

THE GENERALIZED LELONG NUMBERS AND INTERSECTION THEORY

VIỆT-ANH NGUYỄN

ABSTRACT. Let X be a complex manifold of dimension k , and (V, ω) be a Kähler submanifold of dimension l in X , and $B \Subset V$ be a domain with \mathcal{C}^2 -smooth boundary. Let T be a positive plurisubharmonic current on X such that T satisfies a reasonable approximation condition on X and near ∂B . In our previous work [46] we introduce the concept of the generalized Lelong numbers $\nu_j(T, B) \in \mathbb{R}$ of T along B for $0 \leq j \leq l$. When $l = 0$, $V = B = \{\text{a single point } x \in X\}$, $\nu_0(T, B)$ is none other than the classical Lelong number $\nu(T, x)$ of T at x .

This article has five purposes.

Firstly, we formulate the notion of the generalized Lelong number of T associated to every closed smooth (j, j) -form $\omega^{(j)}$ on V . This concept extends the previous notion of the generalized Lelong numbers. We also establish their basic properties.

Secondly, we define the horizontal dimension \hbar of such a current T along B . Next, we characterize \hbar in terms of the generalized Lelong numbers. We also establish a Siu's upper-semicontinuity type theorem for the generalized Lelong numbers. The horizontal dimension was first introduced by Dinh-Sibony [28] in the context where the current T is positive closed and $\text{supp}(T) \cap V$ is compact in V .

In their above-mentioned context, Dinh and Sibony introduced the cohomology classes $c_j^{\text{DS}}(T, B) \in H^{2l-2j}(B)$'s which may be regarded as their analogues of the classical Lelong numbers. Our third objective is to generalize their notion to the broader context where T is (merely) positive pluriharmonic. Moreover, we also establish a formula relating Dinh-Sibony classes and the generalized Lelong numbers. As a consequence, the generalized Lelong numbers are totally intrinsic in this context.

Fourthly, we obtain an effective sufficient condition for defining the intersection $T_1 \wedge \dots \wedge T_m$ in the sense of Dinh-Sibony's theory of tangent currents [28] of m (≥ 2) positive closed currents T_i of bidegree (p_i, p_i) for $1 \leq i \leq m$ on a compact Kähler manifold X .

Finally, we establish an effective sufficient condition for m (≥ 2) sequences of positive closed currents $(T_{i,n})_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ of bidegree (p_i, p_i) for $1 \leq i \leq m$ on a compact Kähler manifold X to satisfy the following equality:

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} (T_{1,n} \wedge \dots \wedge T_{m,n}) = \left(\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} T_{1,n} \right) \wedge \dots \wedge \left(\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} T_{m,n} \right).$$

MSC 2020: Primary: 32U40, 32U25 – Secondary: 32Q15, 32L05, 14J60.

Keywords: positive closed/pluriharmonic/plurisubharmonic current, horizontal dimension, tangent currents, Lelong-Jensen formula, generalized Lelong numbers.

1. INTRODUCTION

Let X be a complex manifold of dimension k . Let d, d^c denote the real differential operators on X defined by $d := \partial + \bar{\partial}$, $d^c := \frac{1}{2\pi i}(\partial - \bar{\partial})$ with $i := \sqrt{-1}$ so that $dd^c = \frac{i}{\pi} \partial \bar{\partial}$. We start with the following basic definitions.

Date: January 04, 2025.

Definition 1.1. A (p, p) -current T defined on X is said to be positive if $\langle T, \Phi \rangle \geq 0$ for every smooth test form Φ of the type

$$\Phi = f \cdot (i\phi_1 \wedge \bar{\phi}_1) \wedge \dots \wedge (i\phi_q \wedge \bar{\phi}_q),$$

where $q := k - p$ and ϕ_1, \dots, ϕ_q are smooth $(1, 0)$ -forms on X , f is a non-negative smooth function compactly supported on X .

Definition 1.2. A (p, p) -current T defined on X is said to be *closed* (resp. *pluriharmonic*¹), (resp. *plurisubharmonic*) if $dT = 0$ (resp. $dd^c T = 0$), (resp. $dd^c T$ is a positive current).

If V is a subvariety of X of pure codimension p , then the current of integration $[V]$ associated to V is a positive closed (p, p) -current. Moreover, if T is positive closed, then it is clearly positive pluriharmonic. If T is positive pluriharmonic, then it is clearly positive plurisubharmonic.

1.1. Main purpose of this work. Let (V, ω) be a Hermitian submanifold of dimension l in X such that the Hermitian form is Kähler. But we point out that the Kählerian assumption of ω could be somehow relaxed. Let $B \Subset V$ be a domain with piecewise \mathcal{C}^2 -smooth boundary. Let T be a positive plurisubharmonic current on X such that T satisfies a reasonable approximation condition near B and near ∂B in X . In our previous work [46] we introduce the concept of the generalized Lelong numbers $\nu_j(T, B) \in \mathbb{R}$ of T along B for $0 \leq j \leq l$. When $l = 0$, $V = B = \{\text{a single point } x \in X\}$, $\nu_0(T, B)$ becomes the classical Lelong number $\nu(T, x)$ of T at x .

Let us first talk about the particular case of positive closed currents. In this case the Lelong numbers play a fundamental role and have numerous applications in Complex Analysis, Complex Geometry, Algebraic Geometry and Complex Dynamics, see, for example, Griffiths-Harris [35], Demailly [16] and Dinh-Sibony [26], Lazarsfeld [42, 43] as well as the references therein. The readers could find some systematic developments on Lelong numbers for positive closed currents in Siu [50] and Demailly [14, 15] etc.

The theory of intersection for positive closed $(1, 1)$ -currents is by now well-developed and well-understood. The key point here is that positive closed $(1, 1)$ -currents can be locally written as the dd^c of plurisubharmonic (psh) functions which are unique up to pluriharmonic functions. Therefore, the study of positive closed $(1, 1)$ -currents can be systematically reduced to the study of psh functions, see the pioneering works of Bedford-Taylor [5], Fornæss-Sibony [31], Demailly [13, 14, 16] etc. This theory has a lasting impact and finds many application in the contemporary study of degenerate Monge-Ampère equations which is an important part of the interface between Complex Analysis and Differential Geometry etc.

However, the case of arbitrary bi-degree currents is still far from being well understood because their local potentials may differ by singular currents. In [13, p. 146], Demailly raised the problem of developing a theory of intersection for positive closed currents of higher bidegree. In [24, 25, 28] Dinh and Sibony gave two remarkable answers to this problem via their two new theories, namely, the super-potential theory and the theory of tangent currents. More concretely, given $m (\geq 2)$ positive closed currents T_i of bidegree (p_i, p_i) for $1 \leq i \leq m$ on a compact Kähler manifold X , under theoretically reasonable assumptions, Dinh-Sibony can define the intersection $T_1 \wedge \dots \wedge T_m$ in the sense of the

¹Some authors use the terminology *harmonic* instead of *pluriharmonic*.

super-potential theory (see Definition 12.1 below), and the intersection $T_1 \wedge \dots \wedge T_m$ in the sense of the theory of tangent currents (see Definition 1.8 below). Dinh-Nguyen-Vu [20] study the relation between these two theories. Ahn, Bayraktar, De Thélin, Dinh, Huynh, Kaufmann, Truong, Vigny, Vu and several other authors apply these two theories to many interesting problems, see [1, 6, 17, 21, 22, 37, 38, 39, 40, 53, 55, 56, 57, 58] etc. In continuation of Dinh-Sibony's pioneering works, we address, in this article, the following basic questions which seem to play a very important role in applications:

Problem 1. Find an effective sufficient condition so that m (≥ 2) positive closed currents T_i of bidegree (p_i, p_i) for $1 \leq i \leq m$ on a compact Kähler manifold X are wedgeable in the sense of the theory of tangent currents, that is, the current $T_1 \wedge \dots \wedge T_m$ exists.

Problem 2. For $m \geq 2$ and for $1 \leq i \leq m$, let $(T_{i,n})_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ be a sequence of positive closed currents of bidegree (p_i, p_i) on a compact Kähler manifold X so that $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} T_{i,n}$ exists in the sense of currents. Find an effective sufficient condition imposed on these m sequences so that the following equality holds:

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} (T_{1,n} \wedge \dots \wedge T_{m,n}) = (\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} T_{1,n}) \wedge \dots \wedge (\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} T_{m,n}).$$

We refer the readers to Coman-Marinescu [12] for a connection between these two problems and the equidistribution of the zero-divisors of random sequences of holomorphic sections in high tensor powers of a holomorphic line bundle.

Next, we speak about the Lelong numbers of positive non-closed currents. The theory of singular holomorphic foliations has been undergoing several developments during the last 25 years. One of its main development is the advent of the ergodic theory which emphasizes the global study of singular holomorphic foliations using the analysis of positive currents and the tools from geometric complex analysis. These techniques are developed by Berndtsson-Sibony [7] and Fornæss-Sibony [32, 33, 34]. One major goal of the latter theory is to study the global behaviour of a generic leaf of a foliation \mathcal{F} . Here, the term “generic” is measured with respect to some new objects called *directed positive harmonic currents* (see for example [33, Definition 7] etc. for a definition of this notion). Although these currents are positive pluriharmonic, the problem is that they are in general not closed. On the other hand, the analysis of these currents are often difficult when one approaches the singularities of \mathcal{F} . The classical Lelong numbers are only suitable to the case where these singularities are isolated. When the set of singularities is of positive dimension, the analysis becomes much harder. We expect that the toolbox that we develop in [46] and in the present work may provide an effective way to handle this situation.

As for positive plurisubharmonic currents, the reader could consult Alessandrini-Bassanelli [3].

Notation. Throughout the article, we denote by

- \mathbb{D} the unit disc in \mathbb{C} ;
- \mathbb{C}^* the punctured complex plane $\mathbb{C} \setminus \{0\}$;
- $\mathbb{R}^+ := [0, \infty)$ and $\mathbb{R}_*^+ := (0, \infty)$;
- ∂B the boundary of an open set B in a manifold Y .

If X is an oriented manifold, denote by $H^*(X, \mathbb{C})$ the de Rham cohomology group of X and $H_{\text{comp}}^*(X, \mathbb{C})$ the de Rham cohomology group defined by forms or currents with compact support in X . If V is a submanifold of X , denote by $H_V^*(X, \mathbb{C})$ the de Rham

cohomology group defined in the same way using only forms or currents on X whose supports intersect V in a compact set.

If T is either a closed current on X or a dd^c -closed current on a compact Kähler manifold X , denote by $\{T\}$ its class in $H^*(X, \mathbb{C})$. When T is supposed to have compact support, then $\{T\}$ denotes the class of T in $H_{\text{comp}}^*(X, \mathbb{C})$. If we only assume that $\text{supp}(T) \cap V$ is compact, then $\{T\}$ denotes the class of T in $H_V^*(X, \mathbb{C})$. The current of integration on an oriented submanifold or a complex variety Y is denoted by $[Y]$. Its class is denoted by $\{Y\}$.

For a differentiable map $\pi : X \rightarrow Y$ between manifolds, π^* (resp. π_*) denotes the pull-back (resp. the push-forward) operator acting on forms and currents defined on Y (resp. on X). These operators induce natural maps on cohomological levels: $\pi^* : H^*(Y, \mathbb{C}) \rightarrow H^*(X, \mathbb{C})$ and $\pi_* : H^*(X, \mathbb{C}) \rightarrow H^*(Y, \mathbb{C})$.

In the next three subsections we will recall known results.

1.2. Classical Lelong numbers. Let T be a positive plurisubharmonic (p, p) -current defined on X and $x \in X$ a point. We first recall the notion of Lelong number $\nu(T, x)$ of T at x . This notion was first introduced by Lelong in [44] for the class of positive closed currents. It was later formulated by Skoda in [51] for the wider class of positive plurisubharmonic currents.

Choose a local holomorphic coordinate system z near x such that $x = 0$ in these coordinates. The Lelong number $\nu(T, x)$ of T at x is the limit of the normalized mass of $\|T\|$ on the ball $\mathbb{B}(0, r)$ of center 0 and radius r when r tends to 0. More precisely, we have

$$(1.1) \quad \nu(T, x) := \lim_{r \rightarrow 0} \nu(T, x, r), \quad \text{where} \quad \nu(T, x, r) := \frac{\sigma_T(\mathbb{B}(0, r))}{(2\pi)^{k-p} r^{2k-2p}}.$$

Here, $\sigma_T := \frac{1}{(k-p)!} T \wedge (\frac{i}{2} \partial \bar{\partial} \|z\|^2)^{k-p}$ is the trace measure of T . Note that $(2\pi)^{k-p} r^{2k-2p}$ is the mass on $\mathbb{B}(0, r)$ of the (p, p) -current of integration on a linear subspace of dimension $k-p$ through 0. When T is a positive closed current, Lelong establishes in [44] (see also [45]) that the *average mean* $\nu(T, x, r)$ is a non-negative-valued increasing function in the radius r . So the limit (1.1) always exists. Skoda [51] proves the same result for positive plurisubharmonic currents. Thie [52] shows that when T is given by an analytic set this number is the multiplicity of this set at x . Siu proves that when T is a positive closed current, the limit (1.1) does not depend on the choice of coordinates.

There is another equivalent logarithmic definition of the Lelong number of a positive closed current that we want to discuss in this work. More specifically, consider

$$(1.2) \quad \kappa^\bullet(T, x, r) := \int_{\mathbb{B}(0, r) \setminus \{0\}} T(z) \wedge (dd^c \log(\|z\|^2))^{k-p} \quad \text{and} \quad \kappa(T, x, r) := \int_{\mathbb{B}(0, r)} T(z) \wedge (dd^c \log(\|z\|^2))^{k-p}.$$

The *logarithmic means* $\kappa^\bullet(T, x, r)$ and $\kappa(T, x, r)$ are non-negative-valued increasing functions in the radius r . Observe that in the expression of $\kappa(T, x, r)$ in (1.2), the wedge-product of currents is only well-defined outside the origin 0 because the second factor $(dd^c \log(\|z\|^2))^{k-p}$ is only smooth there. Here, we consider two simple interpretations of (1.2) which correspond to regularizing either the first or the second factor of the wedge-product of currents in the expression of $\kappa(T, x, r)$. The first interpretation concerns the notion of approximation of currents. By a standard regularization (e.g. a convolution), we see that there is a sequence of positive smooth closed (p, p) -form on $\mathbb{B}(0, r + \epsilon)$ for

some $\epsilon > 0$ such that T_n converges weakly to T . The first interpretation of the integral on the RHS of (1.2) is formulated as follows:

$$(1.3) \quad \int_{\mathbb{B}(0,r)} T(z) \wedge (dd^c \log(\|z\|^2))^{k-p} := \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\mathbb{B}(0,r)} T_n(z) \wedge (dd^c \log(\|z\|^2))^{k-p}.$$

provided that the limit exists. In fact, this is indeed the case. The second interpretation consists in regularizing the integral kernel $(dd^c \log(\|z\|^2))^{k-p}$ in a canonical way:

$$(1.4) \quad \int_{\mathbb{B}(0,r)} T(z) \wedge (dd^c \log(\|z\|^2))^{k-p} := \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0^+} \int_{\mathbb{B}(0,r)} T(z) \wedge (dd^c \log(\|z\|^2 + \epsilon^2))^{k-p}.$$

provided that the limit exists. In fact, this is always the case.

We record here the basic identities of the logarithmic means:

$$(1.5) \quad \lim_{r \rightarrow 0} \kappa^\bullet(T, x, r) = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \nu(T, x) := \lim_{r \rightarrow 0} \kappa(T, x, r).$$

1.3. Tangent currents for $l > 0$ and Dinh-Sibony theory. Next, we deal with the situation where the single point x in the previous subsection is replaced by a submanifold $V \subset X$ of positive dimension l ($1 \leq l < k$). Only recently, Dinh and Sibony [28] have developed a satisfactory theory of tangent currents and density currents for positive closed currents in this context.

Let \mathbb{E} be the normal vector bundle to V in X and $\pi : \mathbb{E} \rightarrow V$ be the canonical projection. Consider a point $x \in V$. If $\text{Tan}_x(X)$ and $\text{Tan}_x(V)$ denote, respectively, the tangent spaces of X and of V at x , the fiber \mathbb{E}_x of \mathbb{E} over x is canonically identified with the quotient space $\text{Tan}_x(X)/\text{Tan}_x(V)$.

For $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}^*$, let $A_\lambda : \mathbb{E} \rightarrow \mathbb{E}$ be the multiplication by λ in fibers of \mathbb{E} , that is,

$$(1.6) \quad A_\lambda(y) := \lambda y \quad \text{for} \quad y \in \mathbb{E}.$$

A current T on \mathbb{E} is said to be *V-conic* if T is invariant under the action of A_λ , that is, $(A_\lambda)_*T = T$ for all $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}^*$. We identify V with the zero section of \mathbb{E} . Let $\bar{\mathbb{E}} := \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{E} \oplus \mathbb{C}) \rightarrow V$ be its canonical compactification.

Let T be a positive closed (p, p) -current on X .

When $V = \{\text{a single point } x\}$, we can assume that T is defined on an open neighborhood of 0 in \mathbb{C}^k . In this context $\mathbb{E} = \mathbb{C}^k$, and by Harvey's exposition [36], when λ goes to infinity, the domain of definition of the current $T_\lambda := (A_\lambda)_*(T)$ converges to \mathbb{C}^k . This family of currents is relatively compact, and any limit current T_∞ for $\lambda \rightarrow \infty$, is called a *tangent current* to T . A tangent current is defined on the whole \mathbb{C}^k , and it is conic.

When V has positive dimension, We expect as in Harvey's exposition [36] that one can define T_λ and obtain a tangent current T_∞ living on \mathbb{E} . However, a basic difficulty arises: in general, no neighbourhood of V in X is biholomorphic to a neighbourhood of V in \mathbb{E} .

To encounter this difficulty, Dinh and Sibony propose a softer notion: *the admissible maps*. More precisely, let τ be a diffeomorphism between a neighbourhood of V in X and a neighbourhood of V in \mathbb{E} whose restriction to V is identity. We assume that τ is admissible in the sense that the endomorphism of \mathbb{E} induced by the differential of τ when restricted to V is the identity map from \mathbb{E} to \mathbb{E} .

Fix $0 \leq p \leq k$ and set

$$(1.7) \quad \bar{m} := \min(l, k - p) \quad \text{and} \quad \underline{m} := \max(0, l - p).$$

Here is the main result of Dinh and Sibony.

Theorem 1.3. (Dinh-Sibony [28, Theorems 1.1, 4.6 and Definition 4.8]) *Let $X, V, \mathbb{E}, \overline{\mathbb{E}}, A_\lambda$ and τ be as above. Let T be a positive closed (p, p) -current on X . Assume in addition that X is Kähler and $\text{supp}(T) \cap V$ is compact. Then:*

- (1) *The family of currents $T_\lambda := (A_\lambda)_* \tau_*(T)$ is relatively compact and any limit current, for $\lambda \rightarrow \infty$, is a positive closed (p, p) -current on \mathbb{E} whose trivial extension is a positive closed (p, p) -current on $\overline{\mathbb{E}}$. Such a limit current R is called a tangent current to T along V .*
- (2) *If R is a tangent current to T along V , then it is V -conic, i.e., invariant under $(A_\lambda)_*$, and its de Rham cohomology class $\{R\}$ in the cohomology group with compact support $H_{\text{comp}}^{2p}(\overline{\mathbb{E}}, \mathbb{C})$ does not depend on the choice of τ and R . We denote $\{R\}$ by $\mathbf{c}^{\text{DS}}(T, V)$ (or simply by $\mathbf{c}^{\text{DS}}(T)$ if there is no confusion on V), and call it the total tangent class of T along V , or equivalently, Dinh-Sibony (total) cohomology class of T along V . In fact, $\mathbf{c}^{\text{DS}}(T, V) \in H_{\text{comp}}^{p,p}(\overline{\mathbb{E}}, \mathbb{C})$.*
- (3) *Let $-h_{\overline{\mathbb{E}}}$ denote the tautological class of the bundle $\pi_0 : \overline{\mathbb{E}} \rightarrow V$. Then, by Leray-Hirsch theorem (see for example [11]), we have the following decomposition of Dinh-Sibony class $\mathbf{c}^{\text{DS}}(T, V)$:*

$$\mathbf{c}^{\text{DS}}(T, V) = \sum_{j=\underline{m}}^{\overline{m}} \pi_0^*(\mathbf{c}_j^{\text{DS}}(T, V)) \smile h_{\overline{\mathbb{E}}}^{j-l+p},$$

where $\mathbf{c}_j^{\text{DS}}(T, V)$ is a class in $H_{\text{comp}}^{2l-2j}(V, \mathbb{C})$. Moreover, this decomposition is unique.

When V has positive dimension l , according to Dinh and Sibony, the notion of Lelong number of the current T at a single point should be replaced by the family of cohomology classes $\{\mathbf{c}_j^{\text{DS}}(T, V) : \underline{m} \leq j \leq \overline{m}\}$ given by Theorem 1.3 (3) above. This is an important and original viewpoint of Dinh and Sibony.

To prove their theorem, Dinh and Sibony develop a cohomological calculus on positive closed currents T such that $\text{supp}(T) \cap V$ is compact. It is worth noting that later on Vu [56] weakens the assumption of Kählerian on X .

Definition 1.4. (Dinh-Sibony [28, Definition 3.7]) *Let X, V be as in Theorem 1.3. Let T be a positive closed (p, p) -current on X such that $\text{supp}(T) \cap V$ is compact. If $\mathbf{c}^{\text{DS}}(T, V) \neq 0$, then we define the horizontal dimension (or h-dimension for short) of T along V to be the maximal $j : \underline{m} \leq j \leq \overline{m}$ such that $\mathbf{c}_j^{\text{DS}}(T, V) \neq 0$, otherwise (i.e. $\mathbf{c}^{\text{DS}}(T, V) = 0$) we define by convention the h-dimension of T to be simply \underline{m} . Denote by \hbar the h-dimension of T .*

Theorem 1.5. (Dinh-Sibony [28, Lemma 3.8]) *Let X, V be as in Theorem 1.3. Let T be a positive closed (p, p) -current on X such that $\text{supp}(T) \cap V$ is compact. Let \hbar be the h-dimension of T along V . Let R be a tangent current to T along V . Then the following assertions hold:*

- *If $R \neq 0$, then \hbar is also the maximal j such that $R \wedge \pi^* \omega^j \neq 0$, otherwise (i.e. $R=0$) we have $\hbar = \underline{m}$.*
- *The class $\mathbf{c}_\hbar^{\text{DS}}(T, V)$ is pseudo-effective compactly supported in V , i.e., it contains a positive closed current compactly supported in V .*

Theorem 1.6. (Dinh-Sibony [28, Theorem 4.11]) *Let X, V be as in Theorem 1.3. Let W be an open subset in X such that $W \cap V$ is relatively compact in V . Let T_n and T be a positive*

closed (p, p) -currents on X with support in W such that $T_n \rightarrow T$. Let \hbar be the h -dimension of T along V . Then the following assertions hold:

- If j is an integer with $j > \hbar$, then $\mathbf{c}_j^{\text{DS}}(T_n, V) \rightarrow 0$.
- If \mathbf{c}_\hbar is a limit class of the sequence $\mathbf{c}_\hbar^{\text{DS}}(T_n, V)$, then the class \mathbf{c}_\hbar and $\mathbf{c}_\hbar^{\text{DS}}(T, V) - \mathbf{c}_\hbar$ are pseudo-effective compactly supported in V .

Theorem 1.7. (Dinh-Sibony [28, Lemma 3.4 and Definition 5.9]) *Let X be a compact Kähler manifold. For $1 \leq j \leq m$, let T_j be a positive closed current of bidegree (p_j, p_j) on X . Consider $\mathbb{T} := T_1 \otimes \dots \otimes T_m$ which is a positive closed (p, p) -current on X^m , where $p := p_1 + \dots + p_m$. Let $\Delta := \{(x, \dots, x) : x \in X\}$ be the diagonal of X^m . Let $\pi : \mathbb{E} \rightarrow \Delta$ be the normal bundle to Δ in X^m . Suppose that*

- (1) *There exists a unique tangent current \mathbb{T}_∞ to \mathbb{T} along Δ ;*
- (2) *The horizontal dimension of \mathbb{T} along Δ is minimal, i.e. $\hbar = k - p$.*

*Then there exists a unique positive closed (p, p) -current S on Δ such that $\mathbb{T}_\infty = \pi^*S$.*

Definition 1.8. Under the hypothesis and the inclusion of Theorem 1.7, we say that T_1, \dots, T_m are wedgeable in the sense of the theory of tangent currents. Identifying Δ to X , Dinh-Sibony [28, Definition 5.9] define $T_1 \wedge \dots \wedge T_m := S$.

1.4. Alessandrini-Bassanelli theory. On the other hand, Alessandrini and Bassanelli introduce in [3] a remarkable notion of Lelong number of positive plurisubharmonic currents. Recall that a positive current T is said to be plurisubharmonic if the current $dd^c T$ is positive. So all positive closed currents are positive plurisubharmonic. In the context of Alessandrini and Bassanelli, (X, V) is a very special pair of manifolds (affine manifolds), however they allow a domain $B \Subset V$ and formulate their Lelong number along B . This means that $\text{supp}(T) \cap B$ may be noncompact in B .

Theorem 1.9. (Alessandrini and Bassanelli [3, Theorem I and Definition 2.2]) *Consider $X = \mathbb{C}^k$ and V is a linear complex subspace of dimension $l \geq 0$. We use the coordinates $(z, w) \in \mathbb{C}^{k-l} \times \mathbb{C}^l$ so that $V = \{z = 0\}$. Let $0 \leq p < k - l$ and let T be a positive plurisubharmonic (p, p) -current on an open neighborhood Ω of 0 in \mathbb{C}^k . Then, for every open ball B in V , $B \Subset \Omega$, the following limit exists and is finite*

$$\nu_{\text{AB}}(T, B) := \lim_{r \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{1}{r^{2(k-l-p)}} \int_{\text{Tube}(B, r)} T(z, w) \wedge (dd^c \|z\|^2)^{k-l-p} \wedge (dd^c \|w\|^2)^l,$$

where the tube $\text{Tube}(B, r)$ of radius r over B is given by

$$(1.8) \quad \text{Tube}(B, r) := \{(z, w) \in \mathbb{C}^{k-l} \times \mathbb{C}^l : \|z\| < r, w \in B\}.$$

$\nu_{\text{AB}}(T, B)$ is called the Alessandrini-Bassanelli's Lelong number of T along B .

The important viewpoint of Alessandrini-Bassanelli is that when V is of positive dimension, tubular neighborhoods $\text{Tube}(B, r)$ of B and a mixed form $(dd^c \|z\|^2)^{k-l-p} \wedge (dd^c \|w\|^2)^l$ should replace the usual balls $\mathbb{B}(x, r)$ around a single point x with the usual form $(dd^c \|z\|^2)^{k-p}$. When V is a single point $\{x\}$ and $B = \{x\}$, Alessandrini-Bassanelli's Lelong number $\nu_{\text{AB}}(T, x)$ coincides with the classical Lelong number $\nu(T, x)$.

Alessandrini-Bassanelli's method relies on some Lelong-Jensen formulas which can be obtained from the usual Lelong-Jensen formula (see [15, 51]) by slicing. They also characterize this Lelong number geometrically in the sense of Siu [50].

Theorem 1.10. (Siu [50, Section 11] for positive closed currents, Alessandrini-Bassanelli [3, Theorem II] for positive plurisubharmonic currents) *Let $F : \Omega \rightarrow \Omega'$ be a biholomorphic map between open subsets of \mathbb{C}^k . If T is a positive plurisubharmonic (p, p) -current on Ω and $x \in \Omega$, then*

$$\nu(T, x) = \nu(F_*T, F(x)).$$

Hence, the limit (1.1) does not depend on the choice of coordinates even for positive plurisubharmonic currents. So, the Lelong number of a positive plurisubharmonic current at a single point is an intrinsic notion.

Although the assumption on the pair of manifolds (X, V) in Theorem 1.9 is quite restrictive and this theorem provides only one Lelong number, Alessandrini-Bassanelli theory may be regarded as the first effort to elaborate the notion of numerical Lelong numbers when the dimension of V is positive.

1.5. Organization of the article and acknowledgments. The paper is organized as follows. The main results of this article is divided into 5 groups.

In Section 2 we first formulate the concept of the generalized Lelong number of a positive plurisubharmonic current associated to a closed smooth (j, j) -form on the base submanifold. This formulation permits us to state the main results shortly afterwards.

Section 3 lay out the background of the problems considered in this work. We first recall some basic facts on currents and positive currents. Next, we recall the notion of strongly admissible maps introduced in [46]. The remainder of the section is devoted to recalling various classes of positive currents introduced in [46].

Section 4 recalls several Lelong-Jensen type formulas which have been obtained in [46]. These formulas play the key role in the present work.

Section 5 begins by introducing standard settings for further technical developments. The rest the section is then devoted to admissible estimates, mass indicators and their finiteness. The new thing here is that the (j, j) -forms $\omega^{(j)}$ are allowed to be simply closed smooth, whereas in our previous work in [46] they are only some powers of a Kähler form.

In Section 6 we adapt and improve the technique developed in [46] in order to study the generalized Lelong numbers for positive closed currents. We also prove Theorem 2.7.

In Section 7 we outline the adaptation and the improvement of the technique from [46] in order to study the generalized Lelong numbers for positive plurisubharmonic currents. This is necessary for the proof of Theorem 2.5. This, together with Theorem 2.7, constitutes the first main result of the article.

Section 8 establishes explicit formulas expressing the generalized Lelong numbers in terms of the tangent currents.

Using these formulas, Section 9 proves the second main result (Theorem 2.12 and Theorem 2.13).

Based on Section 8, Section 10 discovers the link between the generalized Lelong numbers and Dinh-Sibony cohomology classes (Theorem 2.14). This is the third main result of the article. It is quite accidental and unexpected that in the limiting case (that is, when $\lambda \rightarrow \infty$ in Theorem 1.3), knowing Dinh-Sibony cohomology classes are equivalent to knowing the generalized Lelong numbers. Since the latter characteristic numbers are in fact the limits of some generalized Lelong functionals (see, for example, (1.1), (1.3), (1.4),(1.5) in the case of a single point), the advantage of these functionals is that they

help us to quantify the former cohomology classes. This idea will be illustrated in the last two sections. As an outcome of Theorem 2.14, we prove in Theorem 2.16 that in some important situations (including the context of Dinh-Sibony in Theorem 1.3), the generalized Lelong numbers are totally intrinsic. It is a natural generalization of Theorem 1.10 of Siu and Alessandrini-Bassanelli.

Section 11 gives a solution to the above Problem 1. Namely, it provides an effective sufficient condition for defining the intersection of m positive closed currents in the sense of Dinh-Sibony's theory of tangent currents on a compact Kähler manifold, see Theorem 2.18. We use the second main result (Theorem 2.12) and a recent result of Nguyen-Truong [48] on the uniqueness of tangent currents.

Section 12 gives a solution to the above Problem 2. More specifically, it gives us an effective sufficient condition for the continuity of the intersection of m positive closed currents in the above sense, see Theorem 2.21. The proof relies on an explicit formula of m positive closed currents in the sense of Dinh-Sibony's theory of tangent currents (see Theorem 12.8 below), which is inspired by the work of Dinh-Nguyen-Vu [20] on the theory of super-potentials. The section is concluded with a reformulation of Theorem 2.21 in terms of the blow-up along the diagonal (see Theorem 12.24).

Acknowledgments. The author acknowledges support from the Labex CEMPI (ANR-11-LABX-0007-01) and from the project QuaSiDy (ANR-21-CE40-0016). The paper was partially prepared during the visit of the author at the Vietnam Institute for Advanced Study in Mathematics (VIASM). He would like to express his gratitude to this organization for hospitality and for financial support.

2. THE GENERALIZED LELONG NUMBERS AND STATEMENT OF MAIN RESULTS

2.1. The generalized Lelong numbers. Let X be a complex manifold of dimension k , $V \subset X$ a submanifold of dimension l , and $B \subset V$ a relatively compact piecewise \mathcal{C}^2 -smooth open subset. Let V_0 be a relatively compact open subset of V such that $B \Subset V_0$. Let ω be a Hermitian form on V . Let $\tau : U \rightarrow \tau(U)$ be an admissible map along B from an open neighborhood U of \overline{B} in X , see Definition 3.4 below.

Denote by $\pi : \mathbb{E} \rightarrow V$ the canonical projection. Consider a Hermitian metric $h = \|\cdot\|$ on the vector bundle $\mathbb{E}_{\pi^{-1}(V_0)}$ and let $\varphi : \mathbb{E}_{\pi^{-1}(V_0)} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$ be the function defined by

$$(2.1) \quad \varphi(y) := \|y\|^2 \quad \text{for} \quad y \in \pi^{-1}(V_0) \subset \mathbb{E}.$$

Consider also the following closed $(1, 1)$ -forms on $\pi^{-1}(V_0) \subset \mathbb{E}$

$$(2.2) \quad \alpha := dd^c \log \varphi \quad \text{and} \quad \beta := dd^c \varphi.$$

So, for every $x \in V_0 \subset X$ the metric $\|\cdot\|$ on the fiber $\mathbb{E}_x \simeq \mathbb{C}^{k-l}$ is an Euclidean metric (in a suitable basis). In particular, we have

$$(2.3) \quad \varphi(\lambda y) = |\lambda|^2 \varphi(y) \quad \text{for} \quad y \in \pi^{-1}(V_0) \subset \mathbb{E}, \quad \lambda \in \mathbb{C}.$$

For $r > 0$ consider the following *tube with base B and radius r*

$$(2.4) \quad \text{Tube}(B, r) := \{y \in \mathbb{E} : \pi(y) \in B \quad \text{and} \quad \|y\| < r\}.$$

So this is a natural generalization of Euclidean tubes considered by Alessandrini-Bassanelli in (1.8). For for all $0 \leq s < r < \infty$, define also the *corona tube*

$$(2.5) \quad \text{Tube}(B, s, r) := \{y \in \mathbb{E} : \pi(y) \in B \quad \text{and} \quad s < \|y\| < r\}.$$

Since $V_0 \Subset V$, there is a constant $c > 0$ large enough such that $c\pi^*\omega + \beta$ is positive on $\pi^{-1}(V_0)$. Moreover, the latter form defines a Kähler metric there if ω is Kähler on V_0 .

Let \mathbf{r} be small enough such that $\text{Tube}(B, \mathbf{r}) \subset \tau(U)$, see (2.4). Fix $0 \leq p \leq k$. Let T be a real current of degree $2p$ and of order 0 on U . For $0 \leq j \leq \overline{m}$, let $\omega^{(j)}$ be a closed smooth real (j, j) -form on V_0 such that $\omega^{(1)} = \omega$. For $0 \leq j \leq \overline{m}$ and $0 < r \leq \mathbf{r}$, consider

$$(2.6) \quad \nu(T, B, \omega^{(j)}, r, \tau, h) := \frac{1}{r^{2(k-p-j)}} \int_{\text{Tube}(B, r)} (\tau_* T) \wedge \pi^*(\omega^{(j)}) \wedge \beta^{k-p-j}.$$

Let $0 \leq j \leq \overline{m}$. For $0 < s < r \leq \mathbf{r}$, consider

$$(2.7) \quad \kappa(T, B, \omega^{(j)}, s, r, \tau, h) := \int_{\text{Tube}(B, s, r)} (\tau_* T) \wedge \pi^*(\omega^{(j)}) \wedge \alpha^{k-p-j}.$$

For $0 < r \leq \mathbf{r}$, we consider

$$(2.8) \quad \kappa^\bullet(T, B, \omega^{(j)}, r, \tau, h) := \kappa(T, B, \omega^{(j)}, 0, r, \tau, h) = \int_{\text{Tube}(B, r) \setminus V} (\tau_* T) \wedge \pi^*(\omega^{(j)}) \wedge \alpha^{k-p-j};$$

we also consider

$$(2.9) \quad \kappa(T, B, \omega^{(j)}, r, \tau, h) := \int_{\text{Tube}(B, r)} (\tau_* T) \wedge \pi^*(\omega^{(j)}) \wedge \alpha^{k-p-j},$$

provided that the RHS side makes sense according to the following definitions.

Definition 2.1. We say that (2.9) holds in the spirit of (1.3) if $T = T^+ - T^-$ in an open neighborhood of \overline{B} in X and $T^\pm \in \text{SH}^{p; m, m'}(B)$ (resp. $T^\pm \in \text{PH}^{p; m, m'}(B)$, resp. $T^\pm \in \text{CL}^{p; m, m'}(B)$ for some suitable integers $0 \leq m' \leq m$) with the corresponding sequences of approximating forms $(T_n^\pm)_{n=1}^\infty$, and for any such forms (T_n^\pm) , the two limits on the following RHS exist and are finite

$$(2.10) \quad \kappa(T, B, \omega^{(j)}, r, \tau) := \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \kappa(T_n^+, B, \omega^{(j)}, r, \tau) - \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \kappa(T_n^-, B, \omega^{(j)}, r, \tau),$$

and the value on the RHS is independent of the choice of $(T_n^\pm)_{n=1}^\infty$.

Definition 2.2. We say that (2.9) holds in the spirit of (1.4) if the limit on the following RHS exists and is finite

$$(2.11) \quad \kappa(T, B, \omega^{(j)}, r, \tau) := \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0^+} \int_{\text{Tube}(B, r)} (\tau_* T) \wedge \pi^*(\omega^{(j)}) \wedge \alpha_\epsilon^{k-p-j}.$$

Here, the smooth form α_ϵ is given by (4.6) below.

Remark 2.3. In [46, Section 3] the author introduced the following particular case:

$$(2.12) \quad \omega^{(j)} := \omega^j \quad \text{for} \quad \underline{m} \leq j \leq \overline{m}.$$

In this case, we also denote $\nu(T, B, \omega^j, r, \tau, h)$ by $\nu_j(T, B, \omega, r, \tau, h)$. Moreover, when $j = \overline{m}$ we also denote $\nu(T, B, \omega^{\overline{m}}, r, \tau, h)$ by $\nu_{\text{top}}(T, B, \omega, r, \tau, h)$.

Remark 2.4. When there is no confusion about the choice of a metric h and an admissible map τ , we often write $\nu_j(T, B, \omega)$ (resp. $\nu_j(T, B, \omega, r)$) for short instead of $\nu_j(T, B, \omega, \tau, h)$ (resp. $\nu_j(T, B, \omega, r, \tau, h)$).

2.2. First main result: existence of the generalized Lelong numbers. The first theorem of the first main result of the article is the following one which deals with positive plurisubharmonic/positive pluriharmonic currents.

Theorem 2.5. *Let X, V be as above and suppose that (V, ω) is Kähler, and that B is a piecewise \mathcal{C}^2 -smooth open subset of V and that there exists a strongly admissible map for B . For $0 \leq j \leq \overline{m}$, let $\omega^{(j)}$ be a closed smooth real (j, j) -form on V_0 . Let T be a positive plurisubharmonic (p, p) -current on a neighborhood of \overline{B} in X such that $T = T^+ - T^-$ for some $T^\pm \in \text{SH}^{p;3,3}(B)$. Then the following assertions hold:*

- (1) *For every $\underline{m} \leq j \leq \overline{m}$, the following limit exists and is finite*

$$\nu(T, B, \omega^{(j)}, h) := \lim_{r \rightarrow 0^+} \nu(T, B, \omega^{(j)}, r, \tau, h)$$

for all strongly admissible maps τ for B and for all Hermitian metrics h on \mathbb{E} .

- (2) *The following equalities hold*

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{r \rightarrow 0^+} \kappa^\bullet(T, B, \omega^{(j)}, r, \tau, h) &= 0, \\ \lim_{r \rightarrow 0^+} \kappa(T, B, \omega^{(j)}, r, \tau, h) &= \nu(T, B, \omega^{(j)}, h), \end{aligned}$$

for all $\underline{m} \leq j \leq \overline{m}$ with $j > l - p$, and for all strongly admissible maps τ for B and for all Hermitian metrics h on \mathbb{E} .

- (3) *The real numbers $\nu(T, B, \omega^{(j)}, h)$ are intrinsic, that is, they are independent of the choice of τ .*
(4) *If τ is a holomorphic admissible map and if T^\pm belong only to the class $\text{SH}^{p;2,2}(\overline{B})$, then the above three assertions (1)–(3) still hold for $j = \overline{m}$.*
(5) *If instead of the above assumption on T , we assume that T is a positive pluriharmonic (p, p) -current on a neighborhood of \overline{B} in X such that $T = T^+ - T^-$ for some $T^\pm \in \text{PH}^{p;2,2}(B)$, then all the above assertions still hold.*

Remark 2.6. At the first glance the condition $T = T^+ - T^-$ looks artificial. However, it is unavoidable in practice, see Theorem 3.7 and 3.9 below.

The above results generalizes [46, Tangent Theorem I (Theorem 1.8)] except the assertions about the tangent currents.

The second theorem of our first main result deals with positive closed currents.

Theorem 2.7. *Let X, V be as above. Assume that there is a Hermitian metric ω on V for which $dd^c \omega^j = 0$ for $\underline{m} \leq j \leq \overline{m} - 1$. For $\underline{m} \leq j \leq \overline{m}$, let $\omega^{(j)}$ be a closed smooth real (j, j) -form on V_0 . Assume also that B is a piecewise \mathcal{C}^2 -smooth open subset of V and that there exists a strongly admissible map for B . Let T be a positive closed (p, p) -current on a neighborhood of \overline{B} in X such that $T = T^+ - T^-$ for some $T^\pm \in \text{CL}^{p;2,2}(B)$. Then the following assertions hold:*

- (1) *For $\underline{m} \leq j \leq \overline{m}$ and for $0 < r_1 < r_2 \leq \mathbf{r}$,*

$$\nu(T, B, \omega^{(j)}, r_2, \tau, h) - \nu(T, B, \omega^{(j)}, r_1, \tau, h) = \kappa(T, B, \omega^{(j)}, r_1, r_2, \tau, h) + O(r_2).$$

- (2) *For every $\underline{m} \leq j \leq \overline{m}$, the following limit exists and is finite*

$$\nu(T, B, \omega^{(j)}, h) := \lim_{r \rightarrow 0^+} \nu(T, B, \omega^{(j)}, r, \tau, h)$$

for all strongly admissible maps τ for B and for all Hermitian metrics h on \mathbb{E} .

(3) The following equalities hold

$$\begin{aligned}\lim_{r \rightarrow 0^+} \kappa^\bullet(T, B, \omega^{(j)}, r, \tau, h) &= 0, \\ \lim_{r \rightarrow 0^+} \kappa(T, B, \omega^{(j)}, r, \tau, h) &= \nu(T, B, \omega^{(j)}, h),\end{aligned}$$

for all $\underline{m} \leq j \leq \overline{m}$ with $j > l - p$, and for all strongly admissible maps τ for B and for all Hermitian metrics h on \mathbb{E} .

- (4) The real numbers $\nu(T, B, \omega^{(j)}, h)$ are intrinsic, that is, they are independent of the choice of τ .
- (5) If τ is a holomorphic admissible map and if T^\pm belong only to the class $\text{CL}^{p;1,1}(\overline{B})$, then the above four assertions (1)–(4) still hold.
- (6) If instead of the above assumption on ω and T , we assume that the form ω is Kähler and T is a positive closed (p, p) -current on a neighborhood of \overline{B} in X such that $T = T^+ - T^-$ for some $T^\pm \in \text{CL}^{p;1,1}(B)$, then all the above assertions still hold.

Remark 2.8. The above result generalizes [46, Tangent Theorem II (Theorem 1.11)].

Remark 2.9. We keep the hypothesis on X, V , and ω as in Theorem 2.7. For $\underline{m} \leq j \leq \overline{m}$, let $\omega^{(j)}$ be a smooth real (j, j) -form (not necessarily closed) on V_0 such that $dd^c(\omega^{(j)} \wedge \omega^q) = 0$ for $0 \leq q \leq \overline{m} - j - 1$. Then assertions (1)–(5) of Theorem 2.7 still hold.

Definition 2.10. Let h be a fixed Hermitian metric on the vector bundle \mathbb{E} . The value $\nu(T, B, \omega^{(j)}, h)$ is called *the (generalized) Lelong number of T along B with respect to the form $\omega^{(j)}$* . The set of real numbers $\{\nu(T, B, \omega^{(j)}, h) : \underline{m} \leq j \leq \overline{m}\}$ are called *the Lelong numbers of T along B with respect to the set of forms $\{\omega^{(j)}\}$* . The number $\nu(T, B, \omega^{(\overline{m})}, h)$ is called *the top Lelong numbers of T along B with respect to the form $\omega^{(\overline{m})}$* , it is also denoted by $\nu_{\text{top}}(T, B, \omega^{(\overline{m})}, h)$.

2.3. Second main results: horizontal dimension and a Siu's upper-semicontinuity type theorem. Let X, V be as above and suppose that (V, ω) is Kähler, and that B is a piecewise \mathcal{C}^2 -smooth open subset of V and that there exists a strongly admissible map for B . Let T be a positive plurisubharmonic (p, p) -current on a neighborhood of \overline{B} in X such that $T = T^+ - T^-$ for some $T^\pm \in \text{SH}^{p;3,3}(B)$. By Tangent Theorem I (Theorem 3.8) in [46], let T_∞ be a tangent current to T along B , that is, $T_\infty = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} T_{\lambda_n}$ for some $(\lambda_n) \nearrow \infty$, where $T_\lambda := (A_\lambda)_* \tau_*(T)$. We know by this theorem that $T_\infty \wedge \pi^* \omega^{\underline{m}}$ is V -conic positive pluriharmonic. If T is a positive pluriharmonic (p, p) -current on a neighborhood of \overline{B} in X such that $T = T^+ - T^-$ for some $T^\pm \in \text{PH}^{p;2,2}(B)$, then we also know by this theorem that T_∞ is V -conic positive pluriharmonic.

Definition 2.11. The horizontal dimension \hbar of T along B is the largest integer $j \in [\underline{m}, \overline{m}]$ such that $T_\infty \wedge \pi^* \omega^j \neq 0$ if it exists, otherwise we set $\hbar := \underline{m}$.

Theorem 2.12. We keep the above hypothesis and notation. Then:

- (1) $T_\infty \wedge \pi^* \omega^{(j)}$ is V -conic pluriharmonic for every closed smooth real (j, j) -form $\omega^{(j)}$ on V with $\underline{m} \leq j \leq \overline{m}$.
- (2) $\nu(T, B, \omega^{(q)}, h) = 0$ for $\hbar < q \leq \overline{m}$ and for every closed smooth real (q, q) -form $\omega^{(q)}$ on V .
- (3) The horizontal dimension of T along B is also the smallest integer $\hbar \in [\underline{m}, \overline{m}]$ such that $\nu_q(T, B, \omega, h) = 0$ for $\hbar < q \leq \overline{m}$.

- (4) If $\omega^{(h)}$ is strongly positive, then $\nu(T, B, \omega^{(h)}, h)$ is nonnegative. If $\omega^{(h)}$ is strictly positive, then if $T_\infty \neq 0$ then $\nu(T, B, \omega^{(h)}, h) > 0$, else (that is, $T_\infty = 0$) $\nu(T, B, \omega^{(h)}, h) = 0$.

Theorem 2.13. *We keep the above hypothesis and notation. Suppose that X is Kähler. Let U be an open neighborhood of \overline{B} in X , and W be an open neighborhood of ∂B in U . Let $T_n, T \in \text{CL}^p(X)$ such that $T_n \rightarrow T$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$ and $\text{supp}T_n \subset U$ and $\text{supp}T_n \cap W = \emptyset$. Let h be the horizontal dimension of T along B . Then*

- (1) *If $j > h$, then $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \nu(T_n, B, \omega^{(j)}, h) = 0$ for every closed smooth real (j, j) -form $\omega^{(j)}$ on V .*
(2) *For every strongly positive closed smooth (h, h) -form $\omega^{(h)}$ on V (see Definition 3.1), we have*

$$\begin{aligned} \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \nu(T_n, B, \omega^{(h)}, h) &\geq 0, \\ \nu(T, B, \omega^{(h)}, h) &\geq \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \nu(T_n, B, \omega^{(h)}, h). \end{aligned}$$

2.4. Third main result: Dinh-Sibony classes versus the generalized Lelong numbers.

For a smooth closed (p, q) -form γ on complex manifold X , let $\{\gamma\}$ be its class in $H^{p,q}(X)$. If γ is moreover, compactly supported, let $\{\gamma\}$ be its class in $H_{\text{comp}}^{p,q}(X)$. The cup-product \smile on $H_{\text{comp}}^{p,q}(X) \times H^{k-p, k-q}(X)$ is defined by

$$(\{\gamma\}, \{\gamma'\}) \mapsto \{\gamma\} \smile \{\gamma'\} := \int_X \gamma \wedge \gamma',$$

where γ and γ' are smooth closed forms. The last integral depends only on the classes of γ and γ' . The bilinear form \smile is non-degenerate and induces a canonical isomorphism between $H_{\text{comp}}^{p,q}(X)$ and its dual $H^{k-p, k-q}(X)^*$ (Poincaré duality). In the definition of \smile one can take γ' smooth and γ a current in the sense of de Rham. Assume that X is compact Kähler and γ is a dd^c -closed (p, q) -current. Then by the dd^c -lemma, the integral $\int_X \gamma \wedge \gamma'$ is also independent of the choice of γ' smooth and closed in a fixed cohomology class. So, using the above isomorphism, one can associate to such γ a class $\{\gamma\}$ in $H^{p,q}(X)$.

Theorem 2.14. *Let X be a Kähler manifold, and $V \subset X$ a submanifold of dimension $1 \leq l < k$, and $0 \leq p \leq k$. Let $-h_{\mathbb{E}}$ denote the tautological class of the bundle $\pi_0 : \mathbb{E} \rightarrow V$. For $\underline{m} \leq j \leq \overline{m}$, let $\omega^{(j)}$ be a closed smooth real (j, j) -form on V . Then:*

- (1) *For any current $T \in \text{CL}^p(X)$ such that $\text{supp}(T) \cap \text{supp}(\omega^{(h)}) \cap V \Subset V$, we have, by using the notations in Theorem 1.3:*

$$(2.13) \quad \nu(T, V, \omega^{(j)}, h) = \sum_{i=j}^{\overline{m}} \pi_0^* \mathbf{c}_i^{\text{DS}}(T, V) \smile \pi_0^* \{\omega^{(j)}\} \smile h_{\mathbb{E}}^{k-l+i-j}, \quad \forall \underline{m} \leq j \leq \overline{m}.$$

- (2) *Suppose that $T \in \text{PH}^p(X)$ and X is compact. We know by the discussion at the beginning of Subsection 2.3 that any tangent current T_∞ to T along V is V -conic positive pluriharmonic in \mathbb{E} , and therefore, by the discussion preceding this theorem applied to the compact Kähler manifold \mathbb{E} , T_∞ defines a class $\{T_\infty\}$ in $H^{p,p}(\mathbb{E})$. We denote $\{T_\infty\}$ by $\mathbf{c}^{\text{DS}}(T, V)$ (or simply by $\mathbf{c}^{\text{DS}}(T)$ if there is no confusion on V), and call it the total tangent class of T along V , or equivalently, Dinh-Sibony (total) cohomology class of T along V . In fact, $\mathbf{c}^{\text{DS}}(T, V) \in H^{p,p}(\mathbb{E}, \mathbb{R})$. Therefore, by*

Leray-Hirsch theorem, we have the following unique decomposition of Dinh-Sibony class $\mathbf{c}^{\text{DS}}(T, V)$ as in Theorem 1.3:

$$\mathbf{c}^{\text{DS}}(T, V) = \sum_{j=\underline{m}}^{\overline{m}} \pi_0^*(\mathbf{c}_j^{\text{DS}}(T, V)) \smile h_{\mathbb{E}}^{j-l+p},$$

where $\mathbf{c}_j^{\text{DS}}(T, V)$ is a class in $H^{l-j, l-j}(V, \mathbb{C})$. Moreover, the following identity holds:

$$(2.14) \quad \nu(T, V, \omega^{(j)}, h) = \sum_{i=j}^{\overline{m}} \pi_0^* \mathbf{c}_i^{\text{DS}}(T, V) \smile \pi_0^* \{\omega^{(j)}\} \smile h_{\mathbb{E}}^{k-l+i-j}, \quad \forall \underline{m} \leq j \leq \overline{m}.$$

In particular, $\mathbf{c}^{\text{DS}}(T, V)$ is intrinsic, i.e., it does not depend on the choice of a tangent current T_∞ .

Remark 2.15. In the context of Dinh-Sibony (that is, under assertion (1)), knowing Dinh-Sibony cohomology classes of T is **equivalent** to knowing the generalized Lelong numbers of T . Indeed, we use, for $\underline{m} \leq j \leq \overline{m}$, several forms $\omega_s^{(j)}$ such that the classes $\{\omega_s^{(j)}\}$'s span $H^{j,j}(V)$ (see the proof of Theorem 2.14).

Theorem 2.16. Under the assumption of Theorem 2.14, then $\nu(T, B, \omega^{(h)}, h)$ is totally intrinsic, i.e. it is independent of the choice of both τ and h . So we will denote $\nu(T, B, \omega^{(h)}, h)$ simply by $\nu(T, B, \omega^{(h)})$.

Remark 2.17. In [46, Theorem 1.8 (4) (Tangent Theorem I) and Theorem 1.11 (4) (Tangent Theorem II)] we only proved that the top Lelong number $\nu_{\text{top}}(T, B) := \nu_{\overline{m}}(T, B, \tau, h)$ is totally intrinsic. But in the latter theorems, there are less assumptions on T and on X than those of Theorem 2.16.

2.5. Fourth main results: intersection theory and effective criteria. Let (X, ω) be a compact Kähler manifold of dimension k . Consider m integers $p_1, \dots, p_m \geq 1$ such that $p := p_1 + \dots + p_m \leq k$. Let $\Delta := \{(x, \dots, x) : x \in X\}$ be the diagonal of X^m , and ω_Δ be a Kähler form on Δ , and τ be a strongly admissible map along Δ in X^m . Let $\pi : \mathbb{E} \rightarrow \Delta$ be the normal bundle to Δ in X^m . Let h be a Hermitian metric on \mathbb{E} . Let $\text{dist}(\mathbf{x}, \Delta)$ be the distance from a point $\mathbf{x} \in X^m$ to Δ . We may assume that $\text{dist}(\cdot, \Delta) \leq 1/2$. So $-\log \text{dist}(\cdot, \Delta) \cdot \mathbb{T}$ is a positive (p, p) -current on X^m .

Theorem 2.18. Let $T_j \in \text{CL}^{p_j}(X)$ for $1 \leq j \leq m$ with $m \geq 2$, and consider $\mathbb{T} := T_1 \otimes \dots \otimes T_m \in \text{CL}^p(X^m)$. Suppose that

- (1) $\kappa_j^\bullet(-\log \text{dist}(\cdot, \Delta) \cdot \mathbb{T}, \Delta, \omega_\Delta, \mathbf{r}, \tau, h) < \infty$ for some $\mathbf{r} > 0$ and for all $k - p < j \leq k - \max_{1 \leq i \leq m} p_i$;
- (2) $\nu_j(\mathbb{T}, \Delta, \omega_\Delta, \tau, h) = 0$ for all $k - p < j \leq k - \max_{1 \leq i \leq m} p_i$.

Then $T_1 \wedge \dots \wedge T_m$ exists in the sense of the theory of tangent currents (see Definition 1.8).

Remark 2.19. Assumption (1) can be checked using an arbitrary finite cover of Δ by local holomorphic charts $(B_i)_{i \in I}$ in Δ , and over each chart B_i we may use an arbitrary Hermitian metric h_i for $\mathbb{E}|_{B_i}$ (see Remark 11.6 and Lemma 11.3). More concretely, assumption (1) is equivalent to the following: $\kappa_j^\bullet(-\log \text{dist}(\cdot, \Delta) \cdot \mathbb{T}, B_i, \omega_\Delta, \mathbf{r}, \tau_i, h_i) < \infty$ for some $\mathbf{r} > 0$ and for all $k - p < j \leq k - \max_{1 \leq s \leq m} p_s$ and $i \in I$.

By [20], if $m = 2$ and if the super-potential of T_1 is continuous, then $T_1 \wedge T_2$ exists in the sense of the theory of tangent currents (see Definition 1.8) for all $T_2 \in \text{CL}(X)$. Theorem 2.18 provides a more general result than the last one.

Remark 2.20. At the end of the article, we will discuss another version of Theorem 2.18 using the blow-up along the diagonal Δ in X^m , see Theorem 12.20 below.

2.6. Fifth main results: continuity of Dinh-Sibony intersection.

Theorem 2.21. Let $m \geq 2$ be an integer, and let $(T_{j,n})_{n=0}^\infty$ be a sequence of currents in $CL^{p_j}(X)$ for $1 \leq j \leq m$. Consider, for $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $\mathbb{T}_n := T_{1,n} \otimes \dots \otimes T_{m,n} \in CL^p(X^m)$. For $0 < r \leq r$ and j with $k - p < j \leq k - \max_{1 \leq i \leq m} p_i$, set

$$(2.15) \quad \vartheta_j(r) := \sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \kappa_j(-\log \text{dist}(\cdot, \Delta) \cdot \mathbb{T}_n, \Delta, \omega_\Delta, r, \tau, h).$$

Suppose that

- (1) $T_{j,n} \rightarrow T_j$ weakly as n tends to infinity for $1 \leq j \leq m$;
- (2) $\lim_{r \rightarrow 0} \vartheta_j(r) = 0$ for $k - p < j \leq k - \max_{1 \leq i \leq m} p_i$.

Then $T_{1,n} \wedge \dots \wedge T_{m,n}$ and $T_1 \wedge \dots \wedge T_m$ exist in the sense of Dinh-Sibony's theory of tangent currents (see Definition 1.8). Moreover, $T_{1,n} \wedge \dots \wedge T_{m,n}$ converge weakly to $T_1 \wedge \dots \wedge T_m$ as n tends to infinity.

Remark 2.22. Assumption (2) can be checked using an arbitrary finite cover of Δ by local holomorphic charts $(B_i)_{i \in I}$ in Δ , and over each chart B_i we may use an arbitrary Hermitian metric h_i for $\mathbb{E}|_{B_i}$. See Proposition 11.9 and Lemma 11.3 below, see also Remark 2.19 above. More concretely, assumption (2) is equivalent to the following:

$$\lim_{r \rightarrow 0} \vartheta_j^{(i)}(r) = 0 \quad \text{for } k - p < j \leq k - \max_{1 \leq s \leq m} p_s \quad \text{and } i \in I.$$

Here,

$$\vartheta_j^{(i)}(r) := \sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \kappa_j^\bullet(-\log \text{dist}(\cdot, \Delta) \cdot \mathbb{T}, B_i, \omega_\Delta, r, \tau_i, h_i).$$

Remark 2.23. At the end of the article, we will discuss another version of Theorem 2.21 using the blow-up along the diagonal Δ in X^m , see Theorem 12.24 below.

3. BACKGROUND

3.1. Currents and positive currents. Let X be a complex manifold of dimension k endowed with a Hermitian metric β .

Definition 3.1. A real (p, p) -current T on X is said to be strongly positive if for every smooth test $(n - p, n - p)$ -form ϕ compactly supported in X which is also a positive current in the sense of Definition 1.1, we have $\langle T, \phi \rangle \geq 0$.

Let T be a positive (p, p) -current on X . Then $T \wedge \beta^{k-p}$ is a positive measure on X . The mass of $T \wedge \beta^{k-p}$ on a measurable set A is denoted by $\|T\|_A$ and is called *the mass of T on A* . The mass $\|T\|$ of T is the total mass of $T \wedge \beta^{k-p}$ on X . A (p, p) -current T on X is *strictly positive* if we have locally $T \geq \epsilon \beta^p$, i.e., $T - \epsilon \beta^p$ is positive, for some constant $\epsilon > 0$. The definition does not depend on the choice of β .

Let R be a current with measure coefficients (or equivalently, of order 0) on an open set Ω in X . Let W be a relatively compact open subset of Ω and Φ a smooth test form on Ω , we will write

$$(3.1) \quad \int_W R \wedge \Phi := \langle R, \mathbf{1}_W \Phi \rangle,$$

where $\mathbf{1}_W$ is the characteristic function of W . Let $(R_n)_{n=1}^\infty$ be a sequence of positive currents on Ω such that $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} R_n = R$ weakly on Ω , then we see that

$$(3.2) \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_W R_n \wedge \Phi = \int_W R \wedge \Phi$$

for every smooth test form Φ on Ω and every relatively compact open subset $W \subset \Omega$ with $\|R\|(\partial W) = 0$. Here, ∂W is the topological boundary of W and $\|R\|$ is the mass-measure of R . Consequently, if K is a compact subset of Ω and $(W_i)_{i \in I}$ is a family of open subsets of Ω such that $K \subset W_i$ for all $i \in I$ and $\partial W_i \cap \partial W_j = \emptyset$ for $i \neq j$, then we have

$$(3.3) \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{W_i} R_n \wedge \Phi = \int_{W_i} R \wedge \Phi$$

for every smooth test form Φ on Ω and every $i \in I$ except for a countable subset of I .

In this article we are concerned with the following notion of weak convergence of quasi-positive currents.

Definition 3.2. We say that a current R defined on Ω is *quasi-positive* if, for every $x \in \Omega$, there are an open neighborhood Ω_x of x in Ω and a \mathcal{C}^1 -diffeomorphism τ_x of Ω_x such that $\tau_x^* R$ is a positive current.

We say that a sequence of currents $(R_n)_{n=1}^\infty$ *converge in the sense of quasi-positive currents on Ω to a current R* if for every $x \in \Omega$, there are an open neighborhood Ω_x of x in Ω and a \mathcal{C}^1 -diffeomorphism τ_x of Ω_x and two sequences of positive currents $(T_n^\pm)_{n=1}^\infty$ on Ω_x such that all currents $\tau_x^*(R_n - R) = T_n^+ - T_n^-$ and that both sequences T_n^\pm converge weakly to a common positive current T on Ω_x .

The relevance of this notion is justified by the following simple result.

Lemma 3.3. (see [46, Lemma 2.4]) *If a sequence of currents $(R_n)_{n=1}^\infty$ converge in the sense of quasi-positive currents on Ω to a current R , then both (3.2) and (3.3) hold.*

3.2. Normal bundle and admissible maps. The following notion, introduced by Dinh-Sibony [28], plays a vital role in their tangent theory for positive closed currents.

Definition 3.4. (See [28, Definitions 2.15 and 2.18]) Let B be a relatively compact nonempty open subset of V . An admissible map along B is a \mathcal{C}^1 -smooth diffeomorphism τ from an open neighborhood U of \overline{B} in X onto an open neighborhood of $B \subset V$ in \mathbb{E} (where V is identified with the zero section $0_{\mathbb{E}}$) which is identity on an open neighborhood of $\overline{B} \subset V$ such that the endomorphism on \mathbb{E} induced by the restriction of the differential $d\tau$ to \overline{B} is identity. More specifically, a \mathcal{C}^1 -smooth diffeomorphism $\tau : U \rightarrow \tau(U)$ is admissible if for every $x \in V \cap U$, the following two conditions hold:

- (i) $\tau(x) = x$;
- (ii) Let $d\tau_x : \text{Tan}_x(X) \rightarrow \text{Tan}_x(\mathbb{E})$ be the differential $d\tau$ at x . By writing $\text{Tan}_x(X) = \text{Tan}_x(V) \oplus \mathbb{E}_x$ and $\text{Tan}_x(\mathbb{E}) = \text{Tan}_x(V) \oplus \mathbb{E}_x$, $d\tau_x$ induces in a natural way a \mathbb{R} -endomorphism on \mathbb{E}_x . This second condition requires that this endomorphism is identity $\text{id}_{\mathbb{E}_x}$.

In local coordinates, we can describe an admissible map τ as follows: for every point $x \in V \cap U$, for every local chart $y = (z, w)$ on a neighborhood W of x in U with $V \cap W = \{z = 0\}$, we have

$$(3.4) \quad \tau(y) = (z + O(\|z\|^2), w + O(\|z\|)),$$

and

$$(3.5) \quad d\tau(y) = (dz + \tilde{O}(\|z\|^2), dw + \tilde{O}(\|z\|)),$$

as $z \rightarrow 0$ where for every positive integer m , $\tilde{O}(\|z\|^m)$ denotes the sum of 1-forms with $O(\|z\|^m)$ -coefficients and a linear combination of dz , $d\bar{z}$ with $O(\|z\|^{m-1})$ -coefficients.

It is worth noting that in [28] Dinh-Sibony use the terminology *almost-admissible* for those maps satisfying Definition 3.4. In general, τ is not holomorphic. When U is a small enough local chart, we can choose a holomorphic admissible map by using suitable holomorphic coordinates on U . For the global situation, the following result gives a positive answer.

Theorem 3.5. ([28, Lemma 4.2]) *For every compact subset $V_0 \subset V$, there always exists an admissible map τ defined on a small enough tubular neighborhood U of V_0 in X .*

In order to develop a quantitative theory of tangent and density currents for positive plurisubharmonic currents, the following notion, inspired by Dinh-Sibony [29, Proposition 3.8], was introduced in [46, Definition 2.7].

Definition 3.6. Let B be a relatively compact nonempty open subset of V . A *strongly admissible* map along B is a \mathcal{C}^2 -smooth diffeomorphism τ from an open neighborhood U of \bar{B} in X onto an open neighborhood of $V \cap U$ in \mathbb{E} such that for every point $x \in V \cap U$, for every local chart $y = (z, w)$ on a neighborhood W of x in U with $V \cap W = \{z = 0\}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \tau_j(z, w) &= z_j + \sum_{p,q=1}^{k-l} a_{pq}(w) z_p z_q + O(\|z\|^3) \quad \text{for } 1 \leq j \leq k-l, \\ \tau_j(z, w) &= w_{j-(k-l)} + \sum_{p=1}^{k-l} b_p(w) z_p + O(\|z\|^2) \quad \text{for } k-l < j \leq k. \end{aligned}$$

Here, we write $\tau(y) = (\tau_1(y), \dots, \tau_{k-l}(y), \tau_{k-l+1}(y), \dots, \tau_k(y)) \in \mathbb{C}^k$, and a_{pq} , b_p , are \mathcal{C}^2 -smooth functions depending only on w . In other words, if we write $\tau(z, w) = (z', w') \in \mathbb{C}^{k-l} \times \mathbb{C}^l$, then

$$\begin{aligned} z' &= z + zAz^T + O(\|z\|^3), \\ w' &= w + Bz + O(\|z\|^2), \end{aligned}$$

where A is a $(k-l) \times (k-l)$ -matrix and B is a $l \times (k-l)$ -matrix whose entries are \mathcal{C}^2 -smooth functions in w , z^T is the transpose of z ,

Observe that a strongly admissible map is necessarily admissible in the sense of Definition 3.4. On the other hand, holomorphic admissible maps are always strongly admissible. Roughly speaking, strongly admissible maps are those admissible maps which are in some sense *nearly* holomorphic.

Theorem 3.7. (see [46, Theorem 1.19 (i)]) *Let X be a Kähler manifold of dimension k . Let $V \subset X$ be a submanifold of dimension l and $B \subset V$ a relatively compact piecewisely \mathcal{C}^2 -smooth open subset. Then there exists a strongly admissible map for B .*

3.3. Classes CL^p , PH^p , $SH^p(X)$ and $CL^{p;m,m'}$, $PH^{p;m,m'}$, $SH^{p;m,m'}$ ($0 \leq m' \leq m$) of positive currents. Let X be a complex manifold of dimension k and p be an integer with $0 \leq p \leq k$. Denote by $CL^p(X)$ (resp. $PH^p(X)$) (resp. $SH^p(X)$) the class of positive closed (p, p) -currents (resp. the class of positive pluriharmonic (p, p) -currents) (resp. the class of positive plurisubharmonic (p, p) -currents) on X .

Let $V \subset X$ be a Kähler submanifold of dimension l , and ω a Kähler form on V , and $B \subset V$ a relatively compact piecewise \mathcal{C}^2 -smooth open subset.

Definition 3.8. ([46, Subsection 1.5]) Let $m, m' \in \mathbb{N}$ with $0 \leq m' \leq m$. Let T be a positive current of bidegree (p, p) on X . We say that T is *approximable along B with \mathcal{C}^m -smooth positive closed forms* (resp. *positive pluriharmonic forms*, resp. *positive plurisubharmonic forms*) with $\mathcal{C}^{m'}$ -control on boundary, if, there are an open neighborhood U of \bar{B} in X , and an open neighborhood W of ∂B in X , and a sequence of positive closed \mathcal{C}^m -smooth forms (resp. positive pluriharmonic \mathcal{C}^m -smooth forms, resp. positive plurisubharmonic \mathcal{C}^m -smooth forms) T_n defined on U , such that

- (1) the masses $\|T_n\|$ on U are uniformly bounded;
- (2) T_n converge weakly to T on U as n tends to infinity;
- (3) The $\mathcal{C}^{m'}$ -norms of T_n 's on W are uniformly bounded, that is,

$$\sup_{n \geq 1} \|T_n\|_{\mathcal{C}^{m'}(W)} < \infty.$$

Let $CL^{p;m,m'}(B)$ denote the class of all positive closed currents on X which are approximable along B by \mathcal{C}^m -smooth positive closed forms.

We denote by $CL^{p;m,m'}(B)$ the class of all positive (p, p) -currents which are approximable along B by \mathcal{C}^m -smooth positive closed forms with $\mathcal{C}^{m'}$ -control on boundary.

Analogously, we denote by $PH^{p;m,m'}(B)$ the class of all positive (p, p) -currents which are approximable along B by \mathcal{C}^m -smooth positive pluriharmonic forms with $\mathcal{C}^{m'}$ -control on boundary.

We denote by $SH^{p;m,m'}(B)$ the class of all positive (p, p) -currents which are approximable along B by \mathcal{C}^m -smooth positive plurisubharmonic forms with $\mathcal{C}^{m'}$ -control on boundary.

The relevance of these classes of positive currents is illustrated by the following result which is inspired by the work in [23].

Theorem 3.9. (see [46, Theorem 1.19 (ii)]) *Let X be a Kähler manifold of dimension k . Let $V \subset X$ be a submanifold of dimension l and $B \subset V$ a relatively compact piecewisely \mathcal{C}^2 -smooth open subset. Let $m, m' \in \mathbb{N}$ with $m \geq m'$. Let T be a positive plurisubharmonic (resp. positive pluriharmonic, resp. positive closed) (p, p) -current on X which satisfies the following conditions (i)–(ii):*

- (i) T is of class $\mathcal{C}^{m'}$ near ∂B ;
- (ii) There is a relatively compact open subset Ω of X with $B \Subset \Omega$ and dT is of class \mathcal{C}^0 near $\partial\Omega$.

Then T can be written in an open neighborhood of \bar{B} in X as $T = T^+ - T^-$ for some $T^\pm \in SH^{p;m,m'}(B)$ (resp. $T^\pm \in PH^{p;m,m'}(B)$, $T^\pm \in CL^{p;m,m'}(B)$).

Corollary 3.10. *Let X be a compact Kähler manifold of dimension k . Let $V \subset X$ be a submanifold of dimension l and $B \subset V$ a relatively compact piecewisely \mathcal{C}^2 -smooth open*

subset. Let $m, m' \in \mathbb{N}$ with $m \geq m'$. Let T be a positive pluriharmonic (resp. positive closed) (p, p) -current on X such that T is of class $\mathcal{C}^{m'}$ near ∂B in X . Then T can be written in an open neighborhood of \overline{B} in X as $T = T^+ - T^-$ for some $T^\pm \in \text{PH}^{p; m, m'}(B)$ (resp. $T^\pm \in \text{CL}^{p; m, m'}(B)$).

4. LELONG-JENSEN FORMULAS FOR HOLOMORPHIC VECTOR BUNDLES

We keep the notation introduced in Subsection 2.1. Let $B \subset V$ be a domain and $0 < r < \infty$. Consider the tube $\text{Tube}(B, r)$ defined by (2.4). The boundary $\partial \text{Tube}(B, r)$ can be decomposed as the disjoint union of the *vertical boundary* $\partial_{\text{ver}} \text{Tube}(B, r)$ and the *horizontal boundary* $\partial_{\text{hor}} \text{Tube}(B, r)$, where

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_{\text{ver}} \text{Tube}(B, r) &:= \{y \in \mathbb{E} : \pi(y) \in \partial B \text{ and } \varphi(y) \leq r^2\}, \\ \partial_{\text{hor}} \text{Tube}(B, r) &:= \{y \in \mathbb{E} : \pi(y) \in B \text{ and } \varphi(y) = r^2\}. \end{aligned}$$

We see easily that $\text{Tube}(B, r)$ is a manifold with piecewise \mathcal{C}^2 -smooth boundary for every $r \in (0, r]$ except a countable set of values. Here the constant $r > 0$ was defined in Subsection 2.1. When $\partial B = \emptyset$, we have $\partial_{\text{ver}} \text{Tube}(B, r) = \emptyset$.




FIGURE 1. Illustrations of a Tube $\text{Tube}(B, r)$ with base B and radius r , its horizontal boundary $\partial_{\text{hor}} \text{Tube}(B, r)$ and its vertical boundary $\partial_{\text{ver}} \text{Tube}(B, r)$. The boundary ∂B of B is represented by $[$ and $]$ on the base \overline{B} .

Notation 4.1. Let S be a current of bidegree $2p$ defined on $\text{Tube}(B, r) \subset \mathbb{E}$. We denote by S^\sharp or equivalently $(S)^\sharp$ its component of bidegree (p, p) .

In this section we recall from [46, Section 4] some Lelong-Jensen formulas for vector bundles. These formulas play a key role throughout this work.

Theorem 4.2. (see [46, Theorem 4.2]) Let $r \in (0, r]$ and $B \Subset V$ a relatively compact open set with piecewise \mathcal{C}^2 -smooth boundary. Let S be a real current of dimension $2q$ on a neighborhood of $\overline{\text{Tube}}(B, r)$ such that S and $dd^c S$ are of order 0 and that S is of class \mathcal{C}^1

near $\partial_{\text{ver}}\text{Tube}(B, r)$. Suppose that there is a sequence of \mathcal{C}^2 -smooth forms of dimension $2q$ $(S_n)_{n=1}^\infty$ defined on a neighborhood of $\overline{\text{Tube}}(B, r)$ such that

- (i) S_n converge to S in the sense of quasi-positive currents on a neighborhood of $\overline{\text{Tube}}(B, r)$ as n tends to infinity (see Definition 3.2);
- (ii) $dd^c S_n$ converge to $dd^c S$ in the sense of quasi-positive currents on a neighborhood of $\overline{\text{Tube}}(B, r)$ as n tends to infinity;
- (iii) there is an open neighborhood of $\partial_{\text{ver}}\text{Tube}(B, r)$ on which S_n converge to S in \mathcal{C}^1 -norm.

Then, for all $r_1, r_2 \in (0, r]$ with $r_1 < r_2$ except for a countable set of values, we have that

$$(4.1) \quad \frac{1}{r_2^{2q}} \int_{\text{Tube}(B, r_2)} S \wedge \beta^q - \frac{1}{r_1^{2q}} \int_{\text{Tube}(B, r_1)} S \wedge \beta^q = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{V}(S_n, r_1, r_2) + \int_{\text{Tube}(B, r_1, r_2)} S \wedge \alpha^q \\ + \int_{r_1}^{r_2} \left(\frac{1}{t^{2q}} - \frac{1}{r_2^{2q}} \right) 2tdt \int_{\text{Tube}(B, t)} dd^c S \wedge \beta^{q-1} + \left(\frac{1}{r_1^{2q}} - \frac{1}{r_2^{2q}} \right) \int_0^{r_1} 2tdt \int_{\text{Tube}(B, t)} dd^c S \wedge \beta^{q-1}.$$

Here the vertical boundary term $\mathcal{V}(S, r_1, r_2)$ for a \mathcal{C}^1 -smooth form S is given by the following formula, where S^\sharp denotes, according to Notation 4.1, the component of bidimension (q, q) of the current S :

$$(4.2) \quad \mathcal{V}(S, r_1, r_2) := - \int_{r_1}^{r_2} \left(\frac{1}{t^{2q}} - \frac{1}{r_2^{2q}} \right) 2tdt \int_{\partial_{\text{ver}}\text{Tube}(B, t)} d^c S^\sharp \wedge \beta^{q-1} \\ - \left(\frac{1}{r_1^{2q}} - \frac{1}{r_2^{2q}} \right) \int_0^{r_1} 2tdt \int_{\partial_{\text{ver}}\text{Tube}(B, t)} d^c S^\sharp \wedge \beta^{q-1} + \frac{1}{r_2^{2q}} \int_{\partial_{\text{ver}}\text{Tube}(B, r_2)} d^c \varphi \wedge S^\sharp \wedge \beta^{q-1} \\ - \frac{1}{r_1^{2q}} \int_{\partial_{\text{ver}}\text{Tube}(B, r_1)} d^c \varphi \wedge S^\sharp \wedge \beta^{q-1} - \int_{\partial_{\text{ver}}\text{Tube}(B, r_1, r_2)} d^c \log \varphi \wedge S^\sharp \wedge \alpha^{q-1}.$$

The next theorem deals with the special case where the current is approximable by smooth **closed** forms with control on the boundary. Here, we gain the smoothness.

Theorem 4.3. (see [46, Theorem 4.5]) *Let $r \in (0, r]$ and let S be a real closed current of dimension $2q$ on a neighborhood of $\overline{\text{Tube}}(B, r)$. Suppose that there is a sequence of \mathcal{C}^1 -smooth closed forms of dimension $2q$: $(S_n)_{n=1}^\infty$ defined on a neighborhood of $\overline{\text{Tube}}(B, r)$ such that S_n converge to S in the sense of quasi-positive currents on a neighborhood of $\overline{\text{Tube}}(B, r)$ as n tends to infinity (see Definition 3.2).*

Then the following two assertions hold:

- (1) For all $r_1, r_2 \in (0, r]$ with $r_1 < r_2$ except for a countable set of values, we have that

$$(4.3) \quad \frac{1}{r_2^{2q}} \int_{\text{Tube}(B, r_2)} S \wedge \beta^q - \frac{1}{r_1^{2q}} \int_{\text{Tube}(B, r_1)} S \wedge \beta^q = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{V}(S_n, r_1, r_2) + \int_{\text{Tube}(B, r_1, r_2)} S \wedge \alpha^q.$$

Here the vertical boundary term $\mathcal{V}(S, r_1, r_2)$ for a continuous form S is given by

$$(4.4) \quad \mathcal{V}(S, r_1, r_2) := \frac{1}{r_2^{2q}} \int_{\partial_{\text{ver}}\text{Tube}(B, r_2)} d^c \varphi \wedge S \wedge \beta^{q-1} - \frac{1}{r_1^{2q}} \int_{\partial_{\text{ver}}\text{Tube}(B, r_1)} d^c \varphi \wedge S \wedge \beta^{q-1} \\ - \int_{\partial_{\text{ver}}\text{Tube}(B, r_1, r_2)} d^c \log \varphi \wedge S \wedge \alpha^{q-1}.$$

(2) If S is a closed \mathcal{C}^1 -smooth form, then identity (4.3) (with $S_n := S$ for $n \geq 1$) holds for all $r_1, r_2 \in [0, r]$ with $r_1 < r_2$.

Next, we consider the following variant of φ in the spirit of (2.1): for every $\epsilon > 0$, set

$$(4.5) \quad \varphi_\epsilon(y) := \|y\|^2 + \epsilon^2 \quad \text{for} \quad y \in \mathbb{E}.$$

In this case where we have $r_0 = \epsilon$ and $\mathbf{r} = \infty$. Following the model (2.2), consider also the following closed $(1, 1)$ -form for each $\epsilon > 0$ on \mathbb{U} :

$$(4.6) \quad \alpha_\epsilon := dd^c \log \varphi_\epsilon \quad \text{and note that} \quad \beta = dd^c \varphi_\epsilon.$$

The following result which will play a key role for proving logarithmic interpretation version in the spirit of (1.4).

Theorem 4.4. (see [46, Theorem 4.10]) *Let $\mathbf{r} \in \mathbb{R}_*^+$ and $B \Subset V$ a relatively compact open set with piecewise \mathcal{C}^2 -smooth boundary. Let S be a real current of dimension $2q$ on a neighborhood of $\overline{\text{Tube}}(B, \mathbf{r})$. Suppose that there is a sequence of \mathcal{C}^2 -smooth forms of dimension $2q$ $(S_n)_{n=1}^\infty$ defined on a neighborhood of $\overline{\text{Tube}}(B, \mathbf{r})$ such that*

- (i) S_n converge to S in the sense of quasi-positive currents on a neighborhood of $\overline{\text{Tube}}(B, \mathbf{r})$ as n tends to infinity (see Definition 3.2);
- (ii) $dd^c S_n$ converge to $dd^c S$ in the sense of quasi-positive currents on a neighborhood of $\overline{\text{Tube}}(B, \mathbf{r})$ as n tends to infinity.

Then the following two assertions hold:

- (1) For all $r \in (0, \mathbf{r})$ and $\epsilon \in (0, r)$ except for a countable set of values, we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{(r^2 + \epsilon^2)^q} \int_{\text{Tube}(B, r)} S \wedge \beta^q &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{V}_\epsilon(S_n, r) + \int_{\text{Tube}(B, r)} S \wedge \alpha_\epsilon^q \\ &\quad + \int_0^r \left(\frac{1}{(t^2 + \epsilon^2)^q} - \frac{1}{(r^2 + \epsilon^2)^q} \right) 2t dt \int_{\text{Tube}(B, t)} dd^c S \wedge \beta^{q-1}. \end{aligned}$$

Here the vertical boundary term $\mathcal{V}_\epsilon(S, r)$ for a \mathcal{C}^1 -smooth form S is given by

$$(4.7) \quad \begin{aligned} \mathcal{V}_\epsilon(S, r) &:= - \int_0^r \left(\frac{1}{(t^2 + \epsilon^2)^q} - \frac{1}{(r^2 + \epsilon^2)^q} \right) 2t dt \int_{\partial_{\text{ver}} \text{Tube}(B, t)} d^c S^\# \wedge \beta^{q-1} \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{(r^2 + \epsilon^2)^q} \int_{\partial_{\text{ver}} \text{Tube}(B, r)} d^c \varphi \wedge S^\# \wedge \beta^{q-1} - \int_{\partial_{\text{ver}} \text{Tube}(B, r)} d^c \log \varphi_\epsilon \wedge S^\# \wedge \alpha_\epsilon^{q-1}. \end{aligned}$$

- (2) If S is a \mathcal{C}^2 -smooth form, then the above identity (with $S_n := S$ for $n \geq 1$) holds for all $r \in (0, \mathbf{r})$ and $\epsilon \in (0, r)$.

We record a version of Theorem 4.4 for **closed** currents.

Theorem 4.5. (see [46, Theorem 4.11]) *Let $\mathbf{r} \in \mathbb{R}_*^+$ and let S be a real closed current of dimension $2q$ on a neighborhood of $\overline{\text{Tube}}(B, \mathbf{r})$. Suppose that there is a sequence of \mathcal{C}^1 -smooth closed forms of dimension $2q$: $(S_n)_{n=1}^\infty$ defined on a neighborhood of $\overline{\text{Tube}}(B, \mathbf{r})$ such that S_n converge to S in the sense of quasi-positive currents on a neighborhood of $\overline{\text{Tube}}(B, \mathbf{r})$ as n tends to infinity (see Definition 3.2). Then the following two assertions hold:*

(1) For all $r \in (0, \mathbf{r}]$ and $\epsilon \in (0, r)$ except for a countable set of values, we have that

$$(4.8) \quad \frac{1}{(r^2 + \epsilon^2)^q} \int_{\text{Tube}(B, r)} S \wedge \beta^q = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{V}_\epsilon(S_n, r) + \int_{\text{Tube}(B, r)} S \wedge \alpha_\epsilon^q.$$

Here the vertical boundary term $\mathcal{V}_\epsilon(S, r)$ for a continuous form S is given by

$$(4.9) \quad \mathcal{V}_\epsilon(S, r) := \frac{1}{(r^2 + \epsilon^2)^q} \int_{\partial_{\text{ver}} \text{Tube}(B, r)} d^c \varphi \wedge S \wedge \beta^{q-1} - \int_{\partial_{\text{ver}} \text{Tube}(B, r)} d^c \log \varphi_\epsilon \wedge S \wedge \alpha_\epsilon^{q-1}.$$

(2) If S is a closed \mathcal{C}^1 -smooth form, then the above identity (with $S_n := S$ for $n \geq 1$) holds for all $r \in (0, \mathbf{r})$ and $\epsilon \in (0, r)$.

Here is a version of Theorem 4.3 for smooth closed forms when the minor radius r_1 becomes infinitesimally small.

Theorem 4.6. (see [46, Theorem 4.16]) Let $\mathbf{r} \in \mathbb{R}_*^+$ and let S be a \mathcal{C}^1 -smooth closed form of dimension $2q$ on a neighborhood of $\overline{\text{Tube}}(B, \mathbf{r})$. Suppose that $q \leq k - l$.

(1) Then, for all $0 < r \leq \mathbf{r}$,

$$(4.10) \quad \frac{1}{r^{2q}} \int_{\text{Tube}(B, r)} S \wedge \beta^q - \lim_{s \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{1}{s^{2q}} \int_{\text{Tube}(B, s)} S \wedge \beta^q = \mathcal{V}(S, r) + \int_{\text{Tube}(B, r)} S \wedge \alpha^q.$$

Here the vertical boundary term $\mathcal{V}(S, r)$ is given by

$$(4.11) \quad \begin{aligned} \mathcal{V}(S, r) := & \left(\frac{1}{r^{2q}} \int_{\partial_{\text{ver}} \text{Tube}(B, r)} d^c \varphi \wedge S \wedge \beta^{q-1} - \lim_{s \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{1}{s^{2q}} \int_{\partial_{\text{ver}} \text{Tube}(B, s)} d^c \varphi \wedge S \wedge \beta^{q-1} \right) \\ & - \int_{\partial_{\text{ver}} \text{Tube}(B, r)} d^c \log \varphi \wedge S \wedge \alpha^{q-1}. \end{aligned}$$

- If $q < k - l$ then $\lim_{s \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{1}{s^{2q}} \int_{\text{Tube}(B, s)} S \wedge \beta^q = 0$.
- If $q = k - l$ and $S(y)$ is a positive form for all $y \in \overline{B}$, then the last limit is nonnegative.

(2) Suppose in addition that $\text{supp}(S) \cap \partial_{\text{ver}} \text{Tube}(B, \mathbf{r}) = \emptyset$. Then, for all $0 < r < \mathbf{r}$,

$$\frac{1}{r^{2q}} \int_{\text{Tube}(B, r)} S \wedge \beta^q - \lim_{s \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{1}{s^{2q}} \int_{\text{Tube}(B, s)} S \wedge \beta^q = \int_{\text{Tube}(B, r)} S \wedge \alpha^q.$$

Here is a version of Theorem 4.2 for smooth forms when the minor radius r_1 becomes infinitesimally small.

Theorem 4.7. (see [46, Theorem 4.15]) Let $\mathbf{r} \in \mathbb{R}_*^+$ and let S be a \mathcal{C}^2 -smooth form of dimension $2q$ on a neighborhood of $\overline{\text{Tube}}(B, \mathbf{r})$. Suppose that $q \leq k - l$.

(1) Then, for all $0 < r \leq \mathbf{r}$,

$$(4.12) \quad \begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{r^{2q}} \int_{\text{Tube}(B, r)} S \wedge \beta^q - \lim_{s \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{1}{s^{2q}} \int_{\text{Tube}(B, s)} S \wedge \beta^q = \int_{\text{Tube}(B, r)} S \wedge \alpha^q \\ & + \int_0^r \left(\frac{1}{t^{2q}} - \frac{1}{r^{2q}} \right) 2t dt \int_{\text{Tube}(B, t)} dd^c S \wedge \beta^{q-1} + \mathcal{V}(S, r). \end{aligned}$$

Here, the vertical boundary term $\mathcal{V}(S, r)$ is given by

(4.13)

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{V}(S, r) := & - \int_0^r \left(\frac{1}{t^{2q}} - \frac{1}{r^{2q}} \right) 2t dt \int_{\partial_{\text{ver}} \text{Tube}(B, t)} d^c S^\# \wedge \beta^{q-1} - \int_{\partial_{\text{ver}} \text{Tube}(B, r)} d^c \log \varphi \wedge S^\# \wedge \alpha^{q-1} \\ & + \left(\frac{1}{r^{2q}} \int_{\partial_{\text{ver}} \text{Tube}(B, r)} d^c \varphi \wedge S^\# \wedge \beta^{q-1} - \lim_{s \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{1}{s^{2q}} \int_{\partial_{\text{ver}} \text{Tube}(B, s)} d^c \varphi \wedge S^\# \wedge \beta^{q-1} \right). \end{aligned}$$

- If $q < k - l$, then $\lim_{s \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{1}{s^{2q}} \int_{\text{Tube}(B, s)} S \wedge \beta^q = 0$.
- If $q = k - l$ and $S(y)$ is a positive form for all $y \in \overline{B}$, then the last limit is nonnegative.

(2) Suppose in addition that $\text{supp}(S) \cap \partial_{\text{ver}} \text{Tube}(B, \mathbf{r}) = \emptyset$. Then, for all $0 < r < \mathbf{r}$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{r^{2q}} \int_{\text{Tube}(B, r)} S \wedge \beta^q - \lim_{s \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{1}{s^{2q}} \int_{\text{Tube}(B, s)} S \wedge \beta^q \\ = & \int_{\text{Tube}(B, r)} S \wedge \alpha^q + \int_0^r \left(\frac{1}{t^{2q}} - \frac{1}{r^{2q}} \right) 2t dt \int_{\text{Tube}(B, t)} dd^c S \wedge \beta^{q-1}. \end{aligned}$$

Finally, we conclude the section with two asymptotic Lelong-Jensen formulas.

Theorem 4.8. (see [46, Theorem 4.17]) Let $\mathbf{r} \in \mathbb{R}_*^+$ and $0 \leq q \leq k - l$. Let S be a real current of dimension $2q$ on a neighborhood of $\overline{\text{Tube}(B, \mathbf{r})}$ such that S and $dd^c S$ are of order 0. Suppose that there is a sequence of \mathcal{C}^2 -smooth forms of dimension $2q$ $(S_n)_{n=1}^\infty$ defined on a neighborhood of $\overline{\text{Tube}(B, \mathbf{r})}$ such that

- (i) S_n converge to S in the sense of quasi-positive currents on a neighborhood of $\overline{\text{Tube}(B, \mathbf{r})}$ as n tends to infinity (see Definition 3.2);
- (ii) $dd^c S_n$ converge to $dd^c S$ in the sense of quasi-positive currents on a neighborhood of $\overline{\text{Tube}(B, \mathbf{r})}$ as n tends to infinity;
- (iii) there is an open neighborhood of $\partial_{\text{ver}} \text{Tube}(B, \mathbf{r})$ on which the \mathcal{C}^1 -norms of S_n are uniformly bounded.

Then, for all $s, r \in (0, \mathbf{r}]$ with $s < r$ except for a countable set of values, formula (4.1) for $r_1 := s, r_2 := r$ (resp. formula (4.12)) holds with

$$|\mathcal{V}(S, s, r)| \leq cr \quad (\text{resp.} \quad |\mathcal{V}(S, r)| \leq cr),$$

where c is a constant independent of s, r .

Theorem 4.9. (see [46, Theorem 4.18]) Let $\mathbf{r} \in \mathbb{R}_*^+$ and $0 \leq q \leq k - l$. Let S be a real closed current of dimension $2q$ on a neighborhood of $\overline{\text{Tube}(B, \mathbf{r})}$. Suppose that there is a sequence of \mathcal{C}^1 -smooth closed forms of dimension $2q$: $(S_n)_{n=1}^\infty$ defined on a neighborhood of $\overline{\text{Tube}(B, \mathbf{r})}$ such that

- (i) S_n converge to S in the sense of quasi-positive currents on a neighborhood of $\overline{\text{Tube}(B, \mathbf{r})}$ as n tends to infinity (see Definition 3.2);
- (ii) there is an open neighborhood of $\partial_{\text{ver}} \text{Tube}(B, \mathbf{r})$ on which the \mathcal{C}^m -norms of S_n are uniformly bounded, where $m = 0$ if $q < k - l$ and $m = 1$ if $q = k - l$.

Then, for all $s, r \in (0, \mathbf{r}]$ with $s < r$ except for a countable set of values, formula (4.3) for $r_1 := s, r_2 := r$ (resp. formula (4.10)) holds with

$$|\mathcal{V}(S, s, r)| \leq cr \quad (\text{resp.} \quad |\mathcal{V}(S, r)| \leq cr),$$

where c is a constant independent of s, r .

Theorem 4.10. (see [46, Theorem 4.19]) *We keep the hypothesis and the notation of Theorem 4.4 (resp. Theorem 4.5). Then there is a constant c depending only on S such that for all $r \in (0, \mathbf{r}]$ and $\epsilon \in (0, r)$, the following assertions hold:*

- (1) *If $q < k - l$, then $|\mathcal{V}_\epsilon(S, r)| \leq cr$.*
(2) *If $q = k - l$ and we are in the assumption of Theorem 4.4, then*

$$\left| \mathcal{V}_\epsilon(S, r) - \frac{1}{r^{2q}} \int_{\partial_{\text{ver}} \text{Tube}(B, r)} d^c \varphi \wedge S^\# \wedge \beta^{q-1} \right| \leq cr.$$

- (3) *If $q = k - l$ and we are in the assumption of Theorem 4.5, then*

$$\left| \mathcal{V}_\epsilon(S, r) - \frac{1}{r^{2q}} \int_{\partial_{\text{ver}} \text{Tube}(B, r)} d^c \varphi \wedge S \wedge \beta^{q-1} \right| \leq cr.$$

5. ADMISSIBLE ESTIMATES, MASS INDICATORS AND THEIR FINITENESS

In the first six subsections we recall standard settings for further technical developments, and preliminary results established in [46, Sections 5 and 7]. The last subsection is devoted to new results on mass indicators and their finiteness.

5.1. Forms α_{ver} and β_{ver} . Since the transition functions of the holomorphic vector bundle \mathbb{E} are holomorphic, the vertical operators $\partial_{\text{ver}}, \bar{\partial}_{\text{ver}}$ which are the restrictions of the usual operators ∂ and $\bar{\partial}$ on fibers of \mathbb{E} are well-defined. More precisely, for a smooth form Φ on an open set Ω in \mathbb{E} , we can define

$$(5.1) \quad \partial_{\text{ver}} \Phi(y) := \partial|_{\mathbb{E}_{\pi(y)}} \Phi(y) \quad \text{and} \quad \bar{\partial}_{\text{ver}} \Phi(y) := \bar{\partial}|_{\mathbb{E}_{\pi(y)}} \Phi(y) \quad \text{for} \quad y \in \Omega.$$

So the vertical operators d_{ver} and dd_{ver}^c are also well-defined by the formulas

$$(5.2) \quad d_{\text{ver}} \Phi := \partial_{\text{ver}} \Phi + \bar{\partial}_{\text{ver}} \Phi \quad \text{and} \quad dd_{\text{ver}}^c \Phi := \frac{i}{\pi} \partial_{\text{ver}} \bar{\partial}_{\text{ver}} \Phi.$$

Consider for $y \in \mathbb{E}$,

$$(5.3) \quad \alpha_{\text{ver}}(y) := dd_{\text{ver}}^c \log \varphi(y) = dd^c|_{\mathbb{E}_{\pi(y)}} \log \varphi(y) \quad \text{and} \quad \beta_{\text{ver}}(y) := dd_{\text{ver}}^c \varphi(y) = dd^c|_{\mathbb{E}_{\pi(y)}} \varphi(y),$$

where $dd^c|_{\mathbb{E}_{\pi(y)}}$ is restriction of the operator dd^c on the fiber $\mathbb{E}_{\pi(y)}$. Observe that both α_{ver} and β_{ver} are positive $(1, 1)$ -forms on \mathbb{E} . However, they are not necessarily closed.

5.2. Positive forms $\hat{\alpha}$ and $\hat{\beta}$. Recall from Subsection 2.1 the constant $\mathbf{r} > 0$. Recall from [46, Lemma 5.1] the construction of positive currents/forms $\hat{\alpha}, \hat{\alpha}'$ and $\hat{\beta}$. This positivity plays a crucial role in the sequel.

Lemma 5.1. (1) *There is a constant $c_1 > 0$ large enough such that*

$$(5.4) \quad \hat{\beta} := c_1 \varphi \cdot \pi^* \omega + \beta$$

is positive on $\pi^{-1}(V_0)$ and is strictly positive on $\pi^{-1}(V_0) \setminus V_0$, and

$$(5.5) \quad \hat{\alpha}' := c_1 \pi^* \omega + \alpha$$

satisfies

$$(5.6) \quad c_1 \alpha_{\text{ver}} + c_1^2 \pi^* \omega \geq \hat{\alpha}' \geq c_1^{-1} \alpha_{\text{ver}}.$$

In particular, $\hat{\alpha}'$ is positive on $\pi^{-1}(V_0)$.

(2) There are constants $c_2, c_3 > 0$ such that on $\text{Tube}(V_0, \mathbf{r}) \setminus V_0$,

$$(5.7) \quad \hat{\alpha} := \hat{\alpha}' + c_2\beta = c_1\pi^*\omega + \alpha + c_2\beta$$

is strictly positive, and

$$(5.8) \quad \hat{\alpha} \geq c_1^{-1}\alpha_{\text{ver}},$$

and

$$(5.9) \quad \varphi\hat{\alpha} \leq c_3\hat{\beta}.$$

(3) There are constants $c_3 > 0$ such that on $\text{Tube}(V_0, \mathbf{r})$,

$$(5.10) \quad \hat{\beta} \geq c_1^{-1}\beta_{\text{ver}},$$

and on $\text{Tube}(V_0, \mathbf{r}) \setminus V_0$,

$$(5.11) \quad \varphi\alpha_{\text{ver}} \leq c_3\hat{\beta}.$$

5.3. Analysis in local coordinates. The following local model studied in [46] is useful. Consider an open set $V_0 \Subset V$ and let us study \mathbb{E} near a given point $y_0 \in V_0$. We use the coordinates $(z, w) \in \mathbb{C}^{k-l} \times \mathbb{C}^l$ around a neighborhood U of y_0 such that $y_0 = 0$ in these coordinates. We may assume that U has the form $U = U' \times U''$, where U' (resp. U'') is an open neighborhood of $0'$ in \mathbb{C}^{k-l} (resp. of $0''$ in \mathbb{C}^l), and $V = \{z = 0\} \simeq U''$. Moreover, we may assume that $U'' = (2\mathbb{D})^l$. Consider the trivial vector bundle $\pi : \mathbb{E} \rightarrow U''$ with $\mathbb{E} \simeq \mathbb{C}^{k-l} \times U''$. There is a smooth function $A : \mathbb{D}^l \rightarrow \text{GL}(\mathbb{C}, k-l)$ such that

$$(5.12) \quad \varphi(z, w) = \|A(w)z\|^2 \quad \text{for } z \in \mathbb{C}^{k-l}, w \in \mathbb{D}^l,$$

where φ is defined in (2.1). It follows from (5.3) and (5.12) that

$$(5.13) \quad \alpha_{\text{ver}}(z, w) = A(w)^*[dd^c \log \|z\|^2] \quad \text{and} \quad \beta_{\text{ver}}(z, w) = A(w)^*[dd^c \|z\|^2] \quad \text{for } z \in \mathbb{C}^{k-l}, w \in \mathbb{D}^l.$$

5.4. Extended Standing Hypothesis. Let B be a relatively compact piecewise \mathcal{C}^2 -smooth open subset. Let V_0 be a relatively compact open subset of V such that $B \Subset V_0$. Consider a strongly admissible map $\tau : \mathbb{U} \rightarrow \tau(\mathbb{U})$ along B , with \mathbb{U} a neighborhood of \overline{B} in X . By shrinking \mathbb{U} if necessary, we may fix a finite collection $\mathcal{U} = (\mathbb{U}_\ell, \tau_\ell)_{1 \leq \ell \leq \ell_0}$, of holomorphic admissible maps for \mathbb{U} . More precisely, there is a finite cover of $\overline{\mathbb{U}}$ by open subsets \mathbb{U}_ℓ , $1 \leq \ell \leq \ell_0$, of X such that there is a holomorphic coordinate system on $\overline{\mathbb{U}_\ell}$ in X and \mathbb{U}_ℓ is biholomorphic to $\mathbb{U}_\ell := \tau_\ell(\mathbb{U}_\ell) \subset \mathbb{E}$ by a holomorphic admissible map τ_ℓ . By choosing $\mathbf{r} > 0$ small enough, we may assume without loss of generality that $\overline{\text{Tube}(B, \mathbf{r})} \Subset \mathbb{U} := \bigcup_{\ell=1}^{\ell_0} \mathbb{U}_\ell$. Fix a partition of unity $(\theta_\ell)_{1 \leq \ell \leq \ell_0}$ subordinate to the open cover $(\mathbb{U}_\ell \cap V)_{1 \leq \ell \leq \ell_0}$ of $\overline{\mathbb{U} \cap V}$ in V such that $\sum_{1 \leq \ell \leq \ell_0} \theta_\ell = 1$ on an open neighborhood of $\overline{\mathbb{U} \cap V} \subset V$. We may assume without loss of generality that there are open subsets $\tilde{V}_\ell \subset V$ for $1 \leq \ell \leq \ell_0$ such that

$$(5.14) \quad \text{supp}(\theta_\ell) \subset \tilde{V}_\ell \Subset \mathbb{U}_\ell \cap V \quad \text{and} \quad \tau(\tilde{V}_\ell) \Subset \mathbb{U}_\ell \quad \text{and} \quad \pi^{-1}(\text{supp}(\theta_\ell)) \cap \mathbb{U} \subset \mathbb{U}_\ell.$$

For $1 \leq \ell \leq \ell_0$ set

$$(5.15) \quad \tilde{\tau}_\ell := \tau \circ \tau_\ell^{-1}.$$

So $\tilde{\tau}_\ell$ defines a map from $\mathbb{U}_\ell \subset \mathbb{E}$ onto $\tau(\mathbb{U}_\ell) \subset \mathbb{E}$.

We also assume that for every $1 \leq \ell \leq \ell_0$, there is a local coordinate system $y = (z, w)$ on \mathbb{U}_ℓ with $V \cap \mathbb{U}_\ell = \{z = 0\}$.

$\mathcal{U} = (\mathbb{U}_\ell, \tau_\ell)_{1 \leq \ell \leq \ell_0}$ is said to be a *covering family of holomorphic admissible maps* for B . Recall that $\pi : \mathbb{E} \rightarrow V$ is the canonical projection.

Definition 5.2. Let T be a current defined on \mathbb{U} . Consider the current $T^\#$ defined on \mathbb{U} by the following formula:

$$(5.16) \quad T^\# := \sum_{\ell=1}^{\ell_0} (\pi^* \theta_\ell) \cdot (\tau_\ell)_* (T|_{\mathbb{U}_\ell}).$$

By (5.14), $T^\#$ is well-defined.

Let T be a current defined on \mathbb{U} and $0 \leq s < r \leq r$. Consider the currents $T_r^\#$ and $T_{s,r}^\#$ defined on \mathbb{U} as follows:

$$(5.17) \quad T_r^\# := \sum_{\ell=1}^{\ell_0} (\pi^* \theta_\ell) \cdot (\mathbf{1}_{\text{Tube}(B,r)} \circ \tilde{\tau}_\ell) \cdot (\tau_\ell)_* (T|_{\mathbb{U}_\ell}) \quad \text{and} \quad T_{s,r}^\# := \sum_{\ell=1}^{\ell_0} (\pi^* \theta_\ell) \cdot (\mathbf{1}_{\text{Tube}(B,s,r)} \circ \tilde{\tau}_\ell) \cdot (\tau_\ell)_* (T|_{\mathbb{U}_\ell}).$$

5.5. Admissible estimates. Admissible estimates are those estimates which are related to admissible maps. This subsection provides necessary admissible estimates.

Let \mathbb{U} be an open neighborhood of 0 in \mathbb{C}^k . We use the local coordinates $y = (z, w) \in \mathbb{C}^{k-l} \times \mathbb{C}^l$ on \mathbb{U} .

The following notion will be needed in order to obtain admissible estimates.

Definition 5.3. Let Γ be a form of degree 2 and S a positive $(1, 1)$ -form defined on \mathbb{U} . For $(p, q) \in \{(0, 2), (1, 1), (2, 0)\}$, $\Gamma^{p,q}$ denotes the component of bidegree (p, q) of Γ . So $\Gamma^{1,1} = \Gamma^\#$ according to Notation 4.1.

We write $\Gamma \trianglelefteq S$ if there is a constant $c > 0$ such that the following two inequalities hold for $y \in \mathbb{U}$:

$$\Gamma^{0,2}(y) \wedge \overline{\Gamma^{0,2}}(y) \leq cS^2(y) \quad \text{and} \quad \Gamma^{2,0}(y) \wedge \overline{\Gamma^{2,0}}(y) \leq cS^2(y).$$

Notation 5.4. Let Γ and S be two real $(1, 1)$ -forms defined on \mathbb{U} .

We write $\Gamma \lesssim S$ if there is a constant $c > 0$ such that $\Gamma \leq cS$. We write $\pm\Gamma \lesssim S$ if we have both $\Gamma \lesssim S$ and $-\Gamma \lesssim S$.

We write $\Gamma \approx S$ if we have both $\Gamma \lesssim S$ and $S \lesssim \Gamma$.

Definition 5.5. Let $\mathcal{H} = \mathcal{H}(\mathbb{U})$ be the class of all real $(1, 1)$ -forms H on \mathbb{U} which can be written as

$$H = \sum f_{pq'} dz_p \wedge d\bar{w}_{q'} + \sum g_{p'q} d\bar{z}_{p'} \wedge dw_q,$$

where $f_{pq'}$ and $g_{p'q}$ are bounded functions.

Now we place ourselves under the Extended Standing Hypothesis introduced in Subsection 5.4. Since τ is strongly admissible, we infer from Definition 3.6 that the following estimates of 1-forms for the components of $\tau = (s_1, \dots, s_k)$ in the local coordinates $y = (z, w)$. Note that $s_j = \tau^* z_j$ for $1 \leq j \leq k-l$ and $s_j = \tau^* w_{j-k+l}$ for $k-l < j \leq k$.

$$(5.18) \quad d(\tau^* z_j) - dz_j = \sum_{p=1}^{k-l} O(\|z\|) dz_p + O(\|z\|^2) \quad \text{and} \quad d(\tau^* \bar{z}_j) - d\bar{z}_j = \sum_{p=1}^{k-l} O(\|z\|) d\bar{z}_p + O(\|z\|^2).$$

$$(5.19) \quad d(\tau^* w_m) - dw_m = \sum_{p=1}^{k-l} O(1) dz_p + O(\|z\|) \quad \text{and} \quad d(\tau^* \bar{w}_m) - d\bar{w}_m = \sum_{p=1}^{k-l} O(1) d\bar{z}_p + O(\|z\|).$$

Using this we infer the following estimates for the change under τ of a \mathcal{C}^1 -smooth function, of a \mathcal{C}^1 -smooth $(1, 1)$ -form, and of the basic $(1, 1)$ -forms $\pi^*\omega$, β , $\hat{\beta}$.

Proposition 5.6. *Let γ be a \mathcal{C}^1 -smooth $(1, 1)$ -form on V_0 . Then there are constants $c_3, c_4 > 0$ such that $c_3\pi^*\omega + c_4\beta \geq 0$ on $\pi^{-1}(V_0) \subset \mathbb{E}$ and that for every $1 \leq \ell \leq \ell_0$, the following inequalities hold on $\mathbb{U}_\ell \cap \text{Tube}(B, \mathbf{r})$:*

- (1) $|\tilde{\tau}_\ell^*(\varphi) - \varphi| \leq c_3\varphi^{\frac{3}{2}}$, and $|\tilde{\tau}_\ell^*(f) - f| \leq c_3\varphi^{\frac{1}{2}}$ for every \mathcal{C}^1 -smooth function f on $\text{Tube}(B, \mathbf{r})$;
- (2) $\pm(\tilde{\tau}_\ell^*(\pi^*\gamma) - \pi^*\gamma - H)^\sharp \lesssim c_3\varphi^{\frac{1}{2}}\pi^*\omega + c_4\varphi^{\frac{1}{2}}\beta$, and $\tilde{\tau}_\ell^*(\pi^*\omega) - \pi^*\omega \leq c_3\varphi^{\frac{1}{2}}\pi^*\omega + c_4\varphi^{\frac{1}{2}}\beta$;
- (3) $\pm(\tilde{\tau}_\ell^*(\beta) - \beta)^\sharp \lesssim c_3\phi^{\frac{3}{2}} \cdot \pi^*\omega + c_4\phi^{\frac{1}{2}} \cdot \beta$, and $\pm(\tilde{\tau}_\ell^*(\beta) - \beta) \leq c_3\phi^{\frac{3}{2}} \cdot \pi^*\omega + c_4\phi^{\frac{1}{2}} \cdot \beta$;
- (4) $\pm(\tilde{\tau}_\ell^*(\hat{\beta}) - \hat{\beta})^\sharp \lesssim c_3\phi^{\frac{3}{2}} \cdot \pi^*\omega + c_4\phi^{\frac{1}{2}} \cdot \hat{\beta}$, and $\pm(\tilde{\tau}_\ell^*(\hat{\beta}) - \hat{\beta}) \leq c_3\phi^{\frac{3}{2}} \cdot \pi^*\omega + c_4\phi^{\frac{1}{2}} \cdot \hat{\beta}$.

Here, in the first inequalities of (2)-(3)-(4), H is some form in the class \mathcal{H} given in Definition 5.5.

Proof. The case where $\gamma := \omega$ has been proved in Proposition 7.8 and Proposition 7.9 in [46]. However, the proof therein is also valid for the general case of a \mathcal{C}^1 -smooth $(1, 1)$ -form γ on V_0 . \square

The following technical lemma is very often needed.

Lemma 5.7. *Let T be a positive current of bidgree (p, p) on \mathbb{U} . Let R_1, \dots, R_{k-p} be real $(1, 1)$ -currents on $\text{Tube}(B, \mathbf{r}) \subset \mathbb{E}$, let S_1, \dots, S_{k-p} and S'_1, \dots, S'_{k-p} be positive $(1, 1)$ -currents on $\text{Tube}(B, \mathbf{r}) \subset \mathbb{E}$, and for each $1 \leq \ell \leq \ell_0$, let $H_{\ell,1}, \dots, H_{\ell,k-p}$ be real $(1, 1)$ -forms in the class \mathcal{H} on \mathbb{U}_ℓ such that*

$$\begin{aligned} \varphi^{\frac{1}{2}}R_j &\lesssim S_j \quad \text{and} \quad \varphi^{\frac{1}{2}}R_j \lesssim S'_j \quad \text{on } \text{Tube}(B, \mathbf{r}) \text{ for } 1 \leq j \leq k-p; \\ \pm[(\tilde{\tau}_\ell)^*R_j - R_j - H_{\ell,j}]^\sharp &\lesssim S_j \quad \text{on } \mathbb{U}_\ell \text{ for } 1 \leq \ell \leq \ell_0 \text{ and } 1 \leq j \leq k-p; \\ ((\tilde{\tau}_\ell)^*R_1 - R_1, \dots, (\tilde{\tau}_\ell)^*R_{k-p} - R_{k-p}) &\leq (S'_1, \dots, S'_{k-p}) \quad \text{on } \mathbb{U}_\ell \text{ for } 1 \leq \ell \leq \ell_0. \end{aligned}$$

Let $0 < s < r \leq \mathbf{r}$ and set $R := R_1 \wedge \dots \wedge R_{k-p}$. Suppose in addition that there are constants $0 < c_5 < 1$ and $c_6 > 1$ and positive $(1, 1)$ -forms R'_1, \dots, R'_{k-p} such that

- $R'_j \geq R_j \geq -R'_j$ for $1 \leq j \leq k-p$;
- if $y \in \mathbb{U}_\ell$ with $0 < \theta_\ell(y) < c_5$, then we may find $1 \leq \ell' \leq \ell_0$ and an open neighborhood \mathbb{U}_y of y in \mathbb{U} such that for $x \in \mathbb{U}_y$, we have that $\theta_{\ell'}(x) > c_5$ and that

$$-c_6(\tilde{\tau}_{\ell'} \circ \tilde{\tau}_\ell^{-1})^*R'_j(x) \leq R_j(x) \leq c_6(\tilde{\tau}_{\ell'} \circ \tilde{\tau}_\ell^{-1})^*R'_j(x)$$

and that $S_j(x) \leq c_6(\tilde{\tau}_{\ell'} \circ \tilde{\tau}_\ell^{-1})^*S_j(x)$ and that $S'_j(x) \leq c_6(\tilde{\tau}_{\ell'} \circ \tilde{\tau}_\ell^{-1})^*S'_j(x)$.

Then there is a constant c that depends on c_5, c_6 and ℓ_0 such that

$$\begin{aligned} &|\langle \tau_*T, \mathbf{1}_{\text{Tube}(B, \mathbf{r})}R \rangle - \langle T_r^\sharp, R \rangle|^2 \\ &\leq c \cdot \sum_{\ell=1}^{\ell_0} \sum_{I, J, K} \sum_{j=0}^{|I|} \left(\int (\mathbf{1}_{\text{Tube}(B, r+c_0r^2)} \circ \tilde{\tau}_\ell)(\pi^*\theta_\ell)(\tau_\ell)_*T \wedge R'_K \wedge \pi^*\omega^j \wedge \hat{\beta}^{|I|-j} \wedge S_J \wedge S'_{(I \cup J \cup K)^c} \right) \\ &\quad \cdot \left(\int (\mathbf{1}_{\text{Tube}(B, r+c_0r^2)} \circ \tilde{\tau}_\ell)(\pi^*\theta_\ell)(\tau_\ell)_*T \wedge R'_K \wedge \pi^*\omega^{|I|-j} \wedge \hat{\beta}^j \wedge S_J \wedge S'_{(I \cup J \cup K)^c} \right). \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left| \langle \tau_* T, \mathbf{1}_{\text{Tube}(B,s,r)} R \rangle - \langle T_{s,r}^\#, R \rangle \right|^2 \\
& \leq c \sum_{\ell=1}^{\ell_0} \sum_{I,J,K} \sum_{j=0}^{|I|} \left(\int (\mathbf{1}_{\text{Tube}(B,s-c_0s^2,r+c_0r^2)} \circ \tilde{\tau}_\ell) (\pi^* \theta_\ell) (\tau_\ell)_* T \wedge R'_K \wedge \pi^* \omega^j \wedge \hat{\beta}^{|I|-j} \wedge S_J \wedge S'_{(I \cup J \cup K)^c} \right) \\
& \quad \cdot \left(\int (\mathbf{1}_{\text{Tube}(B,s-c_0s^2,r+c_0r^2)} \circ \tilde{\tau}_\ell) (\pi^* \theta_\ell) (\tau_\ell)_* T \wedge R'_K \wedge \pi^* \omega^{|I|-j} \wedge \hat{\beta}^j \wedge S_J \wedge S'_{(I \cup J \cup K)^c} \right).
\end{aligned}$$

Here, the sum $\sum_{I,J,K}$ is taken over all $I, J, K \subset \{1, \dots, k-p\}$ such that $H_j \neq 0$ for $j \in I$, and that I, J, K are mutually disjoint, and $|(I \cup J \cup K)^c|$ is even, and $K \neq \{1, \dots, k-p\}$. Moreover,

$$S_J := \bigwedge_{j \in J} S_j, \quad R'_K := \bigwedge_{j \in K} R'_j, \quad S'_J := \bigwedge_{j \in J} S'_j.$$

Proof. The case where R_1, \dots, R_{k-p} are positive $(1, 1)$ -currents on $\text{Tube}(B, \mathbf{r}) \subset \mathbb{E}$ has been established in [46, Lemma 7.22]. The proof therein is still valid for the general case using the additional lower estimates on R_j in the above two \bullet . \square

The following convergence test established in [46, Lemma 5.2] will be needed.

Lemma 5.8. *Let $0 < r_1 < r_2 \leq \mathbf{r}$. Consider two functions $f : (0, \mathbf{r}] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and $\epsilon : [\mathbf{r}^{-1}, \infty) \rightarrow (0, \infty)$, $\lambda \mapsto \epsilon_\lambda$ such that*

- (i) *there are two constants $c > 0$ and $N \in \mathbb{N}$ such that if $2^n \leq \lambda < 2^{n+1}$ and $2^{n-N} > \mathbf{r}^{-1}$, then $\epsilon_\lambda \leq c \sum_{j=-N}^N \epsilon_{2^{n+j}}$;*
 - (ii) $\sum_{n \in \mathbb{N}: 2^n \geq \mathbf{r}^{-1}} \epsilon_{2^n} < \infty$;
 - (iii) *For $r \in (r_1, r_2)$, we have $f(\frac{r}{\lambda}) - f(\frac{r_1}{\lambda}) \geq -\epsilon_\lambda$.*
- (1) *Then we have $\lim_{r \rightarrow 0} f(r) = \liminf_{r \rightarrow 0} f(r) \in \mathbb{R} \cup \{-\infty\}$.*
(2) *If instead of condition (iii) we have the following stronger condition (iii)':*

$$|f(\frac{r_2}{\lambda}) - f(\frac{r_1}{\lambda})| \leq \epsilon_\lambda,$$

then $\lim_{r \rightarrow 0} f(r) = \liminf_{r \rightarrow 0} f(r) \in \mathbb{R}$, that is, the last limit is finite.

5.6. Local and global mass indicators for positive currents. We use the notation introduced in Subsection 5.4. Following the model formula (5.16), we introduce the following mass indicators for a positive current T of bidegree (p, p) defined on X . For $0 \leq j \leq k$ and $0 \leq q \leq k-l$ and $1 \leq \ell \leq \ell_0$, and for $0 < s < r \leq \mathbf{r}$,

$$\begin{aligned}
(5.20) \quad \mathcal{M}_j(T, r, \tau_\ell) &:= \frac{1}{r^{2(k-p-j)}} \int (\mathbf{1}_{\text{Tube}(B,r)} \circ \tilde{\tau}_\ell) (\pi^* \theta_\ell) \cdot (\tau_\ell)_* (T|_{\mathbf{U}_\ell}) \wedge \pi^* \omega^j \wedge \hat{\beta}^{k-p-j}, \\
\mathcal{H}_{j,q}(T, r, \tau_\ell) &:= \int (\mathbf{1}_{\text{Tube}(B,r)} \circ \tilde{\tau}_\ell) (\pi^* \theta_\ell) \cdot (\tau_\ell)_* (T|_{\mathbf{U}_\ell}) \wedge \pi^* \omega^j \wedge \hat{\beta}^{k-p-q-j} \wedge \hat{\alpha}^q, \\
\mathcal{H}_{j,q}(T, s, r, \tau_\ell) &:= \int (\mathbf{1}_{\text{Tube}(B,s,r)} \circ \tilde{\tau}_\ell) (\pi^* \theta_\ell) \cdot (\tau_\ell)_* (T|_{\mathbf{U}_\ell}) \wedge \pi^* \omega^j \wedge \hat{\beta}^{k-p-q-j} \wedge \hat{\alpha}^q.
\end{aligned}$$

Remark 5.9. A consideration on bidegree using the formula for \bar{m} given in (1.7) shows that $(\tau_\ell)_* (T|_{\mathbf{U}_\ell}) \wedge \pi^* \omega^{\bar{m}}$ is of full bidegree (l, l) in $\{dw, d\bar{w}\}$, see also Corollary 4.8 in [46]. Consequently, by the bidegree reason, we deduce that $\mathcal{M}_j(T, r, \tau_\ell)$, $\mathcal{H}_{j,q}(T, r, \tau)$ and $\mathcal{H}_{j,q}(T, s, r, \tau)$ are equal to 0 provided that $j > \bar{m}$.

We define the following global mass indicators.

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{M}_j(T, r) &= \mathcal{M}_j(T, r, \mathcal{U}) := \sum_{\ell=1}^{\ell_0} \mathcal{M}_j(T, r, \tau_\ell), \\
\mathcal{M}^{\text{tot}}(T, r) &= \mathcal{M}^{\text{tot}}(T, r, \mathcal{U}) := \sum_{j=0}^{\bar{m}} \mathcal{M}_j(T, r), \\
\mathcal{K}_{j,q}(T, r) &= \mathcal{K}_{j,q}(T, r, \mathcal{U}) := \sum_{\ell=1}^{\ell_0} \mathcal{K}_{j,q}(T, r, \tau_\ell), \\
\mathcal{K}_{j,q}(T, s, r) &= \mathcal{K}_{j,q}(T, s, r, \mathcal{U}) := \sum_{\ell=1}^{\ell_0} \mathcal{K}_{j,q}(T, s, r, \tau_\ell).
\end{aligned}
\tag{5.21}$$

Lemma 5.10.

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{M}_j(T, r) &= \frac{1}{r^{2(k-p-j)}} \int T_r^\# \wedge \pi^* \omega^j \wedge \hat{\beta}^{k-p-j}, \\
\mathcal{K}_{j,q}(T, r) &= \int T_r^\# \wedge \pi^* \omega^j \wedge \hat{\beta}^{k-p-q-j} \wedge \hat{\alpha}^q, \\
\mathcal{K}_{j,q}(T, s, r) &= \int T_{s,r}^\# \wedge \pi^* \omega^j \wedge \hat{\beta}^{k-p-q-j} \wedge \hat{\alpha}^q.
\end{aligned}$$

5.7. Inequalities of mass indicators. Let ω be a Hermitian metric on V .

Let $\mathbf{j} = (j_1, j_2, j_3, j_4)$ with $j_1, j_3, j_4 \in \mathbb{N}$ and $j_2 \in \frac{1}{4}\mathbb{N}$, and $k - p - j_1 - j_3 \geq 0$. Let $0 \leq s < r \leq \mathbf{r}$. Consider a positive current T on \mathbf{U} . Define

$$\begin{aligned}
I_{\mathbf{j}}(s, r) &:= \int_{\text{Tube}(B, s, r)} \tau_* T \wedge \varphi^{j_2} (c_1 - c_2 \varphi)^{j_4} \hat{\beta}^{k-p-j_1-j_3} \wedge (\pi^* \omega)^{j_3} \wedge \hat{\alpha}^{j_1}, \\
I_{\mathbf{j}}^\#(s, r) &:= \int_{\text{Tube}(B, s, r)} T_{s,r}^\# \wedge \varphi^{j_2} (c_1 - c_2 \varphi)^{j_4} \hat{\beta}^{k-p-j_1-j_3} \wedge (\pi^* \omega)^{j_3} \wedge \hat{\alpha}^{j_1}.
\end{aligned}
\tag{5.22}$$

We define $I_{\mathbf{j}}(r)$ and $I_{\mathbf{j}}^\#(r)$ similarly replacing the current $T_{s,r}^\#$ (resp. the domain of integration $\text{Tube}(B, s, r)$) by $T_r^\#$ (resp. $\text{Tube}(B, r)$).

Remark 5.11. Observe that $\mathcal{K}_{j,q}(T, r) = I_{(q,0,j,0)}^\#(r)$ and $\mathcal{K}_{j,q}(T, s, r) = I_{(q,0,j,0)}^\#(s, r)$.

Let $\omega^{(j_3)}$ be a \mathcal{C}^1 -smooth real $(1, 1)$ -form on V_0 . Define also

$$\begin{aligned}
\tilde{I}_{\mathbf{j}}(s, r) &:= \int_{\text{Tube}(B, s, r)} \tau_* T \wedge \varphi^{j_2} (c_1 - c_2 \varphi)^{j_4} \hat{\beta}^{k-p-j_1-j_3} \wedge (\pi^* \omega^{(j_3)}) \wedge \hat{\alpha}^{j_1}, \\
\tilde{I}_{\mathbf{j}}^\#(s, r) &:= \int_{\text{Tube}(B, s, r)} T_{s,r}^\# \wedge \varphi^{j_2} (c_1 - c_2 \varphi)^{j_4} \hat{\beta}^{k-p-j_1-j_3} \wedge (\pi^* \omega^{(j_3)}) \wedge \hat{\alpha}^{j_1}.
\end{aligned}
\tag{5.23}$$

We define $\tilde{I}_{\mathbf{j}}(r)$ and $\tilde{I}_{\mathbf{j}}^\#(r)$ similarly replacing the current $T_{s,r}^\#$ (resp. the domain of integration $\text{Tube}(B, s, r)$) by $T_r^\#$ (resp. $\text{Tube}(B, r)$).

Here is the first main technical result of this section.

Lemma 5.12. *There are constants c, c_0 independent of T such that the following inequalities holds for $0 \leq s < r < \mathbf{r}$:*

$$|\tilde{I}_{\mathbf{j}}(r) - \tilde{I}_{\mathbf{j}}^{\#}(r)|^2 \leq c \left(\sum_{\mathbf{j}'} I_{\mathbf{j}'}^{\#}(r + c_0 r^2) \right) \left(\sum_{\mathbf{j}''} I_{\mathbf{j}''}^{\#}(r + c_0 r^2) \right),$$

$$|\tilde{I}_{\mathbf{j}}(s, r) - \tilde{I}_{\mathbf{j}}^{\#}(s, r)|^2 \leq c \left(\sum_{\mathbf{j}'} I_{\mathbf{j}'}^{\#}(s - c_0 s^2, r + c_0 r^2) \right) \left(\sum_{\mathbf{j}''} I_{\mathbf{j}''}^{\#}(s - c_0 s^2, r + c_0 r^2) \right).$$

Here, on the RHS:

- the first sum is taken over a finite number of multi-indices $\mathbf{j}' = (j'_1, j'_2, j'_3, j'_4)$ as above such that $j'_1 \leq j_1$ and $j'_2 \geq j_2$; and either $(j'_3 \leq j_3)$ or $(j'_3 > j_3$ and $j'_2 \geq j_2 + \frac{1}{2})$.
- the second sum is taken over a finite number of multi-indices $\mathbf{j}'' = (j''_1, j''_2, j''_3, j''_4)$ as above such that either $(j''_1 < j_1)$ or $(j''_1 = j_1$ and $j''_2 \geq \frac{1}{4} + j_2)$ or $(j''_1 = j_1$ and $j''_3 < j_3)$.

Proof. We only give the proof of the second inequality since the proof of the first one is similar. Using the compactness of \bar{B} in V , we can write

$$\omega^{(j)} = \sum_{I \in \mathcal{I}} \gamma_{I1} \wedge \dots \wedge \gamma_{Ij},$$

where $\gamma_{I1}, \dots, \gamma_{Ij}$ are \mathcal{C}^1 -smooth forms of bidegree $(1, 1)$ compactly supported in V_0 , and \mathcal{I} is a nonempty finite index set. Observe that

$$\tilde{I}_{\mathbf{j}}(s, r) = \sum_{I \in \mathcal{I}} \tilde{I}_{I, \mathbf{j}}(s, r) \quad \text{and} \quad \tilde{I}_{\mathbf{j}}^{\#}(s, r) = \sum_{I \in \mathcal{I}} \tilde{I}_{I, \mathbf{j}}^{\#}(s, r),$$

where $\tilde{I}_{I, \mathbf{j}}(s, r)$ (resp. $\tilde{I}_{I, \mathbf{j}}^{\#}(s, r)$) are obtained from $\tilde{I}_{\mathbf{j}}(s, r)$ (resp. $\tilde{I}_{\mathbf{j}}^{\#}(s, r)$) by replacing the form $\omega^{(j)}$ by the form $\gamma_{I1} \wedge \dots \wedge \gamma_{Ij}$. Since

$$|\tilde{I}_{\mathbf{j}}(s, r) - \tilde{I}_{\mathbf{j}}^{\#}(s, r)|^2 \leq (\#\mathcal{I}) \left(\sum_{I \in \mathcal{I}} |\tilde{I}_{I, \mathbf{j}}(s, r) - \tilde{I}_{I, \mathbf{j}}^{\#}(s, r)|^2 \right),$$

where $\#\mathcal{I}$ is the cardinal of the set \mathcal{I} , we are reduced to proving the lemma for the case where

$$\omega^{(j)} = \gamma_1 \wedge \dots \wedge \gamma_j,$$

where $\gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_j$ are \mathcal{C}^1 -smooth forms of bidegree $(1, 1)$ compactly supported in V_0 . We argue as in the proof of [46, Lemma 8.6] using Proposition 5.6 (resp. Lemma 5.7) instead of Proposition 7.8 (resp. Lemma 7.22) therein. \square

We conclude the section with an inequality which will be useful later on. This is the last main technical result of this section.

Proposition 5.13. *For $0 < r_1 < r_2 \leq \mathbf{r}$, there is a constant $c_8 > 0$ such that for every $q \leq \min(k-p, k-l)$ and every positive current T , we have the following estimate for $\lambda > 1$:*

$$|\kappa_{k-p-q}(T, \frac{r_1}{\lambda}, \frac{r_2}{\lambda}, \tau)| < c_8 \sum_{0 \leq q' \leq q, 0 \leq j' \leq \min(\bar{m}, k-p-q')} \mathcal{H}_{j', q'}(T, \frac{r_1}{\lambda} - c_0 \left(\frac{r_1}{\lambda}\right)^2, \frac{r_2}{\lambda} + c_0 \left(\frac{r_2}{\lambda}\right)^2).$$

Proof. Fix $0 \leq q_0 \leq \min(k-p, k-l)$ and set $j_0 := k-p-q_0$. Set $s := \frac{r_1}{\lambda}$ and $r := \frac{r_2}{\lambda}$. In the remainder of the proof, we use formula (5.23) for $I_{\mathbf{j}}(s, r)$ and $\tilde{I}_{\mathbf{j}}^{\#}(s, r)$, where $\omega^{(j_3)}$ with $j_3 \geq j_0$ is defined by

$$\omega^{(j_3)} := \omega^{(j_0)} \wedge \omega^{j_3-j_0}.$$

Recall from (5.7) and (5.4) that

$$\alpha = \hat{\alpha} - c_1 \pi^* \omega - c_2 \beta = \hat{\alpha} - c_2 \hat{\beta} + (c_2 \varphi - c_1) \pi^* \omega \quad \text{and} \quad \beta = \hat{\beta} - c_1 \varphi \cdot \pi^* \omega.$$

So we get that

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha^{q_0} &= (\hat{\alpha} - c_2 \hat{\beta} + (c_2 \varphi - c_1) \pi^* \omega)^{q_0} \\ &= \hat{\alpha}^{q_0} + \sum_{j_1, j'_1}^q \binom{q_0}{j_1} \binom{q_0 - j_1}{j'_1} (-c_2)^{j'_1} \cdot \hat{\beta}^{j'_1} \wedge ((c_2 \varphi - c_1) \pi^* \omega)^{q_0 - j_1 - j'_1} \wedge \hat{\alpha}^{j_1}, \end{aligned}$$

where the last sum is taken over all (j_1, j'_1) such that $0 \leq j_1, j'_1 \leq q_0$ and $j_1 + j'_1 \leq q_0$ and $j_1 \neq q_0$. Using this and the first equality of (5.22), we have

(5.24)

$$\begin{aligned} \kappa(T, B, \omega^{(j_0)}, s, r) &= \int_{\text{Tube}(B, s, r)} \tau_* T \wedge \pi^*(\omega^{(j_0)}) \wedge \alpha^{q_0} = I_{q_0, 0, j_0, 0}(T, s, r) \\ &\quad + \sum_{j_1, j'_1} \binom{q_0}{j_1} \binom{q_0 - j_1}{j'_1} (-1)^{q_0 - j_1 - j'_1} (-c_2)^{j'_1} I_{j_1, 0, q_0 + j_0 - j_1 - j'_1, q_0 - j_1 - j'_1}(T, s, r). \end{aligned}$$

We rewrite (5.24) as

$$(5.25) \quad \mathcal{I}_{j_0}(T, s, r) = \mathcal{I}_1 + \mathcal{I}_2 + \mathcal{I}_3,$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{I}_1 &:= I_{q_0, 0, j_0, 0}^\#(T, s, r) + \sum_{j'_1, j_1} \binom{q_0}{j_1} \binom{q_0 - j_1}{j'_1} (-1)^{q_0 - j_1 - j'_1} (-c_2)^{j'_1} \\ &\quad \cdot I_{j_1, 0, q_0 + j_0 - j_1 - j'_1, q_0 - j_1 - j'_1}^\#(T, s, r), \\ \mathcal{I}_2 &:= I_{q_0, 0, j_0, 0}(T, r) - I_{q_0, 0, j_0, 0}^\#(T, s, s), \\ \mathcal{I}_3 &:= \sum_{j'_1, j_1} \binom{q_0}{j_1} \binom{q_0 - j_1}{j'_1} (-1)^{q_0 - j_1 - j'_1} (-c_2)^{j'_1} \\ &\quad \cdot (I_{j_1, 0, q_0 + j_0 - j_1 - j'_1, q_0 - j_1 - j'_1}(T, s, r) - I_{j_1, 0, q_0 + j_0 - j_1 - j'_1, q_0 - j_1 - j'_1}^\#(T, s, r)). \end{aligned}$$

Here the sums \mathcal{I}_1 and \mathcal{I}_3 are taken over all (j_1, j'_1) such that $0 \leq j_1, 0 < j'_1$ and $j_1 + j'_1 \leq q_0$.

Observe that \mathcal{I}_1 is bounded from above by a constant times

$$\sum_{0 \leq q' \leq q_0, 0 \leq j' \leq \min(\bar{m}, k - p - q')} \mathcal{K}_{j', q'}(T, \frac{r_1}{\lambda}, \frac{r_2}{\lambda}).$$

Applying Lemma 5.12 to each difference term in \mathcal{I}_2 and \mathcal{I}_3 yields that

$$(5.26) \quad |I_i(r) - I_i^\#(s, r)|^2 \leq c \left(\sum_{\mathbf{i}'} I_{\mathbf{i}'}^\#(s - c_0 s^2, r + c_0 r^2) \right) \left(\sum_{\mathbf{i}''} I_{\mathbf{i}''}^\#(s - c_0 s^2, r + c_0 r^2) \right).$$

Here, on the LHS $\mathbf{i} = (i_1, i_2, i_3, i_4)$ is either $(q_0, 0, j_0, 0)$ or $(j_1, 0, q_0 + j_0 - j_1 - j'_1, q_0 - j_1 - j'_1)$ with j_1, j'_1 as above, and on the RHS:

- the first sum is taken over a finite number of multi-indices $\mathbf{i}' = (i'_1, i'_2, i'_3, i'_4)$ as above such that $i'_1 \leq i_1$ and $i'_2 \geq i_2$;
- the second sum is taken over a finite number of multi-indices $\mathbf{i}'' = (i''_1, i''_2, i''_3, i''_4)$ as above such that either $(i''_1 < i_1)$ or $(i''_1 = i_1 \text{ and } i''_2 \geq \frac{1}{4} + i_2)$ or $(i''_1 = i_1 \text{ and } i''_3 < i_3)$.

Observe that when r is small enough, $c_1 - c_2\varphi \approx 1$ and $\varphi \lesssim r^2 \ll 1$ on $\text{Tube}(B, r)$. Therefore, $I_{i_1, i_2, i_3, i_4}(T, s, r) \leq cI_{i_1, 0, i_3, 0}(T, s, r)$ for a constant $c > 0$ independent of T and $0 < r \leq r$. Consequently, each sum on the RHS of (5.26) is bounded from above by a constant times

$$\sum_{0 \leq q' \leq q_0, 0 \leq j' \leq \min(\bar{m}, k-p-q')} \mathcal{K}_{j', q'}(T, \frac{r_1}{\lambda}, \frac{r_2}{\lambda}).$$

This, combined with (5.24)–(5.25) gives the result. \square

6. THE GENERALIZED LELONG NUMBERS FOR POSITIVE CLOSED CURRENTS

Using the results developed in Section 5 and the arguments in the proof of [46, Theorem 3.7], we will prove Theorem 2.7 in this section.

6.1. Finiteness of the mass indicator $\mathcal{K}_{j, q}$. Fix an open neighborhood W of ∂B in X with $W \subset U$.

Definition 6.1. Fix an open neighborhood U of \bar{B} and an open neighborhood W of ∂B in X with $W \subset U$. Let $m, m' \in \mathbb{N}$ with $m \geq m'$. Let $\widetilde{CL}^{p; m, m'}(U, W)$ be the set of all $T \in CL^{p; m, m'}(U, W)$ whose a sequence of approximating forms $(T_n)_{n=1}^\infty$ (see Definition 3.8) satisfies the following condition:

$$(6.1) \quad \|T_n\|_U \leq 1 \quad \text{and} \quad \|T_n\|_{\mathcal{C}^1(W)} \leq 1.$$

Recall that ω is a Hermitian metric on V .

Theorem 6.2. *Assume that one of the following two conditions is fulfilled:*

- (1) $(m, m') = (1, 1)$ and ω is Kähler.
- (2) $(m, m') = (2, 2)$ and $dd^c\omega^j = 0$ for $\underline{m} \leq j \leq \bar{m} - 1$.

Then there is a constants $c_\tau > 0$ such that for every positive closed current T on U belonging to the class $\widetilde{CL}^{p; m, m'}(U, W)$, we have $\mathcal{K}_{j, q}(T, r) < c_\tau$.

Proof. Under condition (1) the result follows from [46, Theorem 8.7]. Under condition (2) the result follows from [46, Theorem 14.10]. \square

6.2. Existence of Lelong numbers. This subsection is devoted to the proof of assertions (1)–(3) of Theorem 2.7.

Proof of assertion (1) of Theorem 2.7. First assume that the current T is a closed \mathcal{C}^1 -smooth form. Since $\omega^{(j)}$ is closed, we have for $1 \leq j \leq \bar{m}$ that

$$d[(\tau_*T) \wedge \pi^*\omega^{(j)}] = d(\tau_*T) \wedge \pi^*\omega^{(j)} = (\tau_*dT) \wedge \pi^*\omega^{(j)} = 0.$$

Applying Theorem 4.3 to $\tau_*T \wedge \pi^*(\omega^{(j)})$ and using the above equality, we get that

$$(6.2) \quad \nu(T, B, \omega^{(j)}, r_2, \tau) - \nu(T, B, \omega^{(j)}, r_1, \tau) = \int_{\text{Tube}(B, r_1, r_2)} \tau_*T \wedge \pi^*(\omega^{(j)}) \wedge \alpha^{k-p-j} + \mathcal{V}(\tau_*T \wedge \pi^*(\omega^{(j)}), r_1, r_2).$$

On the other hand, since $j \geq \underline{m}$ we get that $k - p - j \leq k - l$. Therefore, we can apply Theorem 4.9 to the current $\tau_*T \wedge \pi^*(\omega^{(j)})$, which gives that $\mathcal{V}(\tau_*T \wedge \pi^*(\omega^{(j)}), r_1, r_2) = O(r_2)$. This proves assertion (1) in the special case where T is \mathcal{C}^1 -smooth.

Now we consider the general case where T is a general positive closed (p, p) -current such that $T = T^+ - T^-$, where T^\pm are approximable along $B \subset V$ by positive closed

\mathcal{C}^1 -smooth (p, p) -forms (T_n^\pm) with \mathcal{C}^1 -control on boundary. So $T_n^+ \rightarrow T^+$ and $T_n^- \rightarrow T^-$ as n tends to infinity. By the previous case applied to T_n^\pm , we get that

$$\nu(T_n^\pm, B, \omega^{(j)}, r_2, \tau) - \nu(T_n^\pm, B, \omega^{(j)}, r_1, \tau) = \kappa(T_n^\pm, B, \omega^{(j)}, r_1, r_2, \tau) + O(r_2).$$

Letting n tend to infinity, we infer that

$$\nu(T^\pm, B, \omega^{(j)}, r_2, \tau) - \nu(T^\pm, B, \omega^{(j)}, r_1, \tau) = \kappa(T^\pm, B, \omega^{(j)}, r_1, r_2, \tau) + O(r_2).$$

This implies assertion (1) since $T = T^+ - T^-$. \square

Proof of assertion (2) of Theorem 2.7. Let $q := k - p - j$. Fix $r_1, r_2 \in (0, \mathbf{r}]$ with $r_1 < r_2/2$. Applying Proposition 5.13 yields for $\lambda > 1$ that

$$(6.3) \quad |\kappa_j(T^\pm, B, \omega^{(j)}, \frac{r_1}{\lambda}, \frac{r_2}{\lambda}, \tau)| < c_8 \sum_{0 \leq q' \leq q, 0 \leq j' \leq \min(\bar{m}, k-p-q')} \mathcal{H}_{j', q'}(T, \frac{r_1}{\lambda} - c_0(\frac{r_1}{\lambda})^2, \frac{r_2}{\lambda} + c_0(\frac{r_2}{\lambda})^2).$$

On the other hand, since there is an $M \in \mathbb{N}$ such that

$$1 \leq \# \left\{ n \in \mathbb{N} : y \in \text{Tube}(B, \frac{r_1}{2^n} - c_0 \frac{r_1^2}{4^n}, \frac{r_2}{2^n} + c_0 \frac{r_2^2}{4^n}) \right\} \leq M \quad \text{for } y \in \text{Tube}(B, \mathbf{r}),$$

it follows that

$$\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \sum_{0 \leq q' \leq q, 0 \leq j' \leq \min(\bar{m}, k-p-q')} \mathcal{H}_{j', q'}(T, \frac{r_1}{2^n} - c_0 \frac{r_1^2}{4^n}, \frac{r_2}{2^n} + c_0 \frac{r_2^2}{4^n}) \leq M \sum_{0 \leq q' \leq q, 0 \leq j' \leq \bar{m}} \mathcal{H}_{j', q'}(T, \mathbf{r}).$$

By Theorem 6.2 the RHS is finite. Therefore, we infer from (6.3) that

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} |\kappa_j(T, B, \omega^{(j)}, \frac{r_1}{2^n} - c_0 \frac{r_1^2}{4^n}, \frac{r_2}{2^n} + c_0 \frac{r_2^2}{4^n}, \tau)| &\leq \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} |\kappa_j(T^+, B, \omega^{(j)}, \frac{r_1}{2^n} - c_0 \frac{r_1^2}{4^n}, \frac{r_2}{2^n} + c_0 \frac{r_2^2}{4^n}, \tau)| \\ &\quad + \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} |\kappa_j(T^-, B, \omega^{(j)}, \frac{r_1}{2^n} - c_0 \frac{r_1^2}{4^n}, \frac{r_2}{2^n} + c_0 \frac{r_2^2}{4^n}, \tau)| \\ &\leq M c_8 \sum_{0 \leq q' \leq q, 0 \leq j' \leq \min(\bar{m}, k-p-q')} \mathcal{H}_{j', q'}(T, \mathbf{r}) < \infty. \end{aligned}$$

Now we apply Lemma 5.8 (2) to functions f^\pm defined by $f^\pm(r) := \nu(T^\pm, B, \omega^{(j)}, r, \tau)$ and

$$\epsilon_\lambda^\pm := 2c_8 \lambda^{-1} + c_8 \sum_{0 \leq q' \leq q, 0 \leq j' \leq \min(\bar{m}, k-p-q')} \mathcal{H}_{j', q'}(T, \frac{r_1}{2^n} - c_0 \frac{r_1^2}{4^n}, \frac{r_2}{2^n} + c_0 \frac{r_2^2}{4^n}).$$

By assertion (1) and inequality (6.3), we have by increasing the constant c_8 if necessary:

$$|f^\pm(\frac{r_2}{\lambda}) - f^\pm(\frac{r_1}{\lambda})| = |\kappa_j(T^\pm, B, \omega^{(j)}, \frac{r_1}{\lambda}, \frac{r_2}{\lambda}, \tau) + O(\lambda^{-1})| \leq \epsilon_\lambda.$$

Hence, assertion (2) follows. \square

Proof of assertion (3) of Theorem 2.7. We start with the proof of the first part of assertion (3). By (2.8) and assertion (1), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \kappa^\bullet(T, B, \omega^{(j)}, r, \tau) &= \limsup_{s \rightarrow 0^+} \kappa(T, B, \omega^{(j)}, s, r, \tau) = \nu(T, B, \omega^{(j)}, r, \tau) - \liminf_{s \rightarrow 0^+} \nu(T, B, \omega^{(j)}, s, \tau) \\ &= \nu(T, B, \omega^{(j)}, r, \tau) - \nu(T, B, \omega^{(j)}, \tau), \end{aligned}$$

where the last equality holds by assertion (2). Consequently, we infer from assertion (2) again that

$$\lim_{r \rightarrow 0^+} \kappa^\bullet(T, B, \omega^{(j)}, r, \tau) = \lim_{r \rightarrow 0^+} \nu(T, B, \omega^{(j)}, r, \tau) - \nu(T, B, \omega^{(j)}, \tau) = 0.$$

We turn to the proof of the second part of assertion (3).

First, we will prove the interpretation of assertion (3) in the spirit of (1.3). Since $q := k - p - j_0 < k - l$, we infer from Theorems 4.6 and 4.9 that

$$\kappa(T_n^\pm, B, \omega^{(j_0)}, r, \tau) = \nu(T_n^\pm, B, \omega^{(j_0)}, r, \tau) + O(r).$$

Consequently,

$$\begin{aligned} \kappa(T, B, \omega^{(j_0)}, r, \tau) &:= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \kappa(T_n^+ - T_n^-, B, \omega^{(j_0)}, r, \tau) \\ &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \nu(T_n^+, B, \omega^{(j_0)}, r, \tau) - \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \nu(T_n^-, B, \omega^{(j_0)}, r, \tau) + O(r) \\ &= \nu(T^+, B, \omega^{(j_0)}, r, \tau) - \nu(T^-, B, \omega^{(j_0)}, r, \tau) + O(r) = \nu(T, B, \omega^{(j_0)}, r, \tau) + O(r). \end{aligned}$$

This implies the desired interpretation according to Definition 2.1.

Second, we will prove the interpretation of assertion (3) in the spirit of (1.4). To start with, we fix $0 < r < \mathbf{r}$ and let $0 < \epsilon < r$. Theorem 4.5 applied to $\tau_* T \wedge \pi^*(\omega^{(j_0)})$ and using $dd^c[\tau_* T \wedge \pi^*(\omega^{(j_0)})] = 0$ gives

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{(r^2 + \epsilon^2)^{k-p-j_0}} \int_{\text{Tube}(B,r)} \tau_* T \wedge \pi^*(\omega^{(j_0)}) \wedge \beta_\epsilon^{k-p-j_0} &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{V}_\epsilon(\tau_* T_n \wedge \pi^*(\omega^{(j_0)}), r) \\ &+ \int_{\text{Tube}(B,r)} \tau_* T \wedge \pi^*(\omega^{(j_0)}) \wedge \alpha_\epsilon^{k-p-j_0}. \end{aligned}$$

Now we let ϵ tend to 0. Then the LHS tends to $\nu(T, B, \omega^{(j_0)}, r, \tau)$. On the other hand, we deduce from (4.7) and Theorem 4.10 that $\mathcal{V}_\epsilon(\tau_* T_n \wedge \pi^*(\omega^{(j_0)}), r) = O(r)$. Consequently, the second term on the RHS tends to $\nu(T, B, \omega^{(j_0)}, r, \tau) + O(r)$. This proves the desired interpretation according to Definition 2.2. \square

6.3. Independence of admissible maps. In this subsection we will prove assertions (5) and (6) of Theorem 2.7.

Fix j_0 with $\underline{m} \leq j_0 \leq \overline{m}$ and fix a closed smooth real (j_0, j_0) -form $\omega^{(j_0)}$ on V_0 . Writing $\omega^{(j_0)} = (\omega^{(j_0)} + c\omega^{j_0}) - c\omega^{j_0}$ for a large constant $c > 0$ so that $\omega^{(j_0)} + c\omega^{j_0}$ is a strictly positive form, we are reduced to working on two strictly positive forms $\omega^{(j_0)} + c\omega^{j_0}$ and $c\omega^{j_0}$. Consequently, we may assume without loss of generality that $\omega^{(j_0)}$ is strictly positive form on V_0 . In the remainder of the subsection, we use formula (5.23) for $I_j(s, r)$ and $\tilde{I}_j^\#(s, r)$, where $\omega^{(j_3)}$ with $j_3 = j \geq j_0$ is defined by

$$\omega^{(j)} := \omega^{(j_0)} \wedge \omega^{j-j_0}.$$

Using the compactness of \overline{B} in V , we can write

$$(6.4) \quad \omega^{(j_0)} = \sum_{I_0 \in \mathcal{I}_0} \gamma_{I_0 1} \wedge \dots \wedge \gamma_{I_0 j_0},$$

where $\gamma_{I_1}, \dots, \gamma_{I_j}$ are \mathcal{C}^1 -smooth forms of bidegree $(1, 1)$ compactly supported in V_0 , and \mathcal{I}_0 is a nonempty finite index set.

Consider the following mass indicators, for j with $j_0 \leq j \leq \bar{m}$:

$$(6.5) \quad \hat{\nu}_j(T, r) := \frac{1}{r^{2(k-p-j)}} \int_{\text{Tube}(B, r)} \tau_* T \wedge (\beta + c_1 r^2 \pi^* \omega)^{k-p-j} \wedge \pi^* \omega^{(j)}.$$

We also consider the following new mass indicators, where $T^\#$ and $T_r^\#$ are given in (5.16) and (5.17):

$$(6.6) \quad \begin{aligned} \widehat{\mathcal{M}}_j^\#(T, r) &:= \frac{1}{r^{2(k-p-j)}} \int_{\text{Tube}(B, r)} T^\# \wedge (\beta + c_1 r^2 \pi^* \omega)^{k-p-j} \wedge \pi^* \omega^{(j)}, \\ \mathcal{M}_j^\#(T, r) &:= \frac{1}{r^{2(k-p-j)}} \int T_r^\# \wedge (\beta + c_1 r^2 \pi^* \omega)^{k-p-j} \wedge \pi^* \omega^{(j)}. \end{aligned}$$

Lemma 6.3. *There is a constant $c > 0$ such that for every $\underline{m} \leq j \leq \bar{m}$ and $0 < r \leq \mathbf{r}$:*

$$|\mathcal{M}_j^\#(T, r) - \hat{\nu}_j(T, r)| \leq cr \sum_{q=\underline{m}}^{\bar{m}} \mathcal{M}_q^\#(T, r).$$

Proof. By Propositions 5.6, for every smooth real $(1, 1)$ -form γ on V_0 , there are constants $c_3, c_4 > 0$ such that $c_3 r^2 \pi^* \omega + c_4 \beta \geq 0$ on $\text{Tube}(B, r)$ for $0 < r \leq \mathbf{r}$, and that for every $1 \leq \ell \leq \ell_0$, the following inequalities hold on $\mathbb{U}_\ell \cap \text{Tube}(B, r)$ for $0 < r \leq \mathbf{r}$:

$$(6.7) \quad \begin{aligned} \pm(\tilde{\tau}_\ell^*(\pi^* \gamma) - \pi^* \gamma - H)^\# &\lesssim c_3 r \pi^* \omega + c_4 r (\beta + c_1 r^2 \pi^* \omega), \\ \pm(\tilde{\tau}_\ell^*(\beta + c_1 r^2 \pi^* \omega) - (\beta + c_1 r^2 \pi^* \omega))^\# &\lesssim c_3 r^3 \pi^* \omega + c_4 r (\beta + c_1 r^2 \pi^* \omega). \end{aligned}$$

Here, on the LHS of the first line, H is some form in the class \mathcal{H} given in Definition 5.5. We also have that

$$(6.8) \quad \begin{aligned} &\{(\tilde{\tau}_\ell^*(\pi^* \gamma) - \pi^* \gamma), (\tilde{\tau}_\ell^*(\beta + c_1 r^2 \pi^* \omega) - (\beta + c_1 r^2 \pi^* \omega))\} \\ &\leq \{(c_3 r \pi^* \omega + c_4 r (\beta + c_1 r^2 \pi^* \omega)), (c_3 r^3 \pi^* \omega + c_4 r (\beta + c_1 r^2 \pi^* \omega))\}. \end{aligned}$$

Arguing as in the proof of Lemma 5.12, we are in the position to apply Lemma 5.7. We come back the statement of this lemma. Consider the $(1, 1)$ -forms $\gamma_{I_1}, \dots, \gamma_{I_{j_0}}$ appearing in (6.4). For every $I_0 \in \mathcal{I}_0$, let R_1, \dots, R_{k-p} be the $k-p$ forms among $\{\pi^* \omega, \beta + c_1 r^2 \pi^* \omega, \gamma_{I_0 1}, \dots, \gamma_{I_0 j_0}\}$ which appear in the integral of $\hat{\nu}_j(T, r)$ in (6.5) where $\omega^{(j_0)}$ is replaced by $\gamma_{I_0 1} \wedge \dots \wedge \gamma_{I_0 j_0}$. So setting $R^I := R_1 \wedge \dots \wedge R_{k-p}$, we get

$$\hat{\nu}_j(T, r) = \sum_{I_0 \in \mathcal{I}_0} \frac{1}{r^{2(k-p-j)}} \int_{\text{Tube}(B, r)} \tau_* T \wedge R^{(I_0)}.$$

Now we define R'_1, \dots, R'_{k-p} as follows. If $R_j \in \{\pi^* \omega, \gamma_{I_0 1}, \dots, \gamma_{I_0 j_0}\}$, set $R'_j := c_1 \pi^* \omega + \beta$, otherwise $R_j = \beta + c_1 r^2 \pi^* \omega$ and set $R'_j := R_j$. Let S_1, \dots, S_{k-p} be the corresponding positive $(1, 1)$ -form associated to R_1, \dots, R_{k-p} respectively on the RHS of (6.7). Let S'_1, \dots, S'_{k-p} be the corresponding positive $(1, 1)$ -form associated to R_1, \dots, R_{k-p} respectively on the RHS of (6.8). Let H_1, \dots, H_{k-p} be the corresponding real $(1, 1)$ -forms associated to R_1, \dots, R_{k-p} respectively on the LHS of each inequality of (6.7).

The rest of the proof follows along the same lines as those given in the proof of [46, Lemma 8.10] making the obviously necessary adaptation. \square

Proposition 6.4. For $j_0 \leq j \leq \bar{m}$, we have that

$$\lim_{r \rightarrow 0^+} \mathcal{M}_j^\#(T, r) = \lim_{r \rightarrow 0^+} \hat{\nu}(T, r) = \sum_{q=0}^{k-p-j} \binom{k-p-j}{q} c_1^q \nu(T, B, \omega^{(j+q)}, \tau).$$

Proof. Using formula (6.5) and arguing as in the proof of Lemma 6.1 in [46], we obtain the following identity:

$$\hat{\nu}_j(T, r) = \sum_{q=0}^{k-p-j} \binom{k-p-j}{q} c_1^q \nu(T, B, \omega^{(j+q)}, r, \tau).$$

Next, letting r tend to 0 in this identity, we infer from Theorem 2.7 (2) that

$$(6.9) \quad \lim_{r \rightarrow 0^+} \hat{\nu}_j(T, r) = \sum_{q=0}^{k-p-j} \binom{k-p-j}{q} c_1^q \nu(T, B, \omega^{(j+q)}, \tau).$$

This proves the second identity of the proposition.

It remains to show the first identity. Applying Lemma 6.3 yields that there is a constant $c > 0$ such that for $0 < r \leq \mathbf{r}$,

$$(6.10) \quad \left| \sum_{j=\underline{m}}^{\bar{m}} \mathcal{M}_j^\#(T, r) - \sum_{j=\underline{m}}^{\bar{m}} \hat{\nu}_j(T, r) \right| \leq cr \sum_{j=\underline{m}}^{\bar{m}} \mathcal{M}_j^\#(T, r).$$

This, combined with (6.9), implies that there is a constant $c > 0$ such that

$$\sum_{j=\underline{m}}^{\bar{m}} \mathcal{M}_j^\#(T, r) \leq c \quad \text{for} \quad 0 < r \leq \mathbf{r}.$$

Therefore, we infer from Lemma 6.3 that $|\mathcal{M}_j^\#(T, r) - \hat{\nu}_j(T, r)| \leq cr$ for $\underline{m} \leq j \leq \bar{m}$. Letting r tend to 0, the first identity of the proposition follows. \square

Proof of assertion (5) of Theorem 2.7. As in the beginning of the subsection, fix j_0 with $\underline{m} \leq j_0 \leq \bar{m}$. Let τ and τ' be two strongly admissible maps. For $1 \leq \ell \leq \ell_0$ we define $\tilde{\tau}'_\ell := \tau' \circ \tau_\ell^{-1}$ according to formula (5.15). So $\tilde{\tau}'_\ell$ is defined in the same way as $\tilde{\tau}_\ell$ using τ' instead of τ . Similarly, we define $T'^\#$ and $T_r'^\#$ according to formulas (5.16) and (5.17) by using $\tilde{\tau}'_\ell$ instead of $\tilde{\tau}_\ell$. Similarly, we define $\widehat{\mathcal{M}}_j'^\#(T, r)$ and $\mathcal{M}_j'^\#(T, r)$ according to formula (6.6) by using $T'^\#$ and $T_r'^\#$ instead of $T^\#$ and $T_r^\#$.

We need to show that

$$(6.11) \quad \nu(T, B, \omega^{(j)}, \tau) = \nu(T, B, \omega^{(j)}, \tau') \quad \text{for} \quad j_0 \leq j \leq \bar{m}.$$

By (6.7) there are constants $c_3, c_4 > 0$ such that $c_3 r^2 \pi^* \omega + c_4 \beta \geq 0$ on $\text{Tube}(B, r)$ for $0 < r \leq \mathbf{r}$, and that for every $1 \leq \ell \leq \ell_0$, the following inequalities hold on $\mathbb{U}_\ell \cap \text{Tube}(B, r)$ for $0 < r \leq \mathbf{r}$:

$$(6.12) \quad \begin{aligned} & \pm (\tilde{\tau}_\ell^*(\pi^* \gamma) - (\tilde{\tau}'_\ell)^*(\pi^* \gamma) - H) \lesssim c_3 r \pi^* \omega + c_4 r (\beta + c_1 r^2 \pi^* \omega), \\ & \pm (\tilde{\tau}_\ell^*(\beta + c_1 r^2 \pi^* \omega) - (\tilde{\tau}'_\ell)^*(\beta + c_1 r^2 \pi^* \omega)) \lesssim c_3 r^3 \pi^* \omega + c_4 r (\beta + c_1 r^2 \pi^* \omega). \end{aligned}$$

Here, H is some form in the class \mathcal{H} given in Definition 5.5.

By (6.8) for every $1 \leq \ell \leq \ell_0$, the following inequality holds on $\mathbb{U}_\ell \cap \text{Tube}(B, r)$ for $0 < r \leq \mathbf{r}$:

$$(6.13) \quad \begin{aligned} & \{ (\tilde{\tau}_\ell^*(\pi^* \gamma) - (\tilde{\tau}'_\ell)^*(\pi^* \gamma)), (\tilde{\tau}_\ell^*(\beta + c_1 r^2 \pi^* \omega) - (\tilde{\tau}'_\ell)^*(\beta + c_1 r^2 \pi^* \omega)) \} \\ & \leq \{ (c_3 r \pi^* \omega + c_4 r (\beta + c_1 r^2 \pi^* \omega)), (c_3 r^3 \pi^* \omega + c_4 r (\beta + c_1 r^2 \pi^* \omega)) \}. \end{aligned}$$

Using (6.12)–(6.13) and arguing as in the proof of Lemma 6.3 we can show that there is a constant $c > 0$ such that for every $j_0 \leq j \leq \bar{m}$ and $0 < r \leq \mathbf{r}$:

$$|\mathcal{M}_j^\#(T, r) - \mathcal{M}'_j^\#(T, r)| \leq cr \sum_{j=j_0}^{\bar{m}} \mathcal{M}_j^\#(T, r).$$

Thus by Proposition 6.4, $|\mathcal{M}_j^\#(T, r) - \mathcal{M}'_j^\#(T, r)| \leq cr$. So by this proposition again, we get that

$$\lim_{r \rightarrow 0} \mathcal{M}'_j^\#(T, r) = \lim_{r \rightarrow 0^+} \hat{\nu}_{j_0}(T, r) = \sum_{q=0}^{k-p-j_0} \binom{k-p-j_0}{q} \nu(T, B, \omega^{(j_0+q)}, \tau).$$

Hence, for $j_0 \leq j \leq \bar{m}$, we have

$$\sum_{q=0}^{k-p-j} \binom{k-p-j}{q} \nu(T, B, \omega^{(j_0+q)}, \tau) = \sum_{q=0}^{k-p-j} \binom{k-p-j}{q} \nu(T, B, \omega^{(j_0+q)}, \tau').$$

These equalities imply (6.11). The proof is thereby completed. \square

7. THE GENERALIZED LELONG NUMBERS FOR POSITIVE PLURISUBHARMONIC CURRENTS

In Subsection 7.1 we adapt to the present more general context the results obtained in [46, Sections 11, 12]. Using this Subsection 7.2 first presents suitable adaptation of [46, Section 13]. The remainder of the subsection is devoted to the proof of Theorem 2.5.

7.1. m -negligible test forms and abstract estimates. Recall from Subsection 5.4 that for every $1 \leq \ell \leq \ell_0$, there is a local coordinate system $y = (z, w)$ on \mathbb{U}_ℓ with $V \cap \mathbb{U}_\ell = \{z = 0\}$.

Definition 7.1. Let S be a differential form (resp. a current) defined on $\text{Tube}(B, r) \subset \mathbb{E}$ for some $0 < r \leq \mathbf{r}$. So we can write in a local representation of S in coordinates $y = (z, w) \in \mathbb{C}^{k-l} \times \mathbb{C}^l$:

$$(7.1) \quad S = \sum_{M=(I,J;K,L)} S_M dz_I \wedge d\bar{z}_J \wedge dw_K \wedge d\bar{w}_L,$$

where the $S_M = S_{I,J;K,L}(z, w)$ are the component functions (resp. component distributions), and the sum is taken over $M = (I, J; K, L)$ with $I, J \subset \{1, \dots, k-l\}$ and $K, L \subset \{1, \dots, l\}$.

For $M = (I, J; K, L)$ as above, we also write dy_M instead of $dz_I \wedge d\bar{z}_J \wedge dw_K \wedge d\bar{w}_L$.

Given $0 \leq m \leq 2l$, we say that a bounded differential form S is m -negligible if in the above representation, for every I, J, K, L , it holds that $S_{I,J;K,L}$ is smooth outside V and $S_{I,J;K,L}(z, w) = O(\|z\|^{e(m,K,L)})$, where

$$e(m, K, L) := \max(0, |K| + |L| - m) \in \mathbb{N}.$$

Let T be positive plurisubharmonic current T of bidegree (p, p) on \mathbb{U} . Consider the integers

$$(7.2) \quad \underline{m}^+ := \max(0, l - p - 1) \quad \text{and} \quad \bar{m}^+ := \min(l, k - p - 1).$$

In other words, $\underline{m}^+, \bar{m}^+$ are associated to the $(p+1, p+1)$ -current $dd^c T$ in the same way as \underline{m}, \bar{m} are associated to the (p, p) -current T in formula (1.7).

Following the model of (5.21), consider the following mass indicators, for $0 < r \leq \mathbf{r}$,

$$(7.3) \quad \begin{aligned} \mathcal{M}^{\text{tot}}(T, r) &:= \sum_{j=0}^{\bar{\mathbf{m}}} \mathcal{M}_j(T, r), & \mathcal{M}^{\text{tot}}(dd^c T, r) &:= \sum_{j=0}^{\bar{\mathbf{m}}^+} \mathcal{M}_j(dd^c T, r) \\ \mathcal{N}(T, r) &:= \mathcal{M}^{\text{tot}}(T, r) + \mathcal{M}^{\text{tot}}(dd^c T, r) = \sum_{j=0}^{\bar{\mathbf{m}}} \mathcal{M}_j(T, r) + \sum_{j=0}^{\bar{\mathbf{m}}^+} \mathcal{M}_j(dd^c T, r). \end{aligned}$$

where the \mathcal{M}_j 's are defined in (5.21).

In this section following Definition 6.1, we introduce the following class of currents.

Definition 7.2. Fix an open neighborhood \mathbf{U} of \bar{B} and an open neighborhood \mathbf{W} of ∂B in X with $\mathbf{W} \subset \mathbf{U}$. Let $\widetilde{\text{SH}}_p^{p;3,3}(\mathbf{U}, \mathbf{W})$ be the set of all $T \in \text{SH}^{p;3,3}(\mathbf{U}, \mathbf{W})$ whose a sequence of approximating forms $(T_n)_{n=1}^\infty$ satisfies the following condition:

$$(7.4) \quad \|T_n\|_{\mathbf{U}} \leq 1 \quad \text{and} \quad \|dd^c T_n\|_{\mathbf{U}} \leq 1 \quad \text{and} \quad \|T_n\|_{\mathcal{C}^3(\mathbf{W})} \leq 1.$$

Given a class of currents \mathcal{F} and a mass indicator $\mathcal{M}(T)$ for all currents $T \in \mathcal{F}$, We denote by $\sup_{T \in \mathcal{F}} \mathcal{M}(T)$ the supremum of $\mathcal{M}(T)$ when T is taken over \mathcal{F} .

Recall the notation from the Standing Hypothesis in Subsection 5.4. Fix an integer j with $\underline{\mathbf{m}} \leq j \leq \bar{\mathbf{m}}$ and a smooth (j, j) -form $\omega^{(j)}$ on V_0 . Consider the forms on \mathbf{U} :

$$(7.5) \quad \Phi := \pi^*(\omega^{(j)}) \wedge \beta^{k-p-j-1} \quad \text{and} \quad \Phi^{(\ell)} := (\pi^* \theta_\ell) \cdot \pi^*(\omega^{(j)}) \wedge \beta^{k-p-j-1} \quad \text{for} \quad 1 \leq \ell \leq \ell_0.$$

So we have

$$(7.6) \quad \Phi = \sum_{\ell=1}^{\ell_0} \Phi^{(\ell)} \quad \text{on} \quad \mathbf{U}.$$

For ℓ with $1 \leq \ell \leq \ell_0$ and set $\tilde{\tau} := \tilde{\tau}_\ell$. For $r \in (0, \mathbf{r}]$, set $\mathbb{H}_r := \text{Tube}(\tilde{V}_\ell, r) \subset \mathbb{E}$.

Let T be a positive plurisubharmonic current on \mathbf{U} in the class $\widetilde{\text{SH}}^{p;3,3}(\mathbf{U}, \mathbf{W})$. Consider the current

$$(7.7) \quad S^{(\ell)} := (\tau_\ell)_*(T|_{\mathbf{U}_\ell}).$$

By (5.16) we get that

$$(7.8) \quad T^\# = \sum_{\ell=1}^{\ell_0} (\pi^* \theta_\ell) \cdot S^{(\ell)}.$$

Note that the current $S^{(\ell)}$ is positive plurisubharmonic on \mathbb{H}_r . Moreover, arguing as in the proof of [46, Lemma 11.6], we can check that $\Phi^{(\ell)}$ is a $2j$ -negligible smooth form. By [46, Proposition 11.41], there are

- two functions $\mathcal{I}_1^{(\ell)}, \mathcal{I}_2^{(\ell)} : (0, \mathbf{r}] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$;
- three differential operators $D_{10}^{(\ell)}, D_{11}^{(\ell)}, D_{12}^{(\ell)}$ in the class $\widehat{\mathcal{D}}_\ell^0$; and three differential operators $D_{20}^{(\ell)}, D_{21}^{(\ell)}, D_{22}^{(\ell)}$ in the class \mathcal{D}_ℓ^0 ;
- three smooth $2q$ -forms $\Phi_{10}^{(\ell)}$ which is $(2j-1)$ -negligible, $\Phi_{11}^{(\ell)}$ which is $2j$ -negligible, $\Phi_{12}^{(\ell)}$ which is $(2j-1)$ -negligible; and three smooth $2q$ -forms $\Phi_{20}^{(\ell)}$ which is $2j$ -negligible, $\Phi_{21}^{(\ell)}$ which is $(2j+1)$ -negligible, $\Phi_{22}^{(\ell)}$ which is $2j$ -negligible;

such that every $0 < r_1 < r_2 \leq \mathbf{r}$ and every smooth function χ on $(0, \mathbf{r}]$, we have for $\nu \in \{1, 2\}$,

(7.9)

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{r_1}^{r_2} \chi(t) \mathcal{I}_\nu^{(\ell)}(t) dt &= \int_{\text{Tube}(B, r_1, r_2)} \chi(\|y\|) (D_{\nu 1}^{(\ell)} S^{(\ell)} \wedge \Phi_{\nu 1}^{(\ell)})(y) + \int_{\text{Tube}(B, r_1, r_2)} \chi'(\|y\|) (D_{\nu 2}^{(\ell)} S^{(\ell)} \wedge \Phi_{\nu 2}^{(\ell)})(y) \\ &+ \int_{\partial_{\text{hor}} \text{Tube}(B, r_2)} \chi(r_2) (D_{\nu 0}^{(\ell)} S^{(\ell)} \wedge \Phi_{\nu 0}^{(\ell)})(y) - \int_{\partial_{\text{hor}} \text{Tube}(B, r_1)} \chi(r_1) (D_{\nu 0}^{(\ell)} S^{(\ell)} \wedge \Phi_{\nu 0}^{(\ell)})(y), \end{aligned}$$

and that the following inequality holds for all $0 < t \leq \mathbf{r}$:

(7.10)

$$\frac{1}{r^{2(k-p-j)}} \int_{\frac{r}{2}}^r \left| \langle dd^c[(\tilde{\tau}_\ell)_* S^{(\ell)}] - (\tilde{\tau}_\ell)_*(dd^c S^{(\ell)}), \Phi^{(\ell)} \rangle_{\tilde{\tau}(\mathbb{H}_t)} - \mathcal{I}_1^{(\ell)}(t) - \mathcal{I}_2^{(\ell)}(t) \right| dt \leq \sum_{m=\underline{m}}^{\bar{m}} \nu_m(S^{(\ell)}, B, r, \text{id}).$$

Recall from [46, Lemma 12.2] the following result.

Lemma 7.3. *The following equalities hold:*

$$\begin{aligned} (\tilde{\tau}_\ell)_* S^{(\ell)} &= \tau_* T \quad \text{and} \quad (\tilde{\tau}_\ell)_*(dd^c S^{(\ell)}) = \tau_*(dd^c T) \quad \text{on} \quad \mathbf{U}_\ell, \\ \sum_{\ell=1}^{\ell_0} dd^c[(\tilde{\tau}_\ell)_* S^{(\ell)}] \wedge \Phi^{(\ell)} &= dd^c(\tau_* T) \wedge \Phi \quad \text{and} \quad \sum_{\ell=1}^{\ell_0} (\tilde{\tau}_\ell)_*(dd^c S^{(\ell)}) \wedge \Phi^{(\ell)} = \tau_*(dd^c T) \wedge \Phi \quad \text{on} \quad \mathbf{U}. \end{aligned}$$

Recall from [46, Lemma 12.3] the following result.

Lemma 7.4. *Under the above hypotheses and notations, there is a constant c independent of T such that for $\nu \in \{1, 2\}$ and for all $1 \leq \ell \leq \ell_0$ and for all $0 < r \leq \mathbf{r}$:*

$$\frac{1}{r^{2(k-p-j)}} \int_{\frac{r}{2}}^r \left| \int_{\partial_{\text{hor}} \text{Tube}(B, t)} (D_{\nu 0}^{(\ell)} S^{(\ell)} \wedge \Phi_{\nu 0}^{(\ell)}) \right| dt \leq cr^2 \mathcal{M}^{\text{tot}}(T, r).$$

Consider two functions $\chi_1, \chi_2 : (0, r] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$ defined by

$$(7.11) \quad \chi_1(t) := \frac{t}{r^{2(k-p-j)}} \quad \text{and} \quad \chi_2(t) := \frac{1}{t^{2(k-p-j)-1}} \quad \text{for} \quad t \in (0, r].$$

Recall from [46, Lemma 12.4] the following result.

Lemma 7.5. *Under the above hypotheses and notations, let $0 < r \leq \mathbf{r}$. Then there is a constant c independent of T and r such that for $\nu \in \{1, 2\}$ and for all $1 \leq \ell \leq \ell_0$ and for all $0 < s < r$:*

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \int_{\text{Tube}(B, s, r)} \chi(\|y\|) (D_{\nu 1}^{(\ell)} S^{(\ell)} \wedge \Phi_{\nu 1}^{(\ell)})(y) \right| &\leq c \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{r}{2^n} \mathcal{M}^{\text{tot}}\left(T, \frac{r}{2^n}\right), \\ \left| \int_{\text{Tube}(B, s, r)} \chi'(\|y\|) (D_{\nu 2}^{(\ell)} S^{(\ell)} \wedge \Phi_{\nu 2}^{(\ell)})(y) \right| &\leq c \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{r}{2^n} \mathcal{M}^{\text{tot}}\left(T, \frac{r}{2^n}\right). \end{aligned}$$

Here χ is either the function χ_1 or the function χ_2 given in (7.11).

7.2. Basic estimates and finiteness of the mass indicators $\mathcal{K}_{j,q}$ and $\mathcal{L}_{j,q}$. Let $\underline{m} \leq i \leq \bar{m}$ and let $\omega^{(i)}$ be a strictly positive closed smooth (i, i) -form on V_0 .

Using Subsection 7.1, we first adapt to the present more general context the results of [46, Section 13]. We only state these results.

Lemma 7.6. (See [46, Lemma 13.1]). *There is a constant $c > 0$ such that for every j with $\underline{m} \leq j \leq \overline{m}$, and every m with $i \leq j - m$, and every positive plurisubharmonic current T in the class $\widetilde{\text{SH}}^{p;3,3}(\mathbf{U}, \mathbf{W})$, there exists a function $(0, \mathbf{r}] \ni r \rightarrow \tilde{r}$ (depending on T) with $\frac{r}{2} \leq \tilde{r} \leq r$ such that the following two inequalities hold for $0 < s < r \leq \mathbf{r}$:*

$$\left| \int_{\tilde{s}}^{\tilde{r}} \left(\frac{1}{t^{2(k-p-j)}} - \frac{1}{r^{2(k-p-j)}} \right) 2t dt \int_{\text{Tube}(B,t)} (dd^c(\tau_* T) - \tau_*(dd^c T)) \wedge \pi^*(\omega^{(i)} \wedge \omega^{j-m-i}) \wedge \beta^{k-p-j+m-1} \right| \leq cr^{2m+1} \mathcal{M}^{\text{tot}}(T, r),$$

Lemma 7.7. (See [46, Lemma 13.2]). *There is a constant $c > 0$ such that for every j with $\underline{m} \leq j \leq \overline{m}$, and every m with $1 \leq m$ and $i \leq j - m$, and every positive plurisubharmonic current T in the class $\widetilde{\text{SH}}^{p;3,3}(\mathbf{U}, \mathbf{W})$, the following properties hold for every $0 < s < r \leq \mathbf{r}$:*

$$\left| \int_{\tilde{s}}^{\tilde{r}} \left(\frac{1}{t^{2(k-p-j)}} - \frac{1}{r^{2(k-p-j)}} \right) 2t dt \int_{\text{Tube}(B,t)} \tau_*(dd^c T) \wedge \pi^*(\omega^{(i)} \wedge \omega^{j-m-i}) \wedge \beta^{k-p-j+m-1} \right| \leq cr^{2m} \mathcal{M}^{\text{tot}}(dd^c T, r).$$

As an immediate consequence of Lemmas 7.6 and 7.7, we obtain the following result.

Corollary 7.8. (See [46, Corollary 13.3]). *There is a constant $c > 0$ such that for every j with $\underline{m} \leq j \leq \overline{m}$, and every m with $1 \leq m$ and $i \leq j - m$, and every positive plurisubharmonic current T in the class $\widetilde{\text{SH}}^{p;3,3}(\mathbf{U}, \mathbf{W})$, the following inequality holds:*

$$\left| \int_{\tilde{s}}^{\tilde{r}} \left(\frac{1}{t^{2(k-p-j)}} - \frac{1}{r^{2(k-p-j)}} \right) 2t dt \int_{\text{Tube}(B,t)} dd^c(\tau_* T) \wedge \pi^*(\omega^{(i)} \wedge \omega^{j-m-i}) \wedge \beta^{k-p-j+m-1} \right| \leq cr^{2m} \mathcal{N}(T, r).$$

Fix an open neighborhood \mathbf{W} of ∂B in X with $\mathbf{W} \subset \mathbf{U}$. Recall the class $\widetilde{\text{SH}}^{p;3,3}(\mathbf{U}, \mathbf{W})$ given in Definition 7.2.

For $0 < r \leq \mathbf{r}$ and $0 \leq q \leq k - l$ and $0 \leq i \leq j \leq k - p - q$, consider following global mass indicator

$$(7.12) \quad \mathcal{L}_{i,j,q}(T, r) := \int_0^r \frac{2dt}{t^{2q-1}} \left(\int_{\text{Tube}(B,t)} (dd^c T)^\# \wedge \pi^*(\omega^{(i)} \wedge \omega^{j-i}) \wedge (\beta + c_1 t^2 \pi^* \omega)^{k-p-j-1} \right).$$

Since $\beta + c_1 t^2 \pi^* \omega$ is a positive form on $\text{Tube}(B, t)$, it follows that $\mathcal{L}_{j,q}(T, r) \geq 0$.

Lemma 7.9. (See [46, Lemma 13.4]). *There is a constant $c > 0$ such that for every positive plurisubharmonic current T on \mathbf{U} belonging to the class $\widetilde{\text{SH}}^{p;3,3}(\mathbf{U}, \mathbf{W})$, and every $0 < r \leq \mathbf{r}$ and $i, j, q \geq 0$ as above, we have*

$$\left| \int_0^{\tilde{r}} \frac{2dt}{t^{2q-1}} \left(\int_{\text{Tube}(B,t)} \tau_*(dd^c T) \wedge \pi^*(\omega^{(i)} \wedge \omega^{j-i}) \wedge (\beta + c_1 t^2 \pi^* \omega)^{k-p-j-1} \right) - \mathcal{L}_{j,q}(T, r) \right| \leq cr \mathcal{M}^{\text{tot}}(dd^c T, r).$$

Lemma 7.10. (See [46, Lemma 13.5]). *There is a constant $c > 0$ such that for every positive plurisubharmonic current T on \mathbf{U} belonging to the class $\widetilde{\text{SH}}^{p;3,3}(\mathbf{U}, \mathbf{W})$, and every*

$0 < r \leq \mathbf{r}$ and $i, j, q \geq 0$ as above, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \int_0^{\tilde{r}} \frac{2dt}{t^{2q-1}} \left(\int_{\text{Tube}(B,t)} \tau_*(dd^c T) \wedge \pi^*(\omega^{(i)} \wedge \omega^{j-i}) \wedge (\beta + c_1 t^2 \pi^* \omega)^{k-p-j-1} \right) \right. \\ & \left. - \int_0^{\tilde{r}} \frac{2dt}{t^{2q-1}} \left(\int_{\text{Tube}(B,t)} dd^c(\tau_* T) \wedge \pi^*(\omega^{(i)} \wedge \omega^{j-i}) \wedge (\beta + c_1 t^2 \pi^* \omega)^{k-p-j-1} \right) \right| \leq cr \mathcal{N}(T, r). \end{aligned}$$

Lemma 7.11. (See [46, Lemma 13.6]). *There is a constant $c > 0$ such that for every positive plurisubharmonic current T on \mathbf{U} belonging to the class $\widetilde{\text{SH}}^{p;3,3}(\mathbf{U}, \mathbf{W})$, and every $0 < r \leq \mathbf{r}$ and $i, j, q \geq 0$ as above, we have*

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \int_0^{\tilde{r}} \frac{2dt}{t^{2q-1}} \left(\int_{\text{Tube}(B,t)} \tau_*(dd^c T) \wedge \pi^*(\omega^{(i)} \wedge \omega^{j-i}) \wedge \beta^{k-p-j-1} \right) \right. \\ & \left. - \int_0^{\tilde{r}} \frac{2dt}{t^{2q-1}} \left(\int_{\text{Tube}(B,t)} (dd^c T)^\# \wedge \pi^*(\omega^{(i)} \wedge \omega^{j-i}) \wedge \beta^{k-p-j-1} \right) \right| \leq cr \mathcal{M}^{\text{tot}}(dd^c T, r). \end{aligned}$$

Lemma 7.12. (See [46, Lemma 13.7]). *There is a constant $c > 0$ such that for every j with $\underline{m}^+ \leq j \leq \overline{m}^+$, and for every positive plurisubharmonic current T in the class $\widetilde{\text{SH}}^{p;3,3}(\mathbf{U}, \mathbf{W})$, and for every $0 < r \leq \mathbf{r}$, we have*

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \mathcal{L}_{j,q}(T, \tilde{r}) - \int_0^{\tilde{r}} \frac{2dt}{t^{2q-1}} \left(\int_{\text{Tube}(B,t)} (dd^c T)^\# \wedge \pi^*(\omega^j) \wedge \beta^{k-p-j-1} \right) \right| \\ & \leq c \sum_{j'=1}^{\overline{m}-j} \mathcal{L}_{i,j+j',q-j'}(T, r) + c \mathcal{N}(T, r). \end{aligned}$$

Lemma 7.13. (See [46, Lemma 13.8]). *There is a constant $c > 0$ such that for every positive plurisubharmonic current T on \mathbf{U} belonging to the class $\widetilde{\text{SH}}^{p;3,3}(\mathbf{U}, \mathbf{W})$, and every $0 < r \leq \mathbf{r}$ and $i, j, q \geq 0$ as above, we have*

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \int_0^{\tilde{r}} \left(\frac{1}{t^{2q}} - \frac{1}{\tilde{r}^{2q}} \right) 2tdt \left(\int_{\text{Tube}(B,t)} \tau_*(dd^c T) \wedge \pi^*(\omega^{(i)} \wedge \omega^{j-i}) \wedge \beta^{k-p-j-1} \right) \right. \\ & \left. - \int_0^{\tilde{r}} \left(\frac{1}{t^{2q}} - \frac{1}{\tilde{r}^{2q}} \right) 2tdt \left(\int_{\text{Tube}(B,t)} dd^c(\tau_* T) \wedge \pi^*(\omega^{(i)} \wedge \omega^{j-i}) \wedge \beta^{k-p-j-1} \right) \right| \leq cr \mathcal{N}(T, r). \end{aligned}$$

Lemma 7.14. (See [46, Lemma 13.9]). *There is a constant $c > 0$ such that for every positive plurisubharmonic current T on \mathbf{U} belonging to the class $\widetilde{\text{SH}}^{p;3,3}(\mathbf{U}, \mathbf{W})$, and every $0 < r \leq \mathbf{r}$ and $i, j, q \geq 0$ as above, we have*

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \int_0^{\tilde{r}} \left(\frac{1}{t^{2q}} - \frac{1}{\tilde{r}^{2q}} \right) 2tdt \left(\int_{\text{Tube}(B,t)} \tau_*(dd^c T) \wedge \pi^*(\omega^{(i)} \wedge \omega^{j-i}) \wedge \beta^{k-p-j-1} \right) \right. \\ & \left. - \int_0^{\tilde{r}} \left(\frac{1}{t^{2q}} - \frac{1}{\tilde{r}^{2q}} \right) 2tdt \left(\int_{\text{Tube}(B,t)} (dd^c T)^\# \wedge \pi^*(\omega^{(i)} \wedge \omega^{j-i}) \wedge \beta^{k-p-j-1} \right) \right| \leq cr \mathcal{M}^{\text{tot}}(dd^c T, r). \end{aligned}$$

Lemma 7.15. (See [46, Lemma 13.10]). *There is a constant $c > 0$ such that for every j with $\underline{m}^+ \leq j \leq \overline{m}^+$, and for every positive plurisubharmonic current T in the class*

$\widetilde{\text{SH}}^{p;3,3}(\mathbf{U}, \mathbf{W})$, and for every $0 < r \leq \mathbf{r}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \mathcal{L}_{i,j,q}(T, \tilde{r}) - \int_0^{\tilde{r}} \left(\frac{1}{t^{2q}} - \frac{1}{\tilde{r}^{2q}} \right) 2t dt \left(\int_{\text{Tube}(B,t)} (dd^c T)^\# \wedge \pi^*(\omega^{(i)} \wedge \omega^{j-i}) \wedge \beta^{k-p-j-1} \right) \right| \\ & \leq c \sum_{j'=1}^{\overline{\mathbf{m}}-j} \mathcal{L}_{i,j+j',q-j'}(T, \tilde{r}) + c_{\mathcal{N}}(T, \tilde{r}). \end{aligned}$$

Lemma 7.16. *There is a constant $c > 0$ such that for every positive plurisubharmonic current T on \mathbf{U} belonging to the class $\widetilde{\text{SH}}^{p;3,3}(\mathbf{U}, \mathbf{W})$, and every $0 < s \leq \mathbf{r}$ and $0 < \tilde{s} < r \leq \mathbf{r}$ and $i, j, q \geq 0$ as above, we have*

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \left(\frac{1}{\tilde{s}^{2q}} - \frac{1}{r^{2q}} \right) \int_0^{\tilde{s}} 2t dt \left(\int_{\text{Tube}(B,t)} \tau_*(dd^c T) \wedge \pi^*(\omega^{(i)} \wedge \omega^{j-i}) \wedge \beta^{k-p-j-1} \right) \right. \\ & \left. - \left(\frac{1}{\tilde{s}^{2q}} - \frac{1}{r^{2q}} \right) \int_0^{\tilde{s}} 2t dt \left(\int_{\text{Tube}(B,t)} dd^c(\tau_* T) \wedge \pi^*(\omega^{(i)} \wedge \omega^{j-i}) \wedge \beta^{k-p-j-1} \right) \right| \leq cr \mathcal{N}(T, r). \end{aligned}$$

Lemma 7.17. *There is a constant $c > 0$ such that for every positive plurisubharmonic current T on \mathbf{U} belonging to the class $\widetilde{\text{SH}}^{p;3,3}(\mathbf{U}, \mathbf{W})$, and every $0 < s \leq \mathbf{r}$ and $0 < \tilde{s} < r \leq \mathbf{r}$ and $i, j, q \geq 0$ as above, we have*

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \left(\frac{1}{\tilde{s}^{2q}} - \frac{1}{r^{2q}} \right) \int_0^{\tilde{s}} 2t dt \left(\int_{\text{Tube}(B,t)} \tau_*(dd^c T) \wedge \pi^*(\omega^{(i)} \wedge \omega^{j-i}) \wedge \beta^{k-p-j-1} \right) \right. \\ & \left. - \left(\frac{1}{\tilde{s}^{2q}} - \frac{1}{r^{2q}} \right) \int_0^{\tilde{s}} 2t dt \left(\int_{\text{Tube}(B,t)} (dd^c T)^\# \wedge \pi^*(\omega^{(i)} \wedge \omega^{j-i}) \wedge \beta^{k-p-j-1} \right) \right| \leq cr \mathcal{M}^{\text{tot}}(dd^c T, r). \end{aligned}$$

Lemma 7.18. (See [46, Lemma 13.11]). *Let T be a positive plurisubharmonic \mathcal{C}^2 -smooth (p, p) -form on \mathbf{U} . Then for every $\underline{\mathbf{m}} \leq j \leq \overline{\mathbf{m}}$, we have $\nu_j(T, B, \tau) = 0$ if $j \neq l - p$ and $\nu_j(T, B, \tau) \geq 0$ if $j = l - p$.*

Recall from [46, Theorem 13.12] the finiteness of the mass indicators $\mathcal{H}_{j,q}$ and $\mathcal{L}_{j,q}$.

Theorem 7.19. *There is a constant $c_{10} > 0$ such that for every positive plurisubharmonic current T on \mathbf{U} belonging to the class $\widetilde{\text{SH}}^{p;3,3}(\mathbf{U}, \mathbf{W})$, and for $0 \leq q \leq k - l$ and $0 \leq j \leq k - p - q$, we have In particular,*

$$\mathcal{H}_{j,q}(T, \mathbf{r}) < c_{10} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{L}_{j,q}(T, \mathbf{r}) < c_{10}.$$

Recall also from [46, Corollary 13.13] the following finiteness of $dd^c T$.

Corollary 7.20. *There is a constant $c_{11} > 0$ such that for every positive plurisubharmonic current T in the class $\widetilde{\text{SH}}^{p;3,3}(\mathbf{U}, \mathbf{W})$, and every q, j with $0 \leq q \leq \min(k - l, k - p - 1)$ and $0 \leq j \leq k - p - q - 1$, we have*

$$\int_0^{\mathbf{r}} \frac{dt}{t^{2q-1}} \left(\int_{\text{Tube}(B,t)} (dd^c T)^\# \wedge \pi^* \omega^j \wedge \hat{\beta}^{k-p-j-1} \right) < c_{11}.$$

Theorem 7.21. (See [46, Theorem 13.14]). *For every positive plurisubharmonic current T such that $T = T^+ - T^-$ on an open neighborhood of \overline{B} in X with T^\pm in the class $\text{SH}^{p;3,3}(B)$, and every $\underline{\mathbf{m}}^+ \leq j \leq \overline{\mathbf{m}}^+$, we have $(dd^c T, B, \omega^{(j)}, \tau) = 0$.*

Proof. We use Lemmas 7.11 and 7.12 instead of [46, Lemmas 13.6 and 13.7]. \square

Proposition 7.22. (See [46, Proposition 13.15]). *For $0 < r_1 < r_2 \leq \mathbf{r}$, there is a constant $c_{11} > 0$ such that for every $q \leq \min(k-p, k-l)$ and every positive plurisubharmonic current T in the class $\widetilde{\text{SH}}^{p;3,3}(\mathbf{U}, \mathbf{W})$, we have the following estimate:*

$$|\kappa(T, B, \omega^{(k-p-q)}, \frac{r_1}{\lambda}, \frac{r_2}{\lambda}, \tau)| < c_{11} \sum_{0 \leq q' \leq q, 0 \leq j' \leq \min(\overline{m}, k-p-q')} \mathcal{H}_{j',q'}(T, \frac{r_1}{\lambda}, \frac{r_2}{\lambda}) \quad \text{for } \lambda > 1.$$

7.3. End of the proof of Theorem 2.5. We follows along the same lines as those given in [46, Subsection 13.3] making the obviously necessary changes. There are however some small remarks below.

Proof of assertion (1). We use Lemma 7.15 instead of [46, Lemma 13.10]. \square

Proof of assertion (3). We use Lemmas 7.14 and 7.15 instead of [46, Lemmas 13.9 and 13.10]. \square

8. BASIC FORMULAS FOR THE GENERALIZED LELONG NUMBERS

In this section we obtain explicit formulas representing the generalized Lelong numbers in terms of the tangent currents.

8.1. A basic formula.

Theorem 8.1. *Let X, V be as above and suppose that (V, ω) is Kähler, and that B is a piecewise \mathcal{C}^2 -smooth open subset of V and that there exists a strongly admissible map for B .*

(1) *If $k-p \leq l$, we have*

$$\nu(T, B, \omega^{(k-p)}) = \int_B \mathbf{1}_B T \wedge \omega^{(k-p)}.$$

(2) *For $j \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $0 \leq j \leq \overline{m}$ and that $j < k-p$, let $\omega^{(j)}$ be a closed smooth real (j, j) -form on V_0 . Let T be a positive plurisubharmonic (p, p) -current on a neighborhood of \overline{B} in X such that $T = T^+ - T^-$ for some $T^\pm \in \text{SH}^{p;3,3}(B)$. By [46, Tangent Theorem I (Theorem 1.8)], let T_∞ be a tangent current to T along B . Then the following identity holds:*

$$\nu(T, B, \omega^{(j)}) = \frac{1}{r^2} \int_{\text{Tube}(B,0,r)} T_\infty \wedge \omega^{(j)} \wedge \beta \wedge \alpha^{k-p-j-1} \quad \text{for } 0 < r \leq \mathbf{r}.$$

Proof. The first assertion is straightforward. We come to the proof of the second one. Let τ be a strongly admissible map for B . Consider

$$S := \tau_* T \wedge \omega^{(j)} \wedge \beta \quad \text{and} \quad q := k-p-j-1.$$

Applying Theorem 4.4 to such S and q , we obtain for all $r \in (0, \mathbf{r})$ and $\epsilon \in (0, r)$ except for a countable set of values that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{r^2} \frac{1}{(r^2 + \epsilon^2)^q} \int_{\text{Tube}(B,r)} \tau_* T \wedge \omega^{(j)} \wedge \beta^{q+1} &= \frac{\mathcal{V}_\epsilon(S, r)}{r^2} + \frac{1}{r^2} \int_{\text{Tube}(B,r)} \tau_* T \wedge \omega^{(j)} \wedge \beta \wedge \alpha_\epsilon^q \\ &+ \frac{1}{r^2} \int_0^r \left(\frac{1}{(t^2 + \epsilon^2)^q} - \frac{1}{(r^2 + \epsilon^2)^q} \right) 2t dt \int_{\text{Tube}(B,t)} dd^c(\tau_*) T \wedge \omega^{(j)} \wedge \beta^{q+1}. \end{aligned}$$

Lemma 8.2. *The following estimates hold: $\frac{\mathcal{V}_\epsilon(S,r)}{r^2} = O(r)$ and for $0 < \epsilon \ll r$,*

$$\frac{1}{r^2} \int_0^r \left(\frac{1}{(t^2 + \epsilon^2)^q} - \frac{1}{(r^2 + \epsilon^2)^q} \right) 2t dt \int_{\text{Tube}(B,t)} dd^c(\tau_*)T \wedge \omega^{(j)} \wedge \beta^{q+1} = O(r).$$

Proof of Lemma 8.2. The first estimates follows from an application of Theorem 4.10. The second one can be proved arguing as in the proof of Lemma 7.14 and Corollary 7.20. \square

Applying Lemma 8.2 to the last equality, we obtain that

$$(8.1) \quad \frac{r^{2q}}{(r^2 + \epsilon^2)^q} \cdot \nu(T, B, \omega^{(j)}, r) = \frac{1}{r^2} \int_{\text{Tube}(B,r)} \tau_* T \wedge \omega^{(j)} \wedge \beta \wedge \alpha_\epsilon^q + O(r) \quad \text{for } 0 < \epsilon < r.$$

Fix an arbitrarily small $0 < \delta \ll 1$. Applying the above inequality to δr in place of r , it follows that

$$(8.2) \quad \frac{(\delta r)^{2q}}{((\delta r)^2 + \epsilon^2)^q} \cdot \nu(T, B, \omega^{(j)}, \delta r) = \frac{1}{\delta^2 r^2} \int_{\text{Tube}(B,\delta r)} \tau_* T \wedge \omega^{(j)} \wedge \beta \wedge \alpha_\epsilon^q + O(\delta r) \quad \text{for } 0 < \epsilon < \delta r.$$

Since $\lim_{r \rightarrow 0} \nu(T, B, \omega^{(j)}, r) = \lim_{r \rightarrow 0} \nu(T, B, \omega^{(j)}, \delta r) = \nu(T, B, \omega^{(j)})$ and $\frac{r^{2q}}{(r^2 + \epsilon^2)^q} = 1 + O(\delta)$ for $0 < \epsilon < \delta^2 r$, it follows from (8.1)–(8.2) that

$$(8.3) \quad \left| \nu(T, B, \omega^{(j)}) - \frac{1}{r^2} \int_{\text{Tube}(B,\delta r,r)} \tau_* T \wedge \omega^{(j)} \wedge \beta \wedge \alpha_\epsilon^q \right| < \delta, \quad \text{for } 0 < r < \mathbf{r}, 0 < \epsilon < \delta^2 r.$$

Fix $r \in [0, \mathbf{r})$. Then there is a smooth positive form $\gamma = \gamma_{r,\delta}$ such that for all $0 < \epsilon < \delta^2 r$,

$$-\gamma \leq \alpha_\epsilon^q \leq \gamma \quad \text{on} \quad \text{Tube}(B, \delta r/2, \mathbf{r}).$$

Since $\lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0+} \alpha_\epsilon^q = \alpha^q$ on $\text{Tube}(B, \delta r, r)$, it follows from Lebesgue's dominated convergence that

$$\int_{\text{Tube}(B,\delta r,r)} \tau_* T \wedge \omega^{(j)} \wedge \beta \wedge \alpha_\epsilon^q \rightarrow \int_{\text{Tube}(B,\delta r,r)} \tau_* T \wedge \omega^{(j)} \wedge \beta \wedge \alpha^q \quad \text{as } \epsilon \rightarrow 0+.$$

Hence, (8.3) becomes

$$(8.4) \quad \left| \nu(T, B, \omega^{(j)}) - \frac{1}{r^2} \int_{\text{Tube}(B,\delta r,r)} \tau_* T \wedge \omega^{(j)} \wedge \beta \wedge \alpha^q \right| < \delta, \quad \text{for } 0 < r < \mathbf{r}.$$

For $0 < r < \mathbf{r}$, by letting $\lambda := \frac{\mathbf{r}}{r}$ and by acting the homothetic map A_λ and using that $A_\lambda^*(\alpha) = \alpha$, $A_\lambda^*(\beta) = |\lambda|^2 \beta$, we obtain that

$$\frac{1}{r^2} \int_{\text{Tube}(B,\delta r,r)} \tau_* T \wedge \omega^{(j)} \wedge \beta \wedge \alpha^q = \frac{1}{\mathbf{r}^2} \int_{\text{Tube}(B,\delta \mathbf{r},\mathbf{r})} (A_\lambda)_*(\tau_* T) \wedge \omega^{(j)} \wedge \beta \wedge \alpha^q.$$

Since $\pi^* \omega^{(j)}$, β and α are all smooth forms on $\text{Tube}(B, \delta \mathbf{r}, \mathbf{r})$ and $(A_\lambda)_*(\tau_* T) \rightarrow T_\infty$ as $\lambda \rightarrow \infty$. the RHS tends to $\frac{1}{\mathbf{r}^2} \int_{\text{Tube}(B,\delta \mathbf{r},\mathbf{r})} T_\infty \wedge \omega^{(j)} \wedge \beta \wedge \alpha^q$ as $r \rightarrow 0+$. Putting this together with (8.4), we get that

$$\left| \nu(T, B, \omega^{(j)}) - \frac{1}{\mathbf{r}^2} \int_{\text{Tube}(B,\delta \mathbf{r},\mathbf{r})} T_\infty \wedge \omega^{(j)} \wedge \beta \wedge \alpha^q \right| < \delta, \quad \text{for } 0 < r < \mathbf{r}.$$

Letting $\delta \rightarrow 0$ in the last line, the theorem follows for $r := \mathbf{r}$. Clearly, the above proof also holds for $0 < r \leq \mathbf{r}$. \square

We conclude this subsection with the following variant of Theorem 8.3.

- Theorem 8.3.** (1) *If instead of the above assumption on T , we assume that T is a positive pluriharmonic (p, p) -current on a neighborhood of \overline{B} in X such that $T = T^+ - T^-$ for some $T^\pm \in \text{PH}^{p;2,2}(B)$, then the conclusion of Theorem 8.1 still holds.*
- (2) *If instead of the above assumption on T , we assume that T is a positive closed (p, p) -current on a neighborhood of \overline{B} in X such that $T = T^+ - T^-$ for some $T^\pm \in \text{CL}^{p;1,1}(B)$, then the conclusion of Theorem 8.1 still holds.*
- (3) *Let X, V be as above. Assume that there is a Hermitian metric ω on V for which $dd^c \omega^j = 0$ for $\underline{m} \leq j \leq \overline{m} - 1$. If instead of the above assumption on T , we assume that T is a positive closed (p, p) -current on a neighborhood of \overline{B} in X such that $T = T^+ - T^-$ for some $T^\pm \in \text{CL}^{p;2,2}(B)$, then the conclusion of Theorem 8.1 still holds.*

Proof. Assertion (1) can be proved similarly as in the proof of Theorem 8.3 using Theorem 2.5 (5).

The proof of assertion (2) is basically similar to and even simpler than the proof of Theorem 8.3. We make use of Theorem 2.7 (6). We utilize Theorem 4.5 instead of Theorem 4.4. We do not need Lemma 8.2.

The proof of assertion (3) is basically similar to the proof of assertion (2). We make use of Theorem 2.7. \square

8.2. Tangent currents versus the generalized Lelong numbers. Suppose that V is a Kähler manifold of dimension l , not necessarily compact, and let ω be a Hermitian metric on V . Let \mathbb{E} be the normal bundle to V in X and denote by $\mathbb{P}(\mathbb{E})$ its projectivization. The complex manifold $\mathbb{P}(\mathbb{E})$ is of dimension $k - 1$. Denote by $\pi_{\mathbb{P}(\mathbb{E})} : \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{E}) \rightarrow V$ the canonical projection. The map $\pi_{\mathbb{P}(\mathbb{E})}$ defines a regular fibration over V with \mathbb{P}^{k-l-1} fibers.

Consider a Hermitian metric h on \mathbb{E} and denote by $\omega_{\mathbb{P}(\mathbb{E})}$ the closed $(1, 1)$ -form on $\mathbb{P}(\mathbb{E})$ induced by $dd^c \log \|y\|_h^2$ with $y \in \mathbb{E}$. The restriction of $\omega_{\mathbb{P}(\mathbb{E})}$ to each fiber of $\mathbb{P}(\mathbb{E})$ is the Fubini-Study form on this fiber. So $\omega_{\mathbb{P}(\mathbb{E})}$ is strictly positive in the fiber direction. It follows that given an open set $V_0 \Subset V$ there is a constant $c > 0$ large enough such that $c\pi_{\mathbb{P}(\mathbb{E})}^*(\omega) + \omega_{\mathbb{P}(\mathbb{E})}$ is positive on $\pi^{-1}(V_0)$. If ω is a Kähler form on V , then the last sum defines a Kähler metric there.

Let $\pi_{\text{FS}} : \mathbb{E} \setminus V \rightarrow \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{E})$ be the canonical projection.

Theorem 8.4. *Let X, V be as above and suppose that (V, ω) is Kähler, and that B is a piecewise \mathcal{C}^2 -smooth open subset of V and that there exists a strongly admissible map for B . For $0 \leq j \leq \overline{m}$, let $\omega^{(j)}$ be a closed smooth real (j, j) -form on V_0 . Let T be a positive plurisubharmonic (p, p) -current on a neighborhood of \overline{B} in X such that $T = T^+ - T^-$ for some $T^\pm \in \text{SH}^{p;3,3}(B)$. By [46, Tangent Theorem I(Theorem 1.8)], let T_∞ be a tangent current to T along B . We will know from Theorem 2.12 that $T_\infty \wedge \pi^* \omega^{(j)}$ is positive pluriharmonic in $\mathbb{E}|_B$ and V -conic along B . Hence, $T_\infty \wedge \pi^* \omega^{(j)} = \pi_{\text{FS}}^*(\mathbb{T}_\infty^{(j)})$, where $\mathbb{T}_\infty^{(j)}$ is a positive pluriharmonic current living on $\mathbb{P}(\mathbb{E})$. Then, the following identity holds:*

$$\nu(T, B, \omega^{(j)}) = \int_{\mathbb{P}(\mathbb{E}|_B)} \mathbb{T}_\infty^{(j)} \wedge \omega_{\mathbb{P}(\mathbb{E})}^{k-p-j-1}.$$

Proof. Since $V_0 \Subset V$, we only need to prove a local result near a given point $y_0 \in V_0$. We make an analysis in local coordinates. We use the coordinates $(z, w) \in \mathbb{C}^{k-l} \times \mathbb{C}^l$ around

a neighborhood U of y_0 such that $y_0 = 0$ in these coordinates. So $y = (z, w)$. We may assume that U has the form $U = U' \times U''$, where U' (resp. U'') are open neighborhood of $0'$ in \mathbb{C}^{k-l} of ($0''$ in \mathbb{C}^l) and $V = \{z = 0\} \simeq U''$. Moreover, we may assume that $U'' = (2\mathbb{D})^l$. Consider the trivial vector bundle $\pi : \mathbb{E} \rightarrow U''$ with $\mathbb{E} \simeq \mathbb{C}^{k-l} \times U''$. So the canonical projection $\pi_{\text{FS}}|_U : (\mathbb{C}^{k-l} \setminus \{0\}) \times \mathbb{D}^l \rightarrow \mathbb{P}^{k-l-1} \times \mathbb{D}^l$ reads as $(z, w) \mapsto \pi_{\text{FS}}(z, w) := ([z], w)$, where $\mathbb{C}^{k-l} \setminus \{0\} \rightarrow \mathbb{P}^{k-l-1}$ is the canonical projection mapping z to $[z] := [z_1 : \dots : z_{k-l}]$. Observe that

$$(8.5) \quad \pi_{\text{FS}}^*(\omega_{\text{FS}}([z], w)) = dd^c(\log \|(z, w)\|_h^2) = \alpha(z, w) \quad \text{for} \quad (z, w) \in (\mathbb{C}^{k-l} \setminus \{0\}) \times \mathbb{D}^l.$$

We place ourselves on an open set of \mathbb{C}^{k-l} defined by $z_{k-l} \neq 0$. We may assume without loss of generality that

$$(8.6) \quad 2|z_{k-l}| > \max_{1 \leq j \leq k-l} |z_j|.$$

and use the projective coordinates

$$(8.7) \quad \zeta_1 := \frac{z_1}{z_{k-l}}, \dots, \zeta_{k-l-1} := \frac{z_{k-l-1}}{z_{k-l}}, \quad \zeta_{k-l} = z_{k-l}.$$

In the coordinates $\zeta = (\zeta_1, \dots, \zeta_{k-l}) = (\zeta', \zeta_{k-l})$, the form $\omega_{\text{FS}}([z], w)$ can be rewritten as

$$(8.8) \quad \omega_{\text{FS}}([z], w) = dd^c \log \|(\zeta_1, \dots, \zeta_{k-l-1}, 1, w)\|_h^2 = dd^c \log \|(\zeta', 1, w)\|_h^2.$$

Let T_∞ be a tangent current to T along B .

Fix $0 < r \leq r$. By Theorem 8.1, we obtain that

$$\nu(T, B, \omega^{(j)}) = \frac{1}{r^2} \int_{\text{Tube}(B, 0, r)} T_\infty \wedge \omega^{(j)} \wedge \beta \wedge \alpha^{k-p-j-1}.$$

Using a partition of unity on V_0 , the RHS can be rewritten as

$$\frac{1}{r^2} \int_{\{(\zeta', \zeta_{k-l}, w) \in \mathbb{D}^{k-l-1} \times \mathbb{D} \times \mathbb{D}^l : \|(\zeta', 1, w)\|_h | \zeta_{k-l} | < r\}} T_\infty \wedge \pi^* \omega^{(j)} \wedge \beta \wedge \omega_{\mathbb{P}(\mathbb{E})}^{k-p-j-1}.$$

Since $\mathbb{T}_\infty \wedge \pi^* \omega^{(j)} \wedge \omega_{\mathbb{P}(\mathbb{E})}^{k-p-j-1}$ is a current of full degree $(k-1, k-1)$ in $(d\zeta', d\bar{\zeta}', dw, d\bar{w})$, the form $\beta = dd^c \varphi$ only contributes $dd^c |\zeta_{k-l}|^2$ to the wedge-product $T_\infty \wedge \omega^{(j)} \wedge \beta \wedge \alpha^{k-p-j-1}$. Therefore, by Fubini's theorem, we can write the above RHS as

$$\int_{(\zeta', w)} \mathbb{T}_\infty^{(j)} \wedge \omega_{\mathbb{P}(\mathbb{E})}^{k-p-j-1} \left(\frac{1}{r^2} \int_{\{(\zeta', \zeta_{k-l}, w) \in \mathbb{D}^{k-l-1} \times \mathbb{D} \times \mathbb{D}^l : \|(\zeta', w)\|_h | \zeta_{k-l} | < r\}} \|(\zeta', 1, w)\|_h^2 dd^c |\zeta_{k-l}|^2 \right).$$

Since by the change of variable $t := \|(\zeta', 1, w)\|_h | \zeta_{k-l} |$, the inner integral is equal to

$$\frac{1}{r^2} \int_{|t| < r} dd^c |t|^2 = 1,$$

the conclusion of the theorem follows. \square

We conclude this subsection with the following variant of Theorem 8.4.

Theorem 8.5. (1) *Instead of the above assumption on T , we assume that T is a positive pluriharmonic (p, p) -current on a neighborhood of \bar{B} in X such that $T = T^+ - T^-$ for some $T^\pm \in \text{PH}^{p;2,2}(B)$. By [46, Tangent Theorem I (Theorem 1.8) (7)], let T_∞ be a tangent current to T along B . We know from this theorem that T_∞ is positive pluriharmonic in $\mathbb{E}|_B$ and V -conic along B . Hence, $T_\infty = \pi_{\text{FS}}^*(\mathbb{T}_\infty)$, where \mathbb{T}_∞ is a*

positive pluriharmonic current living on $\mathbb{P}(\mathbb{E})$. Then the conclusion of Theorem 8.4 still holds, more concretely,

$$(8.9) \quad \nu(T, B, \omega^{(j)}) = \int_{\mathbb{P}(\mathbb{E}|_B)} \mathbb{T}_\infty \wedge \pi^* \omega^{(j)} \wedge \omega_{\mathbb{P}(\mathbb{E})}^{k-p-j-1}.$$

- (2) Instead of the above assumption on T , we assume that T is a positive closed (p, p) -current on a neighborhood of \overline{B} in X such that $T = T^+ - T^-$ for some $T^\pm \in \text{CL}^{p;1,1}(B)$. By [46, Tangent Theorem II (Theorem 1.11)], let T_∞ be a tangent current to T along B . We know from this theorem that T_∞ is positive closed in $\mathbb{E}|_B$ and V -conic along B . Hence, $T_\infty = \pi_{\text{FS}}^*(\mathbb{T}_\infty)$, where \mathbb{T}_∞ is a positive closed current living on $\mathbb{P}(\mathbb{E})$. Then identity (8.9) still holds.
- (3) Let X, V be as above. Assume that there is a Hermitian metric ω on V for which $dd^c \omega^j = 0$ for $\underline{m} \leq j \leq \overline{m} - 1$. If instead of the above assumption on T , we assume that T is a positive closed (p, p) -current on a neighborhood of \overline{B} in X such that $T = T^+ - T^-$ for some $T^\pm \in \text{CL}^{p;2,2}(B)$. Then the conclusion of assertion (2) still holds.

We leave the proof to the interested reader.

9. HORIZONTAL DIMENSION AND A SIU'S UPPER-SEMICONINUITY TYPE THEOREM

In the first three subsections we prove Theorem 2.12. The last subsection is devoted to the proof of Theorem 2.13.

9.1. Pluriharmonicity and V -conicity. We prove assertion (1) of Theorem 2.12. Writing $\omega^{(j)} = (\omega^{(j)} + c\omega^j) - c\omega^j$ for a large enough constant $c > 0$, we may assume without loss of generality that $\omega^{(j)}$ is strictly positive. By [46, Theorem 15.5], T_∞ is the tangent current to T along B associated to a sequence $(\lambda_n) \subset \mathbb{C}^*$ converging to ∞ . Fix $r_1, r_2 \in (0, r)$ with $r_1 < r_2$. Let $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$ with $\lambda \geq 1$.

For every j with $\underline{m} \leq j \leq \overline{m}$, applying Theorem 4.2 to $(A_{\lambda_n})_*(\tau_* T) \wedge \pi^*(\omega^{(j)})$ yields that

$$\begin{aligned} \nu(T, B, \omega^{(j)}, \frac{r_2}{|\lambda_n|}, \tau) - \nu(T, B, \omega^{(j)}, \frac{r_1}{|\lambda_n|}, \tau) &= \mathcal{V}((A_{\lambda_n})_*(\tau_* T) \wedge \pi^*(\omega^{(j)}), r_1, r_2) \\ &+ \int_{\text{Tube}(B, r_1, r_2)} (A_{\lambda_n})_*(\tau_* T) \wedge \pi^*(\omega^{(j)}) \wedge \alpha^{k-p-j} \\ &+ \int_{r_1}^{r_2} \left(\frac{1}{t^{2(k-p-j)}} - \frac{1}{r_2^{2(k-p-j)}} \right) 2t dt \int_{\text{Tube}(B, t)} dd^c (A_{\lambda_n})_*(\tau_* T) \wedge \pi^*(\omega^{(j)}) \wedge \beta^{k-p-j-1} \\ &+ \left(\frac{1}{r_1^{2(k-p-j)}} - \frac{1}{r_2^{2(k-p-j)}} \right) \int_0^{r_1} 2t dt \int_{z \in \text{Tube}(B, t)} dd^c (A_{\lambda_n})_*(\tau_* T) \wedge \pi^*(\omega^{(j)}) \wedge \beta^{k-p-j-1}. \end{aligned}$$

When n tends to infinity, the LHS tends to 0 since by Theorem 2.5 (1), $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \nu(T, B, \omega^{(j)}, \frac{r}{|\lambda_n|}, \tau) = \nu(T, B, \omega^{(j)}, \tau) \in \mathbb{R}$ for $0 < r \leq r$. By Theorem 4.8, $\mathcal{V}((A_{\lambda_n})_*(\tau_* T) \wedge \pi^*(\omega^{(j)}), r_1, r_2) \rightarrow 0$

as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Therefore, we obtain that

$$(9.1) \quad \begin{aligned} 0 &= \int_{\text{Tube}(B, r_1, r_2)} T_\infty \wedge \pi^*(\omega^{(j)}) \wedge \alpha^{k-p-j} \\ &+ \int_{r_1}^{r_2} \left(\frac{1}{t^{2(k-p-j)}} - \frac{1}{r_2^{2(k-p-j)}} \right) 2tdt \int_{\text{Tube}(B, t)} dd^c T_\infty \wedge \pi^*(\omega^{(j)}) \wedge \beta^{k-p-j-1} \\ &+ \left(\frac{1}{r_1^{2(k-p-j)}} - \frac{1}{r_2^{2(k-p-j)}} \right) \int_0^{r_1} 2tdt \int_{z \in \text{Tube}(B, t)} dd^c T_\infty \wedge \pi^*(\omega^{(j)}) \wedge \beta^{k-p-j-1}. \end{aligned}$$

Next, consider a small neighborhood $V(x_0)$ of an arbitrary point $x_0 \in \text{Tube}(B, r_0)$, where in a local chart $V(x_0) \simeq \mathbb{D}^l$ and $\mathbb{E}|_{V(x_0)} \simeq \mathbb{C}^{k-l} \times \mathbb{D}^l$. For $x \in \mathbb{E}|_{V(x_0)}$, write $x = (z, w)$. Since $\bar{m} = \min(l, k-p)$ and T_∞ is of bidegree (p, p) we see that $T_\infty \wedge \pi^*\omega^{(\bar{m})}$ is of full bidegree (l, l) in $dw, d\bar{w}$. Consequently, we infer from (5.5) that

$$\begin{aligned} T_\infty \wedge \pi^*(\omega^{(\bar{m})}) \wedge \alpha^{k-p-\bar{m}} &= T_\infty \wedge \pi^*(\omega^{(\bar{m})}) \wedge (\hat{\alpha}')^{k-p-\bar{m}}, \\ dd^c T_\infty \wedge \pi^*(\omega^{(\bar{m})}) \wedge \beta^{k-p-\bar{m}} &= dd^c T_\infty \wedge \pi^*(\omega^{(\bar{m})}) \wedge \hat{\beta}^{k-p-\bar{m}}. \end{aligned}$$

This, combined with (9.1) for $j := \bar{m}$, implies that

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= \int_{\text{Tube}(B, r_1, r_2)} T_\infty \wedge \pi^*(\omega^{(\bar{m})}) \wedge (\hat{\alpha}')^{k-p-\bar{m}} \\ &+ \int_{r_1}^{r_2} \left(\frac{1}{t^{2(k-p-\bar{m})}} - \frac{1}{r_2^{2(k-p-\bar{m})}} \right) 2tdt \int_{\text{Tube}(B, t)} dd^c T_\infty \wedge (\pi^*\omega^{(\bar{m})}) \wedge \hat{\beta}^{(k-p-\bar{m})-1} \\ &+ \left(\frac{1}{r_1^{2(k-p-\bar{m})}} - \frac{1}{r_2^{2(k-p-\bar{m})}} \right) \int_0^{r_1} 2tdt \int_{z \in \text{Tube}(B, t)} dd^c T_\infty \wedge (\pi^*\omega^{(\bar{m})}) \wedge \hat{\beta}^{(k-p-\bar{m})-1}. \end{aligned}$$

Since we know by [46, Tangent Theorem I (Theorem 1.8)] that T_∞ is positive plurisubharmonic, both T_∞ and $dd^c T_\infty$ are positive currents. Moreover, $\omega, \hat{\alpha}', \hat{\beta}$ are positive forms. Consequently, all integrals of the RHS of the last line are ≥ 0 . On the other hand, their sum is equal to 0. So all integrals are 0, that is,

$$\int_{z \in \text{Tube}(B, r_2)} dd^c T_\infty \wedge \pi^*(\omega^{(\bar{m})}) \wedge \hat{\beta}^{k-p-\bar{m}-1} = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \int_{\text{Tube}(B, r_1, r_2)} T_\infty \wedge \pi^*(\omega^{(\bar{m})}) \wedge \alpha^{k-p-\bar{m}} = 0.$$

Note that $\hat{\beta}$ and $\pi^*\omega$ are smooth strictly positive $(1, 1)$ forms on $\text{Tube}(B, \mathbf{r})$, and that for every smooth positive $(1, 1)$ form H on $\text{Tube}(B, \mathbf{r})$, we can find a constant $c > 0$ such that $H \leq c(\hat{\beta} + \pi^*\omega)$ on $\text{Tube}(B, \mathbf{r})$. Since $0 < r_1 < r_2 \leq \mathbf{r}$ are arbitrarily chosen, we infer that the following equality holds for all j with $\bar{m} \leq j \leq k$:

$$(9.2) \quad dd^c T_\infty \wedge \pi^*(\omega^{(j)}) = 0 \quad \text{on} \quad \text{Tube}(B, \mathbf{r}) \quad \text{and} \quad T_\infty \wedge \pi^*(\omega^{(j)}) \wedge \alpha^{k-p-j} = 0 \quad \text{on} \quad \text{Tube}(B, \mathbf{r}) \setminus B.$$

Suppose that (9.2) holds for all j with $j_0 < j \leq \bar{m}$, where j_0 is a given integer with $\underline{m} \leq j_0 < \bar{m}$. We need to prove (9.2) for $j = j_0$.

Using (9.2) for all j with $j_0 < j \leq k$, we infer from (5.5) that

$$\begin{aligned} T_\infty \wedge \pi^*(\omega^{(j_0)}) \wedge \alpha^{k-p-j_0} &= T_\infty \wedge \pi^*(\omega^{(j_0)}) \wedge (\hat{\alpha}')^{k-p-j_0}, \\ dd^c T_\infty \wedge \pi^*(\omega^{(j_0)}) \wedge \beta^{k-p-j_0} &= dd^c T_\infty \wedge \pi^*(\omega^{(j_0)}) \wedge \hat{\beta}^{k-p-j_0}. \end{aligned}$$

This, combined with (9.1) for $j := j_0$, implies that

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= \int_{\text{Tube}(B, r_1, r_2)} T_\infty \wedge \pi^*(\omega^{(j_0)}) \wedge (\hat{\alpha}')^{k-p-j_0} \\ &+ \int_{r_1}^{r_2} \left(\frac{1}{t^{2(k-p-j_0)}} - \frac{1}{r_2^{2(k-p-j_0)}} \right) 2t dt \int_{\text{Tube}(B, t)} dd^c T_\infty \wedge (\pi^*\omega^{(j_0)}) \wedge \hat{\beta}^{(k-p-j_0)-1} \\ &+ \left(\frac{1}{r_1^{2(k-p-j_0)}} - \frac{1}{r_2^{2(k-p-j_0)}} \right) \int_0^{r_1} 2t dt \int_{z \in \text{Tube}(B, t)} dd^c T_\infty \wedge (\pi^*\omega^{(j_0)}) \wedge \hat{\beta}^{(k-p-j_0)-1}. \end{aligned}$$

We repeat the above argument using that both T_∞ and $dd^c T_\infty$ are positive currents and that $\pi^*\omega$, $\hat{\alpha}'$, $\hat{\beta}$ are positive forms. Consequently, all integrals on the RHS are 0. Therefore, (9.2) holds for $j = j_0$. Hence, the proof of (9.2) is completed. In particular, $dd^c T_\infty \wedge \pi^*(\omega^{(\underline{m})}) = 0$ on $\text{Tube}(B, r)$. Since we will prove shortly below that $T_\infty \wedge \pi^*(\omega^{(\underline{m})})$ is V -conic, it follows that $dd^c T_\infty \wedge \pi^*(\omega^{(j)}) = 0$ on $\pi^{-1}(B) \subset \mathbb{E}$.

Recall from (5.5) that $\hat{\alpha}' = \alpha + c_1 \pi^*\omega$, and from (5.6) that $\hat{\alpha}' \geq c_1^{-1} \alpha_{\text{ver}} \geq 0$. Moreover, T_∞ is a positive current. Therefore, we infer from the second identity of (9.2) that

$$(9.3) \quad T_\infty \wedge (\pi^*(\omega^{(j)}) \wedge \alpha_{\text{ver}}^{k-p-j}) = 0 \quad \text{on} \quad \text{Tube}(B, r) \setminus B \quad \text{for} \quad \underline{m} \leq j \leq k.$$

Consider the positive pluriharmonic current $\Theta := T_\infty \wedge \pi^*(\omega^{(j)})$. We need to show that Θ is V -conic. We argue as in the proof of assertion (3) of [46, Theorem 16.3].

9.2. Horizontal dimension. We prove assertions (2), (3) and (4) of Theorem 2.12.

Proof of assertion (2) of Theorem 2.12. Let $q > \hbar$ and let $\omega^{(q)}$ be a closed smooth (q, q) -form on V . By Theorem 8.4, the pluriharmonic current $\mathbb{T}_\infty^{(q)}$, defined by $\pi_{\text{FS}}^*(\mathbb{T}_\infty^{(q)}) = T_\infty \wedge \pi^*\omega^{(q)}$, satisfies

$$\nu(T, B, \omega^{(q)}) = \int_{\mathbb{P}(\mathbb{E}|_B)} \mathbb{T}_\infty^{(q)} \wedge \omega_{\mathbb{P}(\mathbb{E})}^{k-p-q-1}.$$

Fix a large constant $c > 0$ such that $c\omega^q + \omega^{(q)}$ is strictly positive. We infer from the assumption $q > \hbar$ that $T_\infty \wedge \pi^*(c\omega^q + \omega^{(q)}) = 0$ and $T_\infty \wedge \pi^*(c\omega^q) = 0$. Therefore, $T_\infty \wedge \pi^*\omega^{(q)} = 0$, hence $\mathbb{T}_\infty^{(q)} = 0$, which in turn implies that $\nu(T, B, \omega^{(q)}) = 0$. \square

Proof of assertion (3) of Theorem 2.12. By assertion (2), we obtain that $\nu_q(T, B, \omega) = 0$ for all $\hbar < q \leq \bar{m}$. Therefore, we only need to show that if $j \in [\underline{m}, \bar{m}]$ is an integer satisfying $\nu_j(T, B, \omega) = 0$ for all $j < q \leq \bar{m}$, and if $j > \underline{m}$ then $\nu_j(T, B, \omega) \neq 0$, then $j = \hbar$.

There is a constant $c > 0$ such that $c\pi^*\omega + \omega_{\mathbb{P}(\mathbb{E})}$ is a Kähler form on $\mathbb{P}(\mathbb{E})$. By Theorem 8.4, the pluriharmonic current $\mathbb{T}_\infty^{(j)}$ on $\mathbb{E}|_B \setminus B$ defined by $\pi_{\text{FS}}^*(\mathbb{T}_\infty^{(j)}) = T_\infty \wedge \pi^*\omega^{(j)}$, satisfies

$$\nu_j(T, B, \omega) = \int_{\mathbb{P}(\mathbb{E}|_B)} \mathbb{T}_\infty^{(j)} \wedge \omega_{\mathbb{P}(\mathbb{E})}^{k-p-j-1}.$$

Using that $\nu_q(T, B, \omega) = 0$ for all $j < q \leq \bar{m}$, we infer that

$$\nu_j(T, B, \omega) = \int_{\mathbb{P}(\mathbb{E}|_B)} \mathbb{T}_\infty^{(j)} \wedge (\omega_{\mathbb{P}(\mathbb{E})} + c\pi^*\omega)^{k-p-j-1}.$$

Since T_∞ is a positive current, and $\pi^*\omega^{(j)}$ and $\omega_{\mathbb{P}(\mathbb{E})} + c\pi^*\omega$ are positive smooth forms, we infer that $\nu_j(T, B, \omega) \geq 0$. By hypothesis, $\nu_j(T, B, \omega) \neq 0$. So $\nu_j(T, B, \omega) > 0$ and $T_\infty \wedge \pi^*\omega^j \neq 0$. Hence, $j = \hbar$. \square

Proof of assertion (4) of Theorem 2.12. Let $\omega^{(h)}$ be a strongly positive closed smooth (\hbar, \hbar) -form on V . By Theorem 8.4, the pluriharmonic current $\mathbb{T}_\infty^{(h)}$, on $\mathbb{E}|_B \setminus B$ defined by $\pi_{\text{FS}}^*(\mathbb{T}_\infty^{(h)}) = T_\infty \wedge \pi^*\omega^{(h)}$, satisfies

$$\nu(T, B, \omega^{(h)}) = \int_{\mathbb{P}(\mathbb{E}|_B)} \mathbb{T}_\infty^{(h)} \wedge \omega_{\mathbb{P}(\mathbb{E})}^{k-p-h-1}.$$

Using that $T_\infty \wedge \pi^*(\omega^{(h)} \wedge \omega^{q-h}) = 0$ for all $\hbar < q \leq \overline{m}$, we infer that $\mathbb{T}_\infty^{(h)} \wedge \omega^{q-h} = 0$, and hence,

$$\nu(T, B, \omega^{(h)}) = \int_{\mathbb{P}(\mathbb{E}|_B)} \mathbb{T}_\infty^{(h)} \wedge (\omega_{\mathbb{P}(\mathbb{E})} + c\pi^*\omega)^{k-p-h-1}.$$

Since T_∞ is a positive current, and $\pi^*\omega^{(h)}$ and $\omega_{\mathbb{P}(\mathbb{E})} + c\pi^*\omega$ are positive smooth forms, we infer that $\nu(T, B, \omega^{(h)}) \geq 0$.

To complete the proof, let $\omega^{(h)}$ be a strictly positive and $T_\infty \neq 0$. there is a constant $c' > 0$ such that $\omega^{(h)} \geq c'\omega^h$, and by the above argument, we infer that the current $\mathbb{T}_\infty^{\langle h \rangle}$ on $\mathbb{E}|_B \setminus B$ defined by $\pi_{\text{FS}}^*(\mathbb{T}_\infty^{\langle h \rangle}) = T_\infty \wedge \pi^*\omega^h$, satisfies

$$\nu_h(T, B, \omega) = \int_{\mathbb{P}(\mathbb{E}|_B)} \mathbb{T}_\infty^{\langle h \rangle} \wedge (\omega_{\mathbb{P}(\mathbb{E})} + c\pi^*\omega)^{k-p-h-1}.$$

Since $T_\infty \wedge \pi^*\omega^h$ is a nonzero positive current and $\omega_{\mathbb{P}(\mathbb{E})} + c\pi^*\omega$ is a Kähler form, we infer that $\mathbb{T}_\infty^{\langle h \rangle}$ is a nonzero positive current, and hence $\nu_h(T, B, \omega) > 0$. This implies that $\nu(T, B, \omega^{(h)}) \geq c'\nu_h(T, B, \omega) > 0$. \square

9.3. A Siu's upper-semicontinuity type theorem. We adapt the method of the proof of Theorem 1.6 in Dinh-Sibony's article [28] in order to prove Theorem 2.13.

For a positive closed current T , let T_∞ be a tangent current to T along B , and \mathbb{T} be the associated current on $\mathbb{E}|_B \setminus B$ defined by $T_\infty = \pi_{\text{FS}}^*(\mathbb{T})$.

If T has positive mass on V , then the horizontal dimension of T along V is maximal, i.e., equal to $k - p$. The theorem is trivial. Suppose now that T gives no mass to V . We deduce that the mass of T_n on V tends to 0. So removing from T_n its restriction to V allows us to suppose that T_n has no mass on V for every n . Denote by \widehat{T} and \widehat{T}_n the strict transforms of T and T_n with respect to the the blow-up $\sigma : \widehat{X} \rightarrow X$ along V . We identify \widehat{V} with $\mathbb{P}(\mathbb{E})$. By [28, Lemma 4.7] and the last assertion of [28, Lemma 4.10], we have

$$\{\mathbb{T}\} = \{\widehat{\mathbb{T}}\} = \{\widehat{T}\}|_{\mathbb{P}(\mathbb{E})} \quad \text{and} \quad \{\mathbb{T}_n\} = \{\widehat{\mathbb{T}}_n\} = \{\widehat{T}_n\}|_{\widehat{\mathbb{P}}(\mathbb{E})}.$$

Passing to a subsequence if necessary, we may suppose that \widehat{T}_n converges to a current \widehat{T}' . Write $\widehat{T}' = \widehat{T} + \widehat{R}$, where \widehat{R} is the restriction of \widehat{T}' to V . So there is a positive closed $(p-1, p-1)$ -current R on $\mathbb{P}(\mathbb{E})$ such that $\widehat{R} = \pi^*R \wedge [\widehat{V}]$. Let $\{R\}$ be the class of R in $H^{p-1, p-1}(\mathbb{P}(\mathbb{E}))$. Let \widehat{R}' denote the class of \widehat{R} in $H_{\widehat{V}}^{2p}(\widehat{X}, \mathbb{C})$. Therefore, we obtain

$$(9.4) \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \{\mathbb{T}_n\} - \{\mathbb{T}\} = \widehat{R}'|_{\mathbb{P}(\mathbb{E})} = -\{R\} \smile h_{\mathbb{P}(\mathbb{E})},$$

where the last equality follows from [28, Lemma 3.17].

Recall from the proof of [28, Theorem 4.11] that the horizontal dimension of \widehat{R} is at most equal to \hbar . Consequently, the horizontal of the limit $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \{\mathbb{T}_n\}$ does not exceed \hbar .

To prove assertion (1), fix $\underline{m} \leq j \leq \overline{m}$ with $j > \hbar$ and let $\omega^{(j)}$ be a closed smooth (j, j) -form on V . Fix an arbitrary $n \in \mathbb{N}$. By the hypothesis on T_n and on U, W , and multiplying

T by a small positive constant if necessary, we apply Theorem 3.9 in order to find two sequences $(T_{n,N}^\pm)_{N \in \mathbb{N}} \in \widetilde{\text{CL}}^{p;1,1}(U, W)$ such that $T_{n,N}^\pm \rightarrow T_n^\pm$ as $N \rightarrow \infty$ and $T_n = T_n^+ - T_n^-$. By Theorem 8.4, we have that

$$\nu(T_n^\pm, B, \omega^{(j)}) = \int_{\mathbb{P}(\mathbb{E}|_B)} \mathbb{T}_n^\pm \wedge \pi^* \omega^{(j)} \wedge h_{\mathbb{P}(\mathbb{E})}^{k-p-j-1}.$$

Since $T_n = T_n^+ - T_n^-$, it follows that $\mathbb{T}_n = \mathbb{T}_n^+ - \mathbb{T}_n^-$, and

$$\nu(T_n, B, \omega^{(j)}) = \int_{\mathbb{P}(\mathbb{E}|_B)} \mathbb{T}_n \wedge \pi^* \omega^{(j)} \wedge h_{\mathbb{P}(\mathbb{E})}^{k-p-j-1}.$$

As $\text{supp} \mathbb{T}_n \cap \mathbb{E}_{\partial B} = \emptyset$, we rewrite this as follows:

$$\nu(T_n, B, \omega^{(j)}) = \int_{\mathbb{P}(\mathbb{E}|_B)} \{\mathbb{T}_n\} \smile \{\pi^* \omega^{(j)}\} \wedge h_{\mathbb{P}(\mathbb{E})}^{k-p-j-1}.$$

Since the horizontal of the limit $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \{\mathbb{T}_n\}$ does not exceed \hbar , we infer that $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \{\mathbb{T}_n\} \smile \{\pi^* \omega^{(j)}\} = 0$, and hence $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \nu(T_n, B, \omega^{(j)}) = 0$.

To prove assertion (2), let $\omega^{(\hbar)}$ be a strongly positive closed smooth (\hbar, \hbar) -form on V . There is a constant $c > 0$ such that $c\pi^* \omega + \omega_{\mathbb{P}(\mathbb{E})}$ is a Kähler form on $\mathbb{P}(\mathbb{E})$. By Theorem 8.4, we have that

$$\nu(T_n, B, \omega^{(j)}) = \int_{\mathbb{P}(\mathbb{E}|_B)} \{\mathbb{T}_n\} \smile \{\pi^* \omega^{(j)}\} \smile h_{\mathbb{P}(\mathbb{E})}^{k-p-j-1}.$$

This, combined with assertion (1), implies that

$$\begin{aligned} \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \nu(T_n, B, \omega^{(j)}) &= \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\mathbb{P}(\mathbb{E}|_B)} \{\mathbb{T}_n\} \smile \{\pi^* \omega^{(j)}\} \wedge \{\omega_{\mathbb{P}(\mathbb{E})}\}^{k-p-j-1} \\ &= \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\mathbb{P}(\mathbb{E}|_B)} \{\mathbb{T}_n\} \smile \{\pi^* \omega^{(j)}\} \smile (h_{\mathbb{P}(\mathbb{E})} + c\{\pi^* \omega\})^{k-p-j-1}. \end{aligned}$$

Since \mathbb{T}_n is a positive current, and $\pi^* \omega^{(j)}$ and $\omega_{\mathbb{P}(\mathbb{E})} + c\pi^* \omega$ are positive smooth forms, we infer that $\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \nu(T_n, B, \omega^{(h)}) \geq 0$.

By Theorem 8.4, we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \nu(T, B, \omega^{(h)}) - \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \nu(T_n, B, \omega^{(h)}) &= \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\mathbb{P}(\mathbb{E}|_B)} ((T) - \{\mathbb{T}_n\}) \smile \{\pi^* \omega^{(h)}\} \smile h_{\mathbb{P}(\mathbb{E})}^{k-p-h-1} \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{P}(\mathbb{E}|_B)} \{R\} \smile h_{\mathbb{P}(\mathbb{E})} \smile \{\pi^* \omega^{(h)}\} \smile h_{\mathbb{P}(\mathbb{E})}^{k-p-h-1}, \end{aligned}$$

where the last equality holds by (9.4).

Since the horizontal dimension of $\{R\}$ does not exceed \hbar , we see that the last integral is equal to

$$\int_{\mathbb{P}(\mathbb{E}|_B)} \{R\} \smile \{\pi^* \omega^{(h)}\} \smile (c\{\pi^* \omega\} + h_{\mathbb{P}(\mathbb{E})})^{k-p-h}.$$

The last expression is ≥ 0 because R is a positive current, and $\pi^* \omega^{(h)}$ and $\omega_{\mathbb{P}(\mathbb{E})} + c\pi^* \omega$ are positive smooth forms. This completes the proof that $\nu(T, B, \omega^{(h)}) \geq \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \nu(T_n, B, \omega^{(h)})$.

□

10. DINH-SIBONY CLASSES VERSUS GENERALIZED LELONG NUMBERS

This section is devoted to the proof of Theorems 2.14 and 2.16. Consider a Hermitian metric \bar{h} on $\bar{\mathbb{E}} := \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{E} \oplus \mathbb{C})$, and denote by $\omega_{\bar{\mathbb{E}}}$ the closed $(1, 1)$ -form on $\bar{\mathbb{E}}$ induced by $dd^c \log \|y\|_{\bar{h}}^2$ with $y \in \bar{\mathbb{E}}$. The restriction of $\omega_{\bar{\mathbb{E}}}$ to each fiber of $\bar{\mathbb{E}}$ is the Fubini-Study form on this fiber. So $\omega_{\bar{\mathbb{E}}}$ is strictly positive in the fiber direction.

Recall $\pi_{\text{FS}} : \mathbb{E} \rightarrow \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{E})$ the canonical projection. Consider $\iota : \mathbb{E} \hookrightarrow \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{E})$ the canonical injection.

Lemma 10.1. *For every smooth volume form Θ on $\mathbb{P}(E)$, we have*

$$\int_{\mathbb{P}(\mathbb{E})} \Theta = \int_{\bar{\mathbb{E}}} \pi_{\text{FS}}^* \Theta \wedge \omega_{\bar{\mathbb{E}}}.$$

Proof. It suffices to prove the theorem for the case where V is a single point, that is, $\mathbb{E} = \mathbb{C}^k$. In this case, the lemma follows by a straightforward computation. \square

End of the proof of Theorem 2.14. We only give the proof of assertion (2) for the sake of clarity. Indeed although the proof of assertion (1) is quite similar to that of assertion (2), it is somehow technically a bit more complicated.

Let $T_{\infty} \in \text{PH}^p(\bar{\mathbb{E}})$ be a tangent current to T along V . By [28, Proposition 3.10] (the proof therein goes through in the present context of positive pluriharmonic currents), we obtain

$$T_{\infty} = \pi_{\text{FS}}^*(\mathbb{T}_{\infty}) + \mathbf{1}_V T.$$

Let $T_0 \in \text{PH}^{l-k+p}(V)$ be such that $\mathbf{1}_V T = (\iota_V)_* T_0$, where $\iota_V : V \hookrightarrow \bar{\mathbb{E}}$ is the canonical injection. When $l < k - p$, we have $T_0 = 0$ and $\mathbf{1}_V T = 0$. By Theorem 1.3, we have $\{T_{\infty}\} = \mathbf{c}^{\text{DS}}(T, V)$ is the total tangent class of T along V , or equivalently, Dinh-Sibony (total) cohomology class of T along V . Let $-h_{\bar{\mathbb{E}}}$ denote the tautological class of the bundle $\pi_0 : \bar{\mathbb{E}} \rightarrow V$. Then we have the following decomposition

$$\{\mathbb{T}_{\infty}\} = \sum_{i=\underline{m}}^{\bar{m}} \pi_0^*(\mathbf{c}_i^{\text{DS}}(T, V)) \smile h_{\bar{\mathbb{E}}}^{i-l+p},$$

where $\mathbf{c}_j^{\text{DS}}(T, V)$ is a class in $H^{2l-2j}(V, \mathbb{C})$. Moreover, for $\underline{m} \leq j \leq \bar{m}$,

$$\mathbf{c}_{k-p}^{\text{DS}}(T, V) = \{T_0\}, \quad \text{and for } j < k - l, \quad \mathbf{c}_j^{\text{DS}}(T, V) = \mathbf{c}_j^{\text{DS}}(\mathbb{T}_{\infty}, V).$$

This decomposition is, in fact, unique.

On the other hand, since $\omega_{\mathbb{P}(\mathbb{E})}$ (resp. $\omega_{\bar{\mathbb{E}}}$) is the curvature form of the line bundle $\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}(\mathbb{E})}$ (resp. the line bundle $\mathcal{O}_{\bar{\mathbb{E}}}$), we see that

$$\iota_*(\pi_{\text{FS}}^*\{\omega_{\mathbb{P}(\mathbb{E})}\}) = h_{\bar{\mathbb{E}}} = \{\omega_{\bar{\mathbb{E}}}\}.$$

By Theorem 8.4, we obtain for $\underline{m} \leq j \leq \bar{m}$ that

$$\nu(T, V, \omega^{(j)}) = \begin{cases} \int_V T_0 \wedge \omega^{(j)}, & \text{if } j = k - p; \\ \int_{\mathbb{P}(\mathbb{E})} \mathbb{T}_{\infty} \wedge \pi^* \omega^{(j)} \wedge \omega_{\mathbb{P}(\mathbb{E})}^{k-p-j-1}, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Putting together the above equalities and applying Lemma 10.1, it follows that

$$\nu(T, V, \omega^{(j)}) = \left(\sum_{i=\underline{m}}^{\bar{m}} \pi_0^*(\mathbf{c}_i^{\text{DS}}(T, V)) \smile h_{\bar{\mathbb{E}}}^{i-l+p} \right) \smile \pi^*\{\omega^{(j)}\} \smile h_{\bar{\mathbb{E}}}^{k-p-j-1} \smile h_{\bar{\mathbb{E}}}.$$

By a consideration of bidegree, we see that on V :

$$\mathbf{c}_i^{\text{DS}}(T, V) \smile \{\omega^{(j)}\} = 0 \quad \text{for} \quad i < j.$$

Therefore, we infer that

$$\nu(T, B, \omega^{(j)}) = \left(\sum_{i=j}^{\bar{m}} \pi_0^*(\mathbf{c}_i^{\text{DS}}(T, V)) \smile h_{\mathbb{E}}^{i-l+p} \right) \smile \pi^*\{\omega^{(j)}\} \smile h_{\mathbb{E}}^{k-p-j}.$$

This proves formula (2.14) of assertion (2).

To complete the proof of assertion (2), we need to show that the total cohomology class $\mathbf{c}_i^{\text{DS}}(T, V)$ is independent of the choice of τ and T_∞ . We fix a Hermitian metric on \mathbb{E} . By the Leray-Hirsch theorem [11], the cohomology $H^*(\mathbb{P}(\overline{\mathbb{E}}))$ is a free module over $H^*(V)$ with basis $\{1, x, \dots, x^{k-l}\}$, where $x := h_{\mathbb{E}}$. So $x \in H^{1,1}(\mathbb{P}(\overline{\mathbb{E}}))$. Moreover, x^{k-l+1} can be written uniquely as a linear combination of $1, x, \dots, x^{k-l}$ with coefficients in $H^*(V)$; these coefficients are by definition the Chern classes of the complex vector bundle $\overline{\mathbb{E}}$:

$$(10.1) \quad x^{k-l+1} + c_1(\overline{\mathbb{E}})x^{k-l} + \dots + c_{k-l+1}(\overline{\mathbb{E}}) = 0, \quad c_j(\overline{\mathbb{E}}) \in H^{j,j}(V).$$

In this equation we identify $c_j(\overline{\mathbb{E}})$ to $\pi_0^*(c_j(\overline{\mathbb{E}}))$. With this definition of the Chern classes, we see that the ring structure of the cohomology of $\mathbb{P}(\overline{\mathbb{E}})$ is given by

$$(10.2) \quad H^*(\mathbb{P}(\overline{\mathbb{E}})) = H^*(V)[x] / (x^{k-l+1} + c_1(\overline{\mathbb{E}})x^{k-l} + \dots + c_{k-l+1}(\overline{\mathbb{E}})).$$

Let T_∞ and T'_∞ be two tangent current to T along V . By Tangent Theorem I (Theorem 3.8) in [46], there are strongly admissible maps τ, τ' along V in X and two sequences $(\lambda_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}, (\lambda'_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \subset \mathbb{C}$ such that $(\lambda_n) \nearrow \infty, (\lambda'_n) \nearrow \infty$, and that

$$T_\infty = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} T_{\lambda_n} \quad \text{and} \quad T'_\infty = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} T'_{\lambda'_n},$$

where $T_\lambda := (A_\lambda)_* \tau_*(T)$ and $T'_\lambda := (A_\lambda)_* \tau'_*(T)$. We know that T_∞ and T'_∞ are both positive pluriharmonic (p, p) -currents on $\overline{\mathbb{E}}$. Consider the pluriharmonic current $S := T_\infty - T'_\infty$ on $\overline{\mathbb{E}}$. To complete the proof of assertion (2), we only need to show that $\{T_\infty\} = \{T'_\infty\}$, i.e. $\{S\} = 0$. By Leray-Hirsch theorem, we have the following unique decomposition:

$$(10.3) \quad \{S\} = \sum_{j=\underline{m}}^{\bar{m}} \pi_0^*(\{S_j\}) \smile h_{\mathbb{E}}^{j-l+p},$$

where $\{S_j\}$ is a class in $H^{l-j, l-j}(V, \mathbb{C})$.

On the other hand, by (2.14), we have for $\underline{m} \leq j \leq \bar{m}$ and for every closed smooth real (j, j) -form $\omega^{(j)}$ on V that

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i=j}^{\bar{m}} \pi_0^*\{(T_\infty)_i\} \smile \pi_0^*\{\omega^{(j)}\} \smile h_{\mathbb{E}}^{k-l+i-j} &= \nu(T, V, \omega^{(j)}, \tau, h), \\ \sum_{i=j}^{\bar{m}} \pi_0^*\{(T'_\infty)_i\} \smile \pi_0^*\{\omega^{(j)}\} \smile h_{\mathbb{E}}^{k-l+i-j} &= \nu(T, V, \omega^{(j)}, \tau', h). \end{aligned}$$

Since we have by Theorem 2.5 (3) that $\nu(T, V, \omega^{(j)}, \tau, h) = \nu(T, V, \omega^{(j)}, \tau', h)$, subtracting the second line from the first one and using $x := h_{\mathbb{E}}$ yield that the class $\{S\} \in H^{p,p}(\overline{\mathbb{E}})$ satisfies the equation

$$(10.4) \quad \sum_{i=j}^{\bar{m}} \pi_0^*\{S_i\} \smile \pi_0^*\{\omega^{(j)}\} \smile x^{k-l+i-j} = 0,$$

for $\underline{m} \leq j \leq \overline{m}$ and for every closed smooth real (j, j) -form $\omega^{(j)}$ on V . It follows from (10.1) and (10.2) that the map $\theta : H^*(V) \rightarrow H^*(\mathbb{P}(\mathbb{E}))$, given by $\theta(\{\gamma\}) := \{\gamma\} \smile x^{k-l}$ for $\{\gamma\} \in H^*(V)$, is one-to-one.

Applying (10.4) for $j = \overline{m}$ yields that $\pi_0^*\{S_{\overline{m}}\} \smile \pi_0^*\{\omega^{(\overline{m})}\} \smile x^{k-l} = 0$. The injectivity of θ implies that $\{S_{\overline{m}}\} \smile \{\omega^{(\overline{m})}\} = 0$ in $H^*(V)$. By choosing $\{\omega^{(\overline{m})}\}$ among a basis of $H^{\overline{m}, \overline{m}}(V)$, it follows from the Poincaré duality that $\{S_{\overline{m}}\} = 0$.

If $\overline{m} = \underline{m}$ then we stop. Otherwise, using $\{S_{\overline{m}}\} = 0$ and applying (10.4) for $j = \overline{m} - 1$ and arguing as the above paragraph yields that $\{S_{\overline{m}-1}\} = 0$. We continue this process until we show that $\{S_{\underline{m}}\} = 0, \dots, \{S_{\overline{m}}\} = 0$. Hence, by (10.3) $\{S\} = 0$. This completes the proof of the theorem. \square

End of the proof of Theorem 2.16. By Theorem 1.3 and Theorem 2.14, the classes $c_i^{\text{DS}}(T, V)$'s are independent of the choice of an admissible map τ . Therefore, the RHS's in the formulas of Theorem 2.14 are independent of the choice of an admissible map τ and a Hermitian metric h on \mathbb{E} . By these formulas, so are the LHS's. \square

11. APPLICATIONS IN INTERSECTION THEORY

11.1. A criterion for the uniqueness of the tangent currents. Our first main result provides a relevant “local” sufficient condition for the uniqueness of the tangent currents. It is very convenient in practice.

For a (p, p) -current T on X consider the current \widehat{T} on X defined by

$$(11.1) \quad \widehat{T}(x) = -\log \text{dist}(x, V) \cdot T(x), \quad x \in X,$$

where $\text{dist}(x, V)$ is the distance from x to V with respect to a fixed smooth Hermitian metric on X .

Theorem 11.1. *Let X be a complex manifold of dimension k . Let $V \subset X$ be a Kähler submanifold of dimension l , and ω a Kähler form on V , and $B \subset V$ a relatively compact piecewise \mathcal{C}^2 -smooth open subset admitting a strongly admissible map. Suppose in addition that \overline{B} can be covered by a finite collection of \mathcal{C}^2 -smooth domains $(B_i)_{i \in I}$ with $B_i \Subset V$ such that $B_i \cap B$ is a \mathcal{C}^2 -smooth open subset in V . Let τ_i be a strongly admissible map for B_i , and h_i a Hermitian metric on $\mathbb{E}|_{\overline{B}_i}$ for $i \in I$. Let T be a positive closed currents of bidegree (p, p) such that $T = T^+ - T^-$ on a neighborhood of \overline{B} in X , where $T^\pm \in \text{CL}^{p,1,1}(B)$, and that for all $i \in I$,*

$$(11.2) \quad \kappa_j^\bullet(\widehat{T}, B_i \cap B, \omega, \mathbf{r}, \tau_i, h_i) < \infty \quad \text{for all} \quad \underline{m} \leq j \leq \overline{m}.$$

Then T admits a unique tangent current along B .

Prior to the proof of Theorem 11.1, we need some preparatory results. Recall from [46, Proposition 7.9] the following:

Proposition 11.2. *There are constants $c_3, c_4 > 0$ such that the conclusion of Proposition 5.6 holds and that for every $1 \leq \ell \leq \ell_0$, the following inequalities hold on $\mathbb{U}_\ell \cap \text{Tube}(B, \mathbf{r})$:*

- (1) $\pm(\tilde{\tau}_\ell^*(\alpha) - \alpha)^\sharp \lesssim c_3\pi^*\omega + c_4\beta + c_3\varphi^{1/2}\alpha$ and $(\tilde{\tau}_\ell^*(\alpha) - \alpha) \leq c_3\pi^*\omega + c_4\beta + c_3\varphi^{1/4}\alpha$;
 - (2) $\pm(\tilde{\tau}_\ell^*(\hat{\alpha}) - \hat{\alpha} - H)^\sharp \lesssim c_3\pi^*\omega + c_4\hat{\beta} + c_3\varphi^{1/2}\hat{\alpha}$ and $(\tilde{\tau}_\ell^*(\hat{\alpha}) - \hat{\alpha}) \leq c_3\pi^*\omega + c_4\hat{\beta} + c_3\varphi^{1/4}\hat{\alpha}$.
- Here, H is some form in the class \mathcal{H} given in Definition 5.5.*

The following result is needed.

Lemma 11.3. *Let τ'_i be a strongly admissible map for B_i , and h'_i a Hermitian metric on $\mathbb{E}|_{\overline{B}_i}$ for $i \in I$. Let T be a positive (p, p) -current on X . Then the following assertions hold:*

(1) *There is a constant $c > 0$ independent of T such that for every $i \in I$,*

$$c^{-1} \mathcal{K}_{j, k-p-j}(T, B, 0, c^{-1}r, \tau'_i, h') \leq \mathcal{K}_{j, k-p-j}(T, B, 0, r, \tau_i, h) \leq c \mathcal{K}_{j, k-p-j}(T, B, 0, cr, \tau'_i, h').$$

(2) *The following integrals are either simultaneously finite or simultaneously infinite:*

$$\sum_{j=\underline{m}}^{\overline{m}} \int_0^r \frac{\mathcal{K}_{j, k-p-j}(T, B_i \cap B, 0, r, \tau_i, h)}{r} dr \quad \text{and} \quad \sum_{j=\underline{m}}^{\overline{m}} \int_0^r \frac{\mathcal{K}_{j, k-p-j}(T, B_i \cap B, 0, r, \tau'_i, h')}{r} dr.$$

Proof. Assertion (2) is an immediate consequence of assertion (1). For the sake of simplicity we omit the sub-index i and suppose that $B_i = B$. We only need to prove assertion (1) in the following two cases:

Case I: $h' = h$.

By (5.20) and (5.21), we see easily that there is a constant $c > 0$ such that

$$c^{-1} \mathcal{K}_{j, k-p-j}(T, B, 0, r/2, \tau', h) \leq \mathcal{K}_{j, k-p-j}(T, B, 0, r, \tau, h) \leq c \mathcal{K}_{j, k-p-j}(T, B, 0, 2r, \tau', h).$$

This inequality implies the result.

Case II: $\tau' = \tau$.

It follows from Lemma 5.1 that

$$(11.3) \quad \hat{\beta} \approx c_1 \varphi \cdot \pi^* \omega + c_2 \beta_{\text{ver}} \quad \text{and} \quad \hat{\alpha} \approx c_1 \varphi \cdot \pi^* \omega + c_2 \beta_{\text{ver}} + c_1 \alpha_{\text{ver}}.$$

Denote by α^h, β^h (resp. $\alpha^{h'}, \beta^{h'}$) the forms α, β associated to the metric h (resp. h'). On the other hand, using (5.3) and (5.13), we see that

$$\alpha_{\text{ver}}^h \approx \alpha_{\text{ver}}^{h'} \quad \text{and} \quad \beta_{\text{ver}}^h \approx \beta_{\text{ver}}^{h'}.$$

Putting these estimates together implies that

$$\alpha^h \approx \alpha^{h'} \quad \text{and} \quad \beta^h \approx \beta^{h'}.$$

Using this and combining (5.20) and (5.21), the last inequality implies the result. \square

We keep the hypothesis and the notation in Subsection 5.7.

Lemma 11.4. *Let $\underline{m} \leq j \leq \overline{m}$ and set $\mathbf{j} := (k - j, 0, j, 0)$ and write, according (5.22),*

$$I_j(\widehat{T}, r) := I_{\mathbf{j}}(\widehat{T}, r), \quad I_j(\widehat{T}, s, r) := I_{\mathbf{j}}(\widehat{T}, s, r) \quad \text{and} \quad I_j^\#(\widehat{T}, r) := I_{\mathbf{j}}^\#(\widehat{T}, r), \quad I_j^\#(\widehat{T}, s, r) := I_{\mathbf{j}}^\#(\widehat{T}, s, r).$$

Let $0 \leq s < r \leq \mathbf{r}$. Then there is a constant c independent of T, s, r such that

$$|I_j(\widehat{T}, r) - I_j^\#(\widehat{T}, r)| \leq cr^{\frac{1}{4}} (\log r)^{1/2} \left(\sum_{i: i \geq j} I_i^\#(\widehat{T}, r + c_0 r^2) \right),$$

$$|I_j(\widehat{T}, s, r) - I_j^\#(\widehat{T}, s, r)| \leq cr^{\frac{1}{4}} (\log r)^{1/2} \left(\sum_{i: i \geq j} I_i^\#(\widehat{T}, s - c_0 s^2, r + c_0 r^2) \right).$$

Proof. We only give the proof of the second inequality since the proof of the first one is similar. Applying Lemma 5.12 yields a constant c independent of T and s, r such that the following inequality holds

$$|I_j(\widehat{T}, s, r) - I_j^\#(\widehat{T}, s, r)|^2 \leq c \left(\sum_{j'} I_{j'}^\#(\widehat{T}, s - c_0 s^2, r + c_0 r^2) \right) \left(\sum_{j''} I_{j''}^\#(\widehat{T}, s - c_0 s^2, r + c_0 r^2) \right).$$

Here, on the RHS:

- the first sum is taken over a finite number of multi-indices $\mathbf{j}' = (j'_1, j'_2, j'_3, j'_4)$ as above such that $j'_1 \leq j_1$ and $j'_2 \geq j_2$; and either $(j'_3 \leq j_3)$ or $(j'_3 > j_3$ and $j'_2 \geq j_2 + \frac{1}{2})$.
- the second sum is taken over a finite number of multi-indices $\mathbf{j}'' = (j''_1, j''_2, j''_3, j''_4)$ as above such that either $(j''_1 < j_1)$ or $(j''_1 = j_1$ and $j''_2 \geq \frac{1}{4} + j_2)$ or $(j''_1 = j_1$ and $j''_3 < j_3)$.

By the first item •, the first sum $\sum_{\mathbf{j}'} I_{\mathbf{j}'}^\#(\widehat{T}, s - c_0 s^2, r + c_0 r^2)$ is bounded by a constant times $\sum_{i: i \geq j} I_j^\#(\widehat{T}, s - c_0 s^2, r + c_0 r^2)$.

By Lemma 11.8 below, the second item •, the second sum is bounded by a constant times

$$\sum_i \mathcal{K}_{i,q}(\varphi^{1/4} \widehat{T}, s - c_0 s^2, r + c_0 r^2) + \sum_{i: i < k-p-q} \mathcal{K}_{i,q}(\widehat{T}, s - c_0 s^2, r + c_0 r^2).$$

We can prove that the second sum in the last line is bounded by a constant times $r^2 \log r$. In all, the the second sum $\sum_{\mathbf{j}''} I_{\mathbf{j}''}^\#(s - c_0 s^2, r + c_0 r^2)$ is bounded by a constant times $cr^{\frac{1}{2}}(\log r)(\sum_{i: i \geq j} I_j^\#(\widehat{T}, s - c_0 s^2, r + c_0 r^2))$. This, combined with the previous estimate on $\sum_{\mathbf{j}'} I_{\mathbf{j}'}^\#(s - c_0 s^2, r + c_0 r^2)$, implies the result. \square

Recall from [48, Theorem 1.6] the following result.

Theorem 11.5. *Let X, V, B and $I, (B_i)_{i \in I}, (\tau_i)_{i \in I}, (h_i)_{i \in I}$ be as in Theorem 11.1. Let T be a positive closed currents of bidegree (p, p) such that $T = T^+ - T^-$ on a neighborhood of \overline{B} in X , where $T^\pm \in \text{CL}^{p,1,1}(B)$, and that for all $i \in I$,*

$$(11.4) \quad \int_0^r \frac{\kappa_j^\bullet(T, B_i \cap B, \omega, r, \tau_i, h_i)}{r} dr < \infty \quad \text{for all} \quad \underline{m} \leq j \leq \overline{m}.$$

Then T admits a unique tangent current along B .

Proof. Since assumption (11.4) is condition (b-i) in [48, Theorem 1.6], the result follows. \square

Proof of Theorem 11.1. Applying Lemma 11.4, assumption (11.2) implies that $I_j^\#(\widehat{T}, B_i \cap B, 0, r, \tau_i, h_i) < \infty$, that is,

$$(11.5) \quad \mathcal{K}_{j,k-p-j}(\widehat{T}, B_i \cap B, 0, r, \tau_i, h_i) < \infty \quad \text{for all} \quad \underline{m} \leq j \leq \overline{m}.$$

Fix j with $\underline{m} \leq j \leq \overline{m}$. Write

$$(11.6) \quad \int_0^r \frac{\mathcal{K}_{j,k-p-j}(T, B_i \cap B, \omega, r, \tau_i, h_i)}{r} dr = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \int_{\frac{r}{2^{n+1}}}^{\frac{r}{2^n}} \frac{\mathcal{K}_{j,k-p-j}(T, B_i \cap B, \omega, r, \tau_i, h_i)}{r} dr.$$

Since we have, for $r \in [\frac{r}{2^{n+1}}, \frac{r}{2^n}]$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{K}_{j,k-p-j}(T, B_i \cap B, \omega, \frac{r}{2^{n+1}}, \tau_i, h_i) &\leq \mathcal{K}_{j,k-p-j}(T, B_i \cap B, \omega, r, \tau_i, h_i) \\ &\leq \mathcal{K}_{j,k-p-j}(T, B_i \cap B, \omega, \frac{r}{2^n}, \tau_i, h_i), \end{aligned}$$

the RHS of (11.6) is dominated by

$$\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \int_{\frac{r}{2^{n+1}}}^{\frac{r}{2^n}} \frac{\mathcal{K}_{j,k-p-j}(T, B_i \cap B, \omega, \frac{r}{2^n}, \tau_i, h_i)}{r} dr = \ln 2 \cdot \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \mathcal{K}_{j,k-p-j}(T, B_i \cap B, \omega, \frac{r}{2^n}, \tau_i, h_i).$$

Rewrite the sum on the RHS as

$$\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \sum_{q=n}^{\infty} \mathcal{K}_{j,k-p-j}(T, B_i \cap B, \omega, \frac{\mathbf{r}}{2^{q+1}}, \frac{\mathbf{r}}{2^q}, \tau_i, h_i) = \sum_{q=0}^{\infty} (q+1) \mathcal{K}_{j,k-p-j}(T, B_i \cap B, \omega, \frac{\mathbf{r}}{2^{q+1}}, \frac{\mathbf{r}}{2^q}, \tau_i, h_i).$$

Since for each $q \in \mathbb{N}$, $|\log \text{dist}(y, V) - q| \leq c$ for $y \in \text{Tube}(B_i \cap B, \frac{\mathbf{r}}{2^{q+1}}, \frac{\mathbf{r}}{2^q})$, it follows that

$$(q+1) \mathcal{K}_{j,k-p-j}(T, B_i \cap B, \omega, \frac{\mathbf{r}}{2^{q+1}}, \frac{\mathbf{r}}{2^q}, \tau_i, h_i) \lesssim \mathcal{K}_{j,k-p-j}(\hat{T}, B_i \cap B, \omega, \frac{\mathbf{r}}{2^{q+1}}, \frac{\mathbf{r}}{2^q}, \tau_i, h_i).$$

Hence, the last sum is dominated by $\mathcal{K}_{j,k-p-j}(\hat{T}, B_i \cap B, \omega, 0, \mathbf{r}, \tau_i, h_i)$, which is in turn finite by (11.5). By [48], condition (11.4) is equivalent to the following appearing in (11.6):

$$\int_0^{\mathbf{r}} \frac{\mathcal{K}_{j,k-p-j}(T, B_i \cap B, \omega, r, \tau_i, h_i)}{r} dr < \infty, \quad \text{for all } \underline{\mathbf{m}} \leq j \leq \overline{\mathbf{m}}.$$

Therefore, condition (11.2) is equivalent to condition (11.4). \square

Remark 11.6. In fact, the method of the proof of the above theorem also shows that for every $i \in I$ and for every $j_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ with $\underline{\mathbf{m}} \leq j_0 \leq \overline{\mathbf{m}}$, the following four conditions are equivalent:

(1)

$$\int_0^{\mathbf{r}} \frac{\kappa_j^\bullet(T, B_i \cap B, \omega, r, \tau_i, h_i)}{r} dr < \infty \quad \text{for all } j_0 \leq j \leq \overline{\mathbf{m}}.$$

(2)

$$\kappa_j^\bullet(\hat{T}, B_i \cap B, \omega, \mathbf{r}, \tau_i, h_i) < \infty \quad \text{for all } j_0 \leq j \leq \overline{\mathbf{m}}.$$

(3)

$$\sum_{j=j_0}^{\overline{\mathbf{m}}} \int_0^{\mathbf{r}} \frac{\mathcal{K}_{j,k-p-j}(T, B_i \cap B, \omega, 0, r, \tau, h)}{r} dr < \infty.$$

(4)

$$\sum_{j=j_0}^{\overline{\mathbf{m}}} \mathcal{K}_{j,k-p-j}(\hat{T}, B_i \cap B, \omega, 0, r, \tau, h) \leq \infty.$$

We give here the following consequence which captures the essential points of the above Theorem 11.1 in the special but important context where the ambient manifold X is Kähler. We expect that this explicit statement will be useful in practice.

Corollary 11.7. *Let X, V be as above and suppose that X is Kähler and that (V, ω) is Kähler and that $B \subset V$ is a relatively compact piecewise \mathcal{C}^2 -smooth open subset. Let T be a positive closed current of bidegree (p, p) on X such that there is a neighborhood W of ∂B in X such that the restriction of T on W is a \mathcal{C}^1 -smooth form and that for all $i \in I$,*

$$\kappa_j^\bullet(\hat{T}, B_i \cap B, \mathbf{r}, \tau_i, h_i) < \infty \quad \text{for all } \underline{\mathbf{m}} \leq j \leq \overline{\mathbf{m}}.$$

Then T admits a unique tangent current along B .

The following auxiliary result will be useful in the next subsection.

Lemma 11.8. *Let $T \in \text{CL}^{p;1,1}(B)$. Let $\underline{\mathbf{m}} \leq j \leq \overline{\mathbf{m}}$ and $0 \leq q \leq k - p - j - 1$. Then $\mathcal{K}_{j,q}(\hat{T}, r, \tau, h) \leq cr^{2(k-p-q-j)} |\log r|$.*

Proof. We argue as in the proof of [48, Proposition 4.3] (which in turn relies on Theorem 6.2) making the obviously necessary changes and taking into account expression (11.1). Consequently, we can show that $\mathcal{K}_{j,q}(\widehat{S}, 0, r, \tau, h) \leq cr^{2(k-p-q-j)}|\log r|$ for all smooth positive closed (p, p) -currents $S \in \widetilde{\text{CL}}^{p;1,1}(\mathbf{U}, \mathbf{W})$, where $c > 0$ is a constant independent of S . Since S is smooth, we infer that

$$\mathcal{K}_{j,q}(\widehat{S}, r, \tau, h) = \mathcal{K}_{j,q}(\widehat{S}, 0, r, \tau, h) \leq cr^{2(k-p-q-j)}|\log r|,$$

Using an approximation of T by smooth positive closed (p, p) -currents S 's, the result follows. \square

We conclude this subsection with the following result which will be needed in Section 12.

Proposition 11.9. *For every $i \in I$ and for every $j_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ with $\underline{m} \leq j_0 \leq \overline{m}$, the following two conditions are equivalent:*

- (1) $\kappa_j(\widehat{T}, B_i \cap B, \omega, \mathbf{r}, \tau_i, h_i) < \infty$ for all $j_0 \leq j \leq \overline{m}$.
- (2)

$$\sum_{j=j_0}^{\overline{m}} \mathcal{K}_{j,k-p-j}(\widehat{T}, B_i \cap B, \omega, r, \tau, h) \leq \infty.$$

In particular, the condition that $\kappa_j(\widehat{T}, B_i \cap B, \omega, \mathbf{r}, \tau_i, h_i) < \infty$ for all $i \in I$ $j_0 \leq j \leq \overline{m}$ is independent of the choice of τ_i, h_i .

Proof. Applying the first inequality of Lemma 11.4 and applying Theorem 6.2 and Lemma 11.8, the first assertion follows.

The second assertion holds by combining the first one and Lemma 11.3. \square

11.2. A criterion for the wedgeability in the sense of Dinh-Sibony. We keep the hypothesis and the notation in Subsection 2.5. Let (X, ω) be a compact Kähler manifold of dimension k . Consider $m \geq 2$ integers $p_1, \dots, p_m \geq 1$ such that $p := p_1 + \dots + p_m \leq k$. Let $\Delta := \{(x, \dots, x) : x \in X\}$ be the diagonal of X^m , and ω_Δ be a Kähler form on Δ , and τ be a strongly admissible map along Δ in X^m . Let $\pi : \mathbb{E} \rightarrow \Delta$ be the normal bundle to Δ in X^m . Let h be a Hermitian metric on \mathbb{E} . Using formula (2.2) we define α and β on \mathbb{E} . Using formula (5.3) we define α_{ver} on \mathbb{E} . Let $\text{dist}(\mathbf{x}, \Delta)$ be the distance from a point $\mathbf{x} \in X^m$ to Δ . We may assume that $\text{dist}(\cdot, \Delta) \leq 1/2$. So

$$\widehat{\mathbb{T}} := -\log \text{dist}(\cdot, \Delta) \cdot \mathbb{T}$$

is a positive (p, p) -current on X^m .

Let $T_j \in \text{CL}^{p_j}(X)$ for $1 \leq j \leq m$ with $p := p_1 + \dots + p_m \leq k = \dim(X)$. Consider $\mathbb{T} := T_1 \otimes \dots \otimes T_m \in \text{CL}^p(X^m)$. In this context, $\underline{m} = k - p$ and $\overline{m} = \min(k, mk - p)$.

Lemma 11.10. *It holds that $\alpha_{\text{ver}}^{(m-1)k} = 0$.*

Proof. We use the local model recalled in Subsection 5.3. It follows from (5.13) that

$$(11.7) \quad \alpha_{\text{ver}}(z, w) = A(w)^*[dd^c \log \|z\|^2] \quad \text{for } z \in \mathbb{C}^{(m-1)k}, w \in \mathbb{D}^k,$$

where $A : \mathbb{D}^l \rightarrow \text{GL}(\mathbb{C}, k - l)$ is a smooth function. Since $(dd^c \log \|z\|^2)^{(m-1)k} = 0$, the result follows. \square

The last lemma of the section shows that the finiteness condition of the minimal dimension is superfluous.

Lemma 11.11. *Suppose that assumption (1) of Theorem 2.18 is fulfilled, that is,*

$$\kappa_j^\bullet(-\log \text{dist}(\cdot, \Delta) \cdot \mathbb{T}, \Delta, \omega_\Delta, \mathbf{r}, h) < \infty \quad \text{for some } \mathbf{r} > 0 \text{ and for all } k-p < j \leq k - \max_{1 \leq i \leq m} p_i.$$

Then the above inequality also holds for } j = k - p, \text{ that is,}

$$\kappa_{k-p}^\bullet(-\log \text{dist}(\cdot, \Delta) \cdot \mathbb{T}, \Delta, \omega_\Delta, \mathbf{r}, h) < \infty.$$

Proof. First consider an index j with $k - \max_{1 \leq i \leq m} p_i < j \leq \bar{m} = \min(k, mk - p)$. Using a local computation and (5.20) and (5.21), we see easily that $\mathcal{H}_{j, k-p-j}(T, B_i \cap B, \omega, 0, r, \tau_i, h_i) = 0$. Therefore, applying Lemma 11.8 and Lemma 11.4 yields that

$$\lim_{r \rightarrow 0^+} \kappa_j^\bullet(-\log \text{dist}(\cdot, \Delta) \cdot \mathbb{T}, \Delta, \omega_\Delta, r, \tau, h) = 0.$$

Hence, we are only concerned with indices j with $\underline{m} = k - p \leq j \leq k - \max_{1 \leq i \leq m} p_i$. By Lemma 11.10 $\alpha_{\text{ver}}^{(m-1)k} = 0$. On the other hand, by (11.3), we have that $\hat{\alpha} \lesssim c_1 \varphi \cdot \pi^* \omega + c_2 \hat{\beta} + c_1 \alpha_{\text{ver}}$. Using these two estimates, we can show that

$$\hat{\alpha}^{(m-1)k} \leq c \sum_{(i,j)} \hat{\alpha}^i \wedge \pi^* \omega^j \wedge \hat{\beta}^{(m-1)k-i-j},$$

where the sum is taken over all $(i, j) \in \mathbb{N}^2$ with $i \leq (m-1)k - 1$ and $i + j \leq (m-1)k$. Using this and (5.20) and (5.21), and applying Lemma 11.8 and Lemma 11.4 we see easily that there is a constant $c > 0$ such that

$$\mathcal{H}_{\underline{m}, 0}(T, B, 0, r, \tau, h) \leq c \sum_{j=\underline{m}+1}^{\bar{m}} \mathcal{H}_{j, k-p-j}(T, B, 0, r, \tau, h) + cr^2 |\log r|.$$

By Remark 11.6 for $j_0 = \underline{m} + 1$, the result follows. \square

End of the proof of Theorem 2.18. By Lemma 11.11, condition (1) of the theorem implies condition (11.2). Therefore, by Theorem 11.1, there exists a unique tangent current to \mathbb{T} along Δ .

On the other hand, by Theorem 2.12 (3), condition (2) of the theorem implies that the horizontal dimension of \mathbb{T} along Δ is minimal, i.e. $\hbar = \underline{m} = k - p$. Then by Theorem 1.7 and by Definition 1.8, $T_1 \wedge \dots \wedge T_m$ exists in the sense of the theory of tangent current. This completes the proof. \square

12. CONTINUITY OF DINH-SIBONY INTERSECTION

In this section we combine the technique of the generalized Lelong numbers developed in the previous sections with that of Dinh-Nguyen-Vu [20] on the super-potential theory in order to study the continuity of Dinh-Sibony intersection.

12.1. Super-potentials. Super-potentials are functions which play the role of quasi-potentials for positive closed currents of arbitrary bi-degree. For simplicity, we will not introduce this notion in full generality but limit ourselves in the necessary setting. Let X be a compact Kähler manifold of dimension k . We also fix a Kähler form ω on X . If T is a positive or negative (p, p) -current on X , its mass is given by $\|T\| := \langle T, \omega^{k-p} \rangle$ or $\|T\| := -\langle T, \omega^{k-p} \rangle$ respectively. Let $\mathcal{D}^q(X)$ (or \mathcal{D}^q for short) denote the real vector space spanned by positive closed (q, q) -currents on X . Define the **-norm* on this space

by $\|R\|_* := \min(\|R^+\| + \|R^-\|)$, where R^\pm are positive closed (q, q) -currents satisfying $R = R^+ - R^-$ and $\|\cdot\|$ denotes the mass of a current. We consider this space of currents with the following *topology* : a sequence $(R_n)_{n \geq 0}$ in $\mathcal{D}^q(X)$ converges in this space to R if $R_n \rightarrow R$ weakly and if $\|R_n\|_*$ is bounded independently of n . On any $*$ -bounded set of $\mathcal{D}^q(X)$, this topology coincides with the classical weak topology for currents. It was shown in [23] that the subspace $\tilde{\mathcal{D}}^q(X)$ of real closed smooth (q, q) -forms is dense in $\mathcal{D}^q(X)$ for the considered topology.

Let $\mathcal{D}_0^q(X)$ and $\tilde{\mathcal{D}}_0^q(X)$ denote the linear subspaces in $\mathcal{D}^q(X)$ and $\tilde{\mathcal{D}}^q(X)$ respectively of currents whose cohomology classes in $H^{q,q}(X, \mathbb{R})$ vanish. Their co-dimensions are equal to the dimension of $H^{q,q}(X, \mathbb{R})$ which is finite. Fix a real smooth and closed (p, p) -form γ_T in the same cohomology class with T in $H^{p,p}(X, \mathbb{R})$. We will consider in this paper the super-potential of T which is the real function \mathcal{U}_T on $\tilde{\mathcal{D}}_0^{k-p+1}$ defined by

$$(12.1) \quad \mathcal{U}_T(R) := \langle T - \gamma_T, U_R \rangle \quad \text{for} \quad R \in \tilde{\mathcal{D}}_0^{k-p+1},$$

where U_R is any smooth form of bi-degree $(k-p, k-p)$ such that $dd^c U_R = R$. This form always exists because the cohomology class of R vanishes. Note that since the cohomology class of $T - \gamma_T$ vanishes, we can write $T - \gamma_T = dd^c U_T$ for some current U_T . By Stokes theorem, we have

$$\mathcal{U}_T(R) = \langle dd^c U_T, U_R \rangle = \langle U_T, dd^c U_R \rangle = \langle U_T, R \rangle.$$

We deduce from this identities that $\mathcal{U}_T(R)$ does not depend on the choice of U_R and U_T . However, \mathcal{U}_T depends on the reference form γ . Note also that if T is smooth, it is not necessary to take R and U_R smooth.

We will not consider other super-potentials of T . They are some affine extensions of \mathcal{U}_T to \mathcal{D}^{k-p+1} or its extensions to some subspaces. The following notions do not depend on the choice of super-potential nor on the reference form α . We say that T has a *bounded super-potential* if \mathcal{U}_T is bounded on each $*$ -bounded subset of $\tilde{\mathcal{D}}_0^{k-p+1}$. We say that T has a *continuous super-potential* if \mathcal{U}_T can be extended to a continuous function on \mathcal{D}_0^{k-p+1} . Recall that $\mathcal{D}^p(X)$ is a metric space.

Definition 12.1. (Dinh-Sibony [24, 25]) Consider now two positive closed currents T and S on X of bi-degree (p, p) and (q, q) respectively. Assume that $p + q \leq k$ and that T has a continuous super-potential. So \mathcal{U}_T is defined on whole \mathcal{D}_0^{k-p+1} . We can define the wedge-product $T \wedge S$ by

$$(12.2) \quad \langle T \wedge S, \phi \rangle := \langle \gamma_T \wedge S, \phi \rangle + \mathcal{U}_T(S \wedge dd^c \phi)$$

for every smooth real test form ϕ of bi-degree $(k-p-q, k-p-q)$. We say that $T \wedge S$ is defined in the sense of Dinh-Sibony's super-potential theory, or equivalently, T and S are wedgeable in the sense of Dinh-Sibony's super-potential theory.

Note that $S \wedge dd^c \phi$ belongs to \mathcal{D}_0^{k-p+1} because it is equal to $dd^c(S \wedge \phi)$. It is not difficult to check that $T \wedge S$ is equal to the usual wedge-product of T and S when one of them is smooth. The current $T \wedge S$ is positive and closed, see [20, 24, 25, 55].

Recall that the projections $\Pi_j : \widehat{X \times X} \rightarrow X$ are submersions, see e.g. [23]. We have seen that the definition of super-potential involves the solutions of the equation $dd^c U_R = R$ for $R \in \tilde{\mathcal{D}}_0^{k-p+1}$. We will recall here the construction of kernel solving this equation and refer to [25] for details.

By Blanchard's theorem [8], $\widehat{X \times X}$ is a Kähler manifold. So we fix a Kähler form $\widehat{\omega}$ on $\widehat{X \times X}$ and we can apply Hodge theory to this manifold. By Künneth's formula, the cohomology class $\{\Delta\}$ of $[\Delta]$ in $H^{k,k}(X \times X, \mathbb{R})$ can be represented by a real smooth closed (k, k) -form γ_Δ which is a finite sum of forms of type $\pi_1^*(\phi_1) \wedge \pi_2^*(\phi_2)$ where ϕ_1 and ϕ_2 are closed smooth forms of suitable bi-degrees on X . By [10, 1.2.1] and [25, Ex. 2.3.1], there is a real smooth closed $(k-1, k-1)$ -form $\widehat{\eta}$ on $\widehat{X \times X}$ such that $\widehat{\eta} \wedge [\widehat{\Delta}]$ is cohomologous to $\Pi^*(\gamma_\Delta)$ and

$$(12.3) \quad \Pi_*(\widehat{\eta} \wedge [\widehat{\Delta}]) = [\Delta].$$

Choose a real smooth closed $(1, 1)$ -form $\widehat{\gamma}$ on $\widehat{X \times X}$ which is cohomologous to $[\widehat{\Delta}]$. So we can write $[\widehat{\Delta}] - \widehat{\gamma} = dd^c \widehat{u}$, where \widehat{u} is a quasi-p.s.h. function on $\widehat{X \times X}$. This equation implies that \widehat{u} is smooth outside $\widehat{\Delta}$ and $\widehat{u} - \log \text{dist}(\cdot, \widehat{\Delta})$ is a smooth function near $\widehat{\Delta}$. Subtracting from \widehat{u} a constant allows us to assume that \widehat{u} is negative. Observe that since $\widehat{\gamma} \wedge \widehat{\eta}$ is cohomologous to $\Pi^*(\alpha_\Delta)$, there is a real smooth $(k-1, k-1)$ -form $\widehat{\gamma}'$ on $\widehat{X \times X}$ such that

$$(12.4) \quad dd^c \widehat{\gamma}' = \widehat{\gamma} \wedge \widehat{\eta} - \Pi^*(\gamma_\Delta).$$

Adding to $\widehat{\gamma}'$ a constant times $\widehat{\omega}^{k-1}$ allows us to assume that $\widehat{\gamma}'$ is positive. For $\epsilon > 0$, denote by $\widehat{\Delta}_\epsilon$ the set of points in $\widehat{X \times X}$ with distance less than ϵ to $\widehat{\Delta}$.

Proposition 12.2. (1) (See [20, Proposition 2.3]) *If R is in $\mathcal{D}_q^0(X)$ and $U_R := (\Pi_1)_*((\widehat{u}\widehat{\eta} + \widehat{\gamma}') \wedge \Pi_2^*(R))$, then $dd^c U_R = R$.*

(2) (See [20, Lemma 2.4]) *Let T, γ_T and \mathcal{U}_T be as above. Then for every R in $\widetilde{\mathcal{D}}_{k-p+1}^0(X)$, we have*

$$\mathcal{U}_T(R) = \int_{\widehat{X \times X}} (\widehat{u}\widehat{\eta} + \widehat{\gamma}') \wedge \Pi_1^*(T - \gamma_T) \wedge \Pi_2^*(R).$$

The following proposition gives us a characterization of currents with bounded super-potentials.

Proposition 12.3. (See [20, Proposition 2.5]) *Let T be a positive closed (p, p) -current on X . Then T has a bounded super-potential if and only if there is a constant $c > 0$ such that for every smooth positive closed $(k-p+1, k-p+1)$ -form R on X with $\|R\| \leq 1$ we have*

$$-\int_{\widehat{X \times X}} \widehat{u} \widehat{\omega}^{k-1} \wedge \Pi_1^*(T) \wedge \Pi_2^*(R) \leq c.$$

We give now a criterion to check if a current has a continuous super-potential. Let T be a positive closed (p, p) -current as above. Recall that for $\epsilon > 0$, $\widehat{\Delta}_\epsilon$ denotes the set of points in $\widehat{X \times X}$ with distance less than ϵ to $\widehat{\Delta}$. Consider the following quantity

$$(12.5) \quad \vartheta_T(\epsilon) := \sup_R \int_{\widehat{\Delta}_\epsilon} -\widehat{u} \widehat{\omega}^{k-1} \wedge \Pi_1^*(T) \wedge \Pi_2^*(R),$$

where the supremum is taken over all smooth positive closed forms R on X , of bi-degree $(k-p+1, k-p+1)$, such that $\|R\| \leq 1$.

Proposition 12.4. (See [20, Proposition 2.7]) *Let T be a positive closed (p, p) -current on X . Then T has a continuous super-potential if and only if $\vartheta_T(\epsilon)$ tends to 0 as ϵ tends to 0.*

12.2. Generalization to m -fold products. Fix an integer $m \geq 2$. Let $\mathbb{X} := X^m$ and let $\Delta := \{(x, \dots, x) : x \in X\}$ be the diagonal of \mathbb{X} . Let $\Pi : \widehat{\mathbb{X}} \rightarrow \mathbb{X}$ be the blow-up of \mathbb{X} along the diagonal Δ and let $\widehat{\Delta} := \Pi^{-1}(\Delta)$ be the exceptional hypersurface. Denote by π_j the projections from \mathbb{X} onto its j -th factors for $1 \leq j \leq m$, and define $\Pi_j := \pi_j \circ \Pi$. Recall that the projections $\Pi_j : \widehat{\mathbb{X}} \rightarrow X$ are submersions, see e.g. [23]. By Blanchard's theorem [8] again, $\widehat{\mathbb{X}}$ is a Kähler manifold. So we fix a Kähler form $\widehat{\omega}$ on $\widehat{\mathbb{X}}$ and we can apply Hodge theory to this manifold. By Künneth's formula, the cohomology class $[\Delta]$ in $H^{k,k}(\mathbb{X}, \mathbb{R})$ can be represented by a real smooth closed $((m-1)k, (m-1)k)$ -form γ_Δ which is a finite sum of forms of type $\pi_1^*(\phi_1) \wedge \dots \wedge \pi_m^*(\phi_m)$ where ϕ_1, \dots, ϕ_m are closed smooth forms of suitable bi-degrees on X . By [10, 1.2.1] and [25, Ex. 2.3.1], there is a real smooth closed $((m-1)k-1, (m-1)k-1)$ -form $\widehat{\eta}$ on $\widehat{\mathbb{X}}$ such that $\widehat{\eta} \wedge [\widehat{\Delta}]$ is cohomologous to $\Pi^*(\gamma_\Delta)$ and

$$(12.6) \quad \Pi_*(\widehat{\eta} \wedge [\widehat{\Delta}]) = [\Delta].$$

Choose a real smooth closed $(1, 1)$ -form $\widehat{\gamma}$ on $\widehat{\mathbb{X}}$ which is cohomologous to $[\widehat{\Delta}]$. So we can write

$$(12.7) \quad [\widehat{\Delta}] - \widehat{\gamma} = dd^c \widehat{u},$$

where \widehat{u} is a quasi-p.s.h. function on $\widehat{\mathbb{X}}$. This equation implies that \widehat{u} is smooth outside $\widehat{\Delta}$ and $\widehat{u} - \log \text{dist}(\cdot, \widehat{\Delta})$ is a smooth function near $\widehat{\Delta}$. Subtracting from \widehat{u} a constant allows us to assume that \widehat{u} is negative. Observe that since $\widehat{\gamma} \wedge \widehat{\eta}$ is cohomologous to $\Pi^*(\gamma_\Delta)$, there is a real smooth $((m-1)k-1, (m-1)k-1)$ -form $\widehat{\gamma}'$ on $\widehat{\mathbb{X}}$ such that

$$(12.8) \quad dd^c \widehat{\gamma}' = \widehat{\gamma} \wedge \widehat{\eta} - \Pi^*(\gamma_\Delta).$$

Adding to $\widehat{\gamma}'$ a constant times $\widehat{\omega}^{(m-1)k-1}$ allows us to assume that $\widehat{\gamma}'$ is positive. For $\epsilon > 0$, denote by $\widehat{\Delta}_\epsilon$ the set of points in $\widehat{\mathbb{X}}$ with distance less than ϵ to $\widehat{\Delta}$. Let $\iota : X \rightarrow \Delta$ be the natural map $x \mapsto (x, \dots, x)$ sending X to Δ . We also denote by $\iota : X \rightarrow X^m = \mathbb{X}$ the natural map $x \mapsto (x, \dots, x)$ sending X to $X^m = \mathbb{X}$. Let $\pi' : \mathbb{X} = X^m \rightarrow X^{m-1}$ be the canonical projection onto the first $m-1$ factors. Set $\Pi' := \pi' \circ \Pi : \widehat{\Pi} \rightarrow X^{m-1}$. Denote also by π_1 the canonical projection $\pi_1 : X^{m-1} \rightarrow X$ onto the first factor. Let Δ' be the diagonal of X^{m-1} , i.e. $\Delta' = \{(x, \dots, x) \in X^{m-1} : x \in X\}$. For a smooth form γ on X^{m-1} let $\gamma|_{\Delta'}$ be the restriction of γ to Δ' .

Proposition 12.5. *Let $R_2 \in \mathcal{D}^{p_2}, \dots, R_m \in \mathcal{D}^{p_m}$ be continuous and assume that γ_R is a closed smooth (p', p') -form in the class of $R_2 \otimes \dots \otimes R_m$ in $H^{p', p'}(X^{m-1})$.*

- (1) *Set $U_R := (\Pi_1)_*((\widehat{u}\widehat{\eta} + \widehat{\gamma}') \wedge (\Pi_2^*(R_2) \wedge \dots \wedge \Pi_m^*(R_m) - (\Pi')^*\gamma_R))$ on X . Then $dd^c U_R = R - \gamma_R|_{\Delta'}$.*
- (2) *Set $\widehat{U}_R := (\widehat{u}\widehat{\eta} + \widehat{\gamma}') \wedge (\Pi_2^*(R_2) \wedge \dots \wedge \Pi_m^*(R_m))$ on $\widehat{\mathbb{X}}$. Then for every smooth form ϕ of bidegree $(k-p', k-p')$ on \mathbb{X} , we have that*

$$\langle \widehat{U}_R, \Pi^*(dd^c \phi) \rangle_{\widehat{\mathbb{X}}} = \langle R, \iota^* \phi \rangle_X - \langle (\pi_1)_*(\gamma_\Delta) \wedge (\pi_1)_*(\pi')^*(\gamma_R), \iota^* \phi \rangle_X.$$

Proof. It is enough to consider the case where R_2, \dots, R_m are smooth.

We start with the proof of assertion (1). A direct computation using (12.8) and the definition of \widehat{u} in (12.7) gives

$$\begin{aligned} dd^c U_R &= (\Pi_1)_*([\widehat{\Delta}] \wedge \widehat{\eta} \wedge \Pi_2^*(R_2) \wedge \dots \wedge \Pi_m^*(R_m) - (\Pi')^*\gamma_R) \\ &\quad - (\Pi_1)_*(\Pi^*(\gamma_\Delta) \wedge \Pi_2^*(R_2) \wedge \dots \wedge \Pi_m^*(R_m) - (\Pi')^*\gamma_R). \end{aligned}$$

Observe that the restriction of $\Pi_j^*(R_j)$ to $\widehat{\Delta}$ is equal to that of $\Pi_1^*(R_j)$ for $j = 2, \dots, m$, and that the restriction of $(\Pi')^*(\gamma_R)$ to $\widehat{\Delta}$ is equal to that of $\Pi_1^*(\gamma_R|_{\Delta'})$. Therefore, using (12.3) and the identity $\Pi_1 = \pi_1 \circ \Pi$, we see that the first term in the RHS of the last equation is equal to

$$(\Pi_1)_*([\widehat{\Delta}] \wedge \widehat{\eta}) \wedge (R - \gamma_R|_{\Delta'}) = (\pi_1)_*[\Delta] \wedge (R - (\pi_1)_*(\gamma_R|_{\Delta'})) = R - (\pi_1)_*(\gamma_R|_{\Delta'}).$$

It remains to check that the second term vanishes. Using $\Pi_j = \pi_j \circ \Pi$, we see that

$$\begin{aligned} & (\Pi_1)_*(\Pi^*(\gamma_\Delta) \wedge \Pi_2^*(R_2) \wedge \dots \wedge \Pi_m^*(R_m) - (\Pi')^*\gamma_R) \\ &= (\pi_1)_*\Pi_*(\Pi^*(\gamma_\Delta) \wedge \Pi_2^*(R_2) \wedge \dots \wedge \Pi_m^*(R_m) - (\Pi')^*\gamma_R) \\ &= (\pi_1)_*(\gamma_\Delta \wedge \pi_2^*(R_2) \wedge \dots \wedge \pi_m^*(R_m) - (\pi')^*\gamma_R). \end{aligned}$$

Now, if Φ is a smooth test form of the right bi-degree on X and if $(x^{(1)}, \dots, x^{(m)})$ denotes the coordinates of points in \mathbb{X} , we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \langle (\pi_1)_*(\gamma_\Delta \wedge (\pi_2^*(R_2) \wedge \dots \wedge \pi_m^*(R_m) - (\pi')^*\gamma_R)), \Phi \rangle \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{X}} \Phi(x^{(1)}) \wedge \gamma_\Delta(x^{(1)}, \dots, x^{(m)}) \wedge (R_2(x^{(2)}) \wedge \dots \wedge R_m(x^{(m)}) - \gamma_R(x^{(2)}, \dots, x^{(m)})). \end{aligned}$$

Since the cohomology class of $R - \gamma_R$ vanishes in X^{m-1} , it is an exact form. Recall from the choice of γ_Δ that it has a nice property of variable separation. Therefore, using Stokes and Fubini's theorems, we see that the last integral vanishes when we first integrate in variables $x^{(2)}, \dots, x^{(m)}$. So

$$(12.9) \quad \langle (\pi_1)_*(\gamma_\Delta \wedge (\pi_2^*(R_2) \wedge \dots \wedge \pi_m^*(R_m) - (\pi')^*\gamma_R)), \Phi \rangle.$$

This completes the proof of assertion (1).

To prove assertion (2), a direct computation using (12.8) and the definition of \widehat{u} in (12.7) gives

$$\begin{aligned} dd^c \widehat{U}_R &= [\widehat{\Delta}] \wedge \widehat{\eta} \wedge \Pi_2^*(R_2) \wedge \dots \wedge \Pi_m^*(R_m) \\ &\quad - \Pi^*(\gamma_\Delta) \wedge \Pi_2^*(R_2) \wedge \dots \wedge \Pi_m^*(R_m). \end{aligned}$$

Observe that the restriction of $\Pi_j^*(R_j)$ to $\widehat{\Delta}$ is equal to that of $\Pi_1^*(R_j)$ for $j = 2, \dots, m$, and that the restriction of $(\Pi)^*(\phi)$ to $\widehat{\Delta}$ is equal to that of $\Pi_1^*(\iota^*(\phi))$. Therefore, by Stokes' formula, we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \widehat{U}_{R,\phi}, \Pi^*(dd^c \phi) \rangle_{\widehat{\mathbb{X}}} &= \langle dd^c \widehat{U}_{R,\phi}, \Pi^*(\phi) \rangle_{\widehat{\mathbb{X}}} \\ &= \langle (\Pi_1)_*([\widehat{\Delta}] \wedge \widehat{\eta}) \wedge (\Pi_1)_*(\Pi_2^*(R_2) \wedge \dots \wedge \Pi_m^*(R_m)), \Pi_1^*(\iota^*(\phi)) \rangle_{\widehat{\mathbb{X}}} \\ &\quad - \langle ((\Pi_1)_*([\widehat{\Delta}] \wedge \widehat{\eta}) \wedge (\Pi_1)_*(\Pi^*(\gamma_\Delta)) \wedge (\Pi_1)_*(\Pi_2^*(R_2) \wedge \dots \wedge \Pi_m^*(R_m))), \Pi_1^*(\iota^*(\phi)) \rangle_{\widehat{\mathbb{X}}}. \end{aligned}$$

Using (12.3) we see that the last expression is equal to

$$\langle R_2 \wedge \dots \wedge R_m, \iota^*(\phi) \rangle_X - \langle (\pi_1)_*(\gamma_\Delta) \wedge R_2 \wedge \dots \wedge R_m, \iota^*(\phi) \rangle_X.$$

Using (12.9) for the second term, assertion (2) follows. \square

The following theorem allows us to compute the value of a wedge-product in terms of super-potentials.

Theorem 12.6. (1) Let $T_1 \in \mathcal{D}^{p_1}$ and let γ_1 be a closed smooth (p_1, p_1) -form such that $\gamma_1 \in \{T_1\}$. Let \mathcal{U}_T be as above. Then for every $R_2 \in \mathcal{D}^{p_2}, \dots, R_m \in \mathcal{D}^{p_m}$ and every closed smooth (p', p') -form γ_R on X^{m-1} such that $\gamma_R \in \{R_2 \otimes \dots \otimes R_m\}$, we have

$$\mathcal{U}_T(R_2 \wedge \dots \wedge R_m - \gamma_R) = \int_{\widehat{\mathbb{X}}} (\hat{u}\hat{\eta} + \hat{\gamma}') \wedge \Pi_1^*(T_1 - \gamma_1) \wedge (\Pi_2^*(R_2) \wedge \dots \wedge \Pi_m^*(R_m) - (\Pi')^*(\gamma_R)).$$

(2) For every $R_1 \in \mathcal{D}^{p_1}, \dots, R_m \in \mathcal{D}^{p_m}$ and every smooth test form ϕ on \mathbb{X} , we have

(12.10)

$$\begin{aligned} \langle T_1 \wedge \dots \wedge T_m, \iota^* \phi \rangle &= \int_{\widehat{\mathbb{X}}} (\hat{u}\hat{\eta} + \hat{\gamma}') \wedge \Pi_1^*(T_1) \wedge \Pi_2^*(T_2) \wedge \dots \wedge \Pi_m^*(T_m) \wedge \Pi^*(dd^c \phi) \\ &\quad - \int_{\widehat{\mathbb{X}}} (\hat{u}\hat{\eta} + \hat{\gamma}') \wedge \Pi_1^*(\gamma_1) \wedge (\Pi')^*(\gamma_R) \wedge \Pi^*(dd^c \phi) + \langle \gamma_1 \wedge (\pi_1)_*(\gamma_R|_{\Delta'}), \iota^* \phi \rangle. \end{aligned}$$

Proof. Let U_R be as in Proposition 12.5. Observe that it is smooth since R is smooth. By definition of super-potential in the introduction, we deduce from the definition of U_R that

$$\mathcal{U}_T(R - \gamma_R|_{\Delta'}) = \langle T_1 - \gamma_1, U_{R - \gamma_R|_{\Delta'}} \rangle = \langle \Pi_1^*(T_1 - \gamma_1), (\hat{u}\hat{\eta} + \hat{\gamma}') \wedge ((\Pi_2^*(R) \wedge \dots \wedge \Pi_m^*(R_m) - (\Pi')^*(\gamma_R)) \rangle.$$

Assertion (1) follows.

By Proposition 12.5 (2) applied to $R_2 := T_2, \dots, R_m := T_m$ and to $\pi_1^*(T_1 - \gamma_1) \wedge \phi$ in place of ϕ , we have that

$$\langle T_1 \wedge T_2 \wedge \dots \wedge T_m, \iota^* \phi \rangle = \langle \gamma_1 \wedge T_2 \wedge \dots \wedge T_m, \phi \rangle + \langle \widehat{U}_R, \Pi^*((\pi_1^*(T_1 - \gamma_1) \wedge dd^c \phi)) \rangle_{\widehat{\mathbb{X}}}.$$

Write $\langle \widehat{U}_R, \Pi^*((\pi_1^*(T_1 - \gamma_1) \wedge dd^c \phi)) \rangle_{\widehat{\mathbb{X}}} = I - II$, where

$$\begin{aligned} I &:= \int_{\widehat{\mathbb{X}}} (\hat{u}\hat{\eta} + \hat{\gamma}') \wedge \Pi_1^*(T_1) \wedge (\Pi_2^*(T_2) \wedge \dots \wedge \Pi_m^*(T_m) \wedge \Pi^*(dd^c \phi)), \\ II &:= \int_{\widehat{\mathbb{X}}} (\hat{u}\hat{\eta} + \hat{\gamma}') \wedge \Pi_1^*(\gamma_1) \wedge (\Pi_2^*(T_2) \wedge \dots \wedge \Pi_m^*(T_m) \wedge \Pi^*(dd^c \phi)). \end{aligned}$$

Set $U_R := (\Pi_1)_*((\hat{u}\hat{\eta} + \hat{\gamma}') \wedge (\Pi_2^*(T_2) \wedge \dots \wedge \Pi_m^*(T_m) - (\Pi')^*\gamma_R))$. Then by Proposition 12.5 (1), $dd^c U_R = T_2 \wedge \dots \wedge T_m - \gamma_R|_{\Delta'}$. Therefore, by Stokes' theorem,

$$\langle \gamma_1 \wedge (T_2 \wedge \dots \wedge T_m - \gamma_R|_{\Delta'}), \phi \rangle = \langle \gamma_1 \wedge dd^c U_R, \phi \rangle = \langle \gamma_1 \wedge U_R, dd^c \phi \rangle$$

On the other hand,

$$II = \langle \gamma_1 \wedge U_R, dd^c \phi \rangle + \int_{\widehat{\mathbb{X}}} (\hat{u}\hat{\eta} + \hat{\gamma}') \wedge \Pi_1^*(\gamma_1) \wedge (\Pi')^*(\gamma_R) \wedge \Pi^*(dd^c \phi).$$

Hence, we deduce that

$$II = \langle \gamma_1 \wedge (T_2 \wedge \dots \wedge T_m - \gamma_R|_{\Delta'}), \phi \rangle + \int_{\widehat{\mathbb{X}}} (\hat{u}\hat{\eta} + \hat{\gamma}') \wedge \Pi_1^*(\gamma_1) \wedge (\Pi')^*(\gamma_R) \wedge \Pi^*(dd^c \phi).$$

Putting this expression for (II) into the above expression for $\langle \widehat{U}_R, \Pi^*((\pi_1^*(T_1 - \gamma_1) \wedge dd^c \phi)) \rangle_{\widehat{\mathbb{X}}}$, the desired expression for $\langle T_1 \wedge T_2 \wedge \dots \wedge T_m, \phi \rangle$ follows. \square

Finally, we introduce a quantity which has some similarity with that given in (12.5). Let $T_i \in \text{CL}^{p_i}(X)$ for $1 \leq i \leq m$ and set $\mathbb{T} = T_1 \otimes \dots \otimes T_m \in \text{CL}^p(\mathbb{X})$. For $0 < \epsilon \leq \epsilon_0$,

consider the quantity

$$(12.11) \quad \begin{aligned} \vartheta(\mathbb{T}, \epsilon) &:= \int_{\widehat{\Delta}_\epsilon} -\hat{u}\hat{\omega}^{mk-p} \wedge \Pi_1^*(T_1) \wedge \dots \wedge \Pi_m^*(T_m) \in [0, \infty], \\ \vartheta^\bullet(\mathbb{T}, \epsilon) &:= \int_{\widehat{\Delta}_\epsilon \setminus \widehat{\Delta}} -\hat{u}\hat{\omega}^{mk-p} \wedge \Pi_1^*(T_1) \wedge \dots \wedge \Pi_m^*(T_m) \in [0, \infty]. \end{aligned}$$

It is worth noting that for $m = 2$, the following relation holds between (12.5) and (12.11):

$$\vartheta_{T_1}(\epsilon) = \sup \vartheta(T_1 \otimes T_2, \epsilon),$$

where the supremum is taken over all smooth positive closed forms T_2 on X , of bi-degree $(k - p_1 + 1, k - p_1 + 1)$, such that $\|T_2\| \leq 1$.

12.3. Blow-up model versus normal vector bundle. Let $\pi : \mathbb{E} \rightarrow \Delta$ denote the normal vector bundle to Δ in \mathbb{X} . We identify Δ with the zero section of \mathbb{E} . For $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}^*$, let $A_\lambda : \mathbb{E} \rightarrow \mathbb{E}$ be the multiplication by λ on the fibers of π . The diagonal Δ is invariant under the action of A_λ . Consider a strongly admissible map τ along Δ from an open neighborhood of Δ in \mathbb{X} to a neighborhood of Δ in \mathbb{E} . Let h be a Hermitian metric on \mathbb{E} . Using formula (2.2) we define α and β on \mathbb{E} . Using formula (5.7) we define $\hat{\alpha}$ on \mathbb{E} . The following result relates the blow-up along the diagonal versus the normal bundle along the diagonal. We use the holomorphic admissible maps $\tau_\ell : \mathbb{U}_\ell \rightarrow \mathbb{U}_\ell$ introduced in Subsection 5.4 for the present context of the submanifold Δ in the ambient manifold \mathbb{X} .

Proposition 12.7. *There is a constant $c_3 > 0$ such that the following inequalities hold*

$$(12.12) \quad \begin{aligned} \Pi_*(\hat{\omega}) &\approx \omega + \tau_\ell^* \alpha_{\text{ver}} + \tau_\ell^* \beta_{\text{ver}} \approx \tau_\ell^* \hat{\alpha} \quad \text{on} \quad \mathbb{U}_\ell \setminus V, \\ \pm((\tau^{-1} \circ \tau_\ell)^*(\Pi_* \hat{\omega}) - \Pi_* \hat{\omega} - H)^\sharp &\lesssim c_3 \omega + c_4 \tau_\ell^*(\hat{\beta}) + c_3 \varphi^{1/2} \Pi_* \hat{\omega} \quad \text{on} \quad (\mathbb{U}_\ell \cap \tau^{-1}(\mathbb{U}_\ell)) \setminus V, \\ (\tau^{-1} \circ \tau_\ell)^*(\Pi_* \hat{\omega}) - \Pi_* \hat{\omega} &\leq c_3 \omega + c_4 \tau_\ell^*(\hat{\beta}) + c_3 \varphi^{1/4} \Pi_* \hat{\omega} \quad \text{on} \quad (\mathbb{U}_\ell \cap \tau^{-1}(\mathbb{U}_\ell)) \setminus V. \end{aligned}$$

Here, H is some form in the class $\mathcal{H}(\mathbb{X})$ given in Definition 5.5.

Note that $\text{Tube}(B, \mathbf{r}) \subset \bigcup_{1 \leq \ell \leq \ell_0} (\mathbb{U}_\ell \cap \tau^{-1}(\mathbb{U}_\ell))$.

Proof. Consider the following local model of the blow-up $\Pi : \widehat{\mathbb{X}} \rightarrow \mathbb{X}$. More specifically, consider a mk -dimensional polydisc \mathbb{D}^{mk} in \mathbb{X} with holomorphic coordinates

$$(z, w) = (z_1, \dots, z_{(m-1)k}, w_1, \dots, w_k)$$

around an arbitrary point of Δ in \mathbb{X} . We can choose these local coordinates so that Δ is equal to the linear subspace $\{z_1 = \dots = z_{(m-1)k} = 0\}$. Let $[u_1 : \dots : u_{(m-1)k}]$ be the homogeneous coordinates on $\mathbb{P}^{(m-1)k-1}$. Then, $\widehat{\mathbb{X}} \cap \Pi^{-1}(\mathbb{D}^{mk})$ may be identified with the complex manifold

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{\mathbb{D}^{mk}} &:= \left\{ (z_1, \dots, z_{(m-1)k}, w_1, \dots, w_k, [u_1 : \dots : u_{(m-1)k}]) \in \mathbb{D}^{mk} \times \mathbb{P}^{(m-1)k-1} : \right. \\ &\quad \left. z_i u_j = z_j u_i \quad \text{for} \quad 1 \leq i, j \leq (m-1)k \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

Observe that Π is induced by the canonical projection from $\mathbb{D}^{mk} \times \mathbb{P}^{(m-1)k-1}$ onto the factor \mathbb{D}^{mk} . Let Π' be the canonical projection from $\widehat{\mathbb{D}^{mk}}$ onto the factor \mathbb{D}^{mk} . Let ω_{mk} be the canonical Kähler form on \mathbb{C}^{mk} , that is,

$$\omega_{mk}(z, w) := dd^c \|(z_1, \dots, z_{(m-1)k})\|^2 + dd^c \|(w_1, \dots, w_k)\|^2.$$

Let ω_{FS} be the Fubini-Study form on $\mathbb{P}^{(m-1)k-1}$. Recall that ω_{FS} is induced by the $(1, 1)$ -form $dd^c \log \|(u_1, \dots, u_{(m-1)k})\|$ on $\mathbb{C}^{(m-1)k} \setminus \{0\}$. Since $\hat{\omega}$ is a Kähler form on $\widehat{\mathbb{D}^{mk}}$, we obtain

$$\hat{\omega} \approx \Pi'^*(\omega_{mk}) + \Pi''^*(\omega_{\text{FS}}) = dd^c \|(z_1, \dots, z_{(m-1)k})\|^2 + dd^c \|(w_1, \dots, w_k)\|^2 + dd^c \log \|(u_1, \dots, u_{(m-1)k})\|.$$

Therefore, we infer that on $\mathbb{D}^{2k} \setminus \Delta$,

$$\Pi_*(\hat{\omega}) \approx \Pi_*(\Pi'^*(\omega_{mk})) + \Pi_*(\Pi''^*(\omega_{\text{FS}})) = \omega_{mk} + \Pi_*(\Pi''^*(\omega_{\text{FS}})).$$

Since $[u_1 : \dots : u_{(m-1)k}] = [z_1 : \dots : z_{(m-1)k}]$ outside the exceptional hypersurface $\Pi^{-1}(\Delta)$ of $\widehat{\mathbb{D}^{mk}}$, it follows that

$$\Pi_*(\hat{\omega}) \approx dd^c \|(z_1, \dots, z_{(m-1)k})\|^2 + dd^c \|(w_1, \dots, w_k)\|^2 + dd^c \log \|(z_1, \dots, z_{(m-1)k})\|.$$

This inequality holds on $\mathbb{D}^{2k} \setminus \Delta$ and hence on \mathbb{D}^{2k} since positive closed $(1, 1)$ -currents have no mass on subvarieties of codimension ≥ 2 . Now we come back the Kähler manifold (X, ω) . Since

$$dd^c \|(z_1, \dots, z_{(m-1)k})\|^2 \approx \beta_{\text{ver}}, \quad dd^c \|(w_1, \dots, w_k)\|^2 \approx \omega(w), \quad dd^c \log \|(z_1, \dots, z_{(m-1)k})\| \approx \alpha_{\text{ver}},$$

we infer that $\Pi^*\hat{\omega} \approx \omega + \pi_*(\beta_{\text{ver}}) + \pi_*(\alpha_{\text{ver}})$. By (11.3), we deduce that $\Pi^*\hat{\omega} \approx \pi_*(\hat{\alpha})$. Consequently, the result follows from an application of Proposition 11.2. \square

12.4. Effective criteria for the continuity of Dinh-Sibony intersection. As in Theorem 2.21 let $m \geq 2$ be an integer, and let $(T_{j,n})_{n=0}^\infty$ be a sequence of currents of uniformly bounded mass in $\text{CL}^{p_j}(X)$ for $1 \leq j \leq m$. Consider, for $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $\mathbb{T}_n := T_{1,n} \otimes \dots \otimes T_{m,n} \in \text{CL}^p(X^m)$. Suppose that $T_{j,n} \rightarrow T_j$ weakly as n tends to infinity for $1 \leq j \leq m$.

For $0 < r \leq r$ set

$$(12.13) \quad \Xi_\infty(r) := \sum_{j=\underline{m}}^{\overline{m}} \mathcal{K}_{j,k-p-j}(-\log \text{dist}(\cdot, \Delta) \cdot \mathbb{T}, \Delta, \omega_\Delta, r, \tau, h).$$

We also set

$$(12.14) \quad \begin{aligned} \Xi_n(r) &:= \sum_{j=\underline{m}}^{\overline{m}} \mathcal{K}_{j,k-p-j}(-\log \text{dist}(\cdot, \Delta) \cdot \mathbb{T}_n, \Delta, \omega_\Delta, r, \tau, h) \quad \text{for } n \in \mathbb{N}, \\ \Xi(r) &:= \sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \Xi_n(r). \end{aligned}$$

By Remark 11.6, assumption (12.5) implies that

$$(12.15) \quad \lim_{r \rightarrow 0^+} \Xi_\infty(r) = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \lim_{r \rightarrow 0^+} \Xi(r) = 0.$$

Consider the following family of closed currents of degree $2p$ indexed by $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}^*$

$$\mathcal{R}_\lambda := (A_\lambda)_* \tau_*(T_1 \otimes \dots \otimes T_m).$$

Since τ may not be holomorphic, the current \mathcal{R}_λ may not be of bi-degree (p, p) and we cannot talk about its positivity. However, for any sequence $(\lambda_n)_{n \geq 1}$ in \mathbb{C}^* converging to infinity, there is a subsequence $(\lambda_{n_j})_{j \geq 1}$ such that $\mathcal{R}_{\lambda_{n_j}}$ converges to some positive closed

current \mathcal{R} of bi-degree (p, p) in \mathbb{E} , as j tends to infinity. We say that \mathcal{R} is a *tangent current* of $T_1 \otimes \dots \otimes T_m$ along Δ . It may depend on the sequence λ_{n_j} but it is independent of the choice of τ . Recall from Theorem 1.3 that \mathcal{R} is invariant under the action of A_λ for every $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}^*$.

Tangent currents can be seen using local holomorphic coordinates near Δ . We will introduce here coordinates which are suitable for the proof of Theorem 2.18. Let $x^{(1)} = (x_1^{(1)}, \dots, x_k^{(1)})$ denote a local holomorphic coordinate system on a local chart U of X . We consider the natural coordinate system $(x^{(1)}, \dots, x^{(m)})$ on U^m with $x^{(j)} = (x_1^{(j)}, \dots, x_k^{(j)})$, a copy of $x^{(1)}$ for $2 \leq j \leq m$, such that $\Delta_U := \Delta \cap (U^m)$ is given by the equation $x^{(j)} = x^{(1)}$ for $2 \leq j \leq m$. We will use the coordinates (w, z) for a small neighborhood W of Δ_U with $z^{(j)} := x^{(j)} - x^{(1)}$ for $2 \leq j \leq m$ and $w := x^{(1)}$. So Δ_U is given by the equation $z = 0$. The restriction of \mathbb{E} to Δ_U can be identified with $\Delta_U \times \mathbb{C}^k$. In this setting, the projection π is just the map $(w, z) \mapsto (w, 0)$. The dilation A_λ is the map $(w, z) \mapsto (w, \lambda z)$.

For simplicity, we also identify W with an open subset of $\Delta_U \times (\mathbb{C}^k)^{m-1}$. With all these notations, the currents $\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{R}_n$ above satisfy

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{R} &= \lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} (A_{\lambda_{n_j}})_*(T_1 \otimes \dots \otimes T_m) \quad \text{on } \Delta_U \times (\mathbb{C}^k)^{m-1}, \\ \mathcal{R}_n &= \lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} (A_{\lambda_{n_j}})_*(T_{1,n} \otimes \dots \otimes T_{m,n}) \quad \text{on } \Delta_U \times (\mathbb{C}^k)^{m-1}, \end{aligned}$$

or equivalently, for any real smooth form Φ of bi-degree $(mk - p, mk - p)$ with compact support in $\Delta_U \times (\mathbb{C}^k)^{m-1}$, we have

$$(12.16) \quad \begin{aligned} \langle \mathcal{R}, \Phi \rangle &= \lim_{\lambda \rightarrow \infty} \langle (A_\lambda)_*(T_1 \otimes \dots \otimes T_m), \Phi \rangle, \\ \langle \mathcal{R}_n, \Phi \rangle &= \lim_{\lambda \rightarrow \infty} \langle (A_\lambda)_*(T_{1,n} \otimes \dots \otimes T_{m,n}), \Phi \rangle. \end{aligned}$$

In what follows, we only need to consider λ such that $|\lambda| \geq 1$.

So we need to study the pairing in the RHS of the identity (12.16). We only need to consider the case where

$$\Phi(w, z) = \Phi_1(w) \otimes \Phi_2(z^{(2)}) \otimes \dots \otimes \Phi_m(z^{(m)}),$$

where Φ_1 is a $(k-p, k-p)$ -smooth form compactly supported in \mathbb{C}^k , and for $2 \leq j \leq m$, Φ_j is a (k, k) -smooth form compactly supported in \mathbb{C}^k so that $\Phi(w, z)$ has compact support in W . We have

$$(12.17) \quad \langle (A_\lambda)_*(T_1 \otimes \dots \otimes T_m), \Phi \rangle = \langle T_1 \otimes \dots \otimes T_m, A_\lambda^*(\Phi) \rangle.$$

Theorem 12.8. *Under the hypothesis and the notation of Theorem 2.18, then the intersection $T_1 \wedge \dots \wedge T_m$ provided by this theorem satisfies the following formula for every smooth test form ϕ on X :*

$$(12.18) \quad \begin{aligned} \langle T_1 \wedge \dots \wedge T_m, \phi \rangle &= \int_{\hat{X}} (\hat{u}\hat{\eta} + \hat{\gamma}') \wedge \Pi_1^*(T_1) \wedge \Pi_2^*(T_2) \wedge \dots \wedge \Pi_m^*(T_m) \wedge \Pi_1^*(dd^c\phi) \\ &\quad - \int_{\hat{X}} (\hat{u}\hat{\eta} + \hat{\gamma}') \wedge \Pi_1^*(\gamma_1) \wedge (\Pi')^*(\gamma_R) \wedge \Pi_1^*(dd^c\phi) + \langle \gamma_1 \wedge \gamma_R|_{\Delta'}, \phi \rangle. \end{aligned}$$

Remark 12.9. In the case $m = 2$, the result was proved in [20, Lemma 2.4] using formula (12.2).

Prior to the proof, we develop some preparatory results. For every $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}$ with $|\lambda| \geq 1$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}^*$, consider

(12.19)

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{I}^\lambda &:= \int_{\widehat{X}} (\hat{u}\hat{\eta} + \hat{\gamma}') \wedge \Pi_1^*(T_1) \wedge \Pi_2^*(T_2) \wedge \dots \wedge \Pi_m^*(T_m) \wedge \Pi^*(A_\lambda^*(dd^c\Phi)) \\ \mathcal{I}^\lambda &:= - \int_{\widehat{X}} (\hat{u}\hat{\eta} + \hat{\gamma}') \wedge \Pi_1^*(\gamma_1) \wedge (\Pi')^*(\gamma_T) \wedge \Pi^*(A_\lambda^*(dd^c\Phi)) + \langle \gamma_1 \wedge \gamma_T|_{\Delta'}, \iota^*(A_\lambda^*(\Phi)) \rangle. \end{aligned}$$

We will show that the following limits exist:

$$(12.20) \quad \mathcal{I} = \lim_{\lambda \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{I}^\lambda, \quad \mathcal{J} = \lim_{\lambda \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{J}^\lambda,$$

where for $\phi := (\pi_1)_*(\Phi)$,

$$(12.21) \quad \begin{aligned} \mathcal{I} &:= \int_{\widehat{X}} (\hat{u}\hat{\eta} + \hat{\gamma}') \wedge \Pi_1^*(T_1) \wedge \Pi_2^*(T_2) \wedge \dots \wedge \Pi_m^*(T_m) \wedge \Pi_1^*(dd^c\phi) \\ \mathcal{J} &:= - \int_{\widehat{X}} (\hat{u}\hat{\eta} + \hat{\gamma}') \wedge \Pi_1^*(\gamma_1) \wedge (\Pi')^*(\gamma_T) \wedge \Pi_1^*(dd^c\phi) + \langle \gamma_1 \wedge \gamma_T|_{\Delta'}, \iota^*(\phi) \rangle. \end{aligned}$$

Lemma 12.10. *It holds that $\mathcal{I} = \lim_{\lambda \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{I}^\lambda$.*

Proof. Since the forms $\gamma_1, \gamma_T, \phi, \hat{\eta}, \hat{\gamma}'$ are smooth, and $\hat{u} = \log \text{dist}(\cdot, \widehat{\Delta}) + O(1)$, a straightforward computation gives the result. \square

For $2 \leq j \leq m$, we consider the $X_1 \times X_j$ and two projections $\pi_{1,j}$ on the first factor and $\pi_{2,j}$ on the second factor:

$$(12.22) \quad \Psi_{j,\lambda} := (\pi_{1,j})_* [A_\lambda^*(\Phi_j) \wedge \pi_{2,j}^*(T_j)].$$

Let Δ_j be the diagonal of $X_1 \times X_j$. Let $\iota_j : X_j \rightarrow \Delta_j$ be the canonical injection. Let $\tilde{\pi}_j : \mathbb{E}_j \rightarrow \Delta_j$ be the canonical projection, where \mathbb{E}_j is the normal vector bundle to Δ_j in $X_1 \times X_j$.

Lemma 12.11. *For $2 \leq j \leq m$, the following assertions hold:*

- (1) $\Psi_{j,\lambda}$ is a closed smooth (p_j, p_j) -form.
- (2) $\Psi_{j,\lambda}$ converges weakly to $\iota_j^*((\tilde{\pi}_j)_*(\Phi_j)) \wedge T_j$ as λ tends to infinity.

Proof. We have

$$(12.23) \quad \Psi_{j,\lambda}(w) = \int_{z^{(j)} \in \mathbb{C}^k} \Phi_j(\lambda z^{(j)}) \wedge T_j(w + z^{(j)}) = \int_{z^{(j)} \in \mathbb{C}^k} \Phi_j(\lambda(z^{(j)} - w)) \wedge T_j(z^{(j)}).$$

Since Φ_j is a smooth (k, k) -form and T_j is closed, $\Psi_{j,\lambda}$ is a closed smooth (p_j, p_j) -form, which proves assertion (1).

Assertion (2) follows from [20, Lemma 3.2]. \square

By (12.17) we have that

$$(12.24) \quad \langle A_\lambda^*(T_1 \otimes \dots \otimes T_m), \Phi \rangle_{\widehat{X}} = \langle T_1 \wedge \Psi_{2,\lambda} \wedge \dots \wedge \Psi_{m,\lambda}, \Phi_1 \rangle_X.$$

By Theorem 12.6 (2) (formula (12.10)), the RHS of the above equation is equal to $\mathcal{I}^\lambda + \mathcal{J}^\lambda$, where

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{I}^\lambda &:= \int_{\widehat{\mathbb{X}}} (\hat{u}\hat{\eta} + \hat{\gamma}') \wedge \Pi_1^*(T_1) \wedge \Pi_2^*(\Psi_{2,\lambda}) \wedge \dots \wedge \Pi_m^*(\Psi_{m,\lambda}) \wedge \Pi_1^*(dd^c\Phi_1) \\ \mathcal{J}^\lambda &:= - \int_{\widehat{\mathbb{X}}} (\hat{u}\hat{\eta} + \hat{\gamma}') \wedge \Pi_1^*(\gamma_1) \wedge (\Pi')^*(\gamma_R) \wedge \Pi_1^*(dd^c\Psi_1) + \langle \gamma_1 \wedge \gamma_R|_{\Delta'}, \iota^*\Psi \rangle.\end{aligned}$$

Fix an arbitrary positive number δ_0 , and then using (12.15), choose a number $0 < \epsilon_0 < \delta_0$ small enough such that

$$(12.25) \quad \Xi_\infty(4\epsilon_0) \leq \delta_0.$$

Let $0 \leq \rho \leq 1$ be a smooth function with compact support in $\widehat{\Delta}_{2\epsilon_0}$ which is equal to 1 on $\widehat{\Delta}_{\epsilon_0}$. Let $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}$ with $|\lambda| \geq 1$, By (12.28), we write

$$(12.26) \quad \mathcal{I}^\lambda := \mathcal{I}'_{\epsilon_0, \lambda} + \mathcal{I}''_{\epsilon_0, \lambda},$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{I}'_{\epsilon_0, \lambda} &:= \int_{\widehat{\mathbb{X}}} \rho(\hat{u}\hat{\eta} + \hat{\gamma}') \wedge \Pi_1^*(T_1) \wedge \Pi_2^*(\Psi_{2,\lambda}) \wedge \dots \wedge \Pi_m^*(\Psi_{m,\lambda}) \wedge \Pi_1^*(dd^c\Phi_1), \\ \mathcal{I}''_{\epsilon_0, \lambda} &:= \int_{\widehat{\mathbb{X}}} (1 - \rho)(\hat{u}\hat{\eta} + \hat{\gamma}') \wedge \Pi_1^*(T_1) \wedge \Pi_2^*(\Psi_{2,\lambda}) \wedge \dots \wedge \Pi_m^*(\Psi_{m,\lambda}) \wedge \Pi_1^*(dd^c\Phi_1).\end{aligned}$$

By (12.21), we have

$$(12.27) \quad \mathcal{I} := \mathcal{I}'_{\epsilon_0} + \mathcal{I}''_{\epsilon_0},$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{I}'_{\epsilon_0} &:= \int_{\widehat{\mathbb{X}}} \rho(\hat{u}\hat{\eta} + \hat{\gamma}') \wedge \Pi_1^*(T_1) \wedge \Pi_2^*(T_2) \wedge \dots \wedge \Pi_m^*(T_m) \wedge \Pi_1^*(dd^c\phi), \\ \mathcal{I}''_{\epsilon_0} &:= \int_{\widehat{\mathbb{X}}} (1 - \rho)(\hat{u}\hat{\eta} + \hat{\gamma}') \wedge \Pi_1^*(T_1) \wedge \Pi_2^*(T_2) \wedge \dots \wedge \Pi_m^*(T_m) \wedge \Pi_1^*(dd^c\phi).\end{aligned}$$

Lemma 12.12. *There is a constant $c > 0$ independent of δ_0, ϵ_0 and the currents T_j 's such that for every $|\lambda| \geq 1$,*

$$|\mathcal{I}'_{\epsilon_0, \lambda}| \leq c\Xi_\infty(4\epsilon_0) \quad \text{and} \quad |\mathcal{I}''_{\epsilon_0}| \leq c\Xi_\infty(4\epsilon_0).$$

Proof. We only prove the first inequality since the proof of the second one is similar, even easier and simpler than the first one.

We may assume without loss of generality that the Φ_j 's are positive volume forms for $2 \leq j \leq m$. Since $\pm dd^c\Phi_1 \lesssim \omega^{k-p}$ and $\hat{u} = -\log \text{dist}(\cdot, \widehat{\Delta}) + O(1)$, the above positivity shows that

$$\begin{aligned}|\mathcal{I}'_{\epsilon_0, \lambda}| &\lesssim \int_{\widehat{\mathbb{X}}} \rho(-\log \text{dist}(\cdot, \widehat{\Delta}) + O(1)) \wedge \hat{\omega}^{(m-1)k} \wedge \Pi_1^*(T_1) \wedge \Pi_2^*(\Psi_{2,\lambda}) \wedge \dots \wedge \Pi_m^*(\Psi_{m,\lambda}) \wedge \Pi^*(\omega^{k-p}) \\ &\lesssim \int_{\mathbb{X}} (\rho \circ \Pi)(-\log \text{dist}(\cdot, \Delta) + O(1)) \wedge \Pi_* (\hat{\omega})^{(m-1)k} \wedge T_1 \wedge \Psi_{2,\lambda} \wedge \dots \wedge \Psi_{m,\lambda} \wedge \omega^{k-p}.\end{aligned}$$

By Fubini's theorem and using (12.23), the last line and hence $|\mathcal{S}'_{\epsilon_0, \lambda}|$ satisfies

$$|\mathcal{S}'_{\epsilon_0, \lambda}| \leq \int_{x \in \mathcal{D}_{\epsilon_0}} \left(\int_{z^{(2)} \in \mathbb{C}^k} \Phi_2(\lambda z^{(2)}) \dots \int_{z^{(m)} \in \mathbb{C}^k} \Phi_m(\lambda z^{(m)}) \log \left(\sum_{j=2}^m \|x^{(j)} - x^{(1)} - z^{(j)}\| \right) \right) (T_1 \otimes T_2 \otimes \dots \otimes T_m)(x) \wedge \hat{\omega}^{mk-p},$$

where

$$\mathcal{D}_{\epsilon_0} := \{x = (x^{(1)}, \dots, x^{(m)}) \in \mathbb{C}^k \times \dots \times \mathbb{C}^k : \|x^{(2)} - x^{(1)}\| + \dots + \|x^{(m)} - x^{(1)}\| < 2\epsilon_0\}.$$

The following elementary result is needed.

Lemma 12.13. *Suppose that the Φ_j 's are positive smooth (k, k) -forms compactly supported in \mathbb{D}^k . Then, for $x = (x^{(1)}, \dots, x^{(m)}) \in \mathbb{D}^k \times \dots \times \mathbb{D}^k$ and for $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}$ with $|\lambda| \geq 1$,*

$$\int_{z^{(2)} \in \mathbb{D}^k} \Phi_2(\lambda z^{(2)}) \dots \int_{z^{(m)} \in \mathbb{D}^k} \Phi_m(\lambda z^{(m)}) \left| \log \left(\sum_{j=2}^m \|x^{(j)} - x^{(1)} - z^{(j)}\| \right) \right| \leq c + c \min \left(\log |\lambda|, \left| \log \left(\sum_{j=2}^m \|x^{(j)} - x^{(1)}\| \right) \right| \right),$$

where $c > 0$ is a constant independent of x .

Proof of Lemma 12.13. We may assume without loss of generality that $\Phi_j(z^{(j)}) = \text{Vol}_{\mathbb{D}^k}(z^{(j)})$, where $\text{Vol}_{\mathbb{D}^k}$ is the canonical volume form on \mathbb{D}^k . Write

$$z' := (z^{(2)}, \dots, z^{(m)}) \in \mathbb{C}^{(m-1)k} \quad \text{and} \quad x' := (x^{(2)} - x^{(1)}, \dots, x^{(m)} - x^{(1)}) \in \mathbb{C}^{(m-1)k}.$$

Let $\text{Vol}(z')$ denote the canonical volume form on $\mathbb{C}^{(m-1)k}$. The lemma boils down to the following inequality

$$\lambda^{2(m-1)k} \int_{\|z'\| < \lambda^{-1}} \log \|y' - z'\| d\text{Vol}(z') \leq c + c \min(\log \lambda, \log \|y'\|) \quad \text{for} \quad \lambda \geq 1.$$

Using a suitable unitary matrix of order $(m-1)k$, we may assume without loss of generality that $y' := (r, 0, \dots, 0)$, where $r \in [0, (m-1)k]$. Let t be the real part of the first coordinate in z' . Since $\|y' - z'\| = \|r - z'\| \geq |r - t|$, an application of Fubini's theorem shows that it suffices to prove the following

$$\lambda \int_{|t| < \lambda^{-1}} |\log |r - t|| dt \leq c + c \min(\log \lambda, |\log r|) \quad \text{for} \quad \lambda \geq 1 \quad \text{and} \quad r \in [0, (m-1)k].$$

To prove the last estimate it is sufficient to observe that its LHS $\leq c + c \log r$ if $r \geq 2\lambda^{-1}$, and that its LHS $\leq c + c \log \lambda$ otherwise. \square

Using the definition of $\Xi_{\infty}(4\epsilon)$ given in (12.13) and Proposition 12.7, we see that $|\mathcal{S}'_{\epsilon_0, \lambda}|$ is smaller than $\Xi_{\infty}(4\epsilon_0)$ times a constant independent of δ_0, T_j . This completes the proof. \square

Lemma 12.14. *It holds that $\lim_{\lambda \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{S}'_{\epsilon_0, \lambda} = \mathcal{S}''_{\epsilon_0}$.*

Proof. Since $(1 - \rho)(\hat{u}\hat{\eta} + \hat{\gamma}')$ is smooth and vanishes near $\hat{\Delta}$, it is equal to $\Pi^*(\Theta)$ for some smooth form Θ on \mathbb{X} which vanishes near Δ . This, combined with Lemma 12.11 implies that the considered term is equal to

$$\Pi_1^*(T_1) \wedge \Pi_2^*(\Psi_{2,\lambda}) \wedge \dots \wedge \Pi_m^*(\Psi_{m,\lambda}) \wedge \Pi_1^*(dd^c\Phi_1 \wedge \Theta).$$

Recall that the tensor product of m currents depends continuously on these currents. Since by Lemma 12.11, the last pairing converges to

$$\begin{aligned} & \langle T_1 \otimes \iota_2^*((\tilde{\pi}_2)_*(\Phi_2)) \wedge T_2 \otimes \dots \otimes \iota_m^*((\tilde{\pi}_m)_*(\Phi_m)) \wedge T_m, \Theta \wedge dd^c\Phi_1 \rangle \\ &= \langle T_1 \otimes \dots \otimes T_m, \Theta \wedge dd^c\Phi \rangle \end{aligned}$$

as λ tends to infinity. By (12.26), the expression in the last line is equal to $\mathcal{J}_{\epsilon_0}''$. This proves the lemma. \square

We arrive at the

End of the proof of Theorem 12.8. Let $\delta_0 > 0$ be an arbitrary number as above. Choose $\epsilon_0 \in (0, \delta_0)$ to satisfy (12.25). By Lemma 12.14, there exists $\lambda_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for all $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}$ with $|\lambda| \geq \lambda_0$,

$$|\mathcal{J}_{\epsilon_0}'',\lambda - \mathcal{J}_{\epsilon_0}''| < \delta_0.$$

On the other hand, by Lemma 12.12, there is a constant $c > 0$ independent of δ_0, ϵ_0 and the currents T_j 's such that for every $|\lambda| \geq 1$,

$$|\mathcal{J}_{\epsilon_0}',\lambda| \leq c\Xi_\infty(4\epsilon_0) \quad \text{and} \quad |\mathcal{J}_{\epsilon_0}'| \leq c\Xi_\infty(4\epsilon_0).$$

Putting these estimates together with (12.25) gives that for all $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}$ with $|\lambda| \geq \lambda_0$,

$$|(\mathcal{J}_{\epsilon_0}',\lambda + \mathcal{J}_{\epsilon_0}'',\lambda) - (\mathcal{J}_{\epsilon_0}' + \mathcal{J}_{\epsilon_0}'')| < (2c + 1)\delta_0.$$

This, coupled with (12.27) and (12.26), implies the first convergence in (12.20). On the other hand, Lemma 12.10 gives the second convergence in (12.20). This ends the proof of the theorem. \square

The remainder is devoted to the proof of Theorem 2.21, which is inspired by the proof of [20, Proposition 2.7]. Set for $n \in \mathbb{N}^*$

(12.28)

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{I}_n &:= \int_{\hat{\mathbb{X}}} (\hat{u}\hat{\eta} + \hat{\gamma}') \wedge \Pi_1^*(T_{1,n}) \wedge \Pi_2^*(T_{2,n}) \wedge \dots \wedge \Pi_m^*(T_{m,n}) \wedge \Pi^*(dd^c\phi) \\ \mathcal{J}_n &:= - \int_{\hat{\mathbb{X}}} (\hat{u}\hat{\eta} + \hat{\gamma}') \wedge \Pi_1^*(\gamma_{1,n}) \wedge (\Pi')^*(\gamma_{T,n}) \wedge \Pi^*(dd^c\phi) + \langle \gamma_{1,n} \wedge \gamma_{T,n}|_{\Delta'}, \iota^*(\phi) \rangle. \end{aligned}$$

By (12.10), we have that

$$\begin{aligned} (12.29) \quad & \langle T_1 \wedge \dots \wedge T_m, \iota^*\phi \rangle = \mathcal{I} + \mathcal{J}, \\ & \langle T_{1,n} \wedge \dots \wedge T_{m,n}, \iota^*\phi \rangle = \mathcal{I}_n + \mathcal{J}_n. \end{aligned}$$

To prove Theorem 2.21, we need to show that

$$(12.30) \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{I}_n = \mathcal{I} \quad \text{and} \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{J}_n = \mathcal{J}.$$

Using a partition of unity and the notations as above, we can assume that Φ has compact support in $U \times \mathbb{C}^k$. Moreover, since the tangent currents are invariant under the action of A_λ , it is enough to consider the case where the support of Φ is contained in W as in the situation of the above lemmas.

Fix an arbitrary positive number δ_0 and then choose a number $0 < \epsilon_0 < \delta_0$ small enough which verifies (12.25). Let $0 \leq \rho \leq 1$ be a smooth function with compact support in $\widehat{\Delta}_{2\epsilon_0}$ which is equal to 1 on $\widehat{\Delta}_{\epsilon_0}$. By (12.28), we write

$$(12.31) \quad \mathcal{J}_n := \mathcal{J}'_{n,\epsilon_0} + \mathcal{J}''_{n,\epsilon_0},$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{J}'_{n,\epsilon_0} &:= \int_{\widehat{\mathbb{X}}} \rho(\hat{u}\hat{\eta} + \hat{\gamma}') \wedge \Pi_1^*(T_{1,n}) \wedge \Pi_2^*(T_{2,n}) \wedge \dots \wedge \Pi_m^*(T_{m,n}) \wedge \Pi_1^*(dd^c\phi), \\ \mathcal{J}''_{n,\epsilon_0} &:= \int_{\widehat{\mathbb{X}}} (1 - \rho)(\hat{u}\hat{\eta} + \hat{\gamma}') \wedge \Pi_1^*(T_{1,n}) \wedge \Pi_2^*(T_{2,n}) \wedge \dots \wedge \Pi_m^*(T_{m,n}) \wedge \Pi_1^*(dd^c\phi). \end{aligned}$$

Lemma 12.15. *There is a constant $c > 0$ independent of δ, ϵ_0 and the currents $T_{j,n}$'s such that for every $n \geq 1$, $|\mathcal{J}'_{n,\epsilon_0}| \leq c\Xi_n(4\epsilon_0)$.*

Proof. The proof of Lemma 12.12 also works in this context. \square

Lemma 12.16. *It holds that $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{J}''_{n,\epsilon_0} = \mathcal{J}''_{\epsilon_0}$.*

Proof. Since $(1 - \rho)(\hat{u}\hat{\eta} + \hat{\gamma}')$ is smooth and vanishes near $\widehat{\Delta}$, it is equal to $\Pi^*(\Theta)$ for some smooth form Θ on \mathbb{X} which vanishes near Δ . It follows that the considered term is equal to $\langle T_{1,n} \otimes \dots \otimes T_{m,n}, \Theta \wedge \pi_1^*(dd^c\phi) \rangle$. Recall that the tensor product of m currents depends continuously on these currents. Since $T_{j,n}$ converges weakly to T_j , the last pairing converges to $\langle T_1 \otimes \dots \otimes T_m, \Theta \wedge \pi_1^*(dd^c\phi) \rangle$. This proves the result. \square

Lemma 12.17. *It holds that $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{J}_n = \mathcal{J}$.*

Proof. Observe that in (12.28) $\gamma_{1,n}$ converges uniformly to γ_1 and $\gamma_{T,n}$ converge uniformly to γ_T as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Consequently, a straightforward computation using the expressions of \mathcal{J}_n in (12.28) and of \mathcal{J} in (12.21) gives the result. \square

End of the proof of Theorem 2.21. By Lemma 12.16, there exists $N_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that for all $n \geq N_0$,

$$|\mathcal{J}''_{n,\epsilon_0} - \mathcal{J}''_{\epsilon_0}| < \delta_0.$$

By Lemma 12.15, there is a constant $c > 0$ independent of δ, ϵ_0 and the currents $T_{j,n}$'s such that for every $n \geq 1$, $|\mathcal{J}'_{n,\epsilon_0}| \leq c\Xi_n(4\epsilon_0)$. Since we know by (12.14) that $\Xi_n(4\epsilon_0) \leq \Xi(4\epsilon_0)$, inequality (12.25) implies that $|\mathcal{J}'_{n,\epsilon_0}| \leq c\delta_0$. On the other hand, by Lemma 12.12 we have that $|\mathcal{J}'_{\epsilon_0}| \leq c\delta_0$. Combining these estimates we obtain that for all $n \geq N_0$,

$$|(\mathcal{J}'_{n,\epsilon_0} + \mathcal{J}''_{n,\epsilon_0}) - (\mathcal{J}'_{\epsilon_0} + \mathcal{J}''_{\epsilon_0})| < (2c + 1)\delta_0.$$

This, coupled with (12.31) and (12.27), implies the first convergence in (12.30). On the other hand, Lemma 12.17 gives the second convergence in (12.30). This ends the proof of the theorem. \square

12.5. Intersection theory via the blow-up along the diagonal. We use the notation introduced in Subsection 12.2. Fix an integer $m \geq 2$ and let (X, ω) be a compact Kähler manifold of dimension k . Let $\mathbb{X} := X^m$ and let $\Delta := \{(x, \dots, x) : x \in X\}$ be the diagonal of \mathbb{X} . Consider the Kähler form $\omega_\Delta := \iota_*\omega$ on Δ , where $\iota : X \rightarrow \Delta$ given by $x \in X \mapsto (x, \dots, x) \in \Delta$ is the canonical biholomorphism. Let $\Pi : \widehat{\mathbb{X}} \rightarrow \mathbb{X}$ be the blow-up of \mathbb{X} along the diagonal Δ and let $\widehat{\Delta} := \Pi^{-1}(\Delta)$ be the exceptional hypersurface. Let $\hat{\omega}$ be a Kähler form on $\widehat{\mathbb{X}}$. Let \hat{u} be the function introduced in (12.7). This is a quasi-p.s.h. function on $\widehat{\mathbb{X}}$.

However we can replace it by an arbitrary function of the form $\log \text{dist}(\cdot, \hat{\Delta}) + O(1)$. The following definition of a pull-back of positive closed currents by a blow-up is needed.

Definition 12.18. Let T be a positive closed (p, p) -current on \mathbb{X} . By [23, Theorem 1.1] (see also Theorem 3.9), there exist two sequences of positive closed smooth (p, p) -forms $(T_n^\pm)_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ in \mathbb{X} with uniformly bounded masses such that $T_n^\pm \rightarrow T^\pm$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$ and $T = T^+ - T^-$. By passing to a subsequence if necessary, we may assume that $\Pi^*(T_n^\pm) \rightarrow \hat{T}^\pm$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. The positive closed (p, p) -current

$$S := \hat{T}^+ - \hat{T}^- \quad \text{on} \quad \hat{\mathbb{X}},$$

is called a *member of the pull-back* Π^*T . It is worth noting that S is not necessarily unique. However, S is uniquely determined on the Zariski open set $\hat{\mathbb{X}} \setminus \hat{\Delta}$, where Π is locally biholomorphic.

Remark 12.19. We are under the context of Definition 12.18. The restriction of a member S of the pull-back Π^*T to $\hat{\Delta}$ defines a unique current $S_{\hat{\Delta}} \in \text{CL}^{p-1}(\hat{\Delta})$, that is, $\mathbf{1}_{\hat{\Delta}}S = \iota_*S_{\hat{\Delta}}$, where $\iota : \hat{\Delta} \rightarrow \hat{\mathbb{X}}$ is the canonical injection (see Skoda [51]). So S gives mass to $\hat{\Delta}$ if and only if $\{S_{\hat{\Delta}}\} \neq 0$, where $\{S_{\hat{\Delta}}\}$ is the cohomology class of $S_{\hat{\Delta}}$ in $H^*(\hat{\Delta}, \mathbb{C})$.

Consider m integers $p_1, \dots, p_m \geq 1$ such that $p := p_1 + \dots + p_m \leq k$. Recall from (12.11) the functions $\vartheta^*(\cdot, \cdot)$ and $\vartheta(\cdot, \cdot)$. The following first main result of this section provides an alternative to Theorem 2.18.

Theorem 12.20. Let $T_j \in \text{CL}^{p_j}(X)$ for $1 \leq j \leq m$ and consider $\mathbb{T} := T_1 \otimes \dots \otimes T_m \in \text{CL}^p(X^m)$. Suppose that $\lim_{r \rightarrow 0} \vartheta^*(\mathbb{T}, r) = 0$ and a member of the pull-back $\Pi^*\mathbb{T}$ gives no mass to $\hat{\Delta}$. Then $T_1 \wedge \dots \wedge T_m$ exists in the sense of Dinh-Sibony's theory of tangent currents.

The proof of Theorem 12.20 relies on the following two auxiliary results. Prior to their formulation, we keep the notation introduced in Subsection 12.3 and in Subsection 5.4 and present some new ones. Fix a strongly admissible map τ along Δ in \mathbb{X} , this is in particular a diffeomorphism from an open neighborhood of Δ in \mathbb{X} onto an open neighborhood of Δ in \mathbb{E} , which is the identity on Δ . For every $0 < r \ll 1$, consider the following open neighborhood of $\hat{\Delta}$ in $\hat{\mathbb{X}}$:

$$(12.32) \quad \mathcal{D}_r := \Pi^{-1}(\tau^{-1}(\text{Tube}(\Delta, r))) \subset \hat{\mathbb{X}}.$$

Observe that there is a constant $c > 1$ such that

$$(12.33) \quad \hat{\Delta}_{c^{-1}r} \subset \mathcal{D}_r \subset \hat{\Delta}_{cr} \quad \text{for} \quad 0 < r \ll 1, \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{D}_r \searrow \hat{\Delta} \quad \text{as} \quad r \searrow 0+.$$

We use the holomorphic admissible maps $\tau_\ell : \mathbb{U}_\ell \rightarrow \mathbb{U}_\ell$ introduced in Subsection 5.4 for the present context of the submanifold Δ in the ambient manifold \mathbb{X} . By Proposition 12.7, we infer that for every $1 \leq \ell \leq \ell_0$,

(12.34)

$$(\tau_\ell)_*(\Pi_*\hat{\omega}) \approx \pi^*\omega + \alpha_{\text{ver}} + \beta_{\text{ver}} \approx \hat{\alpha} \quad \text{on} \quad \mathbb{U}_\ell \setminus \Delta,$$

$$\begin{aligned} \pm(\tau_*(\Pi_*\hat{\omega}) - (\tau_\ell)_*(\Pi_*\hat{\omega}) - H)^\sharp &\leq c_3(\tau_\ell)_*\omega + c_4\hat{\beta} + c_3\varphi^{1/2}(\tau_\ell)_*(\Pi_*\hat{\omega}) \quad \text{on} \quad (\mathbb{U}_\ell \cap \tau(\mathbb{U}_\ell)) \setminus \Delta, \\ (\tau_*(\Pi_*\hat{\omega}) - (\tau_\ell)_*(\Pi_*\hat{\omega}))^\flat &\leq c_3(\tau_\ell)_*\omega + c_4\hat{\beta} + c_3\varphi^{1/4}(\tau_\ell)_*(\Pi_*\hat{\omega}) \quad \text{on} \quad (\mathbb{U}_\ell \cap \tau(\mathbb{U}_\ell)) \setminus \Delta. \end{aligned}$$

Here, H is some form in the class $\mathcal{H}(\mathbb{E})$ given in Definition 5.5. Note that $\text{Tube}(\Delta, r) \subset \bigcup_{\ell=1}^{\ell_0} (\mathbb{U}_\ell \cap \tau(\mathbb{U}_\ell))$.

The first auxiliary result reformulates condition (1) of Theorem 2.18 in terms of the function $\vartheta^\bullet(\mathbb{T}, \cdot)$.

Proposition 12.21. *We keep the notation introduced in Theorem 2.18 and Theorem 12.20. Then the following two conditions are equivalent:*

- (1) $\kappa_j^\bullet(-\log \text{dist}(\cdot, \Delta) \cdot \mathbb{T}, \Delta, \omega_\Delta, \mathbf{r}, \tau, h) < \infty$ for some $\mathbf{r} > 0$ and for all $k - p < j \leq k - \max_{1 \leq i \leq m} p_i$;
- (2) $\lim_{r \rightarrow 0} \vartheta^\bullet(\mathbb{T}, r) = 0$.

In other words, \mathbb{T} satisfies condition (1) of Theorem 2.18 if and only if $\lim_{r \rightarrow 0} \vartheta^\bullet(\mathbb{T}, r) = 0$.

Proof. First, we prove that condition (1) implies condition (2). We deduce from condition (1) and Remark 11.6 that

(12.35)

$$\mathcal{K}_{j,q}(-\log \text{dist}(\cdot, \Delta) \cdot \mathbb{T}, \Delta, \omega_\Delta, 0, \mathbf{r}, \tau, h) < \infty \quad \text{for } j \in \mathbb{N} \quad \text{with } k - p < j \leq k - \max_{1 \leq i \leq m} p_i.$$

On the other hand, arguing as in the proof of Lemma 11.11, the last condition is also equivalent to the following one:

$$\mathcal{K}_{j,q}(-\log \text{dist}(\cdot, \Delta) \cdot \mathbb{T}, \Delta, \omega_\Delta, 0, \mathbf{r}/2, \tau, h) < \infty \quad \text{for } k - p \leq j \leq k, \quad 0 \leq q \leq mk - p - j.$$

This, combined with (12.32) and the first estimate of (12.34), implies that

$$(12.36) \quad \int_{\mathcal{D}_r \setminus \hat{\Delta}} -\log \text{dist}(\cdot, \Delta) \cdot \hat{\omega}^{mk-p} \wedge \Pi_1^*(T_1) \wedge \dots \wedge \Pi_m^*(T_m) < \infty.$$

An alternative way to prove (12.36) is as follows. By Lemma 11.10 $\alpha_{\text{ver}}^{(m-1)k} = 0$. This, combined with the first estimate of (12.34) and (12.35), implies (12.36).

Putting (12.36) together with the second conclusion of (12.33) yields condition (2).

To prove that condition (2) implies condition (1), we argue in a reverse way. \square

The second auxiliary result is a simple test on the minimality of horizontal dimension.

Proposition 12.22. *Let $T_j \in \text{CL}^{p_j}(X)$ for $1 \leq j \leq m$ and consider $\mathbb{T} := T_1 \otimes \dots \otimes T_m \in \text{CL}^p(X^m)$. Then \mathbb{T} has minimal horizontal dimension along Δ if and only if a member of the pull-back $\Pi^*\mathbb{T}$ gives no mass to $\hat{\Delta}$. In particular, whether a member of $\Pi^*\mathbb{T}$ gives mass to $\hat{\Delta}$ (or not) is independent of the choice of members.*

Proof. Let $\hat{\mathbb{T}}$ be a member of the pull-back $\Pi^*\mathbb{T}$. By Theorem 2.12 \mathbb{T} has minimal horizontal dimension along Δ if and only if \mathbb{T} satisfies condition (2) of Theorem 2.18. By [46, Tangent Theorem II (Theorem 1.11)] (3), this is equivalent to

$$(12.37) \quad \lim_{r \rightarrow 0^+} \kappa_j(\mathbb{T}, \Delta, \omega_\Delta, r, \tau, h) = 0,$$

for all $j \in \mathbb{N}$ with $k - p < j \leq k - \max_{1 \leq i \leq m} p_i$.

On the other hand, applying Lemma 5.12, the last condition is also equivalent to the following one:

$$\lim_{r \rightarrow 0^+} \mathcal{K}_{j,q}(\mathbb{T}, \Delta, \omega_\Delta, r, \tau, h) = 0 \quad \text{for } k - p < j \leq k - \max_{1 \leq i \leq m} p_i.$$

By Lemma 11.10 $\alpha_{\text{ver}}^{(m-1)k} = 0$. This, combined with the first estimate of (12.34) and (12.32), the last condition is equivalent to

$$\lim_{r \rightarrow 0^+} \int_{\mathcal{D}_r} \hat{\omega}^{mk-p} \wedge \Pi_1^*(T_1) \wedge \dots \wedge \Pi_m^*(T_m) = 0.$$

By (12.33), the last limit is equal to the mass of the restriction of $\widehat{\mathbb{T}}$ to $\widehat{\Delta}$. This completes the proof. \square

End of the proof of Theorem 12.20. It follows from Propositions 12.21, 12.22 and Theorem 2.18. \square

Here is an immediate consequence of Theorem 12.20

Corollary 12.23. *We keep the notation introduced in Theorem 12.20. Suppose that $\lim_{r \rightarrow 0} \vartheta(\mathbb{T}, r) = 0$. Then $T_1 \wedge \dots \wedge T_m$ exists in the sense of Dinh-Sibony's theory of tangent currents.*

Proof. Since $0 \leq \vartheta^\bullet(\mathbb{T}, r) \leq \vartheta(\mathbb{T}, r)$, by Theorem 12.20 we only need to check that a member of the pull-back $\Pi^*\mathbb{T}$ gives no mass to $\widehat{\Delta}$. By Proposition 12.22 it is sufficient to check that \mathbb{T} has minimal horizontal dimension along Δ . So by the argument in the proof of Proposition 12.22 it remains to check (12.37).

Since $\lim_{r \rightarrow 0} \vartheta(\mathbb{T}, r) = 0$, it follows from (12.11) that

$$\lim_{r \rightarrow 0^+} \int_{\widehat{\Delta}_r} \widehat{\omega}^{mk-p} \wedge \Pi_1^*(T_1) \wedge \dots \wedge \Pi_m^*(T_m) = 0.$$

By the proof of Proposition 12.22 this is equivalent to (12.37). \square

We discuss the continuity of Dinh-Sibony intersection in terms of the blow-up along the diagonal. The following second main result of this section provides an equivalent alternative to Theorem 2.21.

Theorem 12.24. *Let $m \geq 2$ be an integer, and let $T_{j,n}$ be a sequence of currents in $\text{CL}^{p_j}(X)$ for $1 \leq j \leq m$. Consider $\mathbb{T}_n := T_{1,n} \otimes \dots \otimes T_{m,n} \in \text{CL}^p(X^m)$. For $0 \leq r \leq \mathbf{r}$, set*

$$\vartheta(r) := \sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \vartheta(\mathbb{T}_n, r).$$

Suppose that

- (1) $T_{j,n} \rightarrow T_j \in \text{CL}^{p_j}(X)$ weakly as n tends to infinity for $1 \leq j \leq m$;
- (2) $\lim_{r \rightarrow 0} \vartheta(r) = 0$.

Then $T_{1,n} \wedge \dots \wedge T_{m,n}$ and $T_1 \wedge \dots \wedge T_m$ exist in the sense of Dinh-Sibony's theory of tangent currents. Moreover, $T_{1,n} \wedge \dots \wedge T_{m,n}$ converge weakly to $T_1 \wedge \dots \wedge T_m$ as n tends to infinity.

Proof. Using Lemma 11.4 and (12.34), one can show that condition (2) of Theorem 2.21 is equivalent to the following: for $k-p < j \leq k$ and $0 \leq q \leq \min(mk-p-j, (m-1)k-1)$,

$$\lim_{r \rightarrow 0^+} \mathcal{H}_{j,q}(-\log \text{dist}(\cdot, \Delta) \cdot \mathbb{T}, \Delta, \omega_\Delta, r, \tau, h) = 0.$$

On the other hand, arguing as in the proof of Lemma 11.11, the last condition is also equivalent to the following one:

$$\lim_{r \rightarrow 0^+} \mathcal{H}_{j,q}(-\log \text{dist}(\cdot, \Delta) \cdot \mathbb{T}, \Delta, \omega_\Delta, r, \tau, h) = 0 \quad \text{for } k-p \leq j \leq k, \quad 0 \leq q \leq mk-p-j.$$

By (12.32) and the first estimate of (12.34), the last condition is equivalent to

$$\lim_{r \rightarrow 0^+} \int_{\mathcal{D}_r} -\log \text{dist}(\cdot, \Delta) \cdot \widehat{\omega}^{mk-p} \wedge \Pi_1^*(T_1) \wedge \dots \wedge \Pi_m^*(T_m) = 0.$$

By (12.33), this is equivalent to $\lim_{r \rightarrow 0} \vartheta(r) = 0$. Consequently, the result follows from Theorem 2.21. \square

REFERENCES

- [1] Ahn, Taeyong; Vu, Duc-Viet: Equidistribution for non-pluripolar currents with respect to holomorphic correspondences of compact Kähler manifolds. *Anal. Math. Phys.* **14** (2024), no. 6, Paper No. 115, 18 pp.
- [2] Alessandrini, Lucia; Bassanelli, Giovanni: Plurisubharmonic currents and their extension across analytic subsets. *Forum Math.* **5** (1993), no. 6, 577-602.
- [3] Alessandrini, Lucia; Bassanelli, Giovanni: Lelong numbers of positive plurisubharmonic currents. *Results Math.* **30** (1996), no. 3-4, 191-224.
- [4] Bassanelli, Giovanni: A cut-off theorem for plurisubharmonic currents. *Forum Math.* **6** (1994), no. 5, 567-595.
- [5] Bedford, Eric; Taylor, B. Alan: Fine topology, Silov boundary, and $(dd^c)^n$. *J. Funct. Anal.* **72** (1987), no. 2, 225-251.
- [6] Bayraktar, Turgay: Equidistribution of zeros of random holomorphic sections. *Indiana Univ. Math. J.* **65** (2016), no. 5, 1759-1793.
- [7] Berndtsson, Bo; Sibony, Nessim: The $\bar{\partial}$ -equation on a positive current. *Invent. Math.* **147** (2002), no. 2, 371-428.
- [8] Blanchard, André: Sur les variétés analytiques complexes. (French) *Ann. Sci. École Norm. Sup. (3)* **73** (1956), 157-202.
- [9] Blel, Mongi; Demailly, Jean-Pierre; Mouzali, Mokhtar: Sur l'existence du cône tangent à un courant positif fermé. (French) [Existence of the tangent cone of a closed positive current] *Ark. Mat.* **28** (1990), no. 2, 231-248.
- [10] Bost J.-B., Gillet H., Soulé C., Heights of projective varieties and positive Green forms. *J. Amer. Math. Soc.* **7** (1994), no. 4, 903-1027.
- [11] Bott, Raoul; Tu, Loring W.: Differential forms in algebraic topology. *Grad. Texts in Math.*, **82** Springer-Verlag, New York-Berlin, 1982. xiv+331 pp.
- [12] Coman, Dan; Marinescu, George: Equidistribution results for singular metrics on line bundles. *Ann. Sci. Éc. Norm. Supér. (4)* **48** (2015), no. 3, 497-536.
- [13] Demailly, Jean-Pierre: Courants positifs et théorie de l'intersection (French), *Gaz. Math.* **53** (1992), 131-159.
- [14] Demailly, Jean-Pierre: Monge-Ampère operators, Lelong numbers and intersection theory. Complex analysis and geometry, 115-193, Univ. Ser. Math., Plenum, New York, 1993.
- [15] Demailly, Jean-Pierre: Complex Analytic and Differential Geometry. Manuscript available at <http://www-fourier.ujf-grenoble.fr/~demailly/books.html>, (2012).
- [16] Demailly, Jean-Pierre: Analytic methods in algebraic geometry. Surveys of Modern Mathematics, 1. *International Press, Somerville, MA; Higher Education Press, Beijing*, 2012. viii+231 pp.
- [17] De Thélin, Henry; Vigny, Gabriel: Entropy of meromorphic maps and dynamics of birational maps. (English, French summary) *Mém. Soc. Math. Fr. (N.S.)* No. **122**(2010), vi+98 pp.
- [18] Dinh, Tien-Cuong; Nguyễn, Việt-Anh: Siu's analyticity theorem for positive plurisubharmonic currents. *In preparation* (2024).
- [19] Dinh, Tien-Cuong; Nguyễn, Việt-Anh; Sibony, Nessim: Unique Ergodicity for foliations on compact Kähler surfaces. *Duke Math. J.* **171** (2022), no. 13, 2627-2698.
- [20] Dinh, Tien-Cuong; Nguyễn, Việt-Anh; Vu, Duc-Viet: Super-potentials, densities of currents and number of periodic points for holomorphic maps. *Adv. Math.* **331** (2018), 874-907.
- [21] Dinh, Tien-Cuong; Nguyễn, Việt-Anh; Truong, Tuyen Trung: Equidistribution for meromorphic maps with dominant topological degree. *Indiana Univ. Math. J.* **64** (2015), no. 6, 1805-1828.
- [22] Dinh, Tien-Cuong; Nguyễn, Việt-Anh; Truong, Tuyen Trung: Growth of the number of periodic points for meromorphic maps. *Bull. Lond. Math. Soc.* **49** (2017), no. 6, 947-964.
- [23] Dinh, Tien-Cuong; Sibony, Nessim: Regularization of currents and entropy. *Ann. Sci. École Norm. Sup. (4)* **37** (2004), no. 6, 959-971.
- [24] Dinh, Tien-Cuong; Sibony, Nessim: Super-potentials of positive closed currents, intersection theory and dynamics. *Acta Math.* **203** (2009), no. 1, 1-82.
- [25] Dinh, Tien-Cuong; Sibony, Nessim: Super-potentials for currents on compact Kähler manifolds and dynamics of automorphisms. *J. Algebraic Geom.* **19** (2010), no. 3, 473-529.

- [26] Dinh, Tien-Cuong; Sibony, Nessim: Dynamics in several complex variables: endomorphisms of projective spaces and polynomial-like mappings. *Holomorphic dynamical systems*, 165–294, Lecture Notes in Math., **1998**, Springer, Berlin, 2010.
- [27] Dinh, Tien-Cuong; Sibony, Nessim: Equidistribution of saddle periodic points for Hénon-type automorphisms of \mathbb{C}^k . *Math. Ann.* **366** (2016), no. 3-4, 1207–1251.
- [28] Dinh, Tien-Cuong; Sibony, Nessim: Density of positive closed currents, a theory of non-generic intersections. *J. Algebraic Geom.* **27** (2018), 497–551.
- [29] Dinh, Tien-Cuong; Sibony, Nessim: Unique ergodicity for foliations in \mathbb{P}^2 with an invariant curve. *Invent. Math.* **211** (2018), no. 1, 1–38.
- [30] Federer, Herbert: Geometric measure theory. Die Grundlehren der mathematischen Wissenschaften, Band **153** Springer-Verlag New York Inc., New York 1969 xiv+676 pp.
- [31] Fornæss, John Erik; Sibony, Nessim: Oka’s inequality for currents and applications. *Math. Ann.* **301** (1995), no. 3, 399–419.
- [32] Fornæss, John Erik; Sibony, Nessim: Harmonic currents of finite energy and laminations. *Geom. Funct. Anal.* **15** (2005), no. 5, 962–1003.
- [33] Fornæss, John Erik; Sibony, Nessim: Riemann surface laminations with singularities. *J. Geom. Anal.* **18** (2008), no. 2, 400–442.
- [34] Fornæss, John Erik; Sibony, Nessim: Unique ergodicity of harmonic currents on singular foliations of \mathbb{P}^2 . *Geom. Funct. Anal.* **19** (2010), no. 5, 1334–1377.
- [35] Griffiths, Phillip; Harris, Joseph: Principles of algebraic geometry. Pure and Applied Mathematics. Wiley-Interscience [John Wiley & Sons], New York, 1978. xii+813 pp.
- [36] Harvey, Reese: Holomorphic chains and their boundaries. *Several complex variables (Proc. Sympos. Pure Math., Vol. XXX, Part 1, Williams Coll., Williamstown, Mass., 1975)*, pp. 309–382. Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, R. I., 1977.
- [37] Dinh Tuan Huynh; Kaufmann, Lucas; Vu, Duc-Viet: Intersection of $(1, 1)$ -currents and the domain of definition of the Monge-Ampère operator. *Indiana Univ. Math. J.* **72** (2023), no. 1, 239–261.
- [38] Huynh, Dinh Tuan; Vu, Duc-Viet: On the set of divisors with zero geometric defect. *J. Reine Angew. Math.* **771** (2021), 193–213.
- [39] Kaufmann, Lucas: Self-intersection of foliation cycles on complex manifolds. *Internat. J. Math.* **28** (2017), no. 8, 1750054, 18 pp.
- [40] Kaufmann, Lucas; Vu, Duc-Viet: Density and intersection of $(1, 1)$ -currents. *J. Funct. Anal.* **277** (2019), no. 2, 392–417.
- [41] Kiselman, Christer O.: Tangents of plurisubharmonic functions. *International Symposium in Memory of Hua Loo Keng, Vol. II (Beijing, 1988)*, 157–167, Springer, Berlin, 1991.
- [42] Lazarsfeld, Robert: Positivity in algebraic geometry. I. Classical setting: line bundles and linear series. *Ergeb. Math. Grenzgeb. (3)*, **48** [Results in Mathematics and Related Areas. 3rd Series. A Series of Modern Surveys in Mathematics] Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2004. xviii+387 pp.
- [43] Lazarsfeld, Robert: Positivity in algebraic geometry. II. Positivity for vector bundles, and multiplier ideals *Ergeb. Math. Grenzgeb. (3)*, **49** [Results in Mathematics and Related Areas. 3rd Series. A Series of Modern Surveys in Mathematics] Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2004. xviii+385 pp.
- [44] Lelong, Pierre: Intégration sur un ensemble analytique complexe. (French) *Bull. Soc. Math. France* **85** (1957), 239–262.
- [45] Lelong, Pierre: Fonctions plurisousharmoniques et formes différentielles positives. (French) *Gordon & Breach, Paris-London-New York (Distributed by Dunod éditeur, Paris)* 1968 ix+79 pp.
- [46] Nguyễn, Việt-Anh: Positive plurisubharmonic currents: Generalized Lelong numbers and Tangent theorems. arXiv:2111.11024v2, 241 pages.
- [47] Nguyễn, Việt-Anh: Thie type theorems and the generalized Lelong numbers for complex analytic sets. In progress.
- [48] Nguyễn, Việt-Anh; Truong, Tuyen Trung: Uniqueness of tangent currents for positive closed currents. (2025).
- [49] Sibony, Nessim: Quelques problèmes de prolongement de courants en analyse complexe. (French) [Some extension problems for currents in complex analysis] *Duke Math. J.* **52** (1985), no. 1, 157–197.

- [50] Siu, Yum Tong: Analyticity of sets associated to Lelong numbers and the extension of closed positive currents. *Invent. Math.* **27** (1974), 53–156.
- [51] Skoda, Henri: Prolongement des courants, positifs, fermés de masse finie. (French) [Extension of closed, positive currents of finite mass] *Invent. Math.* **66** (1982), no. 3, 361–376.
- [52] Thie, Paul R.: The Lelong number of a point of a complex analytic set. *Math. Ann.* **172** (1967), 269–312.
- [53] Vigny, Gabriel: Exponential decay of correlations for generic regular birational maps of \mathbb{P}^k . *Math. Ann.* **362** (2015), no. 3-4, 1033–1054.
- [54] Voisin, Claire: *Hodge theory and complex algebraic geometry. I*. Cambridge Studies in Advanced Mathematics, **76**. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2007
- [55] Vu, Duc-Viet: Intersection of positive closed currents of higher bi-degree. *Michigan Math. J.* **65** (2016), no. 4, 863-872.
- [56] Vu, Duc-Viet: Densities of currents on non-Kähler manifolds. *Int. Math. Res. Not. IMRN*. 2021, no. 17, 13282–13304.
- [57] Vu, Duc-Viet: Density currents and relative non-pluripolar products. *Bull. London. Math. Soc.* **53** (2021), no. 2, 548–559.
- [58] Vu, Duc-Viet: Exotic periodic points. *Commun. Contemp. Math.* **24** (2022), no. 5, Paper No. 2150029, 15 pp.

UNIVERSITÉ DE LILLE, LABORATOIRE DE MATHÉMATIQUES PAUL PAINLEVÉ, CNRS U.M.R. 8524, 59655 VILLENEUVE D’ASCQ CEDEX, FRANCE.

AND VIETNAM INSTITUTE FOR ADVANCED STUDY IN MATHEMATICS (VIASM), 157 CHUA LANG STREET, HANOI, VIETNAM.

Email address: Viet-Anh.Nguyen@univ-lille.fr, <https://pro.univ-lille.fr/viet-anh-nguyen/>