(F_*^{e_0}(cd \cdot \omega_R))$$

$$= \bigcap_{c \in R^\circ} \sum_{e_0 > 0} T^{e_0}(F_*^{e_0}(c \cdot \omega_R)) \stackrel{(5)}{=} \tau(\omega_R).$$

We are done. \square

Remark 2.10. As in Remark 2.4, the third assertion is equivalent to

$$(2.10.1) \quad \left(\frac{\omega_R}{\tau(\omega_R)} \right)^\vee = 0_{H_m^d(R)}^*.$$

One way to define the test ideal $\tau(R)$ is to first define a test submodule for pairs, specifically, $\tau(\omega_R, D)$ for an effective \mathbb{Q} -divisor D . Then, given a \mathbb{Q} -divisor Δ such that $K_R + \Delta$ is \mathbb{Q} -Cartier, one sets

$$\tau(R, \Delta) := \tau(\omega_R, K_R + \Delta).$$

If K_R is \mathbb{Q} -Cartier, then $\tau(R) := \tau(R, 0)$. This object is discussed in more detail in Subsection 2.3.

Remark 2.11. We conclude this subsection by a brief discussion on how to define $\tau(\omega_R, D)$. We warn the reader that there are multiple ways to define test submodules for pairs, which turn out to be often equivalent. In what follows, we give definitions that, although being somewhat nonstandard, are most convenient for further generalisations to quasi- F -splittings.

First, we need to introduce the following notation.

- Given $c \in R^\circ$ and a \mathbb{Q} -divisor D , we define $T_D^{e,c}$ as the composition:

$$T_D^{e,c}: F_*^e \omega_R(-p^e D) \xrightarrow{\cdot F_*^e c} F_*^e \omega_R(-p^e D) \xrightarrow{T_D^e} \omega_R(-D),$$

where we set $\omega_R(E) := \text{Hom}_R(R(-E), \omega_R)$ for a \mathbb{Q} -divisor E .

- For $e > 0$ and $c \in R^\circ$, we also define

$$K_D^{e,c} := \text{Ker} \left(H_m^d(R(D)) \xrightarrow{F_*^e} H_m^d(F_*^e R(p^e D)) \xrightarrow{\cdot F_*^e c} H_m^d(F_*^e R(p^e D)) \right)$$

and set³

$$0_{H_m^d(R(D))}^{*,\{D\}} := \bigcup_{\substack{c \in R^\circ, \\ e_0 \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}}} \bigcap_{e \geq e_0} K_D^{e,c} \subseteq H_m^d(R(D)).$$

- Finally, we say that an R -submodule $M \subseteq \omega_R(-D)$ is *stable* under⁴

$$T_D^e := T_D^{e,1}: F_*^e \omega_R(-p^e D) \rightarrow \omega_R(-D)$$

if for every $g \in R(-(p^e - 1)D)$ we have that $T^{e,g}(F_*^e M) \subseteq M$, or equivalently that the image of the composition

$$F_*^e M \hookrightarrow F_*^e \omega_R(-D) \xrightarrow{\cdot F_*^e g} F_*^e \omega_R(-p^e D) \xrightarrow{T_D^e} \omega_R(-D)$$

³the following is not the usual definition of $0_{H_m^d(R(D))}^{*,\{D\}}$ (see Definition 2.12), but we show later in Proposition 2.15 that it is equivalent to the usual one

⁴the intuitive way to read this assertion is that $T_D^e(F_*^e M(-(p^e - 1)D)) \subseteq M$, but of course $M(-(p^e - 1)D)$ does not make sense if D is not Cartier

is contained in M . In the above, we implicitly use that

$$(2.11.1) \quad \lceil -D \rceil + \lfloor -(p^e - 1)D \rfloor \leq \lceil -p^e D \rceil$$

which follows from $\lceil a \rceil + \lfloor b \rfloor \leq \lceil a + b \rceil$ for $a, b \in \mathbb{Q}$.

Let D be an effective \mathbb{Q} -divisor and pick $t \in R^\circ$ such that $t0_{H_m^d(R(D))}^{*,\{D\}} = 0$. One can check that the test submodule $\tau(\omega_R, D)$ of $\omega_R(-D)$ (see [BST15a, Definition 2.33]) can be equivalently defined by one of the following assertions:

- (1) $\tau(\omega_R, D) := \bigcap_{c \in R^\circ} \bigcap_{e_0 > 0} \sum_{e \geq e_0} \text{Im}(T_D^{e,c}: F_*^e \omega_R(-p^e D) \rightarrow \omega_R(-D)),$
- (3) $\tau(\omega_R, D) := \left(H_m^d(R(D))/0_{D, H_m^d(R(D))}^* \right)^\vee,$
- (5) $\tau(\omega_R, D) := \bigcap_{c \in R^\circ} \sum_{e_0 > 0} \text{Im}(T_D^{e_0,c}: F_*^{e_0} \omega_R(-p^{e_0} D) \rightarrow \omega_R(-D)),$
- (6) $\tau(\omega_R, D)$ is the smallest nonzero R -submodule of $\omega_R(-D)$ which is stable under T_D^e for every $e > 0$,
- (7) $\tau(\omega_R, D) = T^e(F_*^e(c f^{\lceil a(p^e - 1) \rceil} \omega_R))$ for $c = f^{\lceil a \rceil} t^2$ and every $e \gg 0$ (depending on t), when $D = a \text{div}(f)$, $a \in \mathbb{Q}_{\geq 0}$, and $f \in R^\circ$.

We leave it to the reader to verify the equivalence of all these definitions (see [BSTZ10, Definition-Proposition 3.3] or [ST08, Theorem 6.4] for a similar discussion).

2.3. Tight closure and test ideals. In this subsection, we further summarise the definitions and some known results on tight closure and test ideals. For more details, we refer to [ST12, Section 3], [Tak21, Section 2], and references therein.

Definition 2.12 ([HH90, Definition 8.2], [Tak04, Definition 2.1]). Let R be an F -finite Noetherian reduced ring of characteristic $p > 0$. Let M be an R -module.

- (1) We define the *tight closure* 0_M^* (of 0 in M) by (1a) and (1b) below.
 - (1a) 0_M^* is an R -submodule of M .
 - (1b) Take $z \in M$. Then $z \in 0_M^*$ if and only if there exist an integer $e_0 \geq 0$ and $c \in R^\circ$ such that, for every $e \geq e_0$, the equality $z \otimes_R F_*^e c = 0$ holds in $M \otimes F_*^e R$.
- (2) Assume that R is a normal integral domain. Take an effective \mathbb{Q} -divisor Δ on X . We define the Δ -*tight closure* $0_M^{*\Delta}$ (of 0 in M) by (2a) and (2b) below.
 - (2a) $0_M^{*\Delta}$ is an R -submodule of M .
 - (2b) Take $z \in M$. Then $z \in 0_M^{*\Delta}$ if and only if there exist an integer $e_0 \geq 0$ and $c \in R^\circ$ such that, for every $e \geq e_0$, the equality $z \otimes_R F_*^e c = 0$ holds in $M \otimes F_*^e R((p^e - 1)\Delta)$.

Lemma 2.13. *Let (R, \mathfrak{m}) be a d -dimensional F -finite Noetherian normal local ring of characteristic $p > 0$. Take a Weil divisor D and a \mathbb{Q} -divisor Γ on $\text{Spec } R$. Then we have*

$$H_m^d(R(D)) \otimes_R F_*^e R(\Gamma) \simeq H_m^d(F_*^e R(p^e D + \Gamma))$$

for every integer $e \geq 0$.

Proof. We consider the natural R -module homomorphism

$$\eta: R(D) \otimes_R F_*^e R(\Gamma) \rightarrow F_*^e R(p^e D + \Gamma)$$

and the exact sequences

$$0 \rightarrow K := \text{Ker}(\eta) \rightarrow R(D) \otimes_R F_*^e R(\Gamma) \rightarrow \text{Im}(\eta) \rightarrow 0,$$

$$0 \rightarrow \text{Im}(\eta) \rightarrow F_*^e R(p^e D + \Gamma) \rightarrow \text{Coker}(\eta) =: C \rightarrow 0.$$

Since η is an isomorphism at every point of codimension ≤ 1 , we get

$$\dim \text{Supp } K \leq d - 2 \quad \text{and} \quad \dim \text{Supp } C \leq d - 2,$$

which imply $H_m^j(K) = H_m^j(C) = 0$ for $j \in \{d - 1, d\}$. Therefore, we get the induced R -module isomorphism:

$$H_m^d(\eta): H_m^d(R(D) \otimes_R F_*^e R(\Gamma)) \xrightarrow{\cong} H_m^d(F_*^e R(p^e D + \Gamma)).$$

Then it is enough to show that

$$(2.13.1) \quad H_m^d(M) \otimes_R N \simeq H_m^d(M \otimes_R N).$$

To this end, let x_1, \dots, x_d be a system of parameters of R . Set $R_d := R[x_1^{-1}, \dots, x_d^{-1}]$ and $R_{d-1} := \prod_{1 \leq i \leq d} R[x_1^{-1}, \dots, x_{i-1}^{-1}, x_{i+1}^{-1}, \dots, x_d^{-1}]$. In view of [Sta14, Tag 0A6R] or [BH93, Theorem 3.5.6], we have an exact sequence

$$(2.13.2) \quad M \otimes_R R_{d-1} \rightarrow M \otimes_R R_d \rightarrow H_m^d(M) \rightarrow 0.$$

Then, by tensoring the above exact sequence (2.13.2) with N we obtain

$$(2.13.3) \quad M \otimes_R N \otimes_R R_{d-1} \rightarrow M \otimes_R N \otimes_R R_d \rightarrow H_m^d(M) \otimes_R N \rightarrow 0.$$

Moreover, we also have an exact sequence

$$(2.13.4) \quad M \otimes_R N \otimes_R R_{d-1} \rightarrow M \otimes_R N \otimes_R R_d \rightarrow H_m^d(M \otimes_R N) \rightarrow 0.$$

Comparing exact sequences (2.13.3) and (2.13.4), we obtain (2.13.1), as required. \square

Remark 2.14. Let R be an F -finite Noetherian normal integral domain of characteristic $p > 0$. Take an effective \mathbb{Q} -divisor Δ on $\text{Spec } R$. We now prove that we may replace “ $p^e - 1$ ” by “ p^e ” in Definition 2.12. Specifically, we show

$$(2.14.1) \quad 0_M^{*\Delta} = (0_M^{*\Delta})'$$

for $(0_M^{*\Delta})'$ defined by (a) and (b) below.

(a) $(0_M^{*\Delta})'$ is an R -submodule of M .

(b) Take $z \in M$. Then $z \in (0_M^{*\Delta})'$ if and only if there exist an integer $e_0 \geq 0$ and $c \in R^\circ$ such that, for every $e \geq e_0$, the equality $z \otimes F_*^e c = 0$ holds in $M \otimes F_*^e R(p^e \Delta)$.

Proof of (2.14.1). By the natural inclusion

$$R((p^e - 1)\Delta) \hookrightarrow R(p^e \Delta),$$

we get $0_M^{*\Delta} \subseteq (0_M^{\Delta})'$. Let us prove the opposite inclusion $0_M^{*\Delta} \supseteq (0_M^{\Delta})'$. Fix $z \in (0_M^{\Delta})'$. Then there exist $e_0 \geq 0$ and $c \in R^\circ$ such that $z \otimes F_*^e c = 0$ in $M \otimes F_*^e R(p^e \Delta)$ for every $e \geq e_0$. Take $c' \in R^\circ$ satisfying $\text{div}(c') \geq \Delta$. By $c' \in R(-\Delta)$, we get

$$\cdot c' : R(p^e \Delta) \rightarrow R((p^e - 1)\Delta),$$

which induces

$$M \otimes F_*^e R(p^e \Delta) \xrightarrow{\cdot(1 \otimes F_*^e c')} M \otimes F_*^e R((p^e - 1)\Delta).$$

Therefore, $z \otimes F_*^e (cc') = 0$ in $M \otimes F_*^e \mathcal{O}_X((p^e - 1)\Delta)$. \square

Proposition 2.15. *Let (R, \mathfrak{m}) be a d -dimensional F -finite Noetherian normal local ring of characteristic $p > 0$. Take a \mathbb{Q} -divisor D on $\text{Spec } R$ and $z \in H_{\mathfrak{m}}^d(R(D))$. Then the following are equivalent.*

- (1) $z \in 0_{H_{\mathfrak{m}}^d(R(D))}^{*\{D\}}$.
- (2) There exist an integer $e_0 \geq 0$ and $c \in R^\circ$ such that

$$z \in \bigcap_{e \geq e_0} \text{Ker}(H_{\mathfrak{m}}^d(R(D)) \xrightarrow{F^e} H_{\mathfrak{m}}^d(R(p^e D)) \xrightarrow{F_*^e c} H_{\mathfrak{m}}^d(R(p^e D))).$$

Proof. It follows from Remark 2.14 that (1) \Leftrightarrow (2)'.

- (2)' There exist an integer $e_0 \geq 0$ and $c \in R^\circ$ such that, for every $e \geq e_0$, the equality $z \otimes F_*^e c = 0$ holds in $H_{\mathfrak{m}}^d(R(p^e D)) \otimes F_*^e R(p^e \{D\})$.

By Lemma 2.13, it holds that

$$\begin{aligned} H_{\mathfrak{m}}^d(R(D)) \otimes F_*^e R(p^e \{D\}) &\simeq H_{\mathfrak{m}}^d(F_*^e R(p^e \lfloor D \rfloor + p^e \{D\})) = H_{\mathfrak{m}}^d(F_*^e R(p^e D)) \\ z \otimes F_*^e c &\leftrightarrow (F_*^e c) \cdot F^e(z). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, we get (2) \Leftrightarrow (2)'. \square

Definition 2.16 ([BSTZ10, Definition-Proposition 3.3]). Let R be a Noetherian F -finite reduced ring of characteristic $p > 0$. Set $E := \bigoplus_{\mathfrak{m}} E_R(R/\mathfrak{m})$, where \mathfrak{m} runs over all the maximal ideals of R in the direct sum $\bigoplus_{\mathfrak{m}}$, and $E_R(R/\mathfrak{m})$ denotes the injective hull of the R -module R/\mathfrak{m} .

- (1) We set

$$\tau(R) := \text{Ann}_R(0_E^*),$$

which is called the *test ideal* of R .

- (2) We say that $t \in R$ is a *test element* of R if $t \in \tau(R)$. In other words, $t \in R$ is a test element if and only if $t \cdot 0_M^* = 0$ for every R -module M (Remark 2.18(1)).
- (3) Assume that R is a normal integral domain. We set

$$\tau(R, \Delta) := \text{Ann}_R(0_E^{*\Delta}).$$

This ideal is called the *test ideal* of (R, Δ) .

Remark 2.17. In some literature, our test ideal $\tau(R)$ is denoted by $\tilde{\tau}(R)$ or $\tau_b(R)$ (cf. [Tak21, Remark 2.6]).

Remark 2.18. Let R be a Noetherian F -finite reduced ring of characteristic $p > 0$. It is known that the following hold.

- (1) If t is a test element of R (i.e., $t \in \tau(R)$) and M is an R -module, then $t \cdot 0_M^* = 0$ [BSTZ10, the same proof as in Definition-Proposition 3.3].
- (2) If R is a normal integral domain, Δ is an effective \mathbb{Q} -divisor on $\text{Spec } R$, and $t \in \tau(R, \Delta)$, then $t \cdot 0_M^{*\Delta} = 0$ [BSTZ10, Definition-Proposition 3.3].
- (3) If t is a test element of R , then t is a test element of $R_{\mathfrak{p}}$ for every prime ideal \mathfrak{p} of R by [LS01, Theorem 7.1(2)].
- (4) $(\omega_R/\tau(\omega_R))^\vee \simeq 0_{H_m^d(R)}^*$ by a similar argument to [BST15b, the proof of Lemma 3.5] (cf. (2.10.1)).

2.4. Witt dualising modules.

Notation 2.19. Let X be an F -finite Noetherian equi-dimensional reduced scheme of characteristic $p > 0$. For $e \geq 0$ and $n \geq m \geq 1$, we define the finite morphism $\iota_{X,m,n}^e: W_m X \rightarrow W_n X$ as the composition

$$\iota_{X,m,n}^e: W_m X \xrightarrow{F^e} W_m X \hookrightarrow W_n X,$$

where $W_n X := (X, W_n \mathcal{O}_X)$, $W_m X := (X, W_m \mathcal{O}_X)$, and $W_m X \hookrightarrow W_n X$ denotes the closed immersion corresponding to $R^{n-m}: W_n \mathcal{O}_X \rightarrow W_m \mathcal{O}_X$. Assume that there exist objects

$$W_1 \omega_X^\bullet, W_2 \omega_X^\bullet, \dots$$

of the derived category of $W_n \mathcal{O}_X$ -modules and a set of isomorphisms

$$\{\rho_{X,m,n}^e: W_m \omega_X^\bullet \xrightarrow{\simeq} (\iota_{X,m,n}^e)^\dagger W_n \omega_X^\bullet \mid e \geq 0, n \geq m \geq 1\}$$

in the derived category of $W_n \mathcal{O}_X$ -modules which satisfy the following.

- (1) $W_n \omega_X^\bullet$ is a dualising complex on $W_n X = (X, W_n \mathcal{O}_X)$ for every integer $n > 0$.
- (2) The equality $(\iota_{X,l,m}^{e'})^\dagger \rho_{X,m,n}^e \circ \rho_{X,l,m}^{e'} = \rho_{X,l,n}^{e+e'}$ holds for all $e, e', l, m, n \in \mathbb{Z}$ satisfying $e, e' \geq 0$ and $n \geq m \geq l \geq 1$.

Notation 2.20. We use the same notation as in Notation 2.19. Moreover, assume that X is an integral normal scheme.

Remark 2.21. If R is an F -finite Noetherian ring of characteristic $p > 0$ and X is a separated scheme of finite type over R , then there exist dualising complexes $\{W_n \omega_X^\bullet\}_{n \geq 1}$ and a set of isomorphisms $\{\rho_{X,m,n}^e\}_{e \geq 0, n \geq m \geq 1}$ satisfying the above properties (1) and (2) (Theorem 9.1).

Remark 2.22. We use Notation 2.19.

- (1) For all $e, m, n \in \mathbb{Z}$ satisfying $e \geq 0$ and $n \geq m \geq 1$, we define the morphism $T_{X,m,n}^e$ by

$$T_{X,m,n}^e: (\iota_{X,m,n}^e)_* W_m \omega_X^\bullet \xrightarrow{\rho_{X,m,n}^e} (\iota_{X,m,n}^e)_* (\iota_{X,m,n}^e)^\dagger W_n \omega_X^\bullet \xrightarrow{\text{adj}} W_n \omega_X^\bullet,$$

where adj is the natural morphism induced by the fact that $(\iota_{X,m,n}^e)^\dagger$ is the right adjoint of $(\iota_{X,m,n}^e)_*$ [Sta14, Tag 0A9Y]. Then the equality

$$T_{X,m,n}^e \circ (\iota_{X,m,n}^e)_* T_{X,l,m}^{e'} = T_{X,l,n}^{e+e'}$$

holds for all $e, e', l, m, n \in \mathbb{Z}$ satisfying $e, e' \geq 0$ and $n \geq m \geq l \geq 1$ (cf. Step 1 in the proof of Theorem 9.1).

(2) There exists an $F_*^e W_n \mathcal{O}_X$ -module isomorphism

$$R\mathcal{H}om_{W_n \mathcal{O}_X}(F_*^e W_m \mathcal{O}_X, W_n \omega_X^\bullet) \simeq F_*^e W_m \omega_X^\bullet$$

for every triple $(e, m, n) \in \mathbb{Z}^3$ satisfying $e \geq 0$ and $1 \leq m \leq n$.

Remark 2.23. We use Notation 2.19. Then there exists $e \in \mathbb{Z}$ such that $\mathcal{H}^e(W_n \omega_X^\bullet) \neq 0$ and $\mathcal{H}^i(W_n \omega_X^\bullet) = 0$ for every $i < e$. We define the *dualising* $W_n \mathcal{O}_X$ -module $W_n \omega_X$ by $W_n \omega_X := \mathcal{H}^e(W_n \omega_X^\bullet)$. Since X is equi-dimensional, it holds that

$$W_n \omega_X|_U = W_n \omega_U$$

for every open subset U of X [Sta14, Tag 0AWK] (cf. [KTT⁺22, 2.1.1]).

2.24 (V^*, R^*, T_n^e). We use Notation 2.19. In this article, we shall often consider the $W_n \omega_X$ -dual denoted by $(-)^* := \text{Hom}_{W_n \mathcal{O}_X}(-, W_n \omega_X)$. For example, the $W_n \mathcal{O}_X$ -module homomorphisms

$$V : F_* W_{n-1} \mathcal{O}_X \rightarrow W_n \mathcal{O}_X \quad \text{and} \quad R : W_n \mathcal{O}_X \rightarrow W_{n-1} \mathcal{O}_X$$

induce

$$V^* : W_n \omega_X \rightarrow F_* W_{n-1} \omega_X \quad \text{and} \quad R^* : W_{n-1} \omega_X \rightarrow W_n \omega_X.$$

Here, in order to get V^* , we used the following isomorphisms (Notation 2.19):

$$\text{Hom}_{W_n \mathcal{O}_X}(W_n \mathcal{O}_X, W_n \omega_X) \simeq W_n \omega_X, \quad \text{Hom}_{W_n \mathcal{O}_X}(F_* W_{n-1} \mathcal{O}_X, W_n \omega_X) \simeq F_* W_{n-1} \omega_X.$$

For integers $n > 0$ and $e \geq 0$, we define

$$T_n^e : F_*^e W_n \omega_X \rightarrow W_n \omega_X$$

as the trace map of $F^e : W_n \mathcal{O}_X \rightarrow F_*^e W_n \mathcal{O}_X$, that is, T_n^e is the $W_n \mathcal{O}_X$ -module homomorphism obtained by applying $\text{Hom}_{W_n R}(-, W_n \omega_R)$ to the e -th iterated Frobenius homomorphism $F^e : W_n \mathcal{O}_X \rightarrow F_*^e W_n \mathcal{O}_X$, which is $W_n \mathcal{O}_X$ -linear. Set $T_n := T_n^1$.

Remark 2.25. By applying $\text{Hom}_{W_n R}(-, W_n \omega_R)$ to the short exact sequence

$$0 \rightarrow F_* W_{n-1} R \xrightarrow{V} W_n R \xrightarrow{R^{n-1}} R \rightarrow 0,$$

we get the following exact sequence

$$0 \rightarrow \omega_R \xrightarrow{(R^{n-1})^*} W_n \omega_R \xrightarrow{V^*} F_* W_{n-1} \omega_R \rightarrow (\star),$$

where

$$(\star) = \text{Ext}_{W_n R}^1(R, W_n \omega_R).$$

If R is Cohen-Macaulay, then $(\star) \simeq \text{Ext}_R^1(R, \omega_R) = 0$, and so $V^* : W_n \omega_R \rightarrow F_* W_{n-1} \omega_R$ is surjective.

Definition 2.26. We use Notation 2.20. For an integer $n > 0$ and a \mathbb{Q} -divisor D on X , we define the coherent $W_n \mathcal{O}_X$ -module $W_n \omega_X(D)$ as follows

$$W_n \omega_X(D) := \text{Hom}_{W_n \mathcal{O}_X}(W_n \mathcal{O}_X(-D), W_n \omega_X)$$

Set $\omega_X(D) := W_1 \omega_X(D)$.

Remark 2.27. We use the same notation as in Definition 2.26.

(1) If $n = 1$, then

$$(2.27.1) \quad \begin{aligned} \omega_X(D) &= W_1\omega_X(D) = \mathcal{H}om_{\mathcal{O}_X}(\mathcal{O}_X(-D), \omega_X) \\ &\simeq \mathcal{O}_X(K_X - \lfloor -D \rfloor) = \mathcal{O}_X(K_X + \lceil D \rceil). \end{aligned}$$

In particular, if D is a Weil divisor, then $\omega_X(D) \simeq \mathcal{O}_X(K_X + D)$. On the other hand, we have

$$\omega_X(D) \not\simeq \mathcal{O}_X(K_X + D) (= \mathcal{O}_X(\lfloor K_X + D \rfloor))$$

in general.

(2) We now consider the case when n is an arbitrary positive integer. In contrast to (2.27.1), we have $W_n\mathcal{O}_X(-D) \not\simeq W_n\mathcal{O}_X(-\lfloor -D \rfloor)$, and hence

$$W_n\omega_X(D) \not\simeq W_n\mathcal{O}_X(K_X + \lceil D \rceil)$$

in general.

Remark 2.28. We use Notation 2.20. Take \mathbb{Q} -divisors D_1 and D_2 on X satisfying $D_1 \leq D_2$. Then the natural inclusion $j : W_n\mathcal{O}_X(-D_2) \hookrightarrow W_n\mathcal{O}_X(-D_1)$ induces

$$j^* : W_n\omega_X(D_1) \rightarrow W_n\omega_X(D_2),$$

which can be explicitly written as

$$j^* : \mathcal{H}om_{W_n\mathcal{O}_X}(W_n\mathcal{O}_X(-D_1), W_n\omega_X) \rightarrow \mathcal{H}om_{W_n\mathcal{O}_X}(W_n\mathcal{O}_X(-D_2), W_n\omega_X).$$

Let us show that $j^* : W_n\omega_X(D_1) \rightarrow W_n\omega_X(D_2)$ is injective. Both $W_n\omega_X(D_1)$ and $W_n\omega_X(D_2)$ are S_2 , and hence we may assume that X is regular. It is easy to see that we have the following commutative diagram in which each horizontal sequence is exact:

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} 0 & \longrightarrow & \omega_X(D_1) & \xrightarrow{(R^{n-1})^*} & W_n\omega_X(D_1) & \xrightarrow{V^*} & F_*W_{n-1}\omega_X(pD_1) \longrightarrow 0 \\ & & \downarrow j^* & & \downarrow j^* & & \downarrow j^* \\ 0 & \longrightarrow & \omega_X(D_2) & \xrightarrow{(R^{n-1})^*} & W_n\omega_X(D_2) & \xrightarrow{V^*} & F_*W_{n-1}\omega_X(pD_2) \longrightarrow 0. \end{array}$$

Then the injectivity of j^* follows from the snake lemma and induction on n .

2.29 (The log versions of V^* , R^* , T_n^e). We now introduce the log version of (2.24). We use Notation 2.20. Take an integer $e \geq 0$ and a \mathbb{Q} -divisor D on X . By applying $(-)^* := \mathcal{H}om_{W_n\mathcal{O}_X}(-, W_n\omega_X)$ to the $W_n\mathcal{O}_X$ -module homomorphisms

$$F^e : W_n\mathcal{O}_X(-D) \rightarrow F_*^e W_n\mathcal{O}_X(-p^e D)$$

$$V : F_*W_{n-1}\mathcal{O}_X(-pD) \rightarrow W_n\mathcal{O}_X(-D)$$

$$R : W_n\mathcal{O}_X(-D) \rightarrow W_{n-1}\mathcal{O}_X(-D),$$

we get the following $W_n\mathcal{O}_X$ -module homomorphisms

$$T_n^e : F_*^e W_n\omega_X(p^e D) \rightarrow W_n\omega_X(D)$$

$$V^* : W_n\omega_X(D) \rightarrow F_*W_{n-1}\omega_X(pD)$$

$$R^* : W_{n-1}\omega_X(D) \rightarrow W_n\omega_X(D)$$

Set $T_n := T_n^1$.

Lemma 2.30. *Let R be a Noetherian F -finite equi-dimensional reduced ring of characteristic $p > 0$.*

(1) *If S is a multiplicatively closed subset of R , then*

$$W_n \omega_R \otimes_{W_n R} W_n(S^{-1}R) \simeq W_n \omega_{S^{-1}R}.$$

(2) *If (R, \mathfrak{m}) is a local ring and \widehat{R} denotes the \mathfrak{m} -adic completion of R , then*

$$W_n \omega_R \otimes_{W_n R} W_n \widehat{R} \simeq W_n \omega_{\widehat{R}}.$$

Proof. The assertion (1) follows from the fact that $S^{-1}A$ can be written as a direct limit of A_f , because the corresponding statement holds for open immersions (Remark 2.23).

Let us show (2). Recall that we have

$$E := E_{W_n R} = E_{W_n R} \otimes_{W_n R} W_n \widehat{R} = E_{W_n \widehat{R}}.$$

for the injective hulls $E_{W_n R}$ and $E_{W_n \widehat{R}}$ of the residue field. By Matlis duality, we have

$$H_{\mathfrak{m}}^d(W_n R) = \text{Hom}_{W_n R}(W_n \omega_R, E) \quad \text{and} \quad H_{\mathfrak{m}}^d(W_n \widehat{R}) = \text{Hom}_{W_n \widehat{R}}(W_n \omega_{\widehat{R}}, E) = (W_n \omega_{\widehat{R}})^{\vee},$$

where $(-)^{\vee} := \text{Hom}_{W_n \widehat{R}}(-, E)$. Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} H_{\mathfrak{m}}^d(W_n \widehat{R}) &= H_{\mathfrak{m}}^d(W_n R) \otimes_{W_n R} W_n \widehat{R} \\ &= \text{Hom}_{W_n R}(W_n \omega_R, E) \otimes_{W_n R} W_n \widehat{R} \\ &= \text{Hom}_{W_n \widehat{R}}(W_n \omega_R \otimes_{W_n R} W_n \widehat{R}, E \otimes_{W_n R} W_n \widehat{R}) \\ &= \text{Hom}_{W_n \widehat{R}}(W_n \omega_R \otimes_{W_n R} W_n \widehat{R}, E) \\ &= (W_n \omega_R \otimes_{W_n R} W_n \widehat{R})^{\vee}. \end{aligned}$$

Applying $(-)^{\vee} = \text{Hom}_{W_n \widehat{R}}(-, E)$ again, we obtain

$$W_n \omega_R \otimes_{W_n R} W_n \widehat{R} \simeq (W_n \omega_R \otimes_{W_n R} W_n \widehat{R})^{\vee \vee} \simeq H_{\mathfrak{m}}^d(W_n \widehat{R})^{\vee} \simeq (W_n \omega_{\widehat{R}})^{\vee \vee} \simeq W_n \omega_{\widehat{R}}.$$

Thus (2) holds. \square

2.5. Quasi- F^e -splitting and quasi- F -regularity. In this subsection, we recall the definition of a quasi- F^e -splitting and its variants. For their foundational properties, we refer to [TWY24].

We use Notation 2.20. Take $e \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$ and let Δ be a (non-necessarily effective) \mathbb{Q} -divisor on X . We define a $W_n \mathcal{O}_X$ -module $Q_{X, \Delta, n}^e$ and a $W_n \mathcal{O}_X$ -module homomorphism $\Phi_{X, \Delta, n}^e$ by the following pushout diagram of $W_n \mathcal{O}_X$ -module homomorphisms:

$$(2.30.1) \quad \begin{array}{ccc} W_n \mathcal{O}_X(\Delta) & \xrightarrow{F^e} & F_*^e W_n \mathcal{O}_X(p^e \Delta) \\ \downarrow R^{n-1} & & \downarrow \\ \mathcal{O}_X(\Delta) & \xrightarrow{\Phi_{X, \Delta, n}^e} & Q_{X, \Delta, n}^e \end{array} \quad \lrcorner$$

Definition 2.31. We use Notation 2.20. Let Δ be a \mathbb{Q} -divisor on X . Take integers $n > 0$ and $e > 0$. We say that (X, Δ) is n -quasi- F^e -split if $\lfloor \Delta \rfloor = 0$ and the map

$$\begin{aligned} \mathrm{Hom}_{W_n \mathcal{O}_X}(\Phi_{X, \Delta, n}^e, W_n \omega_X(-K_X)) : \mathrm{Hom}_{W_n \mathcal{O}_X}(Q_{X, \Delta, n}^e, W_n \omega_X(-K_X)) \\ \longrightarrow \mathrm{Hom}_{W_n \mathcal{O}_X}(\mathcal{O}_X, W_n \omega_X(-K_X)) \end{aligned}$$

is surjective.

We say that (X, Δ) *quasi- F^e -split* if it is n -quasi- F^e -split for some $n \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$. We say that (X, Δ) *n -quasi- F^e -pure* (resp. *quasi- F^e -pure*) if there exists an open cover $X = \bigcup_{i \in I} X_i$ such that $(X_i, \Delta|_{X_i})$ is n -quasi- F^e -split (resp. quasi- F^e -split) for all $i \in I$.

The following characterisation of n -quasi- F^e -splitting in terms of local cohomology will be used extensively in this paper.

Lemma 2.32. *Let (R, \mathfrak{m}) be a d -dimensional Noetherian F -finite normal local ring of characteristic $p > 0$. Let Δ be a \mathbb{Q} -divisor on $\mathrm{Spec} R$. Take integers $n > 0$ and $e > 0$. Then (R, Δ) is n -quasi- F^e -split if and only if $\lfloor \Delta \rfloor = 0$ and the map*

$$H_{\mathfrak{m}}^d(\Phi_{R, K_R + \Delta, n}^e) : H_{\mathfrak{m}}^d(R(K_R + \Delta)) \rightarrow H_{\mathfrak{m}}^d(Q_{R, K_R + \Delta, n}^e)$$

is injective.

Proof. See [TWY24, Lemma 3.10]. □

Definition 2.33. We use Notation 2.20. Let Δ be a \mathbb{Q} -divisor on X . Take $n \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$.

- (1) We say that (X, Δ) is *globally n -quasi- F -regular* if
 - (a) $\lfloor \Delta \rfloor = 0$, and
 - (b) for every effective \mathbb{Q} -divisor E on X , there exists $\epsilon \in \mathbb{Q}_{>0}$ such that $(X, \Delta + \epsilon E)$ is n -quasi- F^e -split for all $e \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$.
- (2) We say that (X, Δ) is *globally quasi- F -regular* if (X, Δ) is globally m -quasi- F -regular for some $m \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$.

Definition 2.34. We use Notation 2.20. Let Δ be a \mathbb{Q} -divisor on X . We say that (X, Δ) is *feebly globally quasi- F -regular* if

- (1) $\lfloor \Delta \rfloor = 0$, and
- (2) for every effective \mathbb{Q} -divisor E on X , there exist $n \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$ and $\epsilon \in \mathbb{Q}_{>0}$ such that $(X, \Delta + \epsilon E)$ is n -quasi- F^e -split for all $e \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$.

In this article, we mainly treat the case when X is affine. Under this assumption, we drop ‘‘globally’’.

Definition 2.35. We use Notation 2.20. Further, assume that X is affine.

- (1) We say that (X, Δ) is *(n -)quasi- F -regular* if (X, Δ) is globally (n -)quasi- F -regular.
- (2) We say that (X, Δ) is *feebly quasi- F -regular* if (X, Δ) is globally feebly quasi- F -regular.
- (3) Let R be an F -finite Noetherian normal integral domain of characteristic $p > 0$. We say that (R, Δ) is *(n -)quasi- F -regular* (resp. *feebly quasi- F -regular*) if so is $(\mathrm{Spec} R, \Delta)$.

By definition, it holds that

$$\text{quasi-}F\text{-regular} \Rightarrow \text{feebly quasi-}F\text{-regular}.$$

We shall prove that the opposite implication holds when X is affine and K_X is \mathbb{Q} -Cartier (Theorem 4.34).

3. QUASI-TEST SUBMODULES AND QUASI- F -RATIONALITY

Let R be a Noetherian F -finite equi-dimensional reduced ring of characteristic $p > 0$. The purpose of this section is to introduce quasi- F -rational singularities and establish some foundational results about them. The key objects we consider are

- (1) the n -quasi-test R -submodule $\tau_n(\omega_R) \subseteq \omega_R$, and
- (2) the n -quasi-tight closure $0_n^* \subseteq H_{\mathfrak{m}}^{\dim R}(R)$,

where (2) is defined only when (R, \mathfrak{m}) is a local ring, whilst we do not need such an additional assumption for (1). For an overview of this section, we refer to Subsection 1.2.

We will work with two natural settings.

Notation 3.1. Let (R, \mathfrak{m}) be a Noetherian F -finite equi-dimensional reduced local ring of characteristic $p > 0$. Set $d := \dim R$.

Notation 3.2. Let R be a Noetherian F -finite equi-dimensional reduced ring of characteristic $p > 0$. Set $d := \dim R$.

3.1. Quasi-test submodules (no boundary) and quasi- F -rationality. Recall that we have the trace map

$$T_n : F_* W_n \omega_R \rightarrow W_n \omega_R,$$

which is the $W_n R$ -module homomorphism obtained by applying $\text{Hom}_{W_n R}(-, W_n \omega_R)$ to Frobenius $F : W_n R \rightarrow F_* W_n R$ (2.24).

Definition 3.3. We work in the general setting (Notation 3.2). Let M be a $W_n R$ -submodule of $W_n \omega_R$.

- (1) We say that M is T -stable if $T_n(F_* M) \subseteq M$.
- (2) We say that M is *co-small* if there exists $c \in R^\circ$ such that $[c] \cdot \widetilde{W_n \omega_R} \subseteq M$. In other words, there exists an open dense subset U of X such that $\widetilde{M}|_U = W_n \omega_U$.

Remark 3.4. If M is co-small, then $[c] \cdot M$ is also co-small for $c \in R^\circ$. On the other hand, even if M is T -stable, $[c] \cdot M$ is not necessarily T -stable. For example, if R is F -rational, then R has no non-trivial T -stable R -submodules of ω_R [BST15b, Lemma 2.34]. In particular, $[c] \cdot \omega_R$ is not T -stable for every $c \in R^\circ$ satisfying $[c] \cdot \omega_R \neq \omega_R$.

Recall that we have the following $W_n R$ -module homomorphisms (2.24):

$$V^* : W_n \omega_R \rightarrow F_* W_{n-1} \omega_R$$

$$R^* : W_{n-1} \omega_R \rightarrow W_n \omega_R.$$

Proposition 3.5. *We work in the general setting (Notation 3.2). Fix a test element $t \in R^\circ$ (see Definition 2.16(2)). Let M be a T -stable co-small $W_n R$ -submodule of $W_n \omega_R$. Then the following hold.*

- (1) $(R^*)^{-1}(M)$ and $T_{n-1} \circ V^*(M)$ are co-small and T -stable.
- (2) $[t^2] \cdot W_n \omega_R \subseteq M$.

Proof. Let us show (1). First, we prove that $(R^*)^{-1}(M)$ and $T_{n-1} \circ V^*(M)$ are co-small. We take an affine open dense subset U of $X := \text{Spec } R$ such that $\widetilde{M}|_U = W_n \omega_U$, and both T_{n-1} and V^* are surjective. Then we have

$$\begin{aligned} (R^*)^{-1}(\widetilde{M})|_U &= (R^*)^{-1}(W_n \omega_U) = W_{n-1} \omega_U, \\ T_{n-1} \circ V^*(\widetilde{M})|_U &= T_{n-1} \circ V^*(W_n \omega_U) = T_{n-1}(F_* W_{n-1} \omega_U) = W_{n-1} \omega_U. \end{aligned}$$

Thus $(R^*)^{-1}(M)$ and $T_{n-1} \circ V^*(M)$ are co-small.

Now, the fact that $(R^*)^{-1}(M)$ and $T_{n-1} \circ V^*(M)$ are T -stable follows from the commutative diagrams

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} F_* W_{n-1} \omega_R & \xrightarrow{F_* R^*} & F_* W_n \omega_R & & F_* W_n \omega_R & \xrightarrow{F_* V^*} & F_*^2 W_{n-1} \omega_R & \xrightarrow{F_* T_{n-1}} & F_* W_{n-1} \omega_R \\ & & \downarrow T_n & & \downarrow T_n & (\dagger) & \downarrow F_* T_{n-1} & & \downarrow T_{n-1} \\ W_{n-1} \omega_R & \xrightarrow{R^*} & W_n \omega_R & & W_n \omega_R & \xrightarrow{V^*} & F_* W_{n-1} \omega_R & \xrightarrow{T_{n-1}} & W_{n-1} \omega_R. \end{array}$$

Thus (1) holds.

Let us show (2) by induction on n . We may assume that R is local with maximal ideal \mathfrak{m} (Remark 2.18(3)). The base case $n = 1$ of this induction follows from $\tau(\omega_R) \subseteq M$ [BST15b, Definition 2.33] and Matlis duality: $\omega_R / \tau(\omega_R) \simeq \text{Hom}_R(0_{H_{\mathfrak{m}}^d(R)}^*, E)$ (Remark 2.18). In particular, we have $t \cdot \omega_R \subseteq \tau(\omega_R) \subseteq M$. We assume $n \geq 2$. By the following exact sequence

$$0 \rightarrow \frac{\omega_R}{((R^{n-1})^*)^{-1}(M)} \xrightarrow{(R^{n-1})^*} \frac{W_n \omega_R}{M} \xrightarrow{V^*} \frac{F_* W_{n-1} \omega_R}{V^*(M)},$$

it is enough to show that

$$[t] \cdot F_* W_{n-1} \omega_R \subseteq V^*(M).$$

This is a consequence of

$$[t] \cdot F_* W_{n-1} \omega_R = F_*([t^p] \cdot W_{n-1} \omega_R) \subseteq F_*(T_{n-1} \circ V^*(M)) = V^* \circ T_n(F_* M) \subseteq V^*(M),$$

where the first inclusion follows from the induction hypothesis and the fact that $T_{n-1} \circ V^*(M)$ is co-small and T -stable, whilst the subsequent equality is the commutativity of the diagram (\dagger) above. Thus (2) holds. \square

Proposition 3.6. *We work in the general setting (Notation 3.2). Fix an integer $n > 0$. Let $t \in R^\circ$ be a test element and let $c \in (t^2) \cap R^\circ$.*

- (1) *There exists the smallest co-small T -stable $W_n R$ -submodule $\tau(W_n \omega_R)$ of $W_n \omega_R$.*

(2) For every co-small W_nR -submodule M of $W_n\omega_R$, it holds that

$$\tau(W_n\omega_R) = \sum_{e \geq 0} T_n^e(F_*^e([c] \cdot M)).$$

(3) For every integer $e \geq 0$, the inclusion

$$T_n^e(F_*^e[c] \cdot \tau(W_n\omega_R)) \subseteq T_n^{e+1}(F_*^{e+1}[c] \cdot \tau(W_n\omega_R))$$

holds.

(4) There exists an integer $e_0 \geq 0$ such that the equality

$$\tau(W_n\omega_R) = T_n^e(F_*^e([c] \cdot M))$$

holds for every integer $e \geq e_0$ and every co-small T -stable W_nR -submodule M of $W_n\omega_R$.

(5) Let L be a co-small W_nR -submodule of $W_n\omega_R$. Then there exists an integer $e_L \geq 0$ such that

$$\tau(W_n\omega_R) = T_n^e(F_*^e([c] \cdot L))$$

for every integer $e \geq e_L$.

We call $\tau(W_n\omega_R)$ the n -quasi-test (W_nR -)submodule of $W_n\omega_R$. By (2) and (3), we have $\tau(W_n\omega_R) = T_n^e(F_*^e([c] \cdot W_n\omega_R))$ for $e \gg 0$, where $T_n^e: F_*^e W_n\omega_R \rightarrow W_n\omega_R$.

Proof. Let us show (1). Set

$$\tau(W_n\omega_R) := \bigcap_M M,$$

where M runs over all the T -stable co-small W_nR -submodules M of $W_n\omega_R$. Then it is clear that $\tau(W_n\omega_R)$ is T -stable. Moreover, $[t^2] \cdot W_n\omega_R \subseteq \tau(W_n\omega_R)$ for a test element $t \in R^\circ$ (Proposition 3.5(2)), and hence $\tau(W_n\omega_R)$ is co-small. Thus (1) holds.

Let us show (2). Set N to be the right hand side of (2). Since $T_n^0(F_*^0[c] \cdot M) = [c] \cdot M$ is co-small, also N is co-small. Furthermore, we have

$$T_n(F_*N) = T_n \left(F_* \sum_{e \geq 0} T_n^e(F_*^e([c] \cdot M)) \right) = \sum_{e \geq 1} T_n^e(F_*^e([c] \cdot M)) \subseteq N,$$

and hence N is T -stable. Since N is co-small and T -stable, (1) implies $\tau(W_n\omega_R) \subseteq N$. On the other hand, we have

$$\begin{aligned} N &= \sum_{e \geq 0} T_n^e(F_*^e([c] \cdot M)) \\ &\subseteq \sum_{e \geq 0} T_n^e(F_*^e([c] \cdot W_n\omega_R)) \\ &\stackrel{(*)}{\subseteq} \sum_{e \geq 0} T_n^e(F_*^e \tau(W_n\omega_R)) \\ &\subseteq \tau(W_n\omega_R), \end{aligned}$$

where $(*)$ follows from (1) and Proposition 3.5(2). Therefore, we get $\tau(W_n\omega_R) = N$. Thus (2) holds.

Let us show (3). Since $T_n(F_*\tau(W_n\omega_R))$ is co-small and T -stable, we have $\tau(W_n\omega_R) \subseteq T_n(F_*\tau(W_n\omega_R))$. Furthermore, since $\tau(W_n\omega_R)$ is T -stable, we obtain the opposite inclusion $T_n(F_*\tau(W_n\omega_R)) \subseteq \tau(W_n\omega_R)$, and hence $T_n(F_*\tau(W_n\omega_R)) = \tau(W_n\omega_R)$. Therefore, it holds that

$$\begin{aligned} T_n^{e+1}(F_*^{e+1}([c] \cdot \tau(W_n\omega_R))) &\supseteq T_n^{e+1}(F_*^{e+1}([c^p] \cdot \tau(W_n\omega_R))) \\ &= T_n^e(F_*^e([c] \cdot T_n(F_*\tau(W_n\omega_R)))) \\ &= T_n^e(F_*^e([c] \cdot \tau(W_n\omega_R))). \end{aligned}$$

Thus (3) holds.

Let us show (4). Since W_nR is a Noetherian ring and $W_n\omega_R$ is a finitely generated W_nR -module, the assertion (3) enables us to find $e_0 > 0$ such that

$$T_n^{e_0}(F_*^{e_0}([c] \cdot \tau(W_n\omega_R))) = T_n^{e_0+1}(F_*^{e_0+1}([c] \cdot \tau(W_n\omega_R))) = \cdots.$$

Fix an integer $e \geq e_0$. Then (2) and (3) imply

$$\tau(W_n\omega_R) = T_n^e(F_*^e([c] \cdot \tau(W_n\omega_R))).$$

Therefore,

$$T_n^e(F_*^e([c] \cdot M)) \stackrel{(2)}{\subseteq} \tau(W_n\omega_R) = T_n^e(F_*^e([c] \cdot \tau(W_n\omega_R))) \stackrel{(1)}{\subseteq} T_n^e(F_*^e([c] \cdot M)).$$

Thus (4) holds.

Let us show (5). Since L is co-small, there exists $c_L \in R^\circ$ such that $[c_L]W_n\omega_R \subseteq L \subseteq W_n\omega_R$, which implies

$$[cc_L]W_n\omega_R \subseteq [c]L \subseteq [c]W_n\omega_R.$$

By (4), we can find an integer $e_L \geq 0$ such that

$$\tau(W_n\omega_R) = T_n^e(F_*^e([cc_L]W_n\omega_R)) \quad \text{and} \quad \tau(W_n\omega_R) = T_n^e(F_*^e([c]W_n\omega_R))$$

for every integer $e \geq e_L$, where the first equality is obtained by applying (4) after replacing cc_L by c (note that e_L depends on c_L , and hence on L). Then $\tau(W_n\omega_R) = T_n^e(F_*^e([c] \cdot L))$. This concludes the proof of (5). \square

Proposition 3.7. *We work in the general setting (Notation 3.2). Then the following hold.*

(1) *If S is a multiplicatively closed subset of R , then*

$$\tau(W_n\omega_R) \otimes_{W_nR} W_n(S^{-1}R) \simeq \tau(W_n\omega_{S^{-1}R}).$$

(2) *If (R, \mathfrak{m}) is a local ring, then*

$$\tau(W_n\omega_R) \otimes_{W_nR} W_n\widehat{R} \simeq \tau(W_n\omega_{\widehat{R}}),$$

where \widehat{R} denotes the \mathfrak{m} -adic completion of R .

Proof. Let $t \in R^\circ$ be a test element. Recall that

$$W_n(S^{-1}R) = [S]^{-1}W_nR,$$

where $[S] := \{[s] \in W_n R \mid s \in S\}$, which is a multiplicatively closed subset of $W_n R$ (indeed, it is easy to construct a ring homomorphism $\theta : [S]^{-1} W_n R \rightarrow W_n(S^{-1} R)$; then we can directly check that θ is injective and surjective). We have the trace maps

$$T_{R,n}^e : F_*^e W_n \omega_R \rightarrow W_n \omega_R \quad \text{and} \quad T_{S^{-1}R,n}^e : F_*^e W_n \omega_{S^{-1}R} \rightarrow W_n \omega_{S^{-1}R}.$$

Then we get

$$\begin{aligned} \tau(W_n \omega_R) \otimes_{W_n R} W_n(S^{-1} R) &\stackrel{(i)}{=} \left(\sum_{e \geq 0} T_{R,n}^e (F_*^e [t^2] \cdot W_n \omega_R) \right) \otimes_{W_n R} W_n(S^{-1} R) \\ &\stackrel{(ii)}{=} \sum_{e \geq 0} (T_{R,n}^e (F_*^e [t^2] \cdot W_n \omega_R) \otimes_{W_n R} W_n(S^{-1} R)) \\ &\stackrel{(iii)}{=} \sum_{e \geq 0} T_{S^{-1}R,n}^e (F_*^e [t^2] \cdot W_n \omega_{S^{-1}R}) \\ &\stackrel{(iv)}{=} \tau(W_n \omega_{S^{-1}R}), \end{aligned}$$

where (i) and (iv) hold by Proposition 3.6(2), (ii) follows from the fact that $\sum_{e \geq 0}$ commutes with the flat base change $(-) \otimes_{W_n R} W_n(S^{-1} R)$, and (iii) is assured by Lemma 2.30. Thus we obtain the assertion (1). The assertion (2) follows from a similar argument as above by using $W_n \omega_R \otimes_{W_n R} W_n \widehat{R} \simeq W_n \omega_{\widehat{R}}$ (Lemma 2.30). \square

Definition 3.8. We work in the general setting (Notation 3.2).

- (1) For an integer $n > 0$, we set $\tau_n(\omega_R) := ((R^{n-1})^*)^{-1}(\tau(W_n \omega_R))$, that is, $\tau_n(\omega_R)$ is the R -submodule of ω_R which is the inverse image of $\tau(W_n \omega_R)$ by $W_n R$ -module homomorphism

$$(R^{n-1})^* : \omega_R \rightarrow W_n \omega_R.$$

We call $\tau_n(\omega_R)$ the n -quasi-test (R -)submodule of ω_R . We have the following inclusions (Remark 3.9):

$$(3.8.1) \quad \tau_1(\omega_R) \subseteq \tau_2(\omega_R) \subseteq \cdots \subseteq \tau_n(\omega_R) \subseteq \tau_{n+1}(\omega_R) \subseteq \cdots \subseteq \omega_R.$$

- (2) We set $\tau^q(\omega_R) := \bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} \tau_n(\omega_R)$, which we call the quasi-test (R -)submodule of ω_R . Since (3.8.1) is an ascending chain of R -submodules of ω_R , there exists $n_0 > 0$ such that

$$\tau^q(\omega_R) = \bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} \tau_n(\omega_R) = \tau_{n_0}(\omega_R) \subseteq \omega_R$$

for every integer $n \geq n_0$. In particular, $\tau^q(\omega_R)$ is an R -submodule of ω_R .

Remark 3.9. By applying $\text{Hom}_{W_n R}(-, W_n \omega_R)$ to

$$0 \rightarrow F_* W_{n-1} R \xrightarrow{V} W_n R \xrightarrow{R^{n-1}} R \rightarrow 0,$$

we get the following commutative diagram (2.24) in which each horizontal sequence is exact:

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} 0 & \longrightarrow & \omega_R & \xrightarrow{(R^{n-1})^*} & W_n\omega_R & \xrightarrow{V^*} & F_*W_{n-1}\omega_R \\ & & \uparrow & & \uparrow & & \\ 0 & \longrightarrow & \tau_n(\omega_R) & \longrightarrow & \tau(W_n\omega_R) & & \end{array}$$

By diagram chase, $(R^{n-1})^*$ induces an isomorphism

$$\tau_n(\omega_R) \xrightarrow{\cong} \text{Ker} \left(\tau(W_n\omega_R) \hookrightarrow W_n\omega_R \xrightarrow{V^*} F_*W_{n-1}\omega_R \right).$$

By the injectivity of R^* and the following diagram of exact sequences

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} 0 & \longrightarrow & \tau_n(\omega_X) & \longrightarrow & \tau(W_n\omega_X) & \xrightarrow{V^*} & F_*W_{n-1}\omega_X \\ & & & & \downarrow R^* & & \downarrow R^* \\ 0 & \longrightarrow & \tau_{n+1}(\omega_X) & \longrightarrow & \tau(W_{n+1}\omega_X) & \xrightarrow{V^*} & F_*W_n\omega_X, \end{array}$$

we obtain an inclusion $\tau_n(\omega_X) \subseteq \tau_{n+1}(\omega_X)$.

Theorem 3.10. *We work in the general setting (Notation 3.2). Then the following hold.*

(1) *If S be a multiplicatively closed subset of R , then*

$$\tau_n(\omega_R) \otimes_R S^{-1}R \simeq \tau_n(\omega_{S^{-1}R}) \quad \text{and} \quad \tau^q(\omega_R) \otimes_R S^{-1}R \simeq \tau^q(\omega_{S^{-1}R}).$$

(2) *We have*

$$\tau_n(\omega_R) \otimes_R \widehat{R} \simeq \tau_n(\omega_{\widehat{R}}) \quad \text{and} \quad \tau^q(\omega_R) \otimes_R \widehat{R} \simeq \tau^q(\omega_{\widehat{R}}).$$

Proof. Both assertions follow from Proposition 3.7. Here, we implicitly use that $(F_*^e W_m R) \otimes_{W_n R} W_n \widehat{R} \simeq F_*^e W_m \widehat{R}$ holds for $e \geq 0$ and $1 \leq m \leq n$, which can be proven by an induction on m . \square

The following proposition describes the behaviour of τ_n under alterations and birational morphisms.

Proposition 3.11. *We work in the general setting (Notation 3.2). Fix an integer $n > 0$. Let $f: Y \rightarrow X := \text{Spec } R$ be an alteration between integral schemes. Then the following hold.*

(1) *We have that*

$$\tau_n(\omega_X) \subseteq ((R^{n-1})^*)^{-1}(\text{Im}(T_n^f : f_*W_n\omega_Y \rightarrow W_n\omega_X)),$$

where $T_n^f : f_*W_n\omega_Y \rightarrow W_n\omega_X$ denotes the $W_n\mathcal{O}_X$ -module homomorphism obtained by applying $\text{Hom}_{W_n\mathcal{O}_X}(-, W_n\omega_X)$ to the induced $W_n\mathcal{O}_X$ -module homomorphism $f^* : W_n\mathcal{O}_X \rightarrow f_*W_n\mathcal{O}_Y$.

- (2) *If $f: Y \rightarrow X$ is a proper birational morphism, then $\tau_n(\omega_X) \subseteq f_*\omega_Y \subseteq \omega_X$.*
(3) *If $\tau^q(\omega_X) = \omega_X$, then X is pseudo-rational, that is, $f_*\omega_Y = \omega_X$ for every proper birational morphism $f: Y \rightarrow X$ from an integral normal scheme Y .*

Proof. Let us show (1). Consider the following commutative diagram in which each horizontal sequence is exact:

$$(3.11.1) \quad \begin{array}{ccccccc} 0 & \longrightarrow & f_*\omega_Y & \xrightarrow{(R^{n-1})^*} & f_*W_n\omega_Y & \xrightarrow{V^*} & f_*F_*W_{n-1}\omega_Y \\ & & \downarrow T_1^f & & \downarrow T_n^f & & \downarrow F_*T_{n-1}^f \\ 0 & \longrightarrow & \omega_X & \xrightarrow{(R^{n-1})^*} & W_n\omega_X & \xrightarrow{V^*} & F_*W_{n-1}\omega_X. \end{array}$$

On the regular locus of X , the homomorphism $T_1^f : f_*\omega_Y \rightarrow \omega_X$ is surjective and so are the horizontal homomorphisms V^* in the above diagram. Hence $T_n^f : f_*W_n\omega_Y \rightarrow W_n\omega_X$ is surjective by the snake lemma and induction on n . Therefore the image

$$I_n := \text{Im}(T_n^f : f_*W_n\omega_Y \rightarrow W_n\omega_X)$$

is co-small. Since I_n is T -stable, we get $\tau(W_n\omega_X) \subseteq I_n$ by the minimality of $\tau(W_n\omega_X)$. Therefore,

$$\tau_n(\omega_X) = ((R^{n-1})^*)^{-1}(\tau(W_n\omega_X)) \subseteq ((R^{n-1})^*)^{-1}(I_n)$$

Thus (1) holds.

Let us show (2). Since f is birational, the vertical arrows in Diagram (3.11.1) are injective (as they are injective after removing the non-regular loci of X and Y), and so the statement follows by (1) and diagram chase. Specifically, pick $a \in \tau_n(\omega_X)$. Then by (1),

$$(R^{n-1})^*(a) = T_n^f(b)$$

for some $b \in f_*W_n\omega_Y$. Since $V^*((R^{n-1})^*(a)) = 0$ and $F_*T_{n-1}^f$ is injective, we get that $V^*(b) = 0$, and so $b = (R^{n-1})^*(c)$ for some $c \in f_*\omega_Y$. Finally, as $(R^{n-1})^* : \omega_X \rightarrow W_n\omega_X$ is injective, we obtain $a = T_1^f(c)$. In particular, $a \in f_*\omega_Y$ as desired.

Now (3) follows immediately from (2), because, as in Definition 3.8(2), there exists $n > 0$ such that $\tau_n(\omega_X) = \tau^q(\omega_X) = \omega_X$. \square

Definition 3.12. We work in the general setting (Notation 3.2). For an integer $n > 0$, we say that R is n -quasi- F -rational if R is Cohen-Macaulay and $\omega_R = \tau_n(\omega_R)$. We say that R is quasi- F -rational if R is n -quasi- F -rational for some integer $n > 0$.

Remark 3.13. Recall that we have the inclusions $\tau_n(\omega_R) \subseteq \tau_{n+1}(\omega_R) \subseteq \omega_R$ (3.8.1). Therefore, if R is n -quasi- F -rational, then R is $(n+1)$ -quasi- F -rational.

Corollary 3.14. *We work in the general setting (Notation 3.2). Take an integer $n > 0$. Then the following are equivalent.*

- (1) R is n -quasi- F -rational.
- (2) $R_{\mathfrak{p}}$ is n -quasi- F -rational for every prime ideal \mathfrak{p} of R .
- (3) $R_{\mathfrak{m}}$ is n -quasi- F -rational for every maximal ideal \mathfrak{m} of R .

Proof. Assume (1). Let \mathfrak{p} be a prime ideal of R . Since $\tau_n(\omega_R)$ commutes with localisation (Theorem 3.10(1)), we get

$$\tau_n(\omega_{R_{\mathfrak{p}}}) = \tau_n(\omega_R) \otimes_R R_{\mathfrak{p}} = \omega_R \otimes_R R_{\mathfrak{p}} = \omega_{R_{\mathfrak{p}}}.$$

Therefore, $R_{\mathfrak{p}}$ is n -quasi- F -rational. Thus the implication (1) \Rightarrow (2) holds. The implication (2) \Rightarrow (3) is clear.

Let us prove the remaining implication (3) \Rightarrow (1). Assume (3). Then R is Cohen-Macaulay. For every maximal ideal \mathfrak{m} of R , we have $\tau(\omega_R) \otimes_R R_{\mathfrak{m}} = \tau_n(\omega_{R_{\mathfrak{m}}}) = \omega_{R_{\mathfrak{m}}} = \omega_R \otimes_R R_{\mathfrak{m}}$, which implies $\tau_n(\omega_R) = \omega_R$. Thus (1) holds. \square

Corollary 3.15. *We work in the general setting (Notation 3.2). If R is quasi- F -rational, then $\tau^q(\omega_R) = \omega_R$ and R is pseudo-rational.*

Proof. Recall that we have $\tau_n(\omega_R) = \tau^q(\omega_R)$ for $n \gg 0$ (Definition 3.8). Since R is quasi- F -rational, we obtain $\tau^q(\omega_R) = \tau_n(\omega_R) = \omega_R$ for some $n > 0$. By Proposition 3.11(3), R is pseudo-rational. \square

3.2. Quasi-tight closure in local cohomologies (no boundary). In the above subsection, we defined quasi- F -rationality of Cohen-Macaulay ring by requiring that $\tau_n(\omega_R) = \omega_R$. The next natural step is to find a more intrinsic definition similar to that of quasi- F -regularity from [TWY24]. This will be achieved in Corollary 3.32. To this end, it is convenient to work in the setting of local cohomology and introduce the notion of quasi-tight closure.

In this paragraph, we work in the general setting (Notation 3.2). Take $c \in R^\circ$ and integers $e \geq 0$ and $n > 0$. We define the $W_n R$ -modules $Q_{R,n}^e$ and $Q_{R,n}^{e,c}$, and the $W_n R$ -module homomorphisms $\Phi_{R,n}^e$ and $\Phi_{R,n}^{e,c}$ by the following diagram in which all the squares are pushouts:

$$(3.15.1) \quad \begin{array}{ccccc} W_n R & \xrightarrow{F^e} & F_*^e W_n R & \xrightarrow{\cdot F_*^e[c]} & F_*^e W_n R \\ R^{n-1} \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ R & \xrightarrow{\Phi_{R,n}^e} & Q_{R,n}^e & \longrightarrow & Q_{R,n}^{e,c} \\ & \searrow & & \nearrow & \\ & & \Phi_{R,n}^{e,c} & & \end{array}$$

We start by defining the quasi-tight closure.

Definition 3.16. We work in the local setting (Notation 3.1). Take integers $n > 0$ and $e \geq 0$.

(1) For $c \in R^\circ$, we set

$$\widetilde{K}_n^{e,c} := \text{Ker} \left(H_{\mathfrak{m}}^d(W_n R) \xrightarrow{F^e} H_{\mathfrak{m}}^d(F_*^e W_n R) \xrightarrow{\cdot F_*^e[c]} H_{\mathfrak{m}}^d(F_*^e W_n R) \right).$$

which is a $W_n R$ -submodule of $H_{\mathfrak{m}}^d(W_n R)$. We define $\widetilde{0}_n^*$ by

$$\widetilde{0}_n^* := \bigcup_{\substack{c \in R^\circ, \\ e_0 \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}}} \bigcap_{e \geq e_0} \widetilde{K}_n^{e,c} \subseteq H_{\mathfrak{m}}^d(W_n R).$$

Equivalently, given $z \in H_{\mathfrak{m}}^d(W_n R)$, we have $z \in \widetilde{0}_n^*$ if and only if there exist $c \in R^\circ$ and $e_0 \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$ such that z is contained in $\widetilde{K}_n^{e,c}$ for every integer $e \geq e_0$. Note that $\widetilde{0}_n^*$ is a $W_n R$ -submodule of $H_{\mathfrak{m}}^d(W_n R)$ (Remark 3.17).

(2) For $c \in R^\circ$, we set

$$K_n^{e,c} := \text{Ker} \left(H_m^d(R) \xrightarrow{\Phi_{R,n}^{e,c}} H_m^d(Q_{R,n}^{e,c}) \right),$$

which is an R -submodule of $H_m^d(R)$. We define the n -quasi-tight closure 0_n^* by

$$0_n^* := \bigcup_{\substack{c \in R^\circ, \\ e_0 \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}}} \bigcap_{e \geq e_0} K_n^{e,c} \subseteq H_m^d(R).$$

Equivalently, given $z \in H_m^d(R)$, we have $z \in 0_n^*$ if and only if there exist $c \in R^\circ$ and $e_0 \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$ such that z is contained in $K_n^{e,c}$ for every integer $e \geq e_0$. Note that 0_n^* is an R -submodule of $H_m^d(W_n R)$ (Remark 3.17).

(3) We define the R -submodule 0^{g*} of $H_m^d(R)$ by

$$0^{g*} := \bigcap_{n=1}^{\infty} 0_n^*,$$

which we call the *quasi-tight closure*.

Remark 3.17. We use the same notation as in Definition 3.16. Let us show that $\widetilde{0}_n^*$ is a $W_n R$ -submodule of $H_m^d(W_n R)$. Since it is clear that $\widetilde{0}_n^*$ is stable under scalar product, we only check that $\widetilde{0}_n^*$ is stable under sum. Take $z_1, z_2 \in \widetilde{0}_n^*$. Then there exist $c_1, c_2 \in R^\circ$ and $e_1, e_2 \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$ such that $z_1 \in \bigcap_{e \geq e_1} K_n^{e,c_1}$ and $z_2 \in \bigcap_{e \geq e_1} K_n^{e,c_2}$. By $K_n^{e,c_1} \subseteq K_n^{e,c}$ and $K_n^{e,c_2} \subseteq K_n^{e,c}$ for $c := c_1 c_2 \in R^\circ$, we obtain

$$z_1 + z_2 \in \bigcap_{e \geq e_0} K_n^{e,c}$$

for $e_0 := \max\{e_1, e_2\}$. Similarly, we see that 0_n^* is an R -submodule of $H_m^d(R)$.

Remark 3.18. We work in the local setting (Notation 3.1).

(1) Consider the commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} H_m^d(F_* W_{n-1} R) & \xlongequal{\quad} & H_m^d(F_* W_{n-1} R) & \xlongequal{\quad} & H_m^d(F_* W_{n-1} R) \\ \downarrow V & & \downarrow F^e V & & \downarrow (\cdot F_*^e [c]) \circ F^e V \\ H_m^d(W_n R) & \xrightarrow{F^e} & H_m^d(F_*^e W_n R) & \xrightarrow{\cdot F_*^e [c]} & H_m^d(F_*^e W_n R) \\ \downarrow R^{n-1} & & \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ H_m^d(R) & \longrightarrow & H_m^d(Q_{X,n}^e) & \longrightarrow & H_m^d(Q_{X,n}^{e,c}), \\ & & \searrow \Phi_{R,n}^{e,c} & \nearrow & \end{array}$$

in which all the vertical sequences are exact. By diagram chase, we get

$$R^{n-1}(\widetilde{K}_n^{e,c}) = K_n^{e,c}.$$

Specifically, given $\alpha \in K_n^{e,c}$, we can find $\tilde{\alpha} \in H_m^d(W_n R)$ such that $R^{n-1}(\tilde{\alpha}) = \alpha$. Then the exactness of the rightmost vertical sequence allows us to find $\beta \in H_m^d(F_* W_{n-1} R)$ such that $\alpha - V\beta \in \widetilde{K_n^{e,c}}$. By construction, $R^{n-1}(\alpha - V\beta) = \tilde{\alpha}$.

- (2) Take $\tilde{z} \in H_m^d(W_n R)$ and $z \in H_m^d(R)$ satisfying $R^{n-1}(\tilde{z}) = z$. Then $z \in 0_n^*$ if and only if there exist $c \in R^\circ$ and $e_0 \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$ such that given an integer $e \geq e_0$, we can find $w_e \in H_m^d(F_* W_{n-1} R)$ satisfying

$$(F_*^e[c]) \cdot F^e(\tilde{z} - V(w_e)) = 0.$$

- (3) We have

$$H_m^d(R) \supseteq 0_1^* \supseteq 0_2^* \supseteq 0_3^* \supseteq \cdots.$$

Indeed, this holds by the following factorisation:

$$\Phi_{R,n}^{e,c} : H_m^d(R) \xrightarrow{\Phi_{R,n+1}^{e,c}} H_m^d(Q_{R,n+1}^{e,c}) \rightarrow H_m^d(Q_{R,n}^{e,c}).$$

Since $H_m^d(R)$ is an Artinian R -module, we have $0^{q^*} = 0_n^*$ for $n \gg 0$.

- (4) It holds that

$$0_1^* = \tilde{0}_1^* = 0_{H_m^d(R)}^*,$$

where the first and second equalities follow from Definition 3.16 and Proposition 2.15, respectively.

We recall the following standard lemma.

Lemma 3.19. *Let (R, \mathfrak{m}) be an equi-dimensional reduced Noetherian local ring and let M be a finitely generated R -module. Then there exists $r \in R^\circ$ such that*

$$r \cdot H_m^i(M) = 0$$

for all $i < \dim R$.

Proof. Set $d := \dim R$. The assertion holds by applying [Sta14, Tag 0EFC] for $s := d - 1$, $T := V(\mathfrak{m}) = \{\mathfrak{m}\}$, and $T' := \bigcup_{f \in R^\circ} V(f)$, which is applicable because we have $\dim(R/\mathfrak{p})_{\mathfrak{q}} = d > d - 1$ for every $\mathfrak{p} \notin T'$ and every $\mathfrak{q} \in T$. \square

Proposition 3.20. *We work in the local setting (Notation 3.1). Then the following hold.*

- (1) $R(\widetilde{0_{n+1}^*}) \subseteq \widetilde{0_n^*}$.
- (2) $V^{-1}(\widetilde{0_n^*}) = F_* \widetilde{0_{n-1}^*}$.

Statement (1) says that the first commutative diagram below exists, whilst Statement (2) implies that the second diagram exists and is Cartesian:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} H_m^d(W_{n+1} R) & \xrightarrow{R} & H_m^d(W_n R) \\ \uparrow & & \uparrow \\ \widetilde{0_{n+1}^*} & \xrightarrow{R} & \widetilde{0_n^*} \end{array} \quad \begin{array}{ccc} H_m^d(F_* W_{n-1} R) & \xrightarrow{V} & H_m^d(W_n R) \\ \uparrow & & \uparrow \\ F_* \widetilde{0_{n-1}^*} & \xrightarrow{V} & \widetilde{0_n^*}. \end{array}$$

Proof. By Definition 3.16, (1) holds. Let us show (2). By Definition 3.16, we get

$$\widetilde{0}_n^* \supseteq V(F_*\widetilde{0}_{n-1}^*),$$

that is, $V^{-1}(\widetilde{0}_n^*) \supseteq F_*\widetilde{0}_{n-1}^*$. In what follows, we prove the opposite inclusion

$$V^{-1}(\widetilde{0}_n^*) \subseteq F_*\widetilde{0}_{n-1}^*.$$

Take $F_*z \in V^{-1}(\widetilde{0}_n^*)$, that is, $V(F_*z) \in \widetilde{0}_n^*$. Then there exist $c \in R^\circ$ and $e_0 > 0$ such that $V(F_*z) \in \bigcap_{e \geq e_0} \widetilde{K}_n^{e,c}$. Moreover, recall that we can pick $c' \in R^\circ$ satisfying $c' \cdot H_m^{d-1}(R) = 0$ (Lemma 3.19), which implies that

$$(F_*^e c') \cdot H_m^{d-1}(F_*^e R) = (F_*^e c') \cdot F_*^e H_m^{d-1}(R) = F_*^e (c' \cdot H_m^{d-1}(R)) = 0$$

for every $e \geq 0$. The exact sequence

$$H_m^{d-1}(R) \rightarrow H_m^d(F_*W_{n-1}R) \xrightarrow{V} H_m^d(W_nR)$$

induces the following commutative diagram in which each horizontal sequence is exact:

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} H_m^{d-1}(R) & \longrightarrow & V^{-1}(\widetilde{0}_n^*) & \xrightarrow{V} & \widetilde{0}_n^* \\ \downarrow F^e & & \downarrow F^e & & \downarrow F^e \\ H_m^{d-1}(F_*^e R) & \longrightarrow & F_*^e V^{-1}(\widetilde{0}_n^*) & \xrightarrow{V} & F_*^e \widetilde{0}_n^* \\ \downarrow \cdot F_*^e [c] & & \downarrow \cdot F_*^e [c] & & \downarrow \cdot F_*^e [c] \\ H_m^{d-1}(F_*^e R) & \longrightarrow & F_*^e V^{-1}(\widetilde{0}_n^*) & \xrightarrow{V} & F_*^e \widetilde{0}_n^* \\ \downarrow \cdot F_*^e [c'] = 0 & & \downarrow \cdot F_*^e [c'] & & \downarrow \cdot F_*^e [c'] \\ H_m^{d-1}(F_*^e R) & \longrightarrow & F_*^e V^{-1}(\widetilde{0}_n^*) & \xrightarrow{V} & F_*^e \widetilde{0}_n^* \end{array}$$

By the diagram chase starting with $F_*z \in V^{-1}(\widetilde{0}_n^*)$ (located in the centre at the top), we get $(F_*^e [c']) \circ F^e(F_*z) = 0$ for every $e \geq e_0$, and hence $F_*z \in F_*\widetilde{0}_{n-1}^*$. Thus (2) holds. \square

The following result is the first step towards proving that the Teichmüller lift of a fixed power of a test element is a quasi-test element.

Proposition 3.21. *We work in the local setting (Notation 3.1). Take $t \in R^\circ$ satisfying $t \cdot 0_{H_m^d(R)}^* = 0$. Then, for every $n > 0$ and every $m \geq 0$, the following hold.*

- (1) $[t^2] \cdot \widetilde{0}_n^* = 0$.
- (2) $[t^2] \cdot \text{Ker}(F^m: H_m^d(W_nR) \rightarrow H_m^d(F_*^m W_nR)) = 0$.

Proof. We have the following inclusion (Definition 3.16(1)):

$$\text{Ker}(F^m: H_m^d(W_nR) \rightarrow H_m^d(F_*^m W_nR)) \subseteq \widetilde{0}_n^*.$$

Hence (1) implies (2).

Thus, it is enough to show (1). Specifically, we will show that $[t^2] \cdot \widetilde{0}_n^* = 0$ by an increasing induction on n . The base case $n = 1$ holds by

$$[t] \cdot \widetilde{0}_1^* = [t] \cdot 0_1^* = t \cdot 0_{H_m^d(R)}^* = 0$$

(Remark 3.18(4)). Now assume $n \geq 2$ and consider the exact sequence

$$(3.21.1) \quad H_m^d(F_*W_{n-1}R) \xrightarrow{V} H_m^d(W_nR) \xrightarrow{R^{n-1}} H_m^d(R).$$

Fix $z \in \widetilde{0}_n^*$. Since $R^{n-1}(z) \in \widetilde{0}_1^*$ (Proposition 3.20(1)), we get that $R^{n-1}([t]z) = [t]R^{n-1}(z) = 0$. Thus the exact sequence (3.21.1) enables us to find

$$F_*z' \in F_*H_m^d(W_{n-1}R) = H_m^d(F_*W_{n-1}R)$$

satisfying $V(F_*z') = [t]z$, where $F_*z' \in F_*H_m^d(W_{n-1}R)$ denotes the same element as $z' \in H_m^d(W_{n-1}R)$ (in order to clarify the R -module structure see Subsubsection 2.1.1). As $F_*z' \in V^{-1}(\widetilde{0}_n^*) = F_*\widetilde{0}_{n-1}^*$ (Proposition 3.20(2)), we get $z' \in \widetilde{0}_{n-1}^*$, and so, by the induction hypothesis, $[t^2]z' = 0$. We thus obtain

$$[t^2]z = [t]V(F_*z') = V([t]F_*z') = V(F_*([t^p]z')) = 0.$$

Hence (1) holds. \square

Definition 3.22. We work in the local setting (Notation 3.1). Fix $n \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$. Let S be a W_nR -submodule of $H_m^d(W_nR)$.

- (1) We say that S is *F-stable* if $F(S) \subseteq F_*S$, where $F_*S \subseteq H_m^d(F_*W_nR) = F_*(H_m^d(W_nR))$ denotes the same subset as $S \subseteq H_m^d(W_nR)$ via the identification $H_m^d(F_*W_nR) = F_*H_m^d(W_nR) = H_m^d(W_nR)$.
- (2) We say that S is *small* if there exists $c \in R^\circ$ such that $[c] \cdot S = 0$.

Proposition 3.23. *We work in the local setting (Notation 3.1). Then $\widetilde{0}_n^*$ is the largest W_nR -submodule of $H_m^d(W_nR)$ that is small and F-stable.*

Proof. By Definition 3.16, $\widetilde{0}_n^*$ is *F-stable*, and it follows from Remark 2.18(1) and Proposition 3.21(1) that $\widetilde{0}_n^*$ is small. To show that $\widetilde{0}_n^*$ is the largest such submodule, pick any small T -stable W_nR -submodule M of $H_m^d(W_nR)$ and take $z \in M$. It is enough to show that $z \in \widetilde{0}_n^*$. Since M is small, there exists $c \in R^\circ$ such that $[c] \cdot M = 0$. For every $e > 0$, we get

$$(F_*^e[c]) \cdot F^e(z) \in (F_*^e[c]) \cdot F^e(M) \subseteq (F_*^e[c]) \cdot F_*^e M = F_*^e([c] \cdot M) = 0,$$

which implies $z \in \widetilde{0}_n^*$. \square

The following proposition is fundamental as it shows that the infinite sum and intersection in the definition of $\widetilde{0}_n^*$ stabilise for any choice of $c \in (t^4) \cap R^\circ$, where t is a test element in R° .

Proposition 3.24. *We work in the local setting (Notation 3.1). Take $t \in R^\circ$ satisfying $t \cdot 0_{H_m^d(R)}^* = 0$. Fix $n \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$ and $c \in (t^4) \cap R^\circ$. Then the following hold.*

- (1) $H_m^d(W_nR) \supseteq \widetilde{K}_n^{0,c} \supseteq \widetilde{K}_n^{1,c} \supseteq \dots \supseteq \widetilde{K}_n^{e,c} \supseteq \widetilde{K}_n^{e+1,c} \supseteq \dots$

(2) *There exists an integer $e_1 > 0$ such that*

$$\widetilde{0}_n^* = \widetilde{K}_n^{e,c}$$

for every integer $e \geq e_1$.

(3) $H_m^d(R) \supseteq K_n^{0,c} \supseteq K_n^{1,c} \supseteq \dots \supseteq K_n^{e,c} \supseteq K_n^{e+1,c} \supseteq \dots$.

Proof. Let us show (1). There exists $c' \in R^\circ$ such that $c = c't^4$. Fix $z \in \widetilde{K}_n^{e+1,c}$. We then have

$$F((F_*^e[c't^2]) \cdot F^e(z)) = (F_*^{e+1}[c't^{2p}]) \cdot (F^{e+1}(z)) = (F_*^{e+1}[c_1]) \cdot (F_*^{e+1}[c]) \cdot (F^{e+1}(z)) = 0$$

for $c_1 := c'^{p-1}t^{2p-4} \in R^\circ$, where the last equality is guaranteed by $z \in \widetilde{K}_n^{e+1,c}$. By Proposition 3.21(2), we get

$$0 = (F_*^e[t^2]) \cdot (F_*^e[c't^2]) \cdot F^e(z) = (F_*^e[c't^4]) \cdot F^e(z) = (F_*^e[c]) \cdot F^e(z),$$

which implies $z \in \widetilde{K}_n^{e,c}$. Thus (1) holds. The proof of (1) may be visualised by the following diagram:

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} & & & \cdot F_*^{e+1}[c_1] \circ F & & & \\ & & & \curvearrowright & & & \\ W_n R & \xrightarrow{F^e} & F_*^e W_n R & \xrightarrow{\cdot F_*^e[c't^2]} & F_*^e W_n R & \xrightarrow{F} & F_*^{e+1} W_n R \\ & \downarrow = & \downarrow = & & \downarrow \cdot F_*^e[t^2] & & \\ W_n R & \xrightarrow{F^e} & F_*^e W_n R & \xrightarrow{\cdot F_*^e[c]} & F_*^e W_n R & & \end{array}$$

Let us show (2). Since $H_m^d(W_n R)$ is an Artinian $W_n R$ -module, (1) enables us to find $e_1 > 0$ such that

$$\widetilde{K}_n^{e,c} = \widetilde{K}_n^{e_1,c}$$

for every $e \geq e_1$. Then Definition 3.16(1) implies

$$\widetilde{0}_n^* = \bigcup_{\substack{c \in R^\circ, \\ e_0 \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}}} \bigcap_{e \geq e_0} \widetilde{K}_n^{e,c} \supseteq \bigcap_{e \geq e_1} \widetilde{K}_n^{e,c} = \widetilde{K}_n^{e_1,c}.$$

Conversely, if $z \in \widetilde{0}_n^*$ and $e > 0$, then we get

$$\begin{aligned} F_*^e[c] \cdot F^e(z) &\in F_*^e[c] \cdot F^e(\widetilde{0}_n^*) \stackrel{(i)}{\subseteq} F_*^e[c] \cdot F_*^e \widetilde{0}_n^* \\ &= F_*^e([c] \cdot \widetilde{0}_n^*) = F_*^e([c't^2] \cdot [t^2] \cdot \widetilde{0}_n^*) \stackrel{(ii)}{=} 0, \end{aligned}$$

where (i) and (ii) follow from Proposition 3.23 and Proposition 3.21(1), respectively. Hence $z \in \bigcap_{e > 0} \widetilde{K}_n^{e,c} = \widetilde{K}_n^{e_1,c}$. Thus (2) holds.

The assertion (3) follows from (1) and $R^{n-1}(\widetilde{K}_n^{e,c}) = K_n^{e,c}$ (Remark 3.18(1)). \square

The following result will be used to relate the quasi-test submodule $\tau_n(\omega_R)$ of ω_R with the quasi-test submodule $\tau(W_n \omega_R)$ of $W_n \omega_R$.

Theorem 3.25. *We work in the local setting (Notation 3.1). Fix $n \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$. Then*

$$R^{n-1}(\widetilde{0}_n^*) = 0_n^*.$$

Proof. Take $t \in R^\circ$ satisfying $t \cdot 0_{H_m^d(R)}^* = 0$. Set $c := t^4$. By Proposition 3.24, we can find $e_0 > 0$ such that $\widetilde{0}_n^* = \widetilde{K}_n^{e_0, c}$ and $K_n^{e, c} = K_n^{e_0, c}$ for every $e \geq e_0$. In particular,

$$R^{n-1}(\widetilde{0}_n^*) = R^{n-1}(\widetilde{K}_n^{e_0, c}) \stackrel{(\star)}{=} K_n^{e_0, c} = \bigcap_{e \geq e_0} K_n^{e, c} \subseteq \bigcup_{\substack{c \in R^\circ, \\ e_0 \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}}} \bigcap_{e \geq e_0} K_n^{e, c} = 0_n^*,$$

where the equality (\star) follows from Remark 3.18(1).

In view of the above, it is enough to show $R^{n-1}(\widetilde{0}_n^*) \supseteq 0_n^*$. Take $z \in 0_n^*$ and $t \in R^\circ$ satisfying $t \cdot 0_{H_m^d(R)}^* = 0$. There exist $c \in R^\circ$ and $e_1 > 0$ such that $z \in \bigcap_{e \geq e_1} K_n^{e, c}$. Replacing c by ct^4 (which is allowed by $K_n^{e, c} \subseteq K_n^{e, ct^4}$), we may assume $\widetilde{K}_n^{e, c} = \widetilde{0}_n^*$ for $e \gg 0$ (Proposition 3.24(2)). For $e \gg 0$, we obtain

$$z \in \bigcap_{e \geq e_1} K_n^{e, c} \subseteq K_n^{e, c} \stackrel{(\star\star)}{=} R^{n-1}(\widetilde{K}_n^{e, c}) = R^{n-1}(\widetilde{0}_n^*),$$

where the equality $(\star\star)$ follows from Remark 3.18(1). \square

Below, (1) shows that the infinite sum and intersection in the definition of quasi-tight closure 0_n^* stabilise, whilst (2) shows that the triviality of $K_n^{e_2, t^3}$, as opposed to just $K_n^{e_2, t^4}$, is already enough to deduce that $0_n^* = 0$. Although not needed in this paper, this stronger result will be used in future work.

Proposition 3.26. *We work in the local setting (Notation 3.1). Take $t \in R^\circ$ satisfying $t \cdot 0_{H_m^d(R)}^* = 0$. Fix $n \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$ and $c \in (t^4) \cap R^\circ$. Then the following hold.*

- (1) *There exists an integer $e_1 > 0$ such that $0_n^* = K_n^{e, c}$ for every integer $e \geq e_1$.*
- (2) *If there is an integer $e_2 > 0$ satisfying $K_n^{e_2, t^3} = 0$, then $0_n^* = 0$.*

Proof. The assertion (1) follows from $R^{n-1}(\widetilde{K}_n^{e, c}) = K_n^{e, c}$ (Remark 3.18(1)), Proposition 3.24(2), and Theorem 3.25.

Let us show (2). Take $z \in 0_n^*$. Then there exists $\widetilde{z} \in \widetilde{0}_n^*$ such that $R^{n-1}(\widetilde{z}) = z$ (Theorem 3.25). We can find an integer e such that $e \geq e_2 + 2$ and $\widetilde{z} \in \widetilde{K}_n^{e, t^4}$, i.e., $(F_*^e[t^4]) \cdot F^e(\widetilde{z}) = 0$ (Proposition 3.24(2)). Therefore,

$$F^{e-e_2}(F_*^{e_2}[t] \cdot F^{e_2}(\widetilde{z})) = (F_*^e[t]^{p^{e-e_2}}) \cdot F^e(\widetilde{z}) = 0,$$

which implies $(F_*^{e_2}[t^3]) \cdot F^{e_2}(\widetilde{z}) = (F_*^{e_2}[t^2]) \cdot (F_*^{e_2}[t]) \cdot F^{e_2}(\widetilde{z}) = 0$ (Proposition 3.21(2)). In particular, $z \in K_n^{e_2, t^3} = 0$, and hence $z = 0$. \square

Proposition 3.27. *We work in the local setting (Notation 3.1). Assume that*

$$V : H_m^d(F_*W_mR) \rightarrow H_m^d(W_{m+1}R)$$

is injective for every integer $m > 0$. Then $0_{H_m^d(R)}^ = 0$ if and only if $\widetilde{0}_n^* = 0$ for some integer $n > 0$.*

Proof. By $0_{H_m^d(R)}^* = 0_1^* = \widetilde{0}_1^*$ (Remark 3.18(4)), the only-if part is clear. Assume that $\widetilde{0}_n^* = 0$ for some $n > 0$. By Proposition 3.20(2), we get

$$V^{n-1}(F_*^{n-1}0_{H_m^d(R)}^*) = V^{n-1}(F_*^{n-1}\widetilde{0}_1^*) \subseteq \widetilde{0}_n^* = 0,$$

which implies $0_{H_m^d(R)}^* = 0$ by the injectivity of $V: H_m^d(F_*W_mR) \rightarrow H_m^d(W_{m+1}R)$. \square

3.3. Duality between quasi-test submodules and quasi-tight closure. We start by relating quasi-test submodules with quasi-tight closure.

Proposition 3.28. *We work in the local setting (Notation 3.1). Take an integer $n > 0$. Then the following equality of W_nR -submodules of $(W_n\omega_R)^\vee = H_m^d(W_nR)$ holds:*

$$\left(\frac{W_n\omega_R}{\tau(W_n\omega_R)} \right)^\vee = \widetilde{0}_n^*.$$

In particular,

$$\tau(W_n\omega_R) = \left(\frac{H_m^d(W_nR)}{\widetilde{0}_n^*} \right)^\vee.$$

Proof. Fix a test element $t \in R^\circ$. By Proposition 3.6(4), there exists $e_0 \geq 0$ such that $\tau(W_n\omega_R)$ is the image of

$$T_n^{e_0} \circ (\cdot F_*^{e_0}[t^{4^1}]): F_*^{e_0}W_n\omega_R \rightarrow W_n\omega_R.$$

We now apply the Matlis duality functor $\text{Hom}_{W_nR}(-, E)$. Since $(-)^\vee := \text{Hom}_{W_nR}(-, E)$ is an exact functor (recall that E is an injective W_nR -module), the diagrams

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} T_n^{e, t^4} : F_*^e W_n \omega_R & \twoheadrightarrow & \tau(W_n \omega_R) & \hookrightarrow & W_n \omega_R & & \\ 0 \rightarrow \tau(W_n \omega_R) & \rightarrow & W_n \omega_R & \rightarrow & \frac{W_n \omega_R}{\tau(W_n \omega_R)} & \rightarrow & 0 \end{array}$$

induce the following diagrams:

$$H_m^d(F_*^e W_n R) \hookrightarrow \tau(W_n \omega_R)^\vee \hookleftarrow H_m^d(W_n R)$$

$$(3.28.1) \quad 0 \leftarrow \tau(W_n \omega_R)^\vee \leftarrow H_m^d(W_n R) \leftarrow \left(\frac{W_n \omega_R}{\tau(W_n \omega_R)} \right)^\vee \leftarrow 0,$$

where the latter is exact. For $e \gg 0$, we get

$$\begin{aligned} \left(\frac{W_n \omega_R}{\tau(W_n \omega_R)} \right)^\vee &= \text{Ker}(H_m^d(W_n R) \rightarrow \tau(W_n \omega_R)^\vee) \\ &= \text{Ker}((T_n^e \circ (\cdot F_*^e[t^4]))^\vee : H_m^d(W_n R) \rightarrow H_m^d(F_*^e W_n R)) \\ &= \text{Ker}((\cdot F_*^e[t^4]) \circ F^e : H_m^d(W_n R) \rightarrow H_m^d(F_*^e W_n R)) \\ &\stackrel{(i)}{=} \bigcap_{e \geq 0} \widetilde{K}_n^{e, t^4} \\ &\stackrel{(ii)}{=} \widetilde{0}_n^*, \end{aligned}$$

where (i) and (ii) follow from Definition 3.16 and Proposition 3.24(2), respectively. The above equality and (3.28.1) immediately yield the in-particular part. \square

Theorem 3.29. *We work in the local setting (Notation 3.1). Take an integer $n > 0$. Then the following equality of R -submodules of $(\omega_R)^\vee = H_m^d(R)$ holds:*

$$\left(\frac{\omega_R}{\tau_n(\omega_R)} \right)^\vee = 0_n^*.$$

In particular,

$$\tau_n(\omega_R) = \left(\frac{H_m^d(R)}{0_n^*} \right)^\vee.$$

Proof. Since $\tau_n(\omega_R)$ is the inverse image of $\tau(W_n\omega_R)$ by $(R^{n-1})^* : \omega_R \hookrightarrow W_n\omega_R$ (Definition 3.8), we obtain the following commutative diagram:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \omega_R & \xleftarrow{(R^{n-1})^*} & W_n\omega_R \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ \frac{\omega_R}{\tau_n(\omega_R)} & \xleftarrow{\quad} & \frac{W_n\omega_R}{\tau(W_n\omega_R)}. \end{array}$$

Applying the Matlis dual functor $(-)^{\vee} := \text{Hom}_{W_nR}(-, E)$ (which is exact) to this diagram, we get

$$\begin{array}{ccc} H_m^d(R) & \xleftarrow{R^{n-1}} & H_m^d(W_nR) \\ \uparrow & & \uparrow \\ \left(\frac{\omega_R}{\tau_n(\omega_R)} \right)^\vee & \xleftarrow{\quad} & \left(\frac{W_n\omega_R}{\tau(W_n\omega_R)} \right)^\vee. \end{array}$$

By $\left(\frac{W_n\omega_R}{\tau(W_n\omega_R)} \right)^\vee = \tilde{0}_n$ (Proposition 3.28) and $R^{n-1}(\tilde{0}_n) = 0_n^*$ (Theorem 3.25), we obtain $\left(\frac{\omega_R}{\tau_n(\omega_R)} \right)^\vee = 0_n^*$. The in-particular part follows by Matlis duality applied to the short exact sequence:

$$0 \rightarrow \tau_n(\omega_R) \rightarrow \omega_R \rightarrow \frac{\omega_R}{\tau_n(\omega_R)} \rightarrow 0. \quad \square$$

Next, we provide an explicit definition of $\tau_n(\omega_R)$ in terms of $Q_{R,n}^{e,c}$. First, we need the following remark.

Remark 3.30. Note that we have the following inclusions:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Im} \left(\text{Hom}_{W_nR}(Q_{R,n}^{e,c}, W_n\omega_R) \xrightarrow{(\Phi_{R,n}^{e,c})^*} \omega_R \right) \\ \subseteq \text{Im} \left(\text{Hom}_{W_nR}(Q_{R,n}^{e',c}, W_n\omega_R) \xrightarrow{(\Phi_{R,n}^{e',c})^*} \omega_R \right) \end{aligned}$$

for every $e' \geq e$ if $t \in R^\circ$ is a test element and $c \in (t^4) \cap R^\circ$. Indeed, this can be checked after localisation, in which case it follows by Proposition 3.24 and the fact that

$$\text{Im} \left(\text{Hom}_{W_nR}(Q_{R,n}^{e,c}, W_n\omega_R) \xrightarrow{(\Phi_{R,n}^{e,c})^*} \omega_R \right)$$

is Matlis dual to $\text{Im}\left(H_{\mathfrak{m}}^d(R) \xrightarrow{\Phi_{R,n}^{e,c}} H_{\mathfrak{m}}^d(Q_{R,n}^{e,c})\right) = \frac{H_{\mathfrak{m}}^d(R)}{K_n^{e,c}}$. Moreover, since ω_R is a finitely generated R -module, there exists an integer $e_1 > 0$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Im}\left(\text{Hom}_{W_n R}(Q_{R,n}^{e,c}, W_n \omega_R) \xrightarrow{(\Phi_{R,n}^{e,c})^*} \omega_R\right) \\ = \text{Im}\left(\text{Hom}_{W_n R}(Q_{R,n}^{e_1,c}, W_n \omega_R) \xrightarrow{(\Phi_{R,n}^{e_1,c})^*} \omega_R\right) \end{aligned}$$

for every integer $e \geq e_1$.

Corollary 3.31. *We work in the general setting (Notation 3.2). Then the following hold.*

- (1) $\tau_n(\omega_R) = \bigcap_{c \in R^\circ} \bigcap_{e_0 > 0} \sum_{e \geq e_0} \text{Im}\left(\text{Hom}_{W_n R}(Q_{R,n}^{e,c}, W_n \omega_R) \xrightarrow{(\Phi_{R,n}^{e,c})^*} \omega_R\right)$,
- (2) $\tau_n(\omega_R) = \bigcap_{c \in R^\circ} \sum_{e > 0} \text{Im}\left(\text{Hom}_{W_n R}(Q_{R,n}^{e,c}, W_n \omega_R) \xrightarrow{(\Phi_{R,n}^{e,c})^*} \omega_R\right)$,
- (3) *Fix a test element $t \in R^\circ$ and $c \in (t^4) \cap R^\circ$. Then there exists an integer $e_0 > 0$ such that*

$$\tau_n(\omega_R) = \text{Im}\left(\text{Hom}_{W_n R}(Q_{R,n}^{e,c}, W_n \omega_R) \xrightarrow{(\Phi_{R,n}^{e,c})^*} \omega_R\right)$$

for every integer $e \geq e_0$.

Proof. First, we observe that (3) immediately implies (1). Indeed,

$$\begin{aligned} \bigcap_{c \in R^\circ} \bigcap_{e_0 > 0} \sum_{e \geq e_0} \text{Im}\left(\text{Hom}_{W_n R}(Q_{R,n}^{e,c}, W_n \omega_R) \xrightarrow{(\Phi_{R,n}^{e,c})^*} \omega_R\right) \\ = \bigcap_{c \in t^4 R^\circ} \bigcap_{e_0 > 0} \sum_{e \geq e_0} \text{Im}\left(\text{Hom}_{W_n R}(Q_{R,n}^{e,c}, W_n \omega_R) \xrightarrow{(\Phi_{R,n}^{e,c})^*} \omega_R\right) \\ \stackrel{3.30}{=} \bigcap_{c \in t^4 R^\circ} \sum_{e > 0} \text{Im}\left(\text{Hom}_{W_n R}(Q_{R,n}^{e,c}, W_n \omega_R) \xrightarrow{(\Phi_{R,n}^{e,c})^*} \omega_R\right) \\ \stackrel{(3)}{=} \tau_n(\omega_R). \end{aligned}$$

The same argument shows that (3) implies (2).

In what follows, we fix a test element $t \in R^\circ$, take any $c \in (t^4) \cap R^\circ$, and aim for showing (3). By Remark 3.30 and Noetherianity, it is enough to prove that

$$\tau_n(\omega_R) = \bigcup_{e > 0} \text{Im}\left(\text{Hom}_{W_n R}(Q_{R,n}^{e,c}, W_n \omega_R) \xrightarrow{(\Phi_{R,n}^{e,c})^*} \omega_R\right).$$

In order to verify this, we may assume that R is a local ring by Theorem 3.10 and the fact that localisation commutes with colimits (see also Lemma 2.30). In this case,

$$\text{Im}\left(\text{Hom}_{W_n R}(Q_{R,n}^{e,c}, W_n \omega_R) \xrightarrow{(\Phi_{R,n}^{e,c})^*} \omega_R\right)$$

is Matlis dual to

$$(3.31.1) \quad \mathrm{Im}\left(H_{\mathfrak{m}}^d(R) \xrightarrow{\Phi_{R,n}^{e,c}} H_{\mathfrak{m}}^d(Q_{R,n}^{e,c})\right) = \frac{H_{\mathfrak{m}}^d(R)}{K_n^{e,c}}.$$

Now, Theorem 3.29 and Proposition 3.26(1) imply

$$(3.31.2) \quad \tau_n(\omega_R) = \left(\frac{H_{\mathfrak{m}}^d(R)}{K_n^{e,c}}\right)^{\vee}.$$

for every $e \gg 0$ (depending on $c \in (t^4) \cap R^\circ$). Thus (3) follows by (3.31.1) and (3.31.2). \square

Corollary 3.32. *We work in the general setting (Notation 3.2). Fix an integer $n > 0$. Then R is n -quasi- F -rational if and only if R is Cohen-Macaulay and one of the following equivalent conditions hold.*

- (1) $\tau_n(\omega_R) = \omega_R$.
- (2) For every maximal ideal \mathfrak{m} of R and for every $c \in R^\circ$, the following map

$$\Phi_{R_{\mathfrak{m}},n}^{e,c}: H_{\mathfrak{m}}^d(R_{\mathfrak{m}}) \rightarrow H_{\mathfrak{m}}^d(Q_{R_{\mathfrak{m}},n}^{e,c})$$

is injective (a): for some $e > 0$, or equivalently

(b): for every $e \gg 0$ (depending on c).

- (3) For every $c \in R^\circ$, the following map

$$\mathrm{Hom}_{W_n R}(\Phi_{R,n}^{e,c}, W_n \omega_R): \mathrm{Hom}_{W_n R}(Q_{R,n}^{e,c}, W_n \omega_R) \rightarrow \omega_R$$

is surjective (a): for some $e > 0$, or equivalently

(b): for every $e \gg 0$ (depending on c).

Proof. Note that (1) together with Cohen-Macauliness of R is exactly our definition of n -quasi- F -rationality. By coherence of $Q_{R,n}^{e,c}$ and localisation from Theorem 3.10, we may assume that R is a local ring with maximal ideal \mathfrak{m} .

Then, by Matlis duality, we get the equivalences (2a) \Leftrightarrow (3a) and (3a) \Leftrightarrow (3b). The equivalence of (1) and (3a) follows from Corollary 3.31(2), whilst the equivalence of (1) and (3b) follows from Corollary 3.31(3). \square

One can use the above theorem to show that quasi- F -rationality agree with various non-uniform versions thereof (see Remark 4.35 for a similar discussion in the context of quasi- F -regularity).

Now we explain how to reconstruct $\tau(W_n \omega_R)$ from $\tau_n(\omega_R)$ when R is Cohen-Macaulay. In particular, the following result shows that $\tau(W_n \omega_R) = W_n \omega_R$ if and only if R is F -rational in the usual sense.

Proposition 3.33. *We work in the general setting (Notation 3.2). Assume that R is Cohen-Macaulay. Then there exists the following commutative diagram in which each*

horizontal sequence is exact and the vertical homomorphisms are natural injections:

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc}
 0 & \longrightarrow & \tau_n(\omega_R) & \longrightarrow & \tau(W_n\omega_R) & \longrightarrow & F_*\tau(W_{n-1}\omega_R) \longrightarrow 0 \\
 & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow \\
 0 & \longrightarrow & \omega_X & \xrightarrow{(R^{n-1})^*} & W_n\omega_X & \xrightarrow{V^*} & F_*W_{n-1}\omega_X.
 \end{array}$$

Specifically, the proof below shows that the graded pieces of the natural V -filtration on $\tau(W_n\omega_R)$ are isomorphic to $\tau_n(\omega_R), F_*\tau_{n-1}(\omega_R), \dots, F_*^{n-1}\tau(\omega_R)$.

Proof. It is clear that there exists a complex like above:

$$0 \rightarrow \tau_n(\omega_R) \rightarrow \tau(W_n\omega_R) \rightarrow F_*\tau(W_{n-1}\omega_R) \rightarrow 0$$

and it remains to show that it is exact. To this end, we may assume that (R, \mathfrak{m}) is a local ring.

Consider the exact sequence

$$H_{\mathfrak{m}}^d(F_*W_{n-1}R) \xrightarrow{V} H_{\mathfrak{m}}^d(W_nR) \xrightarrow{R^{n-1}} H_{\mathfrak{m}}^d(R) \rightarrow 0.$$

By Theorem 3.25 and Proposition 3.20, we get the following commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc}
 H_{\mathfrak{m}}^d(F_*W_{n-1}R) & \xrightarrow{V} & H_{\mathfrak{m}}^d(W_nR) & \xrightarrow{R^{n-1}} & H_{\mathfrak{m}}^d(R) & \longrightarrow & 0 \\
 \uparrow & & \uparrow & & \uparrow & & \\
 F_*\widetilde{0}_{n-1}^* & \xrightarrow{V} & \widetilde{0}_n^* & \xrightarrow{R^{n-1}} & 0_n^* & \longrightarrow & 0,
 \end{array}$$

where the left square is Cartesian. Since R is Cohen-Macaulay, the homomorphism $V: H_{\mathfrak{m}}^d(F_*W_{n-1}R) \rightarrow H_{\mathfrak{m}}^d(W_nR)$ is injective. Thus the required diagram exists by applying Snake lemma, Matlis duality, Theorem 3.28, and Theorem 3.29. \square

Proposition 3.34. *We work in the local setting (Notation 3.1). Then the following hold.*

- (1) *If $\tau_n(\omega_R) = \omega_R$ for some integer $n > 0$, then the induced $W_{m+n-1}R$ -module homomorphism*

$$R^{n-1}: \widetilde{0}_{m+n-1}^* \rightarrow \widetilde{0}_m^*$$

is zero for every integer $m > 0$.

- (2) *The following are equivalent.*

- (i) $\tau^q(\omega_R) = \omega_R$.
- (ii) $\varprojlim_n \widetilde{0}_n^* = 0$.
- (iii) $\varinjlim_n \tau(W_n\omega_R) = \varinjlim_n W_n\omega_R$, where each inductive system is induced by R^* .

We emphasise that $R^*: W_n\omega_R \rightarrow W_{n+1}\omega_R$ is injective for every $n > 0$.

Proof. Let us show (1). We prove that

$$R^{n-1}: \widetilde{0}_{m+n-1}^* \rightarrow \widetilde{0}_m^*$$

is zero by induction on $m \geq 1$. The base case $m = 1$ of this induction follows from $R^{n-1}(\widetilde{0}_n^*) = 0_n^* = (\omega_R/\tau_n(\omega_R))^\vee = 0$ (Theorem 3.25, Theorem 3.29). Assume $m \geq 2$. Consider the following commutative diagram in which each horizontal sequence is exact:

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} H_m^d(F_*W_{m+n-2}R) & \xrightarrow{V} & H_m^d(W_{m+n-1}R) & \xrightarrow{R^{m+n-2}} & H_m^d(R) \\ \downarrow R^{n-1} & & \downarrow R^{n-1} & & \parallel \\ H_m^d(F_*W_{m-1}R) & \xrightarrow{V} & H_m^d(W_mR) & \xrightarrow{R^{m-1}} & H_m^d(R). \end{array}$$

We have $R^{m+n-2}(\widetilde{0_{m+n-1}^*}) = 0_{m+n-1}^* \subseteq 0_n^* = 0$ as $m+n-1 \geq n$ (Remark 3.18(3), Theorem 3.25). By the following equality (Proposition 3.20):

$$V^{-1}(\widetilde{0_{m+n-1}^*}) = F_*\widetilde{0_{m+n-2}^*},$$

it suffices to show $R^{n-1}(\widetilde{0_{m+n-2}^*}) = 0$, which follows from the induction hypothesis. Thus (1) holds.

Let us show (2). By (1), we get the implication (i) \Rightarrow (ii). To prove the implication (ii) \Rightarrow (iii), it is enough to prove that

$$\varinjlim_n (W_n\omega_R/\tau(W_n\omega_R)) = 0$$

as \varinjlim_n is exact, which in turn follows from $\widetilde{0}_n^* = (W_n\omega_R/\tau(W_n\omega_R))^\vee$ (Proposition 3.28) given that the Matlis duality functor $(-)^\vee$ turns colimits into limits. Let us show (iii) \Rightarrow (i). Pick $a \in \omega_R$. By (iii), there exists $n > 0$ such that $(R^*)^{n-1}(a) \in \tau(W_n\omega_R)$. Therefore, we have $a \in \tau_n(\omega_R)$, and thus $\omega_R = \tau^q(\omega_R)$. \square

3.4. Quasi-+-rationality. In this subsection, we briefly discuss the concept of quasi-+-rationality and constructions of quasi-+-test submodules. These constructions could be done analogously to the above subsections by ways of quasi-+-closure. However, we will not pursue such an approach for two reasons. First, we do not understand quasi-+-closure as well as quasi-tight closure. Second, we wish to present a different, more geometric, approach to the problem, which is useful in other contexts (see, for example, Subsection 2.5). The main goal of this subsection is to show that quasi-+-rationality implies pseudo-rationality, which, in turn, provides an alternative proof of the same implication for quasi- F -rationality.

In this paragraph, we work in the general setting (Notation 3.2). Take an integer $n > 0$ and a finite extension $f: R \hookrightarrow S$ of reduced rings (here a *finite extension* $f: R \hookrightarrow S$ is an injective ring homomorphism such that S is a finitely generated R -module). We define a W_nR -module $Q_{R,n}^f$ and a W_nR -module homomorphism $\Phi_{R,n}^f$ by the following pushout diagram:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} W_nR & \xrightarrow{W_n f} & W_nS \\ \downarrow R^{n-1} & & \downarrow \\ R & \xrightarrow{\Phi_{R,n}^f} & Q_{R,n}^f. \end{array}$$

Definition 3.35. We work in the general setting (Notation 3.2). We define the *quasi-+-test submodule* of ω_R by the following formula:

$$\begin{aligned}\tau_{+,n}(\omega_R) &:= \bigcap_{f:R \hookrightarrow S} \tau_{f,n}(\omega_R) \quad \text{for} \\ \tau_{f,n}(\omega_R) &:= \text{Im}\left((\Phi_{R,n}^f)^* : \text{Hom}_{W_n R}(Q_{R,n}^f, W_n \omega_R) \rightarrow \omega_R\right),\end{aligned}$$

where $(\Phi_{R,n}^f)^* := \text{Hom}_{W_n R}(\Phi_{R,n}^f, W_n \omega_R)$ and the intersection is taken over all finite extensions $f: R \hookrightarrow S$ of reduced rings.

Definition 3.36. We work in the general setting (Notation 3.2). We say that R is *quasi-+-rational* if $\tau_{+,n}(\omega_R) = \omega_R$. This is the same as saying that for every finite extension $f: R \hookrightarrow S$ of reduced rings, the following map is surjective:

$$(\Phi_{R,n}^f)^* : \text{Hom}_{W_n R}(Q_{R,n}^f, W_n \omega_R) \rightarrow \omega_R.$$

Proposition 3.37. *We work in the general setting (Notation 3.2). Assume that R is quasi-F-rational. Then R is quasi-+-rational.*

Proof. The proof is analogous to [TWY24, Proposition 4.9]. \square

To demonstrate that quasi-+-rationality implies pseudo-rationality, we introduce the quasi-+-test submodule of $W_n \omega_R$.

Definition 3.38. We work in the general setting (Notation 3.2). We define the *quasi-+-test $W_n R$ -submodule* of $W_n \omega_R$ by the following formula:

$$\begin{aligned}\tau_+(W_n \omega_R) &:= \bigcap_{f:R \hookrightarrow S} \tau_f(W_n \omega_R) \quad \text{for} \\ \tau_f(W_n \omega_R) &:= \text{Im}\left(T_n^f : W_n \omega_S \rightarrow W_n \omega_R\right),\end{aligned}$$

where $T_n^f := \text{Hom}_{W_n R}(W_n f, W_n \omega_R)$ and the intersection is taken over all finite extensions $f: R \hookrightarrow S$ of reduced rings.

Proposition 3.39. *We work in the general setting (Notation 3.2). Then*

$$\tau_{+,n}(\omega_R) = ((R^{n-1})^*)^{-1}(\tau_+(W_n \omega_R)).$$

In other words, there exists the following pullback diagram in which the vertical arrows are natural inclusions

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \tau_{+,n}(\omega_R) & \hookrightarrow & \tau_+(W_n \omega_R) \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ \omega_R & \xrightarrow{(R^{n-1})^*} & W_n \omega_R. \end{array}$$

Proof. Let $f: R \rightarrow S$ be a finite extension of reduced rings. Consider the following diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} 0 & \longrightarrow & F_*W_{n-1}R & \longrightarrow & W_nS & \longrightarrow & Q_{R,n}^f \longrightarrow 0 \\ & & \uparrow = & & \uparrow W_n f & & \uparrow \Phi_{R,n}^f \\ 0 & \longrightarrow & F_*W_{n-1}R & \xrightarrow{V} & W_nR & \xrightarrow{R^{n-1}} & R \longrightarrow 0. \end{array}$$

By applying $\mathrm{Hom}_{W_nR}(-, W_n\omega_R)$ we get:

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} F_*W_{n-1}\omega_R & \longleftarrow & W_n\omega_S & \longleftarrow & \mathrm{Hom}_{W_nR}(Q_{R,n}^f, W_n\omega_R) & \longleftarrow & 0 \\ \downarrow = & & \downarrow T_n^f & & (\star) & & \downarrow (\Phi_{R,n}^f)^* \\ F_*W_{n-1}\omega_R & \xleftarrow{V^*} & W_n\omega_R & \xleftarrow{(R^{n-1})^*} & \omega_R & \xleftarrow{\quad} & 0. \end{array}$$

Then (\star) is a pullback square by diagram chase in which it is essential that the left vertical arrow is an equality. This immediately implies that:

$$\tau_{+,n}(\omega_R) = ((R^{n-1})^*)^{-1}(\tau_+(W_n\omega_R)). \quad \square$$

Remark 3.40. There are a couple of results we leave unproven in this subsection. For starters, we do not argue that $\tau(W_n\omega_R)$ and $\tau_+(\omega_R)$ are calculated by a single finite extension, and, in particular, that they are stable under localisation and completion. This should follow by the same argument as in [KTY22, Proposition 4.13].

Second, with a little bit of work, one should be able to establish that there exists the following commutative diagram in which each row is exact and vertical maps are natural injections:

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} 0 & \longrightarrow & \tau_{+,n}(\omega_R) & \longrightarrow & \tau_+(W_n\omega_R) & \longrightarrow & F_*\tau_+(W_{n-1}\omega_R) \longrightarrow 0 \\ & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ 0 & \longrightarrow & \omega_R & \xrightarrow{(R^{n-1})^*} & W_n\omega_R & \xrightarrow{V^*} & F_*W_{n-1}\omega_R. \end{array}$$

Specifically the graded pieces of the natural V -filtration on $\tau_+(W_n\omega_R)$ should be isomorphic to $\tau_{+,n}(\omega_R), F_*\tau_{+,n-1}(\omega_R), \dots, F_*^{n-1}\tau_+(\omega_R)$.

We will also need the generalisation of Hochster-Huneke's vanishing to the Witt setting.

Lemma 3.41. *We work in the general setting (Notation 3.2). Fix an integer $n > 0$. Let $\pi: X \rightarrow \mathrm{Spec} R$ be a proper morphism. There there exists a finite surjective morphism $f: Y \rightarrow X$ over R such that the pullback maps*

$$H^i(X, W_n\mathcal{O}_X) \xrightarrow{f^*} H^i(Y, W_n\mathcal{O}_Y)$$

are zero for every $i > 0$.

Proof. The case of $n = 1$ follows from [Bha12, Introduction, Theorem 1.5]. In general, we argue by an increasing induction on n . Let $f: Y \rightarrow X$ be a finite morphism over R such that

$$H^i(X, \mathcal{O}_X) \xrightarrow{f^*} H^i(Y, \mathcal{O}_Y)$$

is zero for every $i > 0$. Assume by induction that there exists a finite surjective morphism $g: Z \rightarrow Y$ over R such that

$$H^i(Y, W_{n-1}\mathcal{O}_Y) \xrightarrow{g^*} H^i(Z, W_{n-1}\mathcal{O}_Z)$$

is also zero for every $i > 0$. Then the composition

$$H^i(X, W_n\mathcal{O}_X) \xrightarrow{(f \circ g)^*} H^i(Z, W_n\mathcal{O}_Z)$$

is zero for every $i > 0$ by tracing through the following commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccccccc} 0 & \longrightarrow & F_*W_{n-1}\mathcal{O}_Z & \xrightarrow{V} & W_n\mathcal{O}_Z & \xrightarrow{R^{n-1}} & \mathcal{O}_Z & \longrightarrow & 0 \\ & & \uparrow g^* & & \uparrow g^* & & \uparrow g^* & & \\ 0 & \longrightarrow & F_*W_{n-1}\mathcal{O}_Y & \xrightarrow{V} & W_n\mathcal{O}_Y & \xrightarrow{R^{n-1}} & \mathcal{O}_Y & \longrightarrow & 0 \\ & & \uparrow f^* & & \uparrow f^* & & \uparrow f^* & & \\ 0 & \longrightarrow & F_*W_{n-1}\mathcal{O}_X & \xrightarrow{V} & W_n\mathcal{O}_X & \xrightarrow{R^{n-1}} & \mathcal{O}_X & \longrightarrow & 0 \end{array}$$

with H^i applied to it. □

Remark 3.42. We work in the general setting (Notation 3.2). Fix an integer $n > 0$ and let $\pi: Y \rightarrow X$ be a projective birational morphism over R . Then $\pi_*W_n\mathcal{O}_Y = W_n\mathcal{O}_X$. Indeed, we have the natural commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccccccc} 0 & \longrightarrow & \pi_*F_*W_{n-1}\mathcal{O}_Y & \xrightarrow{\pi_*V} & \pi_*W_n\mathcal{O}_Y & \xrightarrow{\pi_*R^{n-1}} & \pi_*\mathcal{O}_Y & \longrightarrow & 0 \\ & & \uparrow = & & \uparrow \pi^* & & \uparrow = & & \\ 0 & \longrightarrow & F_*W_{n-1}\mathcal{O}_X & \xrightarrow{V} & W_n\mathcal{O}_X & \xrightarrow{R^{n-1}} & \mathcal{O}_X & \longrightarrow & 0. \end{array}$$

in which the left vertical arrow is an equality by ascending induction on n . Then π_*R^{n-1} is surjective by diagram chase, and so $\pi^*: W_n\mathcal{O}_X \rightarrow \pi_*W_n\mathcal{O}_Y$ is an equality by Five Lemma.

By combining Lemma 3.41 and Remark 3.42, we may see that the ind-systems $\{R\pi_*\mathcal{O}_X\}_{\pi: X \rightarrow \text{Spec } R}$ and $\{\pi_*\mathcal{O}_X\}_{\pi: X \rightarrow \text{Spec } R}$ taken over all alterations and all finite surjective morphisms, respectively, are equivalent. By Matlis duality this yields the following result.

Proposition 3.43. *We work in the general setting (Notation 3.2). Let $\pi: X \rightarrow \text{Spec } R$ be a projective birational morphism. Then $\tau_+(W_n\omega_R) \subseteq \pi_*W_n\omega_X$.*

Proof. By Lemma 3.41 applied d times⁵ (see also [Bha12, Lemma 2.2], cf. the proof of [Bha12, Theorem 0.4]), we get that there exists a finite surjective morphism $f: Y \rightarrow X$ over R such that the pullback

$$f^*: R^{>0}\pi_*W_n\mathcal{O}_X \rightarrow R^{>0}\rho_*W_n\mathcal{O}_Y$$

is a zero map, where $\rho := \pi \circ f: Y \xrightarrow{f} X \xrightarrow{\pi} \text{Spec } R$. Let D denote the derived category of W_nR -modules. In particular, by applying $\text{Hom}_D(R\pi_*W_n\mathcal{O}_X, -)$ to the exact triangle (cf. the proof of [Bha12, Theorem 0.3]):

$$\rho_*W_n\mathcal{O}_Y \rightarrow R\rho_*W_n\mathcal{O}_Y \rightarrow R^{>0}\rho_*W_n\mathcal{O}_Y \xrightarrow{+1},$$

we get an exact sequence of abelian groups:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Hom}_D(R\pi_*W_n\mathcal{O}_X, \rho_*W_n\mathcal{O}_Y) &\rightarrow \text{Hom}_D(R\pi_*W_n\mathcal{O}_X, R\rho_*W_n\mathcal{O}_Y) \\ &\rightarrow \text{Hom}_D(R\pi_*W_n\mathcal{O}_X, R^{>0}\rho_*W_n\mathcal{O}_Y). \end{aligned}$$

By using this sequence, we get that

$$f^*: R\pi_*W_n\mathcal{O}_X \rightarrow R\rho_*W_n\mathcal{O}_Y$$

factors through $\rho_*W_n\mathcal{O}_Y$. Choose one such factorisation. By Remark 3.42, we have that $\rho_*W_n\mathcal{O}_Y = \theta_*W_n\mathcal{O}_W$ where $\theta: W \rightarrow \text{Spec } R$ is the finite part of the Stein factorisation of $\rho: Y \rightarrow \text{Spec } R$:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} Y & \xrightarrow{f} & X \\ \downarrow & \searrow \rho & \downarrow \pi \\ W & \xrightarrow{\theta} & \text{Spec } R. \end{array}$$

To conclude, we have a sequence of maps:

$$\theta^*: W_nR \xrightarrow{\pi^*} R\pi_*W_n\mathcal{O}_X \xrightarrow{f^*} \rho_*W_n\mathcal{O}_Y = \theta_*W_n\mathcal{O}_W.$$

In particular, we get an induced surjection:

$$\text{Im}(\pi^*: H_m^d(W_nR) \rightarrow H_m^d(R\pi_*W_n\mathcal{O}_X)) \twoheadrightarrow \text{Im}(\theta^*: H_m^d(W_nR) \rightarrow H_m^d(\theta_*W_n\mathcal{O}_W)).$$

By applying Matlis duality $(-)^{\vee} = \text{Hom}_{W_nR}(-, E)$,

$$\tau_{\theta}(W_n\omega_R) \hookrightarrow \pi_*W_n\omega_X.$$

Here the Matlis dual $H_m^d(R\pi_*W_n\mathcal{O}_X)^{\vee}$ can be computed as follows:

$$H_m^d(R\pi_*W_n\mathcal{O}_X)^{\vee} \simeq H^0R\text{Hom}_{W_nR}(R\pi_*W_n\mathcal{O}_X, W_n\omega_R^{\bullet}) \simeq \pi_*W_n\omega_X,$$

where the first isomorphism is [KTT⁺22, Proposition 2.2] and the second one is Grothendieck duality. Therefore, $\tau_+(W_n\omega_R) \subseteq \pi_*W_n\omega_X$. \square

Theorem 3.44. *We work in the general setting (Notation 3.2). Let $\pi: X \rightarrow \text{Spec } R$ be a projective birational morphism. Then $\tau_{+,n}(\omega_R) \subseteq \pi_*\omega_R$. In particular, if R is quasi-+-rational, then it is pseudo-rational.*

⁵we warn the reader that it is *not* true in general that a map in the derived category is zero if and only if it is zero on each cohomology

Proof. Since $W_n\omega_X$ is S_1 , the vertical arrows in the following diagram are injective

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} 0 & \longrightarrow & \pi_*\omega_X & \xrightarrow{(R^{n-1})^*} & \pi_*W_n\omega_X & \xrightarrow{V^*} & F_*\pi_*W_{n-1}\omega_X \\ & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ 0 & \longrightarrow & \omega_R & \xrightarrow{(R^{n-1})^*} & W_n\omega_R & \xrightarrow{V^*} & F_*W_{n-1}\omega_R. \end{array}$$

By diagram chase, we can thus see that

$$\pi_*\omega_X = ((R^{n-1})^*)^{-1}(\pi_*W_n\omega_X).$$

Therefore, by Proposition 3.39 and Proposition 3.43, we get that

$$\tau_{+,n}(\omega_R) = ((R^{n-1})^*)^{-1}(\tau_+(W_n\omega_R)) \subseteq ((R^{n-1})^*)^{-1}(\pi_*W_n\omega_X) = \pi_*\omega_X,$$

concluding the proof of the theorem. \square

4. QUASI-TEST IDEALS AND QUASI-TEST SUBMODULES FOR PAIRS

This section is the central part of this paper, in which we shall introduce the quasi-test ideal $\tau^q(R, \Delta)$, where R is an F -finite normal integral domain of characteristic $p > 0$ and Δ is a \mathbb{Q} -divisor on $\text{Spec } R$ such that $K_R + \Delta$ is \mathbb{Q} -Cartier. Set $D := K_R + \Delta$. In Subsection 4.1 and Subsection 4.2, we shall introduce the n -quasi-test submodule $\tau_n(\omega_R, D) \subseteq \omega_R(-D) := \mathcal{H}om_R(R(D), \omega_R)$ and the n -quasi-tight closure $0_{D,n}^* \subseteq H_m^d(R(D))$, respectively. We warn the reader again that $R(D) = R(\lfloor D \rfloor)$ and $\omega_R(-D) = \omega_R(\lceil -D \rceil)$ in our notation (cf. Remark 2.27(1)).

These subsections are the log versions of Subsection 3.1 and Subsection 3.2. Then the n -quasi-test ideal $\tau_n(R, \Delta)$ is defined by

$$\tau_n(R, \Delta) := \tau_n(\omega_R, K_R + \Delta).$$

The quasi-test ideal $\tau^q(R, \Delta)$ is given by

$$\tau^q(R, \Delta) := \bigcup_{n \geq 1} \tau_n(R, \Delta) = \tau_n(R, \Delta)$$

for $n \gg 0$, where the latter equality holds by $\tau_1(R, \Delta) \subseteq \tau_2(R, \Delta) \subseteq \dots$. We then establish some fundamental properties of $\tau_n(R, \Delta)$ (Subsection 4.3):

- (1) $\tau_n(R, \Delta)$ is compatible with localisations and completions (Remark 4.24).
- (2) If E is an effective Cartier divisor on $\text{Spec } R$, then there exists a rational number $\epsilon > 0$ such that $\tau_n(R, \Delta) = \tau_n(R, \Delta + \epsilon E)$ (Theorem 4.36).
- (3) (R, Δ) is n -quasi- F -regular if and only if $\tau_n(R, \Delta) = R$ (Proposition 4.30).

In order to show (2) and (3), we prove the following duality for the case when R is a local ring (Proposition 4.30):

$$\text{Hom}_R(R(\lceil -\Delta \rceil)/\tau_n(R, \Delta), E) = 0_{K_R + \Delta, n}^*.$$

For example, we have

$$0_{K_R + \Delta, n}^* := \bigcup_{\substack{c \in R^\circ, \\ e_0 \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}}} \bigcap_{e \geq e_0} K_{K_R + \Delta, n}^{e, c} = K_{K_R + \Delta, n}^{e, c} \subseteq H_m^d(R(K_R + \Delta))$$

for suitable $e > 0$ and $c \in R^\circ$. In other words, the intersection \cap and sum \cup stabilise.

4.1. Quasi-test submodules (pairs).

Notation 4.1. Let R be an F -finite Noetherian normal integral domain of characteristic $p > 0$. Set $X := \text{Spec } R$.

Definition 4.2. We use Notation 4.1. Let D be a \mathbb{Q} -divisor on X . Take $g \in R(-(p^e - 1)D)$, which induces a $W_n R$ -module homomorphism:

$$W_n R \xrightarrow{\cdot[g]} W_n R(-(p^e - 1)D).$$

By applying $\text{Hom}_{W_n R}(-, W_n \omega_R)$ to the $W_n R$ -module homomorphisms

$$W_n R \xrightarrow{F^e} F_*^e W_n R \xrightarrow{\cdot F_*^e[g]} F_*^e W_n R(-(p^e - 1)D),$$

we obtain $W_n R$ -module homomorphisms

$$T_n^{e,g} : F_*^e W_n \omega_R((p^e - 1)D) \xrightarrow{\cdot F_*^e[g]} F_*^e W_n \omega_R \xrightarrow{T_n^e} W_n \omega_R,$$

where we used

- $\text{Hom}_{W_n R}(F_*^e W_n R, W_n \omega_R) \simeq F_*^e W_n \omega_R$, and
- $\text{Hom}_{W_n R}(F_*^e W_n R(-(p^e - 1)D), W_n \omega_R) \simeq F_*^e W_n \omega_R((p^e - 1)D)$.

For an integer $e \geq 0$, we set

$$C_n^e(D) := \{T_n^{e,g} \mid g \in R(-(p^e - 1)D)\} \subseteq \text{Hom}_{W_n R}(F_*^e W_n \omega_R((p^e - 1)D), W_n \omega_R).$$

Definition 4.3. We use Notation 4.1. Take an integer $n > 0$. Let D be an effective \mathbb{Q} -divisor on X . Let M be a $W_n R$ -submodule of $W_n \omega_R$.

- (1) We say that M is *co-small* if there exists $c \in R^\circ$ such that $[c] \cdot W_n \omega_R \subseteq M$.
- (2) We say that M is $C_n(D)$ -*stable* if the inclusion

$$\varphi(F_*^e M) \subseteq M$$

holds for every integer $e \geq 0$ and every $\varphi \in C_n^e(D)$. Note that $F_*^e M \subseteq F_*^e W_n \omega_R \subseteq F_*^e W_n \omega_R((p^e - 1)D)$ (Remark 2.28).

Note that if $(p^e - 1)D = \text{div}(g)$ for some $g \in R$ (for example, this is always true when R is local and $(p^e - 1)D$ is Cartier), then in Definition 4.3(2), it would be enough for us to only consider $\varphi = T_n^{e,g}$ for this particular choice of g .

Remark 4.4. Take $T_n^{e,g} \in C_n^e(D)$ and $T_n^{e',g'} \in C_n^{e'}(D)$. Let us construct the natural composition $T_n^{e,g} \circ (F_*^{e'} T_n^{e',g'})$. Recall that $g \in R(-(p^e - 1)D)$ and $g' \in R(-(p^{e'} - 1)D)$. Consider the composition

$$\begin{aligned} W_n R &\xrightarrow{F^e} F_*^e W_n R \xrightarrow{\cdot F_*^e[g]} F_*^e W_n R(-(p^e - 1)D) \\ &\xrightarrow{F^{e'}} F_*^{e+e'} W_n R(-p^{e'}(p^e - 1)D) \xrightarrow{\cdot F_*^{e+e'}[g']} F_*^{e+e'} W_n R(-p^{e'}(p^e - 1)D - (p^{e'} - 1)D) \\ &= F_*^{e+e'} W_n R(-(p^{e+e'} - 1)D). \end{aligned}$$

Applying $\text{Hom}_{W_n R}(-, W_n \omega_R)$, we obtain $T_n^{e,g} \circ (F_*^e T_{n,g'}^{e'})$:

$$F_*^{e+e'} W_n R((p^{e+e'} - 1)D) \xrightarrow{F_*^e T_{n,g'}^{e'}} F_*^e W_n R((p^e - 1)D) \xrightarrow{T_n^{e,g}} W_n \omega_R.$$

Moreover, we have $T_n^{e,g} \circ (F_*^e T_{n,g'}^{e'}) = T_n^{e+e',g^{p^{e'}}} g'$ by

$$((\cdot F_*^{e+e'}[g']) \circ F^{e'}) \circ ((\cdot F_*^e[g]) \circ F^e) = (\cdot F_*^{e+e'}[g^{p^e} g']) \circ F^{e+e'}.$$

Proposition 4.5. *We use Notation 4.1. Let D be an effective \mathbb{Q} -divisor on X . Fix a test element $t \in R^\circ$. Take $d \in R^\circ$ such that $D \leq \text{div}(d) =: D'$. Then the following hold.*

- (1) $W_n \omega_R(-D)$ is a co-small $C_n(D)$ -stable $W_n R$ -submodule of $W_n \omega_R$.
- (2) For every $C_n(D')$ -stable co-small $W_n R$ -submodule M of $W_n \omega_R(-D')$, $[d^{-1}] \cdot M$ is a co-small T -stable $W_n R$ -submodule of $W_n \omega_R$.
- (3) For every $C_n(D)$ -stable co-small $W_n R$ -submodule M of $W_n \omega_R$, it holds that

$$[t^2 d] \cdot W_n \omega_R \subseteq M.$$

Proof. Let us show (1). Take an integer $e \geq 0$ and $g \in R(-(p^e - 1)D)$. Then $T_n^{e,g} \in C_n(D)$ induces the following $W_n R$ -module homomorphisms:

$$F_*^e W_n \omega_R(-D) \xrightarrow{\cdot F_*^e[g]} F_*^e W_n \omega_R(-p^e D) \xrightarrow{T_n^e} W_n \omega_R(-D).$$

Therefore, $W_n \omega_R(-D)$ is $C_n(D)$ -stable. Since $[d] \cdot W_n \omega_R = W_n \omega_R(-\text{div}(d)) \subseteq W_n \omega_R(-D)$, we get that $W_n \omega_R(-D)$ is co-small. Thus (1) holds.

Let us show (2). We have

$$[d^{-1}] \cdot M \subseteq [d^{-1}] \cdot W_n \omega_R(-D') = W_n \omega_R(\text{div}(d) - D') = W_n \omega_R.$$

Moreover, it holds that

$$[d] \cdot T_n^e(F_*^e([d^{-1}] \cdot M)) = T_n^e(F_*^e([d^{p^e-1}] \cdot M)) \subseteq M,$$

because M is $C_n(D')$ -stable and $d^{p^e-1} \in R(-(p^e - 1)D')$. Therefore, $[d^{-1}] \cdot M$ is T -stable and co-small. Thus (2) holds.

Let us show (3). We now reduce the problem to the case when $D = D'$. By $D \leq D'$, we get the natural inclusion $C_n^e(D') \hookrightarrow C_n^e(D)$ given by $R(-(p^e - 1)D') \subseteq R(-(p^e - 1)D)$. Specifically, if $T_n^{e,h} \in C_n^e(D')$ with $h \in R(-(p^e - 1)D') \subseteq R(-(p^e - 1)D)$, then we get

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} & & \xrightarrow{\quad T_n^{e,h} \quad} & & \\ & & \curvearrowright & & \\ F_*^e W_n \omega_R((p^e - 1)D') & \xrightarrow{\cdot F_*^e[h]} & F_*^e W_n \omega_R & \xrightarrow{T_n^e} & W_n \omega_R \\ \uparrow & & \parallel & & \\ F_*^e W_n \omega_R((p^e - 1)D) & \xrightarrow{\cdot F_*^e[h]} & F_*^e W_n \omega_R & & \end{array}$$

Since M is $C_n(D)$ -stable, M is also $C_n(D')$ -stable. Therefore, we may assume $D = D'$.

Since $W_n\omega_R(-D) = [d] \cdot W_n\omega_R$ is $C_n(D)$ -stable by (1), also $M' := M \cap [d] \cdot W_n\omega_R$ is $C_n(D)$ -stable and co-small. Replacing M by M' , we may assume that $M \subseteq [d] \cdot W_n\omega_R$. By (2), $[d^{-1}] \cdot M$ is T -stable and co-small. By Proposition 3.5(2), we have

$$[t^2 d] \cdot W_n\omega_R = [d] \cdot ([t^2] \cdot W_n\omega_R) \subseteq [d] \cdot ([d^{-1}] \cdot M) = M.$$

Thus (3) holds. \square

Proposition 4.6. *We use Notation 4.1. Let D be an effective \mathbb{Q} -divisor on X and take $d \in R^\circ$ such that $D \leq \operatorname{div}(d)$. Fix a test element $t \in R^\circ$ and $c \in (dt^2) \cap R^\circ$. Then the following hold.*

- (1) *There exists a smallest co-small $C_n(D)$ -stable W_nR -submodule $\tau(W_n\omega_R, D)$ of $W_n\omega_R$. Moreover, $\tau(W_n\omega_R, D) \subseteq W_n\omega_R(-D)$.*
- (2) *For $h \in R^\circ$, it holds that*

$$\tau(W_n\omega_R, D + \operatorname{div}(h)) = [h] \cdot \tau(W_n\omega_R, D).$$

- (3) *For every co-small W_nR -submodule M of $W_n\omega_R$, it holds that*

$$\tau(W_n\omega_R, D) = \sum_{e \geq 0} \sum_{\varphi \in C_n^e(D)} \varphi(F_*^e([c] \cdot M))$$

- (4) *If $f \in R^\circ$ and $D = \operatorname{adiv}(f)$ for some $a \in \mathbb{Q}_{>0}$, then*

$$\tau(W_n\omega_R, D) = \sum_{e \geq 0} T_n^e(F_*^e([cf^{[a(p^e-1)]]}] \cdot M))$$

for every co-small W_nR -submodule M of $W_n\omega_R$.

- (5) *Assume $D = \operatorname{adiv}(f)$ and $c \in (f^{[a]}) \cap (dt^2) \cap R^\circ$ for some $a \in \mathbb{Q}_{>0}$ and $f \in R^\circ$.*
 - (a) *For every integer $e \geq 0$, the inclusion*

$$\begin{aligned} & T_n^e(F_*^e([cf^{[a(p^e-1)]]}] \cdot \tau(W_n\omega_R, D))) \\ & \subseteq T_n^{e+1}(F_*^{e+1}([cf^{[a(p^{e+1}-1)]]}] \cdot \tau(W_n\omega_R, D))) \end{aligned}$$

holds.

- (b) *There exists an integer $e_0 \geq 0$ such that*

$$\tau(W_n\omega_R, D) = T_n^e(F_*^e([cf^{[a(p^e-1)]]}] \cdot M))$$

holds for every $e \geq e_0$ and every co-small $C_n(D)$ -stable W_nR -submodule M of $W_n\omega_R$.

- (c) *If L is a co-small W_nR -submodule of $W_n\omega_R$, then there exists an integer $e_L \geq 0$ such that*

$$\tau(W_n\omega_R, D) = T_n^e(F_*^e([cf^{[a(p^e-1)]]}] \cdot L))$$

holds for every $e \geq e_L$.

We call $\tau(W_n\omega_R, D)$ the *quasi-test (W_nR) -submodule* of $(W_n\omega_R, D)$.

Proof. Let us show (1). Set

$$\tau(W_n\omega_R, D) := \bigcap_M M \subseteq W_n\omega_R,$$

where M runs over all the $C_n(D)$ -stable co-small W_nR -submodules M of $W_n\omega_R$. By Proposition 4.5(3), $\tau(W_n\omega_R, D)$ is co-small. Proposition 4.5(1) implies the inclusion $\tau(W_n\omega_R, D) \subseteq W_n\omega_R(-D)$. Thus (1) holds.

Let us show (2). Since $\tau(W_n\omega_R, D + \operatorname{div}(h))$ is $C_n(D + \operatorname{div}(h))$ -stable, it follows from a similar argument to the one of Proposition 4.5 that $[h^{-1}] \cdot \tau(W_n\omega_R, D + \operatorname{div}(h))$ is $C_n(D)$ -stable. By (1), we get $\tau(W_n\omega_R, D + \operatorname{div}(h)) \supseteq [h] \cdot \tau(W_n\omega_R, D)$. The opposite inclusion holds by (1) and the fact that $[h] \cdot \tau(W_n\omega_R, D)$ is $C_n(D + \operatorname{div}(h))$ -stable. Thus (2) holds.

Let us show (3). We denote by N the right hand side of (3). By $\operatorname{id}_{W_n\omega_R} \in C_n^0(D)$ (where $\operatorname{id}_{W_n\omega_R} : W_n\omega_R \rightarrow W_n\omega_R$ denotes the identity map), we obtain

$$N \supseteq \operatorname{id}_{W_n\omega_R}(F_*^0[c] \cdot M) = [c] \cdot M.$$

Since $[c] \cdot M$ is co-small, so is N . For every $T_n^{e',h} \in C_n^{e'}(D)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} T_n^{e',h}(F_*^{e'}N) &= \sum_{e \geq 0} \sum_{\varphi \in C_n^e(D)} T_n^{e',h}(F_*^{e'}\varphi(F_*^e[c] \cdot M)) \\ &= \sum_{e \geq 0} \sum_{g \in R(-(p^e-1)D)} T_n^{e',h}(F_*^{e'}T_n^{e,g}(F_*^e[c] \cdot M)) \\ &\stackrel{(\star)}{=} \sum_{e \geq 0} \sum_{g \in R(-(p^e-1)D)} T_n^{e+e',h^{p^e}g}(F_*^{e+e'}[c] \cdot M) \subseteq N, \end{aligned}$$

where (\star) follows from Remark 4.4. Therefore, N is $C_n(D)$ -stable. Then (1) implies

$$\tau(W_n\omega_R, D) \subseteq N.$$

The opposite inclusion $N \subseteq \tau(W_n\omega_R, D)$ holds by

$$\begin{aligned} N &= \sum_{e \geq 0} \sum_{\varphi \in C_n^e(D)} \varphi(F_*^e[c] \cdot M) \\ &\subseteq \sum_{e \geq 0} \sum_{\varphi \in C_n^e(D)} \varphi(F_*^e[c] \cdot W_n\omega_R) \\ &\stackrel{(i)}{\subseteq} \sum_{e \geq 0} \sum_{\varphi \in C_n^e(D)} \varphi(F_*^e\tau(W_n\omega_R, D)) \\ &\stackrel{(ii)}{\subseteq} \tau(W_n\omega_R, D), \end{aligned}$$

where (i) follows from Proposition 4.5(3) and (ii) holds by the fact that $\tau(W_n\omega_R, D)$ is $C_n(D)$ -stable. Thus (3) holds.

Let us show (4). Since $D = a\operatorname{div}(f)$, we have $[a(p^e-1)]\operatorname{div}(f) - (p^e-1)D \geq 0$. Hence we get $f^{[a(p^e-1)]} \in R(-(p^e-1)D)$, which shows that

$$T_n^e(F_*^e[f^{[a(p^e-1)]}] \cdot -) \in C_n^e(D).$$

Then the assertion (3) implies

$$\sum_{e \geq 0} T_n^e(F_*^e[cf^{[a(p^e-1)]}] \cdot M) \subseteq \tau(W_n\omega_R, D).$$

Let us prove the opposite inclusion. For every $e \geq 0$ and every $g \in R(-(p^e - 1)D)$, we get

$$\operatorname{div}(g) + \operatorname{div}(f) \geq (p^e - 1)D + \operatorname{div}(f) = (a(p^e - 1) + 1)\operatorname{div}(f) \geq [a(p^e - 1)]\operatorname{div}(f),$$

which implies

$$T_n^{e,g}(F_*^e[cf]M) = T_n^e(F_*^e[cf]M) \subseteq T_n^e(F_*^e[cf^{[a(p^e-1)]}]M).$$

As $cf \in (dt^2) \cap R^\circ$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \tau(W_n\omega_R, D) &\stackrel{(3)}{=} \sum_{e \geq 0} \sum_{T_n^{e,g} \in C_n^e(D)} T_n^{e,g}(F_*^e[cf] \cdot M) \\ &\subseteq \sum_{e \geq 0} T_n^e(F_*^e[cf^{[a(p^e-1)]}]M). \end{aligned}$$

Thus (4) holds.

Let us show (5). By a similar argument to the proofs of Proposition 3.6(4)(5), it is easy to see that (a) implies (b) and (c). Hence it is enough to prove (a). By $c \in (f^{[a]})$, it holds that

$$\begin{aligned} \operatorname{div}(c^{p-1}) + \operatorname{div}(f^{p[a(p^e-1)]}) &\geq (p-1)[a]\operatorname{div}(f) + p[a(p^e-1)]\operatorname{div}(f) \\ &\geq ([a(p-1)] + p[a(p^e-1)])\operatorname{div}(f) \\ &\geq [a(p^{e+1}-1)]\operatorname{div}(f). \end{aligned}$$

We then obtain

$$\begin{aligned} T_n^{e+1}(F_*^{e+1}([cf^{[a(p^{e+1}-1)]}] \cdot \tau(W_n\omega_R, D))) &\supseteq T_n^{e+1}(F_*^{e+1}([c^p f^{p[a(p^e-1)]}] \cdot \tau(W_n\omega_R, D))) \\ &= T_n^e(F_*^e([cf^{[a(p^e-1)]}] \cdot T_n(F_*\tau(W_n\omega_R, D)))) \\ &\supseteq T_n^e(F_*^e([cf^{[a(p^e-1)]}] \cdot \tau(W_n\omega_R, D))), \end{aligned}$$

where the last inclusion follows from (1) and (‡) below.

(‡) $T_n(F_*\tau(W_n\omega_R, D))$ is co-small and $C_n(D)$ -stable.

Let us show (‡). Since it is easy to see that $T_n(F_*\tau(W_n\omega_R, D))$ is co-small, we only prove that $T_n(F_*\tau(W_n\omega_R, D))$ is $C_n(D)$ -stable. Pick an integer $e \geq 0$ and $g \in R(-(p^e - 1)D)$. By

$$g^p \in R(-p(p^e - 1)D) \subseteq R(-(p^e - 1)D),$$

we get

$$\begin{aligned} T_n^e(F_*^e[g] \cdot F_*^e T_n(F_*\tau(W_n\omega_R, D))) &= T_n^{e+1}(F_*^{e+1}([g^p]\tau(W_n\omega_R, D))) \\ &= T_n(F_*(T_n^e(F_*^e([g^p]\tau(W_n\omega_R, D)))) \\ &\subseteq T_n(F_*(\tau(W_n\omega_R, D))). \end{aligned}$$

Thus (‡) holds.

Then (a) holds, which completes the proof of (5). \square

Definition 4.7. We use Notation 4.1. Let D be a \mathbb{Q} -divisor on X . Take $h \in R^\circ$ such that $D + \text{div}(h)$ is effective. We define the $W_n R$ -submodule $\tau(W_n \omega_R, D)$ of $W_n \omega_R \otimes_{W_n R} W_n(K(R))$ by

$$\tau(W_n \omega_R, D) := [h^{-1}] \tau(W_n \omega_R, D + \text{div}(h)) \subseteq W_n \omega_R \otimes_{W_n R} W_n(K(R)).$$

This is independent of the choice of $h \in R^\circ$ by Proposition 4.6(2).

Proposition 4.8. *We use Notation 4.1. Let D be a \mathbb{Q} -divisor on X .*

(1) *If S is a multiplicatively closed subset S of R , then it holds that*

$$\tau(W_n \omega_R, D) \otimes_{W_n R} W_n(S^{-1}R) \simeq \tau(W_n \omega_{S^{-1}R}, j^*D),$$

where $j : \text{Spec } S^{-1}R \rightarrow \text{Spec } R$ denotes the induced morphism.

(2) *If (R, \mathfrak{m}) is a local ring, then it holds that*

$$\tau(W_n \omega_R, D) \otimes_{W_n R} W_n \widehat{R} \simeq \tau(W_n \omega_{\widehat{R}}, \pi^*D),$$

where \widehat{R} denotes the \mathfrak{m} -adic completion of R and $\pi : \text{Spec } \widehat{R} \rightarrow \text{Spec } R$ is the induced morphism.

Proof. Taking $h \in R^\circ$ such that $D + \text{div}[h]$ is effective, we may assume that D is effective (Definition 4.7).

Let us show (1). Pick $d \in R^\circ$ satisfying $D \leq \text{div}(d)$. Fix a test element $t \in R^\circ$ and $c \in (dt^2) \cap R^\circ$. Note that the conditions in Notation 4.1 are preserved under taking localisation. We have

$$\begin{aligned} \tau(W_n \omega_R, D) \otimes_{W_n R} W_n(S^{-1}R) &= \left(\sum_{e \geq 0} \sum_{\varphi \in C_n^e(D)} \varphi(F_*^e[c] \cdot W_n \omega_R) \right) \otimes_{W_n R} W_n(S^{-1}R) \\ &= \sum_{e \geq 0} \sum_{\varphi \in C_n^e(D)} (\varphi \otimes_{W_n R} W_n(S^{-1}R))(F_*^e[c] \cdot W_n \omega_{S^{-1}R}) \\ &\subseteq \sum_{e \geq 0} \sum_{\psi \in C_n^e(j^*D)} \psi(F_*^e[c] \cdot W_n \omega_{S^{-1}R}) \\ &= \tau(W_n \omega_{S^{-1}R}, j^*D), \end{aligned}$$

where the above inclusion holds because we have $\varphi \otimes_{W_n R} W_n(S^{-1}R) \in C_n^e(j^*D)$ for $\varphi \in C_n^e(D)$. It is enough to show the opposite inclusion $\tau(W_n \omega_R, D) \otimes_{W_n R} W_n(S^{-1}R) \supseteq \tau(W_n \omega_{S^{-1}R}, j^*D)$. Take $e \geq 0$, $z \in W_n \omega_{S^{-1}R}$, and $\psi \in C_n^e(D|_U)$. It suffices to show $\psi(F_*^e[c] \cdot z) \in \tau(W_n \omega_R, D) \otimes_{W_n R} W_n(S^{-1}R)$. We have $s_1 z \in W_n \omega_R$ for some $s_1 \in S$. We can write $\psi = T_n^{e,g}$ for some

$$g \in \mathcal{O}_{\text{Spec } S^{-1}R}(-(p^e - 1)j^*D) = j^*R(-(p^e - 1)D) = R(-(p^e - 1)D) \otimes_R S^{-1}R.$$

Then there exists $s_2 \in S$ such that $s_2 g \in R(-(p^e - 1)D)$. In particular, $T_n^{e, c_2 g} \in C_n^e(D)$. Therefore, we have

$$[s_1 s_2] \cdot \psi(F_*^e([c] \cdot z)) = T_n^{e,g}(F_*^e([c s_1^e s_2^e] \cdot z)) = T_n^{e, s_2 g}(F_*^e([c] \cdot [s_1^{p^e - 1} s_2^{p^e - 1}] \cdot (s_1 z)))$$

$$\in T_n^{e, s_2 g}(F_*([c] \cdot W_n \omega_R)) \subseteq \tau(W_n \omega_R, D).$$

Hence $\psi(F_*^e([c] \cdot z)) \in \tau(W_n \omega_R, D) \otimes_{W_n R} W_n(S^{-1}R)$. Thus (1) holds.

Let us show (2). The inclusion $\pi^* \tau(W_n \omega_R, D) \subseteq \tau(W_n \omega_{\widehat{R}}, \pi^* D)$ follows from a similar argument to the one of (1). Then we have the induced injective $W_n \widehat{R}$ -module homomorphism

$$\iota: \pi^* \tau(W_n \omega_R, D) \hookrightarrow \tau(W_n \omega_{\widehat{R}}, \pi^* D)$$

of finitely generated $W_n \widehat{R}$. By the Artin-Rees lemma and completeness, it is enough to show that ι is surjective after taking modulo $W_n(\mathfrak{m}^l)W_n \omega_{\widehat{R}} \cap \tau(W_n \omega_{\widehat{R}}, \pi^* D)$ for every positive integer l . If $\psi \in C_n^e(\pi^* D)$, then there exists $g \in \mathcal{O}_{X'}(-(p^e - 1)\pi^* D)$ such that $\psi = T_g^e$. By $\mathcal{O}_{X'}(-(p^e - 1)\pi^* D) \simeq \pi^* R(-(p^e - 1)D)$, there exists $g' \in R(-(p^e - 1)D)$ such that $g - g' \in (\mathfrak{m}^l)^{[p^e]}$. Then we have $\alpha := [g] - [g'] \in W_n((\mathfrak{m}^l)^{[p^e]} \widehat{R})$. In particular, we have

$$T^{e, \alpha}(F_*^e[c]W_n \omega_{\widehat{R}}) \subseteq W_n(\mathfrak{m}^l)W_n \omega_{\widehat{R}}.$$

Therefore, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \psi(F_*^e[c] \cdot W_n \omega_{\widehat{R}}) &= T_n^{e, g}(F_*^e[c] \cdot W_n \omega_{\widehat{R}}) \\ &\equiv T_n^{e, g'}(F_*^e[c] \cdot W_n \omega_{\widehat{R}}) \quad \text{mod } W_n(\mathfrak{m}^l)W_n \omega_{\widehat{R}} \cap \tau(W_n \omega_{\widehat{R}}, \pi^* D) \\ &\subseteq \pi^* \tau(W_n \omega_R, D). \end{aligned}$$

Thus, we obtain the surjectivity of ι after taking modulo $W_n(\mathfrak{m}^l)W_n \omega_{\widehat{R}} \cap \tau(W_n \omega_{\widehat{R}}, \pi^* D)$. \square

Proposition 4.9. *We use Notation 4.1. Let D be a \mathbb{Q} -divisor on X . Then, for every integer $n \geq 2$, the $W_n R$ -module homomorphism $R^*: W_{n-1} \omega_R \rightarrow W_n \omega_R$ induces the following $W_n R$ -module homomorphism:*

$$R^*: \tau(W_{n-1} \omega_R, D) \rightarrow \tau(W_n \omega_R, D).$$

Proof. We may assume that D is effective. It is enough to show that $(R^*)^{-1}(\tau(W_n \omega_R, D))$ is co-small and $C_{n-1}(D)$ -stable (as these imply $\tau(W_{n-1} \omega_R, D) \subseteq (R^*)^{-1}(\tau(W_n \omega_R, D))$ by Proposition 4.6(1)). Since $\tau(W_n \omega_R, D)$ is co-small, we get $[c] \cdot W_n \omega_R \subseteq \tau(W_n \omega_R, D)$ for some $c \in R^\circ$, which implies

$$R^*([c] \cdot W_{n-1} \omega_R) = [c] \cdot R^*(W_{n-1} \omega_R) \subseteq \tau(W_n \omega_R, D),$$

i.e., $[c] \cdot W_{n-1} \omega_R \subseteq (R^*)^{-1}(\tau(W_n \omega_R, D))$. Thus $(R^*)^{-1}(\tau(W_n \omega_R, D))$ is co-small.

It suffices to show that $(R^*)^{-1}(\tau(W_n \omega_R, D))$ is $C_{n-1}(D)$ -stable. Take $e \geq 0$ and $T_{n-1}^{e, g} \in C_{n-1}^e(D)$, where $g \in R(-(p^e - 1)D)$. We have

$$R^* \circ T_{n-1}^{e, g} = T_n^{e, g} \circ R^*$$

for $T_n^{e, g} \in C_n^e(D)$, because we have $T_m^{e, g}(-) = T_m^e(F_*^e[g] \cdot -)$ for $m \in \{n-1, n\}$. Therefore, we get

$$\begin{aligned} R^* \circ T_{n-1}^{e, g}(F_*^e(R^*)^{-1}(\tau(W_n \omega_R, D))) &= T_n^{e, g} \circ R^*((R^*)^{-1}(F_*^e \tau(W_n \omega_R, D))) \\ &\subseteq T_n^{e, g}(F_*^e \tau(W_n \omega_R, D)) \subseteq \tau(W_n \omega_R, D), \end{aligned}$$

where the last inclusion follows from the fact that $\tau(W_n \omega_R, D)$ is $C_n(D)$ -stable (Proposition 4.6(1)). Hence $(R^*)^{-1}(\tau(W_n \omega_R, D))$ is $C_{n-1}(D)$ -stable. \square

Definition 4.10. We use Notation 4.1. Let D be a \mathbb{Q} -divisor on X .

(1) We set

$$\tau_n(\omega_R, D) := ((R^{n-1})^*)^{-1}(\tau(W_n\omega_R, D)),$$

which is the R -submodule of $\omega_R(-D)$ obtained as the inverse image of $\tau(W_n\omega_R, D)$ by

$$(R^{n-1})^* : \omega_R(-D) \rightarrow W_n\omega_R(-D).$$

We call $\tau_n(\omega_R, D)$ the n -quasi-test R -submodule of ω_R along D . We have the following inclusions (Remark 4.11):

$$(4.10.1) \quad \tau_1(\omega, D) \subseteq \tau_2(\omega, D) \subseteq \cdots \subseteq \tau_n(\omega, D) \subseteq \tau_{n+1}(\omega, D) \subseteq \cdots \subseteq \omega_R(-D).$$

(2) We set $\tau^q(\omega_R, D) := \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \tau_n(\omega_R, D)$. Since (4.10.1) is an ascending chain of R -submodules of $\omega_R(-D)$, there exists $n_0 > 0$ such that

$$\tau^q(\omega_R, D) := \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \tau_n(\omega_R, D) = \tau_n(\omega_R, D) \subseteq \omega_R(-D)$$

for every integer $n \geq n_0$. In particular, $\tau^q(\omega_R, D)$ an R -submodule of ω_R . We call $\tau^q(\omega_R, D)$ the quasi-test R -submodule of ω_R along D .

Remark 4.11. We use the same notation as in Definition 4.10. We have the following commutative diagram in which each horizontal sequence is exact:

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} 0 & \longrightarrow & \omega_R(-D) & \xrightarrow{(R^{n-1})^*} & W_n\omega_R(-D) & \xrightarrow{V^*} & F_*W_{n-1}\omega_R(-pD) \\ & & \parallel & & \downarrow R^* & & \downarrow R^* \\ 0 & \longrightarrow & \omega_R(-D) & \xrightarrow{(R^n)^*} & W_{n+1}\omega_R(-D) & \xrightarrow{V^*} & F_*W_n\omega_R(-pD). \end{array}$$

This diagram, together with Proposition 4.9, induces the following commutative diagram in which each horizontal sequence is exact:

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} 0 & \longrightarrow & \tau_n(\omega_R, D) & \xrightarrow{(R^{n-1})^*} & \tau(W_n\omega_R, D) & \xrightarrow{V^*} & F_*W_{n-1}\omega_R(-pD) \\ & & & & \downarrow R^* & & \downarrow R^* \\ 0 & \longrightarrow & \tau_{n+1}(\omega_R, D) & \xrightarrow{(R^n)^*} & \tau(W_{n+1}\omega_R, D) & \xrightarrow{V^*} & F_*W_n\omega_R(-pD). \end{array}$$

Therefore, we obtain an inclusion $\tau_n(\omega_R, D) \subseteq \tau_{n+1}(\omega_R, D)$.

Proposition 4.12. We use Notation 4.1. Take a \mathbb{Q} -Cartier \mathbb{Q} -divisor D and an effective \mathbb{Q} -divisor E on X . Then the following hold.

(1) For every integer $n \geq 1$, there exists a rational number $\epsilon_n > 0$ such that

$$\tau(W_n\omega_R, D) = \tau(W_n\omega_R, D + \epsilon_n E)$$

(2) There exists a rational number $\epsilon > 0$ such that

$$\tau_n(\omega_R, D) = \tau_n(\omega_R, D + \epsilon E) \quad \text{and} \quad \tau^q(\omega_R, D) = \tau^q(\omega_R, D + \epsilon E)$$

for every integer $n > 0$.

Proof. We first reduce the problem to the case when

- (i) $D = a\operatorname{div}(f)$ for some $a \in \mathbb{Q}_{>0}$ and $f \in R^\circ$,
- (ii) $E = \operatorname{div}(g)$ for some $g \in R^\circ$, and
- (iii) $a < 1$.

Enlarging E , we may assume that E is an effective Cartier divisor. Taking a suitable affine open cover of X , we may assume that (i) and (ii) hold. By $D = a\operatorname{div}(f) = \frac{a}{r}\operatorname{div}(f^r)$ for every $r \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$, we may assume (iii).

Let us show (1). Fix $n \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$. For $\epsilon \in \mathbb{Q}_{>0}$, the inclusion

$$\tau(W_n\omega_R, D + \epsilon E) \subseteq \tau(W_n\omega_R, D)$$

is clear by definition. Pick a test element $t \in R^\circ$ and $c \in R^\circ \cap (fgt^2) \cap (f^{[a]})$. By applying Proposition 4.6(5)(c) for $L = W_n\omega_R$, there exists an integer $e > 0$ (depending on n) such that

$$\tau(W_n\omega_R, D) = T_n^e(F_*^e[cg][f^{[a(p^e-1)]}]W_n\omega_R).$$

Set $\epsilon_n := \frac{1}{p^e-1}$. We then get

$$\begin{aligned} \tau(W_n\omega_R, D) &= T_n^e(F_*^e[cg][f^{[a(p^e-1)]}]W_n\omega_R) \\ &= T_n^e(F_*^e[c][f^{[a(p^e-1)]}g^{[\epsilon_n(p^e-1)]}]W_n\omega_R) \\ &\stackrel{(\star)}{\subseteq} \tau(W_n\omega_R, D + \epsilon_n E), \end{aligned}$$

where (\star) can be proven as follows. By Proposition 4.6(3), it is enough to show

$$f^{[a(p^e-1)]}g^{[\epsilon_n(p^e-1)]} \in R(-(p^e-1)(D + \epsilon_n E)),$$

that is, $\operatorname{div}(f^{[a(p^e-1)]}g^{[\epsilon_n(p^e-1)]}) \geq (p^e-1)(D + \epsilon_n E)$, which is assured by

$$[a(p^e-1)]\operatorname{div}(f) \geq (p^e-1)D \quad \text{and} \quad [\epsilon_n(p^e-1)]\operatorname{div}(g) = \operatorname{div}(g) = \epsilon_n(p^e-1)E.$$

Thus (1) holds.

Let us show (2). For every $\epsilon > 0$, the inclusion $\tau^q(\omega_R, D + \epsilon E) \subseteq \tau^q(\omega_R, D)$ is clear. Fix an integer $n_0 > 0$ satisfying $\tau^q(\omega_R, D) = \tau_{n_0}(\omega_R, D)$ (Definition 4.10). By (1) and Definition 4.10, there exists $\epsilon_0 > 0$ (depending on n_0) such that $\tau_{n_0}(\omega_R, D + \epsilon_0 E) = \tau_{n_0}(\omega_R, D)$. Then we get

$$\tau^q(\omega_R, D + \epsilon_0 E) \supseteq \tau_{n_0}(\omega_R, D + \epsilon_0 E) = \tau_{n_0}(\omega_R, D) = \tau^q(\omega_R, D).$$

This completes the proof of $\tau^q(\omega_R, D) = \tau^q(\omega_R, D + \epsilon_0 E)$.

Again by Definition 4.10, we can find $n_1 > 0$ such that

$$\tau_n(\omega_R, D) = \tau^q(\omega_R, D) = \tau^q(\omega_R, D + \epsilon_0 E) = \tau_n(\omega_R, D + \epsilon_0 E)$$

for every $n > n_1$. Set

$$\epsilon := \min\{\epsilon_0, \epsilon_1, \dots, \epsilon_{n_1}\},$$

where each of $\epsilon_1, \dots, \epsilon_{n_1}$ is as in (1). Then, for every $1 \leq n \leq n_1$, we get $\tau_n(\omega_R, D) = \tau_n(\omega_R, D + \epsilon E)$ by (1). Thus (2) holds. \square

At this point, we do not know yet if the condition that $\tau_n(\omega_R, K_R + \Delta) = R$ is equivalent to (R, Δ) being n -quasi- F -regular, when $K_R + \Delta$ is \mathbb{Q} -Cartier. In order to verify this, we need to develop the theory of quasi-tight closure.

4.2. Quasi-tight closure in local cohomologies (pairs).

Notation 4.13. Let (R, \mathfrak{m}) be an F -finite Noetherian normal local ring of characteristic $p > 0$. Set $d := \dim R$ and $X := \operatorname{Spec} R$.

We use Notation 4.13. Take $c \in R^\circ$, a \mathbb{Q} -divisor D on X , and integers $n > 0$ and $e \geq 0$. We define the $W_n R$ -modules $Q_{R,D,n}^e$ and $Q_{R,D,n}^{e,c}$ and the $W_n R$ -module homomorphisms $\Phi_{R,D,n}^e$ and $\Phi_{R,D,n}^{e,c}$ by the following diagram in which all the squares are pushouts:

$$(4.13.1) \quad \begin{array}{ccccc} W_n R(D) & \xrightarrow{F^e} & F_*^e(W_n R(p^e D)) & \xrightarrow{\cdot F_*^e[c]} & F_*^e(W_n R(p^e D)) \\ R^{n-1} \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ R(D) & \xrightarrow{\Phi_{R,D,n}^e} & Q_{R,D,n}^e & \xrightarrow{\quad\quad\quad} & Q_{R,D,n}^{e,c} \\ & \searrow & & \nearrow & \\ & & \Phi_{R,D,n}^{e,c} & & \end{array}$$

Definition 4.14. We use Notation 4.13. Take integers $n > 0$ and $e \geq 0$. Let D be a \mathbb{Q} -divisor on X .

(1) For $c \in R^\circ$, we set

$$\widetilde{K}_{D,n}^{e,c} := \operatorname{Ker} \left(H_{\mathfrak{m}}^d(W_n R(D)) \xrightarrow{F^e} H_{\mathfrak{m}}^d(F_*^e W_n R(p^e D)) \xrightarrow{\cdot F_*^e[c]} H_{\mathfrak{m}}^d(F_*^e W_n R(p^e D)) \right),$$

which is a $W_n R$ -submodule of $H_{\mathfrak{m}}^d(W_n R(D))$. Then we define $\widetilde{0}_{D,n}^*$ by

$$\widetilde{0}_{D,n}^* := \bigcup_{\substack{c \in R^\circ, \\ e_0 \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}}} \bigcap_{e \geq e_0} \widetilde{K}_{D,n}^{e,c} \subseteq H_{\mathfrak{m}}^d(W_n R(D)).$$

Equivalently, given $z \in H_{\mathfrak{m}}^d(W_n R(D))$, we have $z \in \widetilde{0}_{D,n}^*$ if and only if there exist $c \in R^\circ$ and $e_0 \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$ such that z is contained in $\widetilde{K}_{D,n}^{e,c}$ for every integer $e \geq e_0$. Note that $\widetilde{0}_{D,n}^*$ is a $W_n R$ -submodule of $H_{\mathfrak{m}}^d(W_n R(D))$ (cf. Remark 3.17).

(2) For $c \in R^\circ$, we set

$$K_{D,n}^{e,c} := \operatorname{Ker} \left(H_{\mathfrak{m}}^d(R(D)) \xrightarrow{\Phi_{R,D,n}^{e,c}} H_{\mathfrak{m}}^d(Q_{R,D,n}^{e,c}) \right),$$

which is an R -submodule of $H_{\mathfrak{m}}^d(R(D))$. We define the n -quasi-tight closure $0_{D,n}^*$ by

$$0_{D,n}^* := \bigcup_{\substack{c \in R^\circ, \\ e_0 \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}}} \bigcap_{e \geq e_0} K_{D,n}^{e,c} \subseteq H_{\mathfrak{m}}^d(R(D)).$$

Equivalently, given $z \in H_m^d(R)$, we have $z \in 0_{D,n}^*$ if and only if there exist $c \in R^\circ$ and $e_0 \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$ such that z is contained in $K_{D,n}^{e,c}$ for every integer $e \geq e_0$. Note that $0_{D,n}^*$ is an R -submodule of $H_m^d(R(D))$ (cf. Remark 3.17).

Remark 4.15 (cf. Remark 3.18). We use Notation 4.13. Take a \mathbb{Q} -divisor D on X .

(1) Consider the commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccc}
H_m^d(F_*W_{n-1}R) & \xlongequal{\quad} & H_m^d(F_*W_{n-1}R) & \xlongequal{\quad} & H_m^d(F_*W_{n-1}R) \\
\downarrow V & & \downarrow F^e V & & \downarrow (\cdot F_*^e[c]) \circ F^e V \\
H_m^d(W_n R(D)) & \xrightarrow{F^e} & H_m^d(F_*^e W_n R(p^e D)) & \xrightarrow{\cdot F_*^e[c]} & H_m^d(F_*^e W_n R(p^e D)) \\
\downarrow R^{n-1} & & \downarrow & & \downarrow \\
H_m^d(R(D)) & \longrightarrow & H_m^d(Q_{R,D,n}^{e,c}) & \longrightarrow & H_m^d(Q_{R,D,n}^{e,c})
\end{array}$$

where the vertical sequences are exact. By diagram chase, we get

$$R^{n-1}(\widetilde{K_{D,n}^{e,c}}) = K_{D,n}^{e,c}.$$

(2) We have

$$H_m^d(R(D)) \supseteq 0_{D,1}^* \supseteq 0_{D,2}^* \supseteq 0_{D,3}^* \supseteq \cdots.$$

Indeed, this holds by the following factorisation:

$$H_m^d(R(D)) \rightarrow H_m^d(Q_{R,D,n+1}^{e,c}) \rightarrow H_m^d(Q_{R,D,n}^{e,c}).$$

(3) By Proposition 2.15 and Definition 4.14, it holds that

$$\widetilde{0_{D,1}^*} = 0_{D,1}^* = 0_{H_m^d(R(D))}^{\{D\}}.$$

Proposition 4.16. *We use Notation 4.13. Take a \mathbb{Q} -Cartier \mathbb{Q} -divisor D on X . Then the following hold.*

- (1) $R(\widetilde{0_{D,n+1}^*}) \subseteq \widetilde{0_{D,n}^*}$.
- (2) $V^{-1}(\widetilde{0_{D,n}^*}) = F_* \widetilde{0_{pD,n-1}^*}$.

Statement (1) says that the first commutative diagram below exists, whilst Statement (2) implies that the second diagram exists and is Cartesian:

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
H_m^d(W_{n+1}R(D)) & \xrightarrow{R} & H_m^d(W_n R(D)) & & H_m^d(F_*W_{n-1}R(pD)) & \xrightarrow{V} & H_m^d(W_n R(D)) \\
\uparrow & & \uparrow & & \uparrow & & \uparrow \\
\widetilde{0_{D,n+1}^*} & \xrightarrow{R} & \widetilde{0_{D,n}^*} & & F_* \widetilde{0_{pD,n-1}^*} & \xrightarrow{V} & \widetilde{0_{D,n}^*}
\end{array}$$

Proof. By Definition 4.14, (1) holds. Let us show (2). By Definition 4.14, we get

$$\widetilde{0_{D,n}^*} \supseteq V(F_* \widetilde{0_{pD,n-1}^*}),$$

that is, $V^{-1}(\widetilde{0_{D,n}^*}) \supseteq F_* \widetilde{0_{pD,n-1}^*}$. In what follows, we prove the opposite inclusion

$$V^{-1}(\widetilde{0_{D,n}^*}) \subseteq F_* \widetilde{0_{pD,n-1}^*}.$$

Take $F_*z \in V^{-1}(\widetilde{0_{D,n}^*})$, that is, $V(F_*z) \in \widetilde{0_{D,n}^*}$. Then there exist $c \in R^\circ$ and $e_0 > 0$ such that $V(F_*z) \in \bigcap_{e \geq e_0} \widetilde{K_{D,n}^{e,c}}$. Since R is a local ring and D is a \mathbb{Q} -Cartier \mathbb{Q} -divisor on $\text{Spec } R$, there are finitely many possibilities for $R(p^e D)$, up to isomorphisms, when $e \geq 0$. Hence we can find $c' \in R^\circ$ such that $c' \cdot H_{\mathfrak{m}}^{d-1}(R(p^e D)) = 0$ for every $e \geq 0$ (Lemma 3.19), which implies that

$$(F_*^e c') \cdot H_{\mathfrak{m}}^{d-1}(F_*^e R(p^e D)) = (F_*^e c') \cdot F_*^e H_{\mathfrak{m}}^{d-1}(R(p^e D)) = F_*^e (c' \cdot H_{\mathfrak{m}}^{d-1}(R(p^e D))) = 0$$

for every $e \geq 0$. Given a \mathbb{Q} -divisor E , we have the exact sequence

$$H_{\mathfrak{m}}^{d-1}(R(E)) \rightarrow H_{\mathfrak{m}}^d(F_* W_{n-1} R(pE)) \xrightarrow{V} H_{\mathfrak{m}}^d(W_n R(E)).$$

Hence we get the following commutative diagram in which each horizontal sequence is exact:

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} H_{\mathfrak{m}}^{d-1}(R(D)) & \longrightarrow & V^{-1}(\widetilde{0_{D,n}^*}) & \xrightarrow{V} & \widetilde{0_{D,n}^*} \\ \downarrow F^e & & \downarrow F^e & & \downarrow F^e \\ H_{\mathfrak{m}}^{d-1}(F_*^e R(p^e D)) & \longrightarrow & F_*^e V^{-1}(\widetilde{0_{p^e D,n}^*}) & \xrightarrow{V} & F_*^e \widetilde{0_{p^e D,n}^*} \\ \downarrow \cdot F_*^e [c] & & \downarrow \cdot F_*^e [c] & & \downarrow \cdot F_*^e [c] \\ H_{\mathfrak{m}}^{d-1}(F_*^e R(p^e D)) & \longrightarrow & F_*^e V^{-1}(\widetilde{0_{p^e D,n}^*}) & \xrightarrow{V} & F_*^e \widetilde{0_{p^e D,n}^*} \\ \downarrow \cdot F_*^e [c'] = 0 & & \downarrow \cdot F_*^e [c'] & & \downarrow \cdot F_*^e [c'] \\ H_{\mathfrak{m}}^{d-1}(F_*^e R(p^e D)) & \longrightarrow & F_*^e V^{-1}(\widetilde{0_{p^e D,n}^*}) & \xrightarrow{V} & F_*^e \widetilde{0_{p^e D,n}^*}. \end{array}$$

By the diagram chase starting with $F_*z \in V^{-1}(\widetilde{0_{D,n}^*})$ (located in the centre at the top), we get $(F_*^e [cc']) \circ F^e(F_*z) = 0$ for every $e \geq e_0$, and hence $F_*z \in F_* \widetilde{0_{pD,n-1}^*}$. Thus (2) holds. \square

The choice of $t \in \tau(R, \{p^e D\})$ is motivated by Proposition 2.15 and Definition 2.16.

Proposition 4.17. *We use Notation 4.13. Take a \mathbb{Q} -Cartier \mathbb{Q} -divisor D on X and $t \in R^\circ$ such that t is contained in $\tau(R, \{p^e D\})$ for every $e \geq 0$. Fix integers $n > 0$ and $m \geq 0$. Then the following hold.*

- (1) $[t^2] \cdot \widetilde{0_{D,n}^*} = 0$.
- (2) $[t^2] \cdot \text{Ker}(F_*^m : H_{\mathfrak{m}}^d(W_n R(D)) \rightarrow H_{\mathfrak{m}}^d(W_n R(p^m D))) = 0$.

Proof. We have the following inclusion (Definition 4.14(1)):

$$\text{Ker}(F_*^m : H_{\mathfrak{m}}^d(W_n R(D)) \rightarrow H_{\mathfrak{m}}^d(F_*^m W_n R(p^m D))) \subseteq \widetilde{0_{D,n}^*}.$$

Hence (1) implies (2).

Thus, it is enough to prove (1). Specifically, we will show that $[t^2] \cdot \widetilde{0_{D,n}^*} = 0$ by an increasing induction on n (for D replaced by any p^k -th multiple of D). The base case $n = 1$ holds by

$$[t] \cdot \widetilde{0_{D,1}^*} = [t] \cdot 0_{D,1}^* = t \cdot 0_{H_{\mathfrak{m}}^d(R(D))}^*\{D\} = 0$$

(Remark 4.15(3)). Now assume $n \geq 2$ and consider the exact sequence

$$(4.17.1) \quad H_m^d(F_*W_{n-1}R(pD)) \xrightarrow{V} H_m^d(W_nR(D)) \xrightarrow{R^{n-1}} H_m^d(R(D)).$$

Fix $z \in \widetilde{0_{D,n}^*}$. Since $R^{n-1}(z) \in \widetilde{0_{D,1}^*}$ (Proposition 4.16(1)), we get that $R^{n-1}([t]z) = [t]R^{n-1}(z) = 0$. Then the exact sequence (4.17.1) enables us to find

$$F_*z' \in F_*H_m^d(W_{n-1}R(pD)) = H_m^d(F_*W_{n-1}R(pD))$$

satisfying $V(F_*z') = [t]z$. As $F_*z' \in V^{-1}(\widetilde{0_{D,n}^*}) = F_*\widetilde{0_{pD,n-1}^*}$ (Proposition 4.16(2)), we get $z' \in \widetilde{0_{pD,n-1}^*}$, and so, by the induction hypothesis, $[t^2]z' = 0$. We thus obtain

$$[t^2]z = [t]V(F_*z') = V([t]F_*z') = V(F_*([t^p]z')) = 0.$$

Hence (1) holds. \square

Proposition 4.18. *We use Notation 4.13. Fix $t \in \tau(R) \cap R^\circ$ and an integer $n > 0$. Let D be a \mathbb{Q} -Cartier \mathbb{Q} -divisor on X . Assume that there exist $g \in R^\circ$ and a \mathbb{Q} -Cartier Weil divisor D' on X such that $D \leq D' \leq D + \text{div}(g)$. Then the following hold.*

- (1) $[t^2g] \cdot \widetilde{0_{D,n}^*} = 0$.
- (2) For every integer $m \geq 0$,

$$[t^2g] \cdot \text{Ker}(F^m : H_m^d(W_nR(D)) \rightarrow H_m^d(W_nR(p^mD))) = 0.$$

Proof. We have the following commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} H_m^d(W_nR(D)) & \xrightarrow{\iota} & H_m^d(W_nR(D')) \\ \downarrow F^e & & \downarrow F^e \\ H_m^d(F_*W_nR(p^eD)) & \xrightarrow{\iota'} & H_m^d(F_*W_nR(p^eD')), \end{array}$$

where ι and ι' are the W_nR -module homomorphisms induced by the natural inclusions $W_nR(D) \hookrightarrow W_nR(D')$ and $W_nR(p^eD) \hookrightarrow W_nR(p^eD')$, respectively. Thus $\iota(\widetilde{0_{D,n}^*}) \subseteq \widetilde{0_{D',n}^*}$. By Proposition 4.17(1), we have $[t^2] \cdot \widetilde{0_{D',n}^*} = 0$, which implies $[t^2] \cdot \widetilde{0_{D,n}^*} \subseteq \text{Ker}(\iota)$. By the factorisation:

$$\cdot[g] : W_nR(D) \hookrightarrow W_nR(D') \hookrightarrow W_nR(D + \text{div}(g)) \xrightarrow{\simeq, \cdot[g]} W_nR(D),$$

we get $[gt^2] \cdot \widetilde{0_{D,n}^*} = 0$. Thus (1) holds. The assertion (2) follows from (1) and $\text{Ker}(F^m) \subseteq \widetilde{0_{D,n}^*}$ (Definition 4.14). \square

Proposition 4.19. *We use Notation 4.13. Let D be a \mathbb{Q} -Cartier \mathbb{Q} -divisor on X such that $D = a \cdot \text{div}(g)$ for some $a \in \mathbb{Q}$ and $g \in R^\circ$. Take a test element $t \in R^\circ$ and $t_D \in R^\circ$ satisfying $t_D \in \tau(R, \{p^eD\})$ for every integer $e \geq 0$. Fix $c \in R^\circ \cap ((g^2t^4) \cup (t_D^4))$. Then the following hold.*

$$(1) \quad H_m^d(W_nR(D)) \supseteq \widetilde{K_{D,n}^{0,c}} \supseteq \widetilde{K_{D,n}^{1,c}} \supseteq \cdots \supseteq \widetilde{K_{D,n}^{e,c}} \supseteq \widetilde{K_{D,n}^{e+1,c}} \supseteq \cdots$$

(2) *There exists an integer $e_0 \geq 0$ such that*

$$\widetilde{0_{D,n}^*} = \widetilde{K_{D,n}^{e,c}}$$

for every integer $e \geq e_0$.

Proof. We first treat the case when $c \in R^\circ \cap (g^2 t^4)$. In this case, we have $c = c' g^2 t^4$ for some $c' \in R^\circ$.

Let us show (1). Set $D_e := [ap^e] \operatorname{div}(g)$ and take $z \in \widetilde{K_{D,n}^{e+1,c}}$. Since we have $cc_1 = c'^p g^p t^{2p}$ for $c_1 := c'^{p-1} g^{p-2} t^{2p-4} \in R^\circ$, we get

$$0 = F_*^{e+1}[cc_1] \cdot F^{e+1}(z) = F_*^{e+1}[c'^p g^p t^{2p}] \cdot F^{e+1}(z) = F(F_*^e[c' g t^2] \cdot F^e(z)).$$

As $z \in H_m^d(R(D))$, we have

$$F_*^e[c' g t^2] \cdot F^e(z) \in F_*^e[c' g t^2] \cdot H_m^d(F_*^e R(p^e D)) \subseteq H_m^d(F_*^e R(p^e D)).$$

By $p^e D \leq D_e \leq p^e D + \operatorname{div}(g)$, we may apply Proposition 4.18(1), and hence $[t^2 g] \cdot \widetilde{0_{p^e D, n}^*} = 0$. Then

$$0 = F_*^e[t^2 g] \cdot F_*^e[c' g t^2] \cdot F^e(z) = F_*^e[c' g^2 t^4] \cdot F^e(z) = F_*^e[c] \cdot F^e(z).$$

Therefore, $z \in \widetilde{K_{D,n}^{e,c}}$. Thus (1) holds.

Let us show (2). Since $H_m^d(W_n R(D))$ is an Artinian $W_n R$ -module, (1) enables us to find an integer $e_0 > 0$ such that $\widetilde{K_{D,n}^{e,c}} = \widetilde{K_{D,n}^{e_0,c}}$ for every $e \geq e_0$. Definition 4.14(1) implies

$$\widetilde{0_{D,n}^*} \supseteq \bigcap_{e \geq 0} \widetilde{K_{D,n}^{e,c}} = \widetilde{K_{D,n}^{e_0,c}}.$$

Conversely, if $z \in \widetilde{0_{D,n}^*}$ and $e \geq 0$, then we get

$$\begin{aligned} F_*^e[c] \cdot F^e(z) &\in F_*^e[c] \cdot F^e(\widetilde{0_{D,n}^*}) \subseteq F_*^e[c] \cdot \widetilde{F_*^e 0_{p^e D, n}^*} \\ &= F_*^e([c' g^2 t^4] \cdot \widetilde{0_{p^e D, n}^*}) = F_*^e([c' t^2] \cdot [g t^2] \cdot \widetilde{0_{p^e D, n}^*}) = 0, \end{aligned}$$

where the last equality follows from Proposition 4.18(1), which is applicable by $p^e D \leq D_e \leq p^e D + \operatorname{div}(g)$. Therefore, $z \in \bigcap_{e \geq 0} \widetilde{K_{D,n}^{e,c}} = \widetilde{K_{D,n}^{e_0,c}}$. Thus (2) holds.

As for the case when $c \in R^\circ \cap (t_D^4)$, we may apply the same argument as above by using Proposition 4.17 instead of Proposition 4.18. \square

Theorem 4.20. *We use Notation 4.13. Let D be a \mathbb{Q} -Cartier \mathbb{Q} -divisor on X . Then*

$$R^{n-1}(\widetilde{0_{D,n}^*}) = 0_{D,n}^*.$$

Proof. First, we prove that $R^{n-1}(\widetilde{0_{D,n}^*}) \subseteq 0_{D,n}^*$. Take $z \in \widetilde{0_{D,n}^*}$. Then there exist $e_0 \geq 0$ and $c \in R^\circ$ such that $z \in \bigcap_{e \geq e_0} \widetilde{K_{D,n}^{e,c}}$. We get

$$R^{n-1}(z) \in R^{n-1} \left(\bigcap_{e \geq e_0} \widetilde{K_{D,n}^{e,c}} \right) \subseteq \bigcap_{e \geq e_0} R^{n-1} \left(\widetilde{K_{D,n}^{e,c}} \right) = \bigcap_{e \geq e_0} K_{D,n}^{e,c},$$

which implies $R^{n-1}(z) \in 0_{D,n}^*$. Here the last equality follows from Remark 4.15(1). This completes the proof of the inclusion $R^{n-1}(\widetilde{0_{D,n}^*}) \subseteq 0_{D,n}^*$.

Now, it is enough to show the opposite inclusion $R^{n-1}(\widetilde{0_{D,n}^*}) \supseteq 0_{D,n}^*$. We have $D = a \cdot \text{div}(g)$ for some $a \in \mathbb{Q}$ and $g \in R^\circ$. Take $z \in 0_{D,n}^*$ and $t \in \tau(R) \cap R^\circ$. There exist $c \in R^\circ$ and $e_1 > 0$ such that $z \in \bigcap_{e \geq e_1} K_{D,n}^{e,c}$. Replacing c by cg^{2t^4} (this is allowed by $K_{D,n}^{e,c} \subseteq K_{D,n}^{e,cg^{2t^4}}$), we may assume $K_{D,n}^{e,c} = \widetilde{0_{D,n}^*}$ for $e \gg 0$ (Proposition 4.19(2)). For $e \gg 0$, we obtain

$$z \in \bigcap_{e \geq e_1} K_{D,n}^{e,c} \subseteq K_{D,n}^{e,c} \stackrel{(\star)}{=} R^{n-1}(\widetilde{K_{D,n}^{e,c}}) = R^{n-1}(\widetilde{0_{D,n}^*}),$$

where the equality (\star) follows from (Remark 4.15(1)). Thus $R^{n-1}(\widetilde{0_{D,n}^*}) \supseteq 0_{D,n}^*$. \square

Proposition 4.21. *We use Notation 4.13. Let D be a \mathbb{Q} -Cartier \mathbb{Q} -divisor on X such that $D = a \cdot \text{div}(g)$ for some $a \in \mathbb{Q}$ and $g \in R^\circ$. Take $t \in \tau(R) \cap R^\circ$ and $t_D \in R^\circ$ satisfying $t_D \in \tau(R, \{p^e D\})$ for every integer $e \geq 0$. Fix $c \in R^\circ \cap ((g^{2t^4}) \cup (t_D^4))$. Then the following hold.*

- (1) $H_m^d(R(D)) \supseteq K_{D,n}^{0,c} \supseteq K_{D,n}^{1,c} \supseteq \cdots \supseteq K_{D,n}^{e,c} \supseteq K_{D,n}^{e+1,c} \supseteq \cdots$.
- (2) *There exists an integer $e_1 \geq 0$ such that*

$$0_{D,n}^* = K_{D,n}^{e,c}$$

for every integer $e \geq e_1$.

- (3) *If there exists an integer $e_2 \geq 0$ satisfying $K_{D,n}^{e_2,c} = 0$, then $0_{D,n}^* = 0$.*

Proof. The assertions (1) and (2) follow from Proposition 4.19, Theorem 4.20, and $R^{n-1}(\widetilde{K_{D,n}^{e,c}}) = K_{D,n}^{e,c}$ (Remark 4.15(1)). \square

The following lemma will be essential later in comparing the construction of $\tau(R, \Delta)$ with the definition of quasi- F -regularity.

Lemma 4.22. *We use Notation 4.1 and let D be an effective \mathbb{Q} -divisor. Take $t_D \in R^\circ$ satisfying $t_D \in \tau(R, \{p^e D\})$ for every integer $e \geq 0$. Further take $f \in R^\circ$ and set $c := ft_D^2$. Fix integers $e_0 \geq 0$ and $n > 0$. Then*

$$K_{D,n}^{e,fp^{e-e_0}} \subseteq K_{D,n}^{e_0,c}$$

for every $e \geq e_0$.

Proof. Recall first that $K_{D,n}^{e,fp^{e-e_0}}$ is the kernel of

$$\Phi_{R,D,n}^{e,fp^{e-e_0}} : H_m^d(R(D)) \rightarrow H_m^d(Q_{R,D,n}^{e,fp^{e-e_0}}).$$

Take $z \in K_{D,n}^{e,fp^{e-e_0}}$ and a lift $\tilde{z} \in \widetilde{K_{D,n}^{e,fp^{e-e_0}}}$ of z by the surjection

$$R^{n-1} : \widetilde{K_{D,n}^{e,fp^{e-e_0}}} \twoheadrightarrow K_{D,n}^{e,fp^{e-e_0}}$$

(Remark 4.15(1)). Now, for $e \geq e_0$, we have

$$0 = F_*^e [f]^{p^{e-e_0}} \cdot F^e(\tilde{z}) = F^{e-e_0}(F_*^{e_0}[f] \cdot F^{e_0}(\tilde{z})).$$

In view of

$$F_*^{e_0}[f] \cdot F^{e_0}(\tilde{z}) \in F_*^{e_0} \text{Ker}(F^{e-e_0} : H_m^d(R(p^{e_0}D)) \rightarrow H_m^d(R(p^e D))),$$

Proposition 4.17(2) implies that

$$F_*^{e_0}[c] \cdot F^{e_0}(\tilde{z}) = F_*^{e_0}[ft_D^2] \cdot F^{e_0}(\tilde{z}) = 0,$$

which in turn yields $\tilde{z} \in \widetilde{K_{D,n}^{e_0,c}}$. Therefore, $z = R^{n-1}(\tilde{z}) \in R^{n-1}(\widetilde{K_{D,n}^{e_0,c}}) = K_{D,n}^{e_0,c}$. \square

4.3. Duality and quasi-test ideals. We are ready to define and study quasi-test ideals. We warn the reader again about our notation in which $\omega_R(-(K_R + \Delta)) = R(\lceil -\Delta \rceil)$ (cf. Remark 2.27(1)).

Definition 4.23. We use Notation 4.1. Let Δ be a \mathbb{Q} -divisor on X such that $K_R + \Delta$ is \mathbb{Q} -Cartier. Take an integer $n > 0$. Set

$$\begin{aligned} \tau(W_n R, \Delta) &:= \tau(W_n \omega_R, K_R + \Delta) \subseteq W_n \omega_R(-(K_R + \Delta)), \\ \tau_n(R, \Delta) &:= \tau_n(\omega_R, K_R + \Delta) \subseteq R(\lceil -\Delta \rceil) \simeq \omega_R(-(K_R + \Delta)), \\ \tau^q(R, \Delta) &:= \tau^q(\omega_R, K_R + \Delta) \subseteq R(\lceil -\Delta \rceil) \simeq \omega_R(-(K_R + \Delta)). \end{aligned}$$

In particular, $\tau_n(R, \Delta)$ and $\tau^q(R, \Delta)$ are R -submodules of $R(\lceil -\Delta \rceil)$, which we call the n -quasi-test ideal and the quasi-test ideal of (R, Δ) , respectively.

Remark 4.24. We use Notation 4.1. Let Δ be a \mathbb{Q} -divisor on X such that $K_R + \Delta$ is \mathbb{Q} -Cartier. We here summarise some properties which can be immediately obtained from the earlier parts.

(1) By Definition 4.10, it holds that $\tau_n(R, \Delta) = ((R^{n-1})^*)^{-1}(\tau(W_n R, \Delta))$ for

$$(R^{n-1})^* : \omega_R(-(K_R + \Delta)) \rightarrow W_n \omega_R(-(K_R + \Delta)).$$

(2) We have

$$\tau_1(R, \Delta) \subseteq \tau_2(R, \Delta) \subseteq \cdots \subseteq \tau_n(R, \Delta) \subseteq \tau_{n+1}(R, \Delta) \subseteq \cdots \subseteq R(-\Delta)$$

and $\tau^q(R, \Delta) = \bigcup_{n>0} \tau_n(R, \Delta) = \tau_n(R, \Delta)$ for every $n \gg 0$ (Definition 4.10).

(3) Quasi-test ideals commute with localisations and completions (Proposition 4.8). Specifically, the following hold.

(a) If S is a multiplicatively closed subset of R , then

$$(4.24.1) \quad \tau(W_n \omega_R, \Delta) \otimes_{W_n R} W_n(S^{-1}R) \simeq \tau(W_n \omega_{S^{-1}R}, \Delta')$$

$$(4.24.2) \quad \tau_n(R, \Delta) \otimes_R S^{-1}R \simeq \tau_n(S^{-1}R, \Delta')$$

$$(4.24.3) \quad \tau^q(R, \Delta) \otimes_R S^{-1}R \simeq \tau^q(S^{-1}R, \Delta')$$

where Δ' denotes the pullback of Δ to $\text{Spec}(S^{-1}R)$.

(b) If (R, \mathfrak{m}) is a local ring, then

$$(4.24.4) \quad \tau(W_n\omega_R, \Delta) \otimes_{W_nR} W_n(\widehat{R}) \simeq \tau(W_n\omega_{\widehat{R}}, \widehat{\Delta})$$

$$(4.24.5) \quad \tau_n(R, \Delta) \otimes_R \widehat{R} \simeq \tau_n(\widehat{R}, \widehat{\Delta})$$

$$(4.24.6) \quad \tau^q(R, \Delta) \otimes_R \widehat{R} \simeq \tau^q(\widehat{R}, \widehat{\Delta})$$

where \widehat{R} denotes the \mathfrak{m} -adic completion of R and $\widehat{\Delta}$ is the pullback of Δ to $\text{Spec } \widehat{R}$.

The goal of the next proposition is two-fold: we show that the ideal $\tau(W_nR, \Delta)$ can be computed using quasi-tight closure and, to this end, we simplify its definition (cf. Proposition 4.6(3)) by showing that it is equal to $\tau^c(W_nR, \Delta)$ below. This equality is intuitively clear, as $\tau(W_nR, \Delta)$ and $\tau^c(W_nR, \Delta)$ differ by a ‘‘fixed constant’’ which can be subsumed by perturbations inherent in the theory of quasi-test ideals.

Proposition 4.25. *We use Notation 4.1. Fix an integer $n > 0$. Let Δ be a \mathbb{Q} -divisor on X such that $K_R + \Delta$ is \mathbb{Q} -Cartier. Take $a \in \mathbb{Q}$ and $g \in R^\circ$ satisfying $K_R + \Delta = a \cdot \text{div}(g)$. Pick $t \in R^\circ \cap \tau(R)$ and $c \in R^\circ \cap (g^2t^4)$. Set*

$$\tau^c(W_nR, \Delta) := \sum_{e \geq 0} T_n^{e,c}(F_*^e W_n\omega_R(-p^e(K_R + \Delta))),$$

where

$$T_n^{e,c} : F_*^e W_n\omega_R(-p^e(K_R + \Delta)) \xrightarrow{\cdot F_*^e [c]} F_*^e W_n\omega_R(-p^e(K_R + \Delta)) \xrightarrow{T_n^e} W_n\omega_R(-(K_R + \Delta))$$

is the W_nR -module homomorphism obtained by applying $\text{Hom}_{W_nR}(-, W_n\omega_R)$ to

$$W_nR(K_R + \Delta) \xrightarrow{F^e} F_*^e W_nR(p^e(K_R + \Delta)) \xrightarrow{\cdot F_*^e [c]} F_*^e W_nR(p^e(K_R + \Delta)).$$

Then the following hold.

- (1) $I_{K_X + \Delta}^{0,c} \subseteq I_{K_X + \Delta}^{1,c} \subseteq I_{K_X + \Delta}^{2,c} \subseteq \dots$ for $I_{K_X + \Delta}^{e,c} := T_n^{e,c}(F_*^e W_n\omega_R(-p^e(K_R + \Delta)))$.
- (2) $\tau(W_nR, \Delta) = \tau^c(W_nR, \Delta)$.
- (3) If (R, \mathfrak{m}) is a local ring, then the equality

$$\left(\frac{W_n\omega_R(-(K_R + \Delta))}{\tau(W_nR, \Delta)} \right)^\vee = \widetilde{0_{K_R + \Delta, n}^*}$$

of W_nR -submodules of $(W_n\omega_R(-(K_R + \Delta)))^\vee = H_{\mathfrak{m}}^d(W_nR(K_R + \Delta))$ holds.

Proof. We start by proving the following claim.

Claim. *If (R, \mathfrak{m}) is a local ring, then the equality*

$$\left(\frac{W_n\omega_R(-(K_R + \Delta))}{\tau^c(W_nR, \Delta)} \right)^\vee = \widetilde{0_{K_R + \Delta, n}^*}$$

of W_nR -submodules of $(W_n\omega_R(-(K_R + \Delta)))^\vee = H_{\mathfrak{m}}^d(W_nR(K_R + \Delta))$ holds.

Proof of Claim. Set $D := K_R + \Delta$. We define $I_{D,n}^{e,c}$ and $C_{D,n}^{e,c}$ as the image and the cokernel of

$$T_n^{e,c} : F_*^e W_n \omega_R(-p^e D) \xrightarrow{\cdot F_*^e [c]} F_*^e W_n \omega_R(-p^e D) \xrightarrow{T_n^e} W_n \omega_R(-D).$$

By definition, we have

$$\tau^c(W_n R, \Delta) = \sum_{e \geq 0} I_{D,n}^{e,c}$$

and $T_n^{e,c}$ is obtained by applying the Matlis duality functor $\text{Hom}_{W_n R}(-, E)$ to

$$\begin{aligned} F^{e,c} : H_m^d(W_n R(K_R + \Delta)) &\rightarrow H_m^d(W_n R(p^e(K_R + \Delta))) \\ z &\mapsto F_*^e [c] \cdot F^e(z). \end{aligned}$$

By Proposition 4.19, we have

$$H_m^d(W_n R(D)) \supseteq \widetilde{K_{D,n}^{0,c}} \supseteq \widetilde{K_{D,n}^{1,c}} \supseteq \cdots \supseteq \widetilde{K_{D,n}^{e_0,c}} = \widetilde{K_{D,n}^{e_0+1,c}} = \cdots = \widetilde{0_{D,n}^*}.$$

We now apply the Matlis duality functor $\text{Hom}_{W_n R}(-, E)$. Then the kernel $\widetilde{K_{D,n}^{e,c}} = \text{Ker } F^{e,c}$ turns into the cokernel $C_{D,n}^{e,c} = \text{Coker } T_n^{e,c}$. Hence we get

$$W_n \omega_R(-D) \rightarrow C_{D,n}^{0,c} \rightarrow C_{D,n}^{1,c} \rightarrow \cdots \rightarrow C_{D,n}^{e_0,c} \xrightarrow{\cong} C_{D,n}^{e_0+1,c} \xrightarrow{\cong} \cdots = (\widetilde{0_{D,n}^*})^\vee.$$

Since $I_{D,n}^{e,c} = \text{Ker}(W_n \omega_R(-D) \rightarrow C_{D,n}^{e,c})$, it holds that

$$I_{D,n}^{0,c} \subseteq I_{D,n}^{1,c} \subseteq \cdots \subseteq I_{D,n}^{e_0,c} = I_{D,n}^{e_0+1,c} = \cdots.$$

In particular,

$$\tau^c(W_n R, \Delta) = \sum_{e \geq 0} I_{D,n}^{e,c} = I_{D,n}^{e,c}$$

for $e \gg 0$, which implies

$$(4.25.1) \quad \left(\frac{W_n \omega_R(-D)}{\tau^c(W_n R, \Delta)} \right)^\vee = \left(\frac{W_n \omega_R(-D)}{I_{D,n}^{e,c}} \right)^\vee = (C_{D,n}^{e,c})^\vee = \widetilde{K_{D,n}^{e,c}} = \widetilde{0_{D,n}^*}.$$

Thus Claim holds. \square

Now (1) follows from the above argument and (3) is immediate from (2) and Claim, and hence it is enough to prove (2). To this end, by taking a localisation at a prime ideal, we may assume that R is a local ring (here τ^c localises as it is defined as a colimit, and τ localises by Proposition 3.7 and Proposition 4.8). The problem is thus reduced to the case when K_R and $K_R + \Delta$ are effective. Then we have $a \geq 0$ and

$$\begin{aligned} \tau^c(W_n R, \Delta) &= \sum_{e \geq 0} T_n^{e,c}(F_*^e W_n \omega_R(-p^e(K_R + \Delta))) \subseteq W_n \omega_R(-(K_R + \Delta)), \\ \tau(W_n R, \Delta) &= \sum_{e \geq 0} T_n^{e, cg^{\lceil a(p^e-1) \rceil}}(F_*^e W_n \omega_R(-(K_R + \Delta))) \subseteq W_n \omega_R(-(K_R + \Delta)). \end{aligned}$$

where the latter equality holds by Proposition 4.6(4).

We first prove the inclusion $\tau(W_n R, \Delta) \supseteq \tau^c(W_n R, \Delta)$. By $\operatorname{div}(g) \geq 0$ and $a(p^e - 1) + 1 \geq \lceil a(p^e - 1) \rceil$, we get

$$\begin{aligned} -p^e(K_R + \Delta) - \operatorname{div}(g) &= -(K_R + \Delta) - a(p^e - 1) \cdot \operatorname{div}(g) - \operatorname{div}(g) \\ &\leq -(K_R + \Delta) - \lceil a(p^e - 1) \rceil \cdot \operatorname{div}(g) \\ &= -(K_R + \Delta) - \operatorname{div}(g^{\lceil a(p^e - 1) \rceil}). \end{aligned}$$

We have $\tau^c(W_n R, \Delta) = \tau^{cg}(W_n R, \Delta)$ by Claim. Then it holds that

$$\begin{aligned} \tau^c(W_n R, \Delta) &= \tau^{cg}(W_n R, \Delta) \\ &= T_n^{e,cg}(F_*^e W_n \omega_R(-p^e(K_R + \Delta))) \\ &= T_n^{e,c}(F_*^e W_n \omega_R(-p^e(K_R + \Delta) - \operatorname{div}(g))) \\ &\subseteq T_n^{e,c}(F_*^e W_n \omega_R(-(K_R + \Delta) - \operatorname{div}(g^{\lceil a(p^e - 1) \rceil}))) \\ &= T_n^{e,cg^{\lceil a(p^e - 1) \rceil}}(F_*^e W_n \omega_R(-(K_R + \Delta))) \subseteq \tau(W_n \omega_R, K_R + \Delta), \end{aligned}$$

as required.

The opposite inclusion $\tau(W_n R, \Delta) \subseteq \tau^c(W_n R, \Delta)$ follows from

$$\begin{aligned} T_n^{e,cg^{\lceil a(p^e - 1) \rceil}}(F_*^e W_n \omega_R(-(K_R + \Delta))) \\ &= T_n^{e,c}(F_*^e W_n \omega_R(-(K_R + \Delta) - \operatorname{div}(g^{\lceil a(p^e - 1) \rceil}))) \\ &= T_n^{e,c}(F_*^e W_n \omega_R(-(K_R + \Delta) - \lceil a(p^e - 1) \rceil \operatorname{div}(g))) \\ &\subseteq T_n^{e,c}(F_*^e W_n \omega_R(-(K_R + \Delta) - a(p^e - 1) \operatorname{div}(g))) \\ &= T_n^{e,c}(F_*^e W_n \omega_R(-p^e(K_R + \Delta))). \end{aligned}$$

This concludes the proof of (2) and the entire proposition. \square

Proposition 4.26. *We use Notation 4.1. Let Δ be a \mathbb{Q} -divisor on X such that $K_R + \Delta$ is \mathbb{Q} -Cartier. Take $h \in R^\circ$. Then the following hold.*

- (1) $\tau(W_n R, \Delta + \operatorname{div}(h)) = [h] \cdot \tau(W_n R, \Delta)$.
- (2) $\tau_n(R, \Delta + \operatorname{div}(h)) = h \cdot \tau_n(R, \Delta)$.
- (3) $\tau^q(R, \Delta + \operatorname{div}(h)) = h \cdot \tau^q(R, \Delta)$.

Proof. We may assume that there exist $a \in \mathbb{Q}$ and $g \in R^\circ$ satisfying $K_R + \Delta = a \cdot \operatorname{div}(g)$. Take a test element $t \in R^\circ$ and $c \in R^\circ \cap (h^2 g^2 t^4)$. By Proposition 4.25(3), the assertion (1) follows from

$$\begin{aligned} \tau(W_n R, \Delta + \operatorname{div}(h)) &= \sum_{e \geq 0} T_n^{e,c}(F_*^e W_n \omega_R(-p^e(K_R + \Delta + \operatorname{div}(h)))) \\ &= \sum_{e \geq 0} [h] \cdot T_n^{e,c}(F_*^e W_n \omega_R(-p^e(K_R + \Delta))) \\ &= [h] \cdot \tau(W_n R, \Delta). \end{aligned}$$

By Remark 4.24, (1) implies (2) and (2) implies (3). \square

Theorem 4.27. *In addition to Notation 4.1, assume that (R, \mathfrak{m}) is a local ring. Let Δ be a \mathbb{Q} -divisor on X such that $K_R + \Delta$ is \mathbb{Q} -Cartier. Take an integer $n > 0$. Then the equality*

$$\left(\frac{R(\lceil -\Delta \rceil)}{\tau_n(R, \Delta)} \right)^\vee = 0_{K_R + \Delta, n}^*$$

of R -submodules of $R(\lceil -\Delta \rceil)^\vee = \omega_R(-(K_R + \Delta))^\vee = H_{\mathfrak{m}}^d(R(K_R + \Delta))$ holds.

In particular,

$$\tau_n(R, \Delta) = \left(\frac{H_{\mathfrak{m}}^d(R(K_R + \Delta))}{0_{K_R + \Delta, n}^*} \right)^\vee.$$

Proof. Since $\tau_n(R, \Delta)$ is the inverse image of $\tau(W_n R, \Delta)$ by $(R^{n-1})^* : \omega_R(-(K_R + \Delta)) \hookrightarrow W_n \omega_R(-(K_R + \Delta))$ (Remark 4.24), we obtain the following commutative diagram:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \omega_R(-(K_R + \Delta)) & \xrightarrow{(R^{n-1})^*} & W_n \omega_R(-(K_R + \Delta)) \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ \frac{\omega_R(-(K_R + \Delta))}{\tau_n(R, \Delta)} & \hookrightarrow & \frac{W_n \omega_R(-(K_R + \Delta))}{\tau(W_n R, \Delta)}. \end{array}$$

By applying the Matlis dual functor $(-)^{\vee} := \text{Hom}_{W_n R}(-, E)$ (which is exact) to this diagram, we get

$$\begin{array}{ccc} H_{\mathfrak{m}}^d(R(K_R + \Delta)) & \xleftarrow{R^{n-1}} & H_{\mathfrak{m}}^d(W_n R(K_R + \Delta)) \\ \uparrow & & \uparrow \\ \left(\frac{\omega_R(-(K_R + \Delta))}{\tau_n(R, \Delta)} \right)^\vee & \xleftarrow{\quad} & \left(\frac{W_n \omega_R(-(K_R + \Delta))}{\tau(W_n R, \Delta)} \right)^\vee. \end{array}$$

Since

$$\left(\frac{W_n \omega_R(-(K_R + \Delta))}{\tau(W_n R, \Delta)} \right)^\vee = \widetilde{0_{K_R + \Delta, n}^*} \quad \text{and} \quad R^{n-1} \left(\widetilde{0_{K_R + \Delta, n}^*} \right) = 0_{K_R + \Delta, n}^*$$

by Proposition 4.25 and Theorem 4.20, respectively, we obtain the following:

$$\begin{aligned} \left(\frac{R(\lceil -\Delta \rceil)}{\tau_n(R, \Delta)} \right)^\vee &= \left(\frac{\omega_R(-(K_R + \Delta))}{\tau_n(R, \Delta)} \right)^\vee = R^{n-1} \left(\left(\frac{W_n \omega_R(-(K_R + \Delta))}{\tau(W_n R, \Delta)} \right)^\vee \right) \\ &= R^{n-1} \left(\widetilde{0_{K_R + \Delta, n}^*} \right) = 0_{K_R + \Delta, n}^*. \end{aligned}$$

This concludes the proof. \square

Next, we provide an explicit definition of $\tau_n(R, \Delta)$ (Corollary 4.29) in terms of $Q_{R, K_R + \Delta, n}^{e, c}$ (recall the notation from (4.13.1)). First, we need the following lemma.

Lemma 4.28. *We use Notation 4.1 and let D be an effective \mathbb{Q} -divisor. Write $D = a \cdot \text{div}(g)$ for $a \in \mathbb{Q}$ and $g \in R^\circ$. Take $t \in \tau(R) \cap R^\circ$ and $t_D \in R^\circ$ satisfying $t_D \in \tau(R, \{p^e D\})$ for every integer $e \geq 0$. Fix $c \in R^\circ \cap ((g^2 t^4) \cup (t_D^4))$. Then the following assertions are valid.*

(1) *The inclusion*

$$\begin{aligned} \operatorname{Im}\left(\operatorname{Hom}_{W_n R}(Q_{R,D,n}^{e,c}, W_n \omega_R) \xrightarrow{(\Phi_{R,D,n}^{e,c})^*} \omega_R(-D)\right) \\ \subseteq \operatorname{Im}\left(\operatorname{Hom}_{W_n R}(Q_{R,D,n}^{e',c}, W_n \omega_R) \xrightarrow{(\Phi_{R,D,n}^{e',c})^*} \omega_R(-D)\right) \end{aligned}$$

holds for every $e' \geq e$.

(2) *There exists an integer $e_1 > 0$ such that the equality*

$$\begin{aligned} \operatorname{Im}\left(\operatorname{Hom}_{W_n R}(Q_{R,D,n}^{e,c}, W_n \omega_R) \xrightarrow{(\Phi_{R,D,n}^{e,c})^*} \omega_R(-D)\right) \\ = \operatorname{Im}\left(\operatorname{Hom}_{W_n R}(Q_{R,D,n}^{e_1,c}, W_n \omega_R) \xrightarrow{(\Phi_{R,D,n}^{e_1,c})^*} \omega_R(-D)\right) \end{aligned}$$

holds for every integer $e \geq e_1$.

Proof. It is enough to prove (1), because (2) holds by (1) and the fact that ω_R is a finitely generated R -module. In order to show (1), we may assume that R is a local ring. Let \mathfrak{m} be its maximal ideal. Then the assertion follows from Proposition 4.21(1) and the fact that

$$\operatorname{Im}\left(\operatorname{Hom}_{W_n R}(Q_{R,D,n}^{e,c}, W_n \omega_R) \xrightarrow{(\Phi_{R,D,n}^{e,c})^*} \omega_R(-D)\right)$$

is Matlis dual to $\operatorname{Im}\left(H_{\mathfrak{m}}^d(R(D)) \xrightarrow{\Phi_{R,D,n}^{e,c}} H_{\mathfrak{m}}^d(Q_{R,D,n}^{e,c})\right) = \frac{H_{\mathfrak{m}}^d(R)}{K_{D,n}^{e,c}}$. \square

Corollary 4.29. *We use Notation 4.1. Let Δ be a \mathbb{Q} -divisor on X such that $K_R + \Delta$ is \mathbb{Q} -Cartier and set $D = K_R + \Delta$. Take $a \in \mathbb{Q}$ and $g \in R^\circ$ with $D = a \cdot \operatorname{div}(g)$. Then the following hold.*

- (1) $\tau_n(R, \Delta) = \bigcap_{c \in R^\circ} \bigcap_{e_0 > 0} \sum_{e \geq e_0} \operatorname{Im}\left(\operatorname{Hom}_{W_n R}(Q_{R,D,n}^{e,c}, W_n \omega_R) \xrightarrow{(\Phi_{R,D,n}^{e,c})^*} \omega_R(-D)\right),$
- (2) $\tau_n(R, \Delta) = \bigcap_{c \in R^\circ} \sum_{e > 0} \operatorname{Im}\left(\operatorname{Hom}_{W_n R}(Q_{R,D,n}^{e,c}, W_n \omega_R) \xrightarrow{(\Phi_{R,D,n}^{e,c})^*} \omega_R(-D)\right),$
- (3) $\tau_n(R, \Delta) = \bigcap_{c \in R^\circ} \sum_{e_0 > 0} \bigcap_{e \geq e_0} \operatorname{Im}\left(\operatorname{Hom}_{W_n R}(Q_{R,D,n}^{e, c p^{e-e_0}}, W_n \omega_R) \xrightarrow{(\Phi_{R,D,n}^{e, c p^{e-e_0}})^*} \omega_R(-D)\right),$
- (4) *Take $t \in \tau(R) \cap R^\circ$ and $t_D \in R^\circ$ satisfying $t_D \in \tau(R, \{p^e D\})$ for every integer $e \geq 0$. Fix $c \in R^\circ \cap ((g^2 t^4) \cup (t_D^4))$. Then there exists an integer $e_0 > 0$ such that*

$$\tau_n(R, \Delta) = \operatorname{Im}\left(\operatorname{Hom}_{W_n R}(Q_{R,D,n}^{e,c}, W_n \omega_R) \xrightarrow{(\Phi_{R,D,n}^{e,c})^*} \omega_R(-D)\right)$$

for every integer $e \geq e_0$.

Proof. We start by proving (4). By Lemma 4.28, it is enough to prove that

$$\tau_n(\omega_R) = \bigcup_{e > 0} \operatorname{Im}\left(\operatorname{Hom}_{W_n R}(Q_{R,D,n}^{e,c}, W_n \omega_R) \xrightarrow{(\Phi_{R,D,n}^{e,c})^*} \omega_R(-D)\right).$$

In order to verify this, we may assume that R is a local ring by (4.24.2) and the fact that localisation commutes with colimits. In this case,

$$(4.29.1) \quad \text{Im} \left(\text{Hom}_{W_n R} (Q_{R,D,n}^{e,c}, W_n \omega_R) \xrightarrow{(\Phi_{R,D,n}^{e,c})^*} \omega_R(-D) \right)$$

is Matlis dual to

$$(4.29.2) \quad \text{Im} \left(H_m^d(R(D)) \xrightarrow{\Phi_{R,D,n}^{e,c}} H_m^d(Q_{R,D,n}^{e,c}) \right) = \frac{H_m^d(R(D))}{K_{D,n}^{e,c}}.$$

Now, Theorem 4.27 and Proposition 4.21(2) imply

$$(4.29.3) \quad \tau_n(R, \Delta) = \left(\frac{H_m^d(R(D))}{K_{D,n}^{e,c}} \right)^\vee.$$

for every $e \gg 0$ (depending on c). Thus (4) follows by (4.29.2) and (4.29.3).

Second, assertion (1) holds, because

$$\begin{aligned} & \bigcap_{c \in R^\circ} \bigcap_{e_0 > 0} \sum_{e \geq e_0} \text{Im} \left(\text{Hom}_{W_n R} (Q_{R,D,n}^{e,c}, W_n \omega_R) \xrightarrow{(\Phi_{R,D,n}^{e,c})^*} \omega_R(-D) \right) \\ &= \bigcap_{c \in g^2 t^4 R^\circ} \bigcap_{e_0 > 0} \sum_{e \geq e_0} \text{Im} \left(\text{Hom}_{W_n R} (Q_{R,D,n}^{e,c}, W_n \omega_R) \xrightarrow{(\Phi_{R,D,n}^{e,c})^*} \omega_R(-D) \right) \\ &\stackrel{4.28}{=} \bigcap_{c \in g^2 t^4 R^\circ} \sum_{e > 0} \text{Im} \left(\text{Hom}_{W_n R} (Q_{R,D,n}^{e,c}, W_n \omega_R) \xrightarrow{(\Phi_{R,D,n}^{e,c})^*} \omega_R(-D) \right) \\ &\stackrel{(4)}{=} \tau_n(R, \Delta). \end{aligned}$$

Then (2) holds by the same argument.

Thus we are left with showing (3). We denote its right hand side by $\tau'_n(R, \Delta)$. By (2), we immediately have that $\tau'_n(R, \Delta) \subseteq \tau_n(R, \Delta)$. It suffices to show the opposite inclusion $\tau'_n(R, \Delta) \supseteq \tau_n(R, \Delta)$. Fix $t_D \in R^\circ$ satisfying $t_D \in \tau(R, \{p^e D\})$ for every integer $e \geq 0$. For every $e \geq e_0$ and $c \in R^\circ$, we have the the following inclusion (Lemma 4.22):

$$K_{D,n}^{e,c p^{e-e_0}} \subseteq K_{D,n}^{e_0, c t_D^2}.$$

By applying Matlis duality to this inclusion, we get

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{Im} \left(\text{Hom}_{W_n R} (Q_{R,D,n}^{e,c p^{e-e_0}}, W_n \omega_R) \xrightarrow{(\Phi_{R,D,n}^{e,c p^{e-e_0}})^*} \omega_R(-D) \right) \\ & \supseteq \text{Im} \left(\text{Hom}_{W_n R} (Q_{R,D,n}^{e_0, c t_D^2}, W_n \omega_R) \xrightarrow{(\Phi_{R,D,n}^{e_0, c t_D^2})^*} \omega_R(-D) \right), \end{aligned}$$

because (4.29.1) and (4.29.2) are Matlis dual to each other. Therefore,

$$\tau'_n(R, \Delta) \supseteq \bigcap_{c \in R^\circ} \sum_{e_0 > 0} \text{Im} \left(\text{Hom}_{W_n R} (Q_{R,D,n}^{e_0, c t_D^2}, W_n \omega_R) \xrightarrow{(\Phi_{R,D,n}^{e_0, c t_D^2})^*} \omega_R(-D) \right) \stackrel{(2)}{=} \tau_n(R, \Delta).$$

Thus (3) holds. \square

Proposition 4.30. *We use Notation 4.1. Let Δ be a \mathbb{Q} -divisor on X such that $K_R + \Delta$ is \mathbb{Q} -Cartier. Then the following hold.*

- (1) (R, Δ) is n -quasi- F -regular if and only if $\tau_n(R, \Delta) = R$.
- (2) (R, Δ) is quasi- F -regular if and only if $\tau^q(R, \Delta) = R$.

In particular, n -quasi- F -regularity and quasi- F -regularity commute with localisation.

Proof. Since (2) holds by (1), let us show (1). It follows from Corollary 4.29(3) that

$$\tau_n(R, \Delta) = \bigcap_{c \in R^\circ} \sum_{e_0 > 0} \bigcap_{e \geq e_0} \operatorname{Im} \left(\operatorname{Hom}_{W_n R} (Q_{R, D_c, n}^e, W_n \omega_R) \xrightarrow{(\Phi_{R, D_c, n}^e)^*} \omega_R(-D) \right),$$

where $D_c := D + (1/p^{e_0})\operatorname{div}(c)$. In particular, by Definition 2.31, we get that $\tau_n(R, \Delta) = R$ if and only if for every effective Cartier divisor E , there exists $e_0 > 0$ such that $(R, \Delta + \frac{1}{p^{e_0}}E)$ is n -quasi- F^e -regular for every $e \geq e_0$ (equivalently, for every $e \geq 0$). But this is clearly equivalent to the original definition of n -quasi- F -regularity (see Definition 2.33). \square

Theorem 4.31. *We use Notation 4.1. Let Δ an effective \mathbb{Q} -divisor on X such that $[\Delta] = 0$ and $D := K_R + \Delta$ is \mathbb{Q} -Cartier. Take $a \in \mathbb{Q}$ and $g \in R^\circ$ with $D = a \cdot \operatorname{div}(g)$. Pick $t \in \tau(R) \cap R^\circ$ and $t_D \in R^\circ$ satisfying $t_D \in \tau(R, \{p^e \Delta\})$ for every integer $e \geq 0$. Fix $c \in R^\circ \cap ((g^2 t^4) \cup (t_D^4))$ and an integer $n > 0$. Then the following are equivalent.*

- (1) (R, Δ) is n -quasi- F -regular.
- (2) There exists $e \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$ such that $(R, \Delta + (1/p^e)\operatorname{div}(c))$ is n -quasi- F^e -split.
- (3) There exists an integer $e_0 > 0$ such that

$$(4.31.1) \quad (\Phi_{R, D, n}^{e, c})^* : \operatorname{Hom}_{W_n R} (Q_{R, D, n}^{e, c}, W_n \omega_R) \rightarrow \omega_R(-D)$$

is surjective for every $e \geq e_0$.

- (4) $0_{D_{\mathfrak{m}}, n}^* = 0$ for every maximal ideal \mathfrak{m} of R , where $D_{\mathfrak{m}}$ denotes the pullback of D to $\operatorname{Spec} R_{\mathfrak{m}}$.

In particular, (R, Δ) is quasi- F -regular if and only if there exist integers $n > 0$ and $e > 0$ such that $(R, \Delta + (1/p^e)\operatorname{div}(c))$ is n -quasi- F^e -split.

Proof. Note that $0_{D_{\mathfrak{m}}, n}^* = K_{D_{\mathfrak{m}}, n}^{e, c}$ for every $e \gg 0$ by Proposition 4.21. Thus the equivalence (3) \Leftrightarrow (4) is immediate by Noetherian induction and Matlis duality (cf. Matlis duality between (4.29.1) and (4.29.2)). The equivalence (2) \Leftrightarrow (3) follows from Lemma 4.28(1), because $(R, \Delta + (1/p^e)\operatorname{div}(c))$ is n -quasi- F^e -split if and only if (4.31.1) is surjective. Finally, the equivalence (1) \Leftrightarrow (3) immediately holds by Corollary 4.29(4) and Proposition 4.30(1).

The “in-particular” part is immediate from the equivalence of (1) \Leftrightarrow (2). \square

Theorem 4.32. *We use Notation 4.1. Let Δ be an effective \mathbb{Q} -divisor on X such that $K_R + \Delta$ is \mathbb{Q} -Cartier. Then the following hold.*

- (1) Fix an integer $n > 0$. Then (R, Δ) is n -quasi- F -regular if and only if for every $f \in R^\circ$, there exists an integer $e > 0$ such that $(R, \Delta + (1/p^e)\operatorname{div}(f))$ is n -quasi- F^e -split.

- (2) (R, Δ) is quasi- F -regular if and only if for every $f \in R^\circ$, there exists an integer $e > 0$ such that $(R, \Delta + (1/p^e)\text{div}(f))$ is quasi- F^e -split.

The reader should compare this result with Definitions 2.33 and 2.34. We emphasise that in (2), for every $f \in R^\circ$, we just need to find integers $n > 0$ and $e > 0$ such that $(R, \Delta + (1/p^e)\text{div}(f))$ is n -quasi- F^e -split. In particular, we can take $n \gg e$, which is not possible in the original definition.

Proof. Assertion (1) is immediate from Corollary 4.29(2) and Proposition 4.30(1). Now we prove (2).

First, suppose that (R, Δ) is n -quasi- F -regular for some integer $n > 0$. Then, up to multiplying f by an element of R° , we may assume that $f \in R^\circ \cap ((g^2t^4) \cup (t_D^4))$ with notation as in Theorem 4.31. Then the same theorem implies that $(R, \Delta + (1/p^e)\text{div}(f))$ is n -quasi- F^e -split for some $e > 0$.

As for the other implication, pick $f \in R^\circ \cap ((g^2t^4) \cup (t_D^4))$. Then there exist $e > 0$ and $n > 0$ such that $(R, \Delta + (1/p^e)\text{div}(f))$ is n -quasi- F^e -split, which implies that (R, Δ) is n -quasi- F -regular by Theorem 4.31 again. \square

We can finally give the proof of a theorem from the introduction.

Theorem 4.33 (= Theorem F). *Let R be an F -finite normal Noetherian \mathbb{Q} -Gorenstein domain over \mathbb{F}_p . Let D be an effective Cartier divisor such that $\text{Sing}(R) \subseteq \text{Supp } D$, where $\text{Sing}(R)$ denotes the non-regular locus of $\text{Spec } R$. Then, for every rational number $\epsilon > 0$, there exists a constant $e_0(R, D, \epsilon)$ such that the following holds.*

The ring R is quasi- F -regular if and only if there exist a rational number $\epsilon > 0$ and integers $n > 0$ and $e \geq e_0(R, D, \epsilon)$ such that $(R, \epsilon D)$ is n -quasi- F^e -split.

Proof. Taking a suitable finite affine open cover of $\text{Spec } R$, we may assume that $D = \text{div}(g)$. Since the non-regular locus of R is contained in $\text{Supp } D$, we have that $g^m \in \tau(R)$ for some integer $m > 0$. Hence $c := g^{4m}$ satisfies the assumptions of Theorem 4.31. For every rational number $\epsilon > 0$, choose a big enough integer $e_0(R, D, \epsilon)$ so that $\epsilon > \frac{4m}{p^{e_0(R, D, \epsilon)}}$.

By writing $\epsilon D = \frac{\epsilon}{4m}(4mD)$, we can conclude the proof by the ‘‘in-particular’’ part of Theorem 4.31. \square

Theorem 4.34. *We use Notation 4.1. Let Δ be an effective \mathbb{Q} -divisor on X such that $K_R + \Delta$ is \mathbb{Q} -Cartier. Then (R, Δ) is quasi- F -regular if and only if (R, Δ) is feebly quasi- F -regular.*

Proof. This is immediate from Theorem 4.32. For the convenience of the reader, we spell the argument out. First, quasi- F -regularity implies feebly quasi- F -regularity. Now, assume that (R, Δ) is feebly quasi- F -regular. By Definition 2.34 and Definition 2.35, for every effective \mathbb{Q} -divisor E on X , there exist $n \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$ and $\epsilon \in \mathbb{Q}_{>0}$ such that $(X, \Delta + \epsilon E)$ is n -quasi- F^e -split for all $e \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$. In particular, for every $f \in R^\circ$, there exists an integer $e > 0$ such that $(R, \Delta + (1/p^e)\text{div}(f))$ is n -quasi- F^e -split for some $n > 0$. Thus (R, Δ) is quasi- F -regular by Theorem 4.32(2). \square

Remark 4.35. When working with quasi- F^∞ -splittings, one needs to consider its two variants: the usual one and the uniform one, depending on the order of the quantifiers between n and e . This difference is fundamental. For example, cones over supersingular elliptic curves are always quasi- F^∞ -split, but they are never uniformly quasi- F^∞ -split. However, this difference disappears when working with quasi- F -rationality or quasi- F -regularity. This idea is essential for many parts of our paper.

In particular, one can show much stronger statements than that quasi- F -regularity and feeble quasi- F -regularity agree. For example, it is now easy to see from Theorem 4.31 that (R, Δ) is quasi- F -regular if and only if for every effective Weil divisor E , there exists a rational number $\epsilon > 0$ such that for every $e \gg 0$ there exists $n > 0$ such that $(R, \Delta + \epsilon E)$ is n -quasi- F^e -split.

Theorem 4.36. *We use Notation 4.1. Let Δ be a \mathbb{Q} -divisor on X such that $K_R + \Delta$ is \mathbb{Q} -Cartier. Let E be an effective \mathbb{Q} -divisor on X . Then the following hold.*

- (1) *If E is \mathbb{Q} -Cartier, then there exists a rational number $\epsilon > 0$ such that*

$$\tau_n(R, \Delta) = \tau_n(R, \Delta + \epsilon E) \quad \text{and} \quad \tau^q(R, \Delta) = \tau^q(R, \Delta + \epsilon E)$$

for every integer $n > 0$.

- (2) *Take $n > 0$. If (R, Δ) is n -quasi- F -regular, then there exists a rational number $\epsilon > 0$ such that $(R, \Delta + \epsilon E)$ is n -quasi- F -regular.*

- (3) *If (R, Δ) is quasi- F -regular, then there exists a rational number $\epsilon > 0$ such that $(R, \Delta + \epsilon E)$ is quasi- F -regular.*

Proof. The assertion (1) follows from Proposition 4.12(2). In order to show (2) and (3), we may assume, by enlarging E , that E is Cartier. By Proposition 4.30, (1) implies (2) and (3). \square

The following result provides a reformulation of the splitting definition of a quasi- F^e -splitting from [TWY24, Proposition 3.19] and, together with Proposition 4.38 below, will be used in the proof that three-dimensional quasi- F -regular singularities are Cohen-Macaulay.

Proposition 4.37. *We use Notation 4.13. Let D a \mathbb{Q} -divisor on $\text{Spec } R$. Take $c \in R^\circ$ and integers $n > 0$ and $e > 0$. Assume that $(R, \{D\} + (1/p^e)\text{div}(c))$ is n -quasi- F^e -split. Then there exists a $W_n R$ -module homomorphism $\alpha: F_*^e W_n R(p^e D) \rightarrow W_n \omega_R(-K_R + \lfloor D \rfloor)$ such that the following diagram is commutative:*

$$(4.37.1) \quad \begin{array}{ccc} W_n R(D) & \xrightarrow{(\cdot F_*^e [c]) \circ F^e} & F_*^e W_n R(p^e D) \\ R^{n-1} \downarrow & & \swarrow \alpha \\ R(D) = \omega_R(-K_R + \lfloor D \rfloor) & & \\ (R^{n-1})^* \downarrow & & \swarrow \\ W_n \omega_R(-K_R + \lfloor D \rfloor) & & \end{array}$$

Proof. For every \mathbb{Q} -divisor D' on $\text{Spec } R$, we set

$$\varphi_{D'} := (\cdot F_*^e [c]) \circ F^e: W_n R(D') \rightarrow F_*^e W_n R(p^e D')$$

Then $\varphi_{D'}$ coincides with the composition

$$W_n R(D') \xrightarrow{F^e} F_*^e W_n R(p^e D') \hookrightarrow F_*^e W_n R(p^e D' + \operatorname{div}(c)) \xrightarrow{\cdot F_*^e [c]} F_*^e W_n R(p^e D'),$$

where the second homomorphism is the natural injection. Since $(R, \{D\} + (1/p^e)\operatorname{div}(c))$ is n -quasi- F^e -split, there exists a $W_n R$ -module homomorphism $\beta: F_*^e W_n R(p^e \{D\} + \operatorname{div}(c)) \rightarrow W_n \omega_R(-K_R)$ such that the following diagram is commutative [TWY24, Proposition 3.19]:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} W_n R(\{D\} + (1/p^e)\operatorname{div}(c)) & \xrightarrow{F^e} & F_*^e W_n R(p^e \{D\} + \operatorname{div}(c)) \\ \downarrow R^{n-1} & & \searrow \beta \\ R & & \\ \downarrow (R^{n-1})^* & & \\ W_n \omega_R(-K_R) & & \end{array}$$

Therefore, if we define a $W_n R$ -module homomorphism α' as

$$\alpha': F_*^e W_n R(p^e \{D\}) \xrightarrow{\times F_*^e [c]^{-1}} F_*^e W_n R(p^e \{D\} + \operatorname{div}(c)) \xrightarrow{\beta} W_n \omega_R(-K_R),$$

then we obtain the following commutative diagram:

$$(4.37.2) \quad \begin{array}{ccc} W_n R(\{D\}) & \xrightarrow{\varphi_{\{D\}}} & F_*^e W_n R(p^e \{D\}) \\ \downarrow R^{n-1} & & \searrow \alpha' \\ R & & \\ \downarrow & & \\ W_n \omega_R(-K_R) & & \end{array}$$

By tensoring (4.37.2) with $W_n R(\lfloor D \rfloor)$ and taking the S_2 -fications, we obtain the required commutative diagram. \square

Proposition 4.38. *We use Notation 4.13. Take integers $n > 0$ and $m > 0$. Let Δ be an effective \mathbb{Q} -divisor on X such that (R, Δ) is n -quasi- F -regular. Assume that the inequality $\{p^r D\} \leq \Delta$ holds for every integer $r \geq 0$. Then the induced $W_{m+n-1} R$ -module homomorphism*

$$R^{n-1}: \widetilde{0_{D, m+n-1}^*} \rightarrow \widetilde{0_{D, m}^*}$$

is zero.

Proof. Let us show the assertion by induction on m . We emphasise that the assumptions of the proposition are valid for D replaced by $p^k D$ for any integer $k \geq 0$.

First, we treat the base case $m = 1$ of this induction. Fix $t_D \in R^\circ$ such that $t_D \in \tau(R, \{p^e D\})$ for every integer $e \geq 0$. Then there exist $c \in R^\circ \cap (t_D^4)$ and an integer $e_0 \geq 0$ such that $\widetilde{0_{D, n}^*} = \widetilde{K_{D, n}^{e, c}}$ for every integer $e \geq e_0$ (Proposition 4.19). Since $(R, \{D\})$ is quasi- F -regular, we can find an integer $e \geq e_0$ such that $(R, \{D\} + (1/p^e)\operatorname{div}(c))$ is quasi- F^e -split (Theorem 4.31). By Proposition 4.37, there

exists a $W_n R$ -module homomorphism $\alpha : F_*^e W_n R(p^e D) \rightarrow W_n \omega_R(\lfloor D \rfloor - K_R)$ fitting inside the commutative diagram as in (4.37.1). By taking H_m^d , we obtain the following commutative diagram:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} H_m^d(W_n R(D)) & \xrightarrow{(\cdot F_*^e[c]) \circ F^e} & H_m^d(F_*^e W_n R(p^e D)) \\ \downarrow R^{n-1} & & \swarrow \alpha' \\ H_m^d(R(D)) & & \\ \downarrow \beta & & \\ H_m^d(W_n \omega_R(-K_R + \lfloor D \rfloor)) & & \end{array}$$

By $(\cdot F_*^e[c]) \circ F^e(\widetilde{0_{D,n}^*}) = 0$, we get $\beta \circ R^{n-1}(\widetilde{0_{D,n}^*}) = 0$, that is,

$$R^{n-1}(\widetilde{0_{D,n}^*}) \subseteq \text{Ker}(\beta).$$

It suffices to show that β is injective. Applying the Matlis duality $\text{Hom}_{W_n R}(-, E)$ to β , we get

$$R^{n-1} : W_n R(K_R - \lfloor D \rfloor) \rightarrow R(K_R - \lfloor D \rfloor),$$

which is surjective. Hence β is injective. This completes the proof for the case when $m = 1$.

Next, we assume $m \geq 2$. Consider the following commutative diagram in which each horizontal sequence is exact:

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} H_m^d(F_* W_{m+n-2} R(pD)) & \xrightarrow{V} & H_m^d(W_{m+n-1} R(D)) & \xrightarrow{R^{m+n-2}} & H_m^d(R(D)) \\ \downarrow R^{n-1} & & \downarrow R^{n-1} & & \parallel \\ H_m^d(F_* W_{m-1} R(pD)) & \xrightarrow{V} & H_m^d(W_m R(D)) & \xrightarrow{R^{m-1}} & H_m^d(R(D)). \end{array}$$

We have

$$R^{m+n-2}(\widetilde{0_{D,m+n-1}^*}) \stackrel{(i)}{=} 0_{D,m+n-1}^* \stackrel{(ii)}{\subseteq} 0_{D,n}^* \stackrel{(iii)}{=} R^{n-1}(\widetilde{0_{D,n}^*}) \stackrel{(iv)}{=} 0,$$

where (i) and (iii) hold by Theorem 4.20, (ii) follows from $m+n-1 \geq n$, and (iv) is valid by the case when $m = 1$, which has been settled already. By the exactness of the upper horizontal sequence and $V^{-1}(\widetilde{0_{D,m+n-1}^*}) = F_* 0_{pD,m+n-2}^*$ (Proposition 4.16(2)), it is enough to show that $R^{n-1}(\widetilde{0_{pD,m+n-2}^*}) = 0$. This holds by the induction hypothesis. \square

5. QUASI-TEST IDEALS VIA ALTERATIONS

In this section, we investigate the relationship between quasi-test ideals and alterations. Our goal is to prove the implication: quasi- F -regular \Rightarrow klt (Theorem 5.8). This is established as a consequence of the inclusion $\tau_n(X, \Delta) \subseteq \mathcal{J}(X, \Delta)$ (Corollary 5.7).

Moreover, in the log \mathbb{Q} -Gorenstein case, we will show that for a sufficiently high finite cover $f : Y \rightarrow X$, the n -quasi-test ideal $\tau_n(X, \Delta)$ coincides with the image

of the trace map of $\Phi_{X, K_X + \Delta, n}^f : \mathcal{O}_X(K_X + \Delta) \rightarrow Q_{X, K_X + \Delta, n}^f$ (Theorem 5.10). This observation leads to the conclusion that (X, Δ) is n -quasi- F -regular if and only if (R, Δ) is n -quasi- $+$ -regular (Theorem 5.11).

As it is not natural to assume in this section that our schemes are affine, we start by globalising the local concepts introduced earlier (Subsection 5.1).

5.1. Quasi-test ideals in the global case. In this subsection, we globalise some notions obtained in earlier parts.

Definition 5.1. We use Notation 2.20. Take an integer $n > 0$ and a \mathbb{Q} -divisor D on X . For the generic point ξ of X , we denote the stalk of $W_n\omega_X$ at ξ by $W_n\omega_{X,\xi}$, and we let $\underline{W_n\omega_{X,\xi}}$ be the corresponding constant sheaf on X . Set $\underline{\omega_{X,\xi}} := \underline{W_1\omega_{X,\xi}}$.

- (1) $\tau(W_n\omega_X, D)$ is defined as the coherent $W_n\mathcal{O}_X$ -submodule of $\underline{W_n\omega_{X,\xi}}$ such that for every affine open subset U of X and $R := \Gamma(U, \mathcal{O}_X)$, the following equality

$$\Gamma(U, \tau(W_n\omega_X, D)) = \tau(W_n\omega_R, D|_U),$$

of R -submodules of the R -module $W_n\omega_{X,\xi} = W_n\omega_R \otimes_{W_nR} W_n(K(R))$ holds. The existence of $\tau(W_n\omega_X, D)$ is assured by Proposition 4.8.

- (2) $\tau_n(\omega_X, D)$ is defined as the coherent \mathcal{O}_X -submodule of $\underline{\omega_{X,\xi}}$ such that for every affine open subset U of X and $R := \Gamma(U, \mathcal{O}_X)$, the following equality

$$\Gamma(U, \tau_n(\omega_X, D)) = \tau_n(\omega_R, D|_U),$$

of R -submodules of the R -module $\omega_{X,\xi} = \omega_R \otimes_R K(R)$ holds. Equivalently, $\tau_n(\omega_X, D)$ is defined as

$$\tau_n(\omega_X, D) = ((R^{n-1})^*)^{-1}(\tau(W_n\omega_X, D)),$$

where $(R^{n-1})^* : \underline{\omega_{X,\xi}} \rightarrow \underline{W_n\omega_{X,\xi}}$.

Definition 5.2. We use Notation 2.20. Let Δ be a \mathbb{Q} -divisor on X such that $K_X + \Delta$ is \mathbb{Q} -Cartier. Take an integer $n > 0$. Set

$$\begin{aligned} \tau(W_nX, \Delta) &:= \tau(W_n\omega_X, K_X + \Delta) \subseteq W_n\omega_X(-(K_X + \Delta)) \\ \tau_n(X, \Delta) &:= \tau_n(\omega_X, K_X + \Delta) \subseteq \mathcal{O}_X([- \Delta]) \simeq \omega_X(-(K_X + \Delta)) \\ \tau^q(X, \Delta) &:= \tau^q(\omega_X, K_X + \Delta) \subseteq R([- \Delta]) \simeq \omega_R(-(K_X + \Delta)). \end{aligned}$$

In particular, $\tau_n(X, \Delta)$ and $\tau^q(X, \Delta)$ are coherent \mathcal{O}_X -submodules of $\mathcal{O}_X([- \Delta])$, which we call the n -quasi-test ideal and the quasi-test ideal of (X, Δ) , respectively.

For an affine open subset U of X and $R := \Gamma(U, \mathcal{O}_X)$, it is easy to see that

$$\begin{aligned} \Gamma(U, \tau(W_nX, \Delta)) &= \tau(W_nR, \Delta|_U), \\ \Gamma(U, \tau_n(X, \Delta)) &= \tau_n(R, \Delta|_U), \\ \Gamma(U, \tau^q(X, \Delta)) &= \tau^q(R, \Delta|_U). \end{aligned}$$

Proposition 5.3. We use Notation 2.20. Take a \mathbb{Q} -divisor Δ such that $D := K_X + \Delta$ is \mathbb{Q} -Cartier. Let H be a Cartier divisor on X . Then the following hold.

- (1) $\tau(W_n\omega_X, D + H) = \tau(W_n\omega_X, D) \otimes_{W_n\mathcal{O}_X} W_n\mathcal{O}_X(-H)$.

- (2) $\tau_n(\omega_X, D + H) = \tau_n(\omega_X, D) \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_X} \mathcal{O}_X(-H)$.
- (3) $\tau(W_n X, \Delta + H) = \tau(W_n X, \Delta) \otimes_{W_n \mathcal{O}_X} W_n \mathcal{O}_X(-H)$.
- (4) $\tau_n(X, \Delta + H) = \tau_n(X, \Delta) \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_X} \mathcal{O}_X(-H)$.

Proof. Let us show (1). Recall that $\tau(W_n \omega_X, D + H) \subseteq \underline{W_n \omega_{X, \xi}}$ and $\tau(W_n \omega_X, D) \subseteq \underline{W_n \omega_{X, \xi}}$ (Definition 5.1(1)), which implies

$$\tau(W_n \omega_X, D) \otimes_{W_n \mathcal{O}_X} W_n \mathcal{O}_X(-H) \subseteq \underline{W_n \omega_{X, \xi}} \otimes_{W_n \mathcal{O}_X} W_n \mathcal{O}_X(-H) = \underline{W_n \omega_{X, \xi}}.$$

Therefore, both sides of (1) are coherent $W_n \mathcal{O}_X$ -submodules of the constant sheaf $\underline{W_n \omega_{X, \xi}}$. Taking an affine open cover of X on which H is principal, we may assume that $X = \text{Spec } R$ and $H = \text{div}(h)$ for some $h \in K(R)^\times$. There exist $h_1, h_2 \in R^\circ$ satisfying $h = h_1/h_2$. Hence the problem is reduced to the case when $h \in R^\circ$, in which it holds that

$$\tau(W_n \omega_X, D) \otimes_{W_n \mathcal{O}_X} W_n \mathcal{O}_X(-H) = [h] \cdot \tau(W_n \omega_X, D).$$

Then the assertion follows from Proposition 4.6(2), and so (1) holds.

The assertion (2) follows from (1) and $\tau_n(\omega_X, D) = ((R^{n-1})^*)^{-1}(\tau(W_n \omega_X, D))$ (Definition 5.1(2)). Then (1) and (2) imply (3) and (4), respectively (Definition 5.2). \square

Corollary 5.4. *We use Notation 2.20. Take an effective \mathbb{Q} -divisor Δ such that $K_X + \Delta$ is \mathbb{Q} -Cartier and $[\Delta] = 0$. Fix an integer $n \geq 1$ and a point $x \in X$. Then $(\text{Spec } \mathcal{O}_{X, x}, \Delta_x)$ is n -quasi- F -regular (resp. quasi- F -regular) if and only if $\tau_n(X, \Delta)_x = \mathcal{O}_{X, x}$ (resp. $\tau^q(X, \Delta)_x = \mathcal{O}_{X, x}$). In particular, the n -quasi- F -regular locus and quasi- F -regular locus of X are open subsets of X .*

Proof. We take an affine open subset $U = \text{Spec } R$ of X such that $x \in U$. By construction, we have $\tau_n(X, \Delta)_x = \tau_n(U, (\Delta|_U))_x = \tau_n(R, (\Delta|_U))_x$. Thus, by Proposition 4.30, $(\text{Spec } \mathcal{O}_{X, x}, \Delta_x)$ is n -quasi- F -regular if and only if $\tau_n(X, \Delta)_x = \mathcal{O}_{X, x}$. Therefore, the n -quasi- F -regular locus of X coincides with $\{x \in X \mid \tau_n(X, \Delta)_x = \mathcal{O}_{X, x}\}$, thus it is open, as desired. The remaining assertion follows from a similar argument as above. \square

5.2. Behaviour of quasi-test ideals under alterations.

Proposition 5.5. *We use Notation 2.20. Let $f: Y \rightarrow X$ be a finite surjective morphism from an integral normal scheme Y , and let D be a \mathbb{Q} -Cartier \mathbb{Q} -divisor on X . Then*

$$T_n^f(\tau(W_n \omega_Y, f^* D)) = \tau(W_n \omega_X, D),$$

where $T_n^f: f_* W_n \omega_Y \rightarrow W_n \omega_X$ denotes the trace map, obtained from the pullback homomorphism $W_n \mathcal{O}_X \rightarrow f_* W_n \mathcal{O}_Y$ by applying $\text{Hom}_{W_n \mathcal{O}_X}(-, W_n \omega_X)$.

Proof. We may assume that $X = \text{Spec } R$, $Y = \text{Spec } S$, and D is effective. Set $J_Y := \text{Im}(T_n^f: f_* W_n \omega_Y(-f^* D) \rightarrow W_n \omega_X(-D))$. For the time being, we finish the proof by assuming Claim below.

Claim. J_Y is a co-small $W_n \mathcal{O}_X$ -submodule of $W_n \omega_X(-D)$.

After taking a suitable affine cover of X , we may assume that $D = \text{adiv}(g)$ for some $a \in \mathbb{Q}_{\geq 0}$ and $g \in R^\circ$. By Proposition 4.6(4), there exists $c \in R^\circ$ such that

$$\begin{aligned}\tau(W_n\omega_X, D) &= \sum_{e \geq 0} T_{X,n}^e(F_*^e[cg^{[a(p^e-1)]}] \cdot J_Y), \\ \tau(W_n\omega_Y, f^*D) &= \sum_{e \geq 0} T_{Y,n}^e(F_*^e[cg^{[a(p^e-1)]}] \cdot W_n\omega_Y(-f^*D)),\end{aligned}$$

where $T_{X,n}^e$ and $T_{Y,n}^e$ denote the trace maps of X and Y , respectively:

$$T_{X,n}^e : F_*^e W_n\omega_X \rightarrow W_n\omega_X, \quad T_{Y,n}^e : F_*^e W_n\omega_Y \rightarrow W_n\omega_Y.$$

Therefore, we have

$$\begin{aligned}T_n^f(f_*\tau(W_n\omega_Y, f^*D)) &= \sum_{e \geq 0} T_n^f(T_{Y,n}^e(F_*^e[cg^{[a(p^e-1)]}] \cdot W_n\omega_Y(-f^*D))) \\ &= \sum_{e \geq 0} T_{X,n}^e(T_n^f(F_*^e[cg^{[a(p^e-1)]}] \cdot W_n\omega_Y(-f^*D))) \\ &= \sum_{e \geq 0} T_{X,n}^e(F_*^e[cg^{[a(p^e-1)]}] \cdot T_n^f(W_n\omega_Y(-f^*D))) \\ &= \sum_{e \geq 0} T_{X,n}^e(F_*^e[cg^{[a(p^e-1)]}] \cdot J_Y) = \tau(W_n\omega_X, D).\end{aligned}$$

Thus it is enough to prove Claim. By shrinking X , we may assume that

- X and Y are regular,
- $D = 0$, and
- $\mathcal{O}_X \rightarrow f_*\mathcal{O}_Y$ splits as an \mathcal{O}_X -module homomorphism (note that the induced field extension $K(X) \hookrightarrow K(Y)$ splits as a $K(X)$ -linear map).

Then we obtain the following commutative diagram in which each horizontal sequence is exact:

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} 0 & \longrightarrow & f_*\omega_Y & \longrightarrow & f_*W_n\omega_Y & \longrightarrow & f_*F_*W_{n-1}\omega_Y & \longrightarrow & 0 \\ & & \downarrow T_1^f & & \downarrow T_n^f & & \downarrow F_*T_{n-1}^f & & \\ 0 & \longrightarrow & \omega_X & \longrightarrow & W_n\omega_X & \longrightarrow & F_*W_{n-1}\omega_Y & \longrightarrow & 0. \end{array}$$

Since $\mathcal{O}_X \rightarrow f_*\mathcal{O}_Y$ splits, T_1^f is surjective. By the snake lemma and the induction on n , T_n^f is surjective for every integer $n > 0$. This completes the proof of Claim. \square

Theorem 5.6. *We use Notation 2.20. Let D be a \mathbb{Q} -Cartier \mathbb{Q} -divisor on X . Then the following hold.*

- (1) *For every integer $n > 0$ and every alteration $f: Y \rightarrow X$ from an integral normal scheme Y , it holds that*

$$(5.6.1) \quad \tau(W_n\omega_X, D) \subseteq \text{Im}(f_*W_n\omega_Y(-f^*D) \rightarrow W_n\omega_X(-D)).$$

- (2) *For every integer $n > 0$, there exists a finite separable morphism $f: Y \rightarrow X$ from an integral normal scheme Y such that*

$$\tau(W_n\omega_X, D) = \text{Im}(f_*W_n\omega_Y(-f^*D) \rightarrow W_n\omega_X(-D)).$$

Proof. We may assume that $X = \text{Spec } R$.

Let us show (1). We may assume that K_X and D are effective. We consider the diagram

$$(5.6.2) \quad \begin{array}{ccccc} 0 & \longrightarrow & f_*\omega_Y(-f^*D) & \xrightarrow{(R^{n-1})^*} & f_*W_n\omega_Y(-f^*D) & \xrightarrow{V^*} & f_*F_*W_{n-1}\omega_Y(-f^*D) \\ & & \downarrow T_1^f & & \downarrow T_n^f & & \downarrow T_{n-1}^f \\ 0 & \longrightarrow & \omega_X(-D) & \xrightarrow{(R^{n-1})^*} & W_n\omega_X(-D) & \xrightarrow{V^*} & F_*W_{n-1}\omega_X(-D). \end{array}$$

First, we prove that the image J_n of T_n^f is co-small and $C_n(D)$ -stable. Since f is finite over a suitable open subset on X , J_n is co-small by the proof of Proposition 5.5. To prove that it is $C_n(D)$ -stable, take $\varphi \in C_n^e(D)$. Then there exists $g \in \mathcal{O}_X(-(p^e-1)D)$ such that $\varphi = T_{X,n}^e \circ (\cdot F_*^e[g])$:

$$\varphi = T_{X,n}^e \circ (\cdot F_*^e[g]) : F_*^e W_n \omega_X((p^e-1)D) \xrightarrow{\cdot F_*^e[g]} F_*^e W_n \omega_X \xrightarrow{T_{X,n}^e} W_n \omega_X.$$

For

$$\varphi_Y := T_{Y,n}^e \circ (\cdot F_*^e[g]) \in \text{Hom}_{W_n \mathcal{O}_Y}(F_*^e W_n \omega_Y((p^e-1)f^*D), W_n \omega_Y),$$

we have

$$\begin{aligned} \varphi(F_*^e J_n) &= \varphi \circ T_n^f(F_*^e W_n \omega_Y(-f^*D)) \\ &= T_n^f(\varphi_Y(F_*^e W_n \omega_Y(-f^*D))) \\ &\subseteq T_n^f(W_n \omega_Y(-f^*D)) = J_n, \end{aligned}$$

where the inclusion follows from Proposition 4.5(1). Therefore, we have

$$\tau(W_n \omega_X, D) \subseteq J_n$$

by minimality (Proposition 4.6(1)). Thus (1) holds.

Let us show (2). We first treat the case when $D = 0$. By (1) and Noetherian induction, we may assume that R is a local ring. However, being local will not be stable under the following argument, and hence we only assume that R is a semi-local ring, that is, R has only finitely many maximal ideals $\mathfrak{m}_1, \dots, \mathfrak{m}_r$. Set \mathfrak{m} to be its Jacobson radical ($\mathfrak{m} := \mathfrak{m}_1 \cap \dots \cap \mathfrak{m}_r$). For $X_i := \text{Spec } \mathcal{O}_{X, \mathfrak{m}_i}$,

- (A) it holds that $H_{\mathfrak{m}}^d(W_n \mathcal{O}_X) = \bigoplus_{i=1}^r H_{\mathfrak{m}_i}^d(W_n \mathcal{O}_{X_i}) \oplus \dots \oplus H_{\mathfrak{m}_r}^d(W_n \mathcal{O}_{X_r})$, and
- (B) we set

$$\widetilde{0}_{X,n}^* := \bigoplus_{i=1}^r \widetilde{0}_{X_i,n}^* \subseteq \bigoplus_{i=1}^r H_{\mathfrak{m}_i}^d(W_n \mathcal{O}_{X_i}) = H_{\mathfrak{m}}^d(W_n \mathcal{O}_X),$$

where (A) follows from $H_{\mathfrak{m}}^d(W_n R) \simeq H_{\widehat{\mathfrak{m}}}^d(W_n \widehat{R})$ [BH93, Proposition 3.5.4(d)] and $\widehat{R} \simeq \widehat{R}_{\mathfrak{m}_1} \times \dots \times \widehat{R}_{\mathfrak{m}_r}$ [Nag62, Theorem 17.7]. Consider the following statement:

- (\star_n) there exists a separable finite cover $f: Y \rightarrow X$ such that $f^*(\widetilde{0}_{X,n}^*) = 0$ for the pullback map

$$f^* : H_{\mathfrak{m}}^d(W_n \mathcal{O}_X) \rightarrow H_{\mathfrak{m}}^d(f_* W_n \mathcal{O}_Y).$$

We now prove (\star_n) by induction on n . The base case (\star_1) of this induction follows from [BST15b, Theorem 3.2(b)]. Assume $n \geq 2$. By (\star_1) , we can find a separable finite cover $f: Y \rightarrow X$ such that $f^*(\widetilde{0_{X,1}^*}) = 0$. Recall that we have

$$H_{\mathfrak{m}}^d(f_*\mathcal{O}_Y) \stackrel{(i)}{=} H_{\mathfrak{m}_{\mathcal{O}_Y}}^d(\mathcal{O}_Y) \stackrel{(ii)}{=} H_{\mathfrak{m}_Y}^d(\mathcal{O}_Y)$$

where \mathfrak{m}_Y denotes the Jacobson radical of Y , (i) follows from [Sta14, Tag 0952], and (ii) holds by $\sqrt{\mathfrak{m}_{\mathcal{O}_Y}} = \mathfrak{m}_Y$. By applying (\star_{n-1}) to Y , there exists a separable finite cover $g: Z \rightarrow Y$ such that $g^*(\widetilde{0_{Y,n-1}^*}) = 0$ for

$$g^*: H_{\mathfrak{m}_Y}^d(W_{n-1}\mathcal{O}_Y) \rightarrow H_{\mathfrak{m}_Y}^d(g_*W_{n-1}\mathcal{O}_Z).$$

Pick $x \in \widetilde{0_{X,n}^*} \subseteq H_{\mathfrak{m}}^d(W_n\mathcal{O}_X)$. By the choice of f , we have $R^{n-1}(f^*x) = f^*R^{n-1}(x) = 0$. Then there exists $y \in H_{\mathfrak{m}}^d(f_*F_*W_{n-1}\mathcal{O}_Y)$ such that $Vy = f^*x$. By (A) and Proposition 3.20, we obtain $y \in F_*\widetilde{0_{Y,n-1}^*} \subseteq H_{\mathfrak{m}}^d(f_*\mathcal{O}_Y)$. By the choice of g , we have $g^*y = 0$. Therefore, $\widetilde{0_{X,n}^*}$ maps to zero via the composite pullback map

$$g^*f^*: H_{\mathfrak{m}}^d(W_n\mathcal{O}_X) \rightarrow H_{\mathfrak{m}}^d(f_*g_*W_n\mathcal{O}_Z).$$

This completes the proof of (\star_n) .

Let us settle the case when $D = 0$ by using (\star_n) . Note that (\star_n) induces the map

$$f^*: H_{\mathfrak{m}}^d(W_n\mathcal{O}_X) \twoheadrightarrow \frac{H_{\mathfrak{m}}^d(W_n\mathcal{O}_X)}{\widetilde{0_n^*}} \rightarrow H_{\mathfrak{m}}^d(f_*\mathcal{O}_Y).$$

By applying the Matlis duality functor $\mathrm{Hom}_{W_nR}(-, E)$, we get the following

$$W_n\omega_X \leftarrow \tau(W_n\omega_X) \leftarrow f_*W_n\omega_Y,$$

where the middle term can be computed by Proposition 3.28. This, together with (1), completes the proof for the case when $D = 0$.

Let us reduce the general case to this case. There exists a separable finite cover $f: Y \rightarrow X$ from an integral normal scheme Y such that f^*D is Cartier [BST15b, Lemma 4.5]. Since the case when $D = 0$ has been settled already, we can find a finite separable cover $g: Z \rightarrow Y$ such that

$$\tau(W_n\omega_Y) = \mathrm{Im}(g_*W_n\omega_Z \rightarrow W_n\omega_Y).$$

By the following isomorphism (Proposition 5.3):

$$\tau(W_n\omega_Y, f^*D) \simeq \tau(W_n\omega_Y) \otimes_{W_n\mathcal{O}_Y} W_n\mathcal{O}_Y(-f^*D),$$

we get

$$\tau(W_n\omega_Y, f^*D) = \mathrm{Im}(g_*W_n\omega_Z(-g^*f^*D) \rightarrow W_n\omega_Y(-f^*D)).$$

It follows from Proposition 5.5 that

$$\tau(W_n\omega_X, D) = \mathrm{Im}(f_*g_*W_n\omega_Z(-g^*f^*D) \rightarrow W_n\omega_X(-D)).$$

□

Corollary 5.7. *We use Notation 2.20. Let $f: Y \rightarrow X$ be an alteration from an integral normal scheme Y . Let Δ be a \mathbb{Q} -divisor on X such that $K_X + \Delta$ is \mathbb{Q} -Cartier. Then the following hold.*

- (1) $\tau_n(X, \Delta) \subseteq ((R^{n-1})^*)^{-1}(\text{Im}(f_*W_n\omega_Y(-f^*(K_X + \Delta)) \rightarrow W_n\omega_X(-(K_X + \Delta))))$
- (2) $\tau_n(X, \Delta) \subseteq \mathcal{J}(X, \Delta)$.

Proof. By Definition 5.2, we have

$$\tau_n(X, \Delta) = \tau_n(\omega_X, K_X + \Delta).$$

The assertion (1) follows immediately from Theorem 5.6(1) by taking the inverse images by $((R^{n-1})^*)^{-1}$ (cf. (5.6.2)).

Let us show (2). Set $D := K_X + \Delta$. Assume that f is birational. Then all the vertical arrows in (5.6.2) are injective. Hence the left square in the diagram (5.6.2) consists of injections. In what follows, we consider each $W_n\mathcal{O}_X$ -module in this square as a $W_n\mathcal{O}_X$ -submodule of $W_n\omega_X(-D)$. We then get

$$\tau_n(\omega_X, D) \stackrel{(i)}{\subseteq} \omega_X(-D) \cap f_*W_n\omega_Y(-f^*D) \stackrel{(ii)}{\subseteq} f_*\omega_Y(-f^*D),$$

where (i) holds by (1) and (ii) follows by chasing the diagram (5.6.2) (specifically, $\zeta \in \omega_X(-D) \cap f_*W_n\omega_Y(-f^*D) \Rightarrow T_{n-1}^f \circ V^*(\zeta) = 0 \Rightarrow V^*(\zeta) = 0 \Rightarrow \zeta \in f_*\omega_Y(-f^*D)$). Therefore, we get $\tau_n(\omega_X, K_X + \Delta) \subseteq \mathcal{J}(X, \Delta)$. Thus (2) holds. \square

Theorem 5.8. *We use Notation 2.20. Let Δ be an effective \mathbb{Q} -divisor on X such that $K_X + \Delta$ is \mathbb{Q} -Cartier. If (X, Δ) is quasi- F -regular, then (X, Δ) is klt.*

Proof. It follows from Corollary 5.7(2) that

$$\tau_n(X, \Delta) \subseteq \mathcal{J}(X, \Delta) \subseteq \mathcal{O}_X.$$

Assume that (X, Δ) is quasi- F -regular. Then $\tau_n(X, \Delta) = \mathcal{O}_X$ for some $n > 0$ (Proposition 4.30(1)), which implies $\mathcal{J}(X, \Delta) = \mathcal{O}_X$, that is, (X, Δ) is klt. \square

5.3. Quasi- F -regularity and quasi-+-regularity. In what follows, we recall the definition of quasi-+-regularity from [TWY24].

Definition 5.9. We use Notation 2.20. Let Δ be a \mathbb{Q} -divisor on X . Take an integer $n > 0$ and a finite surjective morphism $f: Y \rightarrow X$ from an integral normal scheme Y . We define a $W_n\mathcal{O}_X$ -module $Q_{X,\Delta,n}^f$ and a $W_n\mathcal{O}_X$ -module homomorphism $\Phi_{X,\Delta,n}^f$ by the following pushout diagram:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} W_n\mathcal{O}_X(\Delta) & \xrightarrow{f^*} & f_*W_n\mathcal{O}_Y(f^*\Delta) \\ \downarrow R^{n-1} & & \downarrow \\ \mathcal{O}_X(\Delta) & \xrightarrow{\Phi_{X,\Delta,n}^f} & Q_{X,\Delta,n}^f \end{array}$$

- (1) We say that (X, Δ) is *globally n -quasi- f -regular* if $[\Delta] = 0$ and the induced map

$$(5.9.1) \quad \begin{aligned} \mathrm{Hom}_{W_n \mathcal{O}_X}(\Phi_{X, \Delta, n}^f, W_n \omega_X(-K_X)) &: \mathrm{Hom}_{W_n \mathcal{O}_X}(Q_{X, \Delta, n}^f, W_n \omega_X(-K_X)) \\ &\longrightarrow \mathrm{Hom}_{W_n \mathcal{O}_X}(\mathcal{O}_X, W_n \omega_X(-K_X)) \end{aligned}$$

is surjective, where the map (5.9.1) is obtained by applying

$$\mathrm{Hom}_{W_n \mathcal{O}_X}(-, W_n \omega_X(-K_X))$$

to $\Phi_{X, \Delta, n}^f : \mathcal{O}_X = \mathcal{O}_X(\Delta) \rightarrow Q_{X, \Delta, n}^f$.

- (2) We say that (X, Δ) is *globally n -quasi-+-regular* if $[\Delta] = 0$ and it is n -quasi- f -regular for every finite surjective morphism $f : Y \rightarrow X$ from an integral normal scheme Y . We say that (X, Δ) is *globally quasi-+-regular* if (X, Δ) is globally n -quasi-+-regular for some $n \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$.

When X is affine, we simply say that (X, Δ) is *n -quasi-+-regular* (resp. *quasi-+-regular*) if it is globally n -quasi-+-regular (resp. globally quasi-+-regular).

Theorem 5.10. *We use Notation 2.20. Let Δ be a \mathbb{Q} -divisor on X such that $K_X + \Delta$ is \mathbb{Q} -Cartier. For an alteration $f : Y \rightarrow X$ from an integral normal scheme Y , we define the \mathcal{O}_X -submodule $I_n^f(\Delta)$ of $\mathcal{O}_X([\Delta])$ as the image of the $W_n \mathcal{O}_X$ -module homomorphism*

$$(\Phi_{X, K_X + \Delta, n}^f)^* : \mathcal{H}om(Q_{X, K_X + \Delta, n}^f, W_n \omega_X) \rightarrow \mathcal{H}om(\mathcal{O}_X(K_X + \Delta), W_n \omega_X) = \mathcal{O}_X([\Delta])$$

induced by applying $\mathcal{H}om_{W_n \mathcal{O}_X}(-, W_n \omega_X)$ to $\Phi_{X, K_X + \Delta, n}^f : \mathcal{O}_X(K_X + \Delta) \rightarrow Q_{X, K_X + \Delta, n}^f$. Then the following hold.

- (1) For every integer $n > 0$ and every alteration $f : Y \rightarrow X$ from an integral normal scheme Y , it holds that

$$\tau_n(X, \Delta) \subseteq I_n^f(\Delta).$$

- (2) For every integer $n > 0$, there exists a finite separable morphism $f : Y \rightarrow X$ from an integral normal scheme Y such that

$$\tau_n(X, \Delta) = I_n^f(\Delta).$$

Proof. By Definition 5.1 and Definition 5.2, we have $\tau_n(X, \Delta) = \tau_n(\omega_X, K_X + \Delta)$ and

$$((R^{n-1})^*)^{-1}(\tau(W_n \omega_X, K_X + \Delta)) = \tau_n(\omega_X, K_X + \Delta),$$

where

$$(R^{n-1})^* : \omega_X(-(K_X + \Delta)) \rightarrow W_n \omega_X(-(K_X + \Delta)).$$

Fix an alteration $f : Y \rightarrow X$ from an integral normal scheme Y such that $f^*(K_X + \Delta)$ is Cartier. By Theorem 5.6, it is enough to show that

$$((R^{n-1})^*)^{-1}(\mathrm{Im}(f_* W_n \omega_Y(-f^*(K_X + \Delta)) \rightarrow W_n \omega_X(-(K_X + \Delta)))) = I_n^f(\Delta).$$

Consider the following commutative diagram in which each horizontal sequence is exact:

$$\begin{array}{ccccccccc}
0 & \longrightarrow & F_*W_{n-1}\mathcal{O}_X(p(K_X + \Delta)) & \xrightarrow{V} & W_n\mathcal{O}_X(K_X + \Delta) & \xrightarrow{R^{n-1}} & \mathcal{O}_X(K_X + \Delta) & \longrightarrow & 0 \\
& & \parallel & & \downarrow & & \downarrow \Phi_{X,K_X+\Delta,n}^f & & \\
0 & \longrightarrow & F_*W_{n-1}\mathcal{O}_X(p(K_X + \Delta)) & \longrightarrow & f_*W_n\mathcal{O}_Y(f^*(K_X + \Delta)) & \xrightarrow{\psi} & Q_{X,K_X+\Delta,n}^f & \longrightarrow & 0.
\end{array}$$

Taking $(-)^* := \mathcal{H}om_{W_n\mathcal{O}_X}(-, W_n\omega_X)$, we get

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
0 & \longrightarrow & \mathcal{H}om(Q_{X,K_X+\Delta,n}^f, W_n\omega_X) & \xrightarrow{\psi^*} & f_*W_n\omega_Y(-f^*(K_X + \Delta)) \\
& & \downarrow (\Phi_{X,K_X+\Delta,n}^f)^* & & \downarrow T_n^f \\
0 & \longrightarrow & \omega_X(-(K_X + \Delta)) & \xrightarrow{(R^{n-1})^*} & W_n\omega_X(-(K_X + \Delta)).
\end{array}$$

By construction (specifically, because the leftmost vertical arrow in the first diagram of this proof is an equality), we get that $\text{Coker}(\psi^*) \rightarrow \text{Coker}((R^{n-1})^*)$ is injective. Therefore, we obtain

$$((R^{n-1})^*)^{-1}(\text{Im}(T_n^f)) = \text{Im}((\Phi_{X,K_X+\Delta,n}^f)^*) = I_n^f(\Delta),$$

as required. \square

Theorem 5.11. *We use Notation 4.1. Let Δ be an effective \mathbb{Q} -divisor such that $[\Delta] = 0$ and $K_R + \Delta$ is \mathbb{Q} -Cartier. Take an integer $n > 0$. Then (R, Δ) is n -quasi- F -regular if and only if (R, Δ) is n -quasi-+-regular.*

Proof. Set $X := \text{Spec } R$. Note that the map (5.9.1) is the same as

$$(5.11.1) \quad \text{Hom}_{W_n\mathcal{O}_X}(\Phi_{X,K_X+\Delta,n}^f, W_n\omega_X) : \text{Hom}_{W_n\mathcal{O}_X}(Q_{X,K_X+\Delta,n}^f, W_n\omega_X) \\ \longrightarrow \text{Hom}_{W_n\mathcal{O}_X}(\mathcal{O}_X(K_X + \Delta), W_n\omega_X).$$

Let $I_n^f(\Delta)$ be the image of this $W_n\mathcal{O}_X$ -module homomorphism. It is enough to prove that the following statements are equivalent.

- (i) (X, Δ) is n -quasi- F -regular.
- (ii) $\tau_n(X, \Delta) = \mathcal{O}_X$.
- (iii) $I_n^f(\Delta) = \mathcal{O}_X$ for every finite surjective morphism $f: Y \rightarrow X$ from an integral normal scheme Y .
- (iv) (X, Δ) is n -quasi-+-regular

The equivalences (i) \Leftrightarrow (ii) and (iii) \Leftrightarrow (iv) follow from Proposition 4.30 and Definition 5.9, respectively. We get (ii) \Leftrightarrow (iii) by Theorem 5.10. \square

Proposition 5.12. *Let S be an integral scheme which is flat and of finite type over \mathbb{Z} . Let $\pi: X \rightarrow S$ be a morphism of finite type from an integral normal scheme X . Let Δ be a \mathbb{Q} -divisor on X such that $K_X + \Delta$ is \mathbb{Q} -Cartier. Then there exists an open dense subset U of S such that*

$$\mathcal{J}(X_\mu, \Delta_\mu) = \tau^q(X_\mu, \Delta_\mu) = \tau(X_\mu, \Delta_\mu)$$

for every closed point $\mu \in U$, where $X_\mu := \pi^{-1}(\mu)$ and $\Delta_\mu = \Delta|_{X_\mu}$.

Proof. By [Tak04, Theorem 3.2] (cf. [dFDTT15, Theorem 11]), there exists an open dense subset U of S such that

$$(5.12.1) \quad \mathcal{J}(X_\mu, \Delta_\mu) = \tau(X_\mu, \Delta_\mu)$$

for every closed point $\mu \in U$. By the definition of $\tau^q(X_\mu, \Delta_\mu)$, we have

$$(5.12.2) \quad \tau(X_\mu, \Delta_\mu) = \tau_1(X_\mu, \Delta_\mu) \subseteq \tau^q(X_\mu, \Delta_\mu).$$

On the other hand, by Corollary 5.7, we have

$$(5.12.3) \quad \tau^q(X_\mu, \Delta_\mu) \subseteq \mathcal{J}(X_\mu, \Delta_\mu).$$

Combining (5.12.1, 5.12.2, 5.12.3), we obtain

$$\mathcal{J}(X_\mu, \Delta_\mu) = \tau^q(X_\mu, \Delta_\mu) = \tau(X_\mu, \Delta_\mu).$$

□

Remark 5.13. Last, we point out that one can also prove that \mathbb{Q} -Gorenstein quasi-+-regular rings are klt by a similar argument to that of Theorem 3.44. In particular, this gives a somewhat different proof that \mathbb{Q} -Gorenstein quasi- F -regular rings are klt.

6. CONE CORRESPONDENCE FOR QUASI- F -REGULARITY

In this section, we establish the cone correspondences for n -quasi- F^e -splitting (Theorem 6.5) and quasi- F -regularity (Theorem 6.7). In most parts, the arguments are identical to the one of the cone correspondence for n -quasi- F -splitting established in [KTT⁺23].

Notation 6.1. (1) Let k be an F -finite field of characteristic $p > 0$. Let X be a projective normal variety over k with $\dim X \geq 1$ and $H^0(X, \mathcal{O}_X) = k$. Let D be an ample \mathbb{Q} -Cartier \mathbb{Q} -divisor. Set

$$R := R(X, D) := \bigoplus_{d \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}} H^0(X, \mathcal{O}_X(dD))t^d \subseteq K(X)[t],$$

which is a $\mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ -graded subring of the standard $\mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ -graded polynomial ring $K(X)[t]$. Note that R is a finitely generated $\mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ -graded k -algebra and $\text{Spec } R$ is an affine normal variety ([KTT⁺23, Theorem 10.4]). Let $D = \sum_{i=1}^r \frac{\ell_i}{d_i} D_i$ be the irreducible decomposition, where ℓ_i and d_i are coprime integers satisfying $d_i > 0$ for each $1 \leq i \leq r$. Set $D' := \sum_{i=1}^r \frac{d_i-1}{d_i} D_i$.

(2) For the graded maximal ideal $\mathfrak{m} := \bigoplus_{d > 0} H^0(X, \mathcal{O}_X(dD))t^d \subseteq R$, we set $U := \text{Spec } R \setminus \{\mathfrak{m}\}$. For $n \in \mathbb{Z}_{> 0}$, let

$$W_n R = \bigoplus_{e \in p^{-(n-1)}\mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}} (W_n R)_e$$

be the $p^{-(n-1)}\mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ -graded ring structure induced by Proposition [KTT⁺23, Proposition 7.1]:

$$(W_n R)_e := \{(r_0, r_1, \dots, r_{n-1}) \in W_n R \mid r_0 \in R_e, r_1 \in R_{pe}, \dots, r_{n-1} \in R_{p^{n-1}e}\},$$

where $R_c := 0$ for $c \in p^{-(n-1)}\mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0} \setminus \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$. Set $(W_n R)_{>0} := \bigoplus_{e \in p^{-(n-1)}\mathbb{Z}_{>0}} W_n R_e$, which is a graded primary ideal such that $\sqrt{(W_n R)_{>0}}$ is a maximal ideal.

- (3) For the induced isomorphism $U \simeq \text{Spec}_X \left(\bigoplus_{d \in \mathbb{Z}} \mathcal{O}_X(dD)t^d \right)$ [KTT⁺23, Theorem 10.4], let $\rho: U \rightarrow X$ be the natural morphism (cf. [KTT⁺23, Notation 7.7]). We note that ρ is flat over the regular locus of X by [KTT⁺23, Proposition 10.7(1)]. Let E be a \mathbb{Q} -divisor on X such that $\text{Supp}(\{E\})$ and $\text{Supp}(D')$ have no common irreducible component. Then we define the \mathbb{Q} -divisor \tilde{E} on $\text{Spec } R$ such that the restriction of \tilde{E} to $U' := \rho^{-1}(X_{\text{reg}})$ coincides with $(\rho|_{U'})^*(E|_{X_{\text{reg}}})$. Therefore, if $E = \sum_i a_i E_i$ is the irreducible decomposition, then $\tilde{E} = \sum_i a_i \tilde{E}_i$ is also the irreducible decomposition, and in particular, $\lfloor \tilde{E} \rfloor = \lfloor E \rfloor$. Furthermore, for $q \in \mathbb{Z}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} R(\tilde{E} + qK_R) &= H^0(X_{\text{reg}}, \rho'_* \mathcal{O}_{U'}(\tilde{E}|_{U'} + qK_{U'})) \\ &= H^0(X_{\text{reg}}, \rho'_* \mathcal{O}_{U'}(\lfloor \tilde{E} \rfloor|_{U'} + qK_{U'})) \\ &= H^0(X_{\text{reg}}, \mathcal{O}_{X_{\text{reg}}}(\lfloor E \rfloor|_{X_{\text{reg}}}) \otimes \rho'_* \mathcal{O}_{U'}(qK_{U'})) \\ &= \bigoplus_{d \in \mathbb{Z}} H^0(X, \mathcal{O}_X(E + q(K_X + D') + dD)) \cdot t^d \\ &\subseteq K(X)[t, t^{-1}], \end{aligned}$$

where $\rho' = \rho|_{U'}$ (cf. [KTT⁺23, 7.9]). Here, the third equality follows from [KTT⁺23, Proposition 7.12 (2)] and the equality

$$\lfloor E + q(K_X + D') + dD \rfloor = \lfloor E \rfloor + \lfloor q(K_X + D') + dD \rfloor,$$

which holds by the assumption on supports. In particular, $R(\tilde{E} + qK_R)$ has the natural \mathbb{Z} -graded R -module structure. We further define the $p^{-(n-1)}\mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ -graded structure on $W_n R(\tilde{E} + qK_R)$ by a similar way to the one of [KTT⁺23, Proposition 7.5]. In particular, $W_n R(\tilde{E} + qK_R)$ is a graded $W_n R$ -module.

Proposition 6.2. *We use Notation 6.1. Fix $d, n \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$. Then, for every $e \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$, the following commutative diagram consists of graded $W_n R$ -module homomorphisms of $p^{-(n+e-1)}\mathbb{Z}$ -graded $W_n R$ -modules*

$$(6.2.1) \quad \begin{array}{ccc} H^d(U, \mathcal{O}_U(K_U + \tilde{E}|_U)) & \xrightarrow{\Phi_{U, K_U + \tilde{E}|_U, n}^e} & H^d(Q_{U, K_U + \tilde{E}|_U, n}^e) \\ \downarrow \simeq & & \downarrow \simeq \\ H_{\mathfrak{m}}^{d+1}(R(K_R + \tilde{E})) & \xrightarrow{\Phi_{R, K_R + \tilde{E}, n}^e} & H_{\mathfrak{m}}^{d+1}(Q_{R, K_R + \tilde{E}, n}^e), \end{array}$$

where all the maps are the natural ones, each vertical map is an isomorphism, and the graded structures are given in Remark 6.3.

Proof. The assertion follows from a similar argument to the proof of [KTT⁺23, Proposition 7.14]. \square

Remark 6.3. We use the same notation as in Proposition 6.2. The graded structure on the $W_n R$ -modules in (6.2.1) are defined as follows.

- (1) Since $R(K_R + \tilde{E})$ is a \mathbb{Z} -graded R -module (Notation 6.1(3)), the \mathbb{Z} -graded R -module structure on $H_m^{d+1}(R(K_R + \tilde{E}))$ is introduced by [KTT⁺23, 7.6].
- (2) We define the $p^{-(n+e-1)}\mathbb{Z}$ -graded $W_n R$ -module structure on $Q_{R, K_R + \tilde{E}, n}^e$ by the same way as in [KTT⁺23, Remark 7.13]. The $p^{-(n+e-1)}\mathbb{Z}$ -graded $W_n R$ -module structure on $H_m^{d+1}(Q_{R, K_R + \tilde{E}, n}^e)$ is introduced by [KTT⁺23, 7.6].
- (3) We have the \mathbb{Z} -graded R -module structure $\mathcal{O}_U(K_U + \tilde{E}|_U)$ induced by the restriction of that of $R(K_R + \tilde{E})$, where the \mathbb{Z} -graded structure on $R(K_R + \tilde{E})$ is given in (1). Then the \mathbb{Z} -graded R -module structure on $H^d(U, \mathcal{O}_U(K_U + \tilde{E}|_U))$ is introduced by [KTT⁺23, 7.6]. We get the $p^{-(n+e-1)}\mathbb{Z}$ -graded $W_n R$ -module structure on $H^d(Q_{U, K_U + \tilde{E}|_U, n}^e)$ in the same way as in (2).

Proposition 6.4. *We use Notation 6.1. Set $d := \dim X$. Then, for every $e \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$, we have the commutative diagram*

$$\begin{array}{ccc} H^d(U, \mathcal{O}_U(K_U + \tilde{E}|_U))_0 & \xrightarrow{H^d(U, \Phi_{U, K_U + \tilde{E}|_U, n}^e)_0} & H^d(U, Q_{U, K_U + \tilde{E}|_U, n}^e)_0 \\ \simeq \uparrow & & \simeq \uparrow \\ H^d(X, \mathcal{O}_X(K_X + D' + E)) & \xrightarrow{H^d(X, \Phi_{X, K_X + D' + E, n}^e)} & H^d(X, Q_{X, K_X + D' + E, n}^e). \end{array}$$

Proof. The assertion follows from a similar argument to the proof of [KTT⁺23, Proposition 7.15]. \square

Theorem 6.5. *We use Notation 6.1. Let Δ be an effective \mathbb{Q} -divisor on X such that $[\Delta] = 0$ and $\text{Supp}(\Delta)$ and $\text{Supp}(D')$ have no common irreducible component. Take integers $n > 0$ and $e > 0$. Then $(\text{Spec } R_m, \tilde{\Delta})$ is n -quasi- F^e -split if and only if $(X, D' + \Delta)$ is n -quasi- F^e -split. In particular, $(\text{Spec } R_m, \tilde{\Delta})$ is quasi- F^e -split if and only if $(X, D' + \Delta)$ is quasi- F^e -split.*

Proof. The assertion follows from a similar argument to the proof of [KTT⁺23, Theorem 7.16] by using Proposition 6.2 and Proposition 6.4. \square

Corollary 6.6. *Let k be an F -finite field of characteristic $p > 0$ and let X be a projective normal variety over k . Let Δ be an effective \mathbb{Q} -divisor on X such that $-(K_X + \Delta)$ is \mathbb{Q} -Cartier and ample. Assume that there exists an effective Weil divisor H on X such that (1)-(3) hold.*

- (1) $H \sim -\ell(K_X + \Delta)$ for some integer $\ell > 0$.
- (2) $(X \setminus \text{Supp}(H), \{p^e \Delta\}|_{X \setminus \text{Supp}(H)})$ is strongly F -regular for every integer $e \geq 0$.
- (3) For every integer $m > 0$, there exists an integer $e > 0$ such that

$$(X, \Delta + (m/p^e)H)$$

is quasi- F^e -split.

Then (X, Δ) is globally quasi- F -regular.

Proof. We may assume $H^0(X, \mathcal{O}_X) = k$. Replacing H by rH for some $r \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$, the problem is reduced to the case when H is Cartier. Set $D := H$ and we use Notation 6.1. Since $D = H$ is Cartier, $D' = 0$ and every fibre of $\rho : U = \text{Spec}_X \mathcal{R} \rightarrow X$ is smooth, where

$$\mathcal{R} := \bigoplus_{d \in \mathbb{Z}} \mathcal{O}_X(dH)t^d.$$

As H is effective, we get $t \in R$ by $R = \bigoplus_{d \geq 0} H^0(X, \mathcal{O}_X(dD))t^d \subseteq K(X)[t]$ (Notation 6.1). Let \tilde{H} be the Weil divisor on $\text{Spec } R$ corresponding to H .

Let us show that $\tilde{H} = \text{div}(t)$. We take an affine open cover $\{V_i\}_{i \in I}$ of X such that, for every $i \in I$, we have $H|_{V_i} = \text{div}_{V_i}(f_i)$ for some $f_i \in \mathcal{O}_X(V_i)$. Recall that ρ is induced by the natural injection $\mathcal{O}_X \rightarrow \mathcal{R}$. For $U_i := \rho^{-1}(V_i)$, we get $\tilde{H}|_{U_i} = \text{div}_{U_i}(f_i)$. By $f_i \in \mathcal{O}_{V_i}(-H)$ and $f_i^{-1} \in \mathcal{O}_{V_i}(H)$, both $t^{-1}f_i$ and tf_i^{-1} are contained in $\mathcal{R}(U_i) = \mathcal{O}_U(U_i)$. Therefore, we have $\text{div}_{U_i}(t) = \text{div}_{U_i}(f_i) = \tilde{H}|_{U_i}$. Since $\text{div}(t)$ coincides with \tilde{H} on U , so does on $\text{Spec}(R)$.

Therefore, $\rho : U \rightarrow X$ induces a smooth morphism

$$\text{Spec } R_t = U \setminus \text{Supp}(\tilde{H}) \rightarrow X \setminus \text{Supp}(H).$$

By (2), $(\text{Spec } R_t, \{p^e \tilde{\Delta}\})$ is strongly F -regular for every $e \geq 0$. Then $\tau(R, \{p^e \tilde{\Delta}\})_t = \tau(R_t, \{p^e \tilde{\Delta}\}) = R_t$. Since $\tilde{\Delta}$ is a \mathbb{Q} -divisor, there exists $m > 0$ such that $t^m \in \tau(R, \{p^e \tilde{\Delta}\})$ for every $e \geq 0$. By (3), there exists $e_0 > 0$ such that $(X, \Delta + \frac{3m}{p^{e_0}}H)$ is quasi- F^{e_0} -split. Then $(\text{Spec } R_m, \tilde{\Delta} + (1/p^{e_0})\text{div}(t^{3m}))$ is quasi- F^{e_0} -split by Theorem 6.5. By Theorem 4.31, $(\text{Spec } R_m, \tilde{\Delta})$ is quasi- F -regular. Pick an effective Weil divisor E on X . Since $(\text{Spec } R_m, \tilde{\Delta})$ is n -quasi- F -regular for some $n > 0$, there exists a rational number $\epsilon > 0$ such that $(\text{Spec } R_m, \tilde{\Delta} + \epsilon \tilde{E})$ is n -quasi- F^e -split for every $e \geq 0$ (Definition 2.33). Again by Theorem 6.5, $(X, \Delta + \epsilon E)$ is n -quasi- F^e -split for every $e \geq 0$, where n is fixed and e is independent of n . Therefore, (X, Δ) is globally quasi- F -regular (Definition 2.33). \square

Theorem 6.7. *Let k be an F -finite field of characteristic $p > 0$. Let X be a projective normal variety over k with $\dim X \geq 1$ and $H^0(X, \mathcal{O}_X) = k$. Take a \mathbb{Q} -divisor B on X such that all the coefficients of B are contained in $\{1 - \frac{1}{m} \mid m \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}\}$ and $-(K_X + B)$ is \mathbb{Q} -Cartier and ample. Set*

$$R := R(X, -(K_X + B)) := \bigoplus_{d \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}} H^0(X, \mathcal{O}_X(-d(K_X + B)))t^d \subseteq K(X)[t],$$

which is a $\mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ -graded subring of the standard $\mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ -graded polynomial ring $K(X)[t]$. Set $\mathfrak{m} := \bigoplus_{d > 0} H^0(X, \mathcal{O}_X(-d(K_X + B)))t^d \subseteq R$. Then $R_{\mathfrak{m}}$ is quasi- F -regular if and only if (X, B) is globally quasi- F -regular.

Proof. Set $D := -(K_X + B)$. In what follows, we use Notation 6.1. Then $B = D'$. We take an ample effective Cartier divisor H on X such that

- $\text{Supp}(H)$ and $\text{Supp}(B)$ have no common irreducible components,

- $(X \setminus \text{Supp}(H), B|_{X \setminus \text{Supp}(H)})$ is simple normal crossing, and
- $H \sim -\ell(K_X + B) = \ell D$ for some integer $\ell > 0$.

First, we assume that R_m is quasi- F -regular. Then we can find a rational number $\epsilon > 0$ such that $-(K_X + B + \epsilon H)$ is still ample and $(\text{Spec } R_m, \epsilon \tilde{H})$ is quasi- F -regular by Theorem 4.36(3). In particular, there exists $n \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$ such that $(\text{Spec } R_m, \epsilon \tilde{H})$ is n -quasi- F^e -split for every integer $e > 0$. Applying Theorem 6.5 by setting $\tilde{\Delta} := \epsilon H$, $(X, B + \epsilon H)$ is n -quasi- F^e -split for every $e > 0$. For every integer $m > 0$, there exists $e \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$ such that $m/p^e \leq \epsilon$, and hence $(X, B + (m/p^e)H)$ is quasi- F^e -split. Thus (X, B) is globally quasi- F -regular by Corollary 6.6.

Next, we assume that (X, B) is globally quasi- F -regular. By the same argument as in the second paragraph of the proof of Corollary 6.6, we get $\tilde{D} = \text{div}(t)$. Since we have $H \sim \ell D$, it holds that $\text{div}(f) = \tilde{H} \sim \ell \tilde{D} = \text{div}(t^\ell)$ for some homogeneous element $f \in K(X)[t]$ of degree ℓ . We have the induced morphism:

$$\text{Spec } R_f = U \setminus \text{Supp}(\tilde{H}) \rightarrow X \setminus \text{Supp}(H).$$

Since $(X \setminus \text{Supp}(H), B|_{X \setminus \text{Supp}(H)})$ is simple normal crossing, $U \setminus \text{Supp}(\tilde{H})$ has étale locally toric singularities [KTT⁺23, Proposition 11.6], and hence R_f is strongly F -regular, i.e., $\tau(R)_f = \tau(R_f) = R_f$. Therefore, there exists an integer $m > 0$ such that $f^m \in \tau(R)$. Then f^m is a test element of R_m (Remark 2.18). Since (X, B) is globally quasi- F -regular, there exist $n \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$ and $e \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$ such that $(X, B + (3m/p^e)H)$ is n -quasi- F^e -split. By $\tilde{H} = \text{div}(f)$ and Theorem 6.5, $(\text{Spec } R_m, (1/p^e)\text{div}(f^{3m}))$ is n -quasi- F^e -split. Then it follows from Theorem 4.31 that R_m is quasi- F -regular. \square

7. QUASI- F -REGULARITY FOR FANO VARIETIES AND KLT SINGULARITIES

In this section, we apply our results to Fano varieties and klt singularities.

7.1. Fano varieties. It is natural to ask which Fano varieties are globally quasi- F -regular. As a fundamental result, we prove that quasi- F -regularity is equivalent to quasi- F -splitting for \mathbb{Q} -factorial strongly F -regular Fano varieties (Corollary 7.6). This result is meaningful, because it is much easier to check whether a given variety is quasi- F -split. As a consequence, klt del Pezzo surfaces are globally quasi- F -regular when $p > 5$ (Corollary 7.7).

Lemma 7.1. *Let $k \subseteq k'$ be a field extension of F -finite fields of characteristic $p > 0$. Let X be a projective normal variety over k such that $H^0(X, \mathcal{O}_X) = k$ and $X \times_k k'$ is normal. Take an effective \mathbb{Q} -divisor Δ on X . Then the following hold.*

- (1) *If $(X \times_k k', \Delta \times_k k')$ is globally n -quasi- F^e -split, then so is (X, Δ) .*
- (2) *If $(X \times_k k', \Delta \times_k k')$ is globally n -quasi- F -regular, then so is (X, Δ) .*

Proof. Let us show (1). Set $X' := X \times_k k'$ and $\Delta' := \Delta \times_k k'$. For the induced morphism $\pi : X' = X \times_k k' \rightarrow X$, we have that $\pi^* K_X = K_{X'}$, so we get the following

commutative diagram:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathcal{O}_X(K_X) & \xrightarrow{\Phi_{X,\Delta,n}^e} & Q_{X,K_X+\Delta,n}^e \\ \downarrow \alpha & & \downarrow \\ \pi_* \mathcal{O}_{X'}(K_{X'}) & \xrightarrow{\Phi_{X',\Delta',n}^e} & \pi_* Q_{X',K_X+\Delta',n}^e \end{array}$$

Since π is an affine morphism, we obtain the following commutative diagram by taking $H^d(X, -)$:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} H^d(X, \mathcal{O}_X(K_X)) & \xrightarrow{H^d(\Phi_{X,\Delta,n}^e)} & H^d(X, Q_{X,K_X+\Delta,n}^e) \\ \downarrow \beta & & \downarrow \\ H^d(X', \mathcal{O}_{X'}(K_{X'})) & \xrightarrow{H^d(\Phi_{X',\Delta',n}^e)} & H^d(X', Q_{X',K_X+\Delta',n}^e). \end{array}$$

Since α is a split injection, so is β . Therefore, if $H^d(\Phi_{X',\Delta',n}^e)$ is injective, then so is $H^d(\Phi_{X,\Delta,n}^e)$. Thus (1) holds. The assertion (2) follows from (1). \square

Lemma 7.2. *Let k be an F -finite field of characteristic $p > 0$. Let X be a normal variety over k and take an effective \mathbb{Q} -divisor Δ on X . Fix an integer $n > 0$. Assume that (X, Δ) is n -quasi- F -split. Then $(X \times_k \mathbb{A}_k^1, \Delta \times_k \mathbb{A}_k^1)$ is n -quasi- F -split.*

Proof. Since (X, Δ) is n -quasi- F -split, there exists a $W_n \mathcal{O}_X$ -module homomorphism

$$\sigma: F_* W_n \mathcal{O}_X(p\Delta) \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_X$$

such that $\sigma(F_* 1) = 1$. Set $Y := \text{Spec } k[t]$. Then $X \times_k Y$ is the relative affine spectrum of the \mathcal{O}_X -algebra $\mathcal{O}_X[t]$ over X . We equip $\mathcal{O}_X[t]$ with the natural graded ring structure given by

$$\mathcal{O}_X[t] = \bigoplus_{d \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}} \mathcal{O}_X t^d.$$

Then $W_n(\mathcal{O}_X[t])$ has a $\frac{1}{p^{n-1}}\mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ -graded ring structure ([KTT⁺23, Proposition 7.1]):

$$W_n(\mathcal{O}_X[t]) = \bigoplus_{e \in \frac{1}{p^{n-1}}\mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}} W_n(\mathcal{O}_X[t])_e,$$

where

$$W_n(\mathcal{O}_X[t])_e := \{(f_0, \dots, f_{n-1}) \in W_n(\mathcal{O}_X[t]) \mid f_0 \in \mathcal{O}_X t^e, f_1 \in \mathcal{O}_X t^{pe}, \dots, f_{n-1} \in t^{p^{n-1}e}\}.$$

Here we set $t^c := 0$ for $c \in \mathbb{Q} \setminus \mathbb{Z}$. Define $s := [t] = (t, 0, \dots, 0) \in W_n(\mathcal{O}_X[t])$ to be the Teichmüller lift of t .

Claim. *The following equality*

$$(W_n \mathcal{O}_X)[s] = \bigoplus_{d \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}} W_n(\mathcal{O}_X[t])_d$$

of subrings of $W_n(\mathcal{O}_X[t])$ holds.

Proof of Claim. The inclusion $(W_n\mathcal{O}_X)[s] \subseteq \bigoplus_{d \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}} W_n(\mathcal{O}_X[t])_d$ holds by $W_n\mathcal{O}_X = W_n(\mathcal{O}_X[t])_0$ and $s \in W_n(\mathcal{O}_X[t])_1$. Let us show the opposite inclusion: $(W_n\mathcal{O}_X)[s] \supseteq \bigoplus_{d \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}} W_n(\mathcal{O}_X[t])_d$. Take $d \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$ and $f \in W_n(\mathcal{O}_X[t])_d$. We can write $f = \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} V^i([a_i t^{p^i d}])$ for some $a_i \in \mathcal{O}_X$. Fix $i \in \{0, 1, \dots, n-1\}$. It suffices to show $V^i([a_i t^{p^i d}]) \in (W_n\mathcal{O}_X)[s]$, which follows from

$$V^i([a_i t^{p^i d}]) = V^i([a_i] \cdot F^i[t^d]) = [t^d] \cdot V^i([a_i]) = s^d \cdot V^i([a_i]) \in (W_n\mathcal{O}_X)[s].$$

This completes the proof of Claim. \square

We have the following decomposition into the integral and non-integral parts:

$$\begin{aligned} W_n(\mathcal{O}_X[t]) &= \bigoplus_{e \in \frac{1}{p^{n-1}}\mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}} W_n(\mathcal{O}_X[t])_e \\ &= \left(\bigoplus_{d \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}} W_n(\mathcal{O}_X[t])_d \right) \oplus \left(\bigoplus_{e \in \frac{1}{p^{n-1}}\mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0} \setminus \mathbb{Z}} W_n(\mathcal{O}_X[t])_e \right) \\ &= (W_n\mathcal{O}_X)[s] \oplus \left(\bigoplus_{e \in \frac{1}{p^{n-1}}\mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0} \setminus \mathbb{Z}} W_n(\mathcal{O}_X[t])_e \right), \end{aligned}$$

where the last equality holds by Claim. Since each direct summand is a $(W_n\mathcal{O}_X)[s]$ -submodule, the projection

$$\pi : W_n(\mathcal{O}_X[t]) \rightarrow (W_n\mathcal{O}_X)[s]$$

is a $(W_n\mathcal{O}_X)[s]$ -module homomorphism. Consider the additive homomorphism

$$\begin{aligned} \tau : F_*((W_n\mathcal{O}_X)[s]) &\rightarrow \mathcal{O}_X[t] \\ F_*(as^i) &\mapsto \begin{cases} \sigma(F_*a)t^{\frac{i}{p}} & \text{if } i \in p\mathbb{Z} \\ 0 & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

where $a \in W_n\mathcal{O}_X$. Then τ is a $(W_n\mathcal{O}_X)[s]$ -module homomorphism, because the following holds for $b \in W_n\mathcal{O}_X$:

$$\begin{aligned} \tau(bs^j F_*(as^i)) &= \tau(F_*(aF(b)s^{i+pj})) = \sigma(F_*(aF(b)))t^{\frac{i+pj}{p}} \\ &= (bt^j) \cdot \sigma(F_*(a))t^{\frac{i}{p}} = (bs^j) \cdot \tau(F_*(as^i)), \end{aligned}$$

where we set $t^c := 0$ for $c \in \mathbb{Q} \setminus \mathbb{Z}$.

Take the composite $(W_n\mathcal{O}_X)[s]$ -module homomorphism:

$$\theta : F_*(W_n(\mathcal{O}_X[t])) \xrightarrow{F_*\pi} F_*((W_n\mathcal{O}_X)[s]) \xrightarrow{\tau} \mathcal{O}_X[t].$$

We have $\theta(F_*1) = \tau \circ (F_*\pi)(F_*1) = \tau(F_*1) = 1$. After replacing \mathcal{O}_X by the function field $K(X)$ of X , we also have $(W_nK(X))[s]$ -module homomorphisms:

$$\theta : F_*W_n(K(X)[t]) \xrightarrow{F_*\pi} F_*W_n(K(X))[s] \xrightarrow{\tau} K(X)[t].$$

It is enough to check the inclusion $\theta(F_*W_n(\mathcal{O}_X(p\Delta)[t])) \subseteq \mathcal{O}_X[t]$. This follows from $\pi(W_n(\mathcal{O}_X(p\Delta)[t])) \subseteq W_n(\mathcal{O}_X(p\Delta))[s]$ and $\sigma(F_*W_n\mathcal{O}(p\Delta)) \subseteq \mathcal{O}_X$. \square

Lemma 7.3. *Let k be an F -finite field of characteristic $p > 0$ and take a purely transcendental extension $k \subseteq k' := k(t_1, \dots, t_m)$ of finite degree. Let X be a projective normal variety over k with $H^0(X, \mathcal{O}_X) = k$. Take an integer $n > 0$ and an effective \mathbb{Q} -divisor Δ on X . Then (X, Δ) is n -quasi- F -split if and only if $(X \times_k k', \Delta \times_k k')$ is n -quasi- F -split.*

Proof. By induction on m , we may assume that $k' = k(t_1)$. The “if” part holds by Lemma 7.1. Conversely, assume that (X, Δ) is n -quasi- F -split. Then $(X \times_k \mathbb{A}_k^1, \Delta \times_k \mathbb{A}_k^1)$ is n -quasi- F -split (Lemma 7.2), and hence so is $(X \times_k k', \Delta \times_k k')$ by taking the localisation $(-)\times_{\mathbb{A}_k^1} \text{Spec } k'$. \square

Lemma 7.4. *Let k be a field and let X be a normal variety over k . Assume that X is divisorially Cohen-Macaulay. Then $X \times_k \mathbb{A}_k^1$ and $X \times_k k(t)$ are divisorially Cohen-Macaulay, where $k(t) := K(\mathbb{A}_k^1)$.*

Proof. It is enough to show that $X \times_k \mathbb{A}_k^1$ is divisorially Cohen-Macaulay, which follows from the fact that the pullback map

$$\begin{aligned} \pi^* : \text{Cl}(X) &\rightarrow \text{Cl}(X \times_k \mathbb{A}_k^1) \\ D &\mapsto \pi^* D \end{aligned}$$

is an isomorphism for the projection $\pi : X \times_k \mathbb{A}_k^1 \rightarrow X$ [Har77, Ch. II, Proposition 6.6]. \square

The following is the key theorem of this section. The reader should note that the first assumption is satisfied, for example, when Δ has standard coefficients.

Theorem 7.5. *Let k be an F -finite field of characteristic $p > 0$ and let X be a divisorially Cohen-Macaulay projective normal variety over k . Let Δ be an effective \mathbb{Q} -divisor such that*

- (1) $\{p^r \Delta\} \leq \Delta$ for every integer $r \geq 0$,
- (2) $-(K_X + \Delta)$ is \mathbb{Q} -Cartier and ample,
- (3) (X, Δ) is strongly F -regular, and
- (4) (X, Δ) is quasi- F -split.

Then (X, Δ) is globally quasi- F -regular.

Proof. Set $d := \dim X$. We have $[\Delta] = 0$. Replacing k by $H^0(X, \mathcal{O}_X)$, the problem is reduced to the case when $H^0(X, \mathcal{O}_X) = k$. By Lemma 7.1, Lemma 7.3, and Lemma 7.4, we may replace (X, Δ) by $(X \times_k k', \Delta \times_k k')$ for a purely transcendental field extension $k \subseteq k'$ of finite degree. By the Bertini theorem for the generic member [Tan24, Theorem 4.9 and Theorem 4.19], we can find an integer $\ell > 0$ and a normal prime Cartier divisor H_0 such that

- (i) $H_0 \sim -\ell(K_X + \Delta)$,
- (ii) $H_0 \not\subseteq \text{Supp } \Delta$, and
- (iii) $(X, \Delta + aH_0)$ is strongly F -regular for every rational number $0 \leq a < 1$.

Fix an integer $s_0 > 0$. For $H := s_0 H_0$, we set

$$D_e := K_X + \Delta + (1/p^e)H \quad \text{and} \quad D_\infty := K_X + \Delta.$$

By Corollary 6.6, it is enough to show that $(X, \Delta + (1/p^e)H)$ is quasi- F^e -split for some $e > 0$. Then the problem is reduced to showing (\star) below (see [TWY24, Lemma 3.10]).

(\star) There exist integers $n > 0$ and $e > 0$ such that

$$H^{d-1}(X, B_{X, D_e, n}^e) = 0.$$

Recall that, given integers $e > 0$, $n > 0$, and a \mathbb{Q} -divisor D , a coherent $W_n \mathcal{O}_X$ -module $B_{X, D, n}^e$ is defined by the following exact sequence (cf. [TWY24, (3.0.2), (3.1.1)]):

$$0 \rightarrow W_n \mathcal{O}_X(D) \xrightarrow{F^e} F_*^e W_n \mathcal{O}_X(p^e D) \rightarrow B_{X, D, n}^e \rightarrow 0.$$

Set $Q_{X, \Delta, n} := Q_{X, \Delta, n}^1$ and $B_{X, \Delta, n} := B_{X, \Delta, n}^1$. By (4), there is an integer $m_0 > 0$ such that (X, Δ) is m_0 -quasi- F -split.

Step 1. $B_{X, p^r D_e, n}$ and $B_{X, p^r D_\infty, n}$ are Cohen-Macaulay for every triple $(e, n, r) \in \mathbb{Z}^3$ satisfying $e \geq 0$, $n > 0$, and $r \geq 0$.

Proof of Step 1. Fix integers $e \geq 0$ and $r \geq 0$. By [KTT⁺22, Proposition 3.9], it is enough to show that $(X, \{p^r D_e\})$ is strongly F -regular, because this implies that $(X, \{p^r D_e\})$ is naively keenly F -pure. It holds that

$$\{p^r D_e\} = \{p^r(K_X + \Delta + (1/p^e)H)\} \stackrel{(ii)}{=} \{p^r \Delta\} + \{(p^r/p^e)H\} \stackrel{(1)}{\leq} \Delta + \{s_0 p^r/p^e\}H_0.$$

Thus $(X, \{p^r D_e\})$ is strongly F -regular by (iii). Similarly, $B_{X, p^r D_\infty, n}$ is Cohen-Macaulay, because $(X, \{p^r \Delta\})$ is strongly F -regular by (1) and (3). This completes the proof of Step 1. \square

Step 2. There exists an integer $n_0 > 0$ such that

$$H^j(X, \mathcal{O}_X(p^r D_\infty)) = H^j(X, B_{X, p^r D_\infty, n}) = 0.$$

for every triple $(j, n, r) \in \mathbb{Z}^3$ satisfying $j < d$, $n \geq n_0$, and $r \geq 0$.

Proof of Step 2. By the Fujita vanishing theorem, there exists an integer $r_1 > 0$ such that

$$H^j(X, \mathcal{O}_X(p^r D_\infty)) = H^j(X, B_{X, p^r D_\infty, 1}) = 0$$

for every $j < d$ and every $r \geq r_1$, where the latter equality holds by Serre duality and the fact that $B_{X, p^r D_\infty, 1}$ is Cohen-Macaulay (Step 1). We have the following exact sequence [KTT⁺22, Lemma 3.8]:

$$0 \rightarrow F_* B_{X, p^{r+1} D_\infty, n} \rightarrow B_{X, p^r D_\infty, n+1} \rightarrow B_{X, p^r D_\infty, 1} \rightarrow 0.$$

Therefore, it holds that

$$(7.5.1) \quad H^j(X, \mathcal{O}_X(p^r D_\infty)) = H^j(X, B_{X, p^r D_\infty, n}) = 0 \quad \text{if } j < d, \ n > 0, \ r \geq r_1.$$

Fix $j < d$. Set $n_0 := r_1 + m_0$ and take an integer n satisfying $n \geq n_0$. It is enough to prove that

$$(7.5.2) \quad H^j(X, \mathcal{O}_X(p^r D_\infty)) = H^j(X, B_{X, p^r D_\infty, n-r}) = 0$$

for every $r \geq 0$ by descending induction on r . The base case $r \geq r_1$ of this induction has been settled by (7.5.1). Fix an integer r satisfying $0 \leq r < r_1$. It is enough to show the implication (7.5.3) \Rightarrow (7.5.2), where

$$(7.5.3) \quad H^j(X, \mathcal{O}_X(p^{r+1}D_\infty)) = H^j(X, B_{X,p^{r+1}D_\infty,n-r-1}) = 0.$$

We have the following exact sequences [KTT⁺22, Lemma 3.8]:

$$\begin{aligned} 0 \rightarrow F_*B_{X,p^{r+1}D_\infty,m-1} \rightarrow Q_{X,p^rD_\infty,m} \rightarrow F_*\mathcal{O}_X(p^{r+1}D_\infty) \rightarrow 0, \\ 0 \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_X(p^rD_\infty) \rightarrow Q_{X,p^rD_\infty,m} \rightarrow B_{X,p^rD_\infty,m} \rightarrow 0. \end{aligned}$$

Since (X, Δ) is m_0 -quasi- F -split and $D_\infty = K_X + \Delta$, the latter sequence splits if $m \geq m_0$. Therefore, we get the following implications for $m \geq m_0$:

$$\begin{aligned} H^j(X, \mathcal{O}_X(p^{r+1}D_\infty)) &= H^j(X, B_{X,p^{r+1}D_\infty,m-1}) = 0 \\ \implies H^j(X, Q_{X,p^rD_\infty,m}) &= 0 \\ \implies H^j(X, \mathcal{O}_X(p^rD_\infty)) &= H^j(X, B_{X,p^rD_\infty,m}) = 0. \end{aligned}$$

By setting $m := n - r$, we get the required implication (7.5.3) \Rightarrow (7.5.2). Here the condition $m \geq m_0$ holds by

$$m = n - r \geq n_0 - r_1 = m_0.$$

This completes the proof of Step 2. □

Step 3. *There exist integers $e_1 > 0$ and $r_0 > 0$ such that*

$$H^j(X, B_{X,p^rD_e,n}) = 0$$

for every quadruple $(j, e, n, r) \in \mathbb{Z}^4$ satisfying $j < d$, $e \geq e_1$, $n > 0$, and $r \geq r_0$.

Proof of Step 3. By the following exact sequence [KTT⁺22, Lemma 3.8]:

$$0 \rightarrow F_*B_{X,p^{r+1}D_e,n} \rightarrow B_{X,p^rD_e,n+1} \rightarrow B_{X,p^rD_e,1} \rightarrow 0,$$

we may assume $n = 1$, i.e., the required vanishing is reduced to

$$(7.5.4) \quad H^j(X, B_{X,p^rD_e,1}) = 0.$$

In what follows, we shall provide some details, although the assertion follows from the Fujita vanishing theorem.

It holds that

$$p^rD_e = p^r(K_X + \Delta + (1/p^e)H) = p^r(K_X + \Delta) + (s_0p^r/p^e)H_0.$$

Fix an integer $e^\dagger > 0$ such that $0 < s_0/p^{e^\dagger} < 1$. Depending on e , we shall treat the following three cases separately.

- (I) $e \leq r$ (e is small).
- (II) $r \leq e \leq r + 1 + e^\dagger$ (e is in the middle)
- (III) $e \geq r + 1 + e^\dagger$ (e is large).

It is enough to prove Step 3 under each of (I)-(III). In other words, we shall find pairs $(e_I, r_I), (e_{II}, r_{II}), (e_{III}, r_{III})$, corresponding to the above cases, which assure the required vanishings, and then it suffices to set $e_1 := \max\{e_I, e_{II}, e_{III}\}$ and $r_0 := \max\{r_I, r_{II}, r_{III}\}$.

Fix an integer $\nu_0 > 0$ such that $\nu_0(K_X + \Delta)$ is Cartier. For every $r \geq 0$, we can write

$$p^r = a_r \nu_0 + b_r$$

where a_r and b_r are the non-negative integers satisfying $0 \leq b_r < \nu_0$. It is easy to see that

$$\frac{p^r}{\nu_0} - 1 \leq a_r \leq \frac{p^r}{\nu_0}.$$

We have

$$p^r D_e = p^r(K_X + \Delta) + (s_0 p^r / p^e) H_0 = b_r(K_X + \Delta) + a_r \nu_0(K_X + \Delta) + s_0 p^{r-e} H_0.$$

(I) Assume $e \leq r$. Then $a_r \nu_0(K_X + \Delta) + s_0 p^{r-e} H_0$ is Cartier, and hence we get

$$B_{X, p^r D_e, 1} \simeq B_{X, b_r(K_X + \Delta), 1} \otimes \mathcal{O}_X(a_r \nu_0(K_X + \Delta) + s_0 p^{r-e} H_0).$$

By $0 \leq b_r < \nu_0$, there are only finitely many possibilities for $B_{X, b_r(K_X + \Delta), n}$. Then it is enough to show that $-(a_r \nu_0(K_X + \Delta) + s_0 p^{r-e} H_0)$ is sufficiently ample. We have $\frac{a_r \nu_0}{p^r} \geq 1 - \frac{\nu_0}{p^r} > \frac{2}{3}$ for $r \gg 0$. There exists an integer $e_I > 0$ such that

$$-\left(\frac{1}{3}(K_X + \Delta) + \frac{s_0}{p^e} H_0\right)$$

is ample for every $e \geq e_I$. It holds that

$$\begin{aligned} a_r \nu_0(K_X + \Delta) + s_0 p^{r-e} H_0 &= p^r \left(\frac{a_r \nu_0}{p^r} (K_X + \Delta) + \frac{s_0}{p^e} H_0 \right) \\ &= p^r \left(\left(\frac{a_r \nu_0}{p^r} - \frac{1}{3} \right) (K_X + \Delta) + \left(\frac{1}{3}(K_X + \Delta) + \frac{s_0}{p^e} H_0 \right) \right) \end{aligned}$$

Note that we may apply Serre duality by Step 1. Then, by the Fujita vanishing theorem for \mathbb{Q} -divisors (cf. [Tan18, Lemma 3.5]), there exists $r_I > 0$ such that the required vanishing (7.5.4) holds for $r \geq r_I$ and $e \geq e_I$ under the assumption that $e \leq r$.

(II) As in (I), we get

$$B_{X, p^r D_e, 1} \simeq B_{X, b_r(K_X + \Delta) + s_0 p^{-(e-r)} H_0, 1} \otimes \mathcal{O}_X(a_r \nu_0(K_X + \Delta)).$$

If $r \leq e \leq r + 1 + e^\dagger$, then $0 \leq e - r \leq 1 + e^\dagger$. Hence there are only finitely many possibilities for $b_r(K_X + \Delta) + s_0 p^{-(e-r)} H_0$. Then we may apply a similar argument to the one of (I).

(III) Assume $e \geq r + 1 + e^\dagger$. Recall that $\mathcal{O}_X(D) = \mathcal{O}_X(\lfloor D \rfloor)$. We have

$$\lfloor p^{r+1} D_e \rfloor = \lfloor p^{r+1}(K_X + \Delta) \rfloor + \lfloor \frac{s_0 p^{r+1}}{p^e} \rfloor H_0.$$

By $0 < s_0/p^{e^\dagger} < 1$ and $e \geq r + 1 + e^\dagger$, we obtain

$$0 < \frac{s_0 \cdot p^{r+1}}{p^e} < \frac{p^{e^\dagger} \cdot p^{r+1}}{p^{r+1+e^\dagger}} = 1.$$

Therefore, $\mathcal{O}_X(p^{r+1}D_e) = \mathcal{O}_X(p^{r+1}(K_X + \Delta))$. Similarly, $\mathcal{O}_X(p^r D_e) = \mathcal{O}_X(p^r(K_X + \Delta))$. By the exact sequence

$$0 \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_X(p^r D_e) \rightarrow F_* \mathcal{O}_X(p^{r+1} D_e) \rightarrow B_{X,p^r D_e,1} \rightarrow 0,$$

we get

$$B_{X,p^r D_e,1} = B_{X,p^r(K_X+\Delta),1} \quad \text{if } e \geq r + 1 + e^\dagger.$$

As in (II), it holds that

$$B_{X,p^r D_e,1} \simeq B_{X,b_r(K_X+\Delta),1} \otimes \mathcal{O}_X(a_r \nu_0(K_X + \Delta)).$$

There are only finitely many possibilities for $b_r(K_X + \Delta)$. Then we may apply a similar argument to the one of (I).

This completes the proof of Step 3. \square

Step 4. *There exist integers $e_2 > 0$ and $n_0 > 0$ such that*

$$(7.5.5) \quad H^j(X, B_{X,p^r D_e, n_0}) = 0$$

for every triple $(j, e, r) \in \mathbb{Z}^3$ satisfying $j < d$, $e \geq e_2$, and $r \geq 0$.

Proof of Step 4. Let n_0 be a positive integer as in Step 2. Take positive integers e_1 and r_0 as in Step 3. Fix $j < d$. If $r \geq r_0$ and $e \geq e_1$, then (7.5.5) follows from Step 3. If $0 \leq r \leq r_0$, then we get $B_{X,p^r D_e, n_0} = B_{X,p^r D_\infty, n_0}$ for $e \gg 0$, and hence (7.5.5) follows from Step 2. This completes the proof of Step 4. \square

Step 5. *There exist integers $e_2 > 0$ and $n_0 > 0$ such that*

$$H^j(X, B_{X,p^r D_e, n_0}^c) = 0$$

for every quadruple $(j, c, e, r) \in \mathbb{Z}^4$ satisfying $j < d$, $c > 0$, $e \geq e_2$, and $r \geq 0$.

Proof of Step 5. Take positive integers e_2 and n_0 as in Step 4. We have the following exact sequence [TWY24, Lemma 3.14]:

$$0 \rightarrow B_{X,p^r D_e, n_0}^c \rightarrow B_{X,p^r D_e, n_0}^{c+1} \rightarrow F_*^c B_{X,p^{c+r} D_e, n_0}^1 \rightarrow 0.$$

By induction on $c \geq 1$, the assertion follows from Step 4. This completes the proof of Step 5. \square

Applying Step 5 by setting $j := d - 1$, $c := e_2$, $e := e_2$ and $r := 0$, we get $H^{d-1}(X, B_{X, D_{e_2}, n_0}^{e_2}) = 0$. Therefore, (\star) holds. This completes the proof of Theorem 7.5. \square

Corollary 7.6. *Let k be an F -finite field of characteristic $p > 0$ and let X be a projective normal \mathbb{Q} -factorial variety over k . Assume that X is strongly F -regular and $-K_X$ is ample. Then X is quasi- F -split if and only if X is globally quasi- F -regular.*

Proof. Since X is strongly F -regular and \mathbb{Q} -factorial, X is divisorially Cohen-Macaulay [PS14, Corollary 3.3]. Hence the assertion follows from Theorem 7.5. \square

Corollary 7.7. *Let k be a perfect field of characteristic $p > 5$ and let X be a klt del Pezzo surface over k . Then X is globally quasi- F -regular.*

Proof. Since X is a normal surface, X is divisorially Cohen-Macaulay. By $p > 5$, X is strongly F -regular. Hence the assertion follows from Theorem 7.5 and [KTT⁺22, Theorem B]. \square

Corollary 7.8. *Let k be a perfect field of characteristic $p > 41$ and let (X, Δ) be a log del Pezzo surface with standard coefficients over k . Then (X, Δ) is globally quasi- F -regular.*

Proof. Note that X is divisorially Cohen-Macaulay and (X, Δ) is strongly F -regular. By [KTT⁺23, Theorem C], (X, Δ) is quasi- F -split. Then it follows from Theorem 7.5 that (X, Δ) is globally quasi- F -regular. \square

7.2. Klt singularities.

Theorem 7.9. *Let (X, Δ) be a two-dimensional affine klt pair, where $\Gamma(X, \mathcal{O}_X)$ is a ring essentially of finite type over a perfect field of characteristic $p > 0$. Then (X, Δ) is quasi- F -regular.*

Proof. Note that X is \mathbb{Q} -factorial [Tan18, Corollary 4.11]. By [TWY24, Theorem 7.12], (X, Δ) is feebly quasi- F -regular. Therefore, (X, Δ) is quasi- F -regular (Theorem 4.34). \square

Theorem 7.10. *Let k be a perfect field of characteristic $p > 42$ and let (X, Δ) be a three-dimensional \mathbb{Q} -factorial affine klt pair of finite type over k , where Δ has standard coefficients. Then (X, Δ) is quasi- F -regular.*

Proof. Fix a closed point $x \in X$. After replacing X by an affine open neighbourhood of $x \in X$, there exists a projective birational morphism $f: Y \rightarrow X$ such that $x \in f(\text{Exc}(f))$, $E := \text{Exc}(f)$ is a prime divisor, $-(K_Y + E + f_*^{-1}\Delta)$ is ample, and $(Y, E + f_*^{-1}\Delta)$ is a \mathbb{Q} -factorial plt pair (see [KTT⁺22, the proof of Theorem 6.19]).

Since E is normal (see, for example, [GNT19, Theorem 2.11]), we can write $K_E + \Delta_E = (K_Y + E + f_*^{-1}\Delta)|_E$. If $f(E)$ is a point, then (E, Δ_E) is globally quasi- F -regular (Corollary 7.8), and hence (E, Δ_E) is globally quasi-+-regular [TWY24, Proposition 4.9]. If $f(E)$ is a curve, then (E, Δ_E) is globally quasi-+-regular by [TWY24, Theorem 7.14]. In any case, (E, Δ_E) is globally quasi-+-regular.

By the same argument as in [KTT⁺22, the proof of Theorem 6.19], we see that Y is strongly F -regular and divisorially Cohen-Macaulay. Then we can apply [TWY24, Corollary 6.8], so that $(Y, E + f_*^{-1}\Delta)$ is globally quasi-+-regular. Therefore, its push-forward $(X, f_*(E + f_*^{-1}\Delta)) = (X, \Delta)$ is quasi-+-regular. Then (X, Δ) is quasi- F -regular by Theorem 5.11. \square

8. MISCELLANEOUS RESULTS

8.1. More on quasi- F^e -splittings. The goal of this subsection is to prove that a Cohen-Macaulay ring is quasi- F -split if and only if it is quasi- F^∞ -split. We define a $W_n R$ -module $Q_{R,n}^e$ and a $W_n R$ -module homomorphism $\Phi_{R,n}^e$ by the following pushout diagram:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} W_n R & \xrightarrow{F^e} & F_*^e W_n R \\ \downarrow R^{n-1} & & \downarrow \\ R & \xrightarrow{\Phi_{R,n}^e} & Q_{R,n}^e. \end{array}$$

By applying $\text{Hom}_{W_n R}(-, W_n \omega_R)$ we get the following diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} W_n \omega_R & \xleftarrow{T_n^e} & F_*^e W_n \omega_R \\ \uparrow (R^{n-1})^* & & \downarrow \\ R & \xleftarrow{(\Phi_{R,n}^e)^*} & \text{Hom}_{W_n R}(Q_{R,n}^e, W_n \omega_R). \end{array}$$

Recall that R is n -quasi- F^e -split if and only if $(\Phi_{R,n}^e)^*$ is surjective.

In what follows, we will denote the usual projection of Witt rings $W_n R \rightarrow W_m R$ for $n \geq m$ by $R_{n,m}$. Moreover, we define a $W_n R$ -module $Q_{R,n,m}^e$ and a $W_n R$ -module homomorphism $\Phi_{R,n,m}^e$ for $n \geq m$ by the following pushout diagram:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} W_n R & \xrightarrow{F^e} & F_*^e W_n R \\ R_{n,m} \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ W_m R & \xrightarrow{\Phi_{R,n,m}^e} & Q_{R,n,m}^e. \end{array}$$

In other words,

$$Q_{R,n,m}^e = \text{Coker}(F_*^m W_{n-m} R \xrightarrow{V^m} W_n R \xrightarrow{F^e} F_*^e W_n R).$$

By definition of a pushout, we have the induced $W_n R$ -module homomorphism $Q_{R,n,m}^e \rightarrow Q_{R,n,l}^e$ for every $1 \leq l \leq m$. In particular, in the case of $l = 1$, we get a factorisation:

$$(8.0.1) \quad W_m R \xrightarrow{\Phi_{R,n,m}^e} Q_{R,n,m}^e \longrightarrow Q_{R,n}^e.$$

Remark 8.1. For future use, we also construct the short exact sequence:

$$(8.1.1) \quad 0 \rightarrow F_*^e Q_{R,n-1,m-1}^e \xrightarrow{\psi} Q_{R,n,m}^e \rightarrow F_*^e R \rightarrow 0$$

by applying Snake Lemma to:

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} F_*^m W_{n-m} R & \xrightarrow{=} & F_*^m W_{n-m} R & & & & \\ \downarrow F^e \circ V^{m-1} & & \downarrow F^e \circ V^m & & & & \\ 0 & \longrightarrow & F_*^{e+1} W_{n-1} R & \xrightarrow{V} & F_*^e W_n R & \xrightarrow{R^{n-1}} & F_*^e R \longrightarrow 0. \end{array}$$

Proposition 8.2. *We work in the general setting (Notation 3.2). Assume that R is Cohen-Macaulay and k -quasi- F^e -split. Then*

$$(\Phi_{R,n,m}^e)^* := \text{Hom}_{W_n R}(\Phi_{R,n,m}^e, W_n \omega_R) : \text{Hom}_{W_n R}(Q_{R,n,m}^e, W_n \omega_R) \rightarrow W_m \omega_R,$$

is surjective for every $m \geq 1$ and $n = k + m - 1$,

Proof. We may assume that R is a local ring. Then, by Matlis duality, it suffices to verify that

$$H_m^d(W_m R) \xrightarrow{H_m^d(\Phi_{R,n,m}^e)} H_m^d(Q_{R,n,m}^e)$$

is injective for every $m \geq 1$ and $n = k + m - 1$. We argue by ascending induction on m , specifically, we may assume by inductive assumption that

$$(8.2.1) \quad H_m^d(W_{m-1} R) \xrightarrow{H_m^d(\Phi_{R,n-1,m-1}^e)} H_m^d(Q_{R,n-1,m-1}^e) \quad \text{is injective.}$$

Note that the base case $m = 1$ of the induction follows from [TWY24, Lemma 3.10 and Proposition 3.20].

Pick $\alpha \in H_m^d(W_m R)$ such that

$$H_m^d(\Phi_{R,n,m}^e)(\alpha) = 0 \in H_m^d(Q_{R,n,m}^e).$$

Then consider the following diagram (see (8.0.1)):

$$\begin{array}{ccc} Q_{R,n,m}^e & \longrightarrow & Q_{R,n}^e \\ \Phi_{R,n,m}^e \uparrow & & \Phi_{R,n}^e \uparrow \\ W_m R & \xrightarrow{R^{m-1}} & R. \end{array}$$

Now $H_m^d(\Phi_{R,n}^e)$ is injective, because $n \geq k$ and R is k -quasi- F^e -split. Therefore

$$H_m^d(R^{m-1})(\alpha) = 0 \in H_m^d(R).$$

Now, consider the following diagram (see (8.1.1) and construction thereof):

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} 0 & \longrightarrow & F_* Q_{R,n-1,m-1}^e & \xrightarrow{\psi} & Q_{R,n,m}^e & \longrightarrow & F_*^e R & \longrightarrow & 0 \\ & & F_* \Phi_{R,n-1,m-1}^e \uparrow & & \Phi_{R,n,m}^e \uparrow & & F^e \uparrow & & \\ 0 & \longrightarrow & F_* W_{m-1} R & \xrightarrow{V} & W_m R & \xrightarrow{R^{m-1}} & R & \longrightarrow & 0. \end{array}$$

By the above paragraph, we have $\alpha = H_m^d(V)(\beta)$ for some $\beta \in H_m^d(F_* W_{m-1} R)$. Moreover, $H_m^d(F_* \Phi_{R,n-1,m-1}^e)$ is injective by (8.2.1) and $H_m^d(\psi)$ is injective because $H_m^{d-1}(F_*^e R) = 0$ in view of Cohen-Macauliness of R . Since

$$0 = H_m^d(\Phi_{R,n,m}^e)(\alpha) = H_m^d(\Phi_{R,n,m}^e \circ V)(\beta),$$

it holds that $\beta = 0$. Hence $\alpha = 0$ as well, concluding the proof of the injectivity of $H_m^d(\Phi_{R,n,m}^e)$. \square

Remark 8.3. Take integers $n \geq m$ and consider the following diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc}
0 & \longrightarrow & F_*^m W_{n-m} R & \xrightarrow{F^e \circ V^m} & F_*^e W_n R & \longrightarrow & Q_{R,n,m}^e \longrightarrow 0 \\
& & \uparrow = & & \uparrow F^e & & \uparrow \Phi_{R,n,m}^e \\
0 & \longrightarrow & F_*^m W_{n-m} R & \xrightarrow{V^m} & W_n R & \xrightarrow{R_{n,m}} & W_m R \longrightarrow 0.
\end{array}$$

By applying $\text{Hom}_{W_n R}(-, W_n \omega_R)$ we get:

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc}
F_*^m W_{n-m} \omega_R & \longleftarrow & F_*^e W_n \omega_R & \longleftarrow & \text{Hom}_{W_n R}(Q_{R,n,m}^e, W_n \omega_R) & \longleftarrow & 0 \\
\downarrow = & & \downarrow T_n^e & & (\star) & & \downarrow (\Phi_{R,n,m}^e)^* \\
F_*^m W_{n-m} \omega_R & \xleftarrow{V^*} & W_n \omega_R & \xleftarrow{R_{n,m}^*} & W_m \omega_R & \xleftarrow{\quad} & 0.
\end{array}$$

By diagram chase, (\star) is a pullback diagram.

Corollary 8.4. *We work in the general setting (Notation 3.2). Suppose that R is Cohen-Macaulay and k -quasi- F^e -split. Then with notation of Remark 8.3 for every $m \geq 1$ and $n = k + m - 1$ we have that:*

$$R_{n,m}^*(W_m \omega_R) \subseteq \text{Im}(T_n^e: F_*^e W_n \omega_R \rightarrow W_n \omega_R).$$

Proof. This is immediate from Remark 8.3 and Proposition 8.2. \square

Note that the inclusion $(R^{n-1})^*(\omega_R) \subseteq \text{im}(T_n^e: F_*^e W_n \omega_R \rightarrow W_n \omega_R)$ is equivalent to R being n -quasi- F^e -split.

Theorem 8.5. *We work in the general setting (Notation 3.2). Suppose that R is Cohen-Macaulay. Further assume that R is m -quasi- F^e -split and k -quasi- $F^{e'}$ -split. Then R is $(k + m - 1)$ -quasi- $F^{e+e'}$ -split.*

Proof. Set $n = k + m - 1$ and consider the following diagram.

$$\begin{array}{ccccc}
& & & & F_*^{e+e'} W_n \omega_R \\
& & & & \downarrow T_n^{e'} \\
& & F_*^e W_m \omega_R & \xrightarrow{R_{n,m}^*} & F_*^e W_n \omega_R \\
& & \downarrow T_m^e & & \downarrow T_n^e \\
\omega_R & \xrightarrow{(R^{m-1})^*} & W_m \omega_R & \xrightarrow{R_{n,m}^*} & W_n \omega_R. \\
& & \searrow & \nearrow & \\
& & & & (R^{n-1})^*
\end{array}$$

Since R is k -quasi- $F^{e'}$ -split and m -quasi- F^e -split, Corollary 8.4 yields

$$(\dagger) \quad R_{n,m}^*(F_*^e W_m \omega_R) \subseteq \text{im}(T_n^{e'}: F_*^{e+e'} W_n \omega_R \rightarrow F_*^e W_n \omega_R)$$

$$(\dagger\dagger) \quad (R^{m-1})^*(\omega_R) \subseteq \text{im}(T_m^e: F_*^e W_m \omega_R \rightarrow W_m \omega_R).$$

Therefore

$$\begin{aligned}
 (R^{n-1})^*(\omega_R) &= R_{n,m}^*((R^{m-1})^*(\omega_R)) \\
 &\stackrel{(\dagger)}{\subseteq} R_{n,m}^*(T_m^e(F_*^e W_m \omega_R)) \\
 &= T_n^e(R_{n,m}^*(F_*^e W_m \omega_R)) \\
 &\stackrel{(\dagger)}{\subseteq} T_n^e\left(T_n^{e'}\left(F_*^{e+e'} W_n \omega_R\right)\right) \\
 &= T_n^{e+e'}\left(F_*^{e+e'} W_n \omega_R\right).
 \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, R is n -quasi- $F^{e+e'}$ -split. \square

In particular, a Cohen-Macaulay ring is quasi- F -split if and only if it is quasi- F^∞ -split.

Corollary 8.6. *We work in the general setting (Notation 3.2). Suppose that R is Cohen-Macaulay and n -quasi- F -split. Then R is $(ne - e + 1)$ -quasi- F^e -split for every integer $e > 0$.*

Note that this bound should be sharp by taking cones over Calabi-Yau varieties in view of [TWY24, Theorem 7.1].

8.2. Three-dimensional quasi- F -regular rings are Cohen-Macaulay.

Lemma 8.7. *We use Notation 4.13. Let D be a \mathbb{Q} -Cartier Weil divisor on $\text{Spec } R$. Then there exists $c \in R^\circ$ such that*

$$[c] \cdot H_m^{d-1}(W_n \mathcal{O}_X(p^e D)) = 0$$

for every $e \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$ and every $n \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$.

Proof. Since R is local and D is \mathbb{Q} -Cartier, there are only finitely many possibilities for $R(p^e D)$, with $e \geq 0$, up to isomorphism. Thus there exists $f \in R^\circ$ such that $f \cdot H_m^{d-1}(R(p^e D)) = 0$ for every integer $e > 0$ by Lemma 3.19. Set $c := f^2$. Let us show that c satisfies the required property by induction on n . The base case $n = 1$ of this induction follows from the choice of f .

Assume $n \geq 2$. Consider the exact sequence

$$0 \rightarrow F_* W_{n-1} R(p^{e+1} D) \xrightarrow{V} W_n R(p^e D) \xrightarrow{R^{n-1}} R(p^e D) \rightarrow 0.$$

Taking local cohomologies, we get the exact sequence

$$F_* H_m^{d-1}(W_{n-1} R(p^{e+1} D)) \xrightarrow{V} H_m^{d-1}(W_n R(p^e D)) \xrightarrow{R^{n-1}} H_m^{d-1}(R(p^e D)).$$

Pick $\alpha \in H_m^{d-1}(W_n R(p^e D))$. By the choice of f , we have $R^{n-1}([f]\alpha) = 0$. Therefore, there exists $\beta \in H_m^{d-1}(W_{n-1} R(p^{e+1} D))$ such that $V(F_* \beta) = [f]\alpha$. By the induction hypothesis, we have $[c]\beta = 0$, which implies

$$[c]\alpha = [f]V(F_* \beta) = V(F_*([f^p]\beta)) = V(F_*([cf^{p-2}]\beta)) = 0,$$

as required. \square

Lemma 8.8. *We use Notation 4.13. Let Δ be an effective \mathbb{Q} -divisor on X such that (X, Δ) is quasi- F -regular. Take a \mathbb{Q} -Cartier \mathbb{Q} -divisor D on $\text{Spec } R$ such that $\{p^r D\} \leq \Delta$ for every integer $r \geq 1$. Fix an integer $m \geq 2$. Then the following hold.*

(1) *The $W_m R$ -module homomorphism*

$$R^{m-1} : H_{\mathfrak{m}}^{d-1}(W_m R(D)) \rightarrow H_{\mathfrak{m}}^{d-1}(R(D))$$

is surjective.

(2) *The sequence*

$$0 \rightarrow \omega_R(-D) \xrightarrow{(R^{m-1})^*} W_m \omega_R(-D) \xrightarrow{V^*} F_* W_{m-1} \omega_R(-pD) \rightarrow 0.$$

is exact, where this is obtained by applying $\text{Hom}_{W_m R}(-, W_m \omega_R)$ to the exact sequence

$$0 \rightarrow F_* W_{m-1} R(pD) \xrightarrow{V} W_m R(D) \xrightarrow{R^{m-1}} R(D) \rightarrow 0.$$

Proof. Fix an integer $n \geq 1$ such that R is n -quasi- F -regular.

Let us show (1). We consider the following commutative diagram in which each horizontal sequence is exact:

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} 0 & \longrightarrow & F_* W_{n+m-1} R(pD) & \xrightarrow{V} & W_{n+m} R(D) & \xrightarrow{R^{n+m-1}} & R(D) \longrightarrow 0 \\ & & \downarrow R^{n-1} & & \downarrow R^{n-1} & & \parallel \\ 0 & \longrightarrow & F_* W_{m-1} R(pD) & \xrightarrow{V} & W_m R(D) & \xrightarrow{R^{m-1}} & R(D) \longrightarrow 0. \end{array}$$

Taking local cohomologies, we obtain

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} H_{\mathfrak{m}}^{d-1}(W_{n+m} R(D)) & \longrightarrow & H_{\mathfrak{m}}^{d-1}(R(D)) & \xrightarrow{\sigma_{n+m}} & H_{\mathfrak{m}}^d(F_* W_{n+m-1} R(pD)) \\ \downarrow R^{n-1} & & \parallel & & \downarrow R^{n-1} \\ H_{\mathfrak{m}}^{d-1}(W_m R(D)) & \longrightarrow & H_{\mathfrak{m}}^{d-1}(R(D)) & \xrightarrow{\sigma_m} & H_{\mathfrak{m}}^d(F_* W_{m-1} R(pD)). \end{array}$$

By $\text{Im}(\sigma_{n+m}) = V^{-1}(0) \subseteq V^{-1}(\widetilde{0_{n+m}^*}) = F_* \widetilde{0_{pD, n+m-1}^*}$ (Proposition 4.16(2)), we have

$$\text{Im}(\sigma_m) = R^{n-1}(\text{Im}(\sigma_{n+m})) \subseteq R^{n-1}(F_* \widetilde{0_{pD, n+m-1}^*}) = 0,$$

where the last equality follows from Proposition 4.38. Therefore, σ_m is zero, that is, the map

$$H_{\mathfrak{m}}^{d-1}(W_m R(D)) \rightarrow H_{\mathfrak{m}}^{d-1}(R(D))$$

is surjective. Thus (1) holds.

Let us show (2). By applying $\text{RHom}_{W_m R}(-, W_m \omega_R^\bullet)$ to the exact sequence

$$0 \rightarrow F_* W_{m-1} R(pD) \xrightarrow{V} W_m R(D) \xrightarrow{R^{m-1}} R(D) \rightarrow 0,$$

it is enough to show that

$$(R^{m-1})^* : H^{-d+1} \text{RHom}_{W_m R}(R(D), W_m \omega_R^\bullet) \rightarrow H^{-d+1} \text{RHom}_{W_m R}(W_m R(D), W_m \omega_R^\bullet)$$

is injective. This homomorphism is obtained by applying the Matlis duality functor $\text{Hom}_{W_m R}(-, E)$ to the surjection in (1). Thus (2) holds. \square

Theorem 8.9. *Let R be an F -finite normal integral domain of characteristic $p > 0$. Assume that $\dim R = 3$, R is quasi- F -regular, and K_R is \mathbb{Q} -Cartier. Then $R(D)$ is Cohen-Macaulay for every \mathbb{Q} -Cartier Weil divisor D on $\text{Spec } R$.*

Proof. We may assume that R is a local ring. Let \mathfrak{m} be the maximal ideal of R . Fix a \mathbb{Q} -Cartier Weil divisor D and an integer $n > 0$ such that R is n -quasi- F -regular. By definition,

$$W_m \omega_R(p(D - K_R)) = \mathcal{H}om(W_m R(p(K_R - D)), W_m \omega_R)$$

for every integer $m \geq 1$. Since $W_m \omega_R$ is a dualising $W_m R$ -module, $W_m \omega_R$ is (S_2) [Sta14, Tag 0AWK]. Therefore, $W_m \omega_R(p(D - K_R))$ is also (S_2) , which implies

$$H_{\mathfrak{m}}^1(W_m \omega_R(p(D - K_R))) = 0$$

for every integer $m \geq 1$. Since $K_R - D$ is a \mathbb{Q} -Cartier Weil divisor, we get the following exact sequence (Lemma 8.8(2)):

$$0 \rightarrow \omega_R(D - K_R) \xrightarrow{(R^{n-1})^*} W_n \omega_R(D - K_R) \xrightarrow{V^*} F_* W_{n-1} \omega_R(p(D - K_R)) \rightarrow 0.$$

By $\omega_R(D - K_R) \simeq R(D)$, we obtain an injection

$$(8.9.1) \quad (R^{n-1})^* : H_{\mathfrak{m}}^2(R(D)) \hookrightarrow H_{\mathfrak{m}}^2(W_n \omega_R(D - K_R)).$$

Take $c_1 \in R^\circ$ such that $c_1 \cdot H_{\mathfrak{m}}^2(W_n R(p^e D)) = 0$ for every integer $e \geq 1$, whose existence is guaranteed by Lemma 8.7. For $t_D \in R^\circ \cap \tau(R)$, we set $c_2 := t_D^4$ and $c := c_1 c_2$. Since R is n -quasi- F -regular, there exists an integer $e \geq 1$ such that $(R, (1/p^e)\text{div}(c))$ is n -quasi- F^e -split (Theorem 4.31). By Proposition 4.37, we have the commutative diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} W_n R(D) & \xrightarrow{(\cdot F_*^e[c]) \circ F^e} & F_*^e W_n R(p^e D) \\ R^{n-1} \downarrow & & \swarrow \alpha \\ R(D) & & \\ (R^{n-1})^* \downarrow & & \swarrow \\ W_n \omega_R(-K_R + D) & & \end{array}$$

Taking local cohomologies, we obtain

$$\begin{array}{ccc} H_{\mathfrak{m}}^2(W_n R(D)) & \xrightarrow{(\cdot F_*^e[c]) \circ F^e} & H_{\mathfrak{m}}^2(F_*^e W_n R(p^e D)) \\ R^{n-1} \downarrow & & \swarrow \alpha \\ H_{\mathfrak{m}}^2(R(D)) & & \\ (R^{n-1})^* \downarrow & & \swarrow \\ H_{\mathfrak{m}}^2(W_n \omega_R(-K_R + D)) & & \end{array}$$

By using (8.9.1) and $[c] \cdot H_{\mathfrak{m}}^2(W_n R(p^e D)) = 0$, we get that

$$R^{n-1} : H_{\mathfrak{m}}^2(W_n R(D)) \rightarrow H_{\mathfrak{m}}^2(R(D))$$

is zero. By Lemma 8.8(1), it is also surjective. Therefore $H_m^2(R(D)) = 0$. \square

9. APPENDIX: DUALISING COMPLEXES ON WITT RINGS

Given an \mathbb{F}_p -algebra R , we set $\Omega_R^i := \Omega_{R/\mathbb{F}_p}^i$. The purpose of this appendix is to prove the following theorem.

Theorem 9.1. *Let X be a separated scheme of finite type over an F -finite Noetherian \mathbb{F}_p -algebra. For $e \geq 0$ and $n \geq m \geq 1$, we define the finite morphism $\iota_{X,m,n}^e: W_m X \rightarrow W_n X$ as the composition*

$$\iota_{X,m,n}^e: W_m X \xrightarrow{F^e} W_m X \hookrightarrow W_n X,$$

where $W_n X := (X, W_n \mathcal{O}_X)$, $W_m X := (X, W_m \mathcal{O}_X)$, and $W_m X \hookrightarrow W_n X$ denotes the closed immersion corresponding to $R^{n-m}: W_n \mathcal{O}_X \rightarrow W_m \mathcal{O}_X$. Then there exist objects

$$W_1 \omega_X^\bullet, W_2 \omega_X^\bullet, \dots$$

of the derived category of $W_n \mathcal{O}_X$ -modules and a set of isomorphisms

$$\{\rho_{X,m,n}^e: W_m \omega_X^\bullet \xrightarrow{\cong} (\iota_{X,m,n}^e)^\dagger W_n \omega_X^\bullet \mid e \geq 0, n \geq m \geq 1\}$$

in the derived category of $W_n \mathcal{O}_X$ -modules which satisfy the following.

- (1) $W_n \omega_X^\bullet$ is a dualising complex on $W_n X = (X, W_n \mathcal{O}_X)$ for every integer $n > 0$.
- (2) The equality $(\iota_{X,l,m}^{e'})^\dagger \rho_{X,m,n}^e \circ \rho_{X,l,m}^{e'} = \rho_{X,l,n}^{e+e'}$ holds for all $e, e', l, m, n \in \mathbb{Z}$ satisfying $e, e' \geq 0$ and $n \geq m \geq l \geq 1$.
- (3) For all $e, m, n \in \mathbb{Z}$ satisfying $e \geq 0$ and $n \geq m \geq 1$, we define the morphism $T_{X,m,n}^e$ by

$$T_{X,m,n}^e: (\iota_{X,m,n}^e)_* W_m \omega_X^\bullet \xrightarrow{\rho_{X,m,n}^e} (\iota_{X,m,n}^e)_* (\iota_{X,m,n}^e)^\dagger W_n \omega_X^\bullet \xrightarrow{\text{adj}} W_n \omega_X^\bullet,$$

where adj is the natural morphism induced by the fact that $(\iota_{X,m,n}^e)^\dagger$ is the right adjoint of $(\iota_{X,m,n}^e)_*$ [Sta14, Tag 0A9Y]. Then the equality $T_{X,m,n}^e \circ (\iota_{X,m,n}^e)_* T_{X,l,m}^{e'} = T_{X,l,n}^{e+e'}$ holds for all $e, e', l, m, n \in \mathbb{Z}$ satisfying $e, e' \geq 0$ and $n \geq m \geq l \geq 1$.

Note that we set $(\iota_{X,m,n}^e)_* := R(\iota_{X,m,n}^e)_*$, as $\iota_{X,m,n}^e$ is a finite morphism.

The proof of Theorem 9.1 will be reduced to the case when $X = \text{Spec } R$ and R is regular. In this case, the de Rham-Witt complex $\{W_n \Omega_R^i\}_{i \geq 0}$ will play a crucial role. We now summarise some of its properties.

9.2 (de Rham-Witt complexes). Let R be a regular F -finite \mathbb{F}_p -algebra. In [Ill79], Illusie introduced the de Rham-Witt complex

$$0 \rightarrow W_n \Omega_R^0 \xrightarrow{d} W_n \Omega_R^1 \xrightarrow{d} \dots \xrightarrow{d} W_n \Omega_R^i \xrightarrow{d} W_n \Omega_R^{i+1} \xrightarrow{d} \dots,$$

where each $W_n \Omega_R^i$ is a $W_n R$ -module and d is an additive homomorphism satisfying $d^2 = 0$. For all integers $n \geq 1$ and $i \geq 0$, we have $W_{n+1} R$ -module homomorphisms

$$F: W_{n+1} \Omega_R^i \rightarrow F_* W_n \Omega_R^i \quad V: W_n \Omega_R^i \rightarrow F_* W_n \Omega_R^i, \quad R: W_{n+1} \Omega_R^i \rightarrow W_n \Omega_R^i,$$

which satisfies the following properties [Ill79, Ch. I, Proposition 2.18]:

- (1) $p = FV = VF: W_n \Omega_R^i \rightarrow W_n \Omega_R^i$.

- (2) $dF = pFd : W_{n+1}\Omega_R^i \rightarrow W_n\Omega_R^{i+1}$.
- (3) $Vd = pdV : W_n\Omega_R^i \rightarrow W_{n+1}\Omega_R^{i+1}$.
- (4) $FdV = d : W_n\Omega_R^i \rightarrow W_n\Omega_R^{i+1}$.

Since R is regular, Illusie's de Rham-Witt complex $W_n\Omega_R^i$ coincides with the saturated de Rham-Witt complex $\mathcal{W}_n\Omega_R^i$ introduced by Bhatt-Lurie-Mathew [BLM21, the proof of Theorem 4.4.12].

Lemma 9.3. *Let (R, \mathfrak{m}) be a regular F -finite local \mathbb{F}_p -algebra. Then there exists a smooth \mathbb{F}_p -algebra S and a flat ring homomorphism $\varphi : S \rightarrow R$ such that*

- (1) $\mathfrak{p}R = \mathfrak{m}$ for $\mathfrak{p} := \varphi^{-1}(\mathfrak{m})$, and
- (2) the induced S -module homomorphism

$$F_*^e \Omega_S^i \otimes_S R \rightarrow F_*^e \Omega_R^i$$

is an isomorphism for every integer $e \geq 0$ and every integer $i \geq 0$.

Proof. By [KTY22, the proof of Lemma 3.1], there exists a p -basis x_1, \dots, x_r of R such that x_1, \dots, x_s form a regular system of parameter (i.e., $\mathfrak{m} = (x_1, \dots, x_s)$ and $s = \dim R$) for some $0 \leq s \leq r$. In particular, for every integer $e > 0$, the set

$$\{F_*^e x_1^{i_1} \cdots x_r^{i_r} \mid 0 \leq i_1, \dots, i_r \leq p^e - 1\}$$

is a free R -linear basis of the R -module $F_*^e R$. In other words, $\{x_1^{i_1} \cdots x_r^{i_r} \mid 0 \leq i_1, \dots, i_r \leq p^e - 1\}$ is a free R^{p^e} -linear basis of the R^{p^e} -module R . Here $R^{p^e} := \{r^{p^e} \in R \mid r \in R\}$ is a subring of R , which coincides with the image of the e -th iterated Frobenius ring homomorphism $F^e : R \rightarrow R, r \mapsto r^{p^e}$.

Claim 9.4. *dx_1, \dots, dx_r form a free R -linear basis of the R -module Ω_R^1 .*

Proof of Claim 9.4. We have the following exact sequence [Mat89, Theorem 25.1]:

$$\Omega_{R/R^p}^1 \otimes_R R \rightarrow \Omega_R^1 \rightarrow \Omega_{R/R^p}^1 \rightarrow 0.$$

The first map is zero (because $d(r^p) = pd(r^{p-1}) = 0$ for every $r \in R$), and hence we get $\Omega_R^1 \xrightarrow{\cong} \Omega_{R/R^p}^1$. Furthermore, we consider the R^p -algebra homomorphism

$$\begin{aligned} \theta : R^p[T_1, \dots, T_r] / (T_1^p - x_1^p, \dots, T_r^p - x_r^p) &\rightarrow R \\ T_i &\mapsto x_i. \end{aligned}$$

Since x_1, \dots, x_r form a p -basis of R , θ is an isomorphism. Thus we get R -module isomorphisms

$$\Omega_{R/R^p}^1 \stackrel{(\star)}{\cong} \Omega_{R^p[T_1, \dots, T_r]/R^p}^1 / (d(T_1^p - x_1^p), \dots, d(T_r^p - x_r^p)) \simeq \Omega_{R^p[T_1, \dots, T_r]/R^p}^1,$$

where (\star) follows from [Mat89, Theorem 25.2]. Note that the right term $\Omega_{R^p[T_1, \dots, T_r]/R^p}^1$ has an R -linear basis dT_1, \dots, dT_r , and hence dx_1, \dots, dx_r form an R -linear basis of $\Omega_{R/R^p}^1 (\simeq \Omega_R^1)$. This completes the proof of Claim 9.4. \square

Set $S := \mathbb{F}_p[X_1, \dots, X_r]$ and consider the following \mathbb{F}_p -algebra homomorphism:

$$\begin{aligned} \varphi : S = \mathbb{F}_p[X_1, \dots, X_r] &\rightarrow R \\ X_i &\mapsto x_i. \end{aligned}$$

Then X_1, \dots, X_r form a p -basis of S and dX_1, \dots, dX_r form a free S -linear basis of the S -module Ω_S^1 . Therefore, the image of the S -linear basis

$$\{F_*^e X_1^{i_1} \cdots X_r^{i_r} dX_j \mid 0 \leq i_1, \dots, i_r \leq p^e - 1, 1 \leq j \leq r\}$$

of $F_*^e \Omega_S$ by the natural map $F_*^e \Omega_S \rightarrow F_*^e \Omega_R$ is the basis

$$\{F_*^e x_1^{i_1} \cdots x_r^{i_r} dx_j \mid 0 \leq i_1, \dots, i_r \leq p^e - 1, 1 \leq j \leq r\}$$

of $F_*^e \Omega_R$. Thus we get the natural R -module isomorphism

$$F_*^e \Omega_S \otimes_S R \xrightarrow{\cong} F_*^e \Omega_R.$$

Finally, it is enough to prove that $\varphi : S \rightarrow R$ is flat. Set $\mathfrak{p}' := (X_1, \dots, X_s)$. Then $\mathfrak{p}'R = (x_1, \dots, x_s) = \mathfrak{m}$.

Claim 9.5. *We have $(\mathfrak{p} :=)\varphi^{-1}(\mathfrak{m}) = \mathfrak{p}'$.*

Proof of Claim. The inclusion $\varphi^{-1}(\mathfrak{m}) \supseteq \mathfrak{p}'$ is clear. Let us show the opposite inclusion $\varphi^{-1}(\mathfrak{m}) \subseteq \mathfrak{p}'$. Take $f \in \varphi^{-1}(\mathfrak{m})$, i.e., $f \in S = \mathbb{F}_p[X_1, \dots, X_r]$ and $\varphi(f) \in \mathfrak{m}$. We can write

$$f = \sum_{v \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^r} n_v X^v \in \mathbb{F}_p[X_1, \dots, X_r],$$

where $n_v \in \mathbb{F}_p$ and we set $X^v := X_1^{v_1} \cdots X_r^{v_r}$ for $v = (v_1, \dots, v_r) \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^r$. Then we have $\varphi(f) = \sum_{v \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^r} n_v x^v$, where $x^v := x_1^{v_1} \cdots x_r^{v_r}$. Since this sum $\varphi(f) = \sum_{v \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^r} n_v x^v$ is a finite sum, we can find an integer $e > 0$ such that every nonzero coefficient $n_v = n_{(v_1, \dots, v_r)}$ satisfies $0 \leq v \leq p^e - 1$, i.e., $0 \leq v_1 \leq p^e - 1, \dots, 0 \leq v_r \leq p^e - 1$. Note that $R = \bigoplus_{0 \leq v \leq p^e - 1} R^{p^e} x^v$, i.e., $\{x^v \mid 0 \leq v \leq p^e - 1\}$ is a free R^{p^e} -linear basis of the R^{p^e} -module R . By $\varphi(f) \in \mathfrak{m} = Rx_1 + \dots + Rx_s$, we get

$$\varphi(f) = \sum_{0 \leq v \leq p^e - 1} m_v x^v \quad \text{for} \quad m_v \in R^{p^e},$$

where every nonzero coefficient m_v satisfies (a) or (b) below.

- (a) $v_i > 0$ for some $1 \leq i \leq s$.
- (b) $m_v \in Rx_1 + \dots + Rx_s$.

By

$$\sum_{0 \leq v \leq p^e - 1} n_v x^v = \varphi(f) = \sum_{0 \leq v \leq p^e - 1} m_v x^v,$$

we obtain $\mathbb{F}_p \ni n_v = m_v \in R^{p^e}$. If the case (b) occurs, then we would get $n_v = m_v \in \mathbb{F}_p \cap (Rx_1 + \dots + Rx_s) = 0$, which contradicts $m_v \neq 0$. Therefore, $n_v (= m_v) \neq 0$ implies (a). Hence we get $f \in SX_1 + \dots + SX_s = \mathfrak{p}'$. This completes the proof of Claim 9.5. \square

By Claim 9.5, φ induces a local ring homomorphism $\varphi' : S_{\mathfrak{p}} \rightarrow R$. As the localisation $S \rightarrow S_{\mathfrak{p}}$ is flat, it is enough to show that φ' is flat. Explicitly, we have $S_{\mathfrak{p}} = K[X_1, \dots, X_s]_{(X_1, \dots, X_s)}$ for $K := \mathbb{F}_p(X_{s+1}, \dots, X_r)$. In particular, we get $\dim S_{\mathfrak{p}} = s = \dim R$. Furthermore, we have $\dim R/\mathfrak{p}R = \dim R/\mathfrak{m} = 0$. Then it follows from [Mat89, Theorem 23.1] or [Sta14, Tag 00R4] that φ' is flat. \square

Lemma 9.6. *Let $\varphi: S \rightarrow R$ be a flat ring homomorphism of regular F -finite Noetherian \mathbb{F}_p -algebras. Assume that the induced R -module homomorphism*

$$\theta^{e,i} : F_*^e \Omega_S^i \otimes_S R \rightarrow F_*^e \Omega_R^i$$

is an isomorphism for every integer $e \geq 0$ and every integer $i \geq 0$. Then the following hold.

(i) *We have the induced $W_n R$ -module isomorphism*

$$(F_*^e W_m S) \otimes_{W_n S} W_n R \xrightarrow{\cong} F_*^e W_m R$$

for every triple $(e, n, m) \in \mathbb{Z}^3$ satisfying $e \geq 0$ and $n \geq m \geq 1$.

(ii) *The induced ring homomorphism $W_n S \rightarrow W_n R$ is flat for every integer $n > 0$.*

(iii) *We have the induced $W_n R$ -module isomorphism*

$$(F_*^e W_n \Omega_S^i) \otimes_{W_n S} W_n R \xrightarrow{\cong} F_*^e W_n \Omega_R^i$$

for every triple $(e, n, i) \in \mathbb{Z}^3$ satisfying $e \geq 0, n > 0$, and $i \geq 0$.

Proof. Let us show (i), i.e., the induced homomorphism

$$\pi_{n,m}^e : F_*^e W_m S \otimes_{W_n S} W_n R \rightarrow F_*^e W_m R$$

is an isomorphism. For $e \geq 0$ and $n \geq m \geq 1$, we have the following commutative diagram in which each horizontal sequence is exact:

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} F_*^m (F_*^e S \otimes_{W_n S} W_n R) & \xrightarrow{V^m \otimes \text{id}} & F_*^e W_{m+1} S \otimes_{W_n S} W_n R & \xrightarrow{R \otimes \text{id}} & F_*^e W_m S \otimes_{W_n S} W_n R & \longrightarrow & 0 \\ & & \downarrow F_*^m \pi_{n,1}^e & & \downarrow \pi_{n,m+1}^e & & \downarrow \pi_{n,m}^e \\ 0 & \longrightarrow & F_*^{m+e} R & \xrightarrow{V^m} & F_*^e W_{m+1} R & \xrightarrow{R} & F_*^e W_m R \longrightarrow 0. \end{array}$$

By the snake lemma and induction on m , it is enough to show that $\pi_{n,1}^e$ is an isomorphism. Note that $\pi_{n,1}^e$ can be written by

$$\pi_{n,1}^e : F_*^e S \otimes_{W_n S} W_n R \xrightarrow{\rho} F_*^e S \otimes_S R \xrightarrow{\theta^{e,0} \cong} F_*^e R,$$

where the left arrow ρ is the induced surjection given by

$$\rho : F_*^e S \otimes_{W_n S} W_n R \rightarrow F_*^e S \otimes_{W_n S} R \rightarrow F_*^e S \otimes_S R.$$

In particular, $\pi_{n,1}^e$ is surjective. Taking a localisation of S at a prime ideal, we may assume that $F_*^e S \simeq S^{\oplus \ell_e}$ for some integer $\ell_e > 0$. By the construction of ρ , we may replace $F_*^e S$ by a direct summand S . Hence it suffices to show that $\pi_{n,1}^0 : S \otimes_{W_n S} W_n R \rightarrow S \otimes_S R$ is an isomorphism.

Fix an integer $n \geq 1$. It is enough to prove that $\pi_{n,m}^0$ is an isomorphism for $n \geq m \geq 1$ by descending induction on m . It is clear that $\pi_{n,n}^0$ is an isomorphism. Fix an integer $1 \leq m \leq n-1$ and assume that $\pi_{n,m+1}^0$ is an isomorphism. Since $\pi_{n,1}^0$ is surjective and $\pi_{n,m+1}^0$ is an isomorphism, the snake lemma implies that $\pi_{n,m}^0$ is an isomorphism. Thus (i) holds.

Let us show (ii). By assumption, we may assume $n \geq 2$. We define ideals $W_n^{\geq 1}S$ and $W_n^{\geq 1}R$ by

$$W_n^{\geq 1}S := V(F_*W_{n-1}S) \quad \text{and} \quad W_n^{\geq 1}R := V(F_*W_{n-1}R).$$

Then we have $W_nS/W_n^{\geq 1}S \simeq S$ and $W_nR/W_n^{\geq 1}R \simeq R$. Since we have

$$W_n^{\geq 1}S \otimes_{W_nS} W_nR \simeq F_*W_{n-1}S \otimes_{W_nS} W_nR \simeq F_*W_{n-1}R \simeq W_n^{\geq 1}R$$

by (i), we obtain

$$W_n^{\geq 1}S \otimes_{W_nS} W_nR \simeq W_nS^{\geq 1}S \cdot W_nR = W_n^{\geq 1}(R).$$

Hence the homomorphism

$$S \simeq W_nS/W_n^{\geq 1}S \rightarrow W_nR \otimes_{W_nS} W_nS/W_n^{\geq 1}S \simeq W_nR/W_n^{\geq 1}(R) \simeq R$$

is flat. By the local criterion for flatness ([Mat89, Theorem 22.3] or [Sta14, Tag 051C]), $W_nS \rightarrow W_nR$ is flat. Thus (ii) holds.

Let us show (iii). Given a smooth \mathbb{F}_p -algebra T , we have the following exact sequence of W_nT -modules [Ill79, Ch. I, Proposition 3.11]:

$$0 \rightarrow \frac{F_*\Omega_T^{i-1}}{F_*Z_{n-1}\Omega_T^{i-1}} \xrightarrow{dV^{n-1}} F_*W_n\Omega_T^i \xrightarrow{V} W_{n+1}\Omega_T^i \xrightarrow{F^n} Z_n\Omega_T^i \rightarrow 0.$$

Note that this exact sequence is $W_{n+1}T$ -linear (Lemma 9.7). Since each of R and S can be written as a direct limit of smooth \mathbb{F}_p -algebras, we get the corresponding exact sequence for S and R (cf. [Shi07, Section 2 and Theorem 2.1]). Therefore, we get the following commutative diagram in which each horizontal sequence is exact:

$$\begin{array}{ccccccccc} 0 & \longrightarrow & f^* \left(\frac{F_*\Omega_S^{i-1}}{F_*Z_{n-1}\Omega_S^{i-1}} \right) & \xrightarrow{f^*(dV^{n-1})} & f^*(F_*^{e+1}W_n\Omega_S^i) & \xrightarrow{f^*V} & f^*(F_*^eW_{n+1}\Omega_S^i) & \xrightarrow{f^*(F^n)} & f^*(F_*^eZ_n\Omega_S^i) & \longrightarrow & 0 \\ & & \simeq \downarrow \beta & & \simeq \downarrow \alpha_n^{e+1,i} & & \downarrow \alpha_{n+1}^{e,i} & & \downarrow \gamma & & \\ 0 & \longrightarrow & F_*^e \frac{F_*\Omega_R^{i-1}}{F_*Z_{n-1}\Omega_R^{i-1}} & \xrightarrow{dV^{n-1}} & F_*^{e+1}W_n\Omega_R^i & \xrightarrow{V} & F_*^eW_{n+1}\Omega_R^i & \xrightarrow{F^n} & F_*^eZ_n\Omega_R^i & \longrightarrow & 0, \end{array}$$

where $f^*(-) := (-) \otimes_{W_{n+1}S} W_{n+1}R$. Let us prove that $\alpha_n^{e,i}$ is an isomorphism for all $i \geq 0$ and $e \geq 0$ by induction on $n \geq 1$. The base case $n = 1$ of this induction follows from our assumption. In particular, β and γ are isomorphisms (note that the Cartier isomorphism holds for regular \mathbb{F}_p -algebras [Shi07, Proposition 2.5], and hence $Z_n\Omega_R^i$ and $B_n\Omega_R^i$ can be defined as in the smooth case). Fix $n \geq 1$ and assume that $\alpha_n^{e,i}$ is an isomorphism for all $i \geq 0$ and $e \geq 0$ by induction on $n \geq 1$. Take integers $i \geq 0$ and $e \geq 0$. Then $\alpha_n^{e+1,i}$ is an isomorphism by the induction hypothesis. By the 5-lemma, also $\alpha_{n+1}^{e,i}$ is an isomorphism. \square

Lemma 9.7. *Let R be an \mathbb{F}_p -algebra. Take integers $i \geq 0$ and $n \geq 1$. Then the map*

$$dV^{n-1} : F_*\Omega_R^i \rightarrow F_*W_n\Omega_R^{i+1}$$

is a W_nR -module homomorphism.

Proof. Clearly, dV^{n-1} is an additive homomorphism. Fix $a \in R$ and $F_*^n \omega \in F_*^n \Omega_R^i$, where $\omega \in \Omega_R^i$. It suffices to show $dV^{n-1}(a \cdot F_*^n \omega) = [a] \cdot dV^{n-1}(F_*^n \omega)$. The problem is reduced to the case when $\omega = fdg_1 \cdots dg_i$ for some $f, g_1, \dots, g_i \in R$, because dV^{n-1} is additive and ω can be written as a finite sum of elements of this form. Set $dg := dg_1 \cdots dg_i$. We have

$$\begin{aligned} dV^{n-1}(a \cdot F_*^e \omega) &= dV^{n-1}(F_*(a^p \cdot F_*^{n-1} \omega)) \\ &= d(F_*[a^p] \cdot V^{n-1}(F_*^{n-1} \omega)) \\ &= d(F_*[a^p]) \cdot V^{n-1}(F_*^{n-1} \omega) + (F_*[a^p]) \cdot d(V^{n-1}(F_*^{n-1} \omega)) \\ &= d(F_*[a^p]) \cdot V^{n-1}(F_*^{n-1} \omega) + [a] \cdot d(V^{n-1}(F_*^n \omega)). \end{aligned}$$

In what follows, we drop F_* and F_*^{n-1} . Then it is enough to show $d([a^p]) \cdot V^{n-1}(\omega) = 0$. By

$$V^{n-1}(\omega) = V^{n-1}(fdg_1 \cdots dg_i) = (V^{n-1}f) \cdot d(V^{n-1}g_1) \cdots d(V^{n-1}g_i),$$

it holds that

$$d([a^p]) \cdot V^{n-1}(\omega) = (p[a]^{p-1}d[a]) \cdot (V^{n-1}f) \cdot d(V^{n-1}g_1) \cdots d(V^{n-1}g_i) = 0,$$

because $pV^{n-1}f = FV^n f = 0$ in $W_n R$. \square

Remark 9.8. We use the same notation as in Lemma 9.6. Then the three operations

$$F : W_n \Omega_R^i \rightarrow F_* W_{n-1} \Omega_R^i, \quad V : F_* W_{n-1} \Omega_R^i \rightarrow W_n \Omega_R^i, \quad R : W_n \Omega_R^i \rightarrow W_{n-1} \Omega_R^i,$$

are obtained from the corresponding operations for S by taking the base change $(-)\otimes_{W_n S} W_n R$. More explicitly, we have the following natural $W_n R$ -linear commutative diagrams in which all the vertical arrows are the canonical isomorphisms (Lemma 9.6(iii)):

$$\begin{array}{ccc} W_n \Omega_S^i \otimes_{W_n S} W_n R & \xrightarrow{F \otimes_{W_n S} W_n R} & F_* W_{n-1} \Omega_S^i \otimes_{W_n S} W_n R \\ \downarrow \simeq & & \downarrow \simeq \\ W_n \Omega_R^i & \xrightarrow{F} & F_* W_{n-1} \Omega_R^i \\ (F_* W_{n-1} \Omega_S^i) \otimes_{W_n S} W_n R & \xrightarrow{V \otimes_{W_n S} W_n R} & W_n \Omega_S^i \otimes_{W_n S} W_n R \\ \downarrow \simeq & & \downarrow \simeq \\ F_* W_{n-1} \Omega_R^i & \xrightarrow{V} & W_n \Omega_R^i \\ W_n \Omega_S^i \otimes_{W_n S} W_n R & \xrightarrow{R \otimes_{W_n S} W_n R} & W_{n-1} \Omega_S^i \otimes_{W_n S} W_n R \\ \downarrow \simeq & & \downarrow \simeq \\ W_n \Omega_R^i & \xrightarrow{R} & W_{n-1} \Omega_R^i. \end{array}$$

This fact can be used to generalise many exact sequences known for smooth \mathbb{F}_p -algebras to regular \mathbb{F}_p -algebras. For example, we have the following factorisation of the p^m -multiplication map [Ill79, Ch. I, Proposition 3.4]:

$$p^m : W_n \Omega_S^i \xrightarrow{R^m} W_{n-m} \Omega_S^i \xrightarrow{p^m} W_n \Omega_S^i,$$

which induces the R -version by taking the base change $(-)\otimes_{W_n S} W_n R$ (Lemma 9.3):

$$p^m : W_n \Omega_R^i \xrightarrow{R^m} W_{n-m} \Omega_R^i \xrightarrow{\underline{p}^m} W_n \Omega_R^i.$$

Remark 9.9. Let R be a regular F -finite integral domain. For every $\mathfrak{p} \in \text{Spec } R$, there exists a flat ring homomorphism $S_{\mathfrak{p}} \rightarrow R_{\mathfrak{p}}$ as in Lemma 9.3. By Remark 9.8, we get the decomposition

$$p^m : W_n \Omega_{R_{\mathfrak{p}}}^i \xrightarrow{R^m} W_{n-m} \Omega_{R_{\mathfrak{p}}}^i \xrightarrow{\underline{p}_{\mathfrak{p}}^m} W_n \Omega_{R_{\mathfrak{p}}}^i.$$

For the generic point $\eta \in \text{Spec } R$, we have the following commutative diagram, because R^m is surjective:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} W_{n-m} \omega_{R_{\eta}} & \xrightarrow{\underline{p}_{\eta}^m} & W_n \omega_{R_{\eta}} \\ \uparrow & & \uparrow \\ W_{n-m} \omega_{R_{\mathfrak{p}}} & \xrightarrow{\underline{p}_{\mathfrak{p}}^m} & W_n \omega_{R_{\mathfrak{p}}}, \end{array}$$

where the vertical arrows are the induced injections. Then it holds that

$$\begin{aligned} \underline{p}_{\eta}^m(W_{n-m} \omega_R) &\stackrel{(\alpha)}{=} \underline{p}_{\eta}^m\left(\bigcap_{\mathfrak{p} \in \text{Spec } R} W_{n-m} \omega_{R_{\mathfrak{p}}}\right) \subseteq \bigcap_{\mathfrak{p} \in \text{Spec } R} \underline{p}_{\eta}^m(W_{n-m} \omega_{R_{\mathfrak{p}}}) \\ &= \bigcap_{\mathfrak{p} \in \text{Spec } R} \underline{p}_{\mathfrak{p}}^m(W_{n-m} \omega_{R_{\mathfrak{p}}}) \subseteq \bigcap_{\mathfrak{p} \in \text{Spec } R} W_n \omega_{R_{\mathfrak{p}}} \stackrel{(\beta)}{=} W_n \omega_R, \end{aligned}$$

where the equalities (α) and (β) can be checked by using the fact that the restriction map $W_n \omega_R(U) \rightarrow W_n \omega_R(V)$ is injective for open subsets U and V satisfying $\text{Spec } R \supseteq U \supseteq V \neq \emptyset$. Then we get an R -module homomorphism $\underline{p}^m : W_{n-m} \omega_R \rightarrow W_n \omega_R$ satisfying $\underline{p}^m \circ R^m = p^m$. Moreover, for $K := K(R)$ and the non-negative integer r satisfying $[K : K^p] = p^r$, the sequence

$$0 \rightarrow W_m \Omega_R^r \xrightarrow{\underline{p}^m} W_{n+m} \Omega_R^r \xrightarrow{F^m} F_*^m W_n \Omega_R^r \rightarrow 0$$

is exact.

Proposition 9.10. *Let R be a regular F -finite integral domain and set $K := K(R)$. Let r be the non-negative integer satisfying $[K : K^p] = p^r$. Fix an integer $n > 0$. Let $W_n \Omega_R^{\bullet}$ be the de Rham-Witt complex of length n . Set $W_n \omega_R := W_n \Omega_R^r$. Then*

- (i) $W_n \omega_R$ is a dualising $W_n R$ -module and
- (ii) $W_n \Omega_R^i = 0$ for every integer $i \geq r + 1$.

Proof. We may assume that R is local [Har66, Ch. V, Corollary 2.3]. Take a flat ring homomorphism $\varphi : S \rightarrow R$ from a smooth \mathbb{F}_p -algebra S as in Lemma 9.3. We note that the following properties, corresponding to (i) and (ii), hold on S by [Eke84, Theorem 4.1, Lemma 0.6]:

- (i)' $W_n \omega_S$ is a dualising $W_n S$ -module.
- (ii)' $W_n \Omega_S^i = 0$ for every integer $i \geq r + 1$.

By Lemma 9.6(iii), we have $W_n\Omega_S^i \otimes_{W_nS} W_nR \xrightarrow{\simeq} W_n\Omega_R^i$ for all integers $n \geq 1$ and $i \geq 0$. Therefore, the assertion (ii) follows from (ii)'.

It suffices to show (i). Since W_nS is Cohen-Macaulay and $W_n\omega_S$ is a dualising W_nS -module, the following hold [Sta14, Tag 0A7B].

- (1) $W_n\omega_S$ is a finitely generated W_nS -module.
- (2) $W_n\omega_S$ is of finite injective dimension.
- (3) The natural homomorphism

$$(9.10.1) \quad W_nS \rightarrow R \operatorname{Hom}_{W_nS}(W_n\omega_S, W_n\omega_S)$$

is a quasi-isomorphism.

It is enough to show that the corresponding properties hold for $W_n\omega_R$ [Sta14, Tag 0A7B]. By $W_n\omega_R \simeq W_n\omega_S \otimes_{W_nS} W_nR$, $W_n\omega_R$ is a finitely generated W_nR -module, i.e., (1) holds for R . Since W_nR is flat over W_nS [Mat89, Exercise 7.7], we get a quasi-isomorphism

$$W_nR \xrightarrow{\simeq} R \operatorname{Hom}_{W_nS}(W_n\omega_S, W_n\omega_S) \otimes_{W_nS} W_nR \simeq R \operatorname{Hom}_{W_nR}(W_n\omega_R, W_n\omega_R)$$

by applying $(-)\otimes_{W_nS} W_nR$ to the quasi-isomorphism (9.10.1). Thus (3) holds for R . Set $\mathfrak{p} := \varphi^{-1}(\mathfrak{m})$ and we get $\mathfrak{p}R = \mathfrak{m}$ by Lemma 9.3. Furthermore, we have

$$\operatorname{Ext}_{W_nS}^i(S/\mathfrak{p}, W_n\omega_S) \otimes_{W_nR} W_nS \simeq \operatorname{Ext}_{W_nR}^i(R/\mathfrak{m}, W_n\omega_R).$$

Since $W_n\omega_S$ has a finite injective dimension, there exists $i_0 > 0$ such that

$$\operatorname{Ext}_{W_nS}^i(S/\mathfrak{p}, W_n\omega_S) = 0$$

for every $i \geq i_0$. Therefore, $\operatorname{Ext}_{W_nR}^i(R/\mathfrak{m}, W_n\omega_R) = 0$ for every $i \geq i_0$. By [Sta14, Tag 0AVJ], $W_n\omega_R$ is of finite injective dimension, i.e., (2) holds for R . \square

Proposition 9.11. *Let R be a regular F -finite integral domain and set $K := K(R)$. Let r be the non-negative integer satisfying $[K : K^p] = p^r$. Let $W_n\Omega_X^\bullet$ be the de Rham-Witt complex of length n . Set $W_n\omega_R := W_n\Omega_R^r$. Then there exists a unique set of homomorphisms (called trace maps)*

$$\{T_{m,n}^e : F_*^e W_m\omega_R \rightarrow W_n\omega_R \mid e \geq 0, n \geq m \geq 1\}$$

which satisfies the following.

- (i) For all integers $n \geq m \geq 1$, the W_nR -module homomorphism

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma_{m,n}^e : F_*^e W_m\omega_R &\rightarrow \operatorname{Hom}_{W_nR}(F_*^e W_mR, W_n\omega_R) \\ F_*^e \zeta &\mapsto (F_*^e \alpha \mapsto T_{m,n}^e(F_*^e(\alpha\zeta))), \end{aligned}$$

induced by the trace map $T_{m,n}^e : F_*^e W_m\omega_R \rightarrow W_n\omega_R$, is an isomorphism. Moreover, $\sigma_{m,n}^e$ is $F_*^e W_nR$ -linear.

- (ii) $T_{l,m}^{e'} \circ F_*^{e'} T_{m,n}^e = T_{l,n}^{e+e'}$ for all $e, e', l, m, n \in \mathbb{Z}$ satisfying $e, e' \geq 0$ and $n \geq m \geq l \geq 1$.

(iii) $T_{m,n}^0 = \underline{p}^{n-m}$ and $\underline{p}^e \circ T_{n,n}^e = V^e$ for all $e > 0$ and $n \geq m \geq 1$.

$$(9.11.1) \quad \begin{array}{ccccc} & & \xrightarrow{V^e} & & \\ & & \curvearrowright & & \\ F_*^e W_n \omega_R & \xrightarrow{T_{n,n}^e} & W_n \omega_R & \xleftarrow{\underline{p}^e} & W_{n+e} \omega_R \end{array}$$

Proof. We can directly check the $F_*^e W_n R$ -linearity in (i).

Step 1. *The assertion of Proposition 9.11 holds for the case when R is a finitely generated \mathbb{F}_p -algebra.*

Proof of Step 1. In this case, we have $W_n \omega_R = \pi^! \mathbb{F}_p[-r]$ for $\pi : \text{Spec } R \rightarrow \text{Spec } \mathbb{F}_p$. We then define $T_{m,n}^e : F_*^e W_m \omega_R \rightarrow W_n \omega_R$ as the usual trace map that induces the Grothendieck duality in (i). Then (i) and (ii) hold.

It is enough to show (iii). Recall that the Grothendieck dual $(-)^* := \text{Hom}_{W_n R}(-, W_n \omega_R)$ of F, V, R, \underline{p} are V, F, \underline{p}, R , respectively [Eke84, Lemma 2.2.4]. For example, we have the following commutative diagram for R :

$$\begin{array}{ccc} W_{n-1} \omega_R & \xrightarrow{\underline{p}} & W_n \omega_R \\ \simeq \downarrow \sigma_{n-1,n}^0 & & \simeq \downarrow \text{canonical isom.} \\ \text{Hom}_{W_n R}(W_{n-1} R, W_n R) & \xrightarrow{R^*} & \text{Hom}_{W_n R}(W_n R, W_n \omega_R). \end{array}$$

Hence it holds that $T_{m,n}^0 = \underline{p}^{n-m}$. The other equality $\underline{p}^e \circ T_{n,n}^e = V^e$ in (iii) follows from the fact that the diagram (9.11.1) is obtained by applying $(-)^* = \text{Hom}_{W_n R}(-, W_n \omega_R)$ to the following commutative diagram:

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} & & \xrightarrow{F^e} & & \\ & & \curvearrowleft & & \\ F_*^e W_n R & \xleftarrow{F^e} & W_n R & \xleftarrow{R^e} & W_{n+e} R. \end{array}$$

This completes the proof of Step 1. \square

In what follows, we shall repeatedly reduce the problem to the case when R is a finitely generated \mathbb{F}_p -algebra. If we may assume that R is a local ring, then the problem is reduced to the case when (\star) holds (Lemma 9.3, Lemma 9.6).

(\star) There exists a flat ring homomorphism $\varphi : S \rightarrow R$ of regular F -finite Noetherian domains such that S is a finitely generated \mathbb{F}_p -algebra, $[K(S) : K(S)^p] = p^r$, and we have the induced isomorphism $(F_*^e W_n \Omega_S^i) \otimes_{W_n S} W_n R \xrightarrow{\cong} F_*^e W_n \Omega_R^i$ for all $e \geq 0, n > 0$, and $i \geq 0$.

Step 2. *If each of $\{T_{m,n}^e \mid e \geq 0, n \geq m \geq 1\}$ and $\{T_{m,n}^{e'} \mid e \geq 0, n \geq m \geq 1\}$ satisfies (ii) and (iii), then $T_{m,n}^e = T_{m,n}^{e'}$ for all $e \geq 0$ and $n \geq m \geq 1$.*

Proof of Step 2. By (iii), we get $T_{m,n}^0 = \underline{p}^{n-m} = T_{m,n}^{0'}$ and $\underline{p}^e \circ T_{n,n}^e = V^e = \underline{p}^e \circ T_{n,n}^{e'}$. Since \underline{p}^e is injective, we get $T_{n,n}^e = T_{n,n}^{e'}$. The general case is reduced to these cases by (ii), because

$$T_{m,n}^e \stackrel{(ii)}{=} T_{m,n}^0 \circ T_{n,n}^e = T_{m,n}^{0'} \circ T_{n,n}^{e'} \stackrel{(ii)}{=} T_{m,n}^{e'}$$

This completes the proof of Step 2. \square

Step 3. Fix integers $e > 0$ and $n > 0$. Then there exists a $W_n R$ -module homomorphism $T_{n,n}^e: F_*^e W_n \omega_R \rightarrow W_n \omega_R$ such that $\underline{p}^e \circ T_{n,n}^e = V^e$.

Proof of Step 3. By a similar argument to the one of Remark 9.9, we may assume that R is a local ring. In this case, there exists a flat ring homomorphism $S \rightarrow R$ satisfying the properties in (\star) . By Step 1, there is an $W_n S$ -module homomorphism $T_{S,n,n}^e$ satisfying $\underline{p}^e \circ T_{S,n,n}^e = V^e$. Set $T_{n,n}^e := T_{S,n,n}^e \otimes_{W_n S} W_n R$. We then get $\underline{p}^e \circ T_{n,n}^e = V^e$, as required. This completes the proof of Step 3. \square

Step 4. There exists a set of homomorphisms

$$\{T_{m,n}^e : F_*^e W_m \omega_R \rightarrow W_n \omega_R \mid e \geq 0, n \geq m \geq 1\}$$

which satisfies (i)-(iii).

Proof of Step 4. For integers $e > 0$ and $n \geq m \geq 1$, we set $T_{m,n}^0 := \underline{p}^{n-m}$ and

$$T_{m,n}^e := T_{m,n}^0 \circ T_{n,n}^e,$$

where $T_{n,n}^e$ is defined in Step 3. Then (iii) holds.

Let us show (ii). The required equality can be checked after replacing R by $R_{\mathfrak{p}}$ for a prime ideal \mathfrak{p} of R , and hence we may assume (\star) . Then the problem is reduced to the case when R is a finitely generated \mathbb{F}_p -algebra. Thus (ii) holds by Step 1.

Let us show (i). Again, we may assume that (\star) holds. By Step 2, (ii) and (iii) assure the uniqueness of $T_{m,n}^e$. Therefore, we obtain $T_{R,m,n}^e = T_{S,m,n}^e \otimes_{W_n S} W_n R$, where $T_{R,m,n}^e$ and $T_{S,m,n}^e$ denote the trace maps on R and S , respectively. Hence (i) holds by Step 1. This completes the proof of Step 4. \square

Step 2 and Step 4 complete the proof of Proposition 9.11. \square

Proof of Theorem 9.1. The proof consists of three steps.

Step 1. Theorem 9.1(1) and Theorem 9.1(2) imply Theorem 9.1(3).

Proof of Step 1. Take integers e, e', l, m, n satisfying $e, e' \geq 0$ and $n \geq m \geq l \geq 1$. Set $f := \iota_{X,m,n}^e$, $g := \iota_{X,l,m}^{e'}$, $h := \iota_{X,l,n}^{e+e'}$, $\rho_f := \rho_{X,m,n}^e$, $\rho_g := \rho_{X,l,m}^{e'}$, $\rho_h := \rho_{X,l,n}^{e+e'}$, $T_f := T_{X,m,n}^e$, $T_g := T_{X,l,m}^{e'}$ and $T_h := T_{X,l,n}^{e+e'}$. Then Theorem 9.1(1) and Theorem 9.1(2) imply Theorem 9.1(3) by the diagram

$$(9.11.2) \quad \begin{array}{ccccc} & h_* W_l \omega_X^\bullet & \xrightarrow{f_* T_g} & f_* W_m \omega_X^\bullet & \xrightarrow{T_f} & W_n \omega_X^\bullet \\ & \downarrow h_* \rho_g & \nearrow \text{adj} & \downarrow f_* \rho_f & \nearrow \text{adj} & \\ h_* g^! W_m \omega_X^\bullet & & & f_* f^! W_n \omega_X^\bullet & & \\ & \downarrow h_* g^! \rho_f & \nearrow \text{adj} & & & \\ & h_* h^! W_n \omega_X^\bullet & & & & \end{array}$$

(Note: The diagram also includes a curved arrow from $h_ h^! W_n \omega_X^\bullet$ to $W_n \omega_X^\bullet$ labeled 'adj' and a curved arrow from $h_* W_l \omega_X^\bullet$ to $h_* h^! W_n \omega_X^\bullet$ labeled $h_* \rho_h$.)*

This completes the proof of Step 1. \square

Step 2. Let $f: Y \rightarrow X$ be a morphism of separated schemes which are of finite type over an F -finite Noetherian \mathbb{F}_p -algebra. If the assertion of Theorem 9.1 holds for X , then so does for Y .

Proof of Step 2. Take $W_n\omega_X^\bullet$ and $\rho_{X,m,n}^e$ as in Theorem 9.1 for integers e, m, n satisfying $e \geq 0$ and $n \geq m \geq 1$. For the induced morphism $f_n: W_nY \rightarrow W_nX$, we set $W_n\omega_Y^\bullet := f_n^!W_n\omega_X^\bullet$ and $\rho_{Y,m,n}^e := f_n^!\rho_{X,m,n}^e$. Then $\{W_n\omega_Y^\bullet\}_n$ and $\{\rho_{Y,m,n}^e\}_{e,m,n}$ satisfy Theorem 9.1(1) and Theorem 9.1(2) (cf. [Har66]). By Step 1, they also satisfy Theorem 9.1(3). This completes the proof of Step 2. \square

Step 3. The assertion of Theorem 9.1 holds for the case when X is affine.

Proof of Step 3. We have $X = \text{Spec } R$, where R is an F -finite Noetherian \mathbb{F}_p -algebra. By [Gab04, Remark 13.6], there exists a surjective ring homomorphism $S \rightarrow R$ such that S is a regular F -finite \mathbb{F}_p -algebra. Let $S \simeq S_1 \times \cdots \times S_r$, where every $\text{Spec } S_i$ is connected, so that every S_i is a regular domain. By Step 2, it is enough to show that Theorem 9.1 holds for $\text{Spec } S$. We pick $W_n\omega_{S_i}$ and $T_{S_i,m,n}^e$ as in Proposition 9.11, and set

$$W_n\omega_S := W_n\omega_{S_1} \otimes \cdots \otimes W_n\omega_{S_r}$$

and $T_{m,n}^e := T_{S_1,m,n}^e \otimes \cdots \otimes T_{S_r,m,n}^e$. Then $W_n\omega_S$ is a dualising module on W_nS (Proposition 9.10) and $\{W_n\omega_S\}$ and $\{T_{m,n}^e\}$ satisfy the conditions (i)-(iii) in Proposition 9.11. Let $\iota_{m,n}^e: \text{Spec } W_mS \rightarrow \text{Spec } W_nS$ be the composition of F^e and the closed immersion $\text{Spec } W_mS \rightarrow \text{Spec } W_nS$. By Proposition 9.11(i), we obtain a W_mS -module isomorphism

$$\rho_{m,n}^e: W_m\omega_S \xrightarrow{\cong} (\iota_{m,n}^e)^!W_nS$$

such that $(\iota_{m,n}^e)_*\rho_{m,n}^e = \sigma_{m,n}^e$ (see Remark 9.12(1)).

Then Theorem 9.1(1) holds for S . By Step 1, it suffices to check that Theorem 9.1(2) holds for S . Let $\Psi_{\iota_{m,n}^e}$ be as in Remark 9.12(1). By the construction of $\sigma_{m,n}^e$ and a commutative diagram similar to (9.12.1), we have $\Psi_{\iota_{m,n}^e}(T_{m,n}^e) = \rho_{m,n}^e$. Furthermore, by Proposition 9.11(ii) and Remark 9.12(2), we obtain Theorem 9.1(2). This completes the proof of Step 3. \square

Step 2 and Step 3 complete the proof of Theorem 9.1. \square

Remark 9.12. Let $f: Y \rightarrow X$ and $g: Z \rightarrow Y$ be finite morphisms of separated Noetherian schemes. Set $h := g \circ f$. Assume that X, Y , and Z are Cohen-Macaulay and admit dualising complexes ω_X, ω_Y , and ω_Z , respectively. We identify ω_X, ω_Y , and ω_Z with the corresponding coherent sheaves.

(1) By [Sta14, Tag 0AWZ], we have

$$f_*f^!M = \mathcal{H}om_{\mathcal{O}_X}(f_*\mathcal{O}_Y, M)$$

as an $f_*\mathcal{O}_Y$ -module for every coherent \mathcal{O}_X -module M . Furthermore, for a coherent \mathcal{O}_X -module M and a coherent \mathcal{O}_Y -module N , we have

$$f_*\mathcal{H}om_{\mathcal{O}_Y}(N, f^!M) = f_*\mathcal{H}om_{\mathcal{O}_Y}(N, \mathcal{H}om_{\mathcal{O}_X}(f_*\mathcal{O}_Y, M)) \xrightarrow{\cong} \mathcal{H}om_{\mathcal{O}_X}(f_*N, M)$$

$$(x \mapsto \varphi_x) \longmapsto (x \mapsto \varphi_x(1)),$$

which implies that $f^!$ is the right adjoint functor of f_* (cf. [Sta14, Tag 0AWZ]). Applying this for $N = \omega_Y$ and $M = \omega_X$, we get

$$\Psi_f: \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{O}_Y}(\omega_Y, f^!\omega_X) \xrightarrow{\cong} \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathcal{O}_X}(f_*\omega_Y, \omega_X).$$

Specifically, this adjoint bijection is given by

$$\begin{aligned} \mathrm{adj}: f_*f^!\omega_X &= f_*\mathcal{H}om_{\mathcal{O}_X}(f_*\mathcal{O}_Y, \omega_X) \rightarrow \omega_X \\ \varphi &\longmapsto \varphi(1). \end{aligned}$$

In particular, for an \mathcal{O}_Y -module isomorphism $\rho_f: \omega_Y \xrightarrow{\cong} f^!\omega_X$, the corresponding \mathcal{O}_X -module homomorphism is given by

$$T_f: f_*\omega_Y \xrightarrow{f_*\rho_f \cong} f_*f^!\omega_X \xrightarrow{\mathrm{adj}} \omega_X.$$

In this case, we get the following commutative diagram:

$$(9.12.1) \quad \begin{array}{ccc} f_*\omega_Y & \xrightarrow{T_f} & \omega_X \\ f_*\rho_f \downarrow \cong & & \uparrow \mathrm{adj} \\ f_*f^!\omega_X & \xrightarrow{\quad} & \omega_X \\ \parallel & & \uparrow (\varphi \mapsto \varphi(1)) \\ \mathcal{H}om_{\mathcal{O}_X}(f_*\mathcal{O}_Y, \omega_X) & & \end{array}$$

- (2) We define the adjoint bijections Ψ_g and Ψ_h in the same way as the one of Ψ_f . For isomorphisms $\rho_f: \omega_Y \xrightarrow{\cong} f^!\omega_X$ and $\rho_g: \omega_Z \xrightarrow{\cong} g^!\omega_Y$, the equation

$$\Psi_h(g^!\rho_f \circ \rho_g) = \Psi_f(\rho_f) \circ f_*\Psi_g(\rho_g)$$

holds by a diagram similar to (9.11.2). Therefore, for another isomorphism $\rho_h: \omega_Z \xrightarrow{\cong} h^!\omega_X$, the equation $g^!\rho_f \circ \rho_g = \rho_h$ holds if and only if the equation $\Psi_f(\rho_f) \circ f_*\Psi_g(\rho_g) = \Psi_h(\rho_h)$ holds.

REFERENCES

- [BH93] W. Bruns and J. Herzog, *Cohen-Macaulay rings*, Cambridge Studies in Advanced Mathematics, vol. 39, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1993. MR1251956
- [Bha12] B. Bhatt, *Derived splinters in positive characteristic*, *Compositio Mathematica* **148** (2012), no. 6, 1757–1786.
- [BLM21] B. Bhatt, J. Lurie, and A. Mathew, *Revisiting the de Rham–Witt complex*, *Astérisque* **424** (2021), viii+165. MR4275461
- [BST15a] M. Blickle, K. Schwede, and K. Tucker, *F-singularities via alterations*, *Amer. J. Math.* **137** (2015), no. 1, 61–109. MR3318087
- [BST15b] ———, *F-singularities via alterations*, *Amer. J. Math.* **137** (2015), no. 1, 61–109. MR3318087
- [BSTZ10] M. Blickle, K. Schwede, S. Takagi, and W. Zhang, *Discreteness and rationality of F-jumping numbers on singular varieties*, *Math. Ann.* **347** (2010), no. 4, 917–949. MR2658149

- [dFDTT15] T. de Fernex, R. Docampo, S. Takagi, and K. Tucker, *Comparing multiplier ideals to test ideals on numerically \mathbb{Q} -Gorenstein varieties*, Bull. Lond. Math. Soc. **47** (2015), no. 2, 359–369. MR3335128
- [Eke84] T. Ekedahl, *On the multiplicative properties of the de Rham-Witt complex. I*, Ark. Mat. **22** (1984), no. 2, 185–239. MR765411
- [Gab04] O. Gabber, *Notes on some t -structures*, Geometric aspects of Dwork theory. Vol. I, II, 2004, pp. 711–734. MR2099084
- [GNT19] Y. Gongyo, Y. Nakamura, and H. Tanaka, *Rational points on log Fano threefolds over a finite field*, J. Eur. Math. Soc. (JEMS) **21** (2019), no. 12, 3759–3795. MR4022715
- [Har66] R. Hartshorne, *Residues and duality*, Lecture Notes in Mathematics, No. 20, Springer-Verlag, Berlin-New York, 1966. Lecture notes of a seminar on the work of A. Grothendieck, given at Harvard 1963/64, With an appendix by P. Deligne. MR0222093
- [Har77] R. Hartshorne, *Algebraic geometry*, Springer-Verlag, New York, 1977.
- [Has15] M. Hashimoto, *F -finiteness of homomorphisms and its descent*, Osaka J. Math. **52** (2015), no. 1, 205–213. MR3326608
- [HH90] M. Hochster and C. Huneke, *Tight closure, invariant theory, and the Briançon-Skoda theorem*, J. Amer. Math. Soc. **3** (1990), no. 1, 31–116.
- [Ill79] L. Illusie, *Complexe de de Rham-Witt et cohomologie cristalline*, Ann. Sci. École Norm. Sup. (4) **12** (1979), no. 4, 501–661.
- [KTT⁺22] T. Kawakami, T. Takamatsu, H. Tanaka, J. Witaszek, F. Yobuko, and S. Yoshikawa, *Quasi- F -splittings in birational geometry*, arXiv preprint arXiv:2208.08016 (2022).
- [KTT⁺23] ———, *Quasi- F -splittings in birational geometry II*, arXiv preprint arXiv:2302.13235 (2023).
- [KTY22] T. Kawakami, T. Takamatsu, and S. Yoshikawa, *Fedder criterion for quasi- F -splittings* (2022).
- [LS01] G. Lyubeznik and K. E. Smith, *On the commutation of the test ideal with localization and completion*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **353** (2001), no. 8, 3149–3180. MR1828602
- [Mat89] H. Matsumura, *Commutative ring theory*, Second, Cambridge Studies in Advanced Mathematics, vol. 8, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1989. Translated from the Japanese by M. Reid. MR1011461
- [Nag62] M. Nagata, *Local rings*, Interscience Tracts in Pure and Applied Mathematics, No. 13, Interscience Publishers (a division of John Wiley & Sons, Inc.), New York-London, 1962. MR0155856
- [PS14] Z. Patakfalvi and K. Schwede, *Depth of F -singularities and base change of relative canonical sheaves*, J. Inst. Math. Jussieu **13** (2014), no. 1, 43–63.
- [Shi07] A. Shiho, *On logarithmic Hodge-Witt cohomology of regular schemes*, J. Math. Sci. Univ. Tokyo **14** (2007), no. 4, 567–635. MR2396000
- [Sin99] A. K. Singh, *\mathbb{Q} -Gorenstein splinter rings of characteristic p are F -regular*, Math. Proc. Cambridge Philos. Soc. **127** (1999), no. 2, 201–205.
- [SS] K. Schwede and K. Smith, *A book on F -splittings (in progress)*, Unspecified title.
- [ST08] K. Schwede and S. Takagi, *Rational singularities associated to pairs*, 2008, pp. 625–658. Special volume in honor of Melvin Hochster. MR2492473
- [ST12] K. Schwede and K. Tucker, *A survey of test ideals*, Progress in commutative algebra 2, 2012, pp. 39–99.
- [Sta14] T. Stacks Project Authors, *Stacks Project*, 2014.
- [Tak04] S. Takagi, *An interpretation of multiplier ideals via tight closure*, J. Algebraic Geom. **13** (2004), no. 2, 393–415. MR2047704
- [Tak21] ———, *Finitistic test ideals on numerically \mathbb{Q} -Gorenstein varieties*, J. Algebra **571** (2021), 266–279. MR4200720
- [Tan18] H. Tanaka, *Minimal model program for excellent surfaces*, Ann. Inst. Fourier (Grenoble) **68** (2018), no. 1, 345–376.

- [Tan22] ———, *Vanishing theorems of Kodaira type for Witt canonical sheaves*, *Selecta Math. (N.S.)* **28** (2022), no. 1, Paper No. 12, 50.
- [Tan24] H. Tanaka, *Bertini theorems admitting base changes*, arXiv:1711.04380v2 (2024).
- [TWY24] H. Tanaka, J. Witaszek, and F. Yobuko, *Quasi- F^e -splittings and quasi- f -regularity*, preprint (2024).
- [Yob23] F. Yobuko, *Quasi- f -split and hodge-witt*, arXiv:2312.00682 (2023).

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, GRADUATE SCHOOL OF SCIENCE, KYOTO UNIVERSITY, KYOTO 606-8502, JAPAN

Email address: tatsurokawakami0@gmail.com

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS (HAKUBI CENTER), GRADUATE SCHOOL OF SCIENCE, KYOTO UNIVERSITY, KYOTO 606-8502, JAPAN

Email address: teppeitakamatsu.math@gmail.com

GRADUATE SCHOOL OF MATHEMATICAL SCIENCES, THE UNIVERSITY OF TOKYO, 3-8-1 KOMABA, MEGURO-KU, TOKYO 153-8914, JAPAN

Email address: tanaka@ms.u-tokyo.ac.jp

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, FINE HALL, WASHINGTON ROAD, PRINCETON UNIVERSITY, PRINCETON NJ 08544-1000, USA

Email address: jwitaszek@princeton.edu

GRADUATE SCHOOL OF MATHEMATICS, NAGOYA UNIVERSITY, FUROCHO, CHIKUSAKU, NAGOYA, JAPAN

Email address: soratobumusasabidesu@gmail.com

TOKYO INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY, TOKYO 152-8551, JAPAN

Email address: yoshikawa.s.al@m.titech.ac.jp