

F -THRESHOLDS AND TEST IDEALS OF THOM-SEBASTIANI TYPE POLYNOMIALS

MANUEL GONZÁLEZ VILLA¹, DELIO JARAMILLO-VELEZ², AND LUIS NÚÑEZ-BETANCOURT³

ABSTRACT. We provide a formula for F -thresholds of a Thom-Sebastiani type polynomial over a perfect field of prime characteristic. This result extends the formula for the F -pure threshold of a diagonal hypersurface. We also compute the first test ideal of Thom-Sebastiani type polynomials. Finally, we apply our result to find hypersurfaces where the log canonical thresholds equals the F -pure thresholds for infinitely many prime numbers.

1. INTRODUCTION

The F -threshold of a polynomial f , with respect to an ideal I , $c^I(f)$, is a numerical invariant given by the asymptotic Frobenius order of f in I [MTW05, HMTW08, DSNnBP18]. In particular, if \mathfrak{m} is a maximal ideal, $c^{\mathfrak{m}}(f)$ equals to the F -pure threshold at \mathfrak{m} . This invariant measures the severity of the singularities of f at the point corresponding to \mathfrak{m} [TW04]. This F -threshold is the analogue in prime characteristic of the log-canonical threshold [HY03, TW04, MTW05]. This number is usually very difficult to compute. However, there are formulas for diagonal [Her15], binomial [Her14], Calabi-Yau [BS15], Elliptic Curves [BS15, Pag18], and quasi-homogeneous one dimensional hypersurfaces [HNnBWZ16].

An important aspect of a numerical invariant is its computability in concrete examples. Finding formulas for Thom-Sebastiani type polynomials is a classic strategy to enlarge the class of concrete hypersurfaces for which a invariant can be computed. This type of polynomial can be written as the sum of two polynomials in a different set of variables. Examples of this type of polynomials include, for instance, diagonal hypersurfaces, certain binomials, and suspensions by $n \geq 2$ points or ramified cyclic covers of hypersurfaces. In singularity theory formulas for Thom-Sebastiani type polynomials have been found for, among others, the spectrum [SS85], the monodromy, the Milnor number [ST71], the log canonical threshold [Kol97a], motivic Igusa zeta functions [DL99], multiplier ideals, and jumping numbers [MSS20]. It is natural to look for such formulas for objects in prime characteristic.

In this paper we compute F -thresholds and the first test ideal of a Thom-Sebastiani type polynomial. Our methods are inspired in the work of Hernández [Her15] on diagonal hypersurfaces.

In our first main result, we provide a formula for the F -threshold of a Thom-Sebastiani type polynomial with respect to the sum of two ideals.

Theorem A (see Theorem 3.4). Let \mathbb{K} be a perfect field of prime characteristic p . Let $R_1 = \mathbb{K}[x_1, \dots, x_n]$ and $R_2 = \mathbb{K}[y_1, \dots, y_m]$ with maximal homogeneous ideals $\mathfrak{m}_1 = (x_1, \dots, x_n)$ and

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification*. Primary 13A35; Secondary 14B05.

Key words and phrases. F -thresholds, test ideals, Thom-Sebastiani type polynomials, log canonical threshold.

¹ The first author was partially supported by Spanish national grant MTM2016-76868-C2-1-P.

² The second author was partially supported by CONACyT Fellowship 862006.

³ The third author was partially supported by CONACyT Grant 284598 and Cátedras Marcos Moshinsky.

$\mathfrak{m}_2 = (y_1, \dots, y_m)$ respectively. Let $g_1 \in \sqrt{I_1} \subseteq \mathfrak{m}_1$ and $g_2 \in \sqrt{I_2} \subseteq \mathfrak{m}_2$, where I_1 and I_2 are ideals. Let $f = g_1 + g_2 \in R_1 \otimes_{\mathbb{K}} R_2$, $a_1 = \mathbf{c}^{I_1}(g_1)$, and $a_2 = \mathbf{c}^{I_2}(g_2)$. If $a_1 + a_2 \leq 1$, then

$$\mathbf{c}^{I_1+I_2}(f) = \begin{cases} a_1 + a_2, & \text{if } L = \infty, \\ \langle a_1 \rangle_L + \langle a_2 \rangle_L + \frac{1}{p^L}, & \text{if } L < \infty, \end{cases}$$

where $L = \sup \left\{ N \in \mathbb{N} \mid a_1^{(e)} + a_2^{(e)} \leq p - 1 \text{ for all } 0 \leq e \leq N \right\}$.

Unlike previous work on computation of F -thresholds, we do not assume any shape on the F -pure thresholds of either g_1 or g_2 . Furthermore, we are able to compute F -thresholds with respect to ideals other than the maximal ideal. This is useful to compute lower bound of the number of F -jumping numbers for a Thom-Sebastiani type polynomial (see Remark 3.6).

An important conjecture regarding the F -pure threshold states that $\mathbf{lct}(f) = \mathbf{c}^{\mathfrak{m}}(f_p)$ for infinitely many prime numbers p , where $f \in \mathbb{Q}[x_1, \dots, x_n]$ and $f_p \in \mathbb{F}_p[x_1, \dots, x_n]$ is its model module p (see [MTW05, Conjecture 3.6] and references therein). Using Theorem A, we are able to show several families of polynomials where this conjecture holds (see Section 4).

We are able to compute the first test ideal of a Thom-Sebastiani type polynomial at the F -pure threshold. We point out that, unlike previous work, we do not assume that the test ideals of g_1 or g_2 are monomial. In fact, we do not assume any shape of the ideals. Furthermore, we do not make any assumption on the characteristic.

Theorem B (see Theorem 5.5). Let \mathbb{K} be a perfect field of prime characteristic p . Let $R_1 = \mathbb{K}[x_1, \dots, x_n]$ and $R_2 = \mathbb{K}[y_1, \dots, y_m]$ with maximal homogeneous ideals $\mathfrak{m}_1 = (x_1, \dots, x_n)$ and $\mathfrak{m}_2 = (y_1, \dots, y_m)$ respectively. Let $f = g_1 + g_2 \in R = R_1 \otimes_{\mathbb{K}} R_2 = \mathbb{K}[x_1, \dots, x_n, y_1, \dots, y_m]$, where $g_1 \in \mathfrak{m}_1$ and $g_2 \in \mathfrak{m}_2$. Let $a_1 = \mathbf{c}^{\mathfrak{m}_1}(g_1) = \frac{r_1}{s_1}$, $a_2 = \mathbf{c}^{\mathfrak{m}_2}(g_2) = \frac{r_2}{s_2}$, and $\mathfrak{m} = (x_1, \dots, x_n, y_1, \dots, y_m)$, where $r_i, s_i \in \mathbb{N}$. Suppose that $a_1 + a_2 \leq 1$, and set

$$L = \sup \left\{ N \in \mathbb{N} \mid a_1^{(e)} + a_2^{(e)} \leq p - 1 \text{ for all } 0 \leq e \leq N \right\},$$

and $d = \sup \left\{ e \leq L \mid a_1^{(e)} + a_2^{(e)} \leq p - 2 \right\}$. Then,

$$\tau \left(f^{\mathbf{c}^{\mathfrak{m}}(f)} \right) = \begin{cases} (f) & \text{if } \mathbf{c}^{\mathfrak{m}}(f) = 1, \\ \tau(g_1^{a_1}) + \tau(g_2^{a_2}) & \text{if } \mathbf{c}^{\mathfrak{m}}(f) \notin p^{-e} \cdot \mathbb{N}, \\ \left(g_1^{\lceil p^d a_1 \rceil} \right)^{[1/p^d]} + \left(g_2^{\lceil p^d a_2 \rceil} \right)^{[1/p^d]} & \text{if } \mathbf{c}^{\mathfrak{m}}(f) \in \mathbb{Z}[\frac{1}{p}] \text{ \& } \mathbf{c}^{\mathfrak{m}}(f) \neq 1. \end{cases}$$

We point out that Theorem B includes several cases that were not computed before, even for diagonal hypersurfaces (see Example 5.6).

Convention. In this manuscript, p denotes a prime number and \mathbb{K} denotes a perfect field of characteristic p .

2. BACKGROUND

2.1. Expansions in base p . In this section we recall the notion of the non-terminating base p expansion of a number in $(0, 1]$, and some of its properties.

Definition 2.1. Let $\alpha \in (0, 1]$, and p be a prime number. The non-terminating base p expansion of α is the expression $\alpha = \sum_{e \geq 1} \frac{\alpha^{(e)}}{p^e}$, with $0 \leq \alpha^{(e)} \leq p - 1$, such that for all $n > 0$, there exists

$e \geq n$ with $\alpha^{(e)} \neq 0$. The number $\alpha^{(e)}$ is unique and it is called the e^{th} digit of the non-terminating base p expansion of α .

Example 2.2. Let $\alpha = \frac{a}{b}$ be a rational number in $(0, 1]$. If $p \equiv 1 \pmod{b}$, then $p = bw + 1$ for some $w \geq 1$. The non-terminating base p expansion of α is periodic, and it is given by
$$\alpha = \sum_{e \geq 1} \frac{aw}{p^e}.$$

The elementary notion of adding without carrying for integers (base p) extends to non-terminating base p expansions.

Definition 2.3. Let $\alpha \in (0, 1]$.

(1) For $e \geq 1$, the e^{th} truncation of the non-terminating base p expansion of α is defined by

$$\langle \alpha \rangle_e = \frac{\alpha^{(1)}}{p} + \cdots + \frac{\alpha^{(e)}}{p^e}.$$

We use the conventions $\langle \alpha \rangle_\infty = \alpha$ and $\langle 0 \rangle_e = 0$.

(2) Let $p < n$, and $\alpha_1, \alpha_2 \in (0, 1)$. We say that α_1 and α_2 add without carrying in base p if

$$\alpha_1^{(e)} + \alpha_2^{(e)} \leq p - 1 \text{ for every } e \geq 1.$$

Remark 2.4. The non-terminating base p expansions of α_1 and α_n add without carrying if and only if the base p expansions of the integers $p^e \langle \alpha_1 \rangle_e$ and $p^e \langle \alpha_n \rangle_e$ add without carrying for all $e > 1$.

Lemma 2.5 ([Her11, Lemma 4.6]). *Let $\alpha \in (0, 1]$. Then the following statements hold.*

- (1) *If $\alpha \notin \frac{1}{p^e} \cdot \mathbb{N}$, then $\lfloor p^e \alpha \rfloor = p^e \langle \alpha \rangle_e$.*
- (2) *$\lceil p^e \alpha \rceil = p^e \langle \alpha \rangle_e + 1$.*
- (3) *Let $\alpha_1, \alpha_2 \in (0, 1]$. If α_1 and α_2 add without carrying in base p and $\alpha := \alpha_1 + \alpha_2 \leq 1$, then $\alpha^{(e)} = \alpha_1^{(e)} + \alpha_2^{(e)}$.*

To end this section we include some useful results on divisibility for integers.

Lemma 2.6 ([Luc78, L.E02]). *Let $k_1, k_2 \in \mathbb{N}$ and set $N = k_1 + k_2$. Then*

$$\binom{N}{k_i} = \frac{N!}{k_1! k_2!} \not\equiv 0 \pmod{p}$$

if and only if k_1, k_2 add without carrying in base p .

Theorem 2.7 (Dirichlet). *Given n and m non-zero natural numbers with $\gcd(n, m) = 1$, there exists infinitely many prime numbers p such that $p \equiv n \pmod{m}$.*

Theorem 2.8 (Dirichlet). *For any collection $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n$ of rational numbers, there exists infinitely many prime numbers p such that $(p - 1) \cdot \alpha_i \in \mathbb{N}$ for $1 \leq i \leq n$.*

2.2. Test ideals and F-thresholds.

Notation 2.9. *Throughout this subsection, R denotes the polynomial ring $\mathbb{K}[x_1, \dots, x_n]$ over \mathbb{K} , and \mathfrak{m} denotes its homogeneous maximal ideal (x_1, \dots, x_n) .*

The Frobenius map $F : R \rightarrow R$ is the p^{th} power morphism given by $r \mapsto r^p$. For every ideal $I \subseteq R$, the e -th Frobenius power of I , denoted by $I^{[p^e]}$, is the ideal generated by the set $\{g^{p^e} \mid g \in I\}$. Since R is a regular ring, then the Frobenius map $F : R \rightarrow R$ is flat. Therefore, we have that $(I^{[p^e]} :_R J^{[p^e]}) = (F^e(I) :_R F^e(J)) = F^e((I :_R J)) = (I :_R J)^{[p^e]}$.

Remark 2.10. The ring R is finitely generated and free over $R^{p^e} = \mathbb{K}[x_1^{p^e}, \dots, x_n^{p^e}]$, with basis the set of monomials $\{\mu \mid \mu \notin \mathfrak{m}^{[p^e]}\}$.

Definition 2.11. For an ideal $I \subseteq R$ and a positive integer e , let $I^{[1/p^e]}$ denote the unique smallest ideal J of R with respect to the inclusion such that $I \subseteq J^{[p^e]}$.

Proposition 2.12 ([BMS09, Proposition 2.5]). *Let e_1, \dots, e_s be a basis of R over R^{p^e} . Let f_1, \dots, f_r be generators of the ideal I of R . For each $i \in \{1, \dots, r\}$ let $f_i = \sum_{j=1}^s a_{i,j}^{p^e} e_j$ with $a_{i,j} \in R$. Then, $I^{[1/p^e]} = (a_{i,j} \mid 1 \leq i \leq r, 1 \leq j \leq s)$.*

Definition 2.13 ([HY03, BMS08]). Let $I \subseteq R$ be an ideal, c a positive real number, and e a positive integer. Then, the test ideal of I with exponent c is $\tau(I^c) = \bigcup_{e \geq 1} (I^{[cp^e]})^{[1/p^e]}$.

Remark 2.14. Let I be an ideal of R . Then, $f^{p^e} \in I^{[p^e]}$ if and only if $f \in I$. This follows because R is finitely generated and free over R^{p^e} .

If α is a rational number with a power of p in the denominators, the test ideal can be obtained from the following formula.

Proposition 2.15 ([BMS08, Lemma 2.1]). *Let $r, e \in \mathbb{N}$. Then, $\tau(f^{r/p^e}) = (f^r)^{[1/p^e]}$.*

Definition 2.16. The F -threshold of a non-zero proper ideal $\mathfrak{a} \subseteq \sqrt{J} \subseteq \mathfrak{m}$ with respect to an ideal J , denoted by $\mathbf{c}^J(\mathfrak{a})$, is defined as

$$\lim_{e \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\nu_{\mathfrak{a}}^J(p^e)}{p^e},$$

where $\nu_{\mathfrak{a}}^J(p^e) = \max \{l \in \mathbb{N} \mid \mathfrak{a}^l \not\subseteq J^{[p^e]}\}$.

It is known that the previous limit exists [MTW05, Lemma 1.1], and $\mathbf{c}^J(\mathfrak{a})$ is a rational number [BMS08, Theorem 3.1]. If $\mathfrak{a} = (f)$, we simply write $\nu_f^J(p^e)$, $\mathbf{c}^J(f)$ and $\tau(f^c)$.

Proposition 2.17 ([MTW05, Proposition 1.9]). *Let $J \subseteq \mathfrak{m}$ be an ideal whose radical contains $f \neq 0$. For every non-negative integer e , we have*

$$\langle \mathbf{c}^J(f) \rangle_e = \frac{\nu_f^J(p^e)}{p^e}$$

3. F-THRESHOLDS OF A THOM-SEBASTIANI TYPE POLYNOMIAL

In this section we focus in studying the F -threshold of a Thom-Sebastiani type polynomial with respect to the sum of two ideals in different variables. In particular, we prove Theorem A. We start fixing notation for this section.

Notation 3.1. *Let $\{x_1, \dots, x_n\}$ and $\{y_1, \dots, y_m\}$ be two disjoint sets of variables. Consider the rings of polynomials $R_1 = \mathbb{K}[x_1, \dots, x_n]$ and $R_2 = \mathbb{K}[y_1, \dots, y_m]$. Let $\mathfrak{m}_1 = (x_1, \dots, x_n)$ and $\mathfrak{m}_2 = (y_1, \dots, y_m)$ denote their maximal homogeneous ideals. Let $I_1 \subseteq \mathfrak{m}_1$ and $I_2 \subseteq \mathfrak{m}_2$ be two ideals. Let $a_1 = \mathbf{c}^{I_1}(g_1)$ and $a_2 = \mathbf{c}^{I_2}(g_2)$. Let $f = g_1 + g_2 \in R = R_1 \otimes_{\mathbb{K}} R_2 = \mathbb{K}[x_1, \dots, x_n, y_1, \dots, y_m]$, where $g_1 \in R_1$ and $g_2 \in R_2$.*

We start with a lemma that may be known to the experts. We add it for the sake of completeness.

Lemma 3.2. *We consider Notation 3.1. Let $\theta, e \in \mathbb{N}$. Then, $f^\theta \in I_1^{[p^e]}R + I_2^{[p^e]}R$ if and only if $\binom{\theta}{j} = 0$, $g_1^j \in I_1^{[p^e]}$, or $g_2^{\theta-j} \in I_2^{[p^e]}$ for every $0 \leq j \leq \theta$.*

Proof. We first assume that $\binom{\theta}{j} = 0$, $g_1^j \in I_1^{[p^e]}$, or $g_2^{\theta-j} \in I_2^{[p^e]}$ for every $0 \leq j \leq \theta$. Then, $f^\theta = \sum_{j=0}^{\theta} \binom{\theta}{j} g_1^j g_2^{\theta-j} \in I_1^{[p^e]}R + I_2^{[p^e]}R$.

We now assume that $f^\theta \in I_1^{[p^e]}R + I_2^{[p^e]}R$. We proceed by contradiction. We assume that the set

$$\mathcal{A} := \left\{ j \in \mathbb{N} \mid \binom{\theta}{j} \neq 0, g_1^j \notin I_1^{[p^e]}, g_2^{\theta-j} \notin I_2^{[p^e]}, \text{ and } j \leq \theta \right\}$$

is not empty. Set $t := \min \mathcal{A}$.

By our choice of t , we have that $\sum_{j=0}^{t-1} \binom{\theta}{j} g_1^j g_2^{\theta-j} \in I_1^{[p^e]}R + I_2^{[p^e]}R$, and therefore

$$h = f - \sum_{j=0}^{t-1} \binom{\theta}{j} g_1^j g_2^{\theta-j} = \sum_{j=t}^{\theta} \binom{\theta}{j} g_1^j g_2^{\theta-j} \in I_1^{[p^e]}R + I_2^{[p^e]}R.$$

Let $\beta = \nu_{g_1}^{I_1}(p^e)$. We have that $t \leq \beta$ and

$$g_1^{\beta-t} h = \sum_{j=t}^{\theta} \binom{\theta}{j} g_1^{\beta+j-t} g_2^{\theta-j} \in I_1^{[p^e]}R + I_2^{[p^e]}R.$$

Moreover, $\binom{\theta}{j} g_1^{\beta+j-t} g_2^{\theta-j} \in I_1^{[p^e]}R + I_2^{[p^e]}R$ for every $j > t$. Then, $\binom{\theta}{t} g_1^\beta g_2^{\theta-t} \in I_1^{[p^e]}R + I_2^{[p^e]}R$. Since $\binom{\theta}{t} \neq 0$, we deduce that $g_1^\beta g_2^{\theta-t} \in I_1^{[p^e]}R + I_2^{[p^e]}R$.

Since $g_1^\beta \notin I_1^{[p^e]}$ and $g_2^{\theta-t} \notin I_2^{[p^e]}$, we have that $g_1^\beta \neq 0$ in $R_1/I_1^{[p^e]}$ and $g_2^{\theta-t} \neq 0$ in $R_2/I_2^{[p^e]}$. Then, $0 \neq g_1^\beta \otimes g_2^{\theta-t}$ in $R_1/I_1^{[p^e]} \otimes_{\mathbb{K}} R_2/I_2^{[p^e]} = R/(I_1^{[p^e]}R + I_2^{[p^e]}R)$. Hence, $g_1^\beta g_2^{\theta-t} \notin I_1^{[p^e]}R + I_2^{[p^e]}R$, a contradiction. \square

We start proving Theorem A by finding a lower bound for F -thresholds of a Thom-Sebastiani type polynomial with respect to an ideal that has also Thom-Sebastiani type shape.

Lemma 3.3. *We consider Notation 3.1. Then,*

$$\mathbf{c}^{I_1+I_2}(g_1 + g_2) \geq \langle a_1 \rangle_L + \langle a_2 \rangle_L + \frac{1}{p^L},$$

where $L = \sup \left\{ N \in \mathbb{N} \mid a_1^{(e)} + a_2^{(e)} \leq p - 1 \text{ for all } 0 \leq e \leq N \right\}$.

Proof. We note that $a_1^{(L+1)} + a_2^{(L+1)} \geq p$, by our definition of L . There exists $\alpha_1, \alpha_2 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\alpha_1 + \alpha_2 = p - 1$ with $0 \leq \alpha_1 < a_1^{(L+1)}$ and $0 \leq \alpha_2 \leq a_2^{(L+1)}$. For any integer $e \geq L + 2$, we set

$$\begin{aligned} \eta(e) = (\eta_1(e), \eta_2(e)) &:= (\langle a_1 \rangle_L, \langle a_2 \rangle_L) + \left(\frac{\alpha_1}{p^{L+1}} + \frac{p-1}{p^{L+2}} + \dots + \frac{p-1}{p^e}, \frac{\alpha_2}{p^{L+1}} \right), \\ &= (\langle a_1 \rangle_L, \langle a_2 \rangle_L) + \left(\frac{1}{p^{L+1}} \cdot \left(\alpha_1 + \frac{p^{e-(L+1)} - 1}{p^{e-(L+1)}} \right), \frac{\alpha_2}{p^{L+1}} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Thus, $\eta_2(e) \leq \langle a_2 \rangle_{L+1}$ and $\eta_1(e) < \langle a_1 \rangle_{L+1}$. The base p expansions of the integers $p^e \eta_1(e)$ and $p^e \eta_2(e)$ are

$$p^e \eta_1(e) = p^{e-(L+1)} \alpha_1 + p^{e-(L+2)}(p-1) + \dots + p-1, \text{ and } p^e \eta_2(e) = p^{e-(L+1)} \alpha_2.$$

Since $\alpha_1 + \alpha_2 = p-1$, the integers $p^e \eta_1(e)$ and $p^e \eta_2(e)$ add without carrying in base p . Thus

$$(1) \quad \binom{p^e(\eta_1(e) + \eta_2(e))}{p^e \eta_1(e)} \not\equiv 0 \pmod{p}$$

by Lemma 2.6.

Since $\eta_1(e) \leq \langle a_1 \rangle_e$ and $\eta_2(e) \leq \langle a_2 \rangle_e$ for every $e \geq L+2$, we have that $p^e \eta_1(e) \leq p^e \langle a_1 \rangle_e = \nu_{g_1}^{I_1}(p^e)$ and $p^e \eta_2(e) \leq p^e \langle a_2 \rangle_e = \nu_{g_2}^{I_2}(p^e)$. Therefore, $g_1^{p^e \eta_1(e)} \notin I_1^{[p^e]}$, $g_2^{p^e \eta_2(e)} \notin I_2^{[p^e]}$. Thus,

$$f^{p^e(\eta_1(e)+\eta_2(e))} \notin (I_1 + I_2)^{[p^e]}$$

by Lemma 3.2. It follows that

$$p^e \langle \mathbf{c}^{I_1+I_2}(f) \rangle_e = \nu_f^{I_1+I_2}(p^e) \geq p^e(\eta_1(e) + \eta_2(e)).$$

Finally, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \mathbf{c}^{I_1+I_2}(f) \rangle_e &\geq \eta_1(e) + \eta_2(e) = \langle a_1 \rangle_L + \langle a_2 \rangle_L + \frac{1}{p^{L+1}}(\alpha_1 + \alpha_2) + \frac{p-1}{p^{L+2}} + \dots + \frac{p-1}{p^e} \\ &= \langle a_1 \rangle_L + \langle a_2 \rangle_L + \frac{p-1}{p^{L+1}} + \frac{p-1}{p^{L+2}} + \dots + \frac{p-1}{p^e}. \end{aligned}$$

Taking the limit when $e \rightarrow \infty$, we have that

$$\mathbf{c}^{I_1+I_2}(f) \geq \langle a_1 \rangle_L + \langle a_2 \rangle_L + \frac{p-1}{p^{L+1}} \left(1 + \frac{1}{p} + \frac{1}{p^2} + \dots \right) = \langle a_1 \rangle_L + \langle a_2 \rangle_L + \frac{1}{p^L}.$$

□

Theorem 3.4. *Consider Notation 3.1. If $a_1 + a_2 \leq 1$, then*

$$\mathbf{c}^{I_1+I_2}(f) = \begin{cases} a_1 + a_2, & \text{if } L = \infty, \\ \langle a_1 \rangle_L + \langle a_2 \rangle_L + \frac{1}{p^L}, & \text{if } L < \infty, \end{cases}$$

where $L = \sup \left\{ N \in \mathbb{N} \mid a_1^{(e)} + a_2^{(e)} \leq p-1 \text{ for all } 0 \leq e \leq N \right\}$.

Proof. We split the proof into two cases.

Case 1: $L < \infty$: By Lemma 3.3 we have that

$$(2) \quad \mathbf{c}^{I_1+I_2}(f) \geq \langle a_1 \rangle_L + \langle a_2 \rangle_L + \frac{1}{p^L}$$

We proceed by contradiction, and assume that the inequality in Equation 2 is strict. Then,

$$\frac{\nu_f^{I_1+I_2}(p^e)}{p^e} > \langle a_1 \rangle_L + \langle a_2 \rangle_L + \frac{1}{p^L} \text{ for } e \gg 0.$$

Multiplying by p^e , we obtain that

$$\nu_f^{I_1+I_2}(p^e) > p^e(\langle a_1 \rangle_L + \langle a_2 \rangle_L) + p^{e-L} = p^{e-L} (p^L(\langle a_1 \rangle_L + \langle a_2 \rangle_L) + 1) \text{ for } e \geq L.$$

Therefore,

$$f^{p^{e-L}(p^L(\langle a_1 \rangle_L + \langle a_2 \rangle_L) + 1)} = \left(f^{p^L(\langle a_1 \rangle_L + \langle a_2 \rangle_L) + 1} \right)^{p^{e-L}} \notin (I_1 + I_2)^{[p^e]} = \left((I_1 + I_2)^{[p^L]} \right)^{[p^{e-L}]}.$$

By Remark 2.14, it follows that $f^{p^L(\langle a_1 \rangle_L + \langle a_2 \rangle_L) + 1} \notin (I_1 + I_2)^{[p^L]}$. This implies that there exists $\mathbf{k} = (k_1, k_2) \in \mathbb{N}^2$ such that $k_1 + k_2 = p^L(\langle a_1 \rangle_L + \langle a_2 \rangle_L) + 1$ and $g_1^{k_1} g_2^{k_2} \notin (I_1 + I_2)^{[p^L]}$. In particular, we have $g_1^{k_1} \notin (I_1)^{[p^L]}$, and $g_2^{k_2} \notin (I_2)^{[p^L]}$. By Proposition 2.17, we conclude that

$$k_1 \leq \nu_{g_1}^{I_1}(p^L) = p^L \langle a_1 \rangle_L, \quad \text{and} \quad k_2 \leq \nu_{g_2}^{I_2}(p^L) = p^L \langle a_2 \rangle_L.$$

Since $k_1 + k_2 = p^L(\langle a_1 \rangle_L + \langle a_2 \rangle_L) + 1$, we get

$$\langle a_1 \rangle_L + \langle a_2 \rangle_L + \frac{1}{p^L} = \frac{1}{p^L}(k_1 + k_2) \leq \langle a_1 \rangle_L + \langle a_2 \rangle_L,$$

which is a contradiction. Therefore, it holds

$$\mathbf{c}^{I_1 + I_2}(f) = \langle a_1 \rangle_L + \langle a_2 \rangle_L + \frac{1}{p^L}.$$

Case 2: $L = \infty$: Since $f^{\nu_f^{I_1 + I_2}(p^e)} \notin (I_1 + I_2)^{[p^e]}$, we conclude that there exists $k_1, k_2 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $k_1 + k_2 = \nu_f^{I_1 + I_2}(p^e)$ and $g_1^{k_1} g_2^{k_2} \notin (I_1 + I_2)^{[p^e]}$ by Lemma 3.2. Since the polynomials g_1, g_2 are in different sets of variables, we have

$$g_1^{k_1} \notin I_1^{[p^e]}, \quad g_2^{k_2} \notin I_2^{[p^e]}.$$

It follows that $k_1 \leq \nu_{g_1}^{I_1}(p^e)$ and $k_2 \leq \nu_{g_2}^{I_2}(p^e)$. Since

$$\nu_f^{I_1 + I_2}(p^e) = k_1 + k_2 \leq \nu_{g_1}^{I_1}(p^e) + \nu_{g_2}^{I_2}(p^e),$$

we have that

$$\frac{\nu_f^{I_1 + I_2}(p^e)}{p^e} \leq \frac{\nu_{g_1}^{I_1}(p^e)}{p^e} + \frac{\nu_{g_2}^{I_2}(p^e)}{p^e}.$$

Taking the limit when $e \rightarrow \infty$, we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{c}^{I_1 + I_2}(f) &= \lim_{e \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\nu_f^{I_1 + I_2}(p^e)}{p^e} \leq \lim_{e \rightarrow \infty} \left(\frac{\nu_{g_1}^{I_1}(p^e)}{p^e} + \frac{\nu_{g_2}^{I_2}(p^e)}{p^e} \right) \\ &= \lim_{e \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\nu_{g_1}^{I_1}(p^e)}{p^e} + \lim_{e \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\nu_{g_2}^{I_2}(p^e)}{p^e} = a_1 + a_2. \end{aligned}$$

We now check that $a_1 + a_2 \leq \mathbf{c}^{I_1 + I_2}(f)$. Since a_1 and a_2 add without carrying in base p , Remark 2.4 and Lemma 2.6 imply that

$$(3) \quad \begin{pmatrix} p^e(\langle a_1 \rangle_e + \langle a_2 \rangle_e) \\ p^e \langle a_1 \rangle_e \end{pmatrix} \not\equiv 0 \pmod{p}.$$

Moreover, $\nu_{g_1}^{I_1}(p^e) = p^e \langle a_1 \rangle_e$, and $\nu_{g_2}^{I_2}(p^e) = p^e \langle a_2 \rangle_e$ by Proposition 2.17. Then,

$$(4) \quad g_1^{p^e \langle a_1 \rangle_e} \notin I_1^{[p^e]}, \quad g_2^{p^e \langle a_2 \rangle_e} \notin I_2^{[p^e]}.$$

Equations 3, 4, and Lemma 3.2 imply that

$$f^{p^e(\langle a_1 \rangle_e + \langle a_2 \rangle_e)} \notin (I_1 + I_2)^{[p^e]}.$$

Thus,

$$p^e(\langle a_1 \rangle_e + \langle a_2 \rangle_e) \leq \nu_f^{I_1 + I_2}(p^e) \quad \text{for all } e \gg 1.$$

Dividing by p^e , we have

$$\langle a_1 \rangle_e + \langle a_2 \rangle_e \leq \frac{\nu_f^{I_1+I_2}(p^e)}{p^e} \quad \text{for all } e \gg 1.$$

Finally, taking the limit when $e \rightarrow \infty$, we obtain that $a_1 + a_2 \leq \mathbf{c}^{I_1+I_2}(f)$, and $\mathbf{c}^{I_1+I_2}(f) = a_1 + a_2$. \square

Example 3.5. Let $a, b, n \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$, and $b \geq a$. Let $g_1 = x^n \in R_1 = \mathbb{K}[x]$, $g_2 = y_1^a y_2^b \in R_2 = \mathbb{K}[y_1, y_2]$, and $f = g_1 + g_2 \in R_1 \otimes_{\mathbb{K}} R_2$. Let $I_1 = \mathfrak{m}_1 = (x)$, $I_2 = \mathfrak{m}_2 = (y_1, y_2)$, and $\mathfrak{m} = \mathfrak{m}_1 + \mathfrak{m}_2 = (x, y_1, y_2)$. Since $a_1 = \mathbf{c}^{\mathfrak{m}_1}(g_1) = \frac{1}{n}$ and $\mathbf{c}^{\mathfrak{m}_2}(g_2) = \frac{1}{b}$, we have that

$$\mathbf{c}^{\mathfrak{m}}(f) = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{n} + \frac{1}{b}, & \text{if } L = \infty, \\ \langle \frac{1}{n} \rangle_L + \langle \frac{1}{b} \rangle_L + \frac{1}{p^L}, & \text{if } L < \infty. \end{cases}$$

where $L = \sup \left\{ N \in \mathbb{N} \mid \left(\frac{1}{n}\right)^{(e)} + \left(\frac{1}{b}\right)^{(e)} \leq p - 1 \text{ for all } 0 \leq e \leq N \right\}$. It is worth mentioning that $\mathbf{c}^{\mathfrak{m}}(f) = \mathbf{c}^{\mathfrak{m}}(x^n + y_2^b)$.

Remark 3.6. If $g_1 \in I_1$ and $g_2 \in I_2$, then $f \in I_1 R + I_2 R$. Then, if we run over all the test ideal $I_i = \tau(g_i^{\lambda_i})$ for $\lambda_i \in (0, 1)$, we obtain all the the ideals that contain g_i and whose F -thresholds give the jumping numbers in $(0, 1)$. Using Theorem 3.4, we compute the F -thresholds with respect to $\tau(g_1^{\lambda_1})R + \tau(g_2^{\lambda_2})R$. This give F -jumping numbers of f , but not necessarily all.

4. RELATION WITH LOG CANONICAL THRESHOLD

The behavior of the F -pure threshold for different reductions mod p and their connections with invariants over \mathbb{Q} have attracted much interest. We refer the to recent surveys on this topic [BFS13, TW18]. We are particularly interested in the relation between the log canonical threshold and the F -threshold. As consequence of Theorem 3.4, we give further evidence for the conjecture relating the F -pure and log-canonical threshold.

Let $f \in \mathbb{Q}[x_1, \dots, x_n]$, and let f_p denote the polynomial over \mathbb{F}_p obtained by reducing each coefficient of f modulo p .

A log resolution of f defined over \mathbb{Q} is a proper birational map $\pi_{\mathbb{Q}} : Y_{\mathbb{Q}} \rightarrow \mathbb{A}_{\mathbb{Q}}^n$, with $Y_{\mathbb{Q}}$ smooth, such that $f\mathcal{O}_{Y_{\mathbb{Q}}}$ is a principal and defines a simple normal crossing divisor D . The log canonical threshold $\mathbf{lct}_{\mathbf{0}}(f)$ of f at the origin $0 \in \mathbb{A}_{\mathbb{Q}}^n$ is the minimum number $\lambda \in \mathbb{Q}_{>0}$ such that the ideal $(\pi_{\mathbb{Q}})_* \mathcal{O}_{Y_{\mathbb{Q}}}(K_{\pi_{\mathbb{Q}}} - \lfloor \lambda \cdot D \rfloor)$ is contained in the maximal ideal $(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n)_{\mathbb{Q}}$.

Mustața, Tagaki, and Watanabe showed the following relation between the F -pure threshold and the log canonical threshold.

Theorem 4.1 ([MTW05, Theorem 3.4]). *Let $f \in \mathbb{Q}[x_1, \dots, x_n]$, and let f_p denote the polynomial over \mathbb{F}_p obtained by reducing each coefficient of f modulo p . Then, $\lim_{p \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{c}^{\mathfrak{m}}(f_p) = \mathbf{lct}_{\mathbf{0}}(f)$.*

Furthermore, they have formulated the following conjecture.

Conjecture 4.2 ([MTW05, Conjecture 3.6]). *Let $f \in \mathbb{Q}[x_1, \dots, x_n]$, and let f_p denote the polynomial over \mathbb{F}_p obtained by reducing each coefficient of f modulo p . There exist infinitely many prime numbers p such that $\mathbf{lct}_{\mathbf{0}}(f) = \mathbf{c}^{\mathfrak{m}}(f_p)$.*

We now use Theorem 3.4 to study Conjecture 4.2.

Theorem 4.3. *We consider Notation 3.1 with $\mathbb{K} = \mathbb{Q}$. Let $f = g_1 + g_2 \in R_1 \otimes_{\mathbb{Q}} R_2$ be a Thom-Sebastiani type polynomial as in the previous section. Assume that $g_1 \in R_1$ and $g_2 \in R_2$ satisfy Conjecture 4.2. Denote by B_i , with $i = 1, 2$ the infinite set of primes p such that $\mathbf{lct}_0(g_i) = \mathbf{c}^m((g_i)_p)$. Assume that $a_1 + a_2 < 1$ and there exists an infinite set $B \subseteq B_1 \cap B_2$ such that the non terminating base p extensions of a_1 and a_2 add without carrying for every $p \in B$. Then $f = g_1 + g_2$ satisfies the Conjecture 4.2.*

Proof. This is a consequence of the Thom-Sebastiani property for log canonical thresholds [Kol97b, Proposition 8.21] and Theorem 3.4. \square

We now provide a series of examples where the hypothesis of Theorem 4.3 are satisfied.

Example 4.4 (Thom-Sebastiani type sum of monomials). If $g_1 \in R_1$ and $g_2 \in R_2$ monomials, then $B_1 = B_2$ is the set of all primes p . If $a_1 + a_2 < 1$, Theorem 2.8 implies the existence of an infinite set B of primes p for which the non terminating base p expansions of a_1 and a_2 are periodic, and therefore add without carrying [Her11, Lemma 4.16 and Example 4.4]. Then the hypothesis of Theorem 4.3 are satisfied, and Conjecture 4.2 holds for f . Particular cases of this situation are diagonal hypersurfaces, and Thom-Sebastiani type binomials (or multinomials, since the argument extends to any finite number of summands).

A case of the latter is Example 3.5. Notice that if $\gcd(a, b, n) \neq 1$ the hypersurfaces of Example 3.5 are irreducible quasi-ordinary hypersurfaces with only one characteristic exponent. We point out that the log-canonical thresholds of irreducible quasi-ordinary hypersurfaces has already been computed [BGPGV12].

Example 4.5 (Suspensions or ramified cyclic coverings). Let $g_1 \in R_1$ such that the set B contains an infinite number of primes p such that $(p-1)a_1 \in \mathbb{N}$. An example of this is $g_1 = x_1^{b_1} x_2^{b_2} + x_1^{c_1} x_2^{c_2} \in R_1 = \mathbb{K}[x_1, x_2]$ a binomial hypersurface whose maximal splitting polytope \mathbf{P}_f contains a unique maximal point $\eta = (\frac{r_1}{s_1}, \frac{r_2}{s_2}) \in \mathbb{Q}^2$, with $\frac{r_1+1}{s_1} + \frac{r_2+1}{s_2} \leq 1$) [Her14, Theorem 4.1]. Let $g_2 = y_1^d \in \mathbb{K}[y_1]$. Then $a_2 = \frac{1}{d} = \mathbf{lct}_0(g_2)$ for all primes, and so, B_2 is the set of all primes. Finally, by Theorem 2.8, there is a infinite subset B of $B_1 = B_1 \cap B_2$, consisting of all primes p such that $(p-1)a_1, (p-1)\frac{1}{d} \in \mathbb{N}$. We have that, if $a_1 + a_2 < 1$, then the non terminating base p expansions of a_1 and a_2 add without carrying [Her11, Lemma 4.16 and Example 4.4]. We conclude that $\mathbf{c}^m(f) = a_1 + a_1 = \mathbf{lct}_0(f)$ for all $p \in B$. Hence, $f = g_1 + g_2$ satisfies Conjecture 4.2. We note that it is possible to iterate the previous construction because f satisfies the hypothesis required on g_1 .

The following examples combine the previous cases.

Example 4.6. Let $R_1 = \mathbb{K}[x, y]$, $R_2 = \mathbb{K}[w, z]$, $R_3 = \mathbb{K}[t, u, v]$, and $g_1 = x^4 + y^4 \in \mathfrak{m}_1 = (x, y)$, $g_2 = z^7 w^2 + z^5 w^6 \in \mathfrak{m}_2 = (z, w)$, and $g_3 = v^2 u^3 t^8 \in \mathfrak{m}_3 = (t, u, v)$. Set $f = g_1 + g_2 + g_3 \in R_1 \otimes_{\mathbb{K}} R_2 \otimes_{\mathbb{K}} R_3$, and $\mathfrak{m} = (x, y, z, w, v, u, t)$. We compute the F-pure threshold of f , and check that f satisfies Conjecture 4.2.

- If $p \equiv 1 \pmod{16}$, Theorem 3.4 implies that $\mathbf{c}^{m_1}(g_1) = \frac{8}{16} = \mathbf{lct}_0(g_1)$.
- If $p \equiv 1 \pmod{32}$, then $\mathbf{c}^{m_2}(g_2) = \frac{3}{16}$ [Her14, Theorem 4.1]. Moreover, Theorem 4.1 implies that $\mathbf{c}^{m_2}(g_2) = \mathbf{lct}_0(g_2) = \frac{3}{16}$.
- We have that $\mathbf{c}^{m_3}(g_3) = \frac{2}{16} = \mathbf{lct}_0(v^2 u^3 t^8)$ for any prime p

The set of primes p such that $p \equiv 1 \pmod{32}$ is infinite by Theorem 2.7. Therefore, there are infinite primes such that $\mathbf{c}^m(f) = \frac{13}{16} = \mathbf{lct}_0(f)$.

Example 4.7 (Exploiting other properties of the log canonical threshold and the F -pure threshold). Let g_1 and g_2 be polynomials satisfying the conditions in Theorem 4.3.

We consider first $f = (g_1 + g_2)^n$. Then, for any prime p in the infinite set B , we have

$$\mathbf{c}^m(f) = \frac{\mathbf{c}^m(g_1) + \mathbf{c}^m(g_2)}{n} = \frac{\mathbf{lct}_0(g_1) + \mathbf{lct}_0(g_2)}{n} = \mathbf{lct}_0(f).$$

Thus, Conjecture 4.2 holds for f .

We consider now $f = g_1 g_2$. Then, we have

$$\mathbf{c}^m(f) \leq \mathbf{lct}_0(f) \leq \min \{\mathbf{lct}_0(g_1), \mathbf{lct}_0(g_2)\} = \min \{\mathbf{lct}_0(g_1), \mathbf{lct}_0(g_2)\} = \mathbf{c}^m(f)$$

for any integer p in the infinite set B [TW04, Proposition 3.2] [Kol97b, Theorem 8.20] [Her14, Lemma 3.3].

Hence, $\mathbf{c}^m(f) = \mathbf{lct}_0(f)$ for any prime p in B , and so, Conjecture 4.2 holds for f .

Example 4.8. Consider the polynomial

$$f = w^8 x^4 y^{24} z^{44} + 4u^3 v^7 w^8 x^4 y^{24} z^{44} + 6u^6 v^{14} w^4 x^2 y^{12} z^{22} + 4u^9 v^{21} w^2 x^1 y^6 z^{11} + u^{12} v^{28},$$

and $p \equiv 2 \pmod{77}$. We note that that $f = (u^3 v^7 + w^2 x y^6 z^{11})^4 = (g_1 + g_2)^4$ for $g_1 = u^3 v^7 \in \mathbb{K}[u, v]$ and $g_2 = w^2 x y^6 z^{11} \in \mathbb{K}[w, x, y, z]$. Then, $\mathbf{c}^m(f) = \mathbf{c}^m(g_1 + g_2)/4$, where $\mathbf{m} = (u, v, w, x, y, z)$. For the monomials g_1, g_2 we get that

$$\mathbf{c}^{\mathbf{m}_1}(g_1) = 1/7 = \mathbf{lct}_0(g_1), \text{ and } \mathbf{c}^{\mathbf{m}_2}(g_2) = 1/11 = \mathbf{lct}_0(g_2),$$

where $\mathbf{m}_1 = (u, v)$, and $\mathbf{m}_2 = (w, x, y, z)$. The number $1/7$ and $1/11$ add without carrying whenever $p \equiv 2 \pmod{77}$, then $\mathbf{c}^m(f) = 1/4(1/7 + 1/11) = 9/154$ by Theorem 3.4. There are infinitely many prime numbers that satisfies $p \equiv 2 \pmod{77}$, and

$$\mathbf{lct}_0(f) = \mathbf{lct}_0(g_1 + g_2)/4 = 9/154 = \mathbf{c}^m(f).$$

Therefore Conjecture 4.2 holds for the polynomial f .

Example 4.9. Let $f = w^4 x^6 t^3 + uv^2 w^4 x^6 + t^3 y^2 z + y^2 z w^2 \in \mathbb{K}[t, u, v, w, x, y, z]$, and $p \equiv 1 \pmod{6}$. Notice that

$$f = (w^4 x^6 + y^2 z)(t^3 + uv^2) = g_1 g_2,$$

for $g_1 = w^4 x^6 + y^2 z \in \mathbb{K}[w, x, y, z]$, and $g_2 = t^3 + uv^2 \in \mathbb{K}[t, u, v]$. We have that $\mathbf{c}^m(f) = \min \{\mathbf{c}^{\mathbf{m}_1}(g_1), \mathbf{c}^{\mathbf{m}_2}(g_2)\}$, where $\mathbf{m}_1 = (w, x, y, z)$ and $\mathbf{m}_2 = (t, u, v)$. Using Theorem 3.4, we compute the F -threshold of g_1 , and g_2 . For $p \equiv 1 \pmod{6}$ we have that $1/6$, and $1/2$ add without carrying. Then, $\mathbf{c}^{\mathbf{m}_1}(g_1) = 1/6 + 1/2 = 2/3$. By Example 3.5, we obtain $\mathbf{c}^{\mathbf{m}_2}(g_2) = 5/6$. Therefore, $\mathbf{c}^m(f) = \mathbf{c}^{\mathbf{m}_1}(g_1) = 2/3$. There are infinitely many prime numbers that satisfies $p \equiv 1 \pmod{6}$, and

$$\mathbf{c}^m(f) \leq \mathbf{lct}_0(f) \leq \min \{\mathbf{lct}_0(g_1), \mathbf{lct}_0(g_2)\} = 2/3.$$

Therefore Conjecture 4.2 holds for the polynomial f .

5. TEST IDEAL OF A THOM-SEBASTIANI TYPE POLYNOMIAL

In this section we compute a formula for the first non-trivial test ideal of a Thom-Sebastiani type polynomial.

Notation 5.1. Let $\{x_1, \dots, x_n\}$ and $\{y_1, \dots, y_m\}$ be two disjoint sets of variables. Consider the rings of polynomials $R_1 = \mathbb{K}[x_1, \dots, x_n]$ and $R_2 = \mathbb{K}[y_1, \dots, y_m]$. Denote by $\mathbf{m}_1 = (x_1, \dots, x_n)$ and $\mathbf{m}_2 = (y_1, \dots, y_m)$ their maximal homogeneous ideals. Let $f = g_1 + g_2 \in R = R_1 \otimes_{\mathbb{K}} R_2 = \mathbb{K}[x_1, \dots, x_n, y_1, \dots, y_m]$, where $g_1 \in R_1$ and $g_2 \in R_2$. Let $a_1 = \mathbf{c}^{\mathbf{m}_1}(g_1)$, and $a_2 = \mathbf{c}^{\mathbf{m}_2}(g_2)$.

We start with some of preparation lemmas before proving Theorem B.

Lemma 5.2. *Let $\alpha_1, \alpha_2 \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$. Assume that $\alpha_1^{(e)} + \alpha_2^{(e)} \leq p - 2$, and*

$$\binom{p^e(\langle \alpha_1 \rangle_e + \langle \alpha_2 \rangle_e)}{p^e \langle \alpha_1 \rangle_e} \not\equiv 0 \pmod{p},$$

then

$$\binom{p^e(\langle \alpha_1 \rangle_e + \langle \alpha_2 \rangle_e) + 1}{p^e \langle \alpha_1 \rangle_e + 1} \not\equiv 0 \pmod{p} \quad \& \quad \binom{p^e(\langle \alpha_1 \rangle_e + \langle \alpha_2 \rangle_e) + 1}{p^e \langle \alpha_2 \rangle_e + 1} \not\equiv 0 \pmod{p}.$$

Proof. From the definition of binomial coefficient we get the equalities

$$\binom{p^e(\langle \alpha_1 \rangle_e + \langle \alpha_2 \rangle_e) + 1}{p^e \langle \alpha_i \rangle_e + 1} = \binom{p^e(\langle \alpha_1 \rangle_e + \langle \alpha_2 \rangle_e)}{p^e \langle \alpha_i \rangle_e} \cdot \frac{p^e(\langle \alpha_1 \rangle_e + \langle \alpha_2 \rangle_e) + 1}{p^e \langle \alpha_i \rangle_e + 1},$$

with $i = 1, 2$. The result follows from these equalities and the congruence

$$p^e(\langle \alpha_1 \rangle_e + \langle \alpha_2 \rangle_e) + 1 \equiv \alpha_1^{(e)} + \alpha_2^{(e)} + 1 \not\equiv 0 \pmod{p}.$$

The latter holds because $\alpha_i^{(e)} \leq \alpha_1^{(e)} + \alpha_2^{(e)} \leq p - 2$. □

Lemma 5.3. *Let $\alpha_1, \alpha_2 \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$, and assume that $\alpha_1 + \alpha_2 < 1$. Let*

$$L = \sup \left\{ N \in \mathbb{N} \mid \alpha_1^{(e)} + \alpha_2^{(e)} \leq p - 1 \text{ for all } 0 \leq e \leq N \right\}$$

and

$$d = \sup \left\{ e \leq L \mid \alpha_1^{(e)} + \alpha_2^{(e)} \leq p - 2 \right\}.$$

Then,

$$\langle \alpha_1 \rangle_d + \langle \alpha_2 \rangle_d + \frac{1}{p^d} = \langle \alpha_1 \rangle_L + \langle \alpha_2 \rangle_L + \frac{1}{p^L}.$$

Proof. We proceed by cases.

If $d = L = \infty$, then the result follows because $\langle \alpha_i \rangle_\infty = \alpha_i$.

If $L = \infty$ and $d < \infty$, we have $\alpha_1^{(e)} + \alpha_2^{(e)} = p - 1$ for $e \geq d + 1$. Hence

$$\alpha_1 + \alpha_2 = \langle \alpha_1 \rangle_L + \langle \alpha_2 \rangle_L + \frac{1}{p^L} = \langle \alpha_1 \rangle_d + \langle \alpha_2 \rangle_d + \sum_{j=d+1}^{\infty} \frac{p-1}{p^j} = \langle \alpha_1 \rangle_d + \langle \alpha_2 \rangle_d + \frac{1}{p^d}.$$

If $L < \infty$ and $d < \infty$, we have $\alpha_1^{(e)} + \alpha_2^{(e)} = p - 1$ for $d + 1 \leq e \leq L$. Hence

$$\langle \alpha_1 \rangle_L + \langle \alpha_2 \rangle_L + \frac{1}{p^L} = \langle \alpha_1 \rangle_d + \langle \alpha_2 \rangle_d + \frac{p-1}{p^{d+1}} + \cdots + \frac{p-1}{p^L} + \frac{1}{p^L} = \langle \alpha_1 \rangle_d + \langle \alpha_2 \rangle_d + \frac{1}{p^d}.$$

□

Lemma 5.4. *Consider Notation 5.1, and assume that $a_1 + a_2 < 1$. Let*

$$L = \sup \left\{ N \in \mathbb{N} \mid a_1^{(e)} + a_2^{(e)} \leq p - 1 \text{ for all } 0 \leq e \leq N \right\}.$$

If $a_1^{(e)} + a_2^{(e)} \leq p - 2$ for some $e \leq L$, then

$$\left(f^{p^e(\langle a_1 \rangle_e + \langle a_2 \rangle_e) + 1} \right)^{[1/p^e]} = \left(g_1^{[p^e a_1]} \right)^{[1/p^e]} + \left(g_2^{[p^e a_2]} \right)^{[1/p^e]}.$$

Proof. Let $\theta_i = p^e \langle a_i \rangle_e = \nu_{g_i}^{m_i}(p^e)$ for $i = 1, 2$, and $\theta = p^e(\langle a_1 \rangle_e + \langle a_2 \rangle_e) = \theta_1 + \theta_2$.

First, we check that

$$\left(g_1^{\lceil p^e a_1 \rceil}\right)^{\lceil 1/p^e \rceil} + \left(g_2^{\lceil p^e a_2 \rceil}\right)^{\lceil 1/p^e \rceil} \subseteq \left(f^{p^e(\langle a_1 \rangle_e + \langle a_2 \rangle_e) + 1}\right)^{\lceil 1/p^e \rceil}$$

for $i = 1, 2$. We choose elements $w_{i,j} \in R_2$ such that $1, g_i, \dots, g_i^{\theta_i}, w_{i,1}, \dots, w_{i,s_i}$ is a free basis of R_i as $R_i^{p^e}$ -module. Then,

$$\mathcal{B}_e = \left\{ g_1^{j_1} g_2^{j_2}, g_1^{j_1} w_{2,k_2}, w_{1,k_1} g_2^{j_2}, w_{1,k_1} w_{2,k_2} \mid 0 \leq j_i \leq \theta_i \text{ \& } 0 \leq k_i \leq s_i \right\}$$

is a free basis of R over R^{p^e} . We fix $h_j \in R_1$ such that

$$g_1^{\theta_1+1} = \sum_{j=0}^{\theta_1} h_j^{p^e} g_1^j + \sum_{j=1}^{s_1} h_{\theta_1+j}^{p^e} w_{1,j}.$$

Then,

$$\left(g_1^{\lceil p^e a_1 \rceil}\right)^{\lceil 1/p^e \rceil} = \left(g_1^{p^e \langle a_1 \rangle_e + 1}\right)^{\lceil 1/p^e \rceil} = \langle h_j \mid 0 \leq j \leq \theta_1 + s_1 \rangle$$

by Proposition 2.12. We consider $f^{\theta+1}$ in terms of the basis \mathcal{B}_e . We now show that each $h_j^{p^e}$ appears as a coefficient. Then,

$$f^{\theta+1} = \sum_{k=0}^{\theta+1} \binom{\theta+1}{k} g_1^k g_2^{\theta+1-k} = g_2^{\theta+1} + \dots + \binom{\theta+1}{\theta_1+1} g_1^{\theta_1+1} g_2^{\theta_2} + \dots + g_1^{\theta+1}.$$

By Lemma 5.2, we have

$$\binom{\theta+1}{\theta_i+1} \not\equiv 0 \pmod{p}.$$

We expand $g_1^{\theta_1+1} g_2^{\theta_2}$ as

$$g_1^{\theta_1+1} g_2^{\theta_2} = \left(\sum_{j=0}^{\theta_1} h_j^{p^e} g_1^j + \sum_{j=1}^{s_1} h_{\theta_1+j}^{p^e} w_{1,j} \right) g_2^{\theta_2} = \sum_{j=0}^{\theta_1} h_j^{p^e} g_1^j g_2^{\theta_2} + \sum_{j=1}^{s_1} h_{\theta_1+j}^{p^e} w_{1,j} g_2^{\theta_2}.$$

We note that the other summands are either multiples of $w_{1,k_1} g_2^{j_2}$, or $g_1^{j_1} w_{2,k_2}$, with $0 \leq j_1 \leq \theta_1$, $0 \leq j_2 < \theta_2$, and $0 \leq k_i \leq s_i$. Then, $h_j \in (f^{\theta+1})^{\lceil 1/p^e \rceil}$. We conclude that $\left(g_1^{\lceil p^e a_1 \rceil}\right)^{\lceil 1/p^e \rceil} \subseteq (f^{p^e(\langle a_1 \rangle_e + \langle a_2 \rangle_e) + 1})^{\lceil 1/p^e \rceil}$. Similarly, $\left(g_2^{\lceil p^e a_2 \rceil}\right)^{\lceil 1/p^e \rceil} \subseteq (f^{p^e(\langle a_1 \rangle_e + \langle a_2 \rangle_e) + 1})^{\lceil 1/p^e \rceil}$.

We now show the other containment. From the expression

$$f^{\theta+1} = g_2^{\theta+1} + \binom{\theta+1}{1} g_1 g_2^\theta + \dots + \binom{\theta+1}{\theta_1} g_1^{\theta_1} g_2^{\theta_2+1} + \binom{\theta+1}{\theta_1+1} g_1^{\theta_1+1} g_2^{\theta_2} + \dots + g_1^{\theta+1},$$

we conclude that $f^{\theta+1} \in (g_1^{\theta_1+1}, g_2^{\theta_2+1})$. Then,

$$\left(f^{\theta+1}\right)^{\lceil 1/p^e \rceil} \subseteq \left(g_1^{\theta_1+1}, g_2^{\theta_2+1}\right)^{\lceil 1/p^e \rceil} = \left(g_1^{\lceil p^e a_1 \rceil}\right)^{\lceil 1/p^e \rceil} + \left(g_2^{\lceil p^e a_2 \rceil}\right)^{\lceil 1/p^e \rceil}.$$

□

We are now ready to prove Theorem B.

Theorem 5.5. *Consider Notation 5.1. Let*

$$L = \sup \left\{ N \in \mathbb{N} \mid a_1^{(e)} + a_2^{(e)} \leq p - 1 \text{ for all } 0 \leq e \leq N \right\}$$

and $d = \sup \left\{ e \leq L \mid a_1^{(e)} + a_2^{(e)} \leq p - 2 \right\}$. Then

$$\tau \left(f^{\mathbf{c}^m(f)} \right) = \begin{cases} (f) & \text{if } \mathbf{c}^m(f) = 1, \\ \tau(g_1^{a_1}) + \tau(g_2^{a_2}) & \text{if } \mathbf{c}^m(f) \notin p^{-e} \cdot \mathbb{N}, \\ \left(g_1^{\lceil p^d a_1 \rceil} \right)^{\lceil 1/p^d \rceil} + \left(g_2^{\lceil p^d a_2 \rceil} \right)^{\lceil 1/p^d \rceil} & \text{if } \mathbf{c}^m(f) \in \mathbb{Z}[\frac{1}{p}] \text{ \& } \mathbf{c}^m(f) \neq 1. \end{cases}$$

Proof. It is well know that $\tau(f^1) = (f)$. This settles the first case. We assume that $\mathbf{c}^m(f) \neq 1$.

If $\mathbf{c}^m(f) \notin \mathbb{Z}[\frac{1}{p}]$, then a_1 and a_2 add without carrying by Theorem A. Thus, $L = \infty$, and $\mathbf{c}^m(f) = a_1 + a_2$. There exists infinity $e \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $a_1^{(e)} + a_2^{(e)} \leq p - 2$, because $\mathbf{c}^m(f) \notin \mathbb{Z}[\frac{1}{p}]$.

The result follows from Lemma 5.4, by picking $e \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $a_1^{(e)} + a_2^{(e)} \leq p - 2$, $\tau(g_1^{a_1}) = \left(g_1^{\lceil p^e a_1 \rceil} \right)^{\lceil 1/p^e \rceil}$, $\tau(g_2^{a_2}) = \left(g_2^{\lceil p^e a_2 \rceil} \right)^{\lceil 1/p^e \rceil}$, and

$$\tau(f^{a_1+a_2}) = \left(f^{\lceil p^e(a_1+a_2) \rceil} \right)^{\lceil 1/p^e \rceil} = \left(f^{p^e(\langle a_1 \rangle_e + \langle a_2 \rangle_e + 1)} \right)^{\lceil 1/p^e \rceil}.$$

Finally, suppose that $\mathbf{c}^m(f) \in p^{-e} \cdot \mathbb{N}$. Lemma 5.3 implies that

$$\mathbf{c}^m(f) = \langle a_1 \rangle_L + \langle a_2 \rangle_L + \frac{1}{p^L} = \langle a_1 \rangle_d + \langle a_2 \rangle_d + \frac{1}{p^d}.$$

Then,

$$\tau \left(f^{\mathbf{c}^m(f)} \right) = \tau \left(f^{\langle a_1 \rangle_d + \langle a_2 \rangle_d + \frac{1}{p^d}} \right) = \left(f^{p^d(\langle a_1 \rangle_d + \langle a_2 \rangle_d + 1)} \right)^{\lceil 1/p^d \rceil} = \left(g_1^{\lceil p^d a_1 \rceil} \right)^{\lceil 1/p^d \rceil} + \left(g_2^{\lceil p^d a_2 \rceil} \right)^{\lceil 1/p^d \rceil}$$

by Proposition 2.15 and Lemma 5.4. \square

Example 5.6 ([Her15, Example 4.9]). Let $p > 2$ a prime number, $a = \frac{p-1}{2}$, and $b = \frac{p^2-1}{2}$. Consider the polynomials $g_1 = x_1^b + \dots + x_a^b \in R_1 = \mathbb{F}_p[x_1, \dots, x_a]$, $g_2 = y_1^{pb} + \dots + y_a^{pb} \in R_2 = \mathbb{F}_p[y_1, \dots, y_a]$, and $f = g_1 + g_2 \in R = R_1 \otimes_{\mathbb{F}_p} R_2$. Let $\mathbf{m}_1 = \langle x_1, \dots, x_a \rangle \subset R_1$, $\mathbf{m}_2 = \langle y_1, \dots, y_a \rangle \subset R_2$ and $\mathbf{m} = \langle x_1, \dots, x_a, y_1, \dots, y_a \rangle \subset R$ be the respective maximal homogeneous ideals. Theorem 3.4 implies that $\mathbf{c}^m(f) = a_1 + a_2 = \frac{1}{p} \in p^{-1} \cdot \mathbb{N}$, where $a_1 = \mathbf{c}^{\mathbf{m}_1}(g_1) = a/b$, and $a_2 = \mathbf{c}^{\mathbf{m}_2}(g_2) = a/pb$. Since

$$g_1 = x_1^b + \dots + x_a^b = (x_1^a)^p \cdot x_1^a + \dots + (x_a^a)^p \cdot x_a^a, \quad \text{and} \quad g_2 = (y_1^b + \dots + y_a^b)^p \cdot 1,$$

we conclude from Theorem 5.5, that

$$\tau \left(f^{\mathbf{c}^m(f)} \right) = \left(g_1^{\lceil p a_1 \rceil} \right)^{\lceil 1/p \rceil} + \left(g_2^{\lceil p a_2 \rceil} \right)^{\lceil 1/p \rceil} = \langle x_1^a, \dots, x_a^a \rangle + \langle y_1^b + \dots + y_a^b \rangle = \langle x_1^a, \dots, x_a^a, y_1^b + \dots + y_a^b \rangle.$$

Example 5.7. Consider the following polynomial $f = z^7 w^2 + z^5 w^6 + v^2 u^3 t^8 \in \mathbb{K}[t, u, v, w, z]$. For $p = 97$, we want to compute the test ideal of f at $a = \mathbf{c}^m(f)$, where $\mathbf{m} = (t, u, v, w, z)$. We split the polynomial f into $g_1 = z^7 w^2 + z^5 w^6 \in \mathbb{K}[w, z]$, and $g_2 = v^2 u^3 t^8 \in \mathbb{K}[t, u, v]$. Let a_1, a_2 be the F -threshold of g_1 , and g_2 , respectively. We know that $a_1 = 3/16$, and $a_2 = 1/8$, because g_2 is a monomial [Her14, Example 4.3]. Since, a_1 , and a_2 add without carrying, by Theorem 3.4 we have that $a = a_1 + a_2 = 5/16$. The test ideals $\tau(g_1^{a_1}) = (w, z)$, and $\tau(g_2^{a_2}) = (t)$ were computed using Definition 2.13. Finally, Theorem 5.5 implies that $\tau(f^a) = \tau(g_1^{a_1}) + \tau(g_2^{a_2}) = (t, w, z)$.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The authors thank Daniel J. Hernandez for helpful comments and suggestions. The second author started this work while pursuing a master's degree at CIMAT. He thanks this institution for its support during his studies. We use Macaulay2 [GS] to compute several examples.

REFERENCES

- [BFS13] Angélica Benito, Eleonore Faber, and Karen E. Smith. Measuring singularities with Frobenius: the basics. In *Commutative algebra*, pages 57–97. Springer, New York, 2013.
- [BGPV12] Nero Budur, Pedro D. González-Pérez, and Manuel González Villa. Log canonical thresholds of quasi-ordinary hypersurface singularities. *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 140(12):4075–4083, 2012.
- [BMS08] Manuel Blickle, Mircea Mustață, and Karen E. Smith. Discreteness and rationality of F -thresholds. *Michigan Math. J.*, 57:43–61, 2008. Special volume in honor of Melvin Hochster.
- [BMS09] Manuel Blickle, Mircea Mustață, and Karen E. Smith. F -thresholds of hypersurfaces. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 361(12):6549–6565, 2009.
- [BS15] Bhargav Bhatt and Anurag K. Singh. The F -pure threshold of a Calabi-Yau hypersurface. *Math. Ann.*, 362(1-2):551–567, 2015.
- [DL99] Jan Denef and François Loeser. Motivic exponential integrals and a motivic Thom-Sebastiani theorem. *Duke Math. J.*, 99(2):285–309, 1999.
- [DSNnBP18] Alessandro De Stefani, Luis Núñez Betancourt, and Felipe Pérez. On the existence of F -thresholds and related limits. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 370(9):6629–6650, 2018.
- [GS] Daniel R. Grayson and Michael E. Stillman. Macaulay2, a software system for research in algebraic geometry. Available at <http://www.math.uiuc.edu/Macaulay2/>.
- [Her11] Daniel Jesus Hernandez. *F-purity of hypersurfaces*. ProQuest LLC, Ann Arbor, MI, 2011. Thesis (Ph.D.)—University of Michigan.
- [Her14] Daniel J. Hernández. F -pure thresholds of binomial hypersurfaces. *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 142(7):2227–2242, 2014.
- [Her15] Daniel J. Hernández. F -invariants of diagonal hypersurfaces. *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 143(1):87–104, 2015.
- [HMTW08] Craig Huneke, Mircea Mustață, Shunsuke Takagi, and Kei-ichi Watanabe. F -thresholds, tight closure, integral closure, and multiplicity bounds. volume 57, pages 463–483. 2008. Special volume in honor of Melvin Hochster.
- [HNnBWZ16] Daniel J. Hernández, Luis Núñez Betancourt, Emily E. Witt, and Wenliang Zhang. F -pure thresholds of homogeneous polynomials. *Michigan Math. J.*, 65(1):57–87, 2016.
- [HY03] Nobuo Hara and Ken-Ichi Yoshida. A generalization of tight closure and multiplier ideals. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 355(8):3143–3174, 2003.
- [Kol97a] János Kollár. Singularities of pairs. In *Algebraic geometry—Santa Cruz 1995*, volume 62 of *Proc. Sympos. Pure Math.*, pages 221–287. Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 1997.
- [Kol97b] János Kollár. Singularities of pairs. In *Algebraic geometry—Santa Cruz 1995*, volume 62 of *Proc. Sympos. Pure Math.*, pages 221–287. Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 1997.
- [L.E02] L.E. Dickson. Theorems on the residues of multinomial coefficients with respect to a prime modulus. *Quarterly Journal of Pure and Applied Mathematics*, 1902.
- [Luc78] Edouard Lucas. Théorie des fonctions numériques simplement périodiques. *Amer. J. Math.*, 1878.
- [MSS20] Laurentiu Maxim, Morihiko Saito, and Jörg Schürmann. Thom-Sebastiani theorems for filtered \mathcal{D} -modules and for multiplier ideals. *Int. Math. Res. Not. IMRN*, (1):91–111, 2020.
- [MTW05] Mircea Mustață, Shunsuke Takagi, and Kei-ichi Watanabe. F -thresholds and Bernstein-Sato polynomials. In *European Congress of Mathematics*, pages 341–364. Eur. Math. Soc., Zürich, 2005.
- [Pag18] Gilad Pagi. An elementary computation of the F -pure threshold of an elliptic curve. *J. Algebra*, 515:328–343, 2018.
- [SS85] J. Scherk and J. H. M. Steenbrink. On the mixed Hodge structure on the cohomology of the Milnor fibre. *Math. Ann.*, 271(4):641–665, 1985.
- [ST71] M. Sebastiani and R. Thom. Un résultat sur la monodromie. *Invent. Math.*, 13:90–96, 1971.
- [TW04] Shunsuke Takagi and Kei-ichi Watanabe. On F -pure thresholds. *J. Algebra*, 282(1):278–297, 2004.
- [TW18] Shunsuke Takagi and Kei-ichi Watanabe. F -singularities: applications of characteristic p methods to singularity theory [translation of MR3135334]. *Sugaku Expositions*, 31(1):1–42, 2018.

CENTRO DE INVESTIGACIÓN EN MATEMÁTICAS, APARTADO POSTAL 402, 36000 GUANAJUATO, GTO.

E-mail address: `manuel.gonzalez@cimat.mx`

DEPARTAMENTO DE MATEMÁTICAS, CENTRO DE INVESTIGACIÓN Y DE ESTUDIOS AVANZADOS DEL IPN,
APARTADO POSTAL 14-740, 07000 MEXICO CITY, CDMX.

E-mail address: `djaramillo@math.cinvestav.mx`

CENTRO DE INVESTIGACIÓN EN MATEMÁTICAS, APARTADO POSTAL 402, 36000 GUANAJUATO, GTO.

E-mail address: `luisnub@cimat.mx`